UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 112—PART 21

OCTOBER 20, 1966, TO OCTOBER 22, 1966

(PAGES 27879 TO 29116)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1966

J
11
.R
v.112
pt.21

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

United States of America
PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1966

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by Hon. ROSS BASS, a Senator from the State of Tennessee.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Our Father, God, in the abundance of Thy mercy another day is added to the record of the lengthening years, as swift to its close ebbs out our little day. For the tomorrows and their needs we do not pray. For the day of Thy grace which now bathes us in its returning light, give us courage, give us vision, give us wisdom, that we fail not man nor Thee.

Save us from being embittered by ingratitude, pettiness, or meanness, and from cowardly compromise in the world battle now raging for the minds of men. May we fight the good fight whose issue will mold the future, knowing that soon the night cometh when no man can work.

May Thy kingdom of love and righteousness come within us, that we may contribute worthily to mankind's abiding peace.

Thus, may we—

"Rise up, O men of God,
Have done with lesser things.
Give heart and mind and soul and strength,
To serve the King of Kings."

We ask it in the Name which is above every name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., October 20, 1966.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ROSS BASS, a Senator from the State of Tennessee, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BASS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, October 19, 1966, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it was with a sense of sorrow that I received the news of the passing of our late colleague, Senator Harry F. Byrd, Sr., of Virginia.

Senator Byrd served many years in this body, and was for much of that time a powerful influence on the direction in which the Congress—and by the same token, the Nation—would go. He was always considerate of others; and while he and I were on different sides from time to time, he was always most understanding, he was always a gentleman, he was always considerate.

While the news was not unexpected, nevertheless, it does leave a sense of sadness which words fail to express, but which the heart feels.

I wish at this time to extend to the family of my old friend the deepest condolences and sympathy of Mrs. Mansfield and myself, and to assure them that, as far as the Senator from Montana is concerned, the many contributions which Senator Byrd made toward the betterment of his State and our country will be remembered for decades to come, and will serve as an enduring monument to his efforts in this body and in Richmond.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to join in expressing sorrow on the death of Harry Byrd, Sr. The Nation has lost one of its truly great leaders, and those of us who have had the privilege of serving in the Senate with him will always treasure his friendship.

To me, Harry Byrd will be remembered as a man of absolute integrity, absolute honesty, and absolute courage. In his death, Harry Byrd symbolizes—to me, at least—the end of a vanishing era of public men who stood to the end in the awareness of the true and ultimate responsibility, which was to his country and to history.

Mrs. Carlson and I wish to extend our sincerest sympathy to the family.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, for a year now we have missed the calm judgment and influence of Harry Byrd, Sr., with whom we had served so long.

I do not know exactly what to say on this occasion, but I do want to say that, while Harry Byrd had a viewpoint which was different from that of some of us, yet we should be eternally grateful for that fact, because he had a stabilizing and balancing effect upon Congress and upon the Nation.

He had a great following throughout the country of those people who felt that at times Congress was attempting to go too far and too fast. We know in our hearts that at times we do try to go too far and too fast.

So I simply wish to say that I, too, shall miss Harry, realizing that he will not ever be with us again; but we are thankful for the influence which he wielded while he was with us.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. While driving to the Capitol this morning, Mr. President, I heard the sad news of the passing of former U.S. Senator Harry Byrd, Sr. I listened on the radio to a very sweet tribute by the majority leader, Mr. MANSFIELD, and an equally moving salute by the minority leader, Mr. DIRKSEN, who is, unhappily, in Walter Reed Hospital, awaiting an operation.

The late Harry F. Byrd was every inch a gentleman, and every inch an able public servant, who in his day must have been one of the outstanding chief executives of the great State of Virginia and who, surely, during his long tenure in the U.S. Senate, was one of the leaders in this Chamber. He remained loyal to his own principles and his own code, as each of us should. But his friendships were not measured by politics or which side of an issue you were on, with Harry Byrd.

I mourn his passing. With all my colleagues, I join in sending the deepest of condolences to his children, to all his family. We will never forget the late Senator from Virginia, his devotion to his trust as he saw the light, and the warm and great friendships which he had for his colleagues in the Senate.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to our beloved late colleague, Harry Byrd.

It may well be said that one could disagree with Harry Byrd, but never be disagreeable with him. He himself could never be disagreeable. He was a chivalrous man, a very gentle and considerate man; and I think that his tenure in the Senate may be characterized as folklore in this great institution. He was ever watchful of the Government's purse. He was ever apprehensive of responsibility to the taxpayer, and how he would have to respond in order to meet the many requirements of Government.

I had a personal attachment to Harry Byrd. I looked up to him almost as a son would look to a father. I think the greatest compliment that he ever paid me was when he suggested at one time that possibly I should apply for membership on his Committee on Finance, well knowing at the time that I might often disagree with Harry Byrd. But even recognizing that fact, he made that gesture to me, which really warmed me and increased the great affection that I had for him.

His service as Senator—reaching from March 4, 1933, to the hour of his voluntary retirement—covered the most critical era in our country's history.

Harry Flood Byrd, Sr., made much of that history and this Virginian leaves a heritage of honor to his loved ones.

Our sympathy goes to those loved ones and especially to his son, namesake, and successor in these halls, HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

The end did not come without warning. Indeed, we have been expecting it for days and weeks. But like everything else, even when the expected does happen we are stunned. I know that all of us regret his passing and I know, indeed, that the Senate will miss him, but more particularly, the country has lost a great and devoted public servant who toiled with such industry and integrity to promote the prosperity and security of our beloved land.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in the death of former Senator Harry F. Byrd, Sr., I have lost a dear friend. Virginia has lost its most distinguished citizen. He served in the U.S. Senate longer than any Senator from Virginia, and with a distinction surpassed by no Virginia Senator in the past 100 years.

It was my good fortune to have been closely associated with Senator Byrd, Sr., in Virginia politics for the past 50 years. We served in the State senate together from 1916 to 1923. I had become a member of his cabinet when he became Governor in 1926, and we both entered the 73d Congress—I on the House side and he on the Senate side.

Having known the record of Virginia Governors for a long period, having studied their records before I entered public life, I am definitely of the opinion that the accomplishments of Byrd as Governor of Virginia were on a par with his accomplishments as a U.S. Senator.

It was as a U.S. Senator that Byrd won national recognition and fame. Year after year as a member of the Senate Finance Committee, and later as its chairman, he worked on an ever-increasing program of Federal taxation. During 10 of my years in the House I was privileged to help write 12 tax bills, which then came to the Senate Finance Committee. So that even before I joined him as his colleague in the Senate, I was quite familiar with the fine work he was doing in the field of taxation.

Senator Byrd, Sr. had qualities I have always regarded as essential to success in business or politics—character, courage, integrity, commonsense, and a willingness to sacrifice in order to reach an objective.

His work in the Senate for more than 30 years in behalf of sound fiscal policies will long be remembered.

His life was devoted to serving the people of Virginia. There is no area of the State with which his name is not connected, and no area that will fail to note his passing with a deep sense of sorrow. History will record him as a truly great American.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me join the Senator from Virginia in commemorating the service in the Senate of Harry Flood Byrd. I knew Senator Byrd through family connections before I came to the Senate. I know of no one who was more respected, more able, and more loved than Harry Flood Byrd when he was a Member of the Senate. Conscientious, hard working, and understanding he chaired the Finance Committee for many years and his reports were always clear, concise, and helpful.

Whether we agreed with him—and often we did not because of his conservative attitude toward government—we always respected his point of view and knew that he stood for the things which he believed clearly were for the best interests of his State and country.

Certainly his long period of leadership in Virginia politics, was accomplished because his motives were those which had the best interests of his State at heart, rather than for any personal gain which might have come to him, his family, or those close to him.

In his death, we mourn a great American statesman in the best sense of the word. I wish to join the Senator from Virginia in these few remarks about a great friend and former colleague.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Texas, who is not present today, has asked me to make the following statement in his behalf:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR TOWER READ BY SENATOR KUCHEL

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I wish to join others of my distinguished colleagues to mourn the passing of Harry Flood Byrd. The death of this great legislator will not mark the end of an age but instead brings to a close the life of an American statesman who served the Old Dominion and the United States for nearly half a century. Senator Byrd was a source of guidance and encouragement to me when I arrived on Capitol Hill. Senators of both parties grew to admire and respect Senator Byrd, not only when we agreed with him, but because he was a man who stood firmly and resolutely to the fundamental principles of Jeffersonian doctrines of democratic government. His adherence to philosophy was wider than party lines. An early supporter of Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal, Harry Byrd thrice aided Republicans in carrying the Old Dominion for the National GOP ticket.

For 79 years, the life of Harry Byrd was symbolic of his belief in the American system of hard work as the road to success. Harry Byrd left school at the age of 15 and helped his father to rescue an ailing newspaper, turning it into financial solvency. Byrd rebuilt the family fortune and provided education for his two younger brothers.

Harry Byrd's mark on Virginia and upon the Senate will long be remembered. As State legislator, Virginia Governor, and finally as U.S. Senator for five terms, Harry Byrd was a leader in the fight for a sound economy based on a "pay as you go" basis, and carried his beliefs to the front as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee.

A kind, soft-spoken, compassionate gentleman, Harry Byrd was a paragon of political prowess and principle. His influence never waned to ruthless domination. Political historian V. O. Key, in his monumental book on southern politics, lauded the Byrd Democratic organization as being one of the few such organizations whose political domination was never tainted with the slightest corruption.

I shall miss the wise counsel of Senator Byrd and wish to extend my condolences to his entire family. His life has ended, but his ideals will be cherished by Members of Congress for decades to come.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to pay my respects to the memory of Senator Harry Byrd.

I do not think I need to labor the point to the Senate that he and I disagreed on many things and on basic philosophy as to the direction of our country in terms of individual policies. But, certainly, we both had the same deep feeling for the mission and future of our country as the very model of justice and of integrity and of beneficence for all mankind. I found such a rugged integrity, such warmth of heart and breadth of spirit in Harry Byrd.

He was a man who did his homework. I had many discussions with him in his office about the world's gold problems, imbalance of international trade, our trade problems, the Federal Reserve, and the way in which our internal economy was organized; and these discussions indicated to me a most impressive grasp of the subjects with which he dealt as chairman of the Committee on Finance.

In addition, he was a little adventurous. He went along with me on one occasion on a bill which opened the doors to modern art forms in the United States. He said that even though he did not like them, he knew other people did, and he was convinced they were art, and he helped me immeasurably in passing that legislation.

So, Mr. President, I rise to speak for his posterity—of course, his son serves in the Senate—of the kind of warmth of heart and breadth of character and diligence which characterized Harry Byrd. I extend my condolences to the family, which has a cherished and most distinguished memory in Harry Byrd, Sr.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, all of us are deeply saddened today by the death of former Senator Harry F. Byrd, Sr., of Virginia. Our sadness as individuals is accentuated, I think, in direct proportion to the years we spent in association with him here in the Senate. He is one great American who had the abiding faith and confidence—whether in agreement or disagreement made no difference—of his associates in the Senate.

He had the courage of his convictions, and in every sense of the word was a truly great American, defending the great traditions of the Nation and the interests of his great State.

I think at a later date we will have occasion to say more about the late Senator Byrd, but at this time, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a fine editorial entitled "Senator Byrd," published in today's Washington Daily News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From The Washington Daily News, Oct. 20, 1966]

SENATOR BYRD

In the 178 years of the United States Senate, there may have been senators who were more colorful, senators of greater oratorical flair, senators of more consuming ambition, senators who splashed the headlines farther and wider.

But Sen. Harry Flood Byrd could match any of them in personal integrity, in consistency of principle, in authentic knowledge of the Government as it grew to monster proportions, in dogged devotion to his office, in political independence, and in the influence he exerted because of all these things.

Even in the illness which led to his death Sen. Byrd exhibited the sense of honor and duty which was essential in his character. He resigned from the Senate when the illness began to diminish his capacity for work—even tho he apparently was unaware of the full nature of his ailment.

Harry Byrd was a career man in government—from 1915 when he was elected to the Virginia State Senate until he gave up the seat in the United States Senate he had held for 33 years. Other than one term as Governor, the U.S. Senate had been his home.

This is where he served with grace, balance and militant loyalty to his beliefs—ever the understanding representative of his state, but never unthinking or indifferent to the interests of his country, as he saw them. And he saw with remarkable clartly, despite the revolutionary and emotional shifts in the politics of his time.

Harry Byrd was a Senator who oppcsed Presidents, regardless of their party, their power or their popularity. He also was a Senator on whom Presidents, regardless of party or other factors, came to lean on and trust.

There seldom was a time when Harry Byrd's position on an issue was not known, clearly and with reasons. And on the rare occasions when he chose to withhold a decision for some purpose his ultimate announcement was anxiously awaited by partisans on both sides.

It was not necessary always to agree with Harry Byrd to admire and respect him. Whether he stood with the majority or in dissent, he had the capacity to make his position convincingly logical.

The United States Senate was much the richer because of him—and so is the whole institution of representative government.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, we were all saddened grievously this morning on the news of the passing of our beloved friend, Harry F. Byrd, Sr. I did not have the information or an opportunity to be on the floor of the Senate when earlier remarks were made by the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson].

Mr. President, I wish to say for the Record that I regarded Harry F. Byrd, Sr., as not only one of the greatest of our Americans of this age, and one of the finest Senators we have had here for many years, but I was happy to count him among my dearly loved friends. I have missed him greatly this year. I think every Senator who has had the opportunity to enjoy his hospitality and that of his late wife and family out at Rosemont, their beautiful home at Berryville, Va., will remember with gratitude and nostalgia our visits there.

The home of Harry F. Byrd, Sr., is situated in a grove of great oaks, and it is likewise within one of his well loved apple orchards, facing the Blue Ridge he mentioned so frequently and loved so greatly. It is a beautiful place.

He opened his grounds to the traveling public, whoever they were and from wherever they had come. Mr. President, I want the Record to show the hospitality and generous attitude of this great man never showed to better advantage than in the fact that he made his home and his grounds open to the public at all times.

Mr. President, words would be meaningless because they could not add to the reputation and stature and greatness of Harry Byrd, Sr.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this time as a part of my remarks, an editorial which appears in this afternoon's edition of the Washington Star entitled "Harry F. Byrd."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HARRY F. BYRD

When an ailing Harry Flood Byrd resigned from the United States Senate last November after 32 years of continuous service, he carefully returned $594.99 to the government representing the unused remainder of his Senate stationery account.

The gesture was characteristic. Under the rules, members may keep such funds. But in large things and small, Senator Byrd had always been meticulous about how taxpayer money was handled.

Now, after a lingering, cruel illness, he is gone, the last influential and consistent voice in Congress against federal deficits and welfare spending. Even those who disagreed with his unyielding attitude in fiscal matters must feel concern that the restraint he exercised will no longer be felt.

This descendant of an old and aristocratic family changed the face of his state. While serving as governor of Virginia from 1925 to 1932, his administration linked fiscal conservatism with social progress. He found the state $1.3 million in the red and left it with a $4.2 million surplus. He got a tough anti-lynching law enacted, streamlined the state constitution with 80 amendments, and helped lay the foundation for the prodigious industrial growth Virginia has experienced in recent years.

In the Senate, the Byrd record puzzled many, but there was a thread of conservative consistency and principle running through it. If he opposed a $100 million loan to Spain on financial grounds, he also was capable of an internationalist attitude, voting in favor of NATO, a Trade Agreements Act extension, the Bretton Woods Agreement, and ratification of the U.N. He is remembered for a policy of "massive resistance" in racial matters, yet Hary Byrd never used the issue in the demagogue fashion of men like Alabama's George Wallace.

In the past decade, Senator Byrd may have thought he often spoke to an empty room. The rushing change of America into an urban, welfare-oriented community seemed to have left him a political anachronism. Yet when he announced his intention to retire back in 1958, the response was astonishing. Not only did the letters pour in from his state pleading for him to stay on, but from all over the nation. Typically, he won that year by nearly a three-to-one margin.

Courtly, gentle, privately generous to a fault, beloved by his colleagues on both sides of the Senate aisle, Senator Byrd stuck by his principles throughout his life. In so doing he earned the respect of all.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think that Senators will find this editorial speaks for most of us in its appraisal of his greatness, his generosity, and his fine humanity. Most people who have heard of him as a great Senator do not think of him as a wonderful human being.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I wish to concur in the eloquent remarks which the distinguished Senator from Florida has made about the late Harry F. Byrd, Sr.

Only those who served closely and intimately with this great Senator had or could have a full appreciation of the kindliness, the gentility, and the fineness of the man.

He has departed from us now, and with his passing has gone the gentility and dedication to public service and responsible conservatism, the like of which we shall not soon see again.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for his truthful and eloquent remarks which certainly, I want to say, speak for me also.

In closing, Mr. President, let me read for the Record the closing paragraph in the editorial:

> Courtly, gentle, privately generous to a fault, beloved by his colleagues on both sides of the Senate aisle, Senator Byrd stuck by his principles throughout his life. In so doing he earned the respect of all.

Mr. President, Harry F. Byrd, Sr., certainly had the respect of everyone who knew him.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I join with others of my colleagues in recognizing the sad passing of our former colleague, Senator Harry F. Byrd. It has been my privilege to serve on the Finance Committee for some 14 years, under his chairmanship for the last several years of his service.

I have not words to express the value of this man to his country during his many years of service, and the depth of the friendship he was able to generate in the hearts of those who served with him.

Mr. President, our colleague, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], is necessarily absent today, and he has asked me to offer to the Senate a short statement expressing his feelings on the passing of former Senator Byrd. I ask unanimous consent that the statement of Senator HRUSKA may appear in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HRUSKA

It was with great sadness that I learned of the passing of Senator Harry Flood Byrd. In the 12 years that it was my pleasure to serve with him in the Senate, my admiration for this wonderful man grew with each passing year.

Harry Byrd was the essence of integrity, honesty, and courage. While we may not experience the sorrow which is felt by his family, a sense of loss must be felt not only by the people of his native State of Virginia but by those in every State of our Nation. Each of us must share in the loss of this man who for more than half a century worked tirelessly and selflessly for those abiding principles of our democracy to which he was totally committed.

This great man has left a superior record of devoted service in which his country was always considered before his party and the best interest of the people before his personal popularity.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, each year, as regularly as the winter season, a box of apples has greeted all of us serving in the U.S. Senate. These apples have become a tradition, just as the man who bestowed them had become a tradition.

These apples were, of course, a gift from Senator Harry F. Byrd. They were a lavish counterpoint to a man who built a remarkable record and fine reputation for frugality.

I mention these apples because, to me, they came to typify the man. For Harry F. Byrd was kind and generous. And yet, certainly he was the least lavish when it came to spending the taxpayer's dollar or when it came to matters of public trust.

As chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, Harry F. Byrd was a proponent of sound government and an opponent of reckless spending. The people of this Nation owe him a great debt of gratitude for his dedication to that ideal, for he was an effective advocate.

His death is a great loss to Virginia and a great loss to the Nation. But it is here in the Senate where he served so well for 33 years that the loss of his service is perhaps most keenly felt.

I join with my colleagues in expressing grief at his passing. We share with his family and closest personal friends a deep and abiding sorrow.

A Senator BYRD of a younger generation is here to carry on his father's work and, incidentally, to carry on the tradition of the apples. But the apples will always represent the elder Senator Byrd to me—a symbol of his personal warmth and his generosity to match his public record of devotion to the principle that public moneys and public trust must have a firm and frugal overseer.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I was deeply saddened to learn of the passing of our highly esteemed and beloved former colleague, Senator Harry F. Byrd, Sr. My admiration for Senator Byrd knew no bounds.

Senator Harry Byrd, Sr., first came to the U.S. Senate in 1933 after having been one of the youngest Governors the Commonwealth of Virginia ever elected as its chief executive. He served with the highest distinction in this body until November of 1965, when he resigned.

Senator Byrd's tenure of office spanned the administrations of four Presidents of the United States, and concluded during the administration of a fifth. During this period of time, his advice and wise counsel was often sought, not only by his colleagues in the Senate, but by Presidents as well. Had his advice been followed more often, these United States would be in a much better situation today, financially and in all other ways. Senator Byrd was a man with the courage of his firmly held convictions—convictions arrived at only after the most careful deliberations backed by the experience of a lifetime of public service. He was the personification of the constitutionalist, for he revered the Constitution of the United States and resisted all attempts to deviate from its provisions. Senator Byrd was particularly noted for his never-ending fight to keep Government spending within the resources of the Treasury. For these efforts, he won the well-earned nickname, "Watchdog of the Treasury." He believed that no government, the same as no individual, can continue, year after year, to spend more money than it takes in and remain solvent and free. His predictions in this regard are, unfortunately, beginning to come true.

Above all, Senator Harry F. Byrd, Sr., was a scholar and a gentleman. He harbored no ill will toward any man and at all times conducted himself in the courtly and genteel manner which was the product of his rearing.

The Nation has lost a great man and the world has lost an outstanding humanitarian. During a lifetime devoted to public service, Senator Harry Byrd carved for himself a niche in history. He will be remembered fondly in the hearts of his fellow countrymen right along with the many other outstanding men of public service which Virginia has produced, including George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and Robert E. Lee.

His son, HARRY F. BYRD, JR., an able Member of this body who is following in the footsteps of his esteemed father, and other members of the Byrd family, have my heartfelt sympathy in this time of bereavement.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to one of the finest gentlemen, one of the most outstanding Senators to ever serve in this body, and one of the truly great statesmen of the 20th century, Harry Flood Byrd, Sr.

As everyone knows, Senator Byrd represented a philosophy which, though once a roaring fire, is fast and most regrettably becoming only a flickering flame in this age in our national history. His voice on the floor of the Senate was heard for nearly 33 years. He had a deep love for his State and our country which he so ably represented and served in many capacities for over 50 years. He possessed the unique faculty of being able to cut through directly to the point of an issue and when principles were at stake, he was quick to join the fight. Never throughout his illustrious career did he sway from a dominant theme of fiscal responsibility, economy, efficiency, and integrity in government. He lent his tremendous capacities to a broad spectrum of national problems, including the development of an efficient and fully prepared defense system, to studies of Federal subsidies, unexpanded balances, and foreign currency; in the field of foreign relations, with respect to the Trade Agreements Act; in agriculture, to rural electrification, soil conservation, and flexible parity; in labor, to a continuation of our free enterprise system; and in finance, as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee from 1955 until his retirement last year.

He was a kind and generous man, ever thoughtful, always willing to listen and reason and bend or yield when logic demanded and principles were not compromised. Mr. President, during the 24 years I have been a Member of this body, I have served with 309 different Senators representing, of course, every State in this Nation. I can truly say that among them I never had a closer or better friend, and I have served with no one whom I respected more as a man, as a statesman, and as a true, loyal, and devoted American. He had always my profound admiration. I mourn his death, and Mrs. McClellan joins me in heartfelt sympathy to those relatives and countless friends who survived him.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, this morning we lost one of the truly great men of our time.

It was with a heavy heart that we heard last year of Senator Harry Byrd's decision to retire.

But we know that he retired for good reason.

We recognized that he had earned retirement's time for quiet, reflection, and the opportunity to do the many things that a man in public office never seems to have time to do.

Senator Harry Byrd made a unique contribution to the history and the betterment of our country.

This generation and the generations to follow will benefit from his many and varied contributions.

Senator Harry Byrd was always an effective spokesman and doer for the things in which he believed, for the country, and for his beloved Virginia.

He was a man of great integrity, strong of conviction, and firm in his view of right and wrong.

Yet he always remained gentle and warm in manner, unfailingly kind and considerate.

I shall always cherish the memory of having known and worked with him.

He was a great American, a great U.S. Senator, and most importantly of all, a great human being.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] has asked me to make the following statement for him.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CURTIS READ BY SENATOR CARLSON

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, my admiration and my affection for Harry Byrd have been that of a younger colleague who senses the awesome privilege it is to serve in this body with men whose place in immortality has been assured them. My initial awe was overcome by his gentle nature, his understanding, his complete fairness. Wrath for his fellowman was unknown to him. He was kind and wise, and he has brought to us those virtues of our founding fathers—faith in America and its unique institutions. May we honor this legacy by giving them heed and preserving them for generations yet to be born.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the passing of Harry Byrd has taken from us a man who for years was the voice of Virginia and a leader of men in this body.

He came from a State rich in tradition. He became a tradition himself, and he carried his position well. He entered the Senate shortly after I was born and the men he knew and grew with were men of my father's years.

It was this difference in generations and ideas that made it difficult for me to know Harry Byrd well. We were more often in disagreement than in agreement, yet I recognized that what this man sought for his State and country, he sought because of an unbending commitment to what he thought was right.

Many of the programs and new directions in our Nation that he resisted nonetheless prevailed. Senator Byrd accepted these reversals while yielding nothing in his personal and public struggle against changes that he felt violated his beliefs.

A legislator cannot be faulted for this—it is the hope of us all to be remembered for our courage, our convictions, and our dedication to basic political beliefs. It was this quality of Harry Byrd's that impressed me as a new legislator. And the recollection of his way will, I am sure, serve to assist me in advancing those matters that I hold to be in the public interest.

I express my sincere condolences to his family, his son my colleague, and to the great State of Virginia for their loss today.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the paramount figures in the annals of the Senate has died. Harry Flood Byrd was one of the strongest of Senators, one of the most tenacious of statesmen, most able and honorable of men.

His convictions were as durable as any set of principles could conceivably be. I know that his work in the Senate was ever guided by an innate and eternal concern for country, that this life was one of industrious service and constant attention to principle.

I am especially indebted to him for the assistance he provided in working for the creation of the Padre Island National Seashore. That assistance reflected his continuous concern for preserving our natural resources, and bringing them to a greater number of our citizens. He always supported national parks and other conservation measures.

At the time of his death Senator Byrd was the head of one of America's most illustrious and storied families. Although the seat of that family was in Virginia, it is satisfying to me that the Byrds were not without their Texas ties. Senator Byrd's grandfather was an adjutant general of the State of Texas in 1861 and a lieutenant colonel in a Texas regiment during the Civil War. Senator Byrd's father was born in my home city of Austin, Tex.

And so, Mr. President, I rise to express my respects to a man of deep belief, and lasting worth who will be a long-remembered figure of the 20th century. I extend, also, my greatest sympathy to his son and successor, and to the other members of the Byrd family.

A JUNIOR SENATOR'S TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HARRY BYRD

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, although I knew Senator Harry Byrd, Sr., of Virginia, for only a few years, I share the sorrow of his older associates in the passing of this great American.

Senator Byrd was one of the first senior Members of this body with whom I had any extended personal discussion when I entered the Senate. I was immediately captivated by his human qualities, his charm, his personal interest in each of us, and his consideration of all his colleagues, freshmen and senior Senators alike. I recall one conversation when he took the time to urge me to take good care of my health and to exercise daily—not only for personal reasons but also to maintain physical and mental fitness to do effective work.

I shall always appreciate that, as an extremely busy committee chairman, he was not only accessible, but cooperative and helpful in regard to all the problems I took to him.

I extend my sympathy to our distinguished colleague, Senator HARRY BYRD, JR., and to other members of the family, for I share with them a very real sense of loss in the passing of this illustrious man and good friend. We can be consoled in the knowledge that he led a long and fruitful life and that his proud name will be carried with distinction by his able son, HARRY BYRD, JR.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, Senator Harry Flood Byrd, Sr., was one of the great men of the 20th century.

In his passing the State of Virginia has lost a valuable public servant—our country has lost one of its most respected statesmen—the U.S. Senate has lost one of its ablest and most valuable Members—and I have lost a personal friend.

I join his host of friends throughout America in extending sympathy to the members of his family.

Volumes could be written about the achievements and the character of Senator Byrd, but after all has been said it could be summed up in just a few words—he was a man of integrity and courage, with the strength of his convictions. He was a gentleman, and we are all better men as the result of having known him.

I ask unanimous consent that a series of articles and editorials concerning our friend and colleague be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 22, 1966]

END OF AN ERA: BYRD DEATH, SALTONSTALL LOSS DEPLORED

(By William S. White)

The 89th Congress is drawing to its close in an atmosphere more poignant than is all the usual air of nostalgia and Auld Lang Syne.

For it is saying a farewell to its last human embodiments of an otherwise long-since outdated politics, a politics alike of aristocratic privilege and of a matchless aristrocratic sense of personal responsibility.

Two long-lived symbols of this tradition are departing with this Congress—the one, former Sen. Harry Flood Byrd of Virginia, in death, and the other, Sen. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL of Massachusetts, in voluntary retirement. With their departure, Congress as an institution, and more specifically the Senate, will never be the same again.

For Byrd and SALTONSTALL for years had stood as extraordinarily uncommon men in a political world long since seized by common men.

To be sure, Harry Flood Byrd Sr., in a sense survives through his son, Sen. HARRY FLOOD BYRD JR., assuming the younger BYRD's reelection in November. But in a deeper sense an era has ended with the old gentleman's death in Berryville, Virginia, just as it has ended in the decision of Sen. SALTONSTALL to spend the remainder of his life in his native Massachusetts.

Both Byrd and SALTONSTALL in some ways reflected the political life of a century ago. Both fitted the old concept of the Senate as really a meeting place of powerful personal ambassadors from a congeries of sovereign states.

Neither was ever a partisan as we know partisanship today. And though the Virginian was officially a Democrat and the New Englander officially a Republican, these were titles more of convenience than of reality.

For at the end of it, each voted pretty much as he saw fit, paying an absent-minded deference to party considerations in the small and housekeeping matters.

Neither, moreover, was an ideological man even though the one, Byrd, was endlessly presented as a determined "conservative" and the other, SALTONSTALL as an habitual "moderate." What both really tried to do, though each had his own way of going about it, was to defend old values which were never partisan and never ideological, either.

Though Byrd was almost universally seen as a man who simply wanted to keep the Federal budget balanced, he was in truth a man who most of all wanted to keep this a society with the governing powers deliberately split up and diffused about as the Americans of the 18th century had planned.

SALTONSTALL, for his part, wanted much the same thing in reality. For in his heart the increasing federalization, the increasingly gray homogenization of this country, was no more his cup of tea than it was Byrd's cup of tea.

This did not mean that they were opposed to democratic solution; and it never meant they were lacking in compassion, or hostile to change simply as change. But both were skeptical of change for its own sake—and both were profoundly attached to the ultimate interests of the Nation itself.

They may have been wrong in many things. All the same they were irreplaceable. For they spoke for a kind of public life which gleamed with a personal integrity as it shone with a personal courage not too common any more.

It goes without saying that they were great friends, this Yankee throwback patrician who is SALTONSTALL, and this Southern throwback patrician who was Byrd. And each knew power in the Senate—Byrd a great power indeed for a long time and SALTONSTALL a more casual and lesser demanding power—but neither ever sought power so much as he allowed power to come to him.

Each was undemanding in a place notable for stridency and urgency. Both spoke infrequently and softly, but each had a personal influence as gossamer as moonlight and as real as steel.

They were instinctive charter members of what this columnist once described as the inner club of the Senate which at last rules the human tone of the Senate even on those many occasions when it cannot control the actions of the Senate.

With the going of Harry Flood Byrd Sr., and LEVERETT SALTONSTALL the inner club has lost unelected officers who can never be replaced.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Oct. 20, 1966]

HARRY F. BYRD

When an ailing Harry Flood Byrd resigned from the United States Senate last November after 32 years of continuous service, he carefully returned $594.99 to the government representing the unused remainder of his Senate stationery account.

The gesture was characteristic. Under the rules, members may keep such funds. But in large things and small, Senator Byrd had always been meticulous about how taxpayer money was handled.

Now, after a lingering, cruel illness, he is gone, the last influential and consistent voice in Congress against federal deficits and welfare spending. Even those who disagreed with his unyielding attitude in fiscal matters must feel concern that the restraint he exercised will no longer be felt.

This descendant of an old and aristocratic family changed the face of his state. While serving as governor of Virginia from 1925 to 1932, his administration linked fiscal conservatism with social progress. He found the state $1.3 million in the red and left it with a $4.2 million surplus. He got a tough anti-lynching law enacted, streamlined the state constitution with 80 amendments, and helped lay the foundation for the prodigious industrial growth Virginia has experienced in recent years.

In the Senate, the Byrd record puzzled many, but there was a thread of conservative consistency and principle running through it. If he opposed a $100 million loan to Spain on financial grounds, he also was capable of an internationalist attitude, voting in favor of NATO, a Trade Agreements Act extension, the Bretton Woods Agreement, and ratification of the U.N. He is remembered for a policy of "massive resistance" in racial matters, yet Harry Byrd never used the issue in the demagogue fashion of men like Alabama's George Wallace.

In the past decade, Senator Byrd may have thought he often spoke to an empty room. The rushing change of America into an urban, welfare-oriented community seemed to have left him a political anachronism. Yet when he announced his intention to retire back in 1958, the response was astonishing. Not only did the letters pour in from his state pleading for him to stay on, but from all over the nation. Typically, he won that year by nearly a three-to-one margin.

Courtly, gentle, privately generous to a fault, beloved by his colleagues on both sides of the Senate aisle, Senator Byrd stuck by his principles throughout his life. In so doing he earned the respect of all.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Oct. 21, 1966]

BYRD: MAN OF COURAGE, INTEGRITY

(By David Lawrence)

Harry F. Byrd of Virginia is gone, but the lesson which his career teaches has an enduring significance. For he manifested courage and integrity amid the hypocrisies of political life.

There are all sorts of definitions of "conservatism" being publicized, but most of them do not fit Harry Byrd. Nor could he be described by many of the other "isms" and phrases which are being currently used to describe persons who do not believe in misapplying other people's money to gain even temporarily the voting support of selfish groups.

Simply stated, the departed senator was unequivocally the champion of common honesty in government and of a public servant's obligation to spend taxpayers' money and borrowed funds with the same frugality as if it were his own private income.

Harry Byrd was known countrywide as a "progressive" when he became governor of Virginia in 1926. He put through the state legislature the nation's first anti-lynching law, and there hasn't been a lynching since in Virginia. He undertook a major highway-building program and put it on a pay-as-you-go basis. He reorganized the state government by consolidating about 100 agencies into 12 departments.

Governor Byrd came to the United States Senate on March 4, 1933—the dismal day when all the banks throughout the country were ordered closed indefinitely. He had supported Franklin D. Roosevelt because of the pledge in the Democratic party's 1932 platform that federal expenses would be cut by at least 25 percent.

It was over this issue that he later had differences with the administration, but he always felt he was one of the original New Dealers and that it was not he but others who had strayed from the party platform.

But why was Senator Byrd so absorbed in the subject of sound fiscal policy? The fact is he was frustrated as a young man due to the financial difficulties of his parents and he couldn't afford to go to college. He took over, at the age of 15, the weekly newspaper established by his family which had been plunged into bankruptcy. As he gradually met with success, he bought a tract of land and became one of the largest growers of apples in the world.

What Harry Byrd learned in trying to make ends meet produced an indelible impression on his mind, as so often happens with self-made men. It unquestionably had a lasting effect on the way he dealt with issues in his public career in later years.

Above all, Harry Byrd followed the commands of an ever-present conscience, irrespective of the temptations of politics. He never voted on any bill that could affect his own property. He didn't accept a cent of federal money for his farming operations and once had a technical amendment inserted in a law that would disqualify him from benefiting from a measure affecting certain types of securities he held.

He regarded public office as a sacred responsibility—a trusteeship which required an unswerving fidelity to the cause of fiscal as well as social responsibility.

Many of the theorists of today have never known what it means to borrow money from a bank or accept capital from investors to start and carry on a business, and then to meet these obligations. Senator Byrd thought of public funds in the same way, because he never forgot that individual citizens struggling for a livelihood paid out their hard-earned money in taxes every year with a blind faith that the governmental authorities would deal honestly with the citizens' earnings.

Harry Byrd was brought up in the school of practical experience—not just theory. He always had ideals of a progressive but the common sense of a conservative who knows that, however honestly a man may operate his business, he is no less a bankrupt if he fails to pay back what he owes. The same concept was applied by Senator Byrd to the fundamentals of government finance.

But anybody who, like the late Virginia senator, today dissents from the whimsical doctrines of expediency and insists instead on constitutional methods is called a "negativist." The speeches of Senator Byrd will long be remembered as a series of warnings on the biggest single issue that faces the American people today—how to keep the government from going "bankrupt."

(The foregoing was written at the time Harry Byrd left the United States Senate in November 1965. With his passing, it is presented now as a tribute to an American citizen who in his lifetime contributed much to his state and nation.)

[From the Washington (D.C.) News, Oct. 20, 1966]

SENATOR BYRD

In the 178 years of the United States Senate, there may have been senators who were more colorful, senators of greater oratorical flair, senators of more consuming ambition, senators who splashed the headlines farther and wider.

But Sen. Harry Flood Byrd could match any of them in personal integrity, in consistency of principle, in authentic knowledge of the Government as it grew to monster proportions, in dogged devotion to his office, in political independence, and in the influence he exerted because of all these things.

Even in the illness which led to his death Sen. Byrd exhibited the sense of honor and duty which was essential in his character. He resigned from the Senate when the illness began to diminish his capacity for work—even tho he apparently was unaware of the full nature of his ailment.

Harry Byrd was a career man in government—from 1915 when he was elected to the Virginia State Senate until he gave up the seat in the United States Senate he had held for 33 years. Other than one term as Governor, the U.S. Senate had been his home.

This is where he served with grace, balance and militant loyalty to his beliefs—ever the understanding representative of his state, but never unthinking or indifferent to the interests of his country, as he saw them. And he saw with remarkable clarity, despite the revolutionary and emotional shifts in the politics of his time.

Harry Byrd was a Senator who opposed Presidents, regardless of their party, their power or their popularity. He also was a Senator on whom Presidents, regardless of party or other factors, came to lean on and trust.

There seldom was a time when Harry Byrd's position on an issue was not known, clearly and with reasons. And on the rare occasions when he chose to withhold a decision for some purpose his ultimate announcement was anxiously awaited by partisans on both sides.

It was not necessary always to agree with Harry Byrd to admire and respect him. Whether he stood with the majority or in dissent, he had the capacity to make his position convincingly logical.

The United States Senate was much the richer because of him—and so is the whole institution of representative government.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Oct. 20, 1966]

A Champion of Conservatism Is Lost in Byrd's Death

(By Alex R. Preston)

The death today of former Sen. Harry F. Byrd Sr. wrote the final chapter to a career that has had few equals from the standpoint of the prestige he commanded in Virginia and the conservative influence he exerted in Congress.

Byrd, who in 33 years in the Senate became the nation's leading symbol of fiscal economy and conservatism, announced his retirement Nov. 11, 1965, at the age of 78 because of ill health.

The announcement was made through former Gov. A. S. Harrison Jr., who, two days later, appointed the senator's son, Harry F. Byrd Jr., to serve an interim appointment until the unexpired five years could be filled in the November 1966 election. Byrd Jr., is now a candidate for re-election.

Once before, in 1958, the elder Byrd had sought to retire, giving as his reason the illness of his wife and their desire to spend their days together at their home, Rosemont, at Berryville.

The General Assembly immediately asked him to reconsider. His proposed retirement threatened to split his political organization wide open with the two former governors, John S. Battle and Rep. William M. Tuck, competing to succeed Sen. Byrd.

Mrs. Byrd died Aug. 25, 1964. She had been an invalid much of the time since a heart attack in 1932 and the Senator and Mrs. Byrd would travel together by ambulance between their home and a Washington hotel while Congress was in session.

President Johnson flew to Winchester to attend Mrs. Byrd's funeral. In a touching display of affection, the President strode to the car where the senator was sitting at the right front window. The President grasped the senator's hand and bent low to kiss the back of it.

For most of the years that Sen. Byrd was a member of the Senate, he fought two dragons—deficit spending and encroachments on states' rights by a powerful centralized federal government.

On his annual birthday hike up Old Rag Mountain when he had reached his 75th year on June 10, 1962, he told a reporter:

"I've made my share of mistakes but I've tried to meet every problem in the way I thought best. I am conservative but I do not want to turn the clock back. I believe that the best progress is made on sound fiscal planning.

"Douglas Freeman (the late historian-editor) once called me a progressive based soundly on fiscal conservatism. That's what I think I am."

Sen. Byrd created the phrase "massive resistance" in espousing the South's opposition to the Supreme Court's 1954 desegregation decision. Laying much of the responsibility for that decision on the shoulders of the chief justice, Sen. Byrd in later years refused to identify the tribunal by its name, but referred to it as "the Warren Court."

INFREQUENT SPEECHMAKER

From the day he entered the Senate in 1933, the Virginian made his presence felt by his independence and perseverance in behalf of the principles he believed in.

His speeches were few and far between. But while others talked Senator Byrd frequently wielded a stronger influence in cloak-room consultation with his colleagues. While normally a quiet-spoken man, except when engaging the enemy, Senator Byrd had a faculty for making friends and always was popular with colleagues on both sides of the political aisle.

He was sworn in as a member of the Senate on March 4, 1933, the same day President Franklin D. Roosevelt was inaugurated, but not for more than 20 years did he publicly and actively support the Democratic presidential ticket. This is generally regarded as the factor for Virginia having voted for the Republican nominee in the three presidential elections prior to 1964 when Lyndon Johnson carried the state.

SILENT IN 1960

During President Kennedy's 1960 campaign, the Senator proclaimed he would maintain a "golden silence," which he did.

Ever since he became Virginia's 47th Governor in 1926, the Senator was the leader of an increasingly powerful Democratic organization whose political opponents saw it as "a ruthless machine."

"Organization? Machine? I don't know about that," Senator Byrd said during the mountain climbing interview. "I've been too busy in Washington for too many years * * * I don't have time to do any dictating. Ask any governor. I've never tried to dictate anything to any governor at all.

"I would say we are just a loose organization of friends who believe in sound government."

As head of an influential organization, the Senator seldom openly engaged a candidate of the opposite party in State politics. There was one notable exception, however.

WARS ON BOND ISSUE

That was when Ted Dalton (now a Federal judge) ran for Governor and came within an ace of winning for the Republicans over Democrat Tom Stanley. Dalton made the mistake of urging a bond issue to pay for needed highway construction.

This was the very issue which the Senator had campaigned against when he ran for governor in 1923. He plunged into the Stanley-Dalton campaign with state-wide radio broadcasts scathingly denouncing the bond proposal.

The Senator parted company later with former Gov. J. Lindsay Almond Jr., when the latter abandoned "massive resistance" in order to preserve public schools. President Kennedy gave Almond a recess appointment to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals after the Senate Judiciary Committee had declined to act on an earlier nomination. Senator Byrd's silence was generally believed to be the main factor in the Senate's delay for about a year in confirming Almond.

FOUGHT PUMP-PRIMING

In the early days of the New Deal the Virginian fought against efforts to promote prosperity by pump-priming on borrowed money. But when the second World War started in Europe he fought just as hard for a more adequate defense program in this country before the attack on Pearl Harbor.

In 1941, Sen. Byrd became the first chairman of the Joint House-Senate Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures, through which he continued his fight for a balanced budget. Twice—in 1947 and 1953—the Republicans took control of the Senate, but on both occasions they asked Sen. Byrd to retain the chairmanship. Ordinarily all congressional committees are headed by members of the party in power.

Shortly after his term as governor of Virginia ended, his friends started a move to make him the Old Dominion's favorite son for the Democratic presidential nomination in 1932. Again in 1944 conservatives proposed Sen. Byrd for the presidential nomination, but when the late President Roosevelt announced he would seek a third term there was no contest.

Another high point in Sen. Byrd's career came in 1952, when he declined to support Adlai Stevenson, the Democratic nominee for president. Although he did not indorse President Eisenhower, his neutrality helped Mr. Eisenhower to carry Virginia.

One year later, Sen. Byrd demonstrated again that he placed principles above individuals, by blocking a request from the Eisenhower administration to raise the ceiling on the public debt from $275 to $290 billion. Sen. Byrd felt that his goal of a balanced budget would never be achieved by continued borrowing.

In 1954, he agreed to a compromise increase to $281 billion, and in 1956 the administration reported to Congress that a balanced budget was in sight.

Sen. Byrd also displayed his independence by leading the fight against the Eisenhower bond-issue method of financing a big coast-to-coast highway program in 1955, and the Senate rejected it in favor of a smaller program to be handled by direct appropriations.

Sen. Byrd moved to a position of greater influence in 1955, when he became chairman of the powerful Finance Committee.

Sen. Byrd's penchant for speaking his mind, even when his own party was in power, occasionally produced strong comments from officials. It occurred in April of 1949, when a delegation from the American Veterans Committee called on President Truman in behalf of housing legislation. A spokesman for the group quoted Mr. Truman as having said "there are too many Byrds in Congress."

"HURRAH FOR BYRD"

The next day Sen. Byrd retorted, "If the president wants to purge me from the Senate, I'll be around when the purging starts."

In the summer of 1953 Sen. Byrd got a letter from the White House, to which President Eisenhower had penned this post script: "Hurrah for the Byrds."

Despite their differences, Sen. Byrd was usually on pleasant personal terms with the presidents. As Senate Finance Committee chairman, he had a number of occasions to discuss administration bills with President Kennedy. While they disagreed on most of these measures, they saw more nearly alike on reciprocal trade.

In his crusade against federal spending, Sen. Byrd bent over backwards to keep his own fiscal relations with Uncle Sam on an impeccable basis. As the operator of this country's largest privately owned apple orchards, he could have collected several thousand dollars annually in soil conservation benefits. He refused to make a single claim and he also refused to sell his apples to the government.

"I've made it an absolute rule," he once said, "never to take any federal government check except my salary as senator."

Senator Byrd was a member of the "Tom, Dick and Harry" combination of Byrd brothers, who are descended from William Byrd, who came to Virginia from Cheshire, England, in 1674. The Byrds always have been prominent in the affairs of the Old Dominion, the present generation living up to the family's reputation.

Byrd became Virginia's 47th Governor in 1926 and made an excellent record as State executive. His chief accomplishment was the simplification of State organization through elimination of scores of needless bureaus and positions, thereby contributing to efficiency and economy. Good roads and better schools also were promoted under his regime.

ENTERED NEWSPAPER WORK

Born in Martinsburg, W. Va., in 1887, the son of Richard Evelyn Byrd, who was Speaker of the Virginia House of Delegates and an Assistant United States Attorney General, Harry Byrd received his early education in the county schools and at the Shenandoah Valley Academy at Winchester.

At the age of 15, he entered newspaper work as manager of the Winchester Star, and five years later he founded the Martinsburg Evening Journal.

While still engaged in journalism, he made his first venture into the apple industry by leasing 10 orchards near Winchester. Later he acquired huge orchards in his own right and developed into the largest grower of apples east of the Mississippi River. Byrd apples are shipped to all parts of the world. He has taken a leading part in apple standardization efforts.

From 1908–18, he was president of a company which rebuilt and maintained the Valley pike and then turned the highway over to the State without cost.

ELECTED TO STATE SENATE

Byrd's career in politics began in 1915 when he was elected to the State Senate from Shenandoah County, which normally was a Republican stronghold.

During World War I, he served as Virginia's fuel commissioner. He was re-elected to the State Senate in 1919 and 1923 without opposition. While at Richmond, he took a special interest in highway development as chairman of the Senate Committee on Roads and assisted in framing legislation for the erection of a State Highway Commission, of which he was appointed a member.

In 1922 he was elected chairman of the State Democratic Committee and in that capacity demonstrated his ability as a political organizer and campaigner by paving the way for election of a Democrat to Congress from the 9th district, formerly Republican.

GIVEN 72,000 MAJORITY

He was swept into the gubernatorial chair by a majority of 72,000 votes over his Republican opponent, S. H. Hoge. His service as Governor brought him into public notice as a presidential possibility of the "favorite son" type. His name was mentioned prominently at the 1928 convention.

On retiring from the governorship Byrd resumed active duty as publisher of the Winchester Star, the Harrisonburg News-Record and as the State's leading apple grower. He appeared frequently in the public eye in connection with the aerial triumphs of his distinguished brother, Rear Admiral Richard Evelyn Byrd, who was acclaimed as the first man to fly over the North and South Poles.

Senator Byrd was a vestryman in the Episcopal Church.

Other survivors besides the Senator HARRY F. BYRD, JR., are two other sons, Bradshaw Beverley Byrd and Richard Evelyn Byrd, both of Clarke County, and eight grandchildren.

[From The Evening Star, Washington (D.C.), Oct. 20, 1966]

HARRY F. BYRD, SR., IS DEAD AT 79—VIRGINIA'S FORMER SENATOR LONG RULED STATE DEMOCRATS

BERRYVILLE, VA.—Harry F. Byrd, Sr., former U.S. senator, Virginia governor and Patriarch of the state's conservative Democratic organization, died here today at his home. He was 79.

In a coma since July, he died at 8:25 a.m.

He had been at his home in this Northern Virginia apple center, just a few miles from the West Virginia line, since the middle of March. He had spent a brief period in the University of Virginia hospital at Charlottesville before returning for the last time to the home he loved.

IN COMA SINCE JULY

His family had said at the time that Byrd's brief hospitalization was for a "complete physical checkup," adding that he had been bothered by painful arthritis and an old knee injury.

His fatal affliction was not disclosed until July 6 after he sank into a deep coma.

Death came to the famous politician while his son HARRY, JR. was in the midst of an election campaign to win for himself his father's U.S. Senate seat. BYRD, JR. now holds it by appointment.

The elder Byrd resigned from the U.S. Senate last Nov. 11, attributing his move to infirmities and the desire to step down in favor of a younger man. BYRD, JR., 51, a Virginia state senator, was promptly named to the post by then-Gov. Albertis S. Harrison Jr.

During the elder Byrd's last 10 years in the Senate, he was chairman of the powerful Senate Finance Committee—a post which he personally developed into the watchdog of federal spending. But his fight against ever-growing government expenditures, a Byrd trademark, was consistently a losing one.

Racked by the pain of an old knee ailment and arthritis, Byrd slowed his pace perceptibly in the years preceding his retirement.

In his letter of resignation to then-Gov. Harrison, Byrd said he found himself tiring easily. Because of this and his painful afflictions, he said, "I have reluctantly reached the conclusion that I must give up the heavy responsibilities" of the Senate.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I know that the many friends of Senator Byrd will appreciate the gracious tributes which have been paid to him today by the other Senators who have spoken.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 317) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and extreme regret the announcement of the death of Hon. Harry F. Byrd, Sr., who served in the U.S. Senate from the State of Virginia from 1933 to 1965.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased, together with a transcript of remarks made in the Senate in praise of his distinguished service to the Nation.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States, submitting a nomination, was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 167) to enable the United States to organize and hold an International Conference on Water for Peace in the United States in 1967 and authorize an appropriation therefor, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13935) to give the consent of Congress to the State of Massachusetts to become a party to the agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity as set forth in title II of the act of April 14, 1965 (79 Stat. 60), and consented to by Congress in that act and in the act of November 1, 1965 (79 Stat. 1157).

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1404. An act for the relief of Dr. George H. Edler;

H.R. 17658. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the U.S. Naval Construction Battalions (Seabees) 25th anniversary and the U.S. Navy Civil Engineers Corps (CEC) 100th anniversary;

H.R. 17883. An act to provide training opportunities for persons employed in the legislative branch of the Government;

H.R. 18021. An act to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes;

H.R. 18233. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on river and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 18284. An act to authorize the Attorney General to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands within the Federal Reformatory at Chillicothe, Ohio.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1034) authorizing the printing of an additional 3,000 copies of House Document No. 237, 89th Congress, 1st session, entitled "Sino-Soviet Conflict and Its Implications" for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S. 690. An act for the relief of Norman J. Pitman;

S. 1101. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral interests of the United States in $79^{184}/_{1000}$ acres located near Orangeburg, S.C., to Allen E. Dominick, the owner of such property;

S. 1572. An act for the relief of Merritt A. Seefeldt and August C. Seefeldt;

S. 1760. An act to authorize the acceptance of a settlement of certain indebtedness of Greece to the United States and to authorize the use of the payments resulting from the settlement for a cultural and educational exchange program;

S. 1861. An act to provide additional assistance for areas suffering a major disaster;

S. 2500. An act for the relief of James A. Todd, Jr.;

S. 2947. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to improve and make more effective certain programs pursuant to such act;

S. 3488. An act to grant the consent of Congress for the States of Virginia and Maryland and the District of Columbia to amend the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Regulation Compact to establish an organization empowered to provide transit facilities in the National Capital region, and for other purposes, and to enact said amendment for the District of Columbia;

S. 3887. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit persons from countries friendly to the United States to receive instruction at the U.S. Military Academy, the U.S. Naval Academy, and the U.S. Air Force Academy, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2600. An act to provide for the acquisition and preservation of the real property known as the Ansley Wilcox House in Buffalo, N.Y., as a national historic site;

H.R. 8917. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Omaha Tribe of Nebraska, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10327. An act to require evidence of adequate financial responsibility to pay judgments for personal injury or death, or to repay fares in the event of nonperformance of voyages, to establish minimum standards for passenger vessels and to require disclosure of construction details on passenger vessels, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15857. An act to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 to increase salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department, to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 to increase the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 18217. An act to provide home leave for Federal seafaring personnel, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 2129. An act for the relief of Maria Rossi (Rept. No. 1882);

H.R. 3526. An act for the relief of Dr. Eric J. Lazaro (Rept. No. 1883);

H.R. 3531. An act for the relief of Dr. Julio Desar Munis y Sotolongo (Rept. No. 1884);

H.R. 3756. An act for the relief of James S. Kahriman (Rept. No. 1885);

H.R. 3879. An act for the relief of Ernest Buillet (Rept. No. 1886);

H.R. 5622. An act for the relief of Dr. Jorge Ignacio Miquel Franca (Rept. No. 1887);

H.R. 6115. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose A. G. Mendoza (Rept. No. 1888);

H.R. 6226. An act for the relief of Dr. Bienvenido Benach Carreras (Rept. No. 1889);

H.R. 6443. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio U. Catasus (Rept. No. 1890);

H.R. 6899. An act for the relief of Dr. Myriam de la Caridad Ares y Fernandez de Bosch (Rept. No. 1891);

H.R. 7341. An act for the relief of Dr. Ricardo R. Fuste (Rept. No. 1892);

H.R. 8614. An act for the relief of Miss Rajka Soda (Rept. No. 1893);

H.R. 10253. An act for the relief of Dr. Luis E. Bencomo (Rept. No. 1894);

H.R. 10259. An act for the relief of Dr. Allan Baumal (Rept. No. 1895);

H.R. 10832. An act for the relief of Gloria Alesna Relampagos (Rept. No. 1896);

H.R. 11224. An act for the relief of Dr. Pedro Raphael (Rept. No. 1897);

H.R. 11254. An act for the relief of Julieta Gloria Bersamin (Rept. No. 1898);

H.R. 11590. An act for the relief of Dr. Jacinta Llorens (Rept. No. 1899);

H.R. 11640. An act for the relief of Dr. Juan Antonio Dumois (Rept. No. 1900);

H.R. 11952. An act for the relief of Maria Karidakis (Rept. No. 1901);

H.R. 11957. An act for the relief of Muriel Williams (Rept. No. 1902);

H.R. 12317. An act for the relief of Dr. Augusta J. Fernandez-Conde (Rept. No. 1903);

H.R. 12781. An act for the relief of Dr. Mario Orlando Santos-Estevez (Rept. No. 1904);

H.R. 12920. An act for the relief of Alexander Francis Saker, M.D. (Rept. No. 1905);

H.R. 13101. An act for the relief of Mario P. Navarro, M.D. (Rept. No. 1906);

H.R. 14173. An act for the relief of Antonio Barquet Chediak (Rept. No. 1907);

H.R. 14984. An act for the relief of Renato Camacho Castro (Rept. No. 1908);

H.R. 15488. An act for the relief of Dr. Ali Haji-Morad (Rept. No. 1909);

H.R. 16522. An act for the relief of Vicente Fernandez Marino (Rept. No. 1910);

H.R. 16610. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio Rondon Delgado (Rept. No. 1911); and

H.R. 18033. An act for the relief of Dr. Fidel Rodriguez-Cubas (Rept. No. 1912).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

H.R. 3530. An act for the relief of Dr. Miguel Angel Martinez y Corpas (Rept. No. 1913);

H.R. 10288. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio B. Santillano (Rept. No. 1914); and

H.R. 13192. An act for the relief of Nermin Demirbag Lavapies (Rept. No. 1915).

By Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 17376. An act to authorize the disposal of nickel from the national stockpile (Rept. No. 1916).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 3928. A bill for the relief of John Anthony Bacsalmassy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 3929. A bill to establish the Big Thicket National Park in Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. YARBOROUGH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. STENNIS (for himself and Mr. EASTLAND):

S. 3930. A bill to provide for the replacement of a bridge over the Tchula Lake, Holmes County, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Works.

RESOLUTION

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, SR., OF VIRGINIA

Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. ROBERTSON) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 317) relative to the death of former Senator Harry F. Byrd, Sr., of Virginia, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under a separate heading.)

BIG THICKET NATIONAL PARK FOR TEXAS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to establish a Big Thicket National Park in southeast Texas.

Conservation of our unique natural areas has been one of my prime goals. Beginning in 1958, I worked for the Padre Island National Seashore bill, which was enacted in 1962. In 1963, I began my efforts for establishment of the Guadalupe Mountains National Park, and had the pleasure of seeing President Johnson sign that bill last Saturday, October 15, 1966.

Now the top item on my conservation agenda becomes the conservation and preservation of a portion of the Big Thicket, a unique area of dense vegetation that has until very recently remained an unspoiled refuge for scarce species of animals and plants.

Increasing development of the area has begun to threaten the existence of the Big Thicket as an ecological entity. We must act very soon to preserve some of this area; at least, if we are to have something to show future generations what our land was like.

There is substantial agreement in all quarters that some form of preservation of the Big Thicket is needed. Local groups and individuals have been concerned and active. The Texas Parks and Wildlife Commission has recommended a park. The National Park Service has surveyed the area and is preparing specific recommendations. The U.S. Forest Service has already set aside over 1,000 acres of the Sam Houston National Forest as a Big Thicket scenic area. All of these efforts illustrate the concern we must have lest this area be irrevocably changed before there is action.

The proposal I introduce today is not a detailed proposal ready for immediate enactment; it is rather an attempt to focus attention on the need until we have available the best recommendations from all those who have taken an interest in conservation of the Big Thicket. Particularly needed are the recommendations of the National Park Service resulting from its on-site inspection in November 1965. Perhaps introduction of this bill will help convince that agency of the urgency of having a concrete plan for preservation of this unique biological area.

This area is of sufficient national importance to justify Federal recognition and assistance in preservation of at least a part of the area as a national park. However, this proposal should in no way foreclose efforts by the State of Texas toward a State park; the concepts are by no means exclusive.

A somewhat arbitrary figure of 75,000 acres has been set in the bill as a proposed target indicating the size of park that should be considered. That figure may well be adjusted one way or the other during consideration of detailed proposals. One study has recommended a park of 50,000 acres, other studies have proposed a "string of pearls" park of small tracts of special importance linked by parkways. Perhaps both a large tract and smaller special areas are most desirable, and both could be accommodated by acreage of the magnitude indicated.

I have personally inspected the Big Thicket area, in some places helped to cut a trail through this near jungle. It has huge trees and dense undergrowth; it has multitudes of birds, including perhaps the last of the ivory billed woodpeckers; it has wild orchids and azaleas and gardenias; it even has, it is said, bears and panthers. As a whole, it is irreplaceable, but it will be lost unless action can be obtained in the near future.

No accounting of all the persons who are actively working toward conservation of the Big Thicket could be complete, but I do owe a debt of gratitude to many who have written and counseled with me, and who have accompanied me on excursions into the Big Thicket. Among those who have been especially helpful are Dempsie Henley, of Liberty, Tex., president of the Big Thicket Association; Lance Rosier of Saratoga, Dr. Clarence Cottam, of the Welder Wildlife Foundation at Sinton; Laurence Dexter, chairman of the Texas Conservation Council; Dr. Donovan Correll, of the Texas Research Foundation; and many others.

This bill would provide for a national park not in excess of 75,000 acres in an area northeast of Houston and slightly northwest of Beaumont, in the counties of Hardin, Liberty, San Jacinto, Polk, and Tyler. This is an area of swamps, dense undergrowth, and tall magnolia trees with wildlife of various kinds. This is one of the last great frontiers in the eastern part of our State and most of it has a so-called arid environment.

The area is being bulldozed for development. This is the last chance to save one of the greatest natural areas in our State. It is proposed to save about 75,000 acres. Early explorers found this area to be untenable and they had to go to the gulf coast. This is a great area. The last members of one species of bird, including perhaps the last of the ivory-billed woodpecker, are thought to be found there. I have been in places there where I had to travel by jeep and get out with a machete to cut a path through the dense undergrowth. This is real wilderness. Mr. Justice Douglas went to this area last year and I have letters from him pleading that we save this area.

I hope that the best thought and support of all knowledgeable persons can be enlisted toward working out the details of this proposal.

The time has come to establish a Big Thicket National Park.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3929) to establish the Big Thicket National Park in Texas, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TRIBUTES TO SENATORS SALTONSTALL AND SIMPSON—PRINTED AS SEPARATE SENATE DOCUMENTS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the tributes paid to the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and to the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] be printed as separate Senate documents.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? There being no objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORITY TO HAVE TRIBUTES TO SENATOR SPESSARD HOLLAND PRINTED AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document the tributes to Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND on the completion of 20 years of service in the Senate, which appear in the RECORD of September 26, 1966.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF THE FEDERAL FIREARMS ACT—REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, in line with a commitment made by the Senate when S. 3767, the Federal Firearms Act, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, that it now be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO FILE REPORTS DURING SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations, on its own behalf or on behalf of its subcommittees, be authorized to file reports with the Secretary of the Senate during the adjournment sine die of the 89th Congress, 2d session, and that they be printed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], who is in conference on the unemployment compensation bill, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the very able and distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] be added as a cosponsor of Senate bill 3918, legislation introduced by the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] on October 17, which will make a necessary technical improvement in the provisions of the Social Security Act governing the handling of cases where a person dies and there are social security benefits owing him.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Guest editorial by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH on American highway system, past, present and future, in National Limestone Institute magazine, volume 3, No. 9, fall 1966.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

Keynote speech of Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH at kickoff luncheon for National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message in writing from the President of the United States, submitting the nomination of William Haddon, Jr., of New York, to be Administrator, National Highway Safety Agency, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Harold Barefoot Sanders, Jr., of Texas, to be an Assistant Attorney General;

Byron G. Skelton, of Texas, to be associate judge of the U.S. Court of Claims;

Gerald W. Heaney, of Minnesota, to be U.S. circuit judge, eighth circuit;

James A. von der Heydt, of Alaska, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Alaska;

William P. Copple, of Arizona, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Arizona;

Robert F. Peckham, of California, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of California;

Warren J. Ferguson, of California, to be U.S. district judge for the central district of California;

Manuel L. Real, of California, to be U.S. district judge for the central district of California;

Edward J. Boyle, Sr., of Louisiana, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Louisiana;

Alvin B. Rubin, of Louisiana, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Louisiana;

Lansing L. Mitchell, of Louisiana, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Louisiana;

Fred J. Cassibry, of Louisiana, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Louisiana;

Timothy S. Hogan, of Ohio, to be U.S. district jude for the southern district of Ohio;

David S. Porter, of Ohio, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Ohio;

Donald Stuart Russell, of South Carolina, to be U.S. district judge for the district of South Carolina;

Robert M. McRae, Jr., of Tennessee, to be U.S. district judge for the western district of Tennessee;

Robert D. Smith, Jr., of Arkansas, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Arkansas;

Charles M. Conway, of Arkansas, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Arkansas;

John P. Hyland, of California, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of California;

Edwin L. Miller, Jr., of California, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of California;

Wayne B. Colburn, of California, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of California;

Edward A. Heslep, of California, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of California;

Peter J. Foley, of Rhode Island, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Rhode Island; and

Robert M. Draper, of Ohio, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Ohio.

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for Mr. BAYH), from the Committee on the Judiciary:

James E. Noland, of Indiana, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Indiana.

By Mr. JAVITS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Edward D. Re, of New York, to be a member of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission; and

Anthony R. Marasco, of New York, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of New York.

By Mr. SMATHERS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Bryan Simpson, of Florida, to be U.S. circuit judge, fifth circuit; and

Charles R. Scott, of Florida, to be U.S. district judge for the middle district of Florida.

By Mr. HART, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Aubrey E. Robinson, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. district judge for the District of Columbia;

John Lewis Smith, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. district judge for the District of Columbia;

Philip Nichols, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be associate judge of the U.S. Court of Claims; and

Spottswood W. Robinson III, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. circuit judge, District of Columbia circuit.

By Mr. MONRONEY, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Thirty-two postmaster nominations.

By Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Public Works:

Maj. Gen. Robert George MacDonnel, U.S. Army, to be a member and president of the Mississippi River Commission; and

William Haddon, Jr., of New York, to be Administrator, National Highway Safety Agency.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On the request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

THE MANILA CONFERENCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on the eve of the Manila conference, the President of the Republic of the Philippines, Ferdinand Marcos, has taken sharp issue with those who see this meeting as a prelude to the enlargement of the war in Vietnam or even as a vehicle for organizing new military alliances in Asia. He has made it clear that he did not issue invitations to the participating nations for either of these purposes.

On the contrary, it is readily apparent from recent statements that President Marcos sees the impending meeting as a possible step along the road to a future meeting or meetings. These would probably be of differing composition so that they might have some capability of bringing about an end to hostilities in Vietnam and the beginning of a major social development in east Asia.

and concerted effort at economic and

It is only in that context, Mr. President, that the conference makes sense at this time and President Marcos is clearly not a man to indulge in nonsense. The Manila meeting can be helpful in delineating the road to peace. It can be helpful in the promotion of cooperation for peaceful advance in Asia. By its very composition, however, it cannot be a council of war, aggravated or expanded, in Vietnam. Nor can it be of any great relevance from the point of view of creating another military arrangement or grouping. Military arrangements are already in surplus supply in Asia.

In the Evening Star of October 19, 1966, under the byline of Mr. Richard Critchfield, there appears a paragraph from Saigon, which I shall read:

> SAIGON.—Foreign Minister Tran Van Do said in an interview today that Communist Chinese expansionism cannot be stopped by forging new military alliances but only by strengthening the internal political structure and economies of its smaller Asian neighbors.

The Philippine approach to the Manila Conference as expressed recently by President Marcos is clearly one which coincides with our national interest as well as that of the Filipino people. It would be my hope that this unity of outlook and approach will be preserved throughout the meeting and beyond. It would be my further hope that we would close the door on perversions of this conference, wherever they may originate, which would shift its direction from the purposes of peace to the purposes of intensified and expanded war.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Baltimore Sun on October 18, 1966, entitled "Marcos Opposes Escalation Talk," and an article which appeared in the Washington Post of October 18, 1966, entitled "Escalation Talk Hit by Marcos."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Oct. 18, 1966]

MARCOS OPPOSES ESCALATION TALK—ASSERTS MANILA PARLEY ALSO SHOULD SEEK NO NEW PACT

(By Peter J. Kumpa)

MANILA, October 17.—Philippine President Ferdinand Marcos said tonight that his delegation would oppose any discussion of escalating the Vietnam war at the seven-nation summit meeting here next week.

"The purpose of the meeting is not to discuss escalation," Marcos emphasized.

Neither was it the place to talk about any new military or security alliance which might replace SEATO in the East Asian-Pacific area, according to President Marcos, host of the Manila conference.

PEACE STRATEGY TALK

Responding to questions at the "President's night" of the Manila Overseas Press Club, Marcos outlined a meeting that would, in effect, agree on a peace strategy for Vietnam and go into regional economic programs that would follow such a peace.

Marcos refused to spell out whether he would favor a bombing pause of North Vietnam during the meeting and whether he would favor the seating of the National Liberation Front, the political arm of the Viet Cong, at any future peace talk.

The conference should arrive at a consensus on such questions as Viet Cong participation, he said.

Asked if he favored Indonesia or Japan as an "honest broker" to sponsor future peace talks, Marcos replied that the conference should find a country acceptable to all seven participants, which would include South Vietnam.

"I will have my own recommendation," he said.

Marcos also explained that he would propose that the Saigon Government lead the discussions in the meeting.

PRIORITY FOR SAIGON

Marcos thought that the other six government leaders should listen first to the Vietnamese views before making their own opening statements at the meeting. He reasoned that on such programs as pacification in South Vietnam the Saigon military was in the best position to explain the program.

The Philippines chief executive thought that no one nation would dominate the conference. He said all would be equal, and he praised the United States, "the most powerful nation on earth," for sitting down with those playing smaller roles in Vietnam on a basis of equality.

Marcos gave new clues to the position the Manila Government would take. He saw himself playing a "double role," as a participant which had engineer forces in Vietnam and as the host and "neutral observer" trying to get others to reach a concensus.

He definitely asserted that he would not agree to any proposal that would compromise the territorial integrity of South Vietnam.

Marcos appealed for a domestic moratorium on politics during the three-day meeting. For his Administration's part, he pledged a suspension of investigations involving opposition Liberal party members.

NO OBSTRUCTION

"If you can't pray for the success of the conference, please don't obstruct it," he said.

Most of the evening was spent in light banter with the President kidding the Philippine press, which is free and flourishing to the extreme.

He said later, seriously, that despite the skeptical attitude of many Manila columnists, Washington did not initiate the forthcoming conference.

Marcos also credited outgoing President George McArthur of the Associated Press with an important role in shifting the conference site from Baguio to Manila. Press facilities in the cool hill resort were too primitive.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 18, 1966]

ESCALATION TALK HIT BY MARCOS—OPPOSES ANY NEW SECURITY ALLIANCE PLANS AT MANILA

(By Stanley Karnow)

MANILA, October 17.—Philippine President Ferdinand E. Marcos said tonight that he would oppose talk about escalating the Vietnam War at the seven-nation summit conference scheduled to open here next Monday.

At the same time, Marcos expressed the hope that the meeting would not lead to the creation of any new "military or security alliances" in the Far East.

Speaking at a dinner for the press, the 49-year-old Philippine leader emphasized that the primary purpose of the forthcoming conference should be to find a common approach to peace in Vietnam. He said:

"I hope, by some miracle, that we will be able to fashion a formula to bring about peace and stability in Asia."

Until now, Marcos pointed out, the different nations engaged in Vietnam have each issued "unilateral statements" outlining their objectives. "But there has not been concensus," he said.

WANTS CONSENSUS

Marcos refused to say, in answer to a question, whether he favored the inclusion of Vietcong representatives at eventual negotiations to settle the Vietnam war.

It is understood, however, that he essentially shares the official U.S. view, which advocates Vietcong participation as part of a North Vietnamese delegation.

One of the aims of the conference, Marcos said, would be to agree on an honest broker to help in a Vietnam settlement. He said he had one "in mind" but declined to elaborate.

Sources here suggest, however, that Marcos feels the Japanese may be able to assume the role of mediator. Another possible intermediary mentioned here is Indonesia.

By implying that he is cool both to escalation and to a new Pacific defense organization, Marcos seemed to foreshadow some of the differences that could arise when the seven heads of government and/or state meet.

In addition to the Philippines and the United States, South Vietnam, Thailand, South Korea, Australia and New Zealand will be represented at the meeting.

It is considered probable that South Vietnam's Premier Nguyen Cao Ky will raise the issue of further escalation at the conference.

Ky has repeatedly made it clear that his ideal conclusion to the Vietnam war would be the downfall of the Hanoi government. He has also stated that he will never negotiate with the National Liberation Front, as the Vietcong calls itself.

SUPPORT ALLIANCE

The South Vietnamese Premier's opinions are thought to be shared generally by the South Koreans and Thais. Moreover, the South Koreans have indicated the hope that next week's meeting here might lead to the formation of a new Asian collective security alliance. Among the nations attending the conference, South Korea is the only one that does not belong to or is not protected by the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization which was founded in Manila in October, 1954.

The kind of new organization Marcos would like to evolve from the conference here is what he has called an "Asian Forum," similar to the Organization of American States.

Such a Forum, Marcos has explained, should accept "a diversity of political ideas of people of Asian countries." He would presumably include Communist North Vietnam to stress the importance of economic development over ideology.

One of the Philippine President's aides said today that, while the conference may make no headway on Vietnam, "we may get some progress on the economic side."

In his speech tonight, Marcos proposed that the delegates of the six other nations first listen to the Vietnamese before beginning their discussion.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to say that the statement of the Senator from Montana, the majority leader, is well put. If the advocates of war and more war dominate the Manila Conference it will not only be a total loss as far as the United States is concerned, but it will be very definitely damaging to America and helpful only to Russia, which, as I see it, has been the principal beneficiary of the Asian war to date.

I appreciate Mr. Marcos' courage in making this statement as he has, and I hope that this point of view will prevail.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

WE SHOULD HAVE BROUGHT HOME MOST OF OUR TROOPS AND DEPENDENTS FROM WESTERN EUROPE—WE MUST DO THIS SOON

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I am in complete accord with the purposes of the resolution, introduced by the distinguished majority leader, expressing to the President the sentiment of the Senate that there be a substantial reduction in our forces stationed in Western Europe. I was glad to be a cosponsor of this resolution.

As early as April 1963, I spoke out urging the withdrawal of a great many of our troops from Western Europe. Since that time I have repeatedly urged that we reevaluate our military requirements in Europe with a view toward bringing home hundreds of thousands of military personnel with their dependents as well as thousands of civilian employees stationed in the nations of Western Europe.

Today, unofficial counts put these forces somewhere between 400,000 and 450,000 men and, together with dependents, the total is between 900,000 and 1 million Americans stationed and supported in Europe by American taxpayers.

Following World War II, there was a bitter cold war raging with the Soviet Union and there was a threat of aggression which required the presence of our Armed Forces to deter the Russians. Stalin was then dictator of the Soviet Union. The threat of military aggression by the Communists in Europe has all but vanished. The present rulers of the Soviet Union are no longer rattling their missiles. The Russians are veering toward capitalism. The Soviet Union is no longer a have-not nation. Its leaders now appear principally dedicated to the objective of raising the standard of living of their people.

At the present time we are contributing up to one-third of the manpower and almost 80 percent of the cost of defending Western Europe. The nations of that area are strong enough today, both militarily and economically, to cope with whatever danger remains and to provide for a much greater share of their defense needs. Western Europe has completely rehabilitated itself following the devastation of World War II, largely with money supplied by American taxpayers. It is now a thriving and dynamic region of greatly expanded economic, political, and potential military capacity.

The United States of America is the only member of the NATO alliance that has met its commitment 100 percent. The only nation of the alliance that has come up to 80 percent of its commitment has been West Germany.

Mr. President, 10 years ago this Nation had almost $22 billion in gold reserves. Today we have $13½ billion, a loss of almost $8½ billion. At the same time the gold supply of other countries, primarily in Western Europe, has risen by $13 billion. The fact that we have approximately 1 million Americans in Western Europe supported by American taxpayers, spending American dollars, and enhancing the economy of the nations in that part of the world is the most important factor contributing to our unfavorable balance-of-payments problem. Bringing hundreds of thousands of officers and enlisted men and their dependents home from France, West Germany, and other nations of Western Europe will not only cut down the drain on our gold supply, but will make troops available for assignment to Vietnam and other places where they are needed.

Of course, Mr. President, if it were necessary to the security of our Nation and to the security of the free world to station these huge forces in Western Europe, in one way or another we would find the financial resources to do so. However, when it is obvious that our Military Establishment in Western Europe is far in excess to the actual need, and when the attitude and actions of our Western European allies—primarily De Gaulle of France—confirm this conclusion, then it is wholly unwarranted to continue this unnecessary dollar drain.

Mr. President, at the very best our troops in France and in the NATO countries must be considered as a token force rather than an effective striking force. We can improve our military and financial situation greatly by bringing most of our Armed Forces and their dependents home. By our Operation Airlift we have proven we can airlift a combat-ready division to West Germany from the continental United States in a matter of hours. Furthermore, it is the nuclear umbrella of the United States that provides the real protection for Europe, not these large numbers of ground troops.

The nations of Western Europe can today provide the necessary troops to defend themselves instead of continuing to depend on us. Let their young men be conscripted and drafted into their own armed services. Why should the lives and aspirations of our teenage young men be disrupted to form the first line of defense for the German and French Governments, whose officials and nationals have come to despise us?

Mr. President, the reduction in U.S. Armed Forces in Western Europe might very well induce the leaders of the Soviet Union to make similar reductions in their military forces in Eastern and Central Europe. Such action would produce a significant easing of world tensions and go far toward helping to promote a peaceful settlement in Europe. If adopted by the Senate—and I fervently believe that it should be—the resolution introduced by the distinguished majority leader could well be one of the most important steps toward world peace made in this decade.

SAVE THE OLD METROPOLITAN OPERA HOUSE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, my colleagues will be interested in the valiant efforts being made to save the world famous Old Metropolitan Opera House in New York.

Clearly a great and storied opera house like the Old Met should be preserved if at all possible since New York can use more concert facilities and, as the Nation's cultural capital, it is my judgment that it could support additional facilities without in any way being at the expense of the existing and new ones like the Met at Lincoln Center. Assuming that the New Metropolitan Opera at Lincoln Center can realize a sufficient income so as not to jeopardize the investment it has in the old house, then I believe the old house should properly be preserved and continue to be available for cultural events and artistic performances.

In this respect I am pleased to note that the Vienna State Opera has expressed an interest in appearing in New York next fall if the opera house is available for performances. This would be the company's first appearance in the United States and would be a unique opportunity for Americans to see and hear this world famous, highly acclaimed company.

In connection with the Vienna State Opera appearance, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the New York Times of September 30, the exchange of correspondence between the trustees of the Old Opera House Corp. and Vienna Opera officials, and a letter on the subject from the distinguished and venerated American conductor Leopold Stokowski, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 30, 1966]

Vienna State Opera Invited to Old Met

The Vienna State Opera has been invited to appear at the old Metropolitan Opera House at 39th Street and Broadway next fall. It would be the company's first United States appearance. The Vienna opera will make its North American debut at Montreal's Expo 67 next September.

The invitation was extended in a letter to Egon Hilbert, general manager of the opera company, by the trustees of the Old Met Opera House Corporation, a group formed by an act of the State Legislature to help save the old house, which is facing demolition.

Mr. Hilbert wrote back to the trustees that he would take the matter up with his Government.

"I would consider it a great honor," he said. "I will do my utmost to make the plan come true."

Mr. Hilbert flew back to Austria last night after a New York visit.

The old Met has been the center of litigation since its owner, the Metropolitan Opera Association, moved to a new home in Lincoln Center last spring.

The association has leased the site of the old Met to Keystone Associates, a real estate concern that plans to raze the house and replace it with an office building.

A State Supreme Court judge earlier this month ruled that the law establishing the old Met Corporation was unconstitutional. The court has granted a temporary stay in demolition until the appeal can be ruled on.

Excerpts of Letter, September 25, 1966, From Trustees of Old Opera House Corp. to Dr. Egon Hilbert, General Manager, Vienna State Opera Inviting the Vienna State Opera To Make Its American Debut September 1967 To Reopen the Old Met House

Dr. Egon Hilbert,
General Manager, Vienna State Opera, Care of Dr. Wilhelm Schlag, Austrian Institute, New York City.

Dear Dr. Hilbert: As you know, the plans to dismantle the building which for 80 years housed the Metropolitan Opera Company in New York have been thwarted in the last minute by the efforts of a committee of private citizens with the full support of Governor Nelson Rockefeller and Mayor John Lindsay. This committee established itself as Board of Trustees of the "Old Opera House Corporation." Our publically announced plans are to buy the Old Opera House, refurbish it and put it at the disposal of visiting companies from all over the world.

We understand that the Vienna State Opera is coming to the Montreal World's Fair where it will perform from September 4 to September 22, 1967. It would be most regrettable indeed if such a public appearance of the world-famous Vienna State Opera in North America were made without giving the music loving New York public an opportunity to actually see and hear this company. You will certainly agree that New York City is the cultural focus of the Western hemisphere. To bypass it would mean to deprive a most sophisticated and cultured audience of a unique musical experience.

May we also point out to you that the timing would be ideal. We expect to have the Old Metropolitan Opera House ready for its re-opening in the fall season of 1967. Furthermore, the second half of September has traditionally been the beginning of the musical and operatic season in New York. Thus it would be most suitable if the Vienna State Opera, one of the most exciting Opera Companies in the world, would rededicate a building which for many decades has been the homestead of opera in the United States.

We can assure you that the public response to such an event would be overwhelming and that the news coverage by press, radio, and television would even surpass the many articles, interviews, and special television reports which the closing down of the old building caused last May.

We expect to make this a gala opening with invitations extended to such prominent public figures as Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, Senator Robert Kennedy, Senator Jacob Javits, Governor Nelson Rockefeller, Mayor John Lindsay, as well as outstanding artists, musicians, writers, and performers attending. We would also extend an official invitation to the Austrian Federal President, the Austrian Federal Chancellor, and members of the Austrian Government . . . We have the honor and great pleasure of herewith extending our most cordial invitation to you as the Director of the Vienna State Opera. We hope and trust that you will be able to accept this invitation so that we should have the great benefit of your visit.

Mrs. David Brockman,
Mrs. Wingate Paine,
Trustees, Old Opera House Corp.

September 29, 1966.

Mrs. David Brockman
and Mrs. Wingate Paine,
Trustees, Old Opera House Corp., New York, N.Y.

Dear Mrs. Brockman and Mrs. Paine: I have just received your kind letter of Sept. 25, 1966 informing me of your committee's plans to save the Old Metropolitan Opera House.

I am deeply moved by your and your colleague's inspired efforts to preserve one of the great opera houses of the world and re-open this important cultural center as a home for visiting national and international companies. I wish to thank you also for your gracious invitation to the Vienna State Opera to inaugurate the new era in the existence of the Old Metropolitan Opera House.

As you know, the opera lovers of metropolitan New York and the Vienna State Opera have for years been hoping that a visit of the Opera to this city would become a reality. This is the first invitation to the Vienna State Opera to perform in the United States during the season in a house that has not only a great tradition, but also the necessary auditorium and technical facilities.

Since the Vienna State Opera is a national institution, the final decision about a visit to New York rests with the Austrian Government. But I assure you, dear Mrs. Brockman and Mrs. Paine, that I would consider it a great honor not only for the Opera but for Austria as a whole if the Vienna State Opera would re-open the Old Metropolitan Opera House. As the responsible director of the Vienna State Opera I shall do my utmost to make this plan come true. Immediately upon my return to Vienna tonight I shall take up the matter with the responsible minister, Dr. Theodor Piffl-Percevic.

Sincerely yours,
Dr. Egon Hilbert.

Austrian Institute,
New York, N.Y., October 1, 1966.

Mrs. David Brockman
and Mrs. Wingate Paine,
New York, N.Y.

Dear Mrs. Brockman and Dear Mrs. Paine: I spoke with Dr. Hilbert per telephone an hour ago. I am very happy to tell you that the reaction in Austria to your invitation to the Vienna State Opera to re-open the Old Metropolitan Opera House appears to be extremely favorable and even joyous. The same is true of the reaction in official and private Austrian circles in this country.

Dr. Hilbert is deeply grateful for your efforts to save the wonderful Old Met and proud that the institution which he is heading has been chosen to re-dedicate it. He has asked me to give you his warmest regards.

Sincerely yours,
Wilhelm Schlag,
Director.

October, 6, 1966.

Senator Jacob Javits,
Old Senate Office,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Senator: The old Met. is a beautiful theatre, with good acoustics, and a large stage. I feel strongly it should be preserved. Performing Artists all over the World wish to play and sing for greater New York music lovers. Lincoln Center and Carnegie Hall are occupied all the music season. The Vienna Opera would like to perform in New York, so would many other Operas, Ballets, Orchestras, Choruses, and individual Artists. If old Met. is destroyed, in a few years we will have to build another large theatre and stage, otherwise there will be no place available for visiting Artists. I know it would mean a great deal if you would make a public statement (perhaps on the floor of the

Senate) describing how deeply interested all New Yorkers would be if the Vienna State and other great Opera Companies could perform on the stage of the old Met.

Sincerely,

Leopold Stokowski.

INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE SERVICE CORPS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague from Rhode Island very much for being so accommodating.

Mr. President, the International Executive Service Corps was established about 2 years ago as an outgrowth of several proposals, including one of mine and of Senator Hartke of Indiana, that the managerial skills of American business be made available to the business communities of the developing nations. The soundness of the concept has been proven by the success of IESC during these 2 years.

So far, IESC, under the direction of President Frank Pace, Jr. and David Rockefeller's chairmanship, has accepted nearly 400 individual business-assistance projects in 36 countries of Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, and Far East. More than 100 of these projects, in 17 countries, have been completed. IESC's goal of taking on 400 to 500 new projects yearly is now clearly attainable.

The aim of IESC projects is to improve the managerial practices and productivity of business firms abroad and thereby to strengthen the free-enterprise system in the developing world. This purpose accords fully with the foreign policy of this country as expressed in both the Congress and the executive branch.

The program also displays the spirit of America at its best. For the businessmen who serve as advisers to foreign firms are volunteers who give of their time and know-how to serve the free world; they receive traveling and living expenses, but no other compensation. Most of these men are retired, free of their lifelong business commitments here, but still able and more than willing to offer their experience to fellow businessmen who can make use of it. In some cases, IESC also borrows mid-career executives from American firms and returns them to their companies after the project is completed.

In the majority of cases, the IESC volunteers have taken their wives with them and these fine women have also served their country by enhancing the reputation of Americans for unselfish service. They have developed cordial associations in the local communities and have often assisted in educational and social-service activities.

On the average, the IESC volunteer spends 3 to 4 months on an assignment. For it is a cardinal feature of the program that he is there only to advise and consult with the management of the host firm; he is not running the company or "taking over." When he has made his analysis of the company's problems and submitted his recommendations, he comes home. It is up to the local management to consider his recommendations and carry on from there.

The relationship between the client company and IESC is strictly businesslike. The firm pays a fee for the service and also pays the volunteer's travel costs; the fact that steadily increasing numbers of foreign companies apply for assistance under these conditions is eloquent testimony to the growing receptivity to the IESC program.

The range of businesses which have so applied covers the whole spectrum of economic activity: banking and insurance; mining and manufacturing; retail and wholesale marketing; food production and processing; communications, transportation and service industries.

Finally, a highly significant characteristic of the IESC program: it is a joint undertaking of the U.S. business community and this Government. It is directed and managed privately; its board chairman is David Rockefeller, who made one of the major proposals leading to formation of IESC, and his associates on the board are a blue-ribbon panel of American businessmen; all of its personnel, both paid staff members and volunteers, are private citizens. A portion of its budgetary needs is privately subscribed. The balance is underwritten by the Agency for International Development with funds appropriated by the Congress.

I believe that we here have been wise in providing this support for a new, imaginative, and successful program in international business relations. I trust that we shall continue to do so.

CLOSING OF THE INTRA-BANK OF LEBANON

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that the closing of the Intra-Bank of Lebanon points up the need for Federal regulation of branches of foreign banks doing business in this country.

State banking authorities cannot be expected to be that close to the foreign banking situation in other parts of the world so as to effectively protect American depositors.

I do not believe that the severity of this loss has yet been fully assessed. I am looking into the question as to whether some of the contingent liabilities of Intra-Bank include liabilities to agencies of the United States. If this is true, our Government can lose a considerable amount of money as a result of the closing of this bank. This is in addition to the apparent losses of several millions by American depositors which may result.

I introduced legislation in this session—and I shall introduce it again next year—entitled the Foreign Banking Control Act to give the Federal Government jurisdiction over the chartering and regulation of branches of foreign banks operating in this country. Only the Federal Government is in a position to fully assess the liquidity position of a bank such as the Intra-Bank based on its total commitments throughout the world. The combined knowledge of the Treasury Department and the State Department would give a more complete picture of an international organization than any single State could obtain.

Mr. President, I think that the closing of the Intra-Bank of Lebanon clearly shows the urgent need for this kind of legislation, to take this licensing power out of the hands of the States and place it in the hands of the Federal Government—one, to achieve better regulation with better understanding, and greater facilities for understanding the international position of foreign banks; second, with a view toward seeing that U.S. banks which open branches abroad are also treated in a reciprocally fair way.

There is no indication at the moment that the closing of the Intra-Bank of Lebanon will have an impact outside the Middle East or that it will affect the international monetary system in a significant way. I have every confidence that the International Monetary Fund has the necessary resources to permit Lebanon to overcome the shocks of the Intra-Bank closing.

It is possible, as time goes on, that the Intra-Bank affair may encourage speculators to increase their gold purchases and thereby put pressure on the price of gold in London. This, in turn, would require further gold sales by the United States, which could only hurt our balance of payments.

The Intra-Bank affair should be a reminder that we better hurry up and put into effect a contingency plan which would provide the world with adequate currency reserves. These reserves are gradually declining in relation to international transactions despite the continuing U.S. balance-of-payments deficit. The next shock we may hear about could be disastrous for the entire world economy. So let us act before it is too late, not afterward.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that news stories and other documents with relation to this matter may be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 19, 1966]

Three Banks Defy Order To Return Funds to Lebanon Branch Here—Depositors Must Wait

(By Robert Walker)

Frank Wille, New York State Superintendent of Banks, said yesterday the nation's three largest banks had "dishonored" his demand that they turn over to the New York City branch of Lebanon's Intra Bank the funds the branch had on deposit with them.

Spokesmen for the banks—the Chase Manhattan Bank, the First National City Bank of New York, and the Bank of America, San Francisco—said they would turn over only what was left after funds owed to them by other Intra Bank offices had been subtracted.

Intra Bank's branch here failed to open Monday after the institution's head office in Beirut had closed its doors because of a "shortage of liquidity."

BRANCH TO STAY SHUT

Mr. Wille said the branch would not be allowed to open until the dispute with Chase, First National City and Bank of America had been resolved.

For depositors of the branch, at 680 Fifth Avenue, at 54th Street, a prolonged court fight on the legal issues involved might mean years of waiting for their claims to be settled. If the three national banks successfully contended that Intra Bank in fact owed them money, depositors might have to settle for less than they claimed. Deposits at the branch are not covered by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

It appeared last night that a complex wrangle was taking shape, turning on whether the New York branch could be viewed as a separate legal entity, with its own liabilities and assets.

The Chase, which is reported to hold the bulk of the New York branch's deposits, said these deposits would fall substantially short of covering what Intra Bank as a whole owed to Chase.

Mr. Wille said the Manufacturers Hanover Trust Company and the Irving Trust Company had complied with his order yesterday, turning over deposits to the branch, which was under New York State control. Unlike the three national banks that refused to comply, the Hanover and the Irving are state-chartered institutions.

Intra Bank, one of the largest banks in the Middle East, is understood by authorities to have assets of about $230-million and liabilities of only $170-million.

Further developments in Lebanon might have a strong bearing on the fortunes of depositors of the New York branch.

The New York State Banking Department said that the branch had direct liabilities of about $2.15 million, aside from amounts owed to its own head office and other affiliates.

Assets in cash, marketable securities and demand deposits—most of them at the Chase—were $2,435,000, the department said. However, it added: "The records of the branch also indicate certain contingent liabilities which may or may not materialize, depending on events in Lebanon."

In a statement yesterday, Mr. Wille said his demand on debtor banks of the New York branch was designed to "conserve and safeguard the New York assets of Intra Bank for the ultimate benefit of all New York depositors."

However, a spokesman for Chase said it had been advised by its counsel that it had what was termed "the right of set-off." The Chase contended it was an established legal principle that it could set off the amount it was owed by any legal entity against what it owed to the same entity.

The Chase argues, in effect, that Intra Bank is only one legal entity, no matter how many branches it may have, and that if it has $10 in one pocket and a bill calling for the payment of $10 in another pocket, its net worth is zero.

A letter sent yesterday by the Chase to Mr. White in response to his demand for payment, said, in part: "Because of claims of this bank against Intra Bank and the right of set-off we have exercised, in accordance with advice of our counsel, we have to report that we have no credit balance in collected funds in said [Intra Bank's] account."

Mr. Wille argues that the law of New York State was the governing law.

His statement said, in part: "It is my opinion that any set-off against the amount owing from these three banks to the branch and that its assets under New York branch due to their transactions elsewhere with Intra Bank, is contrary to the New York law and would frustrate the mandatory segregation of the branch's assets and liabilities which the State Legislature intended for the protection of New York depositors."

In San Francisco, a spokesman for the Bank of America said the bank's New York office had sent a letter of reply yesterday to Mr. Willie "taking substantially the same stand as the Chase and Citibank."

All three national banks took exception to the superintendent's use of the word "dishonored."

A Chase spokesman said: "We did not dishonor his request. We told him we could not comply because Intra Bank has no credit balance with the Chase Manhattan Bank."

A Citibank spokesman said: "We will certainly comply with his request as soon as we determine what the relative balance standing to the credit of Intra Bank is. We are doing this as fast as possible, using computers."

Joseph Salameh, manager of Intra Bank's New York branch, said last night the decision of the three national banks was "unfortunate."

[From the New York Times, Oct. 19, 1966]

Three Banks Defiant on Wille Order—Soviet Bid Is Reported

(By Thomas F. Brady)

Beirut, Lebanon, October 18.—The Soviet Union and United States financial interests were reported today to be bidding to take over the biggest bank in Lebanon, which closed its doors last Friday.

The report from reliable banking sources, came amid a spate of rumors that circulated here today over the fate of Intra Bank.

Daniel K. Ludwig of the Miami-based Bulk Carriers, Inc., who is said to be backed by the Chase Manhattan Bank, was reported to be interested in Intra Bank, which controls Lebanon's biggest and most profitable air transport company, Middle East Airlines.

The Soviet Union is known to be bidding generously through Lebanese intermediaries to take over the controlling interest in the shaken bank, which, in addition to the airline, also has financial control of Beirut port facilities and Radio Orient, which provides Lebanon's external communications.

Authoritative banking quarters say that Soviet offers will not be accepted because control of Intra would give Moscow a dangerously powerful leverage in the economy and even in the political life of this free-enterprise country, which in the past has been the banking haven of the Middle East.

Intra Bank closed its doors because of a "lack of liquidity" following heavy withdrawals by depositors of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, France and by the Moscow Norodny Bank, according to reliable reports.

The Soviet offer for control of Intra was said to have been a proposal of outright purchase for $200-million, with indications that the terms could be adjusted to suit Intra's interests.

The financial situation of the bank has not been made public in detail, but its assets, estimated at more than $200-million, are said to exceed its liabilities by a comfortable margin despite the shortage of ready cash.

The deal reported under discussion with Mr. Ludwig is said to include a loan from Chase Manhattan of sufficient cash to insure liquidity, or cash adequate to meet withdrawals by depositors.

[In New York, a spokesman for Chase Manhattan said no discussions had been held between the bank and Mr. Ludwig, and that the bank was unaware of any proposal to lend money to Intra Bank.]

Intra's capital stock outstanding is valued at 60 million Lebanese pounds, or slightly less than $20-million. The bank recently authorized the issuance of a further 60 million Lebanese pounds of capital stock, but this stock has not yet been put on the market.

The proposition reported under discussion with Mr. Ludwig is said to provide for his purchase of this unissued stock plus enough shares of already outstanding stock to give him control.

Intra directors reportedly do not find Mr. Ludwig's offer attractive, but it appears at the moment to be the only alternative to the unacceptable Soviet offer.

Mr. Ludwig already owns one-fourth of a secondary airline, Lebanese International Airways, and it is generally believed that his chief interest in Intra Bank lies in its control of the larger Middle East Airlines.

A senior vice president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, who arrived here Sunday night, said today he had no information to disclose on the situation.

Najib Salha, acting board chairman of Intra Bank, visited the United States Embassy today with what well qualified sources said was a request that the State Department encourage other United States financial groups to come to Intra's rescue.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 18, 1966]

Bank Crisis Halts Business in Beirut—Financial Institutions Closed as Cash Is Sought To Meet Any Run by Depositors

Beirut, Lebanon, October 17.—Business activity here was at a standstill today, with the country's 93 banks and the stock market closed. Cash was at a premium and the dollar and other foreign exchange rose.

Two policemen were posted in front of the offices of each bank in the capital, but crowds of depositors gathered only at the doors of the Intra Bank, which closed Saturday after a run of withdrawals.

Intra is one of the major banks in the Middle East, with assets estimated at $230-million. Its closing, which produced the current crisis, was laid to a lack of liquidity—that is, insufficient cash on hand to meet withdrawal demands by depositors.

The lack of cash was the result, officials said, of withdrawals of $30-million in the last month. The withdrawals have been variously ascribed to considerations of Arab politics and to a desire by major depositors to seek higher interest rates elsewhere.

Last night, after a 12-hour Cabinet meeting, the Government ordered all banks to close for three days starting today. The Government wanted time to make the necessary arrangements with the country's state-controlled central bank, the Bank of Lebanon, for enough cash to meet any run by depositors Thursday when the banks reopen.

The arrangements do not cover the Intra Bank. The Government statement said the solution for the Intra Bank would be sought outside the framework of measures covering other banks.

The statement explained that last Saturday Intra asked for "protective reconciliation" which means the bank offered to pay back depositors in full within a three-year period.

But the board of directors of Intra announced today that it had changed its mind about asking for "protective reconciliation" and had decided instead to ask the Government to provide the bank with cash on equal footing with the other banks.

AGREEMENT UNLIKELY

Informed banking quarters said it was unlikely the Government would agree. They pointed out that the Government measures were not meant to solve Intra's problem but to save other banks and the country's economic position as a whole.

Although the banks were closed, Beirut's money changers were busy. The value of a Lebanese pound has been about 33 cents at the free exchange rate. It was said to have dropped by 3 per cent.

Bankers generally were satisfied with the Government's measures. Pierre Edde, president of the Bankers Association, declared:

"The Cabinet's resolutions will insure sufficient cash liquidity for those who wish to withdraw their deposits. The resolutions will inspire optimism and re-establish confidence in the country's banking and financial position."

Meanwhile, the Government was seeking to tighten control of private banking operations to avoid any future crisis like Intra. The Ministry of Finance was instructed to revise the law to give more power to the central bank in its relations with private banks and in controlling the country's free money market.

Arab Socialists seemed pleased by the Intra crisis and its effect on Lebanon's economy.

A spokesman of the Syrian Ministry of Economy was quoted by the state-run Damascus newspapers as having said today that the crisis in Lebanon "is evidence of the dangers inherent in the capitalist system." He said such a crisis would never happen under the Socialist system.

Beirut's pro-Cairo Al Moharrer (Liberator) said Intra's crisis showed how thin Lebanese prosperity was. The paper urged the Government to reconsider the entire structure of the country's free economic system.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 18, 1966]

Bank Crisis Halts Business in Beirut as Regime Seeks Cash

(By Richard E. Mooney)

Paris, October 17.—The Paris, London and Frankfurt branches of the Intra Bank did not open today, as European financial circles, governmental as well as private, churned with rumors, inquiry and speculation about the meaning of the bank's collapse.

There was a lot of "I told you so," and some genuine apprehension. Some bankers predicted that Intra would not reopen and that other failures would follow soon.

Intra's operations have been viewed on the Continent for some time—in a mixture of competitive jealously and banking conservatism—as those of an over-adventurous upstart.

In the words of one authority, Intra "committed the cardinal sin" of tying itself up in long-term investments.

Paris has more than an average interest in Intra's affairs because some of the bank's biggest known investments are in France, and because Lebanon was a League of Nations mandate under French authority between the two World Wars.

There were rumors here today that private French banking interests—perhaps the Banque de l'Indochine—might seek to take over Intra's European operations now, or possibly even the whole bank. But there were other reports that the Bank of America and other American interests had already made such an offer in Beirut.

The manager of Intra's Paris branch said he was preparing to open this morning when contrary orders came from the Bank of France. The French authorities named a "provisional administrator" to determine the bank's exact condition.

The immediate effect of Intra's crisis on the major money markets was said to be nil. Several bankers said that they had experienced no unusual activity that might be traced to the situation in Beirut.

One immediate reflection was that Intra's trouble might seriously dampen Beirut's lately gained luster as a safe money haven—the Zurich of the Middle East. A Zurich banker said that Beirut had not really taken away much of Switzerland's Arab business because the Beirut banks were continuing to funnel the same funds to Swiss banks.

Bank Crisis Halts Business in Beirut as Regime Seeks Cash

(By Richard E. Mooney)

WITHDRAWALS IN GENEVA

Geneva, October 17.—Withdrawals by worried depositors at the Banque Intra of Geneva were "fairly large" today, according to an official of the bank affiliated with the closed Intra Bank of Beirut.

But the official said that the situation had always been under control, and no difficulties were expected for the time being.

Banque Intra, despite its affiliation with the Beirut bank, is an independent Swiss bank with its own charter and share capital—par value of common stock—of 20-million francs, about $4.6-million.

Five or six of the Geneva bank's customers were waiting for its doors to open this morning to make withdrawals, William F. Emery, its assistant manager, said,

"There was no pushing and everything went off calmly," he reported.

Today was the first opportunity that the bank's customers had to withdraw their money since the Beirut bank's difficulties became known. Some big foreign depositors made heavy calls on the Geneva institution.

Yesterday Banque Intra's board issued a statement that it was an independent Swiss bank that would "continue its normal activities" despite the crisis in Lebanon.

The extent of the Beirut bank's holdings in Banque Intra has not been disclosed.

STATE ACTS ON BRANCH HERE

Frank Wille, New York State Superintendent of Banks, acted yesterday to conserve the assets of the New York Branch of Intra Bank, 680 Fifth Avenue. The bank remained closed.

In a statement, Mr. Wille said:

"The State Banking Department has reviewed the books and records of the New York branch of Intra Bank. Excluding amounts owed to the main office of Intra Bank, its other branches and affiliates, the records of the New York branch indicate direct liabilities of approximately $2.15 million.

"To meet these liabilities, the New York branch has approximately $2,435,000 in cash on hand, readily marketable securities and demand deposits with large New York City bands. The records of the branch also indicate certain contingent liabilities which may or may not materialize depending on events in Lebanon."

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 17, 1966]

Lebanese Banks Closed in Wake of Run on Intra—Three-Day Bank Holiday Set After Cash Lack Causes Fall of Big Institution—New York Branch Is Seized

Beirut.—The Lebanese government ordered a three-day bank holiday in the wake of the closing of Intra Bank, Lebanon's largest bank, because of a lack of cash.

The move appeared to be designed to prevent a mass run on the nation's 86 banks following Intra's closing on Saturday. A government announcement indicated that the country's banks would reopen Thursday, but that Intra Bank would remain closed.

The government also ordered Lebanon's central bank to provide funds to back up the private banks, and instructed its finance ministry to draft a law that would increase the powers of the central bank.

[Assets of the New York branch of Intra were seized immediately by New York State's banking superintendent, Frank Wille, "to protect depositors." Mr. Wille ordered an immediate examination of the branch's financial condition, but said last night that no determination had been made as to whether the branch would be open today. A bank official said the branch had been required to keep 108% of its deposits in liquid assets and that it had more than met this requirement. He said its liquid assests "easily exceed" its liabilities to depositors.]

Foreign banking authorities said the Lebanese central bank's treasury of $200 million, mostly in gold, should be enough to quell a tide of withdrawals that began last week.

The central bank's reported refusal in the past week to handle certain forms of foreign exchange transactions with banks, including U.S. institutions, had caused confusion in the financial market.

The backbone of Intra's deposits came largely from the oil wealth of Kuwait and Saudi Arabia. Sources said that with increased interest rates available in the West, Kuwaiti and Saudi Arabian depositors had been withdrawing big sums from Intra for months, leading to the bank's liquidity troubles.

Intra's chairman, Youssef Beidas, submitted a report on the bank's financial position to the central bank with a copy of a statement by the bank's board announcing Intra's intention to settle 100% with its creditors.

Intra owns shares of Lebanon's major businesses, including a controlling interest in the country's flag air carrier, Middle East Airlines.

The Beirut sources said much of Intra's funds were tied up in such investments such as ownership of a big shipyard at La Ciotat in France and property on the Champs Elysees in Paris. The bank, which was started in 1950 by Mr. Beidas, who is a Palestinian refugee, had expanded rapidly in recent years, opening branches in Europe, Africa and Latin America as well as in New York.

[Intra's affiliate in Switzerland is little affected by the closing, according to bank officials in Geneva, as it is operated independently of the Beirut institution.]

It's understood that a New York financier, Daniel K. Ludwig, has offered, through his Beirut agent, to buy Intra Bank, and that negotiations are being held.

[In addition to the bank holiday, Lebanese stock market officials have asked permission to keep the exchange in Beirut closed today, United Press International reported.]

Lebanese banking circles welcomed the government's action in ordering amendments to the nation's financial regulations aimed at expanding the scope of the central bank.

The central bank said assistance measures would be based on proposals submitted by the Lebanese Bankers' Association. These included permitting banks to draw up to 25% of their paid-in capital and 65% of paid-in deposits.

TRIBUTES TO LEVERETT SALTONSTALL AND MILWARD SIMPSON

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as we come to the end of this session, it is with deep regret that I mark the departure of two colleagues from the Senate after many years of outstanding service to the country.

Lev Saltonstall has always seemed to me to be the epitome of integrity and high character in the public service. I have always considered it a privilege to serve in the Senate with the senior Senator from Massachusetts, and a great honor to call him friend.

Mr. President, Leverett Saltonstall's colleagues all know of his diligence and effectiveness as ranking member on Appropriations and Armed Services Committees and his wise counsel to our party as chairman of the Republican conference. But because of his fine work here, many in Washington may not fully realize the outstanding record of achievement that our esteemed colleague brought with him from Massachusetts.

The only citizen of the Commonwealth in history to serve as Governor of Massachusetts for three terms, Leverett Saltonstall's terms of office are still considered models of effective and progressive State government. During his terms of office, unemployment was reduced, public services were increased, and Massachusetts established the most outstanding labor record of any major industrial State at that time.

Since coming to the Senate in 1944, he has compiled a record of achievement and hard work matched by few others, especially on behalf of the strength of our Armed Forces.

His truly remarkable achievement on behalf of the citizens of Massachusetts and of the Nation during 46 years of outstanding public service—beginning with a term as alderman in his home city of Newton in 1920—is a source of pride to me and I am sure to all Members of this body. His patience and wise counsel will be missed by us all. And I bespeak for Senator Saltonstall and Mrs. Saltonstall many continued years of vigorous, prosperous, and fruitful living.

SENATOR MILWARD SIMPSON

During all my associations with Senator Milward Simpson during the past 4 years, I have found him to be a perfect gentleman and outstanding colleague. His retirement from this body marks a major turning point in his political career which has spanned some 40 years and taken this Wyoming lawyer from the State legislature to the Governor's mansion and to the Senate.

His work on behalf of his native State of Wyoming as a member of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee is well known and most respected. Most of my personal associations with Senator Simpson, however, have concerned our work together on the Government Operations Committee where his quiet strength, his integrity, and his diligence gave us all a sense of calm deliberation in times of stress.

In the 4 years he has been in this body, the Senator of Wyoming has earned the respect and affection of all by his constant willingness to cooperate with his colleagues in seeking fair solutions to the problems of our country and by his conscientious devotion. We will certainly miss him.

I bespeak for him and Mrs. Simpson many continued years of happiness and fruitful living.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, our very dear friend the Republican leader [Mr. Dirksen] has prepared, in his eloquent and knowledgeable style, his own comments on our two colleagues who sit on the Republican side of the aisle and who are voluntarily leaving the Senate. Senator Dirksen has asked me to read these tributes into the Record. The first one is on Senator Leverett Saltonstall.

SENATOR LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, what does one say about this gracious, self-effacing man from Massachusetts who has decided to leave these legislative halls after a long, impressive record and seek the groves of retirement?

He is such a comfortable person to have around and is like an old shoe. His candor is a constant reminder of the deep conviction by which he lives. His record is eloquent evidence of his long devotion to public service and his character shines like an imperishable jewel.

Truly he hallows the traditions which are so essential a part of his native State. He is a man of impeccable manners knowing that they are a mark of culture and of good breeding which enrich the commonplace.

There is about him a rare gentility which is in sharp contrast to the stern business of politics. He exhibits an unfailing courtesy in places and circumstances where courtesy is not always evident.

He has always exhibited a decent respect for the opinions of others. He is a religious man who knows the existence of God in the American tradition. He is at once a gentleman, a statesman, and a public servant in the finest sense of those terms and surely we shall miss him.

Long will his spirit hover in this Chamber as an inspiration to all who shall sit in these seats when he has gone to a richly deserved retirement.

Mr. KUCHEL. And, on Senator Milward L. Simpson:

SENATOR MILWARD L. SIMPSON

Mr. DIRKSEN. The retirement of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, the Honorable Milward Simpson, loses to us one of the most gracious, affable, and kindly persons who ever graced this body.

His quaint humor, his endless store of anecdotes and experiences have come to enliven any gathering where he may be present.

Before he came here he made an impressive mark for himself in the field of public service as the Governor of Wyoming, and his service in the Senate has enhanced his stature, his understanding, and his appreciation of the problems which beset the Nation. To their solution he has brought a talent that is at once rich and rare. His combination of administrative and legislative experience has been invaluable and he has made some telling marks in the cause of freedom which will endure long after he has gone. Truly it will be said of him, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant. Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

MILWARD SIMPSON, SENATOR, GOVERNOR, EDUCATOR, RANCHER, WESTERNER, AMERICAN

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have not known Milward Simpson long—only for the 4 years that he has served in the Senate—but his departure from Washington at the end of this session is a disturbing occasion for me. In our work here in the Senate and during our travels to Interparliamentary Union meetings, I have come to know him as a good friend whose company I will miss.

I have found him always a courteous gentleman, always a man of high ideals. Those ideals, Mr. President, are imbedded very firmly in the character building soil of the old West. His grandfather was a noted Indian fighter so admired by the Shoshone Indians that they called him "Werengo" or "bear guts."

His father was a cattle driver who became one of the West's most noted criminal lawyers. His mother was born on the old frontier after her parents had barely escaped an Indian raid. Senator Simpson comes from the Burnett family of Texas. David G. Burnett, as Provisional First President of the Republic of Texas, presided at the creation of a nation, at the signing of the Texas Declaration of Independence at Old Washington-on-the-Brazos in Texas March 2, 1836, and the adoption of the Provisional Constitution of the Republic of Texas in the same city four days later. David Burnett was President of Texas during the fall of the Alamo and during Sam Houston's defeat of Santa Anna at San Jacinto and during the negotiation of a treaty with Santa Anna. Milward Simpson's mother—who was educated at Saint Ursaline Convent in Galveston, Texas—was a daughter of Ben Burnett, a close relative of David G. Burnett, his counsel and advisor, and one of those who participated in the creation of Texas. Senator Simpson is thus linked honorably and securely not only with his part of the West but with mine as well. The Senator himself, in the western way, earned his college tuition laboring on a ranch, in a coal mine and on a work crew.

He is a man of the West possessed of all the best attributes of the West: He is tenacious and industrious, energetic, honorable, and able.

During his time in public service—as a legislator, Governor, Senator, and president of the board of trustees for the University of Wyoming—he has done much for the West, in conservation, in education, in economic development. The fall 1966 edition of Wyoming on Review, which was dedicated to the Senator for his "outstanding service to his community, State and Nation," included an article describing his work in the West. I ask unanimous consent that that article, entitled "Senator Milward Simpson, Outstanding Citizen," be reprinted in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SENATOR MILWARD SIMPSON, OUTSTANDING CITIZEN

Note.—This edition of "Wyoming on Review" is dedicated to Senator Milward Simpson for his outstanding service to his community, state and nation. His life is a fine example of a dedicated citizen.

The retirement this year of U.S. Senator Milward Simpson will mark the major turning point in a political career that has spanned some forty years and which has taken the Wyoming Republican from the State Legislature to the Governor's Mansion and to the Senate of the United States.

Few Wyomingites of either party have had so lengthy and diversified a history of public service.

Milward Simpson has been both a writer of legislation and an enforcer of laws. One of the first major bills to bear his name was the so-called "Rock Dusting" bill on mine safety which Simpson co-sponsored with former State Legislator John B. Georges of Kemmerer in 1927. The "Rock Dusting" bill set new and, at that time, controversial safety standards for Wyoming's coal mines. It was a good law then and it remains a good law today.

Only a few hours had passed in Milward Simpson's first week as Governor of Wyoming when he called a conference of western governors to help secure the rights of the Upper Colorado River Basin States under the Colorado River Compact. That was in 1955. From that meeting came a hard consensus among the states of Wyoming, Colorado, Utah and New Mexico which helped them secure their rightful water allotments under the far-sighted tenets of the Colorado River Compact.

Long before the Federal Administration coined the term Creative Federalism, Wyoming's Governor Simpson had made Federalism creative in the Equality State through a cooperative effort which cleaned up the once stagnant and moribund North Platte River. And, under his leadership, Wyoming's State Legislature became one of the first in the nation to pass enabling legislation for matching grants for interstate highway construction. The "creative" shown with a brilliance when the National Park Service, goaded by Governor Simpson's threats to buy the concessions in Yellowstone National Park, inaugurated the still on-going Mission '66 program—a multi-million dollar face-lifting and general renovating of 231 National Parks in 45 states.

Republican Administrations have always led the way in creating the proper climate and enthusiasm for the influx of taxpaying and job producing private industry into the Equality State. Milward Simpson's term as governor saw the completion of Pacific Power and Light Company's massive coal-burning 420,000 kilowatt Dave Johnston steam generating plant near Glenrock. New life was pumped into the Kemmerer coal mines by inauguration of Utah Power and Light Company's 150,000 kilowatt steam generating plant. These installations, and others, burn the bituminous coal found under all of Wyoming's twenty-three counties. The Kemmerer facility will eventually burn enough coal to produce 750,000 kilowatts of power.

Under Governor Simpson's leadership, a delegation from Wyoming appeared before the Atomic Energy Commission to petition for an increase in permits for establishment of uranium processing plants. The well-documented presentation by the Wyomingites landed the entire increase in permits—considered for distribution to several states—for Wyoming.

Other accomplishments in Governor Simpson's term included increases in the physical plant at the University of Wyoming, brought about, in part, by the cooperation and donations of the W. R. Coe Foundation with which Governor Simpson worked closely. In conferences with the Coe Foundation, Governor Simpson drew heavily on his experience as past president of the University's Board of Trustees.

In addition were: new quarters for the Wyoming State Highway Department; a new state liquor warehouse for Wyoming's state liquor monopoly; the decision by U.S. Steel to establish a steel plant near South Pass City and Geneva Steel to open its ore facility near Atlantic City; and establishment of a Department of Mental Health in the State Health Department. This department effectively reorganized the operation of the Wyoming State Mental Hospital at Evanston, improved the operation of the Wyoming State Training School at Lander, and under Governor Simpson's leadership brought the mental health issue into the full light of day where it could be dealt with by the people and their elected officials.

Prior to Governor Simpson's election, Wyoming's North Platte River, which has its genesis in the clean, clear mountains of Northern Colorado, had become "so grossly polluted that it is doubtful if recovery could ever be obtained"—in the words of a 1948 Public Health Service report governing a 150-mile section of the river from Casper to the state line.

Inspired by Wyoming newspaper editorials, Governor Simpson hired Arthur E. Williamson as Director of the Division of Environmental Sanitation for Wyoming's Department of Public Health. With the complete and enthusiastic backing of Wyoming's Administration, from the Governor on down, Mr. Williamson worked to clean up the North Platte. He succeeded.

An article on the river, written for the April 1966 issue of *True* magazine, and scheduled for *Reader's Digest*, notes quite correctly that under Governor Simpson's leadership the North Platte became "the only large river in the United States ever to be cleaned up after having been polluted in a variety of ways. In Wyoming," the article continues, "the river has come back to life."

As Wyomingites know, Milward Simpson has predicated his political career on three guiding principles—courage, faith, and enthusiasm. These were put to the test as never before when in 1956 he had an opportunity to become the first Wyomingite ever to hold a cabinet-level post in the Federal Government.

President Eisenhower, searching for a replacement for his outgoing Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay, turned his attention to Wyoming. He was impressed by the articulate, knowledgeable, and personable Republican Governor of the Equality State. In numerous appearances in Washington, Simpson had represented the Upper Basin States in disputes involving the Colorado River Compact and Simpson had been a major force in organizing the campaign which led to Eisenhower's first election.

It was only logical then that he asked Governor Simpson to come to Washington to take over the reins of the Department of the Interior, for Simpson had earned his Republican spurs, and he was an acknowledged expert on interior problems.

Milward Simpson turned the President down, as he was to acknowledge eight years later when then General Eisenhower related the event. Explained the Governor, "I had made a pledge to the people of my state that I would serve a full four-year term as Governor and I could not violate that pledge no matter how tempting the offer."

Senator Simpson got to Washington on his own five years after the Presidential offer when he was elected to the United States Senate by one of the greatest margins ever given a candidate in a traditionally close Wyoming election.

He was elected to the United States Senate for the remaining four years of a term re-opened in 1960 by the death of Senator-elect Keith Thomson. In the less than four years he has served, he has compiled an enviable record of accomplishments.

Serving on three committees and nine subcommittees, Senator Simpson usually starts his day at the office ahead of his staff and divides his time among Committee tasks, Floor work, and helping constituents with their problems.

His appointment to the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee—the Committee which, more than any other, vitally affects the interests of Wyoming—was a natural for the Wyoming lawyer who had become familiar with Wyoming's land and water problems through his gubernatorial experience and membership on dozens of boards and study groups.

Interior was the one of two Committee assignments which Simpson kept as he moved into the 89th Congress last year. He gave up the Senate Banking and Currency Committee in favor of two new Committees, Post Office and Civil Service, and Government Operations, both of which offered new outlets for his enthusiasms.

In a Senate controlled 2 to 1 by an iron disciplined Democrat majority, Senator Simpson counts his major accomplishments in terms of cooperation with his colleagues rather than personal credit earned by legislative successes.

It was the legal argument propounded by Senator Simpson that halted closure of the Horticultural Research Station near Cheyenne. An ill-conceived "economy" move by the Administration would have spelled an end to this important research facility which serves Wyoming and neighboring states. Senator Simpson pointed out, in a lengthy letter and heavily documented report, that the Department of Agriculture had no authority to close a research facility created through a specific act of Congress. After studying the arguments, the Administration rescinded its closing order.

As an Interior Committee member, Senator Simpson succeeded in bringing a subcommittee of that Senate group to Wyoming for on-the-spot hearings on the proposed inclusion of Wyoming's Upper Green River in legislation to establish a Wild Rivers System. The Green was omitted from the bill.

It was Senator Simpson who, in the 88th Congress, introduced legislation limiting beef imports—a measure which led to limitations on such imports and which benefited the livestock industry, not only of Wyoming, but of other western and southern states.

Through Senator Simpson's introduction and guidance, an amendment was affixed to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1965 preventing that Act from being used to deprive taxpaying business concerns, such as the Petroleum Ownership Map Company of Casper, of bona fide government contracts which the Administration had attempted to transfer to the vast tax-supported Federal bureaucracy.

Through Senator Simpson's efforts, parties in the controversy between the Bureau of Land Management and the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission, involving the fencing of Wyoming land, were brought together—in Senator Simpson's office—for a discussion which cleared the air of some misunderstandings.

As this was being written, Senator Simpson announced that a Senate Interior Subcommittee would be in Wyoming in June of this year for on-site inspection of the proposed Flaming Gorge National Recreational area in southwestern Wyoming—another solid accomplishment for which Wyoming can tip its Stetson to Milward Simpson. It was also Senator Simpson's influence on the Interior Committee which was a major factor in the success in the Senate legislation to create the Big Horn Canyon National Recreational area on the Wyoming-Montana border.

In less than four years in the Senate, the gentleman from Wyoming has become one of the most respected and emulated members of the Upper House. In a body where partisan politics ring sharp and accolades come dear, no finer compliment could be paid to the man who will this year leave public office than that uttered on the Senate Floor by Majority Leader Mike Mansfield of Montana.

Senator Mansfield, a Democrat, said of Simpson, "He has gained the respect and affection of colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I want to assure him that he has my personal respect and affection in full measure. I want him to know that his decency, his cooperativeness, and his conscientious work in the Senate will be missed immediately upon his departure and long remembered by all of us who remain."

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR SALTONSTALL

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, over the Dexter Gate at Harvard University, there is an inscription which says:

> Depart here, better to serve thy country and thy kind.

Fifty-two years ago the senior Senator from Massachusetts walked through that gate as a graduate. For 46 of those 52 years he has been in public life. He was the speaker of the Massachusetts House of Representatives for 8 years. He was the Governor of Massachusetts for three terms. He has been Senator from Massachusetts for 22 years.

At the end of this week, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL will leave this Chamber, and end his public career.

The departure of LEVERETT SALTONSTALL from public life in Massachusetts will mark, in one sense, the end of an era. He was the eldest in point of service, and the most respected of those men of Yankee stock, whose roots go deep into Massachusetts history, who have carried their family heritage in the service of their country. To the people of my State, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL is more than an institution. He is and always will be an inspiration.

He was a progressive Governor of Massachusetts in time of war and many landmark bills on behalf of labor, and industry were passed in his term. He has been in this body the firm champion of Massachusetts industry, and commerce, especially in the fields of fishing, textiles, shoes, and electronics. He has been a leader in the passage of the civil rights bill, and the successful fight for immigration reform. He has guided major appropriations bills through the Senate, with great patience and skill. As much as any man in Congress, he has shaped our defense policies to keep our Nation strong.

There are many Senators present today who have served with Senator SALTONSTALL much longer than I and who, I know, wish to be heard on his contribution to this Senate and to this country. I would just like to say that no one has been a better teacher or a finer friend than my senior colleague. When I came to the Senate almost 4 years ago, he took me around the Chamber pointing out the various things of historic interest. He remarked that he had taken President Kennedy on the same tour in 1953, and he hoped he would not have to show any more Kennedys around the Senate. But I think if it had come to that, he would have, nonetheless.

His office has always been in close touch with every Federal development affecting Massachusetts. He has always spoken forcefully for his State.

May I say that President Kennedy valued extremely highly the relationship he developed with Senator SALTONSTALL in their 8 years as colleagues. They collaborated more closely than many Senators from the same State of the same party. They sponsored legislation together. They worked together for the best interests of Massachusetts. It was a sign of President Kennedy's deep respect for the abilities of Senator SALTONSTALL that he consulted him on many matters of defense and foreign policy and asked him to go to Moscow to witness the signing of the nuclear test ban treaty.

We in Massachusetts are proud of our history. It goes back farther than most States. We are proud of the tradition of public service that some of our oldest families have carried out through the years. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL is the noblest of that breed of men. I think I can say on behalf of all the people of Massachusetts that though he may be giving up his office, we are not about to give up him. He has served too well. He means too much. He is too much a part of the landscape.

Senator SALTONSTALL has said that he does not intend to rusticate on his farm in Dover growing flowers and cutting hedges. I hope he will be able to undertake as many opportunities for service as come his way.

I say, in conclusion, that the Senator has had at his side through all his public life, his very lovely wife, Alice, and I wish to both of them many happy years together in contemplation of what has been a stimulating and productive past and what I know will be a happy future.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I appreciate what my colleague has said.

I am glad that I was able to serve with his brother, the late President, for whom we all have such great respect.

I have enjoyed serving with the junior Senator from Massachusetts and with his brother from the State of New York in the past few years.

I cannot say that I will be here to take any more Kennedys down the aisle, but I will be glad to show them around the State of Massachusetts any time they want.

It will be a great pleasure, although a tearful and emotional pleasure, for me to turn over the automobile tag U.S.S. 1 to my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts.

EMERY L. FRAZIER

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the Senate of the United States is accurately and admirably reflected in most of the adult lifetime of its Secretary, Emery L. Frazier, who approaches his retirement. Of course, I support the resolution of commendation, as all of us do, for he is the unassuming, helpful friend of every Senator. He has labored in the Senate for more than 30 years with meticulous care and painstaking devotion. He has served as legislative clerk, as Chief Clerk, and as Secretary of the Senate with distinction and with a quality of spirit far beyond the ordinary.

Let it be noted that Emery Frazier has rendered his services impartially. He has many friends on both sides of the aisle. His particular interest in the lore of the Senate, its traditions, and its history will ever be remembered, and his research will be of benefit to the American public for years to come.

Emery Frazier brought here a knowledge of the law, as well as some firsthand legislative experience as a member of the legislature of his home State of Kentucky. Before he came to Capitol Hill he had already acquired a considerable parliamentary education which can only come through years of proximity to the American legislative process.

I extend to him all best wishes of a friend for many felicitous years ahead.

I also wish to join in welcoming Frank Valeo to his new post as Secretary of the Senate. Frank has already established a fine record in the Senate, and I know he will fill this office with great distinction.

NEED FOR COAL RESEARCH EXPANSION CONTINUES TO GROW

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, last June 30, I spoke here of the need for an expanded research program for coal. The leaders of the coal and allied industries were urged to take the initiative in charting a new and expanded research program which would be a first step in redressing the startling imbalance which currently exists between nuclear power research and that for other forms of energy. The clear danger exists that unless more research is devoted to coal, particularly to improve the efficiency and economy of operation of coal-burning electric powerplants, much of our invaluable coal reserves could remain unused in the ground in the years ahead. This would be a national scandal because it is evident that we eventually will need all the sources of energy available to us to meet the rapidly growing demand for energy.

A few days ago, I addressed a letter to Joseph E. Moody, president of the National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., which represents coal producers, the United Mine Workers of America, coal-carrying railroads, equipment manufacturers, and coal-burning electric utilities. I requested that his organization, as the representative of the entire coal industrial complex, discuss my suggestions which can then be submitted for the consideration of the next session of Congress.

I am aware of the excellent research programs being conducted by the industry-financed Bituminous Coal Research, Inc., an affiliate of the National Coal Association, and by the Office of Coal Research and the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior. Assurance is given that I am not deprecating the useful work of these groups when I say their efforts need to be bolstered and greatly expanded to make certain that the Nation receives the full benefits of its almost limitless coal reserves.

It is my hope that the coal industry leaders can formulate a program which, if accepted by the Congress, would go a long way toward placing coal research on a parity basis with Federal research for nuclear power reactor development which an official of the Atomic Energy Commission recently stated is now approximately $300 million a year. The disparity is incredible.

I am sure members of the Senate and the House Interior Committees and other members of the next Congress will give the most careful consideration to any expanded research program which is aimed primarily at obtaining the maximum utilization of our coal reserves in the years ahead when the demand for energy predictably is going to be extensive.

It is my hope and expectation that, when Congress convenes next January, a long-range program, carefully geared not only to the needs of the industry and its thousands of employees but to the clearly established needs of the Nation as well, will be ready for submission for the consideration of the Congress. It is my conviction that such a course of action is clearly in the national interest.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I have learned with a profound sense of regret that there will be no Legislative Reorganization Act of 1966. Although I will not be a Member of this body next year, I sincerely hope that legislative reorganization will be high on the agenda for the 90th Congress.

Unfortunately, legislative reorganization, particularly to the end that Congress might find itself strengthened, was not what the White House chose to consider "must" legislation. Even more unfortunate is the fact that the Congress in its infinite wisdom could not see fit to bring the bill to the floor for action, regardless of the thinking at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. To expect the White House to support legislative reform of a meaningful nature—which would mean a diminution of executive power—would be to expect the fox to stand diligent guard over the sleeping chickens.

Mr. President, I wholeheartedly endorse legislative reform, although I do not thoroughly concur with the view of the Senator who has described Congress as "The Sapless Branch."

The fact is that we have not had a constitutional Republic for quite some years. We have what might be termed a mongrelized Parliament because the gentleman who resides at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue has a relationship to Capitol Hill far more similar to a Prime Minister to the Parliament than a President to the Congress.

Consider that the White House drafts and introduces most major legislation, that the White House determines the scheduling of deliberation on bills, whether they will be deliberated at all, how a frighteningly large percentage of Congressmen will vote on a given bill, and who will reap the political advantage of legislation regardless of who worked to secure it. This was hardly the system described with such powerful eloquence by those inspired and eloquent statesmen who authored our Constitution.

There is a drastic need for reform on both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue to revamp the checks-and-balance system. What we have now is checks on Congress and the balance with the President, which hardly contributes to the effectiveness of constitutional government.

I favor fully staffed and well paid technical committees working between the Senate and the House of Representatives on a strictly nonpartisan basis. These committees would be the fact-finding arm of the lawmaking branch. I also favor a more equitable congressional staff system in which both parties would have equal access to professional advisers on existing committees. At the present time, there are no Republican staff members or advisers on the key Foreign Relations Committee, on Appropriations, or on Finance. From the Republican point of view, Senate committees are sadly understaffed.

Information is the key to power. So long as Congress must be always beholden to the Executive for the information on which it bases its deliberations, there will be no rebalancing of the scales. Congress must have its own computerized informational system operated perhaps by the Library of Congress and with an effective rapport between the committees and the Library of Congress.

While I am on the subject of the Library, it should be noted for the record that about 70 percent of the total work load of the Library of Congress is on behalf, not of Congress, but of the executive branch. Executive agencies pump more requests for studies and information into the Library of Congress than does Congress. When a Member of Congress does make a request of the Library, he is liable to find himself at the tailend of a long line, and I have discovered recently that at the front of that line is quite likely to be the Department of Defense or some other agency which already has its own information gathering facilities.

Among the changes envisioned in Senator Monroney's S. 3848 was a so-called committee bill of rights to give the majority of the committee the right to call meetings or to require legislation to be reported. The minority would have the right to call witnesses of their choice for at least one day of hearings on a given subject. Certain committees would be reorganized or redesignated. Congress would have a new source of fiscal control. There would be an increase in the number of round trips for Senators and Representatives. There would be a leased-line service and a reorganization within the Library of Congress. Also, the bill would provide for the appointment of postmasters by the Postmaster General on the basis of merit and without senatorial confirmation. This has long needed implementation. Certainly there are other provisions of the bill with which I think the Senate is generally familiar.

Mr. President, Congress is the primary instrument through which the people of our Nation translate their views and philosophy into action by their Government. The diminution of congressional power which we have witnessed in recent years is in fact a diminution of the reflected voice of our Nation in its own affairs. I sincerely hope and pray that Congress will address itself to the question of its own inadequacy in the upcoming 90th Congress and that it will pass legislation, irrespective of the views of the White House, to give the voice of the people a much needed effectiveness.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a report entitled "Management Study of the U.S. Congress," prepared by the Arthur D. Little Co., be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks. The study was commissioned by NBC News for the special report "Congress Needs Help."

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MANAGEMENT STUDY OF THE U.S. CONGRESS

(By Arthur D. Little, Inc., commissioned by NBC News, for the special report, "Congress Needs Help," broadcast on the NBC television network)

I. BACKGROUND

A. Purpose and scope

For eighteen months NBC News contemplated producing a special television program appraising the efficiency of Congressional operations. Recognizing that the affairs of the nation have become ever more complex, and that there was some public concern over the efficiency of the Congressionary machinery, NBC News concluded that it would be an important public service to present an evaluation of the practices and operating machinery of Congress measured against modern management techniques employed by leading corporations. Such a program, aimed at stimulating constructive public discussion, would bring the issue of Congressional efficiency squarely before the public. Accordingly, NBC News asked Arthur D. Little, Inc. (ADL) to evaluate the practices and operating machinery of Congress against the best modern management techniques. In the words of David Brinkley, "We want to help the Congress to do what it really wants to do."

More specifically, ADL was asked to:

1. Appraise Congressional effectiveness and efficiency in terms of the role assigned Congress by the Constitution, and the extent to which Congress can, and does, make use of modern management practices and techniques;

2. Identify operating problems in Congress;

3. Recommend ways in which Congress can improve its effectiveness adopting modern management practices and techniques.

B. Approach

Because the United States Congress is a unique institution, our management analysis has necessarily been adapted to take into account the difference between Congress and organizations that are commonly subject to management study.

The Congress works on three levels: as individuals, in committees, and as a legislative body. The present study focused separately and concurrently on all three levels. At each level the research consisted of: (1) interviews with members of Congress, (2) interviews with members of the supporting staffs, (3) interviews with professional students of Congress, scholars, and press observers, (4) examination of records and documents, and (5) a literature search. Our approach and findings were reviewed by a committee comprised of a historian, a former member of the Senate, and Chairman of the Board of ADL.

1. Interviews with members of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

We interviewed a group of legislators of varying length of experience, party affiliation, committee membership, and size and type of constituency, and asked them to identify problems and to suggest remedies. Throughout the work, we received the fullest possible cooperation from all Congressmen.

2. Interviews with Congressional staff. In interviews with individual office staffs and committee staffs, we explored the types of tasks customarily assigned to them for execution; reviewed methods used in their work; and determined the sources of information upon which they depend. Although scattered, these interviews demonstrated considerable variation in quality and numerical sufficiency of Congressional staff personnel.

3. Interviews with professional students of Congress, scholars, and other observers. We employed academicians to assist our own professional team. We also interviewed scholars on Congressional performance and the possible need for reform.

4. Examination of records. We reviewed Congressional records and publications, primarily those of the 88th Congress. We examined selectively the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, committee hearings and reports, bills, acts, and rules of procedure.

5. Literature search. We read broadly in the vast body of literature of the Congress. We reviewed books and pamphlets and also unpublished manuscripts written by past Presidents, active and retired members of Congress, political scientists and professional students of government and social observers, historians, and others of special qualifications.

C. Conclusions

This management report on the Congress is intended to be as nonpolitical as it is possible for the commentary on a great political body to be. In proposals for change we have attempted to avoid issues that are primarily partisan in their consequences or that relate fundamentally to revising the existing power structure within the Congress.

The study on which this report is based discloses very significant opportunities for improvement in Congressional operations. We believe these opportunities, if exploited, can add substantially to the authority and effectiveness of Congress.

Our recommendations are based on concepts that have been proven in industry.

1. Congress is burdened by an ever-increasing workload, caused by continuing growth of the nation and the government, and Congress' failure to relieve itself of unnecessary work detail. The weight of this work load as felt personally by the legislators is a serious impediment to a greater Congressional effectiveness.

2. Congress often does not get the kind of information needed for sound evaluation of proposed legislation or adequate examination of alternatives. Modern technology and management methods along with more and better staff resources provide opportunities to correct this deficiency.

3. The present organization of the Congressional work year impedes effective attention to and action on national policy issues; Congress thus risks continuing loss of power to the Executive Branch.

4. Congress does not adequately inform the nation of its performance and accomplishments as a body, and thus contributes to its own difficulties.

D. Recommendations

1. Congress should schedule its institutional work on a full-year basis and adjust the schedule week-by-week as needed. Congress has a full-time job; it needs a year-round schedule.

Congress needs a full year to review and act on the Federal budget and should schedule that work accordingly. By laying out house and committee schedules, Congress can reduce time conflicts for its members and make more member time available for institutional business.

2. Congress should establish its own sources for better information and improved analytical tools and methods by:

Establishing a Joint Committee on Fiscal Policy to provide a comprehensive over-all view of Federal revenue and expense. Establishing an analytical "controllership" service in addition to the General Accounting Office.

Strengthening the staffs of many of its committees and providing them with a computerized analytical capability. Insisting on getting from the Executive Branch improved 5 to 10 year forecasts of the commitments Congress is making when it supports new or revised Executive programs.

3. Congress, its committees, and its individual members should make more and better use of staff support to facilitate its attention to and action on matters of national importance by:

Establishing a central clearing house to assist the individual legislator to process constituent requests. Establishing a central personnel office to assist in staff recruitment and selection.

Establishing an office management service to help its members. Adopting modern recording methods for its floor proceedings. Not diverting its attention by detailed administration of the District of Columbia.

Establishing a merit system for selecting postmasters and service academy appointees.

4. Congress should take steps to improve public knowledge of and respect for its institutional worth and accomplishments by:

Adopting a simple, clear code of ethics for its members and the disclosure requirements it applies to officials of the Executive Branch.

Adopting a regular retirement age, perhaps 65 years, for the office of committee chairman.

Sending its members home at frequent intervals to discuss what is being done on Capitol Hill.

Exploring possible methods for using the mass media for regular reports on its accomplishments—e.g., end-of-session or end-of-Congress reports modeled on the Presidential Press Conference.

II. NATURE AND OPERATIONS OF CONGRESS

A. The national enterprise and purpose of Congress

The fundamental goals for which the United States exists are specified in the Preamble to the Constitution: ". . . to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, . . ."

These goals are based on the premise that all men are created equal, that they are entitled to certain inalienable rights, and that the authority of government rests in the people themselves. They have never been fully realized; yet their pursuit is an enterprise in which Congress plays a central role and from which it derives its purpose.

B. The functions of Congress

1. Constitutional and traditional functions. Constitutionally, the functions of Congress are: (1) legislative; (2) judicial, in impeachment proceedings and the judgment of elections; (3) fiscal; (4) electoral, when the Electoral College fails to develop a majority; (5) constituent, in the development of Constitutional amendments; (6) housekeeping, in the maintenance of its own rules; and (7) to serve as an Executive and Investigative Counsel on treaties and appointments.

Yet, the Constitution provides no definitive statement of how Congress should function. One of the ways by which the Founders sought to equalize the power of the Executive, Legislative and Judicial branches was to give them imprecise and overlapping functions; Congress has primacy in—but not exclusive possession of—lawmaking; the President has the power to convene Congress on extraordinary occasions, to recommend measures for its consideration, and to veto its acts. Inasmuch as he has the power to make treaties and to appoint and receive ambassadors, the President has been given primacy in the conduct of foreign relations, but not exclusive control; the Senate must consent to both the making of treaties and the appointment of ambassadors.

Besides being the principal lawmaker and a participant in the conduct of foreign relations, Congress has a major share in the spending of public money. The Constitution warns the Executive that money may not be spent unless it has been appropriated by law. The spending of money, implicitly an Executive function, is thereby made subject to control by Congress, but the extent and kind of control are left open to struggle between the two branches.

Although Congress's power is limited, no function of government is altogether barred to it; in lawmaking its role is central. The Constitution assumes that the Congress will be heavily engaged in deciding what the Government should do. Constitutionally, Congress is not principally an instrument for consenting to the actions of the Executive or even for controlling them; rather it is itself an agent of decision.

2. Present functions of Congress. Congress today devotes most of its time and attention to: (1) lawmaking; (2) overseeing administration; (3) appropriating funds; and (4) serving and communicating with constituents. These functions, taken together, largely define its role in our tripartite government. They also, in practical terms, create an enormous burden for the Congress and its Members. The heavy workload of Congress today is due largely to: (1) the growth of the nation since its foundation, and its enlarged role among the nations of the world; (2) the rapid growth of the Government, particularly over recent decades; and (3) the enormous complexity of issues on which Congress must decide and commit the nation. Exhibit 1 portrays a selection of growth indicators which suggest the increasing Congressional workload since 1940.

The workload of the individual legislator was acutely apparent to us during our observations of Congress. Although it is certainly true that some members of Congress are not hard workers, the overwhelming majority are hardworking, dedicated men and women, painfully aware of their many duties and responsibilities. The arduousness of their task is marked, even by comparison with the most critical executive positions in industry. The 12-hour work-day is common among Federal legislators. Longer work-days of 16 to 18 hours are frequent. There is an unending series of appointments, meetings, decisions, hearings and speeches. Congress is an extraordinarily hard-working organization; yet, its decisions must somehow be carefully deliberative to be effective.

To understand the size of the legislator's work-load, it is well to recognize the breadth of his responsibility. He votes on all Federal legislation and governmental activities. His responsibility is, therefore, and in a very real sense, as broad as that of the President. To understand the role of the legislator, and its several aspects, one should recognize the role played today by Congress itself. It is watching the administration and opening its activities to public discussion, and (c) educating the public, and serving to create, and represent, consensus in the public.

a. Representation of the People and the Management of Conflict

In a democratic system, government strives to alleviate the tensions and coercions of social life and by so doing to help groups and individuals in the society better attain the kind of life they wish to live. However, such a role is not an easy one. It is first necessary to identify the problems, to gather information on the coercions and tensions and the extent and seriousness of their effects. It is then necessary to accommodate the interests involved while still preserving the ability to act effectively.

In both regards, under the American form of government, Congress makes an indispensable contribution. If the Presidency were the only representative institution in the political system, disadvantaged groups in the society would have far less ability to make their grievances known. Victory in an election cannot and does not tell the President much, except in terms of the broad directions the country wishes to go. The information provided by 435 Congressmen and 100 Senators—each of whom represents a certain constituency and each of whom is highly sensitive to, and in a sense personally embodies, the views and grievances of his district—gives a sensitive and continuous reading of public interests and grievances.

It should be noted that, as established in the Constitution, the American system of government forces decisions to be made on the basis of high levels of agreement rather than simply by having 51% of the people rule the other 49%. Laws are not made through plebiscites but through a process that involves the agreement of three different branches, each of which has a different constituency. Moreover, the constituency of one branch, the Senate, is not based on population, but on equal sovereignty of the states. As a result, bare majorities of the people do not and cannot rule in the United States. Rather, bill passage requires the support or at least the acquiescence of many different groups and interests. Thus, when majority coalitions are formed in Congress, much more than a bare majority of the population is represented in the coalition.

b. Watching of the Executive Branch

Control of the governors is an age-old problem. The formulation of laws as solutions to social grievances does not end the problem of representative government. It is also essential that the laws be carried out responsibly: that is, in terms of the intent of the lawmakers; and efficiently: that is, in such a manner that they achieve their objectives at a minimum cost.

Could the bureaucracy be adequately controlled without the existence of a legislature? No. The President does not have adequate resources to meet the full needs of bureaucratic control. He must work primarily through his own staff services and through the top levels of the bureaucracy which are political and which he controls through appointment. However, the political heads of the departments and agencies tend to be captured by their own organizations. They tend to become the spokesmen and defenders of their organizations because their own lack of expertise makes them vulnerable to manipulation by their subordinates and because, in the conflicts that arise within government, their interests merge with those of their organizations.

Legislative control through investigations, appropriations and criticisms on the floor adds an essential brake on bureaucratic power. It acts for groups and individuals in the society with whom it is in close contact and whose interests it shares. It thus provides a mechanism for calling the bureaucracy to account, a mechanism that is effective not only because it is used but also because its mere existence threatens bureaucratic misdeeds and encourages responsible and efficient performance.

In more positive terms the existence of a legislature gives bureaucrats vital clues in the execution of laws, which enhances their representative quality. Moreover, once laws are made, the process of discussion and accommodation does not stop. Not all policy issues can be settled in laws, especially under modern conditions. Much policy-making or discretionary authority must be left to the administrator. Thus, even when an administrator tries to act responsibly, he needs guidance in applying the law to maximize achievement of its objectives while still reducing its adverse effects on groups and individuals in the society. Congressional comment and criticism can be of great service in aiding the administrator to understand the intent of the law and to minimize its adverse effects.

c. Education and Consensus Development

As stated earlier, our Government is not one in which 51% of the nation imposes its views on the remaining 49%. Congress not only reflects public opinion but must help create it as well. Though problems have to be solved and tensions relieved, groups and individuals that are penalized by government intervention cannot be allowed to be disaffected in large numbers. If this were to occur they would begin to see the State as simply an instrument of oppression. The force of law is not enough; it must be buttressed by a process of discussion and accommodation in the light of shared interests and values so that governmental action will be acceptable to or at least tolerable for most groups and individuals in the nation.

The Congress plays an indispensable role in working out accommodations on particular issues; it also plays a vital role in educating the public to the worth of and necessity for these accommodations. It provides a public forum for clashes between competing claims. It focuses public attention on the arguments, pro and con, and helps the public to understand all the factors that influence the final result. By so doing, the Congress augments public understanding of the relations between various claims and common purposes as well as of the worth or necessity of the final result.

3. The function of lawmaking.

Each Congress passes about 2,000 bills and resolutions, and lets die about 16,000 more. Work on the 2,000 is the main occupation of Congress as a body.

Today, Congress rarely initiates important laws, but even so it retains much influence over the content of the legislation. Most major and many minor bills originate in the Executive Branch. By his submission of legislative proposals, the President determines much of what Congress is to consider. Congress, however, retains the power to ignore, delay, amend or reject what he proposes. It has successfully insisted on the right to consider proposals at length and in detail.

Congress's insistence on looking at bills in detail stems in part from its members' need to serve the interests of their constituents. Congress is intensely concerned with the particulars of Presidential proposals, because it is these—not the platitudes in the preambles—that matter to the people back home whom the Congressman must satisfy if he is to be reelected. Congress's detailed consideration of the President's proposals serves the function of bringing to bear on them a variety of interested (and often conflicting) points of view that are represented in Congress but not necessarily in the bureaucracy. What comes out of Congress are laws that take into account the relevant points of view—insofar as these are adequately represented and expressed in Congress—and that integrate these points of view into generally acceptable measures.

Congress's determination to legislate deliberately with regard for the specific content of bills means that it can never do all that the President asks; it never has had, or could have, time for this. Both Congress and the President know this. Congress, therefore, retains considerable discretion in choosing what it will act upon. Since it cannot act upon all items of the President's Program, it exercises choice by letting some items die in Committee and by delaying others so long that the President must either allow them to die or must make concessions to induce Congress to act on them.

4. The function of overseeing administration and appropriating funds.

Although control of the Executive has never been the main activity of Congress, it has become increasingly important. As Congress has yielded more and more authority to the Executive, it has had to seek ways of ensuring that the Executive carries out its intentions.

Here also its method is often focused on matters of detail. Rather than examine Executive action in broad outline, it intervenes deeply in selected small matters, in three ways—through its lawmaking power, through the appropriations power, and through investigations.

Executive agencies have only such power as Congress gives them by law. In principle, therefore, Congress may control the agencies by prescribing in detail their authority, organization and procedures. Legislation for the Civil Service system illustrates the method of detailed control by statute. Congress regulates Federal pay scales, the number of employees in high grades, and almost every aspect of personnel administration—e.g., eligibility for jobs, examinations and appointments, hours of work, holidays, leaves of absence, training, employee ratings, employee relations, medical and other services, awards, promotions, layoffs and separations, and retirement.

In the appropriations process, Congress exercises control over an agency not only by making changes in its budget, but also by inquiring into its projects in hearings and by laying down in appropriations acts and committee reports conditions to govern its conduct.

Investigations for the purpose supervising administration usually deal with projects that Congress suspects of having been poorly managed. Congress does its overseeing, as it does its lawmaking and appropriating, by means of an elaborate division of labor. Particular committees, subcommittees, individual Congressmen, and staff members watch over particular departments, bureaus, and administrators. For their choice of what to watch, Congressmen are often motivated by a desire to serve the special interests of their constituents. Congress's detailed interest in Civil Service administration, for instance, reflects its responsiveness to the interests of Federal employees, an important constituent group.

With respect to appropriations, Congress bears a heavy burden by comparison with legislatures of other nations. Most of this burden falls on subcommittees of the House Appropriations Committee which have jurisdiction over the budgets of individual departments or groups of departments. These subcommittees are among the hardest-working in Congress. (The Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, for example, meets daily for 65 to 75 days, often for both morning and afternoon sessions, and examines departmental witnesses at great length.) After House action on the budget is completed, Senate appropriations subcommittees hold less extensive hearings, at which Executive agencies traditionally appeal to actions of the House. The usual pattern is for the House to make substantial cuts in the President's budget, for the Senate to restore most of them, and for House-Senate conference committees to reach compromises that are not far from the President's initial requests.

Congress's preoccupation with particulars has led it to ignore or slight the more general aspects of fiscal policy. At no point in the Congressional appropriations process is the budget considered as a *whole;* neither are the parts of the budget considered in relation to one another. The appropriations subcommittees work independently of one another, and their parent committees and both houses usually approve what they do. Nor are expenditures, which are handled by the appropriations committees, considered in relation to revenue measures, which are handled elsewhere (the Ways and Means Committee in the House, Finance Committee in the Senate).

5. The function of serving constituents and communicating with them.

Although lawmaking occupies most of the time of Congress as a body, the serving of constituents occupies much of the time of most of its members. Constituents ask for help in dealing with Executive agencies on such matters as social security payments, income taxes, veterans' pensions, housing, loans underwritten by the Government, passports, and government jobs. The volume of such requests has grown enormously in the last thirty years as a result of government's increasing involvement in the life of the individual. Congressmen are assailed also with requests for post office jobs or appointments to the service academies and with requests from local interests for bits of "pork"—construction of new government installations or retention of old ones, rivers and harbor projects, post offices, National Guard armories, Federal office buildings, and the like. The accumulated volume of these constituent requests represents large demands upon the time of the legislator. The volume of communications is enormous, involving hundreds of phone calls and thousands of letters to the average legislator's office each day.

III. FINDINGS

A. Congress is burdened by an increasing workload that is an impediment to its effectiveness

1. Congress has a full-time job. Yet its schedule causes repeated conflicts and delays.

(a) There is no regular provision in the Congressional schedule for members to get home to see their constituents frequently, to travel on pressing government business, or to take family vacations.

(b) There is too little flexibility in scheduling floor business and committee business to provide for a seasonally changing workload.

(c) Important national business is scheduled to suit the personal convenience of those who attend to their Washington duties only during the middle of the week (privately and snidely referred to as the "Tuesday to Thursday Club").

(d) Committee meetings could be scheduled in such a way as to minimize conflicts for individual members.

2. The workload and responsibilities of committee chairmen are too demanding to be assumed by men, many of whom in other walks of life would be regarded as past retirement age.

(a) The average age of the 16 Senate standing committee chairmen in the 89th Congress is 68. The oldest member is 88; only five are under 65, and eight under 70.

(b) The average age of the 20 House standing committee chairmen in the 89th Congress is 65. The oldest member is well over 80; ten are under 65, and 15 are under 70.

3. Six months is not time enough for Congress to review, revise, and approve the President's budget.

(a) Congress has yet to meet the deadline, set by the Reorganization Act of 1946, for cleaning up all its business and going home by July 31st. The principal deterrent has been its failure to finish its analysis of the President's budget and vote the appropriations needed to carry on the business of government for the fiscal year, which starts on July 1. There is ample evidence that the job simply cannot be done adequately in the time allowed.

(b) In 1965, for example, (a year in which Congress conducted its business with unusual expedition) only three of the 12 regular appropriation bills had become law by the start of the new fiscal year (July 1).

(c) Typically, then, department heads and agency directors have to start operating in each new year without a clear directive from Congress as to what it wants them to do. During some legislative sessions, appropriations for important new programs have been held up until nearly half way through the fiscal year to which they apply.

B. Congress lacks the organization, staff support, and analytical procedures to carry out its fiscal and program review function effectively

1. There is no organized means for Congress to review the President's total program.

(a) The Joint Committee on Revenue Taxation pulls together revenue considerations in the President's Budget Report, and the Joint Economic Committee provides a commentary on the President's Economic Report, but no formal unit of Congress is assigned responsibility for reviewing in their entirety the income and expense proposals of the President.

(b) No single unit of the Congress has the responsibility of reviewing and commenting on the balance within the President's program—noting, for example, alternative goals that the Congres might prefer, or alternative ways (that might be more effective or less costly). While this is done well in detail by sub-committees, their jurisdictional boundaries limit their freedom to consider alternatives that cross these boundaries.

(c) The decentralization of review among sub-committees without an organized overview has other questionable effects: it conceals opportunities for consolidating subfunctions of departments in stronger, better directed single units; and it permits possibly undesired duplications of efforts to continue unidentified and hence unchallenged.

2. The fiscal analysis capability of Congress lacks organized professional support.

(a) Financial management has progressed a long way since 1921, when Congress set up the General Accounting Office (GAO), but Congress has done little to bring itself abreast of the times.

(b) Auditing, which tests conformance of operations to policy and law, on the one hand, and tests for dishonesty or abuses, on the other, is amply taken care of by the GAO and overseen by the Committees on Government Operations of the two houses of Congress.

(c) But auditing does not test the validity and consequence of plans, programs, and policies. It does not illuminate discussions in these areas or project the consequences of alternative courses of action. In modern business these are the functions of the financial vice president or controller. They are based on the profession of controllership.

(d) The Congress, perhaps misconceiving controllership, might be concerned that a new corporate body endowed with the attributes of controllership would usurp the right of members to make their own political decisions. Such concern is groundless; the successful Controller does not set policy (except within his own area of administration); instead he provides policymakers with information so organized and analyzed as to help them understand the financial implications of the policy choices open to them.

(e) Congress has only the most limited controllership resources today. The GAO has been trying to add to its services some of the analyses one would expect under a controllership function. Nevertheless, this movement cannot be expected to give the Congress what it needs because:

(1) Industrial experience has demonstrated that those who are best suited for auditing operations for conformance to policy and regulation are not suited to the evaluation of new ideas and untried plans. Thus, in industry these are usually separate functions.

(2) The head of GAO is a Presidential appointee. For its analytical capability, much of which will be in support of Congress as an "adversary" (though friendly) of the President, Congress needs an organization without a trace of divided loyalty.

Without a controllership arm, organized, staffed and equipped to deal with the very complex financial problems of government, Congress will continue to be largely ineffectual in setting fiscal policy.

3. Committee staffs need strengthening.

(a) There are many highly qualified people in committee staff positions. Too many of them must rely too heavily on ingenuity in securing information bearing on problems that cross their desks. Computerized information storage retrieval and analysis are rarely used. Yet the complexity of the information they deal with lends itself to use of data processing services.

(b) Compounding this problem is the fact that some committee chairmen continue to indulge in political patronage at the expense of staff professional competence. There is no good reason why both professional competence and political loyalty needs cannot be met on staff committees.

(c) By comparison with agencies of the Executive branch, Congressional committees are understaffed. Modest increases in staff assistance will help committees to better perform assigned functions.

4. Long-range plans for government programs need greater emphasis.

(a) Most government programs carry some direct or implied obligation into the future. There is evidence that Executive Branch projections (required by law) are prepared without the care required for sound judgments by Congress. Some appear to be prepared casually; others appear to be designed to conceal plans for the future. The Department of Defense, NASA, and the Forest Service are splendid exceptions. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has a very long way to go by the observation of legislators we interviewed.

(b) The Congress must insist upon executive agencies' planning ahead if it is not to continue to be trapped into decisions it might not have made if it had been well informed in the first place.

C. Congress wastes time on non-policy business that could be saved without significant political cost or effect

1. Constituent problems are allowed to take up more time than they should.

(a) The contact between Congressman and his constituent must be protected. Until pressure on the members becomes much greater than at present, transferring this contact to a new agency of government cannot be justified.

(b) Processing requests for help can be improved by delegating it to specialists on the member's staff having no other conflicting duties.

(c) Repetitive citizen complaints are almost impossible to recognize when they are spread over some 535 different offices. Yet if there is repetition, it may be evidence that: (a) the law needs to be revised, or (b) the administration in a particular government agency should be called to task. Congress has the responsibility to deal with both of these faults.

2. Congressmen are unnecessarily handicapped in recruiting staff personnel.

(a) The present system of recruitment depends too much on the limited resources of the legislator himself. Congressmen locate their own candidates for staff positions. If a Congressman himself does not know of someone who seems to fit a job opening, he must resort to the suggestions of his friends. This situation is especially discouraging to a new member.

(b) There are neither standards nor procedures for testing candidates' qualifications.

(c) Competent and interested young people can become easily discouraged from seeking employment on Capitol Hill, because it is difficult for them to see how to build professional careers in such a disordered atmosphere.

3. The management of member offices could be made much easier.

(a) Office management has become a specialized field. Although few legislators have any training in it, there is no place in the Congress a member can turn for professional advice on how to organize, lay out, staff, and equip his office to match his workload.

(b) Learning the established practices on the floor and in committees—a difficult process for a new member—depends largely on informal instruction from senior members when questions arise.

(c) Access to information is a major concern for a new member. While it is available to the persistent, new Congressmen find it hard to learn where to turn for all they need to know. They are reluctant to plague senior members for routine advice.

(d) In effect, a new legislator depends principally on more senior members to fill him in on the complexities of his job. Because the time of these senior members is already strained, and not all are masters of the routines themseves, this method of indoctrination falls short of the need.

(e) Central office services available to the Congressman are minimal. Generally he must provide his own, using allowances given him to meet payrolls and to buy equipment.

Much of the typing, addressing, mailing, and duplicating in a member's office could be done better, faster, cheaper, and semi-automatically in a central office. This could be worked out to satisfy the member that he had not lost control of his own affairs.

Confidential material should not, of course, be subject to centralized processing; but the great bulk of Congressional mail could be processed in an efficient central facility.

4. Congress takes little advantage of modern electronic equipment to facilitate its work.

(a) As noted earlier, the use of high-speed computers to facilitate the work of Congress and its committees is almost nonexistent. The very nature of some analytical problems of Congress calls for flexible manipulation of massive data into many different arrangements to serve many different purposes. Only with large-scale computers can this be done thoroughly and economically.

(b) Considerable savings should be possible through the centralization of automatic typewriting, addressing, and volume mailing.

(c) Probably the most archaic routine of the Congress is the manual note-taking on the floor of both houses, followed by dictation from the notes onto belts, manual transcription of the belts onto long sheets, editing of the sheets, and, finally, typesetting for printing. The whole process could be done faster, more accurately, and at a significant reduction in cost through the use of direct electronic recording and transcribing equipment.

(d) In the House, members are allowed to have remarks inserted in the RECORD without their being delivered orally on the floor. Senators do not have this privilege, and as a consequence find themselves forced to take up floor time that could, in the face of an already crowded schedule, be put to better purpose.

5. Time is unnecessarily diverted to management of the District of Columbia.

(a) Seven Senators and 25 House members sit on committees governing the affairs of the District of Columbia. Some five thousand man-hours per session are spent by the Congress on District of Columbia business. This is an easily avoidable diversion of attention from more pressing business.

(b) Quite reasonable proposals for effecting home rule for the District have been before the Congress frequently in recent years. It is time Congress approved one and divested itself of this unproductive work.

6. The time spent on postmaster and service academy appointments serves little useful purpose.

(a) Some 21,000 postmaster appointments and all appointments to the military academies clear through Congressional offices. While these appointments do not take up much of the time of most members, they are an avoidable distraction.

(b) In the judgment of many Congressmen, the political values of this time-honored custom are not commensurate with even the small amount of time it takes.

D. Congress does not adequately inform the Nation of its own performance and accomplishments

1. Congress allows itself to be judged solely in terms of its law-making.

(a) Law-making is only one of the functions of Congress. To be understood, many of its procedures which are regarded as cumbersome must be thought of in terms of its representative, control, and education functions. Congressmen seem to accept the narrower critical view of them as being mere law-makers.

(b) Congress is subjected to a double standard: it is damned if it doesn't pass Administration bills and belittled if it does. Both standards of judgment are erroneous in their assumptions about Congress's contribution to legislation.

(c) The Congressmen interviewed in our study are far more competent people than the public attitude toward Congress, as measured in various studies, would indicate. Their dedication to public service and not self-interest cannot be doubted by those who see them work.

(d) While Congressmen are often ridiculed for being politicians, it must be recognized that it is the very traits and interests that characterize them as politicians that make them effective in their role of architects of the kind of consensus on which our system of government depends.

2. Congress is vulnerable because of its lack of a code of ethics for its members.

(a) Congressmen are criticized, all too often justifiably, for maintaining private business relationships or putting themselves under obligation to people doing business with the Government, thus casting doubts on their objectivity in carrying out their responsibilities.

(b) Many Congressmen have to travel extensively to perform their jobs with insight and understanding. A few use their jobs as an excuse for what has popularly become known as "junketeering."

(c) While justifiable in certain cases, the hiring of qualified relatives who really work at their jobs presents an opportunity for public misunderstanding of Congress. The Congress cannot afford to allow this opportunity for misunderstanding to continue.

3. Most Congressmen are not able to get away to exchange ideas with their constituents often enough.

(a) They are reimbursed for travel to their homes only four times per year. Many of them with families find frequent trips to be beyond their financial means.

(b) An exchange of ideas with constituents is one of the key supports of our system, and it is a truism that as people come to know a man they gain in appreciation of his qualities. The Congress needs this more favorable recognition.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Congress needs to schedule its work better

1. Congress has a full-time job; it needs a year-round schedule.

(a) It should provide for regular campaign and election recesses, for periodic trips home, work periods and trips on government business, as well as for set family holidays and vacations.

(b) It should provide flexibility in scheduling time between floor and committee activities so as to reflect changing workloads during the year.

(c) It should make use of a computer and some derivative of linear programming techniques to lay out and adjust committee schedules to minimize time conflicts of its members.

2. The work of the Congress would move faster and be more to the point if an age limit were set on key positions.

(a) Wisdom and experience are qualities to be sought in the members of both houses, but administrative responsibility also requires men still in possession of full vigor.

(b) It would be damaging to the quality of our Government to require a fixed retirement age for members of the Congress.

(c) But since the committee chairmen must be able to stand up to the most rigorous, exhausting workload, they should be subject to automatic retirement from these positions at an appropriate age—probably 65. This would conform to the latest practice in industry, where men are forced to retire from executive positions at a predetermined age (usually 65) but permitted to serve as Board members indefinitely.

3. Congress needs a full year to review and act on the federal budget and should schedule that work accordingly.

(a) The Executive departments and agencies should have their appropriations prior to the fiscal year in which they are to be spent.

(b) Adoption of the calendar year as the Government's fiscal year, with the President's budget message submitted in January for the succeeding calendar year, would meet the need.

B. Congress needs better information and improved analytical tools and methods

1. Congress should establish a joint committee on fiscal policy to provide a comprehensive view of federal revenue and expense.

(a) Congress should examine the over-all impact of the President's proposed programs by viewing them as a whole, since many projects cut across present committee jurisdictions.

(b) The present system of decentralized committee consideration of the President's budget is a very practical way for the Congress to examine it in meaningful detail. Members become knowledgeable specialists on segments of the budget.

(c) However, specialization without the means to take an over-all view places the control of policy squarely in the hands of the President and the bureaucracy rather than in the hands of the Congress. Accordingly:

(1) Over-all revenue and expense estimates should be reviewed by the Joint Committee on Fiscal Policy with consideration to the national economic and social objectives and the level of public debt.

(2) Proposed expenditures should be sifted by the Joint Committee for any unrecognized and possibly undesirable duplication of effort among the several Federal agencies.

(d) The Joint Committee on Fiscal Policy should have the following characteristics:

(1) It should be advisory—to both houses and to each legislative and fiscal committee of the two houses.

(2) It should initiate alternative fiscal proposals for the Congress to consider.

2. Congress should establish an analytical budget information service to supplement the general accounting office.

(a) Congress should develop an improved ability to test in advance the relative effectiveness of alternative courses of action. Cost/effectiveness analysis has become a standard tool of American management. Because effectiveness must be measured in tangible results affecting people, it cannot be measured solely in accounting terms. What is needed is operations analysis, disclosing what people get from alternative expenditures of time, effort and money.

(b) Congress should have available to it up-to-date budgetary information relating to agency performance against plan. Individual members should be able to obtain budget information relevant to their needs speedily and accurately. A computerized budget information service should be established for this purpose.

3. Congress needs to strengthen the staffs of many of its committees and provide them with a computerized analytical capability.

(a) Recruitment standards should equal those in industry or Civil Service for equivalent jobs. (Political qualifications would be recognized as governing for selected assignments.)

(b) Committee staff should have the professional capability backed by computers and other aids where appropriate, to identify and evaluate alternatives to the programs proposed by Executive departments and agencies.

(c) Committee staffs should, using proper analytical tools, be able to compare and evaluate all programs in a single field of interest, such as education, in which programs are managed by several independent agencies.

4. Congress should insist on getting improved 5- to 10-year forecasts of the commitments it is undertaking when it supports new or revised executive programs.

(a) The law now requires each Executive agency to submit five-year plans with its budget proposals, but they are (understandably) of very uneven quality.

(b) When Congress is supported by a modern budget information organization, by strengthened committee staffs, and by a comprehensive computer facility, it should be in a position to insist on and get high quality five- to ten-year forecasts from all Executive agencies and to assess the validity of these forecasts.

C. Congress needs to find more time for policy matters by delegating all marginal work to others and adopting the latest business methods and procedures to its own operations

1. Congress should establish a central clearing house for processing constituent requests.

(a) The citizen should continue to make his request and receive his response from the individual member.

(b) The processing of the requests should be centralized in the hands of expert specialists.

(1) This would save sizable amounts of time in most members' offices.

(2) It would permit statistical identification of any concentration of constituent problems not now recognized because of the scattering of requests among 535 different offices, and enable Congress to enact laws to correct abuses.

(3) It would expedite the processing of constituent requests because they would be handled by experts having no other pressing business to divert their attention.

(4) Because the member would continue to control the response to his constituent, he would take personal charge whenever he was not satisfied with the response by the central clearing house.

2. Congress needs a qualified central personnel office.

(a) The Congress should provide a better way of finding the right men for the right jobs on Capitol Hill; this calls for professional placement in committee and office staff positions.

(b) Candidates should be required to list their qualifications with the personnel office, even when they are sponsored by friends at the Capitol. Qualifications would include political loyalties for those seeking key political supportive roles.

(c) The personnel office would send the legislator or committee chairman all those candidates whose qualifications match his needs.

(d) The personnel office would send the professional candidate to those positions that are most likely to be of interest to him. This should encourage young men and women to seek careers in Washington.

3. Congress needs an office management service to help its members.

(a) The Congressional Office Manager should advise members, especially new members, on:

(1) Accepted Practices on the floor and in committees.

(2) Sources of information in Washington and elsewhere.

(3) Staffing requirements, office layout, methods and equipment best suited to the particular member's workload.

(b) The Congressional Office Manager should provide central office services to members on request. These would include: (1) Automatic typewriting; (2) Automatic addressing; (3) Volume mailing; (4) Duplicating.

4. Congress should adopt modern recording methods for its floor proceedings.

(a) The latest equipment and procedures should be installed for recording proceedings in legislative chambers and committee rooms.

(b) The volume of business and the difficulty of making accurate manual transcriptions fully justifies the use of microphones, electronic recording devices and automatic typesetting to produce official Congressional records.

(c) When there are valid reasons for editing the recorded transcriptions prior to their introduction into the official record, the modifications should be allowed just as at present.

(d) Senators, like members of the House, should be privileged to have appropriate remarks printed in the official record without the necessity for oral delivery on the floor.

5. Congress should not divert its attention to the detailed management of the District of Columbia.

(a) There are valid reasons for Congress to retain control over aspects of District affairs that directly affect the national government.

(b) Any avoidable diversion of the attention of even a few members of Congress from their major responsibilities is insupportable in the face of their excessive workload. The District of Columbia should be granted home rule.

6. Congress should establish a merit system for selecting postmasters and service academy appointees to cut down on the time now diverted to their selection.

(a) The political advantage to be gained from these appointments does not justify the time they take away from more important duties.

D. Congress needs to improve its public image

E. Congress should adopt a simple, clear code of ethics for its members.

(a) Conflicts of interest should be clearly defined. Members indulging in them should be subject to censure or removal from office.

(b) The conditions under which travel at public expense are authorized should be carefully spelled out.

(c) Qualifications for staff and the requirements for staff attention to duty should be so rigid as to permit nepotism only when it is clearly professionally justified. The burden of proof should be on the member of Congress who does the hiring.

2. Congress should send its members home at regular frequent intervals to discuss what is being done on Capitol Hill.

(a) Members should seek to learn how the issues in Washington affect their constituents.

(b) Members should seek to explain to their constituents the elements of compromise that are open to them if the national and local interests are both to be served.

(c) Such trips should be paid for by the Government as an essential element in representative government, and so as to place legislators above the need for small favors.

E. Congress is aware of its problems and is taking some steps to improve itself

1. The Congress has established this year a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress.

(a) The Committee has conducted hearings and listened to many who have ideas for improvement.

(b) Most of the suggestions submitted have dealt with questions of political balance and the power structure.

(c) While the attention of the Committee will probably quite properly focus on political considerations, it is virtually certain that some constructive changes in the management aspects of Congressional operations (which are within the scope of this report) will receive Committee support.

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT JOHNSON AT EAST-WEST CENTER, UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the State of Hawaii was honored this week with a visit by President Lyndon B. Johnson and Mrs. Johnson.

In an address delivered at the East-West Center on the campus of the University of Hawaii, the President made some memorable remarks on problems in Asia and our relations with Asian nations.

I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of his remarks as published in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of October 18 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF JOHNSON'S SPEECH AT THE EAST-WEST CENTER

(NOTE.—This is the text of President Johnson's speech as actually delivered at the East-West Center yesterday.

(It varies considerably from the text released in advance, with several deletions and two major insertions, including an ad-libbed finish.)

Governor Burns, Mrs. Burns, President and Mrs. Hamilton, Chancellor and Mrs. Jones, Congressman Matsunaga, Monsignor Kekumano, my fellow Americans, ladies and gentlemen:

It is a source of deep personal satisfaction for me to be back here with you in Hawaii again today.

Seven years ago, inspired by your present Governor and your former delegate, John Burns, I called for the first appropriation for this East-West Center, where two great cultures might share with one another their perspective of man's destiny.

Five years ago I came here to dedicate this great center. I have followed it very closely since, even to the point of keeping in touch with a former boss of mine who is now associated with the East-West Center, your Deputy Chancellor, Mr. Sam Gilstrap. I hope he is more lenient on the faculty members and the students than he was on me 25 years ago.

We know that no opportunities before us today are more crucial or more hopeful than those for expanded ventures in international education.

That is why the Congress, upon my recommendation, has just passed the International Education Act of 1966, to strengthen

American universities as centers of international learning.

During this Pacific journey, on friendly Asian soil, I plan, as President of the United States, to sign this Act.

In addition, I am directing Secretary John Gardner to begin work immediately to establish a new Center for Educational Cooperation. It will advance the aims of the International Education Act and will serve as a focal point in Washington for leadership in education on a global scale.

I have also asked Secretary Gardner to begin immediately to plan this year for a world conference on education to be held in the year 1967. This gathering of world educators and specialists will take a fresh look at the world's new educational needs. I hope it will help the nations to establish new priorities and new proposals for worldwide cooperative efforts in educating our children.

Dr. James Perkins, the distinguished president of Cornell University, has agreed to work with Secretary Gardner on this most laudable undertaking. He will organize and direct a planning conference early this winter to prepare the agenda and the schedule for the larger meeting to come later. I have asked him to invite a number of the world's leading educators to join him in these preparations.

In our continuing efforts to broaden our intellectual horizons, and to still expand our educational frontiers, this still young center of research and study has already begun to play a leading role.

Symbolically, you stand as a bridge—a bridge between the two mainlands on either side of this wide ocean that surrounds all of these islands.

You remind us that our people and the people of Asia have much to give to each other as well as much to learn from each other.

It was not always so.

In centuries past, men of the West went to Asia for many reasons.

Some made the long ocean trek in search of wealth.

Others went as the agents of governments that wanted colonial possessions.

Still others went to teach; to treat the sick; to spread the gospel; to aid the farmer; to help build factories; to advise officials; to translate Western works of literature and technology.

Much that was good and constructive and abiding came from all of these undertakings. But it is a fact that we must understand and recognize that these movements from West to East were also disturbing and revolutionary in their effect.

The West entered the industrial revolution earlier than the East. By this accident of history, the West commanded the tools of modern science and technology much sooner than the East.

Through colonialism and by other means the West intruded its then superior power into the East. And, of course, there was a reaction.

That reaction has taken many forms, some peaceful and other violent. It should not surprise us, therefore, that scars—sometimes deep scars—have remained in men's minds and in their hearts.

Looking back over the years there are many searching questions that we can ask.

How well have we really learned the lessons of our experience in Asia?

How well have we understood the complex causes of conflict in the Pacific's time of troubles?

How well have we understood the feelings and aspirations of Asia's peoples during the century of turbulence?

How well have we understood the impact of West upon East—of Western arms, industry, and ideas upon venerable Asian cultures?

How well have we understood the course of revolution in Asia?

How well have we understood the shocks—as well as the benefits—that modernization can bring to developing societies?

How well have we understood the shifting tides of nationalism in all its forms?

In almost three decades of elective office I have had to answer these questions for myself.

For two decades I answered them as one who conceived America's destiny almost entirely in relation to Europe.

My forebears came from Britain, Ireland and Germany. People in my section of the country regarded Asia as totally alien in spirit as well as nationality. East and West meant to us that Texas was west of where Sam Gilstrap lived—Oklahoma.

We, therefore, looked away from the Pacific, away from its hopes as well as away from its great crises.

Even the wars that many of us fought here were often with left-overs of preparedness, and they did not heal our blindness.

I remember we felt we would get some planes out here after they had all they needed in Europe in the early 40's.

One consequence of that blindness was that Hawaii was denied its rightful part in our union of States for many, many years.

* * * * *

Most of us who were blind two decades ago can now begin to see.

Only by answering these questions with candor can we build solid foundations for our future relations with Asia. Only then can we really understand the depth of the desire in Asia for independence, for modernization, and for dignity.

American policy toward Asia today must be the policy of an open mind.

I am convinced that we have now reached a turning point in Asia's history, in Asia's relationship with the United States of America, in Asia's relations with all the rest of the world in which we live.

I think it has become clear that what we want to see in Asia is what the vast majority of Asians themselves want to see.

* * * * *

Frankly, for two decades I opposed its admission as a State, until at last the undeniable evidence of history, as well as the irresistible persuasiveness of Jack Burns, removed the scales from my eyes.

Then I began to work and fight for Hawaiian statehood.

I hold that to be one of the proudest achievements of my 25 years in the Congress.

There are still those who cannot understand the Pacific for Asia. I cannot. But I do urge my countrymen: Let us listen when the Asians speak for themselves.

In the last few months I have had many, many talks with leaders from practically all of the countries of Asia. They and others of their countrymen have come to speak and have spoken privately and freely of their hopes of tomorrow.

What do they want? They have told me.

First, they want to be secure from outside attack and aggression. They want to end the threat of internal subversion with all the terrorism and murder that is associated with it.

They want their people to be able to live in peace.

They want to raise the living standards of their people.

* * * * *

They want their children to get an education.

They want to be able to plan; work hard; and sacrifice.

They want, above all, to have a voice—a voice in their own destiny—self-determination—a voice in the choice of those who will lead them, whether in the village, the province or in the nation's capital.

They want freedom—freedom and justice—and a fair prospect that their dreams can some day, some time, come true.

The wish to make modern societies—but societies true to their own traditions, their own culture and their own ambitions.

And that is also a good definition, I think, of what the United States wants to see in Asia. That is as good a definition as any that I can offer.

What are the prospects of their achieving this goal?

I travel to the Far East this autumn at a time of great trial and conflict for the people of the Pacific Basin. I come to meet with the leaders of nations which share with us a common determination: that the people of South Viet Nam shall be permitted to shape their own destiny, free from aggression from out and free from terror from within.

On our agenda are the hard questions of war in all of its aspects—of force and a sacrifice; of diplomacy and negotiation, of rehabilitation and reconstruction.

But I can tell you this: I go to Asia with confidence and with hope.

Behind the terrible costs of combat and hostility I believe that a new Asia is gradually coming into its own.

The process is slow, but the signs are unmistakable.

One after another the nations of Asia are casting off the spent slogans of earlier narrow nationalism. One after another, the nations of Asia are grasping the realities of an interdependent Asia.

What are these realities—That the security of every nation is threatened by an attack on any nation.

* * * * *

—That political power held by the few and the rich within a nation is power that will not long survive.

—That lasting national prosperity can only come through full cooperation with one's neighbors, the rich and the poor, the large and the small alike.

—That no single nation can or should be permitted to dominate the Pacific region.

—That disputes settled by other than peaceful means are disputes that will remain unsettled.

—Most important of all, that Asia's destiny lies in the hands of Asians themselves.

Throughout Asia today these realities are grasped, I believe, as never before.

A new spirit seems to be clearly at work: A self-confidence that permits cooperation; a skepticism that rejects illusory shortcuts; a deepening consciousness of Asia's proud past, and an understanding and hope for Asia's great future.

Yes, important things are happening in Asia, and they are happening with Asian leadership and with Asian initiative.

That is, of course, only a beginning.

Great problems and greater challenges lie further ahead.

There remain in Asia, for instance, voices of extremism and apostles of militancy.

Such voices and such rhetoric are out of tune with the new currents in Asia. They are increasingly irrelevant. They are increasingly isolated.

For Asia's leaders and Asia's peoples are looking, I think, beyond narrow nationalism. They are looking beyond ideology.

They see on the one hand the age-old afflictions of poverty, ignorance, and disease. They see on the other hand the possibility of abundance, knowledge, and health. And they see the absolute necessity of matching Asia's needs with Asia's resources and those of other regions.

Nothing has really given us more encouragement in our part of the world—and I think throughout Asia—than the creation of the Asian Development Bank, with its new headquarters in Manila—a billion dollar regional bank to serve this great area of the world.

We think sooner or later this new perception will spread as well to the closed societies of Communist Asia. Sooner or later the pragmatic and compassionate spirit of the Chinese people will prevail over outmoded dogmatism.

We in America look to that day with hope and with confidence.

For our part, we shall do what we can to hasten its coming. We shall keep alive the hope for a freer flow of ideas and people between mainland China and the United States, as I have said so recently on so many other occasions. For only through such exchange can isolation be ended and suspicion give way to trust.

We do not believe in eternal enmity. All hatred among nations must ultimately end in reconciliation. We hopefully look to the day when the policies of mainland China will offer and will permit such a reconciliation.

But we are not prepared to pay for peace the price of freedom. We shall never surrender American freedom or sacrifice the freedom of America's allies in Asia.

America can help. We must help. We are now helping.

But we see our role as helping and not imposing our will on Asia.

We can give advice and technical assistance. We can cooperate in all kinds of activities—from the far reaches of space to the ocean depths.

Asia will provide its own leadership. Some of it is being built and trained right here in your atmosphere.

We do not need to instruct them or direct them. They will take their initiatives, they will make their decisions, and they will time their own actions.

But we must and we shall cooperate with that leadership.

Then our role is that of a neighbor among equals—a partner in the great adventure of bringing peace, order, and progress to a part of the world where much more than half of the entire human race lives.

As long as danger threatens, our strength shall back our commitments in Asia. Yet we seek no special status or privileges, no primacy, no territory, no base rights in perpetuity. We recognize that our strength, our size and our great wealth may impose a very special obligation upon us in the transition to the new Asia. But we also recognize that the cooperative tasks of assistance and defense will be assumed more and more by others, and we hope by collective regional groupings as the nations of Asia develop and build their own strength and their own abundance.

I will go to confer with the leaders of six nations—six nations who have also committed their sons to the proposition that aggression shall not succeed, and the people of South Viet Nam shall have the right to shape their own future, by their own self-determination, and to shape it in peace.

I will go to see, to listen and to learn—and to act with our partners to bring an honorable peace to Southeast Asia at the first day it is possible.

I want to caution all of my countrymen that we are taking with us no magical wands and no instant solutions.

I hope your speculations will be cautious and informed. We know all too well that this is a long road of many miles, but we will walk it, shoulder to shoulder with free Asia.

But I felt it right to share with you this afternoon—here in this very special place to me—the lessons of the past and the hopes for the future in our relations with Asia.

I intend to ask the leaders that I see to visit America—especially to come to this part of America, here in beautiful Hawaii, and to see for themselves a model—a model of how men and women of different races and different cultures can come and live and work together; to respect each other in freedom and in hope.

I shall say to my colleagues that I come not to admonish or to direct, but to inform, and that our foreign policy is as our domestic policy.

We want food for the hungry.

We want income, jobs and wages for our workers.

We want education for our children.

We want medicare, health, research and nursing homes to take care of our needy.

We want a strong and adequate defense in order that we may be secure until that day finally comes when our guns are unloaded and war is no more.

Today in America we have aplenty of food and we are developing a recreation-conservation program never equaled before.

Our income is at the highest in our history. Our gross national product is running at the rate of $750 billion per year.

This Congress passed 18 educational bills compared to six educational bills passed by the first 88 Congresses combined.

This Congress will spend over $4 billion on education, compared to $33 million a year, less than $5 billion for the entire 174 years.

We are laying and charting a course now to put beautiful nursing homes in every area of our country to take care of our old. We are examining the eyes, the ears, the teeth and the bodies of our young who are four and five years old—beginning them on a "Head Start" program where under our educational system, the Government will help them get all the education that they can take.

Finally, we will go to hear a brief report on our sons who are rendering such gallant service and such an excellent account of themselves in attempting to help this little nation of South Viet Nam keep itself from being gobbled up, in an attempt to resist aggression and provide deterrence with the minimum damage and the minimum danger.

I know with me, on this great visit that I am returning to the heads of other states, I will carry your hopes and your prayers. I hope some day next year, the following year, or in the years to come—God only knows when—we can meet again here in peaceful Hawaii when wars will be banished from the face of the earth, then prosperity will be known to every American family, and that the other families of the world will begin to raise their own standards of living. Then we can once again enjoy the blessings of which we have dreamed all these years.

Thank you so much.

AMERICAN LEGION RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE OTTO OTEPKA CASE, 1966

Mr. **THURMOND**. Mr. President, in its national convention of a few weeks ago, the American Legion passed resolution No. 150 on the subject of the Otto Otepka case. In my judgment this resolution succinctly sums up the situation with respect to Mr. Otepka and the kind of treatment he has received at the hands of our State Department. It gives a fair and accurate summation of the facts surrounding this situation, which if allowed to go uncorrected, will intimidate every career Government employee.

So that my colleagues may have the benefit of this outstanding statement by such a patriotic organization as the American Legion, and to further bring this matter to their attention, and to the attention of the American people, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution, adopted by the American Legion convention on September 1, 1966, in Washington, D.C., follow these remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OTEPKA CASE

Resolution No. 150 (Indiana), on the subject of "The Otepka Case," is recommended for adoption, after amendment, as follows:

Whereas, Mr. Otto F. Otepka, Chief, Division of Evaluations, Department of State Office of Security, for the past five years has been subjected—on the part of his superiors in the Department—to undue duress, harassment, insults, and threat of dismissal; and

Whereas, on September 23, 1963, Mr. Otepka was advised that the Department proposed to remove him from his appointment with the Department of State on charges that he had violated Department directives governing classified documents, specifically, that he had furnished certain classified documents to the Chief Counsel of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee; and

Whereas, Mr. Otepka met these charges, and appealed the dismissal notice, on grounds that the documents in question were turned over to the Senate Subcommittee during its investigation of the administration of the Internal Security Act in order to establish the verity of his testimony to the Subcommittee—concerning lax security practices in the Department of State—as opposed to contrary evidence offered the Subcommittee by his superiors; and

Whereas, the documents in question upheld Mr. Otepka's testimony, and subsequent hearings by the Subcommittee brought out the fact that certain of his superiors and other employees of the Office of Security had otherwise misled or misinformed the Senate Subcommittee; and

Whereas, the Code of Ethics for Government Service, expressed in House-Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 175, 85th Congress, Second Session, requires that any person in government service "Put loyalty to the highest moral principles and to country above loyalty to person, party or Government department;" and

Whereas, the American Legion believes that the security program of the State Department must be of the highest possible order; and

Whereas, the Otepka case involves not only loyalty to the United States, it also involves the matter of the dignity of an individual human being; and

Whereas, at stake in Mr. Otepka's appeal is (a) whether or not dedicated professional security officers in government will be permitted to be so intimidated in the conduct of their vital work that the internal security program of the United States will be placed in jeopardy; and (b) whether or not the Congress—consisting of the elected representatives of the people—will preserve its right to oversee the behavior of officials in the Executive Branch; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by The American Legion in National Convention assembled in Washington, D.C., August 30, 31–September 1, 1966, That The American Legion deplores the treatment which Mr. Otto F. Otepka has received at the hands of his superiors in the U.S. Department of State, and commends the action of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in its thorough investigation of the Otepka case and related matters, and in its bringing to the attention of the public the true circumstances surrounding Mr. Otepka's dismissal from his important position in the Department of State.

FARMERS UNION PRESIDENT URGES ATTACK ON WATER PROBLEMS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, Tony Dechant, president of the National Farmers Union, spoke the views of many citizens of both the West and East when he told the Western States Power and Water Conference at Billings, Mont., recently:

> The multiplying needs of a fast-growing economy have created what is only now being recognized as a national water shortage. It has come upon us almost without notice. Now that it is recognized it will demand new, bold, nation-sized thinking in place of the piece-meal programs which have been advanced to solve local shortages.

It was an excellent address, reflecting the attitude of western farm people toward irrigation and family farming, as well as national water problems.

I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by Tony T. Dechant, President, National Farmers Union, Western States Water and Power Consumers Conference, Billings, Mont., September 26, 1966

I am glad to be here. I am glad because it gives me an opportunity to renew and continue my friendship with those in this great assemblage and those who are participating in this great program. Although in past years I have not had the opportunity of working closely with you, I have followed with great interest the activity of this organization ever since that first meeting was held in Salt Lake City in 1957.

The individuals and organizations who have combined their strength and worked with a common purpose represent the muscle which is required to bring into being a program for adequate development of our natural resources. They represent most of those who have the political power and the power to articulate the needs of our burgeoning population for possibly the most indispensable resources—water and power.

I congratulate you on your success. I think the organizations here can claim credit for the success of the rural electrification program and other programs which have resulted in water and power developments which have benefited many millions of people. Although your organization and my organization have not always been victorious, our common wounds have brought us closer together and strengthened our bond of friendship. Failure to pass the Hell's Canyon Dam bill and other legislation merely strengthened our resolve to bring about the creation of other projects such as Yellow Tail Dam and the Basin Electric Power Plant.

It's hard to imagine what the West would have ever been like without the Federal programs. In all, they bring water to more than nine million acres. They provide impoundment of 129 million acre-feet of water in 171 reclamation reservoirs, which provide nearly two million acre-feet of water yearly to industrial and urban users in areas containing more than eleven million people.

They have provided blue lakes among the drylands, for what Theodore Roosevelt called pleasuring-grounds for the people, with swimming, fishing and hunting. They more than earn their way—since 1909 the sale of Reclamation power has brought more than a billion dollars into the Federal Treasury. Reclamation's forty-four power plants supply the electrical needs of a population equal to that of the city of New York.

Daniel Webster, that provincial New Englander, once asked of what use was the West . . . "a vast worthless area of savages and wild beasts, of deserts, prairie dogs and cactus?"

Well, he should see the West now! And an ironic answer, Reclamation methods are now being proposed to redeem Upper New England, as in the pending Dickey-Lincoln School project there. That area is languishing because its people pay one-third more for power than the national average. Fittingly enough, and in the true Webster tradition, its business interests are trying to reject the helping hand of the Federal Government.

But the proof of Reclamation is in its results. And Western soils, fresh and unexhausted compared to Eastern ones, out produce the latter once water is provided. Reclamation has established cities and farms, green oases among the drylands, that are occupied by millions of people whose taxes more than pay for the reclamation program—$6 billions since 1940.

The formula sounds almost like magic. Crops worth $21 billions have been produced on Federal reclamation projects since 1906. Last year more than $100 millions worth of electric power was sold from Reclamation dams; at rates low enough to attract industry, yet which contributed to the Reclamation fund to increase this great constructive program. Yet all this is incidental to the main and proven purpose of bringing water to the thirsty soil.

But the multiplying needs of a fast-growing economy have created what is only now being recognized as a national water shortage. It has come upon us almost without notice. Now that it is recognized it will demand new, bold, nation-sized thinking in place of the piecemeal programs which have been advanced to solve local shortages. And let's not deceive ourselves—there is no easy or inexpensive way out.

Several years ago the Kerr Committee of the Senate estimated that water demands would double by 1980 and triple by 2,000 A.D., which, as I've said, is just around the corner. So far its forecasts have proven correct. This committee estimated that the Nation should spend $228 billions—and that's billions of dollars, not millions—on water supply by 1980.

We estimate that nature provides a supply nationwide that approximates 500 billion gallons daily. Of this we are already using three-fifths, or about 300 billion gallons daily. Industry uses an enormous amount—it takes 1,400 gallons of water to make a dollar's worth of steel. Agriculture likewise uses an enormous amount—a dairy cow requires 26 gallons, either in food or water, to produce a pint of milk. Americans use an average of 147 gallons daily, per person. This is expected to rise to 185 gallons by 1985, and 225 gallons per person by 2,000 A.D.

Yet, where is it coming from? Water tables are falling all over the West. In Arizona alone, the deficit is more than two million acre-feet yearly. West Texas is using water 20 times as fast as nature is replenishing it. Salt water intrusions plague both coasts, and even some areas of the interior.

Water has become our No. 1 resource problem, and water economists say that of all uses, irrigated agriculture has been the most lavish, and, in many instances, wasteful. Half the water that runs down from the mountains is lost before it reaches the plants. Some people see restrictions laid on irrigation and abandoned fields to meet the thirst of people and industries.

But, at the same time, we face fresh demands on farm production. Congress has approved the Food for Freedom legislation, to carry on the world-wide war on hunger. Increased world food supplies—much of which must come from the bountiful fields of America—are an imperative. We can't survive as a self-satisfied island of plenty, in a world of six billion hungry souls.

Farmers like to grow things. They feel spiritual satisfaction in making their acres as productive as possible for the needs of mankind. They have reluctantly consented to restrictions, and have accepted a scale of income and a standard of living below the levels of those whom they feed.

They have, by a sort of miracle, been able largely to preserve the ideal of the farm family on the family farm—most of our production still comes from such farms. This must continue, both for the health of the Nation's farming, and the health of the Nation. We seek an implementation of family farm policy which has been a cornerstone of Congressional policy for thirty years.

The new needs must be supplied by people protected by the principle of family farming—continuance of the 160-acre limitation, and of the preference clauses written into many Federal laws. And we insist on continuance of the yardstick principle, as to rates from public and cooperative power projects. We refuse to concede that administrators are following the law when they refuse to allow rural electrification cooperatives to cut their rates, seemingly only to protect high rates for adjacent private utilities, including rates for the power such vested and protected interests sell to the cooperatives.

Furthermore, we call for the yardstick principle to be applied to interest rates. We think the government should lead and not follow the bankers—and in the direction of lower interest rates. We deplore Federal Reserve Board actions which make that Board seem a chore boy for Wall Street. We call on President Johnson to reverse the namby-pamby policies that have allowed bankers to control flow of money and the interest rates, to the detriment of all consumers, rural or city.

We call for 100 percent of parity for farm income. Unless and until that goal is reached, farming will continue to be a depressed industry, and family farmers will have to compete with the starvation wages paid migrant farm workers.

Overall the family farm is a most efficient unit. We must recognize and preserve it as such, and stem any policies, present or future, that would end up in the dreadful reality of a few hundred thousand great corporate enterprises supplying the Nation's food and fiber.

A stable and prosperous agriculture is a national necessity. President Johnson has truly said we will never solve the problem in the cities, until we reverse the migration from the country. Wise steps have been taken to keep the people in the country. We need more of them to avert such tragedies as the decline in population of just one Kansas town from 22,000 in 1920 to 1,372 in 1960. This particular community has been rebuilt in part by rural development aid. Others have been regenerated by Federal aid and by cooperative enterprises.

But all such endeavors are only a prelude to a program that must be pushed by every organization represented here. We must never get discouraged, even by statements from high officials. We must realize that the price of getting rural America back fully on its feet, the price of implementing a resource program spelled out by John F. Kennedy on this very spot here in Montana in 1960, is hard work, cooperation and unity, by all the groups represented here.

Do not let differences of specific issues affect our united support of fundamentals. Above all, let's recognize that the price of freedom and progress is eternal vigilance in their behalf.

LET US REORGANIZE OUR ARMED FORCES RECRUITING SYSTEM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it is a deplorable fact that the four branches of our Armed Forces—the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps—operate separate recruiting facilities resulting in a waste of more than $21 million of taxpayers' money annually. In 1965, for example, they operated a total of 194 main recruiting stations and 3,140 branch stations staffed with 11,700 personnel. The only ones who benefited are real estate owners who lease office space to the armed services.

In my home city of Cleveland, Ohio, the Army maintains 10 recruiting stations; the Navy 5; the Air Force 8; and the Marine Corps 5—for a total of 28 recruiting stations in that city alone. In Cincinnati, Ohio's second largest city, the Army maintains 4 recruiting stations; the Navy 3; the Air Force 2; and the Marine Corps 2—for a total of 11. The same situation holds true in every metropolitan area in the Nation. The result is an unconscionable waste of taxpayers' money.

There is no reason why these recruiting stations could not be consolidated and all the services jointly utilize office space, furniture, and equipment. Also, recruiting stations too often are located in areas that are not accessible to the public, or the offices themselves are unattractive and small. One-man offices are frequently closed during normal working hours when it is necessary for the recruiter to be away from his station. If the services would consolidate their efforts and pool their resources and manpower they could establish recruiting offices that would adequately serve their needs, and the public.

Furthermore, it is a serious waste of military manpower to divert almost 12,000 military personnel to recruiting duty. Many of these recruiters are highly skilled and highly trained servicemen. Practically all of them are career servicemen in whom a great deal of taxpayers' money has been invested. Active duty personnel now used for recruiting duty are withdrawn from individual career fields for 4 years or more. Very few of them desire this duty because they lose proficiency in their primary career fields, and because of poor promotion possibilities.

Mr. President, at the same time there are thousands of retired enlisted personnel who are able and willing to work but who are unable to find employment because of their age or because of their lack of specific skills for the civilian economy. It appears to me that many of these former servicemen could be hired to good advantage by the Government for recruiting duty in place of active duty personnel. This would release almost 12,000 men and return them to their active military duties.

Retired Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps personnel are the best advertisement in the world for a military career. They have already completed theirs and are reaping the benefits. They could be employed under the civil service system or under some other appropriate Government program and be authorized to wear the uniform of their respective branches of the armed services with some special identification as retired career servicemen. In that event, the entire military recruiting program would be staffed by the most experienced civilians to be found—retired soldiers, sailors, and airmen. Furthermore, anyone seeking employment in this program would have ready references from their previous 20 to 30 years of military service and their efficiency reports.

The use of retired military personnel in this capacity would provide a stabilized and superior force of well-informed salesmen for our Government's recruiting services, and at the same time release active duty personnel for active duty of the sort for which they volunteered or were drafted. In addition, the constant search for servicemen for recruiting duty would also be eliminated.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and the Air Force will give careful and serious consideration to this proposal. Reforms and elimination of waste in our recruiting program must be initiated without delay.

DELAYS IN THE MOVEMENT OF MAIL

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, on Thursday of last week, I spoke about complaints I have received from constituents concerning delays in the delivery of mail. Since making that speech, have talked with one of my constituents, Mr. E. C. Hallbeck of Rockville, Md., the president of the United Federation of Postal Clerks, AFL–CIO. Mr. Hallbeck has recently been in Chicago consulting with the local officers of his union and postal officials, and gathering firsthand knowledge of the situation that exists in the Chicago post office. He was accompanied by Mr. F. S. Filbey, another of my constitutents, who serves as administration aid to the Federation.

These gentlemen have advised me that the situation in Chicago is probably even worse than I had understood and, perhaps more important, is not confined to any single location or area. At the time I spoke to the Senate last week there were in the neighborhood of 8 to 9 million pieces of third-class mail backlogged in the Chicago post office. First-class mail was reasonably current, and due to the fact that parcel post was being diverted to other cities, fourth-class mail, or parcel post, was being reasonably well handled.

However, the diversion of mail to other cities, while it may temporarily have eased the burden on the Chicago post office, seems to have created "little Chicagos" in other post offices. In these offices an already overburdened work force found themselves swamped with an additional volume they were not prepared to handle. It appears, therefore, that the diversion of mail not only failed to make speedier delivery possible but has simply created logjams in other places.

Any number of official reasons have been advanced for the present situation. We are told there has been an unprecedented increase in volume and, of that, I have no doubt. We have been told that recent orders restricting hiring and curtailing the use of overtime is a factor, and I am personally convinced that is true. We have been told that there is "excessive absenteeism," a charge which has yet to be proved. In addition, there have been other "reasons" advanced, none of which get at the heart of the problem.

The simple truth is that the Post Office Department is trying to make bricks without straw. For a long number of years the Post Office Department suffered from the Whitten amendment, which was finally repealed by the 89th Congress. As a result of that amendment, post offices throughout the country were unable to hire a sufficient number of career employees to keep up with the steadily increasing volume of mail. In desperation, perhaps, the Post Office Department turned to the use of temporaries of all kinds. Some of these temporaries have been working for a number of years and are sufficiently skilled to be useful. In my judgment, they should be promptly promoted to career status whenever they are qualified to do the work. However, there are literally thousands of other temporary employees in the postal service whose qualifications to do the work are doubtful to say the very least. I refer now to those hired under a number of very laudable Federal programs. I have no quarrel with these programs, but I suggest that the Post Office Department, which needs skilled workers, is hardly the place to employ them. Evidently the Post Office Department seems to feel that if a body is warm, it can be used in the postal service, while I prefer to believe that what is really needed are not bodies, but skilled workers.

My work on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has led me to believe that if the Post Office Department were to get rid of all their temporary employees and hire about half their number as career people and properly train them, they would in a very short period of time not only move a lot more mail, but move it correctly and expeditiously.

In some places, because of current wage scales, the Post Office has not been able to attract the kind of persons interested in a career in the postal service. As a result, they have had to take persons who were willing to work for the kind of salaries the Post Office is allowed to pay. The Post Office has become a dumping ground and is no longer attracting the kind of people that it should.

Under conditions existing today, I am amazed at the restrictions on the use of overtime. If, as I firmly believe, there has been an unprecedented increase in volume which, in turn, must bring with it increased revenues, why should there be any hesitation about using the increased revenues in the form of overtime to take care of added volume? Why not use the skills of trained personnel, even if they have to be paid at an overtime rate? Certainly, hiring additional people who do not know what they are doing in terms of sorting mail is not going to get the job done, and can only be described as wasteful. If one is badly in need of a plumber, it is cheaper in the long run to hire a plumber than it is to hire two unskilled persons who know nothing about plumbing and expect them to get the job done.

If it is necessary to pay more money to attract the right kind of employees, we should do so, but hire them we must if the mail is to be moved. In the meantime, pending the recruiting and training of a career force, we should make the best possible use of the force that we already have, even if it is necessary to pay for service at an overtime rate.

In Tuesday's Washington Post, Jerry Kluttz referred to mail tieups, saying:

> Two aspects of the mail log jams in Chicago and other large city post offices that have concerned officials are a serious slump in employee productivity and abnormal absenteeism.

He went on to say:

> Employee output has plunged up to 20 percent in recent weeks in the Chicago post office which has nearly 20,000 employees. Absenteeism there is running at a rate of 7.8 percent, compared to an average of 6 percent.

Quite frankly, I doubt whether there has been a 20-percent loss in output among career employees. If there has been a loss in production, it is only the natural loss one would expect from the use of untrained and unskilled workers hired in desperation. I think a spokesman for the Post Office Department laid this ghost quite effectively when he said:

> If we had found any proof of a slowdown, we would have taken disciplinary action.

The fact that no disciplinary actions have been taken indicates to me this charge is unfounded. With respect to the absenteeism which Jerry Kluttz referred to, I would be interested in a breakdown. I would like to know, for example, by categories of employees, career and temporary, how much of the "absenteeism" is due to illness. I would like to know how much of it is reported; how much is unreported; how much is excused leave; and how much is, in fact, what can reasonably be called absenteeism.

Mr. President, even if the figures quoted are correct, I seriously doubt whether an increase of 1.8 percent in alleged absenteeism would account for the huge backlog of mail in the Chicago post office, or in other post offices. The backlog in Chicago is so tremendous as to cause an Assistant Postmaster General for Transportation to suggest that permission be sought from the mailers to destroy millions of pieces of mail already delayed to a point where delivery is of no further value to the patron. Such a suggestion is previously unheard of. It is a sad commentary on a country that boasts of having the best postal system in the world. Perhaps better than anything else, it illustrates the deplorable situation which confronts the public.

BUSINESS AND GOVERNMENT HONOR ROLL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I want to call attention to the increasing number of large businesses which are making positive contributions to social and economic development in our cities. I have always felt that private enterprise had a great role to play in the building of our cities; and I have tried always to implement this opportunity by legislation. I have recommended the establishment of an Economic Opportunity Corporation to encourage the private sector to add its resources and talents to the fight against poverty. I hope the private industry's role in urban affairs will continue to expand. I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD an article by James Reston which appeared in last Wednesday's New York Times setting out some of the specific examples of business' contribution.

He lists David Rockefeller, Henry Ford II, Tom Watson, of IBM, Edgar Kaiser, Tom Gates, of the Morgan Guaranty, as among 22 distinguished U.S. business leaders who issued a public statement in favor of the demonstration cities bill which we passed this past week. I would like to name the remaining 17 who are follows: Stephen D. Bechtel, of Bechtel Corp.; Fred Borch, of General Electric; Donald Cook, of American Electric Power Service Corp.; Howard Clark, of American Express; Justin Dart, of Rexall Drug; R. Gwin Follis, of Standard Oil of California; Ben Heineman, of Chicago & North Western Railway; David Kennedy, of Continental Illinois National Bank and Trust; Robert Lehman, of Lehman Bros.; Cyril Magnin, of Joseph Magnin Co.; John McCone, investment banker; Stanley Marcus, of Neiman-Marcus; Alfred Perlman, of New York Central; Herman Peveler, of Norfolk & Western Railway; Stuart Saunders, of Pennsylvania Railway; Herbert Silverman, of James Talcott; and Jack Straus, of Macy's.

There are also other business leaders, among them George S. Moore, of the First National City Bank of New York and Arthur K. Watson of IBM who have shown a gift for serving in this way.

Because I think this is so critically important for the future of this country, I ask unanimous consent to have the article written by Mr. Reston printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON: THE BIG BUSINESS PROGRESSIVES

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, October 11.—On Election Day, the heart of American Big Business still belongs to the Republican party, but the rest of the time, despite occasional tiffs with President Johnson, Big Business support of the Administration's social programs is surprisingly strong.

For example, John A. McCone, California investment banker and former head of the Central Intelligence Agency, who recently came out for Republican Ronald Reagan for Governor of California, has startled his conservative friends by talking about a $100-million program to deal with the Los Angeles Negro ghetto of Watts.

The other day, Sol M. Linowitz, 52, of Rochester, gave up his job as chairman of Xerox International, Inc., to acept an appointment as President Johnson's Ambassador to the Organization of American States.

THE KAISER LOBBY

And this week 22 chief executives of major American corporations, under the leadership of Edgar F. Kaiser, president of Kaiser Industries, issued a public statement for the Administration's demonstration cities bill that sounded as if it had been written by Walter Reuther of the AFL–CIO. It was signed, among others, by David Rockefeller, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, Henry Ford 2d, chairman of the board of the Ford Motor Company, Thomas J. Watson, Jr., chairman of International Business Machines Corporation, and Thomas S. Gates, Jr., chairman of the board of the Morgan Guaranty Trust Company, and former Secretary of Defense under President Eisenhower.

There seems to be a growing difference these days between how the big business leaders vote and how they talk and act. Henry Ford recently announced that he wouldn't vote for Democrat G. Mennen Williams "for dog-catcher of Grosse Point," but he has been one of the most enthusiastic backers of what is almost a big business lobby to save Mr. Johnson's $900-million demonstration cities bill in the House.

On the whole, the big business executives have opposed Mr. Johnson's bill to suspend the 7 per cent credit for machinery and equipment, but even on this controversial legislation three prominent business leaders testified here for it: Frederick R. Kappel, chairman of the board of A.T. & T.; W. B. Murphy, president of the Campbell Soup Company and chairman of the Business Council, and Stuart Saunders, chairman of the board of the Pennsylvania Railroad.

THE HOLDOUTS

In these days when there is much talk about reaction against the war in Vietnam, against inflation, against some of the Great Society programs and against the pace of racial integration, this evidence of a rising social consciousness by big business leaders is worth noting.

The trend is not general in the entire business community. Outside of the small farmer, the small businessman is still probably the most conservative element in American society, but much of big business is different. It is increasingly directed by men in their forties and early fifties who were well educated, use modern economists in their businesses, and who came to maturity during or after the New Deal. Big business is more and more involved, with its international subsidiaries, in the welfare state and planned economies of other industrial countries, and its progressive attitudes are now expanding well beyond the factory gates.

Maybe these attitudes would change in less prosperous times, but for the time being the old conservative ideological (though not voting) patterns have given way to a new concept that big business is not likely to flourish if large segments of the population are living in poverty and misery.

"Our cities are being submerged," the Kaiser statement said, "by a rising tide of confluent forces—disease and despair, joblessness and hopelessness, excessive dependence on welfare payments and the grim threats of crime, disorder and delinquency. . . . America needs the demonstration cities act."

TO ASSURE ENACTMENT

Twenty years ago the progressive Committee for Economic Development was bold for its time. But the predecessors at the head of these 22 large corporations would certainly not have endorsed such views. In fact the Kaiser Committee not only issued the statement but asked the White House in advance if the statement would be useful, and is now working on their Congressmen to try to assure the necessary votes.

Something is going on here and this is only fair. Big business has clearly made its contribution to the ugliness and slums of America's cities, but a new generation of corporate leaders is obviously trying to make amends.

AIR CARGO WORKSHOPS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the air cargo industry has come into being since the end of World War II. Although shipments at the beginning were only of the high priority, specialized type, the all-cargo and combination cargo-passenger carriers have now moved into many areas of the Nation's $50 billion a year shipping business.

These airlines together with the Civil Aeronautics Board are currently holding a series of cargo workshops throughout the country designed to show the shipper not yet acquainted with the air cargo business what it can do for him. Those handling the workshops held thus far say they have been extremely informative. Their value has been pointed out by Steve Tinghitella, the editor of Traffic Management magazine, who emphasizes the need for better communication between air transporters and shippers as well as a better understanding of the Civil Aeronautics Board role.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have alluded be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Traffic Management, September 1966]

AIR CARGO WORKSHOPS

(By Stephen Tinghitella)

Regional Air Cargo Workshops beginning September 20 in Seattle, and thereafter in four other cities are unique in their organization and from many aspects make a lot of sense.

When a regulatory agency (Civil Aeronautics Board) plays a helpful role to bring shippers and carriers together to discuss mutual problems and review suggestions for improved services, this is news in itself. Of course, since the C.A.B. has the responsibility to promote air transport, we can understand this approach. Still the agency must be commended for moving actively in this direction. Also, we realize why, for instance, the Interstate Commerce Commission does not become involved in such a project, and one reason is because it regulates various modes of transport. Yet, I.C.C. Commissioners are constantly attending or participating in transportation functions of professional or industry groups and they, too, must be cognizant of economic changes in transportation.

Co-sponsorship by the National Industrial Traffic League with their top level committee members covering strategic spots on the agendas is double insurance that attendance and interest will be high. Arranging a program of this magnitude is by no means a routine task. Much of the details and arrangements need expert administrators, and these workshops will have them:

Executive chairman of the workshops is W. Fletcher Lutz, deputy director, Bureau of Economics, C.A.B., and program subject coordinator is Allen J. O'Brien, director of traffic service, Aerospace Industries Association; Bradford H. Smith and Jack Yohe, both of C.A.B. are handling logistics coordinating and information respectively. According to a report we received, the five sessions will be sellouts and the registration fee of $25 per person to defray expenses will be a bargain. (For further details, see TM Brief on Page 88, August, 1966.)

We are convinced that better communication between air transporters and users will result. It has worked with the railroads and motor carriers in their respective organizations—shippers' advisory boards, and shippers/motor carrier councils. Participation of the C.A.B. adds a new dimension to such meetings. This is good because shippers have had little contact with the Board. There are, no doubt, many questions in shippers' minds as to the workings of the agency staff, regulations, rules of practice and the Civil Aeronautics Act itself. Most traffic executives are familiar with the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act and to some extent the Shipping Act of 1916 covering offshore water transport, primarily. Membership of the Interstate Commerce Commission Practitioners Association is heavy with traffic and distribution managers. Many also are authorized to practice before the Federal Maritime Commission, but there is no such permission for non-lawyers to practice before the C.A.B. We expect that this subject will be covered at the workshops.

On rate matters, we feel that the experience shippers have gained over the years in dealing with railroads and truckers will enrich air carriers. And in that connection they might even provide the C.A.B. with valuable data for consideration. Joint rate making procedures and tariff bureau provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act most likely would be suggested at workshops as a basic structure for study to possibly be applied in some respects to air freight rate making. A big difference thus far between air carriers and most surface carriers is that the latter groups work closely with shippers on rates and service; but air carriers individually have set the pace by themselves. This whole cooperative effort might serve to change that.

In talking with organization people who have handled workshops, we were offered some advice: To prevent the entire workshop project from missing its mark, discussion leaders and program directors should:

Spark general participation rather than allow domination by a few;

Recognize a hot topic and keep it going until most have had an opportunity to add their comments;

Steer clear of long dialogue on a nut and bolt subject peculiar to only one person; and

Avoid like the plague anything that sounds like a sales commercial.

May we add that speeches should be short, packed full of salient points, with a minimum of statistics, without tired talk of "break-throughs," or discussions of going off into rocket deliveries in the year 2,000. Future programs depend upon the success of this one. Tackling problems of the day with frank questions and straight answers is the best way to make the meetings productive and bring all participants back for another session.

AN APPEAL OF CONSCIENCE ON BEHALF OF SOVIET JEWRY

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, the right to worship freely has long been cherished by citizens of the United States. We have come to accept this right so readily that we often forget that in many nations all people are not given the opportunity to worship openly and without fear.

In the Soviet Union religious freedom has been replaced by religious persecution. Such persecution is falling most heavily on the Jewish people, who are not permitted to publish religious books, produce religious articles, educate their children in Jewish schools, and engage in traditional religious practice. As if the anti-Semitic persecutions of the last generation were not sufficient, the Government of the Soviet Union has demanded more suffering from its Jewish population.

This persecution and this suffering must not go unnoticed and unanswered by the free world. The Soviet Union is not deaf to public outcry especially when it arises in the United States. In an effort to reach the Soviet Government and deter it from its ominous course, dozens of Americans, including Senators GRUENING, JAVITS, RIBICOFF, TYDINGS, and myself, joined recently in a new appeal of conscience to that nation's leaders.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the appeal and its list of signers be printed in the RECORD as further evidence of this Nation's continued concern for the fate of the Jews of the Soviet Union.

There being no objection, the text of the appeal and the list of signers were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN APPEAL OF CONSCIENCE MANIFESTO ON SOVIET JEWRY

(Over 100 leading American dignitaries, United States Senators, State Governors, Clergymen, Artists, and Writers call for restoration of religious and cultural freedom of Jews in U.S.S.R.)

An Appeal of Conscience Manifesto on behalf of the Soviet Union, was issued by over 100 dignitaries in government, religion, education, business, labor, and leading professions on the eve of the Jewish High Holy Days.

It appeared as a one-page statement in the New York Times on September 14, 1966. Rabbi Arthur Schneier, President of the Appeal of Conscience Foundation, noted that among the over 100 signatories of the manifesto sponsoring this humanitarian plea, were leading United States Senators, State Governors, religious leaders of the three major faiths including prominent bishops and other clergymen of the Protestant and Catholic faiths.

The Appeal of Conscience Foundation, comprising religious and lay leaders of the three major faiths, was established last year for the purpose of helping Soviet Jewry regain full religious freedom throughout the Soviet Union. The officers of the Foundation are Rabbi Arthur Schneier, Spiritual Leader of Park East Synagogue-Congregation Zichron Ephraim, President; Dr. Harold A. Bosely, Minister of Christ Church Methodist, the Rev. Thurston N. Davis, S.J., Editor-in-Chief of the Jesuit magazine, America, Vice-Presidents, both of New York; and former Congressman Francis E. Dorn, Secretary-Treasurer, of Brooklyn.

Earlier this year, they visited the Soviet Union as the first Interfaith Mission to study religious life there. Noting that Soviet policy seemed to be aiming at the "obliteration of the Jewish community and Jewish culture," Rabbi Schneier stressed the need for vigorous protest against this policy, "not only by those who value and revere the ancient Jewish tradition and civilization, but also by every person who respects the fundamental human right of a group to live in peace and security."

He stressed that a "powerful coalition of religious and intellectual leaders will exert a potent moral force which even the leaders of the Kremlin will not be able to ignore." "The plight of Soviet Jewry," Rabbi Schneier declared, "has long been a concern of the entire civilized world." The American Government, he noted, has always been concerned over discrimination against any minority group in any part of the world.

Soviet Jews, he declared, are "prevented from living out their lives freely as Jews—even within the framework of the prerogative and institutions sanctioned by the Soviet Constitution, by Soviet law and practice." Jews alone, among Soviet religious groups, "are forbidden the right to have any form of nation-wide federation of congregations or clergy," the leader of the Foundation declared.

"Despite the restrictive measures against Soviet Jewry, Soviet officials want the world to believe that Russian Jews are abandoning their religion and heritage voluntarily," he continued.

"Should the Russian atheistic regime effect this myth through default of world conscience and concern, they will have won a victory far greater than any military conquest," he said.

"We cannot let this happen, if we truly uphold the manifestation of spiritual freedom as the last fortress of decent mankind," Rabbi Schneier declared. He expressed the hope that the manifesto appeal which is being issued during the most solemn period of the Jewish calendar "will arouse the moral conscience of the world on behalf of Soviet Jewry and thereby mobilize the sentiments of all peoples in face of this grave injustice."

Additional signatures whose names did not appear in the ad, because their letters of consent arrived after the newspaper deadline, and should be included in the Congressional Record:

Hon. Everett McKinley Dirksen, United States Senator, Illinois, minority leader of the Senate.

Dr. Abraham J. Heschel, Theologian, Jewish Theological Seminary.

Hon. Richard J. Hughes, Governor, State of New Jersey.

Hon. Thomas J. Mackell, New York State Senator.

Hon. Ernest Gruening, United States Senator, Alaska.

Hon. John Dempsey, Governor, State of Connecticut.

Hon. Gale McGee, United States Senator.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 14, 1966]

You Are Not Forsaken, Soviet Jewry

Our prayers are with you for peace.

We Americans of all faiths urge the Soviet Government to improve your position as equal citizens of your country.

We welcome the promises made by the Soviet Government to permit the printing of 10,000 prayer books, the granting of resident permits for 20 students at the Moscow Yeshiva and the promise to make matzoth available to all Soviet Jewry.

In addition to the fulfillment of these promises, we hope that these essential religious and cultural rights will also be restored to Soviet Jewry:

Jewish education should be allowed.

All restrictions placed on synagogues throughout the Soviet Union should be lifted.

Central institutions to serve the religious needs of Soviet Jewry should be established.

Obstacles to the acquisition of consecrated burial grounds and to the performance of sacred rites, such as religious burial and circumcision, should be removed.

The publication of sufficient quantities of prayer books, Hebrew Bibles and the production of religious articles, such as prayer shawls, phylacteries and mezuzoth, should be permitted.

Permission to Jews to leave the U.S.S.R. so that they may be reunited with their families abroad should be granted.

Jewish cultural institutions enabling Jewish artists in the theatre, music and literature to develop Jewish culture in the Yiddish and Hebrew language should be reestablished.

Religious and cultural ties with Jewish communities outside the U.S.S.R., official exchange visits and religious pilgrimages to the Holy Land should be permitted.

You are neither forsaken nor abandoned. Remain strong. Keep your faith in your heritage.

Conrad Aiken, Poet & Novelist; Hon. William T. Avery, Governor, Kansas; Dr. Markus Barth, Pittsburgh Theological Seminary; Hon. Birch Bayh, U.S. Senator, Indiana; Hon. Abraham D. Beame; Saul Bellow, Novelist, Playwright; Shelley Berman, Artist; David Berdon; Harry Berse; Theodore Bikel, Artist; Dr. Harold A. Bosley, Minister, Christ Church, Methodist; Kay Boyle, Author; Hon. Daniel B. Brewster, U.S. Senator, Maryland; Hon. Quentin N. Burdick, U.S. Senator, North Dakota; David Callahan, Editor, Commonweal; Very Rev. Msgr. Daniel M. Cantwell, Natl. Cath. Conf. for Interracial Justice; I. J. Caplan; Philip Carmel; Hon. Clifford P. Case, U.S. Senator, New Jersey; John Ciardi, Saturday Review; Hon. John H. Chafee, Governor, Rhode Island; Hon. Joseph S. Clark, U.S. Senator, Pennsylvania; Arthur A. Cohen, Theologian and Author; Isidore M. Cohen; Wayne H. Cowan, Managing Editor, Christianity and Crisis.

Rev. Eugene K. Culhane, S.J., Managing Editor, America; Israel Cummings, Joseph E. Cuneen, Editor-in-Chief, Cross Currents; Maxwell Dane, Samuel H. Daroff, Rev. Thurston N. Davis, S.J., Editor-in-Chief, America; Joseph M. Drexler, Hon. Thomas J. Dodd, U.S. Senator, Connecticut; Hon. Peter H. Dominick, U.S. Senator, Colorado; Hon. Francis E. Dorn, Former Congressman, New York; Hon. Paul H. Douglas, U.S. Senator, Illinois; Very Rev. Msgr. John J. Egan, Dir. Office of Urban Affairs, Chicago; Rt. Rev. Msgr. John Tracy Ellis, University of San Francisco; Jason Epstein, Editor, Random House; James Farmer, Jules Feiffer, Writer and Cartoonist; W. H. Ferry, Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions; Dudley Fitts, Author; Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, Minister Emeritus, Riverside Church; Abel E. Garner, Judge Benjamin Gassman, President, Park East Synagogue; Dr. N. N. Glatzer, Professor, Brandeis University; Dr. Nelson Glueck, President, Hebrew Union College, J. I. R.; Maurice Goldring, Rabbi Harold Gordon, Exc. Vice Pres., N.Y. Board of Rabbis.

George Gray, Pres., Kings County Lafayette Trust Co.; Dr. Simon Greenberg, Vice Chanc., Jewish Theological Seminary; Most Rev. Paul J. Hallinan, Archbishop, Atlanta, Georgia; Hon. Philip A. Hart, U.S. Senator, Michigan; Hon. Vance Hartke, U.S. Senator, Indiana; Kyle E. Haselden, Managing Editor, The Christian Century; Nat Hentoff, Columnist and Critic; Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., President, University of Notre Dame; Rt. Rev. Msgr. George G. Higgins, NCWC—Social Action Dept.; Jack Himoff; John Hollander; Hon. Daniel K. Inouye, U.S. Senator, Hawaii; Edward Isaacs; Hon. Jacob K. Javits, U.S. Senator, New York; Paul Jennings, President, International Union of Electrical Radio & Machine Workers AFL-CIO; Philip Johnson, Architect; Hon. Louis I. Kaplan, Judge, Civil Court of New York; Label A. Katz, Past President, International B'nai B'rith; Martin Kane; Edward M. Keating, Editor and Publisher, Ramparts; Hon. Edward M. Kennedy, U.S. Senator, Massachusetts; Hon. Robert Kennedy, U.S. Senator, New York; Hon. Otto Kerner, Governor, Illinois; Larry King, Commentator.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Nobel Laureate; Emil Koenig, James Laughlin, Poet; Hon. Louis J. Lefkowitz, Attorney-General, State of New York; Maurice Levin, Rabbi Pesach Z. Levovitz, Pres., Rabbinical Council of America; Hon. John V. Lindsay, Mayor, City of New York; Hyman Leshen, Hon. John A. Love, Governor, Colorado; Hon. Stanley H. Lowell, Robert Lowell, Poet; Rev. C. J. McNaspy, S.J., Editor, America; Bernard Malamud, Author; Martin E. Marty, Author; Joseph M. Mazer, Charles Mayer, Hon. Eugene J. McCarthy, U.S. Senator, Minnesota; Hon. George McGovern, U.S. Senator, South Dakota; David Meister, Rabbi Israel Miller, Hon. Pres. Rabbinical Council of America; Henry H. Minskoff, Myron A. Minskoff, Hon. Walter F. Mondale, U.S. Senator, Minnesota; Hon. Joseph M. Montoya, U.S. Senator, New Mexico; Hon. Frank E. Moss, U.S. Senator, Utah; Hon. Gaylord Nelson, U.S. Senator, Wisconsin; Dr. Reinhold Neibuhr, Prof. Emer. Union Theological Seminary.

Hon. Frank O'Connor, Pres. City Council of N.Y.; James O'Gara, Commonweal; Albert Parker; Hon. John O. Pastore, U.S. Senator, Rhode Island; Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, Pres. Protestant Council, City of New York; Rt. Rev. James A. Pike, Bishop of California; Norman Podhoretz, Editor, Commentary; Mortimer J. Propp; Dr. Emanuel Rackman, Assistant to the President, Yeshiva University; Dr. David H. C. Read, Minister, Madison Ave. Presbyt'n Church; Very Rev. Paul C. Reinert, S.J., President, St. Louis University; Hon. Abraham Ribicoff, U.S. Senator, Connecticut; Edward Rice, Jr., Publisher, Jubilee; Hon. Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor, New York; Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr.; Herman A. Rosenberg; Joseph Sandler; Hon. Leverett Saltonstall, U.S. Senator, Massachusetts; Dore Schary, Chairman, Anti-Defamation League; Eugene Schildkraut; Lester Schildkraut; Michael Schimmel; Alfred Schlossberg; Rabbi Arthur Schneier, Park East Synagogue; Sol Schulman; Herman H. Schwartz; Hon. Hugh Scott, U.S. Senator, Pennsylvania; Hon. William W. Scranton, Governor, Pennsylvania; Joseph Shapiro; Stanley Sheinbaum.

S. M. Shor, Max Siegel, Hon. Edward S. Silver, Surrogate, Kings County, New York; Hon. Charles H. Silver, Louis Silver, Tobias Simon, Hon. Milward L. Simpson, U.S. Senator, Wyoming; Isaac B. Singer, Author; Edward S. Skillim, Editor, Commonweal; Hon. George A. Smathers, U.S. Senator, Florida; Bishop Stephen G. Spottswood, Chairman, Board of Directors, NAACP; Spyros P. Skouras, Philip Sporn, R. Peter Straus, William Stringfellow, Author; Hon. Stuart Symington, U.S. Senator, Missouri; Allen Tate, Poet; Charles Taubman, Robert Taubman, Donald J. Therman, Publisher, National Catholic Reporter; Hon. Joseph D. Tydings, U.S. Senator, Maryland; Louis Untermeyer, Author; Kurt Vonnegut, Jr., Novelist; Col. Irwin Waldman, Hon. Robert F. Wagner, former Mayor, City of New York; Whitney M. Young, Jr., Executive Secretary, Urban League; Jack D. Weiler, Eli Wiesel, Novelist.

Appeal of Conscience Foundation, 32 Court St., Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201; Rabbi Arthur Schneier, President; Dr. Harold A. Bosley, Rev. Thurston N. Davis, S.J., Vice-Presidents; Hon. Francis E. Dorn, Sec'y-Treas.

THE UNITED STATES—BEST FRIEND OF LATIN AMERICA

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, it seems that on any given day we can find in any of the media an attack upon "the colossus of the north" by some antagonist in Latin America. Often it seems that we can do no right in the eyes of the editors and journalists of our sister republics to the south. When we seek to help, it is called intervention. Should we attempt to advise, it is branded clumsy and misguided interruption of affairs that are none of our business.

But I believe that underlying this sound and fury is a realistic understanding on the part of Latin America's opinionmakers and able interpreters of events that the United States is the best friend any Latin American nation will ever have. Our spontaneous actions in case of disaster often show these friends of ours who cares for their well-being and who does not. For more often than not we ask no reward or even compensation for assistance we render in times of acute need. Then we ask no questions. We merely pour out, instantly, whatever is needed. The altruists of the Communist world are notable by their absence. While a Fidel Castro is invincible in oratory but invisible in time of need, America saves thousands of lives. In this particular case, it was aid to the Dominican Republic in the wake of Hurricane Inez.

A column by Mr. Jose F. Penson, published on the editorial page of El Caribe, of Santo Domingo, of October 5, 1966, is an example of a down-to-earth opinionmaker speaking his mind on the truth as he sees it. Under the headline, "Those Yankee Imperialists," he speaks for America in the Caribbean as we could never do. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOSE YANKEE IMPERIALISTS

In the aftermath of the tragedy (Hurricane Inez) which has engulfed the Dominican people in mourning, united as a monolithic bloc in this moment of anguish, friendly and generous hands are giving help and moral support to our suffering people.

We have seen the response of the United States of America, of Pope Paul VI, and of those countries which have made common cause with us, in our misfortune, offering their immediate help.

However, we were very much surprised to see that the first ones to answer our call for help were the "Yankee Imperialists," the "exploiters of the working class." Those same people that were bitterly attacked by the extreme left, and those same people at which no one now yells "go home." were the first to provide help to a needy country.

We are very much surprised at the absence of Soviet and Chinese ships and aircraft loaded with clothing, medicines and food, since Russia, Communist China and the bearded Fidel Castro are so much interested in our country's destiny, they should have been the first ones to appear willing to help the needy people of our southern coast.

The worshippers of Lenin and Mao-Tse-tung, who so often have demonstrated on the streets of Santo Domingo, with their red flags and gigantic photographs, must have had to reflect at an obvious contrast. They must have noticed the many United States ships and aircraft operating in the coastal waters of Barahona, providing all kinds of help to the thousands of unfortunates, victims of Hurricane Inez. On the other hand not a single bit of help came from Russia or China, only silence and indifference, not even a word of sympathy and condolence has been heard on their broadcasts.

While the Dominican Communists are calling for the defeat of United States imperialism, and the establishment of the Russian or Red Chinese systems in our homeland, these so-called "yankee Imperialists," have undertaken the task of helping those who survived the tragedy which struck that area of the country.

The so much hated "Imperialist Gringos," who according to the Communist propaganda exploit the peoples of Latin America, are rushing to aid the needy.

The Soviets, the Red Chinese, and the Cubans of Fidel Castro do not shed tears for the unfortunates, they do not care to soothe their wounds; they are not a bit concerned about these people's misfortune, but they do know how to poison the minds of men and women, who fall into their web of intrigue by telling them that "Yankee Imperialists" enjoy everything conceivable in the world at the expense of holding millions of Latin Americans as slave laborers.

This article must be short, so that the Communists can read it; so that those who have not yet noticed the contrast may meditate for a moment and see the enormous difference between the "liberators" from Russia and Red China and the "American Imperialists and exploiters."

When I happen to see Russian or Red Chinese aircraft carriers and ships on missions of peace and aid, when it does happen that Soviet planes and helicopters appear in the sky to offer the same help that the Americans are now providing, then, perhaps, I might start believing in the good faith of the Communists. But in the meantime I must continue to trust the "Yankee Imperialists and Exploiters."

PRAYER IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I am sure that the vast majority of the citizens of this country believe that the only reason we have no prayers in our public schools is that a decision by the U.S. Supreme Court bars them. The truth, of course, is that even before the Court spoke, only 33 percent of the Nation's schools had classroom devotions, and there were Bible readings in only 42 percent of our schools.

People also do not seem to realize that the recent Supreme Court decision did not say that children could not pray in public schools; it only said children could not be compelled to say a specific or set prayer. Any public school can allow, and indeed encourage, any child to pray voluntarily in that child's own way, and can set aside a period for the child to do so.

These facts have been emphasized in a series of articles on prayer published in This Week magazine. I ask unanimous consent that the third article in the series entitled "The Lost R," which was published on October 9, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Lost R

(By Thomas J. Fleming)

Religion was never barred from the classroom by the Supreme Court—it's our educators who are keeping it out.

A third-year high-school student asked to identify Jesus Christ, inquired: "Is he on television?" Other students thought that Sodom and Gomorrah were lovers; that the Four Horsemen appeared on the Acropolis. Still others could not complete such familiar quotations as "Many be called, but few —;" "They shall beat their swords into —;" or "The love of money is the root of all —."

Such findings demonstrate how totally American educators have abandoned the teaching of religion in our public schools. One in four administrators who responded to a 1965 sampling by "Christianity Today" reported that his school or district had changed—which means eliminated—its prayer and Bible reading policies since the Supreme Court banned both activities in 1962 and 1963.

Even before the High Court spoke, only 33 per cent of the nation's public schools had homeroom devotions, 42 per cent conducted Bible reading, and 43 per cent allowed the distribution of Gideon Bibles.

School officials' statements on the subject are even more discouraging. "Frankly, most teachers are scared to death to do anything with religion," said W. W. Dick, formerly the Arizona State Superintendent of Education. A high official of the California State Department of Education said: "We just don't have the time. There are so many other things that are already required." A Westchester County, N.Y., superintendent said there was "no indication of public interest" in teaching the subject. Charles H. Downs, the Executive Secretary of the Massachusetts Secondary School Principals Association, got closer to the truth, admitting that most educators were "afraid to take on the headaches that would go with courses in the Bible or religion."

Such a plague of negative thinking is doubly ironic, because the Supreme Court went out of its way to urge the schools to teach religion and the Bible "objectively" as part of a secular program of education.

"It might well be said," Justice Tom Clark declared, "that one's education is not complete without a study of . . . the history of religion and its relationship to the advancement of civilization. It certainly may be said that the Bible is worthy of study for its literary and historic qualities."

As for lack of public interest, a Purdue survey revealed that 89 per cent of the high-school students queried said they would like to know more about religion.

Clearly, the Court has invited the public schools to experiment with teaching religion. The public wants it. But the educational establishment persists in saying "it can't be done." Fortunately, some teachers have been bold enough to ignore the prevailing opinion in their profession.

Perhaps the most noteworthy is Thayer S. Warshaw, an English teacher in Newton, Massachusetts. When he found that his college-board classes could not answer more than 22 per cent of 112 simple questions on the Old and New Testaments, he decided to teach a nine-week course in the Bible. But first, by deft teaching, he made his students want the course.

In Nobel prize-winner John Steinbeck's novel "The Pearl," Warshaw noted that the book's second paragraph began: "If this story is a parable, perhaps everyone takes his own meaning from it." Nine-tenths of the pupils had already revealed they did not know even what a parable was, much less that in one of Jesus' parables a man "sold all that he had" for "one pearl of great price." In Nobel Prize-winner Ernest Hemingway's "The Old Man and The Sea," Warshaw pointed out how the main character staggered up a hill carrying a heavy mast across his shoulders, stumbled several times and finally collapsed on his bed with his arms outstretched and his hands and forehead bleeding from injuries. Not a pupil in the class could make the association with Christ's journey up the Hill of Calvary. Thus Warshaw demonstrated what the Supreme Court said—without the Bible we cannot understand what some of our greatest poets, novelists, painters are saying.

At the beginning of his course, Warshaw came to an understanding with his pupils on two points. First, they would not discuss fine points of Biblical interpretation—pupils were to take such questions to religious authorities. Secondly, they would use the King James version of the Bible, solely because that was the form in which the pupils would meet most scripture quotations in their reading and in everyday life.

Three times a week, Warshaw gave his pupils assignments in "The Holy Bible in Brief" (Mentor, 50c) which contains excerpts from the King James version. Also three times a week, the pupils had a five-minute quiz to test their knowledge of what they had been assigned—quotations to complete, names to identify and incidents to remember. These quizzes were corrected, graded, returned and used for brief instruction sessions.

Warshaw says, "As we went along, the pupils heard about Milton's 'Samson Agonistes,' Melville's 'Moby Dick' with its Ishmael, Ahab and Elijah, Faulkner's 'Absalom! Absalom!,' MacLeish's 'JB,' da Vinci's 'Last Supper,' Marc Connelly's 'Green Pastures.' They learned the origin of such expressions as the patience of Job, a doubting Thomas, a Nimrod, a Judas, a Jonah. Soon the students were picking up Biblical allusions in their textbooks and in the daily newspapers."

At the end of the course, Warshaw gave his students another test—267 questions on the Old Testament and 310 on the New Testament. This time the class averaged 86.5 per cent on the Old Testament and 92.3 per cent on the New Testament. Two pupils got 100 per cent; one was named Cohen and the other O'Connell.

Warshaw has now been teaching the course, with the same success, for the past four years. Although his classes comprise Protestants, Catholics and Jews, as well as a number of non-believers, "I have over a thousand letters from parents and educators," Warshaw says, "enthusiastic about the children's new knowledge and ability to use it."

Best of all is the reaction of the students themselves. They were asked to write in class on the general topic, "Studying the Bible." One boy aptly summed up the whole idea of the course: "I believe there is a difference between teaching and studying the Bible. To me teaching the Bible means looking at it in a religious sense, while studying the Bible means looking at it as a part of literature. I feel that teaching the Bible should not be done in public schools but studying the Bible should."

The National Council of Teachers of English asked Warshaw to give a demonstration at a recent convention. Some 21 other English teachers in the Newton school system have added his survey to their courses. But the general indifference of the average school administrator has left Warshaw unable to find a publisher for the textbook he wrote, to help more teachers follow his lead.

Another pioneer is James V. Panoch, executive secretary of the Religious Instruction Association, 4001 Fairfield Avenue, Fort Wayne, Indiana 46807. Panoch operates a clearing house for information on religion in our schools, and anyone who wants the latest developments in this field can get clouds of reprints from him. "There seems to be great public interest that the Bible be included in the school program," he says. "Unfortunately, that interest has not been able to make itself felt effectively on the school community."

Panoch feels that the Court has given the American people an open invitation to bring religion into our school systems. "Superintendents regularly raise two objections: 1) What materials will we use? 2) Are teachers trained?" says Panoch sadly. "Both objections are valid." Panoch does report a few hopeful developments. In Beaverton, Oreg., some English teachers have developed a system of including the Bible throughout the English program, studying it in any area where it is relevant. In some school systems, the Bible is studied in relation to a desirable characteristic such as courage. Most significant, perhaps, is a Biblical literature course which Mr. Panoch helped develop and is now included in the digest of courses for the secondary schools of Indiana. It is currently being taught in some 10 schools and has been approved by the Attorney General of the state.

Recently, the Religious Instruction Association surveyed 100 girls and boys who had taken the course and asked them if it was worthwhile and would they recommend it to others. Ninety-eight per cent answered "yes" to both questions.

Courses in the history of religion are also being taught with great success at numerous colleges around the country. They could easily be adapted for high-school use. In Tenafly, N.J., more than a dozen high-school seniors "sat in" on an adult education program on world religion. All faiths were represented. The opinion of one Jewish girl, Sally Rapp, was typical: "I wouldn't participate in recitation of the Lord's Prayer, but I would like to study the Sermon on the Mount in English class." Twenty-six communities have requested information on the Tenafly course.

George R. La Noue, a specialist on church-state relations in education, maintains that "within the canons of good teaching, religious questions may be discussed vigorously in the classroom." Mr. La Noue also points out that the school can certainly put on religious plays such as "JB" or "A Man for All Seasons" occasionally. Along the same line, if students read Voltaire, Hume or Paine, they can certainly read Aquinas, Luther or Pope John XXIII. "The Supreme Court has said the public schools should be neutral in regard to religion. Neutrality certainly does not mean blindness."

Religious holidays are another excellent opportunity for a public school to emphasize the importance of religion in our national life. Wrangles over Christmas trees on public school property and similar disagreements have made more than one school system incline toward giving up religious observance entirely. A report by the Commission on Religion in the Public Schools to the American Association of School Administrators strongly opposes such a decision. Instead of the school's "own" Christmas pageant or Christmas display, the commission recommends that, at various religious feasts during the year, the teachers organize and encourage the children to put on displays and explanations of their individual rites and beliefs for their fellow students. This way the school remains neutral and the teacher's role is to help children see that different customs and beliefs are essential elements of our society.

Finally, the best thinking by Constitutional experts declares that, though the Supreme Court has banned school prayers composed by the State, it has definitely not banned all prayer from our schools.

Justice Hugo Black summed up the court's attitude: "Students have the right to practice prayer and read the Bible. They do not have the right to the aid of the state in that exercise."

The Attorney Generals of Kentucky, West Virginia and Pennsylvania were among the legal figures who emphasized this side of the court's ruling. Leo Pfeffer, a lawyer who has played a prominent role in many of these Supreme Court decisions, says: "If a child felt it necessary to say a prayer before partaking of bread or milk or cookies and the state says you can't do that, that would be a violation of the free exercise clause and just as unconstitutional . . . as it is for the teacher to say to the children that you will now say grace or read from the Bible." What is emerging, in many schools, is a period of meditation at the beginning or close of each day. The Dean of Rutgers University Law School, Professor Willard Heckel, has said: "Clearly there is nothing unconstitutional about giving young people the opportunity, the time for silent prayer or meditation because here again, this is part of the free exercise side of the coin."

Here, as elsewhere in the problem of education, students, aided by their parents and churches, must take the initiative. Panoch sums up the problem:

"In our enthusiasm to eliminate the wrong ways of bringing religion into our public-school education, we have tended to eliminate all ways. Instead of criticizing the Supreme Court, it is time for all of us to realize they have pointed out several right ways to make religion a potent factor in our children's education. What we need now is some enthusiasm for these right ways—before it's too late."

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION SAMPLING OF DRUGS FOR POTENCY

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to a speech which I think should be recommended reading for each adult American and required reading for each doctor and pharmacist.

Those who were here while Senator Kefauver and I were fighting for the enactment of the Drug Amendments of 1962 will recall that one of the major goals of that act was to bring relief to Americans burdened with large drug bills. This we sought to do by guaranteeing—as much as is humanly possible—the safety of every drug sold in interstate commerce and by encouraging the use of generic—chemical shorthand—name drugs. Generics, of course, often sell for one-tenth the price of comparable brandname drugs. Their use could save Americans millions of dollars annually.

The bill was enacted, and the sales of generics annually have climbed slightly. But the drug industry, which first almost succeeded in killing the bill—and, as I see it, would have been successful in killing any meaningful bill if the thalidomide disaster had not struck—then turned its guns on generic prescribing. Their success, I am sure, explains in great measure the slow rise in the sale of generics.

Their major thrust has been at convincing doctors and pharmacists that generic drugs are of inferior quality. Recently they have gone one step further and have bombarded pharmacists with articles and pamphlets warning that if a prescription was filled with a "bad" generic from a small company and the patient sued, the pharmacist could lose his store. Whereas, the industry points out, if on the rare occasion a brandname drug would be the cause of patient harm, the large producer would be the one sued.

Mr. President, last Saturday the Deputy Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, Winton B. Rankin, pointed out that if doctors and pharmacists are attempting to supply patients with the best drugs, they might be better advised to use generics over brandname drugs.

A quality check by FDA of 4,600 samples of 20 of the most important groups of drugs—generic and brandname—Mr. Rankin reported, showed 7.8 percent of the generics not of acceptable potency. But 8.8 percent of the brandname drugs failed to meet standards.

The percentages, admittedly, are still too high in both categories and demonstrates, as Mr. Rankin said:

> That drug manufacturers and the government are going to have to do a better job.

Under the direction of FDA Commissioner Goddard, I am confident that the agency—which has been improving rapidly in recent months—will do the better job required.

The main issue, as the FDA sees it, is:

> If a drug manufacturer cannot put out good drugs, then he will have to get out of the drug business.

As a cosponsor of the Drug Amendments of 1962, I can testify that that was exactly the intent of Congress in enacting the bill.

The agency plans to apply that rule firmly, Mr. Rankin assures us. And he outlines how they will reach that goal.

This seems to me as the best way to counteract the campaign of fear which the drug industry has waged against generic prescribing. And, at this point generic prescribing still strikes me as the best way to cut the cost of drugs to consumers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech by FDA Deputy Commissioner Rankin on Saturday, October 15, to the American College of Apothecaries at Boston be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUALITY DRUGS AND THE PHARMACIST

(Address by Winton B. Rankin, Deputy Commissioner, Food and Drug Administration, delivered at the American College of Apothecaries Convention, Boston, Mass., October 15, 1966)

The pharmacist wants to dispense safe, pure, and effective drugs. This desire is shared by the physician, who prescribes, and the patient, who takes the drugs.

The pharmacist, the physician, and the patient all have a right to expect that any drug which moves across state lines is safe and pure and will do what its makers promise it will do. The physician should have no doubt about any drugs; the pharmacist should have to rate manufacturers as to reliability; the patient should have confidence in what is prescribed and dispensed.

Stated another way, all of us in the United States have a right to get good drugs. The manufacturer has an obligation to supply good drugs, and the Food and Drug Administration has an obligation to check on his fulfillment.

It is not enough to say that drugs must be safe; that they must be pure; that they must do what the label promises they will do. All of us must take practical steps to assure that these ends become everyday accomplishments.

We have made great strides in this country since the early days of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. Blatant nostrums are not so frequently traded in the open market place; people no longer buy without prescription the narcotic-containing cure-alls for young and old alike. And, there are a number of indications of a current general awareness of the need to market good drugs. I'd like to name a few examples for you:

Congress strengthened the Federal Food and Drug law four years ago by adding a requirement, among other, that drugs must be produced in conformity with current good manufacturing practice; this means, for example, that the manufacturer must use adequate plant facilities and equipment, must install proper manufacturing and laboratory controls, and must employ competent personnel to insure that the drugs he puts out are good.

Since the new law was passed in 1962, FDA and the regulated industries have joined in conducting training seminars on good drug manufacturing practice. These have been widely attended by industry representatives. I'd like to pay a special tribute to the University of Wisconsin, which has given us a hand in this program. And, incidentally, Mr. Cain, your very able Executive Secretary, contributed to our last Hershey, Pa. seminar also.

A number of manufacturers have continued or inaugurated programs of significant plant improvement to help them meet the new requirements.

And more effective control of habit-forming stimulant and depressant drugs such as the amphetamines and barbiturates and hallucinogens such as LSD is being achieved under the provisions of the Drug Abuse Control Amendments which were passed unanimously by the Congress just last year.

There is one area in which considerable clarification is desirable—the generic versus brand-name controversy. Some manufacturers insist that their brand-named drugs are generally more reliable than the same chemical produced and sold by others under its common or generic name. Many who are charged with the responsibility of supplying good drugs at the best available price point to the price differential between the two—sometimes an enormous price differential—and ask why the public must pay extra for the brand-named product.

Pharmacists find themselves in the middle. To what extent can they reliably recommend that physicians prescribe by genetric name, and that hospital and Government purchases be made on a generic name basis to the extent possible?

The Food and Drug Administration finds itself in the center of the controversy, too. The law requires that all drugs moving across state lines be manufactured properly and be reliable. If we must rely only on brand-named drugs for quality, then the law is not being administered effectively. And shouldn't the FDA make more effective use of the power Congress gave it in 1962 to establish simple, useful generic names by which drugs must be sold? If you cannot rely on a drug unless you purchase it by brand name, then there must be a lot of bad drugs on the market. If physicians and pharmacists are being pushed into the use of brand-name drugs because the manufacturers have been allowed to coin unwieldly common names that are not readily usable by the professions, then remedial action available to us under the law is clearly in order.

Dr. Goddard decided shortly after he became Commissioner of Food and Drugs last winter to find out more about the quality of both generic and brand-named drugs. We collected almost 4,600 samples of drugs last spring representing the output of about 250 manufacturers. We examined these samples for potency. About 2,600 of the drugs were sold by their generic name only and about 2,000 by brand name. They represented 20 of the most important groups of drugs used in medicine—antihypertensives, oral antidiabetics, anti-infectives, digitalis and digitalis-like preparations, for example.

Antibiotics were not included because every lot of antibiotics for human use is checked by FDA before sale. The samples were collected from stocks being offered for sale or ready to be shipped to the market.

The quality of a drug was judged by applying the potency limits of the U.S.P. or the N.F., if it was an official drug. Otherwise, it was considered acceptable if it contained 90 to 110 percent of the active ingredient declared on the labeling. 7.8% of the generic-named drugs were not of acceptable potency. 8.8% of the brand-named drugs were not of acceptable potency.

I would call attention to the fact that this was a limited survey relating to potency and not to all factors that may have a bearing on a drug's acceptability. But if the potency requirements are not met, then the drug is bad whether or not it meets other requirements. Drugs generally are not subject to the same quality controls that apply to antibiotics and insulin. Manufacturers who would like to avoid increasing demands for extension of the batch-by-batch Government testing of additional drugs would be well advised to clean their own house rather than waiting for the Government to do it.

The poor quality we found both in generic- and in brand-name drugs shows that drug manufacturers and the Government are going to have to do a better job, that the furor over generic versus brand names does not come to grips with one of the main issues.

That main issue is: If a drug manufacturer cannot put out good drugs, then he will have to get out of the drug business. I pledge to you that FDA will apply this yardstick to the full extent of the Federal law.

Where stronger law is required, we will recommend appropriate legislation. We will not tolerate shoddy drugs on the U.S. market.

Corrective actions are already being stepped up. During the six-month period ending June 30, 1965, we brought 43 legal actions because of drug potency deviations; during the comparable period ending June 30, 1966, we brought 64 legal actions because of drug potency deviations—an increase of almost 50%.

During the six-month period ending September 30, 1965, there were 17 drug recalls because of drug potency problems; during the comparable period ending September 30, 1966, there were 50 such recalls—an increase of almost 200%.

Now let's look at the problem of drug names: Doctors are busy people interested in providing good medical care in the least time necessary. They have to carry enough information around in their heads without trying to become a walking encyclopedia of drug nomenclature. If a doctor is given two names by which to designate a drug, it is reasonable to expect that he will remember and use the simpler, more convenient of the two. Thus aspirin is written as "aspirin" or even "ASA" on the prescription, not as "acetylsalicylic acid."

In some cases, the common or generic name of a drug represents a very satisfactory designation. It would be difficult for a manufacturer to convince any large percentage of the doctors in this country that they should prescribe codeine by any other name. In other cases, many cases, the common name suggested and used by the manufacturer is much less usable than the shorter, easier-to-remember brand name. Can we reasonably expect the practitioner to prescribe hydroxyamphetamine hydrobromide instead of Paredrine; lincomycin hydrochloride monohydrate instead of Lincocin; or triacetyloleandomycin instead of TAO? You will see from the examples cited that we in FDA are not pleased with some of the common names that we have allowed where we clearly had the authority to require more useful terms. And you don't have to be much of a historian to determine that for the past generation or more, drug manufacturers have spent vast sums of money to keep the short, catchy brand names constantly before the physician. You don't have to take sides in the controversy to recognize that in general it is hard for the physician to prescribe by generic name and easy for him to prescribe by brand name. Codeine is the kind of exception that proves the rule.

The late Senator Estes Kefauver, the father of the 1962 Drug Amendments to the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, thought it should be convenient for doctors to prescribe by generic name too. He wrote into the 1962 Amendments, and the Congress enacted, a provision that allows our Department to establish simple, useful names for drugs.

The selection of simple, useful generic or established names has been studied carefully by a non-governmental group that calls itself the USAN Council (the United States Adopted Names Council). The Council has suggested generic names for a number of drugs. It has been aided in this endeavor by drug manufacturers. These names do not have official sanction until they are adopted in an official compendium or as established names in regulations which we issue. This should not detract from the importance of the voluntary activities of the USAN group; the start that has been made is very significant and is one that we hope will continue and improve.

Recently we published a proposal to adopt 27 USAN recommended names by regulation as established names. We will expand this modest start. We are studying now the procedures that should be employed to require a simple, useful established name before we approve a new drug or an antibiotic for marketing.

These, then, are two of our immediate goals: first, to be sure that each lot of each drug is reliable; second, to be sure that each drug has a simple, useful official name so that the physician can really choose whether he will prescribe by generic or brand name.

They are reasonable goals. Working together we will reach them.

NEED TO INCREASE FERTILIZER PRODUCTION

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, in a Senate speech on October 12 I called upon the U.S. Government to launch a comprehensive research program on all aspects of the world fertilizer situation. I also proposed that the United States take the lead in exploring ways to use presently wasted natural gas to meet the fertilizer needs of countries in the underdeveloped world.

Increased fertilizer production and utilization is essential if the war against world hunger is to be won.

I ask unanimous consent that three excellent newspaper articles on this problem be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 14, 1966]

World Need Seen—Low-Cost Fertilizer From Gas Promoted

(By Saville R. Davis)

Washington.—Low-cost fertilizer and plenty of it—what this would mean to the developing countries and their hungry peoples is beyond calculation.

Senator George McGovern, Democrat, of South Dakota, has a plan for it.

He would make it from natural gas, some of which is simply burned in the air to get rid of it. He would use the new technology: Huge plants that have halved the cost in five years and can send it lower.

"This amounts to a revolution in the fertilizer industry," he told the Senate in one of his periodic speeches on food appealing to the conscience of mankind. He quoted a United Nations report saying this revolution should not be used for narrow profit, but should be financed on easy terms and its benefits distributed on the basis of "need."

THREE PROPOSALS LISTED

His proposals are:

1. That the United States "take the lead by offering to finance the construction of three pilot plants [the large new 200,000 ton per year type] in the developing world." They would produce fertilizer from natural gas in countries where it is plentiful, such as Algeria, Venezuela, Iran, or Iraq. The cost of the three plants would be approximately $200 million.

"I believe that one or two of the larger private foundations might be willing to assist in financing," Senator McGovern said.

2. While the bulk of the low-cost capital will probably have to come from governments, "private industry can also play an important role in putting this natural resource to work." Several of the larger private American firms have expressed an interest.

3. The United States Government should launch a "comprehensive research program on all aspects of the world-fertilizer situation, with special emphasis on the nitrogen needs of the Indian subcontinent, Latin America, and Africa." There should be "a sound estimate of requirements, capacities, and priorities" and "clear recommendations to government and industry on organization, investment, management, and operations."

FOOD SURPLUS DRAINS

The progress of agriculture has turned out to be "painfully slow" and highly disappointing, Mr. McGovern said, in the developing countries. This is in the face of "a very grave threat of mass famine" in the words of Agriculture Secretary Orville L. Freeman, quoted by the Senator.

The American food surplus is below the level of one year's carryover, needed for a reserve. No other country has sizable amounts of food for sale. Fertilizer is the key to "self-help" in the developing countries. Natural gas is the cheapest raw material for fertilizer where it is available, but it has not been developed at anywhere near the needed speed.

Though the cost of fertilizer from gas has dropped by half in the big new plants, the world selling price is "actually as high as ever."

Order is urgently needed, Senator McGovern said, in what is "now a piecemeal and even chaotic approach to the expansion of world fertilizer production."

He cited two authorities for his grim picture of supply relative to the increase of hunger and need. One was a report of the Tennessee Valley Authority, made for the United States Foreign Aid Administration (AID). The trouble is, said the TVA, that fertilizer production is expanding in the industrial countries, where it already is in surplus but unavailable in quantity to the developing countries.

They cannot afford the dollars to import it.

The McGovern thesis is that the new big plants must be built within the developing world, at places where the gas is available, and distributed on the basis of something approaching public service.

The other authority is an interregional seminar on fertilizer production held by the United Nations at Kiev, in the Soviet Union, a year ago. The United States was represented.

It urgently recommended steps to make capital available on liberal terms, to correct the "imbalance" by which the wealthy countries will produce far more than enough, and the developing countries have far too little and cannot afford to import.

Senator McGovern analyzed the situation in India where a number of big American companies were invited to invest and fill out the Indian production program. There is some progress, the Senator said, but the outlook for reaching India's five-year-plan target "is not so far, encouraging."

Senator McGovern quoted George Woods, president of the World Bank, whose institution has taken part in the development of the natural gas-fertilizer program:

"Rich finds of raw materials lie buried in some countries," Mr. Woods said earlier this year, "for lack of a ready market. One key ingredient, natural gas, is simply being thrown to the winds. Assembling the necessary ingredients at the right places and right times poses some complicated problems.

"But the technology is known; the capital is available. All that is missing is the ingenuity, imagination, and cooperation—particularly cooperation."

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 16, 1966]

The Fertilizer Gap

With population growth continuing to outstrip food production in the developing countries, the United States and the World Bank have increasingly tailored Western aid strategy to promote the use of fertilizer. American aid has helped to finance more than $100 million in fertilizer exports from this country during the 1966 fiscal year, and the United States is pressing major aid recipients such as India to expand domestic fertilizer manufacturing capacity. The U.S. approach to increasing fertilizer production abroad has had a somewhat limited impact, however, since Washington has focused narrowly on pushing foreign private investment and has shunned any role in enlarging publicly controlled fertilizer manufacture.

Indian requests for U.S. and World Bank help in setting up government fertilizer manufacturing enterprises have been turned down for the past decade on the argument—valid as far as it goes—that private foreign capital can build more efficient factories more rapidly. A notable exception to this came when the Kennedy Administration, persuaded that India was firmly wedded to a strong public sector for nationalist political reasons, approved a U.S. loan for the Trombay plant in 1962. But the United States reverted to its former policy late last year. Two new fertilizer ventures at Durgapur and Cochin slated at that time for U.S. aid loans are now being built for the Indian government by Italian firms on straight commercial terms.

Reviewing the effectiveness of American fertilizer policy, Sen. George McGovern pointed out in a speech yesterday that the prospects for massive American fertilizer investment in India are discouraging despite the liberalized Indian policy toward foreign capital adopted last December. McGovern cites in particular the limited results of a special Indian mission sent this summer to woo U.S. firms. He calls for a "comprehensive research program on all aspects of the world fertilizer situation" designed to produce a new policy approach, one envisaging "broader participation in capitalization, management operation and the sharing of profits than has so far been apparent."

Whatever the precise formula adopted, a realistic fertilizer policy must clearly go beyond the political-limited potentialities of an approach restricted to private investment. Neither India on the one hand nor the World Bank and the United States on the other can afford doctrinaire policies in dealing with a problem of this magnitude and urgency. India should continue to liberalize the terms governing foreign private investment. At the same time, the United States and the World Bank should prepare the way for future loans to government fertilizer enterprises in India, Pakistan and other developing countries.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Oct. 17, 1966]

India Failing To Attract Fertilizer Factory Capital

(By James S. Keat)

New Delhi, October 16.—Senior Indian officials are distressed over the lack of progress in getting private foreign capital for badly needed fertilizer plants despite some politically costly policy changes designed to attract it.

"Now that we have done what Washington asked, and exposed ourselves to left-wing attacks, where are the results to show for it?" one official asked.

Since the Government relaxed its price and marketing controls last May, only two agreements have been signed. One of them, however, has since developed snags which may cause it to collapse. Three other American companies are negotiating while four or five more are interested.

Officials here argue that the United States should again consider giving aid to Government-owned fertilizer plants. Two loan agreements were on the verge of settlement last year but have since fallen through as Washington placed its emphasis on India's attracting private investment.

DOOR STILL OPEN

Although high ranking officials appear or profess to be unaware of it, neither the United States Government nor the World Bank has closed the door to assisting Government-owned fertilizer plants.

There are strong indications Washington would consider sympathetically a new request for aid to a publicly owned plant, but none has been made.

The World Bank, which has taken great interest in India's agricultural development, is also understood to be prepared to aid Government-owned fertilizer plants as well as private ones.

This conflict of views illustrates the continued uncertainty which has clouded the Western advice and Indian responses about means of increasing fertilizer output fourfold, to 2,000,000 tons of nitrogen and 1,000,000 of phosphates, by 1971.

Some bitterness has been aroused in Indian officials by what they describe as the harsh terms demanded by private companies which believe they have New Delhi over a barrel because of the pressure from Washington to show results. Some knowledgeable foreigners agree.

BUSINESSMEN BITTER

Business men are equally bitter over what they consider their inability to get prompt decisions from the Indian Government and the increasingly hostile atmosphere to foreign capital despite private assurances to the contrary.

Sources familiar with the protracted negotiations over new fertilizer plants believe potential investors are awaiting the results of India's general elections next February before committing themselves, but the deadline to qualify for the seven-year dispensation from price and distribution controls is next March 31, just five weeks after the elections.

Because of the outcry from left-wingers within and outside the ruling Congress party over the concessions already granted, the Government fears to extend the deadline—at least before election day.

The political concern arises from recent Government statements which could be interpreted as backing off from the promises of a welcome to foreign fertilizer manufacturers.

Business men also express skepticism that the effective demand—the ability as well as the desire to buy fertilizers—will be as great as officials, American as well as Indian, forecast for the next five years.

They are therefore seeking concessions, such as guarantees that no competing plants will be built in their marketing areas, which Indian officials consider a contradiction of American preaching about the value of free enterprise and market competition.

Sympathetic foreigners also argue that Indian officials have not yet realized how great the competition is for foreign capital around the world.

The two American companies which have agreed to build fertilizer plants here are American Oil Company, which plans to go in partnership with the Indian Government in Madras, and Armour and Company, which plans to join with the Birla industrial combine here in a plant at Goa.

COMPANIES NEGOTIATING

The companies which are negotiating for plants are Phillips Oil Company, which is interested in one at Haldia in West Bengal and possibly a second, International Development and Investment Company, a Bahamas-based American concern negotiating for a plant at Mangalore in Mysore, and Allied Chemical Company, which is discussing a plant at Kothagudam in Andhra.

Other American companies which have expressed interest but have not yet begun negotiations are Hercules Powder, United States Borax, Hooker Chemical Company and W. R. Grace and Company.

At least one of the two American oil companies operating refineries here—Esso Standard Eastern—had also expressed some interest.

New Delhi plans to build the two plants for which Washington's aid was expected, at Cochin in Kerala and Durgapur in Bengal, with commercial credits from Italian suppliers of equipment.

AWARD OF ROY C. HAINES MEMORIAL TROPHY TO HAWAII STATE SOCIETY

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I am proud to report that the Hawaii State Society of Washington, D.C., recently received the Roy C. Haines Memorial Award trophy as the outstanding State society of the year.

The award was presented to William W. Graham, immediate past president of the society, by L. Ray Smart, immediate past president of the Conference of State Societies in Washington, at a ceremony at the Sheraton-Carlton Hotel.

Accepting the award with Mr. Graham was Mrs. Lani O'Connor, first vice president of the society for the new season. The large silver trophy was presented to Mr. Graham for the activities of the society during his administration as president. The award is based on points given for community services, organization growth, and participation in conference activities.

Mr. Graham cited the following as outstanding Hawaii State Society activities during his regime:

Publication of the first society newspaper with pictures, Ka Nupepa, under the direction of Mrs. Jeanne Rozamus.

Publication of the society's first historical brochure—it was founded in 1950—by Mrs. Lani O'Connor.

Fund-raising activities in behalf of the Yang Chi Hei Society orphanage in Seoul, Korea, which is operated for the benefit of widows and dependents of ROK servicemen in Vietnam. The Alaska State Society cooperated in this activity.

A benefit for St. Anne's orphanage, Washington, D.C.

Contributions to the fund to assist Mrs. Montoya—sniper victim—in Honolulu.

Provided the Hawaii Cherry Blossom Festival parade float with a big assist from the Pineapple Growers' Association of Hawaii. The edible portion of the hundreds of pineapples used on the float was contributed to two orphanages.

Provided entertainment for a ball to raise funds to restore the ship *Kaiulani*, destined to become a floating museum in Washington.

Manned a speaker's bureau to provide schools and organizations with Hawaii Visitors Bureau promotional material on Hawaii.

Presented a Jean Charlot painting of King Kamehameha to crew of the Polaris submarine U.S.S. *Kamehameha*.

Staged many other activities, including an authentic hukilau, a Holoku Ball at the conclusion of each year, and a luau on Kamehameha Day. Cultural programs included classes in the hula and ukelele, and choral groups directed by Mr. Harold Bailey.

Mr. Graham said the most unusual activity of the year was the shipment to Washington from Hawaii of 3,000 pounds of luau rocks which were collected by members of the Royal Guard in return for hospitality extended them in Washington by the society.

He also singled out Takeshi Kumagai, society publicity chairman, for special mention and credited members of the Hawaii congressional delegation for generous support.

The Conference of State Societies presented certificates of merit to Mr. Graham and past president Orvin L. Nelson for special activities.

Clifford Paulson, new president of the society, said every effort will be made to keep the Hines trophy for a second year.

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY IN 1966

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a list of committee bills which became law or were otherwise acted on, together with a list of 13 nominations considered by the committee during the 2d session of the 89th Congress. A total of 94 Senate bills, 5 House bills, 1 Senate joint resolution, 5 Senate resolutions, and 2 Senate concurrent resolutions were referred to the committee during this session. Twenty-six bills and resolutions were reported to the Senate in this session, and 20 public laws and 1 private law were enacted; and in addition, 4 bills had passed both House and Senate and are awaiting the President's approval.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Major Bills Considered by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency During the 2d Session of the 89th Congress

BANKING

S. 308, to permit the establishment and operation of certain branch offices by the

Michigan National Bank, Lansing, Mich. Senate hearing August 17, 1966. No further action.

S. 801, to improve the balance of payment position of the United States by permitting the use of reserved foreign currencies in lieu of dollars for current expenditure. Senate Report No. 1078, March 21, 1966. Passed Senate March 22, 1966. Reported by House Ways and Means Committee on September 1, 1966. (H. Rept. 1954). Passed House October 7, 1966. Approved October 15, 1966. Public Law 89–677.

S. 1308, to authorize revised procedures for the destruction of unfit Federal Reserve notes, and for other purposes. Hearings July 21, 1965. Senate Report No. 531, August 2, 1965. Passed Senate August 3, 1965. House hearings on a similar bill (H.R. 5305) February 24, 1966. H.R. 5305 reported to House, with an amendment, April 26, 1966 (H. Rept. 1449). H.R. 5305 passed House, with an amendment, May 2, 1966. Proceedings vacated, laid on table May 2, 1966. S. 1308, as amended, passed House in lieu May 2, 1966. Senate concurred in House amendment May 5, 1966. Approved May 20, 1966. Public Law 89–427.

S. 1556, to authorize the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to delegate certain of its functions, and for other purposes. Hearings July 21, 1965. Senate Report No. 533, August 2, 1965. Passed Senate August 3, 1965. Reported to House September 26, 1966 (H. Rept. 2079). Passed the House October 17, 1966.

S. 1698, to amend the Bank Merger Act so as to provide that bank mergers, whether accomplished by the acquisition of stock or assets or in any other way, are subject exclusively to the provisions of the Bank Merger Act, and for other purposes. Hearings May 19, 20, 21, and 27, 1965. Reported with an amendment June 8, 1965 (S. Rept. 299). Passed Senate June 11, 1965. House hearings August 11, 13, 16–20, 23–27, 30, 31; and September 1, 2, 14–17, 22–24, 27, and 28, 1965. Reported to House, with amendments, October 19, 1965 (H. Rept. 1179). Similar bill (H.R. 12173) reported to House January 24, 1966 (H. Rept. 1221). H.R. 12173 passed House, with an amendment, February 8, 1966, but action vacated and House passed S. 1698 on February 8, 1966, after amending S. 1698 to contain the House-passed language of H.R. 12173. Senate concurred in House amendments February 9, 1966. Approved February 21, 1966. Public Law 89–356.

S. 2973, to permit Edward C. Bower to serve as a director of the Virgin Islands National Bank prior to his obtaining U.S. citizenship. Senate Report 1584, September 1, 1966. Passed Senate September 6, 1966. Similar bill (H.R. 13612) reported to House September 12, 1966 (H. Rept. 2027). H.R. 13612 laid on table September 20, 1966. S. 2973 passed in lieu September 20, 1966. Approved October 4, 1966. Private Law 89–340.

S. 3158, to strengthen the regulatory and supervisory authority of Federal agencies over insured banks and insured savings and loan associations. [Increases insurance from $10,000 to $15,000; provides for procedures for removal of officers and directors; provisions of the bill, other than the increase in insurance, to expire June 30, 1972.] Hearings April 4, 5, 7, 12, 14; May 17, 18, and 1966. Reported, with an amendment, August 18, 1966 (S. Rept. 1482). Passed Senate August 22, 1966. House hearings September 15, 20, and 22, 1966. House reported clean bill (H.R. 17899) September 24, 1966 (H. Rept. 2077). H.R. 17899 passed House October 4, 1966. This action vacated and House passed S. 3158, after amending it to contain the House-passed language of H.R. 17899. Senate asked for conference October 6, 1966. House agreed to conference October 10, 1966. Conference report filed October 11, 1966 (H. Rept. 2232). House agreed to conference report October 12, 1966. Senate agreed to conference report October 13, 1966. Approved October 16, 1966. Public Law 89–695.

S. 3368, to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for two years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations from the Treasury. Senate Report 1215, June 8, 1966. Passed Senate June 9, 1966. Reported to the House June 21, 1966 (H. Rept. 1640). Passed House June 23, 1966. Approved June 30, 1966. Public Law 89–484.

S. 3283, to promote private financing of credit needs and to provide for an efficient and orderly method of liquidating financial assets held by Federal credit agencies, and for other purposes. Hearings April 26 and 28, 1966. Senate Report 1040, April 28, 1966. Passed Senate, amended, May 5, 1966. House hearings on a similar bill (H.R. 14544) April 21, 1966. H.R. 14544 reported to House April 25, 1966 (H. Rept. 1448). Hearings on H.R. 14544 by House Rules Committee May 3, 5, and 10, 1966. H.R. 14544 passed House April 19, 1966. Proceedings vacated, laid on table May 18, 1966. S. 3283, as amended, passed in lieu of H.R. 14544 May 18, 1966. Senate agreed to House amendment May 23, 1966. Approved May 24, 1966. Public Law 89–429.

H.R. 7371, to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956. [Eliminates two major open-end exemptions from the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956—the exemption for long-term trusts and religious, charitable, and educational institutions and the exemption for registered investment companies and their affiliates—and to bring up to date the regulatory and administrative provisions of the Bank Holding Company Act and related acts.] House hearings May 27; June 13 and 15, 1965. Reported to the House June 21, 1965 (H. Rept. 534). Passed House September 23, 1965. Senate hearings on S. 2353, S. 2418, and H.R. 7371 March 16, 17, 22, 23, 24, 29, 30, 31; May 2, 3, and 4, 1966. Reported, with an amendment, May 19, 1966 (S. Rept. 1179). Passed Senate, amended, June 7, 1966. House agreed to Senate amendments June 21, 1966. Approved July 1, 1966. Public Law 89–485.

H.R. 14026, to provide for the more flexible regulation of maximum rates of interest or dividends payable by banks and certain other financial institutions on deposits or share accounts, to authorize higher reserve requirements on time deposits at member banks, to authorize open market operations in agency issues by the Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes. House hearings May 9, 10, 11, 12, 19, 24, 26, 31; June 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 16, and 23, 1966. Reported to the House July 28, 1966 (H. Rept. 1777). Passed House September 8, 1966. Senate hearings on similar bills (S. 3627 and S. 3687) on August 4, 1966. Senate hearings on S. 3687 and H.R. 14026 September 13, 1966. H.R. 14026 reported to the Senate September 14, 1966 (S. Rept. 1601). Passed Senate on September 15, 1966. Approved September 21, 1966. Public Law 89–597.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION

S. 14025, to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes. House hearings March 29, 1966. Reported to the House April 2, 1966 (H. Rept. 1411). Passed House June 16, 1966. Senate hearings June 23, 1966. Reported to Senate June 23, 1966 (S. Rept. 1303). Passed Senate June 27, 1966. Approved June 30, 1966. Public Law 89–482.

HOUSING

S. 3688, to stimulate the flow of mortgage credit for Federal Housing Administration and Veterans' Administration assisted residential construction. Hearings on proposed Housing Legislation [34 bills] for 1966 April 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, and 29, 1966. Senate Report 1428, August 3, 1966. [H.R. 15639 reported by House Banking and Currency Committee June 22, 1966 (H. Rept. 1647).] S. 3688 passed Senate, amended, August 11, 1966. Passed House, amended, August 15, 1966. House asked for conference August 15, 1966. Senate agreed to conference August 17, 1966. Conference report filed August 24, 1966 (H. Rept. 1868). Senate agreed to conference report August 25, 1966. House agreed to conference report August 26, 1966. Approved September 10, 1966. Public Law 89–566.

S. 3700, to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964. Hearings on proposed Housing Legislation [34 bills] for 1966 April 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, and 29, 1966. Senate Report 1436, August 8, 1966. [H.R. 14810 reported by House Banking and Currency May 9, 1966 (H. Rept. 1487).] S. 3700 passed Senate, amended, August 15, 1966. H.R. 14810 recommitted with instructions August 16, 1966. Passed House August 16, 1966. Proceedings vacated, laid on table August 16, 1966. S. 3700, as amended, passed in lieu August 16, 1966. House asked for conference August 16, 1966. Senate agreed to conference August 17, 1966. Conference report filed August 24, 1966 (H. Rept. 1869). Senate agreed to conference report August 25, 1966. House agreed to conference report August 26, 1966. Approved September 8, 1966. Public Law 89–562.

S. 3708, to assist comprehensive city demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and services necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in those areas, to assist and encourage planned metropolitan development, and for other purposes. Hearings on proposed Housing Legislation [34 bills] for 1966 April 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, and 29, 1966. Senate Report 1439, August 9, 1966. Passed Senate, amended August 19 1966. Reported to the House September 1, 1966 (H. Rept. 1931). Passed House, amended, October 14, 1966. House asked for conference October 14, 1966. Senate agreed to conference October 17, 1966. Conference report filed October 18, 1966 (H. Rept. 2301). Senate approved the conference report on October 18, 1966; the House approved it on October 20, 1966.

S. 3711, to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development, and for other purposes. Hearings on proposed Housing Legislation [34 bills] for 1966 April 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, and 29, 1966. Senate Report 1455, August 10, 1966. Passed Senate, amended, August 12, 1966. [Portions of S. 3711 are included in S. 3708.]

MEDALS

S. 2719, to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the purchase of Alaska by the United States from Russia. Senate Report 1066, March 10, 1966. Passed Senate March 14, 1966. Reported to the House March 29, 1966 (H. Rept. 1382). Passed House April 4, 1966. Approved April 14, 1966. Public Law 89–383.

H.R. 10357, to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the U.S. Secret Service. Reported to the House October 22, 1965 (H. Rept. 1207). Passed House April 4, 1966. Senate Report 1279, June 15, 1966. Passed Senate June 16, 1966. Approved June 24, 1966. Public Law 89–469.

S. 3704, to provide for the striking of a medal in commemoration of the designation of Ellis Island as a part of the Statue of Liberty National Monument in New York, N.Y. Senate Report 1616, September 20, 1966. Passed Senate September 21, 1966. House reported similar bill (H.R. 16923) October 5, 1966 (H. Rept. 2194). H.R. 16923 passed House October 10, 1966. Proceedings vacated, laid on table October 10, 1966. S. 3704 passed in lieu October 10, 1966. Approved October 15, 1966. Public Law 89–676.

S. 2831, to furnish the Scranton Association, Inc., medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the city of Scranton, Pennsylvania. Senate Report 1067, March 10, 1966. Passed Senate March 14, 1966. Reported to the House March 29, 1966 (H. Rept. 1383). Passed House April 4, 1966. Approved April 16, 1966. Public Law 89–400.

H.R. 7526, to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the founding of San Antonio. Reported to the House October 11, 1965 (H. Rept. 1136). Passed the House October 18, 1965. Senate Report 1072, March 15, 1966. Passed Senate March 17, 1966. Approved March 31, 1966. Public Law 89–382.

H.R. 139, to provide for the striking of medals to commemorate the 1000th anniversary of the founding of Poland. Reported to the House October 22, 1965 (H. Rept. 1206). Passed the House April 4, 1966. Reported to the Senate, amended, July 11, 1966 (S. Rept. 1369). Passed Senate July 12, 1966. House agreed to Senate amendment July 21, 1966. Approved August 5, 1966. Public Law 89–527.

S. J. Res. 153, to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the Federal land bank system in the United States. Senate Report 1278, June 15, 1966. Passed Senate on June 16, 1966. Reported to the House October 5, 1966 (H. Rept. 2193). Passed House October 10, 1966. Approved October 15, 1966. Public Law 89–679.

S. 2835, to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the founding of the American Numismatic Association. Senate Report 1068, March 10, 1966. Passed Senate March 14, 1966. Reported to the House March 29, 1966 (H. Rept. 1384). Passed House April 4, 1966. Approved April 16, 1966. Public Law 89–401.

S. 3881, to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the United States Naval Construction Battalions (Seabees) twenty-fifth anniversary and the United States Navy Civil Engineer Corps (CEC) one-hundredth anniversary. Senate Report 1746, October 17, 1966. Passed Senate October 18, 1966. H.R. 17658, an identical bill, was passed by the House on October 19, 1966, and by the Senate on October 20, 1966.

SECURITIES

S. 2672, to provide full and fair disclosure of the nature of interests in real estate subdivisions sold through the mails and instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce, and to prevent frauds in the sale thereof, and for other purposes. Hearings June 21 and 22; August 18, 1966. No further action.

S. 2704, to amend the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and the Investment Company Act of 1940, to provide for the regulation of collective investment funds maintained by banks, and for other purposes. Hearings March 8, 10, and 11, 1966. No further action.

SMALL BUSINESS

S. 2499, to amend the Small Business Act to authorize issuance and sale of participation interest based on certain pools of loans held by the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes. Hearings October 7 and 11, 1965. Senate Report 1056, March 4, 1966. Passed Senate, amended, March 15, 1966. Reported to the House, with an amendment, April 25, 1966 (H. Rept. 1447). Hearings by House Rules Committee May 4, 5, and 10, 1966. Further action was suspended on this bill. In lieu, the Congress enacted P.L. 89–429, the Participation Sales Act of 1966.

S. 2729, to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act. [Increases SBA revolving fund by $125 million. Also establishes two revolving funds at SBA effective July 1, 1966. One fund is established for SBA disaster loan program; another fund for the lending programs of SBA.] Hearings January 25 and 26 1966. Reported, with amendments, on March 4, 1966 (S. Rept. 1057). Passed Senate March 8, 1966. House hearings March 23, 1966. Reported to the House, with amendments, March 24, 1966 (H. Rept. 1348). Passed House, amended, March 31, 1966. Senate agreed to certain House amendments and disagreed with other on April 5, 1966. House agreed with Senate amendments on April 18, 1966. Approved May 2, 1966. Public Law 89–409.

S. 3493, to provide assistance to the State of Kansas for the reconstruction of areas damaged in recent tornadoes. Hearings June 20, 1966. No further action.

S. 3695, to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes. [Designed to give the Administrator of SBA additional tools to supervise more adequately the small business investment company program.] Hearings August 24 and 25, 1966. Reported, with amendments, September 1, 1966 (S. Rept. 1585). Passed Senate, with an amendment, September 6, 1966. House hearings September 15, 1966, on similar House bill (H.R. 18021). H.R. 18021 reported to the House September 30, 1966 (H. Rept. 2159). H.R. 18021 passed House on October 19, 1966. H.R. 18021 passed Senate October 20, 1966.

MISCELLANEOUS

S. Res. 172, to provide additional funds for the Committee on Banking and Currency. Senate Report 940, January 17, 1966. Referred to Committee on Rules and Administration January 17, 1966. Reported February 9, 1966 (S. Rept. 960). Passed Senate February 17, 1966.

S. Res. 173, authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to make certain investigations, and to provide additional funds therefor. Senate Report 941, January 17, 1966. Referred to Committee on Rules and Administration January 17, 1966. Reported February 9, 1966 (S. Rept. 959). Passed Senate February 17, 1966.

Nominations referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, 89th Cong., 2d sess.

Date	Name and office	Committee action	Reported in Senate	Confirmed
Jan. 14, 1966	Robert C. Weaver, of New York, to be Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.	Jan. 17, 1966.—Ordered favorably reported	Jan. 17, 1966	Jan. 17, 1966
Do	Robert C. Wood, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.	do	do	Do.
Do	James S. Duesenberry, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers, vice Otto Eckstein.	Jan. 20, 1966.—Ordered favorably reported	Jan. 20, 1966	Jan. 24, 1966
Jan. 19, 1966	Philip N. Brownstein, of Maryland, to be Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.	Jan. 27, 1966.—Ordered favorably reported	Jan. 27, 1966	Jan. 27, 1966
Do	Charles M. Haar, of Massachusetts, to be Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.	do	do	Do.
Feb. 28, 1966	Andrew F. Brimmer, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of 14 years from Feb. 1, 1966, vice C. Canby Balderston, term expired.	Mar. 2, 1966.—Ordered favorably reported	Mar. 2, 1966	Mar. 4, 1966
Do	William W. Sherrill, of Texas, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, for a term of 6 years, vice Joseph W. Barr.	do	do	Do.
Apr. 27, 1966	Francis M. Wheat, of California, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term of 5 years expiring June 5, 1971 (reappointment).	May 11, 1966.—Ordered favorably reported	May 12, 1966	May 16, 1966
May 9, 1966	Bernard L. Boutin, of New Hampshire, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.	do	do	Do.
May 10, 1966	H. Ralph Taylor, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.	do	do	Do.
Do	Don Hummel, of Arizona, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.	do	do	Do.
Sept. 9, 1966	Robert L. Rand, of California, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the term of 4 years expiring June 30, 1970.	Sept. 13, 1966.—Ordered favorably reported	Sept. 13, 1966	Sept. 14, 1966
Sept. 20, 1966	Eva B. Adams, of Nevada, to be Director of the Mint for a term of 5 years (reappointment).	Sept. 22, 1966.—Ordered favorably reported	Sept. 22, 1966	Sept. 26, 1966

ORAL CONTRACEPTIVES

Mr. HART. Mr. President, disturbing questions have been raised about the safety of oral contraceptives—in particular their relationship to clotting and cancer. As an original cosponsor with Senator Kefauver of the 1962 Drug Amendments and also as a cosponsor with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] of the population control bill (S. 1676), I feel it necessary to urge the Food and Drug Administration to get better answers to these questions than we now appear to have.

Certainly a fair reading of the report on oral contraceptives released on August 1, 1966, by the Advisory Committee on Obstetrics and Gynecology of the Food and Drug Administration can lead to only one conclusion—that there is insufficient data available to indicate whether the pills are safe or unsafe. Yet what the 1962 drug amendments require is substantial evidence of safety.

The significance of this report is put into perspective when we consider that about 5 million women are taking these pills now, and conservative estimates are that by 1985, 12 million will be taking them. As stated in the report:

> The oral contraceptives present society with problems unique in the history of human therapeutics. Never will so many people have taken such potent drugs voluntarily over such a protracted period for an objective other than for the control of disease.

Yet despite the millions of users and the inadequacy of present medical data on safety, it is my understanding that the FDA presently has two relatively small "retrospective" research projects working specifically on these problems, neither of which is dealing directly with the possibility of cancer.

I have no desire to second guess the FDA on whether permission to market these pills should have been granted in the first instance. But certainly in view of the medical questions which have now been raised, the American people—indeed, people all over the world—are entitled to better answers than we now have.

What is needed is a massive research effort, and this can be accomplished only if the FDA exerts strong and aggressive leadership.

Associate Supreme Court Justice Jackson in 1952 stated in an opinion:

> Where experiment or research is necessary to determine the presence or the degree of danger, the product must not be tried cut on the public, nor must the public be expected to possess the facilities or the technical knowledge to learn for itself of inherent but latent dangers.

That responsibility rests squarely with the Food and Drug Administration. That responsibility requires effort greater than appears to have been applied so far.

I ask unanimous consent that the series of articles by Morton Mintz, the able Washington Post staff writer, bearing on this subject be printed in the RECORD, and also excerpts from an article entitled "Thromboembolism and Oral Contraceptives: Post or Propter?" written by Erik Ask-Upmark, Department of Medicine, University Hospital, Uppsala, Sweden.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 28, 1966]

Conference in September: FDA Meeting on Birth Control Pills Awaited for Decision on New Studies

(By Morton Mintz)

The Government committee on the birth control pills took a long look at the evidence of their safety and, recently, found it wanting. Now, new studies have been urged.

Some scientists doubt that these studies meet the need. If something is to be done about that, the opportunity will arise late next month, when the Food and Drug Administration sponsors a conference on the problem.

The history of the pills over the last six years contains some incidents that are ironical if not incredible. Consider this item:

Early in 1960, FDA's New Drug Branch "concluded that the evidence establishes the safety" of the first oral contraceptive. But now, in 1966, FDA's Advisory Committee on Obstetrics and Gynecology is rating "any assumptions" about the relative safety of that first pill—and of its seven competitors—"unreliable."

An inconsistency between the judgments of 1960 and 1966 seems clear. A look at the record may help to understand how it developed.

Since 1957 the pioneer drug had been used for medical, noncontraceptive purposes. In 1960 the same product was being considered for birth control. At that time, the "entire series of cases" before FDA for evaluation included 132 women who had taken the drug for from 12 to a maximum of 38 consecutive menstrual cycles.

Many scientists consider 132 users too few. They emphasize that the principal users were not destined to be the sick, but healthy women—millions of them. The question then was whether that number—132—was adequate under law.

LARGE NUMBER OF WOMEN

A similar question was raised this month—implicitly by POA's advisory committee, explicitly by one of its members, Dr. Roy Hertz—as to cancer data that has been "properly documented with laboratory studies." In 1960, Dr. Hertz said, FDA had "a 4-year experience in 400 cases." But "any valid conclusion," the Committee said, requires accurate data drawn from a study of at least 10 years' duration in large numbers of women—20,000 or more.

An erroneous statement that 20,000 women are in such studies in Washington was made recently by FDA Commissioner James L. Goddard. Actually, the National Institutes of Health merely has contracted with the District Department of Public Health to see if such studies are feasible.

The Committee emphasized that all substances known to cause cancer in humans "requires a latency period of approximately one decade." Today, proportionately few women have taken the pills for as long as five years. None has taken them more than nine years.

In March, 1961, FDA released the pioneer pill for use in birth control. Then and since, the agency's actions have been taken against a background of the pill's nonmedical advantages—their usefulness in population control, and their convenience, efficacy and popularity.

BOUGHT BY GOVERNMENT

The pills acquired "a diplomatic immunity from criticism," University of Kentucky neurologist David B. Clark said recently. If he is correct, the Government's own support of birth control might be a factor. Last year the Government bought $4 million worth of pills for distribution by public clinics.

In 1962, the Kefauver-Harris Amendments were enacted. One result was a shift in the burden for establishing drug safety. In effect, FDA was empowered to take and to enforce a tougher stance on the quality of testing for the oral contraceptives that came along after the first one. Congressional sources say FDA neglected an opportunity. In so doing, they note, the agency spared itself a fight with several manufacturers. It also spared itself the embarrassment of calling attention to the low standards it had set for release of the first pill.

In 1965, for example, FDA approved two new pills—the so-called sequentials, which use a different method of action than the other type. Despite this, the testing was on the order of what it had been for the first pill in 1961. The number of women tested for 24 *consecutive* menstrual cycles was 148 in the case of one sequential, 160 in the other.

DATA ON ANIMALS

Still beyond reach is a reliable assessment of the pertinence to humans of data on animals given the pills. The question became acute several months ago when breast cancer was found in dogs continuously and massively dosed with an unmarketed, experimental oral contraceptive. The FDA's Dr. Goddard announced that testing of the same unmarketed pill in about 500 women had been halted.

The unmarketed pill had two components. One, mestranol, is an estrogen used in some marketed oral contraceptives. The other, ethynerone, differs in chemical structure from other progestogens used in the marketed pills, but is in the same family. Dr. Hertz, who is former chief endocrinologist of the National Cancer Institute, said in his special report:

". . . It is clearly inconsistent to consider the animal data with the new mixture to be of more significance than the huge body of pre-existing animal findings with a wide variety of synthetic estrogenic compounds in numerous species of animals, including the dog. Either the presently marketed preparations are also to be condemned on the basis of almost certainly expectable findings or ethynerone should not have been condemned."

In 1963, FDA convened a group of specialists—the Wright Committee—to weigh the evidence on clots occurring in pill users. They found the data on nonfatal clots too shaky for use. But for fatal lung clots the Committee was able to make a calculation—one that was "tempered by the assumptions made" from data containing admitted weaknesses. The calculation was simply that the data did not demonstrate a statistically significant relation.

This caution was buried under contentions that the Committee had declared the pills safe—which it had not. Within a year or so, the number of regular users increased by an estimated 1.7 million.

Citing the need for "more conclusive data," the Wright Committee urged "a carefully planned and controlled prospective study." This would match the incidence of fatal and nonfatal clots in groups of selected women—those who would start on the pills, against those who would use conventional or no methods of birth control.

Today, however, we still have "a statistically inadequate mass of scattered observations" about the pills and clotting, Dr. Hertz said. The reason is that in the 37 months since the Wright Committee made its proposal FDA never implemented it. Until such a study is undertaken, Dr. Hertz said, no final evaluation is possible.

PUBLISHED BY COMMITTEE

Dr. Hertz' views are in his special report, which was requested and published by the Advisory Committee. That Committee pointed out that the current birth control pills "are probably not those that will be employed 10 or even 5 years hence." At least 10 years would be needed to complete prospective cancer studies. The Committee recommended these—but recommended against prospective clot studies that would be completed in much less than five years.

Although 65 of the 110 unexplained deaths in pill users reviewed by the Committee were attributed to lung clots, the Committee protested that prospective studies are "extremely difficult . . . to perform." But they are not so difficult, obviously, that the Committee could not recommend them for cancer (and other diseases).

The other objection made by the Committee was that prospective studies are "costly." Four years ago at the National Cancer Institute the cost of a 3-year, prospective clotting study was estimated. The figure: $2.5 million. Apart from that, the Committee itself had stressed the need for "unprecedented standards of safety." Safety was the Committee's concern. Costs are usually deemed the concern of the Executive and Congress.

The Committee did have an alternative to press on FDA—a "large" and "mandatory" expansion of an FDA-financed pilot project at Johns Hopkins Hospital. That study was principally the work of Dr. Philip E. Sartwell, a Committee member and epidemiologist.

RECORDS REVIEWED

The pilot trial took off with the examination of the final diagnosis of all of the several thousand Johns Hopkins patients discharged alive in a 2-year period. These records were given "careful review." Interviewing followed. Finally, the participants were narrowed to two groups of women similar in such factors as age, income, race, religion and marital status. And all had taken the pills.

One group consisted of 10 cases, women who had been treated for unexplained, nonfatal clots. The second group was made up of 20 controls, users who had been treated for fractures or other acute conditions unrelated to the pills.

Among the controls (as contrasted with the cases), one-fourth as many were childless, twice as many had one child, 4½ times as many had two children, and half as many had three or more.

This aspect of the study seemed surprising to some scientists, especially because in ascribing major importance to the project Dr. Sartwell and Dr. Louis M. Hellman, the Committee Chairman, had stressed that the cases and controls were "closely matched."

NUMBER OF CHILDREN

Should there have been close matching as to the number of children? Critics think so. The reason is that the peak of risk of clotting is in the period immediately after pregnancy. Needless to say, the number of children a woman has had is related to the number of times she has been pregnant.

In an interview, Dr. Sartwell said the disparity between the number of children had by the cases and controls was deliberate, a precaution against "overmatching." He refused to discuss the matter further.

On Aug. 11, Commissioner Goddard announced that FDA was expanding the "retrospective" Johns Hopkins study and extending it to four hospitals elsewhere. Dr. Sartwell wants to involve a total of 20 hospitals.

If that were to be done, the number of women with unexplained nonfatal clots would be 200 (exclusive, of course, of controls).

Even a study of that size, Dr. Sartwell acknowledged, would not disclose if the pills might cause clotting—and only nonfatal clotting—in, say, 1 pill user in 4000. What, then, would it reveal? His report to the Committee was modest. It said a 20-hospital, 2-year study would "suggest direction for potentially fruitful research into some of the many clouded aspects . . ."

CONTROLLED CLOT STUDIES

The "direction" could be toward the prospective, controlled clot studies—for fatal as well as nonfatal types—that the Committee has now rejected, or possibly toward an even more refined study promising more precise data on very troubling problems.

But other questions are indicated by the reports of the full Committee and of its clotting task force:

Although the Committee recognized that clotting occurs "most commonly" right after pregnancy, it failed to note a significant point that Dr. Clark, the Kentucky neurologist, among others, has made—a woman on the pills is pseudo-pregnant in each menstrual cycle. In effect, then, she is in the peak-risk period not once, but 13 times a year.

Bibliographies are standard in medical literature. The Committee's clotting task force did not append one to its report. The other task forces did.

The clotting task force did, however, append a letter in which, four years ago, G. D. Searle Co. asked that clot cases be reported. The task force report notes that Searle, maker of Enovid, the pioneer pill, had sent out 275,000 copies of the letter.

The task force report discussed blood coagulation in women taking oral contraceptives. Studies reporting changes were slighted. Emphasized instead—because it was the "newest"—was a study in which no significant coagulation changes were found. The paper reporting this was not available for examination because it has not yet been published.

For all serious adverse effects, clotting included, the data available to the Advisory Committee were inadequate. The Committee in its caution refrained, therefore, from drawing conclusions as to safety. Partly because of televised remarks by Commissioner Goddard, the restraint of the Committee has been downplayed—much as was that of the Wright Committee in 1963.

But the hope he furthered, that the pills are safe—for women who can reliably use alternatives to them as well as for women who need them desperately—is universal. That hope may someday be scientifically demonstrated to be wholly justified. Until there is such a demonstration, a residue of doubt will exist. Could there be a more sensible way to dispel it than for the Government to undertake the studies that promise meaningful data? The Government's answer, for 5 million women in the United States and for millions elsewhere, may come out of the FDA's September conference.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 16, 1966]

Is the Pill Safe? "Proof" and "Evidence" Are Different

(By Morton Mintz)

The Advisory Committee's report on the oral contraceptives did not say there is no evidence that they are unsafe. It did say there is *no proof* they are unsafe.

The Committee was trying—to borrow from the title of Dr. John Rock's popular book—to be "Honest About the Pill."

With the health of millions of women involved, the Committee's mission could not be to provide easy, snappy answers.

Perhaps the only easy, snappy answer to the question of safety should be a three-word question: Safe for whom?

Interpretations of the report have led to confusion over two meaningful words, evidence and proof.

When they said the Committee, in the report it made Monday, found no evidence the pills were unsafe they were wrong. The Committee did find evidence of a possible association between the pills and serious diseases. It also found evidence pointing in the opposite direction.

The Committee looked at the evidence on both sides and found all of it inconclusive—it didn't prove anything. Evidence is often inconclusive. Proof is not.

The Committee went further. It said the data make "any assumptions" about a causal relation between the pills and serious disease "unreliable."

A Committee consultant analyzed 110 deaths of women who were reported to have taken the pills. As with adverse drug reactions generally, this number is below the actual total substantially—no one knows how much.

He found 65 had died of unexplained pulmonary embolisms—clots that have lodged in the lung artery after traveling from another site in the body.

He did not, and the Committee did not, find the available facts sufficient for a conclusion that the use of the pills was, or was not, responsible.

There was evidence of causation, and there was evidence of no causal relation. Both bodies of evidence were found inadequate. So there was evidence—but not proof.

However meager, the evidence of a possible causal relation between the use of the pills, which are combinations of female sex hormones, and clotting, cancer and other serious diseases could not be dismissed.

That is why the report of the Committee and the reports of its task forces and experts, over and over again, abstained from drawing conclusions.

That is why the Committee urged expanded research.

That is why it did not declare the pills "safe."

The Committee failed, however, to make a crucial point.

A sound experiment on the relation, or nonrelation, between a drug and adverse reactions provides not "proof," but a range of probabilities, from negligible to overwhelming.

In certain medical conditions, experiments can be undertaken that yield overwhelming evidence.

But experiments than can produce such evidence cannot be undertaken in the case, say, of a lifelong-disabling clot or stroke. In a humane society, one simply does not experiment to see whether such conditions can be induced a second time by readministration of a suspect drug.

And so there is a question whether the Committee was being realistic when, in its conclusion, it said it finds the data inadequate for "proving these compounds unsafe . . ."

If a causal association exists, it will have to be made clear by probabilities derived from evidence that does not now exist. Proof may never come.

The conclusion of the report—which is what is looked at first, and sometimes exclusively—contains no clearcut, emphatic statement, in laymen's language, about the safety of the pills.

The Committee could have said, for example, that responsible authorities do not suggest that the diaphragm, while less reliable, is remotely suspected of a capacity to cause clotting or cancer. It could have pointed out that while the pills are clearly preferable in some cases, a diaphragm is in others.

There is a difference—to cite extremes—between giving the pills to a woman who may die if contraception fails, and a woman who will have a child sooner than she wished.

There was no such down-to-earth approach.

The result was that even though the physician who was the Committee's anonymous spokesman—now identified by the Associated Press as the chairman, Dr. Louis M. Hellman—told a press briefing that the report was a "yellow" caution light, his characterization got so lost that Dr. Alan Guttmacher of Planned Parenthood could be quoted.

On Channel 26 last night, Dr. Roy Hertz, a member of the committee, said that any implication the report gave a green light was "totally fallacious." But earlier, Commissioner James L. Goddard of the Food and Drug Administration had gone on television to flash just such a green light. The effect was, in the eyes of many, to overwhelm the caution that permeates the committee's review.

His message as a physician was that if the woman is in good health and has a reassuring medical history, he would prescribe the pills.

Apparently unnoticed was a grim message from the Committee's cancer task force—the possibility that a seemingly healthy woman with a fine medical history could have cancer, that the cancer in its long latency period is undetectable and that the pills may speed its development.

Dr. Goddard's remarks also appear at variance with the committee's conclusion that "each physician must evaluate the advantages and risks of this method of contraception in comparison with other available methods or with no contraception at all. He can do this wisely only when there is presented to him dispassionate scientific knowledge of the available data."

THROMBOEMBOLISM AND ORAL CONTRACEPTIVES: POST OR PROPTER?

(By Erik Ask-Upmark)

Repeated reports have been published on thrombosis and/or embolism appearing in connection with the administration of oral contraceptives.[4 5 6 11 15 16 18 20 21 22 23 24 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39]

Whereas the conclusions generally have been guarded it has been felt that the publications have been justified and that so far it is difficult to exclude the possibility of a causal relationship.

On the other hand such a connection has been denied by the manufacturers (42) and who with some emphasis refer to the widespread use of these contraceptives.

Attempts have been made to compare the incidence of the thromboembolic syndrome in women taking these tablets with that in women who do not. For obvious reasons these retrospective surveys have failed to yield any conclusive evidence, since the clinical details are generally not reported, since the diagnosis has generally been based upon death certificates, since in one report no colored women are included and since all sorts of sweeping statements have been made.

In some instances predisposing factors were said to exist, in others not, and no information has been given about the collection of the material: thrombosis and embolism are most certainly not notifiable.

This paper intends to report a few more cases of thrombosis and/or embolism occurring following the administration of oral contraceptives, to add some pertinent cases from the literature and to discuss the problem whether the relationship is only an arbitrary coincidence in time or whether a causal relationship might be present.

MATERIAL

Only women in child-bearing age have been considered. From the literature 36 cases have been gathered, published during the last 4 years, it being a requirement that they were available in original and that no conference-collection was allowed to be admitted. I am well aware of the fact that still more cases have been published, but to meet the requirements already indicated I had to confine my interest to the 36 instances. They have been briefly summarized in table I.

TABLE I.—*Survey of cases of thrombosis in connection with the use of contraceptives as described in the literature for the years 1960 to September 1965. The age, the duration of medication, and the localization of the thrombosis is indicated*

Author	Published	Age	Medication in days	Complications	Fate
Baines	1965	29	14 days	Art. cer. med. sin., art. cer. ant. dext	+
Boyce et al	1963	34	6×21 days	Coronary infarction	
Cohen and Sajid	1964	28	6 months	Pulmonary embolism	+
Ethisamuddin	1965	26	6×21	Thrombosis right vertebral artery	+
Gaylis et al	1962	21	6×21	Ileofemoral venous thrombosis	
Hartveit	1965	32	3×20	Coronary thromboses	+
Jordan	1961	40	28 days+10	Pulmonary embolism	
Leather	1965:				
	(2)	21	14 days	Pulmonary embolism, thrombosis	
	(3)	21	7×21	do	
Lorentz	1962	41	3×30	Aphasia, etc	[1]
McGowan	1963	32	5×22	Thrombosis popl. vein recurring 3 times in 3 months	
McIntyre et al	1962:				
	(1)	28	Months	Pulmonary embolism	
	(2)	27	3×21 days	Phlebothrombosis left leg	
McWilliam et al	1963	22	15 days+3	Phlebothrombosis right leg (and right hand?)	
Minogue et al	1963	21	20 days+12 days	Pulmonary embolism (severe)	
Müller	1965	29	4×20 days	Phlebothrombosis pulmonary embolisms	+
Naysmith	1965	33	3 years	Coronary thrombosis	+
Nevin et al	1965:				
	(1)	35	20×12	Internal carotid thrombosis	+
	(2)	22	20×18	Pulmonary embolism (severe)	
	(3)	28	20	Pulmonary embolism, thrombosis leg	
Reed and Conn	1963:				
	(1)	37	2×25	V. mesent. sup. thrombosis	+
	(2)	40	5 months	Phlebothrombosis both legs (ileofemoral)	
	(4)	24	13 days; 13+4 days	Phlebothrombosis both legs, pulmonary embolism, thrombosis axillary artery	
Reutter et al	1965	22	19 days+5	Pulmonary embolism	+
Richman	1962	41	20 days×2	Thrombophlebitis pulmonary embolism	
Rosenberg	1964:				
	(1)	20	21?×3	Pulmonary embolism	
	(2)	28	21?×3	do	
Schatz et al	1964:				
	(1)	39	2 months	Thrombosis left popl. art	[2]
	(3)	25	21 days	Pulmonary embolism+bilateral venous thrombosis (legs)	
	(5)	23	60 days	Bilateral thrombophlebitis of calves	
	(6)	41	21 days	Thrombosis left calf	
Sender	1962	24	4×21	Phlebothrombosis right leg	
Staddon	1962	38	5 days	Thrombophlebitis left calf	
Stewart Wallace	1964:				
	(1)	32	22×21	Wallenberg syndrome right side	[1]
Zilkha	1964:				
	(1)	23	18 days+20	Vascular lesion of brain	[1]
	(2)	26	20 days×5	Hemianopsia (cortical venous thrombosis?)	[1]

[1] Cerebral lesion

[2] Amputation.

As for my unpublished material it consists of 15 cases, 11 cases are Swedish, whereas the others have occurred in Denmark (1 case) England (2 cases) and Switzerland (1 case). As to the Swedish cases 7 belong to the Uppsala material, and 4 have been kindly described to me by colleagues from other hospitals (Professor Törnblom in Umeå, Surgeon in chief Linton (of Mölndal), Physicians in chief Jonsson (of Sundsvall) and Lublin (of Gävle). The cases from abroad have kindly been reported to me by Professor Senning of Zürich, by Head physician Dr. Clausen of Odense and by my friend Dr. Hagströmer, who was in England at the time when the British cases were mentioned in the daily press and who called my attention to these two instances; on one of these British cases a brief comment has recently been made in the Lancet (2: 548, 1965).

The material thus collected will accordingly be represented by 51 instances, 12 of which concerned arterial thrombosis whereas 37 were of venous origin and 3 were characterized as "cerebral", it being doubtful whether the lesion in question was due to an arterial or to a venous lesion.

A brief summary of the various materials is given in table III.

It will be seen that out of all 51 cases 12 died. Five died from pulmonary embolism, one from thrombosis of the superior mesenteric vein (case 1 of Reed and Conn), and six from occlusion of arteries (in one case internal carotid and its intracranial ramifications, in one case the left medial cerebral and the right anterior cerbral arteries, in two cases coronary thrombosis—the most instructive Norwegian case described by Hartveit and the case described by Naysmith—in one case the intracranial part of the right vertebral artery and in one case of the Swedish material thrombosis of the cocliac axis). However, as to venous thromboses pulmonary embolism was noticed in at least 16 more instances and in several of them it was a very close call. Nobody knows what handicap may be entailed for these cases in the future: in severe instances hypertension of the pulmonary artery may ensue.

TABLE II.—*Survey of material as yet not published, where arterial or venous thrombosis occurred during the use of contraceptive preparations. In all 15 cases are recorded, 11 of whom are Swedish. In addition to these 11 cases we have observed several other similar instances since this paper was written*

Case 1: Age 19. Onset 5 days after end of 21 days medication. Thrombosis right leg (venography). Mother when 34 thrombosis after cholecystectomy.

Case 2: Age 28. Onset after short period of medication. Thrombosis left leg+pulmonary embolism. Convalescence stormy.

Case 3: Age 42. Onset (a) 7 days after start of first 21-day-period phlebothrombosis left leg; (b) 11 days after onset of next period: phlebothrombosis right leg. Her father had a venous thrombosis when 50, his aunt when 30 (died following embolism when pregnant) and the daughter of this aunt at 20.

Case 4: Age 44. Started tablets for 21 days. Before this period was up thrombosis of the left leg. Started next period: after 14 days

---

See footnotes at end of article.

thrombosis of the right hand (arm). Two sisters have had venous thrombosis, one sister had thrombosis of her left carotid artery since the age of 43.

Case 5: Age 21. Started tablets Aug. 10th. First symptoms of phlebothrombosis right calf Aug. 25th. Next cycle of tablets started Sept. 4th. Symptoms from calf markedly accentuated Sept. 20th. Venography.

Case 6: Age 20. Started tablets Aug. 28th, last tablet Sept. 17th. Sept. 19th pain and swelling of right calf. Started new cycle of tablets Sept. 24th. Sept. 26th: pain and swelling of left calf.

Case 7: Age 24. Since March 1965 tablets 22 days out of 28. Taken ill Sept. 18th. Evidence of coronary infarction on admission Sept. 21st.

Case 8 (Törnblom): Age 39. Venous thrombosis of right leg 7 days after onset of medication.

Case 9 (Linton): Age 29. Medication for less than 2 months. Sudden onset of abdominal emergency. Gangrene of intestines. Death. Arterial thrombosis of coeliac artery.

Case 10 (Jonsson): Age 34. Three children, aged 16, 7 and 3. When pregnant in the last trimester 7 years ago phlebothrombosis left leg. Mother phlebothrombosis when pregnant, maternal grandmother likewise phlebothrombosis. One sister phlebothrombosis without connection with pregnancy or tablets. Had been taking contraceptive tablets for 3 months when admitted for pulmonary embolism. Eventually she was sent home but returned with a phlebothrombosis of right leg.

Case 11 (Lublin): Age 18. Phlebothrombosis of left leg (confirmed by venography). This was June 6th. Had started tablets in March for contraceptive purposes.

Case 12 (Senning): Age 35. Two 21-day periods followed by pulmonary embolism. 3 weeks later thrombosis. Venography confirmed.

Case 13 (England): Age 34. Death from pulmonary embolism. Used preparation for a few weeks only.

Case 14 (England): Age 22. Death from pulmonary embolism. Used preparation.

Case 15 (Denmark): The Head physician of the Department of Medicine in Odense, J. Clausen, has at present a woman, aged 26, under treatment for coronary occlusion. She had for some months taken the tablets in question. He is going to report the case in detail elsewhere.

In arterial occlusion the result was good in one case only (when the left axillary artery was involved), whereas in four other instances the result was amputation (case 1 of Schatz and coworkers [34]), a Wallenberg syndrome (case of Stewart-Wallace [38] and two coronary infarctions (the case of Boyce et al.[5] and that of our own material case 15 (Clausen)). To these arterial cases may be added my own case 7. Three more cases should be added where a vascular lesion of the brain was recorded, although there is some doubt whether it was due to venous thrombosis or to arterial infarction (the case of Lorentz [31] and the two cases described by Zilkha [46].

The duration of the medication with the contraceptive preparation is illustrated in table IV (the same reservation as in table III).

It will be seen that in the majority of venous thromboses and pulmonary embolism the medication had been taken for a brief period only, whereas in 10 of the arterial incidents medication did not exceed 6 months and was less than that in most instances.

DISCUSSION

It should be readily admitted, firstly, that the present material of in all 51 cases is of limited size, secondly, that no controls are available of thrombosis or embolism in women of fertile age, not taking oral contraceptives.

However, it is in the nature of things that the number of collected cases in any given centre ought to be limited, the largest material hitherto being that of Schatz et al. who were able in Detroit to assemble 6 cases within a limited period. Two of these cases we have refrained from using, case 2 because the patient had had her leg in a cast for two days whilst the contraceptive treatment was being started, case 4 because of her age. Similar consideration made us exclude case 3 of Reed and Conn and cases 2, 3 and 4 of McGowan. The otherwise extremely instructive, fatal case 1 of Leather had to be excluded since the use of the tablets was connected with an (unexpected) pregnancy. It is, on the whole, instructive that in so many instances more than one case has been reported by several authors.[20, 22, 28, 30, 34, 46]

Secondly, it is difficult to see how a control material might be collected which was, within limits, reliable and compatible with that of women subjected to oral contraceptives. The only valid comparison would have been between monovular twins and to subject one of two twin-sisters to a treatment that was to be withheld from the other one seems beyond human and psychological possibilities. One of my own cases, No. 3, has been willing to submit herself to a third test with the tablets in question. I do not feel such an experiment warranted. Objections have been raised, rightly in our opinion, to the comparisons hitherto made at conferences called in to deal with the statistics in this matter.

In order to proceed further the following facts should be stressed:

1. Arterial thromboses are very rare during the child-bearing age, provided that no severe arterial affliction exists such as atheromatosis, arteritis, diabetes or longstanding hypertension. No such factors were present in this material as evidenced also by the post mortem of the Swedish case 9. Venous thrombosis is, likewise, uncommon if no cardiac disease, no carcinoma (frequently heralded by thrombophlebitis migrans), no pneumonia and no pernicious anemia is present.[1, 2, 3]

2. In the vast majority of instances the thromboembolic complications are apt to appear early during medication, although exceptions occur.

3. In my own cases, 3, 4, 5 and 6, it was instructive to notice the occurrence on repeated occasions of thrombosis in connection with the medication with contraceptives. The same may be said about McGowan's extremely interesting case 1: in a woman aged 32, medication was carried out for 8 cycles, starting in January. In May she developed a thrombophlebitis and thrombosis in the left popliteal vein. Nevertheless, she proceeded during the next 3 cycles to take her tablets but on each occasion there was an exacerbation of pain and swelling of her left leg. For the last 2 cycles she had also cramp-like pains in her right calf, very much of the same type as at the onset of the thrombosis in the left one.

4. The burden of proof is certainly up to those who maintain that these preparations are harmless, not to those who, like us, consider that a certain danger cannot be excluded.

5. If the tablets are used for contraceptive purposes it should not for one moment be forgotten that we have to do with previously healthy women and that they are entitled to a reasonable margin of safety. One may compare the issue to that of vaccination against poliomyelitis. It has rightly been maintained that one case of polio in 10,000 inhabitants represents a severe epidemic, one case in 100,000 inhabitants an ordinary epidemic. The tragedy entailed by the use of the Cutter-vaccine, has taught all of us a lesson. It is now considered that even a risk of one case of polio from 10^6 vaccinations is not allowed, not even one case out of 10^7. It has been maintained that some 100,000–150,000 women in Sweden have taken the tablets here in question during the last year. There are reasons to doubt this figure, evidence being available to the effect that not more than 42,500 women took the tablets for the first six months of 1965. Anyhow, our 11 Swedish cases have been assembled during the time Dec. 1964–Sept. 1965. It should, moreover, be observed that the Swedish material has by no means been systematically assembled: 7 cases were recorded here in Uppsala, 4 cases were put at our disposal by friendly colleagues who knew of our interest in the matter. In view of the evidence already assembled the risk entailed seems to be beyond the margin of safety required.

The evidence thus obtained seems suggestive to a point. It will moreover serve to

TABLE III.—*Survey of the age of the afflicted patients as well as of the localization of the thrombosis/embolism concerned. In one case there was both phlebothrombosis of the leg and thrombosis of the axillary artery, hence there is one case in common in the venous column and in the arterial column*

Age	Venous	Arterial	Cerebral	Total
Less than 20	2			2
20 to 24	14	2	1	17
25 to 29	8	3	1	11
30 to 34	3	5		8
35 to 39	4	2		6
40 to 44	6		1	7
Total	37	12	3	51
Dead	6	6		
Disability	(?)	5	3	

TABLE IV.—*Correlation between the duration of the medication and the occurrence of thrombosis and the localization of this thrombosis (venous, arterial)*

Medication in months	Venous	Arterial	Cerebral	Total
Less than 1	17 (1)	2 (1)	1	20
More than 1, less than 3	12 (2)	2 (1)	1	15
More than 3, less than 6	6 (3)	6 (3)	1	13
More than 6, less than 12	1			1
More than 12	1	2 (1)		3
Total	37	12	3	51

Fatality within parentheses.

See footnotes at end of article.

simulate further clinical observations, if possible as suggested by Stewart-Wallace, on a prospective basis.

Perhaps there is another point to be made. It has rightly been maintained that women partaking of oral contraceptives may experience symptoms apt to mimic a pregnancy (nausea, tension of the breasts, etc.). Whereas opinions have been divergent as to the affections inflicted by these agents on the coagulation of blood [9, 10, 17, 40, 39] recent observations tend to confirm the impression of earlier authors about an increased coagulation ability as in pregnancy. Moreover, the blood volume and the dynamics of the venous walls seem to be affected in the same way by contraceptive compounds as by pregnancy. It is generally agreed upon that pregnancy entails a certain risk, although not great, of thrombosis and embolism. One may rightly ask, as did Reed and Conn, whether a similarly increased risk is justified where oral contraceptives are concerned.

One feels inclined to agree with the two authors just mentioned when they conclude:

"If subsequent clinical observations confirm a definite correlation between the use of contraceptive agents taken by mouth and an increased incidence of thromboembolic disease, in our opinion the use of such agents would not be justified in a community in which other methods of contraception are readily available and reasonably effective."

If, however, notwithstanding this very fair conclusion, the contraceptives nevertheless should be used it seems to be of paramount importance to exclude at least the following women from using them:

1. If thrombosis or thrombophlebitis have occurred or are frequent in the family history.[3] My own cases, 1, 3, and 4, as well as 10 may exemplify this.

2. If the woman in question herself has had thrombosis or thrombophlebitis on earlier occasions. In my own case, 3, such was the case after a miscarriage when 26, although not after normal deliveries when aged 21, 29, and 31.

3. Should any disease in itself disposing to thrombosis and embolism be present the contraceptives must not be used.

4. Earlier liver disorders were noted in the cases described by Reutter et al. (hepatitis when aged 12) and by McIntyre et al. (jaundice in case 2 when 16).

5. Pronounced obesity should likewise rule out the use of contraceptive compounds.

6. Varicosities, present before the administration of the tablets should preclude their use.

7. If the patients are in for a tedious sitting, as in travelling by car or by air for say, 8 hours, this represents a contraindication. This is particularly so if the ladies in question make use of the peculiar contraption called panty girdle, rather a terrific piece of clothing apt to impair the venous drainage from the legs, more so in a sitting position.

8. The interval between the onset of the medication and the appearance of the thrombo-embolic complication makes it at least suggestive that some factor of allergy may be involved. This, of course, is just a guess but should it turn out to be true allergic patients should be spared these tablets as well.

9. Should irregular or undue bleeding warrant the use of these compounds there must be a gynecological examination before embarking on the tablets lest a severe pelvic disorder should lurk behind the symptoms.

10. One has to realize that even with the precaution already mentioned there is apt to remain a risk for thrombosis if this preparation is given to otherwise healthy young women.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

1. A review is made of 51 cases presenting thrombo-embolic complications in connection with the administration of oral contraceptives. 36 cases were derived from the literature and 15 new cases were added, 11 of whom were from Sweden.

2. There is suggestive evidence about a causal relationship between the compounds in question and the occurrence of thrombo-embolism.

3. With Reed and Conn we feel inclined to consider the use of such agents unjustified in a community where other methods of contraception are readily available and reasonably effective. At least the conclusion of a coroner in England (Times, Sept. 7, 1965) regarding one of the cases here recorded seems warranted: "It is important that some publicity be given to this, not so much as a warning that people should not take contraceptive pills but so they can appreciate that there is a possibility of these unfortunate consequences."

4. If, for other reasons, the use of these compounds should be allowed there are certain conditions which seem to represent contraindications. These conditions are briefly enumerated.

5. Since this paper was written several more cases have been observed in Sweden collected in part by myself, in part by the Royal Medical Board. These cases are to be treated in another publication.

ADDENDUM

The repeated occurrence of thrombosis in the same patient on different occasions whilst taking the tablets seems to us particularly important as an evidence. Another evidence, to our mind quite conclusive, is the observation recently made in Switzerland by Haefeli and co-workers from the Department of Gynecology in Basel (Gynacologia *160:* 281–292, 1965). Ten women who had been using oral contraceptives were operated upon for gynacological reasons. In 5 instances pulmonary embolism occurred, in one of them deadly. The other five did not obtain any pulmonary embolism, but in two the "medication" with contraceptives had been stopped 2–5 months before the operation. To have an occurrence of pulmonary embolism in more than 50 percent is certainly food for thought. If any female member of my own family applied to me to get oral contraceptives I would most certainly not dare to give it to her.

See footnotes at end of article.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Ask-Upmark, E.: Acta med. scand. 113: 286, 1943.

[2] Ask-Upmark, E.: Folia clin. int. (Barcellona) 4:439, 1954.

[3] Ask-Upmark, E.: Bedside medicine. Almqvist & Wiksell, Stockholm 1963.

[4] Baines, G. F.: Brit. med. J. 1: 189, 1965.

[5] Boyce, J., Fawcett, J. W. & Noell, E. W. P.: Lancet 1:111, 1963.

[6] Cohen, M. G. & Sajid, M. H.: Delaware med. J. 36:81, 1964.

[7] Donayre, J. & Pincus, G.: Metabolism 14: 418, 1965.

[8] Editorial: Brit. med. J. 2:315, 1962.

[9] Efeberg, O. & Owren, P. A.: Brit. med. J. 1:220, 1963.

[10] Egeberg, O. & Owren, P. A.: Brit. med. J. 2:1089, 1964.

[11] Ethisamuddin, M.: Brit. med. J. 1:921, 1965.

[12] FDA Report on Enovid: J. Amer. Assoc. 185: 776, 1963.

[13] Gaylis, H. & Kramer, M. V.: S. Afr. med. J. 36:1060, 1962.

[14] Gamzell, C. A.: Personal communication (Staff Meeting of University Hospital, Uppsala), 1965.

[15] Goodrich, S. M: & Wood, J: E.: Amer. J. Obstet. Gynec. 90: 740, 1964.

[16] Hartveit, F.: Brit. med J. 1:60, 1965.

[17] Hougie, C., Rutherford, R. N., Banks, A. L. & Coburn, W. A.: Metabolism 14:411 1965.

[18] Jordan, W. M.: Lancet 2:1146, 1961.

[19] Laugh, R.: Personal communication, 1965.

[20] Leather, H. M.: Lancet 1: 270, 1965.

[21] Lorentz, I. T.: Brit. med. J. 1:491, 1962.

[22] McGowan, L.: Amer. J. Obstet. Gynec. 86: 923, 1963.

[23] McIntyre, N. Phillips, M. J. & Voigt, J. G.: Brit. med. J. 2:1029, 1962.

[24] McWilliam, R. S. M., MacDonald, A. J. & Lindsay, I: Canad. med. Assoc. J. 88: 1032, 1963.

[25] Mills, W. G.: Proc. roy. Soc. Med. 57: 207, 1964.

[26] Minogue, W. F., Halperin, I. C., Soler-Bechara, J., Varriala, P. & Flood, F. B.: New Engl. J. med 268: 1037, 1963.

[27] Müller, P. H.: Schweiz. med. Wschr, 95: 1367, 1965.

[28] Naysmith, J. H.: Brit. med. J. 1: 250, 1965.

[29] Nevin, N. C., Elmes, P. C., & Weaver, J. A.: Brit. med. J. 1: 1586, 1965.

[30] Reed, D. L. & Conn, W. W.: New Engl. J. Med., 269: 622, 1963.

[31] Reutter, F., Siebenmann, R. S. & Wegmann, T.: Schweiz. med. Wschr. 95: 303, 1965.

[32] Richman, G.: Brit. med. J. 2: 729, 1962.

[33] Rosenberg, M.: Amer. J. Obstet. Gynec. 90: 745, 1964.

[34] Schatz, I. J., Smith, R. F., Brenneman, G. M. & Boser, G. C.: J. Amer. med. Assoc. 188: 493, 1964.

[35] Sender, N.: Brit. med. J. 2: 1398, 1962.

[36] Sobrero, A. H. J., Fenichel, R. L. & Singher, A. O.: J. Amer. med Assoc. 185: 136, 1963.

[37] Staddon, I. S.: Brit. med. J. 2: 857, 1962.

[38] Stewart-Wallace, A. M.: Brit. med. J. 2: 1528, 1964.

[39] Swyer, J. I. M.: Proc. roy. Soc. Med. 57: 210, 1964.

[40] Topp, M., Thompson, J. H., Walter Bowie, E. J. & Owen, C. A.: Proc. Mayo Clin. 40: 370, 1965.

[41] Tyler, E. T.: J. Amer. med. Assoc. 185: 131, 1963.

[42] Venning, G. R.: Brit. med. J. 2: 478, 1962.

[43] Watson, H., Smith, E., Herring, J. & Hill, I. G. W.: Lancet 2: 523, 1960.

[44] Winter, E. C.: Metabolism 14: 422, 1965.

[45] Wright, I.: The pathogenesis and treatment of thrombosis, Grune & Stratton, New York, 1952.

[46] Zilkha, K. J.: Brit. med. J. 2: 1132, 1964.

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT AT FANEUIL HALL, BOSTON

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, a week ago Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY visited my State of Massachusetts. During his brief stay in Massachusetts, the Vice President was warmly greeted by many thousands of people, who demonstrated clearly that they are aware of the many programs that he has fought for and the many contributions he has made to our national life during his years in public office. I was privileged to accompany the Vice President during part of his Massachusetts visit. I invite particular attention to the open appearance made by Mr. HUMPHREY, in Boston's Faneuil Hall, the cradle of liberty. There, on October 13, he delivered a stirring address which reminded Americans of their heritage of freedom. I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of Vice President Hubert Humphrey, Democratic Rally, Faneuil Hall, Boston, Mass., October 13, 1966

Tonight, we gather again, as so many have before us, in this cradle of liberty.

This hall reminds us that no sacrifice is too high for a man or a society to protect the high principles of human freedom.

It is only in freedom that man's mind can flourish and in which a great society can grow.

It is recorded in one of the history books of our Revolutionary War, that a historian had a conversation many years later with a Continental soldier who had stood at Concord and Lexington.

The historian said: "My histories tell me that you men of the Revolution took up arms against intolerable oppressions."

And the soldier replied: "What were they? Oppressions? I didn't feel them."

"What? Were you not oppressed by the Stamp Act?"

"I never saw one of those stamps . . . I am certain I never paid a penny for one of them."

"Well, what then about the tea-tax?"

"Tea tax? I never drank a drop of the stuff; the boys threw it all overboard."

"Well, then, what was the matter?" the historian asked the Revolutionary. "And what did you mean in going to the fight?"

"Young man," 'he old veteran replied, "what we meant in going for those Red Coats was this: We always had governed ourselves, and we always mean to! They didn't mean we should!"

My friends, you know, as I, that it is the simple truths of freedom that inflame men. It is the plain and obvious injustices that cause the revolutions for social and economic justice.

The torch of freedom that was rekindled at Lexington and Concord must be rekindled anew by every generation.

A young Presidential candidate stood here just six years ago. It was the closing night of an effort to relight that torch in the hearts and minds of Americans.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy found that torch for Americans. He lit it in the very heart of this people as he talked of the unfinished business of our society.

He charged that every man must take his turn standing as the "sentinel at the gate for the cause of freedom around the world."

He spoke to his generation:

"If we succeed, freedom succeeds. If we fail, freedom fails. That is the sober and awesome responsibility which events and our own choice have put upon our shoulders . . . I believe . . . that we can, in this century, provide for the ultimate victory of freedom over slavery."

I say to you tonight that his generation has not faltered in the charge he gave us. The man he so wisely chose to sit beside him was here in this historic hall and heard those words. President Lyndon Johnson has not faltered.

But the man who charged our minds and our hearts for one thousand days, spoke here not only of this generation's role in defense of freedom abroad. He knew that freedom can also die in a man's heart as he sees his children hungry . . . as he cannot find work . . . as he meets hate and discrimination where he turns.

John Kennedy talked here that night of a nation that could not afford to have its steel mills running at 50 per cent of capacity.

He talked of children, and our investment in the unlimited resource of every child's mind, and that we could never afford the luxury of letting that child miss college because the tuition barrier stood in his way.

He talked of the burden of caring for the older members of our families, and the debilitating hopelessness of the senior citizen who had to make the choice between food or medicine every time the retirement check came in.

John Kennedy saw at the horizons of the new frontier the same great society the leadership of Lyndon Johnson is awakening.

Nothing we have done for his memory is greater tribute than what we have achieved in the thousand days since his loss.

In these days we have broken through old barriers. We have made into law and reality the hopes and dreams of 50 years.

We have passed new laws—and made new national commitments—to better educate our children . . . to better care for our parents . . . to make our cities prosperous, open and safe . . . to preserve our natural beauty and our national resources . . . to clean the air we breathe and the water we drink . . . to match our creed with deed when it comes to civil rights.

We have sustained an uninterrupted economic growth.

We have stood fast against international bullying and aggression.

We have been relentless in our search for peace.

And our vision—a vision of "the ultimate victory of freedom over slavery"—has not dimmed.

Our American Revolutionaries never dreamed that, in each year since 1960, as many new Americans would be added to our population *each* year as lived in the 13 colonies.

What a challenge.

But the job is not done. It is not done for the nation; it is not done for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

And that is why we are here tonight.

We must keep at this business of democratic government . . . the business of politics . . . the business of getting before the citizen the issues of tomorrow and the men of high qualification for public service.

We are here to see that Edward J. McCormack is elected the Governor of this Commonwealth.

I know Ed McCormack well. I know his record as Attorney General. He is not a man who will sway under the tensions of the Governor's office.

You know what is at stake for the Commonwealth in this election.

What Ed McCormack is proposing in this campaign is a program that will bring to this Commonwealth the same progress that has been America's in these past 2 thousand days.

He has called for a dramatic and full commitment of this Commonwealth to the development of its human resources.

He has called, above all, for the most fundemental step in that development—the upgrading, from top-to-bottom, of the education of the children of Massachusetts.

The future of this Commonwealth—and the future of its children—depends on the commitment, or lack of commitment, made today by those who lead it. Edward McCormack has made clear where he stands. He is the Governor who will restore this Commonwealth to its rightful place of educational excellence in America.

We are here, too, to see to the election of Endicott Peabody to the United States Senate.

Endicott Peabody is a man of courage and conviction who will represent this Commonwealth in the same tradition as did John F. Kennedy and, today, as Senator Ted Kennedy.

He is a man who has devoted himself to the service of the people of Massachusetts. He deserves the support not only of our own party, but of Republicans who share our commitment to new ideas and social progress.

We are here tonight to see that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is led by a progressive Democratic Governor as well as a Democratic legislature . . . that it is represented in Washington by two liberal and energetic United States Senators . . . that more Democrats are elected to the Massachusetts Congressional delegation . . . that the momentum we have gained in these two thousand days is not lost.

In these tasks I ask your help.

We are today, in America, on the threshold of a bright new age.

There is a spirit of ferment in our country. This is a readiness to try what has not been tried . . . to do what has not been done.

There is the awakening knowledge that, in America, we are finally in sight of the free and full society that the soldiers of our Revolution fought to make possible.

And I find among our people the realization that the plain and obvious injustices which exist in other places are a threat to us as they are to those who today endure them.

John F. Kennedy spoke these words a little more than three years ago to the people of a small and emerging country:

"My country . . . is the possessor of a profound revolutionary tradition which has helped shape the modern world . . . if the task of progress without freedom is more complex, subtle and difficult than the promise of progress without freedom, we are unafraid of the challenge. We are prepared to follow that path which advances man's welfare without destroying his dignity. And we know the lessons of our past promise success for our future."

Tonight, then, let us recommit ourselves to the continuing revolution that is ours and of all men who seek to govern themselves.

UNVEILING OF PLAQUE AND PORTRAIT OF SENATOR HOLLAND

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on October 14, a ceremony took place in the road department building in Tallahassee, the State capital of Florida, officially named the Holland Building in 1948 by the cabinet.

The ceremony was the unveiling of a portrait and plaque of my good friend and distinguished colleague, Senator Holland.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the remarks by Gov. Haydon Burns at the unveiling ceremony.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks by Gov. Haydon Burns, Unveiling Ceremony of Portrait and Plaque of U.S. Senator Spessard Holland, Holland Building, Tallahassee, October 14

Members of the Family of Senator Holland.

Members of the Cabinet and Supreme Court.

My Fellow Admirers and Friends of Florida's Senior United States Senator.

It is with great pride and satisfaction that I join the members of my Road Board this morning in this richly deserved recognition of our senior United States Senator and Florida's distinguished statesman—Spessard Holland.

A few weeks ago Senator Holland started his 21st year in the United States Senate, but that splendid tenure is only a part of the more than 50 years of dedicated service he has given our state and nation as a soldier, prosecutor, jurist, state legislator, governor and United States Senator.

Many of you read recently in the press or, possibly, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of the stirring tribute made by Senator HOLLAND's colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, in recognition of his 20 years in the Senate.

All are worthy of mention, but I felt the remarks of Senator KARL MUNDT, the South Dakota Republican, best expressed the respect and esteem held by the people of this state for Senator HOLLAND.

Senator MUNDT said: "Of SPESSARD HOLLAND it can truly be said he has his eyes on the stars and his feet on the ground.

"He is not the captive of a party label, nor does he consider the Senate to be the supine handmaiden of the White House—whether its temporary occupant be a Democrat or a Republican. He has the independence of mind and the courage of conviction which impel him to measure legislation by its merit rather than by its sponsorship or the vehemence of its supporters."

In the next hour, a few blocks east of this location, we will dedicate the new State Road Department Building.

This fine structure will be a tremendous addition to our Capitol Center and will be the first building in the new area commonly known as Smoky Hollow.

It is significant that the building dedication and this recognition of Senator HOLLAND should come on the same day. No public official contributed more to the establishment and ability to expand this Capitol Center than the man we honor today.

It was his vision as Governor in the early 40s as to Florida's potential explosive growth and the accompanying expansion of state government, that prompted his establishment of the initial Capitol Center Area and its first concrete planning.

Public money was tight in those World War II years. There was no Development Commission authority or machinery under which the state could bond and build public buildings.

Governor HOLLAND, determined to start the Capitol Center on a sound basis, utilized more than $300,000 of surplus funds provided by the Internal Improvement Fund, Industrial Commission, Road Department and the Governor's Contingency Fund, to purchase property immediately west of the Capitol—now Waller Park—and other key parcels of land in the present Capitol Center.

This led the way for subsequent land purchases during the following administration of another fine chief executive—Millard Caldwell—and the construction of this building and the Caldwell Building.

It is interesting to note that in December, 1944, the Cabinet serving with Governor HOLLAND, recognized his yeoman work in behalf of the Capitol Center and unanimously voted "to name the largest building authorized by the Legislature to be constructed on the largest lot in the Capitol Center as the "Holland Building".

In 1948 on completion of this Road Department structure it was named the Holland Building by the Cabinet.

Scanning the four fruitful years of this vigorous, wartime governor, I think his greatest contribution to the future of not only this magnificent Capitol Center, but also the prosperity and soundness of this state, was the stabilization of a state and county credit structure then saddled with exorbitant boomtime debts.

As examples of these progressive steps there was the Secondary Gas Tax Constitutional Amendment by which county road bond structures were strengthened and millions of dollars saved in reduced interest rates. In addition, that program has provided Florida with a 6,000-mile secondary road system second to none in the nation.

Refunding of the Everglades Drainage District bonds, reducing that indebtedness from $16 million to $4 million, laid the foundation for turning the rich and vast Everglades from a disaster area due to oppressive taxation, to the prosperous, teeming development we know it today.

This same solicitous interest in behalf of his state has been abundantly evident during his two decades in the U.S. Senate and his outstanding service on the Appropriations and Agriculture Committees.

There are many outstanding examples of his aggressive and untiring efforts that have reaped rich rewards for Florida. They are too numerous to list here.

However, as Governor, I always shall be grateful for his most effective assistance during 1965 in our successful effort with the White House to secure defense access funds for construction of two multi-million dollar bridges in Brevard County to serve the traffic impacted Cape Kennedy complex.

I am proud to say that I have been a supporter of our distinguished Senator for what seems to be my whole lifetime. At the invitation of his former classmate, Olen Watts, I took an active part in his campaign that first gave Florida the advantage of SPESSARD HOLLAND's leadership as Governor.

Needless to say, I have never lost a vote when it was cast for SPESSARD HOLLAND.

I regret that Senator and Mrs. HOLLAND cannot be with us this morning, but I am proud that three of the children, six grandchildren, his sister, and many of his lifelong friends are here.

To be truthful, with Congress in its closing hectic hours and the Administration pushing new give away programs at every turn, it is most reassuring to know that an experienced, courageous, conservative warrior of SPESSARD HOLLAND's caliber is on duty. There are so few left.

SHORTAGE OF ADEQUATE HOSPITAL FACILITIES

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, the Nation is threatened by a growing shortage of adequate hospital facilities. At present, many who need hospital care must wait their turn. Physicians are forced to postpone noncritical cases so that emergency patients can be treated. Many of those who enter hospitals find that existing conditions do not meet minimum medical standards.

And this situation will continue to deteriorate unless we act. At an absolute minimum, facilities for 66,000 new beds must be created and facilities currently holding 270,000 beds must be drastically modernized during the next 5 years.

Obviously, the long-range solution for this problem is to rebuild existing hospitals and construct new ones. Unfortunately, not all communities can wait until such relief is available.

A survey taken by the U.S. Public Health Service reveals that there are now 143 hospitals serving 97 communities in 29 States and Puerto Rico that are in critical condition. These are hospitals that do not have sufficient beds to keep up with daily demands. The Public Health Service estimates that the immediate threat could be alleviated by the construction of 3,000 new beds in these critical hospitals.

Existing Federal programs cannot solve this current crisis. The hospitals involved have either exhausted the Federal funds presently available or lack the financial resources to supply the required non-Federal portion of estimated construction costs.

H.R. 15969, the Emergency Hospital Assistance Act of 1966, was introduced by Representative RICHARD OTTINGER, of New York, in the House of Representatives on June 27. The bill stemmed from thorough research conducted by the Congressman on how to solve the immediate needs of hospitals facing a severe lack of adequate medical facilities.

Under that bill's provisions, hospitals threatened by immediate bed shortages could obtain direct grants and loans from the Federal Government. The grant program—providing up to 66⅔ percent of the cost of expansion or renovation to provide new bed space—is patterned after the successful Hill-Burton formula except that Federal aid is given directly to the hospitals and is not distributed by the States. The intent of the legislation is not to supplant the Hill-Burton program. Rather it attempts to correct an emergency situation with a single short-term infusion of Federal assistance and without embarking on a massive continuing new Federal spending program. Over the next 3 years, a total of $40 million is authorized to be appropriated for grants.

To meet the needs of those hospitals serving communities without adequate financial resources to supply the remaining 33⅓ percent non-Federal portion, the act authorizes the Secretary to make long-term, low-interest loans of up to 90 percent of the non-Federal share of the construction cost. Interest on these loans shall be charged at 2.5 percent and the hospital would have up to 50 years to repay. A total of $18 million is authorized to provide loans under this part of the program. Under this combined grant and loan program, a hospital need only raise $667 in order to start construction on a $20,000 project to add one bed. The cost to the community of repaying the $6,000 loan over a 50-year period at 2.5 percent interest is minimal.

Mr. President, this legislation is urgently needed. I urge the Senate to give the entire matter its earliest attention. Certainly it does not represent a complete solution, but is a first step that will carry the Nation past its immediate crisis and permit us to devote careful study to the long-term need for new and modern hospitals. I ask unanimous consent that the text of H.R. 15969 be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

H.R. 15969

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act shall be known as the "Emergency Hospital Assistance Act of 1966".

SEC. 2. In order to solve the serious problems caused by the lack of adequate hospital bed space and related facilities in certain hospitals in the United States to meet the demand for service resulting from new Federal programs, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to undertake a program of direct assistance to those hospitals which he finds and declares to be in critical need of such bed space and related facilities according to the terms of this Act.

SEC. 3. In order to carry out the terms of this Act, the Secretary shall immediately conduct a survey of public and nonprofit private hospitals in the United States and shall determine which hospitals are in critical condition in that they lack bed space and related facilities to serve the present and future needs of their communities. The Secretary shall prepare a list of such hospitals (hereafter referred to as "critical hospitals") and shall inform the hospitals so listed of their eligibility for funds under the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 4. In making the determination called for in section 3 of this Act, the Secretary shall be guided by, but not limited to, the following considerations:

(a) the average annual occupancy rate of the hospital, which should be in excess of 90 per centum of reasonable capacity for hospitals qualifying under this Act;

(b) the number and adequacy of other hospital facilities serving the community;

(c) the expected increase in demand for hospital services as a result of population increase and of new and expanded Federal and State medical assistance programs;

(d) the extent to which the hospital can, and will, conform to reasonable standards of medical service;

(e) the availability of the hospitals to accommodate persons qualifying for medical treatment or care under the terms of present and future Federal programs;

(f) such other factors as he deems appropriate and necessary for carrying out the terms of this Act.

SEC. 5. The Secretary is authorized to make grants of up to 66⅔ per centum of the cost of renovating or expanding such hospital facilities as he finds necessary, according to the terms of this Act, to increase bed capacity and related facilities to meet the needs of the communities served.

SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated $40,000,000 to make the grants as provided in this Act and such amounts appropriated pursuant to this section shall remain available for obligation to June 30, 1969.

SEC. 7. (a) In order to obtain a grant under the provisions of this Act for the purpose of carrying out a project of renovation or expansion to increase bed capacity and other facilities, a critical hospital must submit an application to the Secretary in such form and containing such information as the Secretary may prescribe, except that each such application shall set forth—

(1) a description of the site for such project;

(2) plans and specifications for such project;

(3) the estimated cost of such project and the source of non-Federal funds other than the grant applied for which will be used to carry out the project;

(4) the estimated increase in the bed capacity of the applicant which will result from completion of such project;

(5) reasonable assurance that adequate financial support will be available for the completion of such project and for its maintenance and operation when completed; and

(6) reasonable assurance that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of renovation or expansion on the project will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar work in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a–276a(5)); and the Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this paragraph the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

(b) No grant shall be made to any critical hospital which does not fully comply with the provisions of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and all regulations promulgated thereunder.

(c) The Secretary shall approve any application which complies with the provisions of subsection (a) and shall make a grant of up to 66⅔ per centum of the cost of renovation or expansion covered by such application, if sufficient funds are available therefor from amounts appropriated pursuant to section 6 of this Act; except that no grant to any critical hospital under the provisions of this Act may exceed 7½ per centum of the total appropriation.

SEC. 8. (a) If the Secretary determines that any critical hospital whose grant application he has approved under the preceding sections of this Act is unable to secure adequate funds from non-Federal sources to carry out the approved project, he may loan such hospital up to 90 per centum of that portion of the cost of such project not covered by the grant.

(b) Each such loan shall bear interest at the rate of 2½ per centum per annum on the unpaid balance thereof and shall be repayable over a period determined by the Secretary to be appropriate, but not exceeding 50 years.

SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $18,000,000 for making loans to critical hospitals as provided in section 8. Amounts appropriated pursuant to section 7 shall remain available until the thirtieth day after whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the date on which all funds authorized to be appropriated under the third section of this Act are first obligated or (2) June 30, 1969.

SEC. 10. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "critical hospital" means a public or nonprofit private hospital designated by the Secretary in accordance with sections 3 and 4 of this Act.

(2) The term "State" includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia.

(3) The term "hospital" does not include any facility furnishing primarily domiciliary care.

(4) The term "nonprofit" as applied to any hospital means a hospital which is owned and operated by one or more nonprofit corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

(5) The terms "expansion" and "renovation" mean the alteration, enlargement, or remodeling of existing buildings, including initial equipment, architects' fees, and necessary furnishings but does not mean construction of new hospitals.

(6) The term "cost" as applied to renovation or expansion means the amount found by the Secretary to be necessary for the construction involved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1967

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 18381) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on Friday, October 14, 1966, the House Committee on Appropriations reported H.R. 18381, which is the pending business and is known as the supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1967. This bill, as reported to the House and as subsequently passed on Tuesday, October 18, totaled $4,919,076,929.

The Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Supplementals of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, of which I am chairman, commenced hearings Monday afternoon, October 17, and continued hearing witnesses through Tuesday, October 18, on restoration requests, as well as on $67,512,000 for items transmitted directly to the Senate on Saturday, October 15.

The Committee on Appropriations, in executive session, on Wednesday, yesterday, October 19, marked up the bill, reported it to the Senate, and the following is a brief résumé of its recommendations:

In summary, the committee recommendations total $5,096,338,579, which is an increase of $177,261,650 over the House bill, but $95,075,050 under the total estimates considered by the Senate.

The single largest item in the bill is for the Office of Economic Opportunity, known as the poverty bill, and which amounts to $1,662,500,000, which is an increase of $100 million over the House bill.

I might say at this juncture that the program authorization to fight poverty in this country, as passed by the Senate and agreed to in conference, was $1,750 million. The Appropriations Committee of the House recommended $187.5 million less than the budget estimate and the authorized amount. We in the Senate committee restored $100 million of the $187.5 million. We recommended removing limitations in the bill as passed by the House so as to give the Director of that Office discretion to allocate the money as he saw fit, in the public interest, to better carry out the intention of the Congress in fighting poverty in this great land of ours.

A group of items for the Office of Education totals $2,152,654,000, the committee recommendations being substantially the same as those of the House.

For the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs, the bill contains $750 million advance funding—1968—for urban renewal programs, and advance funding—1968—of $85 million for urban mass transportation grants. This latter item represents an increase of $20 million over the amount provided by the House.

The budget estimate for this last item, I understand, was $95 million. It was cut $30 million, being reduced to $65 million by the House action. We restored two-thirds of the cut, which was a restoration of $20 million.

In addition, the Senate committee is recommending the addition to the bill of a total of $24,180,000 for demonstration cities activities.

The committee's recommendations, as well as the House bill, contain the requested $327 million for readjustment benefits for veterans.

The items enumerated amount to $5,001,334,000, approximately 98 percent of the total recommended. The details of these and other items in the bill are covered in the committee report.

Mr. President, I am ready, able, and delighted to answer any questions on the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. May I ask the Senator if he has asked that the committee amendments be agreed to?

Mr. PASTORE. I shall get to that if I can have a little time. I have just completed my opening statement.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, is the Senator yielding for questions on the bill?

Mr. PASTORE. May I first make a unanimous-consent request, so that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] may make a statement?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be considered as original text for the purpose of amendment, provided that no point of order shall have been considered to have been waived by agreement to this request.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] joins me in this request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Rhode Island? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, after line 2, to insert:

"Agricultural Research Service

"Salaries and Expenses

"Plant and Animal Disease and Pest Control

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and Expenses', for Plant and Animal Disease and Pest Control, $800,000."

On page 2, after line 7, to insert:

"Consumer and Marketing Service

"Special Milk Program

"For additional necessary expenses to carry out the Special Milk Program, as authorized by the Act of August 8, 1961 (7 U.S.C. 1446, Note), $4,000,000."

On page 2, after line 12, to insert:

"School Lunch Program

"For an additional amount for 'School Lunch Program', including $3,000,000 for the pilot school breakfast program, and $1,500,000 for the nonfood assistance program, $4,500,000."

On page 3, after line 17, to insert:

"General Services Administration

"Construction, Public Buildings Projects

"For an additional amount for 'Construction, Public Buildings Projects', for construction of substructure of Federal Bureau of Investigation building in the District of Columbia, $11,320,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 4, after line 7, to insert:

"Commission on Political Activity of Government Personnel

"Salaries and Expenses

"For expenses necessary to carry out the Act of October 3, 1966 (Public Law 89-617), including hire of passenger motor vehicles, $100,000, to remain available until June 30, 1968."

On page 5, line 16, after "1968", to strike out "$65,000,000" and insert "$85,000,000".

On page 5, line 21, after the word "activities", to strike out "$75,000" and insert "$99,000".

On page 5, after line 21, to insert:

"Comprehensive City Demonstration Programs

"For financial assistance and administrative expenses in connection with planning and developing comprehensive city demonstration programs, as authorized by the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, $12,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That not to exceed $750,000 of this appropriation shall be available for administrative expenses during the current fiscal year: *Provided further,* That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of S. 3708, 89th Congress, or similar legislation."

On page 6, after line 8, to insert:

"Grants to assist in planned metropolitan development

"For supplementary grants for planned metropolitan development, as authorized by the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, $12,180,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That not to exceed $180,000 of this appropriation shall be available for administrative expenses during the current fiscal year: *Provided further,* That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of S. 3708, 89th Congress, or similar legislation."

On page 9, line 12, to strike out "$800,000" and insert "$1,300,000".

On page 10, line 7, after the word "basis", to strike out "and the aggregate amounts otherwise available for grants within States shall not be less than the amounts expended from the fiscal year 1966 appropriation by local educational agencies in such States for grants,".

On page 11, line 24, after "(20 U.S.C., ch. 16, Public Laws 86-269 and 89-511)", to strike out "$76,000,000" and insert "$57,500,000"; in the same line, after the word "which", to strike out "$35,000,000" and insert "$27,500,000", and on page 12, line 2, after the word "Act", to strike out "$40,000,00" and insert "$29,000,000".

On page 12, after line 11, to insert:

"PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

"Community Health Practice and Research

"For an additional amount for 'Community Health Practice and Research', $6,000,000: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be effective only upon enactment of H.R. 13196, 89th Congress, or similar legislation."

On page 12, after line 17, to insert:

"Freedmen's Hospital

"Salaries and Expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses, Freedmen's Hospital', $1,000,000."

At the top of page 13, to insert:

"Office of the Secretary

"International Educational Activities

"For grants under the International Education Act of 1966 and for salaries and expenses necessary for carrying out that Act and related international educational activities, $500,000: *Provided,* That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H.R. 14643, Eighty-ninth Congress, or similar legislation."

On page 13, line 14, after the word "amended", to strike out "$1,562,500,000" and insert "$1,662,500,000"; in line 18, after the word "available", to strike out "until expended" and insert "for twenty-four months"; on page 14, line 6, after the word "months", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further,* That none of the funds contained in this Act shall be used to make indemnity payments, authorized by part D of title III, to any farmer whose milk was removed from commercial markets as a result of his failure to follow the precedures prescribed by the Federal Government for the use of the offending chemical".

In line 19, after the word "grant", to strike out *"Provided further,* That of the funds appropriated by this paragraph not more than the following amounts may be utilized for the indicated programs: $200,000,000 for the Job Corps, $325,000,000 for the Neighborhood Youth Corps, $25,000,000 for Special Impact Programs, $18,250,000 for the program authorized by the Nelson amendment, $18,250,000 for the program authorized by the Scheuer amendment, and $26,000,000 for the VISTA program:".

On page 15, after line 15, to insert:

"SENATE"

On page 15, after line 16, to insert:

"Salaries, officers and employees

"Office of the Secretary

"For an additional amount for the Office of the Secretary, $10,790: *Provided,* That effective January 1, 1967, the basic allowance for clerical assistance and readjustment of salaries in the Disbursing Office is increased by $7,680."

On page 15, after line 22, to insert:

"Administrative and clerical assistants to Senators

"For an additional amount for administrative and clerical assistants to Senators, $13,860: *Provided,* That the clerk hire allowance of each Senator from the State of North Carolina shall be increased to that allowed Senators from States having a population of five million, the population of said State having exceeded five million inhabitants."

On page 16, after line 4, to insert:

"Contingent expenses of the Senate

"Inquiries and Investigations

"For an additional amount for 'Inquiries and Investigations', fiscal year 1966, $25,000."

On page 17, after line 6, to insert:

"ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

"Capitol Buildings and Grounds

"Capitol Buildings

"For an additional amount for 'Capitol buildings', $18,000."

On page 17, after line 17, to insert:

"CHAPTER VII

"Department of State

"International Organizations and Conferences

"International Conference on Water for Peace

"For necessary expenses incident to organizing and holding the International Conference on Water for Peace in the United States, including not to exceed $20,000 for official functions and courtesies, $75,000, to remain available until December 31, 1967: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available only upon enactment into law of S.J. Res. 167, 89th Congress, or similar legislation."

On page 18, after line 3, to insert:

"Department of Justice

"Law Enforcement Assistance

"For grants and contracts to provide assistance in training State and local law enforcement officers and other personnel, and in improving capabilities, techniques, and practices in State and local law enforcement and prevention and control of crime, for technical assistance and departmental salaries and other expenses in connection therewith, $8,000,000: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available only upon the enactment into law of H.R. 13551 or S. 3063 or similar legislation."

On page 18, after line 14, to insert:

"Department of Commerce

"HemisFair 1968 Exposition

"For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Act of October 22, 1965 (Public Law 89-284), as amended, $7,500,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 18, after line 19, to insert:

"Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center

"For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of February 19, 1966 (Public Law 89-355), without regard to the provisions of law set forth in 40 U.S.C. 278a; 41 U.S.C. 5, 8, 10a, 13 and 252-255; and 44 U.S.C. 111, 322, and 324, $6,520,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That appropriations heretofore made to the Department of Commerce to carry out the provisions of the Act of February 19, 1966 (Public Law 89-355), shall be merged with this appropriation."

On page 19, line 8, after the word "Chapter", to strike out "VII" and insert "VIII".

On page 20, line 1, after the word "Chapter", to strike out "VIII" and insert "IX".

On page 20, at the beginning of line 3, to change the section number from "801" to "901".

On page 20, at the beginning of line 6, to change the section number from "802" to "902".

On page 20, after line 20, to strike out:

"SEC. 803. None of the funds made available because of the provisions of this bill shall be used by the Export-Import Bank to either guarantee the payment of any obligation hereafter incurred by any Communist country (as defined in section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended) or any agency or national thereof, or in any other way to participate in the extension of credit to any such country, agency, or nation in connection with the purchase of any product by such country, agency or nation."

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

"SEC. 903. None of the funds made available because of the provisions of this Act shall be used by the Export-Import Bank to either guarantee the payment of any obligation hereafter incurred by any Communist country (as defined in section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended) or any agency or national thereof, or in any other way to participate in the extension of credit to any such country, agency, or national, in connection with the purchase of any product by such country, agency, or national, except when the President determines that such guarantees would be in the national interest and reports each such determination to the House of Representatives and the Senate within thirty days after such determination."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I commend the Senator from Rhode Island for his chairmanship of the supplemental appropriation bill, for the speed with which he held the hearings, and for the careful way in which the committee went into each appropriation item.

I call attention to a little point he did not mention in his opening statement, with reference to items that came to the Senate for the first time, because they came from the House. In each instance the Committee on Appropriations put in amounts that it believed were correct in view of the time and the extent of the program. We hope the House will take those suggestions.

Mr. PASTORE. I did mention those.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Secondly, in spite of the fact that several suggestions and recommendations came from colleagues and which were unbudgeted items, with considerable regret the committee decided they should be deferred until the next Congress.

I commend the Senator from Rhode Island and his committee for acting on the bill speedily and promptly.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. Mr. President, it will be one of the saddest days in my delightful service in the U.S. Senate when the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts does not return. He has already indicated that he is not a candidate for reelection. I want him to know we shall sorely miss him. I have always considered him a dear friend and colleague, for whom I have tremendous affection, and who always has cooperated in the public interest. I do not think there is a man in the Congress of the United States who can say that LEVERETT SALTONSTALL ever uttered a harsh word against a fellow man.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following statement by my colleague, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR COOPER

The bill providing supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1967 is now before the Senate. I am traveling in Kentucky, and I want to say that many with whom I am meeting are deeply concerned that the Appropriations Committee has cut back the funds for the Library Services and Construction Act many millions of dollars under the authorization.

I was a cosponsor of the bill, now law, which authorizes $76 million for this year to build libraries, put books on shelves, and help pay the salaries of those who are working to make available more opportunities for library use and improvement of services for all American citizens.

The House has provided the amounts authorized for titles I and II of this new Act, and I hope very much that my colleagues give all possible attention to these additional needs. There are yet 50 of the 120 counties in my State which do not even have bookmobile service, and many of the regional library systems in Kentucky need to be updated and expanded.

The people of many communities in Kentucky have benefited from the earlier Acts, but much remains to be done. I hope that funds can be voted so as to keep to the schedule and the program under way in my State and in many other States.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, not very long ago, when the Independent Offices Appropriation bill was before the Senate, an amendment was agreed to deleting a provision for the construction of an FBI building this year.

The supplemental appropriation bill now before us provides $11,320,000 for the construction of that building. The vote in the Senate a very short time ago was 51 to 37 against appropriating those funds. The debate revolved around the issue of inflation; and it was generally agreed, certainly by a majority of the Senate, in view of the vote, that the construction of the proposed FBI building would be an inflationary action, could be deferred, and that there was nothing urgent about it.

The project is unnecessary to provide for the housing of FBI personnel, because even when it is completed, they will be able to use only 84 percent of the building. Under the circumstances, since we still have an inflationary problem in this country, and since the Senate did act, as I say, only a few weeks ago by a decisive margin against the proposed FBI building, I am very puzzled as to why the Appropriations Committee includes this $11 million at this time in a supplemental appropriation bill, when there does not seem to be any real urgency.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, this item was inserted in the supplemental bill, not particularly at my request, and perhaps not to my liking; but the fact remains that the whole Committee on Appropriations, having considered this item on another bill, thought that it was not propitious at the time to make a decision, and they decided that it would be passed over then and be included in the supplemental appropriation bill.

I raised the point at the time that through that action, the responsibility was being thrust upon my shoulders. But because the Good Lord has given me strong shoulders, I accepted the challenge and the responsibility; and it is the unanimous decision of the Appropriations Committee to approve it at this time, because we feel that this new building for the FBI is absolutely necessary, because of the increased activities of that organization, because of the law enforcement problems existing in the land, and because we feel that the construction of the building would add to the efficiency of law enforcement throughout the United States.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the Senator will yield to me just one more minute on this issue, I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Rhode Island, but it is very difficult for me to understand, in view of the unusual fact that the Senate did take action by a vote of 51 to 37 a very short time ago, why there has been a change in the situation. The Senator from Rhode Island has not pointed out any special urgency in this matter.

While the appropriation was approved by the committee in my presence, it went through in a whale of a hurry; there was no debate or discussion about it, and I am sure if there had been, there would have been some difference of opinion expressed in the committee.

I shall not press my amendment to delete this item. I will not call it up. I recognize that it would be hard to persuade the Senate to act favorably on a rollcall on that matter, although the project's inclusion here does seem to me to be highly inconsistent.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, before I yield, I wish to say this: I do not know how much of a hurry "a whale of a hurry" is, but the Senator from Wisconsin is a member of the Appropriations Committee, just as I am a member of the committee, and everyone was given an opportunity to express himself at any length he desired. I think the Senator is quite familiar with the reaction of the entire committee.

That is the way the matter stands. This is no reflection upon the Senate; it is no reflection upon the committee. It represents a matter of a judgment which has been made, and that is the way I submit the matter to the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I not only approve the position of the committee and that of the distinguished chairman—who did a very splendid job in relation to this bill, as usual—but I also wish to say to my distinguished friend from Wisconsin that normally I would share his attitude on such a matter.

However, the Senator attended the hearing at which the Deputy Attorney General made clear the real struggles which exist at the present time.

In the first place, the FBI occupies a good portion of the Department of Justice building, which is badly needed for other departmental functions because of their expansion, and because of the fact that they are scattered around in various parts of the city.

In the second place, the FBI itself, as I recall the testimony, is scattered in 15 different places in the District of Columbia and the neighboring area; and it was stated that the delays in getting needed files and needed information when quick decisions are required is a real handicap, and that it will continue to be a handicap even if we start this FBI building now, because the problem gets bigger and bigger; both the FBI and the Department of Justice as a whole are growing rapidly.

Therefore, with some reluctance, I changed my former position on the matter, because it does seem to me that here is presented an emergency such as does not exist as to most other similar applications for immediate action.

I hope on this matter we shall take immediate favorable action, because it seems to me that to do so would result in a more efficient setup for both the Department of Justice and the FBI.

I appreciate the tolerance of my distinguished friend from Wisconsin, who, I understand, while he has voiced opposition, does not expect to delay Senate action on the matter for any great period of time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as reported from the Appropriations Committee, the pending supplemental appropriations bill contains a serious omission. I refer to the absence of funds for the maintenance of the full costs of law and order on Montana's Indian reservations.

Senator METCALF and I originally requested the sum of $177,000 to supplement current Federal law and order costs. We were later advised that the figure would have to be revised upward to $260,000. According to a memo from the Department of the Interior—and I quote:

> Because of the difference in pay scales between Federal and tribal employees, the Bureau of Indian Affairs would require an additional $260,000 to take over all law and order programs on the Montana reservations.

In view of this information, I respectfully requested that $260,000 be appropriated by the committee. This sum, when compared to other items in this appropriations bill, is modest indeed. But to the Indians involved, it means a great deal. It would permit them to free a like amount to be applied on constructive community programs.

The Indian tribes in Montana are making laudable attempts to develop their reservations and to provide education funds for their children. To the extent that they must pay for law and order.

Mr. President, may the Indians be heard?

Mr. PASTORE. The Indians are being heard, Mr. President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order, and listen to the Indians.

Mr. MANSFIELD. To the extent that they must pay for law and order which is a legitimate Federal function, they must curtail other activities. At present, the Federal Government pays all the costs on only one Montana reservation, that of the Rocky Boys. The cost to the Crows is $65,000; the Blackfeet, $45,000; Fort Peck, $35,000; the Northern Cheyenne, $33,000; and Fort Belknap, $2,000.

Senator METCALF and I maintain that law and order is a Federal responsibility, and that it is, therefore, appropriate that the Federal Government pay the entire cost. I trust that my colleagues, especially the chairman of the committee, who has been most kind and considerate, will find some way in which these vitally needed funds can be approved in some fashion, either now or in the near future.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I merely wish to say this is the supplemental bill. This is the last bill; this is the hopper bill. Hopefully, this will be the last bill that comes before the Senate before we adjourn sine die.

I received a number of communications from Senators. One of the most distasteful responsibilities a chairman can have is to deny a fellow Senator an amendment which has merit. But, on the other hand, Mr. President, we had to take a position; and the position that the subcommittee took was that anything that did not have a budget estimate, unless it was a matter of absolute emergency or urgency, we would not consider for inclusion.

It was only for that reason that we denied the request of the Senator from Montana—and without prejudice. I hope that in January, when we all come back refreshed and renewed, we can consider this and other meritorious items with greater deliberation and patience, and I hope with favor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Rhode Island. I know that his word is his bond and that the Indians of Montana will be given appropriate consideration next year.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I do not rise to oppose the bill. I know that the Senator from Rhode Island and his colleagues have done the best possible job with the pending measure.

I rise to express the belief that Congress could well pay more attention to supplemental appropriation bills in the future.

A practice has grown up in recent years in which the executive branch, through the Bureau of the Budget, asks for less money than they know they will need, with the virtual assurance that Congress will later give them the money in a supplemental bill.

A practice has also grown up among Presidents of having the Budget Bureau recommend appropriations for all expenditures necessary to make the executive branch look good and omitting recommendations for expenditures which they know perfectly well Congress will restore anyway.

The executive branch then can always point to Congress as being a spendthrift. They may have a little difficulty in so doing this year, but that has been the general idea and purpose.

I feel that we could well correct this situation, perhaps not in the pending bill, but in the future, by insisting that departments ask for all the money they are sure to need when they put in their initial request and not come up with billion-dollar supplemental bills later on.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, no one can disagree with the thesis just expressed by the Senator from Vermont.

I merely say that I invite him to come to some meetings of the Appropriations Committee, particularly my own committee.

Mr. AIKEN. I am on one of them.

Mr. PASTORE. In those meetings, we go into the matters very exhaustively.

So far as the pending bill is concerned, practically all of the money—not all of it, of course, but much of it—goes into two programs, the antipoverty program, which authorization bill was just passed and agreed upon a short while ago to the extent of $1,750 million, and the education program, which authorization bill was passed a short while ago to the extent of $2 billion.

If one analyzes the pending bill, he will realize that the situation which the Senator from Vermont is trying to avoid—and I agree with him—does not exist in the pending measure. These are all new programs which we approved a short while ago.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, as a member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations under the leadership of the able senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], I learned the very things which prompted me to make the statement I have just made.

The Bureau of the Budget deliberately knocked the stuffing out of the school milk-lunch program, the ACP, the SCS, Extension Service, and other programs which have performed well in the past, knowing perfectly well that the Appropriations Committee and Congress would restore the funds for these things that they asked to have knocked out or reduced.

I think they may well have had tongue in cheek when they made the original request for reduced funds.

Mr. PASTORE. If they did, they will not get away with it.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding.

The comments that I shall make will be of a critical nature.

I am the ranking Republican on the subcommittee which considered the supplemental appropriations bill. I have never had a more frustrating experience. The bill concerns an appropriation of more than $5 billion. There were only 2 days within which to consider the measure.

On the antipoverty program, which involved $1,750 million, we had 2 hours of hearings. There is much about the program that I would like to learn more about. We cannot do that in 2 hours.

I would like to offer an amendment to cut back the appropriations for this program to the House figure. However, I find it a rather frustrating experience. I do not believe that I would get more than a dozen Senators to support it. I am still considering offering such an amendment, as well as others to cut this huge spending bill, but will not do so if only 10 or 12 Senators support the amendments.

Much of what is contained in the bill is absolutely necessary. There are programs of which I fully approve, programs such as aid to higher education and also at the elementary and secondary levels. Money is contained in the bill for the Vietnam GI bill of rights, which is money that we must make available. There are many other items that I strongly support. However, in some parts of the pending measure, we are embarking upon multibillion-dollar programs after only a few hours of hearings.

I do not believe that this is any way to run a railroad.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President the House of Representatives inserted section 803 under "General provisions" in the bill on the floor. The provision relates to the Export-Import Bank guaranteeing the payment of any obligation or participating in the extension of credit to any Communist country. The House provision was not included in the bill by the committee and it is at variance with language which has been carried in the Export-Import Bank authorizations for several years. The House provision has been deleted by the committee and a provision has been included in the bill which is identical with the language on this subject which has been included in the foreign assistance appropriation bill for several years. The effect of the House provision would be to repudiate the foreign policy objectives the President is pursuing in regard to Europe, and more specifically Eastern Europe.

I received yesterday a letter from the Secretary of State in which the Secretary referred to the President's speech of October 7, in which the President emphasized that "our task is to achieve a reconciliation with the East." The Secretary goes on to say that the essence of the President's policy is to facilitate trade in peaceful goods. The President in his October 7 remarks stated:

> I am today announcing these new steps:
>
> We will reduce export controls on East-West trade with respect to hundreds of non-strategic items;
>
> I have today signed a determination that will allow the Export-Import Bank to guarantee commercial credits to four additional Eastern European countries—Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia. This is good business. And it will help us build bridges to Eastern Europe.
>
> The Secretary of State is reviewing the possibility of easing the burden of Polish debts to the U.S. through expenditures of our Polish currency holdings which would be mutually beneficial to both countries.
>
> The Export-Import Bank is prepared to finance American exports for the Soviet-Italian FIAT auto plant.
>
> We are negotiating a civil air agreement with the Soviet Union. This will facilitate tourism in both directions.
>
> This summer the American Government took additional steps to liberalize travel to Communist countries in Europe and Asia. We intend to liberalize these rules still further.
>
> In these past weeks the Soviet Union and the United States have begun to exchange cloud photographs taken from weather satellites.
>
> In these and many other ways, ties with the East will be strengthened—by the U.S. and by other Atlantic nations.
>
> Agreement on a broad policy to this end should be sought in existing Atlantic organs.
>
> The principles which should govern East-West relations are now being discussed in the North Atlantic Council.
>
> The OECD can also play an important part in trade and contacts with the East. The Western nations can there explore ways of inviting the Soviet Union and the Eastern European countries to cooperate in tasks of common interest and common benefit.
>
> Hand-in-hand with these steps to increase East-West ties must go measures to remove territorial and border disputes as a source of friction in Europe. The Atlantic nations oppose the use of force to change existing frontiers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter addressed to me by the Honorable Secretary of State.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> DEAR SENATOR PASTORE: H.R. 18381, eliminating the President's power to authorize the Export-Import Bank to guarantee private credits to Communist countries, has the effect of repudiating the foreign policy objectives the President is pursuing in regard to Europe, and more specifically Eastern Europe. In his speech of October 7, the President emphasized that "our task is to achieve a reconciliation with the East." He said that our policy toward the Soviet Union has been the same under the last four Presidents, and that "Where necessary, we shall defend freedom; where possible, we shall work with the East to build a lasting peace."
>
> The essence of the President's policy is to facilitate trade in peaceful goods. This policy takes advantage of the opportunity which exists to develop new markets for the products of American industry, and at the same time to reopen natural trade relations between the United States and the East. The President is calling in unmistakable terms for the nations of Eastern Europe in their own self-interest to cease the fruitless support of aggression in Asia and to grasp instead the opportunity for a better and more prosperous life for their own people which the prospect of greater trade with the East and the easing of international tensions offers them.
>
> The President's decision to make export credit guarantees available to Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Czechoslovakia, as announced in his speech of October 7, 1966, was designed specifically to encourage the tendencies toward economic independence and the thrust toward greater contact and trade with the West which are becoming so clearly evident in Eastern Europe.
>
> These export credit guarantees have been available to Romania and Yugoslavia for some time. While the addition of the four countries listed by the President is not in itself likely to create a major increase in our trade with them, it clearly signals our willingness to normalize trade relations and to stimulate the mutual flow of goods and commodities. Moreover, the availability of export credit guarantees places the products of American industry on a competitive footing with those of our Western allies, whose trade

with Eastern Europe has long been far greater than ours. There is nothing in the act of making export credit guarantees available which changes in any way our ability to study carefully and approve or disapprove on its merits each proposed export of American goods or technology to Eastern Europe. The provisions of the Export Control Act of 1949 regulate individual exports, and the sale of strategic items which would adversely affect our national security will not be permitted.

Another step announced by the President on October 7 was that the Export-Import Bank is prepared to make loans to Italy in connection with the construction of an Italian automobile plant in the USSR. The Administration's position is that it is in our national interest to encourage increased production of consumer goods in the Soviet Union. The equipment which would be purchased by Fiat in the United States for use in their plant in the USSR would not contribute to Soviet military capability. The sale would, at the same time, be a positive factor in our balance of payments.

In this connection, the Department of Defense is on record as favoring the loan by the Export-Import Bank for Fiat. It is the judgment of the Defense Department, shared by General Wheeler of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, that a loan that would induce the Soviet Union to devote greater resources to the production of consumer goods at the expense of applying those resources to military purposes is in our national interest.

Sincerely,

DEAN RUSK.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

BUILDING AMERICA'S TRADE IN THE FUTURE THROUGH THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, I rise to observe that the assistance of the Export-Import Bank has been a vital factor in support of overseas sales of American aerospace and electronic products and has contributed significantly to the United States preeminent position in these fields.

In the buyers' market which prevails throughout the world, continuance of this support is absolutely essential if our country is to maintain its position as the principal supplier of these items, and if it is to bring to rights our unsatisfactory balance-of-payments situation. Export-Import Bank loans often act as seed money bringing follow-on orders five or six times greater than the initial order. For example, one overseas airline in the past decade has ordered more than 10 times the amount of its original order from the United States. Airlines tend to standardize on certain makes of aircraft. Once a sale has been gained or lost by an American manufacturer, that airline's business may well flow in that direction indefinitely.

A surprisingly large percentage of the American exports in the areospace and electronic industries have been financed through the Export-Import Bank. In 1965, 40 percent of all commercial aircraft and 55 percent of electronic exports were financed in this manner.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a brief table showing the value of American exports of aerospace products, of which commercial aircraft are an important part, and of electronic products.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Exports of American aerospace and electronic products

	1964	1965	1st half 1966
Aerospace (total)	1,200	1,400	717
Commercial aircraft (subtotal)	287	482	365
Electronics	445	317	[1] 185

[1] Estimated.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, these figures show generally rising trend as the world increases its demand for the creations of our highly advanced technology.

Credit terms, rather than sales price, have come to be the governing financial factor in such sales to foreign nations. The governments of foreign competitors often offer generous support to their manufacturers in support of their own national interests on terms that make economic competition impossible unless reasonable financial facilities are available.

It has been estimated that the commercial sales potential abroad for American aircraft alone exceeds $2 billion in the balance of this decade. Approximately one-third of this would require financial assistance to customers, largely of the developing nations, who could not presently qualify for consideration through ordinary private banking channels now open to the manufacturers.

The major support in our export markets for aerospace equipment and electronics has been and will continue to be the Export-Import Bank. It is imperative that the Bank have sufficient funds to carry on this program.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, because of the confusion that arose with reference to funds for adult education covered under the antipoverty program and also under the education programs, appropriations of $30 million, expected to be contained in the OEO bill, were not placed in the educational bill. The fact remains that the action culminated in such a way that the $30 million necessary for this purpose is not provided.

Mr. President, this is a very good program. Congress has subscribed to the program. Therefore, in order to remedy the situation, I have had a talk with representatives of the HEW and I am going to send to the desk an amendment, the substance of which is not to add $30 million, but to provide that out of the funds approved in the pending bill for purposes of education, $30 million can be used by the Department to carry out the program.

Mr. President, I send to the desk the amendment and ask that it be stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 10, line 16, after the word "Act," insert the following: "*Provided*, That not more than $30,000,000 of the sums contained herein shall be available for carrying out the Adult Education Act of 1966 including obligations incurred for this purpose under the provisions of Public Law 89-481, as amended:".

On page 10, line 17, after the word "*Provided,*" insert the word "further".

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, it is my understanding that this is necessary language to carry out the change of having the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare carry out its program. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator's understanding is correct—out of existing funds, without adding the $30 million.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 6, after line 18, insert the following:

"STUDY CONCERNING RELIEF OF HOMEOWNERS IN PROXIMITY TO AIRPORTS

"For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of Section 1015 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, $100,000".

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, we have had much difficulty with this particular appropriation, which calls for $100,000 to deal with the question of airport noise through seeking to develop building construction materials and building methods which will, as much as possible, avoid noise for homes constructed contiguous to airports.

The measure was first included in section 1113 of the Housing Act in 1965. We got nowhere with it, because it apparently fell between the two stools of the Housing and Urban Development Department and the Federal Aviation Agency, in that we were told, in respect of the supplemental bill in 1965—interestingly enough, on just about a day like today, October 21—that the FAA had enough money to do it and would do it. We found out in the end that the FAA was studying noise made by airplanes as they approached airports, but nothing for the homeowner. Therefore, again the matter failed, and nothing happened.

Mr. President, in the demonstration cities bill I was successful in introducing an amendment, which is section 1015 of that bill, to extend this authority for a period of 6 months after the enactment of the demonstration cities bill. Again, we are faced with a situation in which there is an appropriation, and nothing is provided to do this job, which is of enormous interest to many homeowners, not only in my city of New York but also in cities throughout the Nation where there are large airports. Let us remember that this is a problem which is growing, rather than diminishing.

The provision in this supplemental for the demonstration cities bill is about $12 million, together with $750,000 for administration. I discussed this matter with Senator Pastore. He pointed out to me that the committee is holding the line very sharply and severely on all other problems which he feels are of a roughly similar kind. He called my attention to the majority leader's statement on Indians, and the fact that the majority leader felt that the bill should have covered that situation.

I feel that the amount is not very great; it is very small. The matter has now been delayed for well over a year. It is a matter of great urgency, as we have had enormous complaints from homeowners whose homes are near airports, and this was an effort to really do something about the situation.

I am not attempting to press a $100,000 amendment; because with so much money involved in these various Government departments, any Government department that really set its mind to it, could do it.

What I should like—if the Senator would go along with me to that extent, at least—is to make the Record clear that the Committee on Appropriations and the Senate, as a result, if we pass the bill, wish to see this study made, and that resources of HUD should be utilized for the purpose. There are ample facilities and ample resources in that Department, in my judgment, so that a matter of this kind could be dealt with, without even the need of a special appropriation, once it was made clear that we want it done, that we feel it desirable, and that the fact that it is not included in this bill does not mean that we are striking this legislation from the books.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I wish to make my position perfectly clear.

I was fortunate to come out of the committee, by the skin of my teeth, with new items for the demonstration cities program. We have to go to conference on those amounts, and feelings are mixed. When I say they are mixed, I mean that it is difficult to say what the outcome will be. It is difficult to foresee—it might go one way or the other.

I merely wish to say that this is a meritorious program—there is no question about it. But I do not want the Record to indicate that we are mandating that this study be made. I am perfectly willing that the Record show that the agency give very serious consideration to undertake this important study under available funds, and that is about as far as I can go.

As I have already said, I stood up against members of my committee, Senators who had meritorious amendments, but because the items were not budgeted, I could not recommend them.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the Senator tell me what reason I would have, as a Senator from my State, having had these provisions incorporated both in the 1965 bill and in the 1966 bill, not to press my amendment and have a rollcall on it?

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator can have his rollcall, and I shall have to resist it. I am merely stating my position as fairly as I can.

Mr. JAVITS. Why should not the Senate have to pass on this matter and turn it down, if it wishes?

Mr. PASTORE. Why should not the Senate pass on every other suggestion made by every other Senator?

If we wish to stay here until the cows come home, let us do so. I am not going to resist any Senator calling for a rollcall, and I am not going to beg anyone or make any concessions because I am fearful of a rollcall.

I am representing the Committee on Appropriations. I have struggled with this bill. Here it is. I shall present it. If the Senate wishes to overrule me, that is the privilege of the Senate. I merely wish to make it perfectly clear that I cannot begin to accept on the floor the very things that were denied in committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish the record to show that the Senator from Rhode Island has done a magnificent job in steering this bill in committee.

There was great difference of opinion on this particular budget item. There was a difference of opinion on the wisdom of starting the program at this time. The Senator from Rhode Island stood out for approval of the budgeted amount. The budgeted amount did not contain this particular item. The people who were asking for funds for this new agency knew what they wanted to prefer, and they did not include this.

The Senator from Florida and others stood by the chairman of this subcommittee, who made a doughty fight for budgeted items and against unbudgeted items. I think I am stating the facts when I say that there were at least 20 requests for unbudgeted items, some of which, in my judgment, were highly meritorious, and in the judgment of other members of the committee were highly meritorious. Yet, we stood by the chairman in his feeling that we would open a Pandora's box if we put these unbudgeted items in the bill.

I shall back the chairman on the floor, even in favor of items which I particularly do not like and did not vote for on authorization, because I think he has done a fine job, and I think he is entitled to the respect and the confidence and the support of the Senate.

I hope that the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] will not insist upon his amendment.

I am not against the item that the Senator from New York advances. I hope that it will be recognized later, but I believe we have taken the action that was wise, and the leadership of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] has been splendid. We followed him sometimes against our own inclinations as to particular objectives. I am not going to leave him now. I hope the Senate will vote for the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to say that I had four very worthwhile and meritorious requests. I ended up with zero. My four requests were turned down.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Monroney in the chair). The Senator from New York has the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore].

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I say this as sincerely as I can say it. I implore and beg my colleague, the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] not to fool around with the demonstration cities program, because if he does, if he starts it, I cannot guarantee what will happen on this floor. From then on, I shall not be responsible.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to ask the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], for whom I have the deepest affection, and whom I have always tried to follow, and shall in this case: Was this item on noise abatement studied at all?

Mr. PASTORE. I do not recall. It might have been brought up in the discussions.

Insofar as the request of the Senator is concerned, I wish to repeat that it has merit. There is no question about that. I am not against it. All I am saying is that I hope they will consider this very seriously. I do not want to mandate them. The minute that I do that I am going to be accused on this floor.

Mr. JAVITS. If the matter was not considered, we are in better shape to get action than if it was, providing it was not considered as a specific item.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator uses the word "budgeted," as did the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland]. No Senator can offer an amendment like this one unless the amount is authorized. I have given the specific language of the statute as to the specific authorization for this particular work.

What is meant by "budgeted"?

Mr. PASTORE. I mean that when they came here with a figure of $12,180,000 for metropolitan development, which is a part of the demonstration cities program, they explained exactly what this money was for, and that is what I mean by "budgeted."

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PASTORE. They did not submit the matter as such. All I am saying is that perhaps they should have done it.

I am perfectly willing to agree at this point that maybe what we should do is make a suggestion that they give it serious consideration, but for me to take $100,000 from something already budgeted, and reduce that—the authorization was for $25 million.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. If I give the Senator $100,000 and say that they have to do it under existing funds, I am going to take that $100,000 from something to which they gave some preference or priority. I could not do that.

Mr. JAVITS. I have not the slightest intention to take it from the demonstration cities program. I agree with the Senator in the validity of the program. I voted for it. I am as grateful as anybody on the floor of the Senate to the Senator from Rhode Island for what he has done in connection with this bill.

What I had in mind was an appropriation to HUD not relating to the demonstration cities proposal. As I said before, this is a large agency with many facilities, and in my judgment, whether they received $100,000 or not, the only virtue would be to make them to do something they have been fooling around with—to use the words of the Senator—for a year and a half to do.

Will the Senator, as the chairman of this committee, ask HUD for me what they have done to implement this mandate, and why they have not? If, in January, it appears the reason is they have not had the money specifically earmarked, I will have another stab at it.

Mr. PASTORE. I shall do that.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment.

The amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, on October 3, 1966, the President signed into law an act to create a Hatch Act Study Commission, which established a commission of 12 men. The Vice President has been gracious enough to name me as one of the members of this Commission, along with the junior Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY].

We in Maryland have great interest in the limitations of the Hatch Act, primarily because we have many Federal employees who are denied their full rights of citizenship because of the limitations of the Hatch Act.

This measure had the support of the administration, and an allowance of some $200,000 was approved by the Bureau of the Budget. The Appropriations Committee, however, has only come up with $100,000 to implement this act.

Mr. President, since the President signed the Commission bill into law, we have been making a concerted effort to prepare a reasonable budget for the operation of the Commission. We have done so in consultation with knowledgable people and through comparison with budgets of similar organizations. We have determined that in a variety of other commissions, annual budgets run from $400,000 to $900,000. We have determined that a minimum reasonable figure for the operations of this Commission for 1 year should be $200,000. I am prepared to submit our proposed budget for the examination of my colleagues here on the floor.

I would like to ask the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] if he would accept an amendment that would increase the funds from $100,000, as approved by the committee, to the $200,000 that the administration recommended and which we feel we need.

(At this point, Mr. NELSON assumed the chair.)

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, here again this is a program that has merit. As a matter of fact, there was an inclination of the committee to knock it out entirely. We feel we have had enough of the Hatch Act. But the Senator from Rhode Island did not feel that way about it, and I implored that they keep it alive by appropriating $100,000.

I say to my friend that the $100,000 at this time, 2 months before we come back in January, is certainly sufficient money. After this matter gets off the ground, it can be submitted to the regular committee, and I am sure if the function has merit and is in the public interest, the Congress will come forth with the money.

However, at this point, I must repeat that I have to remain consistent. For that reason, I cannot accept the amendment.

Mr. BREWSTER. I would hope that the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] would consider this matter again next year. I will not offer the amendment I proposed to offer to increase the amount from $100,000 to $200,000, but I wish to advise the Senate and my distinguished colleague that I care very much about this, and we have only 1 year under the authorization to complete this study. I feel that a great many citizens are being deprived of their rights by virtue of the limitations of the Hatch Act.

Mr. President, while I have the floor, I wish to turn to a second subject. It had been my intention to offer an amendment that would increase the supplemental appropriations bill by $150,000 for preserving the Old Georgetown Market, in accordance with Public Law 89-600, enacted on September 21, of this year.

My intended amendment is as follows:

> On page 21, after line 18, insert the following:
>
> "CHAPTER X
>
> "*District of Columbia*
>
> "Preservation of Old Georgetown Market
>
> "For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Act of September 21, 1966 (Public Law 89-600), $150,000, to remain available until expended."

Public Law 89-600 has not been funded so far, and I would respectfully request that the Committee on Appropriations and the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] consider the advisability of appropriating funds for the Old Georgetown Market next year.

Would the Senator be kind enough to comment on that?

Mr. PASTORE. I cannot give that guarantee. Only God knows who will be here next year to make that decision. Again, that item was rejected for the reason that there was no budget estimate on it, and we had to treat it as we did the others, without prejudice. I would hope if there is any merit to this it would be brought before the proper subcommittee after we get back in January, and if merit is established I hope the committee will grant it. I do not believe it will come up on my supplemental bill, but before the committee that has jurisdiction.

We heard at some length from a witness. I sat in the hearings from 2 o'clock in the afternoon until 6 o'clock p.m. without leaving my chair. I turned the meeting over to the distinguished Senator from Florida who heard this gentleman at some length. Without passing judgment on the merits, we rejected it for the reason that there was no budget request for it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I want to corroborate what the Senator has said. I heard that testimony at considerable length by a very fine gentleman. I am in sympathy with what he wants to do. I think we can probably get this dealt with in the supplemental bill shortly after the first of the year. I would hope so, at any rate; but, we could not, without departing from the precedent which I think was all important in the marking up of the bill, put it in the bill as an unbudgeted item.

As I have already said, there were at least 20 requests for unbudgeted items, some of them meritorious and some not so meritorious, at least in my opinion. I thought the Senator's item was meritorious and hope that we will get an opportunity to get to it. That is about all I can say under the conditions at this time.

Mr. BREWSTER. I thank both the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. With reference to the request for the $100,000 for Government personnel, let me say that I think the request is meritorious but if it is felt that additional funds are necessary, they should come back next year. If the committee feels there is need for the additional funds after the first of the year, I am sure that the committee will make such a recommendation. I, for one, will support it.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am very pleased to hear that.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. As the able Senator from Rhode Island is aware, because of the constructive visit I have just had, I rise to speak very briefly to the situation with respect to the Sylvania tract in upper Michigan.

This is a magnificent stretch of some 18,000 acres, as untouched as virtually any such solid block of acreage east of the Mississippi can be.

Parenthetically it adjoins the great State of Wisconsin so that there are two States that have a primary interest in it.

This tract was first purchased from the newly created water and conservation fund. It has attracted considerable national interest. It is urgent that intelligent and adequate planning be made in order that the use to which the tract will be put will be prudent and wise, and that in the future we will not look back and regret very much that for a 12-month or 18-month period we failed to make the plans and, as a consequence, when the public descends on it in the spring, much of it will have been destroyed before we are ever in a position to preserve it.

The Forest Service advises that it has such high priority that they are, in a sense, transferring some $70,000 from other activities in order to do preliminary planning on this tract; but they insist that an additional $100,000 will be essential in order to do the basic resource surveys and analyses which are required.

Additionally, a visitors' information center must be constructed at Watersmeet. I presented myself to the Senator and his committee seeking to persuade them to add $275,000 to the bill, in order to provide the $100,000 for planning and the $175,000 for construction.

Here again, I was confronted with the fact that this was not in the budget. However, there may be a distinction here, because it was not in the budget because the acquisition did not occur until late in the summer, too late for the agency to get through the Budget Bureau the funds which, once the acquisition has been made, became very urgent.

I wonder whether the Senator from Rhode Island could conceive of this being a distinction that would justify his accepting this worthwhile item?

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator appeared before the committee and he made a persuasive presentation. The fact is, I was very much impressed, and I know that my colleagues on the committee were impressed with the necessity for this, and that there was possibly a sense of urgency connected with it. There again, it is a matter of being consistent. There was not a Senator who suggested an amendment in this category without a budget estimate who did not believe that his amendment, his proposal, or his project was a little bit different and required a little special consideration insofar as his amendment was concerned. I suppose that depends upon the individual's own interests.

I want to say to my colleague that only 2 months will pass before we come back into session, and we will go into this matter thoroughly at that time. I feel that the Senator will not be disappointed.

Mr. HART. I wish very much that we had the money instead of that reassuring promise, but I think that the people——

Mr. PASTORE. That is the best I can do today.

Mr. HART. Of my State will be grateful, indeed, for that.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as a member of the Appropriations Committee I was greatly disappointed by the committee's decision not to provide funds for initial resource surveys and followup plans for the Sylvania tract in the supplemental appropriation bill we are now considering, H.R. 18381. The Sylvania tract is a beautiful piece of undeveloped land in Michigan's Upper Peninsula, bordering on Wisconsin, which was acquired by the Forest Service in early August. It has very great outdoor recreation potential. It should attract substantial numbers of visitors and thus help the depressed areas of northern Michigan and Wisconsin by pumping tourist dollars into their economies.

However, basic resource surveys of soils, water, fisheries, wildlife, botanical features, ecological balance, and transportation needs must be made while the area is still in a virgin condition—that is, closed to public use. When the fishing season begins next spring, the area will be opened to the public. It will then be too late to launch the planning surveys that are essential before actual development of the area for maximum recreation use can be undertaken.

A mere $100,000 is needed now if this planning, including the above mentioned resource surveys, is to be successful. Now, many may ask why this sum was not included in the supplemental budget request. The answer is very simple. There was no time for the Forest Service to submit this additional request for Budget Bureau approval, because the tract was so recently acquired, before the supplemental request was sent to Congress. I received this information by phone from the Forest Service yesterday. Furthermore my legislative assistant was told that the Forest Service had already reprogramed $70,000 of its funds for planning purposes—a very good indication of the urgency of the need for funds since this money had originally been earmarked for other high-priority purposes.

Mr. President, the Midwest has been shortchanged by the Federal Government for too many years. My State of Wisconsin, for example, is 40th among 50 States in Federal revenue per $1,000 of personal income and 42d in Federal revenue per capita. By providing $100,000 for resource surveys and followup plans for the Sylvania Tract, we would have been helping a depressed Midwestern area while, at the same time, taking sensible steps to maximize the attractions of one of the Nation's most beautiful scenic and conservation areas in the interest of all Americans.

INDEMNITY PAYMENTS

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I understand that the conference report on H.R. 15111, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966, carries a provision under part D of section 331(c), which extends until June 30, 1967, the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make indemnity payments at a fair market value to dairy farmers who have been directed since January 1, 1964, to remove their milk from commercial markets because it contained residues of chemicals registered and approved for use by the Federal Government at the time of such use.

The committee, in marking up the bill, has inserted a provision similar to the provision carried in the Supplemental Appropriation Act a year ago which reads as follows:

> *Provided further*, That none of the funds contained in this Act shall be used to make indemnity payments, authorized by part D of title III, to any farmer whose milk was removed from commercial markets as a result of his failure to follow the procedures prescribed by the Federal Government for the use of the offending chemical.

The Supplemental Appropriation Act for fiscal 1966 further provided that not more than $1 million of the appropriation last year for the economic opportunity program would be available to carry out the purposes of part D of title III to which I have just referred.

Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which will establish a limitation in this appropriation bill to provide funds for payment of such claims during fiscal year 1967 in the amount not to exceed $500,000, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

> Page 13, line 15, after the word "reimbursements" insert ", of which not more than $500,000 shall be available to carry out the purposes of part D of title III".

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I believe that this amendment is in order, since it does not call for any increase in the appropriation but makes clear the intent of Congress that not to exceed $500,000 shall be available during fiscal year 1967 to carry out the purposes of the amended authorization act.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, this amendment was considered by the committee, and the provision should be included in the bill for 2 years, I am made to understand.

It was unanimously agreed by the committee that it should be included in the bill, and I am perfectly willing to accept the Senator's amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Let me say that $400,000 in claims have been allowed so far. I doubt if much over $200,000 will be needed. The areas in which they have had the biggest problem—in this respect has been the Maryland-Virginia area.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMATHERS. I rise on behalf of myself and my able and distinguished senior colleague, Senator HOLLAND, in support of the items included in this supplemental appropriations bill which provides some $6.5 million in funds for Interama, the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center, which is located in Dade County, Fla.

I wish to compliment my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, for their wisdom and foresight in making this project a part of their committee report filed with the Senate.

In my opinion, Mr. President, the establishment of Interama will be an important event—one which creates a permanent meeting ground for the Americas, where governments and individuals can come together, under the benevolent canopy of freedom, in a continuous exchange of ideas and cultures.

I have long felt that the future of this country is intimately linked with that of Latin America and that our national efforts should continue to be directed toward building unity and better understanding between the nations of the Americas.

For more than two decades, the people of Florida have been working diligently to advance the concept of Interama. The location at Miami places this center at the gateway to Latin America.

In authorizing appropriations for this project earlier this year, the Senate confirmed the belief of the entire Florida delegation that this project is a valid investment in the future, a tangible step toward implementing more of the goals of the Alliance for Progress.

The funds appropriated here today will provide a U.S. exhibit which will develop the theme "Partners for Progress Through Freedom."

In addition to the U.S. exhibit, it is expected that a majority of the Latin nations will also have exhibits, as well as more than a score of industrial exhibitors.

Exclusive of the participation of the U.S. Government, it is estimated that the construction value of the Interama project will total more than $75 million.

Construction will require 4,790 man-years of skilled labor and 7,185 man-years of unskilled labor, over a 2-year period. This is extremely significant in an area which continues to be "impacted" by an influx of refugees from Cuba. In addition, the project will create an impressive number of jobs once it is in operation.

Given the opportunity to move forward as conceived by the Interama Authority, I am convinced that Interama will quickly demonstrate that it stands on its own merits—and that it will truly become one of the more important ventures of our time, a true step toward hemispheric unity.

MENOMINEE INDIANS BENEFIT FROM SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I was very glad to be able to participate in the Senate Appropriations Committee's decision to include $800,000 for the Menominee Indians in the supplemental appropriations bill we are considering today.

The Menominee Indians are one of the very few tribes whose trust status vis-a-vis the Federal Government has been terminated. In fact I can think of only one other instance of this sort of termination. As a result the tribe has been put into the position of becoming completely self sufficient, after a long period of Federal trusteeship, in less than 5 years. During this period, under the terms of the termination agreement, Federal assistance has been gradually reduced until it is almost nonexistent.

I was very hopeful that a program of special assistance as provided for by the $800,000 earmarked in this bill for the Menominees, would not be necessary. In fact, I, as well as other members of the Wisconsin delegation, worked closely with Menominee County in attempting to get assistance for the county under existing Federal legislation.

However, the facts showed that special assistance was necessary. Consequently Senator NELSON and Congressman LAIRD introduced legislation authorizing the appropriation of these special funds. I was glad to cosponsor the Nelson bill.

That legislation is the basis for the $800,000 contained in the supplemental appropriations bill before us today. The expenditure of these funds is contingent upon final action being taken on the authorization bill, H.R. 15111.

These funds will be used for educational benefits, welfare payments and health and sanitation purposes. In other words they will take care of the Menominee's most basic needs. I am sure that I speak for the Menominee people in praising the Appropriations Committees of both Houses for adding these funds to the supplemental appropriations bill even though the authorizing legislation has not been signed into law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I rise to express the hope that, with the passage of this final appropriation bill, the other body may speedily concur with the views of the Senate, so that Senators may go to their hearths in the 50 States of the Union.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I wish to commend the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] for the outstanding job he has done in getting this bill through the Appropriations Committee after thoroughly covering all the items during 2 long days of hearings on Monday and Tuesday, marking the bill up yesterday, and coming to the floor with it today.

This final appropriation contains $327 million for the first full year of the cold war GI bill. After having worked for 7 long years, over the massed opposition of the executive department, the Department of Defense, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Veterans' Administration, to bring this act of elemental justice to our men in uniform, I am very happy to see this day come.

EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

The bill authorizes the full budget request of $1,342,410,000 for elementary and secondary educational activities and $722,744,000 for higher educational activities. This is a very important appropriation, as the money is badly needed and will be put quickly to good use in education. The authorizations for both of these programs are in excess of the budget requests and the appropriations provided here. Every dollar is badly needed and I feel it would have been desirable to appropriate the full authorized amounts. However, in view of the imminence of adjournment, and in consideration of the fact that the legislative committees did not complete conference action on either the elementary or the higher education bill until Tuesday, the budget figures are certainly justifiable at this time. I hope that the administration will come in with a supplemental request next year.

I know that school and college authorities in my State have already made plans and submitted applications for most, if not all, of these educational programs.

This bill provides $93,302,450 for Texas elementary and secondary educational programs and $23,905,261 for construction of undergraduate facilities, plus additional amounts for construction loans and graduate school construction grants in Texas.

WAR ON POVERTY

The appropriation for the Office of Economic Opportunity was increased over the House figure by $100 million to $1,662,500,000; however this is still $87,500,000 below the budget estimate. I feel most strongly that we should have voted the full amount for this program. The war on poverty is a self-help program. Its chief purpose is to make an impact upon the hard-core poverty in this country so that all members of our society can become self-sufficient. In the long run the war on poverty will pay for itself through the greater productivity of its participants.

HEMISFAIR 1968 INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION

I am gratified that this bill contains an appropriation of $7.5 million for American participation in the HemisFair 1968 international exposition to be held in San Antonio, Tex., in 1968. This is going to be a wonderful fair, and I hope that people from all over the country will come to San Antonio to see it. I know they will enjoy the experience. With the certainty that the host country will participate, I feel sure that many of the 30 or so foreign countries which have expressed interest will now decide to have exhibits. Mexico, Spain, Canada, Switzerland, Peru, Bolivia, and Panama have already made firm commitments. The Department of Commerce estimates that the fair will add $38,636,000 to our balance of payments.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, first, I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee for his outstanding handling of this bill. I wish to make a further statement, which is not on the merits of the bill. What I am going to say is not directly related to the chairman or the committee.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee—and I speak only as a member and only for myself—it seems clear to me that the Senate Appropriations Committee is not able to furnish the leadership and the mature recommendations to the Senate it once did if we are going to permit such large sums to be put in supplemental bills and brought to the Senate floor after only the most hurried hearings and briefest consideration.

We have in this bill appropriations of more than $5 billion. We know that another supplemental bill will come to us in January, or soon thereafter, and for the military alone it will contain many billions of dollars. No one knows now how many, but it will certainly be above $10 billion or $12 billion. It could be up to $15 billion, for the war alone.

Referring to this bill itself, it is true that, as I understand, about 75 percent of the money provided in the bill had to be deferred by the subcommittees because the authorization bills had not been passed. Nevertheless, the sum total of what has happened here is that these large supplemental bills cancel out, in a way, and to a large degree, much of the laborious work that is done by the subcommittees that are especially prepared in their fields, as are the staff members of those committees prepared in the various fields, illustrated by the education programs and the poverty program. The authorizations there were very, very late. This is not a question of trying to place blame. This is not an effort to try to assess the blame. I do not blame anyone, but as a member of the Appropriations Committee, in which I have a great deal of pride, I point out we are losing our influence on the floor.

We are losing a chance to make more deliberate, mature recommendations. The whole system tends to downgrade and degrade the legislative branch of the Government, of which I am a very strong advocate. I want to upgrade and enhance the influence and effectiveness of the legislative branch of Government. But just as long as we submit to these delayed authorizations and then come in and, in a rush, and with only very brief consideration, vote the money anyway, we are going to be treated this way.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. May I complete this thought, very briefly? Then I shall be glad to yield first to the Senator from Rhode Island.

This is not in criticism of anyone at all. I am talking about the system. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] was handling one of the authorization bills. I believe it was the antipoverty program. I am told he walked from the Senate floor, where he got the authorization approved, and went right down before the Appropriations Committee and testified there in favor of the money. Certainly, that was not his fault. I am talking about the system.

I notice that the poverty program—and I am not taking it up today for debate—every year since it came into being has come in right at the last, without a chance—not a chance in the world—for proper consideration, checking into it, checking into the real operation of the items by the Appropriations Committee. I assume the Authorizations Committee did go into the matter. I am not critical of what it did. I am simply saying the Appropriations Committee did not have a chance to do anything about it; their only choice was either take it or leave it.

It is not disclosing any secrets to say that there was a great feeling among the membership in the Appropriations Committee room that we should know more about this program, and to know more about the charges that are made, not merely with respect to my own area of the country, because this is not a racial question. The inquiries come from some of the most esteemed and experienced members of the Committee on Appropriations who live far from my area of the country. They expressed their deepest concern about the operations of this poverty program. But there was no opportunity to actually consider it, as well as many other items.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] did his usual splendid work in a short time and had the answers to many questions, far more of them, doubtless, than the average person would have had. But he is a victim of the system. We are all victims of it.

Speaking as one member of the Committee on Appropriations and as a member of this body, I want to raise the flag of warning that the legislative branch of the Government is letting itself be victimized by our failure to resist. The timetables that we allow to be imposed on us are beginning to downgrade our influence, whether we intend it or not. The process is becoming more and more a mere matter of take it or leave it at the end of a session, and usually the money is appropriated.

For my part, I am willing to make any contribution I can; but I believe that the demand must come from the body as a whole and thus assert our sense of responsibility. Our committees must also assert its prerogatives because there is not much that any one Senator can do to change the situation.

I appreciate what the Senator from Rhode Island has done. He carries his part of the load and more on any matter, and he has done so on this occasion. I make no allusions, of course, to our leadership on either side of the aisle.

I now yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Has the Senator from Mississippi finished?

Mr. STENNIS. I have concluded, yes, but the Senator asked me to yield to him.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes, I did at the time.

Mr. STENNIS. I wanted to finish my point.

Mr. PASTORE. There is a great deal of merit to what the Senator from Mississippi has just said. I think, in large measure, all of us are more or less victims of the system. We have had many situations before our committee in which we were considering appropriations when authorizations had not been decided although I must say in fairness that much of the exhaustive study, work, and debate did take place on the authorization bill.

In other words, when the poverty request came before our committee, I was very familiar with it, because I had made it my business to be familiar with it at the time that we were considering the authorization bill.

I do not want anyone on this floor to have the impression that we did not go into the individual items exhaustively, because we certainly did. I stayed up nights studying this bill. I came in early in the morning, and I stayed until late at night. There is no question at all about that.

There are some people who take a week to do a job; there are some people who can do the same job in a day. I am not trying to pin any bouquets on the subcommittee that heard this evidence; but we worked on it exhaustively, especially the members of the staff.

I do wish to say this, Mr. President: Here we are, and something must be done. We are only 2 weeks away from the election. This will be an important election in the history of this great land of ours. I think the challenge of our day is peace and survival. Many of us wish to bring the message back to the people back home.

The RECORD will show that on the last few votes taken in the Senate, there were hardly 60 or 65 Senators present. I do not think we can be too critical of the absence of those who are up for reelection. We all know the old adage: You have got to be elected before you can be a statesman. They have gone back home to try to get elected, and I say we cannot blame them.

Here we are. We have been here since January. We are still here, on the threshold of the election. Our business is not finished, and we do not know for sure if we can even go home this weekend.

That is the situation, and it is hard to work under that kind of pressure. Here we are dealing with over $5 billion in two programs that were authorized only within the last fortnight.

Of course, I agree with the Senator from Mississippi that the system is not without fault. I hope that something can be done to improve it. I hope further that the administration will give the problem deep consideration, and will not be too hasty hereafter, only 2 months before our coming back, to get the appropriation regardless of the consequences, but will prepare its case in a substantial way, so that we can handle it more efficiently and economically. Because if we crash these programs through, we have sadly learned from past experience that sometimes we create abuses.

I agree with the Senator from Mississippi when he says that we are victims of the system. I think the system ought to be changed or modified. Perhaps if we suppose it can be we are merely whistling in the dark. This is an area we have traversed before, and have run into a blank wall; but I hope eventually some improvement can be made.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish not only to back up what the Senator from Rhode Island has said, but to express the greatest possible sympathy with the position of the Senator from Mississippi.

All of us who serve on the Senate Appropriations Committee feel, because some of these large items were authorized within 48 hours or less before the time that our committee was asked to pass upon them, it did not make for the soundest sort of consideration.

I merely wish to say before closing the debate, however, that I never saw a more impartial attitude shown by any leader in the Senate than by the chairman of this subcommittee on the question of unbudgeted items. I think 20 or more were offered, some of them very large. He took impartially the same position with reference to all of them, and was supported, of course, by the majority of the Committee on Appropriations.

I wish to say also that considering the shortness of the time, I think the hearings were quite exhaustive. They were not as exhaustive as if individual Senators had been able to study these questions for days or weeks before the hearings. I think it will be a service to the Senate and to the public if the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee will insist upon the printing of the record of the hearings. Sometimes these last-minute hearings are not printed. I ask my distinguished friend, the Senator from Rhode Island, to please assure us that he will insist upon the printing of the hearings, because many of us would like to have go out generally to interested members of the public the questions which were gone into as exhaustively as was possible—and some of them quite exhaustively—in those hearings.

Mr. PASTORE. I give the Senator that assurance. There will be no question about that at all.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

I have great sympathy with the position of the Senator from Mississippi. I think we all have. But I think we did the best we could under the circumstances.

Having heretofore served as chairman of this subcommittee myself, I think I know something about the difficulties. I wish to say there has never been a time when I was serving as chairman when anything like this number of difficulties came to a head shortly before the hearings, and shortly before our time of adjournment, as this time. I cannot commend too highly the Senator from Rhode Island for the way in which he handled these particular problems, and I am sure that I voice the sentiment of the Senator from Mississippi also, because we all know how grand a performance he showed in rising to meet the frustrating and most difficult circumstance which confronted him in the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me just 1 minute.

Mr. HOLLAND. Gladly.

Mr. STENNIS. I wish to underscore again that I was not complaining about anything the Senator from Rhode Island or any other Senator did or did not do. In fact, I think I stated exactly the opposite at the conclusion of my previous remarks.

I say this further: I think perhaps he did the best job, in the limited time available, that any member of the committee could have done. I have no grievance, and I am a member of the subcommittee. I did have other demanding matters which permitted me to attend only a small part of the committee hearings.

But I do wish to say a further word about the system, to those Senators who are not members of the Appropriations Committee.

May we have order, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. STENNIS. Senators not on the Appropriations Committee had very little or no opportunity, on this bill, really to get into the facts, either through the testimony or through reports. The Senator from Rhode Island is certainly not responsible for that. But, again, we are victims of the system; and Senators do not have one scintilla of testimony before them because, as I understand, there has not been time to print the hearings; the Senators have only a committee report, which was filed and became available yesterday——

Mr. HOLLAND. This morning.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, became available this morning, just a few hours ago. And the bill contains over $5 billion—$5 billion, not $5 million.

I think that underscores the problem; and I think that is a more serious point, perhaps, than the rushing of the matter as far as the members of the Appropriations Committee were concerned.

Most unfortunately, that has also been true as to reports and bills on other major matters taken up so quickly during this session. It leaves a busy Senator who is not on the committee without a chance in the world, either through his staff or through his own efforts, through work at night and weekends and at any other time, to really have first-hand knowledge of what the testimony is, what the issues are, and what his ultimate decision should be. We must find a remedy for such an extreme and neglectful situation. We must demand that the estimates come to us earlier, or refuse to consider them.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator is completely correct in his comments. We all agree on that.

I hope that we may not find ourselves in this kind of an emergency situation when we take up a supplemental bill the next time.

It is a fearful responsibility. I think that it has been discharged in a wonderful way considering the difficulties of the situation. The Senator and I are in complete agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I completely share the views expressed by the Senator from Mississippi.

I have a brief statement to make for the RECORD on one aspect of the bill. I shall vote for the measure, but that does not in any way change my view as to the correctness of the views taken by the Senator from Mississippi.

I realize that many of my colleagues in the Senate do not agree with the observation I made 3 weeks ago, on which observation I stand. In my judgment, the procedure in the Senate in the past 3 weeks has verified over and over again my observation that the Senate could not possibly legislate responsibly between that date and the time of adjournment because of the magnitude of the legislation it had before it and because of the relationship of that legislation to the commonweal. I thought we owed it to the constituency we represent to recess until after the election and then come back at a time when we would have time to make the type of study that the Senator from Mississippi has recommended.

Such a procedure would result in our acting much more responsibly as legislators than I thought we could possibly do if we tried to rush legislation through pellmell without adequate study.

I do not ask people to agree with me, but I want the RECORD to show my view. My view is that the people of this country would be better off if the Senate had recessed 3 weeks ago and come back after election. I think we would have avoided making some of the serious mistakes that I believe time will prove we have made because we have not given adequate consideration to some of the legislation we passed upon in these last weeks of the session.

The comments that I shall make on the pending appropriations bill neither directly nor indirectly, impliedly or otherwise, contain any criticism of the committee or reflection upon the committee.

I happen to be a Senator from Oregon that has a responsibility, as does every other Senator in his respective State, in regard to the interest of that State to do what I can to protect the legitimate rights of my State and to make a record in respect of problems that arise as they are raised in various bills that come before us. We have a serious problem involved in the pending bill.

Mr. President, the bill reported by the Committee on Supplemental Appropriations for the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management meets some of the timber needs of Oregon that ought to be met now. I regret, however, that the proximity of the adjournment makes it difficult to correct a number of deficiencies in the bill relating to the development and management of our forests in Oregon.

I do not see how we can possibly escape the conclusions of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] as to the need for speedy action if we meet the target date for adjournment that has been set. Nevertheless, time does not permit us to deal with the type of problem that I want to mention in this brief speech. It also does not justify the Senate in sweeping under the rug because of the time factor the type of problem that I think ought to be acted upon now.

The recommendations provided under H.R. 18381 for the Forest Service will permit that agency to process timber sales that are now underway. The Bureau of Land Management will be able to market an extra 150 million board-feet of fire-burned timber in Oregon.

I regret that the committee has not provided additional funds to permit a start on increasing the sale of thinning timber and mortality salvage.

Mr. President, from the standpoint of the taxpayers, if we made provision for thinning and made provision for mortality salvage, we would put into the Treasury of the United States many times the cost of the appropriation.

This is not a sound economy that we are following when we hesitate to appropriate the necessary money that will make several times the amount of money in the interest of the taxpayers that we appropriate.

It is indisputable that the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management are correct. If we give them the appropriations, they will make money for us far in excess of the cost of the appropriations.

That is what the Senator from Oregon has been pleading for in this field for his 21 years in the Senate, and so long as I stay here, I will continue to urge that we make progress faster. We have made a lot of progress.

This does not mean that I am not appreciative of what the Appropriations Committee has done in years gone by. However, we have not moved fast enough, and we are not moving fast enough on the problem that I now raise.

Within conservation limits, this program of thinning and mortality salvage could constitute a useful program. I express the hope that next year the budget will provide adequate funds for this type of activity.

This is a type of expenditure that cannot be postponed with justification, because when the trees destroy themselves as the result of the disease that infects them and when the trees destroy themselves because of the fact that they are not thinned, all that we are doing is wasting the assets of the taxpayers of the country.

Shortly before the Senate Appropriations Committee began its consideration of H.R. 18381, there appeared in an Oregon newspaper published in Portland known as the Oregonian a column dated October 14, 1966, by one Gerry Pratt, entitled "Making the Dollar—Lumberman Charges Retaliation by United States."

This article quoted a Joe McCracken, who is described as "head of the Western Forest Industries Association," as claiming that the absence of a request for thinning and salvage funds for use in Oregon in Federal forests occurred as a result of spite action on the part of Government officials; that—

> A promise was made to increase the annual timber cut in Oregon by 469 million feet through special salvage and thinning sales.

And that—

> The whole deal was dumped because of Oregon's defense of Russell Getty, the Director of the Bureau of Land Management in Oregon.

It is interesting to note that Mr. Pratt and Mr. McCracken are among the authors of a number of allegations made in April 1965, concerning alleged malfeasance on the part of Government officials in connection with a proposal to exchange certain privately owned lands within the Point Reyes, Calif., project, for public domain lands in Curry County, Oreg. It is important to recall that a recent report by the Comptroller General on this entire Point Reyes-Curry County matter concluded that the allegations of malfeasance on the part of Government officials were without foundation.

I wish to make clear that Mr. Pratt is a very able newspaperman who has the journalistic responsibility of reporting allegations of malfeasance as he comes upon them. However, reporting them does not make them true, but it does afford an opportunity to have them answered and to have the facts brought out.

In order that my colleagues may have the full text of the Pratt article, I ask unanimous consent that the article be set forth in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for several months another technique has been employed by certain individuals in Oregon who are interested in prying loose from our Federal forests a very substantial increase in the timber allowable cut. This is reflected in a systematic series of charges that the Government is engaged in secrecy-shrouded plans related to its Federal timber program, particularly in the State of Oregon. Bizarre charges to this effect are hurled from many directions and dedicated local government officials, according to these self-appointed accusers, are supposedly muzzled by their bureaucratic superiors in Washington, D.C.

Illustrative of this type of charge is another column by the author of the Oregonian column "Making the Dollar," Mr. Pratt, published under date of May 30, 1966, entitled "Secret Timber Plan Stirs O&C Counties." I ask unanimous consent that the May 30 Pratt article be set forth in the Congressional Record immediately following the October 14 Pratt column.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. MORSE. These two articles constitute interesting journalistic contrasts. The May 30 article expresses anguish over alleged secrecy in Government, but the October 14 column alleges a promise made by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Commerce to the timber industry of Oregon to increase the annual timber cut in our State by 469 million feet. How this promise could be made to an industry that is subjected to abject secrecy by the Government is a little difficult to comprehend, but is nevertheless highly amusing.

When the McCracken charge of spite work on the part of the Government in connection with the timber thinnings and salvage program came to my attention, I followed the course of action that I always pursue when charges of this type, however groundless, are made. I communicated immediately with Senator Hayden, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, calling the Pratt column of October 14 to his attention, and requested the comments of Government officials who had been subjected to the McCracken charges. I ask unanimous consent that my letter of October 17, address to Senator Hayden, be included in the Record following the insertion of the Pratt column of May 30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. MORSE. It is my understanding that my letter of October 17 was included in the hearing record of the Senate Appropriations Committee relative to H.R. 18381.

The comments of the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management relative to the Pratt column of October 14 have come to my attention and I ask unanimous consent that these items be included in the Record following the insertion of my October 17 letter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 4 and 5.)

Mr. MORSE. The comments of the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management are factual, frank, and forthright and present interesting answers and contrasts to the Pratt column.

The replies of the Forest Service and the BLM perform a valuable service in keeping the record straight in connection with the highly inflammatory charges appearing in the Pratt column as attributed to the individual who serves as head of the Western Forest Industries Association.

I have taken the time to discuss this matter and to insert the foregoing materials in the Record because I am increasingly concerned over the possibility that certain people closely allied with some segments of the lumber industry in the State of Oregon are advocating programs which, if effected, will constitute serious inroads on forest conservation in the State of Oregon.

I do not contend that we are without difficulties in the timber industry of Oregon today. We do have some serious problems. Nor do I contend that our Federal timber agencies are paragons of perfection. But I have found that, by and large, the people in our Federal timber agencies are dedicated public servants whose primary objective is conservation and proper management development and harvesting of our forest assets.

These forest assets in the State of Oregon, may I say again—although it is unpleasant to some ears in my State—do not belong only to the people of Oregon, and they certainly do not belong to the lumber interests of Oregon. They belong to all the people of the United States.

Each of us, no matter from what State we come, sits here with a trust to protect these natural resources. Any individual or group that seeks to despoil them in any way, even though the despoilment may take the form of an attempt to have a cut far in excess of what would be a sound conservation program, will have the utmost opposition from many of us in the Senate.

That is why the senior Senator from Oregon has been pleading, time and time again, for appropriated funds that will make it possible for us to carry out the recommendations of our Federal officials who have been charged with the responsibility of administering these forests—so that we can have the funds for the necessary maximum thinning, the necessary maximum mortality salvage of dying timber, so that we can save the money of the taxpayers by that program—but that we do not yield to the type of pressure that often is put upon us, to violate a sound sustained yield program. That is why I am disappointed that time does not permit us—and it does not permit us; the Senator from Rhode Island is correct, that it does not permit us—in the rest of this week to give the further consideration to this bill, which would require some amendments, which would require conferences.

However, I wish to say that come January I will be standing on my hind legs again in the Senate urging early action on the type of appropriations that I think we are omitting from this bill, which would be in the national interest to have in the bill.

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman has done a remarkably fine job in resisting assaults on conservation practices in our Federal forests and I am satisfied that the new Director of the Bureau of Land Management, Mr. Boyd Rasmussen, and the new State Director, Mr. James F. Doyle, will make outstanding contributions in the field of conservation while cooperating fully with our lumber industry within conservation limits.

I am also convinced that the great majority of the lumbermen of my State are dedicated to forest conservation because they have the foresight to appreciate the fact that the future of the industry in the State of Oregon is closely related to the extent to which we engage in wise management of our forests today. To these dedicated members of the Oregon lumber industry and to the Government officials who have the responsibility for developing and protecting our forests, while harvesting them wisely, I pledge my support in a cooperative endeavor to bring about the greatest benefits for the general public and for the lumber industry in one of our greatest natural resource assets, our Federal forests.

I close by promising again to the people of my State and of my country that, come January, I will propose again that we proceed without delay to have hearings and give consideration to the need for additional funds not included in this bill, which will permit the thinning of our forests, which will permit what is called mortality salvage of those trees in Oregon forests that need to be salvaged in order to save them and in order to prevent them from infecting other trees. The cost of such appropriations, I repeat, will be repaid to the Treasury of the United States over and over again by such wise expenditure of taxpayers' money.

Mr. President, I shall vote for the bill, but I thought I owed it to the people of my State to make the record that I have made with regard to this problem.

Exhibit 1

[From the Oregonian, Oct. 14, 1966]

Making the Dollar: Lumberman Charges 'Retaliation' by U.S.

(By Gerry Pratt)

Oregon's timber industry has been staggering through bleak days this year on a hope and promise. The hope has been in a government proposal to increase the annual timber cut in Oregon by 469 million feet through special salvage and thinning sales.

The promise was from Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman and Secretary of Commerce John Connor that this additional timber would be the answer to the squeeze on timber prices.

With the delivery of the budget to the Congress last Friday both the hope and the promise went out the window and at least one strong industry voice, Joe McCracken, head of the Western Forest Industries Association, charges flatly that the whole deal was dumped because of Oregon's defense of Russell Getty.

McCracken makes his case by producing first a December 1965 letter from Secretary Freeman in which Freeman writes: "I recognize the hardships resulting from changes taking place in the wood-using industry of the Northwest. I am directing the Forest Service to use every means available to maintain timber harvesting at allowable-cut levels and accelerate offerings of timber not normally included under allowable-cut limitations such as material from pre-logging salvage operations and thinning of young growth stands."

That was Freeman's answer to what can be done about a soaring timber price resulting from heavy exports to Japan.

Secretary Connor's answer was something the same. On Dec. 9, 1965, he wrote to Sen. WARREN MAGNUSON of Washington; "Rather than restricting the export of logs, it would appear that a positive approach should be taken leading to an over-all increase in timber availability."

TWO SPECIAL STUDIES UNDERTAKEN

That was all that was needed to begin two special studies. The first led to a report from the Forest Service that they could offer an additional 251 million of this type of salvage timber for sale in Oregon this year.

The Bureau of Land Management then reviewed its timber holdings and found it could release an annual extra cut of 218 million both from salvage, neither upsetting the balance of its sustained-yield harvest programs.

Both needed supplemental appropriations to handle the sales which would put the extra 469 million board feet of Oregon timber into the mills now facing record high timber prices at a time they are setting record low lumber and plywood prices.

The Forest Service went to the Bureau of the Budget, the President's office, to justify this, outlining a program that would cost them $5 a thousand to market their supplemental timber throughout the entire West. In return, they reported, they would earn an average of $10 a thousand in the West, but $20 a thousand in Oregon and $30 a thousand in western Oregon.

The BLM needed an additional $839,000 appropriation to get going with their marketing of salvage timber. This sale would return to the government $6.5 million in receipts, they said.

Both requests, claims McCracken, went to the Bureau of the Budget which in turn sought the counsel of the President's Council of Economic Advisors. They approved the requests.

"Now," says McCracken, "the first supplement appropriations bill went to the Congress last Friday. It will have to be acted upon by Oct. 22 when Congress is expected to adjourn.

"Are we in the bill or are we not?

"Well, let me tell you, there was a supplemental sum of $2.3 million for the Forest Service listed as money for timber sales in the West. But it was not for the sale of this additional salvage timber. Not one dime.

"This was $2.3 million to administer the additional cut of timber already under contract. The appropriation specifically does not include a penny for the additional timber sales the industry was promised.

TIMBER SAID GOING TO WASTE

"It also includes," McCracken says, "$540,000 for a brand new program to hire 50 additional foresters back East to contact private owners of hardwood to get them to market the hardwood, a program the National Forest Products Association never heard of until it came out in the appropriations.

"They can do that, but not a dime to keep the promise made to the industry to market timber now going to waste, timber which would give us jobs, produce taxes and bring in additional government revenue."

There was also a supplemental appropriation of $1.3 million for the BLM, McCracken points out. But this was to rehabilitate the Oxbow fire area and market the fire-damaged timber. Again, not one cent to salvage the 218 million feet the BLM said they could put up in Oregon.

"I asked the Forest Service, a high official whose name I am not going to give you at this time," McCracken said. "I asked why? He told me 'We did not want to embarrass another party. We did not want to embarrass the Interior Department.' "

McCracken's charge—the Interior Department went to the Bureau of the Budget and cut their supplemental request for money to market extra timber in Oregon. When they did that, the Forest Service followed suit.

"It is pure spite," he says. "This is what we get for the Russell Getty affair." Getty, an Interior Department employe, resigned from the BLM over a timber management disagreement with the Interior Department chiefs in Washington, D.C.

McCracken's hope now? "That we can get someone back on the hill to put up that supplemental appropriation before they wrap things up in the Congress—and maybe in our timber industry as well."

Exhibit 2

[From the Portland Oregonian, May 30, 1966]

Making the Dollar: Secret Timber Plan Stirs O&C Counties

(By Gerry Pratt)

A history of trust between the Department of the Interior and the O&C Counties in Oregon collapsed this past week when the Department of the Interior denied O&C officials the right to be briefed on a program to increase the allowable O&C timber cut between 200 and 400 million feet a year.

The timber involved is only part of a secrecy-shrouded and politically protected timber program in the works which industry sources claim will also result in an additional 500-million feet of Forest Service timber going on the market in Oregon.

The amount of timber involved in both instances is only a guess, the best guess of Darrell Jones, the president of the O&C Counties Association for the past seven years and Clackamas County commissioner, who confesses: "We can only guess because when we ask for a briefing in the field we are told we cannot have the information, even though it is O&C funds they are spending and O&C lands they are planning on cutting."

Jones will fly to Washington, D.C., Monday to meet with the Oregon delegation Tuesday and review there the Bureau of Land Management studies. When he sought to brief the O&C consultant forester, Lucien Alexander of Mason Bruce and Girard, for this meeting, Assistant Secretary of the Interior Harry Anderson refused him the information.

"We have heard all kinds of figures on the amount of O&C timber found available under the BLM study, timber either rotting and down or available through thinning programs," Jones explained.

COUNTIES REFUND PART OF SHARE

Under its voluntary agreement with the Interior Department, Jones explained, the O&C counties refund a third of their share of the O&C timber sale funds for management, roads and reforestation of the O&C lands by the BLM.

Even after the deduction of a third of their revenues, the O&C Counties, all of the Western Oregon counties except Clatsop, plus Klamath County, collect some $20 million a year from their share of the timber sales.

"Even at $30 a thousand, this program of added harvest could mean an extra $6 million a year to the O&C counties, so naturally we are concerned," the Clackamas County commissioner added. "At $40 a thousand, a more reasonable timber cost today, it means $8 million a year more for the counties."

"In addition the industry desperately needs the added logs to help offset the expanded export of timber to Japan which is beginning to have a serious affect on our employment outlook."

Jones' chief complaint Sunday as he planned his campaign for Washington, D.C, was: "We have been full partners with the BLM in the past. We voluntarily asked Congress to take one third of our O&C revenues and invest it in sustaining these lands and we want to be full partners in this planning.

"There is a full report on the availability of increased yield of timber that is not being made available to us. We are asked to go back to Washington and get briefed without having any of the facts before we get there. The best Anderson would give us is that the information on our lands will be made available to us during the course of our meetings.

"They denied us the right to be briefed until we get it his way, and yet it is our resource and our money involved."

Jones and the O&C officials are jumpy about such dealings in the BLM since the discovery last year of a plan to swap sustained-yield lands in Western Oregon which were a part of the O&C cut program.

DETAILS ON PROGRAM SOUGHT

The Clackamas County official said he is also going to press for details on the Forest Service program to increase its cut in Oregon by 550-million feet a year.

"We have been told the Forest Service is preparing to go to Congress in August for an additional appropriation to allow it another 550-million feet of annual cut under the same salvage and thinning programs," Jones said.

Twenty-five per cent of these Forest Service sales also come back to Oregon counties, Jones pointed out. "So we are intensely interested in this program as well. There are only nine counties in the United States that collect more than half a million dollars a year from Forest Service sales in their areas. Seven of those counties are in Oregon. So you can understand our interest."

At an extremely low price of $30 a thousand, Jones figures, the 550-million increase in Forest Service cuts means more than $4-million a year in additional revenues to the counties from timber sales, plus the jobs and investment in manufacturing.

"We hope to find out what these programs are and maybe we will have some suggestions about the budgets," Jones explained.

"There is a policy of secrecy developing around our federal timber programs in Oregon so that we are finding it increasingly more difficult to get the information Oregon is entitled to, concerning the management of our natural resource.

"Maybe Tuesday," he said, "we can begin to find out why."

EXHIBIT 3

OCTOBER 17, 1966.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman,
Senate Appropriations Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On October 11, I addressed a letter to you requesting favorable action on pending budget requests for the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management, plus the addition of funds for thinnings and salvage timber sales.

There have been some recent developments which make it necessary for me to ask your Committee to carefully review these matters.

On October 14, a Mr. Joseph McCracken, spokesman for the Western Forest Industries Association of Oregon, is reported to have charged in the October 14 *Portland Oregonian* (text enclosed) that the absence of a request for thinning and salvage funds occurred as a result of spite action which may involve the Bureau of the Budget and the Departments of Agriculture, Interior and Commerce. This man and the writer of the newspaper article are among the authors of other allegations made in April, 1965, about a proposed land exchange in Oregon. A recent report by the Comptroller General on this entire matter concluded that their allegations were without foundation on the issue of malfeasance.

I think it is of the utmost importance that the true facts surrounding these latest charges be obtained from those responsible for the budget actions involved. Therefore, I request a statement of facts on the actions taken on the subject of thinnings and salvage be obtained from the responsible policy officials of the Departments involved, with special reference to the charges made in the attached newspaper article.

I am unaware of any promise made by any Federal official to market an extra 469 million board feet of timber from Oregon lands under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management. It is true that Federal officials recognize that thinnings provide a source of additional material that could go on the market, but so far as I can ascertain, this was not a matter on which firm commitments were made to the industry.

The Assistant Secretary of the Interior earlier submitted to me a study committee report on a possible 203 million board feet of timber for BLM, but he specifically advised me he had not yet reviewed or approved it. The Forest Service has, as a legislative service, advised me on possible volume it could offer in the West, including Oregon, but it also has not indicated that these were firm programs or commitments.

In view of the fact that funds must be both requested and appropriated, I am at a complete loss to understand how anyone could conclude there was a promise of additional sales. If there was, I would like to know who made it, the amounts, the times and the places where such commitments were made.

Second, I want the Committee to know that the request I made for additional funds for thinnings and salvage for these two agencies was made upon what I considered to be valid and sufficient evidence. Unless these thinning and salvage programs have a firm conservation foundation, they would not have my support. I shall only support programs which are on a sound conservation basis. So far, I have never known either agency to request funds for conservation programs which were not on sound conservation footing.

Finally, the House Appropriations Committee is of the opinion that $500,000 of the rehabilitation funds requested by the Bureau of Land Management should be funded from the Oregon and California grant land funds and it has so directed.

The President has been enforcing very rigid budgetary savings, yet in this case, he requested an appropriation. I urge the Committee to examine carefully the effect the House proposal would have. This particular fund is used especially to secure needed and urgent road construction on the O&C lands. The amount of $500,000 would construct substantial mileage of essential forest roads needed to assure sustained yield. This benefit should not be lost.

My long experience with this program has demonstrated the need for these roads and I therefore urge the Committee, if the facts support the case, to appropriate the money in the maximum recommended in the budget submission.

Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

EXHIBIT 4

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., October 18, 1966.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Senate Appropriations Committee,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This refers to the letter of October 17, 1966, from Senator WAYNE MORSE concerning material submitted in connection with the request for supplemental appropriations pending now before your Committee. Senator MORSE requested a statement of facts on the actions taken by the Department of Agriculture on the subject of proposals for increased sales of thinnings and of salvage timber.

In September 1965, Secretary Freeman in rejecting an application for a huge sustained yield unit, directed the Forest Service to do what it could to increase the volume of timber available from National Forests, including that from intensified management such as thinnings and salvage.

Subsequent to such direction the Forest Service, in the Pacific Northwest, explored the opportunities to make sales of salvage and thinnings and prepared an estimate of volumes available beyond those included in its normal sales program.

In February of 1966, in response to a specific request, we furnished Senator MORSE with an estimate of that volume. At that time the estimate was 250 million board feet for the Pacific Northwest of which 203 million board feet were for Oregon alone. At the same time we estimated that a total of 540 million board feet could be made available from National Forests all over the West and that the cost of this total program would be $2,600,000 or approximately $5 per M board feet.

Since the above information was not available in time to include in our regular F.Y. 1967 budget presentation, we advised Staff members of the House and Senate Appropriation Subcommittees that it would later be appropriate to consider submitting it together with some other timber production items, as an item in a supplemental appropriation bill.

Last spring, lumber prices rose very rapidly to very high levels. It seemed urgent to place this additional volume of timber on the market promptly in an effort to ease the pressures that produced the price rise.

When lumber prices began to drop sharply in June and continued the drop back down about to the levels previously prevailing, there was no longer the same urgent need to emphasize the program of salvage and thinning sales as a matter of easing the high lumber price levels. Consequently, the decision was made that this salvage and thinning program, although desirable from many standpoints, could not be considered appropriate for financing as a part of a request for supplemental funds.

However, at no time was a commitment of any sort made that such a program would be undertaken.

It is a desirable, long-term program. It would result in more volume available for industrial use. It would promote good forest management. But for the reason indicated, it was not included as a part of the material in the supplemental budget request.

Sincerely yours,

A. W. GREELEY,
Associate Chief.

EXHIBIT 5

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT,
Washington, D.C., October 19, 1966.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: This responds to the request in Senator WAYNE MORSE's October 17, 1966, letter to you on the question he raised on the supplemental appropriation bill pending before your Committee.

In the spring of 1966 the Bureau of Land Management undertook a review of the potential for thinning and premortality salvage using a study committee. Following a request from Congresswoman GREEN for the field report dated May 13, 1966, copies were also made available on May 31 to the Oregon delegation.

Secretary Anderson stated the report was subject to further evaluation both as to volumes for cutting and costs. It pointed out proposed field amendments had been received as late as May 27 and also were under study.

Finally, his letter stated "no position had been taken to date at the Bureau and Departmental level" and that "additional timber cutting would involve budgetary considerations, and no official recommendations can be made until this decision is reached."

No promises were made prior or subsequent to that date that 218 million board feet of additional timber would be offered for sale in F.Y. 1967. However, the August 1966 Oxbow Fire required immediate consideration of the need to salvage the 500 million board feet it burned.

The F.Y. 1967 budget as submitted to and approved by Congress was based upon funding to sell 1.180 billion board feet of timber, an increase in volume from the 1.161 billion board feet sold in F.Y. 1966.

Any increase in volume sold would thus require additional funds. As a legislative service in March 1966 we supplied Senator WAYNE MORSE with data prepared by our field office on the cost to market an additional 21 million board feet of thinnings in Oregon. Again on October 7 at his request we supplied Senator MORSE an estimate of the cost to process an additional 40 million board feet of thinnings, but pointed out that this was "not in the same category of urgency as the salvage of fire-killed timber."

The Oxbow Fire catastrophe will require the sale of additional timber and the request before your committee will fund the sale of 150 million board feet of additional timber, if allowed.

The thinning and premortality salvage program is a useful and worthwhile program. However, considering all factors, the salvage of the fire-burned timber is of a more urgent priority. It will place 150 million board feet more on the market than our F.Y. 1967 budget would have permitted.

We believe the record is clear that no promise was made to sell additional timber above the budgeted amount in F.Y. 1967.

In the period since 1955 we have increased our allowable cut from 614 million board feet to 1.127 billion board feet. In this period we have been funded to place on the market the allowable cut plus such additional volumes as the 1962 windstorm damage.

We shall continue our constant effort to effect orderly improvements and we appreciate the assistance the Committees on Appropriations have given to these needs.

Sincerely yours,

BOYD L. RASMUSSEN,
Director.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, first, let me express my agreement with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and other Senators, including, of course, the floor manager of this Supplemental Appropriations bill, Senator PASTORE, with respect to their grave concern about the procedures which must be followed in connection with this bill. They result in undue haste and inadequate consideration of items totaling many billions of dollars. This is a general derogation of the legislative process.

Something must be done about this in the Senate. We will have the opportunity next January, when we consider the recommendations of the Monroney-Madden Committee for Congressional Reorganization. However, even here the recommendations, in my opinion, do not get to the heart of the matter we are concerned with today.

The Senator from Mississippi used my case as an illustration, I believe. As the chairman of the conferees for the poverty authorization bill, I came from the floor, where the Senate approved the conference report, directly to the Committee on Appropriations, to request the restoration of funds which had been cut by the House Committee on Appropriations before the authorization bill had even passed.

Mr. President, that is no way to run a railroad and it is no way to run the Senate. We must devise procedures which will make this impossible in the future. Among those procedures, I suggest the following as being important.

First, the Congress must put far more pressure than it has heretofore on the Executive to come up early with the legislative proposals which it desires to have enacted during the course of the congressional year. If the Executive does not come up with those recommendations, the legislature should exercise its constitutional prerogative of holding hearings and writing a bill so that it can be brought to the floor of both Houses in due course. This was not done in connection with the poverty program this year.

Second, we should so organize our committee structure that interlocking membership on various committees does not prevent a quorum for the purpose of marking up bills. We do not need to have a quorum for public hearings, so that can be done promptly. But where we need a quorum, as we did with respect to the poverty program, we cannot get one because of the pileup of business which Senators have in connection with other committee assignments.

We are doing a great disservice.

This is a matter that could be remedied, but it is not, by curtailing the number of committee assignments that Senators may have.

Third, we should see to it that the committee jurisdiction is not so overloaded that we cannot get through with the legislative responsibilities before early fall. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is one committee having too much jurisdiction for the workload of its members.

Fourth, the iniquitous rule that committees may not sit except by unanimous consent when the Senate is in session must be changed. A change more drastically than the Monroney committee recommends is needed. I have sat through this problem for 10 years in the Senate and I know, as every Senator knows, that committees are denied permission to sit day after day and month after month. They cannot get their work done. This is inequitable, unwise, and completely undemocratic.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I could not agree with the Senator more. Furthermore, I do not see any problem in the matter of attending committee hearings and yet being available for a vote. We have electronic equipment in the Capitol and in the Senate Office Buildings, if a committee is sitting and Senators are required on the floor all that is needed is to ring the bell and the Senators will come here. A Senator would respond from a committee meeting as readily as from the privacy of his office.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, fifth on my list of problems is the following, and I invite this matter to the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

Historically, the custom has grown up and has been enshrined in the rules that certain favored legislative committees have three ad hoc members appointed to the Committee on Appropriations when their legislative recommendations are being considered. There are a number of other committees which, for reasons known to no man, do not have that privilege. Among those committees is the Committee on Commerce and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

When the Committee on Appropriations came to consider the poverty appropriation yesterday—and I made this point before it—it was suggested there were two members of the Committee on Appropriations who were also on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. However, neither of those two members were members of the subcommittee which carried on the extensive hearings and markups of the poverty bill. Billions and billions of dollars are appropriated every year by the Committee on Appropriations with little opportunity to inform itself of the legislative work done by the appropriate substantive committees.

I would urge that when we come to consider the Monroney report next January we see to it that every legislative committee which brings to the floor legislation which would require an appropriation, be represented on an ad hoc basis on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the Senator name any bill enacted by Congress that does not involve the appropriation of some funds? That would mean every committee would have to be represented.

Mr. CLARK. They should.

Mr. ELLENDER. To do so would make the Committee on Appropriations so large that it would be hard to handle it.

Mr. CLARK. My suggestion would apply only when an appropriation for a particular area in which a legislative

committee has jurisdiction is before the subcommittee.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand.

Mr. CLARK. This is done for six or seven committees now. Why those particular committees are selected, I do not know. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is one, but the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is not. I do not know why. I guess that it is history.

Mr. President, my second major point deals with the poverty program. I wish to express appreciation to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and colleagues for having increased the appropriation recommendation over the amount funded by the House by over $100 million, and by striking from the House bill certain restrictions.

I am delighted that the committee in the Senate struck those restrictions down and increased the appropriation of the House by $100 million. In spite of this the poverty program is still vastly underfunded. The Senate and the House both cut back the authorization below the minimum required to continue the poverty program on an adequate basis during the current year.

The House Committee on Appropriations cut back to the tune of almost $200 million, $100 million of which is being restored. Ordinarily, I would have moved to restore the full appropriation while we were considering this bill. But obviously because of the rush of adjournment and for various other reasons, I waited until after the third reading to make these remarks.

Believe me when I say that this appropriation is inadequate. The full authorized amount is needed and even that is not enough to meet the needs of the 35 million Americans living in poverty.

Now, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] I would like to ask him to refer to page 19 of the committee report. My questions deal with the last paragraph on page 19, which I should like to read into the RECORD:

> **The House bill language carried the following ceilings on the amounts: $200,000,000 for the Job Corps, $325,000,000 for the Neighborhood Youth Corps, $25,000,000 for special impact programs, $18,250,000 for the program authorized by the Nelson amendment, $18,250,000 for the program authorized by the Scheuer amendment and $26,000,000 for the VISTA program. The committee has stricken these limitations from the bill.**

Do I understand in striking those provisions from the bill that the committee had in mind that the allocations of the authorization bill should govern?

(At this point, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts assumed the chair.)

Mr. PASTORE. Not necessarily because this authorization bill was up to the maximum amount of $1,750 million, which is $87.5 million less than that in the appropriations bill, but it gives some authority to the Director, Mr. Shriver, to make allocations. He has, in testimony before our committee, subscribed to the categories and amounts designated in the final authorization report by the conference committee.

Mr. CLARK. I think the Senator is correct, but more than that, in the authorization bill itself, amounts are allocated by title and by program. These authorizations, subject to the necessity to allocate the cuts would be binding on the Director, although he would retain his right, as given by existing law, to transfer not more than 10 percent from title to title.

Mr. PASTORE. I would say that the Senator is correct about that.

Mr. CLARK. Would the Senator agree that the right to transfer, which is set forth in existing law, is not in any way affected by action of the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. PASTORE. No, because all we did was to take out limitations from the appropriation bill which reverts back, of course, to the classic law that was in the authorization bill; but, beyond that, the Director has freedom to make the allocations as prescribed under the authorization bill.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. I am happy to have had this colloquy with the Senator from Rhode Island in order to establish the basic fact that the Appropriations Committee is not attempting to change what was done in the authorization bill, but merely to appropriate some $87 million less than the authorization called for.

I regret the decision to cut $87 million, and I think we will suffer from it during the rest of this fiscal year. But, again, I want to commend the Senator from Rhode Island and his colleagues for having raised by $100 million the amount appropriated by the House. I hope when the conference is held that in the interest of the 35 million poor people of America, the Senate conferees will stand firm.

Mr. PASTORE. The only thing that concerns me, is that I would hope we could hold our position in conference. I think we will have a Herculean job to do that.

As between the cut and the language, I would prefer the language rather than the cut. I say that very sincerely because in the process of carrying out the function as prescribed under the authorization act, I think that the discretion on the part of the Director to put the money where it will do the most good is much more important, possibly, than the cut itself, although that is regrettable. If it were up to me, I certainly would go along with the $1,750 million; but, after all, we must realize that there are people on the Appropriations Committee who sincerely do not look at it in the same way we do.

Mr. CLARK. As the Senator is aware, I gave testimony before his subcommittee yesterday.

Mr. PASTORE. I certainly am.

Mr. CLARK. I say this for the record, so that our friends in the House may be able to read it. I spoke for the entire conference committee which worked extremely diligently to decide how the money would be allocated. I would hope very much that when the Senator goes into conference with his colleagues in the House, he will be able to advise them that the conferees from the House are in accord with the action taken by the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not know how much effect that will have, but I will do that.

Mr. CLARK. I do not know, either.

Mr. PASTORE. But the Senator knows that the thinking in appropriations is different from the thinking in authorizations.

Mr. CLARK. To my sorrow, I have learned that over the years.

Mr. PASTORE. That is traditional in the Senate. When the Senator comes to the Appropriations Committee, who knows, he may become similarly indoctrinated.

Mr. CLARK. Although I hold the Appropriations Committee in high regard, I would not like to be similarly indoctrinated.

Mr. PASTORE. When we have responsibility over the spending of money, we become a little more careful.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. If I could have the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island, the fact is, the cut was restored and was restored across the board; is that not correct?

Mr. PASTORE. That is right.

Mr. JAVITS. Therefore, it is not only a matter of honoring so far as is possible what the authorization bill declared, but it is also a matter of allowing the Director to retain the relationship between the titles, so that the reductions can be across the board with no programs specifically protected from such reductions.

Mr. PASTORE. I would hope that the Director would look at it in precisely that way.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague. Regarding the $100 million which the committee restored, I do think that the Senator should think seriously of the fact that we were terribly short of money in the authorization bill and in the conference. I hope the Senator will forgive me, but I would commend to him the most prayerful consideration in conscience of the sums absolutely necessary to run this program so that he may fight for the full $100 million.

Mr. PASTORE. All right.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator wish the floor in his own right?

Mr. NELSON. I wish to ask the Senator one or two questions.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. NELSON. This report has just been published and, unfortunately, I have not had an opportunity to study it. In reference to the paragraph on page 19 of the report, which the Senator from Rhode Island was discussing with the Senator from Pennsylvania, there were enumerated in that paragraph the ceilings which have been placed on various parts of the program—and then there is the sentence, "The committee has stricken these limitations from the bill."

Despite the colloquy between the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Pennsylvania, I do not understand the effect of this.

Mr. PASTORE. Here is the story. What the Senator is telling me now is related to the Nelson-Scheuer amendment.

Mr. NELSON. Both amendments are affected, but I am particularly concerned about my amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not question that. The Senator has every right to be concerned about his amendment. The authorization on that was $73 million.

Mr. NELSON. Yes. The conference committee agreed on an authorization of $36.5 million for the Nelson amendment and $36.5 million for the Scheuer amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. The House version of this appropriation bill gets it down to $36.5 million.

Mr. NELSON. To be divided, $18.25 million for the Scheuer amendment and $18.25 million for the Nelson amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct. I think the Senator took the matter up with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] who made an appeal that whatever they do in allocating this money, in no instance should the figure fall below the $36.5 million. In all probability, I would hope it would be larger than that in the distribution of the money, if we can hold the money.

Mr. NELSON. It was not then the intent of the Appropriations Committee to reduce the amount, for the Nelson amendment, below the $18.25 million.

Mr. PASTORE. Of course not. After all, we added $100 million, and I would assume that that would indicate an attitude of increasing.

Mr. NELSON. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I should like to be associated with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. Last year, I testified before the Monroney committee considering the reorganization of the Government. At that time I recommended that there be two sessions of Congress each year, one for legislation and authorization, the other for appropriations. I am convinced that if this procedure were adopted, the practice of reporting such large supplemental appropriation bills as the one we have before us today could be avoided. In my judgment, the executive branch ought to be able to determine before the last minute the needs of the executive branch of the Government and to submit its requests accordingly; the Appropriations Committees could then have ample time to consider them; and after the Appropriations Committees had acted, the House and Senate could have ample time to consider the bills and not be forced to wait until the last minute, on the eve of adjournment, to pass them.

I do not know how much longer the Government can continue to spend more than it is taking in. The practice has been continuing for a long time. The last year the budget was balanced was 1960, the last year of the Eisenhower administration. In the last 36 years, the budget has been balanced in only 6 years. Certainly payday will come someday.

It seems to me that procedures could be devised so that Congress could determine the amount to be spent and provide the taxes to pay it, or to reduce the appropriations so that they would come within the expected revenue. It is unsound financing to continue spending year after year more than is taken in. No State in the Nation follows such a procedure. It is true that some States spend more in one year, but they generally make up the difference in the next year.

The constitution of my State of South Carolina provides that if more money is spent than the revenue received in a particular year, a tax must be imposed at the next session of the legislature to pay the deficit.

Congress must devise some way to balance the budget, because spending—overspending and big spending—is the very root of most of the troubles confronting the country. Big spending has enabled foreign aid to go to Communist and pro-Communist countries. Big spending has enabled the U.S. Government to inject itself into fields as to which it has no constitutional authority. Big spending has resulted in deficit financing, and deficit financing is now costing the country approximately $1 billion a month in interest.

Big spending has brought on inflation; and as anyone knows now who has purchased goods of any kind anywhere, the cost of living has gone up tremendously and is still rising. Big spending has resulted in tight money. Homebuilders are unable now to obtain funds with which to build houses and to allow the private enterprise segment of the economy to expand and go forward.

Big spending has resulted in high interest rates, the highest since 1921. They are the highest interest rates the Nation has had in 45 years.

Big spending is bringing controls into the lives of the people of the country. Unless Congress stops the big spending, more and more controls will be exerted upon the lives of the people.

Each year that passes we are going into new fields of jurisdiction. We are spending more and more. This is going to bring to the people of this country an exercise of government that they have never felt before. Eventually it is going to deprive the people of their freedom, because big spending by the Government circumvents the freedom the people now enjoy.

I hope Congress will devise procedures, I hope Congress will take steps, to provide a sensible procedure whereby we will not spend more than we take in.

Of course, I realize that in time of war or emergency it may be necessary to spend more than we take in in any particular year during such war or emergency, but at other times there should be no excuse for it. We should absolutely not spend more than we take in except in time of war or emergency.

I realize that many people say, and I have heard some economists say, they see no harm in big spending; that in view of the size of our gross national product, the Government spends less now than it did years ago in proportion to the gross national product. This is not sound thinking. Again I say a government should be operated on a sound basis. There is hardly a State in the Nation which is operated as the Federal Government is.

I hope we will have reorganization. I hope the Monroney committee will come up with procedures that will enable our Government to keep its budget balanced. I think this is essential and must be done if we are to avoid new controls and regimentation of the lives of the people of this country.

Mr. President, what I have said is no reflection whatever on the work of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], but I have felt for a long time that we must have sound procedures whereby we can balance the budget of this Nation in order that we can maintain a sound fiscal policy and a sound economy, because a sound economy is essential, along with a sound military policy.

We must remain strong, not only militarily but also economically as well as spiritually, if this Nation is to survive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? [Putting the question.]

The bill (H.R. 18381) was passed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. PASTORE, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. MUNDT conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I merely want to say at this juncture that, under very trying and very pressing circumstances, I feel the committee did a yeoman job in bringing this bill before the Senate. I think the best evidence of that is that the bill is intact as it was reported out of committee. The bill could not have been reported that way unless we had had the fine work of the staff. Sometimes we do not take time to pay tribute to the work of dedicated public servants.

At this point I wish to read the names of the members of the staff to whom I give my thanks: Mr. Scott, Mr. Woodruff, Mr. Witeck, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Downey, Mr. Merrick, Mr. Eaton, Mr. Schafer, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. King, Mr. Borda, and Mr. Clark.

We are deeply indebted to them for their skills, their knowledgeability and their untiring application to this task which comes at a hard pressed hour of the Senate session.

I thank them for the fine work they did for the subcommittee in performing their task.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I say "Amen" in joining the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee in these remarks.

LEGISLATIVE JURISDICTION OVER LANDS WITHIN FEDERAL REFORMATORY AT CHILLICOTHE, OHIO

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate H.R. 18284.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 18284) to authorize the Attorney General to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands within the Federal Reformatory at Chillicothe, Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I ask that the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, this bill from the House contemplates that the United States shall withdraw from exercising legislative jurisdiction over the Chillicothe Reformatory. The Reformatory has been leased to the State of Ohio under existing law and all criminal actions and civil transactions come within the jurisdiction of the United States.

The Attorney General of the United States has requested that the Federal Government be permitted to step out so as to allow the State of Ohio to exercise that jurisdiction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record as a part of my remarks a copy of a letter from the Attorney General to the Vice President and the statement on this bill made in the House by Mr. McCulloch on yesterday, which appears beginning on page 27646 of the Congressional Record for yesterday.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Office of the Attorney General,
Washington, D.C., October 10, 1966.

The Vice President,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Vice President: I am enclosing for your consideration and appropriate reference a legislative proposal "To authorize the Attorney General to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands within the Federal Reformatory located at Chillicothe, Ohio."

The United States presently has exclusive jurisdiction over the lands comprising this Federal Reformatory. The proposal would authorize the Attorney General to relinquish to the State of Ohio all or any portion of such jurisdiction as he deems necessary. Relinquishment of jurisdiction would be accomplished by filing notice thereof with the Governor of the State of Ohio and would be effective upon acceptance by the State in such manner as its laws may prescribe.

This legislation is needed because of the developments outlined below which will result in the Chillicothe facility being used for State rather than Federal purposes. The Federal Reformatory at Chillicothe is, at the present time, surplus to the needs of the Federal Bureau of Prisons and its use as a Federal correctional institution is being discontinued. The number of youthful offenders under treatment at this installation has declined to such an extent that it would be more economical and efficient to transfer the inmates to other available and more suitable Federal facilities. It is anticipated that this change in facility utilization also will result in substantial improvements in the programs for the treatment of youthful offenders.

On the other hand, the officials of the State of Ohio find that the facility at Chillicothe would be quite useful and they are anxious to be permitted to use it, hoping that this addition and their current building program would assist them in developing a better correctional system. Therefore, the facility is to be leased to the State of Ohio on condition that it be used so that its value as a Federal correctional facility will be preserved. The permit for the State use will be revocable, so that the facility would be returned to Federal use if and when a need develops. The Bureau of Prisons, General Services Administration, and the State of Ohio presently are preparing the necessary documents to effect the contemplated transfer. It is anticipated that the lease will become effective December 1, 1966.

Since the United States has exclusive jurisdiction over the area on which the Federal Reformatory is located, unless jurisdiction is ceded by the United States and accepted by the State of Ohio, an incongruous situation will result, because any future violations of law which take place after these premises are under State control would have to be prosecuted in the Federal courts. It is therefore desirable that exclusive jurisdiction over this area be ceded to the State of Ohio.

The attached proposal follows the pattern of similar legislation enacted in recent Congresses. See for example legislation affecting Fort Sheridan, Illinois (75 Stat. 398; Public Law 87-160); Eglin Air Force Base, Florida (76 Stat. 436; Public Law 87-636); Fort Hancock, New Jersey (76 Stat. 438; Public Law 87-640); the Naval Supply Depot, Ogden, Utah (76 Stat. 545; Public Law 87-660); Fort Devens, Massachusetts (78 Stat. 336; Public Law 88-384); United States Naval Hospital, Portsmouth, Virginia (78 Stat. 336; Public Law 88-385); Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation (78 Stat. 619; Public Law 88-501); Camp McCoy, Wisconsin (79 Stat. 582; Public Law 89-144); and lands at the mouth of the Columbia River in the States of Washington and Oregon (80 Stat. 202; Public Law 89-452).

I urge the prompt and favorable consideration of this legislation prior to the adjournment of the 89th Congress, if at all possible.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this legislation from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

——— ———,
Attorney General.

Authorizing Attorney General To Adjust Legislative Jurisdiction by United States Over Lands Within Federal Reformatory, Chillicothe, Ohio

Mr. McCulloch. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 18284) to authorize the Attorney General to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands within the Federal Reformatory at Chillicothe, Ohio, introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler].

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Speaker. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

"H.R. 18284

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Attorney General may, at such times as he may deem desirable, relinquish to the State of Ohio all, or such portion as he may deem desirable for relinquishment, of the jurisdiction heretofore acquired by the United States over any land within the Federal Reformatory, Chillicothe, Ohio, reserving to the United States such concurrent or partial jurisdiction as he may deem necessary. Relinquishment of jurisdiction under the authority of this Act may be made by filing with the Governor of the State of Ohio a notice of such relinquishment, which shall take effect upon acceptance thereof by the State of Ohio in such manner as its laws may prescribe."

Mr. McCulloch. Mr. Speaker, the United States presently has exclusive jurisdiction over the lands comprising this Federal reformatory. The proposal would authorize the Attorney General to relinquish to the State of Ohio all or any portion of such jurisdiction as he deems necessary. Relinquishment of jurisdiction would be accomplished by filing notice thereof with the Governor of the State of Ohio and would be effective upon acceptance by the State in such manner as its laws may prescribe.

This legislation is needed because of the developments outlined below which will result in the Chillicothe facility being used for State rather than Federal purposes. The Federal reformatory at Chillicothe is, at the present time, surplus to the needs of the Federal Bureau of Prisons and its use as a Federal correctional institution is being discontinued. The number of youthful offenders under treatment at this installation has declined to such an extent that it would be more economical and efficient to transfer the inmates to other available and more suitable Federal facilities. It is anticipated that this change in facility utilization also will result in substantial improvements in the programs for the treatment of youthful offenders.

On the other hand, the officials of the State of Ohio find that the facility at Chillicothe would be quite useful and they are anxious to be permitted to use it, hoping that this addition and their current building program would assist them in developing a better correctional system. Therefore, the facility is to be leased to the State of Ohio on condition that it be used so that its value as a Federal correctional facility will be preserved. The permit for the State use will be revocable, so that the facility would be returned to Federal use if and when a need develops. The Bureau of Prisons, General Services Administration, and the State of Ohio presently are preparing the necessary documents to effect the contemplated transfer. It is anticipated that the lease will become effective December 1, 1966.

Since the United States has exclusive jurisdiction over the area on which the Federal reformatory is located, unless jurisdiction is ceded by the United States and accepted by the State of Ohio, an incongruous situation will result, because any future violations of law which take place after these premises are under State control would have to be prosecuted in the Federal courts. It is therefore desirable that exclusive jurisdiction over this area be ceded to the State of Ohio.

The attached proposal follows the pattern of similar legislation enacted in recent Congresses. See, for example, legislation, affecting Fort Sheridan, Ill. (75 Stat. 398; Public Law 87–160); Eglin Air Force Base, Fla. (76 Stat, 436; Public Law 87–636); Fort Hancock, N.J. (76 Stat. 438; Public Law 87–640); the Naval Supply Depot, Ogden, Utah (76 Stat. 545; Public Law 87–660); Fort Devens, Mass. (78 Stat. 336; Public Law 88–384); U.S. Naval Hospital, Portsmouth, Va. (78 Stat. 336; Public Law 88–385); Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation (78 Stat. 619; Public Law 88–501); Camp McCoy, Wis. (79 Stat. 582; Public Law 89–144); and lands at the mouth of the Columbia River in the States of Washington and Oregon (80 Stat. 202; Public Law 89–452).

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the bill be passed. I am assured of favorable action by the other body before the end of the session.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 18284 and urge its immediate adoption. As has been pointed out a rather peculiar situation will arise in this instance. The Federal Government is negotiating a lease of these premises with the State of Ohio. The Federal Government over my strong objection has determined they no longer need the facilities at Chillicothe, Ohio. Fortunately for the area the State had the foresight to take advantage of the situation and is going to continue these facilities in operation through a program of its own, as I shall subsequently outline. But because the United States has exclusive jurisdiction over the land, it is necessary to relinquish such portion of that jurisdiction as will not only expedite the lease negotiations but also provide for uniform administration and operation of the facilities by the State.

It would be cumbersome to have an operation in part under State law and in part under Federal law. As an example, if this bill does not pass, any violation committed on the premises, even after the State had accepted the property under a leasehold agreement, would have to be prosecuted in the Federal courts. This would lead to many problems and create an undesirable situation to say the least. It could even raise questions as to the legality of any lease and possibly hold up the action of the State.

The continued use of this reformatory by another governmental agency, namely, the State of Ohio, will lessen the economic impact of the loss of Federal activity at this institution.

I have been in constant touch with the Bureau of Prisons ever since it was rumored that the Federal Government might close down the reformatory because of changes in its overall program, and have worked toward this mutually beneficial arrangement.

It is indeed fortunate that the State of Ohio is in a position to lease the reformatory and thus maintain it into the future. I would not want a legal technicality to stand in the way.

Ohio officials have presented a sound proposal for utilizing the facility and are enthusiastic about the opportunity to accelerate their long-range development program. This bill will expedite the acquisition of this facility and will allow a transfer of the administration of the facility with a minimum of inconvenience. There is adequate precedence for this legislation as pointed out by the Attorney General in his letter to the Speaker and I strongly urge its adoption.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and was passed.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 18233.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 18233) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was read twice by title.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I have at the desk an amendment in the form of a substitute to strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute in lieu of the text of H.R. 18233 the language contained in the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE I—RIVERS AND HARBORS

"SEC. 101. The following works of improvement of rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood control, and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with the plans and subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in the respective reports hereinafter designated. The provisions of section 1 of the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945 (Public Law Numbered 14, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this title; and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto, shall apply as if herein set forth in full.

"Navigation

"Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 494, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,899,000;

"Carolina Beach Harbor, North Carolina: House Document Numbered 515, Eighty-ninth Congress, maintenance;

"Southport Harbor, North Carolina: House Document Numbered 514, Eighty-ninth Congress, maintenance;

"Gulf County Canal, Florida: House Document Numbered 481, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $477,000;

"Saint Lucie Inlet, Florida: House Document Numbered 508, Eighty-ninth Congress, maintenance;

"Pearl River, Mississippi and Louisiana: House Document Numbered 482, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $630,000;

"Biloxi Harbor, Mississippi: House Document Numbered 513, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $753,000;

"Elk Creek Harbor, Pennsylvania: House Document Numbered 512, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $920,000;

"Conneaut Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 484, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $495,000;

"Cross Village Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 490, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $723,000;

"Mississippi River-Fort Madison Harbor, Iowa: House Document Numbered 507, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $975,000;

"Beach erosion

"Ocracoke Inlet to Beaufort Inlet, North Carolina: House Document Numbered 509, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,800,000;

"Mullet Key, Florida: House Document Numbered 516, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $286,000;

"Pinellas County, Florida: House Document Numbered 519, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $116,000;

"San Diego (Sunset Cliffs), California: House Document Numbered 477, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $809,000.

"SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys to be made at the following named localities and subject to all applicable provisions of section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950:

"Mexico Beach, Florida.

"Great Lakes, particularly Lake Ontario and Lake Erie, in connection with water supply, pollution abatement, navigation, flood control, hydroelectric power, and related water resources development and control.

"SEC. 103. The project for navigation on the Upper Mississippi River from the Illinois River to Minneapolis, Minnesota, authorized by the Act of July 30, 1930, as extended and amended, is hereby modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army to reimburse any common carrier by railroad for the cost of permanent reconstrutcion and repair of the Stone Arch Bridge at Minneapolis, Minnesota, performed by such carrier, to repair the damage to such bridge caused by floods during April and May 1965, except that such reimbursement shall not exceed $700,000.

"SEC. 104. The Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to cause an immediate study to be made, under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, in cooperation with appropriate agencies and representatives of the States of Illinois, of the Illinois and Michigan Canal, its lands and appurtenances extending from Chicago to the Illinois River at La Salle as constructed by the State of Illinois pursuant to the provisions, as applicable, of the Acts of March 30, 1822 (3 Stat. 659), March 2, 1827 (4 Stat. 234), and March 2, 1833 (4 Stat. 662) with a view toward determining (1) those portions no longer required for navigation, (2) the feasibility and advisability of declaring such portions abandoned as a navigable waterway, and (3) procedures for releasing and quitclaiming to the States of Illinois the reversionary interests of the United States in such lands not required for navigation purposes. The Secretary shall report to the Congress the results of such study together with his recommendations thereon not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

"SEC. 105. Notwithstanding any provision in the General Bridge Act of 1946 or any other Act of Congress, in the case of the bridge constructed by the city of East Saint Louis, Illinois, across the Mississippi River, pursuant to Public Law Numbered 639, enacted by the Seventy-ninth Congress of the United States of America at the second session, and the bridge constructed across the

Mississippi River by the city of Chester, Illinois, pursuant to Public Law Numbered 191, enacted by the Seventy-sixth Congress of the United States of America, as amended by Public Law Numbered 751, enacted by the Seventy-sixth Congress of the United States of America, and Public Law Numbered 85–512, enacted by the Eighty-fifth Congress of the United States of America at the second session, if the applicable law of the State of Illinois provides or permits the establishment of reasonable tolls sufficient for the reasonable cost of maintaining, operating, and repairing said bridges and the approaches thereto under economical management, and provide a sinking fund to amortize the cost of any bonds or other obligations issued to finance such cost, including reasonable interest and financing costs as soon as possible under reasonable charges and within the period of thirty years from completion, reconstruction, repair, and improvement of such bridge or extensions thereof, and permits or provides the transfer to said city of any surplus income to the city to be used for a proper public purpose, and each of said cities have adopted instruments authorizing construction of said bridges and by such instruments provided for the financing of the same under the applicable State statutes, including the transfer of surpluses to said cities for a proper public purpose, then each such city may, prior to January 1, 1969, charge tolls in the manner and to the extent provided in such instruments, and all collections from such bridges heretofore retained or transferred to said cities shall be valid collections, and may be retained by said cities and used and applied for a proper purpose. An accurate record of the cost of each such bridge and the approaches thereto, the expenditures for maintaining, operating, and repairing the same, including amounts transferred to the cities in accordance with the terms of any instrument adopted by said cities for financing the cost of the bridge and the daily tolls collected, shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

"SEC. 106. (a) The consent and approval of Congress is given to the compact between the States of Missouri and Illinois creating a Missouri-Illinois-Jefferson-Monroe Bridge Commission which reads as follows:

"'*Compact between Illinois and Missouri creating a Missouri-Illinois-Jefferson-Monroe Bridge Commission*

"'Article I

"'There is hereby created a Missouri-Illinois-Jefferson-Monroe Bridge Commission (hereinafter referred to as the commission) which shall be a body corporate and politic and which shall have the following powers and duties;

"'1. To plan, construct, maintain and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River at or near Crystal City, Missouri, at a point deemed by the commission as most suitable to the interests of the citizens of the States of Illinois and Missouri in accordance with the provisions of an act of the Seventy-ninth Congress, Second Session, of the United States entitled "The General Bridge Act of 1946";

"'2. To purchase, maintain and, in its discretion, to operate all or any ferries across the Mississippi River within twenty-five miles of the site selected for the bridge;

"'3. To contract, to sue and be sued in its own name; to purchase or otherwise acquire, hold, and dispose of real and personal property;

"'4. To acquire by proper condemnation proceedings such real property as may be necessary for the construction and operation of the bridge and the approaches thereto;

"'5. To issue bonds on the security of the revenue derived from the operation of the bridge and ferries for the payment of the cost of the bridge, its approaches, ferry or ferries, and the necessary lands, easements and appurtenances thereto including interest during construction and all necessary engineering, legal, architectural, traffic surveying and other necessary expenses. Such bonds shall be the negotiable bonds of the commission, the income of which shall be tax free. The principal and interest of the bonds, and any premiums to be paid for their retirement before maturity, shall be paid solely from the revenues derived from the bridge and ferries;

"'6. To establish and charge tolls for transit over such bridge and ferries in accordance with the provisions of this compact;

"'7. To perform all other necessary and incidental functions.

"'Article II

"'The rates of tolls to be charged for transit over such bridge and ferries shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintenance, repairs and operation (including the approaches to the bridge) under economical management, and also to provide a sinking fund sufficient to pay the principal and interest of the outstanding bonds. All tolls and other revenues derived from facilities of the commission are hereby pledged to such uses.

"'Article III

"'The commission shall keep an accurate record of the cost of the bridge and of other expenses and of the daily revenues collected and shall report annually to the governor of each state setting forth in detail the operations and transactions conducted by it pursuant to this agreement and any legislation thereunder.

"'Article IV

"'When the bonds have been retired, the part of the bridge within the state of Illinois shall be conveyed to the state of Illinois, and that part within the state of Missouri to the state of Missouri, and the high contracting parties to this compact do hereby agree that thereafter the bridge shall be free of tolls and shall be properly maintained, operated and repaired by the two states as may be agreed upon.

"'Article V

"'The commission shall consist of ten members, five of whom shall be qualified electors of the state of Illinois and shall reside in Monroe County, or counties adjacent thereto, Illinois, and five of whom shall be qualified electors of the state of Missouri and shall reside in Jefferson County, or counties adjacent thereto, Missouri. The Illinois members are to be chosen by the state of Illinois, and the Missouri members by the state of Missouri in the manner and for the terms fixed by the legislature of each state, except as herein provided.

"'Article VI

"'1. The commission shall elect from its number a chairman and a vice-chairman, and may appoint such officers and employees as it may require for the performance of its duties and shall fix and determine their qualifications and duties.

"'2. Until otherwise determined by the legislatures of the two states no action of the commission shall be binding unless taken at a meeting at which at least three members from each state are present and unless a majority of the members from each state present at such meeting shall vote in favor thereof. Each state reserves the right hereafter to provide by law for the exercise of the veto power by the governor thereof over any action of any commissioner appointed therefrom.

"'3. The two states shall provide penalties for violations of any order, rule or regulation of the commission, and for the manner of enforcing same.

"'Article VII

"'The commission is authorized and directed to proceed with the planning and construction of the bridge and the approaches thereto as rapidly as may be economically practicable and is hereby vested with all necessary and appropriate powers, not inconsistent with the constitution or the laws of the United States or of either state, to effect the same, except the power to assess or levy taxes.

"'Article VIII

"'In witness thereto, we have hereunto set our hands and seals under authority vested in us by law.'

"(b) The right to alter, amend, or repeal this section is expressly reserved.

"SEC. 107. (a) The consent of Congress is hereby given to the compact, signed by the compact representatives for the States of Kansas and Oklahoma on the 31st day of March 1965, at Wichita, Kansas, and thereafter ratified by the legislature of each of the States aforesaid, which compact is as follows:

"'*Arkansas river basin compact, Kansas-Oklahoma*

"'The state of Kansas and the state of Oklahoma, acting through their duly authorized compact representatives, Robert L. Smith and Warden L. Noe, for the state of Kansas, and Geo. R. Benz and Frank Raab, for the state of Oklahoma, after negotiations participated in by Trigg Twichell, appointed by the president as the representative of the United States of America, and in accordance with the consent to such negotiations granted by an act of Congress of the United States of America, approved August 11, 1955 (Public Law 340, 84th Congress, 1st session), have agreed as follows repecting the waters of the Arkansas river and its tributaries:

"'Article I

"'The major purposes of this compact are: A. To promote interstate comity between the states of Kansas and Oklahoma;

"'B. To divide and apportion equitably between the states of Kansas and Oklahoma the waters of the Arkansas river basin and to promote the orderly development thereof;

"'C. To provide an agency for administering the water apportionment agreed to herein;

"'D. To encourage the maintenance of an active pollution-abatement program in each of the two states and to seek the further reduction of both natural and man-made pollution in the waters of the Arkansas river basin.

"'Article II

"'As used in this compact: A. The term "state" shall mean either state signatory hereto and shall be construed to include any person or persons, entity or agency of either state who, by reason of official responsibility or by designation of the governor of that state, is acting as an official representative of that state;

"'B. The term "Kansas-Oklahoma Arkansas river commission" or the term "commission" means the agency created by this compact for the administration thereof;

"'C. The term "Arkansas river" means that portion of the Arkansas river from a pont immediately below the confluence of the Arkansas and Little Arkansas rivers in the vicinity of Wichita, Kansas, to a point immediately below the confluence of the Arkansas river with the Grand-Neosho river near Muskogee, Oklahoma;

"'D. The term "Arkansas river basin" means all of the drainage basin of the Arkansas river as delimited above, including all tributaries which empty into it between the upstream and downstream limits;

"'E. The term "waters of the Arkansas river and its tributaries" means the waters originating in the Arkansas river basin;

“ ‘F. The term “conservation storage capacity” means that portion of the active storage capacity of reservoirs, including multipurpose reservoirs, with a conservation storage capacity in excess of 100 acre-feet, available for the storage of water for subsequent use, but it excludes any portion of the storage capacity allocated to flood and sediment control and inactive storage capacity allocated to other uses;

“ ‘G. The term “new conservation storage capacity” means conservation storage capacity for which construction is initiated after July 1, 1963, and storage capacity not presently allocated for conservation storage which is converted to conservation storage capacity after July 1, 1963, in excess of the quantities of declared conservation storage capacity as set forth in the storage table attached to and made a part of the minutes of the twenty-fourth meeting of the compact committee dated September 1, 1964, and as filed and identified to this compact in the offices of the secretaries of state of the respective states;

“ ‘H. The term “pollution” means contamination or other alterations of the physical, chemical, biological or radiological properties of water or the discharge of any liquid, gaseous, or solid substances into any waters which creates or is likely to result in a nuisance, or which renders or is likely to render the waters into which it is discharged harmful, detrimental or injurious to public health, safety, or welfare or which is harmful, detrimental or injurious to beneficial uses of the water.

“ ‘Article III

“ ‘The physical and other conditions peculiar to the Arkansas river basin constitute the basis for this compact, and neither of the states hereby, nor the Congress of the United States by its consent hereto, concedes that this compact establishes any general principle with respect to any other interstate stream.

“ ‘Article IV

“ ‘A. For the purpose of apportionment of water between the two states, the Arkansas river basin is hereby divided into major topographic subbasins as follows: (1) The Grand-Neosho river subbasin; (2) the Verdigris river subbasin; (3) the Salt Fork river subbasin; (4) the Cimarron river subbasin; and (5) the mainstem Arkansas river subbasin which shall consist of the Arkansas river basin, excepting the Grand-Neosho river, Verdigris river, Salt Fork river, and Cimarron river subbasins.

“ ‘B. The two states recognize that portions of other states not signatory to this compact lie within the drainage area of the Arkansas river basin as herein defined. The water apportionments provided for in this compact are not intended to affect nor do they affect the rights of such other states in and to the use of the waters of the basin.

“ ‘Article V

“ ‘The state of Kansas shall have free and unrestricted use of the waters of the Arkansas river basin within Kansas subject to the provisions of this compact and to the limitations set forth below:

“ ‘A. New conservation storage capacity in the Grand-Neosho river subbasin within the state of Kansas shall not exceed 650,000 acre-feet plus an additional capacity equal to the new conservation storage in said drainage basin in Oklahoma excepting storage on Spavinaw creek;

“ ‘B. New conservation storage capacity in the Verdigris river subbasin within the state of Kansas shall not exceed 300,000 acre-feet plus an additional capacity equal to the new conservation storage in said drainage basin in Oklahoma, excepting navigation capacity allocated in Oologah reservoir;

“ ‘C. New conservation storage capacity in the mainstem Arkansas river subbasin within the state of Kansas shall not exceed 600,000 acre-feet plus an additional capacity equal to the new conservation storage in said drainage basin in Oklahoma;

“ ‘D. New conservation storage capacity in the Salt Fork river subbasin within the state of Kansas shall not exceed 300,000 acre-feet plus an additional capacity equal to the new conservation storage in said drainage basin in Oklahoma;

“ ‘E. New conservation storage capacity in the Cimarron river subbasin within the state of Kansas shall not exceed 5,000 acre-feet, provided that new conservation storage capacity in excess of that amount may be constructed if specific project plans have first been submitted to and have received the approval of the commission.

“ ‘Article VI

“ ‘The state of Oklahoma shall have free and unrestricted use of the waters of the Arkansas river basin within Oklahoma subject to the provisions of this compact and to the limitations set forth below:

“ ‘New conservation storage capacity in the Cimarron river subbasin within the state of Oklahoma shall not exceed 5,000 acre-feet provided that new conservation storage capacity in excess of that amount may be constructed if specific project plans have first been submitted to and have received the approval of the commission.

“ ‘Article VII

“ ‘A. The commission shall determine the conditions under which one state may construct and operate for its needs new conservation storage capacity in the other state. The construction or utilization of new conservation storage capacity by one state in the other state shall entitle the state whose storage potential is reduced by such construction to construct an equal amount of new conservation storage in a subbasin agreeable to the commission.

“ ‘B. New conservation storage capacity constructed by the United States or any of its agencies, instrumentalities or wards, or by a state, political subdivision thereof, or any person or persons shall be charged against the state in which the use is made.

“ ‘C. Each state has the unrestricted right to replace within the same subbasin, any conservation storage capacity made unusable by any cause.

“ ‘D. In the event reallocation of storage capacity in the Arkansas river basin in Oklahoma should result in the reduction of that state's new conservation storage capacity, such reallocation shall not reduce the total new conservation storage capacities available to Kansas under Article V; provided that a subsequent reinstatement of such storage capacity shall not be charged as an increase in Oklahoma's new conservation storage capacity.

“ ‘Article VIII

“ ‘A. In the event of importation of water to a major subbasin of the Arkansas river basin from another river basin, or from another major subbasin within the same state, the state making the importation shall have exclusive use of such imported waters.

“ ‘B. In the event of exportation of water from a major subbasin for use in another major subbasin or for use outside the Arkansas river basin within the same state, the limitations of Articles V and VI on new conservation capacity shall apply against the subbasin from which the exportation is made in the amount of the storage capacity actually used for that purpose within the exporting subbasin or, in the event of direct diversion of water without storage, on the basis of five acre-feet of conservation storage capacity for each acre-foot of water on the average so diverted annually.

“ ‘C. Any reservoir storage capacity which is required for the control and utilization of imported waters shall not be accounted as new conservation storage.

“ ‘D. Should a transbasin diversion of water of the Arkansas river basin be made in one state for the use and benefit of the other state or both states, the commission shall determine a proper accounting of new conservation storage capacities in each state in accordance with the above principles and with the project uses to be made in that state.

“ ‘Article IX

“ ‘The states of Kansas and Oklahoma mutually agree to: A. The principle of individual state effort to abate man-made pollution within each state's respective borders, and the continuing support of both states in an active pollution-abatement program;

“ ‘B. The cooperation of the appropriate state agencies in Kansas and Oklahoma to investigate and abate sources of alleged interstate pollution within the Arkansas river basin whenever such matters are called to their attention by the commission;

“ ‘C. Enter into joint programs for the identification and control of sources of natural pollution within the Arkansas river basin which the commission finds are of interstate significance;

“ ‘D. The principle that neither state may require the other to provide water for the purpose of water-quality control as a substitute for adequate waste treatment;

“ ‘E. Utilize the provisions of the federal water pollution control act in the resolution of any pollution problems which cannot be resolved within the provisions of this compact.

“ ‘Article X

“ ‘A. There is hereby created an interstate administrative agency to be known as the ‘Kansas-Oklahoma Arkansas river commission.’ The commission shall be composed of three commissioners representing each of the states of Kansas and Oklahoma who shall be appointed by the governors of the respective states and, if designated by the president, one commissioner representing the United States. The president is hereby requested to designate a commissioner and an alternate representing the United States. The federal commissioner, if one be designated, shall be the presiding officer of the commission, but shall not have the right to vote in any of the deliberations of the commission.

“ ‘B. One Kansas commissioner shall be the state official who now or hereafter shall be responsible for administering water law in the state; the other two commissioners shall reside in the Arkansas river basin in Kansas and shall be appointed to four-year staggered terms.

“ ‘C. One Oklahoma commissioner shall be the state official who now or hereafter shall be responsible for administering water law in the state; the other two commissioners shall reside in the Arkansas river basin in Oklahoma and shall be appointed to four-year staggered terms.

“ ‘D. A majority of the commissioners of each state and the commissioner or his alternate representing the United States, if so designated, must be present to constitute a quorum. In taking any commission action, each signatory state shall have a single vote representing the majority opinion of the commissioners of that state.

“ ‘E. The salaries and personal expenses of each commissioner shall be paid by the government which he represents. All other expenses which are incurred by the commission incident to the administration of this compact shall be borne equally by the two states and shall be paid by the commission out of the “Kansas-Oklahoma Arkansas river commission fund.” Such fund shall be initiated and maintained by equal payments of each state into the fund. Disbursements shall be made from said fund in such manner as may be authorized by the commission. Such fund shall not be subject to the audit and accounting procedures of the states; however, all receipts and disbursements of funds handled by the commission shall be audited by a qualified independent public accountant at regular intervals, and the report of such audit shall be included in and become a part of the annual report of the commission.

" 'Article XI

" 'A. The commission shall have the power to: (1) Employ such engineering, legal, clerical and other personnel as in its judgment may be necessary for the performance of its functions under the compact;

" '(2) Enter into contracts with appropriate state or federal agencies for the collection, correlation, and presentation of factual data, for the maintenance of records, and for the preparation of reports;

" '(3) Establish and maintain an office for the conduct of its affairs;

" '(4) Adopt rules and regulations governing its operations;

" '(5) Cooperate with federal agencies in developing principles, consistent with the provisions of this compact and with federal policy, for the storage and release of water from all-federal capacities of federal reservoirs, both existing and future within the Arkansas river basin, for the purpose of assuring their operation in the best interests of the states and the United States;

" '(6) Permit either state, with the consent of the proper operating agency, to impound water, for such periods of time deemed necessary or desirable by the commission, in available reservoir storage capacity which is not designated as conservation or new conservation storage capacity for subsequent release and use for any purpose approved by the commission;

" '(7) Hold hearings and take testimony and receive evidence at such times and places as it deems necessary;

" '(8) Secure from the head of any department or agency of the federal or state government such information, suggestions, estimates and statistics as it may need or believe to be useful for carrying out its functions and as may be available to or procurable by the department or agency to which the request is addressed;

" '(9) Print or otherwise reproduce and distribute all of its proceedings and reports.

" 'B. The commission shall: (1) Cause to be established, maintained and operated such stream, reservoir, or other gaging stations as may be necessary for the proper administration of the compact;

" '(2) Collect, analyze and report on data as to stream flows, water quality, conservation storage, and such other information as is necessary for the proper administration of the compact;

" '(3) Perform all other functions required of it by the compact and do all things necessary, proper or convenient in the performance of its duties thereunder;

" '(4) Prepare and submit an annual report to the governor of such signatory state and to the president of the United States covering the activities of the commission for the preceding fiscal year, together with an accounting of all funds received and expended by it in the conduct of its work;

" '(5) Prepare and submit to the governor of each of the states of Kansas and Oklahoma an annual budget covering the anticipated expenses of the commission for the following fiscal year;

" '(6) Make available to the governor or any state agency of either state or to any authorized representatives of the United States, upon request, any information within its possession.

" 'Article XII

" 'A. Recognizing the present limited uses of the available water supplies of the Arkansas river basin in the two states and the uncertainties of their ultimate water needs, the states of Kansas and Oklahoma deem it imprudent and inadvisable to attempt at this time to make final allocations of the new conservation storage capacity which may ultimately be required in either state, and, by the limitations on storage capacity imposed herein, have not attempted to do so. Accordingly, after the expiration of 25 years following the effective date of this compact, the commission may review any provisions of the compact for the purpose of amending or supplementing the same, and shall meet for the consideration of such review on the request of the commissioners of either state; provided, that the provisions hereof shall remain in full force and effect until changed or amended by unanimous action of the states acting through their commissioners and until such changes are ratified by the legislatures of the respective states and consented to by the congress in the same manner as this compact is required to be ratified to become effective.

" 'B. This compact may be terminated at any time by the appropriate action of the legislatures of both signatory states.

" 'C. In the event of amendment or termination of the compact, all rights established under the compact shall continue unimpaired.

" 'Article XIII

" 'Nothing in this compact shall be deemed: A. To impair or affect the powers, rights or obligations of the United States, or those claiming under its authority, in, over and to the waters of the Arkansas River Basin;

" 'B. To interfere with or impair the right or power of either signatory state to regulate within its boundaries the appropriation, use and control of waters within that state not inconsistent with its obligations under this compact.

" 'Article XIV

" 'If any part or application of this compact should be declared invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, all other provisions and applications of this compact shall remain in full force and effect.

" 'Article XV

" "This compact shall become binding and obligatory when it shall have been ratified by the legislatures of each state and consented to by the Congress of the United States, and when the congressional act consenting to this compact includes the consent of congress to name and join the United States as a party in any litigation in the United States Supreme Court, if the United States is an indispensable party, and if the litigation arises out of this compact or its application, and if a signatory state is a party thereto. Notice of ratification by the legislature of each state shall be given by the governor of that state to the governor of the other state and to the president of the United States and the president is hereby requested to give notice to the governor of each state of consent by the Congress of the United States.

" 'In Witness Whereof, The authorized representatives have executed three counterparts hereof each of which shall be and constitute an original, one of which shall be deposited in the archives of the Department of State of the United States, and one of which shall be forwarded to the governor of each state.

" 'Done at the City of Wichita, state of Kansas, this 31st day of March, A.D. 1965.

" 'Approved:

" 'Robert L. Smith,

" 'Warden L. Noe,

" 'Compact Representatives for the state of Kansas.

" 'Geo. R. Benz,

" 'Frank Raab,

" 'Compact Representatives for the state of Oklahoma.

" 'Trigg Twichell,

" 'Representative of the United States.'

"(b) In order to carry out the purposes of this section, and the purposes of article XV of this compact consented to by Congress by this section, the congressional consent to this compact includes and expressly gives the consent of Congress to have the United States of America named and joined as a party litigant in any litigation in the United States Supreme Court, if the United States of America is an indispensable party to such litigation, and if the litigation arises out of this compact, or its application, and if a signatory State to this compact is a party litigant, in the litigation.

"(c) The right to alter, amend, or repeal this section is expressly reserved.

"Sec. 108. (a) Subsection (b) of the first section of the Act entitled 'An Act authorizing the city of Rock Island, Illinois, or its assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Rock Island, Illinois, and to a place at or near the city of Davenport, Iowa', approved March 18, 1938 (52 Stat. 110), as amended, is amended by striking out the comma after 'foregoing' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '(1) the construction of an additional span to increase the capacity of the bridge and (2)'.

"(b) Subsection (c) of the first section of such Act of March 18, 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: 'except that the construction of an additional span authorized as part of such reconstruction, enlargement, and extension shall be commenced not later than April 1, 1970, and shall be completed within three years after such date'.

"(c) Nothing in this section or the amendments made by this section shall be construed to interfere with or delay future construction of a properly authorized bridge over the Mississippi River at or near the city of Davenport, Iowa.

"Sec. 109. (a) The consent of Congress is hereby granted to Duke Power Company, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a dam with overflow spillway crest at elevation 475 mean sea level across Savannah River between Anderson County, South Carolina, and Elbert County, Georgia, near Middleton Shoals, and about two hundred and ninety-seven miles above the mouth of said river, for the purpose of providing a pool for condenser water for a steam-electric plant. Construction on such dam shall not be commenced until the plans therefor have been submitted to and approved by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and by the Secretary of the Army, and when such plans have been approved by the Chief of Engineers and by the Secretary of the Army, there shall be no deviation from such plans either before or after completion of said dam unless the modification of such plans has previously been submitted to and approved by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army. In approving the plans for said dam such conditions and stipulations may be imposed as the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army may deem necessary to protect the present and future interest of the United States. Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize the use of such dam to develop waterpower or generate hydroelectric energy. The grantee and its successors shall hold and save the United States free from all claims arising from damage which may be sustained by the dam authorized in this section, or damage sustained by the appurtenances of the said dam, by reason of the future construction and operation by the United States of Hartwell Dam and Reservoir or the Trotters Shoals Dam and Reservoir authorized in section 203 of this Act, or any other Federal project upstream or downstream from the dam authorized by this section. In order to make feasible the dam and steam-electric generating plant which Duke Power Company intends to construct, it is hereby expressly provided that, should such dam and plant be constructed, (1) no existing or future unit at Hartwell Reservoir will be operated to pump water from below Hartwell Dam back to Hartwell Reservoir, and (2) a volume of water per week equal to at least an average flow of one thousand five hundred cubic feet per second shall be discharged from Hartwell Reservoir. The Secretary of the Army, upon his finding that such discharges result in damages to Hartwell Reservoir, and after giving the company reasonable notice and opportunity to be heard, shall determine and fix a reasonable and equitable annual charge to be paid by the company to the United States as compensation for such damages.

"(b) The authority granted by this section shall cease and be deemed null and void unless the actual construction of the dam authorized by this section is commenced within twelve years and completed within fifteen years from the date of enactment of this Act. The authority granted by this section shall not be deemed a bar to, or grounds for delaying the construction of the Trotters Shoals project authorized in section 203 of this Act.

"(c) The right to alter, amend, or repeal this section is hereby expressly reserved.

"SEC. 110. The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is hereby authorized and directed, in order to reduce future maintenance costs of the authorized navigation project for Johns Pass, Pinellas County, Florida, to provide suitable protective measures over a frontage of approximately one thousand linear feet of shore along the north end of Treasure Island, at an estimated first cost for construction of approximately $100,000. Local interests shall contribute in cash 40 per centum of the first cost of construction; provide necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way for construction and subsequent maintenance of the project; hold and save the United States free from damages that may be attributed to the project; bear all costs exceeding $500,000 Federal cost for the complete project, including the navigation channel. Local interests may be reimbursed for such protective measures as they may undertake in accordance with plans approved by the Chief of Engineers, subject to the above limitations. Funds authorized to carry out section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960, as amended, shall be available to carry out this section.

"SEC. 111. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to provide for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge, with visitor facilities, over the Washington Channel, from the vicinity of Tenth Street Southwest to East Potomac Park in Washington, District of Columbia. The structure may be so designed and constructed as to provide facilities for the accommodation of visitors to the Nation's Capital area, and to provide convenient and adequate access to East Potomac Park.

"(b) The Secretary may obtain and use such lands or interests therein owned, controlled, or administered by the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, the Corps of Engineers, or any other Government agency, with the prior consent of such agency or agencies, as he shall consider necessary for the construction and operation of said bridge, without cost or reimbursement. Before construction is commenced, the location and plans for the bridge shall be approved by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army subject to such conditions as they may prescribe, in accordance with section 502(b) of the General Bridge Act of 1946 (33 U.S.C. 525b).

"(c) The Secretary is authorized to enter into appropriate arrangements for the construction and operation of the bridge in accordance with the authority contained in section 3 of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended, except that any such arrangements need not be limited to a maximum term of thirty years. The bridge, at all times, shall be under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, and shall be administered, operated, maintained, and policed as a part of the park system of the National Capital.

"(d) The Secretary of the Interior shall cooperate with other Federal and local agencies with respect to the construction and operation of the bridge by him and the construction and operation of associated facilities by such other Federal and local agencies including the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency which shall enter into appropriate arrangements by negotiation or public bid to (i) lease all or part of the land bounded by Maine Avenue, Ninth Street and the Southwest Freeway, Southwest, to provide for the construction, maintenance and operation of a structured automobile parking facility designed to accommodate visitors to East Potomac Park and (ii) provide for the construction of (a) a public park or overlook, which park is to be maintained and operated by the National Park Service; and (b) roads providing access to the Tenth Street Mall from the Southwest Freeway and to and from Ninth Street, Southwest, which roads shall be maintained and operated by the District of Columbia. Any lease of the aforementioned area, executed by the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, shall provide appropriate easements for the construction, maintenance and operation of the aforesaid public park and roadways. Local agencies may enter into arrangements with the person, persons, corporation or corporations, as the Secretary may select pursuant to subsection (c) hereof for the construction and operation of necessary associated facilities otherwise authorized.

"(e)(1) There is hereby established an advisory committee, which shall be composed of the Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission; the Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts; the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia; the Chief of Engineers, United States Army; the Chairman, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency; and three members to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior from among the residents of the Metropolitan Washington area. The ex-officio members of the Committee may be represented by their designees.

"(2) Members of the Committee shall serve without compensation, but the Secretary is authorized to pay any expenses reasonably incurred by the Committee in carrying out its responsibilities under this section.

"(3) The Secretary shall designate one member of the Committee to be Chairman. The Committee shall act and advise by the affirmative vote of a majority of its members.

"(4) The Secretary or his designee shall, from time to time, consult with and obtain the advice of the Committee with respect to matters relating to the design, construction, and operation of the bridge and any associated facilities.

"(f) The construction and operation of the bridge shall be at no expense to the Federal Government, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for maintenance of the bridge and to carry out the other purposes of this section.

"SEC. 112. The authorization of the comprehensive plan for the Alabama-Coosa River and tributaries, as provided in the River and Harbor Act, approved March 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 10), as amended, insofar as it authorizes a development of the Crooked Creek site on the Tallapoosa River in Randolph County, Alabama, for electric power and other public purposes is hereby suspended to permit the development of the Tallapoosa River and tributaries by construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam located not more than fifteen miles below the confluence of the Tallapoosa and Little Tallapoosa Rivers and by other project works in accordance with the conditions of a license, if issued, pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 791(a)). If no application for license is made within two years after the date of the enactment of this section, or upon an order of the Federal Power Commission becoming final denying the application or applications for a license made within such two-year period, the authorization relating to the Crooked Creek site provided for in the Act, approved March 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 10), shall have the same status as it would have had if this section had not been enacted.

"SEC. 113. Title I of this Act may be cited as the 'River and Harbor Act of 1966'.

"TITLE II—FLOOD CONTROL

"SEC. 201. Section 3 of the Act approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law Numbered 738, Seventy-fourth Congress), as amended by section 2 of the Act approved June 28, 1938 (Public Law Numbered 761, Seventy-fifth Congress), shall apply to all works authorized in this title except that for any channel improvement or channel rectification project, provisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of said Act of June 22, 1936, shall apply thereto, except as otherwise provided by law. The authorization for any flood control project authorized by this Act requiring local cooperation shall expire five years from the date on which local interests are notified in writing by the Secretary of the Army or his designee of the requirements of local cooperation, unless said interests shall within said time furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that the required cooperation will be furnished.

"SEC. 202. The provisions of section 1 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (Public Law Numbered 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this Act, and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto shall apply as if herein set forth in full.

"SEC. 203. The following works of improvement for the benefit of navigation and the control of destructive floodwaters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the plans in the respective reports hereinafter designated and subject to the conditions set forth therein. The necessary plans, specifications, and preliminary work may be prosecuted on any project authorized in this title with funds from appropriations hereafter made for flood control so as to be ready for rapid inauguration of a construction program. The projects authorized in this title shall be initiated as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements. Penstocks and similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam authorized in this Act for construction by the Department of the Army when approved by the Secretary of the Army on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission.

"Merrimack River Basin

"The project for North Nashua River, Massachusetts, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 113, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $15,816,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Sudbury River at Saxonville, Massachusetts, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 61, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,300,000.

"Long Island Sound

"The project for food protection on the Pequonnock River, Connecticut, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 115, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,000,000.

"Middle Atlantic coastal area

"The project for hurricane-flood control protection at Beaufort Inlet to Bogue Inlet, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 479, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $320,000.

"The project for hurricane-flood control protection at Bogue Inlet to Moore Inlet, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 480, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,249,000.

"The project for hurricane-flood control protection from Cape Fear to the North Carolina-South Carolina State line, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 511, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,310,000.

"The project for hurricane-flood control protection for Mainland Areas, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 475, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,048,000.

"The project for hurricane-flood control protection for the Outer Banks—Virginia State line to Hatteras, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 476, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,652,000.

"Savannah River Basin

"The project for construction of the Trotters Shoals Reservoir on the Savannah River, Georgia and South Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 52, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $84,900,000. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize inclusion of pumped storage power in this project.

"Lower Mississippi River Basin

"The project for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River, adopted by the Act of May 15, 1928 (45 Stat. 534) as amended and modified by subsequent Acts of Congress, including the Flood Control Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–298), is hereby further modified and expanded to included the following items:

"(1) The project for flood protection in the Teche-Vermilion Basins, Louisiana, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 524, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,100,000.

"(2) Bank revetment for the protection of existing industrial facilities along the river below Baton Rouge, Louisiana, where, in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers, such bank protection is justified.

"Arkansas and Red Rivers

"The project for water quality control in the Arkansas and Red River Basin, Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas, designated as 'Part I,' hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 110, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $46,400,000. Actual construction of the part I works shall not be initiated until the related and supporting works of part II have been authorized by Congress.

"Ouachita River Basin

"The project for Bayou Bartholomew, Arkansas and Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 506, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,360,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Ouachita River at Monroe, Louisiana, authorized in section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1965, is hereby modified to provide for construction in accordance with plan B in House Document Numbered 328, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,160,000.

"Upper Mississippi River Basin

"The project for flood protection on the Mississippi River between river mile 195 and mile 300, Illinois and Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 510, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,193,000.

"Ohio River Basin

"The project for Little Sandy River and Tygarts Creek, Kentucky, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 517, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $15,000,000.

"The project for Taylorsville Reservoir, Salt River, Kentucky, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 502, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $24,800,000.

"The project for Stonewall Jackson Reservoir, West Fork River, West Virginia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 109, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $34,500,000.

"Meramec River Basin

"The project for flood protection and other purposes in the Meramec River Basin, Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 525, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $45,971,000: *Provided*, That construction of this project shall not be initiated until the President has approved a report prepared by the Secretary of the Army reexamining the basis on which the project was formulated and the arrangements for cost sharing.

"Great Lakes Basin

"The project for flood protection on the Maumee River in Ottawa, Ohio, hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 485, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,413,000.

"The project for flood protection on Red Creek, Monroe County, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 107, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,430,000.

"Pajaro River Basin

"The project for flood protection on the Pajaro River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 491, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $11,890,000.

"Klamath River Basin

"The project for flood protection on the Klamath River at and in the vicinity of Klamath, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 478, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,460,000.

"Columbia River Basin

"The project for flood protection on the Boise River, vicinity of Boise, Idaho, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 486, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,576,000.

"Sacramento River Basin

"The project for Marysville Dam and Reservoir, Yuba River Basin, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 501, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $132,900,000.

"Russian River Basin

"The project for Knights Valley, Russian River Basin, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 518, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $166,800,000.

"Skagit River Basin

"The project for flood protection on the Skagit River, Washington, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 483, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,804,000.

"Sec. 204. The second paragraph under the heading 'San Francisco Bay Area' in section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 is hereby amended to read as follows:

" 'The project for Corte Madera Creek, Marin County, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 545, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,790,000. Local interests shall contribute in cash 1.5 per centum of the Federal construction cost of the Ross Valley Unit, a contribution presently estimated at $110,000.'

"Sec. 205. The Secretary of the Army acting through the Chief of Engineers is authorized to provide such school facilities as he may deem necessary for the education of dependents of persons engaged on the construction of the Libby Dam and Reservoir project, Montana, and to pay for the same from any funds available for such project. When he determines it to be in the public interest, the Secretary, acting through the Chief of Engineers, may enter into cooperative arrangements with local agencies for the operation of such Government facilities, for the expansion of local facilities at Federal expense, and for contributions by the Federal Government to cover the increased cost to local agencies of providing the educational services required by the Government.

"Sec. 206. Section 206 of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 500) is amended to read as follows:

" 'Sec. 206. (a) In recognition of the increasing use and development of the flood plains of the rivers of the United States and of the need for information on flood hazards to serve as a guide to such development, and as a basis for avoiding future flood hazards by regulation of use by States and political subdivisions thereof, and to assure that Federal departments and agencies may take proper cognizance of flood hazards, the Secretary of the Army, through the Chief of Engineers, is hereby authorized to compile and disseminate information on floods and flood damages, including identification of areas subject to inundation by floods of various magnitudes and frequencies, and general criteria for guidance of Federal and non-Federal interests and agencies in the use of flood plain areas; and to provide advice to other Federal agencies and local interests for their use in planning to ameliorate the flood hazard. Surveys and guides will be made for States and political subdivisions thereof only upon the request of a State or a political subdivision thereof, and upon approval by the Chief of Engineers, and such information and advice provided them only upon such request and approval.

" '(b) The Secretary of the Army is authorized to expend not to exceed $7,000,000 per fiscal year for the compilation and dissemination of information under this section.'

"SEC. 207. The project for the improvement of the Mississippi River below Cape Girardeau with respect to the West Tennessee tributaries, authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1948, is hereby modified to provide that the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall, subsequent to enactment of this Act, relocate at Federal expense all gas transmission lines required to be relocated by this project, or at his discretion, reimburse local interests for such relocations made by them.

"SEC. 208. Section 2 of the Act of June 28, 1879 (21 Stat. 37; 33 U.S.C. 642), is amended (1) by inserting in the third sentence thereof after 'and the commissioners appointed under this Act' a comma and the following: 'except those appointed from civil life,', and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'Each commissioner appointed from civil life after the date of enactment of this sentence shall be appointed for a term of nine years.'

"SEC. 209. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel and major drainage improvements, and floods aggravated by or due to wind or tidal effects, to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, in drainage areas of the United States and its territorial possessions, which include the localities specifically named in this section. After the regular or formal reports made on any survey authorized by this section are submitted to Congress, no supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made unless authorized by law except that the Secretary of the Army may cause a review of any examination or survey to be made and a report thereon submitted to Congress, if such review is required by the national defense or by changed physical or economic conditions.

"Watersheds and streams of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, with respect to a framework plan for developing water resources of the region.

"Watersheds and streams within the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River below Cairo, Illinois, with respect to a framework plan for developing water resources of the region.

"Watersheds and streams draining into the Great Lakes including the lake areas within the United States, and into the St. Lawrence River at points within the United States with respect to a framework plan for developing water resources of the region.

"The Souris River and the Red River of the north and tributaries within the United States, including adjacent streams in Minnesota draining into Canada, with respect to a framework plan for developing water resources of the region.

"The Arkansas, White, and Red Rivers and tributaries, exclusive of their drainage lying in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River, with respect to a framework plan for developing water resources of the region.

"Watersheds and streams and their tributaries which drain into the Gulf of Mexico along the coastline of Texas, exclusive of the Rio Grande River, with respect to a framework plan for developing water resources of the region.

"Watersheds and streams of Hawaii, with respect to a framework plan for developing water resources of the region.

"Watersheds and streams of Alaska, with respect to a framework plan for developing water resources of the region.

"Great South Bay, New York, including the waters of adjoining lesser bays and inlets with respect to water utilization and control. Such investigations and study shall include, but not be limited to, navigation, fisheries, flood control, control of noxious weeds, water pollution, water quality control, beach erosion, and recreation.

"Cibolo Creek, in and near the community of Presidio, Texas.

"Pacific Palisades Area at and in the vicinity of Los Angeles County, California, study of landslides, soil erosion, surface and subsurface drainage conditions, flood control and seismic disturbances. Such study to be made in cooperation with the United States Geological Survey of the Department of Interior.

"Spring Valley Creek, Sweetwater River, California.

"SEC. 210. The last sentence of the first paragraph under the heading 'Lower Mississippi River Basin' in section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1965 is hereby amended to read as follows: 'The monetary authorization for the lower Mississippi River project authorized by this Act shall be combined with the overall monetary authorization heretofore made available for prosecution of the entire lower Mississippi River and tributaries project and be available for application to any portion of the entire project.'

"SEC. 211. The Secretary of the Army shall reimburse any common carrier by railroad for the cost of protective works constructed by such carrier during the year 1966 along the banks of the Eel River, California, to deter recurrence of damage to land banks by floods or high waters, but such reimbursement shall not exceed $1,200,000.

"SEC. 212. Title II of this Act may cited as the 'Flood Control Act of 1966.' "

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, this is the omnibus rivers and harbors flood control measure. The House has considered the matter, as had the Senate at a prior date. We have a difference, of course, in the Senate and House bills insofar as the total amount of authorization is concerned. The Senate-passed bill authorized $820 million for 43 projects. The House has acted on its version. It has passed, in effect, a measure, which, in agreement in conference, provides for $670 million.

We are dropping the so-called Devil's Jump project in Kentucky; so we are thinking in terms, now, of 42 projects rather than 43.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is this a unanimous report?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Good.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I had intended to make extensive remarks about the magnificent work done by the Committee on Public Works, the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations, the Subcommittee on Supplemental Appropriations, and the full Appropriations Committee concerning their determined and strong support of the school districts in the area of Libby and Lincoln County, which lies in northwest Montana. Coupled with the cooperation of the Corps of Engineers, their efforts will be highly effective in producing vitally needed facilities to accommodate the vast influx of workers and their families.

With work proceeding on the huge Libby Dam in northwestern Montana, the school districts of Libby and the surrounding area are faced with a serious problem of overcrowding. Senator METCALF and I have been most concerned with this crisis, and have made strong representations to the Federal agencies involved.

Our first efforts were directed toward helping to extend aid under Public Law 815 to category B children and to secure the necessary funds under the Supplemental Appropriations Act to carry it out. This is the standard program of the Office of Education of assistance to federally impacted areas.

In the meantime, we were successful in amending the Public Works Appropriation Act of 1966 to direct the Army Corps of Engineers to construct school facilities on a priority basis. It now turns out that the Corps proviso makes unnecessary further action under Public Law 815 and its companion law, Public Law 874. Senator METCALF and I have received the assurance of the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] that the authority now granted the Corps of Engineers will guarantee not only that that organization will construct the necessary school facilities, but that it will provide operating expenses as well. I am further assured by the Corps itself that it will work closely with local school officials and the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to move swiftly in meeting the problem.

The question of operating expenses has been of concern to Senator METCALF and myself. We are gratified by the assurances of the Corps and of Senator ELLENDER that these are contained within the purview of the authorization.

I do not know how many school districts will qualify for aid under this new arrangement. It would seem, however, that the number will increase as more workers flock to the damsite. As of now, there are six districts in Lincoln County and three elsewhere in the area which have been receiving funds under Public Law 874, the law which provides assistance for school maintenance and operation in federally affected areas.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment and the debate assuring prompt consideration of the Lincoln schools in Montana be printed at this point in the RECORD. This debate occurred on October 7, 1966.

There being no objection, the amendment and the debate were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The legislative clerk read as follows: On page 5, line 21 after the word "purpose" insert "*Provided further*, That appropriations under this head shall be available to the Chief of Engineers for the purposes authorized by Section 6 of the Flood Control Act of 1946; *Provided further*, That the authority contained therein is extended to include the Libby Dam and Reservoir Project in Montana."

Mr. Mansfield. Mr. President, it would be my hope that the distinguished chairman of the committee would accept the amendment, because it does not call for additional funds. It calls for transferability.

We do face a very serious school situation with the Libby project in Montana. It is getting worse by the week. This authority proposed by this amendment is necessary at this time so that the schoolchildren will be cared for.

Mr. Ellender. Mr. President, we followed the same procedure in connection with some of the large projects in the Columbia and Missouri River basins where the dams required a long period of time to construct. This procedure was followed in North and South Dakota as I recall.

The Libby Dam, I understand, will probably require 4, 5, or 6 years to complete. I am sure that the procedure to be followed here is that which has been followed in similar situations in the past; to provide adequate schools for the children of workers on the project.

I would have no objection to agreeing to the amendment.

The Presiding Officer. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana. [Putting the question.]

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the debate between the chairman of the committee and the Senator from Montana assuring Montana's right to priority in the use of power generated at Libby Dam be inserted at this point in the Record. This debate also occurred on October 7, 1966.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the Record was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. Mansfield. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may ask him some questions?

Mr. Ellender. I yield.

Mr. Mansfield. As the Senator from Louisiana knows, this appropriation bill provides an appropriation of $32 million to continue the construction of Libby Reservoir on the Kootenai River in Montana, on which construction was very recently initiated. The project as presently planned will initially provide 420,000 kilowatts of installed capacity and will ultimately provide 840,000 kilowatts of power. To my knowledge, there is a provision in the debate on the Columbia Basin Treaty under the authorization for this project which would provide for the residents of the State of Montana some preferential claim upon the power benefits to derive from this project's construction. I would like to call your attention to a colloquy I had with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] with respect to a power allocation from Libby Dam for the use of the State of Montana.

I read now an extract from the Congressional Record of March 16, 1961:

"Senator Mansfield: * * * Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished acting chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee a question, if I may. On page 6 of the report covering the hearings on the Columbia River Treaty, my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], makes the following statement:

" 'I have very little to add to what my colleagues have said, except Senator Mansfield and I insist on an at-site power allocation for Montana similar to the Hungry Horse formula.'

"It is the understanding of the senior Senator from Montana that, insofar as Libby Dam is concerned, if it is built, every effort will be made to see to it that, as in the Hungry Horse project, we will achieve a proportionate share of power from that dam to Montana for the use of the State of Montana."

May I ask the chairman of the subcommittee if that is correct?

Mr. Ellender. That statement is correct.

Mr. Mansfield [reading]:

"* * * I consider it only right and proper that the residents of the State of Montana be given a first claim to a reasonable portion of these benefits. Now, I know of a number of precedents in the authorization of other projects which give such rights to the citizens of the State where projects of this type were to be located."

Is that correct?

Mr. Ellender. The Senator has, in the course of his remarks, cited a few precedents for the provision for preferential consideration for the State where the project is located. Such precedents certainly exist in this case.

Mr. Mansfield. In connection with the authorization for Hungry Horse?

Mr. Ellender. Yes, and there are other precedents, in both the Columbia and Missouri Rivers.

Mr. Mansfield. This is one of the precedents to which I refer. There is also a precedent for preferential use of power for certain projects in the Missouri River Basin. This was provided under the authorization for development of the Missouri River Basin in the 1958 Flood Control Act. It is pertinent to state that a somewhat similar sense of Congress was expressed, though on a broader scale, in the passage of Public Law 88–552 approved August 31, 1964, which was an act primarily designed to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest area first call on the electric energy generated at hydroelectric plants in that region.

Mr. Ellender. That is correct.

Mr. Mansfield. As far as additional specific references and information on the particular legislation being discussed are concerned, Public Law 88–552, which was enacted just prior to the authorization of the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie, had as its principal purpose the prevention of the sale of power to the Southwest as long as there was a demand for such power by users in the Northwest. By way of further explanation, the 1944 Flood Control Act carries a provision which gives preference in the sale of power and energy to public bodies and cooperatives. Public Law 88–552 was designed to prevent this type customer in one region from having a preference over the nonpreference users in the area where the power was to be generated—in those instances where there was a demand by nonpreference users in the area of origin.

The act which authorized the Hungry Horse project gave recognition to the rights of the State in which this project was to be located by giving preferential allocation of the benefits which were to result from its construction. The Hungry Horse Dam was authorized by the act of June 5, 1944, and section 1 thereunder reads, as follows:

"That for the purpose of irrigation and reclamation of arid lands, for controlling floods, improving navigation, regulating the flow of the South Fork of the Flathead River, for the generation of electric energy, and for other beneficial uses primarily in the State of Montana but also in downstream areas, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to proceed as soon as practicable with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the proposed Hungry Horse Dam (including facilities for generating electric energy) on the South Fork of the Flathead River, Flathead County, Montana, to such a height as may be necessary to impound not less than one million acre-feet of water."

Also, the Flood Control Act approved July 3, 1958, included a special provision which protected the interests of the States in which projects were located by authorizing reasonable amounts of the power to be generated by such projects to be reserved for use within such States. The authorization to which I refer reads as follows:

"In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $200,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Missouri River Basin, approved in the Act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented by subsequent Acts of Congress: *Provided*, That with respect to any power attributable to any dam in such plan to be constructed by the Corps of Engineers, the construction of which has not been started, a reasonable amount of such power as may be determined by the Secretary of Interior, or such portions thereof as may be required from time to time to meet loads under contract made within this reservation, shall be made available for use in the State where such dam is constructed: *Provided*, That the distribution and sale of such reserved power within the State shall be made first to preference users in keeping with the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944; and *provided further*, that the power so reserved for use within the State shall be not to exceed 50 per centum of the output of such dams."

Does the Senator care to make any comment on that?

Mr. Ellender. I can see, Senator, the precedent in prior legislation and I would agree that it is only proper that the immediate area and the State where these water resource developments are located, as in the case of Hungry Horse, should be given a right to place a reasonable degree of first call upon the benefits of these projects. I believe Montana is entitled to it since the dam is located in that State it will be more economical to dispose of the power near the source of production and I do not see how the Bonneville Power Authority can fail to provide at least a fair share of the electricity generated to your State.

That has occurred in the Northwest and the Southwest.

Mr. Mansfield. And even in the Missouri River Basin.

Mr. Ellender. And even in the Missouri River Basin. It is my belief that Montana is entitled to have priority in the distribution of electricity generated by the falling water in that locality. The nearer the electricity is to the place where it is generated, the cheaper it will be.

Mr. Mansfield. And it resulted in Anaconda Aluminum being located at Columbia Falls near Hungry Horse.

Mr. Ellender. Montana would be entitled to electricity produced because of its proximity to the facility that produced the electricity.

Mr. Mansfield. In other words, we should be given first priority on our own resource. That was the committee's intent and the way the committee wants it carried out?

Mr. Ellender. That is correct.

Mr. Mansfield. Mr. President, I am delighted with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, which fit in with the thoughts of the people of Montana and the full congressional delegation from that State. I am happy to have this statement in the Record. I express my deep appreciation to the chairman not only for his statement but for the fine work he has done on the committee through the years, not only on this bill but on other bills; and it has been no easy job, I assure the Senate.

Mr. Ellender. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record at this point an excerpt from the Congressional Record of October 14, 1966, showing the debate between the chairman of the committee, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], and myself.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the Record was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. Mansfield. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. Randolph. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. Mansfield. Mr. President, I have discussed with the distinguished chairman of the committee an amendment which I had intended to offer before his committee, but when I approached him he told me they had just that day reported out the bill. With his usual graciousness, he suggested it be offered on the Senate floor.

The amendment, if I may explain it, authorizes no additional funds, but permits the transferability of funds for the purpose of supporting schools in areas where Federal projects are going up. It is a provision which will be of benefit to people in all the States where such a need exists.

Mr. President, I call up my amendment.

The Acting President pro tempore. The amendment of the Senator from Montana will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Page 28, line 7, change the period to a comma, and add the following:

"*And provided further*, That appropriations authorized under this title shall be available to the Chief of Engineers for the purposes authorized by section 6 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (Public Law 526, 79th Cong.): *And provided further*, That the authority contained therein is extended to include the Libby Dam and Reservoir project, Montana."

Mr. Mansfield. Mr. President, the Libby Dam project is faced with a most difficult school problem because of its construction on the Kootenay, which must be supplied under the terms of the Columbia Basin treaty. With the influx of construction workers, school facilities are already overtaxed. Some of the children cannot even go to school. This amendment provides for no additional funds, but relates to funds which have already been approved and enables their transfer for this purpose. This is no precedent. It has been done for the Oahe Dam project in South Dakota, and for other projects along the Missouri River and also in the Columbia River Basin.

Mr. Randolph. Mr. President, I have discussed this matter with the distinguished majority leader and also the distinguished Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong]. The Senator explained the amendment prior to its being offered. This amendment will provide funds for schools for the children of workers on these projects, and the amendment offered by the majority leader is in order. It is our desire to accept the amendment.

Mr. Mansfield. May I extend my deep personal thanks to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] and to the distinguished minority member of the committee, the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong].

The Acting President pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that section 205 of H.R. 18233, the conference report which was agreed on this afternoon, which contains section 205 relative to the need for school assistance at Libby because of the Libby project on the Kootenai River, Mont., be printed in the Record, together with a colloquy between the Senator from Montana and the chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], and the ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong].

There being no objection, the section was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Sec. 205. The Secretary of the Army acting through the Chief of Engineers is authorized to provide such school facilities as he may deem necessary for the education of dependents of persons engaged on the construction of the Libby Dam and Reservoir project, Montana, and to pay for the same from any funds available for such project. When he determines it to be in the public interest, the Secretary, acting through the Chief of Engineers, may enter into cooperative arrangements with local agencies for the operation of such Government facilities, for the expansion of local facilities at Federal expense, and for contributions by the Federal Government to cover the increased cost to local agencies of providing the educational services required by the Government.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to ask, as to section 205, which has to do with the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, being authorized to provide such school facilities as he may deem necessary for the education of dependents of persons engaged on the construction of the Libby Dam and Reservoir project in northwestern Montana, is my understanding correct, on the basis of assurances already received by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works, that as to section 205 in the bill now under consideration, the authority now granted the Corps of Engineers will guarantee not only the construction of the necessary school facilities, but will also provide operating expenses as well?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The distinguished majority leader is correct in his statement of what has been agreed to between the Senate and the House conferees.

We have slightly changed the language of the distinguished Senator from Montana, but the substance of his amendment has been retained. What he has stated is a correct interpretation of the contemplated final action.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate the statement of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works, which I am sure is in accord with the understanding of the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], because it coincides with the intent of Congress and the statements made by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, the chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And the Senator from Hawaii agrees?

Mr. FONG. Yes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on Friday, October 14, the Senate considered S. 3906, the Senate version of the bill we are now considering. We passed that measure. I considered it to be well conceived. It contained authorizations for meritorious flood control and navigational improvements throughout the Nation. In addition, it contained a number of items of general water resource legislation which would promote and carry out the civil works program administered by the United States Corps of Engineers.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Am I correct in my understanding that this bill would drop out the naming of any waterway or river projects and that where we had, on a lake, dam, or waterway project, some provision to name that project, all that is dropped out of the bill? There will be no projects named in this bill, is that correct?

Mr. RANDOLPH. In response to the question of the distinguished Senator from Alabama, it was the opinion of almost all the conferees from both bodies that the naming of lakes and reservoirs and locks and dams unnecessarily encumbered the bill, and the conferees accordingly agreed to drop all such designations from this measure.

We do have certain measures to name or to rename such projects, which have passed the Senate but have not yet passed the House. It was felt that if there were opposition to one project by name, but not to others, we would run into an unnecessarily difficult situation, and so it was our general agreement that in the interest of all, we not name any project in this measure.

Mr. HILL. When the Senator speaks of agreement, that agreement was on the part of not only the Senate conferees, but also the House conferees?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HILL. The House conferees as well as the Senate conferees agreed to leave out any naming?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator is correct. It was a unanimous agreement.

Mr. HILL. A unanimous agreement?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes, sir.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yesterday, the House considered and passed H.R. 18233, a companion bill to the Senate-passed measure. It was the intention of the managers of the bill in the House of Representatives to amend our bill, S. 3906, and send it back to have minor differences ironed out in conference.

However, the parliamentary procedure which subsequently took place was such that action of that nature was prevented. Therefore, we are faced at this late hour with two similar but not identical measures, each acted on by only one House of Congress.

Late yesterday I met with the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives. Meeting with us were the distinguished ranking minority conferee [Mr. Fong] of the Senate Public Works Committee as well as other members of the two committees.

We agreed informally that we could settle these matters in conference, and the differences between the two measures could be adjusted. We agreed that that would be appropriate, in view of the time element and the parliamentary entanglement that results, on this important legislation so vital to the development of the natural resources of our country.

We labored for 5 hours, until late last night, in order to bring to the floor a bill that would be sound and mutually acceptable, as Senator Fong and others know to be true, as agreed upon by both committees and as reflecting the general consensus of both the Senate and the House.

There were concessions made on both sides. So the amendment that I have now offered to H.R. 18233 is in the nature of a compromise, and the able Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong] and I, together with the other members of the Committee on Public Works and the conference committee, recommend that the Senate agree to this amendment here today; if such action is taken, we understand that possibly in an hour or an hour and a half the measure will be taken up in the other body.

It is my hope that, since the distinguished members of the House Committee on Public Works and the equally diligent members of the Senate committee have reached an informal agreement, it will be accepted by the House of Representatives. I am sure that that will take place.

I shall not explain the features of the bill again. We did it very thoroughly when we considered S. 3906 on Friday. We listed every project and the cost-benefit ratio on that project, and made a thorough explanation. If there is any question from any Senator, I am sure Senator Fong and I will be pleased to answer it; and we will make certain that the Record discloses all the compromise agreements which were made in the informal conference I have just mentioned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Lausche in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished Senator from West Virginia in what he has said. We labored for this bill 5 hours yesterday in an informal session with the conferees on the part of the House.

I wish to mention one particular item upon which we were not able to sustain the position of the Senate. The distinguished minority leader had introduced an amendment giving the President the right to withhold up to 20 percent of the funds on any one of these projects. When that matter was presented to the House conferees, they were adamant in the position that they would not accept such a proposal. So I regret to report that, because of their adamancy, the conferees on the part of the Senate were forced, with great reluctance, to recede on that issue.

This fact has been made known to the distinguished minority leader at the hospital, and he is well satisfied that we have done our best to try to retain this item in the bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FONG. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I concur with what my distinguished colleague, a member of the Committee on Public Works and of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, has said.

There was an adamant attitude on the part of the House conferees. We did everything we could. Subsequently we informed the minority leader of our problem, and he realizes that the pending measure is extremely important and he does not want to delay the matter further at this late hour in the Senate.

I reemphasize what the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong] has said, that the Senate conferees did everything in good conscience to support in conference the amendment of the minority leader and the position of the Senate. We presented the matter with all possible advocacy. We hoped that it would prevail. However, we did not prevail as to the amendment agreed to in the Senate, the so-called impoundment of funds.

Mr. President, I wish also to acknowledge the contributions and the diligent attention to committee action in this field on the part of our distinguished ranking minority member of the committee [Mr. Cooper], who is absent today. It was with much reluctance that the Senate conferees withdrew from the Senate authorization of the Devil's Jump project in Kentucky and Tennessee, for which the senior Senator from Kentucky has labored so long and earnestly. We were, however, assured by the House conferees that they would remain open to a reexamination of this project in the future.

I also note for the record, in response to a commitment made in the conference, that the deauthorization of the Federal project on the Crooked Creek site on the Tallapoosa River in Alabama is sponsored by both Senators from Alabama [Mr. Hill and Mr. Sparkman].

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, we kept our commitment with the distinguished minority leader. We were unable to retain the provision in the bill.

Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] is traveling in his State, but I have notified him of the action and of the position taken by the House Members in our meeting last night.

Senator Cooper is the ranking Republican member of the Public Works Committee, and he has given much attention to every omnibus bill and to the different projects authorized over the years.

Because the meeting between members of the House and Senate committees was held on such short notice, to try for action before adjournment, Senator Cooper could not make travel arrangements to return last night, and he has asked that statement of his views be included.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement of Senator Cooper be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed, as follows:

Statement of Senator Cooper

The omnibus authorization bill, S. 3906, voted by the Senate would provide needed authority for new projects and for additional construction. It is a good bill, and it is my view that all of its projects are important.

I was pleased that three projects in my State of Kentucky were included in this bill. The House voted to include two of these projects for authorization in its bill H.R. 18233, but it did not approve authorization for the Devil's Jump Dam and Reservoir on the Big South Fork of the Cumberland River.

This project has passed the Senate three times, and testimony has been given before Committees of both the House and Senate in recent years. Its benefit to cost ratio is well established, and the market for its power has again been confirmed by the Southeastern Power Administration.

Although no formal conference was held, due to the parliamentary situation that has occurred, the chairman of our committee, my friend, Senator Randolph, and the ranking Republican member present, the distinguished Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], have informed me of the stand taken by the House members who met with members of our committee last night.

I know the determination given by my colleagues in support of the position of the Senate. I am sorry that the members representing the House again refused to agree to include this project in a bill, and I regret very much this action.

The fight for Devil's Jump will be maintained. The members of the Public Works Committee of the House have pledged full and open hearings on this project next year, and when consideration is given to the next omnibus bill, I again intend to present the case for its authorization.

I appreciate the determination of the Senate and of the members who conferred on its behalf in support of this project and in support of the position of the Senate. I believe this position will ultimately prevail, and that the needs of this area of Kentucky and Tennessee will be met, and I thank the chairman and my fellow members of the Senate Committee on Public Works.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I urge that the Senate pass the bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, a number of items not in the Senate bill, but contained in the House-passed version, are included in the substitute text. These generally are of a noncontroversial nature and the Senate committee recommends their passage.

However, one of the provisions contained in the House measure, dealing with the use of surplus bridge funds, was amended prior to its inclusion in the substitute text. This item, as it passed the House, would grant congressional approval to the cities of East St. Louis and Chester, Ill., both retroactively and prospectively, to transfer surplus bridge funds for proper public purposes.

The Senate committee felt that since Illinois State law allowed municipalities to transfer such bridge revenues for proper public purposes, although apparently in conflict with Federal statutes, that allowance should be made for prior actions of these two cities since it appears they acted in good faith. Accordingly, the substitute text contains language permitting these two cities to use surplus bridge funds for proper public purposes until January 1, 1969.

In fixing the rates of the tolls to be charged on the bridges at East St. Louis, Ill., and Chester, Ill., it was required that the rates would be sufficient to provide the necessary funds to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridges and their approaches, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of the bridges and their approaches, including reasonable interest and financing, as soon as possible, under reasonable charges, but not to exceed 30 years from the date of completion of the bridges.

These conditions are being fulfilled in East St. Louis as well as Chester, and the sinking funds are being maintained on the basis of a 30-year amortization of the bridges. Thus, only surplus funds have been diverted.

In accepting the amended House language, which terminates diversion of tolls on January 1, 1969, the Senate conferees allowed for forgiveness of the funds already expended by the cities of East St. Louis and Chester and provided for sufficient time for local authorities to plan accordingly in their fiscal management.

In accepting the amended language it was not the intention of the conferees that this provision would intrude on the pending suit by the Department of Justice regarding Federal preemption in this field, nor is this action to be construed as a precedent for possible diversion of tolls elsewhere in the future. The Special Subcommittee on the Federal Aid Highway Program of the House Public Works Committee conducted extensive hearings earlier this year on the relationship of toll facilities to the Federal aid highway program, and any interpretation of congressional policy in this field would be premature until the subcommittee has reported its findings and the Committees on Public Works of both the Senate and the House have had an opportunity to consider this question in all of its implications.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that information on the items contained in H.R. 18233 as amended by the substitute language which was not in the Senate passed version of this bill, be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTION 103—UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER, FROM THE ILLINOIS RIVER TO MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

SECTION 103

This section modifies the navigation project on the upper Mississippi River from the Illinois River to Minneapolis, Minn., authorized by the act approved July 30, 1930, as extended and amended, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to reimburse any common carrier by railroad for the cost of permanent reconstruction and repair of the Stone Arch Bridge, at Minneapolis, Minn., performed by such carrier to repair the damage to the bridge caused by floods during the spring of 1965. The maximum reimbursement for such work would be $700,000.

In May 1965, the Special Subcommittee to Inspect Flooded Areas in the Upper Mississippi River Basin inspected the damaged areas around Minneapolis including the Stone Arch Bridge.

The committee notes that there is indication that the damage to the bridge was partially caused by the existence of a Federal structure, a lock and dam, immediately in the vicinity of the bridge, which diverted the flow of the floodwaters against the piers. The committee believes reimbursement would be in the public interest.

SECTION 104—ILLINOIS AND MICHIGAN CANAL

SECTION 104

The Illinois and Michigan Canal extends from Chicago southwestwardly to Peru, Ill., approximately 101 miles. It was constructed by the State of Illinois between 1836 and 1848 with Federal grants of public land under which the State obtained title to alternate sections of land along the canal route. Use of the canal ceased about 1930 with the development of the Illinois Waterway. The route of the Illinois Waterway is closely alined with that of the canal. Many portions overlap and merge their identities, and in four areas the structural facilities of the old canal are incorporated into the Illinois Waterway. Congress, by an act approved July 1, 1967, relinquished to the State of Illinois all rights of the United States in the Illinois and Michigan Canal subject to certain conditions.

This section directs the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to make a detailed study, in cooperation with appropriate agencies and representatives of the State of Illinois, of the Illinois and Michigan Canal, its lands and appurtenances to determine (1) those portions no longer required for navigation, (2) the feasibility and advisability of declaring such portions abandoned as a navigable waterway, and (3) procedures for releasing and grant claiming to the State of Illinois the reversionary interests of the United States in the lands not required for navigation purposes. The Secretary is directed to report to the Congress the results of such study together with his recommendations thereon not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the River and Harbor Act of 1966.

SECTION 105—BRIDGES AT EAST ST. LOUIS AND CHESTER, ILL.

SECTION 105

The acts of Congress authorizing construction of two bridges, one at Chester, Ill., and the other at East St. Louis, Ill., permit tolls to be charged for transit over the bridges. In fixing the rates of tolls to be charged the rates were required to be adjusted so as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridges and their approaches, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the costs of the bridges and their approaches, including reasonable interest and financing, as soon as possible, under reasonable charges, but not to exceed 30 years from the completion of the bridges. The State of Illinois has enacted legislation which authorizes municipalities to transfer revenue collected as tolls in excess of the funds required for financing the bonded indebtedness and operation and maintenance to municipalities for proper corporate purposes.

This section will permit the cities of East St. Louis and Chester, Ill., to use surplus bridge revenues, for proper public purposes, which is in accordance with Illinois State law, until January 1, 1969.

SECTION 106—COMPACT—STATES OF MISSOURI AND ILLINOIS CREATING A MISSOURI-ILLINOIS-JEFFERSON-MONROE BRIDGE COMMISSION

SECTION 106

This section grants the consent and approval of Congress to the existing compact between the States of Missouri and Illinois creating a Missouri-Illinois-Jefferson-Monroe Bridge Commission. The Commission created by the compact would be authorized to plan, construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Crystal City, Mo. in accordance with the General Bridge Act of 1946 (33 U.S.C. 525–533) and to purchase, maintain and operate all or any ferries across the Mississippi River within 25 miles of the site selected for the bridge. The Commission would have the power to acquire by condemnation real property necessary for construction and operation of the bridge, to establish and charge tolls for the use of the bridge and ferries, and to issue bonds on the security of the revenue derived from the operation. There would be no cost to the Federal Government. The committee considers that consent of Congress to the compact is warranted.

SECTION 108—BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT ROCK ISLAND, ILL.

SECTION 108

This section authorizes the construction of an additional span as part of the reconstruction, enlargement, and extension of the toll bridge across the Mississippi River from Rock Island, Ill., to Davenport, Iowa, authorized by act of Congress approved March 18, 1938, as amended. It provides that the construction of such additional span shall be commenced not later than April 1, 1970, and shall be completed within 3 years after such date, thereby extending the time during which such tolls may be charged by approximately 10 years or until April 1, 2003. There would be no cost to the Federal Government.

SECTION 110—JOHNS PASS, PINELLAS COUNTY, FLA.

SECTION 110

This section authorizes the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to provide suitable protective measures over a frontage of approximately 1,000 linear feet of shore along the north side of Treasure Island, Fla., at an estimated first cost of $100,000. This work may be accomplished by the Corps of Engineers or by the local interests who may be reimbursed for such protective measures as they may undertake in accordance with plans approved by the Chief of Engineers. The committee notes that this project will reduce future maintenance costs of the existing Federal navigation project for Johns Pass, Pinellas County, Fla.; and that local interests, in addition to furnishing the usual items of local cooperation, will contribute 40 percent of the first cost of construction. The committee considers that authorization of the proposed work is desirable.

SECTION 204—CORTE MADERA CREEK, MARIN COUNTY, CALIF.

SECTION 204

The Corte Madera project provides for approximately 8.6 miles of channel improvements and levee enlargements on Corte Madera Creek authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1962. The Chief of Engineers' report called attention to the fact that some land enhancement would occur and some of the excavated channel material would be deposited on tidal marshland and that this land would be usable within 2 or 3 years after material placement. However, the Chief of Engineers did not make a recommendation for any financial contribution due to land enhancement because of its speculative nature. The Secretary of the Army in transmitting this report to Congress recommended that local interests be required to contribute 3 percent of the Federal construction cost of the Ross Valley unit for land enhancement. The project was authorized in accordance with the recommendations of the Secretary.

The committee is satisfied that some land enhancement has resulted but not to the extent envisioned in the report. After careful consideration of all the facts gathered since 1962, the committee considers 1.5 percent of the estimated Federal construction cost of the Ross Valley unit to be a fairer and more equitable contribution from the local interests.

SECTION 207—MISSISSIPPI RIVER BELOW CAPE GIRARDEAU WITH RESPECT TO WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES

SECTION 207

This section modifies the project for the improvement of the Mississippi River below Cape Girardeau with respect to the west Tennessee tributaries, authorized by section 202 of the Flood Control Act of 1948, so as to authorize the Secretary of the Army to relocate all gas transmission lines required to be relocated by this project or at his discretion, to reimburse local interests for relocations made by them. The committee considers that it is equitable in this instance for the United States to assume the cost of such relocations, which were not contemplated at the time the project was authorized.

SECTION 211—EEL RIVER, CALIF.

SECTION 211

Section 217 of the Flood Control Act of 1965 authorized the Secretary of the Army to reimburse any common carrier by railroad for the cost of protective works constructed by such carrier during the years 1965 and 1966 along the banks of the Eel River, Calif., to deter recurrence of damage to such banks by floods or high waters. The maximum reimbursement for such work was established at $3 million. This section would reaffirm and continue that authorization. The committee notes that the $1.2 million authorization stated on this section is a part of, and does not constitute an addition to, the $3 million previously authorized.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the pending authorization of $670 million for civil works projects continues the commitment of the Congress to the development of our national water resources. This bill embodies flood control projects which will save countless lives and many millions of dollars in property damage in future years. In every instance the projects authorized will yield more in dollar benefits than the costs of construction and maintenance. They are, therefore, prudent investments in the future of the communities in which they are located.

The navigation projects authorized in H.R. 18233 also yield benefits far in excess of the costs involved, and will strengthen the sinews of the transportation industry of America and contribute substantially to the welfare of the national economy.

In addition to flood control and navigation improvements, there are multipurpose projects which will provide for recreation uses and the enhancement of water quality. In summary, this is a broad gage bill which will sustain the continuing congressional effort to meet the growing needs for water resource development in America. I therefore urge its prompt enactment by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

STRIKING OF MEDALS COMMEMORATING THE U.S. NAVAL CONSTRUCTION BATTALION'S 25TH ANNIVERSARY AND THE U.S. NAVAL CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS' 100TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 17658.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 17658) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the U.S. Naval Construction Battalion's—Seabees—25th anniversary and the U.S. Navy Civil Engineer Corps (CC) 100th anniversary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 17658) which was read twice by its title.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on October 18 the Senate passed unanimously an identical bill sponsored by my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], S. 3881.

The pending bill has come over to us and this is the only way apparently in which this legislation can be enacted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 17658) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider certain judicial nominations favorably reported earlier by the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words in behalf of our distinguished colleague, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], who has been nominated to be U.S. district judge for the District of South Carolina.

There is no man for whom I have greater affection than DONALD RUSSELL. There is no man who has served his State more conscientiously, more carefully, or more effectively.

It is a sense of personal loss to me that he will not be with us next year, but it is also a sense of personal pleasure that he has been nominated by the President of the United States to be a district judge. It is a nomination which I am certain will shortly be confirmed unanimously.

DONALD RUSSELL is one of those rare Senators whom you get to know and the more you know him the better he wears.

Our loss will be the bench's gain.

We wish him well. We hate to see him go, but we hope that from time to time he will come back to visit us.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am pleased to vote for Senate confirmation of the nomination of Senator DONALD S. RUSSELL, my colleague, to be Federal district court judge in the State of South Carolina.

My colleague in the Senate has held positions of prominence and importance which will qualify him to discharge the duties of the Federal district judgeship. Senator RUSSELL is a product of the public school system of the State of South Carolina, having done his undergraduate work at the University of South Carolina. He also received his law degree from the University of South Carolina. He practiced law for a number of years as a member of an outstanding law firm in South Carolina, and one of the senior members of that firm was the late Honorable C. C. Wyche, the man whom Senator RUSSELL is succeeding on the Federal bench.

During World War II, Senator RUSSELL served in the War Department and also served as Assistant to the Director of Economic Stabilization. He entered the U.S. Army as a major in September of 1944 and was assigned to the Supreme Headquarters of the Allied Forces until November 1944. Thereafter, Senator RUSSELL was Deputy Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion; and in July 1945, he was appointed Assistant Secretary of State for Administration.

After leaving the Government, Senator RUSSELL resumed the private practice of law in his hometown, Spartanburg, S.C. Senator RUSSELL then served as president of the University of South Carolina for 5 years, from 1952 to 1957. In 1957, Senator RUSSELL returned to Spartanburg and continued the practice of law until he was elected Governor of South Carolina in November 1962. Senator RUSSELL served as Governor until his resignation on April 22, 1965, when he was appointed to the U.S. Senate to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the late Senator Olin D. Johnston.

Senator RUSSELL bears the reputation of being well versed in the law. His scholarly attitude and judicial temperament make him particularly well suited for the post to which he has been appointed. He and I have been personal friends for many years, and I know of his splendid qualifications for the bench.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an editorial which appeared in the Greenville News of Greenville, S.C., concerning the qualifications of Mr. RUSSELL to fulfill the duties of the Federal district judgeship.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Donald Russell and the Judgeship

We do not yet know the origin of the movement to make U.S. Sen. Donald Russell a United States District Judge, if there is a movement as such, nor how far along the matter may be.

The Senator has kept his own counsel on the subject and has given no public indication of seeking the appointment.

It is quite clear, however, that the authorities who have the appointive and investigative power have him actively under consideration and the matter could come to a head almost any day now.

It also is true that, while there are many men in South Carolina who are qualified to succeed the late Judge Charles Cecil Wyche, there probably is none more so than Donald Russell.

Maybe it would be better for all concerned, the state and Mr. Russell himself, if one or more other possible choices were considered. But most of the public comment on the matter thus far has come from candidates for high office, which makes a political issue out of what should be a non-political appointment if the ideal rules were followed.

As for politics, Donald Russell was pretty effectively removed from the political arena in the June Democratic party primary, although he continues to serve conscientiously and effectively in the Senate. Under the state law by which he became Senator, Mr. Russell leaves office as soon as his successor is elected.

We regret that the cry of "self-appointment" has been heard from men who in almost all things have behaved like statesmen and should be interested solely in the man's qualifications.

This cry was heard when Russell resigned the office of Governor and accepted appointment to the Senate vacancy at the hands of his successor. This, more than any other one factor, contributed to his defeat in the primary. But, as we said at the time, if Senator Russell was responsible for his own appointment, he chose the best man available.

With respect to the judgeship, it would not be easy for a Senator to appoint himself. In fact it is technically impossible.

The popular conception is that federal judges are appointed by Senators. They are not. Senators may make recommendations. They may be asked by the Justice Department, which investigates all potential appointees to office, for their views on a candidate for an appointment.

But the appointments are made by the President of the United States, and confirmed by resolution of the Senate. This is where the power of a Senator over the judgeships in his state comes in.

If the Senator has strong objections to an appointee the White House and the Justice Department probably will back off; and the Senate most likely would respect his wishes.

But in this instance, South Carolina's senior Senator has raised no public objections. We doubt that he will do so, unless something not now publicly known develops.

Whatever happens, Donald Russell is not finished with the public service. He long ago made up his mind to devote his remaining years to it, for he has developed for himself an independent income. He needs no public salary.

Since his defeat in the primary, we have felt he probably would be offered and would accept some sort of appointive office, probably in the federal service at a high level.

The district judgeship, now that it is available, may be his best opportunity. He is a brilliant lawyer by training and experience and a scholar by nature and habit. Geographically, he comes from the right part of the state to succeed Judge Wyche, with whom he practiced law early in his career.

By all of the rules of the game of politics, Donald Russell is a lame duck, if not a dead one, at least temporarily. He has been soundly defeated. He has voted and spoken against administration bills and programs. He is hardly in position to make any political deals which might gain him preferment.

All that he appears to have going for him in the matter of the district judgeship is merit and ability.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to join in the sentiments expressed by the majority leader and the sentiments expressed by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond] with reference to our colleague, the Honorable Donald Russell.

I do not believe that a finer appointment could have been made to this highly important judicial post than that of Senator Russell. I believe that he will perform those duties not only with outstanding ability but also with extraordinary devotion, dedication, and loyalty to the cause of the judiciary, in accordance with the oath that he will take.

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to our majority leader and to my colleague from South Carolina and to my friend, the Senator from Mississippi, for the very gracious remarks that have been made.

It has been a great pleasure for me to have been a Member of this body, to share in its deliberations for a short time, to develop the keen appreciation, the ability, the dedication, and the true patriotism of Members of this body.

I am especially grateful for the leadership that the distinguished Senator from Montana has given from our side of the aisle. I have never met anyone for whom I have developed a stronger affection, a greater admiration for both his character and his ability, than for the distinguished Senator from Montana.

I am also grateful for the remarks of my colleague, the Senator from South Carolina, because, while we sit on opposite sides of the aisle, we have never had a personal difference. I share with him, I think, the personal regard that goes beyond partisanship. I am particularly grateful, therefore, for his remarks.

When I first came to the Senate, it was a great pleasure for me that the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis] came to me. I have the honor of having been born in the State of Mississippi, so I appreciated particularly his expressing to me his regard and his desire to be helpful. I have turned to him on many occasions, and I feel a very special debt to him.

To these gentlemen and to all the other Members of this body I express my appreciation for the past 2 years, the happiest period of my life.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I say that the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Russell], who has had such an illustrious career in his State and in our country, will leave with our admiration, our respect, and our affection.

RECOMMENDATION OF JAMES E. NOLAND FOR FEDERAL JUDGESHIP IN INDIANA

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, on March 18 of this year the President signed Public Law 89–372. This law, a recommendation of the Judicial Conference of the United States, created an additional Federal judgeship for the Southern District of Indiana.

Subsequently, my colleague from Indiana [Mr. Hartke] and I recommended to the President that the name of Mr. James E. Noland be given consideration for this post. This recommendation was supported, I might add, by the Indiana State Bar Association, the standing committee on the Federal Judiciary of the American Bar Association, Indiana's Representatives Madden, Denton, Roush, Brademas, Hamilton, and Jacobs, as well as by many Indana legal, educational, business, and labor leaders.

In addition, I believe it proper to ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an editorial published in the July 7, 1966, issue of the Indianapolis Star. The Star, Mr. Noland's hometown newspaper, the largest newspaper in Indiana, paid high tribute to Mr. Noland's ability.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Good Choice for Bench

Indiana's two Senators have made a sound choice in their agreement to recommend James E. Noland of Indianapolis for appointment as a Federal district judge here.

Noland is widely known and respected among attorneys. He is a practicing attorney and has had a variety of experience which will help to equip him to deal with the situations which come before Federal courts.

The quality of the judiciary is of very high importance to all citizens. Indiana has been fortunate in this respect with the Federal bench, and we are glad to see a selection—assuming the recommended appointment is made—which promises to carry on that good fortune.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, one of the most pleasing prerogatives of a U.S. Senator is the privilege of recommending a person for appointment to the bench of the Federal district court. It makes it all the more pleasing when the nominee is eminently well qualified and imbued with integrity and moral distinction. That, Mr. President, is true in the case of Jim Noland.

He has compiled an impressive record of educational, professional, military, community, and governmental accomplishments in his 46 years. I cite several of those accomplishments for the information of those who will read the Record.

Served with distinction as Army Transportation Commander, U.S. Army, attaining rank of captain;

Elected from Indiana's 7th Congressional District to 81st Congress;

Appointed deputy attorney general for Indiana;

Appointed special assistant to the attorney general of Indiana;

Appointed as legislative counsel to 1963 session of the Indiana General Assembly;

Appointed assistant city attorney for Indianapolis, Ind.;

Appointed four times to the Indiana State Election Board;

Legislative adviser to Governor during 1961 and 1963 legislative sessions;

Appointed chairman of a three-member land commission by Judge William E. Steckler, chief judge, Federal district court, to hear condemnation proceedings;

Participated in cases questioning the constitutionality of Indiana election laws;

Participated in cases questioning constitutionality of congressional districting;

Participated in cases questioning constitutionality of apportionment of the Indiana General Assembly;

Served as a member of advisory council to the Juvenile Court of Marion County, Ind.;

Member of YMCA; Boy Scouts Fathers Club; Indianapolis Press Club, Indianapolis, Ind.; American Bar Association; American Trial Lawyers Association; and Indiana Trial Lawyers Association;

Admitted to practice law before Indiana Supreme Court, Federal district court and U.S. Supreme Court.

So, Mr. President, I unqualifiedly recommend to the Senate the name of Mr. James Noland to be district court judge for the Southern District of Indiana.

I hope that the Senate will promptly consider the nomination and will overwhelmingly support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

REPORT BY SENATOR JAVITS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, every year I make a report to my constituents in New York State on the current session of Congress and on my own activities during the past year.

This is my 18th report, and it comes at a time when the Congress and the Nation are preoccupied with the Vietnam war and the threat of inflation. Our involvement in Asia set the mood of Congress this session and affected legislative activities in many ways.

I have mixed feelings of gratification and disappointment concerning this session. It is gratifying because as ranking minority member of the Labor and Public Welfare and Joint Congressional Economic Committees and as a member of the Judiciary and the Government Operations Committees, I was able to help shape and guide much important legislation through the Congress.

In all, 71 measures that I sponsored and 42 that I cosponsored were enacted into law in the 89th Congress. An additional 29 measures which I either sponsored or cosponsored were passed by the Senate.

Among the major achievements of the session in which I was particularly active are: the increase in the minimum wage and the extension of its coverage; auto and highway safety legislation; the demonstration cities program; Federal aid for nurses training; the continuation and expansion of the antipoverty program; and aid to higher, elementary and secondary and international education.

But the session was disappointing because its overall record was characterized by legislative lag and failure to come to grips with two major domestic problems facing our country—inflation and civil rights.

Particularly distressing was the failure of the Senate to close off a filibuster and bring to a vote the Civil Rights Act of 1966 which would have helped end discrimination in housing and jury selection and provide Federal protection for civil rights workers. I feel this—as well as efforts to cripple enforcement of earlier acts prohibiting segregation in hospitals and schools—was caused by untoward resentment against riots and racial disorders in many of our cities and against advocates of an ill-defined "black power" slogan.

Inflation could have been dampened if Congress and the administration took proper measures early. Instead, a much-diluted suspension of the 7-percent tax credit for investment was enacted, much too little and too late to have a material effect on the drastically increasing costs of living, high interest rates and tight money.

Legislative lag was also evident in the number of major bills left until the last minute, such as measures to continue the antipoverty program and aid to education programs, passed months after funds from the previous fiscal year had run out.

It was evident again in the failure to reform our draft law, even when its inequities were underscored by the Vietnam situation. I introduced a resolution and testified in support of a proposal for national service providing more equitable selection procedures and opportunities for both military and nonmilitary assignment in the national interest.

Because of the failures of the last session, much unfinished business remains. We must make a new effort to modify Senate rule XXII, which allows filibusters—the device through which a minority of the Senate can keep the majority from even voting on legislation. As in the past, I plan to be in the forefront of this fight and in the effort to enact meaningful civil rights legislation. Also required will be legislation to deal in the national interest with national emergency strikes, to provide a system of Federal-State tax sharing, to improve unemployment compensation and social security benefits, to help modernize our hospitals and to bring about effective congressional reform, including a code of ethics for legislators. I will continue to work with Governor Rockefeller and the New York congressional delegation to assure that our State receives equitable treatment under Federal grant-in-aid programs.

These represent the highlights of the past year and I will now go into the details of the 2d session of the 89th Congress.

VIETNAM, FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The conflict in Vietnam continued to engender debate at home and abroad. In January, I made a personal inspection tour of that country which led to a series of recommendations throughout the session.

I feel the administration is not adequately apprising the public of the problems and prospects of this conflict, but while differing with the administration on certain of its major policies, I support the U.S. commitment in Vietnam. Escalation of force, in my judgment, will not produce a "victory" or bring the Communists to the conference table, but will only risk Soviet or Chinese intervention. Therefore, I have urged the President to use our force as a "shield of confidence" in the south, behind which the real "war" must be waged to win the loyalty of the people by establishing an effective, civilian government through free and open elections, and by giving high priority to economic and social reforms, including land reform.

Even though I am not hopeful about current Communist willingness to negotiate, I fully support all U.S. peace offensives and have urged additional ones because I feel we have a responsibility to offer every realistic proposal for peace. I have proposed the formal acceptance of the National Liberation Front as an independent negotiating party, a military freeze on introduction of additional troops in South Vietnam and reciprocal withdrawal of troops once negotiations end. I have also urged that we clearly inform all nations that we want to work through viable and realistic regional organizations of their own making and do not want to act as "policeman of the world."

Important byproducts of this conflict have been public awareness that without improved United States-Chinese relations there can be no peace in Asia, and our policy shift, which I endorse, to one of containment of Communist China without isolation. We are certainly willing to learn to talk—at least in some areas—while we may dispute in others. To this end, the Joint Economic Committee of Congress agreed to my suggestion to make a study of and hold hearings on the Chinese Communist economy early next year.

As the rapporteur of the NATO Parliamentarians' Political Committee, I was responsible for writing a major report on problems created by French withdrawal from NATO military arrangements and the continued need to integrate West Germany with Western Europe. These problems can be overcome only if NATO members improve intra-alliance consultation and work toward a true Atlantic community.

To help break the disarmament deadlock, I have proposed scrapping ideas for NATO nuclear hardware sharing to meet

Soviet objections about West Germany, and have supported efforts to deal with problems of inspections and control on a trial basis in extending the test ban treaty.

Because of the bloodshed in the Middle East, I have urged our Government to reach an understanding with the Soviet Union on the deescalation of the arms race, and that all U.S. diplomatic channels be used to convene a conference of all nations with interests in the Middle East to seek peace and draft development plans for the region. I have also continuously denounced persecution of the Jews by the U.S.S.R., and was successful in helping secure some compensation from the Rheinmetall firm of Germany for former slave laborers. I have consistently worked for Senate ratification of the Genocide Convention, and will resume my efforts in the next session.

FOREIGN AID AND TRADE

Congress enacted the $2.9 billion foreign aid bill containing two of my amendments establishing an International Private Advisory Council to strengthen the role of private enterprise in foreign aid, and cutting off aid to the United Arab Republic. I feel that the funds approved were inadequate and urged establishment of a $100 million special international fund by the United States to channel aid to the developing nations, if other industrialized nations agreed to contribute too.

On three separate occasions the Senate approved my amendment cutting off aid to any junta that overthrows a freely elected constitutional, democratic Latin American government, but the measure was deleted in conference. Such legislation is needed to back U.S. endorsement of democratic governments in the hemisphere and I will press for enactment again next year. I visited and conferred with leaders of four Latin American countries in March as a delegate to the Inter-American Economic and Social Council and reported to the Senate on the need for a Latin-American Common Market and for local self-help and the multinational approach to common problems within the Alliance for Progress and for a summit conference of Latin American presidents. I also deplored the continuing political instability in Latin America and urged greater inter-American action to support democratic governments. My proposal for an action committee to support a Latin American Common Market is gaining considerable acceptance.

The project to increase economic cooperation between Greece and Turkey continued to make progress under the sponsorship of a special NATO Parliamentarians Committee, of which I am chairman.

I cosponsored the President's East-West trade relations bill, and supported his proposals to improve trade relations with European Communist regimes as means of reducing East-West tensions. The Kennedy round of trade negotiations in Geneva continue to have my support, especially efforts to eliminate nontariff barriers and to negotiate an international agreement on dumping practices. I also urged that the President be given flexible authority to negotiate trade and free trade area agreements after the Trade Expansion Act expires next June; and that the United States proceed with our allies to draft contingency plans for international monetary reform, despite French opposition.

The U.S. Travel Service's request for $4.7 million appropriation had my support and I introduced my own bill to expand and strengthen the Travel Service to increase foreign travel in the United States as a means of reducing the $1.4 billion imbalance in our international payments. I will reintroduce the measure next session.

The Foreign Investors Tax Act, which allows more equitable treatment for nonresident aliens and corporations had my support; and I introduced legislation to provide Federal regulation of foreign banking in the United States to encourage reciprocal privileges for our banks operating overseas.

CIVIL RIGHTS

This was a year of setbacks for the cause of civil rights in Congress. Due to faulty administration strategy and the alleged "white backlash" against "black power" sloganmakers and racial disorders, we not only failed to pass new, much-needed legislation but saw the erosion of support for full financing and strict enforcement of Civil Rights Acts passed in recent years.

Early in 1966, along with Senator Case, of New Jersey, I introduced legislation to provide Federal protection to those exercising their civil rights and to reform the method of jury selection in the Nation's courts. Repeated attacks on civil rights workers in the South emphasized the need for Federal legislation since local law enforcement officials often refused to act and all-white southern juries often failed to convict.

Coupled with this I joined in issuing a call to the President to expand the Federal order against discrimination in the sale or rental of housing financed by Government insured banks, since I believe such housing should be made available to all citizens regardless of race.

Instead the President sent to Congress a bill containing the principal features of my earlier measure but incorporating a sweeping fair housing provision which immediately ran into trouble. The House considerably modified the provision, but the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee failed to take action even though a majority of the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, of which I am a member, approved the measure. A filibuster was launched to prevent the Senate from even taking up the measure, and two attempts to halt the filibuster failed to get the two-thirds vote necessary. I voted for cloture both times and pledged my efforts next year to eliminate the Senate rule permitting filibusters.

My efforts to restore the full budget request to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for civil rights activities were unsuccessful, as were my attempts to block Senate adoption of an exception to HEW hospital segregation regulations already issued. I also opposed the transfer of the Community Relations Service from the Commerce to the Justice Department on the basis that an agency designed for conciliation and negotiation could function best outside the office of the Nation's chief prosecutor.

In speeches throughout the country, I have urged a "Marshall plan for deprived Americans" to provide and coordinate long range and massive assistance to needy citizens along the lines of the aid we provided our European allies. In Harlem, I urged Negro leaders to repudiate Negro extremists whose actions or advocacy of the ill-defined "black power" slogan contributed to racial disorders and the "white backlash."

WAR ON POVERTY

At the 11th hour Congress extended the antipoverty program with a budget of $1.61 billion, $137 million less than the Office of Economic Opportunity originally requested. In committee I helped shape the original $2.5 billion Senate bill and helped lead the fight for it on the floor. The law contains several of my amendments, including provisions requiring coordination of all Federal training and manpower programs and increased support of these programs by the U.S. Employment Service, and procedures to assure that employees administering community action programs are paid no more than is generally paid for similar work in the area served.

To add scope and flexibility to the program, I also introduced amendments, which are now in the law, to allow OEO and the Labor Department to join in setting up combined residential and nonresidential training centers, and allow private enterprise participation in virtually all antipoverty programs. With Senator Kennedy, I cosponsored the Special Impacts Program to provide slum residents with training and employment in their own neighborhoods.

My proposal to create an Economic Opportunity Corporation, along the lines of COMSAT was not acted on but received wide support in the business community. I plan to continue to refine and to press for enactment of this proposal which would make use of the largely untapped resources of the private sector by allowing corporations, unions, and individuals to invest and participate in the antipoverty effort.

The Senate in the closing days of the session approved the bill I cosponsored to establish a National Community Senior Service Corps for community service programs utilizing the abilities, enthusiasm, and energy of men and women over age 60. The House did not have time to act.

INFLATION AND THE ECONOMY

Faced with a serious problem of inflation, caused partly by the demands of the Vietnam conflict, the administration reacted too late with too little to head off a rapid increase in the cost of living. Early in the year, when it would have been effective in dampening inflation, I proposed a temporary, across-the-board tax increase in the area of 5 to 7 percent for the Vietnam war and a voluntary credit restraint program such as we had during the Korean war.

Instead the administration took inadequate fiscal action and proposed suspension of the 7-percent investment tax credit which I said would not halt inflation and could lead to a recession and injure our international balance of payments. When it became apparent that no other anti-inflationary measure would be proposed, I voted for the final bill after my amendment was accepted continuing the tax credit for commuter railroad cars. I also received assurances that Finance Committee hearings would be held next year on my bill to provide investment tax credit to firms instituting manpower training programs.

I continued to press for congressional action on the so-called Javits Plan for sharing a portion of Federal tax revenue with State and local governments to strengthen their ability to meet growing needs for new services. I also cosponsored legislation to end the policy of taxing employees—including Federal employees—who are reimbursed by their employers for moving expenses. I supported the truth-in-packaging bill. The Senate Commerce Committee established a subcommittee on consumer affairs which I have long sought, and after years of struggle, several other Senators and myself succeeded in persuading the Interior Department to relax import controls on residual fuel oil, allowing millions of New York consumers to obtain adequate fuel in a competitive market.

LABOR AND EMPLOYMENT

Congress passed the minimum wage bill, raising the Federal minimum to $1.60 an hour by 1968 and covering an additional 8 million workers, including, for the first time, agricultural workers. The law contains a number of my amendments including one prohibiting, for the first time, the use of child labor in hazardous agricultural occupations. The Senate-House conference eliminated my provision to bar arbitrary age discrimination in employment for those over 45, but retained a provision requiring the Secretary of Labor to make specific recommendations for such laws next year.

The Mine Safety Act was completely rewritten so that the new law, including eight of my amendments, provides comprehensive regulation while guarding against arbitrary enforcement.

Other Senate-passed legislation which I supported included revision of the Employment Services Act and establishment of minimum standards for unemployment compensation. With my support Congress extended coverage of the Coal Mine Safety Act, reduced delays in processing Railway Labor Act cases, and improved Railroad Retirement Act and Federal Employees Compensation Act benefits along the lines I originally proposed.

When the administration failed to back legislation, including mine, to protect the Nation from crippling national emergency strikes, I introduced, on behalf of 21 Senators, a resolution requiring the Secretary of Labor to make recommendations by January 15, 1967, to improve emergency strike laws. Congress adjourned without considering it, but with its broad cosponsorship, it has a good chance of success next session. I also sponsored a bill to strengthen and expand the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and queried all State fair employment practice commissions to obtain data on the adequacy of FEP laws, to form the basis for future legislation.

The Senate-passed Manpower Services Act to update the basic charter of the Federal-State Employment Service contained my amendments requiring coordination of all federally aided manpower training programs around the Employment Service, establishment of a permanent relocation assistance program to increase the mobility of the unemployed, use of automatic data systems for job information, and appointment of experts from the private sector to Federal and State manpower councils.

Disclosures of mismanagement and other inadequacies in some union pension and welfare funds also led me to introduce a proposed set of minimum administrative standards for private employee benefit plans, and I intend to continue to press for legislation to insure that the assets of these funds will be sufficient to provide the promised benefits under reasonable eligibility standards.

URBAN AFFAIRS

The $1.2 billion demonstration cities program was enacted to help rebuild entire slum neighborhoods, and contained a proposal I sponsored to tighten eligibility criteria with emphasis on the use of private enterprise. I was also assured that a large city might have demonstration projects in more than one neighborhood and that both large and small cities would be eligible. This measure will provide a start in solving the problems of our fast-growing urban complexes as revealed by Senate hearings on the cities in which I participated. I cosponsored a resolution establishing a permanent Committee of Urban Affairs, which is vitally needed.

Culminating my efforts since 1961, legislation was enacted late in the session providing for civil commitment and treatment in hospitals of narcotics addicts, and rehabilitation aftercare in community-based facilities where they can be supervised after release. I cosponsored the final bill which contained two of my amendments to: provide Federal funds for construction of treatment facilities and for personnel; and to authorize $15 million a year, double the original amount. I also sponsored legislation to provide grants to local police departments for the purchase of expensive electronic data and communications equipment to help in the war on crime.

The 1966 housing bill contained a proposal I supported to spur metropolitan planning, and also my amendment providing funds for a much-needed noise abatement study of techniques in housing construction and methods of reimbursing affected property owners near airports. Because of the tight money situation, I introduced an amendment that passed the Senate to add $300 million to the loan authorization for college housing. I also introduced the Senate-passed amendment to make State-supported, nonprofit middle income housing projects, such as the Mitchel-Lama program in New York, eligible for persons receiving rent supplements, and I fought hard for passage of the two rent supplement appropriations bills.

I introduced an amendment to the Public Works and Economic Development Act to allow smaller compact and contiguous areas to receive loans for public works improvements. The existing law penalizes contiguous areas within metropolitan complexes simply because they are not independent municipalities. Concerned with the need for expansion of the Nation's airport facilities, I cosponsored the enacted legislation, extending Federal aid to airports for 3 years.

TRANSPORTATION

Congress made progress this year in the field of transportation. It created a Department of Transportation, which I cosponsored, to coordinate Federal aid, construction, and safety activities. I urged establishment of an Office of Noise Abatement in the new Department, but later agreed to a requirement that the new Secretary report on the problem of noise involving transportation of all kinds particularly airport noises. I will watch closely the new Department's efforts to coordinate mass transit programs with the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Appalachian road program with the Commerce Department to guard against overcoordination and delays.

The mass transit bill contained my amendment to allow grants of up to $12.5 million over the 12½-percent limitation which any one State may now receive, giving New York and other large States some relief from this limitation. I cosponsored a bill providing research and demonstration projects on new systems of urban transit, and recommended that transit funds for capital equipment be increased to $300 million, but Congress allowed only $150 million.

I introduced legislation to authorize grants of up to three-fourths the cost of planning for regional solutions to transportation problems, and proposed grants of up to 50 percent of the operating deficits, for up to 3 years, of any regional transit authority running commuter service.

Congress also enacted the Auto Safety Act which includes my amendment to provide funds for construction of prototype safety cars. This will allow New York State, which has already begun such a project, to be eligible for Federal assistance.

HEALTH

With few exceptions, Congress and the administration failed to meet the health care crises facing the Nation. The administration failed to request adequate funds to operate already authorized programs in physicians' training and other fields and to propose new programs to meet the needs raised by medicare and population growth. Congress failed to act on legislation to help modernize the one-third of our hospital facilities considered outmoded and on drug safety proposals, especially those protecting children. The administration also successfully opposed a bill I cosponsored to establish a National Eye Institute for research.

Among the accomplishments in this field were enactment of a proposal I sponsored, incorporated in the Allied Health Professions Act, designed to relieve the national shortage of nurses. The measure provides additional scholarships for needy nursing students, a program to encourage nursing careers, and facilitate use of already authorized nursing school construction funds.

Also enacted was legislation I supported to curb petnapping and provide humane treatment of laboratory animals. This is only a start, however, and most interested groups have united in favor of passage next year of the Humane Laboratory Animal Treatment Act I introduced. My amendment providing Federal aid for the staffing of mental retardation facilities was enacted by the Senate and Congress passed the Model Secondary School for the Deaf Act, which I cosponsored; and the Veterinary Medical Education Act.

Public support has been gaining for the bipartisan alcoholism bill I introduced with other Senators which would establish research and grants for treatment, rehabilitation, and prevention of this disease, afflicting some 6 million Americans. I intend to lead a movement for enactment next year of this and also of my bill to require Senate confirmation of the Commissioner of Food and Drug.

EDUCATION

Congress expanded and renewed for 2 years the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and included a new program for handicapped children.

Included were my amendments to: assure that the Office of Economic Opportunity no longer will have a veto over Office of Education programs; include aid for construction of facilities for handicapped children; and, of special benefit to New York State, to require use of the most recent aid for dependent children data in computing aid allocations. Passed by the Senate, but deleted in the House-Senate conference in the rush toward adjournment, were several of my amendments. They would: broaden the law to include educationally deprived children in all school areas having concentrations of low-income children; increase the poverty level used to compute aid allocations from $2,000 to $2,500 this fiscal year, which will be of particular benefit to troubled urban areas; and earmark 25 percent of Supplemental Educational Center funds for disposition by the States rather than the Federal Government.

Congress also extended the college construction aid program and added needed funds for NDEA student loans. Included in this bill were several provisions I sponsored to: Expand aid for junior and community colleges; provide additional NDEA loan forgiveness for teachers of handicapped children and to assure that academic facilities will be suitable for handicapped students. Dropped in conference was my amendment to give State authorities increased flexibility in allocating college construction funds.

The International Education Act to strengthen international studies programs in U.S. colleges included proposals I proposed to make it easier for foreign students to study here using their own funds and to greatly expand international education opportunities for Americans.

I also cosponsored the Sea Grant College Act to further education and research in the marine sciences, and I fought for adequate funds for the National Teacher Corps to send volunteer trained teachers into slum schools, and will continue to work to assure adequate funds for this effort in the next session.

Congress extended for 5 years and expanded the Library Services and Construction program along the lines of legislation I had introduced earlier with the endorsement of the American Library Association. New provisions which I sponsored will help bolster library services in State welfare and penal institutions and develop cooperative library services and joint use of facilities within States.

NATIONAL SERVICE

Controversy over the inequities of our draft laws caused me to introduce a resolution requesting the President to submit a plan of national service by which most young men would serve either in the military or, if they qualify, in specifically approved civilian "public interest" positions, such as the Peace Corps and VISTA. The resolution also called for habilitation of men not now eligible for the draft, and modernization of the selection machinery. I will continue to press for its adoption.

Congress passed with my support a pay increase of 2.9 percent for more than 150,000 Federal employees, costing $506 million annually. I also supported the enacted bill providing salaries for teachers overseas comparable to those in similar Federal positions at home, and strongly supported the legislation providing increased annuities for Federal retirees.

AGRICULTURE

The need for considering changes in existing agricultural production limitations is evident in light of our dwindling farm surpluses and our expanding commitment to help feed the hungry people of the world. I supported legislation extending the Food-for-Peace program for 2 years with a requirement that the recipient nation itself make every effort to produce what is needed.

To help reverse the trend away from dairy farming, I urged a fairer return on the dairymen's investment and vigorously and successfully opposed crippling administration cuts in the school milk and lunch programs. I supported legislation to improve cotton research to benefit the textile industry.

Congress passed the Community District Development Act, which I cosponsored, to assist cooperating local governments in rural areas in development planning and another plan, which I joined in proposing, to provide States with soil information in planning highways and other public facilities. Both of these laws should help growing rural areas and prevent the haphazard development characterized by many of our suburban areas.

With some of my colleagues, I was successful in restoring administration cuts in the land-grant college, agricultural research, golden nematode and gypsy moth programs; but we were unable to prevent cuts in some other programs, including the Rural Community Development, Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation, and the Soil Conservation Services.

NEW YORK STATE AFFAIRS

A detailed study of Federal grant programs to State and local governments, which I initiated and submitted to the New York Congressional Delegation, showed that heavily populated States—like New York—are being discriminated against. I recommended specific amendments to urban-directed programs, such as housing, urban renewal, and hospitals to bring grant formulas into realistic line with the need for and cost of governmental services in New York State. I was successful in making the necessary changes in aid formulas for libraries. In addition, I organized and sponsored with Senator ROBERT KENNEDY a conference last April for New York city and county officials to familiarize them with Federal programs and procedures available for use in their localities.

The water pollution control bill, which provides $3.6 billion over 5 years to the States, contained two of my amendments of special benefit to New York, which has its own model water pollution abatement program already underway. My amendments would overcome two problems in the State program by: eliminating the $1.2 million Federal grant limit on individual projects thereby allowing a full 30-percent Federal contribution to these projects, generally in our larger cities; and allowing Federal reimbursement to States—like New York—that are moving ahead on their own before Federal money is available.

New York's medicaid program, to provide health aid to the medically indigent, was the most comprehensive in the Nation and, due partly to Federal requirements, the most costly to Washington. To explore possible solutions, I organized a meeting in Washington between State and Federal officials and the New York Congressional Delegation, and introduced an amendment to the Social Security Act which would have permitted the State to reduce its costs in three essential ways.

I cosponsored legislation to create a Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway, urging the cooperation of the State and Federal Governments to protect one of New York's most precious scenic wonders. Another bill was enacted instead to give unnecessary permission for Federal participation in negotiations with New York and New Jersey. It was valuable only as an expression of congressional interest in the Hudson.

The New Haven Railroad commuter service crisis continued this year, but strides have been made toward long-range solutions. I repeatedly urged inclusion of the New Haven commuter service in any merger of the New York Central and Pennsylvania Railroads and that the States involved join in guaranteeing funds to operate this service until the merger, now in the courts, is finally approved.

My bill was enacted authorizing the striking of a medallion commemorating the historic role of Ellis Island as a port of entry to millions of immigrants, and I continued my efforts to effect a compromise in the Senate Interior Committee to provide for Federal purchase of the Ansley-Wilcox House in Buffalo as a national historical landmark.

I also organized meetings in Washington between Federal officials and Buffalo area industry and labor leaders to find ways of increasing shipments of foreign aid goods from the port of Buffalo.

THE RAPIDLY INCREASING CRIME RATE

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, of all the problems facing this Nation today, none is more ominous than the rapid increase in the crime rate. Crime in 1965 increased 6 percent over the previous year with a staggering 2,780,000 serious crimes reported to the police.

Shocking as this figure is, it tells only a small part of the story. It does not record the grief and loss suffered by the family and friends of the victims of these 2,780,000 crimes. It does not describe the pall of fear and suspicion which is spreading through our society. It does not count the millions who have had to give up the simple joy of an evening stroll or abandon other pleasures which would take them out on the streets after dark.

Regrettably, some of the responsibility for this frightening increase in crime and the chilling effect it is having on our society must be placed on our courts. Of course, I do not mean to say that court decisions cause crime, but when the courts strain to find new reasons for returning the agents of crime to the streets, when they vie with each other in imposing new restraints on the police, the courts contribute to the creation of conditions which encourage the commission of crimes.

While the crime rate was rising 6 percent last year, adult convictions were falling 5 percent and the number of acquittals and dismissals increased 13 percent. This decline in convictions is to be expected in the wake of such crippling decisions as the recent opinion in Miranda against Arizona.

In this case, the Supreme Court undertook to write virtually a complete police manual on the interrogation of suspects, which if rigorously enforced, would effectively prevent all police questioning of suspects. As usual, this blow to law enforcement is delivered indirectly. Among the detailed instructions handed down by the Court is a requirement that a lawyer be appointed to counsel the suspect during questioning if he so requests after being advised of his right to counsel.

It is obvious that the first advice any lawyer is going to give his client is to say nothing. If he did not, the Supreme Court would soon be handing down another landmark decision holding that the defendant was denied the effective assistance of counsel. It is clear, therefore, that the essential tendency of this decision and the ultimate goal of the Court is the total prohibition of a police questioning. The Court assures us that this is not the aim, but action speaks louder than words.

As usual, this overthrow of established practice is done in the name of enforcing ancient rights and preserving individual liberty. In the same breath, however, the Court admits that "we might not find the defendants' statements to have been involuntary in traditional terms."

The exact impact of this decision on law enforcement cannot be foretold at this time. Hopefully, the police will find some way to compensate for the loss of this valuable investigative tool. It seems to me, however, to be the height of folly to embark on fanciful new experiments limiting the powers of the police when crime is annually increasing at a disastrous rate.

When Congress convenes in January this entire problem should be the first order of business, with a view toward restoring the balance between liberty and order which is being dangerously weighted in favor of the lawless element that is devouring our society. I think that we should have a real drive to enact legislation giving our law enforcement officials the authority they need to rid our streets and communities of those who commit these violent crimes, robberies, and otherwise. Our citizens are entitled to occupy their homes, walk the streets, and carry on their daily pursuits in the knowledge that they live in a civilized society and enjoy the protection of the law. For my part I expect to exert every effort in behalf of legislation to protect our people.

Mr. President, I wish to add a few words regarding the police officers of this great country. I do not believe there is a harder job to fill, nor one more hazardous, in many respects, than that of being a police officer. I am familiar with their problems from long and direct contact with them, and I do not believe there is a less rewarding job of its kind than that of a policeman who has to go out and meet the hazards and the conditions day and night, 7 days and 7 nights in the week, that these men are faced with.

I think it is absolutely essential—and I speak with all deference to any court decision—that Congress first fully inform itself and study the problem, and then try to evolve some legislation which will strike a better balance.

WORK OF PREPAREDNESS INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, this is the nature of a report to the Senate on the activities of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services during the current session. It is the function of the subcommittee to act as the investigatorial arm of our parent committee and, in so doing, to exercise a continuing watchfulness over the policies, programs, activities, operations, and practices of the Department of Defense, the armed services, and other agencies exercising functions relating to defense.

In short, the subcommittee is concerned across the board with every aspect and facet of our defense activities and our Military Establishment. One of our primary interests lies in insuring that our military services are in all respects adequately prepared and equipped and are fully capable of carrying out the missions assigned to them.

In addition to myself, the members of the subcommittee are Senators SYMINGTON, JACKSON, CANNON, BYRD of West Virginia, SALTONSTALL, SMITH, and THURMOND. I want to express my very deep and sincere appreciation to all of these distinguished Senators for their truly outstanding assistance, support, and cooperation as well as for their unfailing interest and participation in the subcommittee's important work. My job would have been difficult, if not impossible, were it not for their wisdom, counsel, advice, and expert knowledge of the many facets of defense and national security affairs.

I must pay a special tribute to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] who, as the ranking Republican on the subcommittee, has been a veritable tower of strength to me during the years which I have served as subcommittee chairman. Having announced his retirement, he will not be with us next year, and I know that I speak for the entire subcommittee as well as its staff in saying that he will be sorely missed.

The subcommittee has had a very busy, productive, and useful schedule of work during 1966. As in 1965, we continued to give the highest of priority to two matters which are of special and vital importance at this time.

In the first place, we kept in close and continuous contact with military activities and developments in southeast Asia. To insure that we had firsthand information with respect to this very critical problem, three members of the subcommittee and five members of its staff visited and made personal inspections in South Vietnam during the fall and winter of last year. Four members of the staff left earlier this week for a follow-up visit to Vietnam.

We have not only been interested in the progress of combat operations; we have also given close and almost constant attention to the adequacy of our forces and to the question of whether our fighting men are properly trained and equipped and are adequately supplied with the weapons, ammunition, and materiel which is essential to enable them to perform their missions with maximum efficiency.

At the same time, we have not neglected the other side of the coin. Recognizing the heavy demand and drain which the requirements of southeast Asia have imposed on our Armed Forces, we deem it vital that these demands and drains not be permitted to degrade unduly the combat readiness and military preparedness of our forces in the continental United States and elsewhere around the world. We have inquired into this question as diligently and closely as possible and have issued a number of reports bringing certain deficiencies to the attention of the Congress and Defense Department.

During the course of this activity in 1966, we held extensive hearings on the military situation in Vietnam, on the status of ammunition and air munitions, on the combat readiness of six Army divisions and one Marine division in the continental United States, on the personnel, training, equipment, and readiness status of Army Reserve components, on Army combat readiness generally, and on tactical air operations and readiness. These hearings have been published after having been submitted to the Department of Defense for the deletion of classified material.

In the course of these and other hearings, we had before us as witnesses Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus R. Vance; Secretary of the Army Stanley R. Resor; Gen. Harold K. Johnson, the Army Chief of Staff; Secretary of the Navy Paul Nitze; Secretary of the Air Force Harold Brown; Gen. J. P. McConnell, Chief of Staff of the Air Force; Gen. Paul Freeman, Commander of the Continental Army Command; Gen. G. P. Disosway, Commander of the Tactical Air Command; and many others.

Among the reports that we have issued are:

First. A report on the combat readiness of the 4th Infantry Division, the 5th Infantry Division, and the 1st and 2d Armored Divisions which, among other things, found that the impact of the military demands and requirements of the operations in Vietnam and the result of the rapid buildup of our forces in Vietnam had a serious impact upon the readiness of the Active Army divisions which remain in the United States. As a matter of fact, at the time the report was issued, the four divisions covered by it were not combat ready and were essentially training divisions.

Second. A report on the status of the Army Reserve components in which, among other things, it was found that the merger of the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard proposed by the Secretary of Defense has serious disadvantages and drawbacks which were neither balanced nor outweighed by the alleged benefits which would flow from the merger. Consequently, the subcommittee recommended that the proposed merger be disapproved and that the Army Reserve and Army National Guard be continued as separate organizations at such mandatory levels of strength as shall be fixed by the Congress.

Third. A report on the combat readiness of the 101st Airborne Division, the 82d Airborne Division, and the 2d Marine Division, which again portrayed the impact of the military demands of the war in Vietnam and its adverse effect on the readiness of the active combat divisions remaining in the continental United States.

Fourth. A report on tactical air operations and readiness which revealed the severe strain on TAC resources as a result of the demands in southeast Asia and the fact that TAC, because of necessity, had been converted from a combat command to a training command.

We also held extensive hearings on the status of ammunition and air munitions. The hearing record has been printed with appropriate security deletions and thus the results of this study have been made available to the Congress and the public.

I want to make it clear that our purpose in holding the hearings which I have mentioned and issuing the reports I have enumerated was not merely to find fault, criticize, or second guess with respect to the actions which had been taken. It was our purpose to bring deficiencies and problems to the attention of the proper authorities so that needed corrective action could be taken. The reports have had this effect, and, in many respects, we have achieved our purpose.

In addition, we have continued, through a special subcommittee headed by the able Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], to monitor the implementation of the safeguards laid down by the Department of Defense in connection with the limited nuclear test ban treaty. Senator JACKSON has a special expertise in this field and has reported to the Senate separately with respect to it.

We also held hearings on the decision of the Secretary of Defense to close the Springfield Armory. This resulted in a request of the Secretary of Defense that this decision be reviewed and reconsidered. Secretary McNamara did not see fit, however, to comply with this request.

In addition, as a result of a referral from the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the subcommittee handled and held hearings on S. 2444 which proposes to authorize the disposal of Government-owned long-lines communications facilities in the State of Alaska. From these hearings came a recommendation to the full committee that the bill be reported favorably to the Senate with appropriate amendments. It was so reported and subsequently was passed by the Senate.

A very important and significant inquiry, initiated by the subcommittee this year, and which still continues, is with respect to the nature and extent of our worldwide military commitments and our ability to respond to them. Members of the subcommittee staff spent almost a month in Europe earlier this year inquiring into the NATO aspects of this matter and will inquire into it further during their current trip to the Far East. Hearings on this have already commenced and the subcommittee has taken testimony from Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Mr. Richard Helms, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

In addition to the formal hearings I have mentioned, the subcommittee staff has been busy throughout the year inquiring into many vital and critical areas, including manpower requirements and deficiencies, the present and future inventory of tactical aircraft, the readiness, equipment, and personnel status of the Army Reserve Forces, the pilot training programs of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, the Army's small arms program, the readiness of the Atlantic Fleet, and many others. Most of these inquiries are still in progress.

Over and above the matters which I specifically enumerated, the subcommittee has made literally hundreds of routine inquiries to the Department of Defense and the various services with respect to problems arising from day to day. The staff has been briefed upon dozens of occasions by Defense officials upon matters of importance and interest to the subcommittee, and we have handled many requests and inquiries which did not result in formal hearings before the subcommittee.

Before I conclude, Mr. President, let me say that it is well established that the effectiveness and accomplishments of any congressional committee or subcommittee depends to a very large extent upon the talent, dedication, ability, and professional competence of its staff. Our relatively small but extremely able and hard working professional staff possesses these attributes in full measure, and I would be remiss if I did not express deep appreciation to it. The staff members have labored long and diligently throughout the years with no end in view except to contribute to the national security and military preparedness and to discharge their obligations to the subcommittee as efficiently as possible. One high-ranking military official recently described our staff as being thoroughly professional, completely objective, and unusually knowledgeable. I believe that all subcommittee members will join me in attesting to the accuracy of this description.

CUBAN REFUGEES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15183) to adjust the status of Cuban refugees to that of lawful permanent residents of the United States. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YARBOROUGH in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of Oct. 21, 1966, pp. 28605–28606, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the principal purpose of the bill, as agreed to by the conferees, is to permit the adjustment of status in the United States of certain Cuban refugees who arrived in the United States subsequent to January 1, 1959. As passed by the House of Representatives the bill, H.R. 15183, authorized the Attorney General to adjust the status of the Cuban refugees who arrived in the United States subsequent to January 1, 1959, to that of permanent residents and to make the adjustment effective as of the date of approval of the refugee's application for adjustment. The Senate amended the bill to permit the adjustment of any native or citizen of Cuba in the United States regardless of his date of entry, and in addition, certain refugees from the Dominican Republic who arrived in the United States between April 24, 1965, and June 2, 1966, who had been displaced from that Republic as a result of military operations. The House bill was also amended to provide that the adjustment of the status of the Cuban and Dominican refugees would be retroactive to the date of their original arrival. However, the Senate added the requirement that these refugees must have been physically present in the United States for a period of 2 years in order to be eligible to apply for relief.

The conferees agreed to limit eligibility for relief under the bill to Cuban refugees who arrived in the United States subsequent to January 1, 1959, and have been physically present in the United States for at least 2 years prior to the time of their application. The conferees were of the opinion that consideration of the problem of the smaller number of refugees from the Dominican Republic should be deferred until the Congress returns in January.

The bill, as agreed to by the conferees, provides that the adjustment of the status of the Cuban refugees to permanent residents shall be effective as of the date of their last arrival in the United States, or a date 30 months prior to the filing of their applications, whichever is later.

As passed by the Senate, the bill would have permitted the Attorney General to record the lawful entry of those Cuban refugees who had departed from the United States and obtained immigrant visas as of the date of their original arrival in the United States as nonimmigrants or as parolees, or January 3, 1961, whichever date was later, The conferees agreed to authorize the Attorney General, upon application in such cases, to record such Cuban refugees' admission for permanent residence as of the date of original arrival or a date 30 months prior to the date of the enactment of this act, whichever is later.

The remaining provisions of the House and Senate bills are the same in substance.

I believe that the bill, as reported by the conference committee, represents a fair reconciliation of the differences between the House and Senate, and I recommend that the Senate agree to the conference report.

Mr. KUCHEL. I want to say to my good friend from Massachusetts that all of us are aware of his long and active interest, and his constructive work on the problem of refugees. Of course, I support him in adoption of the conference report.

For the record, would the Senator indicate what agreement was reached finally?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I would consider the legislation passed in the Senate to be a more comprehensive piece of legislation than that which was passed by the House. There was one very significant disagreement; namely, should the time that a Cuban refugee has been in the United States count effectively as time for citizenship, or should the time start for application of citizenship as of the passage of the bill?

The Senate-passed legislation provided that the period of time the refugee had been in the United States could be considered time eligible for citizenship, following the pattern and the precedents of the Hungarian refugee program, and a number of other refugee programs.

We settled this by reaching a 2½ year figure, which I think is a liberal figure. The House receded on that important point, which was the fundamental point of difference between the House and the Senate.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 18021.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is that measure on the calendar?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this is a bill which passed the Senate and passed the House and now is before the Senate to accede to the House bill. I have consulted with all the Republican members on the committee and with the Republican staff. They agree, and on our side they are in agreement. There are relatively minor changes in the bill. It is a bill which passed unanimously.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 18021) to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, after holding hearings on the SBIC program on July 15, 19, and 29, 1966, and after extensive discussions with SBA and NASBIC, I prepared a bill to remedy the most urgent problems in the field of SBIC's. I introduced this bill, for myself, and Senators SPARKMAN, HARRIS, TOWER, and MUNDT, on August 8, 1966, as S. 3695. Hearings were held on this bill on August 24 and 25, 1966, and the Small Business Subcommittee considered the bill and amended it in a number of respects. My bill, S. 3695, was reported unanimously by the Banking and Currency Committee to the Senate on September 1.

The Senate then considered my bill, S. 3695, and, after making one technical amendment, passed it without objection September 6.

On September 27, 1966, Congressman PATMAN introduced a similar bill, H.R. 18021, and the House Banking and Currency Committee reported it to the House on September 30, 1966. The House passed H.R. 18021 yesterday.

There are relatively few differences in the two bills and members of the Banking and Currency Committee have agreed to these House changes. Therefore, on behalf of myself and Senator TOWER, the ranking Republican member of the Small Business Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, it is hoped that the Senate passes the House bill. The differences in the two bills are as follows:

The House bill amends section 4 of the Senate bill to assure that notice in any action involving the removal of an officer or director or in the issuance of a cease-and-desist order shall be served on both the individual and the SBIC itself. This amendment will guarantee that all the interested parties to such action will receive adequate notice of the proceedings.

The House bill amends section 313(a) of the Senate bill by redrafting this provision which sets out the tests to be used in the removal or suspension of an officer or director of an SBIC. The House bill does not include the test contained in the Senate bill that it must be shown the action of the officer or director caused the SBIC to "suffer substantial financial loss or other damage or that the interests of the administration shall be seriously prejudiced." The House bill contains the other safeguards contained in the Senate bill to protect the interests of the officer or director in removal proceedings.

The House bill eliminates the provision in section 313(b)(1) of the Senate bill which provides for private hearings in connection with the removal of an officer or director unless a public hearing is agreed to by the party afforded the hearing or the SBA.

The House bill deletes from section 314(a) of the Senate bill the parenthetical phrase, "including the individual officers, directors, employees, or agents of such licensee". This phrase was intended to modify the term "person" immediately preceding it. Since the term "person" would of necessity refer to such individuals, it is proper to remove this language from the bill.

The House bill also eliminates section 9 of the Senate bill. This section provides for the application of criminal penalties to an officer, director, or principal stockholder who pledges his stock in an SBIC for a loan to purchase an additional interest in the same SBIC.

Mr. President, there is no objection to the House bill on the part of SBA or on the part of the National Association of Small Business Investment Companies. I, therefore, hope that the Senate passes the House bill. This will complete action on the bill and send this very important legislation to the President for his signature.

I ask unanimous consent that a comparative print of the two bills be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the comparative print was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[Note.—Language proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, provisions in which no change is proposed is printed in roman.]

S. 3695

An Act to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Small Business Investment Act Amendments of 1966".

Sec. 2. Section 201 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

"ESTABLISHMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT DIVISION

"Sec. 201. There is hereby established in the Small Business Administration a division to be known as the Small Business Investment Division. The Division shall be headed by an Associate Administrator who shall be appointed by the Administrator, and shall receive compensation at the rate provided by law for other associate administrators of the Small Business Administration."

Sec. 3. Section 308 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 is amended—

(1) by striking out the last two sentences of subsection (c); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsections:

"(f) In the performance of, and with respect to the functions, powers, and duties vested by this Act, the Administrator and the Administration shall (in addition to any authority otherwise vested by this Act) have the functions, powers, and duties set forth in the Small Business Act, and the provisions of sections 13 and 16 of that Act, insofar as applicable, are extended to the functions of the Administrator and the Administration under this Act.

"(g) The Administration shall include in its annual report, made pursuant to section 10(a) of the Small Business Act, a full and detailed account of its operations under this Act. Such report shall set forth the amount of losses sustained by the Government as a result of such operations during the preceding fiscal year, together with an estimate of the total losses which the Government can reasonably expect to incur as a result of such operations during the then current fiscal year."

Sec. 4. (a) Section 309 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 is amended by striking out the section heading and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"REVOCATION AND SUSPENSION OF LICENSES; CEASE AND DESIST ORDERS"

(b) Section 309(a) of such Act is amended—

(1) by inserting "revoked or" before "suspended";

(2) by striking out in paragraph (1) "Administration, for the purpose of obtaining the license" and inserting in lieu thereof "Administration"; and

(3) by striking out in paragraph (2) "for the purpose of obtaining the license,".

(c) Section 309(b) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Where a licensee or any other person has not complied with any provision of this Act, or of any regulation issued pursuant thereto by the Administration, or is engaging or is about to engage in any acts or practices which constitute or will constitute a violation of such Act or regulation, the Administration may order such licensee or other person to cease and desist from such action or failure to act. The Administration may further order such licensee or other person to take such action or to refrain from such action as the Administration deems necessary to insure compliance with the Act and the regulations. The Administration may also suspend the license of a licensee, against whom an order has been issued, until such licensee complies with such order."

(d) Section 309(c) of such Act is amended—

(1) by inserting after "licensee", [each] *the first* place it appears, the following: ["or other person"] *and any other person";* and

(2) *by striking out "inform the licensee" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "set forth";*

(3) *by inserting after "licensee", the last place it appears, the following: "and any other person involved;" and*

[(2)] *(4)* by inserting before "suspending", each place it appears, the following: "revoking or".

(e) Section 309(e) of such Act is amended by inserting after "license", the first place it appears, the following: ", or other person against whom an order is issued,".

(f) Section 309(f) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "If any licensee or other person against which or against whom an order is issued under this section fails to obey the order, the Administration may apply to the United States court of appeals, within the circuit where the licensee has its principal place of business, for the enforcement of the order, and shall file a transcript of the record upon which the order complained of was entered." ; and

(2) by inserting "or other person" before the period at the end of the second sentence.

Sec. 5. Section 310 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 is amended—

(1) by striking out the section heading and inserting in lieu thereof "EXAMINATIONS AND INVESTIGATIONS"; and

(2) by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 310.", and by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(b) Each small business investment company shall be subject to examinations made by direction of the Administration by examiners selected or approved by the Administration, and the cost of such examinations, including the compensation of the examiners, may in the discretion of the Administration be assessed against the company examined and when so assessed shall be paid by such company. Every such company shall make such reports to the Administration at such times and in such form as the Administration may require; except that the Administration is authorized to exempt from making such reports any such company which is registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940 to the extent necessary to avoid duplication in reporting requirements."

Sec. 6. Section 311 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) The Administration shall have authority to act as trustee or receiver of the licensee. Upon request by the Administration, the court may appoint the Administration to act in such capacity unless the court deems such appointment inequitable or otherwise inappropriate by reason of the special circumstances involved."

Sec. 7. Title III of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"REMOVAL OR SUSPENSION OF DIRECTOR AND OFFICERS OF LICENSEES

"Sec. 313. (a) The Administration may serve upon any director or officer of a licensee a written notice of its intention to remove him from office whenever, in the opinion of the Administration, such director or officer—

"(1) has willfully and knowingly committed any substantial violation of—

"(A) this Act,

"(B) any regulation issued under this Act, or

"(C) a cease-and-desist order which has become final, or

"(2) has willfully and knowingly committed or engaged in any act, omission, or practice which constitutes a substantial breach of his fiduciary duty as such director or officer, and that such violation or such breach of fiduciary duty is one involving personal dishonesty on the part of such director or officer.

"Sec. 313. (a) [Whenever, in the opinion of the Administration, any director or officer of a licensee has committed any violation of this Act, or any regulation issued thereunder, or of a cease-and-desist order which has become final, or has committed or engaged in any act, omission, or practice which constitutes a breach of his fiduciary duty as such director or officer, and the Administration determines that the licensee has suffered or will probably suffer substantial financial loss or other damage or that the interests of the Administration could be seriously prejudiced by reason of such violation or practice or breach of fiduciary duty, and that such violation or practice or breach of fiduciary duty is one involving personal dishonesty on the part of such director or officer, the Administration may serve upon such director or officer a written notice of its intention to remove him from office.]

"(b) In respect to any director or officer referred to in subsection (a), the Administration may, if it deems it necessary for the protection of the licensee or the interests of the Administration, by written notice to such effect served upon such director or officer, suspend him from office and/or prohibit him from further participation in any manner in the conduct of the affairs of the license. Such suspension and/or prohibition shall become effective upon service of such notice and, unless stayed by a court in proceedings authorized by subsection (d), shall remain in effect pending the completion of the administrative proceedings pursuant to the notice served under subsection (a) and until such time as the Administration shall dismiss the charges specified in such notice, or, if an order of removal and/or prohibition is issued against the director or officer, until the effective date of any such order. Copies of any such notice shall also be served upon the interested licensee.

"(c) A notice of intention to remove a director or officer, as provided in subsection (a), shall contain a statement of the facts constituting grounds therefor, and shall fix a time and place at which a hearing will be held thereon. Such hearing shall be fixed for a date not earlier than thirty days nor later than sixty days after the date of service of such notice, unless an earlier or a later date is set by the Administration at the request of (1) such director or officer and for good cause shown, or (2) the Attorney General of the United States. Unless such director or officer shall appear at the hearing in person or by a duly authorized representative, he shall be deemed to have consented to the issuance of an order of such removal. In the event of such consent, or if upon the record made at any such hearing the Administration shall find that any of the grounds specified in such notice has been establish, the Administration may issue such orders of removal from office as it deems appropriate. Any such order shall become effective at the expiration of thirty days after service upon such licensee and the director or officer concerned (except in the case of an order issued upon consent, which shall become effective at the time specified therein). Such order shall remain effective and enforcible except to such extent as it is stayed, modified, terminated, or set aside by action of the Administration or a reviewing court.

"(d) Within ten days after any director or officer has been suspended from office and/or prohibited from participation in the conduct of the affairs of a licensee under subsection (b), such director or officer may apply to the United States district court for the judicial district in which the home office of the licensee is located, or the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, for a stay of such suspension and/or prohibition pending the completion of the administrative proceedings pursuant to the notice served upon such director or officer under subsection (a), and such court shall have jurisdiction to stay such suspension and/or prohibition.

"(e) Whenever any director or officer of a licensee is charged in any information, indictment, or complaint authorized by a United States attorney, with the commission of or participation in a felony involving dishonesty or breach of trust, the Administration may, by written notice served upon such director or officer, suspend him from office and/or prohibit him from further participation in any manner in the conduct of the affairs of the licensee. A copy of such notice shall also be served upon the licensee. Such suspension and/or prohibition shall remain in effect until such information, indictment, or complaint is finally disposed of or until terminated by the Administration. In the event that a judgment of conviction with respect to such offense is entered against such director or officer, and at such time as such judgment is not subject to further appellate review, the Administration may issue and serve upon such director or officer an order removing him from office. A copy of such order shall be served upon such licensee, whereupon such director or officer shall cease to be a director or officer of such licensee. A finding of not guilty or other disposition of the charge shall not preclude the Administration from thereafter instituting proceedings to suspend or remove such director or officer from office and/or to prohibit him from further participation in licensee affairs, pursuant to subsection (a) or (b).

"(f)(1) Any hearing provided for in this section shall be held in the Federal judicial district or in the territory in which the principal office of the licensee is located unless the party afforded the hearing consents to another place, and shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of *chapter 5 of title 5 of the United States Code* [the Administrative Procedure Act. Such hearing shall be private, unless a public hearing is agreed to by the party afforded the hearing and by the Administration.] After such hearing, and wihin ninety days after the Administration has notified the parties that the case has been submitted to it for final decision, the Administration shall render its decision (which shall include findings of fact upon which its decision is predicated) and shall issue and cause to be served upon each party to the proceeding an order or orders consistent with the provisions of this section. Judicial review of any such order shall be exclusively as provided in this subsection. Unless a petition for review is timely filed in a court of appeals of the United States, as hereinafter provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, and thereafter until the record in the proceeding has been filed as so provided, the Administration may at any time, upon such notice and in such manner as it shall deem proper, modify, terminate, or set aside any such order. Upon such filing of the record, the Administration may modify, terminate, or set aside any such order with permission of the court.

"(2) Any party to such proceeding may obtain a review of any order served pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection (other than an order issued with the consent of the director or officer concerned, or an order issued under subsection (e) of this section), by filing in the court of appeals of the United States for the circuit in which the principal office of the licensee is located, or in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, within thirty days after the date of service of such order, a written petition praying that the order of the Administration be modified, terminated, or set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Administration, and thereupon the Administration shall file in the court the record in the proceeding, as provided in section 2112 of title 28 of the United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, such court shall have jurisdiction, which upon the filing of the record shall, except as provided in the last sentence of said paragraph (1), be exclusive, to affirm, modify, terminate, or set aside, in whole or in part, the order of the Administration. Review of such proceedings shall be had as provided in [the Administrative Procedure Act.] *Chapter 7 of title 5 of the United States Code.* The judgment and decree of the court shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court upon certiorari as provided in section 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code.

"(3) The commencement of proceedings for judicial review under paragraph (2) of this subsection shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of any order issued by the Administration.

"UNLAWFUL ACTS AND OMISSIONS BY OFFICERS, DIRECTORS, EMPLOYEES, OR AGENTS; BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY

"SEC. 314. (a) Wherever a licensee violates any provision of this Act or regulation issued thereunder by reason of its failure to comply with the terms thereof or by reason of its engaging in any act or practice which constitutes or will constitute a violation thereof, such violation shall be deemed to be also a violation and an unlawful act on the part of any person [(including the individual officers, directors, or employees or agents of such licensee)] who, directly or indirectly, authorizes, orders, participates in, or causes, brings about, counsels, aids, or abets in the commission of any acts, practices, or transactions which constitute or will constitute, in whole or in part, such violation.

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any officer, director, employee, agent, or other participant in the management or conduct of the affairs of a licensee to engage in any act or practice, or to omit any act, in breach of his fiduciary duty as such officer, director, employee, agent, or participant, if, as a result thereof, the licensee has suffered or is in imminent danger of suffering financial loss or other damage.

"(c) Except with the written consent of the Administration, it shall be unlawful (1) for any person hereafter to take office as an officer, director, or employee of a licensee, or to become an agent or participant in the conduct of the affairs or management of a licensee, if (A) he has been convicted of a felony, or any other criminal offense involving dishonesty or breach of trust, or (B) he has been found civilly liable in damages, or has been permanently or temporarily enjoined by an order, judgment, or decree of a court of competent jurisdiction, by reason of any act or practice involving fraud or breach of trust; or (2) for any person to continue to serve in any of the above-described capacities, if *(A)* [(i)] he is hereafter convicted of a felony, or any other criminal offense involving dishonesty or breach of trust, or *(B)* [(ii)] he is hereafter found civilly liable in damages, or is permanently or temporarily enjoined by an order, judgment, or decree of a court of competent jurisdiction, by reason of any act or practice involving fraud or breach of trust.

"PENALTIES AND FORFEITURES

"SEC. 315. *Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section,* A licensee which violates any regulation or written directive issued by the Administrator, requiring the filing of any regular or special report pursuant to section 310 (b) of this Act, shall forfeit and pay to the United States a civil penalty of not more than $100 for each and every day of the continuance of the licensee's failure to file such report, unless it is shown that such failure is due to reasonable cause and not due to willful neglect. [:*Provided,* That the Administration may by rules and regulations, or upon application of an interested party, at any time previous to such failure, by order, after notice and opportunity for hearing, exempt in whole or in part, any small business investment company from the provisions of this section, upon such terms and conditions and for such period of time as it deems necessary and appropriate, if the Administration finds that such action is not inconsistent with the public interest or the protection of the Administration. The Administration may for the purposes of this section make any alternative requirements appropriate to the situation.] The civil penalties provided for in this section shall accrue to the United States and may be recovered in a civil action brought by the Administration.

(b) The Administration may by rules and regulations, or upon application of an interested party, at any time previous to such failure, by order, after notice and opportunity for hearing, exempt in whole or in part, any small business investment company from the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, upon such terms and conditions and for such period of time as it deems necessary and appropriate, if the Administration finds that such action is not inconsistent with the public interest or the protection of the Administration. The Administration may for the purposes of this section make any alternative requirements appropriate to the situation.

"JURISDICTION AND SERVICE OF PROCESS

"SEC. 316. Any suit or action brought under section 308, 309, 311, 313, or 315 by the Administration at law or in equity to enforce any liability or duty created by, or to enjoin any violation of, this Act, or any rule, regulation, or order promulgated thereunder, shall be brought in the district wherein the licensee maintains its principal office, and process in such cases may be served in any district in which the defendant maintains its principal office or transacts business, or wherever the defendant may be found."

SEC. 8. (a) Section 4(b) of the Small Business Act is amended by striking out "three Deputy Administrators" and inserting in lieu thereof "a Deputy Administrator and three Associate Administrators (including the Associate Administrator specified in section 201 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958)".

(b) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Deputy Administrator shall be Acting Administrator of the Administration during the absence or disability of the Administrator or in the event of a vacancy in the office of the Administrator."

(c)(1) [Section 303(d) of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964] *Section 5315 of title 5 of the United States Code* is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"[(70)] *(78)* Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration."

(2) Section [303(e)(11)] *5316(11)* of such [Act] *title* is amended by [striking out] *changing* "Deputy Administrators of the Small Business Administration (4)" [and inserting in lieu thereof] *to read* "Associate Administrators of the Small Business Administration (3)".

[Sec. 9. (a) Chapter 17 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

[“§ 338. Stock of small business investment companies as collateral for loans

[“Whoever, being an officer, director, or principal shareholder of any small business investment company which is licensed under the provisions of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, knowingly offers any shares of stock in such company as security for any loan to purchase an interest in such company, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

[“As used in this section, the term ‘principal shareholder’ of any small business investment company means a person who directly or indirectly owns, controls, or holds with power to vote, 10 per centum or more of the outstanding voting shares of such company.

[“This section shall not be construed to apply to any loan made prior to the effective date of this section, to any such officer, director, or principal shareholder, unless, after the expiration of ninety days after such date, such loan is secured in whole or in part by collateral consisting of shares of stock in such company.”

[(b) The analysis to chapter 17 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new item as follows:

[“338. Stock of small business investment companies as collateral for loans.”]

[Sec. 10] *Sec. 9*(a) The table of contents of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 is amended—

(1) by striking out the items describing the contents of sections 309 and 310 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

“Sec. 309. Revocation and suspension of licenses; cease and desist orders.

“Sec. 310. Examinations and investigations.”; and

(2) by inserting at the end of that part which describes the contents of title III the following new items:

“Sec. 313. Removal or suspension of directors and officers of licensees.

“Sec. 314. Unlawful acts and omissions by officers, directors, employees, or agents; breach of fiduciary duty.

“Sec. 315. Penalties and forfeitures.

“Sec. 316. Jurisdiction and service of process.”

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, to repeat, the bill is supported by the Small Business Administration, by the National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, and, as far as I know, all members of the Banking and Currency Committee. I may say, in addition, while the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], who is chairman of the Government Operations Committee, is present on the floor, that much of the credit goes to him. It was through the excellent job which he and his committee did, under his chairmanship and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Harris], this bill was conceived, executed, and brought to the Senate in its present form.

The bill is also the result of the hard work of the Small Business Subcommittee in bringing about agreement on its provisions between the Honorable Bernard L. Boutin, Administrator of the Small Business Administration and Mr. Grogan Lord, president of the National Association of Small Business Investment Companies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 18021) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR DOUGLAS, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there are many editorials on Members of the Senate, pro and con, and some of these editorials we regret, some we approve, but I think the editorial that appeared in the New York Times of this morning on Senator Douglas was one of the finest, most thoughtful, and I think, in view of my acquaintance with the Senator from Illinois, most accurate appraisals I have ever seen.

I wish to read briefly from that editorial:

> Like Lincoln, Senator Paul H. Douglas is a son of Illinois by adoption, having been born and reared in New England. He has the craggy independence on which “Down East” Yankees pride themselves. Although a devout Quaker and man of peace, he was impelled by his conscience to join the Marines at age 50 during World War II and saw front-line service in the Pacific.
>
> In an age when the false values of public relations and image building prevail, his sturdy honesty is profoundly appealing.
>
> Senator Douglas has fought his greatest battles for the consumer and for the broad public interest. As a member of the Senate Finance Committee, Mr. Douglas has exposed the many loopholes in the tax laws which benefit certain industries and wealthy individuals at the expense of ordinary taxpayers. Not afraid to enlist in public causes that take a long time to win, Senator Douglas worked for years on behalf of Medicare, civil rights laws and Federal aid to education which have only recently become law.
>
> Mr. Douglas is a liberal, but his convictions are not confined by any rigid philosophy. No conservative has fought harder for economy in government; he has voted against pork barrel appropriations and tangled with Presidents over waste in their budgets.
>
> There is more at stake here—

Speaking of the election in which Senator Douglas is engaged literally in a fight for his political life in the toughest campaign Senator Douglas has ever been in—

> There is more at stake here than the career of an able Senator. In every generation there are a few men who by force of mind and character become moral exemplars to their contemporaries, the standard by which other men in public life measure their conduct.

Let me repeat that sentence:

> In every generation there are a few men who by force of mind and character become moral exemplars to their contemporaries, the standard by which other men in public life measure their conduct.
>
> Senator Douglas is such a man. For this reason, as well as for his integrity, courage and devotion to the public good, Paul Douglas deserves re-election to the United States Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> Douglas of Illinois
>
> Like Lincoln, Senator Paul H. Douglas is a son of Illinois by adoption, having been born and reared in New England. He has the craggy independence on which “Down East” Yankees pride themselves. Although a devout Quaker and man of peace, he was impelled by his conscience to join the Marines at age 50 during World War II and saw front-line service in the Pacific.
>
> A trained economist and the author of numerous scholarly books, he has never been content to sit in a cloistered office when he could be out battling for the public good, whether his enemies were machine politicians in the Chicago Board of Aldermen or Southern reactionaries in the Senate. In an age when the false values of public relations and image building prevail, his sturdy honesty is profoundly appealing.
>
> Senator Douglas has fought his greatest battles for the consumer and for the broad public interest. As a member of the Senate Finance Committee, Mr. Douglas has exposed the many loopholes in the tax laws which benefit certain industries and wealthy individuals at the expense of ordinary taxpayers. Not afraid to enlist in public causes that take a long time to win, Senator Douglas worked for years on behalf of Medicare, civil rights laws and Federal aid to education which have only recently become law.
>
> He is a Democrat, but his principles transcend any party. When scandals rocked the Truman Administration, he joined with Senator J. William Fulbright of Arkansas in conducting a thorough investigation. He later chaired a special committee on ethics that drew up a code of conduct for Government employes. He has regularly made public the details of his personal finances and has urged full disclosure by all members of Congress.
>
> Mr. Douglas is a liberal, but his convictions are not confined by any rigid philosophy. No conservative has fought harder for economy in government; he has voted against pork barrel appropriations and tangled with Presidents over waste in their budgets.
>
> Senator Douglas’ Republican opponent is Charles Percy, an attractive, successful businessman whom we would ordinarily be pleased to support. We regret that impatient ambition has impelled him to make this race against Senator Douglas, his friend and former teacher. He would have been better advised to wait until 1968 and seek the governorship again, a post better suited to his executive temper and experience.
>
> There is more at stake here than the career of an able Senator. In every generation there are a few men who by force of mind and character become moral exemplars to their contemporaries, the standard by which other men in public life measure their conduct. Senator Douglas is such a man. For this reason, as well as for his integrity, courage and devotion to the public good, Paul Douglas deserves re-election to the United States Senate.

“AMERICA IN THE MARKET PLACE: TRADE, TARIFFS, AND THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS”—BOOK BY SENATOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in the Saturday Review for October 15, 1966, there appeared a thoughtful review, by Dexter M. Keezer, of a book written by Senator Douglas, entitled

"America in the Market Place: Trade, Tariffs and the Balance of Payments."

Mr. Keezer writes:

> Before he went to the United States Senate, where he is winding up his third term and running for a fourth, PAUL DOUGLAS was an eminent economist and ardent teacher. In spite of his political preoccupations, he still retains these attributes in notable degree. They shine through clearly in this remarkable volume on international trade, tariff, and monetary developments and policy.

Mr. Keezer goes on to say:

> What makes the book admirably distinctive is the clarity and conciseness with which it organizes and presents what, as usually purveyed, is an extraordinarily forbidding array of material. (The layman) will also find a remarkably lucid and compact account of the development of international trade and tariffs of the United States, from the beginnings down to the "Kennedy round" of tariff negotiations, now moving toward an uncertain conclusion.

I have read this remarkable book by Senator DOUGLAS. I served with him on the Joint Economic Committee. I have the greatest admiration for him. It was difficult to realize that Senator DOUGLAS entered this "ordinarily forbidding array of material" in an interesting and concise way.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Saturday Review about Senator PAUL DOUGLAS' recent book be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMERCE AND COMITY

(NOTE.—"America in the Market Place: Trade, Tariffs and the Balance of Payments," by PAUL H. DOUGLAS (Holt, Rinehart & Winston. 381 pp. $7.95), traces the history of U.S. commerce with other nations and makes recommendations for future policy. Dexter M. Keezer is economic adviser at McGraw-Hill, Inc.)

(By Dexter M. Keezer)

Before he went to the United States Senate, where he is winding up his third term and running for a fourth, PAUL DOUGLAS was an eminent economist and ardent teacher. In spite of his political preoccupations, he still retains these attributes in notable degree. They shine through clearly in this remarkable volume on international trade, tariff, and monetary developments and policy, with which he graciously acknowledges he had the help of some distinguished staff members of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress.

Although most of them are congenial enough to this reviewer, it is not Senator DOUGLAS' numerous prescriptions for better handling of trade and balance of payments problems, primarily those of the United States, that make this book particularly noteworthy. Most of the prescriptions reflect the better grades of conventional liberal thinking about international political economy, with an occasional variant which could be influenced by the fact that Senator DOUGLAS' great career includes service as a fighting Marine in World War II, against totalitarian powers.

For example, as a general proposition Senator DOUGLAS holds that "broader trade, freely conducted, brings buyer and seller more closely together and makes them better acquainted with and more sympathetic toward the needs and problems of others." But when it comes to extending what he regards as these civilizing influences to hard-core Communist countries, he bridles. He wants no U.S. trade with Communist China or Cuba, and thinks "it would also be a mistake to widen to any appreciable degree the areas of trade with the Soviet Union"—at least until there is "protracted and convincing proof that the Russian government has, in fact, turned over a new leaf" and "is indeed seeking some reconciliation with the West." This will presumably be considerably after the cows come home.

What makes this book admirably distinctive is the clarity and conciseness with which it organizes and presents what, as usually purveyed, is an extraordinarily forbidding array of material. While he will find it something less than perfect bedtime reading, the layman can quite painlessly inform himself about such arcane matters as floating exchange rates for national currencies and CRU's, the usual shorthand for a new international reserve currency, now on the slow and rough road to creation. He will also find a remarkably lucid and compact account of the development of international trade and tariffs of the United States, from the beginnings down to the "Kennedy round" of tariff negotiations, now moving toward an uncertain conclusion.

Perhaps because the subject matter involved is so refractory, the account of the development of the international monetary system and its aches and pains seems somewhat less impressive in educational exposition than the other sections of the book. But I still don't know where to find a clearer, more compact and incisive take-off for an understanding of balance of trade problems, particularly those of Britain and the USA, and possible ways to ease them, of which we shall probably be hearing much more quite soon.

The reason that we have a U.S. balance of payments problem (i.e., more payments going out of the country than coming in) is not that we are heavily in debt to foreigners. Very much on the contrary, foreigners—governments, banks, and individuals—owe us a total of more than twice as much in both long- and short-term obligations as we owe them. But we have managed to get ourselves on the deficit side of the short-term obligations, which have a way of getting converted into a further drain on our dwindling gold reserves. And the bind of this short-term indebtedness which seemed on the way to being loosened now promises to be tightened again, largely as a result of developments stemming out of the war in Vietnam.

Senator DOUGLAS attributes our balance of payments problems largely to our generosity as a nation, in carrying a disproportionate share of the load of defense of the West and economic aid to developing countries. "Never in the history of the world," he writes, "has there been anything comparable to our generosity as well as to our enlightened self-interest." He urges our European neighbors, whose prosperity we contributed much to help restore, to become infected with the same spirit.

It is hard to escape the suspicion that, along with magnanimity, a vital contribution to our balance of payments problem has been made by stupidity or, to put it more genteelly, a rather abysmal lack of foresight. If Senator DOUGLAS had elected to mine this possibly rich vein of inquiry, he might have added even more to the great illumination which "America in the Market Place" throws on its murky but extremely important subject matter.

THE NEW HAVEN'S COMMUTER PROBLEMS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I was deeply distressed to learn that the merger of the Pennsylvania and New York Central Railroads has suffered another delay.

The recent decision of the Supreme Court to stay the order of the Interstate Commerce Commission approving the merger comes as a disappointment to a great many people. It is especially disturbing to residents of the State of Connecticut, who had hoped that the merger, with its inclusion of the New Haven Railroad, would bring about improved rail service throughout the State, and might indeed provide a panacea for the acute problems of Connecticut residents commuting to New York City.

Since oral arguments before the Court will not be heard until January 9, 1967, the merger could not take effect until February at the very earliest. It seems to me, therefore, that the New Haven cannot depend on the merger to provide its long-needed revitalization. Instead, the New Haven's problems must be solved immediately, for the commuter crisis is not merely a question of private convenience, it is a question of public necessity.

Toward this end, I want to call attention to the recent proposal formulated by the Connecticut Transportation Authority and the New York State Metropolitan Commuter Transportation Authority.

Under this proposal, the States of Connecticut and New York will jointly take over the commuter service of the New Haven Railroad between New Haven and New York City and spend $80 million improving it. The States would lease from the railroad all of its tracks and station, then would utilize present management of the New Haven to run the commuter service.

Under the proposal, the States would purchase new high-speed cars, modernize all stations with high-level platforms, rehabilitate the electrification system, and vastly improve the rights-of-way, the signals, and the maintenance shops.

The plan calls for a $14 million expenditure by the Connecticut Transportation Authority and a $13 million expenditure by the New York State Metropolitan Commuter Transportation Authority. In addition, it calls for $53 million of Federal funds to be obtained under the auspices of the Urban Mass Transportation Act.

Since the Urban Mass Transportation Act has appropriated only $150 million for the entire country, questions have been raised in some circles as to whether a single project, such as the New Haven Railroad, deserves as much as one-third of this total.

There is no doubt in my mind that the answer to the question is an unequivocal "yes"; and I shall do everything that I possibly can to urge Federal officials to assist the New Haven in every possible way.

For several years now I have been deeply concerned over the possibility that the New Haven Railroad might have to suspend its commuter service, causing over 25,000 commuters in Fairfield County, Conn., and Westchester County, N.Y., to take to the crowded highways in order to get to work.

Over these years, I have continually worked with my colleagues and with interested parties to find a final solution to the New Haven's commuter problems.

While I feel that the eventual merger of the Pennsylvania and New York Central Railroads will provide this final solution, interim measures must be taken.

I think that the proposal formulated by the transportation authorities of the two States is a step in the right direction.

We must put an end once and for all to what has become a standard commuter's joke about declining conditions on the New Haven's trains.

We must improve the New Haven Railroad in order to lure back passengers and to alleviate the traffic conditions which are virtually clogging the highways leading from Fairfield County to New York City each and every day.

We must succeed, so that an improved New Haven Railroad can serve as a model of modern transportation in the northeast corridor and in the country.

WALLACE STUFFLEBEME: FAREWELL TO A GOOD MAN, A GOOD CITIZEN, A GOOD FRIEND; AN EDITORIAL FROM THE HILLSBORO DAILY MIRROR

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, J. Wallace Stufflebeme, the former mayor of Itasca, Tex., and a civic leader of vast energy, died last week, leaving me bereft of a good friend and longtime supporter.

I am highly saddened by his death for he was a very good man and excellent citizen who served his community well. He was a much-loved mayor and most valued neighbor of all who knew him in Hill County, and he left a telling mark on his north Texas community.

In its October 17 edition, the Hillsboro Daily Mirror published an editorial which I believe aptly expresses the sentiment of all of us who knew him as a friend.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert the editorial, entitled "A Fond Farewell to Mr. Stufflebeme," in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Fond Farewell to Mr. Stufflebeme

(By Jim Barnhill)

Hill County lost one of its great leaders last week with the death of J. Wallace Stufflebeme of Itasca.

Mr. Stufflebeme's story is one that is typically American. From his poor and humble beginning he had the courage and the will to accomplish important and worthwhile tasks.

His diligence, thrift and deep desire for accomplishment brought him, a poor farm boy, to a position of wealth, service and importance.

Even though Mr. Stufflebeme was quite a financial success he still found time to work for the interest of his church and community.

He served as the mayor of Itasca for 10 years and was one of the most capable and respected men in the history of civic service to the City of Itasca and to Hill County.

Here was a man that placed things in the right perspective. He placed his community, his church and his family above his own personal interests. This was one of the reasons for his great success. Too often people do things with the idea that it will benefit them personally. Not Mr. Stufflebeme. He always had the interest of the community and the church right at the head of the list.

Mr. Stufflebeme will be missed by his family, his church and the community. But the mark he made in this world will live long into the future.

We consider it a privilege to have known Mr. Stufflebeme only if it was for just the brief seven years we have lived in Hill County. The "Mayor" was a friend of this newspaper and we're deeply sorrowed by his death.

A TRIBUTE TO WALTER E. ROGERS, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM TEXAS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, for 16 years the 18th Congressional District of Texas has been represented in the House by Walter E. Rogers. The gentleman from Pampa will retire with the finish of the 89th Congress and I take this opportunity to wish him well in the years to come.

Walter Rogers has represented the 28 counties of his panhandle district with enthusiasm and diligence. He has been an energetic member of the House of Representatives, serving on two standing committees and as chairman of three vital and active subcommittees.

The Communications and Power Subcommittee which he directs has jurisdiction over interstate and foreign communications—including legislation affecting the country's radio and television industry—and the petroleum, natural gas, and electric energy resources of the Nation.

Congressman Rogers' Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation deals with the development of water resources, the saline water program, water rights, and interstate compacts relating to the apportionment of water for irrigation purposes.

The third subcommittee chaired by Representative Rogers is the special subcommittee established to investigate the cause of electrical power blackouts and recommend corrective legislation.

All of these subcommittees have worked with impressive diligence in each of their special areas and have produced a large volume of legislation. They deal with important issues of interest both to the United States and to Texas.

Mr. President, I salute my friend Walter Rogers as he leaves the Congress and express the hope that the coming years will be as rewarding for him as the time he has spent in this branch of the Government.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 1718, S. 2798.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CWO GLEN ZEIGLER, U.S. NAVY (RETIRED)

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2798) for the relief of CWO Glen Zeigler, U.S. Navy, retired, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment on page 2, after line 12, to insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. 3. For pay purposes, including retirement and leave, the period from September 9, 1963, through November 30, 1964, shall be deemed to be creditable service.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Chief Warrant Officer Glen Zeigler, United States Navy (retired), of Bremerton, Washington, is hereby relieved of all liability to repay to the United States the sum of $8,111.42, representing the amount paid him as salary for the period from September 9, 1963, through November 30, 1964, while he was employed at the United States Naval Torpedo Station, Keyport, Washington, in violation of section 2 of the Act of July 31, 1894 (28 Stat. 205), which prohibited the employment of certain retired military officers in Federal civilian positions, the said Glen Zeigler having been advised by Government personnel that his employment was legal. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officers of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Glen Zeigler, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act.

Sec. 3. For pay purposes, including retirement and leave, the period from September 9, 1963, through November 30, 1964, shall be deemed to be creditable service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1749), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to relieve CWO Glen Zeigler, U.S. Navy (retired), of liability to repay to the United States the amount of $8,111.42, the sum paid him as salary for the period from September 9, 1963, through November 30, 1964, while he was employed at the U.S. Naval Torpedo Station, Keyport, Wash., in violation of section 2 of the act of July 31, 1894 (28 Stat. 205), which prohibited the employment of certain retired military officers in Federal civilian positions.

STATEMENT

In its report to the committee, the Department of the Navy relates the following:

"The records of this Department show that, Mr. Zeigler retired under the military retirement laws relating to officers rather than to enlisted men and thus was not eligible for civil service employment under the laws existing in September 1963. At a time prior to September 9, 1963, Mr. Zeigler advised his then prospective employer, the Naval Torpedo Station, that a member of the Civil Service Commission's Regional Office staff stated he was eligible for employment due to his prior enlisted status. Mr. Zeigler was employed on September 9, 1963, and complied with a Navy Finance Center direction to notify the Center of any civil-service employment. Apparently, however, this notification was never received by the Navy Finance Center.

"Mr. Zeigler continued his employment with the Naval Torpedo Station. In late 1964 the Navy Finance Center requested that all retired members who had accepted civil-service employment notify the Center of their election of status under section 201 of the act of August 19, 1964, the Dual Compensation Act. The Center's review of Mr. Zeigler's reply resulted in the determination that his employment prior to December 1, 1964, the effective date of the repeal of the 1894 act. was illegal. However, Mr. Zeigler is still employed by the station since he became eligible for employment with the enactment of the Dual Compensation Act.

"From the above facts it appears that due to incorrect legal advice or the confused state of the law on the subject, both Mr. Zeigler and the U.S. Navy Torpedo Station were mistaken as to how the law in effect in September 1963 applied to him. It also appears that both Mr. Zeigler and the Navy acted honestly and in good faith in the matter. In view of this, the Department of the Navy has no objection to the enactment of S. 2798.

"It should be noted, however, that S. 2798 as written will only relieve Chief Warrant Officer Zeigler of liability to repay the amounts he earned while employed in violation of section 2 of the act of July 31, 1894 (28 Stat. 205). In order to make Chief Warrant Officer Zeigler's service as a Federal civilian employee prior to December 1, 1964, creditable for pay purposes, including retirement and leave, it would be necessary to amend S. 2798."

In view of all of the foregoing, the committee believes that the legislation is meritorious, and therefore recommends that the bill, S. 2798, as amended, be considered favorably.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 3557) conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Solomon S. Levadi, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KUCHEL. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

HERMAN FELDMAN

The bill (H.R. 4454) for the relief of Herman Feldman was considered, ordered to a third reading, read a third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1751), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay Herman Feldman $880 in settlement of his claims for amounts actually withheld from his salary for a family allowance but never paid to his wife.

STATEMENT

The report of the House of Representatives in regard to its favorable consideration of H.R. 4454, relates the following:

The Department of the Army in its report to the committee on the bill details the circumstances and hardships faced by the claimant and indictaes that it has no objection to the bill. The Comptroller General questions the relief because of the existence of a statute of limitations.

The beneficiary of the bill, Herman Feldman, arrived in the United States in 1938 as a refugee from Czechoslovakia. He was forced to leave behind his wife and two children and intended to bring them to the United States at a later date; however, the outbreak of the war prevented him from doing so. He was inducted into the U.S. Army in April of 1941 and was released in November of that year just prior to the outbreak of hostilities involving the United States. He returned to active duty as an enlisted reservist in April of 1942 and in June of that year, he attempted to apply for a family allowance on behalf of his wife and two children. At that time, the Army erroneously refused to accept his application. He again applied for a family allowance on December 26, 1944, and this allowance was accepted and approved for payment from December 1, 1944. On June 28, 1945, his application was approved for payments retroactive to June 1, 1942. His allotment remained in effect through September 1945, the month he was discharged.

The Army, in payment of the allotment for the months of December 1944, January 1945, and February 1945, issued a check for $300 dated March 2, 1945, and, as transmittal to the payee in enemy territory was prohibited, deposited the check with the Treasury Department. Later in 1945 the Army issued nine additional checks totaling $3,224, representing allowances from June 1, 1942, through November 30, 1944, and from March 1, 1945, through September 30, 1945. On November 8, 1945, the Army, without knowledge that Mrs. Feldman and the children had been executed in May 1944 at the Auschwitz concentration camp, dispatched a letter to Mrs. Feldman at her last known address in Czechoslovakia, stating that payment, except the $300, would be mailed to her in the near future, and that she should write to the Treasury Department to obtain payment of the $300. The Army simultaneously sent Mr. Feldman a copy of this letter. At an undetermined later date the checks were sent to Mrs. Feldman's reported address in Czechoslovakia. On March 14, 1963, the Army received a refund credit on the unpaid $300 check held by the Treasury Department, and by letter dated March 19, 1963, the General Accounting Office informed the Army that the nine checks totaling $3,224 had not been negotiated, and that as of March 14, 1963, no substitutes had been issued. Deductions from Mr. Feldman's pay as a serviceman for his contributions to these unpaid allowances were at the rate of $22 per month for 40 months, for a total of $880.

The committee notes that this history shows the difficulties faced by Mr. Feldman in seeking to provide an allotment for his family. As has been noted the only reason that Mr. Feldman has not been paid the money deducted from his pay is the statute of limitations, yet he contacted the Army Finance Center within the period of the statute of limitations and requested that the allotment payments be made to him. Here again, he encountered the same kind of difficulties which had complicated the matter for him. Although his wife and children had been dead for 5 years, the Army's reaction was to request that Mr. Feldman secure his wife's acknowledgment that she had not received the payments. The committee understands how discouraging this reaction would be to a man in Mr. Feldman's position. When in 1962 Mr. Feldman's attorney advised the Army Finance Center that Mr. Feldman's family had been executed in a concentration camp, the matter finally reached the General Accounting Office which thereupon denied payment because of the running of the statute of limitations. The committee feels that there is adequate reason for waiving the statute of limitations. The Department of the Army recognized this fact in its report in referring to the extraordinary equities in the case. In stating that it has no objection to the bill, the Army report made these conclusions:

"The extraordinary equities in this case warrant sympathetic consideration of the proposed legislation, even though it has the effect of waiving a 10-year statute of limitations. Mr. Feldman served honorably during World War II and lost his entire family in an enemy concentration camp. He took numerous steps to secure a family allowance for his family and later to seek recovery in his own behalf before the claim was barred. The sum involved represents only the amounts withheld from his pay as a serviceman and is considerably less than the amounts the United States would have paid to his family had they been able to receive it. In view of these considerations, the Department of the Army has no objection to the bill."

After a review of all the foregoing the committee concurs in the action of the House of Representatives and recommends that the bill H.R. 4454, be considered favorably.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE RELATING TO VENUE

The bill (H.R. 7382) to amend section 1391 of title 28, of the United States Code relating to venue, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 9036) for the relief of J. M. Pendarvis, Jr., was announced as next in order.

Mr. KUCHEL. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

CWO JOSEPH J. McGAVIN

The bill (H.R. 11467) for the relief of CWO Joseph J. McGavin was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1754), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to relieve CWO Joseph J. McGavin, U.S. Air Force, retired, of Monroe, N.Y., of liability of $1,220.65, representing compensation paid him for his services as a civilian by the Department of the Air Force from September 8, 1964, through November 30, 1964, which employment was subsequently ruled to have been barred by the Dual Office Act of 1894.

STATEMENT

The facts in regard to this claim as contained in the House Report No. 1991, are as follows:

"The Department of the Air Force in its report to the committee interposed no objection to favorable consideration of the bill with the amendment adding a new section 2 to the bill as recommended by the committee. The General Accounting Office in its report indicates that the granting of relief in cases such as this is a matter of policy for determination by the Congress.

"The bill, H.R. 11467, would relieve CWO Joseph J. McGavin of liability to refund the money he earned as a civilian employee of the Government from September 8, 1964, until November 30, 1964, when the Dual Office Act of July 31, 1894, no longer applied. That act was repealed effective December 1, 1964, as provided by Public Law 88-448. Public Law 88-448, the Dual Compensation Act, approved August 19, 1964, was enacted by the Congress to deal directly with situations such as Mr. McGavin's, where the previous dual employment and dual compensation statutes were of such complexity that unfortunately this type of case often occurred even though the civilian employee entered upon his employment with complete good faith and performed his duties faithfully for the Government.

"The report of the Department of the Air Force makes it clear that neither the Government officials approving Mr. McGavin's employment nor Mr. McGavin himself was aware that his employment was improper or was actually in contravention of any provision of law. Mr. McGavin was employed through a misunderstanding of his military retired status. In his application for civilian employment, he stated that he was retired with 30-percent disability for injuries he had received during World War II and he referred to his disability retirement claim number. This number was Mr. McGavin's Veterans' Administration claim number. The employing officials concluded that he was retired for reasons of physical disability and, therefore, was not subject to the dual employment restrictions because of the explicit provisions then contained in the law. While Mr. McGavin does receive Veterans' Administration compensation at the rate of $58 per month based upon his service-connected disability, he is also entitled to receive military retired pay at a gross amount of $391.50 per month. As is noted in the departmental report, this type of disability situation was subsequently determined not to provide for an exception under the previously applicable law.

"The committee has determined that this is a proper subject for legislative relief. As has been noted, the confusion in this area of the law prompted the enactment of Public Law 88-448 and the repeal of the very provision of law which caused Mr. McGavin to be charged with this liability. The committee has approved bills in similar cases in the past, and it is hoped that the clarification in the law will serve to prevent this unfortunate type of case in the future.

"The Comptroller General in his report to the committee notes that the Government received the full benefit of Mr. McGavin's services in the period in question. It is clear to this committee that it is unconscionable for the Government to receive these benefits and then demand that the employee refund all of the compensation he was paid for performing those services. Since it is clear from the reports that this individual has no recourse but to appeal to the Congress for relief, it is appropriate that this relief be granted. The Department of the Air Force in its report noted the necessity of clarifying Mr. McGavin's civilian employment status during the period and to insure that his civilian service is creditable for any purpose, including retirement benefits and leave. The Department, therefore, recommended that the bill be amended to include language which would have this effect. The committee has, therefore, amended the bill to include a new section 2 in the form set forth in the report of the Department of the Air Force. With this amendment, it is recommended that the bill be considered favorably."

The committee, after a review of all of the foregoing and the attachments hereto, recommends that the bill, H.R. 11467, be considered favorably.

TRI-STATE CONSTRUCTION CO., INC.

The bill (H.R. 12237) for the relief of Tri-States Construction Co., Inc., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1724), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay the Tri-States Construction Co., Inc., a Florida corporation, $42,400 determined by the Court of Claims in congressional case No. 3-59, decided December 17, 1965, as the amount equitably due to reimburse the corporation for a 15 percent overrun in the amount of trees and brush cleared under a lump-sum contract.

STATEMENT

This legislation comes before the committee as a result of a report by the Court of Claims in regard to the claim against the United States by the Tri-States Construction Co., Inc.

The report of the House of Representatives on H.R. 12237 discloses the following:

"On June 23, 1959, House Resolution 282 of the 86th Congress was passed which referred a bill, H.R. 3958, to the Court of Claims for consideration by that court under the congressional reference case provisions of title 28, United States Code. The case was tried in the Court of Claims and was the subject of a decision of that court dated December 17, 1965.

"The Tri-States Construction Co., Inc., was a subcontractor in the performance of work under a contract entered into by the Corps of Engineers with the Schutt Construction Co., Inc., for the clearing of all the trees and brush along a 20-mile stretch along the Cumberland River near Nashville, Tenn. The bid specifications stated that there were approximately 2,828 acres actually wooded. In this connection, the Court of Claims stated:

" 'Since the 30-day period allowed for bidding admittedly was not sufficient to permit intelligent on-site estimates of the wooded acreage involved, bidders had no choice but to rely on the 2,828-acre estimate furnished by the Corps of Engineers. The Army had derived its estimate from photographs rather than an actual survey because of the costs involved. As a result, the estimate turned out to be off by 1,095 wooded acres—an overrun of 39 percent.'

"The contract was subcontracted to a partnership, the Yellow Pine Lumber Co., which, in turn, on December 27, 1953, was suoceeded as subcontractor by the Tri-State Construction Co., the claimant in this bill. The project was completed by the Tri-States Construction Co. on July 3, 1954, 26 days late, and liquidated damages were assessed in the amount of $9,900 for the overall delay and the delay in completing clearing of the lower level within the period limited in the contract.

"The court found that during the clearing operations both the subcontractor and the Government inspector concluded that there were substantially more than 2,828 wooded acres, and the overrun of 1,095 acres was the result of a survey after the completion of the work which disclosed that 3,923 acres were actually cleared. A claim for the overrun was disallowed by the contracting officer on the basis that the overrun did not constitute a 'changed condition' under article 4 of the contract. On appeal to the Corps of Engineers Claim and Appeals Board, the Board ultimately ruled that 'changed condition' did exist; however, the Board did not find that the claimant was entitled to recover cost for the 1,095 acres overrun in that it concluded that the use of the term 'approximate' in the bid specifications obligated the claimant to clear a 15-percent overrun over the lump-sum price. Any overrun exceeding that amount was considered a material change and recovery was allowed. This bill concerns the remaining 15 percent, which amounts to 424 acres. The court found that the conclusion of the Board that recovery should be limited to the excess acreage over 15 percent is not based on any strong legal ground, and stated that normally if a plaintiff proves a material change in construction cases, it has been the practice of the court to allow recovery for the entire change. The court further stated that in that instance, it was required to examine the case to determine if the subcontractor in the facts and circumstances of this particular case was unfairly dealt with by the Government.

"The court referred to the 30-day period which did not give adequate time to survey the area to be cleared, and it concluded that the bidders faced an unusual risk under this contract. The court noted that it is conceded by the Government that there was a mutual mistake of fact in that the estimate furnished by the Corps of Engineers was off by 39 percent in favor of the Government and also concedes that the bidders cannot be held to have inflated their estimates to cover this 39-percent overrun. However, the court concluded that the further conclusion that the bidders should have inflated their price to guard against the 15-percent error in the Army's figures was not equitable. Under the circumstances, the court concluded that the expenses involved in clearing the 15-percent overrun should be shared by the Government and the subcontractor. While the Government received the full benefit of the work performed, the contract contained no guarantee that an overrun would not occur. The situation, therefore, was that the plaintiff could have reasonably anticipated that there might be some excess acreage to clear. Yet, the court found that the Government made no attempt to check the accuracy of the estimate and did not allow plaintiff sufficient time to do so. Its conclusions in this case are stated as follows:

" 'When all the facts are considered we think that, even with some tolerance for a reasonable overrun, there is full justification under our congressional reference jurisdiction for allowing an equal division of this excess cost of clearing 424 acres. We therefore recommend to the Congress that it pay the subcontractor, Tri-States Construction Co., Inc., $42,400. In the circumstances, we do not find that the subcontractor should be compensated for any of the other claims: liquidated damages, counsel fees, etc.

" 'Since the prime contractor, Schutt Construction Co., has suffered no damages as a result of this Government contract, we find that it is not entitled to share in the recovery.'

"In the light of the recommendations of the court, and the facts outlined in this report and more fully discussed in the court's opinion and findings of fact which are attached to this report, the committee recommends that the bill be considered favorably.

"The committee has approved the bill with a limitation of 20 percent on attorneys' fees in recognition of the fact that this matter has been the subject of a court proceeding."

The committee has considered the action of the House of Representatives and the findings and opinion of the Court of Claims and agrees with the conclusions reached thereon.

It is, therefore, recommended that the bill, H.R. 12237, be considered favorably.

CARL V. ELLIOTT

The bill (H.R. 12512) for the relief of Carl V. Elliott, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may I have the number of that bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Calendar No. 1725, H.R. 12512.

Mr. MORSE. No objection.

The bill (H.R. 12512) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1756), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to relieve Carl V. Elliott of Brewster, Wash., of liability of $1,698.07 based upon an overpayment in his salary as a Post Office Department employee in the period November 1, 1949, to August 23, 1958, which resulted from an error in longevity step assignment.

STATEMENT

The House, in its favorable action on H.R. 12512, states as follows:

"The Post Office Department, in its report to this committee on the bill, stated that it favored the bill's enactment. The Comptroller General in his report stated that in view of Mr. Elliott's attempt to clarify the situation and in reliance on assurances by the Department of its correctness, the General Accounting Office would not object to the bill's enactment.

"This bill concerns an overpayment which resulted from the fact that Mr. Carl V. Elliott was erroneously advanced to longevity step B effective November 1, 1949. The liability referred to in the bill, $1,498.07, represents salary overpayments from that date through August 23, 1958. Both the Comptroller General and the Post Office Department in their reports note that Mr. Elliott sought to clarify his salary situation shortly after he had been advanced to the new longevity step. The Comptroller General stated that his investigation of the Department's file disclosed that in January 1950 Mr. Elliott wrote to the Post Office Department and questioned whether his assignment to longevity step B at an annual salary of $4,170 was accurate. In reply, the Department advised him that this salary rate was correct. It was not until some 8 years later that Mr. Elliott was informed that he had been overpaid and that, therefore, he would have to refund the $1,498.07. He was billed for this overpayment in October of 1958. The report of the Comptroller General further indicates that Mr. Elliott may have refunded the overpayment. The committee observes that this aspect of the case is covered by the bill for it provides in section 2 that any amounts paid in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability is to be refunded to him.

"In recommending enactment of the legislation, the Post Office Department stated that '* * * it is clear that postal officials and not the recipient were responsible for the incorrect computation that was made.' That Department further stated that it felt it would be unfair to require an employee to refund past salary overpayments when made through administrative error by postal officials and without fault on the part of the employee.

"The committee is particularly impressed by the comments of the Comptroller General in this case. In this connection, the Comptroller General stated:

" 'Generally we do not favor individual legislation that confers benefits upon an employee which are contrary to the governing statutes and regulations and are preferential in nature. However, in view of Mr. Elliott's attempt in 1950 to ascertain whether an administrative error had been made and the Department's negative reply at that time, our Office would not object to the passage of private relief legislation in this instance. Moreover, we recognize that the determination whether to grant relief to the employee is a matter of policy for the Congress to decide.'

"In view of the facts outlined in this report and in the departmental reports, we recommend that the bill be considered favorably."

After a review of the foregoing, the committee concurs in the action of the House of Representatives, and recommends that the bill, H.R. 12512, be considered favorably.

ROBERT A. IVINS

The bill (H.R. 13683) for the relief of Robert A. Ivins, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1757), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to relieve Robert A. Ivins of liability to the United States in the amount of $1,192.98, representing an overpayment for overtime and night differential pay paid to him by the U.S. Post Office Department.

STATEMENT

The House report on H.R. 13683 relates the following:

"The Post Office Department favors the bill. Mr. Ivins, as well as Mr. Auseon, for whom a companion bill H.R. 13682 was introduced, was employed by the Post Office Department's Motor Vehicle Facility in Canton, Ohio. Between March 29, 1965, and August 27, 1965, Mr. Ivins was detailed to the Gerstenslager Co. in Wooster, Ohio, for the purpose of inspection for procurement of vehicles. In carrying out this assignment, Mr. Ivins drove to and from Wooster each day, using a privately owned automobile. Mr. Ivins could have remained in Wooster each night and been compensated for his stay. However, the postmaster and Mr. Ivins, along with Mr. Auseon (for the relief of whom H.R. 13682 was introduced), computed the cost of paying their expenses should they remain in Wooster during the week against the cost of compensation for travel time. They found that travel pay would be less costly. Accordingly, the postmaster authorized overtime and night differential pay for the amount of time required for them to commute. The time schedule which these men followed was:

"Leave Canton, Ohio............ 6:00 a.m.
"Arrive Wooster, Ohio........... 7:00 a.m.
"Leave Wooster, Ohio............ 5:30 p.m.
"Arrive Canton, Ohio............ 6:30 p.m.

"Their workday at the plant was 10 hours, resulting in 2 hours overtime daily and, in addition, they were given credit for an additional 2 hours of overtime daily for 2 hours spent in travel after 6 p.m. They were also paid at the premium rate for night work.

"Under the provision of section 756.26 of the Postal Manual, time spent in a travel status is not compensable as "work" when it is performed outside the employee's regular scheduled tour of duty. The travel in question was performed outside of Mr. Ivins' regular scheduled tour of duty and no work was performed during this travel; 39 U.S.C. 3574 requires that work be performed in order to be entitled to extra compensation for night work. Therefore, under the circumstances Mr. Ivins' travel from Canton to Wooster and return was not compensable time for purposes of overtime or payment of night differential and resulted in an overpayment to him of $1,192.98."

The committee, in light of all of the foregoing, concurs in the action of the House of Representatives, and recommends that the bill, H.R. 13683, be considered favorably.

THOMAS C. MACPHERSON, JR.

The bill (H.R. 14525) for the relief of Thomas C. Macpherson, Jr., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1758), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to provide for a special annual leave account for Thomas C. Macpherson, Jr., a postal employee of Peekskill, N.Y., to add 96 hours of annual leave to replace an equitable amount of annual leave which he forfeited under applicable law as the result of administrative error.

STATEMENT

The facts in regard to this claim are contained in the House report on H.R. 14525, as follows:

"The Post Office Department and the Civil Service Commission in their reports to the committee on the bill have indicated that they would have no objection to the bill with the amendment added by the committee as section 2 of the bill.

"Mr. Macpherson was placed in annual leave category 2 on January 1, 1956, when, because of his military service, he should have been placed in that leave category on July 12, 1953. The Department took corrective action in 1959, but because of the 30-day ceiling on accumulated annual leave (5 U.S.C. 2062(c)), Mr. Macpherson was required to forfeit 96 hours of the leave due him. Therefore, because of the present law, Mr. Macpherson's case has resulted in an inequity which can only be corrected by legislative action along the lines provided for in this bill.

"The committee agrees that this bill should be amended to provide that no part of the leave granted by the legislation shall be settled by means of a cash payment in the event that all of some of such leave remains unused at the time Mr. Macpherson is separated from the Federal service. The committee, therefore, has adopted the amendment as recommended by the Post Office Department which will have the effect of placing Mr. Macpherson in a position similar to that occupied by other employees who were properly credited with annual leave. Such an amendment would be in keeping with Private Law 89-206. That private law extended similar relief to an individual who had suffered the loss of 33 hours of annual leave as the result of administrative error on the part of the Post Office Department. That law contained language similar to that recommended as a committee amendment to this bill which would bar any cash payment by reason of the leave granted by legislative action.

"In indicating that it had no objection to legislative action in Mr. Macpherson's case, the Post Office Department stated that it recognized that the application of existing law to the circumstances of his case has resulted in an inequity which can only be corrected by legislative action. Similarly, the Civil Service Commission recognized that whereas it would prefer general legislation to adjust cases like this, there were certain hardship cases which, in the absence of such general legislation, justify private legislation. The Civil Service Commission further observed that the error in this case was not one of recordkeeping in the use of leave which a reasonably vigilant person might be expected to detect promptly; rather it resulted from a failure to give service credit for the entire period of the individual's military duty. By the time the error was discovered, it was too late to fully adjust the employee's leave record because of the restrictions of the law. In view of these circumstances and the positions of the Post Office Department and the Civil Service Commission, it is recommended that the bill, as amended, be considered favorably."

The committee, after a review of all of the foregoing and the attachments thereto, concurs in the action of the House of Representatives and recommends that the bill, H.R. 14525, be considered favorably.

HERMAN ADAMS

The bill (H.R. 14990) for the relief of Herman Adams, doing business as the Adams Manufacturing Co., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1759), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay Herman Adams of Charleston, Ark., doing business as Adams Manufacturing Co., the sum of $42,952.04 less the amount due the United States on its counterclaim for unpaid excise taxes under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act and any accrued interest due the Government. The payment authorized by the bill is that recommended by the Court of Claims in a congressional reference case.

STATEMENT

The facts relating to this claim are set forth in House Report 1999 on H.R. 14990, and are as follows:

On April 15, 1966, the U.S. Court of Claims rendered its opinion in the case of Herman Adams, doing business as Adams Manufacturing Co., *Adams Manufacturing Company* v. *The United States*, congressional reference case No. 5–59. This case arose as the result of House Resolution 296 of the 86th Congress, 1st session, which passed the House on June 30, 1959. The claim of the company as presented to the Court of Claims is for losses suffered as the result of delays which occurred in the performance of a contract to produce a large number of wood tent pins for the United States. The contract involved in this matter was awarded to the company on December 30, 1953, and was designated contract numbered DA–11–009–QM–23755. In its opinion the court examined the allegations of the plaintiff concerning the arbitrary and unreasonable action incident to inspection of the product manufactured under the contract. The court held that:

"'Although in a strict legal sense, plaintiff does not have a claim enforcible in this court since he failed to exhaust his administrative remedies, this circumstance is not sufficient to defeat a claim for damages in a congressional reference case. In such a case, plaintiff need only prove that he has an "equitable claim." This term 'is not used in a strict technical sense meaning a claim * * * [cognizable] by courts of equity but [is used in] the broader moral sense based upon general equitable considerations' (citations.)'

"In this connection, after reviewing the nature of the proof in the case, the court stated:

"'* * * It is deemed to be established by the proof that one-third of the verified loss of $128,856.12 is traceable to the arbitrary, erroneous and unwarranted rejection of tent pins by Inspector Burkhart during a period of approximately 3 months when he was assigned to the contract, plus a failure or refusal during the tenure of Burkhart to make available to plaintiff information concerning the inspection procedures to which he was entitled, and the AQL set up for the contract. The attitude and lack of cooperation on the part of Inspector Burkhart was inexcusable. The inspection procedure was ultimately made available to plaintiff by successor inspectors.'

"The court further found that the Government's claim based on the company's failure to pay excise tax for the year 1954 was meritorious. The Government in this case counterclaimed for unpaid Federal unemployment taxes. The court entered judgment for the Government on two counterclaims in the sum of $6,928.04, plus interest as provided by law. In a footnote to the opinion, the court observed that there was a Government stipulation that it would not collect the amount of the counterclaims until the Congress had the opportunity to consider and pass upon the court's opinion and findings. When the bill was introduced the bill provided for the payment of $42,952.04 less the amount due the United States on its counterclaims. The committee interpreted this language as incorporating by reference the determination in the court's opinion that the Government was entitled to judgment on its counterclaims in the amount of $6,928.04, plus interest as provided by law and to payment of that amount.

"The bill contains the customary limitation of attorney's fee in section 2 of the bill, and this provision has been approved by the committee in view of the fact that the matter has been the subject of a court determination and an attorney has rendered services in connection therewith."

This committee has been informed that the interest on the judgment in favor of the Government as of October 1, 1966, was $4,007.88 making a total of $11,005.92. Under the provisions of the bill, that amount plus whatever interest that has accrued since October 1, 1966 to date of settlement would be the amount to be deducted from the award to the claimant.

The committee concurs in the action of the House of Representatives and recommends that the bill, H.R. 14990, be considered favorably.

WALTER W. TAYLOR

The bill (H.R. 15251) for the relief of Walter W. Taylor, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1760), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to relieve Walter W. Taylor, of Leachville, Ark., of liability to the United States in the amount of $391.68, representing overpayment of salary made to him as an employee of the Post Office Department because of an administrative error in promoting him which caused a subsequent cancellation and invalidation of the promotion.

STATEMENT

The House, in its favorable action of this legislation, relates the following:

"The Post Office Department in its report to the committee has recommended the enactment of the bill. The Comptroller General, while questioning private relief on policy grounds, concluded that relief in this instance is a matter for the determination of the Congress.

"On July 31, 1964, the postmaster at the post office at Leachville, Ark., completed the required Post Office Department form promoting Walter W. Taylor from his position as a level 4 clerk to the position of level 5 assistant to the postmaster. This action was made effective as of August 15, 1964. On September 8, 1965, the personnel action in Mr. Taylor's case was canceled. The ground for this cancellation was that it had been determined that the criteria for the establishment of a position of assistant to the postmaster at that particular post office had not been met and, therefore, the position had not actually been authorized. As is noted in the Comptroller General's report, Mr. Taylor had performed the duties required of him as the assistant to the Postmaster from August 15, 1964, to the time in September of 1965 that the promotion was canceled. Prior to that time he had no knowledge that the action of the postmaster was deficient in any way.

"As is also noted in the Comptroller General's report, the Postmaster General sought a ruling from the General Accounting Office as to whether Mr. Taylor could be held to have performed the functions of the position in a de facto status so as to permit the employee to retain the compensation paid him in that position. The Comptroller General's decision in substance held that since the post office was not authorized to create the office, a promotion to that office was void and there could be no de facto status under the particular circumstances of this case.

"The committee agrees that the facts outlined above and in the reports of the Post Office Department and of the Comptroller General provide a firm basis for legislative relief. This is a case where an employee has performed the duties of an office satisfactorily over an extended period of time and it is inequitable that he should be required to refund the amounts paid him as a compensation for the services he rendered the Government in that position. The Post Office Department in recommending relief in this instance stated:

"'The Department favors enactment of this relief legislation for Mr. Taylor. The salary overpayment in this case was clearly due to an administrative error, without fault on the part of the employee. Moreover, the postal service received the benefit of the employee's services at the higher level for a considerable length of time. In these circumstances it would not be equitable to require refund from the employee.'

"The committee agrees with the statement of the Post Office Department and recommends that the bill, as amended, be considered favorably."

After a review of all the foregoing, the committee concurs in the action of the House of Representatives and recommends that the bill, H.R. 15251, be considered favorably.

LEONARD G. DUFFY

The bill (H.R. 15297) for the relief of Leonard G. Duffy, lieutenant, U.S. Navy, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1761), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to pay Leonard G. Duffy additional severance pay so that the total amount of severance pay granted him on separation from the Navy will be computed on the total of commissioned service performed by him as a naval officer.

STATEMENT

In its favorable action on H.R. 15297, the report of the House of Representatives relates the following:

"The Department of the Navy in its report to the committee on the bill states that it supports the enactment of H.R. 15297.

"Legislative relief as provided in H.R. 15297 is necessary because existing law does not permit the recognition of the full commissioned service in the computation of severance pay where an individual has served as both a line officer and then subsequently as a staff corps officer in the course of his naval career.

"Leonard G. Duffy, the individual named in H.R. 15297, was commissioned as an ensign in the line of the Navy and served as a line officer for 5 years. He then transferred to the Supply Corps and served in that corps for 6 years. He failed of selection for promotion to lieutenant commander for the second time in fiscal year 1966 and, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 6382, the Navy was required to discharge him on or before June 30, 1966. At his request he was discharged on June 8, 1966.

"Section 6382(c) of title 10, United States Code, provides that officers who are discharged for two failures of selection are entitled to severance pay in the amount of 2 months' basic pay multiplied by the number of their years of total commissioned service as computed under 10 U.S.C. 6387 which pertains to line officers, or 10 U.S.C. 6388, which relates to staff corps officers.

"Under section 6388, as interpreted by the Comptroller General and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia circuit, a staff corps officer who had prior service in the line may count only his corps service in computing his total commissioned service. Therefore Lieutenant Duffy received only 12 months' basic pay, based on his 6 years in the Supply Corps, whereas if all of his 11 years of service had been in the Supply Corps or if all of them had been in the line, he would have been paid 22 months' basic pay.

"As is noted in the report of the Department of the Navy, this bill, H.R. 15297, would correct the inequity in Mr. Duffy's case. That Department has stated that it would prefer legislation amending applicable law to equalize the method of computing total commissioned service of line and staff corps officers. The committee agrees that this is a subject which would be better dealt with by an amendment to the basic law; however, it is also clear that Mr. Duffy has no recourse at this time but to appeal to the Congress for private relief. The committee has granted similar relief in previous Congresses and it is clear that justice requires relief in this instance. Accordingly, it is recommended that the bill, as amended, be considered favorably."

After a review of the foregoing, the committee concurs in the action of the House of Representatives and recommends that the bill, H.R. 15297, be considered favorably.

CANCELLATION OF CERTAIN UNPAID INTEREST ACCRUED ON LOANS MADE TO WORLD WAR I VETERANS

The bill (H.R. 16074) to cancel certain unpaid interest accrued after September 30, 1931, on loans made to World War I veterans upon the security of adjusted service certificates, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1762) explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to cancel debts owed by veterans of World War I based upon unpaid interest accrued after September 30, 1931, in connection with loans made before January 27, 1936, by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs or by any bank or trust company upon the security of an adjusted service certificate.

STATEMENT

The House Report No. 1738 on H.R. 16074 relates the following:

"This bill was introduced in accordance with the provisions of an executive communication from the Veterans' Administration.

"In 1936, the Adjusted Compensation Payment Act authorized the cancellation of unpaid interest which accrued on certain loans of veterans after September 30, 1931. This bill would permit a similar cancellation of interest on loans of veterans which were construed not to be covered by the foregoing act. The executive communication outlines the history of this matter and demonstrates the fact that these veterans are entitled to parallel treatment. The World War Adjusted Compensation Act, approved May 19, 1924 (43 Stat. 141), provided adjusted-service credits in amounts of $1 per day for home service and $1.25 for overseas service, with certain maximums for military service in excess of 60 days after April 5, 1917, and before July 1, 1919. Application was made to the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, who certified the amount of such service credit to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. If the amount was less than $50 it was paid in cash. If more than $50 the veteran was issued an adjusted-service certificate equal to the amount in dollars of 20-year endowment insurance, calculated on a specified basis, that the amount of his adjusted-service certificate increased by 25 percent would purchase, at his age on the birthday nearest the date of the certificate, if applied as a single net premium. The act authorized the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and certain banks and trust companies to make loans to veterans upon their promissory notes secured by their adjusted-service certificates.

"The Adjusted Compensation Payment Act, 1936, approved January 27, 1936 (49 Stat. 1100) declared the adjusted-service certificates to be immediately payable. It authorized the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to pay the principal and interest on loans made by banks and trust companies on the promissory notes secured by the adjusted-service certificates and for the cancellation of such certificates. With respect to loans made prior to January 27, 1936, 'pursuant to law' the act canceled any unpaid interest accrued subsequent to September 30, 1931, insofar as the veteran is concerned. Settlements were accordingly made on such basis.

"The difficulties which gave rise to the need for legislative relief as embodied in H.R. 16074 are based on the fact that during the process of preparing and certifying some 3½ million adjusted-service certificates for payment under the Adjusted Compensation Payment Act, 1936, a number of overpayments resulted. Among the causes of overpayments were erroneous certifications of basic service credits by the service departments, disallowances for discharges other than honorable, and issuances of duplicate certificates. Appropriate administrative measures were taken for recovery of all improperly paid amounts. However, approximately 3,000 such indebtedness accounts were referred to the General Accounting Office as uncollectible.

"The Comptroller General on August 5, 1937 (17 CG 99), held that section 2 of the Adjusted Compensation Payment Act, 1936, providing for cancellation of any unpaid interest accrued subsequent to September 30, 1931, that otherwise would be charged a veteran against the face value of an adjusted-service certificate, relates only to interest on loans which do not exceed the face value of proper certificates 'issued pursuant to law' and is not effective to stop the running of interest on unlawful or excess loans for which the veterans have executed notes bearing interest but for which the Government has no security. As the result of this decision, the original indebtedness of some $375,000 on about 950 such accounts has generated an accrued interest charge to date in excess of a million dollars. Most of these overpayments clearly developed without fault on the part of the veteran but this type of debt has been held to be not subject to the Veterans' Administration waiver procedure (pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 3102).

"The executive communication, in order to clarify the problem involved in this situation, cited the example of an individual referred to as 'Mr. S.' In this case, the indebtedness of Mr. S. (A–4052869) is a case in point. Mr. S. was issued an adjusted-service certificate bearing the face value of $1,235. He negotiated two loans amounting to $617.50 for the permissible loan privilege of 50 percent of the face value of the certificate. Subsequently, the War Department advised that a recomputation of Mr. S.'s adjusted-service credit necessitated a reduction in the face value of his certificate to $489. Meanwhile, the original loans, plus interest, had reached $639.60 as of the statutory interest cutoff date of September 30, 1931. Settlement for this amount, less the corrected face value credit, resulted in a net indebtedness to the Government of $150.60. However, the applicable 4½ percent interest since September 30, 1931, compounded annually on this debt has already reached $529.58 as of December 31, 1965, with a current total indebtedness figure of $680.18.

"The Veterans' Administration stated that several years ago, the payment records of the Veterans' Benefits Office were centralized in its data processing center and converted to the automatic data processing system. In the course of this conversion, it was determined that approximately 328 adjusted-service certificate overpayment cases pertained to compensation or pension payees in a running award status. A survey indicated that approximately 40 percent of these cases involve unlawful or excess loans that have been accumulating interest compounded annually.

The average interest accrual since September 30, 1931, increased the original debt some four times. Since the conversion to the automatic processing system, other veterans whose adjusted-service certificates were overpaid have become eligible for monthly benefits and have been added to the rolls.

"Where the problem of loan interest accrual was not present, the Veterans' Administration contacted the veteran and attempted to effect arrangements for collection or offset of the overpayments. The bulk of these cases have been closed either as the result of collection, offset, or because of the death of the veteran. However, where interest has been accruing for the past 30 years, the Veterans' Administration finds itself in a difficult position in seeking to recover accrued interest when the veteran is not at fault and where, had not the certificate been in error, the interest would have been canceled under the Adjusted Compensation Payment Act of 1963 referred to at the beginning of this report. Accordingly, the Veterans' Administration has directed their efforts at collecting or offsetting the principal and interest up to 1931. As has been noted, this bill would merely provide for a cancellation of the obligation to pay interest in such cases when that interest accrued after September 30, 1931.

"The committee has carefully considered the communication of the Veterans' Administration and agrees that equity and justice require legislative relief."

After a review of all of the foregoing, the committee concurs in the action of the House of Representatives and recommends that the bill, H.R. 16074, be considered favorably.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 14363) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide rules relating to the deduction for personal exemptions for children of parents who are divorced or separated, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KUCHEL. Over.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over on request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H.R. 17488) to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to increase the rates of pensions payable to certain veterans and their widows, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over on request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ADDITION AT WALTER REED ARMY MEDICAL CENTER, WASHINGTON, D.C.

The bill (H.R. 18019) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct an addition at the Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, D.C., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISPOSAL OF BATTERY GRADE SYNTHETIC MANGANESE DIOXIDE FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

The bill (H.R. 13661) to authorize the disposal of battery grade synthetic manganese dioxide from the national stockpile was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISPOSAL OF FUSED CRUDE ALUMINUM OXIDE FROM THE NATIONAL AND SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILES

The bill (H.R. 13370) to authorize the disposal of fused crude aluminum oxide from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 872) to amend the provisions of title 18 of the United States Code relating to offenses committed in Indian country, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

GLENN D. HUMES

The bill (H.R. 1328) for the relief of Glenn D. Humes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MAJ. RALPH D. CALDWELL

The bill (H.R. 1388) for the relief of Maj. Ralph D. Caldwell was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLAIMS RESULTING FROM EXPLOSION AT A U.S. ORDNANCE PLANT IN BOWIE COUNTY, TEX.

The bill (H.R. 2266) to provide for the settlement of claims resulting from an explosion at a U.S. ordnance plant in Bowie County, Tex., on July 8, 1963, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1764.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JEAN A. QUAINTANCE

The bill (H.R. 4077) for the relief of Jean A. Quaintance was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1766.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPLICATIONS FOR WRITS OF HABEAS CORPUS BY PERSONS IN CUSTODY PURSUANT TO JUDGMENT OF STATE COURTS

The bill (H.R. 5958) relating to applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody pursuant to judgment of State courts was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1797), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

H.R. 5958 revises the procedures applicable to review by lower Federal courts of petitions for habeas corpus by prisoners who have been convicted and who are in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court.

STATEMENT

Legislation to revise the procedures applicable to review by lower Federal courts of habeas corpus petitions by State convicts has been previously before the 84th, 85th, 86th, and 88th Congresses. In each instance the legislation has been sponsored by Judicial Conference of the United States, which has endorsed and urged the enactment of H.R. 5958.

The number of applications by State prisoners for writs of habeas corpus has been steadily increasing. In 1941 only 134 such writs were filed in the Federal district courts. By 1957 the number had grown to 814. In fiscal 1963, 1,692 applications were filed by State court prisoners; in fiscal 1964, 3,248 applications were filed; in fiscal 1965, 4,845 applications were filed; and in the first 9 months of fiscal 1966, 3,773 applications were filed. More than 95 percent of these applications were held to be without merit.

Although only a small number of these applications have been found meritorious, the applications in their totality have imposed a heavy burden on the Federal courts. In many instances the burden has been an unnecessary one, since the State prisoners have been filing applications either containing allegations identical to those asserted in a previous application that has been denied, or predicated upon grounds obviously well known to them when they filed the preceding application. The bill seeks to alleviate the unnecessary burden by introducing a greater degree of finality of judgments in habeas corpus proceedings.

Section 1 of H.R. 5958 amends section 2244 of title 28, United States Code, by adding two additional subsections designated (b) and (c). The new subsection (b) provides that when a person in custody pursuant to a judgment of a State court has been denied, after a hearing by a court of the United States or a justice or judge of the United States, release from custody or other remedy on an application for a writ of habeas corpus, a subsequent application for a similar writ on behalf of the same applicant need not be entertained by a court of the United States or a justice or judge thereof unless it is predicated on a factual or other ground not adjudicated at the earlier hearing and unless the court is satisfied that the applicant did not deliberately withhold such information, or otherwise abuse the writ. Thus, for example, if on a subsequent application for habeas corpus relief a State court prisoner asserts that he has newly discovered evidence relating to an alleged denial of a Federal right, the court would be obliged to entertain the writ provided it was satisfied that the prisoner had not deliberately withheld the newly asserted factual ground for relief in his earlier application, and had not otherwise abused the writ.

The new subsection (c) provides that when a habeas corpus proceeding is brought in behalf of a person in custody under a judgment of a State court, a prior judgment of the Supreme Court of the United States on an appeal or review by a writ of certiorari brought by the prisoner will be conclusive as to all issues of fact and law concerning an alleged denial of a Federal right that were actually adjudicated by the Supreme Court. There is an exception to the conclusiveness of this presumption if the applicant for the writ pleads and proves the existence of a materially controlling fact that did not appear in the record of the proceeding before the Supreme Court and that he, the applicant, could not have caused to appear in such a record by the exercise of reasonable diligence. This subsection is intended to give a conclusive presumption only to actual adjudications of Federal rights, by the Supreme Court, and not to give such a presumption to mere denials of writs of certiorari.

The purpose of these new subsections is to add to section 2244 of title 28, United States Code, provisions for a qualified application of the doctrine of res judicata.

Section 2 of H.R. 5958 provides that a State court determination, made after a hearing on the merits of a factual issue and evidenced by a written finding, written opinion, "or other reliable and adequate written indictia," shall be presumed to be correct by a Federal court considering a State prisoner's habeas corpus petition unless the petitioner establishes or the respondent admits one of eight conditions. These conditions are: (1) that the merits of the factual dispute were not resolved in the State court hearing; or (2) that the factfinding procedure employed by the State court was not adequate to a full and fair hearing; or (3) the material facts were not adequately developed at the State court hearing; or (4) that the State court lacked jurisdiction of the subject matter or over the person of the applicant in the State court proceeding; or (5) that the applicant was an indigent and the State court, in deprivation of his constitutional rights, refused to appoint counsel to represent him in the State court proceeding; or (6) that the applicant did not receive a full, fair, and adequate hearing in the State court proceeding; or (7) that the effect of the State court judgment or proceeding would be or is to deprive the applicant of his life or his liberty without due process of law; or (8) that the pertinent part of the record of the State court proceeding shows, in the judgment of the Federal court after a consideration of such part of the record as a whole, that the factual determination of the State hearing is not fairly supported by the record.

Section 2 further provides that at the evidentiary hearing in the Federal court when proof of the State court's factual determination has been made, unless one of the conditions numbered (1) to (7) outlined above is shown by the applicant, otherwise appears, or is admitted by the respondent, or unless the court concludes pursuant to condition number (8) that the State court record does not support such factual determination, the burden shall rest upon the applicant to establish by convincing evidence that the factual determination by the State court was erroneous.

In their report to the Judicial Conference of the United States, the Habeas Corpus Committee, composed of Circuit Judges Simon E. Sobeloff, Phillip Forman, Luther M. Swygert, J. Skelly Wright, and Orie L. Phillips (Chairman), wrote:

"It is the opinion of your committee that the proposed legislation, if enacted, will be a strong inducement to the States that have not already done so to provide adequate postconviction remedies and procedures and to make and keep available records of evidentiary matter in criminal and postconviction proceedings, and to the State courts in criminal procedings to safeguard the constitutional rights of defendants."

In supporting H.R. 5958 as passed by the House, the Judicial Conference has withdrawn its prior favorable recommendation of a legislative proposal that would have used three-judge Federal courts in the adjudication of petitions for writs by State prisoners. The previous version provided that, when a State prisoner applied for a writ, a single Federal judge was to determine whether the writ should be issued or the application dismissed. If the writ was issued, the question of release was to be heard by a statutory three-judge court. The required impaneling of a three-judge court was considered by many observers to be fraught with administrative problems. Serving on a three-judge court disrupts the work of the circuit judges and district judges who compose the court and often causes them much inconvenience, especially when they must travel away from their normal place of sitting. Furthermore, since the review of the judgment of such a three-judge court was only by the Supreme Court on certiorari, a heavy burden would be placed on that court. In light of the administrative burdens imposed when a three-judge court is convened, three-judge courts should not be required by statute unless there is a very substantial reason therefor. The Judicial Conference has withdrawn its favorable recommendation of the three-judge court proposal and has instead endorsed the bill as passed by the House.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 1768 and the measures which follow in sequence.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

ESTATE OF MAJ. JOHN W. ROY

The bill (H.R. 6035) for the relief of the estate of Maj. John W. Roy, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1799), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to relieve the estate of the late Maj. John W. Roy of liability for amounts paid him as retired pay from September 1, 1950, through October 31, 1958, which were held to have been erroneous and to authorize refund to his widow of amounts withheld or paid in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability.

STATEMENT

The bill was the subject of a hearing before a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

The Department of the Army has reported that it has no objection to the bill.

The Comptroller General has reported that he does not recommend favorable action on the bill.

In its favorable report on the bill the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives set forth the facts in the case and its recommendations as follows:

"Maj. John W. Roy, who was born on November 3, 1888, was placed on the Army of the United States retired list as a major on August 31, 1950, in accordance with the provisions of title III of Public Law 810, 80th Congress (10 U.S.C. 1331–1337), which provided for retirement for Inactive and Active Reserve service. When he was placed on the retired list, he was credited with 23 years 11 months 5 days of active and inactive service which was creditable for retirement under that law. Included in this service was Colonel Roy's active service during World War I. However, after an 8-year period on November 10, 1958, Major Roy's future retired pay was withheld pending a determination of such pay on the basis of a reexamination of the service upon which his Reserve retirement was based. The Court of Claims case of *Waterbury* v. *United States* (121 Ct. Cl. 691), decided in 1952, held that National Guard Reserve service was not creditable service for this type of retirement. The investigation revealed that Major Roy had received qualifying credit for federally recognized National Guard Reserve service from November 1, 1919, to June 20, 1924. The disallowance of this period reduced his qualifying service below the required 20 years necessary for retirement under title III. The subsequent addition of 5 months 8 days of allowable National Guard service still was not enough to qualify him for the full 20-year period because his qualifying service remained at 19 years 8 months 23 days. Subsequent service as a member of the Commissioned Inactive Reserve from May 4, 1942, to December 2, 1946, and the Commissioned Honorary Reserve from December 3, 1946, to November 2, 1948, was similarly not creditable for retirement under title III. The results of all this was that the orders placing Major Roy on the retired list was revoked on April 23, 1959, and the full amount paid to him as a retired Reserve officer amounting to $6,348.11 was ruled to have been an erroneous overpayment. Ultimately, the matter was turned over to a U.S. district attorney for suit and in the face of a threat of legal action, Major Roy compromised the matter by payment of $1,587.03.

"A careful reading of the Army report on this bill discloses that Major Roy was granted retirement benefits in 1950 under the prevailing administrative view that National Guard Reserve service was creditable for retirement under title III of Public Law 810. The Army confirmed this interpretation on December 19, 1951, in an opinion in another case in which that Department ruled that federally recognized National Guard Reserve service between 1916 and 1933 was qualifying service for title III retirement. It is therefore clear that Major Roy's retirement was based on an official determination by the United States that he was properly qualified for retirement. It is obvious that he relied upon this determination to the ultimate detriment of himself and his family. As has been noted, the case of *Waterbury* v. *United States* was decided in 1952. At that time the Army took the position that this case defined eligibility in prospective terms, but that as to prior determination the case would not be applied retroactively. Notwithstanding the official determination by the Department, the Comptroller General ruled that persons in Colonel Roy's position were "unlawfully" placed on the title III retired list and could not be regarded as a de facto retired officer so as to permit the retired officer to retain payments already received.

"As is observed by the Army, Major Roy was placed on the retired list and received payment as a retired officer in good faith over a period of years under an administrative interpretation which was subsequently ruled to have been mistaken. The facts outlined above show that Major Roy had, in fact, been active in the Reserve and National Guard affairs for a period in excess of that required to qualify for retirement if all his service had been creditable. He would therefore have had not notice of the invalidity or question concerning his retirement. Under these circumstances, the committee feels that a just and equitable resolution of the matter would be to relieve his estate of any liability and to authorize the refund of any amounts paid or withheld because of such liability.

However, the committee feels that section 3, which would apparently grant certain rights, benefits, and privileges to the widow as if Major Roy had been correctly retired, goes beyond the scope of the bill which is to relieve the estate and the widow of the burden of the liability. Accordingly, it is recommended that the bill be amended to strike the language of section 3 of the bill. With this amendment, the committee recommends that the bill be considered favorably."

The committee believes that the bill is meritorious and recommends it favorably.

NATHAN LEVINE

The bill (H.R. 7026) for the relief of Nathan Levine was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES A. TURNER

The bill (H.R. 8937) for the relief of Charles A. Turner was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1801), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay Charles A. Turner the sum of $2,551.18 in full settlement of all his claims against the United States for travel and the transportation of his household goods upon termination of his civilian employment with the Air Force in Germany. The travel and transportation of the goods were not provided by the Government because it was delayed beyond the 2-year period limited by applicable regulations due to the fatal illness of Mr. Turner's wife in Germany.

STATEMENT

Mr. Turner resigned (optional retirement) from his Air Force employment at Wiesbaden Airbase, Wiesbaden, Germany, on December 24, 1960. Prior to his separation, Mr. Turner requested that he be authorized delayed return travel and transportation entitlement to the United States because his wife was ill and unable to travel. He stated the reasons for his request as follows:

"My wife, Mrs. Turner, is presently under the care of a local physician and is unable to travel to the Conus. The physician indicates that, in all probability, Mrs. Turner's condition will continue to require treatment for 90 days or more. Since this physician is thoroughly familiar with Mrs. Turner's condition and is making considerable progress in his treatment, it is deemed impracticable to attempt to change physicians at this time."

Mr. Turner's request for delayed use of transportation entitlement was approved by civilian personnel officials; however, no time limitation was stated in the request or in the approval of the request. The Department of the Air Force was unable to determine if Mr. Turner was advised at the time of separation of possible loss of transportation entitlement. Regulations in effect at that time did not require a notice to employee at the time of separation to state his understanding of the loss of travel entitlement if he elected to remain overseas.

Mr. Turner's wife continued to have a history of illness, hospitalizations, and medical treatments so that she was unable to travel to the United States. She died in a hospital in Wiesbaden, Germany, on December 27, 1962. Mr. Turner applied for return travel early in 1963 but was informed that since more than 2 years had passed since his separation from the Air Force, his entitlement for travel and shipment of household goods had expired. Executive Order 9805 (superseded by BOB Circular A-56, effective June 1, 1962) prohibits transportation at Government expense after the expiration of 2 years from date of separation. These restrictive provisions cannot be disregarded by the Air Force, even though Mr. Turner had completed a transportation agreement and had earned entitlement for shipment of household effects at Government expense.

The Department of the Air Force, in its report sets forth a complete analysis of each item of expense involved in the transportation expenses paid by Mr. Turner, and further determined which items would have been paid had the transportation been effected during the 2-year period. These items total $2,551.18, the sum stated in the bill.

The Department of the Air Force, in its report, advises that it has no legal authority to grant an extension or waiver of the 2-year time limitation on shipment of household goods, or to reimburse Mr. Turner for the payment made by him for travel and transportation costs. That Department believed, however, that the physical condition of Mr. Turner's wife which prohibited travel during the period of travel entitlement and Mr. Turner's action to apply for return travel within a reasonable time after his wife's death, constituted extenuating circumstances. That Department advises that in the light of these circumstances it interposes no objection to favorable consideration of this bill.

The Comptroller General of the United States advises that in view of the extenuating circumstances of this case he has no objection to favorable consideration of this bill. Accordingly, the committee recommends favorable consideration of H.R. 8937, without amendment.

WILLIAM A. BUZBEE

The bill (H.R. 9213) for the relief of William A. Buzbee was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1802), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to relieve William A. Buzbee, of Smiths, Ala., of liability to the United States of $3,496.18, based upon an overpayment due to longevity step increases in the period from July 7, 1957, to February 21, 1965.

STATEMENT

The Department of the Army and the Comptroller General have indicated that they have no objection to the enactment of the bill.

The facts in the case are set forth in the report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives as follows:

"William A. Buzbee, a civilian employee at Fort Benning, Ga., became a classification analyst, CAF-8, on July 1, 1947. He was promoted to the next grade of CAF-9 on August 30, 1948. On August 15, 1949, he was promoted to position classifier, CAF-10, which, after the enactment of the Classification Act of 1949, was designated as GS-10. On October 22, 1951, he was promoted to position classifier, salary and wage chief, GS-12; however, this position was changed to step 6 of grade GS-11 on September 8, 1952.

"The problem to which this bill relates arises from the fact that on July 7, 1957, Mr. Buzbee was given a longevity step increase under the provisions of section 703 of the Classification Act of 1949. At that time, administrative personnel of the Army determined that he had satisfied the 10-year aggregate period of service in the same position as required by section 703(b)(6) because his responsibilities had remained the same during the past 10 years even though his grade classification had changed. He was given another longevity step increase on September 14, 1958. These actions were challenged on June 14, 1964, as the result of a Civil Service Commission ruling that Mr. Buzbee's positions in grades GS-11 and GS-12 differed sufficiently from the lower grade positions he had held prior to October 22, 1951, that they had to be classed at different positions. This ruling was based on the fact that the supervisory responsibilities and the number of positions serviced had changed. In view of this determination, the General Accounting Office decided that Mr. Buzbee was not entitled to the two longevity step increases because the 10-year aggregate waiting period did not begin until he was promoted to the grade of GS-12 on October 22, 1951.

"As is noted in the report of the Comptroller General, this is a case where the Department of the Army found itself in disagreement with the Civil Service Commission on the factual question of whether Mr. Buzbee's responsibilities had remained the same during the 10-year period specified in the statute. The General Accounting Office report notes that even after the ruling, the Army authorities at Fort Benning, Ga., continued to contend that no overpayment had been made since, in their view, Mr. Buzbee had no major change in duties and responsibilities. The Army took the position that there had been no change in organizational location and no development which actually resulted in the establishment of a new position. The Comptroller General stated as follows concerning the view of the Department of the Army:

"'Since the view of the Department of the Army to the effect that the same position was involved in the regardings is not without some merit and as Mr. Buzbee's salary rate has been corrected as of February 21, 1965, we offer no objection to enactment of the proposed legislation.'

"In view of the position of the General Accounting Office and the Department of the Army, as well as the review conducted by this committee, it has been determined that this is an appropriate case for legislative relief. In this connection, the committee notes that a somewhat similar situation concerning a group of cases at the Norfolk Naval Shipyard was the subject of a relief bill in the first session of the Congress, which passed the House during that session. H.R. 7446, which passed the House on October 5, 1965, would relieve a group of employees at that shipyard whose reclassifications were initially interpreted by the Navy not to be increases or promotions but as change in grade with no change in duties. The committee feels that where official determinations are made by the U.S. Government and thereafter overturned on the basis of subsequent reviews that the individuals who rely in good faith on the determination should not be called upon to bear the burden of overpayments which are determined in a retroactive manner. Accordingly, it is recommended that this bill be considered favorably."

The committee believes that the bill is meritorious and recommends it favorably.

CERTAIN CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY AT FORT SAM HOUSTON, TEX.

The bill (H.R. 9217) for the relief of certain civilian employees of the Department of the Army at Fort Sam Houston, Tex., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1803), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to relieve civilian employees and former civilian employees of the Department of the Army at the Brooke Army Medical Center, Fort Sam Houston, Tex., of all liability based on overpayments of compensation made in the period July 17, 1956, through September 5, 1959. The bill would also permit a refund of any amounts withheld by reason of the liability created in this matter.

STATEMENT

The employees named in this bill were granted step increases at the time of promotion based upon an erroneous interpretation of a civilian personnel regulation by Army personnel at the Brooke Army Medical Center. These errors were made in the period from June 17, 1956, through September 5, 1959. When these employees were promoted from one Classification Act grade to another, they received an increase in compensation authorized under section 1132(b) of title 5, United States Code, prior to the amendments to that section made in 1962. Concurrently with his promotion, each employee was granted a further step increase because of the time served in the lower grade. This was incorrect because the increase in compensation upon promotion should have been construed as an equivalent increase in compensation within the meaning of section 1121 of title 5, and service performed in the lower grade should, therefore, not have been counted for further step increases. This meant that the employees should have completed the full waiting period after promotion before being entitled to the next higher within-grade step increase.

The Army found that the employees received these overpayments in good faith and in reliance on official action taken by Army personnel. The committee agrees that the most equitable way of adjusting this matter is through the granting of the relief provided by this bill. While the amounts are relatively small in most of the cases, it is clear that for employees of this type, they impose an unfair hardship. The bill also provides a means of treating all persons in the same situation in the same manner. Since both the Department of the Army and the Comptroller General have observed that in some instances, the amounts of overpayment have been repaid, fair and equitable treatment requires that there be a refund provision included in the bill. The committee recommends that the bill be considered favorably.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 1776 and the measures which follow in sequence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOHNNY R. BRADLEY AND OTHERS

The bill (H.R. 11676) for the relief of Johnny R. Bradley and others was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1807), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to relieve nine civilian employees of the Air Force of overpayments received in the period from July 12, 1964, through September 25, 1965.

STATEMENT

The Department of the Air Force has reported to the Congress that it has no objection to the bill.

The Comptroller General in a report to the Congress has outlined the facts in the case without expressing any recommendation.

In its favorable report the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives said:

"The bill, H.R. 11676, was the subject of a subcommittee hearing on August 4, 1966. At that time the members of the subcommittee inquired into the circumstances of the individuals affected. It was determined that the individuals involved were in the grade of GS-9. The committee has been supplied with financial statements showing the income and family circumstances of each of the persons involved and has concluded that the overpayments incurred in this matter has imposed a tangible hardship upon each of these individuals. As a group, these are relatively young men with growing families and it would be unfair to require them to refund the overpayments. The overpayments occurred due to the fact that all nine individuals named in the bill were receiving a special rate of pay under the provisions of section 504 of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, which established special rates of pay for recruitment and retention purposes. All of these employees were promoted during the retroactive period of the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1964, i.e., during the period from the effective date to the date of enactment.

"Employees who were receiving special rates established under section 504 of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 were specifically excluded from the provisions of section 102(b) of the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1964 governing the initial adjustment in the pay rates of Classification Act employees generally. The initial adjustment of pay rates for employees who were receiving these special rates was subject to conversion rules and regulations issued by the Civil Service Commission. These regulations, when issued, contained no provision similar to section 102(b)(6) of the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1964. (Sec. 102(b)(6) of that act provided that the pay of an employee whose pay had been established at a step rate above the minimum of his grade upon promotion from one Classification Act grade to another during the retroactive period covered by that act would be adjusted to the new rate for the corresponding numerical step rate of the grades held during the retroactive period covered by that act.) Through an administrative oversight, the pay rates of the employees named in the bill were adjusted through the application of the general conversion rules of section 102(b)(6).

"In his decision of February 17, 1965 (B-155395), the Comptroller General ruled that the pay of an employee receiving such a special rate who was promoted during the retroactive period of the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1964 must be recomputed as if the new pay rates had been in effect at the time he was promoted.

"In the light of the Comptroller General decision, the Air Force Directorate of Civilian Personnel ruled that all promotions during the retroactive period of the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1964 of employees who were receiving a special rate be reviewed and the necessary adjustments made. The errors were discovered as a result of the review and action was taken to adjust the salaries to the correct rate. The individuals were notified of the overpayments and of their indebtedness to the Government but no collection has been made.

"The Department of the Air Force in its report noted that the overpayments resulted from an erroneous application of governing regulations and that further there is nothing to indicate that the employees did not act in good faith in receiving the overpayments. On the basis of the particular facts of the case as outlined in its report, the Air Force indicated that it would have no objection to favorable consideration of the bill. The committee finds that this is a proper subject for legislative relief and accordingly recommend that the bill, as amended, be considered favorably."

The committee has in the past approved similar claims where an overpayment was made through an error on the part of the Government, was received in good faith by the employee, and where its repayment would be a hardship.

The committee believes that the bill is meritorious and recommends it favorably.

KIM YAP YUNG

The bill (H.R. 12826) for the relief of Kim Yap Yung was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1808), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate the admission into the United States in an immediate relative status of the alien child to be adopted by citizens of the United States.

SP5C. RONALD J. OLSON, U.S. ARMY, RETIRED

The bill (H.R. 13800) for the relief of Sp5c. Ronald J. Olson, U.S. Army, retired, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1809), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to relieve Sp5c. Ronald J. Olson of liability to pay to the United States the sum of $170, representing the balance due on the total amount which

Mr. Olson owes the United States as a result of an administrative error on the part of the Department of the Army.

Section 2 of the bill provides for refund of any amounts paid by reason of the liability.

STATEMENT

The Department of the Army has no objection to the bill.

In its favorable report on the bill the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives said:

"Mr. Olson was born on March 3, 1936, and inducted into the Army on November 15, 1960. He was subsequently placed on the temporary disability retired list on December 30, 1964. His disabilities resulted from an automobile accident in which he was injured which occurred on February 16, 1964, in France, when he was a passenger in a privately owned vehicle. Subsequently he was permanently retired on January 7, 1965, under title 10, United States Code, section 1202, with a 60-percent disability rating.

"During a routine examination of Specialist Olson's account following his retirement, the Army found that an allotment of $40 per month had been paid to Specialist Olson's mother from April 1964 through January 1965, and that no deductions for the allotment were made from his pay for December 1964 and January 1965, resulting in an indebtedness of $80. In addition, an allotment of $60 per month was paid to the clerk of circuit court, Madison, Wis., for the months of October 1963 through January 1965, representing allotment payments to Specialist Olson's minor daughter. Also it was determined that the Army did not withhold deductions from Specialist Olson's pay for December 1964 and January 1965 for the allotment to his daughter, creating an indebtedness of $120, and increasing the total indebtedness to $200.

"Deductions of $10 per month were made from Specialist Olson's salary from November 1964, through January 1965, thus leaving a balance of $170 owing to the United States.

"The Department of the Army in its report to the committee has no objection to this bill. They state that the overpayments resulted from the failure of Army administrative personnel to deduct proper allotment payments for two separate allotments for the months of December 1964 and January 1965, after having made erroneous allotment deductions from Specialist Olson's pay from November 1964 through January 1965.

"Mr. Olson is supporting his minor daughter and his only income is his Army disability retirement pay. Also the Veterans' Administration sent him to a business school so that he could learn a trade to support himself. It therefore appears that refund of the amounts claimed by the Government would impose an unfair hardship on this retired serviceman. In view of these equitable considerations, the committee recommends that the bill, as amended, be considered favorably."

The committee has in the past acted favorably on similar bills to relieve a claimant for an overpayment made through an error on the part of the Government, which was received by the claimant in good faith, and where its repayment would be a hardship.

The committee believes that the bill is meritorious and recommends it favorably.

CERTAIN MEMBERS AND FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMY

The bill (H.R. 14615) for the relief of certain members and former members of the Army on whose behalf erroneous payments were made for storage of household goods was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1812), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to relieve members and former members of the Army of liability to refund amounts paid by the Government prior to January 21, 1964, for nontemporary storage of household goods when the service member involved had been granted permissive temporary duty by the Army in order to complete requirements for degrees at civilian colleges. The bill further permits the refund of any amount repaid by a serviceman in the group covered by the bill.

STATEMENT

The bill was introduced at the request of the Department of the Army.

In its favorable report on the bill the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives said:

"This legislation would relieve members of the liability to refund amounts paid by disbursing officers of the Department of the Army to storage companies for household goods storage for periods of permissive temporary duty en route to permanent stations. The purpose of permissive temporary duty was to permit members to attend civilian colleges to fulfill requirements for degrees under the educational development program of the Department of the Army. To achieve maximum participation in the program, it was the policy of the Department of the Army to issue orders directing members to permanent duty stations with permissive temporary duty en route after detachment from old stations. Orders stated that allowances, including transportation of dependents and movement of household goods, were authorized from the old duty stations to the new duty stations. Storage of household goods was made at Government expense, since it was considered as a necessary service incident to transportation of the household goods to the new duty stations.

"The Comptroller General of the United States held (B-150558, Dec. 30, 1963) that, in the absence of specific authority, the attendance of service members under permissive orders at civilian colleges may not be recognized as assignments to military duty so as to entitle such members to nontemporary storage of household goods at Government expense under the provisions of the Joint Travel Regulations, issued under authority of and to implement section 406, title 37, United States Code. Therefore, the costs of storage of the household goods at Government expense were not proper charges against appropriated funds. Since January 21, 1964, the costs of such storage have been at the expense of the service members concerned.

"Collections from service members have been suspended, except that in order to protect the disbursing officer, procedures have been established which provide for collections from service members who are separated from active duty during the period collections are suspended.

"This committee agrees that the facts in this situation demonstrate that the Department of the Army acted in good faith and with confidence that it was justified in regarding the storage as necessary and as incident to ordered changes of station. It should be emphasized that the payments for storage were made in accordance with regulations which authorized the storage at Government expense. It is, therefore, clear that the storage procedures were accepted by the service members in good faith. The Department of the Army in its communication specifically noted this fact. The Army further noted that collection from service members for the costs of storage would create a hardship.

"The committee finds that this is a proper subject for legislative relief. In recommending enactment of the bill, the Army has noted the facts and referred to the equities of the situation. The committee feels that relief should be extended to these servicemen for it is clear that they relied upon official determinations and assurances that their orders authorized storage under these conditions. The subsequent change of official rules on this subject should not be given this sort of effect and the consequences of the change of policy should not be visited upon the individual Army members. It is recommended that the bill be considered favorably."

The committee believes that the bill, which involves approximately $18,000, is meritorious and recommends it favorably.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 14174) for the relief of Esteban Fernandez Noda was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H.R. 14233) for the relief of Beatriz Diaz was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

MR. AND MRS. WILLIAM NUSSBAUM

The bill (H.R. 14819) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. William Nussbaum, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1813), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to waive the statute of limitations to permit the consideration and settlement of a claim for resettlement reimbursement in connection with the acquisition of property for the Littleville Dam and Reservoir project in Massachusetts, in February of 1965.

STATEMENT

The Department of the Army has reported to the Congress that it feels that this is a matter for the consideration of the Congress.

In its favorable report on the bill the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives said:

"The bill concerns the waiver of applicable limitations so as to permit the consideration of an application for reimbursement of moving expenses which was filed with the Army on January 25, 1965. Mr. and Mrs. Nussbaum owned property designated as tract No. 408, which was acquired by the Government in connection with the Littleville Dam and Reservoir project in Massachusetts. This project is located on the Middle Branch of the Westfield River in Massachusetts and is a project authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297, 306). The United States acquired fee title to some 1,624 acres of land. Included among this land was tract No. 408, upon which Mr. and Mrs. Nussbaum had a summer residence. The tract was deeded to the United States by deed dated February 25, 1963.

"Section 2680 of title 10, United States Code, authorizes the Secretary of a military department to reimburse owners and tenants of land acquired for that department, for reasonable expenses, losses and damages incurred as a direct result of moving themselves and their possessions because of the land acquisition. However, it also provides that the application for reimbursement, by the owner or tenant, must be filed within 1 year after the date of acquisition or within 1 year after the property is vacated, whichever date is later.

"As is observed in the Army report, the application by the Nussbaums for moving expenses as authorized under the law was denied because it was not filed within 1 year after the property was vacated. The application was received by the Army some 3 months too late for consideration. The Army report notes that Mr. and Mrs. Nussbaum were subjected to the pressures of business, a death in the family, and sickness of Mrs. Nussbaum, all of which contributed to the delay in filing the application. Furthermore, their permanent residence was some 100 miles from the Massachusetts property and this made the moving and other incidental arrangements with reference to the property that much more difficult.

"The committee requested and was supplied with further information concerning the circumstances of the parties and the difficulties they encountered in seeking to file their application for moving expenses. Mr. Nussbaum is now 60 years of age and his wife is 54. They have two children who are ages 12 and 16. They run a small restaurant and bar in Bedford Hills, N.Y., and both are required to work long hours 7 days a week. The wife does the cooking and the husband serves the customers with one assistant.

"At the time of the land acquisition, Mrs. Nussbaum's mother was an invalid and lived with the couple. She passed away in July of 1964. During this period Mrs. Nussbaum underwent an operation for varicose veins and she contracted jaundice with the result that she was forced to be absent from work for 2 months during July and August. The committee has concluded that these facts serve to document the difficulties faced by these persons in preparing and submitting the claim. Under the circumstances, the committee has concluded that the fair and just thing to do is to waive the applicable statute of limitations and permit the consideration of their claim on the merits under applicable provisions of law. Accordingly, it is recommended that the bill, as amended, be considered favorably."

The committee believes that the bill is meritorious and recommends it favorably.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 14920) for the relief of Marie del Carmen Bermudez was announced as next in order.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, over.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be passed over.

EUGENE G. PETERSON, HARRY E. BYERS, AND RUSSELL W. JORDAN

The bill (H.R. 16977) for the relief of Eugene G. Peterson, Harry E. Byers, and Russell W. Jordan, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1815), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to pay to Eugene G. Peterson the sum of $405.40; to Harry E. Byers the sum of $195; and to Russell W. Jordan the sum of $102; in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States for reimbursement of expenses and losses incurred in 1963 in connection with the cancellation of duty assignments scheduled by the Federal Aviation Agency.

STATEMENT

In its favorable report on the bill the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives said:

"The bill, H.R. 16977, was introduced in accordance with the recommendations of the Federal Aviation Agency which recommends its enactment.

"Eugene G. Peterson, Harry E. Byers, and Russell W. Jordan are employees of the Federal Aviation Agency. These three employees were among those who were selected to staff new facilities at Minot and Grand Forks, N. Dak., and Great Falls, Mont. These locations were to be utilized as air traffic control facilities, and were to be commissioned in existing Department of Defense semiautomatic ground environment (SAGE) sectors and associated radar systems by the Department of Defense and FAA.

"The employees who were to maintain these air traffic control stations went through a training program at Boston, Mass., and Biloxi, Miss., from February 5 through March 14, 1963. After this training program they were to report to their duty stations at Minot, Grank Forks, and Great Falls.

"Toward the end of the training program, the Agency found it necessary to cancel its plans to establish new facilities at Minot and Grand Forks. The employees who were in training were first informed that such a change was possible 9 days before the end of the training program. The change was announced as definite 2 days later, and on March 12, 1964, the employees were reassigned to the air route traffic control centers at Great Falls or Minneapolis, Minn., or returned to their previous duty stations if they so desired.

"The Federal Aviation Agency reports that "fortunately, the last-minute change of plans did not work to the financial disadvantage of most of the trainees." There were only three employees who suffered losses due to this sudden change of plans.

Mr. Peterson incurred expenses amounting to $405.40 when it became necessary for him and his wife to find temporary quarters while arranging for reshipment of his household goods from Grand Forks, and while awaiting their arrival in Minneapolis. He was originally scheduled to be transferred from New York to Grand Forks, but was assigned to Minneapolis. His losses include expenses incurred by his wife in searching for and renting a new residence at Grand Forks, and expenses incurred both in Grand Forks and Minneapolis because of the necessity of living in temporary quarters while arranging for reshipment of his household goods from Grand Forks, and while awaiting their arrival in Minneapolis.

"Mr. Harry E. Byers was scheduled to be transferred to Minot from New Orleans where he was working when selected for the program. His losses amounting to $195 include amounts incurred by himself, his wife, and daughter in Minneapolis because of the necessity of living in temporary quarters while awaiting arrival of his household goods.

"Mr. Russell W. Jordan was scheduled to be transferred to Minot from Great Falls but remained at Great Falls. He incurred an expense in the amount of $102 when he sold his home in anticipation of his transfer and found it necessary to find another residence in Great Falls. His losses consist of expenses incurred in moving his household goods to his new residence in Great Falls.

"These three employees incurred the losses in connection with a reassignment for the convenience of the Government and the losses were due to no fault on their part. Under these particular circumstances, the committee has concluded that the Government ought to reimburse them as provided in the bill. Accordingly, it is recommended that the bill be considered favorably."

The committee believes that the bill is meritorious and recommends it favorably.

ROBERT A. JELLISON

The bill (H.R. 17260) for the relief of Robert A. Jellison was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1816), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to pay to Robert A. Jellison the sum of $128.96, in satisfaction of his claim against the United States for damage to household effects which were being unloaded at his U.S. Information Service post in Oberammergau, Germany.

STATEMENT

In its favorable report the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives said:

"The bill H.R. 17260 was introduced in accordance with the recommendations of an executive communication from the U.S. Information Agency which recommends its enactment.

"Mr. Robert A. Jellison is an employee of the U.S. Information Agency and was assigned to the Agency post at Oberammergau, Germany, in 1963. On September 18, 1963, his household effects were damaged while being unloaded by U.S. Army personnel at his post.

"The USIA Claims Board has approved his claim in the amount of $128.96 and recommended that this amount be submitted to the Congress for consideration.

"The committee feels that this claim is just on two accounts. First, the accident was due to the fault of the Army and Mr. Jellison was in no way responsible. Second, Mr. Jellison was at the time on duty with the USIA and his furniture was being transferred to his new post at Oberammergau, Germany, in a move incident to his Government employment. The committee recommends that the bill be considered favorably."

The committee believes that the bill is meritorious and recommends it favorably.

AUGUSTUS F. THEODORE

The bill (H.R. 17261) for the relief of Augustus F. Theodore, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1817), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to pay Augustus J. Theodore the amount of $572.50 for loss of personal property as an officer of the U.S. Information Agency.

STATEMENT

The bill was introduced at the request of the U.S. Information Agency.

In its favorable report on the bill the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives said:

"Mr. Augustus J. Theodore is an employee of the U.S. Information Agency. He was assigned to the USIS post at Katmandu, Nepal, and left for his new post on October 16, 1961. Prior to his departure, on October 4, 1961, he delivered a footlocker to the Lion Transfer & Storage Co., Washington, D.C., for crating and shipping to Katmandu. The locker contained clothing and other personal effects belonging to Mr. Theodore, and was packed and locked by him before its delivery to Lion Transfer & Storage Co.

"On June 19, 1962, Mr. Theodore received a wooden case at his residence in Katmandu containing the footlocker. The wooden case arrived with neither customs seal nor steel bands. It had two openings in its top and there was a hole through the top of the footlocker. All of Mr. Theodore's personal effects had been removed and used garments and rags had been substituted therefor. Mr. Theodore has failed in his attempts to secure compensation from the local transport company in Calcutta on whom responsibility had been placed as the delivery carrier.

"The U.S. Information Agency in its report to the committee states that the claim was submitted in accordance with agency regulations to the Agency Claim Board and after careful consideration by the Board, the amount of $572.50 was recommended to the Congress for its consideration.

"The committee feels that since the claimant was having his clothing and personal effects transferred in connection with his duty assignment that the loss was directly related to his Government employment. It is, therefore, only right that the Government reimburse him for his loss. It is therefore recommended that the bill be favorably considered."

The committee believes that the bill is meritorious and recommends it favorably.

JUANITA CEREGUINE DE BURGH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 3689) for the relief of Juanita Cereguine de Burgh which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Juanita Cereguine de Burgh shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act upon payment of the required visa fee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1829), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Juanita Cereguine de Burgh.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3699) to require the Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to make a separate accounting of funds requested for the Department of Agriculture for programs and activities that primarily stabilize farm income and those that primarily benefit consumers, businessmen, and the general public, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

HENRY BOLZ DAM AND RESERVOIR ON THE SANGAMON RIVER

The bill (S. 3747) to designate the dam and reservoir to be constructed on the Sangamon River near Decatur, Ill., as the Henry Bolz Dam and Reservoir was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the dam and reservoir to be constructed on the Sangamon River near Decatur, Illinois, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1962, shall be known and designated hereafter as the "Henry Bolz Dam and Reservoir". Any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States in which such dam and reservoir are referred to shall be held to refer to such dam and reservoir as the "Henry Bolz Dam and Reservoir".

AUTHORITY FOR ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES TO LEASE CERTAIN PROPERTY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 15024) to amend section 8 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 to authorize the Administrator of General Services to lease certain property in the District of Columbia which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Administrator of General Services, in consultation with the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, is authorized to—

(1) select, with the approval of the Government department or agency administering the site, a Government-owned site within the District of Columbia which is appropriate for a temporary heliport;

(2) construct on such site necessary minimum heliport facilities; and

(3) lease, by negotiation or otherwise, and at the highest obtainable rental, such site and facilities on an annual basis to any person who will operate such heliport in accordance with such rules and regulations as are established by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

SEC. 2. There are authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $100,000 for the purposes of this Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An Act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to select an available Government-owned site in the District of Columbia and to improve and lease such site for a temporary heliport."

INCREASE IN NUMBER OF MARINE CORPS OFFICERS WHO MAY SERVE IN COMBINED GRADES OF BRIGADIER GENERAL AND MAJOR GENERAL

The bill (H.R. 14741) to authorize an increase in the number of Marine Corps officers who may serve in the combined grades of brigadier general and major general was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LT. COL. SAMUEL J. COLE, U.S. ARMY, RETIRED

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2147) for the relief of Lt. Col. Samuel J. Cole, U.S. Army, retired, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 1, line 5, after the word "of", where it appears the second time, to strike out "$11,566.60" and insert "$10,322.59"; and, on page 2, line 2, after the word "purposes", to insert "less the amount due under Public Law 89–395"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Lieutenant Colonel Samuel J. Cole, United States Army (retired), is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of $10,322.59, representing the amount of overpayments of retired pay received by the said Lieutenant Colonel Samuel J. Cole (retired), for the period from August 15, 1947, through September 30, 1964, as a result of administrative error in the computation of his creditable service for pay purposes less the amount due under Public Law 89–395. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Lieutenant Colonel Samuel J. Cole (retired), referred to in the first section of this Act, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Orders Nos. 1811, 1812, and 1813 be passed over.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the bills will be passed over.

MAJ. ROBERT G. SMITH, U.S. AIR FORCE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 982) for the relief of Maj. Robert G. Smith, U.S. Air Force which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 5, after the word "of", to strike out "$1,018.83" and insert "$611.63"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Major Robert G. Smith, 55314A, United States Air Force, is hereby relieved of liability to repay the United States the sum of $611.63, which sum represents overpayments of pay paid to him for the period of September 21, 1951, through June 14, 1960, as a result of erroneous credit for pay purposes of prior service in the United States Naval Reserve. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Major Robert G. Smith, the amount certified to him by the Secretary of the Air Force as to the aggregate amount paid to the United States by the said Major Robert G. Smith, or withheld by the United States from amounts due him, on account of the liability referred to in the first section of this Act. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to, or received by, any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1863), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill as amended is to relieve Maj. Robert G. Smith of liability to the United States for $611.63. The amount represents overpayments (less reduction for sums received after notice) received by him from September 21, 1951, through June 14, 1960. The overpayments resulted from erroneous credit for pay purposes of service in the U.S. Naval Reserve. The bill allows for credit in the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer for the amounts for which liability is relieved. The Secretary of the Treasury would be authorized to pay to Major Smith any amounts received or withheld from him because of the overpayment.

STATEMENT

The facts of the case found in the Air Force report are as follows:

"Air Force records show that Major Smith was a midshipman in the U.S. Merchant Marine Cadet Corps from May 25, 1945, through January 15, 1947. He served as an enlisted member in the U.S. Air Force from June 15, 1950, to September 20, 1951. On September 21, 1951, he was commissioned in the Air Force Reserve. He has been on continuous active duty with the Air Force since June 15, 1950. When he enlisted in the Air Force, Major Smith received credit for pay purposes, for his service as a midshipman in the Merchant Marine Cadet Corps. He likewise received credit, for pay purposes, for this service when he was commissioned on September 21, 1951.

"In 1956, Major Smith completed an officer's certificate of service listing his service in the uniformed services creditable for pay purposes. The service listed was compared with official Air Force records. The Air Adjutant General, Headquarters USAF, deleted from creditable service for pay his service as a midshipman in the Merchant Marine Cadet Corps. Under the pertinent laws, service in this status is not creditable for computing basic pay of officers (sec. 202(a)(1), Career Compensation Act (now codified as 37 U.S.C. 205); see Comp. Gen. Decision 138889, May 28, 1959).

"Major Smith's statement of service was corrected by deleting the service as a midshipman, Merchant Marine Cadet Corps. His pay date as an officer was established as June 15, 1950, rather than October 19, 1948. The Air Force Accounting and Finance Center (AFAFC) made an audit of his pay records. It established that from September 21, 1951 (the date he was commissioned in the Air Force), his creditable service for pay had erroneously included the service as a midshipman. As a result, from September 21, 1951 through December 31, 1956, he received overpayments totaling $455.63.

"In September 1957, AFAFC notified Dobbins Air Force Base (where he was stationed) of the overpayments made to Major Smith. Prior to adjusting his pay date and initiating collection action, Major Smith was given an opportunity to present evidence to substantiate credit for service as a midshipman. Under Air Force regulations, action to collect overpayments is suspended until review of additional evidence is completed.

"Major Smith protested having his pay date adjusted and making repayment of the overpayments. He furnished copies of documents issued by the Navy showing he had served as a midshipman and had been honorably discharged. He contended that this service was of a military nature and should be creditable for pay purposes. In July 1958 AFAFC again advised Dobbins Air Force Base that the service as a midshipman was not creditable for pay. Dobbins Air Force Base was requested to collect the overpayments from Major Smith.

"Late in 1960, a review of Major Smith's pay records by AFAFC showed that no action had been taken to collect the overpayments. Major Smith had been transferred from Dobbins Air Force Base to the Pacific Air Command (PACAF). PACAF was advised of the overpayments and requested to take collection action. Major Smith resubmitted his arguments that this service was creditable for pay purposes. AFAFC replied to PACAF that the service was not creditable under Comptroller General Decision B-138889. Further, PACAF was advised that because his pay date had not been adjusted, Major Smith had continued to receive overpayments. A current audit of his pay records established that from January 1, 1957, through June 14, 1960, he received additional overpayments of $563.20. His total indebtedness was established as $1,018.83 resulting from overpayments received from September 21, 1951, through June 14, 1960.

"PACAF adjusted Major Smith's pay date effective July 1, 1960, to reflect the deletion of the service as a midshipman. Major Smith renewed his protests of making repayment of the overpayments. He requested that the validity and amount of the indebtedness be reviewed as provided for in DOD Directive 7330.2. AFAFC verified that service as a midshipman in the Merchant Marine Cadet Corps was not creditable for pay; therefore, overpayments totaling $1,018.83 were a valid indebtedness. Major Smith was notified that refund to the United States was required.

"In March 1961, Major Smith requested collection action be suspended in accordance with Comptroller General Decision B-144276, February 23, 1961. This decision held that officers were not entitled to credit for pay purposes for periods of service as an enlisted member in the Naval Reserve when they held appointments as midshipmen in the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps program. The Comptroller General stated, in this decision, that he would not insist on collection if legislation were sought to relieve the members who received payments contrary to his decision.

"A complete review of Major Smith's records was made. It was determined that Major Smith did not come under this decision. The decision applied, generally, to individuals who served as enlisted members in the Naval Reserve and were appointed midshipmen in the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps program. Major Smith was not in this category since he held no enlisted status prior to his appointment in the Merchant Marine Cadet Corps. The Navy concurred in the determination that Major Smith did not come under this Comptroller General's decision. PACAF was notified of this determination and requested to collect the overpayments.

"Early in June 1961 Major Smith applied for correction of records. He requested that collection be suspended until action had been taken on his application. He was advised that no authority existed to suspend collection action under these circumstances. Air Force regulations in effect at that time required collection at a rate that would assure collection within a year. Major Smith stated collection at such a rate ($84.90 per month) would cause his financial hardship. His request that the rate be reduced to $15 a month was approved by AFAFC. Collection was initiated on August 1, 1961. As of May 31, 1966, Major Smith had paid a total of $855, leaving a balance due the United States of $163.83.

"No administrative procedures exist under which Major Smith may be relieved of his liability. The overpayments originated as a result of an administrative error. There is no evidence of lack of good faith on the part of Major Smith or the administrative officials concerned. Repayment of this considerable sum could impose a financial hardship on the officer."

In agreement with the views of the Air Force, the committee recommends that the bill, as amended, be considered favorably.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Orders Nos. 1815, 1816, and 1817 be passed over.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the bills will be passed over.

H. FOSTER HUNTER

The bill (H.R. 1269) for the relief of H. Foster Hunter was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1847), explaining the purpose of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to relieve H. Foster Hunter, of Washington, D.C., of liability in the amount of $4,964.66 based upon erroneous class E allotment payments made to his former wife by the Government without his knowledge between March 1, 1943, and August 31, 1948.

STATEMENT

In its report to the House committee on the bill, the Department of the Army indicated that it had no objection to the bill.

The facts of the case are set out in House Report 2003, as follows:

"The overpayment, which is the subject of this bill, was created as the result of an error on the part of the Army in March of 1943. At that time an extra allotment of $100 a month was erroneously instituted under an Army service number which was not Mr. Hunter's because it contained an erroneous number, and was paid to Mr. Hunter's first wife under the name of Mrs. Catherine Beverly Hunter. Because of the error in the service number, no deductions were ever made from his pay for this allotment. The unusual nature of this Army error is emphasized by the fact that after his marriage in 1942, Mr. Hunter authorized an allotment to his first wife under the name of Mrs. Beverly F. Hunter. The allotment was begun in the amount of $60 per month and subsequently increased by an additional allotment of $40 per month in September of that year. In 1944, he authorized that the allotment be increased to $115 per month. This allotment was paid through August 31, 1945, the last full month before his discharge. Payments for these allotments were deducted from his pay under his correct Army service number, and there is no question about the allotments actually authorized by Mr. Hunter. The liability is based upon the erroneous allotment which was created by the Army in 1943. The payments were continued after Mr. Hunter's discharge through the period ending August 31, 1948, and resulted in an indebtedness to the United States of $6,600.

"Mr. Hunter was divorced from his first wife in 1949 and the information in the Army report indicates that the couple were separated from January of 1947 on. He stated that he had no knowledge of the overpayment until October of 1948.

"Mr. Hunter commenced small periodic repayments in 1950 which have reduced the debt to $4,964.66. He is limited to a civil service disability retirement income of $311 monthly and Veterans' Administration benefits of $105 monthly which will be reduced to $80 monthly, effective January 1, 1966, and which will cease January 1, 1967. The Army report further notes that his second wife is in poor health and recently underwent surgery for cancer.

"In indicating that it does not object to relief, the Army stated:

" 'The indebtedness arose because of erroneous payments to Mr. Hunter's former spouse through administrative error of the Army under circumstances which fail to disclose that Mr. Hunter was at fault or had any knowledge of the payments. His finances are limited. In view of these equitable considerations, the Department of the Army has no objection to the bill.'

"In view of the report of the Department of the Army, and the hardship outlined therein, it is recommended that the bill be considered favorably."

In agreement with the views of the House, the committee recommends that the bill, H.R. 1269, be considered favorably.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 3901) for the relief of Miss Elisabeth von Oberndorff was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

CITY OF UMATILLA, OREG.

The bill (H.R. 6103) for the relief of the city of Umatilla, Oreg., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1849), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay the city of Umatilla, Oreg., $50,000, representing compensation equitably due the city due to losses suffered by it as a result of the inundation and related effects due to the John Day lock and dam project by the Department of the Army.

STATEMENT

The House in its report on H.R. 6103 relates the following:

"The bill, H.R. 6103, was the subject of a subcommittee hearing on July 14, 1966. The testimony at that hearing and the information submitted to the committee in connection with the matter indicates that the city of Umatilla, Oreg., is located on the south shore of the Columbia River approximately 74 miles above the John Day Dam. In 1960, this city was a community of 617 persons. The northern portion of the city adjacent to the Columbia River comprising an area of about 93 acres is subject to flood or damage by reason of the water level of the John Day Reservoir. This circumstance required that the Government acquire all real estate below an elevation of 287 feet above sea level. As is observed in the Department of the Army report, the area to be taken comprises approximately one-third of the original area of the city. Information submitted to the committee by the city discloses that as of 1964, the property outside of the inundation area had an assessed value of $684,810; whereas the property inside the inundation area had an assessed value of $311,869. Again it can be observed that the city stood to lose approximately one-third of its assessed property by reason of the Government acquisition.

"Some years ago, the construction of water and sewer facilities of the city, including those in the area to be flooded, were financed by $222,000 of general obligation bonds issued by the city. The net operating revenue from the water and sewer utilities is pledged to the payment of principal and interest on the bonds. Any deficit between this net revenue and the requirements for payments on the bonds must be met by taxes or from other revenue available to the city. The report of the Department of the Army on the bill indicates that as of January 1, 1964, $126,000 of this bond issue was still outstanding.

"The Government through the Corps of Engineers has entered into a relocation contract with the city of Umatilla which requires the United States to pay on a cost reimbursement basis the full cost of providing substitute streets and water and sewer utilities for a replacement residential area to meet the needs of residents who plan to relocate in the city. However, as is noted in the Army report itself, this agreement does not serve to meet the problem faced by the city for 50 to 70 percent of the property owners in the area acquired or to be acquired by the Government do not intend to relocate within the city. This, of course, would substantially reduce the number of residents and the value of taxable property left to defray the bonded indebtedness and budgetary requirements of the city. It also can be observed that the United States will, of course, not be required to provide substitute streets and utilities and, therefore, will not fully duplicate existing streets and sewer and water lines. Further, the reduction in the existing tax base in addition to the loss of revenue from water service and sewer use collections will place an increased financial burden upon the remaining citizens who are already paying taxes on the basis of a high tax rate. The prospect of an increase in taxes would further tend to discourage relocation of displaced residents within the city.

"The committee feels that this case is analogous to the case of the town of Kure Beach, N.C., which was granted relief in accordance with the terms of Public Law 89-38, approved on June 12, 1965. That law provided for a payment of $100,000 to the town of Kure Beach in settlement of its claims against the Government based upon the impairment of the collateral value of bonds caused by the taking of a buffer zone by the Army encompassing a substantial area of the town and resulting in a partial frustration of the town's ability to meet its obligation under the bonds. The matter was the subject of a congressional reference case in the Court of Claims and that court recommended the relief provided by Public Law 89-38. As has been observed, the city of Umatilla is also faced with bonded indebtedness and has suffered a detriment markedly similar to that suffered by the town of Kure Beach.

"In its report to the committee, the Department of the Army pointed out that the amount proposed in the bill as introduced would extend relief to the town in a manner which would not be equitable because it would appear to place the city in a better relative position with respect to its bonded indebtedness than existed prior to the project. The Army stated that the enactment of the bill in its original form would grant a benefit to local interests not accorded to others in comparable situations and that such relief would not be in the public interest and would therefore encourage requests by other local interests for Federal payments. The committee agrees that it would not be wise to provide for full payment as provided originally in the bill. As has been noted, the land area taken amounts to approximately one-third, and similarly the assessed value of the land lost in this manner also came to approximately one-third of the total assessed valuation. There are also other factors which have served to prejudice this town. An examination of the map of the town discloses that most of the property directly facing on the Columbia River has been taken. It appears in addition that the area taken by the Government included a grain elevator and a tank storage area. Present information indicates that apparently neither of these commercial activities will be relocated in the town area. The prejudice to the town from this and other effects of the taking have led the committee to conclude that a payment of $50,000 would be an equitable settlement of the matter. Accordingly, it is recommended that the bill amended to provide for a payment of that amount, be considered favorably."

The committee is in accord with the action of the House of Representatives and recommends that the bill, H.R. 6103, be considered favorably.

MILAN COMPRESS CO.

The bill (H.R. 8358) for the relief of the Milan Compress Co. was considered ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CAPT. HAROLD G. WILMARTH

The bill (H.R. 9348) for the relief of Capt. Harold G. Wilmarth was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1851), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to relieve Capt. Harold G. Wilmarth of liability of $3,610.98, the amount of an overpayment of his pay as an officer in the U.S. Air Force in the period beginning March 10, 1961, and ending March 10, 1964, inclusive, because of an administrative error. The bill would permit the refund of amounts repaid or withheld because of the liability.

STATEMENT

The Department of the Air Force in its report to the House committee on the bill indicated that it would have no objection to the bill's enactment.

Air Force records show Captain Wilmarth served as an enlisted member in the Army from August 31, 1945, through November 28, 1946. He was appointed a captain in the Air Force Reserve Nurse Corps on January 3, 1961, and ordered to extended active duty on March 10, 1961. Captain Wilmarth's appointment was under 10 U.S.C. 8353 which provides that a member may be credited with constructive service that reflects his combined years of education and experience. (Such service is creditable in the Air Force Nurse Corps only for appointment or promotion list purposes. It is not creditable for pay under 37 U.S.C. 205. Prior to his appointment, Captain Wilmarth was given 1 year's constructive credit for education and 6 years, 3 months, and 8 days constructive credit for experience as a staff nurse and nurse anesthetist.

Shortly after reporting for duty, Captain Wilmarth completed an "officer's certificate of statement of service." On this certificate, he listed his enlisted service and service in the Inactive and Active Reserve. This service and dates were verified as correct by Headquarters, U.S. Air Force (Hq USAF). Based on the service listed, his pay date was established and entered on the certificate as October 4, 1959. According to a notation on the certificate, the pay date was entered on Captain Wilmarth's pay record on March 16, 1961.

From the time Captain Wilmarth reported on duty with the Air Force (March 10, 1961) through December 31, 1961, his pay records reflect four changes in pay date. Corresponding adjustments were made in his pay. The fourth adjustment resulted in his having been paid since March 10, 1961, on the basis of a pay date of September 23, 1953. The records contain no reason nor any authority for the changes. After December 31, 1961, no further changes in his pay date are shown on his pay records until November 1, 1964. On July 9, 1963, HQ USAF sent a formal statement of service (DD form 13) to Clark Air Force Base. It listed his pay date as October 5, 1959. However, no change was made in his pay records, nor is there any evidence that Captain Wilmarth was notified.

On February 20, 1964, HQ USAF sent a statement of service for Captain Wilmarth to the Air Force Accounting and Finance Center (AFAFC) listing his pay date as October 5, 1959. The latest pay records available at AFAFC showed a pay date of September 23, 1953. Upon inquiry by AFAFC, Clark Air Force Base, where Captain Wilmarth was stationed, reported (1) that on March 11, 1964, they had given Captain Wilmarth a copy of the AFAFC inquiry and (2) that the 1953 pay date was based on the constructive credit sheet prepared prior to Captain Wilmarth's appointment in the Reserve and Captain Wilmarth's appointment orders. Both of these documents cited his "total years of service date" as September 25, 1953. AFAFC asked HQ USAF to verify Captain Wilmarth's pay date. It was affirmed that it was October 5, 1959. An audit of records available at AFAFC showed overpayments of $2,997.53 from March 10, 1961, through June 30, 1963. On April 27, 1964, Clark Air Force Base was notified that Captain Wilmarth's correct pay date was October 5, 1959, and was instructed to effect collection of overpayments.

Early in October 1964, Captain Wilmarth reported for duty at Altus Air Force Base. His pay record, transferred from Clark Air Force Base, showed his pay date as September 23, 1953. On October 19, 1964, Clark Air Force Base forwarded to Altus Air Force Base the AFAFC notification that his proper pay date was Octber 5, 1959, and that he had been overpaid $2,997.53. Altus Air Force Base corrected his pay date and reduced his pay to reflect this change on November 1, 1964. An audit of his pay records from July 1, 1963, through October 31, 1964, established that during this period he received overpayments totaling $1,236.46. His total indebtedness resulting from overpayments because of the erroneous pay date was at that time computed at $4,233.99.

The information supplied to the committee indicates that Captain Wilmarth, when he found that he had been given credit for pay purposes for the constructive credit he was granted for his education and experience, questioned the allowance and was assured and convinced that his pay was correctly computed. When at length it was determined in 1964 that his pay had been incorrectly computed, he instituted an appeal and when the indebtedness was confirmed, a portion of the indebtedness was discharged by deductions from his active duty pay. When he was released from active duty, a total of $1,479.62 had been collected, leaving a balance of $2,680.16.

In the Air Force report, it is noted that the Department did not have as of the date of the report the authority to waive this indebtedness. The Air Force stated that the overpayment was the result of administrative error and there is no evidence of lack of good faith on Captain Wilmarth's part or on the part of administrative officials.

As is customary in cases of this type, the committee has requested additional information concerning the hardship that the overpayment has imposed upon the individual in this case. Captain Wilmarth has now left active duty with the Air Force and now resides in Butler, Mo. He attempts to aid in the support of parents who live in Pennsylvania, and it appears that a liability of the magnitude referred to in this bill does, in fact, impose a hardship upon him.

In indicating that it had no objection to enactment of the bill, and the granting of legislative relief in this case, the Air Force has recommended that the relief be confined to overpayments made between March 10, 1961, and March 10, 1964. Captain Wilmarth received official notice of the indebtedness on March 11, 1964. The indebtedness as of that date was $3,610.98. The committee agrees that relief should be limited to this amount and recommends that the bill be considered favorably.

MRS. ELISABETH MANNINEN

The bill (H.R. 10249) for the relief of Mrs. Elisabeth Manninen was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1852), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay Mrs. Elisabeth Manninen, of Kingsford, Mich., $3,208.40, in settlement of her claim for accrued benefits payable to her deceased husband which the Veterans' Administration is precluded from paying to her as the surviving widow.

STATEMENT

The Veterans' Administration, in its report to the committee, stated that due to the fact that the veteran did not apply for the higher rate during his lifetime due to prejudicial error on the part of the Veterans' Administration, it would not object to favorable consideration of the bill.

In its favorable report on the bill the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives said:

"Mrs. Elisabeth Manninen is the widow of Edwin E. Manninen, who served in the Armed Forces of the United States during World War II from March 17, 1942, to November 22, 1945, and also from September 19, 1947, to November 30, 1959. Disability compensation at peacetime rates was awarded to the veteran effective December 1, 1959, based upon a determination that his disabilities resulted from peacetime service. He was held not entitled to the higher wartime compensation rates provided by 38 U.S.C. 336 for disabilities resulting from an injury or disease incurred while engaged in extrahazardous peacetime service. The veteran died on April 3, 1964, the disability compensation award was accordingly terminated, and dependency and indemnity compensation was awarded the veteran's widow, effective April 1, 1964.

"As is noted in the Veterans' Administration report, subsequently it was determined that the denial during the veteran's lifetime of a wartime disability compensation rate (38 U.S.C. 336) involved clear and unmistakable error in not recognizing the extrahazardous factor in the veteran's service. If that error had been determined during the veteran's lifetime, he would have been entitled to additional compensation for his entire period of benefits, back to December 1, 1959, the date of his original award.

"Benefits not paid to a claimant prior to death, however, are known as 'accrued benefits' and payment thereof is restricted by section 3021 of title 38, United States Code. That law provides with respect to benefits determined to have been payable to a now deceased veteran that payment may be made to the veteran's spouse of an amount not in excess of benefits due and unpaid for a period of 1 year prior to the veteran's death. Under that statute, the Veterans' Administration has paid Mrs. Manninen $1,047.20, representing the additional disability compensation due for the specified 1-year period.

"A recent recomputation by the Veterans' Administration reveals that if disability compensation had been paid to the veteran under 38 U.S.C. 336 from December 1, 1959, until his death, an additional aggregate amount of $4,255.60 would have been paid to him. Upon deducting the $1,047.20 paid to Mrs. Manninen as accrued benefits, there remains a balance of $3,208.40 which has not been paid because of the aforementioned restriction imposed by 38 U.S.C. 3021.

"As was noted at the outset, the Veterans' Administration recommended favorable action on the amended bill. Its recommendation was phrased in the following language:

" 'The failure to pay the veteran disability compensation at a higher rate during his lifetime was due solely to prejudicial error on the part of the Veterans' Administration. The fact that the error was not discovered until after his death has, by reason of the 1-year statutory limitation, resulted in denial of payment of a major portion of the additional compensation which otherwise would have been payable.

" 'Under the circumstances, the Veterans' Administration would not object to favorable consideration of H.R. 10249, provided the bill is amended to authorize payment of $3,208.40, the correct balance of disability compensation due the veteran during his lifetime which is barred from payment by the general law respecting "accrued benefits." '

"On the basis of the facts and circumstances of this case and the recommendation of the Veterans' Administration, this committee has concluded that this is a proper subject for legislative relief. Accordingly, it is recommended that the bill * * * be considered favorably."

In agreement with the views of the House, the committee believes the bill is meritorious and recommends it favorably.

LEONARD J. DALTON

The bill (H.R. 10662) for the relief of Leonard J. Dalton was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1853), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to relieve Leonard J. Dalton, of San Diego, Calif., of liability of $9,588.72, representing compensation paid him as a civilian employee of the Treasury Department from July 1, 1963, through November 30, 1964, which employment was subsequently determined to have been subject to the restriction of the Dual Employment and Dual Compensation Acts.

STATEMENT

The Treasury Department in its report to the House committee on the bill indicates that it has no objection to enactment of the bill. The Department of the Navy defers to the Treasury Department in this connection. The Comptroller General in the report he submitted to the House committee in behalf of the General Accounting Office indicated that that Office would have no objection to Mr. Dalton's being relieved of liability for periods prior to November 30, 1964.

The facts of the case are set out in House Report No. 1990, as follows:

"Mr. Dalton was employed by the Los Angeles (Calif.) district office of the Internal Revenue Service, as an internal revenue agent beginning on July 1, 1963, and he is still employed by the Los Angeles district office.

"Mr. Dalton did not attempt to conceal his military service and retirement prior to his employment by the Internal Revenue Service. On the Standard Form 61, Appointment Affidavits, Mr. Dalton clearly indicated that he retired after 20 years of service under title 10, United States Code. He also indicated on this form 57, prepared on February 27, 1963, that he was receiving U.S. Navy retirement pay (CWO–2) after 23 years of active duty.

"During an audit of the Los Angeles district office by the General Accounting Office in April 1965 it was discovered that the appointment of Mr. Dalton, a retired Navy warrant officer, was in violation of section 2 of the Dual Employment Act of 1894 (28 Stat. 205), which provided that no person who holds an office the salary or annual compensation attached to which amounts to the sum of $2,500 shall be appointed to or hold any other office to which compensation is attached unless specifically authorized thereto by law. This act was subsequently repealed by the Dual Compensation Act of 1964 (Public Law 88–558), and section 201(a) of the act (5 U.S.C. 3102(a)) provides that a retired officer shall receive the full salary of any civilian office which he holds, but during the period for which he receives such salary, his retirement pay shall be reduced according to a specific formula.

"In indicating that it would have no objection to favorable consideration of the bill, the Treasury Department recognized that Mr. Dalton had clearly indicated his retired status prior to his employment by the Internal Revenue Service. The statement of the Department in this connection is as follows:

" 'In view of the fact that Mr. Dalton clearly indicated his retired status prior to his employment by the Internal Revenue Service, the Department would have no objection to the enactment of H.R. 10662.'

"The same factor is commented upon in the report of the Comptroller General. The committee feels that the report of the Comptroller General clearly states the equities of the matter in this language:

" 'Since Mr. Dalton made a full disclosure of his retired status on his application for civilian employment as well as on certain affidavits he was required to execute incident to such appointment, there seems little doubt that he acted in complete good faith. In view thereof and since the Congress now has repealed the prohibition formerly included in the act of July 31, 1894, which was violated by the civilian employment of Mr. Dalton, our Office would have no objection to his being relieved from liability for the amounts received in contravention of the 1894 act. However, we see no equitable or other appropriate basis warranting his being relieved of liability for the retired pay he received in excess of that to which he was entitled under the Dual Compensation Act of 1964. To do so would place him in a preferred status as compared with other retired employees of the uniformed services who are subject to that act.'

"The reservation expressed by the Comptroller General for periods after November 30, 1964, appears to this committee to be consistent with the relief as proposed in the bill. The bill clearly states that the period involved is that from July 1, 1963, through November 30, 1964. An express reference is made in the bill to the previously existing law. The last paragraph of the Comptroller General's report observes that it is the understanding of that Office that section 3 of the bill is intended to allow Mr. Dalton full credit for his civilian service in that period for the purpose of retirement, leave, and other employee benefits.

"The committee views the bill as one granting relief for the unfortunate circumstances which occurred prior to November 30, 1964. In view of the circumstances of the case and the positions taken by the Department of the Treasury and the General Accounting Office, it is recommended that the bill be considered favorably."

In agreement with the views of the House, the committee recommends that the bill, H.R. 10662, be considered favorably.

KATHERINE NABOKOFF AND EMIL HOMOCEANU

The bill (H.R. 10846) for the relief of Katherine Nabokoff and Emil Homoceanu was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1854), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay Katherine Nabokoff $40,182.50 and Emil Homoceanu $17,228.23, for sacrifices they sustained and deprivations they suffered as the result of imprisonment by a foreign government as a result of their employment by the American Legation in Bucharest, Rumania. The bill further provides that the period of imprisonment is to be determined as creditable service under the Civil Service Retirement Act, and that period of imprisonment shall be considered a period of employment by the United States for the purposes of any other employee benefits.

STATEMENT

The bill is recommended by the Department of State.

The facts of the case contained in House Report No. 1432 are as follows:

"The bill, H.R. 10846, was the subject of a subcommittee hearing on February 17, 1966. The testimony presented at that hearing and supplied to the committee in connection with the bill establishes that Miss Nabokoff was originally employed as a consular clerk by the American Legation in Bucharest on March 1, 1929. On March 26, 1948, she disappeared and the circumstances of her disappearance was such that Legation officials assumed that she had been arrested by the Rumanian police. The Legation made repeated attempts to learn of her whereabouts through the Rumanian Foreign Office but little or no information was obtained. However, shortly after her disappearance, an approach was made to her mother regarding the possibility of paying ransom for her daughter's return. It subsequently developed that she had been kidnapped on March 26, 1948, by the Soviet Military Intelligence Service and on July 11, 1948, was flown to Moscow where she was interned in Lubyanka Prison. She was tried and convicted of espionage and sentenced to 15 years in the labor camps of Siberia. In September of 1956, she was transferred from the prison and assigned to a home for the disabled and aged in the vicinity of the labor camps. She was permitted to leave the U.S.S.R. for Brussels in August of 1960. Miss Nabokoff was re-employed by the U.S. Embassy in Paris, on May 23, 1961, and she is presently employed by the Embassy in Paris.

"The report of the Department of State summarizes the basis for the amount stated in the bill, as amended by the committee. At the time of the hearing on the bill, the committee was supplied with a complete computation of the items shown in the State Department report as the salary payment for the time Miss Nabokoff spent in prison. In this connection, it is also relevant to note that the amount advanced to Miss Nabokoff's mother at the time of her imprisonment, and to Miss Nabokoff at the time of her release from prison were subtracted from the amount found to be due her and, therefore, are not included in the amount as stated in the bill.

"Emil Homoceanu was employed by the American Legation in Bucharest, Rumania, on July 1, 1946, to work in the information and cultural section of the Legation as a radio operator. He was arrested by the Rumanian Secret Police on May 15, 1950. Information available to Legation officials indicated that he was reported engaged in forced labor at the Danube Canal on September 11, 1950. Subsequent information indicated that as of November 27, 1957, he was being held in Jilava Prison. In November of 1950, the Legation paid his sister the equivalent of 1 month's salary, $255.97, to enable her to purchase winter clothing and other items for him while he was imprisoned. He was released by Rumanian authorities late in October 1955 and, at that time, the Legation was authorized to pay him severance pay and an amount for leave because he was in desperate need of financial assistance. He was paid $2,630.23 for severance pay and $378.19 for leave. This amount has been taken into account in computing the amount stated in the bill and is not included in the figure of $17,228.23 recommended by the committee. As was the case with Miss Nabokoff at the time of the hearing on February 17, 1966, the committee was furnished with a complete analysis of the basis of the salary payment for the time of his imprisonment which is set forth in the State Department report. The information submitted to the committee at the time of the hearing indicated that the whereabouts of only Miss Nabokoff and Mr. Homoceanu are known to the State Department. Both of these individuals are presently employed by the United States, Miss Nabokoff at the Embassy in Paris, and Mr. Homoceanu at the Legation in Bucharest. Under these circumstances, the committee determined that it was proper to limit the relief in the bill to these individuals. The committee is satisfied that these individuals suffered the privations of imprisonment as the direct result of their employment by the United States. Miss Nabokoff was imprisoned for a period of more than 12 years, and Mr. Homoceanu was imprisoned for more than 5 years. It has, therefore, been concluded that it is appropriate to recognize the sacrifices of these two employees and to compensate them as provided in the bill. In this connection, the committee feels that it is relevant to observe that the basis for payment for these two individuals is the same as that provided for another similarly situated individual by Private Law 89-108, which was approved on September 29, 1965. Accordingly, it is recommended that the bill, as amended, be considered favorably."

In agreement with the views of the House, the committee recommends favorable consideration of H.R. 10846, without amendment.

DONALD E. AUSEON

The bill (H.R. 13682) for the relief of Donald E. Auseon was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1855), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to relieve Donald E. Auseon of liability to the United States in the amount of $831.46, representating an overpayment for overtime and night differential pay paid to him by the U.S. Post Office Department.

STATEMENT

The Post Office Department favors enactment of the bill.

The facts of the case found in House Report 1727 are as follows:

"Mr. Auseon, as well as Mr. Irvins, for whom a companion bill, H.R. 13683, was introduced, was employed by the Post Office Department's motor vehicle facility in Canton, Ohio. Between April 12, 1965, and August 27, 1965, Mr. Auseon was detailed to the Gerstenslager Co. in Wooster, Ohio, for the purpose of inspection for procurement of vehicles. In carrying out this assignment, Mr. Auseon drove to and from Wooster each day, using a privately owned automobile. Mr. Auseon could have remained in Wooster each night and been compensated for his stay. However, the postmaster and Mr. Auseon, along with Mr. Ivins, computed the cost of paying their expenses should they remain in Wooster during the week against the cost of compensation for traveltime. They found that travel pay would be less costly. Accordingly, the postmaster authorized overtime and night differential pay for the amount of time required for them to commute. The schedule which these men followed was:

"Leave Canton, Ohio, 6 a.m.
"Arrive Wooster, Ohio, 7 a.m.
"Leave Wooster, Ohio, 5:30 p.m.
"Arrive Canton, Ohio, 6:30 p.m.

"Their workday at the plant was 10 hours, resulting in 2 hours overtime daily and, in addition, they were given credit for an additional 2 hours of overtime daily for 2 hours spent in travel. For the time spent in travel after 6 p.m. they were also paid at the premium rate for nightwork.

"Under the provisions of section 756.26 of the Postal Manual, time spent in a travel status is not compensable as 'work' when it is performed outside the employer's regularly scheduled tour of duty. The travel in question was performed outside of Mr. Auseon's regular scheduled tour of duty and no work was performed during this travel. Title 39, United States Code, section 3574, requires that work be performed in order to be entitled to extra compensation for nightwork. Therefore, under the circumstances, Mr. Auseon's travel from Canton to Wooster and return was not compensable time for purposes of overtime or payment of night differential and resulted in an overpayment to him of $831.46."

In agreement with the views of the House report, the committee recommends that the bill be considered favorably.

PAYMENTS TO ESTATES OF CERTAIN PERSONS

The bill (H.R. 13982) to amend the Act of August 14, 1964, to authorize payments of any amounts authorized under the act to the estates of persons who would have been eligible for payments under the authority of the act, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1856), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to amend Public Law 88-435, approved August 14, 1964, by adding a new sentence which would make it possible that in those instances where an individual might have been refunded money under the authority of that law be directed prior to receiving payment that the amount could be paid to his estate.

STATEMENT

The Treasury Department supports the enactment of H.R. 13982. The facts of the case as found in House Report 1735 are as follows:

"In the 88th Congress, Public Law 88-435 validated per diem allowances which had been made to Coast Guard members who served at the precommissioning detail for the Coast Guard Reserve Training Center at Yorktown, Va., from March 8, 1959, to July 2, 1959. The law further provided that any member or former member who made a repayment to the United States in connection with the payment for per diem allowances should be refunded the amount repaid. However, the law did not provide authority for payment in the event that an individual should die prior to receiving the refund. The committee understands that there is at least one case where an individual has died and it has not been possible to pay any amount. The bill, as introduced, provided for payment to the individuals, heirs or devisees, however, upon reflection, it appears that it would be better to provide for payment to the individual's estate for this would remove any ambiguity concerning the identity of the persons entitled to payment in that the normal procedures for the distribution of property in the appropriate jurisdiction would then govern the distribution. The committee finds that the amendment provided for in this bill is a logical and needed addition to the law and the Treasury Department has indicated that it favors the amendment also. Accordingly, it is recommended that the bill, as amended, be considered favorably."

In agreement with the views of the House, the committee recommends favorable enactment.

CERTAIN CLAIMS ARISING OUT OF THE TAKING OF THE 1960 DECENNIAL CENSUS

The bill (H.R. 14075) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to settle and pay certain claims arising out of the taking of the 1960 decennial census was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1857), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to settle and pay claims of employees and former employees of the Department of

Commerce incident to their service in taking the 1960 decennial census, in the manner now provided for similar claims by the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964.

STATEMENT

The facts of the case found in the House Report are as follows:

"The bill would permit the Secretary of Commerce to settle the claims of the Bureau of Census employees who suffered personal property losses and damage while taking the 1960 decennial census. In settling and paying these claims, the Secretary of Commerce would follow the standards set forth in the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964.

"In the communication sent to the Congress by the Department of Commerce, that Department stated:

" 'During the taking of the 1960 census a number of temporary employees suffered loss of or damage to their personal property in the course of their employment. In several cases clothing was torn when the enumerators were attacked by dogs. In another case an enumerator's car which was used at the request of a supervisor and without payment for mileage, was sideswiped by a hit-and-run driver while parked in front of a respondent's residence. In one case a respondent became violent when the enumerator sought to obtain census information, and tore the enumerator's clothing.'

"All of the cases which would be considered under the bill were the subject of claims which were filed with the Bureau. Accordingly, the bill requires that in order to be considered, the claim had to have been filed with the Bureau within 2 years after it accrued, and further the bill states that the authority only extends to those claims that were not settled or paid under other provisions of law. The executive communication in this connection observes that as to these claims, the Census Bureau sought to find a means to pay the employees involved for their losses but no statutory authority then existed. Accordingly, the Department requested this legislation.

"Had the losses or damages occurred after enactment of the Claims Act of 1964, they would have been processed under that act. However, under the 1964 act only claims arising after August 31, 1964, may be considered. This proposal would in effect make the provisions of the 1964 act retroactively applicable to the 1960 claims.

"While none of the individual losses was substantial (the accumulated total will probably be less than $5,000) the effect on the individual was a hardship. In some cases the amount of the loss or damage nearly equaled the total compensation received by the employee for his services in connection with taking the census."

In agreement with the views of the House report, the committee recommends that the bill be considered favorably.

KATHERINE M. PERAKIS

The bill (H.R. 14749) for the relief of Katherine M. Perakis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1858), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to provide that in the determination of the entitlement of Katherine M. Perakis to child's insurance benefits under section 202(d) of the Social Security Act based on the wages and self-employment income of the late George Perakis of Peabody, Mass., she shall be deemed to have been the legally adopted child of George Perakis and to have been dependent upon him at the time of his death.

STATEMENT

The facts of the case as contained in the House Report 2138 are as follows:

In April of 1962, Katherine M. Perakis was placed in the home of Mr. and Mrs. George Perakis for adoption. The couple had begun their efforts to adopt a child in 1959 when they contacted the Boston Children's Service Association and indicated their desire to adopt a baby girl of Greek heritage. In cooperation with the International Social Service, arrangements were made to bring a child to the United States. This child is Katherine Perakis. Before Katherine Perakis left Greece, a preliminary adoption hearing was held in a Greek court and, in accordance with Greek law, the child's adoption by Mr. and Mrs. Perakis was to be completed in that court before she was adopted under Massachusetts law. The understanding that Mr. and Mrs. Perakis and the Boston Children's Service Association had was that the association would determine whether or not to sponsor the adoption in Massachusetts after the child had lived in the Perakis home for at least 1 year.

On August 20, 1962, Mr. Perakis died. Following his death, Mrs. Perakis indicated she still wished to adopt the child. Apparently it is unusual for a Massachusetts court to allow a widow to adopt a child, and the Boston Children's Service Association at first hesitated to give its consent. The association consented to the adoption in May of 1964. This date is significant because, as is noted in the report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the law provides that a child must be adopted by a worker's surviving spouse within 2 years of the date of the worker's death in order to qualify the child for child's benefits under the Social Security Act. The memorandum supplied to the committee along with the Department's report states that there were several factors which served to delay the adoption until after the 2-year period had expired. The major reason for the delay was that the lawyer that had been handling the matter was appointed to a judgeship and the case had to be transferred to another lawyer. Further, it appears that the court in which the adoption was pending was not in session in August. Of course, the 2-year period expired in August 1964, because Mr. Perakis died on August 20, 1962. This committee notes that it is significant that the adoption was completed on December 3, 1964, a little over 3 months after the 2-year period had expired.

"The facts outlined above and in the memorandum of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare show that all of the requirements of Federal law which would have resulted in the child's entitlement to social security benefits were accomplished but for the fact that the adoption was completed some 3 months after the 2-year period had expired. The Department itself, while recommending against individual relief, states that it would not object to general legislation which would meet the problem faced by the widow and child in this case. The committee notes that the Department's statement in this connection serves to point up the fact that existing law is inadequate in this instance to accomplish essential justice. Private legislation is intended to remedy inequitable situations where the provisions of existing law are inadequate. While it may be that this case demonstrates the need for an amendment to existing law, such a circumstance should not be urged as a reason to deny justice to this child. Accordingly, it is recommended that the bill be considered favorably.

"In agreement with the views of the House, the committee recommends the bill favorably."

RELIEF OF CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS

The bill (H.R. 14864) for the relief of certain individuals was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HENRY P. LEONHARDY

The bill (H.R. 15014) for the relief of Henry P. Leonhardy was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1860), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to waive applicable limitations of the Trading With the Enemy Act so as to permit Henry P. Leonhardy to file a claim for the return of his vested property.

STATEMENT

The Attorney General of the United States is not opposed to enactment of the bill as amended by the House.

The facts of the case as contained in House Report No. 2000 are as follows:

"The bill would make it possible for Henry P. Leonhardy to file a claim for the return of his vested assets based on his status as a citizen of the United States. Mr. Leonhardy is now 80 years old and resides in Garmisch-Partenkirchen, Germany. As is noted in the Department of Justice report, Mr. Leonhardy was born in Germany on May 25, 1886. He came to the United States in 1912 and was naturalized in Brooklyn, N.Y., in 1927 at which time he was president of the United Brush Manufacturers, Inc., of New York City. His father, who was president of United Brush Manufacturers, Nuernberg, Germany, became ill in 1931. Mr. Leonhardy went to Germany for a visit to assist his father manage the business. This stay in Germany became permanent when his father died in 1933 and Henry Leonhardy took over the management of the Nuernberg parent company.

"Mr. Leonhardy got into trouble with a local Nazi official, the notorious Julius Streicher, because of his militant anti-Nazi attitude, his refusal to dismiss Jews from employment, and his refusal to have himself repatriated in Germany. Finally, in 1939, under threat of imprisonment, concentration camp, and other measures, at a time when the sickness of his daughter made departure for the United States impossible, and after he had been told by the consulate that he no longer stood under the protection of the United States, he completed repatriation proceedings and was renaturalized in Germany on November 17, 1939.

"On June 22, 1946, the American consulate general at Munich, Germany, informed Mr. Leonhardy that he had lost his U.S. citizenship under section 404 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (8 U.S.C. 404) by reason of his naturalization as a German citizen. On August 10, 1948, the consulate reported Mr. Leonhardy's expatriation to the Department of State which later approved the issuance of a certificate of expatriation on January 30, 1949.

"The bill, H.R. 15014, was the subject of a subcommittee hearing on August 4, 1966. The important point in this case is that referred to by the Department of Justice and involves the finding by the Department of State that Mr. Leonhardy did not voluntarily acquire German citizenship with the result that that Department reversed its earlier holding of expatriation."

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON REFORM OF FEDERAL CRIMINAL LAWS

The bill (H.R. 15766) to establish a National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1862), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to establish a National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws, which would make a full and complete review and study of the statutory and case law constituting the Federal system of criminal justice and would make recommendations for revision, reform, and recodification of the criminal laws of the United States, including the repeal of unnecessary or undesirable statutes and appropriate changes in the penalty structure.

STATEMENT

On March 9, 1966, the President sent to the Congress his message entitled "National Strategy Against Crime." In that message, the President stated:

"We must modernize our criminal laws.

"I propose the appointment of a Commission to conduct a comprehensive review of all the Federal criminal laws and to recommend total revision by 1968.

"A number of our criminal laws are obsolete. Many are inconsistent in their efforts to make the penalty fit the crime. Many—which treat essentially the same crimes—are scattered in a crazy-quilt patchwork throughout our criminal code.

"The Commission will be composed of outstanding Americans, including Members of the Congress, officials of the executive branch, jurists, and members of the bar. This Commission will bring to us the most modern and rational criminal code.

"We are a nation dedicated to the precepts of justice, the rule of law, and the dignity of man. Our criminal code should be worthy of those ideals."

Within a few days, the administration's legislative proposal to establish a Commission to review the Federal criminal laws was sent to the Congress. The measure was introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative CELLER, as H.R. 13548, and in the Senate by Senator McCLELLAN, as S. 3064.

On March 30 and June 1, 1966, hearings were held by Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on H.R. 13548 and other law enforcement measures. Deputy Attorney General Ramsey Clark testified as follows on H.R. 13548:

"The proposed revision would be the most ambitious initiated in this century, if not in the history of the Republic. In view of the state of the code, the limited purposes of the 1948 codification and the hundreds of criminal statutes enacted since, it is imperative that these laws be completely and carefully reviewed.

"Several illustrations may help. Is it not puzzling that it is a felony punishable by a fine of not more than *$1,000* or imprisonment for not more than *7 years*, or both, to actually maim a person, while an assault with intent to commit such a felony is punishable by a fine of not more than *$3,000*, or imprisonment for not more than *10 years*, or both? Is maiming a lesser offense than an assault with intent to maim?

"The various false penalty and immunity statutes are equally confusing. Under section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, false statements generally are punishable by a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both. However, under various other statutes, false statements of a particular type are subject to lesser penalties. For instance, false statements in connection with Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation transactions or Federal Housing Administration transactions are punishable by a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both. The immunity statutes are found in approximately 41 places in the United States Code and contain many variances in the procedure for granting immunity to witnesses.

"Some statutes are obsolete or incorrect and should be either updated or repealed. For instance, section 1652 of title 18 speaks of pirates operating under color of any commission from a foreign prince. Section 4041 of that title states that 'The Bureau of Prisons shall be in charge of a Director' who shall receive a salary of $10,000 a year. But the Director should be in charge of the Bureau rather than the Bureau in charge of the Director.

"These are just several examples of the areas in which our criminal code could be improved; there are many others.

"It will be the task of the Commission to find them and recommend their improvement to the Congress."

Subsequent to the hearings, Representative POFF, a member of the subcommittee and a sponsor of the administration's proposal, introduced H.R. 15766, a bill of similar but broader impact. H.R. 15766 was adopted by the subcommittee, favorably reported by the committee and passed by the House of Representatives by a unanimous vote.

In its report on the bill, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives described the differences between H.R. 15766, as reported, and the original administration proposal, as follows:

"The principal differences between H.R. 15766 as here reported and the original administration proposal (H.R. 13548) relate to (1) the scope of the project; (2) membership on the Commission; (3) the addition of an Advisory Committee, and (4) duration of the study to be undertaken.

"Scope: Reform rather than revision

"The administration bill (H.R. 13548) would have created a Criminal Law Revision Commission. H.R. 15766 contemplates a Criminal Law Reform Commission, which would not be limited to recodification or revision, merely restating existing laws and limiting disparities, but would itself determine where its attention will best be focused after having had an opportunity to review the entire spectrum of the criminal laws, including also the possible codification of case law where needed to modernize the system.

"Commission membership

"The administration bill would have provided for a nine-man Commission with three members each to be appointed by the President, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House. No provision was made for participation by members of the judiciary. H.R. 15766 provides that the Chief Justice shall appoint 3 judges to membership on the Commission, increasing its membership to 12. In addition, H.R. 15766 attempts to insure some bipartisanship in the appointment of the Commissioners by requiring that not more than two of the three members to be appointed by the President, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker, shall be of the same political party. The measure also requires that the members appointed by the President of the Senate and by the Speaker shall be Senators and Representatives, respectively.

"Advisory committee

"H.R. 15766 also provides for the creation of a staff and for the creation of an advisory committee of 15 persons to be appointed by the Commission.

"Duration: reports

"Where H.R. 13548 provided a 2-year duration for the Commission, H.R. 15766 increases the life of the proposed Commission to 3 years, with the direction to file an interim report not later than 2 years after the enactment of the legislation."

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS

Section 1 establishes the National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws.

Section 2 provides that the Commission shall be composed of three Members of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate, three Members of the House appointed by the Speaker, three members appointed by the President, one of whom he shall designate as Chairman, and one U.S. circuit judge and two U.S. district judges appointed by the Chief Justice. No more than two of the members appointed by the President, the President of the Senate or the Speaker are to be members of the same political party. Vacancies shall be filled subject to the same limitations with respect to party affiliations as original appointments. Seven members are to constitute a quorum, but a lesser number may conduct hearings.

Section 3 declares the duties of the Commission to make a full and complete review and study of the Federal criminal laws and to make recommendations for their revision and recodification.

Section 4(a) provides that members of the Commission who are Members of Congress or of the executive or judicial branch of the Government shall serve without additional compensation except for reimbursement of travel.

Section 4(b) provides that a member of the Commission from private life shall receive $75 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses.

Section 5 provides that a Director shall be appointed by the Commission without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949 and that his compensation shall be fixed by the Commission without regard to the Classification Act. The Director is to serve as the Commission's reporter and is to supervise the activities of the employees of the Commission, who may be employed without regard to civil service laws or the Classification Act. The Chairman of the Commission is authorized to procure services as authorized for departments by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $75 per diem.

Section 6 establishes an advisory committee of 15 persons to be appointed by the Commission and to include lawyers, U.S. attorneys, and other persons competent to advise the Commission. Members of the advisory committee are not to be deemed to be officers or employees of the United States and are to serve without compensation but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses.

Section 7 provides for cooperation with the Commission by other Federal agencies.

Section 8 requires the Commission to submit an interim report within 2 years after the date of enactment, and to submit its final report within 3 years after enactment.

Section 9 directs the General Services Administration to provide administrative services to the Commission on a reimbursable basis.

Section 10 authorizes the appropriation of not more than $500,000 to carry out the provisions of the act.

CONCLUSIONS

The committee is of the opinion that the hearings conducted by the House of Representatives amply demonstrated the urgent need for a thorough overhauling of the Federal criminal laws. The committee has been advised that the bill, as amended and passed by the House of Representatives, is acceptable to the Department of Justice.

The committee therefore recommends that the bill be favorably considered.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ENLISTED MEMBERS OF THE MILITARY SERVICES

The bill (H.R. 16394) for the relief of certain enlisted members of the military services who lost interest on amounts deposited under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code, or prior laws authorizing enlisted members' deposits, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1877), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill would authorize the military departments to adjust the deposit accounts of certain enlisted members and former enlisted members who have lost interest on savings under the enlisted members deposits program.

EXPLANATION

Public Law 501 of the 83d Congress provided for a uniform system for the deposit of savings of enlisted members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps. Section 2 of this law provided that "For any sums not less than $5.00 so deposited for a period of six months, or longer, the enlisted member, upon final discharge or at such time or times prior thereto as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the department concerned, shall be paid interest at the rate of 4 per centum per annum." The Army interpreted the words "upon final discharge" to mean separation without immediate reentry into the service. Army regulations, therefore, provided that members who were discharged and immediately reenlisted or who were retired and immediately recalled to active duty were not required to withdraw and redeposit their savings in order to continue to draw interest. In 1958 the Comptroller General held that interest should not accrue after a discharge and an immediate reenlistment and, if the member is to continue to draw interest, the savings must be withdrawn and redeposited.

After the ruling of the Comptroller General, the Army determined that approximately 12,000 enlisted members had been discharged and immediately reenlisted or retired and immediately recalled to active duty without withdrawing and redepositing their savings at the time of separation. Although they acted in good faith and in compliance with Army regulations, these members are not entitled to accrue any interest on these deposits until they are withdrawn and redeposited. Furthermore, about 1,200 Army members were paid simple interest on deposits that were not withdrawn and redeposited at the time of separation. This bill would validate the payments of interest as if the deposits had been withdrawn and redeposited and it would authorize additional payments of interest on the portion of the redeposit that represents earned interest paid in the previous reenlistment.

COST

The cost to the Army of this bill would be $70,000. The cost to the other military departments is unknown but it is expected to be less than the Army cost.

BILLS PASSED OVER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Order Nos. 1834, 1835, 1836, 1837, 1838, 1839, 1840, 1841, 1842, 1843, 1844, and 1845 be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 4339 OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 7973) to amend section 4339 of title 10, United States Code, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 4339 of title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

SEC. 2. The organist and choirmaster and the civilian instructors in the departments of foreign languages and tactics at the United States Military Academy who are serving under appointments made prior to January 17, 1963, are entitled to public quarters without charge, and to fuel and light without charge when they occupy public quarters.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1878), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

As amended, this bill would entitle the organist and choirmaster and the civilian instructors in the departments of foreign inaguages and tactics at the Military Academy who are serving in appointments made before January 17, 1963, to public quarters without charge, and to fuel and light without charge when they occupy public quarters.

EXPLANATION

Section 4339 of title 10, United States Code, provides that the organist and choirmaster of the Military Academy and the civilian instructors in the departments of foreign languages and tactics are entitled to public quarters when they are available and to fuel and light therefor. Before January of 1963, the Department of the Army interpreted this law to authorize quarters, fuel, and light without charge to these staff members. On January 17, 1963, and the Comptroller General of the United States ruled that the compensation of these employees must be reduced by the reasonable value of the Government quarters furnished to comply with Public Law 429 of the 81st Congress.

Eighteen civilian instructors and the organist had been hired with the understanding that the quarters, heat, and light would be furrnished without charge. Since February of 1963, they have been losing the value of the quarters rental, heat, and light from they pay.

The Department of Defense recommended legislation to permit the organist and choirmaster and the civilian instructors in foreign languages and tactics to occupy public quarters without charge and to receive fuel and light for these quarters without charge. The Bureau of the Budget, the Civil Service Commission, and the General Accounting Office all opposed a permanent extension of this privilege but suggested that in fairness to the employees who had been hired with the understanding that quarters, heat, and light would be furnished free of charge, some form of transitional relief be provided for those persons employed before the date of the Comptroller General's decision. The committee has amended the bill in accordance with a recommendation by the Civil Service Commission. The amendment would be effective on the date of enactment of the bill. It would authorize the resumption of the granting of free quarters to any employee who accepted one of the positions enumerated in the bill before January 17, 1963, but would deny such privileges to subsequent holders of the positions.

COST

The initial annual cost of the bill is approximately $25,000. This cost should gradually diminish as the staff members employed before January 17, 1963, are replaced by others employed after that date. There are no retroactive costs.

GRANT OF INCREASED BENEFITS TO PERSONS RECEIVING CASH RELIEF UNDER THE PANAMA CANAL CASH RELIEF ACT OF JULY 8, 1937

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 5990) to grant increased benefits to persons receiving cash relief under the Panama Canal Cash Relief Act of July 8, 1937, and to extend cash relief benefits to widows of recipients which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments on page 1, after line 9, to strike out:

SEC. 2. Section 181 of title 2, Canal Zone Code, is further amended by inserting new subsections (c) and (d) and by amending the existing subsection (c) and relettering it as subsection (e), the three subsections to read as follows:

"(c) The Governor of the Canal Zone may pay cash relief to the widow of any former employee of the Canal Zone Government who, until the time of his death, receives or has received cash relief under subsection (a) of this section or under the Act of July 8, 1937. The term 'widow' as used in this section includes only the following:

"(1) A woman legally married to such employee at the time of his termination for disability and at his death; or

"(2) A woman who, although not legally married to such former employee at the time of his termination, had resided continuously with him for at least five years immediately preceding the employee's termination under such circumstances as would at common law make the relationship a valid marriage and who continued to reside with him until his death.

Cash relief granted to such widows shall not at any time exceed 50 per centum of the rate at which cash relief, inclusive of any additional payment under subsection (b) of this section, would be payable to the former employee were he then alive.

"(d) The Governor of the Canal Zone is authorized to conduct an assistance program for the benefit of former employees and their widows who receive cash relief under this section. Such assistance may include medical and nursing services in the recipients' home, medicine, artificial limbs, eye glasses, outpatient treatment, and the repackaging and distribution of donated food and supplies, such as those obtained from the Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe organization. The funds appropriated for this assistance program shall not exceed $25,000 in any fiscal year.

"(e) Effective October 5, 1958, the Civil Service Retirement Act applies to those classes of employees of the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company who would have been eligible to receive benefits under the cash relief program if their services had been terminated by reason of disability prior to that date."

And, on page 3, at the beginning of line 17, to change the section number from "3" to "2".

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An Act to grant increased benefits to persons receiving cash relief under the Panama Canal Cash Relief Act of July 8, 1937."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1879), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

As amended, this bill authorizes a $10 per month increase in the payments received by certain former employees of the Panama Canal whose service was terminated before 1958, when persons in their status were brought under the coverage of the Civil Service Retirement Act.

EXPLANATION

This bill would benefit some oldtime employees of the Panama Canal. The group appears to be unique. Many of them are laborers, primarily from the West Indies, who were employed in the construction of the Panama Canal. They now are receiving cash relief payments under a law enacted in 1937. The original payment to them was $25 a month, the current maximum is $55 a month, and the average payment, which is based on length of service, is about $48.

All of the beneficiaries had their service terminated before 1958, when persons in their status were brought under the Civil Service Retirement Act. Employees in this unique group, all of whom were retired between 1934 and 1948, have remained under the provisions of the 1937 act, as subsequently amended, which applies only to the Panama Canal. There are now about 2,600 of these retired employees and their average age is 75. About 20 of them die each month. They have served the United States for up to 42 years.

The committee was informed that these retired employees are intensely loyal to the United States and that many of them are in pathetic financial circumstances as a result of the increasing cost of living in Panama.

The cost of increasing their cash relief by $10 a month would be charged against canal tolls and would not result in expense to the U.S. taxpayer.

COST

The following tabulations show the age distribution of cash relief annuitants and the cost of a $10 monthly increase in payments to them.

Table showing distribution of cash relief annuitants of the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company by age groups

Age group:	*Number*
40 to 44	4
45 to 49	21
50 to 54	35
55 to 59	61
60 to 64	155
65 to 69	430
70 to 74	900
75 to 79	900
80 to 84	409
85 to 89	76
90 plus	23
Total	3,014

ATTACHMENT C

Estimated cost of increased cash benefits, survivorship annuities to widows, and nursing and medical benefits

Fiscal year	Number of disability relief recipients at end of fiscal year	Cost of current program	Cost of $10 monthly increase in payments to disability relief recipients
1966	2,822	$1,640,400	$328,080
1967	2,630	1,525,200	305,040
1968	2,438	1,410,000	282,000
1969	2,246	1,294,800	258,960
1970	2,054	1,179,600	235,920
1971	1,862	1,064,400	212,880
1972	1,670	949,200	189,840
1973	1,478	834,000	166,800
1974	1,286	718,800	143,760

AMENDMENT OF TITLES 10 AND 37, UNITED STATES CODE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 17451) to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to authorize certain rank, pay, and retirement privileges for officers serving in certain positions and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That

(a) An officer who on the day before the effective date of this Act was serving as the Chief of the Bureau of Ships or the Bureau of Yards and Docks, and who on that effective date was detailed to serve as the commander of one of the six principal subordinate commands of the Naval Material Command, continues, from that date, to be eligible for the rank, pay, and retirement privileges he was entitled to receive as a bureau chief under chapter 513 of title 10, United States Code, and under section 202(h) of title 37, United States Code. If any such officer is retired while serving in the office to which so detailed, he may be retired in the grade of rear admiral, with retired pay based on the upper half of that grade; if retired after serving in that office, his eligibility for the retirement privileges authorized by chapter 513 of title 10, United States Code, is to be determined by adding his service as a bureau chief and all service performed in the office to which detailed on the effective date of this Act.

(b) An officer who on the day before the effective date of this Act was serving as the Deputy Chief of the Bureau of Ships, the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, or the Bureau of Yards and Docks, and who on that effective date was detailed to serve as the vice commander of one of the six principal subordinate commands of the Naval Material Command, is entitled to the pay authorized by section 202(i) of title 37, United States Code, from the effective date of this Act and as long as he continues to serve in the office to which then detailed.

SEC. 2. This Act shall be effective on May 1, 1966.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An Act to preserve the pay and retirement privileges for certain former chiefs of Navy bureaus and to preserve the pay privileges of certain former deputy chiefs of Navy bureaus."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1880), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill would avoid a loss in pay for certain Navy officers who were affected by the reorganization that became effective on May 1, 1966.

EXPLANATION

Under a Department of Defense reorganization plan that became effective on May 1, 1966, after it was submitted to and not disapproved by Congress, four Navy bureaus (Ships, Weapons, Yards and Docks, and Supplies and Accounts) were abolished and superseded by six commands (Air, Ships, Ordnance, Electronics, Supply Systems, and Facilities Engineering) under the Chief of Naval Material.

Under current law the chief and the deputy chief of a Navy bureau are entitled to the pay of a rear admiral, upper half. If the chief of a bureau retires while serving as chief, he is entitled to retired pay based on the pay of a rear admiral, upper half. If an officer serves as chief of a bureau for 2½ years and is later retired while serving in a lower rank or grade, he may receive the retired pay of a rear admiral, upper half.

After the reorganization became effective, the former chiefs and deputy chiefs of the abolished bureaus no longer enjoyed these statutory privileges, although they were serving in comparable positions in successor organizations within the Department of the Navy. Of the four chiefs and four deputy chiefs from the abolished bureaus, five officers suffered a loss in pay of about $200 a month since May 1. The other three officers already were receiving the pay of a rear admiral, upper half, and did not suffer a loss in pay as a result of the reorganization.

Section 1(a) of the bill permits two chiefs of abolished bureaus who became commanders of one of the superseding commands to continue to enjoy the pay, rank, and retirement privileges to which they are entitled as bureau chiefs. This means that if they are retired while serving as commander of one of the subordinate commands of the

Naval Material Command, they would be entitled to the retired pay of a rear admiral, upper half. It also means that service as a commander of one of the new commands may be added to their service as a bureau chief in determining whether they have 2½ years of service in positions that would authorize them to have their retired pay based on that of a rear admiral, upper half, if they should be retired after serving as a commander of one of the subordinate commands and without their having otherwise become entitled to the pay of a rear admiral, upper half.

Section 1(b) of the bill relates only to the deputy chiefs of the abolished bureaus. These officers are not entitled to receive the retired pay of a rear admiral, upper half, if they retire while serving as a deputy chief of a bureau. Section 1(b) permits the deputy chiefs of three abolished bureaus who continued to serve as vice commanders of one of the successor commands to continue to be eligible to receive the pay of a rear admiral, upper half, so long as they continue to serve in the successor office to which they were detailed.

COST

The five officers affected have been incurring a loss in pay of about $200 a month since May 1. Hence, the cost of this bill is approximately $1,000 a month from May 1, 1966.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the calendar for the time being.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I desire to take up two House bills. I have discussed them with the majority and minority leaders, and they have no objection.

CONVEY LAND TO SKYLINE CHURCHES CEMETERY

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from the further consideration of H.R. 10876, and that the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10876) to authorize and direct the administrator of the Farmers Home Administration to quitclaim certain property in Jackson County, Ala., to Skyline Churches Cemetery, a corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee is discharged, and the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, all committee members have been consulted, and there are no objections to this procedure.

Mr. President, the bill would authorize and direct the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration to convey by quitclaim deed all interests of the United States in 9.06 acres of land located in Jackson County, Ala., to Skyline Churches Cemetery, a nonprofit membership corporation organized and existing under Alabama law.

The 9.06 acres of land involved constitutes a community cemetery and was a part of the Skyline Farms project acquired by the Alabama Rural Rehabilitation Corp., for subdivision and development as individual farm units. It was subsequently conveyed in trust to the United States on August 16, 1937. The project consisted of approximately 13,000 acres with something more than 2,000 acres of wasteland, steep bluffs, and very rough timber areas.

The record of this acquisition did not reflect the existence of the cemetery, and it was discovered when the property was being subdivided as individual farm units. Consequently, all of the project property except this cemetery had been disposed of, and the Farmers Home Administration has been without means to convey this 9.06 acres to the local community.

Although the records of the real estate transaction and abstract title for the Government acquisition did not show a conveyance or a dedication of any of the area for cemetery purposes, the cemetery area was apparently a part of the land involved in the conveyance. Therefore, the Department of Agriculture believes that it did get title to the cemetery tract as a part of the larger purchase.

The Farmers Home Administration informed the committee that the cemetery is of no value to the Government, and they favor its return to the local people. In fact, the people of the local community have been requesting title to the cemetery for a number of years.

The committee feels that, in view of the fact that this 9.06-acre cemetery is of no possible value to the Government, the Farmers Home Administration should be permitted to convey by quitclaim deed all interests of the United States in this land to the Skyline Churches Cemetery Corp. Such action would be beneficial to the local people who would then feel more free to maintain the cemetery than they would if the property remained in the hands of the Government. There would be no additional cost to the Government as a result of enactment of this bill, and as a matter of fact there may be saving in administrative and other costs.

The Department favors the enactment of the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] in requesting Senate approval of H.R. 10876.

I have examined the bill in light of the so-called Morse formula and find that it does not violate the formula.

House Report No. 2311 on the bill states that "this 9.06-acre cemetery is of no possible value to the Government."

The Farmers Home Administration testified that the cemetery is of no value to the Government, and the Department of Agriculture has been advised that the conveyance is sought so that the cemetery can be improved and maintained.

In fact, Mr. President, the transfer saves the Federal Government maintenance costs and also relieves it of what I consider to be a very clear obligation, the carrying out of which would entail Federal expenditures, and that is the clear obligation of keeping the cemetery neat and maintained and in proper condition.

The United States gives up no value under the bill; therefore, the Morse formula is inapplicable, and I join in asking for the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 10876) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ASSIGNMENT OF PAYMENTS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from the further consideration of H.R. 17588, and that the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 17588) to amend section 8(g) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act with respect to assignments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee is discharged, and the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, all committee members have been contacted, and there are no objections to this procedure.

The bill would amend the existing law to simplify procedures under which farmers may assign diversion and other payments to be received. Existing law limits the authority to witness signatures of an assignment to members of the county committee or the employees thereof. The bill would permit assignments to be witnessed by a bonded officer of: First, a bank whose deposits are insured by the FDIC; second, the Farmers Home Administration; or third, a production credit association supervised by the Farm Credit Administration.

The bill would expedite the process of signing assignments without it in any manner damaging the security of the farmer, the lending institutions, or the Department of Agriculture. At present, farmers may be required to make several trips to the local committee office before the assignment can be completed. The Department of Agriculture favors the enactment of the bill as does the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration.

I ask for passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 17588) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON WATER FOR PEACE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a joint resolution, and move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 167) to enable the United States to organize and hold an International Conference on Water for Peace in the United States in 1967 and authorize an appropriation therefor, which was, on page 2, line 8, strike out "$1,200,000" and insert "$900,000".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I understand that the only difference is that the sum has been reduced from $1.2 million, agreed to by the Senate, to $900,000, agreed to by the House, and we are willing to accept the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

PRINTING OF HOUSE DOCUMENT 237, 89TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, ENTITLED "SINO-SOVIET CONFLICT AND ITS IMPLICATIONS"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House on House Concurrent Resolution 1034.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 1034, which was read as follows:

> *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That an additional three thousand copies of House Document 237, Eighty-ninth Congress, first session, entitled "Sino-Soviet Conflict and Its Implications", be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1034) was agreed to.

THE METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the District of Columbia Crime Commission this past July issued a report, widely publicized in the press, which deals in great detail with Washington's police department and its administration.

Next Monday, October 24, the District Commissioners are due to report to President Johnson the progress made in implementing the recommendations of the Crime Commission. And later, at the end of the month, the Crime Commission is expected to submit its final report.

Because I have been concerned with crime and the problems facing the police in our Nation's Capital for several years, I have agreed with the Commission that more effective crime control procedures are needed in this city.

At the same time, however, I take issue with the direction and tone of the July report, particularly with the publicity surrounding it, then and now, and with several of the specific recommendations advanced by the Commission for improving the Metropolitan Police Department.

First, I would like to point out that the department has made important changes in recent months, some of which have resulted from the Crime Commission's recommendations and the new focus on police problems, and others which were sought long before the Commission undertook its project. As we await the final recommendations of the Commission and the department's report to the President, I would like to comment on the situation in general and explain my objections to certain specific aspects and attitudes of the Crime Commission's report.

Perhaps basic to my position is my conviction that it is entirely unfair to deposit the blame for shortcomings in the department at the doorstep of John B. Layton, who became the chief of police only 2 years ago. The Commission's report and some of its supporters in Congress have failed to emphasize the fact that since he took over the department, Chief Layton has instituted a number of significant revisions in the organization, administration, and operation of the police force.

Let me cite a few examples:

The Commission has been critical of the department's organization and recommended a reduction in the number of precincts and a reassignment of command personnel to improve administrative and operational efficiency.

Yet early in 1965, Chief Layton himself instituted an organizational study of the police force. He discontinued this study when he learned that the Commission had contracted with the International Chiefs of Police for a similar evaluation.

The police department has been reproached for not getting enough patrolmen away from clerical duties and out on the streets.

Yet in 1965 Chief Layton requested funds for programs to reduce excessive paperwork demands on officers and began to improve communications in general, with the principal goal of making more men available for actual police work.

Much progress has now been made toward developing computerized records, a modernized communications system, a civilian clerical staff, and improved recruiting and training programs.

It should be noted that here, as so often before, the funds for these efforts have not been provided by Congress, and Chief Layton has had to rely largely on money provided under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act.

The Commission's July report also indicated that the police department's number of motor vehicles is inadequate.

Yet Chief Layton has requested more cars, has gotten them, and has instituted a highly successful one-man scout car program within the past 2 years. Since then, he has requested additional funds for more cars, for scooters, for more men.

I think in all fairness to Chief Layton it should be pointed out that he had taken action with regard to every aspect of the functions of his department which the Crime Commission took to task.

This is true with respect to community relations activities; it is true with respect to the recruitment of police officers; and it is true with respect to building and equipment replacement programs.

I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD, following my remarks, a list of outlining all of the activities initiated by Chief Layton since he took over command of the Metropolitan Police Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I do not question that there are differences between the innovations which Chief Layton has proposed or developed and the recommendations of the Crime Commission, but I do question whether the Commission's report should be considered as a new revelation, or as the final word pertaining to the solution of Washington's police problems.

I want to note here that the Commission's report has been based in large part on a study conducted by the International Association of Chiefs of Police. And while I am in no way critical of the association's report, it must be realized that proposing textbook-type changes and innovations is a great deal easier than putting them into effect, in actual practice, in an actual police department which has grown, developed, and functioned according to certain policies for a number of years—and in my estimation has done a good job of enforcing the law under the most difficult conditions.

Again, I speak as one who has studied the problems of the Metropolitan Police force since I became a member and chairman of the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency.

I took to the Senate floor in March of 1962 and spoke on crime and delinquency in the Nation's Capital. My first recommendation was that the Congress take immediate steps to meet the needs of the police department. I asked for an immediate buildup of its authorized strength, a speed up of the man-dog team program, and an increase in the number of police cruisers, especially in the Juvenile Bureau.

I recall distinctly that during that same year the police department was asking for the kind of improvements, the kind of manpower buildup, the kind of modern equipment and the kind of study grants that the Crime Commission has since accused it of not having.

Let me be more specific and refresh the memories of those who now question the conduct of the Metropolitan Police Department. Back in 1962 the police department asked for funds to conduct a broad study of the crime problem in this city so that it could better allocate its manpower, equipment, and other resources for more effective law enforcement.

The money was not made available.

In 1962 the department asked for more scout cars and other specialized vehicles on the street and for more modern equipment so that it could utilize its uniformed forces in actual crime control rather than in auxiliary duties.

The funds for these improvements were only partially appropriated.

In 1962 the department asked for more men to build up its authorized strength and over half the appropriation was denied by the District of Columbia Commissioners.

Today, the reports of the Crime Commission and the International Chiefs of Police are critical of the shortcomings in the Metropolitan Police Department without stressing for the benefit of the public and the press that both Chief Layton and his predecessor, Chief Murray, have gone to the Commissioners and to Congress asking for the money, the understanding, and the help that is essential for any type of reorganization or improvement.

Over the years since 1962, the police department has received some of the things it has asked for—but certainly not all of them. And we know, as is true with other departments, that the formal budget requests contain by and large only items that are expected to be approved.

So, let no one place the Commission's criticisms at the feet of Chief Layton. To do so would be grossly unfair. It is, of course, not Chief Layton, but the Congress and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia that can give to the Metropolitan Police most of the material means of improved effectiveness called for in the report of the Crime Commission.

The point that has been lost in the Commission's report is that no police chief can build an ideal department if he has to beg and bargain with at least two funding authorities for supplying the needs of his police force.

The point has been lost that no police chief can build a great department if he gets his requests approved in bits and pieces, never quite knowing what will be allowed and what refused.

And the point is lost that no police chief can establish good planning and an optimally efficient department if he has to depend on the uncertainty of approvals of his requests, which in the case of the District of Columbia depend on the whims of the Commissioners and on the sporadic, often crisis-induced generosity of Congress.

Before I take issue with some of the specific recommendations made by the District of Columbia Crime Commission, and the chiefs of police, I want to point out that the reports do not give sufficient recognition to the cold realities of police administration in this city—particularly to the fact that it comes under three authorities, the White House, the Congress, and the Commissioners.

I want to point out that while the two studies resemble textbook solutions for the problems of police departments all over the country, in spite of their scholarly appearance they present no evidence or substantial proof that many of the proposals would in fact increase the effectiveness of any specific department, including the Metropolitan Police Department.

One of the specific recommendations of the Commission's July report deals with the handling of community relations and of crime suspects by the police. Here the tone is again quite critical of the department's procedures.

Yet the report fails to emphasize the fact that this city's population is virtually composed of a minority group that lives on the most crime prone socioeconomic level of existence.

It fails to emphasize that this city has perhaps more race-connected problems than any other large metropolitan area in the United States, but, in spite of this, has not had the type of disturbances which have occurred in other cities.

And it fails to emphasize that while most riots have started in connection with police incidents, the procedures used by the Metropolitan Police have not brought about any major rioting.

Let us look at another Commission proposal which the police department has recently been accused of blocking and delaying. The Commission recommends consolidation of the 14 existing precincts into 6 so-called primary patrol areas. I will not argue that this proposal is not in line with theories of sound organization or administration. But I will argue that administrative expediency or economics cannot and should not be the basic objective of a police department.

I believe on the contrary, that the human element is far more important and that a citizen may get more intimate, more personalized, and more satisfactory police service from a local precinct than from a clerk in a relatively remote headquarters office who must deal with hundreds of people every day and who is unable to handle these individuals on any but the most formal and impersonal basis.

Specifically, today, when much is made of the need to improve relations between the police officer and members of the community, some of these Commission recommendations seem diametrically opposed to the objectives of the others.

Another controversial recommendation involves reassignment and reclassification of high-level officers in the department, plus the elimination of the position of executive officer.

I want to take issue with these proposals which were advanced by both the Crime Commission and the chiefs of police. We know that police departments are made up of people, most of whom take pride in their work and in the positions of responsibility which they occupy. To reshuffle the administrative structure at the drop of a hat, as it were, simply because some other arrangement may or may not work better can create far greater morale problems than the department is accused of having at the present.

To this we must add the realization that each organization is influenced and ought to be influenced by the personal style of operation of the man who heads it. The two reports would deny Chief Layton this privilege. As far as I am concerned, and I know I would be backed up by a number of authorities, if a police chief wants to have an executive officer there should be no commission or advisory board or any other authority which can deny him this discretion.

Mr. President, too frequently in recent years the police of this Nation have become whipping boys for social disorders which are far too complex for them to handle and which indeed seem too complex for all of us. In our groping for solutions, we have all but rendered the police ineffective with our civilian review boards, with our panicky concern over alleged police brutality charges, and on occasion with our excessive concern for the constitutional rights of the crime suspect.

I think we have overreacted in criticizing the police, and I think we often attack them for the wrong reasons.

I believe the Commission's study which has severely criticized the Washington police force could not help but be influenced by the climate of anxiety which now prevails across the Nation with respect to police work.

By saying this I do not want to oppose the majority of the proposals in the study. I think they were advanced by competent people and I would accept them for what they are worth.

However, I do object to the frantic and seemingly uncritical manner in which they are being forced upon the Police Department.

I do object to the fact that I have not seen one comment either in the reports or in the press which would give the Police Chief discretion in either accepting or rejecting any of these recommendations.

And I do object to a report, which ought to be an advisory and supportive set of recommendations, becoming, in effect, an accepted decree for a monumental and potentially devastating reorganization of the Metropolitan Police Department.

Is Chief Layton expected to sit helplessly by and have his force completely reorganized by outsiders, while he is denied any say in the matter because the public and the press, in helpless frustration, feel "something should be done?" I think not.

I have come to know Chief Layton as a professional police officer of the highest caliber. I know this from his testimony as a witness before my subcommittee. I know this from the expert cooperation my staff and I have received from his department in our many inquires regarding crime control in the Nation's Capital.

And I know that he is aware of the problems he faces and of the direction in which he must go to solve them.

Because of this, I object to the atmosphere of needless hysteria surrounding the Crime Commission's report which asks us to make a puppet out of a competent police officer who is no longer given the authority to determine what is best for his Department or the city whose laws he has been charged with enforcing.

Mr. President, if we accept without question the criticisms and recommendations in the Commission's report, we are in danger of needlessly crippling a potentially great police chief who has not been given the chance to fully exercise his ability in molding his department according to the peculiar needs of the city, and according to needs which can never be reflected quite accurately in police manuals and textbooks.

I believe the Nation's Capital cannot afford to severely limit the creative ability of Chief Layton, who certainly knows this city at least as well as his critics. I believe the Congress, the city, and the President should give him all the support he needs to build the kind of organization I know he can build.

And I believe he should be the administrator in charge of the changes which will be made in his police force rather than a silent recipient of changes imposed from without. If the Commission's report brings this about, it will have served a good purpose.

Exhibit 1

Recent Actions by the Metropolitan Police Department Designed To Improve Its Operation

I. ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

1. In April 1965 the Chief of Police instituted an organizational study of the Metropolitan Police Department; work on this project was stopped upon announcement by the President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia of the contract for a study by the IACP.

2. In June 1965, the department requested funds for civilian personnel to establish a Planning Unit; this request was deleted by Congress from the special amendment to fiscal year 1966 appropriation. In October 1965, the department began selection of police personnel to form the nucleus of a Planning Unit which was implemented in December 1965. Funds for full financing of the unit were included in the 1967 budget estimates. Grants to supplement this unit were requested and obtained under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act.

3. Records Retention and Storage Program was reviewed and updated, resulting in a potential savings of personnel, time and space.

II. OPERATIONS

1. Tactical Saturation Force was established in July 1966 on an experimental basis; full financing requested in 1967 budget.

2. Additional patrol cars were obtained in fiscal year 1965 and fiscal year 1966 and one-man scout car program was established in fiscal year 1966. Additional cars to expand fleet and program have been requested in fiscal year 1967. Fifty-four additional cars to be obtained during fiscal year 1967 were requested and allowed under a Law Enforcement Assistance Act Grant.

3. Grant requested and allowed under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act to purchase and install police radio receiver converters in the private autos of police officers for use while in an off-duty status.

4. Grant requested and allowed under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act for experimental use of motor scooters.

5. A program was instituted in 1965 to revise department field report forms to provide better formats and handwritten reports, saving an estimated 14 man years annually in police clerical time.

6. A program was instituted to provide dictating equipment to Detective Division Squads to relieve detective personnel of typing chores.

III. PERSONNEL, RECRUITING, AND TRAINING

1. During July 1965, the department began a complete review of all assignments of police officers to administrative, clerical, and technical duties to determine the feasibility of replacing officers assigned to such duties with civilian personnel in order to release such officers for regular police duties. Twenty-seven additional civilian positions have been requested in the 1967 budget estimates to replace police officers assigned to non-police duties.

2. In June 1965, a Police Cadet Program with twenty-five cadets was inaugurated in the department to provide a reservoir of trained police candidates and to release officers from non-police duties. Thirty-five additional cadets have been requested in the 1967 budget estimates.

3. Police salary increases requested in calendar year 1965 were not acted upon by Bureau of the Budget. Salary legislation is currently pending.

4. In May 1966, the department issued procedures for the appointment and promotion of civilian personnel which requires that all eligible applicants be considered before filling vacant positions.

5. In July 1966 an order was issued requiring that all eligible applicants be considered in filling special assignments in the police force.

6. Authorization was obtained to increase the number of school crossing guards to 150.

7. A program was established in 1965 for special walk-in examinations to be conducted on two Saturdays and one Thursday each month in the District of Columbia to allow prospective candidates from the District of Columbia and the metropolitan area to take the examinations without losing time from their present employment.

8. Extensive paid advertising campaigns are being conducted in papers in and within a fifty mile radius of the District of Columbia to bring the special walk-in examinations to the attention of prospective applicants.

9. Recruiting drives have been conducted in 45 cities in 9 states during the fiscal year 1966.

10. A separate Recruiting Bureau was established by the Chief of Police in April 1966 to further strengthen the recruiting efforts of the department.

11. In April 1966 the Director of Training was directed to develop and establish a standardized in-service training program for all units of the Metropolitan Police Department.

12. The Director of Training has been designated Project Director for several new training programs including a major human relations training program and executive development program for senior officials of the department and a supervisory course for Sergeants and Lieutenants. These programs will be financed under a Law Enforcement Assistance Act Grant.

13. Two hundred and fifty-six members of the Metropolitan Police Department are now attending department sponsored college-level training programs.

IV. ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY

1. Early in 1964 the Metropolitan Police Department began to examine the feasibility of computer applications within the department.

2. In the fall of 1964 the department had the District of Columbia Management Office and the International Association of Chiefs of Police study the feasibility of computer applications within the department.

3. Funds requested in a supplemental appropriation request for fiscal year 1966 to implement the department computer program were denied. Request for financing pending in 1967 appropriation.

4. A grant was requested and approved under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965 to implement the computer program.

5. The department participated with other District Agencies early in 1965 in the development of a SHARE program to give it access to a sophisticated computer system.

6. A two-way radio system for footmen was established in September 1961, expanded to cover nine precincts in fiscal year 1966 and will be expanded to cover remaining five precincts in fiscal year 1967.

7. A grant was requested and approved under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act to expand and modernize the existing communications system.

8. Funding was requested in 1967 appropriations for a two-way closed circuit television network.

V. POLICE-COMMUNITY RELATIONS

1. A Police-Community Relations Unit was established in September 1964.

2. The recruit training program was extended to provide 40 hours of training in police-community relations.

3. Precinct Citizens Advisory Councils have been established in each of the fourteen precincts.

4. In June 1966 the Chief of Police issued orders providing united coordination of citizen complaints by the Internal Investigations Unit.

VI. BUILDING AND EQUIPMENT

1. The Metropolitan Police Department established a comprehensive building program in 1961.

Thirteenth Precinct station house replaced in fiscal year 1964.

Third Precinct station house replaced in fiscal year 1965.

Ninth Precinct station house to be replaced in fiscal year 1967.

Training Center to be constructed in fiscal year 1968.

Canine Center to be constructed in fiscal year 1969.

Eleventh Precinct station house to be constructed in fiscal year 1969.

New police headquarters originally requested for fiscal year 1968.

2. Plans for police headquarters to be included with plans for a West Administration Building due for completion in fiscal year 1971.

3. Appropriations have been obtained to reduce replacement schedules for vehicles, boats, photographic equipment, and furniture.

THE FREEDOM STUDIES CENTER

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, late last month a small group of congressional staff assistants journeyed to an estate in the rolling hill country near Boston, Va., for the inaugural seminar of the only serious center for the study of cold-war strategy in existence today. These staff assistants were the first class in the Freedom Studies Center of the Institute for American Strategy.

They spent 3 days in a shakedown session discussing such topics as the response of American constitutionalism to the Communist challenge, the free world alliance system, psychopolitical warfare, Soviet disinformation operations, the effects of East-West trade, and Soviet propaganda.

They listened to the advice and comments of an impressive array of cold-war experts which included Edgar Ansel Mowrer, Pulitzer Prize winning foreign correspondent; Dr. William Yandell Elliott Williams, professor of history and politics at Harvard University; Dr. Eleanor Dulles, professor of government at Georgetown University; Vice Adm. Fitzhugh Lee, commandant of the National War College; Dr. Victor A. Fediay, senior research analyst of the Library of Congress; former Congressman Walter Judd; Arthur Meyerhoff, author of the definitive book on the use of public relations techniques in the cold war; Allen Dulles, former head of the CIA; Joseph Gwyer, Library of Congress Soviet specialist; Dr. Frederick C. Barghoorn, Yale professor of political science; and a team from the National Maritime Union. Military experts—Col. Raymond Sleeper, commander of the Foreign Technology Division of the U.S. Air Force, and Brig. Gen. Edwin Black, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense—gave an account of the conflict in Vietnam and progress in Soviet military technology.

I might add that Mr. Meyerhoff's newly published book, "The Strategy of Persuasion," seconds one of the main points of his speech:

> Our military can cope with the Communists in a clash of firearms, but we are dropped pitifully in our tracks in any war of words.

The Freedom Studies Center was established through the cooperation of 55 educational institutions and major organizations to help close the cold war educational gap. The center is intended to be a private West Point of psychopolitical warfare. Its purpose is to, first, train cold war leadership for all segments of society in the free world; second, study Communist strategies and tactics; and third, develop and recommend programs for defending and extending the sphere of freedom.

Together with the Governor of Wyoming, Clifford Hansen, and a generous representation of other Senators, Representatives, and Governors, I am pleased to be a member of the Freedom Studies Center Advisory Board.

A word is in order with respect to the principal architect of the Freedom Studies Center. John M. Fisher is president of the Institute for American Strategy which administers the Freedom Studies Center. Mr. Fisher, a native of Fairhaven, Ohio, is a graduate of Miami University, Ohio. He studied at the Brooklyn Law School and the Graduate School of Northwestern University. He is a member of the Freedom's Foundation Board of Advisers and is a former special agent in the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

As a result of the inception of the Freedom Studies Center, the Institute for American Strategy was awarded in 1966 a George Washington Honors Medal Award by Freedoms Foundation. It was the second time the Institute had been so honored since Mr. Fisher became president in 1962.

The Freedom Studies Center was officially dedicated in an impressive ceremony on the school's 671-acre campus. The dedication drew expressions of support for the center from several score prominent Americans in and out of Government, including the President of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. It symbolized the launching of what this Nation has long needed, a place where the problems, issues, and answers of the cold war and of man's struggle to gain and retain freedom can be studied in earnest.

The legislation which would create a federally financed Freedom Academy may never become law. But regardless of that, there does exist today an institution dedicated to the study of the preservation and advance of man's most precious of possessions—freedom. I pray that the Freedom Studies Center will grow and prosper and will have an impact as great as its cause on our Nation and on all the free world.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks news, editorial, and other explanatory material relating to the Freedom Studies Center. I also ask unanimous consent that the telegram sent by President Johnson for the center's dedication and the splendid speech delivered during the seminar by Mr. Arthur E. Meyerhoff be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FREEDOM STUDIES CENTER

The Freedom Studies Center will emphasize the need for a positive, constructive approach to Cold War problems based on the principles of American freedom. For example, developing nations and those newly independent of foreign domination need assistance in developing solid political foundations for a free society of their own which can withstand the invasion of Communism into those countries. One purpose of the Freedom Studies Center is to help strengthen those countries by giving their emerging leadership the benefits of American experience in developing a dynamic, free society and free enterprise system.

While it will be expanded several times over, the Center is not intended as the sole means to close the educational gap. Its most effective role will be that of a pilot operation and catalyst for its cooperating agencies in establishing and expanding their own independent Cold War educational programs.

The 34 initial United States cooperating agencies of the Freedom Studies Center include educational institutions such as the Illinois Institute of Technology and Northeastern University and school systems such as the Cook County (Illinois) Schools and the Massachusetts Department of Education. The 21 initial international cooperating agencies include representation from many countries in Africa, Europe, Asia and Latin America. Additional cooperating agencies will be added as the Center grows.

The universal recognition of the need for this Freedom Studies Center is shown by the many educational, business and political leaders who are cooperating as individuals in the development of the Center. They include 13 heads of colleges and universities, 11 deans or directors of university schools, 13 state commissioners of education, 20 professors, 13 top officials of major school systems, 21 business leaders, 12 U.S. Senators, 33 U.S. Congressmen and 11 state governors comprising a balanced representation of both major political parties.

CURRENT PROGRAM

The Freedom Studies Center was established in response to requests from U.S. Senators and Congressmen that the Institute for American Strategy conduct schools for their aides and for other government employees as it had for governors' aides. Similar interest has since been shown by officials in the executive branch and by major corporations.

The Freedom Studies Center is initially operated as a residence school conducting concentrated training programs for free world leaders in both the public and private sectors. These concentrated courses will vary in length from four-day weekends to two-week and six-week sessions.

The first school will be conducted for key congressional staff members in August 1966. Later schools will offer special training for government employees at both national and state levels, educators, business leaders, journalists, labor leaders, church leaders and missionaries, executives of voluntary organizations and community leaders from both the United States and other Free World countries.

The magnificent 23-room Manor on the Freedom Studies Center's 671-acre campus is ideal for the concentrated schools. Only an hour and a half drive from Washington, it is convenient for government officials who will lecture or study there. Yet, it is far enough from both government and business centers to permit uninterrupted study. Its swimming pool, tennis courts, miles of clear mountain river, bridle paths and famous formal gardens provide unexcelled opportunities for relaxation and revitalization after hard study.

The Institute for American Strategy is uniquely qualified to conduct such schools. Its Educational Advisory Committee is made up of 61 of the outstanding educators in America. It sponsored the first National Strategy Seminars for Reserve Officers held at the National War College in 1959 and 1960. It conducted seven annual National Military, Industrial and Educational Conferences and has held seminars such as the School for Governors' Aides conducted under the sponsorship of the National Governors' Conference and with the assistance of the White House.

FUTURE PROGRAM

As the Center grows, it will undertake graduate study programs with the cooperation of participating universities and colleges. Study leading to the Master's degree and Doctorate will be taken partly on the campus of a cooperating university and partly while in residence at the Freedom Studies Center. In addition, candidates for graduate degrees may be required to take selected non-credit courses at the Center or at the cooperating universities.

The Center will also conduct intensive long-term study programs for present and future private and governmental leaders of the Free World.

The Freedom Studies Center will be a continuing source of expert advice and counsel to students after they leave, and to institutions and leaders throughout the Free World. This will include the organization of advisory teams upon request for Free World government.

The Center will conduct research under contract for corporations and institutions of the private sector and also for government agencies. Further, within the limits of available funds, it will prepare research papers upon request for members of the congress, the executive branch, participating educational institutions and communications media.

The Freedom Studies Center will also continue and expand upon the many Institute for American Strategy activities such as: 1) serving as the consultant to the Joint Committee of The American Legion and the National Education Association; 2) conducting comprehensive national surveys on the nature and extent of instruction about Communism in secondary schools; 3) serving as consultant on the production of the sound filmstrip series, *Communism: Challenge to Freedom*, which is now in use in secondary schools in every state.

THE FREEDOM STUDIES CENTER OF THE INSTITUTE FOR AMERICAN STRATEGY

The following telegram was received by John M. Fisher, President of the Institute for American Strategy, on the occasion of the Dedication of the Freedom Studies Center at Boston, Virginia, Sunday, September 25, 1966:

"The will to resist aggression is strengthened by our understanding of the alternative to turning back a foe who would deny man's freedom. That understanding grows through education. It is a responsibility which public and private institutions must share. I commend your commitment to this great and urgent work of defending freedom and promoting peace. You have my every wish for success."

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union, Oct. 3, 1966]

Cold War College

The need for a more effective psychological counterattack against communism has long been apparent to men and women of the Free World who have watched with dismay as the enemy scored ideological victories.

The cold war has been recognized as such for some 20 years. The Reds made no secret of dedication to their side, nor to their long run aims and ambitions. But somehow, despite all of our advertising know-how, we often have fallen far short in ideological combat.

One encouraging long range effort to change this is noted in the opening of a Freedom Studies Center in Virginia, where people will train for cold war leadership.

Called a "West Point" of psychological warfare, the center will provide facilities for studying Communist strategy and purposes. It also will stimulate thought and develop programs to defend against these tactics.

The 671-acre campus was appropriately opened with a four-day seminar for 30 congressional aides. Lecturers were men and women of varied backgrounds whose experiences on the cold war front made them well qualified to instruct others.

Both President Johnson and former President Eisenhower sent messages stressing the need for an alert and informed citizenry. It is encouraging to note that the academy also has the support of many educational, business and political leaders.

The project is a tribute to the spirit of cooperation among individuals who are determined to do more than sit out the battle for men's minds.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, Oct. 1, 1966]

Washington

(By Edward W. O'Brien)

WASHINGTON.—Fourteen years after the idea was born, a Freedom Academy is open and operating. The new school, located on a Virginia hill top 79 miles southwest of here, conducted its first seminar last week for Senate and House staff assistants.

The name—the Freedom Studies Center—is slightly different from the one originally proposed. But there has been no change in the purpose—to educate and train Americans and other free citizens in how to fight the nonmilitary part of the Cold War.

Over the years, many attempts were made to have the federal government launch the Freedom Academy, but Congress declined to pass the legislation, largely because of State Department fear of competition from a rival agency and official faintheartedness over irritating the Kremlin. Finally, sponsors of the idea decided that if something was to be done, it would have to be through private organizers and money.

Now, almost $800,000 has been donated or pledged by foundations, corporations, and individuals. A 671-acre-farm-estate was purchased at a bargain price, refurbished, and on last Sunday was dedicated with the best wishes of President Johnson and an imposing array of other officials and private citizens. The Academy is the first educational institution in the United States giving all of its energy to the study of how to win the struggle with Communism.

Not many Americans understand the Cold War. We see little connection between the fighting in Vietnam, the building of a German steel mill in Red China, the murder of anti-Communist labor union leader in Latin America, the arrival of a new Communist diplomat at the United Nations, and a seemingly innocuous talk on a Midwestern college campus by Communist party boss Gus Hall.

A brochure by the new center explains: "The fronts of the Cold War are everywhere. From time to time it becomes a hot war, as it is now in Vietnam, and as it will become elsewhere on the globe when and if the Communists decide on still another hot test of the will of free peoples to resist them.

"Communist Cold War tactics are as deadly and carry as much threat to free peoples as any military operation. Only through a clear understanding of Communist goals and techniques can a free people act in concert or individually to deny the Communists their goal of world domination.

"The cold war tactics of the Communists are as varied as they are insidious. They range from diplomatic maneuvers, economic sorties, and propaganda, to intimidations, sabotage, terrorism, support of revolutions in free countries, and the driving of wedges of misunderstanding and mistrust between individuals and between nations.

"The Communists in short have mastered the art of psycho-political warfare. The Communist bloc operates more than 6,000 psycho-political warfare schools. The United States has nothing comparable. We are dependent upon those who have had to learn on the job."

The new center hopes to grow enough to be able to accommodate as many as 400 long-term graduate students a year, in addition to many others who will come for brief periods. Without government financing, it will have to struggle, but many believe it will be better in the long run for the center to stand on its own feet, set its own policies, and rely on private citizens who are sufficiently concerned about freedom's survival.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Press, Sept. 29, 1966]

Freedom Studies Center Out To Close Cold War Gap

(By Albert E. Prudence)

A new battle is shaping up in the rolling hills of Virginia, where the armies of the Union and the Confederacy once clashed.

This time the ammunition will be words, not bullets and bayonets, as leaders of a new Freedom Studies Center analyze cold-war strategy.

The center already is being called the West Point of psycho-political warfare. It is located on 671 acres at Boston, Va., about 80 miles southwest of Washington.

Attention of the center will focus on Communist tactics and strategy and close what its leaders say is an educational gap in the cold war.

The center is an outgrowth of a drive by the Institute of American Strategy, which has headquarters in Chicago. This is a private group supported by industrial and educational organizations.

Head of the institute and also president and chief executive officer of the Freedom Studies Center is John M. Fisher, a former FBI agent. He is a native of Fairhaven, O., and a graduate of Miami University.

Fisher said that the center, through seminars and classroom work, will train cold-war leaders, study Communist tactics and develop programs for extending freedom.

He pointed out that the Communist bloc of nations operates more than 600 psycho-political warfare schools for expanding communism but the United States Government has nothing comparable for extending democracy and freedom.

Fisher said there have been several attempts in Congress to establish a freedom academy but bills to that extent have not been passed.

The Center, which was dedicated last Sunday, is supported by private funds and organizations, including schools, colleges and political and fraternal groups.

Plans for the center are ambitious. So far there is only a 23-room manor, where seminars are being held. But other buildings for the 671-acre campus are planned.

The manor and site have cost $500,000 and the center is seeking $11,000,000 for other buildings. So far industrial firms, foundations and individuals have pledged $800,000.

Training up to 400 students a year is contemplated by the center. Administrative director is Maj. Gen. Edward G. Lansdale, who achieved fame as a guerrilla specialist in the U.S. Army. He is currently on a diplomatic mission to Vietnam.

Members of the board of directors include Willard W. Brown of Cleveland. The advisory board includes Cong. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN of Cleveland.

Among those who cooperated in developing the center are 13 heads of colleges and universities, 13 state commissioners of education, 11 governors, 12 senators, 33 congressmen and 21 business leaders.

[From the Sacramento Union, Oct. 5, 1966]

Freedom Studies Center Open

The need for an educational counter attack against communism has long been apparent to men and women of the free world who have watched with dismay as the enemy scored ideological victories.

The cold war has been recognized as such for some 20 years. The Reds made no secret of dedication to their side, nor to their long run aims and ambitions. But somehow, so long as the conflict remained "cold," there was less inclination on our side to actively engage in ideological combat.

Now the tone is different. Alarm bells are ringing where once there was scarcely a tinkle. One result is the opening of a Freedom Studies Center at Boston, Virginia, where people will train for cold war leadership.

Called a "West Point" of psychological warfare, the center will provide facilities for studying Communist strategy and purposes. And it also will stimulate thought and develop programs to defend against these tactics.

The 671-acre campus was appropriately opened with a four-day seminar for 30 congressional aides. Lecturers were men and women of varied backgrounds whose experiences on the cold war front made them well qualified to instruct others.

Both President Johnson and former President Eisenhower sent messages stressing the need for an alert and informed citizenry. In fact, it is encouraging to note that the academy has the support of many educational, business and political leaders.

The project is a tribute to the spirit of cooperation among individuals who are determined to do more than sit out the battle for men's minds.

[From the New York, (N.Y.) News, Oct. 3, 1966]

Congress, Please Note

For years, a lot of us have been urging Congress to set up what might be called a Freedom Academy—a school for teaching young men and women how to fight in cold wars as members of our diplomatic service. The big cold-war enemy, now, and probably for a long time to come, is Communism.

Congress has sat firmly on its hands in this matter; so now a group of private citizens has launched such a school.

NOW, HOW ABOUT FREEDOM ACADEMY?

It is called the Freedom Studies Center of the Institute for American Strategy. Located at Boston, Va. (not Mass.), it has as its president Dr. John M. Fisher. Dr. Fisher is assisted and advised by several well-known and brilliant anti-Communists, including Maj. Gen. Edward G. Lansdale, retired; Clarence Perry Oakes, and Dr. Brutus Coste.

Eventually, the Freedoms Studies Center hopes to be teaching the techniques, tactics and stratagems of cold war to as many as 400 students each academic year.

It is shooting for an $11 million development fund, of which nearly $800,000 has already been promised by patriotic foundations, corporations and persons.

We wish the Freedom Studies Center a world of success. And we hope its coming into existence may spur Congress to create that Freedom Academy—a sort of diplomatic West Point, Annapolis and Air Force Academy all rolled into one—before much longer. The need for plenty of such instruction is great and growing.

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, Sept. 26, 1966]

Cold War School Is Dedicated—1,000 Attend Culpeper Ceremony

Culpeper.—A school of psycho-political warfare, which will turn out cold war professionals just as the service academies turn out hot war professionals, was dedicated here Sunday.

Named the Freedom Studies Center, the school was established through the cooperation of 55 educational institutions and major organizations to help close the "cold war educational gap."

The school describes itself as a "private West Point of psycho-political warfare," and its purpose as the training of "cold war leadership for all segments of society in the free world, the study of Communist strategies and tactics and to develop and recommend programs for defending and extending the sphere of freedom."

LOCATED ON RIVER

The center is situated on 671 acres of rolling farm and forest land straddling the Hazel River in Culpeper County.

More than 1,000 persons gathered on a hilltop near the main building to participate in the dedication and hear a score of high government officials and national organizations' representatives voice "dedication expressions."

Those giving brief, nonpolitical speeches included Sen. Harry F. Byrd Jr., Sen. Thomas J. Dodd of Connecticut, Rep. John O. Marsh Jr. of the 7th District, Dr. Walter H. Judd, former congressman from Minnesota; Adm. Arleigh Burke, John P. Fraim, chairman of the board of Mutual Broadcasting System, and Dr. Woodrow W. Wilkerson, state superintendent of public instruction and personal representative of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff.

John M. Fisher, president of the Institute for American Strategy which established the center, announced that the dedication marked the beginning of an $11-million development program necessary to permit construction and initial operation of a new campus destined to enable the institute to initiate longterm graduate studies by as many as 400 students a year.

Construction of a new conference wing and renovation of the residence already on the property was completed a week ago at a cost, including purchase of the site, of over $500,000. To date nearly $800,000 has been donated or pledged by leading foundations, corporations and individuals, Fisher said.

FIRST SEMINAR COMPLETED

Facilities at the center are now capable of handling seminars of from a few days to several weeks for up to 25 people, Fisher said. He announced that the first seminar was successfully completed Saturday. Faculty members included Allen Dulles, former CIA director, and Vice Adm. Fitzhugh Lee, commandant of the National War College.

In addition to facilities for feeding and housing the seminar participants, the former residence on the property includes a conference room equipped with advanced audio-visual and other training devices.

As quickly as funds become available, work will go forward on a multi-million-dollar complex of dormitory, classroom, library and administrative buildings. All funds will be from private sources.

ADVANCED DEGREES OFFERED

Students at the center will spend part of their time with cooperating universities and their advanced degrees, either master's or doctorates, will come from the cooperating institutions.

Research studies from government and other agencies are expected to become part of the center's activities.

The greater number of persons studying or attending seminars at the center will be from the Americas, but present and future leaders from elsewhere in the world will also be trained here.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, Sept. 25, 1966]

Freedom Studies Center To Fight Reds

(By Frank H. Crane)

Over a number of years I have been subjected to much perplexed head-shaking by staunch anti-Communist friends who could not comprehend The Star's persistent refusal to support the Freedom Academy bill.

This is a plan—which has died many deaths in Congress—to establish a very special kind of educational institution, fostered and supported by the government, to train ideological combatants for the cold war. It is envisioned as a free world counterpart of the intensive training establishments of the Communist world, in which party organizers, agitators, saboteurs, guerrilla fighters and infiltrators are indoctrinated with the dogma of Communism and taught the trade of world revolution.

There has been no question at all about the need for such an academy. The Communists have all manner of skilled cold war combatants—and make no mistake about it, they are highly skilled—precisely because they go about training them in a competent, knowledgeable manner.

Neither in the United States nor elsewhere in the free world have we had any comparable means for training even leaders—much less aides and followers—in the skills necessary to oppose and effectively resist these Communist activist experts. We have needed it, desperately.

The position of The Star has been, however, that this is no job for the government. It is a job for private education.

With great joy I can report that such an academy has now come into being—as a private venture, with the collaboration and indorsement of an impressive array of government figures.

It is the Freedom Studies Center, established under the aegis of the Institute for American Strategy, through the co-operation of 55 educational institutions and major organizations. Twenty-one of the organizations are based outside the U.S. The center is at Boston, Va., 90 minutes from Washington by automobile.

The center is described as "a private 'West Point' of psycho-political warfare."

"Its purpose is to: 1, train cold war leadership for all segments of society in the free world; 2, study Communist strategies and tactics, and 3, develop and recommend programs for defending and extending the sphere of freedom."

The roster of its advisory board, planning and development and educational advisory committees, and its staff and board of directors reads like a "Who's Who" of the responsible, scholarly, nonhysterical anti-Communist leadership of America.

Among them are 13 heads of colleges and universities, 11 deans or directors of university schools, 13 state commissioners of education, 20 professors, 13 top officials of major school systems, 21 businessmen, 12 U.S. Senators, 33 U.S. Representatives and 11 state governors. The governmental officials come in fairly even balance from the two major political parties.

I know personally several of the backers, advisers and staff members. The names of many others are familiar from their writings, lecturing and other activities. I have complete confidence in the quality, the competence and the level-headedness of the lot.

"The Freedom Studies Center," says its brochure, "will emphasize the need for a positive, constructive approach to cold war problems based on the principles of American freedom.

"For example, developing nations and those newly independent of foreign domination need assistance in developing solid political foundations for a free society of their own which can withstand the invasion of Communism into those countries.

"One purpose of the Freedom Studies Center is to help strengthen those countries by giving their emerging leadership the benefit of American experience in developing a dynamic, free society and free enterprise system."

A dynamic, free society is one which is master of its own government—not dependent on it. That's a basic reason I have believed that an academy such as this must be free of dependence on government and the attendant likelihood of domination by government.

It is a very good thing for the free world that this academy at last is a reality.

No one will ever be able to measure the contribution it can and I am certain will make to the survival of freedom in America, and to the spread of freedom in the world.

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times Dispatch, Sept. 29, 1966]

Filling a Cold War Gap

Behind the Iron Curtain, the Communists operate some 6,000 special schools devoted to training experts in the art of propaganda, psychological warfare, subversion and the like. Neither the United States nor its allies in the Free World has made much attempt to compete with the Reds in this vital area of Cold War conflict—though the very survival of liberty may well depend upon our ability to match them. For while the weapons and military techniques of the West are superior to those employed by the Communists, all too often that superiority has been negated by the non-military strategies and tactics which the enemy uses so effectively.

To fill this strategic gap, a number of the nation's top educators, business leaders, military officials and politicians have joined in the launching of a special school to provide training in the arts of psychological warfare. Called the Freedom Studies Center, the school is located on a 671-acre estate at Boston, Va.—just nine miles west of Culpeper.

Last Sunday, more than 1,000 people attended the dedication of the center—including such dignitaries as Senator Harry F. Byrd Jr., former Rep. Walter H. Judd, Admiral Arleigh Burke and many others. But the center's work had already been under way for several days.

During the previous week, 25 congressional aides attended a seminar there, hearing and discussing the views of a number of authorities on military, economic and foreign affairs. Such seminars for other groups will constitute the basic program at the center for the time being, but eventually its sponsors hope to provide full-time graduate study for as many as 400 students a year. And, at that, the program is described as a "pilot project" which, it is hoped, will lead to the establishment of a network of similar centers around the country.

Originally, the school was conceived as a government-operated "Freedom Academy"—a sort of West Point for civilians. But legislation to set up such a school has failed to be adopted by Congress for some seven years. Finally, its sponsors decided to take the bull by the horns and set up an institution that would be completely financed and operated by private sources. Their decision resulted in the launching of the center dedicated last Sunday.

It's an ambitious but highly important project that deserves all the attention and support that the citizens and leaders of Virginia, the nation and the entire Free World can give it.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Sept. 25, 1966]

Freedom Center To Be Dedicated—Virginia School To Teach in "Psycho-Political Warfare"

(By Joseph A. Loftus)

Washington, September 24.—The Freedom Studies Center, making its start in an old stone manor house in rolling country west of Culpeper, Va., will be dedicated tomorrow. Members of the Senate and the House and others in public life will participate.

The center was established through the cooperation of 55 educational institutions and major organizations to help close the "cold war educational gap."

The center describes itself as a "private West Point of psycho-political warfare." It says its purpose to to train "cold war leadership for all segments of society in the free world, the study of Communist strategies and tactics and to develop and recommend programs for defending and extending the sphere of freedom."

DODD ON THE BOARD

The board of directors includes Dr. James E. Allen Jr., New York State Commissioner of Education; Senator Thomas J. Dodd, Democrat of Connecticut, and John M. Fisher, president of the Institute for American Strategy, which operates the center.

The institute, which was founded in 1958, has headquarters in Chicago. It is an educational institution created by several national organizations and private institutions as a specialized educational service center to further public understanding of the "basic foundations of American strength and freedom, the Communist challenge to American freedom, and how a free society can meet the Communist challenge." It is an outgrowth of annual national military, industrial and educational conferences on the cold war held during the early 1950s.

The center plans to "emphasize the need for a positive, constructive approach to cold war problems based on the principles of American freedom."

For example, developing nations and those newly independent of foreign domination "need assistance in developing solid political foundations for a free society of their own which can withstand the invasion of Communism into those countries."

The center proposes to help strengthen those countries by giving their leaders the benefit of American experience in developing a dynamic, free society and free enterprise system.

EXPANSION PLANNED

While it will be expanded several times over, the center is not intended as the sole means to close the "educational gap." It believes its most effective role will be that of a pilot operation and catalyst for its cooperating agencies in establishing and expanding their own independent cold war educational programs.

The 34 initial United States cooperating agencies of the center include educational institutions such as the Illinois Institute of Technology and Northeastern University and school systems such as the Cook county (Illinois) schools and the Massachusetts Department of Education. There are 21 cooperating international agencies.

The center is being operated initially as a residence school conducting concentrated training programs for world leaders in both the public and private sectors. Congressional staff members attended classes in August. The courses vary in length from four-day weekends to two-week and six-week sessions.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Oct. 2, 1966]

A Great Concept: Freedom Studies Center

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Boston, Va.—The tiny community of Boston, Va., lies some 80 miles southwest of "Big Washington." It is 10 miles up the road from Culpeper. On to the west lie Scrabble, Woodville, Sperryville, and "Little Washington," and beyond them lie the Blue Ridge Mountains. Boston thus is situated in the midst of the most beautiful 200 square miles in the world, if not in the universe, but until last Sunday this wide space on Route 522 had no other distinction.

Now Boston, Va., is on the map. If the plans of the Institute for American Strategy come to fulfillment—and these plans already are far along—the Institute's new "Freedom Studies Center" at Boston one day may become as well known in its field as the Naval Academy at Annapolis or the military academy at West Point. The Center, dedicated a week ago, has but a single purpose: It is to turn out graduates who know as much of the tactics and strategy of communism as prospective admirals know of the tactics and strategy of naval warfare.

Toward this end, the Institute for American Strategy some months ago acquired a 671-acre tract of land in Culpeper County, a mile or so from the wide space known as Boston. The property includes an impressive stone mansion that rises out of the hills as naturally as a granite boulder. From its courtyard, one may look to the Hazel River, plunging over rapids far below. In the middle distance, Black Angus cattle graze on green mountain meadows. On beyond are the soft and silent mountains, slate blue and dark blue, and still darker blue. Here the students will come.

It is important to touch on the setting for the leaders of the Institute for American Strategy chose this lovely stillness as deliberately as any Thoreau at Walden Pond. They could have established their Freedom Studies Center smack in the middle of Big Washington or in some glass hutch on the Hudson. But their conviction is that men who would master great ideas need some measure of great tranquility to grasp them in. The small community of scholars they envision is not to be distracted by a jangling urbanism, pressing in.

The name of the "Freedom Studies Center" is a model of precision. The idea is to bring in small groups at first—25 or 30 at a time—for seminars of a few days or a few weeks. Twenty-eight congressional aides came as a vanguard to Boston on September 21 for four days of intensive studies. The next group may be chosen from industrial leaders, then from professors of history and political science. In time, as a prospective building program moves ahead, most of the full-time students (about 400 in all) will be graduate students chosen from participating universities. They will study freedom, what it is, why the West must preserve it, how the East would twist freedom into slavery.

This is training in psychopolitical warfare. For those closest to the project, it is a dream coming true.

More than eight years ago, a group in Orlando, Fla., headed by Alan G. Grant, Jr., perceived the need for an academy that would train key men in government, in the armed services, in academia, and in private life in certain nonmilitary aspects of Communist aggression. They envisioned a government-financed academy, patterned generally after West Point and Annapolis.

The idea was embodied in various House and Senate bills, sponsored by members of Congress from across the political spectrum; Senators FONG, Keating, DOUGLAS, PROXMIRE, LAUSCHE, DODD, HICKENLOOPER. Goldwater, MUNDT. The range was as wide in the House. But under the wet blankets of the State Department's opposition, the bills regularly went to sleep in committee.

Then the idea developed—and it was a better idea in every way—for the proposed Academy to be brought into being with private funds. The Institute for American Strategy, founded in 1958, took the lead. Fifty-five educational institutions and major organizations offered their support. To date, nearly $800,000 has been donated or pledged by leading foundations, corporations and individuals. A long-range goal has been set of $11 million. The land and the manor house are bought and paid for. The Center is now an institution in being.

The congressional aides who came here for the shakedown seminar heard a dozen cold war experts—Edgar Ansel Mowrer, Dr. Eleanor Dulles, Walter Judd, Allen Dulles. They heard Dr. Frederick Barghoorn, of Yale, on "Soviet Propaganda with Special Reference to Peace and Disarmament Themes." Two spokesmen from the AFL–CIO's National Maritime Union gave them insight on the cold war at sea. By the time the seminar ended, their heads were bursting with new understanding of the pivotal struggle of this century.

Not one nickel of "CIA money," or any other government money, has gone into the Freedom Studies Center. It is intended to be the voluntary contribution of a voluntary society toward its own survival. The scholars and officials who are invited to come here will come at their own expense, or on Foundation grants. And because the Center is not an agency of government, it will be free to pursue the study of freedom and communism untroubled by the inhibitions of diplomacy. It is a great concept in terms of the total struggle between West and East, as solid as the distant mountains, as clear and cold as the stream.

America's Unused Weapon in the War of Words

(Text of a speech delivered to Freedom Studies Center, Culpeper, Va., Sept. 23, 1966, by Arthur E. Meyerhoff, chairman of the board, Arthur E. Meyerhoff Associates, Inc., 410 N. Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.)

For some years now, I—and many other Americans—have been deeply concerned about the way our country is being interpreted abroad.

My concern, and the experiences of a lifetime experimenting with advertising and public relations skills in support of public service organizations and various government activities, finally led to my book, *The Strategy of Persuasion,* which tackles the crucial propaganda problem that is facing our country today.

In the twenty years since World War II, we have helped to feed both friend and foe. The U.S. Government has spent in excess of 100 billion dollars for foreign aid. We have no imperialistic nor expansionist designs whatsoever, yet the enemies of freedom have successfully labeled us "imperialists" and "aggressors."

There is evidence to indicate that this is due, in part, to the fact that in dealing with our international tensions our government's informational service follows the same methods that were developed in the horse and buggy days.

As a consequence, they have not developed the craftsmanship to cope with the rapidly expanding, world-wide mass media communications systems, nor have they taken advantage of the findings of the behavioral sciences to achieve a better understanding of what the United States represents to the freedom and self-determination of other governments.

Many people think of our country as being more advanced than Russia in the behavioral sciences, but I assure you that it is they rather than we who use these psychological techniques and understand the reality of emotions and how to make use of them as a social force.

The Russians and Chinese are fighting the propaganda war with the largest skilled propaganda organization the world has ever known, and it will be this war that will decide whether Communism will rule the world or will wither and die.

On the basis of our skill in selling our products through mass media, we have built the most prosperous society in history, yet we have not effectively applied our sales techniques to selling ourselves and our ideas to other countries. Therefore, we have not adopted a persuasive program of truth which would—at the very least—offset the Communists' unscrupulous exploitation of the techniques of manipulating men's minds.

Our military can cope with the Communists in a clash of firearms, but we are dropped pitifully in our tracks in any war of words. Our fighting men cannot be expected to be specialists in ideological semantics on the battlefield.

Some people in the United States feel that we should not use the same methods that the Communists use in propaganda. When they refer to the use of lies and trickery, they are 100% right. I agree completely with those who say our nation must not defile itself with the spread of falsehood. But we are truly foolish if we ignore the techniques available to us to present truths to the world simply because the Reds use parallel techniques to present distortions and half truths. Our own country must use truth ammunition instead of lie ammunition, that is all. In any case, we must match the Reds in the war of words with all the weapons at our command. We must fight fire with fire, slogans with slogans. If we were not prepared with the same military weapons—or better ones than the Communists have—the Free World would have gone down the drain long ago.

Many Americans don't realize that a propaganda offensive can pack the lethal power of that snake called a python—and can coil and choke just as effectively, too. Now, everybody knows about H-bombs, that a 5-megaton bomb will knock out a city and a 50-megaton bomb will knock out a county. But what they don't understand is that a megaton of effective propaganda, repeated over a period of time, can knock the resistance out of a continent—or of the world itself.

Charles Brower, head of the fourth largest advertising agency in the country, BBDO, once gave a speech with a 46-word title. Here is the title:

"When in the Hell is the United States of America Going to Stop Acting like a Rube at the Fair—and Start Using the Advertising and Public Relations Skills with which it Abounds to Win the Cold War which it is Presently Losing like Nobody's Business?"

Is it possible that the talented persuaders, with their modern scientific skills of today, might help rekindle freedom throughout the world? It would be the greatest mission that research, public relations, and advertising people will have ever undertaken, and the noblest and most challenging. Professional persuaders have carried the torch, as it were, for food, for a better way of life, and for many public service projects, but can we do it for freedom?

In an ideal world, the United States would have no need to advertise the humanitarian deeds we are performing throughout the world. Everyone would be intelligent, educated, and able to recognize the truth at once. No enemies would dedicate themselves to misinterpreting our motives. But, unfortunately, this is not quite the best of all possible worlds, and silent merit does not always sell itself right away—it usually needs a promoter.

The motivation behind many of the riots and much of the discontent in the neutral and newly-emerging nations, and even some in our own country, has been traced to trained, unidentified agitators of the Russian and Chinese propaganda organizations who are operating in every country throughout the world.

While we in the United States often fail to recognize the potential force of the behavioral science skills in dealing with our international tensions, the Russians and Chinese, on the other hand, employ a staff of experts to sift and evaluate the world events which they can turn to their advantage in the form of subtle propaganda. According to reputable sources, the Chinese employ in their political departments from eighty-five to ninety Ph. D.'s in psychology—all trained, naturally, in American universities.

In their early revolutionary period, the Russians worked overtly. In the 1930's, Communists were mounting soapboxes in the streets and parks of leading American cities to extol the virtues of Marxism and point out the evils of capitalistic nations, achieving little except to make themselves look ineffectual, and even comical.

Today's Communist revolutionary, whose arena is the entire world, works covertly and is trained in the cunning stratagems of making other people work for him. In the words of J. Edgar Hoover, the Communist principle holds that "Communism must be built with non-Communist hands."

For instance, small but militant groups of young people throughout the world have been stirred up by the Communists, who have applied their knowledge of the psychological problems of young people growing up. Anyone familiar with adolescent psychology will understand their deep-seated desire to cut the apron strings. They are idealistic and rebellious, and yearn for new causes. It is partly a condition of their growing process.

A normal youth goes through such a rebellion-idealism syndrome, but he usually comes out of it without some phony ideology becoming a part of his adult philosophy. The Communists have been quick to exploit the volatility of our youth where they can, to get them to exaggerate their grievances against an adult society that seems to demand so much and at the same time hems them in; therefore, these young people equate growing up with a desperate need for freedom and a resistance to all authority. Our own free democratic society, which paradoxically creates the only political climate in the world that guarantees them the freedom to resist, is often their target.

The Communists' aims and the means they employ are clearly defined. It is a sophisticated concept and one which is based on depth psychology. With highly trained people, they infiltrate youth groups, planting emotionally charged ideas and words, getting them to attack their own society, which becomes a symbol of the authority from which they must free themselves.

The word "freedom," with a generic meaning that should ring like a bell, has begun to take on a dubious connotation. It is a key word for so many "movements" and "causes" that, through the tactics of our enemies, in our country it is losing some of its luster. They imply, as they often do, that it is the Free World that has the Iron Curtain and that it is we, rather than they, who murder people to gain control as they did in Hungary.

The result is that, without being aware of it, in many of the movements in which people believe they are fighting for freedom, they are actually carrying the ball for the enemies of freedom.

I must repeat that the young people so motivated represent only a small minority who have more than a normal share of inner tensions. The highest percentage by far of our young people throughout the world go through this period of growing up without being involved in violent activities, but those who do give the impression that they represent the majority.

We must face the fact that well-meaning people can be motivated by inflammatory words and ideas without actually being directly involved in any subversive organization; so investigations may not reveal party members in student demonstrations on college campuses, or in the fanaticism or religious factions whose monks and nuns burn themselves alive in Viet Nam, or among some civil rights proponents who carry on unwarranted violence. One can be motivated by the highest ideals and yet be trapped into a destructive course of action against his own society.

What has been called "hidden persuasion"—actually nothing more than the use of motivational techniques—precedes Communist takeover in country after country. This tactic involves the creation of a spirit of defeatism—a feeling on the part of the population that their country is going to pot, which, of course, makes it easier for their planted tyrannical leaders to eventually get control. Here in America a segment of our people already have a feeling of despair about our society, but thank the Lord the majority still feels that our way of life is worth fighting for. The enemy's strategy, however, could still pay off, unless we meet their tactics with a strategy of our own.

In our country the public has protection against unscrupulous "hidden persuaders." They are subject to control by the Federal Trade Commission. What is important is that the consumer will not buy the product a second time once he has been fooled, and will more than likely get his money back. The people in countries that are taken over by the Communists have no protection against the unscrupulous "hidden persuaders." Once they buy their idea it will be the last free choice that they will ever make.

We recognize that an inherent freedom in the United States is the right to protest and to fight for social and civic progress. But we must point out that the Communist masters of propaganda utilize our own freedom and our expressions of protest as a propaganda opportunity for themselves. Using their carefully researched psychological devices, the Communists need only give a push in the direction in which a movement leans, either to the right or to the left, and it is off and running. They use our own internal struggle for rights to convince the world we are a disunited nation, rotting from within.

As a matter of fact, in spite of our many problems, there are more freedoms enjoyed and more friendly exchanges in the United States between the various races, creeds, and political beliefs than in any other country in the world, and no man in his right mind would exchange our way of life for that of the man behind the Iron Curtain.

With their covert activities, the destructive results of Communists' actions are all the more effective because somebody else has done all the dirty work, and they can, with impunity, point an accusing finger at the "bad guys." They are the "good guys," playing the hero, befriending the downtrodden. They're like the wolf disguising himself as the friendly grandmother, and the strategy they employ is such a clever psychological move that it is generally not evaluated for its long-term hidden motive of downgrading the Free Societies.

Sometimes the psychological devices are well camouflaged and it is difficult to discover the hidden motives; at other times they are quite obvious and can be easily recognized. One semantic trick is to use terms which actually have a directly opposite meaning. For example, although in Communist countries people have no voice in their governments, they call them "people's democracies"; although their movements enslave nations, they call them "liberation movements."

With an ambitious program aimed at influencing our college and university students, a National Youth Commission has been established within the Communist Party U.S.A. During the past two years alone, Communist spokesmen have appeared on literally hundreds of our campuses from coast to coast with the purpose of raising questions and spreading doubt among these young people concerning the American way of life.

One of the important inequities in the battle for men's minds is that while representatives of the Soviet Union and the Chinese Communists are given free access to people in the United States and can use the mails for disseminating propaganda, one word in a Communist-controlled country in criticism of their system often lands one in jail. On the other hand, there is resistance against our own government propagandizing on behalf of our own country and its ideals.

Recently I went on an official mission to Egypt, where I was able to view firsthand some of the activities of the Russian propaganda organization abroad. In its historical position in the "middle of the world," Egypt is a prime target for Russia's deadly game of using motivational techniques to make themselves look good and the U.S. look evil.

When we in our free society, with its wheels within wheels, barely hesitate in making a decision, the Russians jump in and save the day, as in the case of the Aswan Dam. Another instance: We have furnished the Egyptians with literally hundreds of shiploads of wheat, but because delays are inherent in the democratic process of determining the allocation of foreign aid, we paused in our shipment of grain, and the Russians dramatically jumped in, diverting only two shiploads of wheat en route to their country from Australia. They proclaimed loud and long, "The rich American imperialists would let you starve, but as a poor nation we understand the agony of hunger and share what little we have to sustain our fine and noble friends."

To be certain they were being appreciated, the Russians even placed paid advertisements in the Egyptian newspapers, telling how badly they themselves needed the wheat, but that out of their great love for the U.A.R. their people had given it up to save the Egyptians from starvation. The thousands of shiploads of wheat we had furnished the U.A.R. were lost in the background while the headlines of the token shipment took over.

By putting themselves on the level of the Egyptians, the Russians used a device that has proven quite effective in the "slice of life" commercials in the United States where the ordinary housewife on television extols the virtues of a detergent to the other housewives and, thereby, the content of the commercial becomes more effective.

Through the use of elementary psychology, the Russians plant the idea in the minds of the Egyptians that the rich imperialist is threatening them with starvation in order to control their actions. The Egyptians, threatened with loss of self-respect and sacrifice of pride, have the underlying emotional resentment of the receiver of charity toward the giver.

In interviews with several government leaders and Egyptian newspapermen, I detected a sensitivity, as they read threats on the part of the U.S. into some of our actions—threats which did not actually exist and were planted by the Russians.

In this atmosphere, reason flies out the window. A skilled team of advertising and public relations men, working with men in the behavioral sciences offsetting these propaganda tricks, could go a long way toward building more enduring good will between the United States and the Egyptian people.

Now, of course, it is dangerous to see Communism behind every lamppost and in every liberal utterance, but it is equally if not more dangerous to stick our heads in the sand and not realize that trained Communist representatives are financing and exploiting movements in the United States wherever feelings run high. A great majority of people are quite rational on the subject of Communism, but they hesitate to speak out because of the fear of being labeled "red baiters," "extremists," and "advocators of McCarthyism." These abstract labels are doing just what they are intended to do, and that is to break down all confidence in our government's national security programs and to make it un-American to attribute Communist involvement to some of the movements that are being infiltrated and controlled in the United States and the rest of the Free World.

In 1917, Lenin invented a slogan: "Peace, Land, Bread." That's all—three simple words—and then repetition did the trick. That slogan was to be more effective than the whole Russian Army. An old U.S. advertising technique was getting a potent new application. Lenin saw, as some of our brilliant leaders even today do not see, that if you control the minds of men it doesn't matter who holds the guns. And so Russia has had an enormous jump on us in the strategy of political persuasion.

It's not hard to spot some of the basics of motivational research techniques in the Communists' efforts to appeal to people in terms of their own self-interest. These basics were very well understood by Lenin, who set up the present Russian propaganda organization. In his "Letter to a Comrade in our Organizational Tasks," he laid out a blueprint as large and clear as a warning sign. He said:

"Today we are faced with the comparatively simple task of supporting students demonstrating in the streets of a large town; tomorrow, perhaps, we may be supporting a movement of the unemployed . . . The hardcore revolutionary must have a clear picture in his mind of the economic nature and the political features of the landlord, of the priest, of the high official . . . their strong and weak sides; he must know all the catchwords and sophisms by which each class and each stratum camouflages its selfish strivings . . . he must understand what interests certain institutions and what certain laws reflect and how they reflect them."

So, you see, the Communists use motivational machinery for swaying men's minds; they study the group they are working on; they learn their aims, shortcomings, and aspirations, as well as their failures and frustrations; then they spray the people with a dense cloud of emotionally charged words. If a tactic backfires, they try something else. The Communists are shrewd, and in the long run they figure they can outslicker the Free World with its naive, blundering approach. When our public image as capitalist is no longer an asset, the Reds will be ready for the takeover.

The importance that the Soviets give to the psychological war of words, compared to our efforts, is illustrated by the fact that they spend approximately two billion dollars a year on propaganda, and use some 500,000 persons throughout the world to carry out their propaganda missions. That's quite a bit more than the 140 million dollars that the United States Information Agency gets for its staff of 12,000. No American businessman could stand up against a competitor whose advertising budget is fourteen times larger than his own.

Proctor & Gamble spends more money on a handful of soap products than the United States Government spends abroad for a multiplicity of activities in over 100 countries. To catch up with Russia, we would at least have to match their expenditure, but if it would shorten the Cold War by making them realize that we are going to meet them in the battle for men's minds, we would save billions of dollars in our defense budget.

What is the nature of propaganda? Hitler made bad use of propaganda, the Communists make bad use of propaganda. But propaganda can have noble aims. It is merely an organized effort to spread particular doctrines. Propaganda can be misused, of course, but so can a hammer or a razor or anything else. Automobiles can transport and automobiles can mangle. Water can quench thirst and water can drown. We don't forgo persuasive techniques because somebody else misuses them.

We have often used propaganda to prevent forest fires, to stamp out disease, and to get out the vote. The United States can be proud, I say, to use propaganda internationally in the cause of democracy and personal freedom.

Persuasion is as old as mankind itself, and I guess that affecting the opinions of other people comes to us as naturally as breathing. Nearly everyone uses persuasion almost every day: the popular professor whose classes are crowded, the doctor with a good bedside manner, and even the baby with a sweet smile. But it is the advertising and public relations professions that have developed persuasion to a science and have the experience and proven ability to get results in mass media.

The Communists have made full use of all the techniques of mass selling. A prime rule of effective advertising is to present a simple, compelling message and present it repeatedly. This is just what they are doing with their familiar theme: "We are the People's Democracy. America is the Imperialist." And this theme is repeated over and over again.

The Communists also know how to use "scare selling." In their dealings with other nations they seem to act capriciously, so that when they wave their nuclear weapons the Western world trembles with fear, not knowing whether the Kremlin leaders might push the button and plunge us all into an atomic inferno.

This is the same technique that the old-time medicine man used to peddle his wares. Remember when he talked about "sudden death from a cold" or "the terrible agony of over-heated blood"? Never mind that such a fear was false, the medicine man had you worried enough to accept his remedy.

The Russian medicine men have sold a lot of snake oil.

The mechanics of the brain and nervous system are such that even people in the highest intelligence categories, including those in important diplomatic posts in government, can unconsciously accept as truths propaganda lies that have been repeated to them over and over again. It was Pavlov, the Russian physiologist, whose experiments on animals opened the way to an understanding of how repetition of theme can affect people's ideas in ways now used by the Soviets and Chinese in brainwashing.

It could very well happen that the ideological struggle will, in the end, be won by the side that becomes the most proficient in the understanding of the functions of the nervous system and the brain and how this understanding can best be used to convey ideas.

We know that the Communists are using an effective means to promote a quack remedy, which they claim will lead the world to peace and human welfare. We know the means are successful because we developed them in our own specialized way. By not using them to the utmost of our skill as a counter measure against the ideological assault of the Soviet Union and the Red Chinese, we place ourselves at a competitive disadvantage.

How would the advertising and public relations team work with behavioral and political scientists to prepare material to help reduce our international tensions? The best answer is that the advertising and public relations team act in a dual role: interpreter and salesman.

Men in the behavioral sciences furnish great insight into the nature of what is and what ought to be. But in putting these insights to work there is a great language barrier. As specialists, the scientists are concerned with most things on a highly technical and abstract level. They invent words to precisely identify concepts and phenomena. The language is necessary in research but often meaningless to persons outside the field.

Advertising and public relations men, however, can select ideas from the scientific findings and translate them into simple language that can be understood by masses of people.

As an example, we had the assignment of rewriting an introduction in a booklet of exercises designed specifically for professional ball players. It was written by a Ph. D. in one of the leading universities.

Here is an excerpt from his introduction: "This program has been created to satisfy an imperative need which has existed in baseball at all levels since its inception: the need for a year around conditioning regime specifically oriented for baseball players, based upon proven scientific experimentation, statistical preciseness, kinesiological and physiological surety, and divorced from the many traditional empiricisms and professional naivete."

Beautifully stated, but we couldn't find a ball player who understood it.

Our job was to put this thought into simple language that a ball player can understand, and in a way that will make him want to use the program. Here is the way we rewrote the introduction:

"Compared to people who work indoors, you are in good physical condition, but your profession demands great agility and muscular control, and it places severe strains on muscles most people don't even know they have! An experienced baseball trainer, working with university scientists, has at last developed a training program that exactly fits your needs as a ball player. The program of exercises illustrated in this book has been tested and it works."

We don't try to win literary awards. Our aim is to get results by presenting the message in the simplest possible way. If what I am advocating does come to pass, you should anticipate a great deal of controversy. The behavioral scientists themselves, like the atomic scientists in the 40's and 50's, will divide on these issues. Some will feel that the slightest manipulation of minds through scientific knowledge for political purposes constitutes a threat to a free science. Some will maintain that the state of the art has not yet reached the point of practical usefulness as envisioned here. Many, however, will recognize the value of contributions from behavioral science toward the national good, and toward the preservation of our very freedoms which create the conditions and atmosphere in which science thrives.

In the advertising business we rely to a large extent on realities, whatever hard facts we have at hand. We are not always successful, but we have found through the years that we will often go astray unless we heed the voice of the psychologist, the man who is trained to get into other people's minds to find out, often not what people say, but what they really think and what they might be expected to do.

In the business of selling a correct image of our great country, the knowledge of psychology is indispensable. With this skill must be combined a working knowledge of political science and selling—a large order, but not by any means impossible. If the psychologist were put to work with the other members of the team, the combination could beat the Communists at their own game and thaw the Cold War.

Using the skills of advertising does not always mean that you end up with something that looks or sounds like an ad or an irritating commercial. A little freedom symbol painted on a stone wall could be an advertisement. I'm asked, "How do you reach people who don't have radios or television sets? How do you reach people who cannot read?"

Advertising men make their living finding out how to reach people, and developing the right symbols and media to get people to act in a predictable way—whether those symbols happen to be words or pictures or music—or smoke signals.

Of course, I don't condone all advertising and psychological practitioners. Some of them produce material in bad taste and do not always adhere to the highest ethics. By that same virtue, some mothers are alcoholics and beat their kids—but I don't condemn motherhood as a consequence.

At present the job of handling U.S. public relations abroad is carried out by the United States Information Agency, which was created under a law that was designed to make the United States better understood by other nations of the world.

There is no question of the responsibility and dedication of the men who staff the upper echelons of the USIA. Some of them gave up prominent positions and good incomes to work for the government. Many of them have extensive experience in education, journalism and foreign affairs, and invaluable knowledge of certain areas of the world. But because of their training, their output is long on information and short on persuasion.

The USIA broadcasts news, operates information centers, lending libraries and a multiplicity of other cultural activities that are not designed to present a convincing story that will bring masses of people to the side of the Free World.

USIA's avowed aim is to tell the truth about what goes on in the United States, using its own news facilities to do so.

USIA believes that by getting into the news business along with the free press of the world and broadcasting the news, as they say, "warts and all," people in foreign countries will understand our policies and how our free society works. Unfortunately, news does not always reflect the truth of what goes on in our country as a whole, nor does it illustrate what we mean to the freedom and self-determination of people throughout the world.

There are many more law-abiding citizens than there are law-breakers. There are infinitely more responsible teenagers than wild or delinquent teenagers. There are many more enduring marriages than divorces. But none of that is news.

It is a sad fact that the truth is not usually news. And news does not necessarily reflect the truth.

You cannot sell an idea or product by emphasizing the flaws in it. The flaws often are so fascinating that they overshadow the vast benefits that the product has to offer.

A few people are killed annually by slipping in their bathtub, but if you are trying to popularize bathing, you'd better dwell on the well-known advantages of bathing and not on the rare, though interesting, accidents. This does not mean that you suppress facts—but you simply do not confuse a news function with a selling function. Giving the statistics of people killed in bathtubs is a news function, but telling the advantage of bathing is a selling function.

There is hardly a product or an event that doesn't have its negative factor—and I imagine that even Utopia has its shortcomings. But in selling we emphasize the positive benefits a product has to offer.

I have been advocating that our government should get out of the news business and get into the selling business; that is, that our information agency should no longer attempt to cover the news for the people of the world. This vital function is best left in the hands of the free press of the world, the non-governmental commercial news services that do such a magnificent job of serving the Free World. And for those behind the Iron Curtain who do want news, there are Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty—both privately operated broadcasting operations that are, by some reports, more effective than the Voice of America. The best evidence I have that the government should get out of the news business is the fact that Russia has stopped jamming our news broadcasts.

As a result of my inspection trip to Egypt for the USIA, I have come to a conditional agreement with a review of my book that appeared in the Washington Post. The reviewer said, in essence, that the questions I had raised deserve serious consideration but that this possibility vanishes when one considers the hard facts of political life in Washington.

I agree with the Washington Post about the reality of "hard facts of political life," but I disagree about their unchanging nature. What are these alleged "hard facts"? They arise from the attitudes of the majority of people, through elected and appointed officials are solidified into law or regulation, and are held in place by the power structure. When opinions change, then hard facts become mushy facts and, inevitably, through democratic processes the so-called will of the people appears to be redirected.

An important member of Congress who has been cooperating with me has said (and I quote him), "It would take a ground swell to get our Government Information Agency to change a long-standing policy." I have come to the conclusion that ground swells can be created, and that one way of getting reasonable consideration of a new approach to our international image is through the young people who will be coming into foreign service through schools of international studies. In their probing of our own society, our young people sense pockets of emptiness in our communication to the rest of the world. They are looking for answers, some of which we can provide.

For example, I received a letter from a young lady who was accepted as a student at the American University, and who had read my book. She asked for advice as to what studies she could take at their School of International Service that would give her some orientation into the skills of persuasion I discussed in the book. I communicated with the university and found nothing in their curricula that would meet her needs. I then examined the training courses in public relations and advertising, and was not satisfied that they were oriented toward the political sciences, as they were being taught. It seemed to me that this situation presented both an opportunity and a challenge.

Thanks to encouraging discussions with Dr. Hurst Anderson, the president of the American University, we came to the conclusion that the skills of mass persuasion could and should be adapted for the political sciences and imparted to those students planning a foreign service career. The outcome has been the establishment this year of the Center for Political Psychology and Communications at the American University for graduate students.

To my knowledge, this is the first attempt on the part of any university to start a program that will make people who go into foreign service more proficient in the use of the skills of persuasion and psychology as related to the political sciences. I have some indication that other universities will follow this example.

In the defense of freedom a nation's leaders must exploit every resource. I submit that our army of skilled persuaders—the best in the world and one with tremendous potential—can no longer be overlooked by our national government.

It is high time to call in the experts—not the movie version of the Madison Avenue hucksters, but the trained, imaginative, dedicated men who have proved they have precisely the skills needed to make people yearn for what is good—and motivate them to obtain it. We must decide to accept propaganda for freedom for what it is—a potent weapon far more humane than bombs, more economical, more effective.

Freedom and truth will not be bought on what we consider their "self-evident" merits unless we effectively bring those merits to the attention of the people whom we want to influence.

We must move to the attack in all parts of the world. We need a broad-based, effective propaganda program directed by men who are skilled in the arts of persuasion.

With a nucleus of people expert in depth psychology, our government's propaganda agency can bring people everywhere to know that the true wave of the future is in the hands of free men who will chart their own destiny.

NATIONAL LEADERS DEDICATE PRIVATE FREEDOM ACADEMY

BOSTON, VA., September 25.—More than a score of high government officials and national organizations' representatives today joined in the Dedication of the Freedom Studies Center, the first educational institution in the United States devoted exclusively to the study of how to fight the Cold War being waged by the Communists.

John M. Fisher, President of the Institute for American Strategy which established the Center, told the 1000 persons attending the cremonies that the first seminar had just been successfully completed at the Manor House on the 671-acre site here. Experts in various aspects of the Cold War, or psycho-political warfare, lectured and directed discussions for the congressional aides participating in the seminar.

Mr. Fisher also announced that the Dedication marked the beginning of a $11,000,000 development program necessary to permit construction and initial operation of a "new campus" which will enable the Institute to initiate long term graduate studies by as many as 400 students a year. Construction of a new Conference Wing in the Manor House and renovation of the Manor itself was completed a week ago at a cost, including purchase of the site, of over $500,000. Already nearly $800,000 has been donated or pledged by leading foundations, corporations and individuals.

The Freedom Studies Center facilities now are capable of handling seminars of from a few days to several weeks and that the one for the Congressional aides was but the pilot, or first, educational program of this type to be held at the Center, Mr. Fisher said.

The faculty for the first seminar included Allen Dulles, former head of the CIA and Vice Admiral Fitzhugh Lee, Commandant, the National War College.

Speakers at the Dedication included National Commander John E. Davis of The American Legion, Admiral Arleigh Burke, Director of the Center for Strategic Studies, Dr. Walter H. Judd, Admiral Felix B. Stump, former Commander in Chief, Pacific, Senator THOMAS J. DODD and personal representatives of the Chiefs of all the armed services.

Speakers, as well as those sending messages congratulating the major complex of universities and organizations for undertaking the establishment of the Freedom Studies Center, stressed the dangers that Communist plans contain for the United States and other free nations, and commended the forward step taken by the Institute in the study of how to fight the kind of war we are in.

General Earle G. Wheeler, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, wrote that "the national objectives of the United States can be realized only through careful, dispassionate study of the international facts of life" and that the "comprehensive nature of the plans for the Freedom Studies Center gives promise of a distinguished contribution to the development of well-informed American policies."

Director J. Edgar Hoover of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in a message, said that by pointing out the evils of the enemy and encouraging our citizens to know more about their national heritage, the Freedom Studies Center "will render a great service to our country," and added: "Only by an informed citizenry, conscious of its responsibilities in this giant ideological battle, can we hope to keep alive the flame of freedom."

The Center developed out of eight years of seminar and other Cold War educational activities of the Institute for American Strategy, founded by representative organizations and educational institutions to serve as a clearing house for information on Communist methods, and on the American way of life and what free men can do to preserve this way of life. It will not award master or doctorate degrees, but these will be awarded by the cooperating universities with which students will spend part of their time.

Speakers at the ceremonies represented all areas—government, education, industry and labor. They were introduced by Wallace R. Fanning, Jr., of the National Broadcasting Corp. Ceremonial music was provided by the U.S. Navy Band. The Georgetown University Concert Band provided music for the reception.

A massed color guard participating in the ceremonies consisted of a joint colors team representing all branches of the armed forces; the Department of Virginia of The American Legion and the Department of Virginia, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Flags to fly from the Center's own staff in the future were presented by Virginia State Commander of The American Legion, Wilbur L. Gray and Commander Marshall E. Brookman of the Culpeper Post, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Among the speakers was Alan G. Grant, Jr., President of the Orlando Committee, the originator of the long proposed government-operated Freedom Academy, aims of which would be similar to that of the Freedom Studies Center.

POLICE BRUTALITY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD two items which recently appeared in Reader's Digest. One was titled "Talk About Police Brutality," and the other was titled, "Behind Those 'Police Brutality' Charges."

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

TALK ABOUT POLICE BRUTALITY

(By Bill Shipp)

Ask Atlanta Detective J. P. Arnold, member of that city's "good guy" Crime Prevention Bureau, what he thinks about brutality. You may have difficulty understanding his reply. His face is held together by wire. He has difficulty opening his mouth to speak.

The mild-mannered Negro detective, assigned to the police department's helping-hand squad, recently talked with a father about a juvenile-delinquency problem. When the conversation ended, the father beat Arnold up. The first blow shattered the detective's jaw so badly that he could not yell for help. Arnold finally shot the man in the leg to save himself from a possible fatal beating.

Talk about brutality. Ask the Atlanta patrolman who, last June, wrote matter-of-factly on a report form: "While attempting to unload prisoner at city hall, I was struck across the throat with a knife . . . six stitches."

Talk about brutality. Ask the Atlanta officer who was choked by two suspects wearing handcuffs. Or the one who was shot and had to crawl out of an alley yelling for help. Or the one severely bitten by a dog sicked on him by a woman suspect. Or the one who broke a flying chair with the top of his head when he walked into a beer-joint free-for-all.

Talk about brutality to Lt. C. W. Blackwell, keeper of police statistics and reports. He'll show you a filing cabinet full of reports recounting acts of violence and mayhem directed at policemen that make Mickey Spillane novels seem as tame as Sunday-school lessons. Indeed, despite all the talk about police brutality, there is good evidence that "people brutality" against policemen is a greater and faster-growing problem.

If the present trend continues in Atlanta, more than one out of every ten policemen and detectives will be injured this year while making an arrest.

What's the reason for the increasing number of assaults against policemen?

Many officials cite a growing antagonism toward authority of any kind. Atlanta Police Chief Herbert T. Jenkins agrees that is one factor. But he points out that a growing population means more arrests, and more arrests automatically increase the number of assaults against arresting officers.

What about the other side of the coin—policemen brutalizing suspects?

"This department uses force only when necessary," Jenkins said. "Police brutality—the kind you are talking about—does not exist here. Of course, we have cases when officers act hastily."

Look at the policeman's side of it:

"A policeman called to the scene of a crime must make an instant decision on what action he must take, then take it," Blackwell said.

"A judge may be presented with the same set of facts a month later. He can take all the time he needs in deciding what to do about it. But not a policeman. He has to act—and act now."

"The charge of police brutality," Jenkins added, "is as old as law enforcement. A prisoner's best defense often is to accuse the arresting officer of brutality. If he can discredit the officer, then he stands a good chance of winning the case."

Recent Supreme Court decisions have all but made police strong-arm tactics a thing of the past. But, unlike many of his brother police chiefs, Jenkins has no criticism of the High Court.

"The Supreme Court has the same responsibility as the police—to guarantee the freedom of the individual and to furnish security to individuals and property," Jenkins said. "It's impossible to have 100-percent security and 100-percent individual freedom." But, right now, Jenkins added, the emphasis seems to be on individual freedom.

While the curbs against police brutality appear formidable, the controls against "people brutality" seem to crumble with increasing frequency.

Part of the reason for this, says Jenkins, is the growing "racial and social revolution." The people caught up in this revolution see the police, rightly or wrongly, as the symbol for all they are against.

As a result, Jenkins' men and the men like them across the country will continue to be on the receiving end of shootings, bitings, sluggings, kickings and so forth. And their job, always a dirty dangerous one, appears to be getting dirtier and more dangerous by the day.

BEHIND THOSE "POLICE BRUTALITY" CHARGES

(By Fred E. Inbau)

(Fred E. Inbau is a professor of law at Northwestern University and a member of the Chicago Crime Commission. He is a former director of the Chicago Police Scientific Crime Detection Laboratory, a widely recognized authority on criminal-law procedures, and author of several books, including a standard law text, *Cases and Comments on Criminal Justice*.)

Patrolling his beat in Rochester, N.Y., on a Sunday night in May 1965, policeman Mike Rotolo spotted a hoodlum in a group of teen-age boys smashing a lighted sign. "Hey, you in the white shirt, you're under arrest!" he yelled, chasing the fleeing youths behind a building. All at once he was alone, facing the gang.

"Keep your hands off him, white man," growled a voice. A glint of metal flashed. As 160-pound Rotolo cautiously approached, the burly vandal charged. The policeman grabbed him, managed to snap one handcuff on a wrist, but the youth yanked loose and swung the dangling cuff at Rotolo. The patrolman fought back with his nightstick. Seconds later, more police arrived and took the young man away, charging him with malicious mischief, assault and resisting arrest.

Within 48 hours a militant civil-rights group called FIGHT held a mass meeting on "police brutality," and a spokesman demanded that "racial bigots" be purged from the police force. The next day a superior told Mike Rotolo that he was suspended. The youth's parents had charged him with "brutality." Suddenly, publicity caused the officer's wife to be snubbed, and their three-year-old boy ran home crying that he could no longer play at a friend's house.

Eventually, Rotolo was cleared, but the ugly smear continues to haunt him. Recently a young man he arrested during a street disorder recognized his name and filed a "brutality" charge as a gimmick to dodge prosecution. Another time, after Rotolo hauled a drunken and belligerent husband out of a home, the wife tearfully thanked him for rescuing her. But two days later she charged Rotolo with "brutality." Both claims were investigated and adjudged false. Nevertheless, Rotolo's superiors have moved him to work where he won't "get involved." Is it any surprise that he says, "Too many policemen today feel that the only way to get ahead is to do nothing"?

ALWAYS THE SECOND GUESS

The attacks on Mike Rotolo typify an avalanche of irresponsible "brutality" charges piling up on policemen across the nation. When local police and Internal Revenue agents raided Boston bookies recently, hoodlums ignited an egg-and-tomato-throwing riot simply by running through the neighborhood shouting, "Police brutality! Police brutality!" Phony cries of "police brutality" helped to touch off the bloody explosion in the Watts area of Los Angeles last August. Again last March a high-school dropout hurled a rock through a teacher's car window, and as officers led the boy away, he screamed, "Police brutality! Riot! Riot!"—sparking another Watts outburst. Toll from the two riots: 36 dead, hundreds hurt.

With a "long, hot summer" ahead and some extremists openly threatening riots, the public can expect to hear a rising tumult of "police brutality" accusations. For today this phrase has exploded into a major national issue, supercharged with emotion, riddled with legal and social complexities.

The police have not been faultless. They will inevitably make future mistakes. But their job has become enormously more difficult in this age of "protest" as they face continuing waves of demonstrations, riots and sit-ins. At times a lack of training, plus anger and frustration, have resulted in the use of unnecessary force. Cases of Negro-hating sheriffs using cattle prods are obviously intolerable. But the greatest obstacle to police departments' efforts everywhere to improve community-police relations has been a militant, unreasoning campaign, promoted by subversives, criminals and professional protesters, to discredit all police with the stamp of the few offenders.

The consequences are staggering. Numerous police executives have confided to me that more and more officers are shying away from action that might singe them with the "brutality" brand. "The rank-and-file patrolman," former New York City police commissioner Michael J. Murphy laments, "is now apprehensive about doing *anything* in these situations because of always being second-guessed. If I were on a beat today, I would share his apprehension."

COLLECT YOUR CHECK

Although reluctant to admit publicly that they would ever fail to carry out their duty, dozens of policemen in a number of cities have quietly admitted to me that many laws are not enforced because of possible repercussions. Just a few weeks ago, an order was issued in New York City which requires that any policeman who fires his gun for any reason whatsoever, and injures someone, must be "benched" until the matter is thoroughly investigated.

Nothing, however, has so shaken policemen as what happened to two Chicago patrolmen. Responding to a call for help one night in October 1964, they tried to disarm two men who were terrorizing a neighborhood with a broken bottle. Told to "come and get it," the officers subdued the men only after one of the patrolmen was given a slash across the face that later required 27 stitches.

At the trial, police testimony was undisputed. Nevertheless, a newly elected judge freed the men, explaining that the slashing had been justified because the officers had "no business to pull a gun and attack a citizen."

Understandably, Chicago policemen were outraged. Both officers involved in the incident complain that it is constantly being thrown in their faces by criminals. Another policeman commented, "It's better just to shy away from trouble when you run across it." Still another said, "A lot of us have decided that we're just going to collect our paychecks from now on."

DESPITE ALL CLAIMS

State and federal laws carefully restrict police use of excessive force and prescribe penalties for officers who misuse it. Typically, states authorize a policeman to "use any force he reasonably believes to be necessary" to make an arrest or to subdue an attacker, but what is "reasonable" and "necessary" must be determined case by case. Moreover, authorities severely penalize police misconduct. In Arlington, Va., a 24-year veteran lost his temper one day and kicked and slapped a handcuffed woman. Police Chief William Fawver promptly investigated and dismissed him from the force. In Blackfoot, Idaho, a few years ago, a policeman arrested a man in a barroom brawl, took him to the city limits and beat him unconscious. A federal court convicted the officer for violating the 1870 civil-rights law.

Proved "brutality" complaints, however, are infrequent, despite all the claims. The Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department received 1778 complaints of criminal violations against police during fiscal 1965. Of this number, only 45 contained enough validity to be presented to a grand jury. In the 33 cases terminated, only five policemen were found guilty of the charges.

Washington, D.C., mustered only 11 formal complaints of police misconduct in 1964 (the latest year for which figures are available). The police department's own review board heard the cases, handed down guilty verdicts in seven and dealt firmly with the offenders. In New York City, complaints against the police of excessive use of force and unlawful exercise of authority totaled 324 in 1965, a year in which 203,303 arrests were made. In Philadelphia, a model city for police critics because of its civilian board to review citizen charges against the police, only 31 "brutality" complaints were received during 1964 (the most recent year of record). Of these, only five were upheld, and in nine cases the complainants didn't even show up at the hearings.

THE FAKE ACCUSATION

Today, however, the "brutality" outcry goes far beyond genuine cases of police misbehavior. All too frequently it is automatically attached to *any* physical action by police, however justified. These faked accusations fall into four major patterns:

1. *Offenders who fake charges against police to evade the law.* This ploy is increasingly used by criminals, and junior offenders have caught on to the same trick. One night, two St. Louis policemen pulled over a carload of rambunctious teen-agers and arrested two boys for a liquor-law violation. The boys and their girl friends worked out an elaborate story, then filed formal charges accusing the officers of vicious acts. Finally, realizing the seriousness of their hoax, the youngsters confessed that their story was completely false. Their admitted motive: to seek sympathy for themselves and to "get even" with the arresting officers.

2. *Professional protesters who set up the police as hate targets.* On the day after Harlem's 1964 riots broke out, James Farmer, then national director of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), appeared on WABC-TV's "Page One" show and told viewers in the tense city that police had conducted a "blood orgy." "I saw with my own eyes a woman who walked up to the police and asked for their assistance in getting a taxicab so that she might go home. This woman was shot in the groin, and she is now in Harlem Hospital." This charge, construed

as a shocking accusation of the police, helped to inflame the already explosive situation. Later, however, the charge was carefully checked, and no police attack was ever proved. Moreover, no conclusive evidence has been found that Farmer personally witnessed any such incident.

3. *People involved in disorderly conduct who find police easier to blame than themselves.* Near downtown Detroit, a woman, drunk to the point of incoherence, stumbled up to a house at 4:30 a.m., shouted, "Let me in!" and pounded on the door. As frightened occupants called the police, the woman smashed the door in an explosion of splinters. A man in the house knocked her down, and she lay sprawled in the doorway when the police arrived. She was taken to a precinct station, booked, then hospitalized.

Shortly after, she made a formal complaint that she was walking along, minding her own business, when the police stopped her, accused her of breaking and entering, then beat her. "The brutal treatment I received was a violation of my civil rights!" she shrilled. Her charges were dismissed.

4. *Communists who exploit the "brutality" slogan to undermine law and order.* Known communists and their sympathizers have engaged in police-baiting and brutality smear operations in such diverse areas as the Philadelphia and Harlem riots of 1964, the Watts riot of 1965 and the current wave of anti-Vietnamese-war demonstrations. The FBI considers the tactic so insidious that it has issued special instructions to its agents, explaining that the communist aims are "to arouse the passions of the people against law enforcement; to mislead the public; to smear, discredit and weaken law enforcement everywhere; and to divide, confuse and reduce seriously the strength of the opposition to communism."

Blaming all "police brutality" charges on the communists would be as incorrect as dismissing entirely the Red role in false anti-police propaganda. However, says Dr. Stefan T. Possony of Stanford University, an authority on Red psychological warfare: "It doesn't matter whether the propagandist's motive is outright subversion or simply extremist irresponsibility. The potential results of deliberate faking of accusations are the same: the communists want general public acceptance of the 'police brutality' slogan so they can achieve police disarmament."

MAN IN THE MIDDLE

Today's police officer is truly a man in the middle. Sociologists agree that slum dwellers often turn on police as symbols of the "power structure" that they blame for their plight. Policemen are expected to be social workers, judges, doctors and priests when they go on duty; yet often they do not get the official support they need. The former police chief of a major city privately told me, "Some politicians seem to regard gaining the political support of minority groups as more important than treating their accusations against police with fairness and objectivity."

The police role has been made still harder by instances of unbelievable judicial leniency toward criminals. Take the case of the three young men with long police records who made a vicious and unprovoked attack on Chicago police officer Frank Perry in 1963. The attackers pleaded guilty. Astonishingly, Cook County Judge Leslie E. Salter called Officer Perry a "crybaby" and turned his assailants loose on mere probation.

Compare with this the treatment of two men who punched and kicked two Liverpool, England, policemen in 1962. They were sentenced to 18 months in jail, promptly appealed the judge's harshness, only to have the Court of Criminal Appeals *double* their jail term. "There must be deterrent sentences to ensure that police officers in Liverpool can safely carry out their duties," the court declared.

Attacks on police have become so frequent that the American Law Institute has recommended that states pass a model law clearly emphasizing the duty of every citizen to come quietly when arrested by a badge-displaying officer. Any questions of mistaken arrest would then be settled in court rather than in the street. The New York *Times*, urging the state legislature to pass such a law, declared, "In these days of increasing hoodlumism and street crime, the community rightly expects the police to assume risks, but in return it owes them reasonable protection. Policemen forced to make instantaneous decisions under trying circumstances should not become fair game for a mob."

The well-publicized vilification of America's policemen is hiding the fact that the police themselves are becoming the victims of brutality. The FBI's *Uniform Crime Reports* shows that one out of every ten policemen was assaulted in 1964 (the most recent year of record). In five years, 225 officers were killed, and most of them left wives and children. In 1964 alone, felons killed 57 policemen.

THE STAKES

The harsh fact is that our nation is besieged by crime. During an average week, one city of 1,600,000 has 566 burglaries, 114 robberies, 15 rapes and about four killings. The situation is just as grim in suburban and rural areas, where nearly one-third of all serious crimes occur among one-fifth of the population.

Statistics, however appalling, fail to tell the private horror of those attacked. A Los Angeles man going about his daily business is shot to death near his truck. A U.S. Congressman working late in his Capitol Hill office is knifed and robbed. A woman kneeling in prayer is dragged to a confessional and raped.

Anyone who has ever called for help in such danger knows the feeling of terror, and what it can mean to have police officers who do not hesitate to respond *instantly* and *forcefully*. Protecting the police from unjust "brutality" smears is actually protecting yourself. The stakes could be your home—or your life.

MICRONESIA: AN AMERICAN RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the trip which has been undertaken by President Johnson across 25,000 miles of the Pacific gives renewed emphasis to the role of the United States as a Pacific power.

Across the broad expanse of the Pacific and around its periphery, American garrisons and American bases have been built and are being expanded and strengthened at a rate unprecedented in our history. We are pouring enormous sums of money into the construction of two important bases on the Asian mainland, at Cam Ranh Bay and Sattahip, to supplement our existing bases in Korea, in the Philippines, in Japan, on Guam, and on Okinawa. We maintain large numbers of troops on the fringes of the Asian mainland. The Defense Department does not hesitate to request more to build and maintain these bastions and Congress, so it would seem, does not hesitate to appropriate even more.

But there is an area across this vast expanse of the Pacific where we have been less munificent, where our effort is, to say the very least, something less than energetic—the 3 million square miles of ocean and scattered islands known officially as the United States Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, or more usually, as Micronesia. Micronesia comprises some 2,000 islands, with a total land area of some 700 square miles, less than that of our smallest State. Scattered on the 97 of these islands that are regularly inhabited are 90,000 people. It is thought that in years past, the population of these islands was something over 200,000, but this was before the benefits of contact with the outside world, with smallpox, leprosy, tuberculosis, and venereal disease.

The three groups of islands which make up the trust territory, the Marianas, the Carolines, and the Marshalls, were wrested from Japan at great cost in American lives and materiel during the Second World War, and are administered by the United States under a trusteeship agreement between the United States and the Security Council of the United Nations. They do not fall into the category of U.S. territories such as Guam, which, though geographically a part of Micronesia, has been a possession of the United States since the end of the last century. The Pacific islands are not U.S. possessions; they are wards of the international community, with the United States acting as a kind of foster parent to whose care they have been entrusted. At the time of the conclusion of the trusteeship agreement with the United Nations, the area was designated, at U.S. insistence, a "security trust," the only one of its kind. This gives us the right to fortify the islands, to station troops there, and to close them to outsiders in the interest of the U.S. national security. Indeed, as Secretary of State George Marshall noted, in testifying in favor of the trusteeship agreement, before the Committee on Foreign Relations in 1947, although "we must observe certain forms, we have almost complete liberty of action" in the area.

There is some question whether, in the 20 years during which the United States has exercised jurisdiction over the area, even the forms have been observed.

It is not a stewardship in which the United States can take particular pride. This forgotten area of the globe has made news only twice that I can recall: in 1954, when radioactive fallout from our H-bomb tests on Bikini drifted over the island of Rongelap; and the other occasion was when it was revealed a few years ago that the capital of the trust territory was moved to Saipan into rather opulent quarters, a miniature American suburb built by the CIA at a cost of some $28 million and operated between 1949 and 1962 as a training ground for Chinese Nationalist forces being prepared to reconquer the Chinese mainland. The CIA headquarters, now abandoned, and the $1 billion missile test site on Kwajalein atoll seem to be, in addition to the radioactive fallout, the principal gifts which the richest country in the world has seen fit to bestow on the people of Micronesia in our 20 years of trusteeship.

We have not spent very much on such things as schools, roads, sanitary facilities, or even housing. In 1954, to carry out its obligations to promote the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the people of Micronesia, the Congress appropriated only $7.5 million. The annual appropriation was increased to $17.5 million in 1962, in the wake of a report by a United Nations mission which visited the territory to determine the extent to which the United States was fulfilling its obligations.

A later United Nations mission, which visited the area in 1964, while noting that some progress had been made and while recognizing the formidable problems that distance and inadequacy of transportation present, still felt obliged to note that the United States had come nowhere near fulfilling its stated objectives for the area.

Early this year, a team from the World Health Organization visited Micronesia and their findings belie some of the rather bland generalizations to be found in the U.S. annual report to the United Nations on the trust territory. There is still a high incidence of such diseases as leprosy, amebic dysentery, and tuberculosis, all of which are almost unknown or completely controlled in the United States, and which could be controlled in the trust territory. Gastroenteritis, due to poor sanitation, is common throughout the territory and is a major cause of child mortality. There is not one Micronesian doctor who has qualified to the M.D. level. The WHO team found a shortage of medical personnel and facilities. Much capital equipment required replacement and the maintenance of existing facilities and equipment was termed inadequate. A well-defined program for leprosy control was found wanting, and tuberculosis control needed to be revived and pursued systematically. Measures of environmental sanitation were found to be "in the initial stages of development"—and all this after 20 years of U.S. administration.

Roads in the trust territory are considered deplorable, yet essential programs of education, health, and economic development clearly depend on an adequate road system.

Progress is being made in education, with English the language of instruction. The people of Micronesia speak several different languages and English is rapidly becoming the lingua franca thus contributing to a developing sense of unity. Education and other areas have suffered from the peculiar bureaucratic impasse that arises with respect to the trust territory. Agencies responsible for programs within the United States feel they cannot operate in Micronesia because it is not "domestic," and we cannot give them foreign aid because they are not "foreign." For several years, a similar impasse held up what appears to be one of the more important efforts, the sending of Peace Corps volunteers, mostly teachers, to Micronesia. It has now been decided that the Peace Corps can operate in Micronesia, even though it is not "foreign," and Peace Corp volunteers will soon outnumber all other Americans in the trust territory.

Progress in education, while laudable in itself, raises several questions which are fundamental to the future of the territory and to the role of the United States in that future. What are these people being educated for? Unless a major effort can be made in economic development, to utilize to their fullest potential the admittedly limited resources of the area, the problem will only become greater. The "zoo theory"—espoused by those who feel that we should just let the Micronesians be happy in their simple life and ignorance seems, fortunately, to have been abandoned. Micronesia is moving into the modern world and we cannot reverse that trend. We cannot return the Pacific islands to the era of the simple savage who was the ideal of 18th century Europe before "the fatal impact," as Alan Morehead describes it, of the contact with Western culture.

The essential purpose of government is to bring about conditions of happiness for men, to enable them to develop to the fullest whatever potential they have. We fail in our purpose as a government, and particularly as a liberal democracy, if, through indifference, we neglect to provide this essential service of government to a people who, through the mischance of history rather than through their own choice, have become subject to the United States.

Our responsibility to the international community as far as the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is concerned, includes political advancement and movement toward self-government or independence. The United States has been subject to increasing criticism at the United Nations, not only for its neglect of the economic and social needs of the territory, but for the slowness of its political development. There is much more to the first criticism than to the second. A territorial legislature, the Congress of Micronesia, was established in September 1964. The Congress has wide legislative authority in nonbudgetary areas and, although the U.S. High Commissioner retains the right of veto, there is a provision for appeal to the Secretary of the Interior.

A sense of unity appears to be developing among the peoples of the territory, a considerable achievement in view of the enormous distances and cultural disparities within the area.

What of the future of Micronesia? Three possibilities appear to exist:

First. The territory might eventually achieve independence, a hope frequently expressed in the United Nations. For several reasons, independence does not appear to be a particularly desirable course, even in the eyes of most Micronesians. As far as the United States is concerned, the security considerations, which at the end of the Second World War dictated the maintenance of control over the islands, are somewhat altered with the development of long-range missiles and the establishment of U.S. bases on the Asian mainland, but the necessity to deny control of the area to any other power would presumably still weigh heavily in the minds of Pentagon strategists. As far as the Micronesians themselves are concerned, not even the United Nations mission could find any significant sentiment in the islands for independence, particularly if independence meant loss of the American subsidy. The population of less than 100,000 and the limited economic potential would seem to assure the nonviability of Micronesia as an independent state and U.N. member, the example of the Maldive Islands notwithstanding.

Second. It has been suggested that ultimately Micronesia might be affiliated with Guam, or become a part of the State of Hawaii. There are aspects of these proposals which remain to be explored, but there are several evident disadvantages, notably the distances involved and the different levels of development in Hawaii and on Guam, whose economy is entirely dependent on its U.S. military base.

Third. Some form of continuing association with the United States might be worked out. A status comparable to that of Puerto Rico, for example, might eventually be found to be suitable for Micronesia.

The United States has been challenged repeatedly in the United Nations, particularly by the Soviet Union to subject the future of the islands to a plebiscite, but even the U.N. visiting mission found that the area had not yet achieved the degree of political and economic development required to make such a plebiscite meaningful. The U.N. mission concluded that a plebiscite today would result in an overwhelming expression of sentiment in favor of affiliation with the United States, with the ultimate result that the present situation would be continued, but without the gadfly effect of international supervision. A plebiscite now would be to offer the islanders a kind of choice a la francaise; that is, we would be saying to them, well, you can forage for yourselves in the great wide world, or you can continue to put up with us—and our assistance. But this does not mean that decisions should not be taken now as to when such a choice might be offered, and as to what the United States is going to do in the meantime, to prepare for that choice.

In May of this year, the administration asked the Congress to authorize $172 million for a 5-year capital improvement program for the trust territory.

The bill, as passed by the Senate, provides for an increase in the annual appropriation of $17.5 million to $32 million for fiscal year 1967 and to $35 million for fiscal year 1968, of which $11 million and $10 million respectively would be for the capital improvement program. It now appears unlikely that this bill will become law in the present Congress.

In defending its exercise of its responsibility in the trust territory before the United Nations, the United States was able to escape severe criticism only because our delegation could report that a greatly expanded program was being proposed to the Congress. Now the Congress has failed to act. In my judgment, there are several implications of this failure to meet our responsibilities.

First, it is clear that during the last few years, the United States, for what we are told are reasons of vital national security, has assumed a new role in the world, particularly with respect to countries where, for reasons of geography or traditional historical involvement, we have had a special relationship. This role, most noticeable in the Caribbean, is essentially one of a U.S. veto over the kind of government one of these theoretically sovereign and independent countries may have. Thus, we intervened in the Dominican Republic because we were convinced, rightly or wrongly, that the events of April and May of 1965 would lead to the emergence of another Castro; this we would not permit.

When we presume to exercise this kind of control over a country or an area, we assume certain responsibilities to it. The most important, and perhaps the most logical of these, is that we need to do our utmost to bring about the conditions whereby those countries can develop their economies and their societies. They are then likely to become strong enough as societies to resist internal subversion and thus ultimately to free themselves from U.S. protection.

Last year I proposed that our special relationship with the Dominican Republic made it desirable that we extend to that country special economic and commercial benefits. We have had, over the years, a special relationship with Cuba, though this is now inoperative because of the trade embargo.

In my view, we have a special relationship with the peoples of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. If we are going to consider them essential to our security, then they have a right to expect better treatment than that afforded to a foreign country. These islands are not within the U.S. customs area, as is Puerto Rico; they are not even beneficiaries of the special arrangements that apply to the insular possessions of the United States, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa.

An economic survey of Micronesia is now nearing completion. It is expected that a comprehensive economic development plan for the islands will be proposed. If the Congress is not prepared to spend the money urgently required to meet U.S. responsibilities to the Micronesians and thus to the world community, to whom we are responsible for their welfare, then certain steps must be taken lest the United States stand justly accused of the kinds of policies for which we have faulted the European colonial powers.

First. As a means of developing a more effective policy, the Foreign Relations Committee in the Senate and the Foreign Affairs Committee in the House should have jurisdiction over legislation and the State Department should have general executive responsibility for policy. At present, the Interior Committees in the Senate and House exercise jurisdiction and the trust territory is administered by the Interior Department.

Second. I propose that the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands be accorded the same treatment with respect to our tariffs as those territories which are U.S. possessions. The Customs Simplification Act of 1954, which was calculated to stimulate the development of light industry in U.S. possessions, provides that the growth or product of a U.S. insular possession outside the customs area of the United States are free of duty when imported into the U.S. customs area if they do not contain foreign materials to the value of more than 50 percent of their total value. It is my view that a similar provision for the trust territory would be a considerable incentive to economic development, particularly if combined with a free flow of capital.

Third. This area has always been treated as a kind of private property by the Defense Department, which has restricted travel on alleged grounds of security. But, with the exception of the missile test site at Kwajalein, there are no major U.S. installations in the area. Guam is not considered to be in the area. One suspects this may be another instance of Pentagon inertia at work. Therefore, I propose that the area, with the exception of the missile test site, be opened to tourist travel. This was once known as the Japanese Riviera; it is sunny and warm when Japan and other countries are in the middle of winter. Distance perhaps precludes Micronesia's ever becoming an American playground comparable to the Virgin Islands, but Americans are not the only tourists in the world.

Fourth. If the Congress is not going to provide funds for capital improvement, then we should not seal off this area as an exclusively American economic preserve. It is only within the last few years that even American capital has been permitted into the area. I propose that we permit other nations to move in to help develop the area. This would help improve some of the potentially important industries, such as fishing.

It should be noted that, under the trusteeship agreement, the United States is obliged to treat all nations equally and thus if we let in any foreign capital we will have to let in all.

The era of mercantilism and colonialism is past. Nations are no longer able to exploit the less developed peoples of the world for their own purposes, whether those purposes be worthy or ignoble. The U.S. treatment of these islands is in no way comparable to the exploitation of Africa by the European powers in the 19th century, or to the exploitation of Latin America by the Spanish. Conditions there are not even severe when compared with some other areas of the world today; they are dismal when compared with the United States.

When a nation assumes rights over another nation or people, it also assumes obligations. We require, or believe we require, these rights in Micronesia, and we cannot evade the responsibilities. We exploit the trust territory, not for economic purposes, but for purposes of security. But I believe that the principle is the same. We have obligations and would have them even if we were not entrusted with the welfare of this area by the United Nations. It is time that these obligations be met.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL symbolizes to all of us, in character and in stature, the essence of New England: the unshakable faith in the validity of the American tradition; the courage to stand stanchly by his deeply rooted convictions; the strength to successfully defend these beliefs against the most severe attack; and the integrity of the true leader which draws people to him and welds them together in pursuit of our common goals.

Throughout a long and highly distinguished career, Senator SALTONSTALL has brought the best of this New England tradition to the houses of government, and he has served Massachusetts and the Nation with a sincerity and dedication rare among men.

We accept his decision to retire from the Senate with great regret, for this is our loss, but it is with appreciation and affection that we bid a statesman and a grand gentleman farewell from public life.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CORPORATION COUNSEL VACANCY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a WTOP editorial which was broadcast on October 6 and 7, regarding the District of Columbia Corporation Counsel vacancy.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CORPORATION COUNSEL VACANCY

(This editorial was broadcast on October 6 and 7, 1966 over WTOP Radio and Television.)

This is a WTOP editorial.

We offer today another strange but by no means wonderful example of the way things are done and not done in the District of Columbia.

For more than 10 months the District has not had an officially appointed Corporation Counsel—the District government's highest ranking legal officer.

Since Chester Gray died last November, the job has been filled on a temporary basis by Milton Korman, a 30-year member of the Corporation Counsel's staff.

Almost weekly since Mr. Gray's death, there has been speculation that the DC Commissioners will act soon to fill the vacancy. So far nothing has happened.

Mr. Korman is an unabashed candidate for the appointment, arguing that his experience and long service to the DC government entitle him to it. Apparently, however, there are doubts about Mr. Korman's qualifications in some circles. He has not been offered the job; he has, in fact, received strong indications that he will not get it; he has said that, if passed over, he will quit DC government on the spot. Meantime an alarming number of lawyers in the Corporation Counsel's office are quitting and the DC Bar Association has urged the Commissioners to make up their minds on Gray's successor.

Obviously there are wheels within wheels. By some convoluted process involving the District Building, the White House and heaven knows who else a decision is delayed. All the while various rumors spread and multiply—attorney Tim Murphy was widely reported to be the man to take over, but that speculation is ended by his appointment to the federal bench.

All this represents ridiculously bad personnel management; it is grossly unfair and unkind to Milton Korman. Either the Commissioners should reappoint Korman or end the painful suspense by revealing who their choice will be.

This was a WTOP Editorial, Jack Jurey speaking for WTOP.

GOVERNMENT ACTIONS TO RESTORE THE QUALITY OF OUR ENVIRONMENT

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], together with letters and accompanying documents.

There being no objection, the statement, letters, and documents were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR RIBICOFF

In November, 1965, the Environmental Pollution Panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee issued a very significant report entitled "Restoring The Quality Of Our Environment." The report detailed the effects and sources of the dangerous pollution which plagues our society and recommended steps to reduce the pollution and restore a safe and healthful environment to our country.

President Johnson asked the departments and agencies concerned with the pollution problem to consider the recommendations and advise him of the actions they could take to achieve the goals of the report.

During the hearing of my Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization relating to Reorganization Plan Number 3, I asked Secretary Gardner, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to submit for the RECORD a copy of his response to the President. I found his comments very helpful in assessing the progress his department is making toward providing a proper environment for all the people. Subsequently, I asked five other departments and agencies for similar progress reports.

The answers I received demonstrate that the Federal Government is moving to restore the quality of our environment. Too often these actions pass unnoted. But it is such actions which translate recommendations into accomplishments.

The letters and documents which follow this statement indicate how well the Federal Government is meeting one of its most vital responsibilities.

JUNE 20, 1966.

Hon. PHILLIP S. HUGHES,
Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HUGHES: This is in follow-up of my letter of January 3, 1966, to Mr. Staats commenting on the recommendations contained in the report entitled, "Restoring the Quality of Our Environment." I apologize for the long delay in the transmittal of these comments.

We have given this report careful consideration, after a number of discussions within the Public Health Service, and with outside advisors.

We agree generally with the 13 principles recommended and we have taken specific action with respect to several of these.

Recommendation A4 will be implemented, in part, as a result of Executive Order 11282, of May 26, 1966, dealing with air pollution from Federal installations. An earlier Executive Order provided for water pollution. We have initiated action to expand our research efforts related to pollution as recommended in A6.

The 1965 Clean Air Act Amendments provide for the imposition of exhaust standards on automobiles. Regulations have been issued to provide controls on the 1968 models. While this will contribute to curbing the automobile pollution problem as recommended in A7, it does not deal with the millions of vehicles presently on the highways. Further steps in the area of inspection and maintenance, as well as in the development of long-range solutions, will be needed.

Recommendation A9 was given careful consideration in our reorganization proposals for the Public Health Service. These proposals will be implemented if Congress raises no objection to Reorganization Plan Number 3, 1966. The regulatory and enforcement function will be clearly separated from the research and development function in the new organization. All the enforcement will rest in the Bureau of Disease and Injury Prevention and Control, while the research will be under the newly created Environmental Health Sciences Center within the National Institutes of Health.

These organizational changes will put this Department in a better position to deal with the problems discussed in "Restoring the Quality of Our Environment."

The Section (B) dealing with proposed actions raises a number of basic policy issues which can only be resolved on a Government-wide basis. For example, the question of "effluent charges"[1] is one that will appeal to some while causing grave problems for other departments. Certainly incentives of some type are clearly required to speed the development of effective pollution prevention programs.

Recommendation (B-4) has in part been implemented by a recent agreement between this Department and the U.S. Department of Agriculture concerning the "zero tolerance" and "no residue" registration of pesticides.

The recommendations relating to lead, borax, phosphorus and other potentially hazardous substances has been given special consideration by the Public Health Service. We are developing more effective research surveillance and monitoring capability in this field.

The consideration of the solid waste problems by the Tukey Committee anticipated enactment of Public Law 89-272. We believe that our past experience and present program activities in the field of solid wastes warrant leaving this responsibility in the Public Health Service. We are coordinating with the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Interior Department in this important area. Recommendations for support of community facilities and the improvement of present technology to improve poor waste disposal practice (B-12) should receive emphasis. To be effective, large amounts of money—as well as new approaches—need to be available soon. Typical conservative approaches could delay real accomplishments for generations.

The recommendation (B-14) relating to pollution by Federal Government facilities is now being implemented. The latter portion of the recommendation can be broadly interpreted to apply to essentially all segments of the economy.

Recommendation B-26, "that efforts be increased to establish the scientific bases upon which standards of environmental equality can be set," falls to a large degree within the framework of ongoing environmental health programs, and the mission of the proposed National Environmental Health Sciences Center, National Institutes of Health. It is recognized that environmental quality standards may differ for different purposes, but it is our view that critical issues will center around concern for the health hazards.

Recommendation B 28, "* * * encourage the development and adoption of codes governing noise insulation in apartment buildings," should be broadened. Noise in general is a problem. There is a developing body of opinion that ambient noise represents an important environmental stress, that we accommodate rather than adapt to this. While we already support some research into the health significance of noise, we plan expanded studies directed at determining the psychological and physiological effects of noise.

We have one general comment relating to Section C, Coordination and Systems Studies: They urgently are needed in the field of environmental pollution. Increasing use must be made of the resources of private industry in some of these new approaches.

Section D, Baseline Measurement Programs, is a cause of some concern because of the use of the word "average" in relation to the condition of the environment. The recommendations focus on a single system of survey which may or may not be adequate in terms of the specific missions of the Public Health Service and the Department. We assume that the recommendations relate to the accumulative of benchmark data, and that any agency having this function would make use of data accumulated by other agencies (e.g., the Public Health Service) to meet specific program requirements. We are presently making a detailed study of the network of environmental sampling systems which have the potential for providing generally useful data.

We support fully the general concepts outlined in Section E, Development and Demonstration. Many of the problems described require the development of more effective incentives for industry, higher performance or quality standards set and enforced by governments and the wide use of the resources of private industry in the fields of development and demonstration. Large sums of money may be required to achieve some of the objectives, which because they are in the public interest as well as the interest of private industry will require public and private resources for support.

The specific recommendations relating to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (E8-E9) were given careful consideration in the development of the proposals incorporated in the Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965. Recommendation E10 is incorporated in the President's Budget for the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration now in the Interior Department.

The section on Research (f) clearly reveals the broad ecological approach by the panel to the problems of environmental pollution. We agree that more research must be done and I have indicated the steps which we have initiated to achieve this objective. Additional study should also be given by behavioral scientists to the solution of some of these perplexing problems.

We share the panel's concern for manpower. As in so many other fields relating to the goals of the Great Society manpower, rather than money, has become the key bottleneck. The recommendations follow the principles which have been shown to be effective in the development of manpower in other fields (e.g., biomedical research, mental health).

In summary, the report "Restoring the Quality of Our Environment," has provided a much needed stimulus to our thinking in the field of environmental pollution. In the main, we are in process of implementing all of the recommendations which are specifically directed to this Department.

---

[1] See the proposals in the Administration's "Clean River Act," now being considered by the Congress. The recent visit to the Ruhr by Secretary Udall and his party clarified considerably the European concept of "effluent charges" and resolved many questions raised by the Tukey report.

Again, may I apologize for the long delay in forwarding the Department views to you.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. GARDNER,
Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., August 29, 1966.

Hon. ABRAHAM RIBICOFF,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate

DEAR ABE: I am pleased to send you the enclosed Summary of USDA Comments on the President's Science Advisory Committee Report, "Restoring the Quality of Our Environment."

A majority of the recommendations in the Report relate to one or more on-going programs within the mission of the Department. The Report points to some of the byproducts of a rising civilization that tend to alter the environment in which we live, although a number of those associated with agriculture are identified only in isolated communities or segments of the environmental complex. Although their impact with respect to the total environment is still largely undetermined, there are indications that an expanding population and an advancing technology are resulting in problems that we in the Department must continue to identify and solve.

As appropriately indicated in the summary of your subcommittee's report, "Pesticides and Public Policy," benefit-risk equations must be evaluated in considering factors affecting the quality of our environment. Chemicals are necessary to maintain the quality of our food and fiber in the quantity we need and to protect man and animals against insect-borne diseases. Soil must be tilled and fertilizers added to produce our agricultural crops. Measurable environmental changes result from these and other agricultural practices. The benefits from these practices must be considered in evaluating their impact on the environment.

Please be assured that this Department will continue positive action designed to: (a) further define "common pollution," (b) locate and delineate problem areas, (c) measure the impact of pollutants on such things as soil, vegetation, man, domestic animals, air and water, (d) minimize, control or prevent further pollution, and (e) repair damaged segments of the environment.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

SUMMARY OF USDA COMMENTS ON THE REPORT "RESTORING THE QUALITY OF OUR ENVIRONMENT"

GENERAL

The Department of Agriculture endorses the spirit and intent of this report. The Department has provided leadership in programs to ameliorate the impact of pollutants, especially those associated with agricultural practices. Its existing programs are consistent with the intent of most of the report's recommendations. A few of the recommendations will require new legislation to implement the program being developed by the Department. The Department is working on proposed legislation to provide the necessary authority.

As an essential and highly productive segment of modern America, agriculture has a major role to play in guarding our environment against harmful contamination. Many of the agricultural problems cited in this report have long been recognized, and have received considerable attention from this Department. It stands ready, as it always has, to work with any other agency, group, or individual in a meaningful cooperative effort to safeguard our environment.

Some of the problem areas cited in the report have been given greater attention than others. Pesticides have been the subject of public concern for many years. Many of the recommendations made in this study relating to pesticides are extensions or restatements of proposals contained in previous reports, including the 1963 pesticides study conducted by another panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee. Considerable progress has been made by this Department in implementing these proposals in cooperation with other organizations and individuals.

In regulation, research, and education, the Department has acted on a broad front to increase the efficiency and safety of pesticides. In recent years it has expanded its efforts to develop effective alternative pest control weapons and techniques. It recommends—and follows in its own pest control programs—the use of those means of effective control which provide the least potential hazard to man and wildlife and least danger of air, water, or soil pollution. This approach has yielded some dramatic results, including the control and virtual elimination from the United States of the screwworm fly, a deadly livestock pest, through integrated use of biological and chemical techniques.

Scientists and technicians of the Department are engaged in monitoring soil and water at 55 locations throughout the Nation for any residues traceable to the agricultural use of pesticides. This comprehensive program is being conducted in cooperation with other Federal and State agencies, which are also involved in checking for pesticide residues in rural and urban environments. Preliminary results from a pilot monitoring project conducted in the Mississippi Delta, an area of high agricultural pesticide use, have revealed little or no progressive buildup of residues in farm soil. Another study in the lower Mississippi River delta found no measurable runoff of pesticides from farmland into the River and its tributaries.

In citing these facts, it is not the Department's intent to minimize the role of pesticides as a potential source of pollution, but rather to point out that the Department has been sharply aware of the problems involved—and has been engaged in substantial programs to delineate and solve these problems.

Erosion of the land, both rural and urban, pours tons of sediment into lakes and streams. This erosion may result from improper farming practices, but another major source is construction—suburban housing developments, highways and industrial plants.

The Department has long conducted major programs for conserving the Nation's soils and reducing erosion losses. It cooperates with the many Soil Conservation Districts in developing demonstration areas and giving technical advice to individual land holders. It utilizes the best available procedures in managing National Forests and Grasslands. These action programs are supported by a comprehensive cooperative research effort involving such studies as (1) establishing relationships between sediment yields and erosional processes, (2) understanding and controlling the deposition of sediment in water storage or regulating reservoirs, (3) minimizing or correcting gullying, channel cutting, or streambank erosion on watersheds and (4) determining the extent to which sediment in streamflow may serve as the carrier of undesirable wastes or residues.

Much new knowledge must be obtained and increased application of the best possible erosion control techniques must be sought in order to conserve our soils and related natural resources for future generations and to develop clean streams and lakes.

With the increased use of fertilizers on farms and forest lands and the concern about nitrogen and phosphorous in ground water, there is an urgent need for expanded research to understand the chemistry involved in nutrient movement and to develop fertilization methods that will minimize the movement in the soil. Other basic research should be concerned with mechanism and energy considerations of the retention, transformation and release of chemicals in soil.

Increasing the lead and other heavy metal content in soils due to air pollution may eventually impair the quality of food produced in soils. Studies need to be initiated to investigate the relation of lead added to soils in changing the lead uptake and content of crops.

Disposal of organic wastes—principally sewage and manures—is becoming more and more of a problem on the modern farmstead. The cattle, hogs, horses, sheep, and poultry on farms in the United States produce more than 2 billion tons of manure annually. The problem is particularly acute with respect to confinement-type livestock operations on the fringes of metropolitan areas—where the total amount of manure is concentrated in the confinement area. Under these conditions, it is difficult to avoid creating a sanitation hazard or a public nuisance. Economical, sanitary means of disposition need to be developed. Among means that need further investigation are lagoons, irrigation systems, subsurface absorption systems and reclamation.

In the rural areas of America, there are still 5.2 million dwellings served neither by public sewers nor by individual septic tanks or cesspools. There are many towns in which lack of a sewer system leads to contamination of water. While the Department has accomplished much in terms of financing rural water systems, a Congressional mandate is needed for a full assault on the rural sewage problems.

The Department is aware of the nature of the task ahead. It is prepared to draw from its long experience in mobilizing its resources to carry out its responsibilities. The Department has consistently given priority to marshalling competent scientific manpower and supporting facilities to extend basic research in such areas as wind and water erosion processes, the fate and behavior of pesticides and fertilizers in soils, discovery of better, safer pest control tools and techniques, and development of efficient, economical means of disposing of animal wastes.

In addition to research, the Department will further emphasize pollution control and abatement through its technical assistance, cost-sharing, credit, and similar programs. It will also draw on existing knowledge, experience and resources in such other Federal-State programs as those dealing with watersheds, river basins, and recreation.

The report serves a useful purpose in seeking to establish some goals to be sought and some guidelines for pursuing them. We believe that these concepts are most realistically expressed in terms of man achieving control of his environment to best serve the public need. Consideration of pollution problems must be in the context of interrelationships of social, economic, political, biological and other factors. Thus the extent and rapidity of achieving the goals will depend on many considerations.

Successive and continuing minimization and management of pollution are desirable and practicable. Agriculture will increasingly accept responsibility for its share of pollution abatement. This will involve adjusting many existing practices or the development of new ones, following case by case assessment of benefits and losses to society. There will be difficult choices. It will be necessary to establish and publicize more and better criteria as to what constitutes unacceptable levels of various types of pollution.

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

A majority of the recommendations in the President's Science Advisory Committee Report on Restoring the Quality of Our Environment relate to one or more on-going programs within the missions of the Department of Agriculture.

The Department has studied all of the recommendations and the following comments relate only to those specifically directed to the Department or, in our opinion, relate to programs of paramount interest.

Effluent charges

Should this concept become a rigid program including "all" pollutants, the impact on agriculture would be significant. The concept of assessing a "tax" or a "charge" as an inducement for abating pollution needs careful study to determine its feasibility. Additional basic information is needed on the impact of pollutants on the environment. The Department recognizes the need for a reliable base for determining if "equitable charges" can be assessed in agriculture. Much more research and program experience will be required to develop the necessary information.

Registration of pesticides for agricultural use

The Department has recognized these concepts and has been requiring, on an increasing scale, evidence from registrants on persistence and fate of pesticides. It proposes to expand this requirement over time and to do this deliberately without disrupting food and fiber production.

The Department's research and monitoring programs have as one of their major objectives the acquisition of basic knowledge about the fate and persistence of pesticides. Work in this area has been materially strengthened in recent years. This emphasis will be continued.

Pesticide labels and patterns of use are being reappraised continuously as new significant information is obtained. Modifications in use patterns are required as the new data justify. Therefore, physical review of each label at the reregistration period becomes less significant. Rather than intensify the reregistration process, greater attention will be paid to the continuing individual label reviews. This plus the regular 5-year reviews will result in promptly correcting or canceling all uses that are questionable within the framework of existing knowledge.

The Department agrees that in proceedings concerning the registration of pesticides for agricultural use, as described in recommendation B4., the burden of proof should fall on the registrant as it has always been interpreted to be. When actions regarding violations of the law are involved, the Department will continue to be obligated to prove its point.

Steps to encourage modification of present pesticide practices

This recommendation is in line with the Department's policy to encourage the use of minimum amount of the least toxic pesticide required for effective control and only when needed. This philosophy was reiterated in the Secretary's policy statement of December 23, 1964.

One of the objectives of the Department's research, regulatory, and educational programs continues to be the attainment of economic control of pests with minimal use of toxic chemicals. This varies with the species of pest and the host involved. In some cases less than maximum control results in the rejection of commodities for processing or direct consumption or in the need for repeated applications year after year.

It is assumed this recommendation is not directed toward programs for eradication of newly introduced pests, such as the highly destructive khapra beetle and the Mediterranean fruit fly.

Abating or controlling pollution at Federal installations

These related recommendations are in accord with Department policies, the Clean Air and Water Quality Acts of 1965, and the President's Executive Order 11258 of November 17, 1965, and are endorsed by the Department.

There are many types of Federal installations in all sections of the country suitable for testing and demonstrating the feasibility and economy of abating or controlling pollution. These include research laboratories and facilities at several locations in each State, newly constructed Job Corps Centers across the country and approximately 6,000 camp and picnic grounds in the national forests (serving more than 35 million people annually).

Although Department policies and objectives are in harmony with the actions recommended, satisfactory means for full achievement have not yet been attained. Continued and increased research effort is needed to improve the effectiveness of pollution control under present departmental programs and those of our cooperators. Examples of agricultural research needs include (1) development of improved methods and equipment for disposal of liquid and solid wastes, (2) development of satisfactory alternatives to burning for slash disposal and control of vegetative growth, (3) determination of damages, duration and permissible levels of air pollution from road dust resulting from use and construction, and (4) establishment of pollution criteria, indices, and means of measurement in soil, air, and water.

Effective measures for minimizing the production of dust and sediment

This recommendation is in accord with Executive Order 11258, issued by the President on November 17, 1965, with which all governmental agencies were instructed to comply.

Present practices in on-going programs of the Department and those of its cooperators are tuned specifically to stream protection, soil stabilization, and erosion control and to minimize production of dust and sediment. In addition, these agencies are developing new criteria and improved specifications to further minimize production of pollutants.

Department employees skilled in the field of soil, water, and plant and animal relationships are providing technical assistance in abating dust and sediment. Increased demands for services have hampered accomplishment in pace with need. Implementation of the recommendation calls for additional staffing to expand required technical assistance.

Also, new legislation is needed to preclude expenditure of Federal funds for construction projects or programs which do not meet provisions to minimize production of dust and sediment.

Estuaries and marshes

This recommendation is fully supported by the Department. Estuaries and marshes are a physical and natural part of drainage systems. Compacts and agreements in river basin developments should include them as part of the system. The Department actively participates in such compacts and agreements.

The economic effects of sediment on the wildlife and fish in streams and estuaries are not known. However, through interagency cooperation, the most feasible and desirable programs for the orderly conservation, development, and utilization of water and related land resources are taken into consideration in planned action. It is inherent in these actions that sediment yields will be materially reduced with resultant benefits to all downstream resources.

Department of the Interior undertakes a new program for gathering and making information available about effects of environmental changes on those lands and waters that are peculiarly its responsibility

The gathering and dissemination of information about the effects of environmental changes on lands and waters of the United States are a major part of Department of Agriculture programs, and are not limited by political, geographic, or administrative jurisdictions. Therefore, the undertaking of a new program to gather and disseminate such information on lands peculiarly the responsibility of the Department of the Interior would, to a large extent, overlap and unnecessarily duplicate programs presently assigned to and carried out by the Department of Agriculture. The Federal Government should not establish new programs that would overlap, duplicate, and complicate existing programs.

The Department agrees that there is need for further and continuing research into the effects of environmental changes throughout the United States. It has many programs in research on soil and water conservation and forestry that deal with the problems. Included are studies of the natural environmental factors affecting forests, range, wildlife habitat, outdoor recreation, water conservation, and watershed management. Such research embraces all aspects of the ecology of organisms that make up or affect the whole or any part of these resources. Study of related sociologic and economic factors is also a part of this research. While these programs should be extended and expanded, nothing new should be undertaken that will overlap or duplicate them.

Present research and information programs in the Department of Agriculture now provide considerable information relating to the quality of the environment on most types of land and water resources. This information has been and will continue to be made available to all interested agencies and individuals.

Ameliorating salinity problems

The USDA Salinity Laboratory at Riverside, California, is recognized as a world leader in research in this field. Numerous other Department studies, including those on increasing water use efficiency by crop plants, improving water retaining capacity of watersheds, decreasing evaporation, and other now underway and planned will aid materially in formulating improved agricultural policies, practices, and programs. Flood control and river basin surveys by Forest Service and Soil Conservation Service include estimates of watershed conditions and recommended land treatment to maintain water quality and increased yield.

The guiding principles embraced by the recommendations have been recognized by the Department and have been considered in planning future programs.

Establish the scientific basis upon which standards of environmental quality can be set

The Department concurs in this recommendation. The several interested Federal agencies should participate in a coordinated effort to secure the necessary scientific information. The degree to which an environment may be polluted cannot be ascertained until adequate standards of environmental quality are determined for man and other living organisms. Without information on which to base such standards there is a danger of elimination of certain practices of high economic value which may or may not result in serious pollution.

Though the Department's research effort in this field is substantial, in terms of the total need, it is inadequate. It will be necessary to expand the cooperative research effort between the Department and the States and the agencies outside of Agriculture.

Assess the pollution status of the Nation's soils

Soil is one of this Nation's most valuable resources. Guarding and conserving it is a major responsibility of the Department of Agriculture.

The Department is engaged in research and monitoring programs to evaluate or establish existing levels of some of the pollutants identified by the committee. Our programs do not include all pollutants and are not of the magnitude envisaged in the recommendations. However, they can be redesigned to encompass the objectives outlined. New legislation will be required to authorize the Department to administer control and abatement programs.

Studies are being conducted to distinguish lead native to soil from that added from other sources. In 1965, the U.S. Soils Laboratory initiated a study of adsorption and subsequent availability of lead added to soils. This study includes translocation to crops.

Limited funds have been made available to monitor the impact of pest control programs being conducted by the Department. In addition, special soil studies in high pesticide use areas are underway at 16 locations in 15 States; others in low and nonuse areas are underway at 32 locations in 25 States. Intensive studies including translocation to plants, movement in drainage water and impact on nontarget organisms are conducted in five of the high use areas located in Arizona, Arkansas, Mississippi, and North Dakota. Basic research programs are underway concerning the behavior and fate of pesticides in the soil, plants and water in Colorado, Maryland, Montana, North Dakota, and Washington.

The Department is seeking means to extend research and monitoring programs to include such things as lead, fertilizers, herbicides in its intensive study areas now underway and to increase the number of areas to be studied. The Department plans to use its existing organization to implement and correlate research and other activities associated with or directly related to pollution of soils, crops, including grass and timber, and agricultural waters.

Policy-level Interagency Committee about aid to local governments in connection with waste disposal

Representatives from appropriate USDA agencies will be designated when the proposed committee is established.

The Department of Agriculture sponsored the formation of an interdepartmental committee to consider problems associated with pest control programs and the use of pesticides. This committee became active June 22, 1961, after ratification by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Department of Defense; and the Department of the Interior. It is now known as the Federal Committee on Pest Control and has proven to be an important policy group in the field of pest control. Mutual understanding of departmental responsibilities and problems has developed as a result of an exchange of information and full discussion. The benefits to be derived from a similar committee dealing with pollution would be equally significant.

Establish and improve procedures for making available information needed to protect man, domestic animals, crops, and other living organisms from pollution

The Department appreciates the need to improve procedures for making readily available to all interested agencies and persons information needed to protect man, domestic animals, crops, and other living organisms from pollution. The Department maintains an active program in disseminating such information and is continuing to study, develop, and implement improved procedures for keeping rural America informed on pollution problems.

The National Agricultural Library is working with land-grant colleges and universities to establish a nationwide network for quicker and better informational service. The Department also works with and advises local health authorities in areas of rapid population expansion on proper methods of handling waste disposal. In addition, the Information and Monitoring Subcommittees, Federal Committee on Pest Control, which include representatives from the agencies named have as their missions improved procedures for disseminating information on some aspects of pollution.

National environmental quality survey

It is assumed that the National Environmental Quality Survey will not sponsor or become engaged in programs that will overlap this Department's responsibilities in monitoring, controlling, and abating pollution. It is also anticipated that this Department and others will participate in developing sampling designs and plans for analyses of data.

In this sense we endorse this recommendation and agree to submit pertinent data to the proposed National Environmental Quality Survey.

Baseline population densities to establish a basis for comparison with populations under pollution stress

Forestry and agriculture in the United States will be strengthened by additional knowledge of baseline population densities in polluted and unpolluted habitats. Accordingly, the Department supports this recommendation.

With teams of scientists, together with supporting facilities, the Department could design and establish a program capable of providing adequate plant and animal population inventories in both polluted and unpolluted environments.

Increasing human population pressures are gradually altering ecological communities. Current population densities in unpolluted areas must be tabulated as a base for determining total effects of common pollutants on man, animal, and plant populations. Undisturbed examples of nearly half the recognized forest cover types are preserved in the 15 million acres in natural, primitive and wilderness areas administered by the Department. These areas are ideally suited for baseline population density studies in unpolluted environments and for comparison with those in disturbed environments.

Container materials which will degrade rapidly when discarded

The Department supports this recommendation. The volume of throwaway containers used to package consumer goods has reached staggering proportions. As the population grows the need for degradable containers to replace plastic, metal, and glass will become more acute in cities and in national recreational areas. The Department's research programs include studies to develop degradable packaging materials with greater resistance to water, fire, mold growth, and with better dry and wet strength properties.

Industry has made progress in adopting degradable packaging materials for such items as motor oil, frozen juices and foods, milk, and many other materials. The Department will continue to encourage this trend.

Accelerate the development of improved equipment and methods for applying pesticides more selectively

The Department and its cooperators have made substantial progress in developing of equipment and procedures that have resulted in a marked reduction in the amount of pesticide required to control forest, cotton, range, and cereal insects (low-volume technique with malathion).

A major emphasis of the U.S. Department of Agriculture has been the reduction of the quantity of pesticides used to obtain adequate control of plant and animal pests.

The further development of improved equipment for selective application of pesticides will bolster our continuing effort to confine pesticides to target areas and reduce the amounts added to the environment. Accordingly, the U.S. Department of Agriculture supports this recommendation. To fully implement it will require additional resources.

New or better equipment and methods for the handling, treatment, and use of farm animal wastes

The Department concurs in these recommendations. Proper disposal of animal wastes is recognized as a critical problem in some areas and a growing one in others. For example, concentrations of farm animals and poultry may create wastes beyond the local capacity to absorb them. The research being carried on in the Department and the State Experiment Stations is limited in relation to the scope and breadth of the problem. These programs should be expanded through the acquisition of additional scientists and engineers, facilities and other resources.

Expand research on the effects of common pollutants on beneficial insects, crops, forests, domestic animals and birds and agricultural lands

The Department fully supports this recommendation. Additional studies are urgently needed to further define common pollutants and measure their impact.

The Department has the experience and technical competence to develop and give leadership to an expanded research program. Its on-going programs include studies on the nature and effects on the environment of such things as (1) agricultural chemicals, (2) sediment, (3) salts, (4) farm and forest wastes, and (5) some atmospheric gases.

Pest control and pesticides research

The above recommendations encompass a substantial portion of the research programs now underway in the Department of Agriculture. The major research programs on the control of insects, diseases, weeds, and nematodes deal with the development of bioenvironmental controls, metabolism and fate of the chemicals applied and the development of specific short-term pesticides tailored to the pest to be controlled.

While the measure of the research in terms of professional man-years is large, it is not large enough to cover the magnitude of the problems. In some areas research is concentrated on a relatively few pests due to the importance of the problem and the resources available. Where research is being carried on, it is nationwide either at Federal locations or under contract and grant provisions at educational institutions. Under the Cooperative State Research Service, programs are underway at most land grant institutions.

Research on species composition of plant and animal communities and the interactions among species and between organisms which make up plant and animal communities, including the influence on these communities of physical, chemical and biological factors

The Department supports this recommendation. In doing so, however, it recognizes that environmental interactions are extremely complex and fulfillment of the recommendation will be difficult and costly.

The Department is studying plant and animal communities and species composition in on-going programs. Investigations include such things as (1) effects of grazing management on plant communities and on the adaptation of introduced plant species, (2) relationship between pests and their natural enemies, (3) effects of air pollutants on plant species composition, (4) results of overuse by man on wilderness-type communities, (5) relationship between fertility levels of agricultural water and aquatic weeds, and (6) impact of pest control programs on nontarget organisms.

Implementation of the expanded research recommended would strengthen the Department's programs and lead to a better understanding of plant and animal ecology. It would also lead to the development of new knowledge of environmental changes caused by man and animals and means of coping with the problems.

Research on the mechanisms controlling sizes of pest populations

Department research already underway and planned for the future embodies the intent of this recommendation. To implement new programs additional skilled manpower, operating funds and facilities will be needed.

Research grants, training of students, and development and improvement of facilities

The Department supports these recommendations. It has authority for implementing or expanding all of them except G5 and G7. The Department will seek this authority, possibly as an amendment to Section 2 of Public Law 89–106.

As the Department becomes more actively involved in programs to minimize pollution of the Nation's soils and other segments of the environment, a corresponding research and training program will be initiated through grants to universities and other qualified institutions. Grants will be qualified to stress the importance of training.

Health, education, and welfare support universities' research centers for environmental studies

The Department of Agriculture concurs in this recommendation. A well-balanced program in these centers is mandatory. An interagency policy committee should be established to assist in the guidance of these centers of excellence to assure that all aspects of pollution are given their proper weight.

Training and retraining for Federal scientists and engineers

The Department has initiated a vigorous training program utilizing the authority provided by the Government Employees Training Act of 1958 (PL 85–507). Agricultural employees are encouraged to further their training and develop new skills pertinent to their position. Opportunities and training are possibly greater than envisaged in recommendations G10 and G11.

Departmental scientists are encouraged to attend and actively participate in scientific meetings. Funds are included as a part of the total budget for a project. Administrative judgment is exercised to maintain attendance at meetings at a level consistent with the needs of the Department and its agencies.

Refresher courses for extension personnel, commercial fieldmen, and others who assist farmers with their pest problems

The Department's effort directed toward the safe and efficient use of pesticides and other agricultural chemicals is substantial. We intend to maintain this effort which we feel meets the intent of this recommendation. Training programs for State Extension Pesticide Program Coordinators have been conducted and training programs for other technicians are being planned. Programs are underway to train commercial fieldmen and others as suggested in the recommendations. Available funds for this activity have been fully committed. Any expanded effort will require further financial support.

THE SECRETARY OF HOUSING
AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., October 10, 1966.

Hon. ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In your letter of August 12, you ask for a copy of the Department's comments on the report of the Environmental Pollution Panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee, entitled "Restoring the Quality of Our Environment."

Active Federal concern with pollution control and abatement is relatively new. As recently as the report of the "Second Hoover Commission," *Water Resources and Power*, only half a page was devoted to the matter. The Commission said, "The correction of pollution has been left largely to State and local control * * * The probem of pollution being often of interstate character is in need of definite national policies."

Since then, of course, pollution has been receiving increased Federal attention. The Congress has authorized a number of programs dealing with water, air, and solid waste pollution. The Executive Branch has also given the matter serious attention, and the report of the Environmental Pollution Panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee, "Restoring the Quality of our Environment," is one result.

Inasmuch as the problems created by pollution tend to fall particularly heavily on urban areas, whose problems are of special concern to this Department, we welcome this growing emphasis on the need for pollution control and abatement. We hope these studies will be thoroughly explored by all Federal agencies concerned, and this Department stands ready to cooperate fully in this exploration and in working toward implementation of the recommendations that pass muster.

Concerning specific recommendations that are particularly relevant to this Department, we have the following comments:

1. CHARGES UPON POLLUTERS

When a polluter discharges untreated (or inadequately treated) wastes into a public waterways or pollutes the air through exhaust or incineration discharges, or when he fails to dispose of solid wastes adequately, he is, in effect, transforming a certain portion of his costs of operation into social costs. These social costs then become a burden upon the entire community instead of the individual polluter. This occurs irrespective of whether the polluter is an industrial concern, a municipality, a farm or an individual household. To treat or get rid of such pollution, the community is forced to develop appropriate waste collection and treatment facilities. Recommendation B1 calls for careful study of tax-like systems in which all polluters would be subject to "effluent charges" in proportion to their contribution to pollution. In effect, the costs of pollution would be transferred back to those who cause pollution.

Confronted with such an "effluent charge" the polluter would have several alternatives. He can begin to pay the "effluent charge" that is imposed and adjust his production costs (and prices and charges) accordingly. He can contest the "effluent charge" (with the prospect of paying, upon loss of his suit, court costs, interest costs as well as the "effluent charge"). He can change his method of production or perhaps his product to minimize or perhaps eliminate his polluted discharges. He can install (or improve) his own treatment facilities. Finally, he can close down his plant and move elsewhere.

By the same token, Recommendation B10 proposes that a tax be devised to provide an incentive for eliminating the long-term storage or holding of junk automobiles. Such a tax, in effect, becomes an "effluent charge" upon those who own unsightly junk automobiles until such time as they are able to dispose of these junk vehicles.

In calling for those effluent charges, the Panel does not indicate whether they should be imposed by Federal, State or local governments. Nor does the Panel indicate what should be done with the proceeds derived from such effluent charges. If such charges are imposed and collected at the local government level, they could have an important bearing upon the municipal finance outlook of such governments. The report recognizes that the task of pollution control cannot be handled without more scientific and economic knowledge and more trained technicians. These factors also play a part in the difficulty of measuring the social cost of pollution or imposing an appropriate fee. This should be recognized explicitly in the report.

2. MINIMIZATION OF POLLUTION

A number of the Panel's recommendations call for actions by Federal agencies to help bring about minimization of pollution. Thus, Recommendation B13 proposes that Federal agencies participating in city and regional planning and development insist that minimization of pollution be a required goal.

Recommendation B14 proposes that all agencies responsible for the administration of financial assistance programs for construction projects should be required to issue appropriate regulations to assure that all such facilities would be planned and constructed to minimize the contribution of waste disposal to all forms of pollution. Similarly, Recommendation B15 would specifically require that such Federal agencies neither expend funds nor grant financial aid to any construction project which does not include effective measures for minimizing the production of dust and sediment. Recommendation B28 calls for the encouragement of codes governing noise insulation in apartment buildings.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development fully concurs with the objectives of these four recommendations and will endeavor to develop appropriate and practical administrative regulations to accomplish these recommendations. Enclosed is a copy of a policy statement which has already been developed and issued to our operating program officials regarding the separation of sanitary and storm sewers as a means of helping to minimize pollution.

3. FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR SOLID WASTES

Recommendation B12 calls for the Department of Housing and Urban Development to direct a substantial proportion of support for community facilities to assist cities to use present technology to clean up solid wastes practices, such as open dump burning and unsanitary land fill. This Department is already carrying out a part of this recommendation under the Public Works Planning Program, authorized by Section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended. Interest-free advances are made to municipalities or other local public bodies to finance the specific plans and specifications for various public works, including solid waste disposal facilities. Through June 30, 1965, a total of 42 public works planning advances, involving $1.3 million, were made to finance the planning of incinerators and other solid waste disposal facilities, having an estimated project cost of $68.9 million.

Grants for solid waste disposal facilities are deserving of Federal support, and for some types of wastes such facilities can be viewed as a more efficient means of disposal than sewage collection and treatment. To engage in a significant effort will require a much larger appropriation of funds than now provided under Section 702 of the Housing Act of 1965.

4. REGIONAL COMPACTS AND AUTHORITIES

Recommendation B19 calls for the Federal Government, working in cooperation with the States, to encourage the formation of unified regional authorities for the planning and carrying out of the optimum development of waters and marshes that are threatened by destructive encroachment or severe pollution.

Recommendation B20 calls for the Federal Government, working in cooperation with the States, to encourage the formation of compacts and unified regional authorities to deal with air pollution within natural air sheds.

We fully concur with the objectives of these two recommendations which recognize that the incidence of water or air pollution cannot be limited by the political boundaries of a particular city or even of a State. Instead, they are largely spread over interstate regions, and, therefore, the only practical way of dealing with such interstate pollution is to establish interstate public approaches. In addition to the possibility of regional authorities that could be formed through interstate compacts, consideration needs to be given to the question of whether such public authorities should be instrumentalities of State governments or instrumentalities of the Federal Government. A careful study needs to be made regarding the relative advantages of both routes, before the fundamental decision is made.

5. TRAINING AND FELLOWSHIPS

Recommendations G5, G7 and G9 call for training and fellowship programs in various fields to deal with pollution problems. The recommendations refer to the Departments of Health, Education and Welfare, Agriculture, and Interior regarding Federal assistance programs for such purposes. Inadvertently omitted from these three recommendations is any reference to the training and fellowship programs under the jurisdiction of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964 established a new system of Federal-State training programs designed to develop the skills needed for economic and efficient community development and to provide new and improved methods of dealing with community development problems. Section 802 of the legislation authorizes the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants to States to develop programs to provide training to technical and professional people who are, or are training to be, employed by a public body having community development responsibilities, and to support State and local research in connection with all community development problems. Section 810 of the 1964 legislation authorizes the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide fellowships in institutions of higher learning for the graduate training of professional city planning and urban housing technicians and specialists.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. WEAVER.

POLICY STATEMENT PREVENTION, CONTROL AND ABATEMENT OF WATER POLLUTION

Executive Order No. 11258, dated November 17, 1965, provides, in part, that the heads of the departments, agencies, and establishments of the Executive Branch of the Government shall provide leadership in the nationwide effort to improve water quality through prevention, control, and abatement of water pollution from Federal Government activities in the United States. Section 7(b) of said Executive Order prescribes "The heads of departments, agencies, and establishments are encouraged to prescribe regulations covering loan, grant, or contract practices designed to reduce water pollution."

Accordingly, the Department of Housing and Urban Development establishes the following policy to help reduce water pollution:

1. It has been determined that combination sanitary and storm sewer systems that result in periodic overflows of the systems' treatment facilities and thereby lead to discharges of untreated wastes into local rivers, lakes, streams and other waterways are a significant factor contributing to the growing pollution of the nation's waterways.

2. It has been further determined that Federal financial assistance for (a) water and sewer facilities, (b) urban renewal areas requiring, in part, expansion or modernization of water and sewer lines serving such areas, or (c) land development. involving, in part, the construction of water and sewer lines to serve the land development project, should not contribute to further pollution of local waterways such as would result if combination sanitary and storm sewers were to be constructed, expanded or modernized.

3. Accordingly, no grant for sewer facilities under Section 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 and no mortgage insurance loan for land development pursuant to Section 201 of said Act, and no loan for sewer facilities under Title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955, shall be approved, unless there is a finding that the sewer facilities involved or to serve the area will not contribute to further pollution of the local waterways. Combination sanitary and storm sewers may be approved only if there is a determination that (a) adequate treatment facilities will be available for the foreseeable future to handle the combined discharges of the sanitary and storm sewers or (b) adequate methods such as holding tanks, chlorine contact tanks, lagoons, ponds and lakes, each with appropriate treatment, will be available in the foreseeable future to accommodate periodic overflow situations, or (c) under proper sanitary supervision (by state agencies duly constituted to control existing community combined sewer systems) during periods of heavy precipitation or excessive runoff, combined sewage may be discharged directly into a stream, pond, or other water course in such cases where the increased flow provides acceptable minimal pollution effects on the discharge areas.

4. The foregoing requirements shall also apply to any sewer line that has been, or is to be, installed without HUD financial assistance to serve an urban renewal area where the local public agency requests that the local expenditure for such installation be included as part or all of the local government share of the net project cost of an urban renewal project.

THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., August 29, 1966.

Hon. ABRAHAM RIBICOFF,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your request to the Secretary of Commerce for the comments of this Department on the report of the Environmental Pollution Panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee entitled, "Restoring the Quality of our Environment," and to Mr. Southwick's interim reply of August 16, 1966.

The report has been carefully reviewed in the Department of Commerce. The consensus is that it is an excellent report that presents in a full and effective manner the seriousness of the pollution problem facing our Nation with its expanding population, highlights adequately the many specific problems needing immediate and long-term attention, and makes sensible suggestions as to how the program can be implemented.

Pollution problems have for many years been important in the technical programs of this Department. The newly created Environmental Science Services Administration has been the most heavily involved with pollution, a natural consequence of its responsibility to describe, understand, and predict the state of the atmosphere. In this respect, we wish to state that we concur with the Panel's suggestion that the Department of Commerce is the logical agency in which to set up the National Environmental Quality Survey. Such a survey, it seems to us, is essential to the success of the environmental pollution program and it fits readily within the activities of our existing widespread network of observatories. The cooperation of other agencies, of course, will be vital to the success of the program.

In Fy–1966 the Department of Commerce already had ongoing programs relating to some PSAC Panel's recommendations, e.g., a CO_2 program (Recommendation D2) and a program to monitor stratospheric temperatures (Recommendation D3).

In Fy–1967 the Department plans to expand these and other activities mentioned in the Panel's report. This includes:

1. Augmentation of the CO_2 monitoring and evaluation program through the development of necessary sampling techniques and design of the required global network leading to an operational program in Fy–1968.

2. Augmentation of mathematical modeling to evaluate the global climate and weather effects.

3. Preparation of Air Pollution Advisories (the high pollution potential forecast program) will be supported on a test basis by the Weather Bureau at the National Meteorological Center in Fy–1967, leading to transfer of the operational program support and responsibility from the Public Health Service to ESSA in Fy–1968.

For Fy–1968, as the result of the recommendation of a Task Force established within the Environmental Science Services Administration, we are planning a comprehensive and integrated program which we believe will be further responsive to many of the Panel's recommendations. This program is being coordinated with other interested agencies.

Additionally, broad based programs of basic documentation of the global atmospheric circulation, the development of models of estuarine flows, and, of the fundamental interactions between air and oceans will be required to fully understand our environment and its response to pollution.

Sincerely yours,

J. HERBERT HOLLOMON.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, D.C., September 30, 1966.

Hon. ABRAHAM RIBICOFF,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization, U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR RIBICOFF: This is in response to your letter asking for a copy of my comments on the report of the Environmental Pollution Panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee, entitled "Restoring the Quality of Our Environment."

My office was requested to prepare comments on a group of recommendations in this report relevant to Civil Works activities. A copy of these comments, as furnished to the Department of Defense, is inclosed.

As indicated in these comments, the Corps of Engineers is implementing the applicable recommendations in this report relating to its Civil Work responsibilities. These responsibilities, with regard to protecting and upgrading the quality of environment, may be viewed as consisting of two approaches. First, we plan, design, construct, and operate water resource developments in such a way as to minimize or mitigate any resultant adverse environmental and ecological effects. Second, and more positively, in our formulation and evaluation of plans for comprehensive development of river basins or regional water and related land resources, we carefully assess the possibilities for enhancing water quality, fish and wildlife, recreational, and associated environmental values; and in our execution and operation of individual projects, we specifically provide for these purposes, to the extent feasible and economically justifiable.

In summary, under existing legislative authorization and administrative policy, the Corps of Engineers supports a policy of restoring and improving the quality of our environment.

I trust this information will serve your purpose. If I can be of any further assistance to you on this or related matters, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,
William F. Cassidy,
Lieutenant General, U.S. Army,
Chief of Engineers.

Comments Submitted to the Department of Defense on the Report of the Environmental Pollution Panel, President's Science Advisory Committee, on "Restoring the Quality of Our Environment," With Specific Reference to Recommendations Relevant to Civil Works Activities of the Corps of Engineers

Recommendation B15: "We recommend that Federal agencies neither expend funds on or grant financial aid to any construction project or program which does not include effective measures for minimizing the production of dust and sediment."

Comment: The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers now includes in its contract specifications certain dust control requirements, both direct and incidental to moisture control for embankments. While complete control of dust and sediment from construction operations is not feasible, the Army Corps of Engineers will make every appropriate effort to minimize the production of dust and sediment in connection with its Civil Works project activities.

Recommendation B17: "We recommend that funds be made available to acquire title, either directly or through the states, to important coastal marshes, lagoons and estuaries which could then serve incidentally, as national and state parks, national monuments, wildlife refuges and public recreational areas."

Comment: In planning and accomplishing Civil Works functions close coordination is maintained with the Federal and State Fish and Wildlife agencies, Public Health Officials, and Recreational agencies to protect and enhance the recreation, fish and wildlife resources, as well as for pollution control, in all water resource developments, including projects affecting coastal marshes, lagoons and estuaries. Recommendations for project authorization may include acquisition of lands and waters for recreation, and fish and wildlife which in turn is funded in accordance with the President's budget requirements. Funding of the acquisition may require cost sharing by local interests depending on their interest in the project.

Recommendation B18: "We recommend that interstate and Federal-state river basin development compacts and agreements cover related estuaries and marshes."

Comment: The estuaries and the marshes at the mouths of rivers are integral, geographical, ecological, and economic parts of river basins. Optimum control of pollution of fluvial waters and development thereof require full consideration of the effects of pollution and pollution abatement on related estuaries and marsh resources. Federal, State and joint development studies, agreements, and compacts, should therefore adequately consider such problems both on the ocean shores and on the shores of the Great Lakes.

Recommendation B19: "We recommend that the Federal Government, working in cooperation with the states, encourage formation of unified authorities for planning and carrying out the optimum development of waters and marshes that are threatened by destructive encroachment or severe pollution."

Comments: Federal studies and development can best proceed when non-Federal interests and planning are adequately coordinated among themselves. A responsible unified authority, representing the local governments on the shores of a bay or estuary, might well have recognized earlier such emerging problems as the pollution of Lake Erie. Where widespread interstate or international interests are also involved, participation of the Federal Government would seem a necessity.

Recommendation B22: "We recommend that Federal agencies concerned with water quality should make detailed studies of the sources of salt coming into our western rivers and should seek ways of isolating these sources from the rivers wherever possible."

Comment: In response to a resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate adopted 16 December 1959, the Chief of Engineers in cooperation with the Public Health Service is preparing a study on the development of a comprehensive program to control natural and man-made salt pollution in streams of the Arkansas and Red River Basins.

Such programs, if found to be feasible would, in effect, provide sources of new water in areas seriously short of water. Experience gained in the study of salt pollution in the Arkansas and Red River Basins will be of value elsewhere.

Recommendation B23: "We recommend that water quality as well as water quantity be taken into account in the planning and design of river basin developments in the arid and semi-arid regions of the United States."

Comment: Section 2 of Public Law 87–88 authorizes the Corps of Engineers to consider water quality control needs that may be served by any reservoir project.

Recommendation B25: "We recommend that issuance by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers of permits for dredging, and decisions concerning the Corps' own operations, be conditioned on the anticipated effects on all resources, not on effects on navigation alone."

Comment: Action by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers on applications for permits for dredging and fills by the Department conforms to the River and Harbor Act of 3 March 1899, Section 10 (33 U.S.C.A. 403). The Department's primary responsibility is to insure that there will be no unreasonable obstruction to the navigable capacity of the waterway concerned although careful consideration is also given to the effect of proposed work on our natural resources and other aspects of the general public interest.

This consideration is exercised through public notices and hearings at which all interested parties and agencies may express their views. In order to obviate divergent views of different State agencies, we seek a single coordinated State view from an agency designated by the Governor or from the Governor himself. The Army Corps of Engineers in carrying out its own dredging program also coordinates with other agencies concerned and gives full consideration to their views on proposed plans of operation.

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D.C., September 9, 1966.
Hon. Abraham Ribicoff,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Ribicoff: Your August 12 letter asked for our comments on "Restoring the Quality of Our Environment." Nearly three-fourths of the 102 recommendations are pertinent to this Department, and are commented on in this response. Most of the other recommendations are of interest to us, but they are directed to other agencies or can be carried out best by other agencies.

The title of the report "Restoring the Quality of Our Environment" has many implications. "Restoring" implies that there has been deterioration. "Quality" suggests an earlier preoccupation with quantity. "Environment" obviously is intended to be all inclusive—living and non-living; natural and man-made. Taken together the words in the title are a call to action.

Hardly an agency of the Department is not touched in some way by the recommendations in the report. The philosophy of the report is precisely in keeping with the Department's outlook, as is evident from our annual report "Quest for Quality," our report "The Race for Inner Space," and my book "The Quiet Crisis." We consider of special importance the principles laid down in the report. Clear acceptance by the public of a "right" to quality of our surroundings; understanding that pollution threatens not only our health but more immediately the resources we want and need; recognition that pollution can be managed and that deterioration of our surroundings is not inevitable; acknowledgement that such quality costs money (though perhaps less money than deterioration); and willingness to bear the necessary costs, will go far toward "Restoring the Quality of Our Environment."

To the extent that publication of the report and ensuing discussion engenders public awareness, the Department's programs will be benefited and be able to advance more rapidly. There is much we can do to minimize pollution with knowledge available today. To insure that we take all possible steps to minimize pollution arising on lands administered by Interior or arising from Interior's own or associated activities, I am:

1. Directing each Office and Bureau to examine its programs and to institute actions that will reduce pollution;

2. Directing each unit of the Department to exert its influence towards improved environmental quality in each interagency group in which it participates;

3. Directing that public awareness of the problems of pollution and the values of resources damaged by pollution be stressed in all public information programs using all possible means;

4. Issuing policy directives on a Department-wide basis as appropriate, similar to the pesticide policy I issued in August of 1964; (copy attached).

To hasten the time when we can cope even more effectively with pollution abatement and control, we plan to increase research emphasis within our existing programs on:

1. Research that will provide a basis for future action leading to appropriate levels of pollution abatement and control. Recognizing that pollution is an inevitable consequence of an advanced society, and that we will never eliminate all pollution, we must determine the relations between levels of pollution and consequences of pollution so that we can establish standards of environmental quality that will provide the intended balance between protection of man and his resources and the economic burden upon those whose easiest course is to pollute.

Several Bureaus are increasing their research to provide needed information on tolerance levels for pollutants, on transport and behavior of pollutants, and on measurements of pollutants.

2. Research that will provide new possibilities for preventing and controlling pollution;

3. Research that will permit us to buy the most pollution control per dollar spent in future action programs. Such research in this Department will be directed toward elimination of sulphur compounds as a source of air pollution and toward improved methods of removing nutrients from sewage after conventional treatment. To assist in providing baseline measurements and systems for acquiring such measurements, so that we can measure the effectiveness of the control and abatement procedures we impose in the future we will, (a) contribute to the environmental measurements required for the National Environmental Quality Survey; (b) make available the expertise of geochemists of the Geological Survey in conduct of the recommended surveillance of lead and survey of nickel; and (c) initiate studies that will provide quantitative baseline population densities of natural populations of plants and animals to establish a basis for comparison with populations under pollution stress.

4. Contribute substantially to the training of needed manpower in those fields of pollution control that are our particular responsibility. Extensive training programs for both professional and subprofessional personnel have long been conducted at the Cincinnati facility of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration. In addition financial assistance is given to individuals and institutions for training of professional manpower in fields related to water pollution. We intend to continue and expand these programs.

The Department now has adequate authority to carry out most of the recommendations in the report which concern us. The recommendations which will need legislation to carry them out and our comments on them are:

"B. 10. We recommend that a tax be devised to provide an incentive for eliminating the long-term storage or holding of junk automobiles."

We agree in general with this recommendation. We have been considering this problem for some time. We are not, however, ready to recommend a specific legislative proposal.

The present nationwide study of the factors that influence the movement of automotive scrap is disclosing new information that should be carefully considered when new legislation designed to expedite the removal or minimize the accumulations of junk automobiles is considered. The analysis and report of findings disclosed by the study should be available soon.

Alternative forms of taxes and fees designed to accelerate the disposal of automotive junk deserve serious but cautious consideration in view of the economic aspects of present and potential markets for this material. The Department of the Interior is presently examining the merit of a user fee system that would attach to titles and encourage the rapid disposal of inoperable vehicles within foreseeable marketing patterns.

"B. 17. We recommend that funds be made available to acquire title either directly or through the States, to important coastal marshes, lagoons and estuaries which could then serve incidentally, as national and state parks, national monuments, wildlife refuges and public recreational areas."

The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, 1965, will enable this Department to consider State proposals for the acquisition of these areas and make funds available for this purpose. Also, to the extent permitted by existing law, we will acquire these areas as part of our existing program.

"G. 3. We recommend that the Departments of Agriculture and Interior be authorized to award, on a competitive basis, extramural contracts and grants to universities and other qualified institutions for research and training in scientific and engineering fields supporting their missions."

The present authority of the Department for entering into extramural contracts for research and for making grants for research and to train competent graduate scientists is fragmented. The Senate has passed and the House is now considering a bill to extend our contract authority.

"G. 4. We recommend that the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, of Agriculture, and of the Interior be authorized to provide grants covering up to 100% of costs to universities, or other non-profit institutions for the construction, remodeling and equipping of facilities needed for projects, institutes, or centers to be devoted to research and research training in environmental health, environmental science and environmental engineering."

This Department now has some authority to make matching grants for supplies, instruments and things necessary to a specific research project. Legislation would, however, be necessary to pay up to 100 percent of the cost of buildings, etc., for research. We believe that the need for such legislation ought to be carefully considered in light of other Federal educational programs providing grants to universities. We will consider this item carefully.

"B. 21. We recommend that the Department of the Interior undertake a new program, which is likely to require the establishment of an appropriate organization, for gathering and making information available about effects of environmental changes on those lands and waters that are peculiarly its responsibility."

The Science Adviser of this Department has completed a study on the needs in the area of ecological research and surveys. The study pointed out many of the same needs which we believe underlie this recommendation. We are awaiting the Bureau of the Budget—Office of Science and Technology report on "the best way in which the Federal Government may direct efforts toward advancing our scientific understanding of natural plant and animal communities and their interaction with man and his activities" before submitting proposed legislation. In the meantime we have appointed an Ecological Research Coordinator in the Science Adviser's Office to strengthen and coordinate our work in this area.

For the most part recommendations in the report have far-reaching significance and they will be effective only if they are taken into account in the planning, research and operations of this and other Departments during the months and years ahead. As a first action to implement recommendations appropriate to Interior, I am releasing a policy directive to all Bureaus and Offices calling the report to their attention and directing that wherever possible pertinent recommendations are to be implemented in ongoing operations. The recommendations are to serve as guides for future planning, budgeting and program execution by each entity of the Department.

Sincerely yours,

Stewart L. Udall,
Secretary of the Interior.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, it is a great honor to pay tribute today to Senator A. Willis Robertson, a Virginia gentleman who, as other great Virginians throughout our history, has served his State and his Nation so well.

Senator Robertson will long be remembered in the Halls, the committee rooms, and the Chambers of the U.S. Congress as a man of great talent, unusual diligence, and unquestioned integrity.

We owe him much for the creative and starch role he has played in the financial affairs of the country for so many years. As chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, particularly, he has done an outstanding job and complied an impressive record in what is probably one of the most difficult and demanding positions in Government. In this and in all his other work, he has earned the respect, admiration, and affection of millions of Americans.

Senator Robertson will be sorely missed in this body, but we extend to him every good wish for happiness as he concludes his long and highly distinguished public career.

TRIBUTE TO SENATORS DONALD RUSSELL AND MILWARD SIMPSON

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I would like to pay tribute to Senator Donald Russell and Senator Milward Simpson, both of whom will be leaving us at the end of this session. Their careers are marked with honor and distinction and they will be missed by their colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Senator Russell, a lawyer, served as Deputy Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion in 1945. In the same year he was appointed Assistant Secretary of State for Administration where he served with distinction until 1947. Until appointed to the Senate in 1965, he served 5 years as president of the University of South Carolina and 4 years as Governor of that State. Senator Russell now goes on to a career as a judge on the U.S. district court.

I know all his colleagues wish him well with the knowledge that he will assume serious responsibilities on the bench with that same ability, honor, and integrity that he has shown in all his earlier work.

Senator Simpson, also a lawyer, served for 15 years as a member and president of the University of Wyoming Board of Trust. He served as Governor of Wyoming for 4 years, from 1955 to 1959, and is remembered as one of the most able State administrators in recent history.

Since his election to this body in 1962 Senator Simpson has won the respect and friendship of Members of both parties. It has been my pleasure to work with him on several occasions in an effort to help the captive nations of Eastern Europe which still bear the yoke of Communist tyranny. I know that I and all my colleagues have always found him dedicated and extremely capable in his Senate work.

Although Senator Simpson has expressed his desire to retire, I hope he will visit us often and give us the benefit of his wisdom and experience.

To both these men I pay tribute and say their respective States and the entire country have benefited greatly from their dedicated service.

THE HOUGH RIOTS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the special grand jury report relating to Hough riots, which occurred earlier this year.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECIAL GRAND JURY REPORT RELATING TO HOUGH RIOTS

Your Honor, Judge Thomas J. Parrino, Presiding Judge, Criminal Branch, Common Pleas Court of Cuyahoga County:

As a preface to the attached report of the County Grand Jury convened by you in special session for dealing with the recent Hough Area riots, this Jury would like to make some general observation to you.

These are reinforced by approximately six months of reviewing the status of law and order among the people of this County.

We assume that the people of Cuyahoga County are in the main typical of people of the whole nation during this latter half of the turbulent twentieth century.

It is our firm belief that what America needs more urgently than anything else is a renewal of good citizenship by all of us.

Of equal concern by this Jury are the steady erosion of ideals and principles of God and Country and their persistent replacement by the deification of material idols and material "principals." We profoundly believe that a rigid adherence by everyone to the established law and order of this country should instantly replace the guerilla warfare practiced in the streets and neighborhoods.

Whatever we in this country set out to achieve should be accomplished within the framework of the laws fashioned for the benefit and protection of every citizen and not by any means we think can be employed or the time we fix for ourselves.

We believe there should be a restoration of the qualities of good faith, of honesty, and a willingness to hear out the other person or the other side without resort to violence and disorder; whether, around a bargaining table with capital and labor, or grievances among people of different background or ethnic origin.

We believe in an elevation of moral and ethical standards and conduct, including those in high places in government and in business and in the professions—a general going over of our entire pattern of national life and values.

What this country and this community need, in the opinion of this Jury of laymen, themselves citizens and parents and in business and professions, is not so much a blood bath but a good cleansing spiritual bath.

I

This Jury was called into special session and directed by Presiding Judge Thomas J. Parrino of Common Pleas Criminal Court to inquire specifically into what now has become known as the "Hough Area situation."

Judge Parrino directive was in two parts:

One: To establish the immediate cause of the fire bombing, shooting, pillaging, general lawlessness and disorder.

The Judge requested that this Jury learn whether the outbreak of disorder in this two mile square area, housing 60,000 negro people, was organized, and, if so, by whom.

Two: To establish as nearly as possible the basic circumstance under which 60,000 human beings were living in this relatively restricted area and for whom the life, limb and property of all were placed in jeopardy by the disorders.

The Jury has made this appraisal within the time limits and facilities available and herein reports its general findings.

No. 1

This Jury finds that the outbreak of lawlessness and disorder was both organized, precipitated, and exploited by a relatively small group of trained and disciplined professionals at this business.

They were aided and abetted, wittingly or otherwise, by misguided people of all ages and colors, many of whom are avowed believers in violence and extremism, and some of whom also are either members of or officers in the Communist party.

The majority of people in the Hough Area had no part in either the lawlessness or disorders.

They have been hindered rather than helped by this major tragedy.

This Jury considers it regrettable and unfortunate for the community's sake that the legal statutes of Ohio and Cuyahoga County are either so outmoded or inadequate in their scope that these "responsible irresponsibles" cannot at this time be reached by specific indictments for their infamous activities.

By persistent additional investigative effort they may be reached later on in this fashion.

(This Jury later in this report urges new and more adequate laws in this respect.)

It is likewise observed by this Jury that it did not have the necessary special investigative resources which could be and should be focused exclusively in tracking down the required immediate and far reaching evidence for conclusive legal action against specific individuals.

However, in making this observation, the Jury wishes especially and particularly to commend those established arms of law enforcement which have worked so resourcefully, effectively and energetically in this aggravated situation.

By this the Jury means, to be precise and specific, the Cleveland Police Department in all of its branches, from the Chief to the newest Rookie, and to Ohio National Guard when invoked by the Governor in this serious community emergency.

The Jury nevertheless must emphasize that with the limitations imposed by the necessity of at all times guarding the community, the established arms of law enforcement are not equipped either with the resources or the investigative facilities to make such a total all out and extended inquiry under this situation as is obviously called for.

This Jury, in consideration of the basic and wide public interest, and exercising the latitude granted it under the laws which empower the creation of such a body as ours, nonetheless makes reference to individuals and organizations that in varying degrees were contributors to the Hough Area lawlessness and disorder.

It further notes the presence of many of these same individuals and organizations in another instance of lawlessness and disorder, that on Superior Avenue, which bore many of the striking similarities to the Hough Area disorders.

It notes the further significant fact that the Superior Avenue episode preceded the Hough Avenue disorders by less than a month.

Some of the same people were observed in both places on several nights of the disorders.

This Jury further believes that, even though what already happened is both regrettable and tragic in every conceivable human aspect, there is a grave potentiality for repetition of these disorders, or others like them, occurring elsewhere in this community.

Different techniques might be employed; but the results would be equally disastrous or even more so.

Therefore, this Jury believes its judgment should be made an important part of the formal record of what has happened and of whatever may happen in the rather unpredictable future towards which we all, as citizens of this community, are mutually moving wherever we may live or whatever may be our place in life.

Finally, before making specific reference to adult leaders in these crises areas, and the events leading up to them, the Jury respectfully calls attention to the effective uses made of impressionable emotionally immature and susceptible young minds by those who for one reason or another have set out to accomplish their designs and objectives in Europe, Asia, South America and elsewhere.

It is no casual happenstance or coincidence that those throwing fire bombs, or bricks, or bottles or pillaging or generally engaged in disorder and lawlessness were in the main young people obviously assigned, trained and disciplined in the roles they were to play in the pattern of these dual outbreaks separated by less than one month.

Nor, by the same token, is it happenstance, or even just singular coincidence:

1. That the overall pattern for firebombing and destruction to both the Superior and Hough Areas was so highly selective;
2. That the targets were plainly agreed upon;
3. That certain places were identified to be hit, and that certain other places were similarly spared.

On both of these occasions, the Superior and Hough disorders, the presence of teenagers previously referred to was observed by the police, by plainclothes officers and undercover agents who had been assigned for long periods to observe these youths.

With this background firmly established by the Jury's inquiry, and with the notable help of County Prosecutor John T. Corrigan and his staff, particularly Asst. County Prosecutor John T. Patton, this Jury herewith makes reference to some of the principal and recurring personalities in the chain of events which preceded both the Superior and Hough situations:

The JFK House

The JFK House, meaning Jamo Freedom Kenyata House, is located at 8801 Superior Avenue. The leaders are:

Lewis G. Robinson, and Beth Robinson, his wife, living at 1242 E. 89th Street; Harlell Jones, 9716 Hough Avenue, Albert D. Ware-Bey, 11611 Castlewood Avenue, and Philip Morris, 7806 Radell Avenue.

Lewis Robinson has been affiliated with the Freedom Fighters of Ohio, the Medgar Evers Rifle Club (which he helped to found), The JFK House, of which he is the ultimate head, The Deacons for Defense, and the Revolutionary Action Movement.

All of these Clubs, to which Lewis Robinson belongs are black nationalist clubs.

Testimony before this Jury discredited Lewis Robinson as a leader concerned with generally altruistic interests in youth but rather points to him as inciting these youths to focus their hatreds and as indoctrinating them with his own vigorous philosophy of violence.

He exerted a profound influence over the JFK youth and he still does.

Harlell Jones is affiliated with JFK House, the Medgar Evers Rifle Club, the Revolutionary Action Movement; he is vice-president of the Deacons for Defense in spite of his public disavowals, and had frequently either presided over or sponsored meetings for black nationalists, and espouses the ultimate revolutionary purpose for adjusting differences or obtaining desired ends.

Along with Lewis G. Robinson, Harlell Jones caused 2,000 pieces of literature to be printed and circulated, citing alleged instances of "police brutality", and on the eve of the Hough riots, circulated the greatest number of these to youths of non-voting age under the plausible guide of urging the defeat of a levy at the polls.

Special movies of an undisclosed and voluntary interview shown to the Jury presented Harlell Jones as an outright exponent of violence, a black power apostle with a bitter hatred for all whites, a co-founder of the Rifle Club, and in command of at least one Rifle Club.

Albert D. Ware-Bey, belonged to the same Clubs as Harlell Jones. He declined to testify before the Jury. Police agencies presented evidence that Ware, Robinson and Jones all purchased quantities of rifles, and all belonged to the Rifle Clubs here and in other cities.

Ware-Bey expressed no allegiance to this country, professed himself not to be bound by its laws, and in the opinion of the Jury, by both testimony and his own conduct, was not one who could have other than destructive influence upon youths either at the JFK House or elsewhere.

There was evidence placed before the Jury that Rifle Clubs were formed, that ammunition was purchased, and that a range was established and used, that speeches were made at JFK House advocating the need for Rifle Clubs, and that instructions were given in the use of Molotov cocktails, and how and when to throw them to obtain maximum effect.

Further, irrefutable evidence was shown to the effect that Robinson pledged reciprocal support to and with the Communist Party of Ohio.

In addition, Robinson attended many meetings at which imported Communist speakers talked and was arrested at one of these.

It was established before the Jury that the leaders of the W. E. B. DuBois Club and the Communist Youth Party, with interchangeable officers and virtually identical concepts, arrived in Cleveland only a few days before the Hough Area disorders.

They took up residence at 1844 East 81st Street, only a short distance from the Central point of origin of the Hough Area troubles.

These men, who came from Chicago, New York and Brooklyn, were Mike Bayer, otherwise known as Mike Davidow, Daniel Mack, Ronald Lucas, and Steve Shreefter.

They were seen constantly together. They made swift contact with the JFK House leadership, and with Phil Bart, of Middlehurst Road, Cleveland Heights, Ohio, and his wife, Connie, who, the evidence showed, are the leaders of the Communist party throughout the Ohio Valley District including Cleveland.

With specific regard to the WEB DuBois Club, the evidence further showed that Mike Bayer, Daniel Mack, Ron Lucas and Steve Shreefter previously living and residing a large part of their time outside of Cleveland, are currently making plans to move their efforts from the Hough Area over to the West Side: That they are not employed, are now so far as the Jury knows without any visible means of support but nevertheless are able to carry on their advocacy and to maintain themselves with clothing, food and shelter from some undetermined source. Finally, evidence, was presented that UJAMA is an organization dedicated to black power and has begun its effort to establish itself in the Cleveland area. Their philosophy is that black people should be governed by themselves in every respect and that anything pertaining to the rights of Negroes must be cleared through the central organization of UJAMA which has flourished in New York, and has spread into other places, and is embraced locally by Lewis Robinson and his Lieutenants at JFK House. In attendance at one specific meeting at which plans for UJAMA in Cleveland were discussed were Robinson, Jones and Ware-Bey. Also in attendance at this meeting was Cornelius Freeman from Cleveland and Oserjiman Adefumi, and also known as Serge King, and Gizengaga Latunji, representing New York UJAMA.

It is this Jury's opinion that the investigative authorities have progressed sufficiently to justify the expectation they will ultimately, if either urged or permitted to follow beyond what they have thus far gathered be able to put together all of the pieces to this pattern of lawlessness and disorder.

Because of this Jury's strong judgment in this regard it earnestly urges its successors to pursue the Superior and Hough disorders with the utmost vigor and determination.

Nothing less that this should be permitted in the public interest.

In this section of its report to Judge Thomas J. Parrino the Jury wishes to reiterate the fact that the overall majority of the people living in the Hough area, distressed, frustrated, beset with problems unimaginable to those who do not endure them, had nothing whatever to do with these disorders and destructions, and the Jury, on the contrary, expresses its wholesome admiration for their good citizenship and restraint in these tense and emotional times.

In the course of its investigation, the Grand Jury has learned that police and firemen were targets for snipers and individuals throwing rocks and bricks.

Further, fire equipment was damaged, particularly hoses, which were cut or attempted to be cut so as to render them useless in the protection of persons and property.

These acts were a direct affront to lawful authority and of necessity would lead to justifiable armed self-protection, unfortunately resulting in occasional injury and death to the innocent.

These senseless acts cannot be tolerated and the perpetrators should be subjected to severe penalties.

The police and firemen on the other hand should be commended for their efforts to maintain law and order in the face of great personal danger.

The general conduct of our police and fire departments, we feel, command and receive the highest respect of our law abiding citizens from all groups.

It is the recommendation of this Grand Jury that all decent law-abiding citizens proclaim their support of law and order and their support of policemen and firemen in carrying out their duties toward that end.

This, in turn, will of necessity command a course of conduct on the part of police and firemen and particularly of the police, who have more intimate contact with the public, which will be of the highest caliber of efficiency and decency and patience and will thus contribute to a greater restoration of our American ideal of equal treatment.

As earlier in this section of the Jury report it was indicated, the Jury now requests that the Cuyahoga County delegation to the next session of the Ohio Assembly give serious consideration to the following suggestions for new and more inclusive legislation covering such situations as the Superior and Hough Area disorders represent.

The Jury suggestions therefore are—

(1) Inciting to riot: No person with the intent to cause a riot shall do any act or engage in any conduct which urges a riot, or urges others to commit acts of force or violence, or the burning or destroying of property, and at a time and place and under circumstances which produce a clear and present and immediate danger of acts of force or violence or the burning or destroying of property. Whoever violates this section shall be imprisoned not less than one nor more than twenty years.

(2) Definition of Riot: Any use of force or violence, disturbing the peace, or any threat to use such force or violence, if accompanied by immediate power of execution involving two or more persons carrying on such conduct and without authority of law, is a riot.

(3) Enhanced Penalty for Arson or Attempted Arson during a Riot: An amendment to Revised Code section 2907.06 (this section concerns itself with the attempt to burn or set on fire or to do any act preliminary thereto or the burning of buildings):

"Upon the proclamation of the Governor proclaiming a state of disaster or extreme emergency because of a riot, whoever violates this section during such period covered by said proclamation shall be fined not less than $5,000.00 and imprisoned not less than five nor more than twenty years or both."

(4) Assault against a fireman or policeman acting in the course of his duty: No person shall assault a fireman or policeman while such fireman or policeman is acting in the course of his duties. Whoever violates this section shall be fined not more than $5,000.00 or imprisoned not less than one nor more than twenty years or both.

No. 2

In addressing itself to the second of Judge Parrino's directives, namely, the conditions of life prevailing in the Hough Area, this Jury finds:

Poverty and frustration, crowded by organized agitators, served as the uneasy backdrop for the Cleveland riots.

Unfortunately, it is the overwhelming mass of innocent and law-abiding citizens who pay the greatest penalty in any crossfire of violence.

The following inequities and practices contributed as a feeding ground for disorder:

(a) The density of population in the Hough Area.

(b) Inadequate and sub-standard housing.

(c) Charging of exorbitant rents by absentee landlords.

(d) Non-enforcement of the housing code.

(e) Woefully inadequate recreational facilities for children whose uncertain homelife calls for this kind of wholesome community outlet, and for the constructive guidance and counsel to offset their regrettable environment.

(f) Sub-standard educational facilities as a consequence of long neglect, which, in substantial fairness, have been greatly improved in recent years but which still call for further effort on the part of officials and community leaders.

(g) Excessive food prices in most instances accompanied all too frequently with foodstuffs found to be inferior in freshness or quality.

(h) The denial of equal economic opportunities.

(i) Diminished incentives by repressed and neglected people.

(j) The present system of paying women for having children, frequently out of wedlock, or under a relationship loosely described as "common-law"—which enables the father to walk out of his "marital arrangement" to escape his proper responsibilities.

(The current welfare system should be challenged in this respect for its effect upon the very people who are supposed to benefit. Children brought into the world under such callous and financially expedient circumstances are rarely seen by their father. This system the Jury believes is anything but helpful either to the mothers, or the fathers, or the children, or the community. Surely, this Jury believes, those charged with social and moral responsibility in this community are capable of devising a much more equitable and effective formula than the prevailing one.)

(k) Regardless of how the very large addition of Negroes formerly widely dispersed throughout the deep and mid-South have migrated to the large northern cities, like Cleveland, the fact is that these men, women and children are here.

(In many instances the mode of life they find in such large cities as Cleveland differs substantially from that which prevailed in the places whence they came. Frequently they find themselves bewildered and unable quickly to adjust themselves to the demands of their new surroundings and thus find themselves frequently at cross purposes with the authorities and the older residents of the areas in which they find themselves currently.)

Impatience among the Negro people for the improvement of their citizenship is understandable but the opinion has been expressed they may be attempting to exact too much too fast for the community to bear within an arbitrarily fixed time limit.

The fact, nevertheless, is that too many human beings, however they arrive in our midst, or whence they came, or why, are living under such completely intolerable conditions in the Hough Area at the present time, that inevitably the consequences must be futility, frustration, bitterness, and exposure to the abrasive forces advocating violence.

These factors make them prone to the almost immutable by-products of such prevailing conditions; crime, delinquency, loose-living, tragic deterioration of moral behavior, and the brittle, bitter, hyper-sensitivity which emerges therefrom; and in the aggregate these effects represent potential danger not only to themselves but to the community as a whole.

There are no longer moats complacently situated in which any citizen can live under modern conditions safely removed from the turmoil and anxiety and bitterness of others, irrespective of skin color, or religious identification of political inclinations or economic and social environment.

Whatever happens in the large cities of America, as in the community of Greater Cleveland, eventually affects all citizens in one way or another.

Now, all these complex social evils are used as subtle and inflammatory provocations by resident and non-resident organizers who exploit riots such as both the Superior and Hough Area riots in Cleveland.

Where possible, as earlier indicated, this Jury has diligently sought to pinpoint the causes of these riots.

At this time the return of any additional indictments based upon community vengeance and not upon evidence sufficient to convict in a court of law would not do credit to our democratic society.

Realistic and productive goals must now be set by this community, and that near term emphasis be directed toward:

1. Improvement in Housing Code Enforcement.

2. Improvement in Police Action and Court Findings against prostitutes, cheat spots, gambling, and the profusion of the numbers of liquor license outlets.

3. Continuing drive for improved garbage and rubbish collection; stronger measures against landlords and tenants to make this task easier for the City.

4. Put the Urban Renewal Program back on the track with the full cooperation of the Federal Government as quickly as possible.

Our total resources must be marshaled to prevent a recurrence of this enormous tragedy—a potentiality which this Jury strongly counsels is still present.

Where prejudice and injustice are cast aside, the wilful and malicious agitator finds little support for his provocative and destructive acts.

This Jury does not attempt in this report, while sorely tempted to do so, to fix responsibility upon either individual or individuals, or on pressure groups or organizations for the community's failure to more adequately meet its responsibilities.

It does, however, wish to make unmistakably clear that it does not believe this community has adequately measured up to its responsibilities.

By the same token it does not believe that the influential leaders in either the Hough Area or in other areas of this community have measured up to their responsibilities.

This Jury does at this time urge upon the Mayor, upon the City Council, upon the business, financial and industrial leaders, upon the educators and the civic organizations to act now either individually or in concert to put Cleveland in the forefront in meeting the sociological and moral challenges of our times, as in the past this community has so conspicuously risen to meet the challenges of the past.

This Jury cannot conclude its report without paying wholehearted tribute to those wise and long-range leaders of this community who in their great wisdom saw and recognized a situation which now rests uneasily on the conscience of the entire country, and it applauds them for their selfless work, their patience, their substance, their cooperative efforts, and the many tangible results of their good and wise leadership.

They have set for the rest of us a plateau of good citizenship for which we should all strive.

The time for total community action is now.

LOUIS B. SELTZER,
Grand Jury Foreman.

AUGUST 9, 1966.

WORLD REFUGEE REPORT

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, once again I wish to invite attention to the annual report of the U.S. Committee for Refugees, the citizen's committee whose work is familiar to all of us.

As in past years, the current report is an extremely useful survey of refugee problems throughout the world. It also notes the various governmental and private agencies through which the American people render humanitarian assistance to those who flee persecution, tyranny, and military conflict.

The major refugee problems today are in South Vietnam and Africa, where the needs of displaced persons claim the concern of our country. There is also the continuing problem of refugees from Cuba, who are finding asylum in this country.

As chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees, I commend the U.S. Committee for Refugees for issuing this timely report. The committee deserves our thanks for a job well done in its every effort to help our citizens understand the significance of refugee problems and the continuing need for this country to exert leadership in finding reasonable solutions.

Mr. President, I believe that Members of the Senate will be interested in the report, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD REFUGEE REPORT—ANNUAL SURVEY ISSUE 1966–67—U.S. COMMITTEE FOR REFUGEES, INC.

(Reports from EDWARD M. KENNEDY, James W. Wine, Prince Sadruddin Aga Khan, Bastiaan W. Haveman, Laurence Michelmore, John F. Thomas)

(NOTE.—The U.S. Committee for Refugees, a private Citizens Committee, now in its 8th year, brings the story of the world's refugees to the American people and their leadership in the Congress. It encourages support for more than 50 American voluntary agencies working for refugees all over the world and makes funds available to their projects for refugee assistance overseas.)

These Outstanding Americans are behind the work of the U.S. Committee for Refugees:

Officers: Maxwell M. Rabb, President; Luther H. Evans, Chairman of the Board; George Meany, Vice President; Samuel W. Meek, Vice President; Roderic L. O'Connor, Vice President; William L. Breese, Secretary; Abram Claude, Jr., Treasurer; Victor Jacobs, General Counsel; Frances Humphrey Howard, Chairman of the Executive Committee; R. Norris Wilson, Executive Vice President.

Members of the Board: Marian Anderson, Louis Beck, Joseph A. Beirne, Edgar F. Berman, William S. Bernard, Walter H. Bieringer, Jacob Blaustein, Dorothea Blum, Madeleine Carroll, Daniel G. Cary, Marcus Daly, Thomas J. Deegan, Jr., Mrs. Edison Dick, Joseph W. Donner, Angier Biddle Duke, Charles W. Engelhard, John B. Ford, III, Buell G. Gallagher, J. Peter Grace, Mrs. Erwin N. Griswold, John W. Hanes, Jr., Huntington Hartford, Reginald H. Helfferich, Christian A. Herter, Jr., Celeste Holm, J. Donald Kingsley, William T. Kirk, I. Robert Kriendler, Mrs. Albert D. Lasker, Peter I. B. Lavan, Ralph Lazarus, Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, Clare Boothe Luce, James MacCracken, Juvenal Marchisio, George M. Mardikian, Edward B. Marks, Robert S. McCollum, Robert D. Murphy, Ruth Z. Murphy, Christopher H. Phillips, Henry V. Poor, Jacob S. Potofsky, Marsha Hunt Presnell, Richard W. Reuter, Mary G. Roebling, Karl F. Rolvaag, George N. Shuster, Mrs. Harper Sibley, Spyros P. Skouras, Lowell Thomas, Ilia A. Tolstoy, Robert F. Wagner, Richard H. West.

WE NEED TO SEE

The principal objective of this survey of the world's refugee problems is to give visibility to 11,226,920 persons—men, women and children—who are today's refugees.

Mr. Bastiaan W. Haveman, Director of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, speaking to the Executive Committee of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in Geneva, recently said, ". . . it is somewhat paradoxical to find that the greater the efficiency of the organization concerned with the resettlement of refugees, the greater the difficulty to maintain an active public interest in the human problem and its ramifications.

Were we not doing our job, the plight of the European refugee would be apparent to all, because they would be, unfortunately, *visible* in the camps. But, because our common task is being efficiently attended to, you can see the refugees now embarking in seaports and at airports rather than observing them in the midst of the misery of camps . . . ."

The international apparatus for resettling European refugees has been radically improved. Most of the camps are gone and refugees from Eastern Europe who make their escape just as they did in the late 1940's and 1950's now are moved to new homes in asylum countries in a matter of days. It is tragic irony that a European refugee, now receiving as he does the much improved service from the international community, has become "invisible" and is, therefore, no longer *seen* or *felt* as a burden on the heart and conscience of the free world.

The scene has changed. The most serious refugee problems are no longer in Europe—they are in Africa and Asia. These refugees, too, in vast numbers and in serious need, are "invisible."

The refugees in Africa and Asia are "invisible" partly because of their distance from us; partly because of the confused, almost frantic pace of the world's life; partly because, as distinct from the European refugees, the refugees in Africa and Asia have no large and influential body of American citizens of blood relationship or national origin to plead their cause. And so, tragically, the refugees of Africa wait "behind God's back," "invisible" to the eye and the conscience of Americans.

Even in South Vietnam where there are a million refugees in various stages of resettlement, we do not really see the problem. The plight of those who have had to flee their homes because of the constant to and fro of the fighting has been obscured by the confused atmosphere in the United States over the ends and means of our national effort in Vietnam.

The American citizen has always responded with sympathy and generosity to any humanitarian need. But when he gave his heart and his money for the relief of the distressed, it was because he had been given a believing *vision* of the need which had to be met. There is a deep-seated connection between "seeing," "believing," and "relieving." This is why we believe that giving "visibility" to the problem of the refugee is a task of fundamental urgency. We *need* to see!

Fortunately, these unseen victims of the world's turmoil are coming more and more into our vision. Specifically, Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY and the Senate Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees have recently given immeasurable help in this direction. They have lifted up to public view not only the problems of the refugees wherever they are, but also the strengths and weaknesses of our humanitarian effort, both private and public, to meet their needs.

The United Nations General Assembly, in proclaiming October 24, 1966 as United Nations Day, specifically voted that the major emphasis of all observances of that day should be upon the problems of refugees in Asia and Africa. Therefore, on October 24th, in a great many countries, the vast and wonderful power of the radio and television will dramatize for the private citizen the existence of these deeply serious problems and help them to understand why the existence of 11,000,000 refugees in the world is a matter for their deep personal concern. Hopefully, these public efforts will inform and inspire private citizens everywhere to assume an active role in alleviating the plight of these rootless millions.

This survey of the world's refugee problems is dedicated to bringing indelible visibility to the homeless with the spirited belief that once the private citizen sees this tragedy of modern man he will be moved to understanding and action.

WHO IS A REFUGEE?

This Survey is at most a fragment of the story of over 11,000,000 refugees. They are on every continent and in more than 80 countries. We need to remember that they became refugees *one* by *one*. Statistics are a useful, if sometimes misleading convenience—and we must not let our statistics blind us to the fact that a refugee is a homeless, hopeless and hungry person.

Whether man, woman or child, the refugee is the tragic result of the violent pace and ferment that characterizes our time. Wherever the refugee is—whether Africa, Europe, Asia, Latin America, or in our own country—he, by his rootlessness and need personifies modern man's inability to cope with his personal life, his religion, his ambitions and his hungers, with due concern for his fellow man.

Each refugee group, while it bears some similarities to other groups, is unique. The reasons for their flight differ in each case; the circumstances of their asylum differ in each case; the opportunity for and/or rate of resettlement and integration differ in each case. Moreover, while the human situation for the refugee is always grievous, the political significance of the refugees' predicament varies in importance according to a host of circumstances.

Taking into account the many varied legal, political, economic and religious considerations which bear upon his status as a refugee, we say that a person is a refugee if his forced migration (whether within his own country or to an asylum elsewhere) means that he is deprived of a minimally decent life. If he is still in a camp though he may have a job; if he has good housing but no place to work; if he is well cared for though still separated from his family and uncertain whether they can rejoin him; if by his loss of citizenship or forced migration he is deprived of the fundamental elements of a minimally decent life—he is a refugee.

World refugee population by area of origin, 1966

VICTIMS OF WAR, INTOLERANCE, AND SOCIAL UNREST—11,226,920 HOMELESS

Country of asylum	From—	1965	1966	Source
East Asia (area total)		3,020,500	3,081,000	
Hong Kong	China	1,944,000	2,000,000	ORM; UNHCR.
Korea [1]	North Korea	1,000,000	1,000,000	AKF; CWS.
Macau	China	75,000	80,000	ORM; UNHCR.
China	Russia	1,500	1,000	ORM; WCC.
Southeast Asia (area total)		4,339,526	4,229,526	
Bhutan	Tibet	3,000	3,000	Office of Tibet, U.S.A.; NCC, India.
Pakistan, East and West	India	75,000	500,000	ORM; WCC; others.
India (Calcutta)	Pakistan, East and West	2,000,000	2,000,000	CWS-Stroup report; others.
India	do	283,177	283,177	WCC.
Do	Tibet	41,800	41,800	Office of Tibet, U.S.A.; NCC, India.
Do	Burma	55,249	55,249	Indian Information Service.
Kashmir [2]	(National)	60,000		
Laos	do	250,000	250,000	ORM.
Nepal	Tibet	8,000	10,000	ORM; WCC; NCC, India; UNHCR.
Sikkim	do	6,000	6,000	NCC, India; Office of Tibet, U.S.A.
South Vietnam [3]	North Vietnam	900,000		
Do	(National)	600,000	1,003,000	ORM.
Thailand	Vietnam	40,000	40,000	U.S. Department of State.
Do	Burma	10,000	30,000	New York Times, Aug. 24, 1966.
Do	China	7,300	7,300	U.S. Department of State.
Middle East (area total)		1,301,879	1,374,714	
Gaza Strip	Palestine	289,155	307,000	UNRWA.
Iran		1,032	1,032	UNHCR.
Israel		52,000	52,000	JDC.
Jordan	Palestine	670,985	707,000	UNRWA.
Lebanon	do	155,170	164,000	UNRWA.
Syria	do	131,375	140,000	UNRWA.
Turkey	Iraq	1,482	1,482	UNHCR.
Do		680		
Do	Albania Bulgaria Rumania U.S.S.R. Yugoslavia		2,200	WCC.

See footnotes at end of table.

World refugee population by area of origin, 1966—Continued

VICTIMS OF WAR, INTOLERANCE, AND SOCIAL UNREST—11,226,920 HOMELESS

Country of asylum	From—	1965	1966	Source
Africa (north) (area total): Morocco		2,700	2,700	UNHCR.
Africa (sub-Sahara) (area total)		695,820	1,017,338	
Bechuanaland	South Africa		200	CWS.
Burundi	Rwanda	80,000	50,000	UNHCR.
Do	Congo		20,000	UNHCR.
Central African Republic	Sudan	5,000	18,000	CWS; MCOR.
Do	Congo	30,000	3,000	UNHCR.
Congo	Angola	250,000	400,000	CPRA.
Do	Rwanda	30,000	60,000	ORM; UNHCR.
Do	Sudan	10,000	18,000	ICVA; AFSC.
Dahomey	Ivory Coast Gabon Senegal Mali	12,000	12,000	ICMC, Migration News.
Do	Niger	16,000	16,000	CRS-NCWC.
Ethiopia	Sudan	5,000	10,000	ICVA; CWS.
Do	Somali	70,000	70,000	The Times, London.
Do	South Africa		18	WCC; MCOR.
Kenya	Sudan	100	100	WCC, "Africa Survey."
Tanzania (Tanganyika)	Congo	2,000	2,000	WCC, "Africa Survey."
Tanzania	Rwanda	25,000	25,000	UNHCR.
Do	Mozambique	10,000	10,000	ORM; UNHCR.
Do	Southern Rhodesia	20	20	WCC, "Africa Survey."
Do	Kenya	2,500	2,500	CRS-NCWC.
Togo	Ghana	5,700	5,700	UNHCR; ICMC, Migration News; LWF.
Uganda	Rwanda	50,000	50,000	UNHCR; ORM.
Do	Sudan	40,000	40,000	CRS-NCWC; WCC.
Do	Congo, Léopoldville	8,000	38,000	UNHCR; ICMC, Migration News.
Senegal	Portuguese Guinea	35,000	55,000	ORM; UNHCR; ICVA.
Various African countries	South Africa	500	800	CWS; ORM.
Do [4]	Sudan		70,000	ORM.
Zambia (Northern Rhodesia)	Congo and South Africa	30,000	30,000	New York Times, "Organization for African Unity."
Zambia	Angola	6,000	6,000	Angola office, New York.
Do	Mozambique		5,000	ORM.
Europe [5] (area total)		169,197	243,314	
Austria		858	858	UNHCR.
France		62,500	62,500	UNHCR; SRA; JDC; IRC.
France	Spain		70,588	WCC, "Ci made," Feb. 22, 1966.
Germany [6]	East Europe	15,235	17,564	UNHCR; PAIRC.
Greece		4,775	4,775	UNHCR.
Italy	East Europe	1,030	1,030	UNHCR.
Spain	Cuba	13,800	15,000	ORM.
U.S.S.R.	China	70,000	70,000	U.S. Senate.
Europe (various)	Tibet	600	600	Office of Tibet, U.S.A.
Switzerland	do	399	399	Do.
Western Hemisphere (area total)		261,077	1,278,328	
Argentina	Chile Bolivia Paraguay		1,000,000	New York Times, June 1966.
Bahamas	Haiti		132	IRC.
Dominican Republic	do	5,000	5,000	IRC.
Puerto Rico	Cuba	6,000	6,000	CREC.
Do	Haiti	5,000	5,000	ACNS.
United States	Cuba	89,036	91,148	DHEW.
Do	Tibet	41	48	Office of Tibet, U.S.A.
Do	Haiti	6,000	6,000	IRC.
Argentina, Chile, Peru, Colombia, Venezuela	Europe	130,000	130,000	Tolstoy Foundation; WCC; CWS; U.N. press.
Various Latin American countries	Cuba	20,000	35,000	ORM.
Total		9,790,699	11,226,920	

NOTES

[1] There remain approximately 1,000,000 of the 4,000,000 persons who moved from North to South Korea during the Korean War. It is assumed that most of the refugees have been "integrated." Yet only 1 country in the world (India) is receiving the assistance of more registered American voluntary agencies than Korea!

[2] The presumption is that, with the end of the fighting in Kashmir, these refugees have returned to their homes.

[3] According to ORM, refugees from the fighting in Vietnam were classified as follows 501,000 were still in camps, 361,000 had been resettled with the assistance of the Government of Vietnam and AID, and 141,000 had returned voluntarily to their own villages. Those who were resettled and the returnees continued to require full relief and rehabilitation assistance.

[4] The total number of Sudanese refugees approximates 130,000. To date, accurate figures from asylum countries are unavailable.

[5] These figures represent refugees reported to be settled—however inadequately—in countries of asylum. It is impossible to estimate the additional numbers in transit at any given time. For example, there are reported to be some 49,000 Jewish migrants and refugees moving toward eventual final settlement. Again, at present, refugees are moving in increasing numbers from behind the Iron Curtain into Europe at the rate of approximately 10,000 per year. These persons are not included in the record for European countries since they are in transit to permanent resettlement overseas.

[6] Included in the figures for Germany are some 2,329 persons reported as having escaped "over the wall" during 1965.

ABBREVIATIONS

AKF—American Korean Foundation.
ACNS—American Council for Nationalities Service.
AFSC—American Friends Service Committee.
CPRA—Congo Protestant Relief Agency.
CREC—Cuban Refugee Emergency Center.
CRS-NCWC—Catholic Relief Services-National Catholic Welfare Conference.
CWS—Church World Service.
DHEW—Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
ICMC—International Catholic Migration Commission.
ICVA—International Council of Voluntary Agencies.
IRC—International Rescue Committee.
JDC—Joint Distribution Committee.
LWF—Lutheran World Federation.
MCOR—Methodist Committee for Overseas Relief.
NCC, India—National Christian Council of India.
ORM—Office of Refugee and Migration Affairs, Department of State, U.S. Government.
PAIRC—Polish-American Immigration and Relief Committee.
SRA—Spanish Refugee Aid.
UNHCR—United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.
UNRWA—United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees.
WCC—World Council of Churches.
U.S. Senate—Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees.

MIGRANTS

The statistical summary of refugee problems indicating the presence of refugees in temporary asylum in all parts of the world totaling 11,226,920 does not include a very large number of people who are migrants.

We know of the presence of a million persons who have moved from Chile, Bolivia, and Paraguay to the outskirts of the city of Buenos Aires in the Argentine. They are refugees in the sense that they have no proper travel documents and also because they are for the most part jobless and homeless; in other words, in need of most of the services normally thought appropriate and necessary for refugees.

Many tribal people in Africa are migratory. Their traditional and customary movement in search of fresh pastureland is accepted as normal. It is true, however, that due to the almost universal ferment of Africa's new life, the normal migration of these people creates problems similar to the problems of the refugee. Our summary is also incomplete because we have only the most fragmentary information about current refugee movements from South Africa and Rhodesia.

Moreover, at any moment, there are many thousands of refugees in transit whose movement from their homes to new homes in asylum countries is now accomplished quickly enough to prevent their settlement in camps. For example, 4,000 persons per month are moved from Cuba into Miami and out to new homes in a matter of days. Similarly, refugees from behind the Iron Curtain are being processed so rapidly and so efficiently that their numbers of approximately 10,000 per year do not enter our calculations. Only refugees that are visible can be accounted for.

It is important that our statistical review be studied with these points in mind.

ON THE POSITIVE SIDE

Taking the measure of the problem of the world's homeless often leaves us with a profound sense of discouragement. The problem seems so persistent, it grows in size and complexity year by year, and we wonder as we survey it if any progress is being made toward its solution. Constructive and far-reaching actions have begun and new initiatives are being brought to bear on what appears to be an insoluble complex of problems.

New immigration law

In November, 1965, in a ceremony on Liberty Island in New York Harbor, President Lyndon B. Johnson signed into law the new immigation legislation. This legislation ended the vicious and discriminatory "national origins quota system." Additionally, beginning on December 1, 1965, the revision in the quotas for visa issuance made it possible for a great many families, among them refugees, to be allowed in the United States. The following figures show, in part, how this happened:

Athens, Dec. 1, 1964 to June 30, 1965, 326; Dec. 1. 1965 to June 30, 1966, 5,457.

Hong Kong, Dec. 1, 1964 to June 30, 1965, 128; Dec. 1, 1965 to June 30, 1966, 4,591.

Naples, Dec. 1, 1964 to June 30, 1965, 1,902; Dec. 1, 1965 to June 30, 1966, 10,829.

Manila, Dec. 1, 1964 to June 30, 1965, 22; Dec. 1, 1965 to June 30, 1966, 2,636.

Understanding with Castro

At almost the same time, in November, 1965, an "understanding" was reached between our government and the Castro government of Cuba permitting the resumption of air flights from Cuba to the United States. Since December 1, when the fights began, an average of 4,000 per month, the majority of them women and children, have arrived in Miami, Florida. 70 to 80 percent are being resettled outside of Miami almost immediately with relatives who had preceded them in their flight from Cuba. Major areas of resettlement are California, Illinois, New Jersey, Massachusetts and Puerto Rico.

UNRWA mandate extended

United Nations To Continue Help to Palestine Refugees.—The General Assembly approved on December 15, 1965, a three-year extension of the United Nations aid program for Palestinian Arab refugees. The 15-year-old program has been operated by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency, set up to care for the Arabs left destitute and homeless by the Palestine war of 1948. The United States and Britain provide 82 percent of its income, which last year totalled $35,270,000.

In Vietnam

In Vietnam, definite strides have been made in establishing the emergency relief and rehabilitation services necessary to meet the special problems of refugees. The shape and size of this problem may be seen from the map on page 23. (Not reproduced in the Record.) American people and the people from many countries are contributing to help meet the many-sided needs both of the refugees and the civil population generally. Indeed, through the cooperation of American private agencies and the State Department's Agency for International Development (AID), nearly half of the more than 1,000,000 refugees have been resettled or returned to their home villages.

On January 4, 1966, at the invitation of the Government, the United States Committee for Refugees presented to the Agency for International Development a plan for a nationwide public education and fund raising program for Vietnamese refugees through private agencies cooperating with AID. The need for an effort of this kind is growing increasingly urgent because the 24 voluntary groups working in Vietnam are in desperate need of public support and additional funds. The proposal of the Committee is under active consideration.

Kennedy hearings

On May 17, 1966, at the Annual Meeting of the United States Committee for Refugees in Washington, D.C., Senator Edward M. Kennedy, Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees, announced that his Committee was to hold hearings through the summer on seven questions bearing upon governmental, intergovernmental and private apparatus for dealing with refugee problems. At the same time, the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration appointed a "working group" to study the refugee programs of our government, the intergrovernmental organizations and the private agencies. The findings of the "working group" were reflected in the subsequent testimony and action of the Secretary of State. Senator Kennedy comments on the usefulness of these hearings for the long-range efforts of our government.

Wine appointment

On September 7th, the Secretary of State announced the appointment of Ambassador James W. Wine, a former member of the Board of Directors of the United States Committee for Refugees, as his Special Assistant for Refugee Affairs. Mr. Wine's appointment and Secretary Rusk's statement about it appear on Page 10. This appointment appears to satisfy, in almost every particular, the pleadings of the United States Committee for Refugees and other voluntary groups for an improved fiscal and administrative facility in the State Department, and is, in general, a most helpful development.

Adjustment of status for Cuban refugees

In August, 1966, legislation was introduced in both Houses of the Congress providing for the adjustment of status of Cuban refugees, who, till now, are living in the United States simply as "parolees." This legislation will rectify an extremely unhappy plight for a group of refugees who have been happily resettled in the United States and who now deserve the full life of citizenship.

NEW PROBLEMS, NEW SOLUTIONS

(By Senator Edward M. Kennedy, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees)

"Refugee problems seldom dominate the headlines. But the troubles of our times are taking a growing toll in the flight of people from conflict and oppression.

"All over the world people are on the move. In South Vietnam the flow of refugees continues in nearly direct proportion to the pace of military conflict. Over 1,000,000 Vietnamese have fled their villages into areas secured by the government in Saigon. Thousands of Cubans continue to leave their homeland. Since early 1959, over 300,000 have found asylum in the United States. Additional thousands have fled to Mexico and other countries in Central and South America and to Spain. The flow of refugees continues from Eastern Europe, from Communist China and Tibet. In Africa, nearly 650,000 refugees add heavily to the already serious and difficult problems of that continent. And in the Middle East, the Arab refugee problem continues as a cause of instability and friction.

"In one decade, the focus of refugee problems has shifted dramatically from Europe to other continents—to Africa and Asia, and to the Western Hemisphere. Most of the newer problems bear little similarity to the conventional and familiar problems of Europe. They call for different solutions. They raise new considerations for our government, the international community and the private voluntary agencies. They have greater political and military significance to the operation of our country's foreign policy, and the measure of stability and progress in many areas of the world.

"By failing to assist the millions who flee their homes, we compound the difficulties in many countries already in political, social, and economic ferment. We undermine their welfare and security, as well as our own. The effectiveness of our foreign policy in a given area is often directly related to our leadership in assisting that area's refugees. The Arab problem in the Middle East is a good example. But nothing illustrates this more than our early failure to fully anticipate and identify the very serious problem of displaced civilians in South Vietnam—where some progress is now being made in meeting the emergencies created by military conflict.

"Humanitarian assistance to refugees has always been, and rightly so, a conspicuous mark of our nation's leadership. Through government channels and private voluntary agencies, the American people have played a leading role in providing material help and resettlement opportunities for the homeless.

"Foreign aid program benefits refugees

"Refugees benefit under all categories of the general foreign aid program. Surplus agricultural commodities have been a mainstay in our assistance program for many years. We have contributed heavily to special programs for refugees from North Korea, North Vietnam, Algeria, and Tibet, and to the regular programs maintained by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. Over sixty percent of the budget of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees is contributed by the United States. In Hong Kong the United States maintains the Far East Refugee Program for those who flee from mainland China.

"In South Vietnam United States expenditures for refugee relief are mounting daily.

"The exodus from Cuba necessitated the Cuban Refugee Program established by President Kennedy early in 1961. Cubans are found in every state of the union. They have joined more than 1,000,000 other refugees, chiefly from the countries of Eastern and Central Europe, who have been resettled in the United States since the end of World War II, and today are contributing their spirit and abilities to the development and progress of this country. The United States Escapee Program has enabled additional refugees to resettle elsewhere. So, too, have our generous contributions to the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration. An essential link between most programs of government and the humans in need, has been the private voluntary agencies, whose dedicated personnel give freely of their time and effort to promote the welfare and betterment of refugees and others in distress.

"For some time, the United States apparatus of assistance to refugees has been a matter of special concern to the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees. This concern was outlined, for example, in a report issued by the Subcommittee on June 25, 1965. It was subsequently re-enforced by the Subcommittee's extensive inquiry into the plight of displaced civilians in South Vietnam.

"As Chairman of the Subcommittee, I reiterated this concern a number of times in recent months, and held consultations with refugee specialists in this country and abroad. On May 17, 1966, in an address in Washington before the annual meeting of the United States Committee for Refugees, I announced the Subcommittee would hold hearings on the nature and scope of today's refugee problems, the status and effectiveness of the United States apparatus of assistance, and the alternatives open for the United States in better responding to refugee needs throughout the world.

"There was little doubt in my mind, fully confirmed by the Subcommittee's hearings, that our handling of refugee matters needed review and reform; it needed broader horizons and new initiatives, if our humanitarian traditions were to keep pace with the needs of today and the shape of the future.

"In my statement commencing the hearings on July 14th, I said: 'I firmly believe the refugee situation in 1966, and what we can anticipate over the next several years, requires a greater national concern on the part of all Americans. It requires new approaches by our government. It requires new methods and kinds of assistance by the international community. It requires new and creative thinking on the part of all.'

"Does current legislation adequately express America's deep-seated humanitarian traditions and national concern for the homeless and oppressed. Is it flexible enough to meet all emergencies? Are we giving enough priority to the newer refugee problems in Africa and Asia? What significance do refugee policy and programs have in the operation of our country's foreign policy? Do government agencies, especially the Department of State and the Agency for International Development possess adequate machinery to respond where American assistance is needed and sought? Should our assistance stress bi-lateral or multi-lateral channels? Should we advocate broadening the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration? What alternatives are open in raising the level of responsibility for refugee matters within the executive branch? What steps are needed to facilitate the needed coordination of refugee policy and operations throughout our government? Is the United States wisely allocating its resources available to refugees? Is our level of contribution adequate? How can the role of private voluntary agencies in refugee programs be facilitated and strengthened? These were some of the important questions which concerned the Subcommittee.

"Testimony at refugee hearings

"Secretary of State Dean Rusk, the Subcommittee's first witness, directed his comments toward overall United States policy in refugee affairs. Deputy Under Secretary of State William J. Crockett's testimony was concerned chiefly with budgetary matters and the administrative structure of refugee programs within the government. The testimony of the Honorable William S. Gaud, Administrator of the Agency for International Development, dealt largely with the problems in South Vietnam. The Arab refugee problem was discussed by Assistant Secretaries of State Raymond Hare and Joseph Sisco, African problems by Assistant Secretary of State Joseph Palmer. The Acting Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, Philip Heyman, testified on regular and continuing programs for refugees in Europe and Asia, and our country's relations with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration.

"Additional witnesses included the representatives of several voluntary agencies and other private organizations, including the United States Committee for Refugees.

"All facets of refugee problems and United States involvement were discussed in the hearings, but there was a keen interest, especially, in the proposal of Secretary Rusk to appoint a Special Assistant for Refugee Affairs, directly responsible to the Secretary, with the rank equivalent to an Assistant Secretary of State. The Special Assistant would, among other things, coordinate refugee matters within the executive branch.

"In conclusion, I would quote from my statement which closed the hearings:

" 'The hearings have underscored the seriousness of current refugee problems. They have highlighted both good and bad aspects of United States assistance programs.

" 'There is general agreement among all concerned with these matters that there is a need to upgrade refugee affairs within our government. There is a need to give these affairs a higher level of responsibility within the Department of State, which will effect a better coordination of our assistance throughout the world.

" 'The Secretary of State, at the commencement of these hearings, announced his intention to appoint a Special Assistant for Refugee Affairs. The Subcommittee has received a good deal of testimony on the Secretary's proposal, including testimony in Executive Session by Deputy Under Secretary William J. Crockett.

" 'Speaking for myself, and, I believe, other members of the Subcommittee, I can say that we do not feel the appointment of a Special Assistant to the Secretary of State is an adequate long-range solution to the weaknesses in our current apparatus of assistance to refugees. It ignores, among other things, the obvious need of a statutory basis for a high level refugee official, to insure some degree of permanency in the administrative structure of the Department of State. The Subcommittee sought, and received, assurances that the appointment of a special Assistant would in no way affect efforts to obtain this objective.

" 'The Administration and the State Department have indicated that they would view the appointment of a Special Assistant as a temporary measure, pending the outcome of further studies relating to a more permanent solution in this significant area of public concern. A number of witnesses have testified to the many weaknesses inherent in the proposal of a Special Assistant. Members of the Subcommittee have conveyed their similar thoughts on this matter to the Department of State.

" 'For some time the Subcommittee has been considering an alternative proposal which would give to the administrative structure of our refugee programs a statutory basis.

" 'This plan involves a reorganization of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs. Of the four sections in this Bureau, two would be transferred elsewhere—the Passport Office, and the Office of Special Consular Services. Two sections would remain—the Visa Office and the Office of Refugee and Migration Affairs. This would create, in effect, a Bureau of Refugee, Migration and Visa Affairs. It would streamline our handling of refugee matters, and remove the ad hoc nature of our current approach. It would more fully integrate our humanitarian concern for the world's homeless into the overall operation of our country's foreign policy.'

"The most feasible way for such a plan to be implemented is through the submission to Congress of a formal reorganization plan. Hopefully, the Department of State will fully consider this possibility. The Subcommittee is preparing a detailed report on this, and other matters raised in the hearings. This report of findings and recommendations on the United States program of assistance to refugees throughout the world, will be submitted to the Senate within the near future.

"Special Assistant for Refugee Affairs

"On September 6, 1966, the State Department announced the appointment of an experienced and capable diplomat, Ambassador James W. Wine, as the Special Assistant for Refugee and Migration Affairs. I am sure that Ambassador Wine will contribute much to implement and better our country's traditional humanitarianism and concern for the world's homeless, and to help bring about some degree of permanency for refugee concerns in the administrative structure of the Department of State."

Do you realize that—

Refugees under the care of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in August, 1961 totaled 1,350,000. Five years later, in August, 1966, the High Commissioner's office was responsible for the care of 3 million refugees.

One of the most frustrating refugee problems in the world is in Palestine, both because of its persistence and of its growth. In 1948, at the end of the fighting, there were 900,000 refugees in the host countries—Jordan, Lebanon, Syria and the Gaza Strip. Today there are 1,317,000 and the refugee population of the Middle East grows at an annual rate of approximately 40,000 per year.

According to the Annual Survey of the world's refugee population of the United States Committee for Refugees, the total of the world's homeless in 1964 was 7,910,300. In 1965, it was 9,760,700. In 1966, the total was 11,226,920.

The flight of refugees from Iron Curtain countries to the West continues at the rate of 35,000 per year. Many of these refugees find asylum and new homes in the United States. On the average, every ten days a charter flight lands at Kennedy International Airport in New York with approximately 130 to 150 Iron Curtain refugees and their families.

Since December, 1965, approximately 4,000 refugees from Cuba arrive in Miami every month. Nearly 80% of these refugees are now being quickly resettled in other parts of the United States. Agencies responsible for their resettlement are: Church World Service (CWS), Catholic Relief Services (CRS), International Rescue Committee (IRC) and United Hias Service.

One agency, International Social Service, American Branch, during the last 13 years, has arranged for adoption in the United States of 16,000 homeless and abandoned refugee children.

The United States Government during the fiscal year 1965 spent for all its refugee programs $83,126,302 including $8.7 million worth of United States agricultural surplus at world market prices.

In 1965, 2,329 persons escaped "over the Wall" from East Berlin to West Berlin.

In other words: the shocking number of refugees on every continent is the most tragic evidence of man's inability to manage himself, his religion, his politics and his hungers with due concern for his fellow man. On the other hand, our continuing efforts to help the refugee, wherever he is—in his need, whatever its cause—is heartening evidence that the healing impulses of sympathy and neighborliness are at work among us, nourishing man's hopes for peace and freedom.

U.S. GOVERNMENT APPOINTS NEW LEADERSHIP FOR REFUGEE ACTIVITIES: IDEALISTIC EYES, REALISTIC FEET

(By James W. Wine, special assistant to the Secretary of State for Refugee and Migration Affairs)

(NOTE.—Ambassador James W. Wine, a Kentuckian, formerly Vice President of Park College in Missouri, officer of the National Council of Churches, Ambassador to Luxembourg and the Ivory Coast, and since 1965, Special Assistant to the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration. Ambassador Wine was appointed by the Secretary of State on September 6, 1966 to the newly created post of Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for Refugee and Migration Affairs. Mr. Wine holds the rank in the department equivalent to Assistant Secretary of State.)

"My assignment as a member of the 'working group,' appointed by Deputy Under Secretary of State William J. Crockett during the summer, enabled me to see the broad outline of our government's involvement in the refugee problem. I have only begun to see some of the complexity of this involvement. Certainly, the seriousness and apparent permanence of the problem of refugees allow of no quick and easy answers. At this early stage, I am certain only of my general philosophical approach to this difficult and exciting task.

"My new responsibility for overall direction of U.S. Government activities for refugees is undertaken with humility and determination.

"I believe this Administration and the Congress are sincerely committed to a continuing program of helping to solve the plight of refugees world-wide. I believe the motivation for this commitment springs not alone from respect for traditional national concern and responsibility to advance the national interest, but more particularly from love and compassion for fellow men. Therefore, the philosophy of humanitarianism shall be given first priority in every refugee policy decision.

"Accordingly, it shall be my purpose to establish a working perspective which will develop the highest level of sensitivity to need, while providing adequate and timely means to meet such needs. This includes a positive reaction to crises and, equally important, the anticipation of demands with advance planning. I shall work for administrative simplicity in the carrying out of this charge when working with other governments, international groups, and private organizations. We shall organize to provide maximum flexibility in the application of resources and programs and strive in all relationships for forthrightness and candor.

"It is my belief that in the beginning of this new endeavor we must be willing to be adventurous—to be bold and daring, but also practical in the achievement of definitive goals.

"As someone else put it—

"'Our eyes must be idealistic and our feet realistic. We must walk in a right direction, but we must walk step by step. Our tasks are to define what is desirable, to define what is possible at any time within the scope of what is desirable—to carry out what is possible in the spirit of what is desirable.'"

THE CHANGING ROLE OF UNHCR: THE NEW GEOGRAPHY OF POLITICAL REFUGEES

(By Prince Sadruddin Aga Khan, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees)

"I welcome most keenly this opportunity to reach an American audience, for I feel there is a real need for more understanding in the United States, even in well-informed circles, about the new challenges that face UNHCR.

"In the past 5 years, the scale of refugee problems in Africa and Asia has increased in a most dramatic and alarming manner, bringing in its wake mounting requests from governments of asylum for help from my office.

"Moreover, it is continually growing. The struggle for independence in areas under colonial administration—and this is the main backdrop to African refugee movements—continues to engender frictions which are the cause of new refugee problems. In newly independent countries, acute ethnic or tribal conflicts—another source of refugees—cannot be excluded; this has been the case notably in Rwanda and the Sudan. Sometimes, as in the Congo, the cause is internal political strife. How pervasive these factors are in shown by the fact that during the first half of 1966, there were 90,000 new refugees of concern to UNHCR, of which 75,000 were in Africa.

"What is the role of an office such as UNHCR, having a financial target of only $4.2 million and with only eight professional staff members in all of Africa South of the Sahara? What can be our role in coping with such massive problems?

"Emergency relief and permanent solutions

"Our first task when asked for help by a country of asylum (for it is only on this basis that we can intervene) is to assess the needs. Often, to cover urgently required food and medical care, I make an allocation from my Emergency Fund—a $500,000 reserve made up of repayments on loans made to European refugees under earlier programmes. Simultaneously, we sound out operational partners experienced in emergency relief work, for we ourselves are not operational. Often, in these early stages, we find ourselves in happy harness with the League of Red Cross Societies. Meanwhile, every effort is made to mobilize aid from other sources of goodwill, as well. One of the most important of these, is, of course, the United States by virtue of the vast amount of foodstuffs that it can make available either directly or through the World Food Programme."

"As soon as possible, however, we move on to the next stage, for our basic task is not to sponsor relief programmes but to promote permanent solutions for refugees. As in Europe, there are three possibilities: voluntary repatriation, local integration or settlement in another country. In most of the situations that have faced our Office in Africa South of the Sahara, voluntary repatriation has thus far proved applicable to only a fraction of the refugees concerned. Thus we have had to concentrate on integration on the spot. In this phase, as in the first we can provide only a modest contribution towards the total cost. Again, it is our partners who together give much more than we can. As in Europe, these partners are often the large international voluntary agencies who have always shown themselves so dedicated and persevering in the field of refugee assistance. In Tanzania, for example, operational responsibility rests with the Lutheran World Federation acting on behalf of the World Council of Churches through the Tanganyika Christian Refugee Service. In the Central African Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Rwanda, we work with Catholic voluntary agencies.

"Dependence on other UN bodies

"As settling refugees may entail building a whole new community, we often call on other UN bodies experienced in development work, such as the International Labor Organization (ILO), the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), the World Health Organization (WHO) and the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and ask their experts to draw up programmes and supervise their execution. Choice of the most suitable land, bush clearance, swamp drainage, irrigation tse tse fly eradication, choice of crops—all these are highly technical questions. Our role is to bring to bear the specialized skill required and then to help finance the resulting plans. Since regional development schemes are drawn up years in advance, the only source of international financing in refugee emergencies is usually the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. Fortunately, we have found our sister agencies cooperative and responsive in adapting existing programmes of their own to include refugees (for example, the ILO, which modified a regional development scheme in the Congo to include Rwandese refugees), or in lending us specialists for refugee projects, as the FAO and ILO have done in Burundi. Apart from these formal links, my representatives in each country are in day-to-day touch with their counterparts in the specialized agencies, particularly in the fields of health and education.

"The scale of some of the projects is impressive. For example, at Mugera in Eastern Burundi, UNHOR has taken the lead in creating a village for 25,000 Rwandese refugees with all that this entails in infrastructure and organization.

"Our activities must sometimes be adapted at short notice to take account of sudden changes. In 1964, for example, the disturbances in the Kivu Province of the Congo made conditions of life untenable for many of the Rwandese refugees who had sought asylum there, and we had to organize an airlift to fly 3,000 people to a new settlement area in Tanzania.

"Some may argue that under such circumstances, our work in Africa is a poor risk, particularly if it involves the type of long-term investment required to make refugees self-sufficient. On the contrary, viewing the whole of UNHCR's activities in Africa over the past five years, one is encouraged by how much of a durable nature has been achieved with relatively modest expenditure and by how little has had to be written off as a result of political instability. In all the countries of asylum, UNHCR-assisted projects have led to the firm settlement of thousands of refugees, meaning that after a period of outside aid, usually averaging two years, the refugees are self-sufficient and have attained a standard of living comparable to that of the indigenous population.

"I would like to stress that UNHCR is not in the development business per se. Once the point has been reached where refugees can stand on their own feet, UNHCR's aim is to have the settlements incorporated into broader regional development programmes which are being carried out by the government or other UN agencies. Often, however, it is not easy to find such a successor and rather than risk the deterioration of what has been accomplished, we are obliged to retain an interest in the management of a project longer than we would wish.

"International protection of refugees with 1951 convention

"I have concentrated on describing how my office works in Africa because this is the area in which there is the largest number of refugees who look to my Office for help. In 1965 out of 222,588 refugees assisted under our programmes throughout the world, 208,000 were in Africa, and the ratio this year will be about the same. Both last year and in 1966 one half of our regular financial target has gone to help refugees in Africa, in addition to the lion's share of allocations made from my Emergency Fund. Thus the magnitude of refugee problems in Africa in terms of our resources is clear.

"In Asia, we have projects for Tibetans in Nepal and Chinese refugees in Macau, and have allocated $10,000 for Khmer refugees from Vietnam in Cambodia. This brings me to the question, of understandable interest to Americans, of uprooted Vietnamese in Vietnam. Under the definition that governs my Office, a refugee is: '. . . any person who, as a result of events occurring before January 1, 1951 and owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear or for reasons other than personal convenience, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country. . . .' The Vietnamese are thus not covered under these terms any more than those who flee from the German Democratic Republic to the German Federal Republic.

"In most countries in Europe, we have now reached the end of the so-called major-aid programmes designed to deal with the backlog of refugees left over from World War II. By the end of 1965, a total of 96,522 persons had been firmly settled as a result of these efforts, and a further 10,000 were in the process of resettlement. Out of the $100 million required to finance these projects, $56 million came from UNHCR and $44 million from other sources, mostly in the countries of asylum.

"In my view, the countries of asylum in Europe (Austria, Germany, Greece and Italy) now enjoy a level of prosperity which has greatly reduced the need for material assistance from UNHCR. Moreover, for those among the 10,000 new refugees recognized each year in Europe who prefer to move on to countries of immigration, the opportunities are, at present, adequate. We look to the continued cooperation of lands of resettlement in keeping their doors open to refugees. We hope that the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration will be able to carry out, without interruption, its important task of moving European refugees to their final destinations. Given these two conditions, the formation of a new backlog of refugees in Europe can be avoided. As tasks in the field of material assistance, formerly carried out by my Office are progressively transferred to authorities and voluntary agencies in the countries of first asylum, we will concentrate on our main ongoing responsibility—international protection. This means encouraging a liberal and comprehensive application of the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees and, in general, striving to ensure a constantly improving minimum standard of treatment for refugees.

"Humanitarian and non-political motives of UNHCR's role

"This, then, is a bird's eye view of our work. Although techniques have had to be modified to meet the very different conditions that our Office now faces, particularly in Africa and Asia, UNHCR is steadfastly adhering to the policy set out in the statute of my Office, and reaffirmed by previous High Commissioners—the policy of remaining purely humanitarian and non-political. Our success in proving that we are an impartial agent of the international community has enabled us to act effectively in all situations, no matter how volatile political factors have been. Perhaps the most convincing testimonials in this respect have come from the countries of origin of the refugees who have not hesitated to express their appreciation publicly for UNHCR's work. They realize that in alleviating human misery we are also contributing to political stability by attenuating sources of friction near their borders. They know that our only interest is the welfare of the refugees and that our action in settling refugees serves to diminish greatly the possibility of exploitation of these uprooted people by elements hostile to their country of origin.

"At the same time, countries of asylum find that our assistance can be freely accepted because it is completely devoid of political overtones. This, in turn, means that we can act as a channel of help from the most diverse sources. The advantages of such a multi-lateral channel of aid increase in proportion to the sensibilities of the country in which programmes for refugee assistance are being carried out. I must add that the United States Delegate to the thirty-country Executive Committee which guides our work, has publicly stated his country's recognition of these advantages and has cited as evidence of the importance it attaches to multilateralism the fact that America is a member of 65 international organizations. Other delegates have repeatedly expressed their conviction that our action is the ounce of prevention that may be worth much more than a pound of cure. The type of verbal tribute which my Office receives is illustrated by the texts of some of the decisions taken by the Executive Committee at its last session. In one resolution it 'paid tribute to the High Commissioner for the dynamic and imaginative approach which he has adopted in tackling new problems particularly in Africa.' In another it 'expressed its satisfaction with the results of the projects carried out under UNHCR Current Programmes and with the effective way in which the High Commissioner was dealing with the new problems of refugees.'

"The chronic financial problem and challenge to the United States

"Against the background of such endorsements, it is hard to understand why my Office is in chronic financial difficulty. Our $4.2 million target this year is large for us, but trifling by international standards. Yet governments never seem to be able to contribute more than $3 million. This is why, in the past, we have been obliged to address ourselves to private organizations and sometimes to the public at large—for example, through our phonograph records 'All Star Festival' and 'International Piano Festival.'

"For 1966, on the occasion of UN Day, which has been dedicated to the cause of refugees by the General Assembly, voluntary agencies in 16 European countries and Australia are organizing special fund raising campaigns for refugees in Africa and Asia. Although each national committee is free to decide how its proceeds will be used, I hope that refugees of concern to my Office will benefit from this effort to a substantial degree so that the one million dollar deficit facing UNHCR may be correspondingly reduced.

"However, there will not be UN Day drives every year. The real answer lies in governments facing up to their responsibilities and giving us the funds to carry out the programmes which they approve. This means wider participation among Member States of the United Nations (at present only 57 out of 117 nations give to our programmes), and larger contributions from those already giving.

"Americans may well ask 'Is the United States doing enough in support of UNHCR's work?' My answer is that your country is doing a tremendous amount—the Government, through its foodstuffs and its contribution to the United Nations Administrative budget, and the voluntary agencies which draw so much of their support from America through their role as our operational partners.

"However, there are two steps which my Office would welcome most heartily. One is accession to the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees. This is the main instrument in the field of international protection—fifty nations are bound by it. I was heartened to see that the American Council of Voluntary Agencies in its testimony at the recent hearings of the Senate Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees made a vigorous statement in support of United States ratification of the Convention. I hope, indeed, that the United States will see its way to subscribing formally to the principles embodied in this important document which is nothing less than the keystone in the whole legal structure of efforts to protect the rights of refugees.

"The second would be an increase in the annual cash contribution of $600,000 which the United States Government at present makes to our programmes to bring it into line with United States support for other voluntary programmes of the United Nations in the social and humanitarian field.

"In coping with the new and burning tasks which confront my Office, I have been greatly heartened by the expressions of support that our work has received in Washington. Among members of Congress Senator JACOB JAVITS and Senator EDWARD KENNEDY have been particularly articulate. Within the State Department I have always found warm understanding from former Under Secretary of State George Ball, Justice Arthur M. Goldberg, Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations, and the Honourable Joseph Sisco, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organizations Affairs. Most recently the creation of a new high-level post in the State Department, that of Assistant to the Secretary of State for Refugee and Migration Affairs, and the nomination of Ambassador James Wine to fill it has attested to even greater interest in refugee problems on the part of the government. Finally the State Department's willingness to lend me such an experienced official as Albert F. Bender, Jr. to serve as Deputy High Commissioner is most encouraging."

WE ARE OUR BROTHER'S KEEPER

(From Vice President HUMPHREY's speech at annual meeting)

"Maybe, as your Vice President, I can express on behalf of the President and your nation a heart full of gratitude for what you do and to give you encouragement.

"I know that here are represented many agencies, nay, voluntary groups, our great Labor movement, our great religious—the voluntary—forces of American life. Voluntarism and voluntary activity are so much a part of the American scene that you simply can't talk about our country in any of its activities without recognizing this great private sector. Voluntarism is a unique characteristic of the American life and I think our best, so I salute you.

"I think we should let the world know that we do like people . . . About a month ago, a little over a month ago, I was home and attended my home church. The title of the sermon was the most interesting one that I have ever seen because it came out about the same time that there was a headline in one of the big magazines entitled, 'Is God Dead?' Really, I just hadn't given that much thought—it seemed to me, frankly, that he was quite alive in my life! I have been a mighty lucky person, but this particular sermon was 'The Way You Treat People is the Way You Treat God.' Whatever your religion, I think that about sums it up!

"And what we are talking about is 'the way we treat people.' I don't think we can say that we are a people of principle, that we are a people of ideals, people that believe in human dignity and human brotherhood, unless we treat people that way.

"Those of you that are engaged in this magnificent effort to help the refugee—you really are demonstrating more than a program of action. You are demonstrating a philosophy of life. You are proving that we are our brother's keeper; that we can help other people help themselves, and you are proving, too, that we can shelter the homeless, feed the hungry, heal the sick, and help the less fortunate move down the road of life, of hope and of peace."

UNRWA AND THE PALESTINE REFUGEES

(By Laurence Michelmore, Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East)

"It is almost a generation since the Holy Land was divided by armed conflict. The open fighting lasted only a few months, but the tragedy of the 1948 Arab-Israel conflict is still evident 18 years afterwards. More than one million Palestine Arabs are still living as refugees in the camps that scar the landscape of the Middle East and in shelters which they have found for themselves in the villages, towns and cities of the countries where they took refuge—Jordan, Lebanon, the Syrian Arab Republic and the Gaza Strip.

"As a result of the conflict, hundreds of thousands of Arabs were uprooted from the territory that is now Israel and became refugees, losing both their homes and their livelihood. When they fled, most of the refugees believed that they would soon be able to return to their homes. Many left on foot with their children in their arms, taking only the clothes on their backs and the few belongings that they could carry. The majority found refuge in the neighboring countries—often within sight of the towns and villages, even the very homes, where they had been living. But they have never returned, for the weeks of waiting turned into months and then years. The refugees continue to pin their hopes to the assurance given by the United Nations General Assembly in December 1948 (Resolution 194 (III)) that those of them wishing to return to their homes and live in peace with their neighbours should be permitted to do so and that compensation should be paid for the property of those choosing not to return. This resolution has been reapproved year after year by the Assembly but never implemented.

"For the past 18 years, the greater number of these refugees and their children have depended for the essentials of daily life on international assistance, administered since 1950 by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees (UNRWA), the Agency created by the United Nations General Assembly for this task.

"As the refugees depend on UNRWA, so UNRWA, in turn, depends upon the generosity of governments, voluntary organizations and individuals; the work of the Agency is financed entirely by voluntary contributions. Regular contributions from the United States Government have been the mainstay of UNRWA's financing and numerous American voluntary agencies, corporations and individuals have given significant assistance to UNRWA.

"Upwards of three quarters of a million Palestine Arabs are believed to have become refugees in 1948. Since then, their numbers have grown through natural increase, and today 1,317,000 Palestine refugees are registered with UNRWA. Some 707,000 of these refugees are in Jordan; 307,000 in the Gaza Strip; 164,000 in Lebanon and 140,000 in Syria.

"Of the refugees who fled from Palestine, about 80 per cent were farmers, herders, unskilled workers, the aged, the sick and their families. The other 20 per cent were business or professional men or skilled laborers and their families. Most of these refugees became self-supporting almost immediately in the Arab countries to which they moved, for their skills were in demand; they have never been dependent on, or in need of relief. It is the first and larger category of refugees who found themselves desperately in need of assistance immediately following their flight, and who have continued to be in need for the past 18 years. They found that the countries to which they fled already had a surplus of unskilled labour and shortage of arable land and natural resources, and could offer them little opportunity for the only kind of work they knew.

"Assistance to the refugees

"The help which UNRWA gives to the refugees falls into three main categories: relief, education and health services.

"Today, UNRWA spends about 45 per cent of its funds on relief, which includes the provision of basic food rations, supplementary feeding and milk distribution programmes, shelter, clothing and assistance to cases of particular hardship.

"The food rations consist entirely of dry foodstuffs and cost four cents per refugee a day. They provide less than is needed for bare subsistence—in fact, only about two thirds of the food normally consumed by a poor person living in the Middle East—and they are supplemented with fresh meat and other foods, either grown by the refugees themselves or bought with their limited earnings. The main item in the ration is flour, much of which comes to UNRWA as part of the contribution of the United States Government. Also included are sugar, rice, pulses and edible oil or fat. This basic ration provides only 1,500 calories per refugee per day (increased to 1,600 in winter by additional amounts). Only the needy are eligible for UNRWA rations, and presently about 67 per cent, or some 870,000 refugees, are registered for rations. Over the years, the Agency has made persistent efforts, and is presently trying to intensify those efforts, to ensure that only refugees in genuine need receive rations.

"The basic rations are not sufficient for growing children and for others vulnerable to malnutrition. For many of these refugees, UNRWA has programmes of supplementary feeding and milk distribution to provide additional nourishment. Regular allocations of milk are given to a large number of babies, children and mothers, and to all pupils in UNRWA's elementary schools; thousands of children have a daily hot meal at UNRWA's feeding centres, and extra dry rations are given to pregnant and nursing women and to certain others in need. Almost all of the powdered milk used by UNRWA is donated by the United States Government, over and above its regular contribution.

"UNRWA's 54 refugee camps give shelter to about 39 per cent of the refugees, the others having found accommodation—often no better than that in the camps—in cities, towns or villages. The camps range in population from a few hundred to the largest organized refugee camp in the world, Rafah Camp in the Gaza Strip, which shelters more than 40,000 refugees. Most of the camps consist of mud-brick or concrete block huts, in which up to five members of a family share one small room.

"The Agency relies on voluntary organizations to collect clothing for the refugees, which is shipped to the Middle East and distributed to refugees in need. Special assistance is also given to a number of handicapped refugees and to others in extreme hardship.

"Education—Key to the future

"With half of the total number of refugees below the age of 18, education is a vital aspect of UNRWA's assistance, and without doubt the most constructive aspect. Whatever the solution to the refugee problem as a whole, the young refugees will need a basic education. Increasingly in the Arab world, as elsewhere, a sound education is a prerequisite to most forms of employment. UNRWA has always laid great emphasis on providing education for refugee children, and presently spends some 42 per cent of its funds on education, including general education, vocational training and university scholarships. The education programme is conducted in cooperation with UNESCO.

"The Agency, in cooperation with the host governments, seeks to ensure that six years of schooling are available to all refugee children, a further three years to those who satisfactorily complete the elementary cycle, and secondary education to a limited but increasing number. Some 228,000 refugee children benefited from the Agency's education programme during the 1965–66 academic year, either in the 425 UNRWA–UNESCO schools or in government or private schools with subsidies from UNRWA. A whole education system, comparable with those provided on the national plane by governments in the Middle East, has been developed during these 18 years—not a long period in terms of education planning. To offer refugee children as good an education as possible, UNRWA is presently making intensive efforts to improve the quality of the teaching in its schools. There is a great shortage of qualified teachers throughout the Middle East and, since the time that the first schools were set up in tents pitched on the sand of the refugee camps, UNRWA has had to recruit as best it could from whatever educated men and women were available in the refugee community. Consequently, many of the 5,000 teachers in UNRWA–UNESCO schools—almost all of them refugees themselves—do not have the necessary academic or professional qualifications, even though many of them have now become good practical teachers. The UNRWA–UNESCO Institute of Education aims to improve their qualifications through a programme of inservice training. There are presently some 1,500 teachers enrolled in the Institute's courses, which are based on correspondence courses and supplemented by personal guidance and regular seminars.

"The Agency awards university scholarships to a few outstanding refugee students; 621 refugees benefited from these scholarships during the 1965–66 academic year.

"Over the past few years, UNRWA has concentrated on expanding its programme of vocational training, to teach skills to as many as possible of the 30,000 young refugees who reach maturity each year. There is in the Middle East, generally, a demand for skilled workers, but a surplus of unskilled labour. With training, young refugees can look forward to productive lives wherever their future may lie; without skills, many of them face lives of poverty and dependence. UNRWA now has 10 teacher or vocational training centres: four in Jordan, and two each in Lebanon, Syria and the Gaza Strip. Some 3,500 places are available to refugees at the 10 UNRWA training centres and in other institutions where refugees receive training at UNRWA's expense. The men's training centres offer courses ranging from telecommunications, mechanics and machine fitting to welding and draughting, in addition to teacher training. The largest of the 10 centres is for refugee girls, built on a hilltop near Ramallah, some 20 miles north of the holy city of Jerusalem, Jordan. The Ramallah centre was established in 1962, with "World Refugee Year" contributions from the United States and the United Kingdom. Six hundred refugee girls attend the centre, training to be teachers, dressmakers, hairdressers, secretaries or directors of child care programmes.

"The success of the vocational training programme is evident from the many thousands of graduates who are putting their skills to productive use throughout the Middle East. In the oil industry, in the booming building industry, in commerce and business offices and in the developing manufacturing industries, UNRWA graduates are to be found at work. Some 1,500 more young men and women will be graduated in 1966, all equipped with skills that will enable them to be self-supporting and to help to support their families. Furthermore, as a major supplier of trained technicians and skilled workers, UNRWA is making a significant technical assistance contribution to the Arab world—a fact that has been recognized by many governments in the form of technical assistance grants to support UNRWA's training programme.

"Health care

"Health care for the refugee is vital, for the danger of epidemics in the crowded camps is ever-present. UNRWA's health programme includes both preventive and curative services which have succeeded in protecting the refugees from serious epidemics. The health programme is based on the clinics and mobile health teams that provide health services at 123 locations, and it includes a maternal and child health service, a school health programme and health education.

"Cost of UNRWA services

"The assistance that UNRWA provides to the Palestine refugees is, with the exception of its education services, at a bare minimum. This is evident from the fact that the entire range of aid is provided at an average cost of about 10¢ per refugee per day—roughly 5¢ for relief, 4¢ for education and 1¢ for health. UNRWA's budget for 1966 amounts to $37,830,000.

"UNRWA depends entirely on the generosity of the international community for the funds which enable the Agency to help the refugees, for it is financed wholly by voluntary contributions. Most of its finances come from government contributions, but donations from voluntary organizations, firms and individuals also play an important part.

"The United States Government has, since the early years, borne the main burden of supporting UNRWA, providing approximately 70 per cent of the Agency's total income from governments. The American contributions come partly in cash and partly in kind—mainly flour, and in recent years have amounted to $24,700,000 annually. The United States Government contribution for the fiscal year 1965–66 was reduced to $22,900,000.

"American aid from the private sector has also been important. Business firms have made contributions, as, for instance, the Arabian American Oil Company, which has over the past six years donated some $370,000, and the automobile industry, which has made donations both of cash and of automotive equipment for use in UNRWA's training centres.

"Most of the support from voluntary agencies and individuals has been channelled through UNRWA's Vocational Training Scholarship Programme. Under this scheme, donors can "adopt" individual refugee trainees in UNRWA training centres, or entire classes of trainees, by providing scholarships to finance their training. A one-year scholarship costs $500, and the donor is sent a photograph and brief biographical details of the selected trainee, in addition to regular progress reports and a report on the employment obtained following graduation.

"Women's organizations have been active, particularly the Zonta and Business and Professional Women's organizations, as have churches and religious organizations, foundations, labour unions and countless individuals who have donated scholarships.

"UNRWA has always benefited from the valuable assistance rendered by the United States Committee for Refugees, particularly in bringing the plight of the Palestine refugees to the attention of the American public through its publications, and through the UNRWA publications that the Committee distributes.

"UNRWA and the Palestine refugees are deeply grateful for the generosity of the American Government and people. Without it, the Agency could not have given the assistance that has relieved so much suffering, and opened the door of opportunity to so many refugee youngsters through its education programme.

"Presently, however, the need for continued generosity is greater than ever, for UNRWA finds itself in a serious financial situation. The Agency faces a substantial budgetary deficit, largely as a result of the ever-mounting cost of providing education to an increasing number of refugee children. The Twentieth Session of the United Nations General Assembly issued an urgent appeal for increased contributions, and a number of governments and other contributors have been generous in their response. But the need for further contributions is still urgent, and unless the deficit is covered, UNRWA may have to curtail some aspects of its already very limited programme of assistance to the refugees.

"The future

"What does the future hold for the Palestine refugees?

"As I have reported to the United Nations General Assembly, the international community and its agent, UNRWA, are confronted with a long-term problem in providing for the needs of the refugees. In the absence of an overall solution to the problem, many refugees are likely to remain in need of assistance for a period to which a time limit cannot presently be fixed, and a large "hard core" of refugees could well continue to need aid for the rest of their lives.

"For these refugees, mostly the older generation, UNRWA's relief and health services are essential. For the younger generation, the education services are their lifeline to a future of usefulness and self-respect. For the region as a whole, UNRWA's continued existence contributes to the maintenance of overall stability.

"Until a solution can be found to the whole complex problem of the Palestine refugees, their welfare and their needs must, surely, continue to command the sympathy and concern of the international community which, from the beginning, has been so deeply involved in the plight of these victims of the tragic conflict over the Holy Land. I am confident that the government and people of the United States will continue to respond—as they have done with such notable generosity in the past—to the crying needs of the Palestine refugees."

PROJECTS FOR WHICH UNRWA IS SEEKING FUNDS

Operating rehydration/nutrition centres

UNRWA operates 15 centres for the treatment of refugee infants afflicted with gastroenteritis, a serious ailment in the Middle East particularly during summer months. The average annual operating cost of each centre is about $5,000.

Operating health centres

In the larger UNRWA camps in Lebanon, Jordan, the Syrian Arab Republic and the Gaza Strip, a health centre is established in each to serve the refugees. Each centre is usually comprised of a general out-patient clinic for sick adults and children and provides facilities for medical consultation, dressings, injections, eye-treatment and medicines; and a maternal and child health section for preventive health services for pregnant women and nursing mothers, infants and young children. In some centres, a maternity ward is included for the admission of cases of normal delivery. The cost of operating these centres varies according to the population served and the extent of the facilities provided at a particular centre. The cost usually runs from $30,000 to $50,000 per year for one centre.

School construction

For the 250,000 refugee children of school age, UNRWA provides the normal cycle of elementary and preparatory schooling. Although UNRWA has constructed 240 primary schools, recent increases in the number of children attending school have made it necessary to resort to "double-shifting" and using rented premises, which are at best, unsatisfactory for the purpose and costly in the long run. UNRWA needs about $500,000 for the construction of new schools and for additional classrooms in schools already in use. The following are examples of two new schools required in the Syrian Arab Republic to replace unsatisfactory rented premises:

Tiberias Boys' School

This is a combined elementary and preparatory school situated at El Quneitra. It is proposed to construct 9 classrooms, 2 administrative and 2 handicraft rooms to accommodate about 450 boys, at an estimated cost of approximately $21,000.

Yarmouk Girls' Elementary School

This school is also situated at El Quneitra. It is proposed to construct 5 classrooms and 1 administrative room to accommodate about 200 girls at an estimated cost of approximately $11,000.

Handicapped children

UNRWA itself has no facilities for providing treatment and training for handicapped children but, as funds become available, it places them in existing Middle East institutions that give medical care or specialized training and education. Particulars of cost are as follows:

(a) For crippled children—The treatment of each case is usually of one year's duration at an average cost of approximately $1,000 per child;

(b) For blind or deaf and dumb children—The rehabilitation and education is usually of six years' duration at a total average cost of about $2,500 for each child.

Vocational training scholarships

In order to give as many as possible of the young refugee boys and girls the opportunity to lead useful adult lives in their community, UNRWA operates 10 vocational and teacher training centres for the training of these young men and women in Jordan, Lebanon, the Syrian Arab Republic and the Gaza Strip.

There are teacher training courses for both young men and women. Additionally, for men there are training courses for such trades as auto mechanics, electricians, radio and TV mechanics. There is also a business and office practice course. Besides teacher training, the girls' courses include dressmaking, hairdressing and business education. The classes vary in size and duration but most classes have 16 trainees in two-year courses.

Under the scholarship programme, donors may "adopt" whole classes or individual trainees. A scholarship for a trainee for the full two years of his or her course amounts to $1,000—or $500 per trainee per year. This covers the costs incurred at the Centre, including instruction, classroom and workshop supplies, board and lodging of trainees and other incidental expenses.

Photographs and personal particulars of the trainees being sponsored are provided and, throughout the two years of their training, periodic progress reports are sent to the donor. Subsequently, the donor is informed of the employment obtained by the graduates.

NEW HORIZONS FOR OLD

(By Bastiaan W. Haveman, Director of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration)

"A few weeks ago, a port officer from the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM) greeted 164 European refugee-migrants at John F. Kennedy International Airport and guided them through the public health, immigration and customs formalities.

"An earnest refugee in his forties clutched the sleeve of the port officer. 'I cannot find the words to thank you for your gift,' he said, 'for your ICEM has given my wife and me a new horizon. We fled our homeland just a few months ago. No longer could we practice our religious beliefs or even our professions in freedom. So quickly have you propelled us to a new life. So quickly do we feel welcome in our new land.'

"A week later, our port officer met another plane at the same airport, this one carrying 147 passengers. The thanks were expressed by a 91-year-old woman who had known persecution since she was five years old simply because of her ethnic origin. She explained, "I can be at peace now, for today you have brought us to freedom's land. Now my daughter and my grandchildren can face today and tomorrow with hope."

"This theme, repeated with slight variations at airports and seaports throughout the Western world illustrates the daily work of Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, literally transporting hundreds of thousands to new homelands with a bright, new horizon.

"One million five hundred thousand resettled

"When we commemorate our fifteenth anniversary on December 5, 1966, we can vividly recall that we have resettled 1,500,000 Europeans who reached for our lifeline and that of this group, more than 650,000 were refugees.

"In glancing back at our refugee success stories in moving uprooted peoples as quickly and compassionately as possible, we recall with deep gratitude the unflagging support of our member Governments, the close cooperation of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the U.S. Escapee Program and voluntary agencies, all of whom lent heart, hand and hope to our efforts.

"They have been as determined as we that those continuing to seek freedom and security be spared a demoralizing wait in transit camps, that a mixture of compassion and modern methods can speedily transform these refugees from visible, demoralized problems in the countries where they seek temporary asylum to 'invisible' enheartened newcomers.

"More new refugees in Western Europe

"Our celebration of the success in carrying out the mandate given us in Brussels fifteen years ago is muted by the over-riding concern that the public has forgotten refugees in Europe. They are unaware that today more new refugees are flowing into Western Europe for temporary asylum—seeking permanent resettlement opportunities—than at any period in our existence, except for the Hungarian refugee exodus which began erupting on November 4, 1956.

"Indeed, many of those who think about refugees at all have said that it is time to turn the international community's attention to other continents. Their reasoning appears to be based on three premises. First, there is no sizable number of new refugees in Europe and only a handful of the older 'difficult cases' are left after the International Refugee Organization disbanded in 1951. Second, they argue that political, ethnic, religious and social conditions have improved enough so that no more are motivated to seek asylum in the West. Third, internationally-assisted resettlement in a permanent homeland is an out-moded, if not a lengthy and expensive solution for refugee problems.

"The fallacy of this reasoning is well known by our member Governments who have contributed funds, temporary asylum or permanent sanctuary. It is equally understood by the voluntary agencies, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, and the U.S. Escapee Program.

"The fact that approximately 39,000 have sought our resettlement help this year, some 10,000 more than a dozen years ago, bears out my conviction that the size of the European refugee problem—or challenge, as I prefer to call it—continues to warrant our deep and unceasing concern.

"During the first six months of this year, the number of refugees seeking asylum in western Europe was approximately thirty-five per cent higher than during the same period a year ago.

"To cope with this influx, ICEM, in cooperation with countries of immigration and the voluntary agencies, was able to move during this period thirty per cent more refugees from transit centers in Italy than a year ago, twenty-one per cent more from Germany, and an unprecedented increase of ninety-six per cent more from Austria.

"Many reasons are advanced by the refugees as to why they make the difficult and basically heroic decision to leave their native lands. Some leave because they can no longer endure the spiritual, social, or professional repression which they had long suffered; others leave because of growing government opposition to their ethnic or religious background; still others leave to join relatives in the West from whom they had long been separated. Irrespective of their individual motivation, all sacrifice familiar soil, possessions, status, friends when they make the difficult decision to become refugees. Their flight is based on the hope that the Western community will help them realize their aspirations.

"We in ICEM are determined that the spectre of refugee camps, with their inevitable accompaniment of despair, indignity and frustration, never become a reality again. We owe this to the refugees who have risked much to find freedom and we also owe this to the countries of first asylum whose governments have always accepted the heavy financial burden imposed upon them by the accident of geography.

"Because the numbers of people seeking temporary asylum show no sign of abating in the foreseeable future, it is essential that ICEM's services be maintained and its flexibility and financing assured. We cannot avoid our continuing responsibility and forget that refugees are arriving in Western Europe at an increasing rate or that this flow will cease abruptly.

"European refugees favor resettlement

"As to resettlement as a solution for refugees, the Committee quickly discovered that the overwhelming choice of the European refugees was resettlement, rather than the other choices offered of local integration or repatriation. This was precisely the experience of ICEM's predecessor organization, the International Refugee Organization.

"Resettlement of refugees does cost money. This year, our budget for our refugee program will cost about $8,000,000. Much of it will go for the provision of transportation. The rest will go for the provision of services—whether directly by our staff or through our allied voluntary agencies—designed to prepare the refugee for successful resettlement and integration into the social and economic life of his new country. Since these activities are performed at the request of the Governments concerned, they may vary from country to country.

"In the country of emigration, or first asylum, ICEM may register new arrivals and compile dossiers on old cases. Our staff provides persons desiring to emigrate with information on the country of his choice. Our doctors frequently prepare medical dossiers. We also have contributed funds and operating staff for refugee processing centers where emigration interviews and other formalities can be handled smoothly and swiftly.

"Increasingly, we have been offering language instruction, designed also to assure a speedier integration in the refugee's prospective homeland.

"In most countries of immigration, ICEM assists in the reception of refugees on their arrival. It may be routinely guiding them through Government formalities or improvising a bunting for a baby born unexpectedly at Shannon airport with the mother insisting that she and the baby continue the flight immediately.

"Perhaps the sum of $8,000,000 for this year's refugee resettlement program looks smaller when compared to the alternative and far larger expense were these same asylum-seekers housed in large over-crowded refugee camps. Perhaps it shrinks, too, when compared with the windfall to the receiving nations.

"The then U.S. Secretary of Labor, James P. Mitchell, touched on this matter after the United States had welcomed some 41,000 Hungarian refugees: 'When the decision was made to open the nation's frontiers to the homeless and suffering of Hungary, there was little, if any, thought of what would be received in turn. It is now clear that America has received a valuable economic bonus.'

"Mr. Mitchell reported that of the great majority of some 19,000 employable adults, 72 per cent were in the prime working ages of life, that 34 per cent had skills urgently needed in American industry and that a further 18 per cent were engineers, doctors and other professional people very much in demand. He added that the National Academy of Sciences estimated that 'the education of these Hungarian scientists, engineers and other University graduates represents an investment of over $30 million.'

"There were similar expressions then and since from officials of other countries who welcomed refugees as a humanitarian gesture, but found their countries enriched in the process.

"ICEM pledges itself to continue to provide its humanitarian assistance to refugees in Western Europe. But it must be stressed that our organization can do so only to the extent that resources are made available to us.

"We find ourselves in something of a dilemma. Were we not doing our job, the plight of the European refugees would be unfortunately, visible in the camps. Because our common task is being attended to efficiently, one sees refugees regularly embarking at seaports and airports, not huddled in the midst of the misery of refugee camps.

"It becomes increasingly difficult to mobilize public support to stave off more visible hardship. Yet this is what must be done. Thirty-five to forty thousand refugees a year now make the difficult choice of crossing borders to find freedom. They ask our help in quickly finding peace, security and dignity.

"Let us hope that we can provide an affirmative answer."

THE CUBAN REFUGEE PROBLEM

(By John F. Thomas, Director, Cuban Refugee Program)

"Elfan Rees of the World Council of Churches often refers to the 20th Century as the "Century of the Homeless Man." When one realizes how many persons have been uprooted or are being uprooted throughout the world, one can see the validity of Dr. Rees' statement. The United States Committee for Refugees lists some 11.2 million people who are in refugee status at this present moment throughout the world.

"It is often said that 'a refugee votes with his feet.' It takes a great deal of courage for a man and his family to walk away from the work of a lifetime. One must leave his home, his furniture, his car, his bank account, his employment, to move off into a strange world among strangers to begin life anew. Why should one make such a drastic decision? The main answer lies in the word: 'freedom.' Your action is in reply to a government whose actions restrict and suppress your freedom and your right to human dignity.

"In January 1959, Fidel Castro took over the government of Cuba. People began fleeing to the United States, but the exodus did not grow to large numbers until after Castro publicly announced his intention to follow the Marxist-Lenin line. Thus, in 1960 and 1961, when the schools were taken over and the major firms were nationalized, people began to leave Cuba in large numbers. Prior to October 23, 1962, when the missile crisis brought the daily flights from Cuba to an abrupt halt, refugees were coming in at a rate of 1,700 per week. By the close of 1962, our Refugee Center in Miami had registered over 154,000 persons. Of this number, nearly 67,000 persons were receiving financial assistance in the Miami area.

"The Cuban refugee arrived in a state of destitution, having been stripped of all assets except for a small amount of clothing. As in all refugee problems, the first phase of any program of refugee aid is to meet the immediate needs of food, shelter, clothing, and medical attention. Space will not permit me to go into detail of the complex program that has been developed over the years that has expended, as of the end of fiscal year 1965, some $180 million. Let me touch on some of the highlights.

"With so many people crowding into the Miami area, the Federal Government established a policy of resettlement away from Miami. Four national voluntary agencies were contracted to furnish resettlement services to the Government. These agencies are: National Catholic Welfare Conference, United HIAS Service, Church World Service, and the International Rescue Committee. By December 1, 1965, nearly 100,000 of the 185,000 registered refugees had been moved to some 3,000 communities in every state of the union, including Alaska. This action, based on the generosity of the American people working through their churches, synagogues and community groups, relieved Miami of what could have been a serious conflict of ethnic groups and reduced the financial assistance program in Miami from 67,000 persons to less than 14,000.

"Over 20,000 Cuban refugee children of school age were in the Miami area in 1962. Separate schools were not established, but the fine Miami community accepted these children, 90 per cent of whom could not speak English, into their normal school system. During the early years an additional 13,000 children were sent into the United States by harassed parents who feared communist indoctrination of their children. With the help of Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish child-care agencies, these children were placed in care in 41 States. The number has now diminished to less than 900, as parents have been able to leave Cuba on the current airlift. Over 1,700 medical doctors have arrived from Cuba. Our program has sponsored a refresher course at the University of Miami Medical School for these professional men. The majority cannot practice because of licensing restrictions, but they can serve in hospitals and institutions under the supervision of an American doctor. Hundreds of Cubans are serving as Spanish-language teachers in many schools about the country, as the result of having participated in one of our many teacher training programs.

"These are some of the highlights of the Cuban Refugee Program. On September 28, 1965, Fidel Castro announced that he would permit any person who wished to leave Cuba to do so. President Johnson, in signing the new immigration legislation on October 3, 1965, stated that the United States would hold to its traditional position and grant asylum to anyone who sought it. In November, the Swiss Embassy, acting on behalf of the United States, completed a Memorandum of Understanding with the Cuban government which calls for the orderly movement of Cubans to the United States on the basis of family reunion. Flights were commenced on December 1, 1965, and to date some 26,000 Cuban refugees have arrived in Miami on the current airlift. These refugees are processed by our immigration service, registered by the Cuban Refugee Program and counseled by representatives of the four voluntary agencies working with the Program. About 73 per cent of those registered by the Program move out of Miami to rejoin family members in other parts of the country.

"This is one of the few times in history where a communist country permits an orderly flow of its citizens to escape to a so-called capitalistic country. For the benefit of the families which have faced separation for such a long time, we hope that the permissive nature of the flow will continue. Our data processing equipment in Miami shows that some 700,000 persons may want to leave Cuba. This will reduce the population of six million considerably. Castro gains the possessions of the refugees, we gain their skills and the refugees gain their freedom. This is what it is all about.

"Let us look for a moment at the kind of people who are coming in on the current airlift. Between December 1, 1965, when the airlift was initiated, and May 6, 1966, total arrivals were 19,667. The age breakdown of this group is as follows:

"Cumulative since Dec. 1, 1965 (as of May 6, 1966)

"Ages:	*Percent*
0 to 17 (6,270)	32
18 to 45 (6,893)	35
46 to 64 (5,404)	27
65 and over (1,100)	6

"The occupations of employable family members are as follows:

"Occupations:	*Percent*
Professional, Semiprofessional and managerial (1,698)	9
Clerical and sales (2,184)	11
Skilled (1,086)	6
Semiskilled and unskilled (1,050)	5
Services (769)	4
Agricultural and fishery (374)	2
Students, children, and housewives (12,506)	63

"One of the questions that is often asked of us is: What affect is the current influx of refugees having on the labor market? The answer is that there is little impact. The fact that 63 per cent of our refugee intake is comprised of students, children, and housewives, indicates that we have only a relatively small reservoir of labor building up in the Miami area. We have on file in our Miami Refugee Center over 15,000 requests from employers around the country, seeking Cuban refugees as workers. These requests are not for just a single worker, but for, in many instances, hundreds of workers. If there is any problem caused by the influx, it occurs in housing, but here again it is not an acute problem, and is confined to only a few isolated communities.

"There are often queries on why some people who have placed their name with the Cuban Immigration Service for out movement on the airlift, do not come out. One can deduce many reasons from questioning refugees who arrive in Miami. One of the major reasons appears to be that the Cuban government will not permit a male of military age, i.e., 15 to 26 years of age, to depart. If there is a son or a husband who is denied permission to leave because of military age, many times the whole family will remain behind. In other cases, it might be that a member of the family is a political prisoner, and the Cuban government will not, at this time, permit political prisoners to leave. In some instances the families are caught in a financial situation. One person applies for an exit permit, the Cuban authorities make an inventory of all of his property. If there is evidence that he may have sold his car, or his house, or withdrawn a sizeable amount of money from the bank within the past year, he will be requested to replace the item before he is permitted to depart. Some technicians are held back until such time as a work replacement can be found. However, we have been surprised that more than 60 medical doctors have been permitted to come out on the airlift.

"The great majority of Cuban refugees are in this country on a parole status. This is proving to be a strong barrier in the economic field. It is hoped that the U.S. Congress will see fit to pass legislation that will permit the adjustment from parole status for Cuban refugees to that of permanent-resident status, as was done for the Hungarian refugees in 1958.[1]

"This country recently has taken pride in having its Congress enact legislation that would provide medicare for the elderly citizens. Our Program supports on financial assistance, in the Miami area alone, over 7,000 Cuban refugees who are over 65 years of age. They cannot qualify for medicare because of the lack of permanent-resident status. This represents another injustice caused by continued parole status.

"To conclude, I would hope that the United States Committee for Refugees would concern itself with interpreting to the American people the plight of the refugee who finds himself in this country without permanent-resident status. The holding of a person 'in limbo,' as far as legal immigration status goes, for more than two years (and many thousands of Cubans have been in this situation over five years), is contrary to our American principles and Democratic practices.

"Secondly, I hope that the United States Committee for Refugees will lend its support to a more elastic use of existing international machinery presently available in meeting new refugee situations throughout the world. I believe that it is both senseless and a waste of experienced manpower to rush in a newly formed organization or to establish unilateral arrangements to deal with every new refugee situation as it may occur. We should do our utmost to strengthen existing international machinery which has proven to be very capable in the past."

SOUTH VIETNAM: THE REFUGEE PROBLEM

In South Vietnam, we are faced with a completely novel situation in the history of refugee problems. For the first time, the problem of the refugee is not the plight of the emigre seeking asylum in a strange country; he is a citizen who is a refugee within the borders of his own country despite the fact that his homeland is in the control of his own government.

We are painfully aware of the moral ambiguity rising out of our nation's effort in Vietnam. The debate and controversy, healthy and useful as it is in clarifying our understanding and resolution about our role in Vietnam, and in Southeast Asia as a whole, must not—cannot—hinder or limit in *any way* the expression of our traditional and everresponsive humanitarian concern for the wounded and the wandering.

Our readers will note, from the directory of private agencies, that there are now 24 American voluntary groups at work in Vietnam ministering to the needs of refugees and to the war-stricken civil population generally. The rapidly expanding programs of these agencies have stretched their resources to the absolute limit and they are deeply in need of increased and continuing financial support of the American people. A great number of these agencies have programs in many countries of the world which cannot be neglected and whose support cannot be reduced. Their work in Vietnam, therefore, depends on new and added support from their friends in the United States.

---

[1] From the American Immigration and Citizenship Conference Legislative Bulletin No. 7, August 31, 1966:

The House Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality met today and ordered H.R. 15183 as amended, which was introduced by Congressman JACOB H. GILBERT (D., N.Y.) on May 23, 1966, be reported favorably to the full Committee on the Judiciary. This legislation authorizing the adjustment of status to permanent residents for refugees from Cuba would permit the Attorney General in his discretion to create a record of lawful admission as of the date of approval of the refugee's application.

Refugees who are natives or citizens of Cuba and who arrive in the United States subsequent to January 1, 1959, will be eligible to apply for adjustment.

	Cumulative total, June 30, 1966			
	Refugees in temporary shelters	Resettled refugees	Refugees returned to original villages	Total number of refugees
Region I	125,947	62,515	68,292	256,754
Region II	230,479	114,965	4,379	349,823
Region III	79,086	66,097	15,610	160,793
Region IV	65,220	116,997	52,221	234,438
Total	500,732	360,574	140,502	1,001,808

AGENCIES WORKING WITH REFUGEES INCLUDING PROGRAMS IN VIETNAM

I. Intergovernmental agencies—UNHCR, UNRWA, ICEM

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), United Nations Plaza, New York, New York 10017

The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees continues to give assistance to the homeless and needy in all parts of the world.

In spite of a never-ceasing influx of refugees into Europe over the years, the number of European refugees still of concern to UNHCR had dropped to some 1,070,000 by the end of 1965. The bulk of these refugees—some 650,000—were located in Europe. Some 260,000 were in North America, some 100,000 in Latin America, and some 50,000 in Australia and New Zealand. There were about 7,000 in various countries of Africa and Asia, and about 1,200 still on the mainland of China, seeking resettlement opportunities elsewhere. Of the 650,000 in Europe, 12,000 (including 500 in camps) were still not settled and required UNHCR assistance toward their final re-establishment as 1966 began. These remaining "old" refugees are in Austria, Germany, France, Greece and Italy. Projects for their resettlement are in the process of being implemented.

There is a continuing and increasing influx of refugees in Europe. Each year, over 10,000 of them require the particular attention of UNHCR toward their movement or local integration. Refugees at one time considered resettled in a number of Latin American and other countries require renewed assistance from UNHCR, because of changing circumstances, or because they are now aged, handicapped or in ill-health.

It is in Africa that UNHCR is faced with a most urgent problem, numerically and in terms of seeking solutions which fit in with the general need for assistance of developing countries. UNHCR is actively participating in efforts to deal with situations involving more than 650,000 refugees in Central, East, and West Africa.

Complex relief problems in Asia also required the attention and assistance of the High Commissioner. In Macau, various types of projects are being implemented for the 30,000 Chinese refugees there. As to the 1,100,000 Chinese in Hong Kong, UNHCR has channeled funds in support of the substantial efforts undertaken over the years by the Hong Kong authorities.

The UNHCR program in Nepal for the resettlement of 7,000 refugees from Tibet is mainly directed toward resettlement on the land. In India, UNHCR assistance takes the form of supporting a number of land settlement projects undertaken by the Indian Government and a number of international organizations and agencies on behalf of Tibetan refugees.

United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA), United Nations Plaza, New York, N.Y.

UNRWA is a subsidiary organ of the United Nations, established by the General Assembly to provide assistance to the Palestine refugees. In cooperation with the "host" Governments (Jordan, Lebanon, the Syrian Arab Republic and the United Arab Republic), it carries out its task of providing relief services—basic food rations, shelter, supplementary feeding and welfare to refugees in special need, health services and education services (general education, vocational, teacher training, and some university education).

At the end of 1955, there were 1,300,117 refugees registered with UNRWA, of whom 873,123 received all UNRWA services, including food rations. Since half of the Arab refugees are under 18 years of age, UNRWA is striving to expand and improve its education and training programs; 175,971 pupils are taught by almost 5,000 teachers in 431 UNRWA schools. In addition, almost 60,000 refugee students attend Government and private schools subsidized by UNRWA.

UNRWA has ten residential teacher and vocational training centers with an overall capacity for some 3,500 trainees. One center at Ramallah, Jordan is for girls; the others are for boys. A total of 36 courses are offered to the young men, and 7 courses to the young women in the vocational training centers.

UNRWA is financed entirely by voluntary contributions, primarily from governments,* but also from donations from private sources which provide substantial support for the vocational training program. UNRWA is appealing for scholarships of $500, each of which provides a year's training for a refugee boy or girl. Donors, in return, receive photographs and personal histories of the trainees they have "adopted."

UNRWA headquarters are in Beirut, Lebanon, and the Agency operates in Lebanon, Syrian Arab Republic, Jordan and the Gaza Strip, with liaison offices at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, Switzerland, and at the United Nations, New York.

Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM), 370 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

The movement of European refugees to countries offering them opportunity and security is a major function of ICEM. To ensure the efficient resettlement of 35,000 to 40,000 uprooted people each year, ICEM works closely with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the United States Government through the U.S. Escapee Program, as well as with other governments, international organizations and voluntary agencies.

From 1952, when the agency began operations, to June 30, 1966, ICEM moved a total of 1,444,604 persons of whom 789,235 were refugees.

During the first six months of 1966, there was an increase of 35% in the number of persons from Eastern European countries seeking asylum in Western Europe.

Also of concern to ICEM is a group of European refugees from the mainland of China. ICEM, through its office in Hong Kong, has aided and resettled 20,860 of these refugees since 1952.

During 1965, ICEM assisted 1,700 persons of Western European nationality in North Africa, who, on account of the process of decolonization, sought residence elsewhere. It is expected that there will be a continuing flow of refugees in this category over the next few years.

Member Governments (now totaling 30) have, since 1952, contributed $150,000,000 to the resettlement of refugees. ICEM's budget for 1966 is $8,000,000.*

II. U.S. Government—DHEW, State

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (DHEW), Welfare Administration, Washington, D.C.

Operating the Cuban Refugee Program under a February, 1961, Presidential directive, DHEW works closely with four voluntary agencies in resettlement efforts and had, by July, 1966, resettled 116,000 Cuban refugees of the more than 207,000 who voluntarily registered at the Cuban Refugee Center, Miami, Florida. A significant change in the pattern of arrivals took place on December 1, 1965 when the first planeload of refugees arrived from Cuba under the new "Memorandum of Understanding" with the Cuban government. Since that date, this relative-to-relative airlift has brought 26,332 refugees to the United States. However, escapees by small boats still risk the perils of the Straits of Florida crossing from their homeland, and others arrive via Mexico and Spain. With resettlement through sponsors and jobs the principal objectives, the Program also provides refugees with temporary financial assistance, surplus food distribution, health services, special training opportunities, funds for Cuban children's education in Miami and foster care for unaccompanied children.

Department of State: Agency for International Development (AID), Voluntary Foreign Aid Service, Washington, D.C.

AID cooperates very closely with the private voluntary agencies engaging in a wide variety of overseas programs. These programs, while not always exclusively limited to refugees, do in fact, reach a large portion of the world.

Notable among the programs is the distribution of surplus American foodstuffs. AID reported that during 1966 the Agency is providing about $15 million in Public Law 480 foods to refugees, and through its regular programs, is spending approximately $28 million in assistance to refugees. Other general AID programs provide peripheral benefits to refugees at a cost to the United States government of $55 million.

Many American voluntary agencies have had long experience in providing welfare, education, housing, rural development, health and agricultural services to people in underdeveloped areas.

AID's Voluntary Foreign Aid Service serves as the focal point of contact between the voluntary agencies and AID.

---

*For the fiscal year 1965–66, the United States Government contributed $22.9 million in cash and foodstuffs.

*The U.S. contribution (through ORM) to the ICEM budget in 1965 was $4,553,000.

In addition to its contractual arrangements, AID encourages, through the Voluntary Foreign Aid Service, informal non-contractual relationships in technical cooperation overseas between voluntary agencies and the AID missions. The agencies' services are supported from their own resources.

Department of State: Office of Refugee and Migration Affairs (ORM) Washington, D.C.

The United States has a deep humanitarian concern for refugees throughout the world and since the end of World War II has provided massive amounts of assistance to refugees. Most of United States Government assistance to refugees overseas is administered by or in coordination with the Department of State. Well over a billion dollars of U.S. Government assistance has been provided for refugee programs and current expenditures are at the rate of $115 million a year. Some programs are operated directly by the Department of State working through contracts in cooperation with American and international voluntary agencies. In addition, the United States supports and contributes to the programs of international organizations which assist refugees.

Several programs are administered directly by the State Department through its Office of Refugee and Migration Affairs (ORM). The United States Escapee Program (USEP) operates in Europe and the Near East where, through contracts with voluntary agencies, it assists directly in the integration and resettlement of refugees from European Communist countries. USEP assisted over 8,000 refugees in 1965.

Through the Far East Refugee Program (FERP), ORM provides assistance to refugees from Communist China in Hong Kong and Macau. FERP projects include educational facilities, medical services, vocational training, re-establishment assistance, and other projects which help the refugees to become self-sustaining.

The United States also participates in providing assistance through American voluntary agencies to Tibetan refugees in India and Nepal. Here again, the projects supported are designed to accomplish the permanent resettlement of Tibetans through reestablishment in agricultural centers and industrial projects, and with the provision of vocational training and other educational assistance, medical services, and emergency food and housing.

Since December 1, 1965, when a new "Memorandum of Understanding" was negotiated with the Castro Government, the Department of State has been responsible for coordinating the transportation of Cuban refugees to the United States. As of June 30, 1966, some 28,000 Cuban refugees had arrived in Miami to be united with their families, under the new agreement.

Through the Department of State, the United States also supports the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in its vital role of resolving problems throughout the world. The United States is a member of the Executive Committee of the UNHCR and is the principal contributor both in cash and food commodities.

The Department of State also provides United States support to the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM) of which the U.S. has been a member since its inception in 1951. Through its contribution to ICEM, the United States assisted in the transportation and resettlement of many thousands of refugees and migrants. Half of the approximately 67,000 persons moved by ICEM in 1965 were refugees; the United States contribution for that year was $4,553,000.

The total United States contribution for the support of the above programs in 1966 will be over $7,500,000.

Over the years, the United States has been the principal contributor to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA). The United States contributes 70% of the total cost of the care of these refugees which in 1965 amounted to $24.7 million in cash and food.

In cooperation with the Agency for International Development (AID), the Department of State has arranged for other major contributions to refugee programs in Asia and Africa. For example, AID is providing about $15 million in Public Law 480 foods to refugees during 1966 and is spending about $28 million in assistance to refugees through regular AID programs. It is estimated that other general AID programs provide peripheral benefits to refugees at a cost of $55 million during 1966.

III. Voluntary agencies

American Council for Emigres in the Professions, Inc. (ACEP), 345 East 46th Street, New York, N.Y.

The American Council for Emigres in the Professions, Inc., specializes in counseling, retraining and placement services to refugee professional men and women. In addition to approximately 2,000 academically trained emigres currently in its active files, ACEP registered 932 new refugee professionals during the past fiscal year, ending May 1, 1966. The majority, 497, came from Latin America, mostly from Cuba and Haiti; 379 came from behind the Iron Curtain—with a significant number of Rumanians among them. The balance of new applicants came from troubled areas in the Near, the Middle and the Far East. New registrants were trained originally in 45 fields of learning in the humanities, the social and natural sciences, art, music, and the applied arts and sciences. The largest groups of professionals were physicians, teachers and educators, engineers, lawyers, accountants, linguists and business administrators. The Council was able to secure a total of 327 professional placements—not including the positions which many applicants found on their own as a result of ACEP's counseling. In addition, 76 interim jobs were secured for applicants while they perfected their English or prepared for ultimate professional employment.

As in the past, special orientation or retraining courses were offered to channel the talents of refugee professionals into areas where there is acute need for trained personnel.

Some of the areas of most urgent need for trained personnel are: the Lawyer-Librarian Project; the Volunteer English Tutoring Project in which 65 volunteers give personalized English tutoring to 780 students; and the Social Work Project for Spanish-speaking applicants, with the development this past year of two three-month Institutes for the intensive training of Social Work Aides, directed toward providing Spanish-speaking personnel for community agencies participating in the Anti-Poverty Program.

A special retraining project to enable Spanish-trained elementary and secondary school teachers to qualify for certification to teach in New York public, independent and parochial schools was developed in cooperation with Teachers College, Columbia University, and special financing was arranged through a foundation. It is currently underway, with twenty-five teachers now enrolled in language laboratories preparatory to full-time study toward a Master's degree in education. Other retraining projects for selected refugee physicians, dentists and pharmacists to enter the field of public health, and lawyers to qualify for business administration opportunities are planned for the coming year and await only funds for their implementation.

The American Council for Judaism Philanthropic Fund, 201 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

Dedicated to the belief that Jews can be at home in every truly free society, last year the Fund assisted 2,300 North Africans of Jewish faith who have chosen to live in France, and over 500 refugees from behind the Iron Curtain to resettle in countries of their own choice. It again awarded two scholarships to Arab refugees in UNRWA training schools and made grants to the Shaare Zedek Hospital and The Association for the Blind in Israel.

American Council for Nationalities Service (ACNS), 20 West 40th Street, New York N.Y.

ACNS and its member agencies are primarily concerned with services to immigrants and refugees after they arrive in American communities. These services are designed to aid in their adjustment and integration. ACNS also helps in the resettlement of refugees and is particularly involved today with refugees from Cuba and Hong Kong. In the Cuban program, ACNS cooperates actively with the several resettlement agencies, aiding in finding jobs and housing. Member agencies of ACNS, which number 36 in 18 different states, also seek to stimulate and maintain a spirit of "welcome" and acceptance for the foreign born. To this end, member agencies have oganized non-denominational resettlement committees composed of representative elements in the community. During 1965, ACNS and its member agencies provided casework services to more than 45,000 immigrants and refugees and group work activities for some 225,000 persons of foreign birth or parentage.

American Emergency Committee for Tibetan Refugees, Inc. (AECTR), 1790 Broadway, Room 705, New York, N.Y.

The American Emergency Committee for Tibetan Refugees, Inc. was founded in the spring of 1959, when the Dalai Lama led the flight of Tibetan refugees from the brutalities and ruthlessness of the Communist invaders. It was the first voluntary agency to come to the aid of these unfortunate victims of aggression. The first phase of AECTR aid to the Tibetan refugees was concerned with emergency help. Working in close cooperation with the Indian government, AECTR assisted in setting up primary shelter camps and meeting the urgent needs of clothing, medicines, food and shelter. Gradually, over the years, the emphasis of the program has shifted toward rehabilitation and re-education—to get the refugees settled, help them achieve self-support, learn new languages and customs, and become an integral part of their new environment. AECTR gives support to refugees in India, Bhutan and Nepal.

To assist the approximately 6,000 small Tibetan refugee children who are either orphaned or separated from their families, AECTR has instituted an "adopt a homeless Tibetan child" program. The cost is $15.00 per month, or $180.00 per year. "Adopting parents," who may be individuals or organizations, may indicate their preference for a boy or girl and will be supplied additional details about the child on request.

American Foundation for Overseas Blind (AFOB), 22 West 17th Street, New York, N.Y.

As the world's only specialized agency dealing exclusively with the problems of all blind people regardless of nationality, race, color or creed, AFOB provides service to thousands of refugees who are among the world's 14 million blind people. Programs in agricultural training, industrial training, rehabilitation and education reach a large refugee population, especially in the Middle

East and Southeast Asia. AFOB cooperates with agencies of the United States Government and the United Nations in providing these services.

American Friends of Refugees, Inc. (AFR), 866 United Nations Plaza, New York, N.Y.

The administrative headquarters of AFR are in New York with operational offices in Frankfurt/Main, Germany. The agency assists refugees from the USSR and satellite countries with food, clothing, housing, language training, employment placement and for those desiring to emigrate, a visa-processing program is in effect.

AFR specializes in assisting refugees and escapees with professional and scientific backgrounds, the majority of whom emigrate to the United States. Approximately 350 refugees in this category have been processed recently. Outside of the United States, the agency operates under contracts with the Office of Refugee and Migration Affairs (ORM), Department of State, and maintains close cooperation with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM), and with the American Council for Emigres in the Professions (ACEP).

American Friends Service Committee, Inc. (AFSC), 160 North 15th Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

AFSC continued to provide programs for refugees in Hong Kong and Vienna as well as assisting in the integration of former refugees in Algeria. In addition, the Committee continued to resettle refugees in the United States and is supplying material aid to Angolan refugees in the Congo and to handicapped Arab refugees in Jordan and Lebanon. The Committee has developed an extensive family planning program as part of its public health education services in Hong Kong. The AFSC's major programs to aid refugees are in the following areas:

Algeria—Establishment of a series of community development programs in rural villages composed of former refugees and displaced Algerians. The program includes training in manual skills, health education, agricultural extension work, and assistance in the organization of community projects; 250,000 returning refugees have merged with the rural population and benefit from this program.

Hong Kong—A program has been established within the largest resettlement housing project, offering such services as: a cooperative nursery school, a mothers' and a fathers' club, counseling and recreational groups for youth, and vocational training. Community development projects have been established in fishing villages inhabited by refugees around Hong Kong—10,000 refugees were directly involved in AFSC programs, while some 55,000 were reached indirectly.

Austria—Final stages of phasing out a resettlement program for Hungarian refugees. Some 300 refugees are involved.

Central Africa—Material aid supplied to Sudanese refugees in the Congo, Kenya and Uganda.

United States—Resettlement of European, Chinese, Cuban and Arab refugees.

Vietnam—Relief work in Quang Ngai, South Vietnam.

Program initiated in 1966.

Personnel: 2 US; 6 Vietnamese (anticipated).

Expenditures: 1966 budget—$57,000.

American Fund for Czechoslovak Refugees, Inc. (AFCR), 1775 Broadway, Room 430, New York, N.Y.

There has been a substantial increase in the number of refugees escaping Czechoslovakia into Germany, Austria and Italy during the last 3 years, and it continues. The AFCR caseload now includes more than 4,000 refugees, mostly difficult-to-resettle, of whom about 1,200 are new refugees. The AFCR program is one of continuing assistance in resettlement, local integration, material and medical help, education, recreation, and rehabilitation of refugee children. Newer refugees are resettled as soon as possible into the United States or other free-world countries.

American Immigration and Citizenship Conference (AICC), 509 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

The AICC, as an association of voluntary agencies, does not conduct programs of direct relief. But its work is of importance to refugees in that it bears upon their admission to this country and integration once they are here. The AICC is a coordinating agency for over 90 non-profit and non-political agencies interested in promoting a non-discriminatory immigration policy. Standing committees initiate and carry out studies on immigration legislation, immigrant integration, citizenship preparation, international migration affairs and immigration research. AICC acts as a clearing house for information, stimulates conferences on immigration and refugees and provides the means for joint action by its member agencies. AICC's work is bolstered by its numerous publications.

American Korean Foundation (AKF), 345 East 46th Street, New York, N.Y.

Although the four million refugees who fled from North to South Korea are listed as "officially integrated," more than one million are still unemployed and live in shacks. The Foundation is fighting this poverty through village development programs which include bench terracing eroded hillsides for food production, building earth-block houses for families given the terrace land by the Government of the Republic of Korea, and providing sanitary wells, latrines, community houses, schools and clinics. Last year, refugees also benefited from AKF's agricultural aid and assistance to hospitals, clinics, laboratories, medical schools and orphanages. Destitute Koreans, refugee and non-refugee, were assisted by AKF's provision of scholarships, medicines, vocational training, and educational and medical equipment.

American Middle East Rehabilitation, Inc. (AMER), 777 United Nations Plaza, New York, N.Y.

AMER's aims and objectives are threefold: (1) to help provide vocational training for Palestine Arab refugee youths; (2) to provide emergency relief when needed in the Middle East, and (3) to promote and help support projects designed to help raise the standards of living in the Middle East. Chartered in New York in 1948 as American Middle East Relief, Inc., AMER changed its name in 1963 to more accurately reflect its present emphasis on rehabilitation.

AMER solicits cash donations which are used to provide scholarships, chiefly in UNRWA's vocational training schools and, also, at the Arab Development Society. It also solicits gifts-in-kind from American manufacturers, prepares them for shipment overseas and donates them to UNRWA, who uses the money, originally budgeted for the purchase of essential supplies, to provide additional vocational training opportunities for Palestine refugee youths.

Brethren Service Commission (BSC), 1451 Dundee Avenue, Elgin, Illinois 60120

BSC, cooperating with Church World Service and the Mennonite Central Committee, serves refugees in South Vietnam through the Vietnam Christian Service program. BSC also operates most of the service centers across the United States where material aid, clothing, blankets and medicines are processed for Church World Service, Inter-Church Medical Assistance, and some for Lutheran World Relief. BSC works with CWS in resettling refugees in the United States, including those from Cuba.

Catholic Relief Services (CRS), National Catholic Welfare Conference (NCWC), 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York

Catholic Relief Services-NCWC maintains direct relief, social and economic development projects and various health, education and welfare programs in more than 80 countries throughout Asia, Africa and Latin America. These programs include food, clothing and medicine distributions to the needy—regardless of race, religion or color—as well as vocational training, rural education, urban renewal projects and the provision of emergency supplies and other services.

During the 1965 fiscal year, CRS sent overseas relief supplies, including U.S. government-donated food surpluses, with a total value of $131,914,192.56.

In the field of refugee relief and rehabilitation, Catholic Relief Services continued its assistance to the resettlement of Cuban refugees as well as increased its overall aid program in war-torn Vietnam. Concerned with the growing problem of the combat in Vietnam, CRS added 900,000 refugees, widows, orphans and other war victims to its relief program, totaling over 1,300,000 recipients. Other refugee relief programs in which CRS took part included the Congo; the Central African Republic, working with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in giving assistance to 50,000 Sudanese refugees; and in Tanzania, in conjunction with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and other voluntary agencies, assisting 60,000 Rwandese refugees.

Vietnam—Program initiated in 1954.

Personnel: 8 U.S., 1 Australian, 1 Filipino surgeon, 56 Vietnamese.

Expenditures: 1966 budget—$464,000. Value of shipments—$5.8 million.

The Christian and Missionary Alliance (C&MA), 260 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

The Christian and Missionary Alliance is not a relief organization, but because it is the major Protestant missionary group in Vietnam and in Laos, it is inevitably involved in refugee problems.

C&MA has worked primarily in cooperation with the Mennonite Central Committee, the Christian Children's Fund, World Vision and the N.A.E. World Relief Commission.

In Laos, 6 missionaries are engaged part-time in refugee assistance and social welfare activities. Financial and material support for Laotian refugee aid comes from the N.A.E. World Relief Commission, the Mennonite Central Committee and The Christian and Missionary Alliance.

Vietnam.—Program initiated in 1911.

Personnel: 103 missionaries (17 currently on furlough) of whom about 16 are involved in vocational training, academic instruction and social welfare activities. One staff member currently on loan to N.A.E. World Relief Commission.

Expenditures: Programs supported by local churches with some assistance from the Mennonite Central Committee.

Christian Children's Fund, Richmond, Va.

The Christian Children's Fund provides a wide range of aid—financial, medical, educational, food, clothing, care, adoptions—for both refugee and non-refugee children all over the world. Its principal refugee relief projects last year included:

Brazil—assistance to families who have migrated from the country to the city and have not been able to acclimate themselves to metropolitan economics.

Hong Kong—assistance to several rooftop schools for refugee children, providing books, clothes, emergency medical aid, and one meal a day.

India—maintaining refugee children from Tibet in orphanages close to the disputed border areas.

Israel—educational and emergency aid to children of Arab refugees living near Bethany.

Korea—financial aid to orphanages caring for children of North Korean refugees who have either been abandoned or separated from their families.

Vietnam—Financial aid to orphanages for children of parents killed by the Vietcong, and Family Helper Projects for the children of refugee families.

Program initiated in 1953.

Personnel: Total 60. 1 U.S. nurse, 4 U.S. administrative personnel, 30 Vietnamese cottage mothers and other institutional staff, 20 Vietnamese caseworkers. A permanent U.S. field representative will be placed in Saigon shortly.

Expenditures: 1966 budget—$40,400 for existing facilities. $170,000 has been assigned for expanded program.

Church World Service (CWS), 475 Riverside Drive, New York, N.Y.

Church World Service, a part of the National Council of Churches, is the coordinating and administrative facility for major Protestant Refugee and Relief agencies in the United States.

Refugee resettlement is an ongoing program of Church World Service. In 1965, refugee self-help programs, sustaining relief and direct services were maintained through Church World Service for the 19th year by U.S. Protestant and Orthodox church members. These programs were sustained by $23,144,811 worth of United States surplus and other donated supplies and $10,644,444 in contributions from supporting churches.

Through its 19 years to December 31, 1965, CWS had resettled 149,943 persons. Last year, 1,792 Cuban refugees were resettled and 503 persons were resettled under Public Law 86–648 (Fair Share Law). Another 328 persons entered the United States through the Chinese Parole Program.

Continued emphasis on the Cuban Refugee Program since its inception in 1961, has resulted in 16,531 persons being resettled by CWS.

Vietnam—See Vietnam Christian Service.

Church agencies cooperating with CWS:

World Relief Committee, American Baptist Convention.

Brethren Service Commission, Church of the Brethren.

Disciples of Christ.

Division of World Mission, Evangelical United Brethren Church.

Lutheran World Relief.

Methodist Committee for Overseas Relief (MCOR).

Dept. of Overseas Relief & Interchurch Aid, Presbyterian Church in the U.S.

The Protestant Episcopal Church.

Board for World Ministries, United Church of Christ.

Committee on Relief and Rehabilitation, The United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

Cooperative For American Relief Everywhere, Inc. (CARE), 660 First Avenue, New York, N.Y.

Refugees in Southeast Asia, the Far and Middle East are among the 40 million people CARE is helping during fiscal 1966, through food, self-help and medical programs in 36 countries on four continents. Now marking its 20th anniversary, CARE has distributed more than $798,000,000 worth of aid since its inception, including U.S. agriculture abundance, specially purchased foods, seeds, and agricultural implements, vocational tools, health and educational equipment, medicines and hospital supplies. Through MEDICO, a service of CARE since 1962, it also stations medical teams and specialists in critical health areas.

Normally, CARE does not serve refugees as a special group, but directs its aid to them as part of its assistance for all groups of needy in each operating country. However, at times of crisis, it initiates special refugee programs. For example, since 1959, it has maintained a special fund for Tibetan refugees in India, and it is currently conducting an emergency aid program for the war refugees in South Vietnam. Refugees are also among the major beneficiaries of current CARE education, resettlement and job-training projects in such countries as South Korea, Israel, Hong Kong and the Gaza Strip.

Vietnam—Program initiated in 1954.

Personnel: 5 U.S.; 13 Vietnamese.

Expenditures: 1966 budget—$1,940,000.

Direct Relief Foundation (DRF) 27 East Canon Perdido Street, Santa Barbara, Calif.

Direct Relief Foundation donates drugs and medical supplies to needy hospitals where they are used for treatment of destitute patients and refugees regardless of race, creed or nationality. Shipments are assembled according to needs outlined by a physician who is responsible for receipt and use of these drugs and medical supplies. Direct Relief Foundation has a paid staff of seven and over 300 volunteers and their total overhead is 2½%. In 1965, the total value of shipments exceeded $7,000,000. Drugs and supplies are contributed by manuufacturers and collected by members of the Woman's Auxiliary to the American Medical Association. A substantial part of shipments was donated for the benefit of refugees in Central America, the Near and Far East. In 1966, DRF is confident to match or exceed its 1965 performance.

The Thomas A. Dooley Foundation, Inc., 442 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.

The Dooley Foundation renders medical and health service to refugees and nationals alike who would otherwise receive no care at all. The locations of the program centers are confined to South East Asia with a total of 11 programs in 5 countries—India, Nepal, Thailand, Laos and South Vietnam. Of these 11 programs, four are primary refugee relief. In India mobile health units serve Tibetan refugees in the Punjab and in the Kulu Valley. There is a self-help program of handicrafts and sales at Mussoorie. The other major endeavor in Tibetan refugee assistance is a program of social and educational assistance in foster home care for over 1,000 Tibetan children in the school center at Mussoorie. The fourth unit primarily concerned with refugee care is directed to an institution caring for nearly 600 orphans in South Vietnam.

Vietnam—Program initiated in 1961.

Personnel: 1 U.S. administrator.

Foster Parents' Plan, Inc., 352 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.

Foster Parents' Plan, Inc., a non-sectarian agency, has a twofold purpose—the relief and rehabilitation of destitute children in war-ravaged and underdeveloped countries and the preservation and rehabilitation of the family through help to one of its members. This is done by means of financial "adoptions." A United States or Canadian individual or group "adopts" an overseas child. The Foster Parent pays $15 a month for a minimum of one year. Benefits to the child and his family include an $8 monthly cash grant, new clothing, household equipment, and medical care, plus counseling and guidance by local social workers. Emphasis is on the education of the children.

Of the 42,085 children currently enrolled, 19,758 live in Vietnam, Korea and Hong Kong. Many are refugees. Foster Parents' Plan has a long range program for all children in its care. A Foster Child remains with PLAN until he becomes 16 (18 if still in school), or the family no longer needs assistance.

All finances are handled by an American Director who employs a staff of local social workers, clerical help, etc. Each country has a program tailored to its particular requirements. In Korea, for instance, the Director initiated a project for training older brothers and sisters of Foster Children for actual jobs that await them upon completion of the various courses. Several hundred graduates are now working in industry and helping to support their families.

In many countries, Foster Parents' Plan maintains its own medical clinics, staffed with local doctors and nurses.

PLAN develops person-to-person relationships between Foster Children and their Foster Parents by encouraging a monthly exchange of letters (original and translation are transmitted.) In 1965, more than half a million individual letters were exchanged. Local translators and clerical workers are employed for this purpose, thereby helping the local economy. In addition, PLAN transmitted without charge 43,206 individual cash gifts from Foster Parents. Each child received the full amount of the gift contributed by his Foster Parent in his own currency. PLAN also forwarded 18,875 parcels from Foster Parents. These are distributed at no cost to Foster Parents.

During the last fiscal year, Foster Parents' Plan, Inc. spent $5,056,468 in direct aid to Foster Children and their families.

Vietnam—Program initiated in 1957.

Personnel: 1 Canadian (director); 35 Vietnamese (including 22 social workers).

Expenditures: 1966—$778,000 (exclusive of cash gifts) of which $673,000 will go for cash grants and goods and $10,000 for surgical and medical needs.

Hadassah, 65 East 52nd Street, New York, N.Y.

Although the Women's Zionist Organization of America does not deal directly with refugees, its work does affect refugees who are being resettled into Israel. Hadassah's health, social welfare and education facilities benefit refugees as well as native Israelis. Last year the Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center handled 250,000 patient visits at its outpatient clinic, gave inpatient service to 17,000 people, provided 5,811 patients with surgery and treated 15,400 emergency cases. Hadassah's Oncology Department treated 16,000 patients, which constitutes almost 50% of all cancer patients in Israel. It is impossible to determine the number of resettled refugees who availed themselves of these medical services and other Hadassah facilities.

Heifer Projects, Inc., 45 Ashby Road, Post Office Box 278, Upper Darby, Pa.

Refugees self-help and resettlement programs are the beneficiaries of Heifer Project aid which takes the form of donations of livestock, poultry, tools and technical services.

Operating during 1965 in the Congo, Greece, Hong Kong, Japan, Jordan and Korea, Heifer Project pioneered agricultural assistance to needy refugees in the form of livestock and cash totaling $49,076. Cost of transport was $35,411, making the grand total spent for the year $84,487.

International Rescue Committee, Inc. (IRC), 460 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.

The International Rescue Committee operates programs on 4 continents to assist refugees from political tyranny. Offices are located in Miami, Los Angeles, Washington, D.C., Mexico City, Madrid, Montreal, Geneva, Paris, Munich, Vienna, Rome, Stockholm, Hong Kong, Saigon and Francistown. By the end of 1965, IRC had registered 39,900 Cuban refugees and resettled 20,050.

IRC's European caseload for 1965 consisted of 11,500 refugees of whom 1,334 were resettled in North America and Australia. Haitian refugees were assisted in the Dominican Republic and New York.

The 1965 Hong Kong program included 3 day nurseries, with a fourth day nursery opening in the summer of 1966. The day nurseries provide a wide range of medical, educational and other services to Chinese refugee children and their parents.

Vietnam.—In the summer of 1965, IRC launched a Vietnam emergency program directed toward the needs of Vietnam's orphans and refugees. An integral part of this program was the recruitment of medical doctors and nurses to work in the areas of refugee concentrations.

Program initiated in 1965.

Personnel: 2 U.S.; 3 Vietnamese.

Expenditures: 1966 budget—$785,000 (of which $440,000 is being provided by AID for the medical-team program). A total of $200,000 worth of medical supplies will be shipped in 1966.

International Social Service (ISS), American Branch, Inc., 345 East 46th Street, New York, N.Y.

International Social Service American Branch is part of a worldwide network of individualized services to families and children whose problems require help in more than one country or involve nationals of more than one country. For example, it aids thousands of refugees with problems of divided families, lost or missing parents, international marriage, lost or abandoned children.

Established in 1921, ISS world headquarters are in Geneva, Switzerland.

ISS American Branch is concerned particularly with intercountry problems in which Americans are involved. For example, in the past 13 years, it has made possible the adoption in the United States of 16,000 abandoned or orphaned children for whom no real homes could be found in their own countries. These small refugees are the most helpless victims of war and disaster but they are the ones for whom the future can hold the greatest promise if aid is forthcoming in time.

ISS American Branch also makes available research on the intercountry movement of people, offers consultation on intercountry and intercultural needs and problems, trains personnel in the international aspects of casework, thus strengthening local welfare services in this country and elsewhere.

Other ISS Branch services in 1966 include:

Vietnam—This office is being financially supported and supervised by the American Branch. Support must be found for additional staff, transportation, and training teams.

The orphaned and abandoned children of Vietnam should not be confined in orphanages or hurried off into other countries without safeguards for themselves and their future. Therefore, to maintain children in family care—whether their own or a foster family—(in preference to depersonalizing institutional care) and to safeguard those children taken from Vietnam for a temporary stay or adoption, ISS proposes:

1. To put into Vietnam a training team of at least three professional staff, including personnel from the United States and other nations.

2. To increase the staff of the ISS office in Vietnam from one to at least eight Vietnamese social workers, one of whom will be trained to become the program director.

3. To seek out homeless children in refugee camps, orphanages and hospitals. In collaboration with other agencies, seek to return children to their own families or relatives; failing that, to develop indigenous foster family care for adoption; finally, when all other possibilities have been exhausted, to assist in adoption in foreign countries under conditions that will offer maximum protection and opportunity to the children.

Cost of first stage (6 months) to begin team development and recruitment—about $25,000. First year for full operation—about $150,000.

Hong Kong—Continued services to refugee Chinese—especially adoption, demonstration immunization, counseling and referral of handicapped children.

France—Continued special services to the problems of refugees from Africa—jobs, family movement, adjustment to new communities.

Italy—Emphasized help in community organization and group problems of disabled and otherwise handicapped refugee families who are in a camp near Rome and cannot be quickly settled in permanent homes.

Vietnam—Program reestablished in 1965.

Personnel: 1 American-trained Vietnamese social worker; 1 Secretary; Vietnamese and foreign volunteers.

Expenditures: 1966 basic budget—$70,000.

Joint Distribution Committee, Inc. (JDC), 60 East 42 Street, New York, N.Y.

In 1965, JDC assisted 42,400 refugees, repatriates, etc. Of these, over 11,000 were citizens in a country of asylum; about 30,000 did not have the protection of citizenship and were scattered over 11 countries. JDC helped these refugees with food, clothing, shelter, medical assistance, low cost loans, vocational training, and school and guidance counseling. JDC also maintained a community aid program which provided funds and technical assistance for synagogues, schools and community centers. JDC focused particular attention in 1965 on these chronic refugee problems:

France—Over 34,150 refugees, mostly from Algeria, Tunisia, Morocco and Eastern Europe. Pockets of these refugees are also found in Italy, Austria and Belgium.

World War II—JDC is still assisting 5,000 war refugees and displaced persons. Most of them—3,300, are in Australia; 330 in Sweden; and a smaller number in Belgium, Norway, Portugal and Spain.

Additionally, JDC aid is still going to small numbers of refugees from Hitler's Europe in such widely scattered areas as Italy, Tangier, Haiti, the Philippines, Portugal and Spain.

In 1965, the welfare, rehabilitation and cultural programs on behalf of refugees and other needy Jews in all parts of the world were sustained by a budget of $28,853,500, provided chiefly by the campaigns of the United Jewish Appeal and 19,717,000 pounds of United States-donated Food For Peace supplies worth $194,776 and other material aid.

Lutheran World Federation U.S.A. Committee for LWF, Temporary Address: 50 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

After January 1, 1967: 315 Park Avenue South, New York, New York 10010

During 1966, United States Lutheran churches contributed about 35% of the cost of the following refugee services of the LWF Department of World Service, budgeted at over $1,750,000, not including the value of contributions of gifts-in-kind:

Hong Kong—In addition to distribution of material aid from Lutheran World Relief and other relief sources, the LWF–WS administers a large program of self-help and rehabilitation; education, youth work and vocational training; and medical and health services, primarily for Chinese refugees.

Jordan—Distribution of clothing to 62,000 refugees and needy frontier villagers and United States surplus food to 29,300. LWF–WS also operates work projects, an industrial training center (120 students), a handicraft center for 36 blind boys, a nurses' school (60 students), a hospital (subsidized by UNWRA) and 9 medical clinics.

Syria—LWF–WS operates 5 medical clinics in the Damascus area and contributes to the nursing school of the Palestine Arab Refugee Institute.

Tanzania—At least 27,000 refugees in Tanzania have received help from LWF–WS. This includes 11,000 Mozambicans, 12,300 Rwandese (mostly Watusi), 2,500 Kikuyus and 300 Congolese. A tripartite agreement between the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the Tanzania government and the LWF provides for the creation of an agricultural community in the Mwesi Highlands of Tanzania for several thousand refugees from Rwanda. Similar projects in southern Tanzania are providing for 11,000 Mozambicans who fled the civil unrest in their home country. The LWF–WS conducts programs of material aid, agricultural, health, community development, education, scholarships for refugee students and water development.

Vietnam—See Vietnam Christian Service.

Meals for Millions Foundation, 1800 Olympic Boulevard, Box 1666, Santa Monica, Calif.

During 1965, the Meals for Millions Foundation installed in Santa Monica, California, a demonstration plant with training facilities for the producton of low-cost, high-protein, fortified multi-purpose food (MPF) and other formulated products to use oil-seed resources available in developing countries.

Trainees of this new facility, with access to University of California in Los Angeles' schools of engineering, public health and business administration will assist developing countries to improve the nutrition of their malnourished populations by the production of their own multi-purpose food from available, indigenous oil-seed meals heretofore unused as human food.

Relief and demonstration grants of American, Indian, Brazilian multi-purpose food and the Mexican multi-purpose food, called Protea, totaled 201,470 pounds for 1965. Of this amount 43,512 pounds went to agencies engaged in refugee feeding in the Congo, Hong Kong, Kenya, Taiwan, Tanzania, Uganda, Upper Volta and Vietnam, and for Tibetan refugees in India and Nepal.

Four new Indian factories increased India's MPF production from 10 tons to approximately 27 tons per day.

Production facilities made available in the United States, through the agreement of Meals for Millions and General Mills, made possible direct purchase from the manufacturer of 88,321 pounds of MPF by the Christian Rural Overseas Program (CROP), a part of Church World Service, for relief feeding in Algeria, Burundi, Congo, Ghana, Hong Kong, Korea, Taiwan, Greece, Italy, British Honduras, Grenada and Haiti.

An additional 188,600 pounds of toasted soy protein (the soy base used in multi-purpose food) was purchased by CROP for relief distribution in Burundi, Congo, Ghana, Malagasy Republic, Tanzania, Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Korea, East Pakistan, Philippines, Taiwan and Yugoslavia.

Medical Mission Sisters, Philadelphia, Pa.

The Medical Mission Sisters, in their 21 hospitals and medical centers in the newly emerging nations, are in constant contact with the refugees and migrants of those areas, serving their sick and diseased.

South Vietnam—In Qui-Nhon, the Holy Family Hospital gives medical care to many of the 50,000 refugees who have doubled the population of that city.

Uganda—Medical Mission Sisters visit groups of Watusi, displaced in tribal uprisings, and treat hundreds of them.

India—In hospitals operated by Medical Mission Sisters in New Delhi, young Tibetan girls, who fled their country when the Communists invaded, are being trained as nurses' aides. They are proving to be a valuable asset to the hospital staffs which give medical care and emergency treatment to a great many refugees and hopelessly sick and hungry people.

Pakistan—In the 1965 border conflict between India and Pakistan, hospitals of the

Medical Mission Sisters in Pakistan were able to give medical care and clothing to Kashmiri refugees who had to flee to safety.

Over 650,000 patients were cared for by the Medical Mission Sisters in India, Pakistan, Ghana, Uganda, Vietnam and Venezuela in 1965.

Vietnam—Program initiated in 1960.

Personnel: 10 U.S. (3 doctors, 1 nurse, 4 nurse-midwives, 1 medical technologist and 1 administrative assistant); 2 Filipinos (1 pharmacist and 1 administrative assistant); and 41 Vietnamese (2 assistant nurses and 39 aides and other employees).

Expenditures: 1966 budget—$24,000.

Mennonite Central Committee, 21 South 12th Street, Akron, Pa.

The Mennonite Central Committee, the official agency of the North American Mennonites, conducted refugee relief operations in Asia and Africa. Last year, the Committee assisted refugees in India, Hong Kong, Vietnam, Burundi and the Congo. The relief program in these areas consisted of:

India—A health program, self-help project and educational program in a government-assigned refugee colony for East Pakistanis in Calcutta.

Hong Kong—Meals served to 3,500 school children daily, educational and family-child assistance to 450 children and general distribution of clothing.

Vietnam—Assistance to refugees from North Vietnam with donations of food, clothing, and medicines. Medical treatment at Nha Trang was expanded. A doctor and nurse were sent to Pleiku to initiate another medical project.

Congo—Shipments of food and clothing distributed through the Congo Protestant Relief Agency for refugees from Angola.

Burundi—Food, clothing and medical supplies for refugees from Rwanda and the Congo. This work was conducted in cooperation with Church World Service and the World Relief Commission.

Jordan—Distribution of flour to 23,000 social cases and 44,000 persons in frontier villages, and distribution of clothing to government-designated needy persons.

Vietnam—See Vietnam Christian Service.

N.A.E. World Relief Commission, Inc., 33–10 36th Avenue, Long Island City, N.Y.

The major refugee programs of this agency are in Korea; Bujumbura, Burundi, Africa and South Vietnam. Services include distribution of food, clothing and medicines to needy refugees in these areas, along with projects for the handicapped.

Vietnam—Program initiated in 1965.

Personnel: Administrative—3 U.S. and 1 Canadian. Mennonite Central Committee will provide about 15 relief workers. It is anticipated that about 30 Vietnamese will be employed in administrative and training capacities. About 75 Vietnamese refugees are now employed in farm and building projects.

Expenditures: 1966—$40,000. It is anticipated that expenditures will decrease as programs are developed and become self-sufficient.

Organization for Rehabilitation Through Training (ORT), 222 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.

Basic refugee services include vocational and technical training, apprenticeship placement and aid in job finding on behalf of Jewish refugees primarily. Several thousand refugees from North Africa were enrolled in ORT training centers located in the Paris region, Strasbourg Lyon, Toulouse and Marseilles. Many special courses were organized for adults and increasing attention was given last year to the educational needs of refugee youth. English language and trade training programs were established last year in Paris, Rome and Genoa for several hundreds of refugees destined for English speaking countries. An interesting sidelight—the language training is conducted by means of electronics language laboratories developed at the Central ORT Institute in Switzerland. The Bramson ORT Trade School in New York, specializing in needle trade instruction to Jewish refugees and other immigrants, gave such training to over 700 persons last year. Other programs were conducted for newly arrived refugees in Israel.

Polish-American Immigration and Relief Committee (PAIRC), 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

PAIRC conducts a continuing program for Polish postwar refugees in Western Europe as well as newly arrived escapees. The scope of the Committee's work covers: immigration and integration help for new refugees, registration and documentation for "old" refugees under special immigration schemes, provision of sponsorship for regular immigration cases, financial assistance to needy refugees, and cooperation in UNHCR integration programs. The total number of refugees served by PAIRC last year was 20,813. The breakdown is as follows: 15,220 in Germany, 2,227 in France, 2,215 in the Benelux countries, 459 in Italy, 287 in Austria and 405 in other areas.

Project Concern, Inc., 1017 C Avenue, Coronado, Calif.

Project Concern is an independent nonprofit relief organization; has established four out-patient medical clinics in Hong Kong and treats over 500 patients a day; has a feeding program for more than 1,500 children at the Hong Kong clinics; has a 42-bed hospital in DaMpao, South Vietnam, also provides out-patient services at the hospital and has a mobile clinic unit regularly visiting two dozen villages and strategic hamlets; has developed a six-month training program in basic, preventive medicine. Trainees are local Vietnamese, Montagnard, and Thai refugees who "graduate" as Village Medical Assistants and return to put their training to use in their own villages; has an international staff of more than 100 doctors, nurses, pharmacists, laboratory technicians, teachers, and volunteers in many capacities; plans to develop clinics, training programs, and self-help projects for as many of the world's needy as possible.

Vietnam—Program initiated in 1964.

Personnel: 4 U.S. (1 doctor, 1 administrator, and 2 nurses); 1 Canadian laboratory technician; 2 nurses (1 Australian, 1 New Zealander); 2 Chinese doctors; 50 full-time Vietnamese.

The Salvation Army, 120–130 West Fourteenth Street, New York, N.Y.

At present, the Salvation Army is engaged in programs of direct service to refugees in Hong Kong, Pakistan, India, Korea, and Austria.

In Hong Kong, the Salvation Army aids Chinese refugee families by operating nurseries, kindergartens and primary schools. These schools offer education to 5,400 children. Free libraries are attended by 700 to 1,000 children daily. Salvation Army vocational training centers help some 300 people annually learn a trade that will enable them to support themselves. The Salvation Army also operates a shelter for street sleepers, a children's convalescent home, medical clinics, and gives direct relief to the needy, particularly the aged and ill. During 1966, aid was also given to a group of White Russian refugees.

In Pakistan, the Salvation Army assisted 6,327 individuals forced to flee from their villages during the outbreak of hostilities between Pakistan and India in September, 1965. In cooperation with Church World Service of the U.S.A., wheat, milk powder, cooking oil, quilts, clothing, and cash grants were distributed. As of May, 1966, approximately 3,500 of the refugees had either returned to their villages or were planning to do so immediately. The remainder continue to require assistance. The Salvation Army's program was carried out in coordination with the Refugee Service Committee of the West Pakistan Christian Council.

In India, the Salvation Army set up a special program to feed refugees repatriated from Burma. At present, about 150 people are receiving food daily and the need is expected to continue for at least another year, as more repatriates are expected from Burma and Ceylon.

In Korea, Salvation Army feeding stations distribute food to 12,000 persons a day.

In Austria, the Salvation Army has opened a new men's home which works in close cooperation with the refugee center in Linz. The refugee center was established by a Salvation Army officer but is now under the jurisdiction of the City Mission of the Lutheran Church.

The Salvation Army is aiding Cuban refugees in Florida, with activities centered about Miami and Key West. In Key West, the Salvation Army is the agency responsible for distributing the government commodities to refugees and also assists with emergency relief. In Miami, the Cuban refugees make up the largest part of the Salvation Army's emergency family relief program which involves food, assistance with rent and utilities, clothing, etc. There are also Spanish-speaking Sunday School classes for Cuban refugees in Miami. The Salvation Army also renders service to refugees in such Florida cities as Tampa, Fort Myers, Fort Lauderdale and West Palm Beach.

Save the Children Federation (SCF), Boston Post Road, Norwalk, Conn.

The Federation conducts a world-wide program of child, family and community sponsorships and village self-help projects to assist people, with guidance and financial assistance to improve their circumstances economically and socially. Some of the people and groups the Federation has worked with are refugees. Federation programs for refugees helped Greek children, families and villages in the aftermath of World War II. A child sponsorship and community self-help program was initiated for Korean refugees after that conflict and still continues. Recent Korean projects have included aid for families dislocated by flood and slum clearance. With the Algerian exodus to France, self-help projects were set up for Moslem refugees.

Vietnam—The Federation has established a child sponsorship program and a community self-help program serving refugees in South Vietnam.

Program initiated in 1966.

Personnel: 1 U.S. Additional staff expected shortly.

Expenditures: 1966 budget—$50,000.

Spanish Refugee Aid, Inc. (SRA), 80 East 11th Street, New York, N.Y.

In the 13 years since its founding, Spanish Refugee Aid has raised over $1,000,000 for the relief of Spanish Republican refugees in the South of France. 100,000 Civil War refugees remain in France, of whom 10,000 need help—a total which increases as the refugees grow older. SRA gives general financial aid to the neediest and has sponsored an adoption program through which 278 adopters send monthly contributions. 438 refugees are hospitalized; 32 are adopted and receive financial aid and letters from their adopters. At the Foyer Pablo Casals, a Center for aged Spanish refugees in Montauban, France, 243 refugees receive monthly food packages and clothing. It costs $800 a month to run the Foyer, which is supported by a number of European committees and American contributions. Since 1963, SRA has sponsored a program of scholarships for children of needy families, and hopes to raise an additional $10,000 this year through the Salvador de Madariaga Scholarship Fund.

Tolstoy Foundation, Inc., 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

The Tolstoy Foundation is in continuous contact with same 20,000 refugees and escapees registered with its offices overseas, and with some 2,000 cases in the U.S.A. The Foundation continues to give counseling assistance in emigration and related processing in all countries in the Free World, with emphasis on legal counseling in Belgium and Latin America, and assistance in local integration through the establishment of small business enterprises, cooperative agricultural projects, workshops, etc., in conjunction with programs sponsored by the United Nations High Commissioner for refugees (UNHCR).

Cultural activities are an important part of the Foundation's program which is centered in the L. C. Stevens Library in Munich and at the Tolstoy Center in Valley Cottage, New York.

Pursuing one of its major objectives—the maintenance of Homes for the Aged and Infirm—the Tolstoy Foundation in 1965 established two new Homes in Rouen, France and Sao Paulo, Brazil, and added a new unit to the existing Homes in Santiago, Chile, for a combined total of 157 persons. This brings the number of aged persons guaranteed lifetime care through the efforts of the Tolstoy Foundation to 1,000. The Foundation is responsible for submission of candidates and their processing for final admission and maintains lists of candidates qualifying under criteria of UNHCR.

An expansion of the Home for the Aged at the Tolstoy Center in Rockland County, New York, now in the planning stage, will add an infirmary section for 86 persons.

Assistance to children is centered mainly in West Germany, with valuable cooperation of British voluntary agencies and Swiss Foreign Aid, and continued summer camp programs for children at the Tolstoy Center in the United States and in Belgium.

The United Church Board for World Ministries, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, N.Y.

The Division of World Services of the Board for World Ministries of the United Church of Christ last year administered a fund of more than $1,000,000, with half that much again in gifts-in-kind for relief and rehabilitation in 50 countries. Much of this was in behalf of "current" refugees and for the alleviation of grave social problems remaining from past migrations. There were special programs in Jordan, Senegal, Congo, Ghana, Tanzania, and other African states, in India and Pakistan, in several Latin American countries including Argentina, Uruguay and Ecuador, in Italy and Central Europe. Special programs were also maintained in Greece and Lebanon, continuing the interest of the Congregational Christian Service Committee in these areas. With major emphasis on self-help projects, especially in the field of agriculture, the Board helped finance the work of other agencies. These included: Heifer Project, Inc.; Meals for Millions Foundation; Agricultural Missions, Inc.; Church World Service, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA; Vietnam Christian Service; Division of Inter-Church Aid, Refugee and World Service, World Council of Churches.

Unitarian Universalist Service Committee, Inc., 78 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.

The Unitarian Universalist Service Committee, since 1945, has maintained a continuous program for the benefit of ill Spanish Republican refugees in the South of France. During the past year, 1,099 households, comprising 2,799 persons—mainly elderly people and children of ill parents—received assistance from the Committee in the form of food parcels, clothing, emergency cash aid and scholarships.

United Hias Service, 200 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.

In 1965, United Hias Service assisted 12,100 migrants and refugees to resettle in the United States, Canada, Australia, France, Latin America and other Western countries. The total budget was $2,504,600.

The agency carries out its program through more than 350 Jewish welfare organizations and cooperating committees throughout the world.

During the past 82 years, United Hias Service and its predecessor agencies have assisted more than 3,000,000 persons to find new homes in lands of freedom and security.

United Lithuanian Relief Fund of America, Inc., 105 Grand Street, Brooklyn, N.Y.

About 9,500 Lithuanian refugees in free Western Europe received aid from the Fund. The agency did not receive surplus food and had to increase accordingly its financial assistance to this refugee group. Very few refugees were resettled into the U.S.A., Canada and Australia. Clothing and medicines are the chief items of aid dispensed by the Fund. Some aid was given to the Lithuanian refugees in Poland.

United Ukrainian American Relief Committee, Inc. (UUARC), 5020 Old York Road, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19141

Through its headquarters in Munich, Germany, UUARC helped about 20,000 refugees and escapees to resettle in new homes and to find employment. The agency continues its immigration program and, for the past year, has been engaged in a program for Ukrainian students in Poland. In cooperation with other Ukrainian agencies, UUARC is planning to organize a nursing home for the aged in the United States.

The World Alliance of Young Men's Christian Associations (YMCA), 291 Broadway, New York, New York

The YMCA acts as a complementary service to the large global programs of the United Nations, governments and churches; it is concerned with the morale of refugees. It is not a relief or migration agency. It tries to establish community centers in the camps (a home-away-from-home) and through them help in the organization of educational, recreational, religious programs, etc. The agency also offers language training, orientation courses for prospective migrants, camping for the children, together with handicrafts and vocational training. To support all this it conducts leadership training courses among the refugees so that most of the leadership and work comes from them.

World Rehabilitation Fund, Inc., 400 East 34th Street, New York, New York 10016

The World Rehabilitation Fund is involved in two projects directly providing services to refugees.

In Hong Kong, under a grant from the U.S. Department of State, the World Rehabilitation Fund is building two centers for the care of physically handicapped Chinese refugees and persons in similar circumstances. One center, the John F. Kennedy Memorial Center for Spastic Children, is to be a 60-bed inpatient program for treatment, training and education. The other center, the World Rehabilitation Fund Vocational Center, will provide vocational rehabilitation training and sheltered employment in a program for 450 persons daily.

Vietnam—In Vietnam, under a contract with the U.S. Agency for International Development, the World Rehabilitation Fund is helping to expand the National Rehabilitation Institute at Saigon, and equip and staff three smaller satellite centers in the provinces. The project includes prosthetics and orthotics, medical rehabilitation and vocational training. In the period from January to June 1966, production of artificial limbs and braces was increased from 6 to 500 devices per month.

Program initiated in 1965.

Personnel: 3 U.S. (1 docter, 1 Prosthetist, 1 administrator); 1 Australian physical therapist provided by the UN; 8 full-time Vietnamese, 12 part-time Vietnamese.

Expenditures: January to June 1966—$138,000. July to December 1966 budget—$150,000.

World University Service (WUS), 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

Needy students from all over the world benefit from WUS aid. Last year WUS continued five major programs aimed at refugee students. They were as follows:

Algeria—Finanical assistance was given to 150 Algerians studying in Europe, and food, drugs, clothing, etc. were provided to refugee students in Tunisia and Morocco. In 1966, WUS is helping the Algerian university community get back on its feet, which requires $30,000 in assistance.

Angola—Financial aid ($70,000 since 1961) has been provided on a continuing basis to refugee students from Angola and other African territories ruled by Portugal.

China—More than $600,000 have been provided over the past six years to foster higher education in Hong Kong. This program continued last year, in addition to which sixteen Chinese professors were brought to the U.S. to study and five students sent to Canada.

Hungary—Since 1956, WUS has been aiding Hungarian refugee students a six million dollar program. They have been able to continue their studies in new countries of residence. There are enough funds on hand to terminate this program in the near future.

South Africa—Grants to colleges in neighboring countries enable non-white refugee students from South Africa to continue their education.

World Young Women's Christian Association (YWCA), 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

The World YWCA, in cooperation with the National YWCA's, is continuing its services to refugee women and girls in Jordan, Pakistan, Hong Kong and Greece. In Austria a refugee program is carried out jointly with the World Alliance of YMCAs. The YWCA, in its refugee services, puts great emphasis on the provision of basic education, vocational training and cottage industries in order to help the women and girls to become self-supporting. Socio-medical services, youth activities and community services are part of the refugee program in various countries.

World Vision, Inc., 919 W. Huntington Drive, Monrovia, Calif.

In 19 countries of the world—in South and Central America, in Southeast Asia, India, Africa, and Hong Kong—World Vision, Inc. maintains orphanages ministering to the medical, social, spiritual and vocational needs of approximately 21,000 orphans, many of them refugees.

Through its Emergency Mission of the Month program, sponsored by friends of the organization who contribute $10 monthly, funds are sent to alleviate the plight of refugees around the world. Refugees also benefit from relief goods shipped with the assistance of AID to many undeveloped countries.

World Vision, Inc. is an interdenominational service agency, approved by the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid under the AID program.

Vietnam—Program initiated in 1965.

Personnel: 1 U.S. administrator, 1 national assistant working with the cooperation of the Vietnamese Evangelical Churches.

ADDITIONAL AGENCIES IN VIETNAM LISTED BY THE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE INFORMATION CLEARINGHOUSE

Asia Foundation: P.O. Box 3223, San Francisco, California 94119.

Program initiated in 1956.

Personnel: 2 U.S.; 11 Vietnamese.

International Voluntary Services: 1555 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.

Personnel: Current total 56 including 1 Canadian and 26 U.S. teachers; 1 Canadian and 13 U.S. agriculturists; 5 U.S. administrative personnel; 10 Vietnamese interpreters and clerical personnel. By the end of 1966 the program will have 200 personnel including 80 teachers, 40 agriculturists, 60 community and urban development workers, and 20 administrative personnel.

Expenditures: 1966 budget—$1.2 million as provided by contract with USAID. This does not include payments by Vietnamese Government for housing, transportation, and salaries of local personnel.

People-to-People Health Foundation, Inc. (Project HOPE): 2233 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20007.

Program initiated in 1961.

Personnel: 3 U.S. (1 orthopedic surgeon and 2 nurses); 6 full-time Vietnamese.

Expenditures: 1966 budget—$27,525.

Seventh-Day Adventist Welfare Service: 6840 Eastern Avenue, Washington, D.C.

Personnel: Total 105. 7 U.S., 5 Australian, 93 Vietnamese. (Teaching personnel includes 2 U.S., 5 Australian, 11 Vietnamese.)

Expenditures: 1966 budget—$63,240.

Vietnam Christian Service:

A new joint program sponsored by Church World Service,[1] Lutheran World Relief, and the Mennonite Central Committee.[1] Administered by the Mennonite Central Committee.

Personnel: Total 29 (24 U.S., 5 Canadians) including medical personnel, agriculturalists, social workers, 1 home economist, material aid specialists, and administrative personnel. Two agriculturalists are on loan to NAE–WRC at *Hue*. A total staff of 55 is expected by September 1966; additional local personnel will serve as interpreters and assistants and receive in-service training.

Expenditures: To support this program CWS will make available $250,000; Lutheran World Relief has allocated $100,000 of which $50,000 will go for personnel, $25,000 for supplies to supplement gifts-in-kind, and $25,000 for other program services; and MCC plans to raise $50,000.

Voluntary Physicians for Vietnam: American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois 60610.

Program initiated in 1965.

Personnel: 92 volunteer physicians. In 1966, approximately 200 volunteer doctors will serve in overlapping two-month tours. Thus far 118 physicians have participated.

Expenditures: The current contract with USAID calls for an expenditure of $500,000 a year for the first 3 years.

Worldwide Evangelization Crusade: P.O. Box A, Fort Washington, Pennsylvania 19034.

Program initiated in 1958.

Personnel: 2 U.S.; 5 international (including 4 medical personnel); 45 Vietnamese personnel (including 6 medical personnel).

Expenditures: 1966—$20,400.

THE UNITED STATES COMMITTEE FOR REFUGEES

Assists the United Nations refugee agencies by providing them public information and program assistance in the United States;

Brings to the members of the Congress and to appropriate Government agencies information and recommendations on refugee and immigration legislation, and provides testimony for Congressional Committees considering pending legislation;

Operates an information clearing house on the work of the more than 50 recognized refugee relief agencies in the United States;

Serves the communication media as a source of information and material on all aspects of the refugee problem;

Provides, through its "World Refugee Report," current comprehensive and authoritative data on refugee situations throughout the world;

Maintains a referral service (to relief agencies) for refugees, former refugees, relatives of refugees, and citizens interested or involved in individual refugee situations;

Furnishes individual students, colleges, universities, and secondary schools with educational materials on the world refugee problem as a part of the social science curriculum.

Makes financial grants to operating agencies according to the availability of its funds for special emergency projects proposed by the agencies. Presently, 8 private and intergovernmental agencies are receiving grants from the Committee.

DREAM COMES TRUE FOR YAKIMA SCOUT WITH USCR INDIA TRIP

Editor's Note.—John Hendrix, an Eagle Scout from Yakima, Washington left for India in February 1966 under the auspices of the United States Committee for Refugees to study Tibetan refugees escaped from Red China. His avid interest in Tibetans began over five years ago when he chanced to discover the 7-year-old son of Jigdal Sakyapa, exiled ruler of Sakya Province in Tibet, lost in the streets of Seattle, Washington. The child's identification bracelet led Hendrix to his home.

"From my Tibetan friends I learned about their problems, and I want to try and do something about it," the Eagle Scout told USCR in his initial plea for Committee sponsorship.

Hendrix returned to the United States in June bringing with him a letter of greeting from the Dalai Lama together with a hand-woven rug made by Tibetan refugees especially for Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey who had encouraged his mission. The Eagle Scout also received warm support from Senator Edward M. Kennedy and from his Yakima Congresswoman Catherine May. Congresswoman May was on hand to welcome him back in Washington D. C. and accompanied him on his visit with the Vice President.

Herewith, Hendrix tells the highlights of his trip to India to study Tibetan refugees:

"The trip began in my mind as a dream and it was still a dream even as I waved goodby to Mom and the kids at the Seattle airport that wintry February day.

"The weather had been foggy and overcast when we took off but as we headed toward Honolulu we found the sun and bright blue water of the Pacific. On this first leg of the journey I had time to think about my Tibetan mission quietly for the first time. Up to now, I had spent most of my time trying to convince anyone and everyone who would listen that I was serious and there was a need for my trip.

"In Washington I was excited and thrilled by the reception I was given by my Congresswoman, Catherine May, Senator Edward M. Kennedy and Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey. The core of my problem, though, was to find a sponsor.

"My dream had almost become a nightmare as door after door was closed to me. Finally, the United States Committee for Refugees heard and believed in me. Now, here I was at least on a plane speeding toward India under the sponsorship and guidance of a distinguished organization.

"I had stopovers in Hawaii and Japan and a brief stay in Hong Kong where the Communist press charged me with being a spy. Their stories were so twisted I wanted to laugh but it was also a little frightening. I got a kick out of the Reds reporting I spoke several languages, including two Chinese dialects fluently.

"I reached New Delhi February 28th, a trifle earlier than my scheduled arrival. Not long after I landed in India I made a tour of Tibetan refugee camps in the area near Kashmir. I was gone ten days and saw so much that made my heart break. Many of the refugees were very sick and I think that most of the old people would have rather died than live any longer. It seemed to me they were either quite old or very young. I asked about this and was told the Communists had taken the young Tibetans and sent them off to schools in China or forced them into slave-labor gangs. Others managed to escape the Reds and stayed in Tibet to fight.

"I walked, far from the small city of Dalhousie, up a steep trail that was exhausting even for a rugged Boy Scout to travel. Finally, I came to a small broken down shack where I saw some of the most inhuman sights in my life. Just before me was a man whose eye hung down to his cheek while flies swarmed around it. There was a woman with one leg and I carried her down a steep bunker over to the shack she called 'home.'

"All around me I saw 'living' death. There were people with bones that had healed wrong, people without hands or fingers or even ears. A boy lay at my side and I watched him as he began to dig his elbow into the ground and crawl. His deformed leg met with his spine and this was the only way he could move himself.

"I came away dazed with disbelief that humans could suffer so much and there was so little being done to ease their miseries. Everywhere they needed medicine, doctors, and nurses. I wished then and there with all my heart that I was a millionaire. As I was leaving this Tibetan refugee camp, a woman came to me and putting her head in my hands, she wept. I shall carry the memory of those poor people as long as I live and it fixed forever in my mind that I must do everything possible to help.

"While this was an unforgettable experience, I think the most exciting was my visit with his Holiness, the Dalai Lama in Dharmsala. It took us a total of 14 hours to travel the 250 miles to his residence in exile. The Dalai Lama and I spoke together for over 45 minutes and I was deeply impressed with this man who is a brave symbol of defiance to Red China. He taped a message to all Tibetans in the United States which I brought back with me. I treasure, too, the white scarf, symbol of friendship, that he placed over my neck.

"His Holiness told me he was quite pleased to know that someone as young as I was willing to help his people. He also expressed the hope that 'organizations' would help Indian farmers in the areas adjacent to the Tibetan land resettlement projects. This, he said, would encourage a more friendly relationship between the Indians and Tibetans.

"I was presented with a letter from the Dalai Lama and a hand-woven rug made by Tibetan refugees to be presented to Vice President Humphrey on my return.

"Before going home to Yakima, I stopped off in Washington and met with Congresswoman May. Together we visited the Vice President and presented the rug. He was deeply moved by the token of sentiment from the gallant and brave Tibetans.

"I'm home now and thanks to the USCR my dream came true but that's not the end of it for me—it's a beginning. I talk to groups about my trip, show my pictures and slides with the hope that I will be able to encourage friends to help the courageous Tibetans."

---

[1] *CWS has been in Vietnam since 1954 (no program 1958–1964). MCC relief programs were initiated in 1954.*

DIGNITARIES HIGHLIGHT ANNUAL MEETING

Outstanding United States government leaders in world refugee affairs participated in the Seventh Annual Meeting of the United States Committee for Refugees which took place in the nation's capital on May 17, 1966.

Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and Secretary of State Dean Rusk honored USCR's officers and members of the Board with a Blair House reception held the evening before the all-day meeting. The occasion was a singularly moving tribute on behalf of the Vice President and Secretary of State in recognition of the work of the Committee and the service of its officers and Board.

In attendance at the Annual Meeting conducted by Maxwell M. Rabb, President of the United States Committee for Refugees, were 325 persons representing 31 voluntary agencies, labor unions, business corporations, officers of the Government and members of the Congress. The meeting provided an unusually representative and responsive forum for the exchange of information and opinion for all participants in private, governmental and intergovernmental programs in behalf of refugees.

Vice President HUMPHREY was the featured speaker at the noon luncheon attended by members and friends of USCR. Ambassador W. Averell Harriman was a guest of honor and spoke informally on his recent visit to Vietnam and the Far East.

Dignitaries participating in the Annual Meeting provided invaluable information on a wide variety of subjects pertinent to world refugee affairs. Participants were:

EDWARD M. KENNEDY, United States Senator from Massachusetts and Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees: *"The New Nature of Today's Refugee Problem."*

JOHN FREDERICK THOMAS, Director, United States Cuban Refugee Program, Department of Health, Education and Welfare: *"The Cuban Refugee Problem."*

GEORGE GOSS, Vietnam Refugee Coordinator, Agency for International Development, Department of State: *"Coordination of Voluntary Service and Reconstruction Programs in Vietnam."*

WILLIAM J. CROCKETT, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, Department of State: *"The New Refugee Problems and the State Department's Plans and Policies."*

JAMES L. HENNESSY, Executive Assistant to the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice: *"The New Immigration Law."*

MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Congressman from Ohio, Chairman of the House Judiciary Subcommittee No. 1 (Immigration and Nationality): *"The Next Problems for Immigration Legislation."*

USCR SCHOLARSHIP FUND

For several years there has been a felt need for scholarship assistance to both young refugees who need help in completing their college or university training and also refugees of more mature years who may need vocational or professional re-training in order to adapt to employment opportunities in the United States.

Mr. Daniel F. Cary, a member of the Board of USCR, has made an initial grant to the USCR Scholarship Fund which is available to acceptable candidates on a revolving-loan-fund basis.

Mr. Cary believes that, in addition to loans, the Committee should be in a position to offer "grants-in-aid" in many situations where repayment of loans is unfeasible.

The Board of Directors in accepting Mr. Cary's gift expressed the hope that there will be further contributions to the Scholarship Fund which can be made available, either as loans and grants as circumstances may require.

USCR'S MAXWELL M. RABB NEGOTIATED TO WIN FREEDOM FOR STUDENT IN EAST GERMAN PRISON

A real life cloak and dagger thriller came to a happy climax when the United States Committee for Refugees played a major role in the dramatic release of John Van Altena, 20-year-old University of Wisconsin student freed this spring from solitary confinement in an East German prison.

Maxwell M. Rabb, President of the Committee, spearheaded the arrangements to negotiate Van Altena's freedom which took place March 16, 1966. He was arrested October 10, 1964 by East German police at "Checkpoint Charlie" for attempting to aid in the escape of an East German mother and her child to the Western Zone.[2] He was given a secret trial and sentenced to eight years imprisonment.

At the time of his arrest, Van Altena was a Lufthansa airline employee. "I was aware of the dangers involved but I wanted to help my East German friends. You can't live with these people without having the feeling that you have a responsibility to help, because they can't do anything without your help," the quiet, handsome student recalled.

During seventeen months' solitary confinement, Van Altena read some 250 books in German. Only a few were by American authors and those permitted were socially critical of the United States.

He was unaware of the painstaking but successful negotiations USCR's President Rabb was making on his behalf until two hours prior to his leaving prison. "I was called in by two interrogators," he remembers, "and after the usual routine of questions, I was asked, 'How would you like to have a beer in West Berlin tonight?' "

At USCR's Annual Meeting in May, Van Altena was invited to attend as an honored guest and held a happy reunion with President Rabb. He also received a warm welcome home from Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, who delivered the USCR's keynote address. At the Committee's luncheon, his host, William J. Murphy, Chairman and President of the Americana Corporation, presented him with a 30-volume set of the *Encyclopedia Americana* and the 1966 Annual to aid in his continuing law studies.

Editors of the *Encyclopedia Americana* are on record as stating the *World Refugee Report* by the United States Committee for Refugees provided basic and valuable information for its comprehensive article on refugees in the *Encyclopedia Americana* Annual for 1966.

OPERATING AGENCIES BENEFIT FROM USCR ANNUAL GIFT WRAP PROCEEDS

The annual Gift Wrap sales of the Committee, which began quietly six years ago, is now a major activity. In view of the increased income to the Committee from proceeds of sales, the Executive Committee, in December, 1965, voted to make supporting grants to special projects of the operating agencies engaged in service to refugees. While our present grants are small, the growing and enthusiastic response to USCR Gift Wrap encourages us to believe that our grants may be substantially increased in the coming years.

As a result of the action of the Executive Committee in December, the Committee has made grants to:

The International Social Service, American Branch, Incorporated, for its work among refugees in Vietnam.

American ORT Federation, in support of its Language Training project in Rome, Italy.

Spanish Refugee Aid, Inc., for its Scholarship Program.

The Thomas A. Dooley Foundation, Inc., in support of its mobile medical unit working among Tibetan refugees in Northern India.

Catholic Relief Services-National Catholic Welfare Conference, to assist in reuniting the family of a Hungarian refugee living in Turkey.

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, for his program of assistance to Sudanese refugees in the Central African Republic.

Church World Service through The Division of World Service of the United Church Board for World Ministries, for its program of assistance in Vietnam.

We feel that the Committee's ability to provide funds to the operating agencies in this way achieves one of our longstanding goals. The 1966 Gift Wrap program has been expanded to provide additional grants.

COMMITTEE FINANCES

The United States Committee for Refugees is supported entirely by the voluntary contributions of its members and friends, and by the proceeds from the sale of its "Tree of Life" Gift Wrap.

The auditors of the Committee's accounts are Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co.

The audit for the year ending June 30, 1966 shows that the Committee received contributions of $53,160.32. Income from this source was approximately $12,000 more than the previous year. Net income from Gift Wrap sales and contributions was $25,234.19.

The Committee's account at the year end showed a deficit of approximately $14,000. The deficit was largely due to the unpaid balance on grants made to operating agencies for special emergency projects overseas. The grants were made on recommendation of the Executive Committee at its December 21, 1965 meeting, out of proceeds from the Gift Wrap Program of 1965. It is anticipated that its unpaid balance on these commitments will be covered by income from Gift Wrap sales in 1936.

The operating budget of the Committee is small—less than $100,000 per year—covering its publication, public information, research and liaison activities.

Fund raising for the Committee's activities is done by its own staff with the cooperation and assistance of members of the Board of Directors. In order to insure the economy and the most careful administration of funds for its program activities, the Committee does not employ professional fund raisers.

The Committee is registered with the Department of Social Welfare of the State of New York.

We strongly urge our readers to use the contributor's envelope inserted in this Issue. We depend entirely on gifts—both large and small—of our friends, and we are most hopeful that YOU will make YOUR contribution NOW for the work of the Committee, and for assistance to refugees.

Contributions to the United States Committee for Refugees, Inc. are tax deductible.

USCR GIFT WRAP

Once again the U.S. Committee for Refugees is offering its annual specially-designed "Tree of Life" Gift Wrap during the autumn and pre-Christmas weeks. The gold "Tree of Life" pattern is printed on Holiday Red, Blue, Green and White. Also, for the many who have asked for it, we have added glittering Gold and Silver Foil!

Each package contains 8 large 30" x 20" sheets and 10 matching gift cards—for only $2.00.

The "Tree of Life" design has special meaning, too. The olive branch symbolizes the world peace we hope for . . . the evergreen, long life . . . the mistletoe, brotherly love. These encircle our own symbol, the "Tree of Life," which represents the homeless and uprooted peoples of the world.

---

[2] Western officials reported recently that 24,500 East Germans had fled to West Berlin and West Germany since the wall was built five years ago. The figure included 1,850 soldiers.

The paper was designed by Mr. Thomas F. Naegele, former Art Director of the J. Walter Thompson Company. Mr. Naegele, a brilliant artist, designed a series of 5 Christmas stamps issued by the United States Post Office in 1964. The design has been executed and the paper manufactured by the Dennison Manufacturing Company.

Last year, sales of the Gift Wrap enabled us to provide grants to support emergency relief projects in India, Vietnam, Africa, France, Italy and Turkey. We hope your *increased* Gift Wrap orders and contributions this year will enable us to *increase* these grants in the coming year.

Won't you help? Send your orders to the United States Committee for Refugees, c/o Irving Trust Company, Box 1000, Grand Central Post Office, New York, New York 10017.

NEW MEMBERS STRENGTHEN BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Dr. George N. Shuster, Assistant to the President, University of Notre Dame and former President of Hunter College, has paralleled a brilliant career in education with exceptional service to the United States Government.

His governmental assignments have included membership in the General Advisory Committee of the Division of Cultural Relations, Department of State; Chairmanship of the War Department's Historical Commission, membership on the Public Advisory Committee of International Cooperation Agency, and membership on the U.S. Delegation which helped to establish UNESCO. During 1950–51, he served under John J. McCloy as Land Commissioner for Bavaria, and until 1963 he was U.S. Representative on the Executive Board of UNESCO. He was appointed in 1956 a member of the President's Committee for Hungarian Refugees.

The author of fifteen books, he is also the translator of several more, and co-author of a number of symposia. Two of his books have received Christopher Awards, and several have been widely translated into other languages.

He has received numerous citations from universities for his service to education and he has been decorated by the Governments of Austria, France and Germany.

Mrs. Edison Dick of Lake Forest, Illinois, has served the United Nations in a number of major roles since 1961. Until September 1965 she was the United States Representative to the Social Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. She was Special Adviser for the United States Delegation to the United Nations General Assemblies in 1961, '62, '64. In 1963 Mrs. Dick served as Alternate Representative.

She is an active member of the National Boards of the United Nations Association of the United States, National Council of Women of the United States, Menninger Foundation, and the Midwest Regional Board of Institute for International Education. Mrs. Dick is presently Vice President of the Adlai Stevenson Memorial Fund.

Her social and public welfare activities began with volunteer work at Hull House. Since then, Mrs. Dick has held posts with the Volunteer Services Committee for Illinois State Hospitals, Governor's Commission to Study Mental Health, and the Illinois Social Welfare Foundation.

Christian A. Herter, Jr., General Manager of Socony Mobil Government Relations Department, brings to USCR an impressive career in international achievement. He is an active participant in many economic and foreign policy organizations, including the National Foreign Trade Council, Foreign Policy Association, and the Council on Foreign Relations.

Before assuming his present position with Socony Mobil in 1961, Mr. Herter was a partner in the law firm of Bingham, Dana & Gould in Boston. His government service included such assignments as General Counsel of the Foreign Operations Administrations and Administrative Assistant to the Vice President of the United States. He also served as a representative in the Massachusetts legislature.

A graduate of Harvard, Mr. Herter received his LL.B. from Harvard Law School. He is the son of Christian A. Herter now attached to President Johnson's staff as Special Representative for Trade Negotiations.

Robert F. Wagner, former Mayor of New York City on three successive occasions, brings to the United States Committee for Refugees unique experience as the chief administrative officer of a city celebrated universally as a "Melting Pot" and symbol of "A Nation of Immigrants." On the completion of his third term in office, December 31, 1965, Mayor Wagner returned to the practice of law in New York City.

Social consciousness and devotion to human need have characterized Mayor Wagner's career. These traits were instilled early in life by his father, the late Senator Robert F. Wagner. He grew up in the world of politics and entered actively into it following the completion of his education. He was graduated from Yale University, the Harvard School of Business Administration, the School of International Relations at Geneva, and received his law degree from Yale Law School in 1937.

That same year he was elected to the State Assembly from the Yorkville District and was re-elected until he resigned in early 1942 to enter the armed forces. Following distinguished service in the war he was elected Borough President of Manhattan in November 1949, a post he held until he was elected Mayor of New York City in 1953.

Karl F. Rolvaag took the oath of office as 31st Governor of the State of Minnesota on March 25, 1963. Prior to his gubernatorial election, he was Lieutenant Governor on three successive occasions from 1954 to 1962.

World War II veteran with a distinguished service record, Governor Rolvaag was a successful insurance executive when he began his political career. Mrs. Eugenie Anderson, who was to become United States Ambassador to Denmark in 1949, was among those who persuaded him to enter Minnesota politics. His earliest ambition was to follow his father, the late Professor Ole Edvart Rolvaag, who headed the Department of Norwegian Literature at St. Olaf College in Northfield, Minnesota.

Governor Rolvaag graduated from St. Olaf's and continued to maintain his interest in Scandinavian history and literature. Acting as Goodwill Ambassador at the request of the State Department, he toured Denmark, Sweden and Iceland in November and December, 1961.

On being elected to the USCR Board of Directors, Governor Rolvaag characteristically stated, "I look forward to working with you on this assignment."

Christopher H. Phillips, President of the United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce, has diligently served the world community on governmental business and economic affairs since 1958. His career in government began in 1948 when he was elected Massachusetts State Senator. He was twice re-elected in 1950 and '52.

Mr. Phillips' governmental posts include Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organisations Affairs in '54; United States Representative on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, 1957; and Representative of the Chase National Bank for United Nations Affairs in 1961.

A graduate of Harvard University, he was elected as one of the ten outstanding younger men of Greater Boston in 1952 by the Boston Junior Chamber of Commerce. He is a World War II veteran.

Edgar F. Berman, M.D., Special Assistant to Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, is internationally recognized for his services to world health organizations and holds a distinguished record of working creatively within the U.S. Government to improve health standards at home and in the world community.

A Fellow of the International College of Surgeons, Dr. Berman was a clinical surgeon at Albert-Schweitzer Hospital, Lambarene, West Africa; has served on the survey teams of Medical Needs in Haiti and Southeast Asia and on the initiation of the International Eye Bank. As a United States participant, he attended the 1965 United Nations World Population Conference held in Belgrade, Yugoslavia. Dr. Berman was an invited observer to the 3rd Session Ecumenical Council in Rome and was given a private Papal Audience in 1964.

He served as a consultant on the White House Task Force on Medical Care for the Aged; was Chief Health Consultant attached to the Alliance for Progress in the State Department and also served the Department as Director of the Population Program in 1963. Under President Johnson he acted as Coordinator for the National Physicians Committee.

He received his medical degree from the University of Maryland Medical School and served his surgical residency at Sinai Hospital, Baltimore, Maryland.

Louis Beck is a senior partner in the international accounting firm of Beck & Field. As an attorney and accountant, he has done extensive work in the areas of taxation, foreign aid and corporate activities in the United States, South America and the Far East. His wide travels through Latin America and the Far East have given him a deep understanding of the social and economic problems of the peoples in these areas.

Aside from his business career, Mr. Beck is noted for his philanthropic work with the care of the aged and the prevention of juvenile delinquency.

Mr. Beck is Treasurer of the New York State Democratic Committee.

A native New Yorker, Mr. Beck attended New York University, Southern Methodist University, and Syracuse University. Following service in World War II, he received his law degree from New York Law School.

IN THE UNSEEN PRESENCE OF 11,000,000 HOMELESS REFUGEES

The Annual Meeting of the United States Committee for Refugees provided an unusual forum for representatives of the Government, private voluntary agencies and regional USCR representatives to discuss their common interest in the solution of refugee problems around the world. The meeting on May 17, 1966 in Washington, D.C., was attended by more than 350 people. Citations for Distinguished Service to Refugees were given by the Committee to Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Eugene Carson Blake, George Meany and Countess Alexandra Tolstoy.

RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if no Senators wish to speak at the moment, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(Thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.)

At 3 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m., the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Vice President.

RETURN OF SENATOR CARL HAYDEN, OF ARIZONA, TO THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is not very often that the Vice President has a chance to speak in this Chamber, contrary to the way it used to be, but I think this is one time when I can ask unanimous consent to suspend the rules so that we may once again hear a welcome to a distinguished Member of this body by the Vice President.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** Is there objection?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President——

[Laughter.]

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** The Vice President would like to say to the distinguished majority leader that he very much appreciates this rare privilege and opportunity, but this is a rather happy—indeed, an exceedingly happy—occasion, one of great joy to the Senate, when we see our beloved friend, the distinguished Senator from Arizona, CARL HAYDEN, back in his seat. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have been around in this Chamber since the 4th of March 1927, which is quite a little while ago. I came to the House of Representatives when Arizona was admitted into the Union in 1912 and served there for 15 years. I have served in the Senate since then. Really, this place looks familiar to me. I am glad to be back, and I appreciate the Vice President's welcome. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. MANSFIELD. CARL, we are delighted, more than you will ever know, to see you back.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I want to be sure that we make this a wholesome, bipartisan welcome, in which you, Mr. President, and all of us are participating.

CARL, it is with delightful gratitude that we welcome you back and see you looking so well. Many good wishes from all of us. [Applause, Senators rising.]

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider two nominations which were favorably reported earlier today.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

CIRCUIT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Spottswood W. Robinson III, of the District of Columbia, to be a U.S. circuit judge, District of Columbia Circuit.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. ATTORNEY, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert M. Draper, of Ohio, to be a U.S. attorney for the southern district of Ohio.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** Without objection, the President will be so notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to legislative session.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 O'CLOCK A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, certain additional calendar items having been cleared, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 1717, 1739, 1760, 1763, 1767, 1773, 1774, 1775, 1779, 1780, 1783, 1816, 1834, and 1836, in that order.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CODIFICATION OF RECENT MILITARY LAW

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 9778) to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to codify recent military law and to improve the code, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments.

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of October 18, 1966, the committee amendments will not appear in the RECORD.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

OFFENSES COMMITTED IN INDIAN COUNTRY

The bill (H.R. 872) to amend the provisions of title 18 of the United States Code relating to offenses committed in Indian country was considered, ordered to to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1770), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being on objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to amend section 1153 of title 18 of the United States Code, which relates to crimes committed within Indian country, by adding to the offenses listed in the first paragraph of the section the crimes of carnal knowledge and assault with attempt to commit rape.

The bill would further provide in the second paragraph of the section that the offense of assault with intent to commit rape shall be defined in accordance with State law.

The third paragraph of section 1153 would be amended to provide that the offenses of assault with a dangerous weapon and incest are to be included along with burglary as offenses which are to be defined and punished in accordance with the law of the State in which those offenses are committed.

The bill would also amend section 3242 concerning the trial of Indians, so as to add to the list of offenses included in the section the offenses of carnal knowledge and assault with intent to commit rape.

STATEMENT

The bill was considered by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary which adopted as its statement on the bill the language of the report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

In its favorable report on the bill, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives said:

"The Department of the Interior in its report to the committee on this bill favors its enactment with the amendments recommended by the committee. The same recommendation is made by the Department of Justice.

"An identical bill, H.R. 11846, of the 87th Congress was favorably reported by the committee to the House on June 19, 1962, and passed the House on July 2, 1962. The reports of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Justice submitted to this committee on H.R. 872 both make reference to the fact that they had previously reported favorably on the 87th Congress bill. The only change in the committee's recommendation on this legislation is the addition of the amendments recommended by both Departments. Section 1153 of title 18 of the United States Code presently lists 10 offenses and provides that an Indian who commits within Indian country any of these offenses against the person or property of another person shall be subject to the same laws and penalties that apply to other persons committing those offenses within the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States. The section now lists the 10 following crimes: murder, manslaughter, rape, incest, assault with intent to kill, assault with a dangerous weapon, arson, burglary, robbery, and larceny. As has been noted, H.R. 872 would add to this list the offenses of carnal knowledge and assault with intent to commit rape.

"The importance of section 1153 is clear when it is considered that an Indian who commits offenses other than those listed in that section against the person or property of another Indian in Indian country is subject only to the laws of the tribe that occupies the Indian reservation involved, unless the reservation is located in the few States where Congress had made the State law applicable. Section 1162 of title 18, United States Code, now lists six States in which State law is made applicable to offenses made within Indian country with the exceptions defined in the section.

"Section 1153 of title 18 includes among the listed offenses the crime of rape. The section further provides that 'the offense of rape shall be defined in accordance with the laws of the State in which the offense was committed * * *.' The courts in construing these provisions have held in a line of decisions that, notwithstanding the fact that the statute states that the offense of rape is to be defined in accordance with the laws of the State, the section is to be interpreted as limiting the scope of the offense to its ordinary common law meaning. The offense of rape defined in State laws as including the carnal knowledge of any female under the age of consent and not the wife of the accused, therefore, has been interpreted as not being included within the offense of 'rape' in section 1153. A decision which illustrates the interpretation placed by the courts upon the present language of the section is that rendered by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit on September 16, 1960, in the case of *United States* v. *Rider* (282 F. 2d 476). The court stated that the law only contemplated the definition of rape as the offense was known under common law. However, this committee feels that it is significant that the court stated that the congressional intent was not clear and that either interpretation was plausible. The court further noted that it was limiting the 'literal application of the statute' and rested its decision in part on the fact that the Congress must have been aware that the statutes of the various States were not uniform and indicated that the Congress could have clarified the situation by adding the offense of carnal knowledge to the list of crimes enumerated in section 1153.

"This state of the law serves to make it clear that the Congress must act to clarify the situation at this time. The most direct way to do this is to include the offense of carnal knowledge within the list of offenses in section 1153 and to include the language now used in section 2032 of title 18 which defines the offense and provides the penalty for carnal knowledge now applicable to that offense within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States. As is noted in the report of the Department of Justice on this bill, the definition and penalty provided in section 2032 now applies to the commission of that offense by a non-Indian against an Indian in Indian country by virtue of the provisions of section 1152 of title 18. The enactment of the amendment proposed in this bill would, therefore, make for uniformity in the definition of this offense in Indian country for it would also make it applicable for an offense committed by an Indian against another Indian.

"In addition, this bill would add assault with intent to commit rape by Indians in Indian country to the list of Federal crimes subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal courts and provides that this crime shall be defined in accordance with the laws of the State in which the offense was committed.

"The offense of 'incest' is now included among the crimes listed in section 1153. However, incest is not made a crime under Federal law with the result that its inclusion in this section does not now have the desired legal effect. This bill would correct this situation by including it as among the offenses to be defined and punished in accordance with the laws of the State in which the offense was committed.

"The offense of 'assault with a dangerous weapon' is similarly included among the offenses listed in section 1153. The Department of the Interior in the report made to the committee on the bill in the 87th Congress indicated a desire on the part of that Department that this offense also be defined in accordance with the law of the State where the offense is committed. At that time, the Department indicated that it felt the definition of the crime of 'assault with a dangerous weapon' now included in section 113 of title 18 caused difficulty due to the fact that it included the element of the intent to do bodily harm. This committee feels that it is logical that the State definition of this offense be made applicable.

"The committee has carefully weighed this proposed legislation and has concluded that the bill with the amendments recommended by the Department of Justice and the Department of the Interior should be enacted. The bill will clarify the law in several areas of criminal jurisdiction and thereby provide for a more logical and fair administration of criminal justice in the areas in which these sections apply. Accordingly it is recommended that the bill as amended be considered favorably."

The committee believes that this legislation is meritorious and reports it favorably.

MRS. EMILIE BOULAY

The bill (H.R. 3500) for the relief of Mrs. Emilie Boulay was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1791), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to provide that the marriage of Mrs. Emilie Boulay and Napoleon Boulay on May 15, 1905, is to be held and considered a valid marriage for the purposes of determining the entitlement of Mrs. Emilie Boulay to widow's benefits based upon the wages and self-employment income of her late husband.

STATEMENT

On May 15, 1905, Napoleon Boulay married Emilie Boulay in St. Anne Roman Catholic Church in Berlin, N.H. In 1956, after 51 years of marriage, Mr. Boulay applied for social security benefits and Mrs. Boulay applied for wife's benefits on his account. At that time, Mrs. Boulay was denied benefits and was informed that the social security law did not permit the payment of benefits to her, because that agency concluded that the marriage would not be considered valid under State law. This conclusion was based on the fact that her husband was the son of her brother. The memorandum accompanying the report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare points out that for the purposes of payment of benefits under the Social Security Act a marriage may be deemed valid where the parties entered into a ceremonial marriage believing it to be valid and where the couple were living together as man and wife at the time of the worker's death. In the case of Mr. and Mrs. Boulay, the evidence presented to the committee establishes that they consulted their church authorities concerning their intended marriage and received special permission to enter into the marriage. They were granted a marriage license by New Hampshire State authorities. While Mr. and Mrs. Boulay therefore entered into marriage believing it valid because of the permission just referred to, the memorandum of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare points out that the exception permitting payment of social security benefits relates only to certain specified technical impediments to marriage and not to a case such as Mr. and Mrs. Boulay's. However, it is clear that there are grounds recognized by the Department as the basis for exceptions even though they do not extend to the actual situation faced in this particular case.

In view of the position of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the unusual nature of this case, a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee scheduled a public hearing on this bill on September 15, 1965. The testimony presented at that hearing established that this marriage continued for a period of 55 years until Mr. Boulay passed away. Four children were born to the couple and the family was a respected and recognized part of their community for all of those years.

After the hearing, the Judiciary Committee concluded that this bill should be considered favorably and in its report set out the reasons therefor, as follows:

"Now a widow of advanced age is denied benefits based upon her husband's contributions to the social security system. Those very benefits were meant to provide a degree of security for widows in Mrs. Boulay's circumstances. Relief in this instance is in line with this underlying purpose of the Social Security Act. The committee recognizes that this statement is made in the face of the fact that there was a legal objection to the marriage. The equities and individual circumstances of the case are such, however, that the committee has concluded that relief should be extended to this widow by legislative action. Accordingly, it is recommended that the bill be considered favorably."

In view of the findings and conclusions arrived at by the House Committee on the Judiciary this committee is in agreement with those stated conclusions, and accordingly recommends favorable consideration of H.R. 3500, without amendment.

ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATES OF CITIZENSHIP IN THE CANAL ZONE

The bill (H.R. 3993) to authorize the issuance of certificates of citizenship in the Canal Zone was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1794), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the Attorney General to issue in the Canal Zone certificates of citizenship to eligible U.S. citizens where such certificates are authorized under section 341 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

STATEMENT

The Republic of Panama leased the Canal Zone in perpetuity to the United States by treaty ratified on February 26, 1904 (33 Stat. 2234).

The act of August 4, 1937 (50 Stat. 558), conferred U.S. citizenship on any person born in the Canal Zone on or after February 26, 1904, whose father or mother, or both, was a U.S. citizen at the time of such person's birth. By the same act, persons born on or after its enactment date, under the same conditions of parentage, were declared to have the same U.S. citizenship status at birth. The successor statute, section 203 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1139), bestowed U.S. citizenship upon persons born under identical conditions in the Canal Zone on or after February 26, 1904, and section 303 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (1952) carried identical provisions into that statute, currently in effect.

The provisions of the three successive statutes above cited relate to persons born in the Canal Zone or in the Republic of Panama provided—in the latter case—that the citizen parent at the time of such person's birth was employed by the U.S. Government, or by the Panama Railroad Company or its successor in title.

Section 341 of the Immigration and Nationality Act authorizes the Attorney General to issue certificates of citizenship to citizens specified therein. However, section 341 of the act requires that the applicant for a certificate of citizenship take and subscribe within the United States to an oath of allegiance, and that the Attorney General furnish a certificate to the applicant only if such applicant is at the time within the United States. Section 341 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 263) reads as follows:

"Sec. 341. A person who claims to have derived United States citizenship through the naturalization of a parent or through the naturalization or citizenship of a husband, or who is a citizen of the United States by virtue of the provisions of section 1993 of the United States Revised Statutes, or of section 1993 of the United States Revised Statutes, as amended by section 1 of the Act of May 24, 1934 (48 Stat. 797), or who is a citizen of the United States by virtue of the provisions of subsection (c), (d), (e), (g), or (i) of section 201 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 1138; 8 U.S.C. 601), or of the Act of May 7, 1934 (48 Stat. 67), or of paragraph (3), (4), (5), or (7) of section 301(a) of this title, or under the provisions of the Act of August 4, 1937 (50 Stat. 558), or under the provisions of section 203 or 205 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1139; 8 U.S.C. 603, 605), or under the provisions of section 303 of this title, may apply to the Attorney General for a certificate of citizenship. Under proof to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that the applicant is a citizen, and that the applicant's alleged citizenship was derived as claimed, or acquired, as the case may be, and upon taking and subscribing before a member of the Service within the United States to the oath of allegiance required by this Act of a petitioner for naturalization, such individual shall be furnished by the Attorney General with a certificate of citizenship, but only if such individual is at the time within the United States."

Inasmuch as the Canal Zone is not included in the term "United States" as defined in section 101(a)(38) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 171), certificates of citizenship cannot be issued and delivered in the Canal Zone. The instant bill in broadening the definition of the term "United States" solely for the purpose of permitting the issuance and the delivery of a certificate of citizenship to U.S. citizens in the Canal Zone would obviate the necessity of undertaking a journey to the United States for the sole purpose of obtaining the said certificate.

The enactment of this legislation was recommended by the Canal Zone Government.

DR. RAUL R. MORFFI

The bill (H.R. 5969) for the relief of Dr. Raul R. Morffi was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1798), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

DR. LUIS CRESPO

The bill (H.R. 10151) for the relief of Dr. Luis Crespo was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1804), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

JAMES R. KEMP

The bill (H.R. 11570) for the relief of James R. Kemp was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1805), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to relieve James R. Kemp of liability to repay the sum of $5,142.81, the amount of overpayments of salary which he received, and to pay to him the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayment of salary.

STATEMENT

The Department of the Air Force has reported to the committee that it has no objection to the favorable consideration of the bill.

The facts in the case are set forth by the Department of the Air Force as follows:

"On April 22, 1962, Mr. Kemp was changed from a wage board position, WL–13, step 3, $5.33 per hour ($11,086.40 per annum) in Ketchikan, Alaska, to a Classification Act position, GS–12, step 6, $10,255 per annum, plus 25 percent cost-of-living allowance, with the U.S. Army Alaska Communications System at Juneau, Alaska.

"The governing regulations on establishing the pay of employees changed from wage board to Classification Act positions stated:

" 'When changes between Classification Act and wage board positions are effected in Alaska and Hawaii, the territorial cost-of-living allowance applicable to the Classification Act position will be added to the basic salary of the Classification Act position in determining the rate to be paid under the provisions of this section.'

"Therefore, Mr. Kemp's pay in the GS–12 position should have been set at GS–12, step 1, $8,995 per annum, which when increased by 25 percent cost-of-living allowance, would give him a gross salary of $11,193.75. However, the cost-of-living allowance was disregarded and his pay was established at the maximum scheduled step of the grade (GS–12, step 6, $10,255 per annum), which when increased by the cost-of-living allowance, resulted in a gross salary of $12,818.75 per annum.

"Comptroller General Decision B–154086 September 23, 1964, states that when an employee is changed to a Classification Act position for which a cost-of-living allowance is authorized, the maximum rate at which his pay can be established on the basis of a former Wage Board rate in the same area is the rate which, when increased by the applicable cost-of-living allowance, does not cause him to suffer a loss in salary.

"In September 1963 an inspection of the personnel program of the Alaska Communications System (transferred to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Air Force on July 1, 1962) was conducted by representatives of Headquarters, USAF. Mr. Kemp's rate of pay was questioned during the inspection and officials were orally advised to have the case reviewed at a higher level. An opinion was requested from the local General Counsel and they determined the pay was correctly adjusted.

"Mr. Kemp's pay action was again questioned in December 1964 by the Air Force inspection team. This time administrative officials were directed to obtain an opinion from Headquarters, USAF. They made the determination that Mr. Kemp's rate of pay had been incorrectly set at a rate above the maximum legal rate and that corrective action should be taken to adjust his salary to the proper step. Mr. Kemp was notified of the overpayment and of his indebtedness to the Government. He agreed to repay the amount at the rate of $50 per pay period and had repaid $200 as of October 16, 1965.

"The Department of the Air Force has no authority to waive collection of the overpayment made as the result of setting Mr. Kemp's pay at a rate above the maximum legal rate. There is no evidence to indicate that Mr. Kemp did not act in good faith in receiving the overpayments. A study is currently in progress within the Department of Defense to reevaluate the criteria upon which recommendations on private relief bills are based. The study is being conducted because of the concern that the Department of Defense position in these matters shall represent both due consideration for the interests of the taxpayer and prevention of undue hardship for the individual. The study is not yet completed and it is realized that to postpone reporting on this bill until after the study has been completed might unduly delay consideration of it.

"Accordingly, the Department of the Air Force interposes no objection to favorable consideration of S. 2603 by the Congress. If this bill is favorably considered, it should be amended on line 5, page 1, to reflect the correct amount of $5,142.81.

"The Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this report for the consideration of the committee."

The committee has in the past acted favorably on similar bills where an overpayment was made through error on the part of the Government, where the overpayments were received in good faith by the employee, and where their repayment to the Government would impose a burdensome hardship.

The committee believes that this bill is meritorious and recommends it favorably.

JUN BECKY

The bill (H.R. 11617) for the relief of Jun Becky was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1806), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate the admission into the United States in an immediate relative status of the minor child adopted by citizens of the United States.

ESTEBAN FERNANDEZ NODA

The bill (H.R. 14174) for the relief of Esteban Fernandez Noda was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1810), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

BEATRIZ DIAZ

The bill (H.R. 14233) for the relief of Beatriz Diaz was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1811), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

MARIE DEL CARMEN BERMUDEZ

The bill (H.R. 14920) for the relief of Marie Del Carmen Bermudez was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1814), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate the entry into the United States in an immediate relative status of the adopted child of citizens of the United States.

SUSAN JEANNE CLYNES

The bill (S. 2222) for the relief of Susan Jeanne Clynes was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2222

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for purposes of any application for child's insurance benefits under section 202(d) of the Social Security Act filed after the date of enactment of this Act by or on behalf of Susan Jeanne Clynes, of Webster Springs, West Virginia, on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of the late George I. Clynes (social security account numbered 114-30-3984), the said Susan Jeanne Clynes shall be held and considered to be the child of the said George I. Clynes and to have been dependent upon him at the time of his death.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1845), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is that, for purposes of any application for child's insurance benefits under section 202(d) of the Social Security Act filed after the date of enactment of this act by or on behalf of Susan Jeanne Clynes, of Webster Springs, W. Va., on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of the late George I. Clynes (social security account numbered 114-30-3984), the said Susan Jeanne Clynes shall be held and considered to be the child of the said George I. Clynes and to have been dependent upon him at the time of his death.

STATEMENT

The facts of the case are contained in a memorandum from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as follows:

"The Social Security Act states in general that in order to qualify for child's benefits under the Social Security Act, an applicant must be the child, legally adopted child, or stepchild of the insured worker. To qualify as the child of an insured worker, the applicant must have the right under applicable State law to inherit intestate personal property from the insured worker as his child. The term "legally adopted child" includes a child who was living in the insured worker's household at the time of his death and was legally adopted by the worker's spouse within 2 years after he died, provided the child was not receiving regular contributions from someone other than the worker or his spouse.

"Susan Jeanne Clynes was born on November 13, 1957, and has lived with her paternal grandmother since December of that year. On June 28, 1958, her grandmother married Mr. Clynes; he died, while domiciled in New York, on January 16, 1959. Mrs. Clynes obtained legal custody of Susan in February 1959, and adopted her on February 15, 1962, in West Virginia. Prior to the legal adoption Mrs. Clynes had made two unsuccessful attempts to adopt Susan in New York.

"On January 26, 1962, Mrs. Clynes filed a claim for survivors' benefits on the earnings record of Mr. Clynes on behalf of Susan and herself; the claim was disallowed. On May 17, 1962, Mrs. Clynes asked for a reconsideration of the claim; upon reconsideration, the disallowance of the claim was affirmed. Since Susan had not been adopted within 2 years after Mr. Clynes died, reconsideration of the claim included consideration of whether, under New York law, she could inherit Mr. Clynes' intestate personal property. It was found that she could not.

"Under New York law, a child may acquire inheritance rights to the intestate property of an individual if it can be established that, although the child had not actually been legally adopted by the individual, the individual had entered into a binding contract to adopt the child. The contract to adopt the child must be established by clear and convincing evidence, including complete and absolute surrender of the child to the adopting parents in exchange for a promise of legal adoption. In addition, the contract must be enforceable in a court of law.

"Mrs. Clynes stated that during the 6 months of their marriage, her husband has supported the child and treated her as his own, and that she and her husband had planned to adopt Susan but had postponed the adoption because of her husband's serious illness. She said that before her husband's death she had talked with Susan's father (Mrs. Clynes' son) about adopting the child, but had not talked with the child's mother because she did not know where she was. However, she also stated that she took Susan into her home because she was her son's child and had been left uncared for by her mother, that she had originally agreed to take the child for 6 months, and that the son could have claimed Susan at any time. In addition, the record shows that she took Susan into her home 6 months before her marriage to Mr. Clynes and that she did not obtain legal custody of the child until after Mr. Clynes' death. Based on the evidence of record, it was found that there was no evidence showing that Susan was surrendered pursuant to a promise of legal adoption by Mr. Clynes. She therefore could not inherit his intestate personal property under New York law, and under the Social Security Act cannot become entitled to social security benefits as the child of Mr. Clynes."

The committee has considered the facts and equities of the case and believes that the bill should be reported favorably. Specifically, the committee has considered the fact that prior to the actual adoption, and presumably within 2 years after the death of Mr. Clynes, Mrs. Clynes made two attempts to adopt the child in New York, which were unsuccessful.

The committee has also considered a previous bill of the 85th Congress, which involved a similar case, and which became Private Law 85-337. At that time the law provided that, under the circumstances involved here, an adoption must be final prior to the death of the worker. In the previous case, after the child had been in the home some 6 months, the worker died. The widow then finally adopted the child. Child benefits were refused because the adoption had not been completed prior to the cutoff date, which was the time of death in that instance. In this case, the cutoff date is 2 years after the worker's death. The principle involved appears to be the same in each instance. Under these circumstances, the committee recommends that the bill, S. 2222, be considered favorably.

AMENDMENT OF THE LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965

The bill (H.R. 13551) to amend the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JUDGMENT OR DECREE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

The bill (H.R. 17798) to provide that a judgment or decree of the District of Columbia Court of general sessions shall not constitute a lien until filed and recorded in the office of the Recorder of Deeds was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1867), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 17798 is to provide a suitable means for recording liens established by judgments or decrees entered, or recognizances declared forfeited, by the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, hereinafter in this report referred to as the "Court of General Sessions."

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

At present, a judgment or decree of, or a recognizance declared forfeited by, the Court of General Sessions does not become a lien on interests in real property until it is filed in the office of the clerk of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. However, effective November 1, 1966, under the amendments made to chapter I of title 15, District of Columbia Code, by Public Law 89–493 (80 Stat. 263), judgments, liens, or forfeited recognizances will become liens without recordation. There will be no provision as in existing law for recordation of such liens after November 1, 1966. The obvious confusion and uncertainty in title searches that will develop makes urgent the provision of a system of recordation before such date.

The provisions of H.R. 17798 are intended to correct this uncertainty with regard to recordation by providing that such judgments, decrees, or forfeited recognizances will not become a lien until a certified copy of the judgment, decree, or order of forfeiture of recognizance is filed and recorded in the office of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia. Thus, suitable records for research to determine the existence of liens on interests in real property will be provided.

In the civil division of the Court of General Sessions alone, more than 100,000 civil action cases are filed in the clerk's office annually. The only index available is an index to cases filed. More than 400 judgments, decrees, or forfeitures are entered daily by that court. There is no judgment index or judgment docket. Any person desiring to determine whether a lien exists against a particular parcel of land must run the index of all cases filed to determine whether a judgment has ever been entered.

If the Court of General Sessions were to set up a judgment index or judgment docket, it would be an expensive and in some measure wasteful procedure. New clerical staff would be required to establish and maintain such records. All judgments would have to be entered in such records regardless of whether the amount was significant or the defendant had any interest in real property. Information from the court indicates that only a small percentage of the total number of judgments involve amounts or interests in real property which warrant the expenditure of the nominal fees totaling $1.50 for filing a judgment to create a lien. In 1965, out of more than a total of 107,000 civil cases filed in the Court of General Sessions, only approximately 6,000 judgments were filed with the clerk of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to create liens on interests in real property. In view of these facts, more than 90 percent of any judgment docket or index set up in the clerk's office in the Court of General Sessions would be valueless.

The foregoing facts and problem connected with judgments of the Court of General Sessions did not become apparent until after the enactment of Public Law 89–493. The need for continuation of a system for the recordation of such liens is obvious. The great urgency for the enactment of the provisions of H.R. 17798 is because of the imminence of the effective date for Public Law 89–493, November 1 of this year. Without the bill's enactment, thousands of money judgments, decrees, and forfeitures of recognizances entered by the Court of General Sessions will automatically become liens and will then have to be researched repeatedly for many years even though the great percentage of the judgments, decrees, or forfeited recognizances would not be used to establish a lien if there was a prerequisite of recordation.

To accomplish the foregoing objectives, the bill proposes the repeal of sections 8, 9, and 10 of Public Law 89–493, which sections amended those sections of the District of Columbia Code to which some amendments in this bill are directed. The repeal of the above sections becomes effective upon enactment. Otherwise, the provisions of the bill are to become effective on the effective date of Public Law 89–493; namely, November 1, 1966. The bill would also reenact an important provision of the District of Columbia Code which provided that such liens on equitable interests in real property "may be enforced only by an action to foreclose." The fees established in the bill for filing and recording will cover the costs to the Recorder of Deeds without the necessity of use of public funds.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

At a public hearing held by the full committee on October 19, 1966, testimony was received in support of the bill and urging its prompt enactment. Representatives of the Board of Commissioners and local title companies approved enactment of the bill. No one appeared in opposition to the bill's enactment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the calendar for the moment. The staffs on both sides are still working, however.

JUDGMENT UPON CLAIM OF EUGENE E. LAIRD BY THE U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], as well as of the majority leader, Calendar No. 1813, S. 552, has been objected to.

The Senator from California has been very cooperative in seeking to find the reason for the objection.

I want to make a very brief statement on the bill, thinking it might be helpful to the calendar committees on each side of the aisle.

This is my bill. The bill pertains to a veteran who was in the death march at the time of the shocking, historical incident on Corregidor. He has had problems in regard to claims concerning his pension.

I introduced the bill to give him simply the right to go to the court of claims and let the court of claims pass on the matter. I am not here to debate this afternoon the merits of his claim.

I happen to think his claim is meritorious or I would not have introduced the bill. But I do think that this veteran, who is a very responsible citizen of my State, ought to have his day in court. Let the court of claims pass judgment on whether he is entitled to a pension justly.

In view of the fact that the bill was passed by the committee, I think it would be helpful if we could have spread on the Record the reasons for the objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, to my knowledge no objection has been entered. The Calendar committees, which have been working awfully hard today, are doing what they can. As they clear the bills, we will bring them up for consideration today or tomorrow.

Mr. MORSE. That is very helpful to me, but that is not the information I had.

The information I had was that one of the calendar committees had asked to have the bill go over.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That request was not made of the Senator from Montana; at least not yet.

It is my understanding that the committees are considering the matter. We will await their verdict.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in fairness to myself, I would not have raised the point if I had not been advised by a clerk that the bill was to go over.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I would not doubt the Senator's word, but I am giving my understanding of the situation as it exists.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement for the Record because I have talked plainly with the Senator from Oregon regarding this legislation. Our calendar committee did raise a question, not on this bill alone, but apparently on several others of similar purport. I am trying to be helpful.

Mr. MORSE. I have already recognized that. I want the Record to show my deep appreciation to the Senator from California.

I am doing what the Senator from California and the Senator from Montana would do in making a record regarding what I have attempted to do with respect to the bill.

DISPOSITION OF GEOTHERMAL STEAM AND ASSOCIATED GEOTHERMAL RESOURCES

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1674) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make disposition of geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Geothermal Steam Act of 1966".

Sec. 2. As used in this Act, the term—

(a) "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior;

(b) "geothermal lease" means a lease issued under authority of this Act;

(c) "geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources" means all fluid products of geothermal processes, embracing steam, naturally heated water and brines, and the heat or other energy associated with them and, in addition, any byproduct derived from them;

(d) "byproduct" means any mineral or minerals (exclusive of oil, hydrocarbon gas, and helium) which are found in solution or in association with geothermal steam and which have a value of less than 75 per centum of the value of the geothermal steam or are not, because of quantity, quality, or technical difficulties in extraction and production, of sufficient value to warrant extraction and production by themselves;

(e) "known geothermal resources area" means an area in which the geology, nearby discoveries, competitive interest, or other indicia would, in the opinion of the Secretary, engender a belief in men who are experienced in the subject matter that the prospects for extraction of geothermal steam or associated geothermal resources are good enough to warrant expenditures of money for that purpose.

SEC. 3. Subject to the provisions of section 14 of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior may issue leases for the development and utilization of geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources (1) in lands administered by him, whether those lands are unreserved, withdrawn, or acquired, and (2) in any national forest or other lands administered by the Department of Agriculture through the Forest Service, whether those lands are withdrawn or acquired.

SEC. 4. If lands to be leased under this Act are within any known geothermal resources area, they shall be leased to the highest responsible qualified bidder by competitive bidding under regulations to be formulated by the Secretary. If the lands to be leased are not within any known geothermal resources area, the qualified person first making application for the lease shall be entitled to a lease of such lands without competitive bidding.

SEC. 5. Geothermal leases shall provide for—

(a) a royalty of not less than 10 per centum of the amount or value of steam, or any other form of heat or energy derived from production under the lease and sold or utilized by the lessee;

(b) a royalty of not less than 5 per centum of the value of any byproduct derived from production under the lease and sold or utilized or reasonably susceptible of sale or utilization by the lessee, except that as to any byproduct which is a mineral named in section 1 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (30 U.S.C. 181), the minimum rate of royalty for such mineral shall be the same as that provided in that Act and the maximum rate of royalty for such mineral shall not exceed the maximum royalty applicable under that Act;

(c) payment in advance of an annual rental of not less than $1 per acre or fraction thereof for each year of the lease. If there is no well on the leased lands capable of producing geothermal resources in commercial quantities, the failure to pay rental on or before the anniversary date shall terminate the lease by operation of law: *Provided, however,* That whenever the Secretary discovers that the rental payment due under a lease is paid timely but the amount of the payment is deficient because of an error or other reason and the deficiency is nominal, as determined by the Secretary pursuant to regulations prescribed by him, he shall notify the lessee of the deficiency and such lease shall not automatically terminate unless the lessee fails to pay the deficiency within the period prescribed in the notice: *Provided further,* That, where any lease has been terminated automatically by operation of law under this section for failure to pay rental timely and it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Interior that the failure to pay timely the lease rental was justifiable or not due to a lack of reasonable diligence, he in his judgment may reinstate the lease if—

(1) a petition for reinstatement, together with the required rental for such lease, is filed with the Secretary of the Interior; and

(2) no valid lease has been issued affecting any of the lands in the terminated lease prior to the filing of the petition for reinstatement; and

(d) a minimum royalty of $2 per acre or fraction thereof in lieu of rental payable at the expiration of each lease year for each producing lease, commencing with the lease year beginning on or after the commencement of production in commercial quantities.

For the purpose of determining royalties hereunder the value of any geothermal steam and byproduct used by the lessee and not sold and reasonably susceptible of sale shall be determined by the Secretary, who shall take into consideration the cost of exploration and production and the economic value of the resource in terms of its ultimate utilization.

SEC. 6. (a) Geothermal leases shall be for a primary term of fifteen years and for so long thereafter as geothermal steam is produced or utilized in commercial quantities.

(b) Any lease for land on which, or for which under an approved cooperative or unit plan of development or operation, actual drilling operations were commenced prior to the end of its primary term and are being diligently prosecuted at that time shall be extended for five years and so long thereafter as geothermal steam is produced or utilized in commercial quantities.

(c) Leases which have extended by reason of production and have been determined by the Secretary to be incapable of further commercial production and utilization of geothermal steam may be further extended for a period of not more than five years from the date of such determination but only for so long as one or more valuable byproducts are produced in commercial quantities. If such byproducts are leasable under the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (30 U.S.C. 181, et seq.), or under the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (30 U.S.C. 351–358), and the leasehold is primarily valuable for the production thereof, the lessee shall be entitled to convert his geothermal lease to a mineral lease under, and subject to all the terms and conditions of, such appropriate Act upon application at any time before expiration of the lease extension by reason of byproduct production. Any such converted lease affecting lands withdrawn or acquired in aid of a function of a Federal department or agency, including the Department of the Interior, shall be subject to such additional terms and conditions as may be prescribed by such department or agency with respect to the additional operations or effects resulting from such conversion upon adequate utilization of the lands for the purpose for which they are administered.

SEC. 7. Geothermal leases shall embrace a reasonably compact area of not less than six hundred and forty acres and not more than two thousand five hundred and sixty acres, except where a departure therefrom is occasioned by an irregular subdivision or subdivisions. No person, association, or corporation, except as otherwise provided in this Act, shall take, hold, own, or control at one time, whether acquired directly from the Secretary under this Act or otherwise, any direct or indirect interest in Federal geothermal leases in any one State exceeding fifty-one thousand two hundred acres. At any time after fifteen years from the effective date of this Act, the Secretary, after public hearings, may reduce this maximum holding by regulation.

SEC. 8. If the production, use, or conversion of geothermal steam is susceptible of producing a valuable byproduct or byproducts, the Secretary shall require substantial beneficial production or use thereof unless, in individual circumstances, he modifies or waives this requirement in the interest of conservation of natural resources or for other reasons satisfactory to him. However, the production or use of such byproducts shall be subject to the rights of the holders of preexisting leases, claims, or permits covering the same land or the same minerals, if any.

SEC. 9. The holder of any geothermal lease at any time may make and file in the appropriate land office a written relinquishment of all rights under such lease or of any legal subdivision of the area covered by such lease. Such relinquishment shall be effective as of the date of its filing. Thereupon the lessee shall be released of all obligations thereafter accruing under said lease with respect to the lands relinquished, but no such relinquishment shall release such lessee, or his surety or bond, from any liability for breach of any obligation of the lease, other than an obligation to drill, accrued at the date of the relinquishment, or from the continued obligation, in accordance with the applicable lease terms and regulations, (1) to make payment of all accrued rentals and royalties, (2) to place all wells on the relinquished lands in condition for suspension or abandonment, and (3) to protect or restore the surface and surface resources.

SEC. 10. The Secretary, upon application by the lessee, may suspend operations and production on a producing lease and he may, on his own motion, in the interest of conservation suspend operations on any lease, but in either latter case he may extend the lease term for the period of any suspension.

SEC. 11. Leases may be terminated by the Secretary for any violation of the regulations or lease terms after thirty days' notice, but the lessee shall be entitled to a hearing on the matter if request for the hearing is made to the Secretary within the thirty-day period after notice.

SEC. 12. The Secretary may waive, suspend, or reduce the rental or minimum royalty for any lease or portion thereof in the interests of conservation and to encourage the greatest ultimate recovery of geothermal resources, if he determines that this is necessary to promote development or that the lease cannot be successfully operated under the lease terms.

SEC. 13. Subject to the other provisions of this Act, a lessee shall be entitled to use so much of the surface of the land, covered by his geothermal lease as may be found by the Secretary to be necessary for the production and conservation of geothermal resources.

SEC. 14. (a) Geothermal leases for lands withdrawn or acquired in aid of functions of the Department of the Interior may be issued only under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe to insure adequate utilization of the lands for the purposes for which they were withdrawn or acquired.

(b) Geothermal leases for lands withdrawn or acquired in aid of functions of the Department of Agriculture may be issued only with the consent of, and subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by, the head of that Department to insure adequate utilization of the lands for the purposes for which they were withdrawn or acquired.

(c) Geothermal leases shall not be issued for lands administered in accordance with (1) the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended or supplemented, (2) for lands in a fish hatchery administered by the Secretary, wildlife refuge, wildlife range, game range, wildlife management area, waterfowl production area, or for lands acquired or reserved for the protection and conservation of fish and wildlife that are threatened with extinction, or (3) for Indian-owned trust or restricted lands.

SEC. 15. Leases under this Act may be issued only to citizens of the United States, associations of such citizens, corporations organized under the laws of the United States or of any State or the District of Columbia, or governmental units, including, without limitation, municipalities.

SEC. 16. Administration of this Act shall be under the principles of multiple use of lands and resources, and geothermal leases shall, insofar as possible, allow for coexistence of other leases of the same lands for deposits of minerals under the laws applicable to them and for other uses of the areas covered by them. Operations under such other leases or for such other uses, however, shall not unreasonably interfere with or endanger operations under any lease issued pursuant to this Act, nor shall operations under leases so issued unreasonably interfere with or endanger operations under any lease, license, claim, or permit issued pursuant to the provisions of any other Act.

SEC. 17. For the purpose of properly conserving the natural resources of any geothermal pool, field, or like area, or any part thereof, lessees thereof and their representatives may unite with each other, or jointly or separately with others, in collectively adopting and operating under a cooperative or unit plan of development or operation of such pool, field, or like area, or any part thereof, whenever this is determined and certified by the Secretary to be necessary or advisable in the public interest. The Secretary may in his discretion and with the consent of the holders of leases involved, establish, alter, change, revoke, and make such regulations with reference to such leases in connection with the institution and operation of any such cooperative or unit plan as he may deem necessary or proper to secure reasonable protection of the public interest. He may include in geothermal leases a provision requiring the lessee to operate under such a reasonable cooperative or unit plan, and he may prescribe such a plan under which such lessee shall operate, which shall adequately protect the rights of all parties in interest, including the United States. Any such plan may, in the discretion of the Secretary, provide for vesting in the Secretary or any other person, committee, or Federal or State agency designated therein, authority to alter or modify from time to time the rate of prospecting and development and the quantity and rate of production under such plan. All leases operated under any such plan approved or prescribed by the Secretary shall be excepted in determining holdings or control for the purposes of section 7 of this Act.

When separate tracts cannot be independently developed and operated in conformity with an established well-spacing or development program, any lease, or a portion thereof, may be pooled with other lands, whether or not owned by the United States, under a communitization or drilling agreement providing for an apportionment of production or royalties among the separate tracts of land comprising the drilling or spacing unit when determined by the Secretary to be in the public interest, and operations or production pursuant to such an agreement shall be deemed to be operations or production as to each lease committed thereto.

The Secretary is hereby authorized, on such conditions as he may prescribe, to approve operating, drilling, or development contracts made by one or more lessees of geothermal leases, with one or more persons, associations, or corporations whenever, in his discretion, the conservation of natural products or the public convenience or necessity may require or the interests of the United States may be best served thereby. All leases operated under such approved operating, drilling, or development contracts, and interests thereunder, shall be excepted in determining holdings or control under section 7 of this Act.

SEC. 18. Upon request of the Secretary, other Federal departments and agencies shall furnish him with any relevant data then in their possession or knowledge concerning or having bearing upon fair and adequate charges to be made for geothermal steam produced or to be produced for conversion to electric power or other purposes. Data given to any department or agency as confidential under law shall not be furnished in any fashion which identifies or tends to identify the business entity whose activities are the subject of such data or the person or persons who furnished such information.

SEC. 19. All moneys received under this Act from public lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary shall be disposed of in the same manner as moneys received from the sale of public lands. Moneys received under this Act from other lands shall be disposed of in the same manner as other receipts from such lands.

SEC. 20. (a) Within ninety days after the effective date of this Act, the Secretary shall cause to be published in the Federal Register a determination of all lands which were included within any known geothermal resources area on the effective date of the Act. He shall likewise publish in the Federal Register from time to time his determination of other known geothermal resources areas specifying in each case the date the lands were included in such area.

(b) Geothermal resources in lands the surface of which has passed from Federal ownership but in which the minerals have been reserved to the United States shall not be developed or produced except under geothermal leases made pursuant to this Act. If the Secretary of the Interior finds that such development is imminent, or that production from a well heretofore drilled on such lands is imminent, he shall so report to the Attorney General, and the Attorney General is authorized and directed to institute an appropriate proceeding in the United States district court of the district in which such lands are located, to quiet the title of the United States in such resources, and if the court determines that the reservation of minerals to the United States in the lands involved included the geothermal resources, to enjoin their production otherwise than under the terms of this Act.

SEC. 21. Nothing in this Act shall constitute an express or implied claim or denial on the part of the Federal Government as to its exemption from State water laws.

SEC. 22. Rights to develop and utilize geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources underlying lands owned by the United States may be acquired solely in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 23. The Secretary shall prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem appropriate to carry out the provisions of this Act. Such regulations may include, without limitation, provisions for (a) the prevention of waste, (b) development and conservation of geothermal and other natural resources, (c) the protection of the public interest, (d) assignment, segregation, extension of terms, relinquishment of leases, development contracts, unitization, pooling, and drilling agreements, (e) compensatory royalty agreements, suspension of operations or production, and suspension or reduction of rentals or royalties, (f) the filing of surety bonds to assure compliance with the terms of the lease and to protect surface use and resources, (g) use of the surface by a lessee of the lands embraced in his lease, and (h) the maintenance by the lessee of an active development program.

Mr. BIBLE. On behalf of the Interior Committee, Mr. President, I send to the desk a series of amendments to the House substitute and ask that they be stated en bloc.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendments will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendments.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered, and the amendments will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, are as follows:

1. On page 3, line 11, after the period insert new material as follows:

"Notwithstanding the foregoing, at any time within one hundred and eighty days following the effective date of this Act:

"(a) with respect to all lands which were on September 7, 1965 subject to valid leases or permits issued under the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) or under the Mineral Leasing Act of Acquired Lands, as amended (30 U.S.C. 351, 358), or to existing mining claims filed on or prior to September 7, 1965, the lessees or permittees or claimants who are qualified to hold geothermal leases shall have the right to convert such leases or permits or claims to geothermal leases covering the same lands; and

"(b) where there are conflicting claims, leases, or permits, therefor embracing the same land, the person who first was issued a lease or permit, or who first recorded the mining claim, shall be entitled to first consideration.

"(c) with respect to all lands which were on September 7, 1965 the subject of applications for leases or permits under the above Acts, the applicants may convert their applications to applications for geothermal leases having priorities dating from the time of filing of such applications under such Acts.

"(d) no person shall be permitted to convert any mineral lease or permits, or application therefor, or mining claims for more than twelve thousand eight hundred acres in any one State.

"(e) the conversion of leases, permits, and mining claims and applications for leases and permits shall be accomplished in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary. No right to conversion to a geothermal lease shall accrue to any person under this section unless such person shows to the reasonable satisfaction of the Secretary that substantial expenditures for the exploration, development, or production of geothermal steam have been made by the applicant who is seeking conversion, on the lands for which a lease is sought or on adjoining, adjacent, or nearby Federal or non-Federal lands."

2. On page 8, line 21, strike the word "latter".

3. On page 13, line 20, strike the words "ninety days" and in lieu thereof insert the words "one hundred twenty days".

4. On page 14, line 17, change the period at the end of the subsection to a colon and insert the following: "*Provided,* That upon an authoritative judicial determination that Federal mineral reservation does not include geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources the duties of the Secretary of the Interior to report and of the Attorney General to institute proceedings, as hereinbefore set forth, shall cease."

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, two of the proposed amendments are of substance; the other two are clerical and technical.

The first amendment would amend the House version of the bill by adding thereto a so-called grandfather clause, or preference right for persons who have gone out on the public domain and spent money and time in pioneering to get this new geothermal resource industry started.

A preference right for such pioneers was written into S. 1674 by the Senate Interior Committee and adopted by the Senate on September 7, 1965.

I call the attention of the Senate to the statement in the Interior Committee's report on S. 1674 (S. Rept. No. 683) which states in pertinent part:

> This amendment is in accord with the committee's conviction that persons and groups who have invested money and time in developing, or in taking preliminary steps toward developing geothermal resources should have their enterprise and investment protected. Such persons, the committee believes, have equities, at least, that should be recognized.

The preference clause was not adopted by the House Interior Committee, and the House-passed version of S. 1674 that is now before the Senate for its consideration does not have in it any provision for recognizing the equities of pioneers in geothermal development.

Since the bill has been returned to the Senate, however, a number of Representatives concerned with the measure have reconsidered and are now convinced that a recognition of the equities of the pioneers is in the public interest.

The first of the amendments I send to the desk is substantially the provision which the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs wrote into the bill and which was approved by the Senate on September 7, 1965. The primary change is to make the date that the Senate approved the measure the cutoff point, rather than January 1, 1965. This date is the earliest time that anyone would have had any real basis for believing that perference rights might be accorded pioneers in this field.

OTHER CHANGES

Another change is that the word "existing" with respect to mining claims is substituted for the word "valid." Technically, a geothermal operation under the mining law might not be considered to be the basis for a valid mining claim, strictly and legalistically speaking, but it is the committee's intention that the equities of geothermal pioneers under the mining law should be recognized, regardless of whether they meet all of the tests, such as marketability, now enforced so rigorously by the Interior Department.

Both of these changes, I think, are changes for the better.

Other changes from the Senate-passed version are a limitation of 12,800 acres in the amount of land under mineral lease, permit, or mining claim that can be converted to a geothermal lease in any one State, and a requirement that there must have been actual expenditures of time and money by the pioneer who wishes to assert the preference right. Both of these amendments were considered by the House Interior Committee and are included in the present amendment at the urgent request of the House Members concerned.

I have been in close contact with the Members concerned in this particular geothermal steam problem. I believe they are in full accord with the action taken here today and will accept the Senate amendments to the House amendment when the measure is returned to the House.

The second proposed amendment is simply a technical amendment.

The third proposed amendment is also technical in that it reflects what the House committee intended at the time the bill was ordered reported.

ADMINISTRATIVE BURDENS EASED

The fourth amendment is one of substance. It is intended to modify the totally mandatory language of the House provision requiring initiation of a court action by the Attorney General whenever geothermal development is begun or threatened on lands, title to the surface of which has passed from the Federal Government, but in which the Federal Government retains the mineral rights.

This proviso will make the requirement less burdensome to the executive agencies, and the administration of the act less costly. The act will, of course, bring new revenues into the Federal Treasury, overall.

The purpose of the fourth amendment is to help those who are endeavoring to establish the interest of the Federal Government in the lands involved in the development of geothermal steam, whether the title does or does not pass to the owner of the lease of the geothermal steam.

This will enable us to have one test case rather than a series of test cases.

I think again that this is a definite improvement on the bill, and I think it presents a feasible, practical, and quick way of securing a determination of this troublesome question.

NO GRANDFATHER CLAUSE IN PREVIOUS BILL

Mr. President, in the 88th Congress, I sponsored a geothermal leasing bill, S. 883, which I introduced on February 21, 1963. This measure was the forerunner of the present bill, S. 1674, of this Congress.

Hearings were held on S. 883 in July and October of 1963. At that time, though we received some recommendations for the inclusion of a grandfather clause, the bill was opposed by Interior Department witnesses and no provision for preference rights was adopted.

S. 883 was reported to the Senate, as amended, on August 17, 1964, and passed on August 21, 1964, without a grandfather clause. The measure was not acted on in the House.

On April 1, 1965, I introduced S. 1674, substantially in the form that S. 883 passed the Senate the previous year, including the omission of a provision for preference rights.

Hearings on S. 1674 were held in July of 1965. The bill was considered by the full committee in executive session on August 25, 1965, and was ordered reported to the Senate, with a committee amendment providing for a so-called grandfather clause.

In this respect, the Senate report, as I have already pointed out, states on page 3:

> This amendment is in accord with the committee's conviction that persons and groups who have invested money and time in developing or in taking preliminary steps toward developing geothermal resources should have their enterprise and investment protected. Such persons, the committee believes, have equities, at least, that should be recognized.

When we adopted the grandfather clause, we wrote in the date January 1, 1965, as the cutoff date, and that was the form in which the provision was adopted by the Senate.

In considering whether or not the date of September 7, 1965, the date of passage by the Senate, is a better cutoff date, it should be recognized that this bill, when introduced, did not contain a grandfather or a conversion clause. Although industry testified in favor of such an inclusion, it was opposed by the Department of the Interior.

CLAIMS OR LEASES FEW

It seemed to the commitee—and it seems to me, personally—highly unlikely that any great number of applicants could have rushed into the field to take up oil and gas leases or to file placer mining claims, or even attempt to file a lode claim—if that is possible, and I do not think it is—prior to September 7, 1965, with the hope that they would be able to convert these oil and gas leases and these placer claims into geothermal leases. As I have pointed out, the original bill did not provide for conversion, and in the 88th Congress we had not adopted any such provision in the face of the opposition of the Interior Department.

Neither did the bill of the 88th Congress so provide, and it was not until the bill was reported on September 2 of 1965 that there was any official indication that the committee of the Senate would agree to such a provision. Between that date and the date of passage, September 7, 1965, there would be little time for anyone to engage in large-scale mining, claim filing, or oil and gas leasing activity in order to take advantage of the situation.

A grandfather clause and a cutoff date always pose problems to the authors and architects of legislation. It seems to me that the date we suggest in our proposed amendment to the House substitute is a good date, for the reasons I have given. This matter has been discussed in some detail with those principally interested on the House side; and I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I received today from Hon. CRAIG HOSMER, Member of Congress from the State of California, giving his views, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 20, 1966.

Senator ALAN BIBLE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ALAN: As you know the House Interior Committee rewrote the text of S. 1674.

This was a combined effort of the House Interior Staff and Interior Department people.

I introduced this revised bill as H.R. 16811 in order to have something with page and line numbers to work from, since the rewritten bill came in mimeographed form.

Committee discussions got prolonged, so we had a Committee print made of the rewriting to work from instead.

From that developed the version of S. 1674 which passed the House October 3rd. This version contained several improvements and changes made in Committee. Only two are really pertinent at this point.

First, S. 1674's Sec. 20(b). A question arose as to the nature of geothermal energy in general and, in particular, whether or not it was reserved to the government under reservation clauses of patents issued on government lands. It was felt that a court decision would be needed to decide the point.

Therefore Sec. 20(b) directs the Attorney General to bring the necessary suit to determine the point. As a practical matter, this will be a suit against Earth Energy, Inc., a Union Oil Company subsidiary, as to a lease from patent holders in Northern California.

This subparagraph was written rather hastily. The Justice Department objected to the totally mandatory nature of the language. Our House Interior Committee attorney has written an amendment in the form of a proviso which is helpful in this regard, which does not completely satisfy the Justice Department, but which I believe is satisfactory. This amendment is as follows:

At page 26, line 17, change the period at the end of the paragraph to a colon and insert the following: "*Provided,* That upon an authoritative judicial determination that Federal mineral reservation does not include geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources the duties of the Secretary of the Interior to report and of the Attorney General to institute proceedings, as hereinbefore set forth, shall cease."

Second, deleted from the House passed version of S. 1674 were Sections 20 (a), (b), (c), and (d) of the rewritten draft which were incorporated in H.R. 16811 at page 13, line 6 through page 14, line 21.

This is the so-called "Grandfather Clause" which S. 1674 originally specified as January 1, 1965. The House-passed bill eliminates the clause entirely.

We simply did not, in House Interior, have time to get into it. Early in the year Chairman Aspinall got a Committee Resolution to stop doing any business after a certain date. We were bucking up against that date. Other matters had to be considered. Thus we decided to leave out the grandfather clause, pass out the bill, get it through the House, then get into the grandfather clause matter in the House-Senate Conference.

In bills that I have introduced on the subject in three successive Congresses, I always used an arbitrary date of January 1 of whatever year the Congress in which I introduced the bill convened. I am certain that is true of others.

In any event, establishing a cutoff date is an arbitrary matter. Who is or is not a "pioneer" who should benefit from a grandfather clause—or whether anyone should be entitled to such an equity—is pretty much of an ambiguous matter of philosophy.

If anything else can be accomplished by such a clause, it is my own feeling that it should be first in mind and a date selected accordingly.

In this case events which developed subsequent to the House Interior Committee's deliberations did occur which seem to have a bearing on the subject.

During the House hearings Union Oil and Signal Oil were in a hassle over a piece of patent land in Northern California. Union had a geothermal lease from the patentee. Signal had an oil and gas lease from the government which could, under H.R. 16811's grandfather clause with a September 7, 1965 cut-off-date, be converted to a geothermal lease.

The prospective head-on collision between these two—who could well afford the expenses of a lawsuit—appealed to me to be a quick and desirable way to get a court ruling on the question of whether or not geothermal energy had been reserved by the government patents.

However, as above indicated, time was getting short in the House Interior Committee for action in relation to getting a bill passed at all before the end of this session of Congress so we just dropped consideration of a grandfather clause and ordered the lawsuit provided by Sec. 20.(b).

Subsequently the two oil companies got together and Signal agreed that, should the grandfather clause be restored in conference, it would assign that portion of its converted lease covering the patented property to Union. This protected Union to the extent that whichever way the Attorney General's suit goes, Union still can use the geothermal well it drilled and has capped pending, first the outcome of legislation, and now second, the outcome of the lawsuit. This protected Signal to the extent that the grandfather clause would give it a geothermal lease on the adjoining government land.

A similar situation existed between Signal and Magma, another geothermal steam producer on private patented land adjacent to public land. Signal has made the same agreement with Magma. No other areas are known where similar circumstances prevail.

Restoration of the grandfather clause would thus be good for all these above-mentioned companies. The question then arises, would it be in the interest of the United States?

This question arises because Sec. 4 of S. 1674 and H.R. 16811 both specify that leases under the act within any known geothermal resources area shall be subject to competitive bidding and awarded to the highest responsible qualified bidder. The grandfather clause conversion of oil and gas lease feature would side-step competitive bidding at this location which obviously is a known geothermal resources area. The United States thus would not receive the bonus that might be offered by the highest bidder. Thereby it would lose X number of dollars.

Would it gain anything?

The answer to this is "yes". It is "yes" because Sec. 5 of the bill specifies geothermal lease royalities of "not less than 10 per centum." The Secretary in converting any lease in a known-geothermal area can fix the royalty per centum at whatever reasonably might be bid competitively. To this he can add a sufficient additional per centum to recoup any bonus that might reasonably have resulted from the competition.

The answer also is "yes" for a more cogent reason which is that government royalties can start to accrue before settlement of the lengthy lawsuit to be brought by the Attorney General.

At the location of concern in Northern California no electric utility would make a substantial investment in geothermal steam turbo generating equipment and other items until it was assured of a steam supply with clear title from both the government lessee and the private land lessee. It could not afford to build its plant in stages, first for one steam source and then the other due to the much higher capital costs involved from two smaller plants instead of one larger plant.

My best information is that the patented land parcel would support about 20,000 kilowatts generating capacity and that the government land parcel would support about 40,000 kilowatts. Both estimates are conservative. One 60,000 KW generating plant probably would cost around $9 million @ 150 per KW installed capacity, plus transmission etc. costs. No public utility would make an investment of this magnitude without assurance of clear title, or, at least, full cooperation between all parties involved pending outcome of the lawsuit.

It already is known that the two potential lessees will work cooperatively to feed one turbo generator. Competitive bidding would leave this matter in the laps of the gods. It might be years before the government started to get royalties, simply because high bidder "X" and Union might not be able to get together and utilization of the geothermal energy would have to await settlement of the lawsuit.

In fact it could be anticipated that an alert speculator well might make an unrealistically high bid for a lease, since an opportunity to whipsaw the patent land lessee is clearly apparent. He could afford to delay development of the property for a considerable time while establishing his maximum nuisance value as a price for assigning the lease.

Consequently, as a practical matter it seems the bill should be written to insure an early start on royalty returns to the government. Particularly is this so because no one yet knows whether these geothermal resources are exhaustible, such as oil fields, or perpetual. If the latter is the case, every year's delay just operates to deprive the government of a year's royalties.

Personally I have suggested the cutoff date for the grandfather clause as September 7, 1965—the date the bill passed the Senate. It seems a logical one on the basis of actual notice to the public that something serious was intended by a grandfather clause. It would permit an early start of government royalties from its land as above outlined. Royalties on the patent land parcel would, of course, be paid into court during the lawsuit and eventually paid to the government or the patent owners in accordance with the judgment of the court.

I suggest the grandfather clause also (1) require as an eligibility for conversion that the lessee has made "substantial expenditures for exploration development or production of geothermal steam" on the land in question, and (2) limit the allowable acreage for conversion to 12,800 acres.

Both these matters were kicked around informally on our side of the Hill and more or less thought of as features to make a better bill.

You will note that the grandfather clause would go in as a new Sec. 21 and the sections thereafter be renumbered accordingly.

I have discussed the September 7 date, the 12,800 limitation and the expenditure requirement with Rep. SAYLOR and others and the idea of your simply amending the bill on the Senate Floor and sending it back to us. Rep. SAYLOR will accept the date and other features as will Reps. EDMONDSON, JOHNSON and myself.

Your Committee counsel, Stewart French, has some technical and typographical corrections which also should be made on your side.

The House bill excludes Fish & Wildlife lands which your original bill contains. I would warn against trying to restore them, since some on our side are pretty determined about the matter and it might interfere with passage of the bill.

I hope you will pass the bill with the amendments on the Senate side. We would anticipate promptly passing it as amended on our side.

Many thanks for your consideration of the above. This legislative route on this bill has been a long one and I'm looking forward to its end.

Best personal regards,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress.

Mr. BIBLE. As Representative HOSMER points out, this matter has been discussed with the chairman of the subcommittee that handled this bill on the House side, Representative ED EDMONDSON of Oklahoma. It has been discussed with the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and with other members, particularly those from the State of California, where this geothermal steam problem exists.

As far as is now known geothermal steam resources and problems connected with their development appear to be centralized in my own State of Nevada and in the State of California. There are evidences that geothermal resources concomitant problems exist in other places in the Southwest and elsewhere, but Nevada and California are the States mainly concerned at this time.

CALIFORNIA SENATOR CONSULTED

I have been in constant touch with the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. We have discussed this legislation, as we have attempted to perfect it and move it forward; and I believe that he is in agreement with the position of accepting the House amendment by adding the amendment I have just offered to the Senate.

I yield to the Senator from California on this question of perfecting a bill that is satisfactory.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I express my thanks to my friend and neighbor, the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada, for resolving what could have been an interminable controversy, in bringing what appears to be constructive legislation to the Senate; and I join him in urging the adoption of the agreed-upon amendments.

While I have some comments generally to make on the bill, I wish to ask particularly a question of legislative intent.

Mr. BIBLE. Very well.

I simply wish to add to what I have already said that the amendment which is before the Senate, for its consideration and adoption, in my judgment, adequately safeguards those who have any concern about any untoward profit from this type of operation; because, in the final analysis, the conversion of the lease is subject to regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary.

In addition, there is no right of conversion until such time as the Secretary determines that actual expenditures of time and money have been made on the exploration or development and production of geothermal steam or associated resources.

This is an intriguing new area for the possible development of electrical energy. Patently, it is not without many problems, one of which is the necessity for substantial expenditures of money and time and know-how.

PUBLIC INTEREST PROTECTED

The bill which the Senate passed, and in turn which the House passed, provides the means with which the Secretary of the Interior will be able to protect the public interest. For example, the Secretary has the direct authority to control the amount of royalties and the rentals that should be paid by the lessees for the use of the public domain for the purpose of developing their geothermal steam resources.

Likewise, if there are mineral discoveries within the area, in addition to the steam, which is used to generate electricity, there is also provision that payment be made on a royalty basis for the minerals that might be produced in conjunction with the geothermal steam exploration and development.

Therefore, it seems to me that this bill completely protects the public interest.

With this explanation of these proposed amendments, Mr. President, I move the adoption of the proposed amendments to the House amendment to S. 1764.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I should like to propound a question to the Senator from Nevada, and to make a little legislative history with his answer.

Mr. President, section 1(e) of the proposed amendment—section 4(e) of the bill—requires that substantial expenditures be made as a condition to the right to convert to a geothermal lease. Recognizing that the Department of the Interior has opposed the grandfather clause, my judgment is that the interpretation of the substantial expenditure requirement should not be so strict or stringent as to make the right to convert a meaningless one. The Department of the Interior should take into account, it seems to me, any expenditures made by persons who have pioneered in this new industry, including expenditures for preliminary geological surveys and tests, leasing expenses, and administrative costs, and, of course, more substantial expenditures for actual drilling and testing geothermal prospects.

It would be particularly burdensome, Mr. President, to require the expenditure of large sums of money on Federal land in view of the Interior Department's annnounced position that those holding mineral leases and permits and mining claims had no right to enter Federal lands to explore for geothermal resources.

I wish to ask my friend, the floor manager of the bill, whether he agrees that the comments I have just made accurately reflect the intention of the committee with respect to the amendment which will be adopted and the bill which presumably will then be passed.

Mr. BIBLE. I do agree that what the Senator from California has said accurately reflects the thinking—I feel certain—of all members of the committee who considered the measure.,

I do feel that in this infant industry—one that will require, as I said earlier, considerable know-how and considerable time, and particularly a great deal of money, even to see whether it will be successful—the Secretary of the Interior should be very liberal in his interpretation of this provision for the benefit of those who have pioneered this potentially great industry. He should give them the benefit of the doubt and not administer this provision too rigidly nor hold its intended beneficiaries to too hard a test. We all should join in trying to further the development of this natural resource.

I believe I am correct in saying that the State of Nevada has the greatest potential in this area of any of the States in the Union. I know from my own knowledge and from my work in this field for a number of years that to date all of the pioneers have expended money and received no return. I think they should be encouraged to the geratest degree possible.

Mr. President, I do agree with the comments and the interpretation which the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] has placed upon the proposed section 4(e) in the bill now before us.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, question.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion to concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives, with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, beneath the surface of our earth there are vast untapped pools of energy. Only in the last few years has the prospect of harnessing geothermal steam energy provided us with the promise of a new and challenging American industry.

The Department of the Interior and American industry are convinced that the greater part of the geothermal resources in our country are located on public domain lands. At the present time there is no provision of law by which citizens can apply for and receive leases for the exploration and development of these lands. Although the Mineral Leasing Act allows the exploration and development of land for the production of valuable minerals, there is presently no way that the Federal Government can utilize fully these natural underground steam-energy deposits, which are in great part in Nevada, and to a somewhat lesser extent in my State of California.

On September 7, 1965, the Senate passed S. 1674, a bill introduced by the very distinguished Senator from Nevada Senator BIBLE, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into leases for geothermal steam on the public lands in the United States. After extensive deliberations in the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the House of Representatives passed an amended version of S. 1674 on October 3, 1966.

The Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee recognized the equity in allowing the pioneers in the development of geothermal steam, who were the holders of valid leases or permits issued on the Mineral Leasing Act or who had existing mining claims, to convert those leases, permits, or claims to geothermal leases. Accordingly, the Senate passed a bill with a grandfather clause allowing conversion by holders of such leases, permits, or claims which were in effect on January 1, 1965, the beginning of the 89th Congress.

Certain disputes arose between claimants after the passage of the Senate bill and the House of Representatives excluded the grandfather clause from its bill. However, after the passage of the House bill, the disputes, which had concerned the members of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, were apparently settled and members of the House Interior Committee suggested amendatory language now adopted by the Senate.

The House members have suggested that the "grandfather clause" be restored to the bill with a September 7, 1965 cutoff date. This is the date of Senate passage of S. 1674.

Strict limits are set forth on the conversion privilege; namely, no person will be allowed conversion privileges for more than 12,800 acres of public domain land in any one State; the Secretary of the Interior will promulgate regulations under which conversion will be accomplished; the royalty to be charged the claimant will be set by the Secretary; and no applicant will be allowed conversion privileges without proof of "substantial expenditures for the exploration, development, or production of geothermal steam on adjoining, adjacent or nearby lands."

The interpretation of substantial expenditures is the one which the floor manager of the bill, the Senator from Nevada, enunciated a few moments ago to the Senate in answer to my question.

I hope that this excellent bill will soon be on its way to the White House.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. I wish to compliment the floor manager of the bill on his persistence in getting this bill enacted. The potential for this new arrangement is tremendous, and our State of Wyoming is in a position to explore and develop it.

I associate myself with the remarks of the floor manager for the bill, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], as well as the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. I compliment each of them. I am not unmindful of the fact that down the line somewhere we may want other amendments in other years to perfect an attitude of change.

Mr. BIBLE. I appreciate the sentiments of the Senator. I do not want the opportunity to go by without voicing for the RECORD and the public my very highest regard and esteem for the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON].

I regret that we are losing him at the end of this session. He has been a most valuable member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and he has been one of the most diligent and faithful workers on the subcommittee which I am honored to chair, the Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation.

We have traveled the length and breadth of this land and worked on complex and complicated problems. The Senator has been a great and valuable ally. His contributions have been many and valuable. Personally, I shall miss the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] greatly when he returns to Wyoming. I hope that he will come back and visit with us frequently, and give us the benefit of his experience and wisdom.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE]. A great leader always encourages people to work with him in undertakings for the public good.

THAILAND: OUR STANCH ALLY

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, in recent weeks the American presence in Thailand has been questioned. Concern has been expressed that this presence of American military personnel and equipment may lead to another Vietnam-type involvement.

In answer to these questions and concerns we need to ask ourselves: Why are we in Thailand?

The United States has about 30,000 troops now stationed in Thailand. There is no question that the majority of these soldiers are there to support our efforts in Vietnam.

While we are also anxious to cooperate with Thai efforts to prevent that Kingdom from falling prey to further Communist aggression, we are there primarily to bolster our forces in Vietnam.

As a steadfast ally, Thailand is providing military bases, airfields, seaports, and other facilities to American armed forces. Without this crucial support, the American effort in Vietnam would be seriously hampered.

The vast logistical problems of supplying our forces and the complex deployment of our troops would be even more difficult.

Thus, Thailand's contributions to our battles in Vietnam are as valuable as any nation can give us.

Furthermore, as a resolute ally, Thailand has never faltered in the defense of the free world. She was one of the first nations to respond with troops to support the United Nations action in Korea.

Americans should be deeply grateful that we have such a stanch and willing ally on our side.

Along with six other nations—Great Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, and the Philippines—Thailand and the United States are signatories to the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization—SEATO.

This alliance is but one part of a pattern of more than 40 bilateral and multilateral defense commitments of the United States around the world.

In essence, we have pledged ourselves in these treaties to come to the assistance of these countries in case of any foreign aggression.

It is an undisputed fact that the heart and the strength of these alliances are the American commitment to uphold them.

For the present, the purpose of our presence in Thailand is not to fulfill our SEATO commitments, for there has not yet been any significant foreign aggression against her. Rather, we are in Thailand simply because of our military efforts in Vietnam. However, should there by any aggression against Thailand and should Thailand call upon us for help pursuant to our treaty with her, I am quite sure we would not hesitate to go to her assistance.

When Thailand was threatened along her northern borders by the Pathet Lao, who broke the cease-fire agreement in April of 1962, several SEATO powers responded to a Thai request for assistance by sending troops to Thailand. Along with Australian, New Zealand, and British forces, the United States sent some 5,000 soldiers to that threatened country. This collective action demonstrated to the world that our united efforts to meet aggression would be swift and sure.

When we committed our might and resources to oppose communist aggression against South Vietnam, we showed that we do stand by the pledge that we have made.

Our firm resolve there has given backbone to all our allies in southeast Asia. It has put the Communists on notice that we are firm in our commitment.

Indeed, I would like to believe that our strong determination in Vietnam was partly responsible for the unsuccesful Communist coup d'etat in Indonesia.

I would also like to believe that it has stymied the expansionist designs of Red China into southeast Asia.

If the Communists try to turn Thailand into another Vietnam, they will find quite a different situation there.

The Communists will find a stronger, more united, more stable nation.

Thailand is not Vietnam. The so-called National Liberation Front in Thailand is virtually a paper organization without any significant local support. Its leadership and radio voice are residents in Red China.

Many authorities of southeast Asia say that Thailand's historic, religious, political, and economic background contrasts sharply with that of Vietnam's.

Briefly, some of the differences which they feel are significant in any comparative analysis of Thailand and Vietnam are as follows:

First. There are historic dissimilarities between the two countries.

There have been no major historic differences or regional and cultural conflicts in Thailand as there have been in Vietnam.

Thailand has always been a single, united nation, having no historic dividing line such as the Vietnamese 17th parallel.

This means that there is no safe haven for Communist activities in Thailand as there is in Vietnam, where the North, above the 17th parallel, serves as a Communist deployment area against the South, below the 17th parallel.

Vietnam is in fact a nation made up of three kingdoms—Tonkin, Annam, and Cochin China.

Nowhere in Thai history has there been a serious conflict of lowland peoples versus mountain peoples, a conflict which has constantly threatened the unity of Vietnam. The present Thai Government has initiated a very enlightened civic action program to bridge the gap between these peoples.

Although these conflicts have existed in Vietnam for many years, many of them have been commendably reconciled in the Vietnamese effort to defeat the Communist aggressors.

Second. The religious factor is very important and decisive.

Buddhism is the dominant religion in Thailand. Indeed, 95 percent of the

Thais belong to one Buddhist sect. Religious diversity, on the other hand, characterizes Vietnam where Buddhism, Roman Catholicism, the Cao Dai, and Hoa Hao sects are the dominant religions.

While the Thai Buddhist hierarchy abstains from political activity, the Vietnamese Government enjoys no such freedom from religious interference.

Third. The political and social differences are significant.

Thailand is the only country in southeast Asia that was able to retain its sovereignty during the European colonial period; Vietnam, unfortunately, was a French colony for many generations.

While Thailand has a focus of national unity in the monarch, Vietnam has enjoyed no such rallying point. The Thai monarchy has been a key factor in the political stability Thailand has enjoyed in recent history.

I am well aware that the present government of Thailand came to power by a coup d'etat, and according to some authorities, it is an autocratic regime, albeit a benevolent one. These facts should not deter us from accepting and supporting her as an ally.

I look forward, however, that with peace, material progress, and social advancement, we can hope for the eventual evolvement of a democratic and free government under the leadership of King Bhumibol Adulyadej.

Thailand is also fortunate to have good and effective civil servants. Vietnam, initially the victim of French neglect and civil war, has made great strides in developing a strong corps of public servants.

There is no charismatic Communist leader in Thailand like Ho Chi Minh, who serves as a constant threat to Vietnamese national stability.

The recent elections in South Vietnam clearly indicate that the vast majority of the people of that nation strongly opposes communist domination and are eager to participate in the formation of a broadly based government.

In Thailand there exists a successful melting pot, where various racial and cultural strains are being assimilated into the mainstream of Thai life. In Vietnam this is not yet completely true.

Fourth. The economic status of the two countries is also quite different.

The Thai economy, being relatively developed, stable, and sophisticated, has little problem absorbing its talented, educated, and skilled personnel. The Vietnamese economy, ravaged by the hostilities there, has had some difficulty absorbing its well-trained citizens.

The Thai economy is quite strong and self-sufficient, experiencing a phenomenal gross national product annual growth rate of more than 7 percent. This means that at the present rate, during this decade, the Thai economic growth rate will have doubled. And all of this is taking place with a minimal amount of U.S. economic assistance.

Except for the northeast section of Thailand—and even there the economic conditions are getting better—there is very little village discontentment that can be exploited by the Communist because more than 80 percent of the Thai citizens are already landowners. Vietnam, on the other hand, has recently undertaken land reform.

Despite the many obstacles she has had to face, South Vietnam has, to a large extent, overcome these difficulties. She has consequently been a determined defender of her independence. And she is strongly assured of our commitment to assist her in the defense of her sovereignty.

Mr. President, it is my firm hope that Thai unity, strength, and stability will deter a Communist attack against Thailand.

But should such deterrence fail and the Communists attack, I know our course is clear; I know we will stand by our commitments to Thailand and defend her.

Mr. President, it cannot be emphasized too strongly that we are in Thailand, first, because she is our ally and has willingly offered the use of some of her military facilities for our efforts in Vietnam. Without this generous support, our campaign in Vietnam would undoubtedly be hampered seriously.

Instead of criticizing and belittling Thailand for supporting our campaign against oppression and aggression in Vietnam, all freedom-loving people should thank her for her courage and determination to oppose forceful Communist encroachment anywhere in the world.

Second, should it ever develop, as it did in 1962, that the Communists decide to launch an aggressive attack against Thailand, we have a treaty with her that assures the Thai of our unqualified assistance.

Mr. President, our commitment and resolve in Thailand must be as strong and reliable as it is in Vietnam. I can see no other sensible alternative.

REPORT OF CITIZENS COMMITTEE ON 11TH PRECINCT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the Report of the District of Columbia Commissioners' Citizens Committee on the 11th Precinct of the Metropolitan Washington Police Department.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMISSIONERS' CITIZENS COMMITTEE ON THE 11TH PRECINCT OF THE METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON POLICE DEPARTMENT, WASHINGTON, D.C., SEPTEMBER 29, 1966.

CITIZENS COMMITTEE ON THE 11TH PRECINCT

Co-chairmen

Sterling Tucker, Executive Director, Washington Urban League.

Henry K. Willard II, Vice President, American Security & Trust Co.

Walter Williams, UPO Jr. Supervisor, Rebels with a Cause.

Secretary: Mrs. Willie Hardy, University Neighborhoods Council.

Treasurer: The Rev. Samuel Frazier, Episcopal Diocese of Washington.

Gloria Baker, Lawrence Barnes, The Rev. Geno Baroni, Robert Bell, Joan Braderman, Geraldine Brooks, Sterlyn Carroll, Frank David Epstein, William Ferguson, and Ulysses Garner, Jr.

Wesley Gatlin, Helena Hooper, Janet Jenkins, Lonnie King, James Kunen, Evelyn Lewis, Mrs. Herman Lewis, Darrell Morrow, H. Carl Moultrie, Claude Newton, Robert O'Neally.

George Pace, Calvin Rolark, Benjamin Rubin, Clarence Stanback, Paul Taylor, Frances Wall, Charles Wilson, Rita Wormly, and Grace Hall.

Tangra Pharis, William DeLoach, David Foote, Patricia Washington, Denver Drummond, Marvin Doxie, The Rev. Ernest Gibson, Richard Anderson, and Marie Potter.

Consultants: Mrs. Ruth Bates Harris, Judith Norton.

SEPTEMBER 29, 1966.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,
District of Columbia,
District Building,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: This letter is to transmit the report of your Citizens Committee on the Eleventh Precinct.

As you well know, a task of this kind is never easy and ours was made doubly difficult by our inability to achieve the full support and cooperation either of residents and workers in the Southeast areas or the police—for reasons which they regarded as good and sufficient in view of the fact that court and other possible actions were still pending.

However, even under these handicaps your Committee was able to gather enough information to compile what we regard as a reasonable and objective report. The areas of limitation imposed upon us we raise as questions for further consideration by the proper authorities.

The report is organized into three sections. The first reconstructs the incidents of the disturbance of August 15; the second evaluates the incidents; and the third section offers recommendations which hopefully will considerably reduce the possibility of such a disturbance taking place again.

The reconstruction and evaluation of the events of August 15 suggest to the Committee that there were five decisions made on that evening which were directly responsible for the disturbance: Two by community youth and adults involved, and three by the police. These were: by the youth and adults present, the two decisions to hold the picket lines at the Precinct House. The three decisions by the police were the early evening decision to make arrests in the midst of a tense public meeting, the decision to use privately-owned German Shepherd dogs to control the crowd (whether their use was actively sought or only permitted by police authorities), and the final decision forcibly to disperse the crowd assembled at the intersection of Morris Road and Mt. View Place.

Your Committee, though highly diversified in membership, has worked well together and each active member has conscientiously pursued the assignment given us. This report, therefore, reflects our best collective thinking regarding the disturbance of August 15 and we hope it will be useful to the Commissioners and others as efforts are continued to build a community of opportunity under law, order, and justice.

It is the opinion of this Committee that public interest would be well served if the Commissioners shared with the community by the end of January the results of its efforts to implement the recommendations of this report. This Committee is also prepared to reassemble for a review of this progress if it should be the will of the Commissioners.

Sincerely,

WALTER WILLIAMS,
HENRY K. WILLARD II,
STERLING TUCKER,
Co-Chairmen.

DISTURBANCE IN SOUTHEAST WASHINGTON

The specific events in question

The disturbance on Monday, August 15 seems to have stemmed directly from a series of events beginning Saturday, August 13. These initial occurrences took place in the Congress Heights-Washington Highlands area in the vicinity of the shopping center at Wheeler Road and Wahler Place, S. E. They established a pattern of violence, destruction, and the assemblage of angry crowds for the subsequent events of August 15. The roots of the disturbance, however, lie in far deeper conditions of the community.

August 13

At about 5:00 P. M., a white man was robbed in front of 4137 Wheeler Road, S. E. The man went into the Wheeler Restaurant at 4135 Wheeler Road where he found an off-duty police officer (5th Precinct), who gave chase and apprehended the suspect in an alley off Wheeler Road. The suspect, having been placed in the rear of a scout car, tried to escape. During the ensuing struggle a round of ammunition was discharged into the rear seat of the car. The man was finally subdued and placed in a police wagon. (There were no injuries to anyone.) The suspect was charged with robbery and two counts of assault on a police officer. (The disposition of these charges is unknown, but is immaterial to the Committee's inquiry).

Since the suspect was a person well known in the neighborhood, the gathering crowd had more than casual interest in the incident.

At the same time another resident of the area, one William Arthur Foote, was arrested on a charge on disorderly conduct for having thrown stones at a school building. In this case, friends collected and posted the $10 collateral, and Foote finally was released.

At about 11:45 P. M., one Wallace Poole, a 23-year old white male residing in Friendly, Maryland, was reported to have been assaulted by several Negro males after leaving the Ten 23 Club, at 1023 Wahler Place, S. E., while in the shopping center parking lot. Poole was stabbed, knocked down, kicked, and hit with rocks. (The victim was a member of one of the motorcycle gangs from Maryland and Virginia which frequent the Ten 23 Club and Rip and Kay's Wheeler Restaurant. The assailants at that point had neither been apprehended nor even identified.)

A D.C. Fire Ambulance (8–3–A), responding to a call to take Poole to the hospital, was stoned by the large group which had gathered as it entered and left the parking lot. There was some damage to the roof of the ambulance.

Poole was treated at Casualty Hospital for a concussion, two broken teeth, lacerations near the eye, and two knife wounds in the side.

August 14

At about 1:30 A. M., August 14, a group of young persons threw stones at stores on the South side of Wahler Place while another group committed the same acts around the corner in the 4100 block of Wheeler Road. Both groups eventually dispersed, with damage to doors and windows estimated at $2,800. There were no reports of larceny or injury to persons. Individuals involved were not identified.

August 15

On monday, August 15, about 12 Noon, Lt. Emmett Sullivan of the Metropolitan Police Departments' Police-Community Relations Unit sought out and conferred with three staff members of the Congress Heights Neighborhood Development Program (an anti-poverty program which jointly operates with the Southeast Neighborhood House. Both are funded by UPO and directed by the Washington Welfare Association). Among the staff members was Mr. William Michaels, a community organization specialist who had ancillary responsibilities in the area of police-community relations. Sullivan told them of the assault near the Ten 23 Club and of suspicions as to who might have been involved. He was trying to determine the suspects' identities and the identity of the friends of W. A. Foote who had posted his collateral.

Mr. Michaels spoke for the staff, saying that they could not then divulge what they knew due to social work ethics, but would discuss the matter with the Southeast House Board. He also said he would be meeting with some of those persons who may have posted Foote's collateral, but apparently the time and place of the meeting were not mentioned.

The discussion touched on a number of other subjects. Lt. Sullivan indicated his fear that the motorcycle gangs would attempt to retaliate against the Negro youth in the area; he characterized the mood of the community as "dynamite". Michaels and the workers expressed the antagonism of area youth towards the Ten 23 Club and the Wheeler Restaurant for what the community felt was a policy of discouraging Negro patronage. These are very nearly the only places of entertainment in an area which has recently become heavily Negro. They are also frequented by motorcycle gangs from outside the District as well as by off-duty white policemen. Michaels indicated that the hostility towards the businesses was transferred to the police, who were then regarded as approving the anti-Negro policy. This, he said, added to existing community feeling against the police. A complaint on this ground, according to Michaels, was made to Captain Richmond of the 11th Precinct by a delegation of area residents on May 8, 1966.

Prior to this meeting with Lt. Sullivan, Michaels and other members of the staff at the Congress Heights Neighborhood Development Program had arranged a meeting of area youth to be held at 7:30 P.M. at its Consumer Action Center at 4200 Wheeler Road, S.E. The purposes of the meeting were to discuss the need for a youth development program in Congress Heights (one of only two Neighborhood Development Centers in the city without such a program, eight others already having been funded by UPO), to attempt to prevent further disorder, and to discuss the events of August 13 and perhaps suggest a meeting with Lt. Sullivan.

Michaels and other staff workers (including Reverend James Coates, Assistant Director of the Congress Heights Neighborhood Development Program) arrived between 6:30 and 7:00 and joined some of the group gathered in front of a carry-out shop across the street from the Center. This group included the same W. A. Foote who had been arrested on disorderly conduct charges on Saturday and one Riley Walls. There were a number of police officers, approximately 20, in the area as well as scout cars and motorcycles. The preponderance of police in the area made the youths tense and angry. Initially, they did not want to meet. However, the staff workers persuaded them to go ahead with the meeting on the front lawn of the apartment building of the Center location. Chairs were set up, notebooks distributed, and the meeting began. At this point there were approximately 12 to 18 people present, including several staff workers, according to Michaels.[1]

A scout car containing Detectives Wesley and Quinn and two identifying witnesses had been parked in front of the Consumer Action Center but pulled away just prior to the beginning of the meeting. At about 7:30, shortly after the meeting began, the scout car returned. The detectives approached Foote, and placed him under arrest. They also arrested Walls. No warrants were shown and no charges were mentioned. Staff workers and members of the group asked for the charges and why the arrests were being made. The group also questioned why there was no warrant for an entry and arrest on private property. A staff member, James Lynn Covington, who continued to ask about the charges and allegedly tugged on Foote's arm as the latter was being taken away, was then himself arrested. Detective Wesley informed Reverend Coates that Foote was being arrested on charges of assault with a deadly weapon and Covington for interfering with an arrest. Wesley would give no additional information as to the amount of bond, the release of Foote and Covington, etc. It is not clear to what extent the group was informed of the reasons for the arrests.

Michaels then made a series of phone calls with the following responses: to the Congress Heights Neighborhood Law office—no answer; to the Anacostia NLO—no answer; to the emergency Neighborhood Legal Services number—no one available, told to call Julian Dugas—at a meeting but would call (and did shortly thereafter); to Neighborhood Legal Services attorney James Stafford—out; to the Community Relations Unit at Police Headquarters—no answer; to the 11th Precinct officer in charge, who said Lt. Ruff was out and hung up.

The possibility of forming a picket line, among other actions, was being discussed outside while Michaels was making these calls. The youth had discussed going to the 11th Precinct to get Foote and Covington released. Coates and the staff had tried to get them inside the Center, with no success. Since the group was bent on taking some action and, in the opinion of the staff members, were so agitated that violence and destruction were likely to occur, the only constructive alternative appeared to Reverend Coates and Mr. Michaels to be to organize those persons going to the 11th Precinct in an orderly demonstration. With the assistance of staff workers, makeshift picket signs were hastily made and lettered with such slogans as: "Lawful Assembly Denied", "Police Abuse", "We Need a Youth Program", "Police Brutality", etc. After observing these developments, Michaels called Lt. Sullivan about 8:00 P. M. and asked him to go to the 11th Precinct. Michaels also said he was upset and felt that Sullivan had "double-crossed" him by arranging to have the arrests, for what he understood was a minor violation involving broken school windows, made during the meeting. Sullivan denied that he had done so and said he would go to the 11th Precinct to correct that impression. Sullivan then called Lt. Edwin J. Ruff (who had been transferred to the Precinct only two days before) and inquired about Covington's arrest. However, Ruff had no information on the case. When Wesley arrived with Covington in custody, he briefly described the arrests and Ruff arranged with Sullivan to wait until the latter arrived before booking Covington.

By this time the pickets, numbering about 15, had begun picketing in an orderly manner on Wheeler Road and Wahler Place and Bellevue Street, by the Center and by the Ten 23 Club.

When the group was ready to go to the 11th Precinct (two and one-half miles away), Michaels and another staff worker each took a carload there, as did seven community members who volunteered their services. Others of the group took the bus. By this time, the group had grown; a crowd had begun to gather when the arrests were made, and it is alleged that some onlookers were invited to join the picketing.

---

[1] The Southeast Neighborhood House's own investigation later reported the initial meeting attendance as 7 youths and 4 staff workers. Throughout our inquiry there has been a continuing problem in ascertaining precisely how many persons constituted any of the several "groups" referred to as existing at different times.

Reverend Coates stayed at the Consumer Action Center with the remaining members of the group, who were still questioning the evening's occurrences. He also called the 11th Precinct officer in charge and was told by the Sergeant that Lt. Ruff had been in the Wheeler Road area for three hours. Reverend Coates complained about the lack of discretion on the part of the police in making the arrest during the meeting instead of before or after, since both Foote and Walls had been visible in the area since 4:00 P. M. Coates then drove to the 11th Precinct.

The cronology from here on becomes increasingly unclear because many different people described aspects of varying and often simultaneous events without always indicating the identities of the persons involved. References to times were admittedly only approximations, and the Committee has often had to reconcile discrepancies by "splitting the difference". Specific times will be mentioned essentially for the purpose of establishing a sequence.

According to Lt. Ruff, sometime between 8:00 and 8:15 P.M. two witnesses to the arrests arrived at the 11th Precinct and inquired of Lt. Ruff about Covington's arrest. One of the witnesses gave a version of the arrest differing from Detective Wesley's which he repeated in Wesley's presence. Covington was then brought in and he backed up Wesley's version, though he offered to explain why he had been so active in objecting to Foote's arrest and apologized for his lack of discretion.

About 8:15 P.M., Sullivan arrived with Julian Dugas and L. W. Jacobs, Dugas' assistant. On Dugas' request, Sullivan arranged for Dugas to see Covington prior to his booking, to which Ruff agreed.

First Picket

About 8:30, Michaels arrived at the 11th Precinct with the first carload of demonstrators: seven persons between the ages of 18 and 22, including two of the leaders of the group. Several other carloads arrived shortly thereafter, increasing the group to as many as 40 or 50. Most witnesses concur that the pickets were controlled at this stage.

After arriving, Michaels encountered Lt. Sullivan, who said Dugas had arrived and asked that Michaels hold off the pickets to give them time to secure Covington's release. Sullivan did not indicate that anything was being done on behalf of Foote or Walls. According to police testimony, Michaels denied having "control" over the group he had transported; it was for the group to decide whether or not to picket. He suggested that Sullivan talk to them.

Inside the 11th Precinct, Michaels saw Dugas, Jacobs and Attorney James Stafford. When he was informed that legal assistance was available, he asked Stafford to advise the pickets about the legal aspects of picketing, which was done. The group was further advised that legal assistance was being provided to Messrs. Foote and Covington. Whereupon Michaels returned to Congress Heights to transport another carload of demonstrators.

After Reverend Coates arrived, he talked to Lt. Ruff and again, challenging Covington's arrest, asked why the arrests had been made at the meeting. From Ruff's answers Coates inferred that Ruff had little or no concern for community reaction to police action. (While inside he noticed an individual, later identified as a Mr. Wheeler, a member of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee in Detroit, but a former resident of the Nichols Avenue area, talking to Ruff. Mr. Wheeler played an indeterminate leadership role as the evening proceeded.)

Michaels returned to the 11th Precinct shortly before 9:00. He checked again to see if legal assistance was being provided and saw Walls sitting behind the counter. Learning that Walls had not seen a lawyer he arranged that Stafford should represent him.

As time went on the picketers and the growing crowd became somewhat loud, chanting from time to time such things as "Police Brutality" and "We want Covington". Reports vary on the precise tenor of the crowd. Officers Ruff and Sullivan claimed that they became "loud" and "boisterous". Staff workers maintain that the group was peaceful and that they had been working with the group to keep it so.

Lieutenant Sullivan said that during the "confusion" in the Precinct he never had a chance to talk with Lieutenant Ruff about dropping charges against Covington. As a result, Covington was charged with disorderly conduct. Ruff was concerned about the situation outside the Precinct; he felt the crowd was getting louder and tension was rising. He was unable to get any information from those conferring inside about the situation, and he believed "the sole concern" of the pickets was that Covington be released. Consequently, he allowed Covington to be released on $10 collateral, which was posted by Dugas. (On Tuesday, August 16, the charge against Covington was dropped by the Corporation Counsel, a step urged by Lieutenant Sullivan.) After his release, Covington joined Dugas, Jacobs and Sullivan in a conference about what should be done.

Reverend Coates had returned outside to the group and had told them why Foote was arrested and what he knew about the bond. He noticed that the group was largely from Congress Heights but had been joined by persons from the nearby Barry Farms area. After Covington was released at about 10:00 P.M., he appeared and persuaded the group to stop picketing. Michaels and other staff workers then drove some of them back to Congress Heights. Other groups returned to their own areas.

Second Picket

Upon returning to Congress Heights, the staff and pickets found a crowd awaiting near the carry-out store. The crowd was not satisfied with what had happened and wanted to return to the 11th Precinct to picket some more. The group was unhappy with Lieutenant Ruff's answers. They were also disgruntled over Foote's arrest. Though Michaels told them there was no way Foote could then be released, they still wanted to return. Feelings were running high, and the staff decided that further picketing was again the only constructive alternative to possible violence.

Michaels returned to the 11th Precinct with the first carload of pickets to form the second picket line. Another staff worker, Robert Jackson, also transported members of the group after having received a call from a co-worker. Upon their arrival, they found several other groups in the vicinity of the Precinct including the Barry Farms Block Boys and the Rebels with a Cause. Ironically, these groups were picketing because they thought the Foote who had been arrested was a Foote from their area, a respected neighborhood leader and athlete who had such a reputation for cooperation that it was difficult to believe he had been arrested. The picketing recommenced, and Michaels started to return to Congress Heights for another carload.

About this time (approximately 10:15), a blue van with a Maryland license plate containing watchmen (employed by Watchmen's Service, Inc., of Brandywine, Maryland) and two German Shepherd dogs passed the Precinct House on Nichols Avenue. Noticing the crowd, they stopped at Good Hope Road and appeared to consult with a police officer. The watchmen with their dogs then turned back to the Precinct House and parked behind it.[2] As they emerged onto Nichols Avenue, the dogs lunged at two Negro boys who were passing by; they were not bitten but ran to a corner where a group of people had gathered, and from somewhere in the crowd a firecracker was thrown at the dogs. This is the first reported instance of disorder. The watchmen led the dogs toward the group at the corner and then swept across Nichols Avenue, causing the crowd (now numbering about 100) and the pickets to retreat across the street and disperse. The dogs and men were confronted by members of the crowd armed with rocks, and they retreated, to the cheers of the crowd. This was followed by more throwing of firecrackers and rocks at the dogs, which were then taken into or behind the Precinct. Neither the men nor the dogs appeared to be hit. There were no police officers in front of the Precinct at this time. A number of missiles were thrown during the next few minutes. (Neither at this time nor any other time during this evening were any Precinct windows broken, nor is there any evidence of other property damage caused by thrown objects).

The appearance of the dogs during the approximate period between 10:15 and 10:30 was followed by the disruption of the second picket line and the throwing of missiles. Lieutenant Ruff's statement of events made no mention of the appearance of dogs. (The reason given was that this aspect of the disturbance was under investigation by the Police Internal Investigation Unit, and he was ordered not to discuss the incident.) He had been conferring with "countless groups . . . and individuals" who claimed to have some influence over the crowd. The group which was in front of the Precinct at about 10:30 appeared to Ruff to contain many younger persons and to display a "marked difference" in attitude. He describes them as "profane, obscene, antagonistic, defiant, belligerent, loud and hostile". Due to Ruff's total silence on the issue, it is not clear whether he knew of the occurrence of the dog incident.

However, he says he attempted to work with the staff workers and other representatives before proceeding directly against the pickets. Eventually, though, he states that he felt that the people with whom he was negotiating had, in fact, no real control. In any event, Ruff believed the group to be interested in Foote's release. He told a representative that Foote had been at the central cell block since 10:00 and had counsel who was trying to arrange bond. The doubting representatives were taken to visit the cell block as proof. Ruff wondered whether they disseminated their findings because several other people asked the same questions during the next 10 or 15 minutes to which the same answers were given. In the meantime, Michaels, returning to Congress Heights, was interrupted by the sight of the dogs and the ensuing events. He called James Stafford and said tension was rising and that he might again be needed. He then proceeded to Southeast House where a group was to meet with Lieutenant Sullivan.

Attempts To Dispurse the Crowd

At about 10:30, Reverend Coates arrived at the Precinct to hear people saying, "Let's get the dogs" and see them throwing rocks at the Precinct. Reverend Coates emphasized that the rock throwing was minimal enough so that no damage was inflicted on passersby, the Precinct House or passing cars. Also the dog handlers were not struck. His staff was directed to try to convene the group at Southeast House, where he would attempt to get Captain Robert Richmond to appear to answer questions and listen to complaints. Lt. Sullivan had also returned to the Precinct, and seeing the emotional tenor of the crowd, suggested to William Bankett (Assistant Director of Southeast House), whom he saw near the group, that he try to get the crowd into Southeast House for a discussion. These efforts resulted in perhaps a majority of the crowd going to Southeast House.

---

[2] The Washington Post, August 17, 1966, reports that Arnold Karschner, owner of Watchmen's Service, Inc., said one of his employees was asked for assistance by an unidentified 11th Precinct officer. The officer stopped his scout car at the site being guarded by the watchman and requested him to help and to bring any co-workers he could.

Over 100 people crowded into the Board Room at the House where Bankett attempted to talk about the arrests, but either had trouble being heard or was not being listened to. He introduced Sullivan, who was asked about the charges against Foote and Walls, the bond, why and where they were held, when would they be released, who were the complaining witnesses, etc. Sullivan did not have the answers to most of the group's questions and they began walking out. Reverend Coates then tried to get their attention but was unsuccessful. After many of the group left, Sullivan remained and talked with the staff remaining.

Those who left (about 11:00) went out to an adjacent parking lot opposite the Precinct House on the corner of Nichols Avenue and Morris Road, in the company of Michaels and other staff workers who were trying to keep order. The group wished to resume picketing.

While part of the crowd had been gathered into Southeast House, many remained by the Precinct House. Lt. Ruff stated that about 10:45 the crowd retreated across Nichols Avenue where they began bombarding the Precinct with rocks, bricks, bottles, cans and "small explosives" (fireworks). He ordered an immediate attempt to disperse them. Feeling he had too few men to be effective, he called for more men at the station, but since most were on foot, their arrival took some time.

At about 10:50, Lt. William Burchette arrived to take charge of the 12:00–8:00 A.M. shift. (He had been in the Eleventh Precinct since July 1965.) He saw a group of 30–40 youths marching on the east side of Nichols Avenue (across from the Precinct) chanting, "We want Foote". Once inside, he made arrangements to get more men on the 12:00—8:00 shift.

Those officers outside the station house had to retreat because of what Ruff described as an "intensive barrage of missiles." Ruff ordered nearby scout cars to meet behind the group and, approaching them from the east end of Morris Road, to disperse them. He reports that this was done at 11:00 "without physical contact" and the rock throwing ceased. He did not report the precise manner in which this dispersal was accomplished, perhaps because, being inside the Precinct House, he did not see it. The method of dispersal is suggested by ensuing events which occurred in the parking lot across from the precinct where staff workers and youths were discussing the desirability of resuming the demonstration. Without any discernible warning, a scout car containing two white, helmeted officers, raced its engine and sped into the lot toward the group. Some of the youths tried to avoid the car by dodging behind other parked cars, and the scout car kept turning to chase after them. In the course of one of its maneuvers, the scout car backed into and damaged a parked car (this being the only property damage reported for the entire evening). The scout car immediately left the lot, no person having been injured and the car itself not having been hit by missiles.

The crowd was then rushed again, without discernible warning, by a line of police officers (30–50 according to one estimate) who drew their batons. German Shepherd dogs also were seen, perhaps the same dogs which had appeared earlier. (Police canine cruisers were seen behind the Precinct, but those dogs were never used.) Most of the group in the parking lot ran away this time. Those who stayed, such as Michaels, noted that there were both Negro and white officers on the regular force involved, and that no one was struck at that time. The police chased after all but those who ran up Morris Road away from the Precinct or who went into the Southeast House yard, which became regarded by the group as a "sanctuary."

After the rush by the police in the parking lot, about 11:20 p.m., a crowd forming at Mt. View Place and Morris Road began throwing firecrackers and stones at and under passing cars and buses and down Morris Road toward the Precinct. With this new outbreak, some of the young people from Congress Heights became frightened and wanted to go home. Michaels agreed to drive them. Before leaving he went into Southeast House to inform Reverend Coates, who was still talking to Lieutenant Sullivan. When he left for Congress Heights, fireworks were still being exploded. About 11:35 he returned and took another group back.

Reverend Coates and the staff workers were at this time trying to get the crowd away from the Precinct and into Southeast House. They felt that the youths were more concerned with asking questions than with violence.

By 11:45 the area had quieted down and became calm. Lt. Burchette conducted roll call and the 12:00–8:00 shift went out on duty. Since he feared still more trouble he held the 4:00–12:00 shift in reserve in the Precinct House. As Lts. Burchette and Ruff were conferring outside, they encountered a group of representatives from Southeast House who asked Lt. Burchette if he would come to talk to the group. The representatives said Lt. Sullivan had been before the group and was still there but had not been able to answer their questions about Foote, and the group refused to let him speak. They wanted a precinct official who knew the whole situation. Burchette answered that he was busy deploying his men and could not leave. Moreover, he did not have complete knowledge of the situation. He did say that if they could quiet the area by getting everyone into Southeast House he would appear. Lt. Ruff was encouraged to appear in Burchette's stead by Robert Jackson, one of the staff representatives. Ruff had knowledge of the facts and was not on duty, so he agreed to appear, thinking it might be beneficial.

The staff workers attempted to introduce Ruff, but one of the youths stopped the staff workers and said it was their meeting, their night, and their decision as to what to do next. The group of forty or fifty began asking what seemed like "dozens of questions" of Ruff, most of which he felt had nothing to do with Foote and some of which involved police powers and law in general. Ruff felt these "were not proper questions for a police official to discuss." With respect to bond for Foote, Ruff said that a judge would establish that. He said he did not know the usual amount for Foote's offense.

The group was dissatisfied with Ruff's answers and felt he was being evasive or not directly responsive. Ruff said the staff workers tried unsuccessfully to gain order and he was confronted with "hundreds of questions." He could not hear or understand many and felt that in answering he was talking to himself, as the group was not listening or could not hear. Some of the group started to leave and at about 12:00 a.m., Lt. Ruff returned to the Precinct to support Lt. Burchette.

The group leaving Southeast House then moved to the intersection of Morris Road and Mt. View Place where a crowd of about 80–100 was soon gathered. Some firecrackers and stones were thrown and the crowd was somewhat noisy.

After Lt. Ruff returned to the Precinct House, Lt. Sullivan, who was also there, called Mr. James Banks, Executive Director of the United Planning Organization, who asked him to have Reverend Coates call him. Coates was summoned to the Precinct House and called Banks who, after an appraisal of the situation, agreed to come to talk to the group to assuage them. Coates assured Lt. Sullivan that Banks was coming and then returned to Southeast House to inform the staff workers (of whom there were approximately 18 by then).

During this interlude, the crowd assembled in the intersection had become noisier. From time to time missiles were still thrown down Morris Road towards Nichols Avenue. On hearing that Mr. Banks was coming, the group began to quiet down.

Earlier there had been an incident involving the previously mentioned Mr. Wheeler, a member of SNCC in Detroit, who said he had appointed himself spokesman for the group. After an officer at the corner of Morris and Nichols had directed traffic up Morris Road, Mr. Wheeler started to block the traffic, but he was dissuaded by a staff worker. Reverend Coates requested the police not to route traffic up Morris Road. After this incident, no further attempts to stop vehicles were made by the group.

At approximately the same time, a person believed to be the same Wheeler asked to serve as the group's representative in trying to get someone at the Precinct House to come to them. He said he would go to the Lieutenant only if he had the group's backing, i.e., no violence, no bricks, no firecrackers, no yelling. Because the group still sought dialogue with the police, they agreed. Another member of the crowd joined the young man. Shortly thereafter they returned to say that Lt. Burchette said he was not interested in talking to them and was too busy.

The Final Dispersal

At some point between 12:30 A.M. and 12:45 A.M., Lt. Burchette observed two cars going west through the intersection where the group was assembled. It appeared to him that they had been stopped and surrounded and that the car doors had been opened. He found it "impossible to determine" exactly what was happening, but says that because missiles had been thrown earlier and some Roman candles were still burning, he was concerned for the safety of the occupants. It is not clear whether Burchette knew at this time that the group was awaiting the arrival of Mr. Banks.

"In order to prevent injury to those in the cars and also to disperse the crowd", Lt. Burchette dispatched two cars, one with four men and one with five men, around the block to approach the group from the other side. With no discernible warning to the crowd, Burchette and 20 other helmeted men then began advancing west on Morris Road towards Mt. View and south on Mt. View from Mapleview, converging on the intersection. In the time needed for this deployment and advance, the "besieged" cars disappeared without identification, so that when the police actually rushed the intersection there were no cars on the scene.

The events that followed are the most critical of the night's occurences in the sense that all injury to persons and virtually all arrests occurred in the next 10 or 15 minutes. Because of the restrictions on testimony due to the pending legal cases arising out of this matter, however, this phase of the disturbance has received the least specific testimony. Nonetheless, certain things were reported by so many different witnesses as to be beyond doubt.

Witnesses report that at no time was a discernible warning or request to disperse issued by the police. Police statements have not dealt with this question. Lt. Burchette said the crowd was dispersed "by contact". According to witnesses' testimony, that phrase might refer to their description of helmeted police officers, wielding night sticks, moving upon the crowd.

As soon as staff workers realized what was developing, they tried to get the group into the yard of Southeast House. Witnesses state that several teenagers outside the fence were beaten by three or more officers at once with sticks, blackjacks, and fists. Girls were seen being hit. One boy who had fallen between a car and a high curb on Mt. View Place was beaten as he lay wedged against the car. A few neighbors and innocent bystanders also were said to have been objects of attack, though they had nothing to do with the activities of the evening. Some staff workers were set upon until Reverend Coates identified them.

Even the Southeast House yard was not an effective refuge, as several officers chased one boy over the fence and were reported to have struck him. Another boy was chased by an officer into Southeast House itself. Many persons were crying, one fainted at the sight of the beating. According to the Director of Admissions at D.C. General Hospital, 13 persons were admitted for treatment after these events.

On the other hand, some members of the crowd did not submit to the officers' display of force and engaged in fighting with them. Private James Haney received a scalp laceration and was taken to Washington Hospital Center for treatment and released. Witnesses in the crowd testified that Pvt. Haney was caught by the club of a fellow policeman in a joint attack on a member of the crowd. The police report, however, that Pvt. Haney was injured by an object thrown from the crowd. Lt. Burchette stated that he was hit at one point with a bottle coming from the direction of Southeast House. The "dispersal" resulted in 10 arrests, 6 adults and 4 juveniles, mostly for disorderly conduct and a few for assaulting a police officer.

According to reports from members of the crowd, all of the officers involved in the initial rush were white; a few Negroes were seen only at the end.

Lt. Sullivan, meanwhile, had called Mrs. Ruth Bates Harris, Executive Director of the Commissioner's Council on Human Relations, requesting her to come to the 11th Precinct, and then himself returned to Southeast House during the melee, assuming a position at the main entrance in an effort to keep peace there.

The situation slowly began to ease. Lt. Burchette called some of the officers back. Shortly after, about 1:00 A.M., Inspector Stargel, the acting police chief for that tour of duty, arrived as did Mr. James Banks. Stargel met with staff workers in Southeast House and was asked questions by the group. He did not know why the crowd had been set upon when the police knew Mr. Banks was coming. He did not know about Foote's status. The group than asked questions of Burchette, who also was in the room. The tenor of their questioning concerned Burchette's refusal to appear before them earlier. He was unable to answer their questions. Burchette then returned to the Precinct where Captain Richmond had arrived.

About 1:30 A. M., Banks and Stargel also returned to the Precinct House. Mrs. Harris had by then arrived. Groups formed to discuss the events of the evening. Gradually the disturbance faded into the night, leaving strengthened hostilities and mutual distrust in its wake.

The Aftermath

Although the final rush by the police had succeeded in dispersing the crowd, it had not dissipated the emotions which united the group in the first place. August 16 saw a variety of actions directly related to the disturbance, some a hopeful augury of improved policies and programs, but others an ominous reminder that tensions and frustrations were still high—an outbreak of violence seemed possible.

After the final dispersal approximately thirty youths accompanied Mrs. Harris and Mr. Banks to the Human Relations Council office, where they talked until 4:00 A. M. Feelings of fear and hatred, frustration and despair were expressed. Particular causes of the group's concern were the frightening experience of being set upon by dogs; the unwillingness of the officers in charge to answer fully their questions and, in some cases, to talk to them at all; the violent rush by the police without prior warning to disperse; the physical damage inflicted by the police; and concern for those members of the group who had been injured or arrested. Before they left, Mrs. Harris exchanged her promise that their charges would be thoroughly investigated for their agreement to await peacefully the outcome of such inquiries.

A variety of meetings were held throughout August 16, some involving the police, others the community. The final meeting of the day occurred in Bethlehem Baptist Church in Southeast. Tension was rising, principally because several of those who had been arrested had not been released by the police even though collateral had been posted, nor was any information as to their status forthcoming. Talk of an imminent riot grew, but the group was persuaded to stay in the church to meet with Judge Orem Ketcham of the Juvenile Court, who frankly and sincerely answered as many of their questions as he could.

After the meeting, many people—Mrs. Harris, neighborhood workers, clergy, civil rights workers, roving leaders, police, and community members—made continued and successful efforts to deter the young people from violence. Indeed, the evening ended with an impromptu party at Barry Farms.

By August 17, orderly meetings were being held by youth groups in the community to discuss their problems and proposals. The corner had been turned.

Evaluation

The essential purpose of this report is not only to determine responsibility for the events of August 15 but also to provide guidelines for the future. It is our hope that the evaluations and recommendations will be received in the constructive spirit in which they are offered.

The problems the Committee faced in reconstructing the events of August 15 complicate our evaluation of them. Because of the limitations imposed on the investigation—the Committee's lack of subpoena power, the legal restrictions imposed upon participants' testimony because of cases pending in court, and police and community eyewitnesses' reluctance to testify—there remain many unresolved questions of fact. Some of these questions should be posed to authorities responsible for investigating the incidents from which our inquiries were barred, with the specific request that answers be made public as soon as they are obtained. Other events the Committee feels competent to evaluate on the basis of the record of the hearing and our collective community experience.

The incidents of August 15 were characterized by a progressive breakdown of communications and understanding between the 11th Precinct and the various groups of youth involved throughout the evening. Police-community relations in some areas of this Precinct had been tense and fragile at best. In the Committee's judgment, however, the events of August 15 could have been avoided. Although hostilities on both sides lay beneath the surface, they would not have broken forth on that particular evening except for five critical decisions: two by community youth and adults involved and three by the police. These were, by the youth and adults present, the two decisions to hold the two picket lines at the Precinct House. The three decisions by the police were the early evening decisions to make arrests in the midst of a tense public meeting, the decision to use privately-owned German Shepherd dogs to control the crowd (whether their use was actively sought or only permitted by police authorities), and the final decision forcibly to disperse the crowd assembled at the intersection of Morris Road and Mt. View Place.

The Responsibility of Local Youth and Adult Leadership

Any citizen has the Constitutional right to picket a police precinct. There can be no doubt that the youth were acting within their rights when they picketed in protest before the precinct house.

However, were the picket lines wise and appropriate responses in the given situation of August 15? Whatever their legitimacy, they served throughout the evening as counterprovocation to prior acts of provocation by the police.

After the three arrests during the meeting at the Community Action Center, the youths' strategy to picket the 11th Precinct was approved and supported by members of the community organization staff of the Southeast Neighborhood House. These professional workers were the adult leaders present during this critical decision. As stated in their own testimony, in their judgment picketing was the only acceptable alternative to the possibility of other uncontrolled, possibly destructive acts by the youth, spurred by anger at the police.

The Committee is not satisfied, however, that the decision to picket the precinct was the only acceptable alternative. To what extent were other alternatives presented to the youth? Would the momentum of the group itself have carried it to some uncontrolled, violent action against the Eleventh Precinct House two miles away or to indulge in destructive acts in the Wheeler Road Shopping Center area? Or did the readiness of staff members to transport groups of youths to the station house and to provide materials and guidance for an orderly picket line sustain the group's initial anger?

In the cases of both the first and second picket lines, the ostensible motivation was anger and concern over the arrest of Foote, Walls, and Covington. The interests of the arrested men were best served, however, not by picket lines, but by the speedy provision of legal counsel. This was achieved with commendable speed by staff members of Southeast House. It was the first and most immediate response of professional community workers at the scene of the arrests. From that point onward, the interests of the three arrested men were protected and (with the possible exception of the reduction of charges against Covington) were not affected directly by other community actions.

The effect of the protest in front of the station house was to magnify participation in the entire series of incidents. The original meeting at the Consumer Action Center, interrupted by the arrests, was attended by seven youths and four staff in one account, by 12 to 18 persons including staff, in another. After the police arrests, this group attracted youthful bystanders to it from the nearby shops and carry-outs. The first picket line at the precinct had at most forty participants. By the end of the evening, however, at the time of the final dispersal by the police, from 100 to 150 youths were on the scene. The effect of the decision to picket the station house, it would seem, at the very least quadrupled the number of youth who were ultimately to be affected by the incident at the Consumer Action Center.

Rumors which spread through the area, the natural curiosity of passersby at the scene, and alleged specific efforts at recruitment—all added to the size of the crowd. Moreover, many of the newcomers had no idea why they were there. They fed their own grievances and hostilities into the situation. Thus, an action designed to channel the frustrations of a specific group of 20–30 youths at the Consumer Action Center provided the impetus for the involvement of 100–150 youths.

Whatever the circumstances surrounding the original decision to picket, certain aspects of the execution of the picket lines seem questionable to the Committee. We feel that staff workers did not meet their responsibility to clearly establish and communicate the purposes of the picket line, nor did they adequately convey what reports there were from the police to the pickets. That the issues and purposes of the picket line were poorly defined is attested by the placards carried by the group. Some people were picketing in anger at the police. Others picketed on behalf of the arrested men. Still others picketed to obtain a youth program. The resulting confusion was increased as the evening wore on by the impact of rumors. Thus many members of the second picket line were there because of a case of mistaken identity resulting from a similarity of names between a neighborhood youth and one of the arrested men.

The decision to hold the second picket line was the second crucial community decision. The crowd was considerably larger—many members of it were less well known to staff members. As has been mentioned, rumors and other issues confused the situation. Yet there was a specific decision, again endorsed by staff members, to restage the picket line—in essence, to repeat an action which had failed to reduce tensions or ease the situation earlier in the evening.

With the introduction of the German Shepherd dogs came the first major breakdown of discipline. The use of the dogs brought about a general deterioration in the behavior of the crowd which continued intermittently throughout the remainder of the evening. Subsequent events, particularly the admitted difficulty of staff workers in keeping the situation under control, raise the question of the proper role of a community organizer in similar tense, rapidly changing situations.

Since the picket lines allegedly served as an alternative to violence and since they were carried out under adverse conditions—hastily assembled as a safety valve for anger and frustration—staff responsibility was the greater to ensure that those emotions were not heightened by confusion or misunderstanding of the issues at hand. Because the staff supported the decision to have the picket lines and helped organize them, they must assume responsibility for maintaining a controlled demonstration free from disorderly or unlawful acts.

Despite repeated efforts of some staff workers to reduce tension and conflict, there was a leadership vacuum on August 15 which no one was prepared to fill. It appears that the youth were looking for leadership. It appears also that the police sought to identify community leadership. Yet several times in conversation with the police, staff members denied that they had responsibility for the youths' actions. According to the police, the effect of the community organizers' disavowels of leadership presented the image of a leaderless and uncontrolled mob.

In such time of tension and crisis, the Committee feels community workers must assume more vigorous leadership roles which the community—whether residents or police—expect of them. The assertion of such leadership by community workers is not to deny the validity of group responsibility and decisions which are at the heart of community organization theory. It is, rather, an emergency measure for use when crisis or tension have destroyed the balance of the original situation, when the original decision and organization no longer prevail.

However, the responsibility for leadership, as a matter of professional judgment and method of staff members, must properly be investigated further by the United Planning Organization and the Washington Welfare Association (Southeast Neighborhood House).

The object of community action is to stimulate group action toward the solution of common problems. The action derives from responsible and well-considered decisions made by the group itself—in this case, some youths of the Southeast community. However, if the adult community is to recognize a capacity for mature and responsible decision-making by youth, it also has the right to require similar maturity and responsibility by the youth for their actions. Nothing which occurred August 15 can justify a single youth's throwing a stone or other missile at police or station house. Nothing which occurred provided license for public obscenity or profanity directed at the police. If Washington's youth demand recognition for their rights and their participation in community decisions, they must be prepared to accept the resulting responsibilities.

The Responsibility of the Police

Nothing which occurred August 15 can justify three critical decisions of the police: the circumstances of the initial arrests, the use of dogs, and the final method of dispersing the crowd at the intersection of Morris Road and Mt. View Place. These misjudgments stemmed from two general conditions. First, action August 15 was influenced by the police feeling that they were sitting on a tinderbox. They themselves had characterized the community mood as "dynamite." There had been inflammatory incidents during previous days. On the alert, the police regarded each event as the possible beginning of a full-scale riot. As a result they over-reacted at each critical juncture. The Committee appreciates the difficulties inherent in evaluating on the spot a situation as fraught with the potential of violence as was the August 15 incident. However, the responsibility of the police department includes the ability both to gauge correctly a tense situation and to respond with methods which will control rather than inflame it. The Committee feels the 11th Precinct failed in this responsibility of August 15.

Second, police misjudgments were undoubtedly founded in part on the unfamiliarity of supervisory personnel at the 11th Precint with the neighborhood, its residents and leadership. Of the four top officers on August 15, two had been working in the precinct only one day while another had completed only one month's duty. Although they were experienced police officers, they were not able to assess fully either the mood of the crowd that night or the impact of their own actions, which were intended to assert police authority and control but which appeared to the youth as blatant disregard for their interests. Good police work cannot be summed up merely in the maintenance of police authority. The problems created by the precinct leadership's unfamiliarity with the neighborhood and people most directly involved in the disturbance were compounded by the fact that the one officer most familiar with the community, the Police-Community Relations Unit member, was handicapped by limited jurisdiction. When the officer on the scene with the greatest skill and full-time responsibility in human relations has no authority in a situation which is predominantly one of police-community relations, it reflects a serious weakness in the structure of the police department. The Committee's assessment of responsibility for police misjudgments on August 15 is further complicated by the fact that the acting Chief of Police for that tour of duty, Inspector Stargel, was at the 11th Precinct. What was his role in the events of the evening?

The first mistake—the manner and timing of the arrests of Foote, Walls, and Covington—set off the chain of events. This Committee does not, of course, question the right of the police to make the arrests; we do challenge the prudence of their method. Both Commissioner Tobriner and Chief of Police Layton have stated that there is a policy against the making of arrests in crowds when avoidable. To make an arrest in the midst of a public meeting when, it seems to the Committee, the same arrest easily could have—and should have—been made before or after the meeting in less public circumstances was a violation of police department policy and an unnecessary display of authority by the police.

The group regarded this act as deliberate provocation. This type of provocation reflects the overall absence of good police-community relations in the 11th Precinct. Its effect was compounded by the arresting officers' refusal to answer the group's questions about the arrest and by their arbitrary arrest of Covington. All these mistakes combined to inflame the group's hostilities toward the police. Had the arrests been made in less provocative circumstances, had the police dealt sensitively with the group's natural concerns and questions, had they not, as a token of authority arrested Covington, very likely there would have been no disturbance on August 15.

The second major mistake was the appearance and use of the German Shepherd dogs. Although the police have refused to testify before this Committee as to the circumstances surrounding the use of dogs, the appearance of the dogs constituted, by unanimous community testimony, the single most inflammatory event of the evening until the final dispersal. Up to that point crowd discipline had been largely maintained.

The Committee cannot determine whether or not the dogs and their private handlers appeared at the station house at the direct request of police officers. Dogs were in use from 9:45 to 10:15 (approximately); they reappeared from 11:00 to 12:00. Furthermore, no attempt ever was made by precinct officials to explain the presence of the dogs to the crowd. The use of the dogs was the turning point of the event. The first rock-throwing incidents and real deterioration of the crowd's behavior was a direct reaction to the use of the German Shepherd dogs.

Statements against the use of dogs for crowd control have been issued by the Chief of Police. As in the case of making unnecessary arrests in crowds, however, these policies have remained verbal. There are no written directives concerning either one. The Committee can only conclude that such policies have either not been effectively communicated to the members of the police force or that both were flagrantly violated on the night of August 15. We request the District Commissioners, to order the Chief of Police to make public immediately the results of the department's investigation of the use of these dogs. The department must require the strictest adherance to the regulation forbidding the use of dogs for crowd control and apply severe penalties to any police officers violating this policy.

The third and most serious mistake by the police—the action which created the "Eleventh Precinct Disturbance"—was the manner in which the police finally dispersed the crowd at Morris Road and Mt. View Place, S.E., one block from the station house. The Committee cannot find any action or alleged action by the crowd to that point to justify such an excessively forceful act by the police. Despite police allegations of veritable storms of rocks and other objects thrown at policemen and station house during the evening, there was no reported damage to the station house or to any adjoining property except a parked car struck by a police cruiser in the parking lot. There were no reported injuries to any policemen or other persons, including the private dog handlers and their animals. There was no reported damage to any passing automobiles. Although, at the time, a large and boisterous crowd was gathered at the intersection, traffic had been flowing freely. Allegedly the police acted out of fear for the security of occupants of a car which they thought had been stopped by the crowd. However, by the time of the final dispersal, the car had disappeared. There were no autos in the intersection to be protected.

Physical dispersal of the crowd was the more regrettable because action was already under way to achieve its voluntary dispersal. With the knowledge and approval of some police officers and Southeast House staff, another respected community leader, the executive director of the United Planning Organization, to talk to and presumably to calm the crowd. The police decision to disperse the crowd was so impetuous that they did not even allow this previously agreed upon course of action to be completed.

The final crowd dispersal was carried out in a manner far in excess of what the situation demanded. Two statements are invariably supported by community testimony: First, the police never issued an order or made any request to the crowd to disperse voluntarily or peaceably before their officers, helmeted and with nightsticks in hand, rushed upon the crowd from three prearranged directions.

Chapter II, Section 7 of the Manual of the Metropolitan Police Department states: "On the occurrence of a disturbance it is the duty of the police to restore order and disperse the crowd by moderate efforts or persuasion, if possible. If such efforts fail, force must be used and the principals arrested." Chief Layton, in his testimony to this Committee, cited a recent opinion from the Corporation Counsel and also general police policy to the effect that an attempt to disperse a crowd by peaceful means, by a warning to disperse, must be made whenever possible before any forceful action is taken. Since clearly it was possible for the police to request the crowd to disperse before moving upon them, their failure to issue such an order with the alternative of arrests being made constitutes an open breach of good police procedure.

Second, community witnesses have been unanimous in the view that the police used undue force in scattering the crowd. The fact and degree of alleged police brutality must be determined by the various pending civil and criminal cases.

However, ten arrests and fourteen injuries serious enough to require hospital treatment, one to a policeman and thirteen to civilians, resulted from those actions by the police—actions which this Committee cannot justify and must condemn.

Recommendations

Our consideration of the August 15 disturbance has convinced the Committee that there are many proposals worthy of recommendation. Some of these are directly related to actions taken or omitted in the course of that evening while others relate to policies and programs which affect the lives, relationships, and predispositions of those involved in the disturbance. The third type of recommendation reflects what citizens of the area expressed as necessary or desirable for their community.

Community Action Programs

1. The Committee strongly recommends that the Southeast Neighborhood House and other community action programs throughout the city establish firm working guidelines for staff members organizing or supporting common types of "direct action" activities such as picketing and other forms of public demonstration. Such guidelines should stress that direct action be a disciplined method of protest aimed at specific objectives. Wherever possible the objectives should be clearly defined and clearly understood by participants.

2. The Committee recommends that neighborhood workers and community organizers involved in direct action activities conduct themselves in such a way as not to convey their personal feelings toward the police or other established authorities to those with whom they work. They also must be clear in conveying to such authorities the nature of their role within the group. The Committee appreciates the neighborhood workers' difficulties in trying to guide and encourage indigenous leadership without usurping control. However, when community organizers and neighborhood workers assume the role of advocates, they enter the ranks of the natural leadership of the community. They must then be willing to assume the responsibilities of leadership, especially under conditions of stress and community tension. Under such conditions, in order to prevent any misunderstanding of their role, the workers must acknowledge that limited degree of control which they in fact exercise.

3. Clearer and more effective lines of command (with special procedures for emergency situations) should be established for workers in the field and their supervisors by Southeast Neighborhood House (Washington Welfare Association).

Metropolitan Police Department

1. The Police Department must reemphasize the proper procedures, as outlined in the Manual of the Metropolitan Police Department and in an opinion issued by the Acting Corporation Counsel on June 11, 1966, for crowd control and proper dispersal. In particular, the Police Department must stress the necessity for police officials to seek voluntary dispersal of a crowd by means of public requests. To facilitate police efficiency in this matter, every precinct should be equipped with at least one bull horn, sound truck, or other means of quickly and effectively addressing a crowd or noisy group. Severe disciplinary action must be brought by the Police Department against any police officer who attempts to disperse a crowd forcibly without having sought first voluntary dispersal through publicly announced requests or orders.

2. The Police Department should institute disciplinary action against those officers of the 11th Precinct responsible for either requesting and/or permitting the use of German Shepherd dogs on the night of August 15.

3. The Committee recommends that efforts be made by the Police Department to stress intensive recruitment programs, especially in high schools and colleges, so that a greater proportion of police officers eventually will not only be District residents but also will be from the community in which they serve.

4. More effective guidelines should be established to define the role and requirements for convening of Precinct Advisory Councils in order that they might provide a more effective link between the police and the community.

5. The Committee strongly endorses the suggestion by Captain Owen Davis, the new commander of the 11th Precinct, for the establishment of a community-wide police and community workshop to explore in a cooperative, constructive way the means for improving relationships between law enforcement officers and the public. Similarly, on a smaller scale, police-community relations committees might be established in tenant councils and in other community organizations, particularly youth organizations.

6. All police officers, particularly supervisory personnel, regardless of their total experience, should be required to undergo intensive community orientation upon being assigned to a new precinct. Such an orientation program should not only include contact with traditional civic and citizens groups but also should emphasize contact with alienated and unaffiliated persons and groups in the local community.

7. Police officers should be more systematically informed about the goals and methods of community action programs and direct action methods in particular, so that their dealings with neighborhood workers or active members of the community will not be marred by distrust and lack of understanding.

8. In areas where existing groups and institutions—such as direct action groups or the Roving Leaders of the Recreation Department—provide a link and possible avenue of fruitful communication between the police and the community, every effort should be made by the police to use them.

9. The Committee strongly recommends that the Police-Community Relations Unit be considerably expanded and strengthened so that a Police-Community Relations officer (Lieutenant or Sergeant) can be assigned to each precinct, including the Canine Corps, in order to develop continuing in-service training programs. We also recommend that the Police-Community Relations Unit be moved into police headquarters and be totally integrated into the structure of the Police Department to ensure that the judgments of its officers will be accorded more authority in order that their unique training and experience may be of the fullest benefit to both the Police Department and the community at large. We also endorse the strong recommendations concerning the Police-Community Relations Unit advocated in the Commissioners' Council on Human Relations Report of May 1966.

10. Police officers, particularly supervisory personnel, should be instructed to discuss general questions of police authority and law, particularly if such discussion seems appropriate as a means of preventing disorder or furthering police-community understanding.

11. Unless required by the possibility of flight or other exigency, police officers should not make arrests at such a time and place and in such a manner that adverse community reaction is invited or heightened.

12. If a crowd, perhaps on the brink of serious disorder, is still making efforts to communicate with the police, the police have the obligation to make every effort to continue even the most tenuous dialogue rather than allow all channels of communications to be closed.

13. The Committee recommends reexamination of the rules governing the response of a canine cruiser to police calls to ensure that, as far as possible, dogs do not even appear at incidents at which their use would be incompatible with department rules and policies.

14. Effective supervision of police behavior demands that channels of communication be open to all citizens and means for airing grievances be uninhibited. The procedures for private citizens to make complaints of alleged police misconduct should

be made more accessible to the community. To increase public confidence in the Complaint Review Board, the Committee recommends that the Board's membership be made more representative of all segments of the community. We also recommend that the Complaint Review Board have the power to exact penalties in cases which, though serious, are not sufficiently flagrant to warrant extreme disciplinary measures such as Trial Board action.

15. The Committee reminds police officers that their community's reaction to them is affected not only by actions on the job but by off-duty acts as well, particularly when in uniform. The police must realize that by patronizing businesses located in areas of heavy Negro population but which discourage Negro patronage, they risk appearing anti-Negro in the eyes of the community which they serve.

16. Although the District of Columbia is 63% Negro, the Metropolitan Police Department has only 528 Negro members out of a total membership of 2,828 or only 18.6% Negro membership. Out of 163 Scout Car and Patrol Wagon Crews, 28 are integrated and 19 consist of only Negro members. The Accident Investigation Unit with 78 members has only 6 Negroes. The integration policy of the Police Department remains vague and unclear in interpretation by police officials at the precinct level. This Committee strongly recommends that the Chief of Police renew his commitment to a policy of integration by clearly defining Department policy for integration of scout cars and patrol teams.

17. A manual of current police procedures incorporating all the most recent policies and directives must be made available to every policeman in every precinct. The Committee recommends that the Police Department rely less on verbal policies and more on written directives which it must ensure are promulgated to every member of the Department.

18. The recent Report by the President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia on the Metropolitan Police Department makes many recommendations, all of which the Committee wholeheartedly endorses. In particular, however, we urge that those recommendations be carried out at once which deal with police-community relations (Nos. 31–41), deployment of the Canine Corps (No. 26), reducing racial imbalance (No. 28), recruiting from the area (No. 9), and broader recruit training (No. 11).

District Government

1. The need for more effective and accessible means of communication between the community and its government is underscored by the apparent fact that this Committee's public hearings provided one of the few forums at which people in Southeast could air their particular grievances. To improve the means of communication and the likelihood of responsive action, we endorse Commissioner Tobriner's proposal for a grass roots citizens advisory council. Such a grass roots body would be an effective means of providing two-way communication, both to inform the Commissioners of the problems and wishes of the people and to provide the people with an understanding of the problems faced by the Commissioners. We suggest that Commissioner Tobriner convene anti-poverty workers, grass roots leaders of the political parties, and other neighborhood representatives to determine the procedure by which a permanent committee can be formed.

2. The Committee firmly believes that an important role was played by many citizens and organizations of the Washington community as well as representatives of the Commissioner's Council on Human Relations, particularly its Executive Director, in successfully preventing the community hostilities and frustrations created by the disturbance itself from erupting into further trouble during the days immediately following August 15. We recommend that the office of the Commissioners' Council on Human Relations be kept open for longer hours, that its staff be enlarged, and that it include representatives throughout the city, not just at the District Building. We also recommend that the Council's May 1966 proposals with respect to the Police Department be acted upon as soon as possible.

3. The Committee recommends that every effort be made to assure fair representation from all sections of the District on all governing and advisory bodies of the District Government. In this context, the Committee deplores the fact that of 100 members of the various District advisory boards and councils, only *one* is from Southeast, although Southeast contains 11.7% of the District's population.

4. Frequently mentioned as a factor tending to undermine favorable police-community relationships was the extent to which arrests are made for "failure to move on" or for "disorderly conduct". This Committee feels that the statutes involved are either so broadly worded or applied in such a way as to be unduly vague. We request the Commissioners to clarify these statutes in order to delineate more precisely the unduly broad discretion which they presently confer upon the police.

5. The Committee recommends that, in light of the frequency of arrests for "minimal offenses" such as failure to move on or disorderly conduct, the bond system be adjusted so that persons arrested may be more readily released on personal recognizance or in the custody of some reliable person in the neighborhood. A stay in jail is an undue penalty for failing to have $10 and can only intensify feelings against the police.

6. At the time of the August 15 disturbance, no written directives existed concerning the use of dogs for crowd control or the making of unnecessary arrests in crowds. Both of these matters are too important and sensitive to be left to general understandings or oral communications. The Committee therefore requests the Commissioners to require that clear regulations concerning both matters be issued in writing as soon as possible and that they be thoroughly promulgated throughout the ranks of the Police Department.

Southeast Washington

1. Although the schools in Southeast are overcrowded to the extent of having created an educational crisis, many new housing units, adding hundreds of children to the schools annually, continue to be constructed. In addition, the Defense Department is constructing military housing at Bolling Air Force Base which will add about 2,500 pupils to Southeast schools. Yet a laudable proposal to convert part of the new abandoned Anacostia-Bolling base into a comprehensive development with schools and recreational facilities as well as housing for all income levels has been jeopardized by the Military Construction Authorization Act which "freezes" land use on the bases until 1970. The Committee recommends that the President of the United States act on his promise to "request and work for a change in this law"..

2. The Committee recommends broader, more comprehensive planning for Southeast so that its many needs in the areas of housing, recreation facilities, transportation and schools may be realistically anticipated and met. Planning and construction of new schools must begin immediately. Transportation is a major problem in Southeast, yet neither freeway nor subways are envisioned to provide any sort of comprehensive coverage for the needs of the area. We recommend that the National Capital Planning Commission consult with the citizens of Southeast to consider their needs more carefully and to work out appropriate transportation for the area.

3. A youth development program should be established in the Congress-Heights Washington Highlands area, one of two neighborhood development centers in the city without such a program. The absence of a youth development program has been one of the most commonly mentioned sources of stress by community members.

4. The Committee recommends that various social agencies and antipoverty programs develop more realistic programs for job training and procurement of jobs for the residents of Southeast.

5. Recreational facilities in Southeast are inadequate to meet the needs of a growing population, many of whom are unable to afford private means of recreation. More facilities of all sorts are urgently needed, particularly facilities which challenge older youth. In this respect we second the recommendations of the Citizens Committee on the Glen Echo Disturbance, with the feeling that had some of its recommendations of May 4, 1966 been implemented, a disturbance on August 15 would have been a little less likely.

Finally, because of the various handicaps imposed on the Committee's fact-finding ability by legal procedures, its lack of subpoena power, and the lack of full cooperation from all parties concerned, we have posed certain questions to the Commissioners to be investigated further. If they are unable to obtain satisfactory results from their investigation, they may want to refer the matter to the U.S. Attorney's office for possible consideration by a grand jury.

All the above recommendations have been made by the Committee with the hope that they may be instrumental in combating some of the more pervasive problems confronting citizens of Southeast and of many other areas of the District of Columbia. These problems, whether or not they were immediate causes of the disturbance of August 15, have inevitably provided the climate in which such events take place and were frequently cited by members of the Southeast community in considering how other such disturbances might be avoided. Such problems are relevant not only as they provide a relatively drastic response to a particular stimulus, but also as they represent what the community itself regards as intolerable aspects of its present condition. The mere fact that community feelings on such a broad range of problems were expressed at this forum is itself persuasive evidence of the absence of adequate representation of the community's interests and of the need for broader, more responsive avenues of communication.

It is not too much to say that if careful attention is not directed to the Southeast area and to redressing the grievances of all areas in the District which have similar complaints, Washington may find itself irretrievably split by the violent protests of those whom it has too long ignored.

This Committee recognizes that deep-seated conditions and the lack of long-overdue services and opportunities have created many modern urban problems. We firmly believe that the pace toward solution of these problems must be greatly accelerated and that the community must bear full responsibility for acceleration of this solution.

We know at the same time, however, that many of these conditions will not be easily or quickly corrected. This is a fact of life. However, life cannot stand still nor society sink into decay while we await elimination of our problems.

Concurrent, therefore, with community effort to change longstanding conditions and to right grievous wrongs, the community also must assume the lead in building understanding and relations to make life safer and more bearable and people more humane, to focus frustrations properly and to enhance the functioning of law, order and justice.

Because the ills of society have been heaped upon the neighborhoods, the people upon whom these ills have fallen instinctively fight back at the figure of nearest authority, particularly if it is represented by a uniform, a badge and a club. Because this uniform, badge and club have sometimes been misused, there is a natural tendency to resist all uniforms, badges and clubs.

It is dangerous for these symbols of authority to be misused and we deplore it. It is equally dangerous to fight back automatically at all authoritarian figures because of some abuses of authority, and we deplore this also.

Because the policeman does represent much of the authority of our society, he must bear the responsibility of such representation. And because society needs law enforcement officers, we all must share the responsibility of their work, supporting it in all of its positive aspects.

If there is a single theme which runs clearly through this report, it is that police-community relations must work.

We hope that all concerned will heed the warning of this summer's events, a warning which must not be limited to summers, however. The problems from which disturbances like that of August 15 grow are not confined to summertime. If responsible action is not taken and taken immediately, the problems of Washington's "long, hot summer" will plague the city the whole year through.

APPOINTMENT OF NEW TRUSTEES IN DEEDS OF TRUST—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 647) to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to permit the appointment of new trustees in deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by agreement of the parties. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARTKE in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of Oct. 21, 1967, p. 28550, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adopt the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION OF WORK RELEASE PROGRAM FOR PERSONS SENTENCED BY THE COURTS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1319) to authorize a work release program for persons sentenced by the courts of the District of Columbia; to define the powers and duties in relation thereto, and for other purposes which were on page 2, line 18, strike out all after "courts" down through and including "be," in line 19; on page 2, line 22, strike out "petition" and insert "request"; on page 2, line 23, strike out all after "release." down through and including "reinstituted." in line 23; on page 3, line 1, strike out all after "be" down through and including "be" in line 2; on page 4, line 23, after "disbursements" insert "from the trust fund account established under this section"; on page 4, line 24, after "purposes:" insert "(a) the payment of an amount not to exceed the lesser of 20 per centum of the prisoner's earnings, or $4 per day, as the cost of his room and board;"; on page 4, line 24, strike out "(a)" and insert "(b)"; on page 5, in lines 1 through 4, inclusive, strike out "(b)," "(c)," "(d)," and "(e)," and insert "(c)," "(d)," "(e)," and "(f)" respectively; on page 6, strike out lines 3 through 13, inclusive; on page 6, line 14, strike out "11.' and insert "10."; on page 6, after line 24, insert:

SEC. 11. Section 9 of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–309) is amended (1) by striking out the period at the end of clause (e) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, and (2) by adding after clause (e) the following new clause:

"(f) that he is not a prisoner in a District of Columbia correctional or penal institution who was employed in the free community under authority of the District of Columbia Work Release Act, or that he has not made a claim for benefits with respect to a week during which he was a prisoner in a District of Columbia correctional or penal institution."

SEC. 12. Except when employed and paid by the District of Columbia for the performance of work for the District of Columbia government, no prisoner employed in the free community under the provisions of this Act shall, while working in such employment in the free community or going to or from such employment, be deemed to be an agent, employee, or servant of the District of Columbia government.

And, on page 7, line 1, strike out "12." and insert "13."

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the amendments of the House are acceptable. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia be authorized to have printed in the RECORD, after the adjournment of Congress, a complete report of the committee's activities for the 2d session of the 89th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 195. An act for the relief of Sunnyside Seed Farms; and

S. 1061. An act for the relief of Samuel C. Neiburg.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3254) to amend sections 2072 and 2112 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the scope of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and to repeal inconsistent legislation, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3708) to assist comprehensive city demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and services necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in those areas, to assist and encourage planned metropolitan development, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11555) to provide a border highway along the U.S. bank of the Rio Grande in connection with the settlement of the Chamizal boundary dispute between the United States and Mexico.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15111) to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 18119) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 to the bill and concurred therein.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 18233) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 18119) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of Oct. 20, 1966, pp. 28179–28180, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have only a few remarks to make with respect to the bill as agreed to by the conferees.

The total appropriation allowed is $2,347,826,600.

This sum is $16,182,000 below the House allowance and $286,578,400 under the total budget estimates.

It is $3,115,000 below the sum recommended by the Senate.

All the conferees agreed to the report. In my judgment, it is a good bill and gives to the departments and agencies sufficient funds to carry out their various programs and operations in fiscal 1967.

In addition to the total direct appropriations recommended, there is authorized the sum of $3,968,400,000 from the trust fund account to carry out the Federal-aid highway program.

For the benefit of the Members, I shall mention some of the important items that had been approved in the Senate bill but were either denied or reduced in conference.

For the State Department, the conferees disapproved the $1.5 million increase recommended by the Senate to use additional excess foreign currencies in the educational and cultural exchange program. As respects the Commerce Department, the Senate allowance was reduced in four categories—namely: $300,000 for salaries and expenses of the U.S. Travel Service; $430,000 for salaries and expenses, Environmental Science Services Administration—ESSA; $250,000 for research and development by ESSA; $500,000 for grants and expenses, State Technical Services.

For the Judiciary, the conferees allowed $50,000 of the $155,000 Senate increase to provide an additional law clerk for each of the 11 circuit courts of appeal.

Again I may say that this is a unanimous report of the conferees, and therefore I urge its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a summary table on the bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparative statement of appropriation for 1966 and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1967

PERMANENT AND INDEFINITE APPROPRIATIONS

Item	Appropriation estimate, 1966	Appropriation estimate, 1967	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
DEPARTMENT OF STATE			
Educational exchange fund	$353,000	$353,000	----------
Payment to the Republic of Panama	1,930,000	1,930,000	----------
Replacement of passenger motor vehicles sold abroad	325,000	325,000	----------
Total, Department of State	2,608,000	2,608,000	----------

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

Item	Appropriations, 1960	Budget estimates, 1967	House bill, 1967	Senate bill, 1967	Conference action	Conference bill compared with—		
						Budget estimate, 1967	House bill	Senate bill
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE								
Federal Prison Industries, Inc	$2,270,000	$2,613,000	$2,512,000	$2,512,000	$2,512,000	−$101,000	----------	----------

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS								
Salaries and expenses	$179,660,000	$188,964,000	$186,500,000	$186,500,000	$186,500,000	−$2,464,000	----------	----------
Representation allowances	993,000	993,000	993,000	993,000	993,000	----------	----------	----------
Acquisition, operation, and maintenance of buildings abroad	19,125,000	16,125,000	15,500,000	15,500,000	15,500,000	−625,000	----------	----------
Acquisition, operation, and maintenance of buildings abroad (special foreign currency program)	6,500,000	6,250,000	6,250,000	6,250,000	6,250,000	----------	----------	----------
Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular services	2,050,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	----------	----------	----------
Payment to Foreign Service retirement and disability fund	45,000	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Total, administration of foreign affairs	208,373,000	213,932,000	210,843,000	210,843,000	210,832,000	−3,089,000	----------	----------
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES								
Contributions to international organizations	95,578,000	100,826,000	100,826,000	100,826,000	100,826,000	----------	----------	----------
Missions to international organizations	3,434,000	3,784,000	3,700,000	3,700,000	3,700,000	−84,000	----------	----------
International conferences and contingencies	1,943,000	2,045,000	1,943,000	1,943,000	1,943,000	−102,000	----------	----------
International tariff negotiations	850,000	850,000	850,000	850,000	850,000	----------	----------	----------
Total, international organizations and conferences	101,805,000	107,505,000	107,319,000	107,319,000	107,319,000	−186,000	----------	----------
INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS								
International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:								
Salaries and expenses	832,000	831,000	831,000	831,000	831,000	----------	----------	----------
Operation and maintenance	2,025,000	1,985,000	1,985,000	1,985,000	1,985,000	----------	----------	----------
Construction	10,883,000	[1] 5,754,000	5,454,000	5,754,000	5,754,000	----------	+$300,000	----------
Chamizal settlement	6,640,000	4,440,000	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000	−240,000	----------	----------
American sections, international commissions	475,000	683,000	650,000	650,000	650,000	−33,000	----------	----------
International fisheries commissions	2,125,000	2,150,000	2,125,000	2,125,000	2,125,000	−25,000	----------	----------
Facilities for International Pacific Halibut Commission	500,000	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Total, international commissions	23,480,000	15,843,000	15,245,000	15,545,000	15,545,000	−298,000	+300,000	----------

See footnotes at end of table.

Comparative statement of appropriation for 1966 and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1967—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1966	Budget estimates, 1967	House bill, 1967	Senate bill, 1967	Conference action	Conference bill compared with—		
						Budget estimate, 1967	House bill	Senate bill
EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE								
Mutual educational and cultural exchange activities	$53,000,000	$50,000,000	$47,000,000	$48,500,000	$47,000,000	−$3,000,000		−$1,500,000
Center for cultural and technical interchange between East and West	5,800,000	6,050,000	6,050,000	6,050,000	6,050,000			
Total, educational exchange	58,800,000	56,050,000	53,050,000	54,550,000	53,050,000	−3,000,000		−1,500,000
OTHER								
Presentation of a statue to Mexico	100,000							
Total, title I, Department of State	392,558,000	393,330,000	386,457,000	388,257,000	386,757,000	−6,573,000	+$300,000	−1,500,000
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE								
LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION								
Salaries and expenses, general administration	$5,339,000	$5,767,000	$5,600,000	$5,600,000	$5,600,000	−$167,000		
Salaries and expenses, general legal activities	21,150,000	21,887,000	21,850,000	21,850,000	21,850,000	−37,000		
Alien property activities, limitation on general administrative activities	*(376,000)*	*(80,000)*	*(80,000)*	*(80,000)*	*(80,000)*			
Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division	7,175,000	7,409,000	7,400,000	7,409,000	7,409,000			
Salaries and expenses, U.S. attorneys and marshals	32,797,000	36,666,000	35,000,000	35,000,000	35,000,000	−1,666,000		
Fees and expenses of witnesses	3,000,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000			
Law enforcement assistance	7,249,000	12,693,000				−13,693,000		
Total, legal activities and general administration	76,710,000	88,222,000	72,695,000	72,659,000	72,659,000	−15,563,000		
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION								
Salaries and expenses	169,100,000	175,465,000	175,465,000	175,465,000	175,465,000			
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE								
Salaries and expenses	74,957,000	75,541,000	75,500,000	75,500,000	75,500,000	−41,000		
FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM								
Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons	57,595,000	59,475,000	58,595,000	58,595,000	58,595,000	−880,000		
Buildings and facilities	4,256,000	3,500,000	(2)	(2)	(2)	−3,500,000		
Support of U.S. prisoners	4,975,000	4,700,000	4,700,000	4,700,000	4,700,000			
Total, Federal prison system	66,826,000	67,675,000	63,295,000	63,295,000	63,295,000	−4,380,000		
Total, title II, Department of Justice	387,593,000	406,903,000	386,919,000	386,919,000	386,919,000	−19,984,000		
TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE								
GENERAL ADMINISTRATION								
Salaries and expenses	$4,339,000	$5,050,000	$4,500,000	$4,500,000	$4,500,000	−$550,000		
1967 Alaska centennial	4,600,000							
Total, general administration	8,939,000	5,050,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	−550,000		
APPALACHIAN ASSISTANCE								
Grants for local development districts and for research and demonstration		3,000,000	2,750,000	2,750,000	2,750,000	−250,000		
Supplemental grants-in-aid		35,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	−5,000,000		
Total, Appalachian assistance		38,000,000	32,750,000	32,750,000	32,750,000	−5,250,000		
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION								
Development facilities grants	203,200,000	175,140,000	170,000,000	170,000,000	170,000,000	−5,140,000		
Technical and community assistance	18,125,000	27,245,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	−2,245,000		
Economic development center assistance		40,000,000	20,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	−30,000,000	−$10,000,000	
Economic development	105,000,000	85,000,000	85,000,000	85,000,000	85,000,000			
Total, Economic Development Administration	326,325,000	327,385,000	300,000,000	290,000,000	290,000,000	−37,385,000	−10,000,000	
REGIONAL PLANNING ASSISTANCE								
Regional economic planning	6,100,000	7,550,000	6,100,000	6,100,000	6,100,000	−1,450,000		
OFFICE OF BUSINESS ECONOMICS								
Salaries and expenses	2,550,000	2,965,000	2,750,000	2,750,000	2,750,000	−215,000		
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS								
Salaries and expenses	15,720,000	16,165,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	−165,000		
1964 Census of Agriculture	5,110,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000			
Preparation for Nineteenth Decennial Census	2,200,000	2,950,000	2,750,000	2,750,000	2,750,000	−200,000		
1967 economic censuses	1,150,000	3,230,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	−230,000		
1967 Census of Governments	200,000	1,390,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	−90,000		
Registration and voting statistics	1,192,000							
Modernization of computing equipment		2,000,000	1,900,000	1,900,000	1,900,000	−100,000		
Total, Bureau of the Census	25,572,000	27,535,000	26,750,000	26,750,000	26,750,000	−785,000		

See footnotes at end of table.

Comparative statement of appropriation for 1966 and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1967—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1960	Budget estimates, 1967	House bill, 1967	Senate bill, 1967	Conference action	Conference bill compared with—		
						Budget estimate, 1967	House bill	Senate bill
BUSINESS AND DEFENSE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION								
Salaries and expenses	$5,325,000	$5,520,000	$5,500,000	$5,500,000	$5,500,000	−$20,000		
INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES								
Salaries and expenses	10,910,000	12,625,000	11,250,000	11,250,000	11,250,000	−1,375,000		
Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program)	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000			
Export control	4,775,000	[3] 5,350,000	4,950,000	5,050,000	5,050,000	−300,000	+$100,000	
HemisFair 1968 exposition	125,000							
Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center	160,000							
Total, international activities	16,170,000	18,175,000	16,400,000	16,500,000	16,500,000	−1,675,000	+100,000	
OFFICE OF FIELD SERVICES								
Salaries and expenses	4,290,000	4,525,000	4,450,000	4,450,000	4,450,000	−75,000		
COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE								
Salaries and expenses	1,300,000	2,000,000	1,750,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	−500,000	−250,000	
U.S. TRAVEL SERVICE								
Salaries and expenses	3,000,000	4,700,000	3,000,000	3,300,000	3,000,000	−1,700,000		−$300,000
ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION								
Salaries and expenses	97,563,250	101,635,000	99,400,000	99,830,000	99,400,000	−2,235,000		−430,000
Research and development	19,366,000	22,450,000	20,000,000	20,500,000	20,250,000	−2,200,000	+250,000	−250,000
Research and development (special foreign currency program)	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000			
Facilities, equipment, and construction	4,153,000	7,025,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	−1,025,000		
Satellite operations	25,048,000	33,585,000	27,000,000	27,000,000	27,000,000	−6,585,000		
Total, Environmental Science Services Administration	146,630,250	165,195,000	152,900,000	153,830,000	153,150,000	−12,045,000	+250,000	−680,000
PATENT OFFICE								
Salaries and expenses	34,400,000	35,935,000	35,500,000	35,500,000	35,500,000	−435,000		
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS								
Research and technical services	28,700,000	31,935,000	30,500,000	30,500,000	30,500,000	−1,435,000		
Research and technical services (special foreign currency program)	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000			
Plant and facilities	880,000	560,000	550,000	550,000	550,000	−10,000		
Construction of facilities		1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000			
Total, National Bureau of Standards	30,080,000	34,195,000	32,750,000	32,750,000	32,750,000	−1,445,000		
OFFICE OF STATE TECHNICAL SERVICES								
Grants and expenses	3,500,000	8,000,000	5,000,000	6,000,000	5,500,000	−2,500,000	+500,000	−500,000
MARITIME ADMINISTRATION								
Ship construction	132,150,000	85,000,000	106,685,000	106,685,000	106,685,000	+21,685,000		
Operating differential subsidies (liquidation of contract authorization)	180,000,000	175,000,000	175,000,000	175,000,000	175,000,000			
Research and development	6,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000			
Salaries and expenses	15,833,000	15,790,000	15,790,000	15,790,000	15,790,000			
Maritime training	3,988,000	4,470,000	4,470,000	4,470,000	4,470,000			
State marine schools	1,600,000	1,635,000	1,635,000	1,635,000	1,635,000			
Total, Maritime Administration	340,071,000	289,395,000	311,080,000	311,080,000	311,080,000	+21,685,000		
BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS								
Limitation on general administrative expenses	(51,950,000)	(57,600,000)	(56,000,000)	(56,000,000)	(56,000,000)	(−1,600,000)		
Federal-aid highways (trust fund)	(3,898,400,000)	(3,970,000,000)	(3,968,400,000)	(3,968,400,000)	(3,968,400,000)	(−1,600,000)		
Forest highways (liquidation of contract authorization)	32,000,000	33,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	−1,000,000		
Public lands highways (liquidation of contract authorization)	8,000,000	9,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	−1,000,000		
Highway beautification	70,750,000	91,750,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	−11,750,000		
Highway safety	290,000	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000			
Appalachian development highway system		130,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	−30,000,000		
Repayable advances to the highway trust fund	200,000,000	200,000,000	100,000,000	65,000,000	65,000,000	−135,000,000	−35,000,000	
Inter-American Highway	8,000,000							
Total, Bureau of Public Roads	319,040,000	463,960,000	320,210,000	285,210,000	285,210,000	−178,750,000	−35,000,000	
TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT								
Transportation research	3,000,000	3,200,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	−200,000		
High-speed ground transportation research and development	18,250,000	24,000,000	22,000,000	22,000,000	22,000,000	−2,000,000		
Total, transportation research	21,250,000	27,200,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	−2,200,000		
NATIONAL HIGHWAY SAFETY AGENCY								
Highway and traffic safety: Traffic and highway safety program		[4] 14,000,000		10,000,000	10,000,000	−4,000,000	+10,000,000	
State and community highway safety programs (liquidation of contract authorization)		[4] 12,000,000		10,000,000	10,000,000	−2,000,000	+10,000,000	
Limitation on administrative expenses		[4] (2,650,000)		(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(−650,000)	(+2,000,000)	
Total, National Highway Safety Agency		26,000,000		20,000,000	20,000,000	−6,000,000	+20,000,000	
Total, title III, Department of Commerce	1,294,542,250	1,493,285,000	1,286,390,000	1,263,470,000	1,261,990,000	−231,295,000	−24,400,000	−1.480,000

See footnotes at end of table.

Comparative statement of appropriation for 1966 and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1967—**Continued**

TITLE IV—THE JUDICIARY

Item	Appropriations, 1966	Budget estimates, 1967	House bill, 1967	Senate bill, 1967	Conference action	Conference bill compared with— Budget estimate, 1967	Conference bill compared with— House bill	Conference bill compared with— Senate bill
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES								
Salaries	$1,966,000	$2,003,000	$2,000,000	$2,000,000	$2,000,000	−$3,000		
Printing and binding Supreme Court reports	138,000	138,000	138,000	138,000	138,000			
Miscellaneous expenses	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000			
Care of the buildings and grounds	319,000	318,700	318,700	318,700	318,700			
Automobile for the Chief Justice	8,500	8,900	8,900	8,900	8,900			
Books for the Supreme Court	38,000	38,000	38,000	38,000	38,000			
Total, Supreme Court	2,589,500	2,626,600	2,623,600	2,623,600	2,623,600	−3,000		
COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS								
Salaries and expenses	455,000	475,200	465,000	465,000	465,000	−10,200		
CUSTOMS COURT								
Salaries and expenses	1,178,400	[3] 1,288,200	1,215,000	1,265,000	1,265,000	−23,200	+$50,000	
COURT OF CLAIMS								
Salaries and expenses	1,313,300	1,470,400	1,425,000	1,425,000	1,425,000	−45,400		
COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES								
Salaries of judges	14,700,000	16,205,000	15,857,000	15,857,000	15,857,000	−348,000		
Salaries of supporting personnel	35,110,000	39,208,000	37,300,000	37,455,000	37,350,000	−1,858,000	+50,000	−$105,000
Fees and expenses of court-appointed counsel	3,000,000	7,040,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	−4,040,000		
Fees of jurors and commissioners	7,165,000	8,000,000	7,700,000	7,700,000	7,700,000	−300,000		
Travel and miscellaneous expenses	4,910,000	6,435,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	−435,000		
Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts	1,831,000	2,493,600	1,910,000	1,910,000	1,910,000	−583,600		
Referees, special account:								
Salaries of referees	(4,314,000)	(4,314,000)	(4,314,000)	(4,314,000)	(4,314,000)			
Expenses of referees	(6,550,000)	(6,949,000)	(6,760,000)	(6,760,000)	(6,760,000)	(−189,000)		
Total, courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services	66,716,000	79,381,600	71,767,000	71,922,000	71,817,000	−7,564,600	+50,000	−105,000
Total, title IV, the judiciary, excluding special accounts	72,252,200	85,242,000	77,495,600	77,700,600	77,595,600	−7,646,400	+100,000	−105,000
Total, title IV, the judiciary, including special accounts	83,116,200	96,505,000	88,569,600	88,774,600	88,669,600	−7,835,400	+100,000	−105,000

TITLE V—RELATED AGENCIES

Item	Appropriations, 1966	Budget estimates, 1967	House bill, 1967	Senate bill, 1967	Conference action	Conference bill compared with— Budget estimate, 1967	Conference bill compared with— House bill	Conference bill compared with— Senate bill
AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses	$2,148,000	$2,092,000	$2,092,000	$2,092,000	$2,092,000			
COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS								
Salaries and expenses	1,925,000	2,703,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	−$203,000		
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE								
Office of Education: Civil rights educational activities	8,000,000	11,115,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	−3,115,000		
EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses	3,250,000	5,870,000	5,200,000	5,200,000	5,200,000	−670,000		
FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses	3,218,000	3,475,000	3,375,000	3,375,000	3,375,000	−100,000		
FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses	1,915,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000			
PRESIDENT'S COMMISSIONS ON LAW ENFORCEMENT AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE AND ON CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA								
Salaries and expenses	900,000	600,000	550,000	550,000	550,000	−50,000		
SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION								
Salaries and expenses:								
Appropriation	7,215,000	8,400,000	8,100,000	8,100,000	8,100,000	−300,000		
Transfer	(35,790,000)	(46,550,000)	(45,750,000)	(45,750,000)	(45,750,000)	−800,000		
Revolving fund	310,000,000							
Total, Small Business Administration	+317,215,000	8,400,000	8,100,000	8,100,000	8,100,000	−300,000		
Southeast hurricane disaster	35,000,000	[4] 9,000,000		9,000,000	9,000,000		+$9,000,000	
SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS								
Salaries and expenses	564,000	566,000	566,000	566,000	566,000			
SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD								
Salaries and expenses	400,000	280,000	280,000	280,000	280,000			

See footnotes at end of table.

Comparative statement of appropriation for 1966 and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1967—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1960	Budget estimates, 1967	House bill, 1967	Senate bill, 1967	Conference action	Conference bill compared with—		
						Budget estimate, 1967	House bill	Senate bill
TARIFF COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses	$3,446,000	$3,565,000	$3,500,000	$3,530,000	$3,500,000	−$65,000		−$30,000
U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY								
Arms control and disarmament activities	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	−1,000,000	−$1,000,000	
U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY								
Salaries and expenses	144,005,000	150,693,000	149,000,000	148,818,000	148,818,000	−1,875,000	−182,000	
Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program)	11,112,000	10,941,000	10,941,000	10,941,000	10,941,000			
Special international exhibitions	3,750,000	2,222,000	2,709,000	2,709,000	2,709,000	+487,000		
Special international exhibitions (special foreign currency program)	154,000	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000			
Acquisition and construction of radio facilities	26,205,000	20,510,000	6,510,000	6,510,000	6,510,000	−14,000,000		
Total, U.S. Information Agency	185,226,000	184,716,000	169,510,000	169,328,000	169,328,000	−15,388,000	−182,000	
Total, title V, related agencies	573,287,000	244,382,000	215,673,000	223,521,000	223,491,000	−20,891,000	+7,818,000	−30,000
Grand total	2,731,096,450	2,634,405,000	2,364,008,600	2,350,941,600	2,347,826,600	−286,578,400	−16,182,000	−3,115,000
Consisting of—								
Special accounts	10,864,000	11,263,000	11,074,000	11,074,000	11,074,000	−189,000		
Direct appropriations	2,720,232,450	2,623,142,000	2,352,934,600	2,339,867,600	2,336,752,600	−286,389,400	−16,182,000	−3,115,000

[1] Includes increase of $300,000 in S. Doc. 112.
[2] To be derived from prior year funds.
[3] Includes increase of $400,000 in S. Doc. 112.
[4] Requested in S. Doc. 112.
[5] Includes increase of $66,500 in S. Doc. 112.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I simply want to express my appreciation for the leadership of the Senator from Arkansas, in the hearings, on the floor of the Senate, and in conference. He has done an honorable job. It has been a pleasure to work with him.

Mr. President, I now move that the action of the Senate in passing on this matter be reconsidered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida for his kind remarks. He serves well on the committee. He is a very able member of it. It is his assistance which very often makes it possible to have proper adjustments and a determination with accuracy and judiciousness of the appropriate amounts to be appropriated.

POSTMASTER NOMINATIONS

As in executive session,

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I report, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, 33 postmaster nominations, which I ask may be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

AWARDING OF PLAQUE BY POSTMASTER GENERAL TO SENATOR ROBERTSON OF VIRGINIA

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, in an impressive ceremony yesterday in the auditorium of the Post Office Department, the Postmaster General delivered to Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON a beautifully designed plaque carrying the following inscription:

> In recognition of dedicated legislative leadership and outstanding public service.

I wish to join the Postmaster General in recognition of and in compliment to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] for his dedicated work as chairman of the Subcommittee on the Departments of the Treasury and Post Office of the Appropriations Committee. Over the past many years he has headed this very important committee. He has shown great interest in a more efficient Post Office and in the many thousands of its Federal employees and in improving in all possible ways mail service throughout the 50 States. The Senator deserves recognition for his outstanding interest and work in this field.

Senator ROBERTSON has also had an interest in banking and other national affairs for many years. I am glad to note this recognition by the Postmaster General of the Senator from Virginia.

STATEMENT OF APPRECIATION TO MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I want to express my deep personal appreciation to my colleagues on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for their service and cooperation during this session. We have had some hard issues to resolve this year, and I think we have done quite well. I am proud that two very important bills, the 1966 Federal pay bill and the parcel post bill, were passed by the Senate and the House in the form recommended by our committee. I think they stand as characteristic examples of the work of our members on both sides of the aisle.

I want to pay particular tribute to the ranking minority member, Senator CARLSON, for his cooperation. We have served together now for 16 years on the committee, and our association continues to be warm, cordial, and fruitful.

The committee's achievements during the 89th Congress were in accord with other legislative achievements of a Congress that has enacted progressive and responsible legislation in many fields. It has been favorably compared with the outstanding legislative record of the New Deal Congress of 1933–34 or the New Freedom Congress of 1913–14. We are proud to share in that recognition.

Our committee enacted two major salary bills for classified and postal employees during this Congress, the first time in history that Federal salaries have been increased by law in both sessions of a Congress. Numerous improvements in the Federal retirement and insurance programs were enacted, and a whole new severance pay program was established.

Of particular significance was the parcel post bill recently signed by the President. This bill permits larger size and weight packages to move between first-class offices and will bring in about $100 million in additional revenue for the Post Office Department.

Nearly 3,000 postmaster nominations have been received by the committee during this Congress, and before we adjourn sine die, I hope that nearly all of them will have been confirmed. We have had very fine cooperation with the minority leadership in getting these nominations approved, and I appreciate that cooperative spirit.

The committee will publish a printed "Summary of Activities" when all legislation approved by Congress has been enacted. Our actions, including 29 public hearings and 20 public laws, to date, will be explained in this report, and will be available for general distribution to those who follow the activities of the committee.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, as a minority member of the committee, I want to say that the work of the Senator from Oklahoma has been outstanding, and I wish to compliment the chairman of the committee for his fairness and dedication to his job and for what he has done. I have never had the pleasure of serving with a man of such caliber before.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator from Wyoming, and am appreciative of the work he has done on the committee.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

U.S. STEPS TO CONTROL SCHOOLS SEEN

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I call attention to four speeches delivered by Mr. Harold Howe, II, U.S. Commissioner of Education, titled: "Education's Most Crucial Issue," "The City Is a Teacher," "The 1966 Desegregation Guidelines: A Situation Report," and "The Heat in Our Kitchen." These speeches were delivered in a 6-week period, between May 3, 1966, and June 18, 1966.

Mr. Howe was recently referred to in a newspaper column as the Commissioner of Integration, the implication being that we are without a Commissioner of Education. A careful analysis of Mr. Howe's four speeches, to which I have referred, will indicate that the implication was not without foundation. Very little was said about education per se in those speeches, the emphasis being almost solely upon integration. As a matter of fact, Mr. Howe, in his speech, "The Heat in Our Kitchen," said that—

> School desegregation is the single point on which we who call ourselves educational leaders prove that we really are so.

There should be no doubt, therefore, as to where the emphasis is being applied, in the distribution of Federal school aid to the States.

In his speech, "The City Is a Teacher," Mr. Howe said that—

> The most effective statements on civil rights in our time have not been made from pulpits, but in the cities of Montgomery, Selma, Watts, and a dozen other cities less celebrated in headlines but equally effective as object lessons.

It is inconceivable to me Mr. President, that the tragedy of Watts can be cited as an object lesson in civil rights.

I ask unanimous consent that the four speeches be printed in the Congressional Record, and I also ask unanimous consent that the following newspaper columns and editorials be inserted in the Record:

"Will United States Rewrite Textbooks?", an editorial which appeared in the Williamson, W. Va., Daily News on September 29, 1966.

"Hays Asks Howe To Quit, Raps His Guides Stand," an article by Robert K. Walsh which appeared in the Evening Star of October 3, 1966.

"United States Steps To Control Schools Seen," a column by David Lawrence, whicn appeared in the Evening Star on October 5, 1966.

"Integration Misfire," a column by Felix Kessler, which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of October 12, 1966.

"The Takeover of Our Schools," an editorial which appeared in the Wheeling, W. Va., News-Register on October 13, 1966.

There being no objection, the speeches and newspaper columns and editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

Education's Most Crucial Issue[1]

During the past several weeks members of my staff and I have been meeting with groups of school officials and political leaders from most of the Southern States.

Against a backdrop of considerable press attention—some factual, some darkly speculative—delegations have come to my office in Washington. We in turn have traveled to the South.

While we encountered a spark or two of fire in the eyes of some of the Southern representatives, the conversations were sincere and wholly useful. It was vital that they be so, for we were discussing what I conceive to be the most critical issue facing American education during the latter part of the twentieth century. I speak of the necessity for eliminating segregation from our schools.

In these particular discussions we focused on the segregation that has by official State policy characterized Southern education for the past century and continues to characterize it in large measure even though State laws have changed under Federal pressures. But the basic issues involved in racial discrimination in the schools are by no means confined to the South. The effort to eliminate segregated classrooms will stir increasingly intense debate in every section of this country. The decisions we cannot avoid making will test both the patience and the conscience of every citizen.

Our achievements and failures alike will have a significant impact on the national economy, on the quality of country ours will be, and on the individual lives of millions of people here in the United States and in foreign countries as well.

As President Johnson said last Thursday in his message to Congress urging new civil rights legislation:

"We are engaged in a great adventure—as great as that of the last century, when our fathers marched to the Western frontier. Our frontier today is of human beings, not of land. If we are able to open that frontier, to free each child to become the best that is in him to become, our reward—both spiritual and material—will exceed any that we gained a century ago through territorial expansion."

Those of us professionally connected with education thus have a heavy responsibility to our students and to our fellow men. That responsibility is of course not ours alone. Eliminating segregation, in the schools no less than in other institutions, will require close collaboration among all elements in the community. Government agencies at the local, State, and Federal levels must play their part; and so must city planners, real estate people, architects, civic and political leaders, community groups, and many others.

The call to action must come, however, from within the school itself, and it must come from those of us charged with the conduct of education. The school is where the children of the next generation now are. We cannot allow them to grow up with a cast of mind which perpetuates prejudice and which forces our Nation into another two or three decades of living with the lie that racially separate education can be equal.

Beyond its implications for the professional educator, I do not think it too much to say that continued existence of segregated schools—*de jure* and *de facto* alike—would undermine and in time destroy this Nation's spirit and vitality. Our citizens have always taken pride in their schools, regarding them as characteristically American. It would be a calloused ego indeed that would remain untouched in face of the fact that an enterprise regarded as characteristically American was in practice unfair.

And unfair is the best that can be said about the situation confronting the Negro child in the segregated classroom. Every experience he has seems calculated to demonstrate to him that he is inferior and should resign himself to being so. The system singles him out, separating him by color from the best schools and the best teachers. The least is demanded of him and expected from him. The prescribed neighborhood he lives in and the restrictions that shackle the adults he lives with strongly suggest that his is a lost cause. His life at school combines with the rest of his life to make him see himself as a second-class citizen.

Great though our country's riches are, we cannot afford this waste of human lives. Nor can we lightly disregard its effect on the position of the United States in the family of Nations. Since World War II, the United States has taken the lead in the pursuit of peace and human rights. We seek to advance freedom and to relieve oppression on all fronts—in a world made up of people some two-thirds of whom are not white. When these people look at the conditions among nonwhite Americans, they have little interest in the lengthy historical explanation of how second-class citizenship for Negro Americans has come about. More likely they will conclude, to paraphrase Emerson, "What you are speaks so loudly, I cannot hear what you say." And we must therefore ask ourselves how long we can expect world leadership to be accepted from a Nation that either cannot or will not put its own house in order.

It is necessary that we comprehend these issues. It is necessary to understand that American education—education offered equally and openly to all, not just to the privileged—is on trial. It is necessary to understand that segregated classrooms are not entirely accidental; it is not wholly by chance that our largest cities are marked by predominantly white and predominantly Negro schools and that this separation of the races is on the increase in our city schools. And whatever decisions we make about maintaining or eliminating these arrangements, it is necessary also to recognize that segregated schools—in the North every bit as much as in the South—violate not only the most revered principles of this Nation but our fundamental law.

That position—particularly as set forth in the Office of Education's Revised Statement of Policies for School Desegregation Plans—has been warmly challenged. Some Southern leaders, and they are not without counterparts in the North, contend that our requirements are not only unfair but illegal. By what right, many of them seem to be saying, does the Office of Education interpret "discrimination" (the word used in title VI of the Civil Rights Act) as being synonymous with "segregation?" Why isn't it legal and just to have segregated schools as long as they are created by the choices of pupils and parents or by the patterns of residence which emerge in portions of a school district?

---

[1] Before the Founders' Day Convocation, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, May 3, 1966.

And thus suddenly the calendar is turned back to 1954 and the Supreme Court's decision in the case of *Brown vs. The Board of Education of Topeka.* In its opinion the Court enunciated "the fundamental principle that racial discrimination in public education is unconstitutional," and the Court went on to say that "Old provisions of Federal, State, or local law requiring or permitting such discrimination must yield to this principle." The decision ended, you may recall, with these words: "We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal."

Fortified by these unequivocal statements—and a host of subsequent District Court decisions spelling out the position in detail—those of us in the Office of Education are on firm legal ground when we move against the principle of the dual school system in the South, with its tradition of "separate but (theoretically) equal" schools and its segregated faculties. These arrangements were originally established by State and local laws, by formal public policy. The segregation resulting from them is clearly illegal under the Civil Rights and under Federal court decisions.

But to the North lie quicksands of legal interpretation. No major Northern city has had—in recent decades, at least—a law or a public policy officially setting up separate schools for whites and Negroes. Segregation in the Northern schools has instead come about for a wide variety of reasons connected primarily with patterns of residence—from real estate covenants, for example, or from the flight of well-heeled families to the suburbs; and most of all, perhaps, from the subtle, insidious, undocumented influence of prejudice which herds the Negro into the city ghetto through economic and social pressures which have no standing in law but which operate as effectively as legal segregation ever did in the South.

The consequence is a clearly discernible pattern of predominantly white and predominantly Negro urban schools that have developed without any clearly official planning or policy; and the further consequence is unequal educational opportunity through segregation in many ways more complete and severe than that existing in many small Southern towns. But this segregation—Northern style—is beyond the clear purview of the Civil Rights Act, and outside the compass of other clearly established legal remedies as of this time.

We face a similarly imponderable situation even when we get into the realm of official action taken by a school system. There is, for example, the feeder pattern by which children in elementary schools A, B, C, and D are assigned to east junior high school; while those in schools W, X, Y, and Z are assigned to west junior high. The Office of Education has received complaints from several cities that these assignments have a peculiar way of making east junior high all white and west junior high all Negro. But is this what school officials actually intended or is it just a coincidence? Unless intent can be established, it is difficult for the law to reach the problem.

We have received similar complaints about attendance zone boundaries and about faculty assignments. It would be difficult not to suspect that some of the crazy-quilt attendance zones to be found are the result of deliberate gerrymandering to produce white or Negro schools, or that predominantly Negro faculties in Negro schools are there by something other than coincidence. But how does one penetrate the hearts and minds of those who drew those boundary lines or assigned those teachers? How does one legally establish their intent?

Office of Education teams have spent many weeks in several Northern school districts trying to find the answers—trying to determine how we can successfully proceed. But we are not satisfied with our progress, and it is clear that the end to segregation in the Northern schools will not come soon. What is more, we face the danger that, in the South, patterns of *de facto* segregation will develop as the old dual school system disappears and as more prosperous white families flee to the suburbs of growing cities to avoid integrated schools.

The fact is that, although a great deal is being accomplished under the Civil Rights Act, this law is not an ideal instrument for changing *de facto* school segregation through enforcement.

Its imperfections were recently brought to the attention of Congress through two bills—one introduced by Senator Edward Kennedy, the other by Congressman Adam Clayton Powell. Both bills are aimed directly at the problem of segregation in the big cities. Both provide greatly increased financial assistance to school districts that wish to undertake programs to alleviate their problems. One of the bills would apply sanctions against districts that remain segregated.

Whatever the fate of these proposals, programs enacted into law by Congress during the past few years are proving their usefulness in helping to make equal educational opportunity a reality for every child. Under title IV of the Civil Rights Act, for example, hundreds of teachers are receiving special training—at institutes financed by title IV—in how to deal with the problems of integration effectively and smoothly. As experience has demonstrated, desegregation means a great deal more than simply eliminating separate schools. There are deep educational and psychological needs to be met, and teachers dealing with newly integrated classrooms must know how to meet them. One doesn't hear much about title IV of the Civil Rights Act, but it seems to me a particularly valuable and important teacher-training enterprise. I wish it were larger and more widely used.

A considerably broader program is at work in every State and nearly every community in the Nation under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). This title, you may recall, supports a billion-dollar-a-year drive to bring an array of special new educational programs to the children of poverty—the children (a large proportion of them Negro, of course) whose home and school deprivations are most poignantly acute. The program is working, too, on the minds of school administrators across the Nation. It is showing them that poverty is a problem in education and that education is the best way to destroy poverty. And perhaps it is causing some of them to speculate that sentencing Negroes to poverty may result as much from white people's attitudes as from anything.

Closely allied in spirit with title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is a very special program we are just now trying to get off the ground—the National Teacher Corps. Carefully selected teams of teacher interns, led by experienced career teachers, will—at the invitation of local school systems—take their dedication and talent and spirit into classrooms in city slums and poverty-stricken rural areas. It would be difficult to think of a more challenging or more rewarding or more necessary undertaking. I would hope that the alumni of Teachers College would be well represented among the National Teacher Corps volunteers.

All in all, there are about 100 major programs carried out by the Office of Education. Every one of them, no matter what the level of training, has an important contribution to make to the quality of American education and to making education equally available to every citizen, without regard to race or circumstance.

At the same time local efforts of a variety of kinds are also whittling away at the issue of *de facto* segregation. Open enrollment programs give children and parents the opportunity to desegregate themselves; the "pairing" of schools which have traditionally been white and Negro is a device with some usefulness in the fringes of the Negro ghetto; bussing of pupils to create racial balance is highly controversial but must be conceded to be helpful in some situations; forward-looking schools in many all-white suburbs have attempted to make a contribution through student and teacher exchanges of various kinds.

But all of these laudable efforts, both Federal and local, are doomed to failure unless they are fortified by further energies directed at the basic problem.

The first priority is to make sure that the schools which serve our neediest citizens are at the very least equal to the schools that serve our most fortunate. In spite of local, State, and Federal efforts, this is not now the case. Buildings are older, teachers are less experienced and not as well trained, the turnover of staff is higher, and in many cases equipment, books, and special services are less adequate in those schools where the child has special handicaps to overcome. It seems to me imperative that while we are forging legal and policy weapons to attack de facto segregation in the cities, we must at the same time take immediate steps to bring real excellence to the segregated schools which do in fact exist. The Federal Government can contribute to them by programs like title I of ESEA, and I would hope that my office could bring forward even more adventurous enterprises in the years ahead. But as we do so, we will have to be supported by local resolution to regard the problem as crucial and to bend every effort to solve it.

Here are some things which ought to happen locally:

(1) Personnel assignment policies adopted both by school systems and by teacher organizations should be adjusted to guarantee slum schools their share of experienced, able teachers and to cut down staff turnover in these schools.

(2) Building programs for the future should be planned so that new schools break up rather than continue segregation. The Office of Education will provide Federal planning funds for such efforts right now, and if I have my way about it, we will provide construction funds before long. Moreover, with the creation of the new Department of Housing and Urban Development, there is a new Federal tool to help education in the attack on de facto segregation. Planning for new land use and for housing patterns in the city must go hand in hand with planning for education.

(3) The next generation of citizens should not graduate from our high schools without having confronted—through serious study and in depth—the issues which confront this society in the realm of segregation and civil rights. Efforts to get this subject into the classroom must originate with States and localities, for we cannot and should not set curriculum from the Office of Education. But we can provide research funds to start responsible efforts on curriculum development, so that 18-year-olds shall not enter adult life without an understanding of the

stresses and problems of this society. It is about time we stopped offering an antiseptic history of our country cleaned up to please the local power structure, and it is about time also that we started talking realities with young adults who are joining the military service and entering matrimony at the age of 18.

(4) Local school districts must provide in slum schools all of the special opportunity programs found elsewhere in the school system, so as to create both the opportunity and the expectation of performance by the children of the poor. There is a danger, well documented by Kenneth Clark in his book "Dark Ghetto," that our focus on the culturally deprived will result in an assumption that poor children have less promise than others and should be given a kind of special propping up to atone for their status without giving them the advantage of the stimulation which comes from a rigorous educational program. In addition to more remedial reading and more preschool programs, we need more advanced placement in the schools of the slums.

(5) Teacher education programs must affiliate with slum schools for their practice teaching in such a way as to give us many more young teachers who are willing to venture "Up the Down Staircase." And most schools of education can learn from Columbia Teachers College in this respect.

These are some of the tools available to us to help make equal educational opportunity a fact of American life. But in the long run *we shall overcome,* not just because of laws prohibiting discrimination in the schools or educational programs to dissolve it, but because America wants us to overcome. There is a new spirit abroad in this Nation, and a refreshing new attitude. Spreading in large part from campuses such as this one, there is new determination that we cannot and will not divorce such principles as "equal justice under law" from life as we live it.

This determination is inevitably focused where injustice is most apparent, and injustice is nowhere more apparent than in the segregated classroom. Discrimination will not be eliminated from our schools easily or soon, but the course is, in my opinion, inalterably set.

The changing tide is traced by the results of opinion polls entered into the record of last summer's White House Conference on Education. One of the polls involved the question, "Do you think white students and Negro students should go to the same schools?" In 1942, 40 percent of white Northerners answered, "same schools." By 1963 that figure had climbed to 73 percent. During the same period, the ratio of white Southerners saying "same schools" climbed from 2 percent in 1942 to 34 percent in 1963. Overall, in 1963, 63 percent of the white people sampled felt that whites and Negroes should attend the same schools. As Professor Thomas F. Pettigrew, one of the Conference consultants observed, "White opinions on school desegregation have undergone extremely significant alterations throughout the country in recent years—far greater alterations than commonly recognized."

It is high time that these alterations be reflected in official school policy. American education must catch up with American life and American law. The citizens of this Nation demand that it do so, and they look to teachers and principals and superintendents to lead the way.

As educators, there can be no doubt in our minds that segregated education is inferior education. The wisest minds in our profession have joined the Supreme Court in making that clear. What is sadly lacking is the clear public expression of these facts of our professional life. The educator must speak out and he must act. He must help parents understand that all-white and all-Negro schools harm both races. He must exercise his responsibilities for leadership, forthrightly challenging those who would deny the constitutional requirement of equal educational opportunity for all.

In the face of this most crucial issue in American education, the professional educator cannot remain silent.

THE CITY IS A TEACHER [2]

The city is a teacher, Plutarch said, and everyone who has lived in a city knows why. Within its few square miles of glass, steel, and concrete are concentrated the greatest works of commerce, art, government, and entertainment. Its boundaries—particularly in the case of the American city, with its roots in a hundred different Nations—encircle the cultures of an astonishing variety of national, religious, and ethnic groups.

Each of these facets of a city offers its own lesson. But the kind of lesson you learn depends on where in the classroom you sit.

To some of us, the metropolis represents excitement, a sense of being where the action is. The mingled majesty and mystery to be found in a view of the East River, of Capitol Hill, of Michigan Avenue, or the Golden Gate remind us that despite the normal quotient of tedium and trial in each of our lives, life in an urban setting can be exciting.

But the metropolis teaches a different lesson to those who sit in the back of the room. Removed from the scenes of splendor, excitement, and romance that beguile the rest of us, they see only the squalid, the depressing, and the dangerous. And they conclude—rightly—that the city is a prison.

Jane Addams of Chicago's Hull House called these prisoners "the city's disinherited." They are the Americans who have not shared in the great American success story . . . the story that describes how generations of Irish, of Italians, of Germans, and of Poles labored, prayed, fought, and hoped until they escaped from the immigrants' ghettoes to a more generous life.

It is in one way surprising that the Americans in today's ghettoes have not completed the trip to Wilmette or South Shore, LaGrange or Lake Shore Drive. For they arrived in the United States decades before many of the other new Americans who have since been naturalized by our melting pot.

I refer, of course, to the American Negro. He was poor, ignorant, and without hope 200 years ago. By modern American standards, he remains poor, ignorant, and without hope today. He was a slave in the South 200 years ago; and he remains a slave to unemployment, to poverty, and to despair in the North today.

I have not come to preach a sermon, for sermons have proved notoriously ineffective in bringing about major changes in society. In any case, I think we must concede that the most effective statements on civil rights in our time have not been made from pulpits, but in the streets of Montgomery and Selma, Watts and a dozen other cities less celebrated in headlines but equally effective as object lessons.

I have come, rather, to discuss the educational aspect of the poverty that flourishes in the inner city; to point out that no matter where you sit in the city's classroom, you pay the tuition for the kind of education it dispenses . . . and whether that education is good or bad, its cost is very high; and finally, to discuss some measures for improving education in the city ghetto, whether its residents be white paupers or Negro paupers.

In his message to the Congress urging stronger civil rights legislation, President Johnson pointed out that though segregation takes several forms, it nevertheless comprises a sociological unity. He said:

"It is self-evident that the problems we are struggling with form a complicated chain of discrimination and lost opportunities. Employment is often dependent on education, education on neighborhood schools and housing, housing on income, and income on employment. We have learned by now the folly of looking for any crucial link in the chain that binds the ghetto. All the links—poverty, lack of education, underemployment, and now discrimination in housing—must be attacked together."

I suspect that most white people feel a generalized sympathy with the Negro in his struggle for equality. They may object to some methods used by the civil rights groups, and even favorably disposed whites probably believe—after some spectacular incident—that the Negro is trying to go too far, too fast.

But I suggest that it is a good deal easier to counsel restraint in the attainment of a goal when you have already achieved that goal yourself. Moreover, I believe, every white man has a stake in seeing to it that the Negro progresses just as far as he can, just as fast as he can. For, leaving entirely aside the moral issue and restricting myself to pragmatic matters, I would argue that our experience has shown that every one of us pays in a number of ways to maintain the Negro in his subordinate position.

Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz has estimated that every dropout costs the Nation about $1,000 a year while he is unemployed. To this expense must be added the waste of individual talent to the Nation, and the loss of personal income to the individual. We pay for poor education and for poverty in other ways: in crime rates, in military service rejection rates, in social problems springing as much from lack of dignity, lack of hope, and lack of possibilities for family life as from the flawed human nature which we all share.

And such expenses of spirit and matter diminish, finally, the quality of all our lives as citizens of a city . . . a modern city, moreover, whose boundaries do not stop at the red lines on the maps. Delinquency draws no lines at Howard Street. The North Shore pays rent on the South Side slums; like it or not, we all help maintain the chain of poverty that binds the ghetto.

The education link in this chain of social slavery is the segregated, inferior ghetto school.

What are some of the characteristics of the ghetto school? Why is it failing in its mission to shape free, responsible, capable adults from children who have the normal statistical potential for brilliance, mediocrity, and failure?

First, the ghetto school is underfinanced. Contrary to our American oversimplification, the public schools are not free. They are paid for with taxes; they depend first of all on the incomes of the community's adults.

The ghetto community simply does not have the funds to support schools as educators know they should be supported. It is for this reason that cities need special financial assistance from the State taxing power and from the Federal Government.

Second, the children who attend ghetto schools walk in the door suffering from handicaps that do not hinder their counterparts in suburban schools. They come from homes in which their parents read little and write less. Although many of them share the universal culture provided by TV, there is more than a little question of its value, both in content and in stimulation.

The educator's jargon for these children is "disadvantaged." The term means that they will start slower than children from middle-class homes and that they will not run as fast. It implies that they will in all likelihood not pursue their educational journey as far, unless they receive special help.

---

[2] Before the City Club of Chicago's annual Civic Assembly, Chicago Bar Association, Chicago, May 13, 1966.

Third, the ghetto schools usually have the least experienced teachers; other things being equal, one's teaching, like one's tennis or golf or five-card stud, improves as you do more of it.

The reason for this situation is not necessarily planned discrimination by the school board. Often it is simply understandable human preference. As a teacher gains tenure through years of service, he frequently gains the right to ask for another assignment. And it is entirely to be expected that a teacher with this choice would want to serve in the more attractive neighborhoods. Hence year after year the ghetto schools must replace vacancies on their staffs with brand-new graduates from the schools of education. It is fortunate indeed that a hard core of able, experienced teachers have made these schools their life work. We need more of them.

Finally, it is characteristic of the ghetto school that it has little community understanding or support. Why should parents—many of whom are themselves undereducated or even illiterate—understand what their sons and daughters do every day from nine to three? They are incapable of judging the quality of the education their children receive, even if they are interested in doing so. How can they frame their questions, how can they articulate their hopes and doubts?

They cannot, and the ghetto school continues to limp along without the material and spiritual support that has made some suburban Chicago schools the finest in the Nation.

Why? Is it because the children who attend New Trier township high school are natural geniuses, the happy product of superior genes?

Not at all. It is because they attend a school in a community where adults care about education, and where adults pay for education. And meanwhile, twenty miles to the south, the children of poor whites and poor Negroes in the inner-city schools are being trained for lives of dependency because they did not exercise better judgment in their choice of parents.

One of the finest treatments I have seen of the problems of the ghetto school appeared in the May 7 issue of the New Yorker magazine. The article was mainly an extended interview with Dr. Elliott Shapiro, principal of a public school in central Harlem. Here is one of the things Dr. Shapiro had to say about the relation between a child's innate ability, his academic performance, and his home environment:

". . . It is after the first grade that the great disparities between our children and the children of the middle class start showing up. As our children grow older, their lives get worse and, simultaneously, their responsibilities increase. They have more younger brothers and sisters to take care of, and their mothers are forced to become more distant as their problems increase. In the fifth and sixth grades, there are more children of broken families than there are in kindergarten and the first grade. It gets harder and harder for the fathers to find employment that will bring in enough money and will also keep their egos intact. And precisely because the fathers do have self-respect, they begin to disappear. I remember that during the Depression, a lot of us didn't know what to do with ourselves. The Negro male in a neighborhood like this is in a permanent depression, much worse than anything we went through in the nineteen-thirties."

What can be done about the ghetto schools?

The Congress of the United States has already made a major start. In the last three years alone it has passed 24 pieces of legislation touching every aspect of education from prekindergarten to postgraduate. One of the most impressive is the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Title I of that act is aimed specifically at schools in low-income areas, whether in the city or in the rural districts. It pumps a billion dollars a year into special educational programs for the children of poverty. It recognizes what school administrators have always known: poverty and ignorance go together. And it is giving them the resources to break up that sad association.

Closely allied in spirit to title I is a program that we are just now getting off the ground—the National Teacher Corps. This Corps will be composed of teams of young teacher interns led by experienced, career teachers. At the invitation of local school systems and under the supervision of local school boards, they will bring their dedication, talent, and spirit into classrooms that can now afford precious little of any of those commodities. At the end of their service in the Teacher Corps they will be ready for careers among children of the poor.

All in all, the U.S. Office of Education is responsibile for about 100 major programs. But not all the education news is taking place in Washington; there are laudable advances at the local level.

Chicago deserves tremendous credit for absorbing a great inmigration of undereducated and relatively unemployable newcomers. I understand that the city has within it more Mississippi Negroes than Mississippi has. The city might well have been stunned by the enormous tasks of housing and educating poor whites and Negroes from the South *without* the tax losses caused by the exodus of middle class whites.

But Chicago's efforts to serve the children who are harder to serve—and indeed the efforts of other cities in similar circumstances—may well be futile unless every citizen accept this problem as his own . . . especially those citizens who, like the members of this group, are in a position to do something about it.

What can you and your city do about it?

First, we must recognize that the ghetto school needs not just as much financial support as the suburban school but much more. We must realize that it must provide special services that were considered educational frills just five years ago—such services as counseling and guidance; small classes; remedial instruction; the latest teaching methods and equipment; and psychological, medical, and dental aid.

We must change inner-city schools from nine-to-three-o'clock citadels where all human life vanishes with the dismissal bell, into highly visible neighborhood resources that teach parents as well as children. The inner-city school must create community where there is no other focal point for a common life and shared interests. We must staff our ghetto schools so that they can remain open from morning to late evening, offering adult instruction in everything from reading to making the most of the shopping dollar.

And in this newly involved institution we must above all create the opportunity for, and the expectation of, performance by the children of the poor. Cultural disadvantage need not foreshadow poor academic achievement, as Operation Head Start has demonstrated. Children sense a school's lower expectations and grow to demand less of themselves because the school demands so little of them. Schools are not custodial. Children are there to learn, not just to be kept off the streets.

They will learn best if they are taught by specially trained teachers. Beyond expressing our national need for more teachers of every description, we have done little to focus upon a kind of teacher preparation which is necessary to serve the children of the poor. In general, our colleges and universities train teachers for ideal classrooms, and although the classrooms in the slums may be in some cases excellent in their buildings and equipment, their human environment cries out for special attention of every kind.

A share of the guilt for this irrelevant teacher education must be borne by the profession itself. Somehow the idea of service to those who need it most has been obscured by the drive for better teaching salaries and conditions.

Further, city school systems must adopt assignment policies that will guarantee slum schools their share of experienced, able teachers. We must counteract the tendency of experienced teachers to choose more pleasant schools as soon as their years of service entitle them to transfer. We must also change the policies of schools and teacher organizations which tend to confront the slum child with the inexperienced, uncertificated, and impermanent teacher.

In addition to more and better teachers, slum schools need volunteers and paid teacher-aides to supplement the work of the fully trained teacher. Added personal attention from adults who really care about the child can do as much as any other service to lift the potentialities of the children of the poor.

These are some of the immediate steps that can be taken to improve the ghetto school. But I believe that more drastic measures will be needed over the long run.

For example, traditional school district boundaries often serve education badly and may have to be changed. New York and New Jersey surrendered State prerogatives to form the Port of New York Authority in the interest of improved transportation. If we can make such concessions for transportation, I suggest that we can make them for education.

We could, for example, alter political boundaries to bring the social, economic, and intellectual strength of the suburbs to bear on the problems of the city schools. Building programs for the future could be planned so that new schools would break up, rather than continue, segregation of both the racial and the economic sort. The Office of Education will provide Federal planning funds for such efforts right now . . . and, if I have my way, the Office will provide construction funds before long.

We have recently been considering financial support for a comprehensive study of a system of educational parks to be established within the inner city. We visualize each of these centralized school complexes as educational centers that would provide classes ranging from prekindergarten through junior college.

And we are particularly interested in finding one or two great American cities that are adventurous enough to join us in planning the educational park of the future. These entities will house 20,000 or more pupils and will cut across all geographic, economic, and social boundaries to draw students. While such a park would deny the neighborhood school, it would express the vitality, the imagination, and the cultural mix that every vigorous city exemplifies. Students in such a facility would attend a genuine city school in the deepest sense instead of a school in one section of the city which is untouched by the broader influences of metropolitan life as a whole.

Altering political boundaries or consolidating the educational facilities of a large city would involve major organizational changes—major educational surgery. But I believe that major surgery is required if we are to liberate the children of the slums.

To reach that goal, we will require money; but money is not enough. We will need teachers; but teachers are not enough. We will need research, and educational research is already giving us new teaching techniques, new methods of evaluating academic progress, and a host of additional helps to educate the slum child. But research is not enough.

What is enough?

Perhaps the answer to that question will emerge only when every American recognizes that educating the slum child as a way of breaking the chain of poverty is in his own immediate, direct interest. For this is one of the lessons that your city and all the cities of the United States teach: that, as John Donne said, no man is an island . . . that his well-being, his safety, the very quality of his life and that of his children are bound up with the lives of countless other men whom he will never know and may never see.

The city is indeed a teacher, and it has been teaching us that the ghetto school perpetuates a poverty; an injustice, and a weakness that daily saps all our lives.

It is time we learned our lesson and put it to use.

THE 1966 DESEGREGATION GUIDELINES: A SITUATION REPORT[8]

We meet today a period of considerable contention here in Alabama over the issue of desegregating the schools as required by the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and earlier Federal court decisions. The controversy has focused on the guidelines for school desegregation issued by the Office of Education under the Civil Rights Act, and on their alleged illegality.

Judging from the newspaper reports I have seen, many of the positions taken about our guidelines are based on misinformation and on distinctly erroneous inferences. The inferences any man draws are his own business, and I can do nothing about them. Inaccurate information is another matter, and the issues involved—especially the overall issue of giving our children the best possible education—are such that I cannot in good conscience stand by and not attempt to set the record straight. What I should like to do here today, then, is to review some of the facts and reasoning that lie behind our Guidelines, and to give a short report about where we stand today and what the shape of the future might be. My hope is that a reasoned discussion of the position the United States Office of Education has taken will help local school authorities in Alabama and elsewhere to move into compliance with the law as far as school desegregation is concerned. I would be less than honest if I did not add that Alabama presents a special problem which is apparent in no other State, North or South. For this reason I particularly welcome the opportunity to discuss school desegregation from this platform.

Any such discussion must look back to the school desegregation decisions of the United States Supreme Court of 1954 and 1955. In those decisions the Court ruled that racially separate educational facilities were inherently unequal and therefore unconstitutional. Put another way, the Court said that no matter how splendid a school building might be, if it was reserved for Negro students and staffed by Negro teachers, its continued existence constituted defiance of the law.

As a part of the Supreme Court decisions, lower courts were directed to require school districts to make a prompt and reasonable start toward desegregating the schools. In discharging that responsibility, the courts have in many cases felt it necessary to define what desegregation really means. Thus a recent court opinion stated that "It is not enough to open the previously all-white school to Negro students who desire to go there while all-Negro schools continue to be maintained as such." Furthermore, the schools have been instructed by the courts to make "an adequate start toward the elimination of race as a basis for the employment and allocation of teachers, administrators, and other personnel."

In short, school authorities have been told by the courts that they may not remain passive; on the contrary, they must take definite, affirmative action to eliminate the dual school system.

In July of 1964 the United States Congress gave practical application to this proposition in the following statement from title VI of the Civil Rights Act:

"No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance."

The Civil Rights Act also calls upon individual Federal agencies to spell this provision out in regulations covering the programs they administer. Such regulations were issued by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and approved by the President of the United States. They have the force of law. Since the responsibility for eliminating segregation ultimately rests with local school authorities, the Office of Education would have been perfectly willing to leave it up to local school districts to carry out these regulations. In practice, however, local school authorities raised so many questions or made so little progress that the Office of Education found it necessary to issue guidelines establishing minimum desegregation standards.

We issued our first set of guidelines in April of 1965—and in doing so we clearly stated that this first attempt to outline the procedures for school desegregation did not necessarily represent the final word on the subject . . . that experience in the school year starting in September of 1965 might very well suggest the need for revision. This proved to be the case. Even so, the revised 1966 guidelines issued last March do not introduce a radical departure from the original document. They do go into some greater detail, and they call for greater progress. But the original principles remain. The new guidelines are based on experience with those issued a year earlier. This experience indicated that in many school districts, voluntary compliance under free choice arrangements results in abuses of the rights of Negro students unless special guarantees can be provided. The procedures required in the new guidelines were devised to guarantee that free choice compliance plans would in fact provide the student and his family with a free choice.

I should also like to make it clear that the original guidelines and the revised 1966 version were not prepared in a quick or casual fashion. Health, Education, and Welfare and Justice Department lawyers meticulously studied the law and researched an array of Federal court decisions. They agreed that the principles and procedures embraced in the guidelines were based on firm legal ground found in the Civil Rights Act, court decisions, and the HEW regulations. I can assure you that a great deal of competent legal thinking went into their preparation. Subsequently two court cases have been filed specifically testing our contention that the Office of Education guidelines accurately reflect the law in all its implications. We face these court tests with complete confidence. While they are in process, we shall continue with the policies expressed in the guidelines unless a court ruling requires otherwise. I might mention that anyone interested in reading a responsible legal briefing regarding the legality of the guidelines can get a document from us which performs this service.

While engaged in this discussion of the legal situation, I would like to call to your attention that voluntary compliance plans are one of two ways for a previously segregated school district to meet its obligations under the law. A district which does not comply voluntarily with Office of Education requirements is subject to court action regarding compliance with the Civil Rights Act. Recent rulings by the Federal courts have tended to adopt policies similar to those found in the guidelines for both pupil and faculty desegregation. Right now there is a series of cases before the Fifth Circuit Court reviewing the standards for court-ordered desegregation. We expect that the rulings in these cases will leave scant comfort for those school districts which see court order compliance as the easy way out of meeting their desegregation responsibilities. Any school district which chooses the court order route is, of course, free to do so. Necessarily, however, it will find itself subject to withholding of all Federal funds until it can get a court order operating as the result of a suit brought by local complainants.

Summing up this part of the discussion, I should like to make these points:

First: The basic issue of desegregating the public schools—of eliminating dual systems of education—is settled. It was unequivocally decided by the Supreme Court in its 1954 and 1955 decisions that such systems are discriminatory and unconstitutional.

Second: This principle is clearly supported in the Civil Rights Act by provisions prohibiting Federal agencies from disbursing Federal funds if there is discrimination because of race, color, or national origin.

Third: The fundamental requirements of our guidelines—including faculty desegregation and greater progress in desegregated enrollments—are fully in accord with the law and are based upon court decisions.

Fourth: Court orders offer no refuge from the requirements of the guidelines and they involve the likelihood of an interruption in Federal payments.

Perhaps it would be worthwhile to elaborate just a bit on the two issues which have caused the most discussion—faculty assignments and school enrollments. First, regarding faculty desegregation. It is being said in some quarters that our requirements in the 1966 Guidelines appeared out of the blue, without warning and without preparation. Yet those who read the original 1965 guidelines will recall a passage saying that "all desegregation plans shall provide for the desegregation of faculty and staff" and that steps should be taken to eliminate past segregated assignments. Among other things, we required a year ago in the 1965 guidelines that school districts take the first steps toward faculty desegregation at least through joint faculty meetings and in-service training programs.

The 1966 guidelines call for the normal second step. They point out that the pattern of teacher assignments "may not be such that schools are identifiable as intended for students of a particular race" and they look for evidence of real progress toward this objective. Let it be absolutely clear, however, that our 1966 guidelines do *not* require that every school must have a biracial faculty by next fall. They do *not* establish a fixed formula for staff desegregation, nor do they tell school administrators what people they may hire and which they may fire. They *do* say this: that all personnel decisions—decisions regarding hiring, firing, promotion, demotion, assignment, and reassignment—must be made without regard to race, color, or national origin except to correct past discrimination. And they say there must be real and not merely token progress in staff desegregation.

---

[8] Before the Alabama State Advisory Committee, Civil Rights Commission, Birmingham, Ala., June 11, 1966.

These requirements for starting faculty desegregation have been challenged as being contrary to that portion of the Civil Rights Act—section 604 of the title VI—referring to employment practices. We do not believe this to be the case, and we base our position on the advice of our General Counsel. The desegregation process must involve faculty assignments or it simply will be meaningless. The focus of title VI is on the student, and I cannot imagine that anyone would quarrel with the statement that the existence of an all-Negro faculty in a school clearly signals that this school is intended for Negro students and therefore constitutes the practice of discrimination.

Section 604 excludes considerations connected with fair employment practices. However, it does not exclude—on the contrary it covers—the assignment of faculty in terms of the race of the students to be served. In our guidelines we are not talking about fair employment practices. We are talking about eliminating segregated school situations, and that requires the elimination of the practice of making faculty assignments that place Negro teachers in one school and white teachers in another.

As for student enrollments, there are two basic requirements: first that any desegregation plan, of whatever type, must work; and second, that in the case of free choice plans, the choice must indeed be free. In the guideline requirements covering free choice plans, certain percentages are cited for the transfer of students, the purpose being to give schools a suggested standard for meeting their legal responsibilities to desegregate. These figures have stirred up considerable controversy, apparently based on the notion that they represent arbitrary standards. This is by no means the case. They are simply an effort, based on numerous requests for guidance from local school authorities, to establish broad measures of progress for eliminating the dual school system and to indicate whether or not a free choice plan is working. Clearly such a plan is not producing desegregation if it continues to maintain Negro schools with all Negro students and white schools with white students. We need reasonable standards to indicate whether school districts are moving away from discriminatory arrangements of the past.

We must review 1,800 or more plans, and these percentage figures serve in part to help school districts know the dimensions of the progress we hope for and in part to help us decide which plans seem to require immediate attention. If a free choice plan does not approximate the minimum desegregation according to the percentages listed, that is a signal that we had better take a close look at this plan to determine whether it is operating freely and effectively. The failure to meet a particular percentage does not necessarily indicate the need for a hearing to terminate funds, nor does it by any means suggest that the district should automatically be declared out of compliance on the basis of the figures. It does mean that we will review carefully the processes used by school districts which claim to be operating free choice plans while still continuing largely segregated schools. In accordance with the guidelines we will suggest to them additional procedures they may use to achieve compliance.

It has been argued that these percentages constitute an effort to introduce the idea of racial balance into our compliance requirements and that they are, therefore, in conflict with a provision in another section of the Civil Rights Act which prohibits activities "to overcome racial imbalance." This is just not the case. As I have said, and want to repeat, the percentages are an effort to give school officials some guidance as to a reasonable degree of progress that might normally be expected under free choice plans. Failure to make the indicated progress might suggest—depending on the circumstances—that school officials should take further steps or perhaps that they should change their compliance plan. The guidelines do in fact require that reasonable progress be made, but nowhere do they require that there be any particular proportion of Negro and white children in any particular school. The phrase "correction of racial imbalance" refers to the bussing of children from neighborhood schools which have not been officially segregated but which—because of residential patterns—are "racially imbalanced." The Office of Education guidelines do not bear on this situation at all.

Let me also say this: We are not bent on withholding or deferring funds. Any district that is not in compliance seems to us to represent a defeat. It means failure on our part and failure on the part of those responsible for the schools. Our failure arises from our inability to have helped achieve voluntary compliance under the law of this land. The failure of the schools arises from their determination to cling to a position—a position clearly prohibited under the Constitution of the United States—that threatens the opportunities of children to receive the best possible education. I might add that where such a position is encouraged on a statewide basis, the result is to create a threat of denial of opportunity to young people which is tragic—tragic in the limitations it imposes on the opportunities of individuals and tragic also because its long range influence would clearly work to diminish the prosperity and economic opportunities of the State. I might also add that such a position makes it infinitely more difficult for responsible school officials to exercise local initiative in carrying out their responsibilities under the law.

Against this background, let's take a look at where the Office of Education stands today in its efforts to bring about voluntary compliance. Our basic responsibility as established by the Congress in title VI of the Civil Rights Act has been to ensure that Federal funds do not flow to any school system which is not making progress in eliminating discrimination based on race, color, or national origin. In carrying out this responsibility we have consistently and persistently sought to secure voluntary compliance with the law. We have made every effort to be cooperative, within the limits of the law. Our policy has been to take action to cut off Federal funds only when our efforts have been unsuccessful.

On March 7 of this year we issued the 1966 guidelines and asked that compliance agreements reach us by April 15. Because of the delay in issuing the guidelines, and because of the additional time school boards said they needed to review them and take official action, I subsequently notified chief State school officers that the deadline was extended until May 6. On that date, May 6, we notified State school officials that districts that were not in compliance as evidenced by submission of an acceptable 441–B form should have funds deferred for all new projects proposed under Office of Education programs.

In addition, on that same day I notified members of the Office of Education staff that they too should halt any action on new projects for districts not in compliance. As a consequence, approximately 100 school districts became ineligible for Office of Education funds for new programs.

In the latter part of April and early May, we reviewed growing numbers of reports from school districts as to their plans for student enrollments and faculty assignments. These reports reflected what the districts had in mind for the start of school next September.

As of May 6, more than 1,700 districts in the Southern States had indicated their intention of coming into voluntary compliance under our guidelines, and we now have received the reports from most of these districts. Many are satisfactory; many are not.

Our first step in the case of districts submitting clearly unsatisfactory reports for faculty desegregation has been to write to the superintendents of the affected schools, calling attention to the shortcomings and asking them to tell us what future action they contemplate regarding faculty assignments.

About 360 of these letters have gone out, and it may very well be necessary to give similar notice to other school districts in the coming weeks. In these letters we sought to make it clear that unless there is further progress in faculty desegregation—beyond that indicated in the first report—that these school districts may be called to hearings involving the withholding of all Federal funds.

Another activity which has been taking place since the May 6 deadline has been to formally initiate legal proceedings in cases of districts clearly not in compliance—again, toward the possibility of withholding all Federal funds. I refer here to districts which have not submitted 441–B forms and which—despite our best efforts to bring about voluntary compliance—have stated their intention not to comply.

As you are perhaps aware from public announcements appearing in the press, we have submitted the names of 18 such school districts to the General Counsel's office so that he may begin the formal processes. The largest number of these districts—six of them—is in Alabama.

I guess we have to assume that similar action will be called for in other cases during the coming weeks. The districts that will be involved first will be those that have specifically stated their determination not to comply. Subsequently we will have to move against districts that have submitted 441–B forms but in doing so have made it clear that they are unwilling to make reasonable progress in the areas of student and staff desegregation. In these districts which have made some effort, representatives of the Office of Education will go to the individual school district involved and try to bring about voluntary compliance before getting into the hearing procedure.

I hope that there is no misunderstanding of our position. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Office of Education as one of its constituent agencies, are going to adhere to the procedures and policies established in the law. My staff and I regard these matters as our legal responsibility, and we have the full support of Secretary John Gardner in this view. He approves of the requirements we have set forth in the guidelines and of the activities we have devised to enforce them.

We are seeking always to be fair and just, but we are determined also to face up to the issues squarely and to take whatever action the situation calls for. We deeply regret the occasional necessity of curtailing the opportunities of young people by denying Federal funds to school districts which refuse to comply. The over-riding principle, however, is that Federal funds must not be used to support discriminatory practices. In most States there is local effort to cooperate with us in carrying out this policy. I am sure that there is some in Alabama, and I look forward to working with it.

THE HEAT IN OUR KITCHEN [4]

In their letter describing this conference, Mr. Young and Dr. Fischer outlined two topics for discussion: first, the prospects of obtaining public support for integrated, quality education; second, the feasibility of integrated, quality education.

That agenda has a fine ring to it. The word "feasibility" has five syllables, thus assuring everyone that this will be an intellectual affair, carried out on a high plane by gentlemen wearing shirts, ties, suitcoats, and perhaps Phi Beta Kappa keys. I was pleased to receive an invitation to join your company, and sat down soon after receiving it to compose some gentlemanly, five-syllable thoughts.

And then James Meredith was shot down on a road in Mississippi. Paradoxically, I heard of this event just a few minutes after I left a meeting with Secretary John Gardner, Roy Wilkins of the NAACP, and a number of civil rights leaders accompanying Mr. Wilkins. We were discussing our progress in school and hospital desegregation. And I started to wonder whether civil rights was any place for a gentlemanly discussion. I am beginning to suspect that it is not; in any case I have the feeling that those of us who think of ourselves as gentlemen should either stop pretending that we care about racial equality, or we should step down from our air-conditioned podiums and start something definite in the way of a program. Considering the authority that we gentlemanly education officials have at our command to correct racial injustice in our schools, I feel that we have accomplished very little so far.

We have, to be sure, gotten a fair amount of newspaper space and published enough committee reports on the inequalities of segregated education to build a paper Tower of Babel. Nothing is safer these days than denouncing bigotry. But I find myself puzzling over which is worse, honest bigotry or well-intentioned timidity.

While we have gone on urging moderation, sweet reason, and bigger and better panel discussions, the schools throughout the Nation remain almost as segregated today as they were in 1954, when the Supreme Court decided that racially segregated education was illegal. The small progress that the South has made toward desegregation has been offset by increasing *de facto* segregation in the cities of the North. Since 1954, an entire sub-generation of Negro and white youngsters who started first grade in that year has now graduated from high school—most without any classroom experience with the other race. The facts today are that a Negro youngster in an American elementary school has on the national average not much more than 15 percent of his classmates from the majority white groups; in the Southern States the figure is nearer to 5 percent; white high school students can expect to have nine out of ten of their classmates from their own white group. The picture does not inspire calm satisfaction.

Moderation has a great deal to be said for it, of course, especially by the moderates. I am reminded of the prayer that St. Augustine addressed to heaven when he was a young man "Oh Lord," he said, "make me chaste. But not yet."

Our words have urged the Nation to desegregate its schools. But our reluctance to act has said even louder, "not yet." Somehow we seem to have been lulled into a blind faith in gradualism, a mindless confidence that some morning, some year, a suddenly transformed electorate will spontaneously and joyously decide that this is the day to integrate America.

Well, it is not going to happen. For a variety of reasons—one or two of them arguable, the rest pure rationalization—the majority of American whites display no likelihood of becoming enthusiastic about school desegregation and the changes it demands in the immediate future. The law of this land nevertheless beckons every one of us, calling on us to recognize that desegregating the schools is our legal responsibility, that it will not be easy work, and that it is futile to expect the years to erode those passions that today make the processes of desegregation unpopular. Gradualism—no matter what we call it—has failed, and I think it is fair to say that those who continue to espouse it are fooling themselves and in many ways, failing our Nation.

It seems to me time for school officials to form a third front for racial equality in the United States.

At one end of the civil rights movement today we have the gradualists, both white and Negro, a polite and sometimes sluggish team, deeply respectful of the public and sometimes given to assuring each other that it is possible to make an omelette without breaking eggs. At the other end are the activists, both the non-violent demonstrators and those weary and desperate Americans who have come to feel that violence is the only way to get anything done.

The failure of the gradualists would seem at bottom to be fear—fear of rocking a boat which, no matter how leaky, appears at least to be floating somewhere. The failure of the activists is that while they know in general terms what they want to achieve and are willing to pay a heavy price to obtain it, they have neither the position in society nor the professional's knowledge of the means and importance of advancing racial equality within the framework of law.

School officials have both position and knowledge. Those of us professionally engaged in education are charged with setting educational policy within our respective jurisdictions, and we are familiar with a variety of methods that can be used to advance school desegregation. What we have often lacked is a productive commitment.

I say productive because, for all our recognition of the importance of school desegregation to our society, the fact remains that we have not achieved much of it. I say commitment because achieving desegregation does not require fury or breastbeating; it does require something much more important: the recognition that school desegregation must be accomplished, and the determination to do it.

Our task obviously requires an activity more sophisticated than the gritting of our corporate teeth. School officials occupy a curious position somewhere between that of the educational leader and the political leader. But it is apparent that for many administrators a necessary sensitivity to public opinion has tended so to dilute their sense of responsibility for educational leadership that they have exercised it only after the public parade has already decided which way it wants to go.

This may sound to many educators as an unfair and overdrawn indictment. The record clearly shows that school officials today are making remarkable strides toward improving American education. They are coming up with new ideas and accepting the risk inherent in all experimentation.

But to win public support for such advances as team teaching, modern curriculum, language laboratories, ungraded classrooms, closed-circuit television, and computerized instruction is not enough. We must at the same time desegregate the schools. To do otherwise is to accept the shadow of educational leadership in place of its substance. School desegregation is the single point on which we who call ourselves educational leaders prove that we really are so—or demonstrate that we are merely trying to keep things quiet until we receive our gold watches for a lifetime devoted to the status quo.

The fact is that no matter how hard we try, we will not be able to keep things quiet. A revolution is brewing under our feet, and it is largely up to the schools to determine whether the energies of that revolution can be converted into a new and vigorous source of American progress, or whether their explosion will rip this Nation into two societies. We simply cannot wait until dramatic action becomes safe, for at this point it is much less dangerous to make a mistake than to do nothing.

Feeding that revolution is a major shift in American folkways. Today approximately two of every three adult Negroes living in the North were born and raised in the South. This move has necessarily had a major impact—often a bewildering impact—on the individual. In some ways the life he left in the South was less segregated than it is in the North. The Negro child born in the South was, to be sure, raised on the notion that he would always occupy a subservient position, but it was nevertheless a subservient position within a white society.

The young Northern Negro of today's city lives in a black society. He has few points of contact with whites, and those few—when you reflect on them—are revealing. He is likely to encounter a white teacher, a white policeman, and a white merchant. He can pass his entire adolescence without having to deal with the white world outside the ghetto, and his ideas of that world are based on three types: the teacher, often a symbol of boredom and irrelevance; the policeman, a symbol of authority, if not of repression; and the merchant, often a symbol of white cunning.

And so the young Negro setting forth from the ghetto to confront this white world expects it is going to misunderstand him and oppress him, and too often he finds evidence to justify his fears. It is no wonder that, if he has any spunk and imagination, he rejects the fatalism of his father and decides that it is the part of a man to change this sorry mess he inherited. And if it takes violence to change it—well, that's what it takes.

It is this young Negro who must be convinced that the United States is his home, not his prison, and that it is a country worth fighting for, not a cage to be fought out of. It may already be too late to change his mind. But it is not too late to provide his younger brothers and sisters with a healthier belief nor too late to protect white children from the destructive stereotypes that most white adults inherited from their own segregated education.

What tools have we to demolish the wall which separates our youngest citizens? How can we prevent them from fearing each other before they have even met?

You are as familiar as I with some of the ideas that have been proposed to desegregate the schools: pairing plans that provide faculty and student exchanges between predominantly white and Negro schools; bussing to alter the racial compositions of schools in different parts of a community; educational parks that might have as many as 20,000 students drawn from every racial, economic, and geographic sector of a city; supplementary centers for the special enrichment of education which bring together young people from different sides of the tracks for a common denominator of learning.

In addition, there are a number of federally sponsored programs that offer significant help. Under title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, for example, the U.S. Office of Education provides financial assistance to school personnel and authorities to deal with the special problems resulting from desegregation.

---

[4] Before the School Administrators' Conference sponsored by the National Urban League and Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, June 18, 1966.

Grants are given to school boards for training teachers and other school personnel, and for the employment of specialists. Training institutes are supported to improve the ability of teachers, supervisors, counselors and other school personnel to handle desegregation problems.

Since the beginning of the title IV program of January of 1965, applications have been received for funds totaling more than $35,000,000 against available funds amounting to $12,275,000. The Office of Education has been able to support 59 grants amounting to $4,900,000. We have supported 115 institutes in the amount of $6,500,000. More than 7,500 teachers, supervisors, counselors, and principals have benefited from the institute training alone.

Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 also authorizes Federal aid to school districts to help them plan and carry out new ideas for school desegregation. President Johnson added a special $5 million fund for this purpose in his message on education this year.

Title I of that same Act has the overall effect of erasing the harmful educational results of school segregation, because its entire $959 million is aimed at benefiting those children who have suffered most because of the poverty that usually accompanies racial inequities. These are the estimated 5½ million children from families whose annual income is less than $2,000 a year. Here, too, after-school and summer school projects are providing the opportunity to integrate staff and students in ways that aren't possible in the regular school program.

Each of these Acts, together with the 70-odd other programs administered by the U.S. Office of Education, has been given a special thrust by the Civil Rights Act of 1965. Title VI of that act, as you know, prohibits Federal aid to any program of activity that discriminates among its recipients on the basis of race, color, or national origin.

Thus the Civil Rights Act makes of every Federal program, whether it be for education, urban development, or water pollution control, a powerful financial tool in the drive against racial inequity. The rationale behind this Act is simple: no desegregation, no Federal money.

But though the rationale may be simple, its operation is both frustrating and complex. The Nation sees that frustration in the Office of Education's attempts to secure compliance with our school desegregation guidelines in the South. We in the Office see this frustration in an even more acute form in our attempts to define what constitutes racial discrimination in the cities of the North and West, where segregation depends less on stated community policy than upon patterns of residence.

To say this is by no means to say that the Office of Education is caving in on *de facto* segregation—on segregation Northern style. It is to say that the issues are complicated and subtle, that establishing a clear-cut legal basis on which to take action—and be confident of withstanding any challenge—has required far more investigation and study than we would have preferred. We are not satisfied with our pace. But that dissatisfaction adds up not to retreat but to determination to redouble our enforcement efforts where they are pertinent.

The broad position we must all assume on this matter comprises two parallel and equally important policies. One cannot work without the other. The first is to make the schools of the central city such good schools that they attract people rather than repel them. The second is to use every possible device to include within each school a cross section of the social and economic backgrounds of the metropolis. A student should meet America in his school—not a segregated segment of it. The concept of racial balance may be impractical except as an ideal in a city with more Negroes than whites and a continuing white exodus. But keeping our eyes on that ideal can help us to do practical things now to slow the exodus and provide equal educational opportunity.

Some very practical things are now underway at the instigation of State and local officials acting on their own to make equal educational opportunity a reality . . . sometimes in the face of community opposition, but sometimes hand-in-hand with community determination to eradicate a century-old injustice.

The Denver school board, for example, has authorized double sessions at one of its high schools in order to cut class size and reduce pupil-teacher ratios to a point where teachers can use new instructional techniques to best advantage. A special pilot program of compensatory education was provided for and the administrative staff was instructed to draft plans to bus enough Negro student-volunteers to other schools to achieve better racial balance at a school that was in danger of becoming all-Negro.

Summer programs in Little Rock are fully integrated as to staff and students and are being conducted in formerly all white schools. Portland's (Oregon) program of saturation services for inner city schools aims at producing an education program so good that it will reverse the flight of middle-class whites from racially balanced schools in fringe areas.

The St. Paul school system is considering a plan to combine a rapid-transit system with a cluster of four or five 300-acre educational parks that would bring youngsters from the ghetto, from other city schools, and from parochial and suburban schools into central locations for classes ranging from nursery school through junior college. Other cities looking seriously at the possibility of similar educational parks include East Orange, New Jersey; Philadelphia; Pittsburgh; and New York City.

In describing the St. Paul plan, School Superintendent Donald Dunnan admitted that the educational park may not be the entire answer to school desegregation. "But," he said, "it is the kind of step that's needed. Everybody has been saying, 'Let's do something.' We are."

And that is the point—to do something.

But let us agree on this: that in terms of the magnitude of the task, none of these approaches—not the special arrangements made by the schools nor the programs sponsored by the Federal Government—is a perfect instrument for doing the job they are supposed to complete. Yet that is precisely why educators who know both the uses and the limitations of these ideas must act on them, for we must supply in courage and in action what our plans lack in ingenuity. There is no such thing as the perfect way to achieve school desegregation. There is no magic key that will unlock all the doors that private prejudice and public pressure have placed in the way of equal opportunity in education. We must simply bore ahead with the tools we have, and it won't be pleasant, and it won't be quiet, and it would be much nicer if someone else would share the work.

But the job is there to do, and if any of us entered education with the idea that it would be a soft touch, this is as good a time as any to concede that we made a big mistake. There is a lot of conversation about local control of the schools; if we really believe in it—and I assure you that I am in that number—we must make it work. We must guide the schools to a continuing freedom while at the same time responding appropriately to calls for national action. Local school districts must not sit on their hands and then bellow about having the reins of educational policy yanked from their fingers.

We are in the midst of a struggle for excellent education for every American youngster, and we must use every likely tool we can devise. Local school administrators must consider such means as redrawing school district boundaries, and consolidating with neighboring districts for educational purposes, even though political boundaries may remain unchanged. We cannot wait for mayors and city councils to do the work they hired *us* to do. And sometimes we must do work they don't *want* us to do.

There is no point in waiting for real estate salesmen to get the message from on high and ease our job by selling homes to anyone who wants them. There is no point in our waiting for American corporations to start hiring Negro men as readily as they do light-skinned, well-dressed Negro women. Neither American home salesmen nor American personnel managers have ever insisted that they have a major responsibility for building American democracy. They have never pretended to do anything but their jobs.

American schoolmen, however, have quite properly taken a large share of the credit for establishing national unity and freedom of opportunity. Our predecessors in the classroom helped 20 million European immigrants become American, and we haven't stopped bragging about it yet. It we are to retain that pride in our tradition, I think we must recognize that the great achievements of the past are not only a legacy, but also a heavy burden. If we want to wear the laurels, we must also carry the load.

The load we must carry is that of irritating a fair percentage of our white constituents—of embarrassing some governors and mayors, of alarming some newspaper publishers, and of enraging suburban taxpayers who in proportion to their means are not paying as much for their good schools as paupers in the cities are paying for their bad ones.

And all this means that, finally and most grievously, we must run the risk of being invited to resign. Unless all of us are willing to put our jobs and our integrity on the line, we should admit that American educators are no longer prepared to be the prime movers in American education.

American education today is perhaps the hottest room in our national house. But we picked it out all by ourselves. To paraphrase a metaphor first wrought by President Truman, I would say that we must either adjust ourselves to the heat or let somebody else take over the kitchen.

[From the Williamson Daily News, Sept. 29, 1966]

Will U.S. Rewrite Textbooks?

Under Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, $100 million was authorized for school textbooks and other instructional material for fiscal 1966 and there was 100 per cent participation by the States in this program.

From this it can be seen how closely we may be coming to Federal control over the textbooks used in the nation's public schools. With the States beginning to place more and more reliance on Federal funds to help in meeting their educational budgets, the time is approaching when they will be reluctant to go against the dictates of Federal bureaucrats.

U.S. Commissioner of Education Harold Howe, II., recently said that there was an "overwhelming need" of Negro children for instructional materials "to which they can relate." And members of the House Education sub-committee on de facto segregation have made it plain that they wanted Mr. Howe's office to possess the power to impose such instructional materials on schools throughout the nation. It has been apparent in recent hearings that House liberals are interested in using the vast power of the Federal purse to compel a rewrite of textbooks.

While the education act forbids the commissioner from interfering in textbook choice, Mr. Howe has indicated that he believes his power to withhold funds might yet be used to affect this "very tender issue." Recently he warmly described the individual grants his office is awarding to approved authors and researchers who will produce books expounding the approved line on the American Negro.

The issue here is not one of doing right by Negroes in reading and history books but the matter of allowing Government to dictate what shall be taught our children. Once we allow the Federal bureaucrats to tinker with the texbooks in the schools and the materials in our public library on one aspect of life in America, we can expect more of the same on any number of topics including political philosophy. Someday we could find our children being fed pure political propaganda rather than true knowledge. We had better speak out on this now before it is too late because nothing tends to minimize local control and initiative as does Washington's fat purse.

[From the Evening Star, Oct. 3, 1966]

HAYS ASKS HOWE TO QUIT, RAPS HIS GUIDES STAND

(By Robert K. Walsh)

A northern Democrat demanded in the House today that Commissioner of Education Harold Howe resign because of his stand on school desegregation guidelines.

The Democrat, Rep. WAYNE L. HAYS of Ohio, warned that Howe will destroy the public school system in the United States by such policies as withholding federal funds from districts which fail to desegregate.

"Another member of the House recently called Commissioner Howe an idiot," HAYS said. "I would not call him that. Howe knows exactly what he is doing. He is out to destroy the school system in the United States. This country would be far better off if he resigned."

As soon as HAYS finished talking, EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, announced that he soon will appoint a special subcommittee to determine whether the controversial guidelines are contrary to the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

Critics of Howe have contended that the withholding of federal funds from the school districts which fail to desegregate violates the 1964 law.

CELLER said he would ask the House for $50,000 to finance the investigation.

He promised that the subcommittee would act in a "fair and judicial manner and in the dry light of reason."

He said there would be no emotion or prejudice, and no criticism without clear proof.

While CELLER was speaking, Representative L. MENDEL RIVER, Democrat, of South Carolina, arose as if to comment but did not do so. RIVERS was the congressman who last week bitterly attacked Howe as "an idiot."

Howe is slated to testify for a second time tomorrow before the Rules Committee.

[From the Evening Star, Oct. 5, 1966]

U.S. STEPS TO CONTROL SCHOOLS SEEN

(By David Lawrence)

The U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has just taken the first steps which can lead to complete control in Washington of the entire enducational system of states, cities and counties throughout the country.

Harold Howe II, commissioner of education in the department, is quoted by Rep. FINO of New York as having said:

"If I have my way, schools will be built for the primary purpose of economic and social integration."

Whether the local governments like it or not, they will find themselves required to correct "racial imbalance" or lose federal funds. The authority to distribute money is being taken to mean that, if the local communities do not conform to "guidelines" prescribed by the Office of Education, grants can be withheld or "deferred."

Comments have been made by the U.S. Office of Education denying that any such interpretation is intended. But members of the House Rules Committee, which has been holding hearings for three days, are convinced that Howe has given abundant proof of his purposes in his recital of what has been going on between local communities and the federal government with respect to deferment of federal funds.

In the official transcript of the testimony of Commissioner Howe, he concedes that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 forbids the federal government to require correction of "racial imbalance" in the schools. But he seeks to justify what is being done to achieve the same objective by arguing that the localities have the responsibility and that the mere withholding of funds by the federal government is a discretionary power.

Howe says that his agency is trying to bring about "free choice" by the pupils and that, when they choose a school, they should be assisted by busing or any other means to get into the school they select.

When asked particularly about busing, Commissioner Howe said:

"There are some school boards in Northern communities, Northern school districts, which have decided on their own that they believe this is a useful device to work on the problem of school segregation as it exists in their areas and some of them have decided that they would like to experiment with the busing programs, but I would emphasize that this is entirely a matter of local decision and nothing that is enforced by us and nothing that we have the authority to enforce.

"The chairman: But there are complaints that you will reward them for doing that by giving them extra money for some extra programs, to teach them how to assimilate the segregation principle. Now, is that true? . . . So that you are doing it in an indirect way with federal money?

"Mr. Howe: It is true that there are some complaints and it is also true that local school districts have decided to use some of the federal funds available to them for this purpose. . . .

"I say local school districts—not we—may, if they wish, at their local option, use funds that come from sources that are not subject to this interdiction of the Civil Rights Act to promote projects in which they are interested in this area of busing children."

Members of the House committee said afterwards that they are convinced that the commissioner of education is willing to approve programs of busing through the use of federal funds from other sources, and that this is how the Civil Rights Act, which specifically prohibits such steps to correct "racial imbalance," is circumvented.

The chairman of the House committee found another example of the same approach in the "guideline" demand that teachers and other school employees be integrated. He pointed out that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 specifically states that it does not authorize any action "with respect to any employment practice of any employer," and asked the commissioner to justify his course. Howe denied that assignment is "a condition of employment," and said that it is proper "to require school districts to make assignments without regard to race."

The country as a whole is not informed about the significance of the whole question, for it means that the national government, by the use of federal funds, can control almost any action of the local governments and threaten the withholding or deferment of such funds until there is "compliance" with the wishes of a department in Washington.

This is an issue which, if submitted in comprehensive form to the electorate at the coming elections with the demand that each candidate for Congress state his or her position on it, would have a considerable bearing on the outcome of the elections to both the House of Representatives and the Senate.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 12, 1966]

INTEGRATION MISFIRE—WHITE PUPILS DESERT VOLUNTARILY PAIRED BROOKLYN SCHOOL

(By Felix Kessler)

NEW YORK—When the semester started, the lawyer's daughter no longer was enrolled at Brooklyn's Public School 8; this term, she's going to a private school.

The transfer of itself is not particularly startling. White middle-class parents have been steadily deserting New York City as a place to live, and its public schools as the institutions for educating their children, since the end of World War II. In 1965, for instance, 25,000 fewer white pupils attended public schools here than in the previous year.

The fact, however, that P.S. 8 contributed to this decline by losing 100 white pupils is significant. For the school is supposed to be an example, a demonstration of how to provide an integrated and high-quality education for Negro, Puerto Rican and white children.

The experiment apparently is failing. Increasing numbers of white parents, like the lawyer, have removed their children from the school, thereby unbalancing its desired racial character. What makes this a painful fact for many parents in the community to face is that they were the original advocates of this project in integration.

In the spring of 1964, at a time other white parents in New York were fiercely resisting various integration schemes proposed by the Board of Education, the fashionable, largely white community of Brooklyn Heights furnished what seemed a refreshing contrast. By a 2–1 margin, the Heights parents association urged the Board of Education to "pair" their then predominantly white neighborhood school, P.S. 8, with nearby P.S. 7, where enrollment, 95% Negro and Puerto Rican, was drawn from children living in the Farragut Houses low-income public development. Everyone concerned admitted that the Farragut youngsters' cultural and physical environment differed markedly from that of children living in the Heights, where most of the parents are sophisticated, well-educated (and well-to-do) professional people. Nevertheless, both neighborhoods shared a community of spirit, a desire to see integration succeed.

There were also some physical advantages to the plan. The schools were only three-tenths of a mile apart, a short bus ride or none-too-taxing walk. Although both buildings were old, P.S. 7 was older and more in need of repair, and the city improved the physical plant. In addition, $150,000 was spent in supplying more library books, remedial classes and other teaching services to the combined schools. To ease the pairing, kindergarten children attended their neighborhood school while the first through fourth grades were taught at P.S. 8 and the fifth and sixth grades at P.S. 7. The combined school was administered by one principal and for all practical purposes was considered a single school.

When the consolidated school opened in the fall of 1964, its 923-student enrollment included 358 white children, only a handful fewer than attended in the previous, unpaired year. By 1965, the white enrollment had dropped to 251. The school census for 1966 has not been completed yet, but there is every indication that there are still fewer white children now at P.S. 7–8.

Why? Many reasons are offered, some conflicting, but one refrain is repeated: The quality of education deteriorated.

The lawyer, formerly an articulate pro-pairing spokesman, acknowledges that "any real enthusiasts who felt that pairing would be the solution to all problems had to be disappointed. Maybe our expectations were unreasonably high, our optimism unwarranted in thinking the board would be able to carry out its promises."

He doesn't hold the pairing to blame but the Board of Education, which he feels took insufficient measures to improve or maintain the high caliber of education at P.S. 8 under the strain of administering a new school with twice as many students—a sizable portion of whom obviously had educational deficiencies.

Robert Rubin, an investment banker, says that the school's educational level began eroding "not because the new children were Negroes, but because a lot more children who required educational assistance were in the school, and they happened to be Negro." Mr. Rubin believes that the school authorities made no preparations for this problem, nor did they cope with it when it arose. However, when the quality of education declines, "at some point you finally decide you aren't going to make your children suffer for your hopes or ideals of what's right," he adds.

AN ADVOCATE TRANSFERS SON

Perhaps no parent in the community was as closely identified with the cause of integration-through-pairing as the Rev. Donald McKinney, a Unitarian minister. He still isn't willing to say that the pairing has failed, or even that it isn't succeeding. But this term he transferred his son to a private school. Mr. McKinney says that pairing has provided a good experience for his son "in terms of getting to know other people" but adds that the boy's educational progress "isn't what it should be."

Mr. McKinney assigns considerable blame to the board's traditional methods of instruction. The long-standing practice, which the board employed at P.S. 7–8, is to arrange class sections by "homogeneous" groups determined primarily by reading ability. Predictably, because of their cultural and educational backgrounds, the top classes with the brighter children were predominantly white while the bottom classes with slower pupils were composed mostly of minority group youngsters. So it was that, though the schools were nominally integrated, many classes were in effect segregated. Mr. McKinney's son, who has a reading problem, was placed in a class which was 90% Negro and his "achievement level has not been good," says the minister.

Mr. McKinney, like other parents, emphasizes that his unhappiness doesn't stem from the fact his child became a minority group member in a predominantly Negro class. Rather, he is disenchanted because the teaching of the "slow" class was decidedly inferior to that of the "bright" section. "Pairing could have been an exciting thing, but for a new situation they should have employed new teaching methods," says Mr. McKinney. "You don't bring about integration by just placing two schools together."

If parents in Brooklyn Heights showed a remarkable readiness to accept pairing initially, they have now exhibited an equally quick turn-about in transferring their children to private schools. The school to which many of the former pairing proponents are sending children is a new school established by St. Ann's Protestant Episcopal Church.

PRIVATE SCHOOL'S WAITING LIST

Stanley Bosworth, headmaster there, points out that many of these parents at first were hostile to the idea of private education. "You can be for pairing as an abstraction," he adds, "but if your child isn't receiving the intellectual nourishment needed, if he's receiving a bad education, if he's losing interest, if there's no challenge and his reading is not progressing—as parents you can't go through with it." St. Ann's, where modern teaching programs are used, had an enrollment of 60 pupils when it opened last year. This term there are 143 pupils and a waiting list of "over 100," according to Mr. Bosworth.

Not all critics of the paired school have removed their children. Mrs. Joan Fenichel, president of the P.S. 8 parents association when the pairing was approved, says the Board of Education "failed miserably" in implementing the integration. "There was no special preparation, the principal was appointed at the last minute and the teachers were not specially trained or selected for the program," she says. Mrs. Fenichel believes the school authorities failed to realize that more than "just a matter of racial mixing" was involved. She observes that the communities also had completely different social, economic and cultural climates. "Pairing would have been just as difficult if the children from P.S. 7 all came from families of Italian dock workers," she says. Though Mrs. Fenichel is disappointed, her daughter has continued in the school in a class for bright pupils.

To be sure, not all white parents are critical. Mrs. Rhoda Howard finds improvement in the fact her daughter's classes were reduced from 38 to 26 pupils. "Some parents were indifferent to P.S. 8 until integration began," she says. "It was never an outstanding school, as some claimed. The quality did not deteriorate, although it did not improve as we had hoped it would."

Malcolm Chesney, who says he was never a pairing enthusiast, believes his son's experiences up to the third grade have been satisfactory. "It's always tough to measure achievement, but he's stayed interested, made friends and learned to read," says Mr. Chesney. He hopes the pairing succeeds, because he holds public education "essential if we're ever going to work out a world in which people will continue to live together."

Yet there is, on balance, a sad feeling in Brooklyn Heights that pairing is not succeeding. Numerically, certainly, fewer white children are taking part in the integration experiment than when it began. The Board of Education, which reacted to anti-pairing pressure by reducing its plans from 22 such programs to 4, lately hasn't discussed any broadening of the experiment. "If pairing won't work in Brooklyn Heights," says one education expert, "it won't work anywhere."

[From the Wheeling News-Register, Oct. 13, 1966]

The Takeover of Our Schools

U.S. Commissioner of Education Harold Howe II has come under fire from Congress in recent days and well he should considering the manner by which he has sought to trample on the traditional constitutional doctrine of separation of executive, legislative and judicial powers.

The executive branch—through the Office of Education—has been moving to effect a federally controlled system of education by the misuse of the federal purse power. The bureau's now famous "guidelines" for school desegregation have stripped local control away from the schools under threat of being cut off from federal funds for education.

It is clear that federal educational officials see the schools less at instruments of education but more as the readiest means of achieving the social and political goals of a small minority. This is the whole thrust of the so-called "guidelines" which have become hard and fast rules with the Office of Education.

What is most disturbing is the fact that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 gives no such power to the U.S. Commissioner of Education. The law merely tells what states and local agencies must not do if they wished to receive federal financial assistance. Nowhere does the law give a detailed list of things they must do. Thus if a school practiced no discrimination and could prove it, they would be eligible to participate in federal programs.

In title IV of the Civil Rights Act there is contained a definition of the term "desegregation." It states:

> "The assignment of students to public schools and within such schools without regard to their race, religion, or national origin, but 'desegregation' shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance."

There is no authorization in the Civil Rights Law for a federal program aimed at achieving school racial balance but this is the very aim and purpose of the Office of Education's guidelines. What we are seeing is the executive branch writing legislation and in some instances following through with quasi-judicial functions with respect to the legislation of questionable legality which they have written. Here are men who hold their posts by appointment seizing power tantamount to enacting legislation and in no way are they answerable to the voters of this country.

The educational system in many parts of the country have been in constant turmoil ever since Mr. Howe's rules and regulations were first promulgated. These so-called powers extend to the closing of small schools, the redrawing of attendance zones, the routing of buses, and even to the offering of athletic programs. It is understood then why schoolmen have been torn from their real work—education—to fly to Washington to confer with the Office of Education in an attempt to find a solution to the problems which cut them off from federal assistance.

Congress had better take a firm hand in getting this situation corrected soon or we shall have lost our schools to the federal bureaucrats.

RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

At 4 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m., the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. Morse in the chair).

KENNEDY ROUND—AGRICULTURAL NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think it appropriate to have the Record show, before we adjourn sine die, certain contacts, with which the distinguished occupant of the chair [Mr. Morse] is fully familiar, because he arranged for the first of them; namely, when Members of the Senate from fruit and vegetable States met with members of the U.S. National Fruit Export Council. That meeting was held in the Senate Restaurant several weeks ago.

Shortly after that, a letter was sent forward, signed by a number of Senators, including the distinguished occupant of the chair [Mr. Morse], as will appaer from a copy of the letter, addressed to the President, relative to the concern of the fruit and vegetable industry of this Nation as to the negotiations going on with reference to the possible reduction of tariffs for U.S. agricultural products.

First I ask unanimous consent that that letter of October 3, signed by a number of Senators, be printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Appropriations,
October 3, 1966.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: We are writing you to express our concern about the current status of the GATT negotiations as they relate to U.S. agriculture. We are especially concerned by reports in the European press that the EEC is attempting to incorporate support levels, reference prices, and compensatory levies for agricultural products into the GATT tariff structure. These measures are restrictive of trade; they are protectionist in essence, not trade liberalization.

The U.S. National Fruit Export Council has forcefully called this situation to our attention in the attached statement of the Council's position. Also attached are data compiled by the Foreign Agricultural Service (1960–1965) showing the importance to the United States of fruit and vegetable exports to the EEC countries totalling about $91 Million in 1965. The export market is an integral and essential part of the industry's market. All sales of such products currently are for dollars, thereby contributing materially to the U.S. balance of payment position.

We have been gratified by the repeated assurances from your Office and from Governor Herter during the course of these negotiations that the United States would not enter into any agreement which does not provide satisfactory conditions of access for U.S. farm products to these traditional markets. However, we are frankly concerned over reports that "overriding political considerations" may be put forward as justification for entering into an agreement which would damage the legitimate economic interests of the United States.

We believe the proposals of the EEC are in direct conflict with the philosophy of the Trade Expansion Act, and particularly section 252, wherein our opposition to "nontariff trade restrictions", "variable import fees" and other "unjustifiable foreign import restrictions" is clearly stated. The EEC proposals represent "policies unjustifiably restricting United States commerce".

We urge that the United States remain steadfast in its adherence to the publicly announced policy that we must achieve reciprocity in these negotiations which must include access for United States agricultural products to foreign markets on an equitable basis as stated in section 252 (a)(3) of the Act.

The purpose and principle of the Trade Expansion Act must not be sacrificed to achieve an unmeaningful agreement which will not ". . . maintain and enlarge foreign markets for the products of United States agriculture, industry, mining and commerce.

With kind regards, we remain

Yours truly,

George D. Aiken, Wayne Morse, Thomas H. Kuchel, Jennings Randolph, Milton R. Young, George Smathers, Spessard L. Holland, George Murphy, Warren G. Magnuson, Leverett Saltonstall, Daniel K. Inouye, Maurine B. Neuberger, Robert C. Byrd.

Mr. HOLLAND. Before leaving that letter, Mr. President, I should like to state that the distinguished Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], who was not here at the time we sent over that letter, as he was attending the Interparliamentary Union Conference in Tehran, Iran, as a U.S. delegate, immediately upon his return to the city sent to the White House a letter and asked that his name be joined with those who had signed the letter of October 3. I wish to make it clear that he is one of the copetitioners to the letter that went forward to the President.

Mr. President, certain attachments also went forward with the letter to the President. Among them was a summary on fruits and vegetables, showing their value as exports to EEC countries, annually, for the years 1960 to 1965. I ask unanimous consent that that table be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Summary—Fruits and vegetables: Value of U.S. exports to EEC, annually, 1960–65

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Commodity group	Value of U.S. exports to EEC						EEC as a percentage of total value of U.S exports					
	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965
Fresh fruits	$12,388	$20,667	$16,376	$22,357	$18,755	$23,877	12	18	15	20	15	17
Canned fruits	17,386	19,753	31,605	26,142	29,348	35,916	31	32	40	38	42	47
Dried fruits	9,967	7,940	8,590	8,607	8,580	11,976	23	19	18	20	20	23
Frozen fruits	5	77	428	227	136	891	----------	4	19	9	7	32
Fruit juices	5,874	7,424	8,914	6,584	3,675	4,446	14	16	21	16	11	13
Tree nuts	5,123	563	2,949	4,053	2,911	4,082	34	8	23	23	16	16
Fresh vegetables	13	359	1,171	2,519	159	488	----------	1	2	5	----------	1
Canned vegetables	6,247	6,399	10,008	11,392	9,924	8,164	22	25	35	34	29	24
Frozen vegetables	32	25	71	122	40	203	1	----------	2	2	1	6
Dehydrated vegetables	515	607	1,484	1,535	1,434	932	11	13	23	21	21	18
Total	57,550	63,814	81,596	83,538	74,962	90,975	17	18	21	22	20	21

Mr. HOLLAND. The next attachment that went forward with the letter to the President is a well-written and very able statement showing the position of the U.S. National Fruit Export Council—that being the group with which the Senators had met, and upon whose request our letter went forward to the President. I ask unanimous consent that that statement of the position of the U.S. National Fruit Export Council be printed in the Record at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of Position by U.S. National Fruit Export Council

The U.S. National Fruit Export Council, representing non price-supported perennial fruit crops and their products, has from its inception supported the principle of reciprocal trade agreement negotiations and specifically the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. Since the passage of that Act we have supported the U.S. hopes and efforts for achieving meaningful trade negotiations with balanced and reciprocal concessions.

The U.S. position in the initial stages of preparing for negotiations under the Trade Expansion Act was that it "would not take part" in the exchange of exceptions lists for nonagricultural products unless there had first been some agreement on how agricultural products were to be handled.

In November, 1964, the U.S. policy position was modified when the U.S. agreed to table offers on industrial products separately from agricultural products.

That action was followed by a modified policy statement that the United States would not "conclude" any agreement that did not provide for acceptable conditions of access for U.S. agricultural exports into foreign markets.

In 1964 the United States had advised the EEC that its proposal to negotiate support levels was not acceptable. That proposal was the essential element of the EEC's reference price and compensatory levy system of agricultural protectionism.

It is now clear from published reports from Europe that the EEC agricultural offers do not provide a basis for meaningful negotiations for trade liberalization. In fact, they embody and perpetuate the restrictions on agricultural imports which the United States had already rejected as a basis for negotiations.

Governor Herter has stated (before the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, on August 10, 1966):

"In regard to agriculture the United States has made it clear that its offers have been put forward in the expectation that the other major participants will make comparable concessions, and has warned that if this proves not to be the case these offers will be withdrawn or modified to the extent it deems necessary. It has also warned that both its agricultural and industrial offers will be withdrawn to the extent required to achieve reciprocity in the over-all negotiations."

The statement from Governor Herter's Office recognizes that reductions in U.S. industrial tariffs are the purchase price with which the U.S. will buy improved condtions of access for U.S. agricultural exports. This has been the U.S. position since the start of the Kennedy Round, and its soundness is based on the importance of U.S. agricultural exports to the domestic economic well-being of the U.S. and the contribution of argicultural exports to the U.S. balance of payments. It would be unthinkable for the U.S. to lower its tariffs on industrial products from the EEC without achieving its objectives with respect to argicultural trade liberalization. To do so would preclude hopes for future improvement in conditions of access for U.S. agricultural exports or even for the maintenance of our present level of agricultural exports.

In line with previous U.S. Government policy statements, we insist that the EEC reference price and variable levey system, if implemented, is incompatible with trade liberalization.

Notwithstanding the steadfast support that the U.S. National Fruit Export Council has given the U.S. efforts at trade liberalization, we can come to no other conclusion but that no trade agreement at all is better than a bad trade agreement.

In view of the course of events which is outlined herein, it is the conclusion of the U.S. National Fruit Export Council that the United States should withdraw all offers, industrial and agricultural, on articles of interest to the EEC unless the EEC submits agricultural offers that represent trade liberalization, rather than protection.

Adopted by the U.S. National Fruit Export Council September 20, 1966, at its annual meeting in Washington, D.C.

Mr. HOLLAND. I next ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter which happens to be addressed to me, though I understand similar letters were sent to all the signers of the petition, signed by Gov. Christian A. Herter, Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, in reply to the letter which had reached him from this group of Senators.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations,
Executive Office of the President.
Washington, D.C., October 19, 1966.

Hon. Spessard L. Holland,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Holland: Your letter to the President of October 3, enclosing the statement of the U.S. National Fruit Export Council on the status of the agricultural negotiations in the Kennedy Round, has been referred to me.

Representatives of the U.S. National Fruit Export Council met with me on September 20, to discuss the Council's statement. Since that meeting this Office has received letters from a number of farm organizations proposing that the United States withdraw its Kennedy Round agricultural offers unless the EEC substantially improves its offers. On October 6, I issued a statement to the press setting forth our position in this matter, a copy of which is enclosed.

Please be assured that the position of this Office remains unchanged. We intend to do everything in our power to maximize the scope of trade liberalization achieved for all products, agricultural as well as industrial, in this round of trade negotiations. Any agreement must provide an overall balance that is acceptable to the United States.

Most sincerely,
Christian A. Herter,
Special Representative.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to make it clear that such a letter reached all Senators who signed the petition which was sent to the President.

Mr. President, to conclude my remarks on this subject, I think it might be well to have printed in the Record a news release by Governor Herter under date of October 6, 1966, and which was referred to in his letter to all Senators who signed the petition. I ask unanimous consent that that news release be printed in the Record at this point, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Inouye in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[Release from the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, Oct. 6, 1966]

KENNEDY ROUND AGRICULTURAL NEGOTIATIONS

Since the completion of the tabling of Kennedy Round agricultural offers in August and the resumption of agricultural negotiations in September, concern has been expressed, particularly by agricultural organizations, about the prospects for these negotiations.

Special Representative Christian A. Herter has made the following points in response to these expressions of concern:

The agricultural offers of the European Economic Community have been extensively reported in the newspapers as being extremely limited in scope, and even in some instances as raising the barriers to imports into the Community.

We are very disappointed in the initial offers of the Community and have said so in Geneva where the agricultural negotiations recently got under way. In the coming weeks, an intensive effort will be made to get the Community and our other negotiating partners to improve their agricultural offers.

Our own agricultural offers were put forward in the expectation that the others would make and implement offers of comparable scope and magnitude. We have made it very clear that if this proves not to be the case the U.S. offers will be modified or withdrawn to the extent necessary to achieve reciprocity. We have also made clear that the overall balance in the negotiations must be acceptable to the United States; in other words we must be satisfied that we receive as much as we give in the way of concessions. Again we have emphasized that both our industrial and agricultural offers will be modified or withdrawn to the extent necessary to achieve what we regard as balance.

The question of when we make withdrawals or adjustments in our present offers is one of tactics, and must be determined in the light of the negotiations. The decision as to the timing, therefore, must rest with this Office, which has responsibility for the negotiations. Our primary objective is, consistent with U.S. interests, to maximize the scope of trade liberalization achieved in this round of negotiations. To this end we shall in the coming weeks be concentrating our efforts on getting others to improve their offers.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I want the Record to show that while I was speaking, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], who was one of the signers of the petition, has relinquished the chair to another distinguished signer of the petition, the distinguished Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye], who now occupies the chair.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I left the chair because I wanted the Record to show my deep appreciation to the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] for the leadership he has taken time and time again, for the last several years, as he and others of us have pressed for fair treatment for the fruit industry of this country, in connection with the Kennedy Round of negotiations at Geneva. I am very happy that he has placed the material which he has in the Record, and I hope that eventually we will come to a final solution of this trade policy which will result in fair treatment to the agricultural industries of our country. I want the Record to show that no one could have done more for the legitimate interests of the fruit industry than has the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland].

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I wish to express my thanks for those gracious comments, and to make it clear that this has been a joint effort of all Senators representing States which produce large amounts of fruit, and that we have been happy to cooperate with the council representing the industries affected.

It seems to me that the fruit industries are further entitled to careful consideration in this matter because they represent groups which have not asked for Federal support. They receive no price supports. They get no other special benefits of any kind from the Nation. They do receive the benefits of research and other activities to which all agriculture is entitled, but they prefer an independent, go-it-alone policy. I respect and honor them for that, and I think they are thoroughly within their rights in asking that they be protected fully in any proposed reduction of tariffs. That was the thought of the entire group of Senators who joined in this petition.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to verify what the Senator from Florida has said, and to associate myself with his evaluation. The problem that has confronted us for years, let us face it, is that there has been too great a tendency on the part of our own agencies to sacrifice our agricultural industries in the Geneva conferences for the benefit of the general industrial side of our economy. I think the farmers are entitled to fair distribution of the benefits which would come under a fair trade policy, for which we have been fighting, and that they should not be the sacrificial goats, so to speak, in order to have tariff benefits go to American industry, but that there ought to be at least equality of treatment in this field.

That has been my position, and I shall continue to take that position.

Mr. President, I yield to the majority leader.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for adjournment heretofore entered be rescinded, and that the Senate, instead of convening at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, convene at 9 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AUTHORITY TO RECEIVE MESSAGES DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate from the close of business today until 9 o'clock a.m. tomorrow, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

CLASSIFICATION OF SENATORS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, recently a compilation entitled "The Classification of U.S. Senators" was prepared by the Senate Parliamentarian, Floyd M. Riddick. I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD excerpts from that compilation which will explain the actions taken by the First Congress to divide Senators into three classes, and actions taken to classify West Virginia Senators following the admittance of my State into the Union on June 19, 1863. I also ask unanimous consent to include two tables from the publication.

There being no objection, the excerpts and tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

CLASSIFICATION OF SENATORS

Article I, section 3, of the Constitution of the United States provides that—

"Immediately after they shall be assembled in Consequence of the first Election, they shall be divided as equally as may be into three Classes. The Seats of the Senators of the first Class shall be vacated at the Expiration of the Second Year, of the second Class at the Expiration of the fourth Year, and of the third Class at the Expiration of the sixth Year, so that one-third may be chosen every second Year; . . ."

In the first session of the first Congress, on May 11, 1789, the Senate appointed a committee composed of Messrs. Ellsworth, Carroll, and Few to consider and report a mode of carrying into execution the second paragraph of the third section of the first article of the Constitution, as follows:

"*Ordered*, That a committee, to consist of Mr. Ellsworth, Mr. Carroll, and Mr. Few, be appointed, to consider and report a mode of carrying into execution the second paragraph of the third section of the first article of the constitution." [1]

This committee made a report on May 14, and the Senate thereupon adopted the following resolution:

"Whereupon, *Resolved*, That the Senators be divided into three classes:

"The first to consist of Mr. Langdon, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Morris, Mr. Henry, Mr. Izard, and Mr. Gunn;

"The second of Mr. Wingate, Mr. Strong, Mr. Paterson, Mr. Bassett, Mr. Lee, Mr. Butler, and Mr. Few;

"And the third of Mr. Dalton, Mr. Ellsworth, Mr. Elmer, Mr. Maclay, Mr. Read, Mr. Carroll, and Mr. Grayson.

"That three papers of an equal size, numbered, 1, 2, and 3, be, by the Secretary, rolled up and put into a box, and drawn by Mr. Langdon, Mr. Wingate, and Mr. Dalton, in behalf of the respective classes in which each of them are placed; and that the classes shall vacate their seats in the Senate according to the order of numbers drawn for them, beginning with number one:

"And that, when Senators shall take their seats from States that have not yet appointed Senators, they shall be placed by lot in the foregoing classes, but in such manner as shall keep the classes as nearly equal as may be in numbers." [2]

The last paragraph of the above resolution is still effective as set forth by its use in the classification of the Senators from Alaska and Hawaii.

On May 15, 1789, the Senate, pursuant to the above quoted resolution, proceeded to determine the three classes of Senators.

Mr. Dalton drew lot number 1, and the Senators in his group consisted of: Mr. Dalton, Mr. Ellsworth, Mr. Elmer, Mr. Maclay, Mr. Read, Mr. Carroll, and Mr. Grayson, who were placed in Class 1, and whose terms would expire at the end of the second year, namely March 3, 1791.

Mr. Wingate drew lot number 2, and those in his group consisted of: Mr. Wingate, Mr. Strong, Mr. Paterson, Mr. Bassett, Mr. Lee, Mr. Butler, and Mr. Few, who were placed in Class 2, and whose terms would expire at the end of the fourth year, namely March 3, 1793.

Mr. Langdon drew lot number 3 and those in his group consisted of: Mr. Langdon, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Morris, Mr. Henry, Mr. Izard, and Mr. Gunn, who were placed in Class 3 and whose terms would expire at the end of the 6th year, namely March 3, 1795.[3]

Thus the terms of the three classes of Senators from only 10 of the original 13 States were established at this time, with the term of each expiring at the end of a 6-year period from the respective date of the termination of the first term of each, as set forth above. The other three States had not yet ratified the Constitution and elected Senators—North Carolina and Rhode Island had not even ratified the Constitution by that date and New York, which ratification had been made, had not chosen its Senators.

The above drawing having been completed, the number of Senators in the various classes was as follows:

Class 1	7 Senators.
Class 2	7 Senators.
Class 3	6 Senators.

WEST VIRGINIA (35TH STATE)

West Virginia was admitted into the Union on June 19, 1863; the Senators were classified on December 7, 1863.

The procedure used for classification follows:

Mr. Foot submitted the following resolution; which was considered, by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Senate proceed to ascertain the classes in which the senators from the State of West Virginia shall be inserted, in conformity with the resolution of the 14th May, 1789, and as the Constitution requires.

Ordered, That the Secretary put into the ballot-box two papers of equal size, one of which shall be numbered *one*, and the other shall be a *blank*. Each of the senators of the State of West Virginia shall draw out one paper, and the senator who shall draw the paper numbered *one* shall be inserted in the class of senators whose term of service will expire the 3d day of March 1869. That the Secretary then put into the ballot-box two papers of equal size, one of which shall be numbered *two*, and the other shall be numbered *three*. The other senator shall draw out one paper. If the paper drawn be numbered *two*, the senator shall be inserted in the class of senators whose terms of service will expire the 3d day of March, 1865; and if the paper drawn be numbered *three*, the senator shall be inserted in the class of senators whose terms of service will expire the 3d day of March, 1867.

The Secretary having put into the ballot-box two papers, one of which was numbered *one* and the other a *blank*, the honorable Peter G. Van Winkle drew the paper numbered *one*, and is accordingly in the class of senators whose terms of service will expire on the 3d day of March, 1869.

The papers numbered *two* and *three* were then put by the Secretary into the box, and the honorable Waitman T. Wiley drew the paper numbered *two*, and is accordingly in the class of senators whose terms of service will expire on the 3d day of March, 1865.[23]

Class 1	23
Class 2	24
Class 3	23

After the Senators from West Virginia were classified, the number in each class was:

Expiration of terms of Senators in various classes

Class 1	Class 2	Class 3
1791	1793	1795
1797	1799	1801
1803	1805	1807
1809	1811	1813
1815	1817	1819
1821	1823	1825
1827	1829	1831
1833	1835	1837
1839	1841	1843
1845	1847	1849
1851	1853	1855
1857	1859	1861
1863	1865	1867
1869	1871	1873
1875	1877	1879
1881	1883	1885
1887	1889	1891
1893	1895	1897
1899	1901	1903
1905	1907	1909
1911	1913	1915
1917	1919	1921
1923	1925	1927
1929	1931	1933
1935	1937	1939
1941	1943	1945
1947	1949	1951
1953	1955	1957
1959	1961	1963
1965	1967	1969
1971	1973	

---

[1] Senate Journal, 1st Congress, 1st session, p. 24.

[2] Senate Journal, 1st Congress, 1st session, pp. 25–26.

[3] Senate Journal, 1st Congress, 1st session, p. 26.

States which ratified the Constitution or which were admitted into the Union after Mar. 4, 1789. Ten of the original 13 States ratified the Constitution before Mar. 4, 1789. Election and classification of 1st Senators from all States, except 1st 10

No.	State	Ratified or admitted	Senators	Elected	Service began[1]	Sworn in	Classified	Class
		Ratified						
11	New York	July 26, 1788	Philip Schuyler	July 15, 1789	July 15, 1789	July 27, 1789	July 28, 1789	1
			Rufus King	July 16, 1789	July 16, 1789	July 25, 1789	do	3
12	North Carolina	Nov. 21, 1789	Samuel Johnston	Nov. 27, 1789	Nov. 27, 1789	Jan. 29, 1790	Jan. 29, 1790	2
			Benjamin Hawkins	do	do	Jan. 13, 1790	do	[2]3
13	Rhode Island	May 29, 1790	Theodore Foster	June 7, 1790	June 7, 1790	June 25, 1790	June 25, 1790	1
			Joseph Stanton, Jr.	do	do	do	do	2
		Admitted						
14	Vermont	Mar. 4, 1791	Moses Robinson	Oct. 17, 1791	Oct. 17, 1791	Oct. 31, 1791	Nov. 7, 1791	1
			Stephen R. Bradley	do	do	Nov. 4, 1791	do	3
15	Kentucky	June 1, 1792	John Brown	June 18, 1792	June 18, 1792	Nov. 5, 1792	Nov. 9, 1792	2
			John Edwards	do	do	do	do	[2]3
16	Tennessee	June 1, 1796	William Cocke	Aug. 2, 1796	Aug. 2, 1796	Dec. 6, 1796	Dec. 10, 1796	1
			William Blount	do	do	do	do	2
17	Ohio	Mar. 1, 1803	John Smith	Apr. 1, 1803	Apr. 1, 1803	Oct. 25, 1803	Dec. 15, 1803	1
			Thomas Worthington	do	do	Oct. 17, 1803	do	3
18	Louisiana	Apr. 30, 1812	John N. Destréhan	Sept. 3, 1812	Sept. 3, 1812	(3)	(4)	2
			Allan B. Magruder	do	do	Nov. 18, 1812	Nov. 27, 1812	3
			Thomas Posey		Oct. 8, 1812	Dec. 7, 1812	do	[2]2
19	Indiana	Dec. 11, 1816	James Noble	Nov. 8, 1816	Dec. 11, 1816	Dec. 12, 1816	Dec. 12, 1816	1
			Waller Taylor	do	do	do	do	3
20	Mississippi	Dec. 10, 1817	Walter Leake	Oct. 9, 1817	Dec. 10, 1817	Dec. 11, 1817	Dec. 12, 1817	1
			Thomas Hill Williams	do	do	do	do	2
21	Illinois	Dec. 3, 1818	Jesse B. Thomas	Oct. 7, 1818	Dec. 3, 1818	Dec. 4, 1818	Dec. 4, 1818	2
			Ninian Edwards	do	do	do	do	[2]3
22	Alabama	Dec. 14, 1819	William R. King	Oct. 28, 1819	Dec. 14, 1819	Dec. 22, 1819	Dec. 22, 1819	2
			John W. Walker	do	do	Dec. 14, 1819	do	3
23	Maine	Mar. 15, 1820	John Holmes	June 13, 1820	June 13, 1820	Nov. 13, 1820	Nov. 13, 1820	1
			John Chandler	June 14, 1820	June 14, 1820	do	do	2
24	Missouri	Aug. 10, 1821	Thomas H. Benton	Oct. 2, 1820	Aug. 10, 1821	Dec. 6, 1821	Dec. 6, 1821	1
			David Barton	do	do	Dec. 3, 1821	do	[2]3
25	Arkansas	June 15, 1836	William S. Fulton	Sept. 18, 1836	Sept. 18, 1836	Dec. 5, 1836	Dec. 5, 1836	2
			Ambrose H. Sevier	do	do	do	do	3
26	Michigan	Jan. 26, 1837	Lucius Lyon	Nov. 10, 1835	Jan. 26, 1837	Jan. 26, 1837	Jan. 27, 1837	1
			John Norvell	do	do	do	do	2
27	Florida	Mar. 3, 1845	David Levy Yulee	July 1, 1845	July 1, 1845	Dec. 1, 1845	Dec. 2, 1845	1
			James D. Westcott, Jr.	do	do	do	do	[2]3
28	Texas	Dec. 29, 1845	Thomas J. Rusk	Feb. 21, 1846	Feb. 21, 1846	Mar. 26, 1846	Mar. 30, 1846	1
			Sam Houston	do	do	Mar. 30, 1846	do	2
29	Iowa	Dec. 28, 1846	George W. Jones	Dec. 7, 1848	Dec. 7, 1848	Dec. 26, 1848	Dec. 26, 1848	2
			Augustus C. Dodge	do	do	do	do	[2]3
30	Wisconsin	May 29, 1848	Henry Dodge	June 8, 1848	June 8, 1848	June 23, 1848	June 26, 1848	1
			Isaac P. Walker	do	do	June 26, 1848	do	3
31	California	Sept. 9, 1850	John C. Frémont	Dec. 20, 1849	Sept. 9, 1850	Sept. 10, 1850	Sept. 10, 1850	1
			William M. Gwin	do	do	do	do	3
32	Minnesota	May 11, 1850	Henry M. Rice	Dec. 19, 1857	May 11, 1958	May 12, 1858	May 14, 1858	1
			James Shields	do	do	do	do	2
33	Oregon	Feb. 14, 1850	Delazon Smith	July 8, 1858	Feb. 14, 1859	Feb. 14, 1859	Feb. 14, 1859	2
			Joseph Lane	do	do	do	do	[2]3
34	Kansas	Jan. 29, 1861	James H. Lane	Apr. 4, 1861	Apr. 4, 1861	July 4, 1861	July 4, 1861	2
			Samuel C. Pomeroy	do	do	do	do	3
35	West Virginia	June 19, 1863	Peter G. Van Winkle	Aug. 4, 1863	Aug. 4, 1863	Dec. 7, 1863	Dec. 7, 1863	1
			Waitman T. Willey	do	do	do	do	2
36	Nevada	Oct. 31, 1864	William M. Stewart	Dec. 15, 1864	Dec. 15, 1864	Feb. 1, 1865	Feb. 1, 1865	1
			James W. Nye	Dec. 16, 1864	Dec. 16, 1864	do	do	[2]3
37	Nebraska	Mar. 1, 1867	Thomas W. Tipton	July 11, 1866	Mar. 1, 1867	Mar. 4, 1867	Mar. 4, 1867	1
			John M. Thayer	do	do	do	do	2
38	Colorado	Aug. 1, 1876	Henry M. Teller	Nov. 15, 1876	Nov. 15, 1876	Dec. 4, 1876	Dec. 4, 1876	2
			Jerome B. Chaffee	do	do	do	do	3
39	North Dakota	Nov. 2, 1889	Lyman R. Casey	Nov. 25, 1889	Nov. 25, 1889	Dec. 4, 1889	Dec. 4, 1889	1
			Gilbert A. Pierce	Nov. 21, 1889	Nov. 21, 1889	do	do	3
40	South Dakota	do	Richard F. Pettigrew	Oct. 16, 1889	Nov. 2, 1889	Dec. 2, 1889	do	2
			Gideon C. Moody	do	do	do	do	3
41	Montana	Nov. 8, 1889	Wilbur F. Sanders	Jan. 1, 1890	Jan. 1, 1890	Apr. 16, 1890	Apr. 17, 1890	1
			Thomas C. Power	Jan. 2, 1890	Jan. 2, 1890	do	do	[2]2
42	Washington	Nov. 11, 1889	John B. Allen	Nov. 20, 1889	Nov. 20, 1889	Dec. 2, 1889	Dec. 4, 1889	1
			Watson C. Squire	do	do	do	do	[2]3
43	Idaho	July 3, 1890	George L. Shoup	Dec. 18, 1890	Dec. 18, 1890	Dec. 29, 1890	Jan. 7, 1891	2
			William J. McConnell	do	do	Jan. 5, 1891	do	3
44	Wyoming	July 10, 1890	Francis E. Warren	Nov. 18, 1890	Nov. 18, 1890	Dec. 1, 1890	Dec. 1, 1890	1
			Joseph M. Carey	Nov. 15, 1890	Nov. 15, 1890	do	do	2
45	Utah	Jan. 4, 1896	Frank J. Cannon	Jan. 22, 1896	Jan. 22, 1896	Jan. 27, 1896	Jan. 27, 1896	1
			Arthur Brown	do	do	do	do	[2]3
46	Oklahoma	Nov. 16, 1907	Robert L. Owen	Dec. 11, 1907	Dec. 11, 1907	Dec. 16, 1907	Dec. 16, 1907	2
			Thomas P. Gore	do	do	do	do	3
47	New Mexico	Jan. 6, 1912	Thomas B. Catron	Mar. 27, 1912	Mar. 27, 1912	Apr. 2, 1912	Apr. 2, 1912	1
			Albert B. Fall	do	do	do	do	2
48	Arizona	Feb. 14, 1912	Henry F. Ashurst	do	do	do	do	1
			Marcus A. Smith	do	do	do	do	[2]3
49	Alaska	Jan. 3, 1959	E. L. (Bob) Bartlett	Nov. 25, 1958	Jan. 3, 1959	Jan. 7, 1959	Jan. 7, 1959	2
			Ernest Gruening	do	do	do	do	3
50	Hawaii	Aug. 21, 1959	Hiram L. Fong	July 28, 1959	Aug. 21, 1959	Aug. 24, 1959	Aug. 24, 1959	1
			Oren E. Long	do	do	do	do	3

---

[1] See dates in Senate Manual, pp. 647-711.

[2] Classes even.

[3] Not sworn.

Resigned Oct. 1.

PROPOSED MERGER OF INTERNATIONAL TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH CORP., AND AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the proposed merger of the International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., with the American Broadcasting Co., raises serious questions of public policy. The merger is described by the FCC's staff as:

> A proposed acquisition of one of the most powerful mass media extant—a major national radio and television network and 17 radio and television broadcast stations—by one of the largest and most highly diversified corporate complexes in existence.

The FCC was also reminded by its staff that:

> The transaction you are asked to approve eclipses in size and surpasses in importance any other transfer of broadcast interests the Commission has yet been called upon to consider.

ITT is a huge, highly diversified corporation, with very important investments in many foreign countries.

Sixty percent of its income comes from foreign sources.

Fifty percent of its domestic income comes from the U.S. Government for the performance of defense and space contracts.

Since 80 percent of ITT's income is derived from foreign or U.S. Government sources, this corporation is inevitably subject to influences—some subtle and some overt—which can be dangerous when extended to an important communication network.

Despite the very profound implications of this proposed merger, the hearing before the FCC lasted only 2 days and the only relevant witnesses represented the ITT and ABC, the parties involved. The public was forgotten.

I want to call the attention of the FCC to the fact that the public has a vital interest in such mergers as these. I happen to think that these hearings conducted by the FCC on their very face were inadequate.

The Department of Justice, although invited, did not express its opinion. Independent scholars of the mass media were not there. Independent economists were not there, although one was brought in by ITT to testify in its behalf.

If the independence of the American broadcasting system is destroyed, how long would the others remain independent? I would not bet much that it would hold out for long. In fact, there are rumors in financial circles of a possible merger of CBS with one of the country's very largest industrial corporations.

Just picture the situation then, when the three national networks, with their vast radio and television facilities, penetrating practically every corner of our country, are controlled by three of the largest corporations in the world. This presents a bleak and dismaying picture.

I believe that Senator GAYLORD NELSON has performed a great public service in raising these questions and bringing them to the attention of the American public. He is insisting that this proposed merger be set for full and searching hearings so that its implications can be explored.

Mr. Duane Allison has written an admirable article on this subject in the Christian Science Monitor of October 3.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARTKE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FCC MAY STIFFEN ON MERGERS

(By Duane Allison)

A period of almost routine regulatory approval of radio and TV station mergers may be coming to an end.

As giant companies not previously engaged in broadcasting step into radio and TV station ownership through mergers, key issues of public policy are being raised.

The proposed merger of International Telephone and Telegraph Corporation (ITT) and American Broadcasting Companies, Inc. (ABC) is churning up a number of controversial issues of vital concern to the communications industry.

Under the Federal Communications Act, any merger proposal is required to serve "the public interest, convenience, and necessity."

ITT, a conglomerate corporation with interests in international communications, publishing, insurance, defense, and space work, is asserting that the merger will improve the competitive position of ABC against its larger rivals, NBC and CBS.

Harold S. Genneen, ITT president, told FCC commissioners that his company's resources will allow ABC to speed its conversion to full color programing, improve its programing, and permit longer-range planning on a more solid research-and-development base.

Both Mr. Genneen and Leonard H. Goldenson, ABC president, ran into heavy questioning from the newest FCC Commissioner, Nicholas Johnson, formerly the Federal Maritime Administrator.

After lengthy questioning, Mr. Johnson remained wholly unconvinced as to the public-interest benefit of the merger. Specifically, he charged that ITT and ABC had not met their burden of showing that the merger would result in resources being made available to ABC which it could not procure elsewhere.

At the end of the two-day hearing, he concluded that he could find nowhere in the record a specific commitment for any specific purpose by ITT of resources above that which ABC could presently obtain on its own.

Other detrimental factors, in Mr. Johnson's judgment, that render the merger undesirable are:

(1) That the independence of ABC as a source of news and opinion will be compromised by ITT, whose foreign operations produce 60 percent of its annual income.

Referring to the Federal Communications Act's ban on alien control or participation on the board of directors of any broadcasting company, he remarked that such heavy foreign income made ITT susceptible to pressure by a foreign government to interfere in ABC's news or feature policy.

(2) ITT receives about 50 percent of its domestic income from defense and space contracts and is subject to possible governmental influence that ABC now is independent of in its operations.

(3) ITT has a 10 percent interest in Comsat and supplies services to the networks. Merger with ABC would remove the latter as a potential party of protest on common-carrier issues where networks and common carriers disagree, such as over rates.

(4) ITT's far-flung holdings, from communications equipment to rental cars, offers incentives for favoring ABC in its selling or servicing prices over other buyers. This, he noted, raises antitrust issues.

[A majority of the FCC's seven commissioners is required to approve the merger. To what degree other commissioners share Mr. Johnson's misgivings about the ITT takeover is difficult to assess. But a rejection of the merger bid is considered unlikely.]

Last week concern over the issues raised by Mr. Johnson and the FCC staff spread to the Senate.

Sen. GAYLORD NELSON (D) of Wisconsin, chairman of the monopoly subcommittee of the Senate Small Business Committee, wrote Rosel H. Hyde, FCC chairman, that "at the very least, this merger application seems to call for a searching assessment of its long-term policy considerations."

He added: "I think it is desirable that this proposed merger be set for a full hearing so that all-important policy considerations can be explored."

The Senator did not indicate whether he meant congressional hearings or more FCC hearings. Not long ago, Sen. PHILIP A. HART (D) of Michigan, chairman of the Senate antitrust and monopoly subcommittee, warned about growing concentration in the communications media.

Beneath these rumblings of discontent is a feeling that perhaps the time has come for some clear criteria to protect the media from conflicting pressures generated by owners with other economic interests.

Advocates for shielding communications media from further penetration by nonmedia corporations point to long-established analogies in the banking and transportation field.

Laws prohibit banks from owning other businesses or from being owned by conglomerate firms. Other laws ban carriers such as railroads from owning property—for example, coal mines, whose products are shipped by rail.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD an article appearing in the October 15 issue of New Republic entitled "Broadcast Ownership."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROADCAST OWNERSHIP

Can a broadcasting network—or, for that matter, any of the mass media—report and analyze the news, and generally view the passing scene objectively and critically if it is one tentacle of a big corporate octopus? That's the principal issue posed by the pending merger of International Telephone and Telegraph with the American Broadcasting Company.

Under the law the FCC must find this marriage serves "the public interest, convenience and necessity," and probably it will do so—without ever having faced up to the tough questions posed by conglomerate radio-TV acquisitions. For ITT, ABC is just another chunk of valuable property. Add it to Avis Rent-a-Car, Aetna Finance, Great International Life Insurance, Airport Parking, Hamilton Management, Federal Electric and a plethora of other communications and manufacturing activities, and ABC will help push ITT's sales past the $2 billion a year mark. ITT's operations are so extensive that ABC's news reporting could come to have about as much bite as a dish of yogurt. With communications services and manufacturing in 118 foreign countries, ITT earns about 60 percent of its income outside the U.S. It is not possible, therefore, that an ITT-owned ABC, as Wisconsin Senator GAYLORD NELSON said in a letter to FCC Chairman Rosel H. Hyde, "will tailor its news commentary and reporting so as to minimize any conflict with local governments?" Much the same can also be true at home. ITT is a major defense contractor and supplies services for the Office of Economic Opportunity, in all earning about half of its domestic income from the government. Given that kind of intimate relationship, ITT might think it "prudent" if ABC were to be "restrained" in its analysis of prevailing government policies.

The questions presented by the ITT-ABC merger are by no means limited to this particular consolidation. Other industrial corporations, like RCA, Westinghouse, and AVCO, have substantial—and growing—broadcast interests. Since the communications industries are coalescing and daily newspapers competition is declining, it becomes all the more important to insure that the airwaves are not allowed to come within the control of owners with such diversified interests that their critical informing function risks being compromised. Commercial banks cannot engage in investment banking; aircraft manufacturers must remain apart from airlines; railroads cannot transport articles which they have produced or in which they have an interest. Ultimately the same sort of restriction may have to be imposed on the purchase of broadcast licenses.

The Commission could make a fresh start by using the ITT-ABC application as a basis for seeking the kind of data that would enable it to determine whether any such merger is consistent with the public interest. One owner is not the same as another, and if radio and television are to inform the public rather than simply defend and shelter the status quo from critical appraisal, it may be necessary for the Commission to limit the categories of those whom it permits to acquire licenses. If the FCC abdicates this responsibility, Congress ought to explore the entire subject.

U.S. INTERVENTION IN VIETNAM IS NOT LEGAL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article, entitled "United States Intervention in Vietnam Is Not Legal," which article was published in the American Bar Association Journal of July 1966.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. INTERVENTION IN VIETNAM IS NOT LEGAL

(By William L. Standard, of the New York Bar, New York City)

(Responding to an article in the May issue of the Journal, Mr. Standard asserts that the United States intervention in Vietnam violates the Charter of the United Nations, the Geneva Accords of 1954, the SEATO treaty and our own Constitution. He urges a cease-fire of at least six months' duration, during which the 1954 accords should be renegotiated. If this should fail, he declares that "a great power may withdraw with honor when it admits that it judged poorly.")

Satire and sarcasm often have been weapons of effective, if deluding, advocacy. The article by Eberhard P. Deutsch "The Legality of the United States Position in Vietnam," in the May, 1966, issue of the *American Bar Association Journal* (page 436) is a classical demonstration of this technique. The author takes issue with the Lawyers Committee on American Policy Towards Vietnam, as expressed in its memorandum of law, on the following fundamental questions: (1) The right of self-defense under the United Nations Charter; (2) Violations of the Geneva Accords; (3) Sanctions by the SEATO treaty; and (4) Violations of our own Constitution.

But the author concludes with the statement that the memorandum of the Lawyers Committee "is grounded on an emotional attitude opposed to United States policy, rather than on law." He seeks to demonstrate this by quoting the *concluding* paragraph of a 26-page, carefully documented statement of the applicable law, which in peroration states in the very last sentence: "Should we not spell the end of the system of unilateral action . . . that has been tried for centuries—and has always failed?"

The author then wields the weapon of sarcasm by contrasting the Lawyers Committee memorandum with the "temperate statement of thirty-one professors of law from leading law schools throughout the United States." The statement of these professors appears in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 27, 1966, page A410, and the entirety of that statement is:

"As teachers of international law we wish to affirm that the presence of U.S. forces in South Vietnam at the request of the Government of that country is lawful under general principles of international law and the United Nations Charter. The engagement of U.S. forces in hostilities at the request of the Government of South Vietnam is a legitimate use of force in defense of South Vietnam against aggression. We believe that the evidence indicates that the United States and South Vietnam are taking action that attacks neither the territorial integrity nor the political independence of the People's Republic of Vietnam—action that seeks only to terminate aggression originating in North Vietnam."

This one-paragraph "temperate statement" is not buttressed by a single citation or authority. What is particularly deplorable is that it was issued in November of 1965 as a rebuttal to the committee's memorandum, which was issued in late September, 1965.

The author of the "legality position" article then contrasts the Lawyers Committee memorandum with "the simple resolution adopted unanimously on February 21, 1966, by the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association". This resolution, in a concluding one-sentence statement, asserts that "the position of the United States in Vietnam is legal under international law, and is in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the South-East Asia Treaty". The House of Delegates' resolution, too, does not support its conclusion with a single citation or authority.

When the *Harvard Law Record* on March 10 contrasted the memorandum of law of the Lawyers Committee with the "simple resolution" adopted by the House of Delegates, it had this to say: "Viewed against the background of the *sober and erudite* Lawyers Committee brief and Arthur Krock's research, the ABA resolution contributes little to the national dialogue on Vietnam" (emphasis supplied).

The satirical technique of the author of the "legality position" article is worthy of an undergraduate debater, but not of the respected Chairman of the American Bar Association Committee on Peace and Law Through United Nations. He does, indeed, wrestle earnestly with four basic propositions discussed by the Lawyers Committee, and it is to these propositions that I shall address myself.

I. UNILATERAL INTERVENTION VIOLATES U.N. CHARTER

The writer of the "legality position" article discusses the first exception of Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, which reads: "Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the *inherent* right of individual or collective self-defense *if* an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security" (emphasis supplied).

He asserts "A thesis that members of the United Nations are not permitted to participate in collective self-defense to repel aggression, on the ground that the aggrieved nation is not a member of the United Nations, can hardly be supported on its face, in reason, logic or law." He cites as authority two distinguished writers.[1]

The Lawyers Committee in its memorandum concludes that Article 51 does not permit the United States to act unilaterally in the "collective self-defense" of Vietnam because Article 51 applies only if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations.

This limitation was not inadvertent. It was the result of careful draftsmanship by Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, who "was the principal negotiator in the formulation of this text" of Article 51.[2] In a statement of June 13, 1945, before the United Nations Commission that drafted Article 51, Senator Vandenberg said: ". . . [W]e have here recognized the inherent right of self-defense, whether individual or collective, which permits any sovereign state among us [*i.e.*, members of the United Nations] or any qualified regional group of states to ward off attack . . .".[3]

Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., noted the following on May 21, 1945: "The parties to any dispute . . . should obligate themselves first of all to seek a solution by negotiation, mediation, conciliation, arbitration or judicial settlement, *resort to regional agencies or arrangement* or other peaceful means of their own choice" (emphasis in original).[4]

Professor Julius Stone states: "The license [of individual and collective self-defense] does not apparently cover even an 'armed attack' against a *non-Member*" (emphasis in original).[5]

Furthermore, the United States has acknowledged that the right of "collective self-defense" applies to Vietnam only if it becomes a member of the United Nations. On September 9, 1957, in arguing before the Security Council for the admission of Vietnam to the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge, our representative, stated: "The people of Vietnam . . . ask now only . . . to enjoy the benefits of collective security, the mutual help which membership in the . . . United Nations offers.[6]

This does not mean, of course, that a nonmember state or entity does not have the "inherent" right of self-defense or that nonmember states may be attacked with impunity. But it does mean that in case of an attack upon a nonmember state it is for the United Nations to decide upon the necessary measures to be taken by its member states and not for any state to decide for itself that it will employ arms for "collective self-defense".

During the Suez crisis President Eisenhower said: "The United Nations is *alone* charged with the responsibility of securing the peace in the Middle East and throughout the world" (emphasis supplied).[7]

And at the same time, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles characterized as "unthinkable" a proposal that the United States and the Soviet Union act jointly to restore the peace in that area, saying that that was the function of the United Nations. He said:

"Any intervention by the United States and/or Russia or any other action, except by a duly constituted United Nations peace force would be counter to everything the General Assembly and the Secretary-General of the United Nations were charged by the Charter to do in order to secure a United Nations police cease fire."[8]

---

[1] Bowett, Self-defense in International Law 193–195 (1958); Kelsen, The Law of the United Nations 793 (1950).

[2] The quoted words are from a memorandum. "Participation in the North Atlantic Treaty of States Not Members of the United Nations", dated April 13, 1949, prepared by the Office of the Legal Adviser, Department of State, and reproduced in 5 Whiteman, Digest of International Law 1068.

[3] Memorandum, *op. cit. supra* note 2, in 5 Whiteman, Digest of International Law 1068, 1072.

[4] 12 Dep't. State Bull. 949-950 (1945).

[5] Stone, Legal Controls of International Conflict 244 (1954).

[6] U.N. Security Council Off. Rec., 790th meeting 5.

[7] 4 United Nations Action in the Suez Crisis: International Law in the Middle East Crisis—(Tulane Studies in Political Science, Vol. IV (1956)).

The author of the "legality position" article confuses the right of an attacked nonmember state to defend itself with the lack of right of a member state to participate in that defense in the absence of United Nations' authorization.

The issue is the lawfulness of the actions of the United States, which is both a non-attacked state and a member of the United Nations. It does not follow that because Vietnam has an "inherent" right to defend itself, the United States has an "inherent" right to decide for itself to participate unilaterally in that defense. Professor Hans Kelsen, one of the principal authorities relied upon by Mr. Deutsch, has pointed out this critical distinction: "It is hardly possible to consider the right or the duty of a non-attacked state to assist an attacked state as an 'inherent' right, that is to say, a right established by natural law."[9]

The argument also makes the United States its own judge to determine the occurrence of an "armed attack" in Vietnam, whereas Article 39 of the United Nations Charter provides that "The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression . . .". But as Philip C. Jessup, now a Judge of the International Court of Justice, has noted:

"It would be *disastrous* to agree that every State may decide for itself which of the two contestants is in the right and may govern its conduct according to its own decision. . . . The ensuing conflict would be destructive to the ordered world community which the Charter and any modern law of nations must seek to preserve. State C would be shipping . . . war supplies to A, while State A would be assisting State B . . . and it would not be long before C and D would be enmeshed in the struggle out of 'self-defense' [emphasis supplied]."[10]

Acceptance of Mr. Deutsch's argument would destroy the concept of collective peacekeeping, which the Charter embodies, in the case of nonmember states or areas.

No armed attack within meaning of the charter

The author of the "legality position" article also seeks to justify the United States' intervention in Vietnam on the ground that "these attacks [against United States' naval vessels] are part of a deliberate and systematic campaign of aggression", to quote the Congressional Joint Southeast Asia resolution of August, 1964. The Lawyers Committee on American Policy Towards Vietnam takes the position that the occurrence of an armed attack within the meaning of the United Nations Charter has not been established.

Under the clear text of Article 51 of the charter, the right of self-defense arises only if an "armed attack" has occurred. The phrase "armed attack" has an established meaning in the charter and in international law. It was deliberately employed because it does not easily lend itself to expedient elasticity or to arbitrary ambiguity.

"Self-defense" is not justified by every aggression or hostile act, but only in the case of an "armed attack", when the necessity for action is "instant, overwhelming, and leaving no moment for deliberation". This definition was classically stated by Secretary of State Daniel Webster in *The Caroline*[11] and affirmed in the Nuremberg judgment. It was codified in the charter by unanimous vote of the General Assembly at its first session.[12]

This strict limitation of permissible self-defense to cases of an "armed attack" was at the time of the framing of the charter being pressed by the United States, the Soviet Union and Great Britain in the Nuremberg trials. The defense was offered that Germany was compelled to attack Norway to forestall an Allied invasion. In reply, the tribunal said: "It must be remembered that preventive action in foreign territory is justified only in case of 'an instant and overwhelming necessity for defense, leaving no choice of means, and no moment for deliberation.' (The Caroline Case, Moore's Digest of International Law, II 412.)"[13]

Thus, while any hostile act may be an aggression, not every aggression is an "armed attack", and forceful self-defense is not a permissible response unless there is an "armed attack".

On March 4, 1966, the Department of State issued "The Legality of United States Participation in the Defense of Vietnam". This 52-page memorandum acknowledges that an "armed attack" is an essential condition precedent to the use of force in self-defense and that aggression is not enough. Astonishingly, however, it glosses over the crucial distinction between the two. While it alleges the occurrence of an armed attack "before February 1965", it fails to furnish any facts or details concerning such an attack. Indeed, it admits that it is unable to do so. This is not like the situation in Korea, where the Security Council found that an actual, visible, forcible invasion beyond the demarcation line had occurred at a specific time and place by large forces. This memorandum states that because of the "guerilla war in Viet Nam" (*i.e.*, the indigenous character of the conflict) the State Department is unable to indicate when or where the "armed attack" began. It also admits that "the critical military element of the insurgency . . . is unacknowledged by North Viet Nam". The memorandum contends that acts of externally supported subversion, the clandestine supply of arms and the infiltration of armed personnel over the "years" preceding the direct intervention of the United States, "clearly constitutes an 'armed attack' under any reasonable definition".

These allegations, even if true (as appears below), indicate acts of aggression, but they do not show the occurrence of an armed attack "leaving no choice of means, and no moment for deliberation".[14]

Such acts were well known as forms of aggression when the charter was drawn and long before. Nevertheless, the framers of the charter rejected them as inadequate to justify the unilateral use of force. Except in the limited instance of an armed attack "leaving no choice of means, and no moment for deliberation", they left nations to the peacekeeping procedures of the United Nations for collective redress against aggression.

Furthermore, the State Department memorandum refutes its own charge of the occurrence of an "armed attack". The long-smoldering conditions of unrest, subversion and infiltration cited in the memorandum are not acts that gave rise to such a need for an immediate response that "no choice of means, and no moment for deliberation" remained.

The memorandum does not sustain its charge of external aggression. It indicates that prior to 1964 the "infiltrators" from the North were South Vietnamese who were returning to the South. The lumping of "40,000 armed and unarmed guerillas" is not meaningful. Unarmed Vietnamese have an inherent right to move about in their own country. In the absence of the functioning of the International Control Commission, the subsequent movement of Vietnamese from one zone in Vietnam to another zone in Vietnam would appear to be an internal matter, not a violation of international law.

The Mansfield report (cited in footnote 14) shows that prior to 1965 infiltration of men from North Vietnam had been going on "for many years", but that this "was confined primarly to political cadres and military leadership until about the end of 1964". On the other hand, it notes, "In 1962, U.S. military advisers and service forces in South Vietnam totaled approximately 10,000 men." The Mansfield report makes plain that significant armed personnel were introduced from the North only after the United States had intervened to avoid the "total collapse of the Saigon government's authority [which] appeared imminent in the early months of 1965". The report states:

"U.S. combat troops in strength arrived at that point in response to the appeal of the Saigon authorities. The Vietcong *counter response* was to increase their military activity with forces strengthened by intensified *local* recruitment and infiltration of regular North Vietnamese troops. With the change in the composition of the opposing forces the character of the war also changed sharply [emphasis supplied]."[15]

The introduction of North Vietnamese forces as a counter response is also emphasized by the observation in the Mansfield report that by May, 1965, about 34,000 United States service forces were in Vietnam and that "Beginning in June [1965] an estimated 1,500 North Vietnamese troops per month have entered South Vietnam . . .". Significant forces from the North thus followed and did not precede the direct involvement of the United States.

Intervention Not Justified by "Collective Self-Defense"

The State Department memorandum is structured on the wholly untenable assumption that the conflict in South Vietnam is the result of external aggression ("an armed attack from the North") and is not a civil war. For if it is a civil war, the intervention of the United States is a violation of its solemn undertaking not to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries.

It is hardly open to dispute that the present conflict in South Vietnam is essentially a civil war among what James Reston has described as a "tangle of competing individuals, regions, religions and sects . . . [among] a people who have been torn apart by war and dominated and exploited by Saigon for generations".[16]

The State Department memorandum itself shows that before 1964 the so-called infiltration was of South Vietnamese returning to their homeland. Even if they were returning for the purpose of participating in the fighting in South Vietnam, that still constitutes civil war by any definition.

---

[8] New York Times, November 6, 1956.

[9] Kelsen, *op. cit. supra* note 1, at 797.

[10] Jessup, A Modern Law of Nations 205 (1948).

[11] 7 Moore, Digest of International Law 919 (1906).

[12] U.N. Gen. Ass. Off. Rec. 1st Sess., Res. 95(1).

[13] International Military Tribunal (Nuremberg) 171 (1946); Bin Chang, General Principles of Law 84 (1953).

[14] See the report of Senators Mike Mansfield, Edmund S. Muskie, Daniel K. Inouye, George D. Aiken and L. Caleb Boggs to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, dated January 6, 1966, entitled "The Vietnam Conflict: The Substance and the Shadow", hereafter referred to as the Mansfield report. It is reprinted in Congressional Record, Jan. 13, 1966, p. 161.

[15] Mansfield report, Congressional Record, Jan. 13, 1966, p. 161.

[16] New York Times, April 3, 1966.

The Declaration of Honolulu also implicitly concedes that the conflict had its origin in the internal situation in Vietnam and not in an external armed attack. The stress which the declaration places on the urgent need for basic social reform is an acknowledgement that the war is essentially a revolt against domestic conditions. To this may be added the existence of a desperate desire for peace and independence from foreign intervention, which all neutral reporters have observed.

The author of the "legality position" article also argues that the conflict arises from an external aggression. This is contradicted by his failure to consider the role played by the National Liberation Front; yet it does exists and is unquestionably in actual control of most of South Vietnam and the government in those areas. The only conceivable justification for the refusal of the United States to acknowledge the existence or the belligerent status of the National Liberation Front is that the front consists of rebels or insurgents. If that be so, then they are fighting their own government in a civil strife and are not foreign aggressors.

As stated by Benjamin V. Cohen in the Niles memorial lecture, "The United Nations in Its 20th Year": "True, the charter does not forbid civil war or deny the right to revolt. But it does not sanction the right of an outside state to participate in another state's civil war."[17]

It cannot be asserted that South Vietnam is a separate "country" so far as North Vietnam is concerned. The Geneva Accords recognized Vietnam as but one country, of which South Vietnam is only an organic part. The accords declared that the temporary military line that established the north and south military zones at the seventeenth parallel pending the elections "should not in any way be interpreted as a political or territorial boundary" (Section 6). And Section 7 stated that the political settlement should be effected on the basis of "the independence, unity, and territorial integrity" of Vietnam.

But even if North Vietnam and South Vietnam are deemed separate entities in international law, the United States may not respond to the intervention of North Vietnam in the civil war in the South by bombing the North. There is no legal basis to respond to an intervention of one state in a civil war by a military attack on the territory of the intervening state. It is sobering to reflect that not even Germany under Hitler or Italy under Mussolini claimed that their intervention in behalf of Franco during the Spanish Civil War would have vindicated their use of military force upon the territory of another state intervening in behalf of the loyalists. And no country intervening in behalf of Spain's legitimate government asserted a right to respond by military force against Germany or Italy.

Therefore, even if North Vietnam were an intervening state so far as South Vietnam is concerned, under the legal position advanced by Mr. Deutsch, the bombing of the United States by North Vietnam would have as much legitimacy as does the bombing of North Vietnam by the United States.

II. U.S. MILITARY PRESENCE VIOLATES GENEVA ACCORDS

The author of the "legality position" article suggests that United States intervention in Vietnam is not in violation of the Geneva Accords on the ground that "since their inception these accords have been violated continuously by Hanoi". He states that "It is an accepted principle of international law that a material breach of a treaty by one of the parties thereto dissolves the obligation of the other party, at least to the extent of withholding compliance until the defaulting party purges itself."

The Lawyers Committee takes the position that United States intervention is not justified by the purported breach of the Geneva Accords by Hanoi. The accords embody two central principles: (1) recognition of the independence and freedom of Vietnam from foreign control and (2) the unification in the elections set in the accords for 1956.

In its own pledge to observe the Geneva Accords, the United States recognized that the military participation in Vietnam was temporary and that, in any case, it was not political or geographic. Insofar as the United States referred to that country, it designated it as "Vietnam", not "South Vietnam" or "North Vietnam". The elections thus were to determine not whether North and South Vietnam should be united, but what the government of the single state of Vietnam should be. As the time for the arrangements for the elections approached, however, the Diem regime, which was then in control of South Vietnam, announced on July 16, 1955, that not only would it defy the provisions calling for national elections, but would not engage even in negotiations for modalities.

The reasons for not agreeing to the elections of 1956 are quite understandable. President Eisenhower has told us that the actual reason the elections were not held was because "persons knowledgeable in Indo-Chinese affairs" believed that "possibly 80 per cent of the population would have voted for the Communist Ho Chi Minh".[18]

Under the Geneva Accords, the undertaking to hold the elections within two years was unconditional. The refusal of Saigon to hold the elections plainly violated one of the two central conditions that had made the Geneva Accords acceptable to all parties. That the Vietnam conflict ultimately did resume is, therefore, not surprising. For, as George McT. Kahin and John W. Lewis, professors of government at Cornell University, asked in a question wholly ignored by our State Department, "When the military struggle for power ends on the agreed condition that the competition will be transferred to the political level, can the side which violates the agreed conditions ultimately expect the military struggle will not be resumed?"[19]

The military involvement of the United States in Vietnam also violates the second essential provision of the accords—the prohibition against the introduction of foreign troops and the establishment of military bases. Article 4 of the Geneva Accords prohibits the "introduction into Vietnam of foreign troops and military personnel", and Article 5 prohibits in Vietnam any "military base under the control of a foreign power". Therefore, it is the presence of 250,000 American troops and the installation in Vietnam of massive military bases under the control of the United States that violate these agreements, not the presence of North Vietnamese in Vietnam.

III. U.S. INTERVENTION VIOLATES SEATO TREATY

Mr. Deutsch also challenges the conclusion of the Lawyers Committee with respect to sanctions under the SEATO treaty, which was adopted in September, 1954. Article 1 of the treaty provides:

"The parties undertake, as set forth in the United Nations Charter, to settle any international disputes in which they may be involved, by peaceful means . . . and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

It must be pointed out that Article 53 of the United Nations Charter provides that "No enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies, without the authority of the Security Council." Furthermore, Article 103 of the charter provides:

"In the event of a conflict between the members of the United Nations under the present charter and their obligations under any other international agreement, their obligations under the present charter shall prevail."

The use of our ground forces since the spring of 1965 is sought to be justified under the provisions of the SEATO treaty. But extracts from the 1954 Senate debate on the treaty demonstrate the fragility of this claim. In explaining the commitments under the SEATO treaty to the Senate, Walter F. George, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, made the following statements:

"The treaty does not call for automatic action; it calls for consolidation with other signatories. If any course of action shall be agreed * * * or decided upon, then that action must have the approval of Congress, because the constitutional process of each signatory government is provided for * * * it is clear that the threat to territorial integrity and political independence also encompasses acts of subversion * * * but even in that event the United States would not be bound to put it down. I cannot emphasize too strongly that we have no obligation * * * to take positive measures of any kind. All we are obligated to do is consult together about it."[20]

Richard N. Goodwin, a former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, in a recent article discussing the significance of our reliance upon the SEATO agreement as the basis for our intervention in Vietnam, states in part:

"One can search the many statements of Presidents and diplomats in vain for any mention of the SEATO Treaty. Time after time, President Johnson set forth the reasons for our presence in Vietnam, but he never spoke of the requirements of the treaty, nor did anyone at the State Department suggest that he should, even though they surely reviewed every draft statement. The treaty argument is, in truth, something a clever advocate conceived a few months ago."[21]

Furthermore, the SEATO treaty also clearly pledges the parties to respect the Geneva Declaration of 1954, which was agreed upon only a few months before the SEATO treaty. The State Department memorandum of March 4, 1966, referred to above, significantly misquotes the SEATO treaty on essential points. It asserts (Section IV B) that Article 4(1) of SEATO creates an "obligation to meet the common danger in the event of armed aggression". The term "armed aggression" is not to be found in the treaty. Article 4(1) speaks of "aggression by means of armed attack". In case of such "armed attack", "each Party recognizes" that it "would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes".

---

[17] 111 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (1965). He cites Cohen, The United Nations, Constitutional Developments, Growth and Possibilities 53–54 (1961).

[18] Eisenhower, White House Years: Mandate for Change, 1953–1956, 372 (1963).

[19] Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, "The United States in Vietnam", June, 1965, p. 28.

[20] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 101, pt. 1, pp. 1051–1052.

[21] The New Yorker, "Reflections on Vietnam", April 16, 1966, p. 57, at p. 70.

Hence, only in case of an "armed attack" (in the meaning of Article 51 of the United Nations Charter) would the United States have, at most, the right, but no obligation, to assist the "Free Territory of Vietnam" until it was to be unified by July, 1956.

The invocation of the SEATO treaty is the latest of the eversifting grounds which the State Department has advanced to sustain the lawfulness of its position. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., has characterized this argument as an "intellectual disgrace". Arthur Krock has described its origin as follows:

"The President had utilized the provocation of the Tonkin Gulf attack on the Seventh Fleet by North Vietnamese gunboats to get a generalized expression of support from Congress. This worked well enough until it was argued, against the public record, as approval by Congress of any expansion of the war the President might make in an unforeseeable future. Then Rusk shifted the major basis for the claim to the SEATO compact.

"But extracts from the 1954 Senate debate on the treaty demonstrate the fragility of this claim." [22]

The credibility of the argument that the SEATO treaty furnished a legal justification for the President's action is also refuted by the fact that the State Department in its March, 1965, memorandum, entitled "Legal Basis for United States Actions Against North Vietnam", did not even mention SEATO. Significantly, too, President Johnson in a press conference statement on July 28, 1965, explaining "why we are in Vietnam", made no mention of SEATO. This can hardly be squared with the present belated claim that the treaty imposed an obligation upon the President to intervene in Vietnam.

Moreover, the invocation of SEATO does not advance the State Department's case. In the first place, Article 1 of the treaty is expressly subordinate to the provisions of the United Nations Charter and Article 6 expressly acknowledges the supremacy of the charter. Article 103 of the charter, quoted above, subordinates all regional treaty compacts to the charter, and Article 53 is explicit that "no enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council . . .".

The United States is not obliged by SEATO to engage in any military undertaking in Vietnam even if it were otherwise permitted to do so under the charter. As noted by Representative Melvin R. Laird, the SEATO treaty was "not a commitment to send American troops to fight in southeast Asia. It carefully avoided the kind of automatic response to aggression embodied in the NATO agreement . . .".[23]

Representative Laird pointed out that in soliciting the advice and consent of the Senate to the treaty, Senator H. Alexander Smith of New Jersey, who was a member of the United States delegation to the Manila Conference at which the treaty was negotiated and who was one of the signers of the treaty for the United States, emphasized that "Nothing in this treaty calls for the use of American ground forces . . .". On the floor of the Senate on February 1, 1955, he said:

"Some of the participants came to Manila with the intention of establishing . . . a compulsory arrangement for our military participation in case of any attack. Such an organization might have required the commitment of American ground forces to the Asian mainland. We carefully avoided any possible implication regarding an arrangement of that kind.

"We have no purpose of following any such policy as that of having our forces involved in a ground war. . . .

"For ourselves, the arrangement means that we will have avoided the impracticable overcommitment which would have been involved if we attempted to place American ground forces around the perimeter of the area of potential Chinese ingress into southeast Asia. Nothing in this treaty calls for the use of American ground forces in that fashion." [24]

Article 4, Section 2, is explicit that if South Vietnam were threatened "in any way other than by armed attack", "the [SEATO] Parties shall consult immediately in order to agree on the measures which should be taken for the common defense".

SEATO therefore *prohibits* unilateral assistance action. Indeed, the treaty originally required previous *agreement* among the other seven partners before any SEATO power could take any "measures", including nonmilitary measures, not to mention combat assistance. In 1964 the unanimity requirement was reinterpreted to mean that "measures" could be taken in the absence of a dissenting vote among the SEATO partners. The United States has not convened the SEATO powers because of the certainty of such a dissent. It can hardly claim, therefore, that SEATO *obligates* it to pursue its present course when in fact it is evading its treaty obligation to obtain collective permission for "collective defense", as even the name of the treaty indicates.

Finally, the United States actions also violate Article 53 of the United Nations Charter, quoted above, which unequivocally prohibits enforcement action under regional arrangements except with *previous* Security Council authorization. Hence, even if the United States had obtained the required consent from its SEATO partners, it would still need the authorization of the Security Council to make its "measures" legal.

Therefore, the United States, far from being obligated, is not permitted by SEATO or by the charter to engage in its military undertaking in Vietnam.

IV. U.S. INTERVENTION VIOLATES THE CONSTITUTION

The President has repeatedly stated and acknowledged that the United States is at war in Vietnam.[25] The Lawyers Committee on American Policy Towards Vietnam in its memorandum of law took the position that our intervention is violative of our own Constitution. The committee predicated its conclusion on the provisions of Article I, Section 8, Clause 11, in which the power to declare war is confided exclusively to the Congress. Congress alone can make that solemn commitment. The clause granting this power does not read "on the recommendation of the President" or that the "President with the advice and consent of Congress may declare war". As former Assistant Secretary of State James Grafton Rogers has observed, "The omission is significant. There was to be no war unless Congress took the initiative." [26]

The Supreme Court has held that

"Nothing in our Constitution is plainer than that declaration of war is entrusted only to Congress. . . . With all its defects, delays, and inconveniences, men have discovered no technique for long preserving free government except that the executive be under the law, and that the law be made by parliamentary deliberation." [27]

President Woodrow Wilson underscored the President's lack of power to declare war in his historic statement to a joint session of Congress on April 2, 1917:

"I have called the Congress into extraordinary session because there are serious, very serious, choices of policy to be made, and made immediately, which it was neither right nor constitutionally permissible that I should assume the responsibility of making."

Congress has not declared war in Vietnam and the President does not claim that any declaration of war supports his actions in Vietnam. In fact, the President has been reported to be extremely reluctant to ask Congress to declare war.[28]

The writer of the "legality position" article, however, takes the position that the Southeast Asia resolution (Tonkin resolution) of August 10, 1964, is "undoubtedly the clearest and most unequivocal Congressional sanction of the President's deployment of United States forces for the defense of South Vietnam". The writer then quotes Senators John Sherman Cooper, J. William Fulbright and Wayne Morse during the debates on the Tonkin resolution, and he concludes that since "the resolution authorizes the President 'to make war', it surely has the same legal effect as a Congressional 'declaration of war' *in haec verba* would have had".

It would seem that the action of Congress under the conditions that prevailed when the Tonkin resolution was submitted constitutes, at most, an ultimatum and not a declaration of war.

Senator Fulbright in a recent article stated:

"The joint resolution was a blank check signed by the Congress in an atmosphere of urgency that seemed at the time to preclude debate. . . .

"I myself, as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, served as floor manager of the Southeast Asia resolution and did all I could to bring about its prompt and overwhelming adoption. I did so because I was confident that President Johnson would use our endorsement with wisdom and restraint. I was also influenced by partisanship: an election campaign was in progress and I had no wish to make any difficulties for the President in his race against a Republican candidate whose election I thought would be a disaster for the country. My role in the adoption of the resolution of Aug. 7, 1964 is a source of neither pleasure nor pride to me today." [29]

There have been instances when the President has sent United States forces abroad without a declaration of war by Congress. These have ranged from minor engagements between pirates and American ships on the high seas to the dispatch of our Armed Forces to Latin American countries and our involvement in Korea. But, except for the Korean War, none of these instances remotely involved so massive and dangerous a military undertaking as the war in Vietnam. And in the Korean War the United States fought under the aegis of the United Nations.

Since Mr. Deutsch assumes that the Tonkin resolution does constitute a "Congressional declaration of war *in haec verba*", empowering the President to act, it is fitting to recall that on May 6, 1954, at a time when the fall of Dien Bien Phu was imminent, then Senator Lyndon B. Johnson criticized the President in these terms:

---

[22] The New York Times, "The Sudden Discovery of SEATO", March 6, 1966.

[23] Congressional Record, Mar. 15, 1966, pp. 5809–5810.

[24] Congressional Record, vol. 101, pt. 1, pp. 1052–1054.

[25] 52 Dep't State Bull. 606, 838 (1965). Arthur Krock, "By Any Other Name, It's Still War", The New York Times, June 10, 1965.

[26] Rogers, World Policing and the Constitution 21 (1945).

[27] *Youngstown Sheet & Tube Company* v. *Sawyer*, 343 U.S. 579, 642, 655 (1952) (Jackson, J.).

[28] The Wall Street Journal, "The U.S. May Become More Candid on Rising Land-War Involvement", June 17, 1965, page 1.

[29] The New York Times Magazine, "The Fatal Arrogance of Power", May 15, 1966, p. 28. This article was based on an address at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced Studies.

"We will insist upon clear explanations of the policies in which we are asked to cooperate. We will insist that we and the American people be treated as adults—that we have the facts without sugar coating.

"The function of Congress is not simply to appropriate money and leave the problem of national security at that." [30]

Congress should, therefore, exercise its constitutional responsibility as a coequal branch of government of checks and balances to determine whether this country shall continue to be involved in the war in Vietnam. Under the rule of law, compliance with the forms and procedures of law are as imperative as compliance with the substance of law.

What action to take in this solemn hour

This is a solemn hour in history. We have a moral obligation to history to return to the high purposes and principles of the United Nations. We may be on the threshold of a further involvement in Asia. The United Nations Charter forbids our unilateral intervention in the circumstances which exist in Vietnam.

It may be that the world could be brought closer to peace if we agreed to the following:

1. Declaration of a six months' (or more) cease-fire to create conditions for negotiations.
2. That during the cease-fire period the Soviet Union and Great Britain (the co-chairmen of the Geneva Conference in 1954) be requested to reconvene the 1954 conference and invite all the nations which participated at the "Final Declaration" of the Geneva Conference on July 21, 1954, to renegotiate the 1954 accord.
3. If efforts to negotiate prove inconclusive, we should resort to the candor urged by an eminent political scientist, Emmet John Hughes, after a searching recent visit to Vietnam, details his views of the conditions in that country and concludes his report as follows:

". . . And it means the wisdom to sense that American repute in Asia is not dignified but diminished by untiring war for the unattainable victory . . . and American honor is not tarnished but brightened when so great a power can say, with quiet assurance: we have judged poorly, fought splendidly, and survive confidently.

"I can think of no other way that the leaders of the United States might match the courage of the soldiers they have dispatched." [31]

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, William L. Standard, the author of the article is the chairman of the Lawyers Committee on American Policy Towards Vietnam, and has in the past written for the American Bar Association Journal articles on international and maritime law. He is recognized as one of our outstanding international law authorities.

The Standard article of July 1966, was in response to an article in the May 1966, issue of the American Bar Association Journal written by Mr. Eberhard P. Deutsch, entitled "The Legality of the U.S. Position in Vietnam."

The Eberhard P. Deutsch article has been introduced into the RECORD on several occasions since its publication in May 1966, presumably because it takes issue with the regrettable and inescapable conclusions of the Lawyers Committee on American Policy Towards Vietnam on the following points:

First, the actions of the United States in Vietnam contravene the essential provisions of the United Nations Charter, to which we are bound by treaty.

Second, they violate the Geneva Accords of 1954, which we pledged to observe, although we did not sign.

Third, they are not sanctioned by the treaty creating the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization.

Fourth, they violate our own Constitution and the system of checks and balances which is the heart of it, by the prosecution of the war in Vietnam without a congressional declaration of war.

The editors of the American Bar Association Journal rendered a distinct service by publishing the William L. Standard article in the July 1966, issue of the Journal.

Mr. President, the original memorandum of law of the Lawyers' Committee on American Policy Towards Vietnam issued in September 1965, was endorsed among others by Prof. Quincy Wright, of the University of Virginia, a recognized international law authority; Wolfgang Friedmann, of Columbia University, also a great authority in the field of international law; Thomas I. Emerson, of the Yale Law School; Richard A. Falk, of Princeton; Norman Malcolm, of Cornell; D. F. Fleming, of Vanderbilt; David Haber, of Rutgers; Roy M. Mersky, of the University of Texas; William G. Rice, of the University of Wisconsin; Chancellor Robert M. MacIver, of the New School for Social Research; Profs. Robert C. Stevenson, of Idaho State University, Alexander W. Rudzinski, of Columbia, Darrell Randell, of the American University in Washington, D.C., Wallace McClure and William W. Van Alstyne, both from Duke University and the World Rule of Law Center.

All of these men whom I have just named are recognized authorities and extensive writers in the field of international affairs.

On February 21, 1966, the house of delegates of the American Bar Association adopted a simple resolution asserting that "the position of the United States in Vietnam is legal under international law, and is in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the Southeast Asia Treaty." The house of delegates resolution does not support its conclusion by a single citation of legal authority.

I have talked with fellow members of the American Bar Association, for I am a member of the American Bar Association and active on a number of its committees. They tell me that it was one of these occasions on which a resolution was offered and speeches were made on the floor by people that had never even known that the resolution was going to be adopted, that it was a pretty sad performance of inadequate consideration of a resolution.

When the Harvard Law Record, on March 10, 1966, contrasted the memorandum of law of the Lawyers Committee on American Policy Towards Vietnam with the simple, one sentence resolution adopted by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association, it had this to say:

> Viewed against the background of the sober and erudite lawyers committee brief . . . the American Bar Association resolution contributes little to the national dialogue on Vietnam.

The William L. Standard article discusses the following basic legal points which I believe deserve the consideration of the American people: First, the unilateral intervention of the United States violates the United Nations Charter; second, there was no armed attack within the meaning of the Charter justifying our intervention; third, the principle of "collective self-defense" does not justify our intervention; fourth, the U.S. military presence in Vietnam violates the Geneva Accords of 1954; fifth, the U.S. intervention violates the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization; and sixth, the U.S. intervention violates the Constitution.

Mr. President, for 3½ years now the great Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and I have been speaking repeatedly here on the floor of the Senate, usually several times a week in protest of the U.S. action in Vietnam.

From the very beginning, we have brought out the points of international law verified by these international law authorities, that our course of action in Vietnam from the beginning has been illegal and that it remains illegal up to the very moment that I now speak on the floor of the Senate.

This is supposed to be a hush-hush subject. The spokesmen for the Johnson administration want to brush it off by saying: "But we are in. Maybe we should not have gotten in, but we are in."

Is that not some way to meet an issue on illegality?

Mr. President, we are about to adjourn the Senate, and I want to take these few minutes to give my reply to those journalists who have been writing stories recently to the effect that the so-called doves in the Senate of the United States are not talking very much these days about our war in Vietnam.

It would be more appropriate to say that the journalists have plugged their ears. They are not listening, if they ever did. But millions of Americans are listening. The senior Senator from Oregon has been joined in the Senate this year by an increasing number of his colleagues who are now talking on the floor of the Senate as well as in the cloakrooms. As I have said during the last 3½ years, if I could only have on the floor of the Senate the support I have in the cloakrooms, we might have stayed this unfortunate course of action of our country in the field of foreign policy many, many months ago.

At the close of this session of Congress, I wish to say that the concern over Vietnam in the Senate has grown markedly from what it was only a year ago.

---

[30] Jackson, The Role and Problems of Congress with Reference to Atomic War, Publication No. L 54–135, Industrial College of the Armed Forces (1954).

[31] Newsweek, May 30, 1966, pp. 22–23.

Again on the floor of the Senate, as I have done on platforms across the country, I wish to express my high complements and great regard for the statesmanship of the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. Senator FULBRIGHT did more than anyone else to start this change of attitude in the Senate when, with phenomenal courage, he appeared on a remarkable television program early in the year and said to the American people that he had made a mistake, as the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate in his handling of the resolution of August 1964—the so-called Tonkin Bay resolution.

The Senator from Arkansas not only said it to the American people in that television program, but he also said it several times in other forums. Since then he has led the committee in a review of several aspects of our policy in Vietnam and the Far East, and contributed enormously to the education of the American people on Asian affairs.

To the journalists who are seeking to give the impression that the opposition to this war is somewhat diminishing in this country, may I make this reply, in two points:

There is no doubt, in my judgment, that with the losses we are sustaining in South Vietnam, there is bound to be the development of an attitude in this country that we are there, we are going to have to face the reality that we are there, and we are going to have to end it as quickly as possible—with little emphasis on how we got there, why we are staying there, with very little emphasis upon the proposals that we made for ending the war or the peace.

I wish to say, once again, Mr. President, that we will never have peace in Asia based upon any offer that President Johnson has made yet for peace, for the reason that President Johnson's offer is based upon a false premise. It is based upon a program of bilateral negotiation, led by the United States; and I do not believe there can be a peace table that is bilateral in nature.

My country must face the fact that we have lost the right to seek to negotiate a peace bilaterally, for our course of action has denied us that right, and the world knows it. Our position is that these negotiations shall be conducted with the combatants on the two sides of the table—the United States and the South Vietnamese and those associated with us on one side of the table, and the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese on the other. And I think China belongs on the other side of the table; because, irrespective of her public posture, underneath the table she has been involved in this war from the beginning, in my judgment, and should be on the other side of the table.

But at the head of the table, the third party at that table, laying down the terms and the proposals and eventually calling the shots, should be the noncombatant nations of the world, who have as vital an interest in the outcome of this war as does the United States on the one side and the Communists on the other.

There cannot be a peace table and there cannot be a negotiating table based upon any law of the jungle referring to the vanquished, for we shall win all the military engagements. We have the fire power and the manpower and the equipment sufficiently strong, so that eventually we shall force a surrender. The superpatriots in this country will then hail that surrender as a great victory for peace. It will not be a victory for peace. It will be a forced surrender, which will only cause millions of Asians, with an intense hatred for the United States, to dig in deeper for the decades it will take until they finally drive us out of Asia.

We just do not want to face the lessons of history. In fact, may I say most respectfully that I am afraid that the leaders of my country do not want to read history; for history teaches us how wrong our course of action is.

So I have pointed out that the United States should stop its unilateral course of action. I have pointed out that the United States should insist upon the application to this problem of the existing rules of international law—which means, of course, that we stop the killing, we stop the bombing, we give heed to such great military experts as General Ridgway and General Gavin, to such great diplomats as George Kennan, who have attempted to warn us that the course of action that we are following in Asia is bound to lead us into a major land war in Asia, which will bog down hundreds of thousands of American troops for decades to come. Even then, one day we will have to leave.

The present Presiding Officer of the Senate was on my delegation when we went through Asia last fall, on the appointment of this administration. Time and time again, from government leaders, from labor leaders, from agricultural leaders, from leaders in all walks of life, we listened to this warning: "No Western power is ever going to be allowed to establish a foothold in Asia, to exercise any dominating control over any segment of Asia."

When are we Americans going to learn it? How many more boys do we have to kill before we learn it?

Mr. President, I still say that we should put the signatories to the United Nations Charter on the spot; for every signatory to that charter has pledged its country to enforce a peace when there is a threat to the peace anywhere in the world, which includes Vietnam.

Therefore, Mr. President, my prayers are with my President as he goes to Manila. But I hope that at least the Manila conference will bring out some understanding that will send my President, when he gets back from Manila, to New York City. I hope that my President will talk to the General Assembly of the United Nations and through that General Assembly to the people of the world, laying down the American request for the United Nations to take complete jurisdiction over the threat to the peace of the world in Asia, and for the United Nations to decree a cease-fire. I would have my President pledge that we will respect that cease-fire, that we will stop the shooting, and that the United Nations would then take the steps that the treaty calls upon it to take; that it will send over whatever number of divisions of men are necessary to enforce that peace.

There will be no peace in Asia as long as the United States says to the world, what we are saying by action, and our actions speak louder than the semantics coming from the President of the United States on occasion after occasion, and Rusk and McNamara.

Our actions are actions of war and not peace, when we piously say that we are ready to negotiate a peace on the false assumption that we have the right to insist that the enemy come to meet with us in bilateral negotiations. If we cannot get this type of multilateral action for the settlement of this war, then I want to say to the American people from my desk today: "You are on your way to a war with China."

Therefore, I plead again and pray once more that the people of my country, in the midst of the war hysteria that is now enveloping the Nation, will take the time and meditate as to the moral responsibilities that face us, and our moral responsibility is to stop the killing.

I know that you cannot follow my course of action and not expect what I again point out to the Senate. To take my course of action you must expect to be criticized for so-called letting down the boys in Vietnam. But I repeat that those appropriating the money to kill them are the ones who are letting down the boys, for if this Congress had exercised the check of the purse strings which is set out in the Constitution, and which is within the constitutional power of the Congress, President Johnson would have had to change his foreign policy; he would have had to stop escalating the war.

We owe it to the young men of this country that we are drafting and sending into that war, which at its present rate of escalation will result in killing at least 10 percent of them and wounding three times that number. When the election is over, as I surmise will be the policy of this administration, and there is the step-up in escalation I am satisfied is going to come, we will kill them by increasing hundreds.

And so, as we adjourn, reports in the press to the contrary notwithstanding, the senior Senator from Oregon will take to the hustings, and I shall participate in campaign after campaign across this Nation, from coast to coast, for Democrats who seek to change the foreign policy of my administration.

I shall campaign for no Democrat supporting the killing of these boys in Vietnam. That is why in my State I am not participating in the Democratic campaign. I made that very clear many weeks ago to the Democratic Party of my State and the officers of my party. But I am going to campaign for Democrats in other States that are running for the Congress in both Houses on the basis of a platform that seeks to change the foreign policy of the Johnson administration because, in my judgment, if we do not change that policy, the President does not deserve reelection in 1968, and I shall not support his campaign for reelection. I care not the results and consequences to the senior Senator from Oregon for the issue of this war of the Johnson administration in Vietnam as I talked about once more on the floor of the Senate, pales into insignificance all the other issues facing the people of the United States combined.

I hope my God will give the people the light to see in time that the course of action we are following is not in the interest of our country or mankind.

FOREIGN INVESTORS TAX ACT

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, H.R. 13103, the Foreign Investors Tax Act, as proposed by the administration and as passed by the House of Representatives was a good bill designed to improve the U.S. balance-of-payment situation by attracting more foreign capital to this country. Unfortunately and unwisely, the Committee on Finance and the Senate itself added numerous nongermane amendments which converted a good bill into a grab bag special interest tax measure which was unworthy of the Senate.

The bill, as approved by the conference committee, represents some improvement over the bill as passed by the Senate. But it is still a bad bill, and it ought not be enacted. The bill still contains a number of provisions which grant tax favoritism to certain types of income and to certain special interest groups.

Moreover, the conference committee bill retained a precedent shattering provision which would authorize individual taxpayers to appropriate tax funds for a purpose of their own choosing.

The unwise provisions retained in the bill, in my view, far outweigh the benefits that would flow from the provisions of the basic bill. And it ought not be enacted in the late hours of an adjournment rush.

There will be another opportunity in January to enact the worthwhile provisions of the original bill. The public interest would not be seriously affected by a short delay. On the other hand, approval of the bill as it now stands would write into law additional tax loopholes. Experience has shown that such tax favoritisms become permanent, further eroding the tax base and further complicating the need for tax reform.

So, I hope very much that the Senate will reconsider this matter realistically and reject the conference report and leave the worthy portions of the bill for early action next year and consign the bad provisions to the junk pile.

Among many other things, the conference committee bill retains the Senate amendment which would authorize individual taxpayers to appropriate $1 of their taxes to be paid to political parties for use in political campaigns. This amendment was added by the Senate Finance Committee and approved by the Senate without the benefit of hearings by any committee of the Congress.

Mr. President, I was personally greatly surprised that the Senate itself seriously considered the amendment. I was even more surprised that the conference committee would agree to it. The opportunity for study of this amendment and its many ramifications has been wholly inadequate.

If this amendment is enacted into law, it will add an estimated $60 million to the sums available to the major political parties for use in presidential campaigns without any provision whatsoever to safeguard it from corrupt practices. While a clean election bill dies on the calendar, we have this measure to pour many millions of public funds into the political pot. The bill provides no protection against fraud or misappropriation of these public funds, to say nothing of inadequate safeguards surrounding the use of such additional funds as the parties would continue to be free to raise and spend. Indeed, it would commingle public funds with private campaign money from whatever source. Such a provision would compound rather than correct the evils of money in politics.

True, money is a threat to clean elections; a threat to our entire elective process. Money is used to manipulate elections, to thwart public will, to defeat worthy purposes as well as to promote worthy ones.

The lack of proper controls over the raising and spending of money in political campaigns poses the greatest danger to the democratic elective process. This danger arises from the sources from which such money is obtained, the uses for which it is spent, and also from the amount of money spent in an election.

It is said that this measure would provide a clean source of campaign funds, free from the taint of special interest. Perhaps this is so; but the availability of large sums of Federal tax money for political campaigns would do nothing at all to restrict parties and candidates from raising additional sums, in whatever amount and from whatever source. Indeed, as I have said, good money would be commingled with bad money. Federal tax money would merely be added to what is otherwise available. Thus, the bill would increase rather than decrease the influence of money in Federal elections, multiply its abuses and make more difficult enactment of a clean elections bill.

If the elective process is to be safeguarded, existing law must be drastically revised. Presently, there are no effective limits whatever on the amounts of campaign money that legally can be raised and spent. There should be some reasonable and effective limitation. This problem is not touched by the bill except that it would open the door wider by providing an additional source of funds.

Also, Federal law should provide for timely disclosure of the sources and the uses of campaign funds. The pending bill makes no provision for this. It would not affect in any way the under-the-table interstate traffic in campaign funds in cash unless it should make detection more difficult. If anything, the bill would permit greater freedom in the use of these funds for questionable, unrecorded expenditures, with the Government funds used for legitimate reported transactions.

For many years we have been talking about revising existing law governing use of money in political campaigns. Many bills have been introduced. Ten years ago one such bill was cosponsored by 86 Senators, but that bill was not even reported by the committee to which it was referred. Yet this bill that but makes the problem worse is about to pass without a single day of hearing.

It would thus appear that the Senate is not prepared to deal with the problems of money in elections except to add to them by providing enormous sums of additional money. The evils arising from the raising and spending of campaign funds are frequently and roundly denounced by members of both political parties, but they surely are not reduced by the provisions of the pending bill which would merely compound them by pouring $60 million of additional money into the pot.

In addition, Mr. President, this provision of the bill constitutes a precedent which, if enacted, would pose great potential danger to the legislative process. It would, as I have said, permit individual citizens to appropriate tax funds for a purpose of their choosing. This has never been done before. If we do it now, in later years it may be suggested that the taxpayer should be authorized to earmark a portion of his tax money for other special uses.

Under the Constitution, the authority to appropriate funds rests with the Congress. If we approve the pending measure, the Congress will have partially abdicated its constitutional responsibility to appropriate funds in the national interest. This provision of the bill alone justifies rejection of the conference report.

The bill retains Senate amendments which widen the percentage depletion loophole for those using oyster and clam shells in a manufacturing process and for the makers of brick and sewer pipe. It adds yet other types of clay to the percentage depletion club.

I concede that the conferees improved the bill by limiting one of the Senate amendments which would have provided one of the biggest loopholes. A July 1967 cutoff date was written into the so-called swap amendment involving capital gains transactions. Who are the beneficiaries of this provision? This loophole will cost the Treasury millions of dollars, as those who are in the know scramble to get in under the wire before the July cutoff date.

The conference committee bill retains the provisions of H.R. 10, which would double the deductions allowed for self-employed individuals, principally doctors, lawyers, and other professionals, for contribution to their private retirement plans. This is wholly unjustified. In my view, it is significant that Senate sponsors of this measure did not elect to let it stand on its own feet, preferring instead to attach it as a rider to what they considered a veto proof bill. This provision, if enacted, will more than double the annual revenue loss already attributable to deductions for such retirement plans, because it will make these plans attractive to a substantially larger number of high bracket taxpayers.

Mr. President, other special interest provisions added by the Senate were retained by the conference committee, some in modified form. The only significant omissions are the Senate amendments which would have benefited elderly citizens by allowing fuller deduction of their medical expenses and by providing increased assistance for drugs under medicare. The voice of this large group of our citizens, many of whom are in need, went unheeded.

Mr. President, in my view the Senate acted hastily and without adequate consideration in attaching many unsound amendments to a sound bill. We should pause now, notwithstanding the desire for adjournment, to consider carefully what we are doing. I urge the rejection of the conference report when it is brought up tomorrow.

SENATOR HRUSKA PENETRATINGLY ANALYZES FISCAL POLICIES

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, one of the most thoughtful and penetrating discussions of the Johnson administration's fiscal and tax policies I have seen was presented on October 19 to the annual fall seminar of the Chicago Tax Club by the senior Senator from Nebraska.

Senator HRUSKA's analysis of the suspension of the investment tax credit deserves special attention since he points up cogently and clearly the danger that our economic system could become the "plaything of political whims and political pressures, and the chance congressional majorities of the moment, depending on which economic theory is most in style for the season."

The inflation at which the suspension is aimed—

Senator HRUSKA points out—

is man-made. It can be controlled by governmental policy, just as it is caused by governmental policy. If we continue to suffer from it, it is because we do not choose to exercise the self-discipline involved in cutting back on the rate of expenditures.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the prepared extracts from Senator HRUSKA's remarks.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REFLECTIONS ON FEDERAL TAX POLICY IN AN EXPANDING ECONOMY

(Extracts from the remarks of Senator ROMAN L. HRUSKA, fall seminar, Chicago Tax Club, Holiday Inn, Highland Park, Ill., October 19, 1966)

We meet at a time when the air is full of speculation about possible tax increases next year. Will the President seek to raise taxes or won't he? He declines to say.

In fact, there is still the possibility of a special session after election. Why a special session? For the purpose of raising the taxes that we are afraid to raise before election! The speculation about such a possible session has died away during the last week or two. And yet, we must remember that the decision to call such a special session is in the hands of the President alone. And further, that we have a President who likes to have it understood that he will announce his own decisions, and does not appreciate it when others attempt to forecast the path that he will pursue. So we cannot completely foreclose the possibility of such a call to Congress to meet again in the late November or December.

Furthermore, there is one other consideration that argues for a presidential decision in favor of a special session. . A Congress called to meet after the election will be a lame duck Congress, that is, it will be made up of the present membership, including those who have failed of re-election, and it will exclude all the newly elected Senators and Congressmen who will not yet have taken their seats. Almost surely, this lame duck Congress will be more favorable to the presidential programs—including presidential demands for higher taxes—than will the new set of Congressmen and Senators.

Quite possibly, the President is waiting to have a look at the election returns, before deciding whether he must push his tax program through Congress before the new members take office in January.

Whether the subject is to come up in a special session, or in the regular session, quite evidently the question of federal fiscal policy—and a general tax increase—will be of central importance.

TAX LEGISLATION THIS YEAR

Before trying to pass judgment on that question, we ought to stop and look for a moment at what Congress has already done along this line.

First, let us recall that payroll taxes for the Social Security program were increased effective on January 1 of this year in the amount of nearly $6 billion. Although this levy was put into law last year, it must be counted as a tax increase in 1966. The money thus raised does not, of course, come into the administrative budget. We pour that revenue into a trust fund, rather than into the general fund. Thereby revenues and expenditures of the Social Security fund are not counted in when comparisons are made as to how fast the administrative budget is rising.

But a tax by any other name smells no sweeter to the taxpayer, nor is it any easier to pay.

Then we had the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966 adopted last March. Again, the Administration adopted the palatable equivocation of referring to those tax changes as adjustments—an inoffensive word. Yet, as the President himself advertised, $4 billion was taken out of the economy this year, through a restoration of certain excises, a speed-up of corporate tax payments, and of individual withholdings and administrative acceleration in the payment to the government of taxes withheld. When corporations are forced to pay up two years' tax liability in one year—or four years' liability in three years, I can only call that a tax increase.

Now, we have just passed legislation to suspend the investment credit. Again, the extra revenue to bring the budget nearer to balance is to come out of business.

Finally, let it not be forgotten that when the President called for an expanded scale of social security payments, that also involved some change in the payroll tax. In passing, it should be noted that legislation providing for expanded unemployment benefits also passed both the House and the Senate this year, and is now reaching the stage of conference consideration in the last-minute rush to adjourn.

POLITICAL EXPEDIENCY

Against this background of our activity in the tax field this year, past and pending, one thing at least is clear. When this Administration wants additional revenue, the prime target is business, and particularly the corporations.

It is the first rule of political expediency, of course, not to tax the individual directly except as a last resort. Promise him benefits, promise him favors, but don't tell him about the cost, and avoid irritating him with the taxes to pay that cost. But corporate and other business taxes are generally passed along on to the consuming public of individuals in the end anyhow.

The President's recent call for an increase in Social Security benefits is especially interesting, particularly the timing of it. At this time of the year, in October, he cannot tell us whether additional tax increases will shortly be necessary. He cannot tell us, either, how large a supplemental appropriation will be needed for the prosecution of the hostilities in Vietnam. But he can tell us for sure that he supports higher benefit payments for social security annuitants. It is the kind of decision that is unusually useful to him to be able to make—and announce—during the last month before the election.

As it happens the President is just barely managing to get aboard as the bandwagon leaves the station. The fact is that those receiving social security benefits are very deserving of a moderate increase. They have been badly hurt by this "Johnson inflation." As the cost of living has risen, many professional men, wage earners, businessmen, and others have been able to protect themselves with higher earnings. Those depending upon social security payments have not. They are totally dependent on the sympathy and understanding of their government. If their government will not protect them against rising prices, it ought to find means to improve their scale of benefits.

But that principle is not new. Last year it was proposed, and strongly urged, by the Republican side of the aisle in the Senate. An amendment proposed in July of last year by Senator Jack Miller of Iowa providing an increase in benefits, scaled to the amount of the increase in cost of living, was supported by almost two-thirds of the Republicans in the Senate, but was smothered by the overwhelming votes against of the Democratic majority. The Republicans voted in favor, 15 to 9; the Democrats voted against, 55 to 6. The proposal at the time was for a 3 percent increase, in line with the 3 percent pay raise granted to government employees. Certainly those on the social security rolls are equally deserving, and in far greater need of this consideration. Evidently a good many of the 55 Democratic Senators who voted against that fair and moderate proposal of last year will now have to make a 180 degree turnaround in order to get back into step with their Leader.

A few days ago when the President made his public announcement in support of an across-the-board benefit increase, the Republican leadership in both House and Senate told him that instead of waiting until next year, we were willing to stay in session and vote it into effect immediately. But the President and his party leaders in Congress have apparently decided not to give our senior citizens help when they need it—which is now—but to hold back this particular carrot, and to dangle it before the eyes of this segment of our people until after the votes are counted.

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT SUSPENSION

The investment tax credit when it was enacted was described as a permanent part of our tax structure. The Administration urged most strongly that it was needed to maintain America's technological momentum, and our leading position in the world economy. Some of us were a little suspicious of the idea of using special tax provisions as economic stimuli, to encourage one segment of the economy at the expense of another, and so on.

Now, what are we to say of this proposal for its temporary suspension? My observation is that business can live under a system of low taxes, or a system of high taxes, and somehow come to an adjustment. The credit having become so deeply imbedded in our revenue system, now it is disruptive to business to remove it. It is the uncertainty—not knowing what to expect in the way of taxes—which is most destructive to adjust to. Now that this particular credit has become a basic element in the tax structure, you are told that it is to be taken out. Temporarily? Perhaps. At least, that is the promise. But like so many political promises you cannot be sure of that, when the end of the statutory suspension period approaches, the credit will be restored.

There are powerful arguments against the suspension of this credit. Three are particularly persuasive to me.

First, it is a sound long-range measure to provide an incentive for growth and modernization of our productive capacity. In that respect it has been eminently successful.

Second, suspension of the credit is not suitable as a short-term restraining factor on the economy, that is, to check the boom and dampen the inflationary pressures. There is a considerable "lead time" in carrying out investment policies, with the result that any changes in the investment credit may not alter the scale of business investment for a year, or even two years or more, after the investment credit is suspended. As a result, the strength of present inflationary forces may not be checked at all, but the suspension of the credit may take effect a year or two hence when perhaps the economy no longer requires restraint, but perhaps a further stimulus.

Third, the investment credit has been helpful in meeting our balance-of-payments problem, by making investment here more attractive, and by encouraging modernization and cost-cutting to improve the competitive position of our industry.

Would you believe it, those three reasons are given to you almost verbatim in the words of the Secretary of the Treasury, as explained by him in a statement to a congressional committee just last spring.

IMPACT ON BUSINESS

There is another argument also that appeals to me most forcibly. If the credit is suspended for a sixteen-month period, clearly the Administration hopes that certain types of investments may be cut back during that period. The impact on particular businesses immediately dependent on such business investments may be extremely severe. From a period of feast they are plunged abruptly into a period of famine.

Then, at the end of the sixteen months, there is to be another surge of investment, and again they will be gorged with business. They will have a period of high profits, of heavy overtime work, of frantic recruitment and retraining of skilled workers who may have strayed away during the days of famine, and so on. That is, provided the period of suspension is allowed to come to an end as has been promised. If by that time new reasons are thought up to keep the suspension in effect, or to increase the credit, or to remove it entirely and do something else to either stimulate or discourage investment, then private industry will not know what to do, and how to plan, and what to expect. Our economic system will have become the plaything of political whims, and political pressures, and the chance congressional majorities of the moment, depending on which economic theory is most in style for the season. The whole process of sound economic investment is in danger of being raised and lowered like the height off the knee of women's skirts, according to how the fashion designers see it at that particular time. That is what I fear as we seek to tinker with the economic system.

OTHER MAJOR TAX LEGISLATION

In this report to you of congressional activity this year in the tax field, there is one other major piece of legislation on which action was recently had. That bill is known as the Foreign Investors Tax Act of 1966. During the past week or two the action on tax matters has been so fast and furious that it is almost impossible to report on the current status of any bill without rechecking on what has transpired during the previous twenty-four hours.

Thus, with respect to the foreign investors tax legislation, it started as a bill dealing primarily with the taxability of foreign investments in this country. In the House a good many amendments were added. In the Senate, a good many more, covering all sorts of aspects of taxation including the taxability of private pension plans, the depletion allowance on clamshells, certain tax concessions to older people on the cost of drugs, and a good many other provisions. Then, in the Senate at the last minute we adopted an amendment which would virtually have given a perpetual tax exemption on foreign deposits in our banking institutions. That amendment practically destroyed the original principal purpose of the bill, leaving little of substance except the amendments.

Certain of the amendments were meritorious, but the bill contained so many confusing and contradictory provisions that it was not possible for me to vote for it. In what condition it may emerge from the conference it remains to be seen.

In this context of discussion on tax increases, and when we are told that higher taxes are necessary to stabilize the economy, and to dampen down the inflationary pressures, inevitably the question arises, is this policy really unavoidable? Is there no other way?

What is the problem and what are the facts?

Undeniably we have a problem of inflation. During the past twelve months the whole sale price index has risen by 3.5 percentage points. The cost of living index has increased by 3.1 percentage points. There is not much difference in the rate of increase of the two price indexes, which is an indication of how pervasive it is.

INFLATION IS MANMADE

Furthermore, the range of these price increases is not restricted to any one segment of the economy. Usually in an inflationary situation food prices are among the first to rise, since they usually start from a rather depressed level anyway. But prices of other commodities have increased also, by close to the same percentage rate. Furthermore, the Government tells us that the average cost of services has gone up by 4.8 percentage points, even faster than the price of commodities.

The why is not particularly complex to discover. It is a manmade inflation, as most inflationary periods are. It is caused by too much money chasing not enough goods. It is caused by Government deficits which pump buying power into circulation, without counterbalancing that demand with a supply of products which will soak up the buying power and stabilize the price level.

To be more specific, it is the result of trying to pile the war on poverty on top of the war in Vietnam. The spending on Vietnam alone could have been contained and handled within our economic potential, I am convinced. As a matter of fact, military spending has not yet increased as fast as civilian spending. During the first two months of this fiscal year, July and August of 1966, federal expenditures increased compared with the corresponding two months of last year from $16 billion to $21 billion. Out of that $21 billion total spending, $11 billion was non-military; and $3 billion of the $5 billion increase was non-military. So the real surge of spending has not been for the fighting, it has been for the non-military activities of our Government.

Federal expenditures have increased from $76½ billion in 1960 to about $107 billion in the fiscal year just finished—1966. It is about 40 percent in six years, which is pretty fast even for a country as rich as ours.

In 1965, alone, the cost of inflation to the United States as a whole was calculated at $15.6 billion. Your state of Illinois earns 6.545 percent of the national personal income, so Illinois' loss was $1.02 billion.

Suppose your legislature were to decide to levy a retail sales and use tax at a rate sufficient to recoup that loss by inflation for one year. Do you know that such a tax would have to be at the rate of 6.4 percent? That is in addition to the present tax.

Can you imagine a politician brave enough to recommend such a tax?

INFLATION CAN BE CONTROLLED

In my opinion the causes of the inflation are not far to seek. In fact, it is surprising that we have not suffered sooner and more severely than we have.

Those who follow loose fiscal policies typically seem to underestimate the consequences of their actions. Frequently, history shows us they reject the warnings of the dangers into which they are plunging their people. They cannot or will not believe that their policies are really as disastrous as their critics say.

So we must lie in the bed that our leadership has made. But there is no reason why we should do so in ignorance of why it is ill-made. There is no reason why we should pretend we do not know the source of our ills.

This inflation is man-made. It can be controlled by governmental policy, just as it was caused by governmental policy. If we continue to suffer from it, that is because we do not choose to exercise the self-discipline involved in cutting back on the rate of expenditures.

That may be hard to do. But it is not hard to know what to do.

ADJOURNMENT TO 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I now move that the Senate stand adjourned until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 21, 1966, at 9 a.m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate October 20, 1966:

National Highway Safety Agency

William Haddon, Jr., of New York, to be Administrator, National Highway Safety Agency.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 20, 1966:

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Russell Arnold, Smiths.

CALIFORNIA

Doris A. Esteban, Idria.

Richard M. Mollin, Murphys.

MASSACHUSETTS

Rosemarie L. Dolan, Greenbush.
Edward L. Perry, North Truro.
Richard E. Briggs, South Lee.

NEW JERSEY

William C. Beemer, Sussex.

PENNSYLVANIA

James J. Fragle, DuBois.

TEXAS

George B. Yeager, Jr., Bay City.
Garth A. Bills, Breckenridge.
Jewel M. M. Brooks, Hart.
Theo B. Boydstun, Killeen.

VIRGINIA

Juanita A. Tuttle, Craigsville.
John H. Wayman, Kilmarnock.

WEST VIRGINIA

Loreida F. Hedger, Charmco.

WISCONSIN

Robert E. Dyer, Ferryville.
Alan L. Christensen, Montello.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Harold Barefoot Sanders, Jr., of Texas, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGES

Bryan Simpson, of Florida, to be U.S. circuit judge, fifth circuit, to fill a new position created by Public Law 89-372, approved March 18, 1966.

Gerald W. Heaney, of Minnesota, to be U.S. circuit judge, eighth circuit, to fill a new position created by Public Law 89-372, approved March 18, 1966.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGES

James A. von der Heydt, of Alaska, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Alaska.

William P. Copple, of Arizona, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Arizona to fill a new position created by Public Law 89-372, approved March 18, 1966.

Robert F. Peckham, of California, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of California to fill a new position to become effective September 18, 1966, by Public Law 89-372, approved March 18, 1966.

Warren J. Ferguson, of California, to be U.S. district judge for the central district of California to fill a new position to become effective September 18, 1966, by Public Law 89-372, approved March 18, 1966.

Manuel L. Real, of California, to be U.S. district judge for the central district of California to fill a new position to become effective September 18, 1966, by Public Law 89-372, approved March 18, 1966.

John Lewis Smith, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. district judge for the District of Columbia.

Aubrey E. Robinson, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. district judge for the District of Columbia.

Charles R. Scott, of Florida, to be U.S. district judge for the middle district of Florida to fill a new position created by Public Law 89-372, approved March 18, 1966.

James E. Noland, of Indiana, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Indiana to fill a new position created by Public Law 89-372, approved March 18, 1966.

Edward J. Boyle, Senior, of Louisiana, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Louisiana.

Alvin B. Rubin, of Louisiana, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Louisiana to fill a new position created by Public Law 89-372, approved March 18, 1966.

Lansing L. Mitchell, of Louisiana, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Louisiana to fill a new position created by Public Law 89-372, approved March 18, 1966.

Fred J. Cassibry, of Louisiana, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Louisiana to fill a new position created by Public Law 89-372, approved March 18, 1966.

Timothy S. Hogan, of Ohio, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Ohio.

David S. Porter, of Ohio, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Ohio to fill a new position created by Public Law 89-372, approved March 18, 1966.

Donald Stuart Russell, of South Carolina, to be U.S. district judge for the district of South Carolina.

Robert M. McRae, Junior of Tennessee, to be U.S. district judge for the western district of Tennessee.

U.S. ATTORNEYS

Robert D. Smith, Jr., of Arkansas, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Arkansas for the term of 4 years.

Charles M. Conway, of Arkansas, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Arkansas for the term of 4 years.

John P. Hyland, of California, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of California for the term of 4 years, to fill a new position, to become effective September 18, 1966, created by Public Law 89-372, approved March 18, 1966.

Edwin L. Miller, Jr., of California, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of California for the term of 4 years to fill a new position, to become effective September 18, 1966, created by Public Law 89-372, approved March 18, 1966.

U.S. MARSHALS

Wayne B. Colburn, of California, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of California for the term of 4 years, to fill a new position, to become effective September 18, 1966, created by Public Law 89-372, approved March 18, 1966.

Edward A. Heslep, of California, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of California for the term of 4 years.

Anthony R. Marasco, of New York, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of New York for the term of 4 years.

Peter J. Foley, of Rhode Island, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Rhode Island for the term of 4 years.

U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS

Philip Nichols, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be associate judge of the U.S. Court of Claims, to fill a new position created by Public Law 89-425, approved May 11, 1966.

Byron G. Skelton, of Texas, to be associate judge of the United States Court of Claims to fill a new position created by Public Law 89-425, approved May 11, 1966.

FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

Edward D. Re, of New York, to be a member of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States for the term of 3 years from October 22, 1966.

U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE

Spottswood W. Robinson III, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. circuit judge, District of Columbia circuit, vice George T. Washington, retired.

U.S. ATTORNEY

Robert M. Draper, of Ohio, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Ohio for the term of 4 years, vice Joseph P. Kinneary, resigned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1966

The House met at 10 o'clock a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Peace I leave with you, My peace I give unto you. Let not your heart be troubled.—John 14: 27.

Eternal God, our Father, from the shifting scenes of our mortal life we pause to lift our hearts in prayer unto Thee—who art from everlasting to everlasting.

From daily duties which consume our strength, from meetings and schedules which take up so much of our time, we would for this fleeting moment put our hands upon the window sill of heaven and gaze upon Thy face.

In all our anxious moments grant unto us the assurance that Thou art with us; that behind every shadow stands Thy presence; within every situation abides Thy spirit and beneath every experience are Thine everlasting arms.

Breathe Thou Thy peace upon us, upon our Nation and upon our world—in the spirit of the Prince of Peace we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 12360. An act to permit the sale of grain storage facilities to public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations;

H.R. 13320. An act to authorize the disposal of industrial diamond stones from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; and

H.R. 15335. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish an Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations," approved September 24, 1959.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 985) entitled "An act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1068. An act for the relief of Fred E. Starr;

S. 1349. An act to amend the inland, Great Lakes, and western rivers rules concerning sailing vessels and vessels under 65 feet in length;

S. 1496. An act to repeal the provisions of law codified in title 5, section 39, United States Code, and for other purposes;

S. 2321. An act for the relief of Ioannis A. Vasilopoulos; and

S. 2893. An act to amend section 208(c) of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide that certificates issued in the future to motor common carriers of passengers shall not confer, as an incident to the grant of regular route authority, the right to engage in special or charter operations.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following

titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 433. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain land in Lander, Wyo., and for other purposes;

S. 1406. An act for the relief of CWO Charles M. Bickart, U.S. Marine Corps (retired);

S. 2254. An act for the relief of Jesse C. Johnson;

S. 2396. An act for the relief of Alton R. Conner;

S. 2474. An act for the relief of Henriette Lecordier Redmon;

S. 2510. An act for the relief of the city of El Dorado, Kans.;

S. 2677. An act for the relief of Kathleen Styles;

S. 2913. An act for the relief of Charles H. Thurston; and

S. 2925. An act for the relief of Chester E. Davis.

THE HONORABLE HARRY FLOOD BYRD

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I inform the Members of the House of Representatives of the death of a very great American I have had the honor to represent. A past Governor of my State and a former Member of the U.S. Senate, the Honorable Harry Flood Byrd, of Virginia, died at his home in Berryville at 8:25 this morning.

The death of Senator Byrd marks the passing of one of the great men of our time. He marched across the pages of American history. This Virginia statesman made a mark on our Commonwealth and our Nation that will cause him to be missed and long remembered. My family and I send to his family our deepest sympathy.

GENERAL LEAVE

I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House might have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the life and service of Senator Byrd.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, it was Emerson who said that "an institution is the lengthened shadow of one man."

Senator Harry Flood Byrd stood tall, and he cast a long shadow, one that reaches down to the undawned years. His impact upon his own generation was one few men in man's history have matched. No future historian, faithful to his task, can ignore or pass over lightly the role he played through some of America's most fretful, turbulent years.

In times of turmoil and uncertainty, while the United States was experimenting with new notions, testing new techniques, trying new methods and often trampling upon tradition and truth, Senator Byrd held to a single-minded course set by the stars of principle, integrity, and courage. His refusal to compromise, his resistance to the temptation of expediency, his determination to continue the fight when pale logic spoke the language of surrender won for him the love of many, the admiration of most, and the respect of all.

Although Senator Byrd was looked upon as the most astute and effective political leader in the Nation, I never regarded him as a politician, certainly not in the popular connotation of that word. Even as a neophyte in political life, I felt instinctively that here was a man who could be trusted never to do a little or unworthy thing. Fourteen years of experience in political life have vindicated my instincts.

My most heartfelt sympathy I extend to the family of Senator Harry Flood Byrd in this, their hour of sorrow.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Senator Byrd, Virginia and the Nation share the loss of a great statesmen. Only time will make possible a realization of the full impact of his long, distinguished, intensive activity in the Senate and his influence as the dominant force in the political life of Virginia.

I had the privilege of serving in the House of Representatives for almost 20 years while he was in the Senate. Although we did not always think alike or vote alike, I was grateful for his candor, his cordiality, and his unstinting cooperation. I extend my sympathy to the members of his family.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the name of Harry Flood Byrd has become a legend in our own time stemming from his 50 years of service to the State of Virginia and to the Nation he loved so well.

Harry Byrd was an uncommon man in an age of conformity. He will be best remembered perhaps for his vigilance in fiscal matters and in protecting the Federal Treasury from negligent waste. However, our beloved Senator Byrd was more than just a watchdog of the Treasury, important as this job was.

Coming from a State that has produced so many immortals in American history, Harry Flood Byrd's reputation as an individualist stands high even among the famous Virginians that served this Nation in years past.

Harry Byrd knew that greatness almost always meant standing alone in the great tide of public opinion, when he was faced by the dictates of personal conscience. He spoke for a Nation that would always be strong, resourceful, and independent in the family of nations. He stood for a Congress that was ever responsive to the will of people yet ever mindful of its fearful responsibility to maintain its identity among the three branches of the Government.

The name Harry Flood Byrd is enough in itself to call forth the whole tradition of uncompromising individual responsibility that was his trademark. Senator Byrd did not always agree with his party position on money matters but his opinion was always respected, and it was his very refusal to waver from his principles that made him a man marked for greatness.

A certain stillness has now fallen over the golden apple orchards of Winchester, Va. It is the fall of the year and an autumnal haze has come to the Shenandoah Valley, to the land that Harry Byrd loved so well. It is fitting that we pause to pay tribute to this great American that left us in the autumn of his years. His devotion to the fundamentals of free government will remain an inspiration to us all.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, Senator Byrd was the first great public figure I ever knew. I met him when he was Governor and I was a boy of 7. I was fortunate that our families were friends and have remained friends.

His strength of character and his resolute dedication to principle shall remain among my greatest inspirations. His encouragement and assistance have strengthened my purpose. His friendship was a tribute that I shall always treasure dearly.

Like the comparatively few men of their times who are really worthy of being called men, Harry Flood Byrd stood for something worthwhile. His basic belief was that of sanity in government; sanity in the mind of a people for its government, and of a government for its people.

Like Washington and Lee before him, Harry Byrd became Virginia's greatest American of his century.

There is so much loss at a time of death. The Senator's family is sorely bereaved and so is the Nation, but there is an even greater tragedy. It comes to the very young and to those yet unborn who will know Senator Byrd only in the history in which he wrote a major chapter and in which his place is secure.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret to learn of Senator Harry F. Byrd, Sr.'s passing.

Senator Byrd was always consistent in his fight for the principles in which he believed so strongly. He was an outstanding American and Virginian, and his loss will be deeply felt by countless thousands who linked themselves to his philosophy of government. While we did not always agree on legislation, there was mutual respect for each other's position and opinion.

Virginia has lost an admired and respected leader, a man who many years ago started the State on a progressive path. I mourn his loss with all Virginians and extend my deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to learn early this morning of the passing of my esteemed and close friend over a period of many years, Senator Harry Flood Byrd. It was my particular privilege to work closely with Senator Byrd on many legislative projects, particularly those relating to the activities of the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Finance of the U.S. Senate. We have been the closest of friends for many, many years. He labored to develop legislation in many fields which will be of lasting and direct value to the citizens of this Nation. He was a man of high principle and courage, a man of integrity and character, and a gentleman in the finest sense of the word. I deeply regret that we no longer will have the benefit of his counsel, but his son, the distinguished Senator Harry Byrd, Jr., and the other surviving members of his family, can take lasting pride in the monument of service he has erected.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I am grieved and distressed to learn of the passing of former U.S. Senator Harry Flood Byrd, of Virginia. I have known Senator Byrd for more than 40 years and have been closely associated with him personally and politically for all of that time. I served in the General Assembly with Senator Byrd before he was Governor of Virginia and then I served in the General Assembly throughout his splendid 4-year term as Governor from 1926 to 1930.

Senator Byrd's life and public activities have been of such a character as to enhance the betterment of the entire state of Virginia. Senator Byrd was a statesman of the first rank. He was a strong adherent to sound philosophy and good government administered by men of ability and honor.

Senator Byrd will, without doubt, go down in history as one of the great Virginians of all time and, certainly, the ranking Virginian of this century. He was endowed with keen intellect and possessed extraordinary sterling qualities of character with the courage and ability to do what was right irrespective of what effect it might have had upon him personally or politically. I was with him in many political battles involving serious governmental problems. I have never known him to waver in a fight when principle was involved. He steadfastly clung to principle and was unmovable. When he decided that a course was right, he fearlessly clung to that course. If others around him became excited, the greater was his calm and composure. Like the sturdy oak, he was a refuge in times of storm and stress.

I had unbounded admiration and the warmest personal affections for the late Senator. I loved him dearly. I shall ever cherish the memory of our associations. I have benefited much by having known him, and many are the times I have found the right way through his sage counsel and wise advice.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that we in this country today do not have more men of the type of Senator Byrd. He measured up in every way to the high standards that people have a right to expect of their public servants.

In connection with the life of Senator Byrd, I think these lines are quite appropriate:

> God give us men! A time like this demands
> Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands;
> Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
> Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
> Men who possess opinions and a will;
> Men who have honor—men who will not lie:
> Men who can stand before a demagogue,
> And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking;
> Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog
> In public duty, and in private thinking;
> For while the rabble, with their thumb-worn creeds,
> Their large professions and their little deeds,—
> Mingle in selfish strife, lo! Freedom weeps,
> Wrong rules the land, and waiting Justice sleeps!

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the life of a great statesman, student of government and friend of all Virginians has died and it is a grievous loss for all of us.

Senator Harry Byrd, Sr., was not only a personal friend but an advisor and counsellor of good government whom we all relied on in the Congress, whether we were Virginians or from another area of the nation.

He was that kind of a man. Helpful, courteous and courageous. I will miss him as a friend; Virginia will miss him as an historic individual who led his State into the 20th century with skill and devotion. The Nation will miss Senator Byrd for his efforts to keep her strong and solvent while living within the constitutional limitations of good government. He was a magnificent man and ranks in our history with the great leaders who wrote the Constitution he revered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has suffered a monumental loss with the passing of Hon. Harry F. Byrd, Sr., who long will be remembered as one of the truly great statesmen of our generation. Few, if any, public officials in the annals of American history have had a more distinguished career.

He was a man of high character and unimpeachable integrity who rightfully earned the respect of not only his close associates, but indeed of the entire American public. As an articulate and effective champion of fiscal responsibility in government, he has left a unique legacy of service to the people of this Nation.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, Virginia has lost one of her finest sons—a true Virginia gentleman—and the country has lost a man of outstanding ability and unquestioned honesty and integrity. As State senator, Governor of Virginia, Member of the U.S. Senate for 32 years, and chairman of the powerful Senate Finance Committee for 10 years, Senator Harry F. Byrd leaves behind an outstanding record of accomplishment. His was a lifetime devoted to public duty and service. A strong believer in fiscal responsibility, he never compromised the principles for which he stood. Senator Byrd was a gentle, courtly man; but a man of great determination who never hesitated to do battle for those things in which he believed and which he felt were in the best interest of this great Nation. A true patriot, he regarded public office as a trust, and he discharged the duties of the high office which he held with fidelity.

Senator Byrd has returned forever to the beautiful Shenandoah Valley of his beloved Virginia, and we shall not soon see his like again. I was privileged to have known him as a friend and extend to his sons and to the other members of his family my deep and heartfelt expression of sympathy on their very great loss which we all share.

A TRIBUTE TO HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, as vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Defense Production, I want to express my regret that this committee will lose the valued and able services of its chairman, Hon. A. Willis Robertson, senior Senator from the State of Virginia, at the close of the 89th Congress.

Willis Robertson has had a distinguished career of 34 years of dedicated public service in the Congress of the United States, having served for 14 years in this body and for 20 years in the U.S. Senate. It has been my privilege to be closely associated with Senator Robertson during this entire period of 34 years, and his absence will be a great loss to the Congress of the United States and the Nation and a very personal loss to those of us who have served with him on the Joint Commiteee on Defense Production.

Senator Robertson had already devoted 18 years of effective service to the State of Virginia before beginning his illustrious career in the Congress. His outstanding record of accomplishment during those years has contributed much toward the progress achieved in the Old Dominion.

As chairman of the Joint Committee on Defense Production, Willis Robertson has contributed greatly to the Nation's strength and security by his vigorous advocacy of mobilization preparedness. He brought to this committee, and other committees on which he served, a veritable reservoir of detailed information relating to the budgetary problems and complexities of our Government. Those of us who have served with Senator Robertson respect and admire him as a man of good humor who has shortened our long hours of congressional labor with the amusing stories and historical anecdotes he frequently uses to illustrate his point in discussions and debates.

Willis Robertson has served his State and Nation long and well, and I believe the students of history will find his name high on the roster among those great statesmen from the Commonwealth of Virginia who have preceded him.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the Joint Committee on Defense Production approved a resolution on the 20th day of October 1966, expressing their genuine affection for Senator Robertson and their deep appreciation for his devotion to duty and his outstanding service to the committee, to the Congress and to the Nation. This resolution bears the following signatures:

Wright Patman, vice chairman, and Congressman from the State of Texas.

John Sparkman, Senator from the State of Alabama.

Paul H. Douglas, Senator from the State of Illinois.

Wallace F. Bennett, Senator from the State of Utah.

John G. Tower, Senator from the State of Texas.

Abraham J. Multer, Congressman from the State of New York.

William A. Barrett, Congressman from the State of Pennsylvania.

William B. Widnall, Congressman from the State of New Jersey.

Paul A. Fino, Congressman from the State of New York.

It is requested that this resolution be printed in the Record.

Joint Committee on Defense Production Resolution

Whereas the Joint Committee on Defense Production, Congress of the United States, will lose the valued and distinguished services of its Chairman, Hon. A. Willis Robertson, senior Senator from the State of Virginia, at the close of the 89th Congress; and

Whereas Senator Robertson is one of the two remaining original members of the Committee created by the Defense Production Act of 1950 and has served the Committee as Chairman in the 85th, 87th, and 89th Congresses and as Vice Chairman in the 84th and 88th Congresses; and

Whereas Senator Robertson's dedicated service to the Committee has contributed greatly to the Nation's strength and security in time of both war and peace by his vigorous advocacy of defense preparedness and defense mobilization programs for which the Committee has a major responsibility; and

Whereas Senator Robertson has achieved great distinction and honor as a Member of the Congress for 34 years including 14 years in the United States House of Representatives and 20 years in the United States Senate; and

Whereas Senator Robertson has won the respect and admiration of his fellow Members of Congress and the Nation's leaders who regard him as a patriot, statesman, soldier, lawyer, historian, and sportsman in the finest traditions of the United States of America and the Commonwealth of Virginia; and

Whereas his colleagues on the Committee and his many friends know Senator Robertson to be a God-fearing, courteous, able, energetic, and good humored public servant who will be sorely missed in the Halls of Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Joint Committee on Defense Production of the Congress of the United States express its genuine affection for Senator Robertson and its deep appreciation for his devotion to duty and his outstanding service to the Committee, to the Congress, and to the Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That we, the undersigned members of the Committee, extend to Senator Robertson our best wishes that he may be granted many years of health and happiness and may continue to exert a patriotic influence on his fellow Americans; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution, as unanimously approved on this 20th day of October, 1966, be signed by the members of the Committee for presentation to Senator Robertson and be made a part of the permanent record of the Committee.

Attest:

Wright Patman, Vice Chairman; John Sparkman, Paul H. Douglas, Wallace F. Bennett, John G. Tower, Abraham J. Multer, William A. Barrett, William B. Widnall, Paul A. Fino.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I appreciate the gentleman from Texas yielding at this time. It has been my very great privilege for a number of years to know Senator Willis Robertson. Over the years I served with him on a number of Senate-House conferences involving numerous appropriation bills. He was an outstanding member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. He was always a constructive Member in the various conferences where the conferees sought to achieve a sensible, reasonable, and beneficial compromise of the differences. We will miss him badly in the U.S. Congress—Willis Robertson was a tower of strength, an outstanding legislator, and one of the finest gentlemen who ever served in the U.S. Senate. I certainly wish him and his wife a happy, healthy, and successful future.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the distinguished minority leader for those remarks.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Texas. I have known Senator Willis Robertson for many years, having sat in conferences with him on the Post Office and Treasury Department appropriation bills. I always found him, in my dealings with him, to be a gentleman, a great American, and an outstanding public servant. I appreciated many of the stories I heard about him and his early career when he was one of the country's great and outstanding football players. This was in the days when they did not wear too many pads. He was rugged and a fearless battler, always played to win but played the game by the rules, fair and clean. He carried on in the same tradition in his career in the U.S. Senate. He will be sorely missed by the Senate, by the great State of Virginia which he so dearly loves, and by our great Nation.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I endorse all that has been said about Willis Robertson. I am one of those who was privileged to serve with him in the House years ago. I know of his great qualities and his great contributions to the Nation. He is the type of man the Congress can ill afford to lose.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman for those kind remarks.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Texas for taking this time to pay tribute to a very distinguished Virginian whom I have the honor to represent. Senator A. Willis Robertson lives in my congressional district. He makes his home at Lexington in Rockbridge County. It should be pointed out that prior to earning for himself a national reputation as a Member of the U.S. Senate, he had already distinguished himself as an outstanding Member of the House of Representatives. Both Senator Robertson and myself have had the privilege of representing the Seventh Congressional District of Virginia in the House of Representatives.

As a House Member, he had an enviable career. He served on the Ways and Means Committee, and his legislative accomplishments in this body are many.

Such public service in both the Senate and in the House has been the hallmark of this man. His record of service to the State and Nation has been the story of his life.

I can recall that even still, many citizens of our district refer to him as Major Robertson, which is a tribute in itself to his service in World War I.

It is a pleasure for me to join with others in the House to not only commend him for his service to his country, but to extend to him and his family every good wish, with the hope that he will still make available to us his wisdom and his counsel.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a sense of deep pride to join my colleagues in expressing the honor and respect I hold so fervently for Senator A. Willis Robertson.

I consider myself a close personal friend of Senator A. Willis Robertson but friendship alone does not motivate me to praise this man. Senator A. Willis Robertson has stood resolutely and courageously for Virginia for more than 20 years and he has been one of the most effective Representatives our State has ever had. Senator Robertson is tremendously influential and tremendously respected—both by his Virginia constituents and by his senatorial colleagues. The test of a Senator's value should be his effectiveness, in my judgment, and Senator Robertson has had no peer in working to effectively serve his beloved Commonwealth.

He is quick and energetic and he is one of the hardest working men in Washington. The volume of work he completes for Virginians is tremendous. He not only is willing to work but he loves his work. And those of you who have seen him on the Senate floor as I have know that he is complete and knowledgeable in behalf of his people. His Senate colleagues have complete confidence in his ability and his integrity. And when he rises to speak for Virginia he gets their full attention and more often than not, the fullest support of his Senate colleagues, because they have confidence in his mastery of his subject and confidence in his dedication to the people of Virginia.

A man does not have to know Senator Robertson more than a few minutes before realizing that he has two great loves—the people of Virginia and the Constitution of the United States. I have been with him many times and heard him speak both publicly and privately, both casually and with fervor, and I can tell you that he has an intense personal interest in the future of Virginia and in the people of Virginia. And I believe he is probably one of our Nation's great constitutional lawyers. His statements on the floor of the Senate on constitutional law are probably unexcelled in this or any other time.

Much is said about the importance of our Constitution and our Bill of Rights and our other Government documents but the rights and the freedoms we have enjoyed are not self-executed or self-perpetuating. Men must be willing to defend the Constitution. Men must be willing to continue our assurances of freedom. Many nations have written strong constitutions but many nations have lost their freedom because they failed to possess men like Senator Robertson who are willing to rise to the defense of the people and the people's liberties. The principles inherent in our governing documents are the principles that have guided Willis Robertson throughout his years of public service. He is a man who is dedicated to the people's liberties and a man who is dedicated to the people and the State of Virginia.

On May 27, Willis Robertson celebrated his 79th birthday. Few men in American history have served in the legislative branch of our Government for almost a half a century. That alone is a privileged achievement. But a greater achievement for this man and the millions of Virginians he represents is the fact that his years have been useful and active years. His physical stamina today challenges men half his age. He is a rugged man who has spent much of his leisure time outdoors. And he is a physical man with an unusual degree of health and strength. And he is able today to do his work as vigorously and zestfully as any junior Member of the U.S. Senate. The years have been kind to Senator Robertson and he is able today at 79 to be young in action and young in effectiveness.

Today I would like for my colleagues to know that I am proud that I have had an opportunity to know and work with Senator Robertson. His character and his strength and his dedication to principle will always be a great source of inspiration for me. He will not be returning to the U.S. Senate when the 90th Congress convenes in January, but the imprint that this able and courageous Senator has left on his time will be here as a guide for all of us. The service he has rendered his State and his Nation is a hallmark of effective representation. The work he has done and the greatness of the man himself will always be remembered.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] for the opportunity he has afforded the House to pay tribute to Senator Robertson.

Senator Robertson leaves the Congress after a long and distinguished career which spans a period of more than half a century and covers nearly the whole of the spectrum of public service. To that career he brought a wealth of native talent, education, training, and tireless energy and, perhaps most important, a reservoir of most uncommon commonsense. All of these attributes have been assets of immeasurable value to his State and Nation.

For the Sixth Congressional District I am privileged to represent, I claim a close and abiding identification with Senator Robertson. Educated in the public schools in Lynchburg, he still has many ties there as he does in the great Roanoke Valley where his relatives reside. Senator Robertson, a Member of this body since 1932, was elected first to the other body in 1946 to fill the unexpired term of the late Senator Carter Glass who earlier represented our Sixth Congressional District.

Coming as I did to this body a Republican from a Democratic State represented in the other body by two Democratic Senators, I was, perhaps understandably, anxious about the posture and prospects of things. My anxiety was soon dispelled. Both of our Virginia Senators extended their welcome and offered their cooperation. I was, and remain, most grateful. Our relationship has been not only pleasant but fruitful. Even in the political arena, it has always been a gentle fray which left no scars.

In the legislative arena, we have not contested but rather joined together in all things which concerned the interests of our State and her congressional districts. Speaking for the Sixth District, I express my sincere appreciation to Senator Robertson for the nonpartisan, bipartisan approach he has always pursued in such matters.

As he returns to his family and to Virginia's fields and streams which he loves so well, I salute him and wish him well in all things.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in combining appreciation and good wishes to my friend, Willis Robertson, as he approaches retirement. His service to Virginia and the Nation has been long and distinguished, and future generations of Americans will benefit by his many legislative contributions.

I am grateful to Willis, not only for his cooperation and helpfulness to me in connection with our responsibilities in the Congress, but even more particularly for his personal friendship.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Senator Willis Robertson is not only a man of integrity and courage, as he has proved time and again in a long and distinguished political career—but he is a fighter of great tenacity and vigor for what he believes to be right.

Senator Robertson leaves the service of his people but he will not relinquish his responsibility and affection for them, I know, nor will we, as Virginians, ever forget his loyalty and service.

Senator Robertson leaves with honor. He departs only from the hallways of Congress officially. He will always be welcome as a friend, a statesman, and a man who loved his State and her people and who fought for them down to the wire as a man and an American.

FREDERICK H. SONTAG OF MONTCLAIR, N.J., PRAISED BY EPISCOPAL MAGAZINE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS LEADERSHIP

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, one of the privileges and pleasures of representing my congressional district during the past 2 years has been seeing the outstanding quality of the leadership of the men and women there. Both Episcopal Bishops Stark and Rath are among my valued constituents, as are many priests, ministers, rabbis, and lay leaders of the various faiths.

At a time when civil rights leadership is somewhat less popular than it was some time ago, I am proud of the persistence and dedication of the men and women of the various dioceses which represent Essex County. Earlier this year the largest national Episcopal magazine, the Witness, singled out on its editorial page one of our most distinguished New Jersey church civil rights leaders, Frederick H. Sontag of Montclair, N.J. I think it represents the strength of the people of my congressional district that they have continued to stand by their beliefs regardless of the fact that the going has become somewhat rougher.

There is a lot of work to be done to create equal opportunity for all our citizens and I believe this will be achieved in the period ahead. I think, therefore, that it is very appropriate to take notice of the fact that the leaders of tomorrow of various religious groups, both political parties and both men and women, are being recognized in the manner of this editorial in the Witness.

I congratulate Frederick Sontag on a job well done and know that the clergy and lay people will continue this work in the years to come.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 387]

Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Glenn
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Belcher
Berry
Blatnik
Bolling
Bray
Brock
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Cabell
Callaway
Carter
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain

Clawson, Del
Clevenger
Cohelan
Colmer
Conyers
Cooley
Corman
Craley
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Duncan, Oreg.
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fascell
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Gettys
Giaimo
Gilligan
Goodell
Greigg
Gross
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Hébert
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Hungate
Huot
Jacobs
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, N.C.
Keith
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kornegay
Laird
Leggett
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
MacGregor
Mackay
Mackie
Mailliard
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Meeds
Michel
Miller
Mink
Moeller
Moorhead
Morrison
Morton
Moss
Murray
Nix
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
O'Neal, Ga.
Pool
Powell
Purcell
Randall
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roncalio
Roudebush
Roush
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Scott
Senner
Shipley
Sickles
Sisk
Smith, N.Y.
Stafford
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Toll
Trimble
Tunney
Tupper
Ullman
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watts
White, Idaho
Whitener
Whitten
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Yates

The **SPEAKER**. On this rollcall, 253 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

THE HONORABLE JOSEPH MARTIN, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. **CONTE**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. **CONTE**. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to extend an invitation to all Members to join me later in the day in paying tribute to our distinguished and beloved former Speaker, the Honorable JOE MARTIN, of Massachusetts.

As we all know, this is to be the last session of the Congress in which our distinguished colleague will be with us. The curtain thus comes down on an illustrious career in public service, including a tenure in this House that spans fully two generations of Americans.

Although he truly belongs to all of us, and the warmth of his friendship and generosity were never subject to the confines of partisan politics, he is especially dear to those of us on this side of the aisle. He is our former leader and the most recent gentleman from this side to sit as Speaker of the House.

I am therefore proud and honored to invite all Members, from both sides, to join me in special orders at the close of regular business today so that we might pay tribute to a most distinguished gentleman and a most distinguished career.

THE HONORABLE LEO O'BRIEN AND EUGENE J. KEOGH

Mrs. **KELLY**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. **KELLY**. Mr. Speaker, as the Democratic National Committeewoman of the State of New York, I take this time to pay tribute to two Members from the State of New York, the Honorable LEO W. O'BRIEN and the Honorable EUGENE J. KEOGH. These gentlemen have served well their constituents, the State of New York, and the Nation. They have been great legislators. It was with sorrow that we from New York, learned that they have decided not to seek another term in this body. I am sure all of my colleagues share our thoughts. Mr. Speaker, it is for that reason I feel all of us would possibly like to take a few minutes and pray that they will have made the right decision because we need them in public life. In the years ahead men with their experience and guidance are needed as each in their own way have contributed so much to protect our way of life. These are trying times. Times for great decisions and their greatness must not be lost by their decisions to be retired. Many are not aware that Congressman KEOGH was the one who initiated the revising of the laws and United States Code. When he was chairman of the Standing Committee on the Revision of Laws from 1939 to 1946 he initiated a program to clarify the statute laws of the United States and delete obsolete ones. This has been a great boon to Members of Congress, lawyers, and the public generally and has been a great contribution to American jurisprudence.

Our colleague, Congressman O'BRIEN, who is considered the father of Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood has done an outstanding job as chairman of the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs.

We know these gentlemen from New York will be happy returning to private life and will have the added happiness of spending more time with their families and friends. I am sure the Members of the House will join me in wishing them well and I ask unanimous consent for other Members to join me in paying personal tribute to them so that the record will show the love and affection we have for these able men who have served their country well and bore the responsibility of public service for many years. They were never afraid to take a stand on any issue, whether that issue was controversial or not.

I regret they will not be here with us again for another term, but am sure they will give to us a helping hand when called upon.

Mr. **MONAGAN**. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] in paying tribute to two outstanding Members of Congress from the State of New York who will voluntarily terminate their service at the close of the 89th Congress.

One is the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN], who has served with distinction as a member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and who has brought to the deliberations with which he has been concerned a clarity of exposition and a brilliance of argument that have won the approval of the House. In his rare explosive moments he has had the capacity to dazzle the House and leave a permanent brilliant memory of his spirit and capacity.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] has won the affection and esteem of Members by his unfailing courtesy, his interest in the problems of new Members, and his willingness to advise other Members from the vast fund of information which he has acquired during his long years of service.

A Beau Brummell who epitomizes the spirit of Gotham and an outstanding presiding officer of the House, "GENE" KEOGH's strong character will be sorely missed in the future.

I have been proud to call each of these gentlemen my friend and I want to express here my fondest wishes for their future happiness and success.

Mr. **DOW**. Mr. Speaker, allow me to pay a small tribute to the Honorable EUGENE J. KEOGH who has chosen not to stand for reelection.

Mr. KEOGH has been immensely helpful to me, a new man, by providing advice and much-needed guidance on many occasions during the course of my first term. He has listened carefully to every request I have made and given it judicious consideration. In many cases he has been able to help me by virtue of his senior position on the principal committees. This has been of benefit to my district and I am grateful to the gentleman from Brooklyn.

In addition, I have to admire the brisk and precise manner Congressman KEOGH has always displayed when presiding over the Committee of the Whole. Only a veteran could perform with the skill that Mr. KEOGH possesses.

To go with this, the gentleman from Brooklyn is endowed with a marvelous sense of humor and wit. Even sharply delivered it is accompanied by a twinkle that makes it painless. I recall upon one occasion when I congratulated Congressman KEOGH, after his descent from the chair in the Committee of the Whole, for his outstanding conduct of the proceedings. I laid on the praise for his performance rather heavily and he answered, "JOHN, how would you know?"

Indeed, I probably do not know, but I give myself credit for recognizing that Congressman EUGENE J. KEOGH is a man of stature and accomplishment. I am proud to know him.

Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the retirement of the Honorable LEO W. O'BRIEN from Congress, I hope it is not presumptuous for a new man to express his sentiments of high regard for the gentleman.

During my first term in Congress Mr. O'BRIEN was on numerous occasions a helpful mentor. His sincere and quiet advice permitted me to steer safely through some legislative shoals that I might not have otherwise escaped.

The gentleman from Albany sets an example of jovial and imperturbable conduct that every Member of the Congress could emulate. He understands well the trials and tribulations of behind-the-scenes legislative process. Always he emerges buoyant and able to give advice and comfort to those who are less able to stand the heat.

It has been an immense pleasure to me to have LEO W. O'BRIEN as an acquaintance and friend, even though it has been for a short period of 2 years. We will all look forward to his visits to us in the future with cheerful expectation.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, for 30 years the handsome figure of my good friend, GENE KEOGH, has graced the Halls of this Congress. Since 1936 he has served with great distinction on many of our committees and the people of Brooklyn are proud of his contributions to our Nation.

GENE KEOGH is one of those people who believe firmly that this is a nation of law and not of men; his work on the codification of the law is a tribute to that belief and his service on the House Ways and Means Committee reflects great credit upon him. We will never forget the years he has dedicated to our country.

He will be missed by us all, but his retirement from the Congress will not, I know, be the end of his service to the American people.

Our city of New York will be more than happy to welcome GENE KEOGH back because he represents the finest tradition in New York politics; he is not only a great statesmen but a great politician and that, Mr. Speaker, is meant as a tribute. All of us here are politicians and we know that politics is the science of government. Unfortunately, our friends in the journalistic field have busied themselves in trying to denigrate politics. GENE KEOGH is one of those who gives to lie to their efforts.

GENE KEOGH has been a people's Congressman, and this body will be lacking something when the 90th Congress convenes without him in January 1967.

Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague and my good friend, LEO O'BRIEN, a former member of the fourth estate and a Member of this body since the 82d Congress, has decided to retire to a life away from the hustle and bustle of the Washington scene, to the relative quiet of another great capitol—Albany, his home city.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the legislative activity there will not drive him right back to us. At any rate we all know that his public service is not at an end.

LEO gave the Nation 14 good years and during that time he accomplished a great deal. He is largely responsible for bringing into the Union our two newest States—Hawaii and Alaska. His good judgment and great concern, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs, contributed greatly to the progress and well-being of America's territorial possessions. He is one of those responsible for the turning of the islands of American Samoa into a model for the entire Pacific.

I know that I speak for all of our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, when I say that I am proud to have served with LEO O'BRIEN; his conscientious devotion to duty has been an inspiration to all.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, it is with great personal regret—a regret shared by all my colleagues—that I note the approaching retirement from the Congress of one of the very ablest, as well as one of the very finest, men to serve in the House in the last 14 years. The States of Alaska and Hawaii, hardly less than his own Empire State, are eternally in his debt.

It was the gentlemen from the 29th District of New York who served as floor manager for the Alaska and Hawaii statehood bills. It was he who kept alive the hopes of our great noncontiguous territories after a series of heartbreaking defeats of admission bills. In the final, successful fight for first-class citizenship for the peoples of Alaska and Hawaii, LEO W. O'BRIEN was the spearhead of the assault in 1958 against prejudice and reaction.

Alaska already has insured that the O'Brien name will never die: A mountain has been named after his grandson, Terry. Hawaii, too, will forever remember his unflagging efforts and the brilliant strategy he employed in their behalf. Realizing that the false fears generated by racial prejudice would block an early Hawaii admission, he pushed first for Alaskan statehood. It was his belief that Hawaii would almost automatically follow into the Union. To the gratification of all reasonable men he was proved right.

Now at the age of 66 and after so many fruitful years embracing eight consecutive terms in the House, devoted to the fostering of the interests of his State and his Nation, LEO W. O'BRIEN deserves a rest.

I wish him all the happiness and good fortune beneficent providence can bestow.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues here today in this unanimous nonpartisan tribute to our distinguished colleague from New York and my good friend, LEO O'BRIEN, who is voluntarily retiring from his devoted work at the end of this session.

All of us very deeply regret LEO O'BRIEN's departure from this body because over the years of his outstanding service, he has earned for himself the affection and esteem of our entire membership, regardless of political affiliation.

The record of LEO O'BRIEN's dedicated congressional service to his district, State, and Nation has consistently demonstrated that he is a gentleman of integrity, courage, conscience, competence, and purpose which qualities together with his warm personality and compassionate disposition have made an indelible contribution to the accomplishments of this House over the past 14 years and impression on the minds and the hearts of his multitudinous friends.

In his retirement from our body we fondly wish him Godspeed while we express our appeal that he will not withdraw the continuing contribution of his acclaimed knowledge and intelligent guidance toward solutions of the many great problems and challenges that still beset the destiny of this beloved country.

We join in our prayers that the Almighty will bestow upon our dear friend, LEO O'BRIEN and his most gracious wife, Mabel, continuing good health and good fortune through many, many more years of increasing success in all their further endeavors.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, a Congressman is many things, but seldom is he a newspaperman. A newspaperman is many things but seldom is he a Congressman. But in the case of the Honorable LEO W. O'BRIEN, of New York, we have a man who is both and who, rarely enough, is good at both. For 30 years before he came to this body 14 years ago LEO O'BRIEN was a prominent newspaperman in Albany, N.Y. In addition, when a new era dawned he became an award-winning television and radio commentator. As a Member of Congress LEO O'BRIEN has many times proved his mettle. Few will forget the fight he waged as floor manager on the Hawaii and Alaska statehood bills. His work on the Interior and Insular Affairs and Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees is well known to all of us here. LEO O'BRIEN has served the people of New York State and the country well. They will miss him as we shall miss him. We wish him a happy retirement and a full life.

Mr. Speaker, in April 1965, when our distinguished colleague from Brooklyn, the Honorable EUGENE J. KEOGH, announced that he would resign at the end of this session of Congress we were all deeply saddened. Many of us tried to get him to change his mind but to no avail. So now the moment comes and I frankly find myself unable to think of the House of Representatives without my old friend. For more years than I like to recall, going back to days when neither one of us was yet privileged to be a Member of this body, we have been close friends. "Close friends" is a pale phrase for our relationship, Mr. Speaker. We could not be closer were we brothers. Mr. Speaker, those who do not know New York City or Brooklyn tend to dismiss it as a cold, impersonal big town. I can vouch for the fact that while it may be large there is nothing cold nor impersonal about it. The friendships formed in Brooklyn are as warm and lasting as those formed anywhere in the world. And how could a city be impersonal and cold and produce a man like GENE KEOGH? His warmth, Irish wit, personality, and charm are merely parts of the man. GENE KEOGH is much more than that. For 30 years he has sat in this House representing the people of Brooklyn. And he has represented them well. The people will suffer for his departure, as we in this body will. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all my colleagues join me in wishing GENE KEOGH many, many happy and successful years of retired life. I wish him Godspeed. But I will not say goodby.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my many colleagues in regretting the departure from the House of our dear, able, gracious friend from New York, Congressman GENE KEOGH.

GENE KEOGH is one of the ablest, outstanding leaders of this House. He has served here with great distinction for many years.

Of gracious personality, charming manners, urbane outlook, GENE KEOGH is possessed of great ability and is endowed with a sharp, alert legal mind which encompasses all things. He is a lawyer of fine training, rich experience, and great gifts. He has enjoyed great success in his field and is recognized as one of the leaders of the bar.

Statesman and legislator, eloquent speaker, skilled parliamentarian and presiding chairman of the House, Congressman KEOGH's service has been marked by many constructive contributions and effective service to the great House Ways and Means Committee of which he is a high-ranking member and to the House, his district, and the Nation.

He commands the respect for his ability and talents of every Member of the House and is recognized for his ready wit, keen mental agility and the vigor, intelligence, and effectiveness he displays in his committee work and in debate, and in all his work.

Moreover, GENE KEOGH is a man of faith, fortitude, and broad capacity for friendship—amiable in nature, warmhearted, and generous of impulse, a lucid and stimulating companion and a dear, valued friend.

He has adorned the majesty of the House with his sparkling presence, his courtly manner, and his striking appearance.

And he has won the hearts of many friends here with his kindly, considerate ways, his willingness to help and the color and warming effects of his fine sense of humor and wit.

GENE KEOGH has served in this House with fine distinction, but not without unusual sacrifice on the part of his family and himself.

Devoted to his lovely family and naturally desirous of giving more attention to the fuller potential of his talents as a recognized, outstanding lawyer and the practice of the law, it is easily understood that his decision to leave the House was no doubt prompted by compelling personal considerations.

We are all very sorry to see GENE leave this great body where he has served so effectively for so many years. We will greatly miss him. His place here and in our hearts can never be really filled, because he has been cherished by all of us and will continue to be.

Mr. Speaker, I hope and pray that our dear, distinguished, and valued friend, Congressman GENE KEOGH and his dear ones will enjoy all choicest blessings in the future—good health, good fortune, success, and happiness for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, like many Members of the House, I was quite surprised to learn that our dear, valued, and esteemed friend, Congressman LEO W. O'BRIEN, has decided to leave the House. His departure from these Halls will leave a great void, because his service here has been without stint or limit, and it has been marked by outstanding ability, dedication, and achievement.

LEO O'BRIEN has made an enviable record here. He has used his great abilities and talents in innumerable ways to further the interests of the country, and to serve his large constituency with efficiency and distinction, going far beyond the call of duty.

LEO has labored assiduously and effectively in many legislative areas, and his great historic work in successfully pressing for the admission into the Union of the new States of Alaska and Hawaii was indeed a memorable contribution of first magnitude, of which we as admiring colleagues and warm friends, and everyone who knows LEO may well be proud.

His service here has been marked by great ability, fine statesmanship, and unusual effectiveness, and the record he has made for district, State, and country will be permanently spread on the pages of history and will be recognized as superb and enduring contributions.

To strike a personal chord, LEO O'BRIEN has impressed us, and endeared himself to us, by his lovable personal qualities, his abounding good nature and good will, his cooperative spirit, commonsense, and the warmth and appeal of his loyal friendship.

It is with regret that we see him pass from the congressional scene. His departure truly leaves a void in our midst that could never be filled, not only in the official sense, but in the personal sense.

We will miss him, because he is one of the great Americans who has served here, and we will always gratefully remember and cherish his valued friendship and stimulating companionship.

I know that one of the reasons which prompted LEO in deciding to leave the House is at times felt by so many of us and that is to be in a position to spend more time with his family, something that unfortunately in large measure is so often denied to Members of the House, especially during these crucial days when for one reason or another our labors and responsibilities are so demanding.

I wish for my dear friend, LEO, every success, prosperity, and happiness for many years to come with his family and dear ones, and may all choicest blessings always be with them in the future.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Representative EUGENE J. KEOGH, of the 11th District of New York, who is now completing his 15th consecutive term of service as a Member of the House of Representatives, is a man to whom it is an honor to pay tribute at this landmark of his career. He has invested 30 years in the service of his country in Congress, and has shown himself to be a great Democrat—"Democrat" spelled both with a small "d" and a large one—and both our Congress and our country are greatly the richer for his endeavors. First winning election in 1936, as America began to recover from the great depression, he has witnessed and contributed to the profound events in our national life, in the kaleidoscope of recent American history which includes war, peace, economic development, scientific advance, and social justice.

Representative KEOGH is known both for his personal attributes and his professional accomplishments. His constituents have known him for 30 years as a first-rate representative of their interests in Washington; and if he had not been, we would not now be paying him tribute at the close of his 15th term as an elected Member of this body. His colleagues have recognized in him an excellent parliamentarian, an outstanding debater, and a keen analyst of national affairs. His perception, his fairness, his absolute integrity, in such rare combination with modesty and lack of presumption, have earned him the title of "Ambassador of the House of Representatives." His service on the House Ways and Means Committee as well as on such special committees as the Select Committee on Foreign Aid, or Herter committee, has left the imprint of his character on the kind of legislation which proceeds from the House of Representatives. His district and our Nation are fortunate to have had the advantages, through the past 30 years, of his leadership.

The tasks of a good legislator are many, and, we often feel, thankless. All of us know that they are not truly thankless, for we are reminded each time we have the occasion to observe our system of democracy in action, or to give thanks to God for our many material blessings, or to watch our children grow up to become free, healthy, intelligent adults, that our efforts have contributed in some measure to making America the kind of land she is. But it is also our privilege, here in Congress, to extend our appreciation more vocally to those of our colleagues whose efforts are truly outstanding. It is for this reason that I wish to extend my heartiest congratulations to EUGENE J. KEOGH on the 30 years of excellent service which he is now completing.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my many colleagues who are expressing their affection and respect for Representatives EUGENE KEOGH and LEO O'BRIEN and their regret that these outstanding Members of Congress have chosen to retire.

Each of these men in his different ways has made a major contribution to the work of the Congress during his years here, Eugene Keogh as one of the most influential members of the Ways and Means Committee, and Leo O'Brien for being the recognized father of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. More than that, both men have shown extreme consideration toward their colleagues, and particularly toward the more junior Members.

Many of us in the freshman class have good reason to be grateful to them. All of us, seniors, juniors, and freshmen alike, will sorely miss their presence here, but we all wish them many happy years of relative peace and quiet, and we hope they will come back to see us often.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, with the retirement of our esteemed colleague, Leo W. O'Brien, three States will lose a cherished friend in Congress—his own State of New York and the newest in our Union, Alaska and Hawaii.

Under his effective floor management the bills granting statehood to Hawaii and Alaska were passed and became law. It was also under his able leadership as chairman of the House Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs, however, that many other farsighted and beneficial measures were enacted.

I am particularly grateful to Mr. O'Brien for the generous cooperation which he provided in arranging hearings on my bill to establish a Richard E. Byrd Antarctic Commission.

Respected as a former newspaperman and award-winning radio and television commentator, Mr. O'Brien gained in stature with each session of Congress in which he served. Certainly his dedicated service and his deep knowledge of interior and insular affairs will be sorely missed.

His 14 years of service in the Congress have been years of untiring hard work, of dedication to principle, of sincere and courageous action on behalf of the people he represents.

With him now go my best wishes for a full and happy retirement. It has been an honor to serve with Leo W. O'Brien.

Mr. Speaker, the House will miss the able service of our esteemed colleague from New York, Eugene Keogh, who is leaving this year.

A practicing lawyer with the New York City firm of Halpin, Keogh & St. John, Eugene Keogh has served with distinction on the House Ways and Means Committee and other committees.

His varied experience including the recent positions as director of the New York World's Fair 1964–65 Corporation and director of the Bank of North America has equipped him with special insights which have proved extremely helpful to this body.

He has also contributed his talents as chairman of the Democratic caucus, chairman of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, and member of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in extending my sincere best wishes to Mr. Keogh. His 30 years in Congress have been productive ones. I am sure that his future will also be fruitful.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, Gene Keogh, provided many memorable moments during our deliberations in the Ways and Means Committee and his keen mind and insight have helped to shape much of the legislation which emanates from this Committee. Gene has an unusual talent for expressing his thoughts incisively and emphatically and if I should ever need a lawyer to plead my case in court he would be among the first with whom I would counsel.

Gene Keogh is a loyal fighter for progressive legislation and has served his constituency, as well as the whole country, with a high degree of proficiency in trying to achieve his ideals along the lines of improved conditions for all Americans. His talents in committee sessions and in debate will certainly be missed since Gene has been such a champion for the underprivileged of the entire country.

Additionally, Gene has a fine cooperative personality and during my first months on the Committee he was most helpful to me in the encouragement and advice which he gave to an inquiring mind. We will all miss Gene's fine personality and cheery disposition here in Washington and I wish him well in his retirement from the Congress.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, the State of New York is losing, through retirement, two fine Members of its delegation, the Honorable Eugene J. Keogh and the Honorable Leo W. O'Brien.

They are sincere, conscientious, loyal and able Representatives of their respective districts. They have rendered valuable service and their departure is a distinct loss not only to their constituents but to the Nation as well.

As they leave, I would like to extend to both of them my very best wishes for an abundance of success and happiness in the years ahead.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, if a retiring member of this House were to be judged solely by his contributions to legislative accomplishments, then Leo O'Brien, our distinguished colleague, would certainly obtain a high rating. When a man leaves this chamber to return to family life, he leaves more than a mark on the law of the land, he leaves a personal remembrance among those who have known him over the years.

Leo O'Brien, the legislator, considered by many as the father of Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood, has done great things here, all of which have made America a bit better by his presence.

Leo O'Brien, the man, is considered by all as a kind, helpful, wonderful person. These qualities result in more than the printed words which appear in a statute book. They leave lasting memories in the minds and hearts of us who have had the pleasure of serving with him.

Leo O'Brien is a man of many personal accomplishments, not the least of which was to win the hand of a lovely lady from North Cambridge, Mass.—Mabel Jean.

A former newsman and commentator, Leo O'Brien left that field to contribute to the work of Congress. He now leaves the Congress to what we all hope will be even greater happiness and accomplishments than those which he has achieved in the past.

Perhaps one of the most meaningful accolades which we can render to our colleague is to add, after the description "Leo O'Brien, gentleman"—"And friend".

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my many colleagues in paying tribute to the Honorable Eugene Keogh who is retiring from the Congress at the end of this session.

For 30 years, Gene Keogh has superbly represented his district, his State and his Nation. During those 30 years he has come to occupy a place of real preeminence here in the House, and this is as it should be. For, Gene Keogh, of gracious personality and charming manners, is also an eloquent speaker, skilled parliamentarian, and has a very keen legal mind.

Mr. Speaker, I consider it a real honor to know this fine gentleman and to have served with him in this Congress. The Congress and the Nation are much the better because of his untiring devotion to duty during his years here. May God grant him every blessing and many more prosperous and happy years.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in expressing my respect and affection for the two Members from New York, the Honorable Leo W. O'Brien and the Honorable Eugene Keogh, who will voluntarily terminate their service at the close of this Congress.

As a fellow member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I saw firsthand the untiring work and dedication to principle which were characteristics of Mr. O'Brien. His sincere and courageous action on behalf of the people he represented, as well as the entire Nation, established him as an outstanding lawmaker.

Mr. Keogh also earned the respect for his ability and talents of every Member of the House. His keen legal mind, coupled with a sparkling wit, enabled him to make major contributions to Congress as well as being an amiable associate.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have served with both of these distinguished gentlemen who I consider as warm, personal friends. I join my colleagues in extending to each of them my sincere best wishes for success, prosperity, and happiness in the years to come.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it was with a feeling of sincere regret that I learned that my old and good friend, Eugene Keogh, was to leave the Congress. I have known him since 1941, and I will say this, the House will be a less interesting body upon his departure.

Eugene Keogh is a gentleman in every best sense of that word. I have valued his friendship over all the years that I have served with him in the House. His record as a legislator is known to all of us, as is his outstanding service on the Ways and Means Committee. I can say with the deepest sincerity that the genleman represents the highest order of qualification for service in this body. He is the example which all of us would do well to emulate.

To study his record is to discover what truly makes an outstanding Member of Congress. I—and all of us—will miss him. He has served his district and the country well over all these years and, as I said at the outset, it is with a true feeling of regret that I realize that Eugene Keogh will not be with us in the next Congress.

I bid him farewell with the realization that he can look back on his service in this great body with fully justifiable pride. I know that his endeavors in the future will reflect the same spirit, the same character, the same integrity which has been the mark of his service here.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the 89th Congress were saddened when our colleague, Congressman Eugene J. Keogh, of Brooklyn, N.Y., announced he was retiring and would not seek reelection to the 90th Congress.

Very few Americans in the history of our Nation have been so highly honored as to be reelected to the National House of Representatives on 15 general elections. Gene came to Congress in 1936 and has been consecutively reelected each time by large majorities.

When I came to Congress in January 1943, Congressman Keogh was one of the first Members who came to me and offered advice and some of the facts on procedure which all freshman Congressmen delight in receiving.

He is recognized as one of the top parliamentarians on the floor of the House. He has rendered long and valuable service to the Ways and Means Committee over the years and possesses a keen knowledge of the intricate Federal tax system and could easily be classified as a top expert of that committee which deals exclusively with tax problems.

I know I bespeak the minds of all the Members of this body—Republicans and Democrats—when I say that there have been few men in history who have held their respect and admiration from the standpoint of ability and public service for a period of 30 years in the Congress of the United States.

Congressman Keogh's retirement is a loss to his district, State and Nation.

I wish to congratulate him on his long record of public service and extend to him and his family my best wishes for many years of good health and happiness.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Leo O'Brien has served in the Congress since 1952. The House of Representatives has been a better place to serve because of his presence over these years. I have valued—and will always remember—my association with him. It is with a sincere sense of sorrow that I realize that he will not be with us in the next Congress.

He has served his country well. He has every reason to be proud of the record he has made in the Congress of the United States. I can only hope that I will be able to look back on my service in the Congress with the same sense of satisfaction that is so certainly true of the gentleman from New York. He is a respected and honored Member of this body and I am sure that the regret which I feel is shared by all Members of this House.

He has been an outstanding man and an outstanding legislator. His impression will remain with us.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as this 89th Congress closes, we say goodby to two of our colleagues, Leo W. O'Brien and Eugene J. Keogh, who have served the House faithfully and well for many years. We shall miss them but we understand their desire to return to private life.

It has been a pleasure for me to serve with Leo O'Brien on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, where he was chairman of the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs of which I was also a member. I shall never forget the many courtesies which he extended to me and other members of the subcommittee. It was a privilege to work with him.

As you know, Eugene Keogh has served with distinction for 30 years. When I attended my first session of the House in 1963, he was one of the first of my new colleagues to introduce himself, and this warm and friendly gesture will always be remembered.

May I extend to both Mr. O'Brien and Mr. Keogh my best wishes for many years of health and happiness in their well-earned retirement.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, as this Congress adjourns and we bid farewell to our colleagues we note, not without a tinge of sadness, that our colleague, the Honorable Leo W. O'Brien, will now retire from active participation as a Member of Congress. The retirement which he has chosen is one which is well earned and deserved.

I would like to state that I am proud to have been associated with him in this body, as a colleague from our great State of New York. He has served both the Nation and his constituency well—the finest proof of this being the high esteem in which he is held by all of us here today.

I extend to him my best wishes for a long and healthy retirement during which he may continue, as a private citizen, the work he has done as a public official.

Mr. Speaker, the next session of Congress will be less rich to wit and wisdom as a consequence of the retirement of the distinguished gentleman from New York, the Honorable Eugene J. Keogh.

He has served his constituency in the State legislature and in the Congress long and well and I had the pleasure and privilege of serving in the State legislature with him.

He has taken grand perspective of a Congressman's responsibilities and achieved, during his long tenure of office, the reputation of a statesman.

Congressman Keogh is held in high esteem and warm affection by all of his colleagues, of whom I am proud to number myself one.

As I bid him farewell from this body, I wish him great success for whatever course he plans to follow and many years of good health. I am certain he will remember with justifiable pride his accomplishments while a Member of this body—we certainly will not forget.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, if there were such a thing as a Congressman's Congressman, that person would probably be Eugene Keogh, who will be retiring from the 89th Congress after outstanding service of 30 years.

Representing the 12th District of New York, Congressman Keogh has been elected consecutively since 1936. He has been active on numerous committees in the House, and currently is chairman of the Democratic caucus, Chairman of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Commission, second vice chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, and a respected member of the Ways and Means Committee and Advisory Committee on Intergovernment Relations.

Eugene Keogh is an attorney and a member of the Bar Associations of New York and the District of Columbia, as well as the American Bar Association and the Federal Bar Association. A strong leader, a man known for his courage, dignity, courtesy, and compassion for others, valued counselor and friend, Gene Keogh's presence will surely be missed when we meet again in January. I wish him well, and know his example will guide us in the future.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I believe all the Members of Congress will miss the presence in the next session of our colleagues, Representative Eugene J. Keogh and Representative Leo W. O'Brien. But we New Yorkers will particularly miss them. These two Congressmen, one from New York City and the other from upstate, were the backbone of our delegation. No chore in behalf of the State was too much for them, no responsibility too onerous. New York has been fortunate during their tenure of office to have men of such stature representing it. They will be very hard to replace.

Eugene Keogh, of Brooklyn, has served in this body for 30 years. As a ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, he occupied a position of great power and trust. A man of exceptional wit, he did not seek publicity or adulation for his achievements. Instead, he characteristically worked behind the scenes in behalf of causes that would benefit the Nation and his constituents. New York Congressmen could count on Gene Keogh for fairness in his leadership and for whatever help they might need. He has been a loyal party man and a loyal friend. I think he has been an outstanding Member of Congress.

Leo O'Brien came to this body from Albany after three decades of experience as a newspaperman. He brought with him the wisdom and the perspective of someone who had long observed politics from very close range, without actually being in it. He was remembered once for his journalistic achievement and to this he adds the reputation he has now made as an excellent legislator. Certainly the people of Alaska will remember the contributions he made to their statehood. New Yorkers will remember him for his dedication, his kindliness and his constructive service.

Gene Keogh and Leo O'Brien will not soon be forgotten. Their New York colleagues regret the decision of these two fine men to leave us and we wish them well.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with my senior colleagues in paying tribute to the Honorable Eugene J. Keogh, who has decided not to seek reelection for further service in the House, where he has served with such distinction and marked effectiveness for 30 consecutive years.

As a member of the legal profession, I have always been tremendously impressed with Gene Keogh's knowledge of the law, for he is truly a "lawyer's lawyer." His keen, analytical mind, his splendid parliamentary performances, and his sterling worth as an individual and as a legislator have marked him for the admiration and affection of his peers. I am sure he will adorn the legal profession when he resumes his practice and that his endeavors and accomplishments in that field will be appreciated and admired as they have been here in the House of Representatives.

As a younger man, I have been proud to call Gene Keogh a friend as well as a colleague, and I wish him the best of everything in the years ahead. I will always hold him in highest esteem for his urbane yet warm manner, his mastery of parliamentary procedure, and his penetrating insight into legal problems and national affairs, and, above all, for his devotion to his country and to his chosen faith.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues on the departure at the end of this Congress of our friends, Gene Keogh and Leo O'Brien.

The State of New York and the United States have been fortunate in having the services of these two able gentlemen in the House of Representatives. They have served with distinction to themselves, our native State, and the House. They will be sorely missed.

I am sure that we all regret that they have chosen to retire, but I am sure that we all agree that they have earned their retirement and we wish them well. Knowing these gentlemen as we do, we know that they will continue to serve and advise whenever and wherever needed; they will never fail to heed the call of our country.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I and all other Members so desiring may extend their remarks on the forthcoming departure from the Congress of our two distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from New York, [Mr. Eugene Keogh] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. Leo O'Brien].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE THOMAS H. WERDEL

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have the sad duty to advise the membership, particularly those Members who were here in 1949 and through 1952, that the Honorable Thomas H. Werdel of Bakersfield, Calif., my predecessor in the House, died recently.

Mr. Speaker, Representative Werdel served for a period of two terms here in the House of Representatives, Mr. Werdel was a Republican, a very splendid man.

Tom died in Bakersfield, on September 30, following a lengthy illness. I know that his many friends and colleagues who were in Congress when he was here share my grief at his passing.

He will also be missed by his many friends in Republican politics in California and throughout the Nation.

Tom Werdel was a dedicated conservative. I did not share his views in many respects. However, when I ran against him in 1952 we conducted a clean, high-level campaign and I respected him highly. In recent years I considered him to be a very good friend.

I would like to extend my heartfelt sympathy to his widow, Rosemary, and their three sons, Thomas, Junior, Charles, and Terrance.

I am including herewith the story which was carried in the Bakersfield, Calif., Californian on October 1 relating to Tom's death. The story follows:

> Former congressman Thomas H. Werdel, 61, one-time vice presidential candidate on the Constitution party ticket, died Friday at his home after a long illness.
>
> The former congressman, who played a leading role in Republican politics at both state and national levels, continued to wield much influence for the conservative bloc.
>
> He was adviser to later party candidates in their bids for the presidency.
>
> The former congressman devoted many years to public office. He served in the state Assembly from 1940–1944 and in Congress from 1948 to 1952 when he served on both the Labor and Education committees as coworkers with Richard Nixon and the late President Kennedy, then in Congress.
>
> He headed the 1952 Free Delegation to the Republican National Convention in opposition to then Gov. Earl Warren, and in 1956 became the vice presidential nominee on the Constitution party ticket headed by T. Coleman Andrews, former head of the Internal Revenue Service under President Dwight D. Eisenhower, who resigned his post to head the third party ticket.
>
> Following defeat in the 1956 elections, the former congressman devoted the greater part of time to his own law practice in Bakersfield and to politics when his advice was sought by state and national candidates.
>
> Mr. Werdel was born Sept. 13, 1905, in Cattle County, S.D., but spent the greater part of his life in Bakersfield where he attended elementary schools and was graduated from then Kern County Union High School. He received his bachelor of arts degree in 1930 at the University of California and his law degree at Boalt Hall, U.C., in 1936. He began his Bakersfield law practice with J. Odgen Reavis and was later associated with the firm of Havey, Johnson and Baker from 1936 to 1939.
>
> He was secretary of the Kern County Bar Association in 1939 and served as chairman 1939–1940. He was affiliated with the Kern County Chamber of Commerce and was chairman of its Conference on Community Needs in 1939.
>
> He was a member of Bakersfield Council 977, Knights of Columbus, and was grand knight in 1939–1940. He was a member of the Phi Alpha Delta professional legal fraternity and served as justice in 1935–36. He was affiliated with the Delta Sigma Phi national social fraternity.
>
> When he entered Congress he was interested first in public recreation facilities at Isabella Dam. He won both the Democratic and Republican nominations in the second term bid in 1950. In his political career, he became increasingly conservative, leading to the third party organization in 1956.
>
> After his retirement from active politics in 1957, he returned to his law practice in Bakersfield and was in partnership with Vincent Di Giorgio. More recently he headed his own firm, Werdel and Wallace, where his son, Attorney Charles Cutter Werdel, was also his associate.
>
> He married the former Rosemary Cutter in San Francisco in 1934. He is survived by his widow of the home address, 2200 Pine Street; his son Charles and two other sons, Attorney Tom H. Werdel Jr. of Los Angeles and Terrance J. Werdel, a law student at the University of California. He is also survived by two sisters, Mrs. Clara Sims and Mrs. Helen Werdel Mansfield, both of Bakersfield, and a granddaughter, Ann Alyce Werdel, Los Angeles.
>
> A Requiem Mass will be offered Monday at 11 a.m. in St. Francis Catholic Church. Msgr. Patrick Leddy will officiate. Doughty-Calhoun-O'Meara is in charge of the arrangements.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks, and that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to comment upon the career and personality of Mr. Werdel.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE FRANK CHELF

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to obtain unanimous consent, on tomorrow, to pay tribute to a distinguished colleague from my home State of Kentucky, the Honorable Frank Chelf, who came to this Congress in 1944 and who is voluntarily retiring this year.

Mr. Speaker, on tomorrow, after the conclusion of all regular business and other special orders heretofore entered, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed for 30 minutes, in order to join with other colleagues and pay tribute to the Honorable Frank Chelf.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

THE HONORABLE PAUL J. KREBS

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise with mingled feelings of pride and regret to pay tribute to my distinguished friend and colleague from New Jersey, Paul J. Krebs.

I feel regret for, under the redistricting plan adopted by the New Jersey State Legislature, Paul's congressional seat has been eliminated, and he will not return to Washington next January as a Member of the 90th Congress.

But most important, I feel great pride in the record Paul Krebs has compiled here and in the contribution he has made to the unique legislative accomplishments of this historic Congress.

In 2 very short years in the House, Paul has made a decided impact upon his colleagues. We in the New Jersey delegation have been particularly close to him, and were best able to observe his hard work, leadership and willingness to tackle and follow through on problems of national importance. He was always one who could be counted on to support the vital measures and programs which have made the 89th Congress the most productive and creative in our Nation's history.

His service on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee was outstanding. He is a true champion of all Federal employees, and he has steadfastly fought their battle in the effort to win comparability of pay, better working conditions, and retirement benefits.

In recognition of his distinguished service, Paul was chosen by the Capitol Hill Young Democrats as one of the 10 outstanding freshman Congress.

His dedicated and exceptional record is no surprise to those who know of Paul Krebs' background. His life has been one of dedication to the causes of all the people.

For 20 years he has been a leader in the voter registration and voter participation movements, and he is a member of the Essex County Democratic Committee's Executive Committee.

Prior to his election to the House in 1964, he served 6 years as president of the New Jersey Congress of Industrial Organizations. His career in the labor field began as a shop steward, and he was later political action and education director for region 9 of the United Auto Workers.

Paul has been active in the civic life of Essex County and the State of New Jersey ever since 1940, when his work in the field of labor representation first brought him to Newark. He is a resident of Livingston, and over the years he has selflessly served his community through active participation in a wide variety of civic, education, and charitable efforts.

He is an outstanding example of the self-educated, self-made man, who through determination, hard work, and perseverance has become a leader of his fellow citizens.

As dean of the New Jersey congressional delegation, I know I speak for all Members from New Jersey in wishing Paul the greatest success in his future endeavors. I know with surety that, as in the past, he will make a significant contribution to the welfare of all the people.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of regret that we, in the New Jersey delegation, say farewell to a very fine Congressman and a good friend.

Paul J. Krebs has only served in this body for one term but in that time he has earned a reputation as one of the outstanding men who has ever served in the Congress of the United States.

Congressman Krebs will not be back next session. This is merely because the shifting nature of the population meant that Essex County, which traditionally had three Members in this House, will in the 90th Congress, have only two. Thus, New Jersey and the United States are losing the services of one of the finest men I have ever met.

I am honored to have served with Paul Krebs on the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee and I know I speak for all the members of that great committee when I say that few members ever made a greater contribution in a shorter time than the gentleman we are honoring today. There was no breaking-in period, no apprenticeship period needed for Paul. From the day he was sworn into office he rolled up his sleeves and worked. We, on the Post Office Committee, will miss his quick mind and his unfailing devotion to duty.

Paul Krebs is a man who is almost totally self-educated. He is in the most important sense of the term, a man of the people. America cannot afford to lose the services of men like him. I know that Members of this House will hear much from him in the years that lie ahead.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I am proud and pleased to be able to add my own voice to those presently raised in tribute to our esteemed colleague, the honorable gentleman from New Jersey, Paul J. Krebs.

Paul Krebs' activity in the 2 years he has served in the House of Representatives is illustrative of the determination and spirit which he has brought to every position he has held in his lifetime.

The young man who was forced to end his formal education at the high school level, went on to become a shop steward, secretary, and later political action and education director for one of the largest unions in the United States.

As President of the New Jersey Congress of Industrial Organizations for six succesive terms, his diligence, wisdom, and honesty won him the respect of men in industry as well as in the nationwide labor movement.

Following his election to the 89th Congress, he continued to persevere and fight for those less fortunate Americans. His support of the revision in our immigration laws, medicare, Federal aid to higher education, voting rights bill, and water pollution control have helped to make this country a better place in which to live. It was his tireless efforts on behalf of our Federal employees and his work on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee which perhaps most distinguished him.

Paul Krebs has served his constituents in the 12th District, the residents of New Jersey, and the citizens of America with untiring dedication and brilliance. His presence will be missed in these halls but his imprint on the progressive legislation of the 89th Congress is everlasting.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, few men have demonstrated the energy and resourcefulness in their first years in Congress as has my distinguished colleague from New Jersey, the Honorable Paul J. Krebs. In just 2 years, Paul Krebs has become a champion of the Federal employee, a vigorous fighter for civil rights, and a leader in the battles for social legislation.

As an influential member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, where he has served with near-perfect attendance records both on the full committee and on his subcommittees, Mr. Krebs has been among the vanguard in the efforts to obtain for Government workers salaries comparable to private industry, relief for overtime and compensation for travel time.

Mr. Krebs' voice was frequently heard in the debates within the House in connection with legislation concerning civil rights, especially in the perennial efforts to obtain home rule for the District of Columbia.

In the area of social legislation, Mr. Krebs has earned the gratitude of President Johnson, who has cited him for "the enduring mark of your concern for all Americans," in cosponsoring such vital measures as the medicare and immigration revision bills.

Mr. Krebs' service in the House was the latest in a lifetime of dedication to public life, including a long and distinguished career in the field of labor, where he started as a shop steward, helped build the United Automobile Workers and for 6 years headed the New Jersey Congress of Industrial Organizations.

He has continued his concern for labor as a strong advocate for the repeal of section 14b and in other capacities, particularly on his committee as an aggressive supporter of Federal unions.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my able colleague for his productive years in the House and wish him and his charming wife Peggy continued happiness, and a prosperous future.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND IN TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE PAUL J. KREBS

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members so desiring may extend their remarks with relation to the departure of our colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Paul J. Krebs from this Congress, unfortunately, because of the redistricting plan which was adopted in the State of New Jersey.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join with my colleagues especially those with whom I serve as a member of the New Jersey congressional delegation, in paying tribute to Paul J. Krebs as he concludes his service in Congress.

I have known Paul Krebs for many years—known him as one of the most able and dedicated leaders of organized labor in New Jersey and as a man who takes his convictions and his responsibilities seriously.

Although his services has been limited to one term in the House, Paul Krebs has nevertheless left a firm mark on this institution and he has won the respect of his colleagues for his hard work and his devotion to duty.

Under the congressional redistricting plan adopted by the State legislature, it is my privilege to inherit a portion of the district Paul Krebs has been serving so ably. I know how thoroughly he approached his work and how diligently he served his constituents.

As he completes his service, Mr. Speaker, I know that Paul Krebs can take special pride in having served with honor and distinction in this great representative assembly. We, in turn, are proud to have been his colleagues.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to rise today in tribute to Congressman Paul J. Krebs.

That we take time out of the busiest and most harried moments of the 89th Congress to honor Paul Krebs is but a small measure of the respect and admiration in which we hold him.

Paul Krebs' contribution to this Congress has been substantial. During his brief tenure as Representative of the 12th District in New Jersey he has been a champion of the Federal employee. As a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, he has fought for comparability in salary and fringe benefits between Federal employees and those in private industry. His near-perfect committee-attendance record and scrupulous preparation for each committee action have been admired by his colleagues.

Paul Krebs has cosponsored much of the important and historic legislation passed by the 89th Congress, such as medicare, demonstration cities, establishment of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and revision of the immigration law. Some of the other legislation he has sponsored and fought for brought credit to the House—such as repeal of 14(b), home rule, and a bill called preventicare, which would set up a series of diagnostic medical centers around the country where people could receive a battery of computerized tests for exhaustive and inexpensive medical diagnosis. He was one of the first to stand with us in the historymaking Mississippi challenge, and he is a hero in Newark, N.J., where by unflagging effort he has secured manpower development and training grants for such programs as woodworker machine training and professional nurse refresher courses.

This is the kind of legislative record carved out in a brief 2-year career by Paul J. Krebs—a record of liberalism and imagination.

Mr. Speaker, Paul Krebs is not only admired for his service in the House of Representatives; he is also an inspiration to those who know his personal history. Although formal education ended at the high-school level, in the finest American tradition he undertook to continue his own education and development.

In time he joined the trade union movement where he was one of the early pioneers in building the United Auto Workers Union. He became one of the union's most important leaders. From shop steward he rose to secretary, and later became the director of political action and education for the UAW in New Jersey. He ultimately served for 6 years as president of the New Jersey State CIO.

It is from this background that Paul Krebs came to Congress. He brought the insight and experience that he gained in the labor movement to bear on his work here. It is this first-hand knowledge of the needs of the vast majority of American people that is so necessary and so beneficial to the deliberations of a public servant. This is the sort of person that politics does not always deserve but sorely needs, and needs more of.

In addition to his experience as a labor leader, Paul Krebs has served as lecturer at Rutgers University Labor Institute, lecturer at St. Peter's Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, member of the U.S. Attorney's Commission Against Racket Gambling, member of the Medical Health Care Committee of the White House Conference on Aging, member of the State Reemployment Rights Commission—U.S. Department of Labor; member of the New Jersey Safety Council, member of the New Jersey Joint Minimum Wage Commission, member of the Executive Committee of the Essex County Democratic Committee, and trustee of USO.

Mr. Speaker, it is ironic that the struggle over reapportionment should bring in its wake the loss of a truly dedicated and worthy public servant—lost not by the action of his constituents, but by the mere relocation of a boundary line.

It is to be hoped that in the not-too-distant future the Congress of the United States will once again have the good fortune to be improved and enlightened by the presence of Paul J. Krebs.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself wholeheartedly with the remarks of the distinguished dean of the New Jersey delegation in tribute to our colleague and good friend, Paul Krebs.

I was associated with Congressman Krebs for many years in the labor movement and I have deep affection and respect for him. His splendid record with the United Auto Workers and his selfless service in behalf of countless civic and educational causes made Paul widely known and admired throughout the State. His tireless energy and great ability always enabled him to accomplish far more than the average, and his wide-ranging interests and activities gave him an excellent background for his legislative duties.

The qualities that brought him success in all his undertakings quickly established Paul as one of the most outstanding of the exceptionally able freshmen Members of the 89th Congress. He has made a valuable contribution to the legislative achievements of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and has been an effective champion of Federal employees.

Paul has worked hard in committee and on the floor to advance the principles and programs to which his whole career has been dedicated. He has reason for pride and satisfaction for his part in making the 89th the most productive Congress in modern American history.

As a friend and a citizen, I deeply regret Paul's retirement from the Congress. I congratulate him upon his record and I wish him continued success in his future undertakings. All his endeavors will be characterized, I know, by the zeal, patriotism, and selflessness with which Paul has carried out his responsibilities as a Member of the 89th Congress.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, as this Congress prepares to adjourn, the curtain falls upon the most productive Congress in recent years. This curtain also falls upon a man who has served in this House representing the 12th District of New Jersey with honor and devotion to the people who sent him here. I speak of the Honorable Paul J. Krebs.

His departure from these Halls is not one of his own choice, nor is it one in which his constituents had made a decision. It is rather the uncertainty of a legislative reapportionment which was required to meet the standards set up by decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court—on the basis of one man for one vote.

In its action to redistrict the New Jersey delegation, it was decided that Paul J. Krebs would have his district venting him from representing his present New Jersey constituency in the taken away from him and thus prenext Congress.

Although a freshman Member, like myself, he has shown a deep interest in the legislation which we had before us, both on the national and international scene. He has also shown a fervent desire to help his State of New Jersey and the congressional district which he had the honor to represent in these Halls.

Paul J. Kreb's record of service, short as it was, illustrates that he is a man of integrity, conscience, purpose, courage, and ability. He has made many friends in this House and I wish him well in any future endeavor which he may undertake. The New Jersey delegation will miss him and the people he represented will miss him.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that we in New Jersey's congressional delegation pay tribute to one of our number, Representative Paul J. Krebs, whose distinguished service to his constituents of the 12th District will end at the conclusion of this session because the changes in our State's population distribution has caused elimination of his congressional seat through redistricting.

Mr. Krebs has compiled an enviable and inspiring record during his too-brief term in the House of Representatives. He has been in the forefront of those Congressmen who have championed the landmark legislation which has made the 89th Congress truly historic, and he has been a champion of the interests of Federal employees during his tenure. He has been a valuable member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and has been tireless in his efforts on behalf of his district.

His service in the Congress has been an extension of his service to his State, his community and his fellowman as an outstanding union official, during which he served as president of the New Jersey State CIO, prior to his election to Congress.

Paul J. Krebs will be missed by his colleagues, both from his own State and from all areas of our Nation, who will remember his imprint on the 89th Congress.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for a special order today during which to commemorate the 10th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution against Soviet oppression, which anniversary will be observed on Sunday, October 23, 1966, with a special ceremony at Carnegie Hall in New York City.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that many of my colleagues will want to join with me in this special order today, and I now ask unanimous consent that my colleagues may extend their remarks on this occasion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE HONORABLE HOWARD W. SMITH

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, in the closing hours of the 89th Congress I want to pay brief tribute to our colleague from the Eighth District of Virginia who is about to retire. For 34 years the Honorable Howard W. Smith has not only given outstanding representation to his district, throughout the length and breadth of our land he is recognized as the epitome of American statesmanship.

I well recall my first day of service in this body. At his invitation, I stopped by his office and together we walked over to be sworn in on January 3, 1947. For a number of years his office was just a few doors from mine on the third floor of the Cannon Building, and I shall ever be grateful for the privilege of consulting him and having the benefit of his experienced and wise counsel.

He is a man whose rugged honesty has never tolerated deviation from those deeply ingrained moral and political principles which have been for him a guiding beacon throughout the years. These principles are not complicated, nor or they based on nebulous theorizing. They are as simple and direct as the Ten Commandments. And, the judge has the rare ability to simplify the most complex problems in terms of these principles.

These are the qualities which come to mind whenever the name of Howard Smith is mentioned, but foremost among the characteristics which will forever be his hallmark are integrity and courage. His integrity has always been beyond question. His is the courage to do what he feels is right despite the carping and the niggling criticism of those of lesser stature: courage to stand by his guns and steadfastly refuse to compromise with principle or temporize with circumstance. With beliefs soundly based on fundamental principles he has the guts to stand up and be counted when they are challenged. These are qualities so sorely needed in the world today.

This is the legacy which Judge Smith leaves us as he retires at the end of this session.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the departure of Howard Worth Smith from these revered scenes will leave a void which will never be filled as long as our form of government endures.

He will be remembered by history as one of the greatest committee chairmen of our times.

He will be remembered by those of us who had the privilege of knowing him as a man wholly unique in his steadfast adherence to principle and his gentleness of spirit. We can say of him as Shakespeare said of Henry V:

> He is as full of valor as of kindness;
> Princely in both.

We might also say of him in the words of Shakespeare:

> If it is a sin to covet honor, he is the most offending soul alive.

Howard Smith leaves these Chambers as clean in dignity as any man who ever served here. Even those who wholly disagree with his principles have agreed, without exception, that he has always lived courageously by those principles. His integrity is unshakable. In 40 years of public service, he has never stooped for an instant to demagoguery.

What a refreshing thing to have such a man in an age when the actions of many public men can be summed up in the lines from Alexander Pope:

> Manners with fortunes, humours turn
> with climes,
> Tenets with books, and principles with
> times.

It is unnecessary for me to repeat the details of Howard Smith's public career when they are too well known. Born in his beloved Virginia, he was first elected to office on the Alexandria City Council in 1908, and has been in public office since that time as Commonwealth attorney, judge, and since 1930, as a Member of the House of Representatives.

He has been chairman of the House Rules Committee for 12 years. While there is famous legislation which bears his name—such as "Smith Act" and the "Smith-Connally Wartime Act"—he will be remembered even more as the leader of those who, in his time, believed their first duty in Congress was the defense of the U.S. Constitution.

Howard Smith did not remain steadfast in his principles by refusing to get involved in the issues of his day. He was a leader, a fighter, and a man of courage. A local newspaper, not known for favoring his views, summed up his abilities this way:

> He makes it his business to know when to move and how to move and where the votes are. In short, the benign-appearing former Virginia judge belies his old-school, small town look. He's an operator * * *.

Edmund Burke, the grandest of writers on parliamentary government, once wrote:

> Your representative owes you not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays instead of serving you if he sacrifices it to your opinion.

Howard Smith never promised his constituents anything except that he would deal honestly with the issues as his principles dictated. He was a legislator who used his mind. He did not get his position from any polls on what a transitory majority supposedly supported.

It is easy to speak in ringing words for your principles when the flood of current opinion is on your side. But HOWARD SMITH fought for his principles with equal tenacity when a host of powerful forces were against him. Thinking of him, I recall some little lines written, curiously enough, by Amelia Earhart Putnam:

> Courage is the price that life exacts for granting peace.
> The soul that knows it not, knows no release
> From little things.

It occurred to me that the greatest gift that HOWARD SMITH will take from these Chambers is not our glowing words of praise or even our good opinion, but simply the peace of soul of one who always held his courage straight.

For those of us who know him, there will be additional sadness of losing the company of a truly gentle and humble man; a man of unconscious grace, who was fair and courteous to all.

In closing, I think I can best sum up how all of us feel about HOWARD SMITH leaving us with the lines that the Poet Edwin Markham used in his poem on Lincoln:

> He held his place—
> Held the long purpose like a growing tree—
> Held on through blame and faltered not at praise.
> And when he fell in whirlwind, he went down as when a lordly cedar, green with boughs,
> Goes down with a great shout upon the hills, and leaves a lonesome place against the sky.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, I have always deemed it a privilege just to be in Judge SMITH's presence because I knew I was in the presence of a truly great man.

The judge, to me, epitomizes all the qualities of a true statesman. He has made me ever more mindful of the duties and responsibilities of a Member of the Congress of the United States and he has made me even more proud of being a Virginian.

A man of simple tastes and courtly manner, he commanded and had the genuine respect of the leaders of our Nation for over a third of a century. He had the courage of his convictions and the ability to carry out those convictions. The politics or popularity of pending legislation never concerned him. He seemed to ask only one question: "Is this good for my country?" The answer to that question determined the direction of his mighty efforts.

Judge SMITH will, I know, be active in his retirement and he will always be available to legislators and others for advice and counsel. There is one thing, however, that I wish he would consider. That is the writing of a book setting forth his experiences, observations, and thoughts during his long tenure in the Congress. History almost demands it. Present and future generations of Americans will benefit by it.

It is difficult to say a political goodby to a dear friend.

I will miss him.

Virginia will miss him.

The Nation will miss him.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I believe that it is significant that the House takes these moments to pay tribute to this very great man, who is also a very great American.

During the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia, when it appeared that that body would dissolve into chaos, and the victory obtained at Yorktown would be lost by the inability of the American Colonies to fashion a stable government, Washington is said to have addressed the delegates and set out for them their task, with the remark:

> Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The event is in the hands of God.

I believe HOWARD WORTH SMITH, the distinguished Representative from the Eighth Congressional District of Virginia, has raised such a standard of knowledge, honesty, courage, and duty. Many times, I have been impressed by his intimate knowledge of complex matters coming before the House. His word was his bond and he would not hesitate to take courageous stands on difficult measures this House has considered.

Yet, I cannot help but note his strong sense of duty. Even though he was not successful at the polls last July, nevertheless, he did not hesitate to return to the House and resume his duties as a Member of the House and as a committee chairman. This, to me, is a measure of the man who has raised a standard of public service for us all. It has been a source of pride and honor to me to have served in the House of Representatives with him.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Virginia yielding to me.

At the unveiling of the portrait of Judge SMITH several days ago there was a tremendous gathering of his many friends, not only those in the Congress, but those from all over this area, and from afar.

At that wonderful tribute I said that Judge SMITH epitomized and exemplified integrity and dedication. He is a man who was most articulate on the floor of this House in the discussion of any legislation that came before us. He was a persuasive advocate of a sound, constructive, and responsible position on all issues.

Mr. Speaker, I can say without hesitation or reservation that we will miss him badly in the House. The House of Representatives will not be the same without him. I wish to both the judge and to Mrs. Smith the very best in the months ahead. We all extend them the best in health, happiness, and success.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my friend, the gentleman from Virginia, in paying deserved tribute to one of the greatest men in America, Judge HOWARD SMITH.

Mr. Speaker, the history of this great deliberative body has known many who can lay claim to the title of statesman. None have earned that designation more than HOWARD WORTH SMITH, of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

In the 20 years that I have served in this body, I have formulated my own criteria for measuring what I think to be the hallmarks of great men. These criteria are patriotism, integrity, courage, insight, and ability. Judge SMITH possesses all of these qualities of character. In my considered opinion, he is the embodiment of the perfect legislator.

We shall miss Judge SMITH, as his absence will be felt throughout the country. Indeed, even though he will be gone from this body, he will be remembered by all of us who knew him and sat in his councils. He will be remembered, also, by the millions of Americans whose liberties have been guarded zealously through his efforts, and whose love of America transcends the temporary emoluments of a socialist state.

Mr. Speaker, to Judge SMITH and his gracious and lovely wife go my personal best wishes for a happy and full life among the people of his beloved Virginia whom he represented so long and so well.

Mr. HARDY. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], the minority whip.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in paying tribute to one of the finest, indeed one of the very finest gentlemen I have ever known in my life, Judge HOWARD SMITH, of Virginia. For 32 years I have been privileged to know Judge SMITH and serve with him in this House. I repeat, never have I met or become acquainted with a more dedicated, loyal, more sincere individual than Judge SMITH. Many, many times, although we are on different sides of the aisle, we were looking down the same road, with the same purpose and the same objective—trying to do what we thought was best in our own mind for the welfare of this great Nation. Always the judge was determined to do what he thought right and fair and he had the courage of his convictions. He was fearless, always stood up firmly for those things in which he believed. He is truly one of the greatest Americans I ever have known.

Recently I was privileged to attend a large dinner given in his honor in Warrenton, Va. This was a most beautiful testimonial dinner which the judge richly deserved. Speaker after speaker spoke of the greatness of this man and, in every respect, every word uttered was, as far as I am concerned, true.

This House will in the coming years sorely miss Howard Smith, his abilities, his dedication, and loyalties. It will not be quite the same around here without the judge. With all my heart, let me emphasize how proud I am of my friendship with this man. I only wish there were more Howard Smiths in the House.

I, and I know all the Members of the Congress, are sorry that he will not continue to be with us and we wish for him and his family every happiness and God's blessings.

Mr. HARDY. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Satterfield].

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy, though willing, heart that I join my colleagues in this tribute to Howard Smith.

Words alone cannot begin to convey what we all feel, for as each fleeting day passes there is brought into sharper focus the realization that this is his last Congress. The impact of the loss of his service in future Congresses cannot be measured solely in the hearts of his friends and colleagues for its magnitude is national in scope.

As a member of the Virginia delegation I feel a special sadness. Yet, at the same time, I am grateful that fate has afforded me the privilege to know him personally and the honor to serve with him in this august body. I have thus had the opportunity to share the pleasure of his company, the warmth of his smile, the serenity of his patience and understanding, the wisdom of his counsel, and to observe his abiding loyalty, his impeccable honesty and integrity, his keen intellect, and above all, his unswerving dedication to principle. For these are some of the attributes that have set him apart.

I am confident that history will reflect what we, his colleagues, already know: that Howard Smith is endowed to a remarkable degree with each of those ingredients so essential to greatness.

I join my colleagues with pleasure in wishing to Judge Smith the health and happiness in the years to come, which he so richly deserves.

Mr. HARDY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Poff].

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the Congress from the State of Virginia and a Republican representing but a part of the whole Commonwealth, I want to add my voice to the tribute being paid to the dean of the Virginia delegation.

Judge Smith, as he has always affectionately been called, is a man whose patriotism is unalloyed with the meanness of political partisanship. The only test he has ever applied to any issue that has confronted him on the floor of this House has been, Is it good for America?

Mr. Speaker, it has been well said that modesty is the becoming virtue of true greatness. I know that Judge Smith objects to the proceedings that are now in progress. He does so because he is a modest man and being truly modest is truly great.

The State of Virginia is losing a dedicated servant and America will not soon see his like in these Halls again.

Mr. HARDY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to our distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to join with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Hardy] and my other colleagues in paying tribute to our dear and valued friend, Howard Smith.

Howard Smith and I have been friends throughout his entire service in this body.

He has always shown those fine qualities of a keen and understanding mind in relation to my duties and responsibilities as a Member of this great legislative body during the years that I was majority leader and when the late and esteemed Sam Rayburn was Speaker of the House, and during the time that I have been Speaker of the House.

While our philosophies of government might not have been in complete accord on every occasion, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Smith], as chairman of the Committee on Rules, has always been eminently fair. His cooperation, his understanding cooperation, is something I shall always remember and will be a memory I shall always treasure.

At the testimonial dinner for Judge Smith in Warrenton which Mrs. McCormack and I had the pleasure to attend, I spoke on that occasion and what I said came from the heart. And on the occasion of the unveiling of his portrait the other day, the remarks I made then also came from the heart.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Smith] has played a very important part in the legislative considerations of the Congress of the United States during his years of service in this body. I know of no man, even where there is a difference of policy or philosophy of government, who enjoys more confidence and friendship of his colleagues of today and yesterday than Howard Smith. And I am one of those who entertained for him, and have always throughout the past years and always will in the future, a profound feeling of friendship, respect, and admiration.

I extend to Howard and Mrs. Smith, that fine sweetheart of his, my very best wishes for every happiness in the years that lie ahead.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Tuck].

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Virginia for yielding to me on this occasion. I am glad to have this opportunity to join with my fellow Members of the House of Representatives in paying tribute to the high type of public service which has characterized the activities of Judge Smith since he has been a Member of this body. I have known Judge Smith for many years, possibly longer than any other man on the floor. I have known him approximately 40 years. I have had the pleasure and the honor of visiting him in his home, and he and Mrs. Smith have visited me in my home, both while I was in Richmond and in my home in South Boston.

I am glad to say that I embrace the same philosophy which Judge Smith has embraced, although I regret to say that I do not have the technical skill or the dexterity with which to give it effect. I consider Judge Smith one of the ablest men I have ever known. He is a man of great intellect, a man of impeccable character, a man with an indomitable spirit and courage, ready to do what he thinks is right, irrespective of what effect it might have on him personally politically.

I have unbounded admiration for Judge Smith. I consider that his services in this body have been of such a character as to go down in the pages of history and will cause him to be recognized as one of the greatest men who has ever lived in this body from any State, and certainly one of the greatest men who has ever served in this body from the Commonwealth of Virginia.

I regret that Judge Smith will not be with us at the next session. I wish him and his family the most of happiness in the years which lie ahead. I trust that inasmuch as he lives not so far away that he will honor us with his frequent attendance here on the floor of the House and will give us the benefit of his sage counsel and wise advice.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. George W. Andrews].

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Virginia for yielding to me. This is my 23d year in Congress, and if I have had a leader since I have been here, he has been Judge Smith. He is one of the first men I met when I came to Congress. I learned to admire him from the first day.

Constitutional government has lost a great friend, or will have lost a great friend when Judge Smith leaves this Congress. He believes in the Constitution of the United States; he believes in constitutional government.

Judge Smith has so many fine qualities that it is almost impossible to describe them.

First and foremost, he is honest, sincere, and courageous. Of all the men I have known since I have been here, he is by far the greatest parliamentarian I have ever known.

Frankly, I am sad to see the judge leave us because, as I have stated, he has been my leader and he has been leader of the small group of us who believe in a balanced budget, who believe in constitutional government, and who still believe in the Almighty.

Frankly, I hate to see him leave. I have looked upon him as a father since I have been here.

I wish for him and his sweet wife many years of happiness, and I certainly hope that the judge enjoys a well-deserved rest. He has been a public official for 42 years. I know nothing about him but good things. May the good God bless him.

Mr. HARDY. I thank the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, the Commonwealth of Virginia has produced great statesmen who have shaped the history of our Nation.

Among those great men of modern times is Judge Howard Smith. Some writer said not long ago that an era was passing with Judge Smith's retirement. An era will pass unless those of us who have been the recipients of his wise and able counsel have something of his courage to defend, promote, and sustain the constitutional principles of government to which he has been so long dedicated.

Judge Smith has been an inspiration to me. His very presence in this House of Representatives lends encouragement.

I sometimes wonder what has happened to the conservative voices in this country. There is no doubt they are fewer in the political arena, in our business and professional lives, and even in religious circles.

It seems to me two or three things have happened to the conservative attitude in this country. One which probably afflicts all of us to some degree probably stems from the fact that that voice is not the most popular one. Sheer numbers have in places overpowered it, and particularly in our political life. The rapid movement of events; the rapid developments in science which must have had a great influence on our social structure, have all added their weight.

This voice which Judge Howard Smith was always willing to raise is not inconsistent with these great changes with progress, with great strides forward since the end of World War II particularly. It is not inconsistent at all because there are great reservoirs in the conservative philosophy for change and progress. The true voice of conservatism is not one of status quo; it is not one of reaction, but rather one which places a solid foundation under progress by adhering to constitutional government.

Those of us who have served many years in this Chamber with Judge Smith will miss him tremendously. We will miss his warm and responsive friendship, his wise counsel, and his leavening influence. Yes, we will miss all this personally, but the Nation is also going to be without a man deeply dedicated to its welfare.

I join with others in expressing my deep regret because of his leaving and trust that God will grant good health and happiness to the Judge and Mrs. Smith.

Mr. HARDY. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, the House will experience a grievous loss next year in the absence of our friend, Howard W. Smith. With his departure from this scene, there will be a void that can be filled by no one.

My own association with Judge Smith, both here on the floor of the House and as a member of the Rules Committee, has been one of the most rewarding experiences of my life. His wise advice and counsel have not only been of inestimable value to me in serving the people of the 20th District of California in the House but also have served as a great inspiration to me as I have attempted to carry out my legislative responsibilities here.

No Member of this body has ever left us with a greater reputation for fairness and integrity than will Judge Smith. I know that those who are now serving with him and others who have left us before him, who have disagreed with him most on legislative matters, would be among the first to subscribe to that statement.

If ever there were a man here who, without deviation, has always placed principle above any and all other motives, that man is Judge Smith. That stern devotion to principle has served him well amidst stormy criticism and heaping abuse. It has also well served his constituents, his State, and the House of Representatives.

If it should be my privilege to serve in the next Congress, never a day will pass that I shall not miss my good friend Judge Smith. We shall never see another like him. His absence from our ranks will mark the end of an era which I shall always hold in fond memory.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the able gentleman for the privilege of joining in tribute to Judge Howard Smith.

I came to know Judge Smith when I first came to the Congress in late 1936. But not until I had the privilege, in the 89th Congress, of serving under the distinguished chairmanship of the gentleman on the Rules Committee did I come to know the measure and the manner of man he is.

Every one of us who has been privileged to know this Herculean figure of our times knows that he is a man of extraordinary mental capacity, moral rectitude, and dedication to the public interest. He is one who puts personal honor and spiritual integrity as the highest values in life.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who have been for a number of years in the Congress of the United States have come to know many distinguished colleagues. As the years of our friendships with them have lengthened, as the shadows of life have drawn out, what we remember about them is not particularly what their philosophy politically was or how they voted upon the several measures which confronted them, but whether they were honorable, whether they loved their country, and whether they served it with deep dedication in the way they thought best. This standard Judge Smith has met to the fullest degree, because no man loves America more than Judge Howard W. Smith, and no man with singleness of affection has sought to serve his country with greater fidelity than he. He has left in the record of this House a monument of distinguished service which will always add luster to the annals of our time.

He has set an example of character which will always be emulated. We can truly say, as was said of the departed Hamlet, Mr. Speaker, "We shall not see his like again."

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida and thank the Speaker for permitting us this brief period of time to pay tribute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Smith].

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of sincere regret, personally, that the day has come when we should be here bidding farewell to our beloved colleague, but I am honored by being privileged to add my inadequate words in expressing appreciation for the unsurpassed service rendered our Nation by my friend, Howard Smith. Few men have risen to the height of distinction in the service of his country as has Judge Smith.

He has served the people of northern Virginia and the Nation for the past 36 years in the Congress of the United States. He has endeared himself to all who have known him. To many of us, he has no peer as a patriot, a legislator, or as a friend, teacher, and adviser.

In his long service, the Judge has demonstrated time and again his tremendous love for his country. He has worked long hours, faithfully putting the Nation's interests ahead of political expediency at all times. His untiring efforts in serving his district and his country will not soon be forgotten. His district will find it difficult to fill his shoes, and will be a long time replacing his influence in the Federal Government. His State is losing the services of one of the peers of the able public servants in Virginia's history. The United States of America will miss his able counsel and advice in the affairs of our National Government.

As Judge Smith returns to private life, after a long career of public service, I join in wishing for him and his dear wife and family the best of everything, and that God's richest blessings be ever his. I will miss him as a colleague, but more than that the loss of his services to his Nation, State, and district will be felt as irreplaceable in meeting and solving the difficult problems facing us at this time and in the immediate future. These problems call for the sound judgment and seasoned experience exemplified by Howard Smith.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to an outstanding individual who has provided me with one of my most cherished memories and one of my finest friendships during my 26 years in this legislative body.

Fondly known to us as "Judge," Howard W. Smith is one of the finest examples of true Americanism I have ever known. The Congress has lost the services of a patriot. His absence from this body will leave a niche which cannot be filled.

His courage, honesty, integrity, and devotion to duty are characteristics which have been found and are found in few men. In every way he has exemplified these fine attributes during his 36 years in the Congress.

If I should be able to say one thing—the one thing that I am most proud of—it would have to be the privilege of calling Judge SMITH my friend.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I join with my colleagues today in honoring Judge SMITH for his many years of faithful service—not only to his congressional district—but to the Nation as a whole which he has served so many years with distinction and dedication. On the other hand, there is a touch of sadness in my heart over having to say goodby. However, since he lives so close to Washington, I hope that this is not really goodby but rather that he will return to these Halls often to give us the benefit of his wisdom, his years of experience, and the warmth of his personality.

I would say to Judge SMITH: "The residents of your district and all American people throughout this beloved Nation of ours owe you a debt of gratitude which can never be repaid for your many years of dedicated service in the cause of justice, rightness, and freedom—and your determined stand for those principles upon which our Nation was founded and grew to greatness. I do hope you will enjoy your well-deserved rest from the labors of serving your Nation. Once again, I express the hope that you will somehow find the time to return often to visit with your many friends on Capitol Hill. We shall miss you, Judge SMITH."

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, among the many comments I have heard about the retirement of Judge SMITH from Congress, one theme has been predominant: "There will never be another like him." Let us hope this is not entirely true. Let us hope we have not completely lost the pattern.

This great Virginia gentleman has set standards of service that are the envy of younger Members of Congress. His expert knowledge of legislative procedure and parliamentary rules and traditions should be an example for generations to come. His courtly respect for his colleagues, and his willingness to help younger members learn the ways of Congress, will also stand as guideposts to the stature of a good Congressman.

Like many another legislative stalwart, Judge HOWARD W. SMITH was, and is, a challenging figure. But if this body ever reaches the state where there is no challenge, when there no longer remain any great and difficult issues, then it will be time again to harken back to the era of Judge SMITH and ask what it is we have lost. May we always have men who will defend the minority viewpoint with vigor and skill, as well as the majority viewpoint.

This is more than a great deliberative body; it is a great arena of challenge, where the stresses and strains that have shaped a nation are finally resolved. The contribution of Judge HOWARD W. SMITH to this final, successful resolution can never be forgotten.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, the 90th Congress will assemble next January and, as we all know, some who have served in this Congress will not return. There will be changes, whether for better or for worse I would not undertake to say. But one among us will be missed above all others because he is more than just a Member of Congress.

For more than 20 years Judge SMITH has been the accepted chief spokesman for a philosophy of government in the House of Representatives. He has been a constitutionalist in the classic definition of the term. And he has construed it to be his duty to serve as an anchor to the windward when gale-force winds of expediency have threatened to blow our ship of state toward paths of danger.

The Constitution which protects us all has been the foundation of his public philosophy, and in his judgment the views of those who wrote the Constitution have continued to bear a living purpose. While it cannot be said that his position on all questions has always been popular, the discussions and debates in this body for many years past bear witness to his willingness to sacrifice temporary popularity for adherence to a principle.

Judge SMITH will leave behind many former opponents in countless legislative battles, but no fairminded opponent can call himself an enemy. To be his enemy, it is necessary to be an enemy of the language and intent of the Founding Fathers themselves. Along with the many others who enjoyed serving with him, I wish him Godspeed to go forth, to the end that perhaps he may assemble his memoirs and present them with the typical wit and grace which we have come to know so well. None among us is better qualified to focus the mirror of recent history of what we have done and create a reflection of what was intended by those who came before us. I hope his affairs will permit him to do for his country this last public service in summation of an extraordinary career.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I have known and respected our distinguished colleague, HOWARD SMITH, since 1953, when I first came to Congress. During that time, I have always admired his genuine courage and dedication to his principles.

The judge's statesmanlike demeanor and charm over the years have served to enhance the stature of this body. He will be sorely missed in the House of Representatives, which he has served so well. The judge has always displayed a great love for his country, his home State, his district, and his family. His lovely daughter, Violet, lives in my district in Texas with her family, whom I know well. I also know he is very proud of his Texas grandchildren and rightly so.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure and a privilege to join my colleagues in paying tribute today to the Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH of Virginia, usually referred to as "Judge." He has served many years in the House of Representatives. He has been a dedicated worker and a friend to all.

On many occasions bills in which I have been interested have been brought before the judge in the Rules Committee and each and every time he has given my request serious and careful consideration. At all times he has shown the greatest respect for those of us who appeared before his committee.

It has been a pleasure and a privilege to work with a man so conversant with all phases of legislative work.

As the judge leaves the Halls of Congress I want to wish him every success and only hope that he does not forget his friends on Capitol Hill. His guidance and leadership will be missed as the 90th Congress convenes.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, you and my other distinguished colleagues of the House have painted a magnificent picture of a magnificent man.

You have, in your glowing references to Judge SMITH, employed such deserved words as "integrity," "courage," "patience," and "religious."

All such apply in overwhelming degree.

Yet, lest they add up to a remote figure of grandeur on a lofty hill, may I add the one missing word—kindness?

Mr. Speaker, in my 15 years as a Member of this body, I have never known a kinder man than Judge SMITH.

When what I and others sought conflicted with his beliefs or philosophy he did not hesitate to say "no," but never harshly, never meanly, never in a way to humiliate the seeker.

He is a gentle man, a kind man. These qualities, added to those you have mentioned, add up to a complete human being.

Fate has decreed that my service in this House will terminate with his. He will be missed, not I, but I take vicarious pride in the fact that his final hours here will coincide with mine.

In the twilight years ahead, I will boast to my little grandchildren of the great men I have known. Always in the recital will be the name of Judge HOWARD SMITH.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise on an occasion that distresses me, yet fills me with pride that I am able to take part in it.

I rise to say goodby—officially—to Judge HOWARD W. SMITH, who, in my opinion will stand unmatched in our lifetime as a great Congressman and a giant among Americans.

We are now, Mr. Speaker, in the midst of a partisan political campaign, and thank God that we are—for the good of our Republic.

Yet, some men in the past and some remain today almost totally untouched by these events. They are above them—not because they do not want to engage in them—but because God has given them the quality of gentle decency and intelligence that largely sets them apart from partisan strife.

My friend HOWARD SMITH is such a man.

He belongs to Congress as much as he belongs to America and I only wish that somehow the cruelties of political defeat could have been forever avoided for him. Congress needs him—both parties need him.

I know he would scoff at the thought, but I ask his indulgence in saying it, and saying as well that in my own instance if I have done anything at all worthwhile as a Congressman, it is largely because of HOWARD SMITH.

I have no way of knowing how many Members of Congress he has helped—especially the younger ones—because he keeps such things to himself. I do know how much he helped me. And I wish, Mr. Speaker, I knew equally well how to say thank you.

He not only has helped me as a fledgling Member of this body, but he saw to it that I got the credit for things that were done—done only because he saw to it that they were done.

I do not know who will replace HOWARD SMITH in Congress. I wish with all my heart that no one would—ever—from either political party.

That someone will is inevitable. And when they do, they will stand in the tall shadow of a great man, as I do now, and as I will so long as I serve in Congress.

I am proud to do so. I will be forever proud to do so.

None of us, Mr. Speaker, will ever know the full measure of this man, because it is hidden beneath a gentleness, a decency and a dignity that is obvious, yet impenetrable.

In a way, we can envy HOWARD SMITH, Mr. Speaker, for he will return to the hills and deep valleys of Broad Run in his beloved Virginia. I do not know what his thoughts will be then, but I hope they are often of us, as I know our own will be of him, and the testament of his life which we are privileged to share.

HOWARD SMITH came from the same soil, Mr. Speaker, that nurtured five Presidents of this great Republic—and in their time or our own he is the equal to any or all of them.

Perhaps this is what tempered the steel as well as the compassion in my friend, HOWARD SMITH. Perhaps it was the perspective, the vision, the heritage of his State and her people. Perhaps it was a touch of the good Lord's hand—on the shoulder of a Virginia farm boy long ago.

Whatever it was, Mr. Speaker, it made a man for all of America to admire—a man I shall love and revere through all the days of my life, as I know, Mr. Speaker, will each man among us here today.

I do now know what act, what word, what message my friend HOWARD SMITH wishes us to remember him for. I know the one, Mr. Speaker, that will stay engraved in my own mind—and that word is "integrity." His kindnesses, his firmness, his faithfulness, his decency and his dignity—these are but facets of the shining essence of HOWARD W. SMITH's integrity—integrity in public office, in his personal life and in his belief in the sanctity of man and his God.

This, my friend, whom I admire so much, is in a word—if we can distill your great life into one word now and in the future—the only one that comes close to touching all you stand for, is integrity.

As a colleague and as a personal friend, I know of no way of saying what I hold in my heart for you, other than to say that you have lived with an integrity of character, compassion and intellect each single, shining moment of your life among us. For this we will honor you always. For being our friend, Judge SMITH—we will love and remember you always—in each Congress—for as long as they survive to serve America as you have done so nobly and well.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the one Member of the 89th Congress who will be missed more than any other in the 90th Congress is the Honorable HOWARD W. "JUDGE" SMITH of Virginia. In my opinion he has to his credit as chairman of the Rules Committee, the honor of preventing more poor legislation being passed by Congress than any other one individual.

Fourteen years ago when I came as a new Member, he was most helpful and he has remained one of my real friendly colleagues during these 14 years. I wish him a long life of happiness in his retirement.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, I aspire for the words to describe and the eloquence to express my admiration, esteem, and deep affection for Judge HOWARD SMITH. His consistent and outspoken belief in the Constitution, his efforts for fiscal responsibility, his integrity of conviction, and his intense patriotism have been a genuine inspiration to me.

To have enjoyed the close friendship and counsel of this great American is one of the prime rewards of my service in the Congress.

Judge SMITH's stalwart dedication and reverence for constitutional principles will ever remain a beacon for my emulation.

Warm wishes for many years of health and happiness go with my beloved friend as he leaves Capitol Hill.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the most revered of Virginians, Thomas Jefferson, writing in 1813 from his own acute observations and experience, recommended to all Americans coming after him to elect their legislative representatives solely on the basis of "virtue and talents."

Our 3d President's advice was well taken by Virginians in 1930, when they elected Judge HOWARD WORTH SMITH to the 72d Congress, convening on March 4, 1931. They elected a man with eminent virtue and talents for 17 consecutive terms and he ends a distinguished career as the fifth highest ranking Member of the House in terms of seniority.

Our American democracy demands differences of opinion if it is to retain its vitality and its relevance to the modern and the future world. Its lifeblood is open to frank dialog and even hot controversy. This demands men and women who are strongly alined and openly and vocally committed to some system of thinking and political philosophy.

In every aspect of his thinking, speaking, and acting, Judge SMITH pumped vitality, a balancing and weighing of proposals and healthy dialog and dispute, a necessary adjunct to democratic government and wise legislation. Honest and open, he scorned the sly and subtle and gloried in a partisanship which was at ease with his conscience.

He accepted opposition and partisanship, with its divergent views from his own, as a necessity of politics and such resistance was never carried over into personal relationships. He understood partisanship and his friendships were wholesale among those who understood it also. He was not only understood, but applauded and admired.

Geographically, HOWARD WORTH SMITH never lived far from this Capital on his acres at Broad Run, Va. He never will be far from it in spirit and in the memory of the many hundreds who served here with him and knew his warm friendship and counsel. He leaves us with a wealth of good will and good wishes for future content and happiness.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I have but one reluctance to see this 89th Congress come to a close and that is that we all must lose now from these Halls a figure known to us all and revered by most.

He has stood in this well as the conscience of the Nation. He had the courage to say "no" when it was popular to say "yes." He was as one with that breed of men which founded this Nation. He would have been at home in discourse with Madison, Franklin, Adams, and Jay. His presence in this body has given us the benefit of an echo from those brilliant minds; an echo we have, all too sadly, chosen not to heed on many occasions. But then, we chose also to turn a deaf ear at many times to the words of Madison, Franklin, Adams, and Jay, and so it is not surprising.

This tall man for whom I have so much affection, leaves us now and he will not, I am afraid, be replaced. True, his particular congressional district will have a representative here in the Congress, but no matter who he may be, he will not take the place of Judge SMITH. He might even walk in his footsteps, but he will not fill his shoes.

I do not believe I will see Judge SMITH's equal in my lifetime and I am the loser for it. This Nation is the loser as well. I will miss this great and good man, but I fear I will not realize how much until later in my life.

On behalf of those who cannot be here today to express themselves, may I presume to thank you for all you have done for our country and for each of us individually.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, too, many times during the years that I have served as a Member of this great body, the occasion has arisen when we have paid tribute to a departed colleague who was separated from our midst by death.

It is fitting and appropriate in this instance that our distinguished colleague is still here in the flesh to hear physically our expressions of respect and affection for him.

I succeeded a great North Carolinian here in the House upon his retirement after 26 years of faithful service and one of his closest friends while he served here was Judge HOWARD SMITH.

Graham Barden told me after my election to Congress that one man I could always depend upon through thick and thin was Judge SMITH.

Mr. Barden was fond of saying:

> Judge SMITH is the kind of man you would be willing to rob a bank with.

He meant, of course, that on such a venture, you would want only a companion whom you could trust completely and implicitly.

There are many people, both in and out of the Congress, who have violently disagreed with Judge SMITH over the years, but I have never heard him accused of being unfair. I have never heard him accused of being dishonest. I have never heard him accused of being a demagog, and I have never heard it suggested that he put politics or expediency ahead of principle.

I well remember when he was interviewed by a fellow with a similar name—Howard K. Smith, a TV commentator in 1961, on a program called "The Keeper of the Rules." Judge SMITH was asked how many Presidents he had served under. His answer was short and to the point:

> I never served under anybody. Herbert Hoover was President when I took office, and I have served with every President since.

It has been my privilege as a young Member of Congress, whose service began with the Kennedy administration, to serve with some of the alltime great men here in the House. In that list I would include Sam Rayburn, of Texas; Carl Vinson, of Georgia; Clarence Cannon, of Missouri; and JOE MARTIN, of Massachusetts; but none in a higher position than HOWARD WORTH SMITH, of Virginia.

May his well-earned retirement be a long and happy one and may his country never forget the debt it owes to this great statesman for his 36 years of distinguished service.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to speak of a great Virginian and a great American, Hon. HOWARD WORTH SMITH, who at the end of this 89th Congress will no longer stand among us as a Member of Congress.

Judge SMITH joined this body at the 72d session and since the 74th session has served on the Rules Committee which he has chaired for the past 12 years. At the first of the 79th session, when the rules were amended to allow membership on more than one committee, we on the House Committee on the District of Columbia were pleased to count him one of us.

As chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia for the past 18 years, I have been closely associated with Judge Smith. I must say that the work of the committee is often a thankless task, but in addition to the dedication of the entire membership of the committee, the opportunity to have Judge SMITH on the team and to be able to observe his unequaled statemanship at work is also a great reward.

Conventionally the Members of the House refer to each other as "Mr.," or "Congressman," or "Honorable." All of these he certainly is, and more. Before he was elected to Congress, he served on the bench. He has so many of the characteristics of the best in a judge that most of us call him "Judge SMITH" or just "the Judge."

It has been a pleasure to see the calm deliberation of this man, to watch him chart a course with the purpose of service to his district and to his country, unhesitating when his good judgment dictated the necessary action. His devotion to duty must be admired by all of us, even to those who did not hold to his political theories and beliefs.

In all his activities he was himself, with no pretense, a true, wholesome, Christian gentleman. He did not pretend to work; he did work. He did not pretend to understand an issue; he learned the facts and did understand it. He did not pretend to adhere to a popular cause to endear himself to the influential or to the headliners; he adhered to his beliefs and ideals, considering only what he thought to be the best legislative programs for the continued growth of our Nation.

This he did with all the honor and dignity of a true judge. He respected us and gave to the entire body respect, self-respect, and courage to stand firmly for our convictions, without stooping to pettiness and without fear of consequences.

Judge SMITH has for many years counseled and guided us when we asked him to do so—and sometimes when he knew we needed it. His vast store of knowledge of facts and of human nature, and of the mechanics of lawmaking has been opened many times to his colleagues in Congress. We have greatly benefited from it, but we have never diminished it.

One of the most outstanding rewards of my 28 years in Congress is the honor and pleasure of knowing Judge SMITH. I consider him the greatest statesman of our age, and believe that he will go down in history as one of the greatest statesmen of our Nation. So, I do not feel that we can say goodby to Judge SMITH. He has left us such a great heritage, the image of a legislator, that we know his spirit will long be with us. Needless to say, we will miss his personable companionship. The loss is somewhat compensated by the memories he leaves with us.

May Judge SMITH and his family have the best of everything for many happy years to come.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to Judge HOWARD SMITH. I regret that I do not have the gift of words to properly assess the qualities of this great man. He has been a leader to me, almost like a father, during the 18 years I have been in the Congress. He has never faltered in his unswerving devotion to the highest principles of government. His warm personal nature, his genuine respect for constitutional government, his subtle yet sharp wit have all endeared him to everyone of us, regardless of party.

I can only say that he is going to be sorely missed, and I am going to miss him just about as much as anyone. I wish for him and Mrs. Smith the very best of everything in the years to come.

Except for my own father I have never met a man I respected more than I do Judge SMITH.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Judge SMITH.

The State of Virginia has produced many great men all through the history of our Nation, but time will show that the Honorable HOWARD WORTH SMITH ranks among the greatest Virginians of all time.

In the many years I have known him, I have come to look upon Judge SMITH as an able and most valuable friend, as well as the very embodiment of statesmanship. His greatness was not dependent upon his seniority in the House, although he ranks very high in that respect. His greatness is in the man himself as a splendid human being, as a man of convictions who stood by them and worked for them in the belief that he was serving the best interests of the people of his district, of his State, and of his Nation in so doing. Here is a man who has never surrendered principle for expediency.

Men of Judge SMITH's caliber are all too few today. His sturdy hand and influence are going to be missed very much in the Congress, but we all wish him well in whatever endeavors he may take on in the days ahead.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Chairman HOWARD SMITH, of the Rules Committee, is about to terminate over 35 years in the service of the Congress of the United States.

I have had the honor and experience of serving on the Rules Committee for 16 years with Judge SMITH. He has ably represented his district, State, and Nation as a judge and Member of Congress during most of his adult life.

Very few Americans, in our history, have had the distinction to receive the confidence of his neighbors and constituents and be reelected to public office over the period of several generations. He and his family can indeed be proud of this great record in public service.

Although Chairman SMITH and I have not agreed and endorsed the same legislative programs on several occasions, nevertheless, I along with other members of the committee have admired and respected his fairness and constant respect of all members of the committee regardless of our positions on legislative problems.

During my service with Judge SMITH as chairman of the Rules Committee, I have admired his superior knowledge of parliamentary procedure. He has never at any time in my memory taken unfair advantage of his colleagues, either in the committee or in debate on the floor of the House.

I join with many other Members of Congress in wishing Congressman SMITH and his family many years of good health and happiness.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in expressing deep appreciation for the service of the Honorable Howard "Judge" Smith, of Virginia, in the U.S. House of Representatives.

When one thinks of Judge Smith, he immdiately recognizes in him a unique blend of ability and personality. Here is a man possessed of a soft manner that is backed up by some real hard thinking, a person who relies more on reason and persuasion than on force. In my service with this gentleman, I have grown to respect and admire him greatly and to have a deep appreciation for his judgment and insight.

A host of accomplishments follow in the wake of the industry and energy that Judge Smith has expended here in the Congress, and as he has been recognized by his colleagues, so will he be honored by history with the mark of a true statesman.

Mr. Speaker, this House will not be the same in the 90th Congress because of the absence of the Honorable Howard "Judge" Smith, a fine gentleman and outstanding statesman—it will always, however be a better House because of his presence in it.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to a patriotic public servant, Judge Smith, of Virgina, who has served his country devotedly as the elected representative of the Eighth District of Virginia. In addition to his duties of representing one of the larger congressional districts in the House of Representatives, he has been chairman of the House Committee on Rules, a committee which has provided this body a subject of many hours of debate.

As a committee chairman myself, I have had to appear before Judge Smith on many occasions. I have not always agreed with him but have always held him in high regard, and have respected his decisions. His position as chairman of the Rules Committee of the House placed him in many difficult positions and many of his actions have been most controversial. But, he has always been a champion of our Constitution and constitutional rights, and once he set his course, has never changed it nor deviated from it. This is an exceptional quality and I for one have admired him over the years for it.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, it is perhaps a commentary on the pace and attitude of our day that we never stop to tell a man how much we think of him until he is about to leave us.

Today we have the opportunity, although under circumstances we would not have chosen, to pay our tribute to Judge Howard Smith, as he retires after 36 years in this Congress.

The end of each Congress, it seems, marks the end of an era. A few of the men we knew and worked with retire and with each it seems that something of the Congress we know leaves, too. Particularly to those of us who have been here only a few terms, it is difficult to imagine what the 90th Congress will be without the men we have come to think of as almost a part of this great room itself.

Judge Smith is one of these men. As he leaves this Chamber, I know all of us want him to know that he takes with him our respect, our affection, and our blessing.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the privilege to join with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Hardy] in paying tribute to Judge Smith.

I, too, regret that he will not be with us after this Congress. Although I have differed with Judge Smith on most of the the major issues which have been presented to the House during my service in Congress, nevertheless I want to express my respect for the personal qualities which have made him honored among his colleagues. Judge Smith is a man who is frank about his beliefs. He is also a man whose probity and reliability are acknowledged by all. In addition, his knowledge of parliamentary procedure and his skill in debate will long be remembered in the House.

I wish Judge Smith happiness and contentment in the years ahead.

Mr. MACKIE. Mr. Speaker, as he takes his leave from the House of Representatives which he has served so well and loved so much, we assure Judge Smith that his colleagues in this body feel respect, admiration, and fondness for him that we are unable to describe adequately.

For 36 years his career has been a model of legislative achievement. His chairmanship of the Rules Committee was distingushed by his dedication, his candor, and his high principles.

In his dealings with his fellow Members he was invariably courteous. He kept his word with the strictness of the great Virginia gentleman that he has always been.

A fond farewell, then, to one of the great men of this House. May the years of his retirement from public life be happy ones for a patriot who has superbly served his district, his country, and the House of Representatives.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, Howard W. Smith has played a unique role in the House of Representatives—one that only a man of the temperament and ability of Judge Smith could fill.

He was a proponent and protagonist of the first order, but he was also a quiet Virginia gentleman. Judge Smith has been my friend during my service here in Congress. When I have needed him on matters affecting my district, he has never failed to come to my assistance. The Congress will not be the same without him.

I join in wishing Judge Smith every happiness in his retirement. He has had a long and illustrious career. He has helped shape the history of an era. He has played a unique and important role in the history of his country. May the years of his retirement in the beautiful Virginia countryside be years of happiness.

The judge will be missed by all of us.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to add my humble voice to those who are here paying their homage and respect to my longtime colleague and friend, Chairman Howard W. Smith, of the House Rules Committee. Truly, a giant oak in the forest of legislators in the U.S. Congress is leaving us after 36 years of dedicated service to his beloved Virginia and his United States of America. Surely, no man, surely no Member of the Congress, in the past three decades has rendered more yeoman services to the preservation and perpetuation of this young Republic and its institutions which he cherishes so dearly.

Politics, Mr. Speaker, is a hazardous and cruel undertaking. It is likened unto the law of the jungles where no animal, it is said, ever dies a natural death. If through overconfidence or unawareness one becomes weakened, some younger and more vicious animal pounces upon him and destroys him. In the political arena, those who believe in and subscribe to the philosophy and tenets of a great statesman, and, therefore, support and reelect him, from time to time are prone to become complacent and feel that their idol is invulnerable. However, Congressman Howard Worth Smith has survived the political battles much longer than most men who follow this hazardous game of politics.

Mr. Speaker, Virginia has contributed possibly more outstanding sons to the founding and the maintenance of this young Republic than any of the other States in the Union. I daresay that while the contributions of its Washington, its Jefferson, and its immortal Lee have been more glamorous in their particular fields of endeavor, none have been more dedicated or have fulfilled the duties imposed upon them by the conditions prevailing than has this distinguished son whom we honor here today.

Mr. Speaker, I join with the thousands of Americans who love this country of free men in wishing for Judge and Mrs. Smith a long and well-deserved retirement in the greener and less vexing years that lie ahead.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I seek the privilege of associating myself with those who pay tribute to the Honorable Howard W. Smith. It has been an honor to sit in this august Chamber with him, and to be a sharer of his ripe legislative wisdom, his charismatic personality, and his kindly human understanding.

I am sure that the shades of the illustrious Virginians who helped fashion this benign Republic out of the chaos of disunity and dissention, and who nourished it to greatness and dignity, look down with approval and admiration on a worthy successor. Judge Smith learned well the lessons of honor and probity and selflessness so forcefully taught by Washington and Jefferson and Madison and Lee and all the long line of names which adorn the pages of American history. In his own career as a neighbor, a businessman, a statesman and a servant of the public good, he has kept the faith of their teachings and held high the banner of Virginia nobility. This proud Nation can not falter so long as it produces men of the character of Judge Smith. We honor him today, and we wish for him long years in which to enjoy the happy contemplation of a life well lived, a bright record of public service faithfully performed.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, Judge Howard W. Smith is a great legislator. He is forthright and diligent in his efforts in behalf of sound fiscal policies and frugal government. He is the unrelenting foe of extravagance and waste.

Judge Smith was one of the organizers of the economy bloc in the House. He has spearheaded its work for many years. Hundreds of millions of dollars in savings to the taxpaying citizen has been the result of the work of this group.

He is a man with strong convictions. Like the great oak of the forest, he could break but he would not bend. I wish for Judge and Mrs. Smith good health and every continued happiness in the years that lie ahead.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, statesman, legislator, lawyer, outstanding leader, and great American, Judge Howard Smith has outstandingly served this House, his district, and country for many long years.

His service here has been marked by exceptional devotion to duty, deep consciousness of the urgent need for patriotic service, rugged convictions, and hard, unremitting work. A keen student of government, faithful interpreter of the traditions and principles that have long animated the great statesman and patriots of his famous and beloved State of Virginia, Judge Smith is a skilled parliamentarian, a powerful advocate, unswerving in his purpose, firm in his faith and beliefs and committed to remarkable, self-imposed disciplines of unceasing endeavor and never-failing devotion to the many causes to which he was so deeply pledged.

While he was firm in purpose, as I have said, his fine legal mind was always open to argument and reason, and he scrupulously followed the course and the objectives that he felt were best for the country, and yet he never wavered in his zeal and respect for the rule of law, for the sanctity of legal principles and institutions as he understood them, and for the judicial attitude and approach, as he was given to interpret it.

The great State of Virginia has given many outstanding patriotic statesmen to the service of the country, but none of them has ever served over such a long period of time with greater devotion, greater enthusiasm, or greater zeal, or more sincere regard for the principles of constitutional government than Judge Smith.

His leadership of the great House Committee on Rules over a long period of time, through periods of turmoil, change, and progress, is permanently inscribed in the record of achievement of this House and the Congress, and Judge Smith will, not only be remembered and esteemed by those of us who served with him, but by many other Americans, present and future, for his long-continued, dedicated service to his great committee, the House, his district, and the Nation.

Judge Smith exemplifies, so characteristically, the qualities of the image of the traditional, Virginia statesman that he can well be ranked among the great national leaders from his State who have served in the Congress.

He will also be known and fondly and gratefully remembered for his kindly, generous personal qualities, which no temporary impression of sternness could ever erase.

He was a man of genuinely friendly nature and sympathetic understanding and cooperative spirit and willingness to help those in need of help and kindness to his colleagues are other qualities of his nature that brought him great respect, affection, and admiration in these feelings on both sides of the aisle, and by members of diverse, widely separated political philosophies.

The House as a whole recognized the great abilities, talents and outstanding contributions of Judge Smith, regardless of class, creed or political complexion, and his friendships here went across the board, so to speak, and gave the Judge a unique position in the House, even with those who did not always agree with his thinking, his outlook, his views or his action on legislative matters and matters pending before his Committee.

Judge Smith also has a deeply spiritual side to his nature. He is a man of deep faith and profound religious devotion, and in his spirit of toleration, he emulated the example of his great Virginian predecessor, Thomas Jefferson, probably the greatest of all American statesmen —author of the Declaration of Independence, founder of the University of Virginia, Founding Father of foremost rank, President of the United States, great thinker and political philosopher, brilliant leader and achiever for country, who when once asked what his greatest achievement was, unhesitatingly replied, that it was the authorship of Virginia statute for religious toleration.

The House will not be the same without Judge Smith, and neither will our great Rules Committee, where for years the judge has ruled, if not with an iron hand, with a tactic that generally has enabled him to do his work well and gain most of his goals.

Last week in our beautiful Ways and Means Committee room in the presence of very many distinguished Members of the House and friends, there was unveiled a very beautiful portrait of Judge Smith which will be hung in one of the historic Halls of this Congress.

It is magnificently done by a very talented artist, and is a faithful likeness and reproduction of the judge in a most characteristic pose. This fine picture will remain here for many years to come to remind those who have served with the judge, as well as those of future generations, of the great, long-sustained, faithful outstanding service he has rendered.

Here in the permanent record of the proceedings of the House for many years past, there will be inscribed in perpetuity for all Americans who wish to do so to read, the inspiring story of the life, the work, the achievements, and contributions of this famous, patriotic son of Virginia, who for so long has served our country far beyond the call of duty.

I wish for Judge Smith and his gracious wife many more happy, prosperous years together, and I hope that the good Lord will bless them and all their dear ones His very choicest blessings for many years to come.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, our beloved colleague, Howard W. Smith, has earned a great page in history. A man of conviction and of strength of character, he is at the same time a man of tender and warm affection for all about him.

Truly, his long career in Congress has made a monument for him in the abundant and thoughtful good that he has wrought for his State and Nation. All of us have been enriched by knowing him; and we all wish for him a happy retirement with his delightful and lovely wife.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the grand old men of the House of Representatives, still keen of eye and mind, still alert and witty, still true to his word and his principles, Judge Smith of Virginia takes his leave of the House of Representatives at the end of the 89th Congress after 36 years of distinguished public service.

He was born on February 2, 1883, at Broad Run, Va. After being graduated from the Bethel Military Academy at Warrenton, he obtained a law degree from the University of Virginia in 1903. He married Miss Anne Corcoran in 1923; his children are Howard Worth Smith, Jr., and Mrs. Joe H. Tonahill, and he is very proud of his many grandchildren.

After practicing his profession for 20 years, he was appointed to the bench of the municipal court of Alexandria, Va., and then to the 16th Judicial Circuit Court of Virginia. He resigned his judgeship to run successfully for the 72d Congress, and he was continuously reelected thereafter.

He is a member of the Episcopal church. He holds membership in the Elks, Masons, and Odd Fellows. He is chairman of the board of the Alexandria National Bank, and is also a very successful dairy farmer.

He has had many happy days in the House of Representatives, and many happy days are ahead of him at his beautiful Cedar Hill Farm at Broad Run, near Warrenton, where both he and his mother were born. There he will enjoy the breathtaking view across lovely green fields to the top of High Point Mountain, the largest peak of the Bull Run range. There he will savor the sense of the past that is to be found at Cedar Hill. The judge's mother used to tell him how Yankee troops passed along the road by Cedar Hill's front gate all day long during the assaults on Richmond.

Raymond Moley once said that it was not inappropriate that Howard W. Smith represented a district which was the homeland of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and Marshall. Moley added that, as chairman of the House Rules Committee, Howard Smith scrutinized every bill, exposed every legislative gimmick, and required every bill's sponsor to show good cause. More than once, even after his committee had granted a rule, he implored the House to send a bill back to committee.

He sponsored and succeeded in having passed in 1939 the famous Smith Act. He headed a far-ranging investigation of the administration of the National Labor Relations Act, was responsible for the reorganization of the National Labor Relations Board, and introduced the famous Smith-Connally Act which protected our defense industry during the Second World War.

His great formal authority has always been overshadowed by the authority which derived from the respect in which he was held by all of the Members of the House, whether or not they agreed with him on particular issues.

He has been one of the great men of Congress. We bid goodby to him and assure him of our lasting friendship and respect.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as we look back over the history of the House of Representatives, there are a few individuals whose character, personality and quality of service make them stand out from the rank and file of their colleagues. Without any reservation, I can say that our beloved and admired colleague and friend, Judge SMITH, has, through his many years of strict adherence to the high principles in which he believes, and through his quality of statesmanship through many critical decades, placed himself in that select category of individuals who have left an indelible imprint upon the course of our history as a nation.

I know of no one with whom I have served in the House of Representatives whose character and integrity and moral fiber are as strong as that of Judge HOWARD SMITH.

Mr. Speaker, let me dwell for a moment on a specific aspect of my relationship with HOWARD SMITH. I know of no Member of this body who has been as cooperative in moving ahead the legislative business of the Committee on Ways and Means as he has. On occasion after occasion since I have become chairman of the committee, we have appeared before the Committee on Rules to request rules for the consideration of our legislation on the floor of the House. Invariably, he and his committee have cooperated in according us hearings on our request for a rule, and the Committee on Rules has issued promptly rules for the consideration of our legislation. I know of no occasion in my entire service with Judge SMITH where he has not been wholly and completely cooperative in moving ahead the legislative programs of the committee on which I have had the honor to serve.

It is my confident view that the judgment of history will be kind to this great man and that, in the eyes of the scholars in years to come who will write the chronicles of the development of this great Nation, his place in that history will be assured.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I certainly wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the service of our retiring Virginian, the Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH.

It is impossible to cite Judge SMITH's many accomplishments in this brief comment on his service. I wish to say simply, as I did in a recent letter to the judge on the occasion of a testimonial dinner, that I personally have been grateful for his many kindnesses to me over the years I have served with him. His counsel has been helpful. His understanding of my goals and actions for my people has been appreciated. We have neither always agreed in our philosophy of government, nor in our votes on the issues that have come before the Congress. But, we have mutually understood that not only our goals but our constituencies were different. I have been grateful for the relationship we have enjoyed.

Judge SMITH has served his district, Virginia, and the Nation honorably and with deep convictions. He has made a mark in the House of Representatives that will not be equaled for many years. He has the respect and admiration of all his colleagues.

I join in this tribute to the judge with personal affection. I wish him the highest degree of health and happiness in the future.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have the opportunity to join my colleagues in this well deserved tribute to an outstanding American, HOWARD W. "JUDGE" SMITH, for his long and meritorious service to the great State of Virginia and to the Nation as a Member of the U.S. Congress.

I am convinced that history will record Judge SMITH's 34 years of service as exemplary and deserving of the heartfelt thanks of all Americans.

I have been privileged, on numerous occasions, to testify before the Rules Committee over which Judge SMITH has so faithfully presided. His probing and ever alert questions marked him as a true adversary in the greatest tradition of the word, but, in the final analysis, more perfected legislation was the result.

This body will miss Judge SMITH's presence. This tribute to an outstanding colleague and great political warrior is well deserved.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, as this historic and productive 89th Congress concludes its work it is only right that we pause for a moment to pay a just tribute to one of our most distinguished colleagues, that great statesman and southern gentleman, the Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH.

Judge SMITH has represented the 8th Congressional District of Virginia for the past 35 years and has compiled a record of valuable service to his constituents and the Nation. In his capacity as chairman of the important House Rules Committee he has used his power of penetrating analysis and unexcelled tactical skill in the advocacy of, or opposition to, legislation during committee meetings as well as during the debates in this Chamber. His assistance in helping us frame laws has been invaluable because he pointed out the strengths or weaknesses of measures under consideration. From my association with this able and distinguished Congressman, I must say I admire and respect his judgments and opinions even though I could not always share his point of view.

I am saddened that Judge SMITH will not be a Member of this body in the next Congress and we will no longer have the benefit of his years of experience and wisdom. He will be sorely missed by all of us who rely on his judgment and advice. I know all of us here wish him many years of health and happiness and he carries away from this Chamber our sincere admiration, respect, affection and our very best wishes for the future.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker throughout my relatively brief service in the House, HOWARD W. SMITH has been one of my neighbors across the Potomac. Like most neighbors, we have sometimes agreed and sometimes disagreed, but our differences on some questions have not diluted the respect I hold for him.

It can never be said that Judge SMITH is a mugwump. He is not. He is a gentleman of principles deeply honored, and of convictions firmly held and clearly stated. He takes positions, and knows how to take the consequences of those positions. In so doing, he has given great vitality and life to our deliberations.

During my 6 years in the Congress, no man has voluntarily picked a fight with Mr. SMITH. Just as he is an effective advocate, so is he a most effective adversary. His great ability in debate, his sharp and subtle wit, his talent in turning humor to advantage, and his command of logic made and make him an extremely formidable foe.

He is universally recognized as a master of the rules and parliamentary precedents of this body. More than that, he has been a master, too, of those informal and unwritten precedents which have shaped this legislature as an enduring institution. There have been relatively few, throughout the long, tumultuous history of the Congress, who have so fully understood its standards and its sentiments, so clearly read its moods, and so skillfully commanded a role in its leadership that they have permanently influenced its course. Judge SMITH is one of these few, famous men. In his service to this body, and in his defense of its position as a separate and coequal branch of government, he has been a great legislator. He has represented here not simply his district, but also a classic tradition, and he has done so very well.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, Judge SMITH, one of the true patriots of our country, will soon be leaving this distinguished body and I, for one, am sorry to see him go. The House will not be the same without him.

I have always admired a man who has the courage of his convictions and there is no one who stands taller than Judge SMITH in this regard. Despite the many attacks which have been leveled against him, he has held his head high and gone on to do what he feels to be in the best interests of his constituency and the Nation.

It has been a distinct privilege and an honor to know and to work with this fine gentleman, who has so faithfully and with such dedication served Virginia and the Nation for over 40 years. I am pleased to have the opportunity to join in honoring the judge for these many years of outstanding public service. We hope he will come back to see us.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, it was with great regret and a deep sense of loss that I learned Judge Howard W. Smith, venerable chairman of our Rules Committee, will leave the House at the conclusion of the 89th Congress.

In his 36 years of selfless service to his district, his State of Virginia and our Nation, he spanned an era of great change and movement, an era of war and peace, an era of social and political revolution. Judge Smith is well deserving of our deep thanks for his steadying influence and his contributions to the democratic process. No man has worked harder for the vision of what he saw America to be.

While I sometimes disagreed with his judgment, I valued his friendship and I respected his high ideals. I doubt the House will ever be quite the same after his departure.

Mr. Speaker, I salute Judge Smith—a conscientious legislator, a great Virginian, a distinguished American.

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, the retirement of the Honorable Howard W. Smith of Virginia at the close of this session will be felt deeply by all of us who have had the privilege of working with him here on Capitol Hill. For 31 years he has ably served not only the citizens of his own great Commonwealth but of the entire Nation by his dedication and competence as a legislator. During his many years in Congress, Judge Smith has displayed a steadfast devotion to good government and a sound economy. As chairman of the House Rules Committee he has repeatedly demonstrated his skill as a parliamentarian and his mastery of the art of statemanship. And, today, I would like to join with his many friends and colleagues who will be extending him best wishes and praise as he leaves these Halls.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the retirement of the Honorable Howard W. Smith of Virginia at the close of this term will stir the hearts of all his many friends on Capitol Hill. Those of us who have had the opportunity to know and work with him during his years of invaluable service to the legislative process are united in admiring his performance as a lawmaker, as a parliamentarian and as a man genuinely and deeply devoted to good government.

For 44 years Judge Smith has served the people of his district with a diligence, honesty, and sincerity that renders him today the idol of his colleagues and thousands and thousands of his constituents. He is, beyond question, the prototype of the good, sound, conservative, down-to-earth public official, and as such he is admired by all.

Virginia born and reared, Judge Smith saw fit to serve the people of his State throughout the course of his adult life, and in so doing he established himself in the hearts of all Virginians.

Graduating from the University of Virginia in 1903, he entered the profession of law and practiced for almost 20 years, establishing in the process a record as a topnotch legal mind. In 1922 he was appointed to the bench of the Corporation Court of Alexandria, where he performed with brilliance before resigning 6 years later to accept appointment as judge of the 16th Judicial Court of Virginia. In all his judicial acts, Judge Smith revealed a grasp of the law unequaled by any of his distinguished contemporaries.

In 1930, at the height of the depression years, Judge Smith resigned his place on the bench of the 16th Judicial Court to accept the Democratic nomination for Congress, in the Virginia Eighth District. Elected in this his first political campaign, and reelected repeatedly, on 26 subsequent occasions, he came in time to stand among the best known men in Washington, renowned as a scholar of the law and man of principle.

Of conservative nature, Judge Smith has opposed for many years the possibility of runaway spending by the Federal authorities, and has done his best to economize at every turn. As chairman of the House Committee on Rules, he has scrutinized thousands of House bills, measured their value, exposed their flaws and pounded them into shape. And for all his work in this regard, never once has the judge been questioned in the area of principle. For clearly, he is a man of the greatest integrity.

Every legislative action by Judge Smith was in line with his philosophy of government. A firm believer in the free American system he has sought to preserve our freedoms at every turn. As author of the Smith Act, he struck a blow against the interests of communism in the 1930's, and from that time to this the Communist influence in America has steadily declined.

In all his legislative endeavors in Washington, Judge Smith has earned the respect of all his colleagues and in all his personal dealings he has won their confidence.

We wish him well in whatever activities he now chooses to pursue, knowing full well he will perform with traditional zest and high ability.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Hardy], for notifying me that he was taking this time to pay tribute to the Honorable Howard W. Smith, so that I could arrange to have these brief words of mine included among the tributes.

Judge Smith's views on virtually every issue to come before Congress have been almost the exact opposite of mine. This has never made any difference in his ever-present courtesy and graciousness. Appearing before the Rules Committee has always been something of a challenge and a most unusual experience, but Mr. Smith, as chairman of that committee, and as a colleague here in the House, has been a true gentleman with whom I have enjoyed serving. I have always respected his integrity. He will be missed here in the House.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I think it very fitting that in the closing moments of this great Congress we pause at this time as a tribute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, the Honorable Howard W. "Judge" Smith. For 36 years Judge Smith has been an outstanding figure in this body. His dignity and warmth are too well known to all the Members for me to elaborate at this point. But these two fine attributes are not what we will remember Judge Smith for. He will be remembered, rather, as a man of unshakable principle—a man who kept his own counsel and then acted accordingly, firmly convinced in the right of his course. I cannot, in all truth, say that I have always agreed with Judge Smith, but I can say that I have always admired and respected him. It would be impossible not to. The gentleman from Virginia will not be present when the 90th Congress convenes and it will be a poorer Congress for his absence. We, too, will be poorer for his absence.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I know that every Member of the House feels a deep regret at the retirement of the Honorable Howard Smith. For me, however, this regret is especially deep. I cherish an admiration for Judge Smith that stems from personal contact with him when I was a freshman Congressman. His help to one new to the ways of Congress, his courteous personal consideration of my problems, and his wise counsel were so much more than I expected from a man of his stature that I have never forgotten it and will never forget it. He set an example for me that I shall strive to follow. In the words of his fellow Members of the House of Representatives, Congressman Smith not only is "one of the most dedicated men ever to serve in Congress" but he "epitomizes integrity, conviction and patriotism." I know of no man who more richly deserves such praise.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable pleasure and genuine pride that I join the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Porter Hardy, Jr.] in paying tribute to one of Virginia's most outstanding gentlemen and legislators, my friend and colleague, the Honorable Howard W. Smith.

During the time it has been my honor to serve in Congress with Judge Smith I have come to appreciate the true meaning of the word "gentleman"—a word used many times each day in this Chamber. When applied to Judge Smith, however, it takes on special meaning.

You, Mr. Speaker, recall that it was the great Cardinal Newman who probed the depth of the meaning in that term when he defined a gentleman as one who never willingly inflicted pain on others. Judge Smith, the renowned gentleman from Virginia, is such a person.

In his distinguished chairmanship of the House Judiciary Committee he has always been firm but fair. Determined in his purpose of representing the people of Virginia and true to his own beliefs, Judge Smith has always given consideration to every reasonable request.

Those who failed to recognize those qualities in Mr. Smith have, I think, too often submitted him to unwarranted criticism. Ironically enough, those decisions for which he was perhaps most criticized were those in which he was carrying out the wishes of party leadership and in some cases the wishes of the sponsors of the legislation involved.

Those of us who have known Judge Smith these many years and who have respected him find the prospect of the 90th Congress without him a bleak one indeed.

To him and his gracious and lovely wife go my personal best wishes for a happy and full life in the State and amid the people he has represented for so long with outstanding statesmanship.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, as the departure of the Hon. Howard W. Smith approaches, I want to join my colleagues in wishing him good health and happiness in the years ahead.

The extent of the contribution of Congressman Smith cannot soon be evaluated. He has been a magnificent parliamentarian and a defender of the Constitution. He has kept faith with America and has done his valiant best to make more secure the bastions of liberty and freedom.

His voice has been heard, his advice sought and his counsel heeded. His influence has been mighty and he has lived up to the trust placed in him not only by his constituents but also by the Members of the Congress.

Judge Smith is admired and held in the highest esteem for his integrity, his conscientious service, his loyalty and the warm human qualities of his nature.

The U.S. Congress and this Nation are fortunate to have been blessed by the life and service of Congressman Howard W. Smith.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, few men who have served in this great Capitol have had a stronger hand in shaping the history of our country than our distinguished friend and colleague, Howard W. Smith.

For 34 years, Judge Smith has served with distinction and with honor the people of Virginia and of our Nation.

His courageous voice has been heard, and in fact has led, the greatest debates to sound in this chamber in a century. His wise counsel and advice, his courtly demeanor, his strong adherence to principle, the magnificent ability to disagree without being disagreeable, will be sorely missed in the 90th Congress.

Judge Smith came to Congress as a young and seasoned lawyer, and a jurist of distinction. He came at a time when our Nation was in the bleak depression of the 1930's, and took part in the slow, tedious program of rebuilding a healthy and vigorous economy. He was here when our Nation was almost brought to its knees by the Axis attack in 1941, and took part in the building of strong armed forces that swept over the forces of tyranny. More wars, disasters, both natural and economic, and great social upheavals here and abroad marked the years of his service. And over it all, his calm voice calling for this House to chart its course through uncertain channels by the great guideposts of our Constitution.

One great American, Harry Truman, once said of a politician that if he cannot stand the heat, he should get out of the kitchen. Howard W. Smith not only could stand the heat—he had the courage to light the fire.

Courage and steadfast principles mark his long years of distinguished service, and he leaves for all of us an example that we could well follow. For 8 years, it has been for me a privilege to know this distinguished statesman and lawmaker, to listen to the counsel and advice he offered to this House, and to follow his leadership when in my judgment the course he charted was the wisest for our Nation to pursue. Our Nation owes to this man, as to few others, a deep debt of gratitude for his years of unselfish service and his constant adherence to constitutional principles of good government. With his help, our Nation has grown great and prospered. And he has helped keep us on a course that can only lead to even greater progress in every field.

On behalf of the people of the 22d District of Texas, I extend our warm and sincere best wishes to Judge and Mrs. Smith and his lovely family. May the years ahead be filled with good fellowship and good health, and warm with the memory of great accomplishments on his country's behalf during a singularly long and dedicated career.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to serve in Congress with Judge Howard Smith 24 years. His record as a Member of Congress and as the chairman of the Rules Committee is most outstanding and praiseworthy. His attainments and accomplishments and legislative victories are legion. There is no man with whom I have served whom I esteem more highly.

I wish for Judge Smith and his family every happiness and success in the future.

Incidentally, he has a daughter, who, with her family, lives in Texas not far from where I live. It is my hope he will have the opportunity to be in Texas many times in the years ahead. He always is welcome there.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to join with my colleagues in paying tribute for outstanding service to the nation by one of the truly great figures in Congress, the Honorable Howard W. Smith. I can state truthfully that I consider his loss to the House is irreparable. Men of his stature and of his standing are few indeed. Judge Smith is a remarkable man with a remarkable record, during which a most remarkable courage has been demonstrated time after time. For many years he has been one of the most powerful and influential members of the House, and I would like to add that he is also one of the most dedicated and one of the most beloved. He has added to his remarkable natural gifts and talents an equal amount of determination and energy.

I have observed him for many years as a friend and a man for whom I have deep affection, and I think I know some of the reasons why he has been such a successful leader. I find in him those qualities which we would all like to find in ourselves, and which we rejoice to find in other individuals.

I speak of the virtues of courage, devotion to family and to country, affability exhibited in the midst of arguments on issues on the floor, industry in the performance of work, and willingness to cast aside political expediency in favor of constructive courses and ideals of service to be followed in the interests of our country. People like Judge Smith will be sorely missed in Congress and we can ill afford to lose them.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I share the expressions that have come from both sides of the aisle commending our distinguished colleague Howard W. "Judge" Smith for his outstanding career in the House.

It is especially true in the case of Judge Smith that his record can be best appreciated by noting the belligerent criticism for which he suffered, but which dramatized his strength and character, exceptional legislative ability, and his devotion to his philosophy of government.

Judge Smith will properly go down in history as one of the most effective parliamentarians and powerful committee chairmen that the House has known. He will be remembered by us as an exceptionally effective orator and debater, but above all, he was a very understanding, sympathetic, and human individual whose friendship we will always esteem.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, we are saying goodbye to another old friend who has graced these Halls with his presence for 36 years. And I am most pleased to direct a few remarks, along with those of our colleagues, in appreciation for the years of faithful service performed by the Honorable Howard W. Smith.

The gentleman from Virginia was a distinguished jurist before he came to Congress and had already reached goals that would have satisfied most men for an entire lifetime. But Judge Smith was no average man. He ran for Congress, won, and used his earlier successes and experience to fashion a new and enviable career as a maker of laws rather than an interpreter of them.

Judge Smith's rise to the powerful post of chairman of the Rules Committee is legendary. A position around which revolved controversy, he has always commanded respect if not always agreement.

To anyone who has known him, Judge Smith represents the highest standards of service to his district, State, and Nation. I am most honored to be included on his list of friends, and I join with all Members of this House in wishing Howard W. Smith a most happy and prosperous future.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, after 36 years of distinguished service to his district, his State of Virginia, and our Nation, Judge Howard Smith is leaving the Congress.

Although the judge and I differ on philosophies of government, I have always admired and respected him. Over the last 12 years I have had the privilege of serving under Judge Smith as a member of the Rules Committee. During those years I have come to know and admire the venerable judge. He has always conducted committee business in an eminently fair way consistent with his high sense of personal integrity.

Mr. Speaker, Judge SMITH is a true Southern gentleman in the finest sense of the word. We will miss his keen wit and his courtly judicial manner.

May God grant him the happiness he so richly deserves in the years to come.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my fellow Congressmen in saying farewell to Judge SMITH. As he leaves this arena where he participated in so many legislative battles through the years, he carries with him our respect and admiration. I have considered it a high privilege to serve with such a distinguished, able, dedicated man. His integrity made the title Congressman much more honored and because of him I can hold my head a bit higher. It goes without saying that these Halls will never be the same after he departs.

And, now as we adjourn and wave goodby to him for the last time, I want to wish him a long life of fruitful and full retirement. I must say I envy him in that now he will have the time to enjoy all those activities which he has had to put aside during his busy years of service to his district and his Nation.

It is said that a politician thinks of the next election, but that a statesman thinks of the next generation. So it is with a bit of irony that we bid farewell to a statesman, Judge SMITH.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I come today to pay my respects to a fine man and a good friend known to many of us affectionately as "Judge" SMITH.

I am proud of my State, South Carolina, but today I envy the State of Virginia, for that State is about to claim for itself the time and talents of our learned and beloved friend, HOWARD WORTH SMITH. The late Senator Harry F. Byrd phrased his State's sentiment particularly well when he described him as "the greatest living Virginian," the words inscribed on a recent portrait of the "judge."

HOWARD WORTH SMITH is a name that will long be remembered, respected, and revered in the Congress. To me, he has been a faithful friend, a prudent counselor, and a judicious adviser through my career in this House. He has taught me many wise lessons, as I am sure he has taught others. I admire his principles, and I am proudest of the fact that he has never compromised those principles.

There are those among us who have said that his taking leave of us marks the end of an era. I rather think it is the beginning of an era—an era in which we will all realize the value of his counsel and the assistance he has given. It will be an era for renewal of a vigorous attempt to return this Congress and the Nation to an interpretation of our basic principles of self-reliance and individual worth. It will be much more difficult without "Judge" SMITH, but it will be a fine test of the character and fortitude of those of us who are left to carry on the tradition and the testament he has left us.

The "judge" steadfastly believed in the Jeffersonian principle that "that government governs best which governs least." There are still many others who cling to that principle, and, so, HOWARD SMITH's values are not disappearing from the scene.

As a friend describes another friend, it may be hard to define where truth begins to wane and is replaced by sentiment. Perhaps then it is of more value to recall what critics' thoughts have been. One such has described the "judge" as "rough but fair." Another of his most adamant antagonists has stated:

> Five Presidents have come from his congressional district, but only one HOWARD WORTH SMITH. I cannot recall a single matter on which I agree with him. But I always had the guilty feeling of deserting principle because I liked him.

Other of my colleagues have already covered the history and biography of HOWARD WORTH SMITH's 18 terms in the House of Representatives. I will not belabor the RECORD with further reminiscences. I will only say "goodby," and offer the promise of those of us who remain that we will hold your standards high, "Judge," and will continue to fight the battle still being waged for your kind of constitutional government.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, the 90th Congress will not be like any of its predecessors since the 72d Congress when HOWARD W. SMITH of Virginia began his distinguished career in this body.

Judge SMITH has been the personification of those qualities that are indispensable for greatness in this or any other body—intelligence, dedication, courage, and incorruptibility. A fundamentalist in his constitutional beliefs, he has consistently and persistently fought for those beliefs, and against any measure that he considered would jeopardize his principles. He has been an inspiration even to those Members who have disagreed with his views of the functions of government in the present-day world.

When he retires from the Congress, Judge SMITH will leave an indelible image in this House which will remain for many years to come. The people of Virginia, whom he has represented for so many years, will lose the services of an able, diligent, and tireless advocate. Together with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle I want to express my sincere wishes to Judge SMITH for the best of everything in the days ahead.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, "Judge" SMITH, one of the true patriots of our country, will soon be leaving this distinguished body and I, for one, am sorry to see him go. The House will not be the same without him.

I have always admired a man who has the courage of his convictions and there is no one who stands taller than "Judge" SMITH in this regard. Despite the many attacks which have been leveled against him, he has held his head high and gone on to do what he feels to be in the best interests of his constituency and the Nation.

It has been a distinct privilege and an honor to know and to work with this fine gentleman, who has so faithfully and with such dedication served Virginia and the Nation for over 40 years. I am pleased to have the opportunity to join in honoring the "Judge" for these many years of outstanding public service. We hope he will come back to see us.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, it has been a distinct pleasure to serve with the Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH in the House of Representatives and on the Rules Committee under his able leadership.

During my 12 years in the House there have been two great Americans that I put above all other men I have been privileged to serve with; the late Sam Rayburn, of Texas, and HOWARD WORTH SMITH, of Virginia. As far as I am concerned, Mr. Sam and Judge SMITH are two of the greatest Americans of our era. I have never met a man that more fully possesses the trait of inherent honesty than the judge.

Although we have disagreed on matters of political philosophy on occasion, in my book HOWARD SMITH has truly earned the title of "Mr. Integrity." It has been my experience that when we have agreed, the judge has usually been my most potent ally and when we have disagreed he was a most formidable foe. The reason for this is that when HOWARD SMITH speaks, people listen. They listen because they know he speaks with honesty and forethought.

I consider it an honor and a privilege to have been a colleague of HOWARD SMITH in the House and to have been a member of the Rules Committee under the chairmanship of such a distinguished and able American. His help and assistance over the years have been invaluable. I value his friendship highly and my association with him will never be forgotten.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the history of the House of Representatives is rich in the biographies of unusually talented men whose genius has made this one of the world's greatest legislative bodies, and one of those whose contributions have added most to the luster of its reputation is HOWARD W. SMITH, of Virginia.

Certainly few men in our time have possessed his knowledge and skill in the legislative process, and having the opportunity of observing this man mold and influence the measures we have enacted and those we have rejected, has been one of the most illuminating experiences of my freshman term.

The many who have known and served with Judge SMITH over his long and illustrious career will miss a personal friend when the 90th Congress convenes, but the many of us who admired the master, and the many more who will enter the House in the next and Congresses to come will miss the privilege of serving with one of the great legislators of this century and the history of our Republic.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I will long remember the many courtesies and great consideration which were extended to me by Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH when I arrived in Washington as a freshman Member of the House in the 87th Congress.

During the 6 years I have been privileged to serve in the House, my esteem for Judge SMITH, his high principles, his unquestioned courage and his unblemished honor have grown apace, and it is a matter of deep personal sadness and regret that we are saying goodby to him as this session draws to a close.

Judge HOWARD SMITH has been an example to all of us in his representation of his district, State, and Nation, and he will long be remembered and his memory cherished, in the Halls of Congress—not only for his long tenure of office and able generalship of the powerful and important House Rules Committee, but also for his personal qualities of consideration and graciousness—a true Virginia gentleman in every sense of the word.

Because of his adherence to principles, Judge SMITH could be a formidable foe; but he could also be an understanding and compassionate friend, and an ever-helpful colleague. In William Wordsworth's poem, "The Happy Warrior," the first line asks this question:

Who is the Happy Warrior? Who is he
That every man in arms would wish to be?

And some of the answers to this query given by the poet aptly describe Judge HOWARD SMITH:

But who, if he be called upon to face
Some awful moment to which Heaven has joined
Great issues, good or bad for human kind,
Is happy as a lover; and attired
With sudden brightness, like a man inspired;
And through the heat of conflict keeps the law
In calmness made and sees what he foresaw.

Because of Judge SMITH's proximity to Washington, I hope he will often return to the House, where we may have the pleasure of seeing him and drawing from his wisdom, experience, and clarity of vision strength for the months and years ahead.

And I trust the years ahead will be full of happiness and contentment for this great man, with full knowledge of a job well done and a trust discharged with great honor and fidelity.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a feeling that an era in history is closing in the House of Representatives.

Virginia has produced Presidents of the United States, many brilliant statesmen, and our colleague, HOWARD W. SMITH, stands high among them. His service to his country, his Commonwealth, and his constituents will live long after he departs this scene. He is a gentleman of noble motives and deep public spirit—always dedicated to honor and high principles. Judge SMITH, during his 36 years of outstanding service in the House, has been a tower of strength in the Halls of Congress, a vigorous and courageous advocate of legislation which he supported.

It has been my privilege to know Judge SMITH during my years in Congress. There has been no more thoughtful and considerate Member than he. I have requested his assistance in legislative matters and also in matters affecting some of my constituents. He always graciously offered his helping hand and took the necessary action, for which I am very grateful.

We, his colleagues, recognize and respect Judge SMITH as a forthright man of unshakable convictions—a man of unfailing devotion to the principles and traditions for which he stands and who actively demonstrated his dedication to those principles of government which he believed to be in the best interest of the Nation, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and his constituents.

We shall miss Judge SMITH, and I join with my colleagues in extending best wishes for his continued good health and happiness.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, my heart is heavy as I realize that in the 90th Congress I shall not be able to continue the warm relationship which I have always been able to enjoy with the distinguished and unusually able gentleman from Virginia, Judge SMITH.

I have been fortunate in having a most wonderful and rewarding relationship with the chairman of the Rules Committee and I feel that I have been greatly privileged to have worked with this great, outstanding and dedicated American. Judge SMITH's service here in this House was fearless, forthright, and courageous. He is dedicated and devoted to those principles and ideals which made this country great. I will be a better Congressman having served with this great American.

A parliamentarian without peer; a statesman the likes of which we shall not soon again see, if ever; a gentleman of the old school. I am sure that I speak for thousands of people, when I echo in simple justice my great respect, admiration, and affection for this great American. His departure is a great loss to the Congress.

Mrs. Dorn joins me in wishing for Judge and Mrs. Smith much happiness and best wishes always.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the life and service of the Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENTS TO SELECT COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS AND CONDUCT

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 1013, 89th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct the following Members of the House: Mr. BENNETT, of Florida, chairman; Mr. BROOKS, of Texas; Mr. NIX, of Pennsylvania; Mr. CAREY, of New York; Mr. CAMERON, of California; Mr. RONAN, of Illinois; Mr. GROSS, of Iowa; Mr. BROYHILL, of Virginia; Mr. MICHEL, of Illinois; Mrs. MAY, of Washington; Mr. LATTA, of Ohio; and Mr. STAFFORD, of Vermont.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and pay tribute to the Honorable A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, U.S. Senator from Virginia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DEMONSTRATION CITIES AND METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1966

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 3708) to assist comprehensive city demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and services necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in those areas, to assist and encourage planned metropolitan development, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that since this statement is published in the RECORD and available to every Member, that further reading of it be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I shall not object, but I do make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 388]

Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Glenn
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Belcher
Berry
Blatnik
Bolling
Bray
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Callaway
Carter
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Clawson, Del
Clevenger
Cohelan
Colmer
Conyers
Cooley
Corman
Craley
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Duncan, Oreg.
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fuqua
Gettys
Gilligan
Goodell
Greigg
Gross
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Hébert
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Howard
Hungate
Huot
Jacobs
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, N.C.
Keith
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kornegay
Laird
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Mackay
Mackie

Mailliard
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Meeds
Michel
Miller
Mink
Moeller
Morrison
Morton
Moss
Murray
Nix
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Pool
Powell
Purcell
Randall
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roncalio
Roudebush
Roush
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Scott
Senner
Shipley
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Smith, N.Y.
Stafford
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Toll
Trimble
Tunney
Ullman
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watts
White, Idaho
Whitener
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Yates

The **SPEAKER.** On this rollcall 262 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEMONSTRATION CITIES AND METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1966—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. **PATMAN.** Mr. Speaker, I renew my unanimous-consent request that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be considered as read.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. **CRAMER.** Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman if the gentleman intends to allot some specific time to the minority side? There are some here who would like to ask some questions relating to this matter. Could the gentleman give us some assurance on this side with respect to time?

Mr. **PATMAN.** The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] and I have discussed that. He has submitted names of those who would like to be recognized. That would take about 30 minutes. There will only be 1 hour.

Mr. **WIDNALL.** Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **CRAMER.** I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. **WIDNALL.** I submitted the names of those who had requested time. Up to the time I submitted the names, the gentleman from Florida had not requested time.

Mr. **CRAMER.** Will the gentleman please add my name to the list of those to be recognized?

Mr. **PATMAN.** I am going to allot time to those requested by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. **CRAMER.** Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2301)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3708) to assist comprehensive city demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and services necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in those areas, to assist and encourage planned metropolitan development, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966'.

"TITLE I—COMPREHENSIVE CITY DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS

Findings and declaration of purpose

"SEC. 101. The Congress hereby finds and declares that improving the quality of urban life is the most critical domestic problem facing the United States. The persistence of widespread urban slums and blight, the concentration of persons of low income in older urban areas, and the unmet needs for additional housing and community facilities and services arising from rapid expansion of our urban population have resulted in a marked deterioration in the quality of the environment and the lives of large numbers of our people while the Nation as a whole prospers.

"The Congress further finds and declares that cities, of all sizes, do not have adequate resources to deal effectively with the critical problems facing them, and that Federal assistance in addition to that now authorized by the urban renewal program and other existing Federal grant-in-aid programs is essential to enable cities to plan, develop, and conduct programs to improve their physical environment, increase their supply of adequate housing for low- and moderate-income people, and provide educational and social services vital to health and welfare.

"The purposes of this title are to provide additional financial and technical assistance to enable cities of all sizes (with equal regard to the problems of small as well as large cities) to plan, develop, and carry out locally prepared and scheduled comprehensive city demonstration programs containing new and imaginative proposals to rebuild or revitalize large slum and blighted areas; to expand housing, job, and income opportunities; to reduce dependence on welfare payments; to improve educational facilities and programs; to combat disease and ill health; to reduce the incidence of crime and deliquency; to enhance recreational and cultural opportunities; to establish better access between homes and jobs; and generally to improve living conditions for the people who live in such areas, and to accomplish these objectives through the most effective and economical concentration and coordination of Federal, State, and local public and private efforts to improve the quality of urban life.

"Basic authority

"SEC. 102. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to make grants and provide technical assistance, as provided by this title, to enable city demonstration agencies (as defined in section 112(2)) to plan, develop, and carry out comprehensive city demonstration programs in accordance with the purposes of this title.

"Eligibility for assistance

"SEC. 103. (a) A comprehensive city demonstration program is eligible for assistance under sections 105 and 107 only if—

"(1) physical and social problems in the area of the city covered by the program are such that a comprehensive city demonstration program is necessary to carry out the policy of the Congress as expressed in section 101;

"(2) the program is of sufficient magnitude to make a substantial impact on the physical and social problems and to remove or arrest blight and decay in entire sections or neighborhoods; to contribute to the sound development of the entire city; to make marked progress in reducing social and educational disadvantages, ill health, underemployment, and enforced idleness; and to provide educational, health, and social services necessary to serve the poor and disadvantaged in the area, widespread citizen participation in the program, maximum opportunities for employing residents of the area in all phases of the program, and enlarged opportunities for work and training;

"(3) the program, including rebuilding or restoration, will contribute to a well-balanced city with a substantial increase in the supply of standard housing of low and moderate cost, maximum opportunities in the choice of housing accommodations for all citizens of all income levels, adequate public facilities (including those needed for education, health and social services, transportation, and recreation), commercial facilities adequate to serve the residential areas, and ease of access between the residential areas and centers of employment;

"(4) the various projects and activities to be undertaken in connection with such programs are scheduled to be initiated within a reasonably short period of time; adequate local resources are, or will be, available for the completion of the program as scheduled, and, in the carrying out of the program, the fullest utilization possible will be made of private initiative and enterprise; administrative machinery is available at the local level for carrying out the program on a consolidated and coordinated basis; substantive local laws, regulations, and other requirements are, or can be expected to be, consistent with the objectives of the program; there exists a relocation plan meeting the requirements of the regulations referred to in section 107; the local governing body has approved the program and, where appropriate, applications for assistance under the program; agencies whose cooperation is necessary to the success of the program have indicated their intent to furnish such cooperation; the program is consistent with comprehensive planning for the entire urban or metropolitan area; and the locality will maintain, during the period an approved comprehensive city demonstration program is being carried out, a level of aggregate expenditures for activities similar to those being assisted under this title which is not less than the level of aggregate expenditures for such activities prior to initiation of the comprehensive city demonstration program; and

"(5) the program meets such additional requirements as the Secretary may establish to carry out the purposes of this title: Provided, That the authority of the Secretary under this paragraph shall not be used to impose criteria or establish requirements except those which are related and essential to the specific provisions of this title.

"(b) In implementing this title the Secretary shall—

"(1) emphasize local initiative in the planning, development, and implementation of comprehensive city demonstration programs;

"(2) insure, in conjunction with other appropriate Federal departments and agencies and at the direction of the President, maximum coordination of Federal assistance provided in connection with this title, prompt response to local initiative, and maximum flexibility in programing, consistent with the requirements of law and sound administrative practice; and

"(3) encourage city demonstration agencies to (A) enhance neighborhoods by applying a high standard of design, (B) maintain, as appropriate, natural and historic sites and distinctive neighborhood characteristics, and (C) make maximum possible use of new and improved technology and design, including cost reduction techniques.

"(c) The preparation of demonstration city programs should include to the maximum extent feasible (1) the performance of analyses that provide explicit and systematic comparisons of the costs and benefits, financial and otherwise, of alternative possible actions or courses of action designed to fulfill urban needs; and (2) the establishment of programing systems designed to assure effective use of such analyses by city demonstration agencies and by other government bodies.

"(d) Nothing in this section shall authorize the Secretary to require (or condition the availability or amount of financial assistance authorized to be provided under this title upon) the adoption by any community of a program (1) by which pupils now resident in a school district not within the confines of the area covered by the city demonstration program shall be transferred to a school or school district including all or part of such area, or (2) by which pupils now resident in a school district within the confines of the area covered by the city demonstration program shall be transferred to a school or school district not including a part of such area.

"Financial assistance for planning comprehensive city demonstration programs

"Sec. 104. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to, and to contract with, city demonstration agencies to pay 80 per centum of the costs of planning and developing comprehensive city demonstration programs.

"(b) Financial assistance will be provided under this section only if (1) the application for such assistance has been approved by the local governing body of the city, and (2) the Secretary has determined that there exist (A) administrative machinery through which coordination of all related planning activities of local agencies can be achieved, and (B) evidence that necessary cooperation of agencies engaged in related local planning can be obtained.

"Financial assistance for approved comprehensive city demonstration programs

"Sec. 105. (a) The Secretary is authorized to approve comprehensive city demonstration programs if, after review of the plans, he determines that such plans satisfy the criteria for such programs set forth in section 103.

"(b) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to, and to contract with, city demonstration agencies to pay 80 per centum of the cost of administering approved comprehensive city demonstration programs, but not the cost of administering any project or activity assisted under a Federal grant-in-aid program.

"(c) To assist the city to carry out the projects or activities included within an approved comprehensive city demonstration program, the Secretary is authorized to make grants to the city demonstration agency of not to exceed 80 per centum of the aggregate amount of non-Federal contributions otherwise required to be made to all projects or activities assisted by Federal grant-in-aid programs (as defined in section 112(1)) which are carried out in connection with such demonstration program: *Provided,* That no Federal grant-in-aid program shall be considered to be carried out in connection with such demonstration program unless it is closely related to the physical and social problems in the area of the city covered by the program and unless it can reasonably be expected to have a noticeable effect upon such problems. The specific amount of any such grant shall take into account the number and intensity of the economic and social pressures in the sections or neighborhoods involved, such as those involving or resulting from population density, poverty levels, unemployment rate, public welfare participation, educational levels, health and disease characteristics, crime and delinquency rate, and degree of substandard and dilapidated housing. The amount of non-Federal contribution required for each project in a Federal grant-in-aid program shall be certified to the Secretary by the Federal department or agency (other than the Department of Housing and Urban Development) administering such program, and the Secretary shall accept such certification in computing the grants hereunder.

"(d) Grant funds provided to assist projects and activities included within an approved comprehensive city demonstration program pursuant to subsection (c) of this section shall be made available to assist new and additional projects and activities not assisted under a Federal grant-in-aid program. To the extent such funds are not necessary to support fully such new and additional projects and activities, they may be used and credited as part or all of the required non-Federal contribution to projects or activities, assisted under a Federal grant-in-aid program, which are part of an approved comprehensive city demonstration program. Such grant funds, however, shall not be used—

"(1) for the general administration of local governments; or

"(2) to replace non-Federal contributions in any federally aided project or activity included in an approved comprehensive city demonstration program, if prior to the filing of an application for assistance under section 104 an agreement has been entered into with any Federal agency obligating such non-Federal contributions with respect to such project or activity.

"Technical assistance

"Sec. 106. The Secretary is authorized to undertake such activities as he determines to be desirable to provide, either directly or by contracts or other arrangements, technical assistance to city demonstration agencies to assist such agencies in planning, developing, and administering comprehensive city demonstration programs.

"Relocation requirements and payments

"Sec. 107. (a) A comprehensive city demonstration program shall include a plan for the relocation of individuals, families, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations displaced or to be displaced in the carrying out of such program. The relocation plan shall be consistent with regulations prescribed by the Secretary to assure that (1) the provisions and procedures included in the plan meet relocation standards equivalent to those prescribed under section 105(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 with respect to urban renewal projects assisted under title I of that Act, and (2) relocation activities are coordinated to the maximum extent feasible with the increase in the supply of decent, safe, and sanitary housing for families and individuals of low or moderate income, as provided under the comprehensive city demonstration program, or otherwise, in order to best maintain the available supply of housing for all such families and individuals throughout the city.

"(b)(1) To the extent not otherwise authorized under any Federal law, financial assistance extended to a city demonstration agency under section 105 shall include grants to cover the full cost of relocation payments, as herein defined. Such grants shall be in addition to other financial assistance extended to such agency under section 105.

"(2) The term 'relocation payments' means payments by a city demonstration agency to a displaced individual, family, business concern, or nonprofit organization which are made on such terms and conditions and subject to such limitations (to the extent applicable, but not including the date of displacement) as are provided for relocation payments, at the time such payments are approved, by section 114 (b), (c), (d), and (e) of the Housing Act of 1949 with respect to projects assisted under title I thereof.

"(c) Subsection (b) shall not be applicable with respect to any displacement occurring prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

"Continued availability of Federal grant-in-aid program funds

"Sec. 108. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, unless hereafter enacted expressly in limitation of the provisions of this section, funds appropriated for a Federal grant-in-aid program which are reserved for any projects or activities assisted under such grant-in-aid program and undertaken in connection with an approved comprehensive city demonstration program shall remain available until expended.

"Consultation

"Sec. 109. In carrying out the provisions of this title, including the issuance of regulations, the Secretary shall consult with other Federal departments and agencies administering Federal grant-in-aid programs. The Secretary shall consult with each Federal department and agency affected by each comprehensive city demonstration program before entering into a commitment to make grants for such program under section 105.

"Labor standards

"Sec. 110. (a) All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, or repair of projects which—

"(1) are federally assisted in whole or in part under this title and

"(2) are not otherwise subject to section 212 of the National Housing Act, section 16(2) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, section 109 of the Housing Act of 1949, or any other provision of Federal law imposing labor standards on federally assisted construction,

shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5): *Provided,* That this section shall apply to the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, or repair of residential property only if such residential property is designed for residential use for eight or more families. No financial assistance shall be extended to any such projects unless adequate assurance is first obtained that these labor standards will be maintained upon the construction work.

"(b) The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in subsection (a), the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267; 5 U.S.C. 133z-15), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948; 40 U.S.C. 276c), and the Contract Work Hours Standards Act (76 Stat. 357).

"Appropriations

"Sec. 111. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated, for the purpose of financial assistance and administrative expenses under sections 104 and 106, not to exceed $12,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and not to exceed $12,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated, for the purpose of financial assistance and administrative expenses under sections 105, 106, and 107, not to exceed $400,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and not to exceed $500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

"(c) Appropriations authorized under this section shall remain available until expended.

"Definitions

"SEC. 112. As used in this title—

"(1) 'Federal grant-in-aid program' means a program of Federal financial assistance other than loans and other than the assistance provided by this title.

"(2) 'City demonstration agency' means the city, the county, or any local public agency established or designated by the local governing body of such city or county to administer the comprehensive city demonstration program.

"(3) 'City' means any municipality (or two or more municipalities acting jointly) or any county or other public body (or two or more acting jointly) having general governmental powers.

"(4) 'Local' agencies include State agencies and instrumentalities providing services or resources to a city or locality, and 'local' resources include those provided to a city or locality by a State or its agency or instrumentality.

"Grant authority for urban renewal projects which are part of approved comprehensive city demonstration programs

"SEC. 113. Section 103(b) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following new sentence: 'In addition to the authority to make grants provided in the first sentence of this subsection, the Secretary may contract to make grants under this title, on or after July 1, 1967, in an amount not to exceed $250,000,000: *Provided*, That the authority to contract to make grants provided by this sentence shall be exercised only with respect to an urban renewal project which is identified and scheduled to be carried out as one of the projects or activities included within an approved comprehensive city demonstration program assisted under the provisions of section 105(c) of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966.'

"State limit

"SEC. 114. Grants made under section 105 for projects in any one State shall not exceed in the aggregate 15 per centum of the aggregate amount of funds authorized to be appropriated under section 111.

"TITLE II—PLANNED METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT

"Findings and declaration of purpose

"SEC. 201. (a) The Congress hereby finds that the welfare of the Nation and of its people is directly dependent upon the sound and orderly development and the effective organization and functioning of the metropolitan areas in which two-thirds of its people live and work.

"It further finds that the continuing rapid growth of these areas makes it essential that they prepare, keep current, and carry out comprehensive plans and programs for their orderly physical development with a view to meeting efficiently all their economic and social needs.

"It further finds that metropolitan areas are especially handicapped in this task by the complexity and scope of governmental services required in such rapidly growing areas, the multiplicity of political jurisdictions and agencies involved, and the inadequacy of the operational and administrative arrangements available for cooperation among them.

"It further finds that present requirements for areawide planning and programing in connection with various Federal programs have materially assisted in the solution of metropolitan problems, but that greater coordination of Federal programs and additional participation and cooperation are needed from the States and localities in perfecting and carrying out such efforts.

"(b) It is the purpose of this title to provide, through greater coordination of Federal programs and through supplementary grants for certain federally assisted development projects, additional encouragement and assistance to States and localities for making comprehensive metropolitan planning and programing effective.

"Cooperation between Federal agencies

"SEC. 202. In order to insure that all Federal programs related to metropolitan development are carried out in a coordinated manner—

"(1) the Secretary is authorized to call upon other Federal agencies to supply such statistical data, program reports, and other materials as he deems necessary to discharge his responsibilities for metropolitan development, and to assist the President in coordinating the metropolitan development efforts of all Federal agencies; and

"(2) all Federal agencies which are engaged in administering programs related to metropolitan development, or which otherwise perform functions relating thereto, shall, to the maximum extent practicable, consult with and seek advice from all other significantly affected Federal departments and agencies in an effort to assure fully coordinated programs.

"Metropolitan expediters

"SEC. 203. Upon the request of the duly authorized local officials of the central city in any metropolitan area, and after consultation with local governmental authorities throughout the metropolitan area with respect to whether or not the Secretary should make an appointment under this section (and with respect to the individuals who might be so appointed), the Secretary may appoint a metropolitan expediter for such area whenever he finds a need for the services specified in this section. The metropolitan expediter shall provide information, data, and assistance to local authorities and private individuals and entities within the metropolitan area, and to all relevant Federal departments and agencies, with respect to all programs and activities conducted within such metropolitan area by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and with respect to other public and private activities and needs within such metropolitan area which relate to the programs and activities of the Department.

"Coordination of Federal aids in metropolitan areas

"SEC. 204. (a) All applications made after June 30, 1967, for Federal loans or grants to assist in carrying out open-space land projects or for the planning or construction of hospitals, airports, libraries, water supply and distribution facilities, sewerage facilities and waste treatment works, highways, transportation facilities, and water development and land conservation projects within any metropolitan area shall be submitted for review—

"(1) to any areawide agency which is designated to perform metropolitan or regional planning for the area within which the assistance is to be used, and which is, to the greatest practicable extent, composed of or responsible to the elected officials of a unit of areawide government or of the units of general local government within whose jurisdiction such agency is authorized to engage in such planning, and

"(2) if made by a special purpose unit of local government, to the unit or units of general local government with authority to operate in the area within which the project is to be located.

"(b)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, each application shall be accompanied (A) by the comments and recommendations with respect to the project involved by the areawide agency and governing bodies of the units of general local government to which the application has been submitted for review, and (B) by a statement by the applicant that such comments and recommendations have been considered prior to formal submission of the application. Such comments shall include information concerning the extent to which the project is consistent with comprehensive planning developed or in the process of development for the metropolitan area or the unit of general local government, as the case may be, and the extent to which such project contributes to the fulfillment of such planning. The comments and recommendations and the statement referred to in this paragraph shall, except in the case referred to in paragraph (2) of this subsection, be reviewed by the agency of the Federal Government to which such application is submitted for the sole purpose of assisting it in determining whether the application is in accordance with the provisions of Federal law which govern the making of the loans or grants.

"(2) An application for a Federal loan or grant need not be accompanied by the comments and recommendations and the statements referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection, if the applicant certifies that a plan or description of the project, meeting the requirements of such rules and regulations as may be prescribed under subsection (c), or such application, has lain before an appropriate areawide agency or instrumentality or unit of general local government for a period of sixty days without comments or recommendations thereon being made by such agency or instrumentality.

"(3) The requirements of paragraphs (1) and (2) shall also apply to any amendment of the application which, in light of the purposes of this title, involves a major change in the project covered by the application prior to such amendment.

"(c) The Bureau of the Budget, or such other agency as may be designated by the President, is hereby authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as are deemed appropriate for the effective administration of this section.

"Grants to assist in planned metropolitan development

"SEC. 205. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make supplementary grants to applicant State and local public bodies and agencies carrying out, or assisting in carrying out, metropolitan development projects meeting the requirements of this section.

"(b) Grants may be made under this section only for metropolitan development projects in metropolitan areas for which it has been demonstrated, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, that—

"(1) metropolitanwide comprehensive planning and programing provide an adequate basis for evaluating (A) the location, financing, and scheduling of individual public facility projects (including but not limited to hospitals and libraries; sewer, water, and sewage treatment facilities; highway, mass transit, airport, and other transportation facilities; and recreation and other open-space areas) whether or not federally assisted; and (B) other proposed land development or uses, which projects or uses, because of their size, density, type, or location, have public metropolitanwide or interjurisdictional significance;

"(2) adequate metropolitanwide institutional or other arrangements exist for coordinating, on the basis of such metropolitanwide comprehensive planning and programing, local public policies and activities affecting the development of the area; and

"(3) public facility projects and other land development or uses which have a major impact on the development of the area are, in fact, being carried out in accord with such metropolitanwide comprehensive planning and programing.

"(c)(1) Where the applicant for a grant under this section is a unit of general local government, it must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Secretary that, taking into consideration the scope of its authority and responsibilities, it is adequately assuring that public facility projects and other land development or uses of public metropolitanwide or interjurisdictional significance are being, and will be, carried out in accord with metropolitan planning and programing meeting the requirements of subsection (b). In making this determination the Secretary shall give special consideration to whether the applicant is effectively assisting in, and conforming to, metropolitan planning and programing through (A) the location and scheduling of public facility projects, whether or not federally assisted; and (B) the establishment and consistent administration of zoning codes, subdivision regulations, and similar land-use and density controls.

"(2) Where the applicant for a grant under this section is not a unit of general local government, both it and the unit of general local government having jurisdiction over the location of the project must meet the requirements of this subsection.

"(d) In making the determinations required under this section, the Secretary shall obtain, and give full consideration to, the comments of the body or bodies (State or local) responsible for comprehensive planning and programing for the metropolitan area.

"(e) No grant shall be made under this section with respect to a metropolitan development project for which a Federal grant has been made, or a contract of assistance has been entered into, under the legislation referred to in paragraph (2) of section 208, prior to February 21, 1966, or more than one year prior to the date on which the Secretary has made the determinations required under this section with respect to the applicant and to the area in which the project is located: *Provided,* That in the case of a project for which a contract of assistance under the legislation referred to in paragraph (2) of section 208 has been entered into after June 30, 1967, no grant shall be made under this section unless an application for such grant has been made on or before the date of such contract.

"(f) Nothing in this section shall authorize the Secretary to require (or condition the availability or amount of financial assistance authorized to be provided under this title upon) the adoption by any community of a program to achieve a racial balance or to eliminate racial imbalance within school districts within the metropolitanwide area.

"Extent of grant

"Sec. 206. (a) A grant under section 205 shall not exceed (1) 20 per centum of the cost of the project for which the grant is made; nor (2) the Federal grant made with respect to the project under the legislation referred to in paragraph (2) of section 208. In no case shall the total Federal contributions to the cost of such project be more than 80 per centum. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including requirements with respect to non-Federal contributions, grants under section 205 shall be eligible for inclusion (directly or through refunds or credits) as part of the financing for such projects: *Provided,* That projects or activities on the basis of which assistance is provided under section 105(c) shall not be eligible for assistance under section 205.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated for grants under section 205 not to exceed $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and not to exceed $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968. Appropriations authorized under this section shall remain available until expended.

"Consultation and certification

"Sec. 207. In carrying out his authority under section 205, including the issuance of regulations, the Secretary shall consult with the Department of the Interior; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; the Department of Commerce; and the Federal Aviation Agency with respect to metropolitan development projects assisted by those departments and agencies; and he shall, for the purpose of section 206, accept their respective certifications as to the cost of those projects and the amount of the non-Federal contribution paid or to be paid to that cost.

"Definitions

"Sec. 208. As used in this title—

"(1) 'Metropolitan development' means all projects or programs for the acquisition, use, and development of open-space land; and the planning and construction of hospitals, libraries, airports, water supply and distribution facilities sewerage facilities and waste treatment works, transportation facilities, highways, water development and land conservation, and other public works facilities.

"(2) 'Metropolitan development project' means a project assisted or to be assisted under section 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965; title II of the Library Services and Construction Act; section 606 of the Public Health Service Act; section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act; section 120(a) of title 23, United States Code; section 12 of the Federal Airport Act; section 3 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964; title VII of the Housing Act of 1961; or section 5(e) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965; or under section 101(a)(1) of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (for a project of a type which the Secretary determines to be eligible for assistance under any of the other provisions listed above).

"(3) 'State' means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, any territory or possession of the United States, or an agency or instrumentality of any of the foregoing.

"(4) 'Metropolitan area' means a standard metropolitan statistical area as established by the Bureau of the Budget, subject however to such modifications and extensions as the Secretary may determine to be appropriate for the purposes of this title.

"(5) 'Comprehensive planning' includes the following, to the extent directly related to area needs or needs of a unit of general local government: (A) preparation, as a guide for long-range development, of general physical plans with respect to the pattern and intensity of land use and the provision of public facilities, including transportation facilities; (B) programing of capital improvements based on a determination of relative urgency; (C) long-range fiscal plans for implementing such plans and programs; and (D) proposed regulatory and administrative measures which aid in achieving coordination of all related plans of the departments or subdivisions of the governments concerned and intergovernmental coordination of related planned activities among the State and local governmental agencies concerned.

"(6) 'Hospital' means any public health center or general, tuberculosis, mental, chronic disease, or other type of hospital and related facilities, such as laboratories, outpatient departments, nurses' home and training facilities, and central service facilities normally operated in connection with hospitals, but does not include any hospital furnishing primarily domiciliary care.

"(7) 'Areawide agency' means an official State or metropolitan or regional agency empowered under State or local laws or under an interstate compact or agreement to perform comprehensive planning in an area; an organization of the type referred to in section 701(g) of the Housing Act of 1954; or such other agency or instrumentality as may be designated by the Governor (or, in the case of metropolitan areas crossing State lines, any one or more of such agencies or instrumentalities as may be designated by the Governors of the States involved) to perform such planning.

"(8) 'Special purpose unit of local government' means any special district, public-purpose corporation, or other limited-purpose political subdivision of a State, but shall not include a school district.

"(9) 'Unit of general local government' means any city, county, town, parish, village, or other general-purpose political subdivision of a State.

"(10) 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

"State limit

"Sec. 209. Grants made under section 205 for projects in any one State shall not exceed in the aggregate 15 per centum of the aggregate amount of funds authorized to be appropriated pursuant to section 206(b).

"TITLE III—FHA INSURANCE OPERATIONS

"FHA mortgage financing for veterans

"Sec. 301. The next to last sentence of section 203(b)(2) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out 'If the mortgagor is a veteran who has not received any direct, guaranteed, or insured loan under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration for the purchase, construction, or repair of a dwelling (including a farm dwelling) which was to be owned and occupied by him as his home,' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'If the mortgagor is a veteran,'.

"Areas affected by civil disorders

"Sec. 302. Section 203 of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

" '(1) The Secretary is authorized to insure under this section any mortgage meeting the requirements of this section, other than the requirement in subsection (c) relating to economic soundness, if he determines that (1) the dwelling covered by the mortgage is situated in an area in which rioting or other civil disorders have occurred or are threatened, (2) as a result of such actual or threatened rioting or other disorders the property with respect to which the mortgage is executed cannot meet the normal requirements with respect to economic soundness, and (3) such property is an acceptable risk giving due consideration to the need for providing adequate housing for families of low and moderate income in such area.'

"Cooperative housing insurance fund

"Sec. 303. (a) Section 213(m) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out ', but only in cases where the consent of the mortgagee or lender to the transfer is obtained or a request by the mortgagee or lender for the transfer is received by the Commissioner within such period of time after the date of the enactment of this subsection as the Commissioner shall prescribe'.

"(b) Section 213(n) of such Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'insured under this section and sections 207, 231, and 232' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the insurance of which is the obligation of either the Management Fund or the General Insurance Fund'; and

"(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'Premium charges on the insurance of mortgages or loans transferred to the Management Fund or insured pursuant to commitments transferred to the Management Fund may be payable in debentures which are the obligation of either the Management Fund or the General Insurance Fund.'

"(c)(1) The fourth sentence of section 213(k) of such Act is amended to read as follows: 'The Secretary is directed to transfer to the Management Fund from the General Insurance Fund an amount equal to the total of the premium payments theretofore made with respect to the insurance of mortgages and loans transferred to the Management Fund pursuant to subsection (m) minus the total of any administrative expenses theretofore incurred in connection with such mortgages and loans, plus such other amounts as the Secretary determines to be necessary and appropriate.'

"(2) The second proviso in section 213(l) of such Act is amended by striking out 'pursuant to subsection (k) or (o)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'pursuant to subsection (o)'.

"Supplementary financing for cooperative housing

"Sec. 304. Section 213(j)(2)(A) of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'except that, in the case of improvements or additional community facilities, the outstanding indebtedness may be increased by an amount equal to 97 per centum of the amount which the Secretary estimates will be the value of such improvements or facilities, and the new outstanding indebtedness may exceed the original principal obligation of the mortgage if such new outstanding indebtedness does not exceed the limitations imposed by subsection (b);'.

"Mortgage limits under section 220 sales housing mortgage insurance program

"Sec. 305. (a) Section 220(d)(3)(A)(i) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out '(3) 75 per centum of such replacement cost in excess of $20,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '(3) 80 per centum of such replacement cost in excess of $20,000'.

"(b) Section 220(d)(3)(A)(i) of such Act is further amended by adding before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: ': *Provided further*, That if the mortgagor is a veteran and the mortgage to be insured under this section covers property upon which there is located a dwelling designed principally for a one-family residence, the principal obligation may be in an amount equal to the sum of (1) 100 per centum of $15,000 of the Commissioner's estimate of replacement cost of the property, as of the date the mortgage is accepted for insurance, (2) 90 per centum of such replacement cost in excess of $15,000 but not in excess of $20,000, and (3) 85 per centum of such replacement cost in excess of $20,000. As used herein, the term 'veteran' means any person who served on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States for a period of not less than ninety days (or is certified by the Secretary of Defense as having performed extra-hazardous service), and who was discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable'.

"Increased mortgage limitations under section 220(d)(3)(B) for small projects containing larger family dwelling units

"Sec. 306. (a) Section 220(d)(3)(B)(iii) of the National Housing Act is amended by inserting after '; and except that' the following: 'with respect to rehabilitation projects involving not more than five family units, the Secretary may by regulation increase by 25 per centum any of the foregoing dollar amount limitations contained in this clause which are applicable to units with two, three, or four or more bedrooms: *Provided*, That'.

"(b) Section 220(d)(3)(B)(iii) of such Act is further amended—

"(1) by inserting immediately before 'by not to exceed 45 per centum' the following: '(as determined after the application of the preceding proviso)'; and

"(2) by striking out '*Provided*, That nothing' and inserting in lieu thereof '*Provided further*, That nothing'.

"Mortgage limits for homes under section 221(d)(2)

"Sec. 307. Section 221(d)(2)(A) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out '$11,000' and '$18,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$12,500' and '$20,000', respectively.

"Nondwelling facilities in section 221 projects in urban renewal areas

"Sec. 308. Section 221(f) of the National Housing Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence the following: ': *Provided*, That in the case of any such property or project located in an urban renewal area, the provisions of section 220(d)(3)(B)(iv) shall apply with respect to the nondwelling facilities which may be included in the mortgage if the mortgagor waives the right to receive dividends on its equity investment in the portion thereof devoted to community and shopping facilities'.

"Single occupants in section 221(d)(3) housing

"Sec. 309. Section 221(f) of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'Low- and moderate-income persons who are less than 62 years of age shall be eligible for occupancy of dwelling units in a project financed with a mortgage insured under subsection (d)(3), but not more than 10 per centum of the dwelling units in any such project shall be available for occupancy by such persons.'

"INSURANCE OF MORTGAGES UNDER SECTION 221 TO FINANCE PURCHASE AND REHABILITATION BY NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS OF HOUSING FOR RESALE TO LOW-INCOME PURCHASERS

"Sec. 310. (a) Section 221 of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(h)(1) In addition to mortgages insured under the other provisions of this section, the Secretary is authorized, upon application by the mortgagee, to insure under this subsection as hereinafter provided any mortgage (including advances under such mortgage during rehabilitation) which is executed by a nonprofit organization to finance the purchase and rehabilitation of deteriorating or substandard housing for subsequent resale to low-income home purchasers and, upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, to make commitments for the insurance of such mortgages prior to the date of their execution or disbursement thereon.

"'(2) To be eligible for insurance under paragraph (1) of this subsection, a mortgage shall—

"'(A) be executed by a private nonprofit corporation or association approved for purposes of this subsection by the Secretary, for the purpose of financing the purchase of property (comprising one or more tracts or parcels, whether or not contiguous) upon which there is located deteriorating or substandard housing consisting of five or more single-family dwellings of detached, semidetached, or row construction and of rehabilitating such dwellings with a view to subsequent resale as hereinafter provided;

"'(B) be secured by the property which is to be purchased and rehabilitated with the proceeds thereof;

"'(C) be in a principal amount not exceeding the appraised value of the property at the time of its purchase under the mortgage plus the estimated cost of the rehabilitation;

"'(D) bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance and service charge, if any) at the rate in effect under the proviso in subsection (d)(5) at the time of execution;

"'(E) provide for complete amortization (subject to paragraph (5)(E)) by periodic payments within such term as the Secretary may prescribe; and

"'(F) provide for the release of individual single-family dwellings from the lien of the mortgage upon the sale of the rehabilitated dwellings in accordance with paragraph (5).

"'(3) No mortgage shall be insured under paragraph (1) unless the mortgagor shall have demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Secretary that (A) the property to be rehabilitated is located in a neighborhood which is sufficiently stable and contains sufficient public facilities and amenities to support long-term values, or (B) the rehabilitation to be carried out by the mortgagor plus its related activities and the activities of other owners of housing in the neighborhood, together with actions to be taken by public authorities, will be of such scope and quality as to give reasonable promise that a stable environment will be created in the neighborhood.

"'(4) The aggregate principal balance of all mortgages insured under paragraph (1) and outstanding at any one time shall not exceed $20,000,000.

"'(5)(A) No mortgage shall be insured under paragraph (1) unless the mortgagor enters into an agreement (in form and substance satisfactory to the Secretary) that it will offer to sell the dwellings involved, upon completion of their rehabilitation, to individuals or families (hereinafter referred to as "low-income purchasers") determined by the Secretary to have incomes below the maximum amount specified (with respect to the area involved) in section 101(c)(1) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965.

"'(B) The Secretary is authorized to insure under this paragraph mortgages executed to finance the sale of individual dwellings to low-income purchasers as provided in subparagraph (A). Any such mortgage shall—

"'(i) be in a principal amount equal to that portion of the unpaid balance of the principal mortgage covering the property (insured under paragraph (1)) which is allocable to the individual dwelling involved; and

"'(ii) bear interest at the same rate as the principal mortgage, and provide for complete amortization by periodic payments within a term equal to the remaining term (determined without regard to subparagraph (E)) of such principal mortgage.

"'(C) The price for which any individual dwelling is sold to a low-income purchaser under this paragraph shall be the amount of the mortgage covering the sale as determined under subparagraph (B), except that the purchaser shall in addition thereto be required to pay on account of the property at the time of purchase such amount (which shall not be less than $200, but which may be applied in whole or in part toward closing costs) as the Secretary may determine to be reasonable and appropriate in the circumstances.

"'(D) Upon the sale under this paragraph of any individual dwelling, such dwelling shall be released from the lien of the principal mortgage, and such mortgage shall thereupon be replaced by an individual mortgage insured under this paragraph to the extent of the portion of its unpaid balance which is allocable to the dwelling covered by such individual mortgage. Until all of the individual dwellings in the property covered by the principal mortgage have been sold, the mortgagor shall hold and operate the dwellings remaining unsold at any given time as though they constituted rental units in a project covered by a mortgage which is insured under subsection (d)(3) (and which receives the benefits of the interest rate provided for in the proviso in subsection (d)(5)).

"'(E) Upon the sale under this paragraph of all of the individual dwellings in the property covered by the principal mortgage, and the release of all individual dwellings from the lien of the principal mortgage, the insurance of the principal mortgage shall be terminated and no adjusted premium charge shall be charged by the Secretary upon such termination.

"'(F) Any mortgage insured under this paragraph shall contain a provision that if the low-income mortgagor does not continue to occupy the property the interest rate shall increase to the highest rate permissible under this section and the regulations of the Secretary effective at the time of commitment for insurance of the principal mortgage; except that the increase in interest rate shall not be applicable if the property is sold and the purchaser is (i) then nonprofit organization which executed the principal mortgage, (ii) a public housing agency having jurisdiction under the United States Housing Act of 1937 over the area where the dwelling is located, or (iii) a low-income purchaser approved for the purposes of this paragraph by the Secretary.'

"(b)(1) Section 221(g)(1) of such Act is amended by inserting after 'paragraph (2) of subsection (d) of this section' the following: 'or paragraph (5) of subsection (h) of this section'.

"(2) Section 221(g)(2) of such Act is amended by inserting after 'paragraph (3) or (4) of subsection (d) of this section' the following: 'or paragraph (1) of subsection (h) of this section'.

"(c) Section 221(f) of such Act is amended by inserting after 'Housing Act of 1961,' in the fourth sentence 'or which meet the requirements of subsection (h),'.

"(d) Section 305(h) of such Act is amended by striking out 'section 221(d)(3)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'sections 221(d)(3) and 221(h)'.

"Application of Davis-Bacon Act to cooperative housing projects insured under section 221 (d)(3) and (d)(4) and mortgages insured under section 221(h)(1)

"Sec. 311. The third sentence of section 212(a) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out 'subsection (d)(3) or (d)(4),' and inserting in lieu thereof 'subsection (d)(3) or (d)(4) and (deeming the term "construction" as used in the first sentence of this subsection to mean rehabilitation) of any mortgage described in subsection (h)(1) which covers property on which there is located a dwelling or dwellings designed principally for residential use for more than eight families; except that compliance with such provisions may be waived by the Secretary—

"'(1) with respect to mortgages described in such subsection (d)(3) or (d)(4), in cases or classes of cases where laborers or mechanics (not otherwise employed at any time in the construction of the project) voluntarily donate their services without compensation for the purpose of lowering their housing costs in a cooperative housing project and the Secretary determines that any amounts saved thereby are fully credited to the cooperative undertaking the construction, and

"'(2) with respect to mortgages described in such subsection (h)(1), in cases or classes of cases where prospective owners of such dwellings voluntarily donate their services without compensation, or other persons (not otherwise employed at any time in the rehabilitation of the property) voluntarily donate their services without compensation, and the Secretary determines that any amounts saved thereby are fully credited to the nonprofit organization undertaking the rehabilitation.'

"Waiver of deduction on assignment of property to Secretary in lieu of foreclosure

"Sec. 312. Title V of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'Waiver of deduction on assignment of property to Secretary in lieu of foreclosure

"'Sec. 523. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, from and after the date of the enactment of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, the Secretary, under such terms and conditions as he may approve, may waive all or a part of the 1 per centum deduction otherwise made from insurance benefits with respect to multifamily housing or land development mortgages assigned to him, where the assignment is made at his request in lieu of foreclosure of the mortgage.'

"TITLE IV—LAND DEVELOPMENT AND NEW COMMUNITIES

"Experimental mortgage insurance program for new communities

"Sec. 401(a). Title X of the National Housing Act is amended by inserting after section 1003 the following new section 1004 and redesignating the remaining sections accordingly:

"'New communities

"'Sec. 1004. (a) New communities consisting of developments, satisfying all other requirements under this title, may be approved under this section by the Secretary for mortgage insurance if they meet the requirements of subsection (b) of this section.

"'(b) A development shall be eligible for approval as a new community if the Secretary determines it will, in view of its size and scope, make a substantial contribution to the sound and economic growth of the area within which it is located in the form of—

"'(1) substantial economies, made possible through large-scale development in the provision of improved residential sites;

"'(2) adequate housing to be provided for those who would be employed in the community or the surrounding area;

"'(3) maximum accessibility from the new residential sites to industrial or other employment centers and commercial, recreational, and cultural facilities in or near the community; and

"'(4) maximum accessibility to any major central city in the area.

"'(c) No development shall be approved as a new community by the Secretary under this section unless the construction of such development has been approved by the local governing body or bodies of the locality or localities in which it will be located and by the Governor of the State in which such locality or localities are situated: *Provided*, That if such locality or localities have been delegated general powers of local self-government by State law or State constitution, as determined by the Secretary, the approval of the Governor shall not be required.

"'(d) The aggregate amount of mortgages insured under this title with respect to new communities approved under this section and outstanding at any one time shall not exceed $250,000,000.'

"(b) No mortgage shall be insured under title X of the National Housing Act with respect to a new community approved under section 1004 of such Act (as added by subsection (a) of this section) after October 1, 1972, except pursuant to a commitment to insure entered into before that date.

"Mortgage amount and term

"Sec. 402 (a) Section 1002(c) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out '$10,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$25,000,000'.

"(b) Section 1002(d)(1) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(1) contain repayment provisions satisfactory to the Secretary and have a maturity not to exceed seven years, or such longer maturity as the Secretary deems reasonable (A) in the case of a privately owned system for water or sewerage, and (B) in the case of a new community approved under section 1004;'.

"Encouragement of small builders

"Sec. 403. The section of the National Housing Act redesignated as section 1005 by section 401 of this Act is amended by inserting 'particularly small builders,' after 'broad participation by builders,'.

"Water and sewerage facilities

"Sec. 404. The section of the National Housing Act redesignated as section 1006 by section 401 of this Act is amended to read as follows:

"'Sec. 1006. After development of the land it shall be served by public systems for water and sewerage which are consistent with other existing or prospective systems within the area, except that—

"'(a) in the case of systems for water, the land may be served by privately or cooperatively owned systems which are consistent with other existing or prospective systems within the area; are approved as adequate by the Secretary; and are regulated or supervised by the State or political subdivision or an agency thereof, or (in the absence of such State or local regulation or supervision) are otherwise regulated in a manner acceptable to the Secretary, with respect to user rates and charges, capital structure, methods of operation, rate of return, and conditions and terms of any sale or transfer; and

"'(b) in the case of systems for sewerage, the land may be served by—

"'(1) existing privately or cooperatively owned systems (including reasonable extensions thereto) which are approved as adequate by the Secretary, and which are regulated or supervised by the State or political subdivision or an agency thereof, or (in the absence of such State or local regulation or supervision) are otherwise regulated in a manner acceptable to the Secretary; or

"'(2) if it is necessary to develop a new system and the Secretary determines that public ownership of such a system is not feasible, an adequate privately or cooperatively owned new system (A) which he finds consistent with other existing or prospective systems within the area, (B) which during the period of such ownership will be regulated or supervised by the State or political subdivision or an agency thereof, or (in the absence of such State or local regulation or supervision) will be otherwise regulated in a manner acceptable to the Secretary, with respect to user rates and charges, capital structure, methods of operation, and rate of return, and (C) regarding which he receives assurances, satisfactory to him, with respect to eventual public ownership and operation of the system and with respect to the conditions and terms of any sale or transfer.'

"Federal National Mortgage Association special assistance for new communities

"Sec. 405. Section 302(b) of the National Housing Act is amended by inserting after 'or title VIII,' in the proviso the following: 'or under title X with respect to a new community approved under section 1004 thereof,'.

"Urban planning grants

"Sec. 406. Section 701(a)(4) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: ', or for areas where rapid urbanization is expected to result on land developed or to be developed as a new community approved under section 1004 of the National Housing Act'.

"Public facility loans

"Sec. 407. Section 202(b)(4) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by adding before the period at the end of the second sentence the following: ', or (iii) to be provided in connection with the establishment of a new community approved under section 1004 of the National Housing Act'.

"TITLE V—MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR GROUP PRACTICE FACILITIES

"Purpose

"SEC. 501. It is the purpose of this title to assure the availability of credit on reasonable terms to units or organizations engaged in the group practice of medicine, optometry, or dentistry, particularly those in smaller communities and those sponsored by cooperative or other nonprofit organizations, to assist in financing the construction and equipment of group practice facilities.

"Establishment of program

"SEC. 502. (a) The National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

" 'TITLE XI—MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR GROUP PRACTICE FACILITIES

" 'Insurance of mortgages

" 'SEC. 1101. (a) The Secretary is authorized (1) to insure mortgages (including advances on such mortgages during construction), upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, in accordance with the provisions of this title, and (2) to make commitments for the insuring of such mortgages prior to the date of their execution or disbursement thereon. No mortgage shall be insured under this title after October 1, 1969, except pursuant to a commitment to insure issued before that date.

" '(b) To be eligible for insurance under this title, the mortgage shall (1) be executed by a mortgagor that is a group practice unit or organization, approved by the Secretary, (2) be made to and held by a mortgagee approved by the Secretary as responsible and able to service the mortgage properly, and (3) cover a property or project which is approved for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction or rehabilitation and is designed for use as a group practice facility which the Secretary finds will be constructed in an economical manner, will not be of elaborate or extravagant design or materials, and will be adequate and suitable for carrying out the purposes of this title. No mortgage shall be insured under this title unless it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the applicant would be unable to obtain the mortgage loan without such insurance on terms comparable to those specified in subsection (c).

" '(c) The mortgage shall—

" '(1) not exceed $5,000,000;

" '(2) not exceed 90 per centum of the amount which the Secretary estimates will be the value of the property or project when construction or rehabilitation is completed. The value of the property may include the land and the proposed physical improvements, equipment, utilities within the boundaries of the property, architects' fees, taxes, and interest accruing during construction or rehabilitation, and other miscellaneous charges incident to construction or rehabilitation and approved by the Secretary;

" '(3) have a maturity satisfactory to the Secretary but not to exceed twenty-five years, and provide for complete amortization of the principal obligation by periodic payments within such term as the Secretary shall prescribe; and

" '(4) bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance, and service charges if any) at a rate of not to exceed 5 per centum per annum of the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time, or not to exceed such rate (not in excess of 6 per centum per annum) as the Secretary finds necessary to meet the mortgage market.

" '(d) Any contract of insurance executed by the Secretary under this title shall be conclusive evidence of the eligibility of the mortgage for insurance, and the validity of any contract for insurance so executed shall be incontestable in the hands of an approved mortgagee from the date of the execution of such contract, except for fraud or misrepresentation on the part of such approved mortgagee.

" '(e) Each mortgage insured under this title shall contain an undertaking (in accordance with regulations prescribed under this title and in force at the time the mortgage is approved for insurance) to the effect that, except as authorized by the Secretary and the mortgagee, the property will be used as a group practice facility until the mortgage has been paid in full or the contract of insurance otherwise terminated.

" '(f) No mortgage shall be insured under this title unless the mortgagor and the mortgagee certify (1) that they will keep such records relating to the mortgage transaction and indebtedness, to the construction of the facility covered by the mortgage, and to the use of such facility as a group practice facility as are prescribed by the Secretary at the time of such certification, (2) that they will make such reports as may from time to time be required by the Secretary pertaining to such matters, and (3) that the Secretary shall have access to and the right to examine and audit such records.

" 'Premiums

" 'SEC. 1102. The Secretary shall fix premium charges for the insurance of mortgages under this title, but such charges shall not be more than 1 per centum per annum of the amount of the principal obligation of the mortgage outstanding at any time, without taking into account delinquent payments or prepayments. In addition to the premium charge, the Secretary is authorized to charge and collect such amounts as he may deem reasonable for the analysis of a proposed project and the appraisal and inspection of the property and improvements. Where the principal obligation of any mortgage accepted for insurance under this title is paid in full prior to the maturity date, the Secretary is authorized to require the payment by the mortgagee of an adjusted premium charge. This charge shall be in such amount as the Secretary determines to be equitable, but not in excess of the aggregate amount of the premium charges that the mortgagee would otherwise have been required to pay if the mortgage had continued to be insured until the maturity date. Where such prepayment occurs, the Secretary is authorized to refund to the mortgagee for the account of the mortgagor all, or such portion as he shall determine to be equitable, of the current unearned premium charges theretofore paid. Premium charges fixed under this section shall be payable by the mortgagee either in cash, or in debentures which are the obligation of the General Insurance Fund at par plus accrued interest, at such times and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary.

" 'Payment of insurance benefits

" 'SEC. 1103. The mortgagee shall be entitled to receive the benefits of the insurance under this title in the manner provided in subsection (g) of section 207 with respect to mortgages insured under that section. For such purpose the provisions of subsections (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (l), and (n) of section 207 shall apply to mortgages insured under this title and all references in such subsections to section 207 shall be deemed to refer to this title.

" 'Regulations

" 'SEC. 1104. The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this title, after consulting with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with respect to any health or medical aspects of the program under this title which may be involved in such regulations.

" 'Administration

" 'SEC. 1105. (a) At the request of individuals or organizations operating or contemplating the operation of group practice facilities (as defined in section 1106(1)), the Secretary may provide or obtain technical assistance in the planning for and construction of such facilities.

" '(b) With a view to avoiding unnecessary duplication of existing staffs and facilities of the Federal Government, the Secretary is authorized to utilize available services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government in carrying out the provisions of this title, and to pay for such services and facilities, either in advance or by way of reimbursement, in accordance with an agreement between the Secretary and the head of such agency.

" 'Definitions

" 'SEC. 1106. For the purposes of this title—

" '(1) The term "group practice facility" means a facility in a State for the provision of preventive, diagnostic, and treatment services to ambulatory patients (in which patient care is under the professional supervision of persons licensed to practice medicine in the State or, in the case of optometric care or treatment, is under the professional supervision of persons licensed to practice optometry in the State, or, in the case of dental diagnosis or treatment, is under the professional supervision of persons licensed to practice dentistry in the State) and which is primarily for the provision of such health services by a medical or dental group.

" '(2) The term "medical or dental group" means a partnership or other association or group of persons licensed to practice medicine or surgery in the State, or of persons licensed to practice optometry in the State, or of persons licensed to practice dentistry in the State, or of any combination of such persons, who, as their principal professional activity and as a group responsibility, engage or undertake to engage in the coordinated practice of their profession primarily in one or more group practice facilities, and who (in this connection) share common overhead expenses (if and to the extent such expenses are paid by members of the group), medical and other records, and substantial portions of the equipment and the professional, technical, and administrative staffs, and which partnership or association or group is composed of at least such professional personnel and make available at least such health services as may be provided in regulations prescribed under this title.

" '(3) The term "group practice unit or organization" means—

" '(A) a private nonprofit agency or organization undertaking to provide, directly or through arrangements with a medical or dental group, comprehensive medical care, optometric care, or dental care, or any combination thereof, which may include hospitalization, to members or subscribers primarily on a group practice prepayments basis; or

" '(B) a private nonprofit agency or organization established for the purpose of improving the availability of medical, optometric, or dental care in the community or having some function or functions related to the provision of such care, which will, through lease or other arrangement, make the group practice facility with respect to which assistance has been requested under this title available to a medical or dental group for use by it.

" '(4) The term "nonprofit organization" means a corporation, association, foundation, trust, or other organization no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual except, in the case of an organization the purposes of which include the provision of personal health services to its members or subscribers or their dependents under a plan of such organization for the provision of such services to them (which plan may include the provision of other services or insurance benefits to them), through the provision of such health services (or such other services or insurance benefits) to such members or subscribers or dependents under such plan.

"'(5) The term "State" includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the District of Columbia.

"'(6) The term "mortgage" means a first mortgage on real estate in fee simple, or on the interest of either the lessor or lessee thereof (A) under a lease for not less than ninety-nine years which is renewable, or (B) under a lease having a period of not less than fifty years to run from the date the mortgage was executed. The term "first mortgage" means such classes of first liens as are commonly given to secure advances (including but not limited to advances during construction) on, or the unpaid purchase price of, real estate under the laws of the State in which the real estate is located, together with the credit instrument or instruments, if any, secured thereby, and any mortgage may be in the form of one or more trust mortgages or mortgage indentures or deeds of trust, securing notes, bonds, or other credit instruments, and, by the same instrument or by a separate instrument, may create a security interest in initial equipment, whether or not attached to the realty.

"'(7) The term "mortgagee" means the original lender under a mortgage, and his or its successors and assigns, and includes the holders of credit instruments issued under a trust mortgage or deed of trust pursuant to which such holders act by and through a trustee named therein.

"'(8) The term "mortgagor" means the original borrower under a mortgage and his or its successors and assigns.'

"(b) The first sentence of section 227 of such Act is amended by inserting after 'new or rehabilitated multifamily housing' the following: 'or a property or project described in title XI'.

"Labor standards

"SEC. 503. Section 212(a) of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'The provisions of this section shall also apply to the insurance of any mortgage under title XI; and each laborer or mechanic employed on any facility covered by a mortgage insured under such title shall receive compensation at a rate not less than one and one-half times his basic rate of pay for all hours worked in any workweek in excess of eight hours in any workday or forty hours in the workweek, as the case may be.'

"Amendments to other Federal laws

"SEC. 504. (a) (1) The sixth sentence of paragraph 'Seventh' of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (12 U.S.C. 24), is amended by inserting after 'Federal Home Loan Banks,' the following: 'or obligations which are insured by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development under title XI of the National Housing Act'.

"(2) The third sentence of the first paragraph of section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 371), is amended by inserting after 'or sections 1471–1484 of title 42,' the following: 'or which are insured by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development pursuant to title XI of the National Housing Act,'.

"(b) Subsection (a) of section 304 of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 (15 U.S.C. 77ddd) is amended by striking out the word 'or' at the end of paragraph (8); by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (9) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word 'or'; and by adding after paragraph (9) a new paragraph as follows:

"'(10) any security issued under a mortgage or trust deed indenture as to which a contract of insurance under title XI of the National Housing Act is in effect; and any such security shall be deemed to be exempt from the provisions of the Securities Act of 1933 to the same extent as though such security were specifically enumerated in section 3(a)(2), as amended, of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77c(a)(2)).'

"(c) Section 263 of chapter X of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 663) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Nothing contained in this chapter shall be deemed to affect or apply to the creditors of any corporation under a mortgage insured pursuant to title XI of the National Housing Act.'

"TITLE VI—PRESERVATION OF HISTORIC STRUCTURES

"Preservation of historic structures as part of urban renewal projects

"SEC. 601. (a) Section 110(b) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by inserting 'historic and architectural preservation,' after 'land acquisition,'.

"(b) Section 110(c)(6) of such Act is amended by inserting 'to promote historic and architectural preservation,' after 'deterioration,'.

"(c) Section 110(c) of such Act is further amended by striking out 'and' at the end of clause (8), and by striking out clause (9) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(9) relocation within or outside the project area of structures which will be restored and maintained for architectural or historic purposes; and

"'(10) restoration of acquired properties of historic or architectural value.'

"Local grant-in-aid credit for relocation and restoration of historic structures

"SEC. 602. Clause (2) of section 110(d) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by striking out 'clause (2) and clause (3)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'clauses (2), (3), (9), and (10)'.

"Grants to National Trust for Historic Preservation to cover restoration costs

"SEC. 603. (a) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development is authorized to make grants to the National Trust for Historic Preservation, on such terms and conditions and in such amounts (not exceeding $90,000 with respect to any one structure) as he deems appropriate, to cover the costs incurred by such Trust in renovating or restoring structures which it considers to be of historic or architectural value and which it has accepted and will maintain (after such renovation or restoration) for historic purposes.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the grants to be made under subsection (a).

"Urban planning grants for surveys of historic structures

"SEC. 604. Section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(h) In addition to the other grants authorized by this section, the Secretary is authorized to make grants to assist any city, other municipality, or county in making a survey of the structures and sites in such locality which are determined by its appropriate authorities to be of historic or architectural value. Any such survey shall be designed to identify the historic structures and sites in the locality, determine the cost of their rehabilitation or restoration, and provide such other information as may be necessary or appropriate to serve as a foundation for a balanced and effective program of historic preservation in such locality. The aspects of any such survey which relate to the identification of historic and architectural values shall be conducted in accordance with criteria found by the Secretary to be comparable to those used in establishing the National Register maintained by the Secretary of the Interior under other provisions of law; and the results of each such survey shall be made available to the Secretary of the Interior. A grant under this subsection shall not exceed two-thirds of the cost of the survey for which it is made, and shall be made to the appropriate agency or entity specified in paragraphs (1) through (9) of subsection (a) or, if there is no such agency or entity which is qualified and willing to receive the grant and provide for its utilization in accordance with this subsection, directly to the city, other municipality, or county involved.'

"Grants for historic preservation

"SEC. 605. (a) The heading of title VII of the Housing Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows:

"'TITLE VII—OPEN-SPACE LAND, URBAN BEAUTIFICATION, AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION'.

"(b) Section 701 of such Act is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d), and by inserting after subsection (b) a new subsection as follows:

"'(c) The Congress further finds that there is a need for timely action to preserve and restore areas, sites, and structures of historic or architectural value in order that these remaining evidences of our past history and heritage shall not be lost or destroyed through the expansion and development of the Nation's urban areas.'

"(c) Section 701(d) of such Act (as redesignated by subsection (b) of this section) is amended—

"(1) by inserting after 'urban development,' the following: 'to assist in preserving areas and properties of historic or architectural value,'; and

"(2) by striking out 'and (2)' and inserting in lieu thereof '(2) acquire, improve, and restore areas, sites, and structures of historic or architectural value, and (3)'.

"(d) Section 702(e) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(e) The Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of the Interior on the general policies to be followed in reviewing applications for grants under this title. To assist the Secretary in such review, the Secretary of the Interior shall furnish him (1) appropriate information on the status of national and statewide recreation and historic preservation planning as it affects the areas to be assisted with such grants, and (2) the current listing of any districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects significant in American history, architecture, archeology, and culture which may be contained on a National Register maintained by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to other provisions of law. The Secretary shall provide current information to the Secretary of the Interior from time to time on significant program developments.'

"(e) Section 706 of such Act is amended by striking out the proviso.

"(f) Section 708 of such Act is amended by inserting '(a)' after 'SEC. 708.', by inserting '(b)' before 'The' in the second paragraph, and by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the Secretary may use not to exceed $10,000,000 of the sum authorized for contracts under this title for the purpose of entering into contracts to make grants in amounts not to exceed 90 per centum of the cost of activities which he determines have special value in developing and demonstrating new and improved methods and materials for use in carrying out the purposes of this title.'

"(g) Title VII of such Act is amended by redesignating section 709 as section 710, and by adding after section 708 a new section as follows:

" 'Grants for historic preservation

" 'Sec. 709. The Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts to make grants to States and local public bodies to assist in the acquisition of title to or other permanent interests in areas, sites, and structures of historic or architectural value in urban areas, and in their restoration and improvement for public use and benefit, in accord with the comprehensively planned development of the locality. The amount of any such grant shall not exceed 50 per centum of the total cost, as approved by the Secretary, of the assisted activities. The remainder of such cost shall be provided from non-Federal sources.'

"(h) Commencing three years after the date of the enactment of this Act, no grant shall be made (except pursuant to a contract or commitment entered into less than three years after such date) under section 709 of the Housing Act of 1961 or section 701(h) of the Housing Act of 1954, or under section 103 of the Housing Act of 1949 to the extent that it is to be used for historic or architectural preservation, except with respect to districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects which the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development finds meet criteria comparable to those used in establishing the National Register maintained by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to other provisions of law.

"TITLE VII—URBAN RENEWAL

"Local grants-in-aid

"Sec. 701. Section 110(d) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by inserting immediately after the colon at the end of the first proviso the following: '*Provided further*, That any publicly owned facility, the construction of which was begun not earlier than three years prior to the date of enactment of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, shall be deemed to benefit an urban renewal project or projects to the extent of 25 per centum of the total benefits of such facility, or $3,500,000, whichever is less, if such facility (A)(i) is used, or is to be used, by the public predominantly for cultural, exhibition, or civic purposes, or is a city hall or a public safety building, or (ii) is a facility, constructed or rehabilitated by a public university, which is or will be devoted to the treatment of physical or mental disabilities and illness or to medical research; (B) is located within, adjacent to, or in the immediate vicinity of such urban renewal project or projects; (C) is found to contribute materially to the objectives of the urban renewal plan or plans for such project or projects; and (D) is not otherwise eligible as a local grant-in-aid:'.

"Air rights sites in urban renewal projects

"Sec. 702. (a) Section 110(c)(1) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by inserting in clause (iv), between the word 'income' and the colon immediately preceding the first proviso, the following: 'or, if the area is found by the local public agency to be unsuitable for use for low or moderate income housing, for use for industrial development'.

"(b) Section 110(c)(7) of such Act is amended by inserting immediately before the semicolon the following: ', or construction of foundations and platforms necessary for the provision of air rights sites for industrial development'.

"Additional requirements for redevelopment of urban renewal area

"Sec. 703. (a) Section 105 of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

" '(f) The redevelopment of the urban renewal area, unless such redevelopment is for predominantly nonresidential uses, will provide a substantial number of units of standard housing of low and moderate cost and result in marked progress in serving the poor and disadvantaged people living in slum and blighted areas.'

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply only in the case of contracts for loans or capital grants which are made with respect to urban renewal projects undertaken pursuant to urban renewal plans approved after the date of the enactment of this Act.

"Three-fourths grants for projects in certain redevelopment areas

"Sec. 704. Section 103(a)(2)(B) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by inserting after 'to avoid hardship,' the following: 'or at any time after such contract or contracts are entered into and prior to the time the final grant payment has been made pursuant thereto,'.

"Expenditures by educational institutions and hospitals

"Sec. 705. Section 112(a) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ': *Provided further*, That no such expenditure shall be deemed ineligible as a local grant-in-aid in connection with an urban renewal project, to the extent that the expenditure is otherwise eligible, if the facilities, land, buildings, or structures with respect to which the expenditure is made are located within one mile of the project.

"Requirement of separate sewer systems in redevelopment of urban renewal area

"Sec. 706. Section 105 of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof (after the new subsection added by section 703 of this Act) the following new subsection:

" '(g) Consideration has been given to development of a sewer system to serve the urban renewal area which will, to the maximum extent feasible, provide for effective control of storm and sanitary wastes.'

"TITLE VIII—RURAL HOUSING

"Sec. 801. Section 501(a) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by striking out 'previously occupied' wherever it appears.

"Sec. 802. Section 502(a) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by striking out 'In cases of applicants who are elderly persons, the' and inserting in lieu thereof 'The'.

"Sec. 803. Section 504 of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by striking out '$1,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$1,500'.

"Sec. 804. (a) Section 515(a) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by inserting after 'income' the following: 'or other persons and families of low income'.

"(b) Section 515(d)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out 'elderly persons or elderly families' and inserting in lieu thereof 'occupants eligible under this section'.

"Sec. 805. (a) Subsections (a) and (b) of section 515 of the Housing Act of 1949 are each amended by striking out 'rental housing' and inserting in lieu thereof 'rental or cooperative housing'.

"(b) Section 515(b) of such Act is amended by inserting after 'families' the following: 'or other persons and families of moderate income'.

"(c) Section 515(d)(4) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Such fees and charges may include payments to qualified consulting organizations or foundations which operate on a nonprofit basis and which render services or assistance to nonprofit corporations or consumer cooperatives who provide housing and related facilities.'

"Sec. 806. Section 517(a)(1) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended—

"(1) by inserting 'and' before '(b)'; and

"(2) by striking out ', and (C)' and all that follows and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '; but no loan under this paragraph shall be insured or made after October 1, 1969, except pursuant to a commitment entered into before that date; and'.

"Sec. 807. (a) Section 501(a) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ', and (4) to an owner described in clause (1), (2), or (3) for refinancing indebtedness which—

" '(A) was incurred for an eligible purpose described in such clause,

" '(B) if not refinanced, is likely to result at an early date in loss of the applicant's necessary dwelling or essential farm service buildings,

" '(C) is not held or insured by the United States or any agency thereof, and

" '(D) was incurred prior to the enactment of this clause.'

"(b) Section 501(c) of such Act is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end of clause (1) the following: ', or that he is the owner of a farm or other real estate in a rural area who needs refinancing of indebtedness described in clause (4) of subsection (a)'.

"TITLE IX—URBAN INFORMATION AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SERVICES

"Purpose

"Sec. 901. It is the purpose of this title to assist States to make available information and data on urban needs and assistance programs and activities, and to provide technical assistance, to small communities with respect to the solution of urban problems.

"Grant authority

"Sec. 902. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to States to help finance programs to provide information and data on urban needs and assistance programs and activities, and to provide technical assistance, to small communities with respect to the solution of local problems. Activities aided by such grants may include—

"(1) the assembly, correlation, and dissemination of urban physical, social, and economic development information and data for the purpose of informing local governments of small communities, and interested organizations and individuals, of the availability and status of Federal, State, and local programs and other resources and data for the solution of urban problems; and

"(2) providing technical assistance with respect to the solution of urban problems to any small community requesting such assistance.

"(b) A program assisted under this section shall—

"(1) specify the information and technical assistance activities to be carried on and justify the needs for the costs of such activities; and

"(2) represent substantially increased or improved activities on the part of the applicant State agency.

"Amount of grant

"Sec. 903. (a) A grant under this section shall not exceed 50 per centum of the cost of the activities carried on under an approved urban information and technical assistance program.

"(b) No grant shall be made under this title to assist in assembling data, or providing information, to be used primarily in the day to day operations of State or local governing bodies and agencies.

"Cooperation and coordination

"Sec. 904. (a) Federal departments and agencies shall cooperate with States in providing information to assist in carrying out the purpose of this title.

"(b) In the administration of this title, the Secretary shall seek to ensure the greatest practicable coordination of urban information and technical assistance programs established under this title.

"Definitions

"SEC. 905. As used in this title—

"(1) 'State' means any State of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, or an agency or instrumentality designated by the chief executive of any of the foregoing, or a statewide agency or instrumentality of its political subdivisions designated by such chief executive.

"(2) 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

"(3) 'Small communities' means communities having populations of less than one hundred thousand according to the most recent decennial census.

"Appropriations

"SEC. 906. There are authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title not to exceed $2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and not to exceed $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966. Appropriations authorized under this section shall remain available until expended.

"TITLE X—MISCELLANEOUS

"Housing for the elderly or handicapped

"SEC. 1001. Section 105(b) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 is amended—

"(1) by inserting '(1)' after '(b)';

"(2) by striking out 'Effective with respect to loans made on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, section' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Section'; and

"(3) by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

" '(2) The interest rate provided by the amendment made in paragraph (1) shall be applicable (A) with respect to any loan made on or after August 10, 1965, and (B) with respect to any loan made prior to such date if construction of the housing or related facilities to be assisted by such loan was not commenced prior to such date, and not completed prior to the filing of an application for the benefits of such interest rate.'

"Low-rent housing in private accommodations—Term of lease

"SEC. 1002. Section 23(d) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by striking out 'thirty-six months' and inserting in lieu thereof 'sixty months.'

"Application of Davis-Bacon Act to low-rent housing projects consisting of privately built housing

"SEC. 1003. Section 16(2) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by inserting after 'the development of the project involved' the following: '(including a project for the use of privately built housing in any case, other than under the authority of section 23 of this Act, where the public housing agency and the builder or sponsor enter into an agreement for such use before construction or rehabilitation is commenced), and that each such laborer or mechanic shall receive compensation at a rate not less than one and one-half times his basic rate of pay for all hours worked in any workweek in excess of eight hours in any workday or forty hours in the workweek, as the case may be'.

"Assistance for housing in Alaska

"SEC. 1004. (a) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') is authorized to make loans and grants to the State of Alaska, or any duly authorized agency or instrumentality thereof, in accordance with a statewide program prepared by such State, agency, or instrumentality, and approved by the Secretary, to assist in the provision of housing and related facilities for Alaska natives and other Alaska residents who are otherwise unable to finance such housing and related facilities upon terms and conditions which they can afford. The program shall (1) specify the minimum and maximum standards for such housing and related facilities (not to exceed an average of $7,500 per dwelling unit); (2) to the extent feasible, encourage the proposed users of such housing and related facilities to utilize mutual and self-help in the construction thereof; and (3) provide experience and encourage continued participation, in self-government and individual homeownership.

"(b) Grants under this section shall not exceed 75 per centum of the aggregate cost of the housing and related facilities to be constructed under an approved program.

"(c) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $10,000,000 to carry out the purposes of this section.

"Federal National Mortgage Association participation in Federal Housing Administration-insured construction financing

"SEC. 1005. Section 305 of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

" '(i) In any case where the Association makes a commitment to purchase under this section (1) a mortgage insured under section 213, (2) a mortgage insured under section 220, or (3) a mortgage insured under section 221(d)(3) and executed by a cooperative (including an investor-sponsor), a limited dividend corporation, a private nonprofit corporation or association, or a mortgagor qualified under section 221(e), such commitment may provide for participation by the Association in the making of insured advances on the mortgage during construction. Such participation shall be limited to 95 per centum of the amount of each of the advances involved, and the mortgagee providing the balance of such amount shall perform all necessary servicing and processing of such advances until the final insurance endorsement of the mortgage. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall approve the reasonableness of the fee to be paid a participating mortgagee, taking into account its services and the extent of its participation in the advances.'

"Federal National Mortgage Association special assistance for financing low-cost homes

"SEC. 1006. The Congress hereby finds that the sharp decline in new home construction over the past year threatens to undercut our present high level of prosperity and employment as such declines have in the past; that the substantial reduction which has taken place has had its greatest impact on families of modest income who are seeking to achieve the goal of homeownership; that this decline in homebuilding is due primarily to the shortage of mortgage financing on terms which moderate income families can afford; and that our national policy objectives in the field of housing and community development are thereby being thwarted. The Congress therefore expresses its intent that the special assistance funds made available to the Federal National Mortgage Association for the financing of new low-cost homes by the Act of September 10, 1966 (Public Law 89–556), should be released immediately to halt the continuing decline in the construction of new homes for families of moderate income.

"Federal National Mortgage Association standby commitments

"SEC. 1007. Section 304(a)(1) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out the last sentence.

"Planning grants for research on State statutes affecting local governments

"SEC. 1008. Section 701(b) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ', and for grants to assist in the conduct of studies and research relating to needed revisions in State statutes which create, govern, or control local governments and local governmental operations'.

"Public facility loans

"SEC. 1009. Section 202 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

" '(f) The restrictions and limitations set forth in subsection (c) of this section shall not apply to assistance to municipalities, other political subdivisions and instrumentalities of one or more States, and Indian tribes, for specific projects for cultural centers, including but not limited to, museums, art centers and galleries, and theaters and other physical facilities for the performing arts, which would be of cultural, educational, and informational value to the communities and areas where the centers would be located.'

"Applying advances in technology to housing and urban development

"SEC. 1010. (a) To encourage and assist the housing industry to continue to reduce the cost and improve the quality of housing by the application to home construction of advances in technology, and to encourage and assist the application of advances in technology to urban development activities, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') is directed to—

"(1) conduct research and studies to test and demonstrate new and improved techniques and methods of applying advances in technology to housing construction, rehabilitation, and maintenance, and to urban development activities; and

"(2) encourage and promote the acceptance and application of new and improved techniques and methods of constructing, rehabilitating, and maintaining housing, and the application of advances in technology to urban development activities, by all segments of the housing industry, communities, industries engaged in urban development activities, and the general public.

"(b) Research and studies conducted under this section shall be designed to test and demonstrate the applicability to housing construction, rehabilitation, and maintenance, and urban development activities, of advances in technology relating to (1) design concepts, (2) construction and rehabilitation methods, (3) manufacturing processes, (4) materials and products, and (5) building components.

"(c) The Secretary is authorized to carry out the research and studies authorized by this section either directly or by contract with public or private bodies or agencies, or by working agreement with departments and agencies of the Federal Government, as he may determine to be desirable. Contracts may be made by the Secretary for research and studies authorized by this section for work to continue not more than two years from the date of any such contract.

"(d) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this section not to exceed $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and not to exceed $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968. All funds so appropriated shall remain available until expended.

"(e) Nothing contained in this section shall limit any authority of the Secretary under title III of the Housing Act of 1948, section 602 of the Housing Act of 1956, or any other provision of law.

"Urban environmental studies

"SEC. 1011. (a) The Congress finds that, with the ever-increasing concentration of the Nation's population in urban centers, there has occurred a marked change in the environmental conditions under which most people live and work; that such change is characterized by the progressive substitution of a highly complex, man-contrived environment for an environment conditioned primarily by nature; that the beneficent or malignant influence of environment on all living creatures is well recognized; and that much more knowledge is urgently needed concerning the effect on human beings of highly urbanized surroundings. It is the purpose of this section to authorize a comprehensive program of research, studies, surveys, and analyses to improve understanding of the environmental conditions necessary for the well-being of an urban society, and for the intelligent planning and development of viable urban centers.

"(b) In order to carry out the purpose of this section, the Secretary is authorized and directed to—

"(1) conduct studies, surveys, research, and analyses with respect to the ecological factors involved in urban living;

"(2) document and define urban environmental factors which need to be controlled or eliminated for the well-being of urban life;

"(3) establish a system of collecting and receiving information and data on urban ecological research and evaluations which are in process or are being planned by public or private agencies, or individuals;

"(4) evaluate and disseminate information pertaining to urban ecology to public and private agencies or organizations, or individuals, in the form of reports or otherwise;

"(5) initiate and utilize urban ecological information in urban development projects initiated or assisted by the Department of Housing and Urban Development; and

"(6) establish through interagency consultation the coordinated utilization of urban ecological information in projects undertaken or assisted by the Federal Government which affect the growth or development of urban areas.

"(c)(1) The Secretary is authorized to establish such advisory committees as he deems desirable for the purpose of rendering advice and submitting recommendations for carrying out the purpose of this section. Such advisory committees shall render such advice to the Secretary upon his request and may submit such recommendations to the Secretary at any time on their own initiative. The Secretary may designate employees of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to assist such committees.

"(2) Members of such advisory committees shall receive not to exceed $100 per day when engaged in the actual performance of their duties, in addition to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties.

"(d) The Secretary is authorized to carry out the studies, surveys, research, and analyses authorized by this section either directly or by contract with public or private bodies or agencies, or by working agreement with departments and agencies of the Federal Government, as he may determine to be desirable. Contracts may be made by the Secretary for work under this subsection to continue not more than two years from the date of any such contract.

"(e) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. All funds so appropriated shall remain available until expended when so provided in appropriation Acts.

"Mortgage relief for certain homeowners

"Sec. 1012. That part of section 107 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 which precedes subsection (f) is amended to read as follows:

"'Mortgage relief for certain homeowners

"'Sec. 107. (a) For the purposes of this section—

"'(1) The term "mortgage" means a mortgage which (A) is insured under the National Housing Act, or (B) secures a home loan guaranteed or insured under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 or chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code.

"'(2) The term "Federal mortgage agency" means—

"'(A) the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development when used in connection with mortgages insured under the National Housing Act, and

"'(B) the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs when used in connection with mortgages securing home loans guaranteed or insured under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 or chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code.

"'(3) The term "distressed mortgagor" means an individual who—

"'(A) was employed by the Federal Government at, or was assigned as a serviceman to, a military base or other Federal installation and whose employment or service at such base or installation was terminated subsequent to November 1, 1964, as the result of the closing (in whole or in part) of such base or installation; and

"'(B) is the owner-occupant of a dwelling situated at or near such base or installation and upon which there is a mortgage securing a loan which is in default because of the inability of such individual to make payments due under such mortgage.

"'(b)(1) Any distressed mortgagor, for the purpose of avoiding foreclosure of his mortgage, may apply to the appropriate Federal mortgage agency for a determination that suspension of his obligation to make payments due under such mortgage during a temporary period is necessary in order to avoid such foreclosure.

"'(2) Upon receipt of an application made under this subsection by a distressed mortgagor, the Federal mortgage agency shall issue to such mortgagor a certificate of moratorium if it determines, after consultation with the interested mortgagee, that such action is necessary to avoid foreclosure.

"'(3) Prior to the issuance to any distressed mortgagor of a certificate of moratorium under paragraph (2), the Federal mortgage agency, the mortgagor, and the mortgagee shall enter into a binding agreement under which—

"'(A) the mortgagor will be required to make payments to such agency, after the expiration of such certificate, in an aggregate amount equal to the amount paid by such agency on behalf of such mortgagor as provided in subsection (c), together with interest thereon at a rate not to exceed the rate provided in the mortgage; the manner and time in which such payments shall be made to be determined by the Federal mortgage agency having due regard for the purposes sought to be achieved by this section; and

"'(B) the Federal mortgage agency will be subrogated to the rights of the mortgagee to the extent of payments made pursuant to such certificate, which rights, however, shall be subject to the prior right of the mortgagee to receive the full amount payable under the mortgage.

"'(4) Any certificate of moratorium issued under this subsection shall expire on whichever of the following dates is the earliest—

"'(A) two years from the date on which such certificate was issued;

"'(B) thirty days after the date on which the mortgagor gives notice in writing to the Federal mortgage agency that he is able to resume his obligation to make payments due under his mortgage; or

"'(C) thirty days after the date on which the Federal mortgage agency determines that the mortgagor to whom such certificate was issued has ceased to be a distressed mortgagor as defined in subsection (a)(3).

"'(c)(1) Whenever a Federal mortgage agency issues a certificate of moratorium to any distressed mortgagor with respect to any mortgage, it shall transmit to the mortgagee a copy of such certificate, together with a notice stating that, while such certificate is in effect, such agency will assume the obligation of such mortgagor to make payments due under the mortgage.

"'(2) Payments made by any Federal mortgage agency pursuant to a certificate of moratorium issued under this section with respect to the mortgage of any distressed mortgagor may include, in addition to the payments referred to in paragraph (1), an amount equal to the unpaid payments under such mortgage prior to the issuance of such certificate, plus a reasonable allowance for foreclosure costs actually paid by the mortgagee if a foreclosure action was dismissed as a result of the issuance of a moratorium certificate. Payments by the Federal mortgage agency may also include payments of taxes and insurance premiums on the mortgaged property as deemed necessary when these items are not provided for through payments to a tax and insurance account held by the interested mortgagee.

"'(3) While any certificate of moratorium issued under this section is in effect with respect to the mortgage of any distressed mortgagor, no further payments due under the mortgage shall be required of such mortgagor, and no action (legal or otherwise) shall be taken or maintained by the mortgagee to enforce or collect such payments. Upon the expiration of such certificate, the mortgagor shall again be liable for the payment of all amounts due under the mortgage in accordance with its terms.

''(4) Each Federal mortgage agency shall give prompt notice in writing to the interested mortgagor and mortgagee of the expiration of any certificate of moratorium issued by it under this section.

"'(d) The Federal mortgage agencies are authorized to issue such individual and joint regulations as may be necessary to carry out this section and to insure the uniform administration thereof.

"'(e) There shall be in the Treasury (1) a fund which shall be available to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for the purpose of extending financial assistance in behalf of distressed mortgagors as provided in subsection (c) and for paying administrative expenses incurred in connection with such assistance, and (2) a fund which shall be available to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for the same purpose, except administrative expenses. The capital of each such fund shall consist of such sums as may, from time to time, be appropriated thereto, and any sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended. Receipts arising from the programs of assistance under subsection (c) shall be credited to the fund from which such assistance was extended. Moneys in either of such funds not needed for current operations, as determined by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, or the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, as the case may be, shall be invested in bonds or other obligations of the United States, or paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.'

"Acquisition of certain properties situated at or near military bases which have been ordered to be closed

"Sec. 1013. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to acquire title to, hold, manage, and dispose of, or, in lieu thereof, to reimburse for certain losses upon private sale of, or foreclosure against, any property improved with a one- or two-family dwelling which is situated at or near a military base or installation which the Department of Defense has, subsequent to November 1, 1964, ordered to be closed in whole or in part, if he determines—

"(1) that the owner of such property is, or has been, a Federal employee employed at or in connection with such base or installation (other than a temporary employee serving under a time limitation) or a serviceman assigned thereto;

"(2) that the closing of such base or installation, in whole or in part, has required or will require the termination of such owner's employment or service at or in connection with such base or installation; and

"(3) that as the result of the actual or pending closing of such base or installation, in whole or in part, there is no present market for the sale of such property upon reasonable terms and conditions.

"(b) In order to be eligible for the benefits of this section such employees or military personnel must be or have been—

"(1) assigned to or employed at or in connection with the installation or activity at the time of public announcement of the closure action,

"(2) transferred from such installation or activity, or terminated as employees as a result of reduction-in-force, within six months prior to public announcement of the closure action, or

"(3) transferred from the installation or activity on an overseas tour unaccompained by dependents within fifteen months prior to public announcement of the closure action:

Provided, That, at the time of public announcement of the closure action, or at the time of transfer or termination as set forth above, such personnel or employees must—

"(i) have been the owner-occupant of the dwelling, or

"(ii) have vacated the owned dwelling as a result of being ordered into on-post housing during a six-month period prior to the closure announcement:

Provided further, That as a consequence of such closure such employees or personnel must—

"(i) be required to relocate because of military transfer or acceptance of employment beyond a normal commuting distance from the dwelling for which compensation is sought, or

"(ii) be unemployed, not as a matter of personal choice, and able to demonstrate such financial hardship that they are unable to meet their mortgage payments and related expenses.

"(c) Such persons as the Secretary of Defense may determine to be eligible under the criteria set forth above shall elect either (1) to receive a cash payment as compensation for losses which may be or have been sustained in a private sale, in an amount not to exceed the difference between (A) 95 per centum of the fair market value of their property (as such value is determined by the Secretary of Defense) prior to public announcement of intention to close all or part of the military base or installation and (B) the fair market value of such property (as such value is so determined) at the time of the sale, or (2) to receive, as purchase price for their property, an amount not to exceed 90 per centum of prior fair market value as such value is determined by the Secretary of Defense, or the amount of the outstanding mortgages. Cash payment as compensation for losses sustained in a private sale shall not be made in any case in which the property is encumbered by a mortgage loan guaranteed, insured, or held by a Federal agency unless such mortgage loan is paid, assumed by a purchaser satisfactory to such Federal agency, or otherwise fully satisfied at or prior to the time such cash payment is made. Except in cases of payment as compensation for losses, in the event of foreclosure by mortgagees commenced on or after public announcement of intention to close all or part of the military base or installation and prior to the one hundred and twentieth day after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense may reimburse or pay on account of eligible persons such sums as may be paid or be otherwise due and owing by such persons as the result of such foreclosure, including (without limiting the generality of the foregoing) direct costs of judicial foreclosure, expenses and liabilities enforceable according to the terms of their mortgages or promissory notes, and the amount of debts, if any, established against such persons by a Federal agency in the case of loans made, guaranteed, or insured by such agency following liquidation of the security for such loans.

"(d) There shall be in the Treasury a fund which shall be available to the Secretary of Defense for the purpose of extending the financial assistance provided above. The capital of such fund shall consist of such sums as may, from time to time, be appropriated thereto, and shall consist also of receipts from the management, rental, or sale of properties acquired under this section, which receipts shall be credited to the fund and shall be available, together with funds appropriated therefor, for purchase or reimbursement purposes as provided above, as well as to defray expenses arising in connection with the acquisition, management, and disposal of such properties, including payment of principal, interest, and expenses of mortgages or other indebtedness thereon, and including the cost of staff services and contract services, costs of insurance, and other indemnity. Any part of such receipts not required for such expenses shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. Properties acquired under this section shall be conveyed to, and acquired in the name of, the United States. The Secretary of Defense shall have the power to deal with, rent, renovate, and dispose of, whether by sales for cash or credit or otherwise, any properties so acquired: *Provided, however,* That no contract for acquisition, or acquisition, shall be deemed to constitute a contract for or acquisition of family housing units in support of military installations or activities within the meaning of section 406(a) of the Act of August 30, 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1594i), nor shall it be deemed a transaction within the contemplation of section 2662 of title 10, United States Code.

"(e) Payments from the fund created by this section may be made in lieu of taxes to any State or political subdivision thereof, with respect to real property, including improvements thereon, acquired and held under this section. The amount so paid for any year upon such property shall not exceed the taxes which would be paid to the State or subdivision, as the case may be, upon such property if it were not exempt from taxation, and shall reflect such allowance as may be considered appropriate for expenditures, if any, by the Government for streets, utilities, or other public services to serve such property.

"(f) The title to any property acquired under this section, the eligibility for, and the amounts of, cash payable, and the administration of the preceding provisions of this section, shall conform to such requirements, and shall be administered under such conditions and regulations, as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe. Such regulations shall also prescribe the terms and conditions under which payments may be made and instruments accepted under this section, and all the determinations and decisions made pursuant to such regulations by the Secretary of Defense regarding such payments and conveyances and the terms and conditions under which they are approved or disapproved, shall be final and conclusive and shall not be subject to judicial review.

"(g) The Secretary of Defense is authorized to enter into such agreement with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development as may be appropriate for the purposes of economy and efficiency of administration of this section. Such agreement may provide authority to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and his designee to make any or all of the determinations and take any or all of the actions which the Secretary of Defense is authorized to undertake pursuant to the preceding provisions of this section. Any such determinations shall be entitled to finality to the same extent as if made by the Secretary of Defense, and, in event the Secretaries of Defense and Housing and Urban Development so elect, the fund established pursuant to subsection (d) of this section shall be available to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to carry out the purposes thereof.

"(h) Section 223(a)(8) of the National Housing Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(8) executed in connection with the sale by the Government of any housing acquired pursuant to section 1013 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966.'

"(i) No funds may be appropriated for the acquisition of any property under authority of this section unless such funds have been specifically authorized for such purpose in a military construction authorization act, and no moneys in the fund created pursuant to subsection (d) of this section may be expended for any purpose except as may be provided in appropriation Acts.

"(j) Section 108 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 is repealed.

"College housing

"Sec. 1014. (a) Section 404(b)(4) of the Housing Act of 1950 is amended by striking out 'public' immediately before 'educational institution'.

"(b) Section 401(d) of such Act is amended by inserting before the period at at end thereof the following: 'and, notwithstanding the first proviso of this subsection, the amount of this annual increase which is not utilized for loans for hospitals may be utilized for loans for other educational facilities, as defined herein'.

"Study concerning relief of homeowners in proximity to airports

"Sec. 1015. Section 1113 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 is amended—

"(1) by inserting '(a)' after 'Sec. 1113.';

"(2) by striking out 'one year after the date of the enactment of this Act' and inserting in lieu thereof 'six months after the date of the enactment of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966'; and

"(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(b) There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $100,000 to carry out subsection (a).'

"Quarters and facilities for Federal home loan banks and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board

"Sec. 1016. (a) The second sentence of section 12 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1432) is amended by striking out 'but no bank building shall be bought or erected to house any such bank, nor shall any such bank make any lease' and inserting in lieu thereof 'but, except with the prior approval of the board, no bank building shall be bought or erected to house any such bank, or leased by such bank under any lease'.

"(b) Section 18 of such Act (12 U.S.C. 1438) is amended—

"(1) by adding at the end of subsection (b) the following new sentence: 'Such assessments may include such amounts as the board may deem advisable for carrying out the provisions of subsection (c) of this section.'; and

"(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(c)(1) The board, utilizing the services of the Administrator of General Services (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator"), and subject to any limitation hereon which may hereafter be imposed in appropriation Acts, is hereby authorized—

" '(A) to acquire, in the name of the United States, real property in the District of Columbia, for the purposes set forth in this subsection;

" '(B) to construct, develop, furnish, and equip such buildings thereon and such facilities as in its judgment may be appropriate to provide, to such extent as the board may deem advisable, suitable and adequate quarters and facilities for the board and the agencies under its administration or supervision;

" '(C) to enlarge, remodel, or reconstruct any of the same; and

" '(D) to make or enter into contracts for any of the foregoing.

" '(2) The board may require of the respective banks, and they shall make to the board, such advances of funds for the purposes set out in paragraph (1) as in the sole judgment of the board may from time to time be advisable. Such advances shall be in addition to the assessments authorized in subsection (b) and shall be apportioned by the board among the banks in proportion to the total assets of the respective banks, determined in such manner and as of such times as the board may prescribe. Each such advance shall bear interest at the rate of 4½ per centum per annum from the date of the advance and shall be repaid by the board in such installments and over such period, not longer than twenty-five years from the making of the advance, as the board may determine. Payments of interest and principal upon such advances shall be made from receipts of the board or from other sources which may from time to time be available to the board. The obligation of the board to make any such payment shall not be regarded as an obligation of the United States. To such extent as the board may prescribe any such obligation shall be regarded as a legal investment for the purposes of subsections (g) and (h) of section 11 and for the purposes of section 16.

" '(3) The plans and designs for such buildings and facilities and for any such enlargement, remodeling, or reconstruction shall, to such extent as the chairman of the board may request, be subject to his approval.

" '(4) Upon the making of arrangements mutually agreeable to the board and the Administrator, which arrangements may be modified from time to time by mutual agreement between them and may include but shall not be limited to the making of payments by the board and such agencies to the Administrator and by the Administrator to the board, the custody, management, and control of such buildings and facilities and of such real property shall be vested in the Administrator in accordance therewith. Until the making of such arrangements such custody, management, and control, including the assignment and allotment and the reassignment and reallotment of building and other space, shall be vested in the board.

" '(5) Any proceeds (including advances) received by the board in connection with this subsection, and any proceeds from the sale or other disposition of real or other property acquired by the board under this subsection, shall be considered as receipts of the board, and obligations and expenditures of the board and such agencies in connection with this subsection shall not be considered as administrative expenses. As used in this subsection, the term 'property' shall include interests in property.

" '(6) With respect to its functions under this subsection the board shall (A) annually prepare and submit a budget program as provided in title I of the Government Corporation Control Act with regard to wholly owned Government corporations, and for purposes of this sentence, the terms "wholly owned Government corporations" and "Government corporations", wherever used in such title, shall include the board, and (B) maintain an integral set of accounts which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions as provided in such title, and no other audit, settlement, or adjustment shall be required with respect to transactions under this subsection or with respect to claims, demands, or accounts by or against any person arising thereunder. The first budget program shall be for the first full fiscal year beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this subsection, and the first audit shall be for the remainder of the fiscal year in which this subsection is enacted. Except as otherwise provided in this subsection or by the board, the provisions of this subsection and the functions thereby or thereunder subsisting shall be applicable and exercisable notwithstanding and without regard to the Act of June 20, 1938 (D.C. Code, secs. 5-413—5-428), except that the proviso of section 16 thereof shall apply to any building constructed under this subsection, and section 306 of the Act of July 30, 1947 (61 Stat. 584), or any other provision of law relating to the construction, alteration, repair, or furnishing of public or other buildings or structures or the obtaining of sites therefor, but any person or body in whom any such function is vested may provide for delegation or redelegation of the exercise of such function.

" '(7) No obligation shall be incurred and no expenditure, except in liquidation of obligation, shall be made pursuant to the first two subparagraphs of paragraph (1) of this subsection if the total amount of all obligations incurred pursuant thereto would thereupon exceed $13,200,000, or such greater amount as may be provided in an appropriation Act or other law.'

"Small Business Act

"Sec. 1017. Paragraph (1) of section 8(b) of the Small Business Act is amended by inserting '(A)' after '(1)', by inserting 'and' after 'Administration;', and by adding at the end thereof a new subparagraph as follows:

" '(B) to allow an individual or group of persons cooperating with it in furtherance of the purposes of subparagraph (A) to make such use of its office facilities and related materials and services as it deems appropriate;'.

"Use of certain lands for civil defense purposes

"Sec. 1018. Section 2 of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide for the conveyance of a tract of land in Prince Georges County, Maryland, to the State of Maryland for use as a site for a National Guard Armory and for training the National Guard or for other military purposes', approved August 10, 1949 (63 Stat. 592), is amended by striking out 'The land' and inserting in lieu thereof '(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, the land' and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

" '(b) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall execute the necessary instrument or instruments to provide that a certain portion of land, not to exceed two acres, on the easterly side of the land described in the first section of this Act, as more particularly determined and designated by the Secretary of the Army, may be used for civil defense or other emergency preparedness purposes or the purposes stated in subsection (a) and that such use shall not cause the reverter clause set forth herein to become operable.'

"Mortgage insurance for land development—Clarifying amendments

"Sec. 1019. Section 1001(d) of the National Housing Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'sewerage disposal installations,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'sewage disposal installations, steam, gas, and electric lines and installations,';

"(2) by striking out the semicolon after 'or common use', and inserting in lieu thereof a period and the following new sentence: 'Related uses may include industrial uses, with sites for such uses to be in proper proportion to the size and scope of the development.';

"(3) by striking out 'but such term' and inserting in lieu thereof: 'The term improvements'; and

"(4) by inserting after 'sewage disposal installation,' in clause (1) the following: 'or a steam, gas, or electric line or installation,'.

"Miscellaneous and technical amendments

"Sec. 1020. (a) Section 106(d) of the Housing Act of 1949 is repealed.

"(b) Section 227(a) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "subsection (b)(2)' in clause (vi) and inserting in lieu thereof 'subsection (b)'.

"(c) The last sentence of section 305(e) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out 'supplementing' and inserting in lieu thereof 'supplementary'.

"(d) Section 308 of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out '(a)'.

"(e) Section 512 of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out 'or IX' and inserting in lieu thereof 'IX, X, or XI'.

"(f) Section 1001(c) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out " ' "mortgage" ' " and inserting in lieu thereof " ' "mortgagee" ' ".

"(g) Section 1 of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out 'and X' wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof 'X, and XI'.

"(h) Section 102(h) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by striking out 'section 213 of the National Housing Act, as amended, the Commissioner' and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 213 of the National Housing Act, section 221(d)(3) of the National Housing Act, and section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (insofar as the provisions of such sections relate to cooperative housing), the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development', and by striking out 'such section' each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof 'such sections'."

And the House agreed to the same.

Wright Patman,
Abraham J. Multer,
Wm. A. Barrett,
Mrs. Leonor Sullivan,
Henry S. Reuss,
Lud Ashley,
William B. Widnall,
Managers on the Part of the House.

John Sparkman,
Paul Douglas,
Wm. Proxmire,
Harrison A. Williams,
Edmund S. Muskie,
Edward V. Long,
Thomas J. McIntyre,
John G. Tower,
Wallace F. Bennett,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Statement

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3708) to assist comprehensive city demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and services necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in those areas, to assist and encourage planned metropolitan development, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute amendment. The committee of conference has agreed to a substitute for both the House amendment and the Senate bill. Except for technical, clarifying, and conforming changes, the following statement explains the differences between the House amendment and the substitute agreed to in conference.

TITLE I—COMPREHENSIVE CITY DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS

Priority of use of demonstration grant funds

The House amendment provided that grants under the demonstration cities program would be used either for federally assisted projects or for other projects undertaken as part of such a program. The Senate bill provided that such grants shall be used to assist new projects not federally assisted and only if not necessary for such projects may they be used for federally assisted projects. The conference report contains the Senate language.

TITLE II—PLANNED METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT

Metropolitan expediter

The Senate bill contained a provision not included in the House amendment authorizing the appointment of a Metropolitan Expediter upon request of local officials and after consultation with local officials. The conference report contains the Senate language with a modification requiring that the central city in any metropolitan area must request the appointment of such an official. The conferees wish to emphasize that this expediter is intended to be the servant of the cities in the metropolitan area, and his functions are limited to providing information, data and assistance to local authorities and private individuals and entities in the area.

TITLE III—FHA INSURANCE OPERATIONS

Cooperative housing

The House amendment contained provisions increasing each of the per family unit limitations under FHA section 213, cooperative housing program by $2,500 and authorizing additional exterior land improvement to be financed under that program. The Senate bill contained neither provision and none is contained in the conference report.

Eligibility for occupancy for section 221 (d)(3) below-market interest rate housing

The House amendment contained a provision prohibiting occupancy of section 221(d)(3) below-market interest rate housing by families with an annual income of $10,000 or more. The Senate bill contained no such provision and none is contained in the conference report. The conferees, however, wish to emphasize that they expect the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to limit this program to families of greatest need. The conferees recognize, of course, that higher ceilings are necessary in high cost areas and for large families.

Armed services housing mortgage insurance program

The House amendment contained a provision which would have reactivated the Capehart FHA insurance program for the armed services. There was no such provision in the Senate bill and none is contained in the conference report.

FHA section 810 program

The House amendment contained a provision increasing from 5,000 to 10,000 the maximum number of units which may be covered by mortgages insured under FHA's program for off-base rental housing for the military. The House amendment would also have permitted additional types of mortgagors under this program. There were no comparable provisions in the Senate bill and none are contained in the conference report.

TITLE IV—LAND DEVELOPMENT AND NEW COMMUNITIES

The House amendment contained a provision not included in the Senate bill increasing the maximum mortgage from $10 million to $25 million which FHA can insure for land development and authorizing this assistance for entire new communities. The conference report contains the House provisions with three amendments which would terminate this authority on October 1, 1972; would require approval of any new community by the local governing body and by the governor of the State (except in "home rule" cases); and would limit the total amount of insurance which can be outstanding under this provision at any one time to $250 million.

TITLE V—MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR GROUP MEDICAL PRACTICE FACILITIES

The House amendment contained a provision authorizing FHA mortgage insurance for group practice medical facilities. The conference report retains this provision, with an amendment providing that, while both profit-making and non-profit groups may participate in the program, the actual mortgagor under the new program must be a private non-profit corporation.

TITLE VI—PRESERVATION OF HISTORIC STRUCTURES

Loans for acquisition and rehabilitation of historic structures

The House amendment contained a provision authorizing the use of below-market interest rate loans under section 312 of the Housing Act of 1964 for historic preservation purposes. There was no such provision in the Senate bill and none is contained in the conference report.

TITLE VII—URBAN RENEWAL

Local grants-in-aid

The House amendment contained a provision authorizing the Secretary to count as local credit for urban renewal purposes 25 percent of the cost of public facilities for cultural, exhibition, civic or municipal purposes subject to certain other requirements. The conference report retains this provision with two amendments. First, the word "municipal" is stricken and the phrase "city hall or public safety building" is inserted, and second, certain medical facilities and mental health facilities could be included. Such credit would be limited to 25 percent of the cost of such facility or $3.5 million, whichever is less. The conferees wish to emphasize that this provision is not intended as a "blank check" for the inclusion of such projects for urban renewal credit purposes and the provision includes the requirement that any such local project must "contribute materially to the objectives of the urban renewal plan or plans for such project or projects." The conferees further expect the Department of HUD to report back to the Congress by January of 1967 on the potential cost of section 701 of this Act, together with recommendations for changes in existing law affecting local grants-in-aid.

Application of prevailing wage requirements to multifamily housing in urban renewal areas

The House amendment contained a provision which would have applied the "Davis-Bacon Act" prevailing wage requirement to conventionally financed multifamily housing built in urban renewal areas. There was no such provision in the Senate bill and none is contained in the conference report.

Grant-in-aid credit under section 112 of the Housing Act of 1941

The House amendment contained a provision defining the term "in the vicinity" as used in connection with local credits under urban renewal for certain expenditures by universities and hospitals to mean one mile and further giving the Secretary discretion to recognize expenditures beyond the one mile limit where he felt the facts justified it. The conference report contains the one mile provision but does not contain the discretionary authority beyond one mile.

Sewer systems in urban renewal areas

The House amendment contained a provision which would have required urban renewal areas to be served by storm sewer systems separate from sanitary sewer systems. There was no such provision in the Senate bill. The conference report contains a provision requiring that to the maximum extent feasible urban renewal areas must be served by effective systems for the treatment of storm and sanitary wastes.

TITLE IX—URBAN INFORMATION AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SERVICES

The Senate bill contained a provision authorizing matching grants (limited to appropriations of $5 million for fiscal year 1967 and $10 million for fiscal 1968) to states and metropolitan area agencies for the establishment of urban information and technical assistance centers. The conference report contains a provision authorizing matching grants through the states for technical assistance for communities up to 100,000 population, and authorizes the appropriation of $2.5 million in fiscal 1967 and $5 million for fiscal 1968 for this purpose.

TITLE X—MISCELLANEOUS

Low-rent housing in private accommodations

The House amendment contained a provision extending the maximum term of lease from 36 months to 60 months for private accommodations to be used as public housing but restricted the longer term to housing needed for displaced families. The conference report retained the increase in the maximum term to 60 months but does not restrict it to housing for displaced families.

Open-space grants for development of existing open-space land

The House amendment had a provision authorizing grants under the open space program for the development of land already owned by a municipality. There was no such provision in the Senate bill and none is contained in the conference report.

Acquisition of property in areas affected by the closing of military bases

The House amendment had a provision authorizing the Secretary of Defense to acquire the homes of property owners in areas affected by the closing of military bases or to make certain payments where the property had already been sold by the owner or the owner had lost it through foreclosure. The conference report contains the House amendment with perfecting modifications.

Leasing of housing for bachelor military personnel

The House amendment contained a provision authorizing the Secretary of Defense to lease for periods of up to 15 years appropriate housing for use as bachelor officer quarters. There was no comparable provision in the Senate bill and none is contained in the conference report.

Hydrology research

The House amendment contained a provision authorizing HUD to conduct studies and research concerning urban hydrology. There was no comparable provision in the Senate bill and none is contained in the conference report.

Studies of State laws affecting cities

The House amendment contained a provision authorizing the limited use of urban planning grant funds for studies of State laws affecting municipalities. This is retained in the conference report but the conferees wish to make clear that it is not intended that these funds be used in any way for lobbying State legislatures.

Certain items not included in the conference report

The Senate conferees strongly urged the adoption of five provisions approved by the Senate. These were: FHA mortgage insurance for seasonal homes, fellowships for graduate training in historic preservation, clarification of existing authority for the leasing of privately built housing for use as public housing, authority for FNMA to purchase mortgages insured or guaranteed prior to August 2, 1954, and a provision to conform to nomenclature used in various housing laws to reflect the creation of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. While the House conferees were impressed with the merits of these provisions, it was felt that they could not be accepted at this time, but there was agreement that the House Committee on Banking and Currency would take prompt action on them early next year.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
WM. A. BARRETT,
Mrs. LEONOR SULLIVAN,
HENRY S. REUSS,
LUD ASHLEY,
WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on the demonstration cities bill which is now before the House is virtually identical to the bill which passed the House just last Friday by a vote of 178 to 141. As always, the conferees on both sides presented their views with vigor, but always with fairness and a willingness to seek reasonable solutions. In the 2 days of conference, we had over 50 items to debate, but, as the statement of managers attached to the conference report shows, the changes accepted by the House conferees were relatively few in number, only about 15, and most of them are relatively minor.

Title I of the conference report would inaugurate the President's demonstration cities program. This new program would concentrate the whole array of Government aids for physical and social rehabilitation in the most blighted areas of our towns and cities. The only change in this vital program made in conference was a minor modification of the language governing priorities in the use of the Federal supplemental grant funds.

Title II of the conference report—"Planned Metropolitan Development"—includes a Senate provision on which the conferees in the other body were adamant. They simply would not yield on their provision to authorize the appointment of metropolitan expediters to help cities make the best use of available Federal aids; however, the Senate agreed to a very important modification in its provision so that under the terms of the conference report the central city—that is the municipality with the largest population in the area, would have to request the appointment of an expediter. This, together with the language requiring the Secretary to consult with local officials before making any appointment, should still the fears expressed by a few mayors of large cities.

Moreover, the statement of managers makes it clear that the expediter is, in the words of that statement, "the servant of the city" and is intended only to be helpful to local authorities.

Title III of the conference report which makes a number of amendments to Federal Housing Administration programs was modified. The Senate conferees raised strong objection to the reactivation of the Capehart program and to the additional units authorized for the FHA Section 810 program for off-base housing. These provisions are not included in the conference report. In addition, the House version contained a floor amendment setting a ceiling of $10,000 on the income of families who can occupy housing financed with FHA below-market interest rate mortgages. While few, if any, families would actually be affected by this limitation, the Department strenuously objected to the rigid ceiling and pointed out the special problems of large families in high-cost areas. However, in removing this section, we included language in the statement of managers cautioning the Secretary to approve higher limits only after careful scrutiny and only where exceptional factors justified such action.

I am pleased to report to the House that our conferees were successful in defending title IV of the House bill which authorized FHA mortgage insurance for development of new communities. However, in view of the strong feelings of the Senate conferees, we did accept a limitation of $250 million on the outstanding amount of such insured loans, together with a termination date for this program of 1972. We also accepted an amendment requiring that any such new community must be approved by the local governing body and, in most cases, by the Governor of the State, as well.

Title VI of the conference report is designed to encourage the preservation of historic structures. The House version included the authorization of funds of several types, including the use of urban renewal grants, urban planning grants, open-space grants, and certain special appropriations. The House version would also have authorized the use of low-interest rehabilitation loans, but in view of the strong objection by the Senate conferees, and by the Department, the loan provision was eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious controversies in this legislation has involved the subject of local grant-in-aid credit under the urban renewal program. As the bill passed the House, there were no provisions for specific projects, but section 701 liberalized existing law so that communities under certain conditions could get credit for one-fourth of the cost of certain local projects. These eligible projects were defined as those for cultural, exhibition, civic, or municipal purposes. The other body had earlier approved a very similar provision, but without the word "municipal." The inclusion of "municipal" greatly disturbed the Department because it was so broad and vague. Accordingly, in conference, we struck out the word "municipal" and in its place substituted "city hall or public safety building."

The formula was also modified to enable communities to receive credit for certain kinds of medical and mental health facilities. As a further precaution, the conference report sets a ceiling of $3.5 million on the credits which may be derived from any of these facilities. I would also like to call the attention of the House to the section of the statement of managers, which says:

> The Conferees wish to emphasize that this provision is not intended as a blank check for the inclusion of such projects for urban renewal credit purposes and the provision includes the requirement that any such local project must "contribute materially to the objectives of the urban plan or plans for such project or projects."

The statement of managers further directs the Secretary to report back to us next January with an estimate of potential cost involved and with his recommendations for any changes he feels are needed in existing law.

Mr. Speaker, the final change made in conference that I want to discuss is a provision included in the Senate version, but not in the House bill, which would have authorized a new program of matching grants for urban information centers and for technical assistance through State government for smaller communities. The Senate conferees fought strongly for this provision and we finally accepted half of it, that part which would provide information on Federal programs and similar assistance through State government to communities of less than 100,000 population. The funds which would have been provided in the Senate bill were reduced by one-half to a maximum of $2.5 million in the current fiscal year and $5 million in the next fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other changes of a minor nature listed in the statement of the managers and we feel that all of them were justified under the circumstances. I want to note that it was particularly gratifying that no changes whatsoever were made in the provisions of the rural housing title which will do much to help farm families and people in small towns.

The conference report is vitally needed to improve our cities to dispel the sense of hopelessness which poverty and slums breed, and to help bolster the sagging homebuilding industry. I believe it deserves the support of every Member of the House and I hope it will be adopted by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. WIDNALL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I do think I should review a bit of the circumstances of the conference for the RECORD. I would like to emphasize, also, to the House that the provisions that are now coming before the House are not "virtually identical" with what passed the House originally. There are a number of major changes that have been made in conference. It is with regret that I must report there was no notice of this conference given to the Members or at least not to the minority Members. Prior to the conference a call was made to each Member asking if he was in town, but no indication was given as to the purpose of the call.

If, they were not in town no one was informed as to the change to the effect that the conference was taking place.

Mr. Speaker, it was only later in the day that I found out a conference was actually taking place, deciding upon what should be done with respect to conflicts between the Senate proposal and the House proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I tried to keep in touch, by telephone and, frankly, I felt some things had been adjusted in a satisfactory way and were all right and should be approved by the House of Representatives.

However, Mr. Speaker, I found, after agreeing to sign the report, a number of other changes had been made which in my opinion are very substantial and about which I had not known at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out a couple of these changes which in my opinion are extremely important and which have to do with housing for the armed services.

Mr. Speaker, in the House bill we had reinstated the Capehart housing program. This was stricken.

Also, we had section 810 which contained a provision increasing from 5,000 to 10,000 the maximum number of units which might be covered by mortgages insured through the FHA program, for off-base military housing for the military.

Mr. Speaker, these housing units should have a priority actually in housing these days in the United States, because we are doing a very poor job in taking care of the housing units of our people in the military—and I am not talking about officers of the military now; I am talking about all the way through, and particularly the low-income military personnel.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand why these changes were made, and the House version not agreed to.

Mr. Speaker, other Members on this side of the aisle will want to make remarks about other changes in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the urban renewal section with respect to projects primarily for residential areas, should have the emphasis upon a substantial number of low-income and middle-income housing, and that has been retained by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we are legislating in a very important area where, particularly, we should have agreement and full understanding as to what we are doing.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that some real progress has been made in certain sections of this bill. I, myself, am going to vote for the conference report. I regret that I was not present at the time some of the adjustments were made. That was because I had had no notice with reference to the conference, and also had an understanding that it would be held on Tuesday or Wednesday and not on Monday.

Mr. Speaker, for the RECORD, I want to say this:

I shall never in the future concur with respect to any such conference, if proper notice has not been given to every Member who is to participate in that conference, with a reasonable length of time for notice involved.

In this case, Mr. Speaker, we had an understanding that there would not be a conference on a certain date. It took place on that date.

Mr. Speaker, with those few comments, I am going to close and I suppose it sounds as if I am a little bit mixed up, but I believe there is enough good in the bill for me to support the conference report.

However, Mr. Speaker, I did want to call these changes to the attention of the House of Representatives.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER].

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of great regret to me that the demonstration cities and metropolitan development bill, after lengthy consideration in the House and Senate and in the conference committee, is still not worthy of support. As a conferee, I felt obliged to omit my name from the conference report and I cannot, in good conscience, vote for the compromise bill.

I consider it regrettable because I have strongly supported almost every major housing bill during my 10 years in the House, and because the present bill could have been—and should have been—good legislation. Cities need help in restoring rundown areas, in providing new hope and opportunity for people living in slums, and in improving the quality of life and environment in our major centers of population.

But this bill is so compromised by the addition to it of billions of dollars of special urban renewal credits that the demonstration cities program, which will depend heavily on urban renewal, will be severely handicapped. Inasmuch as the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development has confirmed my estimate, I can only attribute the administration's public silence on this issue to its willingness to pay almost any price to obtain the legislation it wants.

I refer of course to title VII of the bill. As our colleagues will recall, the Banking and Currency Committee, at my repeated urging, deleted a section from title VII which would have authorized local noncash urban renewal credits for 52 special projects at a cost estimated at $750 million. But the committee and the House retained the even more objectionable section 701, which provides credits for 25 percent of the cost of cultural, exhibition, civic and municipal facilities for all of the more than 800 communities with active urban renewal projects. And the House accepted an amendment authorizing local credits for university and hospital projects located as far as 1 mile away from urban renewal projects.

In my remarks during debate on the bill, I estimated that the cost of section 701 alone would exceed $2 billion, and exceed it probably by a substantial margin. It would also, of course, have the same kind of adverse effect on the urban renewal and demonstration cities programs as the 52 special projects we eliminated earlier, and on a much more comprehensive scale.

I emphasize again, Mr. Speaker, that my fear and concern in these respects were also shared by the Housing Secretary.

Although I pursued my fight against these unjustified credits—or subsidies, to give them their correct designation—we were limited under the rules during the conference to consideration of credits for "municipal" facilities and for university and hospital projects within 1 mile of urban renewal areas.

I am glad to report, Mr. Speaker, that the conference did agree to put some limits on the municipal facilities eligible for local credits, but it did not go nearly far enough. While we struck out the word "municipal," the conference inserted in its place "city hall or public safety building" and added certain medical, research and mental health facilities to those eligible for credits. The conference also added to the existing 25-percent credit limitation a dollar figure of $3,500,000, and it approved the 1-mile liberalization for university and hospital facilities eligible for full credit.

It is impossible, Mr. Speaker, to say precisely how much the conference saved in dollar amounts by the action we took on urban renewal credits. We saved something, but not nearly enough. Using my estimate of $2 billion as the cost of section 701 as approved by the House—a conservative estimate—and relying on Secretary Weaver's judgment that municipal facilities would account for approximately half the cost of section 701 credits, I would speculate that conference limitations on eligible municipal projects will reduce the cost by one-half—or a net saving, very approximately, of another $500 million.

As useful as this may be, however, it serves to point up the extremely costly character of what Congress is doing to the urban renewal program in this bill. What Congress left in the bill will still cost billions, it will still distort urban renewal, limit its usefulness as a slum-clearance and residential construction program, and deprive many communities of legitimate urban renewal assistance, and it will still hurt the demonstration cities program. In effect, we are asking urban renewal to subsidize city jails, city halls, firehouses, police stations, hospitals, cultural centers, exhibition halls, university buildings, and other facilities, at the expense of low- and moderate-income families who need decent housing if we are to have decent cities. These may be all good and desirable facilities, but by definition none of them are integral parts of urban renewal and many will not even be in or near the urban renewal area. Urban renewal is being made a convenient source of financing and being transformed into a giant "pork barrel."

Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, the conferees accepted my proposal to include cautionary language in the report, emphasizing that section 701 is not intended to be a "blank check" for urban renewal credits, and requiring the Department of Housing and Urban Development to report to Congress next January on the potential cost of section 701, including recommendations for changes in the law as it affects local grants-in-aid. This will give us another chance to look carefully at what we are doing, though it is an opportunity we should have utilized more thoroughly before we passed this bill.

In voting against the conference report, as I shall, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that my vote will not be against housing or urban renewal or the effort to rehabilitate slum areas. It will be a vote protesting the misuse of these and other potentially valuable programs to serve other and unrelated purposes.

If Congress wants the Federal Government and the Federal taxpayer to subsidize the building of jailhouses or concert halls, then we should enact a program for such purposes. But we should not use a program designed for much more urgent needs. I am afraid Congress action will come back to haunt us.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK].

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, it is a beautiful fall day outside. It is too beautiful a day to be hornswoggled and hoodwinked into accepting legislation which is totally changed in concept from the bill that this House passed.

The chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee says there is virtually no change in this bill. He is wrong. There are people on both sides of the aisle who have expressed great concern over the decline and fall of the House of Representatives—and, gentlemen, you are participating in that very decline and fall today when you accept the statement that "there are virtually no changes in this bill." You are participating in it when you allow a conference to be held without the minority being given notice of the conference.

More importantly, you are participating in it when you pass a bill in this body and come right back a few days later and vote for a conference report which changes the whole concept of that bill without study, without really any thought at all.

You were sold on the demonstration cities bill on the premise that existing Federal aid programs were not effective because there was no coordination of the approximately 120 Federal aid programs that now exist. You were told we need more coordination. You were told the cities could not afford their local share—therefore we should pay their local share for them. That was the way this program was sold to you. That is the way the House passed it.

But what happened? The bill went to conference, and the Senate made what is referred to as a "minor" change. All they did was add the word "not." Gentlemen, "not" is a very significant word. The House bill provided for assistance to demonstration cities with Washington paying the local share of federally assisted programs such as urban renewal, housing, and that sort of thing.

What happened after we sent this bill to conference? The Senate said—and the conferees agreed—that the money must go to nonfederally assisted programs.

What does this mean, when they say: "The Secretary shall give the money to nonfederally assisted programs?"

What is a nonfederally assisted program? I do not know. Parking meters—insignia for policemen's caps? You name it. There is no limit whatsoever other than administrative expenses in this bill.

Do you know something? I did not think our House conferees even knew the change was made. If they knew it, I do not think they knew the significance of it. This destroys the whole intent and purpose of the demonstration title that was passed by the House last Friday. It opens a Pandora's box of Federal programs that have no limit whatsoever in their application.

It takes the Secretary out of the field of coordinating existing programs and tells him that he shall give the money to any project that a city requests money for as long as it is not now federally assisted.

You know, there are a lot of things that are not federally assisted. But our conferees bought this, and now they come in and the chairman of the committee says there is "virtually no change." Well, it just is not true.

The whole concept of this bill has changed—the whole approach is changed. I think it would be a shameful travesty if we were to abdicate our responsibility and vote for a conference report of this type, simply because we are in the closing 2 or 3 days of this session. We do not have any right to abdicate our responsibility to our constitutents and vote for a bill like this.

Who sent you here—the President, or the people? Do they pay you to think, or to be told? I am ashamed of the answer.

This conference report should be soundly defeated. I urge you to return to responsibility, to stand and be counted against such a bill.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROCK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MACGREGOR. I have listened to this discussion. I have heard the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency state that the conference report was unanimous.

Then I heard the ranking Republican, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] state that he was not even advised that the date of the conference had been changed.

Then the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] tells us she did not sign the conference report. Obviously the conferees were not in agreement on the final draft of this demonstration cities bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked when I read this conference report to learn that the maximum income limit of $10,000 that had been inserted by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] as the maximum income limit for occupancy under the 221(d)(3) programs has been removed by this conference committee.

What this means, so that you understand it clearly, and so that you can go back to your constituents and tell them, is that you can live in cities like Anaheim, Calif.; San Francisco, Calif.; Norwalk, Conn.; Rockford, Ill.; Omaha, Nebr.; Las Vegas, Nev.; New York City or in Hawaii or in Alaska—and you can earn between $10,000 and $15,000 per year and yet have your income subsidized under the 221(d)(3) program of our country.

This is a shocking thing, Mr. Speaker, and it is even more shocking to think that even a moderate and modest limitation of $10,000 such as the gentleman from Illinois inserted should be removed by this conference committee. It is even more astounding when you consider that the median income in America is only $6,800 per year. Why then should we subsidize the rent of any earning more than $10,000?

I say to you right here and now, if you vote for this conference report—and I intend to vote against it—but if you vote for it then you are voting to subsidize persons who earn between $10,000 and $15,000 per year in the cities that I named—and that is just naming a few cities.

If you do not believe me, I have here in my hand the FHA maximum income limitation for occupancy in section 221 (d)(3) programs. Examine this FHA list yourself and I assure you that you will be suprised to say the least.

Look at your hometown wherever it may be in America and learn the upper limits for occupancy under the 221(d)(3) program. What this means, Mr. Speaker, is that persons earning over $10,000 per year, but fortunate enough to live in one of these housing developments, will have their rent subsidized in excess of $30 per month.

I say that this a shocking thing indeed, Mr. Speaker. I think we should vote against it.

This program originally started in 1961. It started in order to replace low-income public housing programs. But not only has it not replaced them but it has grown like a monster—all out of proportion—and it has grown to the point where this conference committee was unwilling to accept the very modest limitation of $10,000 per year. This will come as a surprise to the many Americans earning less than that figure.

I think this is indeed wrongful and I would urge the House to vote against this conference report for this reason if for no other reason.

I would point out one other substantial change that has been made and that is in title V, which is entitled "Group Practice Facilities." Mr. Speaker, the President, in his state of the Union message, urged that the Congress encourage the group practice of medicine. This title authorizes insured loans to nonprofit corporations covering buildings, real estate, and equipment to be used in group practice of medicine. In committee, I offered an amendment which was approved and included in the bill when it passed the House, that not only made these mortgages available to nonprofit corporations, but to private physicians as well. In these days of tight money, high interest rates, and difficulty in securing mortgages, it is conceivable that some doctors or dentists would want such a loan. This conference report penalizes the private practitioner who wants to join with a colleague and conduct a group practice. It give a bonus to the labor union or other nonprofit corporation that hires doctors and sponsors a prepayment plan practice of medicine. It is another slap at our doctors and those who want to continue as self-employed. It fails to accomplish what the President urged in his message to Congress. It is another reason, Mr. Speaker, why we should oppose this conference report.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD].

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Minnesota, I have been listening to this debate and I am distressed also. For emphasis let me point out that first the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas, took the floor and indicated that the conference report was unanimous. Then the ranking minority member took the floor and indicated he had not even been notified of when the conference took place, and that he was not present. Then the gentlewoman from New Jersey took the floor and indicated that she refused to sign the conference report. Next I find that the third minority conferee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO], was also not notified and was not present.

How the gentleman from Texas can take the floor and tell the Members of this House that this conference was unanimous is absolutely beyond me.

It seems to me that as we go into the closing days of this session, as in other sessions, each Member has to be alert to see that we in the House do not do anything that is irresponsible, that we do not trim a little bit on our procedures. I think clearly this performance by the committee is trimming on procedures. The procedures of this House are to assure that the people of this country are protected and that the minority is protected. Clearly in this instance the things we are being told by the chairman of the committee give me great pause and concern.

I was also surprised to hear the chairman of the committee say that this conference report reflects what he believes to be the views of this House. Certainly it does not reflect this Member's views.

Members will recall that when the bill was before the House the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK] offered an amendment to place a $7,500 ceiling limitation on earnings to qualify under the rent subsidy program. That amendment was defeated.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON], then offered an amendment to put a $10,000 annual earnings ceiling to qualify for section 221(d)(3) housing. That amendment carried in the House of Representatives.

In the conference, the conferees, absent two minority Members, because they were not notified, then yielded to the Senate. Now, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY] so properly pointed out, anyone who supports this conference report is voting for subsidized housing for individuals who are earning between $10,000 and $15,000 per year.

According to the maximum income limits for occupancy put out by the Department of HUD for the District of Columbia, it shows on page 3 as high as $10,600 for families with seven or more persons.

Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely beyond belief that the administration has insisted upon removing the House-passed $10,000 family income ceiling for the billion plus dollar Federal rent subsidy program enacted in 1961. But there it is on page 45 of the Conference Report No. 2301.

We hear a lot these days about the "credibility gap." Well, this appears to be an example of what is meant.

In 1961, Members of this House were told that the subsidized interest rate rent subsidy program would be for the benefit of low- and low-middle-income families Today we are confronted with the ridiculous situation of being asked to approve a conference report that permits families earning $11,000, $12,000, $13,000, and even $14,000 per year to have their rents subsidized.

This is exactly what was suggested earlier this year on the new rent subsidy program when many warned that the administration intended to subsidize the incomes of upper middle-income families. Many, in fact a majority, did not believe it.

But, make no mistake about it, if we approve this conference report, we are putting the stamp of approval of the 89th Congress on a multibillion-dollar rent subsidy scheme to subsidize the rents of upper middle-income families. At a time in our history when private mortgage money is practically unavailable, when interest rates are the highest they have been in 45 years, when people earning $5,000 and $6,000 can't borrow money to build their own homes, the 89th Congress—the so-called great Congress—must not blindly approve rent subsidies for families earning more than $10,000 per year. The median annual family income in the United States today is only $6,800.

Mr. Speaker, if we approve this conference report, this will indeed be a sad day for the 89th Congress.

I urge that it be rejected.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER].

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, today we are once again faced with a basic question as to whether this Congress is going to do something to solve the almost overwhelming problems of people who live in cities, or whether we are going to find some excuse for doing nothing.

I served on the committee that fashioned this legislation in the House. I participated in the debate on the authorization. I was not a member of the conference committee, but once again, today, I hear from the other side of the aisle all of the excuses that come from that element within this House which wishes to do nothing to help the people of the cities.

Here we are at the 11th hour of the 2d session of the 89th Congress. Soon we will adjourn. We can go home having done something for the people who live in the cities of this Nation—125 million Americans—or we can find an excuse for doing nothing.

That, Mr. Speaker, I submit is the question before the House today.

I hear once again the problem of opening Pandora's box. I observe only that that box has been opened so often by our friends on the other side of the aisle, without the dire consequences they invariably predict, that it is time to close the lid. Let us pass this legislation, adopt this conference report, and do something for 125 million Americans who need help so desperately.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELTNER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I should like to urge the House to vote against this legislation. I am not satisfied with several things in it.

I should like to call the gentleman's attention to these.

First, it is a patchwork kind of thing, to pick some cities out and to leave other cities alone.

Second, I believe it is an open-ended matter as to how much money is going to be spent.

Third, I fear we may be taking money away from some of the smaller communities and giving the bulk of the money to a few large metropolitan areas.

I am on record against this legislation and I plan to vote against it.

Again I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I was quite surprised at the remarks of my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia. He apparently did not read what President Johnson said to the mayors of 30 large cities of the country last Saturday. The President appealed to them, according to the AP story, to postpone spending in order to help battle inflation. He also reminded them that Federal programs with a direct impact on cities has climbed from $5.6 billion to $8.3 billion, or up 48 percent from 1964; and in the 3 years since they will jump from $8.3 to $14.6 billion—up 76 percent.

This allegation, which has been repeated on the floor on numerous occasions within the last few days, that those who object to some features of this bill are not willing to do anything to aid the cities of the country solve their problems, just does not hold water in the light of the facts. The yearend supplemental appropriations bill which passed the House just a few days ago appropriates another $750 million for urban renewal and we are currently funding the urban renewal program at an annual rate of $750 million. This is only one of a multitude of Federal aid-to-cities programs. The President's statement to the 30 mayors last Saturday fully confirms this.

But what I asked this time for—and I hope there are some members of the Committee on Armed Services listening—is to say that I was shocked to note that the conference committee is perpetuating the injustice being practiced by this administration on the men now serving in our military forces.

Here we are with a bill which eliminates the $10,000 ceiling on income for civilians eligible to receive a rent subsidy under section 221(D)(3), so that now this subsidy will be available to civilians with incomes ranging upward to $13,000. At the same time every provision in the original bill that would have provided housing for men in military service has been eliminated.

The administration did another injustice to the servicemen last year when, after Congress had appropriated $600 million in military construction funds, of which $160 million was to build 7,500 family housing units for military personnel in the United States, the administration arbitrarily refused to provide the military housing Congress had authorized and appropriated the money for.

And in the military construction budget for 1967, the President did not ask for one dime for housing for the men in military service and their families.

If you are going to subsidize the house rent of civilians whose incomes range up to $13,000 a year, will someone on this committee who favors that program please explain to the House, the American people, and to the men in military service why this discrimination is being perpetuated.

I do not believe it is fair to require the men in uniform to make all of the sacrifices in the prosecution of the war in which our country is now engaged.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take 1 minute at this time. The reason why I said that this report was signed by all of the conferees is that at the end of the conference I had the impression if we would agree to certain things, all of the members of the minority would sign the report. That was agreed to, and I thought they did sign it. I did look at the Senate conferees and I saw that all of them did sign it, but I was in error on the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO], and the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER]. I had reason to believe that they would sign it, but I had not actually looked it up to see if they did. I was told they would sign it. I am sorry that I made that mistake in my statement. It is not a major mistake, because all of the conferees except those two did sign it.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WIDNALL. I would like to talk about that. I would like to know who told the gentleman from Texas that, because no one has any authority to make any such statement. I told you after I had a phone conversation with some who were attending the conference that I would sign the report.

Mr. PATMAN. I am talking about what happened there at the table at the time. I understood that they all would sign the report.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to clarify this matter about what happened at the conference and what did not happen there. It is quite true than an informal—and I stress the word "informal"—conference was started on Monday at the time when the ranking minority member of the committee was not there and could not be there and he had a prior commitment which the chairman of our committee did try to keep.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] was kept fully advised of what was going on by minority staff members who were present throughout. At that informal conference all that was done was the Senate indicated to us the matters on which they would recede, thus eliminating from discussion many of the matters in disagreement. We thereby saved much time. We did not have to discuss the items that were put in the bill on this side and not on the Senate side and which they agreed to keep in the bill. Similarly as to matters put in by the Senate and not in the House bill and which the Senate agreed not to press. Then when we met in formal conference, after due and proper notice to all concerned, we went over the items that were still in disagreement. I think we brought out a good bill. I do trust that this conference report will be adopted by all of the Members.

Now, with reference to one item that has been referred to by the able and distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK], the only difference there, as I find it, between the bill passed by the House, which contained his amendment, and the bill as finally adopted as a result of the conference is in emphasis. We still limit all of these funds to comprehensive city demonstrations. That language is in the bill in two different places which we bring to the House. Then we provide in so many words that such grant funds shall not, however, be used for the general administration of local governments or to replace non-Federal contributions and so forth.

I want to emphasize that the grant formula in the bill assures that communities will participate in the demonstration cities program and will make use of existing Federal grant-in-aid programs. It does this by tying the amount of the supplemental grant available under the demonstration cities legislation to the aggregate amount of non-Federal contributions required to be made to those projects or activities carried out in connection with the demonstration programs which are assisted under existing Federal grant-in-aid programs.

I believe that the grant formula in the bill and the priority provision for new projects which we have adopted combine to give Congress assurance that there will be a desirable balance in each city demonstration program between the benefits of innovation which can be gained from new programs and the lessons of experience already gained from the operation of existing Federal grant-in-aid programs.

Now, with reference to the matter of exceeding the $10,000 limit, there is not any doubt that what happens here is that that excess of $10,000 per family income, I repeat per family income, can apply only where families are composed of seven or more persons and then only when the total family exceeds the $10,000 figure. I think experience has shown that that is a necessary exception. Therefore, we did agree to take out the limitation that was in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, again I repeat that the bill before us is a good result of a fair and open and free conference, with the conferees acting in good faith, each giving a little bit and getting a little in exchange, thereby bringing to the House a better bill.

There were 55 items in disagreement between the two Houses. The Senate completely receded as to 25 items. The House completely receded as to only 11 items. As to the balance we compromised on the language as indicated in the report and in the statement on the part of the managers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in my opinion, this is one of the most dangerous bills which comes to us as a result of conference coming before the House in some time, as it relates to the octopus of Federal control over local, municipal decisions, and as it relates to cutting off of present Federal grant programs. I hope that sinks in—present Federal grant programs. I thought this was supposed to be a bonus program with Federal grants and then you make up the difference, if you conform, with the Federal Government taking over some of the present non-Federal cost. But when I read section 204, under the so-called planned metropolitan development title II—and I have consulted with our counsel on the Committee on Public Works on this and he confirms my views—it says in section 204, and I say this to you, this metro government type planning is going to be required in every one of these national standard metropolitan statistical areas throughout the country if they are going to get any Federal grant money from grant-in-aid programs.

Mr. Speaker, here they are in section 204. And, if you are going to get any Federal grant money under present programs for any of these projects you will have to comply with the provisions of this section requiring metro type area wide planning. This has reference to hospitals, airports, libraries, water supply and distribution facilities, sewage facilities, waste treatment plants, highways, transport facilities and various other projects under present grant-in-aid programs contained therein.

And, Mr. Speaker, the grant-in-aid projects must be planned by an area-wide agency. You must have metro government. You must have it in all of Broward, Duval, Palm Beach Counties, Fla. They are standard, metro statistical areas, according to the Bureau of the Budget and, Mr. Speaker, I shall put a list of these areas into the RECORD.

The list referred follows:

TABLE 31.—*Population of standard metropolitan statistical areas and component areas in the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, 1940–60*

[Figures relate to areas as defined for 1960. Minus sign (−) denotes decrease. Percent not shown where less than 0.1]

Standard metropolitan statistical area	1960	1950	1940	Percent increase	
				1950–60	1940–50
United States (212 areas)	112,885,178	89,316,903	72,834,468	26.4	22.6
Abilene, Tex	120,377	85,517	67,525	40.8	26.6
Jones County	19,299	22,147	23,378	−12.9	−5.3
Taylor County	101,078	63,370	44,147	59.5	43.5
Akron, Ohio	513,569	410,032	339,405	25.3	20.8
Summit County	513,569	410,032	339,405	25.3	20.8
Albany, Ga	75,680	43,617	28,565	73.5	52.7
Dougherty County	75,680	43,617	28,565	73.5	52.7
Albany-Schenectady-Troy, N.Y	657,503	589,359	531,249	11.6	10.9
Albany County	272,926	239,386	221,315	14.0	8.2
Rensselaer County	142,585	132,607	121,834	7.5	8.8
Saratoga County	89,096	74,869	65,606	19.0	14.1
Schenectady County	152,896	142,497	122,494	7.3	16.3
Albuquerque, N. Mex	262,199	145,673	69,391	80.0	109.9
Bernalillo County	262,199	145,673	69,391	80.0	109.9
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, Pa.-N.J	492,168	437,824	396,673	12.4	10.4
Lehigh County, Pa	227,536	198,207	177,533	14.8	11.6
Northampton County, Pa	201,412	185,243	168,959	8.7	9.6
Warren County, N.J	63,220	54,374	50,181	16.3	8.4
Altoona, Pa	137,270	139,514	140,358	−1.6	−0.6
Blair County	137,270	139,514	140,358	−1.6	−0.6
Amarillo, Tex	149,493	87,140	61,450	71.6	41.8
Potter County	115,580	73,366	54,265	57.5	35.2
Randall County	33,913	13,774	7,185	146.2	91.7
Ann Arbor, Mich	172,440	134,606	80,810	28.1	66.6
Washtenaw County	172,440	134,606	80,810	28.1	66.6
Asheville, N.C	130,074	124,403	108,755	4.6	14.4
Buncombe County	130,074	124,403	108,755	4.6	14.4
Atlanta, Ga	1,017,188	726,989	558,842	39.9	30.1
Clayton County	46,365	22,872	11,655	102.7	96.2
Cobb County	114,174	61,830	38,272	84.7	61.6
De Kalb County	256,782	136,395	86,942	88.3	56.9
Fulton County	556,326	473,572	392,886	17.5	20.5
Gwinnett County	43,541	32,320	29,087	34.7	11.1
Atlantic City, N.J	160,880	132,399	124,066	21.5	6.7
Atlantic County	160,880	132,399	124,066	21.5	6.7
Augusta, Ga.-S.C	216,639	162,013	131,779	33.7	22.9
Richmond County, Ga	135,601	108,876	81,863	24.5	33.0
Aiken County, S.C	81,038	53,137	49,916	52.5	6.5
Austin, Tex	212,136	160,980	111,053	31.8	45.0
Travis County	212,136	160,980	111,053	31.8	45.0
Bakersfield, Calif	291,984	228,309	135,124	27.9	69.0
Kern County	291,984	228,309	135,124	27.9	69.0
Baltimore, Md	1,727,023	1,405,399	1,139,529	22.9	23.3
Baltimore City	939,024	949,708	859,100	−1.1	10.5
Anne Arundel County	206,634	117,392	68,375	76.0	71.7
Baltimore County	492,428	270,273	155,825	82.2	73.4
Carroll County	52,785	44,907	39,054	17.4	15.0
Howard County	36,152	23,119	17,175	56.4	34.6
Baton Rouge, La	230,058	158,236	88,415	45.4	79.0
East Baton Rouge Parish	230,058	158,236	88,415	45.4	79.0
Bay City, Mich	107,042	88,461	74,981	21.0	18.0
Bay County	107,042	88,461	74,981	21.0	18.0
Beaumont-Port Arthur, Tex	306,016	235,650	162,711	29.9	44.8
Jefferson County	245,659	195,083	145,329	25.9	34.2
Orange County	60,357	40,567	17,382	48.8	133.4
Billings, Mont	79,016	55,875	41,182	41.4	35.7
Yellowstone County	79,016	55,875	41,182	41.4	35.7
Binghamton, N.Y	212,661	184,698	165,749	15.1	11.4
Broome County	212,661	184,698	165,749	15.1	11.4
Birmingham, Ala	634,864	558,928	459,930	13.6	21.5
Jefferson County	634,864	558,928	459,930	13.6	21.5
Boston, Mass	2,589,301	2,410,572	2,209,608	7.4	9.1
Essex County (part)	308,051	269,584	250,554	14.3	7.6
Beverly City	36,108	28,884	25,537	25.0	13.1
Lynn City	94,478	99,738	98,123	−5.3	1.6
Peabody City	32,202	22,645	21,711	42.2	4.3
Salem City	39,211	41,880	41,213	−6.4	1.6
Danvers town	21,926	15,720	14,179	39.5	10.9
Hamilton town	5,488	2,764	2,037	98.6	35.7
Lynnfield town	8,398	3,927	2,487	113.9	16.0
Manchester town	3,932	2,868	2,472	37.1	16.0
Marblehead town	18,521	13,765	10,856	34.6	26.8
Middleton town	3,718	2,916	2,348	27.5	24.2
Nahant town	3,960	2,679	1,835	47.8	46.0
Saugus town	20,666	17,162	14,825	20.4	15.8
Swampscott town	13,294	11,580	10,761	14.8	7.6
Topsfield town	3,351	1,412	1,150	137.3	22.8
Wenham town	2,798	1,644	1,220	70.2	34.8
Middlesex County (part)	973,481	854,854	776,100	13.9	10.1
Cambridge City	107,716	120,740	110,879	−10.8	8.9
Everett City	43,544	45,982	46,784	−5.3	−1.7
Malden City	57,676	59,804	58,010	−3.6	3.1
Medford City	64,971	66,113	63,083	−1.7	4.8
Melrose City	29,619	26,988	25,333	9.7	6.5
Newton City	92,384	81,994	69,873	12.7	17.3
Somerville City	94,697	102,351	102,177	−7.5	0.2
Waltham City	55,413	47,187	40,020	17.4	17.9
Woburn City	31,214	20,492	19,751	52.3	3.8
Arlington town	49,953	44,353	40,013	12.6	10.8
Ashland town	7,779	3,500	2,479	122.3	41.2
Bedford town	10,969	5,234	3,807	109.6	37.5
Belmont town	28,715	27,381	26,867	4.9	1.9
Burlington town	12,852	3,250	2,275	295.4	42.9
Concord town	12,517	8,623	7,972	45.2	8.2
Framingham town	44,526	28,086	23,214	58.5	21.0
Lexington town	27,691	17,335	13,187	59.7	31.5
Boston, Mass.—Con.					
Middlesex County—Con.					
Lincoln town	5,613	2,427	1,783	131.3	36.1
Natick town	28,831	19,838	13,651	45.3	43.2
North Reading town	8,331	4,402	2,886	89.3	52.5
Reading town	19,259	14,006	10,866	37.5	28.9
Stoneham town	17,821	13,229	10,765	34.7	22.9
Sudbury town	7,447	2,596	1,754	186.9	48.0
Wakefield town	24,295	19,633	16,223	23.7	21.0
Watertown town	39,092	37,329	35,427	4.7	5.4
Wayland town	10,444	4,407	3,505	137.0	25.7
Weston town	8,261	5,026	3,590	64.4	40.0
Wilmington town	12,475	7,039	4,645	77.2	51.5
Winchester town	19,376	15,509	15,081	24.9	2.8
Norfolk County (part)	442,150	345,605	286,077	27.9	20.8
Quincy City	87,409	83,835	75,810	4.3	10.6
Braintree town	31,069	23,161	16,378	34.1	41.4
Brookline town	54,044	57,589	49,786	−6.2	15.7
Canton town	12,771	7,465	6,381	71.1	17.0
Cohasset town	5,840	3,731	3,111	56.5	19.9
Dedham town	23,869	18,487	15,508	29.1	19.2
Dover town	2,846	1,722	1,374	65.3	25.3
Holbrook town	10,104	4,004	3,330	152.3	20.2
Medfield town	6,021	4,549	4,384	32.4	3.8
Milton town	26,375	22,395	18,708	17.8	19.7
Needham town	25,793	16,313	12,445	58.1	31.1
Norfolk town	3,471	2,704	2,294	28.4	17.9
Norwood town	24,898	16,636	15,383	49.7	8.1
Randolph town	18,900	9,982	7,634	89.3	30.8
Sharon town	10,070	4,847	3,737	107.8	29.7
Walpole town	14,068	9,109	7,443	54.4	22.4
Wellesley town	26,071	20,549	15,127	26.9	35.8
Westwood town	10,354	5,837	3,376	77.4	72.9
Weymouth town	48,177	32,690	23,868	47.4	37.0
Plymouth County (part)	74,290	43,914	33,629	69.2	30.6
Duxbury town	4,727	3,167	2,359	49.3	34.3
Hanover town	5,923	3,389	2,875	74.8	17.9
Hingham town	15,378	10,665	8,003	44.2	33.3
Hull town	7,055	3,379	2,167	108.8	55.9
Marshfield town	6,748	3,267	2,419	106.6	35.1
Norwell town	5,207	2,515	1,871	107.0	34.4
Pembroke town	4,919	2,579	1,718	90.7	50.1
Rockland town	13,119	8,960	8,087	46.4	10.8
Scituate town	11,214	5,993	4,130	87.1	45.1
Suffolk County	791,329	896,615	863,248	−11.7	3.9
Boston City	697,197	801,444	770,816	−13.0	4.0
Chelsea City	33,749	38,912	41,259	−13.3	−5.7
Revere City	40,080	36,763	34,405	9.0	6.9
Winthrop town	20,303	19,496	16,768	4.1	16.3
Bridgeport, Conn	334,576	273,723	225,268	22.2	21.5
Fairfield County (part)	292,914	246,853	208,829	18.7	18.2
Bridgeport City	156,748	158,709	147,121	−1.2	7.9
Shelton City	18,190	12,694	10,971	43.3	15.7
Fairfield town	46,183	30,489	21,135	51.5	44.3
Monroe town	6,402	2,892	1,728	121.4	67.4
Stratford town	45,012	33,428	22,580	34.7	48.0
Trumbull town	20,379	8,641	5,294	135.8	63.2
New Haven County (part)	41,662	26,870	16,439	55.1	63.5
Milford town	41,662	26,870	16,439	55.1	63.5
Brockton, Mass	149,458	119,728	110,463	24.8	8.4
Plymouth County (part)	119,751	99,672	94,361	20.1	5.6
Brockton City	72,813	62,860	62,343	15.8	.8
Abington town	10,607	7,152	5,708	48.3	25.3
Bridgewater town	10,276	9,512	8,902	8.0	6.9
East Bridgewater town	6,139	4,412	3,832	39.1	15.1
Hanson town	4,370	3,264	2,570	33.9	27.0
West Bridgewater town	5,061	4,059	3,247	24.7	25.0
Whitman town	10,485	8,413	7,759	24.6	8.4
Norfolk County (part)	20,629	13,812	10,967	49.4	25.9
Avon town	4,301	2,666	2,335	61.3	14.2
Stoughton	16,328	11,146	8,632	46.5	29.1
Bristol County (part)	9,078	6,244	5,135	45.4	21.6
Easton town	9,078	6,244	5,135	45.4	21.6
Brownsville-Harlingen-San Benito, Tex	151,098	125,170	83,202	20.7	50.4
Cameron County	151,098	125,170	83,202	20.7	50.4
Buffalo, N.Y	1,306,957	1,089,230	958,487	20.0	13.6
Erie County	1,064,688	899,238	798,377	18.4	12.6
Niagara County	242,269	189,992	160,110	27.5	18.7
Canton, Ohio	340,345	283,194	234,887	20.2	20.6
Stark County	340,345	283,194	234,887	20.2	20.6
Cedar Rapids, Iowa	136,899	104,274	89,142	31.3	17.0
Linn County	136,899	104,274	89,142	31.3	17.0
Champaign-Urbana, Ill	132,436	106,100	70,578	24.8	50.3
Champaign County	132,436	106,100	70,578	24.8	50.3
Charleston, S.C	216,382	164,856	121,105	31.3	36.1
Charleston County	216,382	164,856	121,105	31.3	36.1
Charleston, W. Va	252,925	239,629	195,619	5.5	22.5
Kanawha County	252,925	239,629	195,619	5.5	22.5
Charlotte, N.C	272,111	197,052	151,826	38.1	29.8
Mecklenburg County	272,111	197,052	151,826	38.1	29.8
Chattanooga, Tenn.-Ga	283,169	246,453	211,502	14.9	16.5
Hamilton County, Tenn	237,905	208,255	180,478	14.2	15.4
Walker County, Ga	45,264	38,198	31,024	18.5	23.1
Chicago, Ill	6,220,913	5,177,868	4,569,643	20.1	13.3
Cook County	5,129,725	4,508,792	4,063,342	13.8	11.0
Du Page County	313,459	154,599	103,480	102.8	49.4
Kane County	208,246	150,388	130,206	38.5	15.5
Lake County	293,656	179,097	121,094	64.0	47.9
McHenry County	84,210	50,656	37,311	66.2	35.8
Will County	191,617	134,336	114,210	42.6	17.6

TABLE 31.—*Population of standard metropolitan statistical areas and component areas in the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, 1940–60*—Continued

[Figures relate to areas as defined for 1960. Minus sign (−) denotes decrease. Percent not shown where less than 0.1]

Standard metropolitan statistical area	1960	1950	1940	Percent increase	
				1950–60	1940–50
Cincinnati, Ohio-Ky	1,071,624	904,402	787,044	18.5	14.9
Hamilton County, Ohio	864,121	723,952	621,987	19.4	16.4
Campbell County, Ky	86,803	76,196	71,918	13.9	5.9
Kenton County, Ky	120,700	104,254	93,139	15.8	11.9
Cleveland, Ohio	1,796,595	1,465,511	1,267,270	22.6	15.6
Cuyahoga County	1,647,895	1,389,532	1,217,250	18.6	14.2
Lake County	148,700	75,979	50,020	95.7	51.9
Colorado Springs, Colo	143,742	74,523	54,025	92.9	37.9
El Paso County	143,742	74,523	54,025	92.9	37.9
Columbia, S.C	260,828	186,844	140,837	39.6	32.7
Lexington County	60,726	44,279	35,994	37.1	23.0
Richland County	200,102	142,565	104,843	40.4	36.0
Columbus, Ga.-Ala	217,985	170,541	126,407	27.8	34.9
Chattahoochee County, Ga	13,011	12,149	15,138	7.1	−19.7
Muscogee County, Ga	158,623	118,028	75,494	34.4	56.3
Russell County, Ala	46,351	40,364	35,775	14.8	12.8
Columbus, Ohio	682,962	503,410	388,712	35.7	29.5
Franklin County	682,962	503,410	388,712	35.7	29.5
Corpus Christi, Tex	221,573	165,471	92,661	33.9	78.6
Nueces County	221,573	165,471	92,661	33.9	78.6
Dallas, Tex	1,083,601	743,501	527,145	45.7	41.0
Collin County	41,247	41,692	47,190	−1.1	−11.7
Dallas County	951,527	614,799	398,564	54.8	54.3
Denton County	47,432	41,365	33,658	14.7	22.9
Ellis County	43,395	45,645	47,733	−4.9	−4.4
Davenport-Rock Island-Moline, Iowa-Ill	270,058	234,256	198,071	15.3	18.3
Scott County, Iowa	119,067	100,698	84,748	18.2	18.8
Rock Island County, Ill	150,991	133,558	113,323	13.1	17.9
Dayton, Ohio	694,623	518,642	383,975	33.9	35.1
Greene County	94,642	58,892	35,863	60.7	64.2
Miami County	72,901	61,309	52,632	18.9	16.5
Montgomery County	527,080	398,441	295,480	32.3	34.8
Decatur, Ill	118,257	98,853	84,693	19.6	16.7
Macon County	118,257	98,853	84,693	19.6	16.7
Denver, Colo	929,383	612,128	445,206	51.8	37.5
Adams County	120,296	40,234	22,481	199.0	79.0
Arapahoe County	113,426	52,125	32,150	117.6	62.1
Boulder County	74,254	48,296	37,438	53.7	29.0
Denver County	493,887	415,786	322,412	18.8	29.0
Jefferson County	127,520	55,687	30,725	129.0	81.2
Des Moines, Iowa	266,315	226,010	195,835	17.8	15.4
Polk County	266,315	226,010	195,835	17.8	15.4
Detroit, Mich	3,762,360	3,016,197	2,377,329	24.7	26.9
Macomb County	405,804	184,961	107,638	119.4	71.8
Oakland County	690,259	396,001	254,068	74.3	55.9
Wayne County	2,666,297	2,435,235	2,015,623	9.5	20.8
Dubuque, Iowa	80,048	71,337	63,768	12.2	11.9
Dubuque County	80,048	71,337	63,768	12.2	11.9
Duluth-Superior, Minn.-Wis	276,596	252,777	254,036	9.4	−.5
St. Louis County, Minn	231,588	206,062	206,917	12.4	−.4
Douglas County, Wis	45,008	46,715	47,119	−3.7	−.9
Durham, N.C	111,995	101,639	80,244	10.2	26.7
Durham County	111,995	101,639	80,244	10.2	26.7
El Paso, Tex	314,070	194,968	131,067	61.1	48.8
El Paso County	314,070	194,968	131,067	61.1	48.8
Erie, Pa	250,682	219,338	180,889	14.3	21.3
Erie County	250,682	219,388	180,889	14.3	21.3
Eugene, Oreg	162,890	125,776	69,096	29.5	82.0
Lane County	162,890	125,776	69,096	29.5	82.0
Evansville, Ind.-Ky	199,313	191,137	157,803	4.3	21.1
Vanderburgh County, Ind	165,794	160,422	130,783	3.3	22.7
Henderson County, Ky	33,519	30,715	27,020	9.1	13.7
Fall River, Mass.-R.I	138,156	137,298	135,137	.6	1.6
Bristol County, Mass. (part)	128,695	131,639	130,119	−2.2	1.2
Fall River city	99,942	111,963	115,428	−10.7	−3.0
Somerset town	12,196	8,566	5,873	42.4	45.9
Swansea town	9,916	6,121	4,684	62.0	30.7
Westport town	6,641	4,989	4,134	33.1	20.7
Newport County, R.I. (part)	9,461	5,659	5,018	67.2	12.8
Riverton town	9,461	5,659	5,018	67.2	12.8
Fargo-Moorhead, N. Dak.-Minn	106,027	89,240	78,186	18.8	14.1
Cass County, N. Dak	66,947	58,877	52,849	13.7	11.4
Clay County, Minn	39,080	30,363	25,337	28.7	19.8
Fitchburg-Leominster, Mass	82,486	74,943	68,853	10.1	8.8
Middlesex County (part)	5,202	4,271	2,608	21.8	63.8
Shirley town	5,202	4,271	2,608	21.8	63.8
Worcester County (part)	77,284	70,672	66,245	9.4	6.7
Fitchburg city	43,021	42,691	41,824	.8	2.1
Leominster city	27,929	24,075	22,226	16.0	8.3
Lunenburg town	6,334	3,906	2,195	62.2	77.9
Flint, Mich	374,313	270,963	227,944	38.1	18.9
Genesee County	374,313	270,963	227,944	38.1	18.9
Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood, Fla	333,946	83,933	39,794	297.9	110.9
Broward County	333,946	83,933	39,794	297.9	110.9
Fort Smith, Ark	66,685	64,202	62,809	3.9	2.2
Sebastian County	66,685	64,202	62,809	3.9	2.2
Fort Wayne, Ind	232,196	183,722	155,084	26.4	18.5
Allen County	232,196	183,722	155,084	26.4	18.5
Fort Worth, Tex	573,215	392,643	255,905	46.0	53.4
Johnson County	34,720	31,390	30,384	10.6	3.3
Tarrant County	538,495	361,253	225,521	49.1	60.2
Fresno, Calif	365,945	276,515	178,565	32.3	54.9
Fresno County	365,945	276,515	178,565	32.3	54.9
Gadsden, Ala	96,980	93,892	72,580	3.3	29.4
Etowah County	96,980	93,892	72,580	3.3	29.4
Galveston-Texas City, Tex	140,364	113,066	81,173	24.1	39.3
Galveston County	140,364	113,066	81,173	24.1	39.3
Gary-Hammond-East Chicago, Ind	573,548	408,228	321,031	40.5	27.2
Lake County	513,269	368,152	293,195	39.4	25.6
Porter County	60,279	40,076	27,836	50.4	44.0
Grand Rapids, Mich	363,187	288,292	246,338	26.0	17.0
Kent County	363,187	288,292	246,338	26.0	17.0
Great Falls, Mont	73,418	53,027	41,999	38.5	26.3
Cascade County	73,418	53,027	41,999	38.5	26.3
Green Bay, Wis	125,082	98,314	83,109	27.2	18.3
Brown County	125,082	98,314	83,109	27.2	18.3
Greensboro-High Point, N.C	246,520	191,057	153,916	29.0	24.1
Guilford County	246,520	191,057	153,916	29.0	24.1
Greenville, S.C	209,776	168,152	136,580	24.8	23.1
Greenville County	209,776	168,152	136,580	24.8	23.1
Hamilton-Middletown, Ohio	199,076	147,203	120,249	35.2	22.4
Butler County	199,076	147,203	120,249	35.2	22.4
Harrisburg, Pa	345,071	292,241	252,216	18.1	15.9
Cumberland County	124,816	94,457	74,806	32.1	26.3
Dauphin County	220,255	197,784	177,410	11.4	11.5
Hartford, Conn	525,207	406,534	336,991	29.2	20.6
Hartford County (part)	501,466	392,133	324,732	27.9	20.8
Hartford city	162,178	177,397	166,267	−8.6	6.7
Avon town	5,273	3,171	2,258	66.3	40.4
Bloomfield town	13,613	5,746	4,309	136.9	33.3
Canton town	4,783	3,613	2,769	32.4	30.5
East Hartford town	43,977	29,933	18,615	46.9	60.8
East Windsor town	7,500	4,859	3,967	54.4	22.5
Enfield town	31,464	15,464	13,561	103.5	14.0
Farmington town	10,813	7,026	5,313	53.9	32.2
Glastonbury town	14,497	8,818	6,632	64.4	33.0
Manchester town	42,102	34,116	23,799	23.4	43.4
Newington town	17,664	9,110	5,449	93.9	67.2
Rocky Hill town	7,404	5,108	2,679	44.9	90.7
Simsbury town	10,138	4,822	3,941	110.2	22.4
South Windsor town	9,460	4,066	2,863	132.7	42.0
Suffield town	6,779	4,895	4,475	38.5	9.4
West Hartford town	62,382	44,402	33,776	40.5	31.5
Wethersfield town	20,561	12,533	9,644	64.1	30.0
Windsor town	19,467	11,833	10,068	64.5	17.5
Windsor Locks town	11,411	5,221	4,347	118.6	20.1
Middlesex County (part)	6,780	4,286	3,281	58.2	30.6
Cromwell town	6,780	4,286	3,281	58.2	30.6
Tolland County (part)	16,961	10,115	8,978	67.7	12.7
Vernon town	16,961	10,115	8,978	67.7	12.7
Honolulu, Hawaii	500,409	353,020	258,256	41.8	36.7
Honolulu County	500,409	353,020	258,256	41.8	36.7
Houston, Tex	1,243,158	806,701	528,961	54.1	52.5
Harris County	1,243,158	806,701	528,961	54.1	52.5
Huntington-Ashland, W. Va.-Ky.-Ohio	254,780	245,795	225,668	3.7	8.9
Cabell County, W. Va	108,202	108,035	97,459	.2	10.9
Wayne County, W. Va	38,977	38,696	35,566	.7	8.8
Boyd County, Ky	52,163	49,949	45,938	4.4	8.7
Lawrence County, Ohio	55,438	49,115	46,705	12.9	5.2
Huntsville, Ala	117,348	72,903	66,317	61.0	9.9
Madison County	117,348	72,903	66,317	61.0	9.9
Indianapolis, Ind	697,567	551,777	460,926	26.4	19.7
Marion County	697,567	551,777	460,926	26.4	19.7
Jackson, Mich	131,994	107,925	93,108	22.3	15.9
Jackson County	131,994	107,925	93,108	22.3	15.9
Jackson, Miss	187,045	142,164	107,273	31.6	32.5
Hinds County	187,045	142,164	107,273	31.6	32.5
Jacksonville, Fla	455,411	304,029	210,143	49.8	44.7
Duval County	455,411	304,029	210,143	49.8	44.7
Jersey City, N.J	610,734	647,437	652,040	−5.7	−.7
Hudson County	610,734	647,437	652,040	−5.7	−.7
Johnstown, Pa	280,733	291,354	298,416	−3.6	−2.4
Cambria County	203,283	209,541	213,459	−3.0	−1.8
Somerset County	77,450	81,813	84,957	−5.3	−3.7
Kalamazoo, Mich	169,712	126,707	100,085	33.9	26.6
Kalamazoo County	169,712	126,707	100,085	33.9	26.6
Kansas City, Mo.-Kans	1,039,493	814,357	686,643	27.6	18.6
Clay County, Mo	87,474	45,221	30,417	93.4	48.7
Jackson County, Mo	622,732	541,035	477,828	15.1	13.2
Johnson County, Kans	143,792	62,783	33,327	129.0	88.4
Wyandotte County, Kans	185,495	165,318	145,071	12.2	14.0
Kenosha, Wis	100,615	75,238	63,506	33.7	18.5
Kenosha County	100,615	75,238	63,505	33.7	18.5
Knoxville, Tenn	368,080	337,105	246,088	9.2	37.0
Anderson County	60,032	59,407	26,504	1.1	124.1
Blount County	57,525	54,691	41,116	5.2	33.0
Knox County	250,523	223,007	178,468	12.3	25.0
Lake Charles, La	145,475	89,635	56,506	62.3	58.6
Calcasieu Parish	145,475	89,635	56,506	62.3	58.6
Lancaster, Pa	278,359	234,717	212,504	18.6	10.5
Lancaster County	278,359	234,717	212,504	18.6	10.5
Lansing, Mich	298,949	244,159	191,411	22.4	27.6
Clinton County	37,969	31,195	26,671	21.7	17.0
Eaton County	49,684	40,023	34,124	24.1	17.3
Ingham County	211,296	172,944	130,616	22.2	32.4
Laredo, Texas	64,791	56,141	45,916	15.4	22.3
Webb County	64,791	56,141	45,916	15.4	22.3

TABLE 31.—*Population of standard metropolitan statistical areas and component areas in the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, 1940–60*—Continued

[Figures relate to areas as defined for 1960. Minus sign (−) denotes decrease. Percent not shown where less than 0.1]

Standard metropolitan statistical area	1960	1950	1940	Percent increase	
				1950–60	1940–50
Las Vegas, Nev	127,016	48,289	16,414	163.0	194.2
Clark County	127,016	48,289	16,414	163.0	194.2
Lawrence-Haverhill, Mass.-N.H	187,601	182,442	178,404	2.8	2.3
Essex County, Mass. (part)	175,476	175,555	173,723		1.1
Lawrence City	70,933	80,536	84,323	−11.9	−4.5
Haverhill City	46,346	47,280	46,752	−2.0	1.1
Andover town	15,878	12,437	11,122	27.7	11.8
Groveland town	3,297	2,340	2,122	40.9	10.3
Methuen town	28,114	24,477	21,880	14.9	11.9
North Andover town	10,908	8,485	7,524	28.6	12.8
Rockingham County, N.H. (part)	12,125	6,887	4,681	76.1	47.1
Plaistow town	2,915	2,082	1,414	40.0	47.2
Salem town	9,210	4,805	3,267	91.7	47.1
Lawton, Okla	90,803	55,165	38,988	64.6	41.5
Comanche County	90,803	55,165	38,988	64.6	41.5
Lewiston-Auburn, Maine	70,295	68,426	62,538	2.7	9.4
Androscoggin County (part)	70,295	68,426	62,538	2.7	9.4
Auburn City	24,449	23,134	19,817	5.7	16.7
Lewiston City	40,804	40,974	38,598	−1.4	6.2
Lisbon town	5,042	4,318	4,123	16.8	4.7
Lexington, Ky	131,906	100,746	78,899	30.9	27.7
Fayette County	131,906	100,746	78,899	30.9	27.7
Lima, Ohio	103,691	88,183	73,303	17.6	20.3
Allen County	103,691	88,183	73,303	17.6	20.3
Lincoln, Nebr	155,272	119,742	100,585	29.7	19.0
Lancaster County	155,272	119,742	100,585	29.7	19.0
Little Rock-North Little Rock, Ark	242,980	196,685	156,085	23.5	26.0
Pulaski County	242,980	196,685	156,085	23.5	26.0
Lorain-Elyria, Ohio	217,500	148,162	112,390	46.8	31.8
Lorain County	217,500	148,162	112,390	46.8	31.8
Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif	6,742,696	4,367,911	2,916,403	54.4	49.8
Los Angeles County	6,038,771	4,151,687	2,785,643	45.5	49.0
Orange County	703,925	216,224	130,760	225.6	65.4
Louisville, Ky.-Ind	725,139	576,900	451,473	25.7	27.8
Jefferson County, Ky	610,947	484,615	385,392	26.1	25.7
Clark County, Ind	62,795	48,330	31,020	29.9	55.8
Floyd County, Ind	51,397	43,955	35,061	16.9	25.4
Lowell, Mass	157,982	135,987	132,633	16.2	2.5
Middlesex County (part)	157,982	135,987	132,633	16.2	2.5
Lowell City	92,107	97,249	101,389	−5.3	−4.1
Billerica town	17,867	11,101	7,933	60.9	39.9
Chelmsford town	15,130	9,407	8,077	60.8	16.5
Dracut town	13,674	8,666	7,339	57.8	18.1
Tewksbury town	15,902	7,505	6,261	111.9	19.9
Tyngsborough town	3,302	2,05[illegible]	1,634	60.4	26.0
Lubbock, Tex	156,271	101,048	51,782	54.7	95.1
Lubbock County	156,271	101,048	51,782	54.7	95.1
Lynchburg, Va	110,701	96,936	90,862	14.2	6.7
Lynchburg City	54,790	47,727	44,541	14.8	7.2
Amherst County	22,953	20,332	20,273	12.9	.3
Campbell County	32,958	28,877	26,048	14.1	10.9
Macon, Ga	180,403	135,043	95,086	33.6	42.0
Bibb County	141,249	114,079	83,783	23.8	36.2
Houston County	39,154	20,964	11,303	86.8	85.5
Madison, Wis	222,095	169,357	130,660	31.1	29.6
Dane County	222,095	169,357	130,660	31.1	29.6
Manchester, N.H	95,512	88,370	81,932	8.1	7.9
Hillsborough County (part)	95,512	88,370	81,932	8.1	7.9
Manchester City	88,282	82,732	77,685	6.7	6.5
Goffstown town	7,230	5,638	4,247	28.2	32.8
Memphis, Tenn	627,019	482,393	358,250	30.0	34.7
Shelby County	627,019	482,393	358,250	30.0	34.7
Meriden, Conn	51,850	44,088	39,494	17.6	11.6
New Haven County (part)	51,850	44,088	39,494	17.6	11.6
Meriden City	51,850	44,088	39,494	17.6	11.6
Miami, Fla	935,047	495,084	267,739	88.9	84.9
Dade County	935,047	495,084	267,739	88.9	84.9
Midland, Tex	67,717	25,785	11,721	162.6	120.0
Midland County	67,717	25,785	11,721	162.6	120.0
Milwaukee, Wis	1,194,290	956,948	829,629	24.8	15.3
Milwaukee County	1,036,041	871,047	766,885	18.9	13.6
Waukesha County	158,249	85,901	62,744	84.2	36.9
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	1,482,030	1,151,053	967,367	28.8	19.0
Anoka County	85,916	35,579	22,443	141.5	58.5
Dakota County	78,303	49,019	39,660	59.7	23.5
Hennepin County	842,854	676,579	568,899	24.6	18.9
Ramsey County	422,525	355,332	309,935	18.9	14.6
Washington County	52,432	34,544	26,430	51.8	30.7
Mobile, Ala	314,301	231,105	141,974	36.0	62.8
Mobile County	314,301	231,105	141,974	36.0	62.8
Monroe, La	101,663	74,713	59,168	36.1	26.3
Ouachita Parish	101,663	74,713	59,168	36.1	26.3
Montgomery, Ala	169,210	138,965	114,420	21.8	21.5
Montgomery County	169,210	138,965	114,420	21.8	21.5
Muncie, Ind	110,938	90,252	74,963	22.9	20.4
Delaware County	110,938	90,252	74,963	22.9	20.4
Muskegon-Muskegon Heights, Mich	149,943	121,545	94,501	23.4	28.6
Muskegon County	149,943	121,545	94,501	23.4	28.6
Nashville, Tenn	399,743	321,758	257,267	24.2	25.1
Davidson County	399,743	321,758	257,267	24.2	25.1
New Bedford, Mass	143,176	141,984	138,073	.8	2.8
Bristol County (part)	137,178	137,469	134,435	−.2	2.3
New Bedford City	102,477	109,189	110,341	−6.1	−1.0
Acushnet town	5,755	4,401	4,145	30.8	6.2
Dartmouth town	14,607	11,115	9,011	31.4	23.3
Fairhaven town	14,339	12,764	10,938	12.3	16.7
Plymouth County (part)	5,998	4,515	3,638	32.8	24.1
Marion town	2,881	2,250	2,030	28.0	10.8
Mattapoisett town	3,117	2,265	1,608	37.6	40.9
New Britain, Conn	129,397	104,251	90,499	24.1	15.2
Hartford County (part)	129,397	104,251	90,499	24.1	15.2
New Britain City	82,201	73,726	68,685	11.5	7.3
Berlin town	11,250	7,470	5,230	50.6	42.8
Plainville town	13,149	9,994	6,935	31.6	44.1
Southington town	22,797	13,061	9,649	74.5	35.4
New Haven, Conn	311,681	269,714	244,294	15.6	10.4
New Haven County (part)	311,681	269,714	244,294	15.6	10.4
New Haven City	152,048	164,443	160,605	−7.5	2.4
Branford town	16,610	10,944	8,060	51.8	35.8
East Haven town	21,388	12,212	9,094	75.1	34.3
Guilford town	7,913	5,092	3,544	55.4	43.7
Hamden town	41,056	29,715	23,373	38.2	27.1
North Haven town	15,935	9,444	5,326	68.7	77.3
Orange town	8,547	3,032	2,009	181.9	50.9
West Haven town	43,002	32,010	30,021	34.3	6.6
Woodbridge town	5,182	2,822	2,262	83.6	24.8
New London-Groton-Norwich, Conn	156,913	123,141	106,207	27.4	15.9
New London County (part)	156,913	123,141	106,207	27.4	15.9
New London City	34,182	30,551	30,456	11.9	0.3
Norwich City	38,506	37,633	34,140	2.3	10.2
East Lyme town	6,782	3,870	3,338	75.2	15.9
Groton town	29,937	21,896	10,910	36.7	100.7
Ledyard town	5,395	1,749	1,426	208.5	22.7
Montville town	7,759	4,766	4,135	62.8	15.3
Preston town	4,992	1,775	4,206	181.2	−57.8
Stonington town	13,969	11,801	11,002	18.4	7.3
Waterford town	15,391	9,100	6,594	69.1	38.0
New Orleans, La	868,480	685,405	552,244	26.7	24.1
Jefferson Parish	208,769	103,873	50,427	101.0	106.0
Orleans Parish	627,525	570,445	494,537	10.0	15.3
St. Bernard Parish	32,186	11,087	7,280	190.3	52.3
New York, N.Y	10,694,633	9,555,943	8,706,917	11.9	9.8
New York City	7,781,984	7,891,957	7,454,995	−1.4	5.9
Bronx County	1,424,815	1,451,277	1,394,711	−1.8	4.1
Kings County	2,627,319	2,738,175	2,698,285	−4.0	1.5
New York County	1,698,281	1,960,101	1,889,924	−13.4	3.7
Queens County	1,809,578	1,550,849	1,297,634	16.7	19.5
Richmond County	221,991	191,555	174,441	15.9	9.8
Nassau County	1,300,171	672,765	406,748	93.3	65.4
Rockland County	136,803	89,276	74,281	53.2	20.2
Suffolk County	666,784	276,129	197,355	141.5	39.9
Westchester County	808,891	625,816	573,558	29.3	9.1
Newark, N.J	1,689,420	1,468,458	1,291,416	15.0	13.7
Essex County	923,545	905,949	837,340	1.9	8.2
Morris County	261,620	164,371	125,732	59.2	30.7
Union County	504,255	398,138	328,344	26.7	21.3
Newport News-Hampton, Va	224,503	154,977	93,353	44.9	66.0
Newport News City	113,662	42,358	37,067	168.3	14.3
Hampton City	89,258	5,966	5,898	1,396.1	1.2
York County	21,583	11,750	8,857	83.7	32.7
Norfolk-Portsmouth, Va	578,507	446,200	258,927	29.7	72.3
Norfolk City	305,872	213,513	144,332	43.3	47.9
South Norfolk City	22,035	10,434	8,038	111.2	29.8
Portsmouth City	114,773	80,039	50,745	43.4	57.7
Virginia Beach City	8,091	5,390	2,600	50.1	107.3
Norfolk County	51,612	99,937	35,828	−48.4	178.9
Princess Anne County	76,125	42,277	19,984	80.1	111.6
Norwalk, Conn	96,756	65,685	50,936	47.3	29.0
Fairfield County (part)	96,756	65,685	50,936	47.3	29.0
Norwalk City	67,775	49,460	39,849	37.0	24.1
Westport town	20,955	11,667	8,258	79.6	41.3
Wilton town	8,026	4,558	2,829	76.1	61.1
Odessa, Tex	90,995	42,102	15,051	116.1	179.7
Ector County	90,995	42,102	15,051	116.1	179.7
Ogden, Utah	110,744	83,319	56,714	32.9	46.9
Weber County	110,744	83,319	56,714	32.9	46.9
Oklahoma City, Okla	511,833	392,439	299,216	30.4	31.2
Canadian County	24,727	25,644	27,329	−3.6	−6.2
Cleveland County	47,600	41,443	27,728	14.9	49.5
Oklahoma County	439,506	325,352	244,159	35.1	33.3
Omaha, Nebr.-Iowa	457,873	366,395	325,153	25.0	12.7
Douglas County, Nebr	343,490	281,020	247,562	22.2	13.5
Sarpy County, Nebr	31,281	15,693	10,835	99.3	44.8
Pottawattamie County, Iowa	83,102	69,682	66,756	19.3	4.4
Orlando, Fla	318,487	41,833	92,378	124.6	53.5
Orange County	263,540	114,950	70,074	129.3	64.0
Seminole County	54,947	26,883	22,304	104.4	20.5
Paterson-Clifton-Passaic, N.J	1,186,873	876,232	718,999	35.5	21.9
Bergen County	780,255	539,139	409,646	44.7	31.6
Passaic County	406,618	337,093	309,353	20.6	9.0
Pensacola, Fla	203,376	131,260	90,752	54.9	44.6
Escambia County	173,829	112,706	74,667	54.2	50.9
Santa Rosa County	29,547	18,554	16,085	59.2	15.3

TABLE 31.—*Population of standard metropolitan statistical areas and component areas in the United States and the Commonwealth of Puert Rico, 1940–60*—Continued

[Figures relate to areas as defined for 1960. Minus sign (−) denotes decrease. Percent not shown where less than 0.1]

Standard metropolitan statistical area	1960	1950	1940	Percent increase	
				1950–60	1940–50
Peoria, Ill	288,833	250,512	211,736	15.3	18.3
Peoria County	189,044	174,347	153,374	8.4	13.7
Tazewell County	99,789	76,165	58,362	31.0	30.5
Philadelphia, Pa.-N.J	4,342,897	3,671,048	3,199,637	18.3	14.7
Bucks County, Pa	308,567	144,620	107,715	113.4	34.3
Chester County, Pa	210,608	159,141	135,626	32.3	17.3
Delaware County, Pa	553,154	414,234	310,756	33.5	33.3
Montgomery County, Pa	516,682	353,068	289,247	46.3	22.1
Philadelphia County, Pa	2,002,512	2,071,605	1,931,334	−3.3	7.3
Burlington County, N.J	224,499	135,910	97,013	65.2	40.1
Camden County, N.J	392,035	300,743	255,727	30.4	17.6
Gloucester County, N.J	134,840	91,727	72,219	47.0	27.0
Phoenix, Ariz	663,510	331,770	186,193	100.0	78.2
Maricopa County	663,510	331,770	186,193	100.0	73.2
Pittsburgh, Pa	2,405,435	2,213,236	2,082,556	8.7	6.3
Allegheny County	1,628,587	1,515,237	1,411,539	7.5	7.3
Beaver County	206,948	175,192	156,754	18.1	11.8
Washington County	217,271	209,628	210,852	3.6	−0.6
Westmoreland County	352,629	313,179	303,411	12.6	3.2
Pittsfield, Mass	73,839	66,567	60,996	10.9	9.1
Berkshire County (part)	73,839	66,567	60,996	10.9	9.1
Pittsfield City	57,879	53,348	49,684	6.5	7.4
Dalton town	6,436	4,772	4,206	34.9	13.5
Lenox town	4,253	3,627	2,884	17.3	25.8
Lee town	5,271	4,820	4,222	9.4	14.2
Portland, Maine	120,655	119,942	106,566	0.6	12.6
Cumberland County (part)	120,655	119,942	106,566	0.6	12.6
Portland City	72,566	77,634	73,643	−6.5	5.4
South Portland City	22,788	21,866	15,781	4.2	38.6
Westbrook City	13,820	12,284	11,087	12.5	10.8
Cape Elizabeth town	5,505	3,816	3,172	44.3	20.3
Falmouth town	5,976	4,342	2,883	37.6	50.6
Portland, Oreg.-Wash	821,897	704,829	501,275	16.6	40.6
Clackamas County, Oreg	113,038	86,716	57,130	30.4	51.8
Multnomah County, Oreg	522,813	471,537	355,099	10.9	32.8
Washington County, Oreg	92,237	61,269	39,194	50.5	56.3
Clark County, Wash	93,809	85,307	49,852	10.0	71.1
Providence-Pawtucket, R.I.-Mass	816,148	760,202	695,253	7.4	9.3
Providence County, R.I. (part)	558,074	566,756	544,124	−1.5	4.2
Central Falls City	19,858	23,550	25,248	−15.7	−6.7
Cranston City	66,766	55,060	47,085	21.3	16.9
East Providence City	41,955	35,871	32,165	17.0	11.5
Pawtucket City	81,001	81,436	75,797	−.5	7.4
Providence City	207,498	248,674	253,504	−16.6	−1.9
Woonsocket City	47,080	50,211	49,303	−6.2	1.8
Burrillville town	9,119	8,774	8,185	3.9	7.2
Cumberland town	18,792	12,842	10,625	46.3	20.9
Johnston town	17,160	12,725	10,672	34.9	19.2
Lincoln town	13,551	11,270	10,577	20.2	6.6
North Providence town	18,220	13,927	12,156	30.8	14.6
North Smithfield town	7,632	5,726	4,196	33.3	36.5
Smithfield town	9,442	6,690	4,611	41.1	45.1
Washington County, R.I. (part)	22,421	17,098	6,164	31.1	177.4
Narragansett town	3,444	2,288	1,560	50.5	46.7
North Kingstown town	18,977	14,810	4,604	28.1	221.7
Kent County, R.I. (part)	111,450	76,916	57,785	44.9	33.1
Warwick City	68,504	43,028	28,757	59.2	49.6
Coventry town	15,432	9,869	6,998	56.4	41.0
East Greenwich town	6,100	4,923	3,842	23.9	28.1
West Warwick town	21,414	19,096	18,188	12.1	5.0
Providence-Pawtucket, R.I.:					
Bristol County, R.I. (part)	37,146	29,079	25,548	27.7	13.8
Barrington town	13,826	8,246	6,231	67.7	32.3
Bristol town	14,570	12,320	11,159	18.3	10.4
Warrentown	8,750	8,513	8,158	2.8	4.4
Newport County, R.I. (part)	2,267	2,068	1,744	9.6	18.6
Jamestown town	2,267	2,068	1,744	9.6	18.6
Bristol County, Mass. (part)	50,294	42,059	37,342	19.6	12.6
Attleboro City	27,118	23,809	22,071	13.9	7.9
North Attleboro town	14,777	12,146	10,359	21.7	17.3
Seekonk town	8,399	6,104	4,912	37.6	24.3
Norfolk County, Mass. (part)	27,799	19,566	16,258	42.1	20.3
Bellingham town	6,774	4,100	2,979	65.2	37.6
Franklin town	10,530	8,037	7,303	31.0	10.1
Plainville town	3,810	2,088	1,302	82.5	60.4
Wrentham town	6,685	5,341	4,674	25.2	14.3
Worcester County, Mass. (part)	6,697	6,660	6,288	.6	5.9
Blackstone town	5,130	4,968	4,566	3.3	8.8
Millville town	1,567	1,692	1,722	−7.4	−1.7
Provo-Oren, Utah	106,991	81,912	57,382	30.6	42.7
Utah County	106,991	81,912	57,382	30.6	42.7
Pueblo, Colo	118,707	90,188	68,870	31.6	31.0
Pueblo County	118,707	90,188	68,870	31.6	31.0
Racine, Wis	141,781	109,585	94,047	29.4	16.5
Racine County	141,781	109,585	94,047	29.4	16.5
Raleigh, N.C	169,082	136,450	109,544	23.9	24.6
Wake County	169,082	136,450	109,544	23.9	24.6
Reading, Pa	275,414	255,740	241,884	7.7	5.7
Berks County	275,414	255,740	241,884	7.7	5.7
Reno, Nev	84,743	50,205	32,476	68.8	54.6
Washoe County	84,743	50,205	32,476	68.8	54.6
Richmond, Va	408,494	328,050	266,185	24.5	23.2
Richmond City	219,958	230,310	193,042	−4.5	19.3
Chesterfield County	71,197	40,400	31,183	76.2	29.6
Henrico County	117,339	57,340	41,960	104.6	36.7
Roanoke, Va	158,803	133,407	112,184	19.0	18.9
Roanoke City	97,110	91,921	69,287	5.6	32.7
Roanoke County	61,693	41,486	42,897	48.7	−3.3
Rochester, N.Y	586,387	487,632	438,230	20.3	11.3
Monroe County	586,387	487,632	438,230	20.3	11.3
Rockford, Ill	209,765	152,385	121,178	37.7	25.8
Winnebago County	209,765	152,385	121,178	37.7	25.8
Sacramento, Calif	502,778	277,140	170,333	81.4	62.7
Sacramento County	502,778	277,140	170,333	81.4	62.7
Saginaw, Mich	190,752	153,515	130,468	24.3	17.7
Saginaw County	190,752	153,515	130,468	24.3	17.7
St. Joseph, Mo	90,581	96,826	94,067	−6.4	2.9
Buchanan County	90,581	96,826	94,067	−6.4	2.9
St. Louis, Mo.-Ill	2,060,103	1,719,288	1,464,111	19.8	17.4
St. Louis City, Mo	750,026	856,796	816,048	−12.5	5.0
Jefferson County, Mo	66,377	38,007	32,023	74.6	18.7
St. Charles County, Mo	52,970	29,834	25,562	77.5	16.7
St. Louis County, Mo	703,532	406,349	274,230	73.1	48.2
Madison County, Ill	224,689	182,307	149,349	23.2	22.1
St. Clair County, Ill	262,509	205,995	166,899	27.4	23.4
Salt Lake City, Utah	383,035	274,895	211,623	39.3	29.9
Salt Lake County	383,035	274,895	211,623	39.3	29.9
San Angelo, Tex	64,630	58,929	39,302	9.7	49.9
Tom Green County	64,630	58,929	39,302	9.7	49.9
San Antonio, Tex	687,151	500,460	338,176	37.3	48.0
Bexar County	687,151	500,460	338,176	37.3	48.0
San Bernardino-Riverside-Ontario, Calif	809,782	451,688	266,632	79.3	69.4
Riverside County	306,191	170,046	105,524	80.1	61.1
San Bernardino County	503,591	281,642	161,108	78.8	74.8
San Diego, Calif	1,033,011	556,808	289,348	85.5	92.4
San Diego County	1,033,011	556,808	289,348	85.5	92.4
San Francisco-Oakland, Calif	2,783,359	2,240,767	1,461,804	24.2	53.3
Alameda County	908,209	740,315	513,011	22.7	44.3
Contra Costa County	409,030	298,984	100,450	36.8	197.6
Marin County	146,820	85,619	52,907	71.5	61.8
San Francisco County	740,316	775,357	634,536	−4.5	22.2
San Mateo County	444,387	235,659	111,782	88.6	110.8
Solano County	134,597	104,833	49,118	28.4	113.4
San Jose, Calif	642,315	290,547	174,949	121.1	66.1
Santa Clara County	642,315	290,547	174,949	121.1	66.1
Santa Barbara, Calif	168,962	98,220	70,555	72.0	39.2
Santa Barbara County	168,962	98,220	70,555	72.0	39.2
Savannah, Ga	188,299	151,481	117,970	24.3	28.4
Chatham County	188,299	151,481	117,970	24.3	28.4
Scranton, Pa	234,531	257,396	301,243	−8.9	−14.6
Lackawanna County	234,531	257,396	301,243	−8.9	−14.6
Seattle, Wash	1,107,213	844,572	593,734	31.1	42.2
King County	935,014	732,992	504,980	27.6	45.2
Snohomish County	172,199	111,580	88,754	54.3	25.7
Shreveport, La	281,481	216,686	183,365	29.9	18.2
Bossier Parish	57,622	40,139	33,162	43.6	21.0
Caddo Parish	223,859	176,547	150,203	26.8	17.5
Sioux City, Iowa	107,849	103,917	103,627	3.8	.3
Woodbury County	107,849	103,917	103,627	3.8	.3
Sioux Falls, S. Dak	86,575	70,910	57,697	22.1	22.9
Minnehaha County	86,575	70,910	57,697	22.1	22.9
South Bend, Ind	238,614	205,058	161,823	16.4	26.7
St. Joseph County	238,614	205,058	161,823	16.4	26.7
Spokane, Wash	278,333	221,561	164,652	25.6	34.6
Spokane County	278,333	221,561	164,652	25.6	34.6
Springfield, Ill	146,539	131,484	117,912	11.5	11.5
Sangamon County	146,539	131,484	117,912	11.5	11.5
Springfield, Mo	126,276	104,823	90,541	20.5	15.8
Greene County	126,276	104,823	90,541	20.5	15.8
Springfield, Ohio	131,440	111,661	95,647	17.7	16.7
Clark County	131,440	111,661	95,647	17.7	16.7
Springfield-Chicopee-Holyoke, Mass	478,592	413,494	371,972	15.7	11.2
Hampden County (part)	414,770	357,547	323,899	16.0	10.4
Chicopee city	61,553	49,211	41,664	25.1	18.1
Holyoke city	52,689	54,661	53,750	−3.6	1.7
Springfield city	174,463	162,399	149,554	7.4	8.6
Westfield city	26,302	20,962	18,793	25.5	11.5
Agawam town	15,718	10,166	7,842	54.6	29.6
East Longmeadow town	10,294	4,881	3,403	110.9	43.4
Longmeadow town	10,565	6,508	5,790	62.3	12.4
Ludlow town	13,805	8,660	8,181	59.4	5.9
Monson town	6,712	6,125	5,597	9.6	9.4
Palmer town	10,358	9,533	9,149	9.7	4.2
West Springfield town	24,924	20,438	17,135	21.9	19.3
Wilbraham town	7,387	4,003	3,041	84.5	31.6
Hampshire County (part)	60,439	52,541	44,542	15.0	18.0
Northampton city	30,058	29,063	24,794	3.4	17.2
Easthampton town	12,326	10,694	10,316	15.3	3.7
Hadley town	3,099	2,639	2,576	17.4	2.4
South Hadley town	14,956	10,145	6,856	47.4	48.0
Worcester County (part)	3,383	3,406	3,531	−0.7	−3.5
Warren town	3,383	3,406	3,531	−0.7	−3.5
Stamford, Conn	178,409	134,896	98,890	32.3	36.4
Fairfield County (part)	178,409	134,896	98,890	32.3	36.4
Stamford City	92,713	74,293	47,938	24.8	55.0
Darien town	18,437	11,767	9,222	56.7	27.6
Greenwich town	53,793	40,835	3,509	31.7	15.0
New Canaan town	13,466	8,001	6,221	68.3	28.6

TABLE 31.—*Population of standard metropolitan statistical areas and component areas in the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, 1940–60*—Continued

[Figures relate to areas as defined for 1960. Minus sign (−) denotes decrease. Percent not shown where less than 0.1]

Standard metropolitan statistical area	1960	1950	1940	Percent increase	
				1950 to 1960	1940 to 1950
Steubenville-Weirton, Ohio-W. Va	167,756	157,787	155,214	6.3	1.7
Jefferson County, Ohio	99,201	96,495	98,129	2.8	−1.7
Brooke County, W. Va	28,940	26,904	25,513	7.6	5.5
Hancock County, W. Va	39,615	34,388	31,572	15.2	8.9
Stockton, Calif	249,989	200,750	134,207	24.5	49.6
San Joaquin County	249,989	200,750	134,207	24.5	49.6
Syracuse, N.Y	563,781	465,114	405,981	12.2	14.6
Madison County	54,635	46,214	39,598	18.2	16.7
Onondaga County	423,028	341,719	295,108	23.8	15.8
Oswego County	86,118	77,181	71,275	11.6	8.3
Tacoma, Wash	321,590	275,876	182,081	16.6	51.5
Pierce County	321,590	275,876	182,081	16.6	51.5
Tampa-St. Petersburg, Fla	772,453	409,143	272,000	88.8	50.4
Hillsborough County	397,788	249,894	180,148	59.2	38.7
Pinellas County	374,665	159,249	91,852	135.3	73.4
Terre Haute, Ind	108,458	105,160	99,709	3.1	5.5
Vigo County	108,458	105,160	99,709	3.1	5.5
Texarkana, Tex.-Ark	91,657	94,580	82,082	−3.1	15.2
Bowie County, Tex	59,971	61,966	50,208	−3.2	23.4
Miller County, Ark	31,686	32,614	31,874	−2.8	2.3
Toledo, Ohio	456,931	395,551	344,333	15.5	14.9
Lucas County	456,931	395,551	344,333	15.5	14.9
Topeka, Kans	141,286	105,418	91,247	34.0	15.5
Shawnee County	141,286	105,418	91,247	34.0	15.5
Trenton, N.J	266,392	229,781	197,318	15.9	16.5
Mercer County	266,392	229,781	197,318	15.9	16.5
Tucson, Ariz	265,660	141,216	72,838	88.1	93.9
Pima County	265,660	141,216	72,838	88.1	93.9
Tulsa, Okla	418,974	327,900	290,368	27.8	12.9
Creek County	40,495	43,143	55,503	−6.1	−22.3
Osage County	32,441	33,071	41,502	−1.9	−20.3
Tulsa County	346,038	251,686	193,363	37.5	30.2
Tuscaloosa, Ala	109,047	94,092	76,036	15.9	23.7
Tuscaloosa County	109,047	94,092	76,036	15.9	23.7
Tyler, Tex	86,350	74,701	69,090	15.6	8.1
Smith County	86,350	74,701	69,090	15.6	8.1
Utica-Rome, N.Y	330,771	284,262	263,163	16.4	8.0
Herkimer County	66,370	61,407	59,527	8.1	3.2
Oneida County	264,401	222,855	203,636	18.6	9.4
Waco, Tex	150,091	130,194	101,898	15.3	27.8
McLennan County	150,091	130,194	101,898	15.3	27.8
Washington, D.C.-Md.-Va	2,001,897	1,464,089	967,985	36.7	51.3
Washington, D.C	763,956	802,178	663,091	−4.8	21.0
Alexandria City, Va	91,023	61,787	33,523	47.3	84.3
Falls Church City, Va	10,912	7,535	2,576	35.3	192.5
Arlington County, Va	163,401	135,449	57,040	20.6	137.5
Fairfax County, Va	275,002	98,557	38,353	179.0	157.0
Montgomery County, Md	340,928	164,401	83,912	107.4	95.9
Prince Georges County, Md	357,395	194,182	89,490	84.1	117.0
Waterbury, Conn	181,638	154,656	138,779	17.4	11.4
New Haven County (part)	160,951	139,061	125,754	15.7	10.6
Waterbury City	107,130	104,477	99,314	2.5	5.2
Naugatuck Borough	19,511	17,455	15,388	11.8	13.4
Beacon Falls town	2,886	2,067	1,756	39.6	17.7
Cheshire town	13,383	6,295	4,352	112.6	44.6
Middleburytown	4,785	3,318	2,173	44.2	52.7
Prospect town	4,367	1,896	1,006	130.3	88.5
Wolcott town	8,889	3,553	1,765	105.2	101.3
Litchfield County (part)	20,687	15,595	13,025	32.7	19.7
Thomaston town	5,850	4,896	4,238	19.5	15.5
Watertown town	14,837	10,699	8,787	38.7	21.8
Waterloo, Iowa	122,482	100,448	79,946	21.9	25.6
Black Hawk County	122,482	100,448	79,946	21.9	25.6
West Palm Beach, Fla	228,106	114,688	79,989	98.9	43.4
Palm Beach County	228,106	114,688	79,989	98.9	43.4
Wheeling, W. Va.- Ohio	190,342	196,305	208,918	−3.0	−6.0
Ohio County, W. Va	68,437	71,672	73,115	−4.5	−2.0
Marshall County, W. Va	38,041	36,893	40,189	3.1	−8.2
Belmont County, Ohio	83,864	87,740	95,614	−4.4	−8.2
Wichita, Kans	343,231	222,290	143,311	54.4	55.1
Sedgwick County	343,231	222,290	143,311	54.4	55.1
Wichita Falls, Tex	129,638	105,309	81,203	23.1	29.7
Archer County	6,110	6,816	7,599	−10.4	−10.3
Wichita County	123,528	98,493	73,604	25.4	33.8
Wilkes-Barre—Hazleton, Pa	346,972	392,241	441,518	−11.5	−11.2
Luzerne County	346,972	392,241	441,518	−11.5	−11.2
Wilmington, Del.-N.J	366,157	268,387	221,836	36.4	21.0
New Castle County, Del	307,446	218,879	179,562	40.5	21.9
Salem County, N.J	58,711	49,508	42,274	18.6	17.1
Winston-Salem, N.C	189,428	146,135	126,475	29.6	15.5
Forsyth County	189,428	146,135	126,475	29.6	15.5
Worcester, Mass	323,306	303,037	276,453	6.7	9.6
Worcester County (part)	323,306	303,037	276,453	6.7	9.6
Worcester City	186,587	203,486	193,694	−8.3	5.1
Auburn town	14,047	8,840	6,629	58.9	33.4
Berlin town	1,742	1,349	1,057	29.1	27.6
Boylston town	2,367	1,700	1,388	39.2	22.5
Brookfield town	1,751	1,567	1,393	11.7	12.5
East Brookfield town	1,533	1,243	1,016	23.3	22.3
Grafton town	10,627	8,281	7,457	28.3	11.1
Holden town	10,117	5,975	3,924	69.3	52.3
Leicester town	8,177	6,029	4,851	35.6	24.3
Millbury town	9,623	8,347	6,983	15.3	19.3
Northborough town	6,687	3,122	2,382	114.2	31.1
Northbridge town	10,800	10,476	10,242	3.1	2.3
North Brookfield town	3,616	3,444	3,304	5.0	4.2
Oxford town	9,282	5,851	4,623	58.6	26.6
Shrewsbury town	16,622	10,594	7,586	56.9	39.7
Spencer town	7,838	7,027	6,641	11.5	5.8
Sutton town	3,638	3,102	2,749	17.3	12.8
Upton town	3,127	2,656	2,249	17.7	18.1
Westborough town	9,599	7,378	6,463	30.1	14.2
West Boylston town	5,526	2,570	1,822	115.0	41.1
York, Pa	238,336	202,737	178,022	17.6	13.9
York County	238,336	202,737	178,022	17.6	13.9
Youngstown-Warren, Ohio	509,006	416,544	372,566	22.2	11.8
Mahoning County	300,480	257,629	240,251	16.6	7.2
Trumbull County	208,526	158,915	132,315	31.2	20.3
PUERTO RICO					
Mayagüez, P.R	83,850	87,307	76,487	−4.0	14.1
Mayagüez Municipio	83,850	87,307	76,487	−4.0	14.1
Ponce, P.R	145,586	126,810	105,116	14.8	20.6
Ponce Municipio	145,586	126,810	105,116	14.8	20.6
San Juan, P.R	588,805	465,741	302,765	26.4	53.8
San Juan Municipio	451,658	224,767	169,247	100.9	32.8
Cataño Municipio	25,208	19,865	9,719	26.9	104.4
Bayamón Municipio	72,221	48,000	37,190	50.5	29.1
Guaynabo Municipio	39,718	29,120	18,319	36.4	59.0

TABLE 32.—*Population of standard consolidated areas, 1940–60*

[Figures relate to areas as defined for 1960. Minus sign (−) denotes decrease]

Standard consolidated area	1960	1950	1940	Percent increase	
				1950–60	1940–50
New York-northeastern New Jersey	14,759,429	12,911,994	11,660,839	14.3	10.7
New York, N.Y., SMSA	10,694,633	9,555,943	8,706,917	11.9	9.8
Newark, N.J., SMSA	1,689,420	1,468,458	1,291,416	15.0	13.7
Jersey City, N.J., SMSA	610,734	647,437	652,040	−5.7	−.7
Paterson-Clifton-Passaic, N.J., SMSA	1,186,873	876,232	718,999	35.5	21.9
Middlesex County, N.J	433,856	264,872	217,077	63.8	22.0
Somerset County, N.J	143,913	99,052	74,390	45.3	33.2
Chicago-northwestern Indiana	6,794,461	5,586,096	4,890,674	21.6	14.2
Chicago, Ill., SMSA	6,220,913	5,177,868	4,569,643	20.1	13.3
Gary-Hammond-East Chicago, Ind., SMSA	573,548	408,228	321,031	40.5	27.2

Mr. Speaker, included therein for metro statistical planning, as a condition for getting any Federal money under any of the ongoing, existing grant-in-aid programs that I just read, included therein are a number of counties in the State of Florida, as well as a combination of cities, Tampa and St. Petersburg, which are specifically included and for which joint metro planning is required—for all of Hillsboro and Pinellas Counties combined.

Mr. Speaker, that means planning all of these things together, jointly, under a metro government, for all such standard metropolitan statistical areas in order to continue to obtain Federal grants or to obtain any money under any of the present programs which I have just mentioned.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what right in the world has the Federal Government in requiring Tampa to plan with St. Pete insofar as sewage treatment programs are concerned, or libraries, or many other programs covered under this legislation? These cities are about 20 miles apart and have differently constituted local governments and no legislative authority for conforming to Federal demands.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if you want to get in a battle with the rights of local governments in the State of Florida, and the people that do not want metro government, this is one way to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the Members of the House realize that all of these grant programs are going to be in jeopardy, unless they conform to metro planning, thus acquiescing in the heavy-handed bureaucratic pressure of the Federal Government over existing programs.

Mr. Speaker, what is at stake is not only the primary and secondary highways, but the interstate money—$4 billion a year—which was authorized just a few months ago for these highway programs for the years in the future—$3.4 billion was authorized just the other day by this House, and rightly so, for sewage treatment plant construction. Now, these programs are to be jeopardized in the name of master planning required by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, what business is it of the Federal Government to require the planners for the cities of Tampa, Fla., and of St. Petersburg that they can or cannot build a sewage treatment plant because such metro planners are required by this section.

It is none of the Federal Government's business, and I will guarantee you that the people of the congressional district which it is my honor to represent would say so, if they had a right to vote on the matter.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the many problems involved with metro government planning on a standard metropolitan statistical area as required by this section.

Mr. Speaker, this joint metro area planning includes the county in Texas in which the city of El Paso is located. It includes the entire county in Texas in which the city of Houston is located. It includes the entire county in Texas in which the city of Dallas is located. It includes the entire county in Texas in which the city of Fort Worth is located.

Mr. Speaker, areawide planning under penalty of losing all Federal funds is a dangerous thing.

Mr. Speaker, under section 204, metro planning includes two States and the District of Columbia in this area, and this area as an area, is going to have to plan everything—libraries, sewage-treatment plants—on the areawide, metrogovernment basis. And, of course, these metro areas, and how these areas are set up, are subject to the whims of Dr. Weaver's guidelines, and he can exercise any discretion which he chooses to exercise with respect to these matters.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you and to the Members of the House that this is a dangerous thing, a very dangerous thing.

How did it get into this bill? The administration did not recommend it. It got in this bill because a Member of the other body, Senator MUSKIE, demanded it be put in. It was put in. It was not fully understood or considered, and the House committee swallowed it lock, stock, and barrel. This is another reason why this bill should be killed and the conference report voted down.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that this conference report should be defeated. I wish it could have been recommitted.

The conference report adopts a position which is completely at variance with the position the House adopted when the bill was passed by this body. It is a sellout to the Senate, and I think that it is something which all the Members of the House should resent. They should show their resentment by voting down the conference report.

On October 14——

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. No; I cannot yield. I have only 3 minutes.

On October 14 my colleague [Mr. BROCK] offered an amendment to the demonstration cities bill which would place an income ceiling of $7,500 on families eligible for admission for the FHA section 221(d)(3) below market interest rate program. This amendment was rejected by the House, but later an amendment for $10,000 was offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON], which was adopted.

I was most dismayed to discover that the conferees on this bill rejected the $10,000 income ceiling for families eligible to obtain housing with a subsidized 3 percent interest rate mortgage obtained from the U.S. Treasury.

This leaves the state of the law about like this: There is no ceiling whatsoever in the law as to eligibility of families to participate under this program. There is a ceiling in the regulations, but they can be changed at any time. This represents another instance in which the majority have surrendered powers reserved to the prerogative of the Congress to the executive department.

I am sure that many Members of the House have in their constituencies families whose incomes are $6,000 and $7,000 who are ready, willing, and able to go their own way to provide shelter for their families without subsidy from the Federal Government. Yet, here we subsidize families with incomes much higher—and without any ceiling in the law.

Reflect for one moment on this anomalous situation. The Federal National Mortgage Association has been authorized to draw $1.8 billion from the Treasury to buy mortgages with a 3-percent interest rate in order to subsidize the rents of families whose incomes are far beyond the median and average incomes of American families. Yet when the Congress recently authorized the Federal National Mortgage Association to spend $1 billion to buy mortgages at a market rate of 6 percent interest plus a mortgage insurance premium the administration impounded this $1 billion because it was inflationary.

I cannot dismiss lightly the apparent preoccupation of this administration, and the majority of the Members of the House of this Congress, in perpetuating and expanding a subsidy program for upper middle income families. Can this Nation afford to have its burgeoning middle class dependent on the Federal Government for its shelter? Do the middle-class families want to be dependent on the Federal Government for shelter? The answer is "No, they do not." It is equally obvious that the Federal Government cannot afford to have them be dependent.

I hope that when the Congress reconvenes next year that both the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Banking and Currency will reconsider their apparent espousal of this 3-percent middle-income subsidy program, and terminate the program. When a subsidy program has taken such a hold on Members of the Congress then truly I fear for this great Republic.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, to close the debate, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out to both sides of the aisle that in the conference we had approximately 50 differences to settle and we yielded on 15 points.

There were some points there that were talked about informally, on the basis that some of the amendments might be considered by both sides and not be considered favorably.

But because of the very fine representation of the minority, we were able to hold most of the minority's amendments in the conference report.

I am very happy I am able to say here this afternoon that the minority leader in the housing subcommittee has said that he does not altogether agree with the conference report but that he will support it. This is the most important thing—he will support it just as I will support it. Because it helps the people who are in dire need. It helps those blighted areas and slum areas to be rehabilitated. It helps that person who is in dire need and gives him consideration from a human standpoint and gives him an opportunity to live in a decent environment.

There are no differences here this afternoon that we did not have on the day that we debated this bill.

On our left here on the minority side of the House, you heard the same speakers saying the identical same thing. If anything, here today, you are hearing a repetition. Of course, I do not say you are not hearing a repetition from our side. We are repetitious too. We are telling you exactly what we told you on the date we debated this bill.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. It helps the communities. As I said the other day, not only does it help the communities that need this help, but it helps the taxpayers as well. Because in the demonstration cities program they say, "all available Federal aid" will be pooled and on this amount that they pool they will get 80 percent of the local share for that demonstration city project.

It will make, as I pointed out before, multiple watchdogs for these dollars that are being spent by the Federal Government.

It will be a multiple watchdog observation tower from which people can see how the Federal contributions and the local contributions are being spent.

Mr. Speaker, we are now near the end of a long, hard fight to enact the President's demonstration cities bill. Last year when I addressed my colleagues on the conference report on the great Housing Act of 1965, I said it was one of the proudest moments of my life and certainly today is an occasion of equal, if not greater, satisfaction to me personally. I want to express my gratitude to the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], to the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL], and to all members of the Housing Subcommittee and the full committee, as well. For 10 long months, we have labored with this great bill.

I have not begrudged 1 minute of the hundreds of hours spent on this bill because I know that it is a bill which our cities, both large and small, must have. I think we have devised a new weapon with the greatest potential to help our cities rejuvenate and rebuild their blighted and rundown areas, both in terms of physical rehabilitation and social and human rehabilitation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this conference report is voted overwhelmingly because it is in the best interests of the people of this country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] if he would yield me some time.

Mr. PATMAN. We have yielded more than the 30 minutes to the minority. We had our program arranged just as the minority did. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT] was closing the debate and he has closed the debate.

I must, therefore, respectfully refuse to yield any more time.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, that is rather unusual, under the circumstances, because time is precious and, of course, we would like to have a couple of minutes. But if that is the gentleman's attitude, we will forget about it.

Mr. PATMAN. We have people on this side who want to talk too. I do not believe the Speaker would recognize me to extend the time, and if we cannot get the time, I would have to move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas has control of time.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, some very pertinent information has been given to the membership this morning as to what took place in the conference on this bill. In view of these facts alone, I, like other Members, not only on this side of the aisle but on the other side of the aisle as well, feel very strongly that this conference report should be defeated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I would like to ask the committee two questions: How much is this legislation going to cost? Ten or fifteen years from now how much will it cost? Second, I would like to ask about the business of selecting some cities and leaving other cities alone.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee to answer the question.

Mr. BROCK. In answer to the question of the gentleman from Oklahoma, we tried diligently to get an estimate of the cost of the program, and they admitted their total incapacity to come up with any reasonable figure whatsoever.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The second part of the question is this: Is it part of the program to help some cities and leave other cities alone?

Mr. BROCK. I think the gentleman from Oklahoma clearly understands the situation. That is one of the reasons why the conference report should be rejected.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. The gentleman from Illinois has had long service on the Armed Services Committee. He realizes that the conference committee took out a provision for housing aid for men in uniform, and at the same time approved a housing rent subsidy for civilians with incomes ranging up to nearly $15,000. Do you think that is fair?

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman for again bringing this all-important fact to the attention of the House. Those of us, on both sides of the aisle, on the Armed Services Committee, have repeatedly called to the attention of Secretary McNamara that while servicemen's housing is being denied we go merrily on providing more and more housing to civilians with ever-increasing annual incomes. Men in service are being denied adequate housing. Sometime back many were being housed in tents in various parts of the country because of the lack of housing. Yet at this very time we see this provision for more civilian housing taking place as reported in the conference report. It is wrong, as wrong as it can be.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes. A question has been asked about the cost of the program. In the first year $12 million for planning and in the second $12 million; and $400 million in funds for the demonstration projects themselves for the first year and $500 million for the second year. That is all, except for $250 million for urban renewal in the demonstration projects. But the overall cost of this bill will certainly be less than $1.5 billion, a very small, insignificant cost in comparison to the great need that it will serve.

In connection with the conference, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] and I have talked about this matter. I told him I would try to put it over to Wednesday, because that would suit him better. But Monday morning I was told from the other body that we had to have a conference before Tuesday noon, an agreement, or they would not agree to have any bill this year. There was considerable sentiment at the other end of the Capitol for no bill at all. Therefore I agreed we would have an informal conference Monday morning.

I got hold of all members who were here, majority and minority, and informed the minority members' staff, with the understanding that there would be no decisions made until the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] was contacted and apprised of the situation, so he could come back here if he wanted to. We did not do anything that was substantive on Monday, but on Tuesday we did have a conference of all the members, and we agreed on everything. I thought all the members were in agreement with it, because we had to yield on some points and I thought by yielding we would get their support. We did not get it.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has, in its waning moments, the rare opportunity to help move our country smoothly from one great era into another. The 89th Congress has brought to fruition in the 1960's the last of the dreams for a better America born in the 1930's. But we would be remiss, as legislators, if we merely contented ourselves with presiding over the twilight of a revolutionary age, while an even more dynamic epoch was already swiftly underway.

Today, 7 out of 10 Americans live in cities. Tomorrow, four out of five will reside in urban areas. At the same time, nearly twice as many people will be living in the cities and suburbs; and many more schools, houses, health, transportation and other community facilities will be needed. Action is required now, to insure adequate services in tomorrow's heavily populated, heavily urbanized, highly mobilized society.

During the past three decades, special agencies and specific legislation have been created to meet certain problems, such as housing, urban renewal, and mass transportation. These measures were as successful as possible under their limitations. The demonstration cities bill broadens the scope of these efforts into single, coordinated programs embracing entire communities.

As Robert C. Weaver, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, pointed out:

> This bill will help cities to plan, develop and carry out comprehensive city demonstration programs.

These projects, which will be devised at the local level, will restore or rebuild whole sections and neighborhoods of slum and blighted areas, while simultaneously ministering to the human needs of the people in the areas under rehabilitation.

While vast Federal programs have attacked the growing problem of urbanization, they have not been able to eradicate all of the ills of the modern city: poor housing, rundown neighborhoods, congestion, inadequate public services, rising costs, social decay, and economic decline.

From these conditions are festered racial discrimination, employment frustration, hostility, hopelessness, and ugly environment—all of which could be transformed through demonstration cities into something better—a climate of hope, attractive community buildings, adequate transportation systems, and open spaces free from pollution.

The demonstration cities bill is no panacea. Federal housing and urban renewal programs did not provide adequate housing for every American family, the new Department of Transportation will not immediately solve our myriad travel problems, and this bill will not build a network of utopias in this country. But it will be a beginning; it will gradually make life more livable in cities; and most importantly, it will show us where we are wrong, and how we can best guarantee the best life possible in the coming decades. As President Johnson has said:

> The prize cities of spacious beauty and lively promise—where men are truly free to determine how they will live—is too rich to be lost because the problems are complex.

A national assault on urban problems will be complex, but the price of inaction is too high: the rising cost of welfare services; crime; unemployment; declining property values; tax bases which put heavy strains on city budgets, all of which haunt all governments, and which will continue to plague them—whether local, State, or Federal—in the future. But we can avert disaster by moving quickly now to heal and revitalize our cities.

We owe it to today's budding generation. We cannot, in all conscience, leave them a heritage of chaos. We must lay a groundwork from which our heirs in the next 30 years will be able to cope with the problems peculiar to their time, just as farsighted Congresses in the last three decades spread out a base on which we built our present society.

Simply stated, our existing urban centers, however revitalized, cannot accommodate all the urban Americans of the next generation, but this great country has the resources with which to accommodate these areas, as much as we are moved to do so. To do less would be to deny faith in man's good will and the ability to redeem his cities.

President Johnson said at the conclusion of his message to Congress on city demonstration programs:

> If we begin now the planning from which action will flow, the hopes of the 20th century will become the realities of the 21st.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the Congress adopt the Demonstration Cities Act of 1966.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this conference report because I am opposed to the entire premise of the demonstrations cities provisions within this bill and no amount of conferences nor amendments could make of this proposal an acceptable one.

It is obvious that the administration sent this bill to the Congress many months ago prior to the recognition that we are in an overheated economy and that there is dire need for conserving our resources.

It has only been within recent weeks that the President has conferred with Governors of the several States and with mayors of the cities within those States exhorting them to slow down on their capital expenditures in order to cool off this so-called overheated economy and to ease their sales of bonds for these capital expenditures which entail additional demands upon an already tight money market.

It is inconceivable to me, in view of these facts, that the pressure should be retained for the enactment of this bill.

A careful analysis of those who are sponsoring and demanding this bill proves conclusively that this pressure comes from the older eastern and midwestern metropolis where, by their own profligacy they have painted themselves into this corner where their own taxpayers can no longer pay the cost of these past mistakes, and they are asking that the taxpayers of the Nation bail them out of their present predicament.

I hope that this great body will recognize these facts and vote not to agree with the conference report and thus kill this bad legislation for at least the 89th Congress.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 142, nays 126, answered "present" 4, not voting 160, as follows:

[Roll No. 389]

YEAS—142

Addabbo
Annunzio
Ashley
Bandstra
Barrett
Beckworth
Bingham
Boggs
Boland
Brademas
Brooks
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cameron
Carey
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Conyers
Corbett
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Dulski
Edwards, Calif.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Flood
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Pa.
Grider
Griffiths
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hardy
Hathaway
Hays
Hechler
Holland
Horton
Joelson
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
Kluczynski
Krebs
Kupferman
Long, Md.
Love
McDade
McDowell
Macdonald
Machen
Madden
Minish
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morrison
Morse
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Price
Pucinski
Race
Redlin
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schweiker
Sickles
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Staggers
Stalbaum
Tenzer
Thomas
Tupper
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waldie
Weltner
Widnall
Wolff
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—126

Abbitt
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Bates
Battin
Bell
Bennett
Betts
Bolton
Bow
Brock
Broomfield
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Casey
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Collier
Conable
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Erlenborn
Everett
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Gathings
Goodell
Green, Oreg.
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Henderson
Herlong
Hosmer
Hull
Hutchinson
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Kunkel
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McClory
McCulloch
MacGregor
Mahon
Marsh
May
Mills
Minshall
Mize
Moore
Morris
Natcher
Nelsen
Passman
Pelly
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rumsfeld
Satterfield

Saylor
Schneebeli
Secrest
Selden
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stubblefield
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tuck
Utt
Waggonner
Watson
Whalley
White, Tex.
Whitten
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wyatt
Wydler
Younger

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4

Conte
Leggett
Mathias
Mosher

NOT VOTING—160

Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Glenn
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Belcher
Berry
Blatnik
Bolling
Bray
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Callaway
Carter
Cederberg
Clawson, Del
Clevenger
Cohelan
Colmer
Cooley
Corman
Craley
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Duncan, Oreg.
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gettys
Gilligan
Greigg
Gross
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Hébert
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Howard
Hungate
Huot
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jones, N.C.
Keith
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kornegay
Laird
McCarthy
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Mackay
Mackie
Mailliard
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Matthews
Meeds
Michel
Miller
Mink
Moeller
Morton
Moss
Murray
Nix
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
O'Neal, Ga.
Pool
Powell
Purcell
Randall
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rivers, S.C.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roncalio
Roudebush
Roush
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Scott
Senner
Shipley
Sisk
Smith, N.Y.
Stafford
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Toll
Trimble
Tunney
Tuten
Ullman
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watts
White, Idaho
Whitener
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Yates

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Mathias for, with Mr. Belcher against.

Mr. Moss for, with Mr. Leggett against.

Mr. Mosher for, with Mr. Morton against.

Mr. Conte for, with Mr. Michel against.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Denton for, with Mr. Edmondson against.

Mr. Helstoski for, with Mr. Kornegay against.

Mr. Mackay for, with Mr. Whitener against.

Mr. Cohelan for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee for, with Mr. Abernethy against.

Mr. Matsunaga for, with Mr. Colmer against.

Mr. Mackie for, with Mr. Cooley against.

Mr. Fogarty for, with Mr. Steed against.

Mr. Howard for, with Mr. Hall against.

Mr. Trimble for, with Mr. Moeller against.

Mr. Olsen of Montana for, with Mr. Hicks against.

Mr. Ullman for, with Mr. Schisler against.

Mr. Craley for, with Mr. Foley against.

Mr. Jacobs for, with Mr. Hagan of Georgia against.

Mr. Gilligan for, with Mr. Baring against.

Mr. Feighan for, with Mr. Shipley against.

Mr. White of Idaho for, with Mr. Fuqua against.

Mr. Aspinall for, with Mr. Stephens against.

Mr. Corman for, with Mr. Schmidhauser against.

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Rogers of Florida against.

Mr. King of California for, with Mr. Reinecke against.

Mr. Evans of Colorado for, with Mr. Roudebush against.

Mr. Miller for, with Mr. Duncan of Oregon against.

Mrs. Sullivan for, with Mr. Laird against.

Mr. Adams for, with Mr. Halleck against.

Mr. Blatnik for, with Mr. Fino against.

Mr. Brown of California for, with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin against.

Mr. Clevenger for, with Mr. Ayres against.

Mr. McFall for, with Mr. Berry against.

Mr. McVicker for, with Mr. Findley against.

Mr. Dyal for, with Mr. Jones of North Carolina against.

Mr. Hawkins for, with Mr. Fisher against.

Mr. Senner for, with Mr. O'Neal of Georgia against.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana for, with Mr. Wright against.

Mr. Yates for, with Mr. Roush against.

Mr. Sisk for, with Mr. Ichord against.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee for, with Mr. Randall against.

Mr. Hanna for, with Mr. Rivers of South Carolina against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Roberts against.

Mr. Resnick for, with Mr. Tunney against.

Mr. Rivers of Alaska for, with Mr. Watts against.

Mr. Hansen of Iowa for, with Mr. Walker of New Mexico against.

Mr. Nix for, with Mr. Scott against.

Mr. Meeds for, with Mr. King of New York against.

Mrs. Mink for, with Mr. Sweeney against.

Mr. King of Utah for, with Mr. Adair against.

Mr. Hungate for, with Mr. Stanton against.

Mr. Huot for, with Mr. Talcott against.

Mr. Irwin for, with Mr. McEwen against.

Mr. McCarthy for, with Mr. Martin of Nebraska against.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington for, with Mr. Devine against.

Mr. Stratton for, with Mr. Derwinski against.

William D. Ford for, with Mr. Del Clawson against.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson for, with Mr. Cederberg against.

Mr. Matthews for, with Mr. Robison against.

Mr. Reuss for, with Mr. Carter against.

Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Hansen of Idaho against.

Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin against.

Mr. Keith for, with Mr. Mailliard against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Dickinson.

Mr. Albert with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.

Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Glenn Andrews.

Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.

Mr. Tuten with Mr. Bray.

Mr. Todd with Mr. Brown of Ohio.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Callaway.

Mr. Pool with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.

Mr. Purcell with Mr. Watkins.

Mr. Greigg with Mr. Stafford.

Mr. Roncalio with Mr. Smith of New York.

Mr. Murray with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Martin of Massachusetts with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] who if he were present would have voted "yea." I vote "nay" therefore I withdraw my vote "nay" and vote "present."

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER]. If he were here, he would vote "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON]. If he was here, he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote "yea" and vote "present."

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL]. If he were here, he would vote "nay." I voted "yea." Therefore, I withdraw my vote "yea" and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill H.R. 14745, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE WITH RESPECT TO SCOPE OF FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill S. 3254, to amend section 2072 and 2112 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the scope of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and to repeal inconsistent legislation, together with committee amendments which are technical, and ask for its immediate consideration. The bill was on the Consent Calendar and was objected to. The objector has now removed his objection.

The bill was read by title.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. **MOORE**. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, in light of my actions yesterday in respect to the unanimous-consent requests that were made in the House with respect to Senate bills or House bills with Senate amendments thereto, and the explanation that I gave to the House respecting the reasoning behind my numerous objection, I am pleased to announce to the House that the matters which I considered in difference between this body and the other body in the field of private legislation, specifically covering 37 private legislation bills, have been resolved. This is to advise the Members of the House that the white flag is now flying in the other body.

I have been advised by the majority leader of the other body that the Senate will act tomorrow on the 37 House bills the rescue of which was the object of my actions.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the House bills and the authors identified thereby, which were being summarily held up in the other body, there were some 13 bills of Members on this side of the aisle and some 24 bills of Members on the other side of the aisle. Bills introduced by Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. MCCORMACK, the Speaker, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. FULTON, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. WELTNER, Mr. GRIDER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. POLANCO-ABREU, Mr. CONTE, Mr. MOORE, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. POFF, and Mr. CRAMER among others were being dealt with unfairly in the other body.

I felt, in the interest of fair play and the interest of seeing to it that the other body kept its agreement which its conferees had made wtih the House conferees on another subject respecting these bills, that it was necessary that I for a moment display the power of a single Member of the House actually has in order to put the full burden upon the other body and bring to the attention of the Members of the House that their bills were not being dealt with fairly by the other body.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 3254

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the catchline and first paragraph of section 2072 of title 28 of the United States Code are amended so as to read as follows:

"§ 2072. Rules of civil procedure

"The Supreme Court shall have the power to prescribe by general rules, the forms of process, writs, pleadings, and motions, and the practice and procedure of the district courts and courts of appeals of the United States in civil actions, including admiralty and maritime cases, and appeals therein, and the practice and procedure in proceedings for the review by the courts of appeals of decisions of the Tax Court of the United States and for the judicial review or enforcement of orders of administrative agencies, boards, commissions, and officers."

SEC. 2. Sections 2073 and 2074 of title 28 of the United States Code are repealed, but their repeal shall not operate to invalidate or repeal rules adopted under the authority of one of those sections prior to the enactment of this Act, which rules shall remain in effect until superseded by rules prescribed under the authority of section 2072 of title 28 of the United States Code as amended by this Act.

SEC. 3. Item 2072 in the analysis of chapter 131 of title 28 of the United States Code, appearing immediately preceding section 2071 thereof, is amended so as to read as follows:

"Sec. 2072. Rules of civil procedure.",

and items 2073 and 2074 are stricken from such analysis.

SEC. 4. Section 11 of the Act of December 29, 1950 (ch. 1189, 64 Stat. 1132; 5 U.S.C. 1041), is repealed, but its repeal shall not operate to invalidate or repeal rules adopted under the authority of that section prior to the enactment of this Act, which rules shall remain in effect until superseded by rules prescribed under the authority of section 2072 of title 28 of the United States Code as amended by this Act.

SEC. 5. (a) The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 2112 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows: "The rules prescribed under the authority of section 2072 of this title may provide for the time and manner of filing and the contents of the record in all proceedings instituted in the courts of appeals to enjoin, set aside, suspend, modify, or otherwise review or enforce orders of administrative agencies, boards, commissions, and officers."

(b) The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 2112 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by striking out the phrase "the said rules of the court of appeals" and striking out the phrase "the rules of such court" and inserting in lieu of each of such phrases the phrase "the rules prescribed under the authority of section 2072 of this title".

(c) The amendments of section 2112 of title 28 of the United States Code made by this Act shall not operate to invalidate or repeal rules adopted under the authority of that section prior to the enactment of this Act, which rules shall remain in effect until superseded by rules prescribed under the authority of section 2072 of title 28 of the United States Code as amended by this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 19, strike out "Section 11 of the Act of December 29, 1950 (ch. 1189, 64 Stat. 1132; 5 U.S.C. 1041), is" and insert in lieu thereof "Section 2352 of title 28 of the United States Code and item 2352 in the analysis of chapter 158 of title 28 of the United States Code, are".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAMUEL C. NEIBURG

Mr. **CELLER**. Mr. Speaker, in view of the breaking of the logjam, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1661) for the relief of Samuel C. Neiburg.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 1661

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Samuel C. Neiburg, of Saint Albans, Vermont, the sum of $4,150.96, in full settlement of all his claims against the United States for compensation for the overtime hours he performed as a member of the customs patrol of the Department of the Treasury, during the period from September 28, 1931, through August 31, 1938, while he was serving as a United States customs inspector at the Alburg, Vermont, office: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1966—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. **PERKINS**. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 15111) to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. **PERKINS**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the statement of the managers on the part of the House be dispensed with, inasmuch as the conference report and statement have been printed in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

Conference Report (H. Rept. No. 2298)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15111) to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966'.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"Sec. 2. (a) For purposes of carrying out the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (other than part C of title I thereof) there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the sum of—

"(1) $696,000,000 for carrying out title I,

"(2) $846,000,000 for carrying out title II,

"(3) $57,000,000 for carrying out title III,

"(4) $5,000,000 for carrying out section 402(b),

"(5) $100,000,000 for carrying out title V,

"(6) $15,000,000 for carrying out title VI,

"(7) $31,000,000 for carrying out title VIII.

"(b)(1) Of the sums available for carrying out title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (other than part C thereof) in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $211,000,000 is authorized for carrying out part A thereof, $410,000,000 is authorized for carrying out part B thereof, and $75,000,000 is authorized for carrying out part D thereof.

"(2) Of the sums available for carrying out title II of such Act in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $36,500,000 is authorized for carrying out section 205(d); $36,500,000 is authorized for carrying out section 205(e); $8,000,000 is authorized for carrying out section 206(b); $352,000,000 is authorized for carrying out section 211–1(a); $22,000,000 is authorized for carrying out section 211–1(b); $61,000,000 is authorized for carrying out section 211–2; $7,000,000 is authorized for carrying out section 211–3; $323,000,000 is authorized for carrying out programs for which authorizations are not provided in the preceding clauses of this paragraph.

"TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE I OF THE ACT

"Job Corps—Studies to be property of United States

"Sec. 101. (a) Section 103(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act') is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: ': *Provided*, That such agreements shall provide that all studies, evaluations, proposals, and data produced or developed with Federal funds in the course of the operation of any conservation camp or training center shall become the property of the United States'.

"(b) Section 103(b) of the Act is amended by striking out 'with reduced federal expenditures' and inserting in lieu thereof 'at comparable costs'.

"Job Corps—High school equivalency certificates

"Sec. 102. Section 103(b) of the Act is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: ': *Provided*, That such arrangements for education and training of enrollees in the Corps shall, to the extent feasible, provide opportunities for qualified enrollees to obtain education or training necessary to qualify them for the equivalent of a certificate of graduation from high school;'

"Job Corps—Number of women in the Corps

"Sec. 103. Section 104 of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

" '(e) The Director shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that, on or before July 1, 1967, the number of women in residence, and receiving training, at Job Corps conservation camps and training centers is not less than 23 per centum of the total number of enrollees in the Job Corps.'

"Job Corps—Maximum capacity of Job Corps camps and centers

"Sec. 104. Section 104 of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof (after the subsection added by section 103) the following:

" '(f) The Director shall not use any funds made available to carry out this part for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, in such a manner as to increase the capacity of conservation camps and training centers of the Job Corps above the capacity of 45,000 enrollees in such camps and centers.'

"Job Corps—Maximum permissible cost per enrollee in centers

"Sec. 105. Section 104 of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof (after the subsection added by section 104) the following:

" '(g) The Director shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that for any fiscal year the direct operating costs of Job Corps camps and centers which have been in operation for more than nine months do not exceed $7,500 per enrollee in such camps and centers.'

"Job Corps—Community activity

"Sec. 106. Section 104 of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof (after the subsection added by section 105) the following:

" '(h) Job Corps officials shall, whenever possible, stimulate formation of indigenous community activity in areas surrounding Job Corps camps and centers to provide a friendly and adequate reception of enrollees into community life.'

"Job Corps—Enrollee assignment

"Sec. 107. Section 104 of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof (after the subsection added by section 106) the following:

" '(i) Whenever there is a vacancy in a Job Corps camp or center in the region in which an enrollee resides which is an appropriate camp or center to meet the needs of the enrollee as determined by the Director, such enrollee shall be assigned to such camp or center. If no such vacancy exists, the enrollee shall be assigned to the Job Corps camp or center offering programs and activities appropriate to meet the needs of the enrollee as determined by the Director, which is nearest to the residence of such enrollee.'

"Job Corps—Follow-up information

"Sec. 108. Section 104 of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof (after the subsection added by section 107) the following:

" '(j) The Director shall to the maximum extent feasible assure that each enrollee who successfully completes enrollment in the Corps furnishes to him six months and eighteen months after such completed enrollment the following information:

" '(1) The place of residence of such enrollee;

" '(2) The employment status of such enrollee;

" '(3) The compensation received by such enrollee in his current job and the compensation received by him in the job, if any, immediately preceding his current job; and

" '(4) Such other relevant information determined by the Director to be necessary for an effective follow-up.'

"Job Corps—Application of Federal Employees' Compensation Act

"Sec. 109. Section 106(c)(2)(B) of the Act is amended by striking out '$150, except that with respect to compensation for disability accruing after the individual concerned reaches the age of twenty-one, such monthly pay shall be deemed to be'.

"Job Corps—Standards of conduct

"Sec. 110. Part A of title I of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

" 'Standards of conduct

" 'Sec. 111. (a) Within Job Corps camps and centers, standards of conduct and deportment shall be provided and stringently enforced. In the case of violations committed by enrollees, dismissals from the Corps or transfers to other locations shall be made in every instance where it is determined that retention in the Corps, or in the particular Job Corps camp or center, will jeopardize the enforcement of such standards of conduct and deportment or diminish the opportunity of other enrollees.

" '(b) In order to promote the proper moral and disciplinary conditions in Job Corps conservation camps and training centers, the individual directors of Job Corps camps and centers shall be given full authority to take appropriate disciplinary measures against enrollees including, but not limited to, dismissal from the Job Corps, subject to expeditious appeal procedures to higher authority, as provided under regulation set by the Director.

" '(c) The Director shall establish appropriate procedures to insure that the transfer of Job Corps enrollees from State or local jurisdiction shall in no way violate parole or probationary procedures of the State. In the event procedures have been established under which the enrollment of a youth subject to parole or probationary jurisdiction is acceptable to appropriate State authorities, the Director shall make provisions for regular supervision of the enrollee and for reports to such State authorities to conform with the appropriate parole and probationary requirements in such State.'

"Job Corps—Experimental and demonstration projects

"Sec. 111. Part A of title I of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

" 'Experimental and demonstration projects

" 'Sec. 111–1. The Director shall arrange, through grants or contracts, for the carrying out of experimental and demonstration projects of which not to exceed four may involve the construction of new camps or centers) providing youth employment and training on a combined residential and nonresidential basis. Such projects may involve the use of resources or authority under both this part and part B of this title, pursuant to agreements with the Secretary of Labor where funds under part B of this title are so used, and the Director is authorized to waive any provision of such parts which he finds would prevent the carrying out of elements of such projects essential to a determination and demonstration of their feasibility and usefulness. The Director shall report to the Congress a full description of actions taken and progress made under this section no later than March 1, 1968.'

"Work training programs—Revision of the program

"Sec. 112. (a) Sections 111, 112, and 113 of Part B of title I of the Act are amended to read as follows:

" 'Neighborhood Youth Corps

" 'Sec. 112. (a) The Director shall formulate and carry out—

" '(1) programs to provide part-time employment, on-the-job training, and useful work experience for students from low-income families who are in the ninth through twelfth grades of school (or are of an age equivalent to that of students in such grades) who are in need of the earnings to permit them to resume or maintain attendance in school, and

" '(2) programs to provide unemployed individuals useful work experience and on-the-job training, combined where needed with educational and training assistance, including basic literacy and occupational training designed to assist the individuals to develop their maximum occupational potential. Enrollment shall be limited to individuals aged sixteen through twenty-one years.

" '(b) In determining for purposes of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) whether a student is from a low-income family, the Director shall consider a student to be from such a family if the family receives cash welfare payments.

" 'Financial assistance

" 'Sec. 113. (a) The Director is authorized to enter into agreements providing for the payment by him of part or all of the cost of a program submitted under section 112 if he determines, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, that—

" '(1) enrollees will be employed either (A) on publicly owned and operated facilities or projects, or (B) on local projects sponsored by private organizations;

" '(2) no enrollees will be employed on projects involving political parties, or the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship;

" '(3) the program will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services; and

" '(4) the rates of pay for time spent in work, training or education and other conditions of employment will be appropriate and reasonable in the light of such factors as the type of work performed, geographical region, and proficiency of the employee.

" '(b) In approving on-the-job training projects with other than public or private nonprofit organizations, the Director is authorized to enter into agreements to pay reasonable training costs but not wages paid to enrollees for services performed.

" '(c) In approving projects under this part, the Director shall give priority to projects with high training potential and high potential for contributing to the upward mobility of the trainee.'

"(b) Section 114(a) of the Act is amended by striking out 'Participation' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Enrollment' and by striking out 'who have attained age sixteen but have not attained age twenty-two,'.

"(c) Section 114(c) of the Act is amended by striking out 'nonprofit'.

"(d) Section 115 of the Act is amended by striking out 'paid for the period ending three years after the date of enactment of this Act' and by striking out 'and such assistance paid for periods thereafter shall not exceed 50 per centum of such costs,'.

"Special impact programs

"Sec. 113. Title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by—

"(1) striking out the heading of such title and inserting in lieu thereof: 'TITLE I—WORK TRAINING AND WORK-STUDY PROGRAMS'; and

"(2) Inserting the following new part immediately following part C:

" 'PART D—SPECIAL IMPACT PROGRAMS

" 'Establishment of programs

" 'Sec. 131. (a) The purpose of this part is to establish special programs which (1) are directed to the solution of the critical problems existing in particular communities and neighborhoods (defined without regard to political or other subdivisions or boundaries) within those urban areas of the Nation having, in the judgment of the Director, especially large concentrations of low-income persons; (2) are of sufficient size and scope to have an appreciable impact in such communities and neighborhoods in arresting tendencies toward dependency, chronic unemployment, and rising community tensions; and (3), where feasible and appropriate, are part of a citywide plan for the reorganization of local or State agencies in order to coordinate effectively all relevant programs of social development.

" '(b) In order to carry out the purposes of this part, the Director is authorized to make grants to public or private nonprofit organizations, or to enter into contracts with other private organizations, for the payment of all or part of the cost of programs described in sections 205 (d) and (e) of this Act. The Director shall assure that the work training and employment opportunities created under these special programs are filled by the residents of the communities or neighborhoods served, and that the activities pursued are carried out in the communities and neighborhoods described in subsection (a). For the purposes of this section, the Director may include youths aged sixteen to twenty-one who are unemployed, underemployed, or below the poverty level as established for the programs described in sections 205 (d) and (e).

" '(c) The Director shall establish such criteria, and impose such conditions, as may be necessary or appropriate to assure that no program assistance under this part will result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services and to assure that the rates of pay and other conditions of employment will be appropriate and reasonable in the light of such factors as the type of work performed, geographical region, and proficiency of the employee.

" '(d) In carrying out the provisions of this part, the Director shall establish such procedures or impose such requirements as may be necessary or appropriate to assure maximum coordination with community action programs approved pursuant to part A of title II of this Act.

" 'Federal share of program costs

" 'Sec. 132. Federal grants to any program carried out pursuant to this part shall not exceed 90 per centum of the cost of such program, including costs of administration, unless the Director determines, pursuant to regulations adopted and promulgated by him establishing objective criteria for such determinations, that assistance in excess of such percentages is required in furtherance of the purposes of this part. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services: *Provided*, That where capital investment is required under a contract with a private organization (other than a nonprofit organization), the Federal share thereof shall not exceed 90 per centum of such capital investment and the non-Federal share shall be as defined above.'

"TITLE I PROGRAMS—DURATION; LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

"Sec. 114. Part D of title I of the Act is amended to read as follows:

" 'PART E—DURATION OF PROGRAM

" 'Sec. 141. The Director shall carry out the programs for which he is responsible under this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law.'

"TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE II OF THE ACT

"Community action—Definition of 'community'

"Sec. 201. Section 202(a) (1) of the Act is amended by inserting 'in an attack on poverty' after 'utilizes', and by striking out 'in an attack on poverty' and inserting in lieu thereof 'or any neighborhood or other area (irrespective of boundaries or political subdivisions) which is sufficiently homogeneous in character to be an appropriate area for an attack on poverty under this part;'.

"Community action—Criteria for approval programs

"Sec. 202. Section 202(b) of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence to read as follows: 'Such criteria shall include requirements to assure (1) that each agency responsible for a community action program is qualified to administer such program and the funds granted to it efficiently, effectively, and in a manner fully consistent with the provisions and purposes of this part, having due regard for the size and complexity of such program and the number of persons and size of the area served; (2) that each such agency is subject to evaluation of program progress and regular or periodic audits and that the results or findings of such evaluations and audits are considered by the agency as well as by the Director in connection with proposals or applications for the renewal, expansion, or modification of any such program; (3) that each such agency maintains records and internal controls needed to achieve and document compliance with all legal requirements and that all records bearing exclusively on grants made under this part are available to the General Accounting Office; (4) that each such program is carried on in accordance with standards and policies, including rules governing the conduct of officers and employees, to preclude the use of program funds, the provision of services, or the employment or assignment of personnel in a manner supporting, or resulting in an identification of such program with, any partisan political activity or any activity designed to further the election or defeat of any candidate for public office; and (5) that the personnel of each such agency are selected, employed, promoted, and compensated in accordance with standards prescribed by the Director, or personnel plans approved by him, as promoting efficiency and the effective use of funds.'

"Community action—Representatives of the poor

"Sec. 203. Section 202 of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

" '(c) (1) The Director shall not approve, or continue to fund after March 1, 1967, a community action program which is conducted, administered, or coordinated by a board which contains representatives of various geographical areas in the community unless such representatives are required to live in the area they represent.

" '(2) The Director shall not approve, or continue to fund after March 1, 1967, a community action program which is conducted, administered, or coordinated by a board on which representatives of the poor do not comprise at least one-third of the membership.

"'(3) The representatives of the poor shall be selected by the residents in areas of concentration of poverty, with special emphasis on participation by the residents of the area who are poor.

"'(4) In communities where substantial numbers of the poor reside outside of areas of concentration of poverty, provision shall be made for selection of representatives of such poor through a process, such as neighborhood meetings, in which the poor participate to the greatest possible degree.

"'(d) The Director shall require community action agencies to establish procedures under which representative groups of the poor including but not limited to minority groups, the elderly, and the rural population, which feel themselves inadequately represented on their community action agency policy board, may petition for adequate representation on such board.'

"Community action—Use of latest data in making allotments

"SEC. 204. Section 203(b) of the Act is amended (1) by inserting after 'State' the second time it appears in paragraph (1) the following '(as determined on the basis of the latest appropriate data)', (2) by inserting after 'States' the second time it appears in such paragraph the following '(as so determined)', (3) by inserting after 'State' the second time it appears in paragraph (2) the following '(as determined on the basis of the latest appropriate data)', and (4) by inserting after 'States' the second time it appears in paragraph (2) the following '(as so determined)'.

"Community action—Salary limits

"SEC. 205. Section 205(a) of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'The Director shall require that where an agency pays an employee engaged in carrying out a community action program at a rate in excess of $15,000 per annum, payment of such excess shall not be made from Federal funds; and any amount paid such an employee in excess of $15,000 per annum shall not be considered in determining whether section 208(a) has been complied with.'

"Community action—Adult work training and employment programs

"SEC. 206. (a) Section 205 of the Act is amended by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f) and by inserting immediately following subsection (d) the following new subsection:

"'(e) The Director is authorized to make grants or enter into agreements with any State or local agency or private organization to pay all or part of the costs of adult work training and employment programs for unemployed or low-income persons involving activities designed to improve the physical, social, economic or cultural condition of the community or area served in fields including, but not limited to, health, education, welfare, neighborhood redevelopment, and public safety. Such programs shall (1) assist in developing entry level employment opportunities, (2) provide maximum prospects for advancement and continued employment without Federal assistance, and (3) be combined with necessary educational, training, counseling, and transportation assistance, and such other supportive services as may be needed. Such work experience shall be combined, where needed, with educational and training assistance, including basic literacy and occupational training. Such program shall be conducted in a manner consistent with policies applicable under this Act for the protection of employed workers and the maintenance of basic rates of pay and other suitable conditions of employment.'

"Community action—Use of public facilities

"SEC. 207. Section 205(f) of the Act (as so redesignated by section 206) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: 'and to programs which make the maximum utilization of existing schools, community centers, settlement houses, and other facilities during times they are not in use for their primary purpose'.

"Community action—Funding independent programs; membership in sponsoring organizations

"SEC. 208. Section 205 of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"'(g) The Director shall carry out this part in such a manner as to insure that funds available for carrying out this part (other than those available for carrying out subsections (d) and (e) of this section, and sections 206(b), 211-1(a), 211-1(b), 211-2 and 211-3) at least 5 per centum will be used for carrying out independently funded community action programs (other than programs described in subsections (d) and (e) of this section, and sections 206(b), 211-1(a), 211-1(b), 211-2 and 211-3) which are carried on in communities in which there is being carried on concurrently a community action program for which an overall community action agency assumes responsibility for planning, developing, and coordinating communitywide antipoverty programs and provides for the involvement and participation of public and private nonprofit agencies. In addition the Director may use an additional 5 per centum of such funds for carrying out such programs. For purposes of this subsection, a program will be deemed to be independently funded if the grantee is one that develops, and is funded to operate only, programs which are of limited scope and which does not have broad comprehensive community representation on its policymaking board, whether or not the grantee sponsors one or several component programs.

"'(h) The Director shall make grants to, or contracts with, independently funded public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations in predominantly rural areas in accordance with sections 210 and 617, where the Director determines it is not feasible, within a reasonable period of time, to establish community action agencies.

"'(i) If projects are of a regional nature and can be more efficiently operated on this basis, the Director may make grants to, or contract with, independently funded, public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations for the conduct and administration of such projects.

"'(j) No officer or employee of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall be an executive officer or a member of the board of directors of any organization (other than a religious organization) with which the Director has entered into a contract under this section to carry out a community action program or a component program thereof.'

"Community action—Fiscal responsibility and accounting

"SEC. 209. Section 205 of the Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof (after the subsections added by section 208) the following:

"'(k) No funds shall be released to any public or private nonprofit agency, or combination thereof, under this section unless the grantee organization has submitted to the Director either—

"'(1) a statement from the appropriate public financial officer of the community or of the public agency which will maintain the accounts of the grantee, stating that such officer accepts responsibility for providing financial services adequate to insure the establishment and maintenance of an accounting system by such agency and its delegate agencies, with internal controls adequate to safeguard the assets of such agencies, check the accuracy and reliability of accounting data, promote operational efficiency and encourage adherence to prescribed management policies; or

"'(2) an opinion from a Certified Public Accountant or a duly licensed public accountant stating that the grantee has established such an accounting system.'

"'(l)(1) The Director shall make or cause to be made a preliminary audit survey within 3 months after the effective date of a grant or contract with any public or private nonprofit agency, or combination thereof, under this section to review and evaluate the adequacy of the grantee organization's and its delegate agencies' accounting systems and internal controls.

"'(2) Within 30 days of the completion of such survey, the Director shall determine on the basis of the findings and conclusions resulting from such survey whether the accounting systems of the grantee organization and its delegate agencies meet the standards set forth in subsections (k)(1) and (k)(2). If he shall determine that the standards have not been met, he shall immediately notify the grantee organization of his determination and he shall consider whether suspension of further payment of Federal funds under the subject grant is warranted.

"'(3) In the event of suspension of any grant funds pursuant to subsection (l)(2), the affected agency shall be given not more than six months from the date of notice of suspension in which to establish, with the advice of Office of Economic Opportunity auditors, the procedures prescribed in subsection (k). A new audit shall be performed within this period and if, by the end of this period, the Director is still unable to determine that the accounting system meets the required standards he shall terminate the contract or grant.

"'(m) The Director shall establish such rules and regulations as may be required to insure that public or private nonprofit agencies, or combinations thereof, maintain the standards of accounting set forth in sections 205(k) (1) and (2) during the period of any grant or contract under this section.'

"Community action—Payment of allowances for attendance at meetings

"SEC. 210. Section 205 of the Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof (after the subsections inserted by section 209) the following:

"'(n) In extending assistance under this section the Director is authorized to make grants for the payment of a reasonable allowance per meeting for attendance at community action agency board meetings or neighborhood community action council or committee meetings and for the reimbursement of other necessary expenses of attendance at such meetings to members of such boards, councils, or committees who are residents of the areas and members of the groups served in order to insure and encourage their maximum feasible participation in the development, conduct, and administration of community action programs: *Provided, however,* That no such payments shall be made for attendance at more than two meetings in a month, or to any person who is an employee of the United States Government, of a community action agency, or of a State or local governmental agency.'

"Community action—Family planning services

"SEC. 211. Section 205 of the Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof (after the subsection added by section 210) the following:

"'(o)(1) In making grants for programs in the field of family planning the Director shall assure that family planning services, including the dissemination of family planning information and medical assistance and supplies, are made available to all individuals who meet the criteria for eligibility for assistance under this part which have been established by the community action agency and who desire such information, assistance, or supplies.

"'(2) No such grant shall be approved unless it contains and is supported by reasonable assurances that in carrying out any program assisted by any such grant, the applicant will establish and follow procedures designed to insure that—

"'(A) no individual will be provided with any information, medical supervision or supplies which such individual states to be inconsistent with his or her moral, philosophical, or religious beliefs; and

"'(B) no individual will be provided with any medical supervision or supplies unless such individual has voluntarily requested such medical supervision or supplies.

"'(3) The use of family planning services provided by the applicant under such grant shall not be a prerequisite to the receipt of services from or participation in any other programs under this Act.'

"Community action—Technical assistance, training, and emergency loans

"Sec. 212. (a) Section 206 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"'Technical assistance, training, and emergency loans

"'Sec. 206. (a) The Director is authorized to provide, either directly or through grants or other arrangements, (1) technical assistance to communities in developing, conducting, and administering community action programs, and (2) training for specialized or other personnel needed to develop, conduct, or administer such programs or to provide services or other assistance in connection with such programs or otherwise pertaining to the purposes of this part. The Director may, upon request of a grantee under this section, or sections 204, 205, or 209(b), make special assignments of personnel to the grantee to assist and advise in the performance of functions related to the purposes of this part, except that in no event shall more than one hundred persons be employed for, or at any one time regularly engaged in, such assignments, nor shall any such special assignment be for a period of more than two years in the case of any grantee.

"'(b) The Director shall also formulate and carry out a program for making small loans to persons in low-income families to meet immediate and urgent family needs. The total outstanding balance of loans made to an individual under this subsection may not at any time exceed $300. Loans under this subsection shall bear interest at the rate of 2 per centum per annum and shall be made on such other terms and conditions as the Director may prescribe.'

"Community action—Research and demonstrations

"Sec. 213. Section 207 of the Act is amended by striking out ', training,', by striking out '15 per centum' and inserting '5 per centum', and by adding at the end thereof the following: 'No grant or contract for a research or demonstration project shall be made under this section after January 1, 1967, except pursuant to an overall plan setting forth specific objectives to be achieved under this section and setting forth priorities among such objectives. Such plan, to the extent it contemplates activities or programs that may be undertaken by other Federal agencies or the making of grants or contracts that might be made by other Federal agencies having demonstration and research responsibilities, shall be approved by the Director only after consultation with such agencies. The Director shall include as part of the annual report required by section 608, or as a separate and simultaneous report, a description of the principal research and demonstration activities undertaken during each fiscal year under this part, a statement indicating the relation of such activities to the plan and the policies of this Act, and a statement with respect to each such category, describing the results or findings of such research and demonstration activities, or indicating the time or period, and to the extent possible the manner, in which the benefits or expected benefits of such activities will or are expected to be realized. The Director shall require that all applications or proposals for research or demonstrations shall be filed simultaneously in the appropriate regional office of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and shall require such offices to review and make recommendations with respect thereto within fifteen days from the date of filing.'

"Community action—Limitations on assistance

"Sec. 214. Section 208(a) of the Act is amended by striking out 'three years after the date of enactment of this Act,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1967', and by striking out '50 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof '80 per centum'.

"Community action—Headstart and legal services programs

"Sec. 215. Title II of the Act is amended by inserting after section 211 the following new section.

"'Headstart and legal services programs

"'Sec. 211–1. (a) In carrying out sections 204 and 205, the Director shall carry out programs eligible for assistance under such sections which assist young children who have not reached the age of compulsory school attendance and which include (1) the furnishing of such comprehensive health, nutritional, social, educational, and mental health services as the Director finds will aid such children to attain their greatest potential, (2) the provision of appropriate activities to encourage the participation of parents of such children and the effective use of their services, and (3) such other training, technical assistance, evaluation, and follow-through activities as may be necessary or appropriate.

"'(b) In carrying out sections 204 and 205, the Director shall carry out programs eligible for assistance under such sections, which provide legal advice and legal representation to persons when they are unable to afford the services of a private attorney, together with legal research and information as appropriate to mobilize the assistance of lawyers or legal institutions, or combinations thereof, to further the cause of justice among persons living in poverty: *Provided,* That the Director shall establish procedures to assure that the principal local bar associations in the area to be served by any proposed program of legal advice and representation are afforded an adequate opportunity to review the proposed program and to submit comments and recommendations thereon before such program is approved or funded.'

"Health services

"Sec. 216. Part A of title II of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'Comprehensive health services programs

"'Sec. 211–2. (a) The Director is authorized to make grants to, or to contract with, public or private nonprofit agencies in order to provide assistance necessary for the development and implementation of comprehensive health services programs focused upon the needs of persons residing in urban or rural areas having high concentrations of poverty and a marked inadequacy of health services. Such programs shall be designed—

"'(1) to make possible, with maximum feasible utilization of existing agencies and resources, the provision of comprehensive health services, including but not limited to preventive medical, diagnostic, treatment, rehabilitation, mental health, dental, and follow-up services, together with facilities and rehabilitation necessary in connection therewith; and

"'(2) to assure that such services are made readily accessible to the residents of such areas, are furnished in a manner most responsive to their needs and with their participation, and wherever possible are combined with, or included within arrangements for providing, employment, education, social, or other assistance needed by the families and individuals served.

Before approving any program under this section, the Director shall consult with appropriate Federal, State, and local health agencies and take such steps, or impose such conditions, as may be required to make certain that the program will be carried on under competent professional supervision and that existing agencies providing services related to this section are furnished with all assistance necessary or appropriate in order to permit them to plan for participation in such program and for the necessary continuation of such services.

"'(b) In carrying out this section, the Director shall formulate and carry out programs for the prevention of narcotic addiction and the rehabilitation of narcotic addicts. Such programs shall include provisions for the detoxification, guidance, training, and job placement of narcotic addicts.

"'(c) The Director, either separately or as part of the annual report required under section 608, shall submit at least annually to the Congress a comprehensive statement describing the actions taken and progress made under this section and all other provisions of this Act in meeting the needs of the poor for expanded and improved health services. The Director shall also provide for studies of the nature and characteristics of health problems particularly significant to low-income persons.

"'(d) The Director is authorized, after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to secure (by grant or contract) objective studies of the overall operation of the programs authorized under this section, including their relationship to and impact on the adequacy and availability of all relevant programs and services for meeting total health needs. Reports of such studies, together with such comments and recommendations as the Director and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may care to offer, shall be submitted to the President and the Congress.'

"Adult basic education

"Sec. 217. Title II of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof (after the section added by section 216 the following new section:

"'Special projects on adult basic education

"'Sec. 211–3. The Director is authorized to make grants to local educational agencies and to other public or private nonprofit agencies for the purpose of special projects in the field of adult basic education for low-income individuals over eighteen years of age whose lack of basic educational skills constitutes a substantial impairment of their ability to get or retain employment commensurate with their real ability. Such projects shall—

"'(1) involve the use of innovative methods, systems, materials, or programs which the Director determines may have national significance or be of special value in promoting effective programs under this title.

"'(2) involve activities in adult basic education which the Director determines are so coupled with other Federal, federally assisted, State, or local programs, as to have unusual promise in promoting a comprehensive or coordinated approach to the problems of low-income individuals with basic educational deficiencies, or

" '(3) show promise of enabling persons receiving welfare payments or other forms of public assistance to obtain employment which will permit discontinuance of such assistance.'

"Title II programs—Duration

"Sec. 218. Part D of title II of the Act is amended to read as follows:

" 'PART D—DURATION OF PROGRAM

" 'Sec. 221. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law.'

"TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE III OF THE ACT

"Rural areas—Loan authority and indemnity payments

"Sec. 301. (a) Section 302(a) of the Act is amended by striking out 'exceeding $2,500 in the aggregate' and inserting in lieu thereof 'resulting in an aggregate indebtedness of more than $3,500 at any one time'.

"(b) Section 305(f) of the Act is amended by—

"(1) inserting '(1)' immediately after '*Provided,* That'; and

"(2) inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: 'and (2) a cooperative organization formed by and consisting of members of an Indian tribe (including any tribe with whom the special Federal relationship with Indians has been terminated) engaged in the production of agricultural commodities, or in manufacturing products, on an Indian reservation (or former reservation in the case of tribes with whom the special Federal relationship with Indians has been terminated) shall not be regarded as a cooperative organization within the purview of this clause'.

"(c) Section 331(c) of the Act is amended by striking out 'June 30, 1966' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1967'.

"Title III programs—Duration

"Sec. 302. Part C of title III of the Act is amended to read as follows:

" 'PART C—DURATION OF PROGRAM

" 'Sec. 321. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law.'

"TITLE IV—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE IV OF THE ACT

"Sec. 401. Sections 402, 405, and 406 of the Act are amended by striking out 'Director where it appears in such sections and inserting in lieu thereof 'Administrator of the Small Business Administration'.

"Sec. 402. (a) Section 402 of the Act is hereby redesignated section 402(a) and there is added at the end thereof a new subsection (b) as follows:

" '(b) The Director is authorized to make grants to, or contract with, public or private nonprofit agencies, or combinations thereof, to pay all or part of the costs necessary to enable such agencies to provide screening, counseling, management guidance, or similar assistance with respect to persons or small business concerns which receive or may be eligible for assistance under subsection (a). Financial assistance under this subsection shall be subject to the provisions of section 208 of this Act.'

"Sec. 403. Sections 403 and 404 of the Act are hereby repealed.

"Sec. 404. Section 407 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

" 'Duration of program

" 'Sec. 407. The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years.'

"Sec. 405. Section 402 of the Act is amended by inserting '(a)' after 'Sec. 402.' and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

" '(b) To the extent necessary or appropriate to carry out the programs provided for in this title the Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall have the same powers as are conferred upon the Director by section 602 of this Act.'

"Sec. 406. Sections 405, 406, and 407 of the Act, as amended by these Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966, are respectively renumbered as sections 403, 404, and 405 of the Act.

"Sec. 407. Section 606 of the Act is amended by striking out 'and IV' where it appears in subsections (a) and (d) thereof.

"TITLE V—REVISION OF TITLE V OF THE ACT

"Sec. 501. (a) Title V of the Act is amended to read as follows:

" 'TITLE V—WORK EXPERIENCE AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

" 'Statement of purpose

" 'Sec. 501. It is the purpose of this title to expand the opportunities for constructive work experience and other needed training available to persons (including workers in farm families with less than $1,200 net family income, unemployed heads of families and other needy persons) who are unable to support themselves or their families.

" 'Transfer of funds

" 'Sec. 502. In order to permit the carrying out of work experience and training programs meeting the criteria set forth in part E of title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, the Director is authorized to transfer funds to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to enable him (1) to make payments under section 1115 of the Social Security Act for experimental, pilot, or demonstration projects which provide pretraining services and basic maintenance, health, family, basic education, day care, counselling, and similar supportive services required for such programs, and (2) to reimburse the Secretary of Labor for carrying out the activities described in such part E of title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. Costs of such projects and activities shall, notwithstanding the provisions of the Social Security Act and the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, be met entirely from funds appropriated to carry out this title: *Provided,* That such funds may not be used to assist families and individuals insofar as they are otherwise receiving or eligible to receive assistance or social services through a State plan approved under titles I, IV, X, XIV, XVI, or XIX of the Social Security Act.

" 'Limitations on work experience and training programs

" 'Sec. 503. (a) The provisions of paragraphs (1) to (6), inclusive, of section 409 of the Social Security Act, unless otherwise inconsistent with the provisions of this title, shall be applicable with respect to work experience and training programs assisted with funds under this title. The costs of such programs to the United States shall, notwithstanding the provisions of such Act, be met entirely from funds appropriated or allocated to carry out the purpose of this title.

" '(b) Work experience and training programs shall be so designed that participation of individuals in such programs will not ordinarily exceed 36 months, except that nothing in this subsection shall prevent the provision of necessary and appropriate follow-up services for a reasonable period after an individual has completed work experience and training.

" '(c) Not more than 12½ percent of the sums appropriated or allocated for any fiscal year to carry out the purposes of this title shall be used within any one state. In the case of any work experience and training program approved on or after July 1, 1968, not more than 80 percent of the costs of projects or activities referred to in section 502 may be paid from funds appropriated or allocated to carry out this title, unless the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare determines, pursuant to regulations prescribed by him establishing objective criteria for such determinations, that assistance in excess of such percentage is required in furtherance of the purposes of this title. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services.

" 'Duration of programs

" 'Sec. 504. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law.

" 'Transition

" 'Sec. 505. The Secretary of Labor is authorized to provide work experience and training programs authorized by section 261(a) (3) and (4) of part E of title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, commencing July 1, 1967. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to provide such work experience and training programs through June 30, 1967, and may also continue to completion those work experience and training programs commenced prior to that date, but in no event shall such programs be extended beyond June 30, 1968. After June 30, 1967, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, pursuant to agreement with the Secretary of Labor which shall include provisions for joint evaluation and approval of the training and work experience aspect of each project or program, may also—

" '(1) with the concurrence of the Secretary of Labor, renew existing projects and programs, or develop and provide new projects or programs, to accomplish the purposes of this title and of part E of title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962; and

" '(2) with the concurrence of the Secretary of Labor, develop and provide other work experience and training programs pursuant to such part E, with respect to such projects or parts of projects which the Secretary of Labor is unable to provide after being given notice and a reasonable opportunity to do so.

Before July 1, 1967, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may, for the purposes of this title and part E of title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, utilize the services and facilities available under the manpower development and utilization programs administered by the Department of Labor which may include, but not be limited to, testing, counseling, job referral and follow-up services required to assist participants in securing and obtaining employment, training opportunities, either on or off the job, available under the

Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, and relocation assistance to involuntarily unemployed individuals in accordance with the standards prescribed in section 104 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, and shall compensate the Secretary of Labor for the reasonable costs thereof either by advance or reimbursement.'

"TITLE VI—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VI OF THE ACT

"Elderly poor

"SEC. 601. (a) Section 601(a) of the Act is amended by striking out 'three' in the third sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof 'four'.

"(b) Section 610 of the Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: 'The Director shall carry out such investigations and studies, including consultations with appropriate agencies and organizations, as may be necessary (1) to develop programs providing employment opportunities, public service opportunities, and education for the elderly poor under the provisions of this Act, and (2) to determine and recommend to the President and the Congress such programs requiring additional authority and the necessary legislation to provide such authority.'

"Liaison between agencies

"SEC. 602. Section 602(d) of the Act is amended by adding immediately before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: 'subject to provisions to assure the maximum possible liaison between the Office of Economic Opportunity and such other agencies at all operating levels, which shall include the furnishing of complete operational information by such other agencies to the Office of Economic Opportunity and the furnishing of such information by such Office to such other agencies'.

"Elimination of special printing authority of director

"SEC. 603. Section 602(m) of the Act is amended to read as follows:

" '(m) expend funds made available for purposes of this Act—

" '(1) for printing and binding, in accordance with applicable law and regulation; and

" '(2) without regard to any other law or regulation, for rent of buildings and space in buildings and for repair, alteration, and improvement of buildings and space in buildings rented by him; but the Director shall not utilize the authority contained in this subparagraph (2)—

" '(A) except when necessary to obtain an item, service, or facility, which is required in the proper administration of this Act, and which otherwise could not be obtained, or could not be obtained in the quantity or quality needed, or at the time, in the form, or under the conditions in which, it is needed, and

" '(B) prior to having given written notification to the Administrator of General Services (if the exercise of such authority would affect an activity which otherwise would be under the jurisdiction of the General Services Administration) of his intention to exercise such authority, the item, service, or facility with respect to which such authority is proposed to be exercised, and the reasons and justifications for the exercise of such authority; and'.

"Administration—Political activities

"SEC. 604. Section 603 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

" 'Political activities

" 'SEC. 603. (a) For purposes of chapter 15 of title 5 of the United States Code any overall community action agency which assumes responsibility for planning, developing, and coordinating communitywide antipoverty programs and receives assistance under this Act shall be deemed to be a State or local agency; and for purposes of clauses (1) and (2) of section 1502(a) of such title any agency receiving assistance under this Act (other than part C of title I) shall be deemed to be a State or local agency.

" '(b) The Director, after consultation with the Civil Service Commission, is authorized to issue such regulations or impose such requirements as may be necessary or appropriate to supplement the provisions of subsection (a) of this section or otherwise to insure that programs assisted under this Act are not carried on in a manner involving the use of program funds, the provision of services, or the employment or assignment of personnel in a manner supporting, or resulting in the identification of such program with, any partisan political activity or any activity designed to further the election or defeat of any candidate for public office.'

"National Advisory Council on Economic Opportunity

"SEC. 605. Section 605 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

" 'National Advisory Council on Economic Opportunity

" 'SEC. 605. (a) There is hereby established in the Office a National Advisory Council on Economic Opportunity (hereinafter referred to as the Advisory Council), to be composed of twenty-one members appointed, for staggered terms and without regard to the civil service laws, by the President. Such members shall be representative of the public in general and appropriate fields of endeavor related to the purposes of this Act. The President shall designate the chairman from among such members. The Advisory Council shall meet at the call of the chairman but not less often than four times a year. The Director shall be an ex officio member of the Advisory Council.

" '(b) The Advisory Council shall—

" '(1) advise the Director with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this Act; and

" '(2) review the effectiveness and the operation of programs under this Act and make recommendations concerning (A) the improvement of such programs, (B) the elimination of duplication of effort, and (C) the coordination of such programs with other Federal programs designed to assist low income individuals and families.

Such recommendations shall include such proposals for changes in this Act as the Advisory Council deems appropriate.

" '(c) The Advisory Council shall make an annual report of its findings and recommendations to the President not later than March 31 of each calendar year beginning with the calendar year 1967. The President shall transmit each such report to the Congress together with his comments and recommendations.'

"Administration—Comparability of wages

"SEC. 606. Part A of title VI of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

" 'Comparability of wages

" 'SEC. 610-1. (a) The Director shall take such action as may be necessary to assure that persons employed in carrying out programs financed under part A of title I or part A of title II (except a person compensated as provided in section 602) shall not receive compensation at a rate which is (1) in excess of the average rate of compensation paid in the area where the program is carried out to persons providing substantially comparable services, or in excess of the average rate of compensation paid to persons providing substantially comparable services in the area of the person's immediately preceding employment, whichever is higher or (2) less than the minimum wage rate prescribed in section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

" '(b) Not later than sixty days after the close of the fiscal year 1967 and each fiscal year thereafter the Director shall prepare and submit to the President for submission to the Congress a list of the names of all officers or employees whose compensation is subject to the limitations set forth in subsection (a) of this section and who were receiving at the end of such fiscal year a salary of $10,000 or more per year, together with the amount of compensation paid to each such person and the amount of such compensation paid from funds advanced or granted pursuant to this Act. No grant, contract or agreement shall be made under any of the provisions of this Act referred to in subsection (a) of this section which does not contain adequate provisions to assure the furnishing of information required by the preceding sentence.

" '(c) No person whose compensation exceeds $6,000 per annum and is paid pursuant to any grant, contract, or agreement authorized under part A of title I or part A of title II (except a person compensated as provided in section 602) shall be employed at a rate of compensation which exceeds by more than 20 percent the salary which he was receiving in his immediately preceding employment, but the Director may grant exceptions for specific cases. In determining salary in preceding employment for one regularly employed for a period of less than 12 months per year, the salary shall be adjusted to an annual basis.'

"Coordination of programs within executive branch

"SEC. 607. Section 611 of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

" '(c) It shall be the responsibility of the Director, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the heads of all other departments and agencies concerned, acting through the President's Committee on Manpower, to provide for, and take such steps as may be necessary and appropriate to implement, the effective coordination of all programs and activities within the executive branch of the Government relating to the training of individuals for the purpose of improving or restoring employability.

" '(d) The Secretary of Labor, pursuant to such agreements as may be necessary or appropriate (which may include arrangements for reimbursement), shall—

" '(1) be responsible for assuring that the Federal-State employment service provides and develops its capacity for providing maximum support for the programs described in subsection (c); and

" '(2) obtain from the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the head of any other Federal agency administering a training program, such employment information as will facilitate the placement of individuals being trained.'

"Information—Catalog and dissemination

"SEC. 608. Section 613 of the Act is amended by inserting '(a)' after 'SEC. 613.' and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

" '(b) The Director shall publish and maintain on a current basis, a catalog of Federal programs relating to individual and community improvement. The Director is further authorized to make grants from funds appropriated to carry out title II of this Act, to States and communities to establish information service centers for the collection, correlation, and distribution of information required to further the purposes of this Act.

" '(c) In order to insure that all Federal programs related to the purposes of this Act are utilized to the maximum possible extent, and in order to insure that all appropriate officials are kept fully informed of such programs, the Director shall establish procedures to assure prompt distribution to States and local agencies of all current information, including administrative rules, regulations and guidelines, required by such agencies for the effective performance of their responsibilities.'

"Title VI programs—Duration

"SEC. 609. Section 615 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

" 'Duration of program

" 'SEC. 615. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law.'

"Coordination—Transfers of funds

"SEC. 610. Section 616 of the Act is amended by inserting after 'this Act,' the following: 'or any Act authorizing appropriations for any such title (other than part C of title I),'.

"Additional super grades

"SEC. 611. Title VI of the Act is amended by inserting after section 617 the following new section:

" 'Limitation on additional super grades

" 'SEC. 618. No additional positions above those authorized on the date of enactment of this section shall be created or filled in fiscal year ending June 30, 1967 in the classification categories of GS 16, 17, and 18, of the General Schedule of section 5332, title 5, United States Code in the Office of Economic Opportunity and its field offices.'

"Administrative expenses

"SEC. 612. Title VI of the Act is amended by inserting after section 618 the following new section:

" 'Limitation on Federal administrative expenses

" 'SEC. 619. The total administrative expenses, including the compensation of Federal employees, incurred by Federal agencies under the authority of this Act for any fiscal year shall not exceed ten percent of the amount authorized to be appropriated by this Act for that year: *Provided, however,* That grants, subsidies, and contributions, any payments to individuals, other than Federal employees shall not be counted as an administrative expense.'

"Private enterprise participation

"SEC. 614. (a) Title VI of the act is amended by inserting after section 619 (added by section 612) the following new section:

" 'Private enterprise participation

" 'SEC. 620. The Director and the heads of any other Federal departments or agencies to which the conduct of programs described in this Act have been delegated shall take such steps as may be desirable and appropriate to insure that the resources of private enterprise are employed to the maximum feasible extent in the programs described in this Act. The Director and such other agency heads shall submit at least annually to the Congress a joint or combined report describing the actions taken and the progress made under this section.'

"(b) Section 2 of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph: 'It is the sense of the Congress that it is highly desirable to employ the resources of the private sector of the economy of the United States in all such efforts to further the policy of this Act.'

"TITLE VII—TECHNICAL AMENDMENT TO TITLE VII OF THE ACT

"SEC. 701. (a) Section 701(a) of the Act is amended by striking out 'and XVI' and inserting in lieu thereof 'XVI, and XIX'.

"(b) No funds to which a State is otherwise entitled under title XIX of the Social Security Act for any period before October 1, 1967, shall be withheld by reason of any action taken pursuant to a State statute which prevents such State from complying with the requirements resulting from the amendment made by subsection (a).

"TITLE VIII—REVISION OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO VISTA

"SEC. 801. The Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

" 'TITLE VIII—VOLUNTEERS IN SERVICE TO AMERICA

" 'Statement of purpose

" 'SEC. 801. It is the purpose of this title to enable and encourage volunteers to participate in a personal way in the war on poverty, by living and working among deprived people of all ages in urban areas, rural communities, on Indian reservations, in migrant worker camps, and Job Corps camps and centers; to stimulate, develop and coordinate programs of volunteer training and service; and, through such programs, to encourage individuals from all walks of life to make a commitment to combating poverty in their home communities, both as volunteers and as members of the helping professions.

" 'Authority to establish VISTA program

" 'SEC. 802. (a) The Director is authorized to recruit, select, train, and—

" '(1) upon request of State or local agencies or private nonprofit organizations, refer volunteers to perform duties in furtherance of programs combating poverty at a State or local level; and

" '(2) in cooperation with other Federal, State, or local agencies involved, assign volunteers to work (A) in meeting the health, education, welfare, or related needs of Indians living on reservations, of migratory workers and their families, or of residents of the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; (B) in the care and rehabilitation of the mentally ill or mentally retarded under treatment at nonprofit mental health or mental retardation facilities assisted in their construction or operation by Federal funds; and (C) in connection with programs or activities authorized, supported, or of a character eligible for assistance under this Act.

" '(b) The referral or assignment of volunteers under this section shall be on such terms and conditions (including restrictions on political activities that appropriately recognize the special status of volunteers living among the persons or groups served by programs to which they have been assigned) as the Director may determine; but volunteers shall not be so referred or assigned to duties or work in any State, nor shall programs under section 805 be conducted in any State without the consent of the Governor.

" 'Volunteer support

" 'SEC. 803. The Director is authorized to provide to all volunteers during training pursuant to section 802(a) and to volunteers assigned pursuant to section 802(a)(2) such stipend, not to exceed $50 per month (or, in the case of volunteer leaders designated in accordance with standards prescribed by the Director, not to exceed $75 per month), such living, travel, and leave allowances, and such housing, transportation (including travel to and from the place of training), supplies, equipment, subsistence, clothing, and health and dental care as the Director may deem necessary or appropriate for their needs.

" 'Application of provisions of Federal law

" 'SEC. 804. (a) Each volunteer under section 802 shall take and subscribe to an oath or affirmation in the form prescribed by section 104(d) of this Act, and the provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable with respect to such oath or affirmation; but except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, such volunteers shall not be deemed to be Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, and Federal employee benefits.

" '(b) All volunteers during training pursuant to section 802(a) and such volunteers as are assigned pursuant to section 802(a)(2) shall be deemed Federal employees to the same extent as enrollees of the Job Corps under section 106(b), (c), and (d) of this Act except that for purposes of the computation described in paragraph (2)(B) of section 106(c) the monthly pay of a volunteer shall be deemed to be that received under the entrance salary for GS–7 of the General Schedule of section 5332, title 5, United States Code.

" '(c) For the purposes of subchapter III, chapter 73 of title V of the United States Code, a volunteer under this title shall be deemed to be a person employed in the executive branch of the Federal Government.

" 'Special programs and projects

" 'SEC. 805. The Director is authorized to conduct, or to make grants, contracts, or other arrangements with appropriate public or private nonprofit organizations for the conduct of, special programs in furtherance of the purposes of this title. Such programs shall be designed to encourage more effective or better coordinated use of volunteer services, including services of low-income persons, or to make opportunities for volunteer experience available, under proper supervision and for appropriate periods, to qualified persons who are unable to make long-term commitments or who are engaged in or preparing to enter work where such experience may be of special value and in the public interest. Individuals who serve or receive training in such programs shall not, by virtue of such service or training, be deemed to be Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment, including those related to hours of work, rates of compensation, and Federal employee benefits; except that such individuals who receive their principal support or compensation with respect to such service or training directly from the Director or his agent for payment shall be deemed Federal employees to the same extent as volunteers assigned pursuant to section 802(a)(2) of this Act. Not to exceed 15 per centum of the sums appropriated or allocated from any appropriation to carry out this title for any fiscal year may be used for programs under this section.

" 'Duration of program

" 'SEC. 806. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law.'

"TITLE IX—TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

"SEC. 901. (a) Title I of the Act is amended by inserting immediately before section 110 a heading for such section to read as follows:

" '*Youth Conservation Corps*'

"(b) Title II of the Act is amended by redesignating section 219 of part C as section 219–1.

"(c) Section 213 of the Act is amended by striking out 'this section' and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 214'.

"(d) Section 604(b) of the Act is amended by striking out 'Housing and Home Finance Administrator' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Secretary of Housing and Urban Development'.

"TITLE X—AMENDMENTS TO MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962

"SEC. 1001. (a) The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is amended by inserting the following after the period at the end of section 201: 'Whenever appropriate, the Secretary of Labor shall coordinate and provide for combinations of programs, to be pursued concurrently or sequentially, under this Act with programs under other Federal Acts, where the purposes of this Act would be accomplished thereby.'

"(b) The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is amended by adding at the end of section 203(c) the following: 'Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in this subsection or in subsection (h), the Secretary may refer any individual who has completed a program under part B of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to training under this Act, and such individual may be paid a training allowance as provided in section 203(a) of this Act without regard to the requirements imposed on such payments by the preceding sentences of subsection (c) or by subsection (h) of this section. Such payments shall not exceed the average weekly gross unemployment compensation payment (including allowances for dependents) for a week of total unemployment in the State making such payments during the most recent four-calendar-quarter period for which such data are available. Such persons shall not be deemed youths for the purpose of applying the provision under this subsection limiting the number of youths who may receive training allowances.'

"(c) The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is amended by inserting the following after part D of title II:

" 'PART E—WORK EXPERIENCE AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

" 'SEC. 261. (a) The Secretary of Labor in cooperation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall provide, under this part, programs for needy persons who require work experience or special family and supportive services, as well as training, in order that they may be assisted to secure and hold regular employment in a competitive labor market. Such programs shall—

" '(1) provide for the selection of participants pursuant to procedures and criteria jointly prescribed by the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare;

" '(2) include pretraining services and basic maintenance, health, family and day care, counseling, and similar social services and basic education, as provided by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare pursuant to section 502 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended;

" '(3) provide through agreements with appropriate public or private nonprofit agencies, work experience to the extent required to assist participants in developing necessary work attitudes or to prepare them for work or training involving the acquisition of needed skills;

" '(4) provide testing, counseling, training either on or off the job (including classroom instruction where needed through appropriate arrangements agreed to by the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare), to assist participants to develop their occupational potential, improve their occupational level and secure promotion or advancement;

" '(5) provide, through appropriate arrangements with employers, labor organizations, and other public and private agencies, for development where needed of additional employment opportunities for participants, for job referral and follow-up services required to assist participants in securing and retaining employment and securing possibilities for advancement; and

" '(6) provide, in accordance with the criteria prescribed in section 104 of this Act, relocation assistance to involuntarily unemployed individuals where the Secretary of Labor determines they cannot reasonably be expected to secure full-time employment in the community in which they reside.

" '(b) In developing and approving programs under this part, the Secretary of Labor shall give priority to programs with a high-training potential and which afford the best prospects for contributing to the upward mobility of participants.

" '(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the provisions of section 503 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, shall govern the use and apportionment among the several States of funds provided pursuant to such Act for the purpose of carrying out this part.'

"TITLE XI—AMENDMENTS TO CERTAIN OTHER ACTS

"SEC. 1101. (a) Section 205(b)(2)(A)(iv) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out 'section 603' and inserting in lieu thereof 'title VIII'.

"(b)(1) Section 427(a)(2)(C) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended (1) by striking out 'or' before '(iii)', and (2) by inserting immediately after 'Peace Corps Act,' the following: 'or (iv) not in excess of three years during which the borrower is in service, as a volunteer under title VIII of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964,'.

"(2) The amendments made by this section shall not apply to any loan outstanding on the effective date of this Act without the consent of the borrowers.

"SEC. 1102. Clause (3) of section 401(b) of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended to read as follows:

" '(3) no area shall be designated which does not have a population of at least one thousand five hundred persons, except that this limitation shall not apply to any area designated under section 401(a)(3); and'.

"TITLE XII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 1201. No part of the funds appropriated under this Act to carry out the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 shall be used to provide payments, assistance, or services, in any form, with respect to any individual who is convicted, in any Federal, State, or local court of competent jurisdiction, of inciting, promoting, or carrying on a riot, or any group activity resulting in material damage to property or injury to persons, found to be in violation of Federal, State, or local laws designed to protect persons or property in the community concerned."

And the Senate agree to the same.

ADAM C. POWELL,
CARL D. PERKINS,
EDITH GREEN,
FRANK THOMPSON,
JOHN H. DENT,
SAM M. GIBBONS.
Managers on the Part of the House.
JOSEPH S. CLARK,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
CLAIBORNE PELL,
EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
ROBERT KENNEDY,
GAYLORD NELSON,
J. K. JAVITS,
WINSTON PROUTY.
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment to the House bill (H.R. 15111) to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate excised all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute amendment. The committee of conference agreed to a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment. Except for technical, clarifying, and conforming changes the following statement explains the differences between the House bill and the substitute agreed to in conference.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

There were differences between the House bill and the Senate amendment for the authorization of appropriations, as follows:

Title	House bill	Senate amendment	Conference substitute
I	$696, 000, 000	$588, 000, 000	$696, 000, 000
II	832, 000, 000	944, 000, 000	846, 000, 000
III	57, 000, 000	65, 000, 000	57, 000, 000
IV	(1)	5, 000, 000	5, 000, 000
V	119, 000, 000	100, 000, 000	100, 000, 000
VI	15, 000, 000	17, 000, 000	15, 000, 000
VIII	31, 000, 000	31, 000, 000	31, 000, 000

[1] No authorization.

Earmarking

The House bill initially earmarked authorizations within titles for specific programs including Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Operation Headstart, legal services, the Nelson-Scheuer employment programs, narcotics rehabilitation, emergency family loans, and adult basic education.

The conference modified these provisions to earmark all program categories within titles I and II. The earmarking provisions appear in the bill along with the authorizations for appropriations by title.

It is the express wish of the conferees that under no circumstances should the possible transfer of funds from title to title increase the Job Corps authorization above $211 million. The House bill as passed contained an authorization of $496 million for the Neighborhood Youth Corps. The original Senate bill when reported from the Senate committee contained the same figure. The conferees agreed to reduce this authorization for the NYC to $410 million but it is their intention that this be the minimum amount to spend on the NYC. The conferees believe that this has been a highly successful program and feel it would be ill-advised to transfer under administrative procedures any funds away from this program.

In title II the conferees did not intend to put ceilings on all of the money within the title, this was done so that the Director could within the limitations of the Act transfer funds to those programs carried on within the framework of title II. The purpose of earmarking within title II was to express the intention that not less than the allocated sum would be spent on those specified programs.

In title III the conferees left to the discretion of the Director as to how the funds should be divided between the rural loans and the migrants programs. It is the desire of the conferees that not less than $32,000,000 be spent on the migrant program.

Job Corps—Number of women enrollees

The House bill provided that by July 1, 1967, the number of women in residence and receiving training in Job Corps camps and centers must be at least 10,000. The Senate amendment had no comparable provision. The conference substitute modifies this provision to require that by July 1, 1967, 23 percent of the enrollees in camps and centers must be women.

Job Corps—Maximum capacity of Job Corps camps and centers

The House bill provided that for any fiscal year the total enrollment of the Job Corps conservation camps and training centers shall not exceed 45,000 enrollees, and that the cost, excluding capital costs of operating Job Corps centers shall not exceed $7,500 per enrollee.

The conference substitute adopted the House provision with the stipulation that the $7,500 cost per enrollee which is a nationwide average shall only apply to those camps and centers that have been in operation for more than 9 months, and that the cost of operating Job Corps centers be the direct operating costs.

Job Corps enrollees—Assignment near homes

The House bill provided that to the maximum extent feasible Job Corps enrollees should be assigned to camps and centers near their homes. The Senate amendment provided that whenever a vacancy exists in a Job Corps center in the region in which the enrollee resides and it appropriately meets his needs, he shall be assigned there. If there is no such vacancy in the region the enrollee must be assigned to the center nearest his residence which meets his needs.

The substitute agreed upon in conference adopts the Senate provision with the understanding that the word "region", as used therein refers to one of the seven the regions established by the Office of Economic Opportunity for administrative purposes.

Job Corps—Followup information

The Senate amendment contained a provision requiring, to the maximum extent feasible, the Director to obtain certain information from each enrollee who successfully completes enrollment in the Job Corps. Such information to be provided 6 months and 18 months after the completion of enrollment.

The conference substitute adopted the provision in the Senate amendment.

Job Corps—Standards of conduct

The House bill provided individual camp and center directors with authority to take appropriate disciplinary measures against enrollees including but not limited to, dismissal from the camps or centers subject to expeditious appeal procedures to higher authority, as provided under regulations set by the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The conference substituted a technical change to emphasize the Director's additional authority to issue regulations for the entire subsection. The Director is expected to establish appropriate administrative procedures for the protection of the enrollees at each of the camps and centers in connection with these disciplinary measures.

Job Corps—Combined residential and nonresidential demonstration projects

The House bill set a maximum of four experimental and demonstration projects providing vocational education and training and youth employment on a combined residential and nonresidential basis. These projects could involve the use of resources and authority under both the Job Corps provisions of the act and the Neighborhood Youth Corps provisions. The Director was specifically required to report to Congress by March 1, 1969 on action taken and progress made under the section.

The Senate amendment was, in substance, the same as the House bill except that (1) projects were not limited to four, (2) funds under part B, the N.Y.C. provision, could be used only pursuant to agreements with the Secretary of Labor, and (3) the report to Congress was required by March 1, 1968.

The House receded on the date of the report, but the conference substitute provided that there shall be no more than four new such camps or centers which may be constructed. Existing camps or centers may also be adapted or converted for this purpose. The Director is authorized to conduct such projects through grants or contracts.

Job Corps—Qualifications of contractors

The House bill required the Director to establish qualifications for contracting organizations to assure they possess the capacity and educational resources to carry out Job Corps programs. The Senate amendment contained no similar provision. The House receded.

Neighborhood Youth Corps

Sections 112 and 113 of the House bill were agreed to by the conferees with minor changes that serve to carry out the intention of the House provisions. These sections clarify the purpose and scope of the Neighborhood Youth Corps, and authorize improvement of the program to provide the combination of work experience and supportive services best suited to achieve the program objectives for disadvantaged youth.

In section 112(a)(2), the word "enrollment" was substituted for the word "participation" in the last sentence of the paragraph as a clarification of intent.

In section 113(a)(1), the conferees agreed to the deletion of the parenthetical phrase "except those in on-the-job training" as not necessary to the sense of the amendment. They also agreed to delete the word, "nonprofit", in order to permit the placement of enrollees in training programs conducted by private enterprise in accordance with the intent of both Houses.

The wording of the Senate bill, in the paragraph on enrollees in the program, was accepted substituting the word "enrollment" for the word "participation" as a clarification of intent, and the House accepted.

One other Senate amendment makes it possible to utilize the services of private organizations in pursuit of the purposes of this part.

The conferees accepted the House amendment of the paragraph on Limitation on Federal Assistance that extends 90 percent Federal financing of projects for an indefinite period.

Special impact programs

The Senate amendment established a new program providing employment for youths and adults. The program is similar to the work-training programs of the Neighborhood Youth Corps (except for N.Y.C. age requirement), and other work-training programs of the bill. The Senate bill specified that this program shall be directed to those urban areas having especially large concentrations of low income persons; it has also provided great flexibility in program content and financing.

After years of experience with developing and operating work and training programs, the Department of Labor, which has been delegated administrative responsibility for the Neighborhood Youth Corps, has the staff, resources and capacity for the administration of the program. This program shall be implemented in a manner which assures maximum coordination between the Department of Labor and community action programs approved pursuant to part A of title II of this act.

The conferees included in section 132 a limitation of the Federal share of the impact program cost. The limitation provides for a 10 percent matching for public and private non-profit corporation. Section 132 further provides that where private profit-making organizations are involved in contracts under this impact program that such organizations must be able to contribute at least 10 percent of the capital investment required to carry out the program. The reason for including this limitation on a contract with a private organization is to insure that such organization has the necessary skills and capital to successfully carry out such a program and that such organization not be one that is sometimes known as a "fly-by-night" organization. The conferees further feel that this program is designed to insure that sound business practices are followed when dealing with private organizations.

Community action—Residence of area representatives

Section 202(c) (1) and (2) of the House bill provided that the Director shall not approve a community action program unless the board conducting, administering or coordinating the program contains representatives of various geographical areas in the community who are required to live in the area they represent, or by a board on which representatives of the poor comprise at least one-third of the membership. Sections (3) and (4) provided that representatives of the poor must be selected by residents of poverty areas, and that where substantial numbers of poor reside outside of poverty areas, provision, such as neighborhood meetings, shall be made for the selection of representatives of such poor. The conferees adopted the House language with the exception that in Section 202(c) (1) and (2) of the Act, a cut-off date of March 1, 1967 was inserted instead of the instantaneous date in the House bill. In addition to the foregoing, the conferees adopted as Section 202 of the Act a new Subsection (d) which requires the Director to establish procedures by which other groups may be represented on Community Action policy boards. No change was made in the language adopted in the House in Section 202(c) (3) and (4) of the act, it having been established that the requirement of at least one-third representation of the poor on the community action board was not intended to apply to any agencies except the so-called "umbrella" agencies and did not require the restructuring of the city councils where those city councils were not acting as "umbrella" agencies, and further did not require the restructuring of any other governmental agency such as school boards, hospital and welfare boards, unless such agencies were attempting to function as "umbrella" agencies. However, in cases such as New York City where there exist broadly representative boards administering multi-purpose community action programs at the community level, such boards shall be subject to such requirements.

Community action—Use of latest data in making allotments

The House bill provided that for the determination of state allotments the Director shall use the "latest calendar or fiscal year data".

The conference substitute amended this provision to read latest "appropriate date".

Community action—Salary limits

The House bill provided that the Director shall require that where an agency pays an employee engaged in carrying out a community action program at a rate in excess of $12,500 per annum, payment of such excess shall not be made from Federal funds; and any amount paid such employee in excess of $12,500 per annum shall not be considered as counting toward the local share of matching funds.

The conference substitute changed the Federal share with regard to salary from "in excess of $12,500 per annum" to "in excess of $15,000 per annum."

Useful work training for unemployed adults

Section 211(1) of the House bill combined in one section (1) useful work training programs for chronically unemployed adults in, but not limited to, areas of conservation, development or management of natural resources and recreational areas, combined where needed, with educational and training assistance including basic literacy and occupational training, and (2) work training and employment programs for unemployed adults and low income persons in public service and sub-professional occupations involving activities designed to improve the physical, social, economic or cultural condition of the area of community served.

The House managers feel that the employment training opportunities afforded by this section will be of critical importance in areas where there are extreme shortages of public health supporting personnel and substantial numbers of unemployed persons such as in the Applachian area where local community efforts to sustain the Appalachian Regional Hospitals have encountered extreme difficulties.

The conference substitute provided for these programs in slightly modified form in two distinct sections.

Independently funded community action programs

The House bill provided that of the sums available to carry out sections 204 and 205 of the act, at least 20 percent would be used for carrying out independently funded community action programs in communities where an overall community action program is concurrently being carried on.

The conference agreed that this House provision would be modified so that: (1) The Director is required to allocate at least 5 percent of the funds available for programs other than Headstart, Legal Services, the Nelson-Scheuer employment programs, health services, narcotics rehabilitation, and emergency family loans, for implementing such independently funded community action programs. (2) The Director is also specifically authorized to allocate at least an additional 5 percent of such funds for implementing such independently funded community action programs. (3) In the expenditure of funds available under this amendment the Director may fund only community action programs other than those enumerated above.

Without regard to the preceding provision, the Senate bill contained a provision requiring the Director to fund independent agencies in predominantly rural areas where he determines that the establishment of a community action agency within a reasonable period of time is not feasible. The Senate bill also contained a provicion for the funding of projects of a regional nature. The Senate bill also retained the preference clause set forth in section 211 of the act.

The House accepted these features of the Senate bill.

Administrative, accounting and auditing procedures

The House bill contained several provisions regarding administrative, accounting and auditing procedures, as follows:

(1) Public grantee agencies must submit a statement from an appropriate public financial officer as to the adequacy of the agencies accounting system.

(2) The Director may issue or cause to be issued a preliminary audit survey within 3 months of a grant or contract.

(3) Agencies whose funds have been suspended because of accounting inadequacies must make changes and corrections in their systems.

The Senate amendment provided for similar requirements and requirements regarding personnel, policies and standards.

The conference substitute modified the provisions in both bills, as follows:

(1) Public grantee agencies may also secure the opinion of a CPA or licensed public accountant regarding the adequacy of their accounting system;

(2) The required preliminary audit is to be made within 3 months of the effective date of the grant or contract.

(3) Personnel other than auditors may furnish advice needed to improve accounting procedures.

Allowances for meeting attendance and reimbursement for other expenses

The Senate amendment provided for payment of allowances to persons, other than federal or community action agency employees, for attendance at neighborhood community action program council or committee meetings, and for payment of other expenses necessary for participation in the development, conduct, and administration of community action programs.

The conference substitute amended this provision as follows:

(1) Payments and reimbursements shall be payable for attendance at city-wide community action board meetings;

(2) Payments or reimbursement shall be only to such persons who meet the criteria of being poor;

(3) Payments shall not be made for more than two meetings per month; and

(4) Prohibition against receipt of such payments is extended to State and local governmental employees.

Family planning services

The Senate amendment contained a provision not in the House bill with respect to the carrying out of family planning services as a part of community action programs.

The Senate amendment which was agreed to guaranteed that eligibility for family planning services for the poor will be left entirely to the determination of the local community. Such services must be requested by a local community action agency. No individual will be provided with information, medical services, or supplies unless they are specifically and voluntarily requested. In no event shall such information, assistance or supplies be provided if it is inconsistent with an individual's philosophical, moral or religious beliefs. The use of family planning services cannot be a prerequisite to the receipt of services from or participation in any other programs under the Act.

Community action—Research and demonstration

Section 208 of the House bill reduced the allowable percentage of section 207 funds which can be used for research, demonstration and training projects from 15 percent to 5 percent of the total funds available for title II.

The conference substitute removed the word "training" from section 207 of the act and accepted the Senate version of section 206 so that the reduced funding percentage would apply only to research and demonstration.

Small emergency family loans

The House bill provided an allocation of $8,000,000 for family emergency loans. The Senate amendment contained no such provision or earmarking of funds.

The conference substitute provided that emergency family loans should be funded under section 206 rather than section 208, thus consolidating with technical assistance and training. Eight million dollars is allocated for this purpose.

Health services

The conference substitute authorized grants or contracts for the development and implementation of comprehensive health services programs.

Narcotics rehabilitation

The House bill provided for the formulation and conduct of programs for the prevention of narcotic addiction and the rehabilitation of narcotic addicts, earmarking $12,500,000 for this purpose.

The conference substitute incorporated this provision into the comprehensive health services programs.

Although Narcotics Rehabilitation was not specifically earmarked by legislation, the Committee explicitly agreed that no less than $12,000,000 of the earmarked funds for Health Services programs, or an equivalent proportion of such funds as may be appropriated, be used only for Narcotics Rehabilitation.

Adult basic education

The present act contains a comprehensive program for Federal assistance to provide basic education to adults. The House bill severally amended these provisions. The Senate bill contained no such amendments because the Senate was cognizant of proposed Senate legislation to transfer this entire program to the Office of Education. As a result, the conference substitute combined the essential features of the adult literacy program in section 603 and the provision for special projects in section 218(a) of the House bill into a new section under Title IIA. The function of implementing these specialized adult basic education programs is vested in the OEO Director.

Indian tribes

The House accepted the Senate amendment providing that cooperatives organized and operated by Indian tribes on Indian reservations may receive rural loans.

Title IV—Small business loan program

The bill as passed by the House amended this title to transfer the small business loan program from the Director of OEO to the Administrator of the Small Business Administration. The Senate bill contained no similar transfer provision but amended existing law by specifically authorizing the Director of OEO to make grants to, or contracts with, public or private nonprofit agencies to enable them to provide counseling and management guidance to persons and small business concerns eligible for loan assistance. The Senate bill also contained a specific authorization for funding this grant program. The committee of conference recommended that both the House and Senate amendments be agreed to.

The committee of conference intended that SBA shall fund, administer, and be responsible for the loan program; but that OEO shall fund, administer, and be responsible for the counseling and guidance program.

Work experience

The House bill amended the work experience provisions of title V to establish closer coordination between the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Labor to effect more meaningful work training programs which would be complemented with supportive social services and vocational education.

The Conference substitute differed from the House provision by extending the limit on the duration of work experience and training programs from 24 to 36 months. It also included a new section that provides for the orderly transfer of responsibility for the work training and work experience aspects of these programs to the Secretary of Labor to improve the administration and coordination of manpower programs. Through June 30, 1967, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to carry out such programs, and may carry to completion programs begun prior to that date, though in no case may he continue a program beyond June 30, 1968.

Beginning July 1, 1967, the training components of these programs are to be provided by the Secretary of Labor, under part E, of title II of this bill). Subject in each case to the concurrence of the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may, after June 30, 1967, renew existing programs or provide new programs or parts thereof that the Secretary of Labor is unable to provide after having been given notice and a reasonable opportunity to do so.

Prior to July 1, 1967, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may utilize the services and facilities available under the manpower development and utilization programs of the Department of Labor for the purpose of carrying out this title and title X (part E) of the Manpower Development and Training Act.

The 80–20 matching requirements shall not become effective until July 31, 1968, because many state legislatures meet only once every 2 years.

Assistant Director for the elderly poor

The Senate bill contained a provision which required the appointment of a new Assistant Director, with the responsibility for conducting investigations and studies to develop programs with respect for the elderly poor, and to make appropriate recommendations regarding the establishment of such programs. The House bill contained no comparable provision.

The conference adopted the Senate amendment.

Liaison and exchange of information

The Senate bill provided for the maximum possible liaison between the Office of Economic Opportunity and other Federal agencies, including the furnishing of information.

The conference amended this provision to insure that with regard to furnishing information, there shall be a complete and two-way exchange of information between OEO and the other agencies.

Political activities

The House and Senate bills both contained provisions restricting the political activities of OEO employees.

The conference accepted the provision of the Senate bill which provides that employees of community action agencies would be fully subject to the provisions of Section 12 of the Hatch Act prohibiting partisan political activity on the part of employees of State or local agencies whose principal employment is in connection with an activity financed in whole or part by Federal loans or grants.

It also requires that officers and employees of any agency receiving assistance under the Act (other than part C of title I) be treated as employees of State or local agencies for purposes of the prohibitions in the Hatch Act on soliciting funds from other employees for political purposes and using official position to interfere with or affect the result of any election or nomination.

In addition, the Director, after consultation with the Civil Service Commission, is authorized to issue such regulations or impose such requirements as may be necessary or appropriate to supplement the above provisions.

National Advisory Council on Economic Opportunity

The Senate bill contained a provision that revised the section respecting the Advisory Council, as follows:

(1) It shall be composed of 21 members appointed by the President with staggered terms and without regard to civil service laws;

(2) The Director will be an ex-officio member;

(3) Members are to be representative of the public and of appropriate fields of endeavor related to the purposes of the act;

(4) One member of the Advisory Council will be designated Chairman by the President;

(5) The Advisory Council will meet at the call of the Chairman but not less than four times a year.

The duties of the Advisory Council are to advise the Director with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of the act, review the effectiveness and operation of programs under the act, and make recommendations concerning those programs, the elimination of duplication of effort, and the coordination of these programs with other Federal programs. Recommendations by the Advisory Council will include such proposals for change in the Economic Opportunity Act as its members deem appropriate.

Not later than March 31 of each calendar year, the Advisory Council will make a report of its findings and recommendations to the President, who will transmit the report, together with his comments and recommendations to the Congress.

COMPARABILITY OF WAGES

The House bill's wage comparability provision was modified to assure that the rate of compensation of persons employed in carrying our programs under the act be comparable to that either in the area where the program is carried out or in the area of the person's immediately preceding employment. In addition, the Director would be required to assure that compensation be at a rate which is not less than the Federal minimum wage.

The House also accepted a Senate amendment requiring that the Director report to the President for submission to Congress information on persons receiving a salary of $10,000 or more per year.

COORDINATION OF TRAINING PROGRAMS

Both the House and Senate bill contained provisions requiring greater coordination of government training programs.

The conference committee accepted the Senate version which requires the Director, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the heads of other agencies concerned, acting through the President's Committee on Manpower, to provide for and take such steps as may be necessary and appropriate to implement the effective coordination of all programs and activities relating to the training of individuals for the purpose of improving or restoring employability. It further provides that the Secretary of Labor, pursuant to such agreements as may be necessary or appropriate shall be responsible for assuring that the Federal-State employment service provides, and develops its capacity for providing, maximum support for Federal training programs. The Secretary of Labor is also directed to obtain from the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the head of any other Federal agency administering a training program information which will facilitate the placement of individuals being trained.

Information—Catalog and dissemination

The House bill required the Director to publish and maintain a current catalog of all Federal programs relating to individual and community improvement, and to make grants to States and communities to establish information centers.

The conference substitute adopted this provision, except that the word "all" before "Federal programs" is stricken to indicate the amendment is intended to assure continued publication of OEO's present catalog and not intended to require with respect to new material duplication of information already published by other Federal agencies.

Limitation on additional supergrades

The House bill contained a provision which limited the number of positions in OEO and its field offices in the classification categories of GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18, to not exceed 1 for every 100 employees.

The conference substitute provided that no additional positions in these classification categories above those now authorized shall be created or filled in fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

The conference committee recommended that a joint committee comprised of Members of the Senate and of the House shall be convened to investigate and study the OEO administrative operation to determine the numbers of supergrades and consultants necessary to successfully achieve the purpose of this act.

Not later than March 15, 1967, such committee should submit to the Congress a report of its findings, along with any recommendations concerning this section.

Private enterprise participation

The Senate bill provided that the Director or any other Federal department or agency head to which conduct of a program has been delegated shall act to insure that the resources of private enterprise are employed to the maximum feasible extent in Economic Opportunity Act programs. An annual report to Congress on the progress made under the section is required.

Prohibition on assistance to individuals inciting riots

The House bill contained provisions to prohibit assistance under this Act to individuals inciting riots and causing civil disturbances. The Senate amendment had a similar provision.

The conference modified and adopted the House amendment to insure that an individual must have been convicted by a Federal, State, or local court of competent jurisdiction, of inciting, promoting or carrying on a riot, or any group activity resulting in material damage to property or injury to persons.

ADAM C. POWELL,
CARL D. PERKINS,
EDITH GREEN,
FRANK THOMPSON,
JOHN H. DENT,
SAM M. GIBBONS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], the author of the bill, for an explanation of the conference report.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, this conference report has been printed in the RECORD since Tuesday. I hope by this time all Members have had adequate time to examine it. This was a very difficult conference. It took place over a period of almost a week, resulting in 6 or 7 meetings of the conferees in an attempt to resolve some 53 rather major differences between the House and Senate bills. Now, of course, in any conference such as this it is impossible for either side to claim that they have won. The differences between the two bodies must be resolved, and we did resolve those differences. However, in reporting to the House the result of this conference, in all fairness, I must say that we maintained the very strict language which had been built into the House bill over its long period of development, running for almost a year and involving the earmarking of funds, the accounting for funds, the setting up of proper accounting systems involving the control of expenditures and postaudit expenditures, limitations on maximum amounts that can be spent. Overall this is a very tight bill compared to the bills that this House has passed in the past. After all is said and done, I think it was a free and fair conference and the differences were resolved. I think we can point with pride to the changes that have been made in the basic act affecting the war on poverty this year. We have tried to emphasize those programs that have proven to be the most effective in getting to the target. We have tried within the limited funds available to us to preserve the ability of the agency to find new ways of attacking causes of poverty. We have done everything we thought it was possible to do in order to tighten up this very worthwhile program.

I think it is well to point out at this time, Mr. Speaker, as we reach the final vote on this measure that the war on poverty has been successful this year. About 4 million people have been directly touched by its activities. In any such war as this it is extremely hard to measure its returns in tangible quantities that you can put on a graph or a chart. However, we know there are now about 30,000 young men and young women in Job Corps training centers learning for the first time from a rather practical education viewpoint the techniques which will fit them into vocations for the rest of their lives. We know that the Job Corps has run much higher in cost than we want it to be. We want to cut these costs down. I think the legislation this year, because of the amendments that have been placed in the bill, will bring this cost down.

Mr. Speaker, we know the Neighborhood Youth Corps has been remarkably successful. It has had a low cost per enrollee. Over two-thirds of a million young men and young women who would have gone into our society without the opportunity of having a good job have been trained so that they either now do have a good job or else their prospect of getting a good job has been greatly enhanced.

We also know that in the Headstart program, which is really more than just a preschool or a kindergarten or a nursery school program but is one which involves the entire family of the poverty-stricken child, that this has been an extremely successful program. Almost 1 million children and their families have been involved in this program. Hailed as one of the great breakthroughs in family development, in education and training, Operation Headstart will be a milestone. We will all look back on it with a great deal of pride.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, we have instituted as a tool to teach the poor something here which will show them that the law is on their side and teach them to take proper advantage of the law. Mr. Speaker, we have a great legal services program here. This is a program that I might add has been endorsed by the conservative American Bar Association as well as the other associations that deal with the problems of legal representation.

In addition to that, we have started a program that will move deserving, able, but yet not fully achieving high school students into college.

When you couple all of this, together with the other programs that have come out of the Committee on Education and Labor—and I refer to the programs that have come out of the subcommittee chaired by the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], having to do with college assistance for people to go to college—we have opened up great opportunities for the people—young students—regardless of their economic background. If they have the courage and the scholastic background, they can go on and remove themselves from the clutches of poverty.

Mr. Speaker, we hope that in the years to come we shall be able to obtain better coordination between the various programs that move in this sector of our governmental work.

Mr. Speaker, we have tried to do that in title V this year and have tried to coordinate the activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare more closely with the activities of the Department of Labor.

Mr. Speaker, we are amending in this act the Manpower Development and Training Act, the very great act of which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] is the author and an act that has been extremely successful in moving people from the hopeless conditions in which they find themselves into good vocations and into producing citizens.

Mr. Speaker, it is with all of these things that I urge the Members of the House to vote "aye" on final passage of this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, we are right up now to the final hour of this Congress.

All of us have wished for and hoped that this act could have been voted on months and months ago. I sincerely regret that it has not been so voted upon.

Mr. Speaker, not only has it reached the poor generally, but it has permitted the poor, the people in poverty, to undertake to do something about performing a job in this area.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] has worked continuously, for the last couple of years, in trying to improve various programs involved in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman for a breakdown, particularly of the various programs involved.

Mr. Speaker, how do the figures of the Job Corps for fiscal 1967 and for the Neighborhood Youth Corps, on which the gentleman has placed so much emphasis in his statement—compare with the funds made available in fiscal 1966?

Mr. GIBBONS. Well, in fiscal 1966 we spent about $303 million in the Job Corps. This included the great part of the capital outlay program for the Job Corps and the tooling up of the Job Corps.

This year, we propose the expenditure in this legislation of a maximum of $211 million. This is a ceiling figure, and we want it to be a ceiling figure. We believe with this ceiling and the limitation which we have put upon the Job Corps this year, the cost per enrollee will come down.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, we expended $271 million on the Neighborhood Youth Corps. Of course, the program was vastly underfunded last year. It only reached about 10 percent of the eligible youth involved in this very important program.

And, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about "eligible youth," I feel it is necessary to point out that an eligible youth in this program could be from a family of three wherein the family income is $3,150 a year. That works out to the unfortunate situation where a family like that has about 22 cents per person per meal to expend upon its livelihood.

It is a pretty desperate situation. And that is the top of the eligible enrollee income. Some of these people are much poorer than that. We spent in the program last year $271 million. This year we are authorizing $410 million to expand this program, and to expand the on-the-job training program and the eligibility program this year, in the hope we can get more than just 10 percent of the youth who really need this service.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, if I might ask the gentleman a further question:

If I understand the conference report as a conferee, we raised about $150 million of the Headstart funds above the figure last year. Would the gentleman tell the committee why we did that?

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, we raised the authorization this year for Headstart because we thought this had been an extremely effective program, and deserved to have more emphasis than it had had in the past. We felt that this would give the Office of Economic Opportunity the chance of creating more year-round Headstart programs.

We are now able to reach most of the children and their families in the summer programs, but we wanted to bring in a greater followup and a follow through because without the push that they get in Headstart, and without the followup that we must build into the program, we feel that some of the benefits might be short-lived. That is the primary reason for increasing the authorization in Headstart.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I think the Members of the House will be interested in why the gentleman from Florida has recommended so much earmarking under title II, and how the community action compares in fiscal 1966 and 1967.

Mr. GIBBONS. The funds will work out approximately the same, as I see it. There is some flexibility in this act left to the administrator so that he can transfer funds from title II. It seems to me, though, that we should recognize the difference between the earmarking in title I and the earmarking in title II. In title I we earmarked every dollar in that, $211 million for the Job Corps, $410 million for the Neighborhood Youth Corps, and $75 million for the impact program, which was included in this legislation by the Senate.

In the House in title II we did not earmark every single penny, but left quite a bit of it in an unearmarked category.

It was the desire of the conferees that the Director have flexibility in title II so, for instance, if the Director wanted to spend more money in the legal services program—more money than the $22 million which we said should be the minimum in that program—that the Director could perhaps spend the $50 million that the American Bar Association testified was needed—in fact, they said it was a minimum, they would like to have had $96 million in this program.

Thus, the earmarking in title I and title II differs slightly in that in title II the unearmarked funds can be used in addition to the funds that we put in for Headstart and Upward Bound, and for the other programs in title II.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, because of an error in one of the reports, there is some confusion on whether the earmarked funds under title II are minimum or maximum.

Is it abundantly clear that it was the intent of the conferees that in, for example, the legal services to which the gentleman referred a moment ago, that this would be the minimum amount which would be reserved for this, and that from the versatile community action funds they could spend any amount that they so desired above the earmarked $22 million?

Mr. GIBBONS. That is correct. That was the purpose of earmarking in title II.

The gentlewoman from Oregon has referred to an error in this conference report, when this conference report was first printed—and the conference report that the Members should be watching is the one with the star on the bottom, the star print.

When the conference report was first printed, due to an error in the Printing Office, one entire page was left out. As soon as that was caught the first morning the conference report was available, the Government Printing Office immediately reprinted it, and there is a reprint of the conference report available which is actually the official conference report.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. It seems to me the legal service program is one of the programs that has worked well.

Mr. GIBBONS. Yes, I will agree with the gentlewoman.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Of course, there are so many people of inadequate income to whom the old saying "Justice delayed is justice denied" applies and this is one of the programs that helps to secure justice for them. It is my hope that out of the versatile funds a considerably larger amount than $22 million would be spent.

Would the gentleman from Florida—and he is a person who has done more probably than any other Member of Congress to help make this program work—would the gentleman comment on the legal services part of the program and give us his judgment on what it has accomplished?

Mr. GIBBONS. I certainly agree with the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] with respect to the legal services part of the program. There is no doubt—and I am a practicing lawyer, or at least I was before I came to the House of Representatives—there is no doubt, as most of us know, that justice to a great extent has to do with one's ability to hire competent representation, particularly in these commercial areas and areas in which our legal services programs are working. Certainly, the denial of good, competent legal service to a poor person is, in effect, denying justice to that person. I think most lawyers would agree with me on that.

Second, I think we must point out we will accomplish much good in this legal services program by trying to help and educate poor people whose contact with the law has normally been a harsh, abrasive contact—people who sometimes see the law as a challenge to their survival rather than looking at the law as an expression and a model of the mores and customs that we live by in our society. So by bringing the law to these people and by humanizing it, we can teach them that the law is their ally and not their enemy; and so we can assist these people who need this help.

We will accomplish many things by doing this. We will enhance the rule of law, and not of man.

We will enhance the dignity of the law, and not its degradation.

We will make our laws more effective and fair as to all segments of society.

So I applaud the program that has been carried on by the OEO in the legal services field.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURTON of California. With reference to the community action program and the yardstick used by the OEO in determining the allocation to the States, my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL], the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY], and I have been quite interested in this AFDC formula.

If the gentleman from Florida will recall, the House version required the OEO to use the latest calendar or fiscal year data—whichever was the latest. There was an apparently minor modification of that made by the conference committee. It appears not to affect the thrust of the House version but I want to get the gentleman's view on this point.

The language as indicated on page 32 in the conference report indicates that language reading "latest appropriate date" is included now in the bill before us.

My question is this. Am I correct in assuming that the OEO with the passage of this bill will be under a mandate to use the latest accurate annual AFDC data that is available to it?

Mr. GIBBONS. The gentleman from California is correct. That was the purpose of placing this in the legislation, the provision you refer to way back in our committee sessions in March and April. That was the purpose of the conferees and we only seek in the conference report to perfect that language.

Mr. BURTON of California. As the gentleman knows, when the bill was discussed on the floor of the House a few years ago, I posed a question to the then Member of the House from California, Mr. Roosevelt, and at that time it was indicated that the latest data would be used. The Department at that time was using 1959 data. As a result of the discussion on the floor of the House, they began using 1962 data.

If I understand the response just made by the gentleman from Florida to my question, the Department will be using 1965 or 1966 data, or whichever data is the latest and accurate uniform AFDC data available from the Department of HEW; is that correct?

Mr. GIBBONS. That is correct.

Mr. BURTON of California. I thank the gentleman.

In the event OEO does not use the latest available AFDC data, can the gentleman assure me that he will use his good offices to obtain compliance in this regard with the clear intent of the House?

Mr. GIBBONS. Of course.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, before I talk about the conference report, let me talk about today's Drew Pearson column first, because I noted that many of my colleagues, when they read the funny papers this morning, were reading Drew Pearson as well, and I heard the conversations around about whether any of the column was true.

As you know, Drew Pearson has the reputation, at least in this body, of not always telling the truth, all the truth, and nothing but the truth. I would say this morning, only in regards to the staff of the Committee on Education and Labor who are employed by the minority, that not one of the incidents of mismanagement of Federal funds listed in the Drew Pearson column came from either of the two individuals who work for the minority. What was charged about other colleagues mentioned in the column will have to be answered by them, but in regard to the staff members listed I just want my colleagues to know that there was not one bit of truth, not one of the incidents came from either of those two people.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GIBBONS. I read that column this morning when I was having breakfast. I know the two staff members to whom the gentleman refers, Miss Goldman and Mr. Buckley, and I know that they are not the source of the material that you read, because they have very kindly furnished me a copy of all press releases that they have sent out, and I can verify that what the gentleman has said is correct.

Mr. QUIE. I thank my colleague from Florida. I might mention again what we said in the debate. Every poverty memo has been made available to all our colleagues, well documented; where necessary, affidavits have been provided, and not in one instance has OEO been able to disprove any of the information or facts that we have provided.

As Members read through the debate on the poverty bill, they will see that there nothing was refuted.

I have read in the newspapers some time ago about the incidents that were written up in the column. I might say that sometimes there are mistakes in newspapers, and we all take that for granted, but when Miss Goldman and Mr. Buckley have put out anything, it was well documented and has never been refuted.

Let me say about the conference report that we were faring pretty well through most of the conference. We came to the end oi the conference, and then the majority of the House conferees capitulated and accepted really the number of supergrades that are presently authorized for the Office of Economic Opportunity.

In the House, as you will recall, we adopted the Ashbrook amendment by a vote of 257 to 108, requiring that the OEO have no more than one supergrade per 100 employees. They have now 53 authorized supergrades, which amounts to one supergrade per 43.3 employees. No other agency of the Government has so many supergrades other than the Atomic Energy Commission and, as you know, they hire physicists. I think on this disagreement the House conferees cannot come back and say they compromised. The House gave up, and while we had gone along to the point where I thought I might be able to support the conference report, I could not accept a conference report completely contrary to the House position.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, who is the author of the amendment.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding. I find this very astounding in light of the fact not only of the overwhelming vote of 257 to 108 by which the House passed the amendment the gentleman referred to, but also the fact that the nine conferees that represented this body, and supposedly supported our position, the announced position of the House and conference, that six of the nine members had voted affirmatively for the amendment. In other words, 6 of the 9 who were representing our side in the conference were among the 257 who overwhelmingly supported it.

The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL]; our colleague, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN]; the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT]; and, of course, the minority members, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES]. Six of our nine Members had voted affirmatively, and I can conceive of no possible way that the House position could be bargained away so easily had these nine people supported our position.

I wonder if the gentleman can shed some light on that.

Mr. QUIE. I would only speak for myself, and I will assume to speak for my colleagues on the minority side, that we did not vote to recede and accept this language. Others will have to speak for themselves.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I heard the statement that the House conferees bargained this away so easily. Would the gentleman in the well agree that this was the most troublesome point of the whole conference and that we probably came back to it 15 times during the course of the 3 days and that it was the final difference to be settled between the House and Senate conferees?

Mr. QUIE. Yes, I agree that we raised this point many times during the conference. I did not count 15, but many times.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Then the gentleman would not say that we bargained it away or gave it away easily?

Mr. QUIE. Not easily, but I do not believe we should have given up and completely receded.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. May I ask the gentleman another question? I believe he said we authorized 53 supergrade positions. Is it not true that the agreement was that there should be no new positions in the supergrades beyond those presently authorized, which is 53, even though there are some new programs in the OEO bill?

Mr. QUIE. That is correct. Fifty-three is the limit on the number they can hire, even though they have never filled the 53 slots before. Forty-nine, I believe, is the highest they ever had in the past.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Would the gentleman also agree that this is really a matter which is academic, since if we place a limitation of 29 or 35, and it is enforced rigidly, there is absolutely nothing to prevent the Office of Economic Opportunity from hiring 100 consultants at $100 a day and keeping them on the payroll for as long as the law allows, 131 days, and then rehiring them? Is it not true that they could hire any number of consultants at salaries equal to or greater than those paid to the supergrade employees?

Mr. QUIE. I would not agree it is merely academic, but the gentlewoman from Oregon is absolutely correct that the OEO can hire any number of consultants. They have. They have abused the privilege of hiring consultants and have kept them on longer than 131 days in one year.

This amendment did nothing to control consultants.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHBROOK. If it is true what the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon has said—I am sure it is, because she is always accurate in her facts—this indicates that the House has been very slipshod in drawing up the law and has given far too much leeway to the bureaucrats. Perhaps the gentlewoman is pointing out an area in which we should draw further strings, as we attempted to do in this instance.

Mr. QUIE. I might say this comes right to the problem of drawing legislation with proper guidelines and standards.

Let me make some comments concerning the special impact programs, as sent over by the Senate.

This says:

> The purpose of this part is to establish special programs which (1) are directed to the solution of the critical problems existing

in particular communities and neighborhoods, especially large concentrations of low-income persons; (2) are of sufficient size and scope to have an appreciable impact in such communities and neighborhoods in arresting tendencies toward dependency, chronic unemployment, and rising community tensions; and (3), where feasible and appropriate, are part of a citywide plan for the reorganization of local or State agencies.

I would say that if the Members will just look at the main thought in these points they will see that here is a program for which money will be appropriated for special impact programs with three purposes, as follows:

One. Solution of critical problems.

Two. Of sufficient size and scope.

Three. For the reorganization of local and State agencies.

Such loose language will just give an opportunity for my colleague from New York [Mr. Goodell] and I to write poverty memos next year. This is broad and wide open for all the mismanagement and mishandling of this program we have seen for 2 years.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I would agree that this bill puts us in business again for next year.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McClory].

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring with regard to the provisions on page 34 of the statement of the managers on the part of the House, which states that there will be $12 million for narcotic addict rehabilitation.

The reason that I inquire about this is we are going to act soon on the Narcotics Addict Rehabilitation Act which will provide for $15 million per year for 2 years to provide facilities and services to take care of rehabilitating narcotics addicts under a very imaginative program. It does strike me that this will be a duplication of the program which is being established on this comprehensive and very far-reaching legislation which the House already acted upon and which we are about to act upon further by way of this conference committee report.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman from Illinois well knows that this is a serious problem in this country.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute in order to answer this question.

I do not consider it a duplication by any means, because we know it is a serious problem. It is true there has been allocated in title II $12 million for narcotics addicts rehabilitation. The problem is of such magnitude and complexity that we should attack it from many points of view. The fact that you have this amount in here is something else. We felt after the hearings we should put something in here.

Mr. McCLORY. I do have your assurance that the other program will not be duplicated by these funds

Mr. PERKINS. There is no duplication whatsoever. This is for the local community action groups to administer.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I have been assured that the legislation embodied in the conference report on the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966—H.R. 15111—will not duplicate any of the programs or funds which are included in the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966—H.R. 9167.

I have been particularly concerned about the language contained in section 211-2(b) of title II, which states that the Director "shall formulate and carry out programs for the prevention of narcotic addiction and the rehabilitation of narcotic addicts."

The rehabilitation of narcotic addicts is the primary objective of the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act. That legislation—as presented in the conference report—authorizes the appropriation of $15 million for each of the next 2 years. That is the authorization intended to carry out the imaginative program of narcotic addict rehabilitation as embodied in H.R. 9167.

It would seem to be both confusing, and possibly a duplication, for funds to be expended by the Director of Economic Opportunity. It would seem to me that new rehabilitation facilities and services should not be established except under the authority of the Surgeon General—as provided in the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for the purpose of making legislative history for 1 minute?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ICHORD. I will say to the gentleman from Kentucky that during the legislative debate on this bill I had an amendment to section 211, which is shown on page 13 of the conference report. I refer specifically to the proviso which states:

> *Provided,* That the Director shall establish procedures to assure that the principal local bar associations in the area to be served by any proposed program of legal advice and representation are afforded an adequate opportunity to review the proposed program and to submit comments and recommendations thereon before such program is approved or funded.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'Hara] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gibbons], who were handling the legal section of the bill, were working with me on the wording of an amendment, and the wording of the amendment was changed. In the Congressional Record the original amendment was sent to the printers and printed there. I think the permanent Record is correct, but I wanted to make this legislative history to show that this was the wording that was discussed during the legislative consideration of this.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman is absolutely correct, and the Record certainly should be corrected accordingly.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dent].

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as you know, at this moment the only discussion of serious problems happens to be the one dealing with the so-called supergrades amendment accepted by the House by a large vote of 257 to 108. The accusation has been made that the House conferees, six of whom voted with the majority in the House, took what we might call a run-out powder and did not stand by the position of the House. This is not true for the simple reason that we learned, in the conference, a great deal we did not know while we were discussing the matter on the floor. Most of us on the floor—or at least I admit to my own lack of details on this subject matter when it came up on the floor of the House—I refer to the question of the number of supergrades in other departments. You will note that you received a letter from the minority members who refused to sign the conference report. Incidentally, the minority Members of the Senate signed the conference report. It was the insistence of the spokesman of the minority members on the part of the Senate in the conference that caused us to be deadlocked on this very issue. In fact, when we were discussing the point of whether or not we had established a $12,500 limitation on the use of Federal funds for the employees of the local community action programs and other programs under this particular legislation, we were tied up for a whole afternoon in arguing with the Republican Members of the Senate on the question of wiping out that limitation.

And, finally, we had to compromise again, we had to go to 15,000—the House conferees had to agree in order to get the other body to agree to end the conference with a report.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. Wait until I am through, because you have me over a barrel. You have heard used figures that have got to be corrected.

Mr. Speaker, it appears that the figures which they put in the report with reference to employment within the various agencies of the Government, show that NASA has one supergrade to 105.9 employees.

Mr. Speaker, let us look and see the facts about this supergrade ratio in these various departments.

For instance, Mr. Speaker, in the Peace Corps, they say that the Peace Corps has one supergrade for every 216 employees. That is simply not true.

Mr. Speaker, the total number of employees in the Peace Corps is 1,240, and divided by the 216 supergrades, the Peace Corps has one supergrade for every 13.6 employees.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot compare OEO to other departments of Government.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me at this point?

Mr. DENT. Just a minute.

Mr. Speaker, in the Post Office Department—and incidentally they did not compare the Post Office Department in their ratio figures, because in the Post Office Department we have one supergrade for every 8,000 employees.

They are taking Post Office Department, with thousands of employees who work in an area where they need no supergrade supervision, and piling all of them into one basket, and saying, "Look at what they can do in this Department."

But, Mr. Speaker, in doing that, one is comparing pineapples with coconuts, and they just do not belong in the same basket.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. Well, I had better yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, I suppose, or I shall not get to finish my presentation.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] where he obtained his information with reference to the comparison of supergrades as to employees, because I obtained my information from the House Civil Service and Post Office Committee and also out of the budget which was presented to the Congress by the President of the United States.

Mr. DENT. Well, the gentleman had better take that matter up with the other body. I obtained my information from the Senate Civil Service Committee. The Senate Civil Service Committee also pointed out——

Mr. QUIE. Well, I believe we had better check those figures again.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Civil Service Committee also pointed out the fact and the question as to whether or not we had authority to limit supergrades in this legislation, inasmuch as the supergrades requested by the OEO were cleared with the other body. It was cleared with the other body before they granted 53 supergrades.

And, Mr. Speaker, anyone who says they have abused the authorization which they have, does not know what they are talking about. At the present moment they only have 36 supergrades employed. They have never reached the 53 supergrades which they were authorized.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, they have never reached the full use of the full authorization. The Budget Director has authorized 61 slots, the OEO has never filled the slots allowed.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is well to point out here that before we added the extra programs onto the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Civil Service Commission recommended 53 supergrades; is that not correct?

Mr. DENT. I do not feel that we need to get into the question any deeper with reference to supergrades, simply because in this particular program most of the thousands of so-called employees are not direct employees. But if you take and count all of the Youth Corps and all of the Headstart programs covered by the act, as is done with reference to the Post Office Department and as with reference to any other department, these boys in the NYO are being paid out of Federal funds, under supervision of the workers of the OEO, and they could probably be counted.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I believe your point is correct, that you have based a lot of your argument upon the Peace Corps, but how many people are affected in the field?

The gentleman says there are 1,240 employed by the Peace Corps. Does the gentleman know how many Peace Corpsmen there are that would fit into the same category as the gentleman now is mentioning?

Mr. DENT. They are direct employees of the Peace Corps.

Mr. ASHBROOK. By the law that we passed, Peace Corpsmen are Federal employees, and have rights coming back to this country that are given to Federal employees.

We cannot count some groups as Federal employees, then say for purposes of statistics that they are not Federal employees.

Mr. DENT. I wish the gentleman had been at the conference, the gentleman would have been on my side all the way, because at one point, we almost came to blows because they wanted to count all the Community Youth Corps and the Headstart little children as employees of the Government for the purpose of putting them under the Hatch Act. I think the only reason we won the argument on the supergrades was that we proved that if they were Federal employees for the Hatch Act then they must be Federal employees for the supergrades ratios.

It got to the point where the shoe was pinching on both feet so we both gave a little, they gave up on the Hatch Act and we gave up on supergrades.

Mr. Speaker, we must point out that there are professional administrative doctors in this particular program. We admit that we are treating a sickness in America, the disease of poverty, and we are trying to cure millions of stricken people in the United States. Do we want to turn them over to persons who are not trained to give them the proper care and treatment, and consideration, in the administration of this act?

Would you open up a program to go out and give preventive medicine to millions of persons, and have them line up in a line with their shoulders bare for shots, and turn them over to people who are not qualified to do the medical part of the work?

Mr. Speaker, I think this supergrade argument does not need any more explanation. I want to get right to the meat of this.

It seems peculiar to me that throughout this whole discussion, both prior to the passage of the bill and right now in this short moment we have to discuss the poverty program, that there are many who would like to vote down the poverty program, but who have not the courage to vote it down on a direct issue, but would like to do it by voting against something that has some kind of personal appeal this afternoon before the elections. When you get the letter from the minority making the plea that we are taking money from the poor to give it to the supergrades just ignore it. The information does not match the facts.

And yet, is it not true that a vote at this time can only be a vote down or up? We can either vote for the program, or vote it out. If we vote it out what do we do? We close down this community action program and knock the Headstart program right out of existence. We kill off 743,000 little children who have never had the first glimpse of the printed word, or the concept of something related to the printed word.

As a matter of fact, one of the national magazines—I believe it was the Saturday Evening Post—carried an ad by a private concern saying until Headstart started, there were thousands upon thousands of children in the United States who could not relate the word "sky" to that which was above them; could not relate the word "air" to the life-sustaining air that they sucked into their lungs each time they breathe; who could not relate an object to a word.

Yet we are standing here arguing on supergrades when, if we do not pass this bill some 743,000 little children will go back into darkness, the darkness of ignorance.

Mr. Speaker, it is a question of whether we are afraid to face the issue. The issue is: Do we or do we not pass the poverty program? Let us forget the supergrades, let us forget the undergrades, let us remember those who are benefiting from it.

Mr. Speaker, the question before the House in voting on the conference report on H.R. 15111 is one of the utmost urgency and finality. There is no time to select another conference committee to go through the whole process of renegotiating a conference report. Recommittal is not in order. This is it. The question is whether the war on poverty continues or is killed right now. The continuing resolution under which OEO is operating expires on Saturday. There will not be another chance to extend the war on poverty if this conference report is rejected.

A vote to reject the conference report on H.R. 15111 means the end of 1,000 community action agencies operating in every State and district. It means no Headstart for 743,000 little children. It means that 108 Job Corps centers will close down, and that 30,000 Job Corps men and women will be sent packing back to the slums. It means that the Neighborhood Youth Corps will be choked off, releasing young people to the streets. It means the end of VISTA, legal services, Upward Bound, programs for Indians and migrants, and all other antipoverty projects. It means the war on poverty has been lost. A vote to reject this conference report would constitute one of the most irresponsible and destructive actions ever taken by the House of Representatives.

A vote to reject the conference report on H.R. 15111 would constitute a flagrant usurpation of the prerogatives of the U.S. civil service system, and would undermine the role and authority of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Without so stating, the Ashbrook amendment would drastically amend the Classification Act of 1949. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee emphatically condemned just such incursions on its jurisdiction in House Report No. 1604 of this session of Congress. The committee declared that such a cause as that proposed by the Ashbrook amendment "subverts and undermines the object and purpose of the Classification Act of 1949 with respect to the allocation of positions to such top grades of such act."

The letter and memo on the OEO "supergrade" issue which Messers AYRES, QUIE, and GOODELL distributed to their colleagues, and which calls for the rejection of the conference report, is so replete with staggering misstatements of fact that it can be attributed only to the grossest partisan mischief. A few prime examples follow:

It is charged that the ratio of "supergrades"—GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18—to employees at NASA is 1 to 105.9. In fact, there are 751 positions at NASA above GS-15 or the equivalent—other than appointed by the President—out of slightly over 34,000 employees, a ratio of about 1 to 45. The minority characteristically ignores 425 "supergrades" positions which are established at the discretion of the Administrator. No such discretion is allowed Sargent Shriver at OEO.

It is charged that the ratio at the Peace Corps is 1 to 216, an incredible falsehood. The actual ratio is 1 to 13.6—91 of 1,240 employees. While the Peace Corps has slightly over half the number of employees as OEO, it has almost twice as many "supergrades." Yet it remains the model of administrative excellence that Sargent Shriver built from the ground up, as he is building at OEO now.

The minority attempts to compare vast bureaucracies with OEO, a special agency within the Executive Office of the President. Within the FBI, there are 4,643 GS-3's and GS-4's, who perform such functions as fingerprint clerk, and who have no counterparts at OEO. Similarly, it is absurd to compare OEO to organizations containing such divisions as the Bureau of Employment Security and the Wages and Hours Division at Labor. Such comparisons have been specifically discredited by Chairman Macy of the CSC, who rejects the use of any ratio or formula as a method of determining the number of "supergrades" appropriate to any Federal agency.

It is charged that only the AEC within the Federal Government has as large a percentage of "supergrades" as OEO. This is totally false, and a charge that could not have been made in good faith. The following agencies, besides those mentioned above, have "supergrade"-to-employee ratios lower than OEO's:

Bureau of the Budget: 1 to 8.9.

Office of Emergency Planning: 1 to 13.4.

Civil Aeronautics Board: 1 to 15.8.

Interstate Commerce Commission: 1 to 16.2.

NLRB: 1 to 17.4.

Farm Credit Administration: 1 to 39.8.

It is unclear on just what basis the Ashbrook amendment would operate. Were the restriction to refer to the total number of full-time permanent and temporary OEO employees on board at the end of fiscal 1966, OEO would be entitled to only 29 "supergrades." If the current job ceiling, based on authorized permanent positions—2,350—for fiscal 1967 is used, OEO would be cut to 24 "supergrades"—requiring the elimination of 29 presently filled or allocated "supergrade" positions. On this basis, the maximum total "savings" to the Government would amount to $56,153, or 0.0032 percent of the total $1.75 billion authorization. This is computed by eliminating all 13 GS-18 positions and 16 of the 17 GS-17 positions currently allocated to OEO. Persons holding these positions would, under FPM chapter 531.2-4, all revert to the top salaries allowable under GS-15. If the cut were first directed instead against the 23 GS-16's approved for OEO, actual pay raises would often result—since top steps of GS-15 pay more than bottom steps of GS-16. See attached sheet.

Last spring, Congressman AYRES publicly stated that "it will take 6,484 permanent employees to run Mr. Shriver's burgeoning bureaucracy." If this was true, OEO, under the Ashbrook amendment, would be entitled to 65 "supergrades," 12 more than the Civil Service Commission has approved for OEO. Yet now Mr. AYRES says OEO needs only 24 "supergrades." Was Mr. AYRES confused then, or now? We think he has always been confused, at best, regarding the war on poverty.

Grade	Number	From—	To—	Total saving
GS-18	13	$25,890	$23,013	$37,401
GS-17	6	25,800	23,013	16,722
	1	25,040	23,013	2,027
	1	24,280	23,013	1,267
	1	23,520	23,013	507
	7	22,760	23,013	−1,771
Total				56,153

Salaries OEO GS-18's and GS-17's would be entitled to under FPM 531.2-4 if supergrade salaries were to be denied.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. **PERKINS**. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. **QUIE**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **GOODELL**. I will yield in just a moment.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I was moved by the gentleman who preceded me with his statement of endorsement of Headstart, 5 years after we Republicans proposed it and talked about it in our own committee. It took 3 years before we could convince our committee to initiate Headstart. Then it was put in indirectly as a part of the community action program only by our committee writing a legislative history that Headstart was eligible for community action funds. It turned out to be, according to Mr. Shriver's testimony, the most successful part of the program, and we have no dispute with reference to the merits of Headstart.

As the gentleman knows, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] and I were advocating this long before the poverty program went into effect.

Mr. **QUIE**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **GOODELL**. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. **QUIE**. I just want to point out the inaccurate statements made by the gentleman who just preceded the gentleman now in the well, when the gentleman from Pennsylvania said "Republicans"—plural—were supporting the increase to $15,000 on the limitation of salary.

That was one Republican—and not "Republicans"—plural—from the Senate.

Also I shall put in the RECORD the precise basis for the facts I cited with respect to supergrade ratios. The FBI figure is derived from the Schedule of Personnel Compensation in the Appendix to the Budget of the United States for fiscal year 1967. All other comparisons—including the Peace Corps ratio of 1 supergrade to every 216 employees, which was disputed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania—are taken from a table printed on page 31 of the hearings on "supergrade requirements" before the Subcommittee on Manpower, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House of Representatives, and taken from section 1310(d) reports as submitted by Federal agencies to the Speaker of the House in compliance with law. These are absolutely accurate and official figures which the gentleman has questioned.

When the gentleman speaks about trained employees receiving these supergrade salaries of $19,600 to $25,000 plus, I would like to see the training that these people receive. Many of these individuals have not proven to be highly qualified as one expects in the case of a doctor or a physicist. If these individuals were so highly qualified or so dedicated, there would not be such a tremendous turnover as there has been in these jobs. When citing the figures of the numbers of supergrades on board right now—who knows? While we were in conference, the figures came one day—42 supergrades. They came back the next day—36 supergrades. At the rate of turnover, you may not have any supergrades one day and you may have about 53 the next day.

What really disturbs me in the statement the gentleman from Pennsylvania has placed in the RECORD are his remarks beginning with the sentence:

> The question before the House in voting on the conference report on H.R. 15111 is one of the utmost urgency and finality.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] did not utter most of his remarks on the floor and in my presence.

He inserted them. I am certain that this insertion and its reprehensible aspersions on the integrity and honesty of Members of this House were prepared in the Office of Economic Opportunity. I am further certain that the gentleman from Pennsylvania never even read these remarks, or he would not have inserted them. He would know that any such aspersions on the good faith and integrity of myself and my colleagues Charles Goodell and William Ayres, had they been spoken on the floor in our presence, would have at once been ordered to be taken down and subjected to censure by the House.

We are accused in this unspoken insertion—which could not have been read by the gentleman from Pennsylvania for to insert but not speak such things is a grossly unfair act—that we made "staggering misstatements of fact" contributable "only to the grossest partisan mischief," that we uttered "an incredible falsehood," and he accuses—unwittingly, I must assume, through OEO—Congressman Ayres of an untruth and says that "he has always been confused, at best." Therefore, I will answer them by this insertion. I would never believe those to be the words of my esteemed colleague on the Education and Labor Committee. But I can believe these things of the unseen and overpaid supersalaried supergrades at the Office of Economic Opportunity. I can because I must upon the record of their falsehoods. One should not expect even, in this cynical city, for one of our great Federal agencies to publish untrue statements. That is to the credit of our democracy and of the several million loyal public servants who serve it in honor. It is a tradition tarnished by the Office of Economic Opportunity, an agency whose merest puffed-up utterance is seldom believed in either the executive or the legislative branches of this Government, and at the highest levels, nor are they any longer worthy of trust.

Let us take their last allegation first, speaking through my honorable colleague who did not in fact speak these words and, I believe, could not have even read them, for he is a decent and honorable man.

They chided our ranking minority member, Mr. Ayres, for saying that it will take "6,484 permanent employees to run Mr. Shriver's burgeoning bureaucracy" and then cast doubt upon that statement. Look at President Johnson's budget for fiscal 1967. On page 94 of the Appendix to the Budget of the United States for fiscal 1967—President Johnson's own budget—there is an exact breakdown of employees under the Economic Opportunity Act which shows a total of 2,350 permanent employees for OEO and 4,883 permanent employees for other agencies to operate the Economic Opportunity Act programs—a grand total of 7,233 permanent employees for Shriver's "burgeoning bureaucracy," or even more than Congressman Ayres reported.

Further, the supergrade ratio in the Ashbrook amendment would apply only to the 2,350 permanent employees budgeted for OEO itself—as OEO well knows. Therefore their further statement that Ayres' figures would give them 65 supergrades is just not true. It would give them 23 or 24 supergrades as our letter stated. This type of misrepresentation regarding Mr. Ayres' very precise statement on their overpaid personnel—taken from the budget of President Johnson—was repeated in a letter of Director Shriver to the Los Angeles Times last spring. His looseness in curbing his employees self-serving tendencies to falsely smear Members of Congress and other responsible citizens who criticize their silver-salaried empire is, along with demonstrated administrative ineptness, another reason for my demand for his removal from office.

I sympathize with the President in this obviously embarrassing position with regard to the matter at hand.

Other glaring misrepresentations and outright falsehoods in that insertion abound:

In the official table found below, the Peace Corps is shown to have only 3 supergrades and only 648 other employees, a ratio of 1 supergrade for every 216 employees. The insertion claims 1,240 employees and 91 supergrades for the Peace Corps, which if true—and obviously it is not true—would entail either, first, a false report by the Peace Corps to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, or second, a 600-percent growth in employees and a 3,000-percent growth in supergrades in that agency within 8 months. Yet, Shriver's minions charge Members of Congress with "an incredible falsehood."

In the table below—an official report to the Speaker of the House—it will be seen that of the major agencies shown only the Atomic Energy Commission has a better ratio of supergrades than OEO's authorized 1–43.3. However, specialized small "agencies" in the Office of the President, such as the Budget Bureau, set up solely to advise the President and not to administer any programs at all, and quasi-judicial bodies such as the NLRB are not included, and this is the type of organization cited by OEO's insertion by the gentleman from Pennsylvania to disprove our statement concerning OEO's overpaid bureaucracy. This is outright misrepresentation which is unworthy of servants of this Nation.

We are charged with outright lying in saying that NASA has only 249 supergrades for 26,378 employees, a ratio of 1 to 105.9. Yet that is the precise information presented in the table below published by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and taken from the official report of NASA to the Speaker of the House. There may be differing interpretations of information, but in our own account of supergrade positions for OEO we have ignored the six positions paying over $26,000 and the hundreds of "consultants" hired by OEO—some contrary to law—who are paid supergrade salaries running up to $100 per day plus expenses.

There may be many GS–3 and GS–4 clerks at the FBI, as stated by OEO's insertion—the only time that agency has been known to even look at President Johnson's budget was in this instance of determining the number of such positions at the FBI—but it is also sadly true that OEO has more positions above the supergrade level than the FBI, or virtually any other agency of Government.

The point is that OEO and its Director has consistently and deliberately attempted to mislead the American people about the administration of this agency. In private, virtually every Member of Congress in both parties acknowledges this sad situation—as do top administration officials reaching up to the highest levels of President Johnson's administration. This appalling fact just happens to be the truth.

Comparison of employees in grades GS–1 to GS–15 with those in grades GS–16 to GS–18 as of June 30, 1965

Department or agency	Number of GS–1 to GS–15	Number of GS–16 to GS–18	Ratio, GS–1 through 15, to GS–16 through 18
Agriculture	83, 714	196	427. 1
Commerce	26, 039	292	89. 1
Defense (OSD and other activities)	32, 250	215	150. 0
Army	208, 296	198	1, 052. 0
Navy	134, 787	249	541. 3
Air Force	154, 549	139	1, 111. 9
Health, Education, and Welfare	70, 992	179	396. 6
Housing and Urban Development	13, 297	68	195. 5
Interior	46, 221	150	308. 1
Justice	29, 934	202	148. 2
Labor	8, 911	76	117. 2
State	3, 996	56	71. 4
Treasury	77, 962	291	267. 9
Agency for International Development	2, 473	15	164. 9
Atomic Energy Commission	6, 694	284	23. 6
Civil Service Commission	3, 557	36	98. 8
Federal Aviation Agency	40, 894	128	319. 5
General Services Administration	17, 419	72	241. 9
General Accounting Office	4, 205	35	120. 1
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	26, 378	249	105. 9
Peace Corps	648	3	216. 0
Selective Service System	983	2	491. 5
Small Business Administration	3, 635	42	86. 5
U.S. Information Agency	2, 483	26	95. 5
Veterans' Administration	91, 117	67	1, 359. 9

Source: Sec. 1310(d), reports.

Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation—Salaries and expenses

	1965 actual		1966 estimate		1967 estimate	
	Number	Total salary	Number	Total salary	Number	Total salary
Grades and ranges:						
Special positions at rates equal to or in excess of $25,382:						
Director	1.0	$30,000	1	$30,000	1	$30,000
Associate director	1.0	28,500	1	28,500	1	28,500
Assistant to the director	2.0	52,000	2	52,000	2	52,000
GS-18. $25,382:						
Assistant director	9.0	220,500	9	228,438	9	228,438
Special agent in charge	1.0	24,500	2	50,764	2	50,764
GS-17. $22.217 to $25,325:						
Assistant director	2.0	47,390	2	49,873	2	49,873
Inspector	9.0	212,505	11	270,028	11	272,359
Senior administrative officer	3.0	68,835	3	73,644	3	74,421
Special agent in charge	11.0	255,395	12	291,468	12	295,353
GS-16. $19,619 to $25,043:						
Inspector	8.0	168,510	6	136,022	6	138,057
Senior administrative officer	11.0	239,075	12	272,727	12	275,441
Technical specialist	4.0	86,875	4	91,360	4	92,038
Special agent in charge	16.0	330,185	13	284,190	13	288,262
Assistant special agent in charge	1.0	20,900	1	22,331	1	22,331
GS-15. $17,055 to $22,365:						
Inspector	8.0	143,080	9	168,827	11	205,884
Senior administrative officer	37.0	692,810	39	767,800	41	816,078
Technical specialist	4.0	76,100	4	80,021	4	80,611
Special agent in charge	31.0	565,555	33	635,964	33	646,594
Assistant special agent in charge	15.0	267,990	18	335,882	18	341,787
Special agent	10.0	178,845	9	168,231	10	188,827
GS-14. $14,680 to $19,252:						
Senior administrative officer	262.0	4,165,790	275	4,582,746	278	4,697,348
Technical specialist	85.0	1,363,700	87	1,468,043	88	1,505,059
Special agent in charge	1.0	15,640				
Assistant special agent in charge	40.0	636,870	37	623,879	37	633,524
Special agent	161.0	2,546,460	172	2,848,347	173	2,905,162
GS-13. $12,510 to $16,425	4,061.0	55,439,970	3,987	57,430,644	3,827	55,619,743
GS-12. $10,619 to $13,931	397.0	4,314,910	369	4,136,137	519	5,729,702
GS-11. $8,961 to $11,715	746.0	$7,002,570	883	$8,698,484	957	$9,419,954
GS-10. $8,184 to $10,704	954.0	7,950,240	1,033	8,956,236	1,002	9,208,250
GS-9. $7,479 to $9,765	167.0	1,399,045	170	1,476,150	170	1,493,000
GS-8. $6,869 to $8,921	163.0	1,276,710	171	1,409,664	175	1,450,732
GS-7. $6,269 to $8,132	490.0	3,393,300	527	3,823,544	548	4,014,324
GS-6. $5,702 to $7,430	572.0	3,587,125	575	3,787,114	597	3,966,828
GS-5. $5,181 to $6,720	1,787.0	9,838,340	1,863	10,666,817	1,873	10,793,152
GS-4. $4,641 to $6,045	2,141.0	10,150,045	2,186	10,699,948	2,200	10,778,897
GS-3. $4,149 to $5,409	2,374.0	9,794,610	2,472	10,548,443	2,443	10,396,347
GS-2. $3,814 to $4,975	750.0	2,797,815	728	2,779,515	728	2,778,386
Ungraded positions at hourly rates equivalent to less than $14,680	153.0	936,765	151	964,137	151	966,279
Total permanent	15,497.0	130,319,455	15,877	128,937,918	16,022	140,534,305
Pay above the stated annual rate		486,035		516,947		523,547
Lapses	−939.3	−5,879,461	−736	−5,312,590	−736	−4,685,280
Positions abolished during the year	7.0	33,644				
Net savings due to lower pay scales for part of the year		−68,990		−1,275,722		
Net permanent (average number, net salary):						
United States and possessions	14,495.4	124,050,418	15,047	131,729,853	15,202	135,310,118
Foreign countries: U.S. rates	69.3	840,265	94	1,136,700	84	1,062,454
Positions other than permanent: Intermittent employment		16,646		28,877		29,008
Other personnel compensation:						
Overtime and holiday pay		6,717,519		6,950,637		7,362,980
Nightwork differential		291,122		298,774		301,600
Post differentials and cost-of-living allowances		195,153		151,169		152,681
Total personnel compensation		132,111,123		140,296,010		144,218,841
Salaries and wages in the foregoing schedule are distributed as follows:						
Direct obligations		130,788,668		139,154,889		143,378,123
Reimbursable obligations		1,322,455		1,141,121		840,718

Office of Economic Opportunity

OBJECT CLASSIFICATION

[In thousands of dollars]

		1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
	OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY			
	Personnel compensation:			
11.1	Permanent positions	3,924	16,155	21,739
11.3	Positions other than permanent	2,011	1,250	735
11.4	Special personal services payments	1,900	25,350	55,000
11.5	Other personnel compensation	313	601	700
	Total personnel compensation	8,148	43,356	78,174
12.0	Personnel benefits	261	1,350	1,725
21.0	Travel and transportation of persons	1,335	6,295	6,500
22.0	Transportation of things	156	100	100
23.0	Rent, communications, and utilities	857	4,814	5,100
24.0	Printing and reproduction	1,113	4,338	3,950
25.1	Other services	108,820	151,382	65,866
25.2	Services of other agencies	17,449	7,536	7,500
26.0	Supplies and materials	2,028	5,298	5,100
31.0	Equipment	6,999	3,773	2,000
41.0	Grants, subsidies, and contributions	235,882	628,663	888,835
	Total obligations, Office of Economic Opportunity	383,048	856,900	1,064,850

		1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
	ALLOCATION ACCOUNTS			
	Personnel compensation:			
11.1	Permanent positions	6,161	22,550	31,750
11.3	Positions other than permanent	1,165	2,808	2,098
11.4	Special personal services payments	18	1	1
11.5	Other personnel compensation	339	661	771
	Total personnel compensation	7,683	26,020	34,620
12.0	Personnel benefits	576	1,952	2,597
21.0	Travel and transportation of persons	1,361	7,000	6,000
22.0	Transportation of things	624	1,611	1,923
23.0	Rent, communications, and utilities	663	3,309	4,084
24.0	Printing and reproduction	224	302	402

Office of Economic Opportunity—Continued

OBJECT CLASSIFICATION

[In thousands of dollars]

		1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
	ALLOCATION ACCOUNTS—con.			
25.1	Other services	131,700	313,766	353,062
25.2	Services of other agencies	3,586	5,274	9,100
26.0	Supplies and materials	3,902	14,612	26,229
31.0	Equipment	6,642	3,418	6,269
32.0	Lands and structures	30,086	20,110	5,000
41.0	Grants, subsidies, and contributions	115,662	161,093	210,064
	Total obligations, allocation accounts	302,709	558,467	659,350
99.0	Total obligations	685,757	1,415,367	1,724,200
	Obligations are distributed as follows:			
	Office of Economic Opportunity	383,048	856,900	1,064,850
	Agriculture	32,527	73,024	86,050
	Health, Education, and Welfare	116,427	155,443	195,000
	Interior	21,555	71,000	83,000
	Labor	132,200	259,000	290,300
	Small Business Administration			5,000

	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estim te
PERSONNEL SUMMARY			
OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY			
Total number of permanent positions	1,150	2,150	2,350
Full-time equivalent of other positions	211	125	75
Average number of all employees	608	1,775	2,275
Average GS grade	9.5	9.7	9.5
Average GS salary	$9,524	$9,827	$9,792
ALLOCATION ACCOUNTS			
Total number of permanent positions	2,656	4,586	4,883
Full-time equivalent of other positions	139	323	246
Average number of all employees	1,017	3,250	4,600
Average GS grade	7.8	7.8	7.8
Average GS salary	$7,000	$7,200	$7,500

Office of Economic Opportunity, economic opportunity program—Schedule of personnel compensation paid from funds available to the Office of Economic Opportunity

	1965 actual		1966 estimate		1967 estimate	
	Number	Total salary	Number	Total salary	Number	Total salary
Grades and ranges:						
Special positions at rates equal to or in excess of $25,382:						
Director, OEO	1	$30,000	1	$30,000	1	$30,000
Deputy director, OEO	1	28,500	1	28,500	1	28,500
Assistant director	3	81,000	3	81,000	3	81,000
Assistant director, R.P.P. & E	1	26,000	1	26,000	1	26,000
GS-18. $25,382:						
Administrative office	1	24,500	1	25,382	1	25,382
Assistant director, congressional relations	1	24,500	1	25,382	1	25,382
Assistant director, interagency relations	1	24,500	1	25,382	1	25,382
Assistant director, management	1	24,500	1	25,382	1	25,382
Associate director, operations, CAP	1	24,500	1	25,382	1	25,382
Associate director, program planning development, CAP	1	24,500	1	25,382	1	25,382
Deputy director, VISTA	1	24,500	1	25,382	1	25,382
Deputy director, Job Corps	1	24,500	1	25,382	1	25,382
Director, regional office	3	73,500	3	76,146	3	76,146
General counsel	1	24,500	1	25,382	1	25,382
GS-17. $22,217 to $25,325:						
Administrative officer	3	64,335	3	75,975	4	101,300
Assistant director, inspections	1	24,445	1	25,325	1	25,325
Assistant director, private groups	1	24,445	1	25,325	1	25,325
Associate director, enrollee activities, Job Corps	1	21,445	1	22,217	1	22,217
Associate director, program development and field operations, VISTA	1	21,445	1	22,217	1	22,994
Associate director, urban centers, Job Corps	1	22,945	1	24,548	1	24,548
Associate director, program support, CAP	1	21,445	1	22,994		
Associate director, recruitment and community relations, VISTA	1	21,445	1	22,217	1	22,994
Director, regional office	4	85,780	4	88,868	4	91,976
Director, research and plans division, R.P.P. & E	1	21,445	1	22,994	1	23,771
Assistant director, public affairs	1	24,500	1	24,548	1	24,548
GS-16. $19,619 to $25,043:						
Administrative officer	2	37,870	2	39,238	2	39,238
Associate director, selection and training, VISTA	1	18,935	1	19,619	1	19,619
Director, budget and finance division, management	1	20,245	1	20,975	1	21,653
Director, community and public relations, Job Corps	1	18,935	1	19,619	1	19,619
Director, men's centers division, Job Corps	1	18,935	1	19,619	1	19,619
Director, program development and evaluation	1	18,935	1	9,619	1	19,619
Director, program and evaluation division, R.P.P. & E	1	19,590	1	20,975	1	21,653
Director, women's centers division, Job Corps	1	18,935	1	20,297	1	20,975
Executive secretary	1	18,935	1	20,297	1	20,975
Program manager	10	190,005	10	202,970	10	202,970
GS-15. $17,055 to $22,365:						
Accountant	1	17,030	1	17,055	3	52,345
Administrative officer	14	230,440	45	770,425	40	678,125
Attorney	3	52,230	9	158,215	10	174,680
Attorney adviser	1	16,460	2	34,110	4	68,220
Audio visual specialist			1	17,055	1	17,645
Auditor			1	17,055	1	17,645
Budget officer	1	17,600	1	18,825	1	18,825
Communications specialist	1	16,460	1	17,645	1	18,235
Communications relations specialist	1	16,460	1	17,645	1	18,235
Contract specialist			2	34,110	2	35,290
Director, audit division, management	1	18,170	1	18,825	1	18,825
Director, community relations division, VISTA			1	17,055	1	17,645
Director, contracts division, management	1	17,055	1	17,645	1	17,645
Director, field operations division, inspection					1	17,055
Director, field operations division, VISTA	1	16,460	1	17,055	1	17,645
Director, headquarters operations division, inspection			1	17,055	1	17,645
Director, installations and logistics division, Job Corps			1	17,055	1	17,645
Director, management analysis division, management	1	18,170	1	19,415	1	19,415
Director, management support division, management			1	17,055	1	17,055
Director, program development division, VISTA			1	17,055	1	17,645
Director, recruitment division, VISTA	1	16,460	1	17,645	1	18,235
Director, rural task force, CAP			1	17,055	1	17,645
Director, selection division, VISTA			1	17,055	1	17,645
Director, State related centers office, Job Corps			1	17,055	1	17,055
Director, training division, VISTA			1	17,055	1	17,645
Director, urban centers program division, Job Corps			1	17,055	1	17,645
Economist	2	32,920	6	102,330	7	123,515
Education specialist	2	32,920	3	51,165	3	51,755
General engineer	1	16,460	1	17,645	1	18,235
Information specialist			1	17,055	1	17,645
Inspector	3	52,800	7	124,695	7	127,055
Liaison officer			2	38,240	2	38,830

Office of Economic Opportunity, economic opportunity program—Schedule of personnel compensation paid from funds available to the Office of Economic Opportunity—Continued

	1965 actual		1966 estimate		1967 estimate	
	Number	Total salary	Number	Total salary	Number	Total salary
Grades and ranges—Continued						
GS-15. $17,055 to $22,365—Continued						
Logistics specialist	1	$16,460	1	$17,645	1	$18,235
Medical specialist	1	16,460	2	34,110	2	34,700
Personnel specialist	1	17,030	1	18,235	1	18,235
Placement specialist	1	16,460	5	85,275	5	87,635
Program analyst	15	249,180	15	244,670	18	319,380
Psychiatrist			1	17,055	1	17,645
Program manager	37	730,220	75	1,363,465	75	1,387,562
Programer	1	16,460	1	17,055	1	17,645
Property and supply specialist			1	17,055	1	17,645
Public information specialist			1	17,055	2	34,700
Sociologist			2	34,110	2	35,290
Statistician	1	16,460	3	51,165	3	52,345
Systems analyst			1	17,055	1	17,645
Training specialist	1	16,460				
Visual information specialist	1	16,460	1	17,645	1	18,235
Writer			4	68,220	4	70,580
GS-14. $14,680 to $19,252:						
Accountant	1	16,620	4	62,784	4	59,736
Accounting technician			1	14,680	1	14,680
Administrative assistant			2	29,360	2	30,376
Administrative officer	23	328,360	18	269,320	18	264,291
Attorney	3	43,490	3	45,564	2	29,360
Budget analyst	1	14,170	3	44,548	4	60,752
Auditor	2	29,810	3	44,548	6	96,112
Classification specialist	1	14,170	1	14,680	1	15,696
Community relations specialist	1	14,660	1	15,696	1	16,204
Contract specialist	3	42,510	4	58,720	4	60,752
Education specialist	4	56,680	7	105,300	7	108,348
Financial manager	1	14,170	1	14,680	1	15,188
Information specialist			1	14,680	1	15,188
Inspector	2	31,280	8	120,488	11	184,796
General engineer	3	45,940	6	92,144	6	93,668
Liaison officer			7	102,760	7	106,316
Logistics specialist	1	14,170	1	15,188	1	15,696
Management analyst	2	28,340	3	45,056	3	46,580
Media specialist			2	29,360	2	29,360
Medical specialist			1	14,680	1	15,696
Morale and welfare officer			1	14,680	1	15,188
Personnel specialist	1	14,660	1	15,696	1	16,204
Planning officer			1	14,680	1	15,188
Procurement specialist			1	14,680	1	15,188
Program analyst	17	245,790	46	691,564	43	664,768
Program evaluation analyst	1	14,170	5	73,908	7	105,808
Program manager	28	396,760	93	1,367,379	81	1,214,988
Property and supply specialist	1	16,130				
Psychologist	2	28,340	8	117,440	5	76,956
Public information specialist	10	145,130	10	152,896	10	152,896
Research specialist					1	14,680
Systems analyst			4	58,720	5	75,432
Traffic management specialist	1	14,170	1	15,188	1	15,696
Training specialist	1	14,170	6	88,080	8	120,050
GS-13. $12,510 to $16,245	113	1,377,675	226	2,871,330	230	2,960,820
GS-12. $10,619 to $13,931	125	1,290,209	225	2,426,075	255	2,786,116
GS-11. $8,961 to $11,715	79	693,149	150	1,365,570	190	1,746,960
GS-10. $8,184 to $10,704	2	15,800	4	33,296	4	34,976
GS-9. $7,479 to $9,765	84	618,786	150	1,139,630	170	1,308,260
GS-8. $6,869 to $8,921	13	91,728	20	138,520	20	139,631
GS-7. $6,269 to $8,132	111	695,045	200	1,272,430	225	1,449,855
GS-6. $5,702 to $7,430	51	303,086	94	544,436	105	615,712
GS-5. $5,181 to $6,720	151	772,932	270	1,419,390	305	1,623,810
GS-4. $4,641 to $6,045	116	536,107	210	989,274	240	1,144,884
GS-3. $4,149 to $5,409	32	130,878	60	253,140	65	278,085
GS-2. $3,814 to $4,975	9	40,480	20	77,570	20	78,860
GS-1. $3,507 to $3,578	5	16,925				
Total permanent	1,150	11,060,730	2,150	21,191,801	2,350	23,118,675
Pay above the stated annual rate		$42,157		$81,678		$88,918
Lapses	−750	−7,138,455	−500	−4,869,160	−150	−1,468,800
Positions filled by military personnel	−3	−40,184				
Net savings due to lower pay scales for part of year				−249,040		
Net permanent (average number, net salary)	397	3,924,248	1,650	16,155,289	2,200	21,738,793
Positions other than permanent:						
Temporary employment		402,496		250,000		135,000
Intermittent employment		1,608,504		1,000,000		600,000
Special personal services payments:						
Compensation of Job Corps enrollees		1,091,400		21,000,000		44,000,000
Compensation of VISTA volunteers		86,325		4,300,000		11,000,000
Payments to other agencies for reimbursable details		722,117		50,000		
Other personnel compensation: Overtime and holiday pay		313,027		600,621		700,207
Total personnel compensation		8,148,117		43,355,910		78,174,000

Peace Corps—Salaries and expenses

	1965 actual		1966 estimate		1967 estimate	
	Number	Total salary	Number	Total salary	Number	Total salary
Grades and ranges:						
Special positions established by the Peace Corps Act of Sept. 22, 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2506) (as amended by Public Law 89-301):						
Director	1	$28,500	1	$28,500	1	$28,500
Deputy director	1	27,000	1	27,000	1	27,000
Associate director for program development and operations	1	26,000	1	26,000	1	26,000
Associate director for volunteers	1	26,000	1	26,000	1	26,000

Peace Corps—Salaries and expenses—Continued

	1965 actual		1966 estimate		1967 estimate	
	Number	Total salary	Number	Total salary	Number	Total salary
Grades and ranges—Continued						
Special positions established by the Director, Peace Corps:						
Associate director	1	$24,500				
General counsel	1	24,500				
Staff adviser for international programs	1	24,500				
Special assistant to the Director	1	21,445				
Director, operations division	4	80,980				
Director, staff division	1	18,935				
Development officer	2	37,870				
Deputy director, operations division	3	62,590	1	$22,210	1	$22,210
Director, personnel division	1	19,310				
International relations officer	1	16,460				
Selection officer	1	18,240				
Liaison officer	2	29,795				
Management officer	2	37,590	2	38,900	2	38,900
Planning and evaluation officer	2	31,280				
Program officer	1	17,210				
Coordinator for Puerto Rico	1	14,170				
General schedule positions:						
GS-17. $22,217 to $25,325: Deputy associate director	1	21,445				
GS-16. $19,619 to $25,043:						
Director, budget and finance	1	20,245				
Director, operations division	1	19,500				
GS-15. $17,055 to $22,365:						
Chief, administrative services division	1	20,450				
Accountant	1	18,170	1	18,825	1	18,825
Auditor	1	17,600	1	18,235	1	18,235
Budget officer	1	17,600	1	18,235	1	18,235
Congressional relations officer	1	16,460				
Liaison officer	4	72,680	2	37,650	2	37,650
Planning and evaluation officer	3	52,230	1	17,645	1	17,645
Program officer	3	53,370				
Psychologist	1	17,600				
Development officer	3	50,520				
Special assistant to the director	2	35,200				
Staff analyst			1	21,185	1	21,185
GS-14. $14,680 to $19,252:						
Deputy chief, administrative services division	1	15,150				
Attorney adviser	1	14,170				
Auditor	1	14,170	1	15,188	1	15,188
Budget analyst	1	14,660				
Contract specialist	1	16,130				
Medical officer	1	16,130				
Accountant	1	14,170	1	14,680	1	14,680
Development officer	6	86,490				
International relations officer	1	14,660	1	15,188	1	15,188
Liaison	2	28,830				
Management analyst	1	14,660	1	15,188	1	15,188
Personnel officer	3	42,510	3	44,040	3	44,040
Planning and evaluation officer	2	31,280				
Psychologist	4	57,660	2	29,868	2	29,868
Chief, administration services division			1	16,204	1	16,204
Field assessment officer	2	29,810				
GS-13. $12,510 to $16,425	37	456,415	10	128,578	10	128,578
GS-12. $10,619 to $13,931	40	422,425	18	200,704	18	200,704
GS-11. $8,961 to $11,715	48	422,180	11	100,715	11	100,715
GS-10. $8,184 to $10,704	1	8,710				
GS-9. $7,479 to $9,765	87	653,855	29	232,240	29	232,340
GS-8. $6,869 to $8,921	9	66,270	8	61,787	8	61,787
GS-7. $6,269 to $8,132	106	680,100	65	450,142	65	450,142
GS-6. $5,702 to $7,430	68	398,620	41	253,188	41	253,188
GS-5. $5,181 to $6,720	75	401,565	53	291,582	53	291,582
GS-4. $4,641 to $6,045	73	347,490	22	112,054	22	112,054
GS-3. $4,149 to $5,400	37	159,930	9	42,087	9	42,087
GS-2. $3,814 to $4,975	18	71,065	4	17,322	4	17,322
GS-1. $3,507 to $4,578	4	13,655				
Grades established by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 801-1158) (as amended Public Law 89-301):						
Foreign service reserve officer:						
Class 1. $23,465 to $25,382	13	306,590	22	540,056	23	563,521
Class 2. $18,954 to $22,902	43	854,580	60	1,191,912	65	1,286,682
Class 3. $15,395 to $18,599	37	599,775	126	2,032,741	131	2,112,920
Class 4. $12,510 to $15,120	44	566,580	71	920,813	79	1,020,893
Class 5. $10, 303 to $12,451	36	379,895	61	660,652	69	743,056
Class 6. $8,594 to $10,364	35	304,005	75	682,610	82	742,768
Class 7. $7,262 to $8,726	48	355,750	105	796,388	117	883,532
Class 8. $6,269 to $7,511	3	19,950	36	234,137	36	234,137
Foreign service staff officer:						
Class 1. $15,395 to $20,201	1	15,375	2	37,726	2	37,726
Class 2. $12,510 to $16,425	1	12,075	1	12,510	1	12,510
Class 3. $10,303 to $13,525			1	11,019	1	11,019
Class 4. $8,594 to $11,249			1	10,069	1	10,069
Class 5. $7,749 to $10,125	4	33,490	33	267,921	34	275,670
Class 6. $6,998 to $9,095	7	51,335	5	37,788	6	44,786
Class 7. $6,428 to $8,336	13	85,995	14	97,006	15	103,434
Class 8. $5,688 to $7,416	10	59,340	63	399,339	64	405,411
Class 9. $5,190 to $6,729	11	58,245	56	296,472	56	296,472
Class 10. $4,641 to $6,045	8	36,890	49	240,166	49	240,166
Unenumerated positions: $3,507 to $5,400			50	206,578	50	206,578
Ungraded positions at annual rates equivalent to less than $14,680	97	200,210	65	134,160	65	134,160
Total permanent	1,095	9,472,875	1,190	11,151,203	1,240	11,706,650
Pay above stated annual rate		36,434		42,889		45,025
Lapses	36	688,663	48	954,092	52	871,675
Net savings due to lower pay scale for part of year		2,976		106,000		
Net permanent (average number, net salary):						
United States and possessions	687	5,664,234	748	6,498,000	773	6,824,000
Foreign countries:						
U.S. rates	257	2,926,430	304	3,450,000	351	3,924,000
Local rates	115	227,006	90	186,000	64	132,000

Peace Corps—Salaries and expenses—Continued

	1965 actual		1966 estimate		1967 estimate	
	Number	Total salary	Number	Total salary	Number	Total salary
Positions other than permanent:						
Temporary employment: United States and possessions		$38,781		$74,000		$74,000
Intermittent employment:						
United States and possessions		528,082		847,000		649,000
Foreign countries:						
U.S. rate		20,847		50,000		50,000
Local rates		7,900		12,000		12,000
Special personal service payments:						
Volunteer costs—readjustment allowance		9,974,829		12,895,000		14,208,000
Payments to other agencies for reimbursable details		1,222,029		1,342,000		1,616,000
Other personnel compensation: Overtime and holiday pay		370,607		387,000		383,000
Total personnel compensation		20,980,745		25,741,000		27,872,000

Mr. GOODELL. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

I would only add this comment. It is a tragic irony that we have a program called the War on Poverty that is administered by an agency that has the highest paid administrators on the average in the Government with one exception: the Atomic Energy Commission, that does have the physicists and other highly educated gentlemen with professional degrees.

It is an irony, when we are trying to cope with a problem such as this, that our colleagues come down here and deftly defend such exorbitant salaries. But still it is an awkward position to be in for them when they talk about administering a poverty program and defend such high salaries in contrast to the HEW, administering a variety of programs intended to help the less fortunate in our country, involving such complex tasks as medical research, and other highly technical programs and where the ratio there is one supergrade to something like 396 employees. We are talking about in the OEO of one supergrade for every 42 or 43 employees. If they were arguing for 10 or 12 or 15 employees in that ratio, then the gentleman who just preceded me in the well and others who are defending this might have a little better case.

In this instance we are talking about salary ratios in existing agencies that are way, way below what the OEO has reached in terms of salaries.

We are not going to have the time here nor will we have the time at this late hour in this session of the Congress to go into all the details of this conference report.

Let me sum it up with one thought. In conference we predictably did virtually nothing to redirect this program in a meaningful manner. There are some improvements. The improvements are primarily peripheral and superficial and designed to treat symptoms and not the causes of the problems.

I say to you this bill is going to become law and it is going to produce more scandals in the years ahead and more waste and more diversion of funds away from the poor, if any of you can believe it is possible, than the existing law. We have not only failed to correct many of the serious defects in the present legislation, but we have added new programs and we have done it on the same pattern that caused the original problems. We have added new programs without definition and without standards with large amounts of money that will be spent according to the judgments and prescriptions of administrators in the OEO.

The Congress has once again abdicated its responsibility to set up these programs with proper standards.

To give you two illustrations of the unhappy situation that we are in legislatively—many of us have been urging the transfer of adult basic education to the Office of Education. This was one of the variety of transfers that we recommended in the Republican amendments on the floor and in the substitute—our Opportunity Crusade.

In order to win the votes to transfer the adult basic education program to the Office of Education, do you know what we had to do? We had to set up another adult basic education program that the OEO can run and give it $7 million. So we are going to transfer the existing adult basic education program into the Office of Education, and at the same time create a new one that the poverty officials can administer.

Here we go again, the same kind of routine that we have had in the past.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky, who, I must say, worked very hard to get the present adult basic education program transferred into the Office of Education.

Mr. PERKINS. I thank my colleague for his compliment. Is it not true that under the personal community action program, at the present time $315 million, as much of that money can be expended for adult basic education as the Director wants to spend?

Mr. GOODELL. I agree with the gentleman. When we came to the question, and we talked about this in the conference, of trying to put in a prohibition, as the other body did, against any money in the poverty program being used for adult basic education, we were then dealing in an area where many programs might overlap and be considered at least partially adult basic education. That situation would have been impossible, and we rejected the Senate amendment that barred any of these funds being used in any way for adult basic education.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman recalls that he served on the subcommittee several years ago when we were unable to get an adult basic education program enacted, back in 1961, 1962, and 1963, through the action of the Rules Committee. But the poverty bill was in the markup stage before we decided to put the adult basic education program in the Economic Opportunity Act. But our basic reason for trying to get an Adult Basic Education Act was to create the incentive all over the country so that the States would come forth with an adult basic education program. And that was the truth.

The Office of Education has been administering the program under delegated authority, and the transfer here will not make one particle of difference. Am I correct?

Mr. GOODELL. I agree with the gentleman that the Office of Education has been essentially administering this program. I do not agree that it will make no particle of difference, because we have had a situation where the Office of Education and the top people have had to come to OEO with hat in hand even to get funds for the program.

Mr. PERKINS. I agree with that statement.

Mr. GOODELL. That is why the gentleman from Kentucky and I and others were so anxious to get it transferred to the Office of Education and let them have the responsibility.

I think the gentleman will also agree with me that in the conference we did discuss and make clear that the majority wanted $7 million of this money, that he indicated was available, to be used for adult basic education in OEO. This gives them the authority to continue adult basic education courses up to an amount of approximately $7 million.

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct, but it did not add anything or take anything away, in my judgment, because the Director still had the authority to expend funds for adult basic education under the personal community action funds. So we did add $7 million.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. Of course, what the gentleman has said is true. We have written a community action program that in effect gives the Director of OEO authority to go into any field providing he deems it will help to eliminate poverty. In addition, we have failed to write specific standards. We have failed to say, "We do not want you in OEO to set up parallel and overlapping programs to the Office of Education adult basic education program." They can go ahead and set up their own programs parallel to the existing adult basic education programs administered in the Office of Education, and this is very unfortunate.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. I agree that he can do it, but with your permission I would like to say that the temper of the conference was that they were setting up a $7 million authority because of the fact that we wanted the Office of Economic Opportunity to give consideration to adult education programs that would not necessarily come under the type of programs that we have under HEW.

Is it not true that the whole move in that conference was dictated by the fact that the Senate had put $40 million into elementary education for basic adult education, and given us an opportunity to take $17 million plus we had set up out of the 26 plus 5 and given us an opportunity to have this $17 million plus $27 million already allocated, which can be recovered, we believe, by OEO, thereby to give us some money to fund the program the Senate insisted on but did not put any money in to fund.

Mr. GOODELL. Of course, I would agree that the House was enabled in the conference to do what the House refused to do on the House floor, transfer adult basic education over to the Office of Education.

I would also agree with the gentleman that we did discuss this whole problem of how much money could be transferred from one to another.

The fact remains that we have come up with a conference report that does not eliminate duplication. As a matter of fact, it encourages further duplication in this field.

The prevailing tenor, throughout our discussions with reference to the Office of Economic Opportunity, keeps coming back to references that they are the only ones, in OEO, who seem to know how to run programs to eliminate poverty. We have reached the point that anybody in an existing agency who may have been trying to fight poverty for decades is turned aside with the statement, "No; those programs have never worked; we have to have a completely fresh and new approach and we must do it through the OEO."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. GOODELL. I thank the gentleman.

I have one final illustration. We have set up in this bill, section 113(a) in the conference report, page 5, a new program, an addition to the neighborhood youth corps for so-called on-the-job training.

Once again there is great irony. This is a program in which we can pay for training and equipment for people who are on the job. We cannot pay any of their wages. It is a duplication and overlap of the present on-the-job training program in the Manpower Development and Training Act. Once again we are going to give the poverty office authority to run a parallel or overlapping program when we have an existing, ongoing program. If we wanted to incorporate this program it should have been done as an extension of the Manpower Development and Training Act.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. William D. Ford].

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Gilligan] may be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the Economic Opportunity Act, Members of the House showed some considerable interest in the allegations that poverty workers were involved in partisan politics during the voter registration drive in Cincinnati, Ohio. Operation REV-UP—that is, register every voter—was sponsored by many citizen groups, and included the neighborhood council people working under the community action program.

The only documented case was the one I cited on the floor—that of Mr. Ben Simpson, who is working for the Taft committee.

It occurred to me that Members of the House might also be interested in learning what has transpired since the occasion.

Mr. Speaker, the following letter to Mr. John Turner, district representative of the Neighborhood Youth Corps from Mr. Harry T. Martin, Citizens' Committee on Youth executive director regarding the disposition of the case of Ben Simpson, Neighborhood Youth Corps developer, who was involved in political activity, clearly sets forth the policy of the Citizens' Committee on Youth with respect to participation in partisan politics by staff employees:

The Citizen's Committee on Youth,
Cincinnati, Ohio, September 28, 1966.

Re disposition of case of Ben Simpson, NYC, job developer, involved in political activity.

To: Mr. John Turner, District Representative of NYC.

From: Harry T. Martin, CCY executive director.

CHRONOLOGY

It came to the attention of the CCY Executive Director on the evening of September 26, 1966, via Congressman Gilligan's Cincinnati Office, that Ben Simpson, of the NYC staff had declared himself candidate Robert Taft's campaign chairman and was editing a newsletter on his behalf. An item of even more specific concern was an editorial that Mr. Simpson had written (including his picture) which belittled the work (past and present) of Congressman Gilligan—Bob Taft's opponent—and praising the alleged accomplishments of candidate Taft.

The efforts of the Executive Director to reach Mr. Simpson that evening were unsuccessful, but on the following morning an appointment was made with him for 2:00 P.M. that afternoon, immediately following a CCY executive committee meeting which was scheduled for 11:15 A.M. on the morning of the 27th. In the meantime, Mr. Gilligan's office had sent to the Executive Director, a copy of the aforementioned newsletter and editorial.

The matter of Mr. Simpson was brought before the Executive Committee and the following decision was made immediately:

"That Mr. Simpson immediately desist from all political participation or be immediately placed on an indefinite leave of absence without pay. Any further evidence of political activity on his part will result in immediate dismissal".

The Executive Committee also approved the enclosed interim policy governing outside staff activities, until such time as the CCY Board adopts a final policy on political activity.

At the meeting of the Executive Director with Mr. Simpson that afternoon, this position was made clear to him and he elected to desist from any further political activity, with the understanding that he would be summarily dismissed if there was any further evidence of such activity.

Still to be decided, is whether on not Mr. Simpson should be required to make a public announcement of his retirement from political activity. The only argument against this is the possibility of stirring up even more political controversy than is already the case. In any case, he is being required to sign a statement that he understands and will abide by the policy position of the Executive Committee.

I trust this gives a clear picture of what has occurred. It certainly has forcibly pointed up to us the need for sharper definition of policies related to this area of staff activity.

Yours very truly,
Harry T. Martin,
Executive Director.

Mr. Speaker, I also call attention to the following letter dated July 12, 1966, with respect to the policy of the Citizens' Committee on Youth, as well as the memorandum dated September 27, 1966, making it very clear that it is contrary to the policy of the Office of Economic Opportunity for staff people to engage in any partisan political activity.

July 12, 1966.

To: Executive Committee.
From: Personnel Committee.
Subject: Regulation of personnel activities.

In view of the lack of unanimity within the Executive Committee and the Board of Trustees regarding a positive stand on the matter of political activity on the part of staff personnel and in view of the lack of a positive stand on the part of pertinent Federal Agencies in this regard, your Personnel Committee recommends no action at this time on this controversial matter.

Instead your Personnel Committee recommends adoption by the Executive Committee (Board concurrence should be unnecessary) of the following policies regarding conduct of Staff Personnel, whether engaged in direct CCY projects or projects contracted by CCY with Federal Agencies:

1. Staff personnel is subject to immediate termination if personal activities or conduct should be such as to lend destruction to the traditional and desirable public image of the CCY as an organization dedicated to the improved welfare of the youth of the City of Cincinnati, regardless of race, creed, or political affiliation.

2. Staff personnel is subject to immediate termination should personal activities be

such as to detract from their full time devotion to their specific position responsibilities.

3. It is the combined responsibility of the Executive Director of the CCY and the Executive Committee to identify and to act upon any deviations from the above-stated policies.

Respectfully submitted.

——— ———.

MEMORANDUM

SEPTEMBER 27, 1966.

To: Executive directors and project directors.
From: John E. Hansan, executive director, Community Action Commission.
Subject: Political activity of staff during working hours.

As election time nears, there is more and more excitement generated in the community, in and around the matter of political activity. I am writing to urge you as a Director to make it very clear that it is contrary to your contract with us and the Office of Economic Opportunity policies for staff to engage in any partisan political activity during working hours or in any capacity in which they are identified as staff.

If you have knowledge of any instances where this has occurred, I would appreciate having a personal report from you in order that I may be able to answer critics if the matter is brought out.

While I have the utmost confidence in each of you and your key staff, I do know there are times that things happen without the full knowledge of the Director. For this reason I am asking your help in taking extra precautions.

The War-On-Poverty is a big enough fight without our having to use valuable time and energy answering critics who are continuously searching for weak points.

I am attaching a revised CAP Memo 23-A (23-A Superseded CAP Memo No. 23). I think you will find this CAP Memorandum much more acceptable. Please become very familiar with it. I will be in touch with you in the near future about questions you may have about this memo.

This would indicate quite clearly that the activity of an individual engaged in partisan politics was contrary to the policy of the Neighborhood Youth Corps and the Citizens' Committee on Youth.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PATTEN].

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, there has been some discussion in this debate of the Job Corps at Kilmer, which is in my district. I want the House to know, that after a lot of soul searching and activity by advisory groups representing the finest people in our county, it is my considered opinion, after watching the press and watching all reports and talking to the mayors of the towns in the vicinity, that our people want the Kilmer Job Corps to stay and we feel that we should continue our efforts in what is really a tough job, and which will continue to have many problems, for the sake of the several thousand young men at the Job Corps Center.

I have kept tabs on this center, and have kept the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] in touch with all of the publicity, the articles, and the editorials all year long. This is the first time that I have ever expressed myself on the subject.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this conference report passes.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to report to this House on the singularly outstanding work done by an organization known as Youth for Service during the recent disturbance in the Hunter's Point area of San Francisco. I believe this report will be of particular interest to my colleagues because Youth for Service is an agency which has received and put to work funds voted by the House in support of the war on poverty. I should add that Youth for Service also is an agency of the local United Bay Area Crusade.

Youth for Service is interracial, nonsectarian and nonpolitical. The core of the agency is the street workers who are former gang members and who have returned to the ghetto as ambassadors of society. They work daily with the youth of Hunter's Point and other areas of our city where they can be helpful—counseling, helping to find jobs, or just treating a boy to a hamburger. Youth for Service workers never carry weapons, even in a time of crisis. They may often ask youths to surrender their weapons, but they never order them to do so. The motto is "Ask me—Don't tell me."

During the days of difficulty at Hunters Point the young men of this organization moved into the neighborhood in full strength, implementing Operation Freeze Baby—a preplanned operation for times of crisis which calls for all YFS workers to operate on a 24-hour basis, keeping in close personal contact with all tension areas. A command post at the YFS office keeps tally sheets on all the workers' whereabouts and records up-to-the-minute reports on the situation.

During the Hunters Point crisis, YFS set up an auxiliary headquarters in my own neighborhood office at 1600 Oakdale Avenue, in the heart of the area of strife. From this office, staff directors supervised the activity of staff street workers, street work interns from the youth leadership training project, and street worker aids from the Neighborhood Youth Corps program. In addition, YFC enlisted the aid of some 134 peace monitors—recognized leaders among young men of Hunters Point.

Throughout the time of trouble, these young men moved through the streets at great risk to their own safety, urging the crowds to "keep cool." They assumed the task of removing little children from danger areas. They organized a peace patrol which has been given a great deal of the credit for quelling the trouble. At one point, through a mixup in communication, the police riot squad attacked the group with sticks and they were forced to retreat to my office—their headquarters—until the problem could be straightened out. Then they went forth again, even with the riot squad shooting over peoples' heads, and were able to move many people up the hill and out of the immediate riot area. As the situation grew worse, one of the YFS peace monitors was wounded. Nevertheless, the young men worked continuously until the evening of the second day when the National Guard moved into the Hunters Point area. In addition, groups of YFS workers were dispatched into other parts of the city where trouble flared up and they assisted greatly in cooling the situation before it got out of hand.

The third day, the workers moved through Hunters Point again, urging people to "talk the peace and keep your cool." Quiet was maintained.

As the tension lessened in succeeding days, Youth for Service continued to work. Their peace patrol headquarters in my office was converted into a job clinic in an effort to help the young men of the area find gainful employment. It has been generally agreed that unemployment, unusually high in this area, is a basic cause of the outbreak and a communitywide attempt to correct the situation is developing. Sponsors of the job clinic include the Neighborhood Youth Corps, Glide Foundation, and the chamber of commerce.

Youth for Service—in spite of the praise received from all segments of the community for their work—has by no means attempted to give the impression that it handled the problems alone. In fact, in preparing a report on the matter at my request, the director extended congratulations in behalf of the organization to Mayor John Shelley, a former Member of this House; Police Chief Thomas Cahill, and other city officials and civic leaders who painstakingly contributed to restoring and maintaining the peace.

Even so, San Franciscans who followed news of the trouble on radio and television and in the newspapers are fully aware of the outstanding work of Orville Luster, executive director of Youth for Service, and Percy Pinkney, director of street work for the organization. They and their young men worked day and night, far and beyond the line of duty, and must be given great credit for containing a situation which would have grown much worse without their help.

I think it is not incidental that my office was never attacked and suffered no damage during the time it was being used as a headquarters, even though vandalism was going on all around the neighborhood. To me, this is a clear indication of the respect which even those involved in the rioting have for this fine organization, Youth for Service.

I am proud that Mr. Luster has been a dear and longtime friend of mine. More than that, I am proud and deeply grateful for the service he and his young men performed for our city and, indeed, for mankind. I am sure that all the people of San Francisco share this feeling with me.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2298)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15111) to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: That this Act may be cited as the "Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966".

Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 2. (a) For purposes of carrying out the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (other than part C of title I thereof) there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the sum of—

(1) $696,000,000 for carrying out title I,
(2) $846,000,000 for carrying out title II,
(3) $57,000,000 for carrying out title III,
(4) $5,000,000 for carrying out section 402(b),
(5) $100,000,000 for carrying out title V,
(6) $15,000,000 for carrying out title VI,
(7) $31,000,000 for carrying out title VIII.

(b)(1) Of the sums available for carrying out title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (other than part C thereof) in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $211,000,000 is authorized for carrying out part A thereof, $410,000,000 is authorized for carrying out part B thereof, and $75,000,000 is authorized for carrying out part D thereof.

(2) Of the sums available for carrying out title II of such Act in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $36,500,000 is authorized for carrying out section 205(d); $36,500,000 is authorized for carrying out section 205(e); $8,000,000 is authorized for carrying out section 206(b); $352,000,000 is authorized for carrying out section 211–1(a); $22,000,000 is authorized for carrying out section 211–1(b); $61,000,000 is authorized for carrying out section 211–2; $7,000,000 is authorized for carrying out section 211–3; $323,000,000 is authorized for carrying out programs for which authorizations are not provided in the preceding clauses of this paragraph.

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE I OF THE ACT

Job Corps—Studies to be property of United States

SEC. 101. (a) Section 103(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (hereinafter referred to as "the Act") is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: ": Provided, That such agreements shall provide that all studies, evaluations, proposals, and data produced or developed with Federal funds in the course of the operation of any conservation camp or training center shall become the property of the United States."

(b) Section 103(b) of the Act is amended by striking out "with reduced federal expenditures" and inserting in lieu thereof "at comparable costs".

Job Corps—High school equivalency certificates

SEC. 102. Section 103(b) of the Act is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: ": Provided, That such arrangements for education and training of enrollees in the Corps shall, to the extent feasible, provide opportunities for qualified enrollees to obtain education or training necessary to qualify them for the equivalent of a certificate of graduation from high school;"

Job Corps—Number of women in the Corps

SEC. 103. Section 104 of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) The Director shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that, on or before July 1, 1967, the number of women in residence, and receiving training, at Job Corps conservation camps and training centers is not less than 23 per centum of the total number of enrollees in the Job Corps."

Job Corps—Maximum capacity of Job Corps camps and centers

SEC. 104. Section 104 of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof (after the subsection added by section 103) the following:

"(f) The Director shall not use any funds made available to carry out his part for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, in such a manner as to increase the capacity of conservation camps and training centers of the Job Corps above the capacity of 45,000 enrollees in such camps and centers."

Job Corps—Maximum permissible cost per enrollee in centers

SEC. 105. Section 104 of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof (after the subsection added by section 104) the following:

"(g) The Director shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that for any fiscal year the direct operating costs of Job Corps camps and centers which have been in operation for more than nine months do not exceed $7,500 per enrollee in such camps and centers."

Job Corps—Community activity

SEC. 106. Section 104 of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof (after the subsection added by section 105) the following:

"(h) Job Corps officials shall, whenever possible, stimulate formation of indigenous community activity in areas surrounding Job Corps camps and centers to provide a friendly and adequate reception of enrollees into community life."

Job Corps—Enrollee assignment

SEC. 107. Section 104 of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof (after the subsection added by section 106) the following:

"(i) Whenever there is a vacancy in a Job Corps camp or center in the region in which an enrollee resides which is an appropriate camp or center to meet the needs of the enrollee as determined by the Director, such enrollee shall be assigned to such camp or center. If no such vacancy exists, the enrollee shall be assigned to the Job Corps camp or center offering programs and activities appropriate to meet the needs of the enrollee as determined by the Director, which is nearest to the residence of such enrollee."

Job Corps—Follow-up information

SEC. 108. Section 104 of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof (after the subsection added by section 107) the following:

"(j) The Director shall to the maximum extent feasible assure that each enrollee who successfully completes enrollment in the Corps furnishes to him six months and eighteen months after such completed enrollment the following information:

"(1) The place of residence of such enrollee;

"(2) The employment status of such enrollee;

"(3) The compensation received by such enrollee in his current job and the compensation received by him in the job, if any, immediately preceding his current job; and

(4) Such other relevant information determined by the Director to be necessary for an effective follow-up."

Job Corps—Application of Federal Employees' Compensation Act

SEC. 109. Section 106(c)(2)(B) of the Act is amended by striking out "$150, except that with respect to compensation for disability accruing after the individual concerned reaches the age of twenty-one, such monthly pay shall be deemed to be".

Job Corps—Standards of conduct

SEC. 110. Part A of title I of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Standards of conduct

"SEC. 111. (a) Within Job Corps camps and centers, standards of conduct and deportment shall be provided and stringently enforced. In the case of violations committed by enrollees, dismissals from the Corps or transfers to other locations shall be made in every instance where it is determined that retention in the Corps, or in the particular Job Corps camp or center, will jeopardize the enforcement of such standards of conduct and deportment or diminish the opportunity of other enrollees.

"(b) In order to promote the proper moral and disciplinary conditions in Job Corps conservation camps and training centers, the individual directors of Job Corps camps and centers shall be given full authority to take appropriate disciplinary measures against enrollees including, but not limited to, dismissal from the Job Corps, subject to expeditious appeal procedures to higher authority, as provided under regulation set by the Director.

"(c) The Director shall establish appropriate procedures to insure that the transfer of Job Corps enrollees from State or local jurisdiction shall in no way violate parole or probationary procedures of the State. In the event procedures have been established under which the enrollment of a youth subject to parole or probationary jurisdiction is acceptable to appropriate State authorities, the Director shall make provisions for regular supervision of the enrollee and for reports to such State authorities to conform with the appropriate parole and probationary requirements in such State."

Job Corps—Experimental and demonstration projects

SEC. 111. Part A of title I of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Experimental and demonstration projects

"SEC. 111–1. The Director shall arrange, through grants or contracts, for the carrying out of experimental and demonstration projects (of which not to exceed four may involve the construction of new camps or centers) providing youth employment and training on a combined residential and nonresidential basis. Such projects may involve the use of resources or authority under both this part and part B of this title, pursuant to agreements with the Secretary of Labor where funds under part B of this title are so used, and the Director is authorized to waive any provision of such parts which he finds would prevent the carrying out of elements of such projects essential to a determination and demonstration of their feasibility and usefulness. The Director shall report to the Congress a full description of actions taken and progress made under this section no later than March 1, 1968."

Work training programs—Revision of the program

SEC. 112. (a) Sections 111, 112, and 113 of Part B of title I of the Act are amended to read as follows:

"Neighborhood Youth Corps

"SEC. 112. (a) The Director shall formulate and carry out—

"(1) programs to provide part-time employment, on-the-job training and useful work experience for students from low-income families who are in the ninth through twelfth grades of school (or are of an age equivalent to that of students in such grades) who are in need of the earnings to permit them to resume or maintain attendance in school, and

"(2) programs to provide unemployed individuals useful work experience and on-the-job training, combined where needed with educational and training assistance, including basic literacy and occupational training designed to assist the individuals to develop their maximum occupational potential. Enrollment shall be limited to individuals aged sixteen through twenty-one years.

"(b) In determining for purposes of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) whether a student is from a low-income family, the Director shall consider a student to be from such a family if the family receives cash welfare payments.

“Financial assistance

“Sec. 113. (a) The Director is authorized to enter into agreements providing for the payment by him of part or all of the cost of a program submitted under section 112 if he determines, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, that—

“(1) enrollees will be employed either (A) on publicly owned and operated facilities or projects, or (B) on local projects sponsored by private organizations;

“(2) no enrollees will be employed on projects involving political parties, or the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship;

“(3) the program will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services; and

“(4) the rates of pay for time spent in work, training or education and other conditions of employment will be appropriate and reasonable in the light of such factors as the type of work performed, geographical region, and proficiency of the employee.

“(b) In approving on-the-job training projects with other than public or private nonprofit organizations, the Director is authorized to enter into agreements to pay reasonable training costs but not wages paid to enrollees for services performed.

“(c) In approving projects under this part, the Director shall give priority to projects with high training potential and high potential for contributing to the upward mobility of the trainee.”

(b) Section 114(a) of the Act is amended by striking out “Participation” and inserting in lieu thereof “Enrollment” and by striking out “who have attained age sixteen but have not attained age twenty-two,”.

(c) Section 114(c) of the Act is amended by striking out “nonprofit”.

(d) Section 115 of the Act is amended by striking out “paid for the period ending three years after the date of enactment of this Act” and by striking out “and such assistance paid for periods thereafter shall not exceed 50 per centum of such costs,”.

Special impact programs

Sec. 113. Title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by—

(1) striking out the heading of such title and inserting in lieu thereof: “TITLE I—WORK TRAINING AND WORK-STUDY PROGRAMS”; and

(2) Inserting the following new part immediately following part C:

“PART D—SPECIAL IMPACT PROGRAMS

“Establishment of programs

“Sec. 131. (a) The purpose of this part is to establish special programs which (1) are directed to the solution of the critical problems existing in particular communities and neighborhoods (defined without regard to political or other subdivisions or boundaries) within those urban areas of the Nation having, in the judgment of the Director, especially large concentrations of low-income persons; (2) are of sufficient size and scope to have an appreciable impact in such communities and neighborhoods in arresting tendencies toward dependency, chronic unemployment, and rising community tensions; and (3), where feasible and appropriate, are part of a citywide plan for the reorganization of local or State agencies in order to coordinate effectively all relevant programs of social development.

“(b) In order to carry out the purposes of this part, the Director is authorized to make grants to public or private nonprofit organizations, or to enter into contracts with other private organizations, for the payment of all or part of the cost of programs described in sections 205 (d) and (e) of this Act. The Director shall assure that the work training and employment opportunities created under these special programs are filled by the residents of the communities or neighborhoods served, and that the activities pursued are carried out in the communities and neighborhoods described in subsection (a). For the purposes of this section, the Director may include youths aged sixteen to twenty-one who are unemployed, underemployed, or below the poverty level as established for the programs described in sections 205 (d) and (e).

“(c) The Director shall establish such criteria, and impose such conditions, as may be necessary or appropriate to assure that no program assistance under this part will result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services and to assure that the rates of pay and other conditions of employment will be appropriate and reasonable in the light of such factors as the type of work performed, geographical region, and proficiency of the employee.

“(d) In carrying out the provisions of this part, the Director shall establish such procedures or impose such requirements as may be necessary or appropriate to assure maximum coordination with community action programs approved pursuant to part A of title II of this Act.

“Federal share of program costs

“Sec. 132. Federal grants to any program carried out pursuant to this part shall not exceed 90 per centum of the cost of such program, including costs of administration, unless the Director determines, pursuant to regulations adopted and promulgated by him establishing objective criteria for such determinations, that assistance in excess of such percentages is required in furtherance of the purposes of this part. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services: *Provided*, That where capital investment is required under a contract with a private organization (other than a nonprofit organization), the Federal share thereof shall not exceed 90 per centum of such capital investment and the non-Federal share shall be as defined above.”

Title I programs—Duration; limitation on use of funds

Sec. 114. Part D of title I of the Act is amended to read as follows:

“PART E—DURATION OF PROGRAM

“Sec. 141. The Director shall carry out the programs for which he is responsible under this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law.”

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE II OF THE ACT

Community action—Definition of “community”

Sec. 201. Section 202(a)(1) of the Act is amended by inserting “in an attack on poverty” after “utilizes”, and by striking out “in an attack on poverty” and inserting in lieu thereof “or any neighborhood or other area (irrespective of boundaries or political subdivisions) which is sufficiently homogeneous in character to be an appropriate area for an attack on poverty under this part;”

Community action—Criteria for approval programs

Sec. 202. Section 202(b) of the Act is amended by adding of the end thereof a new sentence to read as follows: “Such criteria shall include requirements to assure (1) that each agency responsible for a community action program is qualified to administer such program and the funds granted to it efficiently, effectively, and in a manner fully consistent with the provisions and purposes of this part, having due regard for the size and complexity of such program and the number of persons and size of the area served; (2) that each such agency is subject to evaluation of program progress and regular or periodic audits and that the results or findings of such evaluations and audits are considered by the agency as well as by the Director in connection with proposals or applications for the renewal, expansion, or modification of any such program; (3) that each such agency maintains records and internal controls needed to achieve and document compliance with all legal requirements and that all records bearing exclusively on grants made under this part are available to the General Accounting Office; (4) that each such program is carried on in accordance with standards and policies, including rules governing the conduct of officers and employees, to preclude the use of program funds, the provision of services, or the employment or assignment of personnel in a manner supporting, or resulting in an identification of such program with any partisan political activity or any actively designed to further the election or defeat of any candidate for public office; and (5) that the personnel of each such agency are selected, employed, promoted, and compensated in accordance with standards prescribed by the Director, or personnel plans approved by him as promoting efficiency and the effective use of funds.”

Community action—Representatives of the poor

Sec. 203. Section 202 of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

“(c)(1) The Director shall not approve, or continue to fund after March 1, 1967, a community action program which is conducted, administered, or coordinated by a board which contains representatives of various geographical areas in the community unless such representatives are required to live in the area they represent.

“(2) The Director shall not approve, or continue to fund after March 1, 1967, a community action program which is conducted, administered, or coordinated by a board on which representatives of the poor do not comprise at least one-third of the membership.

“(3) The representatives of the poor shall be selected by the residents in areas of concentration of poverty, with special emphasis on participation by the residents of the area who are poor.

“(4) In communities where substantial numbers of the poor reside outside of areas of concentration of poverty, provision shall be made for selection of representatives of such poor through a process, such as neighborhood meetings, in which the poor participate to the greatest possible degree.

“(d) The Director shall require community action agencies to establish procedures under which representative groups of the poor including but not limited to minority groups, the elderly, and the rural population, which feel themselves inadequately represented on their community action agency policy board, may petition for adequate representation on such board.”

Community action—Use of latest data in making allotments

Sec. 204. Section 203(b) of the Act is amended (1) by inserting after “State” the second time it appears in paragraph (1) the following “(as determined on the basis of the latest appropriate data)”, (2) by inserting after “States” the second time it appears in such paragraph the following “(as so determined)”, (3) by inserting after “State” the second time it appears in paragraph (2) the following “(as determined on the basis of the latest appropriate data)”, and (4) by inserting after “States” the second time it appears in paragraph (2) the following "(as so determined)".

Community action—Salary limits

Sec. 205. Section 205(a) of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Director shall require that where an agency pays an employee engaged in carrying out a community action program at a rate in excess of $15,000 per annum, payment of such excess shall not be made from Federal funds; and any amount paid such an employee in excess of $15,000 per annum shall not be considered in determining whether section 208(a) has been complied with."

Community action—Adult work training and employment programs

Sec. 206. (a) Section 205 of the Act is amended by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f) and by inserting immediately following subsection (d) the following new subsection:

"(e) The Director is authorized to make grants or enter into agreements with any State or local agency or private organization to pay all or part of the costs of adult work training and employment programs for unemployed or low-income persons involving activities designed to improve the physical, social, economic or cultural condition of the community or area served in fields including, but not limited to, health, education, welfare, neighborhood redevelopment, and public safety. Such programs shall (1) assist in developing entry level employment opportunities, (2) provide maximum prospects for advancement and continued employment without Federal assistance, and (3) be combined with necessary educational, training, counseling, and transportation assistance, and such other supportive services as may be needed. Such work experience shall be combined, where needed, with educational and training assistance, including basic literary and occupational training. Such program shall be conducted in a manner consistent with policies applicable under this Act for the protection of employed workers and the maintenance of basic rates of pay and other suitable conditions of employment."

Community action—Use of public facilities

Sec. 207. Section 205(f) of the Act (as so redesignated by section 206) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "and to programs which make the maximum utilization of existing schools, community centers, settlement houses, and other facilities during times they are not in use for their primary purpose".

Community action—Funding independent programs; membership in sponsoring organizations

Sec. 208. Section 205 of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(g) The Director shall carry out this part in such a manner as to insure that funds available for carrying out this part (other than those available for carrying out subsections (d) and (e) of this section, and sections 206(b), 211-1(a), 211-1(b), 211-2 and 211-3) at least 5 per centum will be used for carrying out independently funded community action programs (other than programs described in subsections (d) and (e) of this section, and sections 206(b), 211-1(a), 211-1(b), 211-2 and 211-3) which are carried on in communities in which there is being carried on concurrently a community action program for which an overall community action agency assumes responsibility for planning, developing, and coordinating communitywide antipoverty programs and provides for the involvement and participation of public and private nonprofit agencies. In addition the Director may use an additional 5 per centum of such funds for carrying out such programs. For purposes of this subsection, a program will be deemed to be independently funded if the grantee is one that develops, and is funded to operate only, programs which are of limited scope and which does not have broad comprehensive community representation on its policymaking board, whether or not the grantee sponsors one or several component programs.

"(h) The Director shall make grants to, or contracts with, independently funded public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations in predominantly rural areas in accordance with sections 210 and 617, where the Director determines it is not feasible, within a reasonable period of time, to establish community action agencies.

"(i) If projects are of a regional nature and can be more efficiently operated on this basis, the Director may make grants to, or contract with, independently funded, public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations for the conduct and administration of such projects.

"(j) No officer or employee of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall be an executive officer or a member of the board of directors of any organization (other than a religious organization) with which the Director has entered into a contract under this section to carry out a community action program or a component program thereof."

Community action—Fiscal responsibility and accounting

Sec. 209. Section 205 of the Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof (after the subsections added by section 208) the following:

"(k) No funds shall be released to any public or private nonprofit agency, or combination thereof, under this section unless the grantee organization has submitted to the Director either—

"(1) a statement from the appropriate public financial officer of the community or of the public agency which will maintain the accounts of the grantee, stating that such officer accepts responsibility for providing financial services adequate to insure the establishment and maintenance of an accounting system by such agency and its delegate agencies, with internal controls adequate to safeguard the assets of such agencies, check the accuracy and reliability of accounting data, promote operational efficiency and encourage adherence to prescribed management policies; or

"(2) an opinion from a Certified Public Accountant or a duly licensed public accountant stating that the grantee has established such an accounting system."

"(l) (1) The Director shall make or cause to be made a preliminary audit survey within 3 months after the effective date of a grant or contract with any public or private nonprofit agency, or combination thereof, under this section to review and evaluate the adequacy of the grantee organization's and its delegate agencies' accounting systems and internal controls.

"(2) Within 30 days of the completion of such survey, the Director shall determine on the basis of the findings and conclusions resulting from such survey whether the accounting systems of the grantee organization and its delegate agencies meet the standards set forth in subsections (k) (1) and (k) (2). If he shall determine that the standards have not been met, he shall immediately notify the grantee organization of his determination and he shall consider whether suspension of further payment of Federal funds under the subject grant is warranted.

"(3) In the event of suspension of any grant funds pursuant to subsection (l) (2), the affected agency shall be given not more than six months from the date of notice of suspension in which to establish, with the advice of Office of Economic Opportunity auditors, the procedures prescribed in subsection (k). A new audit shall be performed within this period and if, by the end of this period, the Director is still unable to determine that the accounting system meets the required standards he shall terminate the contract or grant.

"(m) The Director shall establish such rules and regulations as may be required to insure that public or private nonprofit agencies, or combinations thereof, maintain the standards of accounting set forth in sections 205(k) (1) and (2) during the period of any grant or contract under this section."

Community action—Payment of allowances for attendance at meetings

Sec. 210. Section 205 of the Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof (after the subsections inserted by section 209) the following:

"(n) In extending assistance under this section the Director is authorized to make grants for the payment of a reasonable allowance per meeting for attendance at community action agency board meetings or neighborhood community action council or committee meetings and for the reimbursement of other necessary expenses of attendance at such meetings to members of such boards, councils, or committees who are residents of the areas and members of the groups served in order to insure and encourage their maximum feasible participation in the development, conduct, and administration of community action programs: *Provided, however,* That no such payments shall be made for attendance at more than two meetings in a month, or to any person who is an employee of the United States Government, of a community action agency, or of a State or local governmental agency."

Community action—Family planning services

Sec. 211. Section 205 of the Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof (after the subsection added by section 210) the following:

"(o) (1) In making grants for programs in the field of family planning the Director shall assure that family planning services, including the dissemination of family planning information and medical assistance and supplies, are made available to all individuals who meet the criteria for eligibility for assistance under this part which have been established by the community action agency and who desire such information, assistance, or supplies.

"(2) No such grant shall be approved unless it contains and is supported by reasonable assurances that in carrying out any program assisted by any such grant, the applicant will establish and follow procedures designed to insure that—

"(A) no individual will be provided with any information, medical supervision or supplies which such individual states to be inconsistent with his or her moral, philosophical, or religious beliefs; and

"(B) no individual will be provided with any medical supervision or supplies unless such individual has voluntarily requested such medical supervision or supplies.

"(3) The use of family planning services provided by the applicant under such grant shall not be a prerequisite to the receipt of services from or participation in any other programs under this Act."

Community action—Technical assistance, training, and emergency loans

Sec. 212. (a) Section 206 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"Technical assistance, training, and emergency loans

"Sec. 206. (a) The Director is authorized to provide, either directly or through grants or other arrangements, (1) technical assistance to communities in developing, conducting, and administering community action programs, and (2) training for specialized or other personnel needed to develop, conduct, or administer such programs or to provide services or other assistance in connection with such programs or otherwise pertaining to the purposes of this part. The Director may, upon request of a grantee under this section, or sections 204, 205, or 209(b), make special assignments of personnel to the grantee to assist and advise in the performance of functions related to the purposes of this part, except that in no event shall more than one hundred persons be employed for, or at any one time regularly engaged in, such assignments, nor shall any such special assignment be for a period of more than two years in the case of any grantee.

"(b) The Director shall also formulate and carry out a program for making small loans to persons in low-income families to meet immediate and urgent family needs. The total outstanding balance of loans made to an individual under this subsection may not at any time exceed $300. Loans under this subsection shall bear interest at the rate of 2 per centum per annum and shall be made on such other terms and conditions as the Director may prescribe."

Community action—Research and demonstrations

SEC. 213. Section 207 of the Act is amended by striking out ", training,", by striking out "15 per centum" and inserting "5 per centum", and by adding at the end thereof the following: "No grant or contract for a research or demonstration project shall be made under this section after January 1, 1967, except pursuant to an overall plan setting forth specific objectives to be achieved under this section and setting forth priorities among such objectives. Such plan, to the extent it contemplates activities or programs that may be undertaken by other Federal agencies or the making of grants or contracts that might be made by other Federal agencies having demonstration and research responsibilities, shall be approved by the Director only after consultation with such agencies. The Director shall include as part of the annual report required by section 608, or as a separate and simultaneous report, a description of the principal research and demonstration activities undertaken during each fiscal year under this part, a statement indicating the relation of such activities to the plan and the policies of this Act, and a statement with respect to each such category, describing the results or findings of such research and demonstration activities, or indicating the time or period, and to the extent possible the manner, in which the benefits or expected benefits of such activities will or are expected to be realized. The Director shall require that all applications or proposals for research or demonstrations shall be filed simultaneously in the appropriate regional office of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and shall require such offices to review and make recommendations with respect thereto within fifteen days from the date of filing."

Community action—Limitations on assistance

SEC. 214. Section 208(a) of the Act is amended by striking out "three years after the date of enactment of this Act" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1967", and by striking out "50 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "80 per centum".

Community action—Headstart and legal services programs

SEC. 215. Title II of the Act is amended by inserting after section 211 the following new section:

"Headstart and legal services programs

"SEC. 211-1. (a) In carrying out sections 204 and 205, the Director shall carry out programs eligible for assistance under such sections which assist young children who have not reached the age of compulsory school attendance and which include (1) the furnishing of such comprehensive health, nutritional, social, educational, and mental health services as the Director finds will aid such children to attain their greatest potential, (2) the provision of appropriate activities to encourage the participation of parents of such children and the effective use of their services, and (3) such other training, technical assistance, evaluation, and follow-through activities as may be necessary or appropriate.

"(b) In carrying out sections 204 and 205, the Director shall carry out programs eligible for assistance under such sections, which provide legal advice and legal representation to persons when they are unable to afford the services of a private attorney, together with legal research and information as appropriate to mobilize the assistance of lawyers or legal institutions, or combinations thereof, to further the cause of justice among persons living in poverty: *Provided*, That the Director shall establish procedures to assure that the principal local bar associations in the area to be served by any proposed program of legal advice and representation are afforded an adequate opportunity to review the proposed program and to submit comments and recommendations thereon before such program is approved or funded."

Health services

SEC. 216. Part A of title II of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Comprehensive health services programs

"SEC. 211-2. (a) The Director is authorized to make grants to, or to contract with, public or private nonprofit agencies in order to provide assistance necessary for the development and implementation of comprehensive health services programs focused upon the needs of persons residing in urban or rural areas having high concentrations of poverty and a marked inadequacy of health services. Such programs shall be designed—

"(1) to make possible, with maximum feasible utilization of existing agencies and resources, the provision of comprehensive health services, including but not limited to preventive medical, diagnostic, treatment, rehabilitation, mental health, dental, and follow-up services, together with facilities and rehabilitation necessary in connection therewith; and

"(2) to assure that such services are made readily accessible to the residents of such areas, are furnished in a manner most responsive to their needs and with their participation, and wherever possible are combined with, or included within arrangements for providing, employment, education, social, or other assistance needed by the families and individuals served.

Before approving any program under this section, the Director shall consult with appropriate Federal, State, and local health agencies and take such steps, or impose such conditions, as may be required to make certain that the program will be carried on under competent professional supervision and that existing agencies providing services related to this section are furnished with all assistance necessary or appropriate in order to permit them to plan for participation in such program and for the necessary continuation of such services.

"(b) In carrying out this section, the Director shall formulate and carry out programs for the prevention of narcotic addiction and the rehabilitation of narcotic addicts. Such programs shall include provisions for the detoxification, guidance, training, and job placement of narcotic addicts.

"(c) The Director, either separately or as part of the annual report required under section 608, shall submit at least annually to the Congress a comprehensive statement describing the actions taken and progress made under this section and all other provisions of this Act in meeting the needs of the poor for expanded and improved health services. The Director shall also provide for studies of the nature and characteristics of health problems particularly significant to low-income persons.

"(d) The Director is authorized, after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to secure (by grant or contract) objective studies of the overall operation of the programs authorized under this section, including their relationship to and impact on the adequacy and availability of all relevant programs and services for meeting total health needs. Reports of such studies, together with such comments and recommendations as the Director and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may care to offer, shall be submitted to the President and the Congress."

Adult basic education

SEC. 217. Title II of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof (after the section added by section 216) the following new section:

"Special projects on adult basic education

"SEC. 211-3. The Director is authorized to make grants to local educational agencies and to other public or private nonprofit agencies for the purpose of special projects in the field of adult basic education for low-income individuals over eighteen years of age whose lack of basic educational skills constitutes a substantial impairment of their ability to get or retain employment commensurate with their real ability. Such projects shall—

"(1) involve the use of innovative methods, systems, materials, or programs which the Director determines may have national significance or be of special value in promoting effective programs under this title,

"(2) involve activities in adult basic education which the Director determines are so coupled with other Federal, federally assisted, State, or local programs, as to have unusual promise in promoting a comprehensive or coordinated approach to the problems of low-income individuals with basic educational deficiencies, or

"(3) show promise of enabling persons receiving welfare payments or other forms of public assistance to obtain employment which will permit discontinuance of such assistance."

Title II programs—Duration

SEC. 218. Part D of title II of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"PART D—DURATION OF PROGRAM

"SEC. 221. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law.

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE III OF THE ACT

Rural areas—Loan authority and indemnity payments

SEC. 301. (a) Section 302(a) of the Act is amended by striking out "exceeding $2,500 in the aggregate" and inserting in lieu thereof "resulting in an aggregate indebtedness of more than $3,500 at any one time".

(b) Section 305(f) of the Act is amended by—

(1) inserting "(1)" immediately after "*Provided*, That"; and

(2) inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: "and (2) a cooperative organization formed by and consisting of members of an Indian tribe (including any tribe with whom the special Federal relationship with Indians has been terminated) engaged in the production of agricultural commodities,

or in manufacturing products, on an Indian reservation (or former reservation in the case of tribes with whom the special Federal relationship with Indians has been terminated) shall not be regarded as a cooperative organization within the purview of this clause".

(c) Section 331(c) of the Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1966" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1967".

TITLE III PROGRAMS—DURATION

Sec. 302. Part C of title III of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"Part C—Duration of program

"Sec. 321. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law."

TITLE IV—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE IV OF THE ACT

Sec. 401. Sections 402, 405, and 406 of the Act are amended by striking out "Director" where it appears in such sections and inserting in lieu thereof "Administrator of the Small Business Administration".

Sec. 402. (a) Section 402 of the Act is hereby redesignated section 402(a) and there is added at the end thereof a new subsection (b) as follows:

"(b) The Director is authorized to make grants to, or contract with, public or private nonprofit agencies, or combinations thereof, to pay all or part of the costs necessary to enable such agencies to provide screening, counseling, management guidance, or similar assistance with respect to persons or small business concerns which receive or may be eligible for assistance under subsection (a). Financial assistance under this subsection shall be subject to the provisions of section 208 of this Act."

Sec. 403. Sections 403 and 404 of the Act are hereby repealed.

Sec. 404. Section 407 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"Duration of program

"Sec. 407. The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years."

Sec. 405. Section 402 of the Act is amended by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 402." and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) To the extent necessary or appropriate to carry out the programs provided for in this title the Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall have the same powers as are conferred upon the Director by section 602 of this Act."

Sec. 406. Sections 405, 406, and 407 of the Act, as amended by these Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966, are respectively renumbered as sections 403, 404, and 405 of the Act.

Sec. 407. Section 606 of the Act is amended by striking out "and IV" where it appears in subsections (a) and (d) thereof.

TITLE V—REVISION OF TITLE V OF THE ACT

Sec. 501. (a) Title V of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE V—WORK EXPERIENCE AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

"Statement of purpose

"Sec. 501. It is the purpose of this title to expand the opportunities for constructive work experience and other needed training available to persons (including workers in farm families with less than $1,200 net family income, unemployed heads of families and other needy persons) who are unable to support themselves or their families.

"Transfer of funds

"Sec. 502. In order to permit the carrying out of work experience and training programs meeting the criteria set forth in part E of title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, the Director is authorized to transfer funds to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to enable him (1) to make payments under section 1115 of the Social Security Act for experimental, pilot, or demonstration projects which provide pretraining services and basic maintenance, health, family, basic education, day care, counseling, and similar supportive services required for such programs, and (2) to reimburse the Secretary of Labor for carrying out the activities described in such part E of title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. Costs of such projects and activities shall, notwithstanding the provisions of the Social Security Act and the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, be met entirely from funds appropriated to carry out this title: *Provided*, That such funds may not be used to assist families and individuals insofar as they are otherwise receiving or eligible to receive assistance or social services through a State plan approved under titles I, IV, X, XIV, XVI, or XIX of the Social Security Act.

"Limitations on work experience and training programs

"Sec. 503. (a) The provisions of paragraphs (1) to (6), inclusive, of section 409 of the Social Security Act, unless otherwise inconsistent with the provisions of this title, shall be applicable with respect to work experience and training programs assisted with funds under this title. The costs of such programs to the United States shall, notwithstanding the provisions of such Act, be met entirely from funds appropriated or allocated to carry out the purpose of this title.

"(b) Work experience and training programs shall be so designed that participation of individuals in such programs will not ordinarily exceed 36 months, except that nothing in this subsection shall prevent the provision of necessary and appropriate follow-up services for a reasonable period after an individual has completed work experience and training.

"(c) Not more than 12½ percent of the sums appropriated or allocated for any fiscal year to carry out the purposes of this title shall be used within any one state. In the case of any work experience and training program approved on or after July 1, 1968, not more than 80 percent of the costs of projects or activities referred to in section 502 may be paid from funds appropriated or allocated to carry out this title, unless the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare determines, pursuant to regulations prescribed by him establishing objective criteria for such determinations, that assistance in excess of such percentage is required in furtherance of the purposes of this title. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services.

"Duration of programs

"Sec. 504. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law.

"Transition

"Sec. 505. The Secretary of Labor is authorized to provide work experience and training programs authorized by section 261(a) (3) and (4) of part E of title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, commencing July 1, 1967. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to provide such work experience and training programs through June 30, 1967, and may also continue to completion those work experience and training programs commenced prior to that date, but in no event shall such programs be extended beyond June 30, 1968. After June 30, 1967, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, pursuant to agreement with the Secretary of Labor which shall include provisions for joint evaluation and approval of the training and work experience aspect of each project or program, may also—

"(1) with the concurrence of the Secretary of Labor, renew existing projects and programs, or develop and provide new projects or programs, to accomplish the purposes of this title and of part E of title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962; and

"(2) with the concurrence of the Secretary of Labor, develop and provide other work experience and training programs pursuant to such part E, with respect to such projects or parts of projects which the Secretary of Labor is unable to provide after being given notice and a reasonable opportunity to do so.

Before July 1, 1967, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may, for the purposes of this title and part E of title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, utilize the services and facilities available under the manpower development and utilization programs administered by the Department of Labor which may include, but not be limited to, testing, counseling, job referral and follow-up services required to assist participants in securing and obtaining employment, training opportunities, either on or off the job, available under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, and relocation assistance to involuntarily unemployed individuals in accordance with the standards prescribed in section 104 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, and shall compensate the Secretary of Labor for the reasonable costs thereof either by advance or reimbursement."

TITLE VI—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VI OF THE ACT

Elderly poor

Sec. 601. (a) Section 601(a) of the Act is amended by striking out "three" in the third sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "four".

(b) Section 610 of the Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "The Director shall carry out such investigations and studies, including consultations with appropriate agencies and organizations, as may be necessary (1) to develop programs providing employment opportunities, public service opportunities, and education for the elderly poor under the provisions of this Act, and (2) to determine and recommend to the President and the Congress such programs requiring additional authority and the necessary legislation to provide such authority."

Liaison between agencies

Sec. 602. Section 602(d) of the Act is amended by adding immediately before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: "subject to provisions to assure the maximum possible liaison between the Office of Economic Opportunity and such other agencies at all operating levels, which shall include the furnishing of complete operational information by such other agencies to the Office of Economic Opportunity and the furnishing of such information by such Office to such other agencies".

Elimination of special printing authority of Director

Sec. 603. Section 602(m) of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"(m) expend funds made available for purposes of this Act—

"(1) for printing and binding, in accordance with applicable law and regulation; and

"(2) without regard to any other law or regulation, for rent of buildings and space in buildings and for repair, alteration, and improvement of buildings and space in buildings rented by him; but the Director shall not utilize the authority contained in this subparagraph (2)—

"(A) except when necessary to obtain an item, service, or facility, which is required in the proper administration of this Act, and which otherwise could not be obtained, or could not be obtained in the quantity or quality needed, or at the time, in the form, or under the conditions in which, it is needed, and

"(B) prior to having given written notification to the Administrator of General Services (if the exercise of such authority would affect an activity which otherwise would be under the jurisdiction of the General Services Administration) of his intention to exercise such authority, the item, service, or facility with respect to which such authority is proposed to be exercised, and the reasons and justifications for the exercise of such authority; and".

Administration—Political activities

Sec. 604. Section 603 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"Political activities

"Sec. 603. (a) For purposes of chapter 15 of title 5 of the United States Code any overall community action agency which assumes responsibility for planning, developing, and coordinating communitywide antipoverty programs and receives assistance under this Act shall be deemed to be a State or local agency; and for purposes of clauses (1) and (2) of section 1502(a) of such title any agency receiving assistance under this Act (other than part C of title I) shall be deemed to be a State or local agency.

"(b) The Director, after consultation with the Civil Service Commission, is authorized to issue such regulations or impose such requirements as may be necessary or appropriate to supplement the provisions of subsection (a) of this section or otherwise to insure that programs assisted under this Act are not carried on in a manner involving the use of program funds, the provision of services, or the employment or assignment of personnel in a manner supporting, or resulting in the identification of such program with, any partisan political activity or any activity designed to further the election or defeat of any candidate for public office."

National Advisory Council on Economic Opportunity

Sec. 605. Section 605 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"National Advisory Council on Economic Opportunity

"Sec. 605. (a) There is hereby established in the Office a National Advisory Council on Economic Opportunity (hereinafter referred to as the Advisory Council), to be composed of twenty-one members appointed, for staggered terms and without regard to the civil service laws, by the President. Such members shall be representative of the public in general and appropriate fields of endeavor related to the purposes of this Act. The President shall designate the chairman from among such members. The Advisory Council shall meet at the call of the chairman but not less often than four times a year. The Director shall be an ex officio member of the Advisory Council.

"(b) The Advisory Council shall—

"(1) advise the Director with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this Act; and

"(2) review the effectiveness and the operation of programs under this Act and make recommendations concerning (A) the improvement of such programs, (B) the elimination of duplication of effort, and (C) the coordination of such programs with other Federal programs designed to assist low income individuals and families.

Such recommendations shall include such proposals for changes in this Act as the Advisory Council deems appropriate.

"(c) The Advisory Council shall make an annual report of its findings and recommendations to the President not later than March 31 of each calendar year beginning with the calendar year 1967. The President shall transmit each such report to the Congress together with his comments and recommendations."

Administration—Comparability of wages

Sec. 606. Part A of title VI of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Comparability of wages

"Sec. 610-1. (a) The Director shall take such action as may be necessary to assure that persons employed in carrying out programs financed under part A of title I or part A of title II (except a person compensated as provided in section 602) shall not receive compensation at a rate which is (1) in excess of the average rate of compensation paid in the area where the program is carried out to persons providing substantially comparable services, or in excess of the average rate of compensation paid to persons providing substantially comparable services in the area of the person's immediately preceding employment, whichever is higher or (2) less than the minimum wage rate prescribed in section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

"(b) Not later than sixty days after the close of the fiscal year 1967 and each fiscal year thereafter the Director shall prepare and submit to the President for submission to the Congress a list of the names of all officers or employees whose compensation is subject to the limitations set forth in subsection (a) of this section and who were receiving at the end of such fiscal year a salary of $10,000 or more per year, together with the amount of compensation paid to each such person and the amount of such compensation paid from funds advanced or granted pursuant to this Act. No grant, contract or agreement shall be made under any of the provisions of this Act referred to in subsection (a) of this section which does not contain adequate provisions to assure the furnishing of information required by the preceding sentence.

"(c) No person whose compensation exceeds $6,000 per annum and is paid pursuant to any grant, contract, or agreement authorized under part A of title I or part A of title II (except a person compensated as provided in section 602) shall be employed at a rate of compensation which exceeds by more than 20 percent the salary which he was receiving in his immediately preceding employment, but the Director may grant exceptions for specific cases. In determining salary in preceding employment for one regularly employed for a period of less than 12 months per year, the salary shall be adjusted to an annual basis."

Coordination of programs within executive branch

Sec. 607. Section 611 of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(c) It shall be the responsibility of the Director, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the heads of all other departments and agencies concerned, acting through the President's Committee on Manpower, to provide for, and take such steps as may be necessary and appropriate to implement, the effective coordination of all programs and activities within the executive branch of the Government relating to the training of individuals for the purpose of improving or restoring employability.

"(d) The Secretary of Labor, pursuant to such agreements as may be necessary or appropriate (which may include arrangements for reimbursement), shall—

"(1) be responsible for assuring that the Federal-State employment service provides and develops its capacity for providing maximum support for the programs described in subsection (c); and

"(2) obtain from the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the head of any other Federal agency administering a training program, such employment information as will facilitate the placement of individuals being trained."

Information—Catalog and dissemination

Sec. 608. Section 613 of the Act is amended by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 613." and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) The Director shall publish and maintain on a current basis, a catalog of Federal programs relating to individual and community improvement. The Director is further authorized to make grants from funds appropriated to carry out title II of this Act, to States and communities to establish information service centers for the collection, correlation, and distribution of information required to further the purposes of this Act.

"(c) In order to insure that all Federal programs related to the purposes of this Act are utilized to the maximum possible extent, and in order to insure that all appropriate officials are kept fully informed of such programs, the Director shall establish procedures to assure prompt distribution to States and local agencies of all current information, including administrative rules, regulations and guidelines, required by such agencies for the effective performance of their responsibilities."

Title VI programs—Duration

Sec. 609. Section 615 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"Duration of program

"Sec. 615. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law."

Coordination—Transfers of funds

Sec. 610. Section 616 of the Act is amended by inserting after "this Act," the following: "or any Act authorizing appropriations for any such title (other than part C of title I),".

Additional super grades

Sec. 611. Title VI of the Act is amended by inserting after section 617 the following new section:

"Limitation on additional super grades

"Sec. 618. No additional positions above those authorized on the date of enactment of this section shall be created or filled in fiscal year ending June 30, 1967 in the classification categories of GS 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule of section 5332, title 5, United States Code in the Office of Economic Opportunity and its field offices."

Administrative expenses

Sec. 612. Title VI of the Act is amended by inserting after section 618 the following new section:

"Limitation on Federal administrative expenses

"Sec. 619. The total administrative expenses, including the compensation of Federal employees, incurred by Federal agencies under the authority of this Act for any fiscal year shall not exceed ten percent of the amount authorized to be appropriated by this Act for that year: *Provided, however,* That grants, subsidies, and contributions, and payments to individuals, other than Federal employees shall not be counted as an administrative expense."

Private enterprise participation

SEC. 614. (a) Title VI of the Act is amended by inserting after section 619 (added by section 612) the following new section:

"Private enterprise participation

"SEC. 620. The Director and the heads of any other Federal departments or agencies to which the conduct of programs described in this Act have been delegated shall take such steps as may be desirable and appropriate to insure that the resources of private enterprise are employed to the maximum feasible extent in the programs described in this Act. The Director and such other agency heads shall submit at least annually to the Congress a joint or combined report describing the actions taken and the progress made under this section."

(b) Section 2 of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph: "It is the sense of the Congress that it is highly desirable to employ the resources of the private sector of the economy of the United States in all such efforts to further the policy of this Act."

TITLE VII—TECHNICAL AMENDMENT TO TITLE VII OF THE ACT

SEC. 701. (a) Section 701(a) of the Act is amended by striking out "and XVI" and inserting in lieu thereof "XVI, and XIX".

(b) No funds to which a State is otherwise entitled under title XIX of the Social Security Act for any period before October 1, 1967, shall be withheld by reason of any action taken pursuant to a State statute which prevents such State from complying with the requirements resulting from the amendment made by subsection (a).

TITLE VIII—REVISION OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO VISTA

SEC. 801. The Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE VIII—VOLUNTEERS IN SERVICE TO AMERICA

"Statement of purpose

"SEC. 801. It is the purpose of this title to enable and encourage volunteers to participate in a personal way in the war on poverty, by living and working among deprived people of all ages in urban areas, rural communities, on Indian reservations, in migrant worker camps, and Job Corps camps and centers; to stimulate, develop and coordinate programs of volunteer training and service; and, through such programs, to encourage individuals from all walks of life to make a commitment to combating poverty in their home communities, both as volunteers and as members of the helping professions.

"Authority to establish VISTA program

"SEC 802. (a) The Director is authorized to recruit, select, train, and—

"(1) upon request of State or local agencies or private nonprofit organizations, refer volunteers to perform duties in furtherance of programs combating poverty at a State or local level; and

"(2) in cooperation with other Federal, State, or local agencies involved, assign volunteers to work (A) in meeting the health, education, welfare, or related needs of Indians living on reservations, of migratory workers and their families, or of residents of the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; (B) in the care and rehabilitation of the mentally ill or mentally retarded under treatment at nonprofit mental health or mental retardation facilities assisted in their construction or operation by Federal funds; and (C) in connection with programs or activities authorized, supported, or of a character eligible for assistance under this Act.

"(b) The referral or assignment of volunteers under this section shall be on such terms and conditions (including restrictions on political activities that appropriately recognize the special status of volunteers living among the persons or groups served by programs to which they have been assigned) as the Director may determine; but volunteers shall not be so referred or assigned to duties or work in any State, nor shall programs under section 805 be conducted in any State without the consent of the Governor.

"Volunteer support

"SEC. 803. The Director is authorized to provide to all volunteers during training pursuant to section 802(a) and to volunteers assigned pursuant to section 802(a)(2) such stipend, not to exceed $50 per month (or, in the case of volunteer leaders designated in accordance with standards prescribed by the Director, not to exceed $75 per month), such living, travel, and leave allowances, and such housing, transportation (including travel to and from the place of training), supplies, equipment, subsistence, clothing, and health and dental care as the Director may deem necessary or appropriate for their needs.

"Application of provisions of Federal law

"SEC. 804. (a) Each volunteer under section 802 shall take and subscribe to an oath or affirmation in the form prescribed by section 104(d) of this Act, and the provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable with respect to such oath or affirmation; but except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, such volunteers shall not be deemed to be Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, and Federal employee benefits.

"(b) All volunteers during training pursuant to section 802(a) and such volunteers as are assigned pursuant to section 802(a)(2) shall be deemed Federal employees to the same extent as enrollees of the Job Corps under section 106 (b), (c), and (d) of this Act except that for purposes of the computation described in paragraph (2)(B) of section 106(c) the monthly pay of a volunteer shall be deemed to be that received under the entrance salary for GS-7 of the General Schedule of section 5332, title 5, United States Code.

"(c) For the purposes of subchapter III, chapter 73 of title V of the United States Code, a volunteer under this title shall be deemed to be a person employed in the executive branch of the Federal Government.

"Special programs and projects

"SEC. 805. The Director is authorized to conduct, or to make grants, contracts, or other arrangements with appropriate public or private nonprofit organizations for the conduct of, special programs in furtherance of the purposes of this title. Such programs shall be designed to encourage more effective or better coordinated use of volunteer services, including services of low-income persons, or to make opportunities for volunteer experience available, under proper supervision and for appropriate periods, to qualified persons who are unable to make long-term commitments or who are engaged in or preparing to enter work where such experience may be of special value and in the public interest. Individuals who serve or receive training in such programs shall not, by virtue of such service or training, be deemed to be Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment, including those related to hours of work, rates of compensation, and Federal employee benefits; except that such individuals who receive their principal support or compensation with respect to such service or training directly from the Director or his agent for payment shall be deemed Federal employees to the same extent as volunteers assigned pursuant to section 802(a)(2) of this Act. Not to exceed 15 per centum of the sums appropriated or allocated from any appropriation to carry out this title for any fiscal year may be used for programs under this section.

"Duration of program

"SEC. 806. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law."

TITLE IX—TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

SEC. 901. (a) Title I of the Act is amended by inserting immediately before section 110 a heading for such section to read as follows:

"Youth Conservation Corps"

(b) Title II of the Act is amended by redesignating section 219 of part C as section 219-1.

(c) Section 213 of the Act is amended by striking out "this section" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 214".

(d) Section 604(b) of the Act is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

TITLE X—AMENDMENTS TO MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962

SEC. 1001. (a) The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is amended by inserting the following after the period at the end of section 201: "Whenever appropriate, the Secretary of Labor shall coordinate and provide for combinations of programs, to be pursued concurrently or sequentially, under this Act with programs under other Federal Acts, where the purposes of this Act would be accomplished thereby."

(b) The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is amended by adding at the end of section 203(c) the following: "Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in this subsection or in subsection (h), the Secretary may refer any individual who has completed a program under part B of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to training under this Act, and such individual may be paid a training allowance as provided in section 203(a) of this Act without regard to the requirements imposed on such payments by the preceding sentences of subsection (c) or by subsection (h) of this section. Such payments shall not exceed the average weekly gross unemployment compensation payment (including allowances for dependents) for a week of total unemployment in the State making such payments during the most recent four-calendar-quarter period for which such data are available. Such persons shall not be deemed youths for the purpose of applying the provision under this subsection limiting the number of youths who may receive training allowances."

(c) The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is amended by inserting the following after part D of title II:

"PART E—WORK EXPERIENCE AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

"SEC. 261. (a) The Secretary of Labor in cooperation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall provide, under this part, programs for needy persons who require work experience or special family and supportive services, as well as training in order that they may be assisted to secure and hold regular employment in a competitive labor market. Such programs shall—

"(1) provide for the selection of participants pursuant to procedures and criteria jointly prescribed by the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare;

"(2) include pretraining services and basic maintenance, health, family and day care, counseling, and similar social services, and basic education, as provided by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare pursuant to section 502 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended;

"(3) provide through agreements with appropriate public or private nonprofit agencies, work experience to the extent required to assist participants in developing necessary work attitudes or to prepare them for work or training involving the acquisition of needed skills;

"(4) provide testing, counseling, training either on or off the job (including classroom instruction where needed through appropriate arrangements agreed to by the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare), to assist participants to develop their occupational potential, improve their occupational level and secure promotion or advancement;

"(5) provide, through appropriate arrangements with employers, labor organizations, and other public and private agencies, for development where needed of additional employment opportunities for participants, for job referral and follow-up services required to assist participants in securing and retaining employment and securing possibilities for advancement; and

"(6) provide, in accordance with the criteria prescribed in section 104 of this Act, relocation assistance to involuntarily unemployed individuals where the Secretary of Labor determines they cannot reasonably be expected to secure full-time employment in the community in which they reside.

"(b) In developing and approving programs under this part, the Secretary of Labor shall give priority to programs with a high-training potential and which afford the best prospects for contributing to the upward mobility of participants.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the provisions of section 503 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, shall govern the use and apportionment among the several States of funds provided pursuant to such Act for the purpose of carrying out this part."

TITLE XI—AMENDMENTS TO CERTAIN OTHER ACTS

SEC. 1101. (a) Section 205(b)(2)(A)(iv) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out "section 603" and inserting in lieu thereof "title VIII".

(b)(1) Section 427(a)(2)(C) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended (1) by striking out "or" before "(iii)", and (2) by inserting immediately after "Peace Corps Act," the following: "or (iv) not in excess of three years during which the borrower is in service as a volunteer under title VIII of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964,".

(2) The amendments made by this section shall not apply to any loan outstanding on the effective date of this Act without the consent of the borrowers.

SEC. 1102. Clause (3) of section 401(b) of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended to read as follows:

"(3) no area shall be designated which does not have a population of at least one thousand five hundred persons, except that this limitation shall not apply to any area designated under section 401(a)(3); and".

TITLE XII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 1201. No part of the funds appropriated under this Act to carry out the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 shall be used to provide payments, assistance, or services, in any form, with respect to any individual who is convicted, in any Federal, State, or local court of competent jurisdiction, of inciting, promoting, or carrying on a riot, or any group activity resulting in material damage to property or injury to persons, found to be in violation of Federal, State, or local laws designed to protect persons or property in the community concerned.

And the Senate agree to the same.

ADAM C. POWELL,
CARL D. PERKINS,
EDITH GREEN,
FRANK THOMPSON,
JOHN H. DENT,
SAM M. GIBBONS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOSEPH S. CLARK,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
CLAIBORNE PELL,
EDWARD KENNEDY,
ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
GAYLORD NELSON,
J. K. JAVITS,
WINSTON PROUTY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment to the House bill (H.R. 15111) to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate excised all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute amendment. The committee of conference agreed to a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment. Except for technical, clarifying, and conforming changes the following statement explains the differences between the House bill and the substitute agreed to in conference.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

There were differences between the House bill and the Senate amendment for the authorization of appropriations, as follows:

Title	House bill	Senate amendment	Conference substitute
I	$696,000,000	$588,000,000	$696,000,000
II	832,000,000	944,000,000	846,000,000
III	57,000,000	65,000,000	57,000,000
IV	(1)	5,000,000	5,000,000
V	119,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000
VI	15,000,000	17,000,000	15,000,000
VIII	31,000,000	31,000,000	31,000,000

[1] No authorization.

Earmarking

The House bill initially earmarked authorizations within titles for specific programs including Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Operation Headstart, legal services, the Nelson-Scheuer employment programs, narcotics rehabilitation, emergency family loans, and adult basic education.

The conference modified these provisions to earmark all program categories within titles I and II. The earmarking provisions appear in the bill along with the authorizations for appropriations by title.

It is the express wish of the conferees that under no circumstances should the possible transfer of funds from title to title increase the Job Corps authorization above $211 million. The House bill as passed contained an authorization of $496 million for the Neighborhood Youth Corps. The original Senate bill when reported from the Senate committee contained the same figure. The conferees agreed to reduce this authorization for the NYC to $410 million but it is their intention that this be the *minimum* amount to spend on the NYC. The conferees believe that this has been a highly successful program and feel that it would be ill-advised to transfer under administrative procedures any funds away from this program.

In title II the conferees did not intend to put ceilings on all of the money within the title, this was done so that the Director could within the limitations of the Act transfer funds to those programs carried on within the framework of title II. The purpose of earmarking within title II was to express the intention that not less than the allocated sum would be spent on those specified programs.

In title III the conferees left to the discretion of the Director as to how the funds should be divided between the rural loans and the migrants programs. It is the desire of the conferees that not less than $32,000,000 be spent on the migrant program.

Job Corps—Number of women enrollees

The House bill provided that by July 1, 1967, the number of women in residence and receiving training in Job Corps camps and centers must be at least 10,000. The Senate amendment had no comparable provision. The conference substitute modifies this provision to require that by July 1, 1967, 23 percent of the enrollees in camps and centers must be women.

Job Corps—Maximum capacity of Job Corps camps and centers

The House bill provided that for any fiscal year the total enrollment of the Job Corps conservation camps and training centers shall not exceed 45,000 enrollees, and that the cost, excluding capital costs of operating Job Corps centers shall not exceed $7,500 per enrollee.

The conference substitute adopted the House provision with the stipulation that the $7,500 cost per enrollee which is a nationwide average shall only apply to those camps and centers that have been in operation for more than 9 months, and that the cost of operating Job Corps centers be the direct operating costs.

Job Corps enrollees—Assignment near homes

The House bill provided that to the maximum extent feasible Job Corps enrollees should be assigned to camps and centers near their homes. The Senate amendment provided that whenever a vacancy exists in a Job Corps center in the region in which the enrollee resides and it appropriately meets his needs, he shall be assigned there. If there is no such vacancy in the region the enrollee must be assigned to the center nearest his residence which meets his needs.

The substitute agreed upon in conference adopts the Senate provision with the understanding that the word "region," as used therein refers to one of the seven regions established by the Office of Economic Opportunity for administrative purposes.

Job Corps—Followup information

The Senate amendment contained a provision requiring to the maximum extent feasible the Director to obtain certain information from each enrollee who successfully completes enrollment in the Job Corps. Such information to be provided 6 months and 18 months after the completion of enrollment.

The conference substitute adopted the provision in the Senate amendment.

Job Corps—Standards of conduct

The House bill provided individual camp and center directors with authority to take appropriate disciplinary measures against enrollees including but not limited to, dismissal from the camps or centers subject to expeditious appeal procedures to higher authority, as provided under regulations set by the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The conference substituted a technical change to emphasize the Director's additional authority to issue regulations for the entire subsection. The Director is expected to establish appropriate administrative procedures for the protection of the enrollees at each of the camps and centers in connection with these disciplinary measures.

Job Corps—Combined residential and nonresidential demonstration projects

The House bill set a maximum of four experimental and demonstration projects providing vocational education and training and youth employment on a combined residential and nonresidential basis. These projects could involve the use of resources and authority under both the Job Corps provisions of the act and the Neighborhood Youth Corps provisions. The Director was specifically required to report to Congress by March 1, 1969, on action taken and progress made under the section.

The Senate amendment was, in substance, the same as the House bill except that (1) projects were not limited to four, (2) funds under part B, the N.Y.C. provision, could be used only pursuant to agreements with the Secretary of Labor, and (3) the report to Congress was required by March 1, 1968.

The House receded on the date of the report, but the conference substitute provided that there shall be no more than four new such camps or centers which may be constructed. Existing camps or centers may also be adapted or converted for this purpose. The Director is authorized to conduct such projects through grants or contracts.

Job Corps—Qualifications of contractors

The House bill required the Director to establish qualifications for contracting organizations to assure they possess the capacity and educational resources to carry out Job Corps programs. The Senate amendment contained no similar provision. The House receded.

Neighborhood Youth Corps

Sections 112 and 113 of the House bill were agreed to by the conferees with minor changes that serve to carry out the intention of the House provisions. These sections clarify the purpose and scope of the Neighborhood Youth Corps, and authorize improvement of the program provide the combination of work experience and supportive services best suited to achieve the program objectives for disadvantaged youth.

In section 112(a)(2), the word "enrollment" was substituted for the word "participation" in the last sentence of the paragraph as a clarification of intent.

In section 113(a)(1), the conferees agreed to the deletion of the parenthetical phrase "except those in on-the-job training" as not necessary to the sense of the amendment. They also agreed to delete the word "nonprofit" in order to permit the placement of enrollees in training programs conducted by private enterprise in accordance with the intent of both Houses.

The wording of the Senate bill, in the paragraph on enrollees in the program, was accepted substituting the word "enrollment" for the word "participation" as a clarification of intent, and the House accepted.

One other Senate amendment makes it possible to utilize the services of private organizations in pursuit of the purposes of this part.

The conferees accepted the House amendment of the paragraph on limitation on Federal assistance that extends 90 percent Federal financing of projects for an indefinite period.

Special impact programs

The Senate amendment established a new program providing employment for youths and adults. The program is similar to the work-training programs of the Neighborhood Youth Corps (except for N.Y.C. age requirement), and other work-training programs of the bill. The Senate bill specified that this program shall be directed to those urban areas having especially large concentrations of low-income persons; it has also provided great flexibility in program content and financing.

After years of experience with developing and operating work and training programs, the Department of Labor, which has been delegated administrative responsibility for the Neighborhood Youth Corps, has the staff, resources and capacity for the administration of the program. This program shall be implemented in a manner which assures maximum coordination between the Department of Labor and community action programs approved pursuant to part A of title II of this act.

The conferees included in section 132 a limitation of the Federal share of the impact program cost. The limitation provides for a 10-percent matching for public and private nonprofit corporations. Section 132 further provides that where private profit-making organizations are involved in contracts under this impact program that such organizations must be able to contribute at least 10 percent of the capital investment required to carry out the program. The reason for including this limitation on a contract with a private organization is to insure that such organization has the necessary skills and capital to successfully carry out such a program and that such organization not be one that is sometimes known as a "fly-by-night" organization. The conferees further feel that this program is designed to insure that sound business practices are followed when dealing with private organizations.

Community action—Residence of area representatives

Section 202(c) (1) and (2) of the House bill provided that the director shall not approve a community action program unless the board conducting, administering, or coordinating the program contains representatives of various geographical areas in the community who are required to live in the area they represent, or by a board on which representatives of the poor comprise at least one-third of the membership. Sections (3) and (4) provided that representatives of the poor must be selected by residents of poverty areas, and that where substantial numbers of poor reside outside of poverty areas, provision, such as neighborhood meetings, shall be made for the selection of representatives of such poor. The conferees adopted the House language with the exception that in section 202(c) (1) and (2) of the act, a cutoff date of March 1, 1967, was inserted instead of the instantaneous date in the House bill. In addition to the foregoing, the conferees adopted as section 202 of the act a new subsection (d) which requires the director to establish procedures by which other groups may be represented on community action policy boards. No change was made in the language adopted in the House in section 202(c) (3) and (4) of the act, it having been established that the requirement of at least one-third representation of the poor on the community action board was not intended to apply to any agencies except the so-called umbrella agencies and did not require the restructuring of the city councils where those city counsels were not acting as "umbrella" agencies, and further did not require the restructuring of any other governmental agency such as school boards, hospital and welfare boards, unless such agencies were attempting to function as "umbrella" agencies. However, in cases such as New York City where there exist broadly representative boards administering multipurpose community action programs at the community level, such boards shall be subject to such requirements.

Community action—Use of latest data in making allotments

The House bill provided that for the determination of State allotments the director shall use the "latest calendar or fiscal year data".

The conference substitute amended this provision to read latest "appropriate date".

Community action—Salary limits

The House bill provided that the director shall require that where an agency pays an employee engaged in carrying out a community action program at a rate in excess of $12,500 per annum, payment of such excess shall not be made from Federal funds; any amount paid such employee in excess of $12,500 per annum shall not be considered as counting toward the local share of matching funds.

The conference substitute changed the Federal share with regard to salary from "in excess of $12,500 per annum" to "in excess of $15,000 per annum".

Useful work training for unemployed adults

Section 211(1) of the House bill combined in one section (1) useful work training programs for chronically unemployed adults in, but not limited to, areas of conservation, development, or management of natural resources and recreational areas, combined where needed, with educational and training assistance including basic literacy and occupational training, and (2) work training and employment programs for unemployed adults and low income persons in public service and subprofessional occupations involving activities designed to improve the physical, social, economic, or cultural condition of the area of community served.

The House managers feel that the employment training opportunities afforded by this section will be of critical importance in areas where there are extreme shortages of public health supporting personnel and substantial numbers of unemployed persons such as in the Appalachian area where local community efforts to sustain the Appalachian regional hospitals have encountered extreme difficulties.

The conference substitute provided for these programs in slightly modified form in two distinct sections.

Independently funded community action programs

The House bill provided that of the sums available to carry out sections 204 and 205 of the act, at least 20 percent would be used for carrying out independently funded community action programs in communities where an overall community action program is concurrently being carried on.

The conference agreed that this House provision would be modified so that: (1) The Director is required to allocate at least 5 percent of the funds available for programs other than Headstart, legal services, the Nelson-Scheuer employment programs, health services, narcotics rehabilitation, and emergency family loans, for implementing such independently funded community action programs. (2) The Director is also specifically authorized to allocate at least an additional 5 percent of such funds for implementing such independently funded community action programs. (3) In the expenditure of funds available under this amendment the Director may fund only community action programs other than those enumerated above.

Without regard to the preceding provision, the Senate bill contained a provision requiring the Director to fund independent agencies in predominantly rural areas where he determines that the establishment of a community action agency within a reasonable period of time is not feasible. The Senate bill also contained a provision for the funding of projects of a regional nature. The Senate bill also retained the preference clause set forth in section 211 of the act.

The House accepted these features of the Senate bill.

Administrative, accounting, and auditing procedures

The House bill contained several provisions regarding administrative, accounting and auditing procedures, as follows:

(1) Public grantee agencies must submit a statement from an appropriate public financial officer as to the adequacy of the agencies accounting system.

(2) The Director may issue or cause to be issued a preliminary audit survey within 3 months of a grant or contract.

(3) Agencies whose funds have been suspended because of accounting inadequacies must make changes and corrections in their systems.

The Senate amendment provided for similar requirements and requirements regarding personnel, policies, and standards.

The conference substitute modified the provisions in both bills, as follows:

(1) Public grantee agencies may also secure the opinion of a CPA or licensed public accountant regarding the adequacy of their accounting system;

(2) The required preliminary audit is to be made within 3 months of the effective date of the grant or contract.

(3) Personnel other than auditors may furnish advice needed to improve accounting procedures.

Allowances for meeting attendance and reimbursement for other expenses

The Senate amendment provided for payment of allowances to persons, other than Federal or community action agency employees, for attendance at neighborhood community action program council or committee meetings, and for payment of other expenses necessary for participation in the development, conduct, and administration of community action programs.

The conference substitute amended this provision as follows:

(1) Payments and reimbursements shall be payable for attendance at citywide community action board meetings;

(2) Payments or reimbursement shall be only to such persons who meet the criteria of being poor;

(3) Payments shall not be made for more than two meetings per month; and

(4) Prohibition against receipt of such payments is extended to State and local governmental employees.

Family planning services

The Senate amendment contained a provision not in the House bill with respect to the carrying out of family planning services as a part of community action programs.

The Senate amendment which was agreed to guaranteed that eligibility for family planning services for the poor will be left entirely to the determination of the local community. Such services must be requested by a local community action agency. No individual will be provided with information, medical services, or supplies unless they are specifically and voluntarily requested. In no event shall such information, assistance, or supplies be provided if it is inconsistent with an individual's philosophical, moral, or religious beliefs. The use of family planning services cannot be a prerequisite to the receipt of services from or participation in any other programs under the act.

Community action—Research and demonstration

Section 208 of the House bill reduced the allowable percentage of section 207 funds which can be used for research, demonstration, and training projects from 15 percent to 5 percent of the total funds available for title II.

The conference substitute removed the word "training" from section 207 of the act and accepted the Senate version of section 206 so that the reduced funding percentage would apply only to research and demonstration.

Small emergency family loans

The House bill provided an allocation of $8 million for family emergency loans. The Senate amendment contained no such provision or earmarking of funds.

The conference substitute provided that emergency family loans should be funded under section 206 rather than section 208, thus consolidating with technical assistance and training. Eight million dollars is allocated for this purpose.

Health services

The conference substitute authorized grants or contracts for the development and implementation of comprehensive health services programs.

Narcotics rehabilitation

The House bill provided for the formulation and conduct of programs for the prevention of narcotic addiction and the rehabilitation of narcotic addicts, earmarking $12,500,000 for this purpose.

The conference substitute incorporated this provision into the comprehensive health services programs.

Although narcotics rehabilitation was not specifically earmarked by legislation, the committee explicitly agreed that no less than $12 million of the earmarked funds for health services programs, or an equivalent proportion of such funds as may be appropriated, be used only for narcotics rehabilitation.

Adult basic education

The present act contains a comprehensive program for Federal assistance to provide basic education to adults. The House bill severally amended these provisions. The Senate bill contained no such amendments because the Senate was cognizant of proposed Senate legislation to transfer this entire program to the Office of Education. As a result, the conference substitute combined the essential features of the adult literacy program in section 603 and the provision for special projects in section 218(a) of the House bill into a new section under title IIA. The function of implementing these specialized adult basic education programs is vested in the OEO Director.

Indian tribes

The House accepted the Senate amendment providing that cooperatives organized and operated by Indian tribes on Indian reservations may receive rural loans.

Title IV.—Small business loan program

The bill as passed by the House amended this title to transfer the small business loan program from the Director of OEO to the Administrator of the Small Business Administration. The Senate bill contained no similar transfer provision but amended existing law by specifically authorizing the Director of OEO to make grants to, or contracts with, public or private nonprofit agencies to enable them to provide counseling and management guidance to persons and small business concerns eligible for loan assistance. The Senate bill also contained a specific authorization for funding this grant program. The committee of conference recommended that both the House and Senate amendments be agreed to.

The committee of conference intended that SBA shall fund, administer, and be responsible for the loan program; but that OEO shall fund, administer, and be responsible for the counseling and guidance program.

Work experience

The House bill amended the work experience provisions of title V to establish closer coordination between the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Labor to effect more meaningful work training programs which would be complemented with supportive social services and vocational education.

The conference substitute differed from the House provision by extending the limit on the duration of work experience and training programs from 24 to 36 months. It also included a new section that provides for the orderly transfer of responsibility for the work training and work experience aspects of these programs to the Secretary of Labor to improve the administration and coordination of manpower programs. Through June 30, 1967, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to carry out such programs, and may carry to completion programs begun prior to that date, though in no case may he continue a program beyond June 30, 1968.

Beginning July 1, 1967, the training components of these programs are to be provided by the Secretary of Labor, under part E, of title II (X of this bill). Subject in each case to the concurrence of the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may, after June 30, 1967, renew existing programs or provide new programs or parts thereof that the Secretary of Labor is unable to provide after having been given notice and a reasonable opportunity to do so.

Prior to July 1, 1967, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may utilize the services and facilities available under the manpower development and utilization programs of the Department of Labor for the purpose of carrying out this title and title X (part E) of the Manpower Development and Training Act.

The 80–20 matching requirements shall not become effective until July 31, 1968, because many State legislatures meet only once every 2 years.

Assistant Director for the elderly poor

The Senate bill contained a provision which required the appointment of a new Assistant Director, with the responsibility for conducting investigations and studies to develop programs with respect for the elderly poor, and to make appropriate recommendations regarding the establishment of such programs. The House bill contained no comparable provision.

The conference adopted the Senate amendment.

Liaison and exchange of information

The Senate bill provided for the maximum possible liaison between the Office of Economic Opportunity and other Federal agencies, including the furnishing of information.

The conference amended this provision to insure that with regard to furnishing information, there shall be a complete and two-way exchange of information between OEO and the other agencies.

Political activities

The House and Senate bills both contained provisions restricting the political activities of OEO employees.

The conference accepted the provision of the Senate bill which provides that employees of community action agencies would be fully subject to the provisions of section 12 of the Hatch Act prohibiting partisan political activity on the part of employees of State or local agencies whose principal employment is in connection with an activity financed in whole or part by Federal loans or grants.

It also requires that officers and employees of any agency receiving assistance under the act (other than part C of title I) be treated as employees of State or local agencies for purposes of the prohibitions in the Hatch Act on soliciting funds from other employees for political purposes and using official position to interfere with or affect the result of any election or nomination.

In addition, the Director, after consultation with the Civil Service Commission, is authorized to issue such regulations or impose such requirements as may be necessary or appropriate to supplement the above provisions.

National Advisory Council on Economic Opportunity

The Senate bill contained a provision that revised the section respecting the Advisory Council, as follows:

(1) It shall be composed of 21 members appointed by the President with staggered terms and without regard to civil service laws;

(2) The Director will be an ex officio member;

(3) Members are to be representative of the public and of appropriate fields of endeavor related to the purposes of the act;

(4) One member of the Advisory Council will be designated Chairman by the President;

(5) The Advisory Council will meet at the call of the Chairman but not less than four times a year.

The duties of the Advisory Council are to advise the Director with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of the act, review the effectiveness and operation of programs under the act, and make recommendations concerning those programs, the elimination of duplication of effort, and the coordination of these programs with other Federal programs. Recommendations by the Advisory Council will include such proposals for change in the Economic Opportunity Act as its members deem appropriate.

Not later than March 31 of each calendar year, the Advisory Council will make a report of its findings and recommendations to the President, who will transmit the report, together with his comments and recommendations to the Congress.

COMPARABILITY OF WAGES

The House bill's wage comparability provision was modified to assure that the rate of compensation of persons employed in carrying out programs under the act be comparable to that either in the area where the program is carried out or in the area of the person's immediately preceding employment. In addition, the Director would be required to assure that compensation be at a rate which is not less than the Federal minimum wage.

The House also accepted a Senate amendment requiring that the Director report to the President for submission to Congress information on persons receiving a salary of $10,000 or more per year.

COORDINATION OF TRAINING PROGRAMS

Both the House and Senate bills contained provisions requiring greater coordination of Government training programs.

The conference committee accepted the Senate version which requires the Director, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the heads of other agencies concerned, acting through the President's Committee on Manpower, to provide for and take such steps as may be necessary and appropriate to implement the effective coordination of all programs and activities relating to the training of individuals for the purpose of improving or restoring employability. It further provides that the Secretary of Labor, pursuant to such agreements as may be necessary or appropriate, shall be responsible for assuring that the Federal-State employment service provides, and develops its capacity for providing, maximum support for Federal training programs. The Secretary of Labor is also directed to obtain from the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the head of any other Federal agency administering a training program information which will facilitate the placement of individuals being trained.

Information—Catalog and dissemination

The House bill required the Director to publish and maintain a current catalog of all Federal programs relating to individual and community improvement, and to make grants to States and communities to establish information centers.

The conference substitute adopted this provision, except that the word "all" before "Federal programs" is stricken to indicate the amendment is intended to assure continued publication of OEO's present catalog and not intended to require with respect to new material duplication of information already published by other Federal agencies.

Limitation on additional supergrades

The House bill contained a provision which limited the number of positions in OEO and its field offices in the classification categories of GS 16, 17, and 18, to not exceed 1 for every 100 employees.

The conference substitute provided that no additional positions in these classification categories above those now authorized shall be created or filled in fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

The conference committee recommended that a joint committee comprised of Members of the Senate and of the House shall be convened to investigate and study the OEO administrative operation to determine the numbers of supergrades and consultants necessary to successfully achieve the purpose of this act.

Not later than March 15, 1967, such committee should submit to the Congress a report of its findings, along with any recommendations concerning this section.

Private enterprise participation

The Senate bill provided that the Director or any other Federal department or agency head to which conduct of a program has been delegated shall act to insure that the resources of private enterprise are employed to the maximum feasible extent in Economic Opportunity Act programs. An annual report to Congress on the progress made under the section is required.

Prohibition on assistance to individuals inciting riots

The House bill contained provisions to prohibit assistance under this act to individuals inciting riots and causing civil disturbances. The Senate amendment had a similar provision.

The conference modified and adopted the House amendment to insure that an individual must have been convicted by a Federal, State, or local court of competent jurisdiction, of inciting, promoting, or carrying on a riot, or any group activity resulting in material damage to property or injury to persons.

ADAM C. POWELL,
CARL D. PERKINS,
EDITH GREEN,
FRANK THOMPSON,
JOHN H. DENT,
SAM M. GIBBONS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

We have brought to the House a conference report which represents a fair compromise of the differences between the House and Senate. Millions of American citizens will have little hope to become participating productive members of our Nation's most prosperous time without a continuation of this program. We have made some progress in alleviating our unemployment problems under this act. Tremendous progress has been made in work opportunities for the youngster and the teenager. By all means we should continue the Job Corps; we must enlarge the capacity of the Neighborhood Youth Corps so as to accommodate all youngsters who need this opportunity for education, work, and training, and continue all of these very worthy programs.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion let me take this occasion to commend the members of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the War on Poverty Program for their extensive work and effort to fashion legislation which would more effectively assure better working programs. I believe that the managers on the part of the House have been diligent in trying to maintain those carefully worked out provisions which were contained in H.R. 15111 as it passed the House on September 29.

In the Job Corps, the final authorization is $211 million, $17 million under the President's budget estimate. The Neighborhood Youth Corps authorization is $410 million, an increase of $110 million over the President's budget. Thus the total for title I will be $696 million for fiscal year 1967.

In title II, $323 million is being provided for community action programs, $352 million for Project Headstart, $22 million for legal services for the poor, $73 million for special public service training programs, $49 million for health center oriented programs, $12 million for narcotics rehabilitation, $8 million for family loans, and a special basic education program for adults in the amount of $7 million; $57 million has been authorized for the important title III programs pertaining to rural loans and migrants. $5 million has been authorized for Small Business Administration loan counseling, $100 million for work experience and training, $15 million for general administration.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this conference report so that we may carry on and enlarge our efforts to solve the problems of thousands of American families who find themselves caught without education, without job opportunities, and with a feeling of dispair about their future role in this great democracy. I urge the adoption of the conference report. Therefore, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Doorkeeper will close the door, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 170, nays 109, not voting 153, as follows:

[Roll No. 390]

YEAS—170

Addabbo
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Bandstra
Barrett
Beckworth
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Brademas
Brooks
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Cameron
Carey
Casey
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Dulski
Dwyer
Edwards, Calif.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Flood
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Grider
Griffiths
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hathaway
Hays
Hechler
Holland
Horton
Irwin
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kluczynski
Krebs
Kupferman
Landrum
Leggett
Long, Md.
Love
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
Macdonald
Machen
Madden
Mathias
Minish
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Price
Pucinski
Race
Redlin
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Secrest
Sickles
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stubblefield
Tenzer
Thomas
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waldie
Weltner
White, Tex.
Widnall
Wolff
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—109

Abbitt
Adair
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Bates
Battin
Bell
Bennett
Betts
Bolton
Bow
Brock
Broomfield
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burleson
Byrnes, Wis.
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Collier
Conable
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan, Tenn.
Erlenborn
Everett
Ford, Gerald R.
Frelinghuysen
Gathings
Goodell
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hardy
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Henderson
Herlong
Hosmer
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Kunkel
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
McClory
MacGregor
Mahon
Marsh
May
Mills
Minshall
Mize
Mosher
Nelsen
Passman
Pelly
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Selden
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tuck
Utt
Waggonner
Watson
Whalley
Whitten
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wyatt
Wydler
Younger

NOT VOTING—153

Abernethy
Adams
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Glenn
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Belcher
Berry
Bolling
Bray
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Callaway
Carter
Cederberg
Clawson, Del
Clevenger
Cohelan
Colmer
Cooley
Corman
Craley
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Duncan, Oreg.
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Fountain
Fuqua
Gettys
Gilligan
Greigg
Gross
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Hébert
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Howard
Hungate
Huot
Jacobs
Jones, N.C.
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kornegay
Laird
Long, La.
McCarthy
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Mackay
Mackie
Mailliard
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Matthews
Meeds
Michel
Miller
Mink
Moeller
Morton
Moss
Murray
Nix
O'Brien
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
O'Neal, Ga.
Pool
Powell
Purcell
Randall
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roncalio
Roudebush
Roush
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Scott
Senner
Shipley
Sisk
Smith, N.Y.
Stafford
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Toll
Trimble
Tunney
Ullman
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watts
White, Idaho
Whitener
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Yates

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mrs. Sullivan for, with Mr. Berry against.

Mr. Steed for, with Mr. Ayres against.

Mr. Sisk for, with Mr. Bray against.

Mr. Schisler for, with Mr. Glenn Andrews against.

Mr. Schmidhauser for, with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin against.

Mr. Senner for, with Mr. Derwinski against.

Mr. Shipley for, with Mr. Devine against.

Mr. Stratton for, with Mr. Dickinson against.

Mr. Trimble for, with Mr. Edwards of Alabama against.

Mr. Tunney for, with Mr. Fino against.

Mr. Ullman for, with Mr. Hansen of Idaho against.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson for, with Mr. McEwen against.

Mr. Yates for, with Mr. Mailliard against.

Mr. Sweeney for, with Mr. Martin of Nebraska against.

Mr. Clevenger for, with Mr. Findley against.

Mr. Corman for, with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin against.

Mr. Craley for, with Mr. Robison against.

Mr. Denton for, with Mr. Morton against.

Mr. Evans of Colorado for, with Mr. Belcher against.

Mr. Hanna for, with Mr. Roudebush against.

Mr. Hansen of Iowa for, with Mr. Stanton against.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington for, with Mr. Talcott against.

Mrs. Mink for, with Mr. Callaway against.

Mr. Adams for, with Mr. Cederberg against.

Mr. Cohelan for, with Mr. Smith of New York against.

Mr. White of Idaho for, with Mr. Walker of Mississippi against.

Mr. Roush for, with Mr. Michel against.

Mr. O'Brien for, with Mr. Ellsworth against.

Mr. McCarthy for, with Mr. Martin of Alabama against.

Mr. McVicker for, with Mr. Harvey of Indiana against.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Holifield for, with Mr. Kornegay against.

Mr. King of California for, with Mr. Randall against.

Mr. Aspinall for, with Mr. Rivers of South Carolina against.

Mr. Dyal for, with Mr. Colmer against.

Mr. Edmondson for, with Mr. Abernethy against.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee for, with Mr. Baring against.

Mr. Feighan for, with Mr. Cooley against.

Mr. Fogarty for, with Mr. Davis of Georgia against.

Mr. Foley for, with Mr. Fisher against.

Mr. Gilligan for, with Mr. Flynt against.

Mr. Hawkins for, with Mr. Fuqua against.

Mr. Helstoski for, with Mr. Gettys against.

Mr. Hicks for, with Mr. Hagan of Georgia against.

Mr. Carter for, with Mr. Hungate against.

Mr. Howard for, with Mr. Jones of North Carolina against.

Mr. Huot for, with Mr. McMillan against.

Mr. Jacobs for, with Mr. Murray against.

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. O'Neal of Georgia against.

Mr. King of Utah for, with Mr. Pool against.

Mr. McFall for, with Mr. Rogers of Florida against.

Mr. Brown of California for, with Mr. Scott against.

Mr. Matsunaga for, with Mr. Stephens against.

Mr. Mackay for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Mackie for, with Mr. Watts against.

Mr. Meeds for, with Mr. Whitener against.

Mr. Miller for, with Mr. Fountain against.

Mr. Moeller for, with Mr. Long of Louisiana against.

Mr. Moss for, with Mr. Clarence J. Brown, Jr., against.

Mr. Nix for, with Mr. Reinecke against.

Mr. Olsen of Montana for, with Mr. Laird against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Halleck against.

Mr. Resnick for, with Mr. Anderson of Illinois against.

Mr. Reuss for, with Mr. King of New York against.

Mr. Rivers of Alaska for, with Mr. Del Clawson against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Albert with Mr. Roberts.

Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Roncalio.

Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Walker of New Mexico.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Todd.

Mr. Duncan of Oregon with Mr. Haley.

Mr. Greigg with Mr. Purcell.
Mr. Matthews with Mr. Toll.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 17658. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the U.S. Naval Construction Battalions (Seabees) 25th anniversary and the U.S. Navy Civil Engineers Corps (CEC) one hundredth anniversary.

H.R. 18284. An act to authorize the Attorney General to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands within the Federal Reformatory at Chillicothe, Ohio.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 18233. An act authorizing construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 18381. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 18381) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes." Disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. PASTORE, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. MUNDT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2695. An act for the relief of Rosa Anna Genovese;

S. 3050. An act for the relief of Maria Panagiotis Restos;

S. 3111. An act for the relief of John W. Rogers;

S. 3115. An act for the relief of Henri P. Boutin;

S. 3137. An act for the relief of Hye Suk Paeng and Mi Kung Paeng (Patricia Ann);

S. 3144. An act for the relief of the estate of Patrick E. Eagan;

S. 3208. An act for the relief of Kimiko Bethard;

S. 3223. An act for the relief of Dr. Jesus L. Lastra;

S. 3233. An act for the relief of Dr. Roberto E. Parajon and Maria C. Florin Parajon, his wife;

S. 3241. An act for the relief of Dr. Pablo A. Suarez;

S. 3257. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard;

S. 3258. An act for the relief of Deniz Hikmet Sen Manes;

S. 3278. An act for the relief of Ernesto Sanchez Jerez;

S. 3448. An act for the relief of Capt. Robert C. Crisp, U.S. Air Force;

S. 3580. An act to provide additional readjustment assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes;

S. 3674. An act for the relief of Chun Moon Hee (Hi);

S. 3713. An act for the relief of Julio Juan Castellanos Lopez;

S. 3790. An act for the relief of Dr. Luis G. Dediot; and

S.J. Res. 124. Joint resolution to establish the Golden Spike Centennial Celebration Commission.

SUNNYSIDE SEED FARMS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of S. 195, for the relief of Sunnyside Seed Farms.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money not otherwise appropriated, to the Sunnyside Seed Farms, of Middleton, Wisconsin, the sum of $10,200, in full satisfaction of all its claims against the United States for storage charges for the failure to use certain facilities of such firm for a two-year period from November 1, 1951, through November 1, 1953, pursuant to the storage guarantee agreement (alpm (FX) 24721): *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1967

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 18119) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT NO. 2325)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 18119) "making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 4, 10, 11, 14, 23.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 15, 16, 20, 22, 24, 25, and 26; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$20,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"TRAFFIC AND HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS

"For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, and the Highway Safety Act of 1966, $10,000,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"STATE AND COMMUNITY HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

"For the payment of obligations incurred in carrying out the provisions of title 23, United States Code, section 402, as added by the Highway Safety Act of 1966, $10,000,000.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

"For necessary administrative expenses for carrying out the provisions of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, and the Highway Safety Act of 1966, $2,000,000, to be derived by transfer of $880,000 from the appropriation for the current fiscal year for "Traffic and highway safety programs"; and $1,120,000 from the appropriation for the current fiscal year from "State and community highway safety programs (liquidation of contract authorization)": *Provided*, That funds available under this head shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a)."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$37,350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 5.

John J. Rooney,
Robert L. F. Sikes,
John M. Slack, Jr.,
Neal Smith,
Charles S. Joelson,
George Mahon,
Frank T. Bow,
Glenard P. Lipscomb,
Elford A. Cederberg,
Managers on the Part of the House.

John L. McClellan,
Allen J. Ellender,
Warren G. Magnuson,
Spessard L. Holland,
John O. Pastore,
J. W. Fulbright,
Margaret Chase Smith,
Leverett Saltonstall,
Karl E. Mundt,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Statement

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 18119) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

International commissions

International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $5,754,000 for "Construction" as proposed by the Senate instead of $5,454,000 as proposed by the House.

American Sections, International Commissions

Amendment No. 2: Provides for the salary of two commissioners as proposed by the Senate instead of one as proposed by the House.

Educational exchange

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $47,000,000 for "Mutual educational and cultural exchange activities" as proposed by the House instead of $48,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4: Provides that not less than $23,500,000 shall be used for payments in foreign currencies as proposed by the House instead of $25,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

General provisions—Department of State

Amendment No. 5: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the language proposed by the Senate.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Economic Development Administration

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $10,000,000 for "Economic development center assistance" as proposed by the Senate instead of $20,000,000 as proposed by the House.

International Activities

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates $5,050,000 for "Export control" as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,950,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 8: Provides for the transfer of $1,678,000 to the Bureau of Customs as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,658,000 as proposed by the House.

Community Relations Service

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates $1,500,000 for "Salaries and expenses" as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,750,000 as proposed by the House.

United States Travel Service

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates $3,000,000 for "Salaries and expenses" as proposed by the House instead of $3,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The sum of $45,000 is earmarked for support of the international conference of Pacific Area Travel Association scheduled for April 1967 for the promotion of travel to and within the Pacific area.

Environmental Science Services Administration

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates $99,400,000 for "Salaries and expenses" as proposed by the House instead of $99,830,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees do not intend to determine the location of weather stations throughout the country or to try to set the policy as to the number of hours of service, etc. That is the proper function of the Environmental Science Services Administration. If it can be proved that additional service is a necessity, the conferees are of the opinion that the amount recommended herein should be sufficient to fund any and all such essential services.

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $20,250,000 for "Research and development" instead of $20,000,000 as proposed by the House and $20,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of State Technical Services

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates $5,500,000 for "Grants and expenses" instead of $5,000,000 as proposed by the House and $6,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Maritime Administration

Amendment No. 14: Deletes the language proposed by the Senate relating to "Ship construction".

Bureau of Public Roads

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $65,000,000 for "Repayable advances to the highway trust fund" as proposed by the Senate instead of $100,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Highway and Traffic Safety

Amendments Nos. 16 and 17: Appropriate $10,000,000 for "Traffic and highway safety programs" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates $10,000,000 for "State and community highway safety programs (liquidation of contract authorization)" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19: Places a limitation of $2,000,000 on administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE IV—THE JUDICIARY

Customs Court

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates $1,265,000 for "Salaries and expenses" as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,215,000 as proposed by the House.

Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and other Judicial Services

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $37,350,000 for "Salaries of supporting personnel" instead of $37,300,000 as proposed by the House and $37,455,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE V—RELATED AGENCIES

Funds appropriated to the President

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $9,000,000 for "Southeast hurricane disaster" as proposed by the Senate.

Tariff Commission

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $3,500,000 for "Salaries and expenses" as proposed by the House instead of $3,530,000 as proposed by the Senate.

U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates $9,000,000 for "Arms control and disarmament activities" as proposed by the Senate instead of $10,000,000 as proposed by the House.

U.S. Information Agency

Amendment No. 25: Provides for the purchase of uniforms for fourteen guards as proposed by the Senate instead of six as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates $148,818,000 for "Salaries and expenses" as proposed by the Senate instead of $149,000,000 as proposed by the House.

John J. Rooney,
Robert L. F. Sikes,
John M. Slack, Jr.,
Neal Smith,
Charles S. Joelson,
George Mahon,
Frank T. Bow,
Glenard P. Lipscomb,
Elford A. Cederberg,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. ROONEY of New York (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes contains a total of $2,347,826,600 in direct appropriations. It also contains a total of $3,968,400,000 for the Bureau of Public Roads which is derived from the highway trust fund.

This bill now before the House is below both the House and Senate versions.

The amount agreed upon in conference is $16,182,000 below the bill as it passed the House. It should be noted that additional budget estimates totaling $35,766,500 were considered by the Senate over and above those considered by the House.

The amount agreed upon in conference is $3,115,000 below the bill as it passed the Senate.

This bill is $286,578,400 below the total of the budget estimates.

Finally, it is $383,269,850 below the appropriations for fiscal year 1966.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the Record a table showing the actions of House-Senate conferees with regard to the various departments and agencies contained in the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies, 1967

Item	Appropriations, 1966	Budget estimates, 1967	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						Appropriations, 1966	Budget estimates, 1967	House	Senate
Department of State	$392,558,000	$393,330,000	$386,457,000	$388,257,000	$386,757,000	−$5,801,000	−$6,573,000	+$300,000	−$1,500,000
Department of Justice	387,593,000	406,903,000	386,919,000	386,919,000	386,919,000	−674,000	−19,984,000	----------	----------
Department of Commerce	1,294,542,250	1,493,285,000	1,286,390,000	1,263,470,000	1,261,990,000	−32,552,250	−231,295,000	−24,400,000	−1,480,000
Bureau of Public Roads (highway trust fund)	(3,898,400,000)	(3,970,000,000)	(3,968,400,000)	(3,968,400,000)	(3,968,400,000)	(+70,000,000)	(−1,600,000)	----------	----------
The judiciary	83,116,200	96,505,000	88,569,600	88,774,600	88,669,600	+5,553,400	−7,835,400	+100,000	−105,000
American Battle Monuments Commission	2,148,000	2,092,000	2,092,000	2,092,000	2,092,000	−56,000	----------	----------	----------
Commission on Civil Rights	1,925,000	2,703,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	+575,000	−203,000	----------	----------
Office of Education: Civil rights educational activities	8,000,000	11,115,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	----------	−3,115,000	----------	----------
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission	3,250,000	5,870,000	5,200,000	5,200,000	5,200,000	+1,950,000	−670,000	----------	----------
Federal Maritime Commission	3,218,000	3,475,000	3,375,000	3,375,000	3,375,000	+157,000	−100,000	----------	----------
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	1,915,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	+85,000	----------	----------	----------
President's Commissions on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice and on Crime in the District of Columbia	900,000	600,000	550,000	550,000	550,000	−350,000	−50,000	----------	----------
Small Business Administration	317,215,000	8,400,000	8,100,000	8,100,000	8,100,000	−309,115,000	−300,000	----------	----------
Southeast hurricane disaster	35,000,000	9,000,000	----------	9,000,000	9,000,000	−26,000,000	----------	+9,000,000	----------
Special representative for trade negotiations	564,000	566,000	566,000	566,000	566,000	+2,000	----------	----------	----------
Subversive Activities Control Board	480,000	280,000	280,000	280,000	280,000	−200,000	----------	----------	----------
Tariff Commission	3,446,000	3,565,000	3,500,000	3,530,000	3,500,000	+54,000	−65,000	----------	−30,000
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	−1,000,000	−1,000,000	−1,000,000	----------
U.S. Information Agency	185,226,000	184,716,000	169,510,000	169,328,000	169,328,000	−15,898,000	−15,388,000	−182,000	----------
Total	2,731,096,450	2,634,405,000	2,364,008,600	2,350,941,600	2,347,826,600	−383,269,850	−286,578,400	−16,182,000	−3,115,000

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this conference report represents the unanimous judgment of all the House conferees.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, the ranking member of the subcommittee [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I fully endorse this conference report for the conferees on this side and hope that the House will unanimously adopt it.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 5: Page 14, line 19, insert:

"Sec. 106. Existing appointments and assignments to the Foreign Service Reserve in the Department of State which expire during the current fiscal year may be extended in the discretion of the Secretary of State for a period of one year in addition to the period of appointment or assignment otherwise authorized.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Rooney of New York moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 5 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CONSTRUCTION, REPAIR, AND PRESERVATION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS FOR NAVIGATION, FLOOD CONTROL, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 18233) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE I—RIVERS AND HARBORS

"Sec. 101. The following works of improvement of rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood control, and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with the plans and subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in the respective reports hereinafter designated. The provisions of section 1 of the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945 (Public Law Numbered 14, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this title; and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto, shall apply as if herein set forth in full.

"Navigation

"Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 494, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,899,000;

"Carolina Beach Harbor, North Carolina: House Document Numbered 515, Eighty-ninth Congress, maintenance;

"Southport Harbor, North Carolina: House Document Numbered 514, Eighty-ninth Congress, maintenance;

"Gulf County Canal, Florida: House Document Numbered 481, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $477,000;

"Saint Lucie Inlet, Florida: House Document Numbered 508, Eighty-ninth Congress, maintenance;

"Pearl River, Mississippi and Louisiana: House Document Numbered 482, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $630,000;

"Biloxi Harbor, Mississippi: House Document Numbered 513, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $753,000;

"Elk Creek Harbor, Pennsylvania: House Document Numbered 512, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $920,000;

"Conneaut Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 484, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $495,000;

"Cross Village Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 490, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $723,000;

"Mississippi River-Fort Madison Harbor, Iowa: House Document Numbered 507, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $975,000;

"Beach erosion

"Ocracoke Inlet to Beaufort Inlet, North Carolina: House Document Numbered 509, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,800,000;

"Mullet Key, Florida: House Document Numbered 516, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $286,000;

"Pinellas County, Florida: House Document Numbered 519, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $116,000;

"San Diego (Sunset Cliffs), California: House Document Numbered 477, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $809,000.

"Sec. 102. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys to be made at the following named localities and subject to all applicable provisions of section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950:

"Mexico Beach, Florida.

"Great Lakes, particularly Lake Ontario and Lake Erie, in connection with water supply, pollution abatement, navigation, flood control, hydroelectric power, and related water resources development and control.

"SEC. 103. The project for navigation on the Upper Mississippi River from the Illinois River to Minneapolis, Minnesota, authorized by the Act of July 30, 1930, as extended and amended is hereby modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army to reimburse any common carrier by railroad for the cost of permanent reconstruction and repair of the Stone Arch Bridge at Minneapolis, Minnesota, performed by such carrier, to repair the damage to such bridge caused by floods during April and May 1965, except that such reimbursement shall not exceed $700,000.

"SEC. 104. The Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to cause an immediate study to be made, under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, in cooperation with appropriate agencies and representatives of the State of Illinois, of the Illinois and Michigan Canal, its lands and appurtenances extending from Chicago to the Illinois River at LaSalle as constructed by the State of Illinois pursuant to the provisions, as applicable, of the Acts of March 30, 1822 (3 Stat. 659), March 2, 1827 (4 Stat. 234), and March 2, 1833 (4 Stat. 662) with a view toward determining (1) those portions no longer required for navigation, (2) the feasibility and advisability of declaring such portions abandoned as a navigable waterway, and (3) procedures for releasing and quitclaiming to the State of Illinois the reversionary interests of the United States in such lands not required for navigation purposes. The Secretary shall report to the Congress the results of such study together with his recommendations thereon not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

"SEC. 105. Notwithstanding any provision in the General Bridge Act of 1946 or any other Act of Congress, in the case of the bridge constructed by the city of East Saint Louis, Illinois, across the Mississippi River, pursuant to Public Law Numbered 639, enacted by the Seventy-ninth Congress of the United States of America at the second session, and the bridge constructed across the Mississippi River by the city of Chester, Illinois, pursuant to Public Law Numbered 191, enacted by the Seventy-sixth Congress of the United States of America, as amended by Public Law Numbered 751, enacted by the Seventy-sixth Congress of the United States of America, and Public Law Numbered 85–512, enacted by the Eighty-fifth Congress of the United States of America at the second session, if the applicable law of the State of Illinois provides or permits the establishment of reasonable tolls sufficient for the reasonable cost of maintaining, operating, and repairing said bridges and the approaches thereto under economical management, and provide a sinking fund to amortize the cost of any bonds or other obligations issued to finance such cost, including reasonable interest and financing costs as soon as possible under reasonable charges and within the period of thirty years from completion, reconstruction, repair, and improvement of such bridge or extensions thereof, and permits or provides the transfer to said city of any surplus income to the city to be used for a proper public purpose, and each of said cities have adopted instruments authorizing construction of said bridges and by such instruments provided for the financing of the same under the applicable State statutes, including the transfer of surpluses to said cities for a proper public purpose, then each such city may, prior to January 1, 1969, charge tolls in the manner and to the extent provided in such instruments, and all collections from such bridges heretofore retained or transferred to said cities shall be valid collections, and may be retained by said cities and used and applied for a proper purpose. An accurate record of the cost of each such bridge and the approaches thereto, the expenditures for maintaining, operating, and repairing the same, including amounts transferred to the cities in accordance with the terms of any instrument adopted by said cities for financing the cost of the bridge and the daily tolls collected, shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

"SEC 106. (a) The consent and approval of Congress is given to the compact between the States of Missouri and Illinois creating a Missouri-Illinois-Jefferson-Monroe Bridge Commission which reads as follows:

" 'COMPACT BETWEEN ILLINOIS AND MISSOURI CREATING A MISSOURI-ILLINOIS-JEFFERSON-MONROE BRIDGE COMMISSION

" '*Article I*

" 'There is hereby created a Missouri-Illinois-Jefferson-Monroe Bridge Commission (hereinafter referred to as the 18 commission) which shall be a body corporate and politic and which shall have the following powers and duties;

" '1. To plan, construct, maintain and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River at or near Crystal City, Missouri, at a point deemed by the commission as most suitable to the interests of the citizens of the States of Illinois and Missouri in accordance with the provisions of an act of the Seventy-ninth Congress, Second Session, of the United States entitled "The General Bridge Act of 1946";

" '2. To purchase, maintain and, in its discretion, to operate all or any ferries across the Mississippi River within twenty-five miles of the site selected for the bridge;

" '3. To contract, to sue and be sued in its own name; to purchase or otherwise acquire, hold and dispose of real and personal property;

" '4. To acquire by proper condemnation proceedings such real property as may be necessary for the construction and operation of the bridge and the approaches thereto;

" '5. To issue bonds on the security of the revenue derived from the operation of the bridge and ferries for the payment of the cost of the bridge, its approaches, ferry or ferries, and the necessary lands, easements and appurtenances thereto including interest during construction and all necessary engineering, legal, architectural, traffic surveying and other necessary expenses. Such bonds shall be the negotiable bonds of the commission, the income of which shall be tax free. The principal and interest of the bonds, and any premiums to be paid for their retirement before maturity, shall be paid solely from the revenues derived from the bridge and ferries;

" '6. To establish and charge tolls for transit over such bridge and ferries in accordance with the provisions of this compact;

" '7. To perform all other necessary and incidental functions.

" '*Article II*

" 'The rates of tolls to be charged for transit over such bridges and ferries shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintenance, repairs and operation (including the approaches to the bridge) under economical management, and also to provide a sinking fund sufficient to pay the principal and interest of the outstanding bonds. All tolls and other revenues derived from facilities of the commission are hereby pledged to such uses.

" '*Article III*

" 'The commission shall keep an accurate record of the cost of the bridge and of other expenses and of the daily revenues collected and shall report annually to the governor of each state setting forth in detail the operations and transactions conducted by it pursuant to this agreement and any legislation thereunder.

" '*Article IV*

" 'When the bonds have been retired, the part of the bridge within the state of Illinois shall be conveyed to the state of Illinois, and that part within the state of Missouri to the state of Missouri, and the high contracting parties to this compact do hereby agree that thereafter the bridge shall be free of tolls and shall be properly maintained, operated and repaired by the two states as may be agreed upon.

" '*Article V*

" 'The commission shall consist of ten members, five of whom shall be qualified electors of the state of Illinois and shall reside in Monroe County, or counties adjacent thereto, Illinois, and five of whom shall be qualified electors of the state of Missouri and shall reside in Jefferson County, or counties adjacent thereto, Missouri. The Illinois members are to be chosen by the state of Illinois, and the Missouri members by the state of Missouri in the manner and for the terms fixed by the legislature of each state, except as herein provided.

" '*Article VI*

" '1. The commission shall elect from its number a chairman and a vice-chairman, and may appoint such officers and employees as it may require for the performance of its duties and shall fix and determine their qualifications and duties.

" '2. Until otherwise determined by the legislatures of the two states no action of the commission shall be binding unless taken at a meeting at which at least three members from each state are present and unless a majority of the members from each state present at such meeting shall vote in favor thereof. Each state reserves the right hereafter to provide by law for the exercise of the veto power by the governor thereof over any action of any commissioner appointed therefrom.

" '3. The two states shall provide penalties for violations of any order, rule or regulation of the commission, and for the manner of enforcing same.

" '*Article VII*

" 'The commission is authorized and directed to proceed with the planning and construction of the bridge and the approaches thereto as rapidly as may be economically practicable and is hereby vested with all necessary and appropriate powers, not inconsistent with the constitution or the laws of the United States or of either state, to effect the same, except the power to assess or levy taxes.

" '*Article VIII*

" 'In witness thereof, we have hereunto set our hands and seals under authority vested in us by law.'

"(b) The right to alter, amend, or repeal this section is expressly reserved.

"SEC. 107. (a) The consent of Congress is hereby given to the compact, signed by the compact representatives for the States of Kansas and Oklahoma on the 31st day of March 1965, at Wichita, Kansas, and thereafter ratified by the legislature of each of the States aforesaid, which compact is as follows:

" 'ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN COMPACT, KANSAS-OKLAHOMA

" 'The state of Kansas and the state of Oklahoma, acting through their duly authorized compact representatives, Robert L. Smith and Warden L. Noe, for the state of Kansas, and Geo. R. Benz and Frank Raab, for the state of Oklahoma, after negotiations participated in by Trigg Twichell, appointed by the president as the representative of the United States of America, and in accordance with the consent to such negotiations granted by an act of congress of the United States of America, approved August 11, 1955 (Public Law 340, 84th congress, 1st session), have agreed as follows respecting the waters of the Arkansas river and its tributaries:

" 'Article I

" 'The major purposes of this compact are: A. To promote interstate comity between the states of Kansas and Oklahoma;

" 'B. To divide and apportion equitably between the states of Kansas and Oklahoma the waters of the Arkansas river basin and to promote the orderly development thereof;

" 'C. To provide an agency for administering the water apportionment agreed to herein;

" 'D. To encourage the maintenance of an active pollution-abatement program in each of the two states and to seek the further reduction of both natural and man-made pollution in the waters of the Arkansas river basin.

" 'Article II

" 'As used in this compact: A. The term "state" shall mean either state signatory hereto and shall be construed to include any person or persons, entity or agency of either state who, by reason of official responsibility or by designation of the governor of that state, is acting as an official representative of that state;

" 'B. The term "Kansas-Oklahoma Arkansas river commission" or the term "commission" means the agency created by this compact for the administration thereof;

" 'C. The term "Arkansas river" means that portion of the Arkansas river from a point immediately below the confluence of the Arkansas and Little Arkansas rivers in the vicinity of Wichita, Kansas, to a point immediately below the confluence of the Arkansas river with the Grand-Neosho river near Muskogee, Oklahoma.

" 'D. The term "Arkansas river basin" means all of the drainage basin of the Arkansas river as delimited above, including all tributaries which empty into it between the upstream and downstream limits;

" 'E. The term "waters of the Arkansas river and its tributaries" means the waters originating in the Arkansas river basin;

" 'F. The term "conservation storage capacity" means that portion of the active storage capacity of reservoirs, including multipurpose reservoirs, with a conservation storage capacity in excess of 100 acre-feet, available for the storage of water for subsequent use, but it excludes any portion of the storage capacity allocated to flood and sediment control and inactive storage capacity allocated to other uses;

" 'G. The term "new conservation storage capacity" means conservation storage capacity for which construction is initiated after July 1, 1963, and storage capacity not presently allocated for conservation storage which is converted to conservation storage capacity after July 1, 1963, in excess of the quantities of declared conservation storage capacity as set forth in the storage table attached to and made a part of the minutes of the twenty-fourth meeting of the compact committee dated September 1, 1964, and as filed and identified to this compact in the offices of the secretaries of state of the respective states;

" 'The term "pollution" means contamination or other alterations of the physical, chemical, biological or radiological properties of water or the discharge of any liquid, gaseous, or solid substances into any waters which creates or is likely to result in a nuisance, or which renders or is likely to render the waters into which it is discharged harmful, detrimental or injurious to public health, safety, or welfare or which is harmful, detrimental or injurious to beneficial uses of the water.

" 'Article III

" 'The physical and other conditions peculiar to the Arkansas river basin constitute the basis for this compact, and neither of the states hereby, nor the Congress of the United States by its consent hereto, concedes that this compact establishes any general principle with respect to any other interstate stream.

" 'Article IV

" 'A. For the purpose of apportionment of water between the two states, the Arkansas river basin is hereby divided into major topographic subbasins as follows: (1) The Grand-Neosho river subbasin; (2) the Verdigris river subbasin; (3) the Salt Fork river subbasin; (4) the Cimarron river subbasin; and (5) the mainstem Arkansas river subbasin which shall consist of the Arkansas river basin, excepting the Grand-Neosho river, Verdigris river, Salt Fork river, and Cimarron river subbasins.

" 'B. The two states recognize that portions of other states not signatory to this compact lie within the drainage area of the Arkansas river basin as herein defined. The water apportionments provided for in this compact are not intended to affect nor do they affect the rights of such other states in and to the use of the waters of the basin.

" 'Article V

" 'The state of Kansas shall have free and unrestricted use of the waters of the Arkansas river basin within Kansas subject to the provisions of this compact and to the limitations set forth below:

" 'A. New conservation storage capacity in the Grand-Neosho river subbasin within the state of Kansas shall not exceed 650,000 acre-feet plus an additional capacity equal to the new conservation storage in said drainage basin in Oklahoma excepting storage on Spavinaw creek;

" 'B. New conservation storage capacity in the Verdigris river subbasin within the state of Kansas shall not exceed 300,000 acre-feet plus an additional capacity equal to the new conservation storage in said drainage basin in Oklahoma, excepting navigation capacity allocated in Oologah reservoir;

" 'C. New conservation storage capacity in the mainstem Arkansas river subbasin within the state of Kansas shall not exceed 600,000 acre-feet plus an additional capacity equal to the new conservation storage in said drainage basin in Oklahoma;

" 'D. New conservation storage capacity in the Salt Fork river subbasin within the state of Kansas shall not exceed 300,000 acre-feet plus an additional capacity equal to the new conservation storage in said drainage basin in Oklahoma;

" 'E. New conservation storage capacity in the Cimarron river subbasin within the state of Kansas shall not exceed 5,000 acre-feet, provided that new conservation storage capacity in excess of that amount may be constructed if specific project plans have first been submitted to and have received the approval of the commission.

" 'Article VI

" 'The state of Oklahoma shall have free and unrestricted use of the waters of the Arkansas river basin within Oklahoma subject to the provisions of this compact and to the limitations set forth below:

" 'New conservation storage capacity in the Cimarron river subbasin within the state of Oklahoma shall not exceed 5,000 acre-feet provided that new conservation storage capacity in excess of that amount may be constructed if specific project plans have first been submitted to and have received the approval of the commission.

" 'Article VII

" 'A. The commission shall determine the conditions under which one state may construct and operate for its needs new conservation storage capacity in the other state. The construction or utilization of new conservation storage capacity by one state in the other state shall entitle the state whose storage potential is reduced by such construction to construct an equal amount of new conservation storage in a subbasin agreeable to the commission.

" 'B. New conservation storage capacity constructed by the United States or any of its agencies, instrumentalities or wards, or by a state, political subdivision thereof, or any person or persons shall be charged against the state in which the use is made.

" 'C. Each state has the unrestricted right to replace within the same subbasin, any conservation storage capacity made unusable by any cause.

" 'D. In the event reallocation of storage capacity in the Arkansas river basin in Oklahoma should result in the reduction of that state's new conservation storage capacity, such reallocation shall not reduce the total new conservation storage capacities available to Kansas under Article V; provided that a subsequent reinstatement of such storage capacity shall not be charged as an increase in Oklahoma's new conservation storage capacity.

" 'Article VIII

" 'A. In the event of importation of water to a major subbasin of the Arkansas river basin from another river basin, or from another major subbasin within the same state, the state making the importation shall have exclusive use of such imported waters.

" 'B. In the event of exportation of water from a major subbasin for use in another major subbasin or for use outside the Arkansas river basin within the same state, the limitations of Articles V and VI on new conservation capacity shall apply against the subbasin from which the exportation is made in the amount of the storage capacity actually used for that purpose within the exporting subbasin or, in the event of direct diversion of water without storage, on the basis of five acre-feet of conservation storage capacity for each acre-foot of water on the average so diverted annually.

" 'C. Any reservoir storage capacity which is required for the control and utilization of imported waters shall not be accounted as new conservation storage.

" 'D. Should a transbasin diversion of water of the Arkansas river basin be made in one state for the use and benefit of the other state or both states, the commission shall determine a proper accounting of new conservation storage capacities in each state in accordance with the above principles and with the project uses to be made in that state.

" 'Article IX

" 'The states of Kansas and Oklahoma mutually agree to: A. The principle of individual state effort to abate man-made pollution within each state's respective borders, and the continuing support of both states in an active pollution-abatement program;

" 'B. The cooperation of the appropriate state agencies in Kansas and Oklahoma to investigate and abate sources of alleged interstate pollution within the Arkansas river basin whenever such matters are called to their attention by the commission;

" 'C. Enter into joint programs for the identification and control of sources of natural pollution within the Arkansas river basin which the commission finds are of interstate significance;

" 'D. The principle that neither state may require the other to provide water for the purpose of water-quality control as a substitute for adequate waste treatment;

" 'E. Utilize the provisions of the federal water pollution control act in the resolution of any pollution problems which cannot be resolved within the provisions of this compact.

" 'Article X

" 'A. There is hereby created an interstate administrative agency to be known as the "Kansas-Oklahoma Arkansas river commission." The commission shall be composed of three commissioners representing each of the states of Kansas and Oklahoma who shall be appointed by the governors of the respective states and, if designated by the president, one commissioner representing the United States. The president is hereby requested to designate a commissioner and an alternate respresenting the United States. The federal commissioner, if one be designated, shall be the presiding officer of the commission, but shall not have the right to vote in any of the deliberations of the commission.

" 'B. One Kansas commissioner shall be the state official who now or hereafter shall be responsible for administering water law in the state; the other two commissioners shall reside in the Arkansas river basin in Kansas and shall be appointed to four-year staggered terms.

" 'C. One Oklahoma commissioner shall be the state official who now or hereafter shall be responsible for administering water law in the state; the other two commissioners shall reside in the Arkansas river basin in Oklahoma and shall be appointed to four-year staggered terms.

" 'D. A majority of the commissioners of each state and the commissioner or his alternate representing the United States, if so designated, must be present to constitute a quorum. In taking any commission action, each signatory state shall have a single vote representing the majority opinion of the commissioners of that state.

" 'E. The salaries and personal expenses of each commissioner shall be paid by the government which he represents. All other expenses which are incurred by the commission incident to the administration of this compact shall be borne equally by the two states and shall be paid by the commission out of the "Kansas-Oklahoma Arkansas river commission fund." Such fund shall be initiated and maintained by equal payments of each state into the fund. Disbursements shall be made from said fund in such manner as may be authorized by the commission. Such fund shall not be subject to the audit and accounting procedures of the state; however, all receipts and disbursement of funds handled by the commission shall be audited by a qualified independent public accountant at regular intervals, and the report of such audit shall be included in and become a part of the annual report of the commission.

" 'Article XI

" 'A. The commission shall have the power to: (1) Employ such engineering, legal, clerical and other personnel as in its judgment may be necessary for the performance of its functions under the compact;

" '(2) Enter into contracts with appropriate state or federal agencies for the collection, correlation, and presentation of factual data, for the maintenance of records, and for the preparation of reports;

" '(3) Establish and maintain an office for the conduct of its affairs;

" '(4) Adopt rules and regulations governing its operations;

" '(5) Cooperate with federal agencies in developing principles, consistent with the provisions of this compact and with federal policy, for the storage and release of water from all-federal capacities of federal reservoirs, both existing and future within the Arkansas river basin, for the purposes of assuring their operation in the best interests of the states and the United States;

" '(6) Permit either state, with the consent of the proper operating agency, to impound water, for such periods of time deemed necessary or desirable by the commission, in available reservoir storage capacity which is not designated as conservation or new conservation storage capacity for subsequent release and use for any purpose approved by the commission;

" '(7) Hold hearings and take testimony and receive evidence at such times and places as it deems necessary;

" '(8) Secure from the head of any department or agency of the federal or state government such information, suggestions, estimates and statistics as it may need or believe to be useful for carrying out its functions and as may be available to or procurable by the department or agency to which the request is addressed;

" '(9) Print or otherwise reproduce and distribute all of its proceedings and reports.

" 'B. The commission shall: (1) Cause to be established, maintained and operated such stream, reservoir, or other gaging stations as may be necessary for the proper administration of the compact;

" '(2) Collect, analyze and report on data as to stream flows, water quality, conservation storage, and such other information as is necessary for the proper administration of the compact;

" '(3) Perform all other functions required of it by the compact and do all things necessary, proper or convenient in the performance of its duties thereunder;

" '(4) Prepare and submit an annual report to the governor of such signatory state and to the president of the United States covering the activities of the commission for the preceding fiscal year, together with an accounting of all funds received and expended by it in the conduct of its work;

" '(5) Prepare and submit to the governor of each of the states of Kansas and Oklahoma an annual budget covering the anticipated expenses of the commission for the following fiscal year;

" '(6) Make available to the governor or any state agency of either state or to any authorized representatives of the United States, upon request, any information within its possession.

" 'Article XII

" 'A. Recognizing the present limited uses of the available water supplies of the Arkansas river basin in the two states and the uncertainties of their ultimate water needs, the states of Kansas and Oklahoma deem it imprudent and inadvisable to attempt at this time to make final allocations of the new conservation storage capacity which may ultimately be required in either state, and, by the limitations on storage capacity imposed herein, have not attempted to do so. Accordingly, after the expiration of 25 years following the effective date of this compact, the commission may review any provisions of the compact for the purpose of amending or supplementing the same, and shall meet for the consideration of such review on the request of the commissioners of either state; provided, that the provisions hereof shall remain in full force and effect until changed or amended by unanimous action of the states acting through their commissioners and until such changes are ratified by the legislatures of the respective states and consented to by the congress in the same manner as this compact is required to be ratified to become effective.

" 'B. This compact may be terminated at any time by the appropriate action of the legislatures of both signatory states.

" 'C. In the event of amendment or termination of the compact, all rights established under the compact shall continue unimpaired.

" 'Article XIII

" 'Nothing in this compact shall be deemed: A. To impair or affect the powers, rights or obligations of the United States, or those claiming under its authority, in, over and to the waters of the Arkansas River Basin;

" 'B. To interfere with or impair the right of power of either signatory state to regulate within its boundaries the appropriation, use and control of waters within that state not inconsistent with its obligations under this compact.

" 'Article XIV

" 'If any part or application of this compact should be declared invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, all other provisions and applications of this compact shall remain in full force and effect.

" 'Article XV

" 'This compact shall become binding and obligatory when it shall have been ratified by the legislatures of each state and consented to by the congress of the United States, and when the congressional act consenting to this compact includes the consent of congress to name and join the United States as a party in any litigation in the United States supreme court, if the United States is an indispensable party, and if the litigation arises out of this compact or its application, and if a signatory state is a party thereto. Notice of ratification by the legislature of each state shall be given by the governor of that state to the governor of the other state and to the president of the United States and the president is hereby requested to give notice to the governor of each state of consent by the congress of the United States.

" 'IN WITNESS WHEREOF, The authorized representatives have executed three counterparts hereof each of which shall be and constitute an original, one of which shall be deposited in the archives of the department of state of the United States, and one of which shall be forwarded to the governor of each state.

" 'Done at the City of Wichita, state of Kansas, this 31st day of March, A.D. 1965

" 'APPROVED:

" 'ROBERT L. SMITH,

" 'WARDEN L. NOE,

" 'Compact Representatives for the state of Kansas.

" 'GEO. R. BENZ,

" 'FRANK RAAB,

" 'Compact Representatives for the state of Oklahoma.

" 'TRIGG TWICHELL,

" 'Representative of the United States.'

"(b) In order to carry out the purposes of this section, and the purposes of article XV of this compact consented to by Congress by this section, the congressional consent to this compact includes and expressly gives the consent of Congress to have the United States of America named and joined as a party litigant in any litigation in the United States Supreme Court, if the United States of America is an indispensable party to such litigation, and if the litigation arises out of this compact, or its applicaton, and if a signatory State to this compact is a party litigant, in the litigation.

"(c) The right to alter, amend, or repeal this section is expressly reserved.

"SEC. 108. (a) Subsection (b) of the first section of the Act entitled 'An Act authorizing the city of Rock Island, Illinois, or its assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Rock Island, Illinois, and to a place at or near the city of Davenport, Iowa', approved March 18, 1938 (52 Stat. 110), as amended, is amended by striking out the comma after 'foregoing' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '(1) the construction of an additional span to increase the capacity of the bridge and (2)'.

"(b) Subsection (c) of the first section of such Act of March 18, 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: 'except that the construction of an additional span authorized as part of such reconstruction, enlargement, and extension shall be commenced not later than April 1, 1970, and shall be completed within three years after such date'.

"(c) Nothing in this section or the amendments made by this section shall be construed to interfere with or delay future construction of a properly authorized bridge over the Mississippi River at or near the city of Davenport, Iowa.

"SEC. 109. (a) The consent of Congress is hereby granted to Duke Power Company, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a dam with overflow spillway crest at elevation 475 mean sea level across Savannah River between Anderson County, South Carolina, and Elbert County, Georgia, near Middleton Shoals, and about two hundred and ninety-seven miles above the mouth of said river, for the purpose of providing a pool for condenser water for a steam-electric plant. Construction on such dam shall not be commenced until the plans therefor have been submitted to and approved by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and by the Secretary of the Army, and when such plans have been approved by the Chief of Engineers and by the Secretary of the Army, there shall be no deviation from such plans either before or after completion of said dam unless the modification of such plans has previously been submitted to and approved by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army. In approving the plans for said dam such conditions and stipulations may be imposed as the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army may deem necessary to protect the present and future interest of the United States. Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize the use of such dam to develop waterpower or generate hydroelectric energy. The grantee and its successors shall hold and save the United States free from all claims arising from damage which may be sustained by the dam authorized in this section, or damage sustained by the appurtenances of the said dam, by reason of the future construction and operation by the United States of Hartwell Dam and Reservoir or the Trotters Shoals Dam and Reservoir authorized in section 203 of this Act, or any other Federal project upstream or downstream from the dam authorized by this section. In order to make feasible the dam and steam-electric generating plant which Duke Power Company intends to construct, it is hereby expressly provided that, should such dam and plant be constructed, (1) no existing or future unit at Hartwell Reservoir will be operated to pump water from below Hartwell Dam back to Hartwell Reservoir, and (2) a volume of water per week equal to at least an average flow of one thousand five hundred cubic feet per second shall be discharged from Hartwell Reservoir. The Secretary of the Army, upon his finding that such discharges result in damages to Hartwell Reservoir, and after giving the company reasonable notice and opportunity to be heard, shall determine and fix a reasonable and equitable annual charge to be paid by the company to the United States as compensation for such damages.

"(b) The authority granted by this section shall cease and be deemed null and void unless the actual construction of the dam authorized by this section is commenced within twelve years and completed within fifteen years from the date of enactment of this Act. The authority granted by this section shall not be deemed a bar to, or grounds for delaying, the construction of the Trotters Shoals project authorized in section 203 of this Act.

"(c) The right to alter, amend, or repeal this section is hereby expressly reserved.

"SEC. 110. The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is hereby authorized and directed, in order to reduce future maintenance costs of the authorized navigation project for Johns Pass, Pinellas County, Florida, to provide suitable protective measures over a frontage of approximately one thousand linear feet of shore along the north end of Treasure Island, at an estimated first cost for construction of approximately $100,000. Local interests shall contribute in cash 40 per centum of the first cost of construction; provide necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way for construction and subsequent maintenance of the project; hold and save the United States free from damages that may be attributed to the project; bear all costs exceeding $500,000 Federal cost for the complete project, including the navigation channel. Local interests may be reimbursed for such protective measures as they may undertake in accordance with plans approved by the Chief of Engineers, subject to the above limitations. Funds authorized to carry out section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960, as amended, shall be available to carry out this section.

"SEC. 111. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to provide for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge, with visitor facilites, over the Washington Channel, from the vicinity of Tenth Street Southwest to East Potomac Park in Washington, District of Columbia. The structure may be so designed and constructed as to provide facilities for the accommodation of visitors to the Nation's Capital area, and to provide convenient and adequate access to East Potomac Park.

"(b) The Secretary may obtain and use such lands or interests therein owned, controlled, or administered by the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, the Corps of Engineers, or any other Government agency, with the prior consent of such agency or agencies, as he shall consider necessary for the construction and operation of said bridge, without cost or reimbursement. Before construction is commenced, the location and plans for the bridge shall be approved by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army subject to such conditions as they may prescribe, in accordance with section 502(b) of the General Bridge Act of 1946 (33 U.S.C. 525b).

"(c) The Secretary is authorized to enter into appropriate arrangements for the construction and operation of the bridge in accordance with the authority contained in section 3 of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended, except that any such arrangements need not be limited to a maximum term of thirty years. The bridge, at all times, shall be under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, and shall be administered, operated, maintained, and policed as a part of the park system of the National Capital.

"(d) The Secretary of the Interior shall cooperate with other Federal and local agencies with respect to the construction and operation of the bridge by him and the construction and operation of associated facilities by such other Federal and local agencies including the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency which shall enter into appropriate arrangements by negotiation or public bid to (i) lease all or part of the land bounded by Maine Avenue, Ninth Street and the Southwest Freeway, Southwest, to provide for the construction, maintenance and operation of a structured automobile parking facility designed to accommodate visitors to East Potomac Park and (ii) provide for the construction of (a) a public park or overlook, which park is to be maintained and operated by the National Park Service; and (b) roads providing access to the Tenth Street Mall from the Southwest Freeway and to and from Ninth Street, Southwest, which roads shall be maintained and operated by the District of Columbia. Any lease of the aforementioned area, executed by the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, shall provide appropriate easements for the construction, maintenance and operation of the aforesaid public park and roadways. Local agencies may enter into arrangements with the person, persons, corporation or corporations, as the Secretary may select pursuant to subsection (c) hereof for the construction and operation of necessary associated facilities otherwise authorized.

"(e) (1) There is hereby established an advisory committee, which shall be composed of the Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission; the Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts; the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia; the Chief of Engineers, United States Army; the Chairman, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency; and three members to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior from among the residents of the Metropolitan Washington area. The ex-officio members of the Committee may be represented by their designees.

"(2) Members of the Committee shall serve without compensation, but the Secretary is authorized to pay any expenses reasonably incurred by the Committee in carrying out its responsibilities under this section.

"(3) The Secretary shall designate one member of the Committee to be Chairman. The Committee shall act and advise by the affirmative vote of a majority of its members.

"(4) The Secretary or his designee shall from time to time, consult with and obtain the advice of the Committee with respect to matters relating to the design, construction, and operation of the bridge and any associated facilities.

"(f) The construction and operation of the bridge shall be at no expense to the Federal Government, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for maintenance of the bridge and to carry out the other purposes of this section.

"SEC. 112. The authorization of the comprehensive plan for the Alabama-Coosa River and tributaries, as provided in the Rivers and Harbors Act, approved March 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 10), as amended, insofar as it authorizes a development of the Crooked Creek site on the Tallapoosa River in Randolph County, Alabama, for electric power and other public purposes is hereby suspended to permit the development of the Tallapoosa River and tributaries by construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam located not more than fifteen miles below the confluence of the Tallapoosa and Little Tallapoosa Rivers and by other projects works in accordance with the conditions of a license, if issued, pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 791(a)). If no application for license is made within two years after the date of the enactment of this section, or upon an order of the Federal Power Commission becoming final denying the application or applications for a license made within such two-year period, the authorization relating to the Crooked Creek site provided for in the Act, approved March 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 10), shall have the same status as it would have had if this section had not been enacted.

"SEC. 113. Title I of this Act may be cited as the 'River and Harbor Act of 1966'.

"TITLE II—FLOOD CONTROL

"SEC. 201. Section 3 of the Act approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law Numbered 738, Seventy-fourth Congress), as amended by section 2 of the Act approved June 28, 1938 (Public Law Numbered 761, Seventy-fifth Congress) shall apply to all works authorized in this title except that for any channel improvement or channel rectification project, provisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of said Act of June 22, 1936, shall apply thereto, except as otherwise provided by law. The authorization for any flood control project authorized by this Act requiring local cooperation shall expire five years from the date on which local interests are notified in writing by the Secretary of the Army or his designee of the requirements of local cooperation, unless said interests shall within said time furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that the required cooperation will be furnished.

"Sec. 202. The provisions of section 1 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (Public Law Numbered 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this Act, and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto shall apply as if herein set forth in full.

"Sec. 203. The following works of improvement for the benefit of navigation and the control of destructive floodwaters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the plans in the respective reports hereinafter designated and subject to the conditions set forth therein. The necessary plans, specifications, and preliminary work may be prosecuted on any project authorized in this title with funds from appropriations hereafter made for flood control so as to be ready for rapid inauguration of a construction program. The projects authorized in this title shall be initiated as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements. Penstocks and similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam authorized in this Act for construction by the Department of the Army when approved by the Secretary of the Army on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission.

"Merrimack River Basin

"The project for North Nashua River, Massachusetts, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 113, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $15,816,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Sudbury River at Saxonville, Massachusetts, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 61, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,300,000.

"Long Island Sound

"The project for flood protection on the Pequonnock River, Connecticut, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 115, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $15,000,000.

"Middle Atlantic coastal area

"The project for hurricane-flood control protection at Beaufort Inlet to Bogue Inlet, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 479, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $320,000.

"The project for hurricane-flood control protection at Bogue Inlet to Moore Inlet, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 480, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,249,000.

"The project for hurricane-flood control protection from Cape Fear to the North Carolina-South Carolina State line, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 511, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,310,000.

"The project for hurricane-flood control protection for Mainland Areas, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 475, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,048,000.

"The project for hurricane-flood control protection for the Outer Banks—Virginia State line to Hatteras, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 476, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,652,000.

"Savannah River Basin

"The project for construction of the Trotters Shoals Reservoir on the Savannah River, Georgia and South Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 52, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $84,900,000. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize inclusion of pumped storage power in this project.

"Lower Mississippi River Basin

"The project for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River, adopted by the Act of May 15, 1928 (45 Stat. 534) as amended and modified by subsequent Acts of Congress, including the Flood Control Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–298), is hereby further modified and expanded to include the following items:

"(1) The project for flood protection in the Teche-Vermilion Basin, Louisiana, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 524, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,100,000.

"(2) Bank revetment for the protection of existing industrial facilities along the river below Baton Rouge, Louisiana, where, in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers, such bank protection is justified.

"Arkansas and Red Rivers

"The project for water quality control in the Arkansas and Red River Basin Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas, designated as 'Part I', hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 110, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $46,400,000. Actual construction of the part I works shall not be initiated until the related and supporting works of part II have been authorized by Congress.

"Ouachita River Basin

"The project for Bayou Bartholomew, Arkansas and Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 506, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,360,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Ouachita River at Monroe, Louisiana, authorized in section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1965, is hereby modified to provide for construction in accordance with plan B in House Document Numbered 328, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,160,000.

"Upper Mississippi River Basin

"The project for flood protection on the Mississippi River between river mile 195 and mile 300, Illinois and Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 510, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,193,000.

"Ohio River Basin

"The project for Little Sandy River and Tygarts Creek, Kentucky, is hereby authorized subtsantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 517, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $15,000,000.

"The project for Taylorsville Reservoir, Salt River, Kentucky, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 502, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $24,800,000.

"The project for Stonewall Jackson Reservoir, West Fork River, West Virginia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 109, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $34,500,000.

"Meramec River Basin

"The project for flood protection and other purposes in the Meramec River Basin, Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 525, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $45,971,000: *Provided*, That construction of this project shall not be initiated until the President has approved a report prepared by the Secretary of the Army reexamining the basis on which the project was formulated and the arrangements for cost sharing.

"Great Lakes Basin

"The project for flood protection on the Maumee River at Ottawa, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 485, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,413,000.

"The project for flood protection on Red Creek, Monroe County, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 107, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,430,000.

"Pajaro River Basin

"The project for flood protection on the Pajaro River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 491, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $11,890,000.

"Klamath River Basin

"The project for flood protection on the Klamath River at and in the vicinity of Klamath, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 478, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,460,000.

"Columbia River Basin

"The project for flood protection on the Boise River, vicinity of Boise, Idaho, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 486, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,576,000.

"Sacramento River Basin

"The project for Marysville Dam and Reservoir, Yuba River Basin, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of

Engineers in House Document Numbered 501, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $132,900,000.

"Russian River Basin

"The project for Knights Valley, Russian River Basin, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 518, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $166,800,000.

"Skagit River Basin

"The project for flood protection on the Skagit River, Washington, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 483, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,804,000.

"SEC. 204. The second paragraph under the heading 'San Francisco Bay Area' in section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'The project for Corte Madera Creek, Marin County, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 545, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,790,000. Local interests shall contribute in cash 1.5 per centum of the Federal construction cost of the Ross Valley Unit, a contribution presently estimated at $110,000.'

"SEC. 205. The Secretary of the Army acting through the Chief of Engineers is authorized to provide such school facilities as he may deem necessary for the education of dependents of persons engaged on the construction of the Libby Dam and Reservoir project, Montana, and to pay for the same from any funds available for such project. When he determines it to be in the public interest, the Secretary, acting through the Chief of Engineers, may enter into cooperative arrangements with local agencies for the operation of such Government facilities, for the expansion of local facilities at Federal expense, and for contributions by the Federal Government to cover the increased cost to local agencies of providing the educational services required by the Government.

"SEC. 206. Section 206 of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 500) is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 206. (a) In recognition of the increasing use and development of the flood plains of the rivers of the United States and of the need for information on flood hazards to serve as a guide to such development, and as a basis for avoiding future flood hazards by regulation of use by States and political subdivisions thereof, and to assure that Federal departments and agencies may take proper cognizance of flood hazards, the Secretary of the Army, through the Chief of Engineers, is hereby authorized to compile and disseminate information on floods and flood damages, including identification of areas subject to inundation by floods of various magnitudes and frequencies, and general criteria for guidance of Federal and non-Federal interests and agencies in the use of flood plain areas; and to provide advice to other Federal agencies and local interests for their use in planning to ameliorate the flood hazard. Surveys and guides will be made for States and political subdivisions thereof only upon the request of a State or a political subdivision thereof, and upon approval by the Chief of Engineers, and such information and advice provided them only upon such request and approval.

"'(b) The Secretary of the Army is authorized to expend not to exceed $7,000,000 per fiscal year for the compilation and dissemination of information under this section.'

"SEC. 207. The project for the improvement of the Mississippi River below Cape Girardeau with respect to the West Tennessee tributaries, authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1948, is hereby modified to provide that the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall, subsequent to enactment of this Act, relocate at Federal expense all gas transmission lines required to be relocated by this project, or at his discretion, reimburse local interests for such relocations made by them.

"SEC. 208. Section 2 of the Act of June 28, 1879 (21 Stat. 37; 33 U.S.C. 642), is amended (1) by inserting in the third sentence thereof after 'and the commissioners appointed under this Act' a comma and the following: 'except those appointed from civil life,', and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'Each commissioner appointed from civil life after the date of enactment of this sentence shall be appointed for a term of nine years.'

"SEC. 209. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel and major drainage improvements, and floods aggravated by or due to wind or tidal effects, to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, in drainage areas of the United States and its territorial possessions, which include the localities specifically named in this section. After the regular or formal reports made on any survey authorized by this section are submitted to Congress, no supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made unless authorized by law except that the Secretary of the Army may cause a review of any examination or survey to be made and a report thereon submitted to Congress, if such review is required by the national defense or by changed physical or economic conditions.

"Watersheds and streams of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, with respect to a framework plan for developing water resources of the region.

"Watersheds and streams within the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River below Cairo, Illinois, with respect to a framework plan for developing water reseources of the region.

"Watersheds and streams draining into the Great Lakes including the lake areas within the United States, and into the St. Lawrence River at points within the United States with respect to a framework plan for developing water resources of the region.

"The Souris River and the Red River of the north and tributaries within the United States, including adjacent streams in Minnesota draining into Canada, with respect to a framework plan for developing water resources of the region.

"The Arkansas, White, and Red Rivers and tributaries, exclusive of their drainage lying in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River, with respect to a framework plan for developing water resources of the region.

"Watersheds and streams and their tributaries which drain into the Gulf of Mexico along the coastline of Texas, exclusive of the Rio Grande, with respect to a framework plan for developing water resources of the region.

"Watersheds and streams of Hawaii, with respect to a framework plan for developing water resources of the region.

"Watersheds and streams of Alaska, with respect to a framework plan for developing water resources of the region.

"Great South Bay, New York, including the waters of adjoining lesser bays and inlets with respect to water utilization and control. Such investigations and study shall include, but not be limited to, navigation, fisheries, flood control, control of noxious weeds, water pollution, water quality control, beach erosion, and recreation.

"Cibolo Creek, in and near the community of Presidio, Texas.

"Pacific Palisades Area at and in the vicinity of Los Angeles County, California, study of landslides, soil erosion, surface and subsurface draining conditions, flood control and seismic disturbances. Such study to be made in cooperation with the United States Geological Survey of the Department of Interior.

"Spring Valley Creek, Sweetwater River, California.

"SEC. 210. The last sentence of the first paragraph under the heading 'Lower Mississippi River Basin' in section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1965 is hereby amended to read as follows: 'The monetary authorization for the lower Mississippi River project authorized by this Act shall be combined with the overall monetary authorization heretofore made available for prosecution of the entire lower Mississippi River and tributaries project and be available for application to any portion of the entire project.'

"SEC. 211. The Secretary of the Army shall reimburse any common carrier by railroad for the cost of protective works constructed by such carrier during the year 1966 along the banks of the Eel River, California, to deter recurrence of damage to land banks by floods or high waters, but such reimbursement shall not exceed $1,200,000.

"SEC. 212. Title II of this Act may be cited as the 'Flood Control Act of 1966'."

Mr. FALLON (during reading of Senate amendment). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the Senate amendment be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

There was no objection to the consideration of the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, when will a vote come on the bill, as amended by the other body—the House bill, as amended by the other body? When will a vote come on that question?

The SPEAKER. It has already been voted upon.

Mr. CRAMER. No, I will state to the distinguished Speaker it has not. I was on my feet, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the Chair plainly saw the gentleman from Florida on his feet, but the Chair does not—cannot read what is in a Member's mind. Was it the intent of the gentleman from Florida to address the Chair?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, yes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the action in agreeing to the Senate amendment heretofore taken will be vacated.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman from Maryland would take a few minutes during which to explain the conference report and the amendment agreed to by the other body.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Florida that this is not a conference report.

Mr. CRAMER. I understand that.

Mr. Speaker, permit me to rephrase my question.

Is it the intention of the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. Speaker, to explain the Senate amendment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair might state that the gentleman from Florida can reserve the right to object, and the Chair has protected the gentleman, and we are now back where we started.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object to agree to the Senate amendment to the House bill——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida reserves the right to object.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I do this in order to inquire of the gentleman from Maryland as to whether it is the intention of the gentleman from Maryland to explain the Senate amendment—and I am doing so at this time because another opportunity will not be available, and I understand it is not—to discuss the amendments of the other body which I understand are in accordance with the informal discussion had between the House and the other body in the consideration of this legislation of this bill which was passed by the House and then amended by the amendment before us in the other body.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FALLON. That is correct. The gentleman has stated the situation correctly.

Mr. Speaker, speaking as chairman of the Public Works Committee, I would like to make it very clear, with respect to section 105 of this bill, that the authority granted concerning the two bridges at Chester and East St. Louis, Ill., is granted solely for the purpose of resolving, in these specific instances only, a conflict that developed in the handling of toll collections as a result of conflict between State statutes and the governing Federal statutes. The authority is granted only until January 1, 1969, to permit the two cities to get their situation in order; it will not be extended beyond that date, and it cannot be considered a precedent applicable to any other bridge or other toll facilities.

I should also like to state at this time, for the information and guidance of all our colleagues, that in the future, matters involving either bridges or the naming of public works structures, whatever or wherever they may be, will not be considered for inclusion in omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bills. The Public Works Committee will, of course, continue to consider legislation of this nature, but only in legislation limited to that subject matter. It is the committee's position, unanimously taken, that a major authorization bill of this nature is simply not the place for such matters. I know that, in the interest of reasonable legislative procedure, we will have the cooperation of our colleagues in this decision.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished chairman of our committee for his precise explanation of the language in this bill dealing with the toll collections from the bridges at Chester and East St. Louis in my State, and I want to concur without reservation in his statement.

What we are doing here is relieving a hardship situation in these two cities brought about by their erroneous but good faith reliance upon a State statute which is in conflict with the relevant Federal statute. All of us here representing the State of Illinois appreciate both the action being taken and the limitations upon it. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads, with some rather well-known personal as well as official interest in the problems of toll facilities, I want to reinforce the chairman's statement that the action being taken in this instance is not to be and cannot be construed by anyone as a precedent for any future, similar action with respect to toll facilities.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, I will briefly state that this bill comes to the House as a House bill, amended by the other body, consistent with an agreement reached between the House conferees and the Senate conferees, and contains the agreement informly reached between the two bodies, in the form of an amendment to the House bill; is that not correct, I ask the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. FALLON. The gentleman from Florida is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. I concur in the agreements reached, and was a party to them, I will say to the gentleman from Maryland, and I assume that he too concurs in the agreements reached and therefore, the Senate amendments to the House bill now before the House.

Mr. FALLON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. Therefore, the bill that is now before us is in the form of an amended House bill, so in effect this does not necessitate a conference, assuming the House passes the amended version of the House bill as amended by the other body.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that that was the purpose of my reservation of objection to make sure the Members knew the parliamentary situation, No. 1, and, No. 2, that the matters included in the Senate amendment to the House bill are agreeable to the managers, the ranking members of the Committee on Public Works; is that correct?

Mr. FALLON. The gentleman is again correct.

Mr. CRAMER. The third point I wanted to make briefly, Mr. Speaker, is that this amendment that was adopted which appears in the amended version relating to the East St. Louis, Ill., and the Chester, Ill., bridges across the Mississippi River, the language contained in the House amended version of the House bill as amended by the other body, and as agreed to in informal conference is consistent with the motion to recommit the bill I offered when this bill was before the House yesterday and on which a record vote was taken.

Is that not a correct assumption, I would ask the gentleman from Maryland, with the exception providing for an additional period of 1 year to January 1, 1969?

Mr. FALLON. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have just one other observation under my reservation of objection, and that is that I cite that this is an example of where a minority effort on a motion to recommit with instructions serves a constructive purpose of pointing the way for reaching an agreement between the differences in the two bodies. And in this instance in the form of a Senate amendment consistent with the motion to recommit which I offered on the House floor just yesterday, and which was not intended to be and was not in fact a motion to kill the bill, but in fact was with instructions the substance of which ended up as a motion to help solve the differences between the House and Senate bills in informal conferences. Anyone claiming this motion to recommit with instructions to amend the bill to prevent endless draining off of toll revenues to help run the cities involved and to thus perpetuate such tolls when such a provision is eventually adopted is a motion to kill the bill is provably erroneous.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the adoption of the Senate amendments to the omnibus rivers and harbors bill which contain authorization for the resources development in the Meramec Basin of Missouri. The projects recommended for first phase construction should be authorized at this time for the purpose of assuring earlier benefits which are sorely needed in this part of the State of Missouri.

The plan of development prepared by the Corps of Engineers, when fully completed, will provide for the best use or combination of uses of water and relative land resources to meet all foreseeable short- and long-term needs in the Meramec Basin. The plan is flexible and provides for extension of services as they become necessary and justified in the future.

Primarily a flood control project, the Meramec projects will provide indeterminable benefits for local needs including recreation; domestic, municipal, and industrial water supply; water quality control; fish and wildlife conservation.

Mr. Speaker, the bill also approves a compact between the States of Missouri and Illinois establishing a commission for the purpose of building and operating a bridge over the Mississippi near Crystal City, Mo.

I urgently seek authorization of these projects by this Congress so that the development can begin without any further delay.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendment.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman demands the yeas and nays on agreeing to the Senate amendment?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I want to vote on the bill as amended by the other body.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state the Chair would not have recognized the gentleman from Maryland had the Chair known this situation would develop. The Chair understood this was all ironed out.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present, and object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman making the point of order that a quorum is not present on agreeing to the Senate amendment?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, it is on passage of the House bill as amended by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendment.

The gentleman makes the point of order that a quorum is not present and challenges the vote.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would say to the gentleman that it is too late now.

The gentleman challenges the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 261, nays 0, not voting 171, as follows:

[Roll No. 391]

YEAS—261

Abbitt
Adair
Addabbo
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Bandstra
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Bell
Bennett
Betts
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bow
Brademas
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Cameron
Carey
Casey
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Collier
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Edwards, Calif.
Erlenborn
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Fascell
Flood
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Grider
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagen, Calif.
Hamilton
Hardy
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hays
Hechler
Henderson
Herlong
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kluczynski
Krebs
Kunkel
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, Md.
Love
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
Macdonald
MacGregor
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Mathias
May
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Mosher
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Price
Pucinski
Quie
Quillen
Race
Redlin
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Shriver
Sickles
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stubblefield
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thomas
Tuck
Tupper
Udall
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waggonner
Waldie
Watson
Weltner
Whalley
White, Tex.
Whitten
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—171

Abernethy
Adams
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Glenn
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Belcher
Berry
Bolling
Bolton
Bray
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Callaway
Carter
Cederberg
Clark
Clawson, Del
Clevenger
Cohelan
Colmer
Cooley
Corman
Craley
Culver
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Duncan, Oreg.
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Farnum
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Fuqua
Gettys
Gilligan
Greigg
Gross
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Hébert
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Howard
Hungate
Huot
Jacobs
Jennings
Jones, N.C.
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kornegay
Kupferman
Laird
Long, La.
McCarthy
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Mackay
Mackie
Mailliard
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Matthews
Meeds
Michel
Miller
Mink
Moeller
Morrison
Morton
Moss
Murray
Nix
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
O'Neal, Ga.
Pool
Powell
Purcell
Randall
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roncalio
Roudebush
Roush
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Scott
Senner
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Stafford
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Toll
Trimble
Tunney
Tuten
Ullman
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watts
White, Idaho
Whitener
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Yates

So the Senate amendment was concurred in.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Del Clawson.

Mr. Albert with Mr. Belcher.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Reinecke.

Mr. King of California with Mr. Smith of New York.

Mr. Miller with Mr. Clarence J. Brown, Jr., of Ohio.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Martin of Alabama.

Mr. Feighan with Mr. Laird.

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Schisler with Mr. Dickinson.

Mr. Schmidhauser with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Mackay with Mr. Findley.

Mr. Senner with Mr. Devine.

Mr. Mackie with Mr. Roudebush.

Mr. Shipley with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.

Mr. Moss with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.

Mr. Gilligan with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Berry.

Mr. Olsen of Montana with Mr. Bray.

Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Callaway.

Mr. Sisk with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.

Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Stafford.

Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Robison.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Michel.

Mr. McFall with Mr. McEwen.

Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Hall.

Mr. Dyal with Mr. Glenn Andrews.

Mr. Purcell with Mr. Carter.

Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Watkins.

Mr. Fountain with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.

Mr. Foley with Mr. Talcott.

Mr. Moeller with Mr. Stanton.

Mr. Corman with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Denton with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.

Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.

Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Morton.

Mr. Roush with Mr. Cederberg.

Mr. Rogers of Florida with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Stephens with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Steed with Mr. Widnall.

Mr. Taylor with Mr. Smith of California.

Mr. Ullman with Mr. King of New York.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Halpern.

Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Kupferman.

Mr. McVicker with Mr. Brown of California.

Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Hicks.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Roberts.

Mr. Howard with Mr. Rogers of Texas.

Mr. Adams with Mr. Roncalio.

Mr. Hungate with Mr. Craley.

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Baring.

Mr. Huot with Mr. Duncan of Oregon.

Mr. King of Utah with Mr. Flynt.

Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mrs. Mink.

Mr. Fisher with Mr. Meeds.

Mr. Nix with Mr. McCarthy.

Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Stratton.

Mr. Haley with Mr. Thompson of Texas.

Mr. Resnick with Mr. Todd.

Mr. Reuss with Mr. Walker of New Mexico.

Mr. Hansen of Iowa with Mr. Trimble.

Mr. Pool with Mr. Tunney.

Mr. Whitener with Mr. Long of Louisiana.

Mr. Hanna with Mr. McMillan.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Sweeney.

Mr. Randall with Mr. Yates.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Greigg.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Gettys.

Mr. Fraser with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana.

Mr. Farnum with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Smith of Virginia.
Mr. Jennings with Mr. Barrett.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Dingell.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Toll.
Mr. Tuten with Mr. Morrison.
Mr. Matthews with Mr. Clevenger.
Mr. Hanley with Mr. Murray.

Messrs. OTTINGER and BROOMFIELD changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BORDER HIGHWAY—EL PASO, TEX.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 11555) to provide a border highway along the U.S. bank of the Rio Grande in connection with the settlement of the Chamizal boundary dispute between the United States and Mexico, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 2322)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11555) to provide a border highway along the U.S. bank of the Rio Grande River in connection with the settlement of the Chamizal boundary dispute between the United States and Mexico, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That the Secretary of Transportation, hereinafter referred to as the Secretary, is authorized to (1) construct a border highway in the city of El Paso, Texas, between the approximate point of the beginning of the rectified boundary channel, two blocks west of Santa Fe Street in El Paso, thence along the international boundary to the International Bridge at Zaragosa Road—about twelve and a half miles east: *Provided*, That the design plans and specifications for this highway shall be developed to meet design and construction standards established by the Secretary; that the Secretary may work through the Texas State Highway Department in accomplishing any part of this project; that the planning, design, and construction schedule, and works shall be subject to review by the United States Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, to assure coordination with the relocation of the river channel and relocation of related facilities, pursuant to the American-Mexican Chamizal Convention Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 184): *And provided further*, That the Secretary may at his discretion request that the United States Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission, plan and perform such part of the engineering and construction of the highway as may be warranted to assure coordination and efficient construction, and the Secretary may transfer to the Secretary of State funds necessary for such purpose; (2) acquire lands necessary for the border highway in accordance with the approved plans, through the United States Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission: *Provided*, That the provisions of the American-Mexican Chamizal Convention Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 184) for the acquisition of lands for the purposes of that Act will also apply to the acquisition of adjoining lands required for the border highway, and the Secretary may transfer to the Secretary of State funds necessary for such purposes.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized to convey all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the highway authorized to be constructed by this Act to the State of Texas or the city of El Paso, Texas, except that the Secretary shall not construct any highway under authority of this Act until such time as he shall have entered into an agreement with the State of Texas or the city of El Paso, Texas, wherein such State or city agrees to pay to the Secretary of the Treasury at such time as may be specified by the Secretary an amount equal to 50 per centum of the cost of constructing such highway, excluding all costs of acquiring lands or interest in lands as may be required for the construction of the highway authorized by this Act and all preliminary engineering costs, and the State of Texas or the city of El Paso, Texas, agrees to accept all right, title, and interest to the highway upon completion of construction and agrees to maintain such highway for such period and in accordance with such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines necessary to protect the interests of the United States. Amounts paid by the State of Texas or the city of El Paso, Texas, under this section shall be available to the Secretary, together with sums appropriated pursuant to section 3, for use in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

"SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury not to exceed $8,000,000, which shall be available for paying the Federal share of the costs of carrying out the provisions of this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

JIM WRIGHT,
JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI,
WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
JOHN SPARKMAN,
FRANK CARLSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11555) to provide a border highway along the U.S. bank of the Rio Grande River in connection with the settlement of the Chamizal boundary dispute between the United States and Mexico, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

HOUSE BILL

The House bill authorized the Secretary of Commerce to construct a border highway in the city of El Paso approximately 12½ miles in length. The design, plans, and specifications are to be established by the Secretary. He may work through the Texas State Highway Department. These works are to be subject to review by the U.S. Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, to coordinate them with the relocation of the river channel and related facilities pursuant to the American-Mexican Chamizal Convention Act of 1964. The Secretary may request such Commissioner to perform necessary engineering and construction to assure such coordination, and funds may be transferred for that purpose. The Secretary is authorized to acquire lands necessary for this highway through such Commissioner. The provisions of the American-Mexican Chamizal Convention Act of 1964 are made applicable to the acquisition of lands for the highway, and funds may be transferred to the Secretary of State for such purposes.

Section 2 of the House bill authorizes the Secretary to convey all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the highway to either the State of Texas or the city of El Paso subject to the condition that he is not to construct this highway until he has entered into an agreement with the State or the city wherein such State or city agrees to accept this conveyance and to maintain the highway for such period and in accordance with such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

Section 3 of the House bill authorizes not to exceed $12,000,000 to carry out this Act.

SENATE AMENDMENT

The Senate amendment was the same as the House bill except that the Secretary is not to construct the highway until the State of Texas agrees to pay 50 percent of the cost of constructing the highway, including all costs of acquiring additional lands or interest in lands required for construction of the highway, and the authorization of the appropriation of Federal moneys is reduced proportionately to not to exceed $6,000,000.

CONFERENCE SUBSTITUTE

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment except that the Secretary is not to construct the highway until he shall have an agreement with the State of Texas or the city of El Paso wherein the State or the city agrees to pay to the Secretary of the Treasury at such time as may be specified by the Secretary an amount equal to 50 percent of the cost of constructing such highway excluding all costs of acquiring additional lands or interest in lands and all preliminary engineering costs.

The proposed conference substitute authorizes not to exceed $8,000,000 for carrying out this act, a reduction of $4,000,000 from the maximum authorization of $12,000,000 contained in the House bill, and an increase of $2,000,000 over the maximum authorization of $6,000,000 in the Senate amendment.

The proposed conference substitute also provides that this highway will be constructed by the Secretary of Transportation.

JIM WRIGHT,
JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI,
WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a brief statement concerning the conference report on H.R. 11555. Basically, the differences between this House and the other body were reduced to the question of the extent of the moral obligation of the Federal Government to the people of the city of El Paso to help finance construction of the Chamizal Memorial Highway.

The House took the position that the Federal Government should bear all of the estimated $12 million cost of the highway. The Senate took the position that the cost should be divided equally between the Federal Government and the State of Texas or the city of El Paso.

The amendments agreed to by the conferees would limit Federal participation in this project to $8 million. The Federal Government will pay all of the cost of right-of-way acquisition and preliminary engineering and one-half the cost of actual construction. The State of Texas or the city of El Paso, or a combination of the two, will be required to pay the other half of the construction cost. Speaking on behalf of the House conferees, I believe this is a good compromise between the two bodies and sustains the honorable and equitable characteristics of the entire Chamizal settlement. I move the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not correct that the conference report in effect permits a maximum of $8 million Federal money toward the cost of the $12 million Chamizal highway project?

The House bill contained $12 million Federal, the Senate bill $6 million Federal, and $6 million local. This is a compromise between the two, $8 million Federal and $4 million local. Is that not correct?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. One more question.

Is it not correct also that the amendment adopted in the conference is the amendment which I offered on the floor of the House, and as a motion to recommit?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. It is word for word, the same and the amount of money involved being the same, the amendment is precisely the same as it was in the motion to recommit?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. And, this is another example of where the motion to recommit with instructions ends up as the vehicle by which the bill is saved and not killed. It is unfortunate the motion I made to recommit made a few days ago did not pass then as it will in substance on the passage of this bill. Those who supported my motion were sustained in conference and will also be on the final passage of this bill which contains verbatim the language of my motion to recommit.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have just one more question.

Is it correct that the first time this bill came up on the floor of the House it came up under a suspension of the rules and because it came on the floor under a suspension of the rules it was not possible under the rules to offer an amendment? Thus the parliamentary situation was that you either had to vote for the bill or against the bill, we could not offer a motion to recommit with instructions—which is really an amendment. The second time it came to the floor we could and did offer the Cramer amendment to cut from $12 to $8 million.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WHITE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it was the judgment of a majority of this House that the border highway authorized in this bill is a just and proper compensation to the city of El Paso for some $27 million of taxable land removed from the tax rolls of the city, country, and school districts of El Paso, and for the complete cooperation which El Paso has manifest throughout the difficult execution of the Chamizal Treaty settlement.

The U.S. Senate was willing to accept the principle involved, but felt that the city or the State of Texas, should assume 50 percent of the total cost. Under the Senate amendment, the United States would contribute $6 million. The conference committee discussed both viewpoints and came to the conclusion that the Federal Government should assume the entire cost of right-of-way and preliminary engineering, and one-half of the cost of construction—with a ceiling of $8 million on the entire Federal contribution.

Mr. Speaker, while there are abundant arguments for the House's original position, considering the lateness of the session, I believe the House conferees have done the best they could under the circumstances.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the agreement embodied in this conference committee report is less generous than the House-passed bill but more generous than the Senate-passed bill.

The estimated cost of the 12-mile Chamizal Highway, required by the relocation of the United States-Mexico boundary at El Paso, is approximately $12 million.

The bill as we passed it in the House would have paid the entire $12 million out of Federal funds. The Senate version would have paid only $6 million as the Federal share, requiring the State to match this figure with an additional $6 million.

The compromise, as embodied in this conference committee report, would establish the Federal share at approximately $8 million, leaving a lesser figure of approximately $4 million to be provided by the State of Texas.

The essential feature incorporated in this conference committee agreement is that the total cost of purchasing needed rights-of-way and easements and of conducting the preliminary engineering will be borne by the Federal Government.

Thus the city of El Paso is relieved of any financial responsibilities with respect to the right-of-way acquisition and preliminary engineering design.

This will be of considerable assistance to the city, since its legally permissive bonding capacity is nearly exhausted at this time with other expensive projects including a long-planned connecting traffic artery across a high mountain which for many years has separated two parts of the city.

This assistance by the Federal Government in helping construct this highway and in acquiring all the rights-of-way at Federal expense is simply a matter of fairness to the city of El Paso as a sort of recompense for the dislocation, losses, and financial burdens assumed by the city as a necessary and attendant result of the Chamizal border settlement.

The situation was entirely without precedent, Mr. Speaker. Never before in our history, to my knowledge, has any American city been faced with the necessity of giving up a substantial part of its area to a foreign government.

The city of El Paso, whose citizens cooperated wholeheartedly with our Government in working out the solution desired by our Government and by the neighboring Republic of Mexico, surrendered from its tax rolls property valued at approximately $27 million.

Additionally, because of this change in the international boundary, El Paso lost the streets and roads which it had established through the Chamizal area, and this new highway is necessary to reestablish a connecting link between three extremely busy points of international entry so as to facilitate the egress and ingress of citizens from both countries.

Moreover, El Paso willingly gave to the United States approximately $250,000 worth of its own property, free of charge, for the establishment of a U.S. border station.

In view of these facts, Mr. Speaker, it seems abundantly clear that El Paso is eminently entitled to this assistance.

For my own part, I would have preferred to see the House bill adopted by the other body, or in the alternative a more generous settlement than is embodied in this conference committee report visited upon the city of El Paso.

The settlement herein contemplated, however, does represent a very substantial help to that city under the circumstances, and clearly seems to be the best and most equitable agreement that could be reached by the conferees.

Therefore, I urge the adoption of this conference committee report.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF NEW TRUSTEES IN DEEDS OF TRUST

Mr. MULTER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 647) to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to permit the appointment of new trustees in deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by agreement of the parties, which was ordered printed.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. FOGARTY submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 14745) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1966

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 13161) to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for our elementary and secondary schools, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2309)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13161) to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for our elementary and secondary schools, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1966'.

"TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

"Part A—Financial assistance to educational agency for the education of children of low-income families

"Revision of Authorization

"SEC. 101. Section 202 of the Act of September 30, 1950, Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

" 'Duration of Assistance

" 'SEC. 202. The Commission shall, in accordance with the provisions of this title, make payments to State educational agencies for the period beginning July 1, 1965, and ending June 30, 1968.'

"Grants With Respect to Certain Indian Children

"SEC. 102. Section 203(a)(1) of such Act of September 30, 1950, is amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 203. (a)(1)(A) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year for the purposes of this paragraph an amount equal to not more than 3 per centum of the amount appropriated for such year for payments to States under section 207(a) (other than payments under such section to jurisdictions excluded from the term "State" by this subsection). The Commissioner shall allot the amount appropriated pursuant to this paragraph among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands according to their respective need for such grants. In addition he shall allot from such amount to the Secretary of the Interior the amount necessary to make payments pursuant to subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the amount necessary to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children on reservations serviced by elementary and secondary schools operated for Indian children by the Department of the Interior. The maximum grant which a local educational agency in Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands shall be eligible to receive and the terms upon which payment shall be made to the Department of the Interior shall be determined pursuant to such criteria as the Commissioner determines will best carry out the purposes of this title.

" '(B) The terms on which payment shall be made to the Department of the Interior shall include provision for payments by the Secretary of the Interior to local educational agencies with respect to out-of-State Indian children in the elementary or secondary schools of such agencies under special contracts with that Department. The amount of any such payment may not exceed, for each such child, one-half the average per pupil expenditure in the State in which the agency is located.'

"Payments to State Educational Agencies for Assistance in Educating Migratory Children of Migratory Agricultural Workers

"SEC. 103. (a) Section 203(a) of such Act of September 30, 1950, is amended by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph.

" '(6) A State educational agency which has submitted and had approved an application under section 205(c) for any fiscal year shall be entitled to receive a grant for that year under this title for establishing or improving programs for migratory children of migratory agricultural workers. The maximum total of grants which shall be available for use in any State for any fiscal year shall be an amount equal to the Federal percentage of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States multiplied by (A) the estimated number of such migratory children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, who reside in the State full time, and (B) the full-time equivalent of the estimated number of such migratory children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, who reside in the State part time, as determined by the Commissioner in accordance with regulations. For purposes of this paragraph, the "average per pupil expenditure" in the United States shall be the aggregate current expenditures, during the second fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the computation is made, of all local educational agencies (as defined in section 303(6)(A)) in the United States (including only the fifty States and the District of Columbia), plus any direct current expenditures by States for operation of local educational agencies (without regard to the sources of funds from which either of such expenditures are made), divided by the aggregate number of children in average daily attendance to whom such agencies provided free public education during such preceding year.'

"(b) Section 205 of such Act is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

" '(c)(1) A State educational agency or a combination of such agencies may apply for a grant for any fiscal year under this title to establish or improve, either directly or through local educational agencies, programs of education for migratory children of migratory agricultural workers. The Commissioner may approve such an application only upon his determination—

" '(A) that payments will be used for programs and projects (including the acquisition of equipment and where necessary the construction of school facilities) which are designed to meet the special educational needs of migratory children of migratory agricultural workers, and to coordinate these programs and projects with similar programs and projects in other States, including the transmittal of pertinent information with respect to school records of such children;

" '(B) that in planning and carrying out programs and projects there has been and will be appropriate coordination with programs administered under part B of title III of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; and

" '(C) that such programs and projects will be administered and carried out in a manner consistent with the basic objectives of clauses (1)(B) and (2) through (8) of subsection (a), and of section 206(a).

"The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove an application of a State educational agency under this paragraph except after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to the State educational agency.

" '(2) If the Commissioner determines that a State is unable or unwilling to conduct educational programs for migratory children of migratory agricultural workers, or that it would result in more efficient and economic administration, or that it would add substantially to the welfare or educational attainment of such children, he may make special arrangements with other public or nonprofit private agencies to carry out the purposes of this subsection in one or more States, and for this purpose he may set aside on an equitable basis and use all or part of the maximum total of grants available for such State or States.'

"(c)(1) The portion of section 206(a) of such Act which precedes clause (1) is amended by striking out 'participate in the program of this title' and inserting in lieu thereof 'participate under this title (except with respect to the program described in section 205(c) relating to migratory children of migratory agricultural workers)'.

"(2) The first sentence of section 207(a)(1) of such Act is amended by inserting 'it and' after 'the amount which'.

by striking out 'section 206(b)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 205(c) or 206(b)'.

"(4) Section 211(a) of such Act is amended by striking out 'section 206(a)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 205(c) or 206(a)'.

"Payments on Account of Neglected or Delinquent Children

"SEC. 104. (a) The first sentence of section 203(a)(2) of such Act of September 30, 1950, is amended by striking out all that follows 'multiplied by' and substituting: 'the number of children in the school district of such agency who are aged five to seventeen, inclusive, and are (A) in families having an annual income of less than the low-income factor (established pursuant to subsection (c)), (B) in families receiving an annual income in excess of the low-income factor (established pursuant to subsection (c)) from payments under the program of aid to families with dependent children under a State plan approved under title IV of the Social Security Act, or (C) living in institutions for neglected or delinquent children but not counted pursuant to paragraph (5) of this subsection for the purpose of a grant to a State agency, or being supported in foster homes with public funds.'

"(b) The second sentence of such section 203(a)(2) is amended by striking out 'the number of children of such ages and families in such county or counties' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the number of children of such ages in such county or counties who are described in clause (A), (B), or (C) of the previous sentence,'.

"(c) Subsection (b) of section 203 of such Act is amended by—

"(1) striking out, in the part which precedes paragraph (1), all that follows after 'children aged five to seventeen, inclusive,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'described in clauses (A), (B), and (C) of the first sentence of paragraph (2) of subsection (a):'.

"(2) striking out in paragraph (1) 'the number of such children of such families' each time that it appears and substituting 'the number of such children';

"(3) striking out in paragraph (2) 'the number of children of such ages of families with such income' and substituting 'the number of such children'; and

"(4) striking out in paragraph (3) 'the number of children of such ages of families of such income' and substituting 'the number of such children'.

"(d) The third sentence of subsection (d) of such section 203 is amended by inserting ', and the number of children of such ages living in institutions for neglected or delinquent children, or being supported in foster homes with public funds,' before 'on the basis of'.

"(e) Section 203(a) of such Act is further amended by inserting after paragraph (6) as added by this Act an additional paragraph as follows:

"'(7) In the case of a State agency which is directly responsible for providing free public education for children in institutions for neglected or delinquent children, the maximum grant which that agency shall be eligible to receive under this title for any fiscal year shall be an amount equal to the Federal percentage of the average per pupil expenditure in that State multiplied by the number of such children in average daily attendance, as determined by the Commissioner, at schools for such children operated or supported by that State agency, in the most recent fiscal year for which satisfactory data are available. Such State agency shall use payments under this title only for programs and projects (including the acquisition of equipment and where necessary the construction of school facilities) which are designed to meet the special educational needs of such children.'

"Eligibility for Grants; Clarifying Definition of 'Average Per Pupil Expenditure' in a State

"SEC. 105. (a)(1) Section 203(b)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out all that follows 'shall be' and inserting in lieu thereof 'at least ten.'

"(2) Section 203(b)(2) of such Act is amended by striking out 'shall be one hundred or more' and inserting in lieu thereof 'shall be at least ten'.

"(b)(1) Paragraph (2) of section 203(a) of such Act is amended by inserting 'or, if greater, in the United States (which for purposes of this and the last sentence of this paragraph means the fifty States and the District of Columbia),' after 'average per pupil expenditure in that State'.

"(2) Paragraph (5) of section 203(a) of such Act is amended by inserting 'or, if greater, in the United States (which for purposes of this sentence means the fifty States and the District of Columbia),' after 'in that State'.

"(3) The amendments made by this subsection shall be effective with respect to fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1967.

"(c) The last sentence of section 203(a)(2) of such Act is amended to read as follows: 'For purposes of this subsection, the "average per pupil expenditure" in a State, or in the United States, shall be the aggregate current expenditures, during the second fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the computation is made, of all local educational agencies as defined in section 303(6)(A) in the State, or in the United States, as the case may be, plus any direct current expenditures by the State for operation of such agencies (without regard to the sources of funds from which either of such expenditures are made), divided by the aggregate number of children in average daily attendance to whom such agencies provided free public education during such preceding year.'

"Raising the Low-Income Factor After June 30, 1967

"SEC. 106. Section 203(c) of such Act of September 30, 1950, is amended to read as follows:

"'(c) For the purposes of this section, the "Federal percentage" shall be 50 per centum and the "low-income factor" shall be $2,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, they shall be 50 per centum and $3,000, respectively.'

"Using Most Recent Aid-for-Dependent-Children Data Available After June 30, 1966

"SEC. 107. Effective with respect to fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1966, the third sentence (as amended by section 104 of this Act) of section 203(d) of such Act of September 30, 1950, is further amended to read as follows: 'The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall determine the number of children of such ages from families receiving an annual income in excess of the low-income factor from payments under the program of aid to families with dependent children under a State plan approved under title IV of the Social Security Act, and the number of children of such ages living in institutions for neglected or delinquent children, or being supported in foster homes with public funds, on the basis of the latest calendar or fiscal year data, whichever is later.'

"Repealing Provision for Special Incentive Grants

"SEC. 108. (a) Title II of such Act of September 30, 1950, is amended by striking out section 204.

"(b) Such title II is further amended by—

"(1) striking out 'basic grant', 'BASIC GRANTS' and 'basic grants' each time they occur and inserting in lieu thereof 'grant', 'GRANTS' or 'grants', as the case may be:

"(2) striking out 'or a special incentive grant' in the portion of section 205(a) which precedes clause (1); and

"(3) striking out in section 207(a)(2) the portion which follows the comma and inserting in lieu thereof 'except that this amount shall not exceed the maximum amount determined for that agency pursuant to section 203.'

"Treatment of Income of Employees Receiving Aid for Dependent Children

"SEC. 109. The following new section is added immediately after section 212 of such Act:

"'Treatment of Earnings for Purposes of Aid to Families With Dependent Children

"'SEC. 213. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of title IV of the Social Security Act, a State plan approved under section 402 of such Act shall provide that for a period of not less than twelve months, and may provide that for a period of not more than twenty-four months, the first $85 earned by any person in any month for services rendered to any program assisted under this title of this Act shall not be regarded (A) in determining the need of such person under such approved State plan or (B) in determining the need of any other individual under such approved State plan.

"'(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, no funds to which a State is otherwise entitled under title IV of the Social Security Act for any period before the fourth month after the adjournment of the State's first regular legislative session which adjourns more than sixty days after enactment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1966, shall be withheld by reason of any action taken pursuant to a State statute which prevents such State from complying with the requirements of subsection (a) of this section.'

"Providing That a Program or a Project Must Be at Least a Certain Minimum Size To Be Approved.

"SEC. 110. Section 205(a)(1)(B) of such Act of September 30, 1950, is amended by striking out the comma after 'needs' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'and to this end involve an expenditure of not less than $2,500, except that the State educational agency may with respect to any applicant reduce the $2,500 requirement if it determines that it would be impossible, for reasons such as distance or difficulty of travel, for the applicant to join effectively with other local educational agencies for the purpose of meeting the requirement;'.

"Uses of Granted Funds and Coordination With Other Programs

"Sec. 111 (a) Section 205(a)(1) of such Act of September 30, 1950, is amended by striking out '(including the acquisition of equipment and where necessary the construction of school facilities)' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '(including the acquisition of equipment, and, where necessary, the construction of school facilities and plans made or to be made for such programs, projects, and facilities)'.

"(b) Section 205(a)(1) of such Act is further amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: ': *Provided*, That the amount used for plans for any fiscal year shall not exceed 1 per centum of the maximum amount determined for that agency for that year pursuant to section 203 or $2,000, whichever is greater'.

"(c) Section 205(a) of such Act of September 30, 1950, is amended by renumbering paragraphs (5), (6), (7), and (8) as (6), (7), (8), and (9), respectively, and by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

"'(5) in the case of an application for payments for planning, (A) that the planning was or will be directly related to programs or projects to be carried out under this title and has resulted, or is reasonably likely to result, in a program which will be carried out under this title, and (B) that planning funds are needed because of the innovative nature of the program or project or because the local educational agency lacks the resources necessary to plan adequately for programs and projects to be carried out under this title;'.

"(d) Such redesignated paragraph (8) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"'(8) in the case of a project for the construction of school facilities, that, in developing plans for such facilities due consideration has been given to compliance with such standards as the Secretary may prescribe or approve in order to insure that facilities constructed with the use of Federal funds under this title shall be, to the extent appropriate in view of the uses to be made of the facilities, accessible to and usable by handicapped persons;'.

"(e) Section 205(a) of such Act is further amended by striking out the period at the end of the last paragraph, and adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

" '(10) in the case of a project for the construction of school facilities, that, in developing plans for such facilities, due consideration has been given to excellence of architecture and design, and to the inclusion of works of art (not representing more than 1 per centum of the cost of the project).'

"(f) Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (as redesignated by section 161 of this Act) is amended by inserting at the end of section 703 a new subsection as follows:

" '(c) In administering the provisions of this Act and any Act amended by this Act, the Commissioner shall consult with other Federal departments and agencies administering programs which may be effectively coordinated with programs carried out pursuant to such Acts, and to the extent practicable for the purposes of such Acts shall (1) coordinate such programs on the Federal level with the programs being administered by such other departments and agencies, and (2) require that effective procedures be adopted by State and local authorities to coordinate the development and operation of programs and projects carried out under such Acts with other public and private programs having the same or similar purposes, including community action programs under title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.'

"Computing Amount of Payments for State Administrative Expenses

"Sec. 112. Clause (1) of section 207(b) of such Act of September 30, 1950, is amended to read as follows:

" '(1) 1 per centum of the total maximum grants for State and local educational agencies of the State as determined for that year pursuant to sections 203 and 208, or'.

"Provisions To Encourage Local Effort

"Sec. 113. (a) Section 207(e)(2) of such Act of September 30, 1950, is amended by striking out 'for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964' and inserting in lieu thereof 'for the second preceding fiscal year'.

"(b) Section 203(a)(3) of such Act is amended by striking out '1966,' and inserting in lieu thereof '1967' and by striking out '30 per centum' both times it appears and inserting in lieu thereof '50 per centum'.

"Continuing and Revising Provision for Adjustments Where Necessitated by Appropriations

"Sec. 114. (a) Section 208 of such Act of September 30, 1950, is amended by striking out 'for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966' and inserting in lieu thereof 'for any fiscal year'.

"(b) Such section 208 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'In order to permit reductions made pursuant to this section for any fiscal year to be offset at least in part, the Commissioner may set dates by which (1) State educational agencies must certify to him the amounts for which the applications of educational agencies have been or will be approved by the State, and (2) State educational agencies referred to in section 203(a)(6) must file applications. The excess of (1) the total of the amounts of the maximum grants computed for all educational agencies of any State under section 203, as ratably reduced under this section, over (2) the total of the amounts for which applications of agencies of that State referred to in clauses (1) and (2) of the preceding sentence are approved shall be available with regulations, first to educational agencies in that State and then to educational agencies in other States to offset proportionately ratable reductions made under this section.'

"Revision in National Advisory Council Reporting

"Sec. 115. Section 212(c) of such Act of September 30, 1950, is amended to read as follows:

" '(c) The Council shall make an annual report of its findings and recommendations (including recommendations for changes in the provisions of this title) to the President and the Congress not later than January 31 of each calendar year beginning after the enactment of this title. The President is requested to transmit to the Congress such comments and recommendations as he may have with respect to such report.'

"Short Title for Title II of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress

"Sec. 116. Title II of such Act of September 30, 1950 (as amended by this Act), is further amended by inserting at the end thereof an additional section as follows:

" 'Short Title

" 'Sec. 214. This title may be cited as "Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965".'

"Definitions

"Broadening definition of 'local educational agency'

"Sec. 117. (a)(1) Section 303(6) of such Act of September 30, 1950, is amended to read as follows:

" '(6)(A) For purposes of title I, the term "local educational agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of free public education in a county, township, independent, or other school district located within a State. Such term includes any State agency which directly operates and maintains facilities for providing free public education.

" '(B) For purposes of title II, the term "local educational agency" means a public board of education or other public authority legally constituted within a State for either adminstrative control or direction of, or to perform a service function for, public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or other political subdivision of a State, or such combination of school districts or counties as are recognized in a State as an administrative agency for its public elementary or secondary schools. Such term includes any other public institution or agency having administrative control and direction of a public elementary or secondary school, and it also includes (except for purposes of sections 203(a)(2), 203(b), and 205(a)(1)) any State agency which is directly responsible for providing free public education for handicapped children (including mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, crippled, or other health impaired children who by reason thereof require special education) or for children in institutions for neglected or delinquent children.'

"(2) The first sentence of section 203(a)(5) of such Act is amended by striking out ', on a non-school-district basis,'.

"(3) Section 203(a)(3) of such Act is amended by inserting '(A)' after '(3)' and by inserting at the end thereof a new subparagraph as follows:

" '(B) In the case of local educational agencies which serve in whole or in part the same geographical area, and in the case of a local educational agency which provides free public education for a substantial number of children who reside in the school district of another local educational agency, the State educational agency may allocate the amount of the maximum grants for those agencies among them in such manner as it determines will best carry out the purposes of this title.'

"Providing for a more precise definition of 'current expenditures'

"(b) Section 303(5) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

" '(5) The term "current expenditures" means expenditures for free public education, including expenditures for administration, instruction, attendance and health services, pupil transportation services, operation and maintenance of plant, fixed charges, and net expenditures to cover deficits for food services and student body activities, but not including expenditures for community services, capital outlay, and debt service, or any expenditures made from funds granted under title II of this Act or title II or III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.'

"Part B—School library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials

"Appropriations Authorized

"Sec. 121. Section 201(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–10) is amended to read as follows:

" '(b) For the purpose of making grants under this title, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $125,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and $150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; but for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and the succeeding fiscal year, only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.'

"Revision in Authorization for Title II, and Provision for Indian Children in Schools Operated by the Department of the Interior

"Sec. 122. Section 202(a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended to read as follows:

" 'Sec. 202. (a)(1) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year for the purposes of this paragraph an amount equal to not more than 3 per centum of the amount appropriated for such year for payments to States under section 201(b). The Commissioner shall allot the amount appropriated pursuant to this paragraph among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands according to their respective needs for assistance under this title. In addition, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, he shall allot from such amount to (A) the Secretary of the Interior the amount necessary for such assistance for children and teachers in elementary and secondary schools operated for Indian children by the Department of the Interior, and (B) the Secretary of Defense the amount necessary for such assistance for children and teachers in the overseas dependents schools of the Department of Defense. The terms upon which payments for such purpose shall be made to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Defense shall be determined pursuant to such criteria as the Commissioner determines will best carry out the purposes of this title.

" '(2) From the sums appropriated for carrying out this title for any fiscal year pursuant to section 201(b), the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the total of such sums as the number of children enrolled in the public and private elementary and secondary schools of that State bears to the total number of children enrolled in such schools in all of the States. The number of children so enrolled shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available to him. For purposes of this subsection, the term "State" shall not include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.'

"Administrative Expenses and Improved Coordination

"SEC. 123. Section 203(a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended to read as follows through the end of clause (3) of such section:

" 'SEC. 203. (a) Any State which desires to receive grants under this title shall submit to the Commissioner a State plan, in such detail as the Commissioner deems necessary, which—

" '(1) designates a State agency which shall, either directly or through arrangements with other State or local public agencies, act as the sole agency for administration of the State plan;

" '(2) sets forth a program under which funds paid to the State from its allotment under section 202 will be expended solely for (A) acquisition of library resources (which for the purposes of this title means books, periodicals, documents, audiovisual materials, and other related library materials), textbooks, and other printed and published instructional materials for the use of children and teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools in the State, and (B) administration of the State plan, including (i) the development and revision of standards relating to library resources, textbooks, and other printed and published instructional materials furnished for the use of children and teachers in the public elementary and secondary schools of the State, and (ii) the distribution and control by a local educational agency of such library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials in carrying out such State plan for the use of children and teachers in schools referred to in clause (A), except that the amount used for administration of the State plan for any fiscal year shall not exceed an amount equal to 5 per centum of the amount paid to the State under this title for that year or $50,000, whichever is greater;

" '(3) sets forth the criteria to be used in allocating library resources, textbooks, and other printed and published instructional materials provided under this title among the children and teachers of the State, which criteria shall—

" '(A) take into consideration the relative need, as determined from time to time, of the children and teachers of the State for such library resources, textbooks, or other instructional materials,

" '(B) provide assurance that to the extent consistent with law such library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials will be provided on an equitable basis for the use of children and teachers in private elementary and secondary schools in the State which comply with the compulsory attendance laws of the State or are otherwise recognized by it through some procedure customarily used in the State, and

" '(C) provide assurance that, in order to secure the effective and efficient use of Federal funds, there will be appropriate coordination at both State and local levels between the program carried out under this title with respect to library resources and the program (if any) carried out under the Library Services and Construction Act (20 U.S.C. ch. 16);'.

"Part C—Supplementary educational centers and services

Appropriations Authorized

"SEC. 131. Section 301(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended to read as follows:

" '(b) For the purpose of making grants under this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $175,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and $500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; but for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and the succeeding fiscal year, only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law."

"Revision in Authorization for Title III, and Provision for Indian Children in Schools Operated by the Department of the Interior

"SEC. 132. Section 302(a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 302. (a)(1) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year for the purposes of this paragraph an amount equal to not more than 3 per centum of the amount appropriated for such year for grants under this title. The Commissioner shall apportion the amount appropriated pursuant to this paragraph among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands according to their respective needs for assistance under this title. In addition, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, he shall apportion from such amount to (A) the Secretary of the Interior the amount necessary for such assistance for children and teachers in elementary and secondary schools operated for Indian children by the Department of the Interior, and (B) the Secretary of Defense the amount necessary for such assistance for children and teachers in the overseas dependents schools of the Department of Defense. The terms upon which payments for such purpose shall be made to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Defense shall be determined pursuant to such criteria as the Commissioner determines will best carry out the purposes of this title.

" '(2) From the sums appropriated for carrying out this title for any fiscal year pursuant to section 301(b), the Commissioner shall apportion $200,000 to each State and shall apportion the remainder of such sums among the States as follows:

" '(A) He shall apportion to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum of such remainder as the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, in the State bears to the number of such children in all the States, and

" '(B) He shall apportion to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum of such remainder as the population of the State bears to the population of all the States.

For the purposes of this subsection, the term "State" does not include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.'

"Provisions With Respect to Facilities Constructed Under Title III

"SEC. 133. Section 304(a)(4) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by striking out 'and (C)' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '(C) that, in developing plans for such facilities, due consideration will be given to excellence of architecture and design, and to the inclusion of works of art (not representing more than one per centum of the cost of the project), and there will be compliance with such standards as the Secretary may prescribe or approve in order to insure that facilities constructed with the use of Federal funds under this title shall be, to the extent appropriate in view of the uses to be made of the facilities, accessible to and usable by handicapped persons, and (D)'.

"Special Consideration for Local Educational Agencies Which Are Financially Overburdened

"SEC. 134. Section 304 of such Act is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d) and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

" '(c) In approving applications under this title for grants for any fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1967, the Commissioner must give special consideration to the application of any local educational agency which is making a reasonable tax effort but which is nevertheless unable to meet critical educational needs, including preschool education for four and five year olds, because some or all of its schools are seriously overcrowded (as a result of growth or shifts in enrollment or otherwise), obsolete, or unsafe.'

"Part D—Cooperative Research Act amendments

"Permitting the Research Training Program To Be Carried Out Through Contracts as Well as Grants

"SEC. 141. Section 2(b) of the Cooperative Research Act (20 U.S.C. 331a) is amended to read as follows:

" '(b)(1) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to universities and colleges and other public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations to assist them in providing training in research in the field of education (including such research described in section 503(a)(4) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965), including the development and strengthening of training staff and curricular capability for such training, and, without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529; 41 U.S.C. 5), to provide by contracts or jointly financed cooperative arrangements with them for the conduct of such activities; except that no such grant may be made to a private agency, organization, or institution other than a nonprofit one.

" '(2) Funds available to the Commissioner for grants or contracts or jointly financed cooperative arrangements under this subsection may, when so authorized by the Commissioner, also be used by the recipient (A) in establishing and maintaining research traineeships, internships, personnel exchanges, and pre- and post-doctoral fellowships, and for stipends and allowances (including traveling and subsistence expenses) for fellows and others undergoing training and their dependents not in excess of such maximum amounts as may be prescribed by the Commissioner, or (B) where the recipient is a State educational agency, in providing for such traineeships, internships, personnel exchanges, and fellowships either directly or through arrangements with public or other nonprofit institutions or organizations.

" '(3) No grant shall be made or contract or jointly financed cooperative arrangement entered into under this subsection for training in sectarian instruction, or for work to be done in an institution, or a department or branch of an institution, whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

" '(4) Prior to January 31, 1968, the Commissioner shall make a complete report to the Congress with respect to contracts and other arrangements made pursuant to this subsection with private organizations, including benefits received from such contracts and arrangements, and the Commissioner's recommendations with respect to the continuation of the authority to make such contracts and arrangements with private organizations.'

"Consolidating Research Authority Under Section 2

"SEC. 142. Section 4(b) of the Cooperative Research Act is amended by striking out the second sentence thereof.

"Amending the Definition of 'Construction' To Include the Acquisition of Existing Buildings

"Sec. 143. Section 5(4) of the Cooperative Research Act is amended to read as follows:

" '(4) The terms "construction" and "cost of construction" include (A) the construction of new buildings, and the acquisition, expansion, remodeling, replacement, and alteration of existing buildings, including architects' fees, but not including the cost of acquisition of land (except in the case of acquisition of an existing building) or off-site improvements, and (B) equipping new buildings and existing buildings, whether or not acquired, expanded, remodeled, or altered.'

"Part E—Grants to strengthen State departments of education

"Appropriations Authorized

"Sec. 151. Section 501(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended to read as follows: 'For the purpose of making grants under this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.'

"Elimination of Matching Requirement

"Sec. 152. (a) Section 503 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by striking out '(a)' where it appears after 'Sec. 503', by striking out 'Federal share of', and by striking out subsection (b) of such section.

"(b) Section 303(b)(3) of such Act is amended by striking out "503(a)(4)' and inserting in lieu thereof '503(4)'.

"(c) Section 502(b) of such Act is amended by striking out 'Federal share (as defined in section 503(b)) of the' and by striking out the last sentence of paragraph (2) thereof.

"(d) Section 504 of such Act is amended by striking out 'section 503(a)' both times it appears and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 503'.

"Technical Amendment Regarding Interchange of Personnel With States

"Sec. 153. Effective as of April 11, 1965, section 507(c)(3)(D) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by inserting ", and for retention and leave accrual purposes,' after 'toward periodic or longevity step increases'.

"Demonstration Projects To Insure Continuity of Headstart Programs

"Sec. 154. Section 503 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by striking out 'and' at the end of paragraph (9), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (10) and inserting in lieu thereof '; and', and by adding at the end thereof the following:

" '(11) evaluation and demonstration projects to insure that benefits obtained by children in Headstart and other preschool programs are not lost during their early elementary school years, but are instead enhanced so as to provide continuity in and accelerated development of the child's learning, academic and other social achievements.'

"Part F—Handicapped children

"Programs Authorized

"Sec. 161. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by redesignating title VI as title VII, by redesignating sections 601 through 605 and references thereto as sections 701 through 705, respectively, and by adding after title V the following new title:

" 'TITLE VI—EDUCATION OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

" 'Appropriations Authorized

" 'Sec. 601. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants pursuant to the provisions of this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the succeeding fiscal year, for the purpose of assisting the States in the initiation, expansion, and improvement of programs and projects (including the acquisition of equipment and where necessary the construction of school facilities) for the education of handicapped children (as defined in section 602) at the preschool, elementary and secondary school levels.

" '(b) For the purpose of making grants under this title there is authorized to be appropriated $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and $150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.

" 'Definition of 'Handicapped Children"

" 'Sec. 602. As used in this title, the term "handicapped children includes mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, crippled, or other health impaired children who by reason thereof require special education and related services.

" 'Allotment of Funds

" 'Sec. 603. (a)(1) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year for the purposes of this paragraph an amount equal to not more than 3 per centum of the amount appropriated for such year for payments to States under section 601(b). The Commissioner shall allot the amount appropriated pursuant to this paragraph among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands according to their respective needs for assistance under this title.

" '(2) From the total amount appropriated pursuant to section 601(b) for any fiscal year the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to such amount as the number of children aged three to twenty-one, inclusive, in the State bears to the number of such children in all the States. For purposes of this subsection, the term "State" shall not include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

" '(b) The number of children aged three to twenty-one, inclusive, in any State and in all the States shall be determined, for purposes of this section, by the Commissioner on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available to him.

" '(c) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for that year shall be available for reallotment, from time to time and on dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsection (a) for that year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for that year.

" 'State Plans

" 'Sec. 604. Any State which desires to receive grants under this title shall submit to the Commissioner through its State educational agency a State plan in such detail as the Commissioner deems necessary. The Commissioner shall not approve a State plan or a modification of a State plan under this title unless the plan meets the following requirements:

" '(a) The plan must provide satisfactory assurance that funds paid to the State under this title will be expended, either directly or through local educational agencies, solely to initiate, expand, or improve programs and projects, including preschool programs and projects, (A) which are designed to meet the special educational and related needs of handicapped children throughout the State, (B) which are of sufficient size, scope, and quality (taking into consideration the special educational needs of such children) as to give reasonable promise of substantial progress toward meeting those needs, and (C) which may include the acquisition of equipment and where necessary the construction of school facilities. Nothing in this title shall be deemed to preclude two or more local educational agencies from entering into agreements, at their option, for carrying out jointly operated programs and projects under this title. The plan may provide up to 5 per centum of the amount allotted to the State for any fiscal year or $75,000 ($25,000 in the case of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands), whichever is greater, may be expended for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan (including State leadership activities and consultative services), and for planning on the State and local level.

" '(b) The plan must provide satisfactory assurance that, to the extent consistent with the number and location of handicapped children in the State who are enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools, provision will be made for participation of such children in programs assisted or carried out under this title.

" '(c) The plan must provide satisfactory assurance that the control of funds provided under this title, and title to property derived therefrom, shall be in a public agency for the uses and purposes provided in this title, and that a public agency will administer such funds and property.

" '(d) The plan must set forth policies and procedures which provide satisfactory assurance that Federal funds made available under this title will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of State, local, and private funds expended for the education of handicapped children, and in no case supplant such State, local, and private funds.

" '(e) The plan must provide that effective procedures, including provision for appropriate objective measurements of educational achievement, will be adopted for evaluating at least annually the effectiveness of the programs in meeting the special educational needs of, and providing related services for, handicapped children.

" '(f) The plan must provide that the State educational agency will be the sole agency for administering or supervising the administration of the plan.

" '(g) The plan must provide for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this title, including reports of the objective measurements required by paragraph (e) of this subsection; and the plan must also provide for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

" '(h) The plan must provide satisfactory assurance that such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures will be adopted as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid under this title to the State, including any such funds paid by the State to local educational agencies.

" '(i) The plan must provide satisfactory assurance that funds paid to the State under this title shall not be made available to any school for handicapped children eligible for assistance under section 203(a)(5) of title II of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress.

" '(j) The plan must provide satisfactory assurance, in the case of any project for construction of school facilities, that the project is not inconsistent with overall State plans for the construction of school facilities and that the requirements of section 610 will be complied with on all such construction projects.

" '(k) The plan must provide satisfactory assurance that effective procedures will be adopted for acquiring and disseminating to teachers and administrators of handicapped children significant information derived from educational research, demonstration, and similar projects, and for adopting, where appropriate, promising educational practices developed through such projects.

" 'Payments

" 'Sec. 605. From the amounts allotted to each State under section 603, the Commissioner shall pay to that State an amount equal to the amount expended by the State in carrying out its State plan. These payments may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

" 'Administration of State Plans

" 'Sec. 606 (a) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this title, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State agency administering the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing .

" '(b) Whenever the Commission, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to such State agency, finds—

" '(1) that the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 604, or

" '(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provisions,

the Commissioner shall notify such State agency that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this title until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

" 'Judicial Review

" 'Sec. 607. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under section 604 or with his final action under section 606(b), such State may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

" '(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

" '(c) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

" 'National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children

" 'Sec. 608. (a) The Commissioner shall establish in the Office of Education a National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children, consisting of the Commissioner, who shall be Chairman, and not more than twelve additional members, not less than 50 per centum of whom shall be persons affiliated with educational, training, or research programs for the handicapped, appointed by the Commissioner without regard to the civil service laws.

" '(b) The Advisory Committee shall review the administration and operation of this Act, title II of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, and other provisions of law administered by the Commissioner, with respect to handicapped children, including their effect in improving the educational attainment of such children, and make recommendations for the improvement of such administration and operation with respect to such children. These recommendations shall take into consideration experience gained under this and other Federal programs for handicapped children and, to the extent appropriate, experience gained under other public and private programs for handicapped children. The Advisory Committee shall from time to time make such recommendations as it may deem appropriate to the Commissioner and shall make an annual report of its findings and recommendations to the Commissioner not later than January 31 of 1968 and each fiscal year thereafter. The Commissioner shall transmit each such report to the Secretary together with his comments and recommendations, and the Secretary shall transmit such report, comments, and recommendations to the Congress together with any comments or recommendations he may have with respect thereto.

" '(c) Members of the Advisory Committee who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on business of the Committee, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Commissioner, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code for persons in Government service employed intermittently.

" '(d) The Commissioner may, at the request of the Advisory Committee, appoint such special advisory professional or technical personnel as may be necessary to enable the Advisory Committee to carry out its duties.

" 'Bureau for Education and Training of the Handicapped

" 'Sec. 609. The Commissioner shall establish at the earliest practicable date not later than July 1, 1967, and maintain within the Office of Education a bureau for the education and training of the handicapped which shall be the principal agency in the Office of Education for administering and carrying out programs and projects relating to the education and training of the handicapped, including programs and projects for the training of teachers of the handicapped and for research in such education and training.

" 'Labor Standards

" 'Sec. 610. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on all construction projects assisted under this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a–5). The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this section the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).'

"Part G—Dissemination of information

"Sec. 171. Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (as redesignated by this Act) is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

" 'Dissemination of Information

" 'Sec. 706. (a) For the purpose of carrying out more effectively the provisions of this Act and title II of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, the Commissioner—

" '(1) shall prepare and disseminate to State and local educational agencies and other appropriate agencies and institutions catalogs, reviews, bibliographies, abstracts, analyses of research and experimentation, and such other materials as are generally useful for such purpose;

" '(2) may upon request provide advice, counsel, technical assistance, and demonstrations to State or local educational agencies or institutions of higher education undertaking to initiate or expand programs under this Act or such title in order to increase the quality or depth or broaden the scope of such programs, and shall inform such agencies and institutions of the availability of assistance pursuant to this clause;

" '(3) shall prepare and disseminate to State and local educational agencies and other appropriate agencies and institutions an annual report setting forth developments in the utilization and adaptation of projects carried out pursuant to this Act and such title; and

" '(4) may enter into contracts with public or private agencies, organizations, groups, or individuals to carry out the provisions of this section.

" '(b) There are authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and not to exceed $2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, to carry out the provisions of this section.'

"Part H—Racial imbalance and compliance with Civil Rights Act of 1964

"Sec. 181. Section 704 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (as redesignated by this Act, and containing a prohibition against Federal control of education) is amended by inserting the following at the end thereof and before the period: ', or to require the assignment or transportation of students or teachers in order to overcome racial imbalance'.

"Compliance With Civil Rights Act of 1964

"Sec. 182. The Commissioner of Education shall not defer action or order action deferred on any application by a local educational agency for funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act, by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, by the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress), by the Act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress), or by the Cooperative Research Act, on the basis of alleged noncompliance with the provisions of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 for more than 60 days after notice is given to such local agency of such deferral unless such local agency is given the opportunity for a hearing as provided in section 602 of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, such hearing to be held within 60 days of such notice, unless the time for such hearing is extended by mutual consent of such local agency and the Commissioner, and such deferral shall not continue for more than 30 days after the close of any such hearing unless there has been an express finding on the record of such hearing that such local educational agency has failed to comply with the provisions of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

"Part I—Effective date

"Sec. 191. The provisions of this title shall be effective with respect to fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1966, except as specifically provided otherwise.

"TITLE II—FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS

"Part A—Amendments to Public Law 874

"Amendments to Section 3

"Sec. 201. Section 3 of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress), as amended, is amended in the following respects:

"Providing an alternative means of meeting the eligibility requirements

"(a)(1) Section 3(c)(2)(B) is amended by inserting after 'amount to' the following: ', whichever is the lesser, four hundred such children, or a number of such children equal to'.

"(2) Section 3(c)(5) is amended by striking out 'percentage requirements for eligibility under paragraphs (2) and (4) of this subsection' and by inserting in lieu thereof 'requirements for eligibility under paragraphs (2)(B) and 4(C) of this subsection'.

"Method of determining local contribution rate

"(b) Subsection (d) of section 3, relating to the computation of the local contribution rate, is amended as follows:

"(1) The first sentence of subsection (d) is amended by striking out 'and the local educational agency'.

"(2) Clauses (1) and (2) of the first sentence of subsection (d) are amended to read:

" '(1) he shall place each school district within the State into a group of generally comparable school districts; and

" '(2) he shall then divide (A) the aggregate current expenditures, during the second fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which he is making the computation, which all of the local educational agencies within any such group of comparable school districts made from revenues derived from local sources, by (B) the aggregate number of children in average daily attendance to whom such agencies provided free public education during such second preceding fiscal year.'

"(3) The third sentence of subsection (d) is amended by striking out 'If, in the judgment of the Commissioner, the current expenditures in those school districts which he has selected under clause (1)' and substituting in lieu thereof 'If, in the judgment of the Commissioner, the current expenditures in the school districts within the generally comparable group as determined under clause (1)'.

"(4) The next to the last sentence of subsection (d) is amended by inserting after 'as the case may be,' the following: 'plus any direct current expenditures by the States for the operation of such agencies', and by inserting 'either of' after 'funds from which'.

"Providing that children of servicemen shall be deemed to reside with a parent employed on Federal property

"(c)(1) The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 3 is amended by—

"(A) inserting '(1)' before 'resided on Federal property',

"(B) inserting '(2)' before 'resided with a parent', and

"(C) inserting before the period at the end thereof ', or (3) had a parent who was on active duty in the uniformed services (as defined in section 102 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949)'.

"(2) The second sentence of subsection (b) is repealed.

"Children moving into an area as a result of an international boundary relocation

"(d) Such subsection (b) of section 3 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'For the purpose of computing the amount to which a local educational agency is entitled under this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the Commissioner shall also determine the number of children (other than children to whom subsection (a) or any other provision of this subsection applies) who were in average daily attendance at such schools and for whom such agency provided free public education, during such fiscal year, as a result of a change in residence from land transferred to Mexico as part of a relocation of an international boundary of the United States.'

"Providing that all Federal payments will be deducted from gross entitlements on the same basis

"(e) Subsection (e) of section 3 is amended to read as follows:

" '(e) In determining the total amount which a local educational agency is entitled to receive under this section (other than subsection (c)(4) thereof) for a fiscal year, the Commissioner shall deduct (1) such amount as he determines that agency derived from other Federal payments (as defined in section 2(b)(1)) but only to the extent such payments are not deducted under the last sentence of section 2(a), and only to the extent the payments are made with respect to property on which children, counted for purposes of this section, live or on which their parents work, and (2) such amount as he determines to be the value of transportation and of custodial and other maintenance services furnished such agency by the Federal Government during such year. The Commissioner shall make no deduction under this subsection for any fiscal year in which the sum of the amounts determined under clauses (1) and (2) of the preceding sentence is less than $1,000.'

"Making the appropriation for one fiscal year available through the following year to meet obligations of the current year

"Sec. 202. Section 5(b) of the Act of September 30, 1950, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'Sums appropriated pursuant to this title for any fiscal year shall remain available, for obligation and payments with respect to amounts due local educational agencies under this title for such year, until the close of the following fiscal year.'

"State Aid Reductions

"Sec. 203. Section 5 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

" 'Adjustments for Reductions in State Aid

" '(d) The amount which a local educational agency in any State is otherwise entitled to receive under section 2, 3, or 4 for any fiscal year shall be reduced in the same proportion (if any) that the State has reduced for that year its aggregate expenditures (from non-Federal sources) per pupil for current expenditure purposes for free public education (as determined pursuant to regulations of the Commissioner) below the level of such expenditures per pupil in the second preceding fiscal year. The Commissioner may waive or reduce this reduction whenever in his judgment exceptional circumstances exist which would make its application inequitable and would defeat the purpose of this title.'

"Where a Local Educational Agency Cannot or Will Not Educate Children Living on Federal Property

"Sec. 204. Section 6 of the Act of September 30, 1950, is amended by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g), and by inserting immediately after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

" '(f) If no tax revenues of a State or of any political subdivision of the State may be expended for the free public education of children who reside on any Federal property within the State, or if no tax revenues of a State are allocated for the free public education of such children, then the property on which such children reside shall not be considered Federal property for the purposes of sections 3 and 4 of this Act. If a local educational agency refuses for any other reason to provide in any fiscal year free public education for children who reside on Federal property which is within the school district of that agency or which, in the determination of the Commissioner, would be within that school district if it were not Federal property, there shall be deducted from any amount to which the local educational agency is otherwise entitled for that year under section 3 or 4 an amount equal to (1) the amount (if any) by which the cost to the Commissioner of providing free public education for that year for each such child exceeds the local contribution rate of that agency for that year, multiplied by (2) the number of such children.'

"Prohibition Against Certain Assignment or Transportation

"Sec. 205. Section 301(a) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874; Eighty-first Congress), is amended by inserting the following at the end thereof before the period: ', or require the assignment or transportation of students or teachers in order to overcome racial imbalance'.

"Amendments to Section 303

"Sec. 206. Section 303 of the Act of September 30, 1950, is amended in the following respects:

"Extending to all property the provision which permits Federal property used for housing to be counted as Federal property for one year after transfer by the United States

"(a) Clause (B) of the next to last sentence of section 303(1) is amended by striking out 'housing'.

"Repeal of exclusion of property used for provision of local benefits

"(b) The last sentence of section 303(1) is amended by—

"(1) striking out '(A) any real property used by the United States primarily for the provision of services or benefits to the local area in which such property is situated,'; and

"(2) redesignating clauses (B), (C), and (D) as clauses (A), (B), and (C), respectively.

"Authorizing the Commissioner to establish a method of counting children for the purpose of determining average daily attendance

"(c) Subsection (10) of section 303 is amended to read as follows:

" '(10) Average daily attendance shall be determined in accordance with State law, except that (A) the average daily attendance of children with respect to whom payment is to be made under section 3 or 4 of this Act shall be determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, and (B) notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, where the local educational agency of the school district in which any child resides makes or contracts to make a tuition payment for the free public education of such child in a school situated in another school district, for purposes of this Act the attendance of such child at such school shall be held and considered (i) to be attendance at a school of the local educational agency so making or contracting to make such tuition payment, and (ii) not to be attendance at a school of the local educational agency receiving such tuition payment or entitled to receive such payment under the contract.'

"Part B—Amendments to Public Law 815

"Extending Temporary Provisions for One Year

"SEC. 221. Section 3 of the Act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress), is amended by striking out '1966' and inserting in lieu thereof '1967'.

"Reducing Percentage Increase Required for Eligibility and Lengthening Increase Period to Four Years

"SEC. 222. (a) Section 5(c) of the Act of September 23, 1950, is amended by striking out 'at least 5 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof 'at least 6 per centum'.

"(b) Section 15(6) of such Act is amended by striking out 'base year' and inserting in lieu thereof 'second year of the four year increase period'.

"(c) Section 15(15) of such Act is amended (1) by inserting 'third or fourth' immediately before the phrase 'regular school year' the first time that phrase occurs in the subsection, (2) by striking out '1963–1964' and inserting in lieu thereof '1962–1963', and (3) by striking out 'or the regular school year preceding such school year'.

"(d) Section 15(16) of such Act is amended by striking out 'two' and inserting 'four' in lieu thereof.

"(e) Section 5(f) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(f) In determining under this section the total of the payments which may be made to a local educational agency on the basis of any application, the total number of children counted for purposes of paragraph (1), (2), or (3), as the case may be, of subsection (a) may not exceed—

"'(1) the number of children whose membership at the close of the increase period for the application is compared with membership in the base period for purposes of that paragraph, minus

"'(2) the number of such children whose membership at the close of the increase period was compared with membership in the base year for purposes of such paragraph under the last previous application, if any, of the agency on the basis of which any payment has been or may be made to that agency.'

"Reduction in the Non-Federal Growth Requirement

"SEC. 223. Section 5(d) of such Act is amended by striking out '107 per centum' and by inserting in lieu thereof '106 per centum'.

"Extending the Time for Determining the Number of Unhoused Children by Authorizing the Commissioner To Make the Estimate for a Period Extending Two Years Beyond the Increase Period

"SEC. 224. Section 4 of such Act is amended by inserting 'the second year following' immediately before the phrase 'the increase period'.

"Making the Provisions Relating to Indians Living on Reservations Permanent

"SEC. 225. (a) The first sentence of section 14(b) of such Act is amended by striking out 'ending prior to July 1, 1966,' and ', not to exceed $60,000,000 in the aggregate,'.

"(b) The third sentence of section 14(b) is amended by striking out ', except that after June 30, 1966, no agreement may be made to extend assistance under this section'.

"Providing That Children Who Have a Parent in the Uniformed Services Will Be Considered as Federally Connected

"SEC. 226. (a) Section 5(a)(1) of such Act is amended by inserting ', (A) who so resided' immediately before the phrase 'with a parent employed on Federal property' and by inserting immediately before the comma preceding the phrase 'multiplied by 95 per centum' the following: ', or (B) who had a parent who was on active duty in the uniformed services (as defined in section 102 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949)'.

"(b)(1) The first sentence of section 5(a)(2) of such Act is amended by inserting '(A)' after 'children', by inserting '(B)' immediately before 'residing with a parent', and by inserting after 'school district),' the following: 'or (C) who had a parent who was on active duty in the uniformed services (as defined in section 102 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949),'.

"(2) The second sentence of section 5(a)(2) of such Act is repealed.

"Children Moving Into an Area as a Result of an International Boundary Relocation

"SEC. 227. Section 5(a) of such Act is further amended by striking out the period at the end of clause (3), by inserting '; and' in lieu thereof, and by inserting immediately after clause (3) the following new clause:

"'(4) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the estimated number of children, without regard to the limitation in subsection (d), whose membership in the schools of such local educational agency resulted from a change in residence from land transferred to Mexico as part of a relocation of an international boundary of the United States, multiplied by 50 per centum of the average per pupil cost of constructing minimum school facilities in the State in which the school district of such agency is situated.'

"Providing for Transfer of Title to Facilities to the Local Educational Agency Where It Is in the Federal Interest To Do So.

"SEC. 228. Section 10 of such Act is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately before the first word thereof, and by adding the following new subsection:

"'(b) When the Commissioner determines it is in the interest of the Federal Government to do so, he may transfer to the appropriate local educational agency all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to any facilities provided under this section (or sections 204 or 310 of this Act as in effect January 1, 1958). Any such transfer shall be without charge, but may be made on such other terms and conditions, and at such time as the Commissioner deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act.'

"Where a Local Educational Agency Cannot or Will Not Educate Children Living on Federal Property

"SEC. 229. Section 10 of such Act is further amended by adding an additional new subsection as follows:

"'(c) If no tax revenues of a State or of any political subdivision of the State may be expended for the free public education of children who reside on any Federal property within the State, or if no tax revenues of a State are allocated for the free public education of such children, then the property on which such children reside shall not be considered Federal property for the purposes of section 5 of this Act.'

"Repeal of Exclusion of Property Used for Provision of Local Benefits

"SEC. 230. The last sentence of section 15(1) of such Act is amended by—

"(1) striking out '(A) any real property used by the United States primarily for the provision of services or benefits to the local area in which such property is situated,'; and

"(2) redesignating clauses (B), (C), and (D) as clauses (A), (B), and (C), respectively.

"Providing That Minimum School Facilities Be Usable by Handicapped Persons and Have Certain Other Features

"SEC. 231. Section 15(10) of such Act, relating to the definition of 'minimum school facilities', is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Such regulations shall (A) require the local educational agency concerned to give due consideration to excellence of architecture and design, (B) provide that no facility shall be disqualified as a minimum school facility because of the inclusion of works of art in the plans therefor if the cost of such works of art does not exceed 1 per centum of the cost of the project, and (C) require compliance with such standards as the Secretary may prescribe or approve in order to insure that facilities constructed with the use of Federal funds under this Act shall be, to the extent appropriate in view of the uses to be made of the facilities, accessible to and usable by handicapped persons.'

"Including American Samoa in Definition of 'State'

"SEC. 232. Section 15(13) of such Act, relating to the definition of 'State,' is amended by inserting 'American Samoa,' immediately before 'the Virgin Islands'.

"Part C—Effective date

"SEC. 241. The amendments made by this title shall be effective for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1966, except that (1) the amendment made by section 201(b) shall be effective for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1967, and (2) if the amendment made by section 204 or 229 would have reduced payments to a local educational agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966 (if it had been in effect for that year), the amendment shall not apply to that local educational agency for fiscal years ending prior to July 1, 1968.

"TITLE III—ADULT EDUCATION

Short title

"SEC. 301. This title may be cited as the 'Adult Education Act of 1966'.

"Statement of purpose

"SEC. 302. It is the purpose of this title to encourage and expand basic educational programs for adults to enable them to overcome English language limitations, to improve their basic education in preparation for occupational training and more profitable employment, and to become more productive and responsible citizens.

"Definitions

"SEC. 303. As used in this title—

"(a) The term 'adult' means any individual who has attained the age of eighteen.

"(b) The term 'adult education' means services or instruction below the college level (as determined by the Commissioner), for adults who—

"(1) do not have a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education and who have not achieved an equivalent level of education, and

"(2) are not currently enrolled in schools.

"(c) The term 'adult basic education' means education for adults whose inability to speak, read, or write the English language constitutes a substantial impairment of their ability to get or retain employment commensurate with their real ability, which is designed to help eliminate such inability and raise the level of education of such individuals with a view to making them less likely to become dependent on others, to improving their ability to benefit from occupational training and otherwise increasing their opportunities for more productive and profitable employment, and to making them better able to meet their adult responsibilities.

"(d) The term 'Commissioner' means the Commissioner of Education.

"(e) The term 'local educational agency' means a public board of education or other public authority legally constituted within a State for either administrative control or direction of public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or other political subdivision of a State, or such combination of school districts or counties as are recognized in a State as an administrative agency for its public elementary or secondary schools; except that if there is a separate board or other legally constituted local authority having administrative control and direction of adult education in public schools therein, such term means such other board or authority.

"(f) The term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, and (except for the purposes of section 305(a)) the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands.

"(g) The term 'State educational agency' means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or if there is a separate State agency or officer primarily responsible for supervision of adult education in public schools then such agency or officer may be designated for the purposes of this title by the Governor or by State law. If no agency or officer qualifies under the preceding sentence, such term shall mean an appropriate agency or officer designated for the purposes of this title by the Governor.

"Grants to States for Adult Basic Education

"SEC. 304. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 314, not less than 10 per centum nor more than 20 per centum shall be reserved for the purposes of section 309.

"(b) From the remainder of such sums, the Commissioner is authorized to make grants to States, which have State plans approved by him under section 306 for the purposes of this section, to pay the Federal share of the cost of the establishment or expansion of adult basic education programs to be carried out by local educational agencies.

"Allotment for Adult Basic Education

"SEC. 305. (a) From the sums available for purposes of section 304(b) for any fiscal year, the Commissioner shall allot not more than 2 per centum thereof among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands according to their respective needs for assistance under such section. From the remainder of such sums he shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to such remainder as the number of adults who have completed not more than five grades of school (or have not achieved an equivalent level of education) in such State bears to the number of such adults in all States.

"(b) The portion of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for a fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required, for the period such allotment is available, for carrying out the portion of the State plan relating to adult basic education approved under this title shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such period as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsection (a) for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum which the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such period for carrying out such portion of its State plan approved under this title, and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States whose proportionate amounts are not so reduced. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

"State Plans

"SEC. 306. (a) Any State desiring to receive its allotment of Federal funds for any grant under this title shall submit through its State educational agency a State plan. Such State plan shall be in such detail as the Commissioner deems necessary, and shall—

"(1) set forth a program for the use of grants, in accordance with section 304(b), which affords assurance of substantial progress, with respect to all segments of the adult population and all areas of the State, toward carrying out the purposes of such section;

"(2) provide for the administration of such plan by the State educational agency;

"(3) provide for cooperative arrangements between the State educational agency and the State health authority authorizing the use of such health information and services for adults as may be available from such agencies and as may reasonably be necessary to enable them to benefit from the instruction provided pursuant to this title;

"(4) provide for grants to public and private nonprofit agencies for special projects, teacher-training and research;

"(5) provide for cooperation with Community Action programs, Work Experience programs, VISTA, Work Study, and other programs relating to the anti-poverty effort;

"(6) provide that such agency will make such reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information, as may reasonably be necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties under this title and will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the Commissioner finds necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports;

"(7) provide such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid the State under this title (including such funds paid by the State to local educational agencies); and

"(8) provide such further information and assurances as the Commissioner may by regulation require.

"(b) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this title, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State educational agency reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

"Payments

"SEC. 307. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), the Federal share of expenditures to carry out a State plan shall be paid from a State's allotment available for grants to such State. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the succeeding fiscal year, the Federal share for each State shall be 90 per centum.

"(b) No payment shall be made to any State from its allotment for any fiscal year unless the Commissioner finds that the amount available for expenditure by such State for adult education from non-Federal sources for such year will not be less than the amount expended for such purposes from such sources during the preceding fiscal year.

"(c) Payments to a State under this title may be in installments and in advance or by way of reimbursement with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

"Operation of State Plans; Hearings and Judicial Review

"SEC. 308. (a) Whenever the Commissioner after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State educational agency administering a State plan approved under this title, finds that—

"(1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 306, or

"(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision.

the Commissioner shall notify such State agency that no further payments will be made to the State under this title (or in his discretion, that further payments to the State will be limited to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure), until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, no further payments may be made to such State under this title (or payments shall be limited to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure).

"(b) A State educational agency dissatisfied with a final action of the Commissioner under section 306 or subsection (a) of this section may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently, but until the filing of the record, the Commissioner may modify or set aside his order. The findings of the Commissioner as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Commissioner shall be final, subject to the review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subsection shall not unless so specifically ordered by the court operate as a stay of the Commissioner's action.

"Special Experimental Demonstration Projects and Teacher Training

"SEC. 309. (a) The sums reserved in section 304(a) for the purposes of this section shall be used for making special project grants or providing teacher-training grants in accordance with this section.

"(b) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to local educational agencies or other public or private nonprofit agencies, including educational television stations, for special projects which will be carried out in furtherance of the purposes of this title, and which—

"(1) involve the use of innovative methods, systems, materials, or programs which the Commissioner determines may have national significance or be of special value in promoting effective programs under this title, or

"(2) involve programs of adult education, carried out in cooperation with other Federal, federally assisted, State, or local programs which the Commissioner determines have unusual promise in promoting a comprehensive or coordinated approach to the problems of persons with basic educational deficiencies.

The Commissioner shall establish procedures for making grants under this subsection which shall require a non-Federal contribution of at least 10 per centum of the costs of such projects wherever feasible and not inconsistent with the purposes of this subsection.

"(c) The Commissioner is authorized to provide (directly or by contract), or to make grants to colleges or universities, State or local educational agencies, or other appropriate public or private nonprofit agencies or organizations, to provide training to persons engaged, or preparing to engage, as personnel in adult education programs designed, to carry out the purposes of this title, with such stipends and allowances, if any (including traveling and subsistence expenses), for persons undergoing such training and their dependents as the Commissioner may by regulation determine.

"Advisory Committee on Adult Basic Education

"SEC. 310. (a) The President shall, within ninety days of enactment of this title appoint a National Advisory Committee on Adult Basic Education.

"(b) The National Advisory Committee shall have eight members, consisting of the Commissioner of Education, who shall be chairman, and seven other members who shall, to the extent possible, include persons knowledgeable in the field of adult education, State and local public school officials, and other persons having special knowledge and experience, or qualifications with respect to adult basic education, and persons representative of the general public. Such Advisory Committee shall meet at the call of the chairman but not less often than twice a year.

"(c) The Advisory Committee shall advise the Commissioner in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this title, including policies and procedures governing the approval of State plans under section 306 and policies to eliminate duplication, and to effectuate the coordination of programs under this title and other programs offering adult education activities and services.

"(d) The Advisory Committee shall review the administration and effectiveness of the adult basic education program and other federally supported adult education programs as they relate to adult basic education, make recommendations with respect thereto, and make annual reports to the President of its findings and recommendations (including recommendations for changes in this title and other Federal laws relating to adult education activities and services). The President shall transmit each such report to the Congress together with his comments and recommendations. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall coordinate the work of this committee with that of other related advisory committees.

"(e) Members of the Advisory Committee who are not regular full-time employees of the United States, shall, while serving on the business of the Committee, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Commissioner, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, members may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(f) The Commissioner shall engage such technical assistance as may be required to carry out the functions of the Advisory Committee, and the Commissioner shall, in addition, make available to the Advisory Committee such secretarial, clerical, and other assistance and such pertinent data prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as it may require to carry out its functions.

"(g) In carrying out its functions pursuant to this section, the Advisory Committee may utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government, in accordance with agreements between the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the head of such agency.

"Administration

"SEC. 311. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to delegate any of his functions under this title, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

"(b) In administering the provisions of this title, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution, in accordance with agreements between the Secretary and the head thereof.

"Federal Control Prohibited

"SEC. 312. (a) Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system, or over the selection of library resources, textbooks, or other printed or published instructional materials by any educational institution or school system.

"(b) The National Advisory Committee on Adult Basic Education is authorized to encourage the establishment of State and local adult education advisory committees in order to improve reporting of State and local administration of programs under this title. Such local and State advisory committees may be existing groups or especially established by State and local administrators of the programs to assure that the local program is meeting the needs of the community.

"Limitation

"SEC. 313. No grant may be made under this title for any educational program, activity, or service related to sectarian instruction or religious worship, or provided by a school or department of divinity. For purposes of this section, the term "school or department of divinity" means an institution or a department or branch of an institution whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation, or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

"Appropriations Authorized

"SEC. 314. There is authorized to be appropriated $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and $60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, for the purposes of this title.

"Repealer

"SEC. 315. Part B of title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is repealed."

And the House agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

ADAM C. POWELL,
CARL D. PERKINS,
JOHN BRADEMAS,
RALPH J. SCOTT,
HUGH CAREY,
WILLIAM D. FORD,
LLOYD MEEDS,
JAMES SCHEUER,
WM. AYRES,
ALBERT QUIE,
CHAS. GOODELL,
ALPHONZO BELL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WAYNE MORSE,
RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
JOSEPH S. CLARK,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
ROBERT KENNEDY,
HARRISON WILLIAMS,
WINSTON PROUTY,
JACOB JAVITS,
PETER DOMINICK,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13161) to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for our elementary and secondary schools, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute amendment. The committee of conference agreed to a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment. Except for technical, clarifying, and conforming changes the following statement explains the differences between the House bill and the substitute agreed to in conference.

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Part A—Financial assistance to educational agencies for the education of children of low-income families

Education of Indian Children

Section 102 of the House bill provided for an authorization equal to not more than 3 percent of the amount appropriated for title I (title II, Public Law 874) for non-State areas and authorized the Commission to make grants to Department of the Interior for programs in BIA schools.

Section 102 of the Senate amendment is similar to the House provision but further requires the Secretary of the Interior to make payments to local educational agencies with respect to the education of out-of-State Indian children in the schools of such agency. The payment shall not exceed 50 percent of that State's average per pupil expenditure for each such Indian pupil. The authority to make grants to BIA schools is for fiscal year 1967 only.

The conference substitute is like the Senate amendment.

Computation of Per Pupil Payments to Institutions for Handicapped

The Senate amendment provided, effective for fiscal year 1968, that payments to institutions for handicapped children could be based on 50 percent of the State average or 50 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure whichever is greater.

The conferees adopt the Senate amendment.

Minimum Project Size

Section 109 of the House bill required that each project or program must involve an expenditure of not less than $5,000. The comparable provision of the Senate amendment provided for a minimum project size of $2,500. The conference agreement is like the Senate provision.

Education of Neglected and Delinquent Children

The House passed bill provided that in determining the amounts of grants the Commissioner will count children living in institutions for neglected or delinquent children who are not counted for the purpose of determining the amount of the grant to a State agency. It also amended the provisions under which the State agencies received payments, adding children in institutions for neglected or delinquent children and removing the present limit which restricts payments to those to whom the State provides education "on a non-school district basis". The Senate amendment is similar to the House provision but also included the counting of children in foster homes in computing payments to local educational agencies. The conferees adopt a substitute embodying both concepts of the House and Senate provisions. The conferferees expect that the administration will take appropriate steps to assure that in the computation of the numbers of children used in making payments to local educational agencies and to institutions that care will be employed to avoid duplication or overlapping in a count.

Limitation on Size of Grant

The House passed bill raised and extended the limit imposed on Federal grants under title II of Public Law 874 from the 30 percent in effect for fiscal year 1966 to 40 percent of the local school budget in fiscal year 1967. The Senate amendment contained no such provision. The conferees adopt a new provision relaxing the ceiling to 50 percent.

Coordination With Other Comparable Programs

The Senate amendment deletes provisions of section 205(a)(7) of Public Law 874 providing for development of projects in coordination with community action programs approved under title II of the Economic Opportunities Act. In lieu thereof the Senate amendment added a provision to renumbered section 703(c) to require the United States Commissioner of Education to coordinate with other Federal agencies and to require State and local authorities to coordinate the development and operation of such projects with other public and private programs.

The conferees accepted the Senate amendment with the intent that nothing in the language adopted shall be construed to give any of such agencies a veto over the initiation of programs and projects by the local educational agency. Moreover it is expected by the conferees that the coordination requirements will be so employed as to provide no delay in the formulation and initiation of programs and projects. It is the expectation of the managers on the part of the House that the coordination required will prevent a duplication of programs.

STANDARDS FOR CONSTRUCTION FOR HANDICAPPED

Section 101 of Senate amendment amended section 205 of Public Law 874 (Public Law 89–10, title I) to require in plans for construction of facilities that due consideration be given to compliance with standards to be set by the Secretary to insure that facilities constructed will be accessible to and usable by handicapped persons.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference substitute includes this provision.

Eligible School Areas

The Senate amendment amends section 205 of title II of Public Law 874 to provide that in order to be eligible for a program or a project, a school attendance area must have "concentrations of educationally deprived children" in lieu of present language containing the words "high concentrations of children coming from low-income families." The conferees rejected the Senate amendment with the understanding that strong steps would be taken by the Administration to assure that no "means test" would be employed in determining pupil eligibility for program benefits in schools in which programs or projects were operating with Federal funds.

Reports of National Advisory Council

Section 115 of the Senate amendment provides that the National Advisory Council must make its annual report by January 31 of each year rather than by March 31, and such report must be made to the Congress as well as the President. The Senate provision further contains a request of the President that he transmit to the Congress his recommendations with respect to the report.

The House bill did not include this provision. It is included in the conference report.

Short Title

Section 116 of the Senate amendment provided that title II of the act of September 30, 1950 (Title I of Public Law 89–10) could be cited as the "Educationally Deprived Children's Act." No comparable provision was included in the House bill.

The conference substitute provides that such title may be cited as "Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965."

Part B—School library resources, textbooks and other instructional materials

Appropriations Authorized

Section 121 of the House bill authorized the appropriation of $105,000,000 for fiscal year 1967, and $175,000,000 for fiscal year 1968, to carry out title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Section 121 of the Senate amendment authorized the appropriations of $125,000,000 for fiscal year 1967, and $150,000,000 for fiscal year 1968, to carry out such title.

The conference substitute adopts the authorizations in the Senate amendment.

Revision in authorization for title II, and provision for Indian children in schools operated by the Department of the Interior and students in DOD overseas schools

Section 122 of the House bill increased from 2 to 3 percent the amounts that may be set aside for the outlying territories and authorized the Commissioner to make grants to the Department of the Interior for extending to Bureau of Indian Affairs schools the benefits of title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Also, from the set aside of funds the Commissioner was required to make allocation to the Department of Defense for the overseas schools operated for military dependents.

Section 122 of the Senate bill contains a similar provision with respect to BIA schools but contains no provision for overseas dependent schools. In addition, the Senate language authorizing funds for the outlying areas and the Department of the Interior specifies that the amount authorized is "an amount equal to not more than 3 percent of the amount appropriated for such year for grants under title II of such act, whereas the House bill specifies that the authorization shall not exceed 3 percent of the sum appropriated for carrying out the title.

The substitute agreed upon in conference is like the Senate bill, except that provisions from the House bill for overseas dependents schools operated by the Department of Defense.

Part C—Supplemental educational centers and services

Appropriations Authorized

Section 131 of the House bill authorized appropriations of $150,000,000 for fiscal year 1967 and $575,000,000 for fiscal year 1968 for carrying out title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Section 131 of the Senate amendment authorized appropriations of $200,000,000 for fiscal year 1967 and $250,000,000 for fiscal year 1968.

The conference substitute authorizes the appropriations of $175,000,000 for the fiscal year 1967, and $500,000,000 for the fiscal year 1968.

Determinations of Relative Need

The Senate amendment provided that for purposes of allocating library resources, textbooks, and other materials under the title, the determination of relative need will be made "from time to time." The House bill did not contain this provision. The conference substitute includes this provision.

Revision in Authorization of Title III, and Provision for Indian Children in Schools Operated by the Department of the Interior and Students in Department of Defense Overseas Dependents' Schools

Section 132 of the House bill increases the amount set aside for outlying areas from 2 to 3 percent of the amount appropriated under the title and authorizes payment out of this amount to the Department of Interior for supplemental services and centers for children in its Indian schools and to the Department of Defense for such services and centers in its overseas dependent schools.

The Senate amendment provides similar authorization for grants to Bureau of Indian Affairs schools but contains no provision for overseas schools. In addition, the Senate language authorizing funds for the outlying areas and the Department of the Interior specifies that the amount authorized is "an amount equal to not more than 3 percent of the amount appropriated for such year for grants" under title III whereas the House bill specifies that the authorization shall be 3 percent of the sum appropriated for carrying out the title.

The conference substitute is like the Senate amendment, except that it includes the House provisions with respect to the overseas dependents' schools operated by the Department of Defense. However, the conferees do not expect that any of the funds will be used for the construction or leasing of facilities.

Facilities Usable by Handicapped Persons

The Senate amendment required that in developing plans for the construction of facilities that satisfactory assurance be provided that there will be compliance with such standards as may be prescribed or approved by the Secretary to insure that facilities constructed with the use of Federal funds be accessible to and usable by handicapped persons.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference substitute adopts these provisions.

Part D—Cooperative Research Act amendments

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment, in section 141 of each, amended section 2(b) of the Cooperative Research Act to permit contracts with public and private organizations to conduct training in research in the field of education. The Senate amendment contained an additional provision requiring the Commissioner to make a complete report to Congress with respect to such contracts or agreements before January 31, 1968.

The conference substitute retains the additional provision from the Senate amendment.

Compliance With Title VI of Civil Rights Act of 1964

The House bill prohibited the Commissioner from deferring action or ordering action deferred on any application by local educational agencies for funds authorized to be appropriated by this act, or any act amended by it on the basis of alleged noncompliance with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 unless and until, as provided by section 602 of title VI, there has been an express finding on the record, that such agency has failed to comply with such title. The Senate amendment contained no comparable provision.

The substitute agreed to in conference provides that the Commissioner shall not defer action or order action deferred on any application by a local educational agency for funds authorized to be appropriated by this act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Public Law 874, 81st Congress, Public Law 815, 81st Congress, or the Cooperative Research Act, on the basis of alleged noncompliance with the provisions of title VI of the Civil Rights Act for more than 60 days after notice is given to such local agency of such deferral unless such local agency is given the opportunity for a hearing as provided in section 602 of title VI of the Civil Rights Act, such hearing to be held within 60 days of such notice, unless the time for such hearing is extended by mutual consent of such local agency and the Commissioner, and such deferral shall not continue for more than 30 days after the close of any such hearing unless there has been an express finding on the record of such hearing that such local educational agency has failed to comply with title VI of the Civil Rights Act.

TITLE II—FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS

Part A—Amendments to Public Law 874

Providing Alternative Means of Meeting Eligibility Requirement

Section 201 of the House bill relaxes the eligibility requirement for payments to school districts under Public Law 874, 81st Congress to 3 percent of the number of children in average daily attendance or 100 federally connected children, whichever is less. The comparable provision of the Senate amendment relaxed this eligibility requirement to 3 percent or 1,000 federally connected children.

The conference substitute adopts 400 as the number of federally connected children necessary to meet this requirement.

Method of Determining Local Contribution Rate

Section 201(b) of the House bill required the Commissioner to determine the local contribution rate by a system of grouping generally comparable districts within the State so that the local contribution rate of each agency within a group would be the average per pupil expenditure of the entire group. Under the House bill this provision becomes effective with respect to fiscal year 1967.

The Senate provision is identical to the House provision with the exception that the effective date of the amendment is not until fiscal year 1968.

The conference report adopts the Senate provision.

Children Moving Into an Area as a Result of an International Boundary Relocation

Section 201(d) of the Senate bill amends subsection (b) of section 3 of Public Law 874 to require the Commissioner for the purpose of computing the amount to which a local educational agency is entitled, to determine the number of children in such schools as a result of a change in residence from land transferred as a part of a relocation of an international boundary of the United States.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference substitute adopts the provisions of the Senate amendment.

Part B—Amendments to Public Law 815

Children Moving Into an Area as a Result of an International Dispute

Section 227 of the Senate amendment makes provision for including in the number of federally connected children for the purpose of determining a local educational agency entitlement for the fiscal year 1967, the estimated number of children whose membership in the schools of such agency results from a change in residence from land transferred to Mexico as a part of a relocation of an international boundary of the United States.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference substitute retains the Senate provision.

Where a Local Educational Agency Cannot or Will Not Educate Children Living on Federal Property

Section 229 of the Senate bill provides that if a local educational agency cannot or will not educate children living on Federal property such property will not be considered Federal property for the purposes of section 5 of the act.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference substitute contains the Senate provision.

PROVIDING THAT MINIMUM SCHOOL FACILITIES BE USABLE BY HANDICAPPED PERSONS AND HAVE CERTAIN OTHER FEATURES

The Senate amendment provided that regulations of the Commissioner prescribing what constitutes minimum school facilities shall require compliance with such standards as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may prescribe or approve to insure that facilities constructed with Federal funds under the act be accessible to and usable by the handicapped.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report retains the Senate provision.

Section 609 required the Commissioner to establish in the Office of Education a bureau which will be the principal agency for administering and carrying out programs relating to the education and training of the handicapped, including teacher training and research.

Section 610 provided that the requirements of the Davis-Bacon Act shall be applicable for all construction projects assisted under this title.

Part G—Dissemination of information

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment contained a new section relating to dissemination of information and the provision of advice, counsel, technical assistance and demonstrations to State and local educational agencies and certain other agencies. The sections differ in that the House provision waived provisions of law relating to advances of public money and competitive bidding and the Senate amendment authorized the appropriation of $1,500,000 for fiscal year 1967, and $2,000,000 for fiscal year 1968, to carry out the section. In both instances the Senate provisions are kept in the conference report.

Part F—Handicapped children

The Senate amendment added a new title VI to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 providing a new program for the handicapped as follows:

Section 601(a) authorized the Commissioner to make grants pursuant to the provisions of this title during fiscal years 1967 through 1970 for the purpose of assisting the States in initiating, expanding, and improving programs and projects for the education of handicapped children (as defined in section 602) at the preschool, elementary and secondary school levels.

Subsection (b) authorized the appropriation of $150 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and $250 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, for carrying out the title. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and the succeeding fiscal year, only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

Section 602 provided that as used in this title, the term "handicapped children" includes mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, crippled, multiple-handicapped, or other health impaired children who by reason thereof require special education and related services.

Section 603, in subsection (a) authorized appropriations for each fiscal year of an amount equal to not more than 3 percent of the amount appropriated for such year for payments to States under section 601 (b), which the Commissioner shall allot among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands according to their respective needs for assistance under this title. From the total amount appropriated pursuant to section 601(b) for any fiscal year the Commissioner shall allot to each State (other than the above-mentioned outlying areas) an amount based on the ratio of the number of children aged 3 to 21 in each State to the number of such children in all the States.

Subsection (b) provided that the Commissioner shall determine the number of children aged 3 to 21 in any State and in all the States on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available.

Subsection (c) provided that money not required by a State as determined by the Commissioner shall be available for reallotment to other States in proportion to the original allotments under subsection (a). The Commissioner shall make reductions in sums which exceed a State's needs and such reductions will similarly be reallotted among the States with proportionate amounts not so reduced, and with such reallotment deemed part of allotments under subsection (a) for the year.

Section 604. If the State wishes to receive grants under this title it must submit a State plan to the Commissioner. To be approved the State plan must meet the following requirement:

(1) The plan must provide satisfactory assurance that funds paid to the State under this title will be expended, either directly or through local educational agencies, solely to initiate, expand, or improve programs and projects, including preschool programs and projects (including the acquisition of equipment and where necessary the construction of school facilities), (a) which are designed to meet the special educational and related needs of handicapped children throughout the State, and (b) which are of sufficient size, scope, and quality (taking into consideration the special educational needs of such children) as to give reasonable promise of substantial progress toward meeting those needs.

(2) The plan must provide satisfactory assurance that provision will be made for participation of handicapped children enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools in programs assisted or carried out under this title.

(3) The plan must provide satisfactory assurance that the control of funds and title to property derived under this title shall be in a public agency and that a public agency will administer such funds and property.

(4) The plan must set forth policies and procedures which provide satisfactory assurance that Federal funds made available under this title will be so used as to supplement and increase, not supplant, the level of State, local, and private funds expended for the education of handicapped children.

(5) The plan must provide that effective procedures including provision for appropriate objective measurements of educational achievement, will be adopted for evaluating at least annually the effectiveness of the programs in meeting the special educational needs of, and providing related services for, handicapped children.

(6) The plan must provide that the State educational agency will be the sole agency for administering or supervising the administration of the plan.

(7) The plan must provide for making such reports as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his function under this title, including reports of the objective measurements; and the plan must also provide for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary.

(8) The plan must provide satisfactory assurance of proper disbursement and accounting for Federal funds paid under this title to the State, including any such funds paid by the State to local educational agencies.

(9) The plan must provide satisfactory assurance that funds paid to the State under this title shall not be made available to any

school for handicapped children eligible for assistance under section 203(a)(5) of title II of Public Law 874, 81st Cong.

(10) The plan must provide satisfactory assurance that construction projects under this title are not inconsistent with overall State plans for the construction of school facilities and that the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act have been complied with.

(11) The plan must provide satisfactory assurance that effective procedures will be adopted for acquiring and disseminating to teachers of the handicapped relevant information derived from educational research, demonstration, and similar projects pertaining to the education of handicapped children.

Section 605 provided that, from the amounts allotted to each State under section 603, the Commissioner shall pay to that State an amount equal to the amount expended by the State in carrying out its State plan.

Section 606 gave each State a right to notice and a hearing before the Commissioner may disapprove its State plan. It gives the Commissioner authority to suspend the participation of a State in the program under this title whenever it is found: (1) that the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provision of section 604, or (2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provisions.

Section 607 provided for judicial review of the Commissioner's final action with respect to approval of a State plan.

Section 608 provided that the Commissioner shall establish in the Office of Education a National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children, consisting of the Commissioner as Chairman, and not more than 12 additional members, not less than half of whom shall be persons affiliated with educational, training, or research programs for the handicapped, appointed by the Commissioner without regard to the civil service laws. This committee will review and make recommendations regarding the administration and operation of this act and other provisions of law administered by the Commissioner with respect to handicapped children, including their effect in improving the educational attainment of such children, taking into consideration experience gained under this and other Federal programs for handicapped children and, to the extent appropriate, experience gained under other public and private programs for handicapped children. The Advisory Committee shall make an annual report of its findings and recommendations to the Commissioner. The Commissioner will transmit this report to the Secretary, and the Secretary will in turn transmit the report (with his and the Commissioner's comments and recommendations) to the Congress.

TITLE III—ADULT EDUCATION

This title of the Senate amendment provides a program of assistance for adult education. It has no counterpart in the House bill. It provides as follows:

Section 301 provides that title III may be cited as the "Adult Education Act of 1966".

Section 302 states that the purpose of the title is to encourage and expand basic educational programs for adults to enable them to overcome English language limitations, to improve their basic education in preparation for occupational training and more profitable employment, and to become more productive and responsible citizens.

Section 303 defines terms used in the title. Adult education is defined to mean services or instruction below the college level for adults who do not have a high school education or its equivalent and are not currently enrolled in schools.

The term "adult basic education" is defined to mean education for adults whose inability to speak, read, or write the English language constitutes a substantial impairment of their ability to get or retain employment commensurate with their real ability, which is designed to help eliminate such inability and raise the level of education of such individuals with a view to making them less likely to become dependent on others, to improving their ability to benefit from occupational training and otherwise increasing their opportunities for more productive and profitable employment, and to making them better able to meet their adult responsibilities.

Section 304, subsection (a), provided that from the sums appropriated for the purposes of this title, a minimum of 10 percent and a maximum of 20 percent shall be reserved for special experimental demonstration projects and teacher training (sec. 309). Subsection (b) provided that the remainder is to be used to pay the Federal share of adult basic education programs carried out by local educational agencies under this title.

Under subsection (a) of section 305 2 percent of the sums available for adult basic education programs under subsection (b) of the preceding section, shall be allotted among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands according to their needs. The remainder shall be allotted among the States on the basis of the ratio of the number of adults who have completed not more than 5 grades of school (or the equivalent) in each State.

Subsection (b) provided for reallotment of any unused allotments under subsection (a) in proportion to the original allotments.

Section 306, subsection (a) provided that any State desiring to receive its allotment of Federal funds for any grant under this title shall submit through its State educational agency a State plan—

(1) setting forth a program for the use of grants for carrying out adult basic education programs which afford assurance of substantial progress, with respect to all segments of the adult population and all areas of the State;

(2) providing for administration of the State plan by the State educational agency;

(3) providing for cooperative arrangements between the State educational agency and the State health authority authorizing the use of such health information and services for adults as may be available from such agencies and as may be reasonably necessary to enable them to benefit from the instruction provided under this title;

(4) providing for grants to public and private nonprofit agencies for special projects, teacher training and research;

(5) providing for cooperation with community action programs, work experience programs, VISTA, work-study, and other programs relating to the antipoverty effort; and

(6) providing for reports, fiscal control, and fund accounting procedures, and other information and assurances as may be required by regulations.

Subsection (b) provided that the Commissioner must afford the State educational agency reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing before he can finally disapprove any State plan or modification thereof.

Section 307, subsection (a) provided that for fiscal years 1967 and 1968, the Federal share for each State shall be 90%.

Subsection (b) contains a maintenance of effort provision.

Section 308 provided for judicial review of the Commissioner's final action with respect to approval of a State plan.

Section 309, subsection (a) provided that the sums reserved under section 304(a) for the purposes of this section (between 10 and 20 percent of the appropriations for this title) shall be used for making special project grants or providing teacher-training grants in accordance with this section.

Subsection (b) authorized the Commissioner to make grants to local education agencies or other public or private nonprofit agencies, including educational television stations, for special projects—

(1) involving the use of innovative methods, systems, materials, or programs of national significance or of special value in promoting effective programs under this title;

(2) involving programs of adult education, carried out in cooperation with other Federal, federally assisted, State, or local programs which have unusual promise in promoting a comprehensive or coordinated approach to the problems of persons with basic educational deficiencies.

A non-Federal contribution of at least 10 percent of the costs of projects under this subsection (b) would be required, wherever feasible.

Subsection (c) authorizes the Commissioner to provide (directly or by contract), or to make grants to colleges or universities, State or local educational agencies, or other public or private nonprofit agencies, to provide training to persons engaged as, or preparing to become, personnel to carry out adult education programs. Stipends and allowances would be authorized for persons undertaking such training and their dependents.

Section 310 provided that the President shall, within 90 days of enactment, appoint a National Advisory Committee on Adult Basic Education which shall consist of the Commissioner of Education as Chairman and seven other members, including persons knowledgeable in the field of adult education, State and local public school officials, and other persons having special knowledge or experience or qualifications with respect to adult basic education, in addition to representatives of the general public.

The Advisory Committee would review, and make recommendations with respect to, the administration and effectiveness of the adult basic education programs and related federally supported adult education programs. The Committee would make annual reports to the President, including recommendations for changes in this title and other Federal laws relating to adult education. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall coordinate the work of this Committee with related advisory committees.

Section 311 contains the standard provisions regarding delegations of authority and contracting for services.

Section 312(a) provided that nothing contained in this title shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system, or over the selection of library resources, textbooks, or other printed or published instructional materials by any educational institution or school system.

Subsection (b) authorized the National Advisory Committee on Adult Basic Education to encourage the establishment of State and local adult education advisory committees in order to improve reporting of State and local administration of titles under this title.

Section 313 provided that no grant may be made under this title for any educational program, activity, or service related to sectarian instruction or religious worship, or provided by a school or department of divinity. For purposes of this section, the term "school or department of divinity" means an institution or a department or branch of an institution whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation, or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

Section 314 authorized appropriations of $40,000,000 for fiscal year 1967, and $60,000,000 for fiscal year 1968, for the purposes of this title.

Section 315 repeals part B of title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

The conference substitute adopts this title of the Senate amendment.

ADAM C. POWELL,
CARL D. PERKINS,
JOHN BRADEMAS,
RALPH J. SCOTT,
HUGH CAREY,
WILLIAM D. FORD,
LLOYD MEEDS,
JAMES SCHEUER,
WM. AYRES,
ALBERT QUIE,
CHARLES GOODELL,
ALPHONZO BELL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] is recognized.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the House conferees in bringing to the floor today a compromise proposal on H.R. 13161 present to the Members an excellent opportunity to substantially strengthen educational opportunities throughout the Nation. The funds authorized by this legislation are very close to that authorized by the legislation as it passed the House on October 6.

In carrying on our program of impact aid and in continuing the various programs authorized in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the following amounts are authorized for fiscal year 1967 and fiscal year 1968:

Conference amounts

	Fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1968
Title I	$1,433,588,000	$1,878,834,000
Title II	128,750,000	154,500,000
Title III	180,250,000	515,000,000
Title V	30,000,000	50,000,000
Adult basic education	40,000,000	60,000,000
Education of handicapped	50,000,000	150,000,000
Dissemination of information	1,500,000	2,000,000
Public Law 874	451,400,000	480,000,000
Public Law 815	58,000,000	25,900,000
Total	2,373,488,000	3,316,234,000

Estimated State grants under Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1966, title I, as reported (conference committee), fiscal years 1967 and 1968

	Fiscal year 1967 [1]	Fiscal year 1968 [2]
United States and outlying areas	$1,433,589,014	$2,291,404,689
50 States and District of Columbia	1,393,010,529	2,225,841,283
Alabama	36,686,185	84,572,439
Alaska	2,418,615	3,361,685
Arizona	12,809,883	17,523,573
Arkansas	21,735,899	52,673,675
California	119,234,586	125,894,253
Colorado	12,798,828	17,373,630
Connecticut	12,420,861	15,056,472
Delaware	2,874,306	4,019,764
Florida	36,826,323	67,220,509
Georgia	40,482,325	91,733,130
Hawaii	3,196,366	4,393,816
Idaho	3,272,539	6,496,009
Illinois	63,145,718	77,963,406
Indiana	22,313,456	34,292,395
Iowa	21,817,338	30,658,475
Kansas	13,000,512	19,415,641
Kentucky	32,067,084	68,467,075
Louisiana	$42,402,199	$75,814,643
Maine	4,503,139	9,639,406
Maryland	21,809,869	27,682,301
Massachusetts	23,268,579	29,849,796
Michigan	43,705,003	57,011,355
Minnesota	27,845,236	39,889,902
Mississippi	33,850,000	81,283,068
Missouri	32,427,315	50,840,770
Montana	4,739,420	7,094,077
Nebraska	7,783,258	15,637,597
Nevada	1,411,280	1,815,380
New Hampshire	1,983,857	3,448,908
New Jersey	35,019,249	41,182,395
New Mexico	11,291,037	16,081,712
New York	165,056,770	197,484,530
North Carolina	55,226,553	119,208,066
North Dakota	6,259,350	10,521,422
Ohio	47,575,121	66,965,517
Oklahoma	20,128,982	35,176,105
Oregon	10,941,642	14,494,766
Pennsylvania	66,652,756	88,288,217
Rhode Island	5,349,154	6,579,808
South Carolina	30,435,544	71,976,735
South Dakota	7,514,817	11,880,344
Tennessee	33,881,721	80,767,648
Texas	90,516,434	165,978,551
Utah	3,551,904	5,778,985
Vermont	2,180,334	4,020,945
Virginia	34,904,359	66,624,733
Washington	15,005,900	19,186,124
West Virginia	17,911,132	37,467,110
Wisconsin	21,259,915	32,689,560
Wyoming	2,254,741	3,189,306
District of Columbia	7,263,145	9,175,555
Outlying areas	40,578,485	65,563,406

See footnotes at end of table.

[1] Grants estimated on basis 5–17 population, low income factor $2,000 per annum (1959); AFDC 1965; estimated ADA handicapped children (June 30, 1966); estimated migratory children of migratory workers (FTE 1965); dependent and neglected children 5–17 in institutions (Apr. 1, 1960); children under 21 in foster homes under the auspices of public agencies (Apr. 1, 1960); juvenile delinquents 5–17 in training schools and detention homes (Apr. 1, 1960); and 50 percent State C.E.; per pupil in ADA, 1964–65 (except migratory children). 1960 data on children based on 25 percent sample. 3 percent of 50 States and the District of Columbia amounts added for the outlying areas (except migratory children).

[2] Grants estimated on basis of low-income factor $3,000 per annum (1959); 50 percent State or national average C.E. per pupil in ADA, 1964–65 (except migratory children); other factors as in footnote 1. It is estimated that the current expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance for 1965–66 will increase approximately 5 percent. This will increase the fiscal year 1968 amounts listed.

Estimated distribution of authorizations under Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1966, title II, as reported (conference committee), fiscal years 1967 and 1968—School library resources, etc.

	Fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1968
United States and outlying areas	$128,750,000	$180,250,000
50 States and District of Columbia	125,000,000	175,000,000
Alabama	2,210,204	3,094,286
Alaska	159,181	222,853
Arizona	1,047,021	1,465,829
Arkansas	1,186,651	1,661,312
California	12,012,064	16,816,889
Colorado	1,367,352	1,914,293
Connecticut	1,789,558	2,505,382
Delaware	331,395	463,953
Florida	3,372,718	4,721,805
Georgia	2,769,995	3,877,993
Hawaii	499,556	699,378
Idaho	469,919	657,887
Illinois	6,861,965	9,606,751
Indiana	3,253,302	4,554,623
Iowa	1,879,100	2,630,740
Kansas	1,442,628	2,019,679
Kentucky	1,955,944	2,738,322
Louisiana	2,459,448	3,443,227
Maine	668,643	936,101
Maryland	2,336,998	3,271,797
Massachusetts	$3,349,270	$4,688,978
Michigan	5,998,753	8,398,254
Minnesota	2,539,170	3,554,838
Mississippi	1,546,755	2,165,457
Missouri	2,946,895	4,125,653
Montana	485,419	679,587
Nebraska	877,775	1,368,885
Nevada	282,091	394,927
New Hampshire	428,956	600,539
New Jersey	4,137,934	5,793,108
New Mexico	761,337	1,065,872
New York	10,576,851	14,807,590
North Carolina	3,074,100	4,303,741
North Dakota	438,953	614,534
Ohio	6,926,629	9,697,280
Oklahoma	1,549,761	2,169,666
Oregon	1,243,595	1,741,032
Pennsylvania	7,330,210	10,262,292
Rhode Island	546,551	765,172
South Carolina	1,673,077	2,342,308
South Dakota	490,706	686,989
Tennessee	2,317,974	3,245,163
Texas	6,859,291	9,608,008
Utah	748,833	1,048,366
Vermont	$266,006	$372,408
Virginia	2,678,402	3,749,763
Washington	2,009,455	2,813,236
West Virginia	1,144,286	1,602,001
Wisconsin	2,928,634	4,100,088
Wyoming	231,665	324,331
District of Columbia	437,024	611,834
Outlying areas	3,750,000	5,250,000

NOTE.—Estimated distribution of authorized funds to the 50 States and District of Columbia on the basis of estimated total elementary and secondary school enrollment, fall 1965. 3 percent added for outlying areas.

Estimated distribution of authorizations under Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1966 (new) title III, as reported (conference committee), fiscal years 1967 and 1968—Adult education

	Fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1968
United States and outlying areas	$34,000,000	$51,000,000
50 States and District of Columbia	33,320,000	49,980,000
Alabama	1,073,241	1,609,861
Alaska	35,209	52,813
Arizona	271,803	407,704
Arkansas	587,158	880,737
California	1,996,331	2,994,497
Colorado	172,113	258,170
Connecticut	395,066	592,599
Delaware	61,655	92,482
Florida	1,037,849	1,556,774
Georgia	1,382,654	2,073,981
Hawaii	149,355	224,033
Idaho	51,536	77,305
Illinois	1,502,043	2,253,065
Indiana	517,519	776,279
Iowa	203,514	306,272
Kansas	177,329	265,994
Kentucky	894,779	1,342,168
Louisiana	1,287,725	1,931,587
Maine	101,679	152,518
Maryland	569,328	853,993
Massachusetts	717,740	1,076,610
Michigan	984,626	1,476,938
Minnesota	287,384	431,076
Mississippi	807,578	1,211,367
Missouri	709,416	1,064,124
Montana	62,625	93,937
Nebraska	119,139	178,709
Nevada	23,269	34,904
New Hampshire	58,550	87,825
New Jersey	1,056,608	1,584,912
New Mexico	208,861	313,292
New York	3,142,383	4,713,574
North Carolina	1,541,123	2,311,685
North Dakota	75,906	113,859
Ohio	1,223,503	1,835,254
Oklahoma	422,718	634,076
Oregon	138,711	208,067
Pennsylvania	1,830,906	2,746,359
Rhode Island	141,517	212,275
South Carolina	925,210	1,387,815
South Dakota	63,740	95,610
Tennessee	1,117,046	1,675,569
Texas	2,655,785	3,983,678

Estimated distribution of authorizations under Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1966 (new) title III, as reported (conference committee), fiscal years 1697 and 1968—Adult education—Continued

	Fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1968
Utah	$50,973	$76,459
Vermont	34,520	51,780
Virginia	1,140,446	1,710,669
Washington	227,417	341,125
West Virginia	349,138	658,708
Wisconsin	489,258	733,886
Wyoming	27,187	40,780
District of Columbia	128,831	193,246
Outlying areas	680,000	1,020,000

NOTE.—Distribution of authorized funds with 15 percent reserved for special grants, 2 percent of the balance reserved for the outlying areas, and the remainder distributed on the basis of those 18 and over with less than 6 grades of school completed (Apr. 1, 1960).

Estimated distribution of authorizations under Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1966, title V, as reported (conference committee), fiscal years 1967 and 1968—Strengthening State departments of education

	Fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1968
U.S. and outlying areas	$25,500,000	$42,500,000
50 States and District of Columbia	24,990,000	41,650,000
Alabama	492,529	821,313
Alaska	128,189	151,800
Arizona	276,352	424,065
Arkansas	312,962	491,341
California	2,111,489	3,796,325
Colorado	329,742	522,176
Connecticut	371,281	598,508
Delaware	151,140	193,975
Florida	676,064	1,158,579
Georgia	597,957	1,015,050
Hawaii	176,552	240,672
Idaho	181,977	250,642
Illinois	1,085,303	1,910,600
Indiana	630,823	1,075,445
Iowa	395,143	642,357
Kansas	339,263	539,672
Kentucky	413,874	676,778
Louisiana	478,790	796,068
Maine	205,014	292,974
Maryland	459,938	761,425
Massachusetts	581,634	985,054
Michigan	1,032,119	1,812,868
Minnesota	481,440	800,938
Mississippi	375,921	607,034
Missouri	555,134	936,357
Montana	178,706	244,631
Nebraska	250,435	376,440
Nevada	150,005	191,890
New Hampshire	160,815	211,754
New Jersey	706,939	1,215,315
New Mexico	226,343	332,169
New York	1,605,948	2,867,339
North Carolina	657,647	1,124,736
North Dakota	170,261	229,112
Ohio	1,171,398	2,068,807
Oklahoma	375,674	606,580
Oregon	311,686	488,996
Pennsylvania	1,133,510	1,999,184
Rhode Island	172,918	233,995
South Carolina	401,105	653,313
South Dakota	178,173	243,651
Tennessee	511,547	856,262
Texas	1,288,082	2,283,227
Utah	235,171	348,391
Vermont	139,764	173,071
Virginia	565,410	955,240
Washington	441,414	727,385
West Virginia	302,255	471,665
Wisconsin	505,460	845,077
Wyoming	140,734	174,853
District of Columbia	167,970	224,901
Outlying areas	510,000	850,000

Estimated distribution of authorized funds, with 15% reserve for grants, 2% of the balance reserved for the outlying areas, and the remainder distributed on the basis of the Fall 1965 public school enrollment.

Estimated distribution of authorizations under Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1966 (new) title VI, as reported (conference committee), fiscal years 1967 and 1968—Education of handicapped children

	Fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1968
United States and outlying areas	$51,500,000	$154,500,000
50 States and District of Columbia	50,000,000	150,000,000
Alabama	1,013,846	3,041,538
Alaska	70,595	211,784
Arizona	399,051	1,197,153
Arkansas	528,800	1,586,399
California	4,256,927	12,770,783
Colorado	506,469	1,519,407
Connecticut	655,972	1,967,917
Delaware	123,598	370,794
Florida	1,307,185	3,921,555
Georgia	1,211,667	3,635,000
Hawaii	200,669	602,008
Idaho	207,699	623,098
Illinois	2,643,478	7,930,433
Indiana	1,323,111	3,969,332
Iowa	768,576	2,305,728
Kansas	601,305	1,803,915
Kentucky	905,442	2,716,326
Louisiana	1,013,483	3,040,450
Maine	278,365	820,094
Maryland	876,860	2,630,581
Massachusetts	1,332,991	3,998,972
Michigan	2,252,542	6,757,626
Minnesota	981,185	2,943,555
Mississippi	709,644	2,128,932
Missouri	1,139,500	3,418,499
Montana	199,379	598,136
Nebraska	386,092	1,158,275
Nevada	76,210	228,631
New Hampshire	165,013	495,039
New Jersey	1,539,022	4,617,067
New Mexico	312,275	936,826
New York	4,139,217	12,417,653
North Carolina	1,429,603	4,288,809
North Dakota	193,795	581,384
Ohio	2,698,583	8,095,750
Oklahoma	651,453	1,954,358
Oregon	495,460	1,486,381
Pennsylvania	2,968,753	8,906,260
Rhode Island	226,720	680,161
South Carolina	796,873	2,390,618
South Dakota	201,654	604,961
Tennessee	1,052,066	3,156,199
Texas	2,838,837	8,516,511
Utah	294,043	882,128
Vermont	112,463	337,388
Virginia	1,172,327	3,516,981
Washington	802,488	2,407,463
West Virginia	557,631	1,672,894
Wisconsin	1,110,449	3,331,346
Wyoming	97,381	292,144
District of Columbia	178,253	534,758
Outlying areas	1,500,000	4,500,000

NOTE.—Estimated distribution of authorized funds to the 50 States and the District of Columbia on the basis of 3-21 population, Apr. 1, 1960. 3 percent added for outlying areas.

Mr. Speaker, in most respects the legislation follows very closely, if not exactly, the provisions of the bill that passed the House on October 6. Two significant additions were made to the bill which were in the Senate bill but not in the House bill. The first concerns the adult basic education program. Presently, authority for this program is vested in the Office of Economic Opportunity as a result of title II(B) of the Economic Opportunities Act of 1964. The Senate provision accepted by the conferees would repeal title II(B) of the Economic Opportunities Act and initiate a new program of adult basic education in the U.S. Office of Education with appropriation authorizations for fiscal year 1967 of $40 million and fiscal year 1968 of $60 million.

The other major addition is with respect to the establishment of a special program to strengthen educational opportunities for the handicapped, this term including the mentally retarded, the hard of hearing, the deaf, the speech impaired, the visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, crippled, or other health impaired children who require special education. This program is a logical extension and expansion of the Federal assistance extended to the institutions for such children which was enacted into law during the 1st session of the 89th Congress, Public Law 89-313. The provisions of that legislation, however, did not purport to provide grants to local educational agencies to assist in fashioning special programs on the local level which would be available to handicapped children who need such services in a day school as distinguished from a residential institution type program. Many, in fact, the great majority of handicapped children are not institutionalized but reside in their homes.

I think this addition to the legislation is a much needed one and while I am greatly persuaded by arguments that much more needs to be done in this particular field of special education, I do not think that it is wise to initiate the program now and during the next session of the Congress to elaborately pursue the entire problem in hearings. In this connection, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York, Mr. HUGH CAREY, has done an outstanding job in conducting special hearings which appear to point the way to a more substantial program of Federal assistance to States and local communities in the education of children with the handicaps which are covered by the present amendment. The leadership of the gentleman from New York has been extremely helpful in our being able to bring you today a program for the education of handicapped children upon which the Congress may more effectively build in future sessions.

I would like at this time to commend my distinguished colleagues, the gentlemen from California [Mr. BELL], who served on the subcommittee and was one of the conferees, and [Mr. BURTON], who persisted and succeeded in their efforts to secure the benefits of impact aid for grades 13 and 14 for the authorized life of this legislative program. Mr. BURTON was also active in securing amendments to the legislation which would assure that the most recent and accurate data was used in computing AFDC children to be used in the formula for making title I payments to local school agencies.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the conferees have done a remarkable job in bringing to a successful conclusion a thorough review of education programs on the elementary and secondary level which started with hearings in March of this year by the General Subcommittee on Education.

Before concluding, there are several matters of importance to the legislative history which remain to be stressed at this point that have not been touched upon in any of the House and Senate reports but in which, nevertheless, the House and Senate conferees are in unanimous agreement. These are:

First. That in authorizing the establishment of a Bureau for the Physically Handicapped in the U.S. Office of Education the conferees by no means wish to establish any sort of precedent for future creation of other administrative units for special purposes.

Second. That it is absolutely essential that special attention be given in the administration of educational programs for the handicapped in private institutions so that services and program benefits can be provided on the private premises. The special needs of the handicapped child, unlike the special needs of other educationally deprived youngsters—for which programs have been provided in title II, Public Law 874—often to be effective must be provided on the private premises, for to require the transportation of such children to public premises for the purpose of special program participation would quite often result in denying them the appropriate benefits of the special programs.

Third. In connection with the adoption of the Senate provisions dealing with the inclusion of the adult basic education program in the act, the managers on the part of the House were unanimous in their insistence that the major thrust of the program should be directed toward the needs of persons who had no or only a few years of formal education.

Fourth. The conferees were also concerned that appropriate steps would be taken to reallocate funds appropriated pursuant to the authorizations contained in H.R. 13161 for the adult basic education program to reimburse the Office of Economic Opportunity for advancements made to adult basic education programs funded for fiscal year 1967.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, section 182 of the conference report, as worked out in conference, will achieve those objectives which those of us who supported the Fountain amendment sought when it was in the House of Representatives on October 6. This objective is to preclude the abuse of the power to defer action on applications to such an extent that it would amount to a denial of assistance without appropriate provision for a hearing. At the same time it gives effect to those provisions of the Civil Rights Act which require the Commissioner to attempt to achieve compliance by voluntary means before invoking the harsh penalties of title VI of the Civil Rights Act in denying a local agency Federal funds for the support of its programs.

The proposed compromise presented in conference which the House managers present to you today was a bipartisan proposal of the Senate conferees. The Fountain amendment, as recommended in conference, meets the main objective of the original proposal that deferral should not be permitted to be abused or used as a substitute for the denial of an application. It does this by securing in the law provision for a prompt hearing. As the legislative history establishes in the Senate, so it is our intention to establish such history in the House clarifying for those who may yet have some doubt about the provision, the precise compromise of this is:

If the Commissioner wishes to defer payments, he must offer to hold a hearing within 60 days of issuance of his notice of deferral. It was the intention of the conferees that a notice of deferral, if any, be issued expeditiously after the application of the local educational agency is received. If the local agency wants a hearing, the hearing must be concluded within those 60 days, unless the local agency consents to an extension. And the deferral may not continue for more than 30 days after the close of the hearing, the hearing examiner being required to issue his decision within that time. In any case, the deferral must terminate not later than 90 days after issuance of notice of a deferral unless the Commissioner's position is sustained, in which case the regular procedures of the Civil Rights Act would continue to apply.

Let me return to the new program for handicapped children. In the last session of the Congress, we passed Public Law 89-313 which took care of handicapped children in institutionalized programs. But we did not provide any support for education programs for the handicapped children who were in homes and had no access to special training they needed on a day program basis.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] has been for some time conducting hearings on this subject and is the author of legislation on the House side. He is not only an ardent advocate of more attention to this area of need but an authority on the subject. His active participation as a conferee has enabled us to include a start on this program this year with real hope of effective improvement next year.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I would merely like to point out that there are ongoing now various studies under a task force which was initiated at the suggestion of the administration in order to do an overview of all our programs in the field of the handicapped.

Our committee by reason of our hearings and findings are well aware that we are spending nearly $800 million in this field, yet we do not have a true national policy on education and training for the handicapped.

We feel that this amendment to the bill will do a great deal toward the creation of a national policy in this field in the preparation of study plans under a bureau in the Office of Education. For the first time we will pull together all the things we are doing and do them better. In the bill we authorize in the first year of the program $50 million for the planning, study, preparation, and distribution of funds in the training of handicapped children.

I would emphasize that as good as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has been, handicapped children have not had adequate participation because the funds have not been available to local school boards due to the high cost of special education programs in this field.

I think it is a fine forward step in the conference report, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, returning now to other matters, in section 182 of the conference report, as worked out in conference, we made a modification to the Fountain amendment. When it passed this body the objective was to meet the problem of abuse in the time taken to handle applications which in case of extreme delay would amount to a denial of assistance without appropriate provision for a hearing.

At the same time, the report gives effect to those provisions of the Civil Rights Act which require the Commissioner to attempt to achieve compliance by voluntary means before invoking the harsh penalties of title VI of the Civil Rights Act.

The Senate did not have any such provision to meet this problem. The modification that the conference agreed to, we believe, is reasonable and workable. It merely provides, if Members will look on page 20 of the report, section 182:

> SEC. 182. The Commissioner of Education shall not defer action or order action deferred on any application by a local educational agency for funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act, by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, by the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress), by the Act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress), or by the Cooperative Research Act, on the basis of alleged noncompliance with the provisions of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 for more than sixty days after notice is given to such local agency of such deferral unless such local agency is given the opportunity for a hearing as provided in section 602 of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, such hearing to be held within sixty days of such notice, unless the time for such hearing is extended by mutual consent of such local agency and the Commissioner, and such deferral shall not continue for more than thirty days after the close of any such hearing unless there has been an express finding on the record of such hearing that such local educational agency has failed to comply with the provisions of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Mr. Speaker, it was our intention, and it was the intention of the conferees on the part of the Senate and on the part of this body that no deferral should be for a longer period than 90 days, 60 days to give notice to complete the hearing and the remaining 30 days for a determination to be made. If an unfavorable or adverse determination was made to the local educational agency then, of course, the deferral would be for a longer period of time. Otherwise it would be no longer than 90 days.

I tried to make that as clear as I could, because yesterday the Senate in their language, I feel, made that point very clear. I would like to read what Senator JAVITS, who offered this amendment in the conference, stated:

> If the Commissioner wishes to defer payments, he must offer to hold a hearing within 60 days of the issuance of his notice of

> deferral. It was the intention of the conferees that a notice of deferral, if any, be issued expeditiously after the application of the local educational agency is received. If the local agency wants a hearing, the hearing must be concluded within those 60 days—

And that is what we envisage, that the hearing must be concluded within those 60 days, unless the local educational agency consents to an extension.

> And the deferral may not continue for more than 30 days after the close of the hearing, the hearing examiner being required to issue his decision within that time.

So I believe, Mr. Speaker, the modification to the Fountain amendment is reasonable. There is a definite limitation placed on the authority of the Commissioner of Education from what he is exercising at the present time.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the conference report should be approved.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. ABBITT. This deals with the so-called Fountain amendment?

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ABBITT. Which, in effect, provided that the House prohibited the Commissioner from deferring action or ordering action deferred on any application by local educational agencies for funds authorized to be appropriated on the basis of alleged noncompliance with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 unless and until there had been a hearing and a finding on the record and so forth.

Mr. PERKINS. That is what the Fountain amendment provided.

Mr. ABBITT. I congratulate the gentleman from North Carolina for presenting the amendment. As I understand it, the House adopted it overwhelmingly, almost two to one.

I should like to read a short article which appeared in a Richmond newspaper today, which puts an entirely different light on it from that as explained by the gentleman from Kentucky. This demonstrates, if the gentleman is correct—and I know he is—the misinformation which frequently is sent back home by some of the press in Washington.

This is from the Richmond Times-Dispatch of Thursday, October 20, 1966:

> School Bill—The Senate-passed education bill, besides providing funds to continue the grade and high school aid program, also contains a provision giving the Commissioner of Education specific authority to defer granting of funds to segregated schools but putting limits on the length of the deferral.

As I understand it, the Commissioner either already had the authority or usurped the authority to defer, even on accusation, and the Fountain amendment was intended to curb the authority and power of Commissioner Howe, and it did do that. What the conferees have done is to more or less modify the Fountain amendment, not giving the Commissioner any further authority but actually taking away authority he now has, but not quite as stringently as the Fountain amendment.

I feel that we have made a real step toward clipping the wings of and cutting down on the power usurped by Howe, Commissioner of Education, by inserting in the bill the specific proviso prohibiting him from arbitrarily withholding funds because of alleged violations of title VI of the Civil Rights Act. Heretofore Commissioner Howe and his cohorts have arbitrarily withheld funds and demanded, coerced, and almost blackjacked school officials into further steps toward integrating the schools.

In my opinion, no one should be Commissioner of Education unless their overriding desire and interest is the education of our young people. I am convinced that Commissioner Howe does not have as his main interest the education of our youth and for that reason I am still firmly of the opinion that he should either resign or be fired, as it is not in the best interest of our young people to have him as head of the important Office of Education. We need a real educator who is dedicated to educating the youth of America as head of this important office.

I have pointed out to the Members of the House that the action of the House in approving the guidelines amendment when it had the education bill before it last week was a real slap at Commissioner Howe in the manner he has been administering his office. It was intended in no uncertain terms to let the Commissioner and his cohorts know that he was not carrying out the mandate of the Congress; that he was exceeding his authority and that he was usurping power that was never given him by the Congress. The article mentioned earlier is as follows:

> [From the Richmond Times-Dispatch, Oct. 20, 1966]
>
> School Bill—The Senate-passed education bill, besides providing funds to continue the grade and high school aid program, also contains a provision giving the Commissioner of Education specific authority to defer granting of funds to segregated schools but putting limits on the length of the deferral.
>
> The final authorization figure in the legislation is about $1.7 billion more than President Johnson asked.
>
> It continues for the present fiscal year, 1967, and for 1968 the landmark federal aid to education enacted last year to improve schooling for children of poor families. The bill now goes to the House for final action.

Mr. PERKINS. I say to the gentleman that the guidelines resulted because of confusion in trying to voluntarily comply with title VI of the Civil Rights Act, and the needs and wishes of local educational agencies to a great degree were responsible for those guidelines, in order to have orderly procedure, so they could go about desegregation in an orderly way and eliminate a lot of confusion.

Of course, the Justice Department later made recommendations.

To answer the gentleman's question, there is a limit on the authority in connection with the voluntary compliance. Here we provide a maximum period of 90 days unless an adverse finding is made by a referee.

Mr. ABBITT. As I understand it, under the present provisions, if the conference report is not adopted the Commissioner could withhold longer and could withhold his decision indefinitely without a hearing on the record. This would compel him to have a hearing on the record.

I have pointed out before the contention of those of us who supported the Fountain amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to the gentleman, since we are running short of time, the Senate was very adamant. Even though I did not vote for the Fountain amendment, I felt we should stand by the House, inasmuch as the vote was overwhelming, but the Senate was adamant on this point. They have acted first. There is no conference to whom to rerefer the matter now in existence. The conference report has to be voted up or down.

I want to say to my colleague from Virginia this amendment is reasonable. If the Commissioner has been exercising any arbitrary authority, then he is certainly curbed. There is a definite limitation of authority in that regard.

Mr. ABBITT. I want to say to my friend that is the very point I wanted to make.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. In order to make this clear, the understanding is that the Commissioner cannot defer any action prior to giving a notice.

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct.

Mr. QUIE. And after he gives prompt notice he must have a hearing and complete it.

Mr. PERKINS. Within 60 days.

Mr. QUIE. That is right. By mutual agreement they can extend it beyond that.

Mr. PERKINS. That is the only way they can extend it.

Mr. QUIE. But unless there is mutual agreement that extension cannot go beyond the 30 days additional. The findings of the hearing examiner are published at that time.

Mr. PERKINS. That is right. All told it amounts to 90 days.

Mr. QUIE. And it takes mutual agreement of both parties to go beyond 90 days.

Mr. PERKINS. That is right.

Mr. QUIE. The Fountain amendment, as adopted by the House, would not have permitted the Commissioner to defer action until after the hearing. Is that correct?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct.

Mr. QUIE. This new language does not take from or add to title VI of the Civil Rights Act?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct. In no wise does it modify title VI of the Civil Rights Act.

Mr. QUIE. So since it is not yet determined whether the Commissioner has the legal right to defer or not, this does not give him the right or take away that right. Is that correct?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct.

Mr. QUIE. It will have to be up to the court?

Mr. PERKINS. To make that finding.

Mr. QUIE. As to whether they did or not?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes.

Mr. QUIE. And there will be no continued deferment or removal of funds unless he finds that they do not comply with title VI of the Civil Rights Act?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct.

Mr. QUIE. Therefore, we do not by this language give authority to the Commission to defer action. He assumes he has this under title VI of the Civil Rights Act.

Mr. PERKINS. We do not. I know the gentleman has been disturbed, just as I have been, by all of these reports, but I do want to make it clear here in this body that it was the intention of the majority of the House conferees and the majority of the Senate conferees that the maximum period involved would be 90 days unless, by mutual agreement, with the local educational agency, for good reasons they went beyond that time.

Mr. QUIE. I will say to the gentleman from Kentucky that his answers concur with my understanding of the action that we took.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me on that point?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. The reason why I ask this question, Mr. Speaker, is when the 1964 Civil Rights Act was before the House and title VI was before the House I offered an amendment at that time requiring hearings. As now appears in the law, it reads:

> Compliance with any requirement adopted pursuant to this section may be effected (1) by determination or refusal to grant or continue assistance—

Which in my opinion means deferral—

> under such program or activity to any recipient in which he has made an express finding on the record—

And this is what was added as an amendment—

> after opportunity for hearing on a failure to comply with the requirements of title VI.

Now, in offering that amendment and in reading the title, I do not know how anyone can come to a conclusion, including Mr. Howe, that he had authority to defer, because it specifically says that he has no right to do so without a hearing as title VI was amended. I understand what the conference committee intended to do, and I hope it did it. The purpose of my interrogation is to find out, did it do it? I read yesterday in the press, in the Washington Post, a statement by one of the conferees, the distinguished Senator from Iowa, who said this—and this is his interpretation of the compromise:

> The bill was strengthened by restricting the Commissioner's power to defer aid to desegregated school districts under set rules and time restrictions.

His interpretation was that if any question should arise under title VI, now in existence, about which I have a question and about which others have questions, this in effect legislates his right to do so for 60 days, and 30 days thereafter, and during the last 30 days the hearing would be held.

Would the gentleman from Kentucky please discuss that situation?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I believe the difference of viewpoint arises from applications for Federal aid under new legislation where the Secretary has been endeavoring to carry out the Civil Rights Act through voluntary compliance.

Now, Mr. Speaker, no funds can be withheld in the case of on-going programs for which the local agency has been receiving funds, unless a hearing has been held. I believe that is in accordance with the amendment which was offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] and which the gentleman put in the law at that time.

But, here, we are solely dealing with a new application where the local school districts have not been receiving funds and seek for the first time Federal money to start a new program. This is the only instance in which deferral is involved and where there has been use made of it to obtain voluntary compliance with the Civil Rights Act. If you look at the record of all the Southern States it presents a remarkable picture of voluntary compliance.

Mr. CRAMER. Yes; it does.

Mr. PERKINS. And, on occasion I feel as if we are making a mountain out of a molehill. However, I recognize that there may have been some cases which involve injustice. There may have been some "eager beavers" who have gone overboard and who have been over zealous and abused authority. But, by and large, the voluntary compliance program has worked well in the Office of Education and in this instance it would seem to me that this amendment would apply to the withholding of funds and in those instances there must be a hearing thereon.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed here by the gentleman's reply to what I thought was the question of the gentleman from Florida.

As I understood the question of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], it was this:

By this action on the part of the conferees and the action which they have taken, the distinguished Senator from the State of Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has interpreted this action to mean that you have actually strengthened the position of the Commissioner of Education and have legislated him authority to withhold the funds for at least a period of 90 days; is that not correct, I will say to the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that is correct and that is the way I understand it.

Mr. LANDRUM. That is the way I understood the gentleman's response.

Mr. CRAMER. And he commended it as a good conference report. However, in view of the Fountain amendment which was adopted by the House of Representatives there would be no deferral until a hearing. However, this says that there shall be a deferral for at least 60 or 90 days, with a hearing to be held during some period of that time.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, if the Commissioner of Education deferred for a period of 9 months, that would destroy the allocation for that local school district and that local operation.

However, we are here talking about a restriction on any authority to defer action to limit such for a period of 90 days.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, if I may make my position clear, does the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] disagree with the interpretation placed upon this conference report that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has stated to be the case?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what particular statement of the Senator from Oregon the gentleman from Georgia has in mind——

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Kentucky yield further so that the gentleman from Florida may read again the quote from Senator MORSE?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

However, Mr. Speaker, what I am talking about is what appeared in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and concerned the colloquy of the author of the conference amendment and the Senator from Oregon on the floor of the Senate which makes it very clear that no deferral can go beyond a 90-day period.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Kentucky yield further?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield further to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Senator MORSE said and was quoted in the press:

> The bill was strengthened by legislating the Commissioner power to defer aid to segregated districts under certain rules and time restrictions.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion this is the power which I say he will be improperly exercising, in the first place.

Mr. PERKINS. I feel certain that the gentleman from Florida does not want to rely upon hearsay evidence here on the floor of the House.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Kentucky will yield further, I would like to hear the gentleman say whether he does or does not agree with that statement.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I disagree with that newspaper report.

Mr. BELL. I think it is important again to stress the fact that there is a 60-day period within which hearings must be held and concluded, and then you have 30 days under which to make a decision. So there is actually only 60 days during which hearings must be held.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the gentleman from Kentucky earlier stated it correctly. We did not intend either to pass upon the question of whether Congress in title VI had granted the power to defer or not to defer. If the courts interpret title VI to give the Commissioner the power to defer, then we have put a maximum limit on the period in which he can defer.

I believe that is the net effect.

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct.

Mr. GOODELL. If the court's interpretation of title VI gave him such a power under any circumstances then the maximum period in which he can defer would be 60 days, during which period he must hold hearings, and make a final decision 30 days thereafter.

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. Then are we to understand that the distinguished gentleman from New York disagrees with the interpretation attributed to the Senator from Oregon by the newspaper? Is that right?

Mr. GOODELL. Yes.

Mr. LANDRUM. It is the opinion of the gentleman from New York that this conference report does not give authority?

Mr. GOODELL. I think it is absolutely necessary for the RECORD that we say unequivocally that we do disagree with the statement. I disagree with the statement. I do not believe that statement represents the intention of the conferees as it was reported in the newspaper, and read here in the RECORD.

I think the RECORD should be clear, as the gentleman from Kentucky and I just agreed, as to what we did.

Mr. LANDRUM. Then the gentleman is saying that this adds no new authority to withhold funds?

Mr. GOODELL. We are giving him no authority he does not already have under title VI.

If the courts interpret title VI to give him such authority then he has it. We are not taking that authority away. If the courts interpret that he does not have the authority this agreement in conference does not give him such authority. But if the courts interpret that the Commissioner has authority to defer for a period of time, we have put a maximum limit on the period in which he must make a decision.

Mr. PERKINS. The majority of the conferees agreed and that was their understanding when we signed the conference report.

Mr. GOODELL. Then the gentleman from Kentucky agrees with the interpretation I just stated.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I think that that will be a moot question if this exact language of the Fountain amendment is adopted, because it will then make no difference what the court may rule the authority of the Commissioner to be under title VI of the Civil Rights Act because this language will amend, no matter what they do, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and give to the Commissioner of Education authority, which the gentlemen say is in doubt, authority which I say he does not now have, which will give to him authority to withhold these funds for 90 days. Is that not correct?

Mr. PERKINS. I do not believe the gentleman's statement is clear.

I will say to the gentleman from Louisiana that if the courts were to hold that the Commissioner does have the authority, in that event only we have placed a limitation on that authority of a 90-day maximum period, and we have not modified title VI of the Civil Rights Act.

Mr. WAGGONNER. If the gentleman will yield further, if the courts do not rule that he has the authority by this language you have given him authority to withhold funds for 90 days.

Mr. PERKINS. If he does not have the authority, we do not give it to him by this legislation. We only place a limitation of 90 days, a maximum period, wherein he must conduct the hearing and make the finding. And of course if it were an adverse ruling to the local agency it would go beyond 90 days.

Mr. CRAMER. As I understand it, what is being suggested, you are giving him a 90-day grace period to assert authority that he does not have to start with, and he has satisfied now himself in assuming he has, which in my opinion he does not have, under title VI. We intentionally took such power away from him without a hearing in advance.

As the conference report is worded on page 20, section 182 specifically says, "on the basis of alleged noncompliance with the provisions of title VI" money is deferred. Then it can be deferred for 60 days. I can only interpret that as an amendment to title VI.

Mr. PERKINS. I would agree with that statement if the Commissioner of Education were seeking to withhold funds. But here we are trying to bring about voluntary compliance involving a new program under which a local agency has submitted an application for Federal funds. It appears to me that the Office of Education is trying to work to bring about voluntary compliance without instituting immediate proceedings to deny funds.

Under the Fountain provision as modified, if the Commissioner believes that the program does not comply with reasonable guidelines that have been agreed to in this new program, of course, the Commissioner must immediately give notice and conduct hearings within 60 days and make a determination within 30 days thereafter, but with a maximum of a 90-day period.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] is not able to be here during the consideration of this conference report and he has asked me to obtain unanimous consent that he be given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MADDEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 authorizes, under certain circumstances, the denial of Federal financial assistance because of racial or ethnic discrimination. Title VI specifically provides for the termination of or refusal to grant or to continue Federal assistance, but only if there has been an express finding on the record, after opportunity for hearing, of a failure to comply with title VI.

The procedural safeguards to prevent arbitrary denial of Federal funds without an express finding of noncompliance, after opportunity for a hearing, were included in title VI because many Members of Congress were sincerely and deeply concerned that administrative officials might otherwise use title VI to arbitrarily and unjustifiably deny Federal funds.

Despite the procedural safeguards of title VI, the Commissioner of Education has been denying Federal funds for new programs to local school districts which have not been found in noncompliance and have not even been offered an opportunity for a hearing at which to defend themselves against charges of noncompliance. The Commissioner contends he is not refusing to grant new funds to these school districts—which he admits he could not do without a hearing—but is only deferring action indefinitely on their applications. An indefinite deferral of action on an application for funds, of course, has exactly the same effect on the children for whom such funds are intended as a refusal to grant the funds would have.

Nothing in the language or legislative history of title VI authorizes the Commissioner of Education to deny Federal funds by deferring action on applications. Nevertheless, the Commissioner of Education claims he has such authority. And, while the legal authority of the Commissioner to deny Federal funds by deferral is extremely questionable, his control of the Federal purse strings obviously makes it possible for him to withhold funds in this manner without regard to his lack of legal authority unless and until he is stopped by the courts or the Congress.

The purpose of the amendment I offered during House consideration of H.R. 13161 was to make it unmistakably clear that the Commissioner of Education is required to observe the procedural safeguards of title VI and to prevent him from continuing to deny Federal funds without a hearing through deferral action. The 221-to-116 vote by which my amendment was adopted, and the fact that it was supported by Members from all sections of the country, clearly show that this House feels that the Commissioner of Education is exceeding his authority.

The language of my amendment was changed by the conferees. The language of the conference report will, if adopted, specifically prohibit the Commissioner from continuing his present practice of deferring action on applications for new funds indefinitely without either a hearing or a finding of noncompliance. In that respect, it is similar to my amendment.

However, my amendment would have specifically prohibited deferral for any length of time without a hearing or finding of noncompliance. The conference report prohibits deferral for more than 90 days without a finding a noncompliance, and provides that the Commissioner must grant a hearing to be held within 60 days.

While not as strong as my own amendment, the language approved by the conferees will force the Commissioner of Education to drastically change his present practice of indefinitely deferring action on applications.

Neither the language nor the legislative history of the amendment approved by the conferees can be construed as granting any additional authority to the Commissioner. The statements made during debate by the House conferees make this very clear.

I do not believe the Commissioner of Education has legal authority to withhold funds through deferral action. But that is a question for the courts to decide. If he does not already have deferral authority, the conference report will not give it to him. However, it will limit the practice he is presently following and, if the courts should decide that the Commissioner had such authority before adoption of the conference report, it will impose a limitation on any such authority.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, also the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] asked that I express to the House his commendation to the conferees in his understanding of the language in the action of the conference.

I want to say to the chairman, I think the position that the gentleman from New York is taking and the gentleman from Kentucky has taken certainly is in agreement with the understanding of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] that the action of the conferees does not grant the Commissioner of Education any authority that he does not now have or that he had before the adoption of the Fountain amendment of the language in the conference report. But it simply places a limitation upon the authority, if he does have it and a court later determines that he has it, and I believe the gentleman from North Carolina would disagree with the gentleman from Louisiana that the action does not give him any power that he did not have but rather places a limitation upon that power if it is later determined that he had the power to defer funds.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, let me say that I opposed the Fountain amendment and I certainly oppose this modification of the Fountain amendment.

This is another instance of whittling away title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, in my opinion.

Only 7½ percent of the Negro children in the South are in schools with white children. In spite of this, the Commissioner of Education has certified that 98 percent of the school districts are in compliance with the law.

I do not know what all the furor is all about. In my opinion, the Commissioner of Education has not gone far enough in carrying out the mandate of Congress.

I certainly hope that the action of the House today will not result in a further curb on his actions to effectuate compliance with the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York, I certainly hope the gentleman from New York does not vote against this conference report.

Remarkable progress is being made in the South in bringing about integration.

I hope you do not lose sight of the welfare of the child involved here which to my way of thinking should be the polar star which should guide us.

Mr. RYAN. I certainly hope the Commissioner of Education will not interpret the action of the House as placing any further restriction on the authority that the law gives to him and which we wrote into law in 1964. Our guiding star should always be the Constitution.

Mr. PERKINS. We only intended, and we so agreed, to a 90-day maximum deferral period.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the conferees on the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments Act of 1966 for work well done.

In all conferences there must be some give and take.

There is an old adage—if you want the rose, you must put up with the thorns. Those who would keep this Fountain amendment will have to put up with some thorns—but they are very slight thorns.

I think the work done by all conferees is worthy of real praise. I as the author of the Civil Rights Act of 1966, part VI, join forces with the conferees and ask that the conference report be agreed to.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the conference committee report including the amendment regulating deferral of funds pursuant to title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. I am convinced that this amendment offers a satisfactory procedure.

At the time the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] offered his amendment I urged its rejection and expressed a concern that the Commissioner of Education needed the power to defer in instances of clearcut noncompliance with title VI.

Under the proposal of the gentleman from North Carolina any consideration of discrimination by a local school district as a condition for extending financial assistance would be made impossible. The hearing and appeal process could be abused so as to indefinitely frustrate or negate the objectives of title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act which Congress overwhelmingly adopted.

As a matter of fact were it not for the language now adopted by the conference report, no effective regulations, no meaningful compliance with title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act could be required. And were it not for the language of the conference report the Federal Government would be unable to deny or defer school assistance to any who applied, be they those who deliberately refuse to desegregate, those who openly disobey court desegregation orders, or those who openly espouse school segregation as a public policy.

The procedures embodied in this amendment limit the period over which the Commissioner of Education can defer to a maximum period of 90 days unless there has been an express finding by the hearing examiner on the record after a hearing that the applicant has failed to comply with the provisions of title VI. During the first 60 days of this period notice of an opportunity for hearing must be given to the applicant and a hearing held unless waived. If the hearing results in a finding that the applicant is in compliance with title VI, the deferral will cease as soon as such finding is made which will in no case, without the applicant's consent, be more than 90 days after deferral has commenced. If a finding is made adverse to the applicant, deferral will continue; however, the applicant will have an opportunity to have the finding reviewed.

Although the Commissioner of Education will be required to restrict deferrals heretofore considered necessary, it is my understanding that he believes the elementary and secondary education program and the provisions of title IV can be harmonized within this amendment.

As I stated during the debate on the measure on the floor, I prefer that the long term objectives be considered in light of the Attorney General's guidelines and that the Commissioner of Education be free to operate within these guidelines which are designed to assure orderly procedures.

The amendment adopted by the conference committee affords strict safeguards protecting applicants against possible prolonged deferral without an opportunity for hearing. It meets the legitimate concerns of those who favored the proposal offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN]. Further protections are afforded by the fact that the Commissioner will remain subject to the Attorney General's procedural guidelines.

It will be important to see how these restrictions operate in practice and to see whether they meet the requirements of title VI while assuring the development of needed school facilities.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I would like to ask the gentleman a question on another aspect of the conference report. Will the gentleman tell the House how much the conference report authorized to be spent above the House bill?

Mr. PERKINS. I am delighted to give the gentleman the information.

Mr. JONAS. Is it in the neighborhood of $1.5 billion? Can you give us the total of the whole conference report?

Mr. PERKINS. The total authorized by the bill as given earlier in my remarks, a comparison between the House, Senate, and administration recommendations is as follows:

Authorizations—Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1966

[In millions of dollars]

	1966	Administration recommendations 1967	House committee 1967	Conference amounts	
				1967	1968
Title I	1,190	1,230.0	1,363.0	1,433.0	1,8789.0
Title II	100	105.0	105.0	128.0	154.0
Title III	100	150.0	150.0	180.0	525.0
Title V	25	22.0	30.0	30.0	50.0
Adult basic education				40.0	60.0
Education of handicapped				50.0	150.0
Dissemination of information				1.5	2.0
Public Law 874	388	183.4	450.5	451.4	480.0
Public Law 815	50.08	23.0	58.0	58.0	25.9
Total	1,853.08	1,713.4	2,156.5	2,371.9	3,324.9

Mr. JONAS. How much is that in excess of the amount authorized in the bill passed by the House?

Mr. PERKINS. About $200 million.

Mr. JONAS. Will the gentleman respond to one other question? How much does the conference report authorize in excess of the President's budget?

Mr. PERKINS. The big difference is in Public Law 874. That was cut more than half, in the recommendation of the Budget people, and we failed to go along with that recommendation. But we added handicapped, orphans, and delinquent children and some other categories that were not included in the budget, which, with little dissent, everyone in the committee recognized the need for and wanted to include.

Mr. JONAS. I understand. All I am trying to get in the Record is how much this bill, in total now, exceeds the President's budget.

Mr. PERKINS. The President's budget was about $1,600 million, but recommended authorizations were as it previously indicated—about $1.7 billion.

Mr. JONAS. And the amount authorized in the conference report?

Mr. PERKINS. $2,371 million.

Mr. JONAS. What is the difference?

Mr. PERKINS. About $700 million between budget and authorization.

Mr. JONAS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I signed this conference report and I support the action that the conferees took. I would have preferred the Fountain amendment as we originally passed it here in the House with an amendment suggested by Chairman Powell in conference. We now try to remedy the situation by legislative history. What I want to tell my colleagues about is the unhappiness I have today with the fact that the papers did not come back to the House first. They should have come back to the House first. That is the usual procedure, and because of the way the conference was taken up, the House is denied the opportunity of a motion to recommit.

Now we see an effort to write the record, really pressing as hard as we can to write legislative history to bring about an intent we want, which we felt the conferees had.

The language is ambiguous. If we had had the opportunity to send the conference report back to conference we could have written into law exactly what we mean, rather than write legislative history.

I wish to say for the Record that instructions evidently went to the House conferees from the Speaker's office as to how this could be handled. This says:

> The Senate requested the conference and the House agreed to it so under ordinary procedure the House would act on the conference report first, thus giving the minority an opportunity to offer a recommittal motion. If the objective is to eliminate the Fountain amendment in conference, this places the majority at a disadvantage because a recommittal motion with instructions to the House conferees to insist on the Fountain amendment would undoubtedly be approved by the House. Therefore, the regular procedure should not be followed and the Senate should approve the conference report first. Then the House would only have the option of voting the conference report up or down. Under those circumstances the conference report would certainly be approved.
>
> While this is an unusual procedure, it can be done. The following is a quote from Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives, 87th Congress, 2d Session, H. Doc. No. 610, page 119:
>
> "The House agreeing to the conference messages the papers to the House asking conference. The managers on the part of the House asking the conference bring the papers to the conference room. As the close of an effective conference the papers change hands and the managers on the part of the House agreeing to the conference receive them and take them to their House, which first receives and considers the conference report (V. 6254; VIII, 3330).
>
> "But if the managers on the part of the House agreeing to the conference fail to take possession of the papers, by agreement or otherwise, from the managers on the part of the House asking conference then report may be received first by that House (VIII, 3330)."
>
> In a similar situation in 1961 on S. 1, the ARA bill, the Senate asked for the conference and therefore, under ordinary procedures, the House should have acted first. However, at the conclusion of the conference Senator Douglas, the Senate manager, refused to surrender the papers, took the conference report back to the Senate, and the Senate approved it. The final House Calendar for the 87th Congress states on bill S. 1 (page 9) that "the House acts first", but shows in fact the Senate acted on April 20 and the House did not act until April 26.
>
> Also, in 1965, on the Public Works Authorization bill, S. 2300, the Senate asked for the conference and therefore the House should have acted first, but the conference report was approved first by the Senate on October 19 and then by the House on October 20.

I just want to indicate to my colleagues my unhappiness with this action. We can tell today that there is reasonableness on the part of the House. There was reasonableness when the Fountain amendment was drafted, which reiterated title VI of the Civil Rights Act. I believe the House can be trusted to use the usual procedure and to give the opportunity to the Members to act if they feel conferees did not come back with a proper decision.

In the future I expect to protest again if the usual procedure is not followed.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. ABBITT. I should like to point out to the gentleman that in the Record for yesterday, on page 27595, the Senator from Oregon, Mr. Morse, in presenting the conference report, said:

> Mr. President, it is my understanding and that of the Senate conferees that the compromise provision adopted by the conference was intended to limit the authority of the Commissioner to withhold funds.

And so forth.

I assume the Record states his position.

Further, I wish to say that I am very much opposed to the compromise. I am opposed to the bill with the compromise in it. I hope we can defeat the conference report.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, by way of conclusion, I do not agree with the gentleman. I believe we have written the legislative history, and this is an acceptable agreement. I hope the conference report will be adopted.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, at this stage in the proceedings I believe it is not the time for us to get into the full details which we debated in the House when we considered the legislation, and I will not take the full 5 minutes.

I point out that among other things this bill will fund title III in a total of $500 million authorization, and it will go into the second year on a variety of other programs.

Specifically in this year, in terms of the President's budget, titles I and III are about $335 million above the President's budget request. That is $335 million. If we consider the entire bill, by this action today we will go a half-billion dollars above the President's budget for this fiscal year. That is more than $500 million.

Under the procedures of the House we do not have an amendment or recommittal motion or instruction to conferees available to try to cut this to the President's budget figure. We did attempt to do that, as Members will recall, when the House considered this legislation. That was attempted in a recommittal motion.

Our choice is all the school districts operating under the present bill, proceeding with staff employees, anticipating this money is going to come to them, or having been induced to go into these programs by the Federal program—our choice is are we going to cut it all off in the middle of the school year with their school programs and tax assessments already determined? I do not believe we can take such an action. Therefore, as much as many of us regret the fact that this bill is far over the budget proposed by the President, I believe we are in a position where we must vote for the conference report in order to continue the programs that are planned and in operation by our various school boards across the country.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask the chairman of the subcommittee two questions, if I may.

First of all, from the previous discussion there is absolute agreement between the conferees on the House side and on the Senate side on the outside limit of 90 days for any deferral procedures, and the gentleman from Kentucky does agree with the statement of Senator JAVITS and Senator MORSE, two of the conferees, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for October 19, on pages 27594–27595?

Mr. PERKINS. That was our agreement arrived at in conference.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. I do not see where there is any confusion with respect to the understanding of the conferees.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Second, it has been called to my attention in some cases a school district has been required to submit a proposal under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to a community action program. I am well aware of the fact that the language says there shall be cooperation or coordination of programs. I think there is no disagreement on this objective. We would hope there would be the maximum coordination. But will the gentleman from Kentucky please clarify this point: Is there any authority, is there any language in title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which requires by law the submission of a plan by a school district under title I to a community action program for their approval?

Mr. PERKINS. There is no such language in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. There was a provision in the act 205(a)(6) as follows:

> The local educational agency will make an annual report and such other reports to the State educational agency, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the State educational agency to perform its duties under this title, including information relating to the educational achievement of students participating in programs carried out under this title, and will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the State educational agency may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports,

The purpose of that provision was to avoid duplication, but it was never intended to require a local educational agency to submit their plans, as such, their detailed plans, to the community action group, and we specifically provided in House Report No. 143, 89th Congress, that there was to be no project veto by such agencies.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Then, in any case where there has been a rule or regulation issued or a requirement by a regional officer, this is outside of the law?

Mr. PERKINS. That is outside of the law. The purpose of the law was to avoid and to prevent duplication and to coordinate, as my friend has so ably stated. It was never intended to give a community action group any veto power. In conference we deleted the language I have just quoted only to require coordination on the part of both parties in a new section 703(c). On this point the statement of the House managers reads:

> *Coordination with other comparable programs*
>
> The Senate amendment deletes provisions of section 205(a)(7) of Public Law 874 providing for development of projects in coordination with community action programs approved under title II of the Economic Opportunities Act. In lieu thereof the Senate amendment added a provision to renumbered section 703(c) to require the U.S. Commissioner of Education to coordinate with other Federal agencies and to require State and local authorities to coordinate the development and operation of such projects with other public and private programs.
>
> The conferees accepted the Senate amendment with the intent that nothing in the language adopted shall be construed to give any of such agencies a veto over the initiation of programs and projects by the local educational agency. Moreover it is expected by the conferees that the coordination requirements will be so employed as to provide no delay in the formulation and initiation of programs and projects. It is the expectation of the managers on the part of the House that the coordination required will prevent a duplication of programs.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I wonder, then, if I might ask the gentleman from Minnesota on the other side of the aisle if this is his understanding, that no school district at any time is required to submit a plan under title I to any other local group—community action program group or other school group—for their approval and in no case does any other group have a veto power.

Mr. QUIE. That is absolutely correct. The only thing intended by this legislation is that they can advise any other agencies of what is being done. Therefore, the word "cooperate" is in there. We changed it to "coordinate," but in no case can they require approval or can the other agency veto. The gentlewoman is correct.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. We should also stress in our discussions we felt the obligation to coordinate should be mutual. This is actually a question that is apparently in the present law. There is the word "cooperate." They should cooperate with the school districts and are required to submit their proposals to various outside groups, but they have no obligation to coordinate or inform the school districts of projects that obviously involve or are related to school activities.

It was our hope and intention here that there would be coordination on the part of all agencies involved, with no veto on the part of anyone.

I believe that was our intention, and I believe the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] will agree with that statement.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] I believe will agree that we made it mutual, and that was the language that we inserted in conference. It only required the local educational agency to follow certain guidelines, and we felt that there should be some requirements on the part of the community action group. In fact, we felt that it would bring about a better spirit of cooperation. And, that is the way the law now stands.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kentucky will agree that although we felt the problems should be mutual, there was a necessity to coordinate them among all of the agencies involved?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, is there anything in the report which calls for consolidation, besides cooperation? In other words, is there any obligation on the part of a local agency to consult with the outside groups?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes; we provide for that. That is the provision which has been added to the Elementary and Secondary Education bill, to consult with the community action groups.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for yielding. I realize the question I am about to ask has been asked and answered heretofore. However, I would like to ask it again for the purpose of reemphasis and that is this:

Can the new language now contained in the conference report be construed as granting any additional authority to the Commissioner of Education?

Mr. PERKINS. Again, permit me to repeat the statement that it was not the intention—and I do not see any way by which the language can be construed, as granting any additional authority to the Commissioner of Education in the modification of the Fountain amendment. In fact, if it occurred and if the court should say that the Commissioner has the right to make a deferral, the new language would amount to a limitation upon that authority.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished gentleman will yield further, is the Fountain amendment, as amended by the conference report, intended only to prevent the Commissioner from continuing his present practice of indefinitely deferring action upon fund applications?

Mr. PERKINS. Well, the Fountain amendment provides that there should not be any deferral, until after notice. Then a hearing and a finding must take place within the specified 90-day period. This is a modification of the Fountain amendment.

Mr. SELDEN. And, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Kentucky will yield further, is that modification designed or intended to prevent the Commissioner from continuing the practice of indefinitely deferring applications for funds?

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN], that if the gentleman will look at the record, the record even in the gentleman's home State of Alabama, the gentleman will find that out of 118 school districts, only 11, during the fiscal year 1966, were declared ineligible.

Now, I just feel, personally, that the Commissioner has endeavored to do the best he could in obtaining voluntary compliance.

I know that there have been a number of people down there in the Office of Education who have gone overboard, youngsters who have gone out, and law school students, who have gone out to the various local educational agencies and sometimes have given them an ultimatum. But by and large, the Commissioner has tried to bring about voluntary compliance, and in my judgment he has been very reasonable.

Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that the Commissioner intends to abuse any authority or to act arbitrarily. However, this is a limitation and it certainly will assist those school districts, if he, the Commissioner, did undertake to act arbitrarily in deferring local educational funds to which they are entitled, within that 90-day period, if the referee so finds that there has been reasonable compliance.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, as I understand the language of the original Fountain amendment, it forbids the Commissioner of Education from withholding or deferring Federal funds unless and until there has been an express finding, after an opportunity for a hearing, that a school system was practicing discrimination.

Under the language contained in the conference report, however, the Commissioner of Education will be allowed to defer funds up to 60 days prior to a hearing and an additional 30 days following a hearing.

It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that under the new language the Commissioner is being given statutory authority to defer funds prior to a hearing—even though the deferred time is limited.

This, I believe, is contrary to the intent of the House of Representatives in passing the Fountain amendment, and I intend to vote in opposition to the conference report.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that, contrary to my own interpretation, the legislative history will show that the House conferees do not construe the new language as granting additional authority to the Commissioner of Education but intend only by the new language to prevent the Commissioner of Education from continuing his present practice of indefinitely deferring action on applications for funds.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am getting confused, and it seems to me that the gentleman from Kentucky has given different answers to different people. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to page 27594 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and it appears to me that Senator JAVITS said:

> But this compromise also meets the main objectives of those who objected to the House provision—

The House version meaning no deferral without hearings preceding the deferral.

He goes on to say further—

> that during the pendency of such a hearing, which must be expedited, deferral may continue, so that the Commissioner shall not be at the mercy of those in the local agency who may wish to delay the hearing for ulterior purposes.

So it appears to me that those who agreed to the compromise in the other body did so because they thought it had the deferral period which they wanted, only requiring that a hearing during that period take place.

My objection to the conference agreement is that I think it legalizes for a period of 60 days with hearings and 30 days for making a decision, which I felt and still believe title VI did not permit in the first place under the 1964 act, and I believe this interpretation is concurred in by Senator JAVITS and Senator MORSE.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the gentlewoman if the gentleman from Kentucky will yield for that purpose.

Mr. PERKINS. Yes, I will yield.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. May I review the Fountain amendment? I supported the Fountain amendment. It seemed to me there is evidence that arbitrary power was being exercised that was not provided for either in the education bill or in the Civil Rights Act.

The purpose of the Fountain amendment was to prevent the Office of Education from deferring funds for a long period of time without the opportunity for a hearing as provided in the Civil Rights Act. This was the intent.

If the hearing was held and refusal to comply was shown, then the funds should be withheld as the law provides. We have no intention of changing this in any way.

In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, the language which was agreed to by the conferees accomplishes three things. And I think it accomplishes everything that the Fountain amendment sought to accomplish without changing the Civil Rights Act in any way.

If you will turn to the same page from which the gentleman from Florida was quoting, it says this in the second column—and this is upon an agreement by Senator JAVITS and Senator MORSE representing the Senate conferees.

It says:

> It was the intention of the conferees that a notice of deferral, if any, be issued expeditiously after the application of the local educational agency is received. If the local agency wants a hearing, the hearing must be concluded within those 60 days, unless the local agency agrees, because it wishes a more extended hearing, to an extension. And the deferral may not continue for more than 30 days after the close of the hearing, the hearing examiner being required to issue his decision within that time. In any case, the deferral must terminate not later than 90 days after issuance of notice of a deferral unless the Commissioner's position is sustained, in which case other provisions of law take over.

So, I suggest that three things have been accomplished:

First, there has been an agreement that there shall be no delay. The Office of Education cannot just arbitrarily sit on an application for new funds and delay it for weeks or months. And in my judgment if they defer action for that long a period of time they have in fact "withheld the funds" for that school year. I believe this is in violation of the Civil Rights Act if funds are withheld without a hearing.

So we first said there shall be no delay. Second, we said the school district shall be given a hearing if there is to be a deferral of action. The absence of a hearing is what the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] objected to. It is what I objected to. They have deferred action on applications and not given an opportunity for a hearing, as I believe is required by the Civil Rights Act.

Third, it says that if there is any notice of deferral that such deferral must terminate not later than 90 days after the issuance of the original notice of intent to defer.

Now I would suggest we are really accomplishing our purpose on deferral of action on new funds by speeding up the hearing and decision process.

To summarize we are saying to the Office of Education—if you are going to defer action on applications for new funds, you must give that school district an opportunity for a hearing and you must reach a decision on the record within 90 days from the time of original intent to defer.

We have simply limited the power now being exercised.

Mr. CRAMER. I understand the gentlewoman and the comments she has made.

If you assume the commissioner is properly exercising his restrictive authorities under title VI by deferring action, then I would concur in what the gentlewoman says. But, it is my opinion, he is illegally acting in deferring funds on new requests under title VI of the act. It is my further point, that as it passed the House, the Fountain amendment prohibited any such deferral consistent with title VI until hearings were held.

Now we are saying in conference, well it is all right to defer for 90 days with a hearing.

I say that is contrary to title VI which I believe he had no authority to defer without a hearing in advance and it seems to be legalizing for 90 days what I thought was illegal under title VI in the first place.

If he is in fact usurping his authority, and that is conceded, he is usurping it, this may be one way to stop the usurpation after a hearing.

My position is that it is a usurpation of authority he does not have have in the first place and this legalizes the usurpation for 30 days.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, what we are doing here does not prejudice the viewpoint of the gentleman from Florida.

It is true that the figures agreed to in conference do exceed the figures that the House authorized, but when we consider the purpose of the added money, I feel all Members of this body would want to support this conference report.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has today voted to extend and amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Public Law 89–10, authorizing over $1.6 billion in Federal aid to schools. I want to say that the passage of this legislation is a matter of great satisfaction to me personally and of the utmost importance to the Nation.

Last year, the massive program of Federal aid under title I of the act benefited more than 7 million educationally deprived children throughout the country—children who, because they have the misfortune to be poor or handicapped, encounter special difficulty in learning. Over 17,000 school districts received nearly a billion dollars in Federal grants for special programs to help these disadvantaged children—to help them gain a meaningful education so that they can break the chains of ignorance and poverty.

My own State of Rhode Island received over $4 million for these programs. Over 16,000 deprived children in 34 school districts in Rhode Island received special help last year from these funds. Four thousand children went to summer school—and $750,000 in school construction was approved.

In Providence, for example, school officials were able to use $123,000 for a comprehensive summer program for 200 hard-core problem children from the inner city—children who were emotionally disturbed, maladjusted, handicapped, and impoverished. They were able to give them special tests, therapy, and a flexible, unstructured program of instruction and recreation suited to their own needs. This is typical of the things that title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act made possible throughout our State and throughout the Nation during its first year of operation. This is why, for the sake of these helpless children, and for the sake of our country's future, I have fought so hard for legislation which will continue the benefits for the current year.

I understand that the summer program in the Providence schools which I just mentioned is such an excellent one that it will be described in a booklet being prepared by the U.S. Office of Education as a guide to other school planners—a great tribute to the work which our Rhode Island schoolmen are doing.

I am particularly pleased at the changes which we have made in the operation of the program.

We are requiring the use of the latest available data on aid for dependent children when computing the number of disadvantaged children, to provide a more equitable distribution of funds, particularly with regard to our large cities, where so much poverty is concentrated.

The new legislation also provides help for certain groups of children who need the benefits of special programs but were not included in last year's legislation—neglected, delinquent, and foster children, including those in State institutions; the children of migrant workers; Indian children in schools operated by the Department of Interior's Bureau of Indian Affairs.

It authorizes a special fund of $50 million for the current year for handicapped children and requires the U.S. Office of Education to establish a Bureau for the Education and Training of the Handicapped, to be sure that these exceptional children receive the full benefits of the legislation.

Under title II of the act, more than 19,000 school districts are receiving funds to revitalize their school library collections, and acquire textbooks and other instructional materials. At least 20 million pupils throughout the country are benefiting from this program which has, in just 1 year, added at least 1 book for every 2 children in school. Rhode Island received over $400,000 for this purpose.

Throughout the Nation, over 10 million schoolchildren and teachers are benefiting from programs developed under title III of the act. As of September 30, 1966, over 1,000 proposals had been approved for nearly $74 million. The projects range from innovative multipurpose centers and programs to supplementary services such as concerts and summer camps.

To date, 15 projects have been approved in Rhode Island totaling $5.7 million. One innovative project on Block Island permits children to learn the new mathematics through a hookup with the mainland, using an amplified telephone and electrowriter. In Warwick, an exemplary library has been established in the largest elementary school to serve areas with high concentrations of children from low-income families. And in Wakefield, plans have been undertaken to organize a school to accommodate children with different rates of learning and to revitalize adult education.

All States used funds available to them under title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act last year to strengthen their State departments of education. Twenty-five regional projects by groups of States were inaugurated to solve problems common to the participants. Over a thousand professional people, from physicians to photographers, from administrators to accountants, were added to State departments of education under the title V program.

I do not believe there is any doubt that this piece of legislation is one of the most important and forward-looking actions taken by this, or any other, Congress.

All time has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 185, nays 76, not voting 171, as follows:

[Roll No. 392]

YEAS—185

Addabbo
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Ashley
Bandstra
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Bell
Bingham
Boland
Brademas
Brooks
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Cameron
Carey
Casey
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Cleveland
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Curtin
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
de la Garza
Dent
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Dulski
Dwyer
Edwards, Calif.
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Flood
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Grider
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hays
Hechler
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Ichord
Irwin
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Keogh
Krebs
Landrum
Leggett
Long, Md.
Love
McDade
McDowell
McGrath
Macdonald
Machen
Madden
Mathias
May
Mills
Minish
Mize
Monagan
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patmau
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Price
Pucinski
Quie
Race
Redlin
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Rhodes, Pa.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schweiker
Secrest
Shriver
Sickles
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stubblefield
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thomas
Tupper
Udall
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Weltner
White, Tex.
Widnall
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—76

Abbitt
Adair
Andrews, George W.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Bennett
Betts
Bolton
Brock
Broomfield
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Burleson
Byrnes, Wis.
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Collier
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Dague
Dole

Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan, Tenn.
Erlenborn
Ford, Gerald R.
Gathings
Gurney
Hardy
Harsha
Henderson
Herlong
Hull
Hutchinson
Jarman
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Kunkel
Langen
Latta
Lipscomb
McClory
MacGregor
Mahon
Marsh

Mosher
Nelsen
Passman
Poage
Poff
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Schneebeli
Selden
Sikes
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Teague, Tex.
Tuck
Tuten
Utt
Waggonner
Watson
Whalley
Whitten
Williams
Wilson, Bob

NOT VOTING—171

Abernethy
Adams
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Glenn
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Belcher
Berry
Blatnik
Boggs
Bolling
Bow
Bray
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Callaway
Carter
Cederberg
Clawson, Del
Clevenger
Cohelan
Colmer
Cooley
Corman
Craley
Culver
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Delaney
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Duncan, Oreg.
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fuqua
Gallagher
Gettys

Gilligan
Greigg
Gross
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Hébert
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Howard
Hungate
Huot
Jacobs
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, N.C.
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kupferman
Laird
Lennon
Long, La.
McCarthy
McCulloch
McEwen
McFall
McMillan
McVicker
Mackay
Mackie
Mailliard
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Matthews
Meeds
Michel
Miller
Mink
Minshall
Moeller
Moore
Moorhead
Morton
Moss

Murray
Nix
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
O'Neal, Ga.
Pool
Powell
Purcell
Randall
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roncalio
Roudebush
Roush
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Scott
Senner
Shipley
Sisk
Smith, N.Y.
Stafford
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Toll
Trimble
Tunney
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Waldie
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watts
White, Idaho
Whitener
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Younger
Yates

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. King of California for, with Mr. Fuqua against.

Mr. Holifield for, with Mr. Rogers of Florida against.

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Kornegay against.

Mr. Aspinall for, with Mr. Abernethy against.

Mrs. Sullivan for, with Mr. Colmer against.

Mr. Miller for, with Mr. Flynt against.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee for, with Mr. Fisher against.

Mr. Dyal for, with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana against.

Mr. Fogarty for, with Mr. Jones of North Carolina against.

Mr. Feighan for, with Mr. McMillan against.

Mr. Gilligan for, with Mr. Murray against.

Mr. Kluczynski for, with Mr. Rivers of South Carolina against.

Mr. Johnson of California for, with Mr. Rogers of Texas against.

Mr. Howard for, with Mr. Scott against.

Mr. Steed for, with Mr. Gettys against.

Mr. Stratton for, with Mr. Fountain against.

Mr. White of Idaho for, with Mr. Hagan of Georgia against.

Mr. Matsunaga for, with Mr. Lennon against.

Mr. Gallagher for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Foley for, with Mr. Matthews against.

Mr. Delaney for, with Mr. O'Neal of Georgia against.

Mrs. Kelly for, with Mr. Pool against.

Mr. Denton for, with Mr. Roberts against.

Mr. Barrett for, with Mr. Stephens against.

Mr. Hall for, with Mr. Whitener against.

Mr. Moss for, with Mr. Cooley against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Reinecke against.

Mr. Ayres for, with Mr. Walker of Mississippi against.

Mr. Moore for, with Mr. Harvey of Indiana against.

Mr. Smith of New York for, with Mr. Laird against.

Mr. Frelinghuysen for, with Mr. Martin of Alabama against.

Mr. Carter for, with Mr. Glenn Andrews against.

Mr. Stafford for, with Mr. Younger against.

Mr. Mailliard for, with Mr. Roudebush against.

Mr. Kupferman for, with Mr. Edwards of Alabama against.

Mr. Robison for, with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin against.

Mr. Fino for, with Mr. Michel against.

Mr. McFall for, with Mr. Devine against.

Mr. Clarence J. Brown, Jr., for, with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin against.

Mr. Olsen of Montana for, with Mr. Derwinski against.

Mr. Resnick for, with Mr. Dickinson against.

Mr. Shipley for, with Mr. Del Clawson against.

Mr. Sisk for, with Mr. Findley against.

Mr. Moorhead for, with Mr. Talcott against.

Mr. Nix for, with Mr. Hansen of Idaho against.

Mr. Cohelan for, with Mr. Anderson of Illinois against.

Mr. Hawkins for, with Mr. McEwen against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hungate with Mr. Belcher.

Mr. Mackay with Mr. Stanton.

Mr. Craley with Mr. Bray.

Mr. Clevenger with Mr. Morton.

Mr. Brown of California with Mr. King of New York.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Schmidhauser with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Berry.

Mr. Purcell with Mr. Watkins.

Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Bow.

Mr. Reuss with Mr. Minshall.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Ullman with Mr. Callaway.

Mr. Trimble with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Senner with Cederberg.

Mr. Schisler with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.

Mr. Jacobs with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Hicks with Mr. Helstoski.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Adams.

Mr. Roush with Mr. Todd.

Mr. Moeller with Mr. Waldie.

Mr. Van Deerlin with Mrs. Mink.

Mr. Yates with Mr. Walker of New Mexico.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Mackie.

Mr. Corman with Mr. King of Utah.

Mr. Culver with Mr. Duncan of Oregon.

Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Tunney.

Mr. Randall with Mr. Haley.

Mr. Hanna with Mr. Hansen of Iowa.

Mr. Meeds with Mr. Willis.

Mr. McVicker with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.

Mr. Albert with Mr. Roncalio.

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Huot.

Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Greigg.

Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Sweeney.

Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Toll.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING CONTROL AND ELIMINATION OF JELLYFISH

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 11475) to provide for the control or elimination of jellyfish and other such pests in the coastal waters of the United States, with amendments of the Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, after "States" insert "and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico,".

Page 1, line 10, strike out "pests." and insert "pests and in conducting research for the purposes of controlling floating seaweed in such waters."

Page 2, line 1, strike out "States," and insert: "States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico,".

Page 2, line 7, strike out "pests," and insert: "pests and of floating seaweed,".

Page 2, line 8, strike out "pests," and insert: "pests and such seaweed,".

Page 2, line 12, strike out "States," and insert: "States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico,".

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to provide for the control or elimination of jellyfish and other such pests in the coastal waters of the United States, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the elementary and secondary education bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING STUDY OF FACILITIES AND SERVICES TO BE FURNISHED VISITORS AND STUDENTS COMING TO NATION'S CAPITAL

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 14604) to authorize a study of facilities and services to be furnished visitors and students coming to the Nation's Capital, with amendments of the Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, lines 3 and 4, strike out "States and" and insert "States, territories, possessions, and".

Page 3, lines 4 and 5, strike out "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate,".

Page 3, line 18, after "The" insert "Director of the National Park Service, in consultation with the".

Page 3, lines 19 and 20, strike out "from among the personnel and facilities of the General Services Administration".

Page 3, line 24, strike out "March" and insert "September".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Gray]?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has this been cleared with this side of the aisle?

Mr. GRAY. Yes, it has been cleared with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. ARENDS. Will the gentleman kindly explain the Senate amendments so that the Members of the House may know what they are?

Mr. GRAY. I would be delighted to do so.

There are no substantial changes.

The other body added the Director of the National Park Service to the list of those who will work with a 21-member Commission to study the need for a Capital Visitors Center which we think is an improvement to the bill.

The bill, as passed by the House, provided that the Commission should report the results of their study and investigation and plans to the Congress not later than March 15, 1967, but because it took so long to get the bill up for passage, it was thought that that was not enough time and the other body change the report to Congress date to not later than September 15, 1967, so in that way giving the Commission ample time to do a good job.

Otherwise, there are no important changes in the bill, as passed by the House.

Mr. ARENDS. May I say, partly in jest, I hope that when we come back in January, we do not find that they have already started to dig the basement.

Mr. GRAY. I will say to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, that this is only a study provided by this bill and the Congress will be required to take action before anything can be done to construct a visitors center. However, I hope this can be done without undue delay.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Gray] and the other authors of H.R. 14604 for their constructive action in setting up a study commission to make recommendations by next September concerning services for visitors to the Nation's Capital. As the debate in this body on October 7, 1966—Congressional Record 25687—and the Senate report, set forth in the Record for October 18, 1966—Congressional Record, pages 27320 and 27321—make clear, the study commission's work will encompass a feasibility study of a sound and light program for the Nation's Capitol. I am confident that, with the help of the many individuals and organizations who have endorsed sound and light, the study commission's study will favorably recommend a sound and light program for the Capitol to the Congress, and that the Congress will then move speedily to set such a sound and light program in being.

Sound and light, developed in recent years, bring to life a historical narration centered on a particular building or setting. It presents a tremendously impressive show simply and at low cost. Unlike traditional historical pageants, no actors and few technicians are needed for the productions. Once the sound tracks are recorded and the lights and speakers in place, one technician can operate the automated sound and light control mechanism. Sound is heard from different parts of the building and fades away, lights go on and off and dim, all automatically.

Sound and light has been used to produce highly popular spectacles in France and nearly a dozen other countries, including the United States. Productions have been presented in such famous and historic settings as Versailles, the cathedral of Notre Dame in Paris, the Roman Forum, the Acropolis in Athens, the Tower of London, the Chateau de Tourbillon in Switzerland, the Royal Palace in Madrid, and Independence Hall in Philadelphia. A sound and light production utilizing the battleship U.S.S. *North Carolina*, moored at Wilmington, N.C., re-creates events of the Pacific naval war.

The Capitol is an ideal site for sound and light. It is the building that most symbolizes our Nation. The history of the country and of all three branches of Government is closely bound up with the Capitol. It has been the home of Congress since 1800. The Supreme Court met within its walls for 134 years and handed down some of its most important decisions here. Most of our Presidents have been inaugurated at the Capitol, and it has been the scene of many of the greatest Presidential messages and acts. Nineteen Presidents served in Congress before becoming Chief Executive, and two returned to Congress afterward.

In addition, the Capitol is one of the world's architectural achievements. It is probably the best-loved, most historic, and most visited building in America.

Sound and light could revitalize the many dramatic events, the legislative, executive, and judicial acts, the great debates and speeches that have taken place here. Many of the events that might be re-created through sound and light come to mind:

The convening of the First Congress in Washington and the first address to a joint session in the Capitol by President John Adams on November 22, 1800.

The drama of the Jefferson-Burr contest for the Presidency in 1801.

The strident voices of the warhawks of 1812 and the answering voice of British Rear Adm. Sir George Cookburn who reportedly stood in the Speaker's chair and asked:

> Shall this harbor of Yankee democracy be burned?

The great McCulloch against Maryland decision of 1819.

The proclamation of the Monroe Doctrine of 1823.

The tumultuous welcoming of the Marquis de Lafayette at the rebuilt Capitol in October 1824.

The eloquence and rising passion of the Clay-Calhoun-Webster debates of the 1850's.

The ominous tones of the Dred Scott decision of 1857.

Lincoln's first inaugural address.

The conversion of the Capitol into a barracks, hospital, bakery, and storehouse during the Civil War.

The 35-gun salute of the Capitol Hill battery when the head of "Freedom" was bolted into place December 2, 1863, as work on the Capitol went on to symbolize the continuance of the Union.

The noisy gaslight celebration of the news of the fall of Richmond, followed by the solemnity of Lincoln's lying in state.

The intense tones of Thad Stevens' speech of impeachment against President Andrew Johnson and the trial that followed.

The debates on civil rights, silver, and monopolies of the last decades of the 19th century.

Woodrow Wilson's declaration to Congress that the "world must be made safe for democracy."

Passage of the income tax, suffrage for women, prohibition, and the New Deal legislation—and Supreme Court invalidation of the National Industrial Recovery Act as one of its last acts before leaving its Capitol quarters.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt's message to Congress of December 7, 1941.

Congress' welcome to Winston Churchill, symbolizing the Anglo-American alliance.

From these and other events of the recent and more distant past a program to stir the blood of patriots and to delight the eye and ear could be contrived.

Sound and light could portray also the history of the Capitol Building from Dr. William Thornton's original design of 1792 to the recent extension of the east front. The program could recall the wooden walkway that once connected the House and Senate wings, the burned-out Capitol of 1814, Bulfinch's dome and Capitol addition of 1825–56, the dome and wings added in 1850's and 1860's.

The sound and light productions would be free. As I envision it they would be given several times a week throughout the period when the greatest number of Americans are visiting the Capitol—from late spring to early fall.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Gray]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
October 20, 1966.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Room H–206, the Capitol, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It is with considerable regret that I submit my resignation as a member of the Committee on House Administration, effective immediately.

It has been a privilege and an honor for me to work with the many fine members of this Committee during the past several years. My association with and participation in the deliberations of the Committee on House Administration will always remain a pleasant and rewarding experience.

With personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
WILLARD S. CURTIN,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 1070, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1070

Resolved, That JAMES C. CLEVELAND, of New Hampshire, be and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DUTIABLE STATUS OF WATCHES, CLOCKS, AND TIMING APPARATUS FROM INSULAR POSSESSIONS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request of yesterday to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 8436) to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the dutiable status of watches, clocks, and timing apparatus from insular possessions of the United States, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That (a) paragraph (a) of general headnote 3 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. § 1202) is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'Articles' in subparagraph (i) and inserting in lieu thereof 'Except as provided in headnote 6 of schedule 7, part 2, subpart E, articles'; and

"(2) by striking out 'except that all articles' in subparagraph (i) and inserting in lieu thereof 'except that all such articles'.

"(b) The headnotes of schedule 7, part 2, subpart E of the Tariff Schedules of the United States are amended by adding at the end thereof the following new headnote:

"'6. Product of Insular Possessions.—(a) Except as provided in paragraph (b) of this headnote, any article provided for in this subpart which is the product of an insular possession of the United States outside the customs territory of the United States and which contains any foreign component shall be subject to duty—

"'(i) at the rates set forth in column numbered 1, if the countries of origin of more than 50 percent in value of the foreign components are countries to products of which column numbered 1 rates apply, and

"'(ii) at the rates set forth in column numbered 2, if the countries of origin of 50 percent or more in value of the foreign components are countries to products of which column numbered 2 rates apply.

"'(b) If the requirements for free entry set forth in general headnote 3(a) are complied with, watches (provided for in item 715.05) and watch movements (provided for in items 716.08 through 719.__) which are the product of the Virgin Islands, Guam, or American Samoa and which contain any foreign component may be admitted free of duty, but the total quantity of such articles entered free of duty during each calendar year shall not exceed a number equal to one-ninth of the apparent United States consumption of watch movements during the preceding calendar year (as determined by the Tariff Commission), of which total quantity—

"'(i) not to exceed 87.5 per centum shall be the product of the Virgin Islands,

"'(ii) not to exceed 8.33 per centum shall be the product of Guam, and

"'(iii) not to exceed 4.17 per centum shall be the product of American Samoa.

"'(c) On or before April 1 of each calendar year (beginning with 1967), the Tariff Commission shall determine the apparent United States consumption of watch movements during the preceding calendar year, shall report such determination to the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Interior, and Secretary of Commerce, and shall publish such determination in the Federal Register, together with the number of watches and watch movements which are the product of the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa which may be entered free of duty under paragraph (b) during the calendar year.

"'(d) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce, acting jointly, shall allocate on a fair and equitable basis among producers of watches and watch movements located in the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa the quotas for each calendar year provided by paragraph (b) for articles which are the product of the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa, respectively. Allocations made by the Secretaries shall be final. The Secretaries are authorized to issue such regulations as they determine necessary to carry out their duties under this paragraph.'

"(c) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply only with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after January 1, 1967.

"SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty one variable pressure water channel (one-seventh scale model) imported for the use of the Stevens Institute of Technology and one ionosonde (and accompanying spare parts) for the use of the University of Illinois.

"(b) If the liquidation of the entry of the articles described in subsection (a) of this section has become final, such entry shall be reliquidated and the appropriate refund of duty shall be made."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so only to call to the attention of the Members that there was a thorough discussion of the amendment yesterday, and it is printed on pages 27708–27710 of the RECORD. At that time there was no objection to the merits of the legislation. The objection was made on another basis. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL TAX LIEN ACT

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 11256) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, with respect to the priority and effect of Federal tax liens and levies, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 13, strike out all after line 17 over to and including line 14 on page 14 and insert:

"(f) PLACE FOR FILING NOTICE; FORM.—

"(1) PLACE FOR FILING.—The notice referred to in subsection (a) shall be filed—

"(A) UNDER STATE LAWS.—

"(i) REAL PROPERTY.—In the case of real property, in one office within the State (or the county, or other governmental subdivision), as designated by the laws of such State, in which the property subject to the lien is situated; and

"(ii) PERSONAL PROPERTY.—In the case of personal property, whether tangible or intangible, in one office within the State (or the county, or other governmental subdivision), as designated by the laws of such State, in which the property subject to the lien is situated; or

"(B) WITH CLERK OF DISTRICT COURT.—In the office of the clerk of the United States district court for the judicial district in which the property subject to the lien is situated, whenever the State has not by law designated one office which meets the requirements of subparagraph (A); or

"(C) With recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia.—In the office of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, if the property subject to the lien is situated in the District of Columbia.

"(2) Situs of property subject to lien.—For purposes of paragraph (1), property shall be deemed to be situated—

"(A) Real property.—In the case of real property, at its physical location; or

"(B) Personal property.—In the case of personal property, whether tangible or intangible, at the residence of the taxpayer at the time the notice of lien is filed.

For purposes of paragraph (2)(B), the residence of a corporation or partnership shall be deemed to be the place at which the principal executive office of the business is located, and the residence of a taxpayer whose residence is without the United States shall be deemed to be in the District of Columbia.

"(3) Form.—The form and content of the notice referred to in subsection (a) shall be prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate. Such notice shall be valid notwithstanding any other provision of law regarding the form or content of a notice of lien."

Page 14, strike out lines 15 to 21, inclusive, and insert:

"(g) Refiling of Notice.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) General rule.—Unless notice of lien is refiled in the manner prescribed in paragraph (2) during the required refiling period, such notice of lien shall be treated as filed on the date on which it is filed (in accordance with subsection (f)) after the expiration of such refiling period.

"(2) Place for filing.—A notice of lien refiled during the required refiling period shall be effective only—

"(A) if such notice of lien is refiled in the office in which the prior notice of lien was filed; and

"(B) in any case in which, 90 days or more prior to the date of a refiling of notice of lien under subparagraph (A), the Secretary or his delegate received written information (in the manner prescribed in regulations issued by the Secretary or his delegate) concerning a change in the taxpayer's residence, if a notice of such lien is also filed in accordance with subsection (f) in the State in which such residence is located."

Page 14, line 22, strike out "(2)" and insert "(3)".

Page 15, line 6, strike out "(3)" and insert "(4)".

Page 15, line 7, strike out "(2)" and insert "(3)".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I do not intend to object—I would like to ask the chairman for a brief explanation of the amendment for the Membership.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 11256, the Federal Tax Lien Act of 1966, which is before us, represents the first substantial revision of the Federal tax lien laws since before the adoption of the income tax in 1913. Except for one amendment made by the Senate, regarding the place of filing and refiling of notices of Federal tax liens, this bill is identical to the bill which was passed by the House 1 month ago.

The remarkable development of commercial transactions, financing devices, and security interests over the years has made a revision of the Federal tax lien laws imperative. In addition, experience under the present tax lien procedure has indicated instances where the present rules work inequities both in and out of commercial areas.

The act is the result of more than 8 years of consideration by the American Bar Association, working in conjunction with representatives of the Treasury Department and the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and, I believe, provides tax lien procedures more in keeping with modern business usage. It also provides constructive solutions to most of the inequities and uncertainties which exist under present law.

The one change in this bill made by the Senate, that I referred to before, is a good one. It involves the place of filing and refiling of notices of Federal tax liens. Since these notices are supposed to inform potential creditors, it is important that the rules regarding their place of filing be clear. Essentially, the rules are these: Notices affecting real estate will be filed in the office—as designated by the State—where the real estate is located. Notices involving personal property will be filed in the office—as designated by the State—where the taxpayer resides. A corporation or a partnership will be treated as residing at its principal place of business. Any taxpayer who in fact resides outside the country will be treated as residing in the District of Columbia.

Refiling is to be made in the same office in which the original notice was filed. However, where the taxpayer has moved in the meantime and the Internal Revenue Service has received appropriate written notice of that fact at least 90 days before the refiling, then the refiling will be made in two places—the office where the original notice was filed and also the office designated by the State of the taxpayer's new residence. An example of a written notice that would qualify for this purpose is a later tax return of the same taxpayer for the same type of tax.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11256, the Federal Tax Lien Act of 1966, is a good bill and I urge its adoption.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR PROPRIETARY EXTENDED CARE FACILITIES UNDER MEDICARE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 6958) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to promote savings under the Internal Revenue Service's automatic data processing system, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

Conference Report (H. Rept. No. 2317)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6958) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to promote savings under the Internal Revenue Service's automatic data processing system, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 7. Reasonable Cost for Reimbursement of Proprietary Extended Care Facilities Under Health Insurance for the Aged.

"Section 1861(v)(1) of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: 'Such regulations in the case of extended care services furnished by proprietary facilities shall include provision for specific recognition of a reasonable return on equity capital, including necessary working capital, invested in the facility and used in the furnishing of such services, in lieu of other allowances to the extent that they reflect similar items. The rate of return recognized pursuant to the preceding sentence for determining the reasonable cost of any services furnished in any fiscal period shall not exceed one and one-half times the average of the rates of interest, for each of the months any part of which is included in such fiscal period, on obligations issued for purchase by the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund.' "

And the House agree to the same.

W. D. Mills,
Cecil R. King,
Hale Boggs,
Eugene J. Keogh,
John W. Byrnes,
Thos. B. Curtis,
James B. Utt,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Russell B. Long,
George Smathers,
Clinton Anderson,
Frank Carlson,
Wallace F. Bennett,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Statement

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6958) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to promote savings under the Internal Revenue Service's automatic data processing system, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment added a new section 7 to the bill as passed by the House. Under the amendment, section 1861(v) of the Social Security Act (which relates to the determination of reasonable cost of services for purposes of title XVIII of such Act) would have been amended by inserting a new paragraph (2) providing that "reasonable costs" for extended care facilities are to include a return on the fair market value of the facility sufficient to attract capital investment. In determining reasonable costs under section 1861(v), the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare was directed to consider, among other things, certain specified factors.

The House recedes with an amendment which is a substitute for the Senate amendment. The conference substitute requires that regulations under the health insurance program relating to the reasonable cost of extended care services furnished by any proprietary facility specifically recognize a reasonable return on equity capital invested in the facility (or portion of the facility) used for the furnishing of the services. Such equity capital is to include any necessary working capital so invested. The rate of return so recognized for any fiscal period may not, however, in the case of any proprietary facility exceed 1½ times the average rate of interest on obligations issued for purchase by the Federal hospital insurance trust fund during the fiscal period. Such average rate is to be computed by taking the average of the rates of interest for each of the months any part of which was included in that period.

It is expected that in recognition of this amendment the 2 percent of operating costs which would be allowed, in lieu of specific allowances for "other costs", under the proposed regulations of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will in the case of extended care services provided by proprietary facilities be reduced by one-fourth, to a total of 1½ percent of the operating costs.

The conferees expect that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will apply similar or comparable principles in determining reasonable costs for reimbursement of proprietary hospitals for services furnished by them.

W. D. Mills,
Cecil R. King,
Hale Boggs,
Eugene J. Keogh,
John W. Byrnes,
Thos. B. Curtis,
James B. Utt,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MILLS (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement of the managers on the part of the House be dispensed with. We will explain this.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House will recall that the bill, H.R. 6958, as passed by the House on September 6 of this year, was designed to amend the Internal Revenue Code to promote savings under the Internal Revenue Service's automatic data processing system. The principal provisions of the bill related to the filing of income and other tax returns directly with the seven regional service centers.

Mr. Speaker, the other body did not change in any respect those provisions of the bill relating to amendments to the Internal Revenue Code. The other body did add an amendment to the bill, however, which relates to the determination of reasonable cost of services for extended care facilities under the medicare program.

Specifically, the amendment, as passed by the other body, provided that "reasonable costs" for extended care facilities are to include a return on the fair market value of the facility sufficient to attract capital investment.

The managers on the part of the House have recommended that the House recede with an amendment which is a substitute for the Senate amendment. This substitute requires that regulations under the health insurance program relating to the reasonable cost of extended care services furnished by any proprietary facility specifically recognize a reasonable return on equity capital invested in the facility—or portion of the facility—used for the furnishing of the services. Such equity capital is to include any necessary working capital so invested. The rate of return so recognized for any fiscal period may not, however, in the case of any proprietary facility exceed 1½ times the average rate of interest on obligations issued for purchase by the Federal hospital insurance trust fund during the fiscal period. Such average rate is to be computed by taking the average of the rates of interest for each of the months any part of which was included in that period. This rate of return at the present time would, therefore, be about 7½ percent.

It is expected that in recognition of this amendment the 2 percent of operating costs which would be allowed, in lieu of specific allowances for "other costs," under the proposed regulations of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will in the case of extended care services provided by proprietary facilities be reduced by one-fourth to a total of 1½ percent of the operating costs.

Mr. Speaker the conference report also states that it is expected that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will apply similar or comparable principles in determining reasonable costs for reimbursement of proprietary hospitals for services furnished by them.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Byrnes].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report and I rise in support of the amendment. I think I should take a minute or two, though, Mr. Speaker, to call attention to the fact that a very serious problem is still going to exist even with the adoption of the amendment included in the conference report with respect to the factors that should be considered in reimbursing nursing homes. A particular problem exists with respect to the area of the proprietary nursing home.

The medicare bill which we passed a year ago, provides for 100 days of posthospital extended care. However, the bill specified that the amount which will be paid for posthospital extended care—in other words, the amount that will be paid to the individual nursing home or facility—shall be, and I quote, "the reasonable cost" of furnishing such care. In other words, as the law now stands, fundamentally all the Social Security Administration can pay are the costs, with no allowances for profits or a return on the invested capital.

The nursing home care was intended in Public Law 89–97 as a means of reducing the cost of hospitalization. We want to encourage the transfer of patients to the nursing home, if further hospitalization is not required, as a means of saving health insurance funds and costs to the patient.

At the time this matter was before the Ways and Means Committee, seriously questioned whether there would be enough facilities offering extended care on a "no profit" basis. I had serious doubts that nonprofit organizations would be able to provide enough beds to meet the needs of the aged. I suggested that we should be prepared to pay "a reasonable and customary charge" for nursing home care, in order to provide an inducement for the expansion of proprietary nursing homes.

A recent survey in the State of Wisconsin shows that there is a serious shortage of extended care facilities. There simply are not now, and by January 1967, when this part of the program becomes operative, there will not be enough nursing home beds to take care of the aged patients. In fact, the Wisconsin survey shows that there are no facilities for extended care in 17 counties of Wisconsin. In many other counties, while there are facilities, the number of beds available are wholly inadequate in relation to the number of possible patients. Unless we can expand these facilities, the aged citizen in these counties will have to be kept in the hospital until fully recovered. This places an unreasonable burden on the individual and on the program. Certainly this deficiency must also exist in a great many other States.

It is essential that the services, for which payments are to be made under the medical care for the aged program, be in fact available. We will be perpetrating a cruel hoax on our elder citizens if after the Congress has provided for the payment of various medical services for the aged there are no facilities or personnel offering such services. Our commitment to provide medical assistance for the aged under Public Law 89–97 will become an empty promise to pay for the cost of a service which cannot be bought.

This amendment provided here does make a step toward recognizing some return on investment must be provided for the proprietary nursing home. But, Mr. Speaker, by this amendment we also disrupt, it seems to me, the relationship as between the proprietary facilities and the nonprofit facilities.

I have called this problem to the attention of the Social Security Administration from the time of the enactment of the medicare bill last year. In fact, when that bill was before the committee I pointed out by the adoption of the cost method by us paying for these services, we discouraged the construction and expansion of such facilities. It was known at that time we were short of nursing home beds. In fact, as recently as last June the Secretary of the Department of HEW, Secretary Gardner, conceded that our real shortage in health care facilities was in nursing homes. My correspondence with the Department brought this concession. I am including these letters that the Department has been dragging its feet.

JUNE 29, 1966.

Hon. JOHN W. GARDNER,
Secretary, Health, Education, and Welfare,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY GARDNER: In your briefing session on medicare yesterday, you particularly emphasized that the real shortage in health care facilities, after medicare becomes operational, will be in the nursing home area.

I am also deeply concerned about this problem. In order to alleviate the problem, I have introduced a bill (H.R. 11768) to provide for reimbursement of extended care facilities on a reasonable charge basis rather than on a reasonable cost basis.

Health care provided by hospitals has been generally provided by nonprofit charitable or governmental institutions. In providing for reimbursement on a reasonable cost basis for hospital services, the medicare law accords with the practices prevailing in a large segment of the industry.

However, nursing homes have not generally been operated on a nonprofit basis. If we are going to mobilize the resources available to provide the nursing home facilities required to meet our commitments to our senior citizens, we will have to establish a reimbursement formula based on the prevailing practices of nursing homes. I can certainly sympathize with the objective of holding costs down for the individual and the new health insurance system. However, as we discovered in World War II, there is no advantage in having a low price on a nonexisting service.

Although reports were requested last October 28, 1965, the Committee has not received any report. In view of the need to increasing nursing home facilities that we both agree exist, I can't understand the Department's failure to report on H.R. 11768. I am hopeful that while there is still time to meet this critical need that the Department will submit a favorable report on the bill as expeditiously as possible.

Sincerely yours,

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., July 13, 1966.

Hon. JOHN W. BYRNES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: Secretary Gardner has asked me to reply to your recent letter concerning the shortage of nursing home facilities.

We share your interest in alleviating the nursing home shortage, for we wish to do everything possible to insure that the promise held out by medicare is fulfilled.

Our major program for expanding nursing home facilities is the Hill-Burton hospital construction program. The president has requested the maximum amount authorized for long-term care facilities (including nursing homes) in the 1967 budget. He has also proposed legislation to expand support for the modernization of health facilities, including nursing homes. Congressional approval would represent a major step in providing for the needed expansion of facilities.

We are now preparing a report on H.R. 11768, your bill to reimburse nursing homes on a reimbursable charge basis, and we hope to submit the report soon.

If I may provide any further information, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely,

RALPH K. HUITT,
Assistant Secretary for Legislation.

The medicare program does not offer nursing home care today, but it will become available on January 1. At that time, we are going to be facing a shortage in many areas. It seems to me that every effort shold be made to encourage the expansion of these facilities. Otherwise we will find ourselves in a situation where our elderly people are eligible to move into posthospital care facilities and have this benefit afforded them but will be unable to take advantage of it simply because the facilities are not there.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am glad to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. In addition to the regular facilities, who is going to care for these people? We are short so many bedside nurses and we are short practical nurses, and the nursing profession as such is now set upon producing nurse scientists rather than bedside nurses. I hope that will be taken into consideration.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman, because that certainly represents another problem, a severe shortage, into which we must look and attempt to cope with it at the earliest possible moment. What I am addressing myself to are the physical facilities and the other necessary elements which go into them by, of course, the furnishing of these kinds of services. I again suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Department should focus in on this problem, because in my judgment this does not provide a solution to the problem.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I believe you will find that after the adoption of this conference report the proprietary nursing home will be paid on one basis and the nonprofit will be paid on a different basis. There will be legitimate criticism from nonprofit institutions, because here we fix in the statute, discrimination between the manner in which we treat the two types of organizations.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my suggestion, from the beginning, that we pay for these services on the same basis that private insurance companies pay for them when the recipients are covered under private insurance. The insurance companies reimburse nursing homes on a reasonable-charge basis and not a reasonable-cost basis.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if we proceeded upon that basis we would have avoided the discrimination between the two types of facilities and we would also give encouragement to the development of much needed facilities, which today are in very short supply. We will be facing very critical conditions, when we begin authorizing the payment of posthospital extended care on next January.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arkansas, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, correctly stated that this was a unanimous conference report. I did sign the report, but I did so with reservations which I know the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] and others recognize, because I have been objecting for a number of years—and I shall continue to register this objection—to nongermane amendments placed upon tax bills that are sent over to the other body.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that this particular matter well illustrates the point that makes this procedure objectionable.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] has made a number of excellent points in which I wish to join as to the problems that exist in this area of nursing homes.

Mr. Speaker, we who serve on the Committee on Ways and Means—and it is just those of us who are on the conference of the Committee on Ways and Means, cannot say to the Members of the House that we have studied this matter, because we have not.

Mr. Speaker, there have been no public hearings and in this instance I regret to say that there were no public hearings in the other body.

Mr. Speaker, this represents a serious matter. This is a matter which in my judgment, we should have scheduled for hearings, pressed as we are in the Committee on Ways and Means for time, because of problems before the Committee on Ways and Means. We must straighten out some of these difficulties which have arisen in the implementation of medicare.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say this to the Members of the House of Representatives, that to the extent that I was able to go over this proposal—and I did check it myself with a number of the people in the nursing home field, both proprietors and the nonprofit institutions as well as hospitals—I am satisfied it is desirable. That is why I can recommend the adoption of the substance of this conference report.

This is just my opinion, just as it is the opinion of others of the conferees, but the opinions are not backed up by what I think we should always back up opinions on serious matters of this nature by public hearings where an opportunity exists to hear those who have differing viewpoints.

Let me say this: that I am very critical of the administration in this instance for not coming before the Congress in a forthright manner and urging, indeed pushing, to have this matter of nursing home costs and fees clarified as it needs to be clarified through legislation.

I think we are going to see more problems facing Congress on this in the immediate future.

Fortunately, I believe the Chairman has made the announcement that early next session those of us who are reelected and are still here, and on the Committee on Ways and Means, are going to go into a number of aspects, in fact, very comprehensively, of the social security system, of which this should certainly be a part.

There is one other thing I wish to point up because Republicans are often criticized as being negative. This is a particular area that for years I have tried to point attention to: nursing homes. Back in the original Forand bills relating to medicare I made the point, as others did, but I assumed some leadership, that if we are to improve health care for the older people, it is insufficient to talk merely in terms of hospitals, that nursing homes were a very necessary part of this whole problem of health care for the aged, including, I might say, the visiting nurse technique.

I was happy to see, much as I disagreed with the basic approach of medicare, that future medicare proposals did include nursing home care as well as home care with the visiting nurse technique.

But I saw early too, I might say, as did others, that there was a great shortage of nursing homes.

I well remember, I think it was in 1960, that I went to Congressman Rains, who was head of our Subcommittee on Housing in the House, and Senator Sparkman, who was chairman of the committee in the other body, and pointed out this great need of nursing homes. Private lenders would not finance these structures because they said they were single-purpose buildings. I strongly urged that FHA guarantees be extended to this area—indeed, with the help of those two gentlemen the Congress did enact such legislation. And since then we have been building nursing homes.

But, I would add, not to the extent of the demand. And the demand is still there.

Mr. Speaker, I want to direct attention to the very wise observations of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. Bolton] who is so knowledgeable in the field of nursing, she having been in that great profession herself.

The great present and potential need is in the area of medicare, not only for the aged, but for all of us.

A number of us back before 1960 were urging that Federal vocational education be extended to include training in practical nursing, at least. And since then there has been legislation in this area.

Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to point out that sufficient nursing home facilities is a problem that I presently see and one of the big problems that will continue to face us for some time.

To recapitulate, I made the point that this was not a germane amendment on this bill, and I registered the procedural objection which was more than technical, it goes to the substance here. We are not really able to report to the House that we have thoroughly studied it.

On the other hand, to the extent to which my opinion is of any value, I do think that this is desirable legislation, and I support it.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1967

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 18391) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1967, with the Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon]? The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. Mahon, Whitten, Rooney of New York, Fogarty, Passman, Boland, Bow, Jonas, and Cederberg.

TARIFF TREATMENT OF CERTAIN ARTICLES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 11216) relating to the tariff treatment of articles assembled abroad of products of the United States, and as unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Price). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Mills]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

Conference Report (H. Rept. No. 2297)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11216) relating to the tariff treatment of articles assembled abroad of products of the United States, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, and 5; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 3, line 1, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "60th" and insert "120th"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: On page 3 of the Senate engrossed amendments; in the matter following line 6, strike out "Free" in the last column and insert: "The column 2 rate applicable in the absence of this item"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and the Senate agree to the same.

W. D. Mills,
Cecil R. King,
Hale Boggs,
Eugene J. Keogh,
John W. Byrnes,
Thos. B. Curtis,
James B. Utt,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Russell B. Long,
Geo. A. Smathers,
Clinton Anderson,
Frank Carlson,
Wallace F. Bennett,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Statement

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11216) relating to the tariff treatment of articles assembled abroad of products of the United States, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: Item 807.00 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States provides for partial exemption from duty for qualifying imported articles to the extent of the value of components exported from the United States that have been assembled in the articles abroad. The bill as passed by both the House and the Senate amends item 807.00 by eliminating the requirement that a U.S. component must have been exported for the purpose of assembly and return to the United States as part of an assembled article. Senate amendment numbered 1 makes technical changes in the effective date because of the passage of time since the bill was passed by the House. Under the amendment, the bill will apply where the assembled article is entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption on or after the date of the enactment of the bill.

The provision will also apply where the assembled article was entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption after August 30, 1963, and before the date of the enactment of the bill if request therefor is filed on or before the 120th day after the date of the enactment of the bill. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 2: This amendment adds a new section to the bill relating to the duty treatment of acrylic resin and polyester resin buttons (whether finished or unfinished) which are the product of an insular possession of the United States and which are manufactured or produced from button blanks or unfinished buttons which were the product of any foreign country. Under existing law, if the foreign materials do not exceed 50 percent of the total value, such buttons are exempt from duty. Under the amendment, such buttons are to be subject to duty at the rate which applies to products of such foreign country. Under the Senate amendment the new section would apply in the case of articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after the 60th day after the date of the enactment of the bill.

Under the conference agreement, the House agrees to the new section with an amendment changing the effective date so that it applies with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after the 120th day after the date of the enactment of the bill.

Amendment No. 3: This amendment adds a new section to the bill which provides duty free treatment for enumerated articles (whether or not in sets) which are fabricated to specification and designed for the classroom instruction for children. It also applies to containers or holders fabricated to specification and designed for the storage of such instructional articles when not in use. The articles must be imported exclusively for the use of the institution involved, and not for distribution, sale, or other commercial use.

The amendment applies with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of the enactment of the bill.

The House recedes with an amendment under which the column 2 rate is the column 2 rate applicable in the absence of the new provision.

Amendment No. 4: This amendment adds a new section to the bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to admit the following articles (and accompanying equipment, parts, accessories, and appurtenances) free of duty:

(1) one Weissenberg rheogoniometer imported for the use of the Case Institute of Technology,

(2) one mass spectrometer imported for the use of the University of Nebraska,

(3) one mass spectrometer imported for the use of Utah State University,

(4) one mass spectrometer imported for the use of the University of Hawaii, and

(5) one Weissenberg rheogoniometer imported for the use of the University of Utah.

The House recedes.

Amendment No. 5: This amendment adds a new section to the bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to admit free of duty any article which is entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after June 8, 1962, solely for use at the International Peace Garden, Dunseith, N. Dak., and which is the gift to the International Peace Garden of a citizen or resident of Canada, of a Canadian corporation or organization, or of the Government of Canada or of any Province or political subdivision thereof.

Entries and withdrawals of articles covered by the amendment which are made on or after June 8, 1962, and before the date of the enactment of the bill are to be afforded the duty-free treatment if a request is filed within 120 days after the date of the enactment of the bill.

The International Peace Garden is required to notify customs officers at the port of entry and pay the duty on any article if (within 5 years after admitted free of duty) the article (1) is used within the United States at any place other than the International Peace Garden, (2) is transferred by it to any person other than the donor, or (3) is sold by it to any person.

The House recedes.

W. D. MILLS,
CECIL R. KING,
HALE BOGGS,
EUGENE J. KEOGH,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
THOS. B. CURTIS,
JAMES B. UTT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. **MILLS**. Mr. Speaker, I can explain in a very short time the action of the conference with respect to the Senate amendment to H.R. 11216, which passed the House unanimously on October 21, 1965.

The tariff schedules of the United States provide for partial exemption from duty for qualifying imported articles to the extent of the value of components exported from the United States that have been assembled in the articles abroad.

As Members will recall, the original House bill amended the appropriate item in the tariff schedules by eliminating the requirement that a U.S. component must have been exported for the purpose of assembly and returned to the United States as part of an assembled article.

The first Senate amendment made technical changes in the effective date because of the passage of time since the bill passed the House. Under the amendment, the bill will apply where the assembled article is entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption on or after the date of enactment of the bill. The provision will also apply where the assembled article was entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption after August 30, 1963, and before the date of enactment of the bill if request therefor is filed on or before the 120th day after the date of enactment. The House conferees agreed to this amendment as a necessary change because of the passage of time.

The second Senate amendment was designed to remedy a situation which had developed following a bill which was passed last year by the House and Senate to close a tariff loophole. As Members will recall, last June the Ways and Means Committee reported and the Congress passed legislation designed to close a tariff loophole that had developed through the importation of virtually finished buttons which were assessed for duty purposes as button blanks at a substantially lower duty rate than that applicable to finished buttons. However, Mr. Speaker, after closing that loophole, it developed that certain of the same individuals who had been taking advantage of that loophole simply moved their operations to the Virgin Islands in order to exploit another provision of the tariff schedules. Senate amendment No. 2 is designed to remedy this further development by preventing the exploiting of this second provision of law.

This amendment adds a new section to the bill relating to the duty treatment of acrylic resin and polyester resin buttons—whether finished or unfinished—which are the product of an insular possession of the United States and which are manufactured or produced from button blanks or unfinished buttons which were the product of any foreign country. Under existing law, if the foreign materials do not exceed 50 percent of the total value, such buttons are exempt from duty. Under the amendment, such buttons are to be subject to duty at the rate which applies to products of such foreign country. Under the Senate amendment, the new section would apply in the case of articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after the 60th day after the date of the enactment of the bill.

The conference committee made one change, which was to afford an additional 60 days after the date of enactment before this provision becomes effective. Under the conference agreement, the effective date applies with respect to articles entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption after the 120th day after the date of enactment instead of after the 60th day.

Amendment No. 3 added a new section to the bill which provides for duty-free treatment for certain enumerated articles which are fabricated to specification and designed for the classroom instruction of children. This amendment is for articles for use in the so-called Montessori method of teaching. The House bill on this subject has been reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and is presently pending in the House. The articles must be imported exclusively for the use of the institution involved and not for distribution, sale or other commercial use.

In the conference committee, we made one change in this Senate amendment, the effect of which is to preserve the column 2 rates of existing law as they apply to these articles.

Amendment No. 4 added a new section to the bill authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to admit certain specified scientific instruments duty free. These include:

First, one Weissenberg rheogoniometer imported for the use of the Case Institute of Technology; second, one mass spectrometer imported for the use of the University of Nebraska; third, one mass spectrometer imported for the use of Utah State University; fourth, one mass spectrometer imported for the use of the University of Hawaii; and fifth, one Weissenberg rheogoniometer imported for the use of the University of Utah.

The House agreed with these amendments. We followed our usual course of checking through the Department of Commerce with regard to the availability of these instruments from domestic producers.

Amendment No. 5 provided for the free entry of any article which is entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after June 8, 1962, solely for use at the International Peace Garden, Dunseith, N. Dak., and which is the gift to the International Peace Garden of a citizen or resident of Canada, or a Canadian corporation or organization, or of the Government of Canada or of any Province or political subdivision thereof.

Entries and withdrawals of articles covered by the amendment which are made on or after June 8, 1962, and before the date of the enactment of the bill are to be afforded the duty-free treatment if a request is filed within 120 days after the date of the enactment of the bill.

Mr. **CURTIS**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **MILLS**. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. **CURTIS**. I simply want to say that in this instance, although these were Senate amendments, and perhaps in a very technical sense were not germane, they are related to tariff matters, and in most instances I think we had bills introduced in the House. At least I can say that the Ways and Means Committee was familiar with these subject matters in the Senate amendments, in each instance and I want to say that I think these are all desirable.

Mr. **BYRNES** of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. In fact, some of them had passed the House.

Mr. MILLS. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. And they were simply inserted in this bill instead of having to take their separate ways.

Mr. CURTIS. That is correct.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENSIONS OF INVESTMENT CREDIT AND ACCELERATED DEPRECIATION

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 17607) to suspend the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk proceeded to read the statement.

Mr. MILLS (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the conference report will be fully discussed and several Members wish to be heard on it, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the statement and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 2308)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17607) to suspend the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 23, 24, 25, 26, 36, and 42.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 38, and 39, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 2, line 12, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "erected, or acquired" and insert: "or erected".

On page 2, line 15, of the Senate engrossed amendments, after "commenced" insert: "by the taxpayer".

On page 4, line 3, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "erect, or acquire" and insert: "or erect."

On page 4, line 15, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "(E)" and insert: "(D)".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, and in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "the preceding sentences of this paragraph"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(13) Certain replacement property.—Section 38 property constructed, reconstructed, erected, or acquired by the taxpayer shall be treated as property which is not suspension period property to the extent such property is placed in service to replace property which was—

"(A) destroyed or damaged by fire, storm, shipwreck, or other casualty, or

"(B) stolen,

but only to the extent the basis (in the case of new section 38 property) or cost (in the case of used section 38 property) of such section 38 property does not exceed the adjusted basis of the property destroyed, damaged, or stolen.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, and in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "$20,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, and in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "$20,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: On page 12, line 6, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "$100,000" and insert: "$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, and in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "(3)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 14, beginning on line 7, strike out "(or such higher rate as the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the President, may determine necessary)".

On page 14, line 13, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "the amount" and insert: "the maximum amount".

On page 14, line 15, of the Senate engrossed amendment, strike out "such amount" and insert: "such maximum amount".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 15, line 13, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out the comma.

On page 15 of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out lines 14 through 21.

On page 15, line 22, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "(c) (1)" and insert: "(b) (1)".

On page 17 of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out line 6, and insert:

"(c) The amendment made by subsection (a)".

And the Senate agree to the same.

W. D. MILLS,
CECIL R. KING,
HALE BOGGS,
EUGENE J. KEOGH,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
THOS. B. CURTIS,
JAMES B. UTT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

RUSSELL B. LONG,
GEORGE A. SMATHERS,
CLINTON ANDERSON,
JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
FRANK CARLSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17607) to suspend the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The following Senate amendments made technical, clerical, or conforming changes: 4, 9, 10, 13, 15, 19, 20, 28, 30, 32, 34, and 37. With respect to each of these amendments, the House either recedes or recedes with a technical, clerical, or conforming amendment.

BEGINNING OF SUSPENSION PERIOD

Amendments Nos. 1, 2, 3, 11, 12, 16, 17, 31, 38, and 39: These amendments change the effective date for the beginning of the suspension period from September 9, 1966, to October 10, 1966. The House recedes.

SPECIAL PURPOSE STRUCTURES

Amendment No. 5: The bill as passed by the House contained a proposed section 48 (h)(4) of the code providing a rule for equipped buildings. This amendment adds a new sentence to the proposed section 48(h) (4) providing that for purposes of this rule a special purpose structure is to be treated as a building.

The House recedes.

PLANT FACILITY RULE

Amendment No. 6: This amendment inserts a new paragraph (5) in the proposed section 48(h) of the code providing a general rule that where (1) pursuant to a plan of the taxpayer in existence on October 9, 1966, the taxpayer has constructed, reconstructed, erected, or acquired a plant facility, and (2) either the construction, reconstruction, or erection of such plant facility was commenced before October 10, 1966, or more than 50 percent of the aggregate adjusted basis of all the property of a character subject to the allowance for depreciation making up such plant facility is attributable to either property the construction, reconstruction, or erection of which was begun by the taxpayer before October 10, 1966, or property the acquisition of which by the taxpayer occurred before such date, then all section 38 property comprising such plant facility is to be treated as section 38 property which is not suspension period property.

Under the amendment, the term "plant facility" is defined as any facility which does not include any building (or of which buildings constitute an insignificant portion) and which is (1) a self-contained, single operating unit or processing operation, (2) located on a single site, and (3) identified, on October 9, 1966, in the purchasing and internal financial plans of the taxpayer as a single unitary project.

Subparagraph (C) of the new paragraph (5) provides that if (1) a certificate of convenience and necessity has been issued before October 10, 1966, by a Federal regulatory agency with respect to two or more plant facilities which are included under a single plan of the taxpayer to construct, reconstruct, erect, or acquire such plant facilities, and (2) more than 50 percent of the aggregate adjusted basis of all the property of a character subject to the allowance for depreciation making up such plant facilities is attributable to either property the construction, reconstruction, or erection of which was begun by the taxpayer before October 10, 1966, or property the acquisition of which by the taxpayer occurred before such date, then such plant facilities shall be treated as a single plant facility.

The amendment also provides that, for purposes of the new paragraph (5)(A)(ii) (that is, so much of the general rule described above as relates to when the construction, reconstruction, or erection of the plant facility was commenced), the construction, reconstruction, or erection is not to be considered to have commenced until construction, reconstruction, or erection has commenced at the site of such plant facility. The preceding sentence is not to apply if the site of such plant facility is not located on land.

The House recedes with technical amendments.

MACHINERY OR EQUIPMENT RULE

Amendment No. 7: This amendment strikes out paragraph (5) of the proposed section 48(h) of the Code as passed by the House and replaces the two rules contained therein relating to the completion of machinery by a single machinery or equipment rule contained in a new paragraph (6). Under this new paragraph, any piece of machinery or equipment is to be treated as property which is not suspension period property if (1) more than 50 percent of the parts and components (determined on the basis of cost) were held by the taxpayer on October 9, 1966, or are acquired by the taxpayer pursuant to a binding contract which was in effect on such date, for inclusion or use in such piece of machinery or equipment, and (2) the cost of the parts and components of such piece of machinery or equipment is not an insignificant portion of the total cost.

The House recedes.

CERTAIN LEASE-BACK TRANSACTIONS

Amendment No. 8: The bill as passed by the House (in proposed section 48(h)(6)) contained the rule that where, pursuant to a financing transaction, a person who is a party to a binding contract described in paragraph (3) transfers rights in such contract (or in the property to which such contract relates) to another person but a party to such contract retains the right to use the property under a long-term lease with such other person, then to the extent of the transferred rights such other person shall, for purposes of paragraph (3), succeed to the position of the transferor with respect to such binding contract and such property.

This amendment strikes out the proposed section 48(h)(6) and replaces it with a proposed section 48(h)(7). Under the amendment, the requirement that the transfer be pursuant to a financing transaction is eliminated. Second, the requirement that the lease be a long-term lease is eliminated in those cases where the lessor makes an election under section 48(d) of the code to have the lessee treated as if he had acquired the leased property. Third, under the Senate amendment this provision is to apply where a party to the contract retains a right to use the property under a leaseback from the person to whom the rights or property was transferred, even though other persons (such as a joint lessee) may also have a right to use such property.

The House recedes.

CERTAIN LEASE AND CONTRACT OBLIGATIONS

Amendment No. 14: The bill as passed by the House (proposed paragraph (7) of section 48(h) of the code which becomes paragraph (8) under the Senate amendments) contains rules providing that certain property is not to be treated as suspension period property if it is constructed, reconstructed, erected, or acquired pursuant to obligations in a binding lease or contract to lease in effect on September 8, 1966 (October 9, 1966, under the conference agreement). Similar rules applied where the relationship of the contracting parties was that of vendor-vendee (instead of lessor-lessee).

Senate amendment No. 14 adds two new rules to this provision. The first rule provides that where, pursuant to a binding contract in effect on October 9, 1966, the taxpayer is obligated to construct, reconstruct, erect, or acquire property specified in the contract to be used to produce one or more products, and the other party is required to take substantially all of the products to be produced over a substantial portion of the expected useful life of the property, the property so constructed, reconstructed, erected, or acquired is to be treated as property which is not suspension period property. The second rule provides that property to be used for the production of one or more products is not to be treated as suspension period property if it is constructed, reconstructed, erected, or acquired pursuant to the obligations of a binding contract, in effect on October 9, 1966, with a political subdivision of a State, and the political subdivision is obligated under the contract to make substantial expenditures which benefit the taxpayer.

The House recedes.

AFFILIATED CORPORATIONS

Amendment No. 18: This amendment adds a new paragraph (10) to the proposed section 48 (h) of the code, which provides that where one corporation which is a member of an affiliated group acquires property from another member of the same group (1) such corporation is to be treated as having acquired the property on the date on which it was acquired by the other member, (2) such corporation is to be treated as having entered into a binding contract for the property on the date on which the other member entered into a binding contract for the property, and (3) such corporation is to be treated as having commenced construction, reconstruction, or erection of the property on the date on which the other member commenced such construction, reconstruction, or erection. For purposes of the new paragraph (10), the term "affiliated group" has the meaning assigned to it by section 1504 (a) of the code (which applies 80 percent stock ownership tests with respect to the chain of corporations), except that all corporations are to be treated as includible corporations (without any exclusion under section 1504 (b)).

The House recedes.

WATER AND AIR POLLUTION CONTROL FACILITIES

Amendments Nos. 21 and 22: Under the bill as passed by the House, water and air pollution control facilities which meet certain requirements are to be treated as property which is not suspension period property. Among the requirements was a requirement for certification by the State water pollution control agency (or State air pollution control agency) that the facility is in conformity with the State program or requirements for control of water (or air) pollution and is in compliance with the applicable regulations of Federal agencies and the general policies of the United States for cooperation with the States in the prevention and abatement of water (or air) pollution.

Under Senate amendment no. 21, the certification with respect to regulations of Federal agencies and policies of the United States is to be made, in the case of water pollution control facilities, by the Secretary of the Interior. Under Senate amendment no. 22, the certification with respect to air pollution control facilities is to be made by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The House recedes.

RAILROAD ROLLING STOCK AND HIGHWAY TRAILERS AND SEMITRAILERS

Amendment No. 23: Under this amendment, property which is railroad rolling stock designed to carry freight solely or highway trailers and semitrailers of the type used in commercial freight transportation would be treated as property which is not suspension period property.

The Senate recedes.

CERTAIN OTHER RAILROAD ROLLING STOCK

Amendment No. 24: Under this amendment, railroad rolling stock especially designed and used for local or suburban commuter services would be treated as property which is not suspension period property.

The Senate recedes.

NEW UHF TELEVISION STATIONS

Amendment No. 25: Under this amendment, certain property constructed, reconstructed, erected, or acquired for an ultra-high frequency television station which had been authorized by the Federal Communications Commission before October 10, 1966, would be treated as property which is not suspension period property.

The Senate recedes.

CARGO AIRCRAFT

Amendment No. 26: Under this amendment, certain cargo aircraft acquired for use by air carriers and to be delivered after July 1, 1968, would be treated as property which is not suspension period property.

The Senate recedes.

REPLACEMENT PROPERTY

Amendment No. 27: Under this amendment, property constructed, reconstructed, erected, or acquired by the taxpayer, to the extent it is placed in service to replace property which is destroyed or damaged by fire, storm, shipwreck, or other casualty, or is stolen, is to be treated as property which is not suspension period property.

The House recedes with an amendment. Under the conference agreement, the rule contained in the proposed section 48(h)(13) of the code is to apply only to the extent that the basis (in the case of new replacement property) or the cost (in the case of used replacement property) does not exceed the adjusted basis of the property which is destroyed, damaged, or stolen.

EXEMPTION FROM SUSPENSION

Amendment No. 29: The bill as passed by the House provides, in the proposed new section 48(i) of the code, that property, which would otherwise be suspension period property, acquired by the taxpayer by purchase for use in his trade of business is not to be treated as suspension period property to the extent of items (selected by the taxpayer) having an aggregate cost of $15,000 for the suspension period. Senate amendment No. 29 increased this exemption to $25,000.

The House recedes with an amendment under which the amount of the exemption is $20,000.

CERTAIN LEASED PROPERTY

Amendment No. 33: This amendment adds a new sentence to section 48(d) of the code (relating to certain leased property) which provides that where (1) section 38 property is leased after October 9, 1966 (except pursuant to a binding contract in effect on such date), (2) the property is not suspension period property in the hands of the lessor but would be suspension period property if acquired by the lessee, and (3) the property is of the same kind that the lessor ordinarily sold to customers before October 10, 1966 (or ordinarily leased and made the election under section 48(d) of the code), the lessor will be deemed to have made an election under section 48(d) with respect to such property. Thus, the lessee will be deemed to have acquired such property and the lessor will not be eligible for the investment credit with respect to such property.

The House recedes.

EXEMPTION FROM DENIAL OF ACCELERATED DEPRECIATION

Amendment No. 35: Under the bill as passed by the House a new subsection (1) is added to section 167 of the code (relating to depreciation). The new subsection denies (with certain exceptions) the accelerated methods of computing depreciation with respect to new property which were first permitted by the enactment of the 1954 code if (1) the physical construction, reconstruction, or erection of the property by any person begins during the suspension period, or (2) an order for such construction, reconstruction, or erection is placed by any person during the suspension period.

Senate amendment No. 35 exempted from this rule any item of real property selected by the taxpayer if the cost of such property (when added to the cost of other items selected by the taxpayer) does not exceed $100,000.

The House recedes with an amendment under which the amount of this exemption is $50,000.

HOUSING BUILT ON NONNAVIGABLE WATERS

Amendment No. 36: This amendment provided an exception to the rule for denial of accelerated depreciation (described with respect to Senate amendment No. 35) for any item of real property on which housing is built if such housing could not have been provided but for the enactment of section 307 or 309 of Public Law 89–298.

The Senate recedes.

RETIREMENT AND SAVINGS BONDS

Amendment No. 40: This amendment adds a new section 22A to the Second Liberty Bond Act authorizing the issuance of United States retirement and savings bonds.

The new series of retirement and savings bonds (1) may be issued only on a discount basis (2) shall have maturities of not less than 10 nor more than 30 years, and (3) shall be redeemable before maturity on such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe. If held to maturity, the new bonds would provide an investment yield (as prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury) of not more than 5 percent per annum, compounded semiannually, or a higher rate if so prescribed by the Secretary with the approval of the President. The Secretary is authorized to limit the amount of the new bonds issued in any one year which may be held by any individual (but not below $3,000).

Other provisions of the new section 22A of the Second Liberty Bond Act are similar, in general, to the provisions of law applicable to series E savings bonds.

The House recedes with clarifying amendments and with an amendment which eliminates the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the President, to prescribe a rate of investment yield for the new retirement and savings bonds in excess of 5 percent per annum, compounded semiannually.

PROFESSIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUES

Amendment No. 41: This amendment adds a new section to the bill which amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Act of September 30, 1961, with respect to professional football leagues.

Section 501(c)(6) of the code provides, in effect, exemption from income tax for business leagues, chambers of commerce, real estate boards, or boards of trade, not organized for profit and no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual. Professional football leagues, which are not organized for profit and no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, have been held to qualify for tax exemption under this provision of the code.

Subsection (a) of the new section amends this provision to include, among the organizations specifically enumerated, professional football leagues, whether or not administering a pension fund for football players. Thus, under the amendment, in determining for purposes of section 506(c)(6) of the code whether any part of the net earnings of a professional football league inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, there is not to be taken into account the fact that the league administers a pension fund for football players.

Subsection (b) of the new section amends section 512(b) of the code to provide that, in determining the unrelated business taxable income of organizations subject to the tax imposed by section 511 of the code, there was to be excluded all income derived from promoting or sponsoring any professional football game if such promotion or sponsorship does not occur more than four times during the taxable year with respect to any team.

Paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of the new section amends section 1 of the Act of September 30, 1961 (75 Stat. 732; 15 U.S.C. 1291). The amendment provides that the antitrust laws, as defined in section 1 of the Act of October 15, 1914, as amended, or in the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, shall not apply to a joint agreement by which the member clubs of two or more professional football leagues, which are exempt from income tax under section 501(c)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, combine their operations in an expanded single league so exempt from income tax, if such agreement increases rather than decreases the number of professional football clubs so operating, and the provisions of which are directly relevant thereto.

The amendment to the Act of September 30, 1961, would not extend to the combined league any greater antitrust immunity than that now existing for the existing professional football leagues. The amendment does not seek to resolve any of the antitrust problems of professional football or the other professional team sports. It is the intent of the conferees, both on the part of the House and of the Senate, that the new league will commence operations with no greater antitrust immunity than the existing individual leagues now enjoy. The sole effect of this amendment to the Act of September 30, 1961, is to permit the combination of the two leagues to go forward without fear of antitrust challenge based upon a joint agreement between the member clubs of two leagues to combine in a single league and to conduct their affairs as members of a single league.

Paragraph (2) of subsection (c) of the new section makes a technical conforming amendment to section 2 of the Act of September 30, 1961.

Paragraph (3) of subsection (c) of the new section amends section 3 of the Act of September 30, 1961, to extend to high schools the same protection from telecasting of professional football games that is accorded to colleges. This protection prohibits the telecasting of a professional football game from a telecasting station located within 75 miles of the game site of a college or high school game. The protection extends from 6:00 p.m. on Friday (beginning with the second Friday in September of each year) through Saturday of each week (ending on the second Saturday in December of each year).

Subsection (d) of the new section provides that the amendments made by this section to the Internal Revenue Code are to apply to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of the bill.

The House recedes with clerical and conforming amendments and with an amendment which strikes out the amendment described above to section 512(b) of the code.

REDUCTION IN FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT

Amendment No. 42: This amendment added a new section to the bill which would require, in effect, that, with certain exceptions, only 25 percent of the vacancies occurring in civilian positions in the executive branch of the Government could be filled during any month if at the end of the preceding month the number of civilian employees exceeded a number equal to the number of such employees on September 30, 1966, minus 200,000.

The Senate recedes.

W. D. Mills,
Cecil R. King,
Hale Boggs,
Eugene J. Keogh,
John W. Byrnes,
Thos. B. Curtis,
James B. Utt,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 17607, the membership will recall, passed the House on September 30, temporarily suspending the 7-percent investment credit with respect to investment in machinery and equipment and suspending the use of the accelerated methods of depreciation with respect to buildings. The suspensions will apply to equipment or buildings ordered or constructed during the suspension period, which begins on October 10, 1966, and will terminate on December 31, 1967.

The bill is an important element in a larger program designed to moderate the pace of the economy to a level that is more nearly consistent with rapid but noninflationary growth. The overall program includes a reduction of at least $3 billion in new orders, contracts, and commitments on the part of the Federal Government. It also includes efforts to ease conditions in the money market, and, in particular, to provide more funds for the home mortgage market.

The bill is an integral part of this broad program. It will serve to restrain inflationary pressures in an area of the economy where they have been particularly marked—the capital goods industries. Curbing business spending for new equipment will also contribute to better monetary balance by releasing funds to those sectors of the money market where conditions are now so stringent.

As is nearly always the case, the Senate added a good many amendments to the bill passed by the House. While many of these amendments were essentially technical and perfecting amendments and still others were conforming, there were a number of important amendments, including three that dealt with matters largely unrelated to the subject matter of the bill. As in all conference committees, the major issues were compromised. The Senate agreed to recede on six amendments providing exceptions to the suspensions provided in the bill and to recede on an unrelated amendment concerning a reduction in the number of Federal employees. The conferees on the part of the House agreed to a change in the effective date of the bill and to two of the unrelated amendments. Other issues were compromised on an individual basis.

With regard to the suspensions of the investment credit and of accelerated depreciation on buildings, there were, as I noted, a number of major Senate amendments. Six of these amendments provided exemptions for certain segments of the transportation industry and in certain other limited cases. They also advanced the effective date of the bill and provided blanket exceptions for certain amounts of investment in equipment or buildings. In my opinion, these issues were compromised in a way which preserves the intent of the legislation passed by the House.

When this legislation was considered by the House, we recognized that, in fairness to other taxpayers, exceptions for specific industries could not be made. The Senate, however, provided an exception for railway freight cars, railway rolling stock used for commuter service, truck trailers and semitrailers, and for cargo aircraft. After these exceptions were made, taxpayers in competing industries understandably complained that they would be placed at a competitive disadvantage. The exceptions, moreover, would have removed some of the anti-inflationary impact from this bill. The Senate also provided exceptions for certain ultra-high-frequency television broadcasting stations and certain housing to be constructed on nonnavigable waters. At the insistence of the House conferees, the Senate conferees agreed to recede on all these exceptions.

The House conferees in turn receded on the matter of the effective date. When the administration proposed this measure, it suggested a retroactive effective date. The Ways and Means Committee rejected this procedure and set September 8, the day the President's message was sent to Congress, as the effective date. The Senate Committee on Finance subsequently moved this date to October 10, the date they began executive sessions on the bill. The October 10 date was not prospective when announced and, therefore, taxpayers had no opportunity following its announcement to rush out and complete contracts before the deadline. In the view of the House conferees, this date does not significantly diminish the impact of the bill. Moreover, it minimizes problems connected with projects which were underway at the time the suspension began since taxpayers had a month notice of the suspensions.

The two major issues in the conference concerned the blanket exemptions for up to $25,000 of investment credit property and for buildings costing up to $100,000. The House, you will recall, provided only a $15,000 exemption for investment credit property and did not provide any blanket exception for buildings. The conference agreed to halve the differences between House and Senate bills. Thus, the exemption for investment credit property was increased to $20,000 of such property purchased during the suspension period. In the case of buildings, accelerated depreciation will continue to be available for buildings constructed or ordered during the suspension period provided they cost not more than $50,000. However, a taxpayer is entitled to only one such exception.

The remaining amendments to the bill were worked out based upon experience gained with the bill after the time it was approved by the House. These are amendments, in other words, which would have been approved by the House if the existence of the problems to which they are directed had been known at the time the House considered the bill.

One of these amends the equipped building rule provided in the House bill to make it clear that, for the purposes of this rule, special purpose structures are to be treated as buildings. Members will recall that this amendment is in agreement with statements made in a colloquy I had with Mr. BYRNES when the bill was discussed in this Chamber.

A second important amendment in this category relates to a plant facility. This rule, which parallels the equipped building rule, relates to a facility in which buildings as such constitute only an insignificant portion of the whole. Under this rule, where on-site construction commenced before October 10, 1966, pursuant to a plan of the taxpayer, or where more than 50 percent of the depreciable property of the facility was either under contract or had been acquired before October 10, a facility is not to be defined as suspension period property. The plant facility must be a self-contained, single operating unit or a processing operation located on a single site and identified in the internal financial plans of the taxpayer as a single unitary project. The single processing operation referred to, however, may, of course, result in the production of more than one product.

A third perfecting amendment concerns the machinery and equipment rules of the House bill. The amendment combines the two provisions of the House bill by specifying that machinery and equipment are to be eligible for the investment credit if 50 percent of the parts and components were either held by the taxpayer on October 9, 1966, or are acquired by him under a binding contract that was in effect on that date. If this rule is to apply, the parts and components must not be an insignificant portion of the total cost of the item.

A further perfecting amendment concerns sale and lease transactions. It eliminates three requirements contained in the House bill that related to cases where property contracted for before the start of the suspension period is transferred to another person after that date but leased to a party to the original contract. Eliminated is the requirement that the contract and lease arrangement be connected with a financing transaction with a financial institution. Also eliminated is the requirement that the lease be a long-term lease in those cases in which the lessee receives the investment credit. Finally, this amendment provides that the provision in the bill is to apply where a party to the contract is only one of two or more joint lessees or when the party subleases the property to another.

At this point, I should also like to point out that if the lessor retains the investment credit with respect to the property, this is not intended to foreclose the allowance of the investment credit in the case of a leasing contract which was binding on the lessor on or before October 9, 1966, where the lessee was not required to take a specified amount of the property.

An important technical amendment clarifies a matter contemplated in the provisions of the House bill which deal with water and air pollution facilities. The amendment approved by the House specified that such facilities would continue to qualify for the investment credit if they were certified by the proper State agency as being in conformity both with the State program and with applicable Federal regulations. The House conferees agreed with the Senate that a State agency should not be required to certify that facilities are in compliance with Federal regulations. Therefore, they agreed to Senate amendments which require certification of compliance with Federal regulations by either the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare rather than by State agencies. Agreement was based on the understanding that these amendments are not intended to restrict the applicability of the provision in the House bill.

There were also some minor technical amendments which the conferees on the part of the House agreed to. One such amendment provides that a taxpayer required to construct or acquire property under a contract with a political subdivision under which the latter makes substantial expenditures for the benefit of the taxpayer will not be denied the investment credit or accelerated depreciation if the contract was entered into before October 10. This amendment also covers certain situations where a political subdivision is not a party to the contract.

A second minor amendment provides that if one member of an affiliated group of corporations places property in service which was contracted for, or on which construction was begun, before October 10 by another member of the group, then that member is to be treated as having contracted for the property, or having entered into its construction, at the time the action was taken by the other member of the group.

The final related amendments provide that property placed in service to replace stolen property or property destroyed by a casualty is not to be treated as suspension period property and that a taxpayer who normally sells his products or leases them and passes the investment credit on to the lessees cannot take the investment credit with respect to property he has on hand or in process on October 9 and which he leases after that date.

One unrelated amendment agreed to by your conferees permits the Secretary of the Treasury to issue a new kind of retirement and savings bond. This was agreed to only after the Senate conferees agreed to limit the rate of interest which may be paid on the face amount of such bonds to a maximum of 5 percent. In the Senate version, the 5-percent limit could be exceeded with the specific approval of the President. These new bonds are intended to encourage additional saving rather than to draw funds away from existing forms of saving. The Secretary of the Treasury assured the conferees that every attempt would be made to achieve this result, possibly by providing quite low interest rates during the early life of the bond or possibly by specifying that the new bonds could not be redeemed until a longer period had elapsed after purchase than the 6 months now provided in the case of series E bonds.

Now we come to a second nonrelated amendment; that is, nonrelated to the bill itself. That is the amendment which has to do with professional football leagues.

I want to plead guilty, Mr. Speaker, to being an enthusiast with respect to a great number of sports. Football certainly is included among those sports. Thus I believe that entitles me to say that this is a subject matter to which I have devoted some attention.

I find before me my distinguished friend to whom I will yield time later, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee. We asked him to come to the conference to discuss the matter with us. We wanted to have his advice and counsel about it.

We asked Department of Justice representatives to come. We discussed the matter with them. We sought their advice and counsel.

And I, on the telephone, though I did not have them present at the conference, talked with certain people in the Federal Trade Commission, to get their advice and counsel about this matter.

Let me see if I understand it. If I do not, I will stand corrected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

The major provision in this amendment specifies that the antitrust laws are not to apply to a joint agreement under which two professional football leagues combine their operations in a single larger league as long as the agreement serves to increase rather than decrease the number of professional football teams. This provision does not extend to the combined league any greater antitrust immunity than that which now exists for the separate professional football leagues. For example, in the case of player drafts, the only issue which it is intended to foreclose as far as antitrust action is concerned is that arising from the fact that there will be one instead of two such drafts after the merger. Nor does the legislation seek to resolve any of the antitrust problems of professional football or the other professional team sports. Finally, this provision does not in any way affect the status of any pending litigation or decided cases with respect to this or any other professional sport.

The House conferees were well aware that this is a matter which would normally fall within the jurisdiction of the committee chaired by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. We agreed to this Senate amendment. It has received Senate approval and has support in the House.

A second provision of this amendment states that the exception from the antitrust laws is not to apply to any such joint agreement which permits professional football games to be telecast on Friday after 6 p.m. or on any Saturday—in the period beginning on the second Friday in September and ending on the second Saturday in December—from any television station located within 75 miles of the site of a high school football game. This expands present law which provides a similar rule in the case of intercollegiate football games. The conferees were concerned that this provision may not prevent individual professional teams from telecasting games during those times at which high schools and colleges traditionally play their games. However, the matter was outside the jurisdiction of the conference. We hope that the Congress will watch this situation closely in the event that further legislation to circumscribe telecasts by individual professional teams is found to be necessary.

The remaining provision of this amendment includes a professional football league, even though it administers a pension fund for football players, in the category of exempt organizations which also includes business leagues, chambers of commerce, real estate boards, and boards of trade. The fact that the football leagues, even though administering pension systems are included in this category, does not mean that in other respects they are free of the requirements of present law. Apart from any effect arising from the administration of a pension fund it must meet the test of no profits inuring to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual. Moreover, no inference is intended by this change as to the application of section 501(c)(6) to other types of organizations.

The Senate conferees receded on a further provision which involved an exemption from the tax on unrelated business income with respect to income raised at a charity game.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The statement made by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means is eminently correct as reflected by the fact that hearings were being conducted by the Committee on the Judiciary on this proposal. At those hearings it was testified to by the president of the league that it was not the intention of this legislation to exempt from any antitrust laws other than the combination of the league itself coming together. They testified before the committee to the effect that they were not seeking any exemptions under the antitrust law that they did not now enjoy, save and except the combination of the league would make it possible for them to continue their operation in a more orderly manner and expand the league so that there would be greater competition and more exhibitions.

The gentleman is so right, and I hope the report will be adopted.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CASEY. Will the gentleman tell me this: There has been some concern about whether or not the provision in there prohibiting the telecasting of professional games in interference with high school and college games has been properly cared for. The original version of the bill just stated that the league could not telecast. Can an individual professional team now telecast in the prohibited area?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The answer would be "yes" as to individual teams just like it is "yes" under existing law. We could do nothing about this because this would be an extension beyond the jurisdiction of the conference. Also, the high schools contacted me. They would have preferred that the blackout of these telecasts on Friday night be started earlier in the year. I think they wanted it 1 week or 2 weeks earlier than the Senate provision specified. However, this also was not in conference.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MILLS. All we have done is to see to it that the cloak of immunity is thrown around this merger as such. It does not exempt football from the antitrust laws.

What we have tried to do is to say that just because the leagues merged, that this by itself is not going to represent a violation of the antitrust law.

Mr. Speaker, there may be other steps which need to be taken with respect to the application of the antitrust laws to professional football but this can be studied by the Committee on the Judiciary in the next Congress.

Mr. Speaker, there are people who contend that a good long look should be taken at some of these operations by professional sports. However, I am satisfied that there are able enough people serving on the Committee on the Judiciary to make the determinations necessary. But this action is needed now.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has emphasized the fact that the cloak of immunity is thrown around the merger only.

Mr. Speaker, I was at the hearings that were held by the Committee on the Judiciary for 2 days, and I listened to the Commissioner of the National Football League testify on the merger. It was never the intent of the National Football League, nor of the American Football League, to seek any type of immunity, except that of throwing the cloak of immunity around the league merger itself.

Mr. Speaker, it is my feeling that professional football is fortunate in having the leadership it has in Commissioner Rozelle.

Mr. Speaker, when the Commissioner testified, his testimony was emphatic to the effect that there would be no immunity sought from any antitrust suit except the fact of the merger itself.

Mr. Speaker, I believe all of us who are Members of the House of Representatives who are interested in sports, and sport spectators and football players throughout America, can trust the Commissioner to protect the public and players alike.

The conference report is clear on the intent and purpose of this proposal. I quote from it:

> The amendment to the act of September 30, 1961, would not extend to the combined league any greater antitrust immunity than that now existing for the existing professional football leagues. The amendment does not seek to resolve any of the antitrust problems of professional football or the other professional team sports. It is the intent of the conferees, both on the part of the House and of the Senate, that the new league will commence operations with no greater antitrust immunity than the existing individual leagues now enjoy. The sole effect of this amendment to the act of September 30, 1961, is to permit the combination of the two leagues to go forward without fear of antitrust challenge based upon a joint agreement between the member clubs of two leagues to combine in a single league and to conduct their affairs as members of a single league.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the report.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, protestations are one thing. Protestations by the czar of football are one thing, and opinions of those who are interested is another thing.

But the words of the statute proposed speak louder than all of that.

What does the gentleman from Arkansas propose?

Mr. MILLS. It is not what I propose, but what the other body proposed and what we have brought to you from conference.

Mr. CELLER. Well, what the conference proposed.

Mr. MILLS. That is right.

Mr. CELLER. I quote:

> Such language shall not apply to a joint—

I am reading from the report.

Mr. MILLS. That is right.

Mr. CELLER (continuing)—

> Shall not apply to a joint agreement by which the member clubs of two or more professional football leagues, which are exempt from income tax under section 501(c)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, combine their operations in an expanded single league so exempt from income tax——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has again expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. MILLS. The material the gentleman is reading relates to the status of the football league as a tax exempt organization under the tax laws. I can assure you that is in the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. As to the antitrust proposal I have already tried to explain what the conferees propose. It is that a merger of the two football leagues arising out of a joint agreement is not itself to constitute an antitrust violation. The gentleman is reading the tax provision.

Mr. CELLER. Well, I am simply trying to fathom the depth of what this statute means. That is the problem that the conference report poses.

Mr. Speaker, this speaks of a joint agreement and not a joint agreement testified to before the Committee on the Judiciary. It contains all manner and kinds of operations under the two leagues after the merger, including the common draft, including the boycott, including the division of territory, including the parceling out of franchises and actions of that sort which are presently within the four squares of the antitrust law.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman has referred to language in the statute dealing with section 501(c)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code. The antitrust provision is further down. What I have said about the Antitrust Act, the Department of Justice representatives in the conference fully confirmed, just as did the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, in order that the RECORD might be abundantly clear, I would like to state for the RECORD that, first, I regret as much as my distinguished chairman the fact that we have a conflict with the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

This comes about only because, as I see it, these matters that the chairman brings up the Committee on the Judiciary has not gone into, beginning a good many weeks ago when the other body passed this proposed legislation, I think unanimously. I know the amendment to the tax bill was adopted unanimously.

Beginning then, at the request of Members of this body, I went to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and asked him time and time again to hold hearings on this subject.

He first told me that it was not necessary, and then he said that time was running out. Of course, everybody knew that time was running out. That was why I was asking for the hearings. I know that members of the chairman's own committee asked for the hearings.

Finally we had hearings, and they were very peremptory, they lasted for a very short period of time.

Then, Mr. Speaker, when the matter came before the conference we went into these matters that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary was talking about, and we spelled out in the report the fact that this proposal applied to the merger only.

I do not know how language can be more specific, nor do I know how we could be confronted with a greater legislative impasse than we were on this issue.

The other side of the coin is that the people who represent these leagues and these teams make the statement that unless this legislation is considered and passed that professional football will be in a bad way; that some of these clubs will go bankrupt because the inordinate competition among players in the offering of prices that are unheard of will continue at an even more rapid rate, and the net effect will be that professional sports will suffer a very bad blow.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know of a more considerate man in this body or a more judicious legislator than the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, or a man more cognizant of the rules of the House of Representatives than Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. And he no more wanted to be standing here with this proposition under the circumstances than I want to be. But I know that the legislative process, when the great majority of the Members desire a piece of legislation, cannot be stymied completely and totally and indefinitely. And that is what we were up against.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that the House will adopt this conference report.

I might say one other thing in connection with high school football: we have developed tremendous interest in this country, all over this country, in the boys who play high school football, and unless we adopt this measure there will be no protection remaining under the law.

Now, in reply to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY], there is no protection now. This proposal writes in at least the existing protection that is provided for the college football teams.

So I hope, Mr. Speaker, in the light of the history that has gone on here, which

I think the distinguished member of the Committee on the Judiciary will agree is substantially correct, that this measure will be adopted.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of the amendment to H.R. 17607 which will permit the American Football League and the National Football League to merge into a single professional football league.

I regret that this matter must be brought up in this form. I certainly would have preferred that we follow the orderly procedure of taking up a bill reported from the Judiciary Committee, which has been considering such legislation. However, the limited time remaining to us in this session has precluded completion of committee action.

This is, however, a good bill and prompt action on it is essential in the public interest. The purpose of the bill is simply to permit the two professional football leagues to merge into a highly desirable expanded league without risking antitrust suits. Without this legislation the leagues are reluctant to go ahead in view of the serious uncertainties arising from our antitrust laws. In the absence of legislation they would face a prospect of prolonged and complex litigation.

The Senate report clearly states the limited effect of this measure, as not extending "to the combined league any greater antitrust immunity than that now existing for the existing professional football leagues. The proposed legislation does not seek to resolve any of the antitrust problems of professional football or the other professional team sports."

The great need for this legislation has been most effectively presented to the Judiciary Committee by the commissioner of the National Football League.

Certainly the reaction of the public and the press that has come to my attention has been overwhelmingly favorable. Arthur Daley, the veteran sports columnist of the New York Times, summed up the matter very well with the words:

> Everyone presently involved will benefit—owners, coaches, team members, and fans. . . . The merger will bring stability into pro ball to the mutual benefit of all concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I have the utmost respect and esteem for the great chairman of the Judiciary Committee. Nevertheless, I believe this is urgently needed legislation, and in this instance I must respectfully express my dissent from his position. I strongly urge approval of this legislation.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, under the present system a football player has an opportunity to offer his services to one team in either league.

If this merger is consummated, he would no longer be able to do that. He will have to sign up with the one team that drafted him. Am I correct on that point?

Mr. MILLS. That is my understanding of the situation if he desires to play football in the expanded league. Of course with more teams, as is required in the proposed statute there should be more opportunities to play football.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to get back to the basic bill. I must say this debate is a good demonstration of why I think it is important to abide by the basic rules of procedure of the House.

Mr. Speaker, what is happening here illustrates why the rules of the Congress and of the House if properly observed produce orderly and good legislation and that when we do not abide by the rules—and I do not mean to be a stickler for them—but when we do not abide by the basic rules of procedure, we get ourselves involved in this kind of situation.

Here is probably—at least the administration thinks so—one of the most important bills before this Congress that has to do with what might be done with regard to inflation. Sure, this problem of football is important. I follow with great interest the St. Louis Cardinals football team, still at the top of the league, and they have certainly been in touch with me. But gentlemen and ladies of the House, this diversion from matters which involve the very welfare of the Nation results from the Senate attaching nongermane amendments to House bills, matters that are completely extraneous to the work of the Committee on Ways and Means.

I cannot say anything on the subject of football of intelligence here except one thing: The majority of the House Judiciary Committee who were digging into the question seemed to think the amendment was all right.

Let me get on to the bill itself. I wish to speak mainly to those who, along with myself, voted against the investment credit suspension on the ground that it was the wrong remedy at this time, that it actually was a bit of poison at this point, and would hurt our economy to combat inflation rather than help.

I signed the conference report. I did so in spite of this grave violation of the imposition of a nongermane amendment on the bill. I did so because, first, the bill that we are reporting back from the conference, from the standpoint of those who thought the original bill was bad, is not quite as bad. There were approximately 10 liberalizing Senate amendments that were adopted in conference.

Probably the most significant of those was one which would change the date from September 9 to October 10. But let me say that the inequities that we are creating by this measure are great. The President requested industry to cooperate in slowing down on their expansion, and many industries did cooperate. Those who cooperated are the very ones who are hit by the September 9 date we put in the bill. Of course, by making it October 10, the Senate date, many businesses have been going pell-mell to get in under the wire.

This kind of procedure demonstrates that this is bad legislation. It is, as I again say, less damaging than the original House bill because of the 10 liberalizing amendments plus an additional amendment, I might say, that liberalizes the second tax aspect of the bill which had to do with accelerated depreciation of real estate properties. This improvement makes a big difference to farmers particularly. This was an amendment by Senator WILLIAMS. The Senate had a $100,000 ceiling for capital investments and we compromised on $50,000. But it is a very important amendment affecting farm and other groups.

Furthermore, we further liberalized what was the Battin amendment of $15,000 exemption, to all business investment which would help the small business groups as well as farmers. The Senate had a $25,000 figure, and we took a $20,000 figure.

There is another amendment that is perhaps not quite germane to the technicalities of this bill, but I feel was quite germane to the substance. In fact, it was a proposal that I had suggested when the matter was before the Ways and Means Committee, namely, removing the 4½-percent interest ceiling on long-term Government bonds. In this problem of tight money, largely created by the Federal Government coming in to borrow to finance its deficits, why shouldn't we remove the 4½-percent ceiling on long-term Federal securities? Amendment No. 40 is a step forward in increasing the interest ceiling. It gives a 5-percent interest to retirement and savings bonds of 10 years maturity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. In my judgment, this is a step in the right direction, and I only hope that we can go further in giving flexibility to the administration in its job of debt management. I am not going to need the extra 2 minutes, because the only other comment I had to make had to do with the nongermane amendment in regard to football, and I think there will be further debate on it. I do not want to get into that because I know nothing about it. It has no business being here.

I signed the conference report in spite of what I regarded as a gross violation of proper procedures because the President said, and the House, by majority vote, affirmed that the suspension of the 7-percent investment credit was necessary to combat what the President and many, including myself, have described as serious inflation damaging our society. I disagreed. During House debate I did my best to convince my colleagues that this bill would hurt rather than help in combating inflation.

However, this is the only proposal before the Congress designed to combat inflation. If the judgment of the House in this serious matter is to be upheld, some bill must come out of conference—even one containing extraneous matter such as this which pertains to professional football. Feeling my obligation as a conferee responsible to the House, I signed the conference report to bring a bill back to the House—one I would still speak and vote against in my capacity of an individual Congressman.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished dean of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas, for whom I have the highest of respect and regard.

At the outset I wish to say I favor the Investment Credit Act, but I do not approve the football rider.

The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. MILLS]—and repeated by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO]—stated what the managers' statement reflects; namely, that all this conference report does is to immunize the merger. But paramount to and overriding the report is the statute itself, and the statute immunizes the contents of a joint agreement. What is this joint agreement? We do not know. We are not told in the report. We are not told in any writing whatsoever.

But we did at the hearings before the Judiciary Committee try to plumb the depths of this so-called joint agreement, and we are in possession of part of that joint agreement. It contains all manner and kinds of operations under the league that would be formed, including the common draft, the division of territory, an arbitrary method of doling out franchises, and all manner and kinds of additional operations which presently come within the four squares of the antitrust laws.

That is what we will be immunizing by this action today if we pass and approve this rider. That is why I wanted to have some hearings. I did not want to buy a pig in a poke. I did not want to be like a blind man looking for a black cat in a dark room.

That is exactly what is being done. We do not know what this joint agreement is. It is not set forth in the pages of the report. It is not set forth in the statute itself. I pray that the House will not accept anything of this character.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. I should like to ask the chairman whether I am correct in saying that there were absolutely no hearings held on this in the other body, either.

Mr. CELLER. None whatsoever.

Were I permitted only one question with reference to this conference report I would ask: What is so grossly at stake that a measure that has received no study—no study—by either the House or the Senate should be enacted into law in this manner? I have reference, of course, to the provision dealing with the granting of antitrust immunity to the football leagues.

Perhaps I may be permitted another question. Why the haste?

I repeatedly stated during the course of the hearings on the football merger bill that we must know all the facts, that we cannot proceed until we know all the facts.

I am not necessarily opposed to this merger of these leagues. I have never said I was opposed to the merger. But I want to know what the merger entails. I want to know what is in this package. I want to unwrap this package and find out.

The Ways and Means Committee was unable to do that in the short space of time of one afternoon, a few hours. That could not be done.

There may be some rejoicing in some quarters that an end run was made around me by adding this provision as a rider to this investment credit bill. The end run was not made around me. The end run was made around the public, who now have no way of knowing the whys and wherefores and results that may flow from this football merger.

Let me point out that this end run was also made around the players. Only the owners have had an opportunity to be heard. The player representatives of both the American Football League and the National Football League have requested an opportunity that their side be heard. This procedure abruptly cancels their giving of testimony, which could have shed a good deal of light.

The football owners want this bill so that they can run a common draft in both leagues. The draft is a procedure whereby the club owners agree to divide up the players—treat them like pawns on a chess board. The best college player is compelled to negotiate solely with the worst professional team. If the player is dissatisfied, he cannot work; he has no other club to go to. There are a number of other facets to the common draft that remained to be explored. I desire to explore this enigma, inside a riddle, wrapped in a mystery.

The minutes of the owners committee meetings, for example, indicate that they intend to eliminate the "red shirt" draft. This is the draft of college players that have been selected but have not yet been signed. This is a practice that the colleges have protested. The football owners will eliminate the red shirt draft if the colleges will agree to conditions such as permitting the professional clubs to pay assistant coaches of college teams for scouting services.

In addition, involved in this merger is the fact that the American Football League clubs have agreed to pay as indemnity of some $18 to $20 million to the owners of the National Football League clubs.

Why do the owners want this merger? One reason is they have made improvident contracts and they want and need Congress to bail them out. They have paid star football players from colleges as much as $750,000 in bonus. They are poor negotiators and are asking Congress to rescue them from their own ineptitude and folly. Another reason is that the professional football club owners have carefully reserved to the individual clubs the right to go into pay TV. They are even now making preparation to relegate the so-called world championship game on pay TV. This is not in the public interest.

When this football merger bill becomes law, Congress will have done an unprecedented thing. It will have given a group of employers virtually unlimited power over a group of employees. At the same time, no safeguard is given to protect the employees against abuse. This would not be permitted in any other business. Now, when a player is abused, he may bring an action under the antitrust laws. After this bill is enacted, he will have no direct and effective remedy. It is a shameful thing to do to any group of employees.

The football merger amendment also departs from another longstanding policy of our Government. For the first time, an industry will be exempted from the antitrust laws by an act of Congress and no governmental supervisory agency of any kind is established to protect the interests of the participants or of the public.

Again I state that the facts elicited in the course of a complete hearing may serve to indicate that there should be some kind of an exemption, but until all of the facts are known to us, on what basis do we act? I believe, too, that the method used to draw the blinds on all the facts is an affront to the deliberative process of Congress.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I want to say, in thoroughly agreeing with the distinguished gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, that the public is also concerned here, in addition to the teams and the players.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have heard it said that the public is going to be the victim of this deal in that there will be no more free televising of professional football games, and in due time it will all be pay television.

Mr. CELLER. I will say to the gentleman in that regard the testimony indicates that perhaps the championship games were to be televised. The owners estimated they would get $25 million from pay television. There was an indication also that the individual clubs should telecast their games on closed-circuit pay television. When that was brought out, Mr. Roselle, the czar of football, said to me and the members of the committee, "In the light of what you said, Mr. Chairman, we will recommend that that will not be done. We will not have pay television." What does that show? That shows when we had the light of publicity focused on the operations of the football leagues they immediately backed up and said, "We will not have pay television." But if we had not had those hearings, they probably would have pay television. They may still have pay television, and it may be done in concert and it may be done by an agreement. If you give immunity to them, they may avoid justice in that regard. If they do have pay television, it will not be in the public interest.

We never grant immunity to any industry or to any group unless we have proof that it is in the public interest to grant this immunity. When we do grant it, we usually set up some machinery or some method by which we can supervise and regulate the operations of the industry to whom we have given this immunity. There is no such thing involved in this rider to this act, and for that reason I must object.

It may be—it may be that I will lose this game, but I assure you, ladies and gentlemen, that I shall not lose the series. I am going to continue this inquiry. I assure you there will be a great deal that will be developed and made manifest. If those facts had been known to you gentlemen, you would not have voted for this rider. I am quite convinced of that. I do not want to divulge what I know now. For example, I will tell you this: It was developed that the teams of the American League were obligated to pay as a result of this merger to the teams of the National Football League from $18 to $20 million.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. CELLER. As an indemnity. That word was used in a magazine article. As an indemnity. For what? Why did they have to pay $18 to $20 million? Well, I imagine one league was stronger than the other and therefore the weaker teams, in order to be placed on a parity with the stronger teams, had to pay this vast sum of money. Where will this money come from? The public is interested in where this money comes from and how it is to be paid. Those are the things I wanted to find out, but they jumped the gun on me. Well, that is too bad. As the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] said, this is the result of allowing the House to consider in conference Senate bills to which riders have been appended and which have no relevancy to the subject matter of the bill whatsoever. We have had that so frequently, and the rules of the House should be and must be changed in that regard. At the proper time, Mr. Speaker, I shall move to recommit this report with instructions that the football rider be eliminated.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR].

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that we did not fully develop this matter in the Committee on the Judiciary. We had the opportunity to do so. A number of us introduced legislation in April 1964, more than 2 years ago, dealing with the entire pro sports question, only a small portion of which we are faced with now on this rider. I think the prudent thing to do now, even though I agree with the gentleman from New York that this is a bizarre parliamentary procedure, is to approve this conference report with the rider giving limited antitrust immunity to the proposed NFL–AFL pro football merger.

The Minnesota Vikings are the most exciting team in the NFL. They are a great asset to my area. The merger will serve the interests of football fans, the great majority of the players, and the teams themselves.

I would prefer that this rider outlaw all pro football telecasts from September 1 to mid-December which compete with high school and college football games. But I see no other practicable way of beginning the attack on the problem of expanding the protection for high school and college football, except by now enacting into law this particular provision.

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that if we turn down this conference report we will be forfeiting for some time the chance to guarantee to high school and college football immunity from the killing competition of simultaneous telecasts of professional football games. To be sure, this rider does not give the high schools all the protection they seek, but it is an excellent beginning. And we can go forward next year to finish the job by amending this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, high schools in many parts of Minnesota start their competitive season on the first Friday in September. This is high school football day and high school football night. This legislation will only give them protection starting the second Friday.

The Senate rider also fails to give protection against competing telecasts by individual pro football clubs, as opposed to telecasts arranged by the merged league with one or more of the TV networks.

Mr. Speaker, although the rider is incomplete, we should not turn this conference report down. The prospect that we in the Judiciary Committee will make any progress in bringing about this protection is nil in light of the record.

Mr. Speaker, I feel this merger is sound. The language of the rider makes it clear that the sharply limited antitrust immunity is contingent upon there being an increase and not a decrease in the number of professional football clubs. The adoption of the rider will expand, not restrict, competition.

Mr. Speaker, it is true that a common NFL–AFL draft will end the bonus war which each year promises to make a few college graduates rich. But the merged league proposes to elevate the minimum wage for all players to $12,000 annually, and thus a great many present and future backs, ends, tackles, guards, and centers will benefit.

Mr. Speaker, by accepting this conference report now we will be able starting next January to work in the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives to expand the protections that would otherwise remain nonexistent for high school football events, and inadequate for college and university contests.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL].

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] said there has been an end run. I do not think so. I believe the chairman of the committee has been clipped from the rear, that the Judiciary Committee has been mousetrapped, and that every Member of this House has been subjected to "unnecessary roughness."

Mr. Speaker, I would recommend that the commissioner of football be penalized half the distance between the Senate and the House of Representatives for unsportsmanlike conduct.

Mr. Speaker, the National Football League has its rules, and Mr. Rozelle would be the first to complain if they were violated.

Mr. Speaker, we have our rules, and they should also be obeyed.

Mr. Speaker, let us face it. The owners of pro teams do not want to pay football players the price that football players are demanding. But they want to get the price from the television companies that they are demanding, and the television companies want to get the price from the advertisers which they are demanding.

Mr. Speaker, this is big business and, in my judgment, while the merger may ultimately be determined to be proper, it deserves the careful scrutiny of the House of Representatives, for the protection not only of the football players, but of the public.

Mr. Speaker, if the other body had held hearings, and if all facets of this question had been explored, and if this legislation was being intentionally impeded by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I would understand this procedure. But there have been no hearings in either body and this action is premature.

Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, do not let the argument that this legislation has been pending for years fool you. This argument has been presented before, and it is erroneous. This football merger did not become a necessity until the two leagues agreed between themselves as to what the price tag was going to be, and once they agreed on the price tag, they wanted immediate action in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to blow the whistle and postpone the game until the next season.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MACDONALD].

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I rise in opposition to this rider.

There has been much said about clipping and penalties, and so forth, and the fact that much money is invested in this business, and of course there is. But I think there is one thing that is overlooked, and I believe the southern Members of this body should take a closer look at this than they have so far, the fact, as I understand it—and I want to ask a question about it in a minute—these boys who are drafted, the college football players who are drafted, if there is a merger of the leagues they have absolutely no choice as to what they will do. They will either play for the team that wins them in a draft—and I think they even flip a coin for these bodies, they certainly do not treat them as if they were humans. It is a form of slavery which we hear so much about in this great parliamentarian body of ours, that we should free everybody. But at the same time we are freeing everybody, we are waging a war against poverty, we are waging wars for people who have been impoverished because of slavery.

If we adopt this rider with no hearings in the Senate and no hearings in the House we are putting back into bondage these boys who have played in college and who get drafted.

Mr. Speaker, I do not speak from knowledge as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, or even, obviously, a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, but I am one of those people who was drafted, and I know that you either sign with the club that drafts you, or you do not play.

I do not think this is a fair thing that we in the Congress should do without hearing more about it than has been exposed in the hearings that have been held.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. **MILLS**. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Kastenmeier].

Mr. **KASTENMEIER**. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the subcommittee which barely started the hearings, I would like to respond to the comment of the gentleman from Louisiana that he had been stymied in connection with hearings on this, or having this matter treated by the committee.

The bill, S. 3817, which embodies this, was passed by the Senate and came over here September 27 of this year. We started our hearings October 6. What is so terrible about 9 more days? I would say that we proceeded promptly on this.

If there is any reason that we did not even complete the testimony of the first witness, it was because we were constantly going into session at 11 o'clock in the morning, and could not complete our hearings.

Mr. Speaker, the only people that want this are not professional football, but the owners of the franchises of professional football. There are a lot of others involved.

I might also say that if this House and this Congress cannot resist the importuning of these two separate leagues to do as they ask, then we will never be able to do so. I suggest we should stop before it is too late.

In our hearings we were unable to reach, as has been pointed out, the players, people prospectively in other leagues who may have wanted to testify, the Department of Justice, and at least dozens of our own Members who wanted to testify and had no opportunity, the fans, and the high schools and colleges. And even their position is cloudy at the moment.

Here is an AP release from Tuesday of this week, 2 days ago, stating that antitrust action delay was requested by a group of college and high school officials.

I do not know whether they want this or not. I do not know whether anyone can really speak for them on the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we reject this amendment.

Mr. **MILLS**. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Rogers].

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment returned from the conference. I base it on the fact that, if it is adopted, it will make it easier to have more competitive teams and have more competitive games.

I point to the fact that somebody saying something about the draft. In my hometown we have the Denver Broncs. They have not had a draft even recognized in the last 4 years with the result that they are not in a position to be competitive with other teams by having players attracted to them. The players go elsewhere.

It is for this reason that I became interested in this proposal. I want to make it abundantly clear, as I stated before, the president of the league, Pete Rozelle, testified before the committee and he testified that the only objective they had by this legislation was to see that the leagues, by the combination, would not violate the antitrust law.

He went further and testified that if there were antitrust violations—and his attorney was sitting there—that they would take the consequences of that.

Hence we are not buying a "pig in a poke" so to speak as was pointed out by my beloved chairman. He made a positive statement here that it is not their intention to violate the antitrust laws.

In support of that statement, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Record at this point the statement of Commissioner Rozelle which is positive and clear as to his position.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. Price). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The statement referred to is as follows:

Statement of Commissioner Rozelle Before the Antitrust Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary, October 6, 1966

Mr. Chairman and members of the Antitrust Subcommittee of the House of Representatives, professional football will always be most appreciative of this opportunity for hearings extended by Chairman Celler and the members of this Committee. Your recognition of the urgency of our problem and your willingness to review it at this time are most gratifying.

I am here today to respectfully urge this Committee to act promptly and to act favorably on S. 3817, a bill of very limited scope. By doing so, you will be making possible a plan for major league professional football in America which has the support of millions of sports fans and which will be beneficial to the colleges and the high schools as well.

I shall not attempt today to set before you every reason, both practical and legal, for the passage of this bill nor will I attempt to set forth every factor which supports our plan for a single league. I will answer any questions you may have at the close of my statement. Should certain questions fall into areas with which others have greater familiarity, they can be answered by others here today. I have with me Mr. Lamar Hunt, principal founder of the American Football League and current President of the Kansas City Chiefs of that League. I also have with me Texas Schramm, President of the Dallas Cowboys of the National Football League. These two gentlemen have an established experience in football club operations and played the lead role in developing the single league plan which this bill will permit to become effective.

On the basis of our present evaluation of the liabilities that might be accumulated through governmental and/or private litigation, I feel I must say very candidly at this time that if legislation is not passed by the Congress it will be my strong, although reluctant, recommendation to the presidents of the twenty-four clubs comprising the National Football League and American Football League that they should not proceed with the plan.

I am going to limit my comments simply to the four basic elements of the matter before this Committee.

First, I would like to comment on what the bill does and what it does not do.

Secondly, I want to point out some of the many benefits which this single-league plan will bring to the public, to the local fans of professional football clubs, to civic stadium authorities, and the players themselves.

Third, I want to emphasize what is going to happen within a very short period of time if this plan is not made possible.

Fourth, I want to briefly comment on why this bill is necessary and why we urge it be enacted during the present session of Congress.

S. 3817, as passed by the Senate, has two basic purposes. The basic, vital purpose of this bill is to clarify the status under the antitrust laws of our announced plan to bring into existence a single, nationwide professional football league consisting of all present clubs of both the National Football League and the American Football League and other franchises to be added later. The bill would make this possible by declaring that the simple act of the clubs of both present leagues in bringing their operations within the structure of a single league will not in itself be subject to challenge under the antitrust laws.

It does no more than this.

In the words of the Senate Report, it "would not extend to the combined league any greater antitrust immunity than that now existing for the existing professional football leagues". Expressed another way, it would not give the expanded league any greater antitrust immunity than that which other single-league professional sports, such as basketball or hockey, now have. The only item exempted from the application of the antitrust laws would be the agreement among the member clubs of the two leagues to combine into a single league. All other applications of the antitrust laws to professional sports, which various versions of the Sports Bill have attempted to clarify, would remain as they are. But we need this intermediate and thoroughly limited measure now in order to give us the ability to go forward with the plan. The orderly expansion and growth of professional football, as opposed to a disorderly contraction, depend on this.

Secondly, the bill would extend to the high schools of America the same protections against Friday night or Saturday telecasts of professional football games as that presently given college football.

The plan for the expanded league is embodied in an agreement between the member clubs of the two leagues which was entered into during the first week of June of this year. That agreement has been filed with counsel for this Committee. I will outline for you its principal features:

(1) Every franchise of both leagues will remain in its present location.

(2) Two new franchises will be added by the 1968 season, making a total of 26 teams.

(3) Studies will then be made of the feasibility of adding two more franchises.

(4) A world championship game between the champions of the two present leagues will be established beginning in January 1967.

(5) Following this championship game, a player selection system will be instituted by the combined league with priority of selection determined by the won-loss record of each team during the 1966 season.

(6) Pre-season games will be played between the teams of the two present leagues beginning with the 1967 season.

(7) By 1970, there will be full integration of the combined league schedule with regular season games being played by the clubs of the two present leagues.

(8) During the period prior to 1970, each league will continue to operate under existing television contracts. Beginning in 1970, there will be an equal division of television income among all clubs of the combined league.

Professional football unquestionably has widespread public support. We appreciate this and furthermore we recognize the debt that goes with it in meeting fan desires. The pro football fans have told us in recent years that:

1. They wanted a championship game between the leagues.

2. They decried what they considered wild spending for unproven talent.

3. They didn't like the increasing indication that the stronger teams would continue to dominate the various divisions and conferences of the leagues.

These were their basic points.

We believe we have met these demands and more in every phase of this plan. There is no alternative way of meeting these public interests and establishing them on a permanent basis.

The advantages of this plan to many different interests are clear. Among these, I refer to the following:

(1) Professional football operations will be preserved in the 23 cities and 25 stadiums where such operations are presently being conducted. This alone is a matter of considerable public interest—to local economies, stadium authorities, and consumers. Without the plan, franchise moves and/or franchise failures will occur as a matter of course within the next few years.

(2) The plan will guarantee additional professional football franchises for a number of new cities. Professional football will then be even more national in scope, more so than any other professional sport. Without the plan, contraction rather than expansion will be the ultimate consequence, as the developing economic conditions in professional football successively put more and more franchises into difficulty. Professional football experienced this once before in the All America Conference days and is again heading toward the same end.

(3) By placing all the existing major league professional football franchises under one league structure, under a common set of bylaws and on substantially the same basis of economic opportunity, there will be a return to the primary objective of professional football—a type of football competition the public enjoys. With all franchises operating under the same player squad limits, the same pension plan, with equal access to player trades, with equal television income, participation in a player draft, and equally attractive visiting teams, football competition rather than ability to withstand losses can be made the dominant element of the game. Conditions can be created where all clubs, including those in less favorably situated cities, can have an equal run at success in competition with such cities as New York, Los Angeles and Chicago.

(4) Under the plan, a drafted player will receive a minimum income of $12,000 in his first year of competition.

(5) It will substantially increase insurance and pension plan benefits to all AFL players.

(6) The later player selection meeting will eliminate interference with the college football program and improve the relationship between amateur and professional athletics.

Our plan does not involve a merger in any traditional business or antitrust sense. All clubs of both leagues remain under their present ownership and there are no exchanges of stock or business assets. What it is, in essence, is an agreement between the member clubs of the two leagues to play games with one another and to conduct their affairs in the manner in which professional sports leagues operate.

But the implementation of the plan makes a broad series of accompanying commitments necessary. Stadium commitments, television commitments, new franchise commitments, the application of a common set of bylaws to the clubs of both leagues, and literally thousands of contract relationships are broadly involved in the plan. Before even the first of these is undertaken, we must have reasonable assurance that the new league can continue on a permanent basis free of endless litigation directed at each action taken or not taken. As the newspapers have already made clear, possible injunctive suits and potential treble damage liability, accumulating with each step taken, make the plan extremely hazardous in the absence of Congressional approval. The Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice has authorized us to state that they have serious concern about the plan although they have not yet decided whether to bring suit.

It is conceivable that the sum total of financial risks resulting from legal action could easily be larger than the total value and net assets of all the existing franchises. This is what led me to emphasize at the outset that I would have no responsible alternative but to recommend that we not proceed.

The consequences of continuing as separate entities are clear. Club owners in both leagues know it, but current conditions offer no escape.

Both leagues must, if they are to preserve their public image of major league status, secure a fair share of the football talent emerging from the colleges each year. But such talent is in limited supply and, in the last analysis, the competition is not between the two leagues but between the individual clubs of the two leagues. The results would be player costs soaring ever upward, increasing internal deterioration of both leagues, increasing inequalities of team play within each league and the development of conditions where the ability to field representative football teams will depend solely on the franchise's willingness and ability to stand increasing losses.

These are not simply self-serving speculations. The familiar process is already well under way again. No competitive abstractions drawn from other business contexts can alter these results. Factors of income increases, when they have occurred in the past or should they occur in the future, will do no more than advance the struggle to higher income and loss levels.

Today some clubs of both leagues have already withdrawn from the player market. Others, under the pressure of having to remain competitive within their own leagues and with a determination to be among those clubs which survive, are bidding for players at prices which have no relation to football economics. Indeed, many clubs are assuming deferred payment obligations of such dimensions that if this practice continues active player payrolls in future years will be only a minor element of player costs. This is simply a process of exchanging future obligations for present survival, a process which will make future survival even more questionable.

Statistics of individual player contracts have been furnished on a confidential basis to your Committee counsel. I can only say that where bonus commitments and deferred payment obligations to single players have exceeded the entire gross road game receipts of a member club, survival in football is shortly going to depend solely on each league's ability to carry its own failing franchises.

The need for this bill is clear. So also is its urgency. We must immediately designate at least one new city for expansion in order to permit that new franchise to develop its organization to participate in the draft scheduled for January. We must immediately begin making television and other arrangements for the championship game scheduled for this coming January. We must immediately begin preparing for the draft to follow the championship game. We can do none of these things without your prompt support followed by early action in the House of Representatives.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am in support of the football rider because I believe it will result in a better game, a cleaner sport, a more honest sport, and more competitive sport, and that these teams that cannot afford these huge bonuses will not be put out of business.

Franchises will be preserved. More teams will come into being. It appears to me that what has happened is Congress is not permitting the chairman of the committee, for whom I have a great deal of respect, to continue playing the hidden ball trick with one man in possession of the ball during the entire game and until the clock runs out. But, and rightly so, all Members will have an opportunity to determine what should be done relating to this legislation.

This rider, as did my bill, permits only to preventing the antitrust act from applying solely to the merger of those two leagues and antitrust will apply to them hereafter acting as a single league and it does not exempt anything that flows from the contract which the chairman has referred to. The Senate language limits the effect as I have stated. Of course, the contract terms is the red herring that has constantly been spread over these discussions and the committee hearings and the terms there of not directly related to the merger itself is not what they are asking exemption from.

Also, high school terms get the 75-mile noncompetition by TV broadcasts of professional games for the first time. All high schools should be anxious to get this protection although I had prepared an amendment to extend the dates covered to include all high school game dates to be offered in committee.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to play football but I am going to try to talk about the tax bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to direct a question to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

At the time that the Committee on Ways and Means was considering this piece of legislation, I presented a set of facts to the chairman. This involved a company which committed itself to supply coal to utilities and agreed to build a conveyor belt transporting the coal from the mines to the utility. I believe they were committed to acquire the property before the suspension period began. It is my understanding, that this set of facts did not qualify for exemption under the House version of the bill.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman is correct. However, language was developed on the Senate side to cover this situation. It would qualify under what is called a third-party contract—either the regular third-party contract rule or the new third-party supply contract rule.

Mr. SAYLOR. I thank the gentleman.

The **SPEAKER.** The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 11 minutes to my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I must confess that I have a very, very special interest in the amendment that we are discussing in connection with the conference report. I come from Green Bay, Wis. I was born there. It is my hometown. It is the hometown of the Green Bay Packers, the National Football League champions. I will have you know we will repeat that feat again this year.

If the two leagues, the National Football League and the American Football League come together, we will be undisputed world champions, because we will win the playoff between those two leagues. So you can see how important this measure is to some of the people in my district and to me.

Now, let me point out a few facts. Green Bay is a small town. It was one of the earliest cities to have a professional football team. It was one of the first teams in the National Football League. In 1930, when it won the national championship, the town had a population of 37,000 people. It was a pygmy among giants. How have we survived? We survived because of the conduct of the National Football League, which protected the small, which provided for competition. And all this discussion about the efforts of the league to freeze out the small, and favor the big franchise owners, leaves me cold. Let me say to my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER], that this team that is the champion of the league is a nonprofit corporation. It is publicly held. It has 17,000 shareholders among the people in the community of Green Bay, Wis., and the surrounding area. There are no dividends. All they can do is elect a board of directors.

If they go down the drain, or if something happens so far as the franchise is concerned, do you know who gets any money that is involved? The veterans' service organizations in Green Bay, Wis.

The people who want this are the people of Green Bay and the sports fans of northeastern Wisconsin. They want this merger, and it is vital to us.

There has been too much confusion in this picture, and I hope to eliminate some of it.

While the Packers did successfully compete in the so-called bonus war of last year, there is doubt, I would suggest, that this team and a number of other teams could survive the competition year after year with teams that have far greater financial resources and who can give inflated bonuses to many recent college graduate players. That would be reduced under the merger, but more importantly, it seems to me, is that a more equitable distribution of the funds available for salaries among experienced players as well as new players would result.

To me it is in the public interest to provide for increased numbers of professional football teams and the number of football games that give the public an additional opportunity to enjoy the sport, and we would do so by the enactment of this merger.

There would be additional teams and additional games, which would mean more opportunities for employment for players, coaching personnel, and more opportunities for the sports fans. Is that restraint? Is that the kind of thing our antitrust laws are supposed to reach? I do not think so.

I think we are getting the issues confused. There is the problem of the professional football teams themselves, and they have faced it ever since we enacted the antitrust laws, particularly since the Radovitch decision of the Supreme Court, which states that football is a business, and therefore shares the possibility of being subject to the antitrust laws.

A sport has to have rules.

One cannot play a sport without rules, without certain conditions, without leagues, without teams; otherwise, one would not have any organized team sport.

This was apparent to the Judiciary Committee and it was apparent to the Congress years ago. In 1958 the House passed legislation dealing with the problems of the player draft and the reserve clause, and the overall antitrust problems that do face the league.

I believe Congress should face up to the questions and provide a solution to those problems. But this bill is not addressed to those problems. The amendment leaves that open. We do not try to say they are immune from the antitrust laws. If this bill is enacted and there is a merger there will be no different situation with respect to whether football complies with the antitrust laws and whether its practices comply with the antitrust laws than there was before 1960 when we had only one football league, the NFL. When we passed legislation in this House, back in 1958, we were trying to cope with the problem then.

Yes, we are again going to have one league. But, that is all we had back in 1959, if I remember the date when the AFL was organized and started. We are not going to be upsetting anything. All we do is say, "Gentlemen of the NFL and AFL, you can get together."

So far as all the other aspects are concerned, including the draft, they are left undisturbed by this amendment. Whether that is good or bad, whether it violates the antitrust laws is not decided by this amendment. Let me say this: Green Bay, Wis., would not have a football team, and no little town would have a football team if there were not some system to equalize competition. If we had no player draft where would the better players go? They would go to the teams with the big money and the big franchises. They would go to those on the top of the league, not to the little guy. That in my judgment is what the draft is designed to prevent. It is designed to prevent the big from getting bigger and killing off the small. That is also one of the purposes of the antitrust laws.

But, this is not the time to discuss whether the draft is good, bad or indifferent, because that is not involved in this particular amendment.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to my colleague from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman might point out that this very proposition passed the other body twice unanimously. The idea that everyone in the other body is against antitrust legislation is a hard proposition to swallow.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I appreciate the gentleman's bringing that up.

Mr. BOGGS. Including the Senators from the gentleman's home State.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. If I have time remaining I will. I cannot yield further at this time.

Mr. MACDONALD. I was just wondering how many games——

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The gentleman refuses to yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I will yield to any gentleman if I have time remaining, but I have limited time. It cannot be extended.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I said I refuse to yield at this time. I demand the regular order.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The gentleman refuses to yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. We passed legislation in 1958 in the House dealing with these more intricate problems. It went over to the Senate. It was in the latter days of the Senate session, and it got caught in the rush of adjournment.

But the Judiciary Committee of the House and the present chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House have known this was a problem which needed attention since before that time, and that it was an unresolved problem. Bills have been introduced time after time after time. Efforts have been made year after year after year to get the Judiciary Committee, and particularly the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, to take the matter under consideration, to give the players a hearing, to give the teams a hearing, to give the sports fans a hearing, and to resolve the problem.

But, no, we could not get one iota of consideration. Until just the other day, there was not a minute of hearings given to this particular legislation after 1958.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Of course I yield to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CELLER. The bills the gentleman refers to related to all organized sports, including hockey and baseball.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. But football has a more particular interest than other professional sports, because they are under the Radovitch decision, and the gentleman knows that.

Mr. CELLER. That is quite a different situation.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. It has been clear for a long time that there is a problem as far as professional sports are concerned with respect to compliance with the antitrust laws. The problem will remain after this amendment is adopted.

All you are doing is taking one particular, one little aspect here and saying you can get together and join together, the two major football leagues without violating the antitrust laws.

Mr. Speaker, in 1964, 2 years ago, some 14 Members of the House, on April 15, introduced bills to take care of these various problems. I introduced one of the bills (H.R. 10907). Nothing was done. The Judiciary Committee refused to consider our bills that was in the 88th Congress.

What about this Congress, the 89th? The United States on August 31 of last year passed—not this year but last year—passed legislation to face up to the issue of the antitrust problems as far as professional sports are concerned. They passed S. 950 which has been before the committee for over a year. Did we get a hearing? Oh, no. We have been put off and put off and put off. It is only because of that fact, Mr. Speaker, frankly, that I have to support this amendment as part of a tax bill. There is no other avenue open to us because we have been refused consideration in a hearing by the committee.

A little more history might be valuable on this point. When no action was forthcoming on the broader bill (S. 950) a bill limited to the narrow area of permitting the merger was introduced in the Senate on September 9. This bill passed the Senate on September 26. On September 30 the chairman of the Judiciary Committee finally announced he would start hearings on October 6. Remarks at that time, we were talking about adjourning this Congress on October 15. The committee met on October 6 for 2 hours and adjourned to October 11. The committee was making little progress; the Congress was headed for adjournment; the chance for a merger this year was running out. It was at this point that the limited bill was added as an amendment to this tax bill in the Senate.

There is concern about bypassing the Judiciary Committee. I share that concern. But if the merger is to become a reality, we must act in this way and at this time. We have no alternative. I therefore urge, in the interest of a great sport, that we accept this amendment by adopting the conference report.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree to the conference report under consideration, entitled "Foreign Investors Tax Act of 1966."

The provision for designating income tax money to go for presidential campaigns is totally obnoxious to me as written into the conference report by the other body.

There is no provision that additional funds may not be raised by the parties, thus swelling campaign chests to astronomical figures. Large chunks of money may continue to flow into presidential treasuries with the taint that might go with such contributions.

The people are fed up with the 4-year circus paid for by large campaign treasuries and this will only add to the people's disgust. These campaigns are entirely excessive now and the provision in the conference report will make them even more so. Also I believe the Senate language agreed to by the House conferees setting up private pension plans is excessive and goes far beyond the original intent of the House.

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that I plan to vote against the conference report on H.R. 17607. I voted against the House version of the bill several weeks ago, since I felt it would work a hardship on some segments of our economy.

The conference report, in my judgment, does not correct the defects of the original House bill and I intend to vote against the conference report at this time.

At this time, I would also like to make my position clear on another piece of legislation that has come before the House today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the conference report on H.R. 6958, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

After the House passed its version of this bill, the Senate added a new provision dealing with the determination of reasonable cost of services for extended-care facilities under the medical-care-for-the-aged program.

The House-Senate conference committee has reported a revised version of the Senate amendment. Some further changes may be needed later, but the legislation now before the House is a decided improvement over the HEW regulations presently in force.

Basically, the amendment before the House would allow private nursing homes to realize some return on capital investments made for extended-care facilities under the medical-care-for-the-aged program.

This, it seems to me, is only fair and equitable. Moreover, if the program is to operate effective in all areas, it is essential that we make use of facilities at private nursing homes.

The medical-care-for-the-aged program was enacted by Congress just last year. I have stated on many occasions that one of the most important tasks of Congress in the next several years will be a careful scrutiny of the new programs established in 1965.

In this case, it seems clearly evident that a change in the law is needed. In Iowa, more than 80 percent of the nursing home facilities are privately owned and the medical-care-for-the-aged program, both in Iowa and elsewhere in the Nation, needs the help of privately owned homes.

The amendment before the House will allow these homes to cooperate in the program without facing an undue hardship, and I therefore urge its passage.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BETTS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BETTS moves to recommit the conference report on the bill H.R. 17607 to the committee of conference.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CELLER. Can a motion to recommit be amended so that we can provide that the motion to recommit to the conference committee shall be with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist on their disagreement to Senate amendment No. 41 known as the football rider?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will say that the gentleman's previous question has been agreed to and the motion to recommit has been offered and no amendments to the motion to recommit are in order.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CELLER) there were—ayes 32, noes 47.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 57, nays 184, not voting 191, as follows:

[Roll No. 398]

YEAS—57

Ashbrook
Ashmore
Betts
Bingham
Burton, Calif.
Cahill
Callan
Cameron
Celler
Clark
Cleveland
Daddario
Farbstein
Fraser
Fulton, Pa.
Giaimo
Harsha
Hathaway
Hays
Hechler
Hutchinson

Johnson, Pa.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Krebs
Latta
McClory
McGrath
Macdonald
Machen
Mathias
Minish
Morgan
Nedzi
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Patten
Pike
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
St. Onge
Scheuer
Slack
Springer
Staggers
Stalbaum
Tenzer
Udall
Vivian
Wolff
Wydler
Zablocki

NAYS—184

Abbitt
Adair
Addabbo
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Bandstra
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Bell
Bennett
Boggs
Boland
Bolton
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Casey
Chamberlain
Clausen, Don H.
Collier
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Daniels
de la Garza
Dent
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Tenn.
Edwards, Calif.
Everett
Fallon
Farnum
Fascell
Flood
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Garmatz
Gathings
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzales
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Grider
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hardy
Harvey, Mich.
Henderson
Herlong
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Ichord
Irwin
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Okla.
Jonas
Karsten
Kee
Keogh
Kluczynski
Kunkel
Landrum
Langen
Leggett
Lipscomb
Long, Md.
Love
McDade
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
May
Mills
Mize
Monagan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Mosher
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
O'Brien
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Price
Quie
Quillen
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Satterfield
St Germain
Saylor
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Stubblefield
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Utt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Watson
Weltner
Whalley
White, Tex.
Widnall
Williams
Wright
Young

NOT VOTING—191

Abernethy
Adams
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Glenn
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Belcher
Berry
Blatnik
Bolling
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Callaway
Carey
Carter
Cederberg
Chelf
Clancy
Clawson, Del
Clevenger
Cohelan
Colmer
Cooley
Corman
Craley
Culver
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
Delaney
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Duncan, Oreg.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Farnsley
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fuqua
Gallagher
Gettys
Gilligan
Goodell
Greigg
Gross
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Hébert
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Howard
Hungate
Huot
Jacobs
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kornegay
Kupferman
Laird
Lennon
Long, La.
McCarthy
McCulloch
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McMillan
McVicker
Mackay
Mackie
Mailliard
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Matthews
Meeds
Michel
Miller
Mink
Minshall
Moeller
Moore
Moorhead
Morton
Moss
Murray
Nelsen
Nix
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
Pool
Powell
Pucinski
Purcell
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roncalio
Roudebush
Roush
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Scott
Senner
Shipley
Sisk
Smith, N.Y.
Stafford
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Toll
Trimble
Tunney
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Waldie
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watts
White, Idaho
Whitener
Whitten
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wyatt
Yates
Younger

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Albert with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Reinecke.
Mr. King of California with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Miller with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Martin of Alabama.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Schisler with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Schmidhauser with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Mackay with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Senner with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Mackie with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
Mr. Gilligan with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Olsen of Montana with Mr. Bray.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Callaway.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Stafford.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Robison.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Michel.
Mr. McFall with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Hall.
Mr. Dyal with Mr. Glenn Andrews.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.
Mr. Foley with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Moeller with Mr. Stanton.
Mr. Corman with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Denton with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.
Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Roush with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Rogers of Florida with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Van Deerlin.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Whitten.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Charles H. Wilson.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Olson of Minnesota.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Chelf.
Mr. McVicker with Mr. Brown of California.
Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Hicks.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Roberts.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Rogers of Texas.
Mr. Adams with Mr. Roncalio.
Mr Hungate with Mr. Craley.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Baring.
Mr. Huot with Mr. Duncan of Oregon.
Mr. King of Utah with Mr. Flynt.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mrs. Mink.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Meeds.
Mr. Nix with Mr. McCarthy.
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Stratton.
Mr. Haley with Mr. Thompson of Texas.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Todd.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. Walker of New Mexico.
Mr. Hansen of Iowa with Mr. Trimble.
Mr. Pool with Mr. Tunney.
Mr. Whitener with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. McMillan.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Sweeney.
Mr. Randall with Mr. Yates.
Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Bow.
Mrs. Kelly with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Goodell.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. King of New York.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Race with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Younger.
Mr. Redlin with Mr. Keith.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Kupferman.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Clevenger with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Farnsley with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Brademas.
Mr. Greigg with Mr. Moorhead.
Mr. Holland with Mr. Matthews.
Mr. Waldie with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Toll.

Mr. FRASER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Messrs. SECREST and HALPERN changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 161, nays 76, not voting 195, as follows:

[Roll No. 394]

YEAS—161

Abbitt
Addabbo
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Bennett
Bingham
Boggs
Boland
Brademas
Brooks
Broomfield
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell

Cahill
Callan
Casey
Clausen, Don H.
Conable
Conyers
Corbett
Cunningham
Daddario
Daniels
de la Garza
Dent
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Downing
Dulski
Edwards, Calif.
Everett
Fallon
Farnum
Fascell
Flood
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Garmatz
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Grider
Griffiths
Grover
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hardy
Hathaway
Hechler
Herlong
Holland
Hull
Ichord
Irwin
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Kee
Keogh
Kluczynski
Krebs
Landrum
Langen
Long, Md.
Love
McGrath
Macdonald
MacGregor
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Poff
Price
Quie
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Sickles
Sikes
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Stubblefield
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thomas
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Weltner
White, Tex.
Widnall
Wolff
Wright
Young
Zablocki
Hungate
Huot
Jacobs
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kornegay
Kupferman
Laird
Lennon
Long, La.
McCarthy
McCulloch
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McMillan
McVicker
Mackay
Mackie
Mailliard
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Matthews
Meeds
Michel
Miller
Mink
Minshall
Moeller
Moore
Moorhead
Morton
Moss
Murray
Nelsen
Nix
O'Brien
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Pool
Powell
Pucinski
Purcell
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roncalio
Roudebush
Roush
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Scott
Senner
Shipley
Sisk
Skubitz
Smith, N.Y.
Stafford
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Toll
Trimble
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Van Derlin
Waldie
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watts
White, Idaho
Whitener
Whitten
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wyatt
Yates
Younger

NAYS—76

Adair
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Bandstra
Bell
Betts
Bolton
Brock
Buchanan
Burleson
Cameron
Celler
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Cleveland
Collier
Conte
Cramer
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Dole
Dowdy
Duncan, Tenn.
Farbstein
Fraser
Fulton, Pa.
Gubser
Gurney
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Henderson
Horton
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kunkel
Latta
Leggett
Lipscomb
McClory
McDade
Mathias
May
Mize
Morse
Mosher
Patten
Pelly
Pirnie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Saylor
Schneebeli
Shriver
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Springer
Staggers
Stalbaum
Teague, Tex.
Utt
Waggonner
Watson
Whalley
Williams
Wydler

NOT VOTING—195

Abernethy
Adams
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Belcher
Berry
Blatnik
Bolling
Bow
Bray
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Callaway
Carey
Carter
Cederberg
Chelf
Clawson, Del
Clevenger
Cohelan
Colmer
Cooley
Corman
Craley
Culver
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
Delaney
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dorn
Duncan, Oreg.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Farnsley
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fuqua
Gallagher
Gettys
Gilligan
Goodell
Gray
Greigg
Gross
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Howard

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mrs. Dwyer against.
Mr. King of California for, with Mr. Reinecke against.
Mr. Holifield for, with Mr. Moore against.
Mr. Laird for, with Mr. McEwen against.
Mr. Miller for, with Mr. Hansen of Idaho against.
Mr. Feighan for, with Mr. Glenn Andrews against.
Mr. Fogarty for, with Mr. Skubitz against.
Mr. Rivers of Alaska for, with Mr. Walker of Mississippi against.
Mr. Frelinghuysen for, with Mr. Harvey of Indiana against.
Mr. Ayres for, with Mr. Abernethy against.
Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Whitten against.
Mr. Barrett for, with Mr. Colmer against.
Mr. Aspinall for, with Mr. Fountain against.
Mr. McFall for, with Mr. Taylor, against.
Mr. Matsunaga for, with Mr. Kornegay against.
Mr. Gallagher for, with Mr. Scott against.
Mr. Gilligan for, with Mr. Jones of North Carolina against.
Mr. Olsen of Montana for, with Mr. Cooley against.
Mr. Stafford for, with Mr. Dorn against.
Mr. McDowell for, with Mr. Rivers of South Carolina against.
Mr. Johnson of California for, with Mr. McMillan against.
Mr. Shipley for, with Mr. Lennon against.
Mr. Nix for, with Mr. Foley against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Steed with Mr. Van Deerlin.
Mr. McVicker with Mr. Duncan of Oregon.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Farnsley.
Mr. Moeller with Mr. Matthews.
Mrs. Mink with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Greigg.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Hagan of Georgia.
Mr. Randall with Mr. Purcell.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Pool.
Mr. Flynt with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
Mr. Hansen of Iowa with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Redlin with Mr. Whitener.
Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Todd.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Udall.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Thompson of Texas.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Stephens.
Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Roncalio.
Mr. Dawson with Mr. Toll.
Mr. Roberts with Mr. Sweeney.
Mr. Waldie with Mr. Walker of New Mexico.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Murray.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Culver.
Mr. Olson of Minnesota with Mr. O'Brien.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Morton.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Robison.
Mr. Hungate with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Hays with Mr. King of New York.
Mr. Dyal with Mr. Hall.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Mackay with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Schisler with Mr. Younger.
Mr. Rogers of Florida with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Hicks with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Stanton.
Mr. Craley with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.
Mr. Albert with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Keith.
Mr. Denton with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Mackie with Mr. Kupferman.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Goodell.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Martin of Alabama.
Mr. Meeds with Mr. Findley.
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Haley with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Race with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Trimble with Mr. Callaway.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Clarence J. Brown, Jr.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Senner with Mr. Bow.
Mr. King of Utah with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Schmidhauser with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Roush with Mr. Huot.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Chelf.
Mr. Clevenger with Mr. McCarthy.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION OF CONFEREES ON SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, 1967

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Cederberg] be excused from serving as conferees on H.R. 18381, and that the Speaker appoint two Members to serve in their place.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints to fill the vacancies on the conference committee just mentioned by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon], the gentleman from California [Mr. Lipscomb] and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Rhodes]. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the appointment by the Speaker.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967

Mr. MAHON. I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to consider the conference report on H.R. 18381 whenever it is filed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks in the body of the Record in connection with the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 872. An act to amend the provisions of title 18 of the United States Code relating to offenses committed in Indian country.

H.R. 1269. An act for the relief of H. Foster Hunter.

H.R. 1328. An act for the relief of Glenn D. Humes.

H.R. 1388. An act for the relief of Major Ralph D. Caldwell.

H.R. 2266. An act to provide for the settlement of claims resulting from an explosion at a U.S. ordnance plant in Bowie County, Tex., on July 8, 1963.

H.R. 3500. An act for the relief of Mrs. Emilie Boulay.

H.R. 3993. An act to authorize the issuance of certificates of citizenship in the Canal Zone.

H.R. 4077. An act for the relief of Jean A. Quaintance.

H.R. 4454. An act for the relief of Herman Feldman.

H.R. 5958. An act relating to applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody pursuant to judgments of State courts.

H.R. 5969. An act for the relief of Dr. Raul R. Morfi.

H.R. 6035. An act for the relief of the estate of Maj. John W. Roy, and for other purposes.

H.R. 61093. An act for the relief of the city of Umatilla, Oreg.

H.R. 7026. An act for the relief of Nathan Levine.

H.R. 7382. An act to amend section 1391 of title 28 of the United States Code relating to venue.

H.R. 8358. An act for the relief of the Milan Compress Co.

H.R. 8937. An act for the relief of Charles A. Turner.

H.R. 9213. An act for the relief of William A. Buzbee.

H.R. 9217. An act for the relief of certain civilian employees of the Department of the Army at Fort Sam Houston, Tex.

H.R. 9348. An act for the relief of Capt. Harold G. Wilmarth.

H.R. 10151. An act for the relief of Dr. Luis Crespo.

H.R. 10249. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elisabeth Manninen.

H.R. 10662. An act for the relief of Leonard J. Dalton.

H.R. 10846. An act for the relief of Katherine Nabokoff and Emil Homoceanu.

H.R. 10876. An act to authorize and direct the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration to quitclaim certain property in Jackson County, Ala., to Skyline Churches Cemetery, a corporation.

H.R. 11467. An act for the relief of CWO Joseph J. McGavin.

H.R. 11570. An act for the relief of James R. Kemp.

H.R. 11617. An act for the relief of Jun Becky.

H.R. 11676. An act for the relief of Johnny R. Bradley and others.

H.R. 12237. An act for the relief of Tri-States Construction Co., Inc.

H.R. 12512. An act for the relief of Carl V. Elliott.

H.R. 12826. An act for the relief of Kim Kap Yung.

H.R. 13370. An act to authorize the disposal of fused crude aluminum oxide from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.

H.R. 13551. An act to amend the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

H.R. 13661. An act to authorize the disposal of battery-grade synthetic manganese dioxide from the national stockpile.

H.R. 13682. An act for the relief of Donald E. Auseon.

H.R. 13683. An act for the relief of Robert A. Ivins.

H.R. 13800. An act for the relief of Sp5c. Ronald J. Olson, U.S. Army, retired.

H.R. 13982. An act to amend the act of August 14, 1964, to authorize payments of any amounts authorized under the act to the estates of persons who would have been eligible for payments under the authority of the act, and for other purposes.

H.R. 14075. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to settle and pay certain claims arising out of the taking of the 1960 decennial census.

H.R. 14174. An act for the relief of Esteban Fernández Noda.

H.R. 14233. An act for the relief of Beatriz Diaz.

H.R. 14525. An act for the relief of Thomas C. Macpherson, Jr.

H.R. 14615. An act for the relief of certain members and former members of the Army on whose behalf erroneous payments were made for storage of household goods.

H.R. 14741. An act to authorize an increase in the number of Marine Corps officers who may serve in the combined grades of brigadier general and major general.

H.R. 14749. An act for the relief of Katherine M. Perakis.

H.R. 14819. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. William Nussbaum.

H.R. 14864. An act for the relief of certain individuals.

H.R. 14920. An act for the relief of Marie del Carmen Bermudez.

H.R. 14990. An act for the relief of Herman Adams, doing business as the Adams Manufacturing Co.

H.R. 15014. An act for the relief of Henry P. Leonhardy.

H.R. 15251. An act for the relief of Walter W. Taylor.

H.R. 15297. An act for the relief of Leonard G. Duffy, lieutenant, U.S. Navy.

H.R. 15766. An act to establish a National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws.

H.R. 16074. An act to cancel certain unpaid interest accrued after September 30, 1931, on loans made to World War I veterans upon the security of adjusted-service certificates.

H.R. 16394. An act for the relief of certain enlisted members of the military services who lost interest on amounts deposited deposited under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code, or prior laws authorizing enlisted members' deposits, and for other purposes.

H.R. 16977. An act for the relief of Eugene G. Peterson, Harry E. Byers, and Russell W. Jordan.

H.R. 17260. An act for the relief of Robert A. Jellison.

H.R. 17261. An act for the relief of Augustus J. Theodore.

H.R. 17588. An act to amend section 8(g) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act with respect to assignments.

H.R. 17798. An act to provide that a judgment or decree of the District of Columbia court of general sessions shall not constitute a lieu until filed and recorded in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

H.R. 18019. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct an addition at the Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, D.C.

H.R. 18021. An act to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

H. Con. Res. 1034. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of an additional 3,000 copies of House Document No. 237, 89th Congress, 1st session, entitled "Sino-Soviet Conflict and Its Implications" for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5990. An act to grant increased benefits to persons receiving cash relief under the Panama Canal Cash Relief Act of July 8, 1937, and to extend cash relief benefits to widows of recipients.

H.R. 15024. An act to amend section 8 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 to authorize the Administrator of General Services to lease certain property in the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 647) entitled "An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to permit the appointment of new trustees in deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by agreement of the parties."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 18119) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following

titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3535. An act for the relief of Dr. Fernando O. Garcia-Hernandez.

S. 3559. An act for the relief of Nachman Bench.

S. 3564. An act for the relief of Mary Rose Giannone.

S. 3572. An act for the relief of Dr. Sherif Shafey.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a resolution of the following title:

S. Res. 317

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and extreme regret the announcement of the death of Hon. Harry F. Byrd, Sr., who served in the United States Senate from the State of Virginia from 1933 to 1965.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased, together with a transcript of remarks made in the Senate in praise of his distinguished service to the Nation.

FOREIGN INVESTORS TAX ACT OF 1966

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 13103) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide equitable tax treatment for foreign investment in the United States, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a point of order against title III of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this point of order is directed at title III of the conference report. That title is the one that provides for the contribution of $1 apiece from any taxpayer who wishes to do so, to be used as a fund to be divided between the political parties in Presidential elections. The title itself has never been before the House. This is a Senate amendment to the bill that the gentleman from Arkansas has just called up. It is not germane to that bill itself and comes under the prohibition of rule XX of the rules of the House.

And, Mr. Speaker, I shall read the part that is relevant to the point of order:

> Any amendment of the Senate to any House bill shall be subject to the point of order that it shall first be considered in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, if originating in the House, it would be subject to that point.

Mr. Speaker, the point of the rule is not applicable to this situation, but the rule is there for the purpose of seeing that the House of Representatives has an opportunity to at least consider and debate any legislation that it has never had an opportunity to consider before.

Mr. Speaker, in this case, and in some others that we could mention, we are confronted very often with amendments such as this which have been put onto a House bill in the Senate and sent to conference and accepted by the House and Senate conferees, and the House has never had an opportunity to even read it.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report, I believe, was just printed, probably last night.

Did the gentleman from Arkansas have until midnight last night to file the conference report?

Mr. MILLS. If the gentleman from Virginia will yield, I believe the gentleman from Virginia is correct; yes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Until midnight last night, this conference report was not filed in the House. It was not available from the printer's office until early here this morning, probably later than 7 o'clock. The House of Representatives, under the unanimous-consent agreement, met at 10 o'clock this morning. Now, obviously, that is something that the House has never had an opportunity to consider or to even read, or to know anything about it, except what the Members of the House had seen in the newspapers or other than through common gossip that has gone around the Capitol.

Mr. Speaker, this represents a clear violation of the rules of the House, and I do not see how under these circumstances it can be considered in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I have no particular prejudice one way or the other as to the merits or the demerits of the proposal, and I am not discussing this. However, I do feel that this is the wrong way in which to legislate.

Mr. Speaker, the rules of the House seem to be positively against this procedure and it is my opinion that we should stop doing this sort of business.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard on the point of order?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H.R. 13103, which is the bill that the conference report accompanies, amends the Internal Revenue Service Code of 1954, to provide equitable treatment for foreign investment in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the bill amends provisions in that respect, dealing with both the income tax and with the estate tax and perhaps others—I do not recall, there may be even some other aspects of the code that are affected.

Mr. Speaker, title III to which the gentleman from Virginia makes the point of order, under rule XX, as I understood his point of order, amends the Internal Revenue Service Code.

Mr. Speaker, the authority within the entire title is based upon an amendment to section 6096 of the code which is amended by section 302 of title III of the bill as reported by the conferees on the part of the House.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that the matter is certainly germane to the bill in that both the bill and the amendment amend provisions of the Internal Revenue Service Code.

The responsibilities here are such as we normally would place upon the Secretary of the Treasury in providing for a separate account in his books. And I think clearly that it is germane to the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I just want to ask this question:

If that amendment had been offered when the bill was under consideration in the House it would have had to be under rule XX, and considered under rule XX that I have just read.

Now, because it is a bill which is an appropriation bill we cannot consider it except in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. This rule provides that if there is put on it a Senate amendment and it comes back it is subject to a point of order that it has not been considered in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS. Providing it is not germane to the bill. But I am contending that it is germane in that it is an amendment of the Internal Revenue Code which the bill itself is an amendment of the Internal Revenue Code.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I was just going to ask the chairman this question:

The rule provides that the bill must be considered, if this bill was introduced in the House, the rule is that the amendment of the Senate, if it had been introduced in the House, it would have had to be considered in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. And the rule is that if it comes in as a Senate amendment then it is subject to a point of order because it was not considered in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

The gentleman addressed himself to the matter of whether it would have been germane in the House. That is not the question that I am seeking to make clear at this time. It is a question of whether the rule XX has been violated because a Senate amendment, if it was introduced in the House, was subject to a point of order, would have had to have been in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to add on this point of order—and I agree with the gentleman from Virginia—that on examination this Senate amendment is an appropriation, this is authorized revenue, it has to do with actually appropriating funds, and clearly is subject to the point that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] makes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Virginia makes the point of order that title III of the conference report contravenes the first sentence of rule XX:

> Any amendment of the Senate to any House bill shall be subject to the point of

order that it shall first be considered in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, if, originating in the House, it would be subject to that point:

Without passing upon the germaneness of the amendment, because that point was not raised, the Chair calls attention to the fact that the Senate amendment went to conference by unanimous consent. Where unanimous consent was obtained, the effect of that is to circuit rule XX, in other words, to waive or vitiate that portion of rule XX.

If objection had been made at the point when the unanimous consent request was made to send the bill to conference, then the bill could have been referred to the proper standing committee, and then, if and when reported out of the committee would have been brought up for consideration in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

At this point, and under the parliamentary situation, the bill was sent to conference by unanimous consent; and this applies to all bills that go to conference by unanimous consent, if there be provisions therein that might be subject to the first sentence of rule XX. If there is no objection made at that time, the bill goes to conference; which in this case had the effect of suspending that portion of rule XX. Therefore, it is properly before the House at the present time as part of the conference report and the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, may I add one comment since this is a very important question.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will, of course, hear the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this did not go to conference by unanimous consent because it was never in the House bill. It was in the Senate bill and it never got in the House bill until last night.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will call to the attention of the gentleman from Virginia that the unanimous consent request was made to take a bill from the Speaker's desk with Senate amendments thereto, and disagree to the Senate amendments and request a conference.

Of course, the Chair has already ruled on the point of order.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, may I be recognized on this particular point?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, there was a unanimous consent request to take the bill with Senate amendments from the Speaker's table, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference requested by the Senate. I made that request myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Mills] that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

Conference Report (H. Rept. No. 2327)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13103) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide equitable tax treatment for foreign investment in the United States, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with the following amendments (pages and lines refer to pages and lines of the Senate engrossed amendments):

Page 7, strike out line 6, and insert: "an agreement to pay interest thereon."
Effective with respect to amounts paid or credited after December 31, 1972, subsection (a) (1) (A) and this subsection shall cease to apply.' "

Page 7, line 22, strike out "ration," and insert: "ration (other than interest paid or credited after December 31, 1972, by a domestic branch of a foreign corporation, if such branch is engaged in the commercial banking business),".

Page 8, line 7, strike out "foreign corporation," and insert: "foreign corporation (other than interest paid or credited after December 31, 1972, by a domestic branch of a foreign corporation, if such branch is engaged in the commercial banking business),".

Page 52, line 17, strike out "871 (b) (1)" and insert: "871 (b) (2)".

Page 52, line 18, strike out "882(a)" and insert: "882(a)(2)".

Page 73, line 2, strike out the period and insert a comma.

Page 74, in the matter following line 12, strike out "Elections" and insert: "Election".

Page 92, line 14, strike out the period and insert a comma.

Page 92, line 16, after "States." insert: "With respect to estates of decedents dying after December 31, 1972, deposits with a domestic branch of a foreign corporation, if such branch is engaged in the commercial banking business, shall, for purposes of this subchapter, be deemed property within the United States."

Page 93, line 16, strike out "(3)" and insert: "(3) of".

Page 101, line 13, after "owned" insert: "and held".

Page 102, line 19, strike out "934 (b)" and insert: "934 (c)".

Page 103, beginning with line 9, strike out all through line 2, page 105.

Page 105, line 3, strike out "203" and insert: "202".

Page 107, beginning with line 3, strike out all through line 14, and insert:

"Sec. 203. Transfers of Property to Investment Companies Controlled by Transferors.

"(a) Transfers to Investment Companies.—The first sentence of section 351(a) (relating to transfer to corporation controlled by the transferor) is amended by striking out 'to a corporation' and inserting in lieu thereof 'to a corporation (including, in the case of transfers made on or before June 30, 1967, an investment company)'.

"(b) Investment Companies Required to File Registration Statement With The S.E.C.—Section 351 is amended by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e) and by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

" '(d) Application of June 30, 1967, Date.—For purposes of this section, if, in connection with the transaction, a registration statement is required to be filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission, a transfer of property to an investment company shall be treated as made on or before June 30, 1967, only if—

" '(1) such transfer is made on or before such date,

" '(2) the registration statement was filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission before January 1, 1967, and the aggregate issue price of the stock and securities of the investment company which are issued in the transaction does not exceed the aggregate amount therefor specified in the registration statement as of the close of December 31, 1966, and

" '(3) the transfer of property to the investment company in the transaction includes only property deposited before May 1, 1967.'

"(c) Effective Date.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply with respect to transfers of property to investment companies whether made before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act."

Page 107, strike out lines 15 through 25.

Page 108, line 1, strike out "206" and insert: "204".

Page 108, between lines 8 and 9, insert: "(b) Conforming Amendments.—".

Page 108, line 9, strike out "(b)".

Page 110, line 7, strike out "207" and insert: "205".

Page 111, line 3, strike out "208" and insert: "206".

Page 113, line 3, strike out "209" and insert: "207".

Page 113, beginning with line 13, strike out all through line 5, page 114, and insert:

"(b) Effective Date.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act."

Page 114, line 6, strike out "210" and insert: "208".

Page 114, beginning with line 18, strike out all through line 6, page 115, and insert:

"Sec. 209. Percentage Depletion Rate for Certain Clay, Shale, and Slate

"(a) 7½ Percent Rate.—Section 613(b) (relating to percentage depletion rates) is amended—

"(1) by renumbering paragraphs (5) and (6) as (6) and (7), respectively, and by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

" '(5) 7½ percent—clay and shale used or sold for use in the manufacture of sewer pipe or brick, and clay, shale, and slate used or sold for use as sintered or burned lightweight aggregates.';

"(2) by striking out in paragraph (3)(B) (as amended by section 207(a)(2)) 'if neither paragraph (2)(B) nor (5)(B) applies' and inserting in lieu thereof 'if neither paragraph (2)(B), (5), or (6)(B) applies';

"(3) by striking out in paragraph (6) (as renumbered by paragraph (1)) 'shale, and stone, except stone described in paragraph (6)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'shale (except shale described in paragraph (5)), and stone (except stone described in paragraph (7))';

"(4) by striking out, in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (6) (as so renumbered), 'building or paving brick,' and by striking out 'sewer pipe,'; and

"(5) by inserting after 'any such other mineral' in paragraph (7) (as so renumbered) '(other than slate to which paragraph (5) applies)'.

"(b) Conforming Amendment.—Section 613(c)(4)(G) (relating to treatment processes) is amended by striking out 'paragraph (5)(B)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'paragraph (5) or (6)(B)'.

"(c) Effective Date.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act."

Page 115, line 7, strike out "212" and insert: "210".

Page 116, line 9, strike out "213" and insert: "211".

Page 117, line 13, strike out the quotation marks.

Page 117, line 14, strike out the quotation marks.

Page 127, line 17, strike out "214" and insert: "212".

Page 128, line 7, strike out "215" and insert: "213".

Page 129, line 19, strike out "216" and insert: "214".

Page 134, line 3, strike out "217" and insert: "215".

Page 137, line 19, strike out "10,000,000" and insert: "15,000,000".

Page 137, line 22, strike out "equal to—" and insert: "equal to the excess over $5,000,000 of—".

Page 138, line 1, strike out "10,000,000" and insert: "15,000,000".

Page 138, line 7, strike out "10,000,000" and insert: "15,000,000".

Page 138, lines 11 and 12, strike out "more than 1,500,000, but less than 10,000,000," and insert: "more than 5,000,000, but less than 15,000,000,".

Page 138, line 16, strike out "1,500,000" and insert: "5,000,000".

Page 141, line 15, strike out "10,000,000" and insert: "15,000,000".

Page 143, beginning with line 5, strike out all through line 2, page 144, and insert:

"The Secretary of the Treasury shall, on the first day of each regular session of the Congress, submit to the Senate and the House of Representatives a report setting forth, as of the close of the preceding June 30 (beginning with the report as of June 30, 1967), the aggregate and individual amounts of the contingent liabilities and the unfunded liabilities of the Government, and of each department, agency, and instrumentality thereof, including, so far as practicable, trust fund liabilities, Government corporations' liabilities, indirect liabilities not included as a part of the public debt, and liabilities of insurance and annuity programs, including their actuarial status. The report shall also set forth the collateral pledged, or the assets available (or to be realized), as security for such liabilities (Government securities to be separately noted), and shall also set forth all other assets specifically available to liquidate such liabilities of the Government. The report shall set forth the required data in a concise form, with such explanatory material (including such analysis of the significance of the liabilities in terms of past experience and probable risk) as the Secretary may determine to be necessary or desirable, and shall include total amounts of each category according to the department, agency, or instrumentality involved."

Page 144, beginning with line 3, strike out all through line 9, page 153.

On page 3, beginning with the matter in the table of contents relating to title II, strike out all through the end of the table of contents on page 5 and insert:

"TITLE II—OTHER AMENDMENTS TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

"Sec. 201. Application of Investment Credit to Property Used in Possessions of the United States.
"(a) Property used by domestic corporations, etc.
"(b) Effective date.

"Sec. 202. Basis of property received on liquidation of subsidiary.
"(a) Definition of purchase.
"(b) Period of acquisition.
"(c) Distribution of installment obligations.
"(d) Effective dates.

"Sec. 203. Transfers of property to investment companies controlled by transferors.
"(a) Transfers to investment companies.
"(b) Investment companies required to file registration statement with S.E.C.
"(c) Effective date.

"Sec. 204. Removal of special limitations with respect to deductibility of contributions to pension plans by self-employed individuals.
"(a) Removal of special limitations.
"(b) Conforming amendments.
"(c) Definition of earned income.
"(d) Effective date.

"Sec. 205. Treatment of certain income of authors, inventors, etc., as earned income for retirement plan purposes.
"(a) Income from disposition of property created by taxpayer.
"(b) Effective date.

"Sec. 206. Exclusion of certain rents from personal holding company income.
"(a) Rents from leases of certain tangible personal property.
"(b) Technical amendments.
"(c) Effective date.

"Sec. 207. Percentage depletion rate for certain clay bearing alumina.
"(a) 23 percent rate.
"(b) Treatment processes.
"(c) Effective date.

"Sec. 208. Percentage depletion rate for clam and oyster shells.
"(a) 15 percent rate.
"(b) Effective date.

"Sec. 209. Percentage depletion rate for certain clay, shale, and slate.
"(a) 7½ percent rate.
"(b) Conforming amendment.
"(c) Effective date.

"Sec. 210. Straddles.
"(a) Treatment as short-term capital gain.
"(b) Effective date.

"Sec. 211. Tax treatment of per-unit retain allocations.
"(a) Tax treatment of cooperatives.
"(b) Tax treatment by patrons.
"(c) Definitions.
"(d) Information reporting.
"(e) Effective dates.
"(f) Transition rule.

"Sec. 212. Excise tax rate on ambulances and hearses.
"(a) Classification as automobiles.
"(b) Effective date.

"Sec. 213. Applicability of exclusion from interest equalization tax of certain loans to assure raw materials sources.
"(a) Exception to exclusion.
"(b) Technical amendments.
"(c) Effective date.

"Sec. 214. Exclusion from interest equalization tax for certain acquisitions by insurance companies.
"(a) New companies and companies operating in former less developed countries.
"(b) Effective date.

"Sec. 215. Exclusion from interest equalization tax of certain acquisitions by foreign branches of domestic banks.
"(a) Authority for modification of executive orders.
"(b) Effective date.

"TITLE III—PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN FUND ACT

"Sec. 301. Short title.

"Sec. 302. Authority for designation of $1 of income tax payments to presidential election campaign fund.

"Sec. 303. Presidential election campaign fund.
"(a) Establishment.
"(b) Transfers to the fund.
"(c) Payments from fund.
"(d) Transfers to general fund.

"Sec. 304. Establishment of advisory board.

"Sec. 305. Appropriations authorized.

"TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

"Sec. 401. Treasury notes payable in foreign currency.

"Sec. 402. Reports to clarify to national debt and tax structure."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

W. D. MILLS,
CECIL R. KING,
HALE BOGGS,
EUGENE J. KEOGH,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
JAMES B. UTT,
Managers on the Part of the House.
RUSSELL B. LONG,
GEORGE A. SMATHERS,
CLINTON ANDERSON,
EUGENE J. MCCARTHY,
FRANK CARLSON,
WALLACE F. BENNETT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13103) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide equitable tax treatment for foreign investment in the United States, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment to the text of the bill struck out all after the enacting clause of the bill as passed by the House and inserted in lieu thereof a substitute containing four titles: title I, foreign investors tax act; title II, other amendments to internal revenue code; title III, Presidential election campaign fund act; and title IV, miscellaneous provisions. The effect of the action recommended in the accompanying conference report is explained below under the four headings contained in the Senate amendment.

TITLE I—FOREIGN INVESTORS TAX ACT

Income and estate tax treatment of amounts held on deposit

(a) *Income tax treatment.*—Under existing law, interest on United States bank deposits is not treated as United States source income and, therefore, not subject to the Federal income tax in the case of nonresident aliens and foreign corporations not engaged in trade or business in the United States. Under the bill as passed by the House (1) this source rule for interest on bank deposits was broadened for a temporary period so it applied also to accounts with mutual savings banks, domestic building and loan associations, etc., and to amounts held on deposit by insurance companies, and (2) after December 31, 1971, all interest paid or credited on these United States deposits, accounts, or amounts (including interest on bank deposits) was to be treated as United States source income.

Under the Senate amendment, the temporary income tax treatment provided by the bill as passed by the House for interest on these deposits, accounts, and amounts was made permanent. Under the action recommended in the accompanying conference report, the temporary income tax treatment provided in the bill as passed by the House for interest on United States bank deposits, accounts with mutual savings banks, domestic building and loan associations, etc., and amounts held on deposit by insurance companies, will apply with respect to amounts paid or credited before January 1, 1973. Such amounts paid or credited after December 31, 1972, are to be treated as income derived from sources within the United

States (and therefore subject to the Federal income tax).

The conferees in inserting December 31, 1972, as the date for the termination of the income tax exemption for interest on bank deposits, etc., believe that this will provide an opportunity to review the exemption in view of developments in the balance of payments situation and other factors.

(*b*) *Estate tax treatment*.—Under existing law, United States bank deposits of nonresidents who are not citizens are not includible in their gross estates. Under the bill as passed by the House, these bank deposits would have been includible in these gross estates, effective with respect to decedents dying after the date of the enactment of the bill.

Under the Senate amendment, United States bank deposits, accounts with mutual savings banks, building and loan associations, etc., and amounts held on deposit by insurance companies were, in general, deemed to be property not within the United States (and therefore not includible in the gross estate of a nonresident not a citizen of the United States) effective with respect to decedents dying after the date of the enactment of the bill.

The effect of the action recommended in the accompanying conference report is to provide the estate tax treatment for these deposits, accounts, and amounts contained in the Senate amendment (namely, that they are not includible in the gross estate of nonresidents who are not citizens of the United States) with respect to estates of decedents dying after the date of the enactment of the bill and before January 1, 1973. In the case of estates of decedents who are nonresidents and not citizens of the United States and who die after December 31, 1972, these deposits, accounts, and amounts will be includible in gross estate for purposes of the Federal estate tax.

Other modifications

Title I of the Senate amendment, while in general retaining the substance of the bill as passed by the House with respect to matters other than the tax treatment of bank deposits, made numerous technical and other modifications in the provisions which relate to the tax treatment of foreign investors. For an explanation of the more important of these modifications, which are included in the action recommended in the accompanying conference report, see the report of the Committee on Finance of the Senate (Senate Report No. 1707, 89th Congress, 2d session).

TITLE II—OTHER AMENDMENTS TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Application of investment credit to property used in possessions of the United States

Section 48(a) (2) (A) of the code provides the general rule that property used predominantly outside the United States is not to be included within the term "section 38 property" and therefore is not eligible for the investment credit. Section 48(a) (2) (B) of the code provides exceptions to this general rule.

The Senate amendment (in proposed section 201) amends section 48(a) (2) (B) to include among the exceptions from the general rule with respect to property used predominantly outside the United States property which is owned by a domestic corporation (other than a corporation entitled to the benefits of section 931 or 934(b)) or by a United States citizen (other than a citizen entitled to the benefits of section 931, 932, 933, or 934(c)) and which is used predominantly in a possession of the United States by such a corporation or such a citizen, or by a corporation created or organized in, or under the law of, a possession of the United States. Under the Senate amendment, this provision was effective with respect to property placed in service on or after January 1, 1966 (but no carryback of an investment credit attributable to this provision was permitted).

The conference action includes this amendment to the code.

Deduction of medical expenses of individuals age 65 or over

Section 106 of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 provided, in general, that, effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1966, the medical expenses of individuals age 65 and over are to be treated for income tax purposes in the same way as the medical expenses of individuals under the age of 65 (that is, these expenses would be subject to the 3-percent of adjusted gross income provision and to the 1-percent provision for drugs). The Senate amendment would have made permanent the treatment of medical expenses of individuals age 65 and over as not being subject to the 3-percent and 1-percent provisions.

The conference action recommended in the accompanying conference report does not include this provision of the Senate amendment with respect to the medical expenses of the aged.

Basis of property received on liquidation of subsidiary

Under existing law, the "purchase" from an unrelated party by one corporation of at least 80 percent of the stock of another corporation, when followed (within 2 years) by the liquidation of the acquired corporation, is treated as a purchase of the assets of the acquired corporation. For this purpose, where the acquiring corporation owns 50 percent or more of the stock of a subsidiary corporation, the subsidiary corporation is treated as a related party (and, therefore, the acquiring corporation cannot take into account stock in the liquidated corporation which it acquired from such a subsidiary).

The Senate amendment (in proposed section 203) expands the definition of "purchase" contained in section 334(b) (3) of the code to include the purchase of stock from a subsidiary where the stock of such subsidiary was also acquired by purchase (within a specified period). This new definition of "purchase" applies with respect to acquisition of stock after December 31, 1965.

The Senate amendment also contained (in proposed section 203(c)) an amendment to section 453(d) of the code with respect to the treatment of installment notes in a distribution in complete liquidation of a subsidiary described in section 334(b) (2). For a description of such treatment under the Senate amendment, see the report of the Committee on Finance (Senate Report No. 1707).

Under the conference action, the Senate amendment, insofar as it relates to section 334(b) (2) liquidations, is included.

Transfers of property to investment companies controlled by transferors

Section 351(a) of the code, which provides a general rule for the transfer of property to a corporation controlled by the transferor, now reads as follows:

"(a) General Rule.—No gain or loss shall be recognized if property is transferred to a corporation by one or more persons solely in exchange for stock or securities in such corporation and immediately after the exchange such person or persons are in control (as defined in section 368(c)) of the corporation. For purposes of this section, stock or securities issued for services shall not be considered as issued in return for property."

The Senate amendment (in proposed section 204(a)) amends the first sentence of section 351(a) by striking out "to a corporation" and inserting in lieu thereof "to a corporation (including an investment company)". Under the Senate amendment this amendment to section 351(a) was to apply with respect to transfers of property whether made before, on, or after the date of the enactment of the bill.

Under the action recommended in the accompanying conference report, the first sentence of section 351(a) of the code is amended by striking out "to a corporation" and inserting in lieu thereof "to a corporation (including, in the case of transfers made before July 1, 1967, an investment company)". The conference action also inserts a new subsection (d) in section 351 providing special rules relating to the application of section 351 in the case of investment companies which are required to file registration statements with the Securities and Exchange Commission. Under the conference action, these amendments to section 351 are to apply to transfers to investment companies whether made before, on, or after the date of the enactment of the bill.

Minimum amount treated as earned income for retirement plans of certain self-employed individuals

The Senate amendment (in proposed section 205) raised from $2,500 to $6,600 the minimum amount of earnings from a trade or business, in which both personal services and capital are material income-producing factors, which a self-employed person may treat as earned income, for purposes of section 401 of the code, without regard to the general rule that only 30 percent of the net profits of the trade or business may be treated as a self-employed person's earned income. This provision was to apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1965.

This provision is not included in the action recommended in the accompanying conference report. For a related provision which is included in such section, however, see the explanation which immediately follows this paragraph.

Removal of special limitations with respect to deductibility of contributions to pension plans by self-employed individuals

Existing section 404(a) (10) of the code limits the deduction with respect to contributions made on behalf of an individual who is an employee within the meaning of section 401(c) (1) (principally, the self-employed) to an amount equal to one-half of such contributions.

The Senate amendment repeals section 404(a) (10) of the code, effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1967. The Senate amendment also amends section 401(c) (2) of the code (relating to definition of earned income for purposes of certain pension and profit-sharing plans) to treat as earned income all of the net profits from a trade or business in which both the performance of personal services and capital are material income-producing factors. However, the earned income to be taken into account for this purpose includes only net earnings with respect to a trade or business in which personal services of the taxpayer are a material income-producing factor. Under the Senate amendment this provision is effective for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1967.

The action recommended in the accompanying conference report includes both the repeal of section 404(a) (10) and the amendment of the earned income provisions of section 401(c) (2), effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1967.

Treatment of certain income of authors, inventors, etc., as earned income for retirement plan purposes

Section 401(c) (2) of the code contains the definition of "earned income" for purposes of pension and profit-sharing plans which cover self-employed individuals and owner-employees.

The Senate amendment adds a new subparagraph providing that the term "earned income" includes gains (other than capital gains) and net earnings derived from the sale or other disposition of, the transfer of any interest in, or the licensing of the use of property (other than good will) by an individual whose personal efforts created such property.

Under the conference action, this provision is retained.

Exclusion of certain rents from personal holding company income

Section 543(b)(3) of the code defines the term "adjusted income from rents" for purposes of the provisions of the code relating to personal holding companies. The Senate amendment adds a provision providing that such term does not include compensation, however designated, for the use of, or the right to use, any tangible personal property manufactured or produced by the taxpayer, if during the taxable year the taxpayer is engaged in substantial manufacturing or production of tangible personal property of the same type.

Under the conference action this provision is retained.

Percentage depletion rate for certain clay bearing alumina

Section 613(b)(6) of the code provides a 15 percent depletion rate for all other minerals not otherwise provided a percentage depletion rate. Under that provision, clay, laterite, and nephelite syenite used for the extraction of alumina would receive a 15 percent depletion rate. Section 613(c)(4) of the code sets forth the treatment processes which are considered as mining.

The Senate amendment (in proposed section 209(a)) amends section 613(b) to provide a 23 percent depletion rate for clay, laterite, and nephelite syenite produced from deposits in the United States to the extent that alumina and aluminum compounds are extracted therefrom. Section 209(b) would have amended section 613 (c)(4) to provide that in the case of clay, laterite, and nephelite syenite extracted from deposits in the United States, all processes applied to derive alumina of aluminum compounds would be considered as mining. Such amendments would apply to taxable years beginning after the date of enactment of the bill.

Under the conference action proposed section 209(a) is retained but proposed section 209(b) is deleted. The amendment is to apply to taxable years beginning after the date of enactment of the bill.

Percentage depletion rate for clam and oyster shells

Section 613(b)(5) of the code provides a 5 percent depletion rate for mollusk shells (including clam shells and oyster shells).

The Senate amendment (in proposed section 210) amends section 613(b) to provide a 15 percent depletion rate for mollusk shells, except when used for rip rap, ballast, road material, rubble, concrete aggregates or for similar purposes, in which event a 5 percent rate applies. The amendment applies to taxable years beginning after the date of enactment of the bill.

Under the conference action this provision is retained.

Percentage depletion rate for certain clay, shale, and slate

Section 613(b)(5) of the code provides a percent depletion rate for shale; clay used, or sold for use, in the manufacture of brick or sewer pipe; and clay or slate used or sold for use as concrete aggregates or for similar purposes. Section 613(c)(4) sets forth certain treatment processes considered as mining.

The Senate amendment (in proposed section 211) would have amended section 613(c)(4) to provide that the sintering or burning of clay, shale, and slate, used, or sold for use, as lightweight aggregates, would be considered a mining process. This amendment would apply to taxable years beginning after the date of enactment of the bill.

Under the Senate amendment (in proposed section 404) the depletion rate for clay and shale used or sold for use in the manufacture of sewer pipe and brick would be 15 percent. This amendment would apply to taxable years ending after the date of enactment of the bill.

Under the conference action the depletion rate for clay or shale used or sold for use in the manufacture of sewer pipe and brick, and for clay, shale or slate used or sold for use as sintered or burned lightweight aggregates, is to be 7½ percent. Under the conference action this amendment is to apply to taxable years beginning after the date of enactment of the bill.

Straddles

The Senate amendment (in proposed section 212) amends section 1234 to provide that the gain from the lapse of an option granted by the taxpayer as part of a straddle is to be treated as a short-term capital gain. This provision does not apply to any person who holds securities for sale to customers in the ordinary course of his trade or business. The amendment is applicable to straddle transactions entered into after January 25, 1965.

Under the conference action this provision is retained.

Tax treatment of per-unit retain allocations

The Senate amendment (in proposed section 213) amends the present law relating to the taxation of cooperatives and their patrons to provide tax treatment with respect to per-unit retain certificates which parallels, in general, the tax treatment applicable with respect to patronage dividends. The amendment applies generally to taxable years beginning after April 30, 1966.

Under the conference action, this provision is retained.

Excise tax rate on ambulances and hearses

The Senate amendment (in proposed section 214) provides that the sale of a hearse, as well as an ambulance or combination ambulance-hearse vehicle, is to be considered to be the sale of an automobile chassis and an automobile body (rather than a truck chassis and body) for purposes of determining the manufacturers' excise tax on motor vehicles. This amendment applies with respect to articles sold after the date of the enactment of the bill.

Applicability of exclusion from interest equalization tax of certain loans to assure raw material sources

Section 4914(d) of the code excludes from interest equalization tax certain loans to assure raw material sources. However, the exemption may be lost if the obligation is subsequently transferred. The Senate amendment would impose the tax only on a person who acquires the obligation with an intent to sell it to other U.S. persons. This amendment is effective with respect to acquisitions of debt obligations after the date of enactment.

Under the conference action this provision is retained.

Exclusion from interest equalization tax for certain acquisitions by insurance companies

Section 4914(e) of the code permits life insurance companies to establish reserve funds of assets under specified circumstances. The Senate amendment extends this privilege to permit a life insurance company to establish a reserve fund of assets where such a company commences activities in a developed country or where a less developed country is designated as a developed country. This amendment is to take effect on the day after the date of enactment.

Under the conference action this provision is retained.

Exclusion from interest equalization tax of certain acquisitions by foreign branches of domestic banks

The Senate amendment gives the President authority under section 4931(a) to exempt from the Interest Equalization Tax U.S. dollar loans made by the foreign branches of U.S. Commercial banks.

Under the conference action this provision is retained.

TITLE III—PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN FUND ACT

Title III of the Senate amendment adds five new sections (secs. 301–305) to the bill. Under the conference action, these five new sections are retained with the changes noted below.

Section 301—Short title: Section 301 provides that title III may be cited as the "Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966".

Section 301—Authority for designation of $1 of income tax payments to Presidential Election Campaign Funds: Section 302 amends subchapter A of chapter 61 of the code by adding a new part VIII consisting of a new section 6096. The new section 6096 of the code permits every individual (other than a nonresident alien individual) to designate that an amount equal to $1 of his income tax liability for any taxable year shall be paid into the Presidential Election Campaign Fund (established by section 303 of the Senate amendment). Under the Senate amendment, such designations may be made with respect to income tax liability for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1966.

Section 303—Presidential election campaign fund: Subsection (a) of section 303 of the Senate amendment establishes a special fund, to be known as the "Presidential Election Campaign Fund", on the books of the Treasury.

Subsection (b) of section 303 directs the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer to the Fund amounts equal to the amounts designated by individuals under section 6096 of the code (added by section 302 of the Senate amendment).

Subsection (c) of section 303 provides for payments by the Secretary of the Treasury, as authorized by appropriation Acts, out of the Fund to political parties which have qualified under the provisions of the subsection. With respect to each presidential campaign, the Senate amendment provides that payments will be made to political parties whose candidate for President at the preceding presidential election received 10,000,000 or more popular votes in a total amount equal to $1 multiplied by the total number of popular votes cast in such preceding presidential election for candidates of political parties whose candidates received 10,000,000 or more popular votes. Under the Senate amendment, each such political party will share equally in the total amount authorized for payment to these political parties. A political party whose candidate for President at the preceding presidential election received more than 1,500,000 but less than 10,000,000 popular votes will be entitled to payments equal to $1 multiplied by the number of popular votes in excess of 1,500,000 received by the candidate of such political party in such preceding presidential election.

Under the conference action, the provisions in the Senate amendment with respect to payments to political parties whose candidates received 10,000,000 or more popular votes in the preceding presidential election are made applicable only with respect to political parties whose candidates received more than 15,000,000 popular votes in the preceding presidential election. In addition, under the conference action, the provisions in the Senate amendment applicable to political parties whose candidates received more than 1,500,000 but less than 10,000,000 popular votes in the preceding presidential election are made applicable only to political parties whose candidates received more than 5,000,000 but less than 15,000,000 popular votes in the preceding presidential election. Finally, under the conference action, no payment is to be made to any political party with respect to the first 5,000,000 votes received by its candidate in the preceding presidential election.

Under the Senate amendment, payments may be made, with respect to any presidential campaign, beginning September 1 of the year in which a presidential election is held. No payment may be made to a political party with respect to any presidential campaign unless the treasurer of such party has certified to the Comptroller General the total amount spent or incurred by such party, prior to the certification, in carrying on such presidential campaign and has furnished such records and other information as may be requested by the Comptroller General. In addition, no payment may be made to a political party in advance of the time that the party has incurred the expenses for which the payment is made.

Under the Senate amendment, the Comptroller General is to certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amounts payable to each political party which qualifies for payments. The Comptroller General is authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations, and to conduct such examinations and investigations, as he determines necessary.

Subsection (d) of section 303 provides that any moneys in the Fund remaining after political parties have been paid the amounts to which they are entitled with respect to a presidential campaign are to be transferred to the general fund of the Treasury.

Section 304.—Establishment of advisory board: Section 304 of the Senate amendment establishes an advisory board, to be known as the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Advisory Board, to counsel and assist the Comptroller General in the performance of his duties under section 303. Under the Senate amendment, the Board is to consist of two members representing each political party whose candidate for President at the last presidential election received 10,000,000 or more popular votes. These members are to be appointed by the Comptroller General from recommendations submitted by the qualifying political parties. The members of the Board appointed by the Comptroller General will select three additional members of the Board.

Under the conference action, the number of votes required in order for a political party to have representatives on the Advisory Board is raised to 15,000,000.

Section 305—Appropriations authorized: Section 305 of the Senate amendment authorizes appropriations to be made out of the Presidential Election Campaign Fund to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to make payments to political parties under section 303 of the Senate amendment.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Title IV of the Senate amendment added five new sections (secs. 401–405) to the bill.

Treasury notes payable in foreign currency

Under section 16 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to issue bonds (obligations with maturities over five years) and certificates of indebtedness (obligations with maturities of less than one year) payable in foreign currencies. Section 401 of the Senate amendment amends this section so as to authorize the issuance of notes (obligations with maturities between one and five years) payable in foreign currencies. The conference action retains this provision.

Reports to clarify national debt and tax structure

Section 402 of the Senate amendment directs the Secretary of the Treasury to submit to the Congress, on or before March 31 of each year (beginning with 1967), a report setting forth the aggregate and individual amounts of the contingent liabilities and the unfunded liabilities of the Government.

The conference action inserts a substitute for this section which requires that a report be made on the first of each regular session of the Congress with respect to the close of the preceding June 30 (beginning with June 30, 1967).

Coverage of expenses of certain drugs under supplementary medical insurance benefits

The Senate amendment (in proposed section 403) extends the benefits provided by the Supplementary Medical Insurance program (part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act) to include payment in full for certain expenses incurred by eligible individuals in purchasing drugs and biologicals. The drugs and biologicals covered ("qualified drugs") would include only those approved by a newly-established Formulary Committee consisting of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, and the Director of the National Institutes of Health (except that until otherwise determined by such Committee the United States Public Health Service Formulary is to govern); and the amount of the expenses paid therefor with respect to which payment under the program may be made ("allowable expenses") would be established by the Formulary Committee and approved by the Secretary. The Formulary Committee, which would be assisted by a 7-member Advisory Group appointed by the Secretary, is directed to publish and disseminate at least once a year a list of all qualified drugs and the allowable expenses of various quantities of each. This portion of the Senate amendment would become effective on January 1, 1968, or, if earlier, whenever the monthly premium rate under the Supplementary Medical Insurance program is increased (under section 1839(b) of the Act) above its present level of $3.

Under the conference action, the portion of the Senate amendment relating to coverage of drugs and biologicals under the Supplementary Medical Insurance program is omitted.

Percentage depletion rate for clay and shale used in making sewer pipe

The Senate amendment (in proposed section 404) contained provisions relating to the percentage depletion allowance for clay and shale used or sold for use in the manufacture of sewer pipe and brick. The conference action with respect to this provision is explained under title II under the heading "percentage depletion rate for certain clay, shale, and slate".

Preservation from reduction of certain widows' benefits under title II of the Social Security Act

The Senate amendment (in proposed section 405) amends the "family maximum" provisions in title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a widow's insurance benefits will not be reduced on account of any child's insurance benefits which may be payable to a child of an insured individual who died before 1966, if such child is not the widow's child and would not have been considered to be the insured individual's child under the applicable provisions of section 216(h) of the Act (relating to determination of family status) before that section was amended in 1965 to permit certain sons and daughters of insured individuals to qualify as "children" for benefit purposes although not so qualified under State law. This portion of the Senate amendment would apply only to monthly benefits for months after the month of enactment.

Under the conference action, the portion of the Senate amendment relating to these widow's insurance benefits is omitted.

W. D. MILLS,
CECIL R. KING,
HALE BOGGS,
EUGENE J. KEOGH,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
JAMES B. UTT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MILLS (during the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement of the managers on the part of the House be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, let me say first that there is no one in this House who is more concerned about orderly procedure than I am nor about the fact that it is becoming more difficult with each passing year to have tax bills passed through the House and through the Senate without a great number of amendments being added when the bill is in the other body.

I have no objection, Mr. Speaker, whatsoever to the other body working its will with respect to the subject matter which is sent to it. And they do amend our bills.

The social security bill, as I recall, which we passed in 1965 had in excess of 500 amendments attached before it was finally passed by the Senate. The Senate amendments, however, in that instance were by and large germane to the subject matter of the bill. My recollection in that instance is that as to those which were not germane to the subject matter of the bill we succeeded in causing the Senate conferees to agree to eliminate them. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a matter over which conferees have a great deal of difficulty and, of course, we have our share of those difficulties.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13103 is the bill which the House passed on June 15, 1966. The bill as passed by the House added as its primary objective the equal tax treatment by the United States of nonresident aliens and foreign corporations. Additionally, to the extent consistent with the primary objective of this bill, it was designed to provide increased incentives for investment by foreigners and foreign corporations in the United States. The bill as passed by the Senate adopted, with little change, the House-passed version of the Foreign Investors Tax Act of 1966. This part of the bill as passed by the Senate is contained in title I.

In addition, the Senate added other amendments to the bill which appear as titles II, III, and IV. These relate to other Internal Revenue Code provisions and the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act as well as other matters. I will first discuss the amendments made with respect to the Foreign Investors Tax Act and then the other amendments.

AMENDMENTS TO FOREIGN INVESTOR TAX ACT

The amendments made by the Senate to the Foreign Investors Tax Act were primarily perfecting changes which were made because of problems brought to their attention. There was, however, one Senate amendment in this area of major importance. As the bill passed the House it would, in general, subject to U.S. tax—as U.S. source income—all interest received after December 31, 1971, by nonresident aliens and foreign corporations on their U.S. bank deposits, and similar funds. A related amendment in the estate tax area also would have subjected these deposits to U.S. estate tax after the date of enactment of this bill. The Senate adopted an amendment which would have stricken the House-passed provision from the bill and thereby continued present law which grants an exemption from U.S. income and estate tax to the interest income and the deposits of these foreigners.

It was the opinion of the conferees that interest income of this type, which is so clearly derived from U.S. sources, should not escape U.S. taxation. On the other hand, we all realized that an immediate alteration of the present exemption might have a substantial adverse effect on our balance of payments. To meet these two quite different problems, the conference committee agreed to the repeal of the special income tax and estate tax exemptions relating to deposits of foreigners, but the effective date of the repeal was postponed until 1973. Moreover, postponing the date when these funds are taxed until 1973 will give Congress ample opportunity in the future to consider the impact of this provision on our balance of payments and on the gold flow. Should circumstances require, there will be plenty of time to reconsider the effective date of this provision.

The remaining Senate amendments of Title I are perfecting in nature and do not disturb the major substantive provisions of the House bill. They were made in response to technical problems presented by witnesses testifying before the Committee on Finance. I am certain that had these problems been brought to the attention of the Committee on Ways and Means, it would have made the changes prior to reporting the bill to the House. The Treasury Department is not opposed to any of these Senate amendments. At this point, I would like to insert a summary of these additional Senate amendments to which the House receded:

TITLES II, III, AND IV

The Senate added a number of amendments to the House bill which appear in the Senate bill as titles II, III, and IV. These titles relate to other Internal Revenue Code amendments, the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act, and other amendments, respectively. In total, these 3 titles contain 23 amendments. Of these 23 amendments, the Senate receded on 4, 6 were adopted with amendments and the House receded on 13.

Let me make two important observations about the amendments which the House receded. First, of these amendments, the Committee on Ways and Means had previously favorably reported, as separate bills, three and, in addition, it has extensively considered two others but had been unable to complete action on them. The second point, and the one which I should like to emphasize, is that the estimated revenue loss of approximately $460 million, which the 23 Senate amendments would have produced, was reduced by the insistence of your conferees to about $80 million, a reduction of $380 million. Moreover, of the remaining $80 million, the Senate amendment which adopted the House-passed version of H.R. 10, represented approximately $50 million. Therefore, the Senate amendments which had not already passed the House, upon which your conferees receded, represent a revenue loss of approximately $30 million.

One of the two most important Senate amendments to which your conferees agreed relates to a provision which had already been adopted by the House. I am referring to H.R. 10, which as the Members of the House will recall, passed the House on June 6 of this year by a vote of 291 to nothing. There, of course, can be no question with respect to the House conferees agreeing to this amendment in view of this mandate from the House. H.R. 10, both as passed by the House and as included in the Senate amendment, provides for the repeal of two limitations on the deduction a self-employed individual may take with respect to contributions on his own behalf to a retirement plan. First, it repeals the provision which limits the deduction to 50 percent of the contribution. However, it retains the provision restricting the contribution for self-employed persons to the lesser of 10 percent of earned income or $2,500. Second, it also permits a self-employed individual to include in earned income all of his net profits when his income is earned from a business in which both the performance of personal services and capital are material income-producing factors. However, in such cases the personal services of the self-employed person involved must be a material income-producing factor.

In this same area, the House conferees also agreed to a Senate amendment which alters present law relating to self-employed individuals' retirement plans to permit authors, inventors, and others, to include in their earned income base for the purpose of computing deductions for contributions to such plans, income derived from the sale or lease of the books they wrote or other products created from their own personal efforts.

In addition to H.R. 10, the Senate amendments which either have been favorably reported by the Committee on Ways and Means as separate bills or have been extensively considered by the committee relate to the taxation of "straddles" transactions, the basis of property received on the liquidation of certain subsidiaries, reports to clarify the national debt, and tax structure and the application of investment credit to property used in possessions of the United States.

The amendment relating to the tax treatment of "straddles" provides that the income from the lapse of an option which originated as part of a "straddle" is to be treated as a short-term capital gain—instead of ordinary income—so the income can be netted against any possible capital loss from the other side of the straddle option.

The provision relating to the liquidation of a subsidiary in general provides that, where stock in a corporation is acquired indirectly, the same tax consequences may flow from the liquidation of this corporation as in cases where the stock is acquired directly. This extends the tax-free liquidation provisions of existing law, for example, to cases where one corporation acquires stock in a second corporation by purchasing stock of a third corporation and then acquires the stock holdings of the third corporation in the second by exchanging its holdings in the third corporation for the stock it holds in the second corporation.

The third of this group of Senate amendments requires annual reporting on the current status of contingent liabilities of the Federal Government, including its long-range obligations and commitments, together with a report of the assets available to meet these liabilities. This provision has been carefully gone over by the Bureau of the Budget, and the revised version we have adopted meets its requirements from the standpoint of practicability. I am sure that all of us will find this a useful report.

One provision which took a considerable amount of time for the conferees related to the so-called swap funds. Under section 351 of the Internal Revenue Code, transfers of property to a corporation by one or more persons in exchange for stock in a corporation does not result in gain or loss, if immediately after the exchange the person or persons in question are in control of the corporation. On July 14, 1966, the Treasury Department issued a proposed regulation indicating that the exchange of appreciated stock for shares in an investment fund where immediately after the exchange the persons who transferred the stock to the corporation are in control of it does not qualify under this provision. The Senate added an amendment to the bill providing that section 351 applied to corporate investment funds.

The conferees considered this provision at length and concluded that, at least at this time, they did not think that stock or real estate investment funds should be eligible for this tax-free treatment under section 351. It was recognized, however, that in view of the past experience under this provision, it probably was unfair to cut these funds off immediately. After all, in 1960 the Internal Revenue Service ruled that these funds did come under section 351, and while it is true that since that time they have refused to so rule, nevertheless, private tax counsel has so ruled for many funds since that time. In view of these considerations, the conferees provided that these investment funds should come within section 351 only with respect to transfers of stock to the funds prior to July 1, 1967. Moreover, funds required to register with the Securities and Exchange Commission under either of two applicable laws, to be eligible for this treatment must file their registration applications with the Securities and Exchange Commission by January 1, 1967; the prospective shareholders must have deposited their stocks with the fund by May 1, 1967, and the actual transfers must have occurred before July 1, 1967. Where registration applications have set a maximum dollar amount for a fund, this may not be revised upward after January 1, 1967. Any additional amount would qualify for the tax-free treatment under this provision. This latter limitation, of course, applies only to those funds not already established.

The Senate adopted four amendments dealing with the depletion deduction. Your conferees receded on one of these amendments without amendment, but made substantial modifications in the other three. The provision upon which your conferees receded without amendment provides that clam, oyster, and other mollusk shells are to be allowed percentage depletion at the same 15-percent rate as limestone when it is used for the same purposes; namely, when it is used for calcium carbonate content. Equality of competitive treatment requires this. Two of the other three depletion amendments were altered at the insistence of your conferees so as to delete the aspects of these amendments which would grant the depletion allowance on new processes which are not presently classified as mining processes. The portion of the Senate amendment relating to alumina bearing clay, which set the percentage depletion allowance at 23 percent was not altered by the conference. This is the rate now available to bauxite, the principal source of aluminum. The other two depletion amendments which relate to shale, clay, and slate used as a light-weight aggregate and clay and shale used in the making of sewer pipe and brick, were altered by the conference so as to provide a 7½-percent depletion allowance.

The Senate also adopted three interest equalization tax amendments and one relating to Treasury notes issued in foreign currencies. The House conferees accepted these four amendments. The first interest equalization tax amendment provides that subsequent transfers of debt obligations to assure raw material resources are to be exempted from the interest equalization tax where the indebtedness is acquired without an intent (such as a bona fide investment representation) on the part of the purchaser to sell it to other U.S. persons. The second interest equalization tax provides that the present exemption for reserve asset pools of U.S. insurance companies is extended to allow the establishment of reserve asset pools where a U.S. insurance company commences activities in a developed country or where a less developed country is designated by the President as a developed country. The final interest equalization tax amendment grants the President the authority to exempt from the interest equalization tax U.S. dollar loans of more than 1 year made by the foreign branches of U.S. banks. The Senate amendment relating to Treasury notes grants the Secretary of the Treasury authority to issue U.S. notes denominated in foreign currencies.

In addition to the amendments discussed above, the Senate added to the House bill three other amendments. These dealt with: First, the exclusion of rents from personal holding company income where they are attributable to property the company manufactured if it is still currently doing so; second, the extension of essentially the present treatment of patronage dividends of cooperatives to their per-unit retains; and third, the equating of the manufacturer's excise tax rate on hearses with the tax on ambulances. The House conferees agreed to these amendments.

The last amendment I plan to discuss is the one on which the gentleman from Virginia raised his point of order under rule XX. I misunderstood him. At the time I thought he was raising a point of order under rule XXII.

Title III, which the Senate added to the bill, establishes the presidential election campaign fund. The House receded to the addition of this title with certain amendments. As altered by the conference, this provision provides, in general, that by designations on income tax returns, taxpayers will be allowed to create a fund of approximately $60 million which will be equally divided between the major political parties for the purpose of defraying the expenses of presidential election campaigns. This is distributed to the parties during the presidential campaign year—that is 1 year in every 4.

Individual taxpayers are to be given an opportunity to designate on their tax returns that $1 of their income tax liability—$2 in the case of a joint return—is to be placed in the presidential election campaign fund. The amounts in this fund are to be used to defray the expenses incurred by the political parties in presenting candidates for President and Vice President. The funds cannot be used for any other purposes or for any other campaigns. The major parties under this provision are treated equally. All parties receiving more than 15 million votes in the last presidential election are to be given the same amount. For example, in the last presidential election, two candidates for President received more than 15 million votes. The total of the votes they received was approximately 70 million. Therefore, in the next presidential election each of the two principal parties would be eligible to receive an amount equal to one-half of the total votes cast multiplied by $1. In other words, each of them would be eligible to receive $35 million. However, because there is a de minimus rule according no contribution for the first 5 million votes, these amounts would be reduced to $30 million apiece. Of course, this distribution would be made only if campaign expenses of this amount were incurred.

Minor parties are also provided for under this amendment. They will be eligible for funds equal to $1 times the number of votes cast for their candidate in the last presidential election to the extent the votes cast for their candidate exceed 5 million.

The Comptroller General is given supervision of this fund to be sure that the payments to the political parties for presidential campaign expenses are actually incurred, and to see that they are presidential campaign expenses as distinct from personal expenses, and as distinct from campaign expenses of other officeseekers. It will also be his responsibility to determine the popular vote which determines the amount which is to be available for distribution. An Advisory Board consisting of two members from each of the principal parties, together with three independent members selected by them, will assist the Comptroller General in the administration of the fund.

The question often is raised as to what happens if the amount designated by individuals on their tax returns is more or less than the amount which can be divided up among the parties based upon the popular vote. To the extent the amounts designated exceed the popular vote in the last election, the moneys involved are not to go into the fund, but rather to remain in the general fund. To the extent the amounts designated are less than the amount which should be distributed based upon the popular vote, the parties, in effect, receive an "account receivable" which is paid to them in future years to the extent designations are made.

This is a provision about which I was originally somewhat apprehensive. The more I listened to it, the more I became convinced that something needed to be done. I say this despite the fact that it was an amendment added by the Senate that was not related to the subject matter of the bill. Though this amendment does apply to the Internal Revenue Code, the bill itself has to do with the question of the foreign investors' tax treatment here in the United States.

After a thorough consideration of the many proposed solutions to the problem of how to finance presidential election campaigns, I have concluded that this provision is at least a good starting point. I cannot assure the Members of the House that this, in all respects, is the final solution to the problems of funding a presidential election campaign. However, I believe it, at the least, is a good beginning and I believe it is important that we start now.

We are all, particularly at this time, aware of the soaring costs of political campaigns. The dependence on wealthy contributors for substantial portions of needed funds tend to leave candidates of modest means encumbered with debts of loyalty to a wealthy few, rather than to the voting public as a whole. Certainly we should do something about a system which tends to obligate presidential officeholders to wealthy contributors and taxes them with difficulties in maintaining the independence which all of us want them to have. Although candidates other than the President and the Vice President will not directly benefit from this provision, it may be that taking the pressure off from raising funds for the presidential elections will lessen the problems of others in raising funds for their elections. In any event, it seems appropriate to try this proposal in this limited area before making any decisions as to whether it should be broadened.

As I have said, it seems to me that the enactment of this provision will be an important factor in removing the potential for possible improper influence in government. Political parties and their presidential candidates will be assured that they need not rely on the large contributions of a relatively few wealthy contributors to meet the heavy financial demands of political campaigns. Under this system of campaign financing, the man elected President will be obliged equally to every taxpayer and every voter. In other words, the man elected President will be in debt to all American voters and taxpayers and this would seem to be quite close to the ideal of the American system.

Frankly, I do not know how many people will use the system. I am not necessarily concerned at this point about how many people would do it. But I am concerned that we have not yet found a way to provide for the expensive financing of presidential campaigns other than through the present methods that are followed by both major parties of getting most of their moneys in amounts much larger than a dollar.

I have heard a whole lot of complaints recently about the possibility that somebody who belongs to a presidential $1,000 club might get some special favor from Government. The impression is abroad, although I doubt whether there is any truth in it, that this may sometimes be the situation: that some people make large campaign contributions to either of the political parties expecting to exercise some degree of influence upon either of the political parties greater than that which they normally would exercise without the making of that sizable contribution.

The President, when he sent his state of the Union message, I believe this year, in January, asked the Congress to enact a provision that would allow a person to make a political contribution of up to $100 to an individual party, from the presidential level down to the township level.

Under that proposal if a person made a political contribution to any Member, to me, to a county judge, or to anybody else, he could deduct it from his income tax up to $100. That in effect would be his act of appropriating whatever the amount was under the rate applicable in his case to that $100. This is true since otherwise this amount would go into the Federal Treasury.

Under the Senate amendment also the taxpayer, when he makes this X on his return indicating that he wants $1 out of, say, the $61 he is taxed not to go to the general fund of the Treasury but rather to go to this special fund to help the campaigns of those who aspire to be President, is making an appropriation of Federal money by his own act. He would do that in either instance. The difference is that under the Senate amendment the appropriation is equal for all taxpayers.

But what is wrong with it? What is wrong with the effort here being made to induce 70 million people over a 4-year period to provide $70 million so that 7,000 or 70,000 or whatever the number would be, would not have to provide the same amount of money?

Is it wrong to create a circumstance wherein every voter in the United States, if he wants to, can of his own volition make available $1 a year or $4 every 4 years, not to help his political party necessarily but to go into a fund which will be divided between the two major political parties?

Why, we even saw fit to make provision for some of it to go to a third party under the circumstances involved in the conference report.

I do not see anything wrong with it. But I do see something wrong with not trying to do something about the impression that exists on the part of many people, the impression that something ought to be done to minimize the possibility—I am not saying it exists; they are thinking it exists—of people having a greater influence than they ought to have because of the size of their contributions.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MacGREGOR. From what the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has said, I believe I can support this $1 per year idea, but the distinguished chairman also made reference to the proposal to allow a deduction of up to $100 per year per person for contributions for political candidates and political parties.

In the State of Minnesota we have had in our State income tax laws for some time such a provision. We believe it has been very beneficial in broadening the base of political contributions and encouraging citizens' participation.

I should like to ask the gentleman two questions. Did the committee give any consideration to this $100 per year proposal, which many of us have introduced in legislative form? Second, can the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas give us any figures as to the burden on tax receipts which the $1 per year proposal would amount to, and can he tell us anything about what the $100 per year contribution proposal would amount to in terms of lost revenues?

Mr. MILLS. Let me take the gentleman's questions in the order asked.

In the first place, we have not been able to give consideration to the $100 deductible in the committee although this was reviewed in the Senate hearings along with the amendment

As to the pending proposal, we know the maximum, how much is involved. It could never be more than $1 times the number of votes cast in the last Presidential election less 10 million if there are two parties, or more if there are more parties polling over 15 million votes.

I used 1964 in my example because the combined vote of the Democratic and Republican candidates came to 70 million. Subtracting 10 million from this leaves a cost of $60 million.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

That is the maximum, in other words, that could be in this fund for the election year 1968. You always look back to the prior election. The fund rises to a level of $1 times the number of total votes cast at the last election minus $10 million as long as there are two major parties. I am told the $100 deduction would cost about $100 million in revenues. But this may not be a satisfactory estimate since this is not limited to presidential campaigns; it is not limited to senatorial or representative races; it is not limited to gubernatorial races, but it can go down to whatever level of elections are involved. Very frankly, I have not looked with too much favor upon that. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, and I can be wrong. If it has worked in Minnesota, it could work elsewhere, but what I am getting to is this: Remember the $1 has no application except to presidential campaigns. I do not know that the two ideas are even in conflict. Maybe they could be meshed together. I do know this: Even though congressional races are not involved in this proposition, if you get separate financing for presidential campaigns it might be easier for the Republican Campaign Committee of the House and the Democratic Campaign Committee of the House to get what I understand it needs under the present circumstances.

My main point is that this is a worthwhile experiment to see whether or not we can get money this way. It is possible that President Eisenhower and President Truman could get on TV and make a concerted drive and urge the taxpayers to make this contribution in behalf of good government with the elimination of any possibility of undue influence by those who otherwise would make larger contributions. It seems to me people will buy it. However, I am interested in making an effort here to do something to create a better atmosphere with respect to the collection of contributions in Presidential campaigns.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I will be glad to yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me.

First, Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay my tribute to the sterling work that the chairman has done in the conferences that have been presented heretofore and the one pending now. I hope he does not mind if I call the attention of the House to the fact that there is included in the pending conference report the amendments to the Self-Employed Individuals Retirement Tax Act which passed the House on June 6 by a record vote of 291 to nothing. The only change that was effected was that the effective date of those amendments was made for taxable years following December 31, 1967, instead of 1965.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay my respects again and express my appreciation to the chairman for his having cooperated in the retention of what I like to think is a most important improvemen of the Self-Employed Individuals Retirement Tax Act that will make it far more workable than it has been up to now.

Mr. MILLS. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York. There are many provisions in the bill. The gentleman has referred to one of them. Most of these provisions were worked out with complete Treasury support. The gentleman put his finger on one provision that had passed the House. There are several others in it that have also. Certainly this one did. It passed by a record vote. There seemed to be unanimous approval. As I remember it, no one voted against it. The Senate, as I said, included it and made only that one change in the effective date.

And permit me to say, Mr. Speaker, that the distinguished gentleman from New York worked effectively and in his usual intelligent and persuasive manner in securing passage of H.R. 10. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York has served many years on the committee. He is possessed of a brilliant mind. He is industrious. He attends all meetings of the committee. We will miss him when he retires in January.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE). The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has again expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, under title III as the gentleman was explaining, the division of the funds which the gentleman mentioned would be that they would be divided equally between the two major political parties.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, let me get into a little more detail about it.

Mr. BATTIN. Then the gentleman mentioned a third party.

Mr. MILLS. Yes.

Neither major party would get a dollar for the first 5 million votes that it received in the previous election. Neither would a third party begin to participate in this fund until it has received as many as 5 million votes.

If the third party receives as many as 15 million votes, then it becomes a third equal partner in the total of the fund. But if it does not get to the 15-million-vote level, it gets less than this; it would get a dollar for each vote above the 5-million-vote level.

So, if a party received 10 million votes, it would not be paid for the first 5 million, but it would get a dollar for the remaining 5 million votes or $5 million, to help defray the cost of its campaign.

Now, you understand you do not give a party anything until there is certification that actual expenditures have been incurred. This is what I am talking about, the limit you would give in return for certified records of expenditures in that amount.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, then if I understand the gentleman from Arkansas correctly, you would take the last presidential year, 1964——

Mr. MILLS. That is right; you always have to do that.

Mr. BATTIN. And as I recall, there was somewhat of a landslide during that year.

Mr. MILLS. That makes no difference. In the case, about which we are talking, there was no third party which received 5 million votes. If there were 70 million votes—even though the Democrats received 40 million votes and the Republican 30 million votes—the fund would still be divided evenly. The fund would be divided equally between these parties because both of them received more than 15 million votes. Once you get to the 15-million-vote level, you become an equal partner, even though the other party may have gotten 50 million votes and you only 30 million.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, but the division would not become equal based upon the percentage of the total votes?

Mr. MILLS. They would be on the actual votes received less 5 million until you got 15 million votes. Then the division would be equal.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the gentleman in the well appreciates the fact that no one has a higher regard for the gentleman than I. And, certainly, I can appreciate the effort that is being made here to broaden the base for political contributions.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the gentleman in the well, as I, believes in the matter of voluntary contributions.

However, Mr. Speaker, the thing that disturbs me is that under the provisions of this particular section 3, an individual, although he might decide to give only a dollar and checks the square, therefore that individual might feel that the Republicans have been spending too much money and that they are threatening us with bankruptcy and they are causing inflation, and might say, "I will give my dollar instead to the Democratic Party which is trying to keep expenses down."

Now, Mr. Speaker, although the checking of the square is a voluntary matter, subsequent to that there is a compulsory proposition to the effect that a part of that dollar is being forced to go to another party which that individual might not desire to help, even to the extent of 50 cents.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman is completely accurate in that respect. Actually this is a voluntary contribution for good government. It presents both parties a chance to get their ideas across without having to beg for funds.

The main thing here is to stimulate people to take an interest in politics and to broaden the base, as my friend, the gentleman from South Carolina, said, of those who make these contributions to political campaigns.

I think it is much better to do it in one fund, and to divide it among the parties, than to use tax dollars for the purpose of electing a Democratic President per se, by designation, or a Republican President per se by designation. This is only $4 in a presidential campaign. If the man wants to make a contribution to one of the parties in addition to that he may do so in addition to the $4.

Mr. WATSON. Then we would both agree on this proposition that the initial designation of $1 is a voluntary proposition?

Mr. MILLS. Absolutely.

Mr. WATSON. But thereafter the person is being compelled to?

Mr. MILLS. That is right. After that it goes to both parties.

Mr. WATSON. The person is being compelled to contribute to people and parties not necessarily of his choice?

Mr. MILLS. He has the right to designate a dollar to go into the presidential campaign fund. He does not have the right to say that it go to the Republican National Committee, or to the Democratic National Committee. If he puts it in there he will do so with the full knowledge that he is making that contribution toward the costs of the presidential campaign—the presidential campaign of both parties.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HARSHA. If it were not operated in this way would you not soon use up the dollar in trying to categorize or collect the dollar and set aside every individual taxpayer's dollar to a particular candidate?

Mr. MILLS. I would think it would be much less expensive to do it the way the conference report has it.

Mr. HARSHA. Otherwise you would use up the dollar.

Mr. MILLS. Yes.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this is going to contribute to the growth of a third party.

I believe that the genius of American politics is that we have two parties, both of them largely occupying the middle of the road.

I think it is naive to assume that there are not organizations already in existence in the country that are already contributing to campaigns that could run their own candidates and their own President. If they are assured that this money can be transferred then to the taxpayer I think that it will contribute to such growth.

I would assume that it is possible that you could have a labor candidate. I would assume that it is possible that Mr. Wallace, as a States' Rights candidate, may run.

I would assume that it is possible that you could have a black power candidate.

I believe that these things should be considered.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, let me call the gentlewoman's attention to the fact that there is nothing here that provides any encouragement to the development of a third party or a fourth party or a fifth party. What we have here is a proposition that if the major parties are joined by a third party, that receives as much as 5 million votes in an election, that party is going to qualify for part of this dollar for the votes that they received above 5 million. But, that party has to get that many votes first on its own through some other means of financing, before it ever gets anything out of this fund. It has to be qualified first.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. There are organizations available now that have the money to run the candidate, and that are already contributing to candidates.

So if they can rely upon the fact that in the future they are going to get it all paid back to them, to my mind I think you are building up toward the possibility of splintering American politics.

Mr. MILLS. The gentlewoman misunderstands when it gets it paid back. You do not finance a campaign in 1968 and then get paid enough money on the basis of 5 million votes received in that campaign.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. They will have been putting it in all these years and in future years when they get more than 5 million votes they will get paid.

Mr. MILLS. Let me ask my good friend, the gentlewoman from Michigan if this is not worth a trial? That is the only thing I am asking you, to give it a trial. I am not saying it is going to work. I do not know whether it will or not. It is hard to get people to make a political campaign contribution. I know it—we all know it.

What I am concerned about is that we make some effort to interest more people in this business of participating in the financing of these extremely costly presidential campaigns. I do not know what they are going to cost. But it looks like to me as if every time we run one of them, both parties wind up in the hole and then spend the next 4 years trying to have dinners somewhere with people to speak to pay off the deficit.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DINGELL. I have several concerns about this legislation, the first of which is that no hearings were held on this matter before the great Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman is right in that respect.

Mr. DINGELL. I have always viewed it as being highly important that tax legislation originate in the House of Representatives as the Founding Fathers originally intended it to be done.

Mr. MILLS. This bill did—but the gentleman is right as to this provision.

Mr. DINGELL. I think this is the defect in the legislation that is before us.

Now apropos of what the gentlewoman has been discussing, with the distinguished chairman, I would like to point out that political third parties in this country are very ephemeral in their existence and exist for a short period of time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I used?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arkansas has consumed 29 minutes.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute and that is all because I must yield time to other Members.

Mr. DINGELL. I would simply like to point out that I agree with the gentlewoman from Michigan that this is going to continue the third-party structure in this country.

Mr. MILLS. I do not think it would have anything to do with that.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Was any provision added having to do with the use of this money?

Mr. MILLS. This is to be handled by the Comptroller General under the bill.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. Is it not a fact that no third party could participate earlier than 1972?

Mr. MILLS. That is right.

Mr. KEOGH. And then they could participate only if they had a candidate in 1968 who received more than 5 million votes. Is that not correct?

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman is exactly correct.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, as I have said in speaking on previous conference reports, even though I had serious questions on them, I voted as an individual Congressman against the last final version of the suspension of the investment credit, as a conferee I still signed the report.

The point I want to make about this previous bill in reference to this one is that this contained matters that at least the President of the United States said were serious and the House over my objections, of course, and my best endeavors to persuade the House differently, that this would actually combat inflation. I felt to the contrary but as a conferee I felt it was necessary to uphold the position of the House, and that this bill was so important because inflation is indeed a serious problem. I thought I had a responsibility to report back to the House some version of this measure even though it contained extraneous matters, such as we discussed on football.

I did not sign this report because the vehicle used by the other body in this instance, although a good and important bill, certainly is not going to shake the foundations of this Nation if it does not become law this year and, indeed, waits until next year. The Foreign Investors' Tax Act of 1966 is the result of many years of hard work. Our committee did a great deal of work developing it. The Senate Finance Committee did some excellent work in improving it. And there are many Senate amendments that are germane to the bill and have improved this bill. This bill is in such good shape now that I can tell the House it can be introduced in the next Congress and probably become law within about a month.

However, this bill became what some news reporter described as "Christmas tree," on which our colleagues on the other side put one after another amendment, amendments that were completely nongermane to the bill, and, with few exceptions, were matters that the House of Representatives and the Ways and Means Committee had had no opportunity at all of studying.

I must disagree with my Chairman of the committee. I respect him, but believe me, my good colleague, you cannot understand what this new concept of financing political parties is from the conversations that we had—and they were no more than conversations that we had in the conference on this subject. It cannot be understood that easily.

In fact, I believe that this is an unconstitutional provision, as I tried to point out. I thought the point of order made by Judge SMITH was well taken, although, of course, I respectfully bow to the decision of the Speaker. But this is not a tax bill. It is actually an appropriation bill, and one of the strangest that has ever come down the pike.

Under the Constitution the appropriation process requires the action of the Congress of the United States. This bill provides that an individual citizen, by putting an "x" on his income tax return, may direct money that is not his—because as soon as he pays it as a taxpayer it is part of the general funds of the United States—that an individual citizen, by putting an "x" in the box, can direct how money of the United States is to be spent. I think this is unconstitutional. I think an examination into it would reveal it probably to be so. But I do not really know. I am giving an off-the-top-of-the-head opinion on this from what I have seen.

There are other implications.

We were promised by the Secretary of the Treasury this year when another nongermane amendment from the Senate was put on one of our bills that no longer tax deduction for a method that both political parties had developed——

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me an additional 5 minutes?

Mr. MILLS. I yield the gentleman from Missouri 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Both political parties had developed a method in financing their affairs, namely, the Almanac and advertising in it. I did not think it was too good a way of doing it. But let me say this. It had one virtue: It was honest and aboveboard, and all of us know the problems that exist in financing political parties and political campaigns, and I think we are all agreed that this matter is so serious that we have to look at it and look at it in depth. It has become one of the subject matters studied by the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of the Congress.

One of the recommendations we made was that we must get into this subject matter. But let us not get into it in this kind of haphazard, piecemeal method of having a bill come into the conference on a tax measure of some seriousness and some complexity, and hope to get by, as the chairman of the Ways and Means said, "Well, why not try it. It might work."

I hope that is not the way we will proceed in legislation.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Is the gentleman suggesting it would be more proper, and in fact, constitutional, if the dollar were sent in by the individual to a candidate or a political organization and then marked as a legitimate deduction, if the law so provided, but that because the check box on the form is something which goes to the Government, and then the Government pays the money, it becomes unconstitutional? Is this the distinction the gentleman is making?

Mr. CURTIS. It is a distinction, yes. We can say to any taxpayer, "We are not going to tax certain money—money you give to your church, money you give to charity. We will not tax that." But this is money that has been paid as taxes. It is not a deduction from the tax bill. It is money that the citizen owes.

Those who put on an X mark and say, "This money shall be spent," are designating. Suppose I do not put on an X mark. Then nothing will go out of the Treasury for this purpose.

This might be going back to the days when the citizens were those who were property owners, because those who are not in the income brackets to pay income tax and only pay excise taxes to the Federal Government will not get to direct any money from the Federal Treasury to go for this purpose.

Having said this on that particular subject, let me call attention to the all-too-limited discussion on a conference report on a very serious and fine bill, the Foreign Investors Tax Act of 1966. If Members will look at the statement on the part of the managers of the House, they will find that this is only one of the items.

There are four items here that change depletion allowances. There are many of us who in our districts have problems with respect to depletion allowances which affect us. The Ways and Means Committee had no hearings or discussions on these three things. They were just put in here, and they were not kicked out.

I say that the House of Representatives has got to stand firm on this operation of those from the other body, putting on matters at will, almost, that have not been studied, even with very little study on their own part. Many of these are amendments offered on the floor of the Senate, and not even considered by the Senate Finance Committee.

There is one final thing. The one ray of hope about all of this tragedy—and I call it a tragedy so far as the legislative process is concerned—is, the President might well veto the bill. Frankly, I hope he does. Then we can get back and bring in a proper bill in regard to the Foreign Investors Tax Act of 1966.

I have said about all I care to say on the subject. I will close by saying I hope that some day, if I am here—and I hope I will be here long enough—I will see the House of Representatives stand up against the operations, irresponsible—I will use that word—the irresponsible operations we have experienced in this instance, and in instance after instance on the part of Members of the other body. This is not the way to legislate.

This particular idea is an interesting idea for financing campaigns. Frankly, it is no more than just that; an interesting idea that ought to be examined.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I am not sure the gentleman understood my question asked a while ago, when I asked about the audit system.

There are two aspects to this problem. One of course is what control the minority party could have over the question of whether there was an honest count of the amount of money that was to be handled.

Mr. MILLS. Let me explain how it will be handled.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. The other and more important question is how does one control the use of the money, let us say, by the Republican or Democratic National Committee? Suppose this were very successful and resulted in a nice, big windfall and they just decided to pay the chairman a couple of hundred thousand dollars a year? In other words, suppose they declared themselves an informal dividend.

What sort of control would there be over that?

Mr. MILLS. Let me answer the gentleman's first question first. The expenditures may be audited by the Comptroller General. They are certified, and submitted by the Democratic National Committee in behalf of the election of a Democrat or by the Republican National Committee in behalf of a Republican for President. I do not think the gentleman has to have any worry about the fact that this matter would be very carefully scrutinized in that respect. Then there is an advisory committee made up of members of both parties to aid in supervising it. I do not think any Republican member of that committee would allow the Democratic National Committee to fudge or vice versa.

There is no limitation with respect to the matter of whether a part of it could be used to pay a Democratic national committeeman a greater salary than he deserves or to pay a Republican national committeeman a greater salary than he deserves.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I wonder if I could ask the chairman one other question——

Mr. MILLS. Yes.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Which I do not think would necessarily be very realistic, but it could be conceivable, I suppose. As Mr. DINGELL pointed out, third parties are notoriously ephemeral. Suppose you had a third party that managed to poll 7 million votes in 1968. It would not get that money in 1968, but, of course, it would get it in 1972. Suppose the party then virtually disappeared and all that is left is the national committee of that party that decided to get a couple of million dollars and decided to spend it in a very high, wide, and handsome way. Would you have any control over anything like that to keep that money from being dissipated and wasted?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DINGELL. Will we then be placing the Appropriations Committee, which is sometimes a partisan body and ofttimes very partisan, in charge of expenditures by the recipients of this fund?

Mr. MILLS. I do not think the gentleman from Michigan would want to say that a Democratic Congress or a Republican Congress could not be fair in appropriating under the provisions of any act. Actually, however, the Appropriations Committee would be involved.

Mr. DINGELL. At least the gentleman from Arkansas will admit that what we are setting up is a situation where the Committee on Appropriations may at a time later scrutinize the activity of what has been previously preaudited by the great political parties of this country. Am I correct?

Mr. MILLS. You have the Comptroller General to supervise this and you have an advisory committee set up over people who are set up here on a bipartisan basis aiding in the supervision. I do not think the parties are going to misuse this political fund.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further——

Mr. MILLS. No. I do not think they are going to misuse this fund.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I have one further question of the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. Speaker, the rationale as I understand it for this proposal is to do away with the great fundraising efforts which are now handled and incurred by the two parties.

Mr. MILLS. That would be our hope, to broaden the base.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the simple answer to that is that this would be in addition to the funds which would be raised based upon the traditional manner and practices in which they have been raised heretofore.

Mr. MILLS. No. If the gentleman thinks that, the gentleman has missed the entire point of this amendment.

There will never be a penny paid out of this fund until it is certified that there has been an expenditure incurred—expenditure incurred—and then they send the amount into the fund, showing how it has been expended and the purpose for which it has been expended. Then the fund could reimburse them for that amount.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished gentleman will yield further, the gentleman has a great opportunity to convince me in this respect, but I see nothing contained in the statement of the managers on the part of the House——

Mr. MILLS. Read the bill.

Mr. DINGELL. Which would indicate that henceforward the responsibility and obligation for conventional-type fundraising by both parties will either be done away with or otherwise ignored.

As I read this statement of the managers on the part of the House, the conventional type of fundraising practices will continue to operate——

Mr. MILLS. We have not tried to stop it here. You or I or anyone else could say that, "I have $100 in my pocket and I want to give it to the Republican, the presidential candidate—the candidate of my choice." However, the party is not going to try so hard to get money this way if it already has adequate financing.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] has missed the point that has to be recognized that this only covers the expenditure after a nomination.

Mr. MILLS. That is right; on the first of September.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. This will not finance preconventions or convention activities. It is only after a nominee has been selected.

Mr. MILLS. And, it is set out in the bill itself that no expenditure can be made prior to September 1 out of this fund in the presidential election year.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Arkansas will yield further, there is nothing contained in this legislation which would stop the political parties from having the presidential clubs, from conducting the traditional type of fundraising otherwise.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. DINGELL. Or having a special party-type of fundraising, or any other device with which to raise funds. But this would be an additional device through which to raise money for a political party.

Mr. MILLS. It certainly is true that it is possible to have large contributions. But the pressure will be less for them. Moreover, we can still pass some legislation limiting these contributions.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Arkansas will yield further, I do not see anything contained in this bill that changes the present situation with reference to the present policies of fundraising.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing contained in this bill, aside from the fact that we will make an additional contribution and make additional money available.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman from Michigan, my good friend, knows that there is nothing in the Internal Revenue Service Code that has anything to do with the control of political contributions. Political contributions which are made are controlled by legislation, I assume, within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, such control is not within this bill. There is no effort made here to say that a man cannot make a contribution of his own money.

All we are trying to do here is to say that an individual can provide $1 a year to a presidential campaign fund and this would give him the opportunity to do it, if he wants to do it. If we can get 70 million people to contribute to this presidential campaign fund this should finance most, if not all, of the cost of a presidential campaign. Then there is no need for a presidential group or for you or for me to go further into our own pockets. We could spend our money if we so desired toward helping to elect a Governor of some State or a congressional colleague. But do not bring into this discussion things that are not contained in this legislation or in the conference report.

The question is whether what is here is worth a trial run to see if it will work because if it will work, it can have a very wholesome effect in eliminating some of the things that may be in the minds of some people who talk about undue influence.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much criticism of our campaign contribution laws, that candidates and parties depended on individual contributors, and therefore there were certain obligations.

Now, it does not seem to me we can solve this in the least bit. Your committee is not set up to go into campaign practices. And I just cannot accept the premise that if the national committee gets a few million from this source that it will not seek it from other sources.

Mr. MILLS. They are going to seek it from other sources until they get enough money to run the campaign. You know that and I know that. If they can get two-thirds of what they want here then they only have to get one-third from other sources.

Does not my good friend from New Jersey agree that this is a good way to bring about broadening the contribution base, and it would not hurt us to at least try to broaden the base, so as to get more people helping with the political campaign costs so that we do not have to go to a few people and get more from them?

Mr. JOELSON. I would answer that by saying we are not broadening the base; we are just fattening up the till.

Mr. MILLS. I do not think my friend from New Jersey understands the amendment.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The question here is: Are we stacking it against minority groups by really subsidizing through the Government the major parties?

Mr. MILLS. I do not know whether my friend from Pennsylvania was on the floor or not, but the argument has just been made by others that we are stacking it for them.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I am speaking in a different context.

Mr. MILLS. I do not think we are stacking it for or against.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I am raising the other question.

Mr. MILLS. We are going to recognize a third party whenever that third party gets more than 5 million votes. In that event we will help that party to some degree and whenever it gets 15 million votes, in the previous presidential election, it will become a full party in the division of the money with the other major parties.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The question then is this: You are making it the equivalent of one vote and one dollar. That is one of the cheapest elections I ever heard of, where you get a vote for every dollar in your party.

I might say to the gentleman, if I were in one of the what we now call organized groups I would certainly go on the presidential end of it, and do it quick, and altogether, because I would be able to control them. I would not have to finance the presidential end of it.

Mr. MILLS. This might help us to get money needed in congressional campaigns, and I think it would serve a good purpose if it did. But let me say this to my friend from Pennsylvania: I am sure he would——

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Is this constitutional? I do not think it is.

Mr. MILLS. I do not think there is any constitutional question.

But my friend from Pennsylvania, I am sure, would rather see 10,000 people contribute $1 to a campaign than to see one individual contribute $10,000 to cover the same costs.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Yes, but you see——

Mr. MILLS. I think the gentleman would agree with me that there is less possibility of suspicion of influence, real or unreal.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Yes, but the gentleman can see what you come to is this, when you make equivalent and equal one vote and one dollar. I really do not know what the philosophical background of that is, and whether it is right or wrong.

Mr. MILLS. What would the gentleman make of it?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I would not think a dollar a vote. I do not believe I would. It may be right. I am questioning that, and saying it may not be constitutional, because I do not think public money should really finance private groups for political purposes.

Maybe. I do not know. I am asking the question.

Mr. MILLS. I would think the gentleman would believe that this would be preferable than tax deductions. There is no control possible over that. I would believe that the gentleman would think this would be the better way to do it.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BINGHAM. I was going to say, it seems to me that this is worth trying.

Mr. MILLS. Yes, I think it is.

Mr. BINGHAM. I have heard for many years a great deal of discussion and debate about this problem. Many suggestions are made about getting away from the existing system—and of course it is possible for anybody to shoot holes in any proposal.

Mr. MILLS. That is right.

Mr. BINGHAM. But it seems to me, this is a proposal that is worth trying and I think it makes sense.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me so that I may answer my friend, the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MILLS. I will yield briefly to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I would like to answer my friend, the gentleman from New York, whom I respect highly. Suppose somebody who believes contrary to the gentleman from New York and my particular feelings about voting rights and civil rights and all that? If Wallace in the South gets 5 million votes, we have the Government subsidizing things that are against what we believe in.

Mr. MILLS. Has the gentleman looked into this matter close enough to realize that in the case of a third party running for the first time in 1968 even if the party gets over 5 million votes, it would not get anything in 1968?

Mr. CURTIS. But if he is also running under a third party, his third party would.

Mr. MILLS. No, I must say to the gentleman, I am right. That third party would not be eligible to get anything until the campaign in 1972.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman speaks with such positiveness—let me emphasize again that we did not hold a single bit of hearings.

Mr. MILLS. We did not have any hearings. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. All we had was some discussion in the conference room off there for maybe about three-quarters of an hour. That is the most the gentleman knows about it and it is the most that I know.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman cannot say how much I know of this; I did a lot of studying of it.

Mr. CURTIS. There have been no hearings as I said, as far as the House is concerned, and we do not know beans about it.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman is right.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRASER. I just want to commend the chairman. I think it is an excellent proposal. I think it ought to be tried. If particular provisions need to be modified, we can take a look at it next year. But this is a wonderful opportunity to free our political system from dependence on large contributors. I feel very strongly about it.

Mr. MILLS. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, the conference report now before us on H.R. 13103, proposes, as has been thoroughly discussed this evening, that starting in 1967 each individual taxpayer be given an option to divert exactly $1 per year of his Federal income tax payment to a special Treasury fund. This fund would be equitably allocated between the major national political parties to help defray the costs of presidential campaigns.

Mr. Speaker, this scheme definitely does have some merit. In particular, it provides a simple, direct, and practical process by which large numbers of people individually can contribute a small amount to national political campaigns, sufficient to fund these campaigns moderately well, and thereby relieving the candidates of the necessity of depending on a limited number of affluent givers. This scheme therefore would reduce the influence of wealthy individuals or organizations upon the National Government.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, there are two very basic faults of this scheme which overshadow its merits: First, the funds are to be available only for presidential elections, rather than all elections at all levels of government; and the funds will be dispersed according to the inclinations of national party leaders, persons who to date seldom have been known to the public, and hardly immediately subject to broad public choice.

Mr. Speaker, this good idea is being applied wrongly.

Suppose instead, these funds were allocated in proportion to the number of voters each delegate receives directly to the control of the local precinct delegates elected precinct by precinct throughout the Nation by the voters of each party. These delegates, who would be your neighbors, and probably well known to you, in turn would distribute the funds over which they gained control to the local, State, and National candidates and party organizations as they so desired, or more particularly, as they would have promised prior to their own election.

The control of political party activities and finances then would stem from where it should—the neighborhood level, the grassroots of politics, rather than from the Nation's political center.

Today, a national TV network, or a national news service, surely can more strongly influence legislation than can, for example, any one or a few Members of Congress, such as myself.

Today, the Nation's political party leaders, of both parties, and particularly of whichever party controls the agencies or controls the congressional committees, surely can wield "the carrot and the stick" to gain frequent conformity of action of representatives from many districts.

Now I personally do not desire to increase this centralization of political power. Therefore I have decided to vote against the conference report.

Of course, in doing so, I recognize that I will be voting against a number of other provisions encompassed in the report, some of which I certainly support, particularly the provision liberalizing tax deductibility of contributions to pension plans by self-employed individuals. I was a sponsor of that provision. But because the other body, the Senate, has imposed this unamendable conference report upon us, I will have no opportunity to separate the provisions.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate should not have accepted the election fund scheme, and neither should we.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. CURTIS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. CURTIS moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 13103, to the committee of conference.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Obviously, a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 95, nays 127, not voting 210, as follows:

[Roll No. 395]

YEAS—95

Adair
Andrews, George W.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Bates
Battin
Bell
Bennett
Betts
Bolton
Brock
Broomfield
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Burton, Utah
Cabell
Cameron
Casey
Celler
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Collier
Conte
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Dague
Dingell
Dole
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Tenn.
Ford, Gerald R.
Fulton, Pa.
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hardy
Harvey, Mich.
Hechler
Henderson
Hull
Hutchinson
Jarman
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Kunkel
Langen
Latta
Lipscomb
Long, Md.
McClory
McDade
MacGregor
Mahon
Marsh
Mize
Morse
Mosher
Natcher
Passman
Pelly
Pickle

Poage
Poff
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
Saylor
Selden
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Springer
Stalbaum
Teague, Calif.
Tuck
Vigorito
Vivian
Waggonner
Watson
Whalley
Widnall
Williams
Wolff
Wydler

NAYS—127

Addabbo
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Bandstra
Beckworth
Bingham
Boggs
Brademas
Brooks
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Callan
Clark
Conable
Conyers
Corbett
Daniels
Dawson
de la Garza
Dent
Diggs
Donohue
Dow
Edwards, Calif.
Everett
Farbstein
Farnum
Fascell
Flood
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Garmatz
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Grider
Griffiths
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Harsha
Hathaway
Herlong
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Ichord
Irwin
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keogh
Krebs
Landrum
Leggett
Love
McGrath
Machen
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Neill, Mass.
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Price
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Sickles
Smith, Iowa
Staggers
Stubblefield
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thomas
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Utt
Vanik
Weltner
White, Tex.
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—210

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adams
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Belcher
Berry
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Bow
Bray
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Broyhill, Va.
Cahill
Callaway
Carey
Carter
Cederberg
Chelf
Clawson, Del
Clevenger
Cohelan
Colmer
Cooley
Corman
Craley
Culver
Curtin
Daddario
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Delaney
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dorn
Duncan, Oreg.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farnsley
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Gettys
Gilligan
Goodell
Grabowski
Greigg
Gross
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Howard
Hungate
Huot
Jacobs
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kupferman
Laird
Lennon
Long, La.
McCarthy
McCulloch
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mailliard
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meeds
Michel
Miller
Mink
Minshall
Moeller
Moore
Moorhead
Morton
Moss
Murray
Nelsen
Nix
O'Brien
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Pirnie
Pool
Powell
Pucinski
Purcell
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Roudebush
Roush
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Scott
Senner
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Stafford
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Toll
Trimble
Tunney
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Waldie
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watts
White, Idaho
Whitener
Whitten
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wyatt
Yates
Younger

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. King of California with Mr. Reinecke.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Moore.
Mr. Laird with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Miller with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Glenn Andrews.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Pirnie.
Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.
Mr. Frelinghuysen with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Ayres with Mr. Abernethy.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Whitten.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Colmer.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Fountain.
Mr. McFall with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Kornegay.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Gilligan with Mr. Jones of North Carolina.
Mr. Olsen of Montana with Mr. Cooley.
Mr. Stafford with Mr. Dorn.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Rivers of South Carolina.
Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. McMillan.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Lennon.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Foley.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Morton.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Robison.
Mr. Hungate with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Hays with Mr. King of New York.
Mr. Dyal with Mr. Hall.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Mackay with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Schisler with Mr. Younger.
Mr. Rogers of Florida with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Hicks with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Stanton.
Mr. Craley with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.
Mr. Albert with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Keith.
Mr. Denton with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Mackie with Mr. Kupferman.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Goodell.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Martin of Alabama.
Mr. Meeds with Mr. Findley.
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Haley with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Race with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Trimble with Mr. Callaway.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Clarence J. Brown, Jr.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Senner with Mr. Bow.
Mr. King of Utah with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Schmidhauser with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Roush with Mr. Huot.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Chelf.
Mr. Clevenger with Mr. McCarthy.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Kluczynski.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Roncalio.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Rogers of Texas.
Mr. Slack with Mr. Van Deerlin.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Todd.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. White of Idaho.
Mr. Whitener with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Fulton of Tennessee.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Fallon.
Mr. Duncan of Oregon with Mrs. Mink.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Culver.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Macdonald.
Mr. Moeller with Mr. O'Brien.
Mr. Olson of Minnesota with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Pucinski.
Mr. Randall with Mr. Grabowski.
Mr. Greigg with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
Mr. Redlin with Mr. Ottinger.
Mr. Hansen of Iowa with Mr. Pool.
Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Stephens.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Roberts.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Adams.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Flynt.
Mr. Matthews with Mr. McVicker.
Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
Mr. Farnsley with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Toll with Mrs. May.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Walker of New Mexico with Mr. Curtin.
Mr. Waldie with Mr. Murray.

Mr. CAMERON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr RONAN changed his vote from "yea" to nay."

Mr. ANNUNZIO changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. LIPSCOMB changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BROOMFIELD changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. MIZE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. MAHON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. SCHEUER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 171, nays 46, not voting 221, as follows:

[Roll No. 396]

YEAS—171

Adair
Addabbo
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ayres
Bandstra
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Bell
Betts
Bingham
Boggs
Bolton
Brademas
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Callan
Casey
Celler
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Collier
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Cramer
Dague
Daniels
Dawson
de la Garza
Dent
Diggs
Dole
Donohue
Dow
Downing
Duncan, Tenn.
Edwards, Calif.
Everett
Farbstein
Farnum
Fascell
Flood
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Garmatz
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Grider
Hagen, Calif.
Hamilton
Hanley
Hardy
Harsha
Hathaway
Herlong
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Irwin
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Okla.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keogh
Krebs
Landrum
Lipscomb
Long, Md.
Love
McClory
McDade
McGrath
Machen
Mahon
Marsh
May
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Mosher
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Neill, Mass.
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poff
Price
Quillen
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Rhodes, Pa.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roybal
Rumsfeld
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Shriver
Sickles
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stubblefield
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thomas
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Utt
Weltner
White, Tex.
Widnall
Wolff
Wright
Young
Zablocki
The Speaker

NAYS—46

Andrews, George W.
Ashmore
Bennett
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Cabell
Cameron
Cunningham
Curtis
Dingell
Dowdy
Fulton, Pa.
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hechler
Henderson
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Kunkel
Langen
Latta
MacGregor
Mize
Natcher
Passman
Poage
Quie
Rhodes, Ariz.
Ryan
Satterfield
Selden
Teague, Tex.
Tuck
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waggonner
Watson
Whalley
Williams

NOT VOTING—221

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adams
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Aspinall
Baring
Barrett
Belcher
Berry
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Bow
Bray
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Broyhill, Va.
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Callaway
Carey
Carter
Cederberg
Chelf
Clawson, Del
Clevenger
Cohelan
Colmer
Cooley
Corman
Craley
Culver
Curtin
Daddario
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Delaney
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dorn
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farnsley
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Gettys
Gilligan
Goodell
Grabowski
Gray
Greigg
Griffiths
Gross
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Howard
Hungate
Huot
Jacobs
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kupferman
Laird
Leggett
Lennon
Long, La.
McCarthy
McCulloch
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mailliard
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
Meeds
Michel
Miller
Mink
Minshall
Moeller
Moore
Moorhead
Morton
Moss
Murray
Nelsen
Nix
O'Brien
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Pool
Powell
Pucinski
Purcell
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Scott
Senner
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Stafford
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Toll
Trimble
Tunney
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Waldie
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watts
White, Idaho
Whitener
Whitten
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Younger

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call my name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. McCORMACK, and he answered "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Fallon with Mrs. Mink.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Haley.
Mr. Hansen of Idaho with Mr. Grabowski.
Mr. Foley with Mr. Olson of Minnesota.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Sweeney.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Huot.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Adams.
Mr. Schisler with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Slack with Mr. Todd.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. McMillan.
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Duncan of Oregon.
Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Dorn.
Mr. Clevenger with Mr. Trimble.
Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Pool with Mr. Ottinger.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Whitten.
Mr. Whitener with Mr. Toll.
Mr. Walker of New Mexico with Mr. Matthews.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Waldie.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Farnsley.
Mr. Fisher with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Redlin.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Thompson of Texas.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. McCarthy.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Blatnik.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Roncalio.
Mr. Craley with Mr. Roberts.
Mr. Roush with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Greigg.
Mr. Race with Mr. O'Brien.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Rogers of Texas.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Murray.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Kupferman.
Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Hungate with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. King of Utah with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.
Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Carter.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. McVicker with Mr. Callaway.
Mr. Denton with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Martin of Alabama.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Goodell.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Fino.
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.
Mr. Gilligan with Mr. Younger.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Moeller with Mr. Curtin.
Mr. Meeds with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Wydler.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Hicks with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Chelf.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Mackie.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Madden.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Gray.
Mr. Dulski with Mrs. Griffiths.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Resnick.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Randall.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
Mr. Miller with Mr. Stafford.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Reinecke.
Mr. King of California with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Steed with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Schmidhauser with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Robinson.
Mr. Albert with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Moore.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. McFall with Mr. Clarence J. Brown, Jr.
Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Glenn Andrews.
Mr. Dyal with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Hall.
Mr. Mackay with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Leggett with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Senner with Mr. Keith.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. King of New York.
Mr. Rogers of Florida with Mr. Stanton.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Olsen of Montana with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.

Mr. MACGREGOR changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MIZE changed his vote from "present" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days within which to extend and revise their remarks on the conference report just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

TIME OF MEETING TOMORROW, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 21, 1966

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tonight that it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state for the information of Members that the Chair will recognize Members for a few unanimous-consent requests to concur in Senate amendments. No further conference reports will be taken up after those matters, if the Chair can have the indulgence of the Members.

FOR THE RELIEF OF DAVID R. SLEMON

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of S. 2751, for the relief of David R. Slemon.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 2751

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, David R. Slemon shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 21, 1957.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE DESIGNATION OF THE MONTH OF MAY 1966 AS "STEELMARK MONTH"

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1001) to provide for the designation of the month of May 1966 as "Steelmark Month," with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I could not hear the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will reread the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk reread the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "1966" and insert "of each year".

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the month of May of each year as 'Steelmark Month'."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DESIGNATING FEBRUARY OF EACH YEAR AS AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 133) designating February of each year as American History Month, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. Res. 133

Whereas the study of history not only enlivens appreciation of the past but also illuminates the present and gives perspective to our hopes;

Whereas a knowledge of the growth and development of our free institutions and their human values strengthens our ability to utilize these institutions and apply these values to present needs and new problems;

Whereas Americans honor their debt to the creativity, wisdom, work, faith, and sacrifice of those who first secured our freedoms, and recognize their obligation to build upon this heritage so as to meet the challenge of the future; and

Whereas it is appropriate to encourage a deeper awareness of the great events which shaped America, and a renewed dedication to the ideals and principles we hold in trust: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That February of each year is hereby designated as American History Month, and the President of the United States is requested and authorized to issue annually a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to observe such month in schools and other suitable places with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF COLORADO

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I offer amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: On page 2, line 3, strike "of each year" and insert ", 1967"; and on line 5, strike "annually".

Strike all "Whereas" clauses.

The amendments were agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

Amend the title so as to read, "Designating February, 1967, as American History Month."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations may have until midnight, October 21, to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

TO AUTHORIZE THE PRESIDENT TO DESIGNATE OCTOBER 31 OF EACH YEAR AS NATIONAL UNICEF DAY

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 194) to authorize the President to designate October 31 of each year as National UNICEF Day, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does this make automatic the designation of UNICEF Day?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Automatic?

Mr. WAGGONNER. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. It is for this year only, yes.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

TO PROVIDE FOR THE STRENGTHENING OF AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES AND RESEARCH

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 14643) to provide for the strengthening of American educational resources for international studies and research, with a Sen-

ate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That this Act may be cited as the 'International Education Act of 1966'.

"Findings and Declaration

"Sec. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that a knowledge of other countries is of the utmost importance in promoting mutual understanding and cooperation between nations; that strong American educational resources are a necessary base for strengthening our relations with other countries; that this and future generations of Americans should be assured ample opportunity to develop to the fullest extent possible their intellectual capacities in all areas of knowledge pertaining to other countries, peoples, and cultures; and that it is therefore both necessary and appropriate for the Federal Government to assist in the development of resources for international study and research, to assist in the development of resources and trained personnel in academic and professional fields, and to coordinate the existing and future programs of the Federal Government in international education, to meet the requirements of world leadership.

"TITLE I—GRANT PROGRAMS FOR ADVANCED AND UNDERGRADUATE INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

"Centers for Advanced International Studies

"Sec. 101. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') is authorized to arrange through grants to institutions of higher education, or combinations of such institutions, for the establishment, strengthening, and operation by them of graduate centers which will be national and international resources for research and training in international studies and the international aspects of professional and other fields of study. Activities carried on in such centers may be concentrated either on specific geographical areas of the world or on particular fields or issues in world affairs which concern one or more countries, or on both. The Secretary may also make grants to public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations, including professional and scholarly associations, when such grants will make an especially significant contribution to attaining the objectives of this section.

"(b) Grants under this section may be used to cover part or all of the cost of establishing, strengthening, equipping, and operating research and training centers, including the cost of teaching and research materials and resources, the cost of programs for bringing visiting scholars and faculty to the center, and the cost of training, improvement, and travel of the staff for the purpose of carrying out the objectives of this section. Such grants may also include funds for stipends (in such amounts as may be determined in accordance with regulations of the Secretary) to individuals undergoing training in such centers, including allowances for dependents and for travel for research and study here and abroad. Grants under this section shall be made on such conditions as the Secretary finds necessary to carry out its purposes.

"Grants To Strengthen Undergraduate Programs in International Studies

"Sec. 102. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to institutions of higher education, or combinations of such institutions, to assist them in planning, developing, and carrying out a comprehensive program to strengthen and improve undergraduate instruction in international studies. Grants made under this section may be for projects and activities which are an integral part of such a comprehensive program such as—

"(1) planning for the development and expansion of undergraduate programs in international studies;

"(2) teaching, research, curriculum, development, and other related activities;

"(3) training of faculty members in foreign countries;

"(4) expansion of foreign language courses;

"(5) planned and supervised student work-study-travel programs;

"(6) programs under which foreign teachers and scholars may visit institutions as visiting faculty; and

"(7) programs of English language training for foreign teachers, scholars, and students.

The Secretary may also make grants to public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations, including professional and scholarly associations, when such grants will make an especially significant contribution to attaining the objectives of this section.

"(b) A grant may be made under this section only upon application to the Secretary at such time or times and containing such information as he deems necessary. The Secretary shall not approve an application unless it—

"(1) sets forth a program for carrying out one or more projects or activities for which a grant is authorized under subsection (a);

"(2) sets forth policies and procedures which assure that Federal funds made available under this section for any fiscal year will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available for purposes which meet the requirements of subsection (a), and in no case supplant such funds;

"(3) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this section; and

"(4) provides for making such report, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may require to carry out his functions under this section, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Secretary may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(c) The Secretary shall allocate grants to institutions of higher education under this section in such manner and according to such plan as will most nearly provide an equitable distribution of the grants throughout the States while at the same time giving a preference to those institutions which are most in need of funds for programs in international studies and which show real promise of being able to use funds effectively.

"Method of payment; Federal administration

"Sec. 103. (a) Payments under this title may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

"(b) In administering the provisions of this title, the Secretary is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution, in accordance with written agreements between the Secretary and the head thereof published in the Federal Register three weeks prior to the date on which any such agreement is to become effective.

"Federal control of education prohibited

"Sec. 104. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution, or the selection of library resources by any educational institution or over the content of any material developed or published under any program assisted pursuant to this Act.

"Authorization and reports

"Sec. 105. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated $1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, which shall be available only for the purpose of preparing the report provided for in subsection (b) of this section. There are authorized to be appropriated $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $90,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title. For the fiscal years thereafter there shall be appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title only such amounts as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

"(b) The Secretary shall prepare, with the advice of the Advisory Committee appointed pursuant to section 106, a report containing specific recommendations for carrying out the provisions of this title, including any recommendations for amendments to this title and to portions of other laws amended by this Act, and shall submit such report to the President and the Congress not later than April 30, 1967.

"(c) Prior to January 31, 1968, and prior to January 31 in each year thereafter, the Secretary shall make a report to the Congress which reviews and evaluates activities carried on under the authority of this Act and which reviews other activtities of the Federal Government drawing upon or strengthening American resources for international study and research and any existing activities and plans to coordinate and improve the efforts of the Federal Government in international education.

"National Advisory Committee on International Studies

"Sec. 106. (a) The President is authorized to establish in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a National Advisory Committee on International Studies, consisting of the Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Education who shall be chairman, and not more than fifteen additional members appointed by the President so that a majority shall constitute a broad representation of higher education in the United States and the remainder shall include representatives of the general public and individuals experienced in foreign affairs.

"(b) The Advisory Committee shall advise the Secretary in the preparation of the report provided for in section 105(b) of this Act, and thereafter shall advise the Secretary in carrying out the provisions of this Act. The recommendations of the Advisory Committee shall be included in the report provided for in section 105(b) of this Act and in the annual reports provided for in section 105(c) of this Act.

"(c) Members of the Advisory Committee who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on business of the Committee, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the President, but not exceeding $100 per day, including traveltime; and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code for persons in Government service employed intermittently.

"(d) The Advisory Committee is authorized to appoint without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, covering appointment in the competitive service, and fix the compensation of, without regard to chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title, such professional and technical personnel as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its duties.

"TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO OTHER LAWS

"Amendments To Strengthen Title VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958

"Removing requirement for area centers that adequate language instruction not be readily available

"SEC. 201. (a)(1) The first sentence of section 601(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out '(1)' and by striking out ', and (2) that adequate instruction in such language is not readily available in the United States.'

"(2) The first sentence of section 601(b) of such Act is amended by striking out '(with respect to which he makes the determination under clause (1) of subsection (a))' and inserting in lieu thereof '(with respect to which he makes the determination under subsection (a))'.

"Removing 50 per centum ceiling on Federal participation

"(b) The third sentence of section 601(a) of such Act is amended by striking out 'not more than 50 per centum' and inserting 'all or part' in lieu thereof.

"Authorizing grants as well as contracts for language and area centers

"(c) Section 601(a) of such Act is amended further by inserting 'grants to or' after 'arrange through' in the first sentence, and by inserting 'grant or' before 'contract' each time that it appears in the second and third sentences.

"Vesting authority for language and area programs in Secretary

"(d) Section 601 of such Act is further amended by striking out 'Commissioner' each time such term occurs therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'Secretary'.

"Amendments To Strengthen Title XI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958

"SEC. 202. Title XI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended—

"(1) by inserting after the title the following: 'PART I—GENERAL';

"(2) by striking out the word 'title' in section 1102 and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'part'; and

"(3) by adding at the end thereof a new part as follows:

" '*Part II—International affairs*

" 'International Affairs Institutes for Secondary School Teachers

" 'SEC. 1111. There are authorized to be appropriated $3,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and $6,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, to enable the Commissioner to arrange through contracts with institutions of higher education for the establishment and operation of short-term or regular-session institutes for teachers in secondary schools in order to give them a broader understanding of international affairs. Any such arrangement may cover the cost of the establishment and operation of the institute with respect to which it is made, including the cost of grants to the staff of travel in the foreign areas, regions, or countries with which the subject matter of the field or fields in which they are or will be working is concerned, and the cost of travel of foreign scholars to enable them to teach or assist in teaching in such institute and the cost of their return, and shall be made on such conditions as the Commissioner finds necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

" 'Stipends

" 'SEC. 1112. The Commissioner is authorized to pay stipends to any individual to study in a program assisted under the provisions of this part upon determining that assisting such individual in such studies will promote the purpose of this part. Stipends under the provisions of this section may include allowances for dependents and for travel to and from the place of residence.'

"Amendments to Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961

"SEC. 203. (a) Section 102(b) of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2452) is amended (1) by striking the period at the end of clause (9) and substituting a semicolon and the word 'and'; and (2) by adding at the end thereof a new clause as follows:

" '(10) promoting studies, research, instruction, and other educational activities of citizens and nationals of foreign countries in American schools, colleges, and universities located in the United States by making available to citizens and nationals of less developed friendly foreign countries for exchange for currencies of their respective countries (other than excess foreign currencies), at United States embassies, United States dollars in such amounts as may be necessary to enable such foreign citizens or nationals who are coming temporarily to the United States as students, trainees, teachers, instructors, or professors to meet expenses of the kind described in section 104(e)(1) of this Act.'

"(b) Section 104 of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

" '(g)(1) For the purpose of performing functions authorized by section 102(b)(10) of this Act, the President is authorized to establish the exchange rates at which all foreign currencies may be acquired through operations under such section, and shall issue regulations binding upon all embassies with respect to the exchange rates to be applicable in each of the respective countries where currency exchanges are authorized under such section.

" '(2) In performing the functions authorized under section 102(b)(10) of this Act, the President shall make suitable arrangements for protecting the interests of the United States Government in connection with the ownership, use, and disposition of all foreign currencies acquired pursuant to exchanges made under such section.

" '(3) The total amount of United States dollars acquired by any individual through currency exchanges under the authority of section 102(b)(10) of this Act shall in no event exceed $3,000 during any academic year.

" '(4) An individual shall be eligible to exchange foreign currency for United States dollars at United States embassies under section 102(b)(10) of this Act only if he gives satisfactory assurances that (A) he will devote essentially full time to his proposed educational activity in the United States and will maintain good standing in relation to such program; (B) he will return to the country of his citizenship or nationality prior to coming to the United States and will render such public service as is determined acceptable for a period of time determined reasonable and necessary by the government of such country; and (C) he will not apply for an immigrant visa or for permanent residence or for a nonimmigrant visa under the Immigration and Nationality Act after having received any benefits under such section for a period of time equal to the period of study, research, instruction, or other educational activity he performed pursuant to such section.

" '(5) As used in section 102(b)(10) of this Act, the term "excess foreign currencies" means foreign currencies, which if acquired by the United States (A) would be in excess of the normal requirements of departments, agencies and embassies of the United States for such currencies, as determined by the President, and (B) would be available for the use of the United States Government under applicable agreements with the foreign country concerned.'

"(c) Section 105 of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

" '(g) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of making currency exchanges under section 102(b)(10) of this Act, not to exceed $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and not to exceed $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.'

"Extending the Benefits of the Loan Insurance Program Under Title IV–B of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to Students Studying Abroad

"SEC. 204. The second sentence of section 435(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by inserting after 'Such term' the following: 'includes any institution outside the States which is comparable to an institution described in the preceding sentence and which has been approved by the Commissioner for the purposes of this title, and'.

"Amending Title VII of the Public Health Service Act so as To Authorize Direct Student Loans To Be Made to Certain Students Studying Outside the United States

"SEC. 205. (a)(1)(A) Section 741(g) of the Public Health Service Act is amended by inserting 'from a loan fund established' before 'under this part'.

"(B) Section 741(h) of such Act is amended by inserting 'from a loan fund established' before 'under this part' the first time it appears therein.

"(2)(A) So much of the first sentence of section 742(b)(2) of such Act as precedes clause (A) is amended by inserting '(other than the portion there available only for purposes of section 746)' before 'for that fiscal year'.

"(B) Clause (B) of such first sentence of section 742(b)(2) is amended by inserting '(other than the portion thereof available only for purposes of section 746)' after 'the amounts appropriated'.

"(b)(1) Section 742(a) of such Act is amended by inserting immediately before the last sentence thereof the following new sentence: 'Of the sums appropriated under this subsection for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, or for any fiscal year thereafter, an amount equal to 5 per centum of such sums shall be available only for the purpose of making loans under section 746.'

"(2) The last sentence of section 742(a) of such Act is amended by striking out 'Sums' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Except as is otherwise provided by the preceding sentence, sums'.

"(c) Title VII of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding after section 745 the following:

" 'Direct Loans to Students in Foreign Schools

" 'SEC. 746. (a)(1) From the sums made available under section 742(a), the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make direct loans to students who are citizens of the United States and who are pursuing a full-time course of study, at a school of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, or optometry which is located outside the United States and which is approved by the Secretary, which course of study leads to a degree of doctor of medicine, doctor of dentistry or an equivalent degree, doctor of osteopathy, or doctor of optometry or an equivalent degree.

" '(2) The Secretary shall not approve any school for purposes of this section unless he determines that such school offers training of a type and quality substantially similar to that offered by similar schools in the United States which are accredited as provided in section 721(b)(1)(B).

"'(b) Such loans shall, to the extent feasible, be made on the same terms and conditions as are required with respect to loans made to students from loan funds established under this part.'

"TITLE III—STUDY BY THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

"Authorization for a Study on Ways to Reduce the Drain From Developing Countries of Professional Persons and Skilled Specialists Whose Skills Are Urgently Needed

"Sec. 301. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall conduct a study and investigation to determine (1) the total number of individuals who enter the United States from developing countries annually to further their education, and who remain in the United States; (2) the reasons for their failure to return to their home countries; and (3) means of encouraging the return of such individuals to the countries of their last residence or nationality, so they may put their education and training to work in the service of their homelands.

"(b) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall report to the President and to the Congress as soon as practicable on his findings and conclusions together with such recommendations for any legislation he deems desirable to encourage the return of such individuals to such countries.

"(c) It is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $50,000 for the purpose of carrying out this study.

"TITLE IV—AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF CERTAIN LAND AS RECREATION AREA

"Authorization

"Sec. 401. The Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized to transfer jurisdiction over the land at First and C Streets Southeast in the District of Columbia, being the land on which the Madison Memorial Library is proposed for construction, to the Board of Commissioners of the District government, to be operated for recreation purposes only, and without any improvement to said land, for such period of time as said land is not required for building or other purposes by the Architect of the Capitol."

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. **McCLORY**. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The **SPEAKER**. Objection is heard.

RYAN BILL TO AID DEPENDENTS OF CAPTURED OR MISSING AMERICAN SERVICEMEN

Mr. **RYAN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **RYAN**. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago it was revealed that wives and other dependents of American servicemen, who were either missing in action or prisoners of war, were having great difficulties because of their situation. Some had problems in making ends meet because money usually sent home by the serviceman was not forthcoming. Others found that they could not get free medical services or sell the family car or withdraw money from an account. Still others had problems in receiving income tax refunds on joint returns. One of the recurring problems was the lack of information about the serviceman's whereabouts or well-being.

We all sympathize with the relatives of GI's who are missing in action or prisoners of war. But sympathy is not enough. It is important and humane that we do everything we can to ease this tremendous burden. To accomplish that end, I have introduced a bill today which makes it easier for servicemen to provide for their dependents in the event they are not available to do so. The bill also makes certain services available to these dependents.

The bill requires the Secretary of the armed force of which a soldier is a member to provide him with information and necessary legal counsel to permit him to confer a general or special power of attorney on his wife or other person to act in his absence.

The bill also requires the Secretary of the particular armed service to provide, upon request, any dependent of a man who is missing or who is a prisoner of war with legal counsel in connection with any matter which the Secretary determines requires legal counsel. The matter must arise because of the fact that the officer or enlisted man is missing or is a prisoner of war.

The bill also requires the Secretary to make payments of specified pay and allowances to which a serviceman is entitled during the period he is missing or held prisoner. The payments would be made to persons designated in writing to the Secretary by the serviceman in the event he were captured or missing.

Another section of this bill instructs the Secretaries of the armed services to establish and keep current a list of the names, grades or ranks, and serial numbers of officers and enlisted men who are missing or are prisoners. The Secretary is required to give this information to those who apply for it.

Mr. Speaker, this bill ameliorates an intolerable situation. In fairness to those who risk their lives in the armed services and to their dependents, it deserves our urgent attention.

I certainly hope that during the time between adjournment and the beginning of the next session, the Armed Services Committee will study this measure and schedule hearings on it early next January.

ACTIVITIES AND ACCOMPLISHMENT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY IN THE 89TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION, 1966

Mr. **PRICE**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. Holifield] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the Record and to include therewith the report of the activities of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy during the present session.

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. **HOLIFIELD**. Mr. Speaker, the 2d session of the 89th Congress compared favorably with the 1st session as one of the most productive in the history of the Congress. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy played a prominent role in this legislative activity. As chairman of the Joint Committee, I have had the committee staff prepare a brief report highlighting the committee's accomplishments during this session.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this report shows that the Joint Committee has contributed significantly to the continued leadership of the United States in the peaceful and military applications of atomic energy. I believe, as I have said on previous occasions, that the activities of the committee demonstrate clearly the ability of the Congress to cope effectively with the increasingly complex technological problems of the nuclear age.

I wish to thank all the members of the committee for their devotion to duty and close cooperation in the committee's work. In order that the Members of Congress and the public may have a better insight into the work of the committee, under unanimous consent I include in the Record at this point the report on the activities and accomplishments of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy during the 89th Congress, 2d session:

Activities and Accomplishments of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in the 89th Congress, 2d Session (1966)[1]

FOREWORD

The following report on the activities of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy during the second session of the 89th Congress (1966) has been prepared at the direction of the Chairman for the information of the Congress, the Executive Branch, and the public.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy was first organized on August 2, 1946, and is a House-Senate Commitee consisting of nine members from each body, of which no more than five from each body can be members of the same party. Following is a listing of the present membership: Chet Holifield, California, Chairman; John O. Pastore, Rhode Island, Vice Chairman; Melvin Price, Illinois, Wayne N. Aspinall, Colorado; Thomas G. Morris, New Mexico; John Young, Texas;[2] Craig Hosmer, California; William H. Bates, Massachusetts; John B. Anderson, Illinois; William M. McCulloch, Ohio; Richard B. Russell, Georgia; Clinton D. Anderson, New Mexico; Albert Gore, Tennessee; Henry M. Jackson, Washington; Bourke B. Hickenlooper, Iowa; George D. Aiken, Vermont; Wallace F. Bennett, Utah; Carl T. Curtis, Nebraska.

The Joint Committee is one of the few committees established by statute, rather than by rule of each house, and is unique in several respects. For example, it is the only Joint Committee of the Congress with legislative functions, including the receipt and reporting of legislative proposals. The Committee is also charged by law with legislative responsibility as "watchdog" of the United States atomic energy program. As part of its responsibilities, the Committee follows closely the classified activities of executive agencies, including the Atomic Energy Commission and the Departments of Defense and State, concerning the military applications of atomic energy.

---

[1] For "Activities and Accomplishments of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in the 89th Congress, First Session, 1965," see Congressional Record, vol. 111, pt. 21, pp. 28895–28900.

[2] Cong. John Young was appointed to the Joint Committee in March to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Cong. Albert Thomas.

Of equal importance, the Committee plays a major role in stimulating the peaceful applications of the atom. For example, the Committee has encouraged such programs as the development of civilian nuclear power, the preservation of food through irradiation, the application of nuclear power in space, and the large-scale combining of production of nuclear power and the desalting of sea water.

One of the crucial matters facing the country has been the issue of the dangers of the spread of nuclear weapons. In this connection a detailed and thorough review of the problem of proliferation of nuclear weapons was held by the Joint Committee in connection with Senate Resolution 179.

In all these activities, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy as representative of Congress and the public seeks to assure the implementation of the following statutory policy expressed in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954: ". . . the development, use, and control of atomic energy shall be directed so as to make the maximum contribution to the general welfare, subject at all times to the paramount objective of making the maximum contribution to the common defense and security."

During the 89th Congress, second session, the Joint Committee met on a total of 73 different occasions, 55 of which were public and 18 of which were executive meetings. In addition to three Joint Committee reports which were filed on pending legislation, the Senate members of the Committee also reported favorably on a Senate resolution (S. Res. 179) concerning the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. Committee meetings during the 89th Congress, first and second sessions, total as follows:

1st session	86
2d session	73
Total	159

A total of 15 publications consisting of hearings and Committee prints were published or are in the process of printing by the Joint Committee in the second session of the 89th Congress. These publications include testimony taken in executive session with classified material deleted before printing. A list of these publications follows:

EIGHTY-NINTH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION, 1966

AEC Authorizing Legislation, fiscal year 1967:

Part 1: Hearings Jan. 25, Feb. 15, and Mar. 4 and 8, 1966.

Part 2: Hearings Feb. 16, 17, Mar. 3, 15, and 16, 1966.

Part 3: Hearings Feb. 2, Mar. 8, 9, 10, 11, and 15, 1966.

Atomic Energy Legislation Through the 89th Cong., 2d sess.: Committee print (Dec. 1966).

Current Membership of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy: Committee print (Feb. 1966).

International Agreements for Cooperation—1966: Hearings Jan. 27, May 26, June 28, and Aug. 25, 1966.

Enrico Fermi Reactor, Use for Irradiation Testing: Hearing Apr. 5, 1966.

Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program: Hearing Jan. 26, 1966.

Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons (S. Res. 179): Hearings Feb. 23 and Mar. 1 and 7, 1966.

Proposed Amendments to Price-Anderson Act Relating to Waiver of Defenses: Hearings July 19, 20, and 21, 1966.

Proposed Large-Scale Combination Nuclear Power-Desalting Project: Hearing Sept. 14, 1966.

Recordkeeping for Radiation Workers: Hearings Aug. 30, 31, Sept. 20, 21, and 22, 1966.

Review of Developments in the Food Irradiation Programs: Hearing Sept. 12, 1966.

Space Nuclear Power Generators: Hearing Aug. 6, 1965.

Uranium Enrichment Services Criteria and Related Matters: Hearings Aug. 2, 3, 4, 16, and 17, 1966.

Total Committee publications for the 89th Congress therefore are as follows:

1st session	15
2d session	15
Total	30

I. LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES

A. AEC fiscal year 1967 authorization act (Public Law 89–428)

In accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Joint Committee reviewed the proposed fiscal year 1967 authorization for all appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission, including both operating and construction funds.

The Committee held hearings on the AEC's proposed authorization bill (H.R. 12292; S. 3283) over a period of seven weeks, and in the course thereof reviewed each major atomic energy program in detail. The complete hearings, including unclassified portions of the classified executive hearings, were published in three volumes under the title "AEC Authorizing Legislation, Fiscal Year 1967." The authorization hearings on the Naval Propulsion Reactor Program, held on January 26, 1966, were published in April 1966, separately from the other authorization hearings, under the title "Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program."

The hearings culminated in the introduction of "clean bills" by Chairman HOLIFIELD (H.R. 14732) and by Vice Chairman PASTORE (S. 3293). These bills were reported in the House and Senate on May 3, 1966 (House Report No. 1471 and Senate Report No. 1442).

The recommended authorization bill, which amounted to about $14.8 million less than the Administration had requested, was passed without amendment by the House and Senate, and authorized appropriations for the AEC for fiscal year 1967 in the amount of $2,259,958,000 as follows:

Operating expenses	$1,964,128,000
Plant and capital equipment	295,830,000
Total authorization	2,259,958,000

Although the authorization bill provided a single sum in excess of $1.9 billion for operating expenses for the AEC, the Joint Committee's report broke this sum down among the AEC's principal programs. Among the highlights of this fiscal year's operating expense authorization are the following:

1. In the weapons program, the committee recommended the addition of $10 million to provide for strengthening the underground testing program. The committee noted that it is essential to assure there are sufficient funds in the AEC's weapons program to carry out all necessary testing activities in fiscal year 1967, and to conduct the long lead time preparatory work, so that continued underground testing in fiscal year 1968 will be able to proceed without delay.

2. In the Civilian Power Reactor Program, the Committee recommended authorization of the full amount requested by the AEC. The Committee's report noted shifts of emphasis in the AEC's research and development program. Government support of development work directly related to light water reactors now being offered by industry on a commercial basis—in such areas as plutonium recycle development and superheat fuel development—is being phased out or terminated and is being replaced by industrial support. This shift of emphasis has been advocated by the Committee for several years and should continue as various development programs reach the stage of commercial use.

The AEC has reevaluated a number of projects in the civilian power program and has concluded that some were not sufficiently promising to continue. For example, the AEC has decided to terminate the Hallam sodium-graphite nuclear power project and the experimental gas-cooled reactor project at Oak Ridge. According to the AEC, these particular concepts, in light of the relative status of development of alternate systems, do not show sufficient promise to justify their continued support as competitive nuclear power systems. The Committee encourages continued efforts of this type. The "weeding out" of concepts which do not measure up to the competition is a fundamental part of a well run research and development program.

In recommending the authorization for the civilian power reactor program, the Committee also reported on another trend which had emerged concerning the advanced converter and low gain breeder reactor program. This program involves essentially three reactor concepts—the seed-blanket reactor, the high-temperature gas-cooled reactor, and the heavy water organic-cooled reactor. Technical programs have been experienced with each of these three concepts. While approving the full amount requested for the AEC's heavy water organic reactor program, the Committee cautioned the AEC to eliminate effort not directly required to establish the technical feasibility of using this concept for the competitive generation of power.

Detailed testimony was received from the AEC and AEC contractor witnesses on the fast breeder reactor program. The Committee noted it is still too early to assess the adequacy of this program pending its fuller presentation by the AEC. The Report urged the AEC to exercise care that cooperative industrial efforts are not fragmented to such a degree that no single industrial firm obtains the necessary competence to become a competitive force in the field.

Finally, the Committee called for a general up-dating and review of the AEC's 1962 Report to the President on the civilian nuclear power program. This review was urged because of the sharply increased rate of addition of nuclear generating capacity, changes in estimates of future growth of nuclear power, the more recent technical developments which have taken place in certain of the advanced reactor fields, and the latest information which has been developed concerning uranium resources.

3. In the Physical Research Program, the Committee recommended authorization of the full amount requested by the AEC ($258,900,000).

High Energy Physics—This request represented an increase of $11,950,000 over FY '66 spending. More than half of this increase is for the recently completed Stanford Linear Accelerator, the highest energy electron accelerator (20 Bev) and the longest (10,000 feet) in the world. One of the oldest high energy (over 1 Bev) accelerators, the Cosmotron at the Brookhaven National Laboratory, is planned to be phased out of the high energy physics program in fiscal year 1967. Funds have been approved for continued advance accelerator design studies for the proposed 200-Bev accelerator. However, the Commission has not requested and the Committee has not authorized the expenditure of funds for engineering design or construction of this proposed accelerator.

Medium Energy Physics—Continued architect-engineering and research and development work on the Los Alamos Meson Physics Facility was authorized. It is anticipated that construction funds will be requested for fiscal year 1968 for this highest intensity linear proton accelerator of an energy range of about 800 Mev.

Controlled Thermonuclear Research—In response to the Joint Committee's request made in early 1964 for a review of the controlled fusion program, the AEC appointed an outside review panel. This panel made the following major recommendations to the Commission:

(1) To double the number of scientists and engineers engaged in the AEC's controlled fusion program during the next 5 years; and

(2) To take immediate steps toward establishing a national center for plasma studies and nuclear fusion research.

These recommendations were not reflected in the AEC's requests to the Congress for fiscal year 1967. Subsequent to the Joint Committee's authorization report, the Commission issued a report on controlled thermonuclear research in which it endorsed the recommendation to double the research effort in the next five years, but withheld endorsement of the establishment of a new fusion research center at this time.

4. In the Isotopes Development Program, the Committee recommended a decrease of $280,000 (including $170,000 in capital equipment funds) which had been budgeted for a wood-plastics demonstration program. Information received at the Committee's hearings indicated that a private concern had established a manufacturing capability for radiation processing of wood-plastic products. The Committee stated that the necessity for Government support of a demonstration project for the manufacture of wood-plastics could be re-evaluated after the AEC had completed its analysis of this situation.

5. In the Plowshare Program, the Committee recommended the addition of $1.5 million to the AEC's authorization request, to provide for th AEC's fiscal year 1967 costs for Project Gasbuggy. This is a proposed cooperative experiment with the El Paso Natural Gas Co. to establish the feasibility of increasing production of natural gas by means of an underground nuclear explosion to be carried out in the Pictured Cliffs formation in New Mexico.

The economic potential of nuclear explosives for stimulating gasfields is immense. The Report cited a letter from the Bureau of Mines to the AEC in which it was stated:

"If nuclear explosives can be used to stimulate production by fracturing rock in * * * deep, thick, low-productivity reservoirs, as our engineers are convinced, significant increases in recovery can be effected. We estimate that, in Rocky Mountain reservoirs alone, the total increase in production may be as great as 317 trillion cubic feet. This is a greater quantity of natural gas than our present proved reserves of 281 trillion cubic feet * * *

"* * * 317 trillion cubic feet of natural gas has a potential value of about $35 billion. Many of the Rocky Mountain gas reservoirs to which nuclear-explosive stimulation might be applicable are on Federal land, from which the Government derives royalties. Funds received from leasing Federal lands for petroleum and natural gas include bonuses, land rentals, and royalties. An exact relationship does not exist between such receipts and the wellhead price, but the average is about one-eighth the wellhead price. Thus the potential income to the Government would exceed $4 billion."

FINAL ACTION ON THE BILL

On May 9, 1966, the authorization bill was debated and passed in the House of Representatives by a voice vote. On May 10, 1966, the Senate considered and passed the bill by a voice vote. The authorization bill was then forwarded to the President and approved by him on May 21, 1966, as Public Law 89-428. For discussion of the amendment to this Act to authorize a large-scale combination nuclear power-desalting project (Public Law 89-648), see item I C. below.

B. Amendment of Price-Anderson legislation (Public Law 89-645)

During the second session of the 89th Congress, the Joint Committee recommended, and there was enacted, an amendment to the Price-Anderson nuclear indemnity legislation that potentially is the most far-reaching since that legislation's passage in 1957.[3] The Price-Anderson Act provides for a combined program of private insurance and governmental indemnity amounting to a maximum of $560 million to cover damages that could conceivably arise from a nuclear incident. The Act is generally regarded as a cornerstone of the atomic power industry.

As originally enacted the Price-Anderson law did not establish the basis of liability thereunder. Thus, whether negligence on the part of the defendant need be shown in order to recover for damages arising from a nuclear incident, or whether instead a rule of strict liability would be imposed on the defendant in such a case, was a matter left to applicable State (or, in some cases, Federal) law. Similarly, the limitations period within which such suit must be brought was left to varying State law. Over the years, increasing questions have been raised as to the need to eliminate these uncertainties and possible differences in treatment among claimants.

Public Law 89-645 is intended to rectify these and certain related inadequacies without violating one of the cardinal attributes of the Price-Anderson Act, namely, minimal interference with State law. Under the 1966 amendment, the AEC is authorized to incorporate in its indemnity agreements, and to require incorporation in insurance policies and contracts furnished as proof of financial protection, provisions which waive "any issue or defense as to conduct of the claimant or fault of persons indemnified." The primary end result of these waivers would be to eliminate, in the event of an "extraordinary nuclear occurrence" as defined in the amendment, first, any requirement that a claimant prove negligence ("fault") in order to recover for his damages, and second, any possible issue as to the claimant's contributory negligence or assumption of the risk. Similar authority would be conferred on the AEC respecting waivers of any issue or defenses as to charitable or governmental immunity of the defendant; as well as any issue or defense based on any statute of limitations if suit is instituted within 3 years after the victim knows of his injury and its cause, and in any event within 10 years after the nuclear incident.

Other significant provisions in the amendment authorize the AEC to establish coordinated procedures with the nuclear liability insurance pools for the prompt handling, investigation, and settlement of claims arising out of a nuclear incident; provide for the possible consolidation in one Federal district court of all suits arising out of an extraordinary nuclear occurrence; and, under certain circumstances, place a ceiling upon the amount which could be paid from the Price-Anderson insurance-indemnity moneys without prior court approval.

C. Amendment to fiscal year 1967 authorization act to provide for large-scale combination nuclear power-desalting project (Public Law 89-648)

On September 12, 1966, the AEC transmitted to Congress a proposed bill to add a new section 108 to AEC's fiscal year 1967 authorization act (Public Law 89-428), to authorize a large-scale combination nuclear power-desalting project. The bill would authorize the AEC to enter into a cooperative arrangement, in association with the Department of the Interior, with the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, Southern California Edison Co., San Diego Gas & Electric Co., Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, or others. The AEC would be authorized to participate in a large-scale, nuclear power-desalting project involving the development, design, construction, and operation of a desalting plant, back-pressure turbine, and nuclear powerplants which would also be utilized for the generation of electric energy. The contemplated project would be capable of producing 150 million gallons per day of desalted water and about 1,600 megawatts (net) of electric power.

The AEC's assistance, which would not exceed $15 million, would not duplicate any assistance that might be made available by the Department of the Interior and would pertain to the dual-purpose aspects of the project; the siting and related design of the plants; and the coupling of the desalting plant with the back-pressure turbine and the nuclear powerplants; or to other aspects of the project pertaining to the interrelationship of nuclear power and desalting.

The proposed legislation was introduced respectively by Chairman HOLIFIELD, by request, and Vice Chairman PASTORE, by request, as H.R. 17558 and S. 3807.

The Joint Committee held hearings on these bills on September 14, 1966. These hearings were printed under the title "Proposed Large-Scale Combination Nuclear Power-Desalting Project."

The full Joint Committee met in executive session September 28, 1966, to consider these bills. After full discussion the Committee voted without dissent to report these bills favorably, without amendment, and to adopt a committee report on the bills (H. Rept. No. 2145; S. Rept. No. 1622, both filed September 28, 1966).

The bill was considered in the Senate on September 29, 1966, and passed by voice vote. On October 3, 1966, the bill was considered and passed in the House of Representatives by a roll call vote of 316 to 1.[4]

On October 13, 1966, S. 3807 was signed into law by President Johnson as Public Law 89-648.

D. AEC "omnibus" bill for 1966 (H.R. 16211; S. 3617)

On June 30, 1966, the Atomic Energy Commission transmitted to Congress its proposed "omnibus" legislation for 1966. The Commission submits such bills from time to time to effect miscellaneous amendments to the atomic energy legislation. The last such bill was enacted in 1964.

The latest proposed legislation is intended to make two substantive changes in the law relating to atomic energy. First, it is proposed to delete the requirement in section 41 b. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 that the President make an annual determination of the quantities of special nuclear material to be produced by the AEC and the amounts to be available for distribution domestically and abroad pursuant to sections 53 and 54 of the Act. Second, it is proposed that section 5 of the EURATOM Cooperation Act of 1958 be amended to permit implementation with respect to EURATOM of the AEC's authority to provide uranium enrichment services. (See item III H. below.)

---

[3] The Joint Committee's hearings on this legislation, held on July 19, 20, and 21, 1966, were printed under the title, "Proposed Amendments to Price-Anderson Act Relating to Waiver of Defenses."

[4] In this connection, a bill to authorize the Department of the Interior's participation in this project (S. 3823) was introduced in the Senate and passed on September 21, 1966. However, the House did not act on the proposed authorization for the Interior Department.

The AEC's recommended bill was introduced on July 13, 1966, by Chairman HOLIFIELD (by request) as H.R. 16211, on July 15, 1966, by Vice Chairman PASTORE (by request) as S. 3617.

Hearings on this bill were held on August 30, 1966, before the Subcommittee on Legislation of the Joint Committee. On October 12, 1966, Chairman HOLIFIELD wrote to the AEC and noted that the Committee is not aware of any urgent need for enactment of this bill during the current session of Congress, and that passage of the bill during the current session was not feasible. Chairman HOLIFIELD suggested that the Commission consider resubmission of the bill early next year.

E. Proposed legislation relating to recordkeeping for radiation workers, H.R. 16920; S. 3722

On August 30–31 and again on September 20–22, 1966, the Joint Committee held hearings on H.R. 16920 and S. 3722, bills introduced by Congressman MELVIN PRICE and Vice Chairman JOHN O. PASTORE (by request), relating to recordkeeping for radiation workers. The proposed legislation would authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to make financial grants to States for the purpose of defraying additional costs to the States in establishing and maintaining, in accordance with minimum standards prescribed by the Commission, a recordkeeping system for employees who are or may be exposed to ionizing radiation. The bill further provides that such standards may include requirements with respect to workmen's compensation coverage for such employees.

In addition to receiving the testimony of the AEC and the Department of Labor on these bills, the Committee during five days of hearings heard numerous private companies and organizations which desired to present oral testimony on the proposed legislation. Further, for the benefit of those organizations which communicated with the Committee requesting additional time to study the legislation and prepare comments thereon, it was announced at the conclusion of the hearings that the record would remain open for another thirty days.

The Committee's hearings served to focus attention on a number of areas in the field of recordkeeping and workmen's compensation for radiation workers which require further attention by all interested parties, including the AEC and the Joint Committee. The AEC has been requested to furnish the Committee with its comments on the hearing record developed to date. Upon receipt of these comments, the Committee will be in a position to evaluate the most appropriate course of action to be taken concerning these subjects during the next session of Congress.

F. Nonproliferation of nuclear weapons

On January 18, 1966, Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee, introduced in the Senate a resolution (S. Res. 179) commending the President's serious and urgent efforts to negotiate international agreements limiting the spread of nuclear weapons. This resolution was cosponsored by 58 other Senators.

The Joint Committee held hearings on S. Res. 179 on February 23, March 1 and 7, 1966. Witnesses at these hearings were the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk; the Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara; the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Glenn T. Seaborg; and the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, William C. Foster.[5]

At these hearings, the witnesses testified in support of S. Res. 179 and stressed the imperativeness of reaching a nonproliferation treaty.

The Senate members of the Joint Committee voted favorably to report out S. Res. 179 on April 28, 1966. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee filed its favorable report on S. Res. 179 on May 11, 1966. Senate Resolution 179 was considered on the Floor of the Senate on May 17, 1966, and, following debate, was approved 84 to 0.

Chairman CHET HOLIFIELD submitted a similar resolution in the House (H. Res. 673). It and eleven other similar resolutions are pending before the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

II. AGREEMENTS FOR COOPERATION

Section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 requires that agreements for cooperation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy be submitted to and lie before the Joint Committee for a period of thirty days while Congress is in session before becoming effective. Pursuant to this requirement ten civil agreements were submitted to the Committee by the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission during 1966. Each of these proposed agreements was the subject of a public hearing before the Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation.

Of the ten agreements considered by the Committee, four were new civilian power agreements under which the United States gave long-term assurances as to the availability of nuclear fuel for reactors constructed under the cooperating countries' atomic power programs. These agreements are with the countries of Spain, Switzerland, Sweden, and the United Kingdom. All four agreements provide for the transfer to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) of the responsibility for applying safeguards to the facilities and materials transferred pursuant to the agreements. This responsibility entails periodic inspections of the facilities involved to insure against the diversion of fissionable materials to military purposes.

Amendments to six research-type agreements for cooperation were also submitted to the Joint Committee during the session. The countries whose agreements were affected by these amendments were Turkey, Israel, Indonesia, the Philippines, the Republic of China, and the United Kingdom. Most of the amendatory agreements extended the terms of the basic agreements and authorized an increase in the amount and the enrichment of the special nuclear material which could be transferred thereunder. Pursuant to the United States policy of transferring safeguards responsibilities to the IAEA, a policy which the Joint Committee thoroughly supports, provision was made in the Indonesian and Turkish amendments for bringing facilities in those countries receiving United States assistance under international safeguards. The Philippine, Chinese, and Israeli agreements had been amended earlier to provide for assumption of this responsibility by the IAEA.

In addition to the foregoing agreements for cooperation, a proposed draft Memorandum of Cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union was the subject of a Joint Committee open hearing.[6] Neither the existing nor the contemplated agreement with the Soviet Union provides for the transfer of any atomic energy materials or classified information; they encompass only exchanges of scientific delegations and unclassified information on stipulated subjects.

At the urging of the Committee, the Atomic Energy Commission is developing a program for bringing foreign chemical processing facilities under safeguards. These are facilities capable of separating plutonium—a nuclear weapon component—from irradiated reactor fuels. Among other things, the Commission is working with other Federal agencies to assure that important specialized items of equipment specifically designed or intended for use in chemical processing plants will be exported only pursuant to agreements including safeguards provisions, and to restrict the design and engineering services provided in connection with chemical processing plants to be built abroad. The Committee is following this program closely because chemical processing facilities are a critical control point in assuring that a nation is not using nuclear materials for other than peaceful purposes.

III. INFORMATIONAL HEARINGS

As noted in Section I of this report, the Joint Committee during the second session of the 89th Congress held extensive hearings as part of its legislative activities. In addition, the Committee conducted a number of informational hearings in both public and executive session on a wide range of subjects. Highlights of the Committee's informational hearings follow:

A. *Irradiation services in Enrico Fermi reactor*

A memorandum of understanding as to the provisions of a proposed contract between the Atomic Energy Commission and the Power Reactor Development Co. was the subject of a public hearing before the Joint Committee on April 5, 1966. The purpose of the contract is to provide for the irradiation in the Enrico Fermi reactor of certain AEC fuels and materials on which irradiation data are necessary in the Commission's Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Reactor (LMFBR) development program. Under the contract the Commission is to reimburse PRDC, without fee or profit, only those costs that are incremental; that is, are specifically for or because of the AEC work and would not have been incurred except for that work.

Representatives of the Commission who testified stressed in this hearing, as they had in earlier hearings, that fast reactor fuels can be assessed fully only through irradiation in a fast flux environment, and the Fermi reactor is presently the only facility in the country that can accommodate the size, or satisfy some of the other needs, of some of the experiments necessary in the LMFBR fuels and materials development program. Representatives of PRDC also testified during the hearing.[7]

B. *Nuclear proplusion for naval warships*

The Committee held hearings in January to review the work being done on the application of nuclear power to warships.[8] The review concentrated on the utilization of nuclear propulsion for surface warships. After the hearings a report on the application of nuclear power was prepared and printed as a foreword to the hearing. The report reiterated the previous conclusion of the Committee that nuclear propulsion should be used in all first line warships and further recommended that the Congress revise the authorization for conventionally powered warships requested by the Department of Defense to provide for nuclear powered ships in the fiscal year 1967 authorization bill.

Chairman HOLIFIELD prepared a summary report on Congressional action aimed at changing the Defense Department's policy from building conventional surface warships to nuclear propelled surface warships. This report was made in the form of a statement by Mr. HOLIFIELD on the Floor of the House on July 11, 1966. The statement is printed on pages 15045–15049 of the July 11, 1966, edition of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

---

[5] See Joint Committee hearings of February 23, and March 1 and 7, 1966, entitled, "Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons."

[6] See "International Agreements for Cooperation—1966," hearings held Jan. 27, May 26, June 28, and Aug. 25, 1966.

[7] Hearing held Apr. 5, 1966, entitled, "Enrico Fermi Reactor: Use for Irradiation Testing."

[8] See Joint Committee on Atomic Energy Hearings entitled "Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program" dated Jan. 26, 1966.

C. Developments in the food irradiation program

On September 12, 1966, the Subcommittee on Research, Development, and Radiation held hearings to review developments in the food irradiation program. Commissioner James T. Ramey of the AEC, Deputy Assistant Secretary James F. Collins, the Department of Commerce, J. Kenneth Kirk, Associate Commissioner, Food and Drug Administration, and Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army, Charles L. Poor, testified on behalf of the Administration. Non-Federal Government witnesses heard included Richard R. Konicek, Iowa Development Commission; William A. Loeb, Iso Nuclear Corp.; Dr. William L. Brown, John Morrell & Co.; and William D. Keith, Carroll Industrial Development Council, Carroll, Iowa.

The Department of the Army forecast at these hearings that its estimated needs for irradiated ham annually by 1971 will be 15,735,000 pounds to replace canned and frozen ham.

These hearings brought out the fact that it is possible to move ahead with a pilot plant meat irradiator to be built by industry with some assistance by government. The Committee has urged both the AEC and the Department of the Army to proceed with requests for bids on the pilot plant meat irradiator. The Committee has also asked the Food and Drug Administration to review thoroughly and expeditiously the pending application for the licensing of irradiated food processes.

D. Special nuclear material accountability

The Joint Committee has followed most closely the methods of assuring against the diversion of special nuclear material. Particular emphasis has been given to assessing the adequacy of AEC's practices and procedures for insuring that special nuclear material is adequately accounted for. During an executive hearing on February 15, 1966, a public hearing on August 4, 1966, and at several Committee staff meetings with representatives of other governmental agencies, this matter has been kept under continuous review.

The Joint Committee also urged the Atomic Energy Commission to develop a procedures manual to insure that an adequate inspection mechanism is developed to prevent unauthorized diversion of nuclear materials from reprocessing plants. In this connection, the AEC subsequently entered into a contract with the Nuclear Fuel Services, Inc. to develop such a manual.

The Committee further urged the Commission to restrict the flow overseas of information concerning chemical reprocessing plants unless the recipient country agreed to place the facility under IAEA or equivalent international safeguards. This is discussed further in Section II.

In regard to the safeguarding of nuclear materials, the Committee recommended the establishment of the independent panel to review AEC's current procedures for safeguarding special nuclear material and to recommend improvements where necessary. The Commission established an Ad Hoc Advisory Panel to conduct a review of its current and proposed policies and procedures for safeguarding special nuclear materials in the interest of common defense and security on July 22, 1966.

E. Confirmation of Presidential appointees

The Senate Section of the Joint Committee met in public session on June 22, 1966 to consider the nomination of Dr. Gerald F. Tape to continue as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for a term of 5 years expiring June 30, 1971. Dr. Tape was first appointed to the AEC in 1963 to fill the unexpired term of Dr. Leland J. Haworth. He was confirmed by the Senate on June 23, 1966.

The Senate Section met on July 19, 1966, to consider the nominations of Mr. Wilfrid E. Johnson and Dr. Samuel M. Nabrit to be members of the Atomic Energy Commission. Dr. Nabrit was nominated to fill the vacancy made following the expiration of the term of Dr. Mary I. Bunting on June 30, 1965. Mr. Johnson succeeded Mr. John Palfrey[9] whose resignation became effective on June 30, 1966.

Both nominations were reported out favorably by the Joint Committee and the Senate confirmed them on July 22, 1966.

The Senate Section of the Joint Committee met on September 8, 1966, to consider the nomination of Dr. Carl Walske to be Chairman of the Military Liaison Committee (MLC) to the Atomic Energy Commission. Dr. Walske was nominated by the President on August 1, 1966, to fill the position vacated by Mr. William J. Howard, resigned. The Joint Committee reported out favorably the nomination of Dr. Walske, and on September 12, 1966, the Senate confirmed the nomination.

The Joint Committee also reported favorably the nomination of Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the AEC, to represent the United States at the 10th session of the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Also approved as alternate representatives were Verne B. Lewis, Samuel M. Nabrit, James T. Ramey, and Henry deWolf Smyth. These nominations were approved by the Senate on September 14, 1966.

F. Ad hoc uranium barter transactions

The Private Ownership of Special Nuclear Materials Act (Public Law 88–489) provided that the AEC might begin to provide a uranium enrichment service only after December 31, 1968 (see item III H, below). However, as noted in the Joint Committee's Report on the private ownership bill, the AEC possesses authority under the existing language of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to barter enriched uranium distributed to foreign projects pursuant to section 54 of the Act and to accept as partial payment normal uranium to be delivered to the Commission pursuant to section 66 of the Act. It was understood the Commission might wish to enter such arrangements on an *ad hoc* basis pending the date on which uranium enrichment services become available.

In accordance with this authority, the AEC proceeded to negotiate a number of barter transactions with foreign reactor operators. On several occasions the Committee expressed concern about the increasing number of barter projects that were being considered. The Committee emphasized to the AEC that the special provision for *ad hoc* barter arrangements during the intervening period before commencement of uranium enrichment services was not intended as a means of circumventing the basic policy decision concerning the starting date for this service.

The Joint Committee received testimony on this subject from the Commission in executive session on March 2, 1966, at which time a detailed review of the entire uranium barter program, including the AEC's future plans therefor, was conducted. On March 11, 1966, the AEC announced that no further barter arrangements would be considered other than the already approved barter fuel supply arrangements for five power reactor projects in three European countries.

G. Transfer of additional plutonium to EURATOM

On July 18, 1966, the Committee received testimony in executive session from the Secretary of State and the Atomic Energy Commission on a variety of civilian international atomic energy matters, including a request by EURATOM for transfer of an additional 1,000 kilograms of plutonium for experiments in the fast breeder reactor field. The present ceiling on AEC transfers of plutonium to EURATOM, contained in the EURATOM Cooperation Act of 1958, is 500 kilograms.

On September 1, 1966, the Atomic Energy Commission transmitted to Congress a request for an amendment to the EURATOM Cooperation Act of 1958 to authorize transfer of the additional 1,000 kilograms of plutonium. This proposed legislation was introduced on September 7, 1966, by Chairman HOLIFIELD (by request) as H.R. 17557, and by Vice Chairman PASTORE (by request) as S. 3808. No further action was taken by the Joint Committee in view of the lateness in the session when the Administration requested the legislation and since the additional plutonium desired by EURATOM was not needed this year. The Committee will be prepared to consider this matter again in the future.

H. Toll enriching services and related matters

The "private ownership" amendments to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, which were enacted in 1964, authorize the AEC to utilize its facilities to provide a uranium enrichment (commonly known as "toll enrichment") service for domestic and foreign customers after December 31, 1968. Enriched uranium is used as a fuel for nuclear power reactors. The Act requires the AEC to establish criteria in writing setting forth the terms and conditions under which these services shall be made available, and further requires that these criteria shall be submitted to the Joint Committee for a statutory forty-five day waiting period before becoming effective.

On July 1, 1966, the AEC submitted to the Joint Committee proposed "Uranium Enrichment Services Criteria" in accordance with the Act. The Joint Committee immediately announced that public hearings would be held on these criteria and related matters. The Committe also requested the Comptroller General to review these criteria and the contracts which the AEC planned to use to provide the services.

On August 2, 3, and 4, 1966, the Atomic Energy Commission testified in public session before the Committee. Included in the topics covered were the AEC's post-1968 policies on lease and sale of uranium, uranium reserves, and requirements and safeguards against diversion of fissionable material to unauthorized uses.

After allowing a period for review of the Commission's testimony, the Committee on August 16 and 17 heard from a representative group of witnesses representing various segments of private industry. Additional subjects covered in these hearings included competition and economics in the nuclear fuel cycle, and possible private ownership of gaseous diffusion plants.

---

[9] At the suggestion of the Joint Committee, Mr. Johnson was asked to review very carefully his stock holdings in order to preclude any possible conflict of interest. In response, Mr. Johnson indicated that he was willing to dispose of his stock in any manner acceptable to the Committee. This matter was worked out to the satisfaction of the appointee, the AEC, and the Committee. (See hearing held July 19, 1966, on the nomination of Mr. Wilfrid E. Johnson before the Senate Section of the Joint Committee.)

The five days of hearings on these matters[10] afforded an opportunity for a comprehensive public analysis of the AEC's uranium enrichment services criteria, which are expected to be of great significance to the nuclear power industry in this country and abroad. The hearings also provided a full-scale review of developments in the civilian nuclear power industry since the 1964 private ownership hearings, and highlighted the problem areas which will require attention in future years. Some modification in the AEC's proposed Uranium Enrichment Services Criteria is expected resulting from the Joint Committee's review.

IV. CLASSIFIED ACTIVITIES

In addition to open hearings, the Joint Committee conducted a number of hearings in executive session on classified matters. These hearings covered a broad range of subjects concerning the relationship of nuclear energy to the worldwide national security interests of the United States. Highlights of the Committee's executive hearings and other classified activities follow.

A. Intelligence briefings

On January 20, 1966, the Joint Committee received an intelligence briefing on recent developments affecting the field of atomic energy from Admiral William F. Raborn, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. Throughout the year, other informal briefings by CIA personnel were given to the Joint Committee as required.

These meetings were a continuation of the regular practice of the Committee briefings by the CIA on important matters dealing with the atomic energy programs of other nations of interest to the United States.

B. Nuclear weapons policy and requirements hearings

The Subcommittee on Military Applications held executive hearings on February 23 and 24, 1966, concerning the national policies governing nuclear weapons developments and requirements. These hearings were held in conjunction with the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee. Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus R. Vance represented the Department of Defense. He testified to the basic policy goals of deterrence of nuclear attacks upon the United States and its Allies and, should war occur, the measures to be taken to limit damage to our people and industrial capacity. The senior AEC witness was Commissioner Gerald F. Tape.

Other witnesses heard were Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff; Dr. John Foster, Director, Defense Research and Engineering; Lt. Gen. H. C. Donnelly, Director, Defense Atomic Support Agency; Lt. Gen. Austin W. Betts, Chief, Army Research and Development; and the AEC Weapons Laboratory directors.

C. Four safeguards under the limited test ban treaty

In connection with the four safeguards established at the time of the signing of the nuclear test ban treaty, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has monitored their implementation very closely. Periodic reports have been made to the Congress.[11]

Safeguard No. 1 is the Continuance of the Underground Testing Program. The Joint Committee this year recommended that $10 million be added to the AEC's request for this program for FY 1967. This additional sum was authorized by the Congress. The Administration after authorization found it necessary to take additional reprogramming actions to better fund this safeguard.

Safeguard No. 2 is the Maintenance of Modern Weapons Laboratories. The Joint Committee continues to be instrumental in helping to maintain the AEC's three nuclear weapons laboratories at levels that provide challenging research and development programs in weapons and related scientific research.

Safeguard No. 3 is Readiness to Resume Atmospheric Testing. In this connection the Joint Committee has monitored this program and a member of the staff has participated in the annual exercise held in the Pacific known as Operation Windlass.

Safeguard No. 4 is Test Detection and Monitoring of Foreign Nuclear Programs. The Joint Committee has in its periodic briefings from the CIA continued to follow closely the progress of foreign nuclear programs and our ability to satisfactorily monitor them. In connection with test detection capabilities, Joint Committee interests are indicated in part V C. of this report.

D. Safeguarding naval nuclear propulsion information

The Joint Committee met with representatives of the Executive Branch on several occasions to hear testimoney concerning the possible transfer, either directly or indirectly, of naval nuclear propulsion information and technology to foreign nations. The Joint Committee has taken a strong and consistent position that it is not in the national interest to allow this information to be sent abroad because of the danger of its falling into the hands of hostile powers. Also the Committee felt that it was inconsistent with the U.S. policy of nonproliferation.

E. Loss and recovery of nuclear weapons in the Mediterranean area

On January 17, 1966, a B–52 SAC bomber with 4 nuclear weapons on board and a KC–135 aircraft refueling tanker collided and exploded above the Mediterranean Sea off the coast of southern Spain. Two thermonuclear bombs fell essentially undamaged, one on land and the other into the Mediterranean. Two other nuclear weapons dropped on Spanish soil. The high explosive (not the nuclear) components of the weapons exploded on impact, scattering plutonium and uranium from the nuclear components over the countryside.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy followed closely the matters of removing the contaminated soil from Spain and the recovery of the lost bomb from beneath the surface of the Mediterranean Sea. Executive sessions relating to this incident were held on January 20, February 2, and April 19, 1966. A staff member of the Joint Committee also visited the area where the weapons had fallen for firsthand knowledge of the matter. The United States arranged for the proper decontamination of the area near Palomares, Spain, involved in this incident. This operation involved the removal of approximately 1,600 tons of soil. This soil was shipped to the United States and buried at the AEC's Savannah River plant in South Carolina.

The thermonuclear bomb which fell into the Mediterranean was recovered on April 7, almost 80 days after the accident. It was found essentially intact and returned to the United States for examination.

It is to the great credit of the AEC and DoD that safety features designed into these weapons prevent nuclear explosions from taking place in such accidents.

V. OTHER ACTIVITIES

A. IAEA 10th General Conference

The Joint Committee, through staff representation, participated in the 10th General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency in September 1966. Chairman HOLIFIELD took special recognition of the 10th anniversary of the International Atomic Energy Agency and addressed a congratulatory communication to the Director. The message encouraged efforts of the IAEA in the field of inspection of national programs on the development of atomic energy to insure that uranium and plutonium are not diverted for military purposes.

B. Disarmament negotiations

On January 24, 1966, the Committee received testimony in executive session concerning the plans and policy position to be taken by the U.S. representative to the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference (ENDC). This Conference met in Geneva from January 27, 1966, to August 25, 1966. A Committee staff member visited the Conference during May 1966, and the Committee received briefings on matters relating to disarmament throughout the year.

C. Detection and identification of underground nuclear explosions

The Joint Committee has continued to follow actively the research program—known as Vela Underground—on detection and identification of underground nuclear explosions. The most recent executive hearing on this subject was held on June 21, 1966. Witnesses represented the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Department of Defense, and the Atomic Energy Commission.

The Joint Committee believes that while progress in seismic research has been made since 1963 no adequate basis exists for the monitoring of a comprehensive test ban treaty without adequate numbers and types of on-site inspections.

D. Inspection visits

1. The Committee members and staff continued their practice of obtaining firsthand information by visiting various Atomic Energy Commission, Department of Defense, NASA, and U.S. Government contractor installations in the United States. During the second session, 89th Congress, visits were made to the following facilities, among others:

Argonne National Laboratory, Lemont, Ill.

Atomics International Division, North America Aviation Inc., Canoga Park, Calif.

Columbus, Ohio (Nuclear Materials Management Conference).

Edison Electric Institute Annual Conference, San Francisco, Calif.

Elk River Nuclear Power Reactor, Elk River, Minn.

General Electric Co., San Jose, Calif.

Groton, Conn. (Sea trials of USS *George Bancroft*, SSBN643).

Ingalls Nuclear Submarine Construction Yard, Pascagoula, Miss.

La Crosse Boiling Water Reactor Project, La Crosse, Wis.

Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Berkeley and Livermore, Calif.

Lewis Laboratory (NASA).

Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory and Community, Los Alamos, N. Mex.

New London, Conn. (Atomic Safety and Licensing Board hearings on Millstone Nuclear Power Station).

Nuclear Fuel Services, Inc., West Valley, N.Y.

Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tenn.

Peach Bottom Nuclear Reactor, Peach Bottom, Pa.

Santa Monica, Calif. (Atomic Safety and Licensing Board hearings on proposed Malibu Reactor).

Savannah River Plant, Aiken, S.C.

Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, Palo Alto, Calif.

U.S. Naval Ordnance Test Unit, Patrick Air Force Base, Fla.

---

[10] See hearings entitled, "Uranium Enrichment Services Criteria and Related Matters," held August 2, 3, 4, 16, and 17, 1966.

[11] See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 112, p. 27390.

2. Committee members and staff visited the following installations abroad involving atomic energy activities:

BONUS Nuclear Power Plant (Puerto Rico).

Geneva (18-Nation Disarmament Conference).

International Atomic Energy Agency (Vienna).

Johnston Island (Joint Task Force Eight).

ISPRA Nuclear Research Center (Italy).

Karlsruhe Nuclear Research Center (Germany).

Toronto, Canada (Disarmament Conference).

University of Madrid (Nuclear Research Center).

White Shell Nuclear Research Center (Canada).

Visits to a number of classified sites abroad were also made by the Committee staff, including NATO installations and the Holy Loch nuclear submarine base in Scotland.

LEGAL AND MONETARY AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE ACTIVITIES IN THE 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the activities of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, as subcommittee chairman, I today submit a résumé of the activities of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations in the 89th Congress.

Shortly after the Congress convened last year Hon. WILLIAM L. DAWSON, chairman of the full Committee on Government Operations, appointed the following Members of the Congress to the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee: TORBERT H. MACDONALD, Democrat, of Massachusetts; CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, Democrat, of New Jersey; JOHN G. DOW, Democrat, of New York; DONALD RUMSFELD, Republican, of Illinois; and WILLIAM L. DICKINSON, Republican, of Alabama. After the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] resigned from the subcommittee, his place was taken by Hon. ROBERT DOLE, Republican, of Kansas. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] also resigned and in his place Hon. JACK EDWARDS, Republican, of Alabama, was appointed.

I am deeply indebted to the members of the subcommittee for their diligent and constructive efforts, and the valuable contributions they have made to the work of the subcommittee.

A prime responsibility of the House Committee on Government Operations is to examine and evaluate the efficiency and economy of the operations of the executive branch departments and agencies. Among the departments and agencies whose efficiency and economy of operations the subcommittee is concerned with are the Treasury Department, Department of Justice, the Federal banking regulatory agencies, and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Summaries of some of the subcommittee's investigations in the 89th Congress are reported below. The subcommittee can take justifiable pride in the results of its efforts. They have accounted for the institution of numerous economies in agencies under the subcommittee's jurisdiction—including significant savings. They have also resulted in improved agency operations through more efficient procedures.

The subcommittee's efforts to instill efficiency and economy in certain agency operations were successful without the necessity of public hearings. Some of the more significant of the subcommittee's studies are discussed below.

COIN SHORTAGE—PART 1

Between 1959 and 1965 the country was faced with such serious shortages of coin as to interefere with normal business practices. Businessmen, banks, and the public in general at times could not obtain coin in quantities necessary for their normal transactions. The Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee conducted intensive investigations into the shortage, its causes, its effects, and means for remedying it. In public hearings, businessmen and bankers discussed the difficulties they encountered in obtaining sufficient coin to meet their demands, and the means which many of them resorted to to obtain coin.

Immediately after the subcommittee scheduled public hearings, the Treasury announced a "crash" program designed to increase coin production by operating its mints on a 24-hour-day, 7-day-week schedule, and by devising extraordinary methods to obtain additional production, to overcome the shortage. The subcommittee's hearings and investigation developed that substantial amounts of coin were in existence, but that there was vast hoarding; that new coin circulation patterns had developed outside the banking system; and that practices had come into being which reduced the velocity of coin circulation, so that unless the coin situation was relieved, losses to business and communities could far outstrip the extra costs of "crash" coin production. Because of the seriousness of the situation, the subcommittee made numerous recommendations to the Government's monetary agencies, including the following:

The Treasury's crash program be vigorously pursued notwithstanding its higher costs and lower efficiency, until adequate supplies of coin were available and in circulation.

The U.S. mint and the Federal Reserve System should develop inventories of coin adequate to prevent recurrence of any serious shortages.

The mint should use the facilities of private industry, to the fullest extent practicable in alleviating the shortage, including the purchase of strip and blanks.

The mint should formulate plans for decreases in production of coin when the urgent needs and inventory requirements had been met.

COIN SHORTAGE—PART 2

In February 1965, about 7 months after the subcommittee's first public hearings on the coin shortage, additional hearings were held, chiefly to ascertain the progress being made by the Treasury under its crash program. The adequacy of the Treasury's rapidly diminishing silver supply, in the face of increased coin production, was also considered.

These hearings established that the crash program was so effective in increasing production that it averted a disastrous shortage which could have slowed the economy and resulted in extreme losses to individuals, businesses, and the Government.

The subcommittee, however, pressed the Treasury and the Federal Reserve System to continue their efforts to devise more exact means of ascertaining future coin needs, and for fostering more equitable coin distribution.

In view of the silver situation, the subcommittee recommended that the minting of 45 million silver dollars, then authorized, be delayed until a decision—then pending—was reached on new coin alloys, and that the Treasury expedite its recommendations to the Congress for new coin alloys.

The subcommittee's efforts focused attention on the Nation's silver situation and supplied a background for legislation for the new clad dimes, quarters, and halves which have been introduced into circulation.

COIN SITUATION

Subcommittee hearings in early 1966 followed the passage of the Coinage Act of 1965, which, among other things, provided for the minting of silverless dimes and quarters, and reduced the silver content of half dollars from 90 to 40 percent.

The investigation enabled the subcommittee to pronounce the coin shortage as ended, except for half dollars which failed to circulate in any significant quantity, regardless of how many were produced. However, the subcommittee found little progress had been made toward developing criteria for anticipating coin requirements, and for phasing out the crash program.

Among other recommendations, the Treasury was urged to develop reliable means and criteria for forecasting coin needs, and in so doing to consider the technological innovations which lessen the need for coin; to determine whether to continue minting half dollars in the circumstances of their failure to circulate; to plan for orderly and economic return to normal coin manufacturing operations; to activate the Joint Commission on the Coinage provided for in Public Law 89–91; and to revise its instructions so as to clarify the responsibility of the Federal Reserve System to distribute coin to both member and nonmember banks on a uniform basis.

Formal reports followed each of these studies—coin shortage, part 1, House Report No. 194; coin shortage, part 2, House Report No. 195; and the coin situation, House Report No. 1468. The Treasury, following the recommendations of the coin situation report, in cooperation with the Bureau of the Budget, has obtained the assistance of specialists who have been engaged in comprehensive research for the purpose of devising more accurate means of forecasting coin needs and coin inventory requirements, which would tend to lessen the dangers of coin shortages in the future. Also, the Federal Reserve System's coin distribution responsibility for both member and nonmember banks has been clearly spelled out.

U.S. GOLD SITUATION

Contemporaneous with the subcommittee's inquiries into coin and coinage, it noted drains on the country's gold stock through international transactions. Communications received by the subcommittee indicated considerable concern on the part of many citizens that the U.S. gold supply was being drained away, and that adverse effects were inevitable.

A report, entitled "The Gold Situation"—House Report No. 702—issued on July 30, 1965, is a factual, objective review of the country's gold reserves, in the light of the drains thereon through the redemptions of dollars by foreign countries, brought about chiefly through deficits in U.S. international payment balances. It considers U.S. policy as regards the redemption of dollars for gold, the adequacy of U.S. gold reserves, the strength of the dollar, remedies applied to stem the imbalances of U.S. international payments, speculation in gold, and suggested curbs on speculation, and various plans that have been suggested for improving international monetary arrangements. Large numbers of requests for copies have been received from Members of Congress, libraries, schools, and universities, business establishments, U.S. Government agencies, foreign governments, airliners, accountants, large U.S. corporations engaged in international trade, and others. The U.S. armed services obtained quantities for use in its training programs, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has obtained a supply in connection with its October 1966 national symposium on the international balance of payments.

COAST GUARD EXAMINATION OF FOREIGN PASSENGER VESSELS

Fire is the greatest hazard to life at sea. All U.S. passenger vessels built since 1936 are constructed of incombustible materials; and no U.S. passenger ship built before 1936 carries passengers in ocean traffic. However, at the same time that the United States took the wood out of new U.S. passenger ships, the Safety of Life at Sea Convention—SOLAS—of 1929 became effective, which permitted the carrying of passengers from our shores by foreign vessels, regardless of how much wood was built into them. Although SOLAS Conventions in 1948, and again in 1960, imposed higher fire safety requirements, even now foreign passenger vessels can be constructed with large quantities of combustible materials; and the United States must allow them to carry passengers out of U.S. ports, if the vessels are protected by approved sprinklers or fire detection systems. Foreign vessels built before 1952 can contain any degree of combustibility, and still be permitted to operate in passenger trade from the United States. For instance, the *Yarmouth Castle*, which burned and sank in November 1965 with a loss of 90 lives, had well over 400 tons of wood in her superstructure, and yet under the SOLAS Conventions could operate regularly as a cruise vessel, despite her combustibility.

When that disaster happened, the vessel had aboard her a Coast Guard certificate of examination. The subcommittee checked on the Coast Guard's vessel examination procedures to see whether it was doing everything it could to assure the safety of American travelers and to prevent future tragedies of that kind from happening. The study disclosed that the Coast Guard has exercised to the maximum its examination authority over foreign passenger vessels, and through moral suasion often has been able to get foreign ships upgraded considerably beyond convention safety requirements.

In its efforts toward greater safety of life and property at sea, the committee report—House Report No. 1663—recommended that the Coast Guard discontinue issuing its certificate of examination to foreign passenger vessels, thus obviating the possibility of passengers believing that the Coast Guard had approved the vessel's general safety; and that it devise an information sheet on passenger ships inspected or examined, United States and foreign, which in layman's language would clearly reflect the relative safety of each such vessel. The information sheet should describe any particulars in which a vessel failed to meet U.S. standards of construction and fitting out for passenger service, including the materials used therein; the installation and maintenance of firefighting and other equipment designed for the safety of passengers; and manning and operation of the vessel and its equipment; and copies should be made available for public distribution.

The report also recommended the development of a uniform checkoff list to aid inspectors in the examination of foreign passenger vessels, and the establishment, as policy, that if in the course of examination of a foreign passenger vessel any question arises as to whether the vessel can proceed to sea without danger to passengers and crew, all doubts should be resolved by preventing the vessel from carrying passengers out of U.S. ports until all safety deficiencies are corrected.

No degree of excellence of Coast Guard examination efforts can eliminate the hazards of disastrous fire which repose in the combustible materials built into many of the foreign vessels it examines. Appropriate treaty amendments are necessary to remove such danger to U.S. passengers. The Coast Guard has taken the lead in pressing for higher convention safety standards, including the elimination of grandfather clauses—which exempt older vessels from meeting treaty requirements—the bringing up of existing ships to SOLAS-60 standards and the construction of new vessels with incombustible materials. A May 1966 special meeting of the Maritime Safety Committee of Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization—a preliminary step in convention amendment—reported agreement on many U.S. proposals for increased vessel safety; and because the prescribed procedures for amending SOLAS-60 take a long time, recommended that nations not await the completion of the amendment processes before instituting the agreed-upon safety reforms.

As a result of this study, the committee recommended to the Coast Guard that it press for appropriate amendments of the SOLAS Convention which would first, include basic standards for qualifications of classification societies and surveyors of vessels; second, require that only such classification societies or surveyors as meet the basic standards be eligible for appointment to make the inspections that are required by the convention; third, require foreign governments to formerly authorize their appointments of classification societies and surveyors; fourth, require IMCO to maintain a list of classification societies and surveyors which meet the basic standards, as well as records of their authorization to act for member countries; fifth, require IMCO to make available for inspection and circulation upon the request of any interested country marine casualty reports which disclose the identity of the ships involved; sixth, provide minimum qualifications and training requirements for masters, officers, and crews of vessels; and seventh, require that appropriate emergency radio equipment be housed in lifeboats on each side of a vessel; that a radioman be on duty at all times; and that a self-powered, buoyant device which when ejected from the vessel into the water automatically emits distress signals be carried by each vessel.

The report also asked the Coast Guard to urge the countries whose vessels embark passengers from U.S. ports not to await the formal adoption of the IMCO Maritime Safety Committee's safety recommendations, but to put them into effect immediately; and that if the Maritime Safety Committee's recommendations for amendments to the SOLAS Convention to meet the principal objectives of the Coast Guard in advancing safety of sea are not adopted within 2 years, the Coast Guard should recommend denunciation of the convention and the return to bilateral agreements under which examination of foreign and U.S. passenger vessels would be made on a reciprocal basis, in which the Coast Guard could insist upon greater safety provisions.

The report also urged the Coast Guard to recommend denunciation of the convention if it was not amended within 5 years to require fire resistant construction of all new passenger vessels and the existing vessels which required material alteration.

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM—CHECK CLEARANCE FLOAT

Float is the dollar value of checks not yet collected in the Federal Reserve System's clearance process, on which member banks receive credit to their reserve balances with the System. In developing the Fed's system of check clearing it was found impracticable to develop a method of debits and credits which could be made at the exact times when checks were actually collected. Schedules were developed, therefore, under which member banks were given credit, based on the distances between the collecting and drawee banks. Originally, the schedules approximated actual collection times, so the "float" was small. However, as better means of transportation and bookkeeping methods advanced, the credit times were reduced, the last reduction going from a maximum of 3 days to 2 days in 1951. While actual collection times for most checks which give rise to float is longer—the average is 3 days—the maximum deferment under the schedules is but 2 days. Between $700 and $800 million of float, which had a daily average of $1.8 billion last year, could be wiped out by the System's enlarging the deferment time to 3 days.

For various reasons, including the anticipated unpopularity with its member banks of any such change, the Fed has hesitated to take such action. It believes that technological advances will soon completely eliminate the float, by enabling simultaneous entries to be made of debits and credits on checks; and, in fact, by doing away with the need for checks.

The report indicates the committee's awareness that marked technological advances are being made and that the Fed's expectations of their effect on float may be reasonable. However, the float has not always gone the way of expectations. The report, therefore, recommends that the Fed establish quantity and time goals with which to measure the effect of such developments; and if they do not come up to expectations, then consider other measures for dealing with the float, including the issuance of realistic time schedules. It should, in that event, also take steps to evaluate the extent of benefits which particular banks derive from the use of float as reserves, and consider whether proportionate charges therefor should be made. The report also requests the Fed to coordinate its efforts on technology, for mutual benefits, with those of the rest of the Government.

In August 1966, the Federal Reserve Board announced that effective September 1, 1967, all checks sent to Federal Reserve Banks which are not encoded in magnetic ink would be treated as noncash items. The effect will be to eliminate the float as to such items. Also, the Fed has announced the conduct of further studies into means for minimizing bank clearings, and thus reducing, or completely eliminating, the float.

OTHER STUDIES

In the course of this Congress the subcommittee conducted numerous studies in which no public hearings were held and no reports were issued. For example, the procedures of the Internal Revenue Service were studied from the standpoint of the length of time entailed in the processing of the applications for rulings on tax consequences.

So, too, a study was made of the procedures which the Internal Revenue Service applies in determining whether to acquiesce or nonacquiesce in adverse opinions of the U.S. Tax Court.

Also, several specific complaints of improper actions by the IRS were investigated, covering alleged improprieties in the assessing and compromising of income tax liabilities, as well as failure of the IRS to properly file returns of self-employed persons for social security credits with the social security system.

Various studies directed to simplification of forms and procedures were made, such as the feasibility of reducing the burden on taxpayers by permitting them to file one form for both Federal and State payroll taxes.

Two physical security matters involving the Treasury Department were investigated.

One as regards measures taken to prevent the theft of currency from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

The other, an allegation that ordinary silver dollars had been substituted in the Treasury's vaults for silver dollars of high numismatic value.

Other studies involving the Treasury were made of its customs operations, as well as of activities in connection with gold and silver operations, gold and coin swindles, and the loss of proof coins in the mails.

A complaint that the Department of Justice was delaying the trial of certain land condemnation cases with the objective of forcing property holders into settlements of the cases was investigated and found to be without merit, in that the delays were due to the unavailability of trial judges.

Studies involving the Federal banking supervisory authorities included such subjects as the investigation of a complaint that illegal dividend restrictions were imposed upon newly insured savings and loan associations by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board; the possible annual savings of about $800,000 through the adoption of legislation which would permit the Federal Reserve System to destroy unfit Federal Reserve notes locally rather than sending them to Washington for destruction, which culminated in legislation for that purpose, and a complaint that excessive protest fees and service charges by banks were authorized by the Federal supervisory agencies.

Other studies included the operations of the bank supervisory agencies in connection with bank mergers; regulation of interest rates and conflicts between the agencies in the administration of their functions; and the coordination of agencies with reference to the marketing of Government agency obligations.

Inquiries were made concerning operations of the SEC with regard to the supervision of stock exchange specialists and publication by stock exchange members of recommendations regarding particular stocks.

GAO REPORTS

During the 89th Congress numerous GAO reports were considered, among which are the following:

A report that the Coast Guard carried an excess inventory of some $900,000 worth of buoy bodies was closed after Coast Guard assurances of the establishment of adequate guidelines for determining requirements and inventory controls, with large savings to the Coast Guard.

A report that the Coast Guard incurred, and would incur additional unnecessary costs in procuring power unit clamps without competitive bids was closed on the assurance of the Coast Guard that it would maximize competitive procurements, with savings indicated as being in the area of 30 percent in future procurement of the items to which such procedures apply.

A report that the Bureau of Prisons of the Department of Justice charged its employees inadequate rentals was closed on the Bureau's assurance of complying with appropriate directives which will result in additional rental income to the Bureau estimated at between $338,000 and $749,000 per year.

Reports that the Federal Home Loan Banks of San Francisco and Cincinnati could have saved the Government large interest costs totaling about $600,000 by depositing their excess funds with the Treasury rather than with commercial banks were closed after further surveillance of this subject by the subcommittee disclosed marked improvement in the keeping of the accounts, resulting in large savings to the Government.

Several other GAO reports are being retained for further study and consideration.

PRIOR ACTIVITIES OF CONTINUING INTEREST

In the 1st session of the 88th Congress, House Report No. 1147: "Crimes Against Banking Institutions," resulted from the subcommittee's studies of the operations of the Federal bank supervisory agencies insofar as they pertain to reducing crimes against banks and savings and loan associations. The subcommittee's interest in the subject in general is a continuing one. It is gratifying that many of its recommendations have been implemented, both by the supervisory agencies and by the enactment of legislation which will aid in protecting the security of bank funds. That report, for instance, had urged legislation which would permit the supervisory agencies to approve major changes in management arising from changes of control or ownership. A major step in that direction has been taken by the enactment of legislation which provides for the filing of reports of changes in control of insured banks.

In the 2d session of the 88th Congress, House Report No. 1640, entitled "Judgment Collection Practices and Policies of the Department of Justice," recommended means of improving collections. The Department has indicated the intention of complying with those recommendations, and some indication of its success is noted from the fact that its collections improved some $23 million in an 18-month period.

Also, in testifying before the House Appropriations Committee in February 1966, the Attorney General made the following statement with reference to the program:

> A year ago, I told you about our concern for speeding up the collection of debts to the

U.S. Government. I am happy to report that with new strength in the U.S. Attorneys' offices, and hard work in Washington, the Civil Division collected twice as much in calendar 1965 as in 1964. And very nearly twice as much in fiscal 1965, ($78 million) as against the fiscal 1964 figures.

ZAMBIA'S THIRD BIRTHDAY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, just 3 years ago next Monday, the Republic of Zambia became an independent nation on the great Continent of Africa. The best wishes of the American people go to the people of Zambia on the happy occasion of their anniversary of independence.

The Republic of Zambia, formerly Northern Rhodesia, is in south-central Africa. It is bordered on the north by the Republic of the Congo, on the east by Tanzania and Malawi, on the south by Mozambique, Southern Rhodesia, and South-West Africa, and on the west by Angola. With a total area of 290,000 square miles, it is about twice the size of the State of Colorado.

With the exception of an occasional Portuguese explorer, the area lay untouched by Europeans for centuries. Only after the middle of the 19th century was the area penetrated by Western explorers, missionaries, and traders. Until that time it had been the scene of the ebb and flow of Bantu peoples from the north toward the south of Africa. Successive waves of these people supplanted the original primitive inhabitants and formed the foundation of today's population.

Zambia was the first British territory to become a republic immediately on independence. Combining features of the British and American constitutional systems, the Zambian Government is headed by a strong President, who is the military commander in chief and shares legislative responsibility with the Parliament. The President was chosen by the existing Parliament—elected in January 1964 for a 5-year term—by a simple majority. At the end of the first Parliament's term of office, the President will be elected by the people at the same time the Parliament is elected and for the same term. All Zambian citizens 21 years of age or over may vote.

Zambia's resources are as rich as her heritage. It is one of the most richly endowed countries of Africa, possessing in its copper belt a quarter of the world's known exploitable copper reserves—800 million tons.

President Kaunda, an outstanding man and a personal friend of mine, has ambitious economic development plans for his country. This includes large-scale improvements to the primitive transportation system away from the line of rail and the upgrading of agriculture to bring Zambian farmers into the cash economy, thus diminishing the present excessive dependence on copper.

It is my fervent hope that her present economic problems, brought about by external forces, can be quickly and peacefully settled.

We were favored this week with a distinguished visitor from the Republic of Zambia, the Honorable Wesley Nyirenda, Speaker of that country's National Assembly, and his charming wife. We hope that their visit to the United States will bind even more closely the strong ties of friendship between the new nations. Speaker MCCORMACK received Speaker Nyirenda in his office and the two Speakers, one our own and the other from faraway Africa, passed almost an hour in earnest conversation.

I extend personal felicitations to Dr. Kenneth Kaunda, Zambia's first President, and her Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency Samuel Chinyama Mbilishi.

WATERSHED AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
Washington, D.C., October 20, 1966.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of Section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Public Works has approved the work plans transmitted to you which were referred to this Committee. The work plans involved are:

State	Watershed	Executive communication No.	Committee approval
Georgia	Little River	2824	Oct. 18, 1966
Illinois	Coal and Crane Creeks	2824	Do.
Indiana	West Boggs Creek	2824	Do.
Kansas	Upper Wakatusa	2824	Do.
West Virginia and Pennsylvania	Wheeling Creek	2824	Do.

Sincerely yours,
GEORGE H. FALLON,
Chairman.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, there have been 12 rollcall votes on dates when it was necessary for me to be in Illinois. Had I been present, I would have voted as indicated below:

First. On rollcall No. 259, final passage of H.R. 16574, Peace Corps Act Amendments, I would have voted "yea."

Second. On rollcall No. 286, final passage of H.R. 8678, to establish the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore, I would have voted "yea."

Third. On rollcall No. 287, final passage of H.R. 17488, to increase the rates of pension payable to certain veterans and their widows, I would have voted "yea."

Fourth. On rollcall No. 288, final passage of H.R. 15183, to adjust the status of Cuban refugees, I would have voted "yea."

Fifth. On rollcall No. 289, final passage, under suspension of the rules, of Senate Joint Resolution 167, International Conference on Water for Peace, I would have voted "nay."

Sixth. On rollcall No. 290, final passage, under suspension of the rules, of S. 3423, to establish the Wolf Trap Farm Park, I would have voted "yea."

Seventh. On rollcall No. 293, motion to recommit the Foreign Assistance Appropriations Act, H.R. 17788, to cut the total amount by approximately 10 percent, I was paired "for" the motion.

Eighth. On rollcall No. 294, final passage of H.R. 17788, Foreign Assistance Appropriations Act, I was paired "against" passage.

Ninth. On rollcall No. 296, final passage of H.R. 17787, Public Works Appropriations Act, I would have voted "nay."

Tenth. On rollcall No. 298, final passage of H.R. 17195, to strengthen the Reserve components of the Armed Forces and clarify the status of National Guard technicians, I would have voted "yea."

Eleventh. On rollcall No. 300, motion to recommit H.R. 11555, Chamizal Memorial Highway, with instructions to provide that the city of El Paso should pay 50 percent of the cost of the highway and to reduce the amount appropriated by the U.S. Treasury from $12 to $8 million, I would have voted "yea."

Twelfth. On rollcall No. 301, final passage of H.R. 13825, the Tijuana River project, I would have voted "nay."

TENTH ANNIVERSARY, HUNGARIAN UPRISING

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, next Sunday, October 23, will mark the 10th anniversary of a peaceful demonstration for freedom in Communist-held Hungary which turned into one of the most tragic blood baths Europe has ever experienced.

On October 23, 1956, university students assembled at the Petofi Monument in Budapest to express quietly their sympathy with developments in Poland. Soon they proceeded to a second monument, where they were joined by other students, and by workers and journalists spontaneously shouting freedom slogans. They carried no arms. They had no leader. They followed no prescribed program.

Later the entire Hungarian Army joined the demonstrators and provided weapons. Some Soviet soldiers assisted. As the movement began to expand, the university students and other groups drafted statements demanding changes in the way of life imposed on them by the Russians after World War II. They requested withdrawal of Russian troops, the right to speak and criticize freely, free elections, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, the right to strike, abolition of the one-party system and elected representatives in the Parliament and councils by free secret ballot.

For the Hungarians, weary of Russian domination, things seemed to be looking up, but the Soviet powers became alarmed. Mikoyan and Suslov met with Prime Minister Imre Nagy to discuss Russian relations with Hungary. During the discussions unofficial reports began coming in announcing the invading of additional Soviet troops. It became apparent the Russians were using the talks to stall for time to strengthen their forces. Nagy's hurried message for help to the United Nations and leaders of free nations were not heeded soon enough.

At dawn, on November 4, in violation of the United Nations Charter, Russian tank and troop reinforcements entered the capital. In fury the people resisted. Three days later the bitter struggle was over, with the loss of 20,000 Hungarian lives and the mass flight of 200,000 to free territory. Captured leaders of the uprising were executed and many, many freedom fighters were imprisoned or deported to Soviet slave camps.

Too late the Western World awoke to the crisis. By then not even the Secretary General of the U.N. could secure a visa to go observe the situation. Soviet forces were firmly in control.

Recent visitors to Hungary report that after 10 years it is still obvious that the rape of this once proud nation has left deep shock and demoralization. Today it suffers from censorship, paralyzing bureaucracy, prejudice, bribery, theft, and ignorance of world developments. There seems to be little incentive for people to seek progress and self-improvement. Many think the free world no longer cares what happens in Hungary. In spite of recent stirrings for relaxed trade and cultural barriers, the restrictions are legion.

As we commemorate the many courageous patriots who participated in that uprising, should we not do some very serious reflecting? Our Government is seeking to renegotiate trade agreements with the Soviet powers. Does this not provide another opportunity to press for concessions that will hasten the return of freedom and justice to Hungary and other East European nations? In 1956, through fear and refusal to comprehend, the free nations failed to press for withdrawal of the Communists. God grant that we not repeat that tragic mistake in 1966.

Already we face the same aggressor in Vietnam. Soviet goals remain the same as they were 10 years ago. This is one of the powers with which we may have to negotiate—directly or indirectly—over the freedom of South Vietnam. Will we be alert this time to the danger? Will we stand firm?

REPUBLICAN ACCOMPLISHMENTS—2D SESSION, 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include a summary of a number of the Republican accomplishments during the 2d session of the 89th Congress. I believe that it reflects a record of real achievement.

In case after case, the Republican Members have been affirmative, imaginative, and effective. Opposition for the sake of opposition has not been a part of this record. We have, as the loyal opposition, given every majority proposal thoughtful but searching consideration. Whenever it was possible, we have tried to improve legislation through amendment or alternative proposal. We have, however, been strong in our opposition to all legislation that was not in the public interest, and quick to call attention to those matters that needed correction. This, I believe, is in the finest tradition of this great deliberative body and our two-party system.

SAVING THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Under the Johnson-Humphrey administration the once vital Small Business Administration that had been created as an independent agency in 1953 by a Republican President, was downgraded and nearly destroyed. The Office of Administrator was left vacant, the business loan program was gutted, and there were disturbing and recurrent rumors that this independent agency was to be transferred to the Commerce Department. Thanks to Republican efforts, this disastrous trend was reversed. In a series of statements and releases, the plan to eliminate the spokesman for small business in big government was exposed. As a result, the proposed transfer was killed, an Administrator was appointed, and the loan functions were reactivated. See February 23, 1966, policy committee statement.

RESCUING THE MARITIME INDUSTRY

For some unfathomable reason, the Johnson-Humphrey administration has chosen to ignore our steadily deteriorating maritime industry. Our shipbuilding program is lagging, our World War II reserve fleet is growing older and the expanding war in Vietnam is putting the U.S. merchant fleet under tremendous pressure. Even so, the administration's total maritime budget for 1967 set a 7-year low. While we have dropped to 12th place among the shipbuilding nations, Russia has risen from 12th to 7th place. Faced with this serious situation, the Republican members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the Republican policy committee set out to alert the American people to the perils of the administration's course. Although we have been unable to reverse this trend entirely, some significant gains have been made. A bill that would establish the Maritime Administration as an independent agency has been reported from committee. Also, an attempt to bury the Maritime Administration in the newly created Department of Transportation was defeated. Finally, the Appropriations Committee increased the funds for ship construction by $21.6 million.

Our national survival may depend upon the shipping that should be under construction but which the Johnson-Humphrey administration has scuttled. Additional steps must be taken to correct this disastrous situation. If the present trend continues, this country that once boasted the greatest merchant fleet in the world will be left on history's shore waiting for ships that never come in. See April 20, 1966, policy committee statement.

PROTECTING THE AMERICAN PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO KNOW

In an effort to conceal and cover up Federal agencies have adopted 24 ways to keep administrative information from public view. Bureaucratic gobbledygook used to deny access to information has included such gems as "Eyes Only," "Limited Official Use," "Confidential Treatment," and "Limitation on Availability of Equipment for Public Reference." In order to pierce this "paper curtain," Republican Members sponsored and worked hard for the adoption of Freedom of Information legislation.

Due to the opposition of the Johnson-Humphrey administration, this proposal was bottled up in committee for over a year. However, as a result of pressure from Republicans, publishers, and representatives of the press, radio, and TV, it was finally reported and enacted into law. Now this legislation can help to blaze a trail of truthfulness and accurate disclosure in what has become a jungle of falsification, unjustified secrecy, and misstatement by statistic. Hopefully, the saying "Would you believe?" can once again become a line for comedians rather than Government press officials. See May 18, 1966, policy committee statement.

URGING ELECTION AND CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION REFORM LEGISLATION

Republican members have responded to one of the great challenges of our times—the reformation of our election and campaign contribution laws. In the past, there have been a number of excellent studies and reports on this subject. President Kennedy appointed a special Commission on Campaign Contributions, and in 1962 the report of this

Commission sparked the introduction of several bills. President Johnson sent a message to Congress recommending that something be done, but the administration bill, which was finally introduced, proved to be defective and inadequate.

Alert to the importance of this legislation and the need for prompt action, the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives introduced an election reform bill that incorporated a number of the President's proposals, but also included many significant improvements and additions. For example, the Republican bill established a five-member Federal Elections Commission that would receive reports and statements regarding campaign contributions and expenditures and investigate allegations of wrongdoing. All contributions and expenditures of $100 or more would have to be reported. A $100 income tax deduction for campaign contributions is provided.

The Republican members of the House Administration Committee pressed for and obtained committee hearings and consideration of this bill. As a result, the Elections Subcommittee reported an election reform bill that contained many of the Republican suggestions. Every Republican member of the subcommittee voted for this bill and at the following meeting of the full committee, all Republican members were present and ready to vote to report the bill for immediate floor consideration. Unfortunately, the Democratic members would not join the Republicans. So, for this session, this important bill has been killed. However, in the public interest, this legislation must be enacted into law before the 1968 presidential campaign. Republicans will press for its adoption during the next Congress. See May 26, 1966, policy committee statement and reprint of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 30, 1966.

ASSISTING THE VETERANS

During the 89th Congress, action on two major veterans' bills resulted directly from Republican leadership.

The Republican-supported Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966—Public Law 89-358—provided educational benefits for veterans of current military service. This essential legislation was enacted over the determined opposition of the Johnson-Humphrey administration. For example, in March 1965, an administration spokesman told a Senate committee that enactment of such legislation would not be in accord with the program of the President. Again in September 1965, administration spokesmen reiterated to a House committee their opposition to pending veterans' education bills.

Recognizing the need for this legislation, the House Republican policy committee in June 1965 urged Congress to provide educational benefits for Vietnam veterans "as quickly as possible." Again in January 1966, the policy committee called for "the immediate enactment of a bill that will authorize a program of education and training for veterans of military service," and urged the administration to support this legislation. Such a bill became law on March 3, 1966. The President, in approving the bill, said that he would sign it notwithstanding the fact that it went further than he was willing to ask for this year.

The Republican-supported Veterans' Pension Act of 1966—H.R. 17488—provides an average 5.6-percent increase in monthly pension payments to 1.8 million veterans. As early as October 1965, Republican Members of the House were calling for hearings on proposals to liberalize the pension program. When hearings were held in July 1966, an administration spokesman testified in opposition to all of the 188 pension bills pending in the House. After rejecting Republican-sponsored amendments to liberalize the bill by increasing the income limitations that control the monthly rate of pension, the Veterans' Affairs Committee reported H.R. 17488.

On September 14, 1966, the House Republican-policy committee endorsed H.R. 17488, and criticized the Johnson-Humphrey administration for the continued opposition to legislation that would provide a much needed cost-of-living rate increase for veterans. At the same time, they called for an increase in the income limitations of the existing pension laws. See January 26 and September 14, 1966, policy committee statements.

REORGANIZING CONGRESS

On July 28, 1966, the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress filed its final report with Congress. This report contained a number of important recommendations that would materially strengthen and modernize Congress. Concerned by the apparent decline of congressional initiative and independence under the Johnson administration, the Republican policy committee joined the Republican members of the joint committee in urging the immediate consideration of the committee recommendations. A bill, entitled "The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1966, H.R. 17873," that would implement these recommendations was introduced by the ranking Republican member of the joint committee. Republicans believe that if Congress is to be a more effective institution for carrying out its basic modern functions—legislative review, and representative—it must be updated. Authority that has been unwisely delegated to the executive must be regained. The continued dilution of its historic role must be stopped. However, this cannot take place until the organizational effectiveness and internal operation of Congress has been improved. The recommendations of the joint committee provide a giant step in the right direction.

The Republican members of the House of Representatives long have been interested in congressional reform. At the outset of this session of Congress, a task force of the House Republicans on congressional reform and minority staffing was appointed to study the matter of congressional reform in depth. As a result of the work of this task force, a book, entitled "We Propose: A Modern Congress," has been published. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this book were presented in full to the joint committee and many of the recommendations of the committee stemmed from the work of the task force. See October 10, 1966, policy committee statement.

HELPING COLLEGE STUDENTS

One of the most successful programs designed to help students complete their college education is the student loan program of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Under this Republican-sponsored legislation, more than 968,000 students have borrowed $834 million.

This year, the very existence of this vital program was threatened by the Johnson-Humphrey administration's recommendation that the program of direct loans to students by participating colleges be scaled back and finally terminated in favor of insured loans. Sensing that this course of action would be disastrous for the many students who depend upon the loans, the Republican Members of Congress insisted that the student loan program be fully funded. Over the continued opposition of the administration, this was done. As a result, nearly half-a-million students at 1,600 colleges and universities will be able to obtain loans and $179 million in Federal funds will be allocated to the participating institutions for this purpose.

The wisdom of the Republican efforts on behalf of the student loan program has been underlined by recent events. One of the first casualties of the Johnson inflation and soaring interest rates was bank-made student loans. In many areas, banks have stopped accepting applications for Government-backed student loans. The 6-percent-interest rate on a student loan is no longer attractive when banks can charge their best credit risks 6 percent for short-term loans. If the administration's attempt to sabotage the student loan program had not been blocked, many students today would be out of money, out of luck, and out of school.

INCREASING SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

Republican Members of Congress have demanded that social security benefits should be increased now, not in January 1968 as belatedly proposed by President Johnson. This would have been the case if the Democratic majority in Congress had acted upon a Republican proposal that would have provided an automatic increase in benefits whenever there is a stated increase in the Consumer Price Index.

Great Society spending, and the accompanying budget deficits, and certain labor settlements have spiraled living costs to a point where elderly citizens are hard pressed to make ends meet. There are nearly 40 million retired Americans who do not enjoy the benefit of rising wages and income to cope with rising prices. They are painfully aware that the purchasing power of our currency has eroded so that the 1957-59 dollar is today worth 88 cents and the 1940 dollar is worth only 43 cents.

The Republican proposal would have provided an across-the-board, 8-percent-average increase in benefits effective January 1, 1967, for approximately 22 million elderly persons eligible for social security payments. It would have been financed from the social security fund reserves without raising the social security tax rate or the annual earnings base on which it is levied. The entire House Republican membership urged Congress to stay in session until a benefits increase could be worked out. Unfortunately, our pleas on behalf of the people hurt the most by inflation, were not heeded by the Democratic majority.

STRENGTHENING PUBLIC LAW 480 AND THE FOOD-FOR-PEACE PROGRAM

In 1954, Public Law 480 was enacted into law under the leadership of President Eisenhower and by a Republican Congress. This is the cornerstone of food for peace. It has meant the difference between life and death for millions of people in a world where much of the population is engaged in a race between food production and population growth. This year the Republican Members of the House of Representatives not only supported the extension of Public Law 480 but were instrumental in adding a number of amendments that improved the legislation as follows:

First. Congressional review of the operation and administration of the program was insured by limiting the extension to 2 years.

Second. The basic concept of friendly countries was retained.

Third. The effectiveness of the Public Law 480 Joint Congressional-Executive Advisory Committee was improved.

Fourth. A 5-percent cash payment in title I sales agreements will be insisted upon when possible.

Fifth. Food sold for foreign currencies will be identified as being provided through the generosity of the American people.

Sixth. Technical assistance in friendly developing countries was expanded through a farmer-to-farmer program.

Over the determined opposition of the Johnson-Humphrey administration, Republicans also were successful in obtaining a ban on subsidized sales to nations that trade with North Vietnam. Republicans believe that when Americans and their allies are fighting and dying in the defense of freedom, nations that trade with those with whom we are joined in combat should not receive special treatment and assistance. See June 8 and September 27, 1966, policy committee statements.

UPDATING AND IMPROVING THE UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION LAWS

Under the leadership of the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee, a bill was reported and passed by the House of Representatives that preserved the highly successful system of autonomous State programs of unemployment insurance. In contrast to the Federal dictation and controls contained in the rejected administration bill, the Republican-sponsored measure updated and improved the present law as follows:

First. Thirteen weeks of extended unemployment compensation is provided during periods of recession.

Second. Coverage is extended to those workers who can be generally considered regularly employed and for whom there can be reasonable standards of availability for work.

Third. Nonprofit organizations are given the option of participating as "self-insurers."

Fourth. The wage base is increased from $3,000 to $3,900 beginning in 1969 and to $4,200 beginning in 1972.

Fifth. A judicial review of determinations by the Secretary of Labor with respect to qualifications of State plans is provided.

The House rejection of the Johnson-Humphrey administration bill and the acceptance of the Republican measure would have meant that the present program of unemployment compensation, while continuing to provide necessary and essential assistance to the involuntarily unemployed, would not become a federalized system that permits abuse and encourages the unemployed to remain idle the maximum period of time rather than accept suitable employment or enter training programs as quickly as possible. See June 21, 1966, policy committee statement.

IMPLEMENTING WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACTIVITIES

Although the Federal Government has played a leading role in the improvement of our rivers and harbors, it was not until 1956 under the Eisenhower administration that the first comprehensive Federal Water Pollution Control Act was enacted. This act was a good beginning and laid a firm foundation for future action. However, to be completely successful, there had to be greater State financial participation in the construction of sewage treatment works. Thus, since 1959, the Republican members of the Committee on Public Works have insisted that any increase in funds authorized for Federal grants must be used to accelerate needed construction by offering an inducement to the States to participate in the cost of treatment plants. The Water Pollution Control Act of 1966 that was supported by the Republican members and enacted into law accepts this principle. It contains substantial inducements to the States to participate in the cost of projects under both the accelerated existing program and the proposed clean rivers program.

Through the adoption of a Republican amendment, this law also provides the foundation for future industrial pollution abatement. Under this measure, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to conduct an appropriate study of methods for providing incentives to assist in the construction of facilities and works by industry. Tax incentives, as well as other methods of financial assistance, are provided. Seventy percent Federal grants for research and demonstration projects for prevention of pollution of waters by industry are made available also.

Water pollution poses a serious problem that must be solved. The legislation sponsored and supported by the Republican members of the House of Representatives will do a great deal to assist in finding a solution. Moreover, the States, cities and the communities will be encouraged to do their share in combatting the common problem of water pollution. See September 14, 1966, policy committee statement.

COMBATING FEDERAL CONTROLS

When the Defense Production Act was brought to the House floor for extension, the Democratic members of the Banking and Currency Committee included in the legislation a provision that would give the President standby authority to impose consumer credit controls. Although faced with a serious inflationary situation, the 89th Congress under its Democrat leadership was either unwilling or unable to control the real cause of the inflationary problem—the Great Society spending. Instead, they sought to impose governmental controls as a means of stemming the inflationary tide.

The Republican membership in the House of Representatives rejected and opposed this radical and unnecessary proposal. They recognized that in a period of rising inflation, it is the individual with a limited or fixed income that suffers the greatest hardship. Without question, the real casualty of such controls would be the family with substantial needs but moderate means. These individuals do not have the resources to pay cash or make a large downpayment when they purchase an automobile, a refrigerator, or some other household appliance.

Fortunately, a sufficient number of Democrat members joined the Republicans and the standby authority to impose consumer credit controls was striken from the legislation. In this instance, the control philosophy was voted down. Thus, extreme and unwarranted powers were kept from the hands of the very individuals whose spending policies have caused the inflationary problem. See June 14, 1966, policy committee statement.

FIGHTING WASTE, BUNGLING, AND SCANDAL IN THE POVERTY PROGRAM

During the past year, efforts by the Republican members of the Education and Labor Committee to gather information which would be helpful in drafting effective antipoverty legislation were hampered and handicapped at every turn. The Democrat majority on the committee repeatedly promised a full-fledged study and was given $200,000 for this purpose. However, field hearings did not materialize and an ever-changing investigative staff was confused by changes in direction, canceled trips, and recalls from investigations. The reports which were issued were sketchy and contained statistics and percentages rather than material needed to draft corrective legislation. Moreover, some reports were intentionally withheld from the Republican members.

The hearings that were finally held on the antipoverty legislation developed into an 8-day parade of administration spokesmen and apologists for the poverty program. The Republican members of the Education and Labor Committee recommended 62 witnesses who were knowledgeable in all aspects of the antipoverty program. However, these recommendations were ignored and the hearings were abruptly terminated. When Chairman POWELL, of the Education and Labor Committee, was asked why this had been done, his only reply was "Because I am the chairman."

In spite of this arbitrary and woefully inadequate action, there was no real attempt made by the Democrat leadership to correct the many abuses and gross mistakes that plagued the present program and $1.75 billion for fiscal year 1967 was ultimately authorized.

Fortunately for the American public, the Republican members of the Education and Labor Committee conducted an independent investigation of the poverty program. Abuse after abuse was documented and exposed. A solid basis for an overall reform of the antipoverty program was established. In order to effectuate the essential reforms and changes, the Republicans introduced substitute legislation, entitled "The Republican Opportunity Crusade." Unfortunately, this bill, and the reforms that it would impose, was rejected. However, a good start on an eventual cleanup of this scandal-ridden program has been made. Republicans will continue to press for needed controls and reforms in the next Congress. See July 19, 1966, policy committee statement.

IMPROVING PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

In supporting the establishment of a new Department of Transportation, the Republican Members of the House of Representatives continued the historic policy of the Republican Party of encouraging the development of American transportation. The need for better coordination among the various governmental agencies that deal with transportation has been apparent for many years. In his final budget message to Congress, President Eisenhower stated:

> A Department of Transportation should be established so as to bring together at Cabinet level the presently fragmented federal functions regarding transportation activities.

The Republican Members were concerned that in the administration's rush to create a Department of Transportation certain safeguards and considerations might be overlooked. They found that the bill that was originally proposed by the Johnson-Humphrey administration would have granted the Secretary of Transportation broad authority that invaded the policymaking authority of Congress. It would have scrambled the now independent accident investigation functions of the CAB with the regulation and control of the airways. Also, the Maritime Administration would be buried deep within the bureaucracy of the new Department.

Due to Republican efforts, the legislation creating the new Department has corrected these defects in the original administration bill. As a result, the Department of Transportation, as it has now been established, will be able to perform efficiently and effectively. See August 10, 1966, policy committee statement.

ATTACKING TIGHT MONEY PROBLEMS

Although the big company with a large net profit may have little trouble borrowing money, the individual who wants to buy a car, obtain a college loan, or purchase a home has a terrific problem due to the present inflationary situation. If he is lucky enough to find a lender, he may have to pay an extremely high rate of interest to obtain a loan. Long before the Johnson-Humphrey administration was willing to even admit that a problem existed, the Republican Members of the House of Representatives recognized that the average person was being hurt in the present tight money market and set out on a course of action that would afford this individual meaningful relief.

They called for an immediate slash in nondefense, nonessential domestic spending—not just in regard to appropriations as the President urged, but also with respect to new Great Society program authorizations that trigger the appropriations process. The sought a reduction in point discounts on FHA and VA home financing through an administrative adjustment of rates to a more realistic level. Republicans opposed the enactment of the Sales Participation Act scheme, noting that a program of this type could only mean additional Government competition for the already scarce investment dollar.

The administration subsequently recognized its error in enacting this proposal and suspended the sale of participations. Republican Members also called for the removal of FNMA's $15,000 administrative limitation on purchases of mortgages under its secondary market operations. This, too, has been implemented by the administration. Finally, in order to cool off competition for savings among the financial institutions, Republicans pressed for and obtained sound remedial legislation.

It is unfortunate the Johnson-Humphrey administration has been slow to awaken to the dangers of this situation. Interest rates are now at the highest point that they have been in over 40 years. These high interest rates have added tremendously to the cost of financing the ever-mounting Federal debts. The rising demand for credit by the Federal Government and business has drawn credit away from credit-sensitive industries such as homebuilding. As a result, homebuilding and home buying, one of the Nation's largest industries, is now faced with a major crisis. Private housing starts in September were down 26 percent from September 1965. Applications for FHA-insured mortgages on existing homes were down 34 percent from a year ago.

In the next Congress, Republicans will continue to press for appropriate remedial action. They will do all they can to help the pensioner, the social security recipient, and the individual with a fixed income or a fixed wage who has become the forgotten man of the Great Society. See May 10, June 8, and July 27, 1966, policy committee statements.

MAINTAINING LAW AND ORDER

Republicans of the 89th Congress have stood vigilant in protecting the public's interest in, and demand for, measures assuring increased protection for law and order in our society.

Of primary significance was the National Criminal Law Revision Commission bill introduced by Representative POFF, Republican of Virginia, and 20 of his Republican colleagues in June of this year. This bill was drafted and introduced when the President's so-called crime package of legislation was found to be wanting. The Poff bill was substituted for an unimaginative proposal in the President's package, received bipartisan acclaim and support, and was passed by the House by a unanimous vote on September 6, 1966.

Republicans again answered the growing demand for increased responsibility in the streets and urban centers of our land when Representative CRAMER, Republican, of Florida, proposed and won approval for an antiriot measure. This measure prohibited the interstate travel of professional demonstrators and troublemakers. It ultimately prevailed over a watered-down administration substitute but failed in the Senate. Subsequently, approximately 80 Members of the House, Republican and Democrat, introduced this antiriot measure as separate legislation. Unfortunately, this legislation was bottled up in the Democrat-controlled Judiciary Committee and failed of passage before the end of the session.

In another and vital area of criminal law reform, the Narcotics Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966, House Republicans again remained vigilant to the cause of law and order. Republican-backed amendments were successful in turning back an administration attempt to weaken the penalty structure of present law as it applies to sellers of narcotic drugs. Mandatory minimum sentences, which nearly all witnesses at the hearings had agreed upon as an effective deterrent to narcotics traffic, were thereby maintained to assist law-enforcement officers in the war on narcotic traffickers.

CRIME REFORM COMMISSION

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, crime is truly one of the great problems confronting our country today. Each year the Congress enacts new criminal laws with the hope that they will dissuade the antisocial behavior of the criminal, yet each year the crime rate continues to grow. This fact suggests that our criminal laws are failing in their fundamental purpose of protecting society and are in need of reform.

On September 6, 1966, this body overwhelmingly passed H.R. 15766, which would create a National Commission on Reform of the Federal Criminal Laws. Today, the Senate passed that legislation.

This Commission is charged with the duty of recommending to the Congress how our Federal criminal laws might be modernized and improved. It is incumbent upon the Congress to enact effective criminal laws and I believe we can truly anticipate this Commission assisting us with this responsibility.

The author of this legislation, my colleague from Virginia [Mr. Poff] is to be praised for his industry and wisdom in developing this legislation. As the hearing record on this legislation well demonstrates, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Poff] thoroughly researched the problem and carefully planned the structure, organization, membership and powers of the Commission to insure its capability of performing its important task. I am also told that this thoughtful preparation was most persuasive to the other body in acting favorably on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the Congress and the country will indeed benefit from the studies and recommendation of the Poff Crime Commission, and I congratulate and compliment the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Poff] for his successful efforts.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished minority leader in commending our colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Poff], for having introduced this meritorious measure. I, too, believe that the Poff Crime Commission will be undertaking a most necessary and vital assignment. If there are legislative solutions to our mounting crime problem, we must find them and act upon them.

The distinguished 12-man Commission created by this legislation will be made up of three Members of the House, three Members of the Senate, three members of the judiciary, and three executive appointments. The author of this legislation has well stated that this Commission will serve as a much needed forum to review the strengths and weaknesses of our Federal criminal laws and will be a foundry for shaping new proposals and revising existing provisions.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe that the Poff Crime Commission is going to make a historic and beneficial contribution to our federal system of criminal justice.

FOR THE RELIEF OF DR. JOHN E. YANNAKAKIS

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a private bill for the relief of Dr. John E. Yannakakis, who has been employed in the department of obstetrics and gynecology at DePaul Hospital in St. Louis, Mo., since April 8, 1966.

After completing medical school in Greece, Dr. Yannakakis served for 30 months as a medical officer in the Greek Army. He entered the United States on January 2, 1960, as an exchange visitor and was here until July 8, 1965, when he and his American wife and two children returned to Greece. He received a waiver for the 2-year residency requirement because of hardship and returned here with his family on a permanent immigrant visa on February 18, 1966.

Because of the requirements of the medical profession in the State of Missouri, Dr. Yannakakis needs to become an American citizen in order to practice medicine there. From the information I have on hand, he would be a credit to his profession and I am therefore introducing this legislation to enable him to become a naturalized citizen as soon as possible.

BETTS REPORT TO THE PEOPLE—A REVIEW OF THE 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Betts] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, as the 2d session of the 89th Congress draws to a close, I think it is well to examine its activities and accomplishments. I believe also that you who are citizens of the Eighth Congressional District of Ohio are entitled to know something of the part that I, as your Representative, played in it.

This year the growing discontent throughout the Nation was reflected in the position of more and more Congressmen. The President still had his heavy majorities in both Houses, but his administration's proposals were subjected to increasingly probing questions.

While most of the President's bills still were approved, changes made in committees and during floor debate frequently made them hardly recognizable from their originally introduced form. Often, too, the House and Senate could not agree on a measure and at this writing, with Congress about to adjourn, an extraordinarily large number of bills are still either locked in conference committees or have been passed by only one House of Congress. The fate of such measures as civil rights, repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, unemployment compensation, to mention only a few, is very doubtful.

To understand this Congress it is necessary to keep in mind these two facts—the numerical superiority of the President's party in Congress, and the obvious increasing dissatisfaction of the people everywhere.

Probably nowhere is this changing attitude of the people more evident than on the vital issue of Vietnam. Neither "hawks" nor "doves" are content with the President's middle-of-the-road course. All year long I have been receiving letters from our district asking: What is really happening in Vietnam? What are we doing? Where are we going? We are all concerned about the situation and I earnestly wish I could answer these questions. President Johnson, however, chooses to consider this as his war and seldom consults Congress. Faced with the fact that our men are fighting there, Members of Congress, with few exceptions, feel that they have no alternative but to support the war effort. Along with the vast majority, then, I have consistently supported defense appropriations. To do otherwise could leave our troops without the means to defend themselves. I might add that I also voted for what I considered a badly needed military pay raise.

Aside from Vietnam, the most important problem facing our Nation today is, I believe, our economic situation. The constantly increasing cost of living directly affects us all. This dangerous inflationary trend could be reversed by cutting Government spending. This is the reason why I have supported efforts to reduce each appropriation bill which has been brought before the House by a nominal 5 percent. I am sorry to report, however, that these attempts at Government economy were successful only in the field of foreign aid. In that area it has long been my contention that we need a thorough review of the program, a much more highly selective system of distributing our funds, and the elimination of assistance to all Communist nations. Since the foreign aid bill did not meet these criteria, I still could not support it.

This year a number of economic issues came before the Ways and Means Committee, of which I am a member. Again we were asked to increase the limit on the national debt, this time to $330 billion. I voted against this, asking instead for curtailment of Government spending. During this Congress, taxpayers were treated to perhaps the shortest period of slight relief in history when certain excise taxes were repealed, a move which I supported, and then reimposed, an action which did not get my vote.

Another serious matter which occupied the Ways and Means Committee for many weeks in this Congress was the problem of health care for our older citizens. Instead of the compulsory social security medicare plan, which has been adopted, I introduced my own voluntary proposal, which was also designed to provide better care for those most in need. Separate proposals for reasonable increases in social security cash benefits also have my support.

Some of the bills which I have introduced have been referred to my committee and I have naturally worked hard for these. They include the tax credit to employers for expenses of providing training programs—Human Investments

Act, protection of home industry against unfair foreign competition, and a tax credit to teachers for expenses of continuing their education.

Other bills that I have introduced have, of course, not been referred to the Ways and Means Committee. Two of these that I think are important are a proposed constitutional amendment to allow voters of States to determine the composition of their own State legislatures; and a plan to strengthen the General Accounting Office, thus aiding that agency in its work of economy in the Federal Government.

Several groups, in my opinion, were largely forgotten in the legislative program of the Johnson administration. Chief among these were the farmers, veterans, and small business. I have worked for and supported measures which I felt would help them. Most of the farmers in our congressional district indicate to me that they favor less Government control. While I then supported the food-for-peace plan as an outlet for surplus agriculture products, I do oppose Secretary Freeman's controls approach to agriculture in general.

For the veterans I voted for the extension of the GI bill because I feel our country has gained from the training and education that so many have already obtained through it. I also supported some needed pension increases and extensions of existing law to help more of our older veterans, those who are disabled, and their widows and children. These, most of whom served in World War I, too frequently are forgotten.

Perhaps one of the hardest battles which was waged on behalf of small business took place in connection with the minimum wage bill. I was one of those who successfully fought for protective features for small businessmen, and also the farmers, when it was considered in the House. Satisfied with the final form of the bill, I voted for it. Then the Senate restored some of the most objectionable features and when it was reconsidered in the House I could not support it. I hope this helps to explain some confusion which seems to exist about my position on this issue.

It is this same variety of provisions in a single bill which causes what is perhaps a legislator's most perplexing problem. He must weigh the good features against the bad in a bill to decide how to cast a single "yes" or "no" vote. Frequently in this Congress in such fields as education, the war on poverty, civil rights, air and water pollution, conservation, and many others, I had to consider the degree of necessity, whether the particular measure was the right or the best approach to the problem, the issue of the power of the Federal Government versus the individual rights of the people. On the question of education, for example, I have consistently voted my approval of bills for school construction, but when the Federal Government gets into such areas as teacher salaries, textbooks, and curriculums, I see genuine dangers. We must, I believe, retain the control of our educational system on the local level, particularly in elementary and secondary education.

In the case of the war on poverty, certainly some good has been done by many aspects of the program. In our own district, I have seen no evidence of corruption or mishandling of funds. Yet there is a mountain of evidence—case after case—of mismanagement, political bickering, waste, and inefficiency. It is clear that the program needs a thorough examination, and that some method of obtaining more beneficial results from the millions being spent must be found. Therefore, I could not support the continuation of the program in its present form.

Civil rights was another very difficult issue to decide this year. I have always supported the civil rights bills in the past but the proposal presented in this session included a highly controversial provision concerning the rights of private individuals to dispose of their property. I think that the problems in this area must be left to education. A man's neighbors should not be selected for him by a mandate of the Federal Government. In the final analysis I could not support the measure.

There are many other legislative proposals that should be mentioned. Efforts in the fields of conservation, air and water pollution, housing, public works, health research, space exploration, have my general support, but while we are fighting a war in Vietnam, protecting ourselves from communism on worldwide fronts, and while our economy is in danger, we must limit our spending. We must separate the "necessary" from the "desirable." Highway beautification, many new national parks, a mansion for the Vice President, funds for the Alaska Centennial, such things are clearly not absolutely essential at this time, and I did not, therefore, support them.

In this report I have dwelt on the legislative activities of the year. A Congressman, of course, has other duties which might be called the services of his office. I might just briefly touch on the year's activities in this area.

During the 89th Congress, as in the past, I have been engaged in a number of important projects for the Eighth District. Perhaps one of the most significant is the efforts I have made following the tragic Palm Sunday tornadoes of 1965 when the need for improved weather detection devices for the Ohio area became clear. I requested a briefing, reports, and recommendations from the Director of the Weather Bureau and was joined by several colleagues in this. As the result of the investigations we initiated, funds for the procurement of needed equipment and research on tornadoes have been appropriated by Congress and the communications capabilities at each weather station servicing a part of the Eighth District have been improved. Much more remains to be done but at least we have a constructive beginning. I hope also that the tornado warning sheets mailed from my office and distributed by civil defense and sheriff's offices will help to provide better information should tornadoes again threaten.

The response to my legislative questionnaire sent in January was much greater than I expected. Over 18,000 residents of the new Eighth District—including Delaware and Richland Counties—responded. The questionnaries were tabulated and the results have been helpful to me as important measures came before the Congress this year. All comments on questionnaires were noted and letters written in response to many. I plan to continue this method of seeking the views of all residents of the 8th District if I am returned to serve in the 90th Congress.

Each Congressman is provided many free Government publications for distribution in his district. This year booklets on the Capitol, the Congress, the Constitution, maps and other material in considerable quantity were sent to our schools, libraries, and to many individuals.

The number of requests for assistance in servicemen's problems, veterans benefits and social security matters has increased substantially due in part to the war in Vietnam, new veterans pension laws and medicare. Each and every letter is answered and I am pleased to say that in many instances these cases have favorable conclusions.

With the diversity of new Federal programs I receive many requests from municipal and county officials for advice and assistance. In order to answer many of the questions in the minds of local officials, I conducted a Federal seminar inviting elected representatives of all our cities and counties. Over 140 came to obtain information and raise question on these programs.

Another facet of my office duties is to nominate young men to the service academies. A strictly competitive system is used in the selection of appointees and over the years we in the Eighth District have had many outstanding men attend the academies. I always urge parents, school officials, and interested persons to write me about young men who might wish to compete for academy nominations. These highlights illustrate how your Eighth Congressional District office functions every day of the year.

In this report to the people of the Eighth District I have attempted to show my position on most of the important issues which faced this Congress. I know I have omitted some, and if you have any questions, I will be glad to try to answer them. Or you are invited to check my voting record on any bill. If we measure the 89th Congress solely by the quantity of its legislation, then perhaps it was the most productive in history as some high officials have termed it. I believe, however, that we must also consider the quality of its work and here some questions might be raised. The full effects of many of the bills that were passed may not be felt for a long time and perhaps not until then can this Congress be truly evaluated.

NEW YORK MEMBERS OF THE PRESIDENT'S CLUB

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, earlier I placed in the RECORD the names of those listed as contributors to the President's Club, according to the records of the Clerk of the House. At that time I indicated I would, from time to time, place in the RECORD the list of contributors filed in various States.

In this connection, therefore, I am placing at this point in the RECORD the contributors to the President's Club of New York as reported to the secretary of state, State of New York, Albany, N.Y.

The list follows:

(March 9, 1964)

Jonathan Bingham, 5000 Independence Ave., Bronx, N.Y., $1,000.00.

Gustave L. Levy, 20 Broadway, New York, N.Y., $1,000.00.

(March 18, 1964)

David Fromkin, 595 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.00.

(March 20, 1964)

Morris Fromkin, 595 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.00

(April 6, 1964)

Donald J. Sutherland, 270 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., $100.00.

Thomas A. Coleman, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y., $100.00.

(April 10, 1964)

Edward R. Lubin, 17 East 64th Street, New York, N.Y., $100.00.

Lisa Howard, 6 East 74th Street, New York, N.Y., $100.00.

(April 13, 1964)

S. W. Brown, Chrysler Building, New York, $1,000.00.

John A. Coleman, Jr., 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y., $100.00.

Anthony G. DiFalco, 1 Washington Sq. Village, New York, $100.00.

Michael Iovenko, 165 Broadway, New York, $100.00.

Elizabeth E. Mills, 1349 Lexington Avenue, New York, $100.00.

Stephen R. Petschek, 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, $100.00.

Edward J. Sack, 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y., $100.00.

Sam Shain, 1564 Broadway, New York, N.Y., $100.00.

Kennedy Williams, 1170 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., $100.00.

Louis S. Gimbel, 3d, 655 Madison Avenue, New York, $100.00.

Mathew L. Liflander, 660 Madison Avenue, New York, $100.00.

Robert B. Menschel, 230 East 73rd Street, New York, $100.00.

Wm. Martin Stone, Princeton Univ., Princeton, N.J., $100.00.

James W. Harbison, 30 East End Ave., N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

(April 14, 1964)

Mary Anne Krupsak, 305 East 86th St., N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Richard J. Schwartz, 1407 Broadway, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Roger L. Strong, 120 Broadway, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

S. Stinor Gimbel, 655 Madison Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Moore and Schley, 120 Broadway, N.Y., N.Y., $1,000.00.

Maurice Sonnenberg, 580 Fifth Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Bernard J. Steinberg, 330 East 30th St., N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Josephine W. Pomerance, Cos Cob, Connecticut, $1,000.00.

(April 16, 1964)

Charles F. Preusse, 522 Fifth Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $1,000.00.

Walter H. Leiberman III, 44 East 52nd Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

John Stockwell Samuels, 78 Dartmouth St., Forest Hills, N.Y., $100.00.

(April 17, 1964)

Frederick W. Richmond, 743 Fifth Ave., N.Y., N.Y., $1,000.00.

Marjorie L. Everett, P.O. Box 7, Arlington Heights, Ill., $1,000.00.

Paul Winter, 760 West End Ave., N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

David G. Sachs, 120 Broadway, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Fred N. Gerard, 521 Fifth Ave., N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

S. Donald Friedman, 48 East 66th St., N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

(April 20, 1964)

Nathan Burkan, Jr., 160 East 66th St., N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Richard D. Fagan, 39 Broadway, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Stuart W. Thayer, 48 Wall Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Ellen Rosen, 179 East 70th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Chester J. Straub, 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

(April 21, 1964)

Mrs. Dorothy Schiff, 75 West Street, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

Mrs. Edward R. Lubin, 17 East 64th St., N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Michael D. Robbins, 40 East 88th St., N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Barry H. Singer, 111 Broadway, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

William J. Manning, 36 Osborne Rd., Garden City, N.Y., $100.00.

Donald Oresman, 12 Hazel Lane, Larchmont, N.Y., $100.00.

Miss Sylvia Aronwich, 445 East 86th St., N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Abraham Shalo, 6818 Bay Parkway, Brooklyn, N.Y., $100.00.

Abraham Goodman, 759 East 10th St., Brooklyn, N.Y., $100.00.

Edwin L. Weisl, Jr., 912 Fifth Ave., N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

Mrs. Edwin L. Weisl, Jr., 912 Fifth Ave., N.Y., N.Y., $500.00.

Enrico Donati, 438 West 37th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $500.00.

Irving M. Engel, 52 Vanderbilt Ave., N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

William T. Moore, 2 Broadway, N.Y., N.Y., $2000.00.

James H. Marshall, 2 Beekman Place, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

(April 22, 1964)

Seth M. Glickenhaus, 30 Broad Street, N.Y., N.Y., $2000.00.

David G. Baird, 67 Broad Street, Brooklyn, N.Y., $1000.00.

Joseph J. Dowd, 44 Court Street, Brooklyn, N.Y., $100.00.

Gertrude P. Lander, 135 Church St., New Haven, Conn., $100.00.

Dan Melnick, 47 East 88th St., N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

John Heimann, 70 East 77th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $200.00.

Joseph S. Levine, 16 Court Street, Brooklyn, N.Y., $100.00.

John B. Shea, 21 East 87th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $200.00.

Mitchell Rosen, 180 East 79th St., N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Andrew N. Heine, 1155 Park Ave., N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Eastman Birkett, 120 Broadway, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Jerome T. Orans, 22 East 36th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Ernest E. Rosenberg, 32 Gramercy Park South, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

(April 23, 1964)

Rosalind Kramer, 420 Lexington Ave., N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

Maurice D. Spechler, 141–30 Pershing Crescent, Kew Gardens, N.Y., $100.00.

(April 24, 1964)

Michael Russakow 67–35 Yellowstone Blvd., Forest Hills, N.Y., $200.00.

Miss Lucille Gerringer, 53 East 74th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Isaac Shapiro, 285 Riverside Drive, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Louis A. Ferris, Beverly Road, Rye, N.Y., $100.00.

Cyril L. Greenstein, 27 Colonial Woods Drive, West Orange, N.J., $100.00.

Michael A. Kovner, 923 Fifth Ave., N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Mrs. Donald J. Sutherland, 270 Park Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $25.00.

Florence Perlow Shientag, 665 Fifth Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

(April 27, 1964)

Eleanor Clark French, 144 East 38th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

Arthur Israel, Jr., 45 West 81st St., N.Y., N.Y., $100.00

Dennis C. Stanfill, 1 William St., N.Y., N.Y., $125.00.

David Wagstaff III, 315 East 72nd Street, N.Y., N.Y., $125.00.

James W. Murray, Gen. Prec. Equip. Corp., Tarrytown, N.Y., 1000.00.

(April 28, 1964)

M. J. Merkin, 10 Columbus Circle, N.Y., N.Y.,. $2000.00.

David G. Baird, 67 Broad St., N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

Paul O. Buckley, 405 Lexington Ave., N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

Herbert L. Barnet, 500 Park Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $2000.00.

(April 29, 1964)

Robert L. Loeb, 1060 Park Avenue., N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Stuart Miller, 17 East 37th St., N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

James Ottenberg, 145 East 92nd St., N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Pilade Levi, 912 Fifth Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $200.00.

Norris Darrell, Jr., 163 East 81st St., N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Leonard Eisenberg, 5 Stevens Drive, Great Neck, N.Y., $250.00.

Michael Janeway, 311 East 15th St., N.Y., $100.00.

Sol Ulan, 1133 Roxbury St., Westbury, N.Y., $100.00.

Frank P. Davidson, 730 Fifth Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Avrom Waxman, 110 West 55th St., N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Bernard J. Ruggieri, Albany, New York, $100.00.

Marvin S. Hecker, 10 East 85th St., N.Y., N.Y., $125.00.

N. Lawrence Nagel, 14 Crawford Road, Westport, Conn., $125.00.

John A. Herrman, 1 William Street, New York City, N.Y., $100.00.

Jonathan Churchill, 120 Broadway, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Stephen Gordon, 633 Third Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Alan R. Sussman, 595 Madison Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

(April 30, 1964)

B. J. Buttenwieser, 30 Wall Street, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

Leon Finely, 516 Fifth Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

E. J. Dunleavy, Westbury Hotel, Brussels, Belgium, $1000.00.

Edward J. Gerrity, Jr., 45 Maple Hill Drive, Larchmont, N.Y., $1000.00.

Dore Shary, 33 East 70th St., N.Y., N.Y., $500.00.

Andrew N. Heine, 521 Fifth Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $25.00.

Morley Kaye, 666 Fifth Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $125.00.

Frank Karelsen III, 230 Park Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

(May 1, 1964)

Orin Lehman, 118 East 65th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $2000.00.

Evelyn S. Lehman, 32 East 64th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

Francis A. Callery, 120 Broadway, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

Robert M. Warner, 1015 Nautilus Lane, Mamaroneck, N.Y., $100.00.

Jack D. Key, New York, New York, $125.00.

William G. Dillon, 120 Broadway, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Samuel Angerleider, 227 W. 45th St., N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

(May 4, 1964)

Emmett J. Leahy, 149 Broadway, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

Huntington Hartford, 420 Lexington Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $2000.00.

Mary Roebling, 40 West State St., Trenton, N.J., $1000.00.

Franklin Kane, 17 East 97th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Louis P. Singer, 74 Trinity Place, N.Y., N.Y., $200.00.

Edward Botwinick, 60 Sutton Place, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Edward H. Auchincloss, 20 Exchange Place, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Alan I. Greene, 72 Wall Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Michael J. Kenny, 1 Rockefeller Place, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Harrison J. Golden, 1749 Grand Concourse, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

James W. Glanville, 1 William St., N.Y., N.Y., $125.00.

Samuel N. Seiderman, 1 William St., N.Y., N.Y., $125.00.

Henry Michaud, 120 Broadway, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Joseph Magur, 258 Broadway, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Roy L. Reardon, 120 Broadway, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Gerald L. Herzfeld, 295 Fifth Ave., N.Y., N.Y., $800.

N. E. Herzfeld, 295 Fifth Ave., N.Y., N.Y., $900.00.

Saul S. Herzfeld, 295 Fifth Ave., N.Y., N.Y., $800.00.

(May 5, 1964)

Richard D. Simmons, Moore's Hill Rd., Syosset, N.Y., $125.00.

Barry M. Bloom, 175 Adams St., Brooklyn, N.Y., $100.00.

Edwin Roy Eisen, 139 East 35th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

James K. Seymour, Old Redding Rd., Westport, Conn., $200.00.

Gertrude P. Lander, P. O. Box 75, New Haven, Conn., $100.00.

Robert S. Carlson, 120 Broadway, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Irwin Halbreich, 1350 Broadway, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Edwin J. Wesley, 40 Wall Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Robert M. Arias, 219 East 69th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00

Jerome R. Feniger, Jr., 16 West 77th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00

(May 6, 1964)

Agnes Brown Leach, 1021 Park Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $1,500.00

R. Peter Straus, 415 Madison Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $2,000.00

R. Peter Straus, 415 Madison Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $200.00.

David M. Ginzberg, 282 East 35th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Frederick A. Nicholson, 470 West End Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $125.00.

Lewis A. Schein, 969 Park Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

(May 7, 1964)

James E. Birdsall, 11 Broadway, N.Y., N.Y., $2,000.00.

Samuel Rudin, 945 Fifth Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $2,000.00.

Robert M. Morgenthau, 4275 Independence Avenue, Riverdale, N.Y., $1,000.00

R. V. Titus, 655 Fifth Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $1,000.00.

Donald L. Maggin, 529 Fifth Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

George B. Adams, Jr., 1133 Park Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Henry Garfinkle, 627 West 42nd Street, N.Y., N.Y., $1,000.00.

L. Gary Clemente, 41 East 42nd Street, N.Y., N.Y., $1,000.00.

Ruth Field, 250 Park Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $1,000.00.

Edgar G. Parser, 54 West 46th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $1,000.00.

(May 8, 1964)

Frank Karelsen, III, 230 Park Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $1,000.00.

Peter Panayokos, 1577 East 17th Street, Brooklyn, N.Y., $100.00.

Americo Schiavone, 4054 Aske, Elmhurst, N.Y., $200.00.

Morris Gold, South Fallsburg, New York, $500.00.

John B. Alfieri, 150 Broadway, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Samuel Rudin, 945 Fifth Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $400.00.

Col. Francis Vigo Post, No. 1093, New York, New York, $100.00.

Richard Mende, New York, N.Y., $100.00.

Seth Baker, 72 Wall Street, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

Jerome M. Becker, 9 East 40th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

John R. Lehman, 1 William Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Leonard N. Cohen, 14 Wall Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Ira Morse, 42 West 39th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Thomas Lewlyn, 70 East 96th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

(May 11, 1964)

Mary Endicott Tree, 123 East 79th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

Nathan Straus III, 33 East 17th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

Monroe Goldwater, 60 East 42nd Street, N.Y., N.Y., $2000.00.

W. A. Harriman, 63 Wall Street, N.Y., N.Y., $2000.00.

Maurice Newton, 120 Broadway, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

David Berdon and Co., 511 Fifth Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $500.00.

Kendrick R. Wilson, Jr., 120 Broadway, N.Y., N.Y., $500.00.

J. Kenneth Townsend, Jr., 201 East 21st Street, N.Y., N.Y., $125.00.

William L. Bernard, 110 East 87th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Sidney L. Fiederman, 18 Cob Drive, Westport, Conn., $125.00.

Charles P. Sifton, 14 Wall Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Aaron Goodstein, 21 East 40th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Robert Wechsler, 100 East 138th Street, Bronx, N.Y., $100.00.

Stephen H. Herzfeld, 200 East 36th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Max B. Litt, 2028 Seagrit Avenue, Far Rockaway, N.Y., $100.00.

Murray Schwartz, 29 East 9th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

John Z. Morookian, 63 Willow Street, Glen Ridge, N.J., $125.00.

Charles L. Scherer, 163–15 132 Avenue, Jamaica, N.Y., $250.00.

David J. Feldman, 235 Hewes Street, Brooklyn, N.Y., $250.00.

Seymour Rubin, 1205 Avenue R, Brooklyn, 29, N.Y., $250.00.

Ronald S. Daniels, 255 Hicks Street, Brooklyn, N.Y., $125.00.

Oswald L. Johnson, Jr., 173 East 74th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Manley Hudson, Jr., 52 Wall Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Joel J. Winton, 270 Park Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $125.00.

William T. Henderson, 250 Fairmount Ave., Chatham, N.J., $100.00.

Robert L. Dubofsky, 22 Parkside Drive, Great Neck, N.Y., $100.00.

Theodore F. Miller, 631 North Terrace Ave., Mt. Vernon, N.Y., $125.00.

Allen Harris, 330 East 63rd Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Marshall G. Staub, 261 Madison Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Odyssia A. Skouras, 12 East 72nd Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Nathan Burkan, Jr., New York, New York, $25.00.

(May 12, 1964)

Morris Weinberg, 183 East Broadway, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

Sidney E. Cohn, 1776 Broadway, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

Margaret and Joseph Shelley, 61 Andover Lane, Rockville Centre, N.Y., $2000.00.

Harry M. Gerstel, 29 Rosalind Place, Lawrence, N.Y., $2000.00.

Jack D. Saltzman, 14 Wallace Road, Deal, New Jersey, $2000.00.

Herbert G. Martin, 96 Edgecliff Terrace, Yonkers, N.Y., $2000.00

Theodore A. Hellman, 316 East 91st Street, N.Y., N.Y., $2000.00.

John W. Kluge, 205 East 67th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

Ruth Axe, 730 Fifth Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

Larry Kelder, 122 East 42nd Street, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

Marvyn Carton, 30 Broad Street, N.Y., N.Y., $2000.00.

F. William Harder, 30 Broad Street, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

Mr. and Mrs. Edwin F. Shelley, 339 Oxford Rd., New Rochelle, N.Y., $2000.00.

Mr. and Mrs. Harry F. Weyher, 1160 Park Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $2000.00.

Mr. and Mrs. James H. Cassell, Jr., 21 High Ridge Court, Pleasantville, N.Y., $2000.00.

Hart Perry, 57 East 74th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

Ted B. Westfall, 5 Oakledge Rd., Bronxville, N.Y., $1000.00.

C. R. Smith, 6333 Third Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

(May 13, 1964)

Bernard Kowalsky, 291 Genessee St., Utica, N.Y., $1000.00.

Thomas O'Reilly, 291 Genessee St., Utica, N.Y., $1000.00.

Aaron R. Frosch, 120 East 56th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

David V. Russell, 16 Wall Street, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

Carl J. Rubino, 200 Park Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

Jack I. Poses, 400 Madison Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $2000.00.

Clarence J. Plisky, 250 Park Avenue, N.Y., $2000.00.

John I. Snyder, Jr., 250 Park Avenue, N.Y., $2000.00.

Florence Abramson, 400 East 58th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

H. Lilhenthal, 60 East 96th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

Fred Shaw, 93 Fairview Avenue, Jersey City, N.J., $1000.00.

Julia DiLang, 381 Edna Street, Brooklyn, N.Y., $1000.00.

I. M. Diller, 38 Otter Trail, Westport, Conn., $1000.00.

Mrs. D. Davis, 80 Cranberry St., Brooklyn, N.Y., $1000.00.

Ralph Gerstle, 1125 Park Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

Richard T. Hoeber, 431 Summitt Avenue, Cedarhurst, N.Y., $1000.00.

Albert Gottlieb, 1004 Montgomery St., Brooklyn, N.Y., $1000.00.

Fred Bissell, 16 Park Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

Mrs. Carrie E. Schulte, 2 East 61st Street, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

T. Frank Dolan, Jr., 905 Canal Street, Syracuse, N.Y., $1000.00.

(May 14, 1964)

Trans. Wrkr's Union of Am., 210 West 50th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $5000.00.

Stanley Simon, 70 Pine Street, N.Y., N.Y., $2000.00.

Richard B. Scandrett, Jr., Cornwall, New York, $1000.00.

Thomas B. Hess, Mr. & Mrs., 19 Beekman Place, New York, $4000.00.

Allan B. Hunter, 1 William Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

William Mitchell Jennings, 120 Broadway, New York, $100.00

Harry T. Silverman, 711 Fifth Avenue, New York, $100.00.

Lawrence W. Levine, 64 Wall Street, New York, $100.00.

Mrs. Ruth Jacobs, 885 Park Avenue, New York, $100.00.

Lester K. Lipson, 51 Orchard St., New York, $50.00.

Sam Rosen, 35 East 85th Street, New York, $100.00.

Albert Felix, 29 Broadway, New York, $100.00.

Burton M. Abrams, 522 Fifth Ave, New York, $125.00.

Maurice Sonnenberg, 580 Fifth Avenue, New York, $25.00.

Sherman Claude, 30 Broad Street, New York, $375.00.

Martin S. Davis, 1501 Broadway, New York, $125.00.

Victor A. Kovner, 200 Park Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Robert J. McKean, 76 Overlook Place, Rye, N.Y., $100.00.

Edward M. Rappaport, 415 Beverly Road, Brooklyn, N.Y., $100.00.

Blossom Heller, 26 Court Street, Brooklyn, N.Y., $100.00.

Morton J. Levine, 115 Lincoln Road, Brooklyn, N.Y., $50.00.

Barry H. Serper, 277 Broadway, N.Y., N.Y., $125.00.

Stanley J. Reiben, 160 Broadway, N.Y., N.Y., $125.00.

Richard Mende, 33 West 42nd Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Harry E. Gould, Jr., 1088 Fifth Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $500.00.

Emanuel Lewis Greene, 405 Lexington Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

John J. Phelan, Jr., 44 Wall St., N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Paul P. Rao, Jr., 33 West 42nd Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

E. Sweburne, 150 East 61st St., N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Anthony C. Taccetta, Jr., Clifton, New Jersey, $200.00.

James Corines, 52 Broadway, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

R. A. Brecher, 14 Barclay Road, Scarsdale, N.Y., $2,000.00.

E. T. Pulaski, 8 Park Place, Mt. Vernon, N.Y., $2,000.00.

Lawrence Sovik, 805 Demong Drive, Syracuse, N.Y., $1,000.00

Jacob Blaustein, American Building, Baltimore, Md., $2,000.00.

Mr. and Mrs. Sam Harris, 120 Broadway, N.Y., N.Y., $2,000.00.

Al Goetz, 575 Park Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $1,000.00.

Joseph Ende, 65 Walker Street, Malvern, N.Y., $125.00.

Cohen and Simonsen, 25 Broad Street, N.Y., N.Y., $25.00.

Neil Sellin, 80 Pine Street, N.Y., N.Y., $125.00.

Orin Lehman, 118 East 65th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $500.00.

Richard Brandt, 33 West 42nd Street, N.Y., N.Y., $200.00.

Barbara Santangelo, 33 West 42nd Street, N.Y., N.Y., $200.00.

Jerry Finkelstein, 230 Park Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $1,000.00.

Norman Robbins, 1600 Broadway, N.Y., N.Y., $125.00.

Alan Robbins, 115 Central Park West, N.Y., N.Y., $125.00.

Abraham J. Briloff, 30 Broad Street, N.Y., N.Y., $125.00.

Michael Stewart, 729 Seventh Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $125.00.

Kenneth Greengrass, 729 Seventh Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $125.00.

Mrs. Bruce Zenkel, 33 Meadow Road, Scarsdale, N.Y., $125.00.

Eric Pleskow, 729 Seventh Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $125.00.

E. H. Ezxes, 555 Madison Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Joel W. Schenker, 60 East 42nd Street, N.Y., N.Y., $125.00.

(May 15, 1964)

Harold F. Linder, 1901 24th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., $2,000.00.

Dr. Ernest F. Muller, 196 East 75th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $10.00.

Armond Bartos, 155 East 72nd Street, N.Y., N.Y., $2,000.00.

Gerard Oestreicher, 6 East 23rd Street, N.Y., N.Y., $1,000.00.

Frank Karelsen III, 230 Park Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $1,000.00.

Elinor S. Gimbel, 163 East 78th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $2000.00.

Henry C. Lemle, 1107 Fifth Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

Ralph E. Ablon, 728 Park Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

Mr. & Mrs. H. F. Fischbach, 4 Sutton Place, N.Y., N.Y., $6000.00.

Anthony B. Akers, 920 Fifth Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

Sol Shor, 880 Fifth Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $2000.00.

(May 18, 1964)

Chester H. Roth, 425 Fifth Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

Dr. S. A. Dispenza, 208 West State Street, Albion, N.Y., $1000.00

Frank Altschul, 730 Fifth Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

Robert E. Simon, Jr., 250 West 57th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $2000.00.

Fowler Hamilton, Robin Hill Road, Greenwich, Conn., $1000.00.

Thomas J. Watson, Jr., 590 Madison Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $1,000.00.

Dorothy H. Hirshorn, 511 Park Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

Arthur G. Altschul, 993 Fifth Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

Frank P. Graham, 310 East 44th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $25.00.

Harper Sibley, Jr., 550 East Main Street, Rochester, N.Y., $2000.00.

(May 19, 1964)

J. Raymond Jones, 1732 Amsterdam Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

Howard Samuels, Smith Road, Canandaigua, N.Y., $1000.00.

S. Joseph Tankoos, Jr., 635 Madison Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

David D. Wallerstein, 60 East 42nd Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Mr. & Mrs. Richard A. Eisner, 301 East 47th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $125.00.

Frederic S. Berman, 46 East 91st Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Harry Hathaway, 888 Sarbonne, Los Angeles, Calif., $3000.00.

Norman Uris, 1486 Watson Avenue, Bronx, N.Y., $100.00.

Stratford C. Wallace, 18 Tuttle Avenue, Spring Lake, N.J., $100.00.

Peter Swords, 535 East 72nd Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Walter A. Lynch, Jr., 62 Beacon Hill Road, Port Washington, New York, $100.00.

Manuel Messing, 187 Lexington Avenue, Freeport, N.Y., $200.00.

Q. A. Shaw McKean, Jr., River Road, Rumson, New Jersey, $125.00.

Stephen H. Herzfeld, 200 East 36th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $325.00.

Mohun C. Peabody, 120 Broadway, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

P. S. Zuckerman, 30 Broad Street, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

Saul S. Herzfeld, 295 Fifth Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $2500.00.

N. E. Herzfeld, 295 Fifth Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $2500.00.

Gerald Herzfeld, 295 Fifth Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $2500.00.

Helen Hertz Hexter, 4777 Pine Tree Drive, Miami Beach, Fla., $1000.00.

Howard Samuels, 120 Broadway, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

Jerome Kohlberg, Jr., 4 Quarry Road, Larchmont, N.Y., $200.00.

Mr. and Mrs. David R. Baker, 222 East 80th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $125.00.

Morton J. Schrader, 530 Seventh Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $125.00.

Salvator Milazzo III, 8885 15th Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y., $125.00.

Ellsworth A. Whitney, 250 West 57th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Albert J. Petcavage, 250 East 65th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Michael Bennehum, 65 Central Park West, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Curtis E. Calde, Horizon Oil and Gas Works, Dallas, Tex., $100.00.

Mrs. William J. Manning, 36 Osborne Road, Garden City, N.Y., $25.00.

Gerald L. Herzfeld, 295 Fifth Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

N. E. Herzfeld, 295 Fifth Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

Arthur M. McGinness, 20 Pine Street, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

Local # 318 International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulfite, and Paper Mill Workers, 853 Broadway, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

Folding Box, Corrugated Box and Display Workers Union, Local # 381, New York, New York, $1000.00.

Samuel Rubin, 9 East 64th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

John P. Botti, 132 Wichham Avenue, Middletown, N.Y., $1000.00.

Stanley J. Garfinkel, 50 Riverside Drive, N.Y., N.Y., $200.00.

Kenneth Steinreich, 500 Fifth Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $1000.00.

Matthew J. Feeney, 68–13 Ovals Head Court, Brooklyn, N.Y., $10.00.

Mrs. E. Dubin, 234 West 48th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $10.00.

Peter H. Kaminer, 830 Park Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Anna K. Danies, 322 West 72nd Street, N.Y., N.Y., $10.00.

Joseph Weitz, 65–61 Parsons Blvd., Flushing, N.Y., $10.00.

Harold H. Hoohman, 18 Stuyvesant Oval, N.Y., N.Y., $10.00.

Rhoda Hellman, 167 East 82nd Street, N.Y., N.Y., $10.00.

Sanford A. Roth, 381 Broad Street, Newark, N.J., $20.00.

Mr. and Mrs. Dallas Sherman, 830 Park Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $20.00.

Phoebe Hudson, 10 Fairview Avenue, Westwood, N.J., $20.00.

Michael D. Buckley, 202 West 96th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $20.00.

John B. King, 24 Red Oak Lane, White Plains, N.Y., $25.00.

James Martina, 130 Main Street, Dansville, N.Y., $200.00.

Arthur C. Rutzen, 147 Country Village Lane, New Hyde Park, New York, $50.00.

Asher W. Schwartz, 501 Fifth Avenue, New York, $25.00.

Frederick C. Reiber, 605 East 14th Street, New York, $25.00.

Henrietta E. Olding, 400 Central Park West, New York, $25.00.

Joseph D. Barone, 108 Arbonne Drive, Syracuse, N.Y., $25.00.

Fazio L. Palumbo, 1543 Leland Avenue, Bronx, New York, $50.00.

E. J. Rhineschmidt, 99 Park Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $125.00.

Eva Schildt, 183 East 94th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $30.00.

Frederick E. Hackworth, 1 Jerem Avenue, Plainview, New York, $25.00.

George W. Sommer, 208 Centre Avenue, New Rochelle, N.Y., $50.00.

Enos A. Pyle, Savings Bank Building, Ithaca, N.Y., $100.00.

(May 20, 1964)

John E. Parker, 445 Fairfield Road, Stamford, Conn., $1,000.

Lucy Kaufman Broido, 20 Sutton Place South, N.Y., N.Y., $1,000.00.

James A. Farley, 301 Park Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $1,000.00.

Crane Haussman, 40 Central Park South, N.Y., N.Y., $2,000.00.

E. Adams, 65–61 Saunders Street, Forest Hills, New York, $1,000.00

Leon Tempelsman, 529 Fifth Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $1,000.00.

(May 21, 1964)

Henry Garfinkle, 131 Varick Street, N.Y., N.Y., $1,000.00.

James S. Abrams, 1035 Fifth Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $1,000.00.

Andre Meyer, Mr. and Mrs., 44 Wall Street, N.Y., N.Y., $3,000.00.

Felix G. Rohatyn, 1125 Park Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $2,000.00.

Walter Freid, 140 Lovell Road, New Rochelle, N.Y., $2,000.00.

Joseph L. Weiner, 301 East 66th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $2,000.00.

Raymond S. Troubh, 390 First Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $1,000.00.

Marvin Rosenberg, 260 Fifth Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $1,000.00.

Thomas A. Coleman, 11 Wall Street, N.Y., N.Y., $200.00.

John A. Coleman, Jr., 11 Wall Street, N.Y., N.Y., $300.00.

Jay M. Fried, 345 West 58th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $125.00.

Herbert Lawrence, 11 Mark Lane, N.Y., N.Y., $125.00.

Michael Palin, 16 Sutton Place, N.Y., N.Y., $125.00.

Seymour Weissman, 725 DeLavan Street, Teaneck, N.J., $125.00.

Seymour Weissman, 19 Maytime Court, Jericho, N.Y., $125.00.

Stephen S. Girard, 50 Broadway, N.Y., N.Y., $125.00.

Joseph B. Rosenblatt, 544 East 86th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $50.00.

Rennold Wacht, 544 East 86th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $50.00.

James Cohen, 601 East 20th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Thomas T. Stafford, 49 East 96th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Paul Smith, 339 Main Street, Torrington, Conn., $125.00.

Bryan Webb, 222 East 71st Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Peter J. Coleman, 25 Broad Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00

Lester J. Blumenthal, Trinity Pass, Pound Ridge, N.J., $100.00.

Harold Nankin, 27 East 13th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Dorothy Parisi, 315 East 69th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Burton Chait, Putman Valley, New York, $100.00.

Stephen J. Heyman, 642 Fifth Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Alvin Rosen, 5 Hanover Square, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Jeanne Rosenthal, 2 East 72nd Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Timothy J. Cooney, 93 Worth Street, N.Y., N.Y., $125.00.

David H. Larson, 142–29 Oak Avenue, Flushing, N.Y., $100.00.

Sidney Meyers, 73–61 217th Street, Bayside, N.Y., $100.00.

Stanley R. Lee, 195 Willoughby Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y., $100.00.

Eugene L. Case, 119 West 71st Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

James H. Graham, 20 West 43rd Street, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Aaron Erlich, 320 Riverside Drive, N.Y., N.Y., $100.00.

Mrs. E. R. Eisen, 139 East 35th Street, N.Y., N.Y., $25.00.

Mrs. M. D. Robbins, 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, N.Y., N.Y., $25.00.

Mrs. Matthew Lifflander, 660 Madison Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $25.00

Mrs. Frederic S. Berman, 46 East 91st Street, N.Y., N.Y., $25.00.

Andries D. Woudhuysen, Puritan Road, Rye, New York, $125.00.

Walter P. Stern, 60 Broad Street, New York, $125.00.

Richard L. Weill, 60 Broad Street, New York, $125.00.

Joseph M. Kircheimer, 60 Broad Street, New York, $125.00.

Jon M. Burnham, 60 Broad Street, New York, $125.00.

I. W. Burnham, 2nd, 60 Broad Street, New York, $125.00.

Theodore J. Israel, Jr., 11 Wall Street, New York, $300,00.

Charles H. Gross, 5 Hanover Square, New York, $250.00.

Travers and Hume, 120 Broadway, New York, $500.00.

Walter Frank, Jr., 61 Broadway, New York, $1,000.00.

J. J. Snyder, New York, New York, $200.00.

Thomas J. Carroll, Valley Road, Glen Cove, New York, $100.00.

Thomas C. Kean, New York, New York, $100.00.

Sean P. Keating, New York, New York, $100.00.

Irene L. Murphy, New York, New York, $100.00.

Mildred A. O'Doherty, 17 Stuyvesant Oval, New York, $100.00.

John Q. Sheehan, New York, New York, $100.00.

Anthony V. Stoeckert, New York, New York, $100.00.

Louis M. Trivisone, New York, New York, $100.00.

M. T. Burchie, 160 Greenleaf Ave., Staten Island, N.Y., $50.00.

I. J. Canale, 84 Navesink Avenue, Rumson, N.J., $50.00.

Victor Nottingham, 104 Eisenhower Drive, Yonker, N.Y., $50.00.

Bernard Peitzer, Brooklyn, New York, $50.00.

Peter Ruggiero, 33–35 14th Street, Long Island City, N.Y., $50.00.

Walter J. Shanley, 660 North Drye Ave., West Islip, N.Y., $50.00.

William Aninowsky, New York, New York, $25.00.

Arthur P. Carucci, 2221 Westervelt Avenue, Bronx, N.Y., $25.00.

Albert R. Estler, Bayshore, New York, $25.00.

Seymour Fromm, Hampton Bays, New York, $25.00.

Myles J. Madigan, New York, New York, $25.00.

John P. Roach, 15 Kent Road, Glen Rock, N.J., $25.00.

David L. Weissberg, New York, New York, $25.00.

Harold Zierlee, New York, New York, $25.00.

Lou Cheknick, New York, New York, $25.00.

Irving Wolff, New York, New York, $25.00.

Dan Trenacosta, New York, New York, $25.00.

George Latherance, New York, New York, $25.00.

T. Cunningham, New York, New York, $25.00.

Al Schwartz, New York, New York, $25.00.

Bill Mills, New York, New York, $25.00.

Frank Viola, New York, New York, $50.00.

J. Kerivin, New York, New York, $50.00.

O. Liberman, New York, New York, $25.00.

Milt Hammerstein, New York, New York, $25.00.

Fritz Alfsen, 172 67th Street, Brooklyn, New York, $2,000.00.

John J. Flanagan, 120 Broadway, New York, $625.00.

Michael Rosenberg, 30 Broad Street, New York, $1,000.00.

Mr. & Mrs. Morris Schrier, 9 Cooper Road, Scarsdale, N.Y., $2,000.00.

Anna M. Rosenberg, 444 Madison Avenue, New York, $5,000.00.

Manhattan Bronx Postal Union, New York, New York, $500.00.

Jewish Postal Employees, New York, New York, $100.00.

Welfare League of the Bronx and Manhattan, Inc.

Broome County Dem. Comm., Binghamton, New York, $1,000.00.

Andre de Saint-Phalle, 230 Park Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $1,000.00.

(May 22, 1964)

Charles Luckman, Mr. and Mrs., 9220 Sunset Blvd., Los Angeles, Calif., $5,000.00.

Barthley L. Beach, Schenevus, New York, $200.00.

T. H. Edwards, 27 Veronica Pl., Brooklyn, N.Y., $100.00.

William C Greco, 17 Baldwin Ave., Port Edward, N.Y., $100.00.

W. Grant Mitchell, Monticello Hotel, Alexandria Bay, N.Y., $100.00.

Nicholas J. Rogers, Olean, N.Y. (line materials products), $100.00.

Leon Goldberg, 729 Seventh Avenue, N.Y., N.Y., $50.00.

James E. Pigott—V.A., 205 Carlton Drive, Syracuse, N.Y., $25.00.

Louis L. Bennett, 2001 Ave P, Brooklyn, N.Y., $10.00.

John F. Baldasty, 52–28 66th St., Maspeth, N.Y., $10.00.

E. Fargate, 35 West 82nd Street, New York, $10.00.

James A. Foy, 427 76th Street, North Bergen, N.J., $10.00.

A. Elsie Lash, 225 West 15th Street. New York, $10.00.

C. Robert Miller, 111 Old Tarrytown Road, New York, $20.00.

Adrian P. Rosso, Vestal Apartments, Vestal, N.Y., $10.00.

Beonislaus Tencza, 389 Beame Road, Mineola, New York, $10.00.

Harold P. Wisdor, 50 Lemeklin Road, Whitesboro, N.Y., $20.00.

Harold K. Hochschild, 1270 Sixth Avenue, New York, $1,000.00.

Edwin L. Weisl, Jr., 120 Broadway, New York, $1,000.00.

Alexander Abraham, 120 Broadway, New York, $125.00.

George H. Hyman, Jr., 120 Broadway, New York, $125.00.

Sidney R. Winters, 120 Broadway, New York, $125.00.

Ruth E. Kahn, 120 Boardway, New York, $125.00.

J. Bleibtreu, 120 Broadway, New York, $125.00.

Henry G. Freidlander, 221 West 57th Street, New York, $300.00.

George M. Cohen, 52 Wall Street, New York, $125.00.

Raymond T. Hersh, 127 West 96th Street, New York, $100.00.

Mark K. Benenson, 521 Fifth Avenue, New York, $100.00.

Tom A. Liese, 120 Broadway, New York, $100.00.

Graham Williams, 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, $100.00.

Irving G. Kaufman, 120 Boardway, New York, $50.00.

Mary Leone, 155 East 49th St., New York, $1000.00.

Daniel M. Pilot, 60 East 96th Street, New York, $125.00.

S. M. Peck, 120 Broadway, New York, $250.00.

H. W. Sierck, 111 Broadway, New York, $125.00.

Morton Schnapp, 420 East 79th Street, New York, $125.00.

Peter H. Lewis, Nob Hill Road, Wilton, Conn., $125.00.

Irwin Dickman, 729 Seventh Avenue, New York, $125.00.

Herbert T. Schottenfeld, 729 Seventh Avenue, New York, $125.00.

Leonard Rubin, 361 Eton St., Englewood, N.J., $125.00.

Fred Goldberg, 729 Seventh Avenue, New York, $125.00.

Peter P. Nitze, 20 Exchange Place, New York, $100.00.

Anthony J. Gioia, 89 Canal St., Rochester N.Y., $1000.00.

Morris M. Schrier, 120 Broadway, New York, $500.00.

Louis Hernandez, New York, New York, $100.00.

Irving Katz, 50 Broadway, New York, $1,000.00

David Picker, 729 Seventh Avenue, New York, $125.00.

Charles Israel, 1333 Broadway, New York $175.00.

Donald Oresman, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, $100.00.

Richard F. Burke, 3205 Beverly Road, Brooklyn, N.Y., $100.00.

Burton Marks, 12 Sheppard St., Rockville Centre, N.Y., $125.00.

Richard Rosenblatt, 625 Madison Avenue, New York, $100.00.

Robert Jablow, 1046 Channel Road, Hewlett Harbor, N.Y., $125.00.

Jerome B. Shulman, 15 Thixton Drive, Hewlett Harbor, N.Y., $125.00.

Joseph S. Kushner, 192-24 64th Circle, Fresh Meadows, New York, $125.00.

Jay S. Bresler, 176 East 71st Street, New York, $125.00.

Samuel H. Lindenbaum, 16 Court Street, Brooklyn, N.Y., $125.00.

Michael F. Mayer, 30 East 40th Street, N.Y., $75.00.

Donald W. Kramer, 46 Hawley Street, Binghamton, N.Y., $1000.00.

Westchester County Dem. Committee, 48 Mamaroneck Avenue, White Plains, New York, $300.00.

Lewis M. Willing, 35 James Street, Hastings on Hudson, New York, $125.00.

Gabe Sumner, 729 Seventh Avenue, New York, $125.00.

Warner LeRoy, 157 East 64th Street, New York, $100.00.

Jack Tierman, 1697 Broadway, New York, $125.00.

Sweard I. Benjamin, 729 Seventh Avenue, New York, $125.00.

William Ward, Jr., 1 Bruce Court, Suffern, N.Y., $125.00.

Mr. & Mrs. Edwin L. Weisl, 120 Broadway, New York, $6000.00.

(May 25, 1964)

Mrs. David Susskind, 1125 Fifth Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

Wayne Cawley, Endicott, New York, $1000.00.

Stanley J. Harte, 230 Park Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

Giles Wanamaker, 660 Madison Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

Cormack Cochran, 12th and Cumberland Sts., Allentown, Pa., $1000.00.

Mr. and Mrs. Hubert Allen, Jr., 30 Broad Street, New York, $2000.00.

Harry Michaels, 30 Broad Street, New York, $1000.00.

Murray Laven, 30 Broad Street, New York, $1000.00.

Mr. and Mrs. Joseph P. Levine, Time and Life Building, New York, $5000.00.

David J. Greene, New York, New York, $500.00.

Joseph A. Martino, 111 Broadway, New York, $1000.00.

Carmine G. DeSapio, New York, New York, $1000.00.

Mary W. Lasker, 29 Beekman Pl., New York, $1000.00.

Harry Levine, 108 Exeter Street, Brooklyn, N.Y., $1000.00.

Saul Spielberg, 1306 Washington, St. Louis, Mo., $250.00.

Eli Spielberg, 1306 Washington Ave., St. Louis, Mo., $250.00.

Jack Hausman, 10 East 32nd Street, New York, $2000.00.

Leonore Cogliandro, 445 Wooddale Ave., Staten Island, New York, $4000.00.

Morris Morgenstern, Excelsior Club, Brooklyn, N.Y., $1000.00.

Alvin Dworman, 65 West 55th Street, New York, $1000.00.

Dworman Associates, 65 West 55th Street, New York, $1000.00.

Irving Lessen, 712 Empire Building, Syracuse, N.Y., $1000.00.

Mr. and Mrs. Edwin Weisl, Jr., 120 Broadway, New York, $4000.00.

Albert E. Perry, 3253 38th Street, Long Island, City, New York, $1000.00.

Daniel Flynn, 26 Broadway, New York, $2000.00.

Victor L. Anfuso, Jr., 70 Pine Street, New York, $1000.00.

Max L. Shulman, 510 Fulton Street, Brooklyn, N.Y., $1000.00.

Abraham Kraditor, 38 Park Row, New York, $1000.00.

Carl H. Abraham, 60 West 57th Street, New York, $1000.00.

Louis Wolfe, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

Fortune Pope, 136 West 52nd Street, New York, $1000.00.

Joseph H. Wasserman, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

John Ventre, Syracuse, New York, $1000.00.

Sidney Gondelman, 932 Broadway, New York, $1000.00.

Jerome Parker, 11 Broadway, New York, $1000.00.

Charles E. Catalano, 1818 Dutch Broadway, Elmont, N.Y., $1000.00.

Philip A. Kimball, 310 West End Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

Michael Bennahum, 66 Central Park West, New York, $25.00.

Westchester County Democratic Committee, 48 Mamaroneck Ave., White Plains, New York, $1350.00.

Lionel I. Pincus, 525 Park Avenue, New York, $500.00.

Irving H. Sherman, 60 Broad Street, New York, $100.00.

Carlisle and Jacquelin, New York, New York, $700.00.

Mr. and Mrs. Alan H. Kalmus, 410 East 57th Street, New York, $200.00.

Joseph A. Fallon, 2445 P. Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., $100.00.

Vincent T. McCarthy, 165 Beach 129th Street, Belle Harbour, N.Y., $100.00.

Louis Moskowitz, 67-66 108th Street, Forest Hills, New York, $100.00.

Jules N. Bloch, 32 Claidet Way, Eastchester, New York, $100.00.

A. Chester Safian, 120 Broadway, New York, $125.00.

Benjamin S. Richman, 1359 Broadway, New York, $100.00.

Benjamin S. Richman, 1359 Broadway, New York, $25.00.

Donald S. Tracy, 150 Broadway, New York, $125.00.

Stanley Wantola, 85-30 106th Street, Richmond Hill, N.Y., $100.00.

Marion Cohen, 2 Horatio Street, New York, $100.00.

John W. Gracik, 230 East 51st Street, New York, $100.00.

Ralph Schlesinger, 355 East 198th Street, Bronx, N.Y., $100.00.

John A. Schneider, 54-17 31st Avenue, Woodside, N.Y. $100.00.

Estelle Knapp, 141 East 25th Street, New York, $100.00.

Charles M. Spano, 20-12 49th Street, Astoria, N.Y., $100.00.

Jules Steiner, 655 Madison Avenue, New York, $100.00.

Louis Wolfe, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, $100.00.

Louis Sams, 1562 Hoe Avenue, Bronx, N.Y., $50.00.

James F. Dulligan, 150-08 34th Avenue, Flushing, N.Y., $50.00.

John R. Glassford, 15 Pleasant Avenue, Hastings-on-Hudson, N.Y., $25.00.

Frank J. Kilcullen, Jr., 15 Tipton Avenue, Loudonville, N.Y., $25.00.

James Larson, 55 Hanson Place, Brooklyn, N.Y., $25.00.

Fitzgerald Phillips, 270 Convent Avenue, New York, $25.00.

Richard Swanson, Jr., 29 Columbia Turnpike, Florham Park, N.J., $25.00

Edward T. Dunleavy, 127 West 96th Street, New York, $25.00.

John J. Hogan, 905 Foster Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y., $25.00.

Joseph A. Daly, 22 Hillcrest Court, Staten Island, N.Y., $25.00.

John Baker, 405 West 23rd Street, New York, $20.00.

William E. Hendron, 149 Girard Ave., Hartford, Conn., $20.00.

William A. Rowland, 41-42 50th Street, Woodside, N.Y., $20.00.

Andrew Vignali, 147-10 84th Road, Jamaica, N.Y., $20.00.

Charles M. Harden, 49 Continental Ave., Forest Hills, N.Y., $10.00.

Arthur H. Anderson, 113 Wilson Ave., Rutherford, N.J., $10.00.

Esther M. Brown, 2107 Seventh Ave., New York, $10.00.

John Freeman, 110 East 99th Street, New York, $10.00.

Robert J. Hagler, 6901 Northern Blvd., Jackson Heights, New York, $10.00.

Alfred Tayne, 77-35 250th Street, Bellrose, N.Y., $10.00.

Dr. Albert Speed, 205 East 78th Street, N.Y., $10.00.

Roslyn Simeone, 350 First Avenue, New York, $10.00.

Joseph B. O'Connor, 1225 Park Avenue, New York, $10.00.

Bruce Klang, 255-47 148th Drive, New York, $10.00.

Larry Alan Cantor, 500 St. Johns Place, Brooklyn, N.Y., $10.00.

Clifford Henke, 40-29 99th ST., Corona, N.Y., $10.00.

Walter H. Frank, 61 Broadway, New York, $1,000.00.

Amalgamated Political Ed. Committee, 15 Union Square, New York, $2,000.00.

Joseph T. Sullivan, 19 West 44th Street, New York, $1,000.00.

Building Service Employees International, 900 17th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., $200.00.

Francis J. Quillinan, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, $2000.00.

Edwin A. Tennant, Jr., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, $2,000.00.

Jean R. Kinter, 817 Fifth Avenue, New York, $2,000.00.

George M. Bragalini, P.O. Box 932, New York, $1,000.00.

George M. Bragalini, P.O. Box 932, New York, $1,000.00.

R. Keith Kane, 121 East 78th Street, N.Y., $1,000.00.

Henry Ford II, Dearborn, Michigan, $1,000.00.

John A. Coleman, 11 Wall Street, New York, $1,000.00.

Jack Rapoport, 200 Park Avenue, New York, $1,000.00.

Charles A. Miller, 598 Madison Avenue, New York, $2,000.00.

Richard E. Koffman, 47–49 Chenango Street, Binghamton, N.Y., $1,000.00.

M. J. Meehan, 30 Broad Street, New York, $1,000.00.

George H. Bookbinder, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, $1,000.00.

J. Y. Resnik, Box 25, Ellenville, N.Y., $1000.00.

Robert L. Hoguet, Jr., 399 Park Avenue, New York, $2000.00.

M. Harmon Nemetz, 845 Third Avenue, New York, $1300.00.

Walter A. Cantwell, 100 Park Avenue, New York, $2000.00.

John T. Garrity, 100 East 42nd Street, New York, $1000.00.

Mrs. Herbert H. Lehman, 820 Park Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

James L. Garrity, 200 East 42nd Street, New York, $1000.00.

John Q. Adams, 525 West Street, New York, $2000.00

Dean S. Fleming, 168 Ridge Street, Glens Falls, New York, $25.00.

Barthly L. Beach, Schenevus, New York, $200.00.

Robert J. Smith, 1 Glendale, Albany, New York, $100.00.

James E. Reinde, East View Lane, Old Brookville, New York, $200.00.

Lester Eisner, Jr., 1095 Park Avenue, New York, $100.00.

Thomas A. Vitanza, 6 South Broad Street, Norwich, N.Y., $100.00.

Ralph D. Williams, 4 West 43rd Street, New York, $100.00.

Louis Paul Nestel, 711 Third Ave., New York $50.00.

Edward J. Byrnes, 2400 Sedgewick Avenue, New York, $50.00.

Andrew Semon, 4 Speaker St., Comack, N.Y., $25.00.

Mary D'Alessandro, 35–50 32nd St., Long Island City, N.Y., $20.00.

Joseph Thompson, Esq., 217 Broadway, N.Y., $20.00.

Burton Cohen, 350 First Ave., N.Y., $10.00.

Meyer J. Rosenstock, 2171 Bragg St., Brooklyn, N.Y., $10.00.

John S. Wojtowicz, 612 Flatbush Ave., Brooklyn, N.Y., $5.00.

Harold M. Clay, 5 Point Place, Hyde Park, N.Y., $100.00.

Milton M. Farber, 141 East 3rd St., New York, $100.00.

Louis H. Resnick, 1745 East 16th Street, Brooklyn, New York, $100.00.

Louis Wolfe, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, $150.00.

Benjamin D. Skurnick, 1112 Carroll Place, New York, $25.00.

Thomas Flanagan, 313 East 13th Street, New York, $10.00.

Charles S. Kichler, 51 Riverview Ave., Ardsley, N.Y., $10.00.

Matthew P. Janiero, 80–06 35th Avenue, Jackson Heights, New York, $10.00.

Charles Pillman, 21–10 33 Road, Long Island City, New York, $20.00.

Rose Noonan, 622 Magnolia Ave., Elizabeth, N.J., $20.00.

Alexander Gross, Hotel New Yorker, 34th St. & 8th Avenue, New York, $25.00.

Charles M. Hart, 220 East 42nd Street, New York, $50.00.

Sidney A. Wexler, 85 Fourth Avenue, New York, $50.00.

Joel Berger, 927 Livingston Hall, Columbia University, New York, $30.00.

Mrs. Florence Cocino, 38 Sherwood Avenue, Madison, N.J., $30.00.

Raymond B. Curran, 327 Winchester Ave., Staten Island, New York, $25.00.

Ralph R. DiBiase, 76 Watchogue Road, Staten Island, New York, $25.00.

Laburn L. Greene, 54–32 66th Street, Maspeth, N.Y., $20.00.

Ernest Lewis Grossman, 133–01 228th Street, Laurelton, New York, $20.00.

Louis Birnbaum, 157 East 81st Street, New York, $10.00.

John A. Crudo, 99–17 211 St., Queens Village, New York, $10.00.

Martin D. Freier, 570 Stanley Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y., $10.00.

Michael C. Juliano, 51 East Allison Avenue, Pearl River, New York, $10.00.

Irving Klieman, 2825 Olinville Avenue, Bronx, N.Y., $10.00.

Thomas F. Rowe, Jr., Old Peacock Road, Pearl River, N.Y., $10.00.

Mrs. Elsie B. Yvon, 1640 Metropolitan Avenue, Bronx, N.Y., $10.00.

James M. Friery, 443 Chestnut St., Oneonta, N.Y., $20.00.

State Political Action Fund, 15 Union Square, New York, $500.00.

Uniformed Firemans Assn. of Greater NY Local 94, 225 Broadway, New York, $500.00.

Local 144 Hotel and Allied Service Employees Union AFL–CIO, 797 Eighth Avenue, New York, $100.00.

Jerome Parker, 11 Broadway, New York, $1000.00.

Erdman and Anthony, 82 St. Paul St., Rochester, N.Y., $200.00.

N.Y. Letter Carriers Assn., 255 West 43rd St., N.Y., $200.00.

William P. Carr, 3804 Greystone Ave., Bronx, N.Y., $100.00.

Ruth F. Doyle, Glen Cove, New York, $100.00.

Henry R. Jackson, 224 Lewis Ave., Brooklyn, N.Y., $100.00.

Samuel W. Blas, New York, New York, $50.00.

William M. Doliner, 2407 Morris Avenue, Bronx, N.Y., $50.00.

Henry Levitt, 2095 Creston Ave., Bronx, N.Y., $50.00.

Joseph Napoli, 1522 Kimberly Ct., Wantaugh, N.Y., $50.00.

Harold Deas, 48 Garretson Road, White Plains, New York., $50.00.

Mr. & Mrs. J. Romanelli, 1969 West 5th Street, Brooklyn, N.Y., $50.00.

John R. Strachman, New York, New York, $50.00.

David Zuckerman, 1535 Ocean Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y., $50.00.

Joseph Kline, 16 Elm Place, Great Neck, N.Y., $30.00.

N. Albanese, 215 Park Row, New York, $25.00.

Carl T. Bignon, New York, New York, $25.00.

Thomas DiBlasi, 57–40 157th St., Flushing, N.Y., $25.00.

Victor J. Dumb, 3 Hollywood Court, Far Rockaway, New York, $25.00.

Abraham H. Jacobwitz, 125 Brighton 11th St., Brooklyn, New York, $25.00.

Mrs. Morris M. Kreppel, 3915 Orloff Ave., Bronx. N.Y., $25.00.

Frank Lawther, Franklin Square, New York, $25.00.

Henry A. Pauly, New York, New York, $25.00.

Sylburn A. Peterkin, New York, New York, $25.00.

Albert S. Razzetto, 1547 Commonwealth Ave., Bronx, N.Y., $25.00.

Emory L. Russel, Sr., 940 St. Nicholas Ave, N.Y., $25.00.

John Vandergroff, 45 Tiemann Place, New York, $25.00.

Dorothy E. Williams, New York, New York, $25.00.

Morris Kimmelman, New York, New York, $20.00.

Martin Anolick, 455 East 14th St., N.Y., $10.00.

Harry L. Becht, 84 Davidson Ave., Oceanside, N.Y., $10.00.

Henry Bondell, Hampton Bays, New York, $10.00.

Vincent P. Cafarella, 86 Shore View Drive, Yonkers, N.Y., $10.00.

Julius Lampert, New York, New York, $10.00.

Henry Rossin, Syracuse, New York, $10.00.

John F. Ward, Babylon, New York, $10.00.

Leon A. Wheeler, 2517 99th St., Elmhurst, N.Y., $10.00.

Henry Warnken, Jr., 25–42 42nd Street, Astoria, N.Y., $10.00.

Mario Cecconi, 1950 Hutchinson River Pkwy., Bronx, New York, $10.00.

Floyd Kviatkwiski, Owego, New York, $100.00.

Arthur I. Seld, Waterloo, New York, $100.00.

R. Swartwood, Spencer, New York, $100.00.

Robert Williams Plass, Poughkeepsie, New York, $100.00.

Robert J. Roulan, 68 Castle St., Geneva, New York, $100.00.

(May 26, 1964)

Frank Daido, Hotel Martinque, New York, $50.00.

Gus Monsanto, New York, New York, $25.00.

Dan Cummings, New York, New York, $10.00.

John Flynn, New York, New York, $10.00.

Jack McGinnis, New York, New York, $25.00.

Jack Rick, New York, New York, $25.00.

C. Gorman, New York, New York, $400.00.

Arnold M. Picker, Mr. & Mrs., 729 Seventh Ave., New York, $5000.00.

David B. Charney, 250 Park Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

William A. Shea, 41 East 42nd St., New York, $1000.00.

Kings County Dem. Dinner Com., 44 Court Street, Brooklyn, N.Y., $1000.00.

Kings County Dem. Dinner Com., 44 Court Street, Brooklyn, N.Y., $4000.00.

John J. Lynch, Brooklyn, New York, $1000.00.

Norman K. Winston, Mr. & Mrs., 22 West 48th Street, N.Y., $5000.00.

Milton A. Gilbert, Mr. & Mrs., 3755 Henry Hudson Pkwy., Riverside, N.Y., $5000.00.

Charles P. McColough, Rochester, New York, $2000.00.

John Dollonger, Rochester, New York, $1000.00.

William A. Shea, 41 East 42nd St., New York, $1000.00.

Herbert M. Singer, 10 East 56th Street, New York, $3000.00.

Mrs. Herbert M. Singer, 10 East 56th Street, New York, $2000.00.

Seymour J. Greenberg, New York, New York, $1000.00.

Harvey A. Wolff, 508 St. Paul St., Rochester, N.Y., $1000.00.

Julius Morrison, 200 Hudson Street, N.Y., $1000.00.

United Steel Workers of America Political Action Fund, Washington, D.C., $2000.00.

U.A.W. Comm. on Political Education, 8000 East Jefferson Ave., Detroit, Mich., $1000.00.

Harry Brandt, 240 West 42nd Street, N.Y., $1000.00.

Alexander F. Carson, 28 Watkins Drive, Oneonta, N.Y., $1000.00.

William J. Brown, 1999 Mt. Read, Rochester, N.Y., $1000.00.

Theodore W. Kheel, 477 Madison Ave., N.Y., $2000.00.

Eliot Hyman, 200 Park Avenue, N.Y., $2000.00.

N. W. Levin, 660 Madison Avenue, N.Y., $1000.00.

Eugene J. Keogh, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, N.Y., $250.00.

Charles G. Bluhdorn, Time and Life Building, N.Y., $1000.00.

Elaine Burnell, 1575 St. Marks Ave., Bklyn., N.Y., $10.00.

Mrs. Allison Hargrove, 525 East 86th St., N.Y., $10.00.

Madeline Annibale, 1217 St. Lawrence Ave., Bronx, N.Y., $10.00.

T. R. Demsky, 71–54 162nd St., Flushing, N.Y., $10.00.

Paul F. Cirillo, 275 Seaman Ave., Freeport, N.Y., $10.00.

Herbert S. Steinman, 44 Centee Drive, New Hyde Park, N.Y., $10.00.

Charles E. Stiefel, 313 Long Branch Rd., Syracuse, N.Y., $10.00.

Robert B. Zelenko, 150 Bennett Ave., N.Y., $20.00.

Ernest L. Pritchett, 23 Overlook Ave., West Orange, N.J., $20.00.

Frank C. Brevetta, 1452 80th St., Brooklyn, N.Y., $20.00.

Mrs. Nora Saunders, 2 East 127th Street, N.Y., $20.00.

Horace Wilson, 3918 Wallace Street, Phila., Pa., $20.00.

Henry T. Wurzinger, Box 92, R.F.D. #3, Kingston, N.Y., $20.00.

Joseph G. Madonna, 630 Gramaton Ave., Mt. Vernon, N.Y., $25.00.

Herbert Levy, 342 West 84th St., N.Y., $25.00.

Nick M. Nibi, 130 Wadsworth Ave., N.Y., $25.00.

John J. Powers, Jr., 235 East 42nd St., N.Y., $50.00.

Harold M. Balin, 176 Milburn Ave., N.Y., $50.00

Lewis S. Bell, Interlaken, N.Y., $100.00.

William V. Levy, 128 Beechwood Ave., Mt. Vernon, N.Y., $100.00.

Brian Mannix, 42 Broadway, N.Y., $100.00.

Ralph J. Morhard, 527 West 238th St., N.Y., $100.00.

Milton G. Wheeler, 1 Washington Sq. Village, N.Y., $100.00.

Corr. Officers Benevolent Association, 800 Fordham Road, Bronx, N.Y., $200.00.

Eugene M. Lang, 100 East 42nd St., N.Y., $200.00.

Robert W. Seavey, 405 Lexington Ave., N.Y., $200.00.

Sam Lipani, Monroe County, 23 State St., Rochester, N.Y., $250.00.

Richard H. Seidman, Hartford, Conn., $140.00.

Michael Desmond, Eden, N.Y., $5.00.

Saul Seidman, Hartford, Conn., $10.00.

John Toma, 17 Beach St., Woodmont, Conn., $35.00.

Oswego County Dem. Comm., Oswego, N.Y., $250.00.

Billy Rose, 1347 Sixth Avenue, N.Y., $1000.00.

Wholesale Clerks Clothing Union, 45 East 17th Street, N.Y., $200.00.

Clothing Cutters Political Action Comm., 27 Union Square, N.Y., $200.00.

National Maritime Union of America, 346 West 17th Street, N.Y., $1000.00.

Retail Clothing Salesmen's Local #340 ACWA, 147 West 42nd Street, N.Y., $100.00.

(May 27, 1964)

Arthur K. Watson, 821 United Nations Plaza, N.Y., $1000.00.

Arnold Moran, Pocconock Trail, New Canan, Conn., $2000.00.

Jules C. Stein, 1330 Angelo Drive, Beverly Hills, California, $3000.00.

E. M. Simon, 342 Madison Avenue, N.Y., $1000.00.

Mr. and Mrs. Frank Fernandez, 320 East 65th St., N.Y., $2000.00.

Alfred A. Strelsin, Mr. & Mrs., 595 Madison Avenue, N.Y., $5000.00.

Robert H. O'Brien, 1040 Park Avenue, N.Y., $1000.00.

Barnett Quirk, Geneseo, New York, $200.00.

Robert Law, New York, New York, $100.00.

Isaac Shapiro, 285 Riverside Drive, New York, $25.00.

Barry Singer, 111 Broadway, New York, $25.00.

William H. Lendman, New York, New York, $25.00.

David Chasman, New York, New York, $50.00.

Nathaniel Cohen, 230 Crestwood Ave., South Orange, New Jersey, $100.00.

Victor F. Condello, 466 Lexington Avenue, N.Y., $100.00.

Donald A. Cook, 380 Riverside Drive, N.Y., $100.00.

A. L. Feiner, 44 East 32nd Street, N.Y., $100.00.

Arnold Ginsberg, 11 East 86th Street, N.Y., $100.00.

Milton D. Goldman, 29 Broadway, New York, $100.00.

James Heller, 985 Park Avenue, New York, $100.00.

Manny Kay, New York, New York, $100.00.

Jacob Korby, 60 Sutton Place Co., New York, $100.00.

Alfred T. Manacher, 21 East 94th Street, New York, $100.00.

M. Duke Manacher, 900 Fifth Avenue, New York, $100.00.

Alexander C. Naclerio, 2 June Court, White Plains, N.Y., $100.00.

Ewin B. Neale, Scarsdale, New York, $100.00.

Arthur Nestler, 350 Clarkston St., Brooklyn, N.Y., $100.00.

David Padwa, 25 East 86th Street, N.Y., $100.00.

Edward W. Pattison, 22 First Street, Troy, New York, $100.00.

Herbert P. Rickman, New York, New York, $100.00.

H. Ross, 111 Brodway, New York, $100.00.

Dan Schoen, 1800 Boston Road, New York, $100.00.

Murray J. Seigel, Newark, New Jersey, $100.00.

Barrie Simmons, 142 West 113th Street, New York, $100.00.

Julius Tantleff, 180 East End Avenue, New York, $100.00.

Herbert Zimmerman, 200 Central Park South, New York, $100.00.

Morton L. Ginsberg, 900 West End Avenue, New York, $125.00.

Harry C. Harris, 173 Riverside Drive, New York, $125.00.

Werner H. Kramarksy, 35 Sutton Place, New York, $125.00.

Richard Ravitch, 535 E. 86th Street, New York, $125.00.

Benjamin Schlesinger, 595 Madison Avenue, New York, $125.00.

Stuart G. Schwartz, New York, New York, $125.00.

Rawson L. Wood, New York, New York, $125.00.

Morris E. Lasker, 300 Millwood Road, Chappaqua, N.Y., $200.00.

Westchester County Dem. Committee, 48 Mamaroneck Ave., White Plains, New York, $300.00.

Jerome T. Orans, 22 East 36th Street, $25.00.

Frederick A. Schwartz, Jr., New York, New York, $50.00.

John Stockwell Samuels III, 152 Burns St., Forest Hill, N.Y., $50.00.

Thomas P. Bartle, Jr., 135 East 61st Street, New York, $100.00.

Henry I. Burr, 75 Varick Street, New York, $100.00.

Milton Fenster, 4 West 58th Street, New York, $100.00.

Dominick Peluso, 280 Broadway, New York, $100.00.

Dr. Grace L. Hewell, 485 Lenox Avenue, New York, $100.00.

Frederick L. Ehrman, 1 William Street, New York, $100.00.

H. J. Szold, New York, New York, $100.00.

Herman H. Kahn, New York, New York, $100.00.

Monroe C. Gutman, New York, New York, $100.00.

Marvin L. Levy, New York, New York, $100.00.

Frank J. Manheim, New York, New York, $100.00.

Paul E. Manheim, New York, New York, $100.00.

Paul M. Mazee, New York, New York, $100.00.

Morris Natelson, New York, New York, $100.00.

Jos. A. Thomas, New York, New York, $100.00.

A. D. Schulte, New York, New York, $100.00.

Henry A. Lambert, New York, New York, $100.00.

Alan Romm, 335 Old Army Rd., Scarsdale, N.Y., $100.00.

Robert A. Bernstein, 217 Broadway, New York, $125.00.

Paul E. Bragdon, 331 East 71st Street, New York, $125.00.

Matthew Domber, New York, New York, $125.00.

J. Feldman, 415 Madison Avenue, New York, $125.00.

Ralph H. Galpin, 510 E. 86th Street, New York, $125.00.

Bud H. Gibbs, 1 W. 81st Street, New York, $125.00.

Milton Goldstein, 137–05 68th Drive, Flushing, N.Y., $125.00.

Ruth Kotler, 723 E. 58th Street, Bklyn, N.Y., $125.00.

Wm. A. Kummer, New York, New York, $125.00.

Richard E. Leavitt, 16 Court Street, Brooklyn, N.Y., $125.00.

Robert Markewich, 51 Chambers St., N.Y., $125.00.

Maurice N. Nessen, 500 5th Avenue, N.Y., $125.00.

Philip Rose, 50 Central Park West, N.Y., $125.00.

John C. Russell, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, N.Y., $125.00

Emily M. Scheuer, 410 W. 24th St., N.Y., $125.00.

Jerome Tarnoff, 292 Madison Ave., N.Y., $125.00.

Henry D. Sedgwick, 434 E. 87th Street, N.Y., $125.00

Jacob B. Ward, 280 Broadway, N.Y., $125.00.

David Berg, 350 5th Avenue, N.Y., $200.00.

Benjamin Sonnenberg, 280 Park Avenue, N.Y., $250.00.

Albert A. Blinder, 598 Madison Avenue, N.Y., $350.00.

Saxe, Bacon and O'Shea, 598 Madison Avenue, N.Y., $350.00.

Wm. Rosenblatt, New York, New York, $500.00.

Edward S. Feldman, 270 Park Avenue, N.Y., $100.00.

Nathan M. Rudick, 711 Fifth Avenue, New York, $100.00.

Julian Bass, 205 West End Ave., N.Y., $125.00.

Gerald Levine, 1501 Broadway, New York, $125.00.

Lloyd G. Seidman, 150 E. 61st Street, New York, $125.00.

Arthur K. Delson, 120 E. 41st Street, New York, $100.00.

Aubrey Schenck, 466 So. Camden Drive, Beverly Hills, Calif., $100.00

Herman Kroll, 160 Varick Street, New York, $100.00.

Edward A. Wolpin, 200 East 57th Street, New York, $100.00.

George V. Leneas, New York, New York, $100.00.

Donald T. Regan, 830 Amies Lane, Bryn Manor, Pa., $800.00.

J. E. Thomson, New York, New York, $100.00.

Irwin Levy, 309 5th Avenue, New York, $100.00.

John Stockwell Samuels 3rd, 152 Buras St., Forest Hills, N.Y., $25.00.

Wm. H. Abrams, 5 Foster Ct., South Orange, N.J., $100.00.

Irwin Axelrod, 3215 Arlington Ave., Riverdale, New York, $125.00.

Seth Baker, 36 Wall Street, New York, $1000.00.

Burton D. Chait, Putnam Valley, New York, $25.00.

Robert Cook, New Rochelle, New York, $125.00.

Anthony G. DiFalco, 1 Washington Sq. Village, N.Y., $25.00.

Jordan J. Fingar, 16 Court Street, Bklyn., N.Y., $100.00.

Marvin Gelman, 3850 Hudson Manor Terrace, N.Y., $125.00.

Arnold L. Ginsburg, 11 East 86th Street, N.Y., $125.00.

Robert S. Feld, New York, New York, $125.00.

David Fromkin, 595 Madison Avenue, N.Y., $100.00.

Samuel B. Granirer, 70–20 108th Street, Forest Hills, New York, $100.00.

John Iannuzzi, 261 Broadway, New York, $125.00.

Stanley J. Kaufman, 565 E. 84th St., Bklyn., N.Y., $100.00.

Stanley J. Kaufman, 565 E. 84th St., Bklyn., N.Y., $25.00.

Adolph M. Kemper, New York, New York, $200.00.

Robert D. Lubash, 211 E. 53rd Street, N.Y., $125.00.

Dr. F. P. Mandina, 389 Ave. of Americas, N.Y., $100.00.

Harry E. Gould, Jr., 1008 5th Ave., N.Y., $25.00.

Westchester County Democratic Comm., 48 Mamaroneck Ave., White Plains, New York, $600.00.

Donald Oresman, 12 Hazel Lane, Larchmont, N.Y., $25.00.

Harvey Pohl, 277 Broadway, New York, $100.00.

Lawrence J. Resnick, 35 E. 75th Street, New York, $100.00.

Martin Rubenstein, Red Bank, New Jersey, $100.00.

Lewis A. Schein, 969 Park Avenue, New York, $25.00.

Alfred L. Schwartz, 171 W. 79th Street, New York, $100.00.

Vincent Sica, 340 E. 80th Street, New York, $125.00.

Barry E. Silverman, New Haven, Conn., $25.00.

Kenneth B. Smilen, 61 Broadway, New York, $100.00.

John R. Stern, 1225 Midland Avenue, Bronxville, New York, $125.00.

Lt. Stratford C. Wallace, New York, New York, $25.00.

Michael Washor, 16 Court Street, Brooklyn, N.Y., $125.00.

Michael Russakow, Roosevelt, New York, $50.00.

Blanche F. Ittleson, Hampshire House, New York, $1000.00.

Erie County Democratic Comm., Buffalo, New York, $2000.00.

Lansdale K. Christie, 70 Pine Street, New York, $100.00.

Louis Nizer, 1501 Broadway, N.Y., $2000.00.

Edward Greenfield, 16 E. 41st Street, N.Y., $1000.00.

Alexander Purdon, 1 Broadway, New York, $1000.00.

Paul E. Fitzpatrick, 1575 Clinton St., Buffalo, N.Y., $1000.00.

Thomas J. Deegan, Jr., Time and Life Building, N.Y., $1000.00.

J. Paul Austin, Coca-Cola Co., Atlanta, Ga., $1000.00.

Ovid R. Davis, Coca-Cola Co., Atlanta, Ga., $1000.00.

David B. Williams, Erwin, Wasey, Ruthrauff & Ryan, New York, $1000.00.

Walter H. Johnson, Jr., Prichard Wood Co., New York, $1000.00.

Fred L. Hartley, Union Oil Co., California, $1000.00.

James C. Wickersham, Communications Affiliates, N.Y., $1000.00.

Paul E. Foley, McCann-Erickson, New York, $1000.00.

Stuart D. Watson, McCann-Marschalk Co., New York, $1000.00.

Armando M. Sarmento, McCann-Erickson, New York, $1000.00.

International Long Shoremans Ass'n. AFL-CIO, 343 Court Street, Brooklyn, N.Y., $2000.00.

Mr. & Mrs. Robert Lehman, 625 Park Avenue, New York, $5000.00.

(May 28, 1964)

Isador Lubin, 1095 Park Avenue, New York, $50.00.

Adlai E. Stevenson, 799 United Nations Plaza, N.Y., $100.00.

Roger L. Stevens, 745 5th Avenue, New York, $2000.00.

Mr. & Mrs. James P. Wilmot, Rochester, New York, $5000.00.

(June 1, 1964)

Francis S. Levien, 200 Park Avenue, New York, $2000.00.

Harry E. Gould, 200 Park Avenue, New York, $2000.00.

Harold D. Uris, 850 Third Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

Wylie L. Tuttle, 261 Madison Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

Virgil Stark, 936 5th Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

Ted Shelton, Suffern, New York, $2000.00.

Herbert R. Silverman, 1290 Ave. of Americas, N.Y., $1000.00.

Theodore H. Silbert, 530 Fifth Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

J. S. Seidman, 80 Broad Street, New York, $1000.00.

Ralph E. Schneider, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, $1000.00.

Arnold Berman, 200 Park Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

Herman L. Blum, 20 5th Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

Lansdell K. Christie, 70 Pine Street, New York, $1000.00.

O. Roy Chalk, 375 Park Avenue, New York, $2000.00.

Maurice M. Clairmont, 635 Madison Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

Nathan Cummings, 135 S. La Salle St., Chicago, Ill., $1000.00.

Meyer Davis, 119 W. 57th Street, N.Y., $1000.00.

Larry Fisher, 6 E. 45th Street, N.Y., $1000.00.

Donald Flamm, 25 Central Park West, New York, $1000.00.

Irving Geist, 30 E. 72nd Street, New York, $1000.00.

Arnold M. Grant, 598 Madison Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

Louis Green, 55 Liberty Street, New York, $1000.00.

Milton Handler, 425 Park Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

Herbert Papock, 261 Madison Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

Ned Pines, 355 Lexington Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

Simon Scrybnik, 502 Park Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

Mr. & Mrs. H. Levin Fenfield, 425 Park Avenue, New York, $4000.00.

Michael B. Singer, 1150 Park Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

Jack Birnbaum, 349 Sterling Rd., Harrison, N.Y., $1000.00.

Wm. Reinfeld, 55 Spier Drive, So. Orange N.J., $1000.00.

Louis L. Geller, 170 Garfield Pl., Maplewood, N.J., $1000.00.

M. L. Holtz, 17 Holly Drive, Short Hills N.J., $1000.00.

Leonard Birnbaum, 115 Central Park West, N.Y., $1000.00.

Mr. & Mrs. J. M. Kaplan, 55 5th Avenue, New York, $5000.00.

Donald C. Cook, 2 Broadway, New York, $1000.00.

Robert Castle, 150 E. 42nd Street, New York, $1000.00.

Robert W. Dowling, 980 Madison Avenue, New York, $5000.00.

Trevor K. Serviss, Woodchuck Hill Rd., Fayetteville, New York, $1000.00.

Irving S. Norry, 63 Curleau, Rochester, New York, $1000.00.

Lew Wasserman, 598 Madison Avenue, New York, $3000.00.

Local 144, Hotel & Allied Service Employees Union, 797 8th Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

Morris B. Abram, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

Broome County Democratic Comm., Binghamton, New York, $500.00.

(June 3, 1964)

Fortune Peter Ryan, 850 Third Avenue, New York, $200.00.

Louis J. Losordo, 85 Hamilton Rd., Irvington, N.Y., $25.00.

Mr. and Mrs. Arnold Grant, 598 Madison Avenue, New York, $5000.00.

Mr. and Mrs. Harry Gould, 200 Park Avenue, New York, $4000.00.

Alice M. Kaplan, 55 5th Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

Martin V. McLaughlin, 495 Main Street, Orange, N.J., $10.00.

Robert E. Aird, 16 West End Avenue, Westwood, New Jersey, $10.00.

William Fanuzzi, 150 S. Ocean Ave., Freeport, NY, $125.00.

Charles W. Lyon, R.D. #4, Watertown, N.Y., $50.00.

Harold Krueger, 1680 Congress Ave., Peekskill, New York, $10.00.

Cary C. Waldstreicher, 424 Madison Ave., New York, $125.00.

Thomas A. Palazzoto, 151 Maple, So. Massapequa Park, New York, $10.00.

Lawrence W. Tracey, 48 Wellington Rd., Garden City, New York, $10.00.

Jack Zenker, 729 Seventh Ave., New York, $125.00.

Edna Quinn, 44–01 34th Ave., Long Island City, New York, $20.00.

Mary E. Long, 5 Tudor City Place, New York, $5.00.

Sidney Freidberg, 500 Fifth Avenue, New York, $2000.00.

Sidmore Parnes, 200 West 57th Street, New York, $125.00.

Lee Solters, 62 West 45th Street, New York, $125.00.

Robert H. Gorman, 85–21 5th Avenue, No. Bergen, NJ, $25.00.

Arthur J. O'Donnell, 55 East Main Street, Ripley, NY, $100.00.

Robin Farkas, 912 Fifth Ave., New York, $125.00.

Frederick W. Richmond, 743 Fifth Avenue, New York, $3000.00.

Louis Weintraub, 635 Madison Avenue, New York, $125.00.

Robert Konover, 432 Park Avenue So., New York, $125.00.

Leon W. Taylor, R.D. 5, Penn Yann, New York, $10.00.

John French, 144 East 38th Street, New York, $100.00.

Murray Nedler, 1407 Broadway, New York, $100.00.

Daniel Niederman, 1450 Broadway, New York, $200.00.

Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Hopewell Junction, New York, $1000.00.

Thaddeus Suski, 165 W. 46th Street, New York, $200.00.

William J. Brown, 1999 Mt. Read, P.O. 82, Rochester, New York, $1000.00.

Stanley Tannenbaum, 1450 Broadway, New York, $100.00.

Joseph Seiller, 353 West 48th Street, New York, $100.00.

William N. Posner, Rochester, New York, $1000.00.

Farkas and Barron, 309 West 23rd Street, New York, $1000.00.

Rudolph B. Fitzhand, 999 Alabama Ave., Brooklyn, N.Y., $100.00.

David Katz, 1407 Broadway, New York, $100.00.

William Glickstein, Broadway at 48th Street, N.Y., $100.00.

Sam Bromberg, Huntington, New York, $100.00.

Leo Jaffe, 920 Park Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

Herbert Singer, 40 Exchange Place, New York, $100.00.

(June 4, 1964)

Sol G. Atlas, 1528 Northern Blvd., Manhasset, New York, $1000.00.

Carl A. Frische, 144 Wheatley Road, Brookville, New York, $1000.00.

B. M. Greenberg, 27 Hemlock Drive, Great Neck, N.Y., $1000.00.

Robert Haggiag, 12 Beekman Place, New York, $1000.00.

Barney Silber, New York, New York, $10.00.

Edward E. Heiser, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, $20.00.

James Sale, 400 West 57th Street, New York, $10.00.

John Goldner, 307 West 49th Street, $40.00.

Charles E. Johnson, 350 5th Avenue, New York, $10.00.

John J. Galgay, 53 Joyce Rd., Hartsdale, N.Y., $100.00.

B. Carroll, New York, New York, $50.00.

W. Rosenblatt, New York, New York, $10.00.

J. Brown, New York, New York, $10.00.

T. Duke, New York, New York, $10.00.

W. Shanley, New York, New York, $10.00.

Barry Silver, New York, New York, $5.00.

Natalie London, New York, New York, $74.00.

(June 5, 1964)

Moe Gale, 77 West 55th Street, New York, $500.00.

Sam Lichtenberg, 261 Fifth Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

Murray L. Silberstein, 6 Westway, White Plains, N.Y., $1000.00.

Sol M. Linowitz, 5 South Fitzbugh St., Rochester, New York, $2000.00.

Arnold Wells, 200 Park Avenue, New York, $2000.00.

Jack deSimone, 5424 Arlington Ave., Riverdale, N.Y., $3000.00.

Charles Revson, 666 Fifth Ave., N.Y., $3,000.00.

Mr. and Mrs. H. Meresman, 545 Madison Avenue, N.Y., $1,000.00.

Mr. and Mrs. H. Meresman, 545 Madison Avenue, N.Y., $1,000.00.

Charles R. Lachman, 545 Madison Avenue, N.Y., $2,000.00.

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton and Garrison, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, $2,000.00.

Irving Budd, 327 East 29th Street, N.Y., $100.00.

Herbert Gruder, 5620 First Avenue, Bklyn, N.Y., $100.00.

Caryl B. Muehlstein, 60 Sutton Place, New York, $3,000.00.

Robert Bloom, New York, New York, $10.00.

Jeffrey D. Doranz, New York, New York, $10.00.

Albert R. Mand, New York, New York, $10.00.

William J. Scott, Jr., New York, New York, $56.00.

Herbert F. Hauser, New York, New York, $625.00.

Thomas H. Quinn, 111 Broadway, New York, $1,000.00.

Maxwell A. Kriendler, 23 West 52nd Street, New York, $1,000.00.

Richard Levien, Erskine Road, Stamford, Conn., $100.00.

Wm. H. McKeon, Metcalf Building, Auburn, N.Y., $2,000.00.

Irma Badillo, 6495 Broadway, Bronx, N.Y., $100.00.

(June 10, 1964)

David Cogan, 5806 Hough Avenue, Cleveland, O., $1,000.00.

Margaret Healy, 132 Tullaman Rd., Garden City, New York, $20.00.

John A. Johnson, Bronx, New York, $10.00.

M. L. Bougar, 90 Church Street, N.Y., $25.00.

Lawrence A. Bennett, 5098 Skyline Drive, Syracuse, N.Y., $10.00.

John Toma, 17 Beach Ave., Woodmont, Conn., $25.00.

Richard C. Jones, 8 Holly Lane, Latham, N.Y., $10.00.

A. M. Kraft, 226–03 Hillside Avenue, Queens, New York, $10.00.

Felix P. DiNardo, 192–04 D 71st Crescent, Fresh Meadows, New York, $10.00.

Herbert Doddato, 14 Cherry Lane, Huntington, N.Y., $10.00.

George A. Pember, 194 W. Fulton Avenue, Roosevelt, New York, $10.00.

Patrick A. Pilla, 412 Wilmot Road, New Rochelle, New York, $20.00.

Lawrence M. Kruse, 43 Calton Rd., New Rochelle, New York, $25.00.

Geo. H. Wolff, 74 Greatwater Ave., Massapequa, New York, $25.00.

Frank A. Cirillo, 48 Crest Drive, East Northport, New York, $50.00.

John O'Conway, Sugden, New Jersey, $100.00.

Melvin Stein, 433 E. 51st Street, New York, $100.00.

Donald J. O'Connor, 863 Chenango St., Binghamton, New York, $100.00.

Richard O. C. Kehoe, Utica, New York, $100.00.

Charles E. Ennis, Lyons, New York, $100.00.

Wm. S. Andrews, 932 Lancaster Ave., Syracuse, New York, $100.00.

Leo Schwartz, Boston, Mass., $400.00.

Robert Kohm, 236 E. 5th Street, New York, $5.00.

Ellen R. Klausner, New York, New York, $20.00.

Francis C. LaVigne, Massena, New York, $25.00.

G. Lawrence White, Massena, New York, $25.00.

Francis C. Lavigne, 3 Church Street, Massena, N.Y., $25.00.

Walter Basmavian, Massena, New York, $25.00.

A. D. Viskovich, Massena, New York, $25.00.

Robert C. Kohm, 236 E. 5th Street, New York, $95.00.

John Toma, 17 Beach Ave., Woodmont, Conn., $80.00.

St. Lawrence Co. Dem. Com., Madrid, New York, $100.00.

Eugene G. Barrette, 902 Front St., Chicapee Falls, New York, $15.00.

Howard Wohl, Brooklyn, New York, $50.00.

Barry Silver, 94–19 66th Ave., Rego Park, N.Y., $15.00.

Francis J. Carns, 60 Broad Street, Binghamton, N.Y., $30.00.

Richard D. Hayes, New York, New York, $50.00.

Tillie Schlesinger, 1535 150th St., Whitestone, N.Y., $5.00.

Lorraine West, 119 E. 29th Street, New York, $5.00.

Judie Pfeifer, 2640 Marion Avenue, Bronx, N.Y., $5.00.

Vickie Breslow, Forest Hills, New York, $5.00.

Leah E. Deutsch, 799 Blake Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y., $5.00.

Lorraine West, 119 E. 29th Street, New York, $5.00.

Allan S. Ferman, 33 Washington Sq., West, N.Y., $10.00.

Thomas N. Wayne, 23 Ralph St., Stamford, Conn., $50.00

Allan S. Ferman, 33 Washington Sq., West, N.Y., $25.00.

Katherine Young, 6 East 65th Street, New York, $10.00.

Paul Dayton, 123 W. 57th Street, New York, $10.00.

Wm. R. DiPietro, 68 Grand Avenue, Staten Island, N.Y., $10.00.

Wm. H. Hand, 144–80 Sanford Ave., Flushing, N.Y., $10.00.

Judah J. Harris, 806 Dorian Ct., Far Rockaway, N.Y., $10.00.

Herman D. Hillman, 1335 Surry Lane, Rockville Center, New York, $100.00.

Frances E. Dugan, 90 Shadow Lane, New Rochelle, N.Y., $100.00.

John Fladhammer, 30 Walnut Avenue, Patchogue, N.Y., $10.00.

Richard S. Kohn, 366 Broadway, New York, $10.00.

Chas. A. Sanborn, 87 Narragansett Avenue, Ossining, N.Y., $10.00.

Henry D. Newbigging, 1021 Main Street, Buffalo, N.Y., $10.00.

Thomas D. Noonan, 40 Euclid Avenue, Delmar, N.Y., $10.00.

Joseph N. Oliva, 485 Barbara Lane, West Hempstead, N.Y., $10.00.

Timonthy C. Sullivan, Box 17, Comstock, New York, $10.00.

Eugene Vitello, 4350 Furman Avenue, Bronx, N.Y., $10.00.

Gerald J. Sullivan, 1516 Bedford St., Stamford, Conn., $10.00.

Wm. J. Elkins, 525 Brook St., Framingham, Mass., $20.00.

Dorothy H. Ervin, 302 Sandra Drive, Syracuse, N.Y., $25.00.

American Federation of Musicians, 425 Park Avenue, New York, $100.00.

John Axitakes, 42 Broadway, New York, $100.00.

Chas. A. Ciani, 1903 Tenbroeck Avenue, Bronx, N.Y., $50.00.

John E. McKeen, 235 42nd Street, New York, $50.00.

Leo V. Lannin, V.A., 147 Crosby Blvd., Buffalo, N.Y., $100.00.

Sylvia Millman, 32–22 89th Street, Jackson Heights, New York, $55.00.

Pat Alisan, 695 Park Avenue, New York $70.00.

Sidney Resnick, 207 Halsey Avenue, Jericho, N.Y., $25.00.

Edw. E. Turkel, 30 Cathedra Avenue, Hempstead, N.Y., $20.00.

John W. S. McCormick, Hartford, Conn., $30.00.

John Goldberg, Box 989, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn., $15.00.

Ronald P. J. Briggs, Flushing, New York, $30.00.

Fritz W. Alexander, 401 Broadway, New York, $125.00.

Frances W. Karden, 22 W. 32nd Street, New York, $125.00.

Thomas H. Baer, Foley Square, New York, $100.00.

Jacqueline K. Bahn, 40 Wall Street, New York, $100.00.

Samuel Becker, 400 Park Avenue, New York, $100.00.

Judy Bond, 1375 Broadway, New York, $100.00.

John G. Bonomi, 131 Deertrack Lane, Irvington, N.Y., $100.00.

Vincent L. Broderick, 215 Highbrook Ave., Pelham, N.Y., $100.00.

James C. Butcher, Jr., 567 Chauncy St., Brooklyn, N.Y., $100.00.

James J. Clynes, Jr., Ithaca, New York, $100.00.

Harold Cohan, Sea Bright, New Jersey, $100.00.

Donald C. Cook, 380 Riverside Drive, New York, $200.00.

Geo. D. Covington, 135 W. 125th Street, New York, $125.00.

Arthur B. Curran, Jr., Rochester, New York, $100.00.

Anthony G. DiFalco, 1 Washington Sq., New York, $25.00.

Anthony G. DiFalco, 1 Washington Sq., New York, $25.00.

Herbert B. Evans, 80 LaSalle Street, New York, $100.00.

Michael P. Frankfurt, 200 Park Avenue, New York, $100.00.

Joseph Friedman, 1501 Broadway, New York, $125.00.

Bertram S. Futterman, 68–64 Yellowstone Blvd., Forest Hills, New York, $100.00.

Luis F. Gomez, 80 Lafayette St., New York, $100.00.

Maximino Gonzalez, 1591 Bruckner Blvd., Bronx, N.Y., $50.00.

Wilson G. Graves, 60 E. 42nd St., New York, $100.00.

Oscar S. Gray, 5700 5th Ave., Pittsburgh, Pa., $100.00.

Frank Greenberg, 36 Hawthorne Ave., Great Neck, NY, $125.00.

Stanley L. Hilton, New York, New York, $125.00.

Elliott Horton, 5 South Fitzhugh St., Rochester, NY, $125.00.

James W. Hutcherson, 165 Patchen Ave., Brooklyn, N.Y., $100.00.

Morton Lloyd Janklow, 1046 Channel Road, Hewlett Harbor, New York, $100.00.

Franklin Kane, 17 E. 97th Street, New York, $25.00.

Wilson G. Graves, 60 E. 42nd St., New York, $100.00.

Wm. W. Karatz, 40 Wall Street, New York, $100.00.

John D. Kearney, 387 North Burgher Avenue, Staten Island, New York, $100.00.

Robert A. Kerr, 1 Wall Street, New York, $100.00.

Manual M. Koufman, 1330 Beacon Street, Brookline, Mass., $100.00.

Jules V. Lane, 965 5th Avenue, New York, $125.00.

Robert Lebron, 1591 Bruckner Blvd., Bronx, N.Y., $50.00.

Morton J. Levine, 115 Lincoln Rd., Brooklyn, N.Y., $50.00.

Arthur R. Levitt, Jr., 36 E. 57th Street, New York, $125.00.

Eric D. Lipetz, 345 E. 73rd St., New York, $100.00.

Shelly M. Lipsett, 301 E. 63rd St., New York, $125.00.

James B. Llewellyn, 96 Park Avenue, White Plains, N.Y., $100.00.

James B. Llewellyn, 96 Park Avenue, White Plains, N.Y., $50.00.

James B. Llewellyn, 96 Park Avenue, White Plains, N.Y., $100.00.

Robert H. Lounsbury, 161 E. 42nd St., New York, $100.00.

Robert H. Lounsbury, 161 E. 42nd St., New York, $100.00.

Westchester County Dem. Committee, 48 Mamaroneck Ave., White Plains, N.Y., $225.00.

Wm. Maidman, 113 W. 42nd St., New York, $125.00.

Wm. A. Zeck, 57 Lafayette Ave., Suffern, N.Y., $125.00.

David P. McKean, 8542 214th St., Queens Village, N.Y., $100.00.

Benjamin Messinger, 122 E. 42nd St., New York, $100.00.

David Lewis Miller, 410 So. Kensington St., Arlington, Va., $100.00.

Stuart Miller, 35 Cherry Lane, Kings Point, New York, $125.00.

LaVaughn R. Moore, 1634 Union St., Brooklyn, N.Y., $100.00.

David H. Neiditz, 37 Lewis Street, Hartford, Conn., $100.00.

M. Harmon Nemetz, 845 Third Avenue, New York, $100.00.

Curtis V. Newman, New York, New York, $125.00.

Nathan Raybin, 122 E. 42nd Street, New York, $100.00.

Alberto L. Robertson, 439 Manida, Bronx, New York, $100.00.

Richard D. Rosenblatt, 625 Madison Avenue, New York, $25.00.

Harold C. Roser, Jr., 60 W. 49th Street, New York, $100.00.

Mary P. Ross, 4 Peter Cooper Rd., New York, $100.00.

Philip J. Ryan, Jr., Foley Square, New York, $125.00.

H. Safir, 633 3rd Avenue, New York, $25.00.

H. Safir, 633 3rd Avenue, New York, $100.00.

Fred Samuel, 2149 7th Avenue, New York, $100.

Leonard B. Sand, 239 Central Park West, New York, $125.00.

Robert I. Shapiro, 516 5th Avenue, New York, $125.00.

Herbert V. Siegel, 640 5th Avenue, New York, $250.00.

Clayton Sinclair, Jr., 620 Lenox Avenue, New York, $100.00.

M. Bruce Solomon, 7 E. 42nd Street, New York, $100.

Maurice Sonenberg, 580 5th Avenue, New York, $125.00.

Harvey M. Spear, 50 E. 79th Street, New York, $100.00.

Samuel Tankel, 240 W. 40th Street, New York, $125.00.

Victor Temkin, 34 Bonnie Meadow Rd., Scarsdale, N.Y., $125.00.

Andrew R. Tyler, 30 Vesey Street, New York, $100.00.

Joseph M. Wahrhaftig, Monticello, New York, $100.

Barbara M. Watson, 676 Riverside Drive, New York, $100.00.

Elizabeth H. Wheeler, 345 E. 46th Street, New York, $100.00.

Scott C. Whitney, 633 Third Avenue, New York, $100.00.

Robert L. Bruggee, 120 E. 18th Street, New York, $85.00.

Robert L. Bruggee, 120 E. 18th Street, New York, $5.00.

Arthur Douglas, Ausable Forks, New York, $40.00.

Werner H. Kramarsky, 35 Sutton Place, New York, $100.00.

Building Service Employees, 237 East 36th Street, New York, $400.

International Union T.W.V.A. Political Ed. Fund, 99 University Place, New York, $1000.

N.Y. Joint Board A.C.W. of A., New York, New York, $2100.00.

(June 12, 1964)

Marvin I. Cohen, 303 West 42nd Street, New York, $125.00.

Mrs. Fred Leopold, 51 Willoughby Street, Brooklyn, N.Y., $100.00.

Simon H. Rifkind, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

Murray Traub, 250 West 57th Street, New York, $1000.00.

John Falvella, 597 Madison Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

William Lawson, 597 Madison Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

Bernard Tannenbaum, 515 Madison Avenue, New York, $2000.00.

(June 18, 1964)

Stewart Skrill, New York, New York, $125.

Hector M. MacKethan, Jr., 16 Wall Street, New York, $25.00.

John C. Yort, New York, New York, $100.00.

Sheila R. Goldstein, 745 East 231st Street, Bronx 66, N.Y., $5.00.

Judy Roca, New York, New York, $5.00.

Amalia Sachs, 1410 Avenue S., Brooklyn, N.Y., $5.00.

Barbara J. Bercu, New York, N.Y., $10.00.

Leonard C. Zarmore, New York, N.Y., $10.00.

Sidney Schwartz, 518 Third Avenue, New York, $5.00.

(June 19, 1964)

Donald Rivkin, 750 Third Avenue, New York, $125.00.

Grace Dobish, 9441 Wilshire Blvd., Beverly Hills, Calif., $1,000.00.

(June 23, 1964)

Norton Bernstein, 43–31 39th Street, Long Island City, N.Y., $100.00.

Max Fishbein, 1186 Broadway, New York, $100.00.

Seymour J. Smith, 200 Central Park South, New York, $100.00.

Bernard Myerson, 173 Kings Point Road, Great Neck, N.Y., $100.00.

Arthur M. Tolchin, 1540 Broadway, New York, $100.00.

Robert R. Weston, 1271 Sixth Avenue, New York, $125.00.

Marjorie H. Zenker, 312 East 33rd Street, New York, $100.00.

(June 24, 1964)

Joseph Ende, 65 Walker St., Malvern, Long Island, $1,000.00.

Norman Hasselo, 706 Louis Terrace, Brooklyn, N.Y., $1,000.00.

(June 30, 1964)

Mr. and Mrs. Stephen R. Currier, 666 Fifth Avenue, New York, $5,000.00.

(July 2, 1964)

Selig Burrows, 514 West 49th Street, New York, $1,000.00.

Norman H. Grulich, 975 Park Avenue, New York, $1,000.00.

Mrs. Elinor S. Gimbel, 163 East 78th Street, New York, $1,000.00.

F. W. Richmond, 743 Fifth Avenue, New York, $3,000.00.

Mr. and Mrs. Bernard F. Gimbel, Broadway and 34th Street, New York, $5,000.00.

(July 6, 1964)

Dorothy A. Cropper, 676 Riverside Drive, New York, $100.00.

Leon Alpert, Sterling Road, Harrison, New York, $1,000.00.

Daniel Rose, 529 Fifth Avenue, New York, $100.00.

Eugene J. Keogh, 30 Rockefeller Place, New York, $750.00.

John Goldner, 307 West 49th Street, New York, $375.00.

Carol Gluckman, 251 Main Street, Westport, Conn., $100.00.

Warren W. Wilentz, 252 Madison, Perth Amboy, N.J., $1,125.00.

Dominick A. Mirabelli, 1195 E. Grand St. Elizabeth, N.J., $100.00.

Robert W. Wilentz, 252 Madison, Perth Amboy, N.J., $125.00.

David Kushinsky, 433 Main St., Metuchen, N.J., $125.00.

Frederick K. Becker, 252 Madison Ave., Perth Amboy, N.J., $125.00

Jerome Stein, 1180 Raymond Blvd., Newark, N.J., $125.00.

Leon Eskin, 33 Jackson St., So River, N.J., $125.00.

Allen Ravin, 252 Madison Ave., Perth Amboy, N.J., $125.00.

Morris Brown, 20 Clive Hills Rd., Metuchen, N.J., $125.00.

Howard Wigder, 160 New Brunswick Ave., Perth Amboy, N.J., $250.00.

Leonard Berg, Metuchen, New Jersey, $250.00.

Daniel and Myron Shevell, Carlstadt, New Jersey, $250.00.

Sheldon Eskin, 323 Old Bridge Turnpike, East Brunswick, N.J., $100.00.

Wilentz, Goldman and Spitzer, 252 Madison Ave., Perth Amboy, N.J., $300.00.

Maurice Callender, 270 Convent Ave., New York, $50.00.

Michael W. Huber, New York, New York, $100.00.

(July 9, 1964)

John Graham, 11 Westbrook Rd., Great Neck, N.Y., $125.00.

(July 15, 1964)

Jay Wells, 666 Fifth Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

(July 16, 1964)

Lester Palestine, New York, New York, $200.00.

David J. McGrath, 1540 Broadway, New York, $100.00.

Peter J. Renter, 84–15 Beverly Rd., Queens, New York, $100.00.

(July 30, 1964)

Jerome S. Katzin, 30 Wall Street, New York, $100.00.

E. N. Gifford, New York, New York, $25.00.

J. S. Liebowitz, 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

Timothy M. Taylor, 277 Broadway, New York, $100.00.

Richard A. Pearl, 20 Beekman Place, New York, $100.00.

Charles Poletti, 598 Madison Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

Samuel B. Rose, 529 5th Avenue, New York, $100.00.

Richard Lederer, 35 E. 85th Street, New York, $100.00.

Joseph Cioccolanti, Box 356, Brewster, New York, $300.00.

Edward A. Henderson, New Haven, Conn., $200.00.

(August 3, 1964)

Harry Waxman, 4 East 54th Street, New York, $1000.00.

(August 7, 1964)

Nicholas Reisini, 410 Park Avenue, $1000.00.

Sal Fili, 40 Water Street, New York, $1000.00.

Don Axinn, 131 Jericho Turnpike, Jericho, N.Y., $1000.00.

Ford Bartlett, Docks Lane, Great Neck, N.Y., $1000.00.

Frederick DeMatteis, Meadow Road, Old Westbury, N.Y., $1000.00.

Robert Doherty, 210 Revere Road, Roslyn, N.Y., $1000.00.

Kenneth Ellington, 14 Round Hill Road, Great Neck, N.Y., $1000.00.

John English, Split Rock Road, Syosset, N.Y., $1000.00.

Harold Gleason, 94 Ocean Avenue, Massapequa, N.Y., $1000.00.

John Hagan, Hill Road, Port Washington, N.Y., $1000.00.

Nathan Kalikow, 201 Bay Avenue, Atlantic Beach, N.Y., $2000.00.

Harold Madden, 1636 Benedict Place, Baldwin, N.Y., $1000.00.

Eugene Nickerson, 495 Bryant Ave., Roslyn, N.Y., $1000.00.

James O'Connell, 38 Willis Avenue, Mineola, N.Y., $1000.00.

Mundy Peale, 34 Hilton Avenue, Garden City, N.Y., $1000.00.

Clinton Towl, Split Rock Road, Syosset, N.Y., $1000.00.

Robert Battapaglia, 25–33 30th Drive, Long Island City, N.Y., $1000.00.

Mr. & Mrs. Wm. C. Brennan, 55–27 84th Street, Elmhurst, N.Y., $2000.00.

Jack E. Bronston, 184–37 Hovendon Rd., Jamaica, N.Y., $1000.00.

Mario J. Cariello, 25–62 32nd St., Long Island City, N.Y., $1000.00.

Al Cohen, 133–17 101 Ave., Richmond Hill, N.Y., $1000.00.

Joseph J. DeMonte, 30–15 Broadway, Astoria, N.Y., $1000.00.

Milton E. Jacobowitz, 2812 Westbourne Ave., Far Rockaway, N.Y., $1000.00.

Harold Kalikow, 97–47 Queens Boulevard, Forest Hills, N.Y., $1000.00.

Emil Levin, 39–01 Main Street, Flushing, N.Y., $1000.00.

Andrew W. Mulrain, 45–54 Bayside, N.Y., $1000.00.

James A. Roe, Sr., 35–62 167th Street, Flushing, N.Y., $1000.00.

Murray Schwartz, 137–23 227th St., Laurelton, N.Y., $1000.00.

Martin Seligson, 521 5th Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

Joseph L. Smyth, 160 Beach 128, Belle Harbor, N.Y., $1000.00.

Seymour R. Thaler, 63 Groton Street, Forest Hills, N.Y., $1000.00.

Mr. & Mrs. Moses M. Weinstein, 138–33 78th Drive, Flushing, N.Y., $2000.00.

(August 17, 1964)

Frank R. Deluca, 3135 Johnson Ave., Riverdale, N.Y., $100.00.

Mrs. Albert Greenspan, 1 Cooper Road, Scarsdale, N.Y., $1,000.00.

Mrs. Enid A. Haupt, 95 Rye Rd., Greenlawn, Rye, N.Y., $2,500.00.

Mr. Sidney Danziger, 280 Madison Avenue, New York, $1,000.00.

(August 21, 1964)

Mr. Jonas Rosenfield, 40 Hickory Drive, Roslyn, New York, $100.00.

Mr. Robert W. Miller, 66 Beaver St., New York, $100.00.

Mr. Claude A. Giroux, 425 Park Avenue, New York, $1,000.00.

David M. Levitt, 45 West 36th Street, New York, $2,000.00.

Charles H. Silver, 101 Central Park West, New York, $1,000.00.

(August 25, 1964)

Leo Cheque, 589 5th Avenue, New York, $1,000.00.

(August 26, 1964)

Albert Parker, 530 5th Avenue, New York, $1,000.00.

William P. Engel, Birmingham 3, Alabama, $1,000.00.

(September 2, 1964)

Peter I. Feinberg, 60 E. 42nd Street, New York, $1,000.00.

Morton M. Haves, 1307 Harbor Road, Hewlett Harbor, N.Y., $1,000.00.

David Karr, 711 5th Avenue, New York, $1,000.00.

Charles Lipton, 130 E. 59th Street, New York, $100.00.

(September 3, 1964)

Harold Burson, 800 2nd Avenue, New York, $1,000.00.

(September 9, 1964)

Harold S. Coleman, 90 Worth Street, New York, $100.00.

(September 11, 1964)

Charles Schlaifer, 4 West 58th Street, New York, $1,000.00.

(September 14, 1964)

Frances Goldwyn, 1041 No. Formosa Ave., Hollywood, Calif., $5,000.00.

J. Edwin Doyle, 20 West 43rd Street, New York, $1,000.00.

Maxwell Dane, 20 West 43rd Street, New York, $1,000.00.

William Bernbach, 20 West 43rd Street, New York, $1,000.00.

(September 17, 1964)

Stanley Horowitz, 20 Arbor Road, Roslyn, New York, $1,000.00.

(September 21, 1964)

George D. Pratt, Jr., Bridgewater, Conn., $1,000.00.

Leo Model, 120 Broadway, New York, $1,000.00.

Robert E. Leoni, 122 E. 42nd Street, New York, $1,000.00.

(September 17, 1964)

Andre Meyer, Mr. & Mrs., 44 Wall Street, New York, $3,000.00.

Mr. & Mrs. Harvey Picker, Edgewater Point, Mamaroneck, N.Y., $5,000.00.

(September 21, 1964)

Bernard Relin, 654 Madison Avenue, New York, $1,000.00.

(September 25, 1964)

Phyllis R. Susskind, 1125 Fifth Avenue, New York, $1,000.00.

James T. Hill, Jr., 1112 Park Avenue, New York, $500.00.

Mrs. Herbert H. Lehman, 820 Park Avenue, New York, $3,000.00.

Frank Altschul, 730 Fifth Avenue, New York, $3,000.00.

Charles Revson, 666 Fifth Avenue, New York, $2,500.00.

Dorothy H. Hirshon, 911 Park Avenue, New York, $1,000.00.

Mrs. Henry Epstein, 880 Fifth Avenue, New York, $1,000.00.

Saul Lerner, 40 Exchange Place, New York, $1,000.00.

Mr. and Mrs. Lester Avnet, Time and Life Building, New York, $2,000.00.

Blanche F. Ittleson, 200 East 57th Street, New York, $1,000.00.

Joseph F. Reilly, 86 Trinity Place, New York, $1,000.00.

Mrs. David A. Schulte, Sr., Hotel Pierre, New York, $1,000.00.

Harold T. Garrity, 1 Ivy Hill Rd., Chappaqua, N.Y., $1,000.00.

Arnold M. Picker, 729 7th Avenue, New York, $1,000.00.

Charles Merinoff, 10–06 35th Ave., Long Island City, N.Y., $1,000.00.

Ralph Friedman, 60 Wall Street, New York, $1,000.00.

David H. Strassler, 60 East 42d Street, New York, $1,000.00.

William Mazer, 477 Madison Avenue, New York, $2,500.00.

C. Girard Davidson, Portland, Oregon, $1,000.00.

Arman D. Bartos, 155 East 72d St., New York, $1,000.00.

Mrs. Louis Cogliandro, 26 Broadway, New York, $1,000.00.

Murray L. Silberstein, 6 Westway, White Plains, New York, $500.00.

Mr. and Mrs. Harold K. Hochschild, 1270 Avenue of Americas, N.Y., $5,000.00.

(September 28, 1964)

Maxwell Dane, 20 West 43d Street, New York, $1,000.00.

Ned Doyle, 20 West 43d Street, New York, $1,000.00.

Joseph B. Martinson, 200 East 57th Street, New York, $1,000.00.

Mrs. Corning Howard, 29 Wheatley Rd., Westbury, N.Y., $1,100.00.

Richard Rodgers, 598 Madison Ave., New York, $500.00.

Lenore G. Marshall, 30 West 57th Street, New York, $1,000.00.

Viola W. Bernard, 930 5th Avenue, New York, $1,000.00.

Harold D. Uris, 850 Third Avenue, New York, $1,000.00.

Helene O. Rittenberg, 417 Park Avenue, New York, $500.00.

Doris A. Frank, 1130 Park Avenue, New York, $500.00.

Irene Y. Alexander, 55 East 72d Street, New York, $100.00.

Rita S. Karelsen, 480 Park Avenue, New York, $100.00.

(September 29, 1964)

Claudius Philippe, 270 Park Avenue, New York, $1,000.00.

Olga Konow, 200 Park Ave., New York, $5,000.00.

Frank Fernandez, 320 East 65th Street, New York, $1,000.00.

Irving Engel, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, $250.00.

(September 30, 1964)

Charles Frost, 575 Lexington Ave., New York, $1,000.00.

S. M. Estridge, 10–10 Bridge Plaza South, Long Island City, New York, $1,000.00.

Martin D. Fife, 180 Madison Avenue, New York, $1,000.00.

(October 1, 1964)

Herbert M. Singer, 717 5th Avenue, New York, $500.00.

Mr. and Mrs. Jay Wells, 666 5th Avenue, New York, $3,333.00.

John Mosler, 320 Park Avenue, New York, $1,000.00.

John L. Sinn, 33 Broadlawn Ave., Great Neck, N.Y., $1,000.00.

Charles Guttman, 630 5th Avenue, New York, $200.00.

Rogers M. Doering, 120 Broadway, New York, $100.00.

James N. Rosenberg, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, $100.00.

Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers Int'l Union, Denver, Colo., $2,000.00.

(October 2, 1964)

Jack I. Poses, 400 Madison Avenue, New York, $2,000.00.

Orin Lehman, 118 E. 65th Street, New York, $2,500.00.

Arnold Schwartz, 2100 Hunters Point Ave., Long Island City, New York, $1,000.00.

Joseph Harris, 445 Park Avenue, New York, $1,000.00.

Gerard Oestreicher, 6 East 53rd Street, New York, $100.00.

(October 5, 1964)

Wm. Bernbach, 20 West 43rd Street, New York, $1,000.00.

Nathan Kalikow, 97–45 Queens Blvd., Forest Hills, N.Y., $1,000.00.

(October 6, 1964)

Charles H. Gross, 5 Hanover Sq., New York, $750.00.

Elinor Gimbel, 163 E. 78th Street, New York, $2,000.00.

Eliot Hyman, 200 Park Avenue, New York, $1,000.00.

(October 8, 1964)

Harold F. Linder, 1901 24th St., NW., Washington, D.C., $2,000.00.

Bertha R. Linder, 1901 24th Street, N.W., Wash., D.C., $2,000.00.

Stanley H. Lowell, 52 Wall Street, New York, $500.00.

Mr. & Mrs. John I. Snyder, 250 Park Avenue, New York, $4,000.00.

Mr. & Mrs. Arthur Krim, 729 7th Avenue, New York, $1,000.00.

Susan E. Linder, 1125 Lexington Ave., New York, $100.00.

(October 9, 1964)

Saul Horowitz, 515 Madison Ave., New York, $1,000.00.

Lester Lanin, 157 W. 57th Street, New York, $1,000.00.

George B. Blaize, 830 Prospect Place, Brooklyn, N.Y., $100.00.

Edward Wormley, 450 E. 52nd Street, New York, $10.00.

Mrs. Evelyn Dubin, 234 W. 48th Street, New York, $10.00.

Harry Mandel, 18 E. 16th Street, New York, $25.00.

Mr. and Mrs. Albert Gutman, 1056 5th Ave., New York, $25.00.

David Chasman, 729 7th Ave., New York, $50.00.

(October 13, 1964)

Blanche Ittleson, 200 E. 57th Street, New York, $150.00.

Al Goetz, 120 Broadway, New York, $500.00.

Rosalind Stone, 817 5th Ave., New York, $1,000.00.

Mr. & Mrs. Stephen B. Botsford, 243 E. 48th Street, New York, $40.00.

Mr. & Mrs. Jack Bernard, 60 Sutton Pl., So., New York, $250.00.

Terence H. Benbow, 40 Wall Street, New York, $1.00.

Alonzo O. Briscoe, 82–27 165th Street, Jamaica, N.Y., $10.00.

Abraham Briloff, 99 Grace Ave., Great Neck, N.Y., $100.00.

Meyer P. Beck, 729 7th Ave., New York, $100.00.

David Chassler, 150 35th Street, Brooklyn, N.Y., $15.00.

Frank J. Cogan, 289 West Street, Closter, N.J., $10.00.

Edward T. Cone, 1 Queenston Place, Princeton, N.J., $250.00.

Dominick E'Avino, 2115 80th Street, Brooklyn, N.Y., $5.00.

Mrs. Meyer Davis, 101 Central Park West, New York, $10.00.

Fred Dunkels, 923 5th Ave., New York, $100.00.

Edward Dunleavy, 127 W. 96th Street, New York, $25.00.

Herman Elkon, 630 5th Avenue, New York, $10.00.

Mrs. Wm. Epstein, 220 Highland Rd., Scarsdale, N.Y., $50.00.

Mortimer Feuer, 39 Broadway, New York, $50.00.

Moe Fleissig, 32 Greene St., Newark, N.J., $25.00.

George H. Fried, 32 Court Street, Brooklyn, N.Y., $10.00.

Dr. & Maurice Friend, 262 Central Park W., New York, $10.00.

Charles Gingold, 11 Brokan Lane, Great Neck, N.Y., $5.00.

Leon Goldberg, 729 7th Ave., New York, $100.00.

Balfour H. Golden, 251 W. 11th Street, New York, $25.00.

Paul J. Grayson, 40 E. 58th Street, New York, $15.00.

Herman Gross, 12 Jordan Drive, Great Neck, N.Y., $10.00.

Mrs. John H. Hammond, 136 E. 64th Street, New York, $10.00.

Henry H. Harper, 2500 Rand Building, Buffalo, N.Y., $25.00.

Rhoda Hellman, 167 E. 82nd Street, New York, $25.00.

R. E. Higginbotham, 259 Henry Street, Brooklyn, N.Y., $25.00.

Dr. Edith Jacobson, 50 West 96th Street, New York, $5.00.

Miss Celia Joroff, 70 E. 10th Street, New York, $5.00.

Martha Landman, 64–39 98th Street, Forest Hills, N.Y., $5.00.

Aleek Leitman, 115 Central Park West, New York, $15.00.

Lawrence P. Lessing, Bucks County, Pa., $25.00.

Edward B. Levy, 10 E. 43rd Street, New York, $10.00.

Mrs. W. Levy, 300 Central Park West, New York, $50.00.

Mr. & Mrs. Robert G. Link, 600 West 16th Street, New York, $50.00.

Michael F. Mayer, 30 E. 40th Street, New York, $100.00.

George McDonald, 1 Beekman St., New York, $10.00.

John Merriamn, 49 West 73rd Street, New York, $10.00.

Mrs. David Metzger, 176 E. 77th Street, New York, $10.00.

Saul Ozman, 27 Hummingbird Dr., Roslyn, New York, $50.00.

Miss Anna T. O'Hare, 1709 Unity St., Philadelphia, Pa., $1.00.

Irene L. Rieber, 605 E. 14th Street, New York, $10.00.

W. Peter Ronald, 25 Old Field Lane, Lake Success, N.Y., $5.00.

F. W. Parsons, 235 Delevan Ave., Corning, N.Y., $10.00.

Miss Claire Rosenstein, 24 W. 55th Street, New York, $25.00.

Albert Rudnick, 1 Grand St., Albany, New York, $25.00.

Miss Tracy Samuels, 44 E. 67th Street, New York, $25.00.

George J. Schaefer, 1600 Broadway, New York, $25.00.

Dan Schoen, 1800 Boston Road, Bronx, New York, $100.00.

Ralph Schlesinger, 355 E. 198th Street, Bronx, New York, $100.00.

Mr. & Mrs. Henry Schneider, 110 E. End Ave., New York, $25.00.

Dr. & Mrs. L. Schwarzchild, 144 W. 86th Street, New York, $10.00.

Mrs. A. Spector, 233 W. 99th Street, New York, $5.00.

Syrena H. Stackpole, Riverhead, New York, $10.00.

Mr. & Mrs. Julian Streets, Jr., 185 Madison Avenue, New York, $10.00.

Charles M. Waldron, Rensselaerville, New York, $5.00.

Mrs. Mildred Wolp, 30 East 9th Street, New York, $20.00.

Mr. and Mrs. Wm. F. Wolff, 160 Central Park South, New York, $5.00.

Frederick F. Robinson, 111 Broadway, New York, $100.00.

Stanley N. Arnold, 1020 Park Avenue, New York, $1,000.00.

Peter Campbell Brown, 41 East 42nd Street, $1,000.00.

Joshua A. Gollin, 1290 Avenue of Americas, New York, $1,000.00.

Mrs. S. B. Grimson, 165 E. 72nd Street, New York, $1,000.00.

Walter N. Roseman, 1 Washington Sq., New York, $100.00.

Miss Anne Herman, 25 Central Park West, New York, $10.00.

Justin W. D'Atri, 104–60 Queens Blvd., Forest Hills, New York, $25.00.

Dr. H. J. Friedman, 53 West 57th Street, New York, $5.00.

James Martina, 130 Main Street, Dansville, N.Y., $100.00.

Frances I. Whiteman, 176 Waverly Place, New York, $15.00.

(October 14, 1964)

Ernest Adler, 63 Wall Street, New York, $25.00.

Mrs. Walter Binger, 180 E. 75th Street, New York, $50.00.

Kenneth S. Cohen, 220 Madison Avenue, New York, $10.00.

Mrs. Milton Erlanger, Box 305, Elberon, New Jersey, $1,000.00.

Julian Hess, 44 East 92nd Street, New York, $3.00.

Mrs. Jesse S. Katz, 139 E. 63rd Street, New York, $10.00.

Mrs. Paul Lazarfeld, 440 Riverside Drive, New York, $100.00.

Mary E. Long, 5 Tudor City Place, New York, $10.00.

Miss Jessie Perniciaro, 62–95 Saunders St., Rego Park, N.Y., $5.00.

Walter J. Schloss, 863 Park Avenue, New York, $50.00.

Mr. & Mrs. Dallas B. Sherman, 830 Park Avenue, New York, $100.00.

J. M. Van Beuren, Van Beuren Rd., Morristown, N.J., $25.00.

Andrew T. Vignali, 147–10 84th Rd., Jamaica 35, N.Y., $10.00.

Milton Weintraub, 268 West 47th Street, New York, $10.00.

John A. Kiser, 598 Madison Avenue, New York, $1,000.00.

R. Keith Kane, 14 Wall Street, New York, $100.00.

Vincent Sardi, Jr., 123 E. 54th Street, New York, $500.00.

Viola Bernard, 930 5th Avenue, New York, $200.00.

(October 15, 1964)

Herbert L. Stern, 30 Broad Street, New York, $2,000.00.

Kathleen H. Mortimer, 149 E. 73rd Street, New York, $1,000.00.

John R. Lehman, 1 William Street, New York, $1,000.00

Simon H. Rifkind, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, $1,000.00.

Joseph H. Hirshhorn, 100 Park Avenue, New York, $5,000.00.

Henry Hofheimer, 61 Broadway, New York, $250.00.

Richard B. Scandrett, Jr., Cornwall, New York, $1,000.00.

John P. Botti, 132 Wickham Ave., Middletown, N.Y., $500.00.

Mrs. Sumner Welles, Bernardsville, New Jersey, $500.00.

Taina Waisman, 305 E. 45th Street, New York, $100.00.

Mr. and Mrs. Arthur B. Krim, 729 7th Avenue, New York, $5,000.00.

Mr. and Mrs. Robert Benjamin, 729 7th Avenue, New York, $5,000.00.

James Larson, 55 Hanson Place, Brooklyn, N.Y., $10.00.

Mrs. Allen Wardwell, 355 Ocean Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y., $100.00.

Eugene F. Roth, 1 East 57th Street, New York, $250.00.

Joseph W. Burns, 535 5th Avenue, New York, $100.00.

Robert J. McDonald, 48 Wall Street, New York, $100.00.

Paul C. Levison, 665 5th Avenue, New York, $50.00.

Lloyd C. Seidman, 180 West End Avenue, New York, $50.00.

Patrick Tanner, 101 E. 91st Street, New York, $50.00.

Mr. and Mrs. A. C. Troelman, 18 Monroe Street, New York, $20.00.

Maurice N. Nessen, 500 5th Avenue, New York, $10.00.

Miss A. Elsie Lash, 314 E. 41st Street, New York, $2.00.

Dr. Mary O'Neil Hawkins, 49 E. 96th Street, New York, $10.00.

(October 16, 1964)

Mr. Zalman Deanin, 29 Langdon Rd., Farmingdale, N.Y., $10.00.

Irving Graef, 360 E. 55th Street, New York, $20.00.

Frasier W. McCann, 10 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, $100.00.

Eugene C. Radcliffe, 306 W. 51st Street, New York, $50.00.

Miss Ruth Shaw, 1698 Vyse Avenue, Bronx, New York, $5.00.

Robert Stein, 325 E. 79th Street, New York, $25.00.

Isadore and Zachary Rosenfield, 45 West 45th Street, New York, $25.00.

(October 19, 1964)

Sam Harris, 120 Broadway, New York, $2,000.00.

Edwin J. Cohn, Aid, APO 254, New York, $50.00.

Mrs. Louis S. Weiss, 215 W. 88th Street, New York, $100.00.

Mrs. Enid T. Oppenheimer, 1050 5th Avenue, New York, $10.00.

Dr. Bertram Slaff, 1100 Madison Avenue, New York, $10.00.

Beatrice Doerschuk, 33 Cassilis Ave., Bronxville, N.Y., $10.00.

Anthony Donn, M.D., 156 E. 79th Street, New York, $10.00.

(October 20, 1964)

Knapp Engraving Co., 141–155 E. 25th Street, New York, $100.00.

Frank E. DeLuca, 141 Livingston, Brooklyn, New York, $100.00.

Mary C. Draper, 1 Pierrepont St., Brooklyn, N.Y., $100.00.

Dorothy J. Bohen, 93 Cypress St., Floral Park, New York, $25.00.

Mrs. Robert E. Sherwood, 29 E. 64th Street, New York, $25.00.

Louis Paul Nestel, 5355 Henry Hudson Parkway, Riverdale, New York, $25.00.

Madame Rosina Lhevinne, 185 Claremont Ave., New York, $25.00.

Timothy C. Sullivan, Box 17, Comstock, New York, $10.00.

Wallace M. Shawn, 1150 5th Avenue, New York, $10.00.

Eja Schildt, 183 E. 94th Street, New York, $10.00.

Mary E. Parry, 349 E. 50th Street, New York, $10.00.

Mrs. Mabel L. Miller, 600 Lexington Ave., New York, $10.00.

Mrs. Edna A. Merson, 410 E. 57th Street, New York, $10.00.

Daniel C. Mastromarino, 3741 Willett Ave., Bronx, N.Y., $10.00.

Lucile Kohn, 1138 Madison Ave., New York, $10.00.

Jean Jacques Juncker, 160 E. 88th Street, New York, $10.00.

James L. Hilton, 583 Fourth Avenue, Brooklyn, New York, $5.00.

Bert W. Liff, New York, New York, $5.00.

Louis Nizer, 1501 Broadway, New York, $1000.00.

Mrs. Madeline M. Low, 417 Park Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

Jerome A. Siegel, 777 Third Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

Carmack Cochran, 60 Peabody St., Nashville, Tenn., $1000.00.

John E. Roe, 200 East 42nd Street, New York, $1000.00.

James A. Roe, Sr., 200 East 42nd Street, New York, $1000.00.

Irving M. Engel, 52 Vanderbilt Ave., New York, $250.00.

S. H. Scheuer, 39 Broadway, New York, $1000.00.

F. William Harder, 30 Broad Street, New York, $500.00.

Evelyn Lehman, 32 East 64th Street, New York, $2000.00.

Mrs. Orin Lehman, 118 East 65th Street, New York, $2500.00.

Richard A. Brown, 215 East 70th Street, New York, $2000.00.

J. David Stern, 944 Fifth Avenue, New York, $100.00.

Mrs. Corning Howard, 29 Wheatley Rd., Westbury, N.Y., $300.00.

(October 21, 1964)

Mrs. Eleanor Israel, 1301–28th St., N.W., Washington, D.C., $100.00.

Samuel Meyer, 2834 Heath, Bronx 63, New York, $10.00.

Matthew J. Feeney, 6813 Owls Head Court, Brooklyn, N.Y., $5.00.

J. Minkus, 69–39 Juno St., Forest Hills, N.Y., $50.00.

Robert A. Low, 598 Madison Avenue, New York, $100.00.

Jack Zenker, 52 East 19th Street, New York, $25.00.

Eugene D. Cornell, 431 E. 20th Street, New York, $1,000.00.

J. A. Edwards, 514 East 73rd Street, New York, $1,000.00.

J. R. Elyacher, 8 East 48th Street, New York, $1,000.00.

Samuel W. Hurowitz, 271 Central Park West, New York, $1,000.00.

Sidney P. Lipkins, 22–09 Bridge Plaza North, Long Island City, New York, $1,000.00.

John P. Morrissey, 441 Lexington Ave., New York, $1,000.00.

Jack D. Saltzman, 420 Hoboken Avenue, Jersey City, N.J., $1,000.00.

Nathan Simpson, 1857 Sebons Avenue, New York, $1,000.00.

James M. Watters, Jr., 15 Roxborough Rd., Larchmont, N.Y., $1,000.00.

Harold A. Webster, 118 Wagstaff Lane, West Islip, N.Y., $1,000.00.

(October 22, 1964)

B. F. Kenny, 880 Bergen Avenue, Jersey City, N.J., $1,000.00.

Duncan G. Harris, 14 E. 47th Street, New York, $100.00.

Sylvan Oestreicher, 20 Exchange Place, New York, $100.00.

Richard Hofstadter, 25 Claremont Ave., New York, $100.00.

Julius Levy, 295 Madison Avenue, New York, $50.00.

C. S. Mitchell, 70 Pine Street, New York, $50.00.

H. S. Schaffer, 983 Park Avenue, New York, $30.00.

Miss Janet Leckie, 25 West 54th Street, New York, $10.00.

Samuel Shanko, 1541 Broadway, New York, $25.00.

Alice Gundelfinger, 444 Central Park West, New York, $7.00.

(October 23, 1964)

William L. Bernhard, 110 E. 87th Street, New York, $100.00.

Sydney G. Berry, 53 Gordonhurst Ave., Upper Montclair, New Jersey, $5.00.

Herbert H. Blau, 600 West 144th Street, New York, $5.00.

M. D'Alessandro, 35–50 32nd Street, Astoria, New York, $5.00.

Francis S. Carroll, 40 Wall Street, New York, $5.00.

Frank P. Davidson, 1140 5th Avenue, New York, $5.00.

Philip E. Kook, 173 3rd Avenue, Jersey City, N.J., $100.00.

Mrs. Wm. F. Lamb, 55 E. 72nd Street, New York, $25.00.

Thelma Lipkowitz, 205 E. 94th Street, New York, $10.00.

Clarence G. Noel, 399 Park Avenue, New York, $100.00.

Mrs. Edgar S. Oppenheimer, 880 5th Avenue, New York, $50.00.

Harry M. Sadler, Jr., 1860 Broadway, New York, $15.00.

Louis E. Sams, 1562 Hoe Avenue, Bronx, New York, $20.00.

D. Harnett, 32–31 157th Street, Flushing, N.Y., $5.00.

Miss Barbara Sapinsley, 331 E. 71st Street, New York, $10.00.

Louis Shurr, 1501 Broadway, New York, $100.00.

Wm. Unger & Co., 230 5th Avenue, New York, $50.00.

Leonard Walit, 1186 E. 180th Street, Bronx, N.Y., $5.00.

W. Averell Harriman, 16 East 81st Street, New York, $1000.00.

James W. Murray, 50 Prospect Ave, Tarrytown, N.Y., $200.00.

Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Fishkill Farm, Hopewell Junction, N.Y., $1000.00.

George A. Strickman, 1290 Sixth Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

Milton L. Romm, 30 So. Broadway, Yonkers, New York, $250.00.

Mrs. Dewitt Stetten, 240 Central Park South, New York, $1000.00.

(October 24, 1964)

Irving Moskowitz, 40 Wall Street, New York, $1000.00.

(October 26, 1964)

Robert Lounsbury, 201 E. 15th Street, New York, $500.00.

Robert A. Bernhard, 1 William Street, New York, $1000.00.

Lester Avnet, Mr. & Mrs., Time and Life Building, New York, $3000.00.

Samuel J. Lefrak, 97–27 64th Road, Forest Hills, New York, $1000.00.

Sylvia Ravitch, 130 E. 63rd Street, New York, $1000.00.

Mrs. Dewitt Millhauser, 116 E. 66th Street, New York, $250.00.

Charles W. Engelhard, 113 Astor St., Newark, New Jersey, $1000.00.

Joseph Villa Frank, 252 E. Main Street, Westfield, N.Y., $100.00.

Helmer R. Johnson, 1 Chase Man. Plaza, New York, $100.00.

Ben Rivlin, 300 E. 57th Street, New York, $50.00.

Victor W. Humel, 41 Candido Ave., Shirley, N.Y., $50.00.

Wm. J. Manning, 36 Osborne Rd., Garden City, N.Y., $50.00.

Bernard B. Smith, 460 Park Avenue, New York, $50.00.

Henry S. Miles, 550 40th Street, New York, $25.00.

Alan Robins, 115 Central Park West, New York, $25.00.

Fred Goldberg, 155 Executive Drive, New Hyde Park, NY, $25.00.

Simon Gluckman, 160 Broadway, New York, $25.00.

Fitzgerald Phillips, 270 Convent Ave., New York, $20.00.

Alice Herman, 250 E. 65th Street, New York, $20.00.

Sanford A. Roth, 381 Broad Street, Newark, N.J., $20.00.

Bert Stern, 140 E. 39th Street, New York, $20.00.

Mrs. Sigmund Pollitzer, 215 West 88th Street, New York, $10.00.

Dr. Nathan Seriff, 519 E. 86th Street, New York, $10.00.

Aristotle Souval, 1 Wall Street, New York, $10.00.

Mr. and Mrs. Richard Watts, Jr., 920 Fifth Avenue, New York, $10.00.

Joseph Rattner, 444 Madison Avenue, New York, $10.00.

Ernest Walton, 330 E. 33rd Street, New York, $10.00.

Mrs. Mildred B. Fishburn, Hopkinson House, Phila., Pa., $5.00.

(October 27, 1964)

Bernard Bernstein, 165 Broadway, New York, $500.00.

C. Edwin Linville, Underhill Rd., Scarsdale, N.Y., $100.00.

Sally J. Victor, 35. E. 75th Street, New York, $25.00.

Walter Schick, 201 E. 62nd Street, New York, $25.00.

Wm. P. Grayson, 1270 6th Avenue, New York, $10.00.

Eugene M. Kline, 1501 Broadway, New York, $100.00.

Morton M. Rosenfeld, 271 Madison Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

Charles M. Hart, 220 East 42nd Street, New York, $100.00.

William Shea, 41 East 42nd Street, New York, $1000.00.

Martin Barell, 60 E. 42nd Street, New York, $666.67.

R. Alvin Albarino, 19 West 44th Street, New York, $500.00.

J. David Stern, 944 5th Avenue, New York, $500.00.

Morris Weinberg, 183 E. Broadway, New York, $500.00.

Clifford H. Ramsdell, 350 Park Avenue, New York, $500.00.

Carol W. Haussamen, 40 Central Park So., New York, $3000.00.

Doris W. Vidor, 71 East 71st Street, New York, $1000.00.

Lee N. Steiner, 415 Madison Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

Joan Dufault, 539 Oakhurst Rd., Mamaroneck, N.Y., $1000.00.

John Eyre, 50 E. 79th Street, New York, $1000.00.

Armand Bartos, 155 E. 72nd Street, N.Y., $1000.00.

Bernard Novack, 2185 Lemoine Ave., Fort Lee, N.Y., $2000.00.

David Levitt, 45 W. 36th Street, New York, $1000.00.

Mrs. Erwin S. Wolfson, 812 5th Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

Pere Lorentz, 166 East 74th Street, New York, $1000.00.

David, Mr. Levy, 993 Fifth Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

Thomas B. Hess, Mr. & Mrs., 19 Beekman Place, New York, $2000.00.

A. G. Altschul, 993 5th Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

David Sher, 61 Broadway, New York, $1000.00.

Mr. George Farkas, & Mrs., 24 Central Park South, New York, $5000.00.

Mr. & Mrs. Arnold Wells, 200 Park Avenue, New York, $250.00.

Virgil Stark, 936 5th Avenue, New York, $300.00.

George Backer, 295 5th Avenue, New York, $200.00.

Mrs. Watson Blair, 109 E. 64th Street, New York, $100.00.

Mrs. Richard J. Bernhard, 46 E. 71st Street, N.Y., $500.00.

Mrs. Edward M. M. Warburg, 730 Park Avenue, New York, $500.00.

Seymour Milstein, 733 3rd Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

Ed Lewis, 11 East 48th Street, New York, $1000.00.

Dan Brener, 11 E. 48th Street, New York, $1000.00.

Alfred Gross, 110 E. 57th Street, New York, $1000.00.

Eli Black, 122 E. 42nd Street, New York, $1000.00.

Jerry Mastromarino, 7 Hoover St., Haverstraw, New York, $1000.00.

Nicholas F. Lopes, Box 91–49 Maple Ave., New City N.Y., $1000.00.

James M. Jacobson, 630 5th Avenue, New York, $2500.00.

William I. Riegelman, 120 Broadway, New York, $1000.00.

Walter Levy, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, $1000.00.

Vic Anfuso, Jr., 70 Pine Street, New York, $250.00.

Carl H. Abraham, 60 W. 57th Street, New York, $250.00.

Louis Wolfe, 260 Madison Ave., New York, $250.00.

Charles Catalano, 1818 Dutch Broadway, Elmont, N.Y., $250.00.

Sidney Gondelman, 932 Broadway, New York, $250.00.

Abraham Kraditor, 38 Park Row, New York, $250.00.

Edmond Preiss, 22 E. 40th Street, New York, $250.00.

Jerome Parker, 11 Broadway, New York, $250.00.

Jerome Parker, 11 Broadway, New York, $250.00.

(October 28, 1964)

Joseph Halle Schaffner, 320 E. 52nd Street, New York, $250.00.

Jerome A. Siegel, 777 Third Avenue, New York, $250.00.

Mrs. Isaac Liberman, 875 5th Avenue, New York, $25.00.

Mrs. Preston H. Long, 555 Park Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

Mrs. Maurice Stone, 817 5th Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

Wm. Bernbach, 20 W. 43rd Street, New York, $1000.00.

Ned Doyle, 20 West 43rd Street, New York, $1000.00.

Alfred T. Corvin, 300 Central Park West, New York, $10.00.

John Eyre, 50 East 79th Street, New York, $1000.00.

Mrs. Ellen Fargate, 35 W. 82nd Street, New York, $5.00.

Vincent T. McCarthy, 165 Beach 129th Street, Belle Harbor, New York, $100.00.

Manuel Neves, 50 Commerce St., New York, $25.00.

(October 29, 1964)

Mrs. Erwin S. Wolfson, 812 5th Ave., New York, $100.00.

Arthur F. McGinness, 20 Pine Street, New York, $250.00.

Samuel I. Rosenman, 575 Madison Ave., New York, $1,000.00.

Max J. Rubin, 598 Madison Ave., New York, $100.00.

Michael Merkin, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, $1,000.00.

Lawrence Keldor, 122 E. 42nd Street, New York, $100.00.

Patrick A. O'Riodan, 500 5th Ave., New York, $100.00.

Mrs. Ernest L. Ives, 1316 E. Wash., Bloomington, Ill., $100.00

Herbert J. Deitz, 40 Wall St., New York, $100.00.

Myra Bennett, 60 E. 9th St., New York, $5.00.

Irving Farber, 2035 Creston Ave., Bronx, N.Y., $10.00.

Sidney Landau, 139–35 226th St., Laurelton, N.Y., $25.00.

Local No. 318 International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite, Paper Mill Workers Union, 820 2nd Ave., New York, $1,000.00.

Abraham Briloff, 30 Broad St., New York, $250.00.

Mr. & Mrs. Jean P. J. Braitzell, 635 Madison Ave., New York, $2,000.00.

Arnold Berman, 200 Park Ave., New York, $1,000.00.

Tom Lowenstein, 30 Willow Rd., Woodmere, New York, $1,000.00.

Mr. & Mrs. Lansdell K. Christie, 70 Pine St., New York, $5,000.00.

(October 30, 1964)

Jules Steiner, 655 Madison Ave., New York, $500.00.

Raymond S. Rubinow, 537 E. 20th St., New York, $125.00.

Robert Morgenthau, 4725 Independence Ave., New York., $500.00.

Stanley Lowell, 52 Wall Street, New York, $500.00.

Calman J. Ginsberg, 80 Broad St., New York, $1,000.00.

(November 2, 1964)

Mrs. Frederick Heimerdinger, 920 5th Ave., New York, $500.00.

Mrs. Arthur Lehman, 45 E. 70 St., New York, $1,000.00.

Walter Hirshon, 30 Broad St., New York, $1,000.00.

Mrs. Richard J. Bernhard, 46 E. 71st Street, New York, $500.00.

Gerard Oestreicher, 6 E. 53rd Street, New York, $1,000.00.

Jack S. Seidman, 80 Broad Street, New York,, $1,000.00.

Richard C. Patterson, Jr., 50th and Park Avenue, New York, $1,000.00.

Mortimer Levitt, 716 5th Avenue, New York, $2,000.00.

S. Joseph Tankoos, Jr., 635 Madison Avenue, New York, $500.00.

Henry Pearce, 41 East 42nd Street, New York, $1,000.00.

Richard A. Brown, 145 E. 52nd Street, New York, $3,000.00.

John Diebold, 430 Park Avenue, New York, $1,000.00.

John B. Kelley, 377 Middlesex Rd., Darien, Conn., $1,000.00.

Christopher Lindsey, 20 East 46th Street, New York, $1,500.00.

Eugene Leone, 155 E. 49th Street, New York, $500.00.

Col. Samuel Becker, 400 Park Avenue, New York, $100.00.

Rivington Winant, 130 E. 94th Street, New York, $100.00.

Shirley Kahn, 90 West Broadway, New York, $50.00.

Raymond Bell, 711 5th Avenue, New York, $25.00.

Patrick J. Lucey, 57 West 76th Street, New York, $10.00.

Martha Lowenstein, 303 W. 66th Street, New York, $10.00.

Mrs. L. Herskovitz, 72–14 137th Street, Flushing, N.Y., $10.00.

Hildred Britton, 820 Greene Ave., Brooklyn, N.Y., $10.00.

Dr. Howard Weisberg, 1095 Park Avenue, New York, $5.00.

James Brooks, 500 W. Broadway, New York, $2.00.

Arthur Ebenhack, 166 E. 34th Street, New York, $1.00.

(November 3, 1964)

William Stix Wasserman, 895 Park Ave., New York, $1,000.00.

Annan M. Hoffman, 444 Madison Ave., New York, $500.00.

Aaron Frosch, 120 E. 56th Street, New York, $500.00.

Sidney E. Cohn, 717 5th Avenue, New York, $200.00.

Frank Fernandez, 320 E. 65th Avenue, New York, $2,000.00.

Fortune Peter Ryan, 850 Third Ave., New York, $1,000.00.

(November 4, 1964)

Florence Shientag, 665 Fifth Avenue, New York, $1,000.00.

Louis Schweitzer, 261 Madison Avenue, New York, $1,000.00.

Sol Kittay, 404 5th Avenue, New York, $1,000.00.

Fowler Hamilton, 52 Wall Street, New York, $100.00.

Mr. and Mrs. Frank Levien, 200 Park Avenue, New York, $4,000.00.

Jay Wells, 200 Park Avenue, New York, $1,000.00.

Jean K. Cantor, 1175 York Avenue, New York, $100.00.

(November 5, 1964)

Local 320 Bldg. Service Employees Union, 237 E. 36th Street, New York, $500.00.

Leon Dalva, 44 E. 57th Street, New York, $1000.00.

Paul Foley, 485 Lexington Avenue, New York, $100.00.

(November 6, 1964)

David Rose, 529 5th Avenue, New York, $1000.00.

Sidney Harman, Forte Drive, Old Westbury, N.Y., $250.00.

(December 16, 1964)

Gerry Harkavy, 80 Park Avenue, New York, $30.00.

Total receipts for 1964: $998,666.67.

(January 29, 1965)

Ruth Krikorian, 322 49th Street, Union City, N.J., $1,000.

Barbara Voskian, 533 Lindberg Avenue, Cliffside, N.J., $1,000.

Thomas Harnett, 233 Broadway, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

(March 5, 1965)

Sidney Friedman, 15 Wensley Drive, Great Neck, N.Y., $1,000.

(March 18, 1965)

Seth Baker, 72 Wall Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

(March 19, 1965)

Mr. & Mrs. Frank Altschul, 730 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., $5,000.

(April 6, 1965)

Robert M. Morgenthau, 4725 Independence Avenue, Bronx, N.Y., $1,000.

(April 9, 1965)

Evelyn S. Lehman, 32 East 64th Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Orin Lehman, 118 East 65th Street, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

(April 12, 1965)

Ralph I. Straus, 331 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

William J. Hogan, 34 Greenfield Avenue, Bronxville, N.Y., $1,000.

(April 14, 1965)

Elinor S. Gimbel, 163 E. 78th Street, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

Mrs. Richard J. Bernhard, 46 E. 71st Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

(April 15, 1965)

James Ottenberg, 145 E. 92nd Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Phyllis R. Susskind, 1125 5th Avenue, New York, N.Y., $250.

(April 16, 1965)

Rosalind Kramer, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

(April 19, 1965)

Sidney Freidberg, 500 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

Doris Warner Vidor, 71 E 71st Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

(April 20, 1965)

Christopher Lindsey, 20 E. 46th Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Ethel Dupont Lindsey, 20 E. 46th Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Jack I. Poses, 400 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

(April 22, 1965)

Mr. & Mrs. Lansdell K. Christie, 70 Pine Street, New York, N.Y., $5,000.

(April 23, 1965)

Selig S. Burrows, 514 W. 49th Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Vincent Sardi, 123 E. 54th Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

(April 26, 1965)

Mr. & Mrs. Charles Luckman, 680 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., $5,000.

(April 27, 1965)

Mr. & Mrs. George Farkas, 24 Central Park South, New York, N.Y., $5,000.

Roy V. Titus, 655 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

(April 28, 1965)

Mr. & Mrs. George Frankel, 530 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., $5,000.

James E. Birdsall, 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

Frank D. Fernandez, 320 E. 65th Street, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

Mrs. Dorothy Schiff, 75 West Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

(April 29, 1966)

Harold S. Geneen, 2 E. 67th Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Ted B. Westfall, 5 Oakledge Road, Bronxville, N.Y., $1,000.

Francis J. Dunleavy, 12 M. Hudstraat, Asbeek, Asse Belgium, $1,000.

Hart Perry, 57 E. 74th Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Edward J. Gerrity, Jr., 18 Mohegan Rd., Larchmont, N.Y., $1,000.

Dr. S. Dispenza, W. State & Clinton Street Albion, N.Y., $1,000.

Bernard Tannenbaum, 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

(April 30, 1965)

Arnold M. Picker, 729 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

(May 3, 1965)

Peter Campbell Brown, 41 E. 42nd Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Frank Karelsen, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

Murray L. Silberstein, 6 Westway, White Plains, N.Y., $1,000.

J. Edwin Doyle, 20 West 43rd Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Maxwell Dane, 20 West 43rd Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Carrie E. Schulte, Hotel Pierre, 2 E. 61st St., New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Mr. & Mrs. S. R. Field, Hotel Drake, 440 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

(May 4, 1965)

Mrs. Charles Cogliandro, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

Morris Rossoff, 660 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Harold F. Linder, 1901 24th St., NW., Washington, D.C., $2,000.

Stanley N. Arnold, 1020 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Mrs. Corning Howard, P.O. Box 494, Westbury, L.I., N.Y., $1,000.

Stanley J. Harte, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Monroe Goldwater, 60 E. 42nd Street, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

Sam Harris, 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

Joseph H. Hirshhorn, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

(May 5, 1965)

Harold K. Hochschild, 1270 Avenue of Americas, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

Mrs. Dorothy H. Hirshon, 911 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

(May 6, 1965)

E. Roland Harriman, 59 Wall Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Mr. & Mrs. Leon Alpert, Sterling Road, Harrison, N.Y., $5,000.

Richard M. Samuels, 255 Esplànade Drive, Rochester, N.Y., $2,000.

Victor L. Anfuso, Jr., 70 Pine Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Lewis Gruber, 200 E. 42nd Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Meyer Davis, 119 W. 57th Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Owen R. Cheatham, 375 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

(May 7, 1965)

Sidney K. Scheuer, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Agnes Brown Leach, 1201 Park Avenue, New York, NY., $1,000.

Walter A. Cantwell, 100 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y, $2,000.

Aaron R. Frosch, 120 E. 56th Street, New York, NY., $1,000.

Mr. & Mrs. Olga Konow, Regency Hotel, Park & 61st St., NYC, $5,000.

Mary W Warburg, 730 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Mrs. Ronald E. Tree, 123 E. 79th Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Mr. & Mrs. John Q. Adams, 525 West Street, New York, N.Y., $5,000.

Eugene M. Lang, 100 E. 42nd Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Marvin Rosenberg, 260 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Henry Garfinkle, 131 Varick Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

(May 10, 1965)

Simon H. Rifkind, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, NY., $1,000.

Carl A. Frische, 114 Wheatley Road, Glen Head, N.Y., $1,000.

Abraham Schrader, 530 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

Oliver R. Grace, 39 Broadway, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Daniel A. Brener, 420 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Mr. & Mrs. Edwin L. Weisl, 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y., $5,000.

Mrs. Henry Ittleson, 200 E. 57th Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Carol W. Haussamen, 40 Central Park South, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

John P. Botti, 132 Wickham Avenue, Middletown, N.Y., $1,000.

Mrs. Marshall Field, 250 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Joseph Kahn, 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

James Lawrence Garrity, 200 E. 42nd Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Jackson A. Edwards, 514 East 73rd Street, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

Jack D. Saltzman, 428 Hoboken Avenue, Jersey City, N.J., $2,000.

Mr. & Mrs. Henry F. Fischbach, 4 Sutton Place, New York, N.Y., $5,000.

(May 11, 1965)

Edwin L. Weisl, Jr., 4211 California Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., $1,000.

Mr. & Mrs. Arthur B. Krim, 729 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y., $5,000.

Mortimer Levitt, 716 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Audrey S. Hess, 19 Beekman Place, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Donald Flamm, 25 Central Park West, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Stephen Shalom, 511 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Irving Geist, 30 E. 72nd Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Edward R. Lewis, 420 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Alvin Dworman, 65 West 55th Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Murray Lavin, 30 Broad Street, New York, N.Y., $3,000.

Herbert L. Stern,70 East 10th Street, New York, N.Y., $3,000.

Leon Finley, 516 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

(May 12, 1965)

John A. Coleman, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Walter N. Frank, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Joseph Love, 1333 Broadway, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Joseph T. P. Sullivan, 19 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Mr. & Mrs. Jay Wells, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., $5,000.

Mr. & Mrs. Alfred A. Strelsin, 595 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., $5,000.

James A. Farley, 301 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Charles Schlaifer, 4 West 58th Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Jacob Starr, 1095 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Michael J. Merkin, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

B. J. Buttenweiser, 30 Wall Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Mr. & Mrs. Robert Lehman, 1 William Street, New York, N.Y., $5,000.

F. William Harder, 30 Broad Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

(May 13, 1965)

Sol M. Linowitz, 5 South Fitzhugh Street, Rochester, N.Y., $2,000.

Gerard Oestreicher, 680 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

Arnold Berman, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Ned Pines, 355 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Samuel Rudin, 945 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

Anthony B. Akers, 920 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

Francis J. Tierney, Fort Edward, N.Y., $1,000.

Robert W. Dowling, 980 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

Phyllis R. Susskind, 1125 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., $250.

(May 14, 1965)

Morris Weinberg, 183 East Broadway, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Claude A. Giroux, 165 West 46th Street, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

Charles G. Bluhdorn, 1271 Avenue of Americas, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Albert E. Perry, 237 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Mrs. Herbert H. Lehman, 820 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Carmine DeSapio, Hotel Biltmore, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Ruth Axe, 730 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Mr. & Mrs. Ralph Friedman, 60 Wall Street, New York, N.Y., $5,000.

Ralph E. Samuel, 2 Broadway, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Herbert L. Barnet, 500 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Joseph L. Mailman, 460 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Richard L. Geisman, 205 E. 67th Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

John W. Kluge, 205 E. 67th Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

William Benton, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Raymond M. Tierney, 7 Club Circle, Monmouth Beach, New Jersey, $2,000.

Howard J. Samuels, Canandaigua, New York, $3,000.

Mr. & Mrs. Francis S. Levien, 300 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., $5,000.

Mr. & Mrs. Harry E. Gould, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., $5,000.

Harry Kahn, 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Louis Beck, 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., $3,000.

Joseph Maharam, 176 E. 71st Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Ralph I. Straus, 331 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Marvyn Carton, 30 Broad Street, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

Calmon J. Ginsberg, 80 Broad Street, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

(May 17, 1965)

Bernard Cianciulli, Local 381, 853 Broadway, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Thomas J. Watson, Old Orchard Road, Armonk, N. Y., $1,000.

Mr. & Mrs. Robert Benjamin, 729 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y., $5,000.

Sylvester J. Garamella, 51 Boardway, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Louis Fineman, 80–80 Ken Street, Jamaica, N.Y., $1,000.

Nathan E. Herzfeld, 295 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

Gerald L. Herzfeld, 295 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

(May 19, 1965)

Carl H. Abraham, 60 E. 57th Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

James L. Garrity, 200 E. 42nd Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Harriette P. Welles, Bernardsville, N.J., $500.

William S. Yalden, Gates Avenue, Geneva, New York, $1,000.

John Ventre, Ventre Packing, Syracuse, N.Y., $1,000.

Andre Meyer, 44 Wall Street, New York, N.Y., $3,000.

Felix G. Rohatyn, 1125 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

Walter Fried, 44 Wall Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Raymond S. Troubh, 24 Gramercy Park, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Elliott Cox, 1486 Poulson Street, Wantagh, New York, $1,000.

Sidney Wolf, 110–15 71st Road, Forest Hills, N.Y., $1,000.

Jerry Mastromarino, 7 Hoover Street, Haverstraw, N.Y., $1,000.

Nicholas F. Lopes, Box 91, 49 Maple Avenue, New City, N.Y., $500.

Mary Lopes, Box 91, 49 Maple Avenue, New City, N.Y., $500.

Mr. and Mrs. Milton A. Gilbert, 441 Ninth Avenue, New York, N.Y., $5,000.

Charles Merinoff, 10–06 35th Avenue, Long Island City, N.Y., $1,000.

George M. Bunker, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Daniel Flynn, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Nathan Straus III, 40 E. 88th Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Charles H. Gross, 5 Hanover Square, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Nicholas Reisini, 410 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Albert A. List, 1740 Broadway, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Jose A. Ferre, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Francis J. Quillinan, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Edwin A. Tennant, Jr., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

James N. Rosenberg, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

R. Peter Straus, 415 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Norman E. Alexander, 750 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

S. Joseph Tankoos, Jr., 635 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

George H. Bookbinder, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

George M. Bragalini, 350 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

David M. Levitt, 45 W. 36th Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Olga Konow, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Sidney P. Lipkins, 22–09 Bridge Plaza North, Long Island City, N.Y., $1,000.

Roy Riker, LaGroce Sq., Route No. 130, Burlington, N.J., $2,000.

Charles J. Bensley, 1616 Bronxdale Avenue, Bronx, N.Y., $1,000.

Jean R. Kintner, 817 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Amalgamated Political Education Committee, 15 Union Square, New York, N.Y., $5,000.

United Steelworkers of America, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, $2,000.

John Falvella, 595 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

William Lawson, 595 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Elliot Cox, 1486 Poulson Street, Wantagh, N.Y., $1,000.

(May 20, 1965)

Louis S. Gimbel III, 655 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., $100.

John A. Kiser, 598 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Leonard Morey, 383 Lafayette Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Raymond D. O'Connell, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

William S. Wasserman, 100 West 10th Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Peter J. Crotty, 709 Lafayette Bldg., Buffalo, N.Y., $1,000.

Nathan Kalikow, 201 Bay Blvd., Atlantic Beach, N.Y., $2,000.

John English, Split Rock Rd., Syosset, N.Y., $2,000.

Saul Lerner, Seawane Drive, Hewlett Harbor, N.Y., $2,000.

Donald Axinn, 10 Pine Drive, Woodbury, New York, $1,000.

Eugene Leone, 155 E. 49th Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

W. A. Harriman, 16 E. 81st Street, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

Caryl B. Muehlstein, 60 Sutton Place, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Robert E. Simon, Jr., 250 W. 57th Street, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

Henry Ford II, Dearborn, Michigan, $1,000.

Florence Perlow Shientag, 655 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

William A. Shea, 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

Alexander Carson, 28 Watkins Avenue, Oneonta , N.Y., $1,000.

Cyril T. Krenzer, Churchville, N.Y., $1,000.

William F. Wilmot, 154 W. Jefferson Rd., Pittsford, N.Y., $2,000.

Cortland L. Brovitz, 345 Brooklawn Drive, Rochester, N.Y., $1,000.

Anthony Audino, 91 Barry Road, Rochester, N.Y., $1,000.

Harold Yanowitch, 430 Reynolds Arcade Building, Rochester, N.Y., $1,000.

Charles P. McColough, Xerox Corp., Rochester, N.Y., $2,000.

Joseph Fago, 880 Lebrun Road, Eggertsville, N.Y., $1,000.

Robert Hart, 17 Colonial Parkway, Pittsford, N.Y., $1,000.

Frank Abate, 550 East Main Street, Rochester, N.Y., $1,000.

Harper Sibley, 550 Main Street East, Rochester, N.Y., $2,000.

M. Jack Herman, 34 State Street, Rochester, N.Y., $1,000.

Alan J. Goldstein, Wisner Road, Rochester, N.Y., $1,000.

Angelo A. Costanza, 200 Ashbourne Road, Rochester, N.Y., $1,000.

James Wilmot, Page Airways, Rochester, N.Y., $3,000.

Guy A. Panero, 468 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

L. Spezio, 21 Orchard Park Boulevard, Rochester, N.Y., $1,000.

Frank DiMino, 1225 Ridgeway Avenue, Rochester, N.Y., $1,000.

Arthur McGinnis, 20 Pine Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Lennarth Anderson, 450 Cobbs Hills, Rochester, N.Y., $1.000.

(May 21, 1965)

Laurence Sovik, 200 Empire Building, Syracuse, N.Y., $1,000.

Dominic C. Mancuso, 39 Ross Street, Batavia, N.Y., $1,000.

T. Frank Dolan, Jr., 905 Canal Street, Syracuse, N.Y., $1,000.

William Bernbach, 20 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Celeste G. Bartos, 432 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

Giles Wanamaker, 660 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Charles Revson, 666 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

David Sher, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

Mary W. Lasker, 29 Beekman Place, New York, N.Y., $3,000.

Mr. and Mrs. Albert Broccoli, 3 Audley Square, London, England, $5,000.

Mr. and Mrs. Harry Saltzman, 3 Audley Square, London, England, $5,000.

(May 24, 1965)

John French, 63 Wall Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Seymour Milstein, 733 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Joseph Harris, 445 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Enid A. Haupt, 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Mr. and Mrs. Thomas J. Deegan, Time & Life Building, New York, N.Y., $5,000.

Howard Lilienthal, 60 E. 96th Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Richard Hoeber, 11 Park Place, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Louis Naftalison, 440 E. 23rd Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Samuel Paul, 89–30 161st Street, Jamaica, N.Y., $1,000.

Anthony Comparato, 60 Brookwood Rd., Rochester, N.Y., $1,000.

Donald Margolin, 333 W. 57th Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Solomon Bachler, 3400 East Avenue, Rochester, N.Y., $1,000.

Harry Black, 155 Gould Street, Rochester, N.Y., $1,000.

John J. Nasca, 405 Walbridge Building, Buffalo, N.Y., $1,000.

William N. Posner, Suite 200 H, Powers Building, Rochester, N.Y., $2,000.

James P. Wilmot, Page Airways, Rochester, N.Y., $1,000.

Harold Farber, 120 Delaware Avenue, Buffalo, N.Y., $1,000.

Horace P. Gioia, 89 Canal Street, Rochester, N.Y., $1,000.

William Kapner, 112–20 72nd Drive, Forest Hills, N.Y., $1,000.

Trevor K. Serviss, Woodchuck Road, Fayetteville, N.Y., $1,000.

(May 25, 1965)

Sidney Gondelman, 932 Broadway, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Paul Kayser, 1006 Main Street, Houston, Texas, $1,000.

Nel Singer, 10 East 56th Street, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

Herbert Singer, 10 East 56th Street, New York, N.Y., $3,000.

(May 26, 1965)

Robert Haggiag, 12 Beekman Place, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

(May 27, 1965)

Mr. & Mrs. Lester Avnet, 1271 Avenue of Americas, New York, N.Y., $5,000.

Richard Levine, 25 Sutton Place South, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

Patricia Levine, 25 Sutton Place South, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

Mr. & Mrs. Joseph Levine, 25 Sutton Place South, New York, N.Y., $6,000.

(May 28, 1965)

Sol Hurok, 730 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Raymond Hylam, 322 Sandringham Road, Rochester, N.Y., $2,000.

(June 3, 1965)

Anna R. Hoffman, 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., $3,000.

Paul G. Betlem, 1650 University Avenue, Rochester, N.Y., $1,000.

Mr. & Mrs. Newton Glekel, 680 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., $6,000.

Anna Rosenberg, 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

(June 4, 1965)

Richard E. Koffman, 47 Chenango Street, Binghamton, N.Y., $1,000.

(June 7, 1965)

Joshua A. Gollin, 1290 Avenue of Americas, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

(June 10, 1965)

Morris B. Abram, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

(June 11, 1965)

Chester Roth, 425 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

James W. Murray, R.F.D. 1, Box 76, Mt. Kisco, N.Y., $1,000.

(June 14, 1965)

Samuel Rubin, 9 East 64th Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Thomas F. O'Reilly, 291 Genesee Street, Utica, N.Y., $2,000.

(June 16, 1965)

Ralph E. Ablon, 161 E. 42d Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Morton M. Hanes, 1245 Broadway, Hewlett, N.Y., $1,000.

(June 17, 1965)

Norman K. Winston, 22 West 48th Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Arthur G. Altschul, 20 Broad Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Ruth Axe, 730 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

(June 18, 1965)

Maxwell A. Kriendler, 23 West 52d Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

(June 21, 1965)

Henry Pearce, 41 E. 42d Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Fred W. Richmond, 743 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Arthur K. Watson, Old Orchard Rd., Armonk, N.Y., $1,000.

(June 22, 1965)

Edward L. Cournand, 998 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

(June 25, 1965)

Stanley Steingut, 11 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

William Schwendler, Grumman Corp., Beth Page, L.I., N.Y., $1,000.

(June 28, 1965)

Phyllis R. Susskind, 1125 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., $250.

Bernard F. Gimbel, 33rd St. & Bwdy., New York, N.Y., $500.

Nathan W. Levin, 600 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

(July 1, 1965)

Fowler Hamilton, 14 Sutton Place South, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

(July 13, 1965)

Clinton Towl, Grumman Corp., S. Oyster Bay Rd., Syossett, N.Y., $1,000.

(July 14, 1965)

Thomas G. Wyman, 375 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

(July 26, 1965)

David L. Wolper, 205 E. 67th Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

(July 28, 1965)

George J. Feldman, 640 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

(July 30, 1965)

Mr. & Mrs. Samuel Lefrak, 168 Noye Lane, Woodmere, N.Y., $2,000.

Mr. & Mrs. Louis Weintraub, 635 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

(August 2, 1965)

Mr. & Mrs. Eugene Ferkauf, 187–06 Grand Central Parkway, Jamaica Estates, N.Y., $2,000.

Harry Meresman, Seville Avenue, Rye, N.Y., $1,000.

(August 12, 1965)

William Levinson, 1800 W. Indiana Avenue, Philadelphia, Penn., $1,000.

Florence Abramson, 729 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Joseph Ende, 729 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Norman Hasselo, 729 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

David Kramer, 729 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

(August 26, 1965)

Larry Fisher, 6 East 45th Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

(September 1, 1965)

Meshulam Riklis, 711 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

(September 2, 1965)

Phyllis R. Susskind, 1125 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., $250.

(September 3, 1965)

John J. McNiff, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C., $1,000.

(September 10, 1965)

Alexander R. Purdon, 1 Broadway, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

(September 14, 1965)

Leonard Lane, 711 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., $2,000.

Edward Durell Stone, 505 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Harvey Picker, 1275 Mamaroneck Avenue, White Plains, N.Y., $2,500.

(September 15, 1965)

Richard K. Manoff, 845 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

John M. Franklin, U.S. Lines Co., 1 Broadway, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

(September 22, 1965)

Seymour M. Bohrer, 70 Pine Street, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

Jacob Blaustein, 1 North Charles, Baltimore, Md., $1,000.

(October 1, 1965)

Herbert Papock, 261 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

(November 18, 1965)

Mr. & Mrs. Chester Devenow, 805 Chicago Street, Toledo, Ohio, $2,000.

(November 22, 1965)

Joseph Tonelli, 820 Second Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

(November 23, 1965)

Jean Picker, Edgewater Point, Mamaroneck, N.Y., $3,000.

Irving M. Engel, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y., $1,000.

(December 10, 1965)

Mr. & Mrs. Christopher Lindsey, 3 East 43rd Street, New York, N.Y., $3,000.

Total Receipts for 1965, $519,000.

EXECUTIVE ORDER LAYS BASEWORK FOR REGIMENTATION OF AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Bob Wilson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, an executive order signed by the President October 11 and printed in the Federal Register October 13 lays the basework for the complete regimentation of the American people. All that is required is a Presidential declaration of an emergency.

The President could even decide that the election of a Republican House constitutes an emergency.

This order was termed a "standby order." The big question, among others, is this: Why was it issued right now?

Did it have to be issued because wage and price controls will be instituted right after the November 8 elections and a basework has to be laid now?

Was it issued because, without consulting the loyal opposition, the war is to be escalated if highly publicized peace feelers fail?

It was slipped into the Register and made official without fanfare, one might accurately state almost furtively.

The administration professes wonder that the American people are scared. I submit this kind of unexplained decree is enough to frighten them, as do skyrocketing prices, tight money, the stock market sag, and all the other developments caused by the actions of this administration and its blank-check Congress.

In this connection, I introduce in the Record, by unanimous consent, an article by the distinguished president of the Gridiron Club and Chicago Tribune columnist, Walter Trohan:

Report From Washington: Johnson Signs Order; Could Mean Price, Wage Controls

(By Walter Trohan, chief of Chicago Tribune's Washington bureau)

Washington, October 14.—Without any fanfare, President Johnson signed and sealed an extraordinary executive order in the White House last Tuesday which assigns wide emergency preparedness functions to the attorney general.

No explanation was given for ordering the preparation of national emergency plans and the development of war plans at this time. The far-reaching executive order was published in the Federal Register for last Thursday.

Under the order, it would be possible to institute wage and price controls, rationing, civil defense programs, alien controls, border controls, and a host of wartime measures. The order does not proclaim a national emergency but paves the way for action on such a proclamation.

The executive order states that the attorney general shall provide advice with respect to "any emergency directive or procedure prepared by a department or agency as part of its emergency program." This could mean wage and price controls or rationing.

The attorney general is authorized to review legal procedures of federal agencies designed to enlist industrial support, judicial and legislative liaison, mobilize research facilities, and fix security standards.

SHALL ASSIST, IF REQUESTED

The order says that the attorney general shall, on request, assist in the planning and development of law enforcement personnel for civil defense emergency operations and supervise utilization of state and intrastate law enforcing agencies. The attorney general is empowered to develop plans and procedures for identification of the dead.

The order provides for the development of an office of emergency planning, whose director would assume control for total national preparedness. The order says of emergency planning:

"Emergency plans and programs shall be developed as an integral part of the continuing activities of the department of justice on the basis that it will have the responsibility for the carrying out of such programs during an emergency. The attorney general shall be prepared to implement all appropriate plans developed under this order."

The order states that the President issued the "executive order 11310 assigning emergency preparedness functions to the attorney general" under authority vested in him under reorganization plan No. 1 of 1958. Experts in the Library of Congress said the President can proclaim an emergency because of the war in Viet Nam any moment. Experts said he can act under Korean war powers, which have not expired, as well as under the 1958 reorganization act.

HEAR RUMBLINGS OF CONTROLS AND RATIONING

Johnson has denied any intention of instituting wage and price controls. The White House had said that no executive order had been issued when questioned early in the week by Rep. James B. Utt (R., Cal.). Then on Thursday the order signed on Tuesday was published quietly in the government's official daily.

Possibly the President acted quietly because he did not wish to precipitate fear or hysteria of an expected "armed attack." For weeks there have been rumblings that he planned to institute wage and price controls and rationing after the election.

There also have been reports that some dramatic action would come in the far east before the election. Possibly the President issued the executive order as a standby measure in case it might be needed after such a dramatic action.

It is curious that it was issued while there is no attorney general, the office being temporarily vacant until the successor to Nicholas Katzenbach is named. Katzenbach recently was named undersecretary of state, but it is not known whether this appointment had any relationship to the executive order.

HOW TO STEAL AN ELECTION—AND HOW THE CRAMER ANTI-VOTE-FRAUD VOTING RIGHTS AMENDMENT CAN STOP SUCH THEFT

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on November 8, millions of Americans will go to the polls and exercise their right to vote. But if past elections are any indication, many of these Americans will lose their vote on election day through a variety of illicit vote-stealing practices.

Following my remarks is an excellent article from this month's issue of Changing Times magazine which discusses the variety of ways votes are stolen. I strongly recommend this article to my colleagues so that all can be alert to the methods employed to deny the franchise to the voters on election day.

I would also like to bring to the attention of this body a provision of the 1965 Voting Rights Act which I had the privilege of offering on the House floor and which makes voting frauds a Federal offense in many instances. I believe each and every Member of this Congress should fully familiarize himself with the vote-fraud provision of the 1965 Voting Rights Act so that he will be aware that there is a legal remedy available through a complaint to the Justice Department or the U.S. district attorney—should unlawful voting practices be discovered.

The vote-fraud amendment to the 1965 Voting Rights Act, Public Law 89-110, section 11(c), provides:

> (c) Whoever knowingly or willfully gives false information as to his name, address, or period of residence in the voting district for the purposes of establishing his eligibility to register or vote, or conspires with another individual for the purpose of encouraging his false registration to vote or illegal voting, or pays or offers to pay or accepts payment either for registration to vote or for voting shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both: *Provided, however,* That this provision shall be applicable only to general, special, or primary elections held solely or in part for the purpose of selecting or electing any candidate for the office of President, Vice President, presidential elector, Members of the United States Senate, Member of the United States House of Representatives, or Delegates or Commissioners from the territories or possessions, or Resident Commissioner of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Following is the article I referred to entitled "How To Steal an Election" from the October 1966 issue of Changing Times, the Kiplinger Service for Families:

How To Steal an Election

In the elections of 1964, at least 4,000,000 fraudulent or invalid ballots were cast and counted. That figure—an estimate by the Honest Ballot Association—represents about 5½% of the total vote cast, and many elections are won by a considerably smaller margin. For example, a 5% swing would have defeated the 110 current members of the House of Representatives and 43 United States Senators who received less than a 10% majority the last time they went before the voters.

In theory, the states have adequate laws governing the conduct of elections, particularly with regard to fraud. In practice, the election thief has often been protected by lax, if not downright crooked, officials in the precinct in which he operated, and the chances of his being brought to task have been slight indeed.

In federal elections, he was home free practically every time. Until recently, federal law required proof of conspiracy, which in effect allowed an individual to cast fraudulent ballots as long as no one could prove he had conspired with another person to do so.

The result is that election day presents a higher challenge to a skilled ballot thief: thwarting the will of the majority. Traditionally, he has risen joyously to meet it.

No political party has a corner on rigged elections. The chief practitioners in any given precinct, though, usually represent the party in power there, simply because they control the election machinery. Only on the rarest occasions can the out party outsteal the ins, since most schemes for stealing an election take the cooperation of at least one key official.

A BALLOT BURGLAR'S TOOL KIT

If you were a practiced manipulator of elections, hardened to the hazards of state law and undaunted by the threat of federal prosecution, here are some tricks you might employ or, if you're on the side of the angels, some you might watch out for come November 8.

The chain ballot

One of the oldest and most foolproof ways of buying an election, it's possible only in precincts that still use paper ballots (around 40% of the country's 175,000 precincts do). The only thing you need, besides money, of course, is a single official ballot, which forms the first link in the chain. In states with liberal absentee-voting laws you can acquire one easily; in others you must get it at the polls by pocketing your own and depositing a reasonable facsimile in the ballot box.

Once you have the official ballot, you set up in a prearranged headquarters. The first of a line of hired voters takes the ballot, marked by you, into the polling booth, substitutes it for the ballot he received from the election officials, and returns his unmarked ballot to you. You mark that, give it to the next man—and so on. The cost may run from $1.50 to $5 per voter, depending on the precinct and the contest, perhaps with a drink on the house thrown in. The beauty of it is that you can be sure the voters you purchased stay bought and don't double-cross you in the voting booth.

Rigged machines

Voting machines eliminated the chain ballot, but that's about all. One new machine, which produces an electronic tape showing the count at the beginning and the end of the polling, does pose a threat to the cheaters, though at present it's only used in a very few precincts. Elsewhere, a good mechanic can work wonders, and often a paper clip or rubber band will do the trick.

Rigging the machines requires the connivance of election officials, and you have to get up early. Usually machines are delivered to polling places the night before election or early election morning. Before voting starts, election officials open the backs of the machines to see that all counts are set at zero and the machine is in proper working order. So if you're going to have to contend with an honest election official or alert poll watcher, you have to get there well in advance to arrange the alterations you have in mind.

There are all sorts of ways to go about it. A favorite is to run up a few votes, or a few hundred, depending on what you need, before the polling begins. Then you paste a little 000 sticker or decal over the total shown, so that the machine appears to be set properly when inspected before the polling. To insure success, you need to alter the voting books, too, so they will show the same number of voters as the machine. This is fairly simple if a clerk can be persuaded to make some mistakes in numbering. Say the last voter on one page is number 81. When the clerk turns the page, he can start with 182, covering 100 of your phony votes, and repeat this process at intervals until he has added the proper number.

If you have the mechanical know-how you can rig a machine so that votes cast for one candidate are jumped to another candidate's tally, or change the gear ratio so that a lever depressed for one candidate only records every other vote or every tenth vote. These operations obviously take great skill, but are harder to detect than the simpler techniques.

Perhaps one of the simplest is to plug up the lever of a candidate you want defeated by inserting a small obstruction, like a paper clip, at the base of the space below the candidate's lever. When depressed, the lever won't go all the way down and the vote won't register.

Voting the absentee

Absentee ballots are a legitimate system for permitting the ill or necessarily absent to vote, but they put a powerful tool in the hands of dishonest election officials—particularly where the absentee ballots can be cast by mail.

Of all the techniques used to steal elections, this may be one of the most common. The essential first step is to make sure the registration books contain a sufficient number of excess voters. This may require the cooperation of a registrar who will continue to carry on his books the names of persons who have moved away, died or are otherwise disqualified by law—persons serving sentences for felonies, for example, or committed to mental institutions.

It's not unusual to find as many as a dozen absentee ballots mailed to one address, all "in care of" the same person who opens the envelope, marks the ballot, forges a signature for the addressee, and returns it to the proper official. Or with the help of the registrar and the election official whose duty it is to mail the ballots, applications using the last known address or a false address can be filed for those whose vote you intend to cast; then you pick up their ballots and mail them back yourself. Either way, the only costs involved are postage plus whatever certification fees are required.

You can buy absent votes, too. Just have the voter send for his own ballot, which he turns over to you for a small fee, agreeing not to show up at the polls on election day.

An alert poll watcher can sometimes catch forgeries on applications and ballots if he notices that the handwriting is the same for a number of different voters. Also, if a Virginia precinct, for instance, receives 30 ballots from Michigan voters mailed not from Michigan but from the town in which the precinct is located, questions may be raised. However, if you've got a majority of the election officials on your side, you probably can outvote the dissenters and the ballots will go into the box to be counted.

Multiple voting

This is done in areas where the lists of voters are posted on election morning. You simply take "ghost" voters from precinct to precinct, where they assume the names of posted voters who are unlikely to show up.

Another form of ghost voting, again with the assistance of a registrar, is to bring in people by the carload from other communities or other states, having first taken the precaution of getting them on the books. In states where registration is allowed up to and including election day, this does not pose much of a problem. Some areas, and political parties, have been known to trade voters back and forth for primaries—a quid pro quo arrangement that works if both parties live up to the agreement and remove their ghost voters before the general election.

"Assisting" disabled voters

This trick can be used with either paper ballots or machines. Usually, representatives of both parties are supposed to go into the polling booth with a voter who requests assistance, but as a practical matter only one official does go in when the purpose is to throw the election. If you accompany a voter who wants to vote for a certain candidate for alderman, for instance, you might pull the lever for the straight ticket before he has a chance to tell you his other choices. You can also take advantage of voters seeking assistance because of illiteracy or a language barrier. Or, if you're in the business of buying votes, just get your voters to come in and ask for assistance, feigning illness or some other disability that would require it. Then you can make sure they vote the way you told them when you contracted for their ballots.

The fast count and the slow count

The former is the method by which election officials conspire to count a fellow out, either by miscalling the totals on the machines or by totaling votes for one candidate in another candidate's column when paper ballots are counted.

The slow count, on the other hand, involves waiting to see how much you need. You withhold the report of your total count until all other areas are in, then add enough votes to swing the election your way.

THE ARM OF THE LAW

These are only a few of the better-known ways to steal an election. There are plenty of others, and chances of success, unfortunately, are good. Even where fraud is suspected, the time, expense and effort needed to contest an election are too great for the average candidate to undertake. And even when results are contested, official records can mysteriously disappear before the case ever gets to court.

The federal government, however, is taking a dim view of election shenanigans. Last year Congress, in a burst of candor, acknowledged that fraudulent voting is widespread. It tacked an amendment onto the Voting Rights Act of 1965 providing stringent penalties for some forms of fraud in federal elections.

Specifically, the new law calls for a maximum penalty of $10,000 fine or five years in prison, or both, for any person who gives false information in order to register or vote, or who conspires with another person to encourage his false registration or illegal voting, or who either gives or accepts payment for a vote. While other parts of the voting Rights Act are limited in scope, a spokesman for the Department of Justice points out that the language of this section is nonrestrictive, covering all election precincts and districts in all states.

It may not be the ultimate answer, but it can reach to persons engaged in multiple voting or absentee ballot fraud, and to registrars who knowingly register unqualified people as well as the phony voters and outright vote-buyers who still operate in far too many precincts.

WHEN IN DOUBT, HOLLER

The fraudulent election practices discussed on these pages often occur right under an honest poll worker's nose, and he's none the wiser. The best way to assure an honest count in your precinct is to bone up on your state's election laws, then make a vigorous protest at the polls if you see the slightest violation. If there's a federal election involved, complain to the FBI, the United States Attorney in your district, the Attorney General of the United States, or all three. Sen. JOHN J. WILLIAMS and Rep. WILLIAM C. Cramer, sponsors of the clean-elections section of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, say that should bring some action.

EVEN THE LIBERALS WORRY

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the World Journal Tribune is the new New York liberal newspaper. When they start worrying about the spiraling costs of social security, we had all better start worrying.

I am including an editorial which was carried in their paper on October 15, 1966:

SPIRALING SOCIAL SECURITY

Talk of increasing social security benefits is par for the election-year course. The latest drive differs from previous ones only in that it includes expansion of the social security system's newest component, medicare.

This will mean, naturally, a higher social security tax to accommodate the heavier load.

The proposals advanced by President Johnson—and instantly snatched up by issue-hungry Republicans—may well be desirable. If they meet the test of majority approval, in and out of Congress, the proposals will, as they should, be translated into law.

It is just about time, however, for government to begin considering how high social security tax rates can go without becoming oppressive.

It is ancient and irrelevant history to recall that the tax began in 1937 at a rate of 1 per cent on the first $3,000 of earnings. Maximum tax: $30. Today it is 4.2 per cent on the first $6,660. Maximum tax: $277.20.

That's only half the story, of course, since the amount must be matched by employers.

The latest timetable, as revised by Congress last year, schedules rate increases in 1967, 1969, 1973, 1976, 1980 and 1987, which is as far as the timetable goes. For 1987 the rate is pegged at 5.65 per cent.

By that time, in other words, you will be paying (and your employer matching) $372.90 if you earn $6,600 or more.

But that's only theory. Actually you'll be paying more. Congress will surely revise the timetable several more times before then—increasing both the rate and the earnings base (current suggestion, $7,800).

But this sort of improvisation can't go on indefinitely. Somewhere along the way Congress or a presidential commission, or both, will have to (1) put the entire program on a basis of actuarial soundness and (2) determine just how high this federal payroll tax can go without making tomorrow's security overly burdensome on today's paycheck.

Don't misunderstand. We're solidly in favor of the social security program. We simply submit that it must be put on a more solid footing that will never be achieved by helter-skelter amendments and arbitrary, guesswork financing.

EMERGENCY TAKEOVER POWERS?

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Register of October 13, 1966, contains Executive Order No. 11310 which has the title "Assigning Emergency Preparedness Functions to the Attorney General." To read these orders sounds like something the Reichstag would have done in the early thirties. There may be valid reasons for them but any constitutionally minded American must wonder just what the President has in mind in issuing such far-reaching proclamations. I am including Executive Order 11310 with these remarks.

With the bureaucratic doubletalk that we have these days, who can be sure just what constitutes an emergency any more? We already have seen a shift to where treaties are called executive agreements and therefore do not need the advice and consent of the Senate. We are right now fighting a war in Vietnam which is officially not a war.

Who can be so sure what an emergency is? With the power-minded people we have in the White House surrounding the President, who can feel safe with such broad authority on the books? I can hear the knock at my door right now.

The order follows:

[F.R. Doc. 66-11227; Filed, Oct. 11, 1966; 4:40 p.m.]

THE PRESIDENT: EXECUTIVE ORDER 11310—ASSIGNING EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS FUNCTIONS TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

By virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States and pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1958 (72 Stat. 1799), it is hereby ordered as follows:

SECTION 1. *Scope.* (a) The Attorney General shall prepare national emergency plans and develop preparedness programs covering law-enforcement functions of concern to the executive branch of the Federal Government except to the extent that such functions are vested in other departments or agencies by statute or Executive order. Upon request, the Attorney General shall assist, as appropriate, in developing preparedness programs covering law-enforcement functions vested in other departments and agencies of the executive branch. He shall also provide, as appropriate, liaison with and guidance and assistance to the various divisions of State and local government, and maintain liaison with the Federal judicial system and the United States Congress as hereinafter set forth.

(b) These plans and programs shall be designed to develop a state of readiness, in these areas with respect to all conditions of national emergency, including an attack upon the United States.

SEC. 2. *Basic Functions.* The Attorney General shall:

(a) *Emergency documents and measures.* Provide advice, as appropriate, with respect to any emergency directive or procedure prepared by a department or agency as a part of its emergency preparedness function.

(b) *Industry support.* As appropriate, review the legal procedures developed by the Federal agencies concerned to be instituted if it becomes necessary for the Government to institute extraordinary measures with respect to vital production facilities, public facilities, communications systems, transportation systems, or other facility, system, or service essential to national survival.

(c) *Judicial and legislative liaison.* In cooperation with the Office of Emergency Planning, maintain liaison with Federal courts and with the Congress so there will be mutual understanding of Federal emergency plans involving law enforcement and the exercise of legal powers during emergencies of various magnitudes.

(d) *Legal advice.* Develop emergency plans for providing legal advice to the President, the Cabinet, and the heads of Executive departments and agencies wherever they may be located in an emergency, and provide emergency procedures for the review as to form and legality of Presidential proclamations, Executive orders, directives, regulations, and documents and of other documents requiring approval by the President or by the Attorney General which may be issued by authorized officers after an armed attack.

(e) *Alien control and control of entry and departure.* Develop emergency plans for the control of alien enemies and other aliens within the United States and, in consultation with the Department of the Treasury, develop emergency plans for the control of persons attempting to enter or leave the United States. These plans shall specifically include provisions for the following:

(1) The location, restraint, or custody of alien enemies.

(2) Temporary detention of alien enemies and other persons attempting to enter the United States pending determination of their admissibility.

(3) Apprehension of deserting alien crewmen and stowaways.

(4) Investigation and control of aliens admitted as contract laborers.

(5) Control of persons entering or departing from the United States at designated ports of entry.

(6) Increased surveillance of the borders to preclude prohibited crossings by persons.

(f) *Alien property.* Develop emergency plans for the seizure and administration of property of alien enemies under provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

(g) *Security standards.* In consultation with the Department of Defense and with other executive agencies to the extent appropriate, prepare plans for adjustment of security standards governing the employment of Federal personnel and Federal contractors in an emergency.

(h) *Research.* Within the framework of over-all Federal research objectives, supervise or conduct research in areas directly concerned with carrying out emergency preparedness responsibilities, designate representatives for necessary ad hoc or task-force groups, and provide advice and assistance to other agencies in planning for research in areas involving the interests of the Department of Justice.

SEC. 3. *Civil Defense.* In consonance with national civil defense programs developed by the Department of Defense, the Attorney General shall:

(a) *Local law enforcement.* Upon request, consult with and assist the Department of Defense to plan, develop, and distribute materials for use in the instruction and training of law-enforcement personnel for civil defense emergency operations; develop and carry out a national plan for civil defense instruction and training for enforcement officers, designed to utilize to the maximum extent practicable the resources and facilities of existing Federal, State, and local police schools, academies, and other appropriate institutions of learning; and assist the States in preparing for the conduct of intrastate and interstate law-enforcement operations to meet the extraordinary needs that would exist for emergency police services under conditions of attack or imminent attack.

(b) *Penal and correctional institutions.* Develop emergency plans and procedures for the custody and protection of prisoners and the use of Federal penal and correctional institutional resources, when available, for cooperation with local authorities in connection with mass feeding and housing, for the storage of standby emergency equipment, for the emergency use of prison hospitals and laboratory facilities, for the continued availability of prison-industry products, and for the development of Federal prisoner skills to appropriately augment the total supply of manpower; advise States and their political subdivisions regarding the use of State and local prisons, jails, and prisoners for the purpose of relieving local situations and conditions arising from a state of emergency.

(c) *Identification and location of persons.* Develop emergency plans and procedures for the use of the facilities and personnel of the Department of Justice in assisting the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with the development of plans and procedures for the identification of the dead and the reuniting of families during a civil defense emergency.

SEC. 4. *Interagency Cooperation.* Unless otherwise provided in this order, the Attorney General shall assume the initiative in developing joint plans for emergency preparedness functions described in this order in consultation with those departments and agencies which have responsibilities for any segment of such activities.

SEC. 5. *Presidential Coordination.* The Director of the Office of Emergency Planning shall advise and assist the President in determining policy for, and assist him in coordinating the performance of, functions under this order with the total national preparedness program.

SEC. 6. *Emergency Planning.* Emergency plans and programs shall be developed as an integral part of the continuing activities of the Department of Justice on the basis that it will have the responsibility for carrying out such programs during an emergency. The Attorney General shall be prepared to implement all appropriate plans developed under this order. Modifications, based on emergency conditions, will be in accordance with policy determinations by the President.

SEC. 7. *Emergency Actions.* Nothing in this order shall be construed as conferring authority under Title III of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2291–2297), or otherwise, to put into effect any emergency plan, procedure, policy, program, or course of action prepared or developed pursuant to this order. Such authority is reserved to the President.

SEC. 8. *Redelegation.* The Attorney General is hereby authorized to redelegate within the Department of Justice the functions hereinabove assigned to him.

SEC. 9. *Construction.* Nothing in this order shall be deemed to derogate from any now-existing assignment of functions to any Executive agency or officer made by statute or by Executive order.

SEC. 10. *General.* To the extent of any inconsistency between the provisions of any prior order and the provisions of this order, the latter shall control.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 11, 1966.*

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in connection with the special order by Mr. CONTE with reference to Speaker MARTIN.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report on the bill H.R. 13161, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report on H.R. 15111, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION ON OCTOBER 23, 1966

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Spcaker, the Federation of Free Hungarian Jurists, with its office in my district, exists to perpetuate and commemorate the cause of freedom for Hungary.

Its president, Dr. Laszlo Varga, and its executive vice president, Dr. Tibor Weber, are tireless in this cause.

They have helped to prepare for the 10th anniversary on October 23 of the modern Hungarian revolution against tyranny.

As Dr. Varga has stated it:

The aim of the Hungarian Revolution is already an historical fact and the Report of the Special Committee on the problem of Hungary stated as follows:

"From the study undertaken by the committee and the testimony it has received, no doubt remains as to the intensity of the desire of the Hungarian people for the complete withdrawal of Soviet armed forces from Hungary". (General Assembly of the United Nations, Official records, Eleventh Session, Supplement No. 18, A/3592, page 53)

The resolutions of the General Assembly of the United Nations regarding the Hungarian questions, concentrated for the withdrawal of the Soviet armed forces from Hungary (1004–ESUI, 1005–ESII, 1127 XI.1131, XI.1133, XI–1312, XIII. 1857–XVII) were always voted by the overwhelming majority of the General Assembly.

The Hon. U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations, in his speech in the General Assembly on September 17, 1957, at that time as Burma representative, stated:

"We remain convinced that what occurred in Hungary was essentially a spontaneous uprising . . . we regret therefore that the Soviet Union has not seen its way clear to withdrawing its troops and permitting the Hungarian people to work out their own form of government".

I feel that the Hungarian Revolution is unique in one aspect; it was initiated by the youth, it was basically made by them without any leaders and with only one purpose in mind: independence for Hungary.

And what is most remarkable is that the students grew up and were taught by the Communist and they, as the Hungarian Revolution shows, were a product of the dynamic idea of the Twentieth Century: to exercise the right of the self-determination. It means that the iron curtain can not stop the spirit and the idea of a free world.

All announcements, radio or publications were concentrated in one subject: Independence for Hungary.

And as the Revolution showed, the students and the workers sacrificed their lives for it.

Unfortunately, the Revolution was lost, especially because the free world was not alert and did not give the proper help through the United Nations.

Therefore, the aim of the Hungarian Revolution has not been yet fulfilled.

The Hungarian people do not want military help or war, but they just feel that the free world wants to forget their right and legal aspiration to be independent.

The Hungarian people are badly disappointed to realize that the United Nations makes little or no effort at all to lift up the iron curtain.

Our Federation sincerely believes that the aspiration of the Hungarian people can be peacefully accomplished if the thinker leaders of the free world, permanently promote the cause of Hungary. This would help not only the Hungarians but the free world too, because one of the most restless parts of the world would remain quiet.

Their study on the Soviet occupation of Hungary follows:

THE SOVIET OCCUPATION OF HUNGARY

THE PEACE TREATY

The first important legal statement concerning the presence of Soviet armed forces in Hungary is contained in Paragraph 3 of the Armistice Agreement, signed in Moscow on January 20, 1945:

"The Government and Army Supreme Command of Hungary assure to Soviet and other Allied troops freedom of movement on Hungary's territory, in any direction, if, in the opinion of the Allied (Soviet) High Command, this is required by the military situation; moreover, the Government and Army Supreme Command of Hungary will facilitate, by all means and at their own expense, the transportation of troops on land, water, and by air."

From 1944 until the Peace Treaty came into force (October 15, 1947), several hundred thousand Soviet soldiers were stationed on Hungarian territory. The number of other Allied troops (British, American, French) was insignificant.

The second legal statement is contained in the Peace Treaty, and reads as follows:

"Following the coming into force of the present Treaty, all Allied armed forces are to be withdrawn from Hungary within 90 days; however, the Soviet Union shall be entitled to keep on Hungarian territory such Armed Forces as may be needed for the maintenance of the lines of communication of the Soviet Army with the Soviet zone of occupation in Austria." (Peace Treaty, Law XVIII–1947.)

Since the Peace Treaty came into force the number of Soviet troops in Hungary has never been less than 50,000. Although the Treaty specified that the Soviet Union would have to withdraw its troops from Hungary immediately upon the expiration of its right to maintain armed forces in Austria, the Soviet troops stayed. It was only after the first intervention of these forces against the Hungarian revolutionaries in 1956 that the world was told that these Soviet units were stationed in Hungary, and that they had intervened under the provisions of the Warsaw Treaty. Yet there is no clause in that treaty which would justify one of its signatories' stationing troops on the territory of another signatory, or entitle troops to intervene except in case of an exterior attack by a foreign power.

THE WARSAW TREATY

The Warsaw Treaty was signed on May 14, 1955, by representatives of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, and the Soviet Union. It came into force on June 2, 1955, and contained the following statement:

"The Parties agree on the establishment of a Joint Command for certain elements of their Armed Forces which shall be allocated by agreement between the Parties, and which shall act in accordance with jointly established principles. The Parties shall likewise take such other concerted action as may be necessary to reinforce their defensive strength, in order to defend the peaceful labor of their peoples, guarantee the inviolability of their frontiers and territories, and afford protection against possible aggression." (Law III–1955, Article 5.)

INTERVENTION IN THE REVOLUTION

The Hungarian people regained their freedom and re-established the independence of their country by their Revolution, which began on October 23, 1956. By October 28, 1956, peace and order had been re-established in the country. However, in order to protect its domination over Eastern and Central Europe, on November 4, 1956 the Soviet Union carried out an armed intervention in the internal affairs of the Hungarian people, and destroyed the country's independence. As mentioned above, the Warsaw Treaty did not permit the Soviets to station troops in Hungary, and did not give them the right of intervention. In fact, the Warsaw Treaty (Article 4) actually obliged the other contracting powers (Czechoslovakia, Poland, Rumania, etc.) to come to the aid of Hungary:

"If any State . . . commits an armed attack against one or several Parties to the Treaty, each party to the Treaty shall . . . afford the State or States so attacked immediate assistance . . . by all the means it considers necessary, including the use of armed force." (Law III–1955, Article 4).

The Soviet Union and the Hungarian Communist Government were for a long time unable to find any "legal" basis for the Soviet intervention. Their previous invocation of the Warsaw Treaty was allowed to lapse into oblivion, since it was obviously untenable. Any reference to Prime Minister Imre Nagy was equally out of the question, since it was Nagy himself who informed the world, on November 4, 1956, of the Soviet aggression against the Hungarian people. Finally, in a memorandum addressed to the UN Secretary General dated February 4, 1957, a representative of the Hungarian regime now accredited to the United Nations declared that "the Hungarian Government asked the Soviet Union, as one of the signatories of the Peace Treaty, to re-establish democratic order in Hungary." (United Nations A–3521, 1957.) This assertion, too, is unfounded: at the time of the Soviet intervention, the Hungarian people had already reestablished democratic order in Hungary; it was the Soviet aggression which transformed that democratic order once more into a Communist dictatorship.

THE HUNGARIAN-SOVIET AGREEMENT OF 1957

In order to avoid a situation similar to the one that led to the Hungarian Revolution, the Soviet Government subsequently signed with several East European governments (including those of Poland and Hungary), agreements regulating the stationing of Soviet troops in those countries. The Hungarian-Soviet agreement, signed on May 27, 1957, stipulates:

"The number of Soviet troops temporarily in Hungary, as well as the places where they are to be stationed, will be determined by a special agreement between the Governments of the Hungarian People's Republic and the USSR." (*Nepszabadsag*, May 29, 1957.)

But this agreement has no legal validity, because at the time it was signed the Soviet Union was actually "depriving Hungary of its liberty and independence and the Hungarian people of the exercise of their fundamental rights." (UN Resolution 1131 (XI), December 12, 1956.) At the time this "agreement" was signed, the Hungarian government was not recognized by the United Nations as a legal representative of the Hungarian people; the General Assembly did not accept the credentials of the Hungarian Government's representatives at the United Nations until 1962.

UNITED NATIONS RESOLUTIONS

The great majority of members of the General Assembly of the United Nations resolved, during discussion of the Hungarian case, that "the immediate withdrawal of Soviet forces from Hungarian territory is necessary." (UN Resolutions 1004–ES–II, 1005–ES–II, 1127–XI, 1133–XI.)

The Soviet Government has so far failed to comply with these resolutions.

The Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, adopted in December 1960, states that: "the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation."

And in Resolution 213–XX, adopted on January 11, 1966, the General Assembly of the United Nations stated:

"The use of force to deprive peoples of their national identity constitutes a violation of their inalienable rights and of the principles of non-intervention.

"The strict observance of these obligations is an essential condition to ensure that nations live together in peace with one another, since the practice of any form of intervention not only violates the spirit and letter of the Charter of the United Nations but also leads to the creation of situations which threaten international peace and security.

"Every State has an inalienable right to choose its political, economic, social, and cultural systems, without interference in any form by another State."

The Soviet occupation of Hungary violates these United Nations resolutions, though they were approved by the Soviet Delegation to the United Nations. The Soviet Union hinders the political, cultural, and economic development of the Hungarian people in peace and freedom, and represents a permanent danger to peace.

October 23rd marks the day, and at 8:30 p.m. at Carnegie Hall in my District the free people of the United States will join in tribute on the Tenth Anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution.

Theirs too was "the shot heard 'round the world."

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUPFERMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I include at this point a very fine speech on the Hungarian resistance.

Speech by the Right Reverend Dr. Zoltan Beky, Bishop Emeritus of the Hungarian Reformed Church of America and President of the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America Before the Business and Professional Council of New York, October 15, 1966

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, may I express my sincere appreciation and thanks to you first for inviting me to speak before this illustrious gathering on the occasion of the anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution of 1956.

My heart, and I am sure that the hearts of every freedom-loving man and woman are full of deep sorrow and sadness when we recall the brutal and often bestial slaughtering of tens of thousands of innocent freedom-loving men and women during the heroic days of resistance in Hungary and its bloody aftermath.

The dying words of the heroes who died for freedom's cause hounds us incessantly through the passing years and months, it worries your conscience, tears your peace to pieces and disturbs your sleep.

In our ears their heart-breaking cry echoes: "Civilized people of the world . . . in the name of liberty and solidarity we are asking for your help. Our ship is sinking. The light vanishes. The shadows grow darker from hour to hour. Listen to our cry! Start moving. Extend to us your brotherly hands. God be with you and with us. Help! help! help!

However, there was no help for them, no answer to their anguished cries. The Western world remained silent, deaf, blind and unconcerned, and let the martyrs for freedom die on the streets of Budapest. It let tens of thousands of people whose only cry was to believe in freedom and democracy be massacred on improvised gallows, by tanks and firing squads and let 65,000 Hungarian youth be deported to the death camps of Siberia and looked at the spectacle of 230,000 Hungarians flee into exile from their homes and country.

Since the genocidal crimes of the Nazis committed against the Jewish population under their control, the Russian genocide in Hungary was the most tragic, outrageous and horrible crime against humanity inflicted upon an innocent, freedom-loving people during recent history. And the Western world remained quiet despite some verbal denunciations of the evil.

When Khrushchev sent up a dog in a Sputnik to the outer space, the Western world was horrified, and millions of our society ladies sent telegrams to him upbraiding him for having condemned a dog to its certain death in the space. Yet when thousands of innocent children and women of the freedom-loving Hungarian people were massacred, all we had were nice and polite words of praise, admiration and prayer.

I remain firmly convinced that the United States of America missed a great historical opportunity in 1956 by not supporting the freedom fighters of Hungary.

In the Middle East and in the Suez crisis we compromised with the historically most cruel and ruthless Communist power of the Soviet Union the final goal of which the enslavement of all mankind.

Today we see these facts clear. If we would have acted in that spirit ten years ago, we would not have today a Nasser in Egypt, a war of attrition in Formosa, world peace would be secure in a free world. That remains my firm conviction.

We should have learned the lesson of the last two decades i.e., that we cannot compromise with the Soviet Union, nor can heaven compromise with hell. We should remember what the fallen dictator Khrushchev told us not too long, and what has not been changed by his successors: "We shall bury you!"

In these tragic days we must realize that we cannot sit idly by and do nothing. If we permit these murderers whether in Viet Nam or in Hungary to get away with their horrible cries inflicted upon innocent people and nations, our turn will also come. Ten years ago Hungary, before it Korea and today Viet Nam, but tomorrow it may be America!

We must feel the responsibility for our enslaved brethren in their death and life struggle against communism no matter where they are. And we must do everything in our power to stop the cold-blooded killer before it is too late.

One hundred and thirteen years ago Louis Kossuth, the great Hungarian prophet and liberator, uttered these words before the Congress of the United States: "As there is unity in God, and unity in Light, so there is unity in the Principles of Freedom. Wherever freedom is extinguished, wherever the shadow of darkness is cast upon the sun of liberty, there is always danger for the survival of freedom's principles in the world. From Russia no sun will ever rise . . .

"Let not the enemies of freedom grow strong . . . . They hate you . . They consider you as their most dangerous enemy . . . Do not let Russia cross the Carpathian Mountains down to the Adriatic Sea and Asia Minor. If we do not see success in stopping the progress of despotism in Europe; you will see the danger brought home to you!" Now we realize the truth of the words of Kossuth.

Today when we commemorate the day of infamy and remember fondly the heroism of those who died for freedom's sake, our hearts are filled with anger and shame that their glorious day was turned into darkness and new oppression.

I repeat my appeal to the people of the free world to do everything to stop oppression of the Hungarian people. Yet at the same time we receive strength and hope from the nobleness of their sacrifice, for these heroes and martyrs demonstrated to us that the love of freedom cannot be extirpated from the heart of the people no matter how cruel the means and devilish the propaganda of the forces of communism, and no matter how long the indoctrination might last.

Freedom is a God-given gift and it will live rightfully as long as man, created in the image of God will continue to exist on the face of the earth. We must believe in the ultimate victory of freedom and liberty over the evil forces of totalitarian communism.

Let me close my remarks with the words of Louis Kossuth which remains our Creed, too:

> "There is hope for humanity, because there is a God in heaven and an America on earth. The world is not lost! Liberty will conquer! Hungary is not lost! Freedom cannot die!"

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, October 23 will mark the 10th anniversary of the beginning of the Hungarian revolution. I would like to join with my colleagues in acknowledgement of this day of importance to the free world.

Never before in our history was there such a total revolution as that which occurred 10 years ago in Hungary. What began as a peaceful student demonstration launched into a total uprising comprised of the workers, farmers, artisans, schoolteachers, government workers, and members of the Hungarian armed forces. The entire Hungarian people, from teenagers to grandmothers, joined in the revolt against the tyranny of communism. These oppressed Hungarians disproved the theory that national communism can be a substitute for freedom. They disproved the theory by risking their families, homes, work, and future—all sacrificed to throw off the yoke of their oppressors and to establish a free new government.

A terrible price was paid by the good people of Hungary in order that we all might learn a lesson. We will never receive the full benefit of our own basic freedoms, if these same freedoms are being denied elsewhere.

Our own country has been enriched by the survivors and families of these brave people. One American whom I have met and who remembers the terror and tyranny of those days in 1956 is Charlie Gogolak, the place-kicking expert of our own Washington Redskins. Charlie has a long record of football ahievements at Princeton University and now with the Redskins.

The Gogolak family, after walking 20 miles through muddy cornfields in November of 1956 and amidst bullets from the Communist border guards, were able to flee to sanctuary in a refugee camp in Austria. Soon afterward, they were flown to the United States where Dr. Gogolak was accepted to the staff of St. Lawrence State Hospital in New York. Since then, Charlie and his brother Pete, have become football players of national acclaim. The Gogolak family is a fine example of former Hungarians who have continued to exhibit the tenacity and strength of these patriotic people.

Therefore, on the 10th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution, I want to pay tribute to the victims and survivors of the terrible and memorable days of 1956.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on October 23 we are celebrating the 10th anniversary of the glorious, but tragic, Hungarian revolution of 1956.

Let us remember the circumstances under which communism was foisted on the Hungarian people in the first place. Occupation by the Red army, ruthless oppression of the democratic and nationalist parties and their leaders, police terror, and infiltration of all mass organizations by the double method of promises and terror. Rigged elections followed by show trials, "confessions," and purges. Deportation of entire social classes from the city to the rural areas, the establishment of a forced labor economy.

Yet, as soon as the "thaw" of 1953 occurred, even many of the Communists who joined originally from misguided idealism have seen the farce of the totalitarian police state parading as a "people's democracy." But the forces of oppression and the forces of the Soviet Union were stronger than timid attempts to offer concessions. After the first Nagy period, another Rakosi-Gero period followed, embittering the people over and beyond their endurance. The revolution erupted—a living testimonial of martyrs and heroes, many of whom were young Hungarians in their midteens.

At first, there was the smell of victory, but it turned into a massacre as no other power supported them in their search for peace and independence. Deportations, massacres, long-term prison sentences for over 100,000 Hungarians, 230,000 Hungarians in exile were the bitter fruit of a lost struggle for freedom.

Today, we are building bridges to Eastern Europe. It is good and necessary. We must "heal the breach that separates brother from brother in Europe," to quote the words of our President on October 7. But the President also stated, a few days later, that peace cannot be bought at the price of liberty.

Are we not honorbound, as tensions relax, to see that at least the most ominous of the injustices against the Hungarian people—namely, the presence of Soviet Russian troops in Hungary—be remedied? Twenty-three U.N. General Assembly resolutions voted by 48 to 60 nations remain unimplemented. We owe this much to those brave and gallant people who died with the last cry:

> Civilized people of the world . . . in the name of solidarity and liberty we are seeking your help. Our ship is sinking. The light vanishes. The shadows grow darker from hour to hour . . . Extend to us your brotherly hands. God be with you and with us. Help! Help! Help!

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday will mark the 10th anniversary of the beginning of the Hungarian revolution. This is an opportune moment for us to reflect on the meaning that uprising has for us, today.

During the period of the 12 days prior to the Russian tanks' attack on Budapest, the world witnessed the apparent victor of the Hungarian people against the Communists. We saw a peaceful demonstration, turned into a bloodbath, grow into a massive retaliation. We were horrified on November 4, 1956, when the Russian tanks rolled into Budapest and begain their systematic slaughter of the freedom fighters. We were stunned by the brutality of the Communist suppression of the revolution, and by our own helplessness. The entire free world was shaken and revolted by the actions of the Russians.

Now, 10 years later, much of the emotion inspired by these events has subsided and the true significance of those 2 weeks can be examined.

The Hungarian revolution did not fire the minds and hearts of men so much because it was a revolt against communism, or because of the courage of the Hungarians, or because of the Russians' brutality, or because of the refugees' plight in the aftermath. The true glory, and meaning, of the Hungarian revolution lies in its affirmation of the love of freedom as intrinsic to man. The revolution was begun by young people in their teens and early twenties who had been babes when the Communists took over Hungary after the war, and who had therefore never known freedom. They were perhaps inspired by the words of the great 19th century Hungarian patriot, Louis Kossuth:

> Magyars up, your country calls you
> Break the chain which now enthralls you
> Free men be, or slaves forever
> Choose ye, Magyars, now or never!

Children who had never known freedom and adults who had been denied freedom first by the aristocracy, then the Nazis, and finally by the Communists, these were the people who gave their futures and their lives in the faint hope that they might secure freedom for themselves and for their families. This is why the Hungarian revolution must never be forgotten by us in the United States. We already have what the Hungarians were willing to die for: freedom. We must never take it for granted.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, during this month of October, the Hungarian Freedom Fighters Federation, Inc., in the United States of America, is commemorating the 10th anniversary of the 1956 Hungarian revolution and freedom fight. At this time, when we reflect upon the tragedy that occurred in Hungary in 1956, I have submitted a statement to the Freedom Fighters Federation to be used in its memorial this year to those who fought so bravely for the freedom of their homeland. The statement is as follows:

On October 23, 1956, in a valiant effort to shed the bonds of oppression, the Hungarian people rose up against the tide of Communism. As dedicated to the cause of freedom as they had been a century before when they revolted against the Habsburg monarchy, the Hungarian patriots courageously battled to win the rights of man. Bitter the taste of terror, suppression, and tyranny, Hungary longed to be free.

For six long days the freedom fighters fought bravely, stubbornly, and successfully. But an unfed people cannot fight long against the well organized troops of the Communist army. The flesh of tired arms gave way to the hard metal of Soviet Weapons. The Hungarian people had lost their battle. Yet, in the words of William of Orange, "One need not hope in order to act, nor succeed in order to persevere." The yearning for freedom did not die with the hundreds and thousands of Hungarian patriots who lost their lives in those heroic six days; the fight continues today.

The lesson of the Hungarian Revolution cuts hard and deep. It speaks from the profound wisdom of a people who have suffered under the hands of the Communist dictatorship. It tells the world that lies and suppression cannot kill truth—that people cannot be taught to believe that wrong is right, that subservience is freedom. Lazlo Szabo, Peter Szanto, Ferenc Kocsis, Janos Feher—these men died so that others might be free. They rang the clear bell of freedom against the hard clamor of the Communist sword.

The significance of the struggle waged by the Hungarian people lies not only in the Communist atrocities which precipitated the Revolution, but in the unkept promises which the Communists made in order to bring the Revolution to a halt. Today, ten years later, what has happened to the Communist pledges to the Hungarian people?

The Communists promised to withdraw all troops from Hungary. Today, ten years later, 80,000 Soviet troops march on Hungarian soil.

The Communists promised to disband their secret police. Today, ten years later, suppression continues and tyranny persists.

The Communists promised to rectify the serious sins which precipitated the Revolution. Today, ten years later, the Hungarian people are still forcefully denied even the minimal of human rights.

The Communists promised the introduction of a democratic form of government, initiated by the people. Today, ten years later, a small minority holds the reins of power, contrary to the wishes of the Hungarian people.

Let the world learn from the Hungarian experience. Let the suffering of the Hungarian people be a lesson to all who yearn to be free. Let the world know the truth about oppressive, totalitarian Communism and about the lies and treachery which are used to rob the individual of his God-given right to freedom and liberty. Let the ten years which have passed since the heroic fight of the Hungarian patriots underline the true threat of Soviet dictatorship. Let us learn the lessons of truth.

And what of the Hungarian people? What of people all over the world who still live under the control and fear of Communist authority?

We salute the Hungarian Freedom Fighters Federation and other groups of valiant men who struggle to make men free. We admire and support their efforts to gain for the Hungarian people, and for others who suffer under dictatorship and oppression, the rights to which all men are entitled. We sympathize with, and we pledge our help to all who believe in the truth of the democratic way of life. We express our profound hope that the blood of those who died in October of 1956 will, in God's good time, result in a free and unfettered Hungarian people.

On October 23, 1966, let the whole world remember those who died in the cause of freedom. Names like Szabo and Szanto stand with Washington and Lincoln in their meaning to the rights of all mankind.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor to join with my colleagues at this time to bring this Nation's attention to that valiant battle which raged for 13 days, 10 years ago.

A peaceful student demonstration on October 23, 1956, in Budapest, Hungary, turned into an event which held this Nation spellbound as it unfolded in the press and on radio and television.

Only 3 days after the original student demonstration for relaxation of Stalinist terror, the revolt spread to the countryside. But the armed might of the Soviet Union was no match for the only weapons the revolutionists had—a few guns, bravery, and a desire to see their homeland free from external and dictatorial control.

The courage of these men and women, these boys and girls, should never be forgotten.

The battle was to be lost and many Hungarians realized they could no longer live in their homeland, so 28,000 civilian refugees streamed across the border. Of this number, 5,000 came to this country, while Switzerland, Argentina, Australia, the German Federal Republic, the United Kingdom, Italy, Sweden, and the Netherlands gave a new life to others.

Although the battle was lost, Hungarian organizations throughout the free world are effectively working together toward the day when freedom can be restored to their homeland and a legitimate government can again be created by the people of Hungary, for the people of Hungary.

That Soviet troops were moved into another country to crush a popular uprising, is a most vivid reminder of true "aggression." Those troops are still there in a continuing case of aggression against the Hungarian nation.

Between the revolution in 1956 and 1962, some 23 United Nations General Assembly resolutions have condemned the presence of Soviet troops on the national soil of Hungary. It is my fervent hope the United Nations will continue to seek removal of these troops.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday will mark the 10th anniversary of the Hungarian uprising against Communist tyranny. Its suppression by Soviet Russian tanks after 13 days shocked a world too frightened by the nightmare of nuclear war to intervene. Over 20,000 Hungarians died, and another 200,000 fled to the West.

The bloody end to the revolt cannot wash away the memory of man's struggle to be his own master. The Hungarian revolt was not an isolated conspiracy; it was the spontaneous expression of a people united against total domination. On this 10th anniversary of the Hungarian struggle, the free world bows its head to those who sacrificed their lives for a dream of liberty and democracy.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, following the Hungarian revolution of 1956, the Kadar government released a "white paper" which purported to support the legality of the Soviet intervention in the Hungarian revolution, especially the use of Soviet troops. Because of the continuing presence of Soviet troops in Hungary, I would like to have made a part of my remarks a memorandum on the legal and political status of military forces of the Soviet Union in Hungary prepared by Z. Michael Szaz. Dr. Szaz is an associate professor of political science at Seton Hall University and editor of Journal of European Affairs. This report was prepared by Dr. Szaz in connection with his duties as the Secretary of the American Hungarian Federation. This report is timely and I commend it to my colleagues.

I should like also to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] for the fine leadership he has demonstrated in organizing this special order to commemorate the 10th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution.

MEMORANDUM ON THE LEGAL AND POLITICAL STATUS OF MILITARY FORCES OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS IN HUNGARY

At the present time, there are about 75-80,000 Soviet Russian troops stationed in Hungary. Though their presence is disliked by the overwhelming majority of the Hungarian people, their presence is enforced under the May 27, 1957 Agreement between the Kadar authorities in Hungary and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

It is the contention of the American Hungarian Federation that the May 27, 1957 Agreement was concluded with a State still in the state of debellatio, and which was, therefore, unable to exercise the attributes of its political sovereignty vis-a-vis its contract partner. Therefore, the Treaty of May 27, 1957 cannot be accepted as a valid and binding contract between two full subjects of international law falling under the dictum: pacta sunt servanda. As a result, the Treaty fails to create any rights on the part of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or any obligations on the part of the soverign State of Hungary.

It is also the contention of the American Hungarian Federation that even if the Treaty should be recognized as one of limited validity by having been concluded between one sovereign State and one State which had still preserved limited international personality, the presence of Soviet Russian armed forces in Hungary still remains a fruit of aggression condemned in numerous resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly. The only counterclaim of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics could be an express invitation on the part of a Hungarian Government "responsive to its national aspirations and dedicated to its independence and well being" (U.N. Gen. Assembly Res. 1004–ES II).

It is our respectful request to those Governments whose representatives voted for the various General Assembly Resolutions of the United Nations between 1956 and 1962 demanding the withdrawal of Soviet Russian armed forces from the State of Hungary to increase their diplomatic and political pressure upon the Government of the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics in order that these Soviet Russian forces be withdrawn from Hungary. For only such a step would restore full political sovereignty and national independence to the people of Hungary, who are in the final analysis the ultimate possessors of Hungarian State sovereignty.

In support of our contentions, we present the following evidence:

A. THE FACT OF RUSSIAN AGGRESSION OF NOVEMBER 4, 1956

The Kádár Government and its political residue, the Revolutionary Workers' and Peasant Party, was formed on Czechoslovak territory in the early hours of November 4, 1956. It consisted of a few Communist leaders (Janos Kádár, Ferenc Muennich and Antal Apró) who deserted the legal Government of Hungary headed by Prime Minister Imre Nagy. The Nagy Government was brought into power in accordance with the constitutional provisions of the 1949 Constitution of the People's Republic of Hungary, though under popular pressure of widespread demonstrations. The legal character of the Nagy Government was recognized in a radio address by Janos Kádár himself, and later objections to the Nagy Government by Kádár and his colleagues were restricted to certain actions of that Government rather than to its inherently legal status.

Thus, on November 4, 1956 the Kádár Government could not be considered as a belligerent party to a civil war in Hungary, even by the application of the most flexible standards of international law. The Kádár Government, at the moment of its conception did not (a) possess jurisdiction over any Hungarian territory; (b) maintain any armed forces of its own, except for isolated and uncoordinated bands of armed secret police units, and (c) it did not represent even one Hungarian political party, as the Hungarian Workers Party was split in regard to loyalty between Prime Minister Imre Nagy and János Kádár. Therefore, it was not an international personality and and had no rights under international law to ask for the intervention of a foreign power into the affairs of the Hungarian State.

To quote the British international lawyer, George Schwarzenberger: ". . . the rule prohibiting intervention in exclusively domestic affairs makes illegal in relation to a recognised government any premature recognition of rebels as belligerents, as an alternative government, or as a separate state." *A Manual of International Law* (New York; 1963) I, 63.

Schwarzenberger adds also:

"Until a revolution or a civil war has reached serious proportions, any form of intervention by another State in favour of insurgents constitutes an illegal interference in the domestic affairs of a sovereign state."

This state of affairs refutes clearly the argument of the Kádár representative to the United Nations that "the Hungarian Government asked the Soviet Union as one of the signatories of the Peace Treaty, to reestablish democratic order in Hungary." (U.N. Document A-3521, 1957).

This state of affairs was aptly characterized by various General Assembly Resolutions on the subject whether Russian intervention in Hungary was a clear aggression against a sovereign State, or whether it was a justified entry into a civil war in that State.

There was no resistance against the Nagy Government by persons or groups sympathetic to the Kádár view as of November 3, 1956 and the leftist opponents of the regime had no organized armed forces. This evidences that—

(1) The Kadar forces had no sizeable popular backing;

(2) Could not assemble for the purposes of forming a Government on Hungarian soil over which they claimed sovereign rights.

(c) They were not even *bona fide* rebels but only efficient administrators of a foreign power invading Hungary.

Resolution 1004 ES-II of the United Nations General Assembly of November 4, 1956 reenforced by Resolution 1131 of the 11th Session clearly recognized Soviet Russian interference as a clear breach of the Paris Peace Treaty of 1947 and the United Nations Charter, and described it "as an intolerable attempt to deny to the Hungarian people the right of a Government freely elected and representing their national aspirations."

Modern international law literature confirms that the General Assembly during its 1956 Emergency Session and its 11th Session has given true expression to existing law rather than just making a political judgment in condemning Russian aggression. In 1949 the International Court of Justice declared in the *Courfu Channel Case:*

"The Court can only regard the alleged right of intervention as the manifestation of a policy of force, such as has in the past given rise to the most serious abuses and such as cannot, whatever the defects in international organization, find a place in international law . . . Between independent states, respect for territorial sovereignty is the essential foundation of international relations."

The Peruvian draft to the Special Committee on International Law of the United Nations in 1956 defined aggression as follows and received considerable support from Western delegations:

(a) Invasion by the armed forces of a State of territory belonging to another State or under effective jurisdiction of another State;

(b) Armed attack against the territory, population or land, sea and air forces of a State by land, sea or air forces of another State;

(c) The organization, or the encouragement of the organization by a state of armed bands within its territory for incursions into the territory of another State, or the toleration of the organization of such bands in its territory, or the toleration of the use by such armed bands of its territory as a base of operations, or as a point of departure, for incursions into the territory of another State as well as direct participation in or support of such incursions.

There exists no doubt that the actions of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics following November 4, 1956 in Hungary have exhausted all three definitions of the Peruvian draft on aggression.

Even the Soviet Russian draft to the same Commission in 1956 enumerated several acts of aggression in a similar context, emphasizing the finding that whoever commits the enumerated acts first must be considered as the aggressor. Finally, the Soviet Russian doctrine of *bellum justum* contending the righteousness of "wars of national liberations waged to defend the people from foreign attack and from attempts to enslave them, or to liberate the people from capitalist slavery, to liberate colonies and dependent countries from the yoke of imperialism" fails to have any validity in the case of Hungary. For here there was no other aggression except a Russian one; no other power made an attempt to enslave Hungary, and the socio-political order of Hungary was a people's democratic one.

In reaffirming the view that intervention into the politico-social order of a State by another State must be regarded as an act of aggression, two more international lawyers may also be mentioned:

Professor Quincy Wright in his book "The Role of International Law in the Elimination of War" (1961) writes: ". . . in a situation of civil strife, the state is temporarily prohibited from acting. A government beset by civil strife is not in a position to invite assistance in the name of the state." (P. 61)

As a result, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics would have had no legal basis to interfere even if the so-called Kadar Government were a bona fide rebel government and would have asked for Soviet Russian intervention in the affairs of the Hungarian State.

Professor Wolfgang Friedmann in his book "The Changing Structure of International Law" (1964) establishes the following principles of international law on intervention:

(1) ". . . that it is based upon a society of sovereign states, regardless the structure and ideology of the regime. From this follows the illegality, by international law, of foreign interference in internal changes as such, as distinct from internal changes which constitute an actual or imminent attack upon the security of another state . . ."

(2) ". . . it would follow from this premise that any attempt by a foreign power to interfere with internal change, either by assisting rebels to overthrow the legitimate government, or by helping the incumbent government to suppress a revolution, is contrary to international law." (pp. 264–65)

Neither of the exigencies (i.e., actual or imminent attack) occurred in the case of Hungary. The Nagy Government of the Hungarian State did not menace the Soviet Union. Rather, it publicly proclaimed its neutrality and was willing to assume the international law obligations of the status of neutrality. The Nagy Government asked for the opening of formal negotiations on the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary, thereby showing its peaceful intention regarding the solution of the major outstanding issue between the two Governments.

In conclusion, both the opinion of most international law writers, advisory opinions of the International Court of Justice, and resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly between 1956 and 1962 unanimously agree that the intervention of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics with its armed forces in Hungary leading to the forcible removal of the constitutionally organized Nagy Government and its replacement with the Kadar group which was willing to do its bidding, was a clear and complete violation of both international customary law and existing treaty obligations of the U.S.S.R.

B. THE VALIDITY OF THE TROOP STATIONING TREATY OF MAY 27, 1957

International society is based on the principle of sovereign equality. As a corrolary, only fully sovereign States qualify as proper subjects of international law and may conclude treaties which establish rights and obligations under international law. In the twilight zone are so-called dependent states, in the past best-known as protectorates. The Permanent Court of International Justice in the case of *Nationality Decrees in Tunis and Morocco* (1924) emphasized that the legal relationship between the protecting Power and the dependent State varies from one case to the other and that the fact and degree of dependency may only be determined by the knowledge of the particular facts of the treaties involved.

According to Professor J. L. Brierly of Oxford University, a treaty establishing a protectorate is not needed for establishing the dependent status of a state. In his *Law of Nations* (1950) he refers to the de facto dependency of many of the Central American states during the first two decades of the 20th century to the United States without any treaties establishing a protectorate. "Even when native governments have been allowed to function, American officials have controlled the expenditure, collected the customs, commanded the constabulary, had the right to construct naval bases for American use and a practically complete control of foreign relations. A similar *de facto* protectorate by Great Britain, in Egypt, also existed from 1882 until 1914, when a protectorate was declared." (P. 119).

Let us investigate the position of the Kadar Government in Hungary in May, 1957 vis-a-vis the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the legal bases as defined by the two Contracting Parties.

The legal basis for the agreement was given as the membership of the Hungarian State in the Warsaw Mutual Security Treaty of June 2, 1955 which, in Article 5, provides:

"The Parties agree on the establishment of a Joint Command for certain elements of their Armed Forces which shall be allocated by agreement between the Parties, and which shall act in accordance with jointly established principles."

This, of course, contains no express authorization of the stationing of the troops of one member on the territory of the other, but implicitly includes such a possibility by the establishment of a Joint Command for parts of their armed forces. To rely on the Warsaw Pact for the legal status of the Soviet Russian armed forces in Hungary would be at best speculation, at worst legal casuistry.

Thus, the legal basis for the Agreement must evolve from the character of free consent on the part of the Government of Hungary, a soveign and equal partner of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics during the negotiation, signing and ratification of the May 27, 1957 Treaty.

What were, however, the facts of the case and their legal implications under international law?

It is the contention of the American Hungarian Federation that the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics exercised far-reaching sovereign powers in Hungary in the period preceding and during the negotiation, signing and ratification of the Troop Stationing Treaty of May 27, 1957 and therefore, the State of Hungary has not yet recovered its full political independence and territorial sovereignty when asked to agree to a significant auto-limitation of its territorial and political sovereignty. As a result, the May 27, 1957 is at best of limited validity, having been signed by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics with a state which had had a dependent relationship to it, or at worst, Hungary was in the state of *debellatio*, and the signature of the externally imposed Kadar Government has been null and void.

As evidence, we present the following facts:

As late as March, 1957, the Soviet Russian Military Command was in direct control of peace and tranquility in Hungary. It established curfews, designated crimes against public security, and its advisors, and some Rumanian advisors as well, were instrumental in crushing attempts of resistance against the so-called Kádár Government and investigating prisoners by the Secret Police. Thus, military and police power still rested in May, 1957, directly or indirectly with the armed forces of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in Hungary. The Hungarian army was still in a state of partial disarmament and reorganization and could not exercise an independent function at that time.

Forces of the Soviet Russian military command in Hungary were instrumental also in destroying the legal Government of Hungary by arresting the Minister of Defense General Paul Maléter on November 3, 1956 while negotiating at the headquarters of the Soviet Russian forces, by arresting Prime Minister Imre Nagy as soon as he had left his asylum at the Yugoslav Embassy upon receipt of a free conduct letter by the so-called Kádár Government, and by arresting other members of the cabinet, including Minister of State István Bibó, who holed himself up in the Parliament Building as a last symbol of the legal Government of the Hungarian State.

From this state of affairs even the status of *debellatio* may be deduced, as all of Hungary has been occupied by Soviet Russian armed forces, the opposing Government was destroyed and no armistice or peace treaty signed with the legal regime.

The claims of the so-called Kádár Government of Hungary to speak in the name of the sovereign Hungarian State in May, 1957, cannot be taken on face value. Though acquiring the State bureaucracy by the violent destruction of the Nagy Government by military forces of the Soviet Union, they have not yet organized a stable government and Party structure and there was no clear agreement even within the ranks of their new Party on the advisibility of the presence of Soviet Russian troops in the country. The Central Committee of the Socialist Workers and Peasant Party had not been organized only in February, 1957, and the first Party conclave was held only after signing the Troop Stationing Agreement.

These facts are not only known to the historian of the period, but they formed the basis for the interpretation of events by the General Assembly of the United Nations which, though not a law-creating agency, certainly can, with some reservations, be accepted as a law-interpreting forum.

Between November 4, 1956 and December 10, 1957 the General Assembly voted in favor of twelve resolutions on the situation in Hungary with overwhelming majorities ranging from 48 against 11 with 16 abstentions on the most comprehensive Resolution 1005 of November 9, 1956 to 60 against 10 with 10 abstentions on resolution 1133 on September 14, 1957, approving two reports of its Credentials Committee (February 27, 1957 and December 9, 1957) in failing to accept the credentials of the representatives of the Kadar Government as the proper representatives of the Hungarian State.

The principles laid down in the various U.N. General Assembly Resolutions during these 13 months may be summarized as follows:

1. The Hungarian people "have demonstrated clearly the desire to exercise and to enjoy fully their fundamental rights, freedom and independence" (Resolution 1005–ES II) and have "the right to government responsive to its national aspirations and dedicated to its independence and well-being." (Resolution 1004–ES II)

2. In order for them to enjoy fundamental rights, "the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Hungary is necessary." (Resolution 1005–ES II), as "the overwhelming demand of the Hungarian people for the cessation of intervention of foreign armed forces and withdrawal of foreign troops is manifest." (Resolution 1131–XI)

3. The Soviet Russian army of occupation "has been forcibly deporting Hungarian men, women and children from their homes to places outside of Hungary, thereby violating both the principles of the United Nations Charter and the principles of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, in particular articles II (c) and (e), to which Hungary and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics are parties, and also article two of the 1947 Peace Treaty." (Resolution 1127–XI)

4. "The present Hungarian regime has been imposed on the Hungarian people by the armed intervention of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics." (Resolution 1133–XI)

Thus, the lack of binding character of the May 27, 1957 Agreement evolves from the findings of the U.N. General Assembly Resolution alone. The Government is not based on a free consent of the Hungarian people (this has nothing to do with free elections, it is the absence of any free consent including toleration of a coup d'etat by domestic forces), rather the people have specifically demonstrated their will against the conclusion of such a Treaty and the former legitimate Government of Hungary was officially asking for their removal. Furthermore, the Soviet Russian forces of occupation have been guilty of severe and repeated violations of international law over and beyond the illegality of their present in Hungary.

C. THE POLITICAL PROBLEM OF SOVIET RUSSIAN TROOPS IN HUNGARY

It must be made clear that while the international legal basis of the presence of Soviet Russian troops in Hungary is very questionable at least, they are still stationed there now for 10 years in defiance to the twenty-three United Nations General Assembly resolutions requesting their withdrawal. This is a clear and undeniable flouting of the United Nations Charter and prestige of that organization which would be in the interest of the member states to remedy in a peaceful, but effective, manner.

May the American Hungarian Federation respectfully request Your Government, which agreed with the principles laid down in the various resolutions of the U.N. General Assembly, to search for ways in which the withdrawal of Soviet Russian troops may be secured from Hungary so that the Hungarian State may reacquire its political sovereignty and national self-determination. We are aware that the Hungarian question forms part of the overall question of European security and its solution presupposes agreement on force levels between the Western Powers and the Soviet Union in Central Europe. But we hope that Your Government will take active steps to further the solution of the underlying problem: the presence of Soviet Russian forces in Hungary in violation of United Nations General Assembly Resolutions and the dicta of international law against intervention into the domestic affairs of a sovereign State. If the forces of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics are withdrawn, we believe that the other problems, like lack of free elections and the regard of the Government toward national aspirations, will be slowly corrected in an evolutionary manner, but any real progress toward such a state of affairs remains manifestly impossible as long as Soviet Russian forces continue to be stationed in Hungary, or until their return is possible without any effective countersanctions.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it has been 10 years since the heartbreaking, heroic revolution in Budapest. A decade later, Hungary still lies prisoner behind the Iron Curtain.

Along with many of my colleagues I have introduced in this and past Congresses a resolution which would create a Select Committee on the Captive Nations to study, evaluate, and propose methods by which Hungary and other nations dominated by totalitarian governments not of their own choosing can be drawn back into the free world.

No action has been taken on this legislation, and, in all candor, I must state that the tremendous lip service we annually give to Hungary on this anniversary certainly belies the reluctance of the House to adopt legislation which would give meaning to our words. It is most unfortunate.

Once again I must go back to my many Hungarian friends in Cleveland and tell them that most of us took the floor and expressed noble sentiments regarding the revolution and the continuing plight of their family and friends in Hungary but that we did not take action on legislation which would at least be a step toward giving them real assistance and hope.

I will see many of these friends this Saturday night when I attend the 10th annual Night in Budapest celebration in Cleveland, this year saluting one of our community's outstanding Hungarian citizens, Adolph Weinberger, who came from the Carpathian Mountains to this country and founded the Gray Drug Chain in Cleveland. He is one of Hungary's many contributions to American culture and civic responsibility.

The event, under Jack P. Russell's great chairmanship, will feature a seven-course dinner of famous Magyar dishes. There will be more than 200 Hungarian girls in beautiful costume and uniformed Hussars. A 30-piece Hungarian orchestra under the leadership of Emery Deutsch of New York will be one of the entertainment highlights. Paul Lukas, who looks back on a Magyar boyhood, will be an honored guest from Hollywood, and the national chairman, Joe Pasternak, will bring another surprise guest star to provide entertainment.

I always look forward to this gay and lavish occasion. There is a great deal of laughter and fun. But underneath it is the continuing note of sadness, and the realization that the Hungary they celebrate is not, in fact, the Hungary of today. And once again my Hungarian friends will ask me what steps we in the Congress have taken and I will again have to tell them that, for all the beautiful speeches we have made in their behalf, we have not taken action.

I sincerely hope that the 90th Congress will take positive steps to create the Select Committee on Captive Nations. That is a concrete way in which we can express our good faith and determination.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on October 23, it will be 10 years since the youth of Hungary rose in violent revolt against the murder and repression practiced against them by a clique of Communist masters. The blood of innocent demonstrators, spilled first before the radio building and then a day later before the parliament building, lit the flame of worldwide indignation. For weeks, Budapest became the living symbol of man's unquenchable thirst for freedom and dignity. Moreover, it demonstrated that Communist propaganda cannot forever infect man's mind.

Today, I am delighted to join with my colleagues in commemorating the 10th anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution. We must first pay homage to the fallen heroes. To the little 14-year-old girl who clung to the grenades in her fragile hands and threw herself under the tracks of the advancing Russian tank, telling the world by her heroic death that life is not worth living without freedom and individual dignity. To the many young men, transported like cattle in freight cars and oil tankers, to the Soviet Union only to lie, after slave labor, in unmarked graves in Siberia and other areas of the vast Russian steppe. To the aging Cardinal Joseph Mindszenty, now spending his days in prayer and solitude at our Legation in Budapest, who, for all Hungarians regardless of religion, has become the rallying point for those rejecting atheistic Communist philosophy. To the gallant Hungarian workers who remain determined still not to cease fighting the Soviet invaders and their satraps.

Simultaneously, we must remember Soviet Russian treachery. The Russian delegate, the present Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko, who just recently accused us of aggression in Vietnam, sat quietly at the November 3, 1956, meeting of the U.N. Security Council while he was urged to answer the question as to whether Hungary and the Soviet Union were negotiating in good faith or if in fact, were Russian troops ready to invade Budapest. And when the hour of the predawn attack came, it was still late evening in New York, and at the moment when Russian tanks were already entering the city, Gromyko stood up and declared that to the best of his information the Russian and Hungarian Governments were negotiating freely for an equitable settlement.

Yet all the remembering will not help the Hungarian people today even though it strikes a chord of sympathy or rage in us. Today, Hungary still does not enjoy sovereignty. It continues to be under the despotic rule of the Soviet Union which used her troops to remove by force the duly constituted Government of Hungary and which arrested and later executed Hungary's duly installed Prime Minister and Minister of Defense. This clear violation of the principle of noninterference with the domestic order of another sovereign state continues and is best evidenced by the continued reminder of two Russian divisions in Hungary today.

It is my opinion that the U.S. Government must do everything in its power to remind the peoples and governments of the world, of the lawless aggression that the Soviet Union has committed and to this day failed to remedy against the Hungarian people. If coexistence is not to be a one-sided affair, the question of the presence of Russian troops in Hungary must be solved by their evacuation. The United States removed its forces from Santo Domingo, and promise to do so, when peace returns, from Vietnam, though in both cases we came at the invitation of the duly constituted Government and only to defend them from the consequences of an externally financed, led, and equipped subversive force. Yet, the Soviet Union still refuses to do so. It is time for a political offensive aimed at the removal of Soviet troops from Hungary so that the heroes of Budapest shall not have died in vain.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with my colleagues who have addressed the House today in commemoration of the 10th anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution.

The cause of human rights and personal dignity remains a universal aspiration. On the 23d day of October 1956, the brave Hungarian people felt they had suffered far too much from the Communists and a revolution started in the city of Budapest which quickly spread to other parts of that downtrodden country.

Facing the armed might of the Soviet forces and driven by pent-up emotions against their oppressors, the Hungarians appeared for a short time to have been successful in breaking the chains of tyranny. The world was inspired by this display of patriotism, self-sacrifice, and love of liberty. The Hungarian freedom fighters became the symbol of man's unconquerable faith in himself and his future.

One of the darkest pages of history records the savagery of the Communists in suppressing this uprising. Hungary became a veritable bloodbath in which the Soviets waged a campaign without mercy, killing more than 24,000 fighters for freedom. Countless thousands were jailed or deported.

The Hungarian Freedom Fighters believed it is better to struggle against oppression than to live a life of slavery. Their cry of defiance and their faith in the rights of man was heard everywhere in the world.

The United Nations General Assemly has, since 1958, successively adopted 12 political resolutions on Hungary, demanding the withdrawal of Soviet troops and free elections under international control, while condemning the Soviet Union for the brutal crushing of the Hungarian Revolution. The consistent Soviet defiance of these resolutions has gravely affected the prestige of that world organization by creating a dangerous precedent for the impunity of members who do not comply with the general assembly resolutions in critical situations.

Hungary is still one of those nations under the domination of the Communists and we deeply sympathize with their serious plight. Heroes, like Cardinal Mindszenty, have emerged from those valiant forces of resistence, and today they take their rightful place in that never-ending line of those who have defied the tyrant for freedom's sake.

The United States was founded on democratic principles and today our commitment to freedom is worldwide. By marking this 10th anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution we focus the attention of the world on the danger of Communist tyranny. That is the reason I now speak on behalf of the brave Hungarian people so that no one will ever forget what happens to a nation once it is so unfortunate as to be under the Red tyrant's heel.

A great number of Hungarians have come to the United States and have made invaluable contributions to our country with their industry and native ability in many fields of endeavor. Our country is the richer for the scientists, the professional men and women, the music and literature that they brought to these shores from their native land. Those who emigrated here have become good and loyal citizens of the United States of whom we can be justly proud.

I join those who commemorate this day with the fervent hope that a bright new day will dawn for Hungary when she will become a member of the family of free and independent nations.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, a decade ago a peaceful student demonstration in Hungary expanded into a revolution which was awe-inspiring, tragic, and abortive. It proved that even Communist totalitarianism, as repressive and completely tyrannical as it is, is unable to eradicate from the mind of men the desire for freedom or eliminate their spirit of rebellion. Moreover, it demonstrates to the world only too accurately the atrocities to which the Communists were capable of resorting in order to retain their control of a nation.

The Hungarians, virtually unarmed and unprepared, staged a revolt against the Communist regime in power. Quickly overpowered, the Hungarian Communists, representing only two percent of the Hungarian population, called upon the Soviet Union for aid. Soviet force, tanks and artillery were drawn into action against the Hungarians. Even with this barrage of Communist power, they were unable to fully crush Hungarian resistance for 11 more days. The Hungarians displayed immeasurable bravery and courage when one considers the adversary which they faced—the second most powerful nation in the world with the destructive capacity to completely annihilate them. It was inevitable that the revolution should come to an abortive end.

To add to the grief of these unsuccessful revolutionaries, following the revolution, the Communists have invoked even tighter controls over Hungarians. The few token liberties accorded in order to placate them or to prevent further rebellion have been rescinded one by one. The Hungarians still must live in a police state, denied basic rights and dignity of the individual, as well as a national identity free from foreign domination.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we wish to express our deep respect for the Hungarian freedom fighters. The Hungarian Revolution was a spark reflecting the inextinguishable love for liberty which man has felt throughout the ages. It was a spark which rekindled in our hearts an appreciation of a liberty we too often take for granted. And it burned indelibly into our memory the true threat of communism.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, among the peoples subjected to Communist totalitarianism in Eastern Europe, the Hungarians have been among the most difficult for the Communists to deal with and most irreconcilable to the regime imposed upon them with the aid of the Kremlin. Throughout their long history the Hungarian people have shown their stubborn tenacity for individual and personal freedom, and they have fought all forces infringing upon this freedom. No wonder that they found it impossible to reconcile their beliefs with those of rigidly regimented and severely controlled Communist totalitarianism. It is not difficult to understand the motives which impelled them to rise against that regime even if they were aware that they had little chance of success without quick and effective aid from abroad.

On October 23, 1956, the people of Hungary rose against their oppressors, staged a veritable revolution, and before the end of that day the Communist regime was overthrown and a democratic government was instituted. This was a most startling and heartening event, and not only the people of Hungary but all peoples in the free world were jubilant over the instantaneous success of the freedom fighters. In a matter of days the country was virtually free of Communist control excepting the fact that the Soviet troops were still there. The new government asked the Soviet authorities to withdraw these troops, and at first it seemed that the Soviets were inclined to do this. Actually, however, this was not to be done. Instead, the Soviets marked time, while they sent large reinforcements to Hungary to bolster their forces there. This phase of their treacherous move being completed by November 3, they felt that they could attack the Hungarian fighters with the full impact of Soviet might. This they did on November 4, and before the end of that tragic day, the freedom that had reigned in Hungary for barely 2 weeks was no more, having vanished as quickly as it was born. Then a new Communist regime was instituted, one even more brutal than its Communist predecessor. In the bloody oppression which followed, the unhappy Hungarians clamored for foreign aid, but none was forthcoming, and the Hungarian fighters found withaid as heroes and martyrs for the cause of freedom and democracy.

On the observance of the 10th anniversary of that event, we ardently hope and pray for Hungary's freedom from Communist tyranny.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleagues on the 10th anniversary of the fight for freedom by the Hungarian people in 1956.

It is with revulsion and sadness that we recall the days when Hungarian patriots were crushed by overwhelming military power applied not only with ruthlessness but with sly cunning by the Soviet Union against that nation. At that time, Hungary still had a government partly of Communist persuasion but it demonstrated for 13 days both its revulsion of international communism and its unquenchable desire to lead a free life under a system that respects individual rights and national independence.

The Hungarian Revolution, despite the tragic losses at the hands of Communist terrorists and Soviet military power, remains a beacon of hope for the determination of man not to abdicate his dignity and freedom and not to accept tyranny and the criminal conspiracy of the Communist ideology toward human rights and political freedom.

We owe a debt of honor and respect to the brave heroes of the Hungarian Revolution, over 35,000 of whom died on the battlefields or before the Russian-instituted military courts, and over 60,000 of whom were deported to the Soviet Union. This debt entails not forgetting the real nature of their enemy who is also our deadly enemy: international communism, whether it be Russian or Chinese communism. It also entails a rededication on the part of the United States and the free world to do whatever we can to further the cause of freedom for the people of Hungary and of all captive people.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I am joining my distinguished colleagues in commemorating the 10th anniversary of the freedom fight of the gallant people of Hungary.

Today when regard for individual freedom and dignity is so sadly lacking in many countries, including the nations ruled by atheistic Communist regimes, it remains an inspiration and hope to remember the heroic sacrifices the workers, youth, intellectuals, and peasants of Hungary suffered in 1956 in the face of overwhelming odds of modern military forces of the Soviet Union. It is a sad fact that the West and the United Nations caught in the midst of another major crisis could not devote enough of its attention to the stopping of Soviet Russian aggression in Hungary, and the fate of the defenders of freedom in Hungary has become jail, deportation or execution.

Yet the faith and courage of the proud fighters for human dignity and national independence gives to all of us the needed hope that the tides of history are favoring those who believe in individual rights and human decency despite the repeated efforts of totalitarian governments to instill hate, prejudice and atheism in the hearts of their unfortunate subjects.

Yet emotions cannot suffice. Hungary is still occupied by 75 to 80,000, Soviet Russian soldiers and still has not recovered its national self-determination. Not less than 23 resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly requested the Soviet Union to withdraw its forces from Hungary.

On October 7, President Johnson stated the need for improving relations with the peoples of Eastern Europe and also the need for a reexamination of force levels should the Soviet Union also be willing to adjust its force levels in Central Europe. It is my hope that our Government will do its utmost to bring about an implementation of the numerous U.N. resolution on Russian withdrawal from Hungary by diplomatic means so that, 10 years after the unsuccessful revolt, the Hungarian people may start on the slow and tortuous, but inevitable, way to freedom and national self-determination, toward economic well-being and truly representative government. However, such a development cannot take place without the withdrawal of Russian forces from the country.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, on October 23, 1956, in the city of Budapest, Hungary, a handful of people began a demonstration in opposition to the Russian supported Communist regime. Within a few days time, the rebellion had spread through the streets of Budapest and into the Hungarian countryside. During the remaining days of October and into the first week of November, the conflict continued between the Hungarian people and their Communist overlords culminating with a Russian thrust which left in its wake the devastation and death wrought by the Russian tanks and guns. The Hungarian Revolution ended beneath the crushing heels of the superior Communist forces while the poorly equipped but valiant Hungarian Freedom Fighters resolved themselves to await another day.

The statistics of the short-lived revolution are easy to comprehend: 30,000 lives sacrificed in the name of freedom, 200,000 turned from their homes in the cause of liberty. Today, 85,000 Russian troops stand a wary watch over Hungary, ostensibly to guard against an attack from the West but really to insure that the freedom-loving Hungarian people do not continue their revolt against communism.

Those courageous men and women who fought against the tyranny of the Russian dictatorship had no weapons, no equipment, no training, no army and no leaders. Their opponents were schooled in a life of war, carrying every modern device of war and organized into an effective fighting machine. In spite of the unfair balance against the freedom fighters, they challenged the authority of the Russian Army and demanded their freedom. The Russian and Hungarian Communists answered their demands with laughter and a hail of bullets.

Freedom lost the battle of the Hungarian revolution of 1956, but the struggle for freedom continues. Behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains are millions of people who, like the Hungarians, await the day when the full blessing of liberty will be theirs. We, in the free world, hold the hope that the final days of oppression draw nigh and that liberty will soon be the universal condition of mankind. To the oppressed around the world, we can offer the example of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters who so bravely fought and died for their dream of a nation free from the chains of communism. They did not die in vain for they are remembered here today and in the hearts of every free man across this earth as the true embodiment of the spirit that keeps liberty the thriving and real force that it is. We mourn the dead, we pity the wounded and we embrace the imprisoned participants of that revolt 10 years ago. But most of all, Mr. Speaker, we respect the deep and powerful commitment to freedom that is an integral part of the heritage of the Hungarian nation.

TRIBUTE TO REPRESENTATIVE FALLON, OF MARYLAND, CHAIRMAN OF THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express admiration, respect, and affection for the kind and gracious chairman of the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives, Mr. FALLON, of Maryland.

During the time I have been privileged to serve in the U.S. Congress it has been my pleasure to serve on the Public Works Committee under the unsurpassed leadership of Chairman FALLON.

Under his distinguished leadership the Committee on Public Works during the 89th Congress has produced one of the greatest legislative records of any committee in the history of the Congress. The 89th Congress will go down as one of the outstanding in the annals of our Nation and the large portion of that record which this Congress has accomplished is due in substantial measure to the members of the Committee on Public Works and its dedicated chairman, GEORGE H. FALLON.

During his service in the Congress Mr. FALLON has earned the confidence of the Members of the House.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads he was responsible for bringing into existence one of the greatest public works programs in the history of the world—our great Federal-aid Interstate Highway program.

As chairman of the full committee he has continued to show those qualities of leadership he has demonstrated throughout all his years in the Congress. He is acutely conscious of the public need and the public desire and he has been instrumental in pioneering some of the most forward looking pieces of legislation affecting all sections of our Nation. Let us take a brief look at the record of the Committee on Public Works during the 1st and 2d sessions of the 89th Congress. The list I present to you is only a partial one but it demonstrates the magnitude of the work the committee has accomplished and how effective its record has been on the floor of the House.

Major bills which have been enacted into law are:

The Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

The Water Quality Act of 1965.

Additional monetary authorizations for river basin plans.

Pacific Northwest Disaster Relief Act of 1965.

The Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

Increased authorization and apportionment for the Interstate System for fiscal year 1967.

Future highway needs study and highway safety programs.

The Omnibus River and Harbor and Flood Control Act of 1965.

The Highway Beautification Act of 1965.

Southeast Hurricane Disaster Relief Act of 1965.

An official residence for the Vice President.

SECOND SESSION

The Highway Safety Act of 1966.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966.

And soon to become the law of the land are the Disaster Relief Act of 1966.

The Clean Waters Restoration Act of 1966.

The Omnibus River and Harbor and Flood Control Act of 1966.

And three important measures for the use of all Americans to be located in the District of Columbia—The Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden—a heliport—and a study of facilities and services for visitors in our Nation's Capital.

This is a record of achievement in which all Americans can take pride. I am honored to be a member of this committee and to be associated with its fine membership on both sides of the aisle—but I feel privileged to serve with one of the greatest chairmen in the history of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, America is indeed fortunate to have a public official of Mr. FALLON's understanding and experience to serve in this position of leadership—this position of public trust.

INDUSTRIAL STANDARDS—A TWO-EDGED SWORD

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the problem of industrial development and industrial standards is a problem which greatly troubles me and which has greatly troubled many who have taken the time and the effort to study it.

Mr. Speaker, industrial development in America has, during the last century, proceeded at a pace so rapid as to almost defy the imagination. New technology has been developed at an ever-increasing rate. Products, machines, appliances, and techniques which are commonplace today would have been considered as some sort of Buck Rogers fantasy only a few years ago.

One of the chief factors that has made possible our industrial system and the benefits of its products to our people has been the standardization of materials. While the public is largely unaware of industrial standards programs, the fact of the matter is that scores of organizations are busily engaged in the development or revision of voluntary industrial standards. The U.S. Department of Commerce administers two separate programs, commercial standards for 297 commodities and simplified practice recommendations which cover 134 separate categories. Additionally, the United States of America Standards Institute, the successor in interest of the American Standards Association, also administers a large number of voluntary standards.

Marketing experts tell us that we live in an age of brand buying. Many of us buy this or that brand of toothpaste, coffee, canned pears, and so forth, not because we know exactly what the manufacturer has done in preparing and packaging the product, but mainly because we regard the brand as a sign of quality.

We must rely to an even greater extent on standards. I doubt that any one of us here today could explain precisely what has been done to standardize pipes, ducts and fittings for warm air heating and air conditioning systems. The size and quality of these pipes, ducts and fittings have been standardized under SPR No. 207-60, as promulgated by the Department of Commerce. Yet the fact is that we do know from experience that if we buy a fitting of a particular size in Washington it will indeed fit with a similar duct purchased in Baltimore. This may seem like a simple concept, but if one stops for a moment to consider the alternative, we would realize that our entire industrial system would not work were it not for industrial standards.

Industrial standards, we have seen, are a matter of major importance to consumers. They are also of overwhelming importance to the small businessman. To the small businessman who is a producer or distributor of nonagricultural manufactured products, the existence of voluntary industrial standards is vital. If he is to remain in business, the small businessman must manufacture or distribute products of a size, composition and form that are customary in the marketplace. A small businessman generally lacks sufficient economic force to compel the marketplace to accept a nonstandards version of a product for which there is a voluntary standard: For example, for our automobiles we buy oil of SAE 30 or SAE 10 weight, or the like. Probably few of us know exactly what SAE 30 or SAE 10 means. When we buy such oil, it is represented, regardless of the company that produces it, as conforming to a standard published by the American Society of Automotive Engineers. Whether that standard is the best that can be arrived at, I do not know, but it is clear that the instruction book that came with my automobile tells me to use a certain SAE oil. The small businessman who manufactures or distributes oil has no opportunity to sell his product unless it conforms to an SAE standard.

The importance of standards to both consumers and small businessmen is rather vividly illustrated in an article appearing in the October 1966, issue of American Home entitled "You Don't Pay for Quality, You Invest in It." The author of the article offers many suggestions on how to obtain better quality in buying a home. He makes the point that since the average home buyer is really not at all qualified to judge the merits of such items as heating or electrical equipment, he should rely upon standards. The article states:

> A hydronic-heating-system boiler made of cast iron should bear an IBR (Institute of Boiler & Radiator Manufacturers) rating on the name plate; a steel boiler should have an SBI (Steel Boiler Institute) rating. In general, a cast-iron boiler often lasts longer than a steel boiler, particularly if you have hard water.
>
> Electric Heat units should carry the UL (Underwriters Laboratories) seal. The system should be installed according to the standards of the National Electric Manufacturers' Association (NEMA).

The nature of our economy and our industrial structure is such that the decisions of those bodies fashioning and revising industrial standards tend to have the full force and effect of economic law. The electrical heat unit is not likely to be sold unless it bears the Underwriters Laboratories seal. Pipe or lumber that does not meet established standards probably will not meet the requirements of local building codes.

In view of the sheer economic power that is implicit in such standards, it is a matter of interest as to how such voluntary industrial standards are established, their relation to the antitrust laws, the role of small business in the establishment and revision of such standards and the degree to which standards making bodies give way to factors such as consumer interest, and similar considerations.

In the field of voluntary standards we encounter a situation which in relation to our antitrust laws is delicate indeed. In the typical situation you will find a standards committee composed of representatives of producers and consumers. Some committees may also include distributors and specifiers. On a horizontal basis the interests and firms represented are supposedly in stanch competition with each other. The several producers on such a committee are expected to compete with each other. Vertically, producers are supposedly seeking to bargain at arm's length with the various classes of distributors, manufacturers, specifiers, and consumers. If the membership of such a standards committee is well balanced, and truly representative of all the various segments of the industry, and if it has sound technical data and advice available to it, presumably the achievement of a consensus within the committee insures that the interest of no particular group is harmed and that the interests of all are benefited. The many committees of the American Society for the Testing of Materials, the United States of America Standards Institute, and the Department of Commerce are expected to achieve a two-thirds or three-fourths consensus, depending upon the circumstances in their recommendations. It may be concluded therefore that the concept of voluntary industrial standards is sound and that properly administered programs of this nature can bring great benefits to America's industry and to the American consumer.

However, it does not always work out quite that way. Upon occasion those devising the standard attempt to use it to achieve competitive advantage. This is not a new problem. For example, the Federal Trade Commission in its decision dated March 16, 1943, based upon a complaint filed two years earlier, held that the Electrical Alloy Section of the National Electrical Manufacturers Association had "adopted and maintained uniform resistance standards and other uniform standards for use in the manufacture of said wire, with the effect, in some instances, of fixing and maintaining identical prices therefor." The Association was also charged with eliminating competition and "unduly restraining and restricting trade"; that these practices "were all to the prejudice of the public; had a dangerous tendency unduly to hinder and prevent, and actually hindered and prevented, competition in the sale and distribution of unpatented electrical alloy resistance wire."—Docket No. 4558.

The potential is always present for manipulating a standard to confuse or mislead consumers, to achieve marketing advantages for some business interests over other business interests and to suppress legitimate business opportunities for small businessmen. The impact upon small businessmen can be devastating. They cannot afford to have their own staff of technicians but must rely upon the standards committee to a far greater degree than do their larger competitors.

The degree to which this potential is actually used is not known. Indeed, to most of us the entire area of industrial standards is an alien world full of technical language difficult to comprehend and impossible to understand. The suspicion lurks, though, that misuse of standards is by no means absent. The latest evidence of this occurred earlier this month. On October 6, nine of the largest plumbing fixture manufacturers, including such well known names as Kohler Co., Crane Co., and American Radiator & Standard Sanitary Corp., and their trade association, The Plumbing Fixture Manufacturers Association, were indicted by a grand jury for engaging "in an unlawful combination and conspiracy in unreasonable restraint of interstate trade and commerce in enameled cast iron and vitreous china plumbing fixtures in violation of section 1 of the Sherman Act."

One of the specific acts these firms and their trade association were indicted for was that they "agreed to seek and to obtain, as part of the agreement to discontinue the manufacture of enameled cast iron plumbing fixtures"; and that they "used the office of Secretary of PFMA, among other things, to schedule and arrange for the aforesaid meetings, to maintain a line of communication between said defendants and co-conspirators and to coordinate the efforts of said defendants and co-conspirators in seeking and obtaining the revision of the aforesaid Enameled Cast Iron Commercial Standard." The effect of these and other acts was found by the grand jury to be:

> (a) Prices of enameled cast iron and vitreous china plumbing fixtures sold by the defendant corporations and co-conspirators were raised, fixed, stabilized and maintained at non-competitive levels; and
>
> (b) Customers of the defendant corporations and co-conspirators have been deprived of free and open competition in the sale of enameled cast iron and vitreous china plumbing fixtures.

An instructive example of the type of tactics that are sometimes used in seeking acceptance by standards making bodies is the current battle being somewhat fiercely waged between the manufacturers of plastic pipe and the manufacturers of copper, cast iron pipe, steel, and clay pipe. Cast iron, steel, copper, and clay products are in the main already accepted for the purposes of building codes while the plastic product is still in the process of seeking acceptance in most areas. The case is instructive both in terms of the substantive aspects of a standard and the procedural difficulties that can arise if the proponents choose to use all possible means to achieve their goal.

Malcolm C. Hope, an employee of the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, serves as the secretary of Sectional Committee A40 of the American Standards Association—since changed to USASI. This committee is currently seeking to revise the national plumbing code. One of the most hotly contested questions before the committee is whether plastic pipe is to be accepted equally with its copper, cast iron, and clay competitors.

On April 7, 1966, Mr. Hope, acting as secretary of the committee, wrote a letter to all members of the committee calling a meeting for April 28. The purpose of the meeting was stated in the letter as being "to consider the appendices." Toward the end of the meeting a motion was made to approve plastic pipe. A number of the members of the committee had already left. Others, representing copper pipe, clay pipe and steel pipe, had not attended the meeting since they were of the impression that only the relatively unimportant matter of appendices would be considered. The motion to accept ABS, PVC, and PE plastic pipe was made by Mr. Hope. This has been established by those present at the meeting even though Mr. Hope's minutes do not follow his usual practice of giving the name of the person making the motion in the case of his motion for the acceptance of plastic pipe.

Obviously there are a number of questions which may be raised regarding a Government official taking one side or the other in a fight between conflicting interests. At any rate it is clear that only those Government officials who have specialized technical competence and the assigned mission of making such judgments can properly render such a decision. There are conclusions of improper procedure which cannot be avoided as a result of the extreme discrepancy between the stated purpose of the meeting and what actually transpired. It is quite clear that through improper procedure a standards committee effectively deprived a number of competitors of an opportunity to vote upon one of the key questions before the committee. A copy of Mr. Hope's letter, the minutes of the committee meeting and other supporting material are in the files of the Small Business Subcommittee on Regulatory and Enforcement Agencies.

At the present time regional code associations have great influence with those administering local building codes. Perhaps one of the largest of these regional associations is the Western Plumbing Officials Association. Normally, a commodity is first passed upon by that body prior to seeking approval from local officials. If it is found acceptable by WPOA then this has persuasive influence upon the municipal and local plumbing code officials throughout the west.

At the present time the battle between plastic pipe and its competitors seems to be reaching truly heroic proportions. Techniques are being used which raise the most serious questions concerning their propriety and indeed their legality.

During the week of October 15–22 of this year the Western Plumbing Officials Association is holding its 37th annual business conference in Honolulu. The trade press reports that it is widely anticipated that the question of the acceptability of plastic pipe will be on the agenda of the conference. Against this background the following letter was sent to a number of city plumbing officials who are charged with the responsibility of administering city plumbing codes:

> The Western Plumbing Officials Association is holding its 37th Annual Business Conference in Honolulu, Hawaii, this year during the week of October 15–22, 1966. Speaking on behalf of our industry and through this organization, the * * * which represents to the general public the joint efforts of both management and labor for the continued betterment of our Industry for the public good, I should like to stress to you (Mr. Doe), the importance of this year's Annual Business Conference of WPOA in the hope that the city of * * * will be represented at the Conference.
>
> The Business Conference this year will have special importance attached to it because this being a "code year" the Conference is charged with the responsibility of writing the 1967 Edition of the WPOA Uniform Plumbing Code for all the Western States. Your city is now operating under the Uniform Plumbing Code and you readily see the City of * * * will surely be affected by the adoption of the 1967 Uniform Plumbing Code.
>
> The Plumbing Code is, of course, the tool by which we in the industry make our living; it is the tool by which we protect the health, safety and sanitation of all the people. It is the sincere conviction of all of us in the industry that every jurisdiction's Inspection Department should be represented at the Annual Business Conference of WPOA.
>
> With this thought in mind, the * * * is most happy to make the offer to each Jurisdiction in * * * of $200 per voting delegate attending the Annual Business Conference this year. As an industry we are most desirous of helping to offset some of the cost for the benefit of the general public and the taxpayers.
>
> Because of the registration deadline for delegates attending the conference, our offer, if accepted by your city (Mr. Doe), should be no later than * * *.
>
> It is our hope that you will give this matter your attention in the near future and that acceptance of our offer will be favorably received and that you will notify our office of the name of the voting delegate or delegates attending the Conference in October and to whom our check should be made out to.
>
> I want to thank you for considering this matter and hope that you will join with us in making this year's WPOA Annual Business Conference the most successful ever.

It will be noted that these modestly paid city officials are offered $200 toward their expenses in attending the convention in Hawaii. The association which has sent the letter is an industry trade association in one of the more heavily populated areas in California. Letters were sent, however, to officials beyond the association's primary area of activity. The name of the association is being deleted from these remarks, but this and other supplemental information is in the files of my Small Business Subcommittee. The leadership of the association that sent the letter is considered, in California, to be a proponent of plastic pipe and some of their competitors have expressed great fear that officials accepting the offered $200 will be subject to being influenced on any vote concerning the acceptability of plastic pipe.

The California Plumbing Contractor, in its issue of September 1966, contained the following concerning this letter:

> ALOHA POISON
>
> One of the top industry events of this year will be the annual conference of the Western Plumbing Officials Association to be held next month in Hawaii. This will mark the first time in the history of the organization that it has held a conference in such an exotic setting.
>
> We presume, of course, that every plumbing official would like to participate in this meeting. And we don't blame him.
>
> The plumbing official is not in a particularly envious spot when it comes to financing such a trip. Most need help. Few, indeed, are those whose city fathers look with favor upon sending a city employee so far from home—or come up with the kind of money it takes to pay for such a trip.
>
> That's bad. There are a great many items on the agenda: plumbing code changes to be considered; and a new swimming pool code as well as a completely new heating and refrigeration code to be voted on.
>
> The plumbing official, because he is in a position of trust and no little responsibility, must be extra careful that he be always above suspicion, so far as motives, acts, and general deportment are concerned. In this respect, he is in almost the same position as a tax assessor.
>
> The tax assessors, according to the public press, in a number of cities have gotten themselves in something of a jam on alleged charges of accepting bribes.
>
> The interpretation of bribery and some of its ramifications are interesting. Seems that a quite innocent party can get himself in a mess by accepting a gift—be it a horse, vacation or business trip, money, or most anything of value. And keep in mind the fact that there are those who have axes to grind.
>
> According to the penal code, the word "bribe" is defined as signifying anything of value or advantage, present or prospective, or any promise or understanding to give any, asked, given, or accepted, with a corrupt intent to influence, unlawfully, the person to whom it is given, in his action, vote, or opinion, in any public or official capacity.
>
> The code is rather all-inclusive in that it covers not only the receiver of a bribe, but the offerer, or (in the opinion of some legal counsel) a middleman who, presumably, could be construed as a member or members of a city council.
>
> Thus, conceivably, a plumbing official, with his heart set on going to Hawaii, might innocently accept financial help that could prove to be a poisonous potion.
>
> Too, according to counsel, for purposes of the statute, a plaster inspector is "probably" an executive or ministerial officer—so, it is not unlikely that a plumbing official also would come under the same classification. The penalty, incidentally, is one to fourteen years in prison for both bribe taker and bribe giver, plus other penalties.

The city council of Campbell turned down the offer of $200 for the trip to Hawaii by their city plumbing inspector.

City attorney Joseph A. Bonacina stated:

> I view this as nothing more than a form of bribery for a particular type of legislation.

On the substantive side of the plastic pipe standard, most of us as laymen would assume that the commonly used names for the three largest families of plastic pipe, ABS, PVC and PE, are shorthand or abbreviations for precise chemical formulas. This evidently is not the case. For example, an article appearing on page 104 of volume 43, No. 1A of the Modern Plastics Encyclopedia for 1966, issued in September 1965, states that:

> Three monomers—acrylonitrile, butadiene, and styrene—are basic to the creation of ABS thermoplastic polymers.
>
> In the construction of an ABS polymer, the amount and type of butadiene used is a key factor, e.g., the more the butadiene, the higher the impact strength and the lower the tensile strength. Properties of ABS are also materially affected by the ratio between the styrene and acrylonitrile used and the degree and manner in which the styrene and the acrylonitrile are grafted onto the butadiene backbone. The more styrene and acrylonitrile that is grafted on, the more rigid the ABS; the more homogeneous the grafting, the better the performance.
>
> There are, of course, other variables to be taken into consideration. A fourth monomer such as alpha methyl styrene can be used to provide higher heat resistance, although sacrificing impact and some processability. It is also possible to replace the acrylonitrile in the copolymer with methacrylate acid or methyl methacrylate as a fourth monomer (but at a sacrifice in impact of the previous formulation).

The commercial standard CS270-65 for ABS pipe does not give a precise chemical formula from which ABS must be manufactured. Section 6 of the standard, "Physical and Chemical Standards," has a number of subsections, most of which are in the nature of performance standards requiring certain strengths with respect to deflection load, crush resistance, chemical resistance, water resistance, water absorption, and so forth. The only physical composition requirements are found in section 6.1 which states that the pipe and fittings "shall be homogeneous throughout and free from visible cracks, holes, foreign inclusions, or other injurious defects" and that "the pipe shall be as uniform as commercially practicable in color, opacity, density, and other physical properties."

Since ABS can, according to the information I have cited from the "Modern Plastics Encyclopedia," vary as to chemical structure, and consequently also vary as to impact and tensile strength, the question then arises whether the various pipes would all be of the same strength and particularly if they would all pass the strength requirement of the standard.

Section 6.3.1 of the standard states that in terms of crush resistance the pipe "shall deflect 60 percent of the original diameter without cracking, rupture, or other visible evidence of failure," when tested in accordance with prescribed procedure.

The evidence suggests that in addition to chemical variations, strength variations also exist, sometimes falling below the required standards. In tests conducted by Edwin A. Hepp of Froehling & Robertson, Inc., of Richmond, Va., inspection engineers, a 4-inch ABS plastic drain pipe deflected 2.210 inches before showing longitudinal cracks along the sides of the specimen being tested. A second similar pipe developed the same symptoms after being deflected 2.25 inches. The standard requires that ABS pipes deflect 60 percent of their diameter before cracking. In the case of a 4-inch pipe this would be 2.4 inches. Both of these specimens showed signs of cracking before reaching this required deflection. While it is obviously impossible to extrapolate to the output of the entire industry from two specimens, still, this failure of the specimens tested raises doubts as to the thoroughness of the protection being afforded the consumer by the standards. The results of their test are in the files of my small business subcommittee.

Another case in point that has attracted unusual attention in the field of voluntary industrial standards and that has resulted in considerable concern on the part of knowledgeable small businessmen involves the development and revision of voluntary standards for softwood lumber and for plywood. In the lumber industry the controversy centers on the issue of what shall be the standard sizes of and what strength values shall be assigned to framing lumber. This is not the decorative lumber that is used to enclose the space on the outside of a house or that is used for moldings inside the house where the floor meets the wall. It is not the lumber that is used for window frames or window sashes. The controversy centers around the size and safety of the lumber that bears the weight of a house or a school. This is the lumber that is used for the joists that support the floors and for the rafters that support the roof against the pressures of heavy snowfall and high wind, the lumber that furnishes the support for ceilings and the upper stories of a building of frame construction.

Nor does the problem that has developed in plywood relate to decorative panels. The problem, rather, is confined to structural plywood that is used for the subflooring and subroofing, for concrete forms and the like; it is the plywood that is used where strength and not esthetics is the key consideration.

The development and revision of the voluntary standards for such lumber and plywood furnish detailed case studies of the kinds of economic forces that can be brought to bear in the development of standards and the need for an inquiry as to the extent to which a small businessman is able to protect his legitimate interests when these forces are misdirected.

In discussing the development of lumber and plywood standards I do not intend to suggest that the situation in these areas is any better or any worse than in any other area of voluntary industrial standards. I discuss the details of the lumber and plywood situation only because there has been evidence of sufficient public concern and the accumulation of sufficiently detailed information to give preliminary indications of some of the weaknesses and some of the strengths of a system of voluntary industrial standards as they affect the small businessman and the consumer. These lumber and plywood standards are of further interest because in both of them the executive branch participates to assure that the proposed standards are lawful, technically adequate, and consistent with the public interest. As the case studies develop, it will also be interesting to observe the areas both of competition and of coordination between the lumber and plywood industries in the light of the report of the Tariff Commission—TC Publication 79, February 1963—that plywood is a principal competitor of lumber and responsible for the displacement of great quantities of lumber in the marketplace.

The present participation of the executive branch in the field of voluntary industrial standards had its origin in the Department of Commerce in the early 1920's. Recognizing the importance of the development of standards to an industrial economy, Herbert Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce, directed that Department to cooperate with industry in the development of voluntary industrial standards. The program has steadily grown to the point where as of the present time the Department of Commerce has published over 400 industrial standards that have been voluntarily developed by industry in apparent conformance with procedures established by the Department of Commerce.

In effect the Department of Commerce invites any person or group to submit to it a new standard or a revision of an existing standard. If the proposal would have national effect and apparent industry-wide interest or endorsement, the Department submits it to a committee. If the proposal is for a product for which there is no standard the Secretary of Commerce appoints a new committee composed of qualified representatives of producers, distributors, and consumers or users of the product and of any other appropriate general interest groups. If the proposal is for the revision of an existing standard, a standing committee similarly composed and created will have been in existence and the proposal for revision will be submitted to it. Whichever route is followed, the committee may meet to discuss, revise, and vote on the proposal or simply ballot by mail. If the committee achieves a favorable consensus, usually three-fourths of the membership, the Commerce Department reviews the proposal for consistency with well-established public policy to establish that nothing is contrary to the public interest, established policy, or law and to check technical adequacy. If the proposal meets these criteria the Commerce Department then mails the proposal to a sample of producers, distributors, users, and consumers for an expression of their views. If a consensus is achieved upon such balloting and there are no objections voiced that would warrant rejection under the foregoing criteria, the Commerce Department publishes the proposal as a voluntary industrial standard. By and large, consumers and business are thereafter economically, but not legally, bound to profess adherence to the standard. In broad outline such is the role of the Department of Commerce.

On the face of it the procedure seems calculated to assure compliance with law and conformance with the public interest. As our case studies develop we shall observe whether the Department has been able to fulfill its important functions. We shall also observe the consequences that occur when another Government agency thrusts itself into the center of the scene and establishes in effect a standard without consideration for the procedural safeguards that the Commerce Department finds necessary after some 30 years of experience.

The first voluntary standard issued by the Department of Commerce for softwood lumber became effective July 1, 1924. Secretary Hoover called it:

> Proof of industrial conscience and service * * *. This is keeping the Government out of business through the remedying of abuses by business itself. (*History of Lumber Yard Size Standards*, Forest Products Laboratory, Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, September, 1964, page 13.)

By 1940 the use made of the standard by some segments of the lumber industry and limitations they had placed upon its use by other members of the industry attracted the attention of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice. There followed the entry of four consent decrees, one against the National Lumber Manufacturers Association and one against each of its three major constituent trade associations, Southern Pine Association, Western Pine Association and West Coast Lumbermen's Association.

The National Lumber Manufacturers Association decree required that defendant to seek both modifications of the American Lumber Standard in conformance with several detailed provisions of the decree and the establishment of an impartial agency for the determination in accordance with such revised standard of the adequacy of any system of lumber inspection and of the competence of any lumber inspection agency. The decree against the Southern Pine Association resulted in the establishment of a separate and distinct entity, the Southern Pine Inspection Bureau, which was required to furnish nondiscriminatory lumber grading services for all lumber manufacturers in the southern pine area. The West Coast Lumbermen's Association was required to furnish nondiscriminatory grading services to all lumber manufacturers in the Douglas-fir belt and to admit nonmembers of the association, who subscribed to the grading service, to a proportionate voice and vote in the establishment of the programs and practices of the association's grading bureau. The Western Pine Association was required to furnish nondiscriminatory grading services to all lumber manufacturers in the Western pine area regardless of whether they were or were not members of the Western Pine Association. After further lengthy negotiations and in pursuance of the decree against the National Lumber Manufacturers Association, in 1953 a new American Lumber Standard Committee was created and a new lumber standard promulgated, SPR 16–53. It is a proposal for further revision of SPR 16–53 that has induced the controversy of recent years in the lumber industry.

The membership of the American Lumber Standards Committee, as revised in 1953, was intended to be broadly representative of producers, distributors, users, specifiers of softwood lumber. Each recognized agency that under the Standard wrote detailed rules for the grading of particular species of lumber in the various geographical regions was given one representative on the committee. Various distributor, user, and consumer interests were similarily represented. The committee had fundamental functions. First, it was to assure itself of the continuing competence of the several grading agencies. Second, it was to function as the standing committee on the lumber industry under the voluntary standards procedures of the Department of Commerce to consider revisions of the standard. Third, it was to examine the detailed grading rules written by the several agencies to be engaged. Finally, it was to police the activities of approved lumber grading agencies and withdraw approval for misgrading; this last function was of prime importance because all building inspectors, Federal, State and local, depend almost entirely on the grade stamps applied by the officially approved agencies.

As the lumber industry is structured, there have historically been certain industry agencies that write the detailed grading rules for various lumber species in the several producing areas of the country. For example, in the southern pine belt the detailed grading rules are written by the Southern Pine Inspection Bureau. Other grading agencies certified by the American Lumber Standards Committee as competent to grade or supervise lumber grading in that area are free to use and apply the grading rules published by the South Pine Inspection Bureau. The grading rules issued by the Southern Pine Inspection Bureau are submitted to the American Lumber Standards Committee which, through its board of review, approves them as being in conformance with the American lumber standard.

In this fashion the standards program of the softwood lumber industry progressed until the summer of 1962 when a meeting was held in Dallas, Tex., under the sponsorship of the National Lumber Manufacturer's Association to consider a revision of SPR 16–53. The principal trade associations in the industry and the major rules writing agencies that sent representatives were, it has been reported, with one exception, constituent members of the National Lumber Manufacturer's Association. It was apparently agreed that the executive head of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association would appoint a nine-man steering committee to evolve a substantial revision of SPR 16–53 along the lines discussed at the Dallas meeting. The nine-man committee consisted of the principal member and the alternate member on ALSC from Southern Pine Inspection Bureau, Western Pine Association and West Coast Lumbermen's Association. One other man from each of these associations completed the membership of the steering committee. These three associations were all affiliates of NLMA. It is noted in the records that one of the 37 participants at the Dallas conference was a representative of the Forest Products Laboratory of the U.S. Forest Service. It is also noteworthy that, according to industry sources, at that conference there was recognition of the fact that the type of proposals to be made would dislocate existing competitive patterns so that speedy action was thought to be desirable before opponents of the proposal could successfully organize.

Essentially, it was proposed to put less wood material into a piece of framing lumber and to have the size of a piece of framing lumber related to moisture content by requiring green lumber to be as much larger than dry lumber as required to make them the same size when both eventually reached a selected point—a 15-percent moisture level. The relative sizes proved a matter of major dispute, with both sides alleging that unfair competitive advantage was being sought.

A stranger to the lumber industry would assume that before that industry would make load bearing lumber thinner it would have accurate information about the strength characteristics of lumber. This would enable the framers of the standard to know whether the thinner lumber would be able to bear safely the same load. Some segments of the lumber industry strongly urged this course of action. The dominant forces of the industry, however, insisted that first there be a revision of lumber sizes and thereafter a consideration of the strength characteristics of the thinner pieces of lumber. These dominant forces insisted that the new sizes must be promulgated as a standard and placed in use before there was a determination of the load-bearing capacities of the thinner pieces.

This would appear to be a somewhat inadequate basis for producing thinner lumber to bear the loads in our homes and our schools. In any event, in 1964 the American Lumber Standards Committee proposed that the Commerce Department publish a set of sizes for load bearing lumber that would be thinner than the existing sizes. Pursuing its own procedures the Commerce Department sent the proposal out to a representative cross section of producers, consumers, distributors and users of lumber who had asked to be heard. This was some 16,000 persons. The proposal failed substantially to achieve consensus and the Commerce Department declined to promulgate it.

As a result of the substantial disparity between the vote of a supposedly representative committee and the vote of the interested segment of the country, the Commerce Department, after a certain amount of urging by the House Small Business Committee, reconstituted the committee in hopes of achieving a mix that would genuinely reflect in the committee discussions and votes the attitudes, interests, and needs of the segment of the population that is economically involved with lumber.

At the present time that committee has advanced a new proposal for thinner load-bearing lumber. The Commerce Department is to make up the list of persons to whom the proposal will be sent for examination and opinion through a scientific sampling of the industry by the Bureau of the Census. Who will be on the list is unknown. In addition, all parties desiring to may file comments. In the meantime, the Commerce Department is reviewing the proposal with a view to determining whether on its face it violates antitrust or other laws and whether it is adverse to the general public interest. Only mandatory standards require a finding that they are in the public interest.

Opposition has by no means completely subsided. Earlier this week a member of the ALSC who had voted against the proposed standard appeared before Department of Commerce officials pursuant to its procedures objecting that the new standard would be technically inadequate. Among other things the objection included the fact that the standard would delegate to the board of review, a five-man body chosen from members of the ALSC, the right to approve stress ratings—strength that is to say—for lumber. Paragraph 5.3.1 of the proposed standard provides:

> 5.3.1 *Grading—Stresses.*—Development of working stresses shall be in accordance with data and standards judged to be technically sound by the Board of Review with the advise and counsel of the U.S. Forest Products Laboratory. The Board of Review is authorized to obtain such assistance as it deems necessary from the U.S. Forest Products Laboratory in reviewing grading rules.

It is obviously impossible to ascertain what strengths the Board of Review may assign to lumber in the future through the use of this delegation of power. The Secretary of Commerce is being asked to approve "a pig in a poke."

Whether there are antitrust implications and whether the total public interest will be served remains to be seen. But these considerations have not bothered the Federal Housing Administration. Without waiting to find what the impact of the sizes proposals would be on small business, whether it would transgress the antitrust laws, or whether it would serve the total public interest, the Federal Housing Administration has announced that between September 15, 1966, and January 15, 1967, lumber in the proposed new size is acceptable for use in new housing insured by it. The confusion this has engendered I shall discuss later. As for the effect it will have on the opinion of those to whom Commerce will in due course send the pending proposal, it speaks for itself.

Although load-bearing lumber and industrial plywood are products that are highly competitive with each other, a review of the development of the plywood standard reveals certain coordination between these supposedly competing groups—coordination that in some phases seems reasonable and proper and coordination in other phases that tends to provoke some questions.

Industrial plywood has been manufactured in the United States for more than 50 years. Until recently it was made almost exclusively from Douglas fir growing in the western portions of Oregon and Washington and in northern California. The standard sheet of such plywood is 4 feet by 8 feet. Its thickness will vary.

In most uses of industrial plywood the key factor is the element of deflection. Where plywood is used for the subflooring in a home, for example, one is far more concerned with the point at which it bends than the point at which it ultimately breaks. It will bend, of course, long before it breaks. One does not want the living room to sag under the piano, for example, or the tables to rattle when one walks across a room even though the floor may never break through. It was this stiffness in Douglas fir that tended to limit plywood manufacture to the area producing that species. Within the past 10 years there has been some manufacturing of plywood in some of the other forested areas of other States of the West. By and large the producers of all this western plywood were members of the Douglas Fir Plywood Association, a trade group that performed such functions as promotion, development of standards, and the like. In the preparation of standards, the Douglas Fir Plywood Association used the program of the Department of Commerce.

In 1962, interest peaked in some areas of the South regarding the feasibility of manufacturing industrial plywood from southern pine. Technically, there is no such tree as the southern pine. There are seven or eight principal pine species that grow in the South; all are loosely called southern pines. Of these seven or eight principal species several are strong, several have medium strength and the rest are substantially weaker. Within the individual species, strength tends to diminish as one moves from Texas, Louisiana, and Florida northerly into North Carolina, Virginia, and Maryland. In any event, in November 1962, representatives of some of the companies that then owned substantial tracts of southern pine in the southern portion of the growing area met at Madison, Wis., within the U.S. Forest Products Laboratory to discuss the strength characteristics of southern pine with a view to establishment of a southern pine plywood industry.

The Forest Products Laboratory said it would not approve a commercial standard for southern pine plywood that would confer upon it the same stiffness values that were assigned to the Douglas-fir produced in western Oregon, western Washington, and northern California. This position was based upon the lower stiffness values for the two most prevalent species of the southern pine. The industry representatives then explained that they meant, first, to use only the butt or lower logs of larger trees for their plywood and, second, to exclude from the plywood the center portions of these logs. This recognized the general proposition that in southern pine species of coniferous trees, the butt logs of trees with larger diameter tend to produce stiffer wood than the trees with small diameters because the outer rings of a tree tend to produce stiffer wood than the rings nearer the center of the tree and second, upper logs are known to be less dense than lower logs. The Forest Products Laboratory then stated that if only this portion of the tree were used then the plywood produced would be equal to coast Douglas-fir in the West.

In due course in 1963 after following the procedures of the Department of Commerce, the first southern pine plywood standard was promulgated. It defined southern pine for the purposes of the standard as including only the four stronger species of pines growing in the South; all the other pines of the South were excluded. Later to assure that southern pine plywood would actually have the strength that it was represented as having, the standard made provision for testing the specific gravity of the face and back veneers, key strength elements in all industrial plywood. This was based on the belief that there is a direct relationship between the specific gravity of a piece of wood and its stiffness or bending character. If tested samples did not achieve a minimum specific gravity, then either the key face and back veneers were required to be extra thick or the entire panel was required to be thicker. Taking into account the cost of acquiring logs suitable for plywood and moving them through a plywood plant, there was a distinct economic advantage in having wood that met the minimum specific gravity limitations.

There is also a substantial marketing advantage in having panels of a standard thickness so that they may be used interchangeably or together. Nobody wants the plywood panels under the linoleum in the kitchen floor to be of varying thickness because obviously at the edges of these panels the overlaid linoleum will have ripples which will soon wear through. Analogous problems arise where plywood panels of different thickness are used for subroofing or for concrete forms.

At once the giants of the plywood industry who had theretofor confined their activities to the West are reported to have begun a program of timber acquisition in the South costing hundreds of millions of dollars. And the timber that they acquired was not always in the areas where the wood would meet the specific gravity limitations of the Southern Pine Plywood Standard.

This brings the narrative to the point where, as in the case of the proposed new thin lumber for load-bearing purposes, certain technicians would have to show strength characteristics for wood that would satisfy the investment and economic aspirations of the people who pay the technicians their wages. The interests of certain plywood manufacturers and of certain lumber manufacturers now coalesced. The dominant forces in each group needed a way to present the weaker woods in a manner that would enable them to at least qualify on paper as having the same strength as stronger species.

The various strength characteristics of lumber and of the elasticity of plywood are easily determined. To test the elasticity of a plywood panel, for example, it is possible to place the edges of the panel on some supports and pile a known amount of weight in the center of the panel. The panel deflection is measured and with a common moisture meter, the moisture of the piece is noted. A simple chart tells whether, for the moisture involved, the panel deflected too much to be considered top grade for subflooring or subroofing.

The deflection of lumber can be tested the same way. To measure the exact force needed to break lumber, a machine common among laboratories and used in some manufacturing companies is available for about $5,000. In a couple of months, one such machine can easily test 1,000 samples. Still another machine is used in some lumber mills that measures and stamps the strength on thousands of pieces of lumber each day.

The point is that the testing of samples of the actual products to be put in the marketplace is easily performed with machinery and techniques that are neither novel nor expensive and are indeed available today. And such tests would quickly reveal the forest areas that produce wood with the strength that we are led to believe lumber actually has when we buy lumber or plywood which has been grade stamped under a standard promulgated by the Department of Commerce.

But, such simple precise testing of the actual products would be incompatible with any attempt to present either thinner lumber or the plywood manufactured from weaker species in a more favorable light than the facts justified. In order to get new wood-strength values and avoid using data from a limited number of actual breaking tests, two steps had to be taken. First, some new method had to be devised for determining strength characteristics which did not include the actual testing of either the lumber or plywood as it is in fact manufactured. Second, the existing plywood standards had to undergo major revision.

Initially, it was decided that the technicians of the Forest Products Laboratory of the United States Forest Service and the various regional research stations of the Forest Service would undertake a massive study to determine the specific gravity of the various species of softwood trees, area by area. Strength would then be assigned on the basis of specific gravity. This was a project that apparently the Forest Products Laboratory had wanted to undertake for some time. But it is an expensive project. So the project was divided into two parts, a Western Wood Density Survey and a Southern Wood Density Survey. To hasten the western survey the Douglas Fir Plywood Association, the West Coast Lumbermen's Association and its grading agency and the Western Pine Association contributed a total of $300,000 that was spent for gathering data for the project. In partial return for this contribution, the Forest Service agreed that the overall plan for the entire study would be made jointly with the Western Woods Technical Committee. It was also agreed that they would meet regularly to review the progress of the survey and assess information and its analysis. This committee consisted of a handful of employees of some of the biggest lumber and plywood companies in the West. Also involved were the technicians of the three trade associations. Advice was also received from the technicians employed by some individual companies.

This brings me to one salient observation. In a project such as this a small businessman is at the mercy of his large competitors. By and large as these case studies of lumber and plywood demonstrated it is only the very large business units that can afford to employ research technologists and technicians. A second source of technical research for private business is the trade association. But the trade association depends upon the dues of its members and the dues of the members are largely keyed to their production. Hence, the trade association is not entirely free to thwart the determined will of its largest contributors. It may be that the smaller business members of a trade association contribute more in the aggregate than the larger units. But the smaller units are typically not coalesced and lack the technical advice to understand whether or how they are being technically misled. Two or three very large units in an industry trade association may contribute such a substantial portion of the total annual revenue that indication on their part that they might resign will quickly bring the trade association to heel. For example, 3 or 4 years ago, the Weyerhaeuser Company and Georgia Pacific Corporation announced their resignation from the Douglas Fir Plywood Association. The matter about which each was unhappy was, I am told, quickly remedied and the resignations voided. Had they made their resignations effective, the reduction in annual revenues to the association would have been such as to force a serious curtailment in its activities.

We are brought, then, to the point where it is possible to observe from the case studies of both lumber and plywood that the wages of the technicians and technologists employed by private industry, are paid, in the main, either directly by a handful of giants or by trade associations whose activities in a crucial area can be dominated by the same large companies. The small businessman is largely without protection. He has neither the personal knowledge nor the technical staff to combat the great body of statistics clothed in scientific jargon that will assail him. As for consumer protection, the less said the better.

In the case of lumber and plywood, of course, there is the big Forest Products Laboratory of the U.S. Forest Service at Madison, Wis.

This leaves the small businessman in these two industries the possibility of service and advice from the Forest Products Laboratory. But the Forest Products Laboratory, too, is staffed entirely by technologists and technicians. The language they speak and the interests they profess are apt to be most compatible with those of their fellow technologists and technicians employed by private industry. After all, they are in frequent consultation with each other and engaged in the regular exchange of information through professional societies and technical bodies. Before the Appropriations Committees their budgets are apt to be supported mainly by companies that have their own technicians who deal with the laboratory. As we shall observe the assistance of the Forest Products Laboratory to the small businessman in the situation we are discussing was minimal.

We find, therefore, that important funds for the Western Wood Density Survey were contributed by three trade associations embracing the giants of the industry and by the Forest Products Laboratory. In the study, the planning for and reviewing of each step was in the joint hands of the Forest Products Laboratory and the Western Wood Technical Committee. Despite the great sums of Federal money that were committed to the project the Forest Products Laboratory agreed with the Western Woods Technical Committee that all of the data and all of the results would be held in secret by these two groups until the entire project had reached substantial completion. So a handful of men employed by the giants of the industry in consultation with technicians of these companies had advance access to information that could aid them in determining where to invest in timber and what products might be safely developed. This strange arrangement was the subject of hearings conducted in 1964 by the Subcommittee on Distribution Problems of the House Select Committee on Small Business. Based on the evidence of some companies receiving information before the rest of the industry, the committee recommended that henceforth all firms were to have equal access to information of this nature.

What was the density survey? Holes were bored in thousands of trees on an arbitrary imaginary grid spread over the West. The cores taken out of these holes were of a size that could be stored in soda fountain straws. The specific gravity of each such core was determined and then an effort was made to relate the specific gravity of this tiny core to the specific gravity of the entire tree. This was done largely on the basis of mathematical assumptions, not without substantial possibilities of error. Next it was sought to average the specific gravity of the trees in relatively small areas which are assumed to be homogeneous. Having done this, an effort was made to relate the specific gravity for the trees of a species in an area to the strength characteristics that had been revealed in the past by the actual bending and breaking of pieces of lumber. The degree of correlation achieved was substantially less than perfect.

If some of the weaker species of the West were made thinner in accordance with the proposed new standard they simply could not meet existing design criteria in frame construction. A key element in frame construction, for example, is the span table. This tells the builder what size of joists he must use to span a certain length of floor in a house he is building. Millions of dollars invested by small businessmen in sawmills producing such material could be seriously affected if their products, because of a change in the size standard, were rendered suddenly less competitive in the marketplace. Another problem arose from the fact that a considerable sum of money had been invested in the Western Wood Density Survey by the trade association embracing the giants of the intermountain area where the timber historically had been assigned strength values below those of the same species growing in northern California and western Washington and Oregon.

The leader of the forces seeking a standard and underlying data which would permit thinner lumber has been the largest lumber company in the country, the Weyerhaeuser Co. If this firm, which was irrevocably committed to the drive for thinner lumber, was to have the support of the major producers of the intermountain area, some plausible way had to be found by the technicians to assign to the weaker timber of that area the same strength characteristics as the stronger timber in Weyerhaeuser's part of the West. The problem, in any event, was one with which the Forest Products Laboratory did not want to be involved directly.

The Western Wood Density Survey produced results which were in many ways startling. Tests taken over a period of many years have shown that great variation in specific gravity can occur within a species from region to region. The specific gravity of Douglas-fir growing in the State of Arizona was assigned, by the Wood Density Survey, a value of .435, about equal to that of Douglas-fir in western Washington—.437. Actual tests on Douglas-fir in Arizona in 1953 showed that species to have a specific gravity of .349.

In addition the Western Wood Density Survey assigned a specific gravity value of .45 to Douglas-fir trees growing in Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming. This was higher than the average actual value from any strength test taken by the Forest Products Laboratory over the last 55 years.

Western hemlock showed a similar startling result. The density survey assigned a specific gravity value of .42. This again was higher than the average specific gravity value from actual tests conducted by the Forest Products Laboratory which had shown values of .39, .38, .39, .39, .38, .36, .41, and .38. In other words, the newly assigned specific gravity is higher than shown by any previous test.

So this sticky problem was passed to the American Society for Testing and Materials. ASTM, a body incorporated under the laws of the State of Pennsylvania, functions in the formulation and promulgation of voluntary industrial standards. It works through a series of committees of varying sizes. Committee D-7, for example, is the committee on wood. It is composed of 250 or 300 members. As many as 50 may actually attend the annual meeting to discuss pending standards proposals in the field of wood.

The full membership is, in theory, balanced between producers on the one hand and consumers and general interest representatives on the other hand. This major committee has about 17 subcommittees. Such a subcommittee will have a varying number of members, usually in the vicinity of 20 or 30. The membership of the subcommittees is also supposed to be balanced between producers and consumers—general interest representatives. The real work is usually done by task forces of the subcommittees.

In observing the activities of ASTM in connection with the proposed standards it must be recalled that although committee memberships may be theoretically balanced, neither attendance at nor active participation in project work is balanced. Technicians and technologists representing producers who have a real stake in the outcome of the matter attend these meetings as an essential part of the jobs they get paid for by their employers. A few of the representatives of major business users are similarly situated. So are the people from the Forest Products Laboratory. As to representatives of other interests, the problems appear esoteric or so remotely related to their own major interests that their attendance at meetings of the committees may be spasmodic. I do not know who pays the expenses of the general interest members, such as the teachers at various technical colleges, only a few of whom attend committee or subcommittee meetings regularly.

Apparently unwilling to be directly identified with the technical application of the results of the Western Wood Density Survey, the Forest Products Laboratory and the Western Wood Technical Committee agreed that the matter should be referred to ASTM's committee D-7 for reference to the proper subcommittee. A new subcommittee 17 was formed. This was an interesting exercise because the then chairman of the ASTM committee on wood and the chairman of the new subcommittee was a paid employee of the Forest Products Laboratory as were a number of key members of the committee. Other members of the committee included employees of the same companies for whom the members of the Western Wood Technical Committee worked. The technicians employed by the major trade associations who had advised the Western Wood Technical Committee were members of the ASTM committee. The proper subcommittee to which the matter was referred had similar representation. The subcommittee and its task forces supplied no surprises.

For example, in the States of Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho, Douglas-fir strength values would be assigned on the basis of specific gravity. In one strength property E—modulus of elasticity—assigned values would range up to 25 percent higher than results of strength tests conducted by the Forest Service—FS publication 2078.

At the annual meeting of committee D-7 in December 1965, it was decided to mail the proposal of the subcommittee out to all members of that committee for a letter ballot, in accordance with ASTM rules. The customary procedure for determining consensus was followed—strange though this procedure seems. A committee member who approves the proposal merely sends in a ballot so noted. But an adverse vote is required to be accompanied by a full statement of the technical reasons why the voter opposes the proposal. That is to say, a committee member may agree with the proposal for a wrong reason but he may disagree with it only for a valid and fully explained reason.

When the returns were received the subcommittee met, as required by ASTM, to evaluate the reasons assigned by those who voted against their proposal. Evidently the subcommittee found that none of the reasons for opposition to their proposal had any validity.

Minutes of the ASTM subcommittee (17) concerned with the problem of negative votes are revealing. One of the Nation's leading wood technologists, author of many textbooks on the subject, Dr. A. J. Panshin, chairman of the Department of Forest Products, Michigan State University wrote, as follows:

> We, in the Department of Forest Products at Michigan State University, are registering a negative vote on the Draft Revision for "Tentative Methods for Establishing Clear Wood Strength Values". Our reason for this is that we do not feel sufficiently well informed on some of the practical aspects and implications of the proposed standard, and, until we are better informed, we are not prepared to give our approval. In particular, we would like to know more about the following items:
>
> 1. What problems are currently encountered by not grouping species?
> 2. What advantages are to stem from these groupings?
> 3. What species are most likely to be included in specific groupings?
> 4. Would lumber groupings have new trade names?
> 5. For what products are species most likely to be grouped?
> 6. Will grouping of species not cause more building code groups to set their own values on individual species rather than accept new market groupings?
> 7. Why is machine grading of lumber not a better method of assigning modulus of elasticity and stress values? When species are grouped, the organization with the lower strength species are not going to want machine grading.
> 8. When a new species comes on the market, lumber from it could be better evaluated for modulus of elasticity by machine grading than by density samples.

The subcommittee commented as follows:

> Michigan State University (Panshin)—On motion by Bescher, second by Todd, the Subcommittee agreed that the negative vote was based on an expressed lack of knowledge and that this was not a sufficient reason.

A nationally known firm of consulting engineers, King, Benioff and Associates, voted "No," as follows:

> You will note that on my Letter Ballot submitted to ASTM Committee D-7 on Wood, I have noted "No" on Item 15, which relates to "Methods for Establishing Clear Wood Strength Values." It is my opinion that this item is not ready for inclusion as a tentative Standard for general use.

As noted on many occasions, the greatest strength in ASTM lies in the qualities of standards which it has developed; standards which are now used throughout the world. These standards were achieved through the principle of voluntary cooperation where the consensus principle applied to producer, *consumer* and general interest members is used. This is truly the strength of ASTM, but it can be its weakness when such principles are not followed. We urge that approval of this item be deferred until it can be reviewed by the organizations and people vitally interested in this field.

No one is more interested in this problem than the structural engineering and architectural professions who have not been contacted on this problem. I submit this plea to you on behalf of those organizations listed below who agree with me that no action should be taken at this time.

1. Office of Architecture & Construction, State of California.
2. Department of Building & Safety, City of Los Angeles.
3. Los Angeles Board of Education.
4. International Conference of Building Officials.
5. Structural Engineers Association of So. California—Code Committee.
6. West Coast Lumber Inspection Bureau.
7. Department of Building & Safety, County of Los Angeles.

These groups represent a large segment of those consumers interested in this phase of engineering and should be given the opportunity of study and making recommendations before it is incorporated in a so-called standard, rather than after it is adopted.

I cannot emphasize too strongly my suggestions that no action be taken on this matter at this time.

The subcommittee rationalized as follows:

Ben Benioff—On motion by Hess, second by Hoyle, the Subcommittee agreed that postponing action on the proposed standard until organizations outside of ASTM or Committee D-7 had an opportunity to review the draft was not a sufficient reason for a negative vote. (Todd voted negative.)

A no vote and comments from Mr. D. E. Kennedy of the Canadian Forest Products Lab included:

The Majority Report states that "The negative ballot on the proposed standard raises a question regarding a basic concept of the standard and cannot be reconciled without drastic reduction in the utility of the standard". (This basic concept refers to the method of species grouping.)

I suggest that a change in this basic concept would not really reduce the utility of the standard so much as the working stresses which would eventually be assigned to groups of species. An association or group may claim that a standard is "of no use to us" when they really mean that the strength values which evolve are considered by them to be too low.

The Majority Report also states that "the procedure in the proposed standard allows assignment of strength values to a group of species which may exceed the average strength value of the low-line species of that grouping, but in any case, such strength values are conservative in comparison with current and past practices".

This statement appears to minimize the importance of the word "may". If a standard is worth anything at all, it must clearly and distinctly prohibit anything which would be unreasonable or unacceptable. It is not good enough, in my view, to admit that the standard may allow an excess or an abuse and to point out that current proposals based on the standard are reasonable and fair compared to past practices.

The Minority Report points out that the proposed standard leans very heavily on specific gravity surveys. I am inclined to agree that "density or specific gravity is at best only a fair indicator of wood strength." The standard suggests that a forest inventory S.G. survey is the preferred means of determining strength properties. This, in my opinion, is only true to the extent that a very large and extensive S.G. survey may reveal more information regarding strength variation than a totally inadequate sampling and strength-testing program. It could still be true, however, that a reasonably large and extensive strength testing program might yield more reliable strength data than would be obtained from tens of thousands of S.G. increment cores.

The Minority Report further points out that "volume and quality of standing timber has little or no correlation to volume and quality of material going into a single wood product such as construction lumber. Average values have no meaning for groupings where the included species do not grow together, are not cut or shipped together and are not used together. This proposal permits, if not encourages, such groupings simply as a means of obtaining higher values for low strength species."

I find that I cannot disagree with any of these statements and it is on this account, primarily, that I find it painfully necessary to submit a negative ballot. It has always been my view that strength values assigned to groups of species must be based on the strength of the weakest species in the group. I have taken this stand in the past whenever the question was raised in the various committees of the Canadian Standards Association and the National Building Code of Canada. I am now convinced that I cannot, in all honesty, take a different stand in an ASTM committee. It is more than just a matter of changing my mind. I have changed my mind before and I will change it again whenever I have a good reason to do so.

I frequently sit on committees where I am subjected to cross-examination by consulting engineers, proponents of other building materials, and code administrators. I have to explain, in reasonably simple terms that an ordinary engineer can understand, where the suggested working stresses come from and why they are justified. I would find it impossible to justify a working stress for a group of species which is higher than the safe working stress for the weakest species in the group unless each and every carload of lumber were mixed in the proper statistical proportions. Knowing that carload after carload might consist solely of the weakest species, my case would collapse.

I am sympathetic to and would like to be of help to the members of the lumber industry. I feel that I cannot help them by voting for a standard that could create misunderstanding or distrust in the minds of users and regulatory agencies.

Other comments of subcommittee 17 include:

It is obvious from these documents that such a basic difference in technical opinion exists on the critical grouping limit question between the majority and minority that it is not possible at this time to obtain unanimous agreement on Section 4 of the proposed standard.

Since no alternative weighting procedure has been specifically proposed, the views of the five negative voters who objected to timber volume weighting can be accommodated only by changing or eliminating the grouping limits given in the proposed standard. As indicated previously, resolution of the grouping limit question in a manner satisfactory to all is not feasible at this time.

It is the majority opinion that the mass sampling density survey approach provides more reliable estimates of the strength properties of standing timber than standard Forest Service strength data. To accommodate the objections of the three negative voters on this point, it would be necessary to abandon the entire standard.

It is apparent that the controlling interests had fixed their course. It was too late to turn back.

The matter was then referred under the rules to the Administrative Committee of ASTM. The administrative committee satisfied itself that the committee and subcommittee had a proper balance, the required criterion going to membership—actual participation—that there had been a ballot, that the required consensus had been obtained from among those who returned a ballot and that the subcommittee had considered and found lacking in merit all technical objections advanced. Whether the standard is a good or a bad standard, whether the standard might be an instrument to foster, or maintain or suppress competition, whether it serves the public interest, are matters beyond the scope of the functions of the Administrative Committee of ASTM. ASTM rules say that it shall simply satisfy itself that the form of the prescribed procedures was followed.

And so rules were promulgated under which the Western Wood Density Survey could be applied with the desired results to lumber and plywood.

The answer was pretty simple. Average strong wood with weak wood. For example one could average stronger hemlock with some of the weaker white firs and thereby increase in theory—but not in fact—the strength of the weaker white firs by such an amount as to enable them to maintain their present span tables even though the lumber is made thinner. Without such averaging this would not be possible.

But, in arriving at averages it was necessary to weight the various species going into an average. In the case of hemlock and white fir lumber one would suppose that the average would be based upon the volume of white fir lumber and the volume of hemlock lumber that is produced per month or per year in the area involved. But this approach must have seemed too simple and, what is more, would have threatened the investments made by some of the plywood giants in the weaker portions of the southern pine area, as we shall see. So it was decided to weight each species entering into an average by the volume of that species growing in the area involved. In other words, it might be said that the weight to be assigned to each species for the purpose of determining the strength of its lumber was based upon the volume of the timber not going into the lumber because it was still in the forest inventory.

But, what of the southern pines and the Southern Wood Density Survey? From the start it was apparent that such a survey in the South could result in a reduction in the strength characteristics theretofore applicable to southern pines. The strength characteristics of the southern pines, particularly the stiffness which is so critical to plywood, is based upon a bulletin issued by the Forest Products Laboratory in 1935 based upon actual testing of pieces of wood. That testing occurred during the period of 1912 to 1934. As mentioned before, small, fast growing trees tend to have substantially less stiffness than larger old growth trees. Hence, many of the tests made on the southern pines during the period 1912–1934 were necessarily based on wood from the forests that then covered much of the South. Today for the most part those forests are gone. They have been replaced by younger forests grown so speedily that the Director of the Forest Products Laboratory has asked the South to consider a slowing of the growth rate through closer plantings, et cetera, in order to increase the strength of the wood products. In this situation, as one would anticipate, the Southern Wood Density Survey proceeded at nothing like the speed of the Western Wood Density Survey. Unless something drastic occurs the Southern Wood Density Survey is not likely to be concluded for some years to come. In the meantime the strength characteristics of southern pine are largely determined on the basis of wood from a forest that no longer exists.

The latest technical publication FPL–64 July 1966 "Properties of Southern Pine in Relation to Strength Grading of Dimension Lumber" shows strength values lower than those now published on which the new plywood standard was based.

The new ASTM standard, however, with its strange averaging techniques, accomplishes a further strengthening of the wood from this nonexistent forest. As I have mentioned, there are seven or eight principal pine species in the South that are lumped for convenience in the term "southern pine". Two of these species, long leaf and slash pine have high strength characteristics. Not much of this finds its way into lumber and plywood, most of it going into pulp and paper since this dense wood results in profitable pulp yields. Two other species, loblolly and short leaf pine have medium strength characteristics and a good deal of these two pines are manufactured into lumber and plywood. The remaining pines are entirely excluded. But, in order to arrive at a strength characteristic for the four southern pines that are permitted by the proposed standard to be included in plywood without adding extra thickness, an average is struck and weighted on the basis of the volume of timber in each of the four species grown in the South and Douglas-fir in the West. This is a highly convenient bit of mathematics that includes in the average the high strength characteristics of species that are eligible, but stated by some observers to be little used, for the manufacture of plywood in the South. Besides being convenient this mathematics is rather profitable.

One brief footnote is required. Last week pursuant to my instruction, counsel for my subcommittee met with technicians of the American Plywood Association. I informed these APA staff members that it was not my intent to prevent publication of their standard but that I had a number of disturbing matters concerning their proposed new standard that I did want their comments upon. As a matter of courtesy I wanted these issues discussed with them before these remarks I am delivering today were placed before the House.

The APA technicians were most cooperative. For a day and a half they and my counsel discussed the many ramifications of the standard. Some of my objections were fully answered. However, as my counsel informed them I still have grave reservations concerning the manner in which the standards committee was chosen, the designation as a consumer representative of an employee of a major producer, the distinct possibility of economic pressure to achieve committee unanimity, and the abolishing of those tests which had been required as a safeguard when the initial use of southern pine for plywood was approved.

I conveyed this concern to the Department of Commerce. Shortly thereafter—a matter of several days—I was informed that the Department had approved and published the standard. This has served to whet my curiosity as to why such haste was necessary to publish the standard prior to my delivering these remarks.

The new plywood standard, of course, banishes the actual testing of samples of plywood panels for specific gravity, which had been incorporated in the former southern pine plywood standard. About 30 billion board feet of pines excluded from the proposed standard are now growing in the South. They are not in separate forests. Rather, they are intermingled with the other southern pines on the easterly and northerly portions of the southern pine belt. Once these trees are reduced to log form and the bark is removed, an essential first step in the production of plywood, only an expert with sophisticated laboratory equipment can separate and identify the several species of southern pines. The southern pine plywood standard which has heretofore had prescribed tests to guard against the inclusion of these weak species in plywood panels has now been repealed and replaced by a single national plywood standard that carefully avoids the inclusion of testing for such purposes. In fact, even in the western fir region requirements for a count of annual rings to exclude fast grown weak juvenile wood have been removed.

Substantially all the data that are available, whether from the old testing of wood or from the largely incomplete Southern Wood Density Survey indicate that as one moves from the strong southern pines of Texas, Louisiana and Florida into the northeasterly portions of North Carolina and into Virginia and Maryland the strength characteristics of all of the southern pines show a marked diminution. Yet, while the technologists were still engaged in the earnest discussion that was to lead to the establishment of the new ASTM strength averaging procedures, Georgia Pacific Corp., The Weyerhaeuser Co. and United States Plywood Corp., according to stories in the press, were spending great sums of money in acquiring timber in northeast North Carolina, Virginia, and Maryland and in erecting plywood plants. To be successful in the marketplace the plywood of these plants must bear grade stamps which indicate that in terms of strength it is top grade plywood. But it is top grade plywood only if it is averaged arithmetically on paper, and not factually in production, with plywood which is in truth strong.

What is true about the strength of southern pine wood for plywood, of course, is largely true of the strength of southern pine wood for lumber, with some exceptions. These exceptions are all found in the fact that wood from the various species that are excluded from the plywood standard are not excluded from the lumber standard. Lumber made from the weak species could be put in the marketplace and represented as being of average strength. As for the validity of the average, recall that it includes the strength characteristics of the two strong southern pines that for the most part are apparently not made into plywood or lumber.

Based on data of this sort, a new plywood standard proposed by the American Plywood Association has, this week, been published by the Department of Commerce. This plywood standard was developed and proposed by the American Plywood Association. This association represents over 85 percent of all plywood production. APA tells me they have spent over $2 million in developing it. The American Plywood Association, formerly the Douglas Fir Plywood Association, changed its name to American Plywood Association when its key members plunged into their acquisitions and construction programs in the South. The work of this association has served the interests of those key members. It put a substantial amount of money into the Western Wood Density Survey but almost no money into the Southern Wood Density Survey. Its employees worked hard on the ASTM committee, subcommittee and task groups to bring about the new averaging procedures. It published a stream of technical data and held countless meetings and conferences aimed at proving the wisdom of the new national plywood standard it was developing. Small plywood producers, of course, whether member or nonmembers of the association, were without the staffs of technicians who could analyze this mass of material and isolate the fundamental facts. Economic effects were so cloaked in the language of the technicians, that small businessmen were unable to determine the effect of the proposal upon their own interests. Nor was there unanimity in APA ranks. The subcommittee has received a copy of a letter from one APA member to the Secretary vigorously protesting the proposed standard which those dominating his trade association are pushing so vigorously. Somewhere in the process, the "industrial conscience" to which Herbert Hoover referred in 1924 appears to have become somehow muted.

In due course the association sent to the Commerce Department its proposed new plywood standard. And, pursuant to the published regulations of the Department of Commerce, the Commerce Department clerk hired by the Bureau of Standards to care for the processing of standards preliminary to their promulgation, arranged to see that a suitable committee was created for examining the proposal for conformance with public policy, public interest and law. How would such a clerk know who should be on such a committee to judge the proposed plywood standard? This clerk turned to the people who presumably know most about plywood, namely the American Plywood Association to ask who should judge that association's work. So a committee was created with a supposed balance between producers, distributors, users and consumers of plywood. In fairness it must be said this committee appears to have rigidly adhered to required procedures.

Apparently it escaped notice that of the five members of the committee representing consumers, the first member named is an employee of United States Plywood Corporation, one of the world's biggest manufacturers and distributors of plywood. APA points out that he was nominated for the committee by a consumer group. This has been verified by the Department of Commerce. This does not, however, in my opinion justify such an appointment.

Within the United States there are some plywood manufacturers who refuse to associate themselves with the American Plywood Association. When they and Congressman JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI of the House Small Business Committee protested to the Secretary concerning their exclusion from the committee, he immediately appointed representatives of this group to the committee. The Department circulated the proposed standard among the committee members requesting that by letter they either give blanket concurrence without any reasons therefor or, if they opposed the standard, explain in detail their reasons therefor. Like the ASTM procedure, the committee members could agree with the standard for the wrong reasons but they could oppose the standard only for the right reasons. One of the new members did oppose the standard and so informed the Commerce Department. However, after further discussions with officials and key members of American Plywood Association this one discontented member suddenly decided that he would withdraw his negative vote because of marketing considerations, despite his continued and well buttressed assertion that the standard is technically inadequate, a disservice to consumers and contrary to the public interest.

This lone member, who had been appointed just subsequent to Congressman KLUCZYNSKI's objection to an all APA committee, wrote the Department setting forth his objections to the proposed standard in considerable and convincing detail. At the time of his resignation, he wrote a second letter which reiterated his belief in the validity of these objections but stated that he had reluctantly voted for the measure "to preserve the marketing advantage". What pressure may have been brought to bear to bring about this rather bizarre result is a matter of conjecture. Copies of the two letters are in the files of my Small Business Subcommittee.

Thereafter the Department of Commerce having received the unanimous approving vote from the committee transmitted the proposed standard with a covering letter to a selected list of consumers, users, distributors and producers of plywood, together with the ballot on which they were to express their opinion.

The covering letter and ballot make it all pretty easy. The letter explains that if the recipient wishes to approve the standard he should return the ballot. The ballot is in the form of a letter, printed by the Department of Commerce, which expresses the view that the standard is quite satisfactory and that the person or company signing the ballot intends as a voluntary matter to use the proposed standard. The covering letter from the Commerce Department, of course, does not allude to the possibility that one may not wish to approve the standard. On the matter of whether or not a negative vote may be cast, the covering letter is silent. The ballot, naturally, had space for an affirmative vote but no provision at all for a negative vote. Quite a ballot. Such is the outline of the case history of the plywood standard.

The proposed lumber standard is also making its way through the processes of the U.S. Department of Commerce. A proposal for a new standard advanced by the American Lumber Standards Committee in 1964 failed, as I have remarked, to achieve a consensus on the balloting conducted by the Department. Since the expansion of the American Lumber Standards Committee, the committee and its various subcommittees have met diligently and debated earnestly the matter of making load bearing lumber thinner. Once or twice the committee came very close to achieving consensus on sizes. But consideration of criteria for determining the actual strength of the lumber was avoided.

While the discussions went on the Commerce Department arrived at the somewhat remarkable conclusion that no lumber standard at all is better than some lumber standard, even though many communities in the United States key their building codes to the American Lumber Standard. And so the Commerce Department announced in the Federal Register that unless the American Lumber Standards Committee produced a new standard by September 15 the Commerce Department would abolish the existing standard. Shortly before September 15 the committee achieved a consensus within itself. This temporarily satisfied the Commerce Department which announced it would continue with the existing standard for a few more months.

How the consensus on the American Lumber Standards was achieved is a matter into which so far as I have been able to determine the Commerce Department has not looked. One favorable vote on the committee was by a member who was also a member of the Plywood Standards Committee. Whether this raises any question of a conflict of interest, in the light of the Tariff Commission holding on the intense competition between lumber and plywood, is a matter not yet determined. A representative of consumers who had steadfastly opposed any proposal to substitute thinner lumber for the products we now buy, took to heart the threat of the Commerce Department to withdraw all lumber standards and therefore voted for what he considered to be the lesser of two evils. And so it went. By a single vote a consensus was achieved on the American Lumber Standards Committee.

The Commerce Department is now processing the proposal and in a short time probably will send it out for a consensus vote of people economically interested in the manufacture, distribution and use of lumber. Who will be entitled to vote is not now known. Whether votes will be weighted by company size or whether the small businessman will have the same opportunity to protect his interests as does the big businessman is not yet announced. This is important to the small businessman. Particularly in the West the small businessman who is engaged in the manufacture of lumber must bid competitively for the right to cut and remove timber from the portions of Federal forests that are administered for multiple use and sustained yield timber production. According to the Chief of the Forest Service there is an annual shortage of timber supply in most areas of the West as measured against the installed manufacturing capacity. This means that small businessmen must and do bid desperately against each other for the available Federal timber. If thinner lumber sizes enable them to get a few more pieces out of a log to sell on the lumber market, there is no additional profit for them. Rather it means only that they can afford to and will bid more for the timber. On the other hand, the big business units in the lumber industry are the major owners of stands of private timber, some of them owning vast forests purchased years ago at nominal cost. If lumber can be made in small sizes they suddenly find that their trees, solely as the result of a new lumber standard, will produce more pieces of lumber. In effect if the Secretary of Commerce signs the proposed standard, the stroke of his pen will add hundreds of millions of dollars to the timber inventory of the large timber companies. And because of the peculiar provisions of Section 631 of the Internal Revenue Code, this increase in value will be treated as a capital gain rather than as ordinary income when this enhanced inventory is finally harvested by its owner. Under the new standard the small businessman will resume his troubles and the big business units will have strengthened their position.

Whether the Secretary of Commerce will approve the proposed standard he has quite properly not as yet announced. His own procedures require a consensus

vote and review for compatability with law and the public interest and policy prior to the rendering of his decision. The Department, on the whole, does an excellent job of protecting the public interest as concerns standards programs. It must be noted that in the lumber and plywood controversy the root cause of the problem has been the ASTM clear wood standard. ASTM is, of course, not under the jurisdiction of the Department. It is an independent organization answerable only to its own members.

While the Secretary of Commerce is considering the proposal and getting ready to submit it to the consensus vote, the Western Wood Products Association, that includes within its membership the giants of the western lumber industry, which has been the prime promoter of thinner lumber, urged the Federal Housing Administration to approve the use of such lumber in new housing insured by it. In support of its position, the Western Wood Products Association informed FHA that a substantial quantity of thin lumber has been on the market in the recent past. The association, of course, did not explain that almost all of such lumber was produced by or under contract to and marketed by the biggest lumber producer in the United States, The Weyerhaeuser Co. FHA accepted the proposal based upon judgment made on technical matters, not with the problems of small business or with monopoly and antitrust implications. And so FHA announced that it would approve the placing of thinner lumber of the dimensions set forth in the latest ALSC proposal in FHA housing from September 15, 1966, to January 15, 1967.

The current size proposal for a 2 by 4 is 1½ by 3$\frac{9}{16}$. Just a few days ago a local lumber yard advertised a sale on Weyerhaeuser 2 by 4's. In response to a call from counsel for my subcommittee made at my direction the yard stated the size of this Douglas-fir lumber was 1½ by 3½. I regard this as a deceptive practice. The consumer will be buying lumber that is noncompatible with standard sizes. I have, consequently, requested the FTC to investigate this matter and have received word that the FTC is looking into it.

Because housing is the key market for load bearing lumber, it is readily seen that the procedures of the Department of Commerce that are intended to protect the total public interest have been neatly short-circuited. FHA has pretty clearly said in effect that it is not concerned with a program of voluntary industrial standards or the safeguards that are intended to surround the establishment or revision of such a standard. A powerful force in the marketplace, FHA has declared its will. The proposed consensus vote becomes a mockery.

The FHA action gives no help to the small businessman, whether producer or distributor. First, as a producer he cannot readily shift the sizes of the lumber he manufactures. Second, the wholesaler or retailer cannot safely buy the thin lumber because he does not know whether he can get it out of his lumberyard and into FHA housing by January 15. On the other hand, Weyerhaeuser with its massive chain of distribution yards and its ability to procure private financing for homebuilders who will use its products, faces no such problem. Third, the thinner lumber is supposed to have been dried to a point heretofore not required by any standards applicable in any part of the entire West. This means that the small businessman in the lumber manufacturing business, if he is to make this lumber, must install at least $50,000 and frequently $250,000 to $500,000 worth of new equipment to produce a kiln dried product. If he does not do this then he must make his lumber oversize, thereby further increasing the disparity between the small businessman and the giant. And for technical reasons, the manufacture of the particular dimensions of oversize lumber stated in the proposed standard will largely destroy the efficiency in manufacturing and marketing techniques that have allowed the small producer to survive.

One other factor ought to be mentioned in connection with the American Lumber Standards Committee. In the field of voluntary standards, because of the consent decree I mentioned earlier, ALSC has the unique power to impose sanctions where lumber that purports to be grade pursuant to its standard is in fact misgraded. Any agency engaged in such misgrading may find its right to use the official grade stamps withdrawn. And this is important, because building inspectors throughout the nation are given facsimiles of the official stamps and are told that they can, and they do, rely upon them.

For some years the American Lumber Standards Committee has engaged in a policing program, the cost of which is paid entirely by lumber manufacturers. Despite this policing, lumber grading scandals have erupted from time to time. In the summer of 1964 this situation was conspicuous on Long Island. Ensuing criminal prosecutions by local authorities were successful. The ALSC policing program did not reveal that scandal. Legislation has been introduced by several members of the House making misgrading a criminal offense and requiring mandatory grading and marking prior to entry into interstate commerce.

In one limited sense, the policing by the American Lumber Standards Committee has been effective. Its inspectors go here and there, thither and yon examining lumber for its conformance with the grade stamps that are on it. When violations are found they are promptly reported to the committee's headquarters. These reports are brought to the attention of a special subcommittee, denominated the Board of Review, which checks them and assigns them to the appropriate filing cabinet.

Over the years any number of grading agencies have been placed on probation. This means that the agency gets from the committee a letter stating that it must stop misgrading lumber. At the end of that year and succeeding years the agency gets another letter advising that it must stop misgrading lumber. So far no one has been able to point out to me when the American Lumber Standards Committee has ever taken one effective step such as suspending the authority of an agency against any of its officially approved grading agencies for the misgrading of lumber. The committee's policing of lumber grades is effective, then, to the extent that it fills the filing cabinets.

Enforcement seemingly remains forever in the future. To assure that the problem does not disturb too many minds and consciences, the American Lumber Standards Committee has voted that its 5-man Board of Review, which examines the policing reports, must never reveal their contents to anyone, including any of the other members of the American Lumber Standards Committee. So the filing cabinets fill and without knowledge of the facts, the committee members, except for the unlucky 5 on the Board of Review, go with clear consciences.

Before concluding I would like to express my extreme concern for what seems to be going on in the lumber industry.

Home buyers are paying more each year for the house their family lives in. Interest rates are inching up each month. Yet the evidence I have studied strongly suggests that less is being done to protect the Nation's home buyers than ever before.

I am for full utilization of all species of timber. Any marketing approach that groups these species, ascribes strengths to them or in any other way makes their utilization more efficient is in the public interest.

But—and I cannot emphasize this too strongly—this is true if—and only if—full protection for the consumer is built into grading and marketing through a systematic and reliable testing procedure. The unanswered question of established authorities within the ASTM D–7 Committee is both disturbing and alarming.

Referring to the technical deficiency of the proposed lumber standard as concerns stress values, the most likely assumption is that in the West the board of review will utilize the ASTM clear wood standard and group species for marketing purposes in a manner similar to that used in the new plywood standard. Using the results of actual tests for modulus of elasticity values for Douglas-fir, this would result in a range running from 1,732,000 pounds per square inch to a low of 1,129,000 pounds per square inch—a variation approaching 50 percent. Strengths falling within these limits would be marketed bearing identical grade marks.

Here, then, are several case studies in the development of voluntary industrial standards. They provoke a series of obvious but important questions from the point of view of small business.

For example, how is the small businessman to obtain protection from technical data and technical conclusions that are achieved by persons who have loyalties to other interests? What disinterested technical advice is reasonably available to him? What agencies of government are both committed to and ex-

pertly staffed to achieve his protection in the field of technology?

Again, there is the matter of economic analyses. What agencies, private or public, that are concerned with the development and promulgation of voluntary standards, are staffed with economists in sufficient numbers to diagnose the details of the likely economic consequences on competitive balances when a standard is established or revised?

How can the consumer and general interest participation in the formulation of standards be made truly knowledgeable and, consequently, effective?

Are the statutes relating to the maintenance and expansion of competitive opportunities adequate in this area?

What of small business as we move into the far more complex field of international standards?

These are some of the questions that have been raised by correspondence addressed to the Small Business Subcommittee on Regulatory and Enforcement Agencies. The staff of the subcommittee has already started a study in depth. When the study is completed early next year it is my intent that my subcommittee hold hearings to inquire in detail into the extent to which the laudable principle of voluntary industrial standards may have been applied improperly to the detriment of small business. It is a field that has not had careful review. We hope to develop analyses and proposals that will enable the concerned Federal agencies to do a better job in this vital matter.

Standards must not be used as a device to achieve competitive advantage. Standards are for the benefit of all producers and for the protection and convenience of all distributors and consumers. As our Nation becomes increasingly dependent on new technology, it is imperative that smaller firms be allowed equitable participation in the resultant expanded programs of industrial standards.

If larger firms are allowed to use industrial standards as a means of gaining competitive advantage, it will not only hasten and increase economic concentration, but consumer protection will be subordinated to the economic gain of a few industrial giants.

This is a matter that I feel should be studied by all Members of the Congress. I hope to have additional reports on this matter for you in the months ahead.

THE HONORABLE JOE MARTIN OF MASSACHUSETTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATTEN). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the shadows are beginning to lengthen on these final hours of the 89th Congress. And as we convene to dispose of the last remaining business, we are keenly aware of the fact that an unusual number of beloved and familiar faces—faces that have been a part of this body for more years than many of us have lived—will not be seen here when the 90th Congress convenes in January.

Apart from the decisions yet to be made by the electorate within the next few days, we already know that some of the most distinguished lights ever to shine in these halls will shine for the last time when the Speaker's gavel signals an end to the current session.

It is to be expected, of course, that in the natural course of events, time should take its toll. It is fitting in another sense, too, no matter how poignant or reluctant that turn may be, to seek the vitality and the new ideas of youth. It is the inevitable rival to which we all must yield sooner or later.

The best we can hope for is that we have the chance to make a fight of it when the time comes, to test the mettle of our opponent and help him earn the job instead of assuming it as an heir apparent.

I am pleased and proud today to rise in recognition of a Member whose career is destined to be regarded as one of the great traditions of this body; who has yielded in this august hour to a younger successor; but who made a fight of it right to the end.

I speak of our distinguished friend and colleague, my fellow delegate from the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the former minority leader and Speaker of the House, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

Undoubtedly each of us in this body will cherish some special memory of our distinguished former Speaker. His activities on behalf of the Republican Party have had some impact on all of us on this side of the aisle at one time or another during our political careers.

As the senior member of the Massachusetts congressional delegation, certainly he has been an important part of the deliberations and activities of those of us privileged to be part of that delegation.

As a former minority leader and former Speaker, there are many here on both sides of the aisle who took part in debates under his moderating gavel.

I am proud of the personal bond of friendship and mutual respect that has existed between us, dating back even before my first term as a Member of the House.

To me, he has always been "Uncle JOE," a beloved and respected advisor and counselor. His warm friendship was extended freely and without reserve. His advice, sagacious and unfailing, was given with equal generosity.

He was an honored speaker at my very first testimonial dinner following my first election to this body. And he has never failed to respond to any request or need I may have had, both spoken and anticipated. It was "Uncle JOE's" way frequently to sense when a colleague could use a boost, and he was always willing to provide it.

We of the Massachusetts delegation have just cause to feel the pangs of loss as this 89th Congress draws to a close. We bid farewell on this occasion to the senior Member on both sides of the Capitol, to our beloved former Speaker, JOE MARTIN, and to Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.

They have each in their unique and personal way, come to symbolize all that is great in public service; all that has made the American political scene the colorful, brilliant kaleidoscope that it is.

Each has made an indelible contribution, a permanent mark upon the escutcheon of his respective house. Each has become a part of American history.

I am personally proud that I have been privileged to share in the careers of these two men, of Senator LEV SALTONSTALL and Speaker JOE MARTIN, and to share the distinguished heritage of the great State of Massachusetts.

JOE MARTIN will be missed when the 90th Congress convenes in January. And though the shadow he cast while he was here was impressive, it is destined to lengthen as his stature surely will increase in future years.

I am proud to extend my personal congratulations for a long and illustrious career, my personal gratitude for warm friendship and wise counsel, and my personal respects on this occasion to our distinguished colleague and former Speaker. May the years ahead for him be brightened by the knowledge that he has contributed mightily to the greatness and grandeur of the Nation he has served so faithfully. God bless him.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to join in the many tributes which are today being paid to our esteemed colleague, the former minority leader and Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOE MARTIN. The service of JOE MARTIN covers the period of years when this Nation has faced many difficult problems, and he carried a heavy load of responsibility in the leadership position in which he served.

JOE MARTIN can take great pride in his many contributions to the public interest during a period of decades of service to his Nation, his State, and his constituency. I extend to him best wishes.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we of the Pennsylvania Delegation will miss our beloved Republican Speaker when he retires at the end of the 89th Congress. I have always supported JOE throughout my congressional career. We sit side by side on that great Committee of Science and Astronautics, he being No. 1 man and I No. 2. Also I want, at this time to express the committees regrets at the termination of his holding of public office.

I have been associated with JOE MARTIN many years and have seen a keenness of mind and ability as a great legislator. He is one of the great men of our generation, of our century, and perhaps even of our national history. He will be remembered always by those of us who had the privilege of knowing him.

He is a shining example of a self made man. Having no formal education JOE MARTIN made it the hard way. If anybody lived up to the old remark that "he is a born Congressman," Speaker MARTIN certainly does. JOE MARTIN was born in North Attleboro, Bristol County, Mass., November 3, 1884; attended the public schools, and was graduated from North Attleboro High School in 1902; reporter on the Attleboro Sun and Providence Journal 1902–08; publisher of the Evening Chronicle at North Attleboro since 1908 and also publisher of the Franklin, Mass., Sentinel; member of the State house of representatives 1912–14; served in the State senate 1914–17; delegate to the Republican National Convention at Chicago in 1916; chairman of the Massachusetts Street Railway Investigating Commission in 1917; chairman of the Massachusetts legislative campaign committee in 1917; presidential elector on the Republican ticket of Harding and Coolidge in 1920; executive secretary of the Republic State committee 1922–25; delegate at large to the Republican National Convention in 1936; permanent chairman of the Republican National Conventions in 1940, 1944, and 1948; member of the Republican National Committee, serving as chairman 1940–42; elected as a Republican to the 69th and to the 11 succeeding Congresses—March 4, 1925–January 3, 1949; minority leader from the 76th to the 79th Congresses; Speaker of the House of Representatives during the 80th Congress.

I wish JOE all the health and happiness in the world and we shall all miss him greatly.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the 90th Congress will assemble next January but the unhappy fact will be that the 90th Congress will begin its 1st session without Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR. I make this observation knowing that I speak not only for myself but for all the members of this great House in saying that the fact that JOE MARTIN will not be here as a Member is as much a loss to me personally as it must be to the whole Nation, to history, and even to the Republican Party which he served so well and for so many years. JOE MARTIN is not only the "Grand Old Man" of the GOP, so to put it, but he is a kind of solid foundation stone in the two-party system which is the breath of life to the democratic process.

Our country can well be proud of the fact that we have men like JOE MARTIN in both political parties.

Of course, in a political sense we were on opposite sides of the aisle but I would be the first to come forward and say that JOE MARTIN by his style of political combat, by his integrity, and by his essential decency raised the level of the two-party system that governs American politics. Of course, JOE MARTIN and I have fought the political battle here on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives and our political views at times were in opposition to one another. But I cannot recall an incident or a debate from which I emerged—and I hope he did—feeling that the fight was anything but clean and on a plane of honest and legitimate politics. What JOE MARTIN helped to prove is that it is possible to fight hard and yet fight fairly—even in politics.

JOE MARTIN and I are contemporaries here in this House. I on the Democratic side of the aisle and JOE on the Republican side. He took his seat here 42 years ago; I, 38 years ago. It is a tribute to the American tradition and to our kind of political action that in the highest sense we could differ without losing an iota of our regard and respect for each other as men and fellow patriots. My respect and admiration for JOE MARTIN is limitless.

I am proud and unreserved in my opinion that this House and the history of American politics in the last half century or so owes a great deal to JOSEPH W. MARTIN. Not the least of my pride consists in the fact that we both come from Massachusetts and that we both held the gavel here as Speakers of the House. Our American history is the better and richer for the greatness of his personality and the nobility of his service to his country and to his party.

I hope with all my heart that the country will have the wisdom of his advice and that the party and the Nation he served will not forget his magnificent performances on their behalf. And, finally, I hope and pray that he has many years ahead of him of fond remembrances and the tranquillity which he has so fully earned.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I feel a special kinship to the man we honor today. JOE MARTIN once said:

> The position of minority leader of the House of Representatives is the most thankless job in Washington. I would not take 10 times $10,000 to return to it.

And now I am the fellow who is trying to fill the giant shoes that JOE wore for so long, with such distinction, dedication and ability.

Like the 65-pound solid redwood gavel that sits beside the fireplace in JOE's outer office, everything connected with JOE MARTIN's past is bigger than life. Today he holds the record—unsurpassed in either party—of having been five times the permanent chairman of national conventions. JOE got his political start by marching in a torchlight parade for William McKinley in 1896. How many of us can claim political experience over as great a span of years as this?

JOE MARTIN has served with distinction and honor in this legislative body for 42 years. No less a distinguished American than the great Kansas editor, William Allen White, spoke highly of him as a presidential candidate, saying:

> He will make . . . if the dice roll right, a liberty-loving President.

JOE never sought that office though, and at the time his political fortunes seemed pointed in that direction, he chose instead to show his devotion to party by serving as chairman of the Republican National Committee during some of its most trying times.

The greatest tribute came to JOE MARTIN in 1947 when he was first elected Speaker of the House. Even by then he had distinguished himself in the annals of his party to the extent that when he was first nominated in 1939 for House leader, it was said of him:

> We are doing more than electing a floor leader. We are choosing a symbol of the Republican Party.

Through the darkest days of Republican Party history, he has played one of the most significant roles in keeping the two-party system alive and functioning. And JOE MARTIN has been more than just a good man for our party; he has been a magnificent symbol of integrity, dedication, honor, and patriotism to our whole Nation.

Even more than that we all remember him as a warm human being. I am fortunate enough to have on my staff two people who have worked for JOE in the past. No one really knows a public figure as well as the staff members who work with him day in and day out, and they carry with them a memory of his kindness and personal warmth.

I will miss JOE MARTIN most of all because of the advice and counsel that he has shared with me. As most of you know, our offices are very close, his being just above mine in the Capitol. Often I will see him coming into the building early in the morning or leaving in the evening. His step has been slowed a little perhaps in the past 42 years but his kindly smile is still the same, and it beams from a face that we have come to know and love in the time he has been with us. The Halls of Congress will be a little darker and colder after he has left. Yes, we will all miss you, JOE.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I have seen many Congresses end. I have seen many begin. Always we are glad to see adjournment sine die and glad to answer to our name when the new Congress opens with the call of the roll of States. But this is one year when it is not—cannot be—quite the same.

It is hard for me to bring myself to realize that this is the last Congress I will be privileged to serve with our beloved Speaker JOE MARTIN. Whatever the nature of the new Congress, however joyous its opening may be to those of us fortunate to be elected to it, we who have served with JOE will feel a loss when his name is not called. I will, however, have the consolation of knowing that our friend is enjoying private life, doing the things he likes to do, free from the public burdens and pressures he for so many years experienced; but, good friend and good soldier that JOE MARTIN is, he always will be available for counsel and advice.

I do not know any one individual more dedicated to our Republican Party. Nor do I know anyone, past or present, who has contributed more of his life and his unique talents to the advancement of Republicanism. Not only did he serve in the Massachusetts State Legislature and the Congress. Not only did he serve as our minority leader in four successive Congresses beginning in 1937 and in subsequent Congresses. Not only did he serve with great distinction as Speaker of this House in the 80th and 83d Congress.

JOE MARTIN's service has been over and above public office. His devotion to our Republican Party has been over and above what rewards there may be in having achieved high public office. While serving in the Congress he undertook the arduous task of also serving as chairman of the Republican Congressional Committee and even as chairman of our Republican National Committee.

There are, I affirm, few men, if any, who have contributed as much as he to our Republican Party. He has not only been a good soldier. He has been a great leader.

More than that—he has been a true friend. No one could have a better friend, and I am privileged to count myself as one of them. In 1943 I was first elected to the position of whip, and in that capacity I worked closely with Minority Leader Martin. I can speak with intimate knowledge of the skill with which he handled one of the most difficult positions any one could hold. When he became Speaker I continued to serve as party whip and when he returned to be minority leader it was my good fortune to remain the whip.

To know Joe Martin is to love him. To work with him is to be inspired by him. No one, however long he may serve or however competent he may be, can ever really take Joe Martin's place in the Congress. His name has been deeply engraved on the pages of history, that all who come after us will know the great accomplishments of a great man, beloved by all of us who served in the Congress with him.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the retirement of Speaker Martin is a great loss to this Congress and to our country. His able leadership was characterized by his nonpartisan cooperation for the good of his State and our Nation. No one could know him without feeling his personal interest and concern. In giving easily of his friendship he has found it reflected back to him in a well deserved abundance. We will miss him greatly but we all hope that he will enjoy a long and happy retirement.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, while those of us who sit on the opposite side of the aisle may not always be as dispassionate in our views of our counterparts in the other party as we should be, there always are exceptions to the rule of normal congressional behavior. This unusual situation obtains when the class of a man's character shines through in such crystal clear fashion that it strips him of any partisan label and establishes him as primarily a great American citizen rather than as a top flight Republican or Democrat.

Such is the case when we speak of that truly superb representative of the American way of life, the Honorable Joseph W. Martin.

We, of Massachusetts, are particularly proud of a native son who not only has enhanced the prestige of our part of the Nation but has, indeed, over a period of four decades, given a new depth, a new dignity, and a greater dimension to the character of the entire Congress.

In periods of depression and prosperity, Joe Martin has been a beacon light of integrity and of decency, a solid buttress of strength in these Chambers.

We who have the privilege of serving with him cannot help but feel that we are better representatives of the people because of that association. Those who take pride in the contributions of good friends to the progress of the Nation have a special degree of respect for this outstanding citizen.

If it would not be sacrilegious, I might like to observe that I share the opinion of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and from all parts of the Nation when I suggest that God was having his usual great day the day that he created Joe Martin.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, rarely has one man served so long. Rarely has one man served so well. Rarely can one man look back upon a record of over half a century of public service and unwavering dedication to ideals, to party, and to country. As he takes his leave from this House, we ask Joseph William Martin, Jr., the distinguished Representative of the 10th District of Massachusetts, a former Speaker of this House, to accept our solemn assurances of high regard for him, for his record of legislative achievement, and for the high principles that he has scrupulously followed during an outstanding public career.

He first served the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in 1912 when he was elected to the Massachusetts House of Representatives. He gained membership in the Massachusetts Senate where he served from 1914 to 1917. In 1924 he was elected to the 69th Congress and was continuously reelected thereafter.

He has served his party as chairman of the Republican conventions of 1940, 1944, 1948, 1952, and 1956, and as chairman of the Republican National Committee from 1940 to 1942, and in countless other ways.

He was a tireless minority leader from the 76th to the 85th Congress and a beloved and distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives in the 80th and 83d Congresses. His legislative career is one of the very great ones of this century.

But he has been more than a great legislator, more than a great Republican. He has been a wise counselor, a pillar of rectitude, a shining example of integrity in public life.

It has been my great honor to serve with him as a fellow member of the Massachusetts delegation. I speak from my heart when I say that my respect for him is endless, that my admiration for his achievements is boundless, and that I shall forever be in his debt.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the life's work and career of our beloved friend and very distinguished colleague, Speaker Joseph W. Martin, one of Massachusetts and the Nation's most illustrious sons, constitute a very inspiring chapter in the history of our country and the world.

Joe Martin, as he is affectionately known to Members of the House, and to millions of Americans, came from humble beginnings in our great Commonwealth of Massachusetts. He came from a highly respected family of hard working people, and he worked hard from the very start to establish himself in life.

Of rugged character, strong convictions, and unswerving dedication to the achievement of his goals, Joe was so richly endowed with ability, industrious habits, and the capacity, imagination, and will to work himself forward in life, that it did not take him long to establish himself in the business and political leadership of his community and State.

In one successive step after another by his hard work, talents, understanding of people and the practical example of the homely virtues and the basic American principles and spiritual values which it was his inflexible purpose to live by, Joe Martin climbed at a steady pace in the business world, to the State legislature, to the Congress, finally, to the lofty pinnacle of Speaker of the House of Representatives, a position he held during two separate sessions of the Congress and in which he greatly distinguished himself as one of the truly great Speakers of history.

It would not be possible for me in this short time adequately to appraise or evaluate the remarkable life and career of this great American, Joe Martin, whom we all love, respect, and admire, because his devoted service covers a long span of years and touches on many facets of our national life and well-being. It is, in truth, a Horatio Alger story—a story of a real American success.

Joe Martin was distinguished here in every respect—a man of sterling character, high ideals, fine principles, unsurpassed love of country and his fellow man.

He served here, not only with great distinction, but with superb devotion and fidelity to duty that could never possibly be excelled.

He was and is a man of fine rectitude and high concepts, who in the best sense believed in and fostered justice tempered with mercy, not only throughout his service, and while he was Speaker, but at all times and on all occasions.

Speaker Joe Martin has enjoyed the confidence, the trust, the high esteem, the respect, the admiration, and the affection of every man in the House, and this high regard was never fragmented by partisan considerations. Democrats, as well as Republicans, look upon Joe Martin as one of the greatest leaders and dearest friends, a great credit to the House and to the Nation, a leader of great talent, conviction, and understanding, a dear, devoted friend, kindly, generous, considerate of all, whose word was his bond, and whose firm purpose and practice to give of himself to the service of his constituency, his State, and his country and to humankind was always evident.

Through the ironic vicissitudes of politics, a great American will now pass from the House into richly deserved retirement which he has abundantly earned through years of outstanding, faithful service to the Nation.

Joe Martin will be greatly missed in this House. His leadership, counsel, cooperation which he gave so willingly and unselfishly in the national interest, the consistency and inspiration of his warm, loyal friendship for so many of us, the beam of his smile, his encouragement, his assistance when it was needed, regardless of party or other considerations, the stanch, rugged posture of undiluted, uninhibited Americanism that for so long he actively demonstrated and exemplified will long illumine and enrich these historic Halls.

The thoughts of all these things that JOE MARTIN was in this historic place, the great things he achieved here, the warmth of his friendship, which meant so much to all of us, will leave a void in our midst that could never precisely be filled.

The Nation that can rear men like JOE MARTIN and bring them to unselfish, dedicated service of its people is, indeed, fortunate; the Nation that is assured of such leaders and such service is both rich and secure.

The record of stalwart Americanism, of service to our country, which JOE MARTIN has compiled, is unperishably inscribed in the annals of American history. It will go down to countless proud and grateful generations yet unborn as an example to many others who may take up the fight for free government, of what devoted service to the Nation really is and really means.

JOE MARTIN has given practically his entire life to the service of his country and the American people, and we hail and salute him as he departs from this Chamber as one of the great Americans who has ever served here, as well as a very dear friend, whom we will always recall with deepest appreciation and fondest recollection as one of our very best.

In a personal sense, it would be hard for me to express my feelings of gratitude to this great man. He is not of my party, and he is not of my political faith, yet there never has been a time since I first came here as a freshman Congressman that I have not felt free to seek his counsel, advice, and help.

JOE MARTIN has taken a tight grip on our hearts and while he will no longer be with us in the House in reality, his presence will be felt here. The measure of his devotion and patriotism will be recognized here.

The graciousness of his magnetic personality, the kindness and generosity of his warm, personal friendship, and the luster of his rugged Americanism will live in our hearts.

Here is a man, Mr. Speaker, a man who has stood here like the rock of Gibraltar, facing every test with honor and courage, doing the right as God gave him to see the light, standing boldly for the things he believes in to the last roll call.

He leaves us as he came, without malice, because it is alien to his nature, without bitterness or rancor, a real gentleman and great American, bidding us his goodbyes with a smile on his lips and a prayer in his heart for all of us, that we who remain will strive, as he did, for God and country.

We will often see JOE MARTIN, I hope and pray, for years to come. And may he enjoy with his devoted family and friends many happy years filled with choicest blessings from Divine Providence.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, in stature, JOE MARTIN, is not a towering figure but he rose to great heights in the service of his country. Yes, in physical dimensions, like Speaker Rayburn before him, he is a small man but his heart is big and warm and his vision broad. In a multitude of ways, he is a giant to those who know him and whose life was enriched because JOE MARTIN could and wanted to give a helping hand.

Thousands of men have served in the Halls of Congress but the distinguished honor of serving as Speaker since the founding of our Republic has been reserved to but few men. Any man or woman should be honored by being elected to this august body. However, when the membership of this House, selected themselves by the people, designate one from their midst to serve as the Speaker—the voice, if you will, of the House of Representatives—then that individual has had bestowed upon him an honor that is indeed rare, very difficult to attain and not always easy to retain. He becomes upon his election as Speaker only two heartbeats—and, at times, only one heartbeat—away from the highest office of this or any other land, the Presidency of the United States. Some of us never even dream of aspiring to so high an office as Speaker. Yet, our beloved friend was placed twice on that pedestal by those who knew him, loved him, and respected him. Fate brought him close to being the leader of the free world.

We never know, Mr. Speaker, how long the sands of time will run for us. While we are here we never know how long our star will shine or how bright it will be or whether its light will shine constantly, occasionally, dimly or never really shine at all. JOE's star burned brighter and longer than the combined stars of most of us put together.

There are some who believe that the hand of fate was heavy on him as the shadows of his life lengthened. They see him walking through the corridors of the Capitol Building with his cane assisting him along the way. If this is all they see, they understand little of the man himself. If they see in these corridors the wake he has left behind, they will see him as he really was and what many of us would like to be. There should be no weeping for Speaker JOE. The warmth and understanding he has imparted to others, will stand him in good stead today. In years to come, as the majesty of this building and the greatness of the men who served under its dome come to mind, in the foremost will walk a noble son of Massachusetts. The Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., who has left his mark high on the roll of achievement and who enjoyed the deep and abiding affection of his colleagues and his fellow man.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, as this session draws to a close, one of this century's great political leaders and statesman, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts, will say goodby to these Halls. I would like to join with his many friends in extending a warm farewell.

For more than 50 years JOE MARTIN has served with preeminent distinction in public life, and, though his career has been attuned to the Republican Party, he has earned the respect and friendship of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. There is no party division in our deep respect for the role he has played in a great chapter in American history.

First elected to the Massachusetts Legislature in 1912, JOSEPH MARTIN rose in the years that followed to become the leading Republican spokesman in the U.S. House of Representatives. For nearly two decades, from 1939 to 1958, he served both his party and his Nation as either Speaker of the House or minority leader. He has been one of the most outstanding spokesmen of conservative American principles. He has earned admiration as a fair and proficient legislator, as a leader, and as a master of political strategy. He has been the kind of practical idealist that gives tangibility to the concept of a two-party system and a democracy.

JOE MARTIN will be missed on Capitol Hill. But his long and devoted service to his State and to his Nation will remain as a monumental inspiration.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues of the House in expressing my great admiration for my friend and associate of many years, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN.]

There will always be something very special about my feeling for JOE MARTIN. As a great figure and Republican leader, he came to Seattle in 1952 and said some kind words on behalf of my election. That was my first campaign.

During the ensuing years, as minority leader of the House, he never failed to help me where he could. Then, when he was no longer minority leader, I continued to have the benefit of his friendship.

Mr. Speaker, it would not seem like Congress to me next year if I return, as I hope to do, without each day having an opportunity to say hello to JOE.

I have not mentioned, of course, what a great American he is, nor have I said what a proud record he has left to every student of American government. That is a matter of record and history. Words of mine would not add luster to his illustrious career.

Mr. Speaker, a great Roman senator once said he would rather that people would ask why there was no statue of him than why there was one. JOE MARTIN is such a man. He does not need any statue in the Halls of Congress. His life and service to his country have been made a part of the Capitol and the House Chamber and our national seat of Government.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, for our beloved friend and colleague a long and pleasant retirement. No one I know is more deserving of such an end to his career than the great and good and honorable gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, we are setting aside these moments knowing that those of the 89th Congress are numbered, and that when this session ends, so too does an era—one which has lasted for forty full and eventful years and now is committed proudly to history. There, in the annals of the Congress, the name of Joseph W. Martin will be inscribed with honor as it is inscribed with love in our hearts.

We are all saddened in the realization that this familiar figure who is as much a part of this Chamber and a symbol of courageous leadership as any who ever stood on this floor is now bidding us farewell.

So much of his life has been dedicated to public service that the list of capacities and titles under which Joe Martin has carried out his efforts in behalf of his people, party, and nation is a unique and impressive one, and places him far above any of us here. He is known to the world as a great public figure, and has received countless testaments to his qualities as a leader. More significantly, he is known to all of us personally as a great individual, a warm and compassionate man who has devoted himself completely to others and to fighting outrageous obstacles to defend his convictions.

As a leader, Joe Martin has transcended party lines and presided wisely over this body through two Congresses, gaining the admiration and respect of all who have worked with him. As a friend he has given generously of his advice and counsel to all who have sought his help. As the senior member of the Massachusetts delegation, he has shared with us the benefit of his vast experience and insight.

Walter Lippmann said:

> The final test of a leader is that he leaves behind him in other men the conviction and the will to carry on. Speaker Martin is leaving with us not only the great substance of his accomplishments as a legislator but more important, an intangible spirit of friendship and cooperation which will abide with us in his name for future years.

I salute Joe Martin as the greatest Roman gladiator of them all. He fought the battle down through the years against the giants of the time. Joe Martin will always be a champion—he will always be loved and respected. He has carved a niche in history that will stand the test of time. A great American is leaving the Halls of Congress—we his colleagues who knew him best will miss him.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, today I join with my many colleagues honoring the distinguished former Speaker from Massachusetts, the Honorable Joseph W. Martin, Jr.

Speaker Martin has served his State and country in Congress for 42 years. Many of them truly great years, others very difficult. It should be an inspiration for all of us that Speaker Martin has maintained his courage in the face of monolithic problems of state and that he has endured the often thankless drudgery of guiding important measures through the legislative branch.

Speaker Martin has devoted his life to the service of people. I salute him and stand in awe of his public record. It can only be hoped that we may continue to find among us other leaders with the same dedication and confidence as this great gentleman.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, knowing of your unwavering high regard for our former beloved Speaker, the Honorable Joseph Martin, I am confident that we can come before you with our personal tribute to this great and good American.

One of my first official acts as a member of the 80th Congress was to vote for Joe Martin for Speaker, and his handling of that high office justified the confidence of his supporters and earned for him the respect of his loyal opponents. Throughout his incumbency of the speakership in that Congress, as well as in the 83d, he maintained an even hand in his parliamentary decisions, and was universally acclaimed for his fairness. As a legislative novice, I shall always remain in his debt since his sound advice and counsel stayed with me throughout the two decades of my own congressional career.

This distinguished colleague of ours can now rest on his laurels in the confident assurance that patriotic citizens of all political persuasion will rejoice in his long tour of duty in the public service, while the public record will constitute an imperishable record of his contributions to good government, the stature of his political party, and, finally, to his overall commitment to a greater America. As he enters upon his well-earned retirement, we who respect him as a legislator and cherish him as a friend pause in this hour to salute him.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, 42 years of service in this great law-making assembly is a record to be contemplated with awe and respect. Twenty-one times, the people of his district have gone to the polls and cast a majority of their votes to send Joseph W. Martin, Jr., to represent them in Congress. Eight times his fellow party members named him to be their leader and the Congress twice named him its Speaker.

Such records are not compiled by accident, nor achieved lightly, but are the result of years of diligent application, of thorough knowledge of government, and devotion to the public welfare. As one of the younger Members of this body, I want to express my admiration and respect for the record of service which the great Joe Martin has set for our contemplation and emulation.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to a man who has made a grand contribution to his country through outstanding service in the House of Representatives—the Honorable Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts.

It has been for me both a great privilege and experience to serve with this distinguished gentleman in the Congress. I have been the benefactor of his many kindnesses and his guidance, and in knowing him and working with him, I have grown to respect and admire Mr. Martin.

I very easily and pleasantly recall how Joe Martin helped me when I first came to this House in the 1958–59 period. He did for me then what I have seen him do for a multitude of others since—banished the anxiety and apprehension that besiege freshman Representatives by extending them a friendly hand and by familiarizing them with the procedures and purposes of the Congress.

In addition, Mr. Martin played a paramount part in effecting my placement on the House Committee on Agriculture, the committee upon which I have served during my entire congressional service.

I am seized by a sense of sadness when I realize that Joe Martin will not be returning to this Chamber next year—I am proud and pleased, however, that it has been my honor and privilege to know what history will record, undoubtedly, as a great man.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, Joe Martin. Few members of the Republican Party, or for that matter any political party, have contributed more in service to their country than the former Speaker.

In the many years he has been a Member of this body, he has served his district and Nation with integrity, competence, and complete devotion.

When I came to Congress 6 years ago, Speaker Martin was most generous in giving his time and valuable counsel to me and other freshmen Members. I dare say he has helped hundreds of new Members to become more effective Representatives throughout the years.

I am sure that no man has a deeper affection for the U.S. House of Representatives and I am equally certain that there is no man for whom the Members of the House have a warmer regard.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this is always the unhappy time of the session when we say farewell to those of our colleagues who we know will not be with us when the next Congress convenes. One of these colleagues who will be missed next year is our former great Republican Speaker, Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts. Although I, personally, did not have the privilege of serving under his leadership, I know that he deserves the gratitude of all of us for his many contributions and untiring efforts in behalf of all Americans. Therefore, it is with a feeling of nostalgia and sadness that I say: "Thank you for your 42 years of dedicated service and devotion to our Nation. We will miss you and think of you often, Congressman Joe Martin—a great leader, a great statesman, a great man."

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune to come to the Congress when Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts, was Speaker of the House in the 83d Congress. I know of no one who was more helpful to the new Members than was the Speaker. Whether he was Speaker, majority leader or just Congressman Joseph Martin, he was always ready and willing to lend his advice and experience to some of our perplexing problems as Congressmen. He leaves a long and distinguished governmental career and the historians of the House of Representatives will, without doubt, give him a very prominent place in the legislative history of the House of Representatives.

I can only wish for him many years of happiness in his retirement and I know that he will be welcome any time he wishes to visit the House.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I share the regret felt by all members of Congress at the retirement of the Honorable Joseph Martin. His distinguished career in the House of Representatives provides inspiration and encouragement for every representative of the people, regardless of his political affiliation. I know that at one time Representative Martin was engaged in the newspaper publishing business, and as a former newspaperman myself, I am gratified at the heights a member of the fourth estate has ascended.

Representative Martin has contributed tremendously to the history of this great Nation. The ability, dedication, and patriotism of Congressman Joseph Martin has made a significant contribution to the greatness of this Nation. He will long be remembered, not only in history, but in the hearts of those of us privileged to know him and to work with him.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, for 42 years the Honorable Joseph W. Martin, Jr., has labored in this body on behalf of the people of Massachusetts and his party. He has been a veritable giant to both. Elected to the 69th Congress, he became minority leader in the 76th Congress. He held that post until the 85th Congress except during the 80th and 83d Congresses, during which he served this body as Speaker.

Speaker Joe Martin is greatly admired and respected on both sides of the aisle. His integrity and devotion to his party are legendary. I think the people of Massachusetts are indeed fortunate and are to be commended for having two great men such as Speaker Martin and our present Speaker McCormack represent them here in Congress. I have had the good fortune to know Speaker Martin for many years. I have and will always respect him. While we, by virtue of positions on opposite sides of the aisle, have had differences of opinion, those differences have in no way diminished my admiration for Joe Martin.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives and the United States itself is a better place by virtue of the presence here for 42 years of Joe Martin. He will be sorely missed.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with heartfelt agreement, in this eminently merited tribute to my dear friend and revered and beloved colleague from Massachusetts, Speaker Joe Martin, who is unquestionably one of the most distinguished Americans of our time and outstanding leaders in our legislative history.

Considering the acclaimed record of this great man throughout 42 years of dedicated service in the Congress I believe it is safe to prophesize that his legislative learning, knowledge, wisdom, and guidance will forever remain unsurpassed in the annals of congressional accomplishment.

In the darkest and gravest hours of legislative challenge in this Chamber all of us have witnessed the indomitable spirit of this mighty man enlighten and encourage this body toward the patriotic discharge of our full and common responsibility.

This Nation and the world is grateful that Divine Providence, in eternal design, permitted us the unique genius of his patriotic dedication, in direction and perseverance, in the fight for freedom's preservation through many of the most difficult periods of challenge that civilized existence has thus far experienced.

However, beyond this genius, his genuine friendly warmth and compassionate understanding to everyone, regardless of party, and his objective honesty and sincerity in all his personal and official actions have most endeared him to those of us who have been so highly privileged to know and serve with him in this House.

His wise counsel, sympathetic cooperation and thoughtful encouragement to so many Members of this body over so many years will remain a byword in this Chamber forever.

Within himself, and by his own industry and dedication, Speaker Joe Martin has become a national institution in our American political life. His personal example has provided, for all of us here and those who will come after, a permanent inspiration of patriotic service for which this Nation will never cease to be indebted to him.

Although he will leave us at the end of this Congress the legend of his great and generous spirit can never be removed from the atmosphere of this Chamber.

"Mr. Speaker," as we salute you this afternoon, we join in our prayers that the Good Lord will shower his choicest blessings upon all the further endeavors of your long, continuing, wonderful life.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to add to the tribute which is being paid to one of my colleagues, and to my friend, who gave 42 years of his life to public service in this body.

When I came to Congress 26 years ago, the name Joe Martin had already been firmly imprinted on the pages of history. His record is not only a credit to the people he represents, but has been beneficial to the Nation as a whole.

I had the pleasure of serving under him during his two terms as Speaker of the House, and I must say that I have never found a more understanding individual.

It is not often that a man of such conviction and caliber comes to the Congress, and this legislative body will certainly miss the experience, dedication, and capabilities of Joe Martin.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy extended to me by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] in sending word to me of his special order today to express the appreciation of the Members of the House for the long years of service by our former Speaker, and I am happy to be able to have some thoughts of mine included in the Record at this point.

The women Members of the House have always greatly respected and admired the Honorable Joseph W. Martin, Jr., for his fine character and gentle nature, and I might say that in my case my feelings go even a bit deeper than that. Congressman Martin was the Speaker of the House of Representatives in my first term in the Congress, and he was indeed kind and thoughtful in many ways then, and since, which I appreciate. I hope he enjoys to the fullest the many activities I am sure he will be engaged in upon returning to private life after so many years of public service.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the clearest and happiest memories of my service in the House is the way that I was treated by the Speaker of the House when I first came here as a Member of the 83d Congress. The Speaker in the 83d Congress was Joseph W. Martin, of Massachusetts. He was considerate, courteous, and kind to me, and I have never forgotten how this kindly and wise leader, occupying the highest office in the House of Representatives, befriended a newcomer who did not happen to be a member of his party, and who came from a part of Massachusetts far from his district.

It is not appropriate for me to review in any detail the monumental record of service to that district, to his State, and to his Nation that Joe Martin established here in this House. For 42 years his name has been a synonym for honesty, fairness, kindness, devotion to his oath of office, and to his country.

He has served in the House longer than any other Republican except Speaker Cannon. He has been his party's leader in the House, twice Speaker, chairman of five national Republican conventions, and chairman of his party's national committee. His distinguished career is one of which any man would be proud indeed.

It began when he purchased the North Attleboro Evening Chronicle 60 years ago. He still runs it, and runs it well, along with the Franklin Sentinel. He was elected to the Massachusetts House in 1912 and the Massachusetts Senate in 1914. He came to Congress with the 69th Congress after his election in 1924, and he has been here ever since.

Back in the forties, a magazine article generally unfriendly to him nevertheless said that he was becoming an American institution. The article added:

> The half-shy smile on his broad face, the lock of hair falling over his forehead, the amiable personality of Joe Martin are as much a part of Capitol Hill as the statues lining the corridors.

I would have said that they certainly were a much more important part of the life of Capitol Hill than the statues.

The article's author probably had it right, though, when he said that even as a 6-year-old newspaperboy Joe Martin "revealed two talents that have since pushed him up a steady but unspectacular rise to power. He worked hard, and he had an amazing genius for getting folks to like him."

That friendliness of his and that huge capacity for evoking friendship that has been only one of his many talents will be sadly missed in this House where he served so long and so well.

After a lifetime of service to his constituents and to his country, we bid a sad farewell to a son of Massachusetts who has been a credit to his State and his party, to Congress and to himself. We wish Joe Martin well and sincerely hope that he finds peace, leisure, and good health in the years to come.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, Congressman Joseph Martin's long and distinguished career in the House of Representatives was always highlighted by the virtues that we associate with all Yankees. A sense of fair play, a deep knowledge of the issues, a sober and reliable judgment, and a selfless dedication to the interest of all Americans; these and many other qualities are remembered by citizens of both parties. I did not have the privilege of serving in the House during the time Congressman Martin was the leader of the Republicans, but my study of that period, which encompassed some of the most difficult days of our Republic, has led me to have a great admiration for the way in which he discharged his responsibilities.

As Speaker, and as minority leader, Joseph Martin brought great credit to America, the Republican Party, and to the House of Representatives. All of us who serve in the House are grateful to Massachusetts for sending a man like Congressman Martin to us, and we are poorer by his absence.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I consider it an honor and a privilege to join my colleagues today in this well-deserved tribute to a very dear friend and great American, Speaker Joseph W. Martin, Jr.

Speaker Martin has a unique and personal spot in my heart. When I ran for Congress in 1954, he came to my district and campaigned vigorously for my election. I might add that aside from making a significant contribution to my victory, he endeared himself to many thousands of people in the State of Florida.

Throughout his long and distinguished career in public service, during which he served as a member of the Massachusetts State House of Representatives, the Massachusetts State Senate, and the Congress of the United States since the 69th Congress, Speaker Martin has stood out as a statesman who always put his country before himself and his party. For this, he has earned and enjoys the deep love and respect of his country. His dedication to the public weal has indeed served as an inspiration to members of the Congress, and to Americans everywhere.

As the senior Republican member of the Science and Astronautics Committee, Speaker Martin has left a momentous mark on the entire U.S. space program. As a delegate to six Republican national conventions, as permanent chairman of the Republican national convention in 1940, 1944, 1948, 1952, 1956, and 1960, and as a member of the Republican National Committee, Speaker Martin has left his very consequential crest on the Republican Party in the great two-party system tradition.

And as a former speaker of two Congresses, and as minority leader of eight other Congresses, Speaker Martin has left an indelible imprint on American history.

A great statesman whose absence from this body will be sadly missed, Speaker Joseph W. Martin, Jr., from Massachusetts has earned the everlasting gratitude of his fellow Americans. I am privileged to have served with him.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it is very hard to say goodby to our beloved Joseph W. Martin, Jr.

Each of us who has served in this great House of Representatives has his own memories of the magnificent American we today are honoring. He has literally dedicated his entire life to his party, but always above and beyond that, to his Nation.

Speaker Martin introduced me, as he did many of you here, to the unique and time-honored customs of the great body in which we serve. As a freshman it was a mark of distinction to be singled out by "Mr. Republican" for words of advice and encouragement. It was a privilege deeply felt.

The work Joe Martin has done for America in this Chamber will be appreciated for generations to come. It is the greatest tribute possible to this truly great Speaker, Representative, and patriot.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to my friend Joe Martin.

I regret very much that Joe Martin will no longer be a Member of the House of Representatives after the conclusion of the 89th Congress. He is not only a neighbor from the State of Massachusetts, but he is a man of great knowledge in the proceedings and practices of the House and one who is learned in the ways of parliamentarians and humankind generally.

He is a man of compassion and a man who is devoted to his fellow men. He has a deep love of family and deep desire to improve the lot of the underprivileged citizen.

He has written an outstanding record as a legislator and as a member of his political party. He has risen to the post of Speaker of the House, the third most important office in the Nation and above all he has won the admiration and respect of his own constituents and neighbors.

As a fellow alumnus of Dartmouth College, since Speaker Martin has been the recipient of an honorary degree of my alma mater, and as a fellow Member of the House, I extend to Joe Martin my best wishes for peace of mind and continued service in the years ahead.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to a man who has brought nothing but credit to himself and this body, by his actions over the years, the Honorable Joseph W. Martin.

I was a Member of both the 80th and 83d Congresses during which time Joe Martin was Speaker of the House of Representatives. He was at all times a fair and impartial leader of this body during those periods as he was while serving as minority leader for many, many years. As a committee chairman, I conferred with Joe Martin on a number of occasions concerning his party's position on various pieces of legislation with far-reaching implications to our country and its citizens. I can say that his fair approach to the legislation under consideration on those occasions was indicative of a great leader and patriotic citizen whose interests transcended self and party.

As he serves his last days in this body, I want to wish him good luck, health, and the best of everything in his days of retirement.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, this is a sad occasion for all of us as we pay tribute and bid farewell to one of our most highly esteemed colleagues, Joe Martin. His retirement is a loss to us all, but most especially to the members of the minority, for he was our leader during every Congress from the 76th to the 85th. In the 80th and 83d he was the Speaker of this body.

To most of us, however, he has been more than a leader and a colleague—he was a friend and an inspiration. There are few such men in each generation who are mainstays of the causes they represent and whose lives are dedicated to the service of the ideals they believe in.

Joe Martin's contributions to his party, this Congress and the Nation are too numerous to mention and have earned him the everlasting gratitude, respect, and admiration of all of us who have known and worked with him. His career should be an example and inspiration to us all.

The 90th Congress will be smaller without him, for his is a place none of us can fill.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have the opportunity to join my colleagues in paying tribute to a great American, a great Republican, and a great citizen of this country, the Honorable Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts.

He has served his district, his State, and his country in the Halls of Congress for more than 40 years. During this time, he has made an enviable record and received the highest honors from his party and his country that could be bestowed upon a Member of this body.

In his illustrious career, Representative Martin served as Speaker of the House in the 80th and 83d Congresses, and as minority leader in the other Congresses from the 76th to the 85th. For 16 years, from 1940 to 1956, he was the permanent chairman of the Republican national conventions.

Although I am a freshman Member of the House, I have known personally about his outstanding career for many, many years. I represent the First District of Tennessee, which the late B. Carroll Reece served for so long and so well. His association with Mr. Reece is a legend in my district for they were great friends. Our late beloved friend from Tennessee often spoke to me about his high regard for the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I know that this feeling is shared by all who have come to know him as Mr. Reece did.

My sincere congratulations, Mr. Speaker Martin, on your outstanding record of achievements in the Congress of the United States. As Speaker of the House and as a Member, your contributions will long be remembered. Your efforts for the Republican Party are a challenge to all of us on our side of the aisle, for you led our Grand Old Party through many eventful years of progress and victory.

I shall miss you, and my colleagues shall miss you when you leave us at the end of this session. Good luck in all your endeavors, and I know that the future holds many more wonderful things in store for you.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the end of this Congress will mark the departure from public life of one of the greatest gentlemen ever to grace these halls. I refer, of course, to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable Joseph W. Martin, twice Speaker of the House, and former national chairman of the Republican Party.

Speaker Martin was firmly fixed as a major figure in American political history when I first came to the House in 1963. Indeed, he was already a legend. It was with a sense of great anticipation and considerable awe that I sat down with him at the first of the luncheons we Republicans from New England had every week to discuss regional and national issues. The Speaker presided over these as informal chairman, unfailingly courteous, ever alert to the views of the other men, full of sound advice and counsel.

During a career of 42 years in Congress, preceded by service in the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Mr. Martin achieved one of the highest offices in the power of free men to bestow—the Speakership of the House of Representatives. During this period of time, he saw, participated in, and led in many of the most momentous, earthshaking events in history. He grasped the importance of the atomic bomb and it was due in large part to his leadership in Congress that the huge sums needed for the Manhattan Project, which developed the bomb, were passed through the Congress in a manner which did not give the secret away. During those 42 years, there can scarcely be recalled any event of importance to American political history or foreign affairs in which Speaker Martin did not have a hand.

On the lighter side, who can forget the stir he caused when he refused to wear the prescribed topper to a Capitol Hill reception for the King of England in 1939?

There is no better testimony to his effectiveness than the devotion which he earned from the people he represented and served so well for so long.

It is with a deep sense of sadness that we witness his departure. I feel proud, honored, and privileged to have shared even a little of it with him. If I ever am asked to describe what a good Congressman should be, I shall tell my questioner to study the life of Speaker Joe Martin, especially in his own book, "My First 50 Years in Politics."

I join with all my colleagues, with all of Joe Martin's constituents, and with all Americans, in wishing him farewell and a long, happy life among the people and in the country he loves.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is good to have this opportunity to join my colleagues in expressing appreciation to our esteemed colleague and former Speaker, the Honorable Joe Martin.

Joe Martin will always be known as the "Grand Old Man of the Grand Old Party." He has served in the House longer than any other Republican, with the exception of Speaker Joe Cannon. Mr. Martin has been the only Republican Speaker of the House since 1930. He was House Republican leader for 20 years and chairman of five national party conventions. He served through the lean years of the 1930's when Republicans were even a smaller minority than we are today. Then he helped the party come back to power with a majority in the 80th and 83d Congresses.

Although we Republicans have a particular claim on Joe Martin, Members on both sides of the aisle have a deep affection for him. Once when the late Speaker Rayburn was asked to campaign against Joe Martin, he is quoted as having said: "Hell, if I lived there I'd vote for him." Joe Martin is known as a man who always keeps his word. He has contributed much to the House of Representatives and to his country. We are all going to miss him very much, but we wish him well in whatever endeavors he may undertake.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, it is a common human failing for people living through the great upheavals of history not to appreciate the movers and shakers of their own era. Charles Dickens marred his genius, but revealed himself as human, when he revealed his lack of perception by denouncing our 24th Congress as one composed of mediocrities. He did not see the giants whose talents would have made any legislative assembly memorable. Only a minority recognized the spectacular man who was Lincoln when he lived.

It would be easy, but not just, to chide our ancestors for this lack. It well may be that historians will see us as dullards for not appreciating great leaders of our own day.

However, I know with certainty that we Americans of this generation will never be charged with ignoring the qualities and the career of Joseph William Martin, of North Attleboro, Mass. Such oversight would be comparable to ignoring the Rocky Mountains.

If our beloved Joe Martin did no more than routine duties in his public service, he would have achieved notice and distinction because of simple longevity as a public servant. It began in 1912 after election to the Massachusetts House of Representatives in the Taft administration and continued during the tenures of ten Presidents, with twenty-one consecutive terms in this House. This alone would give him a secure place in the annals of our legislative history.

But there are many yardsticks for measuring a man and by any of them, Joe Martin is of extraordinary stature among Americans.

Energetic and forceful with all the qualities of a leader and champion, he did not retreat from what he regarded as the best interests of his own Massachusetts people or Americans anywhere. But in addition to being a bulwark of his party, he had the rare ability to act as the balance-wheel amid whirling dissentions and be the calm center of political hurricanes for almost 40 years.

His party recognized this great talent by making him the standing Chairman of five Republican National Conventions, the Minority Leader of the House for nine Congresses and the Speaker for two others.

Joe Martin had many endearing traits, but to me his most engaging quality was that of a good sport. He never gloated over his many triumphs and never whimpered amid his few defeats. He added luster and respect to his profession as a politician, expecting and taking successes and losses, with admirable equanimity.

It would require a fat volume to record Joe Martin's career. I leave that to the historians. In marking the progress of our country in this century, Joe Martin's influence on our era will remain a monumental peak for any student of our times. To heap more honors on such a man would be superfluous, so we wish him a warm and heartfelt Godspeed.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have served in Congress 24 years with one of the great statesmen of all time, Congressman Joseph W. Martin, Jr. I never knew a finer, more able, or more competent legislator and gentleman in all my life than Speaker Martin. He will be greatly missed as a Member of the House of Representatives. May God bless him and his relatives.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, many great men have graced these Chambers and have left deep imprints on the history of the United States, but one of the truly outstanding Members during my service in the Congress is former Speaker of the House, Joe Martin. I welcome the opportunity to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to him. It has been truly a privilege for me to serve with him in this, the Nation's highest legislative body. I have had many occasions to work with Joe Martin and have come to know him well over the years, and although we sit on opposite sides of the aisle, there have been many occasions when our votes were the same.

His service always has reflected his interest in the well-being of his State and Nation and demonstrated the wisdom, integrity, and devotion to duty which he possesses. Our distinguished colleague has rendered valuable service in the House for 42 years. His record has indeed been impressive and attests to the fact that he is a great public servant and an honorable statesman who has served with distinction and great credit. We shall all sincerely miss Joe Martin and his ability, courage, and graciousness.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, "Mr. Republican" will not be with us in the 90th Congress, and we shall certainly miss the sage advice and direction given to our party by the retiring "Mr. Speaker," Joe Martin.

In the long history of this legislative body, it is something of a rarity to have served 20 consecutive terms, including many years as minority leader and as Speaker. JOE MARTIN came to the House in 1925, and since that time many Members have come and gone while he has remained for over 40 years of close association with this Nation's history, in good times and in bad, and through periods of stress and strain, war and crises, during which the House has had the benefit of his steadying influence and able guidance. And in spite of his tremendous legislative responsibilities and demands on his time and energies, freshmen Congressmen in need of indoctrination and advice have found him a friendly and helpful advisor. His devotion to the cause of our party, and leadership, have earned him the distinction of being referred to as "Mr. Republican."

JOE MARTIN's constituents, the Republican Party, the Congress, and the Nation, have all benefited from his wisdom and outstanding service. As a fellow Dartmouth man here in the Congress, we salute him for the high honor which he has reflected upon his alma mater, as a colleague we respect and admire him for his fine qualities and dedicated service, and as a friend, we will always remember him with great affection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to a fine gentleman, a great American, Speaker JOSEPH W. MARTIN. JOE MARTIN has compiled a record of service to our Nation that will rank him as one of our truly great statesmen. During the years that I have been a Member of this House, I have considered it a privilege to serve with him.

When he was Speaker, he treated all members in the same gracious manner without regard to the side of the aisle on which they served. He has brought a great measure of dignity to the House of Representatives and next year he will be missed by all of us, Democrats and Republicans alike.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN of Massachusetts whose long career in the House of Representatives will end with the 89th Congress.

The admirable accomplishments of the distinguished and highly esteemed Representative from Massachusetts are too lengthy and well known to cite here. Let it suffice to say that few Americans have ever attained so much or have served their country so well as Mr. MARTIN.

This extraordinary man, whose voice has been heard in the Congress for 42 years, dedicated his entire adult life to public service and the betterment of mankind.

The exemplary accomplishments embodied in the career of this great public servant serve as an inspiration and guiding light for all of us and they shall be long remembered.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join in this tribute to one of the finest and most dedicated Members of the House.

Few men in this era have devoted half a century to public service. Fewer men could qualify to write a book entitled, "My First 50 Years in Politics," and publish such a history long before their retirement. Fewer still could relate therein more than five decades of national leadership, and only one could tell us of his experience as a member of both houses of his State's legislature, as a Member of Congress for 21 terms, as a delegate to 6 national conventions and permanent chairman of 5, as chairman of his party's national committee, and as minority leader in 8 Congresses and Speaker of the House in 2.

JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., has written such a book. Far more important, he has written such a record in the annals of American politics. Throughout his career his work has been constructive and progressive. Acutely aware of changing times, he has never failed to bring his principles and energies to bear on the most pressing problems which have challenged the Nation and the world. He has given the best within in him to the Government of America, to the strengthening of our institutions, to the shaping of our laws, and to the guidance of the younger and less experienced legislators whom he has led.

Speaker MARTIN stands in the first rank of American statemen, with the great executives and legislators of both parties who have been his colleagues and his friends; men like President Eisenhower, Senator Robert A. Taft, Speaker Rayburn, and the present Speaker of the House. He stands, too, in the foremost rank of the great Republicans of Massachusetts, with Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL; Mr. MARTIN's close personal friend, Gov. Robert F. Bradford; and three generations of the Lodge family. He has shared with these men the heavy burdens and the great rewards of leadership, and shares with them, too, the tradition of selfless, sound, creative service which has built and stabilized our Nation through troubled and difficult times.

Mr. Speaker, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., has received innumerable honors, degrees, tributes, and citations during his career. He has earned every one of them. But possibly the greatest honor, and the one which he should treasure most, is the sure knowledge that he will be greatly missed and long remembered in this House.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague and once Speaker, JOE MARTIN, has carved out a historic record that is not only appreciated by Representatives, but by all citizens appreciative of the strength of the legislative branch of Government.

His lifelong career in public service, 42 years of which he served as a Member of the House, deserves the appreciation of all who served with him.

JOE MARTIN will go down in history as one of the great House Members in our legislative body. I am honored to have had the opportunity to serve with him and to have known him as an outstanding individual and person, as well as a great public official.

I am pleased to join my colleagues in commemorating the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., and to state that the tribute given him by Members of the House is dramatic evidence of our appreciation of his outstanding career.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with genuine pride that I join the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. SILVIO O. CONTE, and other Members of the House in expressing my deep personal regard for one of our most distinguished Members and former Speaker, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

Over the course of his service in public life Mr. Martin has compiled a distinguished record of dedicated leadership both to his State and Nation. In the 42 years which he has served in Congress Mr. Martin was honored by his party by his repeated election as minority leader and twice as Speaker of the House.

Although he and I are not of the same political allegiance I have, except on the most definitive political issues, often found myself in agreement with the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

His fairness as Speaker, his cool reason, his kind and gentle manner, his ready wit, all of these will be missed by those many friends and admirers whose honor it has been to know him and serve with him in Congress.

It goes without saying that the 90th Congress will be the less without him. And yet, his influence and thought will go on through those whom he led and inspired.

With my many colleagues in the House today I join in extending to Mr. Martin my heartfelt best wishes for a happy and full life. We shall miss him greatly.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct honor and privilege to join our colleagues today in paying tribute to a man who has not only spent 42 distinguished years in this House but has twice been honored to lead this body from the chair in which you sit.

JOSEPH WILLIAM MARTIN, JR., is more than a Representative from the 10th District of Massachusetts. He really represents all Americans, and has spent an illustrious lifetime in the service of this Nation.

His is a voice that will be remembered long after he has left these Halls. His is a voice that has been heard and remembered by people everywhere as he gaveled the Republican National Conventions to order for almost two decades.

I recall with gratitude the assistance JOE MARTIN provided when I came to Congress as a freshman. Many a time he offered words of encouragement or bits of advice that helped me become a more effective Member. I am truly grateful to be numbered among his many friends.

We will miss Speaker MARTIN in this Chamber. But all of us will be better Members because of the example he set through dedication, honesty, integrity, and devotion to duty. We wish him much happiness as he assumes a new and unfamiliar role of private citizen.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to pay tribute to the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., and his distinguished record of public service.

All of us, Democrat and Republican alike, have seen in Mr. MARTIN a devotion to his work and a dedication to his constituents which will serve as a continued inspiration for our own remaining years in the Congress.

I would wish for Congressman Martin a most happy retirement.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, the retirement of our colleague Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of the 10th District of Massachusetts brings to an end a most distinguished career of public service. We recall his devotion to the Republican Party in whose ranks he has worked for a half century, rising to national leadership, marked by 21 terms in the House and elevation to Speaker of this great body. Such a career is an inspiration to us all and commands our respect and admiration. We speak not only for ourselves, but Republicans and indeed Democrats, when we congratulate Joe Martin on his dedicated service to his Nation and wish him all that is best as he lays down his legislative burdens.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I am sure I speak for every Member of this body when I say that the departure of the Honorable Joseph W. Martin, Jr., will leave a great void here which will affect everyone.

He is a former Speaker of the House who is revered on both sides of the aisle and is beloved by us all. He is a dedicated, conscientious, sincere, capable, intelligent Representative of his district.

He has led this House through great periods of decision to major and momentous fulfillment of its legislative destiny. He has been a tower of strength and an enduring source of inspiration to this membership.

Congressman Martin's scope of service has extended far beyond the bounds of the House in his role as sage counsel and national convention leader for his party.

His truly remarkable record speaks for itself and every American citizen can justifiably be thankful for the life and national contribution of such a patriot.

In the House, we do, and always can, point with pride to Joe Martin and his service here. He is the ideal image of what a U.S. Congressman should be.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it has been a genuine privilege to have served during the past 4 years with our colleague, Congressman Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts.

Speaker Joe Martin, as he is familiarly known, is a legendary figure in our political life. As chairman of Republican National Conventions he fascinated and captivated great radio and television audiences. While his service as Speaker of this House preceded my election to the Congress, I know that he was respected and beloved while serving in that prominent post to which his colleagues had elected him.

Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Speaker Martin, has shown the qualities of integrity, dignity, and eloquence that have distinguished men of stature in this and other ages of mankind. The citizens of the 10th District of Massachusetts—indeed, the citizens of the Nation—can turn with loving and profound respect to one of the great public figures of our day, Speaker Joe Martin.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I extend a fond farewell to Speaker Joe Martin, who has so ably served his district, his State, and our Nation for many years. I am delighted, however, to join in paying tribute to this distinguished gentleman who has earned the respect, admiration, and affection of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

It is said that a politician thinks of the next election, but that a statesman thinks of the next generation. So it is with a bit of irony that we bid farewell to Statesman Joe Martin.

It has been a genuine pleasure for me to serve under his leadership in Congress—as Speaker, minority leader, and friend. His counsel and help to me over the years will never be forgotten. As the days of his service draw to a close, he has the right to look forward to that peace of mind which comes to those who have completed a long career of faithful and selfless service.

I wish Joe Martin well as he begins a much-deserved rest. It is my hope that in his days of retirement he will enjoy a full measure of contentment.

I also hope that he will find it possible on occasion to return to this Chamber in which his voice was so often raised to proclaim his principles and where he fought so valiantly for what he believed to be in the best interest of his district, his State, and Nation.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, "A thousand years in Thy sight are but as yesterday when it is past, and as a watch in the night."

One can only stand in awe at the record of a public service which began in 1912 and has continued without interruption to this day. Our highly respected friend, our capable colleague, our former conscientious and much loved Speaker, was present at the birth of the 20th century. In every change, in every advance, of this marvelous era, he was an active witness—nay, he was a moving force. While most of us here in this august body were still testing the possibilities of childhood and youth, Joe Martin was engaged in hammering out the great social movements which are making his century renowned for all ages to come.

Joe Martin has served well the great State of Massachusetts. And it is to the credit of his native State that it recognizes superior ability and capacity. For a period of more than half a century it has continuously commanded him to look after its legislative interests in the State and the National assemblies. It has given him every honor in its power. It has placed its trust in his unwavering integrity and good judgment. And Massachusetts is today a greater State because it has produced and honored Joe Martin.

Those of us in the 89th Congress look on its closing with sadness. It marks a separation from a heroic figure. Our fondest wishes for a long evening in the glow of the achievements he has brought to pass and of the honors he has so justly merited go with him.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the 69th Congress, on March 4, 1925, the Honorable Joseph W. Martin, Jr., began his service as a Member of the House of Representatives. The time was only 6 years after the end of World War I, and the United States was beginning to enjoy the economic boom that was to last until that tragic crash of 1929. The distinguished congressional career of Joe Martin, begun on that day, has continued throughout the great depression, World War II, and the cold war of the past two decades. For 30 years of that time, since I first came to this body, I have known and respected Joe Martin in a way that completely dissolved barriers of political party affiliation.

During many trying days for the United States Joe Martin was not only a stalwart support for his party but for the people of the entire country. As minority leader for 20 years he never permitted partisan considerations to interfere with his duties as an American. During World War II, our enemies were constantly shaken by the solidarity of the Congress which was largely the result of Joe Martin's patriotism. His almost unprecedented close relation with our beloved Speaker Sam Rayburn was firmly based on mutual respect and understanding. Like Sam Rayburn, he is, above all, a man of his word.

The people of Massachusetts and all the United States are losing the services of a dedicated and able legislator.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in wishing Joe Martin good health and success upon his retirement from his distinguished and long service in this body.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that the genius of a good leader is to leave behind him a situation which commonsense, without the grace of genius, can deal with successfully. When the 90th Congress meets in January, it will be minus one of its ablest and strongest leaders, whose genius and commonsense have been a credit to his State and party.

Joe Martin has served the 10th District of Massachusetts for 42 years in the House, and has been a strong advocate of the two-party system since his first days in the 69th Congress. He has served the Republican Party on every level from early days in State and national campaign committees, Massachusetts House and Senate to minority leader and then Speaker of the House. He has been permanent chairman of the Republican National Convention more times than any other man in history. Speaker Martin will indeed be missed in the House and in the Science and Astronautics Committee for his leadership and warm cooperation. To this true servant of the people, I say, "well done," and best wishes for an enjoyable and fruitful retirement.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, when I arrived in the 80th Congress in 1947, Joseph "Joe" Martin, Jr., had already been elected Speaker. He had even then served longer than I have served since. By any and all standards he was a senior and a most respected Member of this body.

Regardless of political affiliation, he was "our friend, Joe."

He was able; he was knowledgeable; he was fair; and he was gracious. He needed no parliamentary rule to designate him a gentleman. He was a gentleman before he came to Congress and all through the days that he spent with us.

We will miss his genial countenance in this Chamber. We will always remember his many kindnesses.

We wish him well in the days ahead.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, although I have had the privilege of serving with JOE MARTIN for only one Congress, I count the opportunity of observing his legislative genius and enjoying his friendship as one of the rich experiences of my freshman term.

Certainly his 50-plus years of public service have earned him an enduring place in the hearts of an admiring Nation.

However, it is this body, and the men who have served and who now serve in the House, who can best appreciate and most deeply respect his contributions as one of our great Speakers and as a legislator of integrity and talent.

Speaker MARTIN will be deeply missed in Congresses to come, but long remembered by his colleagues and in the pages of history as one of our Nation's outstanding statesmen.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, in the 80th and 83d Congresses, the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOE MARTIN, served as Speaker. It was my privilege to serve under Speaker MARTIN in both of those Congresses. He has, and had at the time of his speakership, a wry but kindly humor which certainly made presiding over the House an easier job. It certainly made it much more pleasant for those of us on the floor who were participating in the debates.

JOE MARTIN is a great American who ably represented the people of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and did so with a singular devotion to duty. It saddens us all to note the poor health which he has had in recent years. However, his quick wit has remained with him; one of his many fine qualities which we will miss in the 90th Congress.

Mrs. Dorn joins me in wishing for him every continued success and best wishes always.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, as we near the end of the 89th Congress, we are saying goodby to several senior Members of the House, whose presence will be greatly missed in the future.

Congressman JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., has served in these Halls with great honor, distinction, and courage for 42 years, and during that time he has earned the respect, admiration, and affection of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. Congressman MARTIN has served his party and his country with wholehearted dedication as minority leader in two terms of Congress and as Speaker of the House for two terms. He leaves us full of years and full of honors, and his memory as a man, as a legislator, and as a party leader will linger long in the House even though he will not be with us physically.

I hope that in his retirement Mr. MARTIN will rest at ease on his laurels and enjoy the retirement years he so richly deserves and has so honorably and effectively earned.

RAY T. MILLER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 10, 1963, the late Ray T. Miller, had served 25 years as chairman of the Cuyahoga County Democratic Executive Committee, in Cleveland. Ray Miller died suddenly last July. Many laudatory articles have been written about his activities and accomplishments. On July 14, 1966, the Cleveland Press, in an editorial, said:

> Mr. Miller was a clean fighter, and he was honest. * * * He was astute, too, being one of the first political leaders in the land to support Sen. John Kennedy for President.

The Cleveland Plain Dealer, on July 14, 1966, wrote of him in an editorial:

> Once he became party chairman, whenever he had the say-so, only men of high caliber were chosen for public office.

The most captivating story written about Ray T. Miller was by Richard L. Maher, politics editor of the Cleveland Press, when Mr. Miller celebrated his 25th year as chairman of the Cuyahoga County Democratic Executive Committee, January 10, 1963, which follows:

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AS COUNTY CHAIRMAN: RAY MILLER IS FRIEND OF PRESIDENTS AND PRECINCT WORKERS

By Richard L. Maher

Out of the west (Western Ohio, that is), there came in the post-World War I years a young Lochinvar bent on conquering Cleveland.

And conquer he did!

The young man was Ray Thomas Miller—better known as just plain Ray Miller. He is now a bit older, but still as vigorous, buoyant and effervescent as he was 40 years ago, when he first hit the Cleveland scene.

In the years since young Miller, fresh out of Notre Dame University and fresh out of the Army, nailed up his shingle and began to practice law, this community has known him as County Prosecutor, as Mayor, and as Democratic Chairman.

He was a firebrand as prosecutor, a crusading law enforcer at 35. He was a workhorse as mayor, grappling with the almost insoluble problems of the depression in the pre-WPA and subsidized relief days when there were no state or federal funds to aid the jobless.

But it was as County Chairman that he achieved his most impressive record. Twenty-five years ago, he took over the leadership of a divided Democratic Party split by fussin' and feudin'.

He united the party (except for some splinter operations here and there), saw the city, county, State and nation go Democratic during his regime as Chairman.

BROKE GOP COUNTY RULE

Ray Miller was born in Defiance, Ohio, and lived there until he entered Notre Dame. He spent his summers between college years working at Cedar Point. He came to Cleveland, practiced law for a bit, served in the City Law Department in the early 20's, was elected Prosecutor in 1928, Mayor in 1932, and County Chairman in 1938.

That's the capsule story of Ray Miller's political life.

But the real story is in the lines between those vital statistics.

Ray Miller was hailed as a great prosecutor. He was praised for his service as mayor. He has won fame and nationwide acclaim for his achievements as a party chairman. He has turned a county that 35 years ago was solidly Republican into a Democratic happy hunting ground, the most consistent and biggest Democratic stronghold in the state, and one of the leading Democratic areas in the nation.

Few people realize how much Ray Miller had to do with making John Kennedy President. Ray was the first of the big city Democratic chiefs to throw his support to John Kennedy. Ray was aware as early as 1956, when Kennedy lost his bid for the vice presidential spot on the Democratic ticket, that the young senator from Massachusetts had a big political future.

STEER ROAST INSPIRED JFK

Ray Miller brought John Kennedy to the 1958 Democratic Steer Roast. He brought him back in 1959. There, before the biggest—to that time—crowd ever to attend the annual party outing, Ray Miller told John Kennedy, who was not yet formally a candidate, that he had the backing of Cuyahoga county.

Back to Cleveland came Candidate Kennedy in 1960 to face the greatest crowd he had ever seen in his years of campaigning—and the largest that has ever greeted him even to this day. They say that more than 300,000 persons lined the route from the Hollenden to Euclid Beach and jammed into the amusement park to see and hear the man whom they were sure would become President of the United States.

That wildly enthusiastic outpouring gave John Kennedy the shot in the arm that he needed, the confidence that he showed just 24 hours later when he met and swamped Richard Nixon in the first of their joint television debates.

What Ray Miller did for John Kennedy—including carrying Cuyahoga county for him by 142,000 votes when the rest of the state was going Republican—has been acknowledged by the Kennedy clan often.

CONFIDANTS OF FDR

The big crowd at Euclid Beach in 1960 was not an unusual achievement for Ray Miller.

In 1940, he induced Franklin Roosevelt to close his campaign for a third term in Cleveland on the Saturday night before the November election. People lined the streets ten and twelve deep from Hotel Cleveland to Public Hall. They jammed the area around the hall.

They jammed every seat and every aisle in the big hall, the Music Hall, the basement display floors, and every area where anyone could get in to sit, stand or hang onto the rafters.

As President Roosevelt boarded his special train to return to Washington that night, he called Ray Miller into his private car to talk politics.

Every newspaper and magazine poll—including the Gallup poll—indicated the President would not carry Ohio.

"After tonight, you can go back to Washington and forget Ohio." Miller told Mr. Roosevelt, "You will carry Ohio."

And the President did. He carried Cuyahoga County by 138,000 votes—and that was just about enough to insure victory in the state.

HELPED NOMINATE TRUMAN

Ray Miller played a major role in making Harry Truman President. It was reported at the time of the 1944 convention that he, along with other big city Democratic leaders, threw up the road blocks that sidetracked Henry Wallace from the presidency and knocked James F. Byrnes out of his dream of occupying the White House.

The course of history was changed that summer night in a hotel suite in Chicago when Miller and Ed Flynn of New York, Postmaster General Frank Walker, Edward Kelly of Chicago, and a dozen other Democratic leaders from metropolitan areas sat down with Robert Hannegan, then chairman of the national committee, to talk about a running mate for President Roosevelt in his fourth term bid.

Henry Wallace had been Vice President in the Roosevelt third term. They didn't like him. He was too far to the left. They sent a blunt message to Roosevelt: "We won't take Wallace." The President agreed to dump him. Then came the question: "Who?"

The President mentioned Byrnes. Miller and the Democratic chiefs didn't want Byrnes either. Too far to the right, too conservative, they told Roosevelt.

Then Hannegan, who hailed from Missouri, asked the political leaders if they would take the then Senator Truman. They agreed. Hannegan told the President—and Truman got the nomination.

Ray Miller was able to deliver Ohio for Harry Truman in 1948. Truman won Ohio by 7,200 votes that year, but carried Cuyahoga county by nearly eight times that.

Ray Miller is a Democrat—through and through. He has never been known to stump or speak for a Republican when there was a Democrat opposing the GOP candidate—no matter how little he may have liked that Democrat.

However, he did not as mayor permit his politics to interfere with his civic duties. In 1932, Herbert Hoover was seeking re-election as President. He came to Cleveland for a campaign speech in Public Hall.

Miller had been campaigning for Franklin D. Roosevelt—but on being informed that the President would visit Cleveland, he ordered the city to roll out the red carpet for Mr. Hoover. He went to the train to greet the President, accompanied him to the hall and sat through his speech—though it must be admitted he squirmed a bit.

MAN WITH A MEMORY

There are many who wonder at Ray Miller's ability to hold the Democratic Party together despite some reverses and defeats. The answer is his ability to inspire loyalty in those about him.

Of course, there have been disappointments and disloyalties. Ray Miller came to power in 1938, although he had not been part of the revolution that unseated Burr Gongwer as party leader. Those who directed the revolt against Gongwer put Miller in the contest for party chairman because they knew he could win—and only he.

It is of interest that most of those persons still living who marched down the aisle of the convention hall in Hotel Statler that May afternoon in 1938 with Ray Miller to take over the Democratic organization are with him today.

They say that Ray Miller has been loyal to a fault to those associated with him. He even has been forgiving of those who deserted only to return and seek absolution. There are those within the organization who are so strongly loyal to him that they would never think of questioning his word on candidates, issues or party policy.

Why? Many still remember that in the 30's, Miller put them or their parents to work when jobs were scarce. They remember that Miller has done favors and will do them again. Most of all, they remember that Miller remembers them.

Even those about him marvel at his ability to remember names and faces—from the most prominent party leaders to the little fellows in the trenches.

LADIES VOTE FOR RAY

Prominent visitors who come to the party's annual Steer Roast are amazed as Ray Miller escorts them through the crowd, presenting them to party workers. A ward leader here, a precinct committeeman there, a public official, a little old lady who voted for him for mayor 30 years ago.

A visitor from the White House who stood with Miller at the entrance of Euclid Beach one afternoon as the Steer Roast of that year was opening was struck almost speechless as scores of persons stopped to greet Miller and in turn were introduced to the celebrity from Washington by name, by office, and often with an anecdote about their services to the party.

The strongest unit backing him in the party is the women's division. Anyone attempting to criticize Ray Miller in the presence of the Democratic women is courting disaster.

No other Democratic leader in the county ever sat in the leader's chair long enough to observe his 25th anniversary, as Miller has. Ray Miller has stayed there these twenty-five years because of loyalty—loyalty of his workers to him and loyalty by him to them.

There are other vital statistics about Ray Miller that ought to be noted here. His early life in Defiance, his service in World War I, his marriage and such!

Football is a tradition in the Miller family—football and Notre Dame. Ray played football for Defiance high for four years. His feats have been overshadowed by his brother Don, one of Knute Rockne's Four Horsemen. But in his own right Ray made some records of his own, including being picked on several mythical Ohio teams.

He followed his older brother, Harry "Red" Miller, to Notre Dame—as have some 15 other Millers.

Ray made the Notre Dame team—and during summers he worked at Cedar Point. It was there on the white sands of Cedar Point's beach that he and Rockne and Gus Dorais developed the forward pass that helped make Notre Dame king of football when Rockne took over as coach.

He also was a track star at college.

HELPED ORGANIZE BROWNS

But football has been his real love—and he rarely misses a Notre Dame game. He dipped into professional football in the 40's to help organize the Browns, of which he owned a share or two. He was in on the organization of the All American Football League, which later was consolidated with the National League.

He even played football while in the Army. Ray Miller decided to join the Cleveland Grays about 1915. He liked the uniform and the parade marching. About 1915, he found himself in a Machine Gun Company of the 145th Infantry and on the way to the Mexican border for the skirmishing there.

To while away their spare time, he and a group formed a regimental football team. He played quarterback and halfback along the Rio Grande.

Back in Cleveland only a few months, he was again called to duty, this time to serve as a lieutenant in the 10th Ohio Infantry at Youngstown.

There's a story back of his military service which to date has not been told. Miller went off to Camp Sheridan, where his regiment was broken up into three machine gun battalions. The unit was moved to France in 1918 and immediately went into the trenches in the Alsace-Lorraine sector.

His outfit was shifted to the Meusse-Argonne area in September, 1918 and there he found himself serving under General "Black Jack" Pershing, his commander on the Mexican border.

WINS BATTLEFIELD PROMOTION

In the action that followed, the commander of Company B, 134th Machine Gun Battalion was killed. Ray Miller was given a battlefield promotion to Captain, and transferred from Adjutant, 135th Machine Gun Battalion to Commander of B Company, which was the Divisional Machine Gun Unit.

From mid-September until 11 o'clock on the morning of November 11, 1918 when the armistice was declared, the 134th Battalion and Miller's company saw action.

Under his command the city of Cruysantem was captured. B Company took part in the drive that pushed the Kaiser's army out of Belgium.

It was not until March, 1919 that the unit was relieved and sent back to the States.

After his discharge from the Army that year, Ray Miller returned home, resumed the practice of law, but kept up his association with the Army as machine gun officer of the 37th Division. He rejoined the Grays and became a captain.

And there's a story to that.

In the early 20's, Ray Miller, was an ambitious, dashing young assistant law director for the city. One evening through some friends he met an attractive young girl, Ruth Hamilton. She came from Lima, only 50 miles from his birthplace in Defiance. She was in Cleveland, attending Western Reserve University where she took social study courses and was working as an assistant secretary of the Associated Charities.

The brash young lawyer was quite taken with the young lady from Lima. Proudly he told her that the Grays would parade downtown next day and that if she stood on Euclid Ave. near Playhouse Square, he would watch for her, halt his company and salute her.

He did as he said—but couldn't find her in the crowd because she wasn't there. She had gone home to Lima for the holiday.

MARRIES RUTH HAMILTON

That only made Ray Miller more determined to make Ruth Hamilton his wife—and he did in 1926. She came from a legal family in Lima with a father and an uncle being disciples of Blackstone. And she found young Miller's arguments about two living as cheaply as one quite unanswerable.

There are six Miller children—Mrs. Rosanne Perme, Ray T. Jr. (a politician like his father, he's a state senator); Ruth Mary Galvin, Richard (the only lawyer in the crowd), Robert and Riley. Also, enough grandchildren to make sure there will be no population decrease hereabouts, (27).

Success has come to Miller not only in politics and the law but in business and fraternal pursuits.

He is in his spare time a radio station operator, with stations in Cleveland (WERE), Sandusky (WLEC) and Los Angeles (KFAC).

Back in the 20's he organized the Cheney Chemical Co., which later became a part of the Liquid Carbonic Co.

He organized the Searles Lake Chemical Corp., which owns 10,000 acres of leases in Death Valley. They mine borax (always associated with Death Valley), boron and salt cake.

He took a flyer into the brokerage business with a limited partnership with Merrill, Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith. His other business associations would take a couple of pages to enumerate.

In fraternal life, for many years Ray Miller was one of the outstanding Knights of Columbus in Ohio. He served 12 years as a member of the Supreme Board of Directors of the Knights of Columbus, directing for years the society's investments of its insurance funds.

CATHOLIC MAN OF YEAR

When he left the Supreme Board, he was named Catholic Man of the Year by Cleveland Knights for his long service to the Order—a service that goes back to 1924 when he was named district deputy for Cuyahoga County, a service that carried him to the top post of the Knights in Ohio by 1928.

Charity has always been one of Ray Miller's hobbies—but one that is little known. Only those close to him really know what he has done.

Since 1932 he has served as a trustee of the Catholic Charities Corp. He has been a member of the Board of Trustees Rosemary Home for Crippled Children. He gave that up to join the Board of St. Ann's hospital where the six children of Ruth and Ray Miller all were born.

There is another aspect of Ray Miller's charitable works that only diligent questioning and investigation reveal. Anyone who served in the Army with him can get just about anything from him. They say that while he was mayor, his old Army buddies filled City Hall. That's not quite true, but many who hit bottom during the depression found their old company commander remembered.

And they remember!

To this day every year at Christmas time, one of those who felt his generosity in the 30's drives to the Miller home with a Christmas present. Long ago Ray gave up chiding him and telling him he didn't have to do this to show his appreciation.

And that's the story of the young Lochinvar who came out of the west to win Cleveland!

A 20TH CENTURY COMMITTEE OF CORRESPONDENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATTEN). Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER] for 30 minutes.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include pertinent extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, 10 short years from now we will observe the 200th anniversary of our Nation's independence. With a number of my colleagues in the Congress, I feel that appropriate and significant action should be taken to commemorate this great anniversary. As John Hancock stated during the American Revolution:

> As there is not a more distinguished Event in the History of America than the Declaration of Independence . . ., it is highly proper that the Memory of that Transaction, together with the Causes that gave rise to it, should be preserved in the most careful Manner that can be devised.

In keeping with the heritage of self-government and free inquiry bequeathed to us by the Revolution, we hope to stimulate discussion and debate on the Republic's goals and ideals in its 200th year of the Republic. We hope to generate full and valuable discourse upon how our Government might best continue to protect the rights of man set forth in the Declaration and guaranteed to all Americans by the Constitution.

We think it would be appropriate, historically and practically, to form a new Committee of Correspondence, patterned after those groups which promoted the exchange of ideas during the era of the American Revolution. There were one or more such committees in each of the Original Thirteen Colonies, and it was largely through their efforts that Americans were united in their drive toward independence. In the words of John Adams, these committees "diverted the people's attention from picking up pins, and directed their views toward great objects."

My friends in the House, SAM GIBBONS, RICHARD HANNA, CHARLES MATHIAS, BRADFORD MORSE, PAUL TODD, MORRIS UDALL; and Senator FRED HARRIS, are joining in this project. We are asking Americans of all political philosophies from all walks of life to submit letters expressing their ideas on 20th-century America, and its Government. The best of these letters will be entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and, we hope, given the widest possible circulation.

I wish today, Mr. Speaker, to present the first six letters received by our committee. The writers are, Mr. Sol Linowitz, formerly chairman of the board of the Xerox Corp., and now Ambassador to the Organization of American States; Mr. Harry Golden, author and critic; Mr. Norman Thomas, prominent Socialist leader; Mr. Russell Kirk, noted columnist and editor; Dr. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., historian and professor; and Mr. Roger M. Blough, chairman of United States Steel Corp.

To be sure these letters present differing views of America and her problems, but their essays are thoughtful and timely. We commend them to the Congress and the Nation. At the same time we invite all Americans to join our venture, and share with their countrymen their ideas about America, her heritage, and her destiny.

The letters follow:

ROCHESTER, N.Y.

Congressman CHARLES LONGSTREET WELTNER,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WELTNER: I commend you and your colleagues on your interest in stimulating discussion with reference to the state of our Democracy and the problems which confront us as we approach the 200th year of National Independence.

Your suggestion is that this would be an "especially appropriate time to re-evaluate our national goals." I fully agree that "re-evaluate" is precisely the right term. For we have in the past expended much time, effort and energy in "searches," "debates," "missions" in order to "define" and "identify" our national goals and purposes. The fact of the matter is that we do not need a redefinition of our national goals but, rather, a recollection of our national goals. What is called for is not a further articulation of the things for which we should stand, but an earnest effort to begin to stand for the things for which we have always said we do stand.

It is worth looking back to see what we are all about: We are the kind of nation we are because we have on our side the accumulated benefit of many centuries of groping for ways to make human rights and freedoms more secure. More than anything else, this is what distinguishes us from the Communists. For measured against our own past, the Soviet Union stands coarse and naked and empty: It has never known an awakening from darkness; it has never experienced the mellowing of history; it has never achieved the unity of purpose which comes only when free men join in mutual trust and freedom to pledge to one another their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor.

It is three lifetimes since a group of brave determined men came together in this country to say certain things in which they believed. They borrowed ideas from men like Aristotle, John Locke and Thomas Hobbes and shaped them and set them afire. They said what they had to say "out of a decent respect to the opinions of mankind." And at a time when we were but a loose group of weak and scattered colonies with less than three million people, they lit up the western sky with a great basic idea: That a free society must have as its fundamental overriding purpose the preservation of human rights.

This country has known many black hours since then. The nation grew strong before it was struck down by Civil War. We have survived two world wars, each claiming a generation of American dead. And the great idea of human freedom has been the concept which has been our greatest mark of distinction as a people. It has been and always must be our real National Purpose.

What do we mean when we say our purpose is human freedom? We mean that we believe in the integrity and dignity of the individual human being. We mean we believe in the right to life, a decent life, for every person—a right which comes not from a government, not from fellow men, but from God. We mean that as a nation we support the right of every human being—regardless of his race, color or creed—to stand erect and with dignity in the eyes of God, and to make the best he can of himself.

When we say these things we are, of course, merely echoing what the founders of this nation tried to say when they wrote our National Purpose into the Bill of Rights. For after they had fought the Revolution and finished binding up their wounds, they knew that the price they had paid was high, but not too high. For these men were remembering things—things like the trials of Sir Walter Raleigh and the Earl of Essex in which both were browbeaten, condemned without the rights of counsel, without the right to call witnesses, without the right to testify; they were remembering the Bills of Attainder under which Parliament had, as judge, prosecutor, and jury, sent men to their death without giving them a chance to defend themselves. They were remembering Somerset mounting the steps to the chopping block a few months after he had sent his own brother there by another Bill of Attainder; they recalled the despairing cry of Stafford, who was condemned to death for a political act and heard it asked in Parliament: "Why should he have law himself who would not that others should have any?" and most vividly of all they were remembering the Salem Witch Trials when teen-age girls fell to the floor in convulsive fits and Cotton Mather had instructed the judges as to the manner of handling the accused: "Now first, a credible confession of the guilty wretches is one of the most helpful ways of coming at them . . . Whatever hath a tendency to put the witches into confusion is likely to bring them to confession."

Because the Colonists remembered these things they put into the Bill of Rights a series of "Thou Shalt Nots" fashioned out of abuses such as these which they had known and seen and never wished to know or see again.

So in the First Amendment they provided that there could be no law abridging freedom of speech, religion, or press, for they understood as well as Milton that "the liberty to know, to utter and to argue freely according to conscience is above all liberties." Because they also saw the danger in infringing the people's right to bear arms and remembered the history of forced billeting under Louis XIV of France, they wrote restraints against such practices in the Second and Third Amendments of the Bill of Rights; and in the Fourth they outlawed unreasonable searches and seizures. Then in the Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Amendments they spelled out the lessons they had learned in the Star Chamber and in other dark places by assuring to all men a right to a fair hearing, to trial by jury, to avoidance of self-incrimination, and to protection of life, liberty, and property through substantive and procedural due processes of law. These were safeguards put together for a great and solemn purpose: The assurance of free men's rights in a free society.

There are two simple phrases which, I think, sum up this purpose: One is that "all men are created equal"; the other is Lincoln's assertion that here we have a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people." The question is not whether these are, in fact, the core of our National Purpose. The real problem is how to make them part of our National Practice.

When we, for example, cite the Declaration of Independence and practice Little Rock, who is fooling whom? When we use the right words while we do the wrong things, who is being misled? Is it really possible to make our concept of freedom a rallying cry if millions of colored people about the world feel that we have open mouths but closed hearts—that we are more concerned with a man's skin than with his face? In short, must we not understand—and make sure that the people of the world understand—that what made sense to the pigs in George Orwell's "Animal Farm" just does not make sense to free Americans: That here we cannot announce that all are created equal and then in practice tack on the phrase "but some are created more equal than others"?

Or take Lincoln's reminder that our Government must be one "of the people, by the people, for the people." What do we do in practice to make it this kind of government? Do we really understand that such a government "of and by the people" cannot be achieved through quadrennial spasms; that it requires tending to—conscientiously, thoughtfully, reverently—by all of the people, and not just by politicians and office seekers?

Anyone who travels abroad appreciates the intense interest other people have in our way of life and in what we are doing with the greatest democratic experiment in history. They watch in dismay when we ignore our responsibilities as citizens and fail to exercise the precious right to vote in freedom; or when we try to meet challenges to our nation as world leader by assuming the posture of an ostrich; or when we complain loudly about governmental waste and abuse and at the same time demand special or favored treatment for a pet project; or when we rely upon prejudice, tub-thumping or breast-beating rather than on calm and thoughtful analysis of vital issues.

Never before was it so necessary for us to realize what Lincoln in his wisdom and humility wanted us to realize: That our leaders could walk before us but they would inevitably adjust their step to ours; and that this government, this nation, this democratic dream, would become exactly what we the people are willing to have them become.

We have a great responsibility at one of the decisive hours of world history. We shall discharge that responsibility not by building faster and more destructive missiles—or even by framing new stirring statements of national goals. We can only do it by trying to live up to the things which have always been our national goals: By living and acting the way free men must live and act who truly understand the meaning of human freedom.

Sincerely,

SOL M. LINOWITZ.

HON. CHARLES LONGSTREET WELTNER, *Member of Congress, Longworth Building, Washington, D.C. 20515*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WELTNER: My respectful greetings to your colleagues, Congressmen BRADFORD MORSE, PAUL TODD, RICHARD T. HANNA, CHARLES MATHIAS, SAM GIBBONS, MORRIS UDALL, and Senator FRED HARRIS.

Your "letter project" in anticipation of the observance of the 200th year of America's Independence offers me the rare opportunity to attempt an answer to a question I've pondered for many years: What Is America?

My father brought his family to America in 1905. I was two. I have no recollection at all of the little ghetto town in which we lived. I have no recollection of the old Austro-Hungarian Empire of which we were supposedly an integral part. Literally, I was born again as we passed by the immigration inspector at Ellis Island in New York City's harbor.

To me, therefore, the American Dream is the opportunity given babes in arms of entering the open society. Of course, the babe in arms has to evidence drive and energy, to some degree talent, but he is still automatically involved in the common welfare and common security of America. This opportunity is uniquely America. Even in our sister democracies there is still a pretty stratified economic and class consciousness. The boy who sells chips at the cricket game can reasonably expect to become eventually the foreman who dispenses the fish and chips to the young vendors. The American boy who tosses peanuts at a baseball game can become a vendor, if he chooses, or he can become a clergyman, a congressman, even, or better still he can become the center fielder, if his eye is sharp and his arm is strong.

America is a nation on wheels. Not only did Americans ford the Mississippi River and breech the deserts of the West on wheels, but they are just as fast to move from class to class, neighborhood to neighborhood, and from one income level to another income level.

This privilege is one that has been hard won. It would be hard to say here precisely what qualities it is that won it. But one of those qualities is mobility itself. Abraham Lincoln wrote his Congress once: "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate for the stormy present, we must think anew, we must act anew, we must disenthrall ourselves."

Which about sums up the virtues of mobility: if we want to keep moving, we've got to keep it *new.*

It is to preserve this virtue we must ever make argument with those Americans who have never understood their country, who perhaps will never understand it, who support racial and ethnic ideas as the proper boundaries for men.

Just about the time I arrived in America, there were many Italians beginning to go back to Europe. Over the years, more and more of them went back, a fact which delighted those Americans who sought a restrictive immigration clause. These folks used to document the exodus of Italians and finally they petitioned the Congress and the President for a bill which would prohibit all but token immigration. One of their arguments was that when immigrants returned home they took American money with them. President Woodrow Wilson read over the proposals and savored the argument. Then he asked, "But they left behind the vineyards they planted and the subways they built, didn't they?"

Despite Wilson, the bill passed. For there was more to it than Italians returning to Calabria. There was a terrible envy; just why, I do not know. But there must have been an envy because otherwise no one would have passed a restrictive immigration bill. Because, remember, that in the 1960s, with almost two hundred million people, the United States Patent Office registered less patents for new ideas than it did in 1912 when the population did not exceed one hundred million people.

How many electrical wizards like Charles Steinmetz did we exclude? Think of the Joseph Goldbergers we kept out. The first Joseph Goldberger was an Hungarian Jew who knew every Negro cabin of the deep South, knew them because he was seeking to trace the cause of pellagra. And he found it in one of the cabins and he was able to offer us the remedy. Millions of Southern children grew up with straight legs because this country accepted a Jewish immigrant from Hungary. What other ills we could have cured had there been no passage of the immigration bill in the 1920's we will never know.

But God is good to America. The Americans are really His "Chosen" people. The immigrant and pioneer traditions flooded us with a gulf stream of vitality. We settled the frontiers and closed off the immigrants. But the vitality is still there. There are twenty-four million "strangers" wanting in to the open society, just as my father wanted me in. These twenty-four million "strangers" have curiously lived in America longer than most of the population. These "strangers" are the American Negroes who, striving to be like others, make others define what it is they are, what it is they ought to be.

Perhaps that is also a heritage peculiarly American—to be blessed always with a marginal man struggling to get "in," struggling to be like everyone else. Let us hope for America's sake that by 1976, when the Negroes are buying everything they do not need like the rest of us, America will have yet another stream of vitality, a stream of marginal people seeking the hope of America, the mobility without hindrance.

Sincerely,

HARRY GOLDEN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

HON. CHARLES LONGSTREET WELTNER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WELTNER: I like your idea of a celebration of the 200th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence prefaced by a discussion of American problems which may be carried on by a new version of the old Committee of Correspondence. I am honored by your request to join in the discussion.

What I shall say will mostly be critical of certain features of American development and policy, especially foreign policy. I speak as one who has had much pride in my country and wants to have more. It is because I love her that I want her to stand out as a true leader in the world for democracy, social justice and international fraternity.

We must not unduly idealize the past. Our noble Declaration of Independence with its statement that all men are born free and equal was signed by men who held slaves and the whole Congress accepted the terrible institution of black slavery. Our history has been cursed by that kind of hypocrisy. In our own moment of time we have practically abolished de jure segregation and have gone about as far as it is possible to go by law in ordaining equality of rights.

There remain tremendous problems of de facto segregation in housing, in education and in employment.

In the next ten years properly to celebrate the 200th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence we have got to press on to finish the work begun by the Emancipation Proclamation more than a hundred years ago. The struggle for civil rights or, if you like, the Negro revolution, is one of the major areas of concern in analyzing the American situation. Any successful solution of this type of problem requires us to pay tremendous attention to what it is now the style to call the war on poverty. Poverty and unemployment are especially bad among Negroes, a fact which deserves close attention and action but there is no way of fighting Negro ghettoes without fighting slums which are by no means confined to Negroes in the United States.

There is no way of ending Negro unemployment especially among Negro youth without dealing with the whole problem of employment in an age of cybernetics. We shall, therefore, whether we like it or not, be forced to spend much time on such problems as inflation, strikes, more effective collective bargaining and the whole relation of labor and management to each other and of both of them to the public interest. The institution of what has been called a negative income tax to provide at least a minimum income for those who have been submarginally poor is far preferable to our present system of welfare doles.

We have not yet reached any ideal solution of the problem of who ought to own what, especially in the field of natural resources and public utilities. Our system of taxation from counties and municipalities up to the Federal government certainly requires examination and better correlation. Our welfare state has by no means ended the exploitation of masses of people under our present system but overshadowing the struggles in the two interrelated fields of civil rights and the war on poverty is our third concern which is the peace of the world.

If we must contemplate the continuance of the undeclared Vietnamese war for ten more years with perhaps the addition of other wars growing out of commitments to some forty other nations, which Secretary Rusk says are similar to those made to South Vietnam, or more likely the imminence of world war, nothing else will matter. It is a psychological, if not a practical, impossibility to carry on the undeclared Vietnamese war and at the same time support a proper war against slums and poverty. It is absurd to think that you can carry on the war without a very dangerous degree of inflation. The war itself by its nature and effect progressively will doom any dream of American leadership in a world for a secure peace, democracy and fraternity of people.

The major purpose of American foreign policy has been the containment of communism and an acceptance of war and threat of war as principal tools in the process. It is this which allegedly justifies our present interventions in what was essentially and demonstrably not the war of aggression which our current Administration continually denounces but a civil war in which the United States, despite the Geneva Agreement, intervened earlier and far more extensively than North Vietnam or any communist power.

Our Chinese policy of non-recognition of the effective government of China and our insistence on excluding it from the UN has strengthened the worst features of communism and largely prevented our taking more and practical advantage of the divisions between Russia and China.

The President professes to stand for unconditional negotiation any time and anywhere and yet refuses to give full recognition to the National Liberation Front, the political arm of the Vietcong, which is and has been our principal adversary in the Vietnamese war. The administration professes to be concerned for nothing but self-determination of the Vietnamese people but at the same time in word and deed acts as if it were fighting to destroy communist power in Southeast Asia. That cannot be done even by military victory in a country reduced to stark ruin, moral and material, by the continuance of the war.

The ultimate end of our present policy, if it is to be continued, is a military confrontation with China which in the thermonuclear age spells a supreme catastrophe for mankind. That military confrontation may be postponed one way or another until after 1976 but the skies over our 200th anniversary will be blackened by fear of the results of the policy we are following. No discussion of things as they may be in 1976 will have any value except as the beginning of that discussion now may contribute to a decent end of the Vietnamese war and a necessary coexistence with China.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN THOMAS.

MECOSTA, MICH.

A Letter Concerning Political Change in the American Republic

For nearly two centuries, the outward forms of the government of this nation have altered little. Although during the past thirty-five years, and particularly during the past decade, the actual functioning of our political system has changed rapidly, still the facade of the political edifice looks much as it used to. Within, nevertheless, the house is being transformed—even if no one has designed a radical transformation. No system of laws and institutions is immutable. Can the American Republic direct change into actions which will reconcile with our historical experience and our prescriptive institutions that spirit of the dawning age which just now threatens to bring down the house?

Change, as Edmund Burke said, is the means of our preservation: as the human body exhausts old tissues and takes on new, so must any vigorous society. Yet rash and mindless change, striking to the heart of the body social, may destroy the continuity which invigorates a nation. The character of change in America probably will be determined, for good or ill, within the next few years.

Whatever our civil discontents at present, we stand in no peril of a political or a social revolution which would destroy our national foundations. The American people remain the most conservative in the world—even though their conservatism is not so much the product of reflection as it is of habit, custom, material interests, and attachment to certain documents, most notably the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. Our difficulty, indeed, is not the clutch of ideology, but rather complacency—the smug general assumption that the civil social order, in essence, always will be for our sons what it was for our fathers.

"With conservative populations, slaughter is nature's remedy," Brooks Adams wrote. He referred to what Sir Henry Maine had described as the complacent democratic conservatism of the crowd. If American order, justice, and freedom are to endure, some of us must look into the first principles of politics and apply the wisdom of our ancestors to the troubles of our time. To preserve all the benefits of American society—which may be lost not through revolution, but perhaps in a fit of absence of mind—we must turn political philosophers, as did our ancestors in the last quarter of the eighteenth century.

Like the English, the Americans usually have been reluctant to embark upon abstract political speculation. Except for the period just before, during, and after the Revolution, and—to a lesser extent—the years before and immediately after the Civil War, we have produced little political philosophy; we have trusted, instead, to constitution, custom, convention, consensus, and the filtered wisdom of the species' experience.

Indeed, the Declaration and the Constitution, though drawn up by men of philosophical knowledge and power, are not in themselves manuals of political philosophy. The Declaration of 1776 is, of course, simply a declaration—and a highly successful piece of political propaganda; such philosophical concepts as find expression in its lines are so mistily expressed as to mean all things to all men, then and now. The Constitution is not a tract at all, but a practical instrument of government, molded in part by necessary practical compromises.

We will not repudiate the Declaration, nor much alter the formal Constitution. Yet no society can be bound by parchment. With vertiginous speed, the character of American society is being altered. Can a people whose modes of living, economy, and diversions differ radically from those of the eighteenth century continue to live in harmony and prosperity under a political system developed in quite different circumstances? Can a people of whom the immense majority now dwell in megalopolis, for instance, govern themselves on the old principles of American territorial democracy?

For my part, I do not think that we could construct a brand-new constitution better calculated to reconcile the claims of order and the claims of freedom than does our old Constitution—whatever its anomalies and difficulties today. If that is true, then we will do well to seek means for reinvigorating the Constitution and making sure it deals adequately with the conditions of the twentieth century: otherwise it may be altered out of recognition by an extravagant "judicial reinterpretation", unsupported either by precedent or by public consensus—or, in the long run, it may be discarded altogether by an impatient executive, Congress, and people.

And we must remind ourselves that beneath any formal constitution—even beneath our Constitution, the most successful and enduring of such formal documents—lies an unwritten constitution much more difficult to define, but really more powerful: the body of institutions, customs, manners, conventions, and voluntary associations which may not even be mentioned in the formal constitution, but which nevertheless form the fabric of social reality and sustain the formal constitution.

So the examination of our present discontents cannot be confined to an exercise in formal constitutional law. Ignore a fact, and that fact will be your master. To discuss the future of American politics, in fine, we must confess that, vastly important though they are, the Declaration and the Constitution do not constitute the be-all and end-all of political wisdom; and that, when the file affords no precedent, we must turn from the legal brief to political philosophy.

Recourse to political first principles is attended by risks. Scarcely anything could be more ruinous than to turn the American people into a set of half-educated coffeehouse philosophers, idealogues bent upon gaining Utopia instanter, terrible simplifiers in politics. Yet when the fountains of the great deep are broken up, as they are in our time, a people cannot govern themselves wholly by the decisions and the rhetoric of 1776 and 1787. The intellectual and political leaders of our age have the heavy duty of guiding public opinion into prudent consideration of the means for harmonizing our prescriptive politics with modern conditions that demand some tolerable action.

Here I can suggest only a few of the principal questions which must be examined frankly, if our Republic is to retain, in general, its old political and social character. But here I put down a number of "problems" which must be confronted by the makers, great or obscure, of public opinion and public decision. (It should be remembered that, society not being a mathematical exercise, no profound social "problem" is forever "solved"—or, it it vanishes, its place at once is taken by some other "problem" quite as pressing.)

What most journalists and men of politics regard as "great problems" in their society often are merely ephemeral phenomena—or else they give those difficulties the wrong names. Thus men still speak of the "civil rights struggle"—when, at least in the North and West, the question usually is not at heart one of conferring more abstract rights upon ethnic groups, but actually the restoration of true community among folk abruptly uprooted from their old environment and bewildered in a new. Similarly, men talk of "the need for more classrooms" when that need is much diminished, and when what schools really require is qualitative improvement.

Here, accordingly, I briefly mention ten questions which, I think, go deeper than most of the matters debated in Congress or in the press. Many of these concerns are not directly political; yet unless some intelligent action is undertaken, the failure to confront such larger difficulties will alter American political order for the worse, even though Declaration and Constitution should receive as much lip-service as ever. Therefore some suggestions as to the nature of our more subtle concerns:

(1) The question of the American mind—or how we are to preserve and nurture the moral imagination and the liberal intellect in an age that has fallen victim, educationally, to a disastrous permissivism, an obsessive vocationalism, and a preoccupation with bricks and mortar.

(2) The question of the American heart—or how we are to rise above the democracy of degradation dreaded by Alexis de Tocqueville, in which men would rest content with creature-comforts and a petty round of material pleasures.

(3) The question of social boredom—or how, in this affluent society, we are to find work with purpose for all, and challenges that make life worth living. (Mankind can endure anything but boredom: it is ennui, rather than privation, which provokes riots—and revolutions.)

(4) The question of community—or how we are to encourage and cherish those centers of voluntary action, and those "little platoons" in society, which save us from the total state. (Until such matters are weighed, "urban renewal" will continue to be, often, the creation of urban deserts.)

(5) The question of social justice—or how we are to ensure, so far as possible, that class and individual obtain the work and the rewards appertaining to their needs and talents.

(6) The question of wants—or how we can keep society from becoming a mere producer-consumer equation, in which wants not wholly material are forgotten. *Brave New World* will suggest the question; and that world is very nearly here.

(7) The question of order—or how we are to attain just and far-seeing leadership in the mass society upon which we have entered; and how we are to govern in honor.

(8) The question of power—or how we are to deal with the menace of enervating centralization and consolidation of authority, reducing Americans to perpetual childhood. (Such a study must entail consideration of the power of economic groups and non-political organizations, as well as of the political structure. And it must be concerned with the survival of territorial democracy and of true representative government on a national scale—which last difficulty is taken up intelligently by Dr. Alfred de Grazia in his recent book *Republic in Crisis*.)

(9) The question of loyalty—or how we are to teach men that higher love of country which helps to save them from ideological fanaticism, selfish interest, or sentimental utopianism.

(10) The question of tradition—or how we are to maintain the social and cultural continuity which joins the dead, the living, and those yet unborn, so that men are something better than, in Burke's phrase, "the flies of a summer." More than ever before in history, perhaps, man today is obsessed by the present and by private desires.

In listing such large subjects as these, I do not mean to overlook such immediately pressing matters as interesting the vast democratic public in the formulation of wise foreign policy; or as finding means to exercise those voluntary restraints which might prevent further inflation of the currency. But here I am endeavoring merely to suggest that we must turn afresh to the first principles of political and social reason. The founders of our republic are among those dead who give us life, and their wisdom is not extinguished; yet if independence and the reign of law are to endure, we must confront boldly—as did our forefathers—the realities underlying the demands of the hour. Intelligent action is possible only after some candid reflection.

I am saying that these exists real danger of our drifting mindlessly into the mass-age, unaware that order and justice and freedom are fragile; and that today, as much as in 1776 or 1787, we need to discuss questions concerning the vitality of the good civil social order.

Ever since the Civil War, political thought has languished in the United States. For important political theory almost always is developed out of a time of troubles, when thinking men, forced to examine their first principles, seek means to avert the imminent collapse of order, or to restore some measure of justice and security to a wounded society. The political writings of Plato and Aristotle came out of such an age. So did Cicero's works, and Dante's, and Hobbes's, and Machiavelli's, and Hooker's, and Locke's, and Burke's, and Marx's. The nature of the confusion which provokes the exposition of political theory may be the inadequacy of an old order, morally and administratively, as it was in the society of Calvin and of Rousseau; or the confusion may be the product of a new order's search for sanction, as it was in the society of Bodin or of Bentham. Doubt and violence are the parents of social speculation. Prescription, legal precedent, and muddling-through suffice for ages or nations that experience no serious threat to things established.

Thus the political ideas of Adams, Hamilton, Madison, and Jefferson, though rooted in English and colonial experience and mightily influenced by the legacy of English political philosophy, took form as prudent endeavors to restore order and justice to a society distressed by revolution. Thus the ideas of John Randolph and Calhoun were expressed as a defense of established institutions in the Old South. Once the triumph of the Union, however, had put an end to the debate between North and South, and once the swelling prosperity of the United States after the Civil War combined with the nation's comparative isolation to make any foreign menace trifling, American political speculation sank to a level much lower. No political philosopher of any great stature appeared during the last third of the nineteenth century, and the bulk of what passed for political thought in this country was simply the reflection of various English and German liberal ideas, adapted to the American climate of opinion.

There seemed to be no need for reference to first principles; Things were in the saddle, and most men seemed to be content to let Things ride mankind. Warning voices like those of Henry and Brooks Adams were rather despairing protests than expressions of political philosophy. As the First World War approached, and as the economic and moral problems of the postwar era became pressing, ideas were granted some small hearing, it is true, so that Irving Babbitt and Paul Elmer More and George Santayana asked the greater questions. Yet Things galloped on; the New Deal, fortunately perhaps, was the expression of vague humanitarian aspirations and positive grievances, not of any coherent "liberal" or "radical" system of thought. Nor was America's part in the Second World War governed by any body of general ideas: caused by the combination of moral indignation with fear of Germany and Japan, American intervention stood bewildered for want of first principle when the problems of the peace had to be confronted.

The genius of American politics, as Dr. Daniel Boorstin suggests, consists in an innocence of abstract doctrine and theoretic dogma; and this is quite as true of the genius of English politics. Yet possibly the immunity of these nations from the curse of ideology has resulted not so much from a deliberate contempt for theory, as from two peculiar advantages that today are much diminished: first, a comparative physical isolation from other powers that made possible the postponement of grave decisions; second, an underlying set of moral and political assumptions, common to nearly everyone in these societies, which were the products of a venerable historic experience, and which served the purpose that political belief serves in nations less governed by general prejudice and prescription. (Among these assumptions and habits are the Christian ethical system, the common law, the general concurrence in representative government, prescriptive private rights, and respect for personality.) It was to this body of custom and belief that Burke appealed against the Jacobin ideology; and to established ways of life and political institutions, rather than to abstract notions of social perfection, Adams and Jefferson both adhered in America.

Yet there may come a time in the history of nations when the previous security against foreign intervention is destroyed, and when tradition and established usage are so weakened that they cannot stand unbuttressed against the assaults of ideology. Such an era seems to be America's in these 'Sixties. The dissolution of America's old political and military isolation requires no comment; we survived by a single generation the end of Britain's isolation. The breaking of the cake of custom is the subject of many books, though all its intricacies have not yet been explored. It must suffice to say here that with the triumph of modern technology, the ascendancy of general literacy and secularized schooling, the extreme mobility and fluidity of twentieth-century American society, the disappearance of many elements of authority and class, and the diffusion of positivistic ideas, tradition and custom in the United States—though by no means eradicated—have lost much of their old power. We live, then, in an insecure society, doubtful of its future, an island of comparative but perilous sanctuary in a sea of revolution; and neither the old isolation nor the old received opinions of the mass of men seem likely to hold out unassisted against the physical force of revolutionary powers and the moral innovations of modern ideologies. This is just such a time as has required and produced, repeatedly in the course of history, a re-examination of first principles and a considered political philosophy.

Three vaguely-delimited bodies of political opinion existed in the United States when, a few years ago, thinking men began to perceive the necessity here for some return to principle, as against mere muddling through: conservatism, liberalism, and radicalism. All three of these bodies of opinion were deficient in true political philosophy. American radicalism may be disposed of quite briefly. This had come to mean the Marxist ideology, to which real speculative philosophy is anathema; the other variants of American radicalism, except for decayed remnants, had withered away or had been merged with American liberalism. The dread Russian example of triumphant Marxism, and the national antagonism between the United States and Russia, have so put down this radicalism in America—at least for the present—that its claims to represent any substantial part of American opinion need not be considered seriously. We are left with conservatism and liberalism; and neither of these categories of political belief has admitted of any clear adherence to principles until quite recently. For that matter, the vast majority of American conservatives and liberals still remain ignorant of the history and the probable future of their own body of opinions.

Conservatism in the United States, by the end of the 1940's, almost had lost the power of language. Often, men of conservative prejudices expressed themselves apologetically in the phrases of nineteenth-century liberals; sometimes they even echoed the slogans of old-fangled anarchism. The body of American conservative interest was composed of various elements, some overlapping: natural conservatives, believing, with Falkland, "when it is not necessary to change, it is necessary not to change"; constitutional conservatives, attached to the prescriptive forms of American government; economic conservatives, intent upon preserving private property and a free economy; rural conservatives, vaguely opposed to the urbanization and confusion of modern life; "libertarian" conservatives, fearing for the survival of personal freedom. Most of these people expressed themselves badly, and few were able to describe any coherent moral or philosophical basis for their beliefs. Though frequently their impulses and prejudices were genuinely conservative in the historic sense of that abused term, nevertheless they would endeavor to defend themselves by the arguments of their old adversaries—Bentham, for instance, and John Stuart Mill, and Herbert Spencer.

American liberalism failed to crush this confused conservative rear-guard simply because, as a body of belief, it was in no more coherent state. Originally dedicated to emancipation of the individual from all sorts of traditional restraints and obligations, by the forties American liberalism had come to mean, for the most part, an amorphous feeling that society ought to be improved through the agency of centralized government. The liberty which it now sought was "freedom from the consequences of freedom," and, in George Santayana's phrase, the New Liberal desire to relax no bonds except the marriage tie. This liberalism had become an ideology; from the beginning, indeed, strong ideological tendencies had lurked in its Benthamite foundations—swearing by the god-terms Progress and Equality. It was heavily influenced by the negation of philosophy, pragmatism, and sought futilely to identify itself with the Popular Will. Its sources of support were even more disparate than those of American conservatism—ranging from doctrinaire zealots for emancipation upon the model of Lamartine, to doctrinaire Marxists who hesitated, for all that, to subscribe to Stalinism. When the truth about Communist Russia and other collectivistic dominations became undeniable, the liberal camp tended to break up into factions, some moving in a conservative direction, some expressing contrition for their past errors but altering little their practical politics, and some simply repeating, as a ritual, their old slogans, as if by dint of recitation they could give them fresh life. Many spoke incoherently of effecting some compromise between capitalism and socialism, or of reconciling Christianity and pragmatism. It was discouragingly clear that they possessed even less understanding of principle than did the conservatives.

Yet this ignorance of philosophy, this disregard of first principles among both conservatives and liberals, the forces of permanence and of change, now seems to me to be diminishing. There are some signs that, without embracing the fanatic dogmas of ideology, the conservative and the liberal bodies of opinion in America are commencing to think things through. I do not mean that they are about to coalesce. Any healthy society requires an enduring contest between its permanence and its progression. We cannot live without continuity, and we cannot live without prudent change. But a conservatism of reflection and a liberalism of reflection, each aware of its own first principles, may serve separately to arrest the decay of our civilization and to make common cause against Giant Ideology, which now threatens to put an end to true philosophy and just politics throughout the world. It seems to me that the better minds of both bodies of opinion, here in America, are restoring to our consciousness the real meaning of both conservatism and liberalism. And I think that some practical consequences may be felt, before many years are out.

This return to principle, as yet, may be discerned only dimly among men of partisan politics: the day of the philosopher statesman has passed, though it may return. The signs of a resurgence of principle are to be found, instead, in the work of certain scholars. And their ideas already are making their influence felt upon the universities, governmental administrators, the serious journals, and even the popular press. Rather than run through a catalog of names, I have chosen to analyze this conservatism of reflection and this liberalism of reflection through the work of two writers, much as J. S. Mill describes the currents of thought in his century through the writings of Coleridge and Bentham. These scholars are Dr. Eric Voegelin and Dr. David Riesman. Neither of them is a "political scientist" in the narrower, or cant, meaning of that phrase; but both of them are political thinkers in the old and honorable meaning of the word "politics."

"The true dividing line in the contemporary crisis," Voegelin wrote once (in *The Review of Politics*, January, 1953) "does not run between liberals and totalitarians, but between the religious and philosophical transcendentalists on the one side, and the liberal and totalitarian immanentist sectarians on the other." This theme runs through his influential little book *The New Science of Politics*, and through his massive work *Order and History* (of which one or two volumes are yet to be published). The delusion that human reason can convert the world into a terrestrial paradise is, in Voegelin's view, the principal cause of our modern political catastrophes. For politics, like science, like art, comes out of belief in a transcendent religion; and when that belief decays, politics degenerates, and the fancied terrestrial paradise becomes a real terrestrial hell.

Professor Voegelin, born in Europe, is steeped in classical and Christian learning, and is thoroughly familiar with English and American political philosophy. One of the few benefits conferred by the Second World War was the bringing to the United States of European scholars whose work is elevating the character of our education; and among these, Eric Voegelin is one of the more eminent.

Describing himself as a "pre-Reformation Christian," he is closely associated with Lutheran theologians. The fact of his European origin is related to his influence upon American conservative thought. (Though, incidentally, Voegelin would no more identify himself as a conservative than he would call himself a Catholic or a Protestant: such terms wake passions, when dispassionate discourse is required.) For he sees in the United States and Britain the two nations least seriously infected by ideology and Gnosticism, and in them a hope for the regeneration of our civilization. And America, as the chief bulwark of the rule of law among nations, now requires such an understanding of principle as Voegelin is developing in his books.

Gnosticism, the heresy which substitutes a dream of a perfect mundane society for the City of God, lies at the root of the clamorous ideologies which compete for the support of the modern crowd. Ideology, as Mr. Voegelin correctly defines it, is a set of rigid convictions, fanatically held, which endeavors to reduce to a few simple formulas the complexity of human affairs. To ideology (which claims ability to cure all the ills to which flesh is heir) Voegelin opposes science, or understanding of man and society founded upon observation throughout history. In disavowing ideology, Mr. Voegelin espouses political philosophy, which is quite a different thing: like Burke, he establishes a distinction between "abstraction" (an *a priori* assumption unsupported by history or logic or what we call revelation) and ("principle", or a justified deduction from what we have learned, over the ages, about man and society. With Burke (being influenced, as was Burke, by Richard Hooker), he makes the virtue of prudence the means of political wisdom:

"In classic and Christian ethics the first of the moral virtues is *sophia* or *prudentia*, because without adequate understanding of the structure of reality, including the *conditio humana*, moral action with rational coordination of means and ends is hardly possible. In the Gnostic dream world, on the other hand, nonrecognition of reality is the first principle."

Here Voegelin invokes the conservative principles (though he does not call them conservative) by which Burke and Disraeli, Adams and Calhoun, were guided. Recognition of a transcendent order in the universe does not make a statesman into a dreamer, but into a realist. Knowing his theology and his history, he takes it for granted that man is not a perfect nor a perfectible being, and that the prudent politician will endeavor to make life in the civil social state tolerable, not perfect. It is utopianism, the Gnostic delusion, that leads (in Voegelin's words) "with increasing theoretical illiteracy" to "the form of various social idealism, such as the abolition of war, of unequal distribution of property, of fear and want. And, finally, immanentization may extend to the complete Christian symbol. The result will then be the active mysticism of a state of perfection, to be achieved through a revolutionary transfiguration of the nature of man, as, for instance, in Marxism."

By definition, human nature is unchangeable; knowing this, the conservative statesman is aware that human longing never will be satisfied upon this earth. For him, politics indeed is the art of the possible, and he remains content with patching and improving society here and there; he feels he has done well if he has preserved a tolerable measure of justice and order and freedom.

In modern political action, Gnosticism has two manifestations, its left wing and its right: communism and liberalism. "If liberalism is understood as the immanent salvation of man and society, communism certainly is its most radical expression; it is an evolution that was already anticipated by John Stuart Mill's faith in the ultimate advent of communism for mankind." In the year of the Communist Manifesto, Orestes Brownson declared that communism was a heresy from Christianity; and this view is Voegelin's, as it is Father Martin D'Arcy's and Arnold Toynbee's. But liberalism is only a more moderate form of the same heresy, the notion that Progress consists in material aggrandizement. A culture which abandons knowledge of God for creature-comforts already is far gone in decadence:

"A civilization can, indeed, advance and decline at the same time—but not forever. There is a limit toward which the ambiguous process moves; the limit is reached when an activist sect which represents the Gnostic truth organizes the civilization into an empire under its rule. Totalitarianism, defined as the existential rule of Gnostic activists, is the end form of progressive civilization."

Now this is repudiation of liberalism root and branch, whether old-style individualistic liberalism or new-style collectivistic liberalism. The premises upon which liberalism is founded, Voegelin declares, must lead, soon or late, to a total state; for the Gnostic passion to alter society and human nature endures no opposition, and when it can, it destroys all the traditional political and economic institutions which impede its consolidatory progress. If the only purpose of life is terrestrial and material success, why should reactionaries be permitted to delay the advent of utopia? Voegelin cites Harold Laski, in *Faith, Reason, and Civilization,* to illustrate his point; as Laski puts it, "It is, indeed, true in a sense to argue that the Russian principle cuts deeper than the Christian, since it seeks salvation for the masses by fulfillment in this life, and, thereby, orders anew the actual world we know."

Voegelin's is not the conservatism of complacency, nor yet the conservatism of mere compromise. This body of opinion does not look upon our present muddled society as the best of all possible worlds, nor does it use the word "conservative as a mere term of relation, a kind of stumbling and timid liberalism. The conservatism is bent upon reform of society because, as Voegelin writes, the hour is very late, our society is terribly corrupt, and it will require all our efforts to kindle this glimmer into a flame by repressing Gnostic corruption and restoring the forces of civilization. At present the fate is in the balance."

But this conservatism does not entertain the notion that any ideology, or even any set of reasoned doctrines, will make society perfect. This conservatism begins with the premise that we must be obedient to a transcendent order, which has given a law to man.

The nature of man being complex, no simple set of rules or positive laws, universally applied, will suffice to make man happy or good. And the nature of man being flawed, the evil part of his nature, lusting after power and aggrandizement, envious and violent, must be restrained by custom, authority, and balanced government, which checks power with power.

This conservatism holds that man finds his happiness in fulfillment of his duties, in purposeful work, and in existing as part of a true community and a high continuity, rather than in the gratification of every fleshly desire. This conservatism thinks that the good society is not one in which the abstractions of Liberty and Equality and Fraternity are enforced by positive law, but rather one in which the higher natures among men are free to develop in accordance with the laws of their being, so long as they do not tyrannize over the mass of men—who desire chiefly to be left in peace and pursue their accustomed routine. We were not born yesterday; and the bank and capital of the ages is the source from which flows our knowledge of our own nature. This is a conservatism of reform; but it is pure conservatism, aware of its ancient inspiration, and not merely the disputed middle.

In Voegelin's terms, Dr. David Riesman is a Gnostic of the extreme right wing—that is, usually a moderate and amiable liberal, disavowing ideology nearly as strongly as does Voegelin himself. Although Riesman's historical perspective never goes back beyond the middle of the nineteenth century—and rarely so far—he is (in his *Faces in the Crowd*) no doctrinaire apostle of progress:

"My own view, which smiles on compromise, also has nineteenth-century roots, especially in the English tradition of Burke, Morley, Bagehot, Acton. But in a way, one has to have lived through the mid-twentieth century properly to appreciate the virtues of the bourgeois age and class, and to regard the terms 'bourgeois' or 'middle class' as ones of amiable praise rather than Sorelian or Marxist epithets."

In a time when even the more enthusiastic liberals confess that the intellectual initiative is passing to the conservatives—a time when the remaining unreconstructed liberals of yesteryear, like Mr. Henry Steele Commager and Mr. Archibald MacLeish, sound curiously archaic—the most influential liberal thinker in this country is Mr. Riesman; and he is influential precisely because he is not a ritualistic or doctrinaire liberal. There is reform in the liberal camp nowadays, as well as in the conservative camp.

An eminent European economist, indeed, once asked me whether Mr. Riesman ought to be classified as a "New Conservative." I replied that he ought not; but there are some conservative elements in Riesman's thought, at least if one employs "conservative" as a term of relation. He observes that "the rich are in a minority and have their rights, too"; he implies that much "social legislation" and the enthusiasm it inspires are quite out of date, since the nineteenth-century conundrum of urban want is being solved by modern productivity, rather than by egalitarian laws; he is concerned for individuality; he shies away from cant and slogan; he pokes fun at many stereotypes that obsess "intellectuals and academic people." Yet his premises are thoroughly liberal; they are almost identical with those of John Stuart Mill, whom he takes for his model in much. It is not the fact that he has effected a synthesis of conservatism and liberalism which makes him one of our important modern social critics; he has done nothing of that sort. His accomplishment is to restore to American liberalism, long sunk into the condition of an ideology, a measure of candor, moderation, and perceptivity.

I do not mean that Riesman himself is wholly contemptuous of every King Charles' head of ritualistic liberalism: whenever he turns to the "emancipation of woman," for instance, he is back in Harriet Taylor's parlor with John Stuart Mill; he regrets that recently women have been turning back to their old duties and status, and implies that they really ought to be emancipated, "deprivatized", and taught sexual freedom, whether they relish it or not. (Here, by the way, is an instance of what Voegelin describes as the obsession of the liberals with altering a human nature that necessarily is constant.) Yet, by and large, Riesman stands for reformed liberalism. Perhaps his ideas may best be compared with Voegelin's by a summary of Riesman's notion of utopia.

"I suggest that the utopian tradition has gone sour," Riesman writes in *Individualism Reconsidered,* "because of collectivist, especially Communist, abuse, and gone stale (especially in America) because so many of our earlier hopes for equality and abundance have been attained—leaving us either to try to put meaning back into outdated struggles or to find a political agenda not in planning for a better future, but in postponing a worse one."

The old Fabian and social-democratic slogans have worn thin, he continues; and the utopianism of American business enterprise, the promise of a chicken in every pot and a car in every garage, also has lost its meaning: "First, given our resources, it is not difficult to fulfill them; they are, in fact, just around the corner. Second, attainment of these goals would not make the great mass of well-fed Americans noticeably happier." Populism and the New Deal merely aped the spurious utopia of business enterprise, without having any concept of a fundamental change in the quality of America life; the New Dealers, indeed, were glad to escape into the war and so avoid any re-examination of their own assumptions.

What we require, then, Riesman says, is not an ideological enthusiasm for some vague scheme of economic abundance or "fair share for all", but a utopia founded upon new concepts of community and individuality. He is forever recurring to Bellamy's *Looking Backward,* and he commends the Goodmans' *Communitas: Means of Livelihood and Ways of Life.* But the ends and means of his own utopia remain obscure. He mentions "more spontaneous pleasures and more democratic cooperation"; he takes up town planning; he has various suggestions for "autonomous play." Still, when all this is said, Reisman leaves us groping for purpose in this utopia—supposing it really is something quite different from the social-democratic or business-enterprise pseudo-utopias.

It seems to me that Riesman's ambiguity is produced by his pragmatism. If he were asked, "What is the end of man?" he might have difficulty in replying; one gathers from his books that he might be compelled to say, "Diversion." Man is not made for work, in Riesman's eyes, or for duty, or for high loyalties; grand hopes and ideologies are disastrous; therefore all man can hope for is a round of small pleasures; he may experiment in consumption and sex and urban living. Teleology, the foundation of Voegelin's politics, simply does not exist for Riesman. Although tolerant toward religious belief, he remains condescendingly incredulous. All theological concepts and nearly the whole body of inherited belief are repugnant to him: "A concept of original sin is typical of a view of life which makes the past an authority over the present, in which the individual is mortgaged to society, and both the individual and society are mortgaged to the preceding generations." This debt to the past and obligation to the future, which Burke called "the contract of eternal society," has been the cement of classical and Christian social order; yet Riesman heartily dislikes it. It is not easy to construct a utopia which denies the legacy of dead generation and the rights of those yet unborn; but Riesman is logical in casting off natural rights and inherent obligation when he rejects the religious understanding.

One principle does seem to govern the Riesman utopia: the motto of the Abbey of Thélème, "Do as you will." Since the frowning collectivism of the modern age menances this principle, Riesman desires to check somehow the growth of centralized political authority and—more particularly—the sheep-conformity of the modern crowd, the "other-directed" men. In the final paragraph of *The Lonely Crowd,* he writes, "The idea that men are created free and equal is both true and misleading: men are created different; they lose their social freedom and their individual autonomy in seeking to become like each other." The silent and impalpable democratic despotism over opinion and conduct which Tocqueville foresaw often is in the forefront of Riesman's mind; yet when he approaches the difficulty, he leaves out of consideration Tocqueville's transcendent view, which was founded upon the Christian idea of personality and the Christian doctrines of morality. It is John Stuart Mill to whom Riesman turns, rather; and Mill's idea of individuality, as expressed in his *Liberty,* had no sanction but difference for the sake of differing—a substitution, in

R. P. Anschutz's phrase, of "Bohemian nonsense for bourgeois nonsense." That man has an end which is more than imminent; that man finds his happiness through the performance of duties, and his freedom through the acquirement of moral character—these concepts are wanting altogether in Riesman's thought.

Thus we are brought back, after all, to a Gnostic concept of man, a being who finds his whole duty in the triumph of self in this world, and whose highest hope is to be "autonomous"—somehow different from dull conformists, though severed from tradition, from duty, from hope of much attainment in this world, and from expectation of reward in another realm than this. How satisfying such autonomy would be, if practicable at all; how long such a utopia would gratify the longings of men and keep them from ideology and violence; whether, indeed, even the utopia-life of small experimental pleasures and improved cities and abundant leisure and innumerable creature-comforts might endure in America for any length of time, what with the present rate of destruction of moral capital—all these questions Riesman does not take into account. Along with ideology, he has discarded theory; and he implies that human nature is simply what the drift of society makes it, and therefore requires no further attention.

Yet, this said, Riesman's writings represent a reformed and chastened liberalism. Prudence, at least in its lower aspect, governs this liberalism—not ideology. There is no intention of creating a classless society, or a universal state, or an egalitarian monotony. If there is no appreciation of human dignity, still there is understanding of the importance of individuality. Just this humdrum and compromising liberalism, I am inclined to think, will become the common pattern of American "progressive" and secularistic thought, now that American liberals have recoiled from collectivistic ideology. There is no crusading spirit in it: the modern age has experienced enough secular crusades. And what is called the "New Left" already is doomed to dissolution, for lack of principles of coherence, let alone a platform: its zealots will fall back into the ranks of liberalism, or will be used and absorbed by the Communists or other ideologues.

The lofty and austere "new science of politics", the conservatism for which Voegelin speaks, will contend in America and in much of the rest of the world against this Bellamy-like liberalism. Some things this conservatism and this liberalism have in common: a detestation of ideology, a respect for prudence, and a recognition that modern society, with its tendency toward a deadening conformity and its "devil's sabbath of whirling machinery" either must be humanized, or must perish. These common understandings, and certain common practical interests in opposition to the grim ideological collectivism of the totalist state, are likely to keep the debate between American conservatism and liberalism, for the rest of this century, reasonably civil. Both conservatism and liberalism are experimental and explanatory now, groping for a realization of community that is not collectivism, and for a purpose in work and leisure that is not mere heaping-up of industrial products.

By my preceding observations, I have solved nothing, I know; I have but put the questions, and suggested the approaches which are being made by some men of intellectual power. Only if a number of Americans are willing to entertain such large views, nevertheless, will the documents that symbolize our civil social order survive as something better than historical curiosities. The actual constitution of the Republic will be found in the beliefs and actions of its leading citizens, and not under glass in a museum.

RUSSELL KIRK.

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK,
New York, N.Y.

HON. CHARLES LONGSTREET WELTNER,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WELTNER: Thank you for your letter of August 25. I am glad to know that you and your colleagues are interested in exploring the continuing meaning of the Declaration of Independence.

Jefferson originally enunciated the ideals of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness for a small band of fellow colonists in their revolt against imperial rule. But in the nearly two centuries since 1776 these ideals have become controlling motives for all mankind. If the history of the American republic has been the struggle of our own citizens to fulfill these goals, it may well be that the history of the 20th century will be the struggle of people everywhere—for most of whom life has always been brief, liberty fragile and happiness beyond pursuit—to assert these unalienable rights for themselves and their children.

It is chastening to recall that the Declaration of Independence was written for a small rural society, scattered along the eastern seaboard of North America—before the tremendous modern revolution in transport, communications and technology had changed the face of the world. And it is, of course, striking evidence of the vitality of the ideals then set forth that they nevertheless sum up the aspirations of mankind more urgently in 1966 than in 1776. I have been struck by the way new nations overthrowing colonial rule have so often, in good faith or in bad, invoked the American Declaration of Independence. It should not be forgotten that even Ho Chi Minh, when he proclaimed the Democratic Republic of Vietnam on September 2, 1945, began his own Declaration of Independence with a quotation from the Declaration of 1776.

The problem now is how two centuries later, in a world which has gone through such unimaginable changes, our nation and government can best continue to discharge the commitments made by our Founding Fathers. Two steps seem to me essential: first, the identification of the obstacles to the attainment of these great ideals; and, second, the mobilization of the means necessary to overcome these obstacles. It was this brilliant combination of intellectual clarity and social invention which expressed the genius of the Founding Fathers. A much more compact and tense world, shuddering under the threat of nuclear destruction, demands such qualities more than ever.

We have made progress in our own land in the identification of obstacles. We have begun all too belatedly to understand that what Croly called "the promise of American life" can not be redeemed so long as multitudes of our fellow citizens suffer exclusion and discrimination, or stagnate in poverty, or lack a job or the decencies of education and housing. We have come to recognize the need for the assurance of equal rights to all our citizens, for the modernization of our urban and rural life and for the expansion of our national resources and our public facilities to keep abreast of our population growth. We have come also to understand that the complex problems of the modern world require cool, thoughtful, technical analysis, unimpeded by extinct cliches and obsolete slogans.

We still have far to go, though, in devising and mobilizing the means necessary to overcome these obstacles. The Founding Fathers believed in experiment; Washington, indeed, described "the destiny of the republican model of government" as *"deeply, as finally* staked on the experiment intrusted to the hands of the American people." When the system of government set up under the Articles of Confederation turned out to give too much power to the individual states, the Founding Fathers did not hesitate to supersede it by a new Constitution establishing a central government strong enough to discharge national tasks and meet national needs. We need a similar readiness to experiment today—and we must never forget the great insight that underlay our Constitution: that the national government is one of the most effective means by which a free people can pursue its objectives. Those today who try to incite mistrust of the national government ignore the philosophy of Washington, Adams and Hamilton as well as the practice of Jefferson and Jackson. At the same time, as the Founding Fathers well understood, a strong government can serve the purposes of liberty only as it remains the instrument of a confident and self-reliant people and the beneficiary of their talent and ingenuity. Nor can we ever afford to forget that the Founding Fathers constituted a rare breed of politician-intellectuals, and that we need today the same partnership between the world of ideas and the world of power if we are to have any chance of understanding and mastering the hard challenges ahead.

Intellectual clarity, a purposeful national government, a robust private society, an alliance between power and ideas, a faith in the popular judgment and an inextinguishable zest for innovation and experiment: these qualities, it would seem to me, marked the remarkable generation which founded the American republic. And they are the qualities most needed today if we mean to honor the spirit of the Declaration of Independence in the only way which they would care about—not by the complacent and self-serving "patriotism" of the Fourth of July oration but by the true patriotism of determining to do everything we can to enlarge life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness on this tumultuous and tragic planet.

Sincerely yours,
ARTHUR SCHLESINGER, Jr.,
Regents Professor of the Humanities.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

HON. CHARLES LONGSTREET WELTNER,
Representative in Congress,
Longworth Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WELTNER: As we approach the 200th anniversary of our Nation's Independence, I commend your project to revive the original Committees of Correspondence, and I hope that they will achieve, as the old ones did, an interplay of thought, a cohesiveness of purpose, and a spirit of mutual understanding and respect between the people and their legislative representatives.

You have enumerated some of our overriding problems. We do face labor disputes, slums, water pollution, poverty, overtaxed transportation, medical care for the aged and the debasement of human freedom in so many parts of the world.

More than that, millions yet unborn must be fed. New fertilizers and pesticides must be developed. Food and water must be drawn from the seas. Revolutionary methods must be found to cleanse the air. New forms of energy must be drawn from the earth as our commonplace fuels grow scarce.

To accomplish these things we must develop a degree of cooperation among government, business and labor which even Samuel Adams, Patrick Henry, Thomas Jefferson and James Otis of the original Committees of Correspondence failed to achieve.

In the crucible of competition, government and capitalism are yielding to new forces. No longer does the future of capitalism rest purely on technological advance, increased efficiency, exhaustive research and an effort to build an even stronger competitive position.

The prosperity of the whole, and of all parts of the whole, depends on the ability of government to remain competitive in its tax rates, depreciation laws, trade balances, monetary regulations, buying practices, debt burdens, and the integrity of its currencies.

Here, then, is a two-way reaction. For, as government and business team to solve the problems of the next ten years, as business feels more and more the influence of government, so, too, must government prepare to consider the course of economic prudence. For the future of both turns upon the extent to which men of government understand the free workings of the market system and base their decisions upon the natural economic laws which must be obeyed.

It must never be forgotten that Samuel Adams formed the first Committee of Correspondence in Fanueil Hall because the British Parliament was no longer in tune with the businessmen of Boston. Similarly, when Patrick Henry and Thomas Jefferson proposed a Committee of Correspondence in Virginia, they found a ready ally in the House of Burgesses of that colony, which actually named the committee members.

To produce this happy wedlock of government and business is not as impossible as it once seemed. Both capitalism and American government are blessed with adaptable dispositions. Perhaps neither Adam Smith nor Thomas Jefferson could look forward and foresee the problems that beset us. But the laws of capitalism are natural laws because they are the rules of life itself, which adapt themselves to their surroundings. So, too, while our Founding Fathers may not have seen the specific problems which we face today, in the Constitution they gave us an instrument which can change with change and grow with growth.

Hand in hand, government and business can go forward together in the next decade, as long as they provide a society beneficial to all people and respect the economic laws which lead to adverse circumstances, if flouted.

So wed, they may take us in peace and prosperity to the observance of the 200th Anniversary of our Nation's Independence in 1976.

While I foresee no diminution of the efforts by government to shape a society that officials consider useful and equitable to all, I do believe there will be a growing recognition by the people and their representatives in government that the free market economy is the bastion of our material strength and personal freedom.

If this recognition does grow, then I think there is little question that the next ten years will see more people than ever before in the nation's history able to do more and more for themselves in every area of life as a result of their own productive efforts.

Thanking you for this opportunity to express my views, I am

Sincerely,

ROGER M. BLOUGH.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to commend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER] for the imagination, initiative, and energy he has invested in developing these Committees of Correspondence. The letters he has shared with us today, together with those released earlier this fall, are significant contributions to American thought and eloquent statements of American principles and ideals.

As we approach the bicentennial of the American Revolution, it is important for us to reflect upon the foundations of our Nation and the concepts which it was shaped to advance. Our celebration of the bicentennial should be not simply a reenactment of historical events, not simply a rereading of classic documents, but rather a renewal and contemporary restatement of our national ideals. The thoughts and writings of our most eminent and most perceptive citizens can play as large and important a role in the bicentennial as the work of the original Committees of Correspondence played in the Revolution itself. Accordingly, I am very glad that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER] has exercised the inspired leadership to begin this project now.

It should and, I hope, will be continued, for it has the potential to produce one of the most important intellectual contributions to the bicentennial and to coming generations.

HON. PAUL J. KREBS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PATTEN] for 15 minutes.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker I ask for this special order today so that those of us who have worked with our colleague PAUL KREBS from New Jersey, can pay tribute to him.

The other Members have covered his background and have told of his cooperation here in the House. I join with my colleagues in stating that PAUL KREBS has spent more time on the floor of the House while Congress was in session than any other person I have known or observed in the Congress. I believe he has had the honor of acting as Speaker and also as leader a record number of times for a freshman. The reason Paul would stay on the floor is because he had advocated all his life—so much of the legislation that passed in this 89th Congress.

As leader of the UAW and as past president of the CIO Council in New Jersey he had the honor of actually talking and working and voting for the people—the legislation he had advocated on a thousand rostrums throughout our State over many years. I want to call particular attention to the fact that I was secretary of state for 8 years with Gov. Robert B. Meyner, and in this capacity I spent many hours with PAUL KREBS concerning pending legislation. We sought his advice about personnel problems of the 25,000 State employees. He was always available, knowledgeable and persistent. He is tireless when he advocates a cause.

I am sorry he is not coming back to the 90th Congress. His years of service and experience will be hard to replace. I want my colleagues to know that in all the years that PAUL KREBS was a leader of labor, I never heard one derogatory word, but one thing was clearly established—and management knew—that from the State of New Jersey PAUL KREBS had integrity to a fault.

I wish PAUL KREBS and his wife the best of everything in the future.

CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS ANNOUNCES RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE IN THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF INDIANA

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the tabulated results of a questionnaire which I sent to postal patrons in the following Indiana counties: Elkhart, La Porte, Marshall, St. Joseph and Starke. From approximately 15,400 returned questionnaires the following results were recorded:

1. Do you favor legislation requiring automobile manufacturers to meet minimum safety standards? Yes 81.8 percent No 16.3 percent No opinion 1.9 percent.

2. Do you favor lengthening the term of Congressmen from two to four years? Yes 53.0 percent No 43.4 percent No opinion 3.6 percent.

3. Do you favor legislation to establish both a deep water port and a National Dunes Park on Lake Michigan? Yes 73.9 percent No 18.9 percent No opinion 7.2 precent.

4. Do you favor legislation making it a Federal offense to murder, attack, or coerce civil rights workers? Yes 44.4 percent No 48.8 percent No opinion 6.8 percent.

5. Do you favor legislation setting standards for labeling and packaging consumer goods? Yes 84.9 percent No 11.8 percent No opinion 3.3 percent.

6. Do you favor a new Department of Transportation to bring under one department the transportation activities now conducted by eight different Federal agencies? Yes 71.5 percent No 17.2 percent No opinion 11.3 percent.

7. I would like to have your opinion on U.S. policy in Vietnam. Should we:

a. Withdraw even if doing so would result in a takeover of South Vietnam by the Communists? (14.6 percent)

b. Limit our involvement to the steps necessary to prevent a Communist takeover in South Vietnam, even though this course may require our continued presence for some time? (31.6 percent)

c. Step up our military commitment to seek a decisive victory, even though this course could lead to war with Communist China and Russia? (43.5 percent)

8. Do you favor legislation strengthening existing programs to combat air and water pollution? Yes 90.3 percent No 4.3 percent No opinion 5.4 percent.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my custom to send such questionnaires in past Congresses, and I am grateful for the response to this one.

A CASE AGAINST FEDERAL LAW TO DEAL WITH ANTI-WAR DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. WALDIE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter which I have received from the commander of the U.S. Naval Weapons Station in my District in Concord, Calif., under date of October 18, 1966. Captain Eddy makes reference to the continuing demonstrations against the transport of napalm and weaponry to Vietnam which have been in progress for several months. It is of interest to note that this naval officer, who is in a sensitive position to understand the difficulty presented by these demonstrations, is not in favor of Federal intervention beyond the existing laws that are available. The letter follows:

U.S. NAVAL WEAPONS STATION,
Concord, Calif., October 18, 1966.

Hon. JEROME R. WALDIE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WALDIE: Last night I read in the Transcript of your stand on the pacifist legislation. Despite my irritation about the ability of the State and County to move in a more positive position against the demonstrators, I want you to know that I agree with your stand. The recent county ordinance against sleeping on the highway has been a great help, and the situation is now contained. I certainly did not lack in cooperation and support from the local law enforcement agencies.

There are sufficient federal statutes now on the books to assist me if the Federal Government has to step in. To date, this has not been necessary, and I agree with Mr. Poole that these people should not be afforded this kind of publicity.

Again, it is encouraging to me to know that you are so personally cognizant of the local situation.

Sincerely,

T. R. EDDY,
Captain, U.S. Navy, Commanding.

THE THING ABOUT YAWS

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HELSTOSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, several days ago a most provocative editorial came to my attention, which was printed in the Harvard Medical Alumni Bulletin in its spring 1966 edition.

I believe that it contains some valuable informative material and it should be given wider recognition through the means of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I also commend its contents to my colleagues and I request permission that it be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of my remarks.

The editorial follows:

THE THING ABOUT YAWS

(By Robert M. Goldwyn, M.D.)

Today many of us are concerned about man and his dilemma. This century has witnessed a singular display of technical finesse and social awkwardness. We have succeeded in making contact with the moon 240,000 miles away yet we seem unable to communicate with one-quarter of the World population 10,000 miles away. The years of elaborate wars have unfortunately far exceeded the brief periods of peace.

Against this background of what sociologists have euphemistically called "the cultural lag," the physician does his work. Traditionally and ideally we in the medical and paramedical fields seek the prevention and elimination of disease and the prolongation and betterment of life. It was Ernest Hemingway who said, "The thing about yaws is to cure them." So also for us physicians, the thing about pain and pestilence is to do away with them.

In its broadest fulfillment, our role is a dual one: As scientists, we gather data and subsequently share this knowledge with both the medical and non-medical community in order to promote rational discussion and proper decisions. As clinicians, we treat individual patients at home and in the hospital. These are surroundings familiar to us and here society sanctions and urges our presence. But the significance of our efforts at the patient's bedside dwindles with the realization that a thermonuclear war would create more morbidity and mortality in minutes than physicians have overcome through centuries of doctor-patient relationships.

Unfortunately, we are often myopic when major non-medical problems confront the world. It is difficult for us to wrench ourselves free of the soporific security that comes with the routine of the laboratory, the office, or the wards. As scientists and clinicians, we have dunned the public with facts and warnings about the consequences of such things as high cholesterol diet, lack of exercise, and cigarette smoking.

But a war *is* being waged and we are threatened by an even larger conflict or at least a longer war. In war, the traditional role of the physician has been to patch up the wounded so that they may enter the fray once again. We have been dutiful *fonctionnaires*—and what we have done, has been done well as the record of war time medical service can tell.

As any war progresses, the physician is soon drawn into certain activities that require him to think not only medically, but also nationally. His medical role may soon become subordinate to his country's political purposes. Unfortunately, this situation is not a novel one; it happened we know 30 years ago. Commenting upon the Nazi medical experience, an editorial in the *Journal of the American Medical Association* stated, "Perhaps most serious of all was the failure of German medical organizations and societies to express in any manner their disapproval of widely known experiments. Physicians have a right to expect that men trained in the traditions of medicine would refuse to participate in any way in such acts of inhumanity. That these experiments were conducted under the highest authority of the German State cannot possibly be considered in the slightest an extenuation of the failure of these physicians to act in accordance with the principles and traditions of their profession."

From the Nuremberg Proceedings came a code of principles adopted by the World Medical Association in 1948. Two of the provisions were as follows: "I will not permit considerations of religion, nationality, race, party politics or social standing to intervene between my duty and my patient."

"I will maintain the utmost respect for human life, from the time of conception; even under threat, I will not use my medical knowledge contrary to the laws of humanity."

For the physician in 1966 the problems created by war have a new dimension. With chemical and biological weaponry and the sadistic refinements of psychological warfare, the doctor is no longer, even initially, on the sidelines. Whether in the field or in his laboratory, he is a combatant. Without the help and consent of the medical community, a country would have great difficulty in developing capabilities in these areas. Despite the engagement of our nation in the use of gas, herbicides, and, as recently reported, torture, the medical profession has shown remarkably little concern—a disappointing contrast to their noisy, enraged, and organized protest against another government activity—Medicare.

It is evident that medicine has advanced in an awesome fashion since its first stumblings. These gains have been won at too great a cost for us to end up as purveyors of pestilence and inflictors of pain. To prevent this from happening, each of us must extend his ethical commitment and be alert to the erosion of our values under the guise of expediency. To this task of enlarging our social responsibility, we bring certain advantages:

We possess important information.

We are generally respected by the community and if we present an opinion based on careful data, we will be listened to.

Because disease is universal, there exists a fellowship among physicians; we have the potential to cross frontiers, to communicate with colleagues in all countries including those which diplomats regard as inaccessible. We should be able to work with these doctors in persuading their governments to relinquish activities considered inhumane. Like all mortals, we must fight against our feelings of detachment and moral fatigue.

There is no alternative at this stage of evolution except to try. Only by trying can we hope to tease forth actions that will avoid our extinction—that will avoid undoing the accomplishments of thousands of years of civilization in a second of miscalculation. Like Sisyphus, the physician is used to toilsome tasks. Abraham Flexner, at the conclusion of his autobiography, recalled the bookplate that belonged to the historian Thomas Carlyle. It is as appropriate to our time as it was to his. The bookplate showed a lighted candle and beneath were the words, "I burn so that I may be of use."

ROBERT M. GOLDWYN '56.

U.S. DAY

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HELSTOSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, loyal Americans throughout this land of ours will celebrate and give full recognition to the United States on Sunday, October 23, which has been proclaimed in our cities and States as "U.S. Day".

On this day we should rededicate ourselves to the principles upon which our great Nation was born and we should renew our promise to strengthen it in these perilous times.

To be a citizen of a great Republic is a great privilege and a signal honor—yet some of the "superpatriots" take all means to degrade and tear down our system of government.

While we are primarily interested in the affairs of our own great Nation, it does not mean that we have lost interest in what is going on abroad. The Communist threat is still the overshadowing fact of international life, and we will know it.

In connection with our observance of U.S. Day, I would like to place into the RECORD a memorandum from the "U.S. Day" Committee of Bergen County with additional material on the aspect of this great day.

"U.S. DAY" COMMITTEE OF BERGEN COUNTY
October 7, 1966.

To our elected officials in the U.S. Congress, from New Jersey.

To our elected officials in the New Jersey Legislature.

October 23rd has been proclaimed United States Day by many Mayors and Governors throughout our land for the past 14 years. It is meant to embrace and foster all that has been good about our Country and what it has stood for through the years.

Today, as never before, we need the spirit portrayed by such a day to honor our own United States, whereby we place special emphasis on teaching our youth to know and appreciate the many advantages they have under our Constitution, Bill of Rights, and Free Enterprise system. They need to be taught that under this form of government our country has achieved the highest standard of living; the most personal freedom and the greatest religious freedom, in the history of man; and victory in every war as long as we fought under "Old Glory".

We need to re-dedicate our communities, schools, homes, churches, industries, and business establishments to God and Country. We ask that you fly your American Flag on October 23rd, United States Day.

We sincerely request your cooperation in this endeavor by having the New Jersey Legislature and the United States Congress pass a Resolution embodying the sentiment expressed in the enclosed copy of Proclamation issued by Governor Warren P. Knowles of the State of Wisconsin. Also we enclose a quote from the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover whereby you will learn of his great concern for our country. We firmly believe that much of this lack of patriotism can be corrected through proclamations and resolutions, such as we are requesting, made by our responsible elected officials who in so doing take the lead in promoting love of country (Patriotism).

George Washington, whose Principles are our Creed, His Life a Symbol, said: ". . . In times of imminent danger to a Country, every true Patriot should occupy the Post in which he can render them the most effectually . . . We should never despair, our Situation before has been unpromising and has changed for the better, so I trust, it will again. If new difficulties arise, we must only put forth New Exertions and proportion our Efforts to the exigency of the times."

Sincerely,
MRS. ALFRED D. WRIGHT,
Chairman, U.S. Day Committee of Bergen County.

HACKENSACK, N.J.

[From the State of Wisconsin executive department]

A PROCLAMATION

Whereas we, as Americans, should take every opportunity to keep our country uppermost in our minds; and

Whereas our loyalty to our own United States should be renewed and strengthened in these perilous times; and

Whereas October 23, 1966, has been set aside for the purpose of giving full recognition to our United States;

Now, therefore, I, Warren P. Knowles, Governor of the State of Wisconsin, do hereby proclaim October 23, 1966, as "US Day" in Wisconsin, and I further urge all private citizens, the new media and civic, religious and education institutions give special observance and recognition to this day through special assemblies, prayers, appropriate articles and telecasts, and by proudly displaying the American flag wherever and whenever possible.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Wisconsin to be affixed. Done at the Capitol in the City of Madison this seventh day of September in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-six.

WARREN P. KNOWLES,
Governor.

By the Governor:
ROBERT C. ZIMMERMAN,
Secretary of State.

A QUOTE FROM J. EDGAR HOOVER

(From an address before the National Convention of the American Legion)

It is beyond my comprehension that some allegedly local citizens of our country should be reluctant to proclaim their devotion to our democratic ideals. It is repugnant to me that the pseudoliberals pride themselves upon being internationalists and view the emotion of patriotism as evidence of decadence and weakness. In some circles, I regret to say, the word of patriotism has become a dirty word, and belief in God old-fashioned, if not "ridiculous."

It is a great privilege to me to make known my gratitude for being a citizen of our glorious Republic. I ardently hope that the day will never come when it will be considered "superpatriotism" to have our school children, or anyone else, heartily pledge allegiance to the flag of our country, and to declare our devotion to God and country.

You and your organization have proven yourselves to be loyal Americans, yet you have been the victims of vituperation, lies and vulgar accusations which are the only weapons of the coward and the guilty. In moral and spiritual issues, there can be no neutrality. You can be proud that you have always been on the side of love of God, country, law and order.

On still another front, the never-ending struggle of the communists to capture the minds and loyalties of American youth goes on incessantly. Party leaders overlook no opportunity to pervert academic interest. They have openly lectured to student groups at colleges and universities throughout the country. Glowing reports have been submitted by these adept and devious communist leaders concerning the pliability and receptiveness of their audiences.

Alarming, too, is the ease with which some major educational institutions have been duped, under the much-abused term of "academic freedom," into permitting underhanded attacks to be made on democratic institutions and officials of government by instructors responsible for the higher education of our young people.

When academic freedom fails to recognize the importance of truth as the basic requirement for college classroom lectures and discussions, then the usefulness of our colleges and universities is a thing of the past. (Italic supplied.)

The subversive knows well the value of fully exploiting these vital fields. It is clearly by design, rather than by accident, that communist propaganda surfaces from time to time in our institutions of advanced learning.

SPECIAL REPORT ON VIETNAM BY CONGRESSMAN McGRATH

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McGRATH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson left for southeast Asia on October 17 and, as he departed he said:

> I ask for your prayers. I shall do my best to advance the cause of peace and of human progress.

I am sure all Americans join me in prayer that his mission will achieve success.

I have consistently supported the President and his policies in Vietnam and southeast Asia and, on the basis of my experiences in South Vietnam last December and in July, I intend to follow that course because I think the President has maintained and pursued a sound policy for the United States in the manner in which he has conducted our affairs in Vietnam. I support his search for peace equally as well.

Mr. Speaker, I have been fortunate in having toured South Vietnam twice, last December on a private trip and again in July, as a member of the bipartisan group of combat-veteran Congressmen who toured southeast Asia and reported to you and to the House. I feel the observations I was able to make on both trips and the comparisons I was afforded by the 7-month interim between them enabled me to have a better picture of the situations in which we are involved and the progress we are making in solving them.

I concluded that the United States has in the field in South Vietnam one of the finest fighting forces this Nation has ever sent into battle in any war. The morale among our troops was quite high in December but it was even higher in July. I found our troops highly motivated and sympathetic to the problems the Communist aggressors are causing the South Vietnamese. Most encouraging of all, I found that every military commander of each service branch, from the Supreme Commander down to platoon officers, said without equivocation that the Americans fighting there were the best educated, most highly motivated, and best equipped troops that they ever commanded.

From a purely military strategic standpoint, the fighting in Vietnam is going well. Since July 1965, the Vietcong and their regular North Vietnamese allies have been suffering constant setbacks. During my first visit, when our units were still preparing fortifications and building airfields, our troops were forced to return to their enclaves at the conclusions of their actions. In the 7 months between my visits, infantry, air, cavalry, and marine units had been freed of the necessity to stay "tied" to their bases and were not only defeating enemy units, but were able to follow up their victories by securing the villages and hamlets they had cleared of the Vietcong.

I believe it was the unanimous conclusion of our delegation of 10 Democrats and 4 Republicans that the U.S. presence in southeast Asia is in our national interest and that our policy in Vietnam is the correct one. We also agreed that the leadership being shown by Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge and Gen. William Westmoreland, with whom we had many talks, is excellent and that the morale of our troops is at an all-time high.

About the most impressive indication that our conclusions were correct came from talking to a defector, a former North Vietnamese Army captain, who said the North Vietnamese and Vietcong leaders now realize they cannot win a military victory. Other prisoners and defectors verified that attitude.

On the political side, the September elections indicated clearly that the South Vietnamese people wish freedom and a democratic form of government and that the Vietcong and its political arm, the National Liberation Front, does not represent the majority of the South Vietnamese people. In spite of Vietcong threats to kill all candidates for the Constitutional Assembly and all those who voted on election day, and despite the actual slaying of hundreds in preelection terrorist activities, 80.1 percent of the eligible South Vietnamese voted. This is a most encouraging indication that our Vietnamese policy is correct.

While in Vietnam in July, we went to Cam Ranh Bay. In my opinion, when the facility at Cam Ranh Bay is completed, South Vietnam will have the best port between Singapore and Hong Kong. The installation there will greatly alleviate the shipping problem caused by congestion in Saigon.

We went to An Khe in the Central Highlands, where the base camp of the 1st Cavalry Division, the famous Air Mobile Division, is located. I had been at An Khe in December, when most of the division was contained within the base camp. In July, I found all six of the battalions out in the field fighting the enemy. I think it is a significant sign of the aggressive attitude of our Armed Forces in Vietnam.

I was also impressed by my visit to the U.S.S. *Intrepid*, a great aircraft carrier. While aboard, that ship was launching and recovering air strike missions which had been in air operations in support of ground troops. Between launching and recovering, the *Intrepid* refueled and rearmed underway at sea.

During my December visit I spent most of Christmas day aboard the great nuclear aircraft carrier, U.S.S. *Enterprise*. The only nuclear aircraft carrier in the world, the *Big E* is able to steam at full speed for 7 years without having to refuel. I was tremendously impressed with the spirit of the fliers and support units aboard the carriers, and my two visits to carriers off the South Vietnamese coast impressed me with the close cooperation of all our military branches in South Vietnam.

In July, we visited a Special Forces camp at Song Be near the Cambodian border. The village was overrun a year ago by the Vietcong, but is now rebuilt and being protected by our Army units. We crossed the Song Be River in a dugout canoe and there I met Capt. H. R. Taylor, Jr., of the famous Green Berets who, I am proud to say, is from my district. Captain Taylor told me how important he believes it was that we stay in South Vietnam and halt the Communist aggression there.

During my December visit I spent some time at the Special Forces camp at Minh Thanh on the Ho Chi Minh Trail, in the midst of an area overrun with Vietcong. The Minh Thanh Special Forces camp is where rubber plantations are plentiful and the fortress protects a village of some 2,000 people. There, I saw some results of our AID programs—a school containing the first three grades, with textbooks we supplied—and other exemples of cooperation which were most gratifying and reassuring. There was no school in that village until America helped build one.

Following my December visit I was quite concerned about the congestion in Saigon harbor. In July, I visited the 1st Logistics Command and we flew over the entire Saigon River Port area. The Army is building a new quay in that river which will be able to handle deep-draft vessels and is building a new port facility on the Saigon River. Cargoes unloaded at the new port facility will be able to bypass Saigon traffic and be shipped immediately out into the field to support our troops.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has continually worked for a negotiated peace with honor in South Vietnam. To this end, our military effort has been aimed at convincing the North Vietnamese and Vietcong that their aggression will not result in conquering South Vietnam. At the same time, President Johnson and representatives of our Government at cabinet and diplomatic levels have been and are still working to convince the Communists that we seek only an end to their aggression; that we have no territorial ambitions in southeast Asia, and that we do not wish to crush the Hanoi government. They do so with my full support.

All efforts have been unsuccessful to date. The North Vietnamese will not negotiate with us directly, nor will they agree to permit a third party to act as mediator and have rebuffed our attempts at securing the United Nations as a forum for negotiations.

The Manila Conference, which will be held this week, is still another attempt in good faith by the nations seeking to stem Communist aggression to seek peaceable means of settling the Vietnamese problems, but the North Vietnamese have refused to participate in this conference, too.

OUR NATION'S FIREMEN—UNSUNG GUARDIANS OF OUR LIVES AND PROPERTY

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, this week's tragic blaze which claimed the lives of 12 firemen in New York City, the highest toll in the history of the city, once again brings home to all of us the vital services performed for our people by the Nation's firemen.

It has been said that war amounts to long hours of routine interruption by moments of the utmost physical danger. Such is also the life of the fireman. Like our policemen, firemen work long hours and face extreme hazards on a routine basis. They serve in the highest tradition of the public service. They deserve our respect and support. Our hearts go out to the bereaved families of the following firemen whose lives were lost in the New York tragedy. Let their courageous memory enhance our appreciation for those who steadfastly carry on in the finest tradition of their calling.

I include in my remarks a list of the firemen who gave their lives in the performance of their duties:

Daniel L. Rey, Levittown, N.Y.
Joseph Priore, Astoria, N.Y.
James Gallanaugh, Levittown, N.Y.
Carl Lee, Roosevelt, N.Y.
Thomas A. Reilly, Westbury, N.Y.
John J. Finley, Eastons Neck, N.Y.
John G. Berry, Seldon, N.Y.
William McCarron, Valley Stream, N.Y.
Walter J. Higgins, Queens Village, N.Y.
Rudolph Kaminsky, Astoria, N.Y.
Joseph Kelly, Laurelton, N.Y.
Bernard A. Tepper, Baisley Park, Queens, N.Y.

GENERAL ASSISTANCE SHOULD BE A NEW CATEGORY UNDER OUR WELFARE PROGRAMS RECEIVING FEDERAL AID

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is time to convert local programs of general relief into a categorical aid program under our welfare laws with Federal and State Governments sharing of cost.

I have introduced H.R. 18497 which would amend the Social Security Act to accomplish this purpose. This bill is called the "General Assistance Act of 1967."

For too long we have expected local villages and cities to handle all poor-relief that did not come within such major federally aided categories as old age assistance, aid to families with dependent children, and aid to the blind and disabled. This has resulted in very low standards for general assistance and places too great a burden on the limited tax resources of local government.

The Advisory Council on Public Welfare reported last June in the excellent booklet, "Having the Power, We have the Duty," some of the deficiencies of the present welfare system. They listed the following as the types of poor persons who are not being helped by any federally aided public assistance program:

> Most needy adults under 65 years of age who are unemployed or unable to earn an adequate income;
>
> Most needy children living with both parents or someone other than a close relative;
>
> Needy disabled adults who are not both permanently and totally disabled;
>
> Many children in need because of the unemployment of a parent;
>
> Needy otherwise eligible persons who have not resided in a particular State for a specified period of years;
>
> Needy mothers who are employable but for whom no jobs are available; and
>
> Persons rapidly losing their vision but not yet blind enough to qualify for assistance for the blind.

These are the groups that would be aided by my bill.

The reasons they are not being helped under present laws are also given by the Advisory Council report:

> This is largely because (1) there are gaps in the categories of needy people included within the public assistance titles of the Social Security Act; (2) some States are not financially able or do not wish to participate in all programs provided under Federal law; (3) some States, for similar reasons, impose limitations that result in provisions narrower than those in Federal law or add additional restrictions not expressly prohibited by Federal law; and (4) standards of assistance in some States are so low as to exclude many persons with incomes beyond the State standard but far less than the currently accepted poverty level.

Earlier this year I submitted this bill to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for comments on the possible cost of this program. Below is set forth the letter from Commissioner Ellen Winston estimating the cost at $500 million and explaining ways in which this might vary as the program went into effect.

It seems to me that the time has arrived when we must upgrade the assistance programs being administered throughout the country. Matching funds from the Federal Government and uniform standards for eligibility are badly needed. The "General Assistance Act of 1967" is the remedy we need.

The letter and bill are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., June 28, 1966.

Hon. DONALD M. FRASER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FRASER: Your letter of May 23 to Mr. Robert J. Myers, Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration, asking for an estimate of the cost to the Federal Government of participation in General Assistance has been referred to me for reply.

It is estimated that the proposal would cost at least $500 million in Federal funds for a full year of operation in all States. Of this amount, it is estimated that $435 million would represent the Federal share of money payments to recipients of general assistance and $65 million, the Federal share of the cost of administration, services, and training. The estimate is based on the assumption that annual general assistance money payments from non-Federal funds will be 12 times payments in March 1966 and that the average monthly money payment per recipient from non-Federal funds will be the same as in March 1966.

This estimate does not include the cost of Federal participation in vendor medical payments from general assistance funds for a number of reasons. First, when States initiate medical assistance programs (for which Federal grants-in-aid are available under title XIX, under the Social Security Amendments of 1965), Federal financial participation will be available under title XIX for a substantial amount of vendor medical payments now being made from general assistance funds. However, the amount of vendor medical payments that may be moved to title XIX is not known. Title XIX makes available Federal financial participation in vendor medical payments for those medically indigent persons who meet the Federal eligibility requirements for titles I, IV, X, XIV, or XVI except that their income and resources are sufficient to meet their maintenance needs and they, therefore, do not qualify for a money payment under one of those titles. Second, an unduplicated count of the number of recipients who got either a money payment or a vendor medical payment, or both is not available.

Reporting of both the number of recipients of general assistance and expenditures from general assistance funds is incomplete in many States; it is not available for Idaho, Indiana, and Nebraska. Estimates were made for these three States by the Bureau of Family Services. Once Federal financial participation is made available in general assistance, expenditures for general assistance that are not now being reported will undoubtedly be included in the States' plans for title XX. Moreover, if average monthly general assistance payments are raised by the amount of the Federal share per recipient through higher assistance standards, many more persons will become eligible for a general assistance payment who are now ineligible under present assistance standards. In addition, many persons will become eligible, who otherwise would be ineligible, because of the provision for the exemption of earned income. It is impossible to estimate the cost of exempting earnings because a distribution of families by amount of earned income is not available for a recent year. The amount of earned income among present recipients is not known, but the cost for those who would become eligible as a result of the exemption of earnings would be far greater than that for those now receiving general assistance.

Sincerely,

ELLEN WINSTON,
Commissioner.

H.R. 18497

A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to enable States to establish more adequate general assistance programs

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "General Assistance Act of 1967".

SEC. 2. The Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE XX—GRANTS TO STATES FOR GENERAL ASSISTANCE

"Appropriation

"SEC. 2001. For the purpose of enabling each State to furnish financial assistance, as far as practicable under the conditions in such State, to needy individuals who are not qualified for aid or assistance under a State plan approved under section 2, 402, 1002, 1402, or 1602, and of encouraging each State, as far as practicable under such conditions, to furnish rehabilitation and other services to help such individuals attain or retain capability for self-support or self-care, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year a sum sufficient to carry out the purposes of this title. The sums made available under this section shall be used for making payments to States which have submitted, and had approved by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, State plans for general assistance.

"State plans for general assistance

"SEC. 2002. (a) A State plan for general assistance must—

"(1) provide that it shall be in effect in all political subdivisions of the State, and, if administered by them, be mandatory upon them;

"(2) provide for financial participation by the State;

"(3) either provide for the establishment or designation of a single State agency to administer the plan, or provide for the establishment or designation of a single State agency to supervise the administration of the plan;

"(4) provide for granting an opportunity for a fair hearing before the State agency to any individual whose claim for general assistance is denied or is not acted upon with reasonable promptness;

"(5) provide such methods of administration (including methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, except that the Secretary shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods) as are found by the Secretary to be necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the plan;

"(6) provide that the State agency will make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may from time to time require, and comply with such provisions as the Secretary may from time to time find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports;

"(7) provide that no assistance will be furnished any individual under the plan with respect to any period with respect to which he is receiving aid or assistance under a State plan approved under section 2, 402, 1002, 1402, or 1602 of this Act;

"(8) provide that the State agency shall, in determining need, take into consideration any other income and resources of an individual claiming general assistance, as well as any expenses reasonably attributable to the earning of any such income; except that, in making such determination—

"(A) the State agency may disregard not more than $5 of any income,

"(B) of the first $80 per month of additional income which is earned the State agency may disregard not more than the first $20 thereof plus one-half of the remainder, and

"(C) the State agency may, for a period not in excess of 36 months, disregard such additional amounts of other income and resources, in the case of an individual who has a plan for achieving self-support approved by the State agency, as may be necessary for the fulfillment of such plan, but only with respect to the part or parts of such period during substantially all of which he is actually undergoing vocational rehabilitation;

"(9) provide safeguards which restrict the use or disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients to purposes directly connected with the administration of assistance under the plan;

"(10) provide that all individuals wishing to make application for general assistance shall have opportunity to do so, and that general assistance shall be furnished with reasonable promptness to all eligible individuals;

"(11) provide, if the plan includes payments to individuals in private or public institutions, for the establishment or designation of a State authority or authorities which shall be responsible for establishing and maintaining standards for such institutions; and

"(12) provide a description of the services (if any) which the State agency makes available to applicants for and recipients of general assistance to help them attain self-support or self-care, including a description of the steps taken to assure, in the provision of such services, maximum utilization of other agencies providing similar or related services.

"(b) The Secretary shall approve any plan which fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a), except that he shall not approve any plan which imposes, as a condition of eligibility for general assistance under the plan—

"(1) Any age requirement;

"(2) Any residence requirement which excludes any resident of the State who has resided therein five years during the nine years immediately preceding the application for general assistance and has resided therein continuously for one year immediately preceding the application; or

"(3) Any citizenship requirement which excludes any citizen of the United States.

"Payments to States

"SEC. 2003. (a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for general assistance, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing January 1, 1968—

"(1) in the case of any State other than Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, an amount equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as general assistance under the State plan (including expenditures for premiums under part B of title XVIII for individuals who are recipients of money payments under such plan and other insurance premiums for medical or any other type of remedial care or the cost thereof)—

"(A) thirty-one/thirty-seven of such expenditures, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $37 multiplied by the total number of recipients of general assistance for such month (which total number, for purposes of this subsection, means (i) the number of individuals who received general assistance in the form of money payments for such month, plus (ii) the number of other individuals with respect to whom expenditures were made in such month as general assistance in the form of medical or any other type of remedial care); plus

"(B) the Federal percentage of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (A), not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $75 multiplied by the total number of such recipients of general assistance for such month; and

"(2) in the the case of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as general assistance under the State plan (including expenditures for premiums under part B of title XVIII for individuals who are recipients of money payments under such plan and other insurance premiums for medical or any other type of remedial care or the cost thereof), not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds $37.50 multiplied by the total number of recipients of general assistance for such month; and

"(3) in the case of any State whose State plan approved under section 2002 meets the requirements of subsection (c)(1), an amount equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan—

"(A) 75 per centum of so much of such expenditures as are for—

"(i) services which are prescribed pursuant to subsection (c)(1) and are provided (in accordance with the next sentence) to applicants for or recipients of general assistance to help them attain or retain capability for self-support or self-care, or

"(ii) other services, specified by the Secretary as likely to prevent or reduce dependency, so provided to such applicants or recipients, or

"(iii) any of the services prescribed pursuant to subsection (c)(1), and of the services specified as provided in clause (ii), which the Secretary may specify as appropriate for individuals who, within such period or periods as the Secretary may prescribe, have been or are likely to become applicants for or recipients of general assistance, if such services are requested by such individuals and are provided to such individuals in accordance with the next sentence, or

"(iv) the training of personnel employed or preparing for employment by the State agency or by the local agency administering the plan in the political subdivision; plus

"(B) one-half of so much of such expenditures (not included under subparagraph (A)) as are for services provided (in accordance with the next sentence) to applicants for or recipients of general assistance, and to individuals requesting such services who (within such period or periods as the Secretary may prescribe) have been or are likely to become applicants for or recipients of such assistance; plus

"(C) one-half of the remainder of such expenditures.

The services referred to in subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall include only—

"(D) services provided by the staff of the State agency, or of the local agency administering the State plan in the political subdivision: *Provided*, That no funds authorized under this title shall be available for services defined as vocational rehabilitation services under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (i) which are available to individuals in need of them under programs for their rehabilitation carried on under a State plan approved under such Act, or (ii) which the State agency or agencies administering or supervising the administration of the State plan approved under such Act are able and willing to provide if reimbursed for the cost thereof pursuant to agreement under subparagraph (E), if provided by such staff, and

"(E) subject to limitations prescribed by the Secretary, services which in the judgment of the State agency cannot be as economically or as effectively provided by the staff of such State or local agency and are not otherwise reasonably available to individuals in need of them, and which are provided, pursuant to agreement with the State agency, by the State health authority or the State agency or agencies administering or supervising the administration of the State plan for vocational rehabilitation services approved under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act or by any other State agency which the Secretary may determine to be appropriate (whether provided by its staff or by contract with public (local) or nonprofit private agencies);

except that services described in clause (ii) of subparagraph (D) hereof may be provided only pursuant to agreement with such State agency or agencies administering or supervising the administration of the State plan for vocational rehabilitation services so approved. The portion of the amount expended for administration of the State plan to which subparagraph (A) applies and the portion thereof to which subparagraphs (B) and (C) apply shall be determined in accordance with such methods and procedures as may be permitted by the Secretary; and

"(4) in the case of any State whose State plan approved under section 2002 does not meet the requirements of subsection (c)(1), an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Secretary for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan, including services referred to in paragraph (3) and provided in accordance with the provisions of such paragraph.

"(b) The method of computing and paying such amounts shall be as follows:

"(1) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall, prior to the beginning of each quarter, estimate the amount to be paid to the State for such quarter under the provisions of subsection (a), such estimate to be based on (A) a report filed by the State containing its estimate of the total sum to be expended in such quarter in accordance with the provisions of such subsection, and stating the amount appropriated or made available by the State and its political subdivisions for such expenditures in such quarter, and if such amount is less than the State's proportionate share of the total sum of such estimated expenditures, the source or sources from which the difference is expected to be derived, (B) records showing the number of needy individuals in the State who are not qualified for aid or assistance under any of the plans of the State approved under sections 2, 402, 1002, 1402, and 1602, and (C) such other investigation as the Secretary may find necessary.

"(2) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall then certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount so estimated by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, (A) reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare finds that his estimate for any prior quarter was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to the State under subsection (a) for such quarter, and (B) reduced by a sum equivalent to the pro rata share to which the United States is equitably entitled, as determined by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, of the net amount recovered during a prior quarter by the State or any political subdivision thereof with respect to general assistance furnished under the State plan; except that such increases or reductions shall not be made to the extent that such sums have been applied to make the amount certified for any prior quarter greater or less than the amount estimated by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for such prior quarter: *Provided*, That any part of the amount recovered from the estate of a deceased recipient which is not in excess of the amount expended by the State or any political subdivision thereof for the funeral expenses of the deceased shall not be considered as a basis for reduction under clause (B) of this paragraph.

"(3) The Secretary of the Treasury shall thereupon, through the Fiscal Service of the Treasury Department, and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay to the State, at the time or times fixed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the amount so certified.

"(c) (1) In order for a State to qualify for payments under paragraph (3) of subsection (a), its State plan approved under section 2002 must provide that the State agency shall make available to applicants for or recipients of general assistance at least those services to help them attain or retain capability for self-support or self-care which are prescribed by the Secretary.

"(2) In the case of any State whose State plan included a provision meeting the requirements of paragraph (1), but with respect to which the Secretary finds, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of such plan, that—

"(A) the provision has been so changed that it no longer complies with the requirements of paragraph (1), or

"(B) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with such provision,

the Secretary shall notify such State agency that further payments will not be made to the State under paragraph (3) of subsection (a) until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure to comply. Until the Secretary is so satisfied further payments with respect to the administration of such State plan shall not be made under paragraph (3) of subsection (a) but shall instead be made, subject to the other provisions of this title, under paragraph (4) of such subsection.

"Operation of State Plans

"Sec. 2004. In the case of any State plan for general assistance which has been approved by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, if the Secretary after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of such plan, finds—

"(1) that the plan has been so changed as to impose any age, residence, or citizenship requirement prohibited by section 2002 (b), or that in the administration of the plan any such prohibited requirement is imposed, with the knowledge of such State agency, in a substantial number of cases; or

"(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any provision required by section 2002 (a) to be included in the plan;

the Secretary shall notify such State agency that further payments will not be made to the State until he is satisfied that such prohibited requirement is no longer so imposed and that there is no longer any such failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied he shall make no further certification to the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to such State.

"Definition

"Sec. 2005. For the purposes of this title, the term 'general assistance' means money payments to, or (if provided in or after the third month before the month in which the recipient makes application for assistance) medical care in behalf of, or any type of remedial care recognized under State law in behalf of, needy individuals who are not qualified for aid or assistance under a State plan approved under section 2, 402, 1002, 1402, or 1602, but does not include any such payments to or care in behalf of any individual who is an inmate of a public institution (except as a patient in a medical institution) or any individual who is a patient in an institution for tuberculosis or mental diseases. Such term also includes payments which are not included within the meaning of such term under the preceding sentence, but which would be so included except that they are made on behalf of such a needy individual to another individual who (as determined in accordance with standards prescribed by the Secretary) is interested in or concerned with the welfare of such needy individual, but only with respect to a State whose State plan approved under section 2002 includes provision for—

"(1) determination by the State agency that such needy individual has, by reason of his physical or mental condition, such inability to manage funds that making payments to him would be contrary to his welfare and, therefore, it is necessary to provide such aid through payments described in this sentence;

"(2) making such payments only in cases in which such payments will, under the rules otherwise applicable under the State plan for determining need and the amount of general assistance to be paid (and in conjunction with other income and resources), meet all the need of the individuals with respect to whom such payments are made;

"(3) undertaking and continuing special efforts to protect the welfare of such individual and to improve, to the extent possible, his capacity for self-care and to manage funds;

"(4) periodic review by such State agency of the determination under paragraph (1) to ascertain whether conditions justifying such determination still exist, with provision for termination of such payments if they do not and for seeking judicial appointment of a guardian or other legal representative, as described in section 1111, if and when it appears that such action will best serve the interests of such needy individual; and

"(5) opportunity for a fair hearing before the State agency on the determination referred to in paragraph (1) for any individual with respect to whom it is made."

Sec. 3. (a) The first sentence of section 1601 of the Social Security Act is amended—

(1) by inserting after "permanently and totally disabled" the following: "(but who are not receiving assistance under a State plan approved under title XX)"; and

(2) by inserting after "who are not recipients of aid to the aged, blind, or disabled" the following: "(or of assistance under a State plan approved under title XX)".

(b) Section 1602(a)(11) of such Act is amended by inserting "or title XX" after "title I".

(c) Section 1605(a) of such Act is amended by inserting after "permanently and totally disabled" the following: "(but who are not receiving assistance under a State plan approved under title XX)".

(d) Section 1605(b) of such Act is amended by inserting after "during such month)" the following: "(or of assistance under a State plan approved under title XX)".

Sec. 4. (a) Section 1843(b)(2) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "and XVI" and inserting in lieu thereof "XVI, and XX".

(b) Section 1843(f) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "or XVI" and inserting in lieu thereof "XVI, or XX"; and

(2) by striking out "and XVI" and inserting in lieu thereof "XVI, and XX".

Sec. 5. (a) Section 1901(a) of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting after "necessary medical services," the following: "and on behalf of other individuals who are eligible for assistance under a State plan approved under title XX,".

(b) Section 1902(a)(10) of such Act is amended by striking out "and XVI" and inserting in lieu thereof "XVI, and XX".

(c) Section 1902(a)(17) of such Act is amended by striking out "or XVI" and inserting in lieu thereof "XVI, or XX".

(d) Section 1902(b)(1) of such Act is amended by inserting before the semicolon the following: "(or any age requirement in the case of an individual receiving assistance under a State plan approved under title XX)".

(e) Section 1902(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "or XVI" and inserting in lieu thereof "XVI, or XX".

(f) Section 1903(a)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "or XVI" and inserting in lieu thereof "XVI, or XX".

(g) Section 1905(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "or" at the end of clause (iv), by adding "or" at the end of clause (v), and by inserting immediately after clause (v) the following new clause:

"(vi) eligible for assistance under a State plan approved under title XX,".

(h) Section 121(b) of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 is amended by striking out "or XVI" and inserting in lieu thereof "XVI, or XX".

Sec. 6. (a) Section 1101(a)(1) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "and XIX" and inserting in lieu thereof "XIX, and XX".

(b) Section 1106(c)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "or XIX" and inserting in lieu thereof "XIX, or XX".

(c) The first sentence of section 1108 of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "and XVI (other than section 1603(a)(3) thereof)" and inserting in lieu thereof "XVI (other than section 1603(a)(3) thereof), and XX"; and

(2) by striking out "$9,800,000", "$330,000", and "$450,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$———", "$———", and "$———", respectively.

(d) Section 1109 of such Act is amended by striking out "or XIX" and inserting in lieu thereof "XIX, or XX".

(e) Section 1111 of such Act is amended by striking out "and XVI" and inserting in lieu thereof "XVI, and XX".

(f) Section 1115 of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "or XIX" and inserting in lieu thereof "XIX, or XX";

(2) by striking out "or 1902" and inserting in lieu thereof "1902, or 2002"; and

(3) by striking out "or 1903" and inserting in lieu thereof "1903, or 2003".

(g) Section 1116 of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "or XIX" in subsections (a)(1), (b), and (d) and inserting in lieu thereof in each instance "XIX, or XX"; and

(2) by striking out "or 1904" in subsection (a)(3) and inserting in lieu thereof "1904, or 2004".

(h) Section 1117 of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "and 1903" where it first appears in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "1903, and 2003"; and

(2) by striking out "and 1903" in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "1903, and 2003".

(i) Section 1119 of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "and 1603(a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "1603(a), and 2003 (a)"; and

(2) by striking out "and XVI" and inserting in lieu thereof "XVI, and XX".

Sec. 7. Section 228(d)(1) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "or XVI" and inserting in lieu thereof "XVI, or XX".

Sec. 8. The amendments made by this Act shall be effective January 1, 1968, except that (1) the amendments made by section 4 shall not apply to any agreement which is entered into under section 1843 of the Social Security Act before the date of the enactment of this Act and which is applicable to the coverage group described in section 1843(b)(2) of such Act, and (2) the amendment made by section 7 shall apply only with respect to benefits under section 228 of the Social Security Act for months after December 1967.

SEBASTIAN SPERING KRESGE

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I should like to pay tribute to Sebastian Spering Kresge who died Tuesday in the general hospital in Monroe County, part of my 15th District of Pennsylvania. He was 99. Only recently he retired as head of S. S. Kresge Co. and as chairman of the philanthropic Kresge Foundation.

His life and achievements, set forth briefly, must stand as a brilliant example to every American and to all those of the free world. Certainly it must confound those of the Communist world.

As Mr. Kresge put it:

> When one begins at the bottom in America and learns to scrape, everything comes easy.

At recent retirement he was the oldest chairman and the one with the longest tenure, 53 years, of any corporation listed on New York Stock Exchange. Born in Kresgeville, Monroe County, Pa., he was a son of Sebastian and Catherine Kunkle. He was educated in rural schools, Fairview Academy, Brothersville, Pa., Polytechnic Institute, Gilbert, Pa. and Eastman Business College, New York State. At 20 he was a delivery clerk for a Scranton grocer, then sold tinware and hardware from a horse and buggy. He met James G. McCrory as a customer and joined him in establishing a chain of stores.

From that experience he went on his own and founded a chain of 930 Kresge stores in the United States, Canada, and Puerto Rico. His Kresge Foundation, founded with $1.3 million is now worth $175 million. It maintains Detroit's Children's Village for Underprivileged Children, provides grants to colleges, schools, hospitals, homes for the aged, YMCA's, missions, and many other educational and humane projects. In his home county he made possible the construction of a new general hospital in Monroe County under the Hill-Burton Act by providing a gift of $250,000; and more recently he gave $50,000 for hospital expansion.

He never forgot his humble beginnings and more specially his salesmanship.

Beset by many for grants and gifts, he met them all and gave on merit. None left his home at Mountainhome, Barrett township, Monroe County, without buying something—some of the apples from his prize orchard. He never ceased to be a keen businessman as well as a great humanitarian.

THE 225TH YEAR OF MORAVIAN SEMINARY FOR GIRLS

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in September of 1966 one of our Nation's fine educational institutions for girls began its 225th year, carrying forward its original purpose of preparing its students for the opportunities and responsibilities of life.

This school, Moravian Seminary for Girls, located in Northampton County, Pa., traces its history to the year 1742. During its first 171 years, it was a girls' school, covering all grades. Then, in the period from 1913 to 1954, the school was officially known as Moravian Seminary and College for Women. In 1954, it was merged with the Moravian College and Theological Seminary and a new corporation, Moravian College, was formed. In 1956, it was separately incorporated under the present name Moravian Seminary for Girls at Bethlehem, Pa.

The school's history and growth parallel the history and growth of our country. Whatever its name or form of organization, the steadiness of purpose—to provide a sound education designed to help its students meet constructively and creatively the challenges of each era—has never faltered.

During the commencement program at Moravian Seminary for Girls on June 13, 1966, Mr. C. H. H. Weikel, chairman of the school's planning committee, assessed the future of Moravian Seminary for Girls and outlined plans for further physical development of this institution. His remarks, and the views of a number of prominent educators he quotes, present a vivid picture of the vital roles women have played, and will continue to play, in molding our great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully include Mr. Weikel's remarks in the RECORD:

LOOKING TO THE FUTURE

(A report given by C. H. H. Weikel, Chairman, Planning Committee, Moravian Seminary for Girls, at Commencement, June 13, 1966)

Dr. Turman, Mr. Kuebler, Mrs. Robbins, Members of the Faculty; to this year's Graduating Class in particular; to those who will be on this campus for a few more years; and to the parents and friends of these lovely girls.

When I was honored by election to the Board of Trustees of Moravian Seminary for Girls, I was aware of some of the history of this school and its rich historical traditions over the past 225 years. It is well-known that George Washington was a lad of but ten years when the school was founded and in his later years he was entertained by students of the school. His grandniece attended the school as did the grandniece of President Jefferson and the niece of Mrs. John Quincy Adams. Also students were Maria and Ann Jay, the daughters of the first Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

My few remarks this morning, however, will be directed not at the school's past history but to give you a quick look at some of the plans directed at the school's future. Several happenings in the life of the school within the recent past are deserving of mention particularly as they are related to our plans for the future.

First, the moving of the school to this beautiful campus, the gift of Mrs. Vernon K. Melhado and her brother, John Taylor Snyder, gave the school space in which to grow. The erection of Walter Hall with its attractive and functional Assembly Hall, Dining Room, Gymnasium and Classrooms, was a major step in the school's future.

For the past several years studies of the school, its academic program, its need for plant facilities, have been underway by the combined talents of the Headmistress, Faculty, Board members, outside counsel and Planning Committee to project the growth of the school over the next several decades. We wanted to determine the number, type and location of new dormitories, classroom facilities, a library, chapel, athletic areas, including an indoor swimming pool.

The next step was to engage the firm of Clarke and Rapuano in New York to study our present situation, to appraise our future needs as spelled out to them, and we now have a plan based on these combined studies including both academic goals and physical plant. This plan has had the complete approval of the Board of Trustees of the school.

In the past year a new dormitory, Illick House, was completed and occupied during the school year.[1] I know that you will be interested to learn that the Board of Trustees has approved the erection of a second dormitory based on our recent studies and architects have been engaged to design a building for 40 students which will be ready for occupancy by the opening of the school term in 1967.

In the light of our studies we have arrived at the conclusion that the next major facility that should be erected at the school should be a Science Laboratory pointing particularly to Biology and Chemistry.

A student of a secondary school such as our Seminary with an interest in attending college must have a strong, modern and sophisticated foundation in Science. It is the duty, therefore, of the Trustees to provide the best possible training for entrance to college. If our future projections are reasonably accurate, and my own feeling is that they are on the conservative side, then now we must plan for a science enrollment of 150 students, about double our present load.

It is quite possible that someone will say—"Why a Science course for girls?"

In the first place, it has never been demonstrated that women are inferior to men in intelligence, in ability to learn and in ability to successfully hold a job in an area once thought of as a man's private preserve.

In the second place, the growth of technology over the past half century in this country, while raising our standard of living to the highest of levels, has also created serious problems affecting all of us that must be solved. Pollution of our environment is serious and widespread and as our population grows the menace becomes greater. Clean air and clean streams and lakes can only result from massive technological studies.

And where will the trained technicians come from to do the job? In my opinion there is a desperate need in a number of scientific fields that cannot be filled by graduates of men's colleges. The plain fact is that they are not available in sufficient quantities to do the job so we must look—as we always do when in trouble—to the women.

---

[1] Illick House was struck by lightning on August 16th and severely damaged. Reconstruction is under way and it is anticipated the house will be ready for use by the beginning of the second semester in January, 1967.

The field of medicine also opens great opportunities for women. Today women in this field are not only *wanted*, they are needed.

Can women succeed in these fields—thought by many to be in a man's world?

Think what mankind today owes to a little Polish girl who at the age of 16 found a job in a laboratory in Warsaw. She succeeded so well in her life's work that in 1921 President Harding presented her with a gram of radium and in 1929 on the occasion of her second visit to the United States, President Hoover presented Madam Curie with a gift of $50,000 from American Friends of Science to purchase radium for a laboratory in Warsaw.

The list of women who have done notable work in medicine is a long one. This world of ours is a better place in which to live due to the dedication of women like Dr. Frances Kelsey who played such an important part in the removal of a drug, the use of which resulted in a high incidence of deformed babies.

A study of some of the recent graduates of Moravian Seminary for Girls reveals many who have done well in the sciences—in Medicine—in Biology—in Genetic Research.

These are some of the reasons that have led us to the conclusion that our next major facility should be a Science Laboratory. Studies to this end are now under discussion and more complete details will be available just as soon as possible. In the meantime, we will make some modifications in the present Science Laboratory to enable us to carry on more efficiently until such time as the new Science Building will be available to the school.

I should like to finish this little talk with comments from seven college presidents on the theme that I have outlined on the need of scientific training for women in many fields:

"Among the professional scientists today there is a definite absence of women—due largely to the inadequate science facilities in our female secondary schools and colleges—students must come to Middlebury, well prepared in the basic scientific skills." (Dr. James I. Armstrong, President, Middlebury College.)

"Women can be the key in solving the doctor shortage." (Dr. Marion Spencer Fay, President and Dean of Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania.)

"America today is in the midst of revolutionary change in all phases of education with a growing emphasis upon the study of the natural sciences for women students. The time is long since past when the opportunity for study in the sciences should be limited to men students. On the contrary, the present is a time to encourage women students in scientific studies, and to provide them with the best possible opportunities in terms of adequate laboratories and equipment, updated curricula, and high quality teaching." (Dr. Raymond S. Haupert, President, Moravian College.)

"Science as a career is attracting increasing numbers of women. Many of these women, however, decide late in their college undergraduate work that the academic area which most fires their imagination is some field of science. A solid grounding in science at the secondary school level helps to give direction to the college years. With specialization becoming a way of life, time is crucial in all phases of education, but especially in science. The earlier we can help young women test their inclination for the sciences, the better we will execute our total educational responsibility." (David H. Kurtzman, Chancellor, University of Pittsburgh.)

"I emphatically do agree that women should be encouraged at the secondary level of their education to develop interests in science fields. Only 20 percent of our students major in the sciences. We should have 30 percent or 40 percent to keep up with the hidden talents of the girls and the science needs of our future." (Charles E. Shain, President, Connecticut College.)

"In the modern world where science and the developments and activities springing from it have become so central, no person who is truly educated can be ignorant of science. Courses in science must be regarded as part of a liberal education. Every woman as a citizen and every woman who as a mother is a teacher of her children needs to comprehend some science.

"Beyond this there is another need for scientific education of women. This scientific modern world has a great and growing need for scientists and for professionals with scientific training. Womanpower provides a rich and largely untapped resources for meeting this need, and the need in turn provides a rich opportunity for the use of woman's growing free time. Women have shown that they can become outstanding doctors, computer programmers, psychologists, science teachers and scientific specialists of many sorts. Some have become highly creative scientists.

"In planning more education in science for women we should not blindly imitate what we have done for men. Woman's mental capacity is as great as man's but her interests tend to be different. We should expect a smaller fraction of women to become mathematicians, physicists or engineers. On the other hand, the greater concern of women for personal values and relationships will lead more of them to become involved in the humane and social sciences; medicine, psychology, sociology and anthropology for example.

"If more women are to be educated in science and its applications it is vital to nurture their scientific motivation and competence in secondary school. This requires superior teachers, facilities and programs in science at that level. By providing these fundamentals more amply wherever talented young women are in preparatory school or high school we can in time greatly increase the participation of women in science." Dr. W. Deming Lewis, President, Lehigh University.

"Certainly I would agree that adequate, modern science facilities should be a first priority for any independent secondary school today and especially in a school for girls.

"One must always remember science is an area where change is happening more rapidly than anywhere else in the curriculum, and facilities are more likely, therefore, to fall quickly out of date." Thomas C. Mendenhall, President, Smith College.

These, then, are the reasons that we believe the next major facility to be erected at Moravian Seminary for Girls should be a modern science laboratory in order that your school can continue to contribute to the future welfare of our country.

THE SLATE BELT OF THE 15TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA HAS UNIQUE INDUSTRY

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the small businesses of our great Nation have endowed us with a magnificent heritage from which our phenomenal prosperity continues daily. Many sections of the country can boast of their unique industries. The slate belt of the 15th Congressional District of Pennsylvania has as unique an industry as any area of the land.

There, the centuries-old art of quarrying and manufacturing of slate provides jobs for hundreds of our workers. And, it is there that seven of the country's remaining quarries operate to supply blackboards for our schools, roofs for our homes, flagging for our patios, and structural slate for almost any conceivable use from billiard tables to spandrel facings for New York City's skyscrapers.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a series of two articles recently published in the Easton Express. Stephen Sandler, the author of these articles, worked in one of the slate-quarrying operations during a summer vacation. In his articles he tells a story filled with tradition, folklore, prosperity, and now—some hardships. His firsthand experiences make his tale sound like the fond remembrances of an old, veteran slater.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert into the RECORD both of these articles:

[From the Easton (Pa.) Express, Sept. 10, 1966]

HISTORY OF SLATE, GEOLOGICAL AND HUMAN, IS ONE OF THIS REGION'S MOST FASCINATING CHRONICLES

(By Steve Sandler)

The Geological upheaval that formed the Pocono Mountains also deposited at their foothills a fine grained silica and quartz that hundreds of thousands of years later became slate.

English mining interests, noticing the close resemblance between what is now the Slate Belt and the slate producing Welsh lowlands, sent exploratory teams into the area and almost immediately struck high-grade stone just beneath the surface.

Quarries were started and Welsh and English quarrymen imported to work them. Soon the thriving company towns of Bangor, Pen Argyl and East Bangor were set up.

The slate veins ran close to the surface from what is now Wind Gap in the north and west through East Bangor in the east and into Plainfield Township in the south. A number of quarries were set up and the area became one of the fastest growing in the state.

Today four companies operate seven quarries, all of them over 100 years old. Since 1836 when the industry began it has changed drastically. The roofing and blackboards that once made up most of the slate production now account for only about 40 percent of the output while structural forms, flagging and flooring are predominant.

NEW USES

The greatest innovations in the industry have been in the new uses found for structural slate. The recently completed Washington Square Housing Project in Manhattan was entirely covered with 130,000 square feet of slate facing supplied by two Slate Belt producers. Other high-rise apartment builders, especially in Texas and California, have turned to slate for long-wearing, weather-resistant building fronts, flooring and window sills.

Another innovation is the production of a lightweight aggregate from the formerly useless waste of the dumps. The aggregate, used to strengthen concrete, is fairly cheap but complicated to produce. Most slate men feel it will soon have the general acceptance necessary to make more than the present pilot plant economically feasible.

Today's Slate Belt quarries are on three almost parallel veins, the Albion, Mountain View and Bangor. All produce high-grade stone but after more than 100 years of quarrying it is becoming less economical to quarry at the 500 to 700 foot depths now reached. Most slate men suspect there may be excellent slate between the veins but a lack of workers has curtailed the starting of new explorations.

HIGHEST GRADE

The Jenny Weeks bed in the portion of the Albion Vein now worked by the Stoddard Slate companies in Plainfield Township has long been known as one of the highest grade beds in the area. But lately, because of rock strata cutting into the vein, only one-fourth of the 250,000 tons annually quarried from the bed is usable.

All true slate has a cleavage plane and must be split by hand while wet from the ground. If a piece of slate cannot be broken up immediately the fresh or ground side must be "buried" in wet mud to keep the stone from shattering across its plane when worked.

The stones are dislodged from the bed by dynamite or high-speed wire saws and quickly brought to the surface. Those with slight rock or other impurities are broken into flagging. If the rock content is too high, the entire stone is discarded.

It takes a practiced craftsman to break the stone into usable-sized pieces with one blow of a sledge hammer. These pieces are then quickly split, while still wet, with chisels and smaller hammers. An expert can quickly determine the direction of the cleavage plane and with a slight tap against the chisel split the rock into evenly sized pieces of flagging, all within minutes of the time the rock was cut from the quarry floor.

HUMAN INGREDIENT

The finest slate is used for roofing shingles and blackboards. The size of the shingle or board depends on the shape of the stone and how it will split.

Roofing slates, also split by hand, are then chinked off at the edges, so they can be interlocked. The slaters perch seemingly unafraid in little shacks on the edge of hundred foot high dumps and work in ways unchanged for 100 years.

Blackboards are polished by sanding wheels then stained and rubbed to give them, for slate, a high gloss.

The old slaters who daily split hundreds of dollars in expensive stone are still the most necessary ingredient of any quarrying operation. Mechanized means of replacing the ever diminishing supply of slaters have been tried but to no avail.

The quarries are surprisingly accident-free due to carefully enforced safety standards and the sure footed veteran quarrymen. The few accidents that do occur are met with sincere astonishment by the men who work the quarries.

With the ever increasing demand for slate and the almost limitless quantities of high-grade stone easily accessible in the area, the Slate Belt has all the potential to reverse present patterns and once more become an economically sound region. Reversing the patterns will take time and understanding by the quarry owners and their potential labor force but these are cheap commodities compared to the economic development of an area containing more than 20,000 people.

[From the Easton (Pa.) Express, Sept. 9, 1966]

WELSH MINING TRADITION DYING OUT—ADEQUATE LABOR FORCE LACKING TO WORK QUARRIES, MACHINES

(By Steve Sandler)

For those who grew up in the Slate Belt, as did this reporter, there is a special lore to the slate business.

The area, surrounded by quarry dumps stark and black against the horizon, is peopled by proud old Welsh slaters who congregate on corners talking of their days on the Albion vein.

We learned to tell time by quarry whistles—the starting signal at 7 a.m. when we rose for school; the morning peace at 9 when the quarrymen would stop to eat the first of two lunches they packed and the 4:30 siren signalling the close of the hole. Then we'd watch the men come home dirty and tired and we couldn't wait until we were old enough to work ourselves.

Now throughout the area there is a feeling that slate is dead. The men congregate on corners for rides to Bethlehem or Easton to work and the towns shrink and the stores are vacant.

A depression, traced by many to the decline of slate, has lain heavily over the Slate Belt. The populace mourns a dead industry in reality more vital than ever, with an unlimited market. The industry's problem is labor—lack of a work force big enough to man the quarries.

This is the paradox of the slate business: more uses are found for the mineral every year. The supply of good stone is practically limitless. The chief competitor, Italian slate, has been found to be laced with lime and useless for blackboards and building purposes. A new lightweight aggregate has been developed from the formerly useless waste of the dumps.

Yet the young people of the area will not work the quarries.

David Stoddard, executive vice president and general manager of the Stoddard Slate Cos., Plainfield Township, and president of the Pennsylvania Slate Producers Guild, admits much of the problem stems from the fact that the quarries do not pay beginners the same rates they can get in neighboring industries. This, he said, is because of high production costs and competition from other domestic and foreign producers.

The industry still brings about $2.5 million in annual payrolls into the area, Stoddard said, and this could be increased by up to 40 per cent if enough workers could be found to meet the demand.

The Stoddard Slate companies have been approved as a vocational retraining agency by the United States Government and have made provisions for 40 trainees, he said, but so far there have been no applicants.

Another reason for the lack of employees, he said, is the gradual dying out of the old Welsh and other English families that worked the veins for over a century. Since the first quarry was opened on the Bangor-East Bangor Road in 1836 and quarrymen were imported from Bangor, Wales, the Welsh in Bangor and the Cornwall English who emigrated to work the Pen Argyl quarries have been bringing their sons to the jobs with them.

But that too has changed. As the families die out and move, there is no steady flow of workers that can be counted on from year to year.

The early quarrymen were roofers, hand-splitting multiton rocks into roofing shingles an eighth of an inch thick. At the turn of the century came the demand for blackboards and, finally, for the flagging and structural forms that are the bulk of today's slate business.

The owners have had to spend substantial sums for modernization from the days when horses dragged the rock 400 feet up the side of the quarries. But, as Stoddard made clear, "No one has ever developed a machine that can take the place of a man's judgment when it comes to splitting slate."

It takes years to train a man to find the cleavage and hit the stone just right so it splits into a workable form and not a useless pile of chips, he said.

Today there are seven quarries operating in the Slate Belt, four in the Pen Argyl area, two in Bangor and one in Slatington. Yet the demand for slate cannot be met.

The quarry owners are considering importing labor from depressed areas such as Appalachia but feel this influx of one-generation workers will not fit their needs.

Many of the workers are nearing retirement so a new problem of filling their shoes must be faced. And while more and more families move from the Slate Belt seeking work, the slate industry that has nurtured the area so long goes crying for labor.

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY'S ADDRESS AT THE LEHIGH COUNTY UNITED FUND LUNCHEON, ALLENTOWN, PA., SEPTEMBER 23, 1966

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Rooney] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on the 23d of September of this year, the honorable Hubert H. Humphrey, Vice President of the United States, visited the city of Allentown, Pa., to launch the Lehigh County United Fund campaign.

The Vice President issued a moving challenge to the United Fund workers and to the entire community to put forth their best efforts on behalf of humanity in pursuing the United Fund goal.

I have just learned that this Fund campaign, still 2 weeks from its conclusion, has already realized 92 percent of its goal. At the present time, campaign revenue and pledges total $85,000 more than had been realized at this same point in last year's United Fund campaign.

Officials of the Lehigh County United Fund organization are optimistic. They feel certain this campaign will be the greatest in the history of the Lehigh County United Fund, thanks to Vice President Humphrey's kickoff challenge.

Because Mr. Humphrey's message to the United Fund of Lehigh County carries a message for each American as we consider what we should give to the United Fund, Mr. Speaker, I include the Vice President's remarks in the Record:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, LEHIGH COUNTY UNITED FUND LUNCHEON, ALLENTOWN, PA., SEPTEMBER 23, 1966

In the midst of a political campaign year, it is a pelasure to be with you at a purely nonpolitical event.

I've been spending a lot of my time lately with fund-raisers—but of a different kind altogether.

Whenever I have the chance to come to an occasion such as this, I think how fortunate we are to live in a land where people care about each other as people.

No other country has such a vast army of people responsive to the needs of their community who, through their own initiative, do what must be done to bring progress.

It was men and women such as yourselves who built the first schools and libraries, hospitals and playgrounds in Allentown.

If money was short, they passed the hat. If manpower was needed, everyone pitched in to hammer in the nails and help lay the bricks.

This kind of initiative built your city—just as it built our country.

The volunteer movement is uniquely American. And the reason, I think, is that it embodies so many typical American virtues: A desire for self-improvement, impatience with the status quo, and a determination to build on the foundations of the past.

Yes, we Americans have earned the right to be optimists. We believe that tomorrow will be better than today. And we are working to see to it that it is.

We can be hopeful because we know and understand the nature of our problems. We know that they are interrelated and that they affect the entire fabric of our national life.

We know these problems because we live with them. As citydwellers we see them not at an abstract concept, but as the rundown neighborhood around the corner, the rising crime rate, lack of clean air, overcrowded schools, traffic jams, a shortage of playgrounds and parks, and the need for more revenue.

These problems are not very new. They were with us when the first Mack Truck rolled off the assembly line here in 1905.

But we now understand that our ability to solve them is limited only by the boundaries of our imagination and by the limits of our resolve.

Our national budget for domestic programs has grown by more than 600 per cent since the turn of the century.

Our investment in education has tripled since the end of World War II. Our expenditures for medical care and health research has grown nearly as fast over this same period.

What does this mean?

It means that we now possess the will, the wealth and the technology to create a new era of opportunity for every American.

It means that we are building the most just, humane and enlightened society the world has ever known.

It means that we have made a national commitment to invest in our most precious natural resource: Our human resource.

And it means that we have learned the lessons of history.

We have learned that we cannot be truly free unless all are allowed to share in this freedom * * * that we cannot make the most of our opportunities unless all have the chance to go as far as their abilities allow.

Freedom is truly divisible by the number sharing in it.

We are working—in unity—to extend the horizons of freedom and opportunity into every community and household in the land.

This is the promise of America: That each man, in every place, shall have the chance to prove his worth and live a full and satisfying life.

And this generation of Americans—perhaps more than any other—is making this promise a reality.

Today, as never before, a true partnership is being created at the federal, state and local levels—and the private sector—to solve the problems we have lived with for so long.

As you well know, what is required is a rational, responsible approach—utilizing imaginative research * * * skilled administration * * * trained manpower * * * productive facilities and equipment—all brought to bear at the right places at the right time.

We have come to recognize the importance of local political institutions and local decisions and directions on our national programs.

We have learned that federal aid, both monetary and technical, is necessary to help localities solve their problems, but that the particular solutions should be local in character.

You—as progressive business and civic leaders—are the ones who will plan and lead the way toward progress, just as you are leading this campaign for the United Fund in your community.

You are our hope for a better tomorrow. And I think you will agree that we have no alternative but to succeed.

Finally, may I say a word about the world around us.

We are living in both the best and worst of worlds—daily confronting possibilities for unprecedented progress or terrible destruction.

Our choice is clear. We must resist aggression. We must help those in the world—the disinherited, the hungry, the humble, the weak—who need our help. We must persist in our quest for peace, no matter how often we confront discouragement or hostility.

And finally—and this is as important to our position of international leadership as anything we do in the world—we must practice what we preach at home.

The world is watching, with hope and anxiety, to see how we—the richest and most productive nation on earth—can solve our problems. For surely, if we cannot—what nation can?

We have the knowledge. We have the resources. And, I believe, we have the wisdom to put them intelligently together.

The only question is: Do we have the will? Does each one of us care enough to make it his personal business—as you have done—to invest time and effort in upgrading the quality of our society?

Are there enough Americans willing to answer "yes" in working together to hammer in the nails and lay the bricks?

I believe that there are. And with the help and support of leaders like yourselves we shall realize the full promise of America.

One of my favorite authors is Thomas Wolfe, a man whose vision of America shines forth from every page he ever wrote.

I will leave you with these words he wrote, during a time when all was not well in America.

"I think the true discovery of America is before us, I think the true fulfillment of our spirit, of our people, of our mighty and immortal land, is yet to come.

And I think that all these things are certain as the morning, as inevitable as noon. I think I speak for most men living when I say that our America is Here, is Now and beckons on before us, and that this glorious assurance is not only our living hope, but our dream to be accomplished."

LIBERTY HIGH SCHOOL BAND, BETHLEHEM, PA.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of personal pride that I can call your attention, and the attention of my colleagues, to the selection of the marching band of my high school alma mater to represent the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania at the St. Petersburg, Fla., "Festival of States."

This honor, bestowed upon the marching band of Liberty High School in Bethlehem, Pa., was made public last night in the Bethlehem Globe-Times newspaper.

The selection of the Liberty High School Band was the result of careful screening and close observation of this musical group in action on the high school football field. Gov. William W. Scranton, of Pennsylvania, has designated the Liberty High School Band as the official State band for the purpose of representing Pennsylvania at the Festival of States next spring.

This band is the largest scholastic band in the State of Pennsylvania, and is made up of 162 musical instruments.

Band director, Ronald P. Sherry, all of the Liberty High School Band members, the majorettes and the color guard, have brought to Bethlehem and the Lehigh Valley a fine honor.

I am confident they will represent Pennsylvania with distinction during their forthcoming visit to St. Petersburg.

EXPLANATION OF THE TECHNICAL CHANGES MADE BY THE URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1966—PUBLIC LAW 89-562—IN THE LABOR PROTECTION PROVISIONS OF THE ACT

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, some confusion has apparently arisen among those charged with administering the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 as to the effect of certain technical changes made in that act by the 1966 amendments which were signed into law by President Johnson on September 8, 1966. As a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency and floor manager of these amendments to the act, I have unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a memorandum further clarifying certain technical changes made in the labor protective provisions of the act.

It should be perfectly obvious that the 1966 amendments, which extended the urban mass transportation authorization provided by the act through fiscal year 1969 and broadened its programs, were not intended to make substantive changes in the protections which the 1964 act extended to labor. There is not the slightest suggestion by any administration official, by the leadership, or by any proponent or opponent of the bill during the committee hearings or in the floor debates that anything contained in the 1966 amendments was designed to alter or affect adversely in any way these labor protective arrangements. To the contrary, both the Senate and House committee reports specifically stated:

> Before federal assistance may be provided, the Secretary must determine that "all contracts contain the usual provisions relating to * * * labor * * * under criteria specified in the Act."

It is to dispel any further suggestion that the amendments to the labor provisions were something other than "technical, clarifying, and conforming changes," as stated by the conference report that I have asked unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point a statement explaining the effect of these amendments:

Explanation of the Technical Changes Made by the Urban Mass Transportation Act Amendments of 1966 (P.L. 89–562) in the Labor Protection Provisions of the Act

On September 8, 1966, President Johnson signed into law amendments to the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 which extended the authorization provided by the Act through fiscal year 1969, and added several new programs, including grants for technical studies, managerial training programs, research and training and for study and preparation of a "program of research, development, and demonstration of new systems of urban transportation." A number of technical amendments were also made in the Act, including the re-numbering of Sec. 10(c) as Sec. 13(c), and revising the phrase "under this Act" used in the new Sec. 13(c) to read "under Sec. 3 of this Act."

It has been suggested that the effect of this last change may be to narrow the scope of the employee protective provisions so that they would no longer apply to demonstration projects undertaken pursuant to Sec. 6 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act, such as the operating experiments, inaugurating new bus service in the Watts area of Los Angeles, California, and between major medical centers in Nashville-Davidson County, Tennessee, referred to in the Committee reports. Prior to the 1966 amendments, suitable employee protection arrangements were attached to both of these projects, in accordance with the labor requirements of the 1964 Act.

The following analysis is submitted to establish that nothing in the 1966 amendments was intended to obviate the necessity for similar employee protection arrangements in connection with any future operating demonstration projects under Sec. 6, as shown by the language and logic of the statute as a whole.

Sec. 10(c) of the original Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 required, as a condition of "any assistance under this Act" that fair and equitable arrangements be made, "as determined by the Secretary of Labor," to protect the rights and interests of affected employees. Sec. 10(c) further required that the contract of assistance specify the terms and conditions of the particular protective arrangements.

Although the Secretary of Labor was given the authority and responsibility to determine what terms and conditions are necessary to provide this protection to employees, exclusive authority to determine whether assistance under the Act should actually be provided was lodged by other provisions of the Act with the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency (and more recently, with the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development). Accordingly, to assure proper implementation of the employee protective provisions in Sec. 10(c) (now section 13(c)), the Administrator's authority to award financial assistance was specifically limited by a prohibition included in Sec. 3(c) of the original and amended Act which states that "no financial assistance shall be provided under this Act" for the purchase, construction or "operation of mass transportation facilities or equipment" unless, among other conditions, "(4) the Secretary of Labor certifies that such assistance complies with the requirements of Sec. 13(c) of this Act." The effect of this condition is that before the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may approve any financial assistance under the Act, the Secretary of Labor must certify that the requirements of the labor protection provisions, included in Sec. 13(c) of the Act, are complied with.

In other words, "fair and equitable arrangements" must be made, as determined by the Secretary of Labor, to provide such protection, and the contract for assistance must specify "the terms and conditions of the protective arrangements." Without such a certification the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development is powerless to award such assistance.

Sec. 3(c) applies broadly to all of the various types of financial assistance authorized by the Urban Mass Transportation Act. This is clear from the language used in this Section, which specifies that "no financial assistance shall be provided under this Act to any state or local public body or agency thereof for the purpose of, directly or indirectly" acquiring any facilities or property of a private mass transportation company, constructing, re-constructing or improving any facilities acquired from any such company, "or for the purpose of providing by contract or otherwise for the operation of mass transportation facilities or equipment in competition with or supplemental to, the service provided by an existing mass transportation company," unless certain conditions are met, including the certification of the Secretary of Labor required by clause (4), to assure compliance with the labor protection provisions.

There can be no doubt that the language in Sec. 3(c) is specifically applicable to demonstration grant projects undertaken under Sec. 6 of the Act because the *only* operating projects authorized by the Act, as a whole, which provide by contract or otherwise "for the operation of mass transportation facilities or equipment" are those undertaken pursuant to the demonstration grant authority contained in Sec. 6 of the Act.

Thus, a demonstration project making provision "by contract or otherwise for the operation of mass transportation facilities or equipment in competition with, or supplementary to, the service provided by an existing mass transportation company" is subject to the same terms and conditions as would be applicable to a project for a capital grant or loan under Sec. 3(a) of the Act, as amended. Moreover, as shown by the purposes of the Act stated in Sec. 2(b)(2) and (3) of the Act, and by the definition of "mass transportation" contained in the re-numbered Sec. 12(d)(5), the term "mass transportation company" used in Sec. 3(c) refers without distinction both to public and private operations. Accordingly, the labor provisions as revised by the 1966 amendments continue to apply, as before, to all demonstration projects such as the Watts and Nashville projects. The Watts project involves supplementary services provided by a public operation which, to some extent, is competitive with other existing systems, both public and private, while the Nashville experiment is for supplementary service to be provided by a private operator in a non-competitive situation. Both projects would continue to be covered by the revised language in Sec. 13(c) when properly read in conjunction with the language contained in Sec. 3(c).

It can, therefore, be seen, in the context of the entire statute, that the added language in the new Sec. 13(c) stating that it shall be a condition of any assistance "under Sec. 3 of" the Act, was designed merely to clarify that employee protection arrangements are not required in relation to the non-operating programs undertaken by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. Thus, there is plainly no occasion for application of the labor protection provisions specified in Sec. 3(c) and 13(c) of the Act with respect to the new programs authorized by the 1966 amendments for technical studies under re-designated Sec. 9, managerial training fellowships under re-numbered Sec. 10 and similarly, with respect to grants for research and training in urban transportation problems under the new Sec. 11.

The same is true as regards non-operational demonstration projects undertaken pursuant to Sec. 6 of the amended Act. This Section was amended in 1966 to direct the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce, "to undertake a project to study and prepare a program of research, development and demonstration of new systems of urban transportation that will carry people and goods within metropolitan areas speedily, safely, without polluting the air, and in a manner that will contribute to sound city planning." Obviously, to the extent that this amendment (Sec. 6(b)) simply provides for preparation as distinguished from operation of a research, development and demonstration program, there is clearly no occasion for application of the labor protection provisions specified in Sec. 3(c) and 13(c).

Sec. 6(a) of the Act, however, authorizes the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to "undertake research, development, and demonstration projects in all phases of urban mass transportation (including the development, testing, and demonstration of new facilities, equipment, techniques, and methods)." To finance such projects, Sec. 6(b) of the original Act (now Sec. 6(c)) provided that $10 million of the funds authorized under Sec. 4(b) to be appropriated to finance programs of mass transportation assistance might be made available for such projects. This amount was increased to $20 million on July 31, 1965, $30 million on July 31, 1966, and under the 1966 amendments to the Act, $40 million on July 1, 1967, and $50 million on July 1, 1968.

When projects undertaken under Sec. 6(a) involve the operation of mass transit facilities and equipment to provide mass transportation service, the limitations of Sec. 3(c) will continue to require that employee rights and interests be protected.

In sum, the insertion in Sec. 13(c) of the words "under Sec. 3 of" the Act, was a wholly technical change in the labor provisions designed only to make plain that such provisions do not apply to non-operational programs having no possible impact upon employees. The labor protective provisions contained in the original Urban Mass Transportation Act continue to apply in the case of any project which can conceivably affect the rights and interests of employees.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT ALBEE SQUARE, BROOKLYN, N.Y.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on the afternoon of Wednesday, October 12, the President of the United States addressed a huge crowd that met him at Albee Square in Brooklyn, N.Y., which is located in my congressional district. It is my pleasure and privilege to include with these few words the remarks of President Johnson on that occasion:

Remarks of the President at Albee Square, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Ladies and gentlemen, my fellow Democrats:

I want to thank the next great Governor of New York, a man who follows in the tradition of Al Smith, Franklin Roosevelt, Herbert Lehman, and Averell Harriman—the next great Democratic Governor of New York, Frank O'Connor.

I want to thank my friends and one of the greatest Senators in all New York's history, the able junior Senator of New York, Bob Kennedy.

I am happy to be here on the platform with a man who provides the leadership from the great Borough of Brooklyn, your own Borough President, Abe Stark.

Mr. Democrat of Brooklyn, the great Democratic County leader, Stanley Steingut. Your Comptroller, Arthur Levitt, who is going to be elected by an overwhelming Democratic vote. And your next Attorney General, Frank Sedita.

That is what I call a real Democratic ticket that will be elected in a Democratic way to work for Democrats.

I am happy to be here in the district of that fighter for educational opportunities for our children, that champion of the handicapped, your great Congressman, Hugh Carey.

I want to thank all of his colleagues in the New York delegation who came here with us today. I understand that I am here at the corner of the district of my old friend John Rooney.

Ladies and gentlemen, we need leaders like this to continue the record of the Congress which has done more good for the American people than any Congress in all our history. Measured by laws that mean something to people in education, in income, in health, in fighting poverty, this 89th Congress has not only done more than any other Congress, it has done more in these fields than all of the other Congresses put together.

The 89th Congress averaged better than one major bill for each of the 82 weeks it has been in session.

Can the 90th Congress match that?

The 89th Congress gave us more for health and gave us more for education in America than any other Congress. The 89th Congress gave the Nation's cities new hope by creating a Department of Housing. The 89th Congress did more for low income people, more for college students, more for the elderly and more for the poor than any other Congress.

I believe it can. I believe we will build our record, if we have a progressive Congress in the 90th Congress. We need a creative Congress. We need an energetic Congress. That means we must have a Democratic Congress.

So I ask you to return all of the members of the New York Democratic delegation to the Congress.

I ask you to go to the polls on November 8 and vote for the candidates, the party, and the principles which you believe will bring your family the greatest prosperity.

Vote for the party and the candidates who will challenge this nation's best ideas in the future. If you vote that way, I believe you will keep America on the march. If you vote that way, I believe both you and I will have happier lives; will have lighter burdens in the years to come.

I believe that if you elect Frank O'Connor and the Democratic State ticket, I believe if you elect Hugh Carey and the Democratic Congressional ticket, we will have more jobs at better pay with better education, with better health, with better social security, with better housing, and with better living conditions.

More people have jobs today than ever before. We have the best school legislation we have ever had. So we are just getting started on a program for the Twentieth Century.

Send this Democratic Congress to help us continue it.

Thank you.

LABOR'S STAKE IN DEVELOPMENT AND CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Edwards] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, interest in conserving and developing our natural resources pervades many segments of our country. Evidence of this concern was presented at the Western States Water and Power Consumers Conference in Billings, Mont., on September 26–27, 1966.

Since 1958, the Western States Water and Power Consumers Conference has provided a biennial forum for leaders in resource development to discuss the water and power needs of the West and of the Nation. This year, George Taylor, economist, department of research, AFL–CIO, discussed "Labor's Stake in the Development and Conservation of Natural Resources." He noted the necessity of full utilization of our natural resources:

> What is done, left undone, or badly done in the development of natural resources, affects our people as workers, as consumers, as taxpayers, as citizens strongly motivated to preserving and strengthening the sinews and freshening the wellsprings of our democratic traditions and institutions.

He emphasized the lessons of past water and power developments:

> We know that regional multipurpose development, with clearly fixed plans, full decision making authority and accountability for results is the right framework for harnessing water and associated land resources.

And he suggested solutions to present water and power problems:

> We have the tools to do something about it. Let us pick them up and go to work.

I am pleased to insert the entire text of Mr. Taylor's speech in the Record:

Labor's Stake in the Development and Conservation of Natural Resources

(An address by George H. R. Taylor, economist, Department of Research, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, before the Western States Labor and Power Consumers Conference, Billings, Mont., September 27, 1966)

Eight years ago in October 1958, Andrew J. Biemiller, Director of the AFL-CIO Department of Legislation, had the honor of appearing in Denver, Colorado before most of the groups represented in this audience, to state the views of organized labor on the natural resources issue.

It is interesting to go back eight years to that Denver meeting which was held to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the historic Governor's Conference on Conservation, called by Teddy Roosevelt and termed by many, the real beginning point in America's conservation era.

During the course of two national administrations under General Eisenhower, it had become necessary for farm, labor, public and cooperative power organizations, and others similarly inclined, to band loosely together, in a sort of poor man's Department of the Interior in an effort to protect the American people's resource heritage from being given away, as well as to endeavor to keep the federal resources programs from gradually dying of the dry rot.

The late great Senator James Murray of Montana had attempted in 1957 to get a resolution passed through the Congress which would have established a Commission to celebrate the fifty year anniversary of Teddy Roosevelt's Governor's Conference. By the time friends of the private power lobby in the House had finished with the Murray Resolution, all that was left was an authorization to spend $20,000, and a prohibition against spending any of this vast amount to reveal the views of Teddy Roosevelt on the development of electric power.

So it was that the newly formed Western Water and Power Consumers, with the assistance of many other people's organizations, became the poor man's commemorator of Theodore Roosevelt, the champion of conservation and the foe of monopoly.

Eight years ago, Estes Kefauver made the keynote address in Denver. Among the other speakers were Mrs. Gifford Pinchot and Dr. Harry Curtis of TVA. All of them are now gone, as are Jim Murray, Judson King, and Morris Cooke. When shall we see their like again?

But things aren't altogether lost with the departure of some of these old and well remembered giants of the conservation movement. All of us miss Jim Patton at the helm of the Farmers Union, but the leadership has passed into the strong and capable hands of Tony Dechant.

And while the passing of Jim Murray lost Montana and the nation one of her great men, there was a young Congressman named Lee Metcalf from this state's First District who stepped into his shoes in 1960.

Those of us in organized labor wish to pay tribute to the wisdom of Montana voters who persisted in sending Lee back to Washington for four terms in the House of Representatives and then selected him as their United States Senator six years ago.

We would like very much to think that this excellent discrimination will be once again demonstrated this November, and Senator Lee Metcalf will be back to fight for the people and for their resources heritage.

Labor's stake in resources conservation, development and mangement is real and positive. Organized labor's recognition of the importance of the nation's resources to working people is long standing and consistent. Organized labor's active involvement in issues affecting natural resources is continuing and widening as new situations and new complexities arise in the 1960s.

In the 1870s organized labor in California fought for the family sized farm and against the predatory land barons and railroads. Now, nearly a century later, organized labor still strongly supports the family sized farm, and still fights against the giant corporation farmers attempting to subvert the letter and spirit of the excess land provisions of federal reclamation law.

The 1908 Convention of the American Federation of Labor endorsed Teddy Roosevelt's Governor's Conference, and the "general movement . . . for the preservation of the nation's natural resources." The Convention resolved that "The conservation of the nation's natural resources is a subject of the most vital importance to all our people . . . and our own natural resources should be protected . . . for the welfare of the people as a whole, and not for the benefit and aggrandizement of a few."

At its First Constitutional Convention in 1955, the AFL–CIO in a unanimously adopted resolution stated in part that: "Only the federal government can provide effective leadership to develop our large river basins, and only the federal government can provide for the multipurpose planning that can bring the maximum flood control, power, navigation, recreation and irrigation which so many of our river basins need."

The first AFL–CIO Convention also reaffirmed organized labor's belief that: ". . . the natural resources of this country must be used for the greatest good, for the greatest number, for the longest time possible. The growth of population, expanding technology, demands for an ever higher standard of living, require the fullest practical development of the nation's resources taken from the land, sea and air. While planning the use of available supplies of existing resources, progress in the scientific arts provides our economy an opportunity to develop new and additional resources to meet the needs of modern day living."

During the past 16 years, organized labor has demonstrated in action that these are not merely empty words. We have fought shoulder to shoulder with other organizations during the lean years and the fatter ones on many fronts—Hells Canyon, Niagara, Dixon-Yates, Trinity, Yellowtail, the Colorado River Project, TVA, atomic energy, the family sized farm in California's Central and Imperial Valleys, Bonneville power, shale oil, rural electrification, wilderness legislation, Indiana Dunes, the Open Space and Land and Water Conservation Acts, strong federal water and air pollution programs, natural gas, the offshore oil give-away, Dickey-Lincoln and New England resources development—this is an incomplete but indicative list.

The policy resolutions on natural resources and atomic energy adopted by the AFL–CIO at its Sixth Constitutional Convention in December 1965, covered a broad spectrum of policy and program needs in this field.

The resolution called attention to the need for immediate and continuing attention to the increasing problems—aggravated by greed, waste and neglect—in particular, "the growing contamination of our water and air."

The resolution commended "significant accomplishments" made during the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations and the first session of the 89th Congress, to meet many resources problems, but adding that "much still needs to be accomplished."

Organized labor urged the federal government to shoulder its "inescapable responsibility to formulate, plan, make investigations, institute programs, conserve and manage, and make available the major resources investments and skilled manpower to meet immediate and longer-range additional goals."

Once again, the AFL–CIO urged the federal government "to reorganize and coordinate its resources policies and structure", and to integrate its resources activities with our economic policy. "Resources are an indispensable element that can help attain full employment."

Emphasis was placed in the AFL–CIO policy resolution on the need for federal regional planning and development agencies, geared flexibly to meet problems and requirements of particular regions. It urged the establishment of a national, mixed ownership power supply system and its regional components. The federal government would lay down the rules for its creation and operation, strengthen the federal wholesale power yardstick by expansion of interregional interties between and among federal power systems, and designate all interstate power lines as common carriers.

Our 1965 proposed resources program deals with areas we regard as being of particular significance—soil conservation, reclamation, water supply, water quality, air pollution, electric power, recreation and land use (with special emphasis on urban needs), natural gas, shale oil, minerals, and atomic energy.

Consistent with the long-held position of organized labor, we called for preservation and strengthening of "historical federal safeguards against monopoly" in the natural resources field including priority in the sale of federally generated wholesale power to public groups, and the protections found in the Federal Power, Natural Gas, and Public Utilities Holding Company Act, and the excess ownership provisions of federal reclamation law.

This resolution is the guiding policy of the AFL–CIO. It expresses the basic need for all groups to work together toward a common goal. It is perhaps the most comprehensive conservation program of any people's organization.

The more than 13.5 million working men and women belong to unions affiliated with the AFL–CIO who continue to work for all policies and programs which mesh together the separate but integral parts of the controlling issue—in the words of Gifford Pinchot ". . . the one great central problem of the use of the earth for the good of man."

In more pragmatic terms, we in the AFL–CIO look upon worthwhile endeavors in the natural resources field as being in the national interest. The record shows that they benefit and strengthen America as a whole, as well as those who work in our factories, in our service and construction trades, in our stores and our transportation industries.

We express it in this fashion: "What is good for America, is good for organized labor." I earnestly hope no one will confuse this with an immortal saying about the reverse relationship between General Motors and America, uttered by a famous homespun philosopher of an administration holding office during the 1950's.

What is done, left undone, or badly done in the development and conservation of natural resources, affects our people as workers, as consumers, as taxpayers, as citizens strongly motivated to preserving and strengthening the sinews and freshening the wellsprings of our democratic tradition and institutions. We are also affected as family men and women who with their families, enjoy America's out of doors.

RESOURCES AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Land, water, energy and air—these are the basic stuff of human existence. Their quantity, quality, availability and the development of techniques to employ them effectively to provide for the needs and enjoyment of people determine in large measure the strength of a nation and its capacity for economic growth and stability.

Therefore, natural resources, taken in their separate aspects or in their entirety, must be considered as indispensable aspects of the way this or any other nation's economic policy meets the needs of its people.

America must look to its resources as never before, and it must realize the stern and awesome imperatives:

(1) A population that has arisen from 76 million in 1900 to 192 million in 1966, and under present trends is forecast to exceed 300 million by the year 2000.

(2) A labor force that has increased from 56 million in 1940 to approximately 80 million in 1966 and could reach more than 140 million by the end of this century. This means more than 7 million jobs must be created between now and 1970;

15 million new jobs between 1970 and 1980, and 40 million new jobs between 1980 and 2000.

In other words, on the basis of present trends in population, 62 million new jobs must be made available for oncoming Americans in the next 34 years—almost as many as this nation's total labor force in 1950, just 16 short years ago.

(3) The migration to the city, the rise of the megalopolis, has resulted in a population shift of enormous magnitude in the past few decades. Presently, about 7 of every 10 Americans live in urban communities occupying only about 1% of the nation's land area. By the beginning of the twenty-first century, if present trends prevail, 9 of every 10 Americans will live in urban places. Here is where the greatest resource challenge now lies.

(4) The technological revolution, coupled with population growth, has produced unbelievably vast increases in consumption of energy fuels, minerals, raw materials and pressures on water and land. These too, will continue to skyrocket in the next three decades.

For example, needs for recreation land, timber, demand for metals and energy is expected to triple between 1960–2000. Demand for farm products may more than double. Water withdrawals may be nearly twice the 1960 figure by the year 2000.

(5) The average U.S. working family household has a yearly income of something in excess of $5,000. Hopefully this could more than double by the next three decades. This means that personal consumption of all kinds of goods and services will double every twenty years or so and rise to more than $500 billion by 1970, and over $1 trillion by 2000. Reflected here is a continuing upward trend toward higher living standards, shorter hours of work, availability and use of more leisure time in more and more ways.

This means that there must be fed into the complex funnel out of which surges the agricultural, industrial, service and construction output, food, water, fuel, power, metals, minerals and timber in almost unimaginable quantities. These are the underpinnings of the economy. They have to be here in the country, or available from importation.

(6) Changing space relations brought about by a major revolution in transport have shrunk the world in terms of allowing goods and people to pass quickly and easily from one area to another, not only across our own land but around the globe itself.

Railroads, trucks, the airplane, the automobile have changed our mode of living in the past half century. Where once there were local markets for the land and its products, there are now regional, national and world markets. Where once a worker worked close to his home, now one of the major characteristics of American labor is its mobility. This is also true as regards recreation. Where 50 years ago a trip to the next county was an event, now Americans think nothing of travelling 1,000 miles or more for their vacation and recreation.

Industry is moving from central cores of cities into satellite areas and even into their smaller localities. New areas have been opened up for use of people who live in a certain location. The expansion of our road and highway systems leading between localities, and freeways to suburban areas, have allowed the sprawl of the great metropolitan centers to continue and enlarge.

These changes, which have taken place and show no sign of diminishing, are indissolubly linked with natural resources. They affect the job productivity, the income, the taxes, the money workers pay for consumer goods and utility services, the leisure time of American workers, and the social and political institutions under which they live.

Time and again, we have called attention to the proud achievements of the Tennessee Valley Authority in the rejuvenation of one of the most economically depressed, hopeless regions in America, even at a time when the nation itself was in the grips of a great depression.

Time and time again we have called attention to the accomplishments of the federal government in harnessing in considerable measure the water resources of the Columbia, the Missouri, the Colorado.

Time and time again we have supported and urged the kind of capital investment by the federal government in the resources potential of New England, that has created new industries and job opportunities in these other regions. The Kennedy and Johnson Administrations have made a notably beginning at the Dickey-Lincoln School Project in Maine.

When there is a large scale capital investment in comprehensively harnessing the multiple use potential of land and water resources, it has a multiplying effect economically. Our construction workers feel it first. They get jobs building the projects. The multiplier effect on economic activity in the area or region in which the enterprise is located creates more capital investment which in turn creates more construction, manufacturing, and service jobs and broadens the tax base.

Somewhere, in another region perhaps, our workers in steel mills, in the mines, in communications, and electric equipment industries will be working to provide the elements of a dam or a transmission line or a switchboard, or a communications center for a power system.

With the increase of economic activity stemming from the facilities in operation, people will perhaps be trading in their old cars, buying new ones, buying more furniture or electric appliances, perhaps a new suit or a dress, travelling more, eating better, buying more recreation equipment. The federal power yardstick will be producing lower electric rates which benefits workers and all other consumers.

Everytime this multiplier effect takes place, our workers are bound to find better job security, the likelihood of production cutbacks and layoffs lessened, and their ability to consume enhanced.

These are the well-known fruits of wise investment in our water resources where they have taken place on a large scale. What is needed now to make the economic potential of resources development pay off more fully in terms of achieving the greatest good for the greatest number, and for the longest time possible is to recall and give substance to a key provision of the Employment Act. This provision states it to be the policy of the United States, to use all of its powers in cooperation with industry, labor and agriculture, and state and local governments to promote a free, competitive enterprise system with "maximum employment, production and purchasing power."

We continue to urge that a national resources policy must inevitably be integrated with this country's economic policy, if we are to do the kind of resources job that the next few decades require.

We continue to urge that the federal government should reorganize and unify its resource policies and structures. America can no longer afford a continuation of the long years of duplication, waste, jurisdictional rivalry and policy conflicts that continue to shackle and frustrate progress and the kind unified approach that is so widely needed, and where no one can find where the powers of decision lie.

We continue to urge modernization of the federal budget. The United States government spends and invests more than 16% of the gross national product. This level of federal spending and investing has made it imperative for the establishment of a modern and comprehensive federal financial policy. Such a policy cannot be achieved without an adequate system of financial reporting and planning.

What is of particular importance to organized labor, and, I am sure, to all of the organizations represented here today, is this: The lack of a federal capital budget makes it extremely difficult to plan and execute needed programs in the public sector, calculated to stimulate job creation, and on a long-range basis, to aid in establishing adequate economic growth and stability for the nation.

The most easily determined items that would go into a federal capital budget are self-liquidating lending programs for housing, agriculture, maritime, veterans, small business, rural electrification, and loans to foreign nations.

Under this heading would also fall investments in self-liquidating projects carried forward by TVA, the Army Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Interior. Others not so easily defined would include federal grants-in-aid programs, physical assets owned and dealt with by the United States—such as federal public lands, public buildings and certain water development and land use projects.

Budget policy lies at the heart of financial and economic planning of both governments and corporations. Federal budget reform is required to enable the President to manage government resources, and to formulate sound monetary, tax and public investment policies—not merely for the next fiscal year but in the longer-run, as well. It is in use by most of the large western democracies. Only the federal government lags behind, although President Johnson in 1960, and President Kennedy that same year in this same city, endorsed the capital budget.

Our 1965 policy resolution urged the President to establish a National Commission on Budget reform which would develop a modern business-like budget for the federal government and submit its findings and recommendations as a basis for legislative implementation.

Eight years ago in Denver, Colorado, Andrew Biemiller told the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Conference of labor's deep concern over 7.6% of the nation's labor force unemployed.

Presently, unemployment, at 3.9% of the labor force, while an improvement over 1958, is still a long way from full employment, when one considers joblessness among teenagers—12%; among negroes—8%, and among blue collar workers—4.6%.

In this great land of ours, our techniques of production have opened the doors to the abundance which has been the goal of humanity since the dawn of the species, there is still the tragic fact that millions of Americans go without the necessities of life, while the majority enjoy the highest living standard in the history of the world.

Nearly one of every four persons in the United States, including more than 20 million children, are living within the desperate confines of poverty, or are close to its edge. The AFL-CIO has applauded the vast effort launched by the President in his "unconditional war, here and now on poverty." Banishing poverty has historically been labor's goal.

And as an important element of the war against poverty are the public sector programs—slum clearance, better housing, the Job Corps, expansion of city recreational facilities—all bear heavily on the great opportunity to make natural resources work for and on behalf of the people, and the national policies animating and governing the effort geared with the people's needs and aspirations.

Eight years ago, the nation was on the eve of a recession. Today it is in a period of inflation—profit inflation, characterized by soaring profits, aided by the 7% tax credit for business investment, and with productive capacity expanding faster than demand for goods and services. Attempts to curb this one-sector boom has pushed up interest rates to the highest point in 40 years—causing a sharp rise in the cost of living, and depressing residential construction.

The AFL-CIO Executive Council in August of this year, urged among other steps to be taken immediately by the Executive and the Congress, was repeal of the 7 percent investment credit tax for industry—and that includes the baksheesh being handed out by this provision to the private electric and gas utilities. Other suggested steps were expansion of programs to meet the crying needs of the big cities, increased funds for the war against poverty, and a rollback of interest rates.

I might add that labor has consistently opposed rapid tax amortization and accelerated depreciation handouts to the nation's utilities since these programs were placed on the federal statute books. We still do.

NATURAL RESOURCES AND MONOPOLY

Inextricably linked with the problems and issues of making resources work for people is still the unsolved problem of how to control the enormous corporate forces in American life, which regard our birthright as their exclusive private domain.

Estes Kefauver eight years ago put it in this fashion: "I am convinced that it would be foolish indeed to put our entire faith in the ability of science to discover new reserves or new methods of utilization. Even the scientists work under limitations. But their work . . . perhaps frees the conservationist from being so concerned with absolute supplies that he cannot direct his attention to what is becoming an even more important problem—the manner in which and for whom these resources are made available to the public."

We find this problem converging from all directions: In California's Central and Imperial Valleys, where the giant corporation farmers are attempting to subvert the historic policy on family sized farms set forth in the federal reclamation laws.

On the Colorado Plateau and in Utah and Wyoming, the great oil companies are pressuring the Interior Department to reopen for leasing, the lands under which one of the greatest untapped eneregy resources of the world lie—$300 billion worth of oil shale rock, and to monopolize this stupendous public treasure for their own selfish ends.

In California, the timber companies in the magnificent redwoods forest of the northern coast, until brought to a halt by the President and the Secretary of the Interior, were frantically attempting to log off these beautiful, irreplaceable trees while the Congress was deliberating alternative proposals for a Redwood National Park dedicated to the perpetual enjoyment of all Americans.

Lee Metcalf knows this story because he was there to help protect the public heritage and to make it possible for Congress to evaluate his own broader proposal side by side with the less extensive one proposed by the Administration, and make its decision in the national interest, while there were trees still left standing.

There has been an increasing trend toward mergers within the electric power industry, and an ominous indication that large coal and oil companies may be embarking on the same course.

Large corporations which have befouled America's waters with their pollutants, and expelled their toxic emanations into our air, are asking for special tax write-offs at the expense of the American people to offset the costs of installing equipment to reduce or prevent these effluents.

Mining, oil, timber and stock interests are attempting to use the Public Land Law Review Commission as an apparatus to turn over the Federal public domain to private enterprise at ten cents on the dollar.

What I am saying is that labor's involvement in natural resources began with its alarm over the upgrowth of land and water monopolization. Its concern continues and deepens over the never ending attempts to continue to despoil and loot the public domain while an apathetic public is mesmerized by Madison Avenue slogans.

There was a doggerel verse popular in England two centuries ago which went like this:

"The law doth punish man and woman
Who steals the goose from off the common
But leaves the greater felon loose,
Who steals the common from the goose."

Edward A. Ross in "Sin and Society," wrote in 1907: "Our social organization has developed to a stage where the old righteousness is not enough. We need an annual supplement to the Decalogue . . . How idle it is to intone the old litanies! The reality of this close-knit life is not to be seen and touched; it must be thought. . .

"Blind, instinctive reactions are no longer to be trusted. Social defense is becoming a matter for the expert. The rearing of dikes against faithlessness and fraud calls for intelligent social engineering. If in this strait the public does not speedily become far shrewder in the grading and grilling of sinners, there is nothing for it but to turn over the defense of society to professionals."

This raises again the responsibilities of our government, of ourselves, the organizations we represent, and each of us individuals, to identify, expose and somehow scotch this kind of impersonal sin of monopoly which not only touches individuals, but silently undermines the integrity of their economic, social and democratic institutions.

NATURAL RESOURCES AND THE WHOLE MAN

The labor movement came into being, not only for economic reasons, but to help serve as a rallying point in the fight of people everywhere to lead better, fuller, happier lives.

Our human species holds the sway of a conquerer over the domains of the earth, and we must assume the growing responsibility of intelligently using our natural resources for environment and development of the human spirit.

A century ago, workers toiled 70 hours a week—10 hours a day on a seven day week, or about 12 hours a day for a six day week. Now it is a forty-hour week. We would like to see it drop to 30 hours.

Labor's drive for shorter hours is not only rational, but necessary.

A century ago Henry David Thoreau wrote: "Most men, even in this comparatively free country, through mere ignorance and mistake, are so occupied with the fictitious cares and superfluous labors of life that its finer fruits cannot be plucked by them. Their fingers from excessive toil are too clumsy and tremble too much for that. Actually the laboring man has no leisure for a true integrity day by day; he cannot afford to sustain the manliest relations to men; his labor would be depreciated in the market. He has no time to be anything but a machine."

A century ago, the bosses, the pulpits, the press viewed the shorter work week, and increased leisure time for working people as an invitation to disaster. Where else would this time be spent except in drinking, fighting and crime? But times have changed. Recreation is the fastest growing industry in the country. It takes myriad forms. This has been brought about by higher wages, shorter working hours, longer paid vacations. Workers, farmers, white collar and professional employees now have both opportunity and means to consider the best uses of their spare time. Somehow, the prophecies of a national epidemic of immortality just didn't come to pass.

Demand for out-of-door recreation has grown to such an extent that it is expected to produce, probably quadruple, the number of visitor days at national, state, country and municipal parks by the year 2000.

Modern roads and cars, cheaper travel by bus, train and air, promotion by the entire recreation, travel and chamber of commerce apparatus, all have helped to create the urge of people to participate in out-of-door recreation as never before in all history and at greater distances from their homes.

Here in Montana and over the Western States is a greater recreational potential only partially realized. There is still much to be done—particularly in land administered by the Bureau of Land Management.

The legislation to authorize creation of the proposed Big Horn Recreational Area in this state has passed the Senate and hopefully will be approved by the House this year. It should attract thousands of visitors each year, and build up a new source of economic activity in the affected area. Our people do a lot of travelling to far places, and a lot of fishing, hunting and boating. There will be many working people who will visit the Big Horn Recreational Area. I hope some of them may learn the history of the struggle against the Montana Power Company and the Eisenhower Administration to build Yellowtail Dam, whose backwaters are the heart of the recreation area.

Senators MURRAY and MANSFIELD helped to break the "no new starts" policy of the Eisenhower Administration on this dam. And now through LEE METCALF's leadership, the people of Montana will see this project pay off in dividends of out of door enjoyment for people from all over America.

But what about the open space that is needed for the people, particularly the poor people who live in America's great metropolitan areas? Open space is expensive and hard to acquire . There is numerous competition among different uses of land. Land values are skyrocketing. The Land and Water Conservation Fund is being depleted far more rapidly than anticipated mainly because of speculators driving up the costs of lands being considered for acquisition for recreation by local and state governments.

The ominous possibility is that under present population trends and the increasing migration into urban areas, we may be short 50 million acres of land by 2000 A.D., under all categories of demand, even if every acre of mountain top, desert and swampland were somehow fitted therein. This is simply on the projection that the amount of land needed for urban and non-urban recreation will triple. This projection does not even consider the need for more land for growing of commercial timber to anticipate what the Forest Service expects as a deficit situation by the end of the century.

The Johnson and Kennedy Administrations have succeeded for the first time in making the recreational needs of the American people a problem of high priority in the resources field. The Land and Water Conservation Act, the Wilderness Act, the Open Space Act and other programs have moved the nation forward.

But the resources frontier has shifted away from the wide open spaces to the megalopolis of the East Coast, the Great Lakes, and the Pacific. This is where the major challenge lies—a challenge that money alone will not answer—but sound planning, sound programs, firm decision making, land use priorities, and all necessary steps to scotch ruinous land speculation. We have already been caught short but there is still time if we choose to seize it resolutely by the forelock.

HOUSEBREAKING AMERICA

Rachel Carson wrote that one of the most vital problems confronting mankind today is ". . . how to control the spreading contamination from many sources that is rapidly causing the deterioration of our environment. In biological history, no organism has survived long if its environment became in some way unfit for it. But no organism before man has deliberately polluted its own environment."

In the vernacular, Miss Carson has said that it is a dirty bird that befouls its own nest. We, the children of Mother Earth have never become housebroken, and our wastes are proliferating as we get older—a curious reversal of the process.

Our great age of technological innovations has proceeded without plan and in all directions. It has helped to produce a population explosion which is seriously disturbing the ecological balance between man and his environment. It impairs the beauty of whole regions; it kills the fish and wildlife, it multiplies the problems of waste disposal, it reduces the standards and quality of living, and it poses a threat not only to human health, but to our long-range future on the planet.

All of you are aware that a few first steps have been taken to attack this problem—steps that began with the first water and air pollution control legislation during the Eisenhower Administration on the initiative of the Congress. The Johnson and Kennedy Administrations have moved more rapidly but not rapidly enough to mount programs of a scale equivalent to the problem of our polluted air and water. The most important piece of resource legislation still before the 89th Congress is the bill to provide $6 billion between 1967 and 1972 to help the cities build sewage treatment plants.

Last year the neglected water supply program of the Eastern States was highlighted by the New York City emergency, requiring all kinds of stop-gap suggestions for short-range alleviation, while the Hudson River vile with human and industrial pollution, continued to roll past the metropolis carrying enough water to meet the needs of New York City twice over, water that could not be used.

In 1937, Franklin Roosevelt, in a letter to Henry Wallace wrote: ". . . if a farmer in upstate New York or Georgia or Nebraska or Oregon, through bad use of his land, allows his land to erode, does he have the inalienable right as owner to do this, or has the community, i.e., some form of governmental agency, the right to stop him?"

In 1946, Vice Admiral Hyman Rickover put the case in today's setting. He warned that society ceases to be free if a pattern of life develops where technology, not man, becomes central to its purpose.

"Technology" said Admiral Rickover, "must therefore conform to that most basic of human laws, the maxim of the 'mutuality of liberty,' the principle that one man's liberty of action ends where it would injure another. Without this maxim, freedom would be a barren privilege.

"Much more thought should be given to technological interference with the balance of nature and its consequences to man, present and future." There is need of wider recognition that government has as much a duty to protect the land, the air, the water and natural environment against technological damage, as it has to protect the country against foreign enemies and the individual against criminals."

Most of us are aware of the enormous costs we face if we clean up the Hudson, the Connecticut, the Missouri, the Potomac, the Susquehanna, the Great Lakes, our bays and estuaries, and clear our air of its major burdens of pollution.

Most of us are aware that the costs of cleaning up the awful squalor and unbelievable misery of the ghettos of our cities and relieving rural poverty will be great. But those who would cling to the status quo know the costs of everything but the value of nothing.

It becomes not only a question of what must be invested into the development and conservation of natural resources, but what we think is most important. Is the space program as important? Is the $15 billion of government research and development money that goes mostly to private industry and universities to develop more devastating weapons of war as important? It is up to the people to judge, but they should have the issues squarely posed before them.

Planning for our national resources must be continued and expanded on a note of urgency. We must consider the fact that man's environment is finite. It cannot support infinite growth, any more than a stream can support infinite numbers of trout. Unlimited expansion of consumption, coupled with unrestricted population growth, even with new sources of energy, and expanded farm productivity places an eventually unbearable burden on the nation's and the world's nonrenewable resources.

Working people, farmers, professional people—all of us are in the same bed. We all have a vital stake in what is going to be done about our resources. We should resolve ourselves into a committee of the whole to see what can be done to pull the scattered pieces together and get moving in the same direction, with our objectives clearly defined and with the full knowledge that we had better improve on the dinosaur who got too big and had to make way for something else not so large but more adaptable.

We know enough about what to do. We need national planning. We know that regional multipurpose development, with clearly fixed plans, full decision making authority and accountability for results is the right framework for harnessing water and associated land resources. TVA has taught us that lesson.

We know we have enough water if we clean it up, store it and reuse it. We know that the answer to air pollution from the combustion of powerplants, automobiles and all the other fuel burners is to turn to noncombustible sources of energy.

We know that beauty and utility can go together. A working river can also be a beautiful river. We should try it on the Potomac. Is safeguarding 164 miles of canal and towpath and the lands of the fox hunting gentry as socially desirable as securing an adequate water supply for the people who live in the Washington Metropolitan area, and creating a huge recreational outlet for half a million poor people living in the Washington slums? Could not all these uses be reasonably compromised and reconciled, if there were a comprehensive plan, and a TVA-like agency for the Potomac Basin to carry it out with all the alternatives, uses and values, thoroughly tested and the agency armed with clear congressional directive?

President Meany in 1961 said in his remarks before the George Norris Centennial celebration:

"I wonder what George Norris would say about the Potomac River now. How much water has flown under the 14th street bridge since he made that speech in 1920. And what kind of water is it?"

George Norris would be ashamed of us—and disappointed in us not just because of the Potomac, but because of the Missouri, the Connecticut and Colorado and many more."

We know that the economics of scale in the generation and transmission of electric power can save consumers billions of dollars every year if these savings are passed on in lowered electric rates. And we know that both the federal powers yardstick plus strong Federal and State regulation over electric and gas utilities are absolutely necessary.

We know that the lives of the poor in the cities can be changed with decent housing, with open places to play, with good schools and an opportunity to obtain a good job and decent wages.

With all this knowledge, let's put it to work, without neglecting interdisciplinary resources research of all kinds. Conservation is not a cure-all or a panacea for the problems of this nation or of the world, but it is an essential ingredient together with other measures of building and sustaining our economic, social and spiriutal capital. We are caught up in a global revolution which transcends ideologies, what Adlai Stevenson called "the revolution of expectations." We have our own revolution of expectations in America—all of us—rich, poor and in between, and our responsibilities have never been more grave. We have the tools to do something about it. Let us pick them up and go to work.

THE HONORABLE JOE L. EVINS

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Fulton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on October 14, 1966, I was pleased to place into the Record the first of a two-part story on our very distinguished and able colleague from Tennessee, the Honorable Joe L. Evins, of Smithville.

Today, I would like to place into the Record the second installment of the story from the Nashville Tennessean of October 16, 1966, entitled "A Rising Star Named Joe: A Man Who Won't Go Fishing."

I commend this article for consideration by all Members:

A Rising Star Named Joe: A Man Who Won't Go Fishing

(By Max York and Ed Willingham)

Washington.—It pains Joe Evins when people ask him what he plans to do next, as though he would want to be something other than a congressman.

"When are you going to run for the senate, Joe?" they say.

Or, "I hoped you would announce for governor."

There was a time when Joe Evins, U.S. Congressman from the Fourth District of Tennessee, did seriously consider running for governor. That was in 1962.

But he decided against it, for he had too much to lose—even if he won.

Evins, after 20 years in Washington, has emerged as one of the most influential men in Congress.

In the House he is ranked unquestionably among the top 20 in influence and power, and some insiders place him in the top 10.

His seniority (he is 51st among 435 members of the House), the chairmanships he holds, his standing as a national champion of small towns and small business make him the most powerful man in Tennessee's legislative delegation, including the senators.

At the comparatively youthful age of 55, he has achieved heights usually reserved for a handful of congressmen in their 70s. People are beginning to point to him as the man who may one day be Speaker of the House.

Asks a member of his staff rhetorically: "Why would Joe want to chuck all this to become a governor or a junior senator?"

And so Joseph Landon Evins, Democrat, says, "I want to be a member of Congress as long as people want me."

Evins will be home among "his people" this week.

Tuesday is Joe Evins Day throughout the 23 counties of his Fourth District, largest in area in the state.

The celebration of his 20 years in office will center in Cookeville, where 18 marching bands will parade downtown at 1 p.m., where barbecue will be served on the quadrangle of Tennessee Tech at 4:30, and where lots of friends will gather in the gym at 6:45 to say nice things about Joe.

Evins apparently has as little cause to fret about job security as any man in Congress—he hasn't been strongly opposed since his first term, and he was sometimes unopposed.

He admits candidly that he doesn't worry about his career being in danger, and can't recall a time when he thought it was in danger. He insists, however, that he "always runs hard."

He ran especially hard that first year in 1946, carrying the tag "GI Joe" Evins as token of his wartime service.

He reported to Washington as a freshman in the 80th Congress (two classmates: John F. Kennedy and Richard M. Nixon) and was appointed to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

He learned lessons the hard way. Like, one day he rose and asked if a colleague would yield the floor so he could speak on a TVA appropriations bill.

"Yes," the congressman replied, then added slowly, "if the gentleman has anything to offer!"

"I learned then," Evins says, "that it takes time to get your spurs."

Another time, he wanted to help his friend Percy Priest, the Congressman from Davidson County, in getting a new Veterans Administration hospital for Nashville.

Evins jumped to his feet and amended a bill so as to add funds for the hospital. The amendment went down immediately, decisively.

"My approach," Evins says, "was obviously not the right one."

Later, working through committee, he offered an amendment to provide $10,000,000 for the hospital. This time, he succeeded.

In the Committee on Veterans Affairs, he noticed that many bills were passed to benefit veterans, but often died for want of funds. He discovered two great truths: (1) Legislation, without appropriation, is empty, and (2) Appropriations were controlled in committee.

Still then in his 30s, eager, energetic, Evins talked to his seniors in the House, inquiring who was the most influential man in their midst.

The man often cited was Clifton A. Woodrum of Virginia, chairman of the independent offices sub-committee of the powerful Appropriations Committee.

When Evins' colleague Albert Gore moved across from the House to the Senate, Tennessee was left without a man on the Appropriations Committee.

Evins got the job—and was assigned to the independent offices sub-committee because he had worked for the Federal Trade Commission, an agency that got its money through the sub-committee.

He was on his way.

From Woodrum, the sub-committee chairmanship passed to Albert Thomas of Texas and, when Thomas died early this year, to Evins.

The sub-committee is important because it must recommend funds for about two dozen federal agencies and commissions such as the Federal Communications Commission, Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Aviation Agency, Veterans Administration, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the new Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Together these agencies will receive $75 billion in appropriations this year—nearly a sixth of the federal budget!

Evins is the third-ranking member of the public works appropriations sub-committee (which recommends funds for TVA, the Corps of Engineers, and the Atomic Energy Commission, among others). He is chairman of the House Select Committee on Small Business.

"Joe Evins," says a friend who had watched him in action for years, "is a remarkable combination of political naivete and political shrewdness. He hasn't realized his own power—but he's beginning to. He seemed to sense it first in the Tim's Ford thing . . ."

"The Tim's Ford thing" was when Evins single-handedly took on TVA, the administration, Sen. Albert Gore and, in effect, the entire U.S. Senate—and won.

Lots of people in Tennessee—and in Washington—watched in disbelief. It has since been labeled the Tellico vs. Tim's Ford Fight.

In brief, what happened was this:

The President's budget included funds for starting Tellico Dam in East Tennessee, but nothing for launching Tim's Ford Dam on the Elk River in Evins' district. That's the way TVA wanted it. So did Gore.

Evins didn't. He thought it was time for Middle Tennessee to get a TVA project. In committee, Evins worked a fantastic bit of magic by substituting Tim's Ford for Tellico in the TVA budget—and made it stick!

Later, he was hurt, and infuriated when some people accused him of "playing politics with TVA." Ever since he came to Congress, he has been a tough, effective fighter for TVA, especially in the corridors and committee rooms. The fuss over TVA funds has dwindled in direct proportion to his rise in seniority.

"Maybe," an admirer said, "they'll name a dam for *him* some day."

When Evins returns to Washington after a visit to Tennessee, his pockets are loaded with scraps of paper.

On each is jotted the name of a person and some problem—a missing social security check, a VA loan, a soldier whose family is in distress.

The people of the Fourth District have clearly established Evins as "the court of last resort" when things go wrong—they write him more than 15,000 letters a year. But most of them are still a bit hazy about what their congressman does in Washington in addition to sorting out the little scraps of paper.

It is only beginning to dawn on his constituency that a mere congressman from Smithville, Tenn., could become so influential that the President of the United States sometimes says, "Call Joe Evins!"

(This happened again a few days ago when the White House asked Evins to help get a piece of legislation off the ground. It involved rural and small town America, about which Evins has very strong feelings.)

Though Evins is generally in harmony with the administration, he has stood up to this President—and others—and said, in effect, "Sorry, Mr. President, but I just don't see it that way!"

His neighbors in the district, touring Washington, have often nudged each other and whispered "There's Joe!" as they sat in the visitors' gallery when he was serving as speaker pro tem, as he has many times.

Evins likes to quote a famous Woodrow Wilson saying: "Congress assembled is Congress on display, but Congress in committee is Congress at work!"

In committee, where constituents rarely see him, Evins does most of his work.

"One secret of his power is his charm," says Bill Keel, former Nashville newsman who is his top aid. "He doesn't do much arm-twisting. He wins his battles through homework, not through dirty in-fighting.

"He is hard-driving, aggressive, impatient. He wants to get to the gut of the matter; sometimes he doesn't want to listen to detailed explanation.

"He is considerate, very humane. But you can't fool him.

"He comes in in the morning, and he wants things done, 1-2-3-4, and then 5-6-7-8. He insists on efficiency. He doesn't want the work in the office to pile up."

Four other staff members attack the pile with the congressman and Keel: Miss Rebecca Johnson of Lebanon, his personal secretary; Miss Gerry Parker of Crossville, constituent assistant, and two stenographers.

One day, Evins asked them to keep a log of his telephone calls, visitors, committee meetings, trips to the floor of the House, etc., etc. Even Evins couldn't believe he had done all that when he read the log.

"And it was a quiet day in Congress," he says.

One big problem, he says, is deciding on priorities—"the committee chairman wants you at committee meetings, the speaker wants you on the floor, constituents want you either in the office, handling their problems, or at home at big events. It is frustrating at times."

Evins' wife, Ann, and his staff watch the attrition among the nation's lawmakers due to heart attack, overwork and nervous breakdown, and conspire to lessen the load on their favorite congressman, not always successfully.

The Evinses live in a green-shuttered brick home in a wooded section of the capital.

The congressman usually gets up about 7 a.m. and reads the Congressional Record and the newspapers (he takes both Nashville papers, both Washington papers, 27 papers from his district and the *New York Times*).

He takes a vitamin pill while shaving, and, for breakfast, has orange juice, two eggs with bacon or sausage, a sweet roll if there are some in the house, and coffee.

He likes to walk, and walks almost every evening, in the neighborhood, with his wife. He carries a broom handle and stamps the earth as he walks; he says this lets out tension.

He does his "homework," often bringing home a federal agency budget as thick as the Nashville telephone directory. Bedtime is 11 p.m.

He and his wife decline many invitations; they don't frequent the "cocktail circuit," but do go to social functions when the district or state is involved or when it is a "command performance." Both are active members of the Church of Christ.

They have three daughters: Jane, a French teacher at Montgomery Bell Academy in Nashville; Mary, senior and student body president at Mount Vernon Seminary, and Joanna, wife of Malcolm Carnahan, a United Church of Christ minister in Harrisburg, Pa.

Joe Evins has been described as a Southern moderate in politics.

He was disappointed during his early years in Congress when he didn't get appointed to the Rules Committee. He thinks now that Speaker Sam Rayburn wasn't sure what he would do on civil rights issues.

"Actually," he says, "I wouldn't have voted to bottle up civil right issues. I believe bills should be brought up and discussed."

Some advisers wanted Evins to "go fishin'" in 1964 when he was asked to be Tennessee campaign manager for the Johnson-Humphrey ticket. They said he had the support of his district's liberals and conservatives, Republicans and Democrats, and that he could only lose by choosing sides. They noted that Tennessee had gone Republican in the three previous elections, and could do so again.

Evins replied that he had run on the Democratic ticket all his life, that he supported the Democratic candidates, and that he owed it to the party to run the campaign. Nor was he unaware of what this could mean to his district.

The result—the first time Tennessee had voted for a Democratic presidential candidate since 1948—was a victory for the party, and for him.

He gets some criticism from both sides. Liberals note that he voted for neither the 1964 nor the 1966 civil rights bills, and didn't follow the administration on repeal of 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Law. Conservatives note that he has voted for the vast majority of Great Society goals, the poverty program, Medicare, voting rights legislation, and that he led the fight for rent supplements.

Another example of Evins' drive: Several years after World War II, he was on a committee to investigate the G.I. Bill. The committee found some places offering courses in dances and bar tending, and went to Murfreesboro to investigate irregularities.

Some people thought it was a mistake for Evins to go to his own district. Irregularities were indeed uncovered there—some veterans were picked up at home in taxis, taken to school, marked as present, and then returned home immediately in the cabs; vouchers were turned in for books and supplies never delivered.

The investigations resulted in a new G.I. Bill for Korean veterans, with loopholes plugged.

Evins is outspoken on problems of Congress:

On foot-dragging: "Congress doesn't do its work quickly enough. A lot of appropriation bills were behind schedule this year. Sessions should be shorter, but I doubt if they will. Too many members belong to the Tuesday-Thursday Club—in on Tuesday, out on Thursday."

On the Budget Bureau: "It is a monstrous monolith that resorts to budgetary blackmail. It tells agencies how much to ask for and requires them to testify in support of the bureau. You can't get the agencies' real opinions, except through cross-examination.

The bureau, an arm of the President, impounds and withholds funds and interferes with the intentions of Congress, as expressed in laws. This is an abuse, a mis-use of power."

On erosion of congressional power: "The federal government is supposed to have three co-equal branches, but the executive has become more powerful over the years. Actually Congress is closest to the people, and shouldn't be torn down as an institution. But today, when someone questions a position taken by the executive, he's ridiculed for it."

In 1963, Evins' book, "Understanding Congress," was published. Later, he received a letter from a schoolgirl in Colorado. She wanted to thank him. She had written a theme on the seniority system. "I quoted from your book and got an A," she said.

He makes about eight trips a year to Tennessee, going by train or car; he doesn't care for flying. He says this probably results from a committee trip to Texas. The plane was struck by lightning, though no one was hurt. He has flown with Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

"It takes a President or someone of cabinet level to get Joe off the ground," his friends kid.

He has never taken a junket.

The congressman is said to be well off financially; his father left him substantial business and banking interests, which he has largely disposed of. He is chairman of the board of First National Bank in Smithville.

He takes pride in the preservation of one grandfather's old mill and another's farm outside Smithville.

When his father died in 1954, Evins, the only son since his brother's death, offered to give up his congressional career and come home. His mother refused to let him.

Evins admits that 20 years in Congress have done little to dull his emotional response to those things which make his second home, Washington, a beloved American city.

He admits that the sight of the Stars and Stripes whipping bravely in the wind over the Capitol still sends chills up and down his spine.

He admits that there may be times when he will be at a loss for words as Joe Evins Day progresses next Tuesday.

Contemplating all this he says:

"I keep getting further in debt to my constituents all the time!"

HIGHLIGHTS OF ARTHUR D. LITTLE STUDY ON THE STATE OF THE ART OF TRAFFIC SAFETY

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Farnsley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, a comprehensive report of traffic safety information prepared by Arthur D. Little, Inc., for the Automobile Manufacturers Association was released on October 16.

This study pinpointed some of the principal factors contributing to traffic accidents and pointed up an urgent need for heightened safety research.

I was particularly interested in the following statement contained in this report:

The contribution of artificial illumination has been quantified in a series of before and after trials, all of which indicate substantial reductions in accident and, more significantly, fatality rates after illumination (of any kind) is provided.

The highlights of this study follow:

Highlights of Arthur D. Little Study

Following are highlights of some of the more significant sections of the Arthur D. Little report on the state of the art of traffic safety release today. These highlights are grouped under six headings for convenience of presentation.

The study attempted to determine, from the technical literature now available, the contribution of these various groups of factors to highway accidents and their resultant losses. The statements that follow are an attempt to express what is and what is not yet known about these accident factors. The report cautions, however, that lack of supporting evidence cannot be construed as refuting evidence.

HUMAN FACTORS

(1) ". . . there are, at present, no well-supported scientific data regarding driver behavior that can be applied to the reduction of traffic accidents."

(2) ". . . a major improvement in traffic safety cannot be achieved by means of identifying a small fraction of drivers on the basis of their driving record and removing them from the driving population."

(3) "Research into driving as a skill is needed to provide a basis for work in these latter areas (man-machine and man-environment systems), as well as the role of driver education and medical factors."

(4) ". . . knowledge of the degree to which disease conditions contribute to the risk of traffic accidents is poor . . . These results (of studies of such diseases as epilepsy, diabetes, cardiovascular disease, and mental illness) are not definitive and results from different studies frequently do not agree."

(5) ". . . published information on the relationships between visual defects and accidents is at present sparse. On the basis of this sparse information, it appears that visual defects are not strongly associated with increased accident risk. Driver compensation may be having a strong effect here. Similar statements can be applied to physical handicaps and hearing defects, where less work has been done. In fact there may be negative correlations between these impediments and accidents. . ."

(6) "With drugs and chemical agents, just as with diseases, there are many data concerning their effects on objective performance measures, but very little information relating their use or presence to accidents. Study in this area is difficult, but this does not excuse the abundance of dogmatic and unsupported statements on the danger of these agents to driving. . ."

(7) "The role of carbon monoxide as a contributing factor to accidents is probably slight, but a great deal more research would be needed before its role could be ascertained."

(8) ". . . present studies are sufficient to suggest that drinking itself, and particularly heavy drinking, is a contributor to a major fraction of all traffic fatalities . . . . The distinction between infrequent heavy drinking and chronic alcoholism is not clear . . . but present evidence is adequate to justify intensive investigation of alcoholism as a factor in fatal automobile accidents and of its treatment as a means of reducing the fatality rate."

(9) ". . . at present there is no evidence to demonstrate that a person with any set of specified psychological characteristics is more likely to have an automobile accident."

(10) "Although studies have shown that graduates of such (driver education) courses have better accident records, at least for the first few years, than those not taking the course, there is also evidence to indicate that the decision to take such a course is a self-selective process."

(11) "We have also found no substantive data on the effectiveness of general safety propaganda; the limited information available suggests that it is not particularly effective."

(12) "Research directed at pedestrians has been slight, relative to their proportion of total traffic accident fatalities. . . . Alcohol is a significant factor for pedestrians as well as it is for drivers."

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

(1) ". . . there has been more research into techniques for engineering safety into new or highly modified highways, as contrasted to techniques for improving the safety of existing highways and streets through minor changes."

(2) "Some British work has been carried to the point of estimating a rate of return, in terms of the reduction in accident loss for the capital invested, from the spot elimination of hazards in existing roads through realignment of the road and improvement in superelevation. These studies showed rates of return of from 15 per cent to 70 per cent per year."

(3) "Efforts in improved maintenance of shoulders, or to eliminate holes, ruts and bumps have not produced significant effects on road accident rates."

(4) "Skidding has emerged as a factor of major importance to the overall traffic safety problem, and the surface characteristic of principal concern appears to be the frictional properties of the road surface, both wet and dry."

(5) "Where land use considerations limit median strips to less than 50 feet, physical barriers must usually be used to provide a compromise between an increase in the accident rate due to the presence of the barrier itself and a decrease in fatality rate due to the prevention of head-on collisions."

(6) "A great variety of studies have established rather conclusively the effectiveness of a clear roadside in reducing the overall accident rate."

(7) "A few recent studies have been made of poles and sign supports designed to be crashworthy. More work should be devoted to this approach."

(8) "As with much of this information on accident factors, there is very little information on the cost and the effectiveness over the long term of the alternative treatments that can be provided for the road edge to reduce the hazards of highway transportation."

(9) "The contribution of artificial illumination has been quantified in a series of before and after trials, all of which indicate substantial reductions in accident and, more significantly, fatality rates after illumination (of any kind) is provided."

(10) Lane markings and edge markings appear to reduce the accident rate, although some measurements of before and after experience do not show clear differences."

(11) "The systems of warning and direction signs in use throughout the United States are known to have certain faults of design and placement. Such signs must be effective in communicating in the abnormal as well as the normal driving situation; with the inattentive as well as the alert driver; with the drinking as well as the sober driver; and in low as well as high visibility conditions."

(12) "Whether standardized signs, pictorialized or verbalized, are needed or whether the specialized requirements of different locations and conditions require special signing and signaling has not been firmly established."

(13) ". . . a particular design problem (is pointed to) in connection with the amber

light in a green-amber-red sequence, namely the dilemma faced by the driver who realizes he is unable to stop before the intersection or to clear the intersection before the red light."

(14) "A study by the Bureau of Public Roads suggests that the incidence of accidents is dependent less on speed and more on the difference between a vehicle's speed and that of the general traffic stream, be it positive or negative."

(15) "We have found no meaningful information of effects of such factors as one-way streets, turn restrictions at intersections, and vehicle type exclusions on traffic safety."

VEHICULAR FACTORS—INITIATION PHASE

(1) "The safety of a vehicle is strongly dependent upon the ability of the driver to control it properly and upon the manner in which he adapts to, and compensates for, various design characteristics. Safety research directed at vehicle design must include a strong man-machine element."

(2) "In headlighting, glare during passing seems the major problem. Several headlight systems are in use. All perform well within themselves but may not be adequate in opposition with each other. Misalignment can considerably degrade the operation of any headlighting system."

(3) "We have found no information to indicate the degree to which horns serve as a safety function."

(4) "Improvements in automobile safety in this 'dynamic control' area will require more and better engineering-psychological investigations into the man-machine control interface. Variable stability cars and similar devices, discussed in a preliminary manner in the literature, hold promise as tools for future investigation in this area."

(5) "Although there is no information available to indicate that vehicle failures play a major role in traffic accidents, there is also no information that shows that failures are only a minor problem. The role played by degraded performance is even more poorly understood."

(6) "One study found that of 494 randomly selected cars whose rear wheels only were inspected, 68 percent needed brake work. Many of the defects appeared to have decidedly serious safety implications. Unfortunately, there have been no adequate studies relating braking performance directly to accidents."

(7) "As with brakes, we have found no studies relating the performance and adhesion properties of tires to accidents. Data on the degree to which tire failures contribute to accidents are sparse and of dubious accuracy. Different studies have reported the fraction of accidents initiated by tire failure to be from 0.57 percent to 10 percent, the latter applying to turnpike accidents."

VEHICULAR FACTORS—IMPACT PHASE

(1) "Experimental crash tests have evolved to a sophisticated level with elaborate instrumentation providing a detailed record of events that occur. Unfortunately, this experimental work has not been adequately correlated with the investigation of accidents in which actual injuries occur."

(2) "Improvements to the crash-worthiness of motor vehicles are possible without a detailed understanding of the tolerances of various parts of the human body to injury. Nevertheless, long-term improvements, which must consider trade-offs among different types of injury, will require a knowledge of such tolerances. Although we have found useful data on the degree to which different vehicle components serve as injury agents, we have found only limited information on the changes in injury severity that could be expected from design changes to these components. This limited information is due in part to our presently poor understanding of injury tolerances."

(3) "Research to date on injury tolerances has shown them to be higher than thought several decades ago and that tolerances are highly variable from person to person. It has also provided some preliminary design guidelines for the engineering of better, more effective energy absorbing surfaces for the vehicle interior."

(4) "The degree to which the passenger compartment structure resists collapse and thereby contributes to the attenuation of occupant injuries is not well understood."

(5) "In 1960 Automotive Crash Injury Research of Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory estimated a 30 per cent reduction in injuries of the major-fatal type occurring to seat belt wearers. In 1963, the Road Research Laboratory of Great Britain reported a 51 per cent injury reduction."

(6) "Unfortunately, occupant motion during a collision is complex and only rudimentary information has been obtained concerning the frequency with which different parts of the interior are struck and the forces involved. Although even presently understood principles of good design are not observed as much as they warrant, more definitive information on the role of surfaces as injury agents is needed if the full potential of effective surface design is to be realized."

(7) "The preliminary work that has been done indicates that the attenuation of pedestrian injuries through vehicle design will be a difficult task."

(8) "Although studies in this area (motorcyclist protection) have generally been of a preliminary nature, they have been sufficient to indicate that existing crash helmets more than pay for their cost through the attenuation of head injuries."

LOSS-LIMITING FACTORS—POST ACCIDENT PHASE

(1) "It appears that the actions required to deal with these emergency situations have not been adequately considered in the development of operational tactics, in designing emergency vehicles, in positioning emergency facilities, and in training the personnel required to deal with these emergencies."

REGULATORY AND LEGAL FACTORS

(1) "We have not encountered any research demonstrating that any particular regulation has been a cause of accidents; there may well be such situations, but they have not attracted enough attention to justify formal investigation. We also have not found any research indicating that nonuniformity of laws among the states is a significant cause of accidents."

(2) ". . . all areas of safety engineering, such as road design and vehicle design, must deal with the question: 'How will the drunk react?'"

(3) "The regulatory control of drinking and driving in the United States is rather lax and the social climate does not seem to favor more stringent control. Further study of the successes and failures of foreign control programs would perhaps provide a better-grounded approach to control in the United States than is now possible."

(4) "If enforcement has any effect, it is believed to be through increasing the care with which people drive."

(5) "Studies now under way in the Interstate System may provide a rational basis for determining the amount of police supervision needed and the techniques to be used, on such highways. No comparable work on surveillance of urban traffic is known to be under way."

(6) "A variety of 'driver improvement' actions of a persuasive or educational character have been tried as means of correcting the driving habits of violators of motor vehicle regulations. Not one of these methods has proven successful."

(7) "The literature does not reveal any conclusive evidence suggesting that the age of first licensing should be increased, that applicants should be required to demonstrate higher degrees of driving proficiency or that personality tests should be used in determining whether or not to issue a driver's license."

(8) "Efforts to establish the value of compulsory vehicle inspection in terms of improved traffic safety have been inconclusive but do suggest that inspection is associated with a somewhat reduced fatality rate."

(9) "Efforts at improvement (of inspection systems) could well be guided by more extensive detailed accident investigation to determine just which vehicle defects contribute significantly to accidents, and by development of objective methods of inspection which rely less on the judgment and care of the individual."

(10) "The availability of automobile liability insurance and the method by which premiums for it are set do not seem to have any measurable effect on traffic safety as such, but the overhead cost of automobile insurance does have a major effect on the cost of accidents and on the entire cost of motor vehicle transportation. The excessive costs of insurance seem to be attributable to the fact that the 'fault' of one party to an accident must be demonstrated if the other party is to receive any compensation. It has been proposed that this system be changed so that any victim of an automobile accident would receive compensation for costs incurred (medical bills and wages lost because of personal injury) up to $10,000, regardless of fault. It is expected by the proponents of this proposal that the great majority of today's automobile litigation would thus be avoided and the legal administrative charges now paid through insurance premiums would be greatly reduced."

PROMETHEUS: BOUND OR UNBOUND?

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FARNSLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD a paper that was presented to the Helium Club of Louisville, Ky., on November 18, 1965, by Dean Richard L. Barber of the University of Louisville College of Arts and Sciences:

PROMETHEUS: BOUND OR UNBOUND?

(A paper presented to the Helium Club of Louisville, Ky., on November 18, 1965)

Although I knew that most of the papers prepared for this distinguished group are the product of months or even years of preparation, I must confess that this modest offering began as merely a title only a few weeks ago.

The atmosphere was one of stress and distraction, permeated by anxieties. The immediate focus of my concern was the Bond Issue yet to be presented to the voters of this city. Behind and surrounding this issue were the State's Bond Issue, the federal government's as yet unpassed Education Bill, and a general doubt about the immediate prospects of higher education's growth and expansion in our community, as related to all of these. In retrospect it is easy to brand these anxieties unfounded. At the time it was all too natural to think again of the fire-giving god of forethought, and to raise the question contained in my title, as a question regarding both forthcoming events and their meaning.

At least, it seemed natural to me. I have long thought that the legends of the Greeks are most illuminating. It is all right to call them 'myths', if we accord to mythology its full true functions and significance; it is even better if we realize that these legends are truly theological and philosophical, in basic and fundamental ways.

To review briefly this particular one, it is told in slightly variant forms in Hesiod, Homer, and Aeschylus that, well along in the development of the Olympic pantheon, Prometheus (forethought, intelligence) advised Zeus (the boss) in the decisions allocating to the other gods their various rights and privileges. Epimetheus (after-thought, experience) had the far lesser task of distributing abilities and organic capacities (sharp claws, fleet wings and legs, tall necks, strong jaws, and the like) to the many beasts of the natural world.

Mankind, already in existence, seems to have been both botched and neglected; no godly prerogatives remain, no animal skills or excellences are yet to be allocated. Zeus decides to obliterate the existing human species, and start a new one. But Prometheus, formidable and free Titan that he is, moved by true philanthropy, comprising both love and pity for man, decides to intervene: Not only does he rescue man from Zeus' intended destruction, he also has the effrontery to steal the prize of fire from Zeus' lightning bolts, and gives this priceless gift, the source of all human science and technology, to man. Zeus is outraged, jealous and vindictive. He orders Prometheus to be impaled upon a crag at the end of the world. The order is carried out by Hephaestus, the divine keeper of the forge, aided by two abstract semideities named Might (Kratos, The Controller) and Force (Bia, The Executive), and a very junior god named the Deputy (Hermes, Mercury).

It is at this point that the Greek Choral Masque entitled *Prometheus Bound* begins. It was composed by Aeschylus of Athens in the first third of the 5th century before Christ, and first performed in Athens around 466 B.C. It is believed to be the second part of a trilogy, the first being entitled *Prometheus, The Firegiver*, now lost in its entirety; the third "play" was entitled *Prometheus Unbound*, and some fragments of it are extant, indicating it to be also a series of episodes or pageant scenes in which symbolic figures appear, speak and depart without engaging in dramatic action of the sort expected by modern play-goers, and indeed found in many Greek tragedies and comedies. I hope, however, that I shall be able to convey to you in this brief paper some of the depth and moving qualities to be discovered in this masterful work. It is complex beyond belief, and unceasingly rewarding to the reader who reflects upon its meanings.

To return briefly to the events lying in the background of Aeschylus' tragedy, the rage of Zeus at Prometheus' theft in behalf of man is not satisfied by the crucifixion of this titanic thief. Man, too, must pay for his acquisition of the god-like powers of knowledge and technology. The Olympic gods are summoned to give some of their superficially attractive qualities to a new creation, Pandora ("all-gifted"); particularly endowed with grace, beauty, desire and wasting passion, but even more with shamelessness and deceit in her heart and soul, she is sent to mankind as Zeus' Revenge, as the instrument of his curse:

"For fire, I will give them an evil thing, in which they shall rejoice but embrace their own doom".

Also, for good measure, Zeus hides from mankind his previous livelihood, his bread and shelter, so that man must now work every day (prior to this, one day per year would suffice). He (Zeus) actually manages to hide the fire from man again, but only temporarily, for Prometheus steals it a second time, hiding it this time in a hollow reed (education).

Pandora is delivered to Epimetheus (afterthought, or the "After-Thinker") who characteristically accepts her uncritically on behalf of mankind. Once in the human fold she releases the "ten-thousand" evils from her infamous jar or box, keeping only Hope under its lid. As "sheer delusion inescapable" she becomes the prototype of all Womanhood, sitting at home and consuming the substance and livelihood earned by man's labors, and making certain that no man will ever be really happy with her or without her. So it is demonstrated that none may evade the will of Zeus, the Boss. Prometheus, the god, pays for loving and pitying man, first by being impaled, his liver repeatedly eaten out by an eagle, and ultimately he is plunged into the abyss of chaos; man must labor to endure, but still will eventually destroy himself with the ill-gotten and unmanageable products of this science; poor Pandora, herself but an unknowing and unwilling instrument of Zeus' wrath, must keep man plodding in weariness and frustration along the rocky road to his inevitable self-destruction.

A moment must be taken to compare this with the Hebraic-Christian account of the creation of man and woman in a state of bliss, and of their fall. The more striking similarities and differences gives us deep insights into the self-conceptions or philosophical anthropologies of these two cultures. Two preliminary observations: No literary or historical connections are believed to exist between these two legends, and certainly none is known. A second small but important point: The word "religion" as we understand it and have inherited it from our Hebraic-Christian tradition "cannot even be translated into Greek" in the judgment of classical scholars. Cult, practice, ceremonial devotions, recreative and enjoyable acts bringing a sense of security, relief or beauty—these the Greeks knew, as spiritual feeling. But religious *beliefs*, convictions, dogma, orthodoxy—these are from our Hebraic heritage alone. What interested the Greeks was the nature of man; they gave us naturalistic humanism, scientific humanism, tragic humanism, even anti-humanism. The Jews gave us super-naturalism, and our lively sense of sin—another word not found in the Greek.

Jehovah, then, ultimate and primal, started with nothing (else), and created Heaven and earth, firmament, ocean, land, provident nature, man, all in six days, seeing each day's work to be *good*. A vital factor. After resting on the seventh day, he invented rain, early in the second week, and then planted the Garden of Eden. Adam He put into the garden "to dress it and to keep it", and to enjoy every tree in it but *two*—one named "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil". While alone, Adam didn't deviate. But God thought Adam lonely, and so offered all the beasts of the field and fowls of the air as possible help meets; but Adam, while happy to have them all, did not find any of them really appropriate as a help meet. So God took a rib from Adam after putting him into *deep sleep*, and from the rib made Woman, as yet un-named. The serpent, most subtle of beasts persuaded Woman that surely God did not mean it when He said that death was the penalty for eating the fruit of the forbidden tree—He just wanted to keep man from being as gods, and knowing good and evil. So she ate, disobediently, and she gave to Adam, and he ate, and their eyes were opened, and they knew good and evil. But instead of being like gods, they found they were naked, and ashamed, and afraid. And God came by, and said Where *art* thou. Well, said Adam, after coming out of hiding, This Woman You gave me, she gave me the fruit, and I ate it. And the Woman said, this serpent beguiled me; and so God sent the serpent to slink always on his belly and eat dust, and be at war with woman; woman He made to sorrow and suffer, subordinate to man. Man He condemned to go on eating of the *self-same tree* in sorrow all the days of his life, and to sweat in labor among thorn and thistle just to eat bread, where he had once had all that fruit without a moment's work. As God drove Adam and the Woman (just now named Eve) from the Garden, he posted Cherubims with *flaming swords* turned every way, to prevent any human from ever eating of the *second* tree, the tree of life, immortal and eternal life!

I recount this in some detail, despite its presumed familiarity, for two reasons. It's a beautiful story, *and* almost nobody really remembers it accurately. Accurately enough, that is, to draw the available insights or make any revealing comparisons.

Both of these statements obviously project human feelings onto a cosmic stage, both try to make sense of a world view which is held, however unconsciously or consciously, by those who first invented the legends and then by those who remember and repeat them, and, finally, record them in writing and read them. They have endured because they are meaningful, because they fill some vital need. The second is of course the first 3 chapters of the Book of Genesis, and has a status in our culture ranging from that of a tale of vague familiarity to that of an object of literal belief. The Greek story is named legend, myth, fable, or some such; few of us are familiar with it in any detail. Both accounts reflect a deep sense of resentment and distrust, especially directed at a world which demands work, especially agricultural work. Both show the masculine mind of a patriarchal society, disgusted and disillusioned by the consequences of sexual passion, the burdens, the obligations, the difficult or impossible adjustments required by man's hostages to fortune. Both, on a more abstract and subtle plane, show grave doubts of man's ability to plan ahead, to think and know; he may essay to know, but he must prepare to suffer on account of his knowledge, or even perish.

But the differences are just as great and just as significant. Adam is given everything, and commanded but one virtue or restraint, much as a mere sign or formal symbol of obedience and gratitude. He is tempted to disobey, and he sins, thus setting the scene for the redemption and salvation of fallen man in cosmic time. The good for man is seen as obedience to the will of God (He is just, merciful, omniscient, omnipotent, and benevolent, but man is still free to disobey) and evil is the *absence* of the will to obey, as it is also the will to disobey. Woman is God's well-intended gift, and it's no one's fault that the gift goes sour, except maybe the serpent's. Man's punishment for sin is to continue to know how naked he is, to suffer on account of this knowledge, and to work to live. The Christian advent brings climactic hope to this austere scene, and it must be remembered that *men* crucified Christ although he gave his own human life to save mankind through faith in Him. Thus viewed, a loving God has given a second chance to a world which generally failed to believe in a God of power (i.e., Judaism has continued to be a minority view in the cultures and nations of the world).

How different the human and theological implications of the Greek account! Here, Man is given nothing; it's all been handed out before anyone even thinks of him. He's about to be scrapped, and a new model designed. The saving strength is that of *practical* intelligence, of utilitarian, problem-solving skills; the Greeks saw no gulf between theory and practice such as we attribute; no intrinsic evil is found in such knowledge. but a jealous and vindictive boss-architect-commanding officer, Zeus, attaches a fatal penalty extrinsically, and gives man Pandora to make sure the penalty sticks, and to give man untold additional misery to boot. Prometheus, a Titan who is eons older than Zeus, not an incarnate son, is punished *by* Zeus for saving man from destruction right there and then, and for giving man the ambivalent gift of self-destruction through knowledge.

As we look at our own world and day, and try to make sense of what we see, which of these philosophies of history is meaningful? When Prometheus says:

> "Let me rather
> Relate to you the tragedy of man:
> How from the silly creature that he was
> I made him conscious and intelligent."

and then goes on to suffer the 15 episodes of Aeschylus' classic tragedy, can we see a metaphorical embodiment of the unending struggle between intelligence and power that is evident in the human alienations and civil wars within our culture? Is it the Greek tragic humanistic view, or the Jewish account of sinfully disobedient man, that best explains the modern anxieties arising when we think about nuclear holocaust, radio-active fallout, air pollution, water contamination, despoiling of natural resources, overpopulation, communist aggression, draft-card burners, guitar despoilers, and such problems and perplexities?

Which way can man most helpfully turn when his knowledge of the components of the microcosmic realm shows him truly ignorant of the constituents of his environment and of himself? When his macrocosmic investigations tell him that his earthbound dimensions of spatial extent and temporal duration are of so little moment in an infinitely expanding or exploding universe that meaningful comparison is literally impossible—that the atomizing of this globe, if he does manage to bring it off, would be less in the cosmic balance than the blowing of a speck of dust from the tail of a sleeping elephant?

When we look at the divisive and often purposeless wars of our own century, when we find no evidence of forethought or intelligent planning in many social, political and economic areas; when we find that a large segment of our population actually repudiates intelligence, prefers power or the short-run push, is deeply suspicious of plans and planners, which account of the origins and perils of human intelligence makes the greater sense?

Are we sure of the eventual triumph of intelligence over power, which Aeschylus celebrates in *Prometheus Unbound*, according to the fragments and references that remain? The delivery of Prometheus, by the way, is not a total humiliation of Zeus, the boss. The Deliverer is Zeus' own son, Heracles, and the secret knowledge of the Forethinker has meanwhile served to help the Power-god avoid a disastrous alliance. What has especially saved Prometheus from destruction is endurance, patience *with* intelligence.

Are we, on the other hand, sure of the eventual triumph of good will over evil, of piety over temptation, of our own salvation? If we are destroyed will we think it has been by our own hand, or by God's? Will it be, we think, the runaway disaster of a body of material technology without a statecraft or social understanding able to contain and direct it (just as Zeus' curse predicted)? Or will we see ourselves as justly punished disobedient children of a just and loving Father-God who gave us every chance, until his patience was exhausted and his sustaining grace removed?

What does it matter, you may ask. If we're gone, we're gone, and who really cares why or how? But answer is that we may not really have to go at all, and our staying power may well be a direct function of our self-concept, of the cultural myth we find most meaningful as a root metaphor to explain our humanity and our role in a world of stern necessity, a world where like effects inexorably follow from like causes, except for accountable and reasonable differences.

If our role is truly Promethean, if we mean to go on thinking ahead to consequences before they are upon us, if we really believe in the ultimate victory of intelligence over power, if we have the patience and endurance to survive and persist until that victory is won, on intelligence's own terms, then I think we have a reasonably good chance.

RICHARD L. BARBER.

LOUISVILLE, KY.

THIS IS WASHINGTON

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FARNSLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD the fifth and sixth articles of the series based on a Harris survey entitled "This is Washington" which appeared in the Washington Post recently:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 6, 1966]

THIS IS WASHINGTON—V: NEGROES OPTIMISTIC, BUT REMAIN MILITANT

The mood of the Negro in Washington is optimistic for the future—but tough and militant for the present.

Nearly two of every three Negroes here feel Washington has done a better job than most other places in handling civil rights.

But Washington's Negroes are determined to press their cause for equal rights. Most want to follow peaceful, non-violent means. Yet there is a strong sentiment to switch to bolder tactics of protest to make things happen if they don't come fast enough.

And under the optimism for the future runs a strong undercurrent of discontent over slum housing, law enforcement, jobs and poverty, de facto segregated schools, installment gouging, and the indignities of subtle discrimination when you are deliberately ignored by a store clerk or a waitress.

This reading of the temper of the Negro community comes from a cross-section of Negroes interviewed during a survey made by Louis Harris and Associates for The Washington *Post*.

These were some of the responses:

Nearly two-thirds feel that a Negro has a better chance to get a job for which he is qualified in Washington than in other big cities. Half think he has more chances for an equal break on promotions.

The big majority feel things will improve in the next few years. One reason is that the Federal Government builds pushes progress by its presence in the Nation's Capital.

In housing, less than half (46 per cent) think the situation is better in Washington compared to other big cities. But, again, most look for some improvement in the next few years.

BETTER CHANCE HERE?

Less than half of Washington's Negroes think they have any better chance of getting their children educated with white children (49 per cent), making friends with whites (36 per cent), or getting fair treatment in installment buying (39 per cent).

In the end, only half feel that they can live like everyone else—better in Washington than elsewhere in the country.

Four of five Negroes profess their belief in non-violence.

But at the same time, the trend seems to be to more militant tactics in the push for civil rights. Only a third say they would march in demonstrations. "What good have they done?" asked one 17-year-old. But more than half would sit-in or picket a store. And more than four in 10 would go to jail (although only 4 per cent have). There seems to be little support for store boycotts.

ACTIVE PARTICIPANTS

Washington Negroes have participated in civil rights demonstrations more than Negroes in other cities across the country. The 29 per cent who have marched in demonstrations is more than double the national average—but this probably is due in part to the March on Washington, which drew 200,000 to the Lincoln Memorial in 1963.

Negro participation

[In percent]

	Washington		National	
	Have	Would	Have	Would
Demonstrations	29	34	12	54
Sit-ins	9	59	10	52
Picket store	8	54	7	59
Go to jail	4	43	3	45

While Washington Negroes have hopes for a better future, this doesn't help their dissatisfactions with the way things are here and now. And if Negroes feel things are moving, they still don't believe they are moving fast enough to make up for time lost in long years of discrimination and segregation.

"Well, it's better in the District than it is in Mississippi or Alabama, but there is a heck of a lot of room for improvement," says housewife Millicent Brady of 223 Orange St. se.

THROW SOME BRICKS

"Poor people's only way to get attention is to throw a couple of bricks," says Collins Murray, who works in a brickyard.

And an 18-year-old Negro girl put it this way:

"If the cops don't give better treatment and if the kids don't get jobs—they don't have anything else to do—it could break out into riots."

Public opinion analyst Harris detected an "almost euphoric" feeling among Negroes in Washington. But that could quickly pass, he feels, if the gap between promise and performance doesn't close fast enough.

"Negroes are pleased because of the attention they are getting," he says. "They aren't questioning the results—yet."

HOUSING A KEY ISSUE

Harris thinks that a good part of Negro dissatisfaction centers on bad housing. And if substantial numbers feel Washington offers fairer treatment to Negroes than many other cities, there are also sizable minorities who don't see it that way.

More than a third feel their job chances are worse or no different here. A half don't think there is more opportunity for integrated education for their children. And nearly half feel they don't have an equal chance at promotion or getting good wages.

Also, the sting of the subtler form of discrimination shows in the number of Negroes who still feel they don't get equal treatment in restaurants, hotels, and public accommodations more than a decade after formal racial bars were wiped out in the District.

"At clothing stores, clerks tell you merchandise is not for sale . . . You don't get much attention," complains a 60-year-old Negro cement mason.

GAP IN THINKING

Whites tend to think that Negroes have it much better than the Negroes think they do.

For example, nearly nine in 10 whites think Negroes have a better break at jobs in Washington than elsewhere. This disparity in thinking between the two races is reflected in every area. When it comes to installment buying, however, nearly half the whites say Negroes don't get a fairer shake here than elsewhere.

"Things aren't that bad for Negroes in the District," commented a white Government scientist who earns more than $15,000 a year and lives in Annandale, Va.

When it comes to civil rights groups, Washington Negroes tend to stick to the old-line organizations and lean to the moderates over the militants. They are overwhelming in their rejection of the Black Muslims.

Washingtonians were asked whether they thought various groups had been helpful or harmful to the cause of civil rights. These are the results compared with national figures:

	Helpful	Harmful	Not sure	U.S. helpful
NAACP	87	1	12	81
SCLC	74	1	25	57
Urban League	67	1	32	50
CORE	62	4	34	60
SNCC	43	7	50	44
Coalition of Conscience	34	3	63	--------
ACT	26	6	68	--------
Black Muslims	9	57	34	10

But there are Negroes who dissent from this favorable report on most civil rights groups.

"These groups haven't done a darn thing for me," the wife of a janitor said bitterly. "Negro rights for what?"

And the Negro mood can only be a rough composite of the views of many individuals. A retired, part-time Negro handyman who earns less than $3000 said he would not demonstrate, march, boycott or picket because everybody's been OK to me."

"I've always tended to my own business and never had any trouble," he said. The trouble comes from young punks running around and loafing. If young men want to hang around after they've done an honest day's work, that's OK because they're too tired to get into any trouble."

Washington Negroes count more on the President and the courts than on Congress in their fight for equal rights.

Implicit in these results seems to be a general Negro distrust of the congressional role in the District. The No. 1 villains to Negroes are Senator Robert C. Byrd, Democrat of West Virginia, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee for the District, and Representative John L. McMillan, Democrat of South Carolina, chairman of the House District Committee.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 7, 1966]

This Is Washington—VI: Area Racial Tolerance Similar to Rest of Nation

Whites in Washington are no less—or no more—enlightened in their feelings about Negroes than the Nation as a whole.

The average white man or woman here does not mind working next to a Negro, sitting next to him on a bus or at a lunch counter, having his children go to school with Negroes, or using the same restroom.

He is far less enthusiastic about having a Negro at his supper table or as a next-door neighbor (although more than half say they would not object). He overwhelmingly disapproves of interracial dating or marrying.

In a survey of public attitudes in the Washington area, interviewers for Louis Harris and Associates asked a cross-section of whites this question: "I want to read off a list of things about coming into contact with Negroes. For each, I wish you would tell me if you might or might not object to . . .

This is what the responses show:

Nearly 3 of 5 whites in the area indicated they believe in integrated housing—that is, they said they might not object to having a Negro family as a next-door neighbor.

A little more than half (54 per cent) said they might not object if their son or daughter brought a Negro playmate home for supper.

Nearly 4 of 5 said they had no objections to their children attending integrated classes in school.

The reverse also is true if you want to put things in the negative: 2 of 5 whites might object to a Negro living next-door, 1 in 5 do not want their children going to school with Negroes, and nearly a fifth still balk at such a commonplace as sitting next to a Negro in the movies.

Louis Harris, the public opinion analyst who has made surveys of racial attitudes, feels the area study deflates the "myth that Washington whites have a white Southern outlook." The Washington attitudes follow national averages rather than the much higher Southern negatives on race relations, as shown in this table:

White attitudes

[In percent]

Might object to—	Sitting next to Negro—			Own children going to school with Negro	Using same restroom	Trying on same clothes	Own child bringing Negro home to supper	Negro neighbor next door	Close friend or relative marrying Negro	Teenage daughter dating Negro	Teenage son dating Negro
	At lunch counter	On a bus	In a movie								
National	16	16	20	--------	21	28	38	46	79	88	88
Washington area	14	9	19	21	22	27	46	41	80	88	88
District	7	5	11	18	10	20	28	22	67	75	76
Prince Georges	22	15	31	32	36	37	64	52	86	94	94
Montgomery	11	7	15	11	16	24	33	33	80	87	86
Arlington	14	7	15	22	20	24	51	53	83	93	90
Fairfax	14	7	21	22	23	29	40	49	84	90	92
Under 35	13	11	20	18	18	23	44	38	77	85	85
35 to 49	13	10	20	21	21	23	42	39	75	87	87
50 plus	16	10	19	24	26	35	52	39	92	93	92
Under $8,000	19	7	21	24	25	35	53	48	86	92	91
$8,000 to $15,000	14	8	19	21	22	22	45	43	74	88	89
Over $15,000	8	8	12	13	16	24	31	42	72	83	83
Women	14	7	20	19	24	29	44	36	84	89	89
Men	14	9	18	23	26	25	48	40	77	88	88

The question of white attitudes on integrated housing has become a hot issue in both state and national politics.

AWARE OF BACKLASH

In the Senate, the civil rights bill of 1966, with its limited open-housing provision, has gone down to defeat. In current congressional campaigns, even Northern liberals are showing they are painfully aware of the possibility of white-voter backlash to recent civil rights marches for open housing. In Maryland, perennial candidate George P. Mahoney finally won a close victory in the Democratic gubernatorial primary on the one plank that a man's house is his castle.

In Washington's Maryland suburb of Prince George's County, more than half the people (52 per cent) indicated they opposed housing integration when asked for their views during the Post-Harris survey.

On all questions dealing with race relations, Prince George's consistently offers the least tolerance in the Washington area. Arlington and Fairfax are not too far behind in expressing reservations on race.

Nearly one-third of the residents of Prince George's do not like sitting next to a Negro in a movie. The same number do not want their children to attend integrated schools and nearly two-thirds say a Negro playmate of their children would be an unwanted guest at the supper table.

A retired machinist who lives in the County said he did not particularly mind sitting next to Negroes at a lunch counter "but it is those low-class dirty ones that I object to."

A RACIAL LIBERAL

The higher the income and the younger, the more likely that a person will be a racial liberal.

Less than one third of the whites earning over $15,000 voice objections to their children coming home with a Negro friend for supper. This becomes a majority (53 per cent) among those earning under $8000.

Hostility to the Negro push for equal rights runs deepest among poor whites with low incomes and less education.

They are the ones most likely to find themselves in direct competition for jobs with Negroes. They also are the ones whose neighborhoods are most immediately threatened by Negro moves. And they are most likely to be on the front lines when ghetto violence breaks out near their neighborhoods.

The Negroes they see are most likely to be society's derelicts, the ones who did not make it and settle to the bottom of the ghetto as drunks, dope addicts, and front-stoop loafers.

"HOLD THE LINE"

A part-time painter in Alexandria said he might not object to having a Negro neighbor ("since I already do") but he was not sure whether he would like a son or daughter to bring a Negro friend home for supper.

"I hold the line where I can," he added. "The rich liberals can afford their tolerance since they only see the best Negroes."

Whites in the District of Columbia—many in the higher-income brackets—are the most tolerant group in the Washington area. Well-paid Montgomery County almost matches the District in racial moderation.

Only little more than a fifth (22 per cent) of District whites say they might object to a Negro neighbor (compared with 41 per cent for the area).

ON DATING, MARRYING

Unsurprisingly, the strongest negatives come to questions on interracial dating and marrying.

An overwhelming majority of whites (88 per cent) might object to a teenage son or daughter dating a Negro (75 per cent in the District). Four in five disapprove of a close friend or relative marrying a Negro (67 per cent in the District).

Most of the white people of Washington seem sincerely worried about race problems. Many also show they are troubled in conscience about their feelings toward Negroes.

A young Arlington man had a Negro visitor when the survey interviewer came to call. He asked to fill out his attitude sheet himself rather than answer verbally in front of his Negro guest. He answered honestly. He was not sure how he would feel if a close friend or relative married a Negro and might oppose a son or daughter's dating of a Negro.

Whites are frightened of the prospect of racial violence. Many see riots rooted in misery but still condemn violence in the streets and see no remedy there.

THE TWO MOODS

"There's a white mood as well as a Negro mood," noted one white man, whose answers indicated that he was a racial moderate.

How the two races view each other is extremely important in Washington, the first major American city to have a majority population of Negroes.

THIS IS WASHINGTON

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FARNSLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD the ninth and tenth articles of the series that recently appeared in the Washington Post entitled "This is Washington."

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 10, 1966]

THIS IS WASHINGTON—IX: NEGROES HAVE DOUBTS ABOUT JUSTICE, PARTICULARLY IF THEY ARE CONCERNED

Negroes have serious doubts that justice is being served in Washington, at least when it comes to them.

These doubts were pointed up in their answers to questions about police, jails and courts in the Louis Harris survey for The Washington Post.

Here are some of the findings:

More than a third of Negroes here don't think Washington has done a good job in efforts to erase what they call police brutality. In fact, they call it a "poor example."

A majority of Negroes also feel Washington is no model for treating jail prisoners fairly.

"Courts are prejudiced" is the main reason given by the majority of Negroes who think that Washington is a bad example for the Nation in the administration of justice.

Whites in the District also have some misgivings about justice, prisons and police conduct in Washington but with nowhere near the intensity of feeling that Negroes express.

Most whites see the District as a good example for eradicating police brutality and giving fair treatment to prisoners in jail. They are less confident about justice in the courts, with more than a third rating the District as a poor example. Nearly a fifth mention prejudice. But there are two other reasons cited more often by whites: "Courts are too slow" and, from another point of view, "criminals get off too easy."

Here is a breakdown of the answers on whether the District sets a good example in:

	Negro	District of Columbia whites
Eliminating police brutality:		
Good	43	48
Poor	36	17
Not sure	21	35
Treat prisoners fairly:		
Good	23	35
Poor	29	17
Not sure	48	48
Administration of justice:		
Good	36	45
Poor	41	38
Not sure	23	17

The number of people in the District who have had direct experience with the police was found to be "rather high" by Harris, a specialist in public opinion analysis.

More than 1 in 3 Negroes in Washington report that they have been stopped on the street by police. One in 4 has been arrested. Police have searched 1 in 20 houses of Washington Negroes.

For District whites, the rates are lower but are still higher than in the rest of the Metropolitan Area.

More than 1 in 4 District whites (27 per cent) have been stopped on the street by a policeman. The arrest record is about 1 in 7.

In Arlington County, 1 in 11 white has been stopped by police. The highest suburban figure (about 1 in 6) is in Fairfax.

And the richer the person is—whether Negro or white—the more likely he is to have been stopped. The poorest Negroes have been stopped less often (but arrested more) than those earning more than $8,000.

Part of the reason for the District's police activity probably is the fact that it is the urban center of the Metropolitan Area with city streets and businesses to attract crime—with resultant police vigilance. Whatever the reason, far more District residents have had experiences with police than have suburbanites.

The survey interviewers noted that the white respondents frequently were puzzled by the question: "Have you ever been stopped by a policeman on the streets?"

Many wanted to know if this meant a traffic ticket. (The question covered traffic but not parking.) But Negroes, the interviewers found, didn't have to ask. They seemed to accept the question as a natural one—that they would know about being stopped by police on the street without necessarily thinking of a traffic ticket.

Here is the pattern of police activity in the Washington area:

	Stopped by police	House been searched	Been arrested
Total Negro	34	5	23
Total white	16	2	7
District	27	3	15
Prince Georges	14	4	6
Montgomery	11	1	5
Arlington	9	1	3
Fairfax	17	1	5

Police-Negro relations are the most explosive area in race relations. The roots and causes of Negro frustrations go much deeper but a surface incident with police has been the spark to set off most of the ghetto uprisings in Northern cities this summer. Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY has referred to the "crisis of confidence" between the police and the community.

Harris finds it disturbing for the community that so many Negroes are dissatisfied with police conduct.

"The reliability of the police is something that should be taken for granted, like the fire department or water works," he says. "Something is wrong when more than a third of the Negroes are asking questions about police conduct."

Undoubtedly, whites and Negroes start out with different ways of thinking about police.

If a white man gets heavyhanded treatment, he probably will conclude that the policeman was knuckleheaded and a frustrated tyrant in unform and let it go at that with a few favorite epithets.

But if a Negro thinks that he has been manhandled, he is likely to chalk it up as another example of oppression and the injustice of the white man's law.

For if it is true that whites tend to view District crimes as Negro crime, then it is equally true that Negroes tend to view the law as the white man's law.

Here is the view of a 52-year-old Negro pullman porter:

"If the white man said the Negro did it—he did. They'll take the policeman's word every time. You can't stand on the corner and make conversation. It's move on, move on."

Another middle-aged Negro man thinks "police believe in roughing up poor people." He himself has been arrested and was treated fairly. But he still believes there is police brutality.

Many of the Negros' answers show that acts of humiliation—rather than physical brute force—have stirred up much of the resentment toward police among Negroes.

"Cops lack respect for Negro people and show it," said one Federal employe who is a college graduate.

Van Vranken S. Mathews, a 33-year-old playground supervisor, said:

"The police have to use diplomacy with people. Many Negroes are frustrated and resentful and if officers don't use diplomacy, they are going to strike back."

Of the people who have been arrested, nearly one third in the area don't think they were treated fairly. For Negroes, the figure rises to two of five.

Negroes want more police protection and stricter enforcement of the law. But, at the same time, they have many complaints about police brutality, jail treatment and court justice.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 10, 1966]

THE HARRIS SURVEY: BLACK POWER AND RIOTING INCREASE WHITE BACKLASH ACROSS THE NATION

(By Louis Harris)

An increased white backlash against the civil rights movement has appeared across the United States in both the North and the South. It seems from the fear whites have for their personal safety as a result of the continuing riots and from the stepped up Negro demands for integrated housing, the sorest point in race relations.

Eight out of ten white people feel that black power is hurting the cause of civil rights. They look on black power as an incitement to violence which is rapidly undoing much civil rights progress.

Reaction to the rioting and heightened militancy by civil rights advocates is sharper and more extreme among low-income whites. Only 15 percent of them feel sympathetic to the Negro cause.

Low-income whites are traditionally Democratic Party voters. And many of them are contemplating leaving their Party in this fall's off-year elections over the issue of civil rights.

Whites tend to feel the impact of the riots in a highly personal way. A cross-section of white voters was asked:

"Does the fear of racial violence make you feel personally more uneasy on the streets or not?"

[In percent]

	Total whites	Big cities
Make me feel uneasy	43	59
Don't feel uneasy	50	38
Not sure	7	3

The cross-section of whites also was asked:

"In your opinion, do you feel that the slogan black power is helping or hurting the cause of Negro civil rights?"

	Percent
Hurts Negro cause	77
Helps Negro cause	5
Not sure	18

When asked why they felt the black power slogan is hurting the cause. Here are the main reason volunteered by white people:

Leads to violence.
Makes me angry.
Undoing all the good.
Misrepresents Negro feeling.
Negroes want something for nothing.
Hurts peaceful demonstrations.
Boosts rowdy element.
Proves Communists behind it.

As a consequence, when whites were asked what they thought of Negro demonstrations for civil rights, the vast majority expressed an overwhelming negative reaction:

[In percent]

	Hurt Negro cause	Help Negro cause
October 1966	85	15
June 1966	69	31
June 1963	49	51

The white majority in America is opposed to open housing legislation, and the division by upper and lower income whites is dramatic:

Open housing
[In percent]

	Favor	Oppose
Total whites	49	51
Low income	31	69
Upper income	61	39

It is argued, of course, that Negroes want to move into precisely those neighborhoods where low-income whites now reside. Upper-income white neighborhoods are relatively immune from extensive integrated housing because most Negroes cannot afford to move there.

But the reaction to Negro demands for integration in housing along with increased tensions over rioting and cries of black power make the impact at the polls next month inescapable.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 11, 1966]

THIS IS WASHINGTON—X: JOBS, BIG-CITY AURA

TOP DISTRICT'S APPEAL

Washington is the Nation's Capital. It is also, the home of 2.5 million people, the place where they work, raise their families and center their lives.

Here they get up each morning, take the bus or drive to the office, send the kids off to school, buy homes, shop, tend lawns, and go out for an evening of entertainment.

How do they feel about their home town as a place to live?

A good index to how people feel comes when they are asked what they like and dislike the most about a place. In a survey for The Washington Post by Louis Harris & Associates, a cross-section of 1500 area residents answered that question.

The main finding: Washingtonians think more positively than do residents of other big cities.

The bigger the city, the longer the list of dislikes, public opinion analyst Harris has found. In small towns, people talk first and most about what they like about living there. Perhaps there isn't too much to dislike.

In Washington, interviewers found people generally have more likes and fewer dislikes than other big-city dwellers. And they speak rather optimistically of hopes that Washington will be a still more pleasant, entertaining, comfortable and interesting place in which to live in the future.

But they don't kid themselves. Washington has problems, plenty of them and big ones, as the list of dissatisfactions shows. People have doubts that some things—particularly street traffic, crimes and living costs—will ever get better even after getting worse.

More than one of every four whites living here like Washington because it is "a big city that has nearly everything." Shopping and good schools also rate high with white families (who live largely in the suburbs).

For the Negroes, jobs (23 per cent) and "nice people" (22 per cent) are the big positives about Washington living, followed by neighborhoods and schools.

Both Negroes and whites get upset about crime in the streets and vandalism. White people also dislike intensely traffic and the crowding city. Negroes worry more about high rents and living costs than do whites.

Problems of race—"mixed neighborhoods" and "too many Negroes"—came out relatively low on the roster of dislikes.

These are the things area residents like most about Washington:

NEGROES

1. Jobs.
2. Nice people
3. Good neighborhoods
4. Good schools

WHITES

1. Washington has everything, big city
2. Good shopping, jobs.
3. Good schools, nice people

And these are the things they dislike:

NEGROES

1. Streets not safe, vandalism
2. High rents
3. High cost of living
4. People not friendly

WHITES

1. Traffic
2. City too crowded
3. Streets not safe, vandalism.
4. High cost of living
5. People not friendly

Feelings about Washington sometimes depend on which way the wind is blowing.

About all that an Air Force master sergeant dislikes about living in Forest Heights, Md., is that "three or four times a year you can smell this fertilizer plant, depending on the wind."

From a bachelor's point of view, things are pretty good. A 21-year-old Negro likes Washington because "I can party"—but he doesn't like the early closing hours for bars and restaurants (they close at 2 a.m. every day except Saturday, when bars close at midnight).

Asked what she liked about the Washington area, Mrs. Spero Siadys, of 6204 58th ave., Riverdale, Md., wife of a railroad car repairman, thought and then replied: "I couldn't say. I'm just in a rut. I've been living here all my life."

On a whole, it seems quite a few people would be supremely happy if only Washington could be moved nearer the Atlantic Ocean and beaches. This is the thing they want most that they can't find here.

"There is no ocean beach" is the one reason that Carol Ratner, wife of a physicist, gave for misgivings over moving to Arlington from California a few years ago.

Here is a list of things area people like most but can't find here:

1. Swimming, boating, beaches.
2. Good, safe parks.
3. Live theater.
4. Good music, jazz.
5. Good supper clubs.
6. Youth centers, playgrounds.

If they want more theater, concerts and night life, quite a few people still don't find Washington a cultural void.

After living here a year, Diana Tancill, a young housewife in Arlington, found "so many cultural activities that cost little or no money."

But others feel Washington is a cultural hick town. One 49-year-old woman in the District complained that she couldn't find many hillbilly concerts.

Washington certainly is not the vibrant, turned-on city that is New York or San Francisco. It doesn't have the glow and liveliness of the great European capitals, which lead well-rounded lives as commercial and cultural centers as well as political capitals.

Detractors can scoff at Washington's night life and "unenlightened" bar hours. Even its supporters concede they would like more live theater, music, supper clubs, and a winning football or baseball team once in a while.

But the Capital City does have its compensations for those who live here: The breathing space of generous greenswards, no industrial odors, an intriguing mixture of urbanity and provincialism and the excitement of being where the public action is.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct a statement which I made in the course of the debate on October 18. At that time I inadvertently said that the information which the Director reported to the committee about Dr. Stamler was a summary of information in the committee files and what investigators and the FBI had reported to the committee. What I intended to say was that it was a summary of information in the committee's files and of what investigators and FBI informants had reported to the committee.

SOUTH-WEST AFRICA

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, last week Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg made a statement of the utmost importance before the Assembly of the United Nations on the subject of South-West Africa.

Ambassador Goldberg and the administration are to be congratulated on this major advance by the United States in recognizing the importance of upholding international law and equity in regard to the mandated territory of South-West Africa. Ambassador Goldberg's address was noteworthy particularly, first, in its statement that "by virtue of the breach of its obligations and its disavowal of the mandate, South Africa forfeits all right to continue to administer the Territory of South-West Africa," and second, in the announcement that the United States "would be glad to serve" on a United Nations Commission for South-West Africa which would "recommend means by which an administration for South-West Africa can be set up which will enable the people of the Territory to exercise their right of self-determination."

I hope that the African member States at the United Nations will fully appreciate the significance of this new U.S. commitment and will agree on the terms of a new United Nations resolution that the United States can support.

The situation in all of southern Africa is one of great danger to the peace of the world. If a serious explosion is to be avoided, it is essential that the great powers at the United Nations work hand in hand with the African States. The statesmanlike posture now presented in Ambassador Goldberg's address should make this possible.

The address follows:

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS, IN PLENARY SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON THE QUESTION OF SOUTH-WEST AFRICA, OCTOBER 12, 1966

We of the United States Delegation have listened with close attention to this debate on the future of South West Africa. The extraordinary importance attached to this issue was dramatically demonstrated by the General Assembly when it decided to begin the debate without delay and to hold it in plenary session. We share the general view of the importance of the issue, and we believe this may prove to have been one of the truly decisive debates of the United Nations—if, as we earnestly hope, it results in effective action.

I should like to pay tribute to you, Mr. President, and to the participants in this debate, for the seriousness with which this very difficult question has been treated. My Delegation has great respect for the views expressed, both in the statements made and in the 54-power draft resolution.

We are encouraged to find that, as regards the status of South West Africa, virtually all of the membership, with very few exceptions, is in agreement. This near unanimity finds strong support in the legal framework clearly defined by the three Advisory Opinions of the International Court of Justice, which remain an authoritative statement of the law on this matter.

It may be useful at this stage of our debate to sum up, at this point, the essential elements of this broad agreement, which we believe exists in this Assembly.

First, the people of South West Africa, like all peoples, have the right to determine their own future.

Second, South West Africa is a territory having an international status, and will remain so until its people exercise this right of self-determintion.

Third, South Africa's right to administer the territory arose solely from the Mandate.

Fourth, as the mandatory power, South Africa incurred certain obligations toward the people of the Territory including the promotion of their material and moral well being and their social progress. It has not fulfilled these obligations. Indeed, it has even gone so far as to impose on the Territory the abhorrent system of racial segregation known as apartheid.

Fifth, as the mandatory power, South Africa incurred certain obligations to the international community, for which the General Assembly has supervisory responsibilities. Among these are obligations to report annually on its administration of the Territory and to transmit petitions from the inhabitants. South Africa has repeatedly refused to carry out these obligations. We are thus confronted with a continuing material breach of obligations incumbent upon the mandatory power.

Sixth, South Africa itself has disavowed the Mandate, asserting that it ceased to exist upon the dissolution of the League of Nations.

Seventh, by virtue of the breach of its obligations and its disavowal of the Mandate, South Africa forfeits all right to continue to administer the Territory of South West Africa. Indeed, it is because of South Africa's own actions that it can no longer assert its right under the Mandate, and apart from the Mandate, South Africa has no right to administer the territory.

Eighth, in these circumstances the United Nations must be prepared to discharge its responsibilities with respect to South West Africa.

On these eight points, Mr. President, we believe all but a very few members are in essential agreement. We agree on the nature of the problem. We agree on the objective. It is highly important that our near-unanimity on these fundamentals should be made manifest.

This is all the more true when we come to decide on the best means of implementing our common aim. To be effective in this most important issue, we need more than world opinion voiced by words in a resolution. We need world cooperation manifested by concrete action.

And with this in mind, the United States is prepared to work with all delegations committed to our common goal.

In our view, the General Assembly should begin by expressing explicitly the decision with respect to the status of South West Africa, in a form acceptable to virtually all the membership. Having done this, it should create a practical instrumentality to give effect to its decision.

In considering what form this instrumentality should take, we are very much helped by the eminently sensible suggestion made by a number of representatives during this debate: namely, the establishment of a United Nations Commission for South West Africa. The United States would be glad to serve on an appropriately representative body if that is the desire of the General Assembly.

This Commission, it seems to us, should have very explicit and strong terms of reference. It should be asked to recommend means by which, in accordance with a prescribed timetable, an administration for South West Africa can be set up which will enable the people of the Territory to exercise their right of self-determination. The Commission should report as soon as practicable, and in any event not later than a specific and early date to be agreed upon—a date consistent both with the urgency of the matter and with the need for effective discharge of its important responsibility. All principal Organs of the United Nations should be asked to take appropriate action with respect to the Commission's report, and the cooperation of all Members in its work should be requested.

This, let me emphasize, Mr. President, is an action proposal. It contemplates steps which can be immediately and practically implemented, and which lie within the capacity of this Organization. It is designed to provide the community of nations promptly with a considered blueprint for united and peaceful action for the benefit of the people of South West Africa.

It is extremely important, Mr. President, that the action which the General Assembly takes on this transcendently important issue should be both intrinsically sound and widely supported. This is necessary in the first place for the sake of the people of South West Africa, who have a right to expect from us not only words, but also concrete, helpful and meaningful actions. And it is equally necessary for the sake of the United Nations itself—for the authority and prestige of this world body.

These are the views of the United States on this important subject. We do not suggest that we have spoken the last word on this matter. We are flexible in our approach. But we are also firm in our determination that the United Nations, with all the unanimity and effectiveness we can muster, shall proceed to bring practical relief to the people of South West Africa in their time of need.

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF AIRCRAFT NOISE ABATEMENT RESEARCH BY HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have submitted the following testimony to the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in support of my bill, H.R. 588, to provide for research on aircraft noise abatement:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 588, TO PROVIDE FOR RESEARCH ON AIRCRAFT NOISE ABATEMENT, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND AERONAUTICS, COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, OCTOBER 20, 1966

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, on January 4, 1965, I introduced H.R.

588, a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for research on abatement of objectionable aircraft noise. This bill would require the F.A.A. to "conduct, engage, cooperate with, and render assistance to" those engaged in noise abatement research to "establish practical aircraft noise criteria and for abating objectionable aircraft noise". Subsequently, three of my distinguished colleagues introduced identical legislation. I am referring to bills introduced by Mr. Pucinski—H.R. 670; Mr. Halpern—H.R. 5661; and Mr. Charles Wilson—H.R. 7983.

Noise abatement is largely a neglected environmental issue in the United States. True, it has been an issue to those who are unfortunate enough to live near airports, but no one has actually been doing anything major about the problem. This is not to say the aircraft industry hasn't done a commendable job. They have struggled with the problem for more than five years. But results are considerably less than dramatic.

In the words of Secretary of Interior, Stewart Udall: "We have been a nation of machine worshippers". The technology that has proven to be such a rich source of noisemakers has produced almost nothing that can be used as a noise eliminator.

In Germany, for example, there are excellent national research programs not only to develop noise abatement criteria and techniques, but to understand the details of noise generation and attenuation.

Yet in a more highly mechanized society such as ours such efforts have not been made. State and local governments are in no position to supply all the needed funds for research in aircraft noise reduction and the acquisition of air easements. Only the Federal Government can finance a program at the national level. More important is the fact that this is an interstate problem. Almost anything a locality may do in this regard must have an impact on interstate commerce and may be forbidden to such locality.

While industry has certain state-of-the-art improvements in flight operations which might alleviate noise, it is of absolute necessity that the total system of air traffic control, aircraft, navigation and airport are compatible. Such a massive program of research can only be undertaken by Federal authorities at Federal expense with total cooperation between public and private agencies engaged in such research.

In addition to the obvious general disturbance jet noise produces in airport communities, studies indicate it may cause personal irritability and fatigue. Some doctors have gone so far as to link jet noise with psychotic ills because such illnesses can result from sporadic interruptions of sleep.

Out of 18 million deaf or partially deaf persons in the United States, 2 out of 3 male workers from this group suffer from deafness caused by noise. Such cases result generally from exposure to long periods of high frequency noise. In some states ear guards are required by law for industrial employees working under severe noise conditions.

While aircraft noise perception is sporadic to the general population now, it is not inconceivable that in 9 years when SST's are creating a shockwave that will produce a boom carpet 50–80 miles wide, and by 1970 when jet airports number 300, aircraft noise will be of such frequency that it will have direct adverse effects on our sense of hearing.

Larger, higher performance, and potentially noisier subsonic aircraft will enter airline fleets in future years, to further contribute to increased noise levels.

The World Health Organization had the following to say about noise hazards in general:

"Man's sense of hearing is nowadays being subjected to increasing strains that may well lead both to deafness and to neurotic disorders. The effect of noise is insidious because the human nervous system is very adaptable and high noise levels can apparently be accepted without demur, although hearing is in fact becoming progressively impaired."

The business of noise control is intimately mixed up with the way noise affects people. Getting an accurate measurement of noise in terms of these effects on the human ear is a large portion of the noise control job.

My bill would enable the Federal Government to provide optimum conditions for research in acoustics and psychoacoustics in an effort to devise ways to protect Americans from the adverse physical and psychological effects of aircraft noise.

The Federal Government has already assumed responsibility for the regulation of most aspects of air carrier operation including the establishment of, and control over, air traffic rules, regulations, and flight patterns, in an effort to keep noise disturbance at a minimum.

It is reasonable to say that the industry which has tried to comply with these regulations while at the same time trying not to compromise the safety factor, deserves all the support it can get for research to better enable airports and aircraft to meet present and future standards.

My bill would serve to provide such support through increased research which could be directed to improved measurements and standards, reduction of aircraft engine noise, operational considerations and compatible land usage.

Jet noise also makes property less valuable, in effect, depriving Americans of their property without due process of law. In this sense too, it becomes the responsibility of the Federal Government to actively promote noise abatement research.

The strategy of the attack on noise begins by examining the source. Ideally this is the place to control it. Past research and practical application disclose that this is the most difficult place to stop noise because it most often requires a "trade off" in engine efficiency. Yet such achievements have been made with certain types of machinery.

Thus far there have been no major technical breakthroughs in engine design. The competitive factors of private enterprise do not encourage the "sharing" of research information. This is partly responsible for the overall slow progress being made in noise abatement.

The only way to hasten technological improvements to engine design which would permit noise control at the source, is through the Federal Government. This is the only source not compromised by economic interests in conflict with those of private manufacturers and local governments.

For those of us who become skeptical in our hopes for a reasonably quiet future, modest gains seem to indicate that the growth of noise does not have to keep pace with the growth of society.

We are still in a position to make civilized use of the products of advanced technology. But we can no longer afford to wait for answers from scattered sources.

The President, in his message on transportation to Congress, said: "There are no simple or swift solutions (to the problem) but it is clear that we must embark now on a concerted effort to alleviate the problem of aircraft noise".

In order to realize our hopes for a reasonably quiet future, America needs an urgent and accelerated program of research. Noise control is a matter of decibel improvement. Some of these improvements are squeezed out by gaining a better understanding of what produces the noise in the first place. Others come from an empirical cut-and-dried program that eventually reduces the noise, for reasons often unknown. Still others are the result of new technology, techniques and materials.

It will take the combined effort of all of these through Federal, local and private agencies under an adequately funded and precisely directed program, merely to keep the future from becoming any more noisy than the present.

The government-industry panel on jet aircraft noise, which reported through the Office of Science and Technology, made the following recommendations:

"The FAA and/or NASA using qualified contractors as necessary, should establish and fund adequately an urgent program for conducting the physical, phychoacoustic, sociological, and other research results needed to provide the basis for aircraft hardware and operational specifications."

The enactment of H.R. 588 will enable us to meet these objectives by providing Federal grants and contracts to appropriate private and public agencies for use in conducting research leading to ultimate abatement and control of aircraft noise perception.

Thank you for the opportunity to present these views to you.

THE TRUTH BEHIND RED CHINA'S ISOLATION

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of One Million Against the Admission of Communist China to the United Nations has recently prepared a documentation which supports its position that the Red Chinese are, in fact, "isolating themselves."

The publication demonstrates the frustrating cycle of free world overture and Chinese rejection over a long period of time. It is hoped, of course, that this cycle will in time, or dramatically overnight, be broken and that a comity of all the nations of the world can be realized.

I commend this publication to the attention of our colleagues. It follows:

Who Is Isolating Red China?

(A study of U.S. initiatives and Communist Chinese response prepared by the Committee of One Million)

In recent months, the United States has made a series of overtures to the Chinese Communists in the hope that Mao Tse-tung and his disciples in Peiping will open up the airtight iron gate of the Forbidden City just a little. To the disappointment of those persistently calling for "building bridges," Peiping has contemptuously turned down all the overtures.

At the same time—on the public platform, in editorials, on the floor of Congress—there is increasing talk of the danger of continued isolation of Red China. And the people who are doing the talking, oddly enough, continue to blame the isolation largely on the U.S.

Their approach to the issue can be stated briefly: the Red Chinese can be mollified; their intransigence is more form than substance; by increasing contacts and conciliatory gestures, by exposure to the diplomatic amenities, by declarations of United States peaceful intentions, the Peiping regime can slowly but almost certainly be brought into the family of civilized nations.

One of the less-mentioned facets of United States-Chinese Communist relations is Washington's seeming high hopes for, forbearance toward, and sometimes indirect support of, the Chinese Reds. This dates back even before the Peiping regime came into being. It was in August, 1949—when the war-weary Chinese National Government under President Chiang Kai-shek was struggling with a Soviet-backed Communist rebellion—that the United States issued the White Paper, virtually writing Chiang off in favor of Mao's "agrarian reformers."

We did more than just sit on our hands to "wait for the dust to settle" while Chiang went down helplessly to defeat. Our ambassador to China, J. Leighton Stuart, and our consul-generals in Shenyang (Mukden), Tientsin, Peiping and Shanghai were ordered, when these cities fell one by one to the advancing Red troops, to remain at their posts, anticipating the imminent emergence of a "new China."

On October 1, 1949, Mao proclaimed the People's Republic of China. Coupled with that proclamation, he announced the policy of "leaning to one side," that is, the side of Moscow. America's show of friendship and goodwill was rewarded with humiliating insults as our diplomats were soon kicked out of mainland China in the most unceremonious manner. The Chinese Communists were not interested in our friendship or recognition.

They remain uninterested today.

During the past two years, the United States has dramatically accelerated the pace of friendly overtures to the regime in Peiping. Officially and unofficially, our government has tried to establish a minimal, functional rapport with the Chinese Communist government. And during this same period Peiping has accelerated the pace of its rejections of these overtures. In fact, as their responses to American initiatives clearly show, the Chinese Communists are becoming more intransigent, more paranoid, more tightly sealed in their own ideological vacuum. Many times the United States has extended the hand of friendship—and as many times Peiping has slapped it down. In short, the Red Chinese are isolating themselves.

Indeed, the aging leaders in Peiping are actively planning the future well beyond their own lifetime. A purge is now going on in mainland China to weed out those accused of plotting a "restoration of capitalism." By Peiping's own admission, Mao has been devoting his attention for years to the vital question of "raising and training successors to the proletarian revolutionary cause" to ensure that no soft "second generation" will succeed him.

Mao and his diehard followers want mainland China isolated so that it will forever be the repository and living example of orthodox Marxism-Leninism. They want no bridge to channel the "decadent" capitalist influence from the U.S. to their Marxist pure land. And they fear it.

Look for yourself at the recent record of American initiatives and Communist Chinese responses and the pattern begins to emerge:

U.S. policy toward Red China—"Containment Without Isolation"

U.S. INITIATIVE	CHINESE COMMUNIST RESPONSE *
"Vice President Hubert Humphrey said today that the United States' policy on China should be one of 'containment without necessarily isolation.' Outlining a significant shift in the Administration's strategy toward Peking, Mr. Humphrey indicated that an attempt would be made to approach China . . . with a combination of military firmness and active efforts to explore *better relations.*"—New York *Times*, March 14, 1966.	"It is far from being necessary for Humphrey to 'seize every opportunity' to demonstrate 'friendship' toward the Chinese people. "Humphrey's 'kiss of Judas' approach cannot but arouse the disgust of the Chinese people and put us on the alert a hundredfold. "Humphrey even tries to apply the tactics of an ostrich, in the vain hope of finding a breach in the ranks of the Chinese people."—"Humphrey Jabbers in His Dream," *People's Daily*, March 14, 1966.
"John K. Fairbank, director of the East Asian Research Center at Harvard University, told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that some 'commentators who really ought to know better have over-reacted to the visionary blueprint of world revolution put out by Lin Piao [Peiping's defense minister] last September. "Communist China, like China for a thousand years under emperors in Peking, is still governed by a 'great Confucian political fiction, the myth of rule by virtue.' Mr. Fairbank said. "He said China should be included in all international conferences, such as those on disarmament, and should be admitted to the United Nations. He freely conceded that the Chinese would be 'disruptive and extremely annoying' in the United Nations but said that he would favor their admission *'even if they said they would dynamite the place.'* "—New York *Times*, March 11, 1966. "Senator J. W. Fulbright warned today that the expectation of war between the United States and Communist China in both Washington and Peking had made war more likely 'even though it is not desired.' "To help alter this 'fatal expectancy' and to promote greater understanding of China and the Chinese, the Senator said, his committee will begin a series of hearings this week."—New York *Times*, March 7, 1966. "There are practical alternatives to our current relationship with both the Soviet Union and Communist China. "There are many ways in which we can *build bridges* toward nations who would cut themselves off from meaningful contact with us. We can do so with properly balanced trade relations, diplomatic contacts, and in some cases even by exchanges of military observers."—Speech by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara to American Society of Newspaper Editors in Montreal, New York *Times*, May 19, 1966.	"The Johnson administration wants to make use of the debate as a smokescreen to sidetrack the strong dissatisfaction at home and abroad with the U.S. anti-China policy and to cover up the continuance of the policy of hostility and aggression against China. "The debate shows that the difference between these idea men is about what counter-revolutionary method should be adopted. They are at one in the policy of hostility and aggression towards China. "Helplessly and hopelessly, Harvard Professor John K. Fairbank, the so-called veteran 'China specialist,' and others again put forward the long discredited 'two Chinas' formula. "U.S. imperialism's persistent hostility towards the Chinese people is determined by its reactionary and aggressive nature. There is nothing strange about it. What is strange is that U.S. imperialism even hopes to find a 'way out' of the blind alley of its China policy. The great debate in the United States over Washington's China policy shows once again that it is mere illusion. Look how many politicians, 'scholars' and 'specialists' took part in these discussions. But nothing fruitful has come out of them. Nor will there be any result if more discussions are held. Gentlemen in Washington, there is nothing you can do about it."—"What Does U.S. Big Debate on China Signify?" *People's Daily*, April 9, 1966. "His remark is just a rehash of the 'containment without isolation' idea recently put forth by the U.S. ruling clique. It shows that 'containment' is real and 'without isolation' is false. "Actually, the American policy of hostility towards China has in fact isolated U.S. imperialism itself and not China. China has friends all over the world while U.S. imperialism is at odds even with its allies."—New China News Agency, May 20, 1966.
"The United States should propose to the People's Republic of China an opening of a new *phase of* bilateral negotiation *at which the following items* would be discussed: "(a) Exchange of diplomatic representation; "(b) Renunciation of force as an instrument of policy; "(c) Arms control including problems of the control over nuclear weapons. "The United States should announce that it is prepared to accept accredited newspapermen, scholars, and others from the People's Republic of China and call upon the People's Republic of China to reciprocate."—Position paper signed by 198 American scholars, New York *Times*, March 21, 1966.	"The U.S. ruling circles have recently assumed a posture for 'improving' relations with China. They are merely feigning a 'retreat' for an onslaught. "Their overtures of friendship with China are a smokescreen for intensified 'containment' of China. "The U.S. imperialists think that by making some 'contact' and 'visits' they could weaken the revolutionary will of Chinese people and shake their firm stand of combatting U.S. imperialism and supporting the revolutionary struggle of all peoples. This is sheer day-dream."—"Old Tune; New Conspiracy." *People's Daily*, March 29, 1966.
"It was our hope that by direct systematic communication we might be able to *reduce the sharpness of the conflict* between us. There now have been 129 of these meetings [at the ambassadorial level], the latest of which took place in Warsaw today . . . . I think it is accurate to say that no other non-Communist nation has had such extensive conversations with the Peiping regime as we have had . . . . "We should continue our efforts to reassure Peiping that the United States does not intend to attack mainland China.	"In his statement, Rusk persisted in the policy of hostility and aggression towards China while talking no end of 'increasing contacts' and 'restoring friendship' with China, in an attempt to play before American and world public opinion the counter-revolutionary dual-tactics of sham peace but real hostility. "The ten elements are a mixture of hostility to China and deception. The real aim is to be hostile to and launch aggression against China and to contain and encircle it."—New China News Agency, April 18, 1966.

See footnotes at end of article.

U.S. Policy toward Red China—"Containment Without Isolation"—Continued

U.S. INITIATIVE

"We must avoid assuming the existence of an unending and inevitable state of hostility between ourselves and the rulers of mainland China.

"We should continue to enlarge the possibilities for *unofficial contacts* between Communist China and ourselves—contacts which may gradually assist in altering Peiping's picture of the United States.

"We should keep open our direct diplomatic contact with Peiping in Warsaw.

"We are prepared to sit down with Peiping and other countries to discuss the critical problems of disarmament and nonproliferation."—Statement by Secretary Dean Rusk before the Far East Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, March 16, 1966.

Peace in Asia

"And there is a fourth essential for peace in Asia which may seem the most difficult of all: Reconciliation between nations that now call themselves enemies. A peaceful mainland China is central to a peaceful Asia. A hostile China must be discouraged from aggression. A misguided China must be encouraged toward understanding of the outside world and toward policies of *peaceful cooperation.*

"For lasting peace can never come to Asia as long as the 700 million people of mainland China are isolated by their rulers from the outside world . . .

"But we have also learned that the greatest force for opening closed minds and opening closed societies is the *free flow of ideas and people and goods.*

"For many years now the U.S. has attempted in vain to pursue the Chinese Communists to agree to an exchange of newsmen as one of the first steps to increase understanding between our people.

"More recently, we have taken steps to permit Americans scholars, experts in medicine and public health and other specialists to travel to Communist China.

"And only today we here in the government cleared a passport for a leading American businessman to exchange knowledge with Chinese mainland leaders in Red China.

"All of these initiatives except the actions today *have been rejected by Communist China."*—Speech by President Johnson before the American Alumni Council, in White Sulphur Springs, W. Va. July 12, 1966.

"There are no arbitrary limits to our search for peace. We stand by the Geneva agreements of 1954 and 1962. We will *meet at any conference table,* we will discuss any proposals—four points or 14 or 40—and we will consider the views of any group. We will work for a ceasefire now or once discussions have begun. We'll respond if others reduce their use of force; and we will withdraw our soldiers once South Vietnam is securely guaranteed the right to shape its own future."—State of the Union address by President Johnson, January 12, 1966.

"President Johnson urged the Vietnamese Communists today not to let 'endless and unrewarding argument over what has already happened' prevent peaceful settlement of the war . . . Without naming North Vietnam or *Communist China,* Mr. Johnson appeared to address the heart of his speech *to both* countries."—New York *Times,* March 2, 1966.

"President Johnson said tonight that the United States was ready to begin, without prior conditions, diplomatic discussions to end the war in Vietnam . . . High officials

CHINESE COMMUNIST RESPONSE*

"The U.S. President's apparent saber-rattling statement is in fact an indirect revelation of the nature of the United States as a paper tiger in a world where the four seas are rising, clouds and waters raging, the five continents are rocking, wind and thunder roaring.

"Johnson made it clear that the losing war of aggression in Vietnam had become problem Number One tormenting the U.S. ruling circles."—New China News Agency, July 13, 1966.

"Johnson [In his State of the Union message] let loose his war blackmail against the Vietnamese people who are engaged in the heroic war of resistance to U.S. aggression, and against the Chinese people who have long since made preparations to deal with the American aggressor."—New China News Agency, January 13, 1966.

"Why has this bully who has been working overtime to spread the conflagration of war in Indo-China suddenly assumed the peace posture? . . . because the Johnson Administration actions to expand the war, its outcries to further escalate the war, and its war crimes of using toxic gas and napalm bombs in South Vietnam have incurred the ever stronger opposition and angry denunciation of the world public."—*People's Daily,* March 29, 1966.

"All negotiations wtih the U.S. imperialists are utterly useless if they still refuse to withdraw from South Vietnam all their troops and all kinds of war material, and those of

Peace in

U.S. INITIATIVE

said that Mr. Johnson's use of the word 'unconditional' meant 'exactly what it says,' and that the United States would be willing to enter into any kind of diplomatic contact with such Communist powers as North Vietnam *and China* even while the Vietcong continued to fight in South Vietnam."—New York *Times,* April 8, 1966.

"Senator MIKE MANSFIELD of Montana proposed today that Japan or Burma take the lead in bringing about a *'direct confrontation* across a peace table' of the United States, [Communist] *China,* North Vietnam and 'essential' elements from South Vietnam."—New York *Times,* April 19, 1966.

"Senator MIKE MANSFIELD called yesterday for a meeting between Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Communist China's Foreign Minister Chen Yi, to seek 'a curb on the expansion of the war' in Vietnam 'and a prompt and durable termination of the tragic bloodletting.

" 'The President [Johnson] said this afternoon that he welcomed any constructive suggestions from members of Congress, Senators, and Senator MANSFIELD,' Mr. Moyers [White House Press Secretary] said. He said that it [Mr. Mansfield's suggestion] is something that he would want Secretary Rusk and others to review."—New York *Times,* June 17, 1966.

Nuclear testing and

"Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY proposed today that the United States explore new avenues to world disarmament by inviting Communist China to participate in the 17-nation Geneva disarmament conference."—New York *Times,* October 14, 1965.

"The General Assembly adopted, 112 to 0. . . . a resolution urging that steps be taken for the convening of 'a world disarmament conference no later than 1967.'

"The United States voted for the resolution."—New York *Times,* November 30, 1965.

"Three Democratic Senators urged today that this country *invite* Communist China to discuss nuclear weapons controls and participate in international disarmament efforts.

"Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, Democrat of New York, told the Senate that a third nuclear blast by Red China should cause United States and other world nuclear powers to ask an immediate conference. Senators MIKE MANSFIELD of Montana and GEORGE S. MCGOVERN of South Dakota, both Democrats, supported Mr. KENNEDY's comments, calling them wise and timely."—New York *Times,* May 13, 1966.

"The United States has raised the possibility of entering into a *pledge* with Communist China that neither would be the first to use nuclear weapons if the Chinese would agree to stop their atomic testing."—New York *Times,* June 3, 1966.

See footnotes at end of article.

Asia—Continued

CHINESE COMMUNIST RESPONSE*

their satellite countries; if they still refuse to dismantle all their military bases in South Vietnam; and if the traitors still surrender the South Vietnamese people's sacred rights to independence."—*People's Daily*, April 11, 1966.

"What is meant by 'direct confrontation' negotiations? It is simply a reproduction of the 'unconditional discussions' ware offered by the Johnson administration more than a year ago. It means asking the Vietnamese people to give up their sacred right to resist aggression, defend their independence and sovereignty, and fight for the reunification of their motherland; it means asking them to sit at a table with the U.S. aggressors whose hands are dripping with the blood of the Vietnamese, while allowing the United States to hang on in South Vietnam and keep expanding the war frantically."—*People's Daily*, May 5, 1966.

"We must warn the U.S. aggressors in all seriousness: Do not miscalculate and do not misjudge your opponents. In order to support the Vietnamese people in winning thorough victory in the war of resistance against U.S. aggression, the Chinese people are ready to undertake the greatest national sacrifices.

"Since you have torn the 1954 Geneva agreements to shreds, the Chinese government and people have naturally ceased to be bound by the Geneva agreements in supporting the Vietnamese people's struggle against U.S. aggression and for national salvation."—Speech by Liu Shao-chi, Peiping's chief of state, at a Peiping rally in support of North Vietnam, New China News Agency, July 22, 1966.

disarmament

"Under the United States control, the United Nations has all along maintained a hostile attitude toward our country.

"China will never enter into any relations with the United Nations and any conference connected with it before restoration of her legitimate rights in the United Nations and the expulsion of the Chiang Kai-shek clique from the organization."—Statement by Peiping's Foreign Ministry, on Dec. 1, 1965, New York *Times*, December 2, 1965.

"China will determinedly continue to develop nuclear weapons and will definitely not attend any world disarmament conference at the United Nations or outside it."—*People's Daily*, June 20, 1966.

"The U.S. promise that it will consider the question of not using nuclear weapons first is false; its real intention is to fasten China to the tripartite nuclear test ban treaty. Just what is this tripartite treaty? It is a criminal concoction of the two nuclear overlords—the United States and the Soviet Union—of combined exertion to consolidate their nuclear monopoly, to bind the peace-loving countries hand and foot, and to hood-

Nuclear testing and disarmament—Continued

U.S. INITIATIVE	CHINESE COMMUNIST RESPONSE*
	wink the people of the world . . . The Chinese Government was the first to oppose the treaty and opposes it most firmly. At no time and in no circumstances shall we subscribe to it."—*People's Daily*, June 20, 1966.
*Peiping's admission to the United Nations***	
"The National Council of Churches' World Order Study Conference urged Saturday that the United States *end its opposition* to seating Red China in the United Nations.	"The United Nations has always been a United States tool for aggression. Today it has become also a stock exchange for political dealings between the United States and the Soviet Union. "China may as well stay out of a United Nations like this.
"About 500 delegates to the conference asked that the U.S. take the step 'without prejudice to its own policy of diplomatic recognition.' "—Associated Press, October 23, 1965. "Mr. Thant's [U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations] remedy for the neurotic Chinese would be to admit the Peking regime into the United Nations to normalize their international relations."—New York *Herald Tribune*, March 21, 1966. "Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY proposed yesterday that the United States take 'some initiatives' toward getting Communist China into the United Nations."—New York *Times*, June 27, 1966.	"The United States may keep China out of the United Nations for 1,000 or even 100,000 years without harming China one iota. China is doing very well."—*People's Daily*, November 19, 1965. "He is merely acting as Washington's political broker."—New China News Agency, September 13, 1965.
	"The United Nations must rectify its mistakes and undergo a thorough reorganization and reform. It must admit and correct all its past mistakes. Among other things, it should cancel its resolution condemning China and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea as aggressors and adopt a resolution condemning the United States as the aggressor; the U.N. Charter must be reviewed and revised jointly by all countries, big and small; all independent states should be included in the United Nations; and all imperialist puppets should be expelled."—Statement by Peiping's Foreign Minister Chen Yi, September 29, 1965.
Travels and exchanges	
"The State Department disclosed today that several American universities had been notified that scientists and scholars from Communist China would be permitted to visit the United States. "The move represents another step in the quiet cautious attempts by the Johnson Administration to *broaden* the scientific and cultural contacts with Communist China. Thus far, according to officials, the overtures have not been met with any favorable response."—New York *Times*, April 15, 1966.	"The spokesman of the U.S. State Department has come out to say on 14 April that the U.S. government would permit some American universities to invite Chinese scientists and scholars to visit the United States. "Earlier, the same spokesman also indicated that American scientists and scholars would be permitted to visit China. "Obviously, these statements are nothing but a fraud. "It is obvious that its aim is to deceive American people and world opinion and exploit the American people's friendly sentiments for China in the interest of its policy of hostility toward China."—Statement by Peiping's Foreign Ministry, New China News Agency, April 16, 1966.
"The State Department in announcing its new policy (on travel to Red China) said it was an exploratory move toward closer scientific cooperation with the Communist bloc. Under the new regulations, doctors and scientists in the field of public health will be granted passports to make professional visits to the five Communist countries."—New York *Times*, December 30, 1965.	"The State Department's action easing passport restrictions on travel to Communist China and four other countries is 'nauseating hypocrisy,' Jenmin Jih Pao (People's Daily), the Communist Party newspaper, said today . . . 'The U.S. imperialists conducted chemical warfare against the Vietnamese people. What consideration have they ever had for humanity?' "—Reuters, January 1, 1966.
"Two specialists in child development have been granted permission by the State Department to travel in Communist China as scholars. Hershel Alt said in New York yesterday that he and his wife had received word that the government would validate their passports."—New York *Times*, July 17, 1966. "Three of Communist China's leading high-energy physicists have been invited to two international conferences in the San Francisco area next month.	

See footnotes at end of article.

Travels and exchanges—Continued

U.S. INITIATIVE	CHINESE COMMUNIST RESPONSE*
"The invitation was issued about 10 days ago with State Department approval. No reply has been received from the Chinese Academy of Sciences, which was asked to deliver the invitations to the physicists."—New York *Times*, August 12, 1966.	
"In Washington the State Department in a new relaxation of travel restrictions, said it would permit travel of businessmen and athletes to China and four other Communist countries."—New York *Times*, July 12, 1966. "A young business executive with a strong curiosity about Communist China has passed the first obstacle in an attempt to visit that country. "G. William Miller, president of Textron, Inc., was notified that the State Department has validated his passport for travel to Communist China under new guidelines announced yesterday."—Associated Press, July 12, 1966. "The State Department is prepared to permit tourist travel to Communist China but only by prominent American citizens."—New York *Times*, July 17, 1966.	"Communist China regards the relaxing of the United States ban on travel of United States citizens to the mainland of China as a 'trick,' according to an official of the Chinese consulate here [Geneva]. "It will not accept travelers cleared by the United States, he added. "He added, the hostile posture of the American government means that it will 'misuse' the friendly persons who might seek to go to China. "It would make no difference whether the applicant for travel were a doctor, reporter or professor, said the official."—*Christian Science Monitor*, July 26, 1966. "Communist China has closed its doors to most categories of foreign visitors while the country is going through its political purge. "Reports reaching Hong Kong say that the Peking regime evidently wishes to conceal the extent of the upheaval caused by the denunciation of hundreds of party officials and educators on charges that they had manifested 'bourgeois' or Soviet 'revisionist' tendencies."—New York *Times*, July 12, 1966.
"We have tried unsuccessfully to arrange with the Chinese [Communists] either a formal or an informal exchange of newsmen and more recently we have indicated to them our willingness *unilaterally and without reciprocity* to see Communist Chinese newsmen enter the United States."—Speech by William P. Bundy, assistant secretary of state for Far Eastern affairs, at Pomona College, Pomona, Cal., February 12, 1966. "The United States, in an avowed move toward establishing closer contacts with Communist China, has offered to permit Chinese newsmen to visit the United States, even if American newsmen continue to be barred from China."—New York *Times*, February 15, 1966. "The State Department has issued passports to 60 U.S. newsmen to go to Red China."—*Oakland Tribune*, March 31, 1966.	
"The State Department has given permission to Rep. Weston E. Vivian (D.-Mich.) to travel to Red China. "The freshman Representative from Ann Arbor said he believed he was the first member of Congress to ask for, and receive, explicit permission."—New York *Post*, May 25, 1966.	
"The State Department has told Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas that it will approve his request for permission to travel to Communist China, officials said today. "Justice Douglas has said he has been invited by the Communist Chinese Government to visit Peking late this year."—New York *Times*, July 22, 1966.	"A news dispatch from Tokyo said that Red China denied Douglas had ever been invited. Communist Chinese Foreign Ministry sources were quoted as saying: 'Indeed, it's laughing matter. It simply can't be.' "—Associated Press, July 23, 1966.

---

*In mainland China, all newspapers, journals and news agencies are owned and operated by the Chinese Communist Party and serve as its mouthpiece. The New China News Agency and the *People's Daily* are the most authoritative organs, coming directly under the CCP Central Committee and headed traditionally by deputy ministers of propaganda. The opinions cannot be compared with that of any American news media, but must be regarded as Peiping's official line. All passages quoted from the New China News Agency and the *People's Daily* were in original English.

** The Johnson Administration is, of course, opposed to the admission of Communist China to the United Nations. But Peiping's response to a completely unofficial proposal is instructive.

EPILOGUE

These contrasting quotations can go on and on, *ad infinitum*, but there must be a limit to the patience of any reader. In closing, let us borrow from President Johnson who, at a White House press conference on September 8, 1966, welcomed a statement attributed to Peiping's Foreign Minister Chen Yi (subsequently denied) that the Peiping regime sought no confrontation with the United States; and a statement issued by Peiping's Ambassador Wang Kuo-Chuan on the same day, following the 132nd "ambassadorial talk" with U.S. Ambassador John A. Gronouski in Warsaw:

President Johnson: "We always are glad when other nations feel that there is no reason for them to engage in a confrontation with us . . . First, we are glad to see people feel that there is no reason why they should have a confrontation with us and second, yes, we do explore every possibility that we are aware of and encourage everything that we think has any potential."—Press conference, Sept. 8, 1966.

Wang Kuo-Chuan: "Of late, one United States official after another has indicated a wish for 'reconciliation,' 'building a bridge' and entering into 'peaceful cooperation' with China. The United States Government thinks that the Chinese people and the people of the world will be hoodwinked by these high-sounding words it has uttered. This is sheer wishful thinking.

"The iron-clad facts of the last 17 years, and particularly in the recent period, prove that the United States Government's talk about 'easing' Chinese-United States relations is not worth a penny.

"The United States Government's attempt to encircle China is futile. The Chinese people who held high the banner of opposition to United States imperialism will never be encircled. It is definitely not China but the United States that has been besieged ring upon ring by the people of the whole world. The Chinese people are confident that together with the oppressed peoples and nations of Asia, Africa, Latin America and the rest of the world, they can thoroughly smash any scheme of the United States Government for aggression and are determined to do so.

"What the United States Government has done to China irrefutably proves that the United States Government does not have the slightest sincerity about easing Chinese-United States relations. On the contrary, it is carrying out its policies of hostility and aggression against China with redoubled efforts, shifting the center of gravity of its global strategy eastward and regarding the Chinese people as its main enemy."—Statement issued on Sept. 8, 1966.

KEY LEGISLATIVE LANDMARKS IN THIS CONGRESS

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CULVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, the adjournment of the 89th Congress in a matter of hours will mark the close of the most productive legislature in the history of this Nation.

Since we convened 22 months ago, this Congress has considered more than 1,800 separate measures with far-reaching implications for every segment of our society and every sector of our economy. We have taken on the problems passed down through years of neglect and unconcern; we have faced those problems and we have found solutions—in education, agriculture, public works, health, conservation, opportunity, safety, and foreign affairs.

Mr. Speaker, it has been an honor to serve in this Congress, and I point with pride to some of the key legislative landmarks which indicate the scope and the meaning of our accomplishments:

EDUCATION

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act: Providing funds to local schools for aid to educationally deprived children, grants for books, equipment, and educational services, including almost $3 million for Second District schools during the first year of implementation.

The Higher Education Act: Providing scholarships for needy undergraduates, insured-interest private loans to any student, special assistance for college libraries and facilities, including $7 million for Second District colleges.

The Library Services and Construction Act: Authorizing a 5-year extension of funds for this proven valuable program of assistance.

The National Arts Foundation: Established to provide aid to individuals and groups to encourage and support the arts and humanities.

The cold war GI bill: Providing education benefits, as well as guaranteed home loans, Federal job preference, and VA medical care, for veterans who have served since 1955.

Juvenile delinquency prevention: Financing special education, employment, and social work projects to aid in preventing and controlling juvenile delinquency.

AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AMERICA

The omnibus farm bill: Extending the feed grain program, which brought nearly $20 million to farm and mainstreet economies in the Second District in 1966; and a cropland adjustment program.

The Rural Water Sanitation Act: Authorizing grants and loans for communities under 5,500 for water and waste disposal facilities, under which projects have already been approved for 7 Second District communities, totaling over $1 million.

Farmers Home Administration: Program increased by more than $200 million annually.

Food for peace: Providing for planned production of farm commodities for export, particularly significant for Iowa, which already exports almost $600 million in agricultural products.

Farm Credit Administration: Simplification of procedures making operation more flexible.

PUBLIC WORKS

The Dubuque floodwall: Appropriations not only to complete planning as included in the President's budget, but to begin actual construction in 1967, a year ahead of schedule, to provide permanent protection against future devastating losses which amounted to more than $8 million in the 1965 spring floods alone.

The Clinton Bridge: Authorizing a new bridge across the Mississippi after more than 20 years of administrative and legislative opposition.

The Guttenberg flood control project: Appropriating $100,000 for construction of a permanent flood protection device.

Interstate highways: Appropriating additional funds to complete presently planned interstate mileage within 5 years with a total of about $56 million for Iowa roads, and authorizing a Federal-State study to be completed by 1968 to meet additional highway needs beyond the present interstate plans.

HEALTH

Medicare and social security: Establishing a basic hospital insurance program for persons over 65 with a voluntary health insurance program to cover doctor bills, and a 7-percent increase in old-age and survivors' benefits, to assist the 52,000 senior citizens in northeast Iowa.

Regional medical centers: Launching a program to fight heart disease, cancer, stroke, and other major diseases.

Child nutrition: Expanding the national school lunch and special milk programs.

Cigarette labeling: Requiring warnings that cigarette smoking may be hazardous.

Health professions education assistance: Authorizing grants to construct teaching facilities for physicians, dentists, optometrists, pharmacists, and health technicians, and offering scholarships and loans to needy medical students.

CONSERVATION

Air pollution control: Authorizing programs to control air pollution from automobile exhausts and to develop improved solid waste disposal methods.

Water pollution control: Expanding program to combat water pollution in interstate waters, and increasing Federal grants for research and construction of pollution control projects.

Oceanography: Authorizing expansion of oceanographic research and development of food, mineral, and other resources of the seas, continental shelves, and Great Lakes.

Water resources planning: Authorizing 10-year research program to investigate water resource problems.

OPPORTUNITY

Older Americans Administration: Established to develop programs at the Federal and State levels related to special needs of senior citizens.

Economic opportunity: Extending programs for youth, community action, rural property, work experience, and adult education.

Voting rights: Enforcing the 15th amendment and authorizing Federal registrars where local officials discriminate against potential voters.

Immigration: Replacing discriminatory national origins with a first-come, first-served system of preferential admissions for immigrants with advantageous skills, education or training, or close relatives in the United States.

Manpower retraining: Extending and expanding the Manpower Development and Training Act and a job development program to stimulate on-the-job training, providing $160,000 for Second District projects.

SAFETY AND CONSUMERS

Traffic safety: Establishing mandatory safety performance standards for motor vehicles and tires, expanding the national driver register for quick and easy identification of individuals whose driving privileges have been suspended or revoked, establishing a National Traffic Safety Agency to conduct programs of safety research and development, incorporating legislation which I introduced earlier this year.

Highway safety: Authorizing funds for a 3-year highway safety program with each State to establish a highway safety program to receive Federal aid funds.

Drug controls: Placing stricter controls on the possession, distribution, and disposal of depressing barbiturates and stimulating amphetamines.

Truth in packaging: Providing protection for consumers against misrepresentation in package labeling.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Food for peace: Continuing program of food aid to developing nations, with increased emphasis on their own agricultural production.

Asian Development Bank: Authorizing U.S. membership in Bank to which 31 nations contribute, to make and guarantee loans for sound projects to promote economic development of Asian countries.

Foreign aid: Authorization funds for economic and military aid, including technical assistance to a limited number of countries, based on self-help and development of each nation's own resources.

Peace Corps: Authorizing program to provide volunteers for some 40 countries in 1967, expanding the work being done today by young men and women like the 66 volunteers from the Second District.

BUDGET

It is notable that we have established these programs to fulfill previously unmet needs without causing any undue strain on the national budget. All of the health, education, and welfare programs taken together will account for only 7.6 cents of the Federal tax dollar, and the largest portion of these are for health benefits. The economic opportunity program costs 1 cent per tax dollar.

The great expenditures of the Federal Government are for our national defense and security, which with the conflict in Vietnam is taking more than 41 cents of each dollar. Had there not been an increase in the cost of the Vietnam conflict, there would have been a substantial legal budget surplus even with the new programs we have enacted.

This does not mean that we do not have to exercise restraint in our domestic expenditures, because with present inationary pressures we must reduce Federal spending wherever possible. It is for this reason that I opposed a number of new programs, including rent subsidies, the teachers corps, and certain beautification projects, which would have added more than $1 billion in Federal expenditures, because I felt that these were less essential programs which could be deferred.

In spite of the fact that there have been two tax cuts in the past 3 years, one in the income tax rate and the other abolishing certain excise taxes, tax receipts have increased more than usual due to high employment and prosperity.

There is no State that has shared more in that prosperity, or contributed more to the national wealth than Iowa, where personal income has risen at almost twice the rate of the national average—15.3 percent in a 3-month period—and where unemployment remains among the lowest in the country—less than 2 percent.

In the past 2 years the needs of our State have been effectively represented at the national level. As a result, we in Iowa have received a fair return of our Federal tax dollars. In the last fiscal year in fact, Federal expenditures in Iowa exceeded the amount Iowans paid in all Federal taxes combined, by more than $158 million.

Mr. Speaker, what we have done in 2 years will be subject to reexamination, review, and revision by future Congresses, but there can be no question of the very real accomplishments which the 89th has made, and the progress and promise already being realized as a result of this legislation.

As laws are enacted which more directly affect the life of every citizen, it is increasingly important that the individual becomes more involved in the legislative process.

Two years ago, the voters of this Nation made their commitment to this program when they elected this 89th Congress. Since then, I have sent out two questionnaires on the legislation we have considered, and the results—which I have reported to this body—demonstrate that the overwhelming majority of my constituents are in agreement with the work of this Congress.

In addition, I have sought the observations and recommendations of local officials and citizens who have the responsibility for implementing the legislation which has been enacted, to insure that these programs are reaching the individuals for whom they are intended and are carrying out the original purpose of Congress with a minimum of waste and bureaucratic inefficiency.

Through districtwide conferences with northeast Iowa participants in the economic opportunity program, through a special questionnaire sent to more than 1,200 volunteers in the program, and through meetings with local school officials on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, we have been able to submit reports to Congress and the appropriate agencies on our experience with these programs in the Second District of Iowa, and I am pleased that some of our recommendations have already been incorporated into amendments to the law and changes in administrative procedures.

Because the people of the Second District have demonstrated their interest and concern in the actions of this Congress, and in keeping with the spirit of the U.S. Constitution—article I, section 5—I am taking this opportunity to report to them my voting record over the past 2 years as their Representative, on all of these measures which so directly affect our State and Nation.

I am proud of this record and present it to them for their judgment. On no occasion did I miss any key vote, and on virtually every one of the small number of votes for which I was not present because of more urgent business on behalf of my constituents, I did vote on the measures again at another stage of the legislative process.

The Members of the 89th Congress have voted on more issues than any legislature in modern American history—more than 370 recorded roll-call votes to date.

Although this listing today will not include the remaining votes taken during the brief time before adjournment, under unanimous consent I will place my voting record in the Congressional Record at this point, so that there is time to have it reprinted at my expense and offer my constituents the opportunity to examine for themselves the accomplishments of the 89th Congress and the positions taken during this period by their Congressman:

Accomplishments of the 89th Congress

1ST SESSION, 1965

Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
Jan. 4	H. Res. 1, authorizing oath of office to certain (Mississippi) members. (Passed 276–149.)	Yes.
Jan. 4	H. Res. 8, relating to Rules of the House. (Passed 224–202.)	Yes.
Jan. 19	H. Res. 126, dismissal of contest of election of Richard L. Ottinger. (Passed 245–102.)	Yes.
Jan. 26	H. J. Res. 234, supplemental appropriations for Department of Agriculture. On motion to recommit, designed to bar use of any funds to finance exportation of agricultural commodities to the United Arab Republic. (Passed 204–177.)	No.
Feb. 8	H.J. Res. 234, supplemental appropriations for Department of Agriculture. On motion instructing House conferees to insist on disagreement to Senate amendment providing Presidential discretion in granting of aid to the United Arab Republic. (Failed 165–241.)	No.
Feb. 9	H.R. 3818, eliminating requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit liabilities. On motion to recommit. (Failed 93–289.)	No.
Feb. 9	H.R. 3818, eliminating requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit liabilities. (Passed 300–82.)	Yes.
Feb. 17	H.R. 2998, amending Arms Control and Disarmament Act. (Passed 302–63.)	Yes.
Feb. 18	H.R. 45, amending Inter-American Development Bank Act. On motion to recommit designed to reduce the authorization from $750,000,000 to $725,000,000. (Failed 142–237.)	No.
Feb. 18	H.R. 45, amending the Inter-American Development Bank Act. (Passed 288–93.)	Yes.
Feb. 25	H. Res. 188, providing $370,000 for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities. On motion to recommit, designed to provide for open hearings on authorization of funds. (Failed 58–333.)	Yes.
Feb. 25	H. Res. 188, providing $370,000 for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities. (Passed 360–29.)	Yes.
Mar. 3	S. 3, Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965. On motion to recommit, designed to replace text of S. 3 with provisions of H.R. 4466. (Failed 100–323.)	No.
Mar. 3	S. 3, Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965. (Passed 257–165.)	Yes.
Mar. 10	H.R. 2, Drug Abuse Control Act. (Passed 402–0.)	Yes.
Mar. 15	H.R. 4714, amending National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964. (Passed 217–113.)	Yes.
Mar. 16	H.R. 5505, relating to establishment of Federal standards for Congressional redistricting. On Mathias amendment providing election of Representatives at large pending reapportionment under the act. (Failed 147–255.)	No.
Mar. 17	H.R. 5374, increasing by $3,000 the annual salaries of the Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court. On agreeing to H. Res. 276, the rule providing for consideration of the bill. (Passed 202–183.)	Yes.
Mar. 17	H.R. 5374, increasing by $3,000 the annual salary of the Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court. (Failed 178–202.)	Yes.
Mar. 22	H.R. 5688, relating to crime and criminal procedure in the District of Columbia. On motion to recommit. (Failed 166–216.)	Yes.
Mar. 22	H.R. 5688, relating to crime and criminal procedure in the District of Columbia. (Passed 251–131.)	No.
Mar. 23	H.R. 5721, amending the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco. (Passed 206–170.)	Yes.
Mar. 26	On ordering the previous question on motion to consider the Journal as read. (Passed 274–119.)	Yes.
Mar. 26	H.R. 2362, strengthening and improving educational quality and opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools. On motion to recommit. (Failed 149–267.)	No.
Mar. 26	H.R. 2362, strengthening and improving educational quality and opportunity in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools. (Passed 263–153.)	Yes.
Mar. 31	H.R. 3708, providing assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons. (Passed 396–1.)	Yes.
Mar. 31	H.R. 1111, providing for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources. (Passed 385–0.)	Yes.
Apr. 1	H.R. 4257, Manpower Act of 1965. (Passed 395–0.)	Yes.
Apr. 5	H.R. 980, providing for the return of obscene mail. (Passed 360–21.)	Yes.
Apr. 5	H.R. 7064, authorizing an appropriation of $1 million for construction of a U.S. Embassy building in Saigon. (Passed 378–0.)	Yes.
Apr. 5	H.R. 7060, Treasury-Post Office Departments appropriations. (Passed 347–7.)	Yes.
Apr. 6	H.R. 7091, 2d supplemental appropriation, 1965. (Passed 348–62.)	Yes.
Apr. 8	H.R. 6675, providing a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act (medicare). On motion to recommit. (Failed 191–236.)	No.
Apr. 8	H.R. 6675, providing a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act (medicare). (Passed 313–115.)	Yes.
Apr. 13	H.R. 2998, Arms Control and Disarmament Act. On agreeing to conference report. (Passed 316–65.)	Yes.
Apr. 13	H.J. Res. 1, presidential inability and succession. (Passed 368–29.)	Yes.
Apr. 14	H. Res. 310, providing $50,000 for additional expenses of Committee on Un-American Activities incurred in investigation of Ku Klux Klan. (Passed 313–43.)	Yes.
Apr. 27	H.R. 6497, authorizing an increase in the International Monetary Fund quota of the U.S. On motion to recommit. (Failed 113–275.)	General pair.
Apr. 27	H.R. 6497, authorizing an increase in the International Monetary Fund quota of the United States. (Passed 301–88.)	General pair.
Apr. 28	S. 4, Water Quality Act of 1965. (Passed 396–0.)	General pair.
Apr. 29	H.R. 7091, supplemental appropriations, 1965. On agreeing to conference report. (Passed 316–55.)	General pair.
Apr. 29	H.R. 7091, supplemental appropriations, 1965. On preferential motion to recede and concur in Senate amendment. (Failed 144–288.)	General pair.
Apr. 29	H.R. 4714, amending the National Arts and Cultural Act of 1964. (Passed 239–115.)	General pair.
May 3	H.R. 2986, extending and amending certain expiring provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to community health services. (Passed 347–0.)	General pair.

Accomplishments of the 89th Congress—Continued

1ST SESSION, 1965—Continued

Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
Apr. 27–May 3	In district working to provide Federal flood assistance to local communities.	
May 4	H.R. 2985, authorizing assistance in meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for comprehensive community mental health centers. (Passed 389–0.)	Yes.
May 5	H.J. Res. 447, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1965 for the Department of Defense. (Passed 408–7.)	Yes.
May 5	H.R. 7657, appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, etc., for the Armed Forces. (Passed 395–0.)	Yes.
May 6	H.R. 7717, authorizing appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. On agreeing to H. Res. 366, providing for consideration of the bill. (Passed 389–0.)	Yes.
May 6	H.R. 7717, authorizing appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. (Passed 389–11.)	Yes.
May 10	H.R. 2984, amending the Public Health Service Act provisions for construction of health research facilities. (Passed 334–4.)	Yes.
May 12	S. 701, International Coffee Agreement Act. (Passed 300–97.)	Yes.
May 20	H.R. 8122, Atomic Energy Commission appropriations. On motion to recommit. (Failed 43–313.)	General pair.
May 20	H.R. 8122, Atomic Energy Commission appropriations. (Passed 352–1.)	General pair.
May 25	H.R. 7750, amending further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. On motion to recommit. (Failed 178–219.)	No.
May 25	H.R. 7750, amending further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. (Passed 354–41.)	Yes.
May 26	H.R. 8370, Department of Agriculture appropriations. On motion to recommit. (Failed 187–208.)	No.
May 26	H.R. 8370, Department of Agriculture appropriations. (Passed 354–41.)	Yes.
June 1	H.R. 8639, State, Justice, Commerce, judiciary appropriations. (Passed 322–60.)	Yes.
June 1	H.R. 3584, Coal Mine Safety Act. (Passed 336–42.)	Yes.
June 2	H.R. 8371, Excise tax reduction. (Passed 401–6.)	Yes.
June 3	H.R. 7777, appointment of Gen. William F. McKee to the Office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. (Passed 228–137.)	Yes.
June 7	H.R. 3157, amending the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to eliminate the provisions which reduce the annuities of the spouses of retired employees by the amount of certain monthly benefits. (Passed 323–0.)	Yes.
June 8	H.R. 8775, legislative appropriations. On motion to recommit. (Failed 149–244.)	No.
June 8	H.R. 7105, providing for continuation of authority on regulation of exports. (Passed 388–1.)	Yes.
June 9	H.R. 8464, public debt limit increase. On H. Res. 413, providing for consideration of the bill. (Passed 273–109.)	Yes.
June 9	H.R. 8464, public debt limit increase. (Passed 229–165.)	Yes.
June 6	H. Con. Res. 285 Kennedy film. On request for a separate vote on an amendment to prevent the charging of a fee from viewers of the film. (Failed 174–216.)	No.
June 9	H. Con. Res. 285, Kennedy film. (Passed 311–75.)	Yes.
June 16	H.R. 6927, housing and urban development. On motion to recommit. (Failed 141–259.)	No.
June 16	H.R. 6927, housing and urban development. (Passed 217–184.)	Yes.
June 16	H. Res. 416, authorizing each Member of the House of Representatives to employ annually, on a temporary basis, a student congressional intern. (Passed 229–153.)	Yes.
June 21	H.R. 7743, establishing a system of loan insurance and a supplementary system of direct loans to assist students to attend post-secondary business, trade, technical and other vocational schools. (Passed 300–0.)	General pair.
June 21	H.R. 8620, amending the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to take into consideration floods and other natural disasters in reference to the feed grains, cotton and wheat programs for 1965. (Passed 297–2.)	General pair.
June 21	H. Con. Res. 416, requesting the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia. (Passed 298–0.)	General pair.
June 23	H.R. 9221, Defense Department appropriations. (Passed 407–0.)	Yes.
June 24	H.J. Res. 541, extending the Area Redevelopment Act for 2 months. (Passed 224–167.)	Yes.
June 28	H.R. 7984, housing and urban development. On agreeing to H. Res. 425, providing for debate on the bill. (Passed 230–115.)	Yes.
June 30	H.R. 7984, housing and urban development. On Stephens amendment to rewrite sec. 101, relating to rent subsidies, to limit eligibility to persons eligible for public housing. (Passed 240–179.)	Yes.
June 30	H.R. 7984, housing and urban development. On motion to recommit designed to delete secs. 101 and 106, relating to rent subsidy payments and rehabilitation grants to homeowners in urban renewal areas. (Failed 202–208.)	Yes.
June 30	H.R. 7984, housing and urban development. (Passed 245–169.)	Yes.
July 6	H.R. 6400, Voting Rights Act of 1965. On agreeing to H. Res. 440, providing for debate. (Passed 310–58.)	Yes.
July 9	H.R. 6400, Voting Rights Act of 1965. On Cramer vote-fraud amendment to provide criminal penalties for giving false information on voting eligibility status. (Passed 253–165.)	Yes.
July 9	H.R. 6400, Voting Rights Act of 1965. On Boggs amendment respecting judicial review. (Failed 155–262.)	No.
July 9	H.R. 6400, Voting Rights Act of 1965. On Gilbert amendment to allow people illiterate in English to vote if they have completed sixth grade in Spanish-language schools. (Failed 202–216.)	Yes.
July 9	H.R. 6400, Voting Rights Act of 1965. On motion to recommit designed to substitute the text of H.R. 7896 prohibiting the denial to any person of the right to register or to vote because of his failure to pay a poll tax or any other such tax, for the language of the committee amendment. (Failed 171–248.)	No.
July 9	H.R. 6400, Voting Rights Act of 1965. (Passed 333–85.)	Yes.
July 12	H.R. 8856, Atomic Energy Act of 1954, intent of Congress. (Passed 216–139.)	Yes.
July 12	H.R. 242, extending the apportionment requirement in the Civil Service Act of Jan. 16, 1883, to temporary summer employment. (Passed 336–22.)	Yes.
July 13	S. 559, Cigarette Labeling Act. On agreeing to conference report. (Passed 285–103.)	Yes.
July 14	H.R. 8926, Coinage Act of 1965. On Battin amendment to require the silver content of quarters and dimes to be fixed at 40 percent. (Failed 187–218.)	No.
July 14	H.R. 8926, Coinage Act of 1965. (Passed 255–151.)	Yes.
July 20	H.R. 9075, military pay increase. (Passed 410–0.)	Yes.
July 22	H.R. 8283, Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965. On motion to recommit. (Failed 178–227.)	No.
July 22	H.R. 8283, Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965. (Passed 245–158.)	Yes.
July 26	H.R. 77, Taft-Hartley Act Amendments. On H.Res. 437, open rule for consideration of the bill. (Passed 248–171.)	Yes.
July 27	H.R. 6675, providing a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act (medicare). On agreeing to conference report. (Passed 307–116.)	Yes.
July 27	H.R. 7984, housing and urban development. On agreeing to conference report. (Passed 251–168.)	Yes.
July 27	H.R. 2985, Community Mental Health Centers Act Amendments. On agreeing to conference report. (Passed 414–0.)	Yes.
July 28	H.R. 77, Taft-Hartley Act Amendments. On motion to recommit. (Failed 200–223.)	No.
July 28	H.R. 77, Taft-Hartley Act Amendments. (Passed 221–203.)	Yes.
July 29	H.R. 8856, Atomic Energy Act of 1954, intent of Congress. (Passed 275–125.)	Yes.
Aug. 2	S.J. Res. 81, to increase the amount authorized for the Interstate Highway System for fiscal year 1967 and to authorize apportionment of such amount. (Passed 314–11.)	Yes.
Aug. 2	H.R. 8027, providing assistance in training state and local law enforcement officers and other personnel and in improving capabilities, techniques and practices in state and local law enforcement and prevention and control of crime. (Passed 326–0.)	Yes.
Aug. 2	H.R. 6964, amending the United States Code to facilitate the rehabilitation of persons convicted of offenses against the United States. (Passed 325–0.)	Yes.
Aug. 3	S. 1564, Voting Rights Act of 1965. On motion to recommit designed to delete the Boggs-Long amendment. (Failed 118–284.)	No.
Aug. 3	S. 1564, Voting Rights Act of 1965. On agreeing to conference report. (Passed 328–74.)	Yes.
Aug. 3	H.R. 8469, providing certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund. (Passed 396–0.)	Yes.
Aug. 4	H.R. 8439, military construction authorizations. On agreeing to conference report. (Passed 389–0.)	Yes.
Aug. 4	S. 1742, permitting U.S. Governors of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Finance Corporation to agree to amendments to the articles of agreement of such Bank and Corporation. (Passed 330–54.)	Yes.
Aug. 5	H.R. 4750, providing an extension of the interest equalization tax. On agreeing to H. Res. 498, the closed rule under which the legislation was considered. (Passed 329–44.)	Yes.
Aug. 5	H.R. 4750, providing an extension of the interest equalization tax. (Passed 274–97.)	Yes.
Aug. 9	H.R. 9918, amending the Fire and Casualty Act and the Motor Vehicles Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia. On Sikes amendment supplying new text. (Passed 173–156.)	Yes.
Aug. 10	H.R. 10306, amending the Universal Military Training and Service Act of 1951 to prohibit destruction or mutilation of draft cards. (Passed 393–1.)	Yes.
Aug. 12	S. 1648, providing grants for public works and development facilities, etc. On Sisk amendment to make more areas eligible for grants under title I; to increase the authorization from $400,000,000 to $500,000,000; and to limit the program from 5 years to 4 years. (Passed 196–194.)	General pair.
Aug. 12	S. 1648, providing grants for public works and development facilities, etc. On Cramer motion to recommit designed to require funds provided for projects to be spent on American products, prevent the making of working capital loans; and provide for annual congressional review of Economic Development Loan Fund. (Failed 163–224.)	Paired against.
Aug. 12	S. 1648, providing grants for public works and development facilities, etc. (Passed 246–138.)	General pair.
Aug. 16	H.R. 6431, amending the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that certain forms of nickel be admitted free of duty. (Passed 297–48.)	Yes.
Aug. 16	H.R. 8436, establishing and prescribing the duties of a Federal Boxing Commission. (Passed 346–4.)	Yes.
Aug. 19	H.R. 7750, amending the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. On agreeing to conference report. (Passed 244–150.)	Yes.
Aug. 19	H.R. 9811, Food and Agriculture Act of 1965. On motion to recommit. (Failed 169–224.)	No.
Aug. 19	H.R. 9811, Food and Agriculture Act of 1965. (Passed 221–172.)	Yes.
Aug. 24	Supplemental appropriations for Departments of Labor, health, Education, and Welfare. On motion to recommit. (Failed 139–263.)	No.
Aug. 25	H.R. 2580, amending the Immigration and Nationality Act. On MacGregor amendment to establish on July 1, 1968, a limit of 115,000 immigrants per year from countries in the Western Hemisphere and require cancellation of special immigration visas from numerical ceiling of 115,000 when deportation proceedings are stayed or alien status adjusted. (Failed 189–218.)	No.

Accomplishments of the 89th Congress—Continued

1ST SESSION, 1965—Continued

Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
Aug. 25	H.R. 2580, amending the Immigration and Nationality Act. (Passed 318-95.)	Yes.
Aug. 26	H.R. 9567, Higher Education Act of 1965. (Passed 367-22.)	Yes.
Aug. 30	H.R. 9022, amending Public Laws 81-815 and 81-874 to provide financial assistance in the construction of public elementary and secondary schools in areas affected by a major disaster. (Passed 304-37.)	Yes.
Aug. 31	H.R. 9042, implementing agreement between United States and Canada concerning automobile products. On agreeing to H. Res. 551, the closed rule for consideration of the bill. (Passed 363-23.)	Yes.
Aug. 31	H.R. 9042, implementing agreement between United States and Canada concerning automobile products. (Passed 280-113.)	Yes.
Sept. 1	H.R. 3141, Health Professionals Educational Assistance Amendments of 1965. (Passed 340-47.)	Yes.
Sept. 2	H.R. 5863, authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research and development in high-speed ground transportation. (Passed 317-24.)	Yes.
Sept. 7	H.R. 8439, military construction authorization. On motion to table a motion providing for discharging the Committee on Armed Services from further consideration of the bill. (Passed 323-19.)	Yes.
Sept. 7	H.R. 10775, military construction authorization. (Passed 347-0.)	Yes.
Sept. 7	H.R. 168, veterans' disability compensation increase. (Passed 348-0.)	Yes.
Sept. 7	S.J. Res. 102, authorizing funds for the Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice and the District of Columbia Commission on Crime and Law Enforcement. (Passed 339-0.)	Yes.
Sept. 8	H.R. 10871, foreign aid appropriations. (Passed 239-143.)	Yes.
Sept. 13	Procedural votes to delay consideration of or in opposition to one or more bills under the 21-day rule or in opposition to the consideration of bills without a "rule" from the Rules Committee.	Not voting.
Sept. 13	H.R. 10065, Equal Employment Opportunity Act. On agreeing to H. Res. 506, the open rule for consideration of the bill. (Passed 259-121.)	General pair.
Sept. 13	H.R. 7371, amending the Bank Holding Company Act of 1965. On agreeing to H. Res. 499, the open rule providing for consideration of the bill. (Passed 201-171.)	General pair.
Sept. 13	H.R. 9460, National Foundation on the Arts, and the Humanities Act of 1965. On agreeing to H. Res. 478, the open rule providing for consideration of the bill. (Passed 260-114.)	General pair.
Sept. 13	H.R. 10281, Government Employees Salary Comparability Act. On agreeing to H. Res. 536, the open rule providing for consideration of the bill. (Passed 288-84.)	General pair.
Sept. 14	H.R. 2091, establishing concession policies in areas administered by the National Park Service. On motion to recommit. (Failed 73-298.)	No.
Sept. 15	H.R. 8283, Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965. On motion to recommit the conference report. (Passed 209-180.)	No.
Sept. 15	H.R. 9460, National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965. On motion to recommit. (Failed 128-251.)	No.
Sept. 16	H. Res. 574, directing the Postmaster General to provide the names of temporary employees employed by the Post Office Department during the summer of 1965. On motion to table the resolution. (Passed 186-180.)	Yes.
Sept. 16	S. 2042, Atomic Energy Act of 1964, indemnification agreements. (Passed 338-30.)	Yes.
Sept. 17	H.R. 9221, Department of Defense appropriations, 1966. On agreeing to conference report. (Passed 381-0.)	Yes.
Sept. 17	H.Res. 585, Mississippi contested elections. On agreeing to resolution. (Passed 228-143.)	Yes.
Sept. 20	S. 2127, Armed Forces, indemnity insurance. (Passed 362-0.)	Yes.
Sept. 20	H.Res. 560, communism in Western Hemisphere. (Passed 312-52.)	No.
Sept. 21	S. 4, Water Quality Act of 1965. On agreeing to conference report. (Passed 381-0.)	Yes.
Sept. 22	S. 2300, rivers, harbors, and flood control. On Clark amendment to authorize the Secretary of the Army to conduct a survey of St. John River, Maine, for flood control and allied functions separate and apart from the Passamaquoddy tidal power project. (Passed 207-185.)	No.
Sept. 22	H.R. 30, Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center. (Passed 255-112.)	Yes.
Sept. 22	On motion to adjourn. (Failed 89-204.)	No.
Sept. 23	H.R. 7371, amending the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956. On committee substitute amendment to eliminate several additional exemptions from the act. (Passed 199-178.)	No.
Sept. 23	H.R. 10232, water and sanitation systems in rural areas. On ordering the previous question on H. Res. 580, the open rule providing for debate on the bill. (Passed 280-70.)	Yes.
Sept. 23	H.R. 10232, water and sanitation systems in rural areas. (Passed 326-10.)	Yes.
Sept. 24	S. 306, clean air pollution program. On motion to recommit designed to delete the provisions for solid waste disposal. (Failed 80-220.)	No.
Sept. 24	S. 306, clean air pollution program. (Passed 294-4.)	Yes.
Sept. 27	H.R. 4644, District of Columbia home rule. On Multer motion to discharge Committee on Rules from further consideration of H. Res. 515, the rule providing for consideration of the bill. (Passed 213-183.)	Yes.
Sept. 27	H.R. 4644, District of Columbia home rule. On agreeing to H. Res. 515. (Passed 223-179.)	Yes.
Sept. 27	H.R. 4644, District of Columbia home rule. On Multer motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of H.R. 4644. (Passed 234-155.)	Yes.
Sept. 29	H.R. 4644, District of Columbia home rule. On motion to strike the enacting clause and thus kill the bill. (Failed 179-219.)	No.
Sept. 29	H.R. 4644, District of Columbia home rule. On Multer amendment as amended by the Sisk amendment. (Passed 227-174.)	No.
Sept. 29	H.R. 4644, District of Columbia home rule. On motion to recommit. (Failed 134-267.)	No.
Sept. 29	H.R. 4644, District of Columbia home rule. (Passed 283-117.)	Yes.
Sept. 30	H.R. 2580, Immigration and Nationality Act. On agreeing to conference report. (Passed 320-69.)	Yes.
Sept. 30	H.R. 10281, Government Employees Salary Comparability Act. On motion to recommit designed to remove the provisions for a permanent system for the establishment and maintenance of proper salary relationships in federal, executive, judicial, congressional, and career salaries. (Passed 238-140.)	No.
Sept. 30	H.R. 10281, Government Employees Salary Comparability Act. (Passed 370-7.)	Yes.
Oct. 1	H.J. Res. 642, 3d Library of Congress Building. On motion to recommit. (Failed 17-321.)	No.
Oct. 1	H.J. Res. 642, 3d Library of Congress Building. (Passed 328-5.)	Yes.
Oct. 1	H.R. 10871, foreign assistance appropriations. On motion to recommit with instructions to the conferees to insist on disagreement to amendment No. 7, which deleted North Vietnam from the language prohibiting aid to countries that furnish aid to Cuba or North Vietnam. (Failed 164-174.)	No.
Oct. 1	H.R. 10871, foreign assistance appropriations. On agreeing to conference report. (Passed 204-127.)	Yes.
Oct. 1	H.R. 3142, Medical Library Assistance Act. (Passed 296-3.)	Yes.
Oct. 1	H.R. 6519, Jefferson National Expansion Memorial. (Passed 250-12.)	Yes.
Oct. 7	S.J. Res. 32, Ryukyu Islands, contributions to. (Passed 312-55.)	Yes.
Oct. 7	H.R. 2020, Nevada water project. (Passed 240-134.)	No.
Oct. 7	S. 2084, Highway Beautification Act of 1965. On motion to recommit. (Failed 153-230.)	No.
Oct. 7	S. 2084, Highway Beautification Act of 1965. (Passed 245-138.)	Yes.
Oct. 8	H.R. 9811, Food and Agriculture Act of 1965. On agreeing to conference report. (Passed 219-150.)	Yes.
Oct. 12	H.R. 11135, Sugar Act Amendments of 1965. On agreeing to H. Res. 598, the closed rule providing for consideration of the bill. (Passed 253-80.)	Yes.
Oct. 13	H.R. 11135, Sugar Act Amendments of 1965. On motion to recommit. (Failed 160-230.)	No.
Oct. 13	H.R. 11135, Sugar Act Amendments of 1965. (Passed 246-147.)	Yes.
Oct. 14	H.R. 11588, supplemental appropriations, 1965. On Harvey of Michigan amendment to delete the rent supplement program. (Passed 185-162.)	Yes.
Oct. 14	H.R. 11588, supplemental appropriations, 1965. (Passed 242-100.)	Yes.
Oct. 20	H.R. 9567, Higher Education Act of 1965. On motion to recommit with instructions to conferees to insist on deletion of provision for national teachers corps. (Failed 152-226.)	Paired against.
Oct. 20	H.R. 9567, Higher Education Act of 1965. On agreeing to conference report. (Passed 313-63.)	General pair.
Oct. 20	S. 2300, Rivers and Harbors Act of 1965. On agreeing to conference report. (Passed 221-130.)	General pair.
Oct. 21	H.R. 11588, Supplemental Appropriations, 1965. On agreeing to conference report. (Passed 251-84.)	General pair.
Oct. 21	H.R. 11588, Supplemental Appropriations, 1965. On motion to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 66. (Passed 166-162.)	Paired for.
Oct. 22	H.R. 11135, Sugar Act Amendments of 1965. On agreeing to conference report. (Passed 174-88.)	Paired for.
Oct. 20-22	On official business for the House Foreign Affairs Committee to Viet-Nam.	

2D SESSION, 1966

Jan. 27	H. Res. 665, authorizing expenditures of funds for expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities. (Passed 299-24.)	Yes.
Feb. 2	H. Res. 699, citing Robert M. Shelton for contempt of Congress. (Passed 344-28.)	Yes.
Feb. 3	H. Res. 706, taking H.R. 30, providing for Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center, from Speaker's table and agreeing to Senate amendments. (Passed 201-141.)	Yes.
Feb. 7	H.R. 12410, providing education and other benefits for veterans of military service after Jan. 31, 1955. (Passed 381-0.)	Yes.
Feb. 8	S. 1698, to amend the Bank Merger Act. (Passed 372-17.)	Yes.
Feb. 9	H.R. 12563, the Asian Development Bank Act. (Passed 293-80.)	Yes.
Feb. 9	H.R. 706, the Railway Labor Act. (Passed 380-0.)	Yes.
Feb. 23	H.R. 12752, the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966. On agreeing to H. Res. 736, closed rule, with 4 hours of debate on, and waiving points of order against H.R. 12752. (Passed 327-50.)	Yes.
Feb. 23	H.R. 12752, the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966. On motion to recommit designed to eliminate postponement of certain excise tax deductions regarding motor vehicles and telephones. (Failed 187-207.)	No.
Feb. 23	H.R. 12752, the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966. On passage. (Passed 246-146.)	Yes.
Feb. 24	H.R. 12169, supplemental foreign assistance authorization: On agreeing to H. Res. 742, the rule under which the legislation was considered. (Passed 360-11.)	Yes.

Accomplishments of the 89th Congress—Continued

2D SESSION, 1966—Continued

Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
Feb. 24	H.R. 12169, supplemental foreign assistance authorization. On motion to recommit, designed to put limitations on funds for Vietnam, Laos, Thailand and the Dominican Republic. (Failed 169–213.)	No.
Feb. 24	H.R. 12169, supplemental foreign assistance authorization. On passage. (Passed 350–27.)	Yes.
Mar. 1	H.R. 12889, supplemental authorizations for military procurement for fiscal year 1966. (Passed 393–4.)	Yes.
Mar. 2	S. 1666, providing for appointment of additional circuit and district judges. (Passed 371–23.)	Yes.
Mar. 2	H.R. 9963, providing for U.S. participation in Alaska statewide exposition in 1967. (Passed 202–173.)	Yes.
Mar. 3	H.R. 12322, marketing order for cotton research and promotion: On motion to recommit designed to allow each producer one vote in the referendum regardless of the amount produced. (Failed 185-191.)	No.
Mar. 3	H.R. 12322, marketing order for cotton research and promotion. (Passed 189–183.)	Yes.
Mar. 15	H.R. 12752, the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966. On agreeing to conference report. (Passed 288–102.)	Yes.
Mar. 15	H.R. 13546, supplemental defense appropriations, 1966. (Passed 389–3.)	Yes.
Mar. 16	H.R. 6785, the Uniform Time Act of 1966. (Passed 292–93.)	General pair.
Mar. 21	H.R. 13448, mailing privileges for members of the U.S. Armed Forces. (Passed 304–0.)	Yes.
Mar. 22	S. 2394, authorizing an official residence for the Vice President of the United States. On agreeing to H. Res. 774, the rule for consideration of the bill. (Passed 236–135.)	Yes.
Mar. 22	S. 2394, authorizing an official residence for the Vice President of the United States. (Passed 197–184.)	Yes.
Mar. 29	H.R. 14012, second supplemental appropriation bill, 1966. On motion to recommit designed to delete additional appropriations for the rent supplemental program. (Failed 190-198.)	Yes.
Mar. 29	H.R. 14012, second supplemental appropriation bill, 1966. (Passed 269–122.)	Yes.
Mar. 30	S. 1404, Uniform Time Act of 1966. On agreeing to conference report. (Passed 282–91.)	Yes.
Mar. 31	S. 2729, amendments to Small Business Act. On agreeing to H. Res. 802, providing for consideration of bill. (Passed 363–4.)	Yes.
Mar. 31	S. 2729, amendments to Small Business Act. (Passed 373–0.)	Yes.
Apr. 6	H.R. 14224, Social Security Act Amendments of 1966. (Passed 387–0.)	Yes.
Apr. 6	H.R. 14122, Federal Salary and Fringe Benefits Act of 1966. (Passed 393–1.)	Yes.
Apr. 6	H.R. 14215, Department of Interior and related agencies appropriation bill, 1967. On motion to recommit designed to limit the total amount of expenditures authorized by the bill. (Failed 157–233.)	No.
Apr. 6	H.R. 14215, Department of Interior and related agencies appropriation bill, 1967. (Passed 370–16.)	Yes.
Apr. 6	H.R. 14266, Treasury, Post Office, and executive office appropriation bill, 1967. On motion to recommit designed to limit the total amount of expenditures authorized by the bill. (Failed 127–244.)	No.
Apr. 6	H.R. 14266, Treasury, Post Office, and executive office appropriation bill, 1967. (Passed 368–2.)	Yes.
Apr. 19	H.R. 7406, third powerplant, Grand Coulee Dam, Columbia Basin project, Washington. On committee amendment. (Passed 240–111.)	No.
Apr. 19	S. 1761, third powerplant, Grand Coulee Dam, Columbia Basin project, Washington. On Rogers of Texas motion to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the text of H.R. 7406 as passed. (Passed 249–79.)	Yes.
Apr. 20	H. Res. 756, expressing the disapproval of the House of Representatives to Reorganizaton Plan No. 1 of 1966, Community Relations Service. (Failed 163–220.)	No.
Apr. 26	H.R. 14596, Department of Agriculture appropriation, 1967. On motion to recommit with instructions to report it back with amendment. (Passed 290–98.)	No.
Apr. 26	H.R. 14596, Department of Agriculture appropriation, 1967. (Passed 366–23.)	Yes.
Apr. 27	H.R. 10065, Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1966. (Passed 300–93.)	Yes.
Apr. 28	H.R. 13881, Transportation, sale and handling of dogs and cats for research purposes. (Passed 352–10.)	General pair.
May 3	H.R. 14324, authorizing appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. On motion to recommit designed to use research and development funds to reduce aircraft noise. (Failed 90–271.)	No.
May 3	H.R. 14324, authorizing appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. (Passed 349–10.)	Yes.
May 5	H.R. 14745, Department of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare appropriation, 1967. On motion to recommit designed to limit the total amount of expenditures authorized by the bill. (Failed 143–236.)	General pair.
May 5	H.R. 14745, Department of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare appropriation, 1967. (Passed 355–27.)	General pair.
May 10	H.R. 14921, Independent Offices appropriation, 1967. On Boland (Mass.) amendment to increase by $20 million the rent supplement program. (Passed 192–188.)	No.
May 10	H.R. 14921, Independent Offices appropriation, 1967. (Passed 296–82.)	Yes.
May 11	H.R. 14088, Military Medical Benefits Act. (Passed 358–0.)	Yes.
May 12	S. 1098, National Freight Car Shortage. (Passed 306–27.)	Yes.
May 16	S. 693, Foreign Agents Registration Act amendment. (Passed 285–0.)	Yes.
May 16	H.R. 14544, Participation Sales Act. On H. Res. 852, rule under which the legislation was considered. (Passed 184–120.)	Yes.
May 18	H.R. 14215, Department of Interior appropriation, 1967. On agreeing to conference report. (Passed 378–10.)	Yes.
May 18	H.R. 14544, Participation Sales Act of 1966. On motion to recommit designed to limit the interest permitted to be paid on participation holdings. (Failed 180–217.)	No.
May 18	H.R. 14544, Participation Sales Act of 1966. (Passed 206–190.)	Yes.
May 26	Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1966. On Anderson amendment regarding limitations on gross sales under Definition of Enterprise title. (Failed 195–200.)	No.
May 26	H.R. 13712, Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1966. On Ayers-Morris amendment to strike the word year and insert 2 years. (Passed 205–194.)	No.
May 26	H.R. 13712, Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1966. On motion to recommit designed to strike all agricultural sections from the bill and regarding food processing in certain industries in regard to overtime during peak seasons on highly perishable products. (Failed 167–232.)	No.
May 26	H.R. 13712, Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1966. (Passed 303–93.)	Yes.
June 1	H.R. 9167, Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act. On motion to recommit with instructions. (Passed 190–168.)	No.
June 1	H.R. 9167, Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act. (Passed 367–1.)	Yes.
June 2	H.R. 14050, Library Services and Construction Act amendments of 1966. (Passed 336–2.)	Yes.
June 6	H.R. 14643, International Education Act of 1966. (Passed 194–89.)	Yes.
June 6	H.R. 10, regarding self-employed individuals tax retirement amendments. (Passed 291–0.)	Yes.
June 7	H.R. 15465, Legislative Appropriations Act. (Passed 341–2.)	Yes.
June 7	S. 1357, Bail Reform Act. (Passed 319–14.)	Yes.
June 8	H.R. 15202, a temporary increase in the public debt limit. On H. Res. 882, the rule under which the legislation was considered. (Passed 205–153.)	Yes.
June 8	H.R. 15202, a temporary increase in the public debt limit. (Passed 199–165.)	Yes.
June 9	H.R. 14929, Food for Freedom Act. On committee amendment. (Passed 193–165.)	Yes.
June 9	H.R. 14929, Food for Freedom Act. On motion to recommit designed to change resale formula section and deny Communist governments access to loans. (Failed 157–200.)	No.
June 9	H.R. 14929, Food for Freedom Act. (Passed 333–20.)	Yes.
June 13	H.R. 14019, Foreign Service Buildings Act amendments. (Passed 290–3.)	Yes.
June 14	S. 2950, authorizing defense procurement and research and development and military pay. (Passed 356–2.)	Yes.
June 16	H.R. 14025, Defense Production Act extension. On committee amendment regarding control of consumer credit. (Failed 73–275.)	General pair.
June 20	S. 1160, clarifying and protecting the right of the public to information. (Passed 307–0.)	General pair.
June 20	H.R. 10860, amending the Connally Hot Oil Act. (Passed 308–1.)	General pair.
June 22	H.R. 15119, Unemployment Insurance Amendments. (Passed 374–10.)	Yes.
June 23	H.R. 13196, Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act. (Passed 364–0.)	Yes.
June 27	H.R. 14904, revising postal rates on certain fourth-class mail. On agreeing to H. Res. 875, the rule under which the legislation was considered. (Passed 222–148.)	Yes.
June 27	H.R. 5426, Common-law marriages may not be contracted in the District of Columbia. On motion to recommit. (Failed 39–328)	No.
July 12	S. 2950, Armed Forces procurement authorization, 1967. On agreeing to conference report. (Passed 358–2)	Yes.
July 14	H.R. 15750, Foreign Assistance Act of 1966. On motion to recommit designed to reduce from two years to one all authorization except for Development Loan Fund and for Alliance for Progress and to reduce the amount for developmental assistance. (Failed 191–193.)	No.
July 14	H.R. 15750, Foreign Assistance Act of 1966. (Passed 237–146.)	Yes.
July 20	H.R. 15941, Department of Defense appropriations. (Passed 392–1.)	Yes.
July 21	S. 602, Small Reclamation Projects Act. On agreeing to conference report. (Failed 136–204.)	No.
July 25	H.R. 14765, Civil Rights Act of 1966. On agreeing to H. Res. 910, the rule under which the legislation was considered. (Passed 200–180s)	Yes.
Aug. 9	H.R. 14765, Civil Rights Act of 1966. On Mathias amendment to permit a real estate broker or his agent to discriminate in the sale or rental of a dwelling on express written instruction to do so from an owner otherwise exempt, provided the broker or agent did not encourage or solicit the instruction. (Passed 237–176.)	Yes.
Aug. 9	H.R. 14765, Civil Rights Act of 1966. On Cramer amendment making it a Federal crime to travel in interstate commerce or to use the mails with intent to incite or commit riot, to commit an act of violence or any State or Federal felony or to assist or encourage commission of such acts. (Passed 389–25.)	Yes.
Aug. 9	H.R. 14765, Civil Rights Act of 1966. On Whitener amendment requiring a complaint in writing to the Attorney General from a person deprived or threatened with loss of equal protection of the laws before the Attorney General filed suit to desegregate public schools or facilities. (Passed 214–201.)	No.
Aug. 9	H.R. 14765, Civil Rights Act of 1966. On Moore motion to recommit, designed to delete title IV, the open housing title. (Failed 190–222.)	No.
Aug. 9	H.R. 14765, Civil Rights Act of 1966. (Passed 259–157.)	Yes.
Aug. 10	S. 3105, authorizing construction at military installations. (Passed 389–1.)	Yes.
Aug. 11	H.R. 14359, Federal Aid Highway Act. On motion to recommit designed to strike the beautification section. (Failed 173–175.)	Yes.
Aug. 11	H.R. 14359, Federal Aid Highway Act. (Passed 341–1.)	Yes.
Aug. 15	S. 3688, stimulating flow of mortgage credit for FHA and VA. (Passed 315–1.)	Yes.

Accomplishments of the 89th Congress—Continued

2D SESSION, 1966—Continued

Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
Aug. 15	H.R. 16114, correcting employment inequities with respect to premium compensation. (Passed 313-0.)	Yes.
Aug. 15	H.R. 14604, authorizing a study of facilities and services to be furnished to visitors and students coming to the Nation's Capital. (Failed 209-108.)	No.
Aug. 15	H.R. 11555, providing a border highway along the U.S. bank of the Rio Grande in connection with the settlement of the Chamizal boundary dispute between the United States and Mexico. (Failed 174-123.)	No.
Aug. 16	H.R. 14810, Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1966. On motion to recommit designed to reduce the funds from $175 million to $150 million in fiscal 1968. (Passed 205-160.)	Yes.
Aug. 16	H.R. 14810, Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1966. (Passed 235-127.)	No.
Aug. 17	H.R. 13228, National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act. On committee amendment designed to have the President appoint a National Motor Vehicle Safety Advisory Council, instead of the Secretary of Commerce. (Failed 168-205.)	No.
Aug. 17	H.R. 13228, National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act. (Passed 371-0.)	Yes.
Aug. 18	H.R. 14921, Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1967. On motion to recommit insisting on House disagreement to Senate amendment No. 35. (Failed 176-190.)	No.
Aug. 18	H.R. 13290, Highway Safety Act of 1966. (Passed 317-3.)	Yes.
Aug. 22	S. 602, Small Reclamation Projects Act. On agreeing to conference report. (Passed 198-81.)	Yes.
Aug. 22	H.R. 16340, prohibiting picketing in the District of Columbia within 500 feet of any church. On motion to recommit with instructions to hold hearings. (Failed 55-237.)	Yes.
Aug. 22	H.R. 16340, prohibiting picketing in the District of Columbia within 500 feet of any church. (Passed 249-44.)	No.
Aug. 24	H.R. 14596, Department of Agriculture appropriations, 1967. On agreeing to conference report. (Passed 325-28.)	Yes.
Aug. 25	H.R. 15941, Department of Defense appropriations, 1967. On agreeing to conference report. (Passed 383-1.)	Yes.
Aug. 25	H.R. 15941, Department of Defense appropriations, 1967. On Mahon (Tex.) motion to insist upon disagreement to Senate amendment No. 5. (Passed 378-3.)	Yes.
Aug. 26	S. 3688, stimulating the flow of mortgage credit for FHA and VA assisted residential construction. On agreeing to conference report. (Passed 235-1.)	Yes.
Aug. 26	S. 3700, Urban Mass Transportation Act. On agreeing to conference report. (Passed 156-86.)	No.
Aug. 29	H.J. Res. 1284, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1967. (Passed 323-6.)	Yes.
Aug. 30	H.R. 15963, Department of Transportation Act. On amendment designed to exclude jurisdiction of maritime activities from the Secretary of Transportation. (Passed 261-117.)	No.
Aug. 30	H.R. 15963, Department of Transportation Act. On motion to recommit designed to remove air accident investigation from the bill. (Failed 143-238.)	No.
Aug. 30	H.R. 15963, Department of Transportation Act. (Passed 336-42.)	Yes.
Aug. 31	S. 3155, Federal Aid Highway Act of 1966. On agreeing to conference report. (Passed 359-1.)	Yes.
Aug. 31	S. 3005, National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966. On agreeing to conference report. (Passed 365-0.)	Yes.
Aug. 31	S. 3052, Highway Safety Act of 1966. On agreeing to conference report. (Passed 360-3.)	Yes.
Aug. 31	H.R. 16574, amending Peace Corps Act. (Passed 322-15.)	Yes.
Sept. 1	H.R. 15750, Foreign Assistance Act of 1966. On agreeing to conference report. (Passed 217-127.)	General pair.
Sept. 1	H.R. 15098, re participation of the U.S. in the HemisFair 1968 Exposition in San Antonio, Tex. On motion to recommit. (Failed 147-184.)	Yes.
Sept. 6	H.R. 15766, establishing a National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws. (Passed 259-0.)	Yes.
Sept. 7	H.R. 13712, Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1966. On motion to recommit with instructions. (Failed 163-183.)	No.
Sept. 7	H.R. 13712, Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1966. On agreeing to conference report. (Passed 260-89.)	Yes.
Sept. 8	H.R. 14026, prohibiting insured banks from issuing negotiable interest-bearing or discounted notes, certificates of deposit or other evidence of indebtedness. On motion to recommit. (Failed 130-214.)	No.
Sept. 8	H.R. 14026, prohibiting insured banks from issuing negotiable interest-bearing or discounted notes, certificates of deposit or other evidence of indebtedness. (Passed 271-68.)	Yes.
Sept. 12	H.J. Res. 688, Beirut Agreement implementation legislation. On agreeing to H. Res. 1002, waiving points of order with 2 hours of debate for consideration of H.J. Res. 688. (Passed 242-2.)	General pair.
Sept. 12	H.R. 11256, Federal Tax Lien Act of 1966. On agreeing to H. Res. 1005, making it in order to consider the committee substitute. (Passed 243-9.)	General pair.
Sept. 12	H.R. 8664, Florence Agreement implementation legislation. On agreeing to H. Res. 1004, waiving points of order for 2 hours of debate. (Passed 241-7.)	General pair.
Sept. 12	H.R. 11555, the Chamizal Memorial Highway. On agreeing to H. Res. 976, an open rule with 1 hour of debate for consideration of H.R. 11555. (Passed 202-48.)	General pair.
Sept. 13	H.R. 17636, District of Columbia appropriation bill, 1967. On motion to recommit designed to reduce by 5% the funds appropriated. (Failed 103-217.)	No.
Sept. 13	H.R. 17636, District of Columbia appropriation bill, 1967. (Passed 320-3.)	Yes.
Sept. 14	H.R. 17637, military construction appropriation bill, 1967. (Passed 346-3.)	Yes.
Sept. 19	H.R. 8678, establishing Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore in Michigan. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 247-70.)	Yes.
Sept. 19	H.R. 17488, increasing non-service-connected disability and death pensions for veterans and their survivors. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 315-2.)	Yes.
Sept. 19	H.R. 15133, permitting Cuban refugees to apply for permanent residence status. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 300-25.)	Yes.
Sept. 19	S.J. Res. 167, authorizing $1.2 million for International Conference on Water for Peace. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Rejected 161-154, a two-thirds majority being required.)	Yes.
Sept. 19	S. 3423, authorizing $600,000 to establish cultural and recreation area in Fairfax County, Va. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Failed 195-105, a two-thirds majority being required.)	No.
Sept. 20	H.R. 17788, appropriations for foreign aid and other programs, 1967. On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce economic aid by 1.9 percent. (Passed 187-182.)	No.
Sept. 20	H.R. 17788, appropriations for foreign aid and other programs, 1967. (Passed 234-141.)	Yes.
Sept. 21	H.R. 17787, public works appropriations, 1967. (Passed 354-25.)	Yes.
Sept. 21	H.R. 17195, authorizing the President to call up reserves without declaring a national emergency and barring merger of Reserves and National Guard. (Passed 332-6.)	Yes.
Sept. 22	H.R. 11555, authorizing $12 million for border highway in El Paso, Tex. On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce Federal funds to $8 million and to require that El Paso or Texas pay 50 percent of highway cost. (Failed 149-199.)	Yes.
Sept. 22	H.R. 13825, authorizing funds for Tijuana River flood control project. (Passed 293-42.)	Yes.
Sept. 29	H.R. 15111, authorizing funds for antipoverty program, 1967. On motion to strike enacting clause. (Failed 156-208.)	No.
Sept. 29	H.R. 15111, authorizing funds for antipoverty program, 1967. On amendment to limit supergrades to one for each 100 programs. (Passed 257-108.)	Yes.
Sept. 29	H.R. 15111, authorizing funds for antipoverty program, 1967. On motion to recommit with instructions to substitute Opportunity Crusade. (Failed 162-203.)	No.
Sept. 29	H.R. 15111, authorizing funds for antipoverty program, 1967. (Passed 210-156.)	Yes.
Sept. 30	H.R. 17607, suspending 7 percent investment tax credit. On Byrnes amendment continuing credit for construction of water and air pollution control facilities. (Passed 330-2.)	Yes.
Sept. 30	H.R. 17607, suspending 7 percent investment tax credit. (Passed 221-118.)	Yes.
Sept. 30	H.R. 16076, authorizing funds for water pollution control. (Passed 312-0.)	Yes.
Oct. 3	S. 985, establishing certain fair packaging and labeling standards. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 300-8.)	Yes.
Oct. 3	S. 3807, authorizing funds for nuclear power desalting project. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 316-1.)	Yes.
Oct. 3	H.R. 13447, authorizing funds for estuarine areas. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Failed 208-108, a two-thirds majority being required.)	Yes.
Oct. 4	H.R. 18119, Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce appropriations, 1967. On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce all but FBI funds by 5 percent. (Failed 152-201.)	No.
Oct. 4	H.R. 18119, Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce appropriations, 1967. (Passed 319-38.)	Yes.
Oct. 5	H.R. 14929, Food for Freedom Act promoting international trade in agricultural commodities. On motion to recommit. (Passed 306-61.)	No.
Oct. 6	H.R. 13161, authorizing funds for Federal aid to elementary and secondary education. On amendment allowing withholding of funds for noncompliance with Civil Rights Act of 1964 only after hearings and findings. (Passed 221-116.)	Yes.
Oct. 6	H.R. 13161, authorizing funds for Federal aid to elementary and secondary education. On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce funds. (Failed 150-185.)	No.
Oct. 6	H.R. 13161, authorizing funds for Federal aid to elementary and secondary education. (Passed 237-97.)	Yes.
Oct. 7	H.R. 17788, appropriations for foreign aid and other program, 1967. On agreeing to conference report. (Passed 189-80.)	Yes.

STATEMENT OF HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN ON TRUST TERRITORY CEILING LEGISLATION

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the great rewards of serving on the Territories Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is that of getting to know and of working with the fine people of the small islands that comprise the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. I have found that this area poses one of the greatest challenges and one of the greatest opportunities to the United States.

We administer this area under a strategic trusteeship agreement which obligates us to promote the economic, educational, social and political advancement of the people of Micronesia. Our committee has overseen the way these obligations have been carried out by the Department of the Interior during the past 15 years and I think the record is clear that the Congress has responded favorably and generously to the needs of the territory during this period, and I submit that we have made substantial progress in the fulfillment of our obligations. My own contacts have convinced me that our efforts have struck a favorable chord in the people of Micronesia and that the reputation of the United States generally stands high.

We cannot, however, rest on past laurels. Despite the progress that has been made, we still need to strike the spark of greater private initiative in the islands, to attract private investment, to provide throughout the islands decent educational opportunities and health services. We have yet to provide the basic physical facilities, such as roads, docks, airfields, and public utilities which will support greater development and enable the Micronesians to make the most of their resources. In the past few months our committee has had before it legislation which would have provided funds for a much greater effort. Our committee devoted many hours of hearings and study to this legislation and on October 3 recommended enactment of a bill which would have authorized a $14,500,000 increase for this fiscal year and a greater increase for next year. Because of the approaching adjournment date, not because of opposition, the bill will not be enacted in this Congress.

I urge in the interest of this very important program that legislation be introduced early in the 90th Congress to provide the means for greater development in the Trust Territory. The need exists, and I am confident that any such legislation will be given careful and favorable consideration.

"AN ENCOURAGING DEVELOPMENT FOR FRIENDSHIP AIRPORT"

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I have often taken the floor to address the House on the subject of the dangerously overcrowded conditions at Washington National Airport while nearby Friendship International Airport suffers from inadequate service to more than 4 million people. There is no doubt in my mind that this condition exists because Dulles and National Airports are Government owned, Government operated, and Government regulated. I have repeatedly stated that Friendship airport could compete if these two airports were privately owned or State owned but it cannot compete against the Federal Government.

In my discussions with representatives of various airlines I have found them to be willing to cooperate with us in an effort to provide better service to the people of the Washington-Maryland area who find Friendship far more convenient than either National or Dulles. But they must contend with the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Aviation Agency, both constantly urging the Airlines to put more flights into Dulles. Today I am glad to say that another step is being taken to upgrade the service from Friendship International Airport.

Officials of United Air Lines have just advised me that their company will inaugurate daily nonstop jet service between Friendship Airport and Seattle/Tacoma on November 15, 1966. The westbound flight will depart Friendship at 6 p.m. and arrive at 8:25 p.m. Pacific standard time. Elapsed time will be 5 hours, 25 minutes, cutting an hour off the fastest present schedules. Eastbound service will depart Seattle/Tacoma at 9 a.m. Pacific standard time and arrive Friendship at 4:25 p.m. eastern standard time. This new air service will be one of the most important developments in the history of Baltimore's air-transport progress. It will provide a vital link between the great air transport and missile communities of the Pacific Northwest and this area's manufacturing and Government offices that play such an important role in the defense effort. It also will offer new convenience to citizens of the Northwest who wish to visit the many historic and recreational attractions in the Chesapeake Bay region.

I would like to commend United Air Lines for its decision to bring this important new service to Friendship. United is the largest operator at Friendship with 62 daily flights, and over the years it has consistently offered frequent and high quality air service to our citizens. United's new jet flight to the Pacific Northwest will be another fine contribution in that tradition.

At the same time United advised me they will begin a daily nonstop flight between Friendship and San Francisco. They said the flight would depart Friendship at noon and arrive in San Francisco at 2:20 p.m. Pacific standard time. Eastbound, the flight will leave San Francisco at 1:30 p.m. and arrive here at 9:05 p.m. United already operates two daily nonstop flights between Dulles International and San Francisco.

THAT WE MAY LIVE

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to call to the attention of the House a book about pesticides, "That We May Live," written by one of the able members of the House, the Honorable JAMIE L. WHITTEN, of Mississippi. This book has just been released by the D. Van Nostrand Co. of Princeton, N.J., and is now coming on to the Nation's bookstands.

JAMIE WHITTEN is chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman. He is the third ranking member of the full Appropriations Committee and also serves on the Public Works and Defense Subcommittees. He has been a Member of the Congress for 25 years, and a member of the Appropriations Committee for over 20 years. During this period he has made an enviable record as an outstanding legislator.

Few if any Members of Congress are more fully informed on all phases of agriculture than our colleague from Mississippi. He has devoted a great deal of his time and effort to this subject during his career here in Congress and on the committee. The record of his annual hearings on Department of Agriculture appropriations has become a well-known reference document by all those interested in agriculture. JAMIE WHITTEN is an indefatigable worker with an objective viewpoint and rare good judgment. He seeks out the facts and uses them to advance the interests of agriculture as well as all other segments of our national economy. No one is better qualified to write a book on the complex problems of pesticides and their use in this country.

Inevitably, "That We May Live" will be called an answer to "Silent Spring," the book about pesticides written by the late Rachel Carson back in 1962. JAMIE WHITTEN's book is not meant to be a direct answer to Rachel Carson, although it deals with "Silent Spring" as any book on pesticides must do. Its purpose is to inject a sense of balance into the pesticide controversy and to offset the one-sided presentation of this subject by Rachel Carson, some segments of the press, and certain organizations and agencies with special interests.

In "That We May Live," JAMIE WHITTEN tells us that the tremendous furor caused by "Silent Spring," and other publications led him to fear that public reaction would seriously injure American agriculture, and eventually would threaten the food supply and general welfare of the consumers of this country and the entire world. The Mississippian is keenly aware of the tremendous benefits resulting from the marvelous agricultural system in this country, and he has devoted much of his congressional career to promoting its stability and efficiency. His book reflects his strong conviction that we must continue to use pesticides if we are to protect our rapidly expanding populations from disease and hunger in the future.

In preparing "That We May Live," for publication, Mr. WHITTEN drew upon information which had been developed by a special study of the staff of the House Committee on Appropriations on pesticides, their uses, and effects. The staff in preparing this study interviewed about 185 scientists, and many physicians and laymen. This study proved to be one of the finest ever made by the investigative staff of the committee. The information derived therefrom was extremely valuable to Mr. Whitten in the preparation of his book.

I hope this book will find its way into many homes and all public libraries in the country. It is a remarkably valuable contribution to the whole pesticide question. It should have wide circulation among Government officials, scientists in and out of Government, as well as the general public. It should do much to reduce public alarm and create better understanding concerning pesticides. It makes clear the fact that pesticides are an important tool of agriculture and that they are an essential weapon for the protection of public health.

REPUBLICAN'S $1,000-PER-MEMBERSHIP BOOSTERS CLUB

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Stalbaum] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, on October 11, several of my colleagues and I joined in pointing out the continuing ties of many Republican office seekers and far-right organizations.

In preparing my background material at that time the many-splendored activities of the Republican's $1,000-per-membership Boosters Club aroused my curiosity, as it has that of some of my Democratic colleagues.

In recent weeks we Democrats have heard a great deal about our fund raising from the minority leader and others of his party.

Wearing their white hats, they have galloped through press conference after press conference castigating the Democrats for alleged wrongdoing—but never offering any facts.

Now that we Democrats have started taking a hard look at the Republican fund raising, we find the GOP white hats are turning darker every day. And underneath their hats their faces are getting redder.

For the truth is that they forgot, as one newspaper reporter put it, to look for the skeletons in their own closet before they began talking about hanky-panky among the Democrats.

For example, the Republicans hardly even acknowledge the existence of their Boosters Club.

I readily admit I was not present when this exclusive organization was formed late in 1964. But, according to stories by Walter Pincus published in the Washington Evening Star and the Atlantic Magazine, the avowed purpose of the Boosters Club was solely to aid Republican candidates running against Democratic incumbents.

Well, it was not long before it became apparent that whoever gave Mr. Pincus that information was surely putting him on. Mr. Pincus reported on June 25, 1965, that $2,500 in Boosters Club funds had been given to Congressman Prentiss Walker for his legal defense fund when his seat was being challenged by the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party.

In the same news story Mr. Pincus also reported that $1,000 from the Boosters Club had gone to Congressman H. R. Gross to aid him in his recount. Mr. Pincus quoted a Boosters Club member as saying, "That's the end of the road for that type of thing."

It clearly was not.

If anyone cares to look over the Boosters Club reports filed with the Clerk of the House, he will find that a total of five incumbents have received funds from the $1.2 million raised in the last 2 years.

The Republican leadership also has found much to talk about in the so-called large contributions given by families to the Democratic President's Club. But in their eagerness to criticize the Democrats they forgot the biggest skeleton of them all in their own closet—a total of more than $50,000 given by the family and officials of one firm to the Boosters Club.

Then there was the matter of the John Birch Society member from California who sent a contribution from himself and his wife to the President's Club.

No one invited him to do it.

No one asked him to do it.

And when the President's Club found out about his rightwing ties, the contribution was promptly returned.

This man then sent a contribution to the Republicans. It provided the minority leader with a gimmick to embarrass the Democrats so he announced to the world through the press that the GOP would not accept the tainted money.

Again, in their eagerness to cast a shadow on the Democrats, they overlooked a pile of their own bones. For as several of my Democratic colleagues have pointed out, the Boosters Club membership list is riddled with supporters of the John Birch Society.

It has been previously pointed out that Boosters Club contributions in excess of $15,000 came from those with known John Birch affiliation. And that many thousands more came from contributors active in other rightwing organizations.

But to the best of my knowledge, not one red cent of this money has been returned to its sources. And on the very small chance it is ever sent back, you can bet that the minority leader will not call a press conference to let the public know about it.

What, then, has happened to the money?

The answer to that question is available in the reports filed with the Clerk of the House.

It has been distributed along with some $690,000 to 126 Republican candidates all over America. And I am sorry to say, there is plenty more where that came from.

Perhaps at this point we should examine the question of accepting political contributions from supporters of the Birch Society.

First, I want to make it clear that the Democratic Party does not want their money.

We always have had within the Democratic Party the flexibility of a wide range of political philosophy. But we do not, in my opinion have the flexibility to embrace those who believe President Eisenhower was a conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy, who want to impeach the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and who want to infiltrate and control the American Government.

Far be it from me to decide who the Republican Party will embrace. Or from whom they will accept contributions. If they want all the John Birchers in this country they can have them.

But I think that when the minority leader and his colleagues make a grandstand play to embarrass my party, they ought to be consistent and return all of the contributions from John Birch supporters.

In order to make it a little easier for them to do so, I am happy to provide them at this time another name of a known John Birch Society supporter.

He is Willard D. Voit, of Balboa, Calif., who contributed $1,000 to the Boosters Club on February 9, 1966. Mr. Voit was a member of the General Committee of the Robert Welch Testimonial Dinner given in Hollywood, Calif., in 1963. Mr. Welch, as most people know, is the founder and titular head of the Birch Society.

Finally, I want at this time to insert into the Record the names of the Republican candidates who have received campaign assistance from the Boosters Club funds which include the contributions given by known supporters of the John Birch Society.

Republican Booster Club—Disbursements January 1, 1965, to August 31, 1965

ALASKA

Campaign of Howard Pollock, At Large nominee opposing incumbent Ralph Rivers: $10,000.

Year 1964 campaign of Lowell Thomas Jr, At Large nominee opposing incumbent Ralph Rivers: $500.

ARIZONA

Campaign of G. Alfred McGinnis, 2nd district nominee opposing incumbent Morris K. Udall: $5,000.

Campaign of Sam Steiger, 3rd district nominee opposing incumbent George F. Senner Jr.: $5,000.

ARKANSAS

Campaign of John Paul Hammerschmidt, 3rd district nominee opposing incumbent James Trimble: $2,500.

Campaign of Lynn Lowe, 4th district nominee opposing David Pryor: $2,500.

CALIFORNIA

Campaign of Bob Barry, 38th district nominee opposing incumbent John V. Tunney: $5,000.

Campaign of Malcolm Chaplin, 7th district nominee opposing incumbent Jeffery Cohelan: $5,000.

Campaign of Robert C. Cline, 22nd district nominee opposing incumbent James C. Corman: $10,000.

Campaign of Frank La Magna, 34th district nominee opposing incumbent Richard T. Hanna: $2,500.

Special election campaign of Ed Marshall, 26th district nominee opposing Thomas Rees: $1,000.

Campaign of Bob Mathias, 18th district nominee opposing incumbent Harlan Hagen: $5,000.

Campaign of Frank Newman, 14th district nominee opposing incumbent Jerome Waldie: $10,000.

Campaign of Henri O'Bryant, 30th district nominee opposing incumbent Edward Roybal: $2,500.

Campaign of Bill Orozco, 29th district nominee opposing incumbent GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.: $5,000.

Campaign of Jerry Pettis, 33rd district nominee opposing incumbent KEN W. DYAL: $10,000.

Campaign of William R. Sutton, 19th district nominee opposing incumbent CHET HOLIFIELD: $1,000.

Campaign of Samuel Vener, 37th district nominee opposing incumbent LIONEL VAN DEERLIN: $5,000.

Campaign of Charles Wiggins, 25th district nominee opposing incumbent RONALD B. CAMERON: $5,000.

COLORADO

Campaign of Donald Brotzman, 2nd district nominee opposing incumbent ROY H. MCVICKER: $10,000.

CONNECTICUT

Campaign of John Bonee, 1st district nominee opposing incumbent EMILIO Q. DADDARIO: $5,000.

Campaign of Joseph Goldberg, 2nd district nominee opposing incumbent WILLIAM ST. ONGE: $2,500.

Campaign of Thomas J. Meskill, 6th district nominee opposing incumbent BERNARD GRABOWSKI: $5,000.

Campaign of Romeo Petroni, 5th district nominee opposing incumbent JOHN S. MONAGAN: $2,500.

Campaign of Stelio Salmona, 3rd district nominee opposing incumbent ROBERT GIAIMO: $5,000.

Campaign of Abner Sibal, 4th district nominee opposing incumbent DONALD IRWIN: $5,000.

FLORIDA

Campaign of J. Herbert Burke, 10th district nominee opposing Joe Varon: $5,000.

Campaign of Joe Z. Lovingood, 7th district nominee opposing incumbent JAMES A. HALEY: $5,000.

Campaign of Mike Thompson, 12th district nominee opposing incumbent DANTE FASCELL: $2,500.

GEORGIA

Campaign of Ben Blackburn, 4th district nominee opposing incumbent JAMES A. MACKAY: $5,000.

Campaign of Porter Carswell, 1st district nominee opposing incumbent G. ELLIOT HAGAN: $5,000.

Campaign of G. Paul Jones Jr, 6th district nominee opposing incumbent JOHN J. FLYNT JR.: $5,000.

Campaign of Mack Mattingly, 8th district nominee opposing William S. Stuckey, Jr.: $2,500.

Campaign of Billy Mixon, 3d district nominee opposing Jack Brinkley: $5,000.

Campaign of Leroy Simpkins, 10th district nominee opposing ROBERT STEPHENS, incumbent: $5,000.

HAWAII

Campaign of Jimmy Kealoha, At Large district nominee opposing incumbents SPARK MATSUNAGA and PATSY MINK: $5,000.

IDAHO

Campaign of James A. McClure, 1st district nominee opposing incumbent COMPTON WHITE JR.: $5,000.

ILLINOIS

Campaign of John Hoellen, 11th district nominee opposing incumbent ROMAN C. PUCINSKI: $10,000.

Campaign of Leslie N. Jones, 23rd district nominee opposing incumbent GEORGE SHIPLEY: $5,000.

Campaign of Albert Manion, 3rd district nominee opposing incumbent WILLIAM T. MURPHY: $1,000.

Campaign of Thomas Railsback, 19th district nominee opposing incumbent GALE SCHISLER: $5,000.

Campaign of David Reed, 1st district nominee opposing incumbent WILLIAM DAWSON: $5,000.

INDIANA

Campaign of Kenneth Bowman, 5th district nominee opposing incumbent J. EDWARD ROUSH: $5,000.

Campaign of Robert Ehlers, 3rd district nominee opposing incumbent JOHN BRADEMAS: $2,500.

Campaign of John Lewis, 9th district nominee opposing incumbent LEE HAMILTON: $5,000.

Campaign of John Meyers, 7th district nominee opposing Elden Tipton: $5,000.

Campaign of Roger Zion, 8th district nominee opposing incumbent WINFIELD K. DENTON: $10,000.

IOWA

Legal defense of H. R. GROSS, 3rd district: $1,000.

1964 campaign of incumbent H. R. GROSS, 3rd district opposing Stephen M. Peterson: $1,000.

Campaign of Robert Johnson, 2nd district nominee opposing incumbent JOHN CULVER: $10,000.

Campaign of John Kyl, 4th district nominee opposing incumbent BERT BANDSTRA: $10,000.

Campaign of Wiley Mayne, 6th district nominee opposing incumbent STANLEY GREIGG: $10,000.

Campaign of Fred Schwengel, 1st district nominee opposing incumbent JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER: $10,000.

KANSAS

Campaign of Larry Winn, Jr., 3rd district nominee opposing Marvin Rainey: $5,000.

KENTUCKY

Campaign of William Cowger, 3rd district nominee opposing Norbert Blume: $5,000.

Campaign of Gene Snyder, 4th district nominee opposing John Moloney: $10,000.

MAINE

Campaign of Howard Foley, 2nd district nominee opposing incumbent WILLIAM HATHAWAY: $5,000.

Campaign of Peter Garland, 1st district nominee opposing PETER N. KYROS: $5,000.

MARYLAND

Campaign of Paul McHenry Jr, 2nd district nominee opposing incumbent CLARENCE LONG: $2,000.

MICHIGAN

Campaign of Gary E. Brown, 3rd district nominee opposing incumbent PAUL TODD JR.: $10,000.

Campaign of John Dempsey, 16th district nominee opposing incumbent JOHN DINGELL: $1,000.

Campaign of Marvin Esch, 2nd district nominee opposing incumbent WESTON VIVIAN: $5,000.

Campaign of Jack H. McDonald, 19th district nominee opposing incumbent BILLIE FARNUM: $5,000.

Campaign of Donald W. Riegle, 7th district nominee opposing incumbent JOHN MACKIE: $5,000.

Campaign of Philip Ruppe, 11th district nominee opposing incumbent RAYMOND CLEVENGER: $10,000.

Campaign of Guy Vander Jagt, 9th district nominee opposing HENRY DONGVILLO: $5,000.

MINNESOTA

Campaign of John Zwach, 6th district nominee opposing incumbent ALEC G. OLSON: $5,000.

MISSISSIPPI

Campaign of William B. Alexander, 1st district nominee opposing incumbent THOMAS ABERNETHY: $2,500.

Campaign of L. L. McAllister, 4th district nominee opposing G. V. Montgomery: $2,500.

Campaign of James Moye, 5th district nominee opposing incumbent WILLIAM COLMER: $2,500.

Legal defense for incumbent PRENTISS WALKER, 4th district: $2,500.

Campaign of S. B. Wise, 2nd district nominee opposing incumbent JAMIE L. WHITTEN: $2,500.

MONTANA

Campaign of Dick Smiley, 1st district nominee opposing incumbent ARNOLD OLSEN: $5,000.

NEBRASKA

Campaign of Robert V. Denney, 1st district nominee opposing incumbent CLAIR CALLAN: $10,000.

NEVADA

'64 Campaign of George Von Tobel, At Large nominee opposing incumbent WALTER BARING: $500.

NEW JERSEY

Campaign of John Hunt, 1st district nominee opposing Michael Piarulli: $5,000.

Campaign of Frank Osmers, 9th district nominee opposing incumbent HENRY HELSTOSKI: $5,000.

NEW MEXICO

Campaign of Robert C. Davidson, 2nd At Large district nominee opposing incumbent E. S. JOHNNY WALKER: $7,500.

NEW YORK

Campaign of Frank J. Biondolillo, 16th district nominee opposing incumbent JOHN M. MURPHY: $5,000.

Campaign of Thomas Brennan, 5th district nominee opposing incumbent HERBERT TENZER: $5,000.

Campaign of Daniel Button, 29th district nominee opposing Richard Connors: $5,000.

Campaign of James M. Catterson Jr, 1st district nominee opposing incumbent OTIS G. PIKE: $5,000.

Campaign of Steven Derounian, 3rd district nominee opposing incumbent LESTER WOLFF: $10,000.

Campaign of Frederick D. Dugan, 35th district nominee opposing incumbent SAMUEL STRATTON: $2,500.

Campaign of Hamilton Fish Jr, 28th district nominee opposing incumbent JOSEPH Y. RESNICK: $5,000.

Campaign of Stewart E. Hancock Jr, 34th district nominee opposing incumbent JAMES M. HANLEY: $5,000.

Special election campaign of TED KUPFERMAN, 17th district nominee opposing Orin Lehman: $10,000.

Campaign of Frederick Martin Jr, 25th district nominee opposing incumbent RICHARD OTTINGER: $5,000.

Campaign of Louis V. Mills, 27th district nominee opposing incumbent JOHN G. DOW: $5,000.

Campaign of John R. Pillion, 39th district nominee opposing incumbent RICHARD MCCARTHY: $5,000.

Campaign of Herbert F. Ryan, 15th district nominee opposing incumbent HUGH CAREY: $2,500.

NORTH CAROLINA

Campaign of Richard Barnwell, 6th district nominee opposing incumbent HORACE KORNEGAY: $5,000.

Special election campaign of John East, 1st district nominee opposing WALTER B. JONES: $6,500.

Campaign of James Gardner, 4th district nominee, opposing incumbent HAROLD COOLEY: $10,000.

Campaign of Reece B. Gardner, 2nd district nominee opposing incumbent L. H. FOUNTAIN: $1,000.

Campaign of G. Fred Steele Jr., 5th district nominee opposing Nick Galifianakis: $7,500.

NORTH DAKOTA

Campaign of Thomas Kleepe, 2nd district nominee opposing incumbent ROLLAND REDLIN: $5,000.

OHIO

Special election campaign of CLARENCE J. BROWN, 7th district opposing James Berry: $5,000.

Campaign of Jane Kuebbeler, 9th district nominee opposing incumbent THOMAS ASHLEY: $2,000.

Campaign of Donald Lukens, 24th district nominee opposing James Pelley: $5,000.

Campaign of Clarence Miller, 10th district nominee opposing incumbent WALTER MOELLER: $5,000.

Campaign of Robert Taft, Jr., 1st district nominee opposing incumbent JOHN GILLIGAN: $5,000.

Campaign of CHARLES WHALEN, JR., 3rd district nominee opposing incumbent RODNEY M. LOVE: $5,000.

Campaign of Chalmers P. Wylie, 15th district nominee opposing Robert Van Heyde: $5,000.

OKLAHOMA

Campaign of Danzil Garrison, 2nd district nominee opposing incumbent ED EDMONDSON: $5,000.

Campaign of James V. Smith, 6th district nominee opposing incumbent JED JOHNSON: $2,000.

OREGON

Campaign of John R. Dellenback, 4th district nominee opposing Charles O. Porter: $5,000.

PENNSYLVANIA

Campaign of Edward G. Biester Jr, 8th district nominee opposing Walter S. Farley Jr.: $5,000.

Campaign of Herbert Cain Jr, 2nd district nominee opposing incumbent ROBERT N. C. NIX: $5,000.

Campaign of Robert Cohen, 4th district nominee opposing Joshua Eilberg: $2,500.

Campaign of Erwin Eshleman, 16th district nominee opposing Richard Charles: $5,000.

Campaign of George Gooding, 19th district nominee opposing incumbent N. NEIMAN CRALEY JR.: $5,000.

Campaign of George Joseph, 15th district nominee opposing incumbent FRED B. ROONEY: $2,500.

Campaign of James D. Weaver, 24th district nominee opposing incumbent JOSEPH VIGORITO: $10,000.

Campaign of Lawrence Williams, 7th district nominee opposing John J. Logue: $5,000.

RHODE ISLAND

Campaign of Raymond Houghton, 1st district nominee opposing incumbent FERNAND ST GERMAIN: $2,000.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Campaign of John Grisso, 3rd district nominee opposing incumbent W. J. BRYAN DORN: $5,000.

Campaign of Archie Odom, 6th district nominee opposing incumbent JOHN L. MCMILLAN: $5,000.

Special election campaign of Albert Watson, 2nd district opposing Preston Callison: $5,000.

TENNESSEE

Campaign of Julius Hurst, 7th district nominee opposing Ray Blanton: $5,000.

Campaign of Dan Kuykendall, 9th district nominee opposing incumbent GEORGE GRIDER: $10,000.

TEXAS

Campaign of Duke Burgess, 5th district nominee opposing incumbent EARLE CABELL: $10,000.

Campaign of George Bush, 7th district nominee opposing Frank Briscoe: $10,000.

Campaign of James Collins, 3rd district nominee opposing incumbent JOE POOL: $5,000.

Campaign of D. C. Norwood, 13th district nominee opposing incumbent GRAHAM PURCELL: $2,000.

Campaign of Robert Price, 18th district nominee opposing Dee Miller: $10,000.

UTAH

Campaign of Sherman P. Lloyd, 2nd district nominee opposing incumbent DAVID S. KING: $5,000.

VIRGINIA

Campaign of Bill Scott, 8th district nominee opposing George Rawlings: $5,000.

Campaign of William Wampler, 9th district nominee opposing incumbent W. PAT JENNINGS: $10,000.

WASHINGTON

Campaign of Eugene Smith, 2nd district nominee opposing incumbent LLOYD MEEDS: $5,000.

WEST VIRGINIA

Campaign of Elizabeth Ann Bowen, 5th district nominee opposing incumbent JAMES KEE: $1,000.

WISCONSIN

Campaign of Henry Shadeberg, 1st district nominee opposing incumbent LYNN STALBAUM: $5,000.

Campaign of William B. Smith, 2nd district nominee opposing incumbent ROBERT KASTENMEIER: $2,000.

Campaign of William Steiger, 6th district nominee opposing incumbent JOHN RACE: $5,000.

WYOMING

Campaign of William H. Harrison, At Large district nominee opposing Al Christian: $5,000.

ACHIEVING CONSISTENCY IN COTTON STORAGE PRICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's agriculture long has been troubled by the three-pronged problem of oversupply, underconsumption, and maldistribution.

Commodities today are in the marketplace in programs of planned marketing, in order to prevent more chaos on the farm; our farmers were badly harmed by the 1930's, with its rotting potatoes and burning wheat.

In recent years, the Congress has been attempting to bring back to agriculture something of the competitive market. Since the days of Ezra Taft Benson, farmers have made great headway.

Mr. Speaker, we are now at the point where we have small surpluses of grains and dairy products. With our school lunch and food for peace programs, we have seen the superabundance of the Nation's farmland become a blessing instead of the curse that it was during the Eisenhower years.

The farm price-support program, which is aimed at keeping our farmers from the poorhouse, is under heavy attack. A number of those who advocate abolition of the existing program of price supports do so because of a lack of awareness and understanding of the unique problems facing farmers.

Others oppose the existing program on other bases, chiefly that the long-range effects have been to price a number of commodities, particularly cotton, out of normal markets. I believe this would result in increased competition from foreign cotton and from the synthetic fibers.

Opponents of the programs are able to point to the enormous costs imposed upon the National treasury—particularly the tremendous costs of storing and warehousing cotton, both while under loan and after government acquisition.

What I will suggest will not require legislation, since the authority already exists in the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965. I am going to address myself to a practice that is actually subverting the intent of the Congress in last year's omnibus farm bill.

We can find in many places in the South that cotton is being grown not for textile or paper or actual use. Why is it grown? It is grown, Mr. Speaker, for storage in warehouses. The current cotton regulations encourage this practice.

We are confronted with a double standard in the commodity price-support program. If I were a wheat farmer in Nebraska or Wyoming or South Dakota, Mr. Speaker, I would be able to place my crop along about this time of the year into the commodity loan program, but I would have to prepay my storage charges; I would not be eligible for the commodity loan programs, even if I complied with the acreage allotment and other regulations of the Department of Agriculture, if I did not prepay the storage charges.

But if I were a cotton farmer, I would be able to place my entire cotton crop under the loan program without any prepayment of storage costs. In fact, I would be at a great economic disadvantage if I were to try to sell my crop on the market.

I have learned, Mr. Speaker, that cotton placed under price supports is stored at the expense of the taxpayer—at possibly $50 million a year more than it should cost the taxpayer. The entire cotton program, let it be noted for the RECORD, costs about $1 billion a year.

It is only—and let me underscore the word "only"—in the case of cotton, that price-support loans are not subject to advance deductions of storage costs. It is this feature of the program, more than any other, that encourages the maximum use of the program of price supports, and ultimately the serious abuse of the program itself. Under present practices, the price-support loan becomes a speculative device, cost-free to the producer, but of great cost to the National Treasury.

Only in the case of cotton are members of cooperatives provided a separate and altogether different type of program. Under the designation "Form G," this program can cause serious economic harm to independent producers and independent handlers of cotton. There are some competitive harms done by several inequities.

The present regulations actually penalize and discriminate against producers and handlers who prefer the good old American way of acting independently, Mr. Speaker, or those who have not joined cooperative marketing associations.

That this special treatment for cotton cooperatives has led to serious abuses of the program is evidenced by the fact that many cooperatives and their banks have placed a large amount of ineligible cotton under loan.

I offer some testimony by Horace D. Godfrey, Administrator of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, and a member of the Commodity Credit Corporation, as substantiation of the problems from the "Form G" loan program. At page 234 of the Fiscal 1967 hearings before the Agriculture Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, Mr. Godfrey said:

> The problem that has occurred in this is that the banks and co-ops have placed some ineligible cotton under loan, a considerable amount.

Mr. Godfrey then introduced into the hearing record the specific cases of violations. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I insert the pertinent portion of Mr. Godfrey's testimony in the RECORD.

FORM G COTTON LOANS

Mr. GODFREY. We have a real problem, Mr. Chairman, in servicing the lending agencies who are working with cotton co-ops on form G loans. We call them form G loans.

Mr. WHITTEN. Explain that for the record.

Mr. GODFREY. Form G loans are cotton loans made to approved co-ops on cotton produced by members of the co-ops. The co-ops make advances to their producer-members for not less than the full loan value of the cotton. They then submit the loan documents including warehouse receipts to the servicing bank and are reimbursed for the loan value of the cotton by CCC through the banks.

Custody of the warehouse receipts is maintained in the office of the servicing agent bank and the bank handles loan redemptions. This is the procedure for all except one of the large cotton co-ops, and in that case, the loan documents and warehouse receipts are tendered to the New Orleans ASC Commodity Office. The New Orleans office arranges for reimbursement of the co-op, maintains custody of the warehouse receipts and handles loan redemptions.

The problem that has occurred in this is that the banks and the co-ops have placed some ineligible cotton under loan, a considerable amount.

Mr. WHITTEN. What are those instances, and what action have you taken?

Mr. GODFREY. Well, we will be glad to supply this for the record. We have had investigations on each one of them.

(The material referred to follows:)

"Cotton cooperative violation cases investigated by inspector general

"1. American Growers, Inc., Lubbock, Tex. Referred to Justice Department for tendering ineligible cotton and for other reasons. Co-op not approved for 1965 cotton loan program.

"2. Blackland Cotton Producers, Inc., Dallas, Tex. Referred to Justice Department for tendering ineligible cotton and for other reasons.

"3. Calcot, Ltd., Bakersfield, Calif. Referred to Justice Department for tendering ineligible cotton.

"4. Cotton Producers Association, Atlanta, Ga. Presently being investigated for tendering ineligible cotton.

"5. Plains Cotton Cooperative Association, Lubbock, Tex. Referred to Justice Department for tendering ineligible cotton and for other reasons.

"6. Western Cotton Growers Association, Lubbock, Tex. Presently being investigated for tendering ineligible cotton and for other reasons.

"The additional following co-ops have been examined by the New Orleans Office and found to have tendered ineligible cotton to CCC.

"1. Producers Marketing Association, Levelland, Tex.

"2. South Texas Cooperative Association, Corpus Christi, Tex.

"3. Texas Cotton Growers Cooperative Association, Dallas, Tex.

"4. Mississippi Federated Cooperative Association (AAL), Jackson, Miss.

"We have required the co-ops to redeem all ineligible cotton from loan."

FEES FOR SERVICES

Mr. GODFREY. In addition to this, we are paying out at the present time what we consider excessive fees for the services rendered, and in the case of cotton loans to co-ops for the last year for which we have a complete record, which is 1964, we paid out approximately $800,000 in service fees, sc we asked the servicing banks and the co-ops to come in to a meeting in Texas last week to discuss ways and means of reducing the cost of this service, or other ways of handling the service. We proposed no set way of handling it. We discussed several alternatives.

The warehouse receipts could be tendered to the Commodity Credit Corporation at New Orleans, as one of the cotton associations is now doing, or that they could be tendered to a central location in the State, a county office or a State office.

We even suggested that an employee of ASCS could be assigned to the co-op.

They could look at their service fees that they are now charging to see if they could make an adjustment in the service fees. The service fees are 15 cents for each bale of cotton that goes under loan, and the co-op has been receiving 15 cents for each bale of cotton that was redeemed. This amounts to approximately $80,000 a year.

We believe that it can be done cheaper.

Mr. Speaker, recently a large syndicate came into existence in Memphis, Tenn. Without a great amount of comment, I offer for the RECORD a copy of three stories from the Memphis Commercial Appeal of September 22, 1966, which tells the story of a syndicate that is attempting to take over storage facilities in order to capitalize on the shortcomings of the cotton price-support program.

One story names the financial leaders involved in the current deal. The second describes the charter issued by the State of Tennessee to bring the new firm into being. The third story, entitled "Cotton Comment," tells the real story. At this point, I insert the three stories:

CO-OP CHARTER ISSUED BY STATE TO COTTON GROUP—ORGANIZATION IS LINKED TO TALKS TO BUY FEDERAL COMPRESS STOCK

(By Gerald L. Dearing)

A charter has been issued by the Secretary of State at Nashville for a co-operative to be known as the Central Belt Cooperative, Inc., with headquarters in Memphis.

The charter was issued to a group which has been closely identified with negotiations to buy the common stock of the Federal Compress & Warehouse Co. in a deal which would involve about 50 million dollars.

The issuance of the new charter on Sept. 13 has resulted in the organization of a board of directors and the election of officers.

E. M. Regenoid of Blytheville and Armorel, Ark., is president. He is president of the First National Bank of Blytheville and of the Crain Co. near Wilson, Ark.

E. P. Peacock, Jr., president of the Bank of Clarksdale, Miss., is vice president.

Tom F. Baker, Baker, Mo., farmer and landowner, is treasurer.

A. V. Shannon of Memphis, farmer and landowner, is secretary.

There are seven other directors, all of whom were incorporators.

If the new co-operative complies with the USDA regulations, it must be a sales organization as well as offering storage facilities. If it acquires Federal, as seems its objective, its activities will encompass the Central Belt and the State of Arizona, where Federal has warehouses.

Federal normally stores about 25 percent of the cotton crop, which if handled through a co-operative, would give a business volume of between three and five million bales annually. This would make it the largest cotton co-operative in the country.

Federal Compress had its beginning in 1925 with the acquisition of the Grenada Compress Co., which had been in existence since 1886. Its 93 warehouses and compresses have combined storage space of more than 25 million square feet, and the capacity of all the plants is 5,260,000 bales. In addition it operates the Dixie Portland Flour Mills, Inc., and the Cosby-Hodges Milling Co.

There are 1.5 million shares of the stock outstanding. The stock was quoted at 31¼ bid and 34 asked yesterday.

According to the last report of the company on May 31, it has assets of more than 50 million dollars and the stockholders' equity was $35,896,550.

There has been no formal offer to stockholders for the Federal Compress stock by the co-op.

Funds for the purchase, it is reported, will come mainly from the Louisville Bank of Cooperatives at Louisville, Ky., which has agreed to advance funds when certain requirements have been met, such as establishing a backlog of funds from the sponsors and the grower members of the co-operative.

The Louisville bank has set a deadline for Central to qualify for its assistance. Sponsors expect the requirements to be met.

AREA LEADERS HEAD SYNDICATE—CENTRAL BELT OFFICIALS ARE AMONG MID-SOUTH'S TOP BUSINESS FIGURES

Directors and officers of the newly formed Central Belt Cooperative, Inc., which has as its goal the purchase of the majority stock of Federal Compress & Warehouse Co., are among the banking, farming, and business leaders of the Mid-South.

E. M. Regenold of Blytheville, Ark., who is president of the First National Bank at Blytheville, has extensive land holdings and through his connection with the Crain Co. near Wilson, Ark., controls the farming of about 60,000 acres of rich alluvial land.

E. P. Peacock, Jr., vice president, is president of the largest bank in the Mississippi Delta, the Bank of Clarksdale, which was founded in 1900. He also is a farmer.

A. V. Shannon of 433 North Highland, secretary, is known for his extensive farming interests in Mississippi. Until the first of the year, when he sold it, he owned and operated the Redbird Plantation at Lake Cormorant, Miss. He has other Mississippi farms.

Tom F. Baker, Baker, Mo., treasurer, operates a 7,000-acre farm near Essex known as Trailback Plantation. He also has extensive land holdings in Colorado and California. He is chairman of the Cotton Producers Institute in Missouri.

George S. Lensing of Lake Providence, La., is president of the Bank of Lake Providence. He also is president of Agricredit, a production credit organization. He has extensive farm holdings and operates real estate and insurance businesses.

Frank Hyneman of Trumann, Ark., is board chairman of the First National Bank of Trumann, chairman of the American Pioneer Life Insurance Co., and head of 12 closed corporations. He operates 12,500 acres of land, has two gins, a soybean elevator and a cottonseed delinting plant. He also buys and sells cotton and other agricultural products.

J. T. Murff of 565 Country Club Lane, is partner in Murff & Co., Inc., which deals in buying, selling and shipping cotton, plus the operation of about 8,700 acres of farm land in Mississippi. Mr. Murff is a director of Union Planters National Bank.

A. K. Morrison of Rossville, Tenn., operates a general mercantile business, two cotton gins, owns one farm of 600 acres and rents or leases other farms which he operates.

S. Haskins Ridens of Newbern, Tenn., owns about 5,000 acres which he rents. He is president of the Newbern State Bank and a director of the Dyersburg State Bank. He has a general insurance agency in Newbern. He owns seven cotton gins, the Nashville Cotton Oil Mill, the Lake County Cotton Oil Mill, the Dyersburg Oil Mill and the West Tennessee Soya Mill.

Taylor G. Barbee of 198 South Holmes is partner in Murff & Co., Inc., and shares in the operation of that company and its holdings.

Charles E. Ishee of Collierville, Tenn., is a farmer with extensive holdings in Shelby County and neighboring counties. He has been a leader in business and agriculture in his community.

Cotton Comment—Idea of Co-Operative, Based on Federal Compress Facilities, Has Been Stirring Since Starting of 1965 Legislation

(By Gerald L. Dearing)

The idea of a strong co-operative, based on the warehouse facilities of Federal Compress & Warehouse Co., was born about 18 months ago when the Agricultural Act of 1965 was being formulated.

The business men, bankers and producers behind the movement realized that there was no overall producer organization speaking for cotton growers, who were widely split on the merits of the new legislation, with some fighting it bitterly and some supporting it to the limit of their ability.

There was a realization, too, that the days of high support prices and high loans are in the past, that the present program with payments to farmers has only three more years to run and that at the end of that period the farmer may be returned to a competitive world without loans or subsidies.

The sponsors are realistic enough to know that the production and diversion payments, plus the loans to the larger commercial growers are political hay to such members of Congress as Senator JOHN WILLIAMS (R., Del.), who makes a practice periodically to insert the list of the larger payments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They are of a mind that, if taxes rise, if the administration changes, and means of economizing in government are sought, agriculture, not poverty programs or urban relief will be the victim of the economy.

Central Belt Cooperative, Inc., was formed with these and other things in mind. The Federal Compress complex spreads from Missouri through Arkansas and Louisiana, into Tennessee and Mississippi. The warehouses outside the closely knit organization are those in Arizona.

This complex, it was argued, could be made the basis for a co-operative which would store cotton, make loans and market it, with profits accruing to the producer through patronage dividends. These profits are exempt from Federal taxes at the co-operative level if paid in dividends. The farmer, of course, must pay taxes against the payments as income.

The sponsors of the co-op have other things in mind. In addition to being a voice for growers who produce from 20 to 30 per cent of the cotton grown in the United States, they would be a strong force in the field of investigating the qualities of cotton desired by the mills, and in seeking to correct the problems of such things as high micronaire, poor ginning practices and the likes.

They hope to ease the transition to a competitive economy for cotton if political necessity requires it.

They are thinking in broad terms. They are men with the business and agricultural background to get the job done. They will have opposition, especially from shippers and merchants who believe that the co-ops are pre-empting their function. They may find the existing co-operatives within the territory they hope to serve something less than enthusiastic with their formation.

One key paragraph in the "Cotton Comment" story well describes the thinking of the gentlemen who are setting up the cooperative, that—

> They are of a mind that, if taxes rise, if the Administration changes, and means of economizing in government are sought, agriculture, not poverty programs or urban relief, will be the victim of the economy.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that any genuinely necessary poverty or urban relief or agricultural program will be cut back.

The Federal Compress & Warehouse Co., in its operations in 6 States has a total capacity of 4,654,700 bales. Even if the Federal Government were to pay 1 cent per bale too much for storage of cotton by this company, the resulting added cost would amount to $46,547—or enough to pay for one-tenth of a new school building.

I offer for the RECORD a table of capacities of the Federal Compress & Warehouse facilities, by city and State, with State totals, for insertion in the RECORD, under unanimous consent:

Federal Compress & Warehouse Co.

City	*Capacity*
ARIZONA	
Phoenix	60,000
Picacho	45,000
Yuma	45,000
State total	150,000
ARKANSAS	
Ashdown	30,000
Blytheville	200,000
Conway	22,500
Dumas	30,000
Earle	45,000
England	45,000
Eudora	37,500
Forest City	70,000
Fort Smith	37,500
Helena	55,000
Hugues	30,000
Little Rock	130,000
McCrory	15,000
McGehee	52,500
Magnolia	22,500
Marianna	60,000
Marvell	37,500
Morrilton	45,000
Newport	60,000
Osceola	67,500
Pine Bluff	162,500
Portland	60,000
Searcy	45,000
Trumann	67,500
Walnut Ridge	82,000
West Memphis	160,000
Wynne	15,000
State total	1,684,500
LOUISIANA	
Lake Providence	37,500
Monroe	60,000
Newellton	5,000
Tallulah	37,500
State total	140,000
MISSISSIPPI	
Amory	17,200
Batesville	37,500
Belzoni	70,000
Booneville	22,500
Canton	67,000
Carthage	7,500
Clarksdale	165,000
Cleveland	60,000
Como	37,500
Corinth	70,000
Drew	37,500
Greenwood	175,000
Grenada	48,500
Holly Spring	52,500
Inverness	45,000
Jackson	75,500
Macon	28,500
Marks	67,500
New Albany	67,500
Okloiona	7,500
Ripley	15,000
Ruleville	36,000
Shaw	30,000
Shelby	50,000
Sledge	15,000
Tunica	52,500
Tupelo	90,000
Tutwiler	15,000
West Point	30,000
Yazzo City	90,000
State total	1,582,700
MISSOURI	
Lilbourn	37,500
Portageville	67,500
State total	105,000
TENNESSEE	
Brownsville	88,500
Covington	45,000
Dyersburg	70,000
Jackson	85,000
South Memphis	495,000
Memphis	70,500
Memphis	71,000
Ripley	30,000
Tiptonville	37,500
State total	992,500
Grand total	4,654,700

But nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, I do have some concern that a company such as the one being formed in Memphis will manage to circumvent our best intentions of helping the cotton farmer. I fear that the middleman, the warehouseman, will reap more profit that the farmer. I feel that our free enterprise system should actually reward the man who takes the real risks more than the opportunist.

A highly interesting article appeared in the August 20, 1966, edition of the Cotton Digest. At this point, I insert part of the text of the column entitled "The Digest Spotlight," which notes that cotton storage costs for the first 9-month period after harvest can cost the Federal Government more than $7 a bale or more.

What's Ahead for Cotton From the National Capitol

(By Washington Correspondent)

When a cotton producer defaults on his price support loan, the agriculture department takes his cotton and assumes the storage charges. In addition, USDA pays the interest rate. For a nine-month period, that comes to a total cost of more than $7 a bale.

It is a different situation when a farmer decides to redeem the cotton he has placed in storage. He pays both the storage charges and the interest. The net effect is that the government is rewarding farmers who default with a bonus.

The American Cotton Compress and Warehouse Association disagrees with this practice. The association has urged the White House and USDA to make these changes in the government's cotton storage programs: (1) Stop free storage for cotton placed under price support loans, and (2) Require that cotton already owned by the government be stored on the basis of competitive bids.

Under the association's proposal, cotton farmers would pay the full term storage and interest on cotton placed under loan. Farmers who redeem their cotton would get refunds for the storage time not used. The idea is to encourage farmers to take more interest in placing their cotton in the free market, and to reduce costs in running the cotton program.

For the crop year which ended July 20, the association's plan would have meant payment to the government for storage and interest on all 6,900,000 bales put under the loan and not just on the cotton redeemed.

Under present policy, USDA will acquire at least 5,000,000 bales of this cotton and will have to pay more than $7 in charges on each bale. As matters stand, USDA is likely to absorb a similar amount this year. The association figures its plan could save $35,000,000 a year on cotton storage and interest costs, and reduce new budget outlays by $300,000,000.

As the association figures it, the second half of its proposal—to store all cotton owned by the government on the basis of competitive bids—would save the government an additional $1,000,000 a month.

Under present policy, most government-owned cotton is stored at fixed rates in the original warehouse until the warehouse operator asks that the cotton be moved or for other reasons. Cotton on which competitive rates are being paid is averaging about 22 cents a bale a month, and in some instances as low as ten cents a month, according to the financial newspaper, Journal of Commerce. This is considerably below fixed rates.

The association's proposal would not require legislation. However, the plan is certain to be opposed by some farm organizations and warehousemen. The Journal of Commerce says terminal warehousemen have won some support from shippers.

President Johnson has a report on the cotton textile situation from Commerce Secretary John T. Connor. It's this: There should be no pressure—in spite of the current inflationary situation—on manufacturers to increase the price of cotton fabrics this year.

A preliminary report by the commerce department shows that domestic production and imports are increasing supply at a faster rate than the total demand of the country.

A number of cotton textile men agree with this forecast. However, some of them say the report fails to take into account rising labor and raw material costs.

Mr. Speaker, the article from the Cotton Digest is rather difficult for anyone outside of the cotton business to understand. However, the eminent columnist, Ralph McGill, has put the cotton question into understandable prose in his September 14, 1966, column, which I insert at this point, under unanimous consent:

GROWN FOR LOAN?—QUALITY OF SOUTH'S COTTON POOR

(By Ralph McGill)

There is a story to tell.

Weep some more, my lady . . . weep about Watts, Harlem, Chicago, Omaha. Weep, too, for all the other cities, South and North, filled with refugees from cotton fields. Weep about the blindness of Americans who are economic romantics or "conservatives" in the blind Puritan manner.

In March of 1858, J. M. Hammond, an arrogant man, arose in the United States Senate amid gathering secession clouds and said:

"Sir, you dare not make war on cotton. No power on earth dares make war upon it. Cotton is king. Until lately the Bank of England was king; but she . . . has been utterly vanquished. The last power has been conquered."

In August of 1966, the agricultural commissioner of Georgia told the public what the farmers already know. Cotton is in trouble. Of all the old cotton states only South Carolina seems to have made the competitive transition—in the field, at the gin, and in the market.

Now, as cotton bolls ripen for opening, Georgia's agricultural commissioner writes:

"Georgia's cotton has the poorest spinning quality of that produced in any cotton state.

"Less than 30 percent of the cotton produced in Georgia is sold to the textile industry . . . Better than 70 percent of the crop remains in government loan. (All the old cotton states, save South Carolina, have quality problems.)

". . . Georgia's textile mills," he said, "use more than 1.5 million bales a year—a vast majority of which comes from other states . . . A survey of 41 textile firms in Georgia reveals that, since 1950, 14 had stopped using Georgia cotton completely and 18 had reduced purchases.

"Why?

". . . The leading criticism was the low strength of Georgia cotton . . ." (The quality of loan cotton was poor . . . too much trash, usually leaves; cotton ruined by being picked wet, and so on.)

The commissioner had one sentence in his announcement that is part of the scandal in cotton. "There is still salable cotton in many Georgia warehouses which has not moved due to the attractiveness of government storage fees," he said.

The scandal is that the fee, $6 per bale, encourages growing cotton for loan—and warehouse storage. (How many farmers are growing cotton just for "loan" is a story yet to be investigated.)

New Mexico was the leading cotton state in quality price in 1965 at 31.3 cents per pound. California was second with 30.2 cents per pound.

In the cotton South, South Carolina provided the one bright spot. In quality and price she moved from ninth place in 1964, when her cotton brought 29.5 cents, to 29.7 cents in 1965. Her farmers and extension service are well organized and—most important—well informed.

All this is background.

Americans, angry and fearful about slum riots, and thinking in terms of "getting tough," finding fault with political leadership, will do well to understand.

In 1965, 18 Mississippi Delta counties hired about 14,500 Negroes to chop weeds out of cotton. This year chemicals and machines have reduced the hired hands to about 7,000. There is hunger and near starvation in some Mississippi counties.

Some counties quietly coerce these unemployed out of the counties. Some offer bus fare—nothing else. (New York City alone took in about 200,000 Negroes from 1960 to 1964. Watts was receiving about 1,000 a month until the riots came.)

All cities will receive those now being made jobless and homeless. There are thousands more to be pushed off Southern fields. Nowhere is there any planning.

Americans who react simply in anti-Negro fashion can only make their country sicker than it is.

Note the statements that—

> There is still salable cotton in many Georgia warehouses which has not moved due to the attractiveness of government storage fees.

A sizable amount of the cotton in Government storage is elderly. I have learned that the 1952 crop still exists; there are still 65,720 bales harvested while Adlai Stevenson was running the first time. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe any cotton broker in possession of his faculties would buy those 65,720 bales of 1952 cotton. But each month, the Federal Treasury is paying storage fees on them.

There are 103,498 bales of cotton from the 1958 crop still in storage. There are 697,912 bales from 1961. The total number of bales as of July 31, 1966, was 14,723,608.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that our cotton policies must be changed. In 1930, the United States produced 50 percent of the world's cotton. Last year, we produced under 30 percent. In that same period, foreign cotton production is three times the 1930 figure, and foreign acreage is up about 50 percent.

Our high price supports have kept our cotton out of foreign markets and have encouraged cotton acreage and production expansion in foreign countries. Our policies also have led to the increased production and use of synthetic fibers, another factor in the decline of cotton. Between 1950 and last year, Mr. Speaker, production of synthetic fibers has nearly quintupled, to 12 billion pounds.

A moment ago I noted that the Commodity Credit Corporation on July 31, of this year, held in excess of 14 million bales of cotton. The cost of taking this cotton under price-support loan, of taking ownership when the loan matures and is not paid back by the cotton farmer, of storing each bale for the average of 20 months before it is disposed of, runs to a total of about $25 per 500-pound bale, or 5 cents a pound.

This includes the costs of handling the cotton and deterioration and other shrinkage. It does not include losses due to selling cotton for less than the CCC's investment in order to sell the cotton.

During the last 14 years, Mr. Speaker, more than 66 million bales of cotton have been placed under loan. Some was redeemed, but more than 50 million bales have come into CCC ownership.

The Federal Government should not be in the business of buying, storing, shipping and selling cotton. I feel the best way to take the Government out of business—which is a favorite theme of the conservative element—is to let cotton enter the market at competitive prices.

Domestic cotton should compete with foreign cotton and with synthetics.

What we must do, Mr. Speaker, is to maintain farmers' income by keeping their price supports at the highest practicable level while letting cotton seek its value in the market. I agree that the Department of Agriculture should supplement farmers' free market prices with direct payments to the farmers. Essentially this same policy is working well in other commodities, such as wheat, feed grains, sugar, and wool.

The cotton section of last year's Food and Agriculture Act intended to correct the difficulties in the cotton market. I am convinced that the program can work if properly administered.

I wish to offer three specific suggestions in amending USDA cotton storage policies:

First. That Commodity Credit Corporation be prohibited from paying storage costs before CCC actually acquires the cotton.

Second. That all Government-owned cotton be stored on the basis of competitive bids, a sound business policy.

Third. That the Secretary of Agriculture be prohibited from entering into agreements with cooperative marketing associations to make loans to their members if the associations own or operate warehouse facilities for storage of cotton on which such loans would be made, or if such a cooperative association has an agreement with another association that owns or operates cotton storage facilities.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out that the Department of Defense has had good success in reducing the costs of shipping its material by asking for and securing competitive bids.

It is our duty to see to it that tax money is not wasted in the conduct of our Federal programs. I am confident that the Members of this House who are committed—as I am—to the most value for the tax dollar will join me in calling upon the Department of Agriculture for a reexamination of its policies. Fifty million dollars will pay one one-thousandth of the year's defense bill.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. HENDERSON), from 1:05 p.m., October 20, 21, on account of official business.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, for October 21, 22, on account of official business.

Mr. WHITENER (at the request of Mr. WAGGONNER), for the remainder of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. WELTNER, for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PERKINS, for 30 minutes, Friday, October 21; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KUPFERMAN, for 60 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KUPFERMAN (at the request of Mr. CLEVELAND), for 30 minutes, on October 22; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MORSE (at the request of Mr. CLEVELAND), for 60 minutes, on October 21; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. JENNINGS) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. STALBAUM, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. FRASER, for 60 minutes, on Friday, October 21.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. KREBS.

Mr. PATTEN and to include a speech by the Right Reverend Dr. Zoltan Becky, following the remarks of Mr. KUPFERMAN, during his special order today.

Mr. PHILBIN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. MULTER.

Mr. ABBITT to revise and extend his remarks made today on the conference report on H.R. 13161.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CLEVELAND) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RUMSFELD.

Mr. O'KONSKI.

Mr. LAIRD.

Mr. WYDLER.

Mr. MICHEL.

Mrs. DWYER.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

Mr. SAYLOR.

Mr. HORTON.

Mr. UTT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JENNINGS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ASPINALL.

Mr. ROYBAL

Mr. BRADEMUS.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. HAYS.

Mr. VIVIAN.

Mr. FALLON.

Mr. LOVE.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon.

Mr. VANIK in two instances.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a Joint Resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 433. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain land in Lander, Wyoming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1406. An act for relief of CWO Charles M. Bickart, U.S. Marine Corps (retired);

S. 2254. An act for the relief of Jesse C. Johnson;

S. 2396. An act for the relief of Alton R. Conner;

S. 2474. An act for the relief of Henriette Lecordier Redmon;

S. 2510. An act for the relief of the city of El Dorado, Kans.;

S. 2677. An act for the relief of Kathleen Styles;

S. 2695. An act for the relief of Rosa Anna Genovese;

S. 2913. An act for the relief of Charles H. Thurston;

S. 2925. An act for the relief of Chester E. Davis;

S. 3050. An act for the relief of Marina Panagiotis Restos;

S. 3111. An act for the relief of John W. Rogers;

S. 3115. An act for the relief of Henri P. Boutin;

S. 3137. An act for the relief of Hye Suk Paeng and Mi Kung Paeng (Patricia Ann);

S. 3144, An act for the relief of the estate of Patrick E. Eagan;

S. 3208. An act for the relief of Kimiko Bethard;

S. 3223. An act for the relief of Dr. Jesus L. Lastra;

S. 3233. An act for the relief of Dr. Roberto E. Parajon and Maria C. Florin Parajon, his wife;

S. 3241. An act for the relief of Dr. Pablo A. Suarez;

S. 3257. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard;

S. 3258. An act for the relief of Deniz Hikmet Sen Manes;

S. 3278. An act for the relief of Ernesto Sanchez Jerez;

S. 3448. An act for the relief of Capt. Robert C. Crisp, U.S. Air Force;

S. 3535. An act for the relief of Dr. Fernando O. Garcia-Hernandez;

S. 3559. An act for the relief of Nachman Bench;

S. 3564. An act for the relief of Mary Rose Giannone; and

S. 3572. An act for the relief of Dr. Sherif Shafey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3580. An act to provide additional readjustment assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 3674. An act for the relief of Chun Moon Hee (Hi);

S. 3713. An act for the relief of Julio Juan Castellanos Lopez; and

S. 3790. An act for the relief of Dr. Luis G. Dediot; and

S.J. Res. 124. Joint resolution to establish the Golden Spike Centennial Celebration Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2600. An act to provide for the acquisition and preservation of the real property known as the Ansley Wilcox House in Buffalo, N.Y., as a national historic site;

H.R. 5688. An act relating to criminal procedure in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 8917. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Omaha Tribe of Nebraska, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10327. An act to require evidence of adequate financial responsibility to pay judgments for personal injury or death, or to repay fares in the event of nonperformance of voyages, to establish minimum standards for passenger vessels and to require disclosure of construction details on passenger vessels, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11555. An act to provide a border highway along the United States bank of the Rio Grande River in connection with the settlement of the Chamizal boundary dispute between the United States and Mexico;

H.R. 12360. An act to permit the sale of grain storage facilities to public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations;

H.R. 13320. An act to authorize the disposal of industrial diamond stones from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 15335. An act to amend the Act entitled "An act to establish an Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations", approved September 24, 1959;

H.R. 15727. An act to establish rates of compensation for certain positions within the Smithsonian Institution;

H.R. 15857. An act to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 to increase salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department, to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 to increase the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 16114. An act to provide for the inclusion of premium pay under section 5545(c)(1) of title 5, United States Code, for the purpose of determining benefits under the civil service retirement, group life insurance, and injury compensation provisions of such title, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 18217. An act to provide home leave for Federal seafaring personnel, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 360. An act to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes;

S. 985. An act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes;

S. 1068. An act for the relief of Fred E. Starr;

S. 1349. An act to amend the inland, Great Lakes, and western rivers rules concerning sailing vessels and vessels under 65 feet in length;

S. 1496. An act to repeal section 3342 of title 5, United States Code, relating to the prohibition of employee details from the field service to the departmental service, and for other purposes;

S. 2621. An act for the relief of Ioannis A. Vasilopoulos and Chester (Abramczyk) Hill;

S. 2720. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to develop, through the use of experiment and demonstration plants, practicable and economic means for the production by the commercial fishing industry of fish protein concentrate;

S. 2893. An act to amend section 208(c) to provide that certificates issued to motor common carriers of passengers pursuant to future applications shall not confer, as an incident to the grant of regular route authority, the right to transport special or chartered parties;

S. 3008. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to promote and assist in the extension and improvement of comprehensive health planning and public health services, to provide for a more effective use of available Federal funds for such planning and services, and for other purposes; and

S. 3148. An act to provide for the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States reserved or retained in certain lands heretofore conveyed to the city of El Paso, Tex.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 21, 1966, at 10 o'clock, a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2830. A letter from the Assistant to the Treasurer, U.S. Olympic Committee, New York, N.Y., transmitting a copy of its financial report covering the year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of seciton 12 of Public Law 805; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2831. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend chapter 73 of title 10, United States, relating to the retired servicemen's family protection plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 17660. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain real property to the city of Batavia, N.Y.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2328). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affiairs. S. 3580. A bill to provide additional readjustment assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2329). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MULTER: Committee of Conference. H.R. 647. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to permit the appointment of new trustees in deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by agreement of the parties (Rept. No. 2330). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FOGARTY: Committee of Conference. H.R. 14745. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2331). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 18495. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 18496. A bill to amend the law providing supplemental annuities for individuals entitled to regular annuities under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 so as to make such supplemental annuities available to certain additional individuals; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 18497. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to enable States to establish more adequate general assistance programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 18498. A bill to amend the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act relating to the discontinuance of passenger operations by common carriers of passengers by motor vehicle and to impose an 18-month moratorium on the discontinuance of any such operations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 18499. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 10-percent benefit increase, to provide a minimum $100 a month benefit for certain individuals with 25 years' service, to liberalize the retirement test, and to increase the earnings base for benefit and tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee:

H.R. 18500. A bill to provide additional readjustment assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 18501. A bill to amend section 607 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to make the partners of the Alliance for Progress eligible to receive services and commodities from Federal agencies thereunder; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 18502. A bill to simplify the footwear schedule of the Tariff Schedules of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 18503. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 18504. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize and facilitate the deduction from gross income by teachers of the expenses of education (including certain travel) undertaken by them, and to provide a uniform method of proving entitlement to such deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 18505. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the feasibility and desirability of a Cuyahoga River Valley National Recreation Area, in the State of Ohio, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 18506. A bill to amend titles 10 and 37 of the United States Code to permit members of the Armed Forces to provide for their dependents in certain circumstances; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS and RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 18507. A bill for the relief of Carmen Esperanza Centeno Vasquez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18508. A bill for the relief of Socorro Guillen Picado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 18509. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Veronica Nixon Manning; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 18510. A bill for the relief of Dr. John E. Yannakakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 18511. A bill for the relief of Mr. Raymond D. Yousseyteh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 18512. A bill for the relief of Nicola Ragusa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18513. A bill for the relief of Salvatore and Rosalia Li Vigni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 18514. A bill for the relief of Hedva Haimson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 18515. A bill for the relief of Dr. Emil Bruno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLANCO-ABREU:

H.R. 18516. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alberto Porro Zayas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18517. A bill for the relief of Antonio Manuel Angulo Sandoval and Maria Josefa Angulo-Medina; to the Committee of the Judiciary.

H.R. 18518. A bill for the relief of Manuel Dorta Duque; to the Committee of the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 18519. A bill for the relief of Marco Vaira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18520. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Bevilaqua; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18521. A bill for the relief of Ilias, Catherine, and Panagiotes Venetis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18522. A bill for the relief of Carmelo Farruggia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18523. A bill for the relief of Samuel Renwick Too-A-Foo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 18524. A bill for the relief of Dr. Carmelita Teves Carriaga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18525. A bill for the relief of Georgia Giannakopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 18526. A bill for the relief of Hermogena O. Fajardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RONAN:

H.R. 18527. A bill for the relief of Vasilios Kyriakopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 18528. A bill for the relief of Dr. Sunshil Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 18529. A bill for the relief of Antonio Lora and his wife, Angela Columna de Lora; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 18530. A bill for the relief of Herveline Jean-Baptiste; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18531. A bill for the relief of Fortunato Varisco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Commemoration of the 10th Anniversary of the Hungarian Uprising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL J. KREBS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 20, 1966

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, when Nikita Khrushchev was running affairs in Russia he put himself on record as stating that Russia was against all wars of "national liberation." What Mr. Khrushchev meant by "national liberation" was exactly what our men are now fighting in South Vietnam; an attempt by Communists, from within and without, to take over a non-Communist government by force. Any guerrilla struggle which could be turned to Communist advantage fell within the scope of Mr. Khrushchev's terminology.

But when true national liberation was attempted against the Soviet Union, then it was another matter. The most glaring, and the most heartbreaking example of this came during the Hungarian revolt of 1956. If ever there was a true struggle for national liberation, that was it. The entire Hungarian people rose as one to throw off the yoke of Communist tyranny. The Premier, Imre Nagy, promised to form an all-party government, and announced that free elections would be held. He called for the Soviet forces to withdraw from Hungary, and asked for a permanent guarantee of Hungary's neutrality by the United Nations.

The Soviet government entered into ostensible negotiations with the Nagy government, and just as in the case of our own Pearl Harbor, struck while negotiations were still in progress. Powerful Soviet forces of infantry, tanks and artillery invaded the country, and at dawn on November 4, 1956, launched a ferocious assault against Budapest without any previous warning. Other provincial centers were likewise attacked. The government of Nagy was overthrown, and a Soviet puppet regime was instituted. The world watched with helpless anger as the resistance of the Hungarian patriots was slowly crushed by the Soviet mammoth.

While the revolt was in progress, thousands of refugees made their way to the Austrian border and freedom. They arrived cold, wet, and hungry, and Austrian facilities were swamped by their influx. It is estimated that over 100,000 Hungarians fled to freedom during the revolt. The Austrian State Secretary appealed for rapid help in this emergency, and nation after nation responded with money, food, and medical supplies. But the big problem was the resettlement of the refugees.

In this situation the United States agreed to take 21,500 refugees, and Congress gave them permanent status to remain in the country. An airlift was organized to bring the refugees out, not only by this country, but by Canada and Britain as well. Eventually the bulk of the refugees found new homes abroad.

For those that came to the United States, the first point of contact for most of them was Camp Kilmer, in my own State of New Jersey. This installation, through which so many GI's had passed in World War II, became the chief reception and processing center for thousands of the refugees.

From Camp Kilmer the refugees spread out to other areas of the Nation, merging, as did millions before them, with the mainstream of American life. They have made many constructive contributions to our society and to my own State of New Jersey.

Let those of us here in this House, and let all the American people remember Hungary, in October and November of 1956. Never were a people more heroic. Never was patriotism more nobly displayed. Never was the struggle for national liberation given more genuine meaning. Whatever the outcome, we can all take heart from the lesson taught us by the Hungarian uprising—that the spirit of freedom never really dies.

Hon. Walter Rogers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 20, 1966

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure and to my personal benefit to have been closely associated with Congressman WALTER ROGERS, of Texas, in the work of Congress since he became a Member of the House of Representatives in the 82d Congress. He has been an effective and outstanding member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which I now have the honor to be chairman, since the 83d Congress. He was chairman of the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining in the 84th and 85th Congresses. He has been a faithful and capable chairman of the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee since January 1959. Congressman ROGERS also has long and faithful service on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, chairing an important subcommittee of that committee during the last several Congresses.

It was with sincere regret that I learned of Congressman ROGERS' retirement from the House of Representatives. His decision to retire came after he had been nominated by his party for the upcoming election. In the Interior Committee he has guided some of our most important legislation through the committee and through the Congress. When he was assigned as floor manager, he was most effective, securing the confidence of his colleagues as the legislation progressed. Legislation was always bettered by his having worked on it.

I have found WALTER ROGERS to be an astute legislator whose knowledge and ability will be greatly missed, not only by the district he represented but by the entire Nation.

As my respected and esteemed colleague goes on to other duties and responsibilities, the kind thoughts of his many friends will follow him—especially those of his chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to whom he gave unstintingly of his valuable talents and time. Mrs. Aspinall and I wish for WALTER and his charming wife, Jean, the best of fortune's good gifts in the years ahead.

Contracts Approved by Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 20, 1966

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a list of persons who have been under contract with the Committee on Un-American Activities during the past 5 years and the amounts of the contracts. The list follows:

Committee on Un-American Activities contracts approved

87TH CONG.

Name	Date approved	Amount
Lillian E. Howard	May 3, 1961	$1,800.00
Maurice Malkin	June 8, 1961	400.00
Ruth Taylor Hunter	Feb. 1, 1962	1,800.00
Total		4,000.00

88TH CONG.

Name	Date approved	Amount
1ST SESS.		
John Santo	Mar. 14, 1963	$2,500.00
George H. Lynch	July 17, 1963	1,000.00
Margaret Ann Kerr	do	1,800.00
John Lautner	Dec. 11, 1963	1,000.00
Herbert Romerstein	do	1,000.00
Total		7,300.00
2D SESS.		
Margaret Ann Kerr	Aug. 24, 1964	$800.00
Andrew J. Berecz	Oct. 2, 1964	200.00
Charles S. Weatherholt	do	378.50
George H. Lynch	Jan. 2, 1965	4,500.00
Total		5,878.50

89TH CONG.

Name	Date approved	Amount
1ST SESS.		
John Sullivan	June 25, 1965	$3,600.00
William Hendrix	July 2, 1965	250.00
George H. Lynch	Aug. 20, 1965	3,000.00
John D. Sullivan	Sept. 2, 1965	3,600.00
Do	Dec. 28, 1965	3,600.00
Total		14,050.00
2D SESS.		
Phillip Abbott Luce	Aug. 22, 1966	1,000.00
George H. Lynch	Oct. 11, 1966	3,000.00
Total		4,000.00

American Highway Development Brings Progress—Senator Randolph Guest Editorialist for National Limestone Institute Magazine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 20, 1966

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, as this session of the 89th Congress ends, it is my thought that my colleagues might find helpful a general review of some of the accomplishments of our Government—not only in this Congress, but in other Congresses—in relationship to our American highway system. I had been asked to provide an article in this vein for the National Limestone Institute magazine Limestone, and I now include this guest editorial for the benefit of Members who may wish to have a sketch of our past, our progress, and our future plans for Nation's highway system. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GUEST EDITORIAL BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, CHAIRMAN, SENATE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

This is an appropriate time for us to view the long-term development of the American highway system, and the place of highways in the overall transportation system of the future. With two-thirds of the 20th century behind us and 50 years of experience in Federal aid to the construction of highways, we are now at a place which offers us a historic prospective on the contribution of highways to American civilization.

It is worth noting that the idea of community responsibility for the construction of roads is as old as American civilization itself. The first instance of governmental responsibility for road construction in North America was an Act of the Legislature of Virginia, passed in 1632 at Jamestown, which stated in part:

"Highwayes shall be layd out in such convenient places as are requisite accordinge as the Governor and Counsell or the commissioners for the monthlie corts shall appoynt, or accordinge as the parishioners of every parish shall agree."

There have perhaps been only two other occasions in history—during the period of the Roman Empire and in the Incan civilization—when highways received as much of the concentrated talents and energies of society. But in both instances, historians inform us, the primary purpose of the ancient highway systems was to facilitate military transport and maintain imperial domain.

In contrast, the purpose of roads and highways in America has been to serve all the values of civil life. This conception was expressed in the 19th century by the American philosopher Ralph Waldo Emerson when he wrote,

"When the Indian trail gets widened, graded, and bridged to a good road—there is a benefactor, there is a missionary, a pacificator, a wealth-bringer, a maker of markets, a vent for industry".

There is, indeed, little question but that automotive transportation and our highway system of the 20th century have been a major factor, if not the most important single force, in bringing the United States to its present position of unparalleled economic strength.

Having reached such a position of economic development, it is therefore not surprising that we would now seek to appraise our highway system in terms of other values as well—such as safety factors, aesthetic considerations, the effect of highways on the amenities of urban life, and their place in the total matrix of the American community.

These are the areas which will draw our attention in the future, as has already been indicated by recent Congressional actions. In the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1962, the Congress required a continuous and comprehensive planning process be initiated in all metropolitan areas by January 30, 1965, as a condition for receiving Federal aid funds for urban highways.

Also in 1962, the Congress authorized Federal funds for assistance to persons and businesses displaced by highways.

In 1965, we enacted the Highway Beautification Act.

This year we enacted the Highway Safety Act.

And also, this year, in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1966, we requested a study of the problems of relocating displacees, and directed the Bureau of Public Roads to exercise all efforts to avoid damage to parklands and sites of historic value.

A further indication of the broadening conception of the function of the modern highway is evidenced in the recent development in the Bureau of Public Roads of the idea of acquiring entire city blocks for urban rights-of-way. Thus, instead of slicing through a neighborhood, disrupting community life, taking pieces of land and paying severance damages, it is suggested that urban freeways become an integral part of urban redevelopment, rebuilding our cities block by block along the path of our urban freeways.

In demonstration of its continuing commitment to the highway program, the Congress this year increased authorizations for the interstate system to $3.4 billion for fiscal year 1968 and $3.8 billion for fiscal year 1969. These levels of authorization will not be sufficient to complete the interstate system by the original target date of 1972, but it is expected that the Congress next year will resolve the financing problem of the Highway Trust Fund, so that 1973 will be a realistic target date.

Cleaner Air Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 20, 1966

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, Cleaner Air Week will be observed October 23 to 29. While emphasizing the tremendous tasks that confront the Nation in the effort to keep our atmosphere as free from pollution as is possible, it also points up industry's outstanding contributions in this field during recent years.

One of the most notable accomplishments in the drive for cleaner air has been the development of equipment to capture fly ash rather than to permit it to be released into the atmosphere. Instead of unceremoniously spewing cinders into the air to the discomfiture of neighbors for miles around, new powerplants are equipped with expensive electrostatic precipitators to stop the pollution as it comes from the boilers.

At the giant mine-mouth powerplants under construction and in planning in Pennsylvania's 22d Congressional District, air pollution control equipment will arrest almost 100 percent of the cinders resulting from coal combustion. Such progress not only removes a common menace from the community; it also, through application of engineering technique, provides a byproduct of the combustion process that has considerable utility value.

For many years cinders have been used as a safety measure on ice- and snow-covered highways. More recently, they have been used as a reinforcement agent in cement roads, dams, and building blocks. Now there is another use in the making, and from it may come new industrial enterprises in areas where fly ash supply is available.

Last year I met with George Fumich, Jr., director of the Office of Coal Research, to inspect the end results of laboratory experimentations with bricks containing fly ash. I was impressed with the extraordinary strength, durability, and attractiveness, and I am encouraged by OCR's progress in making ready a pilot plant for the production of this material.

Cleaner Air Week is also a reminder that science and research have other important chores in the quest of controlling atmospheric pollutants. One objective is to provide for the recovery of sulfur from stack gases. As in the case of fly ash, extracting sulfur before it leaves the stacks would not only eliminate an unpopular pollutant, but would also tend to conserve an important natural resource.

A highly useful purpose is served by Cleaner Air Week. Charles N. Howison, of Cincinnati, who introduced the annual event through the Air Pollution Control Association a decade and a half ago, is to be commended for this contribution to the cause of improvement in the national environment and in the interest of new uses for natural resources.

Information About Legislative Matters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 20, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure most of our colleagues receive as many letters as I do asking for information about legislation and issues.

These requests in large part are so general in nature as to require hours of time for research, if we were to attempt to answer them.

I am sure most of these people would try to be specific in their requests if they realized the volume of business transacted by the Congress.

The 89th Congress compiled a CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that will contain approximately 55,326 pages up to the date it closes on October 22, 1966, exclusive of 12,242 pages of the Appendix.

A total of 26,566 measures were introduced in both Houses of Congress, of which 21,999 were introduced in the House of Representatives.

The House passed 2,148 bills and resolutions and the Senate passed 1,968.

There were 145 conference reports filed in the House.

There were 794 public laws and 367 private laws enacted.

Ten bills were vetoed by the President and no vetoes were overridden by Congress.

These figures indicate how important it is for our constituents to be definite and specific when they write to us about legislative matters.

Frank Chelf

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 20, 1966

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret the decision of my beloved friend and colleague, the able, distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, Congressman FRANK CHELF, to leave this House where for so many years he has served with shining ability and outstanding distinction.

His career is typical of our great country in that he worked his way from the ranks to one of the highest offices within the gift of the American people.

His keen alert mind, great ability, his industry and diligence, his deep interest in the people's cause, the vigor and unselfishness of his service, the graciousness and charm of his personality, the depth and gentility of his friendship and his great patriotic impulse and devotion to his constituency and Nation have all combined in enabling FRANK CHELF to make a memorable contribution to this body.

He will leave us a great legacy of what devoted service and true friendship really mean, and he will be missed in this body in which, for so many years, he so brilliantly served with sparkling wit, sterling leadership, and lofty Americanism.

Like other members, I especially prize his warm friendship which I have had the privilege of enjoying for so many years, and I know that other Members have the same feeling toward FRANK, whose lovable, human qualities touched so deeply in our daily lives and helped so much to make our services in this great body such a rich experience never to be forgotten.

His departure from the House will leave a great void here, but it will give him the opportunity that he has sought to devote more time to his family and friends and to resume his civilian interests and pursuits.

In whatever he undertakes, I know he will be very successful, and I wish for him and his devoted family many more years of good health, prosperity, and happiness, and hope that we will have the opportunity to see him from time to time to renew our warm friendship with one of the finest gentlemen who has ever served in the Congress.

Post-Riot Study in Dayton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RODNEY M. LOVE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 20, 1966

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, the people of Dayton, Ohio, were recently shocked by the fact that a riot could and did happen in our city.

Immediately following the disturbance, one of Dayton's leading citizens, C. J. McLin, Jr., a Negro who has worked quietly but effectively in helping his people, proposed the establishment of a study committee to investigate causes of the violent outbreak and to suggest remedial programs. The mayor of Dayton accepted Mr. McLin's proposal and the following account of his work may he helpful to other cities faced with similar problems. I compliment Mr. McLin for his dedication and initiative.

The study committee consists of 40 percent representatives from areas of the city other than the troubled zone, 40 percent representatives of the people in the troubled area, and 20 percent representatives of agencies active in the troubled area.

To select his committee, Mr. McLin abandoned orthodox procedures and called an evening meeting of any interested persons at a tavern in the heart of the troubled area. Approximately 90 people attended the meeting and, in this informal atmosphere, expressed their views, in their own words, regarding causes of the disturbance. At the close of the meeting those in attendance were asked to elect three of the people among those present to serve on the study committee. Six similar meetings were held at different locations within the troubled area. Three new study committee members were elected at each of these. Also, the members of the study committee which had been elected at previous meetings attended each of the subsequent meetings to broaden their concepts of just exactly what had happened in Dayton.

Key agencies, both within the troubled area and in other sections of the city, were asked to appoint representatives to orovide their percentage of the study committee.

The study committee members interviewed each of the businessmen located in the troubled area to determine his views regarding the causes of the disturbance and suggested corrective programs.

The study committee members met in small groups with all of the high school seniors in the troubled area.

A final meeting similar to the neighborhood meetings and meetings with the high school seniors was held in the area of the disturbance specifically for dropouts and parolees.

All of the above meetings were recorded and later transcribed so that none of the comments would be forgotten.

Regarding the philosophy behind his methods, Mr. McLin said the entire scheme was designed to afford the man-on-the-street an opportunity to participate directly in shaping public policies. There is an implied hope that participation will breed responsibility. Through the representatives of the agencies located throughout the city, the problems of the troubled area, as expressed by the people from that area, were communicated to the people in all parts of the city. Through the representatives of the man-on-the-street, the people in the troubled area were made aware of the problems regarding financing and assignment of properties to programs attacking community problems.

A Tribute to Some Wonderful People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 20, 1966

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, lest we forget, I take this opportunity in the closing days of the 89th Congress to pay my respects and express my admiration to a group of highly respected and hard-working Americans. I refer to the many thousands of railroad workers who are members of the various railroad brotherhoods. They man and make possible the very backbone of our economic system; namely, transportation.

I would be remiss if I did not also express my great admiration and deep appreciation to the leadership of the various railroad brotherhoods with whom I have worked on various legislative matters during my 10 years as a Member of the House of Representatives. As a member of the Transportation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I have had particularly close relationships with the leaders and legislative representatives of the various railroad brotherhoods, and I consider them to be men of integrity, trustworthiness, and devotion to the betterment of the rank and file of railroad workers.

I have devoted a great deal of my time as a Member of the House of Representatives working for the best interests of transportation in general, particularly the many problems that have beset the railroad industry and its employees. I hope that we have made some progress, and I believe we have. But there are many difficult problems yet awaiting solution before this great industry and its loyal employees will be able to fully enjoy the rights and privileges belonging to them.

I was pleased to have made the motion to report out the bill, H.R. 706, which was enacted into law and with which all employees are familiar. This was an important piece of legislation, long overdue, and I was also pleased to support other legislation which will be of benefit to the employees and to management as well.

So, Mr. Speaker, I thought it would be only proper at this time to pay this tribute to this fine group of men and their Washington representatives, and I am sure other Members of the Congress feel as I do.

Congressman Horton Urges Nationwide Observance of 10th Anniversary of 1956 Hungarian Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK HORTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 20, 1966

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, a decade has passed since the world awoke to discover the startling news that the courageous people of Hungary had struck a sudden, though unfortunately not fatal blow, against the Communist presence which had oppressed them since the end of World War II. Outgunned and finally deceived by Soviet armed forces, those gallant Hungarian men and women still chose to cast aside all regard for their personal safety to register their opposition to a system which had made their country a satellite of the Soviet Union.

On the seventh day of the 1956 revolt, a news correspondent wrote from Budapest that:

> It is doubtful if the Soviets have ever churned up such hatred anywhere, anytime.

By October 29, 1956, after days of pitched battles between armored tanks and Hungarian students armed with stones and Molotov cocktails, the streets of Budapest were red with the blood of its citizens, and sadly, still Red with the continued imposition of Communist military and political power.

The response of the American people was magnificent. We came to the aid of the revolt's victims by providing medicine, food, and sincere welcome to the thousands of refugees who came to these shores. Many of those refugees have made significant contributions toward making this a better America. But few indeed, if any, have forgotten their former countrymen who daily labor under the Communist system, unable to enjoy the blessings of a free society.

The Hungarian patriots gave the term "freedom fighters" true meaning and the world must not forget what those thousands of fallen heroes accomplished. While their revolt was an unsuccessful one, they gave the world a true example of courage and sacrifice in the name of freedom. Let those of us who have freedom learn to love and cherish it as those martyrs of 1956 surely cherished freedom for Hungary.

Mr. Speaker, I have far more than a commonplace interest in the anniversary of this revolt. I serve as chairman of the board of the American Citizens' Committee to Commemorate the 10th Anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution. In this capacity, I have tried to reawaken the American people to the realities of life in Eastern Europe under the boot of totalitarianism.

This coming weekend and during the week following, I will be attending commemoration ceremonies both in Washington and in my home community of Rochester, N.Y. In fact, I have invited Dr. Andras Pogany, U.S. president of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters' Federation, to be my guest at the Rochester commemoration dinner on Saturday, October 29. I think it is important that other Members of Congress and that all Americans participate in some way in the commemoration of this landmark of human history.

In our land of abundance, it is too easy to push aside memories of hardship and persecution which men and women in other nations experience day after day. We cannot allow ourselves to forget how many millions of people in the world look to our country as their best and last hope for freedom of life and thought.

But my words and those of my colleagues in Congress are powerless by themselves to brighten this hope unless they are heeded by our fellow Americans. Thus, Mr. Speaker, I urge all of our countrymen to take part in some way in remembering the events of 10 years ago in Hungary.

Jet Aircraft Noise Damaging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 20, 1966

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, every day as more and more jet aircraft streak their noisy way over Washington and its environs, more and more people become aware of the damage to residential values throughout Metropolitan Washington resulting from noise pollution. As one who must rely on using the airlines for arrival and departure at least once each week, I am convinced that this type of nuisance must be moved away from the center of the Capital City to either Dulles Airport or to Friendship Airport. If jet schedules increase at National Airport, Washingtonians will come to realize that the airport is a very damaging noise factory in the heart of a very beautiful city in which peace and quiet are a greater asset than the convenience of the National Airport at its heart.

Tenth Anniversary of Hungarian Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 20, 1966

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago the people of Hungary, in a seldom-seen spirit of unity against their foreign Russian and domestic Communist oppressors demanded free elections, a return to the rule of law, and the restoration of human and political rights for themselves. They also renewed their pledge to national independence so dear to the heart of Hungarians, Americans, and Poles alike. It is not a coincidence that the demonstration ending in the revolution which for 2 weeks toppled the shackles of tyranny in Hungary started out as a sympathy demonstration in favor of the Poles and commenced under the statue of General Bem who is equally a hero of freedom for Poles and Hungarians as he fought with them in their war of independence.

The world has seen the spectacle of a people subjugated for a decade by Communist totalitarian rule yet rising only with small arms and homemade weapons against the military might of the Red army and sending them to flee for cover in Budapest despite the rumbling of tanks trying to destroy their opponents.

For a week it looked like David is defeating Goliath; that determination, idealism, and heroism are going to triumph in Hungary over the evil power of the Soviet Union and its domestic satraps. The Government of Hungary was changed and included many of the non-Communist elements and those Communists who found during the revolution that they are Hungarians first and Communists second, like Prime Minister Imre Nagy and Gen. Pal Maleter.

Unfortunately, their sacrifices were not leading to victory. Preoccupied with the twin Middle East crisis, the West rent by dissension over Middle East policy, neither the United States Government nor the governments of Western Europe extended any diplomatic or military help for the new Hungary that declared its withdrawal from the Warsaw Pact and clamored for the recognition of its neutrality status. The end was oppression and massacre Russian style by open military aggression, the arrest of the Government leaders, the death of 35,000 freedom fighters in Hungary and the deportation of another 60,000 Hungarian youths to the death camps of the Soviet Union. And this occurred 3 years after Stalin's death, unless someone might wash the sins of the Communist leaders away saying that only in Stalin's time did such things occur.

Today, when we commemorate the 10th anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution we do not find a Communist monolith anymore; polycentrism has grown among the Communist nations as well, witness the Chinese-Russian and various subfeuds within the bloc. In a way, this is a result of the temporarily successful Hungarian revolution.

However, this is no time for complacency. The danger of international communism divided into two parts might be less militarily, but its political-economic subversive appeal was only heightened by the split as their approach has become wider for the masses in Asia and the underdeveloped countries of the world.

The best memorial we can build for the fallen freedom fighters of Hungary is not to make speeches, but see to it that our executive branch takes appropriate steps to see the basic aim of the Hungarian revolution of 1956 realized which in colloquial Hungarian: "Ruszkik ki!"—"Russian out"—effectively summarized the need for the restoration of Hungarian national sovereignty.

Professor Szaz, in his study on the legal and political status of the troops of the U.S.S.R. in Hungary made two marked points. First, there is no legal basis for their presence in Hungary because they entered Hungary between November 2 and 4, 1956, as open aggressors condemned by the United Nations General Assembly as well as by most writers on international subjects as aggressors sui generis. Second, the validity of the May 27, 1957, troop-stationing agreement was concluded with a government that was in a state of dependency to the Soviet Union and could not obligate the Hungarian state fully as it lacked the sovereign power to do so.

I hope that the executive branch will heed the advice of many of my colleagues and that President Johnson's first step in bringing about "peaceful engagement with Eastern Europe" will be appropriate steps to make the Soviet Union comply with international law, expressed also in 23 U.N. resolutions between 1956 and 1962: the withdrawal of Russian forces from Hungary.

Ohi Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESTON E. VIVIAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 20, 1966

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, next week on October 28, persons of Greek descent will be celebrating throughout the world an important day in Greek national history. I should like to take this occasion to note the significance of Ohi Day, not only for persons of Greek descent, but also for all those who treasure liberty. The Greek people have long been noted for their love of freedom, in ancient times as well as modern times. On October 28, 1940, during World War II, Greece once again was challenged to submit to armed force, and as often before in history, and, as before, her leaders and citizens continued their proud tradition of defiance against those who would take away her citizens' precious liberty. In commemoration of that day, Ohi Day has become a day of national celebration and a reaffirmation of the will of the Greek peoples to resist tyranny.

Early in that year, Mussolini had begun a campaign of harassing their country. The Greek head of state, Gen. John Metaxas, was awakened at 3 a.m. on October 28 by a telephone call from Count Grazzi, the Italian Minister, who requested an immediate meeting with Metaxas.

Shortly afterward, Grazzi arrived and presented Metaxas with an ultimatum which demanded that Fascist forces be allowed to occupy "a number of strategic points in Greek territory." The ultimatum, which was to be answered by 6 a.m., declared any resistance would be met by the force of arms. At this point the following dialog ensued:

> METAXAS. Then the communication is in fact a declaration of war?
>
> GRAZZI. No, Excellency, it is an ultimatum.
>
> METAXAS. It is tantamount to a declaration of war.
>
> GRAZZI. Of course not, as I believe you will give the facilities my government requests.
>
> METAXAS. Ohi! (No!)

This single word of defiance, "ohi," soon unified the nation and aroused the Greeks' national pride and honor. October 28 has therefore become Ohi Day for Greeks around the globe. On that day, Greece reminds the world that tyranny may be stopped by any nation that possesses the will to defy evil. Greeks everywhere are to be proud of their traditional love of freedom which Ohi Day proclaims to all nations and all men.

Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 20, 1966

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to insert my newsletter which is scheduled for release in my congressional district this date.

The newsletter follows:

> In the last Washington Report concerning Viet Nam (Viet Nam in Prospective, #66-9), I discussed several aspects of the struggle. At the time I stated that our only excuse for wasting our sustenance and the flower of our manhood in the rice paddies of Viet Nam was in pursuit of a clearly defined strategy.
>
> In recent weeks my mail on the subject of Viet Nam has been quite heavy, and since this will be my last Washington Report before this lengthy, and often disastrous, session of the Congress ends, I thought it might be fitting to once again discuss Viet Nam.
>
> Most of the letters I receive concerning the war are in the form of a question: "When are we going to win the war in Viet Nam?"

I wish I knew!

This I do know; you cannot win a war until you make up your mind to win it, and it is becoming more clear by the day that this most basic decision has *not yet* been made. As a matter of fact, President Johnson, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, and various and sundry other officials of the Administration have repeated over and over their contention that our aim in Viet Nam is not victory, but stalemate. It has not yet occurred to the civilians running this war that in the absence of a quest for victory, the only alternative is defeat.

It seems to me that our problem in clearly defining a goal in Viet Nam lies in the fact that we do not appear to have a clearly defined policy vis-a-vis the International Communist Conspiracy. This fact has manifested itself time and time again in the failures we have suffered in Cuba, Africa, and the remainder of the world.

The Communists, be they Russians, Bulgarian, Vietnamese or Chinese, are actively engaged in a war, sometimes cold, often hot. They recognize the free-world as their enemy, and the United States as the prime target in this war. Our position would be very much like that of a prize fighter standing in the ring, being beaten vigorously by his opponent, and all the while insisting that he was not involved in a fight. Indeed this parallel could be carried even further by adding the greater absurdity of having the prize fighter's manager and handlers assist the aggressor between rounds.

The war in Viet Nam is part and parcel of the Communist drive to conquer the world. It is not a separate or isolated incident; it is just another battle in the cold war.

We cannot begin to achieve victory in Viet Nam until this Administration accepts these facts as valid. We cannot begin to achieve victory in Viet Nam until we cease to attempt to "build bridges" to the homelands of our Communist enemies, over which continue to flow the supplies and materials of war to be used against our boys in places like Viet Nam.

It is an unfortunate fact, but none the less a fact, that the only way in which peace in this world can be obtained is through the reduction of the Communist conspiracy to a point of impotency from which they can no longer threaten mankind.

If we continue to respond to each armed Communist thrust as if it were merely an isolated incident, we will soon be bled white, our enemy will be ruined, and, eventually, our Nation destroyed by attrition.

The Viet Nam war has had an impact upon our economy, and upon every other facet of our National life, greater than that brought about by the Korean War. Conversely, it has been a cheap struggle indeed for our enemies. In terms of lives, which are very cheap in the eyes of the enemy, their losses have been confined to the infiltrators from North Viet Nam killed in relatively few numbers in the South. No Russian soldiers die in Viet Nam, and it is doubtful that any Chinese soldiers do, but Americans die there! And South Koreans. And Filipinos. And South Vietnamese. And Australians.

All this war costs the Communists is a relatively modest amount of munitions and supplies, almost all of it produced by cheap slave labor.

The Communists would be foolish to permit this war to end as long as it is fought in the manner in which it is now being fought. They have much to gain and little to lose. It has become the *Verdun* of this era—a human meat grinder into which America pours its substance and its life blood, while the Russian and Chinese Communists merely stand by and applaud.

Recently, former President Eisenhower, who out of consideration for the vast burdens borne by any President, has avoided criticism of the Administration's war policy, demanded that we fight with everything that we have, and that we fight to win, and win quickly. This is wise counsel from a military man of great experience and brilliance, and a statesman of the first order. The time has now come for the Administration to remove the blinders that prevent it from seeing the unspeakable evil of Communism for what it is, and loosen the shackles that have bound it and prevented it from taking the action so clearly indicated by the facts of the existing situation. In short, it is time that we get on with the business of winning this war.

In recent weeks I have had occasion much-too-frequently to express my deepest sympathy to parents and wives of young men killed in Viet Nam. In one letter, a constituent of mine, while informing me of the death of yet another American boy in Viet Nam, asked me, almost plaintively, to reassure this young man's parents that he had not died in vain. No words of mine, however, can ever give that assurance as long as the Administration persists in its completely immoral policy of refusing to adopt victory as its goal. If this Administration persists in refusing to face up to the facts, I am willing to predict that in generations to come, its memory will be despised and held in the utmost contempt. And that will be the fate that it will deserve.

The Coin Speculators' Bubble Has Burst

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 20, 1966

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, a prime contributor to the country's recent coin shortage was the speculator. Many took bags and barrels of coins out of circulation and hoarded them in the expectations of great profit. These speculators were not coin hobbyists, interested in the rare, the unusual or in acquiring sets of coins, but were quick-buck artists who hoped to profit from the plight of businessmen unable to obtain adequate quantities of coins to conduct their commercial affairs.

In the work that the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, of which I am chairman, did to assure the country of adequate supplies of coins we warned that the bubble of speculation in coins would burst, with great loss to many.

In the coin shortage report, part 2—House Report 195, 89th Congress, 1st session—which was issued on March 22, 1965, we stated that the true coin collector did not materially contribute to the coin shortage, but those who bought up new coins by the bag and barrel were a problem. As we said:

> The speculators' goals are not the education and pleasure derived from the pursuit of a hobby but solely expectations of financial gain. This gives rise to speculation, creates hoarding, increases prices inordinately, and intensifies the shortage. Collaterally, it also adversely affects the true collectors, who are finding it difficult to add to their collections except at highly inflated prices.
>
> While there is no way of accurately counting the coin holdings of hoarders, a clear realization that the holdings are large may be gained from a perusal of the advertisements in coin publications. Often these contain offers of coins, at fancy prices, by the roll, the bag, and even the ton. Treasury officials in reviewing one such publication found advertisements by 53 dealers and 69 individuals which offered 1964 coins for sale or trade by the roll or the bag. Such trafficking in, or holding of, coins is not illegal; however, there is at present no reliable means of estimating the quantities of coins so held out of circulation.
>
> Some further conception of the sizes of hoards is reflected in an article in the Wall Street Journal for January 14, 1965, which reports that a bank has loaned speculators $1.1 million, secured by 34 tons of silver coins, and expressed a willingness to make more such loans.
>
> A belief popular with many coin hoarders is that they cannot lose on their investment in coins; that even if they do not make a profit, they cannot lose. The fact is, as testified to by the Treasury witness, they are losing the interest or profit which could be made by putting their money somewhere else. Thus they could earn 4 or 4½ percent by putting their money in banks or savings and loan accounts, their losses would be protected at least to the extent of $10,000 of each deposit, and they would be relieved of the burdens of safeguarding and storing bulky quantities of heavy coin.
>
> Since about 1962 what had formerly been the quiet hobby of coin collecting developed for many persons into a wild speculation, with bid-asked markets and sales conducted through teletype services throughout the United States. A small dealer in a remote part of the United States can offer coins just as can his counterpart in metropolitan areas, quite a contrast to the time when trades took place at meetings of local coin clubs. The speculation grew to such extent that rolls and bags of coins minted in 1964 were hoarded, and advertised for sale at premiums the Treasury witness characterized as "fantastic." Speculators are interested in promoting the idea that there is a coin shortage, that current coins have high value and are going to get more valuable and, therefore, are good investments for individuals.
>
> Speculation is often completely unrelated to realities. For example, dealers have offered, at from $2 to $3 each the 45 million silver dollars which the Congress has authorized, but which have not been minted.
>
> As more and more people enter the market, prices rise. The bubble of speculation, however, can burst and purchasers of coin can suffer large losses.

As we said:

> The speculation in coins, at its height was, reminiscent of the 17th century tulipomania when Dutchmen wildly speculated in the acquisition of tulips. As they bid against each other prices soared and speculators all over Europe became involved. About 1636 the rage peaked, and single bulbs sold for (today's equivalent) $5,000. Soon brokers began selling futures in tulips, and investors eagerly bought. It couldn't last, of course, and when the market finally broke, disaster was widespread.

As is indicated in an article by James F. Kelly published in the Coin World for Wednesday, October 19, 1966, it is no secret that the coin speculators' bubble has burst. Mr. Kelly aptly summarizes the reasons, and I believe it will be of interest to every Member of the House:

TRENDS OF TODAY'S U.S. COIN VALUES: SUGGESTS REASONS FOR DOLDRUMS

(By James F. Kelly)

I do not believe we are revealing any secrets or violating any confidences in admitting that today's coin market is in the doldrums. There has been a complete reversal of form in the past 18 months, going from a seller's market to a buyer's market. While the speculative and investment phase of the hobby has suffered most severely, the "blue chip" collectors' items have, to some extent, and with certain exceptions, followed the trend of the market.

The sixty-four-dollar question now is, what has caused this condition and what can be done about it? Many reasons have been propounded by the so-called experts and interested parties. But in my opinion, and for what it may be worth, here are several which seem to be the most logical and realistic.

One, Coin prices became too inflated due to excessive and unrealistic promotion, all of which was successful due to the human desire for large and quick profit the easy way. And neither the dealer nor the investor is without blame in this respect.

Two, The coin shortage which brought the threat of Federal laws against collecting, and the unfavorable national publicity which accompanied this action.

Three, Lack of confidence brought about by the increase of counterfeits and altered dates and Mint marks on many of the scarce coins.

Four, Apprehension, due to the many robberies, for personal safety, as well as the security of one's collection, due to the many robberies. Many insurance companies even discontinued the practice of insuring coins, and all of them tightened their requirements for such insurance.

These are just a few of the reasons which we agree would account for the current depressed coin market. Some feel this is a good thing; that it will eliminate many of the undesirables from the business and put the hobby back in the hands of the collector.

We have been in the business a long, long time and have experienced similar conditions and similar reactions. In 1938 the Commemorative market, which had been speculative, went to pot. In 1946 the common gold market dropped 25 per cent in less than 30 days. It is true that the coin hobby, like the stock market, has seen its ups and downs. And it is also true that it has always come back bigger and stronger than ever.

It would be nice to believe that both collector and dealer have learned a valuable experience from these recent past experiences, but human nature being what it is, we have strong doubts.

The 14th Report From Washington to the Residents of Los Angeles 30th Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 20, 1966

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I am firmly convinced that one of the most important duties of a Representative in Congress is to make regular reports on his activities in Washington to his constituents at home.

For that reason, and because of the vital necessity of an active and fully informed citizenry, I would like to include in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of the 14th in a series of regular reports to the residents of my 30th California Congressional District.

The report follows:

CONGRESSMAN ED ROYBAL REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

THE 14TH REPORT FROM WASHINGTON, OCTOBER 1966

This is the 14th in a series of regular "Reports from Washington" made to the residents of the 30th District on my activities as your Representative in the Nation's Capital.

While I realize that I cannot please all my constituents, I wish to assure you that I am constantly trying to represent the best interest of our District, our State and our Nation.

In addition to my Reports from Washington, I have also sent you nine special reports designed to cover all major items of legislation considered by Congress, events of national and international significance, and particularly, those matters of immediate concern to Metropolitan Los Angeles and Southern California.

EIGHTY-NINTH CONGRESS—RECAP

In its 2 years' work, the 89th Congress has compiled one of the most productive records of legislative achievement in our nation's history.

Congress has supported measures to assure prudent conduct of the government's fiscal business, while adopting progressive programs to meet the essential needs of a rapidly growing modern society of nearly 200 million citizens.

Great strides were made toward reaching the goals of a more prosperous economy, equal opportunity for all Americans, a strong defense posture, and lasting world peace with freedom.

I am proud to have had a part in building this constructive record, and I have attempted to outline for you some of the highlights of the historic 89th Congress in this "Report from Washington".

NEW LOS ANGELES FEDERAL BUILDING

Just this month Congress approved my request for a new $6.5 million, 800,000 sq. ft., multi-level federal auto parking building to help alleviate the extremely critical shortage of parking space in Los Angeles' crowded Civic Center.

I've been working on this urgently-needed car parking facility since 1963 when I first came to Congress, so I'm naturally delighted at our success in securing authorization to proceed with this essential project.

PEACETIME GI BILL

I was proud to have been co-author of the new G.I. Bill of Rights, a permanent program of comprehensive readjustment benefits to help some 5 million post-Korea and Vietnam veterans return to civilian life, go to college, train for a job, and have a chance to buy a home for their families.

MINIMUM WAGE

America's working men and women scored a resounding, landmark victory with recent Congressional enactment of the most comprehensive improvements in the national minimum wage law since 1938, when that historic legislation was first adopted.

By extending coverage to nearly 8 million new workers, and raising the present $1.25 minimum wage for the 30 million employees already covered, by stages, to $1.60, we will be protecting the vital interests of Golden State workers and employers alike—by helping reduce the unfair, low-wage competition from our neighboring states whose average pay scales do not come up to California's higher rate.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR ALL AMERICANS

The 89th Congress gave its strong bi-partisan support to measures to assure first-class citizenship to every American, regardless of race, color, creed or national origin. The two chief legislative accomplishments were passage of the Voting Rights Act to guarantee the basic right to register and vote to all citizens, and establishment of the U.S. Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity to help eliminate, once and for all, unfair discrimination in the vital area of job opportunities.

NEW HOUSING AND TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENTS

Secretary Robert Weaver of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, established in 1965, discusses how his agency's programs, plus those of the new Cabinet-level Department of Transportation just created by Congress this month, can assist Los Angeles and other major metropolitan centers meet the challenge of continuing rapid growth.

With Southern California's population due to triple from 10 million to over 30 million before the year 2000, when some 80 percent of our people will be living in cities, these forward-looking programs are of vital importance to every child.

The new Departments will serve as focal points of federal concern for such pressing urban problems as sharply rising local tax rates, efficient mass transportation, adequate housing, expanded educational and job opportunities, effective air and water pollution control, recreation, and related necessities of modern life in 20th Century America.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

This historic measure, the first major revision of our immigration laws in over 40 years, eliminated the highly discriminatory national origins quota system, and set up a more equitable first-come-first-served selection procedure based on a greatly improved preference system.

PEACE IN VIETNAM

As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I was one of the sponsors of an urgent petition to the President asking him to expand his worldwide peace offensive and vigorously pursue his search for meaningful negotiations aimed at achieving equitable terms for a just settlement of the war in Vietnam.

We also urged the President on several occasions to enlist the aid of the United Nations in arranging an effective cease-fire that could help move the conflict away from the battle-field and to the conference table.

In response, the President assured us of his firm determination "to make every possible use of the United Nations in moving toward peace . . . I can give you categorical assurance that there will be no abandonment of our peace efforts."

As your Representative in Congress, I pledge myself to continue to speak out strongly for the cause of peace in Vietnam.

AID TO EDUCATION

Congress acted to assume leadership in the vital effort to provide full educational opportunity for all Americans by adopting the landmark Elementary, Secondary, and Higher Education Acts—the nation's first comprehensive program of investment in the education of our youth, in recognition that nothing is more important to America's future well-being than the fullest possible development of our human educational resources.

CLEAN AIR AND PURE WATER

California's outstanding pioneer work was recognized when Congress took decisive action to organize a truly national effort to eliminate the dangerous impurities in the air we breathe and the water we drink.

Using California standards as a guideline for effective air and water pollution control, the new rules encourage a cooperative local, state, federal, and private industry approach to creating a healthy living environment in America's crowded metropolitan areas like Los Angeles, where our own Pollution Control District will be eligible for several million dollars in federal funds to help in the fight against smog.

AUTO SAFETY

The 89th Congress has responded to an aroused public demand for strong, affirmative action to help reduce the tragic toll of needless injury and death on the Nation's highways by adopting federal standards of highway traffic, motor vehicle, and tire safety—and by offering important financial aid to strengthen state and local auto safety programs ranging from driver training and licensing to highway construction and vehicle inspection.

NARCOTIC REHABILITATION

Congress has followed California's leadership in attempting to develop a fresh approach to deal more effectively with the serious problems of narcotic addiction—stressing modern medical treatment, rehabilitation programs, and intensive aftercare for narcotic victims.

MEDICARE—SOCIAL SECURITY

Senator Robert Kennedy outlines his plan for a substantial cost-of-living increase in benefits and expansion of coverage under medicare and social security.

As one of the original Congressional sponsors of the historic medicare program to provide comprehensive health benefits for some 19 million older Americans, including California's 1½ million elderly, I am deeply gratified that never again in this country should our senior citizens find their life savings suddenly wiped out by huge hospital and medical bills.

In my opinion, medicare will take its place along with the social security program of 30 years ago as among the most progressive and forward-looking pieces of legislation ever enacted by Congress.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

With growing national concern over the rising cost-of-living, and the increased threat of inflation, I am happy to report success in obtaining passage this month of my Truth-in-Packaging Consumer Protection Bill to outlaw deceptive and unfair practices in labeling and packaging retail goods—and to provide American consumers and housewives with accurate, complete, and honest information on the foods and drugs they buy.

THE 1967 SERVICE ACADEMY EXAM

Congratulating Pvt. Ruben Garcia of Los Angeles, one of my West Point nominees, on his excellent record at the Military Academy's Ft. Belvoir Prep School near Washington.

Because I am anxious to appoint qualified young men from the 30th District to the Military, Naval, Air Force, and Merchant Marine Academies, I am asking interested students to take the special Civil Service Academy Designation Exam to be given in Los Angeles on November 5th (a make-up exam will be held December 1st). For more information call our District Office on 688-4870.

WAR ON POVERTY

Though less than two years old, and experiencing the usual administrative growing pains, the Nation's War on Poverty holds promise of developing a series of new approaches to solving the tragic paradox of extreme poverty for more than 30 million disadvantaged citizens, in the midst of an all-time-record-high prosperity for most Americans.

AT YOUR SERVICE

The members of my Congressional office staff in Washington, as well as those in our Los Angeles District Office, are anxious to help you in any way they can. Please continue to make full use of the many services available through our offices by contacting us whenever you feel we can be of personal assistance.

Congressman Donald Rumsfeld Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD RUMSFELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 20, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, it has been my policy to report to the people of the 13th District of Illinois at the end of each session of Congress.

The report on the 89th Congress, 2d session, follows:

Congressman Donald Rumsfeld Reports—Annual Legislative Report, 1966, 89th Congress, 2d Session

Washington, D.C.—Adjournment of the 89th Congress came amidst speculation that the Administration may be waiting until early next year to ask for tax increases and for funds to further accelerate the war in Vietnam. Whatever the case may be, it is clear that additional funds will be requested if the war continues to escalate and if, at the same time, the Administration continues the present level of domestic spending.

During the 89th Congress, more than 26,000 bills and resolutions were introduced and over 950 were enacted into law. The results of more than 350 roll calls are on record in detail over 50,000 pages of the Congressional Record.

This annual Legislative Report highlights Congressional activity in 1966. As always, your comments and views on matters relating to Congress are welcomed. Full details on any measure before Congress may be obtained by writing our office, 241 House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

INFLATION, FEDERAL SPENDING, AND PRIORITIES

Little meaningful action has been taken to control inflation or otherwise halt the rising cost of living. The President has blamed Congress for adding to his already sizable budget, thus leaving the impression that Congress, rather than the Administration, will be responsible if either wage or price controls or increased taxes are requested.

However, the swollen budget submitted in January contained false-front cuts on items the Administration knew the 2-1 Democrat-controlled Congress would increase, such as milk for school children, and, further, his budget did not accurately reflect the anticipated costs involved in fighting the war in Vietnam. Despite periodic statements on economy, there is no indication that the President communicates his economy desires to the leaders of his party in Congress. Also, the President has the power, under the Constitution, to veto any spending bill he does not like. He has not exercised this power to any major extent. Further, the Administration need not spend funds appropriated by Congress. Spending can be deferred.

Inflationary pressures are due in part to excessive Federal spending at a time when Vietnam is draining billions of dollars from the Federal treasury. Priorities in Federal spending must be established. Government cannot provide funds for every worthwhile project and at the same time curb inflation.

REAPPORTIONMENT OF 13TH DISTRICT

The 1965 Court reapportionment of the 13th Congressional District unfortunately removes from our District the 50th Ward of Chicago and the townships of Barrington and Hanover, effective in January 1967. It has been a privilege to represent the people of these areas in Congress for the past four years, and it is with a real sadness that I see them leave the 13th District.

Despite reapportionment, the 13th District's population will remain well above the 435,000 average. The estimated 1965 population of the eight townships of Elk Grove, Evanston, New Trier, Niles, Northfield, Palatine, Schaumburg, and Wheeling, which will comprise our new District, is 523,319. This figure is expected to jump to 605,000 by 1970. Our District is one of the fastest growing districts in the nation.

A BUSY YEAR

The heavy legislative schedule in Congress and the long session have required me to "commute" back and forth from Washington to the 13th District on weekends, but the rest of the Rumsfeld family have been in our home in Glenview since August. I look forward to seeing many of you during the brief adjournment of Congress.

During 1966, I took on a number of new responsibilities, becoming a member of the House Republican Policy Committee and serving as co-chairman of the House GOP Task Force on Latin America. I continue my membership on the Science and Astronautics (Space) Committee and on its Manned Space Flight Subcommittee. I also serve on the Government Operations Committee and on its subcommittees on Foreign Operations and Government Information and Legal and Monetary Affairs, on the latter as ranking minority member.

A highlight of 1966 came on July 4th, the day the President signed into law the "Freedom of Information" bill which I have supported strongly for two years. In April, our Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information went to South Vietnam to conduct an investigation of waste and mismanagement in the AID program there. The Subcommittee report may be obtained by writing to our office.

LEGISLATION SPONSORED

Part of a Congressman's responsibility is to identify problem areas and to initiate action to resolve them. This year, I have introduced and co-sponsored various bills and resolutions, including proposals for:

Air and water pollution: To authorize an incentive tax credit for facilities and equipment installed by industry for the control of air and water pollution.

Reform of Federal criminal laws: To create a 12-man Commission to undertake a study of needed improvements in the Federal system of criminal justice.

Opportunity for underprivileged: To combine private efforts with those of Government to provide jobs, training, and education for the disadvantaged.

Miscellaneous: I also introduced measures to: permit teachers to deduct from gross income their expenses for continuing education; remove postmasters from politics; establish a World Food Commission; and permit individual tax credits for parents financing students in college.

EXCELLENCE OF 13TH DISTRICT'S YOUTH

The 13th District will be especially well represented at U.S. Service Academies in the graduating class of 1970. Eight outstanding men from our District began their military careers this summer: Air Force Academy—Malcolm Dean Whitfield II of Glenview and Robert J. Drabant of Palatine; Military Academy—Jeffrey A. Schmidt of Niles; Naval Academy—John S. Biallas of Chicago, Dennis P. Breen of Mount Prospect, Howard Dawson, Jr. of Mount Prospect, Edward Graves of Rolling Meadows, and Richard Thomas of Skokie. Stephen Svanda, Wilmette, was accepted for appointment by the Merchant

Marine Academy. The letter notifying him of his appointment never reached him. On May 2, he was lost attempting to save a companion in a boating accident.

Applications are now being accepted from young men interested in attending U.S. Service Academies in June 1967. Applicants must be U.S. citizens, between 17 and 22 years old, unmarried, and residents of the 13th District. Selection is based entirely on merit.

A CITIZEN'S PRIDE

A 13th District resident who just became an American citizen wrote me a wonderful letter. I felt you would be interested in her comments. She wrote:

"It is indeed a great moment, more than any of you can imagine; it is a long wait, hopes, and sometimes fears. . . . I saw a lot of people becoming Americans the same day I did. Probably all of us had different reasons, but there was a wonderful thing in common—we are Americans by choice. . . . In my case the reason was a need for justice, freedom, honesty and love . . . (Here) there is a great deal of family life, self-respect and sincerity. I love this country. Please try to keep this country as I have dreamed. Above all freedom, challenge, sincerity and honesty, with justice."

POSTMASTERS AND POLITICS

My bill to remove postmasters from politics has gained important support. As reported in the Washington press, the President may ask Congress next year to approve a measure providing that postmasters and rural letter carriers be appointed the same way as other Federal civil servants—on the basis of qualifications and merit. Earlier, the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress recommended that Congress adopt this proposal. It is backed also by the Secretary of the National Association of Postal Supervisors, who wrote that politics in the appointment of postal supervisors and managers is "one of the major reasons for inadequate mail service."

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

No meaningful Congressional reforms were made in 1966. However, the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress has issued its final report and prepared the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1966. It is unfortunate that the Democratic leadership in Congress failed to schedule consideration of the Act in the 89th Congress. The Joint Committee adopted more than 15 of the recommendations which I made in 1965. Among them were: Creation in the House of a Committee on Standards and Conduct (Ethics); Congressional Committee hearings to be open to the public to the maximum extent possible, including televising and broadcasting; and Recording of "yea" and "nay" votes on appropriations bills.

Many other necessary reforms were not recommended. Some trouble areas were totally avoided. For example, study of the role of Congress in foreign policy was ignored. Hopefully, both the House and Senate will be ready to implement the Joint Committee's recommendations in 1967.

CHECKS AND BALANCE

One significant proposal which was not acted upon by the 89th Congress is a provision that when both the Executive and the Legislative Branches of the Federal Government are controlled by the same political party, the Committees on Government Operations in the House and Senate, the chief investigating Committees, would be under the control of the minority party. It is my hope that this measure will be considered in the 90th Congress, for such a revision would assure vigorous probing, challenging, and questioning of the conduct of government.

The idea of giving the minority party control of the Government Operations Committees is not unique. In 1923, the "Teapot Dome" investigation was conducted by a Democratic senator at a time when the Congress and the White House were both controlled by the Republican Party. Even today, the British House of Commons has a Committee of Public Accounts whose chairman is always a leading member of "the loyal opposition," and this committee has legislative oversight of the spending of public monies.

The need for such a "watchdog" committee in Congress is obvious. The political party which controls the investigative machinery of government is generally not eager to investigate its own appointees or personnel.

THE PEOPLE

The close of the Second Session of the 89th Congress prompts me to look back at progress made and to conclude that there is a great deal of work ahead. World peace continues to elude us, and many domestic problems remain unsolved.

To be sure, Government has an important role, but each individual citizen also shares a portion of the responsibility. Government cannot solve all of the complex problems facing us. To achieve the best solutions will require the interest and the dedication of millions of individual citizens who recognize that our form of Government, the best ever devised by man, is based on the involvement of the people. In the final analysis, it is the people who must guide and direct the efforts of Government, determine the quality of its leadership, and shape its course.

Senator Jennings Randolph, of West Virginia, Keynote Speaker at Kickoff Luncheon for National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week—Presents Award to Civil Service Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 20, 1966

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia was the keynote speaker at the District of Columbia kickoff luncheon for National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, on Thursday, September 29, 1966.

Today, after more than two decades of ever-increasing public acceptance of the "specially able" employee, NEPH-Week has become one of the shining symbols of the remarkable accomplishments of the handicapped—the real heroes and heroines of the story. Their individual successes are as varied as mankind itself, their hopes for the future as boundless as the wide universe which challenges us all.

On behalf of the Nation's Capital chapter of the National Association of the Physically Handicapped, Senator RANDOLPH presented an award to the Honorable L. J. Andolsek, Commissioner, U.S. Civil Service Commission. The award was in recognition of the Federal Government's outstanding contribution and leadership in the employment of physically handicapped persons.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the introduction of Senator RANDOLPH by William P. McCahill, executive secretary of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped; the address by Senator RANDOLPH; and the remarks of Hon. L. J. Andolsek, Vice Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTION OF THE HONORABLE JENNINGS RANDOLPH, U.S. SENATOR

(By Mr. William P. McCahill, executive secretary, the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped at the National Kick-Off Luncheon of the D.C. Commissioners' Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, Washington, D.C.)

Our speaker today was born in the same town as my wife—Salem, W. Va. Like most of us he went to school, got married, had two sons and worked hard for a living. But, unlike most of us, he is a man of many parts who has been many things to many people in many careers and many occupations. He's up for reelection this fall, but since we are nonpolitical, I won't mention that to any West Virginians present. But, he is one of the best friends Government workers have on the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and he is chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Service.

He has honored seven universities by accepting honorary degrees from them in his busy life. He has rendered distinguished lay service to the Seventh Day Baptist Church, and today is vice chairman of the North American Fellowship of the Baptist World Alliance.

Our speaker is a personal friend of many years—as he is of many citizens of this panic-button city on the muddy Potomac. Unlike many politicians who have been known to undertake spectacular flights of fancy, our speaker has been both an airline executive, and a newspaper and magazine editor with a flair for being airborne, and a reputation for taking dictionary words and making them sing. He has almost put to music many of the dreams we dream and the thoughts we think, fashioning them into legislation helpful to his fellow man. Leonard Robinson, for one, certainly knows of our speaker's dedication in both the House and Senate.

In June, I missed the D.C. Lions Club luncheon, recognizing 30 years of the Randolph-Shepard Act. The blind, some 2,700, who operate their small businesses under this act, earned almost $15 million last year. So, it is poetic justice that I receive a raincheck today with this opportunity to introduce him and to recognize him. You did not come here to hear or see me, but to see and hear our speaker who, at this critical time in the affairs of our Nation is the new chairman of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

It is a pleasure to introduce one of the very few men in Congress today who has been an active spokesman for and participant in the annual observances of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week for more than 20 years, and a daily champion of the handicapped during that entire time, the Honorable JENNINGS RANDOLPH of West Virginia.

KEYNOTE COMMENTS BY SENATOR RANDOLPH

Our Nation is engaged in building a massive program to salvage the talents of handicapped Americans through publicity, education, rehabilitation, training, and placement, we are slowly—but surely—succeeding. More and more, handicapped citizens are able to achieve lives of productivity and self-respect. National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week is a major factor in this progress. Yet, as we know, the task remains gigantic.

On a national scale, our accomplishments in the field of rehabilitation have been truly gratifying—especially in the past 10 years. Last year alone, we rehabilitated a total of 154,000 persons. That is more than twice the figure of 10 years ago. We hope to reach 200,000 in fiscal year 1967.

Before congratulating ourselves, however, let us remember that Mary Switzer, Commissioner of the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, has written recently about a backlog of unhelped disabled in excess of 2 million.

Legislation has, and will continue to expand our ability to help these individuals. Federal programs are in effect which provide funds for a wide range of responsive activities. State and local officials are participating in every State.

However, a vital part of this overall effort remains that of restoring the handicapped individual to a productive place in society.

We must find new jobs that handicapped men and women can do. We must find new ways to do old jobs so that maximum employment opportunities are afforded the handicapped. And, equally important, we must continue to build in the minds of all Americans an awareness—a realization that a handicapped person can work, can compete, can achieve, can succeed in our modern and rapidly changing world.

The important week which we officially "kick off" today is an essential tool in this effort.

Examples of Federal effort in areas of the handicapped are:

Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1966 currently pending which would create a National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children. The Committee would work to improve educational attainment of handicapped children, including school administration and operation. Reports annually to the Commissioner of Education.

The bill also provides for the establishment of a new and separate bureau in the Office of Education to oversee programs for the education of handicapped children. Among existing programs which would be administered by the new Bureau would be: Training of teachers for handicapped children; captioned films for the deaf; a $100 million grant program (in this bill) to public schools for training of handicapped children; grant program to residential schools for handicapped which are State-operated or supported, and research for handicapped education.

Presentation Comments

Each year, the Nation's Capital chapter of the National Association of the Physically Handicapped recognizes an "Employer of the Year."

Our Federal Government today operates an aggressive program for extending job opportunities to handicapped citizens. As our Nation's largest single employer it is appropriate that Governmental leadership in this field be both broad ranged and effective under the central direction of the Civil Service Commission the various agencies are encouraged to hire qualified persons who are handicapped. This includes those persons with physical impairment, a history of mental illness, mental retardation, and severe physical handicap.

The program has been marked by increased emphasis, innovation, and improving results for the past 25 years.

Jobs which can be filled by handicapped persons were identified, and administrative roadblocks were smoothed.

Special coordinators were appointed at major installations, and employment for those with a history of mental illness, and mental retardation was emphasized.

Interagency boards of civil service examiners are being set up in 65 principal cities. This will aid the placement of applicants who are handicapped.

Last year, 13,617 persons with measurable physical defects went to work for Uncle Sam. Between January 1964, and June 1966, mentally retarded workers placed in Federal jobs totaled 1,676.

We are proud that our Federal Government is leading the way in providing new opportunity for the handicapped. We are confident that it will continue to seek new and better methods for accomplishing this important task.

It is entirely appropriate, therefore, that the U.S. Civil Service Commission has been chosen as the 1966 "Employer of the Year."

It is an honor, on behalf of the Nation's Capital Chapter of the National Association of the Physically Handicapped to present this award. Here to receive it is the Honorable L. J. Andolsek, Commissioner.

Award Acceptance Remarks

(By L. J. Andolsek, Vice Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission)

My very sincere thanks to you, Senator RANDOLPH, to President Beach, and to the membership of this fine organization.

As you know, Chairman John Macy is in San Francisco today or he would be delighted to accept this award on behalf of the Commission. In his place, I am honored indeed to receive this splendid expression of encouragement and appreciation to the Civil Service Commission.

The Commission is frequently conscious that we are a very small agency of Government, and when we see indications that we sometimes exercise an influence out of proportion to our small size, it is indeed most gratifying to us.

Because the Commission is the central personnel agency of the Federal Government—the "people" agency, as we are sometimes called—we are thrust into a leadership role when it comes to personnel policies. We have worked hard in this role to insure that physical and mental standards for all jobs in the Federal service are truly realistic. Medical officers, examining job standards, have persistently asked the question: "Why couldn't a handicapped worker do this or that job?" And they won't accept any lame answers.

I might add that when the medical officers and forward-thinking managers have had their way, and have helped the handicapped worker to obtain a job, everybody has been pleased with the results. In most cases, handicapped workers are excellent employees.

As a result, we like to believe that the Federal Government, the Nation's largest single employer, is playing the role of pacesetter among employers when it comes to extending job opportunities to the handicapped.

We have sought to remove every procedural difficulty—every bit of so-called "red tape"—that might stand in the way of hiring the handicapped, and since 1957 we have utilized Coordinators for employment of the handicapped at Federal installations. The Coordinator serves as a middleman between the manager who needs a worker, and the skilled handicapped applicant who needs a job. This system has proved to be remarkably successful, from both viewpoints.

Of course, much remains to be accomplished. This gracious act of appreciation on the part of your organization will help to renew and revitalize our efforts.

This symbol of recognition will have a place of honor, along with another which we keep in our hearts. The other symbol is intangible but none-the-less real: it is the new dignity, the new pride that comes to a person who has been told over and over, "You're not good enough," but who now finds that as an employed citizen he can look the whole world in the eye.

This award gives us the same kind of lift we get from watching the rebirth of human dignity. We of the Commission are deeply grateful.

Water in the Space Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 20, 1966

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the problems of water resources for the future of our Nation have demanded much of our time. The Congress is moving with dispatch to meet these problems.

Just this week we have concluded action on the clean rivers bill, which will trigger vast improvements in the water pollution problem, and on an omnibus rivers and harbors bill, which provides for development of our water resources and protection from flood damages.

My distinguished colleague and chairman of the Flood Control Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee, the gentleman from Alabama, Representative ROBERT E. JONES, one of the most knowledgeable Members of either body on the problem of water and one of the foremost advocates for adequate development of our Nation's water resources, outlined the basic ingredients of our drive to achieve clean water for the space age in a recent address to the Alabama-Mississippi section of the American Water Works Association meeting in Huntsville, Ala.

So that my colleagues may have the opportunity to examine the very pertinent remarks of Representative JONES, I include them at this point:

Speech of Honorable Robert E. Jones at 1966 Annual Conference Alabama-Mississippi Section, American Water Works Association, October 11, 1966

I am delighted to be here today to express my appreciation, and that of my colleagues in the Congress, for your effective and steadfast support of our local and national clean water programs.

The support of the American Water Works Association, and your personal efforts, have made, and are making, a significant contribution to the drive to preserve our most precious natural resource—clean water.

The country has been aroused, and Congress has been aroused, to take action, and none too soon. We are on the move at last to clean up our rivers and lakes and estuaries.

The present decade of the 20th century will provide historians with much to write about. But no chapter will relate more to the future of our nation than the one which recounts how America awoke in the 1960's to the grim and inescapable danger of water pollution and then proceeded to do something about it.

The road to effective water pollution control and abatement will be a long one. And the journey will be exceedingly costly. But most Americans, I believe, agree today that any other route would lead inevitably to national disaster. For the simple arithmetic of water has told us that by 1980, we, as a nation, will be using and polluting more water each day than we will have at our disposal.

Consider this fact. No less than 20 billion gallons of water every day are being spoiled and wasted in the United States because of pollution. And these 20 billion gallons, my friends, represent fully one-fourth of our total pure water needs. It has been estimated that the loss of this water affects the lives, the economy, the health and the pleasure of far more than half of our population.

Millions of words have been written and spoken in recent years about the degradation of our national water resources and about the critical threat thus posed to our national existence in the years ahead. These words have not been in vain. They have identified the problem. They have illuminated the issues. They have educated and marshalled public opinion. They have sparked the action which we are taking today to save our water resources from certain destruction.

The action program on which this nation has now embarked is comprised of these basic ingredients:

1. Establishment of water quality standards throughout the country;

2. Creation of regional plans to anticipate and meet the future water needs of vast metropolitan growth;

3. Sharp increases in Federal aid to municipalities for construction of waste treatment plants;

4. A new awareness of the vital importance of accelerating research in the water pollution field and strong Federal support thereof;

5. A tougher attitude toward the industrial polluter.

6. Increased emphasis on the concept of Federal, State and local partnership in the task to get clean water.

You are aware, I know, of the landmark legislation approved by Congress last year—the Water Quality Act of 1965. This Act, I firmly believe, has given us the fundamental tool with which to begin to conquer water pollution.

The Act places upon the states the initiative for setting water quality standards for the portions of interstate rivers within their boundaries. The states have until July 1, 1967 to set these standards. If they fail to do so, the Federal Government will do it for them.

Establishment of water quality standards puts us a step ahead of the game we've been playing heretofore. The standards will provide the guidelines for preventive, not simply remedial action.

Under the law and procedures in force before passage of the Water Quality Act, no action was taken until pollution had reached the point where it endangered the health or welfare of a community. Then abatement action was taken and efforts were made to correct a situation which could have been prevented if standards of water quality had been established.

Further, once the standards are set, municipalities and industries may develop realistic plans for new or expanded treatment facilities without uncertainties about waste disposal requirements.

But the great, overriding purpose of establishing the standards is to enhance the quality and productivity of our water resources by means of an orderly programmed approach. What this boils down to is that this country has discarded the piecemeal approach to water pollution control. A deliberate, planned, nationwide program is now under way to upgrade the condition of our lakes, rivers and streams.

Now, a positive nationwide action program to control and improve water quality, it seems to me, must include a series of regional or river basin plans.

Our major water pollution problems, for the most part, stem from a combination of urban and industrial complexes. These complexes tend to dominate river basins or other water courses.

It seems to me that it is utterly fruitless—and certainly uneconomical—to attempt to clean up the waters of one section of a river basin or interdependent region when the causes and results of water pollution exist on the entire river.

Under this program, I believe we may anticipate a vigorous and coordinated drive to achieve effective water quality control in those vital areas of the nation where the blight of water pollution is the most critical.

This year's legislation also provides very substantial increases in Federal grants to municipalities for sewage treatment plants. It recognizes that we cannot fight water pollution without money. It recognizes that the longer we put off coming to grips with water pollution problems the greater the final cost will be.

Today, I recall with some pride how hard I worked ten years ago with my colleague JOHN BLATNIK of Minnesota to persuade the House to approve the idea of construction grants. Our approach was finally accepted but only, at first, on an experimental basis.

As of August 31, 1966, my friends, 7,051 Federal grants have been awarded for construction of sewage treatment facilities costing $3.8 billion, of which the Federal share totaled $803.4 million.

The construction grant program has already proved itself. With additional funds assured in the years ahead it will become the most powerful single weapon we have to combat water contamination.

A huge backlog of treatment facility needs was created during the long period of neglect that preceded Federal legislation in this field. As you know, municipal wastes, discharged untreated or inadequately treated, comprise one of the two major sources of water pollution. In the last decade, we have whittled away at the backlog with limited funds.

Now, there is new hope. We are going after the backlog with a power saw instead of a pocketknife.

As would be expected, the Federal dollar earmarked for anti-pollution efforts must be cut into many sections. Over the years, in my opinion, one section has been too small. I refer to Federal assistance for research and development in pollution abatement.

Fortunately, in the last two years there has been a growing recognition that we are fighting a new war with old weapons. The Congress has responded by expanding Federal support for research and development programs.

We are moving in the right direction, but are we moving rapidly enough? Certainly, there is need and justification for at least tripling our research and development to contain the pollution problems at hand. We may have to increase our present efforts tenfold if we are to make significant advances toward a final solution.

Millions of dollars are being spent to construct conventional treatment plants using conventional waste treatment processes. It is well known that these plants do not do the whole job. They fail to eliminate at least 10 percent or more of the suspended solid wastes and other organic matter. Also, they fail to remove metallic salts and certain other chemical pollutants.

New treatment processes, then, must be evolved through accelerated research and development programs.

What is the point of removing organic materials from sewage and leaving minerals and other nutrients (such as phosphates, nitrates, etc.) in the effluent to nourish growth of algae and other offensive organisms in the receiving waters?

Then there is the problem of combined sewers, which exists in about 1,940 cities in the United States. These sewers commingle sewage and storm waters. They permit untreated sewage to bypass treatment plants and discharge directly into watercourses. They flush some 65 billion gallons of raw sewage annually into receiving waters. It would cost over $30 billion to separate all the combined sewers now used in the United States.

Fortunately, the seriousness of the combined sewer problem was recognized in the Water Quality Act of 1965. The Act established a four-year program of research and development grants to demonstrate new or improved methods to eradicate the combined sewer problem. For this purpose, Congress voted an annual appropriation of $20 million for fiscal years 1966 through 1969.

The combined sewer evil must be a prime target of the national action program. To eliminate it we must have new ideas, new approaches, new devices. Therefore, I hope that the Congress will soon provide more funds for research and development in this field.

The Government Operations Committee recently issued a report entitled "Separating Storm and Sanitary Sewers in Urban Renewal." The report was based on a study by the Subcommittee on Natural Resources and Power of which I am chairman.

Recommendation number two of the report stated:

"The combined sewers demonstration grants program should be expanded and accelerated, and increased emphasis should be given, through both laboratory and field research and engineering studies, to develop improved methods of controlling pollution resulting from existing combined sewer systems."

There is another area which today demands more intensive research. I refer to the problem created by industrial wastes. Many of these wastes contain toxic materials dangerous to aquatic life and even to men. Other industrial wastes contain mineral substances which complicate the sewage treatment process when discharged into municipal sewage systems. Others contain large quantities of organic substances that deplete oxygen in receiving waters. Industry discharges huge volumes of heated water which raise the temperature of the receiving waters and thereby frequently destroy all but the hardiest of organisms.

It is my firm belief that industry should play a major role in an accelerated research program. And this is why I proposed an amendment, which the House approved, to authorize Federal grants to industry for research to help the Nation find the right answers to the very complex industrial waste problems. Under the amendment, the Federal Government would bear up to $1 million or 70 percent of the cost of this research for any single research project which would have industry-wide application.

Large key industries already have on their staffs researchers and technicians with specialized training and knowledge in the field of industrial waste. These experts have the know-how and the experience. It is my hope that their program of investigation can be expanded substantially with Federal support.

This Federal support, in effect, would help industry to put its own house in order. For today, industry is a major polluter of the Nation's waterways.

And, today, the American public no longer accepts the fiction that water pollution is a price we have to pay for progress.

Unfortunately this fiction has wide acceptance at an earlier stage of our development when the belching smokestack and the outpouring of wastes from our factories were considered symbols of surging productivity and prosperity.

Today, water is everybody's business. The American people realize that what one town or industry does to the water on which others depend is not for that town or that industry alone to decide.

The day is over, my friends, when an industry (or a town for that matter) can say, in effect, that it is not responsible for the condition of the water that it returns to a lake or river.

I am not here today to belabor industry for its growing contribution to water pollution. In fact, during the last 3 years as Chairman of the Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee I have heard testimony from dozens and dozens of industrial leaders on the subject of water pollution and for the most part they have been cooperative and forward-looking.

But I would like to say this. All segments of industry should vigorously cooperate with the national drive to control and abate water pollution in their own best interest. Industry requires clean water to continue to produce and prosper.

Further, in light of the present temper of American public opinion, those segments of industry which fail to cooperate with the national program will not go unchallenged. They will, without doubt, be exposed to the pitiless glare of unfavorable publicity and increasingly rigorous enforcement action.

Of course, it costs an industry money to clean up its effluent. This fact was taken into consideration in this year's water pollution legislation. Moreover, when the House recently passed the bill to suspend the 7% tax credit for construction of capital facilities, it specifically permitted the continued use of the tax credit for the construction of industrial facilities to control air and water pollution.

The new water pollution bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a full investigation and study on methods for providing financial incentives to assist industry to construct facilities to reduce or abate water pollution. Personally, I believe this is a step in the right direction.

The upsurge of public interest in clean water has moved communities and state governments to take action and, I might add, has also stimulated the Congress of the United States.

The happy result has been that Federal, State and local governments are now in harness together working toward the same end—clean water. Local communities, today, comprise the nerve center of our national program to control and abate water pollution. From them radiate the impulses, the calls for action, which go to the state houses and to the Congress.

All three units of government are now entwined in a partnership with a common mission. This is, indeed, a healthy development.

Communities and State governments have rightfully assumed important responsibilities in the national drive against water pollution. But in many instances they lack trained personnel to carry out these responsibilities.

This year's water pollution legislation authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to make a complete investigation and study to determine the need for additional trained State and local personnel to carry out the water pollution program.

I have discussed with you some of the basic ingredients of our national drive to achieve clean water. In combination, these ingredients, strengthened from time to time, should provide us with the energy and direction necessary to arrive at our goal of effective water pollution control and abatement.

The message I wish to leave with you above all is that at last we are on the move. We are making more effective and widespread use of the knowledge we already have and at the same time we are pressing for new and better ways to get the job done. To my mind this makes up an active program.

In conclusion let me say this:

I don't know how good the years 1965 and 1966 have been for wine but they certainly have been great years for water.

Remarks of Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oreg., September 28, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. DUNCAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 20, 1966

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I think that many of the Members would appreciate the remarks made by Vice President HUMPHREY during his visit to the campus of the University of Oregon on September 28. I think that it is a very well stated explanation of our policies in southeast Asia.

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, EUGENE, OREG., SEPTEMBER 28, 1966

Woodrow Wilson once said that "every man sent out of a university should be a man of his nation as well as a man of his time."

Certainly this university has striven to produce men and women both of this nation and of this time.

I doubt that there has been a major issue or problem which has not in recent years been entered in depth—far beyond normal research and teaching—by the University of Oregon. I know of your international studies programs and the recent conferences you have held on the problems of 20th century society.

And I am particularly cognizant of the fact that the University of Oregon has taken a leading role, among all our colleges and universities, in its participation in the war on poverty.

This university was the first in the nation to enter into a contract for a Job Corps training center.

The idea for Project Upward Bound—a program to help deprived high school graduates get a college education—first came from the University of Oregon. Your President, Arthur Flemming, is chairman of the National committee of educators who are now helping to organize a long-range Upward Bound program.

You also maintain a regional training program for Project Head Start, which I believe is perhaps the single most impressive and successful program in our entire war on poverty.

I know that your campus has been one of the most productive in our country of Peace Corps and VISTA volunteers.

And I have been especially impressed by what I have learned about your Honors College . . . about your planned School of Community Service and Public Affairs . . . and the interdisciplinary program in Asian studies which you have established to aid your graduate program.

Today, on this campus which has so concerned itself with the surrounding world, I would like to discuss what certainly must be the single greatest present-day concern of all of us: our national involvement in Asia, the Pacific and Vietnam.

To those who live near the Pacific, it should be no surprise that we in the United States find ourselves involved with the peoples of the Asian and Pacific world.

Our involvement is not new.

We have been a Pacific power from the days of the New England clipper ships in the late 18th century.

Three times in this generation we have committed our resources and our young men to military conflict in Asia and the Pacific—against Japan in World War II; in defense of Korea in the last decade; and in Vietnam today.

Today we have two objectives in Asia: To help the nations of that part of the world maintain their independence and to help them build strong and progressive societies.

Neither of these objectives can be achieved so long as those who preach militant force and aggression have reason to believe that force and aggression can succeed.

Asia is of critical importance to us.

Three-fifths of the world's people live in Asia.

One Asian country—Japan—has led all countries in its rate of economic growth in the last decade.

In India, we see the most daring contemporary experiment in applying the principles and procedures of democratic government to a vast, tradition-minded and diverse nation.

In Asia today we find a new surge of interest in international cooperation—in new multinational ways of building strong, independent societies.

We have recently witnessed the formation of the Asian Development Bank, the conference of Asian and Pacific nations in Seoul, and the revival of interest in the Association of Southeast Asian states.

But these hopeful signs remain jeopardized so long as Communist aggression and subversion continue.

For almost a decade aggression and subversion have been directed against the Government of Vietnam.

We have seen in Vietnam the application of the so-called "war of national liberation"—a new and sophisticated form of warfare that threatens the aspirations of all Asian peoples.

This new warfare is one in which the leaders cannot be located . . . in which the sources of supply cannot be easily cut off . . . in which the enemy forces are not all outsiders, but also indigenous troops . . . in which signed truces do not halt the struggle.

The challenge today—and not only in Asia—is to prove that the "wars of national liberation," if resisted, cannot succeed.

Today there can be no doubt that we stand behind our commitment to the defense of Vietnam, and that we have the will to endure as well as the will to resist.

Nor is there any doubt today of our determination to fight "the other war" in Vietnam—the struggle of the Vietnamese people for political self-determination, and for economic and social justice.

We know—and the present South Vietnamese government knows—that overwhelming military power alone is not an adequate response to the wars of national liberation.

Despite the terror, harassment and aggression mounted by a determined enemy—both from within and without—the South Vietnamese people have made progress in building schools and hospitals, in strengthening their economy, and in modernizing their agriculture.

Most important of all, they have progressed in creating truly representative political institutions. The elections held this month for a constituent assembly show not only the emptiness of the Vietcong's claim to represent the popular majority of the Vietnamese people—but also a recognition that the social revolution needed in Vietnam must rest on a solid, popular political base.

The progress of the Vietnamese people—and of all Asian peoples—will be threatened so long as the war in Vietnam continues. We persist in our efforts to bring it to a negotiated settlement.

Last week Ambassador Arthur Goldberg addressed himself to the proposals made earlier by U.N. Secretary General U Thant. He made our position clear.

In return for a reduction or cessation of infiltration by Hanoi, we would be prepared to suspend the bombing of North Vietnam.

We are prepared to see the National Liberation Front represented in peace negotiations. The role that they might play in the future political life of Vietnam can be worked out by the Vietnamese themselves.

We have no desire to establish a permanent military presence in Vietnam. We stand ready to withdraw our forces as others withdraw theirs.

We favor international machinery—either of the United Nations or other machinery—to insure effective supervision of withdrawal.

We support the Geneva Agreements—including the section banning formal foreign alliances. We therefore would support a truly neutral Vietnam, just as we supported the Agreements of 1962 calling for a neutral Laos.

If a just settlement can be achieved in Vietnam—which only awaits the response of those who presently wage aggression—the leaders of Asia can turn their efforts toward bringing social justice and economic progress to their peoples.

In both settling the immediate conflict in Vietnam and in confronting the long-range problems of Asia, the guiding principle to be followed was enunciated last week at the United Nations by a distinguished Asian statesman, President Ferdinand Marcos of the Philippines: That Asian peoples are under "an inescapable obligation to devise Asian solutions to Asian problems."

If Asians take the initiative in organizing to defend their independence and stability, American power—President Marcos has suggested—should remain as an "umbrella" extending over non-Communist Asia, but need not remain deeply involved militarily on the Asian land mass itself.

Though we know that the militancy of Red China may delay the implementation of President Marcos' plan, we also know that in the long run his advice is sound.

There need be no fear that America seeks a permanent military stronghold in continental Asia.

Our hope for Asia is what Asians hope for Asia.

We seek only to help Asians in their tasks of nation-building . . . in their wars on poverty, ignorance and disease. We stand ready to assist them in their efforts to achieve regional cooperation.

While doing so, we seek and will continue to seek to build bridges, to keep open the doors of communication to the Communist states of Asia, and in particular Communist China.

We shall persevere and explore means of communication and exchange, looking to the day when the leaders of Asian communism—as their former colleagues in Europe—will come to recognize the selfdestructiveness and wastefulness of their present bellicose policies.

As we Americans strive to deal with the immense problems—and the promise—of a vibrant, modernizing interdependent Asia in the years ahead, we will be called upon to show special qualities of mind and spirit and understanding as a nation.

We will have to learn far more about Asian history and Asian cultures than any of us now know.

We will need more than nodding acquaintance with the critical issues that absorb the attention of Asians.

We will have to learn to speak and read Asian languages.

We will have to become more sensitive to the differences among Asian nations as well as their similarities.

Finally, we will have to learn to suppress our national enthusiasm for quick solutions.

Asia's problems are extraordinarily complex and intractable: They will be there for a long time to come, and we should force ourselves to practice some traditional Asian patience.

With patience and perspective—with compassion and humility—we can live to see the hopes of Asian peoples fulfilled.

And in that fulfillment, our own peace and security will be strengthened immeasurably.

The Value of Congressional Staff Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 20, 1966

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, at this time of the year when members of Congress are recapitulating the achievements of the Congress, I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the special services which are rendered by our congressional staffs in connection with our duties as Representatives to the Congress from our respective congressional districts.

Because of the changing nature of our responsibilities, the preparation and analysis of legislation has become only a part of our overall responsibilities. Over and beyond our legislative functions, it has become the responsibility of a Member of Congress and his staff to monitor and oversee the Federal programs which are enacted into law. In Washington our staffs are busy following the movement of local community requests for Federal loans, grants, and programs relating to urban renewal, community planning and development, education, poverty, manpower training, water and air pollution, and public development. The Washington staff endeavors to follow through on every application, while my district office staff monitors the actual administration of these programs.

Because of my special interest in consumer affairs, my Washington and my district staff has conducted field trip shopping experiments to compare the Washington and Cleveland consumer markets. In this connection, special studies were made of bread and flour prices, coffee and orange juice prices, and bacon prices which resulted in considerable national interest in these fields.

Last year when the Ways and Means Committee, of which I am a member, took action to reduce or remove excise taxes on consumer items, my staff made a widespread survey to determine whether these excise tax reductions were reflected in lower prices for automobiles, automobile parts, appliances, and other consumer items. The publication of my staff committee work resulted in widespread interest in the entire subject. This contributed extensively to reduce consumer prices in these items for at least a 6-month period. In addition, my staff arranged a compilation of the costs of automobiles to the automobile dealer so that new car purchasers could determine the profit factor in their automobile purchase. Over 500,000 reports of these lists were requested throughout the Nation.

My staff was first among congressional staffs to develop a recapitulation of the Federal impact in our congressional district. At the beginning of this 89th Congress, my staff conducted an agency-by-agency research project to determine as accurately as possible the exact total Federal expenditure on various programs in my community. The first research project required over 7 months of staff work. Since its compilation, many other congressional staffs have engaged in the same kind of staff study. This project ultimately resulted in the reorganization of information services in the various Government agencies which are now oriented to more readily provide essential information on a district-by-district basis. As a result of this analysis of Federal programs and their effect upon my congressional district, I have been able to direct local efforts toward increased utilization of Federal programs and at the same time I have been able to develop accelerated Federal response to community needs. This has resulted in a two-way advantage, to the community which I represent and to the Federal bureaucracies involved.

This summer, my staff utilized the summer intern program to determine all the programs of grants, loans, and scholarships currently offered by many branches of the Federal Government for educational advancement. As a result of this fine research job, my office is mailing to every high school principal, every guidance counselor, and all other interested individuals in my district a compendium and description of each of the programs which the Federal Government now offers. To complete this project, it was necessary to review over 1,400 separate documents published by the Federal Government and reduce and assemble this information so that it would be useful to the principal or the guidance counselor.

Earlier this year, the city of Cleveland announced its interest in a proposal to build a new international airport over submerged land in Lake Erie and relocate highways of the Federal interstate system through this site as a new community development proposal. My Washington staff and my Cleveland staff developed research studies which proved the weakness of this proposal, after which I urged my community to dismiss it from consideration since it would make an unreasonable and unforeseeable demand on Federal resources which did not exist. In addition, my staff studies established the fact that cost estimates were unrealistically low and thoroughly inadequate.

During the past 6 years, my staff has been deeply involved in a study of urban renewal and its effect upon our community. My district staff has analyzed the displacement of families from the urban renewal areas and traced their movement from slum to slum. In the Cleveland Erieview project, our studies traced the movement of business and industry from urban renewal areas and determined that one-third of the displaced businesses and industries removed to suburban areas remote from the city center, one-third closed their doors and went out of business, while the remaining one-third found another site for operation within the city's limits. This study indicated that the "urban renewal project lost" two-thirds of the employing enterprises which existed in the area prior to the urban renewal development.

In the Euclid-University Circle Urban Renewal Project in Cleveland, my staff first discovered the failure of the program to provide adequate housing for displaced families and involved the General Accounting Office in such a way as to expedite the project and relate its purposes more concretely with the legal intent of Congress.

More recently, my staff has been studying the impact upon my community of a newly proposed urban renewal project involving the construction of a new campus for Cleveland State University in downtown Cleveland. In this connection, my staff has been endeavoring to determine the tax valuation which would be lost to the city, the migration of taxable salaries and wages which would result from the removal of industries and commercial activities within the area and the interest of effected businesses and industries in relocating in the area of urban renewal if that were possible. In this connection, I have addressed the following letter to every industry, commercial activity, and employer in this new area:

> It has recently come to my attention that plans to construct a new campus for Cleveland State University involve the ultimate taking of your plant facilities.
>
> In order that the total impact of the Cleveland State University campus at this site can be calculated, will you kindly advise me whether your company has plans in this event to: 1) relocate in Cleveland; 2) relocate in the Cleveland Labor Market Area; or 3) relocate in some other community.
>
> If your present location is acquired for University purposes, it is my hope that your company will remain in the Cleveland area as a major employer. This community values employment opportunities and must make every effort to preserve employment which is presently situated in this area.
>
> Will you also advise whether your company would consider relocation and expansion in Cleveland if adequate and suitable land could be made available through further urban renewal acquisitions.

From the results of this survey, it should be possible to determine the tax loss and the payroll loss as a result of the new urban renewal project. This can be offset against the potential community gain in the proposed new use of the project to determine whether the community can expect a net gain or a net loss from the urban renewal proposal.

It seems to me it is incumbent upon a Member of Congress to carefully study the effects of these Federal programs on his community, to determine that the programs are sound and realistic and to determine that they meet the legislative intent. In this sense, the Congressman becomes an overseer of these Federal expenditures to insure that the taxpayer is getting his monies worth and that the local program meets the highest standards.

In addition to this type of project, my staff has been deeply involved in research and study on water and air pollution control legislation and the methods by which Federal programs can be brought to bear upon local problems.

My staff always maintains a review of the unemployment factor in my community to accurately determine our eligibility for Economic Development assistance. There is a constant audit by census tract of critical areas in my district.

When the Medicare Act was recently adopted by Congress, my staff determined the extent of need for new workers in the Health Occupations field and as a result of this study we were able to develop the first health occupations training program in the entire United States. Thirteen hundred persons have already completed this training and an equal number of trainees are currently involved in the program. In order to perfect this program, it was essential at the staff level to bring together the representatives of hospitals, the state employment agency, and leaders in the health occupations field.

During a recent tornado in my area in which there were numerous casualty losses, my staff was instrumental in marshalling pertinent information and bringing in the facilities of the Small Business Administration and the Federal Housing Administration to expedite the handling of the special problems of those in distress.

In addition to these responsibilities, my staff undertakes special efforts to accommodate hundreds of visitors and thousands of school children who come to Washington each year from my district. Some bring problems involving extensive case work before completion.

My Cleveland staff carries on a "problem in-take" at the rate of sixty visitors every working day. General Services Administration statistics indicate that our district office is the busiest Federal office in the Cleveland area. The processing of these inquiries serve to make our bureaucracy more efficient and responsible and provide me with essential information concerning the effectiveness of Federal programs and Federal legislation. In this mutual interchange, government serves more effectively as the servant of the people.

Apologies Will Be Accepted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 20, 1966

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in the column, Washington Merry-Go-Round, appearing in the October 20, 1966, issue of the Washington Post, it states:

> In an obscure room in the Longworth Building, two ghostwriters pound out political propaganda for the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee * * *. From this office have come part of the weird stories about the antipoverty program recently going the political rounds. Here are some of them:
>
> 4. That $290 of antipoverty funds had been used to rent tuxedos so high school boys could attend a senior prom in Florida. This was stated by Representative Robert H. Michel, Republican, of Illinois. Again, it did not happen. No money was spent to rent tuxedos in Florida or anyplace else.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, as a member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, I have my own staff for investigating the poverty program which includes not only the Office of Economic Opportunity, but the Office of Education and the entire Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Just so the Record is correct, I request unanimous consent to include at this point the 1-minute speech I made on the floor of the House on May 26, 1966, appearing on page 11599 of the Record.

> War on Poverty—Tuxedos Furnished
>
> Mr. Michel. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.
>
> The Speaker. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?
>
> There was no objection.
>
> Mr. Michel. Mr. Speaker, I have noted with great interest the frequent references to the war on poverty which has punctuated the debate on the minimum wage bill. I would like to take this moment to report to you another glorious victory against poverty which has come to my attention. The Fort Lauderdale News of May 22 reports that 16 boys at Dos Palos Union High School there will be able to attend their junior prom because the war on poverty furnished tuxedos at a cost of $290. In addition, their bill for dinner afterward and tips will be courtesy of the taxpayers.
>
> I know that dancing and partying are very much in vogue in this administration, but I am a little surprised to find that they are considered such vital areas in the war against poverty. What next? Perhaps it will be deemed equally important to furnish mink stoles for those who want to attend the opera but would not feel they were properly attired without a furpiece.
>
> With these fancy-dancy goings on, the so-called Great Society is fast becoming the high society.

Mr. Speaker, you will note that I referred to an article appearing in the Fort Lauderdale, Fla., News, but the high school is in Dos Palos, Calif.

An exchange of correspondence with Sargent Shriver, Director of the OEO, followed my speech. Under unanimous

consent, I include those letters at this point:

Office of Economic Opportunity,
Washington, D.C., May 27, 1966.

Hon. Robert H. Michel,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Bob: I wish you had checked in advance before making that speech about community action funds on the floor of the House. Of course, the facts were all wrong. There has been no community action money used to rent or purchase tuxedos anywhere, and you could have found that out very easily by telephoning me. I know this is a political year and we thought we were prepared for the worst, but I really didn't think you would do such a thing without even bothering to check the facts. Next time, I hope you will pay us the courtesy of at least a telephone call because I would like to avoid instances like that which tend to humiliate and pillory the poor without, in fact, doing much good for the well-to-do.

Hope all is going well in Peoria.

Sincerely,

Sargent Shriver,
Director.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., June 1, 1966.

Hon. Sargent Shriver,
Director, Office of Economic Opportunity,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sarge: I have your note of May 27 in which you make mention of my remarks on the floor of the House, Thursday, May 26, having to do with the furnishing of tuxedos as part of the war on poverty.

I did not say anywhere in my remarks that the funds came out of your shop or, more specifically, as you put it, "community action money." As a matter of fact, it came from money appropriated under the Primary and Secondary Education Act. The so-called poverty war is not confined to the activities of your shop by any means, so you need not be offended that by my remarks I was taking pot shots at you personally.

Everything is going Gung Ho in Peoria these days.

Hearty regards,

Robert H. Michel,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, contrary to the aforementioned "Merry-Go-Round" article which said "no money was spent to rent tuxedos in Florida or anyplace else," I wish to include at this point a letter from the Office of Education to Congressman Don Clausen trying to explain why money was spent on tuxedos:

Department of Health,
Education, and Welfare,
Office of Education,
Washington, D.C., September 2, 1966.

Hon. Don H. Clausen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Clausen: Thank you for your letter of August 19 to Commissioner Howe requesting information regarding the Public Law 89-10 Title I Program in Dos Palos, California.

The Title I allocation to the elementary and high school districts which serve Dos Palos was based upon 404 children aged 5-17 who met the poverty criteria. Thirteen projects totalling $102,078.89 were approved by the State Department of Education, two of them directed at language arts improvement in the elementary school, and 11, totalling $44,975, for a variety of curriculum improvements in the high school. These include expansion of library service, remedial reading and mathematics programs, individualized instruction for slow learners, programs for the physically handicapped, homemaking, industrial arts, etc.

One of the approved high school projects, for which $2,000 was authorized, is entitled "Equal Opportunities for Cultural Development for Economically Deprived Students." Field trips, special programs, classroom discussion, and provision of needed clothing were included in the techniques to be used. The development of self-confidence, cultural appreciation, and etiquette in dress, eating and behavior were among the objectives of the project. Although the project proposal makes no specific mention of clothing for the senior prom, it was pointed out that lack of clothing "limits these students participation in school functions."

We have been informed by the State department of education that under this project, tuxedos were rented for 15 boys to enable them to attend the senior prom. Furthermore, since the affair was a dinner-dance, $2 per person was paid for dinner for these boys and their dates.

The total expenditure is $232 or approximately 0.2 percent of the total funds authorized for Dos Palos. Formal gowns for needy girls were provided by local women's organizations.

To the best of our knowledge, this is the only instance in which the local school administration has decided that Title I funds were to be used in this manner.

We share your concern about the use of these funds. We have notified the State and local educational agencies which are responsible for the development and approval of Title I projects that more caution is to be used before cultural development proposals are approved and funded. We have urged a careful evaluation of the merits of each project on the basis of the unmet educational needs of the educationally deprived children in the local school districts.

If the Office of Legislation can be of further assistance, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

August W. Steinhilber,
Acting Assistant Commission for Legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I did receive another letter from Sargent Shriver dated June 10, 1966, which starts out like this:

Dear Bob: I'm sorry you were so blatantly misquoted * * *.

Mr. Speaker, any other apologies will be accepted.

Vietnam—Glimmers of New Hope?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 20, 1966

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, underlying everything Congress does during these last crowded days before adjournment—an adjournment which may not come before October 22—is the war in Vietnam. It remains the most troublesome and disturbing issue facing the American people. And it is right that it should be disturbing, for the peace of the world hangs in the balance in that faroff corner of the world and the cost to us and the Vietnamese people in terms of destruction and the loss of lives and wealth has become enormous.

But faint glimmers of new hope have lately become visible—hope that negotiations may yet be possible and that the war can be ended with honor and security for all. Accompanying this new hope, if I read the signs correctly, is a growing concurrence among Americans about our country's proper role in Vietnam—all of which make it appropriate to reassess our position there.

The great majority of our people, I believe, have come to shun the twin extremes of unlimited escalation of the war and of unilateral withdrawal in favor of the more realistic and humane position that negotiation offers the only real possibility of halting the destruction and guaranteeing the peace, independence and neutrality of the Vietnamese people.

A RESPONSIBLE OBJECTIVE

This is also the stated and official objective of our Vietnam policy. It is a sound and restrained and responsible one. And it is the objective with which I agree.

It is not our purpose to destroy North Vietnam or to engage Communist China in all-out warfare, either of which could result in unlimited destruction and shatter world peace. By the same token, it would not serve our legitimate interests or the cause of peace and freedom to pull out without assuring the South Vietnamese their right to determine their own destiny. It would only turn the country over to the Communist forces already there and weaken the resolve of other free countries in southeast Asia to protect their independence against attempted Communist subversion. An independent, neutral Vietnam would pose no threat to anyone, either the Communists or other neighbors. A defeated and Communist-subjugated Vietnam clearly would.

This is sometimes a difficult position to maintain. It is attacked both by those who believe we must get out because we should never have become involved in Vietnam and by those who believe we should use any military means, whatever the cost, to end the war immediately. But I believe it's the right position, and while I respect those who hold the opposing views and defend their right to express them, I think both would be self-defeating.

In the case of the former, unilateral withdrawal would solve nothing. Whether or not it was wise or right for us to become involved in Vietnam, we cannot restore the status quo by withdrawing. It would only make a bad situation worse, postpone the inevitable, and make more costly the need to prevent Communist takeovers elsewhere.

In the latter case, proponents of a major setup in the war overlook the recent history of escalation in Vietnam. It has not been notably successful in ending the war or defeating the Communists. And it presents serious risks. Who, for instance, would pick up the pieces if we destroyed North Vietnam and prevent the almost certain Red Chinese attempt to move into the vacuum? How long and bloody could the war become if China intervened? Might not Soviet Russia and Communist China be led to

mend their differences in the face of what they would then consider a common threat from the United States? In such circumstances—and most experts consider them highly likely—the quick and easy victory could become a nuclear world war.

A REAL RISK

What we cannot afford to forget is that any powerful nation will resist what it believes to be a threat to its own interests and security—just as we forced the Russians to back down at the time of the Cuban missile crisis. And with hundreds of thousands of troops and a sizable Navy and Air Force operating thousands of miles from home on the doorstep of Soviet and Chinese Asia, we are not adding to their sense of security. We are taking a risk—a risk we should not unnecessarily compound.

Our task is the delicate one of convincing the Communists not only that we intend to preserve the independence of South Vietnam and will not be deterred from this purpose, but also that we have no intention of threatening their own security.

While this may resemble, more or less, the position of the administration, it does not follow that the administration has done an adequate job of developing or implementing its policy. I do not believe it has. It has often, for example, allowed the impression to be fostered that it has no consistent policy. It has frequently confused, deliberately or otherwise, both its friends and its enemies. It has reflected divisions within its own ranks. It has failed to be candid in reporting the facts of the war to its own people—naively optimistic one day, despairingly pessimistic the next. Official spokesmen of the administration have issued conflicting statements the very same day, unbeknownst to each other. It is little wonder that people are apprehensive—ourselves, our friends, and our enemies.

Therefore, though our basic policy, as I understand it, is right and reasonable, it must be made effective. But to be effective, it has to be credible, believable. And to be credible, it has to be consistent and it has to be reiterated. Our words and our actions have both got to fit the same policy mold.

A CONVINCING INITIATIVE

In this context, it is almost incredible that Ambassador Goldberg's recent address before the United Nations should have been the first real initiative the United States has taken in the effort to find a basis for negotiations. Previously, we had been content simply to react to others initiatives. agreeing to consider proposals from the Communist side but making none ourselves. What have we got to lose by convincing the world of our peaceful intentions—so long as we insist that peace be based on justice and freedom for Vietnam?

More than 8 months ago, I spoke on the House floor urging that Congress conduct a full-scale debate on Vietnam in an effort to clarify the issues and reach a true consensus about our direction and policy. Until Ambassador Goldberg's speech, nothing the administration said seemed to answer the questions I raised—questions I am sure have been on the minds of millions of Americans.

I hope, therefore, that Ambassador Goldberg spoke not for himself alone, but for a united, determined administration. I hope his initiative will be taken up, repeated, developed, and expanded—again and again—by other administration spokesmen, including the President himself. It will be a sign of strength, not weakness. If we say it right, and mean what we say, it will be understood by friend and enemy alike. It will encourage neutrals of good will to renew their effort to persuade the Communists to talk. It could even lead to periods of cease-fire, honored by both sides, which would stop the bloodshed and destruction and provide the time and circumstances for at least the beginnings of negotiation. Again, I ask, what have we got to lose?

There is reason for hope, for restrained optimism, in recent developments. Since Ambassador Goldberg's speech, the United States at least temporarily has restricted bombing of the de-militarized zone between North and South Vietnam in the hope the Communists will stop using it for military purposes. Premier Ky of South Vietnam, heretofore a severe critic of U.N. Secretary General U Thant, has expressed "deep appreciation" of Thant's efforts to restore peace and has urged the Secretary General to remain at his post. Thant, himself, has renewed diplomatic efforts to convince the North Vietnamese to talk. And there are new rumors of peace feelers from Hanoi itself.

Just how the President's forthcoming mission to Asia will affect this situation remains to be seen. It could contribute greatly if he and our Asian allies pursue the Goldberg theme persuasively. Unless the conference is convincing, however, it may only prolong the doubt and destruction.

Meanwhile, the mothers and fathers and other loved ones of Americans fighting in Vietnam—and I am one such parent—know why we must be there and why we must end the fighting. We are strong and we shall win. But our victory must be one of peace and freedom, not of devastation and death.

Congressman Dingell Reports From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 20, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the 2d session of the 89th Congress is drawing to a close and, as I have done during the 11 years I have been in the House, I am reporting to my constituents on the problems facing the country and about our accomplishments in Congress. Thus, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the last portion of my report to the people of the 16th Congressional District of Michigan for the 2d session of the 89th Congress:

CONGRESSMAN JOHN D. DINGELL REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

So many things happened as Congress drew to a close that I want to continue my earlier report to you.

The Vietnam war, of course, is on all our minds.

REDS LOSE FRIENDS

President Lyndon B. Johnson's Asian journey emphasizes the great impact which the American fighting in Vietnam has had on the 400 million non-Chinese people who live in the Far East.

Every Government from East Pakistan to North Korea now has moved in some degree away from Communist China. Indonesia has replaced a pro-Communist regime.

Even the Japanese Communist party rejects Peking leadership.

A VOTE FOR FREEDOM

The big turnout of voters, 80 percent of those eligible which occurred recently when South Vietnam elected a national assembly is a great victory for freedom. Hopefully, a duly elected government acting under a written constitution will soon be a reality.

The farmers and villagers who trooped to the polls that day were rejecting communism and defying Viet Cong terrorist threats.

By simply taking part in that election the great majority of Vietnamese people voted for freedom.

CRISIS IN THE WAR

Winning the war in Vietnam calls for much more than driving out invading Red armies.

Behind the shield of military security which the presence of American troops establishes, the South Vietnamese people face problems about creating a free and self-governing society.

Our purpose is not to remain permanently in Vietnam but to preserve the independence of the Vietnamese people and to prevent a Communist takeover of Southeast Asia, which is a threat not only to the security of that area but to the United States.

NEED LOCAL LEADERS

An independent South Vietnam can readily become prosperous. The land is rich.

But in addition to technical and economic assistance the people need leaders and teachers to bring them up to date, and these teachers and leaders must be Vietnamese.

Otherwise some will say the Reds were right after all, and the Americans really came to Vietnam to succeed the French as colonial masters.

Only Vietnamese administrators can inspire confidence in Vietnamese independence and self-government.

NEW GROUPS TRAINED

The United States Agency for International Development, the Vietnamese Army, and the Saigon Government train "Rural Construction" groups for this phase of the war.

Each "Rural Construction" team is taught how to move into a village, drive out the local Reds, and establish self-government.

Then the members are expected to build and run schools, open health clinics, repair roads and bridges, introduce the use of fertilizers, of new rice seed, sweet potatoes, sugarcane, and hogs, organize fishing cooperatives, etc.

IKE WAS RIGHT ON VIETNAM

I think former President Dwight D. Eisenhower spoke the minds of most Americans when in 1960 he promised that this country would uphold Vietnamese independence. His words to the Vietnamese people were:

"Although the main responsibility for guarding independence will always, as it has in the past, belong to the Vietnamese people and their government. I want to assure you that for so long as our strength can be useful, the United States will continue to assist Vietnam in the difficult yet hopeful struggle ahead."

I believe that if Americans courageously support our policy of assisting development of a free democratically elected government and furnishing economic and technical assistance to build a stable, viable economy, we can turn back this Communist probe as we have already turned back Communist probes in Berlin, Greece, Turkey, Malaysia and the Philippines.

Success in our great endeavor will prevent Communist takeover of all of Southeast Asia, and can mean years of peace in the area and the world.

CLEAN RIVERS

The new Clean Rivers law increasing Federal grants to cities for sewage treatment construction up to $1 billion, will finally make enough money available for real cleanup.

I was a sponsor of the House bill and for the first time, I am satisfied that the amounts authorized for the next few years will be nearly large enough to meet the needs.

HELP FOR INDUSTRIAL AIR AND WATER CLEANUP

In the closing days of the session, I was able to persuade the tax writing House Ways and Means Committee to continue the seven percent investment tax credit on money spent to install water and air pollution control equipment.

This $10 million exemption will stimulate heavy industrial investment in cleanup facilities on the Detroit River and elsewhere. Industries which must install air and water pollution controls will find it financially attractive to do so.

INFLATION

As we all know to our sorrow, prices are continuing to rise. The price of food rose three percent during the past 12 months, the prices of services rose 4.5 percent, and the price of borrowing money (interest rates) climbed 33 percent!

Crippling inflation is the last thing this country needs or wants. Both Congress and the President have moved strongly to moderate price increases. But one cannot yet say the trend has been checked.

FOOD INCREASES

Increases in food costs hit consumers hardest. They especially penalize large families, poor families, retired persons, and persons with fixed or limited incomes. Rising food prices create nagging problems for harassed housewives.

The record shows that the wholesale prices of farm products ended a long decline late in 1964, and since then have risen approximately 16 percent. This is a basic change, which retail food prices reflect.

YOUR GOVERNMENT ACTS

I voted to suspend temporarily the seven percent investment tax credit which had been adopted in 1962 to encourage business to make capital investments.

This plan had perhaps worked too well. Since 1962 the annual volume of capital investments of manufacturers had doubled, and the volume of capital investments by all business had grown from $37 billion to $60 billion a year.

Demand for money to finance these investments was one of the prime causes of the 33 percent interest rate rise.

INTEREST CEILING

I also voted to protect building and loan associations and savings institutions which were losing deposits to banks. Congress put a ceiling on the interest rates which commercial banks could pay on deposits of less than $100,000.

I hope this will make more money available for the home building industry, which hasn't been able to compete with business building at current high interest rates.

WILL CUT SPENDING

During the year Congress temporarily withheld some of the excise tax cuts made in 1965, advanced income tax withholding schedules, and took other actions to restrain inflationary pressures.

The President vigorously resisted wage demands which exceeded productivity gains, and price rises not justified by cost increases.

The Federal Reserve Board raised rediscount rates, and demanded that bankers extend credit selectively. Perhaps the greatest deflationary influence was the fall in stock prices.

As Congress ends, the President has placed a freeze on Government jobs, and is preparing to cut Government spending $3 billion a year.

MORE ACTION COMING

Some observers blame price rises on the war in Vietnam and the $2 billion a month expenditures which accompany it. In this view the distortion of normal trade is great enough to justify wartime economic controls.

Others call for wartime emergency tax increases. I do not believe either action is necessary at this time. I am sure that Congress and the President can and will prevent a disastrous inflation, and I expect other actions to be taken when necessary by your Government.

NEW WONDERLAND FOR YOU

I am happy to report that nature lovers in Michigan soon will be able to enjoy a new wilderness park.

One of the first purchases made by the U.S. Forest Service out of the new Federal Land and Water Conservation fund is the Sylvania tract in the Upper Peninsula.

Sylvania comprises 29 square miles of wild woods and beautiful lakes which had been the private playground of millionaires for half a century. Now the Forest Service will open it to public use, building roads and trails, providing guides and camping facilities, and displaying its beauties to visitors.

GOLDEN PASSPORTS

I was a sponsor of the law which created the Land and Water Conservation fund 18 months ago. In addition to supplying the money to buy Sylvania, this fund will pay for the new Pictured Rocks lakeshore recreation area. And it has given the State of Michigan $4,665,000 with which to buy other recreation areas on a dollar-for-dollar matching basis.

The fund revenues come from the sale of $7 Golden Passports (visitors' permits) to Federal recreational areas, from motor boat fuel taxes, from sales of surplus Federal lands, and from other sources.

FEDERAL AID TO COMMUNITIES

Congress is paying more and more State and local government bills every year, and if we are to provide for 400 million Americans in 80 years I expect the trend to continue. Many of the most pressing needs for public services today are local, and many kinds of taxes are most economically and best collected nationally.

The change has taken place fairly rapidly. Only 10 years ago the Federal Government supplied about eight percent of the money that states and cities spent. Today it supplies nearly 20 percent.

EFFECT OF FEDERAL AID IN MICHIGAN

Michigan and its local governments received $339 million from Federal sources in 1963. To raise this money from non-Federal sources would have required a 63 percent increase in the Michigan sales tax, or a 77 percent increase in property taxes collected for schools, or a 200 percent increase in gasoline tax receipts.

Clearly, in this day of local revenue problems, Federal aid has become a most important part of local government financing.

President Johnson Discusses International Education at the Honolulu Conference, October 18, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 20, 1966

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor in the House of Representatives of the International Education Act of 1966, of which the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, the Honorable WAYNE MORSE, was cosponsor in the Senate, I am naturally deeply grateful that this important measure was passed by both Chambers just before Congress adjourned this week.

In his address at the East-West Center at Honolulu on October 18, President Johnson spoke of the International Education Act and announced his intention to establish a Center for Educational Cooperation in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and also to call a World Conference on Education to be held next year in Hawaii.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD the President's Honolulu address as well as an editorial from the New York Times of October 18 on his address:

SPEECH AT EAST–WEST CENTER

We are meeting today in a place that has long been an East-West crossroads.

To these islands 1,400 years ago came brave sailors from Southeast Asia—the Polynesians in their seagoing canoes.

To these islands nearly 200 years ago came explorers from Europe, then traders and missionaries from America, and later settlers from Japan, China and the Philippines.

Hawaii was once a remote outpost of both East and West. Today it is a vital focal point of peoples and cultures, of ideas, institutions, and hopes.

It is fitting that this crossroads should be the site of our nation's new and vigorous East-West Center for Cultural Exchange.

It is a source of deep personal satisfaction to be here today.

Seven years ago I joined with your present Governor, John Burns, and Hawaii's Senators and other farsighted members of Congress in calling for the establishment of the East-West Center—where two great cultures might share with one another their perspective of man's destiny. Five years ago I had the pleasure of helping dedicate this center. I said at that ceremony:

"The ultimate defense of freedom lies not in weapons systems, nor in the implements of arms. These we must maintain as responsible men to deter the folly of those few leaders who acknowledge no responsibility to God or men or their own people. But freedom's surest defense and freedom's greatest force is the enlightenment of the minds of the people."

We know the world we seek cannot be won by arms. It must be built with ideas.

We know that no opportunities before us are more crucial—or more hopeful—than those for expanded ventures in international education.

That is why the Congress, upon my recommendation, has just passed the International Education Act of 1966.

TO STRENGTHEN UNIVERSITIES

This act will strengthen American universities as centers of international learning. This act promises a stronger emphasis at every level of American education upon giving learning an international dimension.

During this Pacific journey, on friendly Asian soil—I will sign this act.

In addition, I am directing Secretary Gardner to begin work immediately to establish, in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, a new Center of Educational Cooperation. This new center will advance the aims of the International Education Act; it will serve as a focal point in Washington for leadership in international education.

I have also asked Secretary Gardner to begin planning this year for a World Conference on Education to be held in 1967. This international gathering of world educators and specialists will take a fresh look at the world's educational needs. I hope it will help the nations to establish new priorities and new proposals for worldwide cooperative efforts in education.

Dr. James Perkins, the distinguished president of Cornell University, will work with Secretary Gardner in this project; he will organize and direct a planning conference early this winter to prepare the agenda and the schedule for the larger meeting. I have asked him to invite a number of the world's leading educators to join in these preparations.

In our continuing efforts to broaden our intellectual horizons and expand our educational frontiers, this still young center of research and study has begun to play a leading role.

CULTURAL EXCHANGE

Through its program of cultural and technical interchange between Asia and the United States, it assumes both a practical as well as a symbolic position.

More than 6,000 persons—Asians and Americans—have been educated here or have taken part in intellectual exchange through your conferences and seminars. At the Institute of Advanced Projects, more than 150 senior scholars and administrators have done research and made reports on a wide variety of problems that face peoples on both sides of the Pacific.

Symbolically, you stand as a bridge between the two mainlands on either side of the wide ocean that surrounds us on these islands. This center reminds us that our people and the people of Asia have much to give to each other, much to learn from each other.

It was not always so.

In centuries past, men of the West went to Asia for many reasons.

Some made the long ocean trek in search of wealth.

Others went as agents of governments that wanted colonial possessions.

Still others went to each; to treat the sick; to spread the gospel; to aid the farmer; to help build factories; to advise officials; to translate western works of literature and technology.

Much that was good and constructive and abiding came from those efforts. But it is a fact we must understand and recognize that these movements from West to East were also disturbing and revolutionary in their effort.

The West entered the Industrial Revolution earlier than the East. By this accident of history, the West commanded the tools of modern science and technology sooner than the East. Through colonialism and by other means the West intruded its then superior power into the East. And there was a reaction.

NOTES DEEP SCARS

That reaction has taken many forms, some peaceful and some violent. It should not surprise us that scars—have remained in men's minds and hearts.

While many Western countries were trying to acquire special and exclusive privileges for themselves, we were arguing for an Open Door.

We acquired our responsibility in the Philippines through conflict. But we lived up to our pledge to grant that nation independence.

Looking back over the years there are searching questions we must ask.

How well have we learned the lessons of our experience in Asia?

How well have we understood the complex causes of conflict in the Pacific's time of troubles?

How well have we understood the feelings and aspirations of Asia's peoples during their century of turbulence?

How well have we understood the impact of West upon East—of Western arms, industry, and ideas upon venerable Asian cultures?

How well have we understood the course of revolution in Asia?

How well have we understood the shocks—as well as the benefits—that modernization can bring to developing societies?

How well have we understood the shifting tides of nationalism in all its forms?

Only by answering these questions with candor can we build solid foundations for our future relations with Asia. Only then can we understand the depth of the desire in Asia for independence, for modernization, and for dignity. American policy today must be the policy of an open mind.

SEES A TURNING POINT

I am convinced that we have now reached a turning point in Asia's history, in Asia's relations with the United States, in Asia's relations with the rest of the world.

I think it has become clear that what we want to see in Asia is what the vast majority of Asians themselves want to see.

I do not pretend to speak for Asia. I cannot. But I urge my countrymen: Let us listen when the Asians speak for themselves.

In the last few months I have had many talks with leaders from most of the countries of Asia. They and others of their countrymen have spoken freely of their hopes.

What do they want?

They have told me.

First, they want to be secure from outside attack. They want to end the threat of internal subversion with all the terrorism and murder that is associated with it.

They want their people to be able to live in peace.

They want to raise the living standards of their people. They want their children to get a good education.

They want to be able to see a doctor when they are ill.

They want, above all, to have a voice in their own destiny—in the choice of those who will lead them, whether in the village or in the nation's capital.

They want freedom—and justice—and a fair prospect that their dreams can sometimes come true.

They wish to make modern societies—but societies true to their own traditions, their own culture, their own ambitions.

And that is also as good a definition of what the United States wants to see in Asia as any I can offer.

What are the prospects for achieving this goal?

I travel to the Far East this autumn at a time of trial and conflict for the people of the Pacific basin. I come to meet with the leaders of nations which share a common determination: that the people of South Vietnam shall be permitted to shape their own destiny, free of aggression from without and terror from within.

On our agenda are the hard questions of war in all its aspects—of force and sacrifice; of diplomacy and negotiation; or rehabilitation and reconstruction.

But I tell you this: I go to Asia with confidence and hope.

"NEW ASIA" FORESEEN

Behind the terrible costs of combat and hostility a new Asia is gradually coming into its own.

The process is slow, but the signs are unmistakable.

One after another, the nations of Asia are casting off the spent slogans of earlier narrow nationalism. One after another, they are grasping the realities of an interdependent Asia.

What are these realities?

That the security of every nation is threatened by an attack of any nation.

That national stability and strength can only come through self-help; rigorous planning; hard work; and sacrifice.

That political power held by the few and the rich within a nation is power that will not survive.

That lasting national prosperity can only come through full cooperation with one's neighbors, the rich and the poor, the large and the small alike.

That no single nation can or should be permitted to dominate the Pacific region.

That disputes settled by other than peaceful means are disputes that will remain unsettled.

Most important of all, that Asia's destiny lies in the hands of Asians.

Throughout Asia today these realities are grasped as never before.

A new spirit is clear at work: a self-confidence that permits cooperation; a skepticism that rejects illusory short cuts; a deepening consciousness of Asia's proud past and its great future.

This new spirit has already yielded action and results.

In the past year, Japan and Korea reached agreement to settle old differences and work more closely together.

Ten Asian nations came together in Seoul to form the Asian and Pacific Council.

The Asian Development Bank has been formed.

Economic Ministers from a number of Asian countries met in Tokyo to consider the future of economic development in Southeast Asia.

Ministers of Education have met to consider mutual problems.

Agricultural specialists will gather in Tokyo later this year to study ways of raising productivity.

An Asian technical institute is a going concern in Bangkok.

The list could be extended.

But the important thing is that all these things are happening; and they are happening with Asian leadership and at an Asian initiative.

ONLY A BEGINNING

This is, of course, only a beginning.

Great problems and challenges lie ahead.

There remain in Asia, for instance, voices of extremism and apostles of militancy.

Such voices and rhetoric are out of tune with the new currents in Asia. They are increasingly irrelevant. They are increasingly isolated.

For Asia's leaders and Asia's peoples are looking beyond narrow nationalism. They are looking beyond ideology.

They see on the one hand the age-old affliction of poverty, ignorance, and disease. They see on the other hand the possibility of abundance and knowledge and health. And they see the absolute necessity of matching Asia's needs with Asia's resources and those of other regions.

Sooner or later this new perception will spread as well to the closed societies of Communist Asia. Sooner or later the pragmatic and compassionate spirit of the Chinese people will prevail over outmoded dogmatism.

We look to that day with confidence.

And for our part, we shall do what we can to hasten its coming. We shall keep alive the hope for a freer flow of ideas and people between mainland China and the United States. For only through such exchange can isolation be ended and suspicion give way to trust.

We do not believe in eternal enmity. All hatred among nations must end in reconciliation. And we look to the day when the policies of mainland China will permit such a reconciliation.

But we are not prepared to pay for peace and the price of freedom—American freedom or the freedom of America's allies in Asia.

What, then, is America's role in this new emerging Asia?

The answer is this.

We can help. We must help. We are helping.

But we see our role as that, not more.

We can give advice and technical assistance. We can cooperate in all kinds of activities—from the far reaches of space to the ocean depths.

Asia will provide its own leadership.

We shall cooperate with that leadership.

Our role is that of a neighbor among equals—a partner in the great adventure of bringing peace, order, and progress to a part of the world where more than half the human race lives.

WILL BACK COMMITMENTS

As long as danger threatens, our strength shall back our commitments in Asia. Yet we seek no special status or privileges, no primacy, no territory, no base rights in perpetuity. We recognize that our strength, our size and wealth may impose a special obligation upon us in the transition to the new Asia. But we also recognize that the cooperative tasks of assistance and defense will be assumed more and more by others and by collective groupings as the nations of Asia build their own strength and abundance.

As we Americans watch the emergence of the new Asia, we are deeply conscious of our historic and cultural debts to the people of the Pacific region. And here in Hawaii I am particularly reminded of the extraordinary role that has been played in our nation by citizens of Asian descent.

All of us know of the brave exploits of Japanese-Americans in the 100th Infantry Battalion and the 442d Combat Team during World War II—and we know of the similar heroism in the Korean War.

How many of us know the statistics of peacetime performance by Americans of Asian descent? The 1960 census showed that the percentage of Chinese-Americans and Japanese-Americans in "professional, managerial, clerical, and sales" categories exceeded that of white Americans—47.2 per cent for the Chinese, 56.7 per cent for the Japanese, and 42.6 percent for the whites. That same census also showed that Americans of Chinese and Japanese descent had twice as high a proportion of their young people enrolled in schools and colleges as the white population.

We have seen, then, the promise of Asians at home.

Now we sense the new surge of promise within Asia.

Tomorrow we leave for Asia.

I go to confer with the leaders of six nations, who have also committed their men to the proposition that aggression shall not succeed and the people of South Vietnam shall have the right to shape their own future in peace.

I go to see, to listen, to learn, and to act with our partners to bring an honorable peace to Southeast Asia at the first day it is possible.

But I felt it right to share with you—here in this special place—the lessons of the past and the hopes we have for the future in our relations with Asia.

I intend to ask the leaders I see to visit America—especially to come to Hawaii, a model of how men of different races and different cultures can live and work together in freedom and hope.

EDUCATION FIRST

In his speech at the East-West Center in Honolulu, President Johnson laid great stress on the establishment of a new Center for Educational Cooperation within the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and on a World Conference on Education to be held in Hawaii next year.

Both the center and the conference will be the outgrowth of the new International Education Act of 1966. The special significance of placing much of the responsibility for America's part in international education in the hands of H.E.W. could and should be to remove the widely held suspicion abroad that American institutions and scholars on foreign soil are mere extensions, if not outright agents, of U.S. policy.

The effectiveness of the education conference will be greatly enhanced by the fact that it is to be organized by Secretary John W. Gardner, with the aid of Dr. James A. Perkins, president of Cornell University, rather than by the State Department.

And since President Johnson, in the same address, also spoke of the hope "for a freer flow of ideas and people between mainland China and the United States," the new center and next year's conference might well begin a scholarly rather than a political effort to establish the kind of exchanges with Communist China which have become very nearly routine as between the Soviet Union and the United States.

Address of Hon. Charles McC. Mathias, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 20, 1966

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] addressed the National Multiple Sclerosis Society on October 15, 1966, on the occasion of its 20th anniversary at the Shoreham Hotel.

The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] discussed the role of private health groups such as the NMSS in our national attack on health problems today and addressed himself to the question of whether "in this age of massive Federal support for health research," such private health groups have, in fact, an essential role to play in this most important area.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I ask that the remarks of the gentleman from Maryland be placed in the RECORD at this point.

The remarks referred to follow:

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, JR., ON THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS SOCIETY, SHOREHAM HOTEL, OCTOBER 15, 1966

I am very happy to be with you today and to take a small part in your biennial meeting. It is a real tribute to the Society, and to your interest in its important work, that so many of you have come together from all over the country to share ideas and information in this vital field.

Today I would like to discuss with you a two-pronged question. First, what is the role of a private health group such as yours in our national attack on health problems today? More basically, in this age of massive Federal support for health research, do you have an essential role at all?

It seems especially appropriate for me to ask these questions, since I represent the National Institutes of Health. NIH is one of the major industries in Montgomery County, with a budget of more than a billion dollars per year and a roster of over 11,000 employees. Beyond that, NIH is among the foremost agencies of medical research in the entire world. Its nine separate institutes support over 40% of all health research in the United States, and tremendous influence over the entire field here and abroad.

The growth of NIH dramatizes the changing distribution of responsibility for medical research in the United States. Not too long ago, as late as 1945, the major burdens of research and preventive work were borne by state and local governments, and by private charitable organizations such as yours. At that time, obviously, your contributions in specialized fields were conspicuous and necessary. Since World War II, however, the Federal government has moved to the center of the stage, as the Congress has recognized that the problems of disease and its prevention and cure are national problems, requiring the efforts of the national government.

Today the Federal government has assumed substantial responsibility not only for the construction of medical schools and research facilities, but also for specialized medical training and research. Given the tremendous operating budget of NIH, and the reservoir of talent available to the Institutes, you may well wonder what there is today that you can do which NIH cannot.

From my point of view, the perspective of both a Member of Congress and a layman in the field of health, it seems that there are three areas in which your Society can make unique contributions: as a stimulus to public effort, as an independent and creative partner in continuing cooperative programs, and as an inspiring leader among private societies and groups.

One example of your value as a stimulus is your role in convincing Congress, sixteen years ago, of the need to establish the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness. Since its formation in 1950, this Institute has performed extremely valuable service in the whole field of neurological diseases, and in the area of blinding eye diseases in particular. Under the leadership of Dr. Pearce Bailey and its current head, Dr. Richard Masland, the Institute has broadened its research responsibilities into new areas in each successive year, while continuing to intensify its ongoing work. You are to be commended for your foresight in recognizing, over sixteen years ago, the great need for such an Institute, and for your energies in obtaining initial Congressional approval and continuing Congressional support.

The fiscal 1966 budget of the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness totaled $101,153,000 with a substantial increase expected in 1967.

One might think that, with expenditures of such size, the Institute has reached the point at which it can be virtually self-starting and self-sustaining, and can reply far less on the aid which you gave it at the start. But this is not at all the case. Although your Society's budget of $4.1 million per year is less than 4% of that of this particular Institute, the continuing assistance you give to it is invaluable. It would be impossible to place a price tag on the help which you have provided, both in your direct dealings with the Institute and in your work with Members of Congress on behalf of the Institute's programs.

One fact of legislative life which makes a Member of Congress' job so difficult is the inescapable reality that most of us are not experts in most fields. The volume and complexity of issues before the House requires Members to specialize in a few fields, and to rely on the special knowledge of others in most areas. For example, as you know, the members of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and the HEW Subcommittee of Appropriations, are well-versed in the legislation which you discuss with them. Their long and intimate familiarity with the subject matter permits them to make reasoned judgments on every question before them in the field of health, and they are able to evaluate complicated proposals on their merits with the aid of their experience and their knowledge.

For most other Members of Congress, this is not the case. When a bill comes to the floor of the House from the Commerce Committee, of which I am not a member, I try as best I can to learn as much as possible about it from my colleagues on the Committee, from the Committee report, and from the floor debate itself. I also consult the recommendations of the executive branch, and whatever outside opinion is available. This is where you come in.

One special threat to the autonomy of Congress which has developed rapidly in the past several years is the overwhelming dominance of the executive branch as a source of information. There is a tremendous and growing "data gap" between the Congress, with its 12,000 employees and no computers at all, and the executive, with its 2.5 million people and great data processing resources. It is not healthy, for the Congress or the country, for the legislative branch to rely solely on the executive for expert knowledge and factual information. Yet unless the balance can be swung back, this will soon be the case.

In this situation, I especially welcome the opinions of private agencies with long experience and ability in specialized fields. Often the testimony and suggestions of groups such as yours have led to the refining and tightening of legislation, or to totally new legislative steps. Often, too, this outside opinion has helped keep the Congressional vision clear, and has helped Congress to maintain a workable and equitable balance between public and private participation in programs in health and other fields.

Your Society's efforts have been especially helpful to the Congress because you have sent as witnesses during the last fifteen years some of the most eminent neurologists in the country. The observations and judgments of these outstanding men have had great weight with Congressional committees, and with individual Members like myself who have relied on expert testimony in evaluating bills and appropriations. The legislative task would be far harder if we did not have these celebrated specialists to turn to.

Your participation in the legislative process is not just important to laymen like myself. It is also immensely valuable for the Committees concerned. Because your judgments are respected, because your interest is well known, and because the quantity of your work is so high, your testimony carries particular weight. It might almost be said that you serve as staff for the Committees in your field—but as unique staff members, independent in position and therefore totally independent in vision and judgment.

The contributions which your witnesses can make are dramatized by the work of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee this year on the NINDB budget request. One of the men who submitted testimony was Dr. Houston Merritt, the Dean of the Columbia University Medical School and medical advisor to the Multiple Sclerosis Society. Dr. Merritt's statement emphasized three areas of neurology; head injury, multiple sclerosis research, and epilepsy. In each area he presented specific information and made specific suggestions. In each area the Senate Subcommittee, after reviewing all the arguments before it, made very similar recommendations and supported them with facts which included those presented by Dr. Merritt.

This case illustrates the way in which experienced, intelligent representatives of private, non-profit groups can contribute to the legislative process. If Dr. Merritt had not appeared, the same conclusions might have been reached anyway; but it is certain that they would not have carried the same weight, and would have lacked the extra impetus which the support of informed non-governmental specialists can give.

Thus private organizations like your own, however modest their resources and staff may seem, do have a vital and exciting role to play in Washington. I might add that that role is even more influential precisely because you *are* private and non-profit in orientation. From your detached position, you can judge complicated questions on their merits, and can contribute valuable information free from the shadow of either partisanship or the perpetual competition among the branches of the Federal establishment.

In conclusion, then, I would summarize your role in our national effort against crippling disease as a three-sided one. First, of course, you contribute your own work and independent efforts. Second, you serve as a stimulus to Congress and to the executive, pointing the way from your own advanced position and exercising your initiative in making progress occur. Third, you serve as a continuing source of information and expert opinion, helping to shape and bolster the judgments of Members of Congress in your field.

Finally, you make a larger contribution to the national well-being. Our great advances in the understanding and treatment of disease, and our proud position as a world leader in the field of health, have been possible because we have been blessed with dedicated professionals of the highest caliber, and with objective, creative organizations acting not for the sake of profit, but for the sake of the public good. This is a tradition as old as our nation, and it has continued in full strength because of the efforts and commitment of people such as yourselves. I am confident that you will serve us all as well in the future as you have in the past. Thank you.

Position Papers, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 20, 1966

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, we are on the threshold of a great national election for the Congress of the United States. The entire House of Representatives must face the people to account for their stewardship of the trust this Nation has placed in them. The future course of our Nation at home and in the world will be affected by the decision of the people on election day.

YEAR OF DECISION

The national issues this year are: Vietnam and the direction of our foreign policy; the high cost of living and inflation; high interest rates; and lawlessness in our streets.

These are the issues which the Democratic administration and the overwhelming Democratic Congress have been called upon to meet. The extent to which they have succeeded is a fair question for each person to ask as he votes this year.

VIETNAM—SYMBOLIC OF LEADERSHIP GAP

I do not look upon the war in Vietnam as a partisan political issue, but it does symbolize the difficulties we are experiencing in the handling of our foreign affairs. My position is to support the negative aspects of the President's policy in Vietnam. That is to say, I agree with him that we must stop Communist aggression, and we must back and protect our men who are fighting in Vietnam. I do not agree with nor do I fully understand the positive aspects of the President's foreign policy. I cannot see, nor can I justify, his refusal to use our Nation's economic power to the fullest to bring this war to an end. The recent action of the administration in demanding the right to continue aid to nations dealing with North Vietnam is to my mind something that can well be misunderstood around the world.

The President has failed to unify our country behind the war: first, because of the lack of credibility in the accounts of what we are doing there; and second, because of the deep split in the Democratic Party into two wings generally called "hawks" and "doves." It is the President's responsibility to unify his party and our Nation behind the effort we are making.

I believe that we should engage in quiet, effective diplomacy in our search for peace. We should seek an all-Asian peace conference and not a conference at Geneva, dominated by large Western powers. We should establish a goal of winning the war in Vietnam and explain our commitments in southeast Asia fully to the American people. We should remain ready and willing to negotiate. We should be using the armed forces of South Vietnam to a greater extent. We are making this a totally American war, and I believe that it would be more effective if the war were made more and more a South Vietnamese war.

The real question arising from Vietnam is what have we learned as a result to establish a policy to deal with the next war of "national liberation." It is not a reassuring sight to see a NATO dissolving in Europe and no new ideas to take its place. Our real needs in the world today are stability in Saigon and constructive diplomacy in Washington.

INFLATION: WHO IS RESPONSIBLE?

The issue of constantly rising prices is one that bothers all Americans. It affects all Americans. The growing inflation threatens the prosperity which we are now enjoying. This is the result of wasteful Government spending and the refusal to live by the sound rules of economics. For years the administration has continued to spend vastly more than it takes in. This year, the President insisted on giving the American people both guns and butter. The results can be seen both in the cost of items in the supermarkets and the constantly declining stock market. A loss of confidence has resulted.

There is only one true cure and that is to cut the cost of the Great Society. This domestic spending can and must be cut. We should not start new Great Society programs while we are fighting a war in Vietnam. We should hold down and cut Great Society programs now in existence. We should trim the Federal budget of all departments and agencies. This can be done. The prime example is our agricultural programs which spend billions of dollars for food subsidies. At a time when we are facing a world food shortage, the need for these programs is questionable. We should be taking a completely new and fresh look at our farm programs. In my opinion, billions of dollars could be saved and the consumer-taxpayer and farmer benefited.

POSTELECTION TAXES

It is well known in Washington that the President is waiting until after this year's election to ask for a general tax increase. I, for one, will not support such a tax increase unless and until the President cuts the spending I have outlined and it becomes clear that further steps are necessary. The people do not want additional taxes and, in my opinion, they are not necessary.

HIGH INTEREST, HIGH PRICES, HIGH TAXES

The question of higher interest rates affects every person buying a home or car, any person who wishes to borrow money for his personal needs or business purposes. This administration has deliberately and intentionally forced interest rates up to the highest levels in history. They sponsored legislation which placed Government securities on the market in large amounts which pay 6-percent interest. This has dried up much of the normal sources of money for our banking institutions.

The failure of the President to take steps to cut spending has left those with responsibility no choice but to force up interest rates to combat inflation. The main attack on higher interest rates is a cut in domestic and unnecessary Federal spending.

WHO WANTS RIOTS?

Lawlessness in our streets bothers us all, but again, the administration gives no direction to the American people or points them in the wrong direction.

The Attorney General, chief law enforcement officer, has yet to come up with a single proposal which might do something to control and end unlawful demonstrations and riots in our streets, or to control the ever-increasing crime rate across our Nation. While showing great imagination in the field of civil rights legislation, he seems unable to think of anything that might protect the majority of our citizens from the lawless use of our streets. The Vice President for his part cries out that he could "lead a good riot himself." Just imagine the reaction of those Negroes—the vast majority, indeed—who have remained lawful and stayed away from the riots. They are faced with the fact that the Vice President has indicated they have done the wrong thing.

THERE IS NO EASY WAY

I share the Nation's concern over the lawless elements that have crept into the civil rights movement under the title of "Black Power." To me, black power signifies an attempt of some civil rights leaders to seize control of the civil rights movement. I think it would be a mistake, as some have advocated, to repeal the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which contains basic voting right guarantees for all citizens. This is an overreaction. To my mind, it is clear that our Negro citizens are entitled to equal opportunity but that his advancement will come by merit and not through violence. The overwhelming majority of the Negro people realize this clearly.

RETURN TO BALANCED GOVERNMENT

This year more than ever we need a balanced government in Washington, a Congress that can truly keep a check on the Presidential power. No matter how benevolent that power may appear, it is a danger to our system and a step toward one-man government.

OPPORTUNITY FOR CHANGE ON ELECTION DAY

The Republican Party offers checks and balances instead of a blank check. Our people are choosing more than a representative in Washington this election day. They are choosing a way of life and the way of the future of our country. Their choice should be one of which they will be proud.

SENATE

Friday, October 21, 1966

The Senate met at 9 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by Hon. Daniel K. Inouye, a Senator from the State of Hawaii.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let Thy beauty, O Lord, be upon us, that our spirits may be radiant as in Thy strength we face the perplexities of these troubled days. Use us, we pray, in all our human relationships as ambassadors of good will, so that at the end of the day we may be able to say, "I have kept the faith."

May Thy truth make us free—free from pride and prejudice, and from all the ugly sins of disposition that doth so easily beset us.

Enrich us with those durable satisfactions of life so that the multiplying years may not find us bankrupt in those things that matter most—the golden currency of faith, and hope, and love.

And whatever the voice of the people may be, in the weeks to come we thank Thee that as Americans we can say with utter confidence, "God reigns, and the Government at Washington still stands"—and stands even amid the encircling gloom, as a beacon light of truth and liberty for all the earth.

We lift our prayer in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. Senate,
President pro tempore,
Washington, D.C., October 21, 1966.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. Daniel K. Inouye, a Senator from the State of Hawaii, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

Carl Hayden,
President pro tempore.

Mr. INOUYE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 20, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6958) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to promote savings under the Internal Revenue Service's automatic data processing system.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11216) relating to the tariff treatment of articles assembled abroad of products of the United States.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13161) to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for our elementary and secondary schools.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17607) to suspend the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8436) to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the dutiable status of watches, clocks, and timing apparatus from insular possessions of the United States.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11256) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the priority and effect of Federal tax liens and levies, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11475) to provide for the control or elimination of jellyfish and other such pests in the coastal waters of the United States.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14604) to authorize a study of facilities and services to be furnished visitors and students coming to the Nation's Capital.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 18381) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Mahon, Mr. Whitten, Mr. Rooney of New York, Mr. Fogarty, Mr. Passman, Mr. Boland, Mr. Bow, Mr. Jonas, and Mr. Cederberg were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13103) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide equitable tax treatment for foreign investment in the United States.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S. 360. An act to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes;

S. 985. An act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes;

S. 1068. An act for the relief of Fred E. Starr;

S. 1349. An act to amend the inland, Great Lakes, and western rivers rules concerning sailing vessels and vessels under 65 feet in length;

S. 1496. An act to repeal section 3342 of title 5, United States Code, relating to the prohibition of employee details from the field service to the departmental service, and for other purposes;

S. 2621. An act for the relief of Ioannis A. Vasilopoulos and Chester (Abramczyk) Hill;

S. 2720. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to develop, through the use of experiment and demonstration plants, practicable and economic means for the production by the commercial fishing industry of fish protein concentrate;

S. 2893. An act to amend section 208(c) to provide that certificates issued to motor common carriers of passengers pursuant to future applications shall not confer, as an incident to the grant of regular route authority, the right to transport special or chartered parties;

S. 3008. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to promote and assist in the extension and improvement of comprehensive health planning and public health services, to provide for a more effective use of available Federal funds for such planning and services, and for other purposes;

S. 3148. An act to provide for the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States reserved or retained in certain lands heretofore conveyed to the city of El Paso, Tex.;

H.R. 5688. An act relating to criminal procedure in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 11555. An act to provide a border highway along the U.S. bank of the Rio Grande in connection with the settlement of the Chamizal boundary dispute between the United States and Mexico;

H.R. 12360. An act to permit the sale of grain storage facilities to public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations;

H.R. 13320. An act to authorize the disposal of industrial diamond stones from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 15335. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish an Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations," approved September 24, 1959;

H.R. 15727. An act to establish rates of compensation for certain positions within the Smithsonian Institution; and

H.R. 16114. An act to provide for the inclusion of premium pay under section 5545 (c)(1) of title 5, United States Code, for the purpose of determining benefits under the civil service retirement, group life insurance, and injury compensation provisions of such title, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1404. An act for the relief of Dr. George H. Edler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17883. An act to provide training opportunities for persons employed in the legislative branch of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Overobligation of an Appropriation

A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of an appropriation "Salaries and Expenses, Agricultural Research Service"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Reports on Reapportionment of Appropriations

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of the Interior for "Management and protection," National Park Service, for the fiscal year 1967, had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of the Interior for "Resources management", Bureau of Indian Affairs, for the fiscal year 1967, had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation for the Department of the Interior for "Management of lands and resources," Bureau of Land Management, for the fiscal year 1967 had been reapportioned on a basis indicating the need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Report on Military Procurement Actions for Experimental, Developmental, Test, or Research Work

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics) transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military procurement actions for experimental, developmental, test, or research work, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report of Comptroller General

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of policies and procedures followed in determining the size of the new second lock at Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, Corps of Engineers (Civil Functions), Department of the Army, dated October 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Reports on Receipt of Applications for Loans Under the Small Reclamation Projects Act

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, an application by the Yolo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District of Woodland, California, for a loan and grant under the Small Reclamation Projects Act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, an application by the West San Bernardino County Water District of Rialto, Calif., for a loan under the Small Reclamation Projects Act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H.R. 7502. An act relating to the income tax treatment of certain casualty losses attributable to major disasters; (Rept. No. 1917).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. MONRONEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated October 10, 1966, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law,

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Samuel De Palma, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be an Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency;

Robert G. Neumann, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Afghanistan;

Rutherford M. Poats, of Virginia, to be Deputy Administrator, Agency for International Development;

Emmett J. Rice, of New York, to be U.S. Alternate Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development;

Charles Frankel, of New York, William Benton, of Connecticut, Thomas P. Malone, of Connecticut, Nan Tucker McEvoy, of the District of Columbia, and Joseph R. Smiley, of Colorado, to be representatives of the United States of America to the 14th session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organizations; and

Fredric R. Mann, of Pennsylvania, Patrick E. Haggerty, of Texas, and Whitney M. Young, Jr., of New York, to be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the 14th session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

BILL INTRODUCED

A bill was introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE:

S. 3931. A bill for the relief of Miss Mariel Madamba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUTHORITY TO HAVE TRIBUTES TO SENATOR A. WILLIS ROBERTSON PRINTED AS A SENATE DOCUMENT (S. DOC. NO. 125)

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all remarks during the year 1966 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD eulogizing the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and his service in the Senate, be compiled and printed as a Senate document.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO FORMER SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who is unable to be present, has prepared a statement which he has asked me to read for him.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN READ BY SENATOR KUCHEL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there are gentle men in whom gentility finally destroys whatever of iron there was in their souls.

There are iron men in whom the iron corroded whatever gentility they possessed.

There are men—not many to be sure—in whom both the gentility and the iron were preserved in proper balance, each of these attributes to be summoned up as the occasion requires.

Such a man was Harry Byrd, the squire of Berryville, the successful publisher, the outstanding orchardist, the statesman by any standard, the proud boast of Virginia and the Senator from, of, and for the United States of America.

To recite his achievements would be but to gild the lily; to recount his adventures in public life, to evidence his conviction and courage would be but to speak of the obvious; to say that gentle spirit became as fixed as Gibraltar is general knowledge to all who knew him.

He had the fixed and lasting quality of the Northern Star and whether it was as Governor or Senator it shone through his every act.

His credo was simple, indeed, and it applied to men and nations alike. Frugality was the hallmark of progress; self-reliance was the magic element for advancement. Individual responsibility was the answer to the deeper and deeper intrusions of government into the affairs of the citizenry. Courtesy and good manners were the answer to those who reviled him. The endless honors and plaudits which came to him provoked no immodesty and produced no halo of vanity. He was what he was. As the writer in Reader's Digest described him some years ago, he was "a rare Byrd—bird—among men."

When I was a Congressman I knew him only slightly. When I came to the Senate I came to know him better. When he appealed to me to become a member of the Senate Finance Committee of which he was the chairman, I came to know him intimately.

How tolerant he was of every viewpoint on the controversial measures with which that committee dealt. How forbearing he was so that every member might express his opinion. How firm he was when he differed with a majority of the committee and how candid he was in expressing his views on the floor of the Senate. I believe it can be said of him as one examines his principles and convictions, the views he expressed, the votes he cast in the committee and on the Senate floor, that he was one of the most consistent, if not the most consistent, statesman in several generations.

When everything that has been said and written of him shall have been spent by the evening breeze, one thing will and can be said which will certainly endure: In life Harry Byrd preferred to "light a candle than to curse the darkness."

Senator Harry Byrd was forever keeping alight and alive the flame of constitutional government, the sovereignty of the States, the attributes of frugality and economy, the need for commonsense, the courage of the commonplace, a dedication to truth, a devotion to freedom, and a friendship for all men.

VIETNAM AND AMERICAN POLICY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have recently received the text of a remarkable well-written and well-reasoned discussion of our involvement in Vietnam. I believe it will be of interest to Senators and to the public.

I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum, prepared by Mr. Edward W. Lane, Jr., be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIETNAM AND AMERICAN POLICY

(By Edward W. Lane, Jr., Jacksonville, Fla.)

I. PRELIMINARY

The war in Viet Nam forces death upon many of our citizens. Therefore, it is our most serious public issue, which not only justifies but demands the fullest debate on a constructive and statesmanlike level. That is quite different from criticism for partisan political purposes, which is admittedly bad.

One of the earliest and most basic purposes of government is to protect the persons of its citizens. Therefore, a governmental decision is to conscript its citizens to fight and die thousands of miles from home is the most drastic decision government can make—and one which requires the clearest justification.

The Congress, having the Constitutional authority to declare war, should decide whether our fighting in Viet Nam is justified. If not justified, we should withdraw; but if justified, then Congress should identify the enemy, declare a state of war to exist with that enemy, and throw our full power into the conflict.

II. OUR PRESENT COURSE IS INDEFENSIBLE

(a) *We should not spend American lives at calculated rates by executive decision*

Our present policy of restrained fighting is indefensible. It amounts to buying a political posture with personal lives—to spending citizens at a planned rate so that we can proclaim "our" determination to resist Communist aggression everywhere and "our" restraint in not escalating the conflict.

That policy may satisfy the politically popular cliches of our day, against appeasement on the one hand and against being "trigger happy" on the other. Unfortunately for our citizens, however, it treats their lives like dollars to be spent in such amounts as we can "afford" for the aid of our foreign diplomacy; and that sounds more totalitarian than American.

We seem no longer to regard war as an abnormal condition of dire emergency, which can be declared only by the elected representatives of the people, and which when declared involves the total and immediate commitment of all our people. Today we are getting accustomed to war, provided it doesn't become big enough to hurt prosperity at home. We permit our President to wage a new and sophisticated kind of war of exactly the intensity he chooses; and we condone the conscription of our children and our neighbors—the confiscation of their very lives—to serve the plans and theories of our international diplomats.

(b) *We should not undersupport Americans in battle*

If any American is conscripted to fight abroad, he is at least entitled to the fullest support his Nation can give, both in weapons and manpower. Without such support, his danger increases; and he is to that extent abandoned by the Nation for which he fights. Such is the case in Viet Nam. Many have died and will die there, who might be spared if our full power were thrown into the struggle.

Doubtless our leaders fear confrontation with a major power such as China—and properly so. That fear may well enter into the consideration of whether to fight in Viet Nam or not; but it cannot justify our present middle course. To undersupport Americans in battle because we fear attack on other Americans who are not in battle, is excessively timid. It partially betrays the men who are made to fight, and doles out a shabby security to those who are left at home. It is wrong to conscript and spend any American lives without being willing to risk them all.

(c) *We should not use war as an instrument of foreign policy*

Our present course is radically and depressingly different from traditional American policy. By the Stimson Resolution in the '30s, and often since that time, we have denounced the use of war or the threat of war as an instrument of foreign policy; and after World War II, we vigorously promoted the United Nations as an alternative and collective device for security and peace. Today, however, we ourselves are acting unilaterally in Viet Nam; and we are there waging war as a carefully calculated instrument of our own foreign policy.

III. OUR FIGHTING IN VIETNAM IS NOT JUSTIFIED

Our present middle course being unjust and indefensible, the Senate and House of Representatives, with assistance of a special joint committee, should explore and report on whether our fighting in Viet Nam is justified.

(a) *We are not "obligated" to fight there*

Are we obligated as a Nation to fight there, and if so, what is the scope of our obligation, and when and by whom was it made? In answering that question, Congress must confront and resolve policy problems of the utmost national importance. Our leaders often refer to honoring our obligations. Yet, there has been no declaration of war by Congress, as required by the Constitution; nor are we obligated by any clear treaty which the Senate has ratified, as required by the Constitution. Our "obligation," then, if any there be, must reside in Presidential speeches and diplomatic communications. Here is an issue which touches a most fundamental principle in our form of government, and in which the very lives of our citizens are at stake. Can our Executive Branch, by its own pronouncements and without the Constitutional concurrence of our Legislative Branch, obligate our Nation to fight a war of undetermined extent and indefinite duration? The answer clearly must be "No"; and the Congress should declare it in unmistakable terms.

It is the urgent duty of Congress to retake its proper position in such affairs and to serve plain notice on all people that neither our President nor any executives in our Government have the power to obligate this Nation to war. Such a declaration by Congress would hopefully deter our Executive Branch from similar intemperate pronouncements in the future.

It is admittedly embarrassing for a democratic majority in Congress thus to reprimand its own executive leaders; but if the awful issue of war is indeed to rise above partisan politics, the reprimand must be given. The Executive Branch has the Constitutional authority to conduct our foreign policy; but of necessity this means foreign policy short of war, and it must be plainly reaffirmed that no Nation can depend upon our military aid without the Constitutional sanction of our Congress.

There are sound historical precedents for Presidential action in so-called brush-fire incidents; and reasonable actions of that kind are not here criticized. They are typically of small extent and short duration; and, most importantly of all, they involve only professional soldiers. The case is radically different when conscripted civilians are used, or when the "incident" plainly assumes the proportions of a true war.

Even if not obligated, are we justified in fighting in Viet Nam to resist Communist aggression against the South Vietnamese?

(b) *The compassion of our Government leaders for the South Vietnamese does not justify it*

Our leaders sometimes invoke our feelings of Christian compassion as a basis for defending the helpless South Vietnamese from Communist slavery. Such feelings are admirable, and may move many citizens to volunteer; but they cannot in any decree justify our Government in forcing any American to go.

Compassion is an affair of the heart. It is intimately and essentially personal. It is a virtue in government officials as well as in other men; but in government officials, compassion alone cannot enlarge the powers of their office, nor can it morally justify them in donating the lives of others.

Our officials in Washington are free, as we all are, to commit their personal lives as they think right; but the lives of other Americans are not "on call" simply to serve the personal compassion of those officials for other peoples.

(c) *It is not necessary to our territorial security*

The question of justification must be considered strictly in terms of the territorial security of the United States. This does not require literal territorial invasion. Aggression against an important ally, such as England, or invasion of land which is dangerously close to us, such as Cuba, could reasonably jeopardize our territorial security to the point of war; and obviously the confidential opinions of our professional military chiefs should weigh heavily in any such decision.

By such a test, Viet Nam seems clearly excluded.

(d) *It will not deter future aggressions*

Our leaders say repeatedly that by defeating Communist aggression in Viet Nam we will deter larger aggressions in the future. This is mostly myth; and yet it has become so popular in our political pronouncements that it represents a major danger to American lives.

The most certain thing about war is that it does not prevent future war. Except for the defeated nation during the brief period in which it remains subjugated, war is no deterrent at all; if anything it is a promoter of war.

In 1917 we entered World War I to make the world safe for democracy; but within 20 years Germany, Spain and Italy were Fascist, and Russia had long been Communist. Then came World War II, which we fought to end all wars. Shortly thereafter China became Communist. We fought in Korea to resist Communist aggression and thereby deter large aggressions elsewhere in the future. But the larger aggression came anyway, in Viet Nam; and now we are bleeding again for the same old threadbare slogan.

Unfortunately there is no personified "aggressor" who can be "taught a lesson," like the local bully. Different nations are involved and millions of individual personalities within each nation. Moreover, in each nation, the persons who wield its power are continually changing. The historical truth is that war breaks out from the alignment and aspirations of nations and the calculations of their leaders at that time with little or no regard for the outcomes of other wars in other years. War spawns many things, but none of them is Peace.

That general truth is especially applicable to Communism. Here is a doctrine which is inherently militant and expansionist. It seems ridiculous to suppose that one military reverse, or many, will eliminate those elements from the doctrine or deter its leaders from the next aggression which looks promising. On the contrary, such a doctrine and such a leadership thrive on foreign conflicts of manageable size; for the conflicts seem to justify the militancy of the doctrine and tend to unite the masses behind their leaders. Our fighting in Viet Nam, far from intimidating the Chinese, is probably sharpening and hardening their militancy; and all fringe fighting of that kind will have the same unfortunate result.

IV. WE SHOULD WITHDRAW THROUGH THE UNITED NATIONS

Assuming the above views to be correct, how can withdrawal be now accomplished? Two difficulties are at once apparent. First it is unwise to proclaim publicly our intention to ignore Communist aggression in remote places for fear of thereby inviting the aggression. Secondly, it is obviously embarrassing to abandon a project which has been seriously undertaken. Even a Western Power wants to "save face" if possible.

(a) *Viet Nam is a typical problem for collective action*

The sound answer is to remit the entire problem to the United Nations, where it originally belonged. This may initially take the form of consultation as a background for negotiating a direct settlement. Failing a reasonable and prompt settlement by that route, a formal vote by the United Nations should be forced. If the family of nations there represented resolves to defend Saigon, we may and probably should assume our exact proportionate share of that defense; but if the United Nations does less, we should conform to that also.

Aggression in remote Viet Nam, being no more dangerous to us than to any other peace-loving nation (except perhaps the immediate geographic neighbors), is typically a problem for collective action. We may hope the decision is to defend collectively; but if it is otherwise, as it probably will be in the shadow of China, our Government does not thereby receive any warrant to put the entire blood burden of that defense on its own people.

In theory the United Nations can thwart aggression by confronting the aggressor with an overwhelming alignment of Powers to which the aggressor will bow without fighting; but the theory may not work when the aggressor is supported by a major Power and the aggression presents no serious threat to the territorial security of the other major Powers. The comparative disinterest of England, France and West Germany in Viet Nam strongly indicates that they do not regard the aggression there as a serious threat to them. If their disinterest renders the United

Nations impotent in Viet Nam, we should accept that verdict.

We should continue patiently within the United Nations to urge what we think the United Nations should do. We may thereby help the United Nations over the years to evolve in the direction we think best. However, when we act unilaterally, as in Viet Nam, and thereby relieve the United Nations from the necessity of deciding or doing anything, we do not promote the evolution of the United Nations, we retard it.

(b) *Inaction by the United Nations would not justify putting on our people the blood burden of trying to police the world*

It is sheer folly for us to undertake the impossible task of policing the world—of trying to do alone what the United Nations may be unwilling or unable to do. Such a project is not only beyond our power to accomplish, but far more importantly it forces a blood burden on our people which is completely beyond their duty as American citizens and is therefore intolerably unjust.

What then if Communist aggression proceeds unchecked in Viet Nam and other areas? First, we must recognize that in terms of our own security, it is not so much Communism we fear as Nations. We may well fear Communist China, but we are quite at ease with respect to Communist Jugoslavia. Secondly, it is clear that a China which has the military and economic problem of controlling Viet Nam and other subjugated areas is certainly no stronger and probably somewhat weaker than China is today. The continuing subjugation of foreign peoples is usually a drain. If, however, Communist aggression should attack an area or an ally which seriously important to our territorial defense, we would then know how to fight for our country—a country whose regard for its own citizens would make it worth fighting for.

Those views may seem callous—particularly in contrast to our leaders' speeches in which every sentimental appeal is made to defend the helpless everywhere. It must be admitted, however, that the subjugation of peoples by stronger groups has been occurring continually since the beginning of recorded history; and we must accept the harsh fact that such subjugations cannot be eliminated overnight. War itself cannot eliminate them, as history shows; nor can they be eliminated by the fiat of any one Nation unless that Nation is strong enough and ruthless enough literally to dominate and coerce the whole world into the pattern of its own judgments. Such a course is not for us.

V. ABOVE ALL, WE SHOULD EITHER GET OUT OR GET ALL THE WAY IN

Undersupporting Americans in battle for fear of endangering Americans at home impugns our courage and outrages our sense of fair play. Moreover, it violates our basic belief that the Government exists to serve and protect the citizen, rather than that the citizen exists to serve and die for his Government.

VI. SUMMARY

Our Government exists to serve our citizens. By conscripting a citizen for war, the Government seizes all that he has—his life; and that drastic action should never be taken except for a properly declared war, to which all citizens are committed. That concept of the value and availability of American lives to their Government is essential to our democratic system, and must not be abandoned or compromised for any supposed subtlety or sophistication in the conduct of our foreign policy.

Congress should now reassert its basic control over the awful issue of war and peace. It should find and declare that we are not now validly obligated to fight in Viet Nam, and that we cannot become so obligated without the Constitutional action of Congress. It should further recognize that our unilateral war in Viet Nam is not necessary to our territorial security nor justified as a deterrent to future aggression; and it should remit the entire issue to the United Nations where it belongs.

If, however, contrary to those views, Congress should decide that we will fight in Viet Nam, for whatever reason, then Congress should identify the enemy, declare a state of war to exist and throw our full power into the struggle.

Above and beyond all, we should either get out or get all the way in. To deliberately undersupport Americans in battle is grossly unjust and excessively timid. It partially betrays those in battle and seeks a shabby security for those at home.

THE TRUE MEANING OF THE RULE OF LAW

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Ohio Bar, a publication of the Ohio State Bar Association, for May 22, 1961, contains an article entitled "The Rule of Law—What It Truly Means," written by Robert N. Wilkin, a retired Federal judge.

The discussion of this subject by Judge Wilkin is of such forcefulness and clarity that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

The necessity of living under a government of laws is indispensable, if the dignity of man is to be preserved. Where lawlessness prevails, liberty is lost, and dictatorship inevitably takes over.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RULE OF LAW—WHAT IT TRULY MEANS [1]

(By Robert N. Wilkin, U.S. Federal judge (retired)) [2]

The greatest obstacle to peace is the general want of understanding of Law—its history, its purpose, its function.

That law is the only practical substitute for war is generally understood. The President's proposal to substitute "The rule of law for the rule of force" has had a cordial response.

But there is no constructive action to accomplish such a proposal and no public demand for such action. Our nation fails to insist on a convention to amend the Charter of the U.N. Our government has declined to call a convention to consider the creation of an Atlantic Union or Federation of Free States. The Senate refused (by the Connally Reservation) to concede unqualified jurisdiction to the International Court of Justice over international disputes.

We sentimentalize over peace, but refuse to do the only thing that will insure peace. We acquiesce in the need for lawful order in the world, but obstinately refuse to proclaim that in world affairs we will hold our sovereignty subject to Law. We boast of a government of law for national and interstate affairs, but refuse to accept government of law for international affairs.

The chief cause of such inconsistency is a very general misconception of law. Law is thought of as command, as the assertion of will. Most people think of law as being all those arbitrary rules and regulations imposed by government for the maintenance of civil order. Such rules and orders are phases or detailed expressions of law, but they are not The Law.

The Law that is needed for international relations is the Law of laws. It is not arbitrary will or capricious command. It is the universal and eternal principles of right and justice. It was not proclaimed by government, but is the natural restraint on government. It was established by the providence that created the universe and made it subject to law. Like the laws of chemistry and physics, it can not be violated with impunity.

Man is endowed with free will. He is also endowed with reason which enables him to learn the law, and should enable him to exercise his will according to the law of his individual—social nature. Dean Pound defines the Law as "Experience developed by reason and reason tested by experience." Now the will of a nation is generally referred to as sovereignty; but the will of a nation is no more exempt from the law than is the will of an individual. As C. H. McIlwain has said, "the problem of law *versus* will remains the most important of all practical problems." Since the world has become one community, the problem is world-wide, and since the munitions of war are totally destructive, the issue is life or death.

To gain an understanding of the Law, it must be considered in historic perspective. As we study human evolution through the ages, with failures and accomplishments, we perceive what Rudolph von Ihering referred to as "The struggle for law." Peace and prosperity followed in the wake of established law, as shown by the Pax Romana and Pax Britannnica. Just as the physical sciences advanced by the discovery and application of the laws of physical nature, so political science advanced by the observance of the laws of human nature, in spite of the differences between physical and human nature.

Greek philosophers of classical antiquity expounded the theory of universal principles of law that ruled all nature. This became a basic tenet of Stoic philosophy. The Stoics taught that there were standards of righteousness and justice which were revealed to man through reason according to nature, and which, if strictly heeded, were manifest and clear—almost as evident as things perceived by the external senses. They taught therefore that law in its very essence rests not upon the arbitrary will of a ruler or upon the emotional decree of a multitude, but upon nature and the innate ideas of man's moral and social nature.

Stoicism made a strong appeal to educated Romans, and this was important at the time of the dissolution of the city-states. In place of a law embodied in the closely unified political tradition of a single city, it was necessary to conceive of law for the whole civilized world.

When Rome became the supreme political power, it also became the commercial center of the world. A large body of alien residents settled in the city. The magistrates and lawyers of Rome were compelled to recognize the differences of customs and local rules among these aliens and the provinces and countries from which they came. In the process it was discovered that underlying the differences of formalities and procedure, there were principles of honesty, fair dealing, and good business practice. The Roman administrators and lawyers called this *ius gentium*, law common to all peoples.

The great lawyers and magistrates of the second and third centuries B.C. saw in *ius gentium* an exemplification of the Stoic principle of universal law, and, they, with the aid of the juris-consults, made it a basic tenet of Roman jurisprudence. They spoke of it as *vera lex*, true law.

The Romans not only rationalized true law, they also gave it practical application. They demonstrated that where true law was honestly and fairly administered the people prospered and were satisfied. The accomplishments of Scaevola, Cato, Sulpicius, and Cicero, serving as pro-praetor or colonial governors, enabled Cicero to inform the Senate that there were provinces and foreign countries where the Roman rule of law was preferred to the despotic rule of native kings.

---

[1] Reprinted from Freedom & Union, 2700 Ontario Road N.W., Washington 9, D.C.

[2] Judge Robert N. Wilkin, Cleveland, is a former senior partner of the firm of Smith, Renner, Hanhart & Miller, New Philadelphia.

The Church Fathers found the ethics of Stoicism and the jurisprudence of Rome consonant with their religious teaching. They became expositors of true law, and preserved it after the disintegration of the Roman Empire. Officers of the Church were educated in Latin and studied Roman jurisprudence. As administrators and justiciars they gave the impress of Roman law to all Europe. Throughout the Middle Ages and well down into modern times the existence and validity of true law were taken for granted. Its central idea, as Sir Frederick Pollock has said, "was an ultimate principle of fitness with regard to the nature of man as a rational and social being, which is or ought to be, the justification of every form of positive law." It embraced such conceptions as equality before the law, faithfulness to engagements, equity and fair dealing.

For hundreds of years the judges of England were officers of the Church. By the end of the thirteenth century the Common Law had become more Roman than Anglo-Saxon. One of its basic principles was "the supremacy of law." Chief Justice Coke quoted Bracton, a judge and a priest, when he told King James that he was "under God and the law." It was these conceptions of true law that led to the Bill of Rights.

It was true law that prompted the establishment in this country of "government not of men but of law." Through colonization, Roman Law and Common Law, with their central idea of true law, were carried to all parts of the world, and when colonies established their independence they retained the law of the colonists. So true law has strong roots extended throughout the world today.

When the Roman Empire disintegrated and Europe separated into many different states, nationalism became strong, sovereignty was emphasized and universal law was neglected or opposed. Will prevailed over law. When the national kings and feudal rulers asserted their sovereignty as against other states or the papacy, the people generally, prompted by an inherited clan instinct, supported their monarch. In time, however, the movement for freedom opposed the claim of absolute sovereignty at home. The evolution of popular government suppressed the "divine right of kings," but then absolute sovereignty was assumed by the legislative agents of the people, and finally the popular movement, in its tendency to draw all power into its "impetuous vortex," vested absolute sovereignty in the people.

Democracy, like nationalism, has a strong tendency to exalt the will above the law. Pandering politicians and demagogues acclaim the "sovereign people" and the "popular will," and legislative agents, instead of exercising their own best judgment, are motivated by what they assume to be the will of their constituents. The assumption that the majority should rule, creates the impression that the majority is always right. But often the instant, emotional opinion of the majority is not right.

The problems of government require learning, study, discussion and deliberation. That is why wise Founders established here a representative republic. The truth is revealed first, not to the majority, but to the saints, scientists, savants and patriots who discipline themselves to receive it, and evolution follows in their wake.

The ultimate, informed and considered judgment of the people can be trusted, because they are imbued with the principles of the true law of human nature. But their arbitrary will is no more sovereign than the will of a king or parliament.

In recent times true law has been opposed by another influence. The modern revolt against traditional standards of morals, taste and decorum (most evident in modern art, music and literature) was also directed against the objective standards of true law. Truth, justice, right were to the modern sophisticates only subjective standards, at best mere principles of ethics; and law to them was only the commands which government had the power to enforce. Such "positivist" philosophy of law was soon found to be at one with the ideologies of the dictatorships of recent years. The willful and inhuman conduct of the dictatorships has caused legal scholars and statesmen to appreciate the inter-relations of law and value, and now almost everywhere there is a revival of interest and faith in the higher law—true law.

Thus the history of law repeats. When the city-states failed to meet the needs of expanding Mediterranean civilization, universal law supplied the needs of that time; and now when the nation-states fail to meet the needs of expanding world-civilization, universal law again comes to the fore.

Next to the history of true law the most urgent need is an understanding of its purpose. The basic purpose of law is to maintain civil order—to restrain crime and violence and keep the peace.

Its aim is the commonweal, and the just settlement of disputes by impartial tribunals.

It is not the purpose of true law to control or regulate the economic or social affairs or other details of the life of individuals, local communities or nations. Under true law humanity would be free to enjoy and profit by the interesting variations in life, and evolution would continue without interruption from arbitrary will.

It is also important to understand the function of true law, its method of operation. Law requires implementation. As a great Roman lawyer said 2,000 years ago, "The law is a voiceless magistrate; the magistrate is the voice of the law." In order to accomplish its purpose that law must have a sustaining organization with three departments: one to promulgate, one to adjudicate, and one to enforce.

Since true law exists in universal, general principles, political life requires from time to time more specific directions for control of details; and experience indicates that this need is best met by some representative agency empowered to enact statutes, ordinances and orders. Dean Pound distinguishes such enactments and commandments from Law by designating them "rules of law." They help to serve the purpose of law so long as they do not contravene the principles of true law. Such legislative agencies as town councils, state assemblies and congress would conserve local self government while true law, if properly implemented, would preserve world peace.

The most essential and important function of true law is the function as to which there is the greatest misunderstanding and reluctance. It is in the judicial court that law finally prevails over will. That is why the most wilful (gangsters, unions and nations) most bitterly oppose the judicial functions.

When a dispute arises that cannot be settled by negotiations or arbitration, the only way it can be settled peacefully is by "third party judgment." Any dispute that threatens the peace or commonweal of the community must be justiciable because the community welfare transcends other interests. So today the welfare of the world community has become supreme.

As law was the gift of Rome to the world, the best way of administering it was the gift of England. In England the judicial function was separated from other branches of government and judges were given independence and security of tenure so that they might be wholly devoted to the law. The U.S. Constitution made strict provision for an independent judiciary.

Judicial history is a record of commendable accomplishment. It shows that when men are given a fair chance they prove worthy of trust and confidence. History has dealt generally with dynasties, wars and political campaigns. The devotion of judges to the law has advanced and stabilized civilization, and their moral courage has equalled the physical courage of military and political patriots. When men of character and learning in law have been chosen for judicial office their service has been uniformly free from racial, religious, national or other bias.

The judicial function affords the means of restraining the action of local, state, national and international agencies and officers within the legal limits of their respective jurisdictions. It acts only, however, on what is submitted; it cannot initiate action; and with final judgment its power ends. Another limitation on the judicial function is the requirement that its procedure be in accordance with what has come to be known as "due process of law," a term that includes such concepts as impartial tribunal, fair trial, due notice to interested parties, right to call and examine witnesses and right of counsel. The judgment must be, not the arbitrary will of the court, but "the voice of the law."

The administration of law requires that some agency be empowered to protect the lawful from the lawless. Cities, states and nations maintain police and law enforcement officers who are authorized to restrain violations of the law and to arrest and suppress law violators. The possession and use of fire-arms and dangerous weapons are restricted to law enforcement officers. Similar provisions should now be made for the protection of the world community. The munitions of war have become so devastating that they dare not be entrusted to the arbitrary will of nations. The welfare of humanity requires that such munitions and armament must be under lawful control.

President Eisenhower in his New Delhi address said: "What is now needed is to infuse into international law the finest traditions of all the great legal systems of the world."

Six of the great legal systems are:

1. The Law of the Sea, or Admiralty
2. The Torah, or Talmudic Jurisprudence
3. Roman Law
4. Canon Law, or Law of the Church
5. Code Napoleon
6. Anglo-American Common Law.

The Law of the Sea is the oldest system. It had its origin in custom and is administered today in all lands bordering on navigable waters. U.S. Courts were vested with jurisdiction over this law by the Constitution. Lawyers are now attempting to formulate a similar system of law to regulate navigation of the air and outer space.

The Talmudic Law had its origin in the theism of the Hebrew people. It was based on a belief in a divine creation and conduct of the Universe. It is still observed by Orthodox Jews.

Roman Law was based on Greek philosophy and Roman jurisprudence. Its principle of universal order led to what Cicero described as True Law. His definition is accepted today as "one of the finest expressions in all political literature."

Canon Law, while the law of the Church of Rome, contains both spiritual and temporal provisions. Its temporal rules resulted from the temporal power exercised by the papacy after the decline of the Roman Empire. It is still the universal law of Catholicism and respected by devout Catholics everywhere.

The Code Napoleon was the work of the great jurists of the Napoleonic period. It was founded on Roman jurisprudence and became the basic law of all the countries of Continental Europe. It is frequently referred to as The Civil Law to distinguish it

OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

from the Common Law. It is the basic law of most of the countries of Central and South America, one of the provinces of Canada and the state of Louisiana.

HOW TO PROMOTE TRUE LAW

Anglo-American Common Law had its origin in the customs of the Anglo-Saxon tribes and in feudal polity. After the Norman Conquest it became predominantly Roman in principle. It is the prevailing law of the British Commonwealth of Nations. It is also the law of the U.S., Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and India.

The predominant characteristic of all these great systems of law is that they recognize and embody the principles of true law. When the United Nations Organisation adopted the Statute of The International Court of Justice, it recognized the established sources of international law, but it also authorized such world tribunal to decide cases ex aequo et bono, according to equity and good conscience. That provision definitely impressed the principles of true law on International Law.

The recommendation of President Eisenhower that the rule of law be substituted for the rule of force, and that international law be impressed with the fine traditions of the great systems of law is sound, logical, and practicable. The recommendation, however, will not be accomplished unless it is supported by public opinion. There will be no such support until the people of character and intelligence who create and express public opinion become informed as to the history, purpose, and function of law.

People who obey the law learn to love the law and are blessed by the law. It manifests itself unto them and abides with them, and they find in it the source of their freedom, the protection of their rights, and the greatest possible assurance of peace. All nations that believe in true law must now unite to maintain it in the world, and all people will in time join that union. They will believe "for the very work's sake."

NICHOLAS RAIMO ELECTED NATIONAL COMMANDER OF ITALIAN-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, my State of New Jersey was honored recently when one of its residents, Mr. Nicholas Raimo, of Belleville, was elected national commander of the Italian-American War Veterans.

Commander Raimo, who was elected national commander at the 31st annual convention of the Italian-American War Veterans held in Philadelphia, will head the 65,000-member national organization for a 1-year term.

For the past 21 years, Mr. Raimo has been active in veterans' affairs on a local, State, and National level. In recognition of his outstanding service to the community and Nation, he has received five past national commander's awards. In addition to his work in behalf of veterans, Mr. Raimo has found time for numerous civic and community activities. We are indeed fortunate to have such a public-spirited man in our State, and I am glad that his capabilities have been recognized by the Italian-American War Veterans.

Mr. Raimo, a World War II Army veteran, served in Europe. He holds five combat stars, the Purple Heart, and the Combat Infantryman's Badge.

A lifelong resident of Belleville, N.J., Mr. Raimo publishes a monthly newspaper, the Belleville Record.

I offer my warmest congratulations to Commander Raimo, and I am glad to have an opportunity to invite the attention of the Senate to his election.

RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock and 3 minutes a.m.) the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

At 9 o'clock and 25 minutes a.m., the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair).

SUSPENSION OF INVESTMENT CREDIT AND ALLOWANCE OF ACCELERATED DEPRECIATION IN THE CASE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17607) to suspend the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The assistant legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of Oct. 20, 1966, p. 28224, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senate approved last Friday, October 14, a bill that would suspend the 7-percent investment tax credit and accelerated depreciation for a period of 15 months that will terminate after December 31, 1967. The bill had been requested by President Johnson in a message he sent to Congress on September 8, 1966. The request for the bill was based upon the continuing high level of demand for investment in machinery, equipment, and commercial and industrial construction which exceeded the capacity of the economy to meet those demands. Consequently, serious inflationary pressures have been generated and were reflected in rising wholesale and consumer price indexes. Furthermore, the high level of civilian demand and rising prices have made it difficult to fill defense orders resulting from the Vietnam conflict and have been raising defense costs.

The House approved a modified version of the President's recommendation. The Senate also passed such a bill but with modifications clarifying how the provisions of the bill affected various commitments and industrial activities, and containing several exceptions for selected industries. These amendments were taken to conference, and I am now reporting back on the results of the conference.

Of the 42 amendments sent to conference, all but 7 involved substantive issues which had been added by the Committee on Finance or by the Senate during its floor discussion of the bill.

The House receded on a series of clarifying and perfecting amendments which were added by the Committee on Finance: the equipped building rule, the plant facility rule, the machinery and equipment rule, leaseback transactions, third party supply contracts, affiliated corporations, the casualty loss replacement rule, and amendments relating to the leasing of property after the effective date. Of these amendments probably the most significant was the plant facility rule which relates to a facility which is self-contained and produces a product or products through a single operating unit or single processing operation. This rule is similar in application to the equipped building rule except for the fact that it relates to a facility which for the most part is not enclosed in a building. There, of course, can be structures, machinery or equipment which are incidental to the plant facility of the type referred to as "appurtenances" in connection with the equipped building rule, which if essential to the operation of the plant facility rule, would come within it.

The House also receded on a Senate amendment which authorizes the Federal Government to issue long-term, small-denomination saving or retirement bonds at rates of interest up to 5 percent.

The Senate conferees agreed to deletion of a clause which would allow the Treasury to issue such bonds carrying a rate of interest above 5 percent with the approval of the President. It was agreed that the administration should return to Congress in the event it believes it is necessary to issue a bond yielding more than 5 percent. It was the understanding of the conferees that to the extent possible the bonds would be designed as a supplement to the services provided to savers by existing savings institutions and that the bonds would not be redeemable after a short period of possession. Presumably, low interest rates also will be provided where the bonds are retired early in their life.

Another amendment on whether the House receded requires certification by the Secretary of Interior that water antipollution devices meet Federal standards and certification by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that air antipollution devices meet Federal standards, before either type could qualify for the investment tax credit during the suspension period. They were assured in accepting this, however, that there was no expectation that this would cut back on the introduction of these facilities.

The House also receded on the amendment relating to professional football with minor adjustments to the amendment. The first part of this amendment related to the income tax treatment of professional football leagues. As Senators will recall, the Senate amendment provided that professional football leagues are to be exempt even though administering a player pension fund. The fact that the football leagues, even though administering pension funds are included in the tax-exempt category, does not mean in other respects that they are free of the requirements of present law. Apart from any effect arising from the administration of a pension fund, a league must meet the test of no profits inuring to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual in the same manner as any other organization coming under this provision. Moreover, no inference is intended as a result of this change as to the application of section 501(c)(6) to other types of organizations.

The second part of the football league amendment concerned exemption from the tax on unrelated business income of a professional football game sponsored by a tax-exempt organization. This portion of the amendment was deleted.

The third part of the football league amendment which relates to the exception from the antitrust laws for the joint agreement was retained by the conferees. The conferees indicated that it was their intention that this provision, providing an exemption from the antitrust laws, apply solely to the results of the merger of the two leagues and that it would not provide the new league with any greater antitrust immunity than the individual leagues enjoy now. For example, in the case of player drafts the only issue which it is intended to foreclose as far as antitrust action is concerned is that arising from the fact that there will be one, instead of two player drafts.

The fourth part to this amendment stated that the exception from the antitrust laws is not to apply to any joint agreement which permits professional football games to be telecast on Friday after 6 p.m. or on any Saturday beginning with the second Friday in September and ending on the second Saturday in December from any television station located within 75 miles of the site of a high school football game.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I think it might be helpful if the Senator will agree that it is clear that it was the intention of the conferees that, despite some apparently loose language in that part of the bill which had to do with football, it was never the intention of the conferees to permit an individual team, as distinguished from the league, to still be permitted to telecast games back into an area within 75 miles of where a high school football game was being held. The language of the law which this bill amends states that the league itself cannot do that. The question arose whether or not the language was loose enough so that an individual team could make a contract with a television station to telecast a game when a high school football team was playing on Friday night or a college football game was being held on Saturday.

Does the Senator wish to establish that it was the intention of members of the conference to cover that situation, and that if the language is not conclusive on that point, next year we will have language specific enough to cover it? Was it the intention of the members of the conference to provide specific language to make it clear if it is not clear?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It was assumed that since a league signs television contracts, therefore the league would not be permitted to engage in such a contract and thereby we would protect high school football teams playing games on Friday night. Someone pointed out that while it was not specifically provided that neither the league nor any team in the league would be permitted to enter into such a contract, that matter was not in conference, but we agreed that it should be tightened up next year if it were necessary.

Inasmuch as the item was not in conference, we did not pass on it under the circumstances, but we wanted an understanding of our intent on the record. But next year the Congress might provide language, if necessary, so there will be no doubt about it at all.

Mr. SMATHERS. If the Senator will yield further, we felt it was not as necessary this year as it might be next year for the simple reason that television contracts have already been made for this year and, so far as we were able to ascertain, very few, if any, provisions have been made for teams in football leagues to telecast games back to where high school games are going on.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It was our thought that high school teams are protected from now until next September. By next September we would have an opportunity to close any loopholes that may exist.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to associate myself with the remarks made in the colloquy between the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] with regard to the discussion of the language on the football merger which was in conference. As a conferee, I agree with the statement made by the Senator from Florida as to the intent that there will not be a televising of professional football games on Friday nights in areas where it would seriously affect high school football games. As was stated, we anticipate no difficulty with this problem, but if any develops, we will be ready in the next session of the Congress with clarifying language, which we were unable to do at this time because the matter was not in conference.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We think the teams are cooperating in good faith.

When we passed the original legislation on this subject, the Senate committee report showed it was the legislative intent of that bill to see to it that teams would not be permitted to televise their games in competition with high school games. I might read from a part of that report:

> The committee adopted an amendment amending Public Law 87-331, which granted professional team sports an exemption from the antitrust laws to permit them to pool their separate television rights. The amendment prohibits professional football teams from telecasting their games into areas where high school games are played in the times set aside for intercollegiate football games in Public Law 87-331.
>
> The committee is of the opinion that this amendment is necessary to obviate the great disadvantage that could result to high school football programs and to other high school athletic programs for which football provides financial support if there is competition from televised professional football games.
>
> The committee is aware that the amendment does not cover those instances where member teams of a professional football league contract independently of the league for the telecasting of their games. The committee views the practice of telecasting professional football games at those times traditionally used for the playing of high school and college football games as a threat to the scholastic athletic programs.
>
> The committee intends to follow closely all developments in the organized professional team sports, including those areas where proposals have been suggested. If abuses do occur it will then recommend that remedial action be taken. Certainly the exemptions granted to the team sports involved constitute an obligation on them to act in the public interest.

To continue with my statement, this is much like a similar rule which presently applies with respect to intercollegiate football games. The conferees were concerned that this provision may not prevent individual professional teams from televising games during specified times. However, this is a matter which was not in the bill passed earlier by the Senate and therefore was not included in the amendment offered to this bill by Senator DIRKSEN. For that reason, this matter was not in the jurisdiction of the conference. We hope that Congress will watch this situation closely in the event that further legislation to circumscribe telecasts by individual professional teams is found to be necessary.

A series of amendments involved the effective date of the bill which had been moved forward to October 10, 1966, by the Committee on Finance in order to offset some of the retroactive character of an effective date earlier than the date of enactment. The House conferees argued against the Senate's change in the effective date. However, the Senate conferees insisted that an effective date earlier than the day when the committee even considered the subject in executive session was grossly unfair to business, and its views finally prevailed. So, finally the House receded on the amendments relating to the effective date.

The House conferees, however, in agreeing to the effective date change, insisted that there be no concessions that would single out specific industries for special treatment. They maintained that the suspension should affect all industries to some degree; in other words, they believed that each industry should make some sacrifice as its contribution to the struggle in Vietnam and against inflationary pressures. In view of these considerations and the belief that the change in effective date had been a concession to industry across the board, the Senate conferees receded on the amendments affecting the transportation industries and selected other activities. As a result, the Senate receded on all of the amendments which would allow exceptions to the suspension of the investment tax credit. These amendments were the exception for freight carrying railroad rolling stock, the exception for highway trailers and semitrailers, the exception for railroad rolling stock specially designed for use in local or suburban commuter services, the exception for cargo aircraft, the exception for the construction of ultrahigh frequency television broadcasting stations and the amendments which would exempt urban housing projects that would be constructed on nonnavigable waters.

A somewhat different issue arose with respect to the amendment providing limitations upon general exceptions from the suspension for personal property and construction. The Senate had adopted committee amendments which raised the limitation on the property eligible for the investment credit exception from $15,000—as provided in the House bill—to $25,000 and the amendment which provided a limitation of $100,000 on construction. Both amendments would allow one such exception to the taxpayer during the suspension period.

As the Senate knows, exceptions for minimum amounts of investment in property eligible for the investment credit and for accelerated depreciation were placed in the bill to furnish some relief for various small businesses and farming, which have been hit hardest by the tight money policy which has prevailed during the past year. The conferees from both Houses agreed upon the desirability of these exceptions, but there was dispute concerning the level of the limitation. While the House conferees agreed that some exceptions were desirable from the standpoint of public policy, they would not go along with the limitations established in the Senate bill. Accordingly, the conferees retained the concept of exceptions primarily for the benefit of smaller scale business and farming operations, but they reduced the limitation from $25,000 to $20,000 for the investment credit, and in the case of accelerated depreciation from $100,000 to $50,000. In effect, the conferees compromised halfway between the positions of the two Houses on these amendments.

I am pleased to note that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson] is present, because he was very anxious to raise these limitations from the House figures. In arriving at the $20,000 investment credit limitation figure, we feel that, while the figure is a compromise, we did provide substantial relief for small businesses and farming operations.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I share the views of the chairman in respect to the exemption of $20,000, what I call a small business exemption, dealing with purchases by farmers in the way of machinery and equipment and of business people in small industries. I think it will be very helpful. I also think the section providing $50,000 accelerated depreciation for the construction of buildings will be most helpful to what I call the small people, the small industries in this Nation, as well as to agriculture.

As the distinguished chairman well knows, I hoped the investment credit limitation would be $25,000, because I think it can be demonstrated that $25,000 is not a large amount to invest, even in agriculture, for the operation of farms and ranches; and that is certainly true in small industries, even such as milk processing plants, tool machinery plants, laundries, and many other types of small manufacturing or service businesses. But I was pleased to sign the conference report with the $50,000 limitation for accelerated depreciation, which I think will also be helpful to both groups.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator. I do think that was a very good amendment, and I think the conference was well advised to agree to the $50,000 figure.

The Senate receded on the amendment that would require a 200,000 reduction of civilian employment in the Government below the September 30, 1966, level. This reduction would have been carried out by filling one out of every four civilian vacancies. The conferees were informed that it would be extremely difficult to carry out and would seriously disrupt the smooth functioning of Government administrative processes.

It was pointed out that 85 percent of the recent civilian employment increase originated in three agencies: the Defense Department, where civilians had been hired to replace military personnel who then were released for purely military duties; the Post Office, which is experiencing an unusually large increase in mail volume and where it is less expensive to hire additional personnel than it is to schedule large amounts of overtime; the Social Security Administration, which hired additional staff to fulfill its responsibilities under the medicare program. The weight of the amendment as a result would fall primarily upon approximately 800,000 civilian employees. It was clear that this is too small a base to reduce by 200,000 persons. Accordingly, the Senate conferees receded on this amendment.

Mr. President, we believe we have returned with a conference report that provides a very good bill. As the bill stands now, it is a tight bill that will help to restrain the inflationary margin of the high level of investment we presently enjoy in a full employment economy. The bill affects all industries without discriminatory exceptions for special industries. At the same time, there is a small margin of exception which continues to allow the investment credit for $20,000 of personal property investment and accelerated depreciation for $50,000 of construction. While the chief beneficiaries would be the smaller enterprises in the country, the exception is available generally to all businesses and farming operations.

While the Senate conferees receded on several important amendments, they succeeded in maintaining the Senate position on the great majority. The conference report provides us with a bill well designed to carry out its objectives. I urge the Senate to adopt the conference report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the conference committee has completed its work on the bill embodying President Johnson's request that the Congress suspend the 7-percent investment credit and accelerated depreciation until 1967. A word is in order at this time to commend the conference committee for its excellent work.

The committee has reduced the exceptions which were added to the bill by the Senate. We as Senate conferees attempted to uphold the position of the Senate with respect to the exceptions on transportation. We recognize there is much competition between the modes of transportation in our society today; and we like that competition. There is keen competition between rails, trucks, and airlines.

The feeling was, however, on the part of the House conferees and some of the Senate conferees, that it would be discriminatory for us to except one mode of transportation without excepting all. Therefore, the conference saw fit to drop them out.

To be effective in meeting the President's objectives of reducing the inflationary pressures which the high rate of business investment is creating, our legislation must be broadly applicable.

I recognize that there were sound reasons supporting all the exceptions. But most exceptions must clearly be held subordinate to the compelling need of the economy, which is for the stabilizing influence that suspension of the investment credit and accelerated depreciation can provide. We must keep it firmly in mind that what we are doing is suspending tax advantages for certain activities which are contributing directly to inflationary pressures. We are not suspending the activities themselves; rather we are trying to moderate their rate of growth.

The conference committee has given us a clean bill. It is very close to what the President asked for. It gives us every reason for confidence that it will produce the results the economy needs. At the same time, it provides safeguards for farmers and small businessmen, who are not as well able to adapt their operations and plans to the 15-month suspension.

The conference committee carried out its task admirably. I should like at this time particularly to commend the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committe, who was our chairman in the conference, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] and the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, Representative Mills, as well as all the members of the conference committee, for their very statesmanlike approach to this particular conference; and I ask unanimous consent that the names of all the conferees be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list of conferees was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Number and date sent to conference: H.R. 17607, October 14, October 17.

Brief of title: Investment tax credit.

CONFEREES

Senate

Messrs. LONG of Louisiana, SMATHERS, ANDERSON, WILLIAMS of Delaware, and CARLSON.

House

Messrs. MILLS, KING, BOGGS, KEOGH, BYRNES of Wisconsin, CURTIS, and UTT.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, it was a privilege to have served on this conference, and I commend our distinguished chairman, the Senator from Louisiana, and also the distinguished chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee [Mr. MILLS], for the fine way in which the conference was conducted and held.

It is true that we on the Senate side fought hard for the amendments we had adopted in the Senate, and tried to preserve the Senate position, but unfortunately we were unable to do so in many cases. I particularly regretted that the House had taken out some of the amendments I thought were essential when it came to dealing with transportation, because we do have a problem in the transportation field at the present time. But the House conferees adamantly refused to accept them, and therefore we had to abide by their decision on that particular matter.

Many of the features in the conference report I heartily approve of. For that reason, I signed the report, and am pleased with it. I hope it will be adopted unanimously.

I do wish to say, however, that when this bill, H.R. 17607, was presented to the Finance Committee and to the Senate for final action, I was not happy with it. I voted against it on the final vote on the Senate floor. I did so for the reason that I have grave doubts that it will be effective and carry much weight when it comes to assisting to reduce inflationary pressure.

However, I hope I shall be disappointed in that expectation as the provisions of the bill become operative. At any rate, the suspension will expire on December 31, 1967.

I think, based on the increase in the cost-of-living index released yesterday, it is evident that we need some very definite action in this country to prevent inflation from destroying much of the value of the American dollar and of the purchasing power of this Nation. I do not think this bill will be very effective. I think the conferees wrote in some amendments that will be helpful; and, having signed the conference report, I support it and hope for the best.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. I know the Senate is eager to act on the report.

I felt, in voting for this very limited measure, that we were not dealing directly with the inflationary threat in an effective and adequate way, and that this measure may prove to be counterproductive, because we may need this very stimulus, in a somewhat declining economy, at the very moment when it will be suspended.

Mr. President, it is my belief that we should have had a temporary across-the-board Vietnam tax increase and that it is not too late now in lieu of what we are doing. However, this is the only measure offered at the present time and even a crumb is better than nothing.

I say to my colleagues on the Finance Committee and on the Joint Economic Committee, of which I am the ranking minority member, that I think we ought to be very alert to what is happening in the economy in the next 3 months.

I think we ought to be fleet of foot. I hope we will not be afraid to initiate measures ourselves if, upon the findings of the President's Economic Report and other indicia in the country, we feel in January the way so many of us feel now with regard to the inadequacy of this measure.

In addition, we should ourselves lift the suspension sooner than it is scheduled to be lifted if we think this should be done.

I urge the President during the adjournment of Congress, if necessary and if he thinks he has the statutory authority to institute a voluntary credit restraint program in line with the program in effect during the Korean war. If he does not, he should ask Congress for this authority. I have already introduced such legislation which has been pending before the Senate Banking Committee since August. The rising interest rates weigh very heavily when we consider the failure to take elementary measures to ration credit in the country. There is plenty of credit in the country, but much of it is not going to the right places.

We are not making the progress that we need to make on the economic front. In dealing with the present international currency reserves, we are gravely imperiled. We are still trying to deal with international monetary reform in the back room with nine other central bankers.

Time will not wait for us. Bank failures, such as the one we witnessed the other day, in Lebanon, are a bad sign.

I hope very much that while we are home the administration will get on the ball on these things.

The people would like such action. This is a new world. The people are not the suckers that they were formerly when we had to give them the good news before the election and the bad news after the election. The people know a thing or two and can accept the news.

I hope that, as we approve the report and go home, we and the administration keep these thoughts very much in mind.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a story which appeared in the New York Times this morning on the current inflationary situation may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

TAX RISE IF INFLATION GROWS IS URGED BY JOHNSON PANEL—LABOR-MANAGEMENT UNIT FAVORS SPENDING CUTS—CONSUMER COSTS UP

(By David R. Jones)

WASHINGTON, October 20.—A Presidential committee has recommended more Government spending cuts and a follow-up increase in individual and corporate taxes if the Administration's present programs do not curb inflation.

The panel also contended that recent interest rate increases had added to inflation, and urged the Administration to consider applying selective credit controls if the spending cuts and tax increase do not work.

Authoritative sources said the recommendations were submitted to President Johnson on Oct. 10 by the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy, composed of 21 leading labor, business and public figures.

One of President Johnson's anti-inflation programs, a bill suspending tax incentives for business investment, was passed tonight by the House.

The Labor Department, meanwhile, reported that the Consumer Price Index rose slightly in September, largely because of higher prices for women's apparel, a further increase in mortgage interest rates and higher medical care costs. Arthur M. Ross, commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, told newsmen that he expected consumer prices would go up less in 1967 than they have in 1966. He estimated the overall increase for 1966 at 3.5 per cent.

The Labor Department said that the index, based on the prices of the 1957–59 period, has risen three-tenths of a point in September to 114.1.

The figures mean that the products and services that a typical city family could have bought for $10 during the base period now cost $11.41.

The September increase was two-tenths of a point less than the increase recorded in August and brought the total increase in consumer prices since September, 1965, to 3.5 per cent.

Food prices dropped last month by two-tenths of 1 per cent. This was attributed by Labor Department spokesmen to a "substantial decline" in the prices of most fresh fruits and vegetables.

Apparel prices in September rose an average of 1.4 per cent, and the increases were particularly noticeable in the prices of women's and girls' clothes. Apparel prices usually do go up in September, because of the introduction of the new fall and winter lines, but the increases of last month were greater than normal for September.

Although the inflation report reached the White House before President Johnson departed on his 17-day Far Eastern trip, it has not been made public. The White House did make public last Sunday a report in which Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler gave an optimistic assessment of the economy and the price outlook.

The committee's report was one of several it is preparing in response to President Johnson's public appeal to it last May for "constructive suggestions" on how to meet inflation, which at the time he called "the crucial domestic issue of the day."

The White House in August made public without comment a committee report on wage-price guideposts, but gave no explanation today for not releasing the latest report.

The report is significant because it represents a consensus of a tripartite committee of members with varied economic views that includes Secretary of Commerce John T.

Connor and Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz.

The sources said the committee emphasized the need to pursue the twin goals of price stability and full employment, and noted that President Johnson recently announced plans to cut Government spending by $3-billion to curb rising prices.

But it called for more spending cuts and tax increases to cool the economy if the President's program proved inadequate, the sources said.

The report did not specify how much inflation was too much, or when its proposals should come into play, the sources said. The committee also refrained from specifying the size of a spending cut or tax increase that might be appropriate, they added.

If the President's planned spending cuts are not adequate to halt inflation, the committee said, then expenditures on the space program, highway construction, river and harbor projects, and domestic agricultural programs should be deferred or stretched out. Such a move should not impair current efforts to improve the quality of life in the nation, it said.

If the spending cuts are insufficient to curb inflation without interfering with domestic and Vietnam war commitments, the committee said, then the Government should impose a temporary surtax of equal size on both individuals and corporations. Such a surtax would not apply to low income families, the committee said.

Consumer Price Index—U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics

[1957-59=100]

	Index for September 1966	Percentage change from—		Point change from August 1966
		August 1966	September 1965	
UNITED STATES				
All items	114.1	+0.3	+3.5	+0.3
Food [1]	115.6	−.2	+5.4	−.2
Housing [2]	111.8	+.3	+2.9	+.3
Apparel and upkeep [3]	110.7	+1.4	+3.3	+1.5
Transportation	113.3	−.2	+2.1	−.2
Health and recreation	119.9	+.3	+3.5	+.4
Medical care	120.4	+.8	+5.4	+1.0
Personal care	113.0	+.3	+3.5	+.3
Reading and recreation	117.5	+.1	+2.4	+.1
Other goods, services	115.7	+.2	+2.7	+.2
NEW YORK CITY				
All items	117.3	+.5	+3.9	+.6
Food [1]	116.3	−.1	+5.0	−.1
Housing [2]	116.4	+.3	+2.6	+.4
Apparel and upkeep [3]	115.1	+3.9	+2.5	+4.3
Transportation	113.7	−1.0	+5.4	+1.1
Health and recreation	125.2	+.1	+4.4	+.1
Medical care	131.9	+.2	+7.0	+.2
Personal care	111.2	+.4	+2.9	+.4
Reading and recreation	126.7	+.2	+2.1	−.3
Other goods, services	123.8	+.2	−4.0	+.3

[1] Includes restaurant meals.

[2] Includes hotel and motel rates, home purchase, and other home-owner costs not shown separately.

[3] Includes infants' wear, sewing materials, jewelry, and apparel upkeep not shown separately.

The sources said the committee also favored giving the President the authority to restore on short notice the 7 per cent tax credit on business investment. Congress now is considering legislation to suspend the credit, at the President's request, as part of the Administration's anti-inflation move.

The sources said the committee expressed the hope that these programs would end the rise in interest rates, if not prompt reductions. The committee reportedly said that the rising interest rates had placed an undue burden on home buyers and builders and small businessmen, and had fed inflation by adding to costs and carrying charges.

The committee also suggested that the Administration undertake a study on the feasibility of selective credit controls, the sources said. Such controls apparently would seek to make distinctions between borrowers whose needs were important to the country and those whose needs were less urgent. But the sources said the committee did not spell out how the distinction would be made.

The committee was set up in 1961 by President Kennedy, but fell into disuse under President Johnson because it did not fit into his personal style. Mr. Johnson revived and reconstituted the panel last May, when inflation was a growing threat, after an 18-month hiatus.

FOOD COSTS OFF IN CITY

The average housewife in the New York metropolitan area spent slightly less on food in September than in August, the regional office of the Department of Labor reported yesterday. But that same housewife, if she went shopping for fall clothes, found higher price tags all along the racks.

The cost of women's and girl's wearing apparel rose 7.9 per cent in September from August and was one of the key factors in an over-all increase in the Consumer Price Index here of 0.5 per cent.

Herbert Bienstock, regional director, said the latest over-all increase carried prices to a level 3.9 per cent above September of last year. In addition to clothes, the costs of housing, medical and personal care were up.

Food prices, Mr. Bienstock said, dipped 0.3 per cent last month with fruits and vegetables declining 3.2 per cent. He pointed out that food prices normally decline at this time of year and should remain steady or decline the remainder of the year.

The family that ate round steak, potatoes, tomatoes and coffee in September found prices for those items lower than in August. But the family that bought porterhouse steak, spinach, ice cream and milk paid higher prices.

Mr. Bienstock said that chicken continued to be a very good buy for families watching costs.

Mr. Bienstock said that in September, the cost of restaurant meals increased by 0.3 per cent and was 4.3 per cent higher than a year ago. Over-all food prices were 5 per cent higher than September, 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Senators MAGNUSON and JACKSON are detained on official business. They want the record to show that they are opposed to the conference report on H.R. 17607, providing for the suspension of the investment tax credit and allowance of accelerated depreciation on certain real property, and that if there had been a rollcall vote on the conference report, they would have been paired in opposition and would have voted "nay."

CHANGE OF CONFEREE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] be relieved of his responsibility as a conferee on H.R. 18381, the supplemental appropriation bill for 1967, and that the Chair appoint the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] to serve as a conferee on that measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOREIGN INVESTORS TAX ACT OF 1966—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill, H.R. 13103, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide equitable tax treatment for foreign investments in the United States. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The assistant legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of Oct. 20, 1966, pp. 28241–28242, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may withdraw that request temporarily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the death of Senator Harry F. Byrd has removed from the American scene one of its best known and most respected Senators.

Few men have had the privilege to serve in the Senate with such distinction or to leave such an indelible mark upon the times in which he served.

His leadership in his State began when he entered the Virginia State Senate in 1915 and continued through his remarkable service as Governor of the Old Dominion State. His 33 years in the U.S. Senate was terminated only by his serious illness.

Throughout all this long service, Senator Byrd fought for the ideals in which he believed. He was one of the best informed Members of this body and his work extended throughout the wide spectrum of governmental affairs.

Senator Byrd was a man of great courage. He was a great champion of sound fiscal policies and a chief advocate of a pay-as-you-go principle.

The leadership of Senator Byrd established in Virginia a following that was personally devoted to him and that took its bearings on political philosophy from his actions and his services as Governor and later as the senior Senator from that State.

While Senator Byrd worked on the Washington scene, his State followed closely in his footsteps out of its respect and affection for his character and his personality.

Senator Byrd's friendships extended throughout the entire State. Members who politically espoused far different ideas of government loved and respected him as a dear and devoted friend. This was because of his gentle personality and consideration and courtesy in debate and in all his dealings with his Members.

While his death will be a severe blow to his native State, his many admirers in the other 49 States will be saddened by the passage from the American scene of a man of such character, leadership, integrity, and kindness.

To his devoted family and especially to his son Harry F. Byrd, Jr., I extend my sympathy. The record already being made by his son is characteristic of the father's record and thus the service of great distinction will be carried on.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2751) for the relief of David R. Slemon.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 133) designating February of each year as American History Month, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message notified the Senate that Mr. Lipscomb of California and Mr. Rhodes of Arizona had been appointed conferees at the conference of the two Houses on the disagreeing votes thereon to the bill (H.R. 18381) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, vice Mr. Bow of Ohio and Mr. Cederberg of Michigan, excused.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT TO ATTEMPT CIVIL ENFORCEMENT RE WELFARE FUNDS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that we had quite a set-to last week in the Senate Labor Committee concerning a section of the law which deals with Federal supervision or Federal concern with pension and welfare funds in the union-management field. The specific question was whether the Department of Justice had authority to institute civil suits under a certain section of the law—section 302 of the Taft-Hartley Act.

I insisted that they did. The Department was unsure about it. In view of my insistence, and with the gracious cooperation of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor [Mr. Yarborough], we now have a letter from the Department of Justice assuring us that this civil remedy will be tried.

Mr. President, it happens in so many cases that the civil remedy is much better than the criminal remedy. Because of the nature of the case and the higher burden of proof, there is a great reluctance to use a criminal enforcement provision.

The Department of Justice has never used section 302(e), which provides for civil enforcement. They are now prepared to use it. I think this is a measurable advance in this particular field.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter addressed to the chairman of the subcommittee by Acting Attorney General Ramsey Clark under date of October 14, 1966, may be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

October 14, 1966.

Hon. Ralph W. Yarborough,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Yarborough: During the hearing before your Labor Subcommittee this morning Senator Javits asked the Department of Justice witness, Mr. Nathaniel E. Kossack, if the Department had resolved the issue as to whether the Government can sue for an injunction under Title 29, Section 186(e) U.S. Code.

Section 302(e) (29 U.S.C. 186(e)) confers jurisdiction on the district courts to restrain violations of this section. While there is no express prohibition against the Government's instituting such an action, we believe there is a substantial question whether the Congress intended the Government to have standing to bring such a suit. However, the arguments in favor of such standing are sufficiently weighty that the Department is prepared in an appropriate case to litigate the issue. If it is the clear intention of Congress that the Government should have such authority, then it would seem desirable that the statute be amended to make such authorization explicit.

The question of whether, as a policy matter, it is desirable for the Government to have the authority to bring such actions is not within the cognizance of this Department.

We appreciate the opportunity to be of assistance.

Sincerely yours,

Ramsey Clark,
Acting Attorney General.

THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NEW YORK STATE PODIATRY SOCIETY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the 70th anniversary of the New York State Podiatry Society and the important part which this profession plays in the health of people through the diagnosis and treatment of diseases, injuries, and infections of the human feet.

Mr. President, keeping our citizens on their feet and actively engaged in the mainstream of community life is one of the most important objectives of those in the health care professions. And it is to this fine purpose that the New York State Podiatry Society—currently celebrating its 70th anniversary—is dedicated.

The Podiatry Society was established in 1896 by a special act of the New York State Legislature. Over the years, the organization has grown both in size and stature and today has a membership of more than 1,000 throughout the State.

Podiatry, the science of diagnosing and treating diseases, injuries, and defects of the human foot, has made noteworthy contributions to the health care of our people.

Indeed, the members of the New York State Podiatry Society have personified the profession's pioneering and continuing efforts in the development of new and improved techniques in the treatment of foot disabilities. The podiatrist brings his skills and education to bear in a number of situations involving diagnosis and treatment, ranging from X-rays to surgery.

The vital role played by the podiatrist comes into sharp focus when we recognize that approximately 130 million Americans have suffered, at one time or another, from some form of foot ailment. Moreover, foot ills have cost industry in our Nation hundreds of millions of dollars a year.

Mindful of their mounting responsibilities to the community, the members of the New York State Podiatry Society have provided commendable leadership in advancing programs that seek to assure optimum efficiency in industry.

The society's public service programs are designed to stress the need for close attention to foot care early in life as well as for its efforts to assure the aged of good foot health; and podiatrists throughout the State devote many hours to clinics in hospitals and homes for the aged. In their clinic work, podiatrists have a dual objective. One, of course, is to provide periodic examinations for clinic visitors. The second is to closely observe patients who are bedridden and, wherever possible, to suggest rehabilitation programs that will help these patients get back on their feet.

While the condition of a patient's feet is of primary importance to the podiatrist, he also is deeply concerned with overall physical health, and consequently works closely with others in medicine to give New Yorkers quality and comprehensive health care.

Podiatrists take a keen interest in overall health because physical ailments that affect the entire body often appear first as foot problems. When, in his examination, a podiatrist detects an incipient disease that requires medical attention, he refers the patient to the appropriate specialist.

Foot care, like general medical and dental care, is vital to modern living. And as the New York Podiatry Society marks this important milestone in its history, I join with my colleagues whose names are appended in congratulating this organization and its able and dedicated membership.

I ask unanimous consent that a list of their names may be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the list of names were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senator Robert F. Kennedy.
Congressman John W. Wydler.
Congressman Herbert Tenzer.
Congressman Seymour Halpern.
Congressman Joseph Patrick Addabbo.
Congressman Benjamin S. Rosenthal.
Congressman James J. Delaney.
Congresswoman Edna F. Kelly.
Congressman Abraham J. Multer.
Congressman Eugene J. Keogh.
Congressman Hugh L. Carey.
Congressman Adam C. Powell.
Congressman Jonathan B. Bingham.
Congressman Paul A. Fino.
Congressman Richard Lawrence Ottinger.
Congressman John Goodchild Dow.
Congressman Joseph Y. Resnick.
Congressman Alexander Pirnie.
Congressman Howard Winfield Robison.
Congressman James Michael Hanley.
Congressman Samuel S. Stratton.
Congressman Frank Horton.
Congressman Richard Dean McCarthy.
Congressman Thaddeus J. Dulski.

MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

TRIBUTE TO REPRESENTATIVE JOE MARTIN

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as a former Member of the other body, I call the attention of the Senate to the retirement of Joe Martin who was Speaker of the House and also minority leader during the 8 years that I served, from 1947 to 1954.

Joe Martin is one of the dearest and most estimable human beings that it has ever been my privilege to meet. I have always enjoyed my personal contacts with Speaker Martin.

I had the privilege of going into his State, and indeed before his constituency in Fall River, in an effort to express to the people there how I felt about him.

Mr. President, I shall never forget that when I was elected to the Senate, Joe came here on the first day I was present and put his arm around my shoulder. He looked over the Chamber with me and said: "Jack, it is a mightly hard place to get to."

That statement has always stayed in my mind. It is an explanation of why the American people consider these 100 men and women to be really among the elite of the Nation and why this is such a challenging and very exciting place to be. It is a hard place to get to and a hard place to stay in.

I pay this tribute to Joe Martin because I regard him so highly. As so many of us are prone to do, I did kick over the traces far more often than I stayed in them. I do feel that I am spiritually one of Joe Martin's friends.

I wish him well. There will always be a warm and happy place in my heart for Joe.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I am delighted that the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] has spoken briefly in regard to the fine services of Speaker Joe Martin.

I, too, am indebted to Joe Martin for many favors. When I came to the House of Representatives in January 1935, one of the first men to greet me was Joe Martin. We were closely associated there for 12 years.

For over 40 years the House of Representatives was the home and the love of Speaker Martin.

In the House of Representatives at that time we had two stalwarts whose influence and decisions were in the national interest. One was Speaker Rayburn, and the other was Speaker Martin.

It was a privilege to serve under both of them.

Joe was always kind and generous to those of us who, as the Senator from New York has said, did not go along with him.

There were times when I did not agree with him, but he never held that against me. He always recognized that there were different problems in different areas of the United States.

Joe Martin realized that on matters of legislation those from the Eastern area of the country might have a different viewpoint than those from the Midwest. Quite often I had to disagree with Joe Martin on farm legislation. However, at no time did he ever quarrel with me in regard to my views or on the position I took.

He has rendered outstanding service to our Nation and his name will go down in history as one of the great leaders of his time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Young of Ohio in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to continue for an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the comments that the distinguished Senator from New York has made with respect to Speaker Martin. The comments were well deserved.

Speaker Martin has been and is a great Member of the House of Representatives. He is a great citizen of Massachusetts and has served in many positions of honor and trust. And one thing must be said about Joe Martin—he never betrayed them. The people had a great Representative in him.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague. I think it is especially important that we have a sense of perspective. It is true that the Speaker will not return, but we know his service, and it is legendary, and it is so fine that we remember and make note of it for posterity.

I thank my colleague very much—it is characteristic of him—for joining me in this tribute.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

SENATOR HARRY FLOOD BYRD, SR.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, to but a few men in any generation, or in the history of any nation, is given such power over and responsibility for the lives of so many people as that held by the Members of the U.S. Senate during the past 30 years.

For out of the depths of the great depression came profound economic changes for this Nation; out of World War II our Nation emerged as the heart and sustainer of the free world; and, now, as we are on the threshold of abundance in material goods, we are in the process of developing a great social evolution in our concept of the role of man, and the meaning of life. In such periods of great decisionmaking, where no answer is certain and where all men must grope and search, our Nation can possess no greater asset in its leaders than that they be knowledgeable, that they have deep and profound convictions, and that they have a conscience that keeps their daily decisions in closest harmony with these guiding principles.

Senator Harry Flood Byrd was such a man. He was able and versatile. Though he was the product of a different milieu than many of us and though we often disagreed, his beliefs were nonetheless genuine and sincere, consistent with his political philosophy of what was best for the people he represented and the Nation he served.

For this, we here bear him respect and our Nation owes him gratitude. There can be no greater faithful service than that we as Senators lend our talents freely, and serve this Nation in conscience.

We may all profit in the life of Harry Flood Byrd. In sorrow we pay him tribute and to his sons and hosts of friends go our utmost sympathies.

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the opening of the 90th Congress will find a seat vacant that no other of the Members can fill. It will be the seat vacated by every Senator's dear friend, Leverett Saltonstall.

During my 16 years in the Senate, I have never known a Senator who was more universally admired by Members, staffers, reporters, pages, and all of the Senate's aids as has been the senior Senator from the Bay State.

His decision to retire after a long and distinguished period of service will leave an irreplaceable void in the lives of all of us who have served with him throughout a part of his long and able service in the upper House.

If it were possible we all would have petitioned him to remain on and to continue to be a mellowing influence and a balance wheel in the two-party system. His sage New England advice and his great and enduring sense of fairness proved on countless occasions the greatness of two-party system because his good humor made it possible for men to reach agreement.

While we wish he would stay on and help us in succeeding years, we cannot deny to him his right to enjoy the fruits of his service to the public extending over some 46 years. This, of course, was nothing new in the life of the Saltonstalls, whose members have filled the highest posts of government, from the earliest Colonial days.

I have had the great pleasure to serve with Senator Saltonstall for several years on the Senate Committee on Appropriations. I have also served with him on several subcommittees of that committee. His work has been outstanding as a balance wheel in arriving at solutions of difficult differences which always arise over money matters.

Time after time I have seen him come up with a compromise, bringing out the best of the positions of contending groups and helping to make everyone feel satisfied by the result.

To Senator Saltonstall and to Mrs. Saltonstall I wish them all the happiness of their native New England, but with the sincere wish that they will often find it possible to return to Washington to renew the thousands of friendships which have been formed.

The dignity and courtesy, the friendship and spirit, the great sense of fairness of Senator Saltonstall will be

deeply missed as will be the leadership he has always exerted in building a strong and a safe America.

REDUCTION OF TROOPS IN EUROPE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, last week I made a brief statement congratulating President Johnson on his New York speech on Europe. Since then, there has been praise from many quarters, including much favorable comment in the press. I wish to direct the attention of Senators to one press editorial that seems to me to be particularly worthy of attention because it points out that it is not only the United States that has reason to consider reducing the number of troops now stationed in Europe. Similar considerations apply to the Russians.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "The Russians Are Coming," published in the October 15 issue of the Economist.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Economist, Oct. 15, 1966]

THE RUSSIANS ARE COMING

President Johnson has seen the chance that Chairman Mao and the Red Guards are offering to him, and he has jumped at it. He has now made his bid to coax Russian foreign policy off the dead-center position on which it has been stuck for the last two years. The Russians are afloat again. For the first time since Mr. Khrushchev was sacked there is water under Mr. Gromyko's keel, and it is China that has put it there.

Mao Tse-tung's decision to convert the world at the head of a children's crusade has changed the Russians' calculations in two ways. Like the Americans, they now wish that less of their army were square-bashing in Europe when it could be doing serious duty in Asia. They have lately been putting the story around that they have had to send four extra divisions to Siberia to guard their border against Chinese demonstrations. One purpose of this autumn's Warsaw Pact maneuvers has been to reassure Russia's nervous east European allies that it is safe for the Russians to take part of their army out of Europe because it can always be air-lifted back in an emergency. It is the mirror-image of the Americans' Big Lift, in 1963. The Antonov–22 troop transport plane is Russia's equivalent of America's C–5—a promise of quick-delivery airborne help in time of trouble, if trouble unexectedly comes. So the Russians have reasons for wanting a stabilised Europe. More important, what has been happening in China has taken most of the sting out of Chinese criticisms about Russian collaboration with the United States. Nobody in the third world, or in the communist world for that matter, is going to pay much attention to anything China says while it is behaving like one great big campus riot. China's opinions will start being listened to again in Asia and Africa when the Red Guards have quieted down. But for the moment Mao's power to embarrass the Russians has sharply diminished. Mr. Kosygin has regained his freedom of maneuver, if he wants to use it.

Mr. Johnson's speech in New York on October 7th (see page 257) was an invitation to use it. What was important about the speech was not the collection of economic tit-bits the President held out to the Russians and east Europeans. Most of these would do no more than bring the Americans into line with what the west Europeans are already doing in their trade with the communists. These were cocktail snacks. The really important part of the speech was what it said, between the lines, about Mr. Johnson's order of priorities in the world. The message came through pretty clear. The United States now ranks its relations with Russia above those with Germany. The order of the last fifteen years has been reversed. If the Russians are willing to do business with the Americans despite the Vietnam war, then Mr. Johnson is willing to do business with the Russians despite the opposition this will arouse in Germany. The Germans used to be the lynch-pin of American policy in Europe. They are now relegated to the status of a little local difficulty, to be handled by the techniques of persuasion that Mr. Johnson uses on all such problems.

The change has been in the making since last year. First it became clear that the scheme for a Nato nuclear fleet with Germans aboard had been sunk: the ANF rammed the MLF and then scuttled itself. Then in July Mr. Johnson called for a compromise between the rival American and Russian drafts of a non-proliferation treaty, with the implication that this compromise would make it hard for the Germans even to claim a place in any other joint nuclear force that might just conceivably be dreamed up in the future. Mr. Gromyko hinted in Washington on Tuesday that some progress has been made towards a compromise. Last month Herr Erhard discovered on his trip to Washington that the Americans are going to cut their army in Germany if the Germans do not pay the full foreign currency cost of keeping it there (and they almost certainly cannot afford to pay that much). The Americans have good reasons for wanting to thin out their army in Germany, whatever the Russians do. But the Russians probably have their own reasons for wanting to thin theirs out too. China has made both of them realise that the military dispositions they made during the cold war look pretty silly now the cold war is over. So once again there emerges the shape of a mutually convenient Russian-American deal fixed up over the Germans' heads. And last Friday, as if this were not enough, President Johnson brought his boot down neatly on the most sensitive German corn of all. Germany cannot be reunited, he said, until Russia and the West are reconciled. It sounds obvious. But it is the exact opposite of what Dr. Adenauer and his friends have always said and are still saying—that if the Russians want a reconciliation they must do something about German unity first.

The Russians can read between the lines. They can see what all this adds up to. So can the Germans, and there are a lot of people in Germany who will not like it. The line Mr. Johnson has taken will strengthen the arguments of those who want German foreign policy to strike out in new directions. It will increase the opposition to Herr Erhard inside his own party. It could even tip the scales against his chances of holding on to the chancellorship. But Mr. Johnson seems to have decided that none of this presents an unmanageable problem for American policy.

He is probably right; and he is certainly right to make the try. The Germans who oppose the Johnson line include some formidable politicians, but they are only one section of one party. The Social Democrats and the Free Democrats in Germany will go along with a policy of reconciliation; so will part of the Christian Democratic Union. The next German elections may show an explosion of nationalist revolt on the right wing. But Mr. Johnson is a formidable politician himself, and he has presumably made his own calculations. He knows that the German opponents of what he is trying to do are still a fairly small minority. He also knows they have no plausible alternative to offer. They talk of turning to France. But how many of them really believe that France as an ally is any sort of substitute for America? They know it isn't, and the Americans know they know. It is a calculated risk, but the odds are that Mr. Johnson has got it right. There may be an explosion of German indignation, but it is an explosion that can be contained.

So the President has made his bid. If the Russians will come across, he will come across. Will they? If Mr. Johnson were asking them to abandon their support for North Vietnam, the answer would be no. Russia can deal with America only as one power with world-wide interests dealing with another power of the same class. If Mr. Kosygin and Mr. Brezhnev washed their hands of south-east Asia (as Mr. Khrushchev tried to wash his) they would be forfeiting their claim to equality of status with America. They will not do business on those terms. But Mr. Johnson is not asking them to cut off their help—such as it is—to North Vietnam. It would not stop the war if they did. Nobody on the communist side can stop the war except the North Vietnamese. The North Vietnamese will call it off if and when they decide that the cost of going on fighting is greater than their diminishing hopes of victory warrant. If and when they do move towards such a decision, it will be useful for the Russians to carry enough weight in Hanoi to push events in the right direction. That is the limit of their power. It would be pointless for Mr. Johnson to ask them to sell the North Vietnamese down the river. He is not. He is proposing that the war should not be allowed to prevent agreements on other fronts.

The Russians are plainly tempted. On Tuesday Mr. Gromyko showed his interest in the American offer of a compromise on the non-proliferation treaty. Last week the Russians withdrew one of the last-minute obstacles they had thrown up in September to the signing of the treaty on the peaceful use of outer space. But whether they can carry themselves over the brink of actually signing either document on the dotted line depends on how they think their supporters in the communist world will react to this fraternisation with the Vietnam enemy. For two years, abused by the Chinese and abusing the Americans, Russia has not really had a foreign policy at all. Its substitute for a policy has been to build up its position as the leader of the international communist movement against the challenge of the Chinese. It has not done at all badly. It has managed to gather most of the brood under its wing. It now has to decide whether they will stay there if it does a deal with America.

This is where Mr. Kosygin, like Mr. Johnson, has good cause to give thanks to Chairman Mao. China's lurch to extremism has given almost as much offense inside the communist world as it has outside it. It has created a new emotion in communist breasts which to some extent neutralises the anti-Americanism that has been dominant in the last two years. It has made most European communists remember that their chief concern is to get a stable settlement in Europe. It has made a lot of Asian communists remember that their chief concern is what the growth of Chinese power means for them. The sight of China running amok has made all of them think more in terms of national power interests and less in terms of ideological solidarity. The Russians will get protests and denunciations from some of their supporters if they move towards the reconciliation Mr. Johnson is offering them. But, like Mr. Johnson with the Germans, they can probably keep the trouble under control. This is why Russian foreign policy is floating free again. It looks as if it may be moving towards another experiment at co-operation with the West. If

MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

it does, Mao will have given new life to the thing he hates.

THE NEW JERSEY ASSOCIATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND POLITICAL SCIENCE EDUCATION

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senator Williams, of New Jersey, in order to make the Members of the Senate familiar with the objectives and supporters of the New Jersey Association of Secondary Schools and Political Science Education, I ask unanimous consent to have certain informational material printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of Aims and Objectives

The purpose of this Association is to establish an Institute of Practical Politics and Government at Trenton State College, Trenton, New Jersey. The Institute will be the center for the New Jersey Association of Secondary Schools for Political Science Education and will serve as the vehicle to carry out the following objectives:

Improve the future political and governmental structure by encouraging qualified high school students to consider politics and public service as a career.

Give young men and women an opportunity to become acquainted with candidates seeking office and to focus student interest and concern upon the most challenging political, economical, and social problems facing the municipalities, counties, states, and the nation.

Advance and improve the study and teaching of political science.

The Institute will also serve as regional headquarters for the creation of sister associations in New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland.

The following people have endorsed the New Jersey Association of Secondary Schools for Political Science Education:

President Harry S. Truman.
Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey.
Nicholas B. Katzenbach, Under Secretary of State.
John T. Connor, Secretary of Commerce.
Robert C. Weaver, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.
William J. Brennan, Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.
Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg, U.S. Representative to the U.N.

GOVERNORS

Richard J. Hughes, State of New Jersey.
George Romney, State of Michigan.
Nelson A. Rockefeller, State of New York.
Roberto Sanchez Vilella, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

SENATORS

Clifford P. Case, New Jersey.
Harrison A. Williams, Jr., New Jersey.
Everett McKinley Dirksen, Senate Minority Leader.
Jacob K. Javits, New York.
Edward M. Kennedy, Massachusetts.
Robert F. Kennedy, New York.

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Speaker John W. McCormack.
Representative Gerald R. Ford.
Representative Frank Thompson, Jr.
Representative William T. Cahill.
Representative Thomas C. McGrath, Jr.
Representative Peter Frelinghuysen, Jr.
Representative William B. Widnall.
Representative Charles S. Joelson.
Representative Henry Helstoski.
Representative Peter W. Rodino, Jr.
Representative Joseph G. Minish.
Representative Paul J. Krebs.
Representative Cornelius E. Gallagher.
Representative Dominick V. Daniels.
Representative Edward J. Patten.

MEMBERS OF THE NEW JERSEY STATE LEGISLATURE

Senator Sido L. Ridolfi, Majority Leader of the New Jersey State Senate.
Speaker Maurice V. Brady, New Jersey Assembly.
Assemblyman Raymond H. Bateman.
Assemblyman Robert N. Wilentz.

NEW JERSEY MAYORS

John V. Lindsay, New York City.
Hugh J. Addonizio, Newark.
Thomas J. Whelan, Jersey City.
Walter J. Davis, Bloomfield.
Thomas G. Dunn, Elizabeth.
William E. Lovell, Irvington.
James Flynn, Jr., Perth Amboy.
Joseph M. Healey, Kearny.
Alexander Wrighey, Linden.
Robert Ferris, Montclair.
Paul G. De Muro, Passaic.
Robert C. Maddox, Plainfield.
Henry Gorton, Vineland.
John R. Armellino, West New York.
James J. Sheeran, West Orange.
Arthur Holland, Trenton.
F. E. Biertuempfel, Union.
Nicholas Franco, Orange.
Chester W. Paulus, New Brunswick.

NEW JERSEY EDUCATORS

Bishop John J. Dougherty, Seton Hall University.
Dr. Robert F. Goheen, Princeton University.
Dr. Mason W. Gross, Rutgers University.
Mr. Donald Herzberg, Eagleton Institute of Politics.
Dr. Thomas E. Robinson, Glassboro State College.
Dr. Eugene G. Wilkins, Newark State College.

INTERESTED CITIZENS

Richard Cardinal Cushing, Douglas Dillon, James Farley, Leonard W. Hall, James A. Michener, Richard M. Nixon, Theodore C. Sorensen, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.

PROFESSIONAL POLITICIANS

Edward W. Brooke, Attorney General of Massachusetts.
John M. Bailey, Democratic National Committee.
Ray C. Bliss, Republican National Committee.
Robert J. Burkhardt, New Jersey Democratic State Committee.
Webster B. Todd, New Jersey Republican State Committee.

NEW JERSEY BUSINESSMEN

Edward E. Booher, President, McGraw-Hill Book Company.
William J. Doyle, President, M. J. Doyle, Inc.
Henery Gadsden, President, Merck & Co., Inc.
G. O. Lienhard, President, Johnson & Johnson-Worldwide.
Robert D. Lilley, President, New Jersey Bell Telephone Co.

NEW JERSEY ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. Franklin H. Berry, President, New Jersey Bar Association.
Mr. Robert H. Fust, Executive Director, New Jersey State League of Municipalities.
Dr. Frederick L. Hipp, New Jersey Education Association.
Dr. Evron M. Kirkpatrick, American Political Science Association.
Joel R. Jacobson, New Jersey State AFL–CIO.
Leonard C. Johnson, New Jersey Manufacturers Association.
Richard Lothian, New Jersey Bankers Association.
Orin F. Nolting, International City Managers' Association.
Mary Louise Nuelsen, League of Women Voters of New Jersey.
Ruth H. Page, State Federation of District Boards of Education, New Jersey.
Mrs. Oakford A. Schalick, New Jersey Congress of Parents and Teachers.
Richard Armstrong, Effective Citizenship Organization.

ACADEMIC-POLITICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE NEW JERSEY ASSOCIATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS FOR POLITICAL SCIENCE EDUCATION

Mr. Donald Herzberg, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers, University.
Dr. Norman W. Beck, Jersey City State College.
Mr. Maurice C. Blanken, Glassboro State College.
Dr. Charlotte C. Brown, Paterson State College.
Dr. Sidney Burrell (Barnard College-Columbia University).
Dr. Joseph F. Carroll, Trenton State College.
Mr. William Deitz, Administrative Assistant, Office of Rep. Frank Thompson, Jr., 2442 Rayburn Building, Washington, D.C.
Mr. William Dunham, Seton Hall University.
Mr. Daryl R. Fair, Rider College.
Miss Frances Henderson, Administrative Assistant, Office of Senator Clifford Case, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.
Dr. Neil A. McDonald, Douglass College.
Dr. Donald McKee, Upsala College.
Dr. Robert Neiman, Fairleigh Dickinson University.
Dr. Gerald Pomper, Rutgers University.
Dr. H. E. Royer, Montclair State College.
The Rev. Edmund G. Ryan, S.J., Dean of the College, Saint Peter's College.
Mr. Robert V. Schauer, Georgian Court College.
Dr. Harry H. Shapiro, Dr. Jay A. Sigler, College of South Jersey, Rutgers University.
Dr. John Shenis, Newark State College.
Dr. Robert G. Smith, Director, Institute of Research on Govt., Drew University.
Dr. H. H. Wilson, Princeton University.

Purposes of committee

1. To give advice and suggestions to proposed programs of the state association.
2. To co-ordinate the exchange of ideas between high schools and colleges and work toward the improvement of the political science curriculum.
3. To serve on a scholarship selection committee.
4. To inform future teachers of the purpose and activities of the Institute of Practical Politics and Government and the New Jersey Association of Secondary Schools for Political Science Education.

EXTRAORDINARY POWERS OF ATTORNEY GENERAL IN TIME OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article published in the October 14, 1966, Chicago Tribune. In the article, Walter Trohan, a reporter of high regard in Washington, calls our attention to Executive Order No. 11310, which assigns the U.S. Attorney General extraordinary powers in the event of a national emergency.

Since many of us have so long asked questions about the possibility of price and wage controls, I invite the attention of Senators to the article and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT FROM WASHINGTON

(By Walter Trohan, chief of Chicago Tribune's Washington bureau)

WASHINGTON, October 14.—Without any fanfare, President Johnson signed and sealed an extraordinary executive order in the White House last Tuesday which assigns wide emergency preparedness functions to the attorney general.

No explanation was given for ordering the preparation of national emergency plans and the development of war plans at this time. The far-reaching executive order was published in the Federal Register for last Thursday.

Under the order, it would be possible to institute wage and price controls, rationing, civil defense programs, alien controls, border controls, and a host of wartime measures. The order does not proclaim a national emergency but paves the way for action on such a proclamation.

The executive order states that the attorney general shall provide advice with respect to "any emergency directive or procedure prepared by a department or agency as part of its emergency program." This could mean wage and price controls or rationing.

The attorney general is authorized to review legal procedures of federal agencies designed to enlist industrial support, judicial and legislative liaison, mobilize research facilities, and fix security standards.

SHALL ASSIST, IF REQUESTED

The order says that the attorney general shall, on request, assist in the planning and development of law enforcement personnel for civil defense emergency operations and supervise utilization of state and intrastate law enforcing agencies. The attorney general is empowered to develop plans and procedures for identification of the dead.

The order provides for the development of an office of emergency planning, whose director would assume control for total national preparedness. The order says of emergency planning:

"Emergency plans and programs shall be developed as an integral part of the continuing activities of the department of justice on the basis that it will have the responsibility for the carrying out of such programs during an emergency. The attorney general shall be prepared to implement all appropriate plans developed under this order."

The order states that the President issued the "executive order 11310 assigning emergency preparedness functions to the attorney general" under authority vested in him under reorganization plan No. 1 of 1958. Experts in the Library of Congress said the President can proclaim an emergency because of the war in Viet Nam any moment. Experts said he can act under Korean war powers, which have not expired, as well as under the 1958 reorganization act.

HEAR RUMBLINGS OF CONTROLS AND RATIONING

Johnson has denied any intention of instituting wage and price controls. The White House had said that no executive order had been issued when questioned early in the week by Rep. JAMES B. UTT [R., Cal.]. Then on Thursday the order signed on Tuesday was published quietly in the government's official daily.

Possibly the President acted quietly because he did not wish to precipitate fear or hysteria of an expected "armed attack." For weeks there have been rumblings that he planned to institute wage and price controls and rationing after the election.

There also have been reports that some dramatic action would come in the far east before the election. Possibly the President issued the executive order as a standby measure in case it might be needed after such a dramatic action.

It is curious that it was issued while there is no attorney general, the office being temporarily vacant until the successor to Nicholas Katzenbach is named. Katzenbach recently was named undersecretary of state, but it is not known whether this appointment had any relationship to the executive order.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, it is with a deep sense of sadness and grief that I rise to pay final tribute to the former senior Senator from Virginia, the Honorable Harry Flood Byrd, Sr., who died yesterday at the age of 79.

The passing of Harry Flood Byrd is a loss not only to the members of his family, but also to those of us who knew him as a good friend and colleague.

Long before I came to the Senate in 1959, I knew of Senator Byrd of Virginia. His reputation as the outstanding proponent of fiscal soundness and financial responsibility in government was as well known in my State of Hawaii as in his beloved Virginia.

Then, as a Member of the Senate, I came to know and respect Harry Flood Byrd. He was a public official who served our Nation and the people with dedication and unflagging devotion. He was a colleague who could be trusted, a friend who would be loyal. He was a gentleman in the finest tradition of the South.

Harry Flood Byrd stood unique among us. He achieved success in not merely one, but three separate careers—journalism, farming, and politics.

He began his newspaper career at the tender age of 15. He advanced in this field, eventually becoming publisher of the Winchester Star and the Harrisonburg News-Record.

While pursuing his career in journalism, young Harry Flood Byrd entered the applegrowing industry. He was still in his teens and he lacked financial backing, but he possessed the maturity and the fortitude to make a success of this venture. He became the largest applegrower in the United States.

At the age of 28, Harry Flood Byrd turned to politics and was promptly elected to the upper house of the Virginia Legislature. He served there with distinction from 1915 to 1925.

In 1926, he became the 47th Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia. He received 72,000 more votes than his opponent—a sizable majority even today—and Governor Byrd did not betray this mandate from the people. His administration was marked by progress and service.

Then, in 1933, Harry Flood Byrd was sworn in as a Member of the U.S. Senate. He rose to a position of prominence and leadership and became one of the most powerful and influential men in the Senate. He was chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. He served in the Senate for 33 years and won the admiration and praise of his colleagues as a man of "absolute integrity, absolute honesty, and absolute courage."

When Senator Byrd announced his retirement last November, the Members of the Senate joined in one voice to express our regrets. Today, we unite with bowed heads and sorrowful hearts to pay our last respects to Harry Flood Byrd and to convey our humble condolences to the members of his family, particularly to his son, our colleague, the junior Senator from Virginia, HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

Harry Flood Byrd has passed on, but the example that he set during his long public tenure will shine on and on for generations of Americans to come: unselfish devotion to duty, unwavering allegiance to public office as a public trust, and tireless safeguarding of the people's money.

Aloha, dear friend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Thereupon (at 10 o'clock and 3 minutes a.m.) the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

At 12 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m., the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. STENNIS in the chair).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1674) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make disposition of geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14644) to amend the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 to extend it for 3 years, and other purposes; and to authorize assistance to developing institutions for an additional year.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14929) to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 13161) to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for elementary and secondary schools, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14644) to amend the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 to extend it for 3 years, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have the honor to bring before the Senate today the second conference report on education legislation. I am very pleased to be able to report to the Senate that our conference with the House on H.R. 14644 has resulted in conscionable compromises which, I am sure, will be acceptable not only to Senators but also to the academic community.

The principal differences between the House and Senate versions of the bill were money differences. For the most part, these are resolved by taking the 1967 authorization from the House bill and the Senate authorizations for the succeeding 2 fiscal years.

An exception, however, was made on the title I grant program for undergraduate construction where, for the current fiscal year $475 million was authorized to be appropriated, rather than the $560 million of the Senate bill and the $453 million of the House bill. The Senate authorizations for fiscal years 1968 and 1969, however, prevailed.

A second point in disagreement related to the share of the total authorization which would be reserved for the use of junior and community colleges. In the present act this is now established at 22 percent. The Senate provision would have changed, in effect, this to a 25 percent reservation. The conference agreement sets the percentages at 22 percent for the current fiscal year, 23 percent for fiscal year 1968, and 24 percent for fiscal year 1969. In my view, this is the type of reasonable resolution of a difference which should commend itself to the Senate.

Mr. President, there was one problem that came up during the course of the conference which it is our hope can be resolved in future meetings, and that was the question of the actual enrollment statistics of various segments of higher education. It would certainly be my hope and that of the Senate conferees, a hope I believe is also shared by the House managers, that the statistical and data collation activities of the Office of Education can be so organized in the coming year as to bring forth a clear picture on first- and second-year enrollments and relative rates of growth of enrollment of 2-year institutions, 4-year institutions, 4-year institutions with partial graduate offerings, and finally the first- and second-year enrollments of the universities which have a full graduate school complement, which would also indicate the geographical variations, if any, which might affect these statistics. As was stated in the Senate report, it is the belief of our committee that the Office of Education could perform a most useful service in the compilation of this and related statistical material, such as the per pupil costs of construction of academic facilities and related student service buildings, including housing, in each type of institution. It is only on the basis of such solid facts that we can in subsequent sessions properly decide the degree of Federal assistance further required for each of the types of institutions.

Mr. President, rather than discuss in detail each of the actions which were taken, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks there appear an excerpt from the House Report No. 2326, the conference report on the bill, which discusses each of the items in detail, and I further ask unanimous consent that following this there appear certain tables prepared by the Office of Education which gives the State-by-State breakdown, where appropriate, of the various provisions of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the report and tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14644) to amend the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 to extend it for 3 years and other purposes; and to authorize assistance to developing institutions for an additional year, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment to the text of the bill insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Higher Education Amendments of 1966'.

"EXTENSION OF GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF UNDERGRADUATE ACADEMIC FACILITIES

"SEC. 2. (a) Section 101(a) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended by striking out 'four succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'seven succeeding fiscal years'.

"(b) Section 101(b) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) For the purpose of making grants under this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $230,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for the succeeding fiscal year, $460,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $475,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $728,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $936,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969; but for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and the succeeding fiscal year, only such sums may be appropriated as Congress may hereafter authorize by law. In addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year for which an appropriation is authorized by the preceding sentence, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for that fiscal year for making such grants the difference (if any) between any specific sums authorized to be appropriated under the preceding sentence for the preceding fiscal year and the sums which were appropriated for such preceding year under such sentence.'

"(c) Section 102 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

" 'ALLOTMENTS

" 'SEC. 102. The following percentage of the funds appropriated pursuant to section 101 for a fiscal year shall be allotted among the States in the manner prescribed by section 103 for use in providing academic facilities for public community colleges and public technical institutes:

" '(1) In the case of fiscal years ending before July 1, 1967, 22 per centum.

" '(2) In the case of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, 23 per centum.

" '(3) In the case of fiscal years ending after June 30, 1968, 24 per centum.

The remainder of the funds so appropriated for any fiscal year shall be allotted among the States in the manner as prescribed in section 104 for use in providing academic facilities for institutions of higher education other than public community colleges and public technical institutes.'

"(d) Sections 103(c) and 104(c) of such Act (relating to the reallotment of appropriations) are each amended by striking out 'for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and the succeeding fiscal year,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'for any fiscal year'.

"PAYMENTS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES AND FOR PLANNING

"SEC. 3 (a) Subsection (b) of section 105 of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended to read as follows:

" '(b) The Commissioner is authorized to expend not exceeding $3,000,000 during the fiscal years ending June 30, 1965, and June 30, 1966, and not exceeding $7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years, in such amounts as he may consider necessary (1) for the proper and efficient administration of the State plans approved under this title, and under part A of title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965, including expenses which he determines were necessary for the preparation of such plans, and (2) for grants, upon such terms and conditions as the Commissioner determines will best further the purposes of this Act, to State commissions for conducting, either directly or through other appropriate agencies and institutions, comprehensive planning to determine the construction needs of institutions (and particularly combinations and regional groupings of institutions) of higher education. Not more than $3,000,000 may be expended in any fiscal year for the purposes set forth in clause (1). For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and the succeeding fiscal year, the Commissioner may expend for purposes of this subsection only such sums as Congress may hereafter authorize by law.'

"(b) Section 601 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended (1) by striking out subsection (d) thereof and by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (d), and (2) by striking out 'subsections (b), (c), and (d)' in the subsection redesignated as subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof 'subsections (b) and (c)'.

"EXTENSION OF GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF GRADUATE ACADEMIC FACILITIES; EXTENDING AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 4. Section 201 of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended to read as follows:

" 'APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

" 'SEC. 201. In order to increase the supply of highly qualified personnel critically needed by the community, industry, government, research, and teaching, the Commissioner shall, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and each of the seven succeeding fiscal years, make construction grants to assist institutions of higher education to improve existing graduate schools and cooperative graduate centers, and to assist in the establishment of graduate schools and cooperative graduate centers of excellence. For the purpose of making grants under this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, the sum of $60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, the sum of $120,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, the sum of $60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the sum of $120,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for the succeeding fiscal year; but for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and the succeeding fiscal year, only such sums may be appropriated as Congress may hereafter authorize by law. In addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year for which an appropriation is authorized by the preceding sentence, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for that fiscal year for making such grants the difference (if any) between any specific sums authorized to be appropriated under the preceding sentence for the preceding fiscal year and the sums which were appropriated for such preceding year under such sentence. Sums appropriated pursuant to this title for any fiscal year shall remain available for grants under this title until expended.'

"EXTENSION OF LOANS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF ACADEMIC FACILITIES

"SEC. 5. Section 303(c) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'four' in the first sentence and inserting 'seven';

"(2) by striking out in the second sentence '; but for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967,' and inserting in lieu thereof ', the sum of $200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the sum of $400,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for the succeeding fiscal year; but for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970,'; and

"(3) by amending the third and fourth sentences to read as follows: 'In addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year for which an appropriation is authorized by the preceding sentence, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for that fiscal year, for making such loans, the difference (if any) between any specific sums authorized to be appropriated under the preceding sentence for the preceding fiscal year and the sums which were appropriated for such preceding year under such sentence. Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection for any fiscal year shall be available without fiscal-year limitations for loans under this title.'

"AMENDMENT TO DEFINITION OF DEVELOPMENT COST

"SEC. 6. Subsection (c) of section 401 of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended (1) by inserting '(1)' immediately after '(c)', (2) by redesignating clauses (1) and (2) as clauses (A) and (B), respectively, (3) by redesignating subclauses (A) and (B) as subclauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and (4) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

" '(2) In determining the development cost with respect to an academic facility, the Commissioner may include expenditures for works of art for the facility of not to exceed 1 per centum of the total cost (including such expenditures) to the applicant of construction of, and land acquisition and site improvements for, such facility.'

"REPEAL OF AUTHORITY TO PRESCRIBE A SCHEDULE OF FEES FOR CERTAIN INSPECTIONS AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

"SEC. 7. The Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended by striking out subsection (b) of section 304 and by redesignating subsection (c) and references thereto as subsection (b),

"PROVIDING THAT ACADEMIC FACILITIES WILL BE USABLE BY HANDICAPPED PERSONS

"SEC. 8. Section 401(a)(1) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended by inserting after the period at the end thereof the following: 'Plans for such facilities shall be in compliance with such standards as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may prescribe or approve in order to insure that facilities constructed with the use of Federal funds under this Act shall be, to the extent appropriate in view of the uses to be made of the facilities, accessible to and usable by handicapped persons.'

"REVISION OF MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT REQUIREMENT FOR COLLEGE LIBRARY ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 9. Effective for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1966, clauses (a) and (b) of section 202 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 are each amended by inserting after 'June 30, 1965' the following: ', or during the two fiscal years preceding the fiscal year for which the grant is requested, whichever is the lesser'.

"TWO-YEAR EXTENSION OF ASSISTANCE TO DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS

"SEC. 10. Paragraph (1) of section 301(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by inserting after 'June 30, 1966,' the following: 'the sum of $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the sum of $55,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968,'.

"INCREASE IN MINIMUM ADVANCES FOR RESERVE FUNDS FOR INSURED LOAN PROGRAM

"SEC. 11. The second sentence of section 422(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended to read as follows: 'The amount available, however, for advances to any State for each fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1968 shall not be less than $25,000, and any additional funds needed to meet this requirement shall be derived by proportionately reducing (but not below $25,000 per year) the amount available for advances to each of the remaining States.'

"AMENDMENT TO HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 TO AUTHORIZE THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO ESTABLISH A LOAN INSURANCE PROGRAM FOR THE PURPOSES OF SUCH ACT AND THE NATIONAL VOCATIONAL STUDENT LOAN INSURANCE ACT OF 1965

"SEC. 12. The Higher Education Act of 1965 is further amended by inserting after section 435 a new section as follows:

" 'DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STUDENT LOAN INSURANCE PROGRAM

" 'SEC. 436. (a) The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia is authorized (1) to establish a student loan insurance program which meets the requirements of this title and the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965 for a State loan insurance program in order to enter into agreements with the Commissioner for the purposes of this title and such Act, (2) to enter into such agreements with the Commissioner, (3) to use amounts appropriated to such Board for the purposes of this section to establish a fund for such purposes and for expenses in connection therewith, and (4) to accept and use donations for the purposes of this section.

" '(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of any applicable law, if the borrower, on any loan insured under the program established pursuant to this section, is a minor, any otherwise valid note or other written agreement executed by him for the purposes of such loan shall create a binding obligation.

" '(c) There are authorized to be appropriated to such Board such amounts as may be necessary for the purposes of this section.'

"STUDY TO DETERMINE MEANS OF IMPROVING LOAN INSURANCE PROGRAM

"SEC. 13. The Commissioner of Education shall make an investigation and study to determine means of improving the loan insurance program pursuant to part B of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, particularly for the purpose of making loans insured under such program more readily available to students. The Commissioner shall report the results of such investigation and study, together with his recommendations for any legislation necessary to carry out such improvements, to the President and the Congress no later than January 1, 1968.

"REVISION OF MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT REQUIREMENT FOR COLLEGE EQUIPMENT PROGRAM

"SEC. 14. Effective with respect to applications filed after December 30, 1966, section 604(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by striking out the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'An institution of higher education shall be eligible for a grant for a project pursuant to this part in any fiscal year only if such institution will expend from current funds for instructional and library purposes, other than personnel costs, during such fiscal year an amount not less than the amount expended by such institution from current funds for such purposes during the previous fiscal year.'

"INCREASE IN AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FEDERAL CAPITAL CONTRIBUTIONS FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE STUDENT LOANS

"SEC. 15. Section 201 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out 'and $195,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968' and inserting in lieu thereof 'and $225,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968'.

"LOAN CANCELLATION FOR TEACHING HANDICAPPED CHILDREN, AND FOR TEACHING IN THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

"SEC. 16. (a) Section 205(b)(3) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out 'and (B) for the purposes of any cancellation pursuant to clause (A)' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '(B) such rate shall be 15 per centum for each complete academic year or its equivalent (as so determined by regulations) of service as a full-time teacher of handicapped children (including mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed or other health impaired children who by reason thereof require special education) in a public or other nonprofit elementary or secondary school system, and (C) for the purposes of any cancellation pursuant to clause (A) or (B)'.

"(b) Section 103(a) of such Act is amended by inserting after 'except that' the following: '(1) as used in section 205(b)(3) such term includes the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and (2)'.

"(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to teaching service performed during academic years beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, whether the loan was made before or after such enactment.

"ASSISTANCE IN INDUSTRIAL ARTS ADDED TO TITLE III OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

"SEC. 17. (a) Effective for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1967, clauses (1) and (5) of section 303(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 are each amended by inserting 'industrial arts,' after 'economics,'.

"(b) Section 301 of such Act is amended by striking out 'and $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof '$100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for the succeeding fiscal year and $110,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill, and agree to the same.

Adam C. Powell,
Edith Green,
John Brademas,
Carlton R. Sickles,
Sam M. Gibbons,
Hugh Carey,
William D. Hathaway,
Phillip Burton,
William H. Ayres,
Albert H. Quie,
Ogden Reid,
John Erlenborn,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Wayne Morse,
Lister Hill,
Ralph W. Yarborough,
Joseph Clark,
Jennings Randolph,
Robert Kennedy,
Harrison Williams,
Winston Prouty,
J. K. Javits,
Peter Dominick,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14644) to amend the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 to extend it for 3 years, and for other purposes; and to authorize assistance to developing institutions for another year, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment to the text of the bill strikes out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserts a substitute. The House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment. The differences between the text of the House bill and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted below except for clerical corrections, incidental changes made necessary by reason of agreements reached by the conferees, and minor drafting and clarifying changes.

AMENDMENTS TO HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963

Section 2. Extension of grants for construction of undergraduate academic facilities

Section 2 of the conference substitute amends title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 (referred to in the analysis of secs. 2 through 8 of the conference substitute as "act"). Section 101 of the act established a program of grants to institutions of higher education for the construction of undergraduate academic facilities. The program presently expires on June 30, 1968, but for the last 2 fiscal years of the program no appropriations have been authorized to carry it out. Present law (sec. 102), moreover, requires that 22 percent of the total appropriation for any fiscal year be allotted among the States for use in providing academic facilities for public community colleges and public technical institutes, and the remainder for use in providing academic facilities for other institutions of higher education.

The amendment made by the House bill would have extended this program for 3 years, until June 30, 1971, and would have authorized appropriations for the fiscal years ending in 1967, 1968, and 1969, of $453, $700, and $900 million, respectively.

The Senate amendment would have—

(1) extended the duration of the program for 3 fiscal years;

(2) terminated, beginning with the fiscal year ending in 1967, the requirement that 22 percent of the total appropriation under title I of the act for any fiscal year be allotted for academic facilities for public community colleges and public technical institutions;

(3) authorized, for construction of academic facilities for public community colleges and public technical institutions, appropriations of $140 million for the fiscal year ending in 1967, $182 million for the fiscal year ending in 1968, and $234 million for the fiscal year ending in 1969;

(4) authorized, for academic facilities for other institutions of higher education, appropriations of $420 million for fiscal year 1967, $546 million for fiscal year 1968, and $702 million for fiscal year 1969; and

(5) made applicable to allotments made for any fiscal year the provisions of present law (secs. 103(c) and 104(c) authorizing reallotment of the unused portion of allotments, which at present applies only to allotments made for the fiscal years 1965 and 1966.

The conference substitute authorizes appropriations of $475 million, $728 million, and $936 million for the fiscal years ending in 1967, 1968, and 1969, respectively. Of the sums appropriated pursuant to this authorization, public community colleges and public technical institutes will receive 22 percent in fiscal years ending before 1968, 23 percent in the fiscal year ending in 1968, and 24 percent in fiscal years ending thereafter. The conference substitute also includes the provision of the Senate amendment relating to reallotments (described in par. (5), supra).

Section 3. Payments for administrative expenses and planning

This section of the conference substitute differs from the House bill in that under the substitute, sums authorized to be appropriated by section 105(b) of the act will be available for administration of State plans approved under the program for financial assistance for the improvement of undergraduate instruction established by part A of title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965. The conference substitute authorizes $60 million for the fiscal year ending in 1967, and $120 million for each of the 2 succeeding fiscal years.

Section 4. Extension of grants for construction of graduate academic facilities; extending availability of appropriations

The House bill amended section 201 of the act (which authorizes appropriations for the program of assistance for the construction of graduate academic facilities) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years ending in 1967, 1968, and 1969 of $60, $90, and $120 million, respectively. The Senate amendment authorized $120 million for each of these years. In addition, the Senate amendment and the conference substitute repeal the authority in part A of title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965, which authorized an appropriation of funds for the administration of State plans approved under that title.

Section 5. Extension of loans for construction of academic facilities

The House bill amended section 301 of the act (which presently authorizes appropriations to a revolving fund out of which loans are made to institutions for the construction of academic facilities) to authorize appropriations of $200 million yearly for the fiscal years ending in 1967, 1968, and 1969. The Senate amendment authorized $400 million yearly for these fiscal years. The conference substitute authorizes $200 million for the fiscal year ending in 1967, and $400 million for each of the 2 succeeding fiscal years.

Section 8. Providing that academic facilities will be usable by handicapped persons

The Senate amendment contained a provision, not present in the House bill, which would add to section 401(a)(1) of the act (which defines the term "academic facilities") a requirement that plans for such facilities comply with such standards as the Secretary may prescribe or approve to insure that facilities constructed with Federal aid under the act be accessible to and usable by handicapped persons to the extent appropriate in view of the uses to be made of the facilities. The conference substitute includes this provision of the Senate amendment.

AMENDMENTS TO HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Section 9. Revision of maintenance-of-effort requirement for college library assistance

The Senate amendment contained a provision, not present in the House bill, which modified the maintenance-of-effort requirements for eligibility for basic grants under part A of title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (relating to grants for college library resources). Under present law (sec. 202 (a) and (b)), an institution or combination of institutions, in order to be eligible for basic grants for books and other library resources and materials, must provide satisfactory assurance that the applicant will, during the fiscal year for which the grant is requested, expend from funds other than those received under part A, (1) for all library purposes (exclusive of construction) and (2) for books and other library materials, respectively, amounts not less than the average amounts it respectively expended for such purposes during the 2-year period ending June 30, 1965. (These requirements are in addition to a matching requirement in the act.) The Senate amendment would, as an alternative to the use of the average annual amount expended during the 2-year period ending June 30, 1965, as a measure of the required effort, have substituted the average annual amount expended by the applicant during the 2 fiscal years preceding the fiscal year for which the grant is requested if that amount is less. The conference substitute includes this provision of the Senate amendment.

Section 10. Two-year extension of assistance to developing institutions

The House bill extended the program of assistance to developing institutions under title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 for 1 fiscal year, until June 30, 1967, and authorized an appropriation of $30 million for that year. The Senate amendment extended the program for 3 fiscal years, and authorized an appropriation of $55 million for each year. The conference substitute extends the program for 2 years, and authorizes $30 and $55 million for the fiscal years ending in 1967 and 1968, respectively.

Section 11. Increase in minimum advances for reserve funds for insured loan programs

Part V of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 provides—in addition to a standby Federal student loan insurance program—for making advances, from Federal appropriations, for the reserve funds of State and nonprofit private student loan insurance programs.

Section 421(b) of that act authorizes aggregate appropriations of $17,500,000 for making such advances, such appropriations to remain available for advances through the fiscal year 1968. Section 422(b) requires that the total of such advances may not exceed an amount which bears the same ratio to $17½ million as the population of the State aged 18 to 22 bears to the total population of all the States in this age group, but that if the amount so determined for any State is less than $25,000 it shall be increased to $25,000, with proportionate reduction (but not below $25,000) in the amount determined for each of the remaining States.

The Senate amendment contained a provision, not present in the House bill, which would amend the provision for a minimum advance to each State, so that the minimum advance to a State would be an annual minimum of $25,000 for each fiscal year (prior to the fiscal year 1969) rather than a minimum of $25,000 in the aggregate. The conference substitute includes this provision of the Senate amendment.

Section 12. Authorizing District of Columbia to establish a federally assisted student loan insurance program

The Senate amendment contained a provision, not present in the House bill, which would amend part B of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 adding thereto a section 436 authorizing the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish a student loan insurance program meeting the requirements of such part B and the requirement of the National Vocational Student Insurance Act of 1965 for a State loan insurance program and to enter into agreements with the Commissioner of Education for the purposes of these Federal programs. This provision of the Senate amendment further provides that a minor obtaining a student loan insured under the program established by the Board of Commissioners pursuant to this section shall be legally bound by any note or other written agreement executed by him for the purposes of such loan, regardless of whether under other applicable law a binding obligation would otherwise be created. The conference substitute includes this provision of the Senate amendment.

Section 13. Study to determine means of improving loan insurance program

The Senate amendment contained a provision not present in the House bill directing the Commissioner of Education to make a study of means of improving the loan insurance program under part B of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and to report to the President and Congress before 1968 on the results of his study. This provision is included in the conference substitute.

Section 14. Revision of maintenance-of-effort requirement for college equipment program

Under part A of title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965, providing for grants to institutions of higher education for equipment for undergraduate instruction, an institution of higher education is eligible for a grant for a project in any fiscal year only if it will expend during such year, "for the same purposes as, but not pursuant to" such part A, an amount at least equal to the amount expended by such institution in the previous fiscal year. Under a provision of the Senate amendment, not present in the House bill, this provision (sec. 604(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965) would be amended effective with respect to applications filed after December 30, 1966, so that the institution would be eligible if during the fiscal year involved it would expend "from current funds for instructional and library purposes, other than personnel costs," an amount not less than that expended by the institution from current funds for such purpose during the previous fiscal year. The conference substitute includes this provision of the Senate amendment.

AMENDMENTS TO THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

Section 15. Increase in appropriation authorization for Federal capital contributions for national defense student loans

The Senate amendment amended the first sentence of section 201 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 so as to increase from $190 to $220 million for the fiscal year 1967, and from $195 to $225 million for the fiscal year 1968, the authorization for appropriations under that section of the national defense student loan program. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference substitute increases the authorization for the fiscal year ending in 1968 from $195 to $225 million.

Section 15. NDEA loan cancellation for teaching handicapped children and for teaching in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands

The Senate amendment amended section 205(b)(3) of the NDEA to provide up to 100 percent cancellation of a student loan at the rate of 15 percent for each year of service by the debtor as a full-time teacher of handicapped children in a public or other nonprofit elementary or secondary school system. (Under existing law, this particular loan cancellation provision applies only to those who teach in elementary or secondary schools with high concentrations of children from low-income families.) In addition the Senate amendment had a provision which would close a gap in existing law by extending the benefit of the loan cancellation provisions of the NDEA to borrowers teaching full time in public or nonprofit private elementary or secondary schools in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. The House bill contained no comparable provisions. The conference substitute includes these provisions of the Senate amendment.

In light of the absence of evidence that the cancellation provisions in the student loan program have attracted any sizable number of people into the teaching profession, it was further agreed that the loan cancellation provisions be reconsidered next year after the House and Senate, independently, make a study of the impact of these provisions on the teaching profession.

Section 17. Assistance in industrial arts added to title III of National Defense Education Act of 1958

The Senate amendment added industrial arts to the list of critical subjects in which the quality of instruction may be improved through financial assistance under title III of the NDEA, and authorized an appropriation for the purposes of title III of the NDEA, of $110 million for the fiscal year 1967 and an equal amount for fiscal year 1968. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference substitute contains this provision of the Senate amendment, but delays its effective date for 1 year, until the fiscal year ending in 1968.

It was also agreed that before the effective date of this provision further consideration will be given to an expansion of the scope of title III either through the deletion of categorical limitations or by the inclusion of additional categories and that detailed consideration will be given to the question of whether, and to what extent, priorities for such assistance should be determined by the Commissioner of Education in view of the desirability of insuring maximum freedom of choice in such matters at the State and local levels.

The House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill, and agrees to the same.

Adam C. Powell,
Edith Green,
John Brademas,
Carlton R. Sickles,
Sam M. Gibbons,
Hugh Carey,
William D. Hathaway,
Phillip Burton,
William H. Ayres,
Albert H. Quie,
Ogden Reid,
John Erlenborn,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Estimated Distributions of Authorizations for Title I, Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, as Proposed to be Amended by H.R. 14644 (Conference Committee Report): Fiscal Years 1967, 1968, and 1969

Distribution of authorizations with 22%, 23% and 24% for public junior colleges and public technical institutes (Sec. 103) and the balance for other higher education facilities (Sec. 104). Distribution under Sec. 103 is based on State products of FY 1967 allotment ratios, with limits of 33⅓% and 66⅔% and total high school graduates, 1964–65. Distribution under Sec. 104 is based 50% on total public and nonpublic grade 9–12 enrollment Fall 1965, and 50% on full-time and full-time equivalent degree-credit and non-degree-credit enrollment in institutions of higher education, Fall 1965.

Estimated distributions of authorizations for title I, Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, as proposed to be amended by H.R. 14644 (conference committee report) fiscal years 1967, 1968, and 1969

[UNDERGRADUATE FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION GRANTS]

	1967	1968	1969
United States and outlying areas	$475,000,000	$728,000,000	$936,000,000
50 States and District of Columbia	470,325,592	720,813,889	926,732,469
Alabama	8,125,566	12,518,311	16,178,302
Alaska	374,290	573,194	736,381
Arizona	4,614,323	7,065,179	9,074,959
Arkansas	4,788,096	7,369,959	9,516,252
California	47,974,121	73,235,205	93,784,827
Colorado	5,620,685	8,605,834	11,053,590
Connecticut	6,061,695	9,267,502	11,885,990
Delaware	1,029,794	1,573,626	2,017,231
Florida	12,153,389	18,643,928	23,992,959
Georgia	9,511,874	14,630,090	18,876,832
Hawaii	1,792,764	2,750,947	3,541,178
Idaho	2,005,771	3,062,676	3,974,455
Illinois	23,251,190	35,560,564	45,624,369
Indiana	12,241,090	18,765,656	24,133,156
Iowa	7,873,384	12,076,229	15,538,450
Kansas	6,261,366	9,587,967	12,316,586
Kentucky	7,514,869	11,548,643	14,888,268
Louisiana	8,794,634	13,513,812	17,419,747
Maine	2,456,348	3,780,994	4,882,268
Maryland	7,725,745	11,835,601	15,210,618
Massachusetts	14,231,171	21,760,451	27,912,561
Michigan	21,226,089	32,494,825	41,731,555
Minnesota	10,323,521	15,838,104	20,363,784
Mississippi	5,627,469	8,648,273	11,149,342
Missouri	10,950,015	16,773,323	21,554,106
Montana	1,956,133	3,002,828	3,866,946
Nebraska	4,018,366	6,160,587	7,923,084
Nevada	744,654	1,138,404	1,459,965
50 States and District—Con.			
New Hampshire	$1,788,222	$2,743,752	$3,531,621
New Jersey	12,383,913	18,999,692	24,453,523
New Mexico	2,766,106	4,248,390	5,473,750
New York	38,835,937	59,368,073	76,133,521
North Carolina	12,079,117	18,578,865	23,972,006
North Dakota	1,963,508	3,011,946	3,875,861
Ohio	24,751,764	37,936,635	48,777,343
Oklahoma	7,076,644	10,854,850	13,967,758
Oregon	5,624,553	8,622,323	11,088,358
Pennsylvania	26,851,689	41,225,294	53,095,940
Rhode Island	2,291,046	3,510,399	4,512,174
South Carolina	5,757,930	8,869,549	11,461,261
South Dakota	2,028,705	3,112,479	4,005,901
Tennessee	9,368,660	14,395,693	18,556,307
Texas	25,066,222	38,453,578	49,486,976
Utah	3,888,362	5,951,349	7,641,347
Vermont	1,205,862	1,848,455	2,376,986
Virginia	9,069,721	13,929,636	17,946,939
Washington	8,608,442	13,179,364	16,936,483
West Virginia	4,960,566	7,636,455	9,861,672
Wisconsin	11,326,117	17,372,214	22,352,905
Wyoming	920,516	1,411,713	1,816,220
District of Columbia	2,468,578	3,750,523	4,779,802
American Samoa	50,650	78,618	102,355
Canal Zone	----------	----------	----------
Guam	161,094	247,562	319,149
Puerto Rico	4,398,726	6,761,696	8,719,412
Virgin Islands	63,938	98,235	126,615

FISCAL YEAR 1967

	Total	Sec. 103 (public junior and community colleges)	Sec. 104 (other undergraduate institutions)
United States and outlying areas	$475,000,000	$104,500,000	$370,500,000
50 States and District of Columbia	470,325,592	103,225,670	367,099,922
Alabama	8,125,566	2,513,287	5,612,279
Alaska	374,290	77,274	297,016
Arizona	4,614,323	938,137	3,676,186
Arkansas	4,788,096	1,406,864	3,381,232
California	47,974,121	7,291,115	40,683,006
Colorado	5,620,685	1,140,202	4,480,483
Connecticut	6,061,695	1,077,806	4,983,889
Delaware	1,029,794	174,283	855,511
Florida	12,153,389	2,867,015	9,286,374
Georgia	9,511,874	2,673,603	6,838,271
Hawaii	1,792,764	431,381	1,361,383
Idaho	2,005,771	537,195	1,468,576
Illinois	23,251,190	4,276,157	18,975,033
Indiana	12,241,090	2,744,273	9,496,817
Iowa	7,873,384	1,835,512	6,037,872
Kansas	6,261,366	1,283,439	4,977,927
Kentucky	7,514,869	2,001,673	5,513,196
Louisiana	8,794,634	2,325,341	6,469,293
Maine	2,456,348	723,092	1,733,256
Maryland	7,725,745	1,642,328	6,083,417
Massachusetts	14,231,171	2,563,310	11,667,861
Michigan	21,226,089	4,256,041	16,970,048
Minnesota	10,323,521	2,449,753	7,873,768
Mississippi	5,627,469	1,500,458	4,127,011
Missouri	10,950,015	2,308,034	8,641,981
Montana	1,956,133	484,060	1,472,073
Nebraska	4,018,366	904,890	3,113,476
50 States and District—Con.			
Nevada	$744,654	$131,623	$613,031
New Hampshire	1,788,222	427,737	1,360,485
New Jersey	12,383,913	2,945,199	9,438,714
New Mexico	2,766,106	708,973	2,057,133
New York	38,835,937	6,829,599	32,006,338
North Carolina	12,079,117	3,396,695	8,682,422
North Dakota	1,963,508	461,212	1,502,296
Ohio	24,751,764	5,459,929	19,291,835
Oklahoma	7,076,644	1,657,206	5,419,438
Oregon	5,624,553	1,259,300	4,365,253
Pennsylvania	26,851,689	6,708,451	20,143,238
Rhode Island	2,291,046	493,625	1,797,421
South Carolina	5,757,930	1,767,955	3,989,975
South Dakota	2,028,705	482,390	1,546,315
Tennessee	9,368,660	2,475,258	6,893,402
Texas	25,066,222	5,920,913	19,145,309
Utah	3,888,362	764,993	3,123,369
Vermont	1,205,862	268,787	937,075
Virginia	9,069,721	2,321,090	6,748,631
Washington	8,608,442	1,819,496	6,783,946
West Virginia	4,960,566	1,469,032	3,491,534
Wisconsin	11,326,117	2,642,330	8,683,787
Wyoming	920,516	212,616	707,900
District of Columbia	2,468,578	174,738	2,293,840
American Samoa	50,650	22,241	28,409
Canal Zone	----------	----------	----------
Guam	161,094	42,888	118,206
Puerto Rico	4,398,726	1,192,426	3,206,300
Virgin Islands	63,938	16,775	47,163

FISCAL YEAR 1968

	Total	Sec. 103 (public junior and community colleges)	Sec. 104 (other undergraduate institutions)
United States and outlying areas	$728,000,000	$167,440,000	$560,560,000
50 States and District of Columbia	720,813,889	165,398,145	555,415,744
Alabama	12,518,311	4,027,032	8,491,279
Alaska	573,194	123,815	449,379
Arizona	7,065,179	1,503,174	5,562,005
Arkansas	7,369,959	2,254,214	5,115,745
California	73,235,205	11,682,528	61,552,677
Colorado	8,605,834	1,826,942	6,778,892
Connecticut	9,267,502	1,726,965	7,540,537
Delaware	1,573,626	279,253	1,294,373
Florida	18,643,928	4,593,808	14,050,120
Georgia	14,630,090	4,283,906	10,346,184
Hawaii	2,750,947	691,200	2,059,747
Idaho	3,062,676	840,746	2,221,930
Illinois	35,560,564	6,851,671	28,708,893
Indiana	18,765,656	4,397,139	14,368,517
Iowa	12,076,229	2,941,035	9,135,194
Kansas	9,587,967	2,056,450	7,531,517
Kentucky	11,548,643	3,207,274	8,341,369
Louisiana	13,513,812	3,725,886	9,787,926
Maine	3,780,994	1,158,008	2,622,986
Maryland	11,835,601	2,631,497	9,204,104
Massachusetts	21,760,451	4,107,183	17,653,268
Michigan	32,494,825	6,819,440	25,675,385
Minnesota	15,838,104	3,925,231	11,912,873
Mississippi	8,648,273	2,404,178	6,244,095
Missouri	16,773,323	3,698,156	13,075,167
Montana	3,002,828	775,608	2,227,220
Nebraska	6,160,587	1,449,902	4,710,685
50 States and District—Con.			
Nevada	$1,138,404	$210,899	$927,505
New Hampshire	2,743,752	685,362	2,058,390
New Jersey	18,999,692	4,719,083	14,280,609
New Mexico	4,248,390	1,135,985	3,112,405
New York	59,368,073	10,943,042	48,425,031
North Carolina	18,578,865	5,442,514	13,136,351
North Dakota	3,011,946	738,999	2,272,947
Ohio	37,936,635	8,748,426	29,188,209
Oklahoma	10,854,850	2,655,336	8,199,514
Oregon	8,622,323	2,017,773	6,604,550
Pennsylvania	41,225,294	10,748,928	30,476,366
Rhode Island	3,510,399	790,933	2,719,466
South Carolina	8,869,549	2,832,788	6,036,761
South Dakota	3,112,479	772,932	2,339,547
Tennessee	14,395,693	3,966,097	10,429,596
Texas	38,453,578	9,487,060	28,966,518
Utah	5,951,349	1,225,745	4,725,604
Vermont	1,848,455	430,677	1,417,778
Virginia	13,929,636	3,719,075	10,210,561
Washington	13,179,364	2,915,372	10,263,992
West Virginia	7,636,455	2,353,825	5,282,630
Wisconsin	17,372,214	4,233,796	13,138,418
Wyoming	1,411,713	340,674	1,071,039
District of Columbia	3,750,523	279,983	3,470,540
American Samoa	78,618	35,636	42,982
Canal Zone	----------	----------	----------
Guam	247,562	68,719	178,843
Puerto Rico	6,761,696	1,910,621	4,851,075
Virgin Islands	98,235	26,679	71,356

***Estimated distributions of authorizations for title I, Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, as proposed to be amended by H.R. 14644 (conference committee report) fiscal years 1967, 1968, and 1969*—Continued**

FISCAL YEAR 1969

	Total	Sec. 103 (public junior and community colleges)	Sec. 104 (other undergraduate institutions)
United States and outlying areas	$936,000,000	$224,640,000	$711,360,000
50 States and District of Columbia	926,732,469	221,900,617	704,831,852
Alabama	16,178,302	5,402,726	10,775,576
Alaska	736,381	166,112	570,269
Arizona	9,074,959	2,016,681	7,058,278
Arkansas	9,516,252	3,024,286	6,491,966
California	93,784,827	15,673,453	78,111,374
Colorado	11,053,580	2,451,053	8,602,527
Connecticut	11,885,990	2,316,923	9,569,067
Delaware	2,017,231	374,650	1,642,581
Florida	23,992,959	6,163,122	17,829,837
Georgia	18,876,832	5,747,352	13,129,480
Hawaii	3,541,178	927,324	2,613,854
Idaho	3,974,455	1,154,790	2,819,665
Illinois	45,624,369	9,192,304	36,432,065
Indiana	24,133,156	5,899,268	18,233,888
Iowa	15,538,450	3,945,736	11,592,714
Kansas	12,316,585	2,758,964	9,557,621
Kentucky	14,888,263	4,302,926	10,585,337
Louisiana	17,419,747	4,998,705	12,421,042
Maine	4,882,258	1,554,406	3,327,852
Maryland	15,210,618	3,530,456	11,680,162
Massachusetts	27,912,551	5,510,258	22,402,293
Michigan	41,731,555	9,149,062	32,582,493
Minnesota	20,383,784	5,266,149	15,117,635
Mississippi	11,149,342	3,225,481	7,923,861
Missouri	21,554,106	4,961,501	16,592,605
Montana	3,866,946	1,040,567	2,826,379
Nebraska	7,923,084	1,945,210	5,977,874
50 States and District—Con.			
Nevada	$1,459,965	$282,946	$1,177,019
New Hampshire	3,531,621	919,491	2,612,130
New Jersey	24,453,523	6,331,192	18,122,331
New Mexico	5,473,750	1,524,055	3,949,695
New York	76,133,521	14,681,349	61,452,172
North Carolina	23,972,006	7,301,757	16,670,249
North Dakota	3,875,861	991,452	2,884,409
Ohio	48,777,343	11,737,019	37,040,324
Oklahoma	13,967,758	3,562,438	10,405,320
Oregon	11,088,358	2,707,074	8,381,284
Pennsylvania	53,096,940	14,420,922	38,675,018
Rhode Island	4,512,174	1,061,127	3,451,047
South Carolina	11,461,261	3,800,510	7,660,751
South Dakota	4,005,901	1,036,977	2,968,924
Tennessee	18,556,307	5,320,975	13,235,332
Texas	49,486,976	12,727,981	36,758,995
Utah	7,641,347	1,644,478	5,996,869
Vermont	2,376,986	577,803	1,799,183
Virginia	17,946,939	4,989,567	12,957,372
Washington	16,936,483	3,911,306	13,025,177
West Virginia	9,861,672	3,157,927	6,703,745
Wisconsin	22,352,995	5,680,124	16,672,871
Wyoming	1,816,220	457,053	1,359,167
District of Columbia	4,779,802	375,629	4,404,173
American Samoa	102,355	47,810	54,545
Canal Zone			
Guam	319,149	92,194	226,955
Puerto Rico	8,719,412	2,563,317	6,156,095
Virgin Islands	126,615	36,062	90,553

NOTE.—See attachment to summary table, title I, fiscal years 1967, 1968, and 1969 for distribution procedures.

Estimated distribution of authorizations under title II, NDEA of 1958 as proposed to be amended by H.R. 14644 (conference committee report): Fiscal years 1967 and 1968

	1967	1968
United States and outlying areas	$190,000,000	$225,000,000
50 States and District of Columbia	188,680,050	223,436,901
Alabama	2,691,695	3,187,534
Alaska	81,061	96,017
Arizona	2,137,150	2,530,835
Arkansas	1,800,482	2,132,150
California	19,057,903	22,568,571
Colorado	2,771,517	3,282,060
Connecticut	2,363,160	2,798,479
Delaware	361,210	427,748
Florida	4,496,921	5,325,301
Georgia	3,203,014	3,793,042
Hawaii	668,833	792,040
Idaho	788,301	933,514
Illinois	9,350,501	11,072,962
Indiana	5,265,085	6,234,968
Iowa	3,679,867	4,357,737
Kansas	3,219,036	3,812,016
Kentucky	2,951,299	3,494,960
Louisiana	3,546,361	4,199,638
Maine	762,936	903,477
Maryland	2,803,272	3,319,664
Massachusetts	6,987,245	8,274,369
Michigan	8,589,792	10,172,122
Minnesota	4,496,146	5,324,384
Mississippi	2,271,333	2,689,736
Missouri	4,845,061	5,737,572
Montana	854,231	1,011,589
Nebraska	1,825,266	2,161,499
50 States and District of Columbia—Con.		
Nevada	$221,315	$262,083
New Hampshire	790,431	936,036
New Jersey	3,352,251	3,969,771
New Mexico	1,013,633	1,200,355
New York	14,948,284	17,701,916
North Carolina	4,494,404	5,322,320
North Dakota	932,504	1,104,281
Ohio	9,208,080	10,904,316
Oklahoma	3,237,721	3,834,143
Oregon	2,502,571	2,963,570
Pennsylvania	9,532,890	11,288,843
Rhode Island	1,075,448	1,273,557
South Carolina	1,796,706	2,127,678
South Dakota	911,496	1,079,403
Tennessee	3,878,140	4,592,534
Texas	10,439,746	12,362,857
Utah	2,283,095	2,703,665
Vermont	601,597	712,417
Virginia	3,082,384	3,650,192
Washington	3,949,394	4,676,914
West Virginia	1,799,272	2,130,717
Wisconsin	4,751,878	5,627,224
Wyoming	405,114	479,741
District of Columbia	1,603,080	1,898,384
American Samoa		
Canal Zone	29,576	35,025
Guam	28,705	33,993
Puerto Rico	1,257,748	1,489,438
Virgin Islands	3,921	4,643

NOTE.—Distribution of authorizations on the basis of full-time degree credit enrollment in institution of higher education, fall 1965.

Estimated distribution of authorizations for grants to public schools, title III, secs. 301 and 302(a), NDEA of 1958 as proposed to be amended by H.R. 14644 (conference committee report): Fiscal years 1967 and 1968

[Equipment grants]

	1967	1968
United States and outlying areas	$88,000,000	$96,800,000
50 States and District of Columbia	86,400,000	95,040,000
Alabama	2,238,425	2,462,267
Alaska	109,155	120,070
Arizona	887,657	976,423
Arkansas	1,188,069	1,306,875
California	5,867,857	6,454,644
Colorado	905,491	996,040
Connecticut	803,986	884,385
Delaware	157,356	173,092
Florida	2,600,527	2,860,580
Georgia	2,710,099	2,981,108
Hawaii	359,088	394,997
Idaho	437,245	480,969
50 States and District—Con.		
Illinois	$3,411,813	$3,752,995
Indiana	2,313,283	2,544,612
Iowa	1,355,144	1,490,658
Kansas	1,070,806	1,177,886
Kentucky	1,945,642	2,140,206
Louisiana	2,336,460	2,570,106
Maine	528,345	581,179
Maryland	1,452,125	1,597,328
Massachusetts	1,689,750	1,858,725
Michigan	4,051,056	4,456,162
Minnesota	1,830,931	2,014,025
Mississippi	1,570,866	1,727,952
Missouri	1,797,665	1,977,431
Montana	396,647	436,312
Nebraska	688,821	757,703

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Estimated distribution of authorizations for grants to public schools, title III, secs. 301 and 302(a), NDEA of 1958 as proposed to be amended by H.R. 14644 (conference committee report): Fiscal years 1967 and 1968—Continued

[Equipment Grants]

	1967	1968
50 States and District of Columbia—Con.		
Nevada	$122,521	$134,774
New Hampshire	306,626	337,288
New Jersey	2,008,681	2,209,549
New Mexico	704,600	775,060
New York	4,858,918	5,344,810
North Carolina	3,088,096	3,396,905
North Dakota	400,215	440,236
Ohio	4,694,077	5,163,484
Oklahoma	1,264,429	1,390,872
Oregon	870,719	957,791
Pennsylvania	4,688,402	5,157,242
Rhode Island	341,835	376,019
South Carolina	1,713,248	1,884,573
South Dakota	$420,829	$462,912
Tennessee	2,288,073	2,516,880
Texas	5,860,831	6,446,915
Utah	644,340	708,774
Vermont	211,944	233,139
Virginia	2,375,381	2,612,919
Washington	1,323,348	1,455,682
West Virginia	1,119,137	1,231,051
Wisconsin	2,019,471	2,221,419
Wyoming	173,934	191,327
District of Columbia	196,036	215,639
Outlying areas	1,600,000	1,760,000

NOTE.—Distribution of 88 percent of total authorizations, with 1.6 percent reserved for the outlying areas. Balance distributed on basis of State products of (1) NDEA biennial allotment ratios, fiscal years 1966 and 1967 and (2) the estimated 5-17 population, July 1, 1964.

Estimated distribution of authorizations for loans for nonprofit private schools, title III, secs. 301 and 305, NDEA of 1958, as proposed to be amended by H.R. 14644 (conference committee report): Fiscal years 1967 and 1968

[Equipment loans]

	1967	1968
United States and outlying areas	$12,000,000	$13,200,000
50 States and the District of Columbia	11,880,322	13,068,356
Alabama	58,877	64,765
Alaska	4,542	4,997
Arizona	63,420	69,762
Arkansas	23,411	25,752
California	770,998	848,098
Colorado	84,909	93,400
Connecticut	219,961	241,957
Delaware	37,388	41,127
Florida	174,711	192,182
Georgia	51,540	56,694
Hawaii	58,353	64,189
Idaho	17,995	19,795
Illinois	1,046,691	1,151,361
Indiana	260,494	286,543
Iowa	192,881	212,169
Kansas	101,157	111,273
Kentucky	176,108	193,719
Louisiana	280,236	308,259
Maine	68,661	75,527
Maryland	266,259	292,885
Massachusetts	508,233	559,057
Michigan	653,068	718,375
Minnesota	324,962	357,458
Mississippi	36,689	40,358
Missouri	331,077	364,184
Montana	40,708	44,778
Nebraska	111,990	123,188
50 States and District of Columbia—Con.		
Nevada	$7,862	$8,648
New Hampshire	68,312	75,143
New Jersey	583,883	642,271
New Mexico	53,112	58,423
New York	1,660,624	1,826,688
North Carolina	38,611	42,472
North Dakota	40,183	44,202
Ohio	772,221	849,443
Oklahoma	39,659	43,625
Oregon	67,089	73,798
Pennsylvania	1,188,556	1,307,413
Rhode Island	103,953	114,348
South Carolina	29,876	32,863
South Dakota	46,298	50,928
Tennessee	62,197	68,417
Texas	294,213	323,634
Utah	11,880	13,068
Vermont	34,767	38,244
Virginia	109,369	120,306
Washington	110,767	121,843
West Virginia	34,069	37,475
Wisconsin	502,468	552,715
Wyoming	7,687	8,456
District of Columbia	47,347	52,081
American Samoa	2,621	2,883
Canal Zone	1,398	1,537
Guam	8,037	8,840
Puerto Rico	102,031	112,234
Virgin Islands	5,591	6,150

NOTE.—Distribution of 12 percent of total authorization on the basis of total estimated nonpublic school enrollment, fall 1965.

Comparison of authorizations—Higher Education Amendments of 1966, H.R. 14644

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Administration recommendation 1967 [1]	As passed by the House			As reported by the Senate			As reported by conference		
		1967	1968	1969	1967	1968	1969	1967	1968	1969
Grand total	780,000	750,000	997,000	1,227,000	1,212,000	1,350,000	1,518,000	772,000	1,350,000	1,463,000
I. Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 (total)	(720,000)	(720,000)	(997,000)	(1,227,000)	(1,067,000)	(1,255,000)	(1,463,000)	(742,000)	(1,255,000)	(1,463,000)
A. Title I (total)	460,000	460,000	707,000	907,000	567,000	735,000	943,000	482,000	735,000	943,000
1. Public community colleges and technical institutes	99,660	99,660	154,000	198,000	140,000	182,000	234,000	104,500	167,440	224,640
2. Other undergraduate facilities	353,340	353,340	546,000	702,000	420,000	546,000	702,000	370,500	560,560	711,360
3. State commissions	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000
B. Title II—Graduate facilities	60,000	60,000	90,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	60,000	120,000	120,000
C. Title III—Loans	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	200,000	400,000	400,000
II. Higher Education Act of 1965, title III—Developing institutions	30,000	30,000	----------	----------	55,000	55,000	55,000	30,000	55,000	----------
III. National Defense Education Act of 1958 (total)	30,000	----------	----------	----------	70,000	40,000	----------	----------	40,000	----------
A. Title II—Student loan programs (total) [2]	(30,000)	----------	----------	----------	(60,000)	(30,000)	----------	----------	30,000	----------
1. Loans to students	----------	----------	----------	----------	30,000	30,000	----------	----------	30,000	----------
2. Loans to institutions	30,000	----------	----------	----------	30,000	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
B. Title III—Equipment [3]	----------	----------	----------	----------	(10,000)	(10,000)	----------	----------	(10,000)	----------

---

[1] The administration recommendation did not contain specific authorizations beyond fiscal year 1967.

[2] New obligational authority; present law authorizes $190,000,000 in fiscal year 1967 and $195,000,000 in fiscal year 1968.

[3] New obligational authority; present law authorizes $100,000,000 for fiscal year 1967 and 1968.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the conference report which I have just entered into the RECORD sets forth the major agreements which have been reached. My further comments are solely amplifications of certain points.

Because of the tremendous interest which has been made manifest by Senators in the student loan program of title II of the National Defense Education Act during the course of our hearings this year, I believe that Senators will be pleased to learn that we were successful in holding the Senate provision for fiscal year 1968 for this purpose at the Senate figure of $225 million, an increase of $30 million over the presently authorized $195 million for this purpose. It is a source of regret that we were unable, however, to increase for this fiscal year by $30 million the presently authorized $190 million sum. In this connection, also, the new Administration program which was presented and which was in the Senate bill, which would have provided, through sales participation techniques, an additional source of funding, did not survive the conference. But in view of the current suspension of this program, there was serious question as to whether it would, for the balance of this year, provide the source of additional relief that the administration hoped to obtain.

We are only some 2 to 3 months away from a new Congress. I feel sure that if the administration puts forward the proposal in connection with its legislative program in the 1st session of the 90th Congress, it will be given the opportunity to present the arguments in support of this program and it can be properly considered at that time.

I am also very pleased to report to the Senate that the provision for extension of 100 percent forgiveness of National Defense Education Act title II loans to teachers of handicapped children emerged unscathed from conference. In this connection, Mr. President, for the purpose of making legislative history, I should like to state that other health impaired children, in the view of the Senate conferees, ought to be construed in accordance with the handicapped children title of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, by the public law which I hope will follow from the acceptance of the conference report on the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1966.

I am also pleased that the loan forgiveness provisions of title II of National Defense Education Act which are contained in the Senate bill, with respect to the teachers in the Trust Territories of the Pacific also emerged from conference. This places those teachers in the same position as teachers in the United States with respect to loan forgiveness.

I particularly wish to salute at this time the stanch support I have received on this bill and in this area from my colleagues on the minority side, Senator PROUTY, of Vermont; Senator JAVITS, of New York; and Senator DOMINICK, of Colorado, who stood shoulder to shoulder with Senator HILL, Senator YARBOROUGH, Senator CLARK, Senator RANDOLPH, Senator KENNEDY of New York, and Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey on the majority, in our united determination to provide recognition to the problems of handicapped children in obtaining the special education they need. This was evidenced once again in the conference reported bill in the provision of section 8, which insures that facilities constructed with Federal funds under this act shall, to the extent appropriate, be accessible to and usable by handicapped persons.

The conference committee also approved the Senate addition of industrial arts as a category under the equipment grant program contained in title III of the National Defense Education Act. However, it was agreed that this would not become effective until July 1 next, at which time the total authorization for this program will also be increased by the $10 million. The reasoning behind Senate acceptance of this change was cogently presented by the House managers and it was to the effect that we are well advanced in the fiscal year and that to make the new regulations which must be written applicable in this fiscal year could cause uncertainly and disruption of planning on the part of the local school officials.

By being given advance notice of this change, school officials will be able to plan carefully the extent to which they may wish to participate in this program. I would also add as the chairman of the Senate conferees, that there was a general agreement that by adding this additional category at this time we are not foreclosing further consideration of title III next session. Then, I hope we can give very careful consideration to such additional disciplines as may need to be included and, indeed, it would be my hope that we can obtain testimony which will give us the factual basis for such other changes in the language as in the view of our school officials are deemed justified.

I think I am not overstating the general agreement on both sides of the aisle and on both sides of the Capitol that in the administration of this program we should make sure that the Office of Education does not set priorities in any sense of the word, that in the administration of this title as in the other parts of educational legislation, the decisions are those which are freely taken by local school authorities.

Finally, Mr. President, I wish to report that we brought back from conference the provision which should help to bring the insured loan program of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 closer to reality for students in the District of Columbia.

In concluding this opening statement on the conference report, I reiterate what I have said before, that we believe this is a sound compromise and one which is deserving of Senate support. I should like only to add that I have deep appreciation for the spirit which prevailed in the conference and I wish to commend our colleagues in the other body and their able and efficient staff for the preparatory work, which I am sure smoothed the path for the conferees.

Mr. President, the chairman of the conference, upon my motion was the Representative from New York [Mr. POWELL], and the chairman of the House conferees was my colleague from Oregon, Mrs. EDITH GREEN. Mr. POWELL and Mrs. GREEN, in my judgment, exhibited at all times in the conference a fairness and a desire to work out the compromises that I have reported to the Senate; and in behalf of my conferees on the Senate side, I wish to thank Representatives POWELL and GREEN. In fact, I wish to thank all the House conferees for the cooperation they extended to us, and for the understanding and fairness they exhibited at all times.

He may close his ears for a moment if he wishes, but I wish to say of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], who is with me on the floor of the Senate at this time—and who exercised the proxy of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] who was in the hospital—that I would not have this conference report today were it not for the unfailing cooperation Senator JAVITS has extended to me at all times, not only in connection with this bill, but in connection with other education bills I have presented to the Senate.

I have said this, in effect, before, but I wish to put it this way now: In my years in managing educational bills in the Senate, Mr. President, I have never brought to the floor a single educational bill without knowing and having the understanding in advance with Senator JAVITS, Senator PROUTY that, although they might offer amendments to the bills—and they did offer amendments—on the floor of the Senate, that after the Senate had worked its will on those amendments I could count on their support for final passage.

This is not well understood by some, in and out of the Senate. I have said, for example, to people downtown in the Government agencies, and to people in the educational associations of the country, "I will not go to the floor of the Senate with an education bill unless I can have the support of the Republicans in the Senate and the Republicans on the committee. So long as there is extended to me by the minority the cooperation that ought to be extended to the manager of a bill, in trying to work out fair and reasonable compromises of differences that may develop within the committee or within the Senate, I shall be glad to do so."

I think the Senator from New York—and through him I speak also to Senator PROUTY and Senator DOMINICK—and the other members of the minority are entitled to have this RECORD show from me as the manager of the bill my deep appreciation, which I express not only in my own behalf but in behalf of every Democrat on my committee, for their unfailing cooperation and assistance, as we have sought to serve the educational needs of this country. Particular thanks are also due to Senate and House legislative counsel and counsel of the committees for excellent work produced under great pressure of time.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall be very brief.

First, I acknowledge with deepest gratitude and greatest friendship the very fine things said about the minority by the Senator from Oregon. He, of course, omitted to add that without a manager there would be no bill and no opportunity for the minority to make its contribution.

He has handled this measure in the most exemplary style. Wayne Morse is, on occasion, a maverick, and sometimes may needle many of us here with the positions he takes. However, when charged with the management of a bill, there is not a man in the Senate who has greater skill and greater capability for serving and responding to the feelings of the majority of Senators, in trying to put together a measure which will merit and receive their support, and in piloting it through the Scylla and Charybdis of conferences, the give and take of the representatives of the two Houses, the attitude of the time, and all the other perils. I think the country is indeed fortunate to have a Senator who can personify in a single individual a lone voice, if need be, willing to stand alone on the most unpopular issues, and on other occasions the very model of what it means to be a Senate leader, with the real ability to put a measure through.

I congratulate the Senator. I feel certain that the American people really appreciate his efforts.

Mr. MORSE. I am just human enough never to grow tired of such fine statements; I only wish I deserved them.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, we of the minority are most gratified that we were able to make contributions to this bill—and they are made by every member of the minority, as the Senator from Oregon has so generously said.

I wish particularly to invite attention to the contribution made by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty]—due to illness he was unable to join us in the conference—on the matter of adding industrial arts to title III of the National Defense Education Act which is so important to the country. It is highly important that we provide effective training in this field. We are coming more and more to the stage where the industrial arts will need to be operated by college graduates. It is estimated that as many as 25 percent, or double the present number of operatives in industry within the United States during the next decade, will have to be professionally trained. This will present great problems to our colleges.

Senator Prouty's ideas, which will take effect next year, beginning in fiscal year 1968, will be of immeasurable help in assisting the country to meet that responsibility.

I take great pleasure myself in the approval by the conference of the provision for loan cancellations for teachers of handicapped children which I sponsored and in which Senator Prouty joined. In this field there is a tremendous shortage of teachers; 300,000 teachers a year will be needed, yet only 12,500 a year are being graduated. This is a most humanitarian, constructive work, and we must encourage our young boys and girls to enter upon it.

I also take great pleasure in the advancement and progress made by junior colleges, again with the tremendous help of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse]. We are gradually beginning to step up our participation in junior colleges with a 23-percent contribution for next year and 24 percent the following year as contrasted with 22 percent of available funds this year.

This program, too, is extremely important, because almost everyone in the country in the years ahead will need a college education of some kind in order to hold his own in economic competition. So the 2-year junior and community college is extremely important to enable America to meet the challenge of providing higher education for all our children, no matter what their economic status. The Senator from California [Mr. Murphy] joined me in sponsoring this provision.

I really believe that a most constructive bill has been fashioned under the generalship of Senator Morse, and that each of us who had the privilege to contribute to it has every reason for gratification at this stage of the proceedings.

I join the Senator from Oregon in urging the Senate to approve the conference report.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, my only regret about the conference report on the higher education bill is that we were unable to provide more adequate funds for American higher education. The need is so great and we are still not meeting it as we should. Education is the most valuable investment we can make. It is because of education more than anything else that America is the strongest nation in the world and has the highest standard of living. But great credit that the bill is as good as it is is due the ability and determination of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, Wayne Morse. His brand is on every education bill of the last 6 years.

Now we are making a great effort to spread the blessings of education to more of our citizens. Our goal is to enable each American to advance as far in the educational process as he has the ability and desire to go. This is one of the most important of American freedoms—the freedom to receive an education commensurate with one's abilities and desires, regardless of the size of a parent's pocketbook.

In view of current budgetary problems, however, I believe that this is a realistic bill, and about the best we can hope for at the present time. The conference bill authorizes $475 million for the construction of undergraduate facilities in fiscal year 1967, $728 million in 1968, and $936 million in 1969. The percentage going to junior colleges was increased, in recognition of their explosive growth—a 100-percent enrollment increase in 5 years—from the present 22 percent to 23 percent in 1968 and to 24 percent in 1969. The junior or community college is a uniquely American invention, and it is doing a wonderful job in allowing young people to continue their educations who otherwise would have to stop with high school if they had to undergo the expense of going off to a 4-year institution in another town.

The total authorization for fiscal year 1967 is $955 million. For 1968 it is $1,608 million. This money will go for the undergraduate construction grants already mentioned, graduate construction grants, undergraduate facilities loans, grants to developing institutions, and NDEA student loans.

Texas badly needs these funds. My State is 35th in the Nation in per capita expenditures for institutions of higher education. This bill authorizes $25,066,222 in grants for construction of undergraduate facilities in Texas colleges and junior colleges during fiscal year 1967. $10,439,746 is authorized for National Defense Education Act loans to students. Additional amounts are authorized for graduate facilities construction grants and for construction loans.

Recently proposals have been made in my State to increase tuitions in our State colleges and universities. I am strongly opposed to such proposals, because that is the wrong way to increase educational expenditures. Education benefits everybody, and the State has the duty of providing our boys and girls an education. The State government should improve Texas higher education. Increasing tuitions places the whole burden of the increase on those who, by and large, can afford it least—the students, especially those from moderate- and low-income families, which include over 90 percent of the students. Our immediate goal should be to provide a free public education through the junior college level as they do now in California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Stennis in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

FOOD FOR PEACE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14929) to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the report adopted by the conferees of the House and Senate on Public Law 480 is essentially the same as the bill passed by the Senate.

Senators may remember that the Senate bill differed from the House bill on 38 major points. Of these the Senate conferees were able to retain a total of 34 of the amendments that we made to the House bill.

In essence the report before the Senate today provides for:

First. A 2-year extension of Public Law 480;

Second. An authorization of $1.9 billion per year for foreign currency and dollar credit sales;

Third. Six hundred million dollars per year for donations of agricultural commodities;

Fourth. Emphasis on self-help;

Fifth. Dollar credit sales on 20-year terms with a 2-year grace period;

Sixth. Foreign currencies received under future agreements to be convertible to the extent of American tourist expenses, or 25 percent of the currencies so received, whichever is less:

Seventh. A realistic exchange rate;

Eighth. Retention of the existing requirement that dollar credit sales not replace cash sales;

Ninth. Dollar credit sales agreements to specify the economic development to which the sales proceeds will be devoted;

Tenth. The establishment and expansion of institutions for adaptive agricultural research among the self-help criteria of section 109;

Eleventh. Requiring that title I agreements show that the recipient country is engaging in a self-help program, and providing for termination of the agreement if such program is not carried out;

Twelfth. An expression of the sense of the Congress that the assistance of other countries should be sought;

Thirteenth. A prohibition against the disposition of any commodity under the act if such disposition would result in a shortage;

Fourteenth. Fourteen additional members to the Advisory Committees as follows: the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the second ranking majority and minority members of the House Committee on Agriculture, the second ranking majority and minority members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the top two majority and top two minority members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and the top two majority and minority members of the Senate Foreign Relations Commitee;

Fifteenth. An annual Presidential report to be made not later than April 1;

Sixteenth. Publicizing the concessional nature of title I sales; and

Seventeenth. Restrictions against sales under title I to other than friendly nations as defined in section 103(d).

With regard to North Vietnam and Cuba, the conferees agreed on the following language:

> (3) for the purpose only of sales of agricultural commodities under title I of this Act, any nation which sells or furnishes or permits ships or aircraft under its registry to transport to or from Cuba or North Vietnam (excluding United States installations in Cuba) any equipment, materials, or commodities so long as they are governed by a Communist regime: *Provided*, That with respect to furnishing, selling, or selling and transporting to Cuba medical supplies, nonstrategic raw materials for agriculture, and non-strategic agricultural or food commodities, sales agreements may be entered into if the President finds with respect to each such country, and so informs the Senate and the House of representatives of the reasons therefor, that the making of each such agreement would be in the national interest of the United States and all such findings and reasons therefor shall be published in the Federal Register.

The language agreed upon by the conferees will permit, if it is determined to be in the national interest, sales agreements with countries who send to Cuba only such items as medical supplies, nonstrategic raw materials for agriculture, and nonstrategic food and agricultural commodities. The term "agricultural commodities" is intended to cover jute as well as other products produced from agricultural commodities.

The Senate bill also contained a maintenance-of-value clause which was proposed by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and adopted by the Senate. The language proposed by the Senator from Illinois has been omitted from the conference substitute, but we believe that the objective he sought is preserved. The substitute provides for progressive transition either to credit sales for dollars or to credit sales for foreign currencies with full maintenance of value and the right to convert to dollars. In some ways this goes beyond the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, since it provides not only for maintenance of value, but for convertibility as well. We will not merely receive more foreign currencies, but what is more important, we will be able to convert them to dollars and bring them home. The transition should begin immediately and should be completed in 5 years.

I feel sure that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] will be glad to know that the Senate provision which specified the Secretary of Agriculture as the official to designate the countries with which agreements could be signed has been omitted from the conference substitute. The House insisted that the President be given this authority and the Senate conferees receded from the Senate position.

Mr. President, when the extension of Public Law 480 was before the Senate for approval it was made abundantly clear that under its provisions the administration was expected to pursue a course that would lead to a complete transfer from foreign currency sales to credit sales for dollars during the next 5 years if that were at all possible. To the extent that such transition was not possible, transition was to be made to sales for foreign currencies on terms permitting conversion to dollars and providing the same dollar return to the United States as is required of loans under section 201 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. In order to provide for this transition, the administration had recommended a softening of the dollar credit sales terms. But the Senate provided for accomplishment of this transition without changing the dollar credit sale terms or diminishing the significance of "dollar credit sales" as "hard" sales.

In other words the Senate maintained the existing requirements for dollar credit sales. Under these requirements payment on dollar credit sales must be made in not more than 20 years, with not more than 2-year deferral of the date for beginning annual payment. These are the terms applicable to agreements totaling $808 million signed under existing law. This program has worked well and it is helping our balance-of-payments position.

On the other hand, the House had adopted the administration proposal and provided for dollar credit sales on the terms provided by section 201 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. Payment may be made under that section over a period of 40 years with a 10-year grace period—or even longer if the President sees fit. The Senate and House Conferees agreed that it would be a mockery to provide for terms of 40 years, with no principal payments for 10 years, and call such sales "dollar credit sales." Such terms are so much softer than those we now know as dollar credit sales, that they would completely change the meaning and significance of "dollar credit sales." In retaining the 20-year repayment and 2-year grace limits of existing law it is our intention to spotlight the success, or lack of success, of the transition to dollar sales. The achievement of transition to these dollar credit terms should be our objective. However, like the Senate, the conferees realized that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to have a complete transition to dollar credit terms for all countries purchasing commodities under Public Law 480.

Therefore, the conferees adopted the Senate provision permitting sales for foreign currencies convertible to dollars on terms as favorable to the United States as those provided by section 201 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended. The conferees modified it, however, to permit these convertible foreign currency sales to be made on credit terms, instead of requiring them to be made on a cash basis with the proceeds immediately being loaned to the purchasing country. This change was intended as a change in form only, to eliminate unnecessary procedures.

During the period allowed for repayment, amounts already received by the purchasing country from the resale of the commodities would be required to be devoted to economic development or other purposes designed to carry out the objectives of the act.

OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

In essence, the conference report provides for three types of sales: first, foreign currency sales as we now know them; second, foreign currency sales on credit terms convertible to dollars; and, third, dollar credit sales with payment in not more than 20 years with not to exceed a 2-year grace period.

As chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, it is my intention to follow very closely each agreement that is signed under this bill with each country in order to see how quickly and completely the administration accomplishes the objectives of moving from nonconvertible soft currency sales to dollar credit sales.

We no longer have huge surpluses of food commodities. Everything that moves under Public Law 480, with the exception of cotton, must be produced specifically for that purpose. Therefore, our negotiators must take these facts into consideration when dealing with nations.

Finally, Mr. President, I wish to point out that section 401 of this report requires that "no commodity shall be available for disposition under this act if such disposition would reduce the domestic supply of such commodity below that needed to meet domestic requirements, adequate carryover, and anticipated exports for dollars as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture at the time of exportation of such commodity."

In other words, this act not only fully protects and assures a supply of food and fiber for domestic use, but it also protects our dollar markets, and assures an adequate carryover.

In my opinion, and I am sure in the opinion of the other conferees who signed it, the report before the Senate today provides for a highly desirable and realistic program under which this country can still provide our foreign friends with needed food and fiber, and at the same time protect our farmers and this country against injury.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I just wish to commend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for bringing us this conference report today on a piece of important legislation, as far as agriculture is concerned.

I was pleased to hear the Senator state that the conference report contains practically the language that was approved in the Senate, which I thought was a great step forward, when it comes to dealing in international trade, particularly under food-for-peace programs, which are largely the results of sale, or have been, for foreign currencies. I think that a great step has been made in that area, and the chairman is entitled to much credit.

The legislation that is being considered by the Senate at this time is of great importance to the agricultural sections of this Nation, as it will determine largely the amount of commodities we will be able to export; and, with the chairman, I sincerely hope that we may export as much as possible of our agricultural products for dollars.

It is true that in the past few years, with large surpluses, we have not been able to dispose particularly of large quantities of wheat for foreign currencies. I certainly have not objected to it, and I do not object now. But it is encouraging to hope, at least, that we can sell more for dollars in the future than we have in the past.

The amendments adopted this year provide a basis for a much more effective food-for-peace program than heretofore. In particular, the emphasis on self-help programs provides a real opportunity for encouraging the development of needed local food production in many countries and especially a more effective food distribution of both domestic and imported supplies.

The act, as I understand it, gives considerable freedom to administering agencies for carrying out these self-help programs, and it is on that basis that I hope that the people dealing with the trade negotiations in GATT will also observe the agreements that we have made and the legislation we have approved in the Senate, because I think it is important as we are dealing with the Kennedy round in Geneva at the present time.

After seeing the results of many previous overseas programs of this kind, I am somewhat concerned if the Congress has given too much general authority so that it will not be long until we see a number of projects being approved or encouraged that will prove harmful and restrictive to world trade because they are not economically sound for the country and will require special protection.

As one interested in the present GATT trade negotiations, I am very conscious of this problem and I sincerely hope that this new program will not encourage additional restrictions to international trade in food commodities. To do anything that will encourage more restrictions, especially at the very time we are trying to negotiate to reduce existing restrictions, just does not make sense to me and I am sure that most of my colleagues will agree. Should such a development start to occur, I plan to submit amendments to this act later that will be directed to deal with this kind of problem.

One matter that greatly concerns me about the Kennedy round and the trade agreements in GATT, which are now being considered in Geneva and must be acted on before July 1, 1967—unless Congress acts again—is that they keep in mind the problems of agriculture in writing these agreements.

I have attended one or two of these conferences, and I do not think that we have difficulty in dealing with industrial products; but there is great concern on my part in regard to taking care of agriculture as I believe it properly should be done.

Meanwhile, I believe that it will be very useful for those agencies and officials concerned with administering this program to have made available to them a statement on "U.S. Food for Export, Aid and Development" submitted by the Millers' National Federation to the New York public hearing of the National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber.

I quote the following paragraph from the statement:

> With respect to basic food products such as wheat foods, one of the most constructive results that might be achieved from this program would be the encouragement in every participating country of an open and non-discriminatory trading system for such foods to reach the masses of the people of the country at as low a cost as possible. It is largely trade restrictions and protection that make bread a luxury in so many countries, and "Food for Freedom" could be achieved in fact as well as in name if this Act were administered to reduce barriers to basic foods.

If this thought is kept in mind and becomes something of a guideline for considering self-help projects, this 1966 Food for Peace Act will indeed become a historic one.

Again, I wish to say that I commend the chairman for his splendid work in this field.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair). The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Louisiana, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. ELLENDER] for the excellent work which he did in getting this program through and passed in a workable way. This bill means a great deal to people in the area from which I come, as it does to the people in the Kansas area, the two principal wheat producing areas. There are involved over 800 million bushels a year of exports of wheat. About two-thirds of all our wheat exports are under this Public Law 480 program.

When the Secretary of Agriculture contemplated announcing a second increase in wheat acreage, I told him he should wait to see what happened to the extension of Public Law 480; if they had severe restriction on the exports of wheat, this additional acreage would mean that we would pile up a surplus of wheat again and have low prices.

Mr. President, this is a most important piece of legislation that Congress has passed affecting the future of the wheat producers.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad to hear my good friend's remarks. As he will recall, we had quite a battle, as I pointed out a while ago. There were 38 points of difference, and we carried 34 of those 38 points, which I thought was very good. I think the bill, as it will become law, is a great improvement on the present law.

As the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] pointed out, we have specific language in the bill to get the recipient countries to produce their own products instead of our having to furnish them. That is why I said I am very anxious to follow through with these agreements to see that the recipient countries do their best to produce their own wheat and not lean on the shoulder of this country, as they have in the past.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, Senator Cooper has been deeply interested in this program, since the original enactment of Public Law 480, which he cosponsored in 1954, and has worked, spoken, and voted for its extensions. He has faithfully followed the progress of the food-for-freedom proposal this year, and participated fully in the development by the committee of the measure adopted by the Senate on August 31—and which after conference with the House is maintained in this final bill.

The knowledge and experience in this field of the Senator from Kentucky has been helpful to all of us on the committee, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement by Senator Cooper be included at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of Senator John Sherman Cooper

I am very glad, as I know all of us are, that the Food for Peace Act of 1966, adopted by the Senate by a vote of 74 to 2 on August 31, will be enacted by the Congress before it adjourns. The differences between the Senate and House bills have been resolved in conference, principally along the lines of the bill recommended by the Senate Committee on Agriculture, on which I serve. In this way, Public Law 480, which I cosponsored twelve years ago, will be extended for at least two years—and with new emphasis and purpose.

I take this opportunity to recognize especially the thorough and painstaking work of the Chairman of our Committee (Mr. Ellender) as well as of the ranking minority members Senators Aiken and Young, in developing a bill which will open up new markets abroad for American farm products, which will encourage self-help by the developing nations, and which has won the overwhelming approval of members of Congress. During our hearings, I recall also the effective testimony of the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman, and of officials of the Department of State and the Agency for International Development, who will share the responsibility for the operation of this program.

I think it fair to say that the Food for Peace Act of 1966 is perhaps the most important legislation to come before the Agriculture Committees this year. It is designed to enable farmers to produce food and products to (1) meet domestic and dollar export needs, (2) provide this nation a reserve against emergencies, (3) help the developing countries meet their food needs while building up their own agriculture, and (4) open up new markets abroad for American farm products.

The Food for Peace Act—originally proposed by the President as the "Food for Freedom" bill—makes three fundamental changes of emphasis in its extension of PL 480. First, it authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to take into account world food needs, and allows farmers to produce for this purpose, so that the program will no longer be wholly dependent on surplus stocks.

Second, it requires that recipient countries take definite steps to develop their agriculture—so that they can effectively work toward the goal of providing adequate food for their growing populations. It is a fact that this country no longer has the vast agricultural surpluses it had in 1954 and, by 1980, a world population exceeding three billion will be demanding about 800 million tons of food grains—or 300 million tons more than is currently consumed. And it is reported that the world could experience a food crisis by 1985.

Third, it is the purpose of this bill to move away from sales of agricultural commodities for foreign currencies—and to shift within a period of five years, so far as that is possible, to dollar credit sales. The bill authorizes terms of up to 20 years, not unlike the terms of loans extended by AID under the Foreign Assistance Act, and following the pattern of dollar credit sales which have already proved desirable and successful under the existing PL 480 program.

This program is related and complementary to our other programs of assistance, and I do point out that I have supported these efforts, and this year again support the Foreign Aid Appropriation Act, just as I support this Food for Peace bill.

I have confidence that our American farmers, who responded to their country's call during the Korean war and the two world wars to step up their production—and who later accepted voluntary production controls to bring supplies into balance with demand—will again make the adjustment to higher production. And at this point, I would like to say that Congressional actions this year on an extension of PL 480 with more specific goals is timely—for the General Advisory Committee on Foreign Assistance Programs, set up by the President along the lines of my resolution, has been studying our aid programs on a country-by-country basis for about a year and a half.

When the Food for Peace Act was before the Senate earlier, an amendment was offered to prohibit the donation or sale of alcoholic beverages and tobacco. In the debate, I pointed out that alcoholic beverages had never been included, and there had been no donation of tobacco or tobacco products—and none was intended. The Senate adopted instead my own amendment, by a vote of 60 to 15, making clear the intention and providing the authority to continue our tobacco exports sales program. The Senate-House conference adopted this Senate provision, confirming the intention of the Congress that this program be continued.

The larger purpose of the bill is to share the abundance of American agriculture, and the productivity of American farmers, with those who do not now have the capacity to produce enough food, to expand our agricultural markets abroad through dollar credit sales, and to provide the authority to meet hunger, starvation and famine where these unhappy events occur.

It is a worthy purpose, and a good bill. I was glad to work for its development, and I am happy to support today its final enactment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the conference report was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the October issue of the American Banker carries a splendid editorial entitled "Out of the Thicket." The editorial points out the value of the Financial Institutions Supervisory Act of 1966, and it also puts special emphasis on the role played by our colleague, Senator A. Willis Robertson, in the formulation and passage of this important congressional act.

The editorial is of special value in its analysis of the act, and is so accurate in the evaluation of the services of Senator Robertson to the Senate and to the Nation. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Out of the Thicket

The Financial Institutions Supervisory Act of 1966 finally has been pushed through the Congressional thicket, and is on its way to the President for signature. The original package, which has come to be known as the cease-and-desist bill, has been bent, pounded, slashed and patched in the process—but it comes out remarkably close to what most of the banking industry believed was needed. The compromises which were necessary to achieve passage did no serious damage—and indeed, in some cases, now are considered to have made the final result more effective than the original proposal might have been.

Specifically, one compromise reached in the joint House-Senate conference on the bill may turn out to be quite useful. This is the agreement to set a time limit, of almost six years, on the cease-and-desist powers it gives to the regulatory agencies.

The agencies want these powers, which refine the means at their disposal of discipline over financial institutions. In simplest form, these powers give the agencies the authority to tell a financial institution to stop doing certain things, or to throw out certain people, without having to go the extreme of closing the whole place down.

This refinement opens up whole new areas of disciplinary responsibility to the agencies; and while there is a widespread belief that this will be a good thing, there is room for reasonable doubt as to just how useful it will be. Therefore, the action of the Congress in setting a termination date for these powers makes sense. One high regulatory official expressed complete satisfaction with this decision. "If the new powers are any good at all, we can prove their value in that time," he said. "The time limit should encourage us to do so."

For obviously if the new tool is not used and just rusts, it will be much better to have the time limit, which will junk it automatically, than for the industry to have to take the initiative at some future date to get it dropped, or to tolerate its existence passively.

The deadline serves notice on the regulatory agencies to use their new powers well—but above all to use them.

Another important aspect of the new legislation is the nature and intensity of the debate among bankers which surrounded it almost from the beginning. It was an issue which came very close to creating a serious division among bankers. The American Bankers Association, after vigorous debate, endorsed the original proposition, but resisted strongly, albeit vainly, the effort to increase the insurance limit on deposits in banks and savings and loan associations. A number of state associations broke with the ABA on the need for cease-and-desist powers, as did the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks and the Independent Bankers Association of America; they regarded the whole proposition as a further encroachment of Federal power into state affairs.

OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Much of the opposition died down in the course of the long legislative process, however, as positions were clarified and compromises made. By the time the bill was enacted in final form, the banking industry consensus seemed to be much stronger than it was at the start. Considering the high emotional content of some of the early debate on the issue, that is no mean accomplishment, and attests to the essential reasonableness of most of the participants.

No review of the cease and desist bill would be complete without special emphasis upon the role played by Sen. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, D., Va., chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, in the crucial House-Senate conference. There the Senate view, that the new regulatory powers be made permanent, came into conflict with the House view, that they should expire after 20 months. Sen. ROBERTSON led the fight for the Senate view, and effected a meaningful compromise that the new powers should remain in effect for almost six years—long enough for a thorough test of their value.

He fought with all the skill and courage which have characterized his 35 years in Congress—15 in the House, and 20 in the Senate. It was his last legislative battle. He lost in his primary bid for renomination last month, and so is serving out his term as a lame duck.

Banking should have ducks lame like this!

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as our friend, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] completes his term in the U.S. Senate, I know that the Senate is losing one of its most valuable and highly esteemed Members. I know that I am losing from this membership a very dear friend, but I certainly am not losing his friendship.

Mr. President, as long as character, honor, integrity, trust, confidence, and loyalty remain cardinal virtues in the minds and hearts of the people of our Nation, and as long as these virtues remain the guiding principles in the operation of our Government, just that long will the influence of the efforts and achievements of our esteemed friend from Virginia live and influence the course of our Government. In a striking and highly effective way he has personified and helped build these principles into the very fabric of legislation and other policies of our Government. His name will be honored, respected, and esteemed as long as these virtues live.

It is true of WILLIS ROBERTSON, as it was true of a great teacher whose graduating class paid him this compliment: "You will be a part of us and our offspring forever." So will his public service be a part of our Nation forever.

RULE XXII

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, when the civil rights bill of 1966 was dropped I said that I would put in the RECORD an analysis of what the Vice President should think about in the recess as to what his ruling should be in order to enable the Senate at long last, as the Constitution provides, to deal with the amendment of rule XXII in the opening of the next Congress.

Mr. President, the fulcrum of the matter is this: If the Vice President rules that the majority of the Senate has a right, free of rule XXII, to close debate because it is the beginning of a new Congress, and because the Constitution so provides, then an appeal from his ruling is nondebatable and the Senate can work its will. But if—as did then Vice President Lyndon Johnson, did—he refers that question to the Senate, it is debatable, and you double back on yourself and you are in the same kind of filibuster that can only be closed off—nobody knows how—but supposedly by rule XXII. That is the essence of the question.

This memorandum marshals all the precedents, and makes a strong argument that the Vice President should, as Vice President Nixon indicated in his advisory opinon when he was Vice President, that the Vice President should rule and let the Senate exercise its will on a nondebatable appeal, and that is the way to settle this historic question.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the memorandum.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Rule XXII of the Senate permits limitation of debate only upon the vote of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting, two days after a petition for cloture has been filed by sixteen Senators. Thereafter, debate is limited to one hour for each Senator on the bill itself and on all motions and amendments affecting it.

Between the adoption of Rule XXII in 1917 and the present time, the Senate has voted 34 times on the question of cloture. Six of these efforts have been successful, but in the remainder of the cases, a one-third minority of the Senate was able to kill measures which they opposed, by filibuster.

A major obstacle to Senators seeking to change Rule XXII has been the question of whether the Senate was a continuing body whose rules carried over from one Congress to the next, or whether it could adopt new rules pursuant to Article I, Section 5 of the U.S. Constitution by majority vote at the beginning of each new Congress; the essence of the problem is whether Rule XXII applies at such a time during a debate on a change in the rules. Those seeking to change Rule XXII contend that the Senate, at the beginning of each new session should be able to amend its rules, and close debate during a debate on amending the rules by a majority vote under generally accepted parliamentary rules of order.

The key to the effort for those working to change Rule XXII is a favorable ruling from the Vice-President, who is the presiding officer of the Senate, that each new session of the Senate may adopt rules changes by majority vote at the beginning of the session and may close debate on a motion for "the previous question" which can be made by any member recognized, also by majority vote.

In 1957, Vice-President Nixon rendered an advisory opinion that the Senate could adopt new rules "under whatever procedures the majority of the Senate approves" and could not be bound by any "existing" Senate Rule "which denies the membership of the Senate the power to exercise its constitutional right to make its own rules".

Vice-President Nixon said that this was a personal opinion, and that the question of constitutionality could only be decided by the Senate itself. The question was referred to the Senate Rules and Administration Committee, but no action was taken that year. The question was also raised unsuccessfully in 1959, 1961 and 1963 by Senate liberals.

During the 1963 session, Senator CLINTON ANDERSON offered a motion which, in effect, called upon Vice-President Lyndon Johnson to rule that the Senate could change its rules at the beginning of each new session. Vice-President Johnson refused to make such a ruling and instead, submitted the question to the whole Senate, where it was of course subject to unlimited debate all over again thus precipitating a filibuster and ending all hope of rules change that year. For while an appeal from the ruling of the chair is not in effect debatable (because a motion to force can be made by any Senator) a refusal to rule and a submission to the Senate continues the filibuster.

In 1965, at the beginning of the 89th Congress, two separate resolutions to amend Rule XXII were introduced—one of which would have required a majority vote for cloture after a specified period of debate, and the other a three-fifths vote. Both resolutions were referred to the Rules Committee with instructions to report them back to the Senate no later than March 9. At that time, they were reported and placed on the calendar, but no motion has been made to call them up for Senate consideration.

When the 90th Congress convenes in January a renewed effort will be made to amend Rule XXII and speaking as one Senator who has always worked for the change, I urge the Vice-President carefully to study the precedents and the situation so as to be prepared to rule on the question. The Vice-President can end the impasse if he so rules and gives the majority of the Senate a chance to work its will, as the Constitution contemplates. The Vice-President would have to rule that each new Congress has the power to adopt its own rules by majority vote at the beginning of each session to effect this result. An appeal would lie to the Senate which would be taken by any Senator but such an appeal is not debatable and could be decided by a majority vote and if the chair was sustained the issue could then and there be decided.

Rule XXII has, in this session alone, killed efforts to Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, postponed indefinitely vitally needed civil rights legislation and ended hope for home rule in the District of Columbia. In each case, a majority of the Senate favored action but was unable to obtain cloture of debate. The historic opportunity to end an extra constitutional power over legislation by a minority of the Senate—a kind of extra constitutional veto—is at hand, it will represent a major development in United States history if the Vice-President can act on it.

HEROISM OF NEW YORK FIREMEN

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate, and I believe it is worthy of the attention of the Senate, the heroism of 12 New York firemen.

This morning, in New York City, funeral services are being held for 12 firemen who died in the line of duty early Tuesday morning. A five-alarm fire on East 23d Street in Manhattan was the scene of the worst tragedy in the history of the New York City Fire Department. Off-duty firemen and volunteers by the hundreds had rushed to the scene when the involved building collapsed, and a desperate attempt was made to find and free the trapped men. Tragically, these efforts were unsuccessful and today the entire city mourns.

So often, Mr. President, we fail to commemorate the extraordinary heroism of such men who, routinely, risk life and limb to protect the public. A disaster of this scale, however, calls to mind our enormous debt to these brave men.

As their Senator, and as an individual, I express my deepest sympathy to the families of these firemen—12 widows, one of whom is also the daughter of a fireman killed in the line of duty, and 32 children. I ask unanimous consent that a New York Times article concerning the tragedy, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWELVE DEAD: THE DEPARTMENT'S WORST FIRE—"ABSOLUTE NIGHTMARE," MAYOR SAYS

(By Robert Alden)

The crushed and charred bodies of 12 firemen were removed yesterday from a burned-out commercial building on 23d Street just east of Broadway after the worst Fire Department disaster in its 101-year history.

The men were killed when the floor of a drugstore collapsed beneath them late Monday night while they were fighting a stubborn five-alarm fire that destroyed three buildings in the Madison Square area.

Parallel investigations were immediately begun in the early morning hours of yesterday to determine the cause of the tragedy and whether criminal negligence was involved.

Over the roar of pumpers still pouring tons of water on the burning building in the first light of dawn. Fire Commissioner Robert O. Lowery, said as he wiped tears from his eyes:

"I don't understand it. These men were under the command of experienced officers who died with them. Either that floor was terribly weak, or the fire had been burning under it treacherously for some time.

"In my 25 years in the department, I've never felt worse."

The tragedy was heightened by the fact that the dead firemen left 12 widows and 32 children.

Mayor Lindsay, who had spent most of the night at the fire, returned to Gracie Mansion for two hours' sleep and then came back to the scene twice during the day. He ordered all flags in the city to half staff in memory of the dead men.

"It's a horror, and absolute nightmare," the Mayor said. "It is a terrible, terrible tragedy."

The Mayor stared at the building under which the men were buried. He wore a light mackinaw raincoat and had just put on big black firemen's redtipped boats.

Three hundred or more off-duty firemen stood grimly on the street outside the burned out buildings. They had come to offer their help to retrieve the bodies from under the debris and some risked their lives to get the men out.

As each body was carried to the street in the stretcher baskets of the Fire Department, the firemen silently doffed their helmets.

MEN PRAY IN PARK

After the 12th body was removed shortly after 2 P.M., Chief of Department John T. O'Hagen ordered all of the men to Madison Square Park across the street from the Wonder Drug & Cosmetics Store, where the men had perished. He doffed his white helmet and told the men:

"This was the saddest day in the 100-year history of the Fire Department. I know we all died a little."

He asked the men to join him "in a moment of silent prayer for the repose of their souls".

By this time the neighboring Metropolitan Life Insurance Building towering over Madison Square Park on its eastern edge had already lowered its flag to half staff.

Although almost all officials concerned, from the Mayor to Fire Commissioner Lowery to Buildings Commissioner Charles G. Moerdler, were guarded in their comments, it was clear from what they said that something had gone terribly wrong.

Mr. Moerdler made the point that the building in which the men perished, at 6 East 23d Street, was at least 75 years old and "perhaps 100 years old."

Firemen who were familiar with the building pointed out that until recently there was a cafeteria with a tiled floor on the site of the Wonder Drug store and two adjoining stores—Barton's Candy Store and Fan's, a women's dress shop.

"It's an old building and all that renovation may well have weakened the floor dangerously," Commissioner Lowery said.

"We know that there was once a dance hall in one of the buildings also. Those buildings have been altered many times and that may well be what caused the disaster. But we won't know until we investigate, and we don't want to speculate on the matter now."

MAY HAVE BEEN GAS BLAST

Commissioner Lowery said also there were reports from inside the building just before the collapse of the floor that there was the smell of illuminating gas.

"It could have been a gas explosion," he said.

The fire was discovered at about 9:30 P.M. on Monday by Mr. and Mrs. Herbert L. Brown, who, with their four children, were the only residents of any of the three buildings there at the time. The Browns live on the top floor of a four-story brownstone at 7 East 22d Street.

The rear and side walls of this brownstone abut on the three-story white brick commercial building to its west, 940–948 Broadway and the five-story brown-brick building to its north at 6 East 23d Street—the building in which the firemen perished.

On its second and third floors the brownstone has connecting doorways with these adjoining buildings.

The Browns—particularly Mrs. Brown—have long been fearful of fire, and Mrs. Brown had occasionally complained to her husband that she thought she smelled gas or smoke in the building.

Monday night Mrs. Brown told her husband that she "smelled something strange." Her husband went outside to check and found smoke coming from the roof of the three-story building to the west.

Mr. Brown returned to his apartment and quickly he and his wife dressed their children—a 6-year-old, 5-year-old twins and an infant of 21 months. Mrs. Brown called the Fire Department.

GROPE WAY DOWN STAIRS

Before the Browns and their children could leave their apartment, now rapidly filing with smoke, the lights failed, and they groped down the stairway by flashlight and into 22d Street.

There was no chance for Mr. Brown, an artist, to save "1,000 paintings—my life's work," which remained in the apartment.

By this time the first fire companies were responding to the alarm on East 22d Street.

There are lamp and lampshade companies on the lower floors of the brownstone.

The fire officials, after their first investigation, believed and still believe that the fire originated in the basement of the brownstone at 7 East 22d Street where, they said, lamp shade fabrics and plastic were stored.

The first firemen entered the cellar of the brownstone, stretching two lines to fight the blaze.

Although upper floors of the brownstone are connected with the commercial building at 6 West 23d Street, at the cellar level a firewall separates the two buildings. Nevertheless, firemen responding to the alarm said it was apparent at once that the fire was spreading through the wall to the building to the north and to the building to the west.

More equipment and men were needed and a second alarm was sounded.

Four fire companies responded—Engine No. 5, Ladder No. 2, Engine No. 17 and Ladder No. 7.

All went to the five-story building fronting on 23d Street to attack the fire from the rear.

TWO COMPANIES ENTER CELLAR

Crews of Engine No. 5 and Ladder No. 2—about a half dozen men each—entered the cellar of Wonder Drug & Cosmetics. Men from Engine No. 18 and Ladder No. 7 went to the main floor of the drugstore.

A ladder company's job in such a situation is to chop holes in the wall to give access to the fire. An engine company brings lines into the building to play water on the fire.

The men started to do their jobs on both the first and cellar floors. But it was soon apparent to the crews of Engine No. 5 and Ladder No. 2 that the cellar was becoming an inferno, filled with fire and smoke.

"Get out, get out," was the general shout and the two companies rushed out of the cellar and onto 23d Street.

On the main floor of the drugstore, however, there was but little smoke and the evidence of fire was confined to hot spots, evidence of burning through, that had just begun to appear on the floor.

Directing the men on this floor were experienced fire officers, Deputy Chief Thomas Reilly of the Third Division and Battalion Chief Walter J. Higgins of the Seventh Battalion, as well as the two lieutenants in charge of the two companies.

The two companies began to hack away at the walls and two hose lines were brought into the ground floor of the drugstore.

Reports are confused, but, apparently the shouts of "Get out, get out," by the men below as they clambered out of the cellar and onto the street were heard by the men on main floor.

All at once, with a thundering crash, a 20 by 5-foot section of floor gave way. There was a burst of flame that rolled along the ceiling of the drugstore and flared out into the street.

TEN PLUNGED TO DEATH

Ten men, who were by this time at the rear of the drugstore attacking the wall that abutted on the brownstone to the south, were pitched to their death in the inferno below. Two others, trapped by the burst of flame caused by the collapse of the floor, were burned to death on the main floor of the drugstore.

One man of Engine Company 18, Manuel Fernandez had been busy connecting the hoses on the street to his pumper. When he heard the explosion and saw the burst of flame, Mr. Fernandez rushed to the door of the store.

"I went over and shouted inside, 'Eighteen! Eighteen!' But there was nobody to answer me."

The only other member of Engine No. 18 who had responded to the alarm who survived the collapse was Fireman John Donovan. He had been checking violations of parking near fire hydrants and when he heard the alarm he drove in his own car to the fire.

Arriving late, he stepped into the store just as the collapse occurred. He was plunged into the fire below, but managed to keep from falling completely by grasping the nozzle of his hose line "by three fingers."

A fireman from another company grabbed him and hauled him to safety.

Those firemen who had responded to the first alarm and who were fighting the fire in the cellar of the brownstone at 7 East 22d Street, were, a fire official said, "knocked about like ten pins" as the air shock of the collapse broke down the firewall separating the buildings.

In all, 17 were injured and 10 taken to Bellevue for treatment. Last night none were reported to be in serious condition.

VERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Because some of the firemen thought that they had smelled illuminating gas before the collapse and because the collapse caused an acceleration of the fire, many of the firemen, including for a time Commissioner Lowery, said through most of yesterday that there might have been an explosion.

But by nightfall, Buildings Commissioner Moerdler said that there "definitely" was no evidence of an explosion and that the collapse of the floor had caused a blast of air and fire that "appeared to be but was not an explosion."

With the collapse of the floor, a third alarm was sounded. Flames now spread through all floors of 6 East 23d Street and 7 West 22d Street and broke into 940 Broadway.

There was no chance to save the men that were lost in the cellar as flames, feeding on dry timbers, broke through the roofs of the buildings and firemen on the scene were ordered back into the street—and only in time.

Floor after floor on all three buildings now began to crash down, until all three buildings were open from cellar to flame-lit sky.

TOWER IS RUSHED TO SCENE

Fourth and fifth alarms were sounded. The best fire equipment the department owns was rushed to the scene, including a new high powered fire tower capable of pouring tons of water on a blaze. In all there were 40 pieces of equipment, 200 men and a disaster unit from Bellevue Hospital, including eight doctors.

Mayor Lindsay arrived shortly before 1 A.M. and was told by Commissioner Lowery, choked with grief, that he thought that 12 of his men were gone. Donning fire gear, Mayor Lindsay entered the burning drugstore and came out shortly saying, "It's terrible in there—the heat and smoke are awful."

Through the night the fire raged, destroying almost everything but the walls of the three buildings.

Several times the firemen advanced and then retreated. By first light, however, the fire was largely confined. But Francis J. Love, assistant chief of department in immediate command of fighting the blaze, would not call the fire under control "until we get all our our men out of there."

One by one, and with the greatest difficulty because of the imminent danger of further structural collapses, the charred remains of the men were brought out of the building.

With them came burnt and broken helmets marked "Engine 18," "Ladder 7," "Deputy Chief" and "Battalion Chief." There were torn fire boots, ripped gas masks and burnt fire hose. One tall fireman, his face blackened with soot, cried as he put tags on the equipment of the dead men.

When Lieut. Joseph Priore's body was brought out, someone remarked that this was his first fire as a lieutenant.

"I just attended the party celebrating his promotion in Queens last Thursday," one fireman said.

When all the bodies save one had been brought out, someone whispered to Chief Love, "They all agree it's Rey who is still down there."

"Rey" was Probationary Fireman Daniel L. Rey. It was Fireman Rey's first fire.

With the light the Salvation Army and the Red Cross set up canteens to provide cake and coffee for the weary firemen and the hundreds of off-duty firemen who came to the scene. It is a department tradition that when men are trapped in a building volunteers come to the scene to offer their help.

But there was no help for the trapped men.

And at 11:45 A.M., the department's most dreaded signal "four fives"—the fire alarm signal sounding four times with five rings in each group—was sounded in the city's 300 firehouses. The signal was repeated three times. It means that flags in the firehouses are to be lowered to half staff because of the death of a fireman.

When "four fives" are sounded firemen immediately gather about the radios in their firehouses to get the official word of fresh tragedy. It soon came:

"The following members died of injuries sustained at a fifth-alarm fire at Box 598 on Oct. 17 at 9:36 P.M.:

"Deputy Chief Thomas Reilly, Third Division.

"Battalion Chief Walter J. Higgins, Seventh Battalion.

"Lieut. Joseph Priore, Engine 18.

"Lieut. John J. Finley, Ladder 7.

"Fireman John G. Berry, Ladder 7.

"Fireman Carl Lee, Ladder 7.

"Fireman William McCarron, aide to the Deputy Chief Third Division.

"Probationary Fireman Daniel L. Rey, Engine 18.

"Fireman Joseph Kelly, Engine 18.

"Fireman James Galanaugh, Engine 18.

"Fireman Bernard A. Tepper, Engine 18.

"Fireman Rudolph Kaminsky, Ladder 7."

THE DRIVE AGAINST ALCOHOLISM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John Gardner announced yesterday a major Federal departmental program of research, education, and professional training to combat alcoholism, the fourth major health menace affecting our country. We have recently passed a bill dealing with narcotic addicts, and we should have a similar alcoholism bill.

This announcement comes almost 8 months after the President first proposed the program in his health message, but better late than never. However, it raises this question—how far can the announced departmental program go toward achieving its objectives without authorizing legislation and without being effectively funded?

On January 25, 1966, together with five of my minority colleagues, I introduced the Alcoholism Control Act to establish a research and Federal grand-in-aid program for the treatment, rehabilitation, education, and prevention of alcoholism. Similar legislation was later introduced by colleagues of the majority.

It is my intention, in cooperation with the North American Association of Alcoholism Programs, and other interested groups, to prepare for introduction next year on a bipartisan basis the comprehensive legislation which is needed to deal fully and adequately with what the Public Health Service has described as the Nation's fourth greatest health menace, alcoholism.

Also, since the President first set forth his antialcoholism program last winter, a series of court decisions have established policies which presage a new era in dealing with the Nation's 5 to 6 million alcoholics as being ill rather than as law offenders. Just as the Congress in the narcotics addiction treatment bill passed this week has recognized that the emphasis for the narcotic addict—as distinguished from the dealer or pusher—must be on civil commitment and rehabilitation rather than mere punishment, so, it is becoming clear, we must act the same way with respect to treating the chronic alcoholic.

Despite the heavy incidence of alcoholism and its human and economic costs, up until this time the Federal establishment has had relatively few programs dealing with this problem. We expend some $380 annually to treat each tuberculosis patient, but only 16 cents is spent on the average each year for treatment and rehabilitation of alcoholics. Effective action is sorely needed with the present departmental start and should come early in 1967.

Finally, in the light of certain assertions, recent departmental announcement, I should like to call attention to the fact that President Eisenhower was the first President to proclaim Alcoholism Information Week. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Arthur Fleming was the first postwar Cabinet officer to demonstrate significant interest in the problems of alcoholism. It was he who cautioned the Nation that "alcoholism is the fourth most serious health problem" facing us. And, in 1964, the Republican platform specifically asked for increased financial support for combating alcoholism.

THE SYRIA-ISRAEL CRISIS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the United Nations Security Council is presently engaged in vital discussions affecting world peace. If the dispute between Syria and Israel brought before it at the beginning of the current session is not settled, the world faces the very real danger of general conflict in the Middle East which could easily expand into a wider war involving the major powers.

Several African states have suggested stronger enforcement of the 1949 Palestine armistice agreements. The fact that the United Nations Emergency Force has served so successfully in preserving the peace in the Gaza and Sinai areas between Egypt and Israel argues for the establishment of a well-manned truce force in the area of the alleged Syrian incursions.

However, Mr. President, if the world is not to be brought to the brink of disaster periodically by crises in the Middle East, we must see a major international effort to achieve peace in that area and remove a possible source of conflict between the United States and the U.S.S.R. The President, who is now using the prestige and power of his office to seek a peaceful solution to warfare in southeast Asia, in an unprecedented and historic trip to the Far East, should also direct our Nation's talents and resources toward achieving a Middle East peace—before it is too late.

I strongly recommend the following:

First. An understanding should be reached with the Soviet Union on the deescalation of the arms races in the Middle East. I use the plural term because there is not only an arms race between Israel and the Arab States but also between groups of Arab States themselves. To this end, I urge that the administration invite the Soviet Union to a conference for the purpose of curbing shipments of arms and materials of war to the Middle East.

Second. We must do all we can to promote an understanding between the Arab States and Israel. This is possible of achievement, as has been indicated in part by the overtures for rapprochement which have come from Tunisia. To this end, I suggest that we explore all diplomatic channels open to us to see if any kind of a conference grouping can be convened in the Middle East of nations with vital interests in this region in the quest for peace and to make practical plans for the region's development.

The United States has a well-established history of active concern in promoting stability in the Middle East. In May 1950, this Nation joined France and the United Kingdom in issuing the tripartite declaration declaring their "unalterable opposition to the use of force or threat of force" and pledging action to preserve the frontiers and armistice lines of all the Middle East nations. In August 1955, on behalf of President Eisenhower, Secretary of State Dulles declared U.S. willingness to "join in formal treaty engagements to prevent or thwart either side to alter by force the boundaries between Israel and its Arab neighbors" and invited other nations to join in such guarantees.

In 1957, there was added the Eisenhower doctrine which was accepted by the Congress with the addition of an important amendment, the so-called Mansfield amendment, which stipulated that "the preservation of the independence and territorial integrity of the nations of the Middle East is vital to the interests of the United States."

In 1958, these declarations were put to the test. Following the leftist revolution in Iraq in the summer of that year, the United States sent American troops into Lebanon to preserve the independence of that small nation. Also that year agreements were signed with Iran, Pakistan and Turkey to aid them "in case of aggression."

In August 1960 John F. Kennedy stated that the United States should make it clear that "we will act promptly and decisively against any nation in the Middle East which attacks its neighbor."

We have sent more than $4.5 billion worth of economic and military aid to the nations of the Middle East to those states which are now pro-free-world and those which are pro-Soviet, to both Israel and the Arab States, and both to those which have been accused of aggression and those which have been the victims of aggression.

The United Nations Security Council is now engaged in seeking a means to allay the war fever in the Middle East. But, Mr. President, let us also strive to remove the source of the infection for, as the scarlet pages of history indicate, war fever is among mankind's most infectious—and dangerous—afflictions. We fail at our peril.

INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE SERVICE CORPS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the public interest is heavily involved in the activities of many business leaders nowadays. I spoke on this subject yesterday. However, I wish now to add the names of 24 outstanding U.S. business executives who under the auspices of Time magazine are visting Hungary, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Yugoslavia to open the way to a dialog between the economic leaders of those countries and the economic leaders of this country, in the hope of bringing about better relations and perhaps beginning to implement the broad view taken by the President in his recent speech, which sought to open new channels for a detente in Eastern Europe through economic means and the channels of trade.

I ask unanimous consent to have an article published in the New York Times today, containing the names of these top executives, entitled "Twenty-Four U.S. Executives Visting Red Bloc," placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWENTY-FOUR U.S. EXECUTIVES VISITING RED BLOC—SEEK TO STIMULATE TRADE IN FIVE-COUNTRY TOUR

Executives of 24 American corporations departed yesterday on a tour of five East European nations to open the door to potential trade.

The tour, organized by Time magazine, will take the group to Hungary, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Poland and Yugoslavia. The participants will pay their own way beyond the cost of flying.

The importance of the trip was enhanced recently by the Johnson Administration's decision to liberalize trade with Eastern Europe. Administration officials will receive a report on the prospects of expanding financial and trade relations when the delegation flies from Belgrade to Washington on Nov. 1.

The following Time executives are accompanying the delegation: Bernard M. Auer, the publisher; James A. Linen, president; Andrew Heiskell, chairman of the board; Henry R. Luce, editorial chairman; Hedley W. Donovan, editor in chief; Lawrence E. Laybourne, assistant publisher; Otto Fuerbringer, managing editor; Champ Clark, senior editor, and Robert C. Gordon, advertising director.

Members of the delegation have made it clear that their intention is not to propose any modification of United States policy but to see and be seen, to listen and talk. It is expected that they will be received by the heads of state and other officials.

John L. Loeb, senior partner of Carl M. Loeb, Rhoades & Co., who is in the delegation, said:

"I am confident that the trip could definitely further the Administration's recently stated policy of increasing trade with Eastern Europe."

The delegation, he said, plans to explore possibilities of expanding financial and commercial relations and to develop better understanding of American industry.

NAMES OF DELEGATES

Among the business leaders in the delegation in addition to Mr. Loeb, are John L. Atwood, president, North American Aviation, Inc.; Eugene N. Beesley, president, Eli Lilly & Co.; James H. Binger, chairman, Honeywell Inc.; William Blackie, chairman, the Caterpillar Tractor Company; Edgar M. Bronfman, president, Joseph E. Seagram & Sons, Inc.; Joseph F. Cullman 3d, president, Philip Morris Inc., and Russell Deyoung, chairman, the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company.

Also, A. P. Fontaine, chairman, the Bendix Corporation; Henry Ford 2d, chairman of the board of the Ford Motor Company; Keith Funston, president of the New York Stock Exchange; Gordon Grand, president, Olin Mathieson Chemical Corporation, John D. Harper, president of the Aluminum Company of America; Robert S. Ingersoll, chairman, the Borg-Warner Corporation; George A. Murphy, chairman, Irving Trust Company; Robert S. Oelman, chairman, National Cash Register Company; Frank Pace Jr., president, International Executive Service Corporation, and S. Warner Pach, president Gillette Safety Razor Company.

Also Henry R. Roberts, president, Connecticut General Life Insurance Company; Willard F. Rockwell Jr., president, Rockwell Standard Corporation; C. William Verity Jr., president, Aramco Steel Corporation; Leslie H. Warner, president, General Telephone and Electronics Corporation; Rawleigh Warner Jr., president, Mobil Oil Corporation, and Kendrick R. Wilson Jr., chairman, Avco Corporation.

In addition to the business leaders, and Time magazine executives, the delegation includes Dr. Alexander Heard, chancellor of Vanderbilt University, and Whitney Moore Young Jr., executive director of the National Urban League.

The group is travelling on a jet chartered by Time.

Mr. Auer recalled that the magazine had sponsored two similar trips in the past—one to the Soviet Union in 1963 and another to Southeast Asia in 1965.

Mr. Auer said all the participants shared the expenses beyond the cost of the aircraft. He said that the magazine hoped the journey would offer "information and insight into countries that were once part of a monolithic bloc but now appear to be moving toward considerable automony."

SOUTH-WEST AFRICA

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I noted with unusual interest an article which was published in the Washington Evening Star on Tuesday, October 18, written by James J. Kilpatrick, entitled "Goldberg Alines United States in Assault on South Africa." This article deals with the position of the United Nations on the South-West African problem. This problem arises from the fact that under a mandate from the old League of Nations, South-West Africa was entrusted to the charge of South Africa.

I do not pose as any expert on this subject, but I do know that it was presented to the World Court and that that body handed down a decision sustaining the position of South Africa.

I am somewhat surprised to find that the United States has now joined in a movement to overthrow that decision by the mere force of numbers in the United Nations. Here, of late, our great liberals have gone to great pains to tell us that we should respect the decisions of any duly formulated court of competent jurisdiction.

In the case mentioned in this article, the jurisdiction was recognized by the plaintiffs when they brought the case. While the world may have been astonished by the decision, at least it was a decision by a court to which the United States subscribes. But now that the court has rendered a decision of which our State Department disapproves we join in or take the lead in efforts to degrade or nullify the decision.

Mr. President, I am not particularly concerned about what happens in South-West Africa, but I am concerned about the implications of the action of the United Nations in undertaking to take

RSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

this vast territory under United Nations control as it affects this country, the United States.

We have had considerable experience with the United Nations, and when it comes down to the last analysis, it usually means that the United States is the country which is expected to carry out the recommendations voted by the so-called newly emerging states who now dominate the United Nations. Whatever it costs in blood and treasure is expected to be borne by us.

Back in 1954, I thought I saw a cloud over Asia no larger than the size of a man's hand. I strongly opposed our involvement in any military moves on the Asian mainland. Those in higher authority saw it differently, but we now have almost 400,000 Americans in combat in that area and they are being killed at the rate of more than 100 a week.

Mr. President, I hope that this action planned in the United Nations will not place upon the United States the responsibility for sending our military forces into Africa to enforce the vote which I understand will be had in the United Nations. However, the gullibility of those directing our foreign affairs causes me to fear the worst.

The United Nations has perhaps in some respects served a useful purpose, but if it continues to place upon the United States the principal responsibility for financial support of the United Nations, as well as the responsibility for enforcing with military might the decisions of the United Nations, I am of the opinion that the people of this country will reevaluate their views as to the United Nations and the relations of our Government thereto.

Mr. President, I rise to express the hope that the United States has not embarked upon a course which will bring about another Vietnam in Africa, with the United States undertaking practically alone to enforce the political views of a majority of the members of the United Nations.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have the article to which I have referred printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Oct. 18, 1966]

GOLDBERG ALIGNS U.S. IN ASSAULT ON SOUTH AFRICA

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—On Wednesday of last week, U.S. Ambassador Arthur Goldberg formally joined the Afro-Asian lynch mob in its assault upon South Africa. He aligned the United States with the 54 member nations of the United Nations who are demanding that South Africa's mandated territory of South West Africa be placed under U.N. control.

The more one listens to the fantasies that abound in this carpeted cave of the winds, and the more one delves into the typical case history of South West Africa, the more one despairs of discovering any useful purpose in the United Nations as a whole. In times past, it has been said of the United Nations that at least it offers a forum in which the nations of the world may speak to one another. But the necessary premise of this argument is that when nations speak formally to one another, they will speak in reasoned speech, based in realities, directed to the intellect and not to the viscera.

In the debates over South West Africa, as in the debates over Rhodesia, this premise disappears. Reason vanishes through the great windows and flies off with the gulls outside. Reality dissolves in the vapors of illusion.

A gross of international lawyers, working at the task all night, could not translate the legalisms of the South West Africa case into anything intelligible for popular consumption. On this score, it will suffice to say that simply as a matter of law, South Africa's position has been sustained by the highest tribunal in which the question could be argued.

But it is as true of the court of public opinion, as it is true of courts generally, that cases should be weighed not upon the law alone but upon the evidence also. The charges that were brought in the World Court by Ethiopia and Liberia, plaintiffs, against South Africa, defendant, were profoundly serious charges. What evidence did the plaintiffs produce to support them? The answer, incredibly, is not one iota.

These were among the grave allegations of the complainants—that South Africa was practicing genocide upon the indigenous population; that the natives were being herded into concentration camps; that they were subjected to naked terror; that they were treated like animals. It was formally charged that South Africa has violated its trust by refusing to provide education, by denying any vestige of self-government to the people, by keeping them in perpetual servitude. Still another charge was that South Africa had established military bases, including nuclear and missile centers, in South West Africa, and that these constituted a threat to the peace of the continent.

What happened when the case came on for hearing? The plaintiffs were not able to offer one single witness in support of the charges they themselves had filed. Counsel for South Africa made a sporting proposition to the Court. Would the judges themselves come to South West Africa for an on-the-scene inspection?

The complaining nations reacted with sheer consternation. In open court, they accepted as truth all the averments of fact in South Africa's defensive pleadings. Ultimately even one of the dissenting judges was to agree that the allegations having to do with military bases were "completely without foundation."

On the afternoon of Sept. 26, South Africa's David P. De Villiers reviewed this case history in a brilliant address.

He spoke to an almost empty chamber. The Afro-Asian delegations rudely stalked out. As soon as de Villiers had concluded, they returned. And at 6:20 p.m., after the gentleman from Ethiopia, Mr. Wodajo, had charged South Africa with insulting the intelligence of the body, the General Assembly adjourned.

The vote to strip South Africa of her mandated territory doubtless will be taken soon. Goldberg, for the United States, will vote "aye."

SENATOR DONALD RUSSELL

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, few men could point to a longer, broader, or a more varied career in public service than that of DONALD RUSSELL.

From positions in the War Department and with the Director of Economic Stabilization during the depression, he entered the military service in World War II. Then, following a period as Deputy Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, and a term as Assistant Secretary of State, he moved into academic circles as president of the University of South Carolina. From there his path has taken him to the Governor's chair in his State and from thence to the Senate of the United States.

The breadth and depth of insight he has brought with him to Senate considerations is seldom paralleled. We wish him well and take delight in knowing that he now assumes the obligations of a judgeship, and thus will add another dimension to an already well-rounded career in the public service.

We wish him well in his undertaking.

WATERSHED PROJECTS APPROVED BY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of Mr. RANDOLPH, I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, information on watershed projects approved by the Committee on Public Works on October 18, 1966, as follows:

Projects approved under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, Public Law 566, 83d Cong., as amended

Project	*Estimated Federal cost*
Big Cedar Creek, Ga	$1, 946, 453
Little River, Ga	928, 378
Coal and Crane Creek, Ill	719, 385
West Boggs Creek, Ind	629, 193
Upper Wakarusa, Kans	2, 814, 900
Conewango Creek (supplement), New York	4, 690, 674
Brandywine Creek (supplement), Pennsylvania and Delaware	2, 080, 978
Rush Creek, Tex	1, 961, 153
Wheeling Creek, W. Va. and Pa	4, 979, 000
Total	21, 020, 114

LEGISLATIVE ACHIEVEMENTS OF SENATOR SIMPSON

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, although I joined other Members of the Senate earlier this week in praising the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] for his outstanding years of Senate service, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD additional material spelling out the specific legislative achievements of Senator SIMPSON.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF SENATOR MILWARD L. SIMPSON, OF WYOMING—89TH CONGRESS

Senator SIMPSON, along with his colleague, the senior Senator from Wyoming, has been responsible for a number of bills in the 89th Congress which are of immediate and direct interest and importance to their State of Wyoming.

In the light of the numerous tributes paid to Senator SIMPSON yesterday on the floor of the Senate, it is most appropriate that a record be made of those bills sponsored by Senator SIMPSON which have passed the Senate during this Congress. This is no little achievement and is but a further testament to the dedication he has shown to his great State.

S. 84. Sweetwater County Lands (Farson Pilot Farm): To provide for reimbursement to the State of Wyoming for improvements made on certain lands in Sweetwater County, Wyoming, if and when such lands revert to the United States, passed Senate October 10, 1966.

S. 433. Lander Land: To authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain land in Lander, Wyo. and for other purposes, reported by Senate Agriculture Committee, October 18, 1966.

S. 491. Big Horn Canyon Recreation Area: To provide for the establishment of the Big Horn Canyon National Recreation Area, and for other purposes, passed Senate, February 10, 1965, Public Law 89–664.

S. 553. Niobrara River Compact: To consent to the Upper Niobrara River Compact between the State of Wyoming and Nebraska, passed Senate, August 9, 1966.

S. 554. Cheyenne Land: Authorizing the Administrator of Veterans Affairs to convey certain property to the City of Cheyenne, Wyoming, H.R. 4421 passed Senate, October 22, 1965. Public Law 89–345.

S. 602. Small Reclamation Projects Act, 1956: To amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, passed Senate, July 1, 1965, passed House, September 7, 1965. Public Law 89–553.

S. 625. Agricultural Trespass: To authorize the sale of isolated or disconnected tracts of land, passed Senate July 28, 1965.

S.J. Res. 33. Wind River Indian Irrigation Project: To cancel any unpaid reimbursable construction costs of the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, chargeable against certain non-Indian lands, S.J. Res. 9 (McGee), passed Senate, November 21, 1965, passed House February 16, 1966. Public Law 89–364.

S. 1880. Mule Creek Oil Company, House bill (HR 8699): For the relief of . . ., passed Senate, September 22, 1966. Private Law 89–341.

S. 2595. Wind River Indian Reservation: To place in trust status certain lands on the Wind River Indian Reservation in Wyoming, passed Senate, June 1, 1966.

Amendment No. 390 to H.R. 8283, adopted by Senate August 17, 1965: Set out the important precedent which disallowed participation by Job Corps employees in any area competitive with existing private enterprise employment.

Amendments to S. 1446. Wild Rivers System: Three major amendments to S. 1446 were proposed by Senator Simpson and adopted by Senate Interior Committee. These amendments insured greater protection of a state's water rights in the event of creation of a Wild Rivers System.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, in addition, I wish to bring to the Senate's attention a glowing tribute paid to Senator Simpson by his home State. This tribute was in the form of an editorial broadcast by KTWO–TV in Casper. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[A KTWO, radio-television editorial, Oct. 12, 1966]

Perhaps but once in a generation does a person emerge who can be called a "Wyoming Man" a person whose life is thoroughly dedicated to his native State and its people. K–2 believes that Milward Simpson's forty years of distinguished public life qualifies him for that title.

His career has been marked by many instances where he has put aside personal considerations in order to promote the best interests of our State. A recent example of this unselfish attitude was his voluntary decision to step down from his seat in the United States Senate. Simpson feared that an arthritic condition might hamper him in rendering the service to Wyoming to which he felt it is entitled. It is quite certain that Senator Simpson could have been reelected easily this year since his personal popularity is at the highest level.

In the early years of the Eisenhower Administration, the then Governor Simpson was offered a Presidential Cabinet appointment as Secretary of the Interior. Few of us would have resisted this once-in-a-lifetime opportunity, but Milward Simpson remembered his pledge to serve a full four-year term as Governor and declined the honor.

Never known as a person to avoid an issue, Simpson's frankness occasionally has caused him some political discomfort, especially in his four years as Governor. But his term in that office produced some of the most sweeping administrative improvements that the Wyoming Executive Department ever has undergone.

When 1967 rolls around and the pressures of office are transferred to Senator Simpson's successor, Milward's thoughts likely will turn to the trout streams of his Bobcat Ranch. K–2 hopes that Senator Simpson will continue to allow the people of Wyoming to share his thoughts and solicit his guidance on the problems of developing our State.

Those of us who have had the privilege to know this man who made the phrase "Wonderful Wyoming" completely believable realize we have been exposed to an individual who is truly a "Wyoming Man."

SENATOR LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the Senate will miss the happy combination of great ability and courage, tempered by restraint and kindness, embodied in the character of Leverett Saltonstall.

His long period of public service both prior to his entry into the Senate in 1944, and subsequently, are eloquent testimony of the love and esteem in which this man is held. It has been my particular privilege to work with and know him well through our close associations in the Armed Services Committee. As you realize, there can be no room for partisanship in the decisions that group is obliged to make. As a senior member of the minority party, he has been a major factor in keeping the committee truly nonpartisan.

Massachusetts has produced many distinguished citizens who have served this Nation well throughout its history. Unquestionably, the name of Leverett Saltonstall belongs to this honored group. It is a delight to have known him. I wish him the very best.

GREECE AND VIETNAM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, there are some who say that we cannot possibly win in Vietnam because we lack the experience to prosecute an antiguerrilla war successfully.

These critics forget that the tactic of guerrilla warfare is not a new one, and it is certainly not a new approach by world communism.

The Communists attempted to take over the Philippines by the use of this tactic, and failed. They attempted to overthrow the government of Malaya with this tactic, and were defeated. They also sought to communize Greece through the use of guerrillas, and here, too, they were not permitted to succeed.

We often overlook the similarities between Greece and Vietnam, and New York Times Columnist C. L. Sulzberger has performed a valuable service in bringing this similarity to our attention.

Mr. Sulzberger quotes the following passage from "Revolution and Defeat," by Prof. D. George Kousoulas, of Howard University:

> To broaden its popular basis, a Communist guerrilla force will in most cases conceal its true identity behind a smoke-screen of attractive demands for national integrity and social justice . . . after a protracted and inconclusive anti-guerrilla war, Communists and sympathizers seek admission to a coalition government as a compromise solution.

Mr. Sulzberger notes that it is "naive Americans who now propose such a solution" for Vietnam. He states that the military tide is now turning in Vietnam, and that in the recent election the Vietcong repeated the mistake of the Greek Communists in ordering abstentions.

Although he admits that there are many dissimilarities between the two situations, Mr. Sulzberger writes that:

> We should nevertheless . . . not lose sight of the basic parallels between those two examples of "revolutionary warfare" and what was done to counter it.

I wish to share the important insights of this column with Senators and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Foreign Affairs: A Greek Lesson for Vietnam

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

Athens.—Greece is the best European vantage point from which to view the Vietnam war because Greece experienced a similar tragedy less than a generation ago. Indeed, there are many resemblances between the two conflicts, their strategies, mistakes and misconceptions. The degree of American involvement in Greece was far less than in Vietnam yet it was categorical and would have mounted had the Communist insurrection not dissolved.

When the United States began actively supporting Athens under the Truman Doctrine the Communists' so-called "democratic army" held 80 per cent of Greece. A poorly informed United States public opinion largely sympathized with the insurgents and denounced the Athens Government as "monarcho-fascist."

SOURCES OF SUPPLIES

The "democratic army," holding more of Greece than the Communists ever gained in South Vietnam, was supplied from neighboring Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and Albania as the Vietcong are now supplied from North Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. It received additional materiel (stolen from Government stores), intelligence and recruits through an underground organization on Government territory, later infiltrated and crippled.

Lenin maintained: "No moral condemnation of civil war can be allowed from the standpoint of Marxism." The Greek rebels were ordered to abstain from national elections, a move they later regretted as an error. From 1947 on practically all their recruitment was forcible, as is now true for the Vietcong. Retreating Greek guerrillas, like their Vietnamese successors, posed as civilian villagers. They brutally punished anyone friendly to Athens.

In "Revolution and Defeat," Prof. D. George Kousoulas of Howard University points out: "To broaden its popular basis, a Communist guerrilla force will in most cases conceal its true identity behind a smokescreen of attractive demands for national integrity and social justice." He notes that "after a protracted and inconclusive anti-guerrilla war, Communists and sympathizers [seek admission] to a coalition government as a compromise solution." Naive Americans propose such a solution for South Vietnam.

CAMOUFLAGE TECHNIQUES

Communist insurrections endeavor to camouflage themselves. Thus a Greek leader ordered: "Whenever party members speak they should not say that they express the opinion of the party, but they should present the party directives as their own personal views." The Communist nations, knowing these truths, never recognized Greece's National Liberation Front "government"—nor that in South Vietnam.

While shamming a truculent game that fooled Washington, Stalin in fact gave the Greek rebels only limited support. He cautioned their more enthusiastic backers against embroilment with the powerful U.S.A. Meanwhile, encouraged by heavy American arms shipments and an extensive military mission under General Van Fleet, the Greek Army started to win. At this point Athens realized it could never triumph without a comprehensive pacification program.

FINANCED FROM ABROAD

Kousoulas writes: "Under the new system all those eligible for military service were inducted without exception. Those of questionable loyalty were placed in unimportant posts. The most dangerous of them were held in a concentration camp on the island of Makronisos off the coast of Attica, where they received intensive indoctrination. Some of the most celebrated anti-Communist military battalions came out of this camp.

Greece's civil war, of course, did not take place in a partitioned former colony. The rebels were, however, generally trained, financed, armed and led from abroad. They paid lip service to a "temporary democratic Government" at a hideout near the border as do the Vietcong.

Before being defeated, the Greek insurrection had to be stifled on five fronts: military, political, security, diplomatic and propaganda. Now, in Vietnam, the military tide is turning. Politically an election has been held and the Vietcong repeated the Greek mistake of ordering abstentions. The security issue is being faced with a pacification program still less coherent than Greece's.

Diplomatically we hope to reduce the open flank through which Vietcong aid pours across Laos and Cambodia as it once poured to Greek rebels across Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and Abania. For his own reasons Tito broke with Russia and choked off the supply line. With no such Asian possibility in sight, we gingerly seek to persuade Cambodia to close its borders to the Vietcong. On the fifth front, propaganda, peace talk helps in Europe while battlefield prowess helps in Asia where nations preach morality and respect force.

DISSIMILARITIES AND PARALLELS

There are, of course, many striking dissimilarities between yesterday's Greek and today's Vietnamese conflicts, and the contemporary world is far more dangerously explosive even than that of the 1940's. Nevertheless, we should not lose sight of the basic parallels between these two examples of the new doctrine of "revolutionary warfare" and what was done to counter it.

SYSTEMS ANALYSIS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the systems approach to problem-solving has attracted considerable attention in the past several years. Born out of the defense and space efforts, this approach is now finding application in the civilian sector. The rising problems of transportation, environmental pollution, crime and regional and urban development lend themselves to the ever-improving tools and techniques of systems analysis, automatic data processing, systems engineering and operations research.

A firm endorsement of the systems approach occurred when the President announced last year that the planning-programing budgeting system, introduced and developed in the Department of Defense, would be extended to the majority of the civilian agencies. This process, which systematically relates planning and budgeting considerations to the decisionmaking process, relies heavily on systems analysis and its associated cost-benefit techniques.

In addition, a pilot program conceived by Governor Brown in California several years ago has demonstrated compellingly that the concept of systems analysis can in fact be applied creatively to social problems.

The shortage of skilled manpower and the unrealized potential of the systems approach at State and local levels convinces me that congressional action is needed soon.

In October 1965 Senator CLARK and I introduced the Scientific Manpower Utilization Act, S. 2662, which is designed to foster the application of systems analysis at the regional, State and local levels as well as to provide for an adequate base of trained manpower. The Special Subcommittee on Scientific Manpower Utilization, of which I am chairman, has held two sets of hearings on this bill and plans another set for later this year.

I welcome the support which this proposal has received from Republicans and I am hopeful that all those representatives who are interested in this program will present their views at future hearings.

A summary of recent activity in the systems analysis field is presented in an article in Science magazine by Luther Carter, entitled "Systems Approach: Political Interest Rises." I ask unanimous consent that the article be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SYSTEMS APPROACH: POLITICAL INTEREST RISES

(By Luther J. Carter)

The idea of applying the "systems approach" to the solution of domestic problems such as environmental pollution, traffic congestion, and crime control is, of course, familiar to the technically literate and to a growing number of public officials. Now some Republican congressmen and senators are giving notice that they will try to drum the systems concept into the heads of ordinary citizens and voters.

On 25 August, 44 Republican congressmen and ten Republican senators introduced legislation to establish a National Commission on Public Management as the first step toward implementing what the congressmen called a "revolutionary new concept." The congressmen said that their proposal envisaged having problems such as water pollution and urban blight farmed out by government to private industry, which would use the "modern 'systems management' approach and technology to develop and administer a comprehensive solution."

Senator GAYLORD NELSON of Wisconsin, a Democrat, immediately derided the Republicans, indicating that they weren't the avant-garde politicians they pretended to be. "The support of these Republicans should be extremely helpful in enacting the legislation which I introduced last October," NELSON said. The Nelson bill—dubbed the "Scientific Manpower Utilization Act"—would authorize the Secretary of Labor to spend $125 million in helping states and universities (or other public or private institutions) to apply systems analysis and systems engineering to urgent problems.

NELSON noted that in 1964 Governor Edmund G. Brown of California—a fellow Democrat—had aerospace firms submit bid proposals for conducting studies in the fields of waste disposal, transportation, crime control, and information services. The California studies, he said, had "demonstrated compellingly that the concept of systems analysis could in fact be applied creatively to social problems."

The Republican congressmen and senators sponsoring the systems management bill are, ideologically speaking, a heterogeneous lot. Representative F. BRADFORD MORSE of Massachusetts, a prime mover behind the legislation, belongs among the moderate-to-liberal Republicans. But the sponsors include a number who are distinctly conservative, among them Senator JOHN G. TOWER of Texas. According to MORSE, advocacy of an industry-managed systems approach to solving social problems is likely to become a major Republican theme. MORSE says that, while the Republican minority leader, Representative GERALD R. FORD of Michigan, is not among the 44 sponsors of the legislation, he is interested in it.

With Democrats in control of Congress and the Administration, Republican legislative proposals seldom follow a charmed course, however. The principal effect of the Republicans' systems management proposal may be to encourage the administration to come forward next year with a proposal of its own, perhaps by adopting the Nelson bill or some variation of it. In fact, even prior to the Republican initiative, some administration planners were considering the possibility of such a step. "This has not been high on our agenda, but it's an idea which has been percolating," one official said.

The administration is still in the painful process of having all government departments and agencies adopt the integrated system of analysis, program planning, and budgeting which Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara and his former comptroller, Charles J. Hitch, instituted at the Pentagon in 1961. One qualified observer within the administration reports that adoption of the new methods is well under way but that several years must pass before they become part of the bureaucratic way of life.

This view is supported by a high official who says that the secretary of his department has been chary about accepting systems analysis and mathematical model studies as basic tools in making assessments and decisions in some vital areas of national policy. Moreover, the official says it has taken him 18 months just to persuade one of his own principal subordinates to undertake a systems study of his agency's procedures. The Northeast Corridor transport studies (*Science*, 4 March 1966) illustrate strikingly how the government can use systems analysis as an integral part of its process of program development, however.

In view of the very gradual—in some cases grudging—acceptance of systems analysis techniques within the federal government, it is not surprising that the states and localities should need help and encouragement in using these techniques. Inquiries received by the Bureau of the Budget about the new planning, programming, and budgeting (PPB) system indicate that interest in this approach to management and decision-making is becoming widespread.

The PPB methodology involves a comprehensive and precise statement of government objectives, together with cost-benefit studies of various alternatives for attaining those objectives. Mastering this methodology can be a first step toward effective use of systems analysis studies of major social problems.

The Bureau of the Budget is helping to organize a 12-month pilot project for the development of PPB systems by five states, five counties, and five cities in several program areas, such as health and public housing, which receive substantial federal support. The operational phase of the project has not yet begun, and the states and localities which will participate have not yet been identified. New York City has moved on its own initiative to adopt the PPB system, to make greater use of computers (in police work, for example), and to undertake systems studies leading to a reorganization of the city government.

If effective use of the new approach to government decision-making and problem-solving is to be widespread, a much larger federal effort to assist the states and localities in that regard apparently will be necessary. Systems analysis of major problems is not cheap, and, furthermore, it demands special training of those who sponsor the studies as well as of those who conduct them. When California began its four initial systems studies, for which it paid $100,000 apiece, the state found that it lacked the competence to monitor them. It hired System Development Corporation to oversee the methodological aspects of the studies conducted by the four aerospace companies—Aerojet General, Space-General, Lockheed, and North American Aviation.

After several days of hearings on his bill, held in Los Angeles and Washington, Senator Nelson has concluded that the measure should be revised to provide for more than just funds for the financing of systems studies. He would provide also for at least enough training of state and local officials in systems analysis techniques to enable them to monitor studies done on contract. Not only is some technical expertise required of those who monitor studies, but some grasp of systems analysis methods by government policy makers is necessary if the study results are be used and appreciated.

BROWN ENTHUSIASTIC

Governor Brown of California has enthusiastically endorsed the Nelson bill. Although some people are disappointed that the first California studies have not yet led to dramatic action programs, the state has shown enough interest in the results to follow them up with further investigations. For example, a $200,000 contract for a study of social welfare problems has been awarded to Space-General Corporation, partly as an outgrowth of the crime control study which Space-General conducted. A $200,000 contract also has been awarded for a study of land-use data, a project closely related to the study of a statewide information system. If some urgency has gone out of the California study program, it is because the aerospace industry has not suffered the heavy loss of defense and space contract work once feared.

Some large questions must be answered before "systems" to combat pollution, crime, urban blight, and other social ills are not only formulated but established and put in operation. Just what such systems would be, and how they would operate, generally remains vague.

Having a private firm establish a waste disposal system for a large metropolitan region is perhaps one way of overcoming the region's political fragmentation. But that fragmentation may prove one of the greatest obstacles in creating the system in the first place. How can the multitude of individual political units within metropolitan regions be brought to collaborate in so novel a venture? And will they simply have a company establish the system, then turn it over to a regional political authority for operation? Or will the operating authority be delegated to the company? And, if the latter, how will the voters react to the fact that a profit-making enterprise has been given authority to run a service affecting their interests?

These and other questions involved in the application of systems analysis to social problems are indeed important and difficult—so much so that the Republican enthusiasts for the "systems approach" believe that establishment of their proposed National Commission on Public Management should precede any other steps. The commission would be asked to identify those social problems to which the systems approach is most applicable and to suggest how that approach can best be applied. The 13-member commission would consist of two senators, two congressmen, and nine members to be appointed by the President from among persons in government, education, business, or research, who have special training or interest in the matter which the commission will consider.

For his part, Senator Nelson calls the Republican bill a "half-hearted step," and says that no national study is needed. However this may be, it now seems evident that political interest in the systems approach to the problems of government and society is fast growing. This may be taken as a hopeful sign by those who believe that this approach offers the only real solution to problems which are among the nation's most important and vexing.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARING

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, last August the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization held 3 weeks of hearings on how the Federal Government is organized to deal with the problems of urban America.

In the first week, we heard from the heads of the Federal agencies administering those programs having the greatest urban impact—Housing and Urban Development; Health, Education, and Welfare; Justice; Labor; and the Office of Economic Opportunity. We were interested in not so much what their programs were—one need only read one of the many handbooks to discover that—but how they operated, how they were managed and coordinated, at the Federal level in an efficient and economical manner.

We were especially concerned with the effect of Public Law 89–174, the act which created the Department of Housing and Urban Development. That Department was created to serve as the principal Federal agency to deal with the growing crisis in American cities, and one of our basic concerns was to determine how effectively the Department was organized to accomplish that purpose.

In the course of the subcommittee's consideration of the bill establishing HUD, two amendments were adopted which reflect our subcommittee's concern. The first, introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], contemplated the creation of the position of Director of Urban Program Coordination. We intended that this Director would play a key role in coordinating the Federal efforts in urban affairs.

The second amendment, introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], directed the President to study the scope of the Department's functions and recommend such additional functions as he saw fit.

These amendments demonstrated the subcommittee's belief that the Department of Housing and Urban Development was not created as a finished agency—and that the Department should play the leading role in the Nation's efforts to resolve the problems of the cities.

If this Nation is to develop a meaningful organization to carry out the policy for our urban areas, then we must base that organization and that policy on the conditions as they actually exist and not on the conditions that we in Washington may think exist.

And so we devoted the second and third weeks of our hearings to an effort to determine if our Federal effort—as evidenced by over 100 Federal urban programs and the expenditure of many hundreds of millions of dollars—was making itself felt at the grassroots, where the people live. We heard from the chief executives of some of our Nation's leading cities—from the East, the Midwest, the South, the Far West. And we heard from people who tried to tell us what ghetto life was all about, what seeking aid from a Government agency is really like.

We learned a good deal. We learned that we must recognize what the city was in the past and how men of previous generations regarded life in the city. We must learn what benefits they took from the city and what handicaps the city created. And then we must repeat that inquiry into the city of today.

We want to know the sociology of the city. How do people organize their lives together? What are the personal and impersonal forces that have deep consequences on individual lives? We want to understand the psychology of the city. How does living in a city, or in a particular neighborhood, and working at a particular kind of job, affect a person's outlook on both himself and the world around him? And we want to examine the economics of the city. For in examining the organization of the executive branch relating to urban problems, we must know the basic facts of urban life and we must learn them from the people who live there.

For the organization of the Federal Government is not an impersonal, paper-shuffling matter. It is not merely organization charts arrayed in neat patterns. Rather, it is the very essence of democracy—the very kernel of the real business of Government—its effect on and relationship with the Government.

It would be well to keep in mind some cogent thoughts written on the subject of improving the machinery of Government which are very applicable:

Improving the Machinery of Government

> Throughout our history we have paused now and then to see how well the spirit and purpose of our Nation is working out in the machinery of everyday government with a view to making such modifications and improvements as prudence and the spirit of progress might suggest. Our Government was the first to set up in its formal Constitution a method of amendment, and the spirit of America has been from the beginning of our history the spirit of progressive changes to meet conditions shifting perhaps

> more rapidly here than elsewhere in the world. Since the Civil War, as the tasks and responsibilities of our Government have grown with the growth of the Nation in sweep and power, some notable attempts have been made to keep our administrative system abreast of the new times . . . Now we face again the problem of governmental readjustment . . . There is room for vast increase in our national productivity and there is much bitter wrong to set right in neglected ways of human life.
>
> There is need for improvement of our governmental machinery to meet new conditions and to make us ready for the problems just ahead. Facing one of the most troubled periods in all the troubled history of mankind, we wish to set our affairs in the very best possible order to make the best use of all our national resources and to make good our democratic claims. If America fails, the hopes and dreams of democracy over all the world go down. We shall not fail in our task and our responsibility, but we cannot live upon our laurels alone. We seek modern types of management in National Government best fitted for the stern situations we are bound to meet, both at home and elsewhere . . . The efficiency of government rests upon two factors: The consent of the governed and good management.
>
> In a democracy consent may be achieved readily, though not without some effort, as it is the cornerstone of the constitution. Efficient management in a democracy is a factor of peculiar significance. Administrative efficiency is not merely a matter of paper clips, time clocks, and standardized economies of motion. These are but minor gadgets. Real efficiency goes much deeper down. It must be built into the structure of a government just as it is built into a piece of machinery . . . In proceeding to the reorganization of the Government it is important to keep prominently before us the ends of reorganization. Too close a view of machinery must not cut off from sight the true purpose of efficient management. Economy is not the only objective, though reorganization is the first step to savings; the elimination of duplication and contradictory policies is not the only objective, though the new organization will be simple and symmetrical; higher salaries and better jobs are not the only objectives, though these are necessary; better business methods and fiscal controls are not the only objectives, though these too are demanded. There is but one grand purpose, namely, to make democracy work today in our National Government; that is, to make our Government an up-to-date, efficient, and effective instrument for carrying out the will of the Nation.

This inspired statement of the role of proper executive management—with its striking implications for today—comes from the introduction to the Report of the President's Committee on Administrative Management which was submitted to the Congress by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, January 12, 1937.

Thirty years have passed since that statement was written. But we are still grappling with the same basic issues: How do we keep our Federal Government a live, responsive instrument of national policy? How do we insure that it is organized effectively to deal with the Nation's needs?

To explore these issues in greater depth, I wish to announce that the subcommittee will resume its hearings during the recess, beginning November 29. After these additional hearings, the subcommittee will be better prepared to deal specifically with improving the machinery of Government—especially HUD—in order to assure realization of our Nation's grand purpose, to make democracy work, to make our Government an up-to-date, efficient, and effective instrument for carrying out the will of the Nation.

SENATOR MILWARD L. SIMPSON

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, it is with regret that I see the termination of Milward Simpson's career in the Senate. It culminates many years of productive service to his State and to the Nation, and illustrates the breadth of experience this country has been fortunate in being able to draw from in its political leadership.

He moved from the practice of law as a young man in the colorful State of Wyoming to service in its State Legislature; then to a distinguished career as Governor of that State; and now as its Senator.

No better proof of a free and democratic society could be found than this record of his career, and no better example of the character and good judgment of the American people could be cited than that they have selected as their leader a man of his strength and diligence, his integrity and warmth.

I wish him well. We shall all miss him.

JUSTICE DOUGLAS' EXPENSES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the Washington Daily News of Wednesday, October 19, 1966, there appeared an editorial concerning the $12,000 per year which Supreme Court Justice Douglas has allegedly been receiving as an expense account from the Albert Parvin Foundation.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Justice Douglas' Expenses

> It all may be quite honorable, but the questions raised by Senator John J. Williams of Delaware about Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas' expense account from a tax-exempt foundation also are quite legitimate.
>
> The Justice, according to a published account, has been getting $12,000 a year in expense money from the Albert Parvin Foundation in Los Angeles which finances fellowship programs for students from so-called underdeveloped countries. The students study at Princeton or the University of California at Los Angeles.
>
> One of the questions has to do with whether or not the foundation gets some of its income indirectly from a Las Vegas hotel and gambling casino.
>
> But the source of the foundation's money is beside the point. Gambling is legal in Las Vegas.
>
> More important, should a Justice of the Supreme Court derive outside funds from anybody, whether used for "expenses" or otherwise? Should he be involved in the work of any foundation, whatever its worthiness?
>
> Senator Williams pointed out the salary of a Justice is $39,500 a year, which he may retain in full in retirement. This, along with his lifetime appointment, was designed to "insulate members of the Supreme Court from being dependent upon outside income."
>
> Foundations in general—not this one in particular—have been under Congressional investigation from the standpoint of their eligibility for tax exemption. It would be no surprise if a case involving this question should develop before the Supreme Court. In that case, Justice Douglas might excuse himself from any part in the case. But his position as an expense-paid consultant still would color public acceptance of the court's decision, whatever it might be.
>
> Confidence in the Supreme Court's complete impartiality (regardless of differences over its judgment) is a root essential in our judicial system. Anything, well-intentioned or otherwise, which ruffles that confidence detracts from the prestige and authority of the court. On that basis, we dissent, along with Senator Williams, from Justice Douglas' judgment of his own ethics.

SPEECH BY JONG PIL KIM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the cornerstone-laying ceremonies for the Winston Churchill Memorial and Library took place at Westminster College, Fulton, Mo., on October 6, 1966. The ceremonies brought together a distinguished group of guests from Britain and the United States and other countries. I consider it highly significant that the main address on this occasion was delivered by an Asian visitor, Brig. Gen. Jong Pil Kim, chairman of the Democratic Republican Party of Korea.

General Kim has been a moving spirit in the new Government since its inception. This Government, it perhaps should be recalled, had its genesis in a military coup in 1960, directed against a corrupt and inept civilian government. But unlike most military juntas in Asia and elsewhere, the military leaders in Korea acted to restore parliamentary democracy and showed themselves willing to risk their leadership in free and open elections. For this alone, President Park and his able assistant, Jong Pil Kim, deserve a world of credit.

Chairman Kim also deserves far more recognition than he has yet received for his statesmanship and courage in promoting the treaty normalizing relations between Korea and Japan.

Speaking about the attitude of his own people toward the Vietnamese war, Chairman Kim quoted the words of Korean President Park:

> Our own experience both in war and in international cooperation has taught us that this is the right thing to do. Our help to Vietnam was dictated by a conscience of a free people. Our support to Vietnam is not an aggressive intervention in a foreign country, but a constructive participation in defense of peace. Let it be known that our objective is not prolongation of the war, but a speedy restoration of peace.

In his speech, Chairman Kim also painted an impressive picture of the economic and social progress achieved by Korea in recent years. Let me quote briefly from his eloquent statement:

> Even as late as 1961, the image of my country as a war-devastated agricultural nation, with no products to export, lacking the capacity for industrial development, was valid.
>
> Today it is totally obsolete.
>
> From 1962 onward, President Park has been a dynamo behind the First Five Year Development Plan. The results have been spectacular.
>
> Compared to 1961, Korean economy today can boast productivity which has doubled, tripled, or in some cases grew 10 times as

much as that of the base year. The basic industries today include electricity, fertilizer, cement, petroleum refining, coal, iron and steel. Unemployment that had numbered over two million in 1961 declined to several hundred thousands.

It is expected that Korea will achieve self-sufficiency in food production by the year 1970.

Chairman Kim said that the most powerful ally of Communist aggression was fear. He said that the West was too much concerned over the possibility that Red China might enter the Vietnam conflict.

"Given limitations to Communist Chinese capability," he declared, "and, given the current circumstances, I know that Chinese Communists do not have the means with which to vastly expand their commitment in Vietnam or to fight a decisive battle against the United States.

"In Cuba and the Congo, in Algeria and Indonesia, they overextended themselves. As the newly emerging nations gained insight into the true nature of the dragon, they also began to awaken to the benefits of a free society. Today China has lost almost every friend she had in the world except her captive nations and Albania. And from that European power she cannot expect significant foreign aid."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, the entire text of Chairman Kim's remarks at Westminster College on October 6.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAWN OVER ASIA—THE PATH TO FREEDOM

(By Jong Pil Kim)

(A John Findley Green lecture to be delivered on October 6, 1966 at Westminister College, Fulton, Mo., on the occasion of the cornerstone-laying ceremonies for the Winston Churchill Memorial and Library.)

President Davidson, My Lord Bishop, Your Excellencies, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentleman, it is a great honor for me to speak from this rostrum today at this most prominent institution of learning. The compliment is magnified by this occasion on which free men throughout the world will quietly join us in prayer for peace and praise for the endowment left to all of us by Sir Winston Churchill. It was here twenty years ago that the great world leader delivered the famous "Iron Curtain" address, in which he named an historical era that had yet to unfold before the human race. By bringing the issues of the Cold War into focus, he compelled the attention of the world to be fixed on Europe for two decades to come.

Sir Winston had correctly forecast the polarization of the world. The impact of his vision on the American public opinion was enormous, but so was the criticism against him. Soon events proved the accuracy of his predictions and proved that he had given all of us an understanding of the challenge that confronted the free world. With this understanding, the West was able to form an alliance for effective reconstruction of a free Europe.

Twenty years ago, Sir Winston had come to America from across the Atlantic. He had come to speak for Europe. I have traveled across the Pacific to talk about Asia where a hot war is being fought at this very moment. Nevertheless, my message is one of hope.

The Iron Curtain traversing Europe from the Baltic to the Adriatic Sea is rusting and the bamboo curtain stretching from the Himalayas to Mt. Diamond on the east coast of Korea has the appearance of decay after 20 years of wind and rain.

The eyes and ears of the world are turning from the Iron Curtain toward the bamboo curtain, because peace has suffered a critical wound in Asia; and because a great surgical operation has been started on this wound.

Asia is not merely a geographic name. Asia is the home of three fifths of world population. Asia occupies 30 per cent of the land surface of the earth. The Asian land mass is four times as large as that of Europe.

Asia has its philosophies, ethics, cultures, and above all it has a history of civilizations at least five thousand years old. But a realistic picture of Asia, with its seemingly portraying frustration, aggression, disunion, and laceration. Asia, with its seemingly inexhaustible natural resources, is suffering from poverty and hunger.

But the other side of this dark picture shows that hundreds of millions of free Asian peoples are struggling to improve their future.

Who are these peoples? I would say without a moment's hesitation that these are your friends, and they can be your partners in building a prosperous free world united in understanding, mutual trust and cooperation.

Modern history of Asia began with a severe shock from the Western World and Asia's reaction to this jolt. Asians were powerless before the onrushing wave of history.

Only a few centuries earlier, the Asians had been an intrepid race with their own brilliant civilization. This traditional non-materialistic culture had to yield to the scientific civilization of the West. After World War II, while the United States pursued a "Europe first" policy, a power vacuum existed in Asia.

International communism sought to fill this vacuum, often with success. In 1949, Communists took over the Chinese continent. In 1950, Communists attempted a military conquest of the Republic of Korea. Having failed in Korea, the Communists followed up with a series of probing actions along the periphery of China, from the Indian Ocean to the East China Sea. They soon found a weak spot, Vietnam.

And so, disunited Asia met with piecemeal aggression. Today Vietnam is the victim of the only hot war on the globe. And it is here freedom is fighting against an evil and ruthless international terrorism. If totalitarianism is defeated in Vietnam, it may be the last hot war.

If freedom is defeated there, it may leave us forever. The war in Vietnam may well decide the fate of the freedom of us all.

Let us remember that in Vietnam we are acting upon the truth that freedom belongs to those who are ready and willing to fight for it.

Less dramatic problems are innumerable throughout Asia; political instability resulting from the gap between socio-economic reality and adopted Western institutions; dissimilarity in the language, cultures, religions, and historical experiences of Asian countries, and conflict between assertive nationalism and need of foreign aid for modernization.

Asians have not been totally unaware of these difficult problems. There have been past attempts at solutions by calling upon the chauvinistic doctrine of the "Celestial Empire", or the totalitarian idea of the "Greater Asian Coprosperity Sphere". These designs were based on a feudal conception of a master-servant relationship applied to nations. They were predoomed to fail in an age of growing nationalism.

After World War II, a more rational solution to the problem of regional organization was offered in the form of organizations such as SEATO.

But these tend to be too West-oriented to satisfy the increasing need of the Asian peoples to exercise initiative and responsible leadership.

It is high time we gave frank recognition to the earnest aspiration of Asian peoples to build their own cooperative arrangement to promote balanced development and prosperity based on principles of equal partnership and shared responsibility.

Asians are awakening to a sense of responsibility for their own welfare, and it accounts for the recent success of spontaneous inter-Asian cooperation in political, economic, social, cultural, and even in military endeavors.

Is this a sign of Asian exclusiveness? No, it is a healthy manifestation of a regional spirit, which makes free Asia more valuable to the world community.

This new trend, evaluated against the background of traditionalism in the Asian social fabric, has a truly revolutionary significance. In contrast to the accelerated development of the Asian drive for modernization, authoritarianism and person charisma are becoming less important in Asian politics.

Asia is discovering a new and vigorous leadership, not only to rally a nation around goals of freedom, but also to promote understanding between nations. It is leadership that encourages faith and inspires trust. It is leadership that unites a people.

If faith and trust are important to a national community, so are they to an international community.

And so I would say this to my Asian contemporaries: Let us appreciate the pervasiveness and ubiquity of Western values.

To our friends in the West, I say: Let us recognize and understand the universality of the Asian issues.

I do not deny that primary responsibility for Asia's prosperity and freedom lies ultimately with the Asian peoples themselves.

I am an Asian. I have witnessed and experienced Asia's plight. Emotionally and intellectually I can identify with my fellow Asians in their sorrows and sufferings but being an Asian is not the same as knowing about Asia.

You may know much about Asia. You have perceived Asia through various communications media which enabled you to form an idea of a region thousands of miles away.

But we know that human perception is culturally conditioned and patterned. How one sees, feels and imagines about any situation is, to a large extent, determined by the kind of cultural environment in which one lives. We must admit that this has often been a cause of international misunderstandings.

Having said this, and without any pretensions to expertise, I am grateful to you for this opportunity to state my views frankly. Ladies and Gentlemen:

I wish to speak of Communist China as those of us who suffered most at her hand see her. The Chinese have always thought of their Middle Empire as a dragon in the center of the world. Throughout 5,000 years in the History of China, internal strife was a frequent occurrence. After each successful take-over, the impetus of conquest invariably victimized all those peoples and countries on the periphery of the Chinese mainland.

In 1950, only one year after their revolution, one million Red Chinese Troops crossed the Yalu to attack the Republic of Korea. This aggression was stopped, thanks to the swift and courageous resistance offered by the Korean, United States and other U.N. forces.

It is important to note that the Chinese Dragon did not recoil voluntarily. Its advance was frustrated by freedom's power to resist.

In 1953, an armistic agreement was concluded in spite of strong opposition by the Koreans. Our people had opposed an armistice that would perpetuate the tragic division of Korea indefinitely.

The Korean people were angered by the realization that in spite of untold sacrifices in blood and tears the chance to repair their lacerated country had been lost. We in Korea do not believe that the opportunity was lost because Chinese Communist forces were superior to the U.N. and U.S. forces; rather we suspect the policy of appeasement adopted by the West allowed the Communists to keep what they had gained through an open defiance of international law and order.

Chinese communism emerged out of the Korean War with a mistaken impression that they had won victory over the West and that internal discord and hesitation on the part of the West would guarantee ready success throughout the world.

Such overconfidence led the Communist Chinese to launch bold ventures overseas. The Chinese Communists seemed to operate everywhere in the world. In the Middle East, in Europe, in Africa, in Cuba and indeed in the rest of Latin America, the Chinese Communists instigated destruction and insurgence. They swallowed inoffensive and defenseless Tibet. They invaded India. They turned against their former friend, the Soviet Union, with increasing stridency. Their arrogance was incredible.

Their most powerful ally was Fear.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I know there exists in the United States a considerable pacifistic sentiment. I appreciate the attractiveness of the logic of appeasement. It can be very persuasive. But Communism is essentially a strategy of violence derived from its extremely inflexible world view which has nothing to do with what the free world prefers to hope.

What the Chinese Communists do, in short, is determined by what their strategy of world communication demands, and not by the "good will" or "good sense" of appeasement. Well meaning people have underestimated the seriousness of their enemy's intent, as they have overestimated her power.

I am well aware of the generally felt concern about the possibility of a direct confrontation between the United States and Communist China following a larger scale Communist Chinese intervention in Vietnam.

I know that it can be argued that the internal frustrations of the Chinese Communists could be turned outward.

I note with all caution the existence of potential Red Chinese nuclear capability. I do not underestimate Red Chinese's ability to raise ten million men for military and para-military purposes. I know, as all Koreans know, what the "human wave" tactics can and cannot do.

But, given limitations to Communist Chinese capability and, given the current circumstances, I know that Chinese Communists do not have the means with which to vastly expand their commitment in Vietnam or to fight a decisive battle against the United States.

In Cuba and the Congo, in Algeria and Indonesia, they overextended themselves. As the newly emerging nations gained insight into the true nature of the dragon, they also began to awaken to the benefits of a free society. Today China has lost almost every friend she had in the world except her captive nations and Albania. And from that European power she cannot expect significant foreign aid.

Meanwhile, internal convulsions such as the "Great Leap Forward" movement had reaped failure in Red China. Purges and struggles inevitably followed under the system of Communist dictatorship.

Even on the mainland, the Chinese people have offered resistance against the incredible vandalism and barbarity of the Red Guard. The weakness fundamental to the Chinese Communist regime is clearly observed by those of us who live in Asia.

Above all, we must not overlook the decisive encouragement and commitment of the United States. I believe this has been a constant source of inspiration and encouragement to millions of Asian peoples and had much to do with the shift of world opinion against the excessively militant breed of Communism.

Before I proceed further, let me make it clear that I am no believer in a preventive war.

But the war is a fact in Vietnam. You have already committed your national resources and prestige to the noble task of performing surgery on a wound in the tissues of peace. This wound was inflicted upon peace by the Communist aggressors, emphatically not by the surgeon. You hold in your hand a surgeon's knife.

And you do not stand alone. Side by side with your soldiers are Asian crusaders for freedom and peace in Vietnam. The United States, the Republic of Korea, Thailand, the Philippines, Australia and New Zealand are fighting a war against the Communist terrorists and guerrillas in Vietnam.

There is a voice in the United States, clamoring for immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam. To leave Vietnam now would be like asking a surgeon to quit the patient after an incision has been made but before the wound has been sutured. If the surgeon followed that advice, a man would die from loss of blood, or would, at best, become crippled for the rest of his life.

I think the duty in this case is to see the operation through.

Those who advocate appeasement would give the patient a temporary relief, some kind of pain-killing drug. I do not think this is the right prescription.

I abhor fanaticism; but I am equally against defeatism. I do not believe in quitting or abandoning one's responsibility.

Everyone desires peace. Mankind has fought for thousands and thousands of years for peace, but peace cannot be gained by stopgap measures or makeshift policy.

Peace requires understanding and mutual cooperation among those who sincerely desire it. Such understanding and cooperation can be achieved only through sacrifice. Yes, peace requires efforts, yours and mine. Peace may call for our blood and our tears, as it does now. But the Korean people are convinced the prize of peace is worth the sacrifice.

Peace is a supreme virtue that man can cultivate.

The mainspring of power for peace lies in the collective conscience of mankind, for through the living conscience of mankind the will of God is revealed. Man must do what he can and obey the will of God.

Upon the shoulders of all of us who are born in this age—regardless of the difference in color of skin, nationality or traditional backgrounds—lies the inescapable responsibility to trudge on the narrow path of peace.

In 1965, the government of the Republic of Korea under President Park accepted the request of the government of the Republic of Vietnam for military assistance and sent more than 40,000 Korean soldiers to their aid.

On that occasion, President Chung Hee Park declared: "Our own experience both in war and in international cooperation has taught us that this is the right thing to do. Our help to Vietnam was dictated by a conscience of a free people. Our support to Vietnam is not an aggressive intervention in a foreign country, but a constructive participation in defense of peace. Let it be known that our objective is not prolongation of the war, but a speedy restoration of peace."

At the root of President Park's decision are faith, trust and courage.

Korea has never forgotten that she owes a debt of gratitude to the free allies which had offered help in the darkest days of the republic. Koreans attach a great importance to loyalty and trust. Koreans are a faithful people.

I would like to say to President Truman, "You kept faith with us. Now we will keep faith with you."

I know that in modern international relations, where "national interest" is paramount, loyalty or trust are often thrown aside. I know that international loyalty is an extremely rare occurrence. But precisely because it is so hard to come by, its value is enhanced.

It may be that the very concept is peculiarly "Asian" or premodern. But this is one traditional value which I do not wish to see discarded.

Now let me tell you of a country, my country, that is strongly conscious of these values. My country is determined to strengthen the sinews of peace in Asia. And the news from Korea is good—astonishingly good!

Ladies and Gentlemen:

The Republic of Korea has journeyed a turbulent path since 1948. We had barely recovered from the economic dislocations imposed by a half century of Japanese occupation and imperialism, and the illegal division of our country imposed by Soviet Arms at the end of World War II, when we were plunged into a new crisis.

Even as late as 1961, the image of my country as a war-devastated agricultural nation, with no products for export, lacking the capacity for industrial development, was valid.

Today it is totally obsolete.

From 1962 onward, President Park has been a dynamo behind the First Five Year Development Plan. The results have been spectacular.

Compared to 1961, Korean economy today can boast productivity which has doubled, tripled, or in some cases grew 10 times as much as that of the base year. The basic industries today include electricity, fertilizer, cement, petroleum refining, coal, iron and steel. Unemployment that has numbered over two million in 1961 declined to several hundred thousands.

It is expected that Korea will achieve self-sufficiency in food production by the year 1970.

Korea has emerged out of despair and is now growing at a yearly rate of 7.6 per cent. Today, Korea exports six times as much as she did five years ago. Manufactured goods occupy 62 per cent of the gross export earnings, and Korea is now fast becoming an industrial nation.

Economy is expected to reach a "take-off" stage by 1970s and Korea's annual per capita income is expected to more than triple.

We are forging the iron sinews of self sufficiency in the furnace of a free economy. Our success has rested on the industry and resourcefulness of the Korean people but our progress could not have been possible, first without military victory of the United Nations forces and subsequently without massive an intelligently utilized American aid.

Once, our future and the future of the free democracies everywhere in Asia looked dim; economic stagnation seemed to conspire with political instability to complete a vicious circle. Today it is our hope that your patience and generosity will be rewarded when we so raise our standards of living in an atmosphere of freedom that we become a beacon for all the newly developing nations who seek the way to social justice and economic plenty.

Other nations in free Asia are making similar progress. We are much encouraged to see that understanding by the United States and European countries for Asia is developing and consequently their assistance and cooperation with Asia is increasing.

Although American concern for Asia in the past was belated and negative compared with that for Europe, Asian problems have a greater bearing on the destiny of the United States than any other problems in today's world.

Last July, President Johnson said, and I quote: "Asia is now the crucial arena of man's striving for independence and order . . . and for life itself . . . If enduring peace can come to Asia, all mankind will benefit. But if peace fails there, no where else will our achievements be secure."

We believe that President Johnson's analysis is prophetic.

Asia now faces a decisive moment. Opportunity knocks but once. This is the opportunity the Free World can ill afford to lose.

Let no historian in the future sadly reflect on the what-might-have-been in Asia.

There is a growing consensus about what should be done in Asia by Asians. And today Asia is more daring than ever before in taking the initiative in solving numerous problems.

The Republic of Korea wishes to play a leading role in the march toward a free and unified Asian community. We have already given momentum to this movement. The Republic of Korea, which suffered untold sacrifices when Communistic aggression provoked the war of 1950, is again fulfilling its responsibility in South Vietnam with conviction and zeal. We are convinced that ultimately peace will never be achieved through appeasement, but only through a positive action backed by the united strength of the entire free world.

This is the moment when United States cooperation with Asia should be intensified. The firm American stand in Vietnam has also provided the momentum to establish a system of regional cooperation in Asia. Our own efforts to establish a regional cooperative system have been steadily progressing and bearing fruit.

I think the signal is "Go" for a free united Asia.

It is my belief that world peace will have a solid foundation when free Asia is bound with a "rope of peace" and is further united with the western free world. Only then will the free world be able to tear down the rusting Iron Curtain and roll up the Bamboo Curtain. Only then, the free world, if it so desires, will be able to negotiate with the Communist bloc through strength achieved by unity. Then can the peoples of divided Korea and Vietnam be able to regain territorial and national unity.

In this way, when a new cooperative system comes into being, Asia, once considered as a burden to the world, will become a proud region which can make a positive contribution to the welfare of all. Asian civilization, which has been superseded by European material culture, will recover its lustre and contribute toward a greater and higher civilization.

Asia, emerging from a long darkness, faces a new dawn.

My country, Korea, is at the forefront on Asia's path to freedom—shoulder to shoulder with other free men and women everywhere.

Toward the bright sun—and toward a shining peace.

Thank you.

A TRIBUTE TO RETIRING SENATORS SALTONSTALL, RUSSELL, AND SIMPSON

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I want to join with the many others who have a sense of loss at the retirement of Senators SALTONSTALL, SIMPSON, and DONALD RUSSELL, of South Carolina.

My association with each of these three Senators has given me a great respect for them, not only as friends and associates, but as men true to their own deep personal convictions on national policy.

Senator SALTONSTALL's thoughtful, rather, than partisan, approach to problems before us have repeatedly impressed me.

It has been my pleasure to serve with Senator DONALD RUSSELL on the Agriculture Committee, and MILWARD SIMPSON on the Interior Committee. I consequently know something of the time and energy they have devoted to the national interest, and to effective representation of their constituencies.

I am pleased to know that Senator RUSSELL will continue in the public service on the Federal bench, a role for which he is extremely well qualified. He has made a real contribution to the development of domestic agricultural programs, and the new food-for-peace program.

Senator SIMPSON has proved not only a genial colleague, but one of our committee's most knowledgeable members in the fields of water, recreation, and natural resources.

I wish each of them Godspeed in the years ahead. I am sure that wherever they may be, they will be continuing to serve the public good, as they have so ably served it in the past.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 3466) to change the name of the Rolla Jewel bearing plant at Rolla, N. Dak., to the William Langer Jewel bearing plant.

The message also anounced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9167) to amend title 18 of the United States Code to enable the courts to deal more effectively with the problem of narcotic addiction, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 647) to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to permit the appointment of new trustees in deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by agreement of the parties.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14643) to provide for the strengthening of American educational resources for international studies and research, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 203) to amend title 38, United States Code, to set aside funds for research into spinal cord injuries and diseases.

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1966

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14643) to provide for the strengthening of American educational resources for international studies and research, which was in lieu of the matter inserted by the Senate amendment to the text of the bill, insert the following:

That this Act may be cited as the "International Education Act of 1966".

Findings and declaration

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that a knowledge of other countries is of the utmost importance in promoting mutual understanding and cooperation between nations; that strong American educational resources are a necessary base for strengthening our relations with other countries; that this and future generations of Americans should be assured ample opportunity to develop to the fullest extent possible their intellectual capacities in all areas of knowledge pertaining to other countries, peoples, and cultures; and that it is therefore both necessary and appropriate for the Federal Government to assist in the development of resources for international study and research, to assist in the development of resources and trained personnel in academic and professional fields, and to coordinate the existing and future programs of the Federal Government in international education, to meet the requirements of world leadership.

TITLE I—GRANT PROGRAMS FOR ADVANCED AND UNDERGRADUATE INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

Centers for Advanced International Studies

SEC. 101. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to arrange through grants to institutions of higher education, or combinations of such institutions, for the establishment, strengthening, and operation by them of graduate centers which will be national and international resources for research and training in international studies and the international aspects of professional and other fields of study. Activities carried on in such centers may be concentrated either on specific geographical areas of the world or on particular fields or issues in world affairs which concern one or more countries, or on both. The Secretary may also make grants to public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations, including professional and scholarly associations, when such grants will make an especially significant contribution to attaining the objectives of this section.

(b) Grants under this section may be used to cover part or all of the cost of establishing, strengthening, equipping, and operating research and training centers, including the cost of teaching and research materials and resources, the cost of programs for bringing visiting scholars and faculty to the center, and the cost of training, improvement, and travel of the staff for the purpose of carrying out the objectives of this section. Such grants may also include funds for stipends (in such amounts as may be determined in accordance with regulations of the Secretary) to individuals undergoing training in such centers, including allowances for dependents and for travel for research and study here and abroad. Grants under this section shall be made on such conditions as the Secretary finds necessary to carry out its purposes.

Grants To Strengthen Undergraduate Programs in International Studies

SEC. 102. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to institutions of higher education, or combinations of such institutions, to assist them in planning, developing, and carrying out a comprehensive program to strengthen and improve undergraduate instruction in international studies. Grants made under this section may be for projects and activities which are an integral part of such a comprehensive program such as—

(1) planning for the development and expansion of undergraduate programs in international studies;

(2) teaching, research, curriculum development, and other related activities;

(3) training of faculty members in foreign countries;

(4) expansion of foreign language courses;

(5) planned and supervised student work-study-travel programs;

(6) programs under which foreign teachers and scholars may visit institutions as visiting faculty; and

(7) programs of English language training for foreign teachers, scholars, and students.

The Secretary may also make grants to public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations, including professional and scholarly associations, when such grants will make an especially significant contribution to attaining the objectives of this section.

(b) A grant may be made under this section only upon application to the Secretary at such time or times and containing such information as he deems necessary. The Secretary shall not approve an application unless it—

(1) sets forth a program for carrying out one or more projects or activities for which a grant is authorized under subsection (a);

(2) sets forth policies and procedures which assure that Federal funds made available under this section for any fiscal year will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available for purposes which meet the requirements of subsection (a), and in no case supplant such funds;

(3) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this section; and

(4) provides for making such report, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may require to carry out his functions under this section, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Secretary may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

(c) The Secretary shall allocate grants to institutions of higher education under this section in such manner and according to such plan as will most nearly provide an equitable distribution of the grants throughout the States while at the same time giving a preference to those institutions which are most in need of funds for programs in international studies and which show real promise of being able to use funds effectively.

Method of Payment; Federal Administration

SEC. 103. (a) Payments under this title may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

(b) In administering the provisions of this title, the Secretary is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution, in accordance with written agreements between the Secretary and the head thereof published in the Federal Register three weeks prior to the date on which any such agreement is to become effective.

Federal Control of Education Prohibited

SEC. 104. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution, or the selection of library resources by any educational institution or over the content of any material developed or published under any program assisted pursuant to this Act.

Authorization and Reports

SEC. 105. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated $1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, which shall be available only for the purpose of preparing the report provided for in subsection (b) of this section. There are authorized to be appropriated $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $90,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title. For the fiscal years thereafter there shall be appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title only such amounts as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

(b) The Secretary shall prepare, with the advice of the Advisory Committee appointed pursuant to section 106, a report containing specific recommendations for carrying out the provisions of this title, including any recommendations for amendments to this title and to portions of other laws amended by this Act, and shall submit such report to the President and the Congress not later than April 30, 1967.

(c) Prior to January 31, 1968, and prior to January 31 in each year thereafter, the Secretary shall make a report to the Congress which reviews and evaluates activities carried on under the authority of this Act and which reviews other activities of the Federal Government drawing upon or strengthening American resources for international study and research and any existing activities and plans to coordinate and improve the efforts of the Federal Government in international education.

National Advisory Committee on International Studies

SEC. 106. (a) The President is authorized to establish in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a National Advisory Committee on International Studies, consisting of the Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Education who shall be chairman, and not more than fifteen additional members appointed by the President so that a majority shall constitute a broad representation of higher education in the United States and the remainder shall include representatives of the general public and individuals experienced in foreign affairs.

(b) The Advisory Committee shall advise the Secretary in the preparation of the report provided for in section 105(b) of this Act, and thereafter shall advise the Secretary in carrying out the provisions of this Act. The recommendations of the Advisory Committee shall be included in the report provided for in section 105(b) of this Act and in the annual reports provided for in section 105(c) of this Act.

(c) Members of the Advisory Committee who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on business of the Committee, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the President, but not exceeding $100 per day, including traveltime; and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code for persons in Government service employed intermittently.

(d) The Advisory Committee is authorized to appoint without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, covering appointment in the competitive service, and fix the compensation of, without regard to chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title, such professional and technical personnel as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its duties.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO OTHER LAWS

Amendments To Strengthen Title VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958

Removing requirement for area centers that adequate language instruction not be readily available

SEC. 201. (a)(1) The first sentence of section 601(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out "(1)" and by striking out ", and (2) that adequate instruction in such language is not readily available in the United States".

(2) The first sentence of section 601(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "(with respect to which he makes the determination under clause (1) of subsection (a))" and inserting in lieu thereof "(with respect to which he makes the determination under subsection (a))".

Removing 50 per centum ceiling on Federal participation

(b) The third sentence of section 601(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "not more than 50 per centum" and inserting "all or part" in lieu thereof.

Authorizing grants as well as contracts for language and area centers

(c) Section 601(a) of such Act is amended further by inserting "grants to or" after "arrange through" in the first sentence, and by inserting "grant or" before "contract" each time that it appears in the second and third sentences.

Vesting authority for language and area programs in Secretary

(d) Section 601 of such Act is further amended by striking out "Commissioner" each time such term occurs therein and inserting in lieu therof "Secretary".

Amendments to Strengthen Title XI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958

SEC. 202. Title XI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended—

(1) by inserting after the title the following: "PART I—GENERAL";

(2) by striking out the word "title" in section 1102 and inserting in lieu thereof the word "part"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof a new part as follows:

"Part II—International affairs

"International Affairs Institutes for Secondary School Teachers

"SEC. 1111. There are authorized to be appropriated $3,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and $6,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, to enable the Commissioner to arrange through contracts with institutions of higher education for the establishment and operation of short-term or regular-session institutes for teachers in secondary schools in order to give them a broader understanding of international affairs. Any such arrangement may cover the cost of the establishment and operation of the institute with respect to which it is made, including the cost of grants to the staff of travel in the foreign areas, regions, or countries with which the subject matter of the field or fields in which they are or will be working is concerned, and the cost of travel of foreign scholars to enable them to teach or assist in teaching in such institute and the cost of their return, and shall be made on such conditions as the Commissioner finds necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

"Stipends

"SEC. 1112. The Commissioner is authorized to pay stipends to any individual to study in a program assisted under the provisions of this part upon determining that assisting such individual in such studies will promote the purpose of this part. Stipends under the provisions of this section may include allowances for dependents and for travel to and from the place of residence."

Amendments to Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961

SEC. 203. (a) Section 102(b) of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2452) is amended (1) by striking the period at the end of clause (9) and substituting a semicolon and the word "and"; and (2) by adding at the end thereof a new clause as follows:

"(10) promoting studies, research, instruction, and other educational activities of citizens and nationals of foreign countries in American schools, colleges, and universities located in the United States by making available to citizens and nationals of less developed friendly foreign countries for exchange for currencies of their respective countries (other than excess foreign currencies), at United States embassies. United States dollars in such amounts as may be necessary to enable such foreign citizens or nationals who are coming temporarily to the United States as students, trainees, teachers, instructors, or professors to meet expenses of the kind described in section 104(e)(1) of this Act."

(b) Section 104 of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(g)(1) For the purpose of performing functions authorized by section 102(b)(10) of this Act, the President is authorized to establish the exchange rates at which all foreign currencies may be acquired through operations under such section, and shall issue regulations binding upon all embassies with respect to the exchange rates to be applicable in each of the respective countries where currency exchange are authorized under such section.

"(2) In performing the functions authorized under section 102(b)(10) of this Act, the President shall make suitable arrangements for protecting the interests of the United States Government in connection with the ownership use, and disposition of all foreign currencies acquired pursuant to exchanges made under such section.

"(3) The total amount of United States dollars acquired by any individual through currency exchanges under the authority of section 102(b)(10) of this Act shall in no event exceed $3,000 during any academic year.

"(4) An individual shall be eligible to exchange foreign currency for United States dollars at United States embassies under section 102(b)(10) of this Act only if he gives satisfactory assurances that (A) he will devote essentially full time to his proposed educational activity in the United States and will maintain good standing in relation to such program; (B) he will return to the country of his citizenship or nationality prior to coming to the United States and will render such public service as is determined acceptable for a period of time determined reasonable and necessary by the government of such country; and (C) he will not apply for an immigrant visa or for permanent residence or for a nonimmigrant visa under the Immigration and Nationality Act after having received any benefits under such section for a period of time equal to the period of study, research, instruction, or other educational activity he performed pursuant to such section.

"(5) As used in section 102(b)(10) of this Act, the term 'excess foreign currencies' means foreign currencies, which if acquired by the United States (A) would be in excess of the normal requirements of departments, agencies, and embassies of the United States for such currencies, as determined by the President, and (B) would be available for the use of the United States Government under applicable agreements with the foreign country concerned."

(c) Section 105 of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(g) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of making currency exchanges under section 102(b)(10) of this Act, not to exceed $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and not to exceed $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.".

Extending the Benefits of the Loan Insurance Program Under Title IV–B of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to Students Studying Abroad

SEC. 204. The second sentence of section 435(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by inserting after "Such term" the following: "includes any institution outside the States which is comparable to an institution described in the preceding sentence and which has been approved by the Commissioner for the purposes of this title, and".

TITLE III—STUDY BY THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Authorization for a Study on Ways To Reduce the Drain From Developing Countries of Professional Persons and Skilled Specialists Whose Skills Are Urgently Needed

SEC. 301. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall conduct a study and investigation to determine (1) the total number of individuals who enter the United States from developing countries annually to further their education, and who remain in the United States; (2) the reasons for their failure to return to their home countries; and (3) means of encouraging the return of such individuals to the countries of their last residence or nationality, so they may put their education and training to work in the service of their homelands.

(b) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall report to the President and to the Congress as soon as practicable on his findings and conclusions together with such recommendations for any legislation he deems desirable to encourage the return of such individuals to such countries.

(c) It is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $50,000 for the purpose of carrying out this study.

TITLE IV—AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF CERTAIN LAND AS RECREATION AREA

Authorization

SEC. 401. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Act of April 29, 1876 (19 Stat. 41; 40 U.S.C. 214) and the provisions of the Act of July 31, 1946 (60 Stat. 718; 40 U.S.C. 193a–193i), the Architect of the Capitol is authorized to permit the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to operate for recreational purposes only, and without any improvement to said land, that part of the United States Capitol Grounds known as Square 732 in the District of Columbia, bounded by Independence Avenue Southeast, Second Street Southeast, C Street Southeast, and First Street Southeast, and inersected by Carroll Street, for such period of time as said land is not required for building or other purposes by the Architect of the Capitol.

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this bill, H.R. 14643, is returned to us from the House of Representatives in the identical form that it passed the Senate on October 13 with the exception of section 205. This section amends title VII of the Public Health Service Act to authorize direct student loans to students studying outside the United States at a school of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, or optometry approved by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Section 205 was dropped by the House without prejudice and solely for jurisdictional reasons without reference to the merits of the provision. In the Senate, the Labor and Public Welfare Committee has jurisdiction over both health and education matters. However, the House Committee on Education and Labor exercises no jurisdiction over health. Since section 205 amends a health law and normally comes within the area of responsibility of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the House Committee on Education and Labor dropped it from the bill.

It is anticipated that the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee will have an opportunity during the next session to consider the provisions of section 205 as part of an appropriate health measure. I have discussed this with Senator JAVITS, the sponsor of section 205, and he is satisfied, interposes no objections, and supports H.R. 14643 as it now comes to us.

Mr. President, one final word. In passing this bill, it is not, of course, the intention of either the Senate or the House to finance the education of foreign students in foreign countries.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. First, Mr. President, I should like to express to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] our thanks for allowing us to proceed with this matter when he was entitled to the floor. I told him I would take only a minute. This I intend to do.

It is true that without any regard to the merits we must drop the section providing for direct loans for U.S. medical school students studying abroad. I agree with that. However, the bill is a landmark, because, for the first time, it recognizes where our country stands with respect to the need of international affairs education so we can carry out our enormous responsibilities as a first-rate power.

The bill contains amendments which I had the honor to sponsor.

First, it provides for what we may call a reverse Fulbright program, so that we can, to a limited extent, help students in those underdeveloped countries where we do not have surplus local funds who wish to study here, including those whom their governments wish to aid to study in the United States. By use of their local currencies, which can then be exchanged, they can pay for their expenses over here. Hence, it does not hurt us at all, and will help some thousands of foreign students as part of this so-called reverse Fulbright program.

Second, there was an amendment adopted to title XI of the National Defense Education Act to include in the bill provision for institutes for high school teachers on international affairs, so that our teachers, even at the high school level, may be able to get some concept of international relations and our role in the world.

Finally, there was included guaranteed loans for American students abroad from private sources following the pattern of the domestic program established under title IV of the Higher Education Act.

So it is an excellent bill. What we have had to drop is regrettable, but by no means decisive, and I hope the Senate will accept the House bill, as amended.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Oregon spoke earlier on the higher education bill, but he is speaking again on another piece of education legislation.

There has been passed, in the 89th Congress, 2d session, more legislation, which originated in the Education Subcommittee, than in the rest of the history of the Congress of the United States combined. The Senator from Oregon has been the architect in writing this legislation and in working out compromises between the House and the Senate.

In addition to the higher education bill, which was passed a short time ago, we now have the international education bill.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] brought out one point that is of significance when he said that we ought to be helping with loans American medical students who go to foreign schools. This would be helpful to those students, but the need is underscored by the fact that there are not sufficient opportunities for Americans to attend American medical schools. Twelve percent of American medical students are in foreign universities, because there are not enough American medical schools.

In 1963 we passed the Medical Education Act to help build more medical schools, envisioning 20 new medical schools. Only six have been built. Twenty-one or twenty-two percent of the interns in hospitals are graduates of foreign schools, and 27 percent of the residents are.

By our failure to build enough medical schools, we are denying to American boys and girls the opportunity to fill the gap by training enough physicians to take the place of doctors who are dying and retiring and the additional number needed as a result of the expanding number of Americans.

This bill is a step forward, but I think it is essential that we have provisions in other legislation that will enable American medical students to go to foreign schools to get their medical education.

I repeat, it has been a pleasure to work with the Senator from Oregon on education legislation. It has been my pleasure to work shoulder to shoulder with him since 1958, when I joined in the coauthorship of the National Education Defense Act. It has been my privilege to support all those measures in the subcommittee and on the floor. I think we can be proud of the work of the subcommittee and of the full committee in bringing to the floor measures which could be enacted into law, bills that have done so much to strengthen education in the primary schools, the secondary schools, the junior and senior colleges.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Texas for his generosity. I have already expressed on many occasions my appreciation for the help Senator YARBOROUGH has been to me as chairman of the subcommittee and as manager of the bill.

Mr. President, the record speaks for itself. The Senator from Texas and the Senator from Oregon have never differed on these matters. We have given our complete support to the objectives of these pieces of legislation. It is that kind of support I have received in the committee that makes it possible for us to report this bill and other education bills.

However, I want to say that the person who deserves the major credit for the bill before us today is the President of the United States. I want the record to show that this bill carries out the objective of the President. The President recognizes the importance of our dealing with an international education program, first by providing support for our graduate and undergraduate institutions here in this country, and for developing the programs, the curriculums, and the personnel necessary to make it possible for us to attack the major problems we face in the field of education abroad. There are many problems abroad, but this is a major one.

When the President called me and asked me to introduce a bill, I will never forget what the President said. The President pointed out the direct relationship between peace and literacy. How right he is. When we proceed today to enact this education bill, in my judgment we are striking a blow for world peace, because as we prepare ourselves to bring literacy to the world, we increase the chances, in my judgment, of mankind living in peace. Out of literacy will come that support for the programs that are necessary to improve the economic standards of the masses of the people of the world, who, because of their illiteracy are or have been victims of communism and other forms of totalitarianism.

So although the President's original program was not the bill in the form in which we are passing it today, the bill in the form in which we are passing it today carries out the major objective of the President. But come next year, let me announce to the Senate today, so that it will be a matter of record, a bill will be introduced to expand the program, once the institutions in this country develop the curriculums and the personnel necessary to make it possible for us to attack educational problems abroad, including the problem of illiteracy.

There is one item I wish I could report, but cannot report. I wish I could report that the Committees on Appropriations of the two Houses have agreed to include in the supplemental appropriation bill money with which to enable this program to be started. The authorization bill provides for $1 million. It provides for the appointment of a National Advisory Council whose April 30th report to the Congress should outline the international education programs scheduled to start July 1, 1967.

I was advised this morning—and it is sad to contemplate—that the Appropriations Committees have eliminated any funds for the financing of the National Advisory Council. The bill before us calls for a report of the council's plans by April 30, 1967. But a program cannot be started at all if the National Advisory Council cannot begin its work.

I cannot speak for the President, but I am willing to take judicial notice, because of the President's dedication to the cause of the bill, that undoubtedly, either in the state of the Union message or in a special message to Congress in January, he will make his plea for the funds, so that we can get on with the job. It may not be possible, let the legislative history show, to have the National Advisory Council created by the bill submit its report by April 30, 1967, because we are denying the Council an opportunity to work in November and December 1966. It may be possible, with great effort on their part, to submit the report anyway; but Congress should know that although we pass the bill today, it is a bill which will have no financing. I hope that at an early date in January, through the intervention of the President by way of recommendations for immediate funds, a supplemental appropriation can be made, so that the President may create the Council, because he is the on who will appoint it, and the Council may get on with its work.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks there may appear a brief table containing the authorization of the conference bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

H.R. 14643—International Education Act of 1966—Conference bill

[In millions]

	1967	*1968*	*1969*
Sec. 105 (grant programs) (study)	$1	$40	$90
Sec. 111 (institutes)	3.5	6	----
Sec. 203 (currency exchange)	-----	10	15
Sec. 301 (foreign student study)	.05	----	----

Mr. MORSE. Now, before I make the motion that the Senate concur, I have a little personal message from my friend from Ohio. I do not only wish to join the Senator from New York in thanking him for yielding to us, so that we could get this very important privileged matter taken care of by the Senate, but I have whispered to him that as soon as I get the bill passed——

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Oregon will never finish.

Mr. MORSE. I shall slip down to the restaurant and get him a cigar—and I promise him it will not be a Cuban cigar.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion of the Senator from Oregon was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CONFERENCE OF SOCIALIST SCHOLARS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President in the September 19 issue of Barron's magazine, there appears an article written by

Alice Widener. This particular article is an excerpt of a paper which she had previously written. The title of the article is "East-West Ballrooms—A Report on the Second Conference of Socialist Scholars." I shall read excerpts from the article, and later ask that the entire piece be printed in the RECORD.

Alice Widener states:

> While ordinary out-of-towners were registering at the reception desk in the main lobby of the Hotel Commodore in New York City, Friday evening, September 9, 1966, more than two thousand members of the Old and New Left were registering at tables set up in ballroom floor hallways to attend the Second Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars.
>
> There were no TV cameras around to film the arrival from London of White-bearded Marxist zealot Isaac Deutscher, invited by the Socialist Scholars to open the conference with a discourse "On Socialist Man." Nor were any cameras turned on 54-year-old Victor Perlo, identified in Congressional hearings as a member of a Soviet espionage ring while he was in U.S. Government employ during World War II.

She further notes that Communist Herbert Aptheker, age 51, was present. She goes on to state:

> For some reason, it seems that nowadays communications media report only the effects of the Leftist radicals' activities—on the bloody race riots, street demonstrations—

Is the Senator calling me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I had better read this paragraph again:

> For some reason, it seems that nowadays communications media report only on the effects of the Leftist radicals' activities—on the bloody race riots, street demonstrations, and acts of civil disobedience—but (though most meetings, like this one, are publicly announced), avoid the gatherings where plans for such activities are hatched.

Mrs. Widener, continuing, states that the speaker, Deutscher, made the following statement:

> The whole trouble with the world—said Deutscher—is that "unsocial private property disunites society." There is no need, he said, for man to concern himself with "an ultimate metaphysical purpose" in his existence. "Socialist man," he ranted, "will be exempt from worship and awe."

I suppose he meant exempt from worship and awe at the thought of the Lord.

Further he is quoted as saying:

> After fatherhood has come to be regarded only as biological, and "paternal authority" as a mere social institution to be destroyed, the "bourgeois form of the patriarchal family" will be obliterated.

The family will be obliterated because there will be no justification for it, was the effect of what Deutscher said to those 1,200 Socialist scholars assembled in the Commodore Hotel in New York on September 9, 1966.

The article continues:

> At the Socialist Scholars' discussion of "poverty and powerlessness," panelist James Haughton, director of the Harlem Unemployment Center, ranted into the microphone on the dais:
>
> "Specifically, yes, the welfare system is rotten, but so is the whole American system rotten. You can't look anywhere in this country and see anything but rottenness . . . Wherever the American octopus reaches out its tentacles, there you will find exploitation, cruelty, poverty, mass impoverishment." Dr. Haughton called for "revolutionary change, not reforms." The applause in the ballroom was deafening.
>
> Haughton's impassioned speech followed a paper presented by Prof. Richard A. Cloward of Columbia.

I ask my fellow Senators to pay special attention to what Cloward said, what he advised, and how his advice was carried into execution, with the cameras, the televisions, and the radios all there, to portray to the people of the Nation what happened.

I read further from the article:

> Haughton's impassioned speech followed a paper presented by Prof. Richard A. Cloward of Columbia, whose work in sociology has greatly influenced the scandal-ridden, multimillion dollar Mobilization for Youth program in New York City, as well as the multibillion dollar federal Poverty Program. Dr. Cloward is also a member of Citizens Crusade Against Poverty.
>
> Written with associate sociologist Frances Piven of Columbia, Dr. Cloward's paper for the Socialist Scholars opened with a call for a systematic strategy of "irregular and disruptive tactics" among the poor, urging them to overburden city and state governments with their "demands."
>
> Prof. Cloward explained that each welfare "client" in New York City is entitled by law to special benefits for clothing, blankets and the like. He said that in 1965, special city benefits welfare payments amounted to "about $40 per client," and he called for each welfare client to demand $100 to $1,000 in such benefits.

One will wonder why he was advocating concerted action of the poor in increasing their demands upon the Government by asking for from $100 to $1,000 of benefits.

I continue to read:

> He said there are now 550,000 welfare clients in the city, but that by 1967 there probably will be 600,000.
>
> He went on to say that last month he had participated in "a national conference to organize the welfare recipients movement." Dr. Cloward said that he also had taken a personal part in Wednesday night meetings with welfare clients "week after week, month after month," and that as a result, "Next Monday there will be a demonstration of welfare recipients at City Hall."
>
> Dr. Cloward read his paper to the Socialist Scholars Conference on Saturday afternoon. On Monday night CBS and NBC television newscasts showed the demonstration of screaming welfare recipients that took place right on schedule.

I summarize this last part. Saturday afternoon Cloward addressed the Socialist scholars. He said that he was in conference with welfare recipients on last Wednesday and that they were organized to demonstrate on Monday night.

When Monday night arrived, these welfare recipients were involved in riots and were screaming and protesting in front of the New York City Hall.

While there are many important aspects of this matter, the one that perplexes me the most is that when they met on September 9, with 1,200 of them assembled there, not one word was reported in the news media concerning what was going on. Discussions were had and predictions were made as to what was going to happen on Monday night. When the riots took place on Monday night, the television cameras were there. Why were they not present when Aptheker and Cloward and Deutscher were speaking in condemnation of our system and foretelling what was going to happen?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, is the Senator suggesting that in our efforts to maintain order and peace and orderly processes it might be part of the duty of the radio and television media and the press to report the rehearsals which occur before the riots take place so that they can be anticipated and never allowed to occur or that the problem may be taken care of before public welfare is endangered and put in jeopardy, as recently occurred in Oakland, Calif.?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from California has stated my thinking on the matter. He has stated the thinking of the writer of this column, Alice Widener when she said:

> For some reason it seems that nowadays communications media report only on the effects of the leftist radicals' activities—on the bloody riots, street demonstrations, and acts of civil disobedience, but though most meetings like this one are publicly announced, they avoid the gatherings where plans for such activities are hatched.

Is it not mysterious that, when 1,200 Socialist scholars assemble and speeches of the type which have been quoted are made, not one report is made on the "Today" program or on any other television broadcasts, and no report is made of the prediction that was made on Saturday that there would be riots on Monday?

There is complete silence until the riots occur. The media are then there to portray to the world what is supposed to be the riotous and disorderly conditions existing, without telling the world how the plans were hatched and became a reality.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, in the present status of world affairs and with the tensions existing in the presence of a dangerous trip being made by the Chief Executive of the United States to far-off places in order to bring understanding and peace, would the Senator agree that possibly the prediction of such riots might work to the disadvantage of the efforts being made by the President of the United States and to the disadvantage of all people who are thinking of constructive solutions rather than of a perpetration of further troublemaking?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Unquestionably, the answer is yes. Our country is portrayed as being inhumane, oppressive, and unwilling to recognize the needs of people. This is done by showing the riots.

When others try to appraise our pride in our humanitarian instincts and deeds, all they have to do is to point out that a riot has occurred in New York.

They have the pictures of the riot, but where was it hatched? It was hatched at the Commodore Hotel, with 1,200 scholars of socialism present, and where it was foretold that on Monday night the welfare recipients would be making their attack upon the city hall.

Mr. MURPHY. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes, I do.

Mr. MURPHY. Knowing the Senator's background and experience in these matters, would it seem proper to say that this is a technique that was started many, many years ago, in the beginning of World War II, which all America and all the world objected to: the technique of the big lie, the technique of the manufactured circumstance, the technique of the fabricated condition—the riot, if you will; and has not this technique been adopted by the Communists as part of the program of the hoped-for destruction of our way of life; and does not this seem to be a familiar characteristic that the American people, particularly the media, who are experienced in these matters, should recognize and expose, so that the American people and the people around the world might have a truer picture of what actually is the character of America and its people?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator has expressed the situation in far better terms than I am capable of. I merely wish to express my approval of what he has said.

In addition, Alice Widener writes:

> The prospects outlined by Dr. Cloward delighted Prof. William Ryan (formerly of Harvard, now of Yale), who described himself as "a radical without portfolio."

This is Prof. William Ryan. Professor Ryan said:

> I have been enchanted with the Cloward strategy of blowing a fuse in the welfare agencies, housing developments, and among unmarried mothers. I wonder what would happen if there was a really systematic overload.

Well, the implication is that if you make the overload through demands achieved by demonstrations and riots, Ryan asks what will happen. He implies that he hopes that the revolutionary overturn may come. That is the only deduction that I can make from his statement.

There are several more columns to this article, Mr. President. I shall not attempt to discuss them in detail. I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The East-West Ballrooms—A Report on the Second Conference of Socialist Scholars

While ordinary out-of-towners were registering at the reception desk in the main lobby of the Hotel Commodore in New York City, Friday evening, September 9, 1966, more than two thousand members of the Old and New Left were registering at tables set up in ballroom floor hallways to attend the Second Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars.

The New Left movement in this country is generally described as a spontaneous, amorphous grouping of rebellious youth. It is not. Any observer who attended the conference during the week-end of September 9–11, would have recognized that most members of the New Left are activists who are instigated, controlled and manipulated by disciplined members of the Communist Party, working in a united front with Marxian ideologists.

There were no TV cameras around to film the arrival from London of white-bearded Marxist zealot Isaac Deutscher, invited by the Socialist Scholars to open the conference with a discourse "On Socialist Man." Nor were any cameras turned on 54-year-old Victor Perlo, identified in Congressional hearings as a member of a Soviet espionage ring while he was in U.S. Government employ during World War II. No well-known reporter was present to interview conference panelist Communist Herbert Aptheker, age 51, now running for Congress in Brooklyn, N.Y., who last year told the First Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars, "Of course, Watts was glorious!"

For some reason, it seems that nowadays communications media report only on the effects of the Leftist radicals' activities—on the bloody race riots, street demonstrations, and acts of civil disobedience—but (though most meetings, like this one, are publicly announced), avoid the gatherings where plans for such activities are hatched.

There was not an empty chair in the 800-seat Windsor Ballroom at the Commodore when the Socialist Scholars and their radical Leftist audience gathered to hear Polish-born Isaac Deutscher of London. He was introduced by Prof H. H. Wilson, of Princeton University, who described him as "a contributor to The Economist and The Observer."

When Deutscher went to the rostrum, the audience stood to honor him; they did so again after his address. Deutscher's appearance as the featured guest was illustrative of the "Socialist Unity" of the conference; he is the authentic biographer of Leon Trotsky, but even the Stalinists in the crowd gave him a big hand and the young New Leftists hung on his every word.

The whole trouble with the world—said Deutscher—is that "unsocial private property disunites society." There is no need, he said, for man to concern himself with "an ultimate metaphysical purpose" in his existence. "Socialist man," he ranted, "will be exempt from worship and awe." After fatherhood has come to be regarded only as biological, and "paternal authority" as a mere social institution to be destroyed, the "bourgeois form of the patriarchal family" will be obliterated.

Three main facts emerged clearly from the Second Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars. (1) American Marxists are abandoning their pretense of non-violence for open advocacy of violence; (2) they have successfully linked the American Marxist revolutionary movement with its counterparts throughout the world; (3) they are drunk with success.

At the Socialist Scholars' discussion of "poverty and powerlessness," panelist James Haughton, director of the Harlem Unemployment Center, ranted into the microphone on the dais:

"Specifically, yes, the welfare system is rotten, but so is the whole American system rotten. You can't look anywhere in this country and see anything but rottenness . . . Wherever the American octopus reaches out its tentacles, there you will find exploitation, cruelty, poverty, mass impoverishment." Dr. Haughton called for "revolutionary change, not reforms." The applause in the ballroom was deafening.

Haughton's impassioned speech followed a paper presented by Prof. Richard A. Cloward of Columbia, whose work in sociology has greatly influenced the scandal-ridden, multi-million dollar Mobilization for Youth program in New York City, as well as the multi-billion dollar federal Poverty Program. Dr. Cloward is also a member of Citizens Crusade Against Poverty, the group organized by Walter Reuther.

Written with associate sociologist Frances Piven of Columbia, Dr. Cloward's paper for the Socialist Scholars opened with a call for a systematic strategy of "irregular and disruptive tactics" among the poor, urging them to overburden city and state governments with their "demands."

Prof. Cloward explained that each welfare "client" in New York City is entitled by law to special benefits for clothing, blankets and the like. He said that in 1965, special city benefits welfare payments amounted to "about $40 per client," and he called for each welfare client to demand $100 to $1,000 in such benefits. He said there are now 550,000 welfare clients in the city, but that by 1967 there probably will be 600,000.

He went on to say that last month he had participated in "a national conference to organize the welfare recipients movement." Dr. Cloward said that he also had taken a personal part in Wednesday night meetings with welfare clients "week after week, month after month," and that as a result, "Next Monday there will be a demonstration of welfare recipients at City Hall."

Dr. Cloward read his paper to the Socialist Scholars Conference on Saturday afternoon. On Monday night CBS and NBC television newscasts showed the demonstration of screaming welfare recipients that took place right on schedule. On Tuesday, the New York Daily News reported: "About 500 welfare recipients picketed the Department of Welfare building . . . . and staged sitdowns and sit-ins yesterday . . . As police called reinforcements, the demonstrators blocked one of the two entrances to the building and marched along the sidewalk."

The prospects outlined by Dr. Cloward delighted Prof. William Ryan (formerly of Harvard, now of Yale), who described himself as "a radical without portfolio." He said "I have been enchanted with the Cloward strategy of blowing a fuse in the welfare agencies, housing developments, and among unmarried mothers. I wonder what would happen if there was a really systematic overload."

When a member of the audience asked whether Dr. Cloward's strategy is a substitute for "socialist organization of the proletariat, the industrial factory workers," Dr. Frances Piven of Columbia replied from the dais: "I really only want to make one point—the disruption of the system. Welfare rolls will begin to go up; welfare payments will begin to go up—the impact will be very, very sharp. The mounting welfare budget will increase taxes, force cities to turn to the federal government. We have to help people to make claims; for this they will organize and act."

The big press coverage of the welfare recipients' demonstration at City Hall was at the wrong time in the wrong place. NBC and CBS cameras should have been focused on Prof. Richard A. Cloward as he read his scholarly Socialist paper in the ballroom at the Commodore. TV newscasters would have gotten a beat on news about to burst into print. And if the U.S. Attorney General had been present at the Second Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars, he might have obtained useful information about who are the real agitators in our midst.

James Petras of the Free Speech Movement at the University of California at Berkeley described to the audience his recent trips to Latin America and his contacts with Marxist and Communist revolutionary forces there. Petras said that in Latin America today, "revolutionary guerrilla warfare in the countryside fosters citizenship."

All during the Commodore conference, many Socialist Scholars and members of the audience talked openly about their direct contacts with guerrilla leaders in Asia, Africa and Latin America. They discussed recent visits to Havana, Hanoi, Moscow, Prague and other Red capitals.

Like many citizens, I have puzzled over how young campus radicals and academicians manage to travel from continent to continent with the greatest of ease, often in defiance of State Department regulations and of Passport Division security provisions. At the Second Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars this month, I learned how they do it.

The young radicals travel along the smooth rails of an underground campus shuttle system that transports them, armed with highest academic credentials from sponsoring Socialist professors, from California to Tanzania, from Michigan to guerrilla camps in Peru and Chile, from Massachusetts to African bush rebel enclaves in Mozambique and Angola. Often the bills are footed by tax-exempt foundations.

Robert Fitch, a young radical present at the conference, told friends on Saturday: "I have an appointment Monday morning with someone in the Department of African Affairs at New York University to arrange for a trip to Mozambique to see Mondlane."

"Wonderful!" they said. Dr. Eduardo Mondlane is head of the Mozambique Liberation Front.

During the Socialist Scholars' business meeting on Sunday afternoon in the East Ballroom (at which the notorious Prof. Eugene D. Genovese of Rutgers University presided), there took place in the West Ballroom a meeting of leaders in the Radical Education Project (REP), an enterprise of Students for a Democratic Society (Barron's, January 31, 1966).

REP, headquartered at Ann Arbor, Mich., sent out a letter on August 18, 1966, that stated: "The Socialist Scholars Conference looms as a significant event in the development of the Left in America."

The letter was accompanied by an outline of REP projects. Among them is listed "International Intelligence Network." The ensuing text boasts of a "a network of people in the U.S. and abroad, closely tuned to international events, who will serve the movement as quick, incisive sources of intelligence . . . Such a network, including scholars, journalists, leftist youth leaders, government officials, guerrilla leaders, etc., can provide us with first hand reports and analysis of the action of insurgent movements, the workings of the foreign policy apparatus, kinds of impending developments . . . Already we have contacts in Japan, most European countries, Canada, and with Guatemalan guerrillas, Vietnamese rebels and neutrals, African nationalists and others. These contacts are being extended, and to them we must add American scholars with specialized knowledge and contacts . . . By maintaining regular correspondence with radical groups and scholarship abroad, we can increase the degree of coordination between their work and that of the American movement."

On reading the foregoing, I understand how it happened that Communists parading in the Place Bruckere on May Day in Brussels last year, and "Peace Parade" marchers along Fifth Avenue this year, carried identical effigies of Uncle Sam, identical banners and placards and shouted identical slogans in Flemish, French and English.

The Second Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars in New York City showed conclusively that the American campus-based radical international intelligence network exists and is a threat to the security of the United States. I wish some high-ranking members of our judiciary had been present to hear the Socialist Scholars discuss their new "five year plan" to cooperate with "national revolutionary liberation wars" on three continents to put "unbearable strain" on the U.S. Government "to bring it down."

In the Sunday afternoon panel session on "The Legacy of Negro Slavery," the main paper was delivered by "I would welcome a Vietcong victory," Prof. Eugene D. Genovese, of Rutgers. He urged on American Negroes a policy of black nationalism. In the course of his remarks, Prof. Genovese talked about Karl Marx's theory of surplus value and said, "We ought to be delighted every time a worker steals something from his plant."

Though Genovese's fellow panelist, Communist Herbert Aptheker, opposed the policy of black nationalism, he agreed with Prof. Genovese's point of view on theft. "There is a whale of difference," said Aptheker, "between the stealing by a worker and the wholesale stealing by General Motors."

The inter-Socialist dispute over Black Nationalism versus Negro-White Radical Unity was fairly sharp but not really antagonistic. Prof. C. Vann Woodward of Yale University commented on the Genovese paper and on Aptheker's remarks, referred to himself as "a liberal," but hastened to add "I identify with Aptheker."

At the Socialist Scholars' business meeting in the East Ballroom, Sunday afternoon, it was decided the conference is to become a permanent, dues-collecting organization. Prof. Genovese was elected President of the Steering Committee for next year. From the dais, Paul Sweezy, gray-haired editor of the radical Monthly Review and a member of the Socialist Scholars steering committee, commented on "the amazing progress we have made since our First Conference at Columbia, last September, progress far beyond our expectations."

Late Sunday afternoon, as the conference neared its end, I looked around at the pastel walls of the ballroom, the crystal chandeliers, the ornate ceiling with classical motifs set in graceful medallions. What bourgeois surroundings for revolutionaries, I thought. The Hotel Commodore, solidly built in the Grand Central commuter complex in the center of Manhattan, is the very symbol of middle class America, the hated enemy of the Socialist Scholars, the constant object of their vituperation, derision, denigration and subversion.

Quietly, I made my way through the crowded aisle in the ballroom. It seemed I was being swept away into the crashing cacophony of the finale in Maurice Ravel's symphonic work, "La Valse," the most prophetic artistic creation of the 20th Century, in which dancers sway gladly in a ballroom with mirrors, candelabra, and doors opening into formal gardens, but are caught in an inexorable force, whirling faster and faster until the floor vanishes beneath their feet, the mirrors splinter, the doors fly off their hinges in the gusts of a terrible wind, and nothing remains but destruction and chaos.

Is this to be the fate of the American society? It will be if the Socialist Scholars and the New Left have their way.

SENATOR BASS BIDS FAREWELL

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, in the closing hours of this session of Congress, and in rounding out a span of 12 years in Congress, I should like to make a few remarks, not to be looked upon necessarily as a George Washington type of address or as a Douglas MacArthur proclamation, but to express my appreciation to the electorate in the State of Tennessee for the privilege of having served these 12 years in both the House of Representatives and the Senate, and to express to my colleagues, particularly in the Senate, having been here for 2 years, my deep appreciation for the courtesies that have been extended to me as a Member of this great body.

Particularly, Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the members of the staff of the Senate—those people who do the backbreaking and sometimes mind-numbing jobs of keeping this body going, or keeping us informed of what is transpiring, and helping us with our work. I have been associated with many different bodies and organizations, both parliamentary and otherwise, but I know of no body in the world that is better staffed by capable, competent men—from the pages all the way up through the elected officers, the Sergeant at Arms, and the Secretary of the Senate—than those who serve us in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. President, in leaving the Senate, in closing my short span of years here and full service in Congress, I leave with no remorse or regret, but with a sense of appreciation of having served in this great body. I find a great sense of comity among the Members of the Senate and the Members of the House of Representatives. I know of no other place where men of such divergent views can be imbued with the same sense of friendliness and appreciation as is found in this great body.

In the 12 years that I have served in Congress, I have seen probably some of the most serious issues and the most emotional issues come before Congress in all its history, except, perhaps, for a declaration of war. I have seen Members of this body and of the other body deliberate on these great issues although diametrically opposed philosophically, socially, and emotionally. Yet, they expressed their views to each other in opposition, directly and in no uncertain terms; and they still can remain very close personal friends and can have a deep respect for the feelings and the abilities of those with whom they serve. I think that this is a great lesson that could be learned by those whom we represent, not just by those with whom we serve.

I believe that these productive years that I have had the privilege of serving in Congress will have great influence, particularly in the field of domestic and social endeavors of people, as well as in the future of education.

If there is one item I would have to point to and say that I think it has been one of the great programs that has been accomplished, it is that Congress has accepted its responsibility in the field of education. Today we passed the higher education bill. I came to Congress hoping to see this field of endeavor greatly expanded, hoping that the parent Government would assume its responsibility in this field. I am happy to see that this has been done. I hope that future years will see Congress and the Federal Government accept more responsibility in the field of secondary education.

These are some of the thoughts I should like to leave with my colleagues and with those with whom I have served and those who have helped me in my service in the Senate.

With these remarks, Mr. President, on this day, which I anticipate and hope will be the last day of this session, I should like to once again express my appreciation to my colleagues and to the others who have made this life in the Senate very pleasant and, I hope, very productive.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before Senator Bass leaves the floor, I wish to express my thanks to him for the many services that he has rendered to me while he has been in the Senate.

The Senator mentioned education. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, I can say that the record speaks for itself. The Senator from Tennessee has supported the Subcommittee on Education time and time again, as we have sought to take through the Senate the education legislation.

It is his kind of support that makes it possible for the elementary and secondary school children of this country and the college students of this country to enjoy the benefits that they are now enjoying as a result of the passage of legislation that the Senator from Tennessee was so helpful in our having adopted by Congress.

Mr. President, I want the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass] to know that I hope what I say will never rise to plague him in regard to any future activities in the State of Tennessee, but I want him to know that I hope he comes back in due course because I think that the record he has made in the Senate is one that entitles him to future public service for his State in the U.S. Senate. I wish to thank him very much for the many services, and manifestations of friendship that he has extended to the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. BASS. I thank the Senator.

ORDER FOR RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, after the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd] completes his remarks, and after the distinguished Senator from Oregon completes his remarks, and the conference report on the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations is disposed of, the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14745) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 5, 45, 65, and 70 to the bill and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 15 and 32 to the bill and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15024) to amend section 8 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 to authorize the Administrator of General Services to lease certain property in the District of Columbia.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11631) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to clarify the responsibility of the Veterans' Administration with respect to the training and education of health service personnel, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 5 to the bill (H.R. 14347) to liberalize the provisions for payment to parents and children of dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes, and concurred therein; that the House had agreed to certain amendments of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 6, 10, 11, and 12 to the bill.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S. 195. An act for the relief of Sunnyside Seed Farms;

S. 1661. An act for the relief of Samuel C. Neiburg; and

S. 3708. An act to assist comprehensive city demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and service necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in those areas, to assist and encourage planned metropolitan development, and for other purposes.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, OF VIRGINIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, 2 days ago when I was off the floor of the Senate, carrying out my duties as chairman of the Subcommittee on Education in connection with conferences with the House on education bills, several colleagues in the Senate paid tribute to the dedicated public service of our colleague in the Senate, A. Willis Robertson.

At this time, I wish to join them, although belatedly, in setting forth in the Congressional Record my great respect, high regard, and sincere personal friendship for Willis Robertson.

Senator Robertson has served the people of his State and the Nation for 34 years in the Congress of the United States. He served for 14 years in the House and 20 years in the Senate.

While still a boy, he started to become a keen biographic student and authority on the lives, public service record, and philosophy of two great Virginians, Thomas Jefferson and Gen. Robert Lee. I have listened many times to discussions led by Senator Robertson about the views and records of these two great men in our history. As I have listened to him, the thought passed through my mind many times that I doubted if Senator Willis Robertson himself was fully aware of the great imprint made on his own philosophy by Thomas Jefferson and Gen. Robert Lee. The record that Senator Robertson has made in his years of service in the Senate reflects over and over again the influence of these two great Americans on Senator Robertson's own thinking and record of public service.

Senator Robertson is not only a keen historical student of Jeffersonian democracy and of the War Between the States and of the important part the State of Virginia has played in the development of the United States, but he is also a biblical scholar. I have known few men either in or out of the clergy who are as well versed from a scholarly standpoint with the history and development and meaning of the Christian religion. It has been my privilege for many, many years to join with a group of fellow Senators in a breakfast that is held each Wednesday morning in the Vandenberg Room of the Capitol for the purpose of discussing the moral and spiritual obligations of Members of the Senate in their work in the Senate. Senator Robertson has been the leader of many of these breakfast meetings. I always look forward to his scholarly presentation of some lesson in the Bible as he expounds its application to our lives and work as Members of the Senate.

In the ink of indelible statesmanship, Senator Robertson has left his imprint on many pieces of legislation which are now the law of the land. I have worked with him in support of some pieces of legislation and opposed him in regard to others. One of the best tributes I can pay to him and one he richly deserves is that irrespective of whether he was with you or against you in any legislative debate on any issue, he never ceased to be your friend. In my judgment, that is the test of professionalism in one's relations with his colleagues in the Senate.

Furthermore, as chairman of his Senate committee, I have never known him to conceal from me or any other Senator any information available to him which would be helpful to us in our opposing a bill coming out of his committee which he was supporting. He has always recognized that, as chairman of his committee, he owes such a responsibility of giving all the information possible to both sides involved in a controversy on any issue.

I am sure that Senator Robertson would not object to my expressing the following evaluation of him, although he might hold somewhat different definitive views as to the meaning of my descriptive labels. However, as one who is labeled a liberal in American politics, I wish to say that I consider Senator Robertson to be a very sincere and able, conservative statesman.

Many times, I have sat here in the Senate in various debates and had nothing but great respect and high regard for sincere conservatives and for sincere liberals. Their philosophies, in my opinion, are based upon an identical, common denominator; namely, they vote the way they talk. That is why I have said so many times to American voters, "Don't pay attention to anything a politician ever says to you unless he votes the same way he talks."

WILLIS ROBERTSON always squares his votes with his talk.

Finally, may I say I am a richer man in the most priceless of values, because I have been the beneficiary of Senator ROBERTSON's friendship. Although he is retiring from the Senate at the end of his term, he will never retire from the love and affection of his many friends in the Senate of the United States.

TRIBUTE TO FORMER SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, SR., OF VIRGINIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to comment on a great Virginian, and it is a very sad comment for my heart is filled with sadness.

Mr. President, Mrs. Morse and I join with the thousands of people who are saddened by the death of Harry F. Byrd, Sr. We wish to extend Senator Byrd's family our sincere sympathy and our prayers for God's comfort.

Senator Byrd extended to me on many, many occasions advice, assistance and manifestations of friendship which I shall always prize in memory of this great American. His many kindnesses and assistance to me over the years are so personal in connection with our relationship here in the Senate that I do not consider it appropriate to enumerate them.

However, as a great conservative, Senator Byrd held in high respect and tolerant understanding the views of liberal colleagues in the Senate who, from time to time, differed with him on various issues. His brilliant mind always reflected a compassionate understanding of the views of those who sincerely differed with him.

I have often said in conversations about the work of Senator Byrd in the Senate, "He never takes offense at opposition so long as that opposition springs from sincerely held views and expresses itself in keeping with the ethical standards of professional senatorial debating."

One of the most delightful facets of the personality of Harry Byrd was his keen wit and contagious sense of humor. My personal relationships with him were such that we often enjoyed needling each other good naturedly. I remember on one occasion during a rollcall vote involving an issue in the Senate when it was to be expected that Senator Byrd and I would vote on the opposite side, we ended up voting together. I walked over to Senator Byrd's desk and said, "Harry, I doubt if you should go back to Virginia tonight. I think you should stay in your Washington hotel quarters until the people of Virginia can adjust to the fact that you voted with me on this issue." He laughed and said, "WAYNE, I will not have any trouble with this vote, because all I have to say is I voted first on the rollcall."

To his illustrious son, HARRY BYRD, JR., who has succeeded him in the Senate, I express today not only my sympathy but also say to him that I am sure he will meet the inspiring challenge of the heritage of statesmanship which his father and the people of Virginia have bequeathed to him.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14745) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, let me say that the report was unanimously agreed to and signed by all the conferees on the part of the Senate, and all the conferees on the part of the House.

The bill as approved by the committee of conference provides total appropriations of $10,463,244,500, a decrease of $10,065,000 from the amount allowed by the Senate, a decrease of $110,028,000 under the amount allowed by the House, but an increase of $380,060,000 over the budget estimates for fiscal year 1967.

But the President's budget contemplated several reductions; namely, $232,800,000 for payments to school districts under Public Law 874, $11,950,000 for grants to land-grant colleges under the Morrill Act of 1862, as amended, $157,813,000 for the student loan program under the National Defense Education Act of 1958, as amended, and $21 million for the student loan programs for medical and health-related students and for nursing students—totaling $423,563,000, from programs of years' duration, reductions which the Bureau of the Budget, which assessed such reductions, was aware the Congress would not approve.

For the Department of Labor, the total appropriation approved is $638,220,000, the amount approved by the Senate, but a reduction of $48 million from the amount approved by the House.

For the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the total appropriation approved is $9,768,060,500, a reduction of $10,065,000 from the amount allowed by the Senate, a reduction of $62,028,000 from the amount allowed by the House, but an increase of $433,320,000 over the budget estimates for fiscal year 1967.

The decreases approved by the Senate, $48 million, for the Department of Labor were concurred in by the conferees. A decrease of $950,000 proposed by the Senate for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Employment Security" from funds to be derived from the unemployment trust fund was changed to $250,000, restoring $450,000 which the Senate had taken from the program for management improvement, and $250,000 of the $500,000 which the Senate had taken from the farm labor services program.

The conferees adopted the Senate allowances for the Food and Drug Administration, reductions of $3,454,000 for salaries and expenses, and $950,000 for planning of a second laboratory building in the Beltsville area of Maryland.

The Senate proposed total reductions, under the House allowance, of $46,045,000 for the Office of Education. The conferees restored $17,875,000 of the Senate reductions, of which $5,725,000 was for the vocational education program, $10 million for the higher educational activities, and $2,150,000 for salaries and expenses for the Office of the Commissioner.

The conferees approved increases for the Public Health Service voted by the Senate as follows: $1 million for "Chronic diseases and health of the aged" for coronary care units; $90,000 net for "Community health practice and research" of which $250,000 was provided for the schools of public health, offset by a decrease of $160,000 for the President's Council on Physical Fitness; $1 million for "Control of tuberculosis" for additional project grants; $500,000 for "Dental services and resources" for the purposes set forth in the committee's report on the bill; $250,000 for "Occupational health" for research on the causes of pulmonary diseases in coal miners; $500,000 for "Radiological health" of which $250,000 is for certain work at the Colorado State University and $250,000 for protection against the hazards of X-rays; and $100,000 for the National Library of Medicine for its extramural program.

Of the total Senate increase of $41 million for the operating programs of the National Institutes of Health, the conferees approved $35 million, cutting back the $15 million allowed by the Senate for the artificial heart program of the National Heart Institute to $10 million. The Senate was forced to recede on its recommended increase of $25 million for "Grants for construction of health research facilities."

The conferees approved the Senate increase of $160,000 for "Buildings and facilities, St. Elizabeths Hospital" for planning a facility to house 50 youths apart from the adult patients.

The conferees accepted the increases proposed by the Senate for "Limitation on construction, Social Security Administration" of $16,959,000, to be derived from the social security trust funds for the building of 42 additional district offices and the purchase of additional land at the headquarters site in Baltimore, Md.

The decreases amounting to $47,400,000 proposed by the Senate for the Welfare Administration were approved by the conferees.

The increases proposed by the Senate for Gallaudet College, $35,000 for "Salaries and expenses," and $20,000 for "Construction," were approved by the conferees.

The conferees restored $350,000 of the $531,000 reduction proposed by the Senate for the Office of the Secretary, salaries and expenses.

Mr. President, the Senate added a general provision, section 206, a limitation affecting title VI compliance under the Civil Rights Act of 1964. After prolonged discussion by the managers on the part of the Senate with the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and members of his staff including the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, the provision was eliminated, relying upon written assurances given by Secretary Gardner with respect to future handling of alleged noncompliance actions on the part of grantees.

Mr. President, a little later on I shall ask unanimous consent to have a table printed in the RECORD showing the whole story.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Senate amendment which was section 206 of title II of the bill was not agreed to in conference and is not now included in the bill.

That amendment provided:

> No funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to impose or enforce any requirement and responsibility so far as certified patients are concerned on any hospital or other medical facility as to an individual beneficiary which is contrary to the beneficiary's physical or mental well-being as certified by the attending physician and the chief medical officer of the facility or the acting chief medical officer.

The Senate conferees were firm in their conviction that the policy of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should conform to the general provisions of this agreement. For that reason, the Senate conferees continued to insist that this amendment be accepted by the conference committee.

On the other hand, a majority of the House conferees were equally as strong in opposition to the amendment.

The Senate conferees continued to insist upon the amendment until, through a series of conferences with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Gardner, the Surgeon General, Dr. Stewart and their staffs, and in one conference the Acting Attorney General, Mr. Clark, it was agreed in writing that the policy as stated in the amendment would be followed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The primary objective of the Senate conferees was to make the policy stated in the amendment also the policy of the Department. Whether that was accomplished by law or by agreement was considered to be secondary so long as the agreement was clear and binding.

Such an agreement has been made by Secretary Gardner and put in writing in a series of three letters dated October 12, 18, and 19. These letters have been made a part of the report of both the House and Senate conferees.

Through this round of conferences and exchange of letters, the Secretary has agreed to follow the provisions of the amendment and has already put this policy into effect. In addition, he has conceded and clarified some other important points.

Briefly, he has agreed to the following:

First. The Department will permit either attending physicians, the medical staff, or the hospital administrator's designee to make segregated room assignments wherever, in their judgment, there are valid medical reasons or special compelling circumstances that indicate need to segregate a patient on an individual basis.

Second. The Department will disregard patient assignments made in accordance with a medical determination in evaluating the hospital's compliance with the provisions of title 6 of the Civil Rights Act, subject only to the qualification that if it appears over a period of time that segregation is being practiced as a matter of policy by the flagrant misuse of medical determinations, the Department would be obligated to review and make a determination as to whether title VI was being complied with.

Third. Once a hospital has been certified as entitled to participate and to receive payment for services to medicare beneficiaries, its participation in the medicare program or its rights to payment cannot be terminated on civil rights grounds until it has been accorded the opportunity for hearings in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act, administrative review has been completed, and an adverse decision has lain for 30 days before the appropriate congressional committees.

Fourth. Any hospital which fails to obtain approval to participate in the program and receive payments for services to medicare beneficiaries should be notified in writing of the reasons for such failure to be certified, and the hospital applicant will be given an opportunity to respond in writing and will be given an opportunity for a hearing under the Administrative Procedure Act, and any final decision to deny the application will be delayed until it has lain for 30 days before the appropriate congressional committees.

Fifth. The Department will not establish a system of integration quotas nor will quotas be used in the determination of nondiscriminatory treatment for all persons without regard to race, color, or national origin.

Sixth. The Department will not add new or additional requirements to the guidelines during the remainder of this year.

Seventh. The Department will not include requirements in or interpret the present provisions of the assurance form No. HEW-441, 12-64, to mean that the assurance given in signing this form means also assurance to comply with future requirements imposed by the Department subsequent to the agreement but that the assurance given therein relates only to the regulations in effect at the time the agreement is entered into. It was stated by the Secretary that the Acting Attorney General concurs in this view.

Mr. President, in some respects this agreement goes further than the Senate amendment, and, although it does not have the technical force of law behind them, I am sure the Secretary and others who were parties to the agreement will honor this agreement fully and in good faith.

This agreement was made as we sat across the table from each other. The Senator from Alabama was present, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] was present, the Secretary of HEW, the Surgeon General, and some of the staff—and I was the remaining conferee. Later, I conferred with the Acting Attorney General, Mr. Clark, on some of the same points.

While the amendment would have the effect of law, it would be in effect for only the balance of this fiscal year. This agreement is not so limited.

In any case, however, it will be but a few months before the entire matter will be before the Senate again, at which time we will have the opportunity to review and evaluate the situation.

If, at that time, there appears to be a need for some adjustment, by law or otherwise, such an adjustment can be made in whatever manner appropriate.

Now, Mr. President, we tried to impress—and I reimpress it now—that policing professional people as to how to operate hospitals which they may own or of which they may have custody, is not an ordinary matter of calling for police methods on like surveillances matters. It cannot be handled on a crash basis or as if one were policing a street in a lawless part of a city.

We found, too, that just to meet the effective date on the medicare program, HEW and the Surgeon General moved in extreme haste it appeared to us, in trying to force the rules on the hospitals in a very limited time. There was no requirement of any law, and no requirement in reason, to have all these hospital regulations and guidelines in operation by the time the medicare payments became effective. In fact, reason and commonsense required the contrary. Personally I think that HEW were given instructions for political reasons, to demand guideline compliance prior to the effective date of medicare payments. Such a policy is to put integration plans ahead of health plans.

By the very nature of things, this is a matter of adjustment to customs and requires a long period of time. I hope, therefore, that those points will be borne in mind hereafter by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Surgeon General who doubtless are being urged to get immediate results and make their demands in toto.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the letters referred to from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, one dated October 12, one October 18, and the other October 19, printed in the RECORD.

I wish to commend as well as thank the Senator from Alabama, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], for their untiring efforts and wise counsel in working on this problem. Further as chairmen of the subcommittee, the Senator from Alabama is not only fully familiar with the operation of the program, but is alert and concerned as to how this practice had affected the people of Alabama and wanted to protect them.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Secretary of Health,
Education, and Welfare,
Washington, D.C., October 12, 1966.

Hon. Lister Hill,
Hon. John E. Fogarty,
Managers of the Conference Committee on the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, Fiscal Year 1967, Washington, D.C.

Gentlemen: At your request I have again reviewed Section 206 of the HEW Appropriations Bill (H.R. 14745) as passed by the Senate on September 27. This letter will supplement and clarify my letter of October 7 addressed to each of you, in which I recommend deletion of this section. As indicated in my earlier letter, it is our policy to permit either attending physicians, the medical staff, or the hospital administrator's designee to make segregated room assignments wherever, in their judgment, there are valid medical reasons or special compelling circumstances that indicate need to segregate a patient on an individual basis.

In carrying out the provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 during this current fiscal year, you can be assured that I and the staff responsible for this activity at all levels will honor determinations made by physicians that are based on a valid medical reason for making room assignments in a hospital on a segregated basis. We will consider this determination to be conclusive as it applies to a specific patient. We will disregard patient assignments made in accordance with a medical determination in evaluating the hospital's compliance with the provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act subject only to the qualification set forth below.

If it appears that over a period of time segregation is being practiced as a matter of policy by the flagrant misuse of medical determinations, we would be obligated to review and make a determination as to whether Title VI was being complied with.

We share with you the concern that the health of the patient be uppermost in our considerations and we assure you that we will endeavor to administer our responsibilities governed by this policy.

Sincerely,

John W. Gardner,
Secretary.

The Secretary of Health,
Education, and Welfare,
Washington, D.C., October 18, 1966.

Hon. Lister Hill,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Hill: I appreciated the opportunity to meet with you and your colleagues to discuss the administration of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as it applies to hospitals. I would like to use this opportunity to confirm our discussions and to summarize the several letters, memoranda, and documents which we have made available to you on this subject.

It is our policy to permit either attending physicians, the medical staff, or the hospital administrators' designees to make segregated room assignments wherever in their judgment there are valid medical reasons or special compelling circumstances that indicate need to segregate a patient on an individual basis.

In carrying out the provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 during this current fiscal year, you can be assured that I and the staff responsible for this activity at all levels will honor determinations made by physicians that are based on a valid medical reason for making room assignments in a hospital on a segregated basis. We will consider this determination to be conclusive as it applies to a specific patient. We will disregard patient assignments made in accordance with a medical determination in evaluating the hospital's compliance with the provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act subject only to the qualification set forth below.

If it appears that over a period of time segregation is being practiced as a matter of policy by the flagrant misuse of medical determinations, we would be obligated to review and make a determination as to whether Title VI was being complied with.

We not only have no plans for modifying the regulations or guidelines that pertain to physician determinations but we do not contemplate any other change in regulations or guidelines affecting hospitals for the remainder of this fiscal year under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act.

A hospital's participation in the Medicare program is of course wholly voluntary. The method of effecting participation is the submission of an agreement signed on behalf of the hospital, relating to the acceptance of the Government payments in satisfaction of the hospital's bills to Medicare beneficiaries. Even though the hospital has been found to meet the quality standards of the Medicare program, its agreement is not accepted and countersigned on behalf of the Government unless the hospital has signed also the necessary civil rights assurance and has been found to be in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Once a hospital's agreement to participate has been countersigned and returned to the hospital, it is entitled to participate in the program and to receive payment for services to Medicare beneficiaries. If thereafter a question of its compliance with Title VI arises, the hospital continues to be entitled to participate and to receive payment while the various steps outlined in Title VI and our procedural regulations are in process. Once a hospital has received the countersigned agreement, in other words, its participation in the Medicare program or its right to payments cannot be terminated on civil rights grounds until it has been accorded opportunity for hearing in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act, administrative review has been completed, and an adverse decision has lain for thirty days before the appropriate Congressional committees. An alternative to this procedure would be consideration of a case by the courts rather than use of our administrative procedures. Under such circumstances, payments would of course continue.

Where the hospital's application fails to include the required assurance or the assurance is inadequate on its face or where it appears that the assurances are untrue or not being followed, every effort is made to effect corrective action by voluntary compliance. If this is not successful, the hospital is notified in writing of the reasons action on the application is being deferred. The procedures provide that promptly following the notice of deferral, the applicant will be given an opportunity to respond in writing and will be given an opportunity for a hearing under the Administrative Procedure Act, and that any final decision to deny the application will be delayed until it has lain for 30 days before the appropriate congressional committees. With respect to those instances where voluntary compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act fails and it becomes necessary to go to a hearing, it is estimated that it will take five or six months or longer to accomplish all of the various procedural steps provided for in the regulations. As you know, we have not had sufficient experience thus far to arrive at a specific period of time but on the basis of other activities where comparable procedures subject to Administrative Procedure Act are used, this would appear to be a reasonable approximation of the necessary time.

You raised questions about the phraseology used in the assurance form and indicated concern that it might be misinterpreted. I am requesting the General Counsel to look into the terminology used on this form. I will keep you informed of the results of this exploration.

We are pleased that it has been possible to enter into agreements with 97 percent of the hospitals, to participate in providing services to Medicare beneficiaries. We are hopeful that the experience of the participating hospitals will encourage the nonparticipating hospitals to take such steps as may be necessary to effect voluntary compliance with Title VI. It is our purpose to extend the benefits of public programs to all of our citizens and to accomplish the purpose of the Civil Rights Act of assuring nondiscrimination in the administration of these programs. It is not our intent to establish a system of quotas but rather to assure nondiscriminatory treatment for all persons without regard to race, color or national origin.

We share with you the concern that the health of the patient be uppermost in our considerations and we assure you that we will endeavor to administer our responsibilities governed by this policy.

Sincerely,

John W. Gardner,
Secretary.

The Secretary of Health,
Education, and Welfare,
Washington, D.C., October 19, 1966.

Hon. Lister Hill,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Hill: In my letter to you yesterday dated October 18, 1966, I indicated that I had requested the General Counsel to look into certain terminology used in the assurance form.

I am pleased to report that we have completed the review of one of the aspects of this assurance form which concerned you. You indicated concern that the first sentence of the Assurance (Form No. HEW–441, 12–64) might be interpreted as an agreement not only to comply with the present Regulation but with subsequent modification to this Regulation. General Counsel advises me that it is clear that the assurance relates only to the Regulation in effect at the time the agreement is entered into. The Acting Attorney General concurs in the view.

You also indicated concern with the meaning of the term "immediately" as used in the first paragraph of the Assurance Form. We are exploring the points you have raised as to the interpretation and application of this term. We will be working with the Department of Justice and other relevant officials in this review. We want to respond to your inquiry in a thoughtful and thorough manner and to see that our administration of the Civil Rights Act is uniform and consistent among government agencies and programs. Thus, it will probably take a week or so to complete our consultations and reviews. You can be assured that we will actively pursue this point and inform you of the results of our review as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

John W. Gardner,
Secretary.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the agreement reached—to which the distinguished Senator from Mississippi has referred, which is embodied in the letters from Secretary of HEW Gardner and which appear in full in the conference report—fully meets the purposes and the objectives of the amendment as offered by the Senator from Mississippi. In fact, the agreement gives important commitments beyond the amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HILL. I want to strongly commend the Senator from Mississippi on his amendment and the many fine contributions he has made toward getting the agreement which will enable the purposes and the objectives of the amendment to be carried out. The Senator is always the able, dedicated, and dynamic representative of his State and her people.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his very generous words and for his great help on this legislation, as well as that of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. ROBERTSON. I want to commend the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for offering this amendment because while in so many words it is not written into law, the objective has been reached.

This is not an issue just in Mississippi and Virginia alone—although it is vital to both our States—it is a national issue.

For instance, I have in mind a hospital in Lynchburg, Va., where I used to live. The hospital has always been fully integrated, but all the colored leaders in that city wanted this amendment because they did not want to be put in a room with any patient who did not want them in there, when it would be to the detriment of both patients.

This agreement on the part of the Department is a wise one. I hope there will be no finagling in carrying it out, because we have their solemn assurance in writing that they will carry it out.

It means a great deal to the hospital in Virginia and elsewhere, and I shall expect them to do what is necessary.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, we are always grateful for the bills that are handled by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. He supported this amendment. But for that support, I am not so sure we would have gotten the bill through, because if we had not gotten the amendment, there would have been a long session on it before we would have gotten rid of the issue.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I refer specifically to the so-called Stennis amendment, which deals with section 206 of the Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill, as passed by the Senate on September 27.

It will be remembered, Mr. President, that I staged as much of a fight as anyone humanly could upon the amendment, which I felt would erode the application of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to Federal aid to hospitals in respect of permitting a pattern of segregating patients, thereby keeping the hospital segregated, without disqualifying the hospital from getting Federal funds.

That amendment has been deleted. The intention of the Department has been set forth in a letter to the chairman of the committee on this side and to the chairman of the conference committee in the other body, which gives assurance that medical reasons for handling individual cases will be respected. Of course, that has constantly been the policy of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. President, I shall not endeavor to change or revise what is contained in this letter by any observations I make on the floor. I only wish to serve notice that here is one Senator who will be watching with the greatest care—as I am sure Senator STENNIS will be watching from his point of view—to see that the intent and purpose of title VI is not eroded, jeopardized, and wiped away by the way in which this provision is administered, such as by having so many exceptions as to nullify the purpose and thrust of the law which stipulates that hospitals which get Federal help shall not be segregated.

Mr. President, I pledge myself to that end.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the conference report be adopted.

The report was agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill (H.R. 14745), which was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 45, 65, and 70 to the bill (H.R. 14745) entitled "An Act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes", and concur therein.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "$198,225,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ", $100,000 to be available only for the National Conference on Education of the Deaf, $150,000 to be available only for transfer to the appropriation "Office of the Secretary, Salaries and Expenses" for a comprehensive study of training programs financed in whole or in part with Federal funds".

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 15 and 32.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a tabulation setting forth the appropriations for fiscal year 1966, the budget estimates for 1967, the House allowance, the Senate allowance, and the conference agreement for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1967, H.R. 14745

Item	Appropriation, fiscal year 1966	Budget estimates, 1967	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference agreement
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR					
MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION					
Manpower development and training activities	$339,595,000	$400,044,000	$400,004,000	$390,044,000	$390,044,000
Office of Manpower Administrator, salaries and expenses	35,395,800	30,162,000	35,900,000	30,900,000	30,900,000
BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP AND TRAINING					
Salaries and expenses	7,105,000	8,397,000	8,180,000	8,180,000	8,180,000
BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY					
Limitation on grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration	(402,100,000)	(508,950,000)	(508,950,000)	(524,000,000)	(524,000,000)
Advances for employment services	10,000,000	23,000,000	23,000,000		
Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen	127,911,100	107,000,000	100,000,000	90,000,000	90,000,000
Trade adjustment activities	1,000,000				
Salaries and expenses	3,826,100	2,625,000	2,750,000	2,750,000	2,750,000
Transfer from unemployment trust fund	(15,640,100)	(19,384,000)	(18,172,000)	(17,222,000)	(17,922,000)
LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS					
Labor-Management Services Administration	8,580,000	8,510,000	8,510,000	8,510,000	8,510,000
WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS					
Wage and Hour Division	21,519,000	22,256,000	22,256,000	22,256,000	22,256,000
Bureau of Labor Standards	3,281,500	3,349,000	3,389,000	3,389,000	3,389,000
Women's Bureau	871,000	888,000	888,000	888,000	888,000

Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1967, H.R. 14745—Continued

Item	Appropriation, fiscal year 1966	Budget estimates, 1967	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference agreement
BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION					
Salaries and expenses	$4,553,000	$4,707,000	$4,707,000	$4,707,000	$4,707,000
Transfers from trust funds	(64,550)	(65,000)	(65,000)	(65,000)	(65,000)
Employees' compensation claims and expenses	48,530,000	44,375,000	44,375,000	44,375,000	44,375,000
BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS					
Salaries and expenses	19,968,000	20,785,000	20,350,000	20,350,000	20,350,000
BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR AFFAIRS					
Salaries and expenses	1,219,000	1,230,000	1,230,000	1,230,000	1,230,000
Special foreign currency program			75,000	75,000	75,000
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR					
Salaries and expenses	5,469,000	5,451,000	5,451,000	5,451,000	5,451,000
Transfer from unemployment trust fund	(139,000)	(140,000)	(140,000)	(140,000)	(140,000)
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY					
Salaries and expenses	3,580,00	3,685,000	3,685,000	3,685,000	3,685,000
Transfer from unemployment trust fund	(140,000)	(140,000)	(140,000)	(140,000)	(140,000)
Federal contract compliance and civil rights program	451,000	689,000	1,103,000	1,103,000	1,103,000
President's Committee on Consumer Interests		327,000	327,000	327,000	327,000
Activities relating to admission and employment in agriculture of nonimmigrant aliens	1,723,000				
Total appropriations, Department of Labor	704,577,500	696,480,000	686,220,000	638,220,000	638,220,000
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE					
FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION					
Salaries and expenses	53,079,000	63,454,000	63,454,000	60,000,000	60,000,000
Buildings and facilities	5,720,000	4,080,000	4,080,000	3,130,000	3,130,000
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Expansion and improvement of vocational education	253,441,000	250,791,000	290,041,000	272,291,000	278,016,000
Vocational student loan insurance fund	50,000				
Higher educational activities	166,300,000	413,900,000	403,900,000	373,900,000	383,900,000
National Teacher Corps	9,500,000	32,372,000		7,500,000	7,500,000
Student loan insurance fund		3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000
Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts	11,950,000		11,950,000	11,950,000	11,950,000
Payments to school districts	388,000,000	183,400,000	416,200,000	416,200,000	416,200,000
Assistance for school construction	50,078,000	22,937,000	22,937,000	22,937,000	22,937,000
Defense educational activities	412,608,000	273,544,000	431,357,000	446,357,000	446,357,000
Educational improvement for the handicapped	25,500,000	32,600,000	32,600,000	32,600,000	32,600,000
Research and training	70,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000
Educational research (special foreign currency program)	1,000,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Foreign language training and area studies	2,000,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Salaries and expenses	29,547,000	41,563,000	39,095,000	33,000,000	35,150,000
Total, Office of Education	1,419,974,000	1,338,607,000	1,736,580,000	1,693,935,000	1,711,810,000
VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION					
Grants to States	171,310,000	259,060,000	259,060,000	244,060,000	244,060,000
Research and training	53,145,000	60,325,000	60,325,000	60,325,000	60,325,000
Research and training (special foreign currency program)	2,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	2,000,000	3,000,000
Grants for correctional rehabilitation study	560,000	800,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
Salaries and expenses	3,875,000	5,082,000	4,869,000	4,869,000	4,869,000
Transfer from Social Security trust funds		(299,000)	(299,000)	(299,000)	(299,000)
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE					
Buildings and facilities	8,977,000	18,279,000	18,279,000	18,279,000	18,279,000
Injury control	4,350,000	5,760,000	5,759,000	5,759,000	5,759,000
Chronic diseases and health of the aged	83,088,000	86,659,000	90,614,000	91,614,000	91,614,000
Community health practice and research	82,182,000	103,228,000	124,190,000	124,280,000	124,280,000
Trust fund transfer	(2,100,000)				
Communicable disease activities	40,497,000	44,230,000	44,220,000	44,220,000	44,220,000
Control of tuberculosis	15,666,000	20,605,000	20,597,000	21,597,000	21,597,000
Control of venereal diseases	10,392,000	10,594,000	10,593,000	10,593,000	10,593,000
Dental services and resources	8,383,000	9,196,000	9,193,000	9,693,000	9,693,000
Medical care services		10,389,000	10,385,000	10,385,000	10,385,000
Trust fund transfer		(3,512,000)	(3,512,000)	(3,512,000)	(3,512,000)
Nursing services and resources	19,575,000	25,634,000	25,623,000	25,623,000	25,623,000
Hospital construction activities	303,304,000	313,544,000	313,525,000	313,525,000	313,525,000
Construction of health educational facilities	90,599,000	160,794,000	160,727,000	160,727,000	160,727,000
Environmental health sciences	15,983,000	24,312,000	24,298,000	24,298,000	24,298,000
Air pollution	26,662,000	35,577,000	35,561,000	35,561,000	35,561,000
Environmental engineering and sanitation	13,842,000	21,971,000	21,963,000	21,963,000	21,963,000
Occupational health	5,857,000	6,345,000	6,342,000	6,592,000	6,592,000
Radiological health	21,044,000	20,404,000	20,395,000	20,895,000	20,895,000
Hospitals and medical care	58,980,000	61,643,000	61,643,000	61,643,000	61,643,000
Foreign quarantine activities	7,648,000	8,030,000	8,030,000	8,030,000	8,030,000
National Institutes of Health:					
General research and services	60,469,000	67,821,000	68,534,000	68,534,000	68,534,000
National Institute of General Medical Sciences	127,188,000	137,175,000	142,613,000	145,113,000	145,113,000
Biologics standards	6,806,000	7,905,000	7,904,000	7,904,000	7,904,000
National Institute of Child Health and Human Development	55,024,000	61,448,000	61,422,000	64,922,000	64,922,000
National Cancer Institute	163,768,000	163,957,000	170,656,000	175,656,000	175,656,000
National Institute of Mental Health	232,669,000	253,115,000	258,119,000	264,119,000	264,119,000
National Heart Institute	141,462,000	148,407,000	154,770,000	169,770,000	164,770,000
National Institute of Dental Research	23,677,000	24,884,000	28,308,000	28,308,000	28,308,000
National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases	123,203,000	129,908,000	133,687,000	135,687,000	135,687,000
National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases	77,987,000	85,702,000	88,670,000	90,670,000	90,670,000
National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness	101,153,000	106,418,000	111,296,000	116,296,000	116,296,000
Regional medical programs	25,000,000	45,024,000	45,004,000	45,004,000	45,004,000
Subtotal, National Institutes of Health	1,138,406,000	1,231,764,000	1,270,983,000	1,311,983,000	1,306,983,000

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

***Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1967, H.R. 14745*—Continued**

Item	Appropriation, fiscal year 1966	Budget estimates, 1967	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference agreement
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE—continued					
Construction of community mental health centers	$50,000,000	$50,000,000	$50,000,000	$50,000,000	$50,000,000
Grants for construction of health research facilities	56,000,000	21,000,000	56,000,000	81,000,000	56,000,000
Scientific activities overseas (special foreign currency program)	5,000,000	19,217,000	19,217,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
National health statistics	7,230,000	9,312,000	9,312,000	9,312,000	9,312,000
National Library of Medicine	9,685,000	19,231,000	20,092,000	20,192,000	20,192,000
Retired pay of commissioned officers (indefinite)	(8,020,000)	(8,977,000)	(8,977,000)	(8,977,000	(8,977,000)
Office of the Surgeon General, salaries and expenses	6,648,000	8,207,000	8,069,000	7,648,000	7,858,000
Total, Public Health Service	2,089,998,000	2,345,925,000	2,445,610,000	2,505,412,000	2,475,622,000
FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ADMINISTRATION					
Building and facilities		4,624,000	4,624,000	4,624,000	4,624,000
Water supply and water pollution control	45,142,000	55,439,000	55,439,000	55,439,000	55,439,000
Grants for waste treatment works construction and sewer overflow control	141,000,000	173,000,000	173,000,000	173,000,000	173,000,000
ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL					
Salaries and expenses (indefinite)	(10,280,000)	(8,078,000)	(8,953,000)	(8,953,000)	(8,953,000)
Buildings and facilities	1,977,000	2,138,000	2,138,000	2,298,000	2,298,000
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION					
Limitations on salaries and expenses	(488,341,000)	(587,438,000)	(586,433,000)	(586,483,000)	(586,483,000)
Limitation on construction	(15,048,000)	(26,250,000)	(26,250,000)	(43,189,000)	(43,189,000)
Payment to trust funds for health insurance for the aged	125,800,000	832,947,000	832,947,000	832,947,000	832,947,000
Payment for military service credits	105,000,000	105,000,000	105,000,000	105,000,000	105,000,000
WELFARE ADMINISTRATION					
Grants to States for public assistance	3,603,000,000	3,746,400,000	3,746,400,000	3,700,000,000	3,700,000,000
Assistance for repatriated U.S. nationals	452,000	460,000	460,000	460,000	460,000
Bureau of Family Services, salaries and expenses	6,948,000	8,295,000	7,890,000	7,890,000	7,890,000
Grants for maternal and child welfare	187,000,000	228,900,000	228,900,000	228,900,000	228,900,000
Children's Bureau, salaries and expenses	4,840,000	5,331,000	5,331,000	5,331,000	5,331,000
Juvenile delinquency and youth offenses	6,750,000	8,207,000	8,207,000	8,207,000	8,207,000
Cooperative research or demonstration projects	1,882,000	3,150,000	3,150,000	2,650,000	3,150,000
Research and training (special foreign currency program)	1,200,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Office of the Commissioner, salaries and expenses	1,292,000	1,589,000	1,522,000	1,522,000	1,522,000
ADMINISTRATION ON AGING					
Salaries and expenses	7,500,000	10,300,000	10,275,000	10,275,000	10,275,000
SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS					
American Printing House for the Blind	1,000,000	1,027,500	1,027,500	1,027,500	1,027,500
National Technical Institute for the Deaf	420,000	491,000	491,000	491,000	491,000
Freedmen's Hospital, salaries and expenses	4,624,000	5,193,000	5,193,000	5,193,000	5,193,000
Gallaudet College, salaries and expenses	2,301,000	2,485,000	2,485,000	2,520,000	2,520,000
Gallaudet College, construction	384,000	50,000	50,000	70,000	70,000
Howard University, salaries and expenses	11,198,000	13,344,000	13,344,000	13,344,000	13,344,000
Howard University, construction	2,920,000	3,342,000	3,342,000	3,342,000	3,342,000
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY					
Office of the Secretary, salaries and expenses	3,789,000	4,983,000	7,531,000	7,000,000	7,350,000
Transfer from OASI trust fund	(501,000)	(646,000)	(11,249,000)	(1,249,000)	(1,249,000)
Office of Audit, salaries and expenses	3,493,000	4,477,000	4,477,000	4,477,000	4,477,000
Transfer from OASI trust fund	(510,000)	(678,000)	(678,000)	(678,000)	(678,000)
Office of Field Administration, salaries and expenses	1,785,000	1,980,000	1,980,000	1,980,000	1,980,000
Transfers	(1,631,000)	(1,780,000)	(1,780,000)	(1,780,000)	(1,780,000)
Surplus property utilization	1,073,000	1,093,000	1,093,000	1,093,000	1,093,000
Office of the General Counsel, salaries and expenses	1,591,500	1,803,000	1,780,000	1,780,000	1,780,000
Transfers	(1,115,000)	(1,335,000)	(1,330,000)	(1,330,000)	(1,330,000)
Educational television facilities	8,826,000	3,304,000	3,304,000	3,304,000	3,304,000
Total, direct appropriations, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	8,082,848,500	9,312,685,500	9,812,158,500	9,760,195,500	9,750,130,500
Indefinite appropriations	18,300,000	17,055,000	17,930,000	17,930,000	17,930,000
Total, direct and indirect appropriations, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	8,101,148,500	9,329,740,500	9,830,088,500	9,778,125,500	9,768,060,500
TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD					
Salaries and expenses	28,713,100	30,442,000	30,442,000	30,442,000	30,442,000
TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD					
Salaries and expenses	2,077,000	2,085,000	2,085,000	2,085,000	2,085,000
TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD					
Limitation on salaries and expenses	(11,725,000)	(11,175,000)	(11,175,000)	(11,175,000)	(11,175,000)
Payment for military service credits	16,558,000	17,201,000	17,201,000	17,201,000	17,201,000
TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE					
Salaries and expenses	6,725,000	7,100,000	7,100,000	7,100,000	7,100,000
TITLE VII—INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN					
Contribution to Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
TITLE VIII—U.S. SOLDIERS' HOME					
Limitation on operation and maintenance	(7,222,000)	(7,433,000)	(7,433,000)	(7,433,000)	(7,433,000)
Limitation on capital outlay		(3,575,000)	(3,575,000)	(3,575,000	(3,575,000)
TITLE IX—FEDERAL RADIATION COUNCIL					
Salaries and expenses	166,000	131,000	131,000	131,000	131,000
Grand total	8,859,970,100	10,083,184,500	10,573,272,500	10,473,309,500	10,463,244,500
Consisting of—					
Direct appropriations	8,841,670,100	10,066,129,500	10,555,342,500	10,455,379,500	10,445,314,500
Indefinite appropriations	18,300,000	17,055,000	17,930,000	17,930,000	17,930,000

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the conference report was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who so graciously and kindly yielded his right to the floor so that we might proceed to the adoption of the conference report. Once again he has indicated his wonderful cooperation and courtesy.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator, and, in the words of Alexander Pope, may I say to him, "Thou wert my guide, philosopher, and friend."

GUIDELINES FOR FEDERAL WELFARE PAYMENTS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, Members of Congress have expressed on the floor their concern regarding the tenor, the trend, the thrust, and the meaning of recent guidelines issued by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dealing with hospital care and education.

On March 18, 1966, the Bureau of Family Services of the Welfare Administration of HEW sent to all State agencies administering approved public assistance plans, handbook transmittal No. 77, entitled "Methods for Determination of Eligibility."

This transmittal supersedes Federal Handbook IV–2200–2241 dated July 31 and becomes effective July 1, 1967. The State plan amendments implementing these requirements for each program must be submitted to regional offices by each State no later than April 1, 1967, as State plan approval will be necessary prior to release of the grants for the quarter beginning July 1, 1967, the effective date of the requirements. The transmittal letter indicates that the material is limited to conformity—to requirements for State plans and the interpretation of those requirements.

I feel that the ambiguous terminology used in these HEW provisions is such that, if interpreted literally, it could lead to the disbursing of public moneys to persons not entitled to them, while others who may be far more needy will have to go without support. I believe that vagueness and lack of clarity of these guidelines are such that the door is opened for a wide variety of interpretations, making for a capricious application depending on individual reading.

To demonstrate: Sections IV–2220 and 2230, items 5a and 5c, make it mandatory to rely on the individual as the primary source of information, supplemented if necessary by information from public records and limiting the verification of conditions of eligibility to those "reasonably necessary" to assure that expenditures under the program will be legal.

Mr. President, the Welfare Administration is refusing to face realities.

The Comptroller General of the United States, on July 26, 1962, stated, after a careful investigation of the aid to dependent children public assistance cases in the District of Columbia:

> Reliance cannot be placed on the caretaker-relatives (parents or other relatives of specified relationship) to inform the Public Assistance Division of the actual conditions or circumstances which have a bearing on the recipients' eligibility for financial assistance.

The Comptroller General, on July 30, 1962, stated, in a special report on the same investigation:

> The investigation definitely disclosed that reliance cannot be placed on the ADC mothers to reveal the actual conditions or circumstances which have a bearing on the recipients' eligibility for financial assistance.

Mr. Scholz, Chief of Public Assistance at the time, stated in the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee hearings for the District of Columbia 1963 budget:

> We tried to create a public image that the social worker is not a snoop who looks under the bed and in the closet, but is, as one well-known training film put it, a friend at the door. And, as a result, a relationship has been built up which is not realistic, where the social worker, as the Society Security (Welfare) Administration puts it, uses the clients, the applicant, as the primary source of information. And we find this information is not reliable.

In spite of this strong evidence against the reliability of the recipient, sections 2220 and 2230, items 5a and 5c, state that it is ordinarily unnecessary to consult sources of information other than the recipient. How illogical can one be?

The GAO found, in many investigated cases, concealed resources, concealed employment and the allegedly missing employed father of the children actually living in the home with the recipient. Yet, the handbook can be so interpreted that nearly all investigations by the caseworker or by the investigator, to determine the facts about the recipient's eligibility, would be abolished.

Item 5a emphasizes reliance on applicants and recipients as the primary source of information "supplemented if necessary by information from public records."

Public records have been established as the basis for any number of fiscal and other procedures in this country, and their use is considered to be consistent with the citizen's constitutional rights. Why, then, is the use of public records to be considered only as a, more or less, last resort in the case of welfare recipients? Are their constitutional rights different from those of other citizens? Should not they be treated in the same way as other citizens?

Every taxpayer of the United States must be prepared to furnish proof that the information furnished in his tax return is correct and properly substantiated. Social security funds and Veterans' Administration funds are dispensed only if the recipient's title to such funds has been properly established. Should the same principles not also govern the expenditures of funds to welfare recipients?

Public welfare applicants and recipients do not have established records such as Social Security or Veterans' Administration claimants have. It is, therefore, necessary for the Welfare Department to establish the necessary proofs of eligibility for each of its claimants. Redetermination of eligibility must be made periodically at intervals no longer than 3 months in AFDC–UP, 6 months in other ADFC cases, and 12 months in the other categories. HEW recognizes the possibility of frequent changes or it would not require such periodic redeterminations of eligibility. On the other hand, it ties the hands of the State agencies trying to assure the legality of expenditures.

What is meant by the expression "public records"? Are court records considered in that category? What about real estate records or school records? Not all individuals have access to such records so they would not ordinarily be considered as "public records." I discussed this point with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and his staff, and it was agreed that a definition of the term "public records" was necessary.

Item 5c limits the "verification of conditions of eligibility to what is reasonably necessary to assure that expenditures under the program will be legal."

"Reasonably necessary" is a very vague term when related to the legality of expenditures of public funds.

Just what is reasonably necessary? Does this mean that, if the dispensing agency or worker is 25-percent convinced the expenditure will be legal, this is sufficient? Or does the agency or worker have to be 50-percent convinced the expenditure will be legal? Or 75, 80, or 95 percent? It would appear to me that there can be no question that an expenditure is either legal or illegal. There can be no no man's land. Verification of conditions of eligibility must be conducted to the point necessary—and not "reasonably necessary," or any other vague description—or else the entire program is a giveaway of public funds without evidence of need or entitlement to anyone wishing to avail himself of free handouts and who is able to present a convincing story in interviews with the agency social workers. Without a doubt, under this proposed system, the convincing talker, the smooth operator, will receive a bigger share of welfare moneys than will the quiet person not as well able to describe his situation of need. It must be obvious, if the States are to administer a program of welfare properly and be held accountable for the expenditures made under the program, that verification of conditions of eligibility must be to the point necessary.

Section 2230, item 5c, states:

> Reliance on the applicant (and public records) as the primary source of information will ordinarily make it unnecessary to consult other sources of information. The agency should take no steps in the exploration of eligibility to which the applicant does not agree, including contact with collateral sources. When information is sought from collateral sources, there should be clear interpretation of what information is desired, why it is needed, and how it will be used. Agencies should not rely on a "blanket" consent for outside contacts, but should obtain specific consent for each contact, whether with social agencies, doctors, hospitals, and similar resources, or with relatives or other individuals.

> The consent should cover the purpose of the contact as well as the individual or agency to be consulted.

Mr. President, it will be impossible for a public agency to conduct the investigations necessary to assure that expenditures under the program will be legal if the agency cannot make collateral visits and contacts without specific consent for each and every visit and contact. For example, under this provision it would be impossible for the agency to check on a complaint that the recipient has concealed her employment, or that he or she is operating a roominghouse if the recipient said he or she would not give permission. How could the recipient be prosecuted for fraud if the agency cannot check on the employment? Why should not the applicant or recipient give a blanket consent for outside contacts? What could possibly happen if the applicant or recipient is telling the truth? A blanket consent can always be withdrawn. However, such blanket consent would permit the agency to prove fraud or misrepresentation or overpayment during the time the recipient was receiving public assistance.

If specific consent is interpreted literally, it would mean the worker must contact the recipient, or have the recipient contact him, for each separate phase of the investigation necessary to establish eligibility. Such trips to the home of the recipient, or to the office by the recipient, would be very time consuming and costly in terms of overall production.

I can see no disadvantage to an honest recipient's giving blanket consent to allow the agency to make the checks it deems necessary to assure that the recipient is, and continues to be, eligible.

Again, let us not forget that we are dealing with expenditures of public moneys collected from the citizens of the United States through taxes and that these funds must be administered carefully and with the interest of all citizens in mind. All due precaution must, therefore, be taken that only those truly in need receive these payments. We must make certain that the needy are protected from infringement by the dishonest and the indolent who would rob them of their subsistence.

It is proper at this point, I think, Mr. President, to digress briefly to reflect upon the question, Where would the District of Columbia ADC caseload be today were it not for the work done in ferreting out the ineligibles?

The AFDC random sample investigation began in November 1961. What had been happening to the caseload prior to this investigation instituted by the Senate?

From July 31, 1958, to June 30, 1959, the AFDC caseload increased from 3,177 to 3,835. By June 30, 1960, it had increased to 4,578. In the next year it had risen to 5,481, and the caseload reached its highest peak—5,628 cases—in November 1961, the month the random sample investigation started. This investigation, plus the addition of investigators, decreased the AFDC caseload until in October 1963 it was 3,823, its lowest point since May 1959. The need for even more investigators was apparent and the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee added them to the District of Columbia budget requests for 1964. This was approved by the Senate but knocked out on a technicality in a Senate-House conference. Without the additional investigators, the AFDC caseload has gradually crept back up, and by August 31, 1966, had reached a total of 4,769 cases. But where would it have been without investigators?

Between July 31, 1958, and November 1961, the ADC caseload increased from 3,177 to 5,628 cases—in other words, 2,451 cases in a period of slightly over 3 years. This would be an average of 800 cases per year.

Projecting this average increase of 800 cases annually over the years from November 1961 to the present, we would have experienced an increase roughly, of 4,000 cases, which, when added to the 5,628 cases on the November 1961 ADC caseload, would be something like 9,600 cases. In other words, instead of there being 4,769 ADC cases on August 31, 1966, there would have been 9,600 cases, or, roughly, double the current ADC caseload.

A similar situation would obtain with regard to the general public assistance program.

The average length of time for cases receiving assistance has also been reduced. In January 1965, the arithmetic average length of time an AFDC case had been on assistance was 50 months. In January 1966, this average had been reduced to 43 months.

It would appear that the continuing need for securing facts necessary to determine eligibility and continuing eligibility of welfare recipients is indubitably obvious.

Another paragraph in the proposed provisions, section 2230, item 1, states:

> States must especially guard against violations in such areas as entering a home by force, or without permission, or under false pretenses, making home visits outside of working hours, and particularly making such visits during sleeping hours; and searching in the home, for example, in rooms, closets, drawers, or papers, to seek clues to possible deception.

This paragraph is particularly poorly designed combining, as it does, acts which no welfare department should permit, such as "entering a home by force," with other features which welfare departments should allow and which are necessary such as making home visits outside of working hours.

Again, in this paragraph, we find vague, ambiguous terminology—whose "working hours," the welfare recipient's, or the agency's, or the social worker's? Whose "sleeping hours," the client's, or the social worker's? What are the working hours or the sleeping hours referred to? People are known to have varying living habits. Does this mean a client may, perhaps, be visited only between 10 a.m. and 12 noon, not visited during possible afternoon nap hours, and then again during a couple of hours in the afternoon?

In the District of Columbia Welfare Department, investigators work from 8:15 a.m. to 10 p.m. Would these hours fall within the provision of normal working hours? Would the interpretation exclude a social worker working nights or Saturdays or Sundays on a voluntary or an overtime basis and making home visits during these periods? Such situations do arise when it becomes necessary to work at different hours of the day or night.

What is wrong with looking at the rooms and in the closets with permission of the client? Many violations of eligibility were found by the General Accounting Office in doing just that. It is unfortunate, but very true, that employed husbands and fathers were found to be hiding in bedrooms and closets—hiding, I might say, to conceal the fact that they were not absent or had not deserted as claimed by their wives in deceiving the Welfare Department to receive public assistance.

How could this be interpreted as a violation of a recipient's constitutional rights or an invasion of privacy so long as his consent was given?

The recipient has every constitutional right not to let anyone in her home, but the welfare agency has the right, under its eligibility requirements, to deny to the recipient any further assistance because of her refusal to permit the determination of her actual living conditions. Those who administer the programs must assure that people in need—the aged, the sick, the disabled, the deserted children—receive the moneys when they are eligible. But, they must also, with the same vigor and zeal, insure that the ineligibles, the cheaters, the freeloaders, the dishonest, and the indolent are kept from the rolls or removed from the rolls when found. The Administration must always vigorously insist that public moneys not be wasted. This should always be our goal, but it is even more important now in view of current world involvements of the United States.

The points I have discussed are some of the more flagrant among the ambiguities and excessive restrictions, and my enumeration of them is not to imply that they are exclusive of others.

Because of my concern with this matter, I wrote, on June 30, 1966, to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare about some of the areas I have discussed. On July 1, 1966, in my office, I conferred with the Secretary and members of his staff regarding Handbook Transmittal No. 77. They agreed that certainly some of the items discussed needed clarification. Among other points, I urged that the ambiguous terminology used in handbook transmittal No. 77, dated March 18, 1966, be amended or clarified in the following respects: First, that verification of conditions of eligibility to the point necessary be permitted; second, that the restriction "outside of working hours" be removed or at least clarified to permit home visits to continue as at present; third, that continued inspections in the home, for example, in rooms, closets, and so forth, to seek clues to possible deception be allowed with permission of the client; fourth, that the provision against "blanket" consent be withdrawn, and that the agency be permitted to make collateral visits and contacts without special consent for each and every visit and contact; and fifth, that reliance on the individual as a primary source of information concerning eligibility not be mandatory.

Secretary Gardner expressed understanding of my position and stated that the matter would be further considered. The Secretary and his staff agreed to get back in touch with me. To date this has not been done.

Upon my recommendation, therefore, the Senate Appropriations Committee, in its report on the 1967 appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies, stated:

> In view of the open end authorization for public assistance funds, and to insure maximum utilization of Federal funds for the people for whom they were authorized, the committee strongly urges the Department in its guidelines to direct the States that thorough checks, including inspection of the premises, with permission of the client, are required in all determinations of eligibility for public assistance cases receiving matchable funds to uncover unreported resources and other factors affecting eligibility, and to determine the true living conditions and resources of public assistance clients.

Mr. President, Edward V. Sparer, legal director, center on social welfare policy and law, the Columbia University School of Social Work, wrote an article entitled "Social Welfare Law Testing," which appeared in the April 1966 issue of the Practical Lawyer. I call attention to portions of that article. Mr. Sparer says:

> Among the functions of the legal division of the Center on Social Welfare Policy and Law of The Columbia University School of Social Work is service as a social welfare law testing resource for legal aid attorneys and others who are giving free representation to welfare clients.

Mr. Sparer also says:

> An unusual opportunity now exists to afford expanded legal recourse to social welfare clients as a result of the increasing attention given by government antipoverty programs to legal services for the poor; that past experience indicates such legal service efforts tend to become inundanted with the problems of representing a mass clientele, and can be helped by special assistance in the development of test cases involving complex issues of social welfare law;
>
> The general issues upon which the Center is prepared to extend its maximum aid—including brief writing, research, consultation on appropriate strategy, etc.—to attorneys representing social welfare clients have been selected by an advisory committee of outstanding law and social work professors of Columbia University.
>
> Below we state and thereafter briefly describe 10 issues—or, more correctly, areas of public assistance law concerning which we are particularly interested in rendering assistance to attorneys. These issues are:
>
> The "man-in-the-house" rule and its variations;
>
> "Midnight raids," early morning visits, and other privacy and illegal search issues;
>
> Settlement and residence laws in various forms;
>
> Maximum family grants;
>
> Relatives' liability;
>
> Certain work-relief practices and statutes;
>
> Use of penal measures to impose standards of morality upon welfare clients;
>
> The present scope of discretionary (or arbitrary) decision-making as it affects entitlement;
>
> Fair procedure and due process in welfare administration;
>
> Federal requirements on uniform application of state plans for public assistance.
>
> The members of the Center's advisory committee are not here taking a personal position as to the appropriate legal resolution of any of the issues described.

Here, Mr. President, we see government-paid lawyers of one government agency attacking the policies, procedures, and personnel of another government agency. Why should we not give the welfare departments adequate legal staff so that they can defend themselves? How utterly absurd and wasteful have we become. Is there some other purpose behind this?

Let us examine another article. Richard Cloward and Frances Fox Piven wrote an article titled "A Strategy To End Poverty," which appeared in the May 2, 1966, issue of the Nation.

Who are Mr. Cloward and Mrs. Piven? Mr. Cloward is professor of social work, and Mrs. Piven is a research associate, both at the Columbia University School of Social Work, where Mr. Sparer is also employed.

What views were expressed by Mr. Cloward and Mrs. Piven? I shall quote from the May 2 article:

> How can the poor be organized to press for relief from poverty? How can a broad-based movement be developed and the current disarray of activist forces be halted? These questions confront, and confound, activists today. It is our purpose to advance a strategy which affords the basis for a convergence of civil rights organizations, militant anti-poverty groups and the poor. If this strategy were implemented, a political crisis would result that could lead to legislation for a guaranteed annual income and thus an end to poverty.
>
> The strategy is based on the fact that a vast discrepancy exists between the benefits to which people are entitled under public welfare programs and the sums which they actually receive.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The discrepancy is not an accident stemming from bureaucratic inefficiency; rather, it is an integral feature of the welfare system which, if challenged, would precipitate a profound financial and political crisis. The force for that challenge, and the strategy we propose, is a massive drive to recruit the poor onto the welfare rolls.
>
> The distribution of public assistance has been a local and state responsibility, and that accounts in large part for the abysmal character of welfare practices.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Public welfare systems try to keep their budgets down and their rolls low by failing to inform people of the rights available to them; by intimidating and shaming them to the degree that they are reluctant either to apply or to press claims, and by arbitrarily denying benefits to those who are eligible.
>
> A series of welfare drives in large cities would, we believe, impel action on a new federal program to distribute income, eliminating the present public welfare system and alleviating the abject poverty which it perpetrates. Widespread campaigns to register the eligible poor for welfare aid, and to help existing recipients obtain their full benefits, would produce bureaucratic disruption in welfare agencies and fiscal disruption in local and state governments. These disruptions would generate severe political strains, and deepen existing divisions among elements in the big-city Democratic coalition: the remaining white middle class, the white working-class ethnic groups and the growing minority poor. To avoid a further weakening of that historic coalition, a national Democratic administration would be constrained to advance a federal solution to poverty that would override local welfare failures, local class and racial conflicts and local revenue dilemmas. By the internal disruption of local bureaucratic practices, by the furor over public welfare poverty, and by the collapse of current financing arrangements, powerful forces can be generated for major economic reforms at the national level.
>
> The ultimate objective of this strategy—to wipe out poverty by establishing a guaranteed annual income—will be questioned by some. Because the ideal of individual social and economic mobility has deep roots, even activists seem reluctant to call for national programs to eliminate poverty by the outright redistribution of income. . . . many of the contemporary poor will not rise from poverty by organizing to bargain collectively. They either are not in the labor force or are in such marginal and dispersed occupations (e.g., domestic servants) that it is extremely difficult to organize them. Compared with other groups, then, many of today's poor cannot secure a redistribution of income by organizing within the institution of private enterprise. A federal program of income redistribution has become necessary to elevate the poor en masse from poverty.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The right to income must be guaranteed, or the oppression of the welfare poor will not be eliminated. Because benefits are conditional under the present public welfare system, submission to arbitrary governmental power is regularly made the price of sustenance. People have been coerced into attending literacy classes or participating in medical or vocational rehabilitation regimes, on pain of having their benefits terminated. Men are forced into labor on virtually any terms lest they forfeit their welfare aid. One can prize literacy, health and work, while still vigorously opposing the right of government to compel compliance with these values.
>
> Conditional benefits thus result in violations of civil liberties throughout the nation, and in a pervasive oppression of the poor.
>
> * * * * *
>
> In order to generate a crisis, the poor must obtain benefits which they have forfeited. Until now, they have been inhibited from asserting claims by self-protective devices within the welfare system: its capacity to limit information, to intimidate applicants, to demoralize recipients, and arbitrarily to deny lawful claims.
>
> Ignorance of welfare rights can be attacked through a massive educational campaign. Brochures describing benefits in simple, clear language, and urging people to seek their full entitlements, should be distributed door to door in tenements and public housing projects, and deposited in stores, schools, churches and civic centers. Advertisements should be placed in newspapers; spot announcements should be made on radio.
>
> Leaders of social, religious, fraternal and political groups in the slums should also be enlisted to recruit the eligible to the rolls. The fact that the campaign intended to inform people of their legal rights under a government program, that it is a civic education drive, will lend it legitimacy.
>
> But information alone will not suffice. Organizers will have to become advocates in order to deal effectively with improper rejections and terminations. The advocate's task is to appraise the circumstances of each case, to argue its merits before welfare, to threaten legal action if satisfaction is not given. In some cases, it will be necessary to

contest decisions by requesting a "fair hearing" before the appropriate state supervisory agency; it may occasionally be necessary to sue for redress in the courts. Hearings and court actions will require lawyers, many of whom, in cities like New York, can be recruited on a voluntary basis, especially under the banner of a movement to end poverty by a strategy of asserting legal rights. However, most cases will not require an expert knowledge of law, but only of welfare regulations; the rules can be learned by laymen, including welfare recipients themselves (who can help to man "information and advocacy" centers). To aid workers in these centers, handbooks should be prepared describing welfare rights and the tactics to employ in claiming them.

Advocacy must be supplemented by organized demonstrations to create a climate of militancy that will overcome the invidious and immobilizing attitudes which many potential recipients hold toward being "on welfare." In such a climate, many more poor people are likely to become their own advocates and will not need to rely on aid from organizers.

As the crisis develops, it will be important to use the mass media to inform the broader liberal community about the inefficiencies and injustices of welfare. For example, the system will not be able to process many new applicants because of cumbersome and often unconstitutional investigatory procedures (which cost 20c for every dollar disbursed). As delays mount, so should the public demand that a simplified affidavit supplant these procedures, so that the poor may certify to their condition. If the system reacts by making the proof of eligibility more difficult, the demand should be made that the Department of Health, Education and Welfare dispatch "eligibility registrars" to enforce federal statutes governing local programs. And throughout the crisis, the mass media should be used to advance arguments for a new federal income distribution program.

* * * * *

The idea of "welfare rights" has begun to attract attention in many liberal circles.

* * * * *

To generate an expressly political movement, cadres of aggressive organizers would have to come from the civil rights movement and the churches, from militant low-income organizations like those formed by the Industrial Areas Foundation (that is, by Saul Alinsky), and from other groups on the Left. These activists should be quick to see the difference between programs to redress individual grievances and a large-scale social-action campaign for national policy reform.

* * * * *

The plan has the extraordinary capability of yielding mass influence without mass participation, at least as the term "participation" is ordinarily understood. Mass influence in this case stems from the consumption of benefits and does not require that large groups of people be involved in regular organizational roles.

Moreover, this kind of mass influence is cumulative because benefits are continuous. Once eligibility for basic food and rent grants is established, the drain on local resources persists indefinitely.

* * * * *

The ultimate aim of this strategy is a new program for direct income distribution. What reason is there to expect that the federal government will enact such legislation in response to a crisis in the walfare system?

We ordinarily think of major legislation as taking form only through established electoral processes. We tend to overlook the force of crisis in precipitating legislative reform, partly because we lack a theoretical framework by which to understand the impact of major disruptions.

By crisis, we mean a *publicly visible* disruption in some institutional sphere. Crisis can occur spontaneously (e.g., riots) or as the intended result of tactics of demonstration and protest which either generate institutional disruption or bring unrecognized disruption to public attention. Public trouble is a political liability: it calls for action by political leaders to stabilize the situation. Because crisis usually creates or exposes conflict, it threatens to produce cleavages in a political consensus which politicians will ordinarily act to avert.

* * * * *

The electoral context which made crisis effective in the South is also to be found in the big cities of the nation today. Deep tensions have developed among groups comprising the political coalitions of the large cities—the historic stronghold of the Democratic Party. As a consequence, urban politicians no longer turn in the vote to national Democratic candidates with unfailing regularity. The marked defections revealed in the elections of the 1950s and which continued until the Johnson landslide of 1964 are a matter of great concern to the national party. Precisely because of this concern, a strategy to exacerbate still further the strains in the urban coalition can be expected to evoke a response from national leaders.

* * * * *

A crisis in public welfare would expose the tensions latent in this attenuated relationship between the ghetto vote and the urban party leadership, for it would thrust forward ghetto demands and back them with the threat of defections by voters who have so far remained both loyal and quiescent.

In the face of such a crisis, urban political leaders may well be paralyzed by a party apparatus which ties them to older constituent groups, even while the ranks of these groups are diminishing. The national Democratic leadership, however, is alert to the importance of the urban Negro vote, especially in national contests where the loyalty of other urban groups is weakening. Indeed, many of the legislative reforms of the Great Society can be understood as efforts, however feeble, to reinforce the allegiance of growing ghetto constituencies to the national Democratic Administration. In the thirties, Democrats began to put forward measures to circumvent the states in order to reach the big-city elements in the New Deal coalition; now it is becoming expedient to put forward measures to circumvent the weakened big-city mayors in order to reach the new minority poor.

Recent federal reforms have been impelled in part by widespread unrest in the ghetto, and instances of more aggresive Negro demands. But despite those signs that the ghetto vote may become less reliable in the future, there has been as yet no serious threat of massive defection. The national party has therefore not put much pressure on its urban branches to accommodate the minority poor. The resulting reforms have consequently been quite modest (e.g., the war against poverty, with its emphasis on the "involvement of the poor," is an effort to make the urban party apparatus somewhat more accommodating).

A welfare crisis would, of course, produce dramatic local political crisis, disrupting and exposing rifts among urban groups. Conservative Republicans are always ready to declaim the evils of public welfare, and they would probably be the first to raise a hue and cry. But deeper and politically more telling conflicts would take place within the Democratic coalition. Whites—both working-class ethnic groups and many in the middle class—would be aroused against the ghetto poor, while liberal groups, which until recently have been comforted by the notion that the poor are few and, in any event, receiving the beneficent assistance of public welfare, would probably support the movement. Group conflict, spelling political crisis for the local party apparatus, would thus become acute as welfare rolls mounted and the strains on local budgets became more severe. In New York City, where the Mayor is now facing desperate revenue shortages, welfare expenditures are already second only to those for public education.

* * * * *

If this strategy for crisis would intensify group cleavages, a federal income solution would not further exacerbate them. The demands put forward during recent civil rights drives in the Northern cities aroused the opposition of huge majorities. Indeed, such fierce resistance was evoked (e.g., school boycotts followed by counter-boycotts), that accessions by political leaders would have provoked greater political turmoil than the protests themselves, for profound class and ethnic interests are at stake in the employment, educational and residential institutions of our society. By contrast, legislative measures to provide direct income to the poor would permit national Democratic leaders to cultivate ghetto constituencies without unduly antagonizing other urban groups, as is the case when the battle lines are drawn over schools, housing or jobs. Furthermore, a federal income program would not only redeem local governments from the immediate crisis but would permanently relieve them of the financially and politically onerous burdens of public welfare*—a function which generates support from none and hostility from many, not least of all welfare recipients.

What is being proposed by the authors of the two articles is a crisis, a revolution, a destruction of established systems. One must wonder who or what ideology will benefit by the carrying through to their conclusion of the ideas and goals expressed by the writers.

We have but to look around to see that some of the ideas have been accepted or are being advocated. Look at Handbook Transmittal No. 77 and other HEW releases and views.

Let us examine a situation here in the District of Columbia. Neighborhood Legal Services, antipoverty lawyers, sued the Board of Commissioners, the Welfare Department, and some of its officials and investigators on behalf of two welfare recipients and on behalf of all others similarly situated. Who was also of counsel? Mr. Edward V. Sparer. The suit was for declaratory and injunctive relief. The attorneys contended that the constitutional rights of recipients were violated, particularly their rights under the first, third, fourth, fifth, and ninth amendments to the Federal Constitution. They wanted the U.S. District Court in Washington, D.C., to have all investigators either receive the express consent of recipients for entry into their homes—which they contend is being given now, but not voluntarily—or obtain a search warrant before they enter the home.

The Department of Public Welfare has specific regulations for investigators, requiring on a visit to the client's home that first, all investigators must identify themselves by showing their identification cards which contain their name, picture, job title, and place of employment. These ID cards are signed both by the investigators and by the Director of Public Welfare; second, all investigators must also identify themselves by stating their name and their title and that they are employed by the Department of Public Welfare; third, all investigators must request and receive permission from the client or an adult person in the home before entering the home; fourth, all investigators must ask for and receive permission from the client before checking on the living arrangements; and fifth, if permission is refused, the investigator must immediately leave.

Mr. Brewer, Director of Public Welfare in the District of Columbia, filed an affidavit with the District court stating that no employee of his Department is authorized to enter upon the premises of any recipient of any program administered by the Department without having first asked for and received consent from said recipient to enter the premises.

A motion for summary judgment was filed on behalf of the defendants, the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners, and others.

The civil action, docket No. 1447-66, *Patricia A. Smith, et al.*, plaintiffs, v. the *Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, et al.*, defendants, was heard in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia on October 7, 1966.

The motion of the defendants for summary judgment was granted. The court rendered the following opinion:

Opinion of the Court

The Court: This is an action brought against the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Director and certain other officials of the Department of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia.

The plaintiffs are mothers of children receiving assistance under the provisions for aid to families with dependent children administered by the Government of the District of Columbia through its Department of Public Welfare.

The defendants move for summary judgment.

The gravamen of the action is that investigators employed by the Department of Public Welfare at times used harsh, oppressive, illegal, and humiliating methods in making their investigations as to the question whether a particular recipient of assistance is worthy of that aid.

The Court is of the opinion, first, that it has no jurisdiction over the internal administration of this agency or any other government department. What the Court is asked to do here is to direct how the department should be administered and to do so either by declaratory or injunctive relief, or both.

Second, the Court is of the opinion that the administration of relief funds involves discretion on the part of the agency entrusted with that duty. Relief funds are grants and gratuities. Their payment does not constitute payment of legal obligations that the government owes. Being absolutely discretionary, there is no judicial review as to the manner in which that discretion is exercised.

It must be borne in mind that an individual may not maintain an action to enjoin the day-to-day administration of government functions. That was established in the leading case of Massachusetts v. Mellon.

Further than that, the type of relief that is requested here may not be accorded by a court of equity.

This Court may not enjoin a large number of unnamed investigators and instruct them how to conduct their duties under penalty of being punished for contempt of court. The Court would have no means of supervising and determining the day-to-day compliance or failure to comply with such an injunction. Moreover, equity does not enjoin unnamed individuals for equity acts in personam.

It must be borne in mind that counsel for the plaintiffs does not attack the legality or the propriety of the regulations in this action. He contends, however, that the regulations are being violated by various investigators. It must be borne in mind, too, that in connection with the administration of welfare funds the government has a right to make investigations in order to determine that the money is properly spent, is not squandered improvidently, and is not obtained on the basis of misrepresentation. If there is any grievance as to the conduct of any particular investigator the matter should be submitted to the administrative agency. There is no showing that the administrative remedies have been exhausted because if the agency refuses redress appeal can be taken to the Board of Commissioners.

Each of the reasons the Court has just given is in itself sufficient to warrant a granting of the defendants' motion for summary judgment.

The defendants' motion is granted. You may submit an order.

(The hearing stood concluded.)

Reporter's Certificate

Certified as the official transcript of proceedings.

Gerald Nevitt,
Official Reporter.

During the hearing of the civil action, many pertinent observations were made by the Court. Some of these are as follows:

The Court: Of course nobody has a constitutional right to go on the relief rolls.

* * * * *

Of course the welfare recipients have a perfect right to refuse to submit to an investigation which they consider oppressive, but in that event, on the other hand, the agency has a right to take them off the rolls. In other words, I don't think, and I don't suppose the Corporation Counsel will claim, that investigators of the agency have a right to insist on making the investigation. I presume he will admit, and certainly the Court would hold, that any recipient of welfare funds has a right to decline to submit to investigation, but then the funds can be withheld from him.

* * * * *

Any recipient has a perfect right to slam the door in the face of the investigator. Of course he runs the risk then of being cut off the rolls, but these investigators can always be excluded by the recipient.

* * * * *

I think the agency in charge of relief has a right to say that unless you let our investigator enter your home and look around we will cut you off the roll.

Of course the investigator doesn't have a right to break down the door and go in.

* * * * *

The Court: What kind of an injunction do you ask this Court to render?

Mr. Marlin: To enjoin the pattern of conduct of these investigators.

The Court: Equity doesn't enjoin patterns of conduct; it doesn't enjoin unnamed individuals.

* * * * *

Equity acts in personam.

* * * * *

The Court: Mr. Marlin, you may proceed.

Mr. Marlin: Your Honor, one question that was raised before we recessed was the right of an individual to public welfare. I don't know that that is a question that must be decided this morning, but our contention is that if a person is eligible under the conditions laid down, then that person has a right to welfare.

The Court: No; welfare is discretionary, of course.

* * * * *

The rules as to eligibility are there to exclude anyone who is not eligible. In other words, relief payments are a gratuity or a grant; they are not a debt, the payment of an obligation. The eligibility rules are intended to exclude certain persons. It doesn't mean that everybody who is eligible has a right to sue for relief if it is refused, for example.

* * * * *

Mr. Marlin: Well, Your Honor, we would contend, though, that the eligibility rules not only are intended to exclude those ineligible, but also set up standards.

The Court: That is right, but the administration of relief is discretionary in that it is a grant or gratuity and is not the payment of a legal obligation.

Now you may proceed with your argument.

Mr. Marlin: Your Honor, the next question then becomes whether somebody who applies for public assistance and/or whose application is granted must then surrender other constitutional rights—must surrender constitutional rights that other persons have.

The Court: I don't think he does. You don't have to argue that he shouldn't be required to surrender constitutional rights. He cannot be compelled to surrender constitutional rights.

Now what particular constitutional rights do you refer to?

Mr. Marlin: We refer, for example, to the right not to give incriminating evidence to investigators who are employed by the Welfare Department.

The Court: Oh, no, he has a right to refuse. Of course he cannot be compelled to answer questions, but on the other hand, if he refuses to give the information he can be taken off the relief rolls. For example, we have seen a great deal of discussion on the man of the house rule. Of course that rule is intended to prevent diversion of funds intended for children to the support of an unemployed idle paramour. Suppose a mother of children who are on the relief rolls is asked do you have a man living with you to whom you are not married, and she says I refuse to answer because the answer might incriminate me. They have a right to take her off relief. They cannot require her to answer.

Mr. Marlin: I think that is one of the questions, Your Honor, whether they do have a right to take her off relief for that.

We are not arguing the right of the Department to police its public monies and find out whether they are going to people who are eligible for them.

The Court: One of the things they want to know, for example, is whether part of the money given to a particular family where the mother is either separated from the father or is not married, whether she has a paramour living or visiting her who is supported from these relief funds intended primarily for children. They have a right to find that out.

* * * * *

They cannot coerce an answer from her, but they have a right to say, Well, if you don't want to answer probably the answer would be adverse to your interests.

There is a rule of law that in a criminal case you cannot draw an unfavorable inference from the fact that the defendant doesn't testify, but in civil cases you can. In civil litigation if a litigant is asked a question to which he refuses an answer you have a right to infer that his answer would be unfavorable to him. That is a well established principle, Mr. Marlin.

* * * * *

I agree with you thoroughly that unnecessary humiliation should not be extended to a person unfortunate enough to be on relief, but on the other hand it is reasonable enough to expect the recipient to cooperate.

* * * * *

Mr. MARLIN: Your Honor, because there are so many parties, potential parties, it is very difficult for anyone—and we are probably the only agency, the only legal agency in the city which is set up, funded by public monies, in order to represent the interests of people who otherwise can't afford attorneys.

The COURT: That is another thing that puzzles me, Mr. Marlin. Your agency is a governmental agency in the sense that it is supported by appropriated funds, is it not? * * * it is a strange thing, here are lawyers paid by the government for them to sue other government departments.

Mr. MARLIN: We think it is not only a strange thing, but we think it is something that has been a long time in coming and we think it is a very salutary thing, Your Honor.

The COURT: Well, it is certainly anomalous, Mr. Marlin. It was my understanding that these Neighborhood Legal Councils weren't instituted to sue the government but to give legal advice and legal protection to people who could not afford to hire lawyers. For example, people in disputes with their landlords or in disputes with people to whom they are claimed to owe money and so on, and that is a very salutary and desirable project. In other words, it is the type of work that the Legal Aid Bureau does, only it is brought into the neighborhood.

Mr. MARLIN: That is right, Your Honor.

The COURT: But now you turn around and bring suits against the government. That seems an anomaly to me.

* * * * *

Of course a recipient of public welfare should be treated politely and without humiliation and if an investigator is acting impolitely or bruskly or oppressively he should be reported to the agency. But they do have a right to ask questions, however, in order to ascertain what the situation is.

Mr. MARLIN: We think, Your Honor, as a prelude to asking questions they should inform recipients that they have a right not to answer them, because we think they do have that right.

The COURT: No, no; that applies only to criminal prosecutions.

Mr. MARLIN: Frequently the information gathered from this investigation leads to criminal prosecutions and that is, in fact, Your Honor, one of the threats that is made.

The COURT: You might have a defense to a criminal prosecution there.

That is different. If a criminal prosecution is instituted and there is testimony as to what the defendant said to an investigator, you would have a right, perhaps, to object to the introduction of the testimony if there was no warning given. But for purposes of administering relief, that is a civil matter and in a civil matter you can draw an unfavorable inference from refusing to answer questions.

Mr. President, I believe these excerpts and the decision of the Court should help to clear the air. There has been entirely too much confusion and vagueness in the minds of welfare officials, or at least in the guidelines issued by them. This has certainly been aided and abetted by many in the field of social work, as shown by the documents presented.

It should be obvious to everyone that, in the light of the plethora of statements of irritation, resentment, and alarm by many Members of Congress in recent days concerning hospital and education guidelines promulgated by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Congress must act to reassert its constitutionally ordained coordinate status in a government of checks and balances. Congress should not permit bureaucrats, who are not selected by or responsible to the people, to exercise a full and unchecked rein upon the disbursement of Federal moneys. The omnipotence of the Federal purse is incalculable and virtually beyond comprehension, and it is the responsibility and the duty of Congress, in the fulfillment of its oversight functions, to see that this power is not abused by individuals in the executive branch.

In my judgment, Congress next year should take action to fully explore the constitutionality and the impact of hospital, education, and welfare guidelines and relevant policies of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and such an intense study should also be extended to the Job Corps and community action programs administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity. All of these are areas which heretofore have lacked appropriate and deserved scrutiny on the part of the legislative branch, and it is in the highest interest of the taxpayers, and, for that matter, of the programs mentioned, that the Congress take steps to assure itself that the programs involved are being administered properly, efficiently, and within the intent of the law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, the following items:

First. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Handbook Transmittal No. 77, dated March 18, 1966.

Second. The article "Social Welfare Law Testing," from the April 1966 issue of the Practical Lawyer.

Third. The article "A Strategy To End Poverty" from the May 2, 1966, issue of the Nation.

Fourth. The brief filed by the plaintiff in civil action No. 1447-66.

Fifth. The brief filed by the defendants in civil action No. 1447-66.

Sixth. The transcript of the court testimony in civil action No. 1447-66.

Seventh. District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare, Office of Investigations and Collections, memorandum, dated May 27, 1965, entitled "Rules Pertaining to Investigator's Home Visits and Investigator's Conduct."

Eighth. A memorandum prepared by members of my staff reporting on the meeting held in my office, attended by various persons including the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, on July 1, 1966, to which I have referred in my remarks.

Ninth. An article by Dorothy Gilliam, which appeared in the May 29 issue of the Washington Post, entitled "District of Columbia Tenants Lose Their Fears and Learn To Mobilize for Action."

Tenth. A July 26, 1962, report of the Comptroller General of the United States to the chairmen of the Senate and House Subcommittees on Appropriations for the District of Columbia.

Eleventh. A July 30, 1962, report of the Comptroller General of the United States addressed to me with reference to the investigation of the ADC program in the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
WELFARE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., March 18, 1966.

HANDBOOK TRANSMITTAL NO. 77

To: State agencies administering approved public assistance plans.
From: Fred H. Steininger, Director.
Subject: Methods for determination of eligibility, handbook IV-2200.

Material transmitted: IV-2200-2230 (effective 7/1/67).

Material superseded: IV-2200-2241, dated 7/31/63 (effective 7/1/67).

BACKGROUND AND EXPLANATION

The enclosed statement has been developed in response to a long recognized need for a comprehensive statement about methods for determination of eligibility in public assistance programs under the Social Security Act. This is a crucial area of administration, both for achieving the objectives of the programs and for maximum efficiency in administration.

This material is limited to conformity—to requirements for State plans and the interpretation of those requirements. It differs from current Handbook material primarily as follows:

1. It imposes a requirement that the State plan contain policies and procedures for determination of eligibility that are consistent with the objectives of the program and the constitutional and statutory rights of applicants and recipients and that do not violate those rights or the individual's privacy or personal dignity, or harass the individual.
2. It deletes material now in IV-2232 on Federal financial participation. This subject is treated in IV-5514.
3. IV-2220, item 4a clearly establishes a time limit of 30 days for promptness in acting on information about changes that may affect a recipient's eligibility.
4. IV-2220, item 5a and 5c make mandatory a practice now recommended in IV-2241—relying on the individual as the primary source of information; and limiting the verification of conditions of eligibility to those "reasonably necessary to assure that expenditures under the program will be legal."
5. IV-2230, item 5c contains new specific content about obtaining the individual's consent for outside contacts and the way the agency makes such contacts.

SUBMITTAL OF PLAN MATERIAL

All State agencies are required to submit plan material to comply with the enclosed material.

Plan amendments implementing these requirements for each program should be submitted to the appropriate regional office as early as possible, but not later than April 1, 1967, as plan approval will be necessary prior to release of the grants for the quarter beginning July 1, 1967, the effective date of the requirements. Preferably, plan material covering the six plan requirements should be submitted as a unit, as an integral part of the State plan. However, if the State agency, upon review of its current approved plan provisions on determination of eligibility, believes that any of them fully meet one or more of the six plan requirements in the enclosed material, such plan material may be cited in respect to the identified specific plan requirement(s) in IV-2200. This is important so that there is mutual understanding of the identity and content of the plan provisions governing practice under the approved plan with respect to "Methods for Determination of Eligibility."

EFFECT ON OTHER POLICIES

To the extent that other current policies in the Handbook may be inconsistent with the enclosed Handbook statement, when it becomes effective the latter will govern.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR HANDBOOK MAINTENANCE

1. In Part IV, at the top of pages 2200 through 2241–p. 4, dated 7/31/63, put the notation "Remove this page on 7/1/67" with pen-and-ink.

2. In Part IV, insert the enclosed pages immediately following page 2241–p. 4, dated 7/31/63.

3. Make appropriate notation on the Form, Record of Receipt of Handbook Transmittals.

PART IV. HANDBOOK OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION: ELIGIBILITY, ASSISTANCE, AND SERVICES

Methods for determination of eligibility

2200. Methods for Determination of Eligibility.

2210. Provisions of the Act.

Sections 2(a), 402(a), 1002(a), 1402(a), and 1602(a) specify that: "A State plan . . . must . . . (5) provide such methods of administration . . . as are found by the Secretary to be necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the plan;"

Sections 2(a)(10)(B), 2(a)(11)(D), and 1602(a)(13) specify that a State plan under title I or XVI must: "include reasonable standards, consistent with the objectives of this title, for determining eligibility for and the extent of" aid or assistance under the plan.

2220. Requirements for State Plans.

Effective July 1, 1967, a State plan under titles I, IV, X, XIV, and XVI must:

1. Include policies and procedures for determination of eligibility for assistance or other services that are consistent with the objectives of the program, and that respect the rights of individuals under the United States Constitution, the Social Security Act, title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (see Supplement C), and all other relevant provisions of Federal and State laws, and that will not result in practices that violate the individual's privacy or personal dignity, or harass him, or violate his constitutional rights.

2. Provide that (a) each person who wishes to do so will be given an opportunity to apply without delay for public assistance and other services, (b) prompt action will be taken on each application, and (c) assistance will be given promptly and will continue regularly to all eligible persons until they are found to be ineligible, so long as assistance is being provided under the specific category.

3. Provide that each decision that an applicant for or recipient of assistance or other services is eligible or ineligible will be supported by information in the case record that shows either that all eligibility requirements of the State plan are met or that one or more such requirements is not met.

4. Provide that eligibility will be redetermined in each case where an individual has been determined to be eligible:

a. Through prompt action within a specified time period—no longer than 30 days—after the agency has information which indicates that changes in a recipient's circumstances may affect the amount of assistance to which he is entitled or may make him ineligible.

b. Through regular periodic redetermination at specified intervals, of eligibility factors subject to change—intervals no longer than 3 months in AFDC–UP, 6 months in other AFDC cases, and 12 months in the other categories.

5. Provide that in the process of determination of initial and continuing eligibility:

a. Applicants and recipients will be relied upon as the primary source of information about their eligibility, after an adequate interpretation of the agency's requirements, and the agency will help them provide needed information, or, if they are unable to do so, because of physical or mental or other difficulties, the agency will obtain the necessary information for them.

b. Each determination of eligibility will include at least one interview with the applicant or recipient, or, if direct contact with him is impractical or would delay case action, with someone acting responsibly for him. Where a declaration form or similar procedure is used, the interview may take place within a reasonable time after determination of eligibility.

c. Verification of conditions of eligibility will be limited to what is reasonably necessary to assure that expenditures under the program will be legal.

d. Applicants and recipients will be notified in writing that assistance has been authorized in a stated amount or that it has been denied or terminated for a specified reason.

6. Include a description of the methods by which the State agency will be kept currently informed about local agencies' adherence to the State's plan provisions concerning the above requirements and to the State agency's procedural requirements for methods for determination of eligibility. (See II–4200 re State-wide operation.)

2230. Interpretation of Requirements.

The above requirements for State plans are considered essential for proper and efficient operation of public assistance programs under the Social Security Act. They reflect the basic principles about the rights and responsibilities of individuals and of governmental agencies in our democracy. They are necessary in order that these rights shall be protected in the determination of eligibility. They are also necessary to achieve the broad objectives of the programs for individuals and families and for society. Public assistance programs based on these requirements will inspire public confidence so that those who are eligible will make appropriate use of the programs and those who do not need them will respect both the agency and those who avail themselves of the agency's assistance and other services.

The following explains the import of the corresponding items in IV–2220:

1. The requirement that a State plan contain policies and procedures for determination of eligibility that are consistent with program objectives and that respect legal rights of individuals and do not violate the individual's privacy or personal dignity, or harass him or violate his constitutional rights, necessitates the testing of each pertinent policy and procedure against those positive and negative criteria. If the program is locally administered with State supervision, the State agency must see that supplementary locally developed procedures are consistent with this requirement.

The prohibition against a State plan containing policies and procedures for determination of eligibility that will result in violation of privacy or personal dignity, that constitute harassment, or that violate constitutional rights, requires careful and continuing attention to practices and procedures that may result in violations of these rights and principles. By way of illustration, States must especially guard against violations in such areas as entering a home by force, or without permission, or under false pretenses, making home visits outside of working hours, and particularly making such visits during sleeping hours; and searching in the home, for example, in rooms, closets, drawers, or papers, to seek clues to possible deception.

2. The general requirement about the application process requires the State agency to take those actions that are necessary to facilitate the exercise of the right to apply for assistance and other services, for the application process is the first step in determination of eligibility. Such actions include: making arrangements to accept applications without delay, informing applicants about the eligibility requirements and their rights and obligations under the program, and acting promptly on applications. This is a general requirement. Detailed requirements covering the application process are contained in IV–2300.

3. The requirement that the plan provide that decisions on eligibility or ineligibility will be adequately supported and recorded requires that each decision be based on facts—statements about eligibility requirements that have been substantiated by observation, or written records, or other appropriate means.

This requirement should result in the maintenance of case records that will provide a valid basis for accounting for expenditures of public funds, and that will assure the availability of needed information if the applicant or recipient appeals to the State agency for a fair hearing.

4. The requirement that a State plan provide that redetermination of eligibility will be made promptly—at least within 30 days after the agency has available information which suggests the need for redetermination—and at regular intervals no longer than the specified maximum periods, is designed to contribute to efficient administration. This applies when the agency obtains the information during a regular redetermination of eligibility or when providing social services, or when the recipient or another person or agency reports changes in the recipient's situation.

In requiring that a State plan provide that redeterminations of eligibility will be made periodically—at periods no longer than every 3 months in AFDC–UP, every 6 months in other AFDC cases, and every 12 months in the other programs—it is recognized that the situations of families with children are apt to change more frequently than those of recipients of the other categories. The time periods specified are the maximum periods that a State plan may provide for between periodic redetermination of eligibility. This requirement in no way affects the right of the recipient to receive assistance regularly so long as he remains eligible. Hence, failure of the agency to make a periodic redetermination cannot be used as a basis for withholding assistance.

5. The detailed procedural requirements for State plan provisions on methods for determination of eligibility are based on recognition of the rights and obligations of applicants and recipients to be responsible participants in the process and the fact that the objectives of the program can only be achieved through an agency-client relationship based on mutual respect.

a. The requirement that a plan provide that applicants and recipients will be relied upon as the primary source of information regarding their initial and continued claim for assistance does not relieve the agency of the responsibility to recognize the differing capacities of applicants and recipients to discharge their responsibilities to the agency. Some can provide or obtain needed information after the agency explains what information is needed; others will need specific directions to sources of information; others may want, or have to rely on, the agency to obtain the information for them.

If the individual is unable to participate in the determination of eligibility, because of such circumstances as physical or mental disability, inability to speak English, or other difficulties, the agency is obliged to take measures to provide him the assistance and services for which he is eligible.

Reliance on applicants and recipients as the primary source of information will enable the agency to determine initial or continuing eligibility in a large percentage of cases on the basis of information provided by the individual, supplemented if necessary by information from public records. Such reliance on the individual includes placing responsibility on recipients for notifying the agency, on the basis of instructions understood by them, about changes in their situations that may affect the amount of assistance to which they are entitled or may terminate their eligibility.

When available information is inconclusive, reliance on the applicant or recipient as the primary source of information requires the agency to explain to the individual, in writing if necessary, (1) what questions remain and how he can resolve or help to resolve them and/or what actions the agency can take to resolve them, and (2) the necessity for resolving the questions if eligibility is to be established or continued. If the individual is reluctant or unwilling to help resolve the question or permit the agency to do so, the agency is responsible for considering carefully with him his reasons—both to prevent him from deciding unnecessarily or unwisely to withdraw from the program when he is eligible, and to discharge the agency's responsibility for evaluating whether facts had previously been presented correctly. (See IV–2600 re Fraud.)

If the individual is unwilling to have the agency seek verifying information, the agency may not be able to determine eligibility and thus have no recourse but to deny or terminate assistance. In such instance, the individual should be told that he has the right to re-apply at any time.

b. The plan requirement of an interview with applicants and recipients in each determination of eligibility requires a personal interview, preferably in the individual's home, unless this is impractical or would delay case action. If difficulties of transportation or other causes preclude a personal interview, contact by telephone or correspondence may be substituted. If the physical or mental condition of the applicant or recipient makes any type of direct contact with him impractical, the requirement may be met by a personal interview or other contact with someone who can act responsibly for him. In the case of initial determinations of eligibility, however, a personal interview with the applicant is required as soon as possible.

In States where eligibility is determined either initially or on redetermination on the basis of declaration forms or similar procedure, the interview should take place as soon as possible, and in any event within 90 days.

c. Reliance on the applicant (and public records) as the primary source of information will ordinarily make it unnecessary to consult other sources of information. The agency should take no steps in the exploration of eligibility to which the applicant does not agree, including contact with collateral sources. When information is sought from collateral sources, there should be clear interpretation of what information is desired, why it is needed, and how it will be used. Agencies should not rely on a "blanket" consent for outside contacts, but should obtain specific consent for each contact, whether with social agencies, doctors, hospitals, and similar resources, or with relatives or other individuals.

The consent should cover the purpose of the contact as well as the individual or agency to be consulted.

If the agency has to assume responsibility for the entire process of determination of eligibility or for parts of it, because of the individual's inability to participate in establishing his eligibility, the same care must be taken in selecting sources to be contacted as would be taken if he were participating. Agency actions contrary to the foregoing practices will be inconsistent with requirement IV–2220, item 5c, unless limited to specific situations where there is special need to use other procedures. If other procedures are followed in a specific situation, the case record must specify the reasons why they were needed, and the specific procedures followed, which must be consistent with IV–2220, item 1, and IV–2230, item 1.

d. The requirement that applicants and recipients be notified in writing that assistance has been authorized in a stated amount requires such notification both at the initial determination of eligibility and each redetermination that results in a change in the amount of assistance to which the individual is entitled. When assistance is denied to an applicant and when a recipient's assistance is terminated, the written notice to him must contain the reason why he has been determined to be ineligible. The written notice will provide a basis for the individual to express dissatisfaction with the agency action. (See IV–6000 re Hearings.)

6. The State plan must provide reporting and other administrative and supervisory methods for obtaining information about whether local agencies carry out the State plan provisions and meet Federal requirements in determination of eligibility, thus enabling the State agency to identify problem areas and take corrective action. (See II–4200, item 3, re State-wide operation.)

[From the Practical Lawyer, April 1966]

Social Welfare Law Testing

(By Edward V. Sparer, legal director, Center on Social Welfare Policy and Law, the Columbia University School of Social Work)

(Author's Note.—The author gratefully acknowledges the assistance of Howard M. Thorkelson, legal associate at the Center on Social Welfare Policy and Law.)

Among the functions of the legal division of the Center on Social Welfare Policy and Law of The Columbia University School of Social Work is service as a social welfare law testing resource for legal aid attorneys and others who are giving free representation to welfare clients. The creation of the resource was based upon the following notions: That many of the significant issues of social policy in the welfare field involve legal issues that have never—or hardly ever—been reviewed by courts of law or even administrative review boards; that the sound development of social welfare programs requires judicial scrutiny of these legal issues; that unusual opportunity now exists to afford expanded legal recourse to social welfare clients as a result of the increasing attention given by government antipoverty programs to legal services for the poor; that past experience indicates such legal service efforts tend to become inundated with the problems of representing a mass clientele, and can be helped by special assistance in the development of test cases involving complex issues of social welfare law; that a university based center, drawing knowledge from the legal and social work professions, could serve both the clients of governmental welfare agencies and the long-range interests of the agencies by providing this special assistance.

The general issues upon which the Center is prepared to extend its maximum aid—including brief writing, research, consultation on appropriate strategy, etc.—to attorneys representing social welfare clients have been selected by an advisory committee of outstanding law and social work professors of Columbia University. The committee includes Professors of Law Monrad G. Paulsen, Chairman, Curtis J. Berger, R. Kent Greenawalt, Louis Lusky, and Michael I. Sovern, and Professors of Social Work George Brager, Eveline M. Burns, Hyman Grossbard, Alfred J. Kahn, and Thomas F. Lewin.

Below we state and thereafter briefly describe 10 issues—or, more correctly, areas of public assistance law concerning which we are particularly interested in rendering assistance to attorneys. These issues are:

The "man-in-the-house" rule and its variations;

"Midnight raids," early morning visits, and other privacy and illegal search issues;

Settlement and residence laws in various forms;

Maximum family grants;

Relatives' liability;

Certain work-relief practices and statutes;

Use of penal measures to impose standards of morality upon welfare clients;

The present scope of discretionary (or arbitrary) decision-making as it affects entitlement;

Fair procedure and due process in welfare administration;

Federal requirements on uniform application of state plans for public assistance.

The members of the Center's advisory committee are not here taking a personal position as to the appropriate legal resolution of any of the issues described. The advisory committee intends to indicate only that each of the issues described involves matters of law of great significance to welfare clients, that serious question may be raised about current application or interpretation of the law with regard to these issues, and that the best development and presentation of the legal positions of clients affected by these issues would be of benefit to American society.

Aside from the above-listed issues, the Center's legal staff is available for consultation on any legal issue affecting welfare clients.

THE "MAN-IN-THE-HOUSE" RULE

The term "man-in-the-house" rule is used in different public welfare programs to refer to different kinds of regulations. Its primary application is to those states that, by statutory direction, extend AFDC (aid to families with dependent children) aid only to those children deprived of parental support by reason of the death, continued absence from the home, or physical or mental incapacity of a parent, and not to those children deprived of parental support because their fathers are unemployed, under-employed, or ill-paid. Nineteen states plus the District of Columbia have such statutory restrictions (despite the availability of federal funds for a more inclusive program).

A serious equal protection argument might be developed concerning the reasonableness of the two classifications of needy children created by such statutes:

Those who will be helped by the state because their fathers have deserted or are otherwise absent; and

Those who will not be helped by the state because their fathers have refused to desert and are unable to find enough work to provide minimal support.

Such an equal protection argument would be relevant where an adequate general assistance program for those denied aid under AFDC does not exist. One should look not only to whether the statute provides for general assistance but to whether it is actually funded and operating. There is reason to believe that, in some localities, statutory directions for the implementation of general assistance are ignored. In such localities, mandamus actions to compel assistance might also be considered.

Second application

A second application of the "man-in-the-house" rule is made by certain of those states in the above-described grouping that deny aid not only to those children whose father is in the home, but also to those children who have an alleged "substitute father." The welfare policies of these states usually define the "substitute father" more in terms of the man's sexual relationship with the mother than in terms of his support or guardianship of the children.

Thus, in Georgia, a man who "visits frequently" at the mother's home for the purpose of "co-habiting" is deemed to have "a common-law relationship" with the mother and therefore is ruled a "substitute father." In Arkansas, a "substitute parent" is a man to whom the mother "affords the privileges of a husband" in a "continuing relationship" as evidenced by "frequent visits" to the home or "frequent appearances of the man and mother in public as a couple." In Alabama, a man who "co-habits" with the mother, even though "he does not frequent the home" but "co-habits . . . elsewhere" with the mother, is deemed a substitute parent. The Washington, D.C. public assistance department also denies aid where a vaguely defined "substitute parent" exists, whether he is living in the home or not, but ostensibly requires some relationship to the children (such as taking them on walks). The Michigan welfare department does not use the "substitute parent" label but deems a home "unsuitable" for aid to dependent children if the mother gives "the rights of a spouse" to a man to whom she is not legally married.* Additional states follow closely analogous policies.

Since these policies result in a denial of welfare aid to needy children who are in fact "deprived of parental support" by reason of the death or desertion of their real father (the statutory test), they appear arbitrary and in conflict with the purpose of both the federal and the relevant state AFDC statutes. In addition, they are often so vaguely defined as to defy a uniform application. Finally, since the policies referred to place the burden on the mother of proving that she is *not* "affording the privileges of a husband" to a man, the policies permit extraordinary intrusions into the privacy of mothers on welfare. For these reasons, with the assistance of Center lawyers, the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc., has filed a complaint and petition for a hearing with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and requested that the Secretary find that such policies do not conform to the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 301 *ff*. Court action may also be appropriate.

Other applications

Other states make still other applications of the "man-in-the-house" rule by which aid is not necessarily denied because a father or father-substitute is in the home. In some states (e.g., California), while it is held that a father-substitute is not legally liable for support of the children of the mother with whom he is allegedly cohabiting, welfare departments are directed by statute or regulation to draw a binding inference that the father-substitute is giving support. Other states (e.g., New York) allow the mother to rebut the presumption, but suspend payments pending rebuttal when an unreported man is discovered to be living in the house.

At the present time, it is recommended that the first two applications of the "man-in-the-house" rule be given particular priority in testing.

MIDNIGHT RAIDS

Midnight raids on the homes of AFDC mothers received some general publicity as a result of the mass raids conducted in Alameda County, California. The practice exists in a great many cities, however, including—at least as of the end of 1965—New York (where the practice is referred to as an "early morning visit," taking place at 6:00 a.m. or 6:30 a.m.). The purpose of the raid or visit is to discover a man in bed with an AFDC mother (who did not report the man's presence in the home to the welfare department). Upon discovering his presence through the raid, welfare will be suspended.

The general practice is not to obtain search warrants. Often (as in New York) policemen accompany special welfare investigators to the home. The investigators are usually instructed to obtain consent to enter by knocking on the door and informing the mother that her welfare aid will be cut off if she does not consent to a search of the home. Criminal prosecution for fraud will sometimes follow the discovery of the man in bed, though more often it will not.

Legal questions

Among the relevant legal questions are: Is the consent thus obtained a voluntary consent? Are the searches conducted under these circumstances a violation of the mothers' constitutional protections against illegal search? Reich has explored the legal problems and concluded that these searches are illegal. Reich, *Midnight Welfare Searches and the Social Security Act*, 72 Yale L.J. 1347 (1963).

A few city governments have been persuaded to discontinue such searches because of the constitutional issues posed. No judicial precedent exists, though one case is now working its way through the California appellate courts on a related issue (can a public welfare case worker be fired for refusing to participate in such a raid?).

Other privacy issues exist. For example, may a welfare worker inspect the home of a welfare client (during ordinary daylight hours), threatening to suspend aid if she stops him—without giving her reasonable notice? May he search her home—in daylight hours—for evidence of criminal wrongdoing without a search warrant? These issues are currently being tested, with the Center's assistance, by the Legal Services Unit of Mobilization for Youth in New York City.

Still other privacy issues need exploration as to their nature, extent, and accessibility to remedy by judicial or administrative review.

SETTLEMENT AND RESIDENCE LAWS

Analysis of this subject for test purposes becomes hopelessly muddled unless distinctions are made between the various types of residential restrictions on public welfare aid. Among the restrictions are:

Residence laws affecting applicants for aid under the federally-supported categorical programs (AFDC, OAA, AB, AD) (aid to families with dependent children, old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the disabled). The states are limited by the provisions of the Social Security Act in the length of the residential requirements they are permitted to impose upon applicants to such programs [e.g., one year immediately preceding application for AFDC; see 42 U.S.C. § 602(2)].

Residence laws for general assistance programs: Several laws range from three to five years, some with residential requirements in the county of application.

Settlement laws for general assistance: Settlement laws invariably include residential requirements. Their purpose is to define which towns or counties within a state have the duty to provide general assistance. Those who are not settled may be entitled to emergency assistance, or no assistance at all, or assistance in restricted forms. Generally, one does not gain settlement for any period in which he receives any form of public aid.

Statutes authorizing the forced removal (by court order) of needy persons from one county or town within a state to another where such person has settlement. E.g., (Burns) Ind. Stat. Ann. § 52:156.

Statutes authorizing the forced removal of needy persons (by court order) from the state on the ground that they have settlement "or otherwise belong" elsewhere. E.g., Mass. Ann. Laws ch. 122, § 21: "Certain Persons To Be Deported." Section 21 authorizes a justice of the Superior Court to issue a warrant causing persons given general assistance and "not born or not having a settlement in the commonwealth, who may conveniently be removed, to be conveyed at the expense of the commonwealth to any state or, if not a citizen of the United States, to any place beyond sea, where he belongs." The section was reenacted as recently as 1958. In order to gain settlement in Massachusetts, one must have lived five consecutive years in any town in the commonwealth. Mass. Ann. Laws ch. 116, § 1. Settlement is not a prerequisite to a grant of aid. Mass. Ann. Laws ch. 117, § 2.

Statutes that prevent a needy person from ever gaining settlement in a particular state through the service of certain notices. E.g., S.D. Code § 50.0102(6).

Statutes authorizing imposition of criminal penalties upon needy persons who have settlement elsewhere. E.g., N.J. Stat. Ann. § 44:8A–36.

Statutes that make it a crime for a needy person who has once been transported at public expense to his county of settlement to leave that county and apply for public assistance in any other county. E.g. (Burns), Ind. Stat. Ann. § 52:156.

Administrative practices that deny entitlement to needy residents and nonresidents alike on the ground that it is in their best interests or the state's best interests for them to return to their state of origin. Such cases have occurred recently in New York and may exist on a wide scale.

Abuse laws that impose no residential restrictions as such, but deny entitlement to those who are found to have come to the state for the purpose of receiving aid. At least three states, including New York, have such laws.

Residence-in-lieu-of-citizenship requirements that, in some cases, require noncitizens to have resided in the state for as long as 25 years. Eleven states either require public assistance recipients in at least one program to be citizens or have a specified number of years' residence. Such programs are usually OA, AB, or AD (federally supported programs); one state (Texas) has such a law for the AFDC program. In at least six states, such residence requirements range from 15 to 25 years (as of 1963).

The Texas statute may have the effect of denying aid to the large sections of the Mexican-born population of Texas. The denial of aid to resident aliens may well be inconsistent with the Social Security Act. Section 606(a)(1) of 42 U.S.C. defines "dependent child" as "a needy child who has been deprived of parental support or care" and says nothing about citizenship; section 602(b) limits residence requirements in approved state plans to a one-year maximum.

---

* The basic public assistance policies of the various states, aside from the very general state public assistance statutes, are contained in handbooks or manuals of public assistance issued by the state social welfare departments and the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW). The manuals, with rare exceptions only, are not published but are issued in loose-leaf form to welfare department offices. State manuals dealing with federally supported programs are on file with HEW in Washington, D.C., and in its various regional offices, where they may be seen. Quotations in the text are taken from the manuals of public assistance of the indicated states. The Federal Handbook of Public Assistance sets forth a number of requirements for state programs and is of great value to any lawyer representing welfare clients. It is not published in the Federal Register or elsewhere, but is issued to federal and state welfare offices in loose-leaf form.

It is relevant to section 606(a)(1) that section 601 identifies the program's beneficiaries as "needy dependent children" and that section 602(a)(9) requires that aid be given "to all eligible individuals" residing in the state for more than one year. *Cf. Harman v. Forssenius,* 380 U.S. 528 (1965). These sections seem to preclude the denial of aid to resident aliens. A denial of aid to resident aliens also appears to contravene Fourteenth Amendment equal protection. ". . . nor shall any state . . . deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." Since alienage is irrelevant to the purposes of the program, it does not justify the denial of aid to resident aliens as a class for such long periods.

Underlying notion

Some generalizations can be made about these laws. They are, by and large, vestiges from Elizabethan days that owe their continuing vitality to the notion enjoyed by legislators that poor people often move, or plan to move, in order to obtain the welfare benefits of other states. The contrary notion is asserted by the overwhelming bulk of social workers, public welfare workers, and others who have commented upon their experience with in-migrants (i.e., that these persons generally move for many different reasons, but not to obtain welfare benefits). At least some reported instances of death stemming from the operation of the residence laws exist. There is only one reported constitutional challenge of residence laws—a 1940 Illinois Supreme Court case—and that failed. *Heydenreich v. Lyons,* 374 Ill. 557, 30 N.E.2d 46 (1940).

Constitutional challenges

Successful challenges of residence laws might best proceed by testing the more obviously onerous statutes and practices on a variety of constitutional grounds (the forced removal statutes, criminal penalty statutes, best interest practices, ridiculously long residence-in-lieu-of-citizenship statutes, settlement laws that operate to prevent a needy person from ever gaining a new settlement, etc.), plus settlement or general assistance residence laws of unusual length. There is a great need of court opinion, dicta or otherwise, that would provide a more adequate legal background against which analysis may be made of other residence laws. The one presently existing appellate case in this general area that provides support for a further development is *Edwards* v. *California,* 314 U.S. 160 (1941). There, a statute authorizing criminal prosecution of persons who brought indigents into the state was found unconstitutional.

Research needed

Aside from instituting initial tests, two research efforts are needed:

An accurate compilation of contemporary residence laws and practices, to the extent that is feasible (the residence laws have been undergoing legislative revision in a number of states during the sixties; no complete national description exists; practices in this area may in some ways be more tolerant and in other ways more severe than any of us imagine—it has been many years since an accurate general survey of actual practice has been made, at least to the writer's knowledge);

A compilation and analysis of the whole of social work, public welfare, and other experience with the motivations of migrating destitute people since the thirties and early forties.

MAXIMUM FAMILY GRANTS

As of June, 1963, more than one-third of the states imposed maximum limits on the aid to any AFDC applicant, regardless of the number of eligible children. The maximums ranged from a high of $250 per family unit (Maine) to a low of $81 (Florida). Some states scale payments so that each additional child reduces the rate but increases the multiplier by one. Arizona's statute illustrates a more liberal maximum limitation provision:

". . . In no event shall the total amount of assistance paid . . . to any recipient exceed eighty dollars for any calendar month for a family containing one dependent child, and twenty-seven dollars for each additional dependent child, but in no event shall any one family receive assistance in excess of two hundred twenty dollars per month." ARIZ. REV. STAT. ANN. § 46–294.

If "family" is defined as the family unit living in the mother's home, the effect is that children of a family of six children or more could receive maximum payments only by living outside their mother's home.

A comparable statute was held to deny equal protection in *Collins* v. *State Bd. of Social Welfare,* 248 Iowa 369, 81 N.W.2d 4 (1957). The decision was based on the provision of the Iowa constitution requiring that laws operate equally and uniformly, but the Court applied the Fourteenth Amendment principle "reasonable grounds for classification." The Court found that the statute established a "subclassification of the original classification, i.e., dependent children based solely upon the number of children in the home, with no consideration as to need, a circumstance completely disconnected [sic] with the basic classification and the purpose and reason therefor." 81 N.W.2d at 9.

It is recommended that such statutes in other states be tested on grounds of both state and federal constitutional provisions, as well as possible conflict with the purpose and provisions of the federal Social Security Act and state welfare law.

RELATIVES' LIABILITY STATUTES

Most states have statutes providing for the recovery of support costs from various members of the recipient's family (these may include spouse, parents, grandparents, children, grandchildren). These liability statutes are usually attached to most, but not necessarily all, public assistance programs within the state. Some states impose liability on different relatives, depending on which program is involved.

In addition, the 1965 amendments to the Social Security Act require that most forms of relative liability be omitted in medical assistance if federal funds are to be obtained. See 42 U.S.C. § 1396.

Such statutes, like settlement laws, derive from Elibethan concepts that placed the primary burden of support of the poor upon their families and appear in striking contradiction to modern welfare concepts that recognize the social gain that accrues from the relief of poverty. Some laws that impose support liability on relatives of public assistance recipients do not impose such liability on relatives of members of other classes.

Problems

The financial problems created by liability provisions are compounded by caseworkers who sometimes misapply relatives' reimbursement provisions and use them to intimidate clients. In at least one major city, although the law places the burden of recovery on the agency rather than on the recipient, some caseworkers have reduced payments and denied assistance altogether on grounds of a relative's prior obligation of support.

In states where an action by the applicant for support is a condition of assistance, enforcement may, in many cases, have the effect either of inducing the applicant to sacrifice public assistance without adequate contributions from relatives or of straining his relations with his family. The effect of such enforcement of liability provisions is not only that family life is disrupted but also that purported aid payments are made as loans to the persons made responsible. Oddly enough, while the public welfare department usually is granted the right to recovery of money it gives to the recipient when she acquires assets at a later date, relatives who are required to give support rarely are granted similar statutory rights.

Constitutionality

In 1964, the Supreme Court of California held that a statute that imposed liability on adult children for the cost of their mother's maintenance in a state hospital (to which she had been civilly committed) violated the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the constitution. *Department of Mental Hygiene* v. *Kirchner,* 60 Cal. 2d 716, 388 P. 2d 720 (1964). The United States Supreme Court remanded the decision for determination of whether the California Court relied on federal or state constitutional grounds. The California Supreme Court later stated that it relied on state grounds, and thus a United States Supreme Court review of the analogous federal issue was precluded.

tenBroek aptly summarized the reasoning of the California Court as follows:

"The central reasoning of the court in the *Kirchner* case is expressed in three summary passages: First, the enactment and administration of laws providing for treatment of persons in appropriate state institutions is a proper state function. Being so, the costs should be borne by the state. Second, "A statute obviously violates the equal protection clause if it selects one particular class of persons for a species of taxation and no rational basis supports such classification. . . . Such a concept for the state's taking of a free man's property manifestly denies him equal protection of the law." Third, the cost of a proper state function conducted for the public benefit "cannot be arbitrarily charged to one class in the society." Imposing liability for the cost on the relatives of recipients does arbitrarily charge it to one class in society and violates the basic constitutional guarantee of the equal protection of the law." tenBroek, *California's Dual System of Family law,* 17 STAN. L. REV. 614, 639 (1964–1965).

In 1963, the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia reached an opposite result, in *Beach* v. *Government of the District of Columbia,* 320 F. 2d 790. The father of a mental incompetent was held liable for the cost of her care. Although the Court affirmed the primacy of the public's responsibility, it held, on the basis of older state decisions, that the imposition of liability was not irrational and, therefore, not a denial of due process. The Court appeared to be considering only property rights and not equal protection.

Kirchner, coupled with tenBroek's extensive research and analysis of the relevance of the equal protection requirements to the statutes in question, creates a basis for challenging the relative liability statutes in the categorical and general assistance programs.

Different area

A different area of liability relates to the statutes creating a type of debtor-creditor relationship in public welfare between the recipient and the welfare department. Research as to the basis for liability in this area is needed.

WORK-RELIEF STATUTES AND PRACTICES

Some states, by statute or regulation, impose work requirements on recipients of general assistance and AFDC. Here referred to are work-relief programs and not requirements that employable recipients look for work. While the general notion of work-relief as a condition of welfare aid may be proper, there are a variety of issues relating to such work programs that would gain from judicial or quasi-judicial review. For example, are the "good cause" grounds [cf. 42

U.S.C. § 609(a)], permitting a client to refuse particular kinds of work-relief requirements, adequately defined and communicated to the clients?

Criminal penalties

Some agencies attempt to impose criminal penalties upon persons who refuse work. A recent New York case dealt with such an attempt. While the conviction was reversed by the Appellate Division, the constitutional issues, unfortunately, were not reached. *People* v. *LaFountain*, 21 App. Div. 2d 719, 249 N.Y.S. 2d 744 (1964).

The Massachusetts poor laws illustrate the highly questionable statutes that authorize criminal penalties in general assistance (Mass. Ann. Laws ch. 117, §§ 20, 22):

"§ 20 The board of public welfare and the officer in charge of premises provided by a town for the purpose of supplying food or lodging on said premises may and in cases of tramps or vagrants shall require any person applying for and receiving food or lodging to perform, if physically able, a reasonable amount of labor in return therefor, and may detain him for not more than twenty-four hours after such application until the labor . . . has been performed.

"§ 22 Whoever refuses or neglects to perform any labor required of him under the preceding two sections shall be punished . . . by imprisonment . . . for not more than one year."

Among the many issues raised by this statute might well be the involuntary servitude issue posed but not reached in *LaFountain, supra.*

USE OF PENAL MEASURES TO IMPOSE STANDARDS OF MORALITY

A different application of penal process to welfare clients occurs in the incarceration or threatened incarceration of welfare clients for violations of moral standards that cost the state money (i.e., illegitimate babies). A report of a New Jersey legislative committee was replete with suggestions for "new methods" designed to "combat and contain this group [AFDC mothers who have illegitimate children while on public aid] with emphasis on legal punitive measures in addition to psychiatric and psychological counseling." *See Legislative Report on the Aid to Dependent Children Program in New* Jersey, reprinted in the Congressional Record, volume 109, part 17, pages 22188–22199. Because of the lack of adequate reporting services, the extent to which such punishment is threatened or actually carried out is not known.

Occasional reports, however, do indicate that legal punitive measures are carried out to some extent. For example, a newspaper story alleged that "a 25-year-old woman had been sent to jail for an indefinite term of having one too many illegitimate children" in New Jersey. The domestic relations judge was quoted as saying "I warned you on October 12, 1962, not to have any more illegitimate children and you have violated my order and violated your probation, the proof being you are unmarried and expectant." He then sentenced her to an indefinite term in Clinton Reformatory for Women, according to the article, New York Daily News, Dec. 18, 1964.

Issues posed

Major statutory and constitutional issues are posed by applications of the penal process. Is there proper statutory authorization? Are civil processes here being used to effect a penal consequence? If fornication in New Jersey is a crime (as distinguished from adultery), are the penal consequences applied only where welfare clients are involved? Is incarceration (in a reformatoy or otherwise) for having "more illegitimate children" (as distinguished from adultery, fornication, etc.) itself consistent with constitutional provisions and standards?

DECISIONMAKING AS IT AFFECTS ENTITLEMENT

Central to the protection of the legal rights of welfare recipients is the development of a more adequate basis for discretionary decision-making, particularly as it affects entitlement issues, and the revision of regulations, administrative practices, etc., that permit or encourage arbitrary decision-making. These tasks are among the most difficult faced by any administrative agency. The problems are compounded—for many reasons—for public welfare agencies.

Initial studies should be made, and test cases brought, in three areas of discretionary decision-making. These areas are:

Employable mother standards;

Suitable home standards; and

The best interest theory as it operates to create quasi-residential requirements.

Employable mother standards

Many AFDC programs, either by statute or regulation, require mothers to seek employment under conditions that are extraordinarily ill-defined. Should the mother refuse, her benefits are—or may be—terminated.

STATE REGULATION

As an illustration, the relevant public assistance regulation of a major northern state is cited. After declaring that a mother's first responsibility is the care and protection of her children, the regulation states that self-support should, nevertheless, be encouraged. The regulation then authorizes the termination of welfare benefits by the county welfare board "where a mother has been evaluated as able to work and she refuses to seek or accept employment." The following criteria are set forth to determine whether employment is "not contra-indicated":

"(1) The need for the mother's services at home depends upon the number, age and special needs of the children; incapacity of the father; the mother's acceptance of homemaking responsibility; and the availability of a mother-substitute to assure the adequate care of the children at home;

"(2) Her potential for employment depends upon her training and capacity for employment, the economic feasibility, the job availability and her physical and emotional ability to assume the dual responsibility of mother and breadwinner."

The regulation may give an initial impression of reasonable guidelines. It does not take much imagination, however, to visualize the kind of opposite results easily reached in the same kinds of cases. Such breadth to discretionary situations translates itself in practice to arbitrary decision-making. There is a need, of course, to avoid rigid rules. Perhaps, in this area, satisfactory guides could not be worked out without incorporating a provision that the ultimate decision as to whether the welfare of her children is better served by staying at home or going to work must be made by the mother.

WASHINGTON, D.C., REGULATION

Certain regulations in this area on their face are not vague but arbitrary, and need challenge and review. For example, the Washington, D.C., regulation, according to the Metropolitan Washington Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers, states that if the mother has been employed and loses work, she has 30 days to find other employment; after 30 days, she becomes ineligible for the AFDC grant. The Public Welfare Crisis in the Nation's Capital, p. 34, 1964. Such a regulation flouts the policy underlying the AFDC program and arbitrarily penalizes children and mothers who do seek work when encouraged.

An interesting test might also be made in the case of a woman who is evaluated as suitable for work, but disagrees, feeling she is needed in her home, and is then terminated. Does the welfare department have a mandate to continue aid to children, or may they leave the children in a condition dangerous to their health and lives because the mother has disagreed?

Suitable home provisions

So-called suitable home provisions, often concerned primarily with the conduct of the parent or guardian, are significant features of a large number of state public assistance plans. Under these plans, a home may be declared unsuitable for a variety of reasons, including the presence of illegitimate children. A consequence of such a finding may be termination of AFDC benefits.

FLEMMING RULING

Since 1961, a ruling of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (the Flemming Ruling) has limited state power to deny AFDC assistance on the ground of an unsuitable home, without otherwise providing for adequate care and assistance. In 1962, the Flemming Ruling was incorporated into the Social Security Act. 42 U.S.C. § 604. Unfortunately, however, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has not yet taken the necessary steps to implement fully the Flemming Ruling.

One authority who conducted a thorough review of unsuitability practices concluded that:

"In retrospect it is clear that the Flemming Ruling was not sufficiently inclusive to solve the problem . . . [U]ntil the complex of policies which discriminate against Negro and illegitimate children is approached realistically and welfare regulations are required to conform to the general statutes [dealing with support liability], a shift in one particular eligibility condition will have little effect on the program." Bell, Aid to Dependent Children 150–151. (Columbia University Press, New York, N.Y., 1965).

AREAS OF CONCERN

Subjects of concern in this area are:

Whether welfare departments have power to terminate aid to children on the ground of vaguely defined suitability provisions;

Whether practices that result in a ban of aid to families with illegitimate children without an adequate alternative plan are still in effect;

Whether various other policies, such as the "substitute father" policy, are nothing more than devices designed to evade the Flemming Ruling; and

The constitutionality of neglect proceedings where such proceedings are instituted on the ground of illegitimate children only in the case of welfare clients.

The best interest theory: New York practice

An administrative practice existing in New York (and in other states as well) is to deny AFDC to families in New York, even to families who have been in New York for more than a year, where it has been deemed to be socially valid and in the best interest of such families to return to their state of origin. In New York, this practice applies to both state residents and nonresidents and affects hundreds of families yearly.

While the practice continues, and has reappeared in recent litigation, the only attempt to indicate proposed standards may be found in Eisner, *The Return of Dependent Persons to Place of Legal Settlement,* 21 J. Social Case Work 181 (1940). As the practice has appeared in recent cases, both statutory and constitutional objections may be raised to it.

MASSACHUSETTS STATUTE

A Massachusetts statute authorizes a similar practice, limited to nonresidents, however. The Massachusetts statute authorizes aid where it is "for the public interest" and where the public welfare board "deems [it] expedient." Those nonresidents (defined as persons lacking an established place of abode in the state) for whom the local administrators do not deem it expedient to give aid shall be removed from the state. MASS. ANN. LAWS ch. 117, § 18.

OTHER PROVISIONS

Other states have analogous provisions, leaving to the unfettered discretion of the welfare department whether aid shall or shall not be given. These provisions may be challenged on a number of grounds.

FAIR PROCEDURE IN WELFARE ADMINISTRATION

Procedures for the administration of public welfare programs are an odd combination of reasoned, protective regulations and restrictive, perhaps arbitrary, procedures. Usually, procedural rights on a hearing level are well-defined and fair, as a result of the hearing requirements established by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Procedural rights that exist on the level of client-caseworker relationship are often ignored—to the extent that they do exist. Existing procedural protections with regard to agency policy vis-a-vis client entitlement particularly need more and fairer definition.

Two areas needing study

There is a dire need for a thorough survey and study of the entire area. Recommended now, however, are both study and testing in two specific areas:

The right of clients to see the written rules or policies that are invoked to deny aid.

See Davis' discussion of "secret law;" I ADMINISTRATIVE LAW TREATISE, § 4.16, pp. 102–112 (West Publishing Co., St. Paul, Minn., 1965 pocket part). Various illustrations of "secret law" in public assistance on the part of some state and local departments could be offered here. An incident reported in a recent *New Republic* editorial, "The Apparatchik" (July 24, 1965, p. 7), allegedly took place in Chicago: Mrs. Dorothy Perez, the client, was denied certain back payments. She went to the local department office and it was conceded that she was due certain back payments but not all that she requested. "'Why not?' Mrs. Perez asked. 'There's a rule,' said the apparatchik. 'Let me see the rule,' Mrs. Perez rejoined. 'There's a rule against seeing the rule. . . .' The next day . . . the director (who had not been in the office the previous day) agreed that Mrs. Perez was due the back payments. He defended the apparatchik: The rules Mrs. Perez had asked to see were too 'difficult for her to read.'"

Clients have a right to see written rules or policies at a hearing. In most states, a public inspection suit could probably force revelation of such documents. However, agency policy itself should direct the ready disclosure to clients and applicants and others of all rules, policies, procedure, etc., that affect eligibility. There are several possible avenues of changing present state agency policy on this matter in those states that are restrictive.

Procedure followed when some reason appears to question fraud by a client receiving public assistance, but insufficient reason to warrant a conclusion that she is ineligible.

To illustrate one aspect of the problem raised by procedures on fraud, examine the different approaches taken by the New Jersey and New York regulations. The New Jersey regulations state (pt. II, § 2951, Manual of Administration, Bureau of Assistance):

> . . . in any receiving case, except as provided in the following paragraph [The following paragraph refers to instances where the client refuses to "cooperate" with the agency in disclosing information] assistance should be continued to an otherwise eligible person, even though there is reason to suspect that fraud has been committed, while the facts are under review by the agency or the law enforcement authority. . . .

In New York, in contrast, assistance "may" (or may not) be automatically suspended wherever "continuing eligibility is questionable and under investigation" (reg. 351.22 (3)(b), Rules and Regulations of the New York State Department of Social Welfare).

The right to assistance

There is a right to assistance, of course, under the relevant statutes, whenever the conditions for eligibility have been established. Federal regulations on fraud investigation require that such procedures be "consistent with principles recognized as affording due process of law" (pt. IV, § 2633, HANDBOOK OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION). One may doubt that suspension of aid vital to life itself—of aid that is granted as a right after eligibility requirements have been established—may be suspended because of "question(s)" prompting an "investigation," at least under procedures that are "consistent with principles recognized as affording due process of law."

FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS ON UNIFORMITY

Social Security Act

The Social Security Act provides that a state plan "shall be in effect in all political subdivisions of the state" (42 U.S.C. § 602). As interpreted in the federal HANDBOOK OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE, the statute requires (pt. II, § 4300): "that the benefits of the programs will be equally available to all eligible persons; and that state policies, standards, and methods will apply equally to persons in like situations wherever they may live.

"Where the program is administered by political subdivisions under State supervision, the State agency is responsible for assuring that the State program and State rules and requirements are in effect in all political subdivisions. This means that the specific eligibility factors for each assistance program, including resources and standards of need, and any additional eligibility factors included in the approved State plan are uniformly applied in area offices or political subdivisions."

State welfare programs receiving federal financial support are required to conform to the "uniform operation" provision of the Act as well as to other provisions. In the history of the Act, only 15 hearings have been called by the Secretary to resolve disputed conformity issues. To the extent uniform operation has been an issue, it has usually arisen because of disparities appearing on the face of the state plans and in the reports of the state agencies.

Yet plans do not really operate in a uniform manner in many states. Gross disparities in at least some states exist from county to county, department to department, and caseworker to caseworker. Some of the egregious maladministration of public welfare takes place in violation of the uniformity requirement. E.g., see the 1960 Greenleigh Associates report on the lack of uniform operations in Cook County, Illinois, "Facts, Fallacies and Future" 64–65 (Greenleigh Associates, Inc., 437 Fifth Ave., New York, N.Y.). Often practice deviates sharply from established agency policy. On the subject of disparity between practice and policy, Greenleigh Associates noted in its report (p. 65): "In almost every instance of departure from policies, it was to the disadvantage of the applicant or recipient not the agency. . . ."

Causes of lack of uniformity

The causes for failure in uniform operation are many: on the one hand, vague regulations; on the other hand, regulations so bulky that many workers are not familiar with them and do not wish to be; reliance on oral interpretations; discrepancies in social attitude of the workers, etc. In part, the situation described continues to exist in more than a few communities because the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare itself has had neither the means nor the support to enforce uniformity concepts on an operating level.

Conclusion

Some minimal steps should be taken to revitalize the uniformity requirement and to introduce conformity hearings as a major weapon in such a revitalization.

[From the Nation, May 2, 1966]

THE WEIGHT OF THE POOR—A STRATEGY TO END POVERTY

(By Richard A. Cloward and Frances Fox Piven)[1]

How can the poor be organized to press for relief from poverty? How can a broad-based movement be developed and the current disarray of activist forces be halted? These questions confront, and confound, activists today. It is our purpose to advance a strategy which affords the basis for a convergence of civil rights organizations, militant anti-poverty groups and the poor. If this strategy were implemented, a political crisis would result that could lead to legislation for a guaranteed annual income and thus an end to poverty.

The strategy is based on the fact that a vast discrepancy exists between the benefits to which people are entitled under public welfare programs and the sums which they actually receive. This gulf is not recognized in a society that is wholly and self-righteously oriented toward getting people off the welfare rolls. It is widely known, for example, that nearly 8 million persons (half of them white) now subsist on welfare, but it is not generally known that for every person on the rolls at least one more probably meets existing criteria of eligibility but it is not obtaining assistance.

The discrepancy is not an accident stemming from bureaucratic inefficiency; rather, it is an integral feature of the welfare system which, if challenged, would precipitate a profound financial and political crisis. The force for that challenge, and the strategy we propose, is a massive drive to recruit the poor onto the welfare rolls.

The distribution of public assistance has been a local and state responsibility, and that accounts in large part for the abysmal character of welfare practices. Despite the growing involvement of federal agencies in supervisory and reimbursement arrangements, state and local community forces are still decisive. The poor are most visible and proximate in the local community; antagonism toward them (and toward the agencies which are implicated with them) has always, therefore, been more intense locally than at the federal level. In recent years, local communities have increasingly felt class and ethnic friction generated by competition for neighborhoods, schools, jobs and political power. Public welfare systems are under the constant stress of conflict and opposition, made only sharper by the rising costs to localities of public aid. And, to accommodate this pressure, welfare practice everywhere has become more restrictive than welfare statute; much of the time it verges on lawlessness. Thus, public welfare systems try to keep their budgets down and their rolls low by failing to inform people of the rights available to them; by intimidating and shaming them to the degree that they are reluctant either to apply or to press claims, and by arbitrarily denying benefits to those who are eligible.

---

[1] Mr. Cloward is professor of social work, and Mrs. Piven is a research associate, both at the Columbia University School of Social Work.

A series of welfare drives in large cities would, we believe, impel action on a new federal program to distribute income, eliminating the present public welfare system and alleviating the abject poverty which it perpetrates. Widespread campaigns to register the eligible poor for welfare aid, and to help existing recipients obtain their full benefits, would produce bureaucratic disruption in welfare agencies and fiscal disruption in local and state governments. These disruptions would generate severe political strains, and deepen existing divisions among elements in the big-city Democratic coalition: the remaining white middle class, the white working-class ethnic groups and the growing minority poor. To avoid a further weakening of that historic coalition, a national Democratic administration would be constrained to advance a federal solution of poverty that would override local welfare failures, local class and racial conflicts and local revenue dilemmas. By the internal disruption of local bureaucratic practices, by the furor over public welfare poverty, and by the collapse of current financing arrangements, powerful forces can be generated for major economic reforms at the national level.

The ultimate objective of this strategy—to wipe out poverty by establishing a guaranteed annual income—will be questioned by some. Because the ideal of individual social and economic mobility has deep roots, even activists seem reluctant to call for national programs to eliminate poverty by the outright redistribution of income. Instead, programs are demanded to enable people to become economically competitive. But such programs are of no use to millions of today's poor. For example, one-third of the 35 million poor Americans are in families headed by females; these heads of family cannot be aided appreciably by job retraining, higher minimum wages, accelerated rates of economic growth, or employment in public works projects. Nor can the 5 million aged who are poor, nor those whose poverty results from the ill health of the wage earner. Programs to enhance individual mobility will chiefly benefit the very young, if not the as yet unborn. Individual mobility is no answer to the question of how to abolish the massive problem of poverty now.

It has never been the full answer. If many people in the past have found their way up from poverty by the path of individual mobility, many others have taken a different route. Organized labor stands out as a major example. Although many American workers never yielded their dreams of individual achievement, they accepted and practiced the principle that each can benefit only as the status of workers as a whole is elevated. They bargained for collective mobility, not for individual mobility; to promote their fortunes in the aggregate, not to promote the prospects of one worker over another. And if each finally found himself in the same relative economic relationship to his fellows as when he began, it was nevertheless clear that all were infinitely better off. That fact has sustained the labor movement in the face of a counter pull from the ideal of individual achievement.

But many of the contemporary poor will not rise from poverty by organizing to bargain collectively. They either are not in the labor force or are in such marginal and dispersed occupation (e.g., domestic servants) that it is extremely difficult to organize them. Compared with other groups, then, many of today's poor cannot secure a redistribution of income by organizing within the institution of private enterprise. A federal program of income redistribution has become necessary to elevate the poor en masse from poverty.

Several ways have been proposed for redistributing income through the federal government. It is not our purpose here to assess the relative merits of these plans, which are still undergoing debate and clarification. Whatever mechanism is eventually adopted, however, it must include certain features if it is not merely to perpetuate in a new guise the present evils of the public welfare system.

First, adequate levels of income must be assured. (Public welfare levels are astonishingly low; indeed, states typically define a "minimum" standard of living and then grant only a percentage of it, so that families are held well below what the government itself officially defines as the poverty level.) Furthermore, income should be distributed without requiring that recipients first divest themselves of their assets, as public welfare now does, thereby pauperizing families as a condition of sustenance.

Second, the right to income must be guaranteed, or the oppression of the welfare poor will not be eliminated. Because benefits are conditional under the present public welfare system, submission to arbitrary governmental power is regularly made the price of sustenance. People have been coerced into attending literacy classes or participating in medical or vocational rehabilitation regimes, on pain of having their benefits terminated. Men are forced into labor on virtually any terms lest they forfeit their welfare aid. One can prize literacy, health and work, while still vigorously opposing the right of government to compel compliance with these values.

Conditional benefits thus result in violations of civil liberties throughout the nation, and in a pervasive oppression of the poor. And these violations are not less real because the impulse leading to them is altruistic and the agency is professional. If new systems of income distribution continue to permit the professional bureaucracies to choose when to give and when to withhold financial relief, the poor will once again be surrendered to an arrangement in which their rights are diminished in the name of overcoming their vices. Those who lead an attack on the welfare system must therefore be alert to the pitfalls of inadequate but placating reforms which give the appearance of victory to what is in truth defeat.

How much economic force can be mobilized by this strategy? This question is not easy to answer because few studies have been conducted of people who are *not* receiving public assistance even though they may be eligible. For the purposes of this presentation, a few facts about New York City may be suggestive. Since practices elsewhere are generally acknowledged to be even more restrictive, the estimates of unused benefits which follow probably yield a conservative estimate of the potential force of the strategy set forth in this article.

Basic assistance for food and rent: The most striking characteristic of public welfare practice is that a great many people who appear to be eligible for assistance are not on the welfare rolls. The average monthly total of New York City residents receiving assistance in 1959 was 325,771; but according to the 1960 census, 716,000 persons (unrelated or in families) appeared to be subsisting on incomes at or below the prevailing welfare eligibility levels (e.g., $2,070 for a family of four). In that same year, 539,000 people subsisted on incomes *less than 80 per cent* of the welfare minimums, and 200,000 lived alone or in families on incomes reported to be *less than half* of eligibility levels. Thus it appears that for every person on welfare in 1959, at least one more was eligible.

The results of two surveys of selected areas in Manhattan support the contention that many people subsist on incomes below welfare eligibility levels. One of these, conducted by Greenleigh Associates in 1964 in an urban-renewal area on New York's upper West Side, found 9 per cent of those *not* on the rolls were in such acute need that they appeared to qualify for *emergency* assistance. The study showed, further, that a substantial number of families that were not in a "critical" condition would probably have qualified for supplemental assistance.

The other survey, conducted in 1961 by Mobilization for Youth, had similar findings. The area from which its sample was drawn, 67 square blocks on the lower East Side, is a poor one, but by no means the poorest in New York City. Yet 13 per cent of the total sample who were not on the welfare rolls reported incomes falling below the prevailing welfare schedules for food and rent.

There is no reason to suppose that the discrepancy between those eligible for and those receiving assistance has narrowed much in the past few years. The welfare rolls have gone up, to be sure, but so have eligibility levels. Since the economic circumstances of impoverished groups in New York have not improved appreciably in the past few years, each such rise increases the number of people who are potentially eligible for some degree of assistance.

Even if one allows for the possibility that family-income figures are grossly underestimated by the census, the financial implications of the proposed strategy are still very great. In 1965, the monthly average of persons receiving cash assistance in New York was 490,000, at a total cost of $440 million; the rolls have now risen above 500,000, so that costs will exceed $500 million in 1966. An increase in the rolls of a mere 20 per cent would cost an already overburdened municipality some $100 million.

Special grants: Public assistance recipients in New York are also entitled to receive "nonrecurring" grants for clothing, household equipment and furniture—including washing machines, refrigerators, beds and bedding, tables and chairs. It hardly needs to be noted that most impoverished families have grossly inadequate clothing and household furnishings. The Greenleigh study, for example, found that 52 per cent of the families on public assistance lacked anything approaching adequate furniture. This condition results because almost nothing is spent on special grants in New York. In October, 1965, a typical month, the Department of Welfare spent only $2.50 per recipient for heavy clothing and $1.30 for household furnishings. Taken together, grants of this kind amounted in 1965 to a mere $40 per person, or a total of $20 million for the entire year. Considering the real needs of families, the successful demand for full entitlements could multiply these expenditures tenfold or more—and that would involve the disbursement of many millions of dollars indeed.

One must be cautious in making generalizations about the prospects for this strategy in any jurisdiction unless the structure of welfare practices has been examined in some detail. We can, however, cite other studies conducted in other places to show that New York practices are not atypical. In Detroit, for example, Greenleigh Associates studied a large sample of households in a low-income district in 1965. Twenty per cent were already receiving assistance, but 35 per cent more were judged to need it. Although the authors made no strict determination of the eligibility of these families under the laws of Michigan, they believed that "larger numbers of persons were eligible than receiving." A good many of these families did not know that public assistance was available; others thought they would be deemed ineligible; not a few were ashamed or afraid to ask.

Similar deprivations have been shown in nation-wide studies. In 1963, the federal government carried out a survey based on a national sample of 5,500 families whose benefits under Aid to Dependent Children had been terminated. Thirty-four per cent of these cases were *officially in need of income at the point of closing;* this was true of 30 per cent of the white and 44 per cent of the Negro cases. The chief basis for termination given in local department records was "other reasons" (i.e., other than improvement in financial condition, which would make dependence on welfare unnecessary). Upon closer examination, these "other reasons" turned out to be "unsuitable home" (i.e., the presence of illegitimate children), "failure to comply with departmental regulations" or "refusal to take legal action against a putative father." (Negroes were especially singled out for punitive action on the ground that children were not being maintained in "suitable homes.") The amounts of money that people are deprived of by these injustices are very great.

In order to generate a crisis, the poor must obtain benefits which they have forfeited. Until now, they have been inhibited from asserting cliams by self-protective devices within the welfare system: its capacity to limit information, to intimidate applicants, to demoralize recipients, and arbitrarily to deny lawful claims.

Ignorance of welfare rights can be attacked through a massive educational campaign. Brochures describing benefits in simple, clear language, and urging people to seek their full entitlements, should be distributed door to door in tenements and public housing projects, and deposited in stores, schools, churches and civic centers. Advertisements should be placed in newspapers; spot announcements should be made on radio. Leaders of social, religious, fraternal and political groups in the slums should also be enlisted to recruit the eligible to the rolls. The fact that the campaign is intended to inform people of their legal rights under a government program, that it is a civic education drive, will lend it legitimacy.

But information alone will not suffice. Organizers will have to become advocates in order to deal effectively with improper rejections and terminations. The advocate's task is to appraise the circumstances of each case, to argue its merits before welfare, to threaten legal action if satisfaction is not given. In some cases, it will be necessary to contest decisions by requesting a "fair hearing" before the appropriate state supervisory agency; it may occasionally be necessary to sue for redress in the courts. Hearings and court actions will require lawyers, many of whom, in cities like New York, can be recruited on a voluntary basis, especially under the banner of a movement to end poverty by a strategy of asserting legal rights. However, most cases will not require an expert knowledge of law, but only of welfare regulations; the rules can be learned by laymen, including welfare recipients themselves (who can help to man "information and advocacy" centers). To aid workers in these centers, handbooks should be prepared describing welfare rights and the tactics to employ in claiming them.

Advocacy must be supplemented by organized demonstrations to create a climate of militancy that will overcome the individual and immobilizing attitudes which many potential recipients hold toward being "on welfare." In such a climate, many more poor people are likely to become their own advocates and will not need to rely on aid from organizers.

As the crisis develops, it will be important to use the mass media to inform the broader liberal community about the inefficiencies and injustices of welfare. For example, the system will not be able to process many new applicants because of cumbersome and often unconstitutional investigatory procedures (which cost 20c for every dollar disbursed). As delays mount, so should the public demand that a simplified affidavit supplant these procedures, so that the poor may certify to their condition. If the system reacts by making the proof of eligibility more difficult, the demand should be made that the Department of Health, Education and Welfare dispatch "eligibility registrars' to enforce federal statutes governing local programs. And throughout the crisis, the mass media should be used to advance arguments for a new federal income distribution program.[3]

Although new resources in organizers and funds would have to be developed to mount this campaign, a variety of conventional agencies in the large cities could also be drawn upon for help. The idea of "welfare rights" has begun to attract attention in many liberal circles. A number of organizations, partly under the aegis of the "war against poverty," are developing information and advocacy services for low-income people [see "Poverty, Injustice and the Welfare State" by Richard A. Cloward and Richard M. Elman, *The Nation*, issues of February 28 and March 7]. It is not likely that these organizations will directly participate in the present strategy, for obvious political reasons. But whether they participate or not, they constitute a growing network of resources to which people can be referred for help in establishing and maintaining entitlements. In the final analysis, it does not matter who helps people to get on the rolls or to get additional entitlements, so long as the job is done.

Since this plan deals with problems of great immediacy in the lives of the poor, it should motivate some of them to involve themselves in regular organizational activities. Welfare recipients, chiefly ADC mothers, are already forming federations, committees and councils in cities across the nation; in Boston, New York, Newark, Cleveland, Chicago, Detroit and Los Angeles, to mention a few. Such groups typically focus on obtaining full entitlements for existing recipients rather than on recruiting new recipients, and they do not yet comprise a national movement. But their very existence attests to a growing readiness among ghetto residents to act against public welfare.

To generate an expressly political movement, cadres of aggressive organizers would have to come from the civil rights movement and the churches, from militant low-income organizations like those formed by the Industrial Areas Foundation (that is, by Saul Alinsky), and from other groups on the Left. These activists should be quick to see the difference between programs to redress individual grievances and a large-scale social-action campaign for national policy reform.

Movements that depend on involving masses of poor people have generally failed in America. Why would the proposed strategy to engage the poor succeed?

First, this plan promises immediate economic benefits. This is a point of some importance because, whereas America's poor have not been moved in any number by radical political ideologies, they have sometimes been moved by their economic interests. Since radical movements in America have rarely been able to provide visible economic incentives, they have usually failed to secure mass participation of any kind. The conservative "business unionism" of organized labor is explained by this fact, for membership enlarged only as unionism paid off in material benefits. Union leaders have understood that their strength derives almost entirely from their capacity to provide economic rewards to members. Although leaders have increasingly acted in political spheres, their influence has been directed chiefly to matters of governmental policy affecting the well-being of organized workers. The same point is made by the experience of rent strikes in Northern cities. Their organizers were often motivated by radical ideologies, but tenants have been attracted by the promise that housing improvements would quickly be made if they withheld their rent.

Second, for this strategy to succeed, one need not ask more of most of the poor than that they claim lawful benefits. Thus the plan has the extraordinary capability of yielding mass influence *without* mass participation, at least as the term "participation" is ordinarily understood. Mass influence in this case stems from the consumption of benefits and does not require that large groups of people be involved in regular organizational roles.

Moreover, this kind of mass influence is cumulative because benefits are continuous. Once eligibility for basic food and rent grants is established, the drain on local resources persists indefinitely. Other movements have failed precisely because they could not produce continuous and cumulative influence. In the Northern rent strikes, for example, tenant participation depended largely on immediate grievances; as soon as landlords made the most minimal repairs, participation fell away and with it the impact of the movement. Efforts to revive tenant participation by organizing demonstrations around broader housing issues (e.g., the expansion of public housing) did not succeed because the incentives were not immediate.

Third, the prospects for mass influence are enhanced because this plan provides a practical basis for coalition between poor whites and poor Negroes. Advocates of low-income movements have not been able to suggest how poor whites and poor Negroes can be united in an expressly lower-class movement. Despite pleas of some Negro leaders for joint action on programs requiring integration, poor whites have steadfastly resisted making common cause with poor Negroes. By contrast, the benefits of the present plan are as great for whites as for Negroes. In the big cities, at least, it does not seem likely that poor whites, whatever their prejudices against either Negroes or public welfare, will refuse to participate when Negroes aggressively claim benefits that are unlawfully denied to them as well. One salutary consequence of public information campaigns to acquaint Negroes with their rights is that many whites will be made aware of theirs. Even if whites prefer to work through their own organizations and leaders, the consequences will be equivalent to joining with Negroes. For if the object is to focus attention on the need for new economic measures by producing a crisis over the dole, anyone who insists upon extracting maximum benefits from public welfare is in effect part of a coalition and is contributing to the cause.

The ultimate aim of this strategy is a new program for direct income distribution. What reason is there to expect that the federal government will enact such legislation in response to a crisis in the welfare system?

We ordinarily think of major legislation as taking form only through established electoral processes. We tend to overlook the force of crisis in precipitating legislative reform, partly because we lack a theoretical framework by which to understand the impact of major disruptions.

By crisis, we mean a *publicly visible* disruption in some institutional sphere. Crisis can occur spontaneously (e.g., riots) or as the intended result of tactics of demonstration and protest which either generate institutional disruption or bring unrecognized disruption to public attention. Public trouble is a political liability; it calls for action by political leaders to stabilize the situation. Because crisis usually creates or exposes conflict, it threatens to produce cleavages in a political consensus which politicians will ordinarily act to avert.

---

[3] In public statements, it would be important to distinguish between the income distributing function of public welfare, which should be replaced by new federal measures, and many other welfare functions, such as foster care and adoption services for children, which are not at issue in this strategy.

Although crisis impels political action, it does not itself determine the selection of specific solutions. Political leaders will try to respond with proposals which work to their advantage in the electoral process. Unless group cleavages form around issues and demands, the politician has great latitude and tends to proffer only the minimum action required to quell disturbances without risking existing electoral support. Spontaneous disruptions, such as riots, rarely produce leaders who articulate demands; thus no terms are imposed, and political leaders are permitted to respond in ways that merely restore a semblance of stability without offending other groups in a coalition.

When, however, a crisis is defined by its participants—or by other activated groups—as a matter of clear issues and preferred solutions, terms are imposed on the politicians' bid for their support. Whether political leaders then design solutions to reflect these terms depends on a twofold calculation: first, the impact of the crisis and the issues it raises on existing alignments and, second, the gains or losses in support to be expected as a result of a proposed resolution.

As to the impact on existing alignments, issues exposed by a crisis may activate new groups, thus altering the balance of support and opposition on the issues; or it may polarize group sentiments altering the terms which must be offered to insure the support of given constituent groups. In framing resolutions, politicians are more responsive to group shifts and are more likely to accommodate to the terms imposed when electoral coalitions threatened by crisis are already uncertain or weakening. In other words, the politician responds to group demands, not only by calculating the magnitude of electoral gains and losses, but by assessing the impact of the resolution on the stability of existing or potential coalitions. Political leaders are especially responsive to group shifts when the terms of settlement can be framed so as to shore up an existing coalition, or as a basis for the development of new and more stable alignments without jeopardizing existing support. Then, indeed, the calculation of net gain is most secure.

The legislative reforms of the depression years, for example, were impelled not so much by organized interests exercised through regular electoral processes as by widespread economic crisis. That crisis precipitated the disruption of the regionally based coalitions underlying the old national parties. During the realignments of 1932, a new Democratic coalition was formed, based heavily on urban working-class groups. Once in power, the national Democratic leadership proposed and implemented the economic reforms of the New Deal. Although these measures were a response to the imperative of economic crisis, the types of measures enacted were designed to secure and stabilize the new Democratic coalition.

The civil rights movement, to take a recent case, also reveals the relationship of crisis and electoral conditions in producing legislative reform. The crisis in the South took place in the context of a weakening North-South Democratic coalition. The strains in that coalition were first evident in the Dixiecrat desertion of 1948, and continued through the Eisenhower years as the Republicans gained ground in the Southern states. Democratic party leaders at first tried to hold the dissident South by warding off the demands of enlarging Negro constituencies in Northern cities. Thus for two decades the national Democratic Party campaigned on strongly worded civil rights planks but enacted only token measures. The civil rights movement forced the Democrats' hand: a crumbling Southern partnership was forfeited, and major civil rights legislation was put forward, designed to insure the support of Northern Negroes and liberal elements in the Democratic coalition. That coalition emerged strong from the 1964 election, easily able to overcome the loss of Southern states to Goldwater. At the same time, the enacted legislation, particularly the Voting Rights Act, laid the ground for a new Southern Democratic coalition of moderate whites and the hitherto untapped reservoir of Southern Negro voters.

The electoral context which made crisis effective in the South is also to be found in the big cities of the nation today. Deep tensions have developed among groups comprising the political coalition of the large cities—the historic stronghold of the Democratic Party. As a consequence, urban politicians no longer turn in the vote to national Democratic candidates with unfailing regularity. The marked defections revealed in the elections of the 1950's and which continued until the Johnson landslide of 1964 are a matter of great concern to the national party. Precisely because of this concern, a strategy to exacerbate still further the strains in the urban coalition can be expected to evoke a response from national leaders.

The weakening of the urban coalition is a result of many basic changes in the relationship of local party leadership to its constituents. First, the political machine, the distinctive and traditional mechanism for forging alliances among competing groups in the city, is now virtually defunct in most cities. Successive waves of municipal reform have deprived political leaders of control over the public resources—jobs, contracts, services and favors—which machine politicians formerly dispensed to voters in return for electoral support. Conflicts among elements in the urban Democratic coalition, once held together politically because each secured a share of these benefits, cannot now be so readily contained. And as the means of placating competing groups have diminished, tensions along ethnic and class lines have multiplied. These tensions are being intensified by the encroachments of an enlarging ghetto population on jobs, schools and residential areas. Big-city mayors are thus caught between antagonistic working-class ethnic groups, the remaining middle class, and the rapidly enlarging minority poor.

Second, there are discontinuities in the relationship between the urban party apparatus and its ghetto constituents which have so far remained unexposed but which a welfare crisis would force into view. The ghetto vote has been growing rapidly and has so far returned overwhelming Democratic majorities. Nevertheless, this voting bloc is not fully integrated in the party apparatus, either through the representation of its leaders or the accommodation of its interests.

While the urban political apparatus includes members of new minority groups, these groups are by no means represented according to their increasing proportions in the population. More important, elected representation alone is not an adequate mechanism for the expression of group interests. Influence in urban politics is won not only at the polls but through the sustained activity of organized interests—such as labor unions, home-owner associations and business groups. These groups keep watch over the complex operations of municipal agencies, recognizing issues and regularly asserting their point of view through meetings with public officials, appearances at public hearings and the like, and by exploiting a whole array of channels of influence on government. Minority constituencies—at least the large proportion of them that are poor—are not regular participants in the various institutional spheres where organized interest groups typically develop. Thus the interests of the mass of minority poor are not protected by associations which make their own or other political leaders responsive by continuously calling them to account. Urban party organizations have become, in consequence, more an avenue for the personal advancement of minority political leaders than a channel for the expression of minority-group interests. And the big-city mayors, struggling to preserve an uneasy urban consensus, have thus been granted the slack to evade the conflict-generating interests of the ghetto. A crisis in public welfare would expose the tensions latent in this attenuated relationship between the ghetto vote and the urban party leadership, for it would thrust forward ghetto demands and back them with the threat of defections by voters who have so far remained both loyal and quiescent.

In the face of such a crisis, urban political leaders may well be paralyzed by a party apparatus which ties them to older constituent groups, even while the ranks of these groups are diminishing. The national Democratic leadership, however, is alert to the importance of the urban Negro vote, especially in national contests where the loyalty of other urban groups is weakening. Indeed, many of the legislative reforms of the Great Society can be understood as efforts, however feeble, to reinforce the allegiance of growing ghetto constituencies to the national Democratic Administration. In the thirties, Democrats began to put forward measures to circumvent the states in order to reach the big-city elements in the New Deal coalition; now it is becoming expedient to put forward measures to circumvent the weakened big-city mayors in order to reach the new minority poor.

Recent federal reforms have been impelled in part by widespread unrest in the ghetto, and instances of more aggressive Negro demands. But despite these signs that the ghetto vote may become less reliable in the future, there has been as yet no serious threat of massive defection. The national party has therefore not put much pressure on its urban branches to accommodate the minority poor. The resulting reforms have consequently been quite modest (e.g., the war against poverty, with its emphasis on the "involvement of the poor," is an effort to make the urban party apparatus somewhat more accommodating).

A welfare crisis would, of course, produce dramatic local political crisis, disrupting and exposing rifts among urban groups. Conservative Republicans are always ready to declaim the evils of public welfare, and they would probably be the first to raise a hue and cry. But deeper and politically more telling conflicts would take place within the Democratic coalition. Whites—both working-class ethnic groups and many in the middle class—would be aroused against the ghetto poor, while liberal groups, which until recently have been comforted by the notion that the poor are few and, in any event, receiving the beneficent assistance of public welfare, would probably support the movement. Group conflict, spelling political crisis for the local party apparatus, would thus become acute as welfare rolls mounted and the strains on local budgets became more severe. In New York City, where the Mayor is now facing desperate revenue shortages, welfare expenditures are already second only to those for public education.

It should also be noted that welfare costs are generally shared by local, state and federal governments, so that the crisis in the cities would intensify the struggle over revenues that is chronic in relations between cities and states. If the past is any predictor of the future, cities will fail to procure relief from this crisis by persuading states to increase their proportionate share of urban welfare costs, for state legislatures have been notoriously unsympathetic to the revenue needs of the city (especially where public welfare and minority groups are concerned).

If this strategy for crisis would intensify group cleavages, a federal income solution would not further exacerbate them. The demands put forward during recent civil rights drives in the Northern cities aroused the opposition of huge majorities. Indeed, such fierce resistance was evoked (e.g., school boycotts followed by counter-boycotts), that accessions by political leaders would have provoked greater political turmoil than the protests themselves, for profound class and ethnic interests are at stake in the employment, educational and residential institutions of our society. By contrast, legislative measures to provide direct income to the poor would permit national Democratic leaders to cultivate ghetto constituencies without unduly antagonizing other urban groups, as is the case when the battle lines are drawn over schools, housing or jobs. Furthermore, a federal income program would not only redeem local governments from the immediate crisis but would permanently relieve them of the financially and politically onerous burdens of public welfare[3]—a function which generates support from none and hostility from many, not least of all welfare recipients.

We suggest, in short, that if pervasive institutional reforms are not yet possible, requiring as they do expanded Negro political power and the development of new political alliances, crisis tactics can nevertheless be employed to secure particular reforms in the short run by exploiting weaknesses in current political alignments. Because the urban coalition stands weakened by group conflict today, disruption and threats of disaffection will count powerfully, provided that national leaders can respond with solutions which retain the support of ghetto constituencies while avoiding new group antagonisms and bolstering the urban party apparatus. These are the conditions, then, for an effective crisis strategy in the cities to secure an end to poverty.

No strategy, however confident its advocates may be, is foolproof. But if unforeseen contingencies thwart this plan to bring about new federal legislation in the field of poverty, it should also be noted that there would be gains even in defeat. For one thing, the plight of many poor people would be somewhat eased in the course of an assault upon public welfare. Existing recipients would come to know their rights and how to defend them, thus acquiring dignity where none now exists; and millions of dollars in withheld welfare benefits would become available to potential recipients now—not several generations from now. Such an attack should also be welcome to those currently concerned with programs designed to equip the young to rise out of poverty (e.g., Head Start), for surely children learn more readily when the oppressive burden of financial insecurity is lifted from the shoulders of their parents. And those seeking new ways to engage the Negro politically should remember that public resources have always been the fuel for low-income urban political organization. If organizers can deliver millions of dollars in cash benefits to the ghetto masses, it seems reasonable to expect that the masses will deliver their loyalties to their benefactors. At least, they have always done so in the past.

In the U.S. District Court for the District Columbia—Civil Action No. 1447–'66

(*Patricia A. Smith, 46 Pierce Street, Northwest, Washington, D.C., and Dora M. Crowder, 50 O Street, Northwest, Apartment 2, Washington, D.C., individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, plaintiffs* v. *The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia; Walter N. Tobriner, individually and as President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia; John B. Duncan, Brig. Gen. C. M. Duke, individually and as members of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia; Donald D. Brewer, individually and as Director of the Department of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia; Donald Gray, individually and as Chief of the Public Assistance Division, Department of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia; William R. Galvin, individually and as Chief of the Office of Investigations and Collections, Department of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia; Joseph Klugewicz, Danaa Froe, individually and as investigators employed by the Department of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia, defendants.*)

COMPLAINT (FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF)

1. This action is brought under 42 USC 1983 for declaratory and injunctive relief to redress deprivation under color of District of Columbia laws, statutes, ordinances, regulations, customs and usages of rights, privileges, and immunities secured by the First, Third, Fourth, Fifth, and Ninth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, and by 42 USC 601 et seq. Jurisdiction is conferred on this Court by Title 28, Sections 1651, 1343, 2201, and 2202 of the United States Code.

2. Plaintiffs are adult citizens of the United States, residents of the District of Columbia, are, and were at all times herein relevant, mothers of needy children receiving assistance under the District of Columbia's Aid to Families with Dependent Children (hereinafter referred to as AFDC) program promulgated, administered, supervised, and executed by defendants, under color of laws, statutes, ordinances, regulations, customs and usages of or pertaining to the District of Columbia.

3. Plaintiffs are members of a class composed of hundreds of District of Columbia resident mothers of needy children who are recipients of assistance under the AFDC program of the District of Columbia, and who in connection with the administration and execution of said program have been, are, and continue to be threatened with, and subjected by defendants, either directly or by persons acting under their authority or as their agents, to invasions of rights secured by the Constitution of the United States, and of laws of or pertaining to the District of Columbia. Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves and on behalf of all persons constituting the above described class who are similarily situated. Such persons number in the hundreds and it is therefore impractical to bring them all before the Court, but there is a common question of law and fact, and a common relief for the entire class is sought, and plaintiffs fairly insure adequate representation of the entire class above described.

4. Defendants: (a) Defendant Board of Commissioners, pursuant to the provisions of D.C. Code 3–202 et seq. (Supp V) is vested with the duty of administering the District of Columbia Public Assistance Act of 1962, which authorizes the AFDC program, and establishing and enforcing rules and regulations to carry out these provisions. Defendants Walter N. Tobriner, John B. Duncan, and Brig. Gen. Charles M. Duke are members of and constitute the defendant Board of Commissioners.

(b) Defendant Donald D. Brewer is and was during all the times in question herein Director of the Department of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia, an agency of the Government of the District of Columbia which has exclusive responsibility for the administration of AFDC, and whose agents enforced the policies and conducted the practices herein complained of. The Director of the Department of Public Welfare performs all the functions vested in the Board of Commissioners by the District of Columbia Public Assistance Act of 1962, except the adoption and promulgation of regulations (D.C. Code § 3–220 (Supp V); D.C. Code, Title I, Appendix, Reorg. Ord. No. 140 (Supp V)).

(c) Defendant Donald Gray is and was during all the times in question herein Chief of the Public Assistance Division of the Department of Public Welfare, which Division has been delegated responsibility for determining initial and continuing eligibility of plaintiffs and all others similarly situated to receive AFDC benefits.

(d) Defendant William R. Galvin is and was during all the times in question herein the Chief of the Office of Investigations and Collections, which office is responsible for the supervision and conduct of the agents employed within his office who executed the policies and engaged in the practices herein complained of.

(e) Defendants Joseph Klugewicz and Danaa Froe are investigators in the Office of Investigations and Collections, and personally executed the policies and engaged in the practices specifically complained of by plaintiff Patricia A. Smith.

5. At all times here relevant, defendants, and each of them, were officials, employees, agents, or otherwise instruments of the Government of the District of Columbia and had a legal duty to administer, operate and execute the AFDC program of the District of Columbia, as authorized by D.C. Code 3–202 et seq. (supp. V), in a manner not inconsistent with the laws of or pertaining to the District of Columbia, the Social Security Act (42 USC 601 et seq.), and in a manner so as not to deprive plaintiffs and those similarly situated of rights secured by the Constitution of the United States. Notwithstanding, defendants, and each of them have to the detriment of plaintiffs and those similarly situated administered, operated, and executed the AFDC program of the District of Columbia, in a manner inconsistent with the laws of or pertaining to the District of Columbia, and the Social Security Act, and in a manner which has deprived plaintiffs and those similarly situated of the right to privacy, the right to counsel, the right not to be compelled to give evidence against themselves, the right to be free from unreasonable searches, the right to freedom of association, and the right to be free from oppressive, arbitrary and capricious governmental action, as secured by the First, Third, Fourth, Fifth and Ninth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

6. On numerous occasions between 1961 and March 14, 1966, defendants Joseph Klugewicz and Danaa Froe and unknown investigators of the District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare, acting under color of the laws, statutes, ordinances, regulations, customs and usages of or pertaining to the District of Columbia, and further acting in concert and participation with, under the orders, direction, control and supervision of,

---

[3] It should also be noted that the federal government, unlike local jurisdictions, has taxing powers which yield substantially increased revenues as an automatic by-product of increases in national income.

and pursuant to practices and procedures established by defendants named herein, and by each of them and further acting without authority of law, without the consent of plaintiffs, and in the absence of plaintiffs' waiver of any rights secured by the Constitution of the United States, or by the laws of or pertaining to the District of Columbia, and under conditions and in a manner inconsistent with the laws of or pertaining to the District of Columbia, the Social Security Act, and in deprivation of the aforesaid rights secured by the aforesaid amendments of the Constitution of the United States, entered upon plaintiff's premises, conducted unreasonable searches thereof, interrogated plaintiffs thereon about plaintiffs' participation in criminal activity, conducted interrogations of plaintiffs' guests thereon, interrogated plaintiffs about their sexual activity thereon, placed their ears against plaintiffs' door and eavesdropped upon plaintiffs, maintained harassing surveillances of plaintiffs and plaintiffs' premises, and otherwise engaged in oppressive, arbitrary and capricious conduct which denied plaintiffs due process of law.

7. Plaintiffs have never consented to the acts of the defendants herein complained of, but defendants have always demanded that plaintiffs allow deprivation of the rights herein alleged to be secured as a condition precedent to continuing receipt of benefits under the AFDC program of the District of Columbia, and if plaintiffs actively resist the aforesaid acts and demands of defendants, and if plaintiffs assert the rights which are herein alleged to be secured, defendants threaten to and will terminate plaintiffs' benefits received under the AFDC program of the District of Columbia.

8. Plaintiffs have not actively opposed the aforesaid acts, demands, and intrusions of defendants, but have submitted to defendants' assertion of authority because of fear created in plaintiffs by defendants that any other course would result in termination of plaintiffs' benefits received under the AFDC program of the District of Columbia.

9. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and therefore aver, that the conduct of defendants perpetrated upon plantiffs is in like manner perpetrated upon members constituting the class hereinbefore described, of which plaintiffs are members.

10. Defendants threaten to continue the conduct herein complained of, and plaintiffs suffer, and will continue to suffer, irreparable injury for which there is no adequate remedy at law, unless this Court declares the rights of plaintiffs and those similarly situated, and enjoins the unlawful conduct of defendants.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, plaintiffs respectfully pray on behalf of themselves and those similarly situated that this Honorable Court declare:

1. That the administration, operation and execution by the defendants of the AFDC program of the District of Columbia as herein alleged is in violation of rights, privileges and immunities secured to the plaintiffs and others similarly situated by the Constitution and laws of the United States, specifically, the right to privacy, the right to counsel, the right not to be compelled to give evidence against themselves, the right to be free from unreasonable searches, the right to freedom of association, and the right to be free from oppressive, arbitrary and capricious governmental action, as secured by the First, Third, Fourth, Fifth and Ninth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States;

2. That defendants, their agents and successors, and all persons acting in concert and participation with them, may not enter into the dwelling places of plaintiffs and others similarly situated for the purpose of conducting investigations without (1) obtaining a valid search warrant issued upon probable cause, or (2) without obtaining the freely given consent of plaintiffs or others similarly situated, having first specifically informed plaintiffs or others similarly situated of their right to refuse admittance.

3. That defendants, their agents and successors, and all persons acting in concert and participation with them, may not lawfully terminate, suspend or in any way diminish the AFDC benefits of plaintiffs or others similarly situated in the District of Columbia because of their refusal to admit defendants to their dwelling places, or otherwise exercise their rights, privileges and immunities under the Constitution and laws of the United States.

And for further relief, plaintiffs respectfully pray on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated that this Honorable Court enter a permanent injunction enjoining defendants, their agents and successors, and all persons acting in concert and participation with them:

1. From entering into the dwelling places of plaintiffs and other similarly situated for the purpose of conducting investigations (a) without obtaining a valid search warrant issued upon probable cause, or (b) without obtaining the freely given consent of plaintiffs or other similarly situated, having first specifically informed plaintiffs or others similarly situated of their right to refuse admittance;

2. From terminating, suspending or in any way diminishing the AFDC benefits of plaintiffs or others similarly situated in the District of Columbia because of their refusal to admit defendants to their dwelling places, or otherwise to exercise their rights, privileges and immunities under the Constitution and laws of the United States.

Plaintiffs further pray that this Honorable Court will allow them their costs herein and grant such other additional or alternative relief as may appear to the Court to be equitable and just.

PATRICIA A. SMITH.
HUGH GAVIN DUFFY,
Neighborhood Legal Services Project,
DORA M. CROWDER.
FRANCIS A. CUNNING,
Neighborhood Legal Services Project,
Attorneys for Plaintiffs.

Of counsel: Edward V, Sparer, New York, N.Y.

VERIFICATION

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, *ss:*

I, Patricia A. Smith, being first duly sworn depose and say that I am one of the plaintiffs in the within action; that I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof; that the same is true to my knowledge, except as to matters therein stated to be alleged on information and belief, and that as to those matters I believe them to be true.

PATRICIA A. SMITH.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, *ss:*

I, Dora M. Crowder, being first duly sworn, depose and say that I am one of the plaintiffs in the within action; that I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof; that the same is true to my own knowledge, except as to matters therein stated to be alleged on information and belief, and that as to those matters I believe them to be true.

DORA M. CROWDER.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—CIVIL ACTION No. 1447-66

(Patricia A. Smith, 46 Pierce Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., and Dora M. Crowder, 50 O Street, N.W., #2, Washington, D.C., individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, plaintiffs versus *the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia; Walter N. Tobriner, individually and as President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia; John B. Duncan, Brig. Gen. C. M. Duke, Individually and as members of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia; Donald D. Brewer, individually and as Director of the Department of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia; Donald Gray, individually and as Chief of the Public Assistance Division, Department of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia; William R. Galvin, individually and as Chief of the Office of Investigations and Collections, Department of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia; Joseph Klugewicz, Danaa Froe, individually and as investigators employed by the Department of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia, defendants.)*

DEPENDENTS' MOTION TO DISMISS OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT OR, FURTHER IN THE ALTERNATIVE, FOR A MORE DEFINITE STATEMENT

Preliminary statement

Plaintiffs allege that they are mothers of needy children receiving assistance under the District of Columbia's Aid For Dependent Children Program. Plaintiffs alleged they have been, are, and continue to be threatened with invasions of rights secured them by the Constitution of the United States. Plaintiffs allege deprivation of their constitutional rights of privacy, of counsel, of association, of not being compelled to give evidence against themselves, to be free from unreasonable searches, and to be free from oppressive, arbitrary, and capricious governmental action. Plaintiffs alleged these rights are secured by the First, Third, Fourth, Fifth, and Ninth Amendments to the Constitution. Plaintiffs' complaint alleges jurisdiction under Title 42 U.S.C., § 1983 and Title 28 U.S.C., §§ 2201 and 2202. The complaint is for declaratory and injunctive relief.

I. The complaint fails to contain a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the party is entitled to relief

Rule 8(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure states, in part, that a pleading "shall contain . . . (2) a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief. . . ."

The complaint is replete with innuendo and inference. Defendants are alleged to have operated the Aid for Dependent Children Program to the "detriment" of the plaintiffs; nowhere is there any allegation as to what the detriment was or is. Defendants are alleged to have "deprived" the plaintiffs of the aforementioned constitutional privileges, but nowhere is it alleged in what manner these privileges have been deprived.

The only allegation of any substance relates to "numerous occasions between 1961 and March 14, 1966" and relates to only two of the defendants named herein and "unknown investigators" (unknown to defendants, as well) and iterates the charges of deprivations of constitutional rights. A mere reading of this allegation exhibits the vagueness, indecisiveness, looseness, and unspecificity which permeates the entire pleading.

At no point, even in the last mentioned allegation, is there any reference to the manner or time in which these deprivations occurred or the injury suffered by these plaintiffs.

II. Jurisdiction under title 42 U.S.C. § 1983

These plaintiffs allege deprivation of constitutional rights by the defendants who are all municipal officers or employees acting under the provisions of Federal and local laws, rules, and regulations.

(a) It is unquestioned that no action may be brought under this section to challenge Federal rules and regulations. It is the position of these defendants that the majority of the administrative decisions, rules, and regulations promulgated by them are "under color of" *Federal law*, 42 U.S.C. 601 et seq., (The Social Security Act)

(b) A grave question is presented as to whether or not a public official performing *within the scope of this authority* is subject to the civil remedy provided by Title 42 § 1983. In *Basiste* v. *Weir*, 225 F. Supp. 619 (W. D. Penna., 1964) the court stated:

"When a public official performs within the scope of his authority, regardless of motives with which he performs his duties, he is immune from civil suit based on such acts. But where his act is *outside* the scope of his powers and beyond his authority, he is liable for the consequences of his action.

"While, however, this chapter of the Act was enacted to protect the civil rights of individuals, it was not enacted to discipline local law enforcement officers . . . in any event, this chapter should be so construed as to respect the proper balance between the states and the federal government in law enforcement. . . .", at 625.

On appeal, *Basista* v. *Weir*, 340 F. 2d 74, (3rd Cir., 1965 reversed on other grounds), the court said, on this point:

". . . The statutory words 'under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory' do not exclude from the purview of the Civil Rights statutes acts of an official *who can show no authority for what he does. . . .*" (Emphasis added) at 80.

Although the instant suit is not directed to an "enforcement officer", several of the defendants are in effect enforcing the provisions of the Public Assistance Program in the District of Columbia and their position is arguably analagous.

It is not the position of these defendants that every officer should be immune under the statute for every act. The defendants, however, are of the opinion that: "This statute is aimed at *reprehensible* action on the part of the defendant in the civil action authorized by it." *Striker* v. *Pancher*, 317 F. 2d. 780 (6th Cir., 1963) (Emphasis added), at 784. However, no such reprehensible actions, as outlined in *Striker, supra.*, exist or are alleged to exist in this pleading.

(b) The defendants further stand on the proposition announced in *Thomas* v. *Chamberlain*, 143 F. Supp. 671, (E.D. Tenn., S.D., 1955) which is that:

"The plaintiff's right to recover is not affected by the validity or invalidity of the Ordinance. Sections 1983 and 1985(3) of Title 42 U.S.C.A., under which the plaintiff sues, predicate liability upon deprivation of federal rights by virtue of acts under color of law, *not upon the validity or invalidity of the law under color of which the defendants acted;* and because no presumption of improper motive may be ascribed to ministerial official acts solely by reason of the unconstitutionality of the statute under which they were taken." (Emphasis added.) at 674.

(c) A reading of the complaint, with the verbiage exorticated, seems to allege violations which would be more properly brought under laws which have not been avered.

III. Jurisdiction under title 28 U.S.C. § 2201.

To bring an action within the purview of this procedural remedy, the plaintiff must establish that there is *an actual controversy*.

In the case of *Taylor* v. *Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks*, 106 F. Supp. 438, (1952), decided by this Court, it was stated:

"It is well established that the courts will entertain only *actual controversies* between parties having adverse legal interests *of certainty and immediacy*, and will not judicially determine abstract questions or render a decree upon a hypothetical state of facts framed for the purpose of invoking the advice of the court without a real case." at 442. (Emphasis added.)

The affidavit of Donald D. Brewer submitted in support of this motion establishes that there is no intent on the part of the Department of Public Welfare, at this time, to suspend, curtail, or terminate any benefits these plaintiffs are presently enjoying. Failing that, it is submitted, there is no actual controversy. An expression in *Pollack* v. *City of Newark*, 147 F. Supp. 35, (N.J., 1956, aff'd. 248 F. 2d 543 (3rd Cir. 1957)) seems appropriate at this time:

"Considering the complaint in a light most favorable to the movant-plaintiff, as the court must, the sole serious allegation found among a plethora of irrelevant, redundant, repetitious and impertinent matter is that defendants by words and conduct gave plaintiff 'an impression' that he was under arrest." at 38.

Here, the plaintiffs assert "defendants threaten to and will terminate plaintiff's benefits received under the A.F.D.C. Program of the District of Columbia." and that these plaintiffs "have not actively opposed . . . because of fear . . ."

Nowhere is it alleged what the basis for this fear is or what facts predicate to these plaintiffs the basis for their pleading.

Infringement of Constitutional Rights

Plaintiffs allege that the actions of the defendants violate certain rights, privileges, and equities secured by the First, Third, Fourth, Fifth, and Ninth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

(a) The First Amendment to the Constitution states in pertinent part:

"Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech, . . . or the right of the people peaceably to assemble. . . ."

It is here attempted to assimilate a relationship between the operation of the Public Assistance Program and an infringement of this Amendment as to these plaintiffs. Certainly, nowhere in the complaint is there a specific allegation as to how these rights have been abridged.

(b) The Third Amendment to the Constitution states:

"No Soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law."

The defendants, with due respect to the Court, consider that an answer to this allegation would be in the nature of answering a rhetorical question.

(c) The Fourth Amendment to the Constitution states that the people shall be secure against unreasonable searches and seizures. Dedendants contend that the answer to this allegation is inherent in the statement thereof. Plaintiffs seek from this Court an order that *no entries* shall be made but have failed to convincingly present how *any* entry has been "unreasonable". Moreover, plaintiffs in their own pleading state:

"Plaintiffs have not actively opposed the aforesaid acts, demands, and intrusions of defendants, but have submitted to defendants' assertion of authority . . ."

Further, the plaintiffs aver ". . . they have not consented to the acts of the defendants. . . ."

In *Parrish* v. *The Civil Service Commission of the County of Alameda*, ------Cal. App. 2d------, ------ P. 2d------, (First Appellate District of California, Civil Action 22556, decided June 2, 1966) the Court stated:

"*Even if we assume* the operation to be a criminal investigation, it is not illegal or unreasonable 'for officers to seek interviews with suspects or witnesses or to call upon them at their homes for such purposes . . .' It is well established that where a person freely and voluntarily consents to the search of the premises under his control, his constitutional rights are not violated and any search or taking of evidence is not unreasonable." at 8.

Speaking to the issue of "consent", (which defendants in the instant case submit, has been extended on every occasion) the court further stated: ". . . we are not prepared to conclude, in the absence of a specific factual showing to the contrary, however, as in the Johnson case (*Johnson* v. *United States*, 333 U.S. 10 (1948), that the ANC [AFDC] recipients had no alternative but to submit to a search."

Parrish decided particularly that the plaintiff, an employee of the Department of Public Welfare of Almeda County, could be removed from his job for failing to conduct an investigation ordered by his department to determine the continued eligibility for assistance by Welfare recipients. It may be noted at this point that Department regulations in force in the California case provided that workers were to "thoroughly search the premises, *including looking in and under beds*", a procedure which these denfendants have, with particularity, excluded in home visits.

(d) The Fifth Amendment to the Constitution says in pertinent part: "No person shall . . . be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself . . . ." There is no allegation in this complaint to support the premise that investigations by defendants required by regulations of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, are in any degree criminal in nature. Using the language in *Parrish, supra*, "Even if we assume the operation to be a criminal investigation . . ." there is no indication that any statements taken in the process of the visit will be used in any criminal proceeding. The broadest interpretation of *Miranda* v. *State of Arizona*, 34 Law Week 4521, decided June 13, 1966, considered to be a liberal decision which is still subject to further interpretation, fails to be of any value to these plaintiffs since the regulations promulgated by these defendants establish that the identification of the investigator and his purpose must be announced.

(d) The Ninth Amendment to the Constitution reads:

"The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

"The only right which the Supreme Court has explicitly acknowledged as protected by this amendment is the right to engage in political activity. That recognition was accorded by way of *dictum* in *United Public Workers* v. *Mitchell*, where the powers of Congress to restrict the political activities of federal employees was sustained. *Constitution of the United States of America—Analysis and Interpretation*, 1963 Ed., Page 1031.

Investigations as an Incident to the Proper Administration of Public Policy.

Plaintiffs basically object to visits by members of the Office of Investigation and Collections of the Department of Public Welfare. Defendants urge upon this Court the language employed by the Court in *Parrish, supra*,

"We see nothing inherently wrong with making weekend eligibility calls [or home visits] which experience has demonstrated disclose widespread fraudulent misappropriation of public funds and the deprivation of the children for whose benefit the ANC (AFDC) Program was instituted." at 13.

It is repugnant to human knowledge and logic to believe that recipients of public assistance shall voluntarily report all matters necessary to their continued eligibility, honestly, and frankly upon a regular schedule to the Department. In view of this and experience the only dependable way to determine that the assistance is being used properly for the benefit of the children and that eligibility to receive this assistance continues, is to cause investigations to be made. The regulations promulgated by the defendants demand every consideration be given to the human dignity, legal rights, and privileges of recipients. Nowhere in this complaint is there an allegation that any defendant has impunged or has specifically abused any rights or privileges of these plaintiffs.

Further the defendants urge upon this Court the language expressed by Justice Crosby in *Wilkie* v. *O'Connor*, 25 N.Y. Supp. 2d. 617, at 619. "One of appellant's arguments gathered from his brief, is that after the local welfare officer has once granted the petitioner a pension he has no control over the matter, and that his only duty is to pay the pension regularly, and that his power is limited to the performance of that duty. The Public Welfare Law clearly negatives that argument. Appellant also argues that he has a right to live as he pleases while being supported by public charity. One would admire his independence if he were not so dependent, but he has no right to defy the standards and conventions of civilized society while being supported at public expense . . ." Defendants also invite the attention of this Court to the words of the late Justice Holmes who said in *McAuliffe* v. *City of New Bedford*, 29 N.E. 517 (1892) ". . . The petitioner may have a constitutional right to talk politics, but he has no constitutional right to be a policeman."

Perhaps it is not, as Voltaire wrote, "The best of all possible worlds", and there are many who by birth or misfortune have been reduced to conditions of severity. However, while their position must be understood and their human dignity preserved, their position must be realistically evaluated to arrive at an understanding that to prevent the improper flow of monies from the public treasury to persons who do not genuinely need and deserve it, *some system of control must be used*. Further, there is a correlative duty upon the recipient to be cooperative in providing truthfully and expeditiously the minimal information required to establish continued assistance eligibility.

It is not urged that a recipient must at every hour and under every condition submit to intrusions to the sanctity of his or her home but it is urged that they must, by virtue of their own agreements, voluntarily signed, when applying for receipt of welfare assistance, allow reasonable visits at reasonable hours by officials of the Department of Public Welfare.

Conclusion

Based upon the foregoing it is respectfully urged that the present complaint be dismissed or, in the alternative, that defendants' motion for summary judgment be granted or, further in the alternative, that plaintiffs prepare and present a more definite statement describing the acts complained of and the injury or damage suffered thereby.

MILTON D. KORMAN,
Acting Corporation Counsel,
JOHN A. EARNEST,
Assistant Corporation Counsel,
ROBERT M. WERDIG, Jr.,
Assistant Corporation Counsel,
Attorneys for the District of Columbia.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—C.A. No. 1447-66

(*Patricia A. Smith and Dora M. Crowder, Plaintiffs*, v. *the Board of Commissioners, et al., Defendants.*)

AFFIDAVIT

Donald D. Brewer, being duly sworn under oath, deposes and says that he is the Director of the Department of Public Welfare, D.C., that no employee of his Department is authorized to enter upon the premises of any recipient of any program administered by the Department without having first asked and received consent from said recipient to enter the premises.

Further, this affiant states that the plaintiffs in the instant action are not in jeopardy, at this ime, of having suspended, curtailed, or terminated their benefits under the A.F.D.C. Program administered by the Department for refusing admission to their premises to members of the Office of Investigations and Collections, Department of Public Welfare, D. C.

DONALD D. BREWER,
Director, Department of Public Welfare, District of Columbia.

(U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, Civil Action 1447-66, Washington, D.C., Oct. 7, 1966)

PATRICIA A. SMITH, ET AL, PLAINTIFFS, *v.* THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, ET AL, DEFENDANTS

OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

The above cause came on for hearing of motions before the Honorable Alexander Holtzoff, United States District Judge.

Appearances:

For the Plaintiffs: David H. Marlin, Esq.

For the Defendants: Robert M. Werdig, Esq., Asst. Corporation Counsel.

PROCEEDINGS

The Deputy Clerk: Smith and others vs. D.C. Commissioners and others.

The Court: You may proceed, gentlemen.

Mr. Werdig: May it please the Court, my name is Robert M. Werdig, Jr. I am an Assistant Corporation Counsel in and for the District of Columbia.

Looking on the bulletin board outside of Your Honor's courtroom I notice there are motions to be argued this morning, one of which is the plaintiffs' motion for an extension of time to answer Motion No. 2.

The Court: That has become moot because the opposition has been filed.

Mr. Werdig: Thank you, Your Honor.

The Court: Now what motion do you have, Mr. Werdig?

Mr. Werdig: We have a pleading, Your Honor, which is entitled a motion to dismiss or in the alternative for summary judgment or further in the alternative for a more definite statement.

The Court: Which of these are you going to press? I am not going to make the election for you.

Mr. Werdig: May we address particularly at this time, Your Honor, the motion for summary judgment.

The Court: Very well.

Mr. Werdig: Incorporated in the pleadings, Your Honor, is an affidavit of Donald Brewer, who is the Director of the Department of Public Welfare.

Essentially this case has been brought by two mothers of children who are receiving assistance for dependent children pursuant to federal and local programs in the District of Columbia.

We assume that the gist of the pleading—and I use that terminology because if we get to the motion to dismiss we will attempt to convince Your Honor that the pleadings are ambiguous in the finest sense of the word.

The Court: I don't like to dispose of cases on technicalities.

Mr. Werdig: No, your Honor, we realize that, but if we have to approach that particular portion of it we shall give you substantive reasons why we have interjected this pleading.

Assuming that the essence of the argument by these mothers is unreasonable searches and seizures by investigators attached to the Department of Public Welfare, we submit in the sworn affidavit, first, that no investigator in the Department of Public Welfare in this city is allowed by the regulations of the Department to make investigations which impinge upon constitutional rights.

Secondly, in the affidavit we have presented the proposition that these mothers, nor any other mothers in the District of Columbia, are subject to have any of their benefits reduced, terminated or otherwise altered by the mere refusal to allow investigators into their homes.

We might say——

The Court: Will you repeat that?

Mr. Werdig: That these two mothers particularly, and we represent to the Court that no other mother in the District of Columbia, is subject to having benefits terminated, reduced or in any other way altered by the mere refusal to allow investigators to come into their homes.

The Court: Well, I should think you would have a right to have investigators come into their homes.

Mr. Werdig: Your Honor, it is the Department's position that the fiat, the express language of both regulations promulgated by the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Act of Congress setting up the Public Assistance Act of 1962 directs the Department to make investigations. The thrust of the plaintiffs' argument is that these investigations have been conducted in such a manner as to be a violation of the First, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Ninth Amendments to the Constitution.

We urge upon the Court that the regulations of the Department set specific, critical, humane guidelines for the conduct of Public Welfare investigators.

The Court: I am not going to pass upon whether the regulations are sufficiently humane or not.

Isn't the administration of relief entirely discretionary on the part of the agency?

Mr. Werdig: I would not go so far as to say entirely discretionary. There are national guidelines.

The Court: I don't know what is meant by guidelines. Guidelines is an ambiguous term. Are they binding regulations or are they suggestions? A guideline might be a suggestion, it might be a regulation, or it might be a provision of law. You tell me there are guidelines. I don't know what you mean. You might mean one of several things.

Mr. Werdig: That to participate in the Federal program and receive Federal funds we must submit that which we have termed for nomenclature guidelines. Regulations, if you will, Your Honor, which must be accepted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for our participation in the national program.

The Court: In order to get Federal funds, is that it?

Mr. Werdig: Yes, Your Honor; and from time to time we receive instructions which we consider are in the way of constructive suggestions, but yet we accept them as regulations and follow them to the best or in the best way that we possibly can.

We suggest to the Court, however, that if there have been violations of constitutional rights of these plaintiffs, that the Department itself, by virtue of its administrative process, is set up to hear any complaints against these investigators.

The Court: Of course nobody has a constitutional right to go on the relief rolls.

Mr. Werdig: Your Honor, in our brief or in our memorandum of authorities we quoted from a New York case which I think Your Honor in view of your last comment would be interested in hearing. This is an old case, which doesn't destroy its validity now, we contend. That is Wilkie v. O'Connor, which is found at 25 N.Y. Supp. 2d 617, in which the Court states:

"One of appellant's arguments gathered from his brief, is that after the local welfare officer has once granted the petitioner a pension he"—referring to the local welfare officer—"has no control over the matter, and that his only duty is to pay the pension regularly, and that his power is limited to the performance of that duty. The Public Welfare Law clearly negatives that argument."

The Court: I am going to ask you a question, Mr. Werdig. Before you proceed will you tell me what the cause of action is, what the plaintiffs' cause of action is? I have got to know that.

Mr. Werdig: It is in two parts, Your Honor. It is for declaratory injunction——

The Court: Declaratory judgment?

Mr. Werdig: Declaratory judgment, and for an injunction.

Addressing myself to the injunction——

The Court: No, no; tell me briefly in a sentence or two what the cause of action is. Don't read me anything.

Mr. Werdig: They want Your Honor to order the Department of Public Welfare to have all investigators either to receive the express consent of recipients for entry into their homes or to obtain a search warrant before they enter the home.

The Court: Of course they couldn't obtain a search warrant because a search warrant may be issued by law only in criminal cases.

Mr. Werdig: Correct, Your Honor.

The Court: That is the cause of action. Is there anything else?

Mr. Werdig: And in the nature of declaratory judgment they ask that you declare that the Department is operating the program in deprivation of their constitutional rights.

The Court: I think I will hear the other side and then let you reply. I will hear counsel for the plaintiffs.

Mr. Marlin: Your Honor, my name is David Marlin.

Your Honor, the only thing that has been discussed this morning by counsel for——

The Court: I think you have the burden even though it is their motion. You have the burden to show that you have a cause of action. That is why I suggested to Mr. Werdig that I would hear you and then let him reply.

Mr. Marlin: Your Honor, our cause of action is, I think, put in a nutshell, that the Department of Public Welfare is running, in its investigative practices to determine whether recipients of public welfare are in fact eligible and remain eligible, is running a program of investigation which infringes upon the constitutional rights of those welfare recipients.

The Court: Of course the welfare recipients have a perfect right to refuse to submit to an investigation which they consider oppressive, but in that event, on the other hand, the agency has the right to take them off the rolls. In other words, I don't think, and I don't suppose the Corporation Counsel will claim, that investigators of the agency have a right to insist on making the investigation. I presume he will admit, and certainly the Court would hold, that any recipient of welfare funds has a right to decline to submit to investigation, but then the funds can be withheld from him.

Mr. Marlin: The facts of the matter are, though, Your Honor, although the Welfare Department claims that it has regulations which govern the conduct of its investigators, and we certainly admit that those regulations are there and if they were obeyed we wouldn't be here this morning.

The Court: These plaintiffs, of course, are on relief rolls.

Mr. Marlin: They are.

The Court: May I inquire on what basis they managed to get counsel? In other words, are you connected with the Neighborhood Counsel?

Mr. Marlin: I am a Deputy Director of Neighborhood Legal Services Project, yes, Your Honor.

The Court: I see.

Mr. Marlin: The activities of the investigators—well, one of the questions at issue here and we would like to submit to trial on the facts, is how in fact the investigators gain admittance.

The Court: No; first you have to establish a cause of action before we will have a trial on the facts.

Mr. Marlin: Yes, Your Honor. What I was attempting to say to the Court was that our allegations and our cause of action in the complaint with respect to the one issue that we have discussed here, and there are others, as has been mentioned, in terms of gaining entry into the homes of the welfare recipients, we allege in our complaint that entry is gained on one reason because of the assertion of authority to enter. We also allege that threats are made to welfare recipients to allow investigators into the home.

In other words, Your Honor, we assert in the complaint that entry into the homes of recipients is not freely given.

The Court: Any recipient has a perfect right to slam the door in the face of the investigator. Of course he runs the risk then of being cut off the rolls, but these investigators can always be excluded by the recipient.

Mr. Marlin: Your Honor, that would be nice if in fact it would be true, but I think the difficulty is that trading on the badge of authority, on their position with the Welfare Department, threatening recipients with cutting of relief unless they are permitted to enter the home—

The Court: Well, they have a right to do that. I think the agency in charge of relief has a right to say that unless you let our investigator enter your home and look around we will cut you off the roll.

Of course the investigator doesn't have a right to break down the door and go in.

Mr. Marlin: Your Honor, even their regulations would prohibit that. Their regulations state that if an investigator wishes to gain admittance into the home of a recipient and that admittance is denied, the investigator should turn around and leave the home. But in fact, by using threats, by using threats, for example, to withdraw the children from their parents, by using threats to cut off the——

The Court: If they do that, of course, threats of that kind are irregular.

I don't think equity can step in and issue an injunction to enjoin a list of unnamed persons from making threats. I think your remedy should be an administrative one and go to the agency and say, Well, now, here is Investigator A who on such and such an occasion made such and such a threat.

Mr. Marlin: Your Honor, this is why we are bringing a class action, because there are tens of thousands of persons in this category in the District and our files, operating ten Neighborhood offices, staffed by 30 attorneys in the poor sections of the city——

The Court: What kind of an injunction do you want this Court to render?

Mr. Marlin: To enjoin the pattern of conduct of these investigators.

The Court: Equity doesn't enjoin patterns of conduct; it doesn't enjoin unnamed individuals.

Mr. Marlin: Your Honor, as an analogy, the voting discrimination cases that have been brought in the south which have been brought by the government and also on some occasions by individuals.

The Court: In those cases specific registrars have been enjoined.

Mr. Marlin: But those are intimidation cases, Your Honor, which apply also to private citizens.

The Court: I don't think any equity court has ever issued an injunction enjoining a large number of unnamed individuals from doing things. Equity acts in personam.

We will take our usual mid-morning recess at this time and I will let you continue after the recess.

(Recess.)

The Court: Mr. Marlin, you may proceed.

Mr. Marlin: Your Honor, one question that was raised before we recessed was the right of an individual to public welfare. I don't know that that is a question that must be decided this morning, but our contention is that if a person is eligible under the conditions laid down, then that person has a right to welfare.

The Court: No; welfare is discretionary, of course.

Mr. Marlin: The question that I think is presented, Your Honor——

The Court: The rules as to eligibility are there to exclude anyone who is not eligible. In other words, relief payments are a gratuity or a grant; they are not a debt, the payment of an obligation. The eligibility rules are intended to exclude certain persons. It doesn't mean that everybody who is eligible has a right to sue for relief if it is refused, for example.

Mr. Marlin: Well, your Honor, we would contend, though, that the eligibility rules not only are intended to exclude those ineligible, but also set up standards.

The Court: That is right, but the administration of relief is discretionary in that it is a grant or gratuity and is not the payment of a legal obligation.

Now you may proceed with your argument.

Mr. Marlin: Your Honor, the next question then becomes whether somebody who applies for public assistance and/or whose application is granted must then surrender other constitutional rights—must surrender constitutional rights that other persons have.

The Court: I don't think he does. You don't have to argue that he shouldn't be required to surrender constitutional rights. He cannot be compelled to surrender constitutional rights.

Now what particular constitutional rights do you refer to?

Mr. Marlin: We refer, for example, to the right not to give incriminating evidence to investigators who are employed by the Welfare Department.

The Court: Oh, no, he has a right to refuse. Of course he cannot be compelled to answer questions, but on the other hand, if he refuses to give the information he can be taken off the relief rolls. For example, we have seen a great deal of discussion on the man of the house rule. Of course that rule is intended to prevent diversion of funds intended for children to the support of an unemployed idle paramour. Suppose a mother of children who are on the relief rolls is asked do you have a man living with you to whom you are not married, and she says I refuse to answer because the answer might incriminate me. They have a right to take her off relief. They cannot require her to answer.

Mr. Marlin: I think that is one of the questions, Your Honor, whether they do have a right to take her off the relief for that.

We are not arguing the right of the Department to police its public monies and find out whether they are going to people who are eligible for them.

The Court: One of the things they want to know, for example, is whether part of the money is given to a particular family where the mother is either separated from the father or is not married, whether she has a paramour living or visiting her who is supported from these relief funds intended primarily for children. They have a right to find that out.

Mr. Marlin: Yes, they do; no question about that, Your Honor. The question is how do they find it out.

The Court: Well, one of the ways they have is to ask her. Of course they are under no duty to accept her statement.

Mr. Marlin: Can they coerce an answer from her?

The Court: They cannot coerce an answer from her, but they have a right to say, Well, if you don't want to answer probably the answer would be adverse to your interests.

There is a rule of law that in a criminal case you cannot draw an unfavorable inference from the fact that the defendant doesn't testify, but in civil cases you can. In civil litigation if a litigant is asked a question to which he refuses an answer you have a right to infer that his answer would be unfavorable to him. That is a well established principle, Mr. Marlin. But proceed with your argument.

Mr. Marlin: My argument, sir, would be at this juncture to relate——

The Court: Not at this juncture; argue the motion here.

Mr. Marlin: Your Honor, to relate our cause of action as the denial of specific constitutional rights that we think are denied by the conduct of the investigators of the Department of Public Welfare, I have mentioned one, Your Honor, the self-incrimination. There is a case in this city, the Blackmone case in 1959, and there is a part of the D.C. Code which gives the city the power to prosecute someone criminally for welfare fraud. We are not arguing that someone who commits welfare fraud shouldn't be prosecuted. What we are talking about is the methods by which information is gathered which could lead to such a prosecution, and I call the Court's attention to the Lynumn v. Illinois case in which for purpose of getting a confession about narcotics the police in Chicago threatened the prisoner with cutting off welfare and with depriving her of the custody of her children.

The Court: That is a criminal case, Mr. Marlin.

Mr. Marlin: It is. I would only use it as an analogy, Your Honor.

Another area that we feel is infringed on by the conduct of the defendants and the Welfare Department which ratifies that conduct is the right to privacy.

The Court: Well, don't you think that the welfare agency should have a right to send an investigator to see, for example, that welfare funds aren't spent on costly television sets, to take an example?

Mr. Marlin: I think there may be other ways of discovering that information without employing a fleet of investigators to do it.

The Court: The easiest way, of course, is for an investigator to seek admission to the house and say, Well, we would like to see what you spend the money on.

Mr. Marlin: Irrespective of that, Your Honor, we have made allegations that the investigators furtively and secretly photograph, that they listen with their ears to the door on people's homes.

The Court: What is wrong in taking photographs?

Mr. Marlin: It is how it is done, again.

The Court might take judicial notice of a story that appeared in the Washington newspaper with great prominence.

The Court: I never take judicial notice of newspaper articles. We never try cases on newspaper articles, Mr. Marlin. You know better than that.

Mr. Marlin: The persons who are interrogated by the Welfare Department investigators are not only recipients, they are friends of recipients.

You mentioned, Your Honor, the man in the house rule as part of the discussion in the general problem of welfare. We have information from people who come into our law offices in terms of the enforcement of that rule, where if a brother or a father is in the home of a recipient of public welfare, investigations are frequently made in that area, who is that man, who is the man in the house.

The Court: Isn't it reasonable to ask that?

Mr. Marlin: I think there are some limits, Your Honor, and I think people do have some rights which should be protected against——

The Court: Of course, I don't believe and I feel very strongly that recipients of charity should not be humiliated, but this is nothing that the Court can stop. I think that should be taken up administratively with the agency. I agree with you thoroughly that unnecessary humiliation should not be extended to a person unfortunate enough to be on relief, but on the other hand it is reasonable enough to expect the recipient to cooperate.

Mr. Marlin: There is only one way this kind of conduct that we allege can be stopped, Your Honor, and that is by an injunction directed against those responsible for it, which is the Department of Public Welfare. We have named two specific investigators in our two plaintiffs who represent a class in our complaint. We are talking about facts that occurred, as well as information that we would be prepared to submit to a court.

The Court: Have you exhausted your administrative remedies? Have you presented this matter to the agency?

Mr. Marlin: We feel, Your Honor—we have not. We have not exhausted administrative remedies and it is our position that we shouldn't be forced to in these sort of conditions where there are thousands of persons involved.

The Court: Well, that is it. The Court can't enjoin thousands of persons. If there are 50 investigators or 100 investigators the Court can't issue an injunction to a list of unnamed investigators.

Mr. Marlin: The relief we would ask the Court, Your Honor, would be an injunction running against the Department of Public Welfare prescribing a code of conduct for its employees, the investigators.

The Court: Well, that isn't anything that the Court can interject itself into. I think you getter go to the District Commissioners. If some investigators use unduly harsh methods, I think you have a right to complain, but the complaint should be to the agency, and if you are not satisfied with what the agency does, then to the District Commissioners.

Mr. Marlin: Your Honor, because there are so many parties, potential parties, it is very difficult for anyone—and we are probably the only agency, the only legal agency in the city which is set up, funded by public monies, in order to represent the interests of people who otherwise can't afford attorneys.

The Court: That is another thing that puzzles me, Mr. Marlin. Your agency is a governmental agency in the sense that it is supported by appropriated funds, is it not?

Mr. Marlin: Well, I would agree to the latter part, but I don't think that the description of governmental agency——

The Court: It is supported by government funds, is it not?

Mr. Marlin: It is in part, Your Honor.

The Court: And where is the other part?

Mr. Marlin: The other part is under the Economic Opportunity Act. Part of the funding for recipient community action programs comes——

The Court: Well, that is government funds, too.

Mr. Marlin: The part that is government funds is the part that comes from the Office of Economic Opportunity. One portion is supposed to come from local contributions, ten per cent, Your Honor.

The Court: You mean contributions by local government or by local individuals?

Mr. Marlin: By local individuals, which can be in the form of money or services or other groups sending in money.

The Court: That is ten per cent, you say?

Mr. Marlin: That is right, Your Honor. That would be a minimum.

The Court: Actually, in connection with these Neighborhood Councils, where does the ten per cent come from?

Mr. Marlin: Well, actually, specifically for the Neighborhood Legal Services project, we are a component of the United Planning Organization in this city and it is the United Planning Organization which administers the program and they are the ones who derive that percentage of their funding, of their efforts, from the community.

The Court: When you say from the community, whom do they get the ten per cent from? Do they get it from the District Government or do they get it from foundations or from whom?

Mr. Marlin: Your Honor, I am afraid and I am sorry I can't be authoritative. I know that in the past they have received money from foundations. For example, our program was originally funded in part from the Ford Foundation.

The Court: That is what I thought. Of course, it is a strange thing, here are lawyers paid by the government for them to sue other government departments.

Mr. Marlin: We think it is not only a strange thing, but we think it is something that has been a long time in coming and we think it is a very salutary thing, Your Honor.

The Court: Well, it is certainly anomalous, Mr. Martin. It was my understanding that these Neighborhood Legal Councils weren't instituted to sue the government but to give legal advice and legal protection to people who could not afford to hire lawyers. For example, people in disputes with their landlords or in disputes with people to whom they are claimed to owe money and so on, and that is a very salutary and desirable project. In other words, it is the type of work that the Legal Aid Bureau does, only it is brought into the neighborhood.

Mr. Marlin: That is right, Your Honor.

The Court: But now you turn around and bring suits against the government. That seems an anomaly to me.

Mr. Marlin: Well, as an example, Your Honor, a great number of persons in this city, as well as all over the country who are poor, live in public housing, which is a government owned and sponsored activity. Surely if a public housing unit was in such disrepair or was run and administered so badly that tenants of that public housing has a legal right to redress, you could see there that the government would be a proper defendant. And there are, in fact, Your Honor, a great number of programs which deal particularly and have a particularly heavy weight upon people who are poor and who have no other legal representation.

I don't think, Your Honor, that our suit here today against the Welfare Department is the first, nor will it be the last, involving governmental agencies because the rights of people who we feel need legal protection frequently are invaded by governmental agencies.

The Court: Your may proceed.

Mr. Marlin: I suppose, Your Honor, and one of the things we have touched on before in terms of the constitutional rights that we feel are affected by and invaded by the conduct of the defendants is the security in the home. I just want to reaffirm what I had alluded to once before about the gaining entry into the homes by authority. Your Honor would be the first to correct me, it is in the criminal area, but there are cases, there are a great number of cases, as Your Honor would know, where police officers and other persons in authority and frequently wearing uniforms and acting under color of law, have gained entry into the homes, and the courts have said—using certain techniques—that the courts have said vitiated the right of free consent.

The Court: That relates to criminal prosecutions, Mr. Marlin.

Mr. Marlin: Your Honor, we are trying to draw analogies in this case to criminal law in a number of areas and this is one of them.

The Court: No, I am afraid you are wasting your time trying to use cases out of the criminal law.

Mr. Marlin: The freedom of association cases that we have cited in our memorandum, such as the NAACP vs. Alabama case, again relating back to the interrogation of the plaintiffs, of welfare recipients, of their families, of their friends, of a rather broad scope of search that goes on once an investigation is conducted which we think discourages freedom of association and interferes with First Amendment rights.

The Court: Specifically, what excesses do you claim in that respect?

Mr. Marin: You mean what excesses by the Department of Welfare?

The Court: What excesses do you claim in that respect?

Mr. Marlin: The excesses, the one illustration I gave before of indiscriminately questioning people who are seen in a home.

In other words, Your Honor, we think just because somebody is on public welfare their life is not a complete open book subject to——

The Court: Of course a recipient of public welfare should be treated politely and without humiliation and if an investigator is acting impolitely or bruskly or oppressively he should be reported to the agency. But they do have a right to ask questions, however, in order to ascertain what the situation is.

Mr. Marlin: We think, Your Honor, as a prelude to asking questions they should inform recipients that they have a right not to answer them, because we think they do have that right.

The Court: No, no; that applies only to criminal prosecutions.

Mr. Marlin: Frequently the information gathered from this investigation leads to criminal prosecutions and that is, in fact, Your Honor, one of the threats that is made.

The Court: You might have a defense to a criminal prosecution there. That is different. If a criminal prosecution is instituted and there is testimony as to what the defendant said to an investigator, you would have a right, perhaps, to object to the introduction of the testimony if there was no warning given. But for purposes of administering relief, that is a civil matter and in a civil matter you can draw an unfavorable inference from refusing to answer questions.

Mr. Marlin: Your Honor, let me finally say this, that we don't object, as I had mentioned before, we don't object to the Department of Public Welfare attempting to find out whether the recipients of its monies are deserving of them; but we do object to how they do it. We think that investigations that are conducted as they have been conducted, whereby entry is practically forced, where consent is not freely given to entry, whereby threats and coercive measures gain information from welfare recipients, when their homes have been invaded at all hours of the day and night, when people seen entering and leaving their homes are followed and questioned, when surveillance is made from automobiles or by listening, putting one's ear to the door——

The Court: You wouldn't object to surveillance from the outdoors, would you?

Mr. Marlin: I wouldn't object to surveillance if it was not secret and not furtive.

The Court: Before you were objecting to entry into the house. Now you are objecting to surveillance from the outside?

Mr. Marlin: Some surveillance from the outside, Your Honor, has been conducted in cars that are masked to conceal that anyone is inside them.

The Court: I think this is a very good way to conduct an investigation.

Mr. Marlin: It also smacks, in our opinion, Your Honor, something of a police state whereby investigators and other officials are spying and prying on the lives of American citizens.

The Court: You wouldn't say, for example, if a motorcycle policeman is hiding behind a tree so that he couldn't be seen by drivers and he sees a speeder, if he goes after him you will say that is unfair surveillance?

Mr. Marlin: I would make this distinction, Your Honor, that there is a law violator; that is what he is looking for and that is who he goes to apprehend. We don't have that posture in this case, Your Honor, where people are not law violators and are attempting to lead their lives and they are unfortunately leading them on public assistance but are yet subject to the kinds of spying and invasions of their privacy that is carried on by the Department of Public Welfare.

I would like to end my argument at this time. If the defendants wish to get into some of the more technical nature, I would like the opportunity, Your Honor, of responding to that.

The Court: Yes, I will give you a full hearing.

Mr. Werdig: Your Honor, we have but brief commentary to make and that is this:

As to the role of the investigator, in the Department of Public Welfare he is a fact finder.

We agree with Your Honor if threats, intimidation, personal force are used, this man should not be an employee of the District of Columbia. However, the plaintiffs stop at this point and do not explain that this is a two-phased operation. Every recipient of public welfare has first and foremost a social caseworker. It is our position, in line with Your Honor's suggestion as to the administrative device, that when the social worker calls at the home there is no threat, there is no coercion, there has been none alleged as to the social caseworker. It is at that time that the recipient has every opportunity to express chagrin, affrontry, to any activities taken on by an investigator. None of this has been reported to our Department.

First and foremost, though, Your Honor, we urge upon the Court that this program is administered to protect the children. If it is onerous upon these parents to provide to the Department the information that we must of necessity have to continue the assistance, what alternative do we have but to declare in the nature of parens patriae and take the children away from the home to make sure that they do receive the proper environment?

The Court: Of course the relief agency doesn't have any right to take children away from the home.

Mr. Werdig: No, Your Honor, but if this is to be a prelude to the limitations on our Department to know the facts surrounding continued eligibility to give money and it is upheld that they do not have the right to ask these questions, they do not have the right to come in——

The Court: You are now referring to another matter. You just a moment ago were referring to threats to take children away. Your agency doesn't have that authority.

Mr. Werdig: No, Your Honor. May we also state to Your Honor for clarification that at any time that a recipient does receive money and it is terminated, for whatever reason, there is an administrative appeal allowed as a matter of right.

The Court: How speedy is this appeal administered? Do you happen to know, Mr. Werdig?

Mr. Werdig: I would suggest, Your Honor, that it is within 30 to 60 days after a termination.

The Court: Well, I think it ought to be speedier because a person can starve to death in 30 days and a lot less than 30 days.

Mr. Werdig: Correct, Your Honor.

The Court: I think there is one thing that is always necessary in the administration of either private charity or governmental relief and that is speed.

Mr. Werdig: Your Honor, the information I now have to present to you is that when a case is closed, such as on a termination, there is an immediate right of appeal, and in any other appeal matter when there is a reduction in the benefits there is a maximum allowable period of 30 days.

The Court: How promptly is the appeal of the first type decided?

Mr. Werdig: Immediately. Within, I would say——

The Court: What do you mean by immediately?

Mr. Werdig: Excuse me, Your Honor.

The Court: Surely.

(Pause.)

Mr. Werdig: There is the possibility, Your Honor, that upon a termination there can be immediate reapplication for assistance on an emergency basis. However, as we know, there are administrative decisions being made in these matters. We attempt with expedition to see that these matters are terminated. We would suggest to Your Honor that the maximum time in most instances, not in all instances, is 30 days.

The Court: Well, of course I am not going to substitute myself for the head of the agency. I do think that expedition is vital in administering relief. I know that because shortly after World War I, I was in a rather subordinate capacity in charge of administering veterans relief in New York City and one of the things we did was to decide upon an application within a day or two, sometimes the same day, because speed I think is of vital importance in relief.

However, as I say, I am not going to instruct the Department how it should conduct its affairs. That is not a judge's function.

Mr. Werdig: Thank you, Your Honor.

The plaintiffs' counsel says that what they desire in the nature of injunctive relief, in part, is that a code of conduct be established by the Department. We submit to Your Honor that in the affidavit we have established the fact that the rules and regulations in effect in the Department now are tantamount to that which the plaintiffs now say they wish to have. The rules of the Department prohibit forceful, coercive entry onto premises. They explicitly set out a policy that the dignity of the individual be preserved and appreciated and respected. Any violation of any of these regulations is grounds upon which an employee of the Office of Investigations and Collections may be dismissed from his job for cause.

We respectfully ask that you rule in our favor on our motion for summary judgment.

The Court: Did you wish to say anything else, Mr. Marlin?

Mr. Marlin: Your Honor, I just wish to say one additional thing. That is to point out, because I feel an obligation to do so, the disparity of advantage between the class of persons that we are representing here today, Neighborhood Legal Services, and the Welfare Department. In other words, Your Honor, I think it somewhat mocks the facts for the defendants to talk about administrative review and to suggest that since one class of District employees, social workers are not informed of violations of regulations by another class of District employees, that is, investigators, that there must not be any such violations.

The Court: But, Mr. Marlin, it seems to me that all these are practical matters. If a violation is brought to your notice shouldn't you send somebody down to the District Building and bring it to the attention of the agency? Isn't that the practical way?

Mr. Marlin: Really, Your Honor, there is practically only one legal outlet for such activity and that is Neighborhood Legal Services. And, Your Honor, we know because we have done investigation, naturally, in preparation of this case, we know that there are untapped hundreds and hundreds of individuals in this city in this capacity. They don't complain, they don't take administrative reviews because they are coerced into not doing so, because they are afraid of losing their benefits. They are subjected to almost any kind of conduct that the defendants wish to inflict upon them and they are afraid to complain about it.

In addition to that, unless they come to us, pretty generally they have no legal representation available to them to make the complaint.

The Court: You have stated, perhaps I misunderstood you, you have stated in answer to my question that you have not taken this whole subject up with the agency. Shouldn't you?

Mr. Marlin: The subject of complaints about investigative conduct has been taken up with the agency, yes, Your Honor.

The Court: And what has the agency done about it?

Mr. Marlin: The agency has said very much what they have said to Your Honor this morning, that they have rules and regulations which prescribe conduct, that those rules and regulations are sufficient to govern the conduct of their investigators.

The Court: You want this Court to issue an injunction to these investigators to require them to comply with their own departmental rules? The Court would be stepping out of its proper role.

Mr. Marlin: No, Your Honor, I am not asking that. I am asking to have this case go to trial so we can bring in evidence to show what conduct the investigators actually perform.

The Court: I know, but the question is whether this Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter. You can't have a case tried unless you have a cause of action.

What is the ultimate relief that you seek? Is it to have this Court issue an injunction directing that under pain of punishment for contempt all investigators of the Department of Welfare must comply with its rules?

Mr. Marlin: No, Your Honor; we would seek to have the rules more narrowly defined and spelled out so that the conduct that is occurring will be prohibited, not the vague conduct that is contained in the rules.

The Court: I don't think that this Court can prescribe a code of rules for any governmental agency.

Mr. Marlin: But, Your Honor, courts have done that. For example again, voting registrars in the south, spelled out a course of conduct in handling voting applications.

The Court: Is there anything else you wish to say?

Mr. Marlin: No, Your Honor. Thank you.

OPINION OF THE COURT

The Court: This is an action brought against the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Director and certain other officials of the Department of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia.

The plaintiffs are mothers of children receiving assistance under the provisions for aid to families with dependent children administered by the Government of the District of Columbia through its Department of Public Welfare.

The defendants move for summary judgment.

The gravamen of the action is that investigators employed by the Department of Public Welfare at times used harsh, oppressive, illegal, and humiliating methods in making their investigations as to the question whether a particular recipient of assistance is worthy of that aid.

The Court is of the opinion, first, that it has no jurisdiction over the internal administration of this agency or any other government department. What the Court is asked to do here is to direct how the department should be administered and to do so either by declaratory or injunctive relief, or both.

Second, the Court is of the opinion that the administration of relief funds involves discretion on the part of the agency entrusted with that duty. Relief funds are grants and gratuities. Their payment does not constitute payment of legal obligations that the government owes. Being absolutely discretionary, there is no judicial review as to the manner in which that discretion is exercised.

It must be borne in mind that an individual may not maintain an action to enjoin the day-to-day administration of government functions. That was established in the leading case of Massachusetts v. Mellon.

Further than that, the type of relief that is requested here may not be accorded by a court of equity. This Court may not enjoin a large number of unnamed investigators and instruct them how to conduct their duties under penalty of being punished for contempt of court. The Court would have no means of supervising and determining the day-to-day compliance or failure to comply with such an injunction. Moreover, equity does not enjoin unnamed individuals for equity acts in personam.

It must be borne in mind that counsel for the plaintiffs does not attack the legality or the propriety of the regulations in this action. He contends, however, that the regulations are being violated by various investigators. It must be borne in mind, too, that in connection with the administration of welfare funds the government has a right to make investigations in order to determine that the money is properly spent, is not squandered improvidently, and is not obtained on the basis of misrepresentation. If there is any grievance as to the conduct of any particular investigator the matter should be submitted to the administrative agency. There is no showing that the administrative remedies have been exhausted because if the agency refuses redress appeal can be taken to the Board of Commissioners.

Each of the reasons the Court has just given is in itself sufficient to warrant a granting of the defendants' motion for summary judgment.

The defendants' motion is granted. You may submit an order.

(The hearing stood concluded.)

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

Certified as the official transcript of proceedings.

——— ———,
Official Reporter.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE, OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS AND COLLECTIONS,
May 27, 1965.

Memorandum to: OIC staff.
Subject: Rules pertaining to investigator's home visits and investigator's conduct.

This memorandum supersedes my memoranda dated May 25, 1965, subject as above.

We are again summarizing the rules pertaining to OIC investigations particularly relating to home visits and investigator's conduct.

The investigations phase of the Office of Investigations and Collections is a fact finding operation. The true facts in a PA case are ascertained, verified and reported to the Public Assistance Division without opinions or recommendations. The determination of the eligibility of a Public Assistance case rests with the Public Assistance staff.

The investigative staff of the Office of Investigations and Collections does not advise, recommend or render opinions to Public Assistance Clients.

Suggestions as to eligibility, ineligibility, continuance or withholding of the Public Assistance grant are areas in which the OIC investigators are specifically reminded to withhold their comments.

Investigators and supervisors do not investigate friends, acquaintances or relatives. Investigators cannot hire or contract recipients to perform any services for them.

Investigators will not disperse gifts regardless of how small in value to recipients or children of recipients. Such gifts however well intentioned are often resented or objected to by clients who may be reluctant to voice their objections. Investigators will refrain from advising recipients or rendering other assistance normally given by a social worker.

Investigators do not have arrest power or subpoena power. They do not carry side arms or concealed weapons.

Investigators must at all times use propriety, common sense and good judgment in questioning recipients. They must treat them with the human dignity to which all people are entitled.

All complaints received by any OIC personnel about investigators or members of OIC must be reported in writing to the Investigations and Collections Officer.

A home visit made by an investigator means a visit to a recipient or applicant's home in which the investigator has talked to the recipient at her home.

Home visits are conducted only between the hours of 8:00 AM and 10:00 PM on weekdays and 8:00 AM and 12:00 noon on Sundays. Home visits by investigators between the hours of 10:00 PM and 8:00 AM are forbidden.

No inspection of premises will be made if the recipient does not live on the premises.

On all home visits to the home of the recipient, the investigator assigned the case must be accompanied by another investigator. Whenever the recipient is contracted in person outside of the Office of Investigations and Collections this contact may be made only when accompanied by another investigator. There is no exception to this rule regardless of the reasons for contacting the recipient or visiting the home of the recipient.

The purposes of home visits are primarily to establish family composition, household composition, living conditions and resources to include employment.

No home visits are made on National Holidays or Religious Holidays.

Home visits are kept at a minimum. Three home visits are a maximum in any given investigation. An additional home visit due to unusual circumstances, such as change of residence, transfer of investigator, or a request from the Social Worker, must be approved in advance by the immediate supervisor.

Each case under investigation is scrutinized carefully prior to the home visit to ascertain if mental problems exist, the family composition, the amount of space occupied, etc. Investigators do not enter homes with preconceived ideas of what exists in the home, rather each investigation is an objective study for the Department of Public Welfare.

The investigator when making inquires in the home is only to ask questions which are pertinent to the investigation.

Questions asked in the home are applicable to the eligibility factors pertaining to

Department of Public Welfare and Public Assistance Division regulations. OIC uses Forms PW–RC 158, PW–RC 320, PW–RC 104 and PW–RC 105 to cover questions on eligibility and to limit investigator's time in interviewing the recipient.

Prior to entering a home investigators must identify themselves by giving their name and agency and show their identification card. They must request permission to enter the home and are not permitted to enter any home without the expressed approval of the occupant.

When admission to the home is refused by the recipient, the investigator shall leave immediately. A report is made of the situation to the Social Worker with the request that the Social Worker advise OIC regarding future action. Home visits are suspended pending a reply.

Investigators will not enter any recipient's home when no one is in the home, when only minor children are in the home or whenever no other adult member of the household is home.

If requested to leave after initially authorized entry, the investigators will do so immediately.

Investigators will immediately excuse themselves and leave the home if the recipient or any person being interviewed appears to be under the influence of alcohol.

In situations where the investigators have properly identified themselves and have been granted permission to enter the home but the recipient refuses to cooperate with the investigation, the investigator shall leave immediately. A report is submitted to the Social Worker outlining the circumstances. Home visits are suspended until a reply is received from the Social Worker.

When in the home, investigators will conduct themselves in a courteous manner. Investigators will not request any services of the recipient that would impose an obligation on the recipient to comply which is not directly related to and pertinent to the investigation.

When considered appropriate to check the living arrangements, the investigator will request permission of the recipient to make such a check and will request that an adult member of the household accompany him while viewing the premises. During such a survey, investigators will not enter any room where any female is sleeping, or in which there is a sick person, and particularly will not enter any bedroom where girls are sleeping without the expressed permission of the recipient and accompanied by the recipient.

Investigators will not open closets or bureau drawers, look under the bed, or handle personal items during such a tour of the premises. Nothing will be removed from the home by the investigators without the permission of the recipient.

At any time a recipient threatens, assaults, or attempts to assault or otherwise creates an incident with the investigators during a home visit the investigators will immediately excuse themselves and leave the home. A written report will be immediately submitted to the Investigations and Collections Officer.

William R. Galvin,
Investigations and Collections Officer.

This is to certify that I am acquainted with the above rules, have read this document, and I am complying with these instructions.

Date.

——— ———.
(Signature.)

———

July 1, 1966.

A meeting was held in the office of Senator Robert C. Byrd to discuss HEW Handbook Transmittal No. 77 with reference to the methods for determination of eligibility of welfare recipients. The meeting began at 9:30 a.m., with the following persons present:

The Honorable John W. Gardner, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare;

The Honorable Robert C. Byrd, Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia;

Mr. Joel Cohen, Assistant General Counsel, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare;

Mr. Fred H. Steininger, Director, Bureau of Family Services, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare;

Mr. John Hurley, Deputy Director, Bureau of Family Services, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare;

Mr. William Galvin, Office of Investigation and Collections, Department of Public Welfare, District of Columbia.

After introductions, Senator Byrd gave to Secretary Gardner a letter, dated June 30, 1966, addressed to the Secretary by Senator Byrd concerning the new regulations transmitted to State agencies administering approved public assistance plans by Handbook Transmittal No. 77.

Senator Byrd read the letter, after which the Secretary asked if he could bring up any questions. He then read from page two, paragraph three, of the letter concerning public records. The Secretary stated that, in his opinion, the phrase "supplemented, if necessary, by information from public records," certainly indicated public records could be utilized. Mr. Galvin raised the question of what constituted a public record and whether or not a court record, for example, or Unemployment Compensation Board record—which were not public—were considered public under the definition in the Handbook. Mr. Steininger said that they were. Mr. Galvin then asked if real estate records were public records, and Mr. Steininger said that they were not. Senator Byrd also posed questions submitted by Mr. Brewer to him regarding the definition of the term "public records."

Mr. Steininger then agreed to clarify the question of public records in the Handbook transmittal.

The question was raised as to the meaning of harassment. Senator Byrd brought out that, in the District, harassment meant any type of checking on recipients. It was agreed by HEW that this point should be clarified. It was later indicated that the examples of harassment under Part IV–2230, page two, left much to be desired:

"By way of illustration, States must especially guard against violations in such areas as entering a home by force, or without permission, or under false pretenses, making home visits outside of working hours, and particularly making such visits during sleeping hours; and searching in the home, for example, in rooms, closets, drawers, or papers, to seek clues to possible deception." Secretary Gardner stated his views on privacy and personal integrity, and indicated that, just as we wanted our homes and privacy and personal dignity respected, so do the welfare recipients. All concurred with these sentiments and examples of what the District investigators do, such as never entering a home without permission; never inspecting a home without permission; and never looking into rooms where people are asleep, particularly small children, without permission.

There was a general discussion concerning clarification of the examples to conform with what is permitted and what is not permitted. Senator Byrd cited numerous examples from the General Accounting Office reports of the AFDC investigation in 1962, showing the necessity for search in rooms and closets, and gave illustrations of what was found by such searches. Mr. Steininger agreed that visiting the home or searching in the home with permission was permissible and that failure of the recipient to consent to such home visits or searches would render the recipient ineligible. He agreed to insert this clarification in the Handbook transmittal.

Secretary Gardner had to leave the room for a few minutes. During this time, there was a discussion on the number of ineligibles in the District, the inability of the social workers to find the ineligibles, the rate of ineligibility in the nation-wide review of the AFDC program, the GAO report on the nation-wide review, and the effective work of the social workers in Mr. Steininger's home state.

Upon the Secretary's return, Mr. Hurley emphasized the HEW nation-wide review as being significant in its indication that ineligibility was rather minimal throughout the country, thus implying, perhaps, that the situations, such as were revealed in the District of Columbia, were somewhat exceptions rather than the rule. Senator Byrd then stated that, if we are going to discuss the HEW nation-wide survey, we should also consider the GAO monitoring of that survey and the GAO report which rather severely criticized the procedures used by HEW in the nation-wide survey and seriously questioned the validity of the conclusions reached by HEW.

The question of mandatory reliance upon the recipient as a primary source was discussed, and Senator Byrd read some excerpts from the GAO report. Then Mr. Steininger stated that most of the recipients were truthful and the reason for this requirement was because of that fact.

The question of blanket consent versus individual consent was discussed in great detail. Senator Byrd cited the findings of ineligibilty which resulted from the 1962 D.C. investigations to show that these findings reflected support for the Comptroller General's contention that recipients cannot be depended upon to give the facts and that one should, therefore, not take for granted that the "majority" of recipients are dependable and reliable. Mr. Hurley and Mr. Steininger at first held that each item would have to be approved individually by the applicant or recipient. They later agreed that once consent had been received from the applicant or recipient to make investigations on particular items, no further consent was necessary on those same items whether the investigation was made by the social worker, investigator, or quality control reviewer.

The matter of what could be done when clients did not give consent and the question of fraud had to be determined, was brought out by Mr. Galvin. Mr. Steininger said that, if the client refused consent, the case would be ineligible and from that point any investigation concerning fraud could be made. Part IV-2230, page 7, paragraph 1, was given by Mr. Steininger to cover those situations where the client would not give consent, but suspicions had to be investigated without consent. The Senator brought out that, under the qualifications in the paragraph, it would be impossible to investigate any suspicions without the consent of the client. It was finally agreed, since this was an all-encompassing directive, that the matter be clarified, allowing investigations to be conducted without the consent of the client when there was suspicion of fraud.

The meaning of "reasonably necessary" and "reasonably necessary to insure that expenditures under the program will be legal," was discussed in detail. Senator Byrd stated that "reasonable" was too ambiguous to limit what is legal. Secretary Gardner, looking at the second full paragraph of page four of Senator Byrd's letter to him, stated that the new regulations in Transmittal No. 77 were merely bringing the situation of the welfare client into conformity with the situation of the taxpayer of the United States, implying

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

that the taxpayer is put upon his honor to state the truth and merely fills out a form, states that it is correct, and this is accepted by the Internal Revenue Service. Senator BYRD referred again to the Comptroller General's statement to the effect that welfare recipients are not reliable generally and cannot be depended upon to give the full facts, whereas nowhere and at no time has the Comptroller General made such a statement with reference to U.S. taxpayers. Mr. Galvin brought out the fact that the Internal Revenue Service is mostly computerized and requires all agencies paying interest, selling stocks, holding bank accounts, etc., to keep records and furnish data to the IRS. The IRS not only has this type of collateral check for possible tax evasion, but also checks 300,000 or more cases each year on which there is no suspicion.

Senator BYRD asked the Secretary if a copy of the Task Force report (as related in the Washington Post of June 30) could be supplied to the Senator's office, whereupon the Secretary said that this would be done today.

There was a discussion of an article by Robert A. Cloward and Frances Fox Piven, entitled "A Strategy to End Poverty," with which the Secretary was familiar, and there was also a discussion of an article entitled "Social Welfare Law Testing," by Edward V. Sparer, in The Practical Lawyer of April 1966, a copy of which Mr. Galvin promised to supply to Secretary Gardner at his request. It was brought out that both articles were by people working in the same agency, namely, the Columbia University Center on Social Welfare Policy and Law.

Senator BYRD expressed concern at current events which are not, apparently, unrelated to the theories promulgated in "A Strategy to End Poverty," alluding specifically to the demonstrations and protest marches by welfare recipients, in many cases encouraged by antipoverty workers.

Senator BYRD asked if welfare directors throughout the 50 states has been consulted by HEW before the new regulations were promulgated. Mr. Steininger answered in the negative, but stated that they had been discussed with the Council of State Administrators, the Executive Committee, American Public Welfare Association.

Senator BYRD asked if there had been any reaction from State welfare directors, and the answer from Mr. Steininger was that there had been practically no reaction, but that he anticipated that certain questions might be raised at the time that the new State plans would be drawn up for implementation. Senator BYRD stated that he intended to take action to see that the directors are apprised of the new regulations.

In closing the meeting, Senator BYRD stated that it was not his desire to uphold questionable methods in the investigation of welfare recipients and that he recognized the importance of observing the constitutional rights of welfare recipients, but that, at the same time, the restrictions in this transmittal letter would inordinately tie the hands of the investigators. He also emphasized that social workers are not normally qualified by training and experience to use investigative techniques and that the fact that the situation which was brought out by the investigation in 1962, in the District of Columbia, had existed for many years was clear proof that the social workers could not be depended upon to discover infractions and eliminate ineligibles. Senator BYRD also made the point that the taxpayers have a right to know that their moneys are going to deserving recipients and that the individual who has nothing to hide should have no objections to a search of his premises with his permission. In other words, only those people who have something to hide should want to object to investigators looking into their rooms and closets. Senator BYRD expressed a great concern at the trend of events, feeling that the new restrictions with "open holes which would need to be plugged," would increase drastically welfare expenditures nation-wide, and result in an increased case-load of ineligibles.

Secretary Gardner expressed his understanding of Senator BYRD's position and stated that the matter would be further considered. Senator BYRD expressed the hope that the five points raised in the penultimate paragraph of the letter would be resolved, and the Secretary and his staff agreed to get back in touch with Senator BYRD.

[From the Washington Post, May 29, 1966]

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TENANTS LOSE THEIR FEARS AND LEARN TO MOBILIZE FOR ACTION

(By Dorothy Gilliam)

The rumblings started early. It was back last summer, and needy-citizens' organizations started popping up in offices downtown.

They told Washington's appointed officialdom that things weren't all right.

The Capital has no city hall, but it does have the District Building, and somehow, from somewhere, citizens who had been silent for years and years came forth with their problems.

This activity sprang from a nebulous, sometimes terrifying (to public officials), exciting (to the citizens) concept that has evolved in the war on poverty. The poverty people call it community action.

And it is happening, often, because of the dollars pumped into the community by the Federal Government's anti-poverty arm, the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Poor citizens in Washington have been awakening, joining hands and voices to try to make an impact and get things changed.

Nine days ago, tenants of the Barry Farm Public Housing Project in Southest Washington noticed a car that had been parked outside their homes for a long time.

They suspected its occupant was a welfare investigator, a symbol of official harassment and a source of fear to many in public housing projects.

They got together, went into the street and barricaded the man's car and asked the police to arrest him.

Later, these same citizens started picketing the Welfare Department's Investigations and Collections Office in protest against "harassment" by investigators.

Now, they picket almost daily the Alexandria home of William R. Galvin, head of the Office.

And yesterday, they asked whether the Welfare Department is using "a new form of terror" against them. They charged that one picket, Shirley Jones of 1302 Stevens rd. se., has been told she owes the Department $99 because her husband allegedly stayed away from work six years ago.

"We will fight for her," the group said in a statement. And they asked City officials once again: "Which side are you on?"

A PUBLIC DEBATE

Their actions have raised eyebrows and brought on healthy public debate from District offices to Capitol Hill. Sen. ROBERT C. BYRD (D-W. Va.) has complained that the welfare recipients are harassing the welfare workers and has called on the District Commissioners to protect the employes.

Welfare Director Donald Brewer has had to declare that no picket will be punished but has charged that the United Planning Organization is stirring up trouble. The UPO has retorted that it is simply encouraging the Barry Farm residents to voice their complaints.

These tenants are not the only ones who are getting organized.

Eleven days ago, another group of citizens, these at the Neighborhood Development Center at 3308 14th st nw., pleaded with presidential adviser Charles A. Horsky to do something about the city's welfare rules.

On May 10, a group of Cardozo area citizens attacked the UPO, the city's antipoverty coordinator, for failing to name a Negro to head its Manpower Division.

On Feb. 26, a group of young adults and teenagers from Anacostia sat in at the UPO's main office and, in effect, forced the UPO to sponsor a demonstration project with young people as community organizers.

On Nov. 29, representatives of Lower Cardozo block clubs organized a pep rally to spur the UPO to appoint Samuel Harris director of operations.

On Nov. 1, 80 pickets, organized by UPO workers, marched in front of a tenement house where two families were evicted.

SANCTIONED PROTESTS

Times have changed, and in many areas it is UPO and OEO money that is dong the changing.

All through this, some public officials have been bitterly critical of the UPO, just as, nationwide, some city officials have been critical of the OEO. They say the citizens' noisy demonstrations have not been spontaneous—that they have been "put up to it" by Government-financed organizers.

The thing is, the officials are right.

The poor citizens have been chided into action by paid organizers, but many of these organizers are poor citizens themselves. And the other poor citizens have welcomed the impetus.

The poverty program has put poor people on the payroll and has taught them and others how to make noise and make it effectively. This is what community action money was for in the first place.

In Southeast Neighborhood House, for instance, 50 per cent of the paid neighborhood workers are tenants of public housing. They are men and women who earn $80 a week.

THE WORKER'S ROLE

The big question is, when does a man picket officialdom as an antipoverty worker and when as an aggrieved citizen?

Ralph Fertig, director of Southeast House, draws the line this way: Staffers can demonstrate only on their own time. He discourages them from speaking out at meetings of the Neighborhood Advisory Board.

"This dual role thing is a real problem," says Joan Cole, head of the UPO's housing division. "Sometimes they get their roles as neighborhood workers confused with that of tenant, and we do have more educating to do here."

The next problem is whether the paid staff is forcing the citizenry further than the citireally want to go—whether it is more militant.

Say the professional poverty workers:

Poor people do not have book learning, but they have a kind of savvy that has somehow permitted them to exist in a hostile society. It is doubtful that they would blindly follow organizers if they were not convinced of their cause.

Joan Cole says the idea that the paid organizers are more radical than the people is "nonsense. Poor people have both the intelligence and the guts to decide what they want to do," she says.

George Holland, in charge of all ten UPO neighborhood centers, agrees with Mrs. Cole.

Many tenants still refuse to go along, but most feel they are not being dictated to.

Maria Lefwitch, a Barry Farm tenant, says the organizers "have a little influence over the group, but not that much. They couldn't make us do anything we didn't want to do."

BARRY FARM CLOSEUP

A close look at what is happening at Barry Farm, one of the most changed areas of Washington, illuminates the whole poverty program.

Barry Farm is a dilapidated, isolated housing development in Anacostia. It is between Summer and Wade Roads and Firth Sterling Avenue. Its 2600 tenants live in 442 units, set down in a valley.

The buildings are of dirty white brick and have black slate roofs. The project looks like a concentration camp.

Barry Farm has no public bus transportation, no traffic lights, no laundromats, no supermarkets. Yet it has those 2600 tenants, enough people to fill a small city.

Those people, just five or six months ago, reflected their surroundings.

"The best way to get along here is to mind your own business," one resident told a reporter last year. "People will rat on you in a minute if they know anything about you."

"I hate this place," a teenager said, spitting on the grassless ground. "They named it right. That's just what this place is—a farm!"

The transformation of Barry Farm began after the UPO gave $162,000 to Southeast Neighborhood House in January, 1965. Southeast House is an old, established welfare agency that is funded partly by the United Giver's fund.

The people who ran Southeast Neighborhood House quickly realized that, while $162,000 was a lot of money, it wasn't enough to solve many problems. Staffers were troubled that nothing permanent was being accomplished.

So they started to pick some targets, with Barry Farm a principal one.

ORGANIZERS PICKED

First, six "community organizers" were carefully selected. They were to be called the Southeast Target Team (SETT). Chosen to head it was Pharnal Longus, a young man who grew up in Washington's slums and who, at the time, was working for another welfare agency, the United Givers Fund-supported Family and Child Services.

On Jan. 3, 1966, SETT set to work, one street at time, in Barry Farm.

The six found alienation, anger, complacency, lethargy. Nearly two of every three residents were getting public assistance.

The tenants were afraid of welfare investigators, of their neighbors, of the National Capital Housing Authority, the manager of the city's 40 public housing projects.

The six organizers started knocking on doors. At first, they were just telling residents about the poverty program.

They quickly learned there was plenty of reason for lethargy—many of the residents had not even heard of the poverty program. Many did not have a television set or a radio and did not get newspapers.

They found, too, that some of the people had lived in Barry Farm for five or ten years but had never spoken to a neighbor, any neighbor.

So the workers started "organizing." They asked questions like what community problems affect you, what changes would you make in Barry Farm, how would you go about changing things?

They contacted about half the 2600 residents.

Most of all, they found tenants feeling powerless to do anything. They did have complaints, though.

THE GRIEVANCES

Lack of upkeep of the project was the complaint most often made.

While the team talked to adults, Southeast staffer Leroy Washington spent two months organizing the young people—the idle, hostile jobless teenagers and young adults.

He started with 12 young men who he knew "hung together."

They were suspicious, but he kept talking. Finally they started talking too: about their problems—no jobs, no money, no recreation, no hope.

From these two months of organizing came a 250-member youth group now called Rebels With a Cause.

That the youth of Barry Farm had become organized became very, very clear when Southeast House signed a new contract last January with UPO. The contract omitted one item—pay for young neighborhood workers, like the Rebels With a Cause.

The Rebels first tried to get some results from their elders, the advisers to Southeast Neighborhood House. No luck.

So the youths marched on UPO headquarters. First the UPO's trustees again rejected them. But the Rebels persisted.

Finally, on April 6, they were granted $15,000 for a trial run of 90 days.

Back home at Barry Farm, people were stunned.

If the youngsters could do it, some of the older people reasoned, maybe we can, too.

With the SETT survey completed, meetings were called. At one, 20 or 30 scared, skeptical people showed up.

Many of them shifted uneasily on the hard, wooden seats of the basement meeting room as the target team encouraged them to think of solutions to their problems.

At one point, the SETT staffers suggested they could even buy Barry Farm from the housing authority, and run it themselves.

But the tenants weren't that far along, yet. They didn't want to swallow a whole loaf, they wanted a bite: They wanted to improve what they had.

They wanted, eventually, a supermarket, a laundromat, bus transportation.

But first they wanted better maintenance, they wanted rodents and bugs controlled, they wanted outdoor lighting.

So, with strength in their numbers and in the Southeast Neighborhood House staff, they set out to tackle officialdom.

They first discussed the need for lighting with two aides of Walter Washington, executive director of the National Capital Housing Authority.

Court lights had been installed several years before, but youngsters had broken the bulbs so many times that the management stopped replacing them.

An aide insulted the tenants by saying: "Barry Farm was without lights for almost 20 years. Why should they be important now?"

AN INITIAL SUCCESS

So the people went over the aide's head to Washington himself.

Washington had new bulbs burning in two days, simply by supplying the tenants nearest the lights with bulbs and asking them to replace broken ones. And light bulbs aren't broken so often any more.

With the success, the tenants of Barry Farm, who now were calling themselves the Band of Angels, were really ready to move.

When Washington announced that $385,000 would be spent on an improvement project for Barry Farm, they didn't accept it gratefully.

They were worried that the money would be spent for the outside, and they wanted interior repairs.

Lillian Wright, chairman of the Band of Angels, complained that the renovations had been projected without consulting the tenants' "needs, wants or opinions."

Mrs. Wright's efforts to see Washington in his office were rebuffed by a NCHA secretary, she said.

What to do? The tenants already know, from the light bulb incident, that the only way to get things done was at the top.

Longus's team told them they could do one of three things: call a press conference and tell the whole city how they felt; try Walter Washington again, or forget the whole thing.

They called a press conference Feb. 26. To their surprise, four newspapers sent representatives, and all four published stories.

When Washington was called by a reporter to get his side of the story, he moved in quickly.

He said he had never heard of the Band of Angels, but he would be "delighted to meet with them" and right away.

That Sunday, he showed up at the Farm with his top staff.

But the Angels thought they smelled a rat and picketed the meeting. They were resentful of the secretary's rudeness and said they wanted to see Washington downtown.

The incident split the community. "Publicity seekers," some tenants spat at the Band of Angels.

So the target team suggested that the Tenant Council, defunct for years, be reactivated, with the Band of Angels a part of it.

From this grew the recently formed city-wide Tenant Association. Twenty of the city's 40 housing projects are represented.

The Association has held two heated meetings with Washington, at which members issued demands, booed and catcalled.

Residents of public housing insist that their target is not Walter Washington, but rather bad public housing. "He responded real nice to us," one resident explained. "I don't think he knew a lot of things were going on."

Washington has stressed new and more buildings since he has headed the public housing program, and his awareness of the need for services can be seen at Garfield Terrace, where he hired a full-time social worker.

But Barry Farm was in disrepair and the responsibility was Washington's.

Partly in response to what he felt were just demands, he hired a special consultant, a skilled, veteran community organizer who now is making the rounds of the apartments, organizing tenants along less militant lines.

REACTION DIFFERS

Some tenants have applauded the hiring of an organizer by the official agency; others say the action has divided the tenants, pitting neighbor against neighbor.

Washington's organizer insists that any improvements must be a joint affair between tenants and agency. He says members of the tenants' union have tried to break up his meetings and opposed his program of fixing up the project.

"We're after the same thing—a better community," says Longus, the poverty program organizer. "We are attacking the causes and encouraging the poor people to change things themselves. This new move by management is trying to attack the symptoms."

In all of this, Barry Farm is growing; it has become a vital, concerned community.

Its people are learning how to get things done, from getting some light bulbs replaced to getting an organizer assigned to them by officials.

One case made clear their growing readiness to confront authority.

The tenants picketed the Welfare Department's inspections office and intentionally blocked the door. The police arrested one community organizer, Phil Perkins.

The whole group decided to be arrested.

But Southeast Neighborhood House Director Ralph Fertig, renowned as a militant, walked up and advised them that it didn't make sense for them to get arrested "just to go to the precinct and pay $10."

Later, Maria Lefwich, by now an official of the Tenant Council, said, "Ralph's saying not to was all it took for some people to back out."

Tenants claimed Fertig's moderating influence split the group.

FERTIG HAS DOUBTS

Fertig, who has been arrested in civil rights demonstrations in the South, says he emerged from the incident as a "ratfink."

"Maybe it was bad advice," he says now. "Maybe they needed just the experience of getting arrested for a cause they believed in."

The irony of the incident is that these were the same people who, just months ago, were afraid to even speak to their neighbors, too reluctant to attend a community action meeting.

Now they were beginning to be more radical than their mentors.

Barry Farm is still a slum. It still has no buses, no traffic lights, no laundromats and no supermarkets. But it does have light bulbs.

And for the first time residents have a say in the decision-making that concerns their daily lives. They have an avenue through which to act in their own behalf.

And it feels good, they say.

"I just felt wonderful walking in front of Galvin's house," a Barry Farm tenant said of her first picketing experience. "It was like . . . like you was full up. It was like nothing I've felt before. For once in my life I wasn't just throwing up my hands. I was saying, 'This is wrong.' "

Barry Farm will never be the same.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, July 26, 1962.

To the CHAIRMEN,
Subcommittees on District of Columbia, Senate and House Committees on Appropriations:

Herewith is our report on the investigation of selected cases under the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) Program, administered by the Public Assistance Division (PAD), Department of Public Welfare, District of Columbia Government, June 1962. We participated in the investigation pursuant to your request of March 6, 1962.

The investigation of 236 ADC cases disclosed that the recipients in 133, or 57 percent, of the cases were ineligible for financial assistance under the eligibility requirements and need standards as prescribed by the Board of Commissioners. The ineligibility of the recipients in 69 of the cases was directly related to the so-called man-in-the-house rule, although in 32 of the cases other ineligibility findings also existed.

The high incidence of ineligibility of the recipients in the 236 cases investigated leads to the conclusion (1) that the PAD, in its determinations and redeterminations of the recipients' eligibility, either had not completely verified facts represented by the recipients as entitling them to financial assistance or had not maintained sufficiently close contact with the recipients to be aware of changes in their conditions or circumstances affecting their continued entitlement to financial assistance, (2) that reliance cannot be placed on the caretaker-relatives (parents or other relatives of specified relationship) to inform the PAD of the actual conditions or circumstances which have a bearing on the recipients' eligibility for financial assistance, and (3) that the ADC cases not covered in the current investigation should be investigated to determine whether or not the recipients are eligible for the financial assistance they are receiving.

We believe that a continuing field investigation should be instituted with the objective of investigating ADC cases for the purpose of determining the eligibility of the recipients for financial assistance and the effectiveness of the PAD's prior verfication of representations by the recipients. We believe also that such a continuing field investigation program should be conducted by an investigative unit organizationally placed outside the Public Assistance Division with a reporting responsibility not only to the PAD, but also to the Director, Department of Public Welfare. We believe further that procedures should be adopted to insure that the investigative findings are given adequate and proper consideration by the PAD in making its eligibility determinations.

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

REPORT ON INVESTIGATION OF SELECTED CASES UNDER THE AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN PROGRAM, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT, JUNE 1962

The General Accounting Office has participated with the Department of Public Welfare (DPW), District of Columbia Government, in an investigation of selected cases administered by its Public Assistance Division (PAD) under the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) Program. The purpose of the investigation was to determine the facts having a bearing on the eligibility of the recipients for financial assistance under the eligibility factors and need standards, as prescribed by the Board of Commissioners, and to establish whether, on the basis of the facts, the recipients are eligible for such assistance.

The Department of Public Welfare started its investigation of the ADC cases on November 13, 1961. The General Accounting Office participated in the fact-finding phase of the investigation beginning on March 14, 1962, pursuant to a request on March 6, 1962, of the Chairmen of the Subcommittees on District of Columbia, Senate and House Committees on Appropriations.

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION FINDINGS AND ACTIONS TAKEN

The PAD Office of Research and Statistics selected 280 ADC cases—about 5 percent of the caseload—for investigation. Subsequently, it was determined that 42 cases had been closed by the PAD prior to review by the investigative unit established to ascertain the factual information, that the caretaker-mother in 1 case was not investigated because she was in residence at the Residential Training Center, and that the proper record had not been furnished to the investigative unit in another case. Therefore the investigation actually pertained to only 236 cases. The investigation of these cases resulted in eligibility determinations by the PAD, as follows:

	Number of cases	Percent to total cases
Recipients ineligible for financial assistance	141	59.8
Recipients eligible for continued financial assistance	95	40.2
Total	236	100.0

Upon the PAD's notifying the recipients in the 141 cases of their ineligibility for financial assistance, a number of the recipients gave notice of their intention to appeal the discontinuance of the assistance. By June 25, 1962, the PAD had informed us that the status of the 236 cases was as follows:

		Number of cases	Percent of total cases
Action based on investigative findings:			
Financial payments discontinued	127		
Financial payments continued based on appeal findings	3		
Appeals pending	3		
		133	56.3
Financial payments continued:			
No infractions of eligibility requirements or need standards	23		
Adjustments in payments based on existing need	20		
Miscellaneous administrative adjustments	52		
		95	40.3
Action based on events occurring subsequent to investigation:			
Financial payments discontinued	7		
Appeals pending	1		
		8	3.4
Total		236	100.0

PURPOSE OF THE AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN PROGRAM

The purpose of the Aid to Dependent Children Program, as stated in the PAD Manual, is "to encourage the care of dependent children in their own homes or in the homes of relatives through financial assistance and other social services to the needy dependent children, and to the parents or relatives with whom they are living, to help maintain and strengthen family life and to help parents or relatives to attain the maximum self-support and personal independence consistent with the maintenance of continuing parental care and protection." In Aid to Dependent Children cases, the child is the recipient and payment is made to the parent or relative in his behalf.

The District of Columbia Aid to Dependent Children Act defines "dependent child" as a child who has been deprived of parental support or care by reason of death, continued absence from the home, or physical or mental incapacity of a parent. However, the PAD Manual requires that both "need" and "deprivation of parental support or care" exist in each case without regard to whether one condition results from the other.

The PAD Manual provides that a needy child to be eligible for financial assistance (1) must be under the age of 16 or, if between the ages of 16 and 18, must be in regular attendance at school or be prevented therefrom by physical or mental disability, (2) must be living with a caretaker-relative—father, mother, or other relative of a specified degree of relationship—in a place of residence maintained by the relative as his own home and in which the relative exercises the primary responsibility for the care of the child, and (3) must meet the District of Columbia residence requirements.

The manual sets forth definitions of what constitutes deprivation of parental support by reason of death of a parent, incapacity of a parent to work, a mother's unavailability to work, and a parent's continued absence from the home.

The PAD Manual defines "need" as that part of the subsistence requirements of an assistance unit (caretaker-relative and children) which can not be met by available income and other resources. The manual provides that the requirements of an assistance unit shall be based on Budget Standards prescribed by the Board of Commissioners. The Budget Standards are stated to have been developed on the basis of the cost, obtained from studies made by the Department of Agriculture, of the subsistence requirements recognized as constituting the essentials of living. These requirements include basic personal requirements—food, clothing, and housekeeping necessities—and shelter requirements. The budget allowances prescribed for the items constituting the subsistence requirements vary according to the number of persons making up the "assistance unit" and their living and eating arrangements. The budget allowances for shelter requirements are the actual costs incurred but not in excess of prescribed maximum amounts which vary according to the number of persons in the assistance unit.

The manual contains detailed procedures, criteria, and instructions for (1) determining the eligibility of a child for financial assistance under many varying conditions, (2) applying the Budget Standards in determining the amount of an assistance unit's subsistence requirements under varying situations, and (3) determining the income and resources of any and all members of the assistance unit.

REASON FOR CONDUCTING THE INVESTIGATION

The Department of Public Welfare's investigation of the ADC cases was undertaken pursuant to a request of the Senate Committee on Appropriations in its report on House bill 8072,[1] a bill to provide appropriations for the District of Columbia for 1962. The Committee stated, in part: "Public assistance in the District of Columbia has been continually increasing over the past several years, particularly in the aid to dependent children and general public assistance categories. The Committee is concerned over this upsurge in grants and recommends that the Department establish, within available funds, a pilot project composed of at least five investigators to ferret out any so-called freeloaders who may be benefiting under the public assistance program. * * *"

PLANNING AND DIRECTION OF THE INVESTIGATION

The Board of Commissioners, on October 5, 1961, approved the establishment of an investigative committee to plan and direct the investigation. The committee was made up of seven representatives of the District of Columbia Government—four from the Department of Public Welfare, two from the Internal Audit Office, and one from the office of the Corporation Counsel—and a representative of the Public Welfare Advisory Council. The committee, in a meeting on November 6, 1961, decided that:

1. The investigation of the public welfare cases would be conducted by an independent investigative unit to be established in an office apart from the Public Assistance Division which has the responsibility for the administration of the various public welfare programs.

2. The investigative unit would be headed by the Chief, Resources and Investigation Division,[2] Department of Public Welfare, who would conduct the investigation under the supervision of the committee and the operational direction of the Deputy Director, Department of Public Welfare.

3. The investigation would be conducted in a manner that would avoid all possible implications that it was not entirely and completely objective both in its approach and in its findings.

The Investigative Committee adopted procedures for the conduct of the investigation. Generally they provided for:

1. The Office of Research and Statistics to make a scientific selection of ADC cases for investigation.

2. The Investigative Unit to:

a. Analyze each case and record on a case schedule the essential information and eligibility factors involved in the case.

b. Make a field investigation of each case to determine the validity of the information and the eligibility factors.

c. Submit a comprehensive report on the field investigation to the PAD for determining the eligibility of the recipient on the basis of the reported investigative findings.

3. The PAD to (a) review the field investigative report on each case and determine the eligibility or ineligibility of the recipient on the basis of the facts disclosed in the report and (b) notify the chief of the investigative unit of the determination and the action taken, if any.

4. The chief of the investigative unit to refer each case in which he does not concur in the PAD's determination of eligibility to the Chairman of the Investigative Committee for consideration.

5. The Investigative Committee to review, summarize, and analyze investigative findings and to make recommendations for further avenues of investigation depending on the nature of the findings.

CONDUCT OF THE INVESTIGATION

On November 13, 1961, the DPW established an investigative unit in the Bell School Building, Second Street and Virginia Avenue, S.W.—with a staff of five investigators under the direct supervision of the Chief, Resources and Investigation Division—to undertake the investigation of the ADC cases that had been selected. Five more investigators were added to the staff in the early part of January 1962.

The General Accounting Office, on March 12, 1962, assigned 10 representatives to work with the DPW investigators, pursuant to the request of the Chairmen, Senate and House Subcommittees on District of Columbia, in a joint letter dated March 6, 1962, that we participate in the investigation in order to accelerate its completion and to insure its independence.

At March 14, 1962, the investigative unit had completed its investigation of 115 of the 236 ADC cases. Also, the PAD had determined the eligibility status of the recipients for financial assistance in 82 of the 115 cases. Therefore, our direct participation in all phases of the field investigation was limited to 121 of the ADC cases.

The following comments pertain to the conduct of the investigation of the cases in which we participated. However, our review of the reports on the investigation of the cases that had been completed prior to our participation indicates that the same approach had been followed in respect to those cases.

The investigation generally was conducted in accordance with the adopted procedures as previously described. A minimum of four home visits were made in all cases except in those cases where ineligibility findings were disclosed by fewer visits. The initial visit was usually made at nght or early Saturday or Sunday morning, at which time all members of the families would most likely be at home and available for interview. The initial home visit was made by two investigative teams, one to conduct the interview and the other to assure that no person left the home to avoid the disclosure of his presence. Each investigative team conducting a home visit comprised a DPW investigator and a GAO representative.

The initial home visit was made for the purpose of (1) verifying the facts related to the assistance unit (2) determining the identity and relationship to the household of any person present who was not a part of the assistance unit, (3) inspecting the living areas to ascertain whether they indicated that a male other than one included in the assistance unit actually was part of the household, and (4) inspecting the household facilities to ascertain whether they were indicative of unreported resources. Additional home visits and home surveillances were made at night and early Saturday and Sunday mornings to verify all information obtained during the initial home visit and to determine whether any unreported male actually resided in the home or had access thereto.

Collateral inquiries were also made which included (1) the checking of (a) vital statistics records to determine the identity and age of the children of the household and (b) school records to determine children's attendance, and (2) various other checks to determine (a) in the case of a person constituting part of the assistance unit, whether facts had been correctly reported relating to his relationship to the household, resources, and employability or whether he had been involved in any transaction or circumstances inconsistent with the case record information, (b) in the case of any other person residing in the home, his relation to the household and the extent of his contribution to the maintenance of the household, and (c) in the case of a male found in the home, but not a resident thereof, his relationship to the household, his regular place of abode, and his employment status. These latter checks involved contacting employers, utility companies, real estate companies, the Police Department, and the Department of Motor Vehicles, as well as other persons and organizations.

Investigative findings

A summary of PAD's determinations of eligibility of the recipients for financial assistance in the 236 cases investigated and the actions taken or pending are presented beginning on page 2 of this report. Comments relating to the cases in which the recipients were considered to be either eligible or ineligible for financial assistance are contained in the following sections.

Recipients eligible for financial assistance

The investigation disclosed information indicating that the recipients in 95, or 40 percent, of the 236 cases investigated were eligible for continued financial assistance (see p. 2) but that an adjustment was necessary in the amount of the assistance payments in 20 cases and that some administrative action was necessary in 52 cases to bring them into conformity with manual requirements (see p. 3).

Recipients ineligible for financial assistance

As shown on page 3, the recipients in 141, or 60 percent, of the ADC cases investigated were determined by the PAD to be ineligible for financial assistance—in 133 cases, on the basis of ineligibility findings disclosed by the field investigation and, in 8 cases, on the basis of events that occurred subsequent to the completion of the field investigation.

In the following table the 133 cases are classified according to the investigative finding which, in our opinion, had the most significant bearing on the recipients' eligibility status. Only one ineligibility finding was disclosed in each of 72 cases, and an average of 2.2 ineligibility findings was disclosed in 61 cases. In appendix II, a further classification of the cases is presented to show the nature of the additional ineligibility findings that existed in the 61 cases.

---

[1] Senate Report 993, Eighty-seventh Congress.

[2] Subsequently redesignated as the Office of Investigations and Collections.

Ineligibility finding	Number of cases— Considered to be ineligible	Number of cases— Having a single ineligibility finding	Number of cases— Having additional ineligibility findings	Number of ineligibility findings
Man-in-the-house rule:				
Mother living in continuing relationship with a man who is her husband and/or father of her ADC children	31	21	10	44
Mother living in home with man other than her husband or father of her ADC children, in relationship similar to that of husband and wife	20	9	11	33
Man constituting an undeterminable resource	10	7	3	13
Total	61	37	24	90
Other ineligibility findings:				
Resources undeterminable for other reasons	11	9	[1] 2	13
Living arrangements not clarified	11	4	[2] 7	22
Parent employed	3	1	2	5
Parent employable	29	13	[3] 16	49
No eligible child in home	4	3	1	5
Refusal to cooperate	8	2	[1] 6	16
Miscellaneous	6	3	3	9
Total	133	72	61	209

[1] Includes 2 cases involving "man constituting an undeterminable resource."
[2] Includes 1 case involving "man constituting an undeterminable resource."
[3] Includes 3 cases involving "man constituting an undeterminable resource."

Man-in-the-house rule

The foregoing table shows that the recipients in 61 of the 133 ADC cases were considered to be ineligible because of the involvement of a man in a situation related to the so-called man-in-the-house rule. We ascertained that in eight additional cases a man was involved but the cases were classified according to other investigative findings deemed to be more significant. Thus, the man-in-the-house rule was a factor in 69, or 51.9 percent, of the 133 cases, or 29.2 percent of the 236 cases investigated. However, in 32 of the 69 cases, other investigative findings were disclosed, any one of which, in our opinion, constituted sufficient reasons for considering the recipients to be ineligible. It is important to point out that, in the 37 cases where the sole finding related to the man-in-the-house rule, there is the possibility that other ineligibility factors also may have existed since the cases were not investigated beyond the point where it was definitely established that they were ineligible because of that rule.

Mother living in a continuing relationship with a man who is her husband and/or father of her ADC children

The investigation disclosed 31 ADC cases where the caretaker-mother was associating with her husband and/or father of one or more of her children in a manner which negated the claim that the children were deprived of parental support by reason of the continued absence of the parent from the home. The PAD Manual, in section 243.132, states that:

"A parent is considered to be continually absent from the home * * * if he is known to be residing away from the home under conditions which imply a definite dissociation from the normal marital relationship and from the normal exercise of parental custody and control of the children; this dissociation may exist whether or not the absent parent's whereabouts are known and whether or not he is making a financial contribution. * * * Continued absence does not exist solely because the parent rents or has living quarters available at another address or is supporting by court order. If the parents are engaging in a marital relationship and the man has free access to the home, then that man is not to be considered as 'absent from the home.'

* * * * *

"Only in situations where strong, convincing evidence is submitted that a parent is no longer in the home and has discontinued his relationship, shall the factor of continued absence be established."

The manual, in section 243.134, g, states: "Children are ineligible whose mother associates with a man in a relationship similar to that of husband and wife and the man continues a relationship with the children similar to that of father and children regardless of whether such man lives in the home."

In each of the 31 cases there was no clear dissociation of relationship between the mother and her husband and/or the father of her children. In eight cases the relationship was between the mother and her husband, and in 23 cases the relationship was between the mother and the father of one or more of her children.

Mother living in home with a man other than her husband or father of her ADC children in relationship similar to that of husband and wife

The investigation disclosed 20 ADC cases where the caretaker-mother was living with a man other than her husband or the father of any of her children in a relationship similar to that of husband and wife.

The PAD Manual, in section 243.134, states that: "Children are ineligible whose mother associates with a man in a relationship similar to that of husband and wife and the mother, her children, and such man live in a family setting regardless of whether such man is the father of the children."

The recipients were considered to be ineligible in 9 cases solely on the basis of the finding related to the foregoing regulation and in 11 cases on the basis of that finding and various other investigative findings.

Man constituting an undeterminable resource

The investigation disclosed 10 ADC cases where the recipients were deemed to be ineligible for financial assistance because of the presence in the home of a man or men whose relationship to the mother and/or the children and the extent of their contribution to the support of the mother and the children could not be determined. A similar situation existed in eight other cases where the recipients were considered to be ineligible because of other more significant investigative findings.

The PAD Manual, in section 243.134, h, provides, in respect to the situation disclosed in the 18 cases, that a mother and her children may receive financial assistance even if the mother maintains a conjugal relationship with a man, provided the mother and her children are otherwise eligible and all resources available to the mother and the children are determined or clarified in establishing need.

The investigation disclosed that, in each of these cases, a man or men were present in the home but the nature of their relationship with the mother could not be established. Consequently, in none of these cases could the existence of need be established because the extent of the resources available to the mother and children that resulted from the presence of the man or men in the home could not be determined or clarified.

Other ineligibility findings

Resources Undeterminable

The investigation disclosed that in 11 ADC cases there was evidence of resources available to the recipients but the extent of such resources could not be determined. The finding of undeterminable resources also was present in 39 additional cases which were classified as ineligible on the basis of more significant findings.

The existence of undisclosed resources was determined by admissions of the caretaker-relatives (parents or other relatives of a specified relationship) or by evidence that the family was living on a scale beyond that possible under the financial assistance being provided. In each case, the caretaker-relative was either unwilling or unable to satisfactorily explain the existing situation. Therefore, it was impossible to definitely establish that a need for financial assistance existed.

Living Arrangements Not Clarified

The investigation disclosed that in 11 ADC cases the relationships between the parents of the children and various other persons living together in the same dwelling could not be determined. The same situation existed in 13 additional cases where the recipients were considered to be ineligible because of other investigative findings deemed to be more significant.

The questionable relationships which the parents of the children were unwilling to clarify were with landlords, relatives, and purported visitors. This failure to clarify the living arrangements made it impossible to determine either the extent of the available resources or that need for financial assistance existed.

Parents Employed

The investigation disclosed three ADC cases in which the parents of the ADC children were employed full time. In two of these cases other findings were also present, and in two additional cases the parent was found to be employed but the cases were considered ineligible because of the existence of more significant findings.

The PAD Manual, in section 235.100, provides that assistance shall be denied in those cases where a parent is employed full time.

Parents Employable

The investigation disclosed 29 ADC cases where the recipients were considered to be ineligible because the ADC parents were employable. Also, in eight additional cases the parents were employable, although the recipients were considered to be ineligible because of other more significant findings.

The PAD Manual, in section 243.121, states that it is generally expected that a mother without a husband will work to help support her children if she is not incapacitated and if there are relatives or other reliable persons available to care for her children. It also sets forth criteria for guidance in determining whether a mother is employable.

In 16 of the 29 cases, other investigative findings bearing on eligibility were also present.

No Eligible Child in Home

The investigation disclosed four ADC cases where financial assistance payments were being made although no eligible children were in the homes. In two cases, the only child in the home was over 16 years of age but he did not meet the eligibility requirements for a child over that age because he was not attending school regularly. In one case, the child, in respect to which financial assistance had been granted, had not been living in the home since August 1961. In the remaining case the only child in the home was not related to the caretaker within the required specified degree of relationship.

Refusal To Cooperate

In eight ADC cases the recipients were considered to be ineligible because the caretaker-relatives refused to cooperate with the investigators in their attempt to determine facts substantiating that the children had been deprived of parental support or care, or to determine the extent of any existing need. In six of these cases other ineligibility findings were present. In five additional cases there also was a refusal to cooperate although the recipients were considered to be ineligible because of other reasons.

With respect to determining need, the PAD Manual, in section 350.000, states:

"The agency, therefore, needs factual and authentic information concerning an applicant's and recipient's income and resources in cash and in kind, in order to evaluate and measure them against the Budget Standard for the determination of the amount of the person's need.

"a. The Worker must clearly explain to the client why the information is needed, and must help him to understand that he has three choices:

"1. Having his need determined by providing the required information, or authorizing the Worker to obtain it;

"2. Withdrawing his application;

"3. Being denied assistance since his need cannot be determined.

* * * * *

"An applicant or recipient who refuses to supply, obtain, or to authorize the Worker to obtain information regarding his income and other resources, thereby makes himself ineligible for assistance because his need cannot be established."

The caretaker-relatives' refusal to cooperate with the investigators generally consisted of a refusal to admit the investigators into the home, a refusal to allow the investigators to inspect the interior of the home in order to determine living arrangements, or a refusal to supply information needed to establish the eligibility of a child or children for financial assistance or the extent of the need.

Miscellaneous

In six ADC cases the recipients were determined to be ineligible for financial assistance for the following reasons.

1. Failure of returned husband to register with United States Employment Services (USES)—two cases.

2. Husband's absence only a separation of convenience.

3. Presence of coin-operated machines in home.

4. Absent husband willing but not permitted to return to home (absence not established).

5. Parent's purported incapacity to work not established.

With respect to reason 1, the PAD Manual, in section 243.120, states, in effect, that the provisions set forth in sections 244.00 and 245.00, which relate to the General Public Assistance Program, are applicable to the ADC Program. Section 245.310 states that active registration with the USES, as a part of the recipients effort to find work, is an eligibility requirement. In the two cases where the recipients were deemed ineligible for the reason of failure to register with USES, originally the children had been determined to be eligible on the basis of continued absence of the fathers who were committed to the Occuquan Workhouse. In both cases they had been released and were not employed but had not registered with USES.

With respect to the case under reason 2, the investigation disclosed that although the absent parent had dissociated himself from the normal family relationship the absence was primarily for the purpose of enabling the mother and children to obtain ADC aid. In this connection the PAD Manual, section 243.132, states: "Continued absence is not established when, in the judgment of the agency, a man or woman who have lived together make separate living arrangements for the purpose of establishing eligibility for assistance."

In regard to the case under reason 3, the investigation disclosed the presence in the home of several coin-operated machines constituting business activities. These machines consist of a telephone with a lock on it, two television sets, and a washing machine. In addition, there was evidence that the parent in this case may have been engaged in the illegal distillation of whiskey and in other business activities. The PAD Manual, in sections 352.470 and 352.500, states, in effect, that under such circumstances financial assistance cannot be granted in the absence of a clarification of resources in order to determine whether any need exists.

In the case under reason 4, the investigation disclosed that the absent husband was willing to return to his family but was prevented from doing so by his wife. The PAD Manual, in section 243.135, provides that: "* * * if the woman bases her need for assistance on the reason of her unwillingness to live with her husband, or to permit him to live in the home, and he is willing to live with and support his family, they are not considered to be in need."

In the final case, an examination of the case record disclosed evidence that the recipients were ineligible because the father, who had been considered unemployable, had not complied with the regulation requiring periodic medical reports to be furnished in support of his claim of unemployability.

Voluntary withdrawals from program

During the investigation, 13 caretaker-mothers voluntarily signed statements expressing their desire to withdraw from the ADC program. In two cases, the ADC mothers refused to cooperate with the investigators by denying them permission to examine or inspect the living arrangements and chose to withdraw from the program instead. In each of the other cases the withdrawal request was made after the investigation had disclosed findings which adversely affected the eligibility of the recipients.

EFFECT OF DISCONTINUANCE OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

As shown on page 3, the PAD discontinued financial assistance payments in 134 cases of the 236 cases investigated. The discontinued monthly payments, aggregating $20,881, had been made on behalf of 511 children.

We have not attempted to estimate the savings that may accrue to the District as a result of the discontinuance of financial assistance in the 134 cases because of the probability that, in some instances, the caretaker-mother may effect changes in her living arrangements that would result in her children's becoming eligible for assistance and, in other instances, actions may be taken to clarify resources or living arrangements or to otherwise comply with the prescribed eligibility requirements and need standards.

PROPOSAL TO LIBERALIZE THE AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN PROGRAM

The Director, Department of Public Welfare, in hearings held on May 24, 1962, before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, presented for consideration a program for Aid to Dependent Children of Unemployed Parents (see p. 1257 of the hearings) predicated on congressional passage of House Bill 10606, and act providing for an extension through June 30, 1967, of Federal financial participation in aid to dependent children of unemployed parents. The Director, in response to a question by the Chairman of the Subcommittee as to what percentage of the ADC cases investigated would have been determined to be ineligible if there had been a change in eligibility requirements, stated: "Assuming the policy on the man in the home were to be changed and if the District were to extend aid to the unemployed, I don't believe there would be a very large percentage, much beyond 17—maybe it would go to 25 percent. But the statistics that have been reported have indicated that most of the reasons given for the closing of the cases, or finding them ineligible has been related to the man-in-the-home policy * * *."

The investigation was not directed toward ascertaining the employment status of the men involved in the 69 cases where the recipients were considered to be ineligible because of the man-in-the-house rule—in 37 cases solely because of that rule and in 32 cases because of that rule and other ineligibility findings. (See p. 14.) However, the fact that the men involved in 24 of the 37 cases and in 21 of the 32 cases were employed was disclosed through statements made by the mothers of the ADC children or by the men themselves, either to the investigators or to public utility or other companies when seeking service or credit, and verified by the investigators through interviews with the indicated employers. Therefore, since the ineligibility of the recipients was based solely on the man-in-the-house rule in only 37 cases and since the men involved in 24 of the cases were employed, it would appear that in only 13 of the cases would the recipients have been eligible for financial assistance if the proposed program and the man-in-the-house policy, as outlined on page 1254 of the hearings, had been in effect. Thus, instead of 133 ineligible cases, as shown on page 3 of the report, there would have been only 120, or 50.8 percent of the 236 cases investigated, unless the extent of the men's employment in the 24 cases did not meet the criteria set forth in the proposed program.

CONCLUSIONS

The high incidence of ineligibility of the recipients for financial assistance in the 236 ADC cases, as disclosed by the investigation and confirmed by the PAD, leads to the conclusion (1) that the PAD, in its determinations and redeterminations of the recipients' eligibility, either had not completely verified facts represented by the recipients as entitling them to financial assistance or had not maintained sufficiently close contact with the recipients to be aware of changes in their conditions or circumstances affecting their continued entitlement to financial assistance, (2) that reliance cannot be placed on the caretaker-relatives (parents or other relatives of specified relationship) to inform the PAD of the actual conditions or circumstances which have a bearing on the recipients' eligibility for financial assistance, and (3) that the ADC cases not covered in the current investigation should be investigated to determine whether or not the recipients are eligible for the financial assistance they are receiving.

We believe that a continuing field investigation program should be instituted with the objective of investigating ADC cases for the purpose of determining the eligibility of the recipients for financial assistance and the effectiveness of the PAD's prior verification of representations by the recipients. We believe also that such a continuing field investigation program should be conducted by an investigative unit organizationally placed outside the PAD with a reporting responsibility not only to the PAD, but also to the Director, Department of Public Welfare. We believe further that procedures should be adopted to insure that the investigative findings are given adequate and proper consideration by the PAD in making its eligibility determinations.

APPENDIX I

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
March 6, 1962.

Hon. JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CAMPBELL: This will confirm our verbal request for your office to furnish the investigative personnel that may be required to accelerate completion of the special public assistance investigation now being made by the Welfare Department of the District of Columbia Government. As you know, this investigation was urged by our Committees during the last session of Congress with a view to ferreting out any cases of violators on the welfare rolls. Since a sizeable number of ineligibles have already been disclosed in the 280 selected cases, it is deemed important that all such cases be subjected to an independent review and report by your office.

It is requested that your report include such additional pertinent information on the District welfare program as may be determined of interest to the Committees.

Copies of communications with Commissioner Tobriner giving further details on the subject matter are enclosed.

With warm personal regards, we remain
Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. BYRD,
Chairman of Subcommittee on District of Columbia Appropriations Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate.

WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
Chairman of Subcommittee on District of Columbia Appropriations Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., July 30, 1962.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
Chairman, Subcommittee on District of Columbia, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Herewith is our special report on the investigation of selected cases under the Aid to Dependent Children Program administered by the Public Assistance Division of the Department of Public Welfare, District of Columbia Government, June 1962.

This report, which is being submitted pursuant to your request of June 18, 1962, contains certain information in respect to the investigated cases in addition to that contained in the report submitted to you on July 26, 1962.

Because of the nature of the investigation, many of the statements contained in the report are necessarily based on conclusions arrived at after a reasonable evaluation of facts disclosed through observations, interviews, and admissions and through examination of public and business records.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

SPECIAL REPORT ON INVESTIGATION OF SELECTED CASES UNDER THE AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN PROGRAM, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT, JUNE 1962

(By the Comptroller General of the United States)

The General Accounting Office submitted a report to the Chairman, Subcommittee on District of Columbia, Senate and House Committees on Appropriations, on the investigation of selected cases under the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) Program, Department of Public Welfare (DPW), District of Columbia Government, on July 26, 1962. This report contains certain additional information in respect to the cases investigated, as requested by letter dated June 18, 1962. (See Appendix IX.)

CASES INVESTIGATED AND ACTIONS TAKEN

The aforementioned report pointed out that of 280 cases selected by the Public Assistance Division (PAD), Department of Public Welfare, for investigation, 42 cases had been closed prior to review by the investigative unit established by the DPW and that two cases were not investigated. The report showed that for the 236 ADC cases investigated, the PAD had informed us by June 25, 1962, that the status of the cases was as follows:

		Number of cases	Percent of total cases
Action based on investigative findings:			
Financial payments discontinued	127		
Financial payments continued based on appeal findings	3		
Appeal pending	3	133	56.3
Financial payments continued:			
No infractions of eligibility requirements or need standards	23		
Adjustments in payments based on existing need	20		
Miscellaneous administrative adjustments	52	95	40.3
Action based on events occurring subsequent to investigation:			
Financial payments discontinued	7		
Appeal pending	1	8	3.4
Total		236	100.0

In appendixes I through VIII of this report the 280 cases selected by the PAD for investigation are listed to show (1) the 42 cases that had been closed prior to review by the investigative unit, (2) the 2 cases not investigated, and (3) the 236 cases that were investigated. Those in the latter group have been classified according to their eligibility or ineligibility status. Comments pertaining to the cases in each of the foregoing categories are contained in the following sections of this report.

CASES CLOSED PRIOR TO INVESTIGATION

Shown as appendix I are the 42 cases in this category. We reviewed 28 of these cases for the purpose of evaluating the propriety of the actions taken. We believe that the actions were proper in view of the circumstances involved in each case.

CASES NOT INVESTIGATED

Listed as appendix II are the two active cases which were not investigated. In one of these cases the mother of the ADC children was a resident of the DPW's Residential Training Center, and an investigation of the case was deemed to be inexpedient. In the other case, the PAD inadvertently furnished the investigators a case record pertaining to a previous award which had been discontinued, and the fact that the assistance payments had been reinstated did not become known until after the field investigation work had been completed.

RECIPIENTS ELIGIBLE FOR CONTINUED ASSISTANCE

No infractions

Listed as appendix III are the 23 cases in which no infractions of PAD Manual requirements were disclosed by the investigation. Of the 23 cases, 10 had been investigated prior to our participation in the investigation. However, our review of the investigation reports on these cases indicated no reason for disagreeing with the PAD's conclusions.

The amount of the assistance payments in the 23 cases ranged from $62 to $292 a month, the number of children receiving aid ranged from 1 to 7, and the commencing date of the payments ranged from January 1953 to September 1961. The cases in which assistance had been granted more recently involved the greatest number of children and the largest monthly payments.

The monthly assistance payment in one case was reduced $33 because of the death of a child which occurred during the period of the investigation.

The fact that the investigation disclosed no irregularities in only 23 cases, or in only 9.7 percent of the cases investigated, is most significant and indicates a very serious weakness in the administration of the ADC Program.

Adjustment of assistance payments

Listed as appendix IV are the 20 cases in which the recipients were considered eligible for continued assistance but circumstances existed which required the monthly assistance payments to be adjusted.

In 15 cases, the monthly payments were reduced by amounts ranging from $12 to $72. In four of these cases, the monthly payments for 1, 2, or 3 months were further reduced in varying amounts to compensate for income which had been received in prior months but not reported. In three cases, similar deductions were made although the rate of the regular monthly payment was not changed.

In one case the monthly payment was increased by $6 because the recipients were required to move to more suitable quarters.

We participated in the field investigation of 5 of the 20 cases. While the investigation of the other 15 cases had been completed prior to our participation in the investigation, our review of 2 of these cases indicated no basis for disagreeing either with the adequacy of the investigation conducted or with the propriety of the actions taken.

Administrative adjustments needed

Appendix V lists the 52 cases in which the recipients were determined to be eligible for continued assistance but which required some administrative action. In some cases, the administrative action to be taken was dependent on actions required to be taken by the caretaker-relatives (parents or other relatives of specified relationship).

Examples of the types of actions required follow.

1. Refer to Office of Investigations and Collection (OIC) for recovery of overpayments.

2. Require unemployable parent to obtain an overdue medical examination report.

3. Require mother to take certain required action to locate missing husband.

4. Correct records to show change of address and recompute rental needs.

5. Consider the feasibility of referring children to the Child Welfare Division (CWD).

6. Correct records relating to birth dates of children.

7. Revise rental needs because of change in number of persons occupying a dwelling with members of an assistance unit (caretaker-relative and children).

We participated in the investigation of 24 of the 52 cases. Also, we reviewed 3 of the 28 cases which had been investigated prior to our participation in the investigation and found no reason for disagreeing either with the investigative findings or with the actions necessary to comply with normal requirements.

In 1 of the 24 cases which we investigated jointly with the PAD, the recipients appeared to be ineligible on the basis of findings indicating that both the ADC mother and father were employable. The PAD subsequently obtained medical information which indicated that the father was capable of part-time work only and made arrangements for him to receive medical treatment. Also, the PAD directed the mother to register with United States Employment Service (USES) and to report weekly on her efforts to find employment.

Although the recipients in each of the 52 cases were determined by the PAD to be eligible for continued assistance, the fact that, in some cases, they were required to take certain actions to completely meet the eligibility requirements and that the failure to do so could result in their becoming ineligible for continued financial assistance is a further illustration of a weakness in the PAD's administration of the program.

RECIPIENTS INELIGIBLE FOR CONTINUED ASSISTANCE

The PAD determined that 141 of the 236 cases investigated were ineligible for financial assistance—133 cases on the basis of the investigative findings and 8 cases on the basis of events occurring subsequent to the investigation. Assistance payments were later reinstated in 3 of the 133 cases on the basis of appeal findings. Appeals are pending in 1 of the 133 cases and in 1 of the 8 cases.

The 133 cases are classified in the following table according to the investigative finding which, in our opinion, had the most significant bearing on the recipients' eligibility status. Only 1 ineligibility finding was disclosed in each of 72 cases, and an average of 2.1 ineligibility findings was disclosed in 61 cases.

We participated in the investigation of 79 of the 141 cases. We reviewed the investigation reports in the remaining 62 cases to determine the adequacy of the investigation conducted and the propriety of the PAD's determination of ineligibility in each case. Our review disclosed no reason to disagree with the action taken by the PAD except in one case. (See p. 31.)

Ineligibility finding	Number of cases			Number of ineligibility findings
	Considered to be ineligible	Having a single ineligibility finding	Having additional ineligibility findings	
Man-in-the-house rule:				
Mother living in continuing relationship with a man who is her husband and/or father of her ADC children	31	21	10	44
Mother living in home with man other than her husband or father of her ADC children in relationship similar to that of husband and wife	20	9	11	33
Man constituting an undeterminable resource	10	7	3	13
	61	37	24	90
Other ineligibility findings:				
Resources undeterminable for other reasons	11	9	2	13
Living arrangements not clarified	11	4	7	22
Parent employed	3	1	2	5
Parent employable	29	13	16	40
No eligible child in home	4	3	1	5
Refusal to cooperate	8	2	6	16
Miscellaneous	6	3	3	9
Total	133	72	61	200

A listing of the cases in each of the foregoing classifications is presented as appendixes VI and VII of this report. Comments concerning the cases in each of the classifications follow.

Man-in-the-house rule—Mother living in continuing relationship with a man who is her husband and/or the father of her ADC children

As shown in appendix VI the investigation disclosed 31 cases where the ADC mother was associating with her husband and/or the father of her ADC children in a manner which negated the claim that the children were deprived of parental support or care by reason of the continued absence of the parent from the home. No distinction is made as to whether the relationship was carried on inside or outside the home.

In 21 of the cases the "lack of clear dis-association" was the only finding of ineligibility disclosed, but in 10 cases other ineligibility findings existed, any one of which, in our opinion, was a sufficient reason for considering the recipients to be ineligible.

In 8 of the cases the relationship of the mother was with her husband and in 23 cases the relationship was with a man not her husband although he was the father of one or more of her ADC children. In one of the latter cases the recipient appealed the PAD's determination of ineligibility, and the case remains open pending the outcome of the appeal.

In 18 of the 31 cases the man involved was employed; in 12 cases he was not employed but was apparently employable since there was no evidence of incapacity, either in the form of obvious physical disability or in the form of medical evidence; and in 1 case he was retired and receiving a pension.

Some of the more flagrant cases of abuses of the right to receive assistance under the ADC Program are presented below.

1. A mother of four children, who had been receiving ADC assistance payments for over 4 years was determined to have been living during the entire period, since September 1957, with a man whom she had represented to the PAD as being her brother but who actually was her paramour and the father of two of her children. The mother admitted to the investigator that the man was employed and earning $85 a week. She was receiving $154 a month in assistance payments at the time the assistance was discontinued.

2. A 36-year-old mother, who was receiving assistance payments on behalf of herself and 4 of her 6 children had received such assistance during most of the period since April 1953. The father of 3 of the 4 children, although not their mother's husband, was found by the investigators to be in the mother's home at 6:30 a.m. on a Sunday morning, barefoot and naked to the waist, and hiding under a bed. When asked if he was employed he said that he was a "gambler." The mother had been receiving assistance payments continuously since November 1959, and at the time the payments were discontinued they amounted to $143 a month.

3. A married 27-year-old mother of six children told investigators that the man found in her home was her brother-in-law. The investigation disclosed that he was actually her husband and the father of her children, five of whom were included in the assistance unit, and that he was employed and earning about $65 a week. The mother had been receiving assistance payments since December 1960, and at the time they were discontinued they amounted to $191 a month. She subsequently admitted to the investigators that the man was her husband and stated that she wished to withdraw from the ADC program rather than have the investigation continued.

4. A married 35-year-old mother and her four children had been determined to be eligible for assistance on the basis of her claim that her husband had deserted her and that his whereabouts was unknown. The investigators located the husband and obtained his signed statement asserting that his wife had forced him to leave the home by threats and abuse so that she could obtain public assistance, that his wife had always known his whereabouts, that he had given his wife at least $50 a month since January 1962, that he is presently employed, and that he wants to return to the home and support his family. The mother had received assistance payments since September 1961, the latest payments being $169 a month.

5. A 41-year-old mother of six children, all of whom are included in the assistance unit, represented to the PAD that she was living rent-free in the attic of her sister's home. She requested the PAD not to probe into the manner in which her sister had obtained her home. She also represented that another woman living in the home, who was a recipient of aid under the Aid to the Permanently and Totally Disabled (APTD) Program, was only a roomer.

The investigation disclosed that the APTD recipient, who was receiving $63 a month and who had been represented as a widow without relatives, was actually the mother of the ADC mother and was the lessee of the dwelling along with a man who was listed in the lease agreement as her husband. This man, who was found in the home, was determined to be employed full time and earning $1.25 an hour. The ADC mother, instead of living in this home as she had represented, was found to be living at another address with her children and her husband who was the father of her children. The father had been continuously employed with one firm since 1954 except for one period of 120 days in the early part of 1961 when he was in jail. He had claimed seven dependents on his tax withholding exemption certificate, which is the same as the number of persons in the assistance unit. The ADC mother had been receiving assistance payments since September 1959, with the latest payments amounting to $149 a month.

6. A 24-year-old mother of four children, fathered by three different men, none of whom were her husband, successfully withheld from the social workers the knowledge of the birth of her youngest child on March 11, 1961. The father of this child and of one of the other children was found hiding in the bathroom of the ADC mother's home at 6:10 a.m. on a Sunday morning. He admitted spending the night with the ADC mother. He admitted also that he was employed. The ADC mother said that this man had been living with her since the birth of her youngest child. The mother had been receiving assistance payments since February 1959, the latest payments amounting to $109 a month.

We believe that some of the facts with respect to these and other cases in this category could have been disclosed with only a reasonable amount of effort on the part of the social workers. In some of these cases it appears that the recipients were never eligible for financial assistance and that such a finding would have become apparent if the eligibility standards had been diligently applied at the time the applications were first received.

Mother living in home with man who is not her husband or the father of her ADC children in a relationship similar to that of husband and wife

This ineligibility finding was disclosed in 20 cases listed in appendix VI. In 11 of the cases, additional ineligibility findings existed.

The men involved in 15 of the cases were employed and in the other 5 cases were unemployed but appeared to be employable. In one of the 15 cases where the men involved was employed, the ADC mother was also employed to the extent that this fact alone would cause the recipients to be ineligible. In three cases, the ADC mother was employable under the prescribed standards for determining employability.

The ADC mothers in 3 of the 20 cases voluntarily withdrew from the program.

Cases illustrating this type of investigative finding follow.

1. A man found in the home of an ADC mother of 4 children who had received assistance payments since February 1956—the latest payments amounting to $153 a month—was represented to the investigators as being merely a visitor. The address given by this man as his residence proved to be false, and later both he and the ADC mother admitted that they had been living together but neither would state how long the relationship had existed. The man was employed. The ADC mother admitted that she was also employed, but she would not furnish information as to her employer, length of employment, or earnings. She signed a voluntary statement requesting withdrawal from the program.

2. A 22-year old mother, who had received assistance payments since September 1961 for herself and 3 children admitted during the investigation that she had been supported by a man by whom she was again pregnant. It was determined that this man was employed. The other signed a voluntary statement requesting withdrawal from the program. When contacted by a social worker subsequent to the investigation, she stated that she had signed the statement because she felt "the jig was up." At the time the assistance payments were discontinued they amounted to $148 a month.

3. A 26-year-old mother of six illegitimate children, fathered by three different men, was again pregnant by a man whom she did not identify. Her condition was known to the PAD in November 1961. She had been receiving assistance payments since April 1960, and as of March 1962 these payments were at the rate of $79 a month. The April 1962 assistance payment was suspended pending further inquiry into the matters disclosed by the investigation including (a) birth of a child in February 1962, (b) relationship with a man who, she admitted, spent nights with her "too often to mention" and who provided her with money in excess of $100 a month, (c) presence of another man, his wife, and 3 children in an apartment in the dwelling, (d) an unidentified sick child in the home, and (e) squalid, overcrowded, and rat-infested premises.

4. A man found in the home of a 27-year old ADC mother was addressed as "Daddy" by one of the mother's 3 illegitimate children. The children had been represented to the PAD as having been fathered by two different men, neither of whom was the ADC mother's husband or the man found in the home by the investigators. An informant told the investigators that this man was the ADC mother's current paramour and that a former paramour still frequents the home and creates disturbances. Both of these men are reported to have threatened to kill the other. The man found in the home refused to provide any information concerning his employment status or his relationship to the family. During a visit by a social worker subsequent to the investigation, the ADC mother denied that any serious or intimate relationship existed between her and the man found in the home and said that she would rather be "self-supporting" than to continue to receive public assistance. The monthly assistance payment of $154 was thereupon discontinued. She had been receiving assistance payments since April 1958.

Man constituting a resource the extent of which is undeterminable

Appendix VI lists 10 cases where the recipients were considered ineligible because a man was involved in the family unit but the extent of his contributions to the support of the assistance unit could not be determined. In each case, the man's relationship with the mother was not determined to be similar to that of husband and wife, nor was his relationship with the children determined to be that of a father. While the investigation disclosed that the man in each of these cases provided some assistance to the family unit, neither the mother nor the man would divulge information as to the extent of the contribution. Therefore, the need for assistance could not be established and the recipients were considered to be ineligible for assistance. In 3 of the 10 cases, additional ineligibility findings were found to exist. The involvement of a man in the family unit was disclosed also in 8 other cases which have been classified by other ineligibility findings deemed to be more significant.

The men involved in 12 of the 18 cases were employed, in 4 of the cases the men were unemployed but no evidence was disclosed to indicate that they were not employable, and in 2 of the cases no determinations were made of the men's employment status because of the number of men involved and the undeterminable status of their relationship to the family unit. In one of these latter two cases the recipients appealed PAD's determination of ineligibility and were reinstated for continued assistance after the appeal hearing.

The following examples illustrate the situations found to exist in the cases included in this category.

1. The ADC mother who had three illegitimate children and expected another child in 2 or 3 months, which fact was unknown to the PAD, had been receiving assistance payments since June 1961, the latest payments being $154 a month. Information provided by the mother concerning the father of her last-born child and that of the expected child was unverifiable because of her conflicting statements. This ADC mother formerly lived with her mother in a house leased in the name of a man who was not a member of the assistance unit. She moved from that house upon being informed that assistance payments were to be discontinued since her mother could care for her children and she was considered to be employable. Both this man and the ADC mother separately admitted a conjugal relationship over the past 2 years and that the man contributed to the family support. The man is married and living with his wife who stated that she has no respect for him because of his promiscuity and that he is the alleged father of "many" illegitimate children.

2. A 34-year old mother of seven children fathered by three different men had concealed the birth of the seventh child from the PAD for 3 years through fear of being removed from the ADC Program. The father of the seventh child had been living with the ADC mother until the time of the investigators' first visit to the home, although the ADC mother had professed to have terminated the relationship in September 1961 when he got into trouble with the police. The ADC mother stated to the investigators that she realized that she had violated agency regulations. She stated further that the man involved presumably had returned to his wife's home after the investigation of this case had commenced. This ADC mother had been receiving assistance payments since May 1957 for herself and five of her seven children. These payments amounted to $221 a month at the time they were discontinued. One of these five children, who was 16 years old, was not in regular school attendance having been absent 29 days between January 29 and April 11, 1962.

3. A 28-year old mother of five children told the investigators that she wished to withdraw from the ADC program, upon being found with a man in her bedroom. The investigators did not accept her offer of withdrawal since it was made during distress occasioned by being found in an embarrassing situation. The investigators, during the next few days after the first home visit, observed different men entering the home. The mother, during a subsequent visit by the investigators, repeated her request to withdraw from the program. Her request was accepted, and the investigation was terminated. She had been receiving assistance payments since January 1960, and at the time of their discontinuance the payments were at the rate of $197 a month.

Cases ineligible for other reasons—Resources undeterminable

Appendix VII to this report lists 11 cases where the recipients were considered to be ineligible because the caretaker-relative either was unable or was unwilling to divulge information relating to income and other resources that apparently were available to the assistance unit. In two of the cases, an additional ineligibility finding was disclosed; namely, the presence of a man in the home whose relationship to the family could not be definitely established but who constituted an available resource. Final determination of eligibility has been withheld in two cases pending the outcome of appeal hearings.

In each of 39 additional cases, the resources available to the assistance unit also could not be determined. These cases have been classified by other ineligibility findings considered to be more significant reasons for considering the recipients to be ineligible for assistance. Thus, the finding of undeterminable resources was disclosed in 50 cases.

Details of illustrative cases in which this finding was disclosed follow:

1. A 44-year-old ADC mother of four children, two of whom were fathered by men other than her husband, had been receiving monthly assistance payments since January 1956, the latest payments being $205 a month. The mother had represented to the PAD and to the investigators that she had no other resources. However the investigation disclosed that she had earnings of about $20 a week from caring for children and had received about $10 a week from a "boy friend" during the period from September 1959 to July 1960 for the purchase of a television set which cost $419.90. When apprised of these findings, she acknowledged that they were correct. The investigation also disclosed some evidence of other earnings from laundry work, caring for a woman convalescing from a hospitalization, and caring for other children.

2. A 25-year-old ADC mother had been receiving assistance payments since December 1959 for herself and two of her three children to augment payments of $65 a month which she was supposed to receive from her absent husband. The latest of these payments amounted to $76 a month. Notwithstanding the lack of regular support from her husband, as evidenced by a court order of commitment for back payments, totaling $465, in September 1961 and by court records showing payments to her of only $450 during the period from March 1961 through April 1962, she was living in a two-bedroom, well-furnished apartment. The furnishings included a three-speed record player, a cabinet model television set, two telephones, a typewriter, and a radio. Evidence was obtained that she had received contributions from various members of her family which had not been reported to the PAD.

3. A 32-year-old ADC mother of six children, five of whom were included in the assistance unit, telephoned the PAD to state that the investigators had been to her home and that she wished to withdraw from the ADC program. She had previously represented to the PAD that her husband was the father of four of her six children and that the other two children had been fathered by two other men.

The investigation disclosed that she was again pregnant. She told the investigators that a fourth man was the father of the expected child. The investigation also disclosed that she received irregular contributions for the support of the children from two of the three fathers. When pressed for information concerning the amounts of the contributions and the identity of the fourth man, she announced her intention to withdraw from the ADC program. Therefore no further inquiry was made to develop information as to the resources apparently available to her, or as to her employment, evidence of which was also present.

This ADC mother had been receiving assistance payments since December 1960, the latest payments being $109 a month.

Living arrangements not clarified

Appendix VII to this report lists 11 cases where the recipients were considered to be ineligible for financial assistance because the existing living arrangements could not be clarified. In 7 of the cases other ineligibility findings also were disclosed. In 13 other cases the living arrangements could not be clarified but the cases have been classified by other ineligibility findings which constituted more significant reasons for considering the recipients to be ineligible for assistance.

The cases included in this category are those where the basic or most significant findings disclosed was the presence in the home of persons whose relationship with the recipients could not be clearly established because of the caretaker-relative's conflicting or misleading statements to the investigators. The term "relationship" as here used includes relationships involving economic as well as personal and legal aspects. In one of the 11 cases the recipient was reinstated for continued assistance after appeal.

Details of cases illustrating situations constituting this type of ineligibility finding follow:

1. An ADC mother who had been receiving assistance payments for herself and one child since December 1960, was occupying the first floor of a dwelling in which the landlord was also living, without any definite separation of the living quarters and with the personal effects of the ADC mother intermingled with those of the landlord. Although the landlord claimed that his common-law wife lived with him, he would not furnish any corroborating information in support of that claim. He stated that he did not know where she worked or when she could be interviewed in the home. The rental receipts exhibited by the ADC mother appeared to be false since the pertinent information shown thereon differed from statements by the ADC mother and from statements by the landlord. The authenticity of the rental receipts could not be verified since the signatures thereon were purported to be those of the landlord's legal wife who has been absent from the home since December 1960. The lease agreement between the landlord and the rental agency, dated December 8, 1961, shows that the landlord claimed the occupants of the dwelling to be himself, his wife, and two children, although he has no children of his own living in the home. The assistance payments to this ADC mother amounted to $118 a month at the time they were discontinued.

2. An ADC mother who had been receiving $145 a month on behalf of herself and four children had been receiving assistance since July 1953. Living with her in the home were her four adult children with their children, a living arrangement apparently unknown to the PAD. The adult children appeared to be employable and, to some extent, were employed. Efforts to clarify the living arrangements and to determine the extent to which her adult children were contributing to the support of the household were nullified by the conflicting statements of the ADC mother; her refusal to answer some quesions; her differing answers to other questions; and, in some instances, her misrepresentation of facts. Also, it appeared that the mother may be employable since all her minor children were in regular attendance at school.

ADC parent employed

Appendix VII lists three cases in which the ADC mother was determined to be employed full time and to have an adequate child care plan.

Illustrative of these cases is one where the mother of three illegitimate children, whose application for financial assistance was approved in August 1961, had been receiving assistance payments of $119 a month. At the time she applied for assistance, she was considered to be unemployable because she supposedly lacked an adequate child care plan. Although she had indicated on her application that she had been employed, the extent of her employment apparently had not been determined by the social worker. The investigation disclosed that she had been working full time as a domestic for the same employer continuously since 1959, except for one month in August 1961, when her youngest child was born. Since her mother, her 18-year-old brother, and her 14-year-old sister lived with her and she had been employed, it was apparent that she was not in lack of an adequate child care plan.

ADC parent employable

Appendix VII lists 29 cases where the ADC mother or, in some cases, the ADC father, who was supposedly incapacitated, was considered to be employable under the criteria set forth in the PAD Manual. In one of these cases the recipient appealed the ineligibility determination and was reinstated after a hearing on the appeal.

The following cases illustrate the findings leading to the conclusion in these cases.

1. A 45-year-old mother had been receiving assistance payments since August 1961 for the benefit of herself and three children. The investigation disclosed that there was no evidence that the mother was incapacitated and therefore unemployable. Also, she apparently had an adequate child care plan since an unmarried daughter who lived with her was unemployed, was not a member of the assistance unit, and who made no contribution to the maintenance of the household, was available to provide child care. At the time her assistance payments were discontinued she was receiving $172 a month.

2. A 37-year-old mother of three children had been receiving assistance payments of $105 a month, although she appeared to be employable under the PAD standards, and had been earning $12.50 a week in part-time employment. She stated to the investigators that she was doing all right on welfare relief and would not return to full-time employment unless she could make "big money." She also had been receiving undeterminable amounts from a "boy friend" with whom she admitted to have been carrying on a conjugal relationship. The "boy friend" admitted to helping the family by providing food and personal services and a new Hi-Fi record player. The investigation further disclosed that on applications for credit he has shown the ADC mother to be his wife. Hospital records show that at various times the ADC mother has stated her address to be that of the "boy friend." She had been receiving assistance payments since March 1954.

3. An ADC mother of eight children, four of whom were fathered by two men other than her husband, had been receiving assistance payments since July 1960, although she apparently is employable since she has been employed part time and, for short periods, full time. She informed the investigators that it would be foolish for her to work because she would lose the welfare payment and that it would be too hard for her to work outside the home and also do the work in the home. Her latest assistance payments amounted to $255 a month.

This ADC mother, before being approved by the PAD as eligible for ADC assistance, had been receiving assistance from the Volunteers of America. This assistance was discontinued when it became known that she was living with a man other than her husband. The investigation disclosed that she has been employed for varying periods as a telephone operator, PBX operator, waitress, and collector. In the latter employment she earned about $40 a week during December 1961. Her employer stated that if she obtained a driver's license she could be employed full time and become self-supporting. The mother admitted that she had two firm job offers during 1962 which she declined for the reasons stated above.

4. A 26-year-old ADC mother of five children had been receiving assistance payments since March 1960 for herself and three of her children; her other two children are under custody of the Child Welfare Division because of her claim that she is too "weak" to care for five children. She appeared to be physically able to work and admitted that she is. Also, it appeared that the lack of a child care plan should not prevent her from working inasmuch as it had not precluded her from being away from her home for entire nights at which times she either had had her children cared for by a neighbor or had left them unattended. She apparently has undisclosed resources as evidenced by the fact that she lives beyond the means afforded through her assistance payments. She acknowledged that she had relations with a man but contended that such relations were indulged in outside the home with a certain man whom she identified. The investigators, after three home visits and four other visits when they either were not admitted or could not interview the ADC mother because she was absent, and after a surveillance of the home at seven different times to detect arrivals and departures of persons, on being admitted early on a Sunday morning found a man in the ADC mother's bed. The ADC mother represented the man to be her brother but eventually admitted that he was the man she had previously acknowledged as having had relations with. The man was determined to be an employee of the Department of Public Welfare. At the time the assistance payments were discontinued they amounted to $132 a month.

5. A 25-year-old mother of four children, two of whom were fathered by two men other than her husband, had been receiving assistance payments since October 1956, the latest being $181 a month. Upon the investigator's first visit to the home, the mother admitted that she was employable, stated that she did not want investigators coming to her home, and voluntarily signed a statement requesting withdrawal from the ADC assistance program. After she signed the withdrawal statement she said:

"Now I can have all the men I want in my home and you men can't do a thing about it."

No eligible child in the home

In appendix VII, four cases are listed where no eligible child was found in the home. Also, in one of the cases it was impossible to clarify the living arrangements.

The following cases illustrate the situations in which this finding was disclosed.

1. An ADC mother with one minor child had been receiving assistance pay since December 1948, the latest payments being $88 a month. However, it was determined that the child was over 16 years of age and was no longer eligible for assistance since she had been officially removed from the rolls of the school she was supposedly attending.

Also living in the ADC mother's home was another daughter and her five children and a man who was the father of the youngest of these children. This daughter had also been receiving ADC assistance payments on behalf of herself and the five children. Although the case was not one of the cases included in the investigation sample, the recipients also were determined by the PAD to be ineligible for assistance on the basis of information disclosed during the investigation.

2. An ADC mother of one child had been receiving assistance payments since September 1953, the latest payments being $118 a month. Since August 1961, the child has been living and attending school in New York.

Refusal to cooperate

Listed in appendix VII are eight cases where the recipients were considered to be ineligible because the ADC mothers refused to cooperate with the investigators in their efforts to determine the facts with respect to the recipients' deprivation of parental support or care or with respect to the need for financial assistance. In six of the eight cases, additional ineligibility findings were present. In five additional cases, a refusal to cooperate was present but the recipients were considered to be ineligible for other reasons deemed to be more significant. Thus, the findings of refusal to cooperate existed in 13 cases.

Illustrative cases are:

1. An ADC mother of three children had been receiving assistance payments since November 1959. During the investigation of her case she submitted a statement in which she indicated her wish to withdraw from the Public Assistance Program because she did not want investigators coming to her home nor want to answer any questions about her business or household arrangements.

Prior to the time she submitted that statement, the investigators had disclosed certain facts which apparently were unknown to the PAD. These facts are:

a. The mother of the ADC mother was living in the home.

b. The ADC mother was paying $100 a month rent as opposed to $65 which she formerly had been paying at another address, but was receiving $50 a month from a tenant.

c. Numerous articles of men's clothing were found in a hall closet opposite the ADC mother's bedroom.

d. The ADC mother was working 4 days a week as opposed to the 2 days a week she had represented to PAD.

e. Her "absent" husband lives directly across the street from her home.

The ADC mother failed to give satisfactory explanations concerning the articles of men's clothing found in her home, or the manner of acquiring two TV sets and two refrigerators also found in the home.

The PAD has determined that overpayments of $1,400 have been made and has referred the case to the Office of Investigations and Collections for recovery of the overpayments. At the time the assistance payments were discontinued, they amounted to $108 a month.

2. An ADC mother who had been receiving assistance payments since December 1958 on behalf of herself and two children admitted to investigators that she had been carrying on an affair with a man whom she has known for about 20 years and hopes to marry. Despite the frequency of her relationships with this man, which she states occurs about every week end, she claimed she was unable to provide any information concerning him which would enable investigators to determine the extent of resources available through him. The assistance payments amounted to $142 a month at the time they were discontinued.

Miscellaneous

Listed in appendix VII are six cases which were considered to be ineligible because of findings other than those discussed hereinbefore.

These findings are:

1. A separation of convenience to enable the ADC mother to obtain assistance, rather than a real dissociation of the husband from the family and deprivation of the children of parental support.

2. The presence of coin-operated machines in the home as a source of income, the amount of which could not be ascertained.

3. An employable husband willing to return to the home but not permitted to do so by the ADC mother.

4. The unemployability of ADC mother's husband not established.

5. The failure of a returned husband of an ADC mother to register with the United States Employment Service.

Cases closed on the basis of findings disclosed subsequent to the investigation

Attached as appendix VIII is a list of eight cases in which the PAD determined that the recipients were ineligible, although the investigation of these cases did not disclose any information indicating ineligibility. However, the records pertaining to seven of these cases show that PAD's determination of ineligibility was based on events occurring subsequent to the investigation and that the determinations were proper under the circumstances involved in each case. The remaining case on this list was determined by PAD to be ineligible on the basis of findings disclosed by the investigation which in our opinion did not conclusively demonstrate ineligibility. However, we are not in a position to say the action was improper since a judgment factor was involved.

POLICE RECORDS OF ADULTS INVOLVED IN CASES INVESTIGATIONS

Incident to the investigation of the eligibility of recipients of financial assistance under the ADC program, we requested the Metropolitan Police Department, District of Columbia Government, to conduct a name file search of the police records to ascertain the police record, if any, of the adult persons involved in 130 of the cases determined by the PAD to be ineligible. The information on four cases was not requested through inadvertence.

Following is a summary of the results of this record search, classifying the males involved into two categories: one, those men whose names appeared on case records as the husbands of the ADC mothers and the other, those men otherwise identified with the cases:

ADC mothers:	
Has an arrest record	31
Has no arrest record	99
No record check made through inadvertence.	4
Total	134
Males:	
Husbands of ADC mothers:	
Has an arrest record	42
Has no arrest record	11
Subtotal	53
Other than husbands of ADC mothers:	
Has an arrest record	40
Has no arrest record	18
Information insufficient to obtain record	7
Subtotal	65
Total	118

The records furnished by the Metropolitan Police Department show that, of the 31 mothers who have police records, 21 had been arrested once, 8 had been arrested twice, 1 had been arrested 3 times, and 1 had been arrested 6 times. The charges included having an unleashed dog, drunkenness, disorderliness, stealing Government checks, and assault with a deadly weapon.

The records showed that 42 of the ADC mothers' husbands had been arrested a total of 358 times. Of the 42 men, 14 had a single arrest, 1 had 2 arrests, 3 had 3 arrests, 2 had 4 arrests, and 22 had 5 or more arrests with 3 of this group each having from 31 to 41 arrests. The records for the 40 other males involved in the cases showed a total of 247 arrests. Of these 40 men, 7 had a single arrest, 4 had 2 arrests, 2 had 3 arrests, 4 had 4 arrests, and 23 had 5 or more arrests with 1 of this group having 29 arrests.

The charges in the cases of both groups of men included drunkenness, disorderliness, housebreaking, robbery, grand larceny, assault with a deadly weapon, manslaughter, and homicide.

PLACEMENT OF CHILDREN IN JUNIOR VILLAGE RESULTING FROM CASES CLOSED SUBSEQUENT TO INVESTIGATION

At our request the DPW made a check of the Child Welfare Division (CWD) files to determine the number of children that had been placed in Junior Village because of the discontinuance of financial assistance as a result of the ineligibility determinations.

The Director, DPW, informed us by letter dated June 13, 1962, that, while the CWD had given attention to the children in 28 of the cases investigated, in only 4 of the cases had any children been placed in Junior Village as a result of the investigation. He stated that, in the other 24 cases, some children had been committed to the DPW as delinquents and had been placed by the CWD in Junior Village, private institutions, or foster homes but that such actions were not attributable to the investigation. The data submitted by the Director's letter showed that as of June 1, 1962, 16 children were involved in the four cases, that in two of the cases involving 5 children a question exists as to whether the family is actually destitute, and that further investigation by the Office of Investigations and Collections is warranted. Data pertaining to the four cases, as reported to us by the Director, is itemized below.

Case 1—From CWD records

Case opened on May 16, 1962, as the family was destitute. Woman's Bureau placed two of the children in Junior Village on May 15, 1962, and CWD placed the other child in Junior Village on May 16, 1962. All three children remain there.

Case 2—From CWD records

Case opened on May 10, 1962, by request of the mother who was referred by the Woman's Bureau because the mother was homeless. Two children were placed in Junior Village on May 10, 1962, and remain there.

Case 3—From PAD records

Three children were placed in Junior Village on May 1, 1962, as homeless. Referral was made by the Woman's Bureau. All these children remain there.

Case 4—From CWD records

Case opened on March 15, 1962, by request of the mother who was referred by the PAD. Six children were placed in Junior Village on March 16, 1962. Two children were placed in Junior Village on March 19, 1962. All eight children remain there.

In case 1 above the recipients were considered ineligible because the ADC mother was found to have been employed for the past 3 years. She was initially determined as qualified for assistance for the reason that she lacked a child care plan, notwithstanding the fact that she had worked for the same employer since 1959. Apparently this employment record was concealed from the social worker, as was the whereabouts of the father of her two youngest children.

In case 2 above the ADC mother was considered to be ineligible because she was continuing a relationship with the father of her children. It was determined that he was unemployed. Although she had received a surplus food certificate, she had not picked up any surplus food since December 1961.

In case 3 above the ADC mother was determined to be living with a man in relationship similar to that of husband and wife. The man was unemployed and evidence was that he did not contribute to the household upkeep. The mother was 3 months in arrears in her rent and said she had no intention of paying it, although she first displayed what proved to be spurious rent receipts. The children were placed in Junior Village after the mother had been arrested for fighting in the street. They had been found unattended in the home on two different occasions by investigators.

In case 4 above the recipients were considered ineligible because the absence of the father of five of the children was one of convenience and not a clear dissociation from the family. This man is being sought by the police as a suspect in a holdup, having been identified by the victim. This fact may account for his absence since he was determined to have been in the home a few days before the initial visit by investigators.

EVIDENCE OF BAD FAITH ON PART OF ADC MOTHERS

The investigation definitely disclosed that reliance cannot be placed on the ADC mothers to reveal the actual conditions or circumstances which have a bearing on the recipients' eligibility for financial assistance. A specific review was made of 85 of the cases closed by the PAD subsequent to the investigation to determine the number of instances in those cases where the mothers had misrepresented facts or attempted to conceal existing conditions or situations. The review disclosed (1) 11 cases where a man was found hiding in the ADC mother's house—in the bedroom, sometimes under the bed; in a closet; or in the bathroom—or attempting to flee by the back door to evade questioning by investigators and (2) 8 cases of gross misrepresentation of information vital to determining the recipients' eligibility. Illustrative of the type of misrepresentation in these cases are: four cases where the ADC mother falsely identified the man found in the house as a relative or gave information concerning the man which further investigation proved to be false, and four cases where the ADC mother supplied rent receipts or other documents which proved to contain false information. In several of the latter cases there appeared to be collusion on the part of others to assist the ADC mother in her attempts to misrepresent her actual living conditions or circumstances.

We believe that the foregoing instances evidence that ADC mothers are obtaining and attempting to continue to obtain financial assistance for recipients when they are aware that disclosure of actual living conditions or circumstances to the PAD would reveal that they are not entitled to receive further financial assistance.

USE BY PAD OF CODE REASONS FOR CLOSING CASES

We have reviewed the "Code reasons for closing cases" which have been assigned by the PAD to the 127 cases closed as of June 25, 1962, on the basis of ineligibility findings disclosed by the investigation. In our opinion the stated code reasons do not always reflect the actual reasons for terminating assistance and distort any statistical data which is based thereon.

Section 624.500 of the PAD Manual provides that the "classification of reasons for closing cases should reflect events that lead to ineligibility with respect to need and the resulting discontinuance of assistance" and states that the codes used are "in conformity with the classification" issued by the Social Security Administration. These reasons classify cases into major groups as follows:

1. Those closed because of death.
2. Those no longer eligible with respect to need.
3. Those no longer meeting eligibility requirements other than need.
4. Those transferred to other assistance programs.
5. Those closed for other reasons.

Code number 00 is to be assigned to cases closed because of death, 01 to 54 to cases no longer eligible with respect to need, 71 to 79 to cases no longer meeting eligibility requirements other than need, and 90 to 94 to cases transferred to other welfare programs. Code numbers 54, 79, and 94 are assigned to the general classification of "other" within the second, third, and fourth major groups. Where more than one reason exists for closing a case, the primary code reason is to be assigned.

Our review disclosed that, in 75 of the 127 cases closed, the assigned code reasons for closing the cases were not compatible with what we considered to be the primary reasons for ineligibility. For example, code 79 is required to be used when a case is closed because an eligibility requirement other than need, which is not specifically listed in codes 71–8, is no longer met. The PAD classified 62 of the 127 cases under code 79, whereas, in our opinion, only 23 should have been so classified. A more meaningful classification in the remaining 39 cases would have been as follows:

Code:	*Number of cases*
04—ADC mother employed	1
11—Return of absent employed father	10
74—Return of absent employable father	7
73—Parent no longer incapacitated	9
72—Refusal to comply with eligibility requirements	3
94—Unable to determine resources—extent of need undeterminable	9
Total	39

On the other hand, five cases classified under other codes, in our opinion, should have been classified under code 79.

Another example of this situation relates to nine cases which PAD classified under code 90 (voluntary withdrawal when reason for such withdrawal is not known) whereas a more meaningful classification would have placed them in code classifications as follows:

Code:	*Number of cases*
11—Return of absent employed father	1
74—Return of absent employable father	1
73—Parent no longer incapacitated	1
72—Refusal to comply with eligibility requirements	1
79—No continued absence established	2
94—Other—unable to determine resources—extent of need undeterminable	3

It is significant to note that no code reason is prescribed for those cases closed because a recipient was improperly receiving aid. The code reasons provided imply that the changed circumstances in the recipients' situations arose at a time coincident with the closing of the case. We believe that a code reason should be provided for use in those cases that are closed because the recipient had been improperly receiving assistance. In this way, the cases closed because of improper receipt of assistance could be distinguished from those closed because of changes in recipients' conditions or circumstances.

(At this point, Mr. BREWSTER took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

ANIMAL DRUG AND FEED BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have requested that hearings be held on the proposed animal drug amendments embodied in H.R. 16474. I have requested hearings because these amendments raise fundamental issues of Federal-State relations in a critical area involving questions of sound agricultural economics and efficient administration of health laws in the public interest.

It is clear from the representations made to me that the highly organized drug industry wants this bill rushed through the Senate in the closing hours of this session even though they claim that the proposed amendments constitute nothing more than a codification of existing law and give the Food and Drug Administration no authority that it does not already have.

It is abundantly clear that the public interest does not require that this bill be adopted without a hearing.

All I am asking for is a hearing. May I say that the majority of the members of the committee support my position that there should be hearings.

There is no consideration of public health that requires adoption of this bill. There is no emergency of any sort requiring action at this time. The proponents of the bill agree—they, in fact, contend—that it gives the Food and Drug Administration no power that it does not already have.

Although it is clear that the organized drug industry wants the bill passed, it is not clear that State officials who share responsibility in this area with the Food and Drug Administration want the bill. Indeed, although they have learned of its provisions only very recently, there is every indication that responsible State officials have grave doubts about the wisdom of the legislation and some have expressed the desire to testify against it—including, may I say, the Secretary of Agriculture of the State of Minnesota. I mean the State secretary, not the Federal Secretary.

Furthermore, it is not clear to me that the small feed manufacturers of the Nation support the bill, and there is some indication that the large feed manufacturers are opposed to sections of the bill pertaining to exports. Representatives of the small feed manufacturers have indicated that they will testify against the bill in its present form.

From my brief study of the bill—and my mind is open and will be determined by the evidence at the hearings—I must question whether it represents the best possible or even a constructive accommodation of State and Federal power in this very important area of agricultural economics and public health.

I have several objectives in mind in requesting hearings. First, the Senate owes it to those who are affected by the bill—the feed manufacturers, the State officials, and the farmer—support their requests for an opportunity to be heard.

Second, I want to make sure that the public interest—the interests of those other than the major producers in the regulated industry and the Federal regulators—is fully protected.

Finally, I want to determine whether it is actually necessary for the Federal Government to police minutely the operations of small feed manufacturers and to preempt control of both interstate and intrastate commerce in a field which has traditionally been regulated by the States and where a major portion of the commerce is exclusively intrastate.

In my judgment, there is a possibility that investigation will show that the State feed control officials are in a better position to supervise the performance of feed mills operating within their borders than is the Food and Drug Administration. I am informed that the Public Administration Services report prepared by the Public Administrations Services at the request of the Food and Drug Administration has recommended that the Food and Drug Administration not undertake to preempt this area of public health control but should instead work out a basis of constructive cooperation with the existing State regulatory agencies.

This bill would render State control pointless by requiring the feed mills to obtain from the Food and Drug Administration approval of every feed formulation containing a new animal drug apparently on the assumption that the feed mill is incompetent to follow the instructions for use of the drug which are stipulated by the Food and Drug Administration. I do not want to support this present bill, which closes the door on the adoption of the Public Administrations Services' report recommendation, until I am convinced that all-pervasive Federal control is the only answer to this problem.

Mr. President, the more I learn about this proposed legislation, the more I question the necessity for it, and question its effect on competition in the drug and feed business as well as the effect it will have on the existing pattern of State and Federal control in this area of public health. In fact, I am very much concerned as to whether, behind the scenes, there is not an attempt on the part of big feed companies to seek further monopolistic control of the processing of animal feed by insisting upon the procedures that would flow from this bill, to enhance their competitive advantages and force out of business more and more of the small feed mills.

It has been said that everything which this legislation purports to do to facilitate the approval of new animal drugs, and to accord such drugs separate recognition distinctive from human drugs, has already been accomplished by administrative changes within the Food and Drug Administration. If the proponents of this legislation have, by advocating these changes by congressional action, actually brought them about by administrative action, then they deserve to be commended; but why should Congress confirm by statute what has been done administratively?

Indeed, Mr. President, it appears that the only new feature of this bill is that it would attempt to replace State supervision of feed mills with Federal control and duplicate the work of State administrative agencies, many of which were in existence long before the Food and Drug Administration existed. These State agencies, let me say, are probably the only effective inspection agencies operating in this field of public health.

The matter of the necessity for supplemental new drug applications covering feed formulations should be left within the discretion of the Food and Drug Administration. In my judgment, this is a discretionary power that should be exercised with great restraint.

It is my fear that this bill in its present form plays into the hands of the big companies, and works to the disadvantages of the small mill operators. All of this will produce no net gain in public health standards, because the feed control offices of the 50 States, with some help from Federal Government agencies, are entirely competent to regulate the manufacture of feed, now, as they have in the past.

These are some of the considerations which, in addition to a basic concern for orderly procedure, have led me to insist that hearings be held on these so-called new animal drug amendments early in the next session of Congress. I have filed with the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I am a member, and which has jurisdiction over the subject matter in the Senate, a list of witnesses who have already manifested a desire to testify against the bill next year.

It could be that the testimony will clear up these points to my satisfaction, and if so, I shall support the bill. But the place for these issues to be clarified is in a public hearing.

TITLE I—ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT PROJECTS, FISCAL YEAR 1966

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Office of Education, at the request of my subcommittee, has prepared a series of tables showing the number of participating schools by State in projects financed under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in fiscal year 1966.

The tables also set forth the number of children participating in one or more projects. It is my hope that a committee print of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will be issued in December which will contain information regarding the number of participating schools in each of the eligible school districts, in each of the States, in a format similar to the second table where this is set forth for the State of Oregon.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the tables to which I have alluded be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I.—*Number of participating schools and children under title I, Public Law 89–10, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, fiscal year 1966*

State	Number of participating—	
	Schools [1]	Children [2]
United States and outlying areas	58,155	13,851,317
50 States and the District of Columbia	56,013	13,222,905
Alabama	1,411	320,049
Alaska	140	28,971
Arizona	411	115,443
Arkansas	1,037	153,213
California	3,315	1,295,790
Colorado	594	46,371
Connecticut	371	67,078
Delaware	95	8,250
District of Columbia	77	25,329
Florida	1,138	384,232
Georgia	1,081	385,542
Hawaii	195	76,492
Idaho	456	74,902
Illinois	2,573	602,402
Indiana	1,695	117,540
Iowa	1,536	165,101
Kansas	1,380	188,875
Kentucky	1,480	243,539
Louisiana	665	269,108
Maine	693	52,080
Maryland	227	85,475
Massachusetts	664	99,398
Michigan	2,403	1,031,850
Minnesota	1,527	278,684
Mississippi	481	489,151
Missouri	1,408	405,429
Montana	690	32,096
Nebraska	648	53,922
50 States and the District of Columbia—Con.		
Nevada	93	10,901
New Hampshire	294	14,869
New Jersey	1,550	139,802
New Mexico	500	90,248
New York	3,903	1,173,840
North Carolina	1,243	334,879
North Dakota	461	40,030
Ohio	2,416	565,066
Oklahoma	1,761	172,768
Oregon	738	97,479
Pennsylvania	3,132	1,067,348
Rhode Island	132	13,566
South Carolina	588	505,312
South Dakota	775	47,287
Tennessee	1,533	429,971
Texas	2,865	414,431
Utah	287	63,588
Vermont	360	16,058
Virginia	964	159,038
Washington	1,137	335,606
West Virginia	1,355	189,827
Wisconsin	1,403	143,161
Wyoming	123	11,518
Outlying areas	2,142	628,412
Trust Territory	64	16,378
Guam	25	38,203
Puerto Rico	2,027	561,407
Virgin Islands	26	12,424

[1] Number of participating schools: In most cases this represents an unduplicated count of schools in the school districts with children in title I projects.

[2] Number of participants: This represents a duplicated count of participants since participation counts were obtained on a project basis.

TABLE II

State and local education agency	Number of participating schools	Number of participating children
OREGON		
Baker Co Sch Dist 30-J	4	58
Huntington SD 16 Baker	1	84
Pine Eagle SD 61 Halfway	2	106
Baker Co SD 5J	2	122
Benton Co SD 7J	2	26
Bell Fountain SD 23 Monroe	1	26
Fir Grove SD 74 Benton	1	5
Corvallis SD 509J	15	1,610
Benton Co SD 17J	5	132
Lake Oswego SD 7	1	185
Clackamas Co SD 1	3	293
Canby Union HS D 1	1	20
Sandy Union HS D 2	1	216
West Linn SD 3	2	121
Molalla Union HS D	1	12
Milwaukie Un HS D 5	2	165
Welches Elem SD 13 Wemme	1	47
Damascus Un Elem SD 26	1	19
Concord SD 28 Milwaukie	2	45
Carus SD 29 Oregon City	1	10
Molalla Grade SD 35	1	41
Boring Grade SD 44	1	21
Bull Run Dist 45 Sandy	1	13
Clackamas Co SD 46	1	48
Colton SD 53	1	14
Clackamas Co SD 62	9	946
Clackamas Co SD 64	3	94
Butte Creek SD 67 Mt Angel	1	21
Mulino SD 84	1	25
Canby Elem SD 86C	1	159
Rural Dell SD 92 Molalla	1	5
Cottrell Grade SD 107 Boring	1	26
Estacada Elem SD 108	2	140
Redland Elem SD Oregon City	1	31
Three Lynx SD 123 Estacada	1	10
Ninety-One SD 91 Hubbard	1	22
Union HS D 1 Seaside	1	42
School Dist 1C Astoria	4	120
Lewis & Clark 5 Astoria	1	135
Seaside Cons SD 10	2	67
Olney SD 11C Astoria	1	21
SD 15C Clatsop Co	1	60
Warrenton SD 30	3	89
Oakland Public Schs	2	134
Coos Co SD 41	4	911
Coos Co SD 8	7	214
Coos Co SD 9	7	1,398
Coos Co SD 13	6	625
Powers SD 31	2	172
Bandon SD 54	3	250
Crook Co SD	7	400
Gold Beach Union HS	1	24
SD 3C Gold Beach	2	123
Ophir SD 12	1	35
Brookings Barber SD 17C	2	241
Redmond Dist 2	4	240
Deschutes Co SD 3	1	31
Deschutes Co SD 5	1	22
Deschutes Co SD 6	3	46
Deschutes Co SD 24	1	13
Deschutes Co SD UHIJ	1	116
Admin SD 1 Deschutes Co	3	212
Douglas Co SD 4	3	1,760
Glide Co SD 12	4	152
Days Creek SD 15	3	56
Douglas Co SD 19	5	300
Camas Valley SD 21	3	51
Drain Pub SD 22	2	220
Douglas Co SD 32	1	52
Elkton Admin SD 34	2	52
Umpqua SD 45	1	46
Glendale Pub SD 77	2	221
Southern SD 130C	4	109
Goble Graded SD 20	1	26
Veronia SD 47J	4	112
Columbia Co Adm SD 502	6	274
Riddle Pub Schs Dist 70	2	184
Winston SD 116	5	462
Admin SD 116	3	44
Admin SD 3 Arlington	2	161
John Day Grade SD 3	2	195
Grant Co SD 4	2	30
Dayville SD 16J	2	25
Burns Elem SD 1	1	150
SD 17 Diamond	1	15
SD 30 Hines	1	272
Hood River Co SD 1R	8	476
Phoenix SD 4	2	144
Central Point SD 6	1	140
Eagle Point SD 9	1	25
Butte Falls SD 91	2	39
Jefferson Co Dist Pub S 4	2	58
Jefferson Co SD 509J	5	305
Josephine Co SD	11	323
SD 7 Grants Pass	6	286
Union HS Dist 2 Klamath	3	125
Klamath Co SD	6	1,926
Nestucca Un SD U3 Cloverdl	1	40
Lakeview SD 7	3	182
Paisley SD 11	1	30
Pleasant SD 1	3	150
Fern Ridge SD 28J	6	135
Sandridge 30C Shadd	1	4
Mapleton SD 32	2	29
Creswell Pub Adm Dist 40	3	276
Harris SD 46 Linn	1	5
Lane Co SD 69	6	383
Lowell SD 71	3	481
Lane Co SD 76	4	195
Siuslaw SD 97J Lane	5	174
Lane SD 4	9	2,474
Lane Co SD 19	7	407
So Lane SD 45J3	9	1,002
Lane Co SD 52	4	270
Lincoln Co SD	9	2,566
Lincoln Co Un H SD UHI	1	96
Albany Un HS D U8J	3	775
Sodaville El SD 13 Linn	1	24
Grand Prairie SD 14 Linn	1	157
Oak Creek SD 15 Albany	1	9
Knox Butte SD 19 Albany	1	21
Dever SD 20 Albany	1	18
Riverside Elem SD 24 Linn	1	29
McFarland Elem SD 25 Linn	1	24
Tangent Elem SD 26C	1	38
Mari Linn Elem SD 29J	1	53
Hamilton Crk Elem SD 33 Linn	1	92
Harrisburg Elem SD 42CJ	1	72
Sweet Home SD 55	8	225
Fairview SD 66 Linn	1	57
Lacomb Elem SD	1	43
Crowfoot SD 89C Linn	6	79
Scio SD 95C	2	185
Linn Co SD 102	1	25
Linn Co SD 110C	3	19

TABLE II—Continued

State and local education agency	Number of participating schools	Number of participating children
OREGON—continued		
Linn Co SD 124	1	16
Clover Ridge SD 136 Linn	1	18
Central Linn SCH Dist 552C	4	155
Lebanon Elem SD 16C	1	203
Linn Admin SD 129J	3	143
Malheur Co SD 1	1	9
Vale Union HS D U3	1	240
Ontario SD 8C	9	320
SD 15 Malheur Co	1	220
Malheur Co SD 26	3	432
Annex SD 29 Malheur	2	39
Malheur Co SD 42	1	114
Adrian SD 61	1	489
Harper SD 66	1	72
Gervais Un HS D 21	1	118
Marion Co SD 4C	1	661
Marion Co SD UH7J	1	362
Stayton Un H SD UH4J	1	56
Cascade H SD 5 Marion	2	289
Sublimity Elem SD	1	60
Aumsville SD 11C	1	94
Pioneer SD 13 Marion	1	18
Marion CO SD 14CJ	3	305
No Marion SD 15	3	204
Marion Co SD 20	1	57
SD 24J Marion Co	8	6.638
Victor Pt SD 42C Marion	1	14
St Paul SD 45	3	152
Marion Co SD 50	1	14
N Howell SD 51	1	18
Eldridge SD 60C Marion	1	29
W Stayton SD 16 Marion	1	78
Bethany SD 63C Marion	1	18
Scotts Mills G S Dist 73J	1	35
Stayton S D 77CJ	2	224
Turner Elem SD 79C	1	94
Mt Angel SD 91	1	49
Detroit SD 123J	2	46
Bethel Elem SD 125C	1	17
Buena Crest Elem SD Salem	1	20
Cloverdale SD 144C Turner	1	22
Central Howell SD 540C Marion	1	101
Marion Co SD 93C	1	24
Marion Co SD 103C	4	211
Monitor Elem SD Marion	1	26
Morrow Co SD R1	7	77
Parkrose SD 3 Portland	7	424
Gresham Elem SD 4	4	213
Reynolds SD 7 Troutdale	5	742
Multnomah Co SD 15-302Jt	1	74
Union HS D U2-20J Gresham	2	37
Rockwood SD 27 Portland	2	775
Lynch SD 28 Portland	3	429
Holbrook SD 38 Portland	1	16
Bonneville SD 46	1	18
Orient Gr SD 6300 Gresham	2	387
SD 1 Multnomah Co	32	35,296
David Douglas SD 40 Portland	6	942
Dallas SD 2	10	1,082
Central SD 13J Polk	1	669
Tillamook SD 9	3	60
Hebo Grd SD 13J	1	16
Cloverdale Grd SD 22	1	25
Neah Kah Nie SD 56 Rockaway	5	114
Umatilla Co SD 2R Pilot Rock	2	150
McCloughin Un H SD Umatilla	1	115
Tum A Lum SD 4 Umatilla	1	32
Umatilla Co SD 5R	1	14
Umatilla Co SD 6R	2	36
Umatilla Co SD 8R	5	310
Ferndale SD 10 Umatilla	1	31
Umatilla Co SD 13R	2	43
Pendleton SD 16R Umatilla	6	130
Umatilla SD 19R	2	66
Umatilla Co SD 29R	1	106
Milton Freewater SD 31	5	139
Union Co SD 1	5	265
Union SD 5	3	55
SD 8J No. Powder	2	30
Imbler SD 11	2	107
Union Co SD 15	2	32
Elgin SD 23	2	111
Wallowa SD 12	2	76
Enterprise SD 21	1	136
Chenowith SD 9 Wasco Co	4	294
Wasco Co SD 12	2	198
Wasco Co SD 10	1	54
Wasco Co SD 84	1	227
Tualatin Grade SD 1J	1	21
Washington Co SD 2	2	90
Banks Dist 13 Washington Co	2	167
Forest Grove Elem SD 15	2	270
Reedville Elem SD 29 Aloha	1	24
Gales Creek SD 30	1	53
Groner SD 39 Washington Co	1	30
Farmington VW Elem SD 88J	1	24
North Plains SD 70	1	128
Witch Hazel SD L79 Wash Co	1	34
Sherwood Grd SD 88J	1	30
Washington Co SD 7	2	30
Washington Co SD 48	11	979
Spray SD 1	2	40
Mitchell SD 55	2	43
Yamhill Co Un HS D 1	1	97
Amity Grd SD 4-45Jt	1	68
Dayton Pub SD 8	2	154
Carlton Elem SD 11	1	71
Yamhill Grade SD 16	1	66
Yamhill SD 29J	7	836
SD 30-44-63 Jt Yamhill	1	124
McMinnville Pub SD 40	5	236
Clatsop Co Sch Dist 37	1	45
Medford Sch Dist 549C	2	188
Dickey Prairie Sch 25	1	29
Albany Un HS D U-8J	3	173
Neah-Kah-NE SD 56 Rockaway	5	182
Banks Sch Dist 13	1	20
Gresham Un HS D U2-20	2	622
Sheridan Pub Schs	2	46
Union H Dist 3	2	[1] 88
Sch Dist 1 Jt Scappoose	4	[1] 1106
Clatskanie Grade Sch 5	5	[1] 83
Sch Dist U H I J Monroe	4	[1] 100
Josephine Co Sch Dist	2	[1] 665
Reedsport Dist U-13	4	[1] 365
Jackson Co Inter Ed Dist	5	[1] 1,573
Sch Dist 20 Harney Co	11	[1] 48
Union Lake Co Sch Dist 5	6	[1] 76
Lane Co Sch D1 79 Marcola	7	[1] 110
Tigard Elem Dist 23	7	[1] 218
Gaston Elem S D 511-555 Jt	2	[1] 35
Joseph District 6	3	[1] 63
Beaver Elem Sch Dist 8	2	[1] 38
Marion Co S D 4C	3	[1] 705
St Louis Elem Sc Dist 50	2	[1] 105
Evergreen Sch Dist 10	2	[1] 9
Total	738	97,479

---

[1] Cooperative projects with other schools. Only the originating school is given.

NATO AND THE REDUCTION OF AMERICAN FORCES IN EUROPE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the distinguished majority leader on his statesmanlike decision to withhold presentation of Senate Resolution 300, in deference to the administration's commitment to discuss the matter of NATO strategy and NATO force levels in formal negotiations with our British and German allies.

Senate Resolution 300, as originally worded, did, I believe, serve a positive purpose by letting our European allies know that there is widespread resentment over the failure of the NATO nations, with the exception of West Germany, Britain, and Turkey, to accept their fair share of the burden of the defense of Europe.

However, because I had serious misgivings about the wisdom of reducing our forces in Europe by unilateral action, I had planned to introduce another resolution underscoring the prime need for the reinvigoration of NATO and calling for a comprehensive study of all the problems confronting NATO. My resolution among other things stated:

> The re-invigoration of NATO, combined with improvements in the techniques of modern warfare, might well make it possible, with the full understanding of our allies, to effect a significant reduction of United States forces permanently stationed in Europe, without adversely affecting Western security, or the military-diplomatic balance in Europe, or our ability to meet our commitments under the North Atlantic Treaty.

Other Senators had agreed to cosponsor this resolution with me, and I was in the process of consulting with them when the decision was made to set up the negotiations which are now underway in Bonn.

Since this decision took care of my major concern about the unilateral implication of Senate Resolution 300, I decided to withhold presentation of my own resolution.

I think it appropriate to make this a matter of record.

We have now made it clear to our allies that we have no intention of acting unilaterally on the question of American forces in Europe. This is all to the good.

While I am speaking on the matter, there are a few other aspects of the situation I wish to comment on because they bear on the negotiations which get underway today.

I believe that Senate Resolution 300, as originally worded, failed to give due weight to some of the legitimate grievances which our NATO allies have against us. I note that the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, in a recent report on "The Crisis in NATO," said that—I quote:

> Our efforts to bring the other members of NATO into a meaningful partnership have been sporadic, inadequate, and marked by inconsistencies. We made unilateral declarations and entered into bilateral agreements instead of trying to arrive at joint decisions on issues which affect the security of the entire North Atlantic community. And we have devoted less than our best effort to the task of promoting the mutual understanding which is vital to the achievement of unity within the North Atlantic community.

The impression has been fostered by numerous writings and statements, including certain statements by administration spokesmen, that there has been a firm and irreversible normalization of relations between Western Europe and Communist Europe.

There has been no apparent normalization in the sense that the existence of NATO has for almost two decades now served as a deterrent to open Communist aggression in Europe. But if, through overcomplacency, we fail to take countermeasures to arrest the current erosion of NATO, we would also soon learn that the danger of Soviet aggression is not a thing of the past.

Those who have found comfort in the belief that Soviet policy has undergone significant moderation, would do well to read the speech of Mr. Sharaf Rashidov, the leader of the Soviet delegation to the Tricontinental Conference, which took place in Havana in January of this year. Mr. Rashidov said that:

> The Soviet delegation has arrived at this conference with the aim of giving all-around assistance to the unification of the anti-imperialist forces of the three continents in order to provide greater impetus to our common struggle against imperialism, colonialism, and neo-colonialism—led by the U.S. capitalists.

Said Mr. Rashidov further:

> The Soviet Union is supplying the fraternal people of Vietnam with the most modern weapons for meeting U.S. aggression. We are

> doing everything in order that the deliveries of Soviet military equipment—aircraft, rockets, artillery ammunition, and so on—will get into the hands of the Vietnamese freedom fighters as rapidly as possible.

Saluting the Communist-dominated guerrillas in South America, Mr. Rashidov declared:

> We express our fraternal solidarity with the armed struggle being waged by the Venezuelan, Peruvian, Colombian, and Guatemalan patriots for freedom against the stooges of imperialism.

Rashidov's statement led to vigorous protests by more than 20 Latin-American governments. It also led the Special Consultative Committee on Security of the Organization of American States to condemn Communist intervention and aggression and to describe the Havana Conference as "the most serious and dangerous threat that international communism has yet made against the inter-American system."

That the Soviet statements in Havana were no idle threats is attested to by the continuing campaign of terror and guerrilla action in the Americas and by the Kremlin's flagrant incitation of Syria's current confrontation with Israel.

It would be dangerous in the extreme to regard the present detente in Europe as a proof of Soviet moderation. What it means is simply that the existence of NATO has thus far made aggression in Europe an unacceptable risk for the Kremlin. Because of this, the Soviets have in recent years directed their energy to other areas of the world like Vietnam and Latin America and Africa where they can engage in subversion or support aggression without risking an open confrontation with Western powers. But we should ask ourselves why the Soviets continue to seek the dissolution of NATO through a thousand different artifices if they harbor no aggressive intention toward Western Europe.

NATO was created to contain Soviet aggression. The sacrifices necessary to maintain it can only be justified by the NATO governments on the grounds that the danger of Soviet aggression still exists. The tendency to minimize this danger bears a large portion of the responsibility for the erosion of NATO unity and morale. Conversely, a realistic acceptance of this continued danger is the essential first step in the rehabilitation of NATO.

The problems of NATO are too many and too complex to respond to any single remedy. But, among other things, it is clear that a solution for the problem of nuclear sharing in NATO will have to be found if the confidence of our allies is to be restored.

There has, in my opinion, been too much emphasis on sharing control of strategic weapons targeted against Soviet population centers. It is true that, even if a formula could be found for sharing control of such weapons, the so-called "two key" system would make it impossible for any NATO nation to let fly with strategic weapons without American concurrence. But despite this, it is possible to understand Soviet apprehensions about any dilution in American control of weapons capable of destroying all of the Soviet population centers.

It would be more realistic politically and more meaningful in a military sense if a formula could be found for sharing in the control of tactical nuclear weapons of stated maximum tonnage and stated maximum range, so that there could be no doubt about their clearly defensive nature.

Such a solution would fit in with the concept of a graduated response to Soviet aggression, while providing NATO with an effective means of meeting the contingency of aggression by superior Communist forces.

It would reduce Soviet fears of a thermonuclear incident, while the retention of the two-key system should satisfy them that none of our allies would be able unilaterally to trigger a tactical nuclear weapons incident along the East-West curtain.

I intend to speak on this matter at greater length when Congress convenes again, in a speech which I am captioning "Nuclear Sense and Nuclear Nonsense."

I raise these points for the purpose of illustrating some of the problems and complexities that confront us. This is not a situation in which we can jump at conclusions. On the contrary, any stand we take has to be based on the most careful and comprehensive study, carried out in consultation with our allies.

The North Atlantic Treaty has been a cornerstone of our security structure. It has effectively served as a shield against the contingency of Communist aggression in Europe.

Any further erosion of the NATO structure or of European confidence in NATO would seriously weaken the free world, diplomatically and militarily, and might reactivate the danger of Communist aggression in Europe.

Conversely, the reinvigoration of NATO would assure the maintenance of peace in Europe. By persuading the Communists that aggression will not be permitted to succeed and that their efforts to destroy NATO have been frustrated, it would encourage the trend toward a genuine normalization of relations in Europe.

Let us all hope that the conference which convenes today in Bonn will be able to find an answer to the many problems that now threaten NATO's existence.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ROBERTSON

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I wish to add just a few remarks to the well-deserved tributes already paid to my great friend and distinguished colleague from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

During my term here in the Senate I have found the senior Senator from Virginia to be always one to whom I could go for sound advice. He was one who could and would give thoughtful consideration to the problems of each day and who shared his thoughts with us all.

As chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee he has played a large part in much of the important business passed on by the Senate. We have all come to respect the chairman and the manner in which his committee has conducted itself.

As one who is also retiring I feel that I share with my friend, WILLIS ROBERTSON, some mutual regret at leaving the Senate. But in leaving he should remain confident in the knowledge of the great esteem with which he has been regarded by his colleagues and should know that his presence in the Senate will be greatly missed.

JOBS FOR PROGRESS, INC., AND PROJECT SER

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of a speech delivered recently by the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] concerning the private efforts of a group of Texans of Latin American descent to help solve the problems of Latin American people in Texas.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR TOWER

I wish to commend Jobs for Progress, Inc., a non-profit organization, chartered in Texas on February 8, 1966, by Mr. Alfred J. Hernandez, Mr. Augustin A. Fores, Mr. William D. Bonilla, and Mr. Gabino Sedillo, who besides being the incorporators, served as initial directors together with Mr. E. D. Cardiel, Sr., Mr. John J. Herrera, Mr. Alfonso G. Sanchez, Mr. Fermin Calderon, Mr. Rudolf Gonzalez, Mr. Manuel O. Santz, Mr. Louis Tellez, and Mr. Albert Pinon. Also worthy of commendation are Mr. Bob Ornelas, Mr. George Roybal, and Mr. Girard P. Clark, of the Department of Defense, who originated and drafted Project SER as the vehicle for Jobs for Progress, Inc.

I am enthusiastic over the entire package because as United States Senator for Texas, I represent a State that now has 2,000,000 citizens who bear Spanish surnames—20 percent of my State's population.

After careful consideration, I am of the opinion that Project SER, guided by many dedicated and altruistic Latin-American leaders, will go a long way toward solving the problems of my Latin-America friends, not only in Texas, but in the entire southwest, where the majority of our Latin-American population now lives.

The median education of my Latin-American constituents in Texas was around 6.1 years in 1960; the median family income for Latin-American families in my State was $2,029 in 1959; the dependency ratio (those under 15 years of age and those over 65) was 93.3 out of 100 in 1960; and 13.7 percent of the Latin-American families in Texas made less than $1,000 in 1960. I have been greatly concerned about these problems and have given careful consideration to possible solutions. Therefore, I am going on record today to state my belief that it takes a Latin-American to understand and feel the problems of the Latin-American community. I am pleased that this is one of the things Project SER advocates. I am pleased, too, with the way Project SER works on the local level through the local Latin organizations. But most of all, I am pleased because I feel that Project SER and the Latin-American leaders involved at last have a vehicle to begin solving the problems of the large Latin-American population of my State. I stand ready to consider every problem and help wherever I can.

In extending my best wishes to Project SER, my greatest hopes are that this unique program will succeed, and that it can be operated on a bi-partisan basis free of political overtones, under responsible management, so that it can do the work it was designed to do efficiently and fruitfully.

SENATOR SIMPSON OF WYOMING

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, it has been my privilege to serve with many fine men in the U.S. Senate. Many have made contributions to the Senate and their wise counsel has been helpful to me. But I do not know of any Member with whom I have served who, in such a short time, impressed his Senate colleagues as favorably as did our friend from Wyoming, the Honorable MILWARD SIMPSON.

Senator SIMPSON's honor, his high integrity, his courage, his understanding of the problems of government, and his unyielding loyalty to principle have all combined to rapidly make him one whose influence was felt here in the Senate. Further, that influence was rapidly becoming outstanding.

His personal life, his fine Christian ideals, his practical understanding of life, all lent strength to his influence to his fellow Senators as well as among all of those with whom he came in contact. It has been a privilege to me to observe directly the great esteem and respect he enjoys in his native State of Wyoming, whose people he loves and whose native soil has his great devotion.

I remember an inscription over a gateway at a sacred historical spot in our Nation which included these words:

> Enter this gateway in search of truth, the way of honor, and the will to work for men.

MILWARD SIMPSON has done exactly those things and the Senate, the State of Wyoming, our Nation, and his friends, are much better because of him.

I salute him and wish him and his charming wife many more years of happiness and usefulness, all of which they richly deserve.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ROSS BASS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am very sorry that our able and distinguished colleague from Tennessee, Senator ROSS BASS, will not join us when the 90th Congress convenes in January.

ROSS BASS and I have served together in both the House and the Senate, and we have sat next to each other in this Chamber for some months.

I have always thought that ROSS BASS was a fitting and worthy successor to the great Estes Kefauver.

In the Senate these two shared and worked hard for similar goals and ideals, based on a fair deal for the average man and for the underprivileged. Both held the firm conviction that equal rights for all means just that, regardless of a person's race, religion or ethnic origin and both had an inherent dislike for the large, the impersonal and the selfish whether this be found in a business, an institution or a person.

Even though ROSS BASS has been a Member of the Senate for only 3 years, he has already established himself as one of our leading Senate spokesmen for progressive causes and legislation.

I shall miss Senator BASS as a seatmate, as a colleague, as a holder of many beliefs and views similar to mine, and as an outstanding and sincere person.

And I wish him well in the future, as he turns his ability, energy and good will to other equally challenging endeavors.

COMPENSATION TO INNOCENT VICTIMS OF VIOLENT CRIMES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, much comment has been made since introduction in 1965 of my bill, S. 2155, to create a Federal Violent Crimes Compensation Commission to consider the claims of those injured by criminal violence.

The need for such legislation is illustrated by the increasing discussion of this approach to a neglected subject in our usual treatments of the problem of criminal violence—the status of the victim of the crime.

Serious comment has come from the legal community in such publications as the December 1965 Minnesota Law Review. Legislative action on similar programs has taken place in California and New York. Other States are considering such compensation. These further illustrate that this is an idea whose time has come.

Another indication of the interest engendered by this approach is its treatment in the national press. As an example of this, I ask unanimous consent to print at this point in the RECORD an article in the October 9, 1966, edition of Family Weekly by myself with Charles Remsberg, which is entitled "Should Crime Victims Be Paid?"

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD CRIME VICTIMS BE PAID?—MANY HELP THE CRIMINAL, BUT NO ONE AIDS THE MAN HE ATTACKS—THIS SENATOR PROPOSES WE GIVE A HAND TO AMERICA'S FORGOTTEN MINORITY

(By RALPH YARBOROUGH, U.S. Senator from Texas, with Charles Remsberg)

In recent months, more than 70 persons in a single state—Illinois—have been reduced from productive citizens to relief recipients by something that can befall any of us.

Through no fault of their own, they were victims of violent crimes which temporarily or permanently wiped out their savings, their jobs, and their future hopes.

Four years ago, for instance, George T. was attacked by three robbers as he headed home from his factory job. In the fight for his wallet, the bandits beat him and shoved him off a loading platform. He suffered head injuries that have since made it impossible for him to control his muscles—or to work!

Max K., a truck driver, was mercilessly beaten by a band of drunken teen-agers last October. Since then he has three times been hospitalized for recurring internal injuries, has run up more than $3,000 in medical debts, and has lost $350 in wages every month. His wife cannot work because she must care for their three small children.

Harold B. happened upon a street fight outside a tavern as he was shopping one evening. One of the fighters, apparently mistaking him for a fellow brawler, suddenly lunged at him and stabbed him in the head. Brain damage has claimed much of the sight of one eye and has left Harold paralyzed.

These startling cases, revealed in a survey by the Illinois Department of Public Aid, have their counterparts all across the nation. And for every victim who is completely impoverished by his encounter with crime, scores more are burdened with serious financial, psychological, and physical losses, simply because they happened to be in the wrong place at the wrong time.

Your chances of joining their ranks are increasing yearly. The rate of serious crime in this country is mushrooming six times faster than the population.

Collectively, these crime victims and their survivors constitute the largest forgotten minority in the U.S. Their attackers, if captured, often are defended by lawyers, examined by psychiatrists, and treated by physicians—all paid for by the state. If sent to prison, they are given everything from clothing to college educations without personal cost.

Yet their victims, whose live may have been turned to chaos by the crimes, are almost universally ignored.

If a man is injured in an industrial accident—even if his own negligence contributed to the mishap—he is eligible for financial awards under our workmen's compensation laws.

Yet the only way to collect reimbursement for medical bills, lost wages, or other expenses in a criminal case is to sue your attacker. Often his identity is unknown. And even when he is in custody, he rarely has assets with which to pay for the trouble he caused.

On one case I am familiar with, a man beaten and blinded by a robber was able to get a judgment against the assailant. But the thief, because of his own poverty, can pay such small weekly installments that the victim would have to live more than 400 years to collect the total due him!

Ever since I was a district judge in Texas 30 years ago, I have been disturbed by the unfair irony of this system. Now I think it is time for us to follow the pioneering lead of some other countries and extend a helping hand to these innocent victims of crime.

After all, our government demands that we go into the streets unarmed. We pay taxes for police protection. We realize, of course, that lawmen cannot possibly prevent all all crime. But as U.N. Ambassador Arthur Goldberg has pointed out: "The victim of a robbery or an assault has been denied the constitutionally guaranteed protection of the law in a very real sense, and society should assume some responsibility for making him whole."

In legislation I have introduced in the U.S. Senate, I offer a steppingstone toward this goal.

My bill calls for the creation of a Violent Crimes Compensation Commission. This three-man tribunal, appointed by the President and sitting in Washington, would be empowered to award Federal funds to cover the medical expenses, pain and suffering, lost wages, and decreased earning power inflicted on innocent citizens by crimes of violence.

A victim—or, in the case of murder, the victim's family—would be expected to file proof of his injuries and costs within two years of the crime. Applications would be checked out by an investigative staff, much as insurance claims are verified. Cases of assault, mayhem, lewd acts with children, kidnaping, murder, rape, and voluntary manslaughter are among the crimes that would be covered. The bill would also provide compensation to "good Samaritans" who are injured or killed trying to stop a crime.

No more than $25,000 would be granted to any one victim, and the size of the award would be influenced by personal insurance settlements, public donations, or job benefits an applicant might have received to help meet his expenses. Property losses would not be reimbursed, and no compensation would be allowed to victims who are relatives of their attackers or who were living with their assailants at the time of the crime.

However, policemen killed or injured in the line of duty would be eligible. Small-town police departments, particularly, often have little or no benefit funds to aid their personnel. Also persons adversely affected by witnessing a crime might qualify. Last May in Kansas City, for instance, one woman collapsed in shock and another suffered an epileptic seizure when they saw a murder committed.

The attacker would not have to be identified, arrested, or convicted for a victim to collect. Nor would the assailant's sobriety, sanity, or age affect the case, as it so often does in the courtroom.

Because the costs and machinery of such a program are hard to estimate accurately at the outset, I am proposing that compensation initially be limited to crimes which occur in areas of Federal jurisdiction—principally the District of Columbia and parks, military bases, maritime provinces, and other Federally policed territories.

Some experts suggest that a nationwide compensation program can be run for $20 million a year or less. If our pilot experiment suggests that this would be the case, I certainly would not object to future expansion. Meantime, I hope that the legislation I have drafted will serve as a model for individual states to adopt and finance with state funds.

A limited compensation program went into effect in California last January, and New York City has adopted an ordinance to aid persons who are injured or killed trying to prevent crimes. The New York law was passed after a young airline employee was stabbed to death in front of his wife and daughter as he grappled with a drunk who was molesting two elderly women on a subway train. The widow was so impoverished by the murder that she had to send her daughter to live with relatives in Germany.

Victim-compensation legislation also has been passed by New York State, effective next March. Other states considering such legislation are Oregon, Michigan, New Jersey, Illinois, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Maryland, and Massachusetts. I believe the climate is ripe for action. A recent Gallup Poll shows that 62 percent of the American people agree that society has a moral obligation to aid those citizens it fails to protect from crime.

I believe we have missed the mark by not devoting concern to the innocent victims of crime equal to that we have given the criminal. The victim needs our help through compensation.

We can give him no less.

HARRY F. BYRD, AMERICAN STATESMAN

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, one of the great figures of American political life—Senator Harry Flood Byrd—has left our midst. His passing marks the end of a profoundly influential career. All of us, no matter what our political persuasion, are diminished by the loss of this great statesman. For Harry Byrd personified the best in the American political tradition. A man of great honor and personal integrity, Harry Flood Byrd stood always for the preservation of principles and ideals which furthered our Nation. When he resisted legislative change, it was always based on a philosophy of government—for Harry Flood Byrd loved the Constitution and the legacy of the great Virginia statesmen of our founding days.

He, himself, came from illustrious forebears. The Byrds of Virginia are among the names which continue to shine throughout American history. Yet Harry Byrd's personal story is one which reveals his strength of character—for he rose in fame, not through inherited wealth, but through his own hard work and perseverance. He knew what hard work was and how the benefits of life had to be earned. Yet, Harry Flood Byrd always had room in his heart for people and was uniformly friendly, courteous, and encouraging to all. He believed deeply in the pioneer virtures and his own life's story bore out a theme often repeated in our history—the triumph of hard work and dedication to duty over adversity.

Born in Martinsburg, W. Va., on June 10, 1887, Harry F. Byrd moved with his parents to Winchester, Va., in that same year.

Times were not easy for this young man, but at 16 he entered the newspaper business and became publisher of the Winchester Star in 1903. He also became active in the growing and storing of apples and peaches near Berryville in 1906. Here again, he demonstrated the diligence and capability that ultimately enabled him to become the world's largest applegrower.

It was not surprising that this hard-working young man should enter public life—first as president of the Valley Turnpike Co., from 1908 to 1918; then as a member of the State senate from 1915 to 1925; as State fuel commissioner in 1918; as chairman of the Democratic State Committee in 1922, and as Governor of Virginia, 1926–30.

Appointed to the Senate in 1933 to fill a vacancy caused by the death of Claude A. Swanson, he served with distinction until 1965, when he resigned because of health reasons.

Those years in the Senate were productive and valuable ones for this Republic. The lessons of his youth were not lost on Harry Flood Byrd and he continued to his death to be a stanch defender of sound management and Jeffersonian principles in the Federal Government. He was truly a watchdog of the Treasury in the finest sense.

I had the privilege of serving many years on the Senate Finance Committee under the able and always honorable leadership of Senator Byrd.

In all those years, Senator Byrd hewed to a consistent philosophy of government activity—striving to preserve those values which he felt were synonymous with constitutional government. Senator Byrd was a conservative without rancor and a patriot without stint.

Though we sometimes did not see eye to eye on issues, he was always fair and impartial and cognizant of a differing view.

He was an American worthy of the word greatness.

He was a stanch believer in integrity and soundness in government, as well as in personal conduct.

A distinguished leader of Virginia, a Senator for all the Nation, Senator Harry Flood Byrd will be sorely missed by all of his former colleagues in this Chamber.

My deepest sympathy goes to Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr., and to brothers.

WATER: THE KEY TO WYOMING'S FUTURE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to a matter of great importance to my home State of Wyoming. This is the subject of water.

A few days ago I presented a statement to the Appropriations Committee, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of U.S. Senator Milward L. Simpson to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, October 18, 1966

Mr. Chairman, I wish to testify on behalf of my State of Wyoming concerning feasibility investigations on the Upper Colorado River. For many years, Wyoming has been awaiting the results of a report on the so-called Sublette participating project. This project includes the proposed Kendall Reservoir on the Green River in Wyoming and a diversion of water from the Green River to the North Platte River Basin in Wyoming.

The 84th Congress passed as Public Law 485 the Colorado River Storage Project Act. Among other things, that important act provided for the construction of a number of participating projects. Most of these eleven projects have been completed or are now under the final phases of construction.

Section 2 of the Colorado River Storage Project Act directed the Secretary of the Interior to give priority to the completion of planning reports on twenty-five other designated participating projects. The Sublette Project was among those designated for such priority. Since the passage of the 1956 Colorado River Storage Project Act, almost all of the feasibility reports on these priority projects have been completed. Completed reports have been made, and in some cases construction begun, on the following projects: Animas-La Plata, Bostwick Park, Dolores, Fruitland Mesa, Navajo Indian irrigation, San Juan-Chama, Savery-Pot Hook, Dallas Creek, San Miguel, West Divide.

On the other hand, the Sublette Project in Wyoming is among those few for which funds were never appropriated. This omission has placed the economic development of the State of Wyoming in jeopardy and I am in the hopes that feasibility studies can be commenced at the earliest opportunity. Wyoming stands on the threshold of increased growth and prosperity if it can find the proper combination of keys to unlock its mineral resources. Water is one of those keys. The proposed Sublette or Upper Green River feasibility study as contemplated by Wyoming's State Engineer and by Wyoming's Natural Resource Board would include planning for crucial municipal and industrial water. The study would help to determine possible means for delivery of that M&I water to appropriate locations within the state.

I urge the Committee to consider Wyoming's basic needs and to consider that state's proper place in the future development of the Upper Colorado River Basin. I, therefore, request, Mr. Chairman, that an appropriation of $25,000 be made from available funds for use by the Department of the Interior for a Bureau of Reclamation feasibility study of the Sublette participating project as authorized by the Colorado River Storage Project Act of 1956. A supplemental report from the Department of the Interior will follow.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the committee was then considering various supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1967. At that time I sought to have included in the bill a modest amount of money which would have enabled the Bureau of Reclamation to conduct a long overdue and much-needed reconnaissance study on the Upper Green River in Wyoming. This study had previously been authorized in 1956 by the 84th Congress in the Colorado River Storage Project Act, Public Law 485. Section 2 of this act had directed the Secretary of the Interior to give priority to the completion of planning reports on the Sublette and other designated participating projects. Since the passage of the 1956 Colorado River Storage Project Act almost all of the feasibility reports on these priority projects, with the exception of the Sublette project, have been completed and in many cases project construction is underway.

It is imperative that Wyoming's needs be considered in the future planning and development of the Upper Colorado River Basin. Unfortunately, the Appropriations Committee was not able to provide funds for unbudgeted items at this time, but I have urged that the Bureau of Reclamation be given the "go ahead" at the very earliest opportunity. I have written the Department of the Interior to this effect and will stress the urgency of this matter to the man who succeeds me as Senator from Wyoming.

On October 18, the Bureau of Reclamation submitted a statement to me and to the Senate Appropriations Committee indicating their favorable support for such a study and so I feel confident that the way is now well paved for prompt action on behalf of Wyoming.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ON SUBLETTE PROJECT, WYOMING, OCTOBER 18, 1966

The 1967 Public Works Appropriation Act does not contain any funds that can be used for further studies of the Sublette project.

In the late 1950's the Bureau did considerable planning work on the Sublette project which would involve a multi-purpose dam and reservoir on the Green River and facilities to provide irrigation service for some 87,000 acres of land. The studies were not completed, however, because of lack of local interest. In recent months there has been evidence of increasing interest on the part of both the State of Wyoming and the local people in proceeding with development of the project. Further, there is a growing need for additional water in the North Platte Basin primarily for municipal and industrial purposes. For all practical purposes, however, the waters in the North Platte Basin are now being fully utilized and the future growth of that area will be dependent upon importations. One of the possibilities for importation is from the Green River. A reconnaissance investigation is needed to bring up to date the plans for the Sublette project and to evaluate the possibility of a transbasin diversion into the North Platte Basin. Funds in the amount of $25,000 could be used in fiscal year 1967 to get such a study underway.

STOP FOOLING OUR PEOPLE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, in this regard I wish to express—with no little reluctance—my shock upon discovering that the Representative from Wyoming introduced two bills in the House of Representatives on September 8, 1966. These bills were introduced by a proxy method since the Representative was absent from Washington at the time and perhaps this accounts for the misleading and inaccurate nature of these bills. Be that as it may, it is of great importance for the purpose of making proper legislative history that the situation with respect to these bills be clarified, despite the fact that no House action has been taken on these bills, because both of these bills attempt to affect Wyoming water.

Let me, then, try to set the record straight. H.R. 17616, as introduced by the Representative from Wyoming, was entitled:

> A bill to authorize the Secretary of Interior to proceed with construction, maintenance, and operation for the Seedskadee irrigation project of Wyoming to investigate means of augmenting the water supply of the Colorado River Basin, and for other purposes.

Despite the fact that the bill's title purports to authorize a project, the text of the bill reads as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of Interior for the Seedskadee participating project of the Colorado River storage project shall establish the nonexcess irrigable acreage for which any single ownership may receive project water at three hundred and twenty acres of class 1 land or the equivalent thereof as determined by the Secretary in other land cases.

This language frankly leaves me at a loss, but I can assure one and all that the bill does not do what it claims by its title. The fact of the matter is that the Seedskadee participating project was specifically authorized by Public Law 485 of the 84th Congress, the Colorado River Storage Project Act, approved April 11, 1956. In 1958, the Seedskadee Participating Project Acreage Limitation Act, Public Law 85–797, authorized the acquisition and disposition of certain private lands and the establishment of the size of farm units in the Seedskadee reclamation project. This inevitably leads us to the conclusion that any future effort to amend the acreage limitations of the Seedskadee project must be properly addressed to these previously named acts.

Next, I note that H.R. 17617 was also introduced by the Congressman from Wyoming on September 8, 1966. Unfortunately, that bill also serves no constructive purpose that I can detect. As I have noted earlier, the Bureau of Reclamation has already expressed its willingness to complete the feasibility studies as previously authorized by the Colorado River Storage Project Act. The Sublette study as previously proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation will include a reconnaissance of possible damsites and will investigate the possibility of transwatershed diversion from the Green to the North Platte River. All that has been lacking, as I previously noted, has been the funds for the completion of this study and it is hoped that these funds will now be rapidly forthcoming. H.R. 17617 does nothing to further these studies; in fact, its introduction has only served to confuse the problem. Such irresponsibility as the introduction of H.R. 17616 and H.R. 17617, makes a mockery of the legislative process and does a great disservice to the future fulfillment of Wyoming's water needs.

On the other side of the coin, let me state for the Record the positive need which Wyoming has for the completion of a feasibility study on the Upper Green River. Wyoming presently stands on the threshold of increased growth and prosperity which will come when it puts together the proper combination of keys to unlock its great wealth of mineral resources. One of these keys—in fact, I would not hesitate to say the most important of them—is water. As I said in a statement recently printed in the Casper Star-Tribune:

> Water is the lifeblood of the West.

I ask unanimous consent that that article be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WATER: THE LIFEBLOOD OF THE WEST

WYOMING WATER

(Statement by Milward L. Simpson, U.S. Senator from Wyoming)

Water has been and will continue to be the single most important resource in the history of the West. Wyoming has always been a leader in the development of Western water. The annals of our State are filled with the names of those great men who helped to shape our laws or who turned the sagebrush prairie into rich cropland.

Today, we are both proud and fortunate to have the leadership of Governor Hansen, of State Engineer Floyd Bishop, of Oscar Barnes of the Wyoming Agricultural Extension Service, and of Wyoming's Natural Resource Board—all working to protect and promote Wyoming's rich interest in its waters.

The history of water development in Wyoming can be traced through several phases. First came community-inspired projects and mutual ditch companies. In those early days, canals and reservoirs were dug by horse and by hand.

The next phase witnessed large dams, built to supply water to reclamation projects. This phase continues today.

Wyoming now stands on the threshold of the newest phase in water development. This phase contemplates trans-watershed diversions. Within the State, studies must be authorized to determine the feasibility of transfer of waters from the Green to the North Platte River. Wyoming should be careful, however, that it does not "rob Peter to pay Paul."

Interstate transfers will also occur, and in this respect Wyoming occupies a unique geographic position at the head of four great river basin systems: The Columbia; the Upper Colorado; and the Upper and Lower Missouri basins. Wyoming must be assured of intelligent representation in the complex planning under way for future transfer of water from one river system to another.

With the 89th Congress now drawing to a close, the chief sponsors of the Colorado River Basin Project legislation reluctantly announced that their bill would not pass this year. Thus, the effort that had been made in the House of Representatives to tie certain of Wyoming's water projects to that legislation proved to be an untimely error in judgment. Back in Wyoming, however, Governor Hansen and the officers of our State agencies had already seen the handwriting on the wall and were working to adequately protect Wyoming's interests. They stood firm in their demand for an assured future water supply for Wyoming. Their present emphasis on the need for a greater allocation to municipal and industrial water in future projects commands the support of us all.

On the national level, the threat posed to our State's use of its water has recently grown especially intense. In January of this year, the Senate passed the proposed Wild Rivers bill. I cast the single dissenting vote, for that bill would contribute greatly to the cause of water "federalism." The Senate unfortunately rejected an amendment proposed by Senator ALLOTT of Colorado and myself which would have required compliance with State law for water appropriation and for the allocation of waters in years of shortage.

This trend which Congress now follows with respect to water underscores the urgency of Governor Hansen's recent realistic assessment of Wyoming's interests when he says, "With our water, it's now either use it or lose it." Wyoming must be prepared to follow his leadership.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, Wyoming's future growth hinges inextricably upon the proper development of its water. More particularly, added attention must now be given to the increasing allocations of water for municipal and industrial purposes. The mining of Wyoming's uranium reserves; the continued production, refining, and marketing of Wyoming's oil; the increased use of Wyoming's vast coal reserves for electric power production; the continued development of Wyoming's iron ore reserves; the development, mining, and refining of Wyoming's fabulous oil-shale deposits; the exploration, discovery, and production of as yet unspecified minerals; the further development of chemical, electronic, and defense industries; and last but not least the continued prosperity of our all-important agricultural communities, cattle, sheep, and farms—all of these things depend for their growth upon that all important lifeblood—water.

Further, most of the needs of Wyoming's cities and of its people have so far been met. There will come a day, however, when the more populated areas of the State will find themselves in need of additional domestic and municipal water. Our neighbor State to the south, Colorado, many years ago experienced this problem and the recent history of that State has shown an astronomic rise in the cost of municipal water for its eastern slope coupled with unfortunate court actions, snarled water rights, and costly diversion projects.

Wyoming is more fortunate, for there is still time to plan properly for trans-watershed diversions to meet the needs of our projected population centers. The proposed Sublette reconnaissance would study just such a diversion as this and, of course, it goes without saying that this study must be done now—when Wyoming does have time.

WILD RIVERS AND WATER FEDERALISM

In this past session of Congress, Wyoming has looked with great attention to events unfolding in Washington. Early this year the Senate passed the so-called wild rivers bill, S. 1446. That bill would have provided for a national wild rivers system. I objected to that bill because of its provisions which indicated an intention to include the Upper Green River in that system. Nevertheless, several valuable and improving amendments were included in the bill while it was being debated in the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I am proud of those amendments since they helped to clarify the intention of the committee that the wild rivers bill would not be permitted to derogate the right of individual States to adjudicate the appropriation of waters according to State law. These amendments are now a firm part of the legislative history and need not be reiterated here.

However, a final clarifying amendment was offered on the Senate floor by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and myself, and this was unfortunately rejected. The rejection of this amendment was another reason why I was finally forced to disapprove of the wild rivers bill. A discussion of the consequences of the Senate's action with respect to wild rivers legislation is contained in an article written last spring by David Dominick while he attended the University of Colorado Law School.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILD RIVERS LEGISLATION

(Prepared by David D. Dominick, June 1, 1966)

"With respect to the water of our western states it has now become a case of 'Use it or Lose it.'"—Clifford Hansen, Governor of Wyoming.

LOOKING AHEAD

1. The year is 1970. Mr. Lavender Cowboy is the owner of the "Lazy D" dude ranch in the state of Wyoming. The ranch is split in two by the Upper Green River. On the west side of the river lie one hundred and sixty acres of irrigated hay lands originally homesteaded by Lavender's father, "Cactus Jack," under the Desert Land Act during Wyoming's territorial days. And on the east the ranch house and corrals have been built on "school land" that Lavender's mother had bought from Wyoming after it had become a state. Surrounding the ranch on all sides is the Jim Bridger National Forest. Some miles upstream is the lower boundary of the Washakie Wilderness Area and about a mile below Lavender's lower fence the Green enters a stretch that had been designated as "Wild River Area" in 1969 by the 91st Congress.

In the spring of 1970 Lavender began diverting, with some return flow, a portion of the waters of the Green into a ditch which supplied some private fish ponds and a swimming pool which he had recently constructed, at considerable expense, for the enjoyment of his high-paying summertime "guests." Lavender had applied to the Wyoming State Engineer for a diversion permit and sought to perfect his appropriation when he was abruptly sued, along with the State of Wyoming as a party defendant, by the United States which sought a permanent injunction against this and any further attempted diversions by Lavender.

2. Assume the same situation as has just been given except that this time Lavender's ranch lies within the designated Wild River Area along the Green. That spring a heavy runoff from the mountain snow-pack has washed out many banks along the Green. And now, instead of seeking to divert water from the river, Lavender has cut down several tall spruce trees and has hauled in some wrecked car bodies in an effort to prevent further deterioration of the river bank next to his hayfield. Now Lavender is sued by the United States for damages to the "scenic easement" that a year before he had been forced to sell to the federal government.

3. Or, assume again the year 1970. Again the Wild Rivers Act has been made law and an area of the Upper Green River has been set aside under its provisions. This time the State of Wyoming plans to construct a dam for the purpose of impounding water. The water will be offered as an inducement to an industry which contemplates the production of gas fuels from Wyoming's large coal reserves. But the upper two miles of the proposed storage reservoir behind this dam will flood back into the established Wild River Area.

The United States sues Wyoming, enjoining the building of the dam.

4. And lastly, assume a Wild Rivers Area as before. This time, however, the Valley Development Company seeks to appropriate under state law some of the waters of the Green from some point within the Wild Rivers Area. The appropriation is necessary for the exploitation of sodium deposits that have been federally leased to the joint venture corporation by the Department of Interior.

At this point the Secretary of Interior sues both Wyoming and the Valley Development Company enjoining the attempted appropriation.

THE EFFECT OF WILD RIVERS LEGISLATION

If the Wild Rivers Bill[1] were to be passed by this, or any subsequent, Congress then the United States would probably prevail in court against all other parties in the hypotheticals just posed.

The purpose of this paper is to examine this proposed legislation in two major areas: First, as it will affect present and future private water rights; And second, as it reflects current legislative thinking about Federal-State relations in the field of water law.

---

[1] S. 1446, 89th Cong., 1st Sess. (1965).

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

In 1962 the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission[2] recommended that:

"Certain rivers of unusual scientific, esthetic, and recreational value should be allowed to remain in their free-flowing state and natural setting without manmade alterations."[3]

Following that recommendation the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture conducted a "Wild Rivers Study" of all the nation's streams in order to identify those areas suitable for inclusion in a wild rivers system. Then on March 3rd 1965, Senator Church of Idaho submitted an administration-drafted wild rivers proposal to Congress. Hearings were held before the full Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on April 22nd and 23rd[4] and field hearings were conducted at Green River, Wyoming, May 17th and at Boise, Idaho, May 18th.[5]

Following these hearings numerous amendments to the original bill were submitted by a unified minority and on September 28, 1965 Senator Church reported out the bill, in the form of an amendment, favorably from the Committee. Minority views were submitted with the report[6] and further amendments to the committee amendment were offered on January 14, 1966,[7] January 17th,[8] and January 18th.[9] The bill was passed by the Senate, 71 to 1, on January 18, 1966,[10] then sent to the House and referred to the House Interior Committee where it presently pends.

FIRST: WATER RIGHTS

As passed by the Senate the Wild Rivers Bill provides for a national Wild Rivers System. The System is to be jointly administered by the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture in a manner that has been patterned after the Wilderness Act of 1964.[11] Under Section 3(a) of the bill, "the instant section," five rivers are listed for immediate inclusion in the national system. These include the Salmon and the Clearwater of Idaho, the Rouge of Oregon, the Rio Grande of New Mexico, and the Eleven Point of Missouri. The Upper Green River of Wyoming is included, along with ten other named rivers, under Section 3(b) of the bill contemplating that the rivers in this so-called "study section" will be added to the national system upon the recommendation of the President to Congress following "consultation" between the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture and the Governors of the various states within which the rivers lie.

In terms of "public" water law, the largest "tooth" in the measure as it is presently written, is found in Section 5(a) which prohibits the authorization by the Federal Power Commission of any dam or project work under the Federal Power Act[12] in any wild river area except as specifically authorized by Congress.

Nothing in the bill affects the applicability of federal mining and mineral leasing laws except that any claims located or patents issued will be subject to regulations prescribed by the appropriate Secretary in order "to effectuate the purposes of this Act." (Section 5(b).) In case that any wild rivers area is established within a designated Wilderness Area under the National Wilderness Preservation System,[13] the more restrictive provisions of the respective acts will apply.

In the private sector, however, federal condemnation of private lands extending three hundred feet on either side of the stream is authorized by the bill with the caveat under Section 4(c) that no condemnation will be allowed when over 50 percent of the acreage or streambank within the entire wild river area is owned by Federal, State, or local governmental agencies.[14] This limitation does not apply, however, to the acquisition of scenic easements.

This is the first time that the concept of "scenic easements" has been written into federal legislation and its meaning or the manner in which such a concept will be administered is not at all clear. Section 4(f), of the bill simply limits the easement, which may be acquired by condemnation, to an area which extends no more than 1320 feet from either side of the stream. Section 4(c) of the bill does state: "As used in this Act the term 'scenic easement' means the right to control the land (including the air space above such land) for the purpose of protecting the scenic view from the river for the purpose of this Act, but such control shall not affect any regular use exercised prior to the acquisition of the easement."

Section 5(h) of the bill provides: "Designation of any stream or portion thereof shall not be construed as a reservation of the waters of such streams for purposes other than those specified in this Act, or in quantities greater than necessary to accomplish these purposes."

However, it is to be noted that the bill states in Section 2(b) that a wild river is one which ". . . should be left in its free-flowing condition, or that should be restored to such condition. . ." In any given case where future private appropriations are sought from wild river water, either above or within a designated area, this language may be easily construed by the administrators of the system to mean "undiminished condition." In this regard, Senator Church said, "[T]he bill contemplates maintaining the water in the natural bed of the streams . . . so that the river can be preserved in its pristine, free-flowing and natural state."[15] And on this basis such attempted future appropriations would probably be prohibited after passage of the Act.

Senator Allott, in introducing his Amendment No. 475,[16] addressed himself to a related problem—that of federal taking of vested water rights perfected prior to the Act. He notes particularly the wording of Section 5(d) of the reported bill:

"(d) The jurisdiction of the States and the United States over waters of any stream included in a wild river area shall be determined by established principles of law. Under the provisions of this Act, any taking by the United States of a water right which is vested under either State or Federal law at the time such river is included in the Wild Rivers System shall entitle the owner thereof to just compensation. Nothing in this Act shall constitute an express or implied claim or denial on the part of the Federal Government as to exemption from State water laws."

The second sentence of this section obviously implies the granting of a federal condemnation power as to water rights and Senator Allott poses the problems which are bound to arise in a time of shortage, namely—the condemnation of a prior upstream vested water right (that has been appropriated for "beneficial" consumptive use under state law) in order that the wild river stream flow might continue undiminished in accordance with the purposes of the Act. Such condemnation would give preference to a recreational or conservational water use by the Federal Government in direct contradiction to the preferences established under state law.[17] Indeed, if the Federal Government were to assert the superiority of a recreational use for the waters of a wild river in a state such as Colorado, it would do so in opposition to Colorado's leading case on the subject.[18]

And yet, the Wild Rivers Bill seems to have done just that. Such a view is strengthened by the fact that the Senate, in adopting the bill, rejected Amendment No. 475 as proposed by Senator Allott.

The Senator said of his amendment before its rejection: "I have submitted this amendment to clear the matter up and to make it crystal clear that the Federal Government cannot by this act come in and usurp water which has already been placed to a consumptive, beneficial use, and which is now being used, and on which persons and residents of that State have already perfected their property rights."[19]

His proposed amendment would have read as follows:

"(i) Other provisions of this Act notwithstanding, whenever either Secretary shall reserve any portion of the waters of a stream for the purpose of this Act he shall comply with the laws of the State with respect to water and water rights, and any rights perfected under the applicable State laws shall be subject to State law with respect to the allocation of waters in years of shortage."[20]

---

[2] Established under the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission Act, 72 STAT. 238 (1958), 16 U.S.C. Sec. 17(k) (1964) creating the commission and requiring it to make a broad survey of present and future needs and resources for national outdoor recreation.

[3] S. Rep. No. 792, 89th Cong., 1st Sess. 3 (1965).

[4] *Hearings Before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs*, 89th Cong., 1st Sess., Pt. 1 (1965).

[5] *Ibid.*, Pt. 2.

[6] S. Rep. No. 792, *op. sit. supra* note 3.

[7] Congressional Record, Jan. 14, 1966, p. 246. Amendment No. 475 proposed by Sen. Allott.

[8] Congressional Record, Jan. 17, 1966. At p. 497, amendment by Sen. Jordan of Idaho providing for the establishment of a National Wild Rivers Review Board; agreed to at p. 500. At p. 501, amendment by Sen. Kuchel pertaining to the jurisdiction of the States over waters of any stream included in a wild river area; agreed to at p. 502. At p. 502, the Allott amendment No. 475 pertaining to the reservation of waters of streams within the wild rivers system and the applicability of State law was called up by Sen. Simpson; rejected at p. 504. At p. 505, an amendment by Sen. Morse excluding all Oregon streams from the wild rivers system; withdrawn at p. 587, Jan. 18, 1966.

[9] Congressional Record (Jan. 18, 1966). At p. 587, amendment by Sen. Church reducing a 75 percent public land limitation prohibiting condemnation of private lands to a 50 percent limitation; agreed to at p. 587. And at p. 587, amendment by Sen. Church concerning Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands; agreed to at p. 588. And at p. 588, an amendment by Sen. Morse adding the word "zoning"; agreed to at p. 588.

[10] Congressional Record, p. 600 (Jan. 18, 1966).

[11] 78 Stat. 890 (1964), 16 U.S.C. Secs. 1131–36 (1964).

[12] 41 Stat. 1063, as amended, 16 U.S.C. sec. 791a et seq.

[13] See op. cit. supra note 11.

[14] Cf., first floor amendment made by Senator Church, op. cit. supra note 9.

[15] Congressional Record, p. 501 (Jan. 17, 1966). Remarks of Senator Church.

[16] See op. cit. supra note 7.

[17] See Wyo. Comp. Stat. sec. 71–401 (1945) for the definitions of applications for beneficial use. See also, Trelease, The Concept of Reasonable Beneficial Use in the Source of Surface Streams, 12 Wyo. L.J. 1 (1956).

[18] Empire Water and Power Co. v. Cascade Town Co., 205 Fed. 123 (C.C.A.A., 8 Cir., 1913).

[19] Congressional Record, p. 246 (Jan. 14, 1966). Remarks of Senator Allott.

It is assumed that such compliance with State law will not now be required by the administrators of the national wild rivers system. This brings us to the second part of our inquiry; namely, the present status of water law with respect to Federal-State relations.

SECOND: WATER LAW

The key to current legislative thought with respect to Federal-State relations is to be found when one compares Senator Allott's rejected amendment with an amendment proposed by Senator Kuchel and accepted by the Senate.[21] This latter amendment, to which Senator Allott strenuously objected,[22] reads as follows:

"The jurisdiction of the States over waters of any stream included in a wild river area shall be unaffected by this Act to the extent that such jurisdiction may be exercised without impairing the purposes of this Act or its administration."[23]

The following colloquy occurred with regard to this amendment:

"Mr. Morse. I assume that it is clear now in the legislative history that has been made that the purpose of the amendment of the Senator from California, particularly with reference to the Federal Government is that no change is contemplated under the bill with respect to the water rights of the states. I believe that the Senator from California has made it clear that it seeks the preservation of the status quo * * *.

"My next question is this: Does the Senator from California, through his amendment, intend in any degree whatever to stop the Federal Government from bringing to issue any controversy that the Federal Government may have with any State in respect to claims dealing with water rights as between a State and the Federal Government, which may be in conflict or in dispute?

"Mr. Kuchel. Not at all."[24]

Thus, it seems clear that the Senate, in this instance under the leadership of Senator Kuchel, has expressed its intent that the proposed Wild Rivers Act should in no way inhibit the vigorous efforts in the last two decades on the part of the Federal Government to assume jurisdiction and proprietorship over all the nation's unappropriated waters.[25] In fact, as we have seen, the bill, by virtually prescribing recreational and conservational purposes as "beneficial use," contributes greatly to the cause of water "Federalism."

The Interior Department's position with respect to the amendments just compared sets out the case for such Federalism plainly.[26] The Department makes these basic points. First; "The enactment of the bill is itself a reservation of the water needed to carry out its purposes." Therefore no affirmative action is required or permitted by the Secretary to acquire any water under State law. Next; Since most state laws do not provide for the appropriation of water for the purposes of maintaining the natural flow of a stream, it would be impossible for the Act to comply with such laws. And third: "It is settled law (presumably on the basis of the 'Pelton Dam' case)[27] that Federal legislation authorizing Federal lands to be used for a particular purpose reserves sufficient unappropriated water flowing through the Federal lands to accomplish that purpose."

Such declarations made by the Department of Interior and tacitly conceded by the Senate have a most unpleasant sound to those who would still contend that the western states have ownership, by virtue of their constitutions[28] or otherwise,[29] and regulatory powers over the unappropriated water within their boundaries.[30] Such arguments for states' rights to water as might have been made before the implications of *Arizona* v. *California*[31] had been fully felt now appear outdated. With such legislation as "Wild Rivers" on today's Congressional scene, the doctrinaire disputes over water ownership and questions of the source of Federal power are rapidly evaporating into thin air. Thus, Governor Hansen's call is urgent to those western states that hope to derive some commercial benefit from their water—Now, let's either "Use it or Lose it."

WYOMING IS PROUD OF ITS WATER LEADERS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, also in this session of Congress the House has been considering legislation encompassed in H.R. 4671 known variously as the central Arizona project bill or the Lower Colorado River Basin project bill. As we all know, that bill is now dead for this session of Congress, but it will undoubtedly be reintroduced in the next session of Congress, and it is therefore of great importance to Wyoming that the record be set straight with respect to it. In 1922 an interstate compact was signed by Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, Arizona, and New Mexico which allocated waters of the upper Colorado River between these various upper basin States. Wyoming has never used its full share of the waters allocated and under the terms of the central Arizona project bill a portion of Wyoming's presently unused water would have been released temporarily to Arizona, California, and other lower basin States. In considering these provisions Wyoming was, indeed, fortunate to have the benefit of capable leaders in the person of Gov. Cliff Hansen and the many excellent officers of the State who have stood behind him. These leaders foresaw the inherent danger in the central Arizona project bill as it was being considered by the House last summer and indicated their disapproval of the bill unless sufficient safeguards were written into the legislation that would have assured Wyoming's right to use its full share of allocated water when such water was needed by the State. These safeguards were never provided by those attempting passage of the bill here in Congress and the leaders from Wyoming were perfectly correct when they then withdrew their support for the project.

I ask unanimous consent that the comments of Governor Hansen, appearing October 16 in the Casper State Tribune, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Legislators' Water Concern

(By Gov. Clifford Hansen)

Wyoming's past has been written in the language of water. Historically the emphasis on types and amounts of water used has gradually changed, but throughout our history water has remained a controlling factor in the state's development.

Six interstate compacts control the division of the waters of the major interstate streams between Wyoming and the downstream states. Those Wyoming statesmen who carefully and skillfully negotiated these compacts in years past secured to Wyoming a supply of water surplus to immediate needs. It is vital that we protect and maintain both our right and our ability to use this water which is the cornerstone of our future development. While the interstate compacts provide assurance of our future rights to use water, the exercise of these rights through actual application of the water to beneficial use must be pursued diligently.

If constructed as proposed, the Central Arizona Project would divert approximately one and one-quarter million acre-feet of water per year from the Colorado River. Over one-third of this requirement would have to be "borrowed" from Wyoming's entitlement to Colorado River water. This is water which Wyoming is not now using. The ultimate problem is how the "borrowed" water will ever be recovered for use in Wyoming.

The future situation, if the Central Arizona Project is constructed, will be that of a vast project in Arizona which is heavily dependent on the use of Wyoming water. The economic impact will have been felt. Many Arizonans will be using this water to produce their livelihood.

Under such circumstances, is it reasonable to suppose that Arizona or any of the Lower Basin States will look kindly upon the return of this water to Wyoming? I think it is obvious they would not.

---

[20] Congressional Record, p. 246 (Jan. 14, 1966).

[21] Congressional Record, p. 502 (Jan. 17, 1966).

[22] Congressional Record, p. 246 (Jan. 14, 1966). Remarks by Senator Allott.

[23] Congressional Record, p. 501 (Jan. 17, 1966).

[24] Congressional Record, p. 432, Jan. 17, 1966. Remarks of Senators Morse, and Kuchel. For a more complete exposure of Senator Kuchel's views, see his excellent comments (Congressional Record, Mar. 29, 1965) concerning water rights legislation proposed by him (S. 1636, 89th Con., 1st sess.). That bill would clarify existing law in the following areas: Effect of reservations and withdrawals; rights claimed by the United States under State law; compensability; condemnation; and preservation of existing laws.

[25] See generally, Goldberg, Interposition—Wild West Water Style, 17 Stanford L. R. 1, 1964.

[26] Congressional Record, p. 433, Jan. 17, 1936. Sen. Church reading from Interior Department's reply.

[27] Federal Power Commission v. Oregon, 349 U.S. 435 (1955). For a discussion of the supposed ominous repercussions of that highly publicized case see Sato, Water Resources—Comments Upon the Federal State Relationship, 48 Calif. L. R. 43 (1960).

[28] Wyoming Constitution, Art. VIII, Sec. 1.

[29] See generally Sax, Water Law; Cases and Commentary (1965), Chap. XI.

[30] Congressional Record, p. 247, Jan. 14, 1966. Remarks of Sen. Allott. "We in Colorado feel, as do most Westerners, that the administration of the water belongs to the State, and that if the Federal Government wants to acquire title to or use the water, as would be the case under this bill, it should comply with the laws of the State, as any other person would have to do."

[31] 373 U.S. 546 (1963). See generally, Trelease v. California; Allocation of Water Resources to People, States and Nations. The Supreme Court Review 158 (1963).

The reality of the situation is that Wyoming's only feasible system of ultilizing this water requires complex and expensive works. The historic pattern of the development of such works in the western United States for the past 60 years involves a dependence upon the federal government in whole or in part for planning and financing. Beyond the legal certainty of Wyoming's right to the water lies the practical question of how we could ever hope to get the necessary Congressional approval for future Wyoming projects which would return the "borrowed" water from downstream projects such as the Central Arizona Project.

Future growth and development of Wyoming is heavily dependent upon the available water supply. The highest responsibility of all public officials concerned should be to preserve this vital resource which was secured for Wyoming by our predecessors. We cannot permit our water to be bartered away for political expediency or any other reason. This effort is certainly one that transcends partisan political considerations.

A seer may be needed to predict the future use of Wyoming's water with any degree of exactitude, but it requires only sage men to perceive the magnitude of that future and to preserve the resource for the state.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the central Arizona project bill will be reintroduced in the next Congress, and once again Wyoming must look to her leaders for vigilant protection of that State's future interests. Once again the effectiveness of Wyoming's elected leaders will be put to the test. They have done well in the past, and I am confident that they have the vision and the strength to do well again.

NOMINATION OF WILLIAM BENTON AS U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO UNESCO

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, as a citizen of Connecticut, I take pride and satisfaction in the fact that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee this morning reported favorably on the nomination of my old friend and colleague, William Benton, as U.S. representative to UNESCO.

Bill Benton's name and his record are so well known to the Members of the Senate that I am confident his confirmation will be voted unanimously. But I do want, nevertheless, to say a few words about his unique qualifications for the post to which he is now assigned.

Former Senator Benton is a man of many and varied accomplishments. Among other things, he has served as chairman of the board of Encyclopaedia Britannica for almost two decades. The position is profoundly suggestive of the scope of his interests and activities. For Bill Benton is truly a man of encyclopedic compass. Indeed, he is almost a throw-back to the Renaissance man who was a scholar in every area and a practitioner in many areas, and who could do everything he attempted well.

He has served as vice president of the University of Chicago, as an Assistant Secretary of State, as a U.S. Senator, as vice chairman of the U.S. Commission for Inter-American Development, as a member of the Advisory Committee on Arts, and as the U.S. member of the Executive Board of UNESCO from 1963 to date.

I consider William Benton a great American patriot and a true citizen of the world community of culture and knowledge. The United States could not possibly have a better representative in UNESCO.

SENATOR ROSS BASS OF TENNESSEE

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I sincerely regret to see our friend and my neighbor, Ross BASS, leave the Senate. In his services here he has made many friends. He is genial by nature and active in his work. I have learned to appreciate him and his fine personality.

Certainly my good wishes go with him for many years of happiness and usefulness in the years ahead, and I hope that our paths will continue to cross as the years come and go.

SENATOR DIRKSEN'S REPLY TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excellent editorial published in the Wyoming State Tribune on October 17, 1966. I think that the comments of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], as reflected here, help to put in proper context some of the events of recent days.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIRKSEN'S REPLY TO JOHNSON

The state of poverty in which President Johnson finds himself in his defense against his chief critics, the Republican party, is illustrated no better than his charge that the GOP is the "party of fear."

The Republicans might well say that Mr. Johnson tried his campaign gimmick once before. Only in 1964 there was something of a reverse twist to the trick.

Two years ago Mr. Johnson and the Democratic party's high command were embarked on a strategy that aimed at describing the Republicans, or at least their presidential standard-bearer, as the party to be feared.

The GOP, ran the pro-Johnson campaign theme, were dangerous people because they would get us into war, among other troubles. All sorts of dire things would happen to the country, according to this thesis.

History now exposes this trickery for what it was. It is interesting that "fear" once again is being used in connection with a national campaign, only this time the implication is that the Republicans are afraid of the future, particularly one under the flapping banners of the Great Society.

This strategem worked in 1964, but it will not work in 1966 because not only are Republicans concerned, worried, disturbed and fearful about the future but so are Democrats and independents all across the land.

To the President's charge of "fear" Senator DIRKSEN, the Republican minority leader in the Senate, retorted: "Is the President bewildered? Was he referring to his administration? His statements actually spell out the most damning self-indictment in modern political history."

Refuting the Johnson statement and flatly describing it as untrue, DIRKSEN said: "We do not admit to being a party of fear. An honest reading of history will prove the contrary. But we do admit as a people, to being concerned about this administration and the many unwise courses it has chosen to take."

DIRKSEN said that what lies ahead in Viet Nam under Johnson's administration cannot be foreseen, and that the Republican leadership truly is concerned about high and rising living costs in the face of which the administration has been helpless.

"We are concerned—indeed, we know—we are losing our money and our friends abroad," said DIRKSEN. "We are concerned—for it is a fact—that the 'War on Poverty' is being lost, with the poor and the underprivileged receiving little actual help, and with millions of the people's dollars being wasted.

"We are concerned—for we can prove—that the farmer and consumer are, calculatingly, being played against one another. We are concerned—for the proof is undeniable—that an echo-chamber Democratic Congress, with its steam-roller majorities, will continue, without thought or question, to carry out the slightest whims of this administration.

"We are concerned—for the signs are frightening—that we are being led down the road to national bankruptcy. We are concerned that an all-Asian Peace Conference—a practical first step toward peace in Viet Nam—now has been summarily rejected as a peace hope.

"We are concerned—for we are convinced—that the American people are not being told the whole truth about their government and this administration's plans for them."

Mr. Johnson's charge that the Republican party has no constructive programs or policies to offer the people, said old EV DIRKSEN, indicates that the Administration from its very first days has been blind, deaf and indifferent. Then he proceeded to tick off a list of Republican proposals dealing with everything with strategy in Vietnam to balance of payments; and to all of these recommendations and suggestions, said Senator DIRKSEN, the Johnson administration has been indifferent.

Said DIRKSEN: "When the President chooses to speak directly and candidly to the American people, the Republican leadership and the Republican party will be attentive and responsive, but when the President chooses to do otherwise we are indeed apprehensive and concerned. We hope—we pray—that in the weeks to come we will witness administration deeds calculated to inspire faith, not fear; belief, not doubt; confidence, not concern; hope, and not despair."

THE BOBBY BAKER CASE

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, more than 2½ years have passed since Bobby Baker, former Senate secretary to the majority, resigned his high public position to avoid facing public scrutiny of his financial and business dealings. Repeated reports in the press during 1963 finally prodded a reluctant Senate into directing the Rules Committee to investigate Baker's activities.

The committee inquiry was a half-hearted, off-again-on-again affair. Nevertheless, in the course of hearings held in March 1964, it became clear beyond question that Bobby Baker had used his Senate office to advance his personal, financial, and business interests. The committee could not avoid the conclusion that Baker was "guilty of many gross improprieties," and his conduct was "inimical to the public welfare."

One of the committee's recommendations called for review by the Justice Department of all information gathered in the investigation, to determine whether criminal action was warranted.

Several months passed, when press reports of additional instances of Baker's misconduct in office forced a reopening of the Rules Committee inquiry. The ensuing inquiry conducted by the committee led to further findings that in several instances Baker had "used the influence of his public office to feather his own nest." Concerning legislation in which ocean-freight forwarders had a vital interest, the committee stated:

> This case furnished evidence of the most flagrant of all Baker's activities in the use of his office and the prestige of his position for his personal financial profit . . . it justifies careful consideration looking to an indictment for violation of the conflict-of-interest statutes. The boldness with which Baker and Weiner acted also illustrates how unrestrained and unpoliced wrongdoing can grow and flourish in places where high standards of morality and ethics should prevail.

Even before the Baker investigation was reopened, I had suggested to the Department of Justice in July of 1964 that civil suit could be instituted by the Attorney General of the United States to require an accounting of any profits which Bobby Baker may have reaped through the use of his office. My proposal was well received in legal circles. But not by the Department of Justice. To this day, the Justice Department has yet to comment on the merits of my proposal for a civil suit.

For many months its only reply to my inquiries was to point out that Baker's activities were being considered by a Federal grand jury.

The grand jury finally reported, and it did, indeed, indict Bobby Baker. However, as many have noted, the criminal indictment, limited chiefly to charges of tax evasion and larceny, bears little semblance to the allegations of corruption and abuse of his office made before the Senate Rules Committee. Trial of the case has been postponed.

I suggest that, quite apart from the trial on the criminal indictment, the Baker case is still unfinished business.

I again renew my request that the Department of Justice institute a civil suit to recover on behalf of the United States any profits which Baker made out of the use of his office. Civil action is peculiarly appropriate in the circumstances of the Baker case. The institution of such a suit would serve as a warning to others. To take the profit out of misuse of office is far and away the most effective deterrent to abuse of public trust.

Actions can be unlawful without being violations of a criminal statute. If Bobby Baker used his public position and influence for personal gain or that of his family, his friends, or his associates, his conduct was unlawful, and a legal remedy exists, apart from criminal action. Bobby Baker can be compelled in a civil action to pay over to the United States every penny he has made through the use of his influence and the prestige of his office.

Public office is a public trust. This is a maxim that has its roots in the Biblical injunction that no man can serve two masters. Every Member of this body, I am sure, regards himself as a fiduciary to the people of the Nation and to the Nation itself. We are all accountable, in the fullest sense, to the public.

The Rules Committee in its recommendations recognized this, saying:

> There is always a need for any public official—from the highest to the lowest—to conduct himself in a manner beyond question. As Government grows more complicated and more sensitive to the needs of the public, this becomes more and more abundantly clear that those who serve the public must recognize that their office is a public trust and should not be compromised by private interests.

The accountability of a government official for breach of his fiduciary duty is well recognized by the courts.

In my memorandum of July 1964, I cited several cases, among them the English case of *Reading* v. *Attorney General* (1951) A.C. 507, and the American case of *U.S.* v. *Drumm,* 329 F. 2d 109 (1st Cir. 1964).

In my own state of New Jersey, the courts have spoken out clearly in *Driscoll* v. *Burlington Bristol Bridge Co.,* 8 N.J. 433, 86 A. 2d 201 (1952) and *Jersey City* v. *Hague,* 18 N.J. 584, 115 A. 2d 8 (1955). In the Burlington Bristol Bridge case, the Governor and others were permitted recovery on the theory of constructive trust against active members of a bridge syndicate who had benefited as a result of the improper conduct of the county bridge commission which had failed to exercise good faith free from corrupting influence in executing contracts of sale for two bridges. In the second case, citing other State court decisions in support, the court held that the city could institute a civil proceeding against its former officials to recover money allegedly extorted from city employees as a condition to obtaining or retaining employment. The court noted that where the actions of public officials are "inimical to and inconsistent with the public interest," they are not only deserving of public censure, but the transactions which they have consummated are contrary to public policy, illegal, and should be set aside.

All of these cases recognize the principle of civil accountability, as a remedy for breach of fiduciary responsibility by persons holding public positions or positions affected with a public interest.

Bobby Baker held a position of public trust. The influence and prestige which went with his position as a fiduciary was not his personal property. They were not his to sell or barter or otherwise compromise.

More than 2 years have passed since I first proposed a civil suit to recover Baker's ill-gotten gains. There has been no indication that the Department of Justice has ever considered the suggestion on its merits. The Department has been inexcusably lax, I believe, in its sole and exclusive reliance on criminal action. If it is truly minded to proceed vigorously against the abuse of public office, it would have long since moved along the lines I have proposed. Its failure to do so gives credence to the widespread belief that it is uninterested—for whatever reasons—in pursuing this flagrant abuse of official position. Thus the Department itself contributes to the undermining of public confidence in the integrity of government.

A CORRECTIONAL HOME FOR A SCHOOL LABORATORY—ADDRESS DELIVERED BY SENATOR BYRD OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a valuable and worthwhile speech delivered by our colleague and friend from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] entitled "A Correctional Home for a School Laboratory" appeared in the October 1966 edition of the West Virginia School Journal which is the official journal of the West Virginia Education Association.

I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CORRECTIONAL HOME FOR A SCHOOL LABORATORY

(By U.S. Senator ROBERT C. BYRD)

It may be one of the major ironies of our highly-advanced 20th Century American society that a correctional home for juvenile boys, now under construction at Morgantown could possibly become an outstanding laboratory in the field of education.

That is the optimistic view of many U.S. Department of Justice planners for the new $9 million National Training School for Boys which is due to be opened in 1968 on a 340-acre site near the campus of West Virginia University.

They speak of the school in terms of its becoming a "model showcase" in the rehabilitation of young boys who have had conflicts with the law. I am most pleased to learn that the major emphasis in the program of rehabilitation at the school will be on education—both for the basic skills to prepare one to be a useful citizen in our democracy and vocational talents to serve individual economic needs.

It is interesting to me—since I place extremely high value on education—that some of our country's best qualified school planners should look upon these young boys, from all levels of family income, sentenced to a correctional home, as material for experiments in learning. Could it be that they expect great motivation from these boys, less interference from glamorous detractions of the outside world, and more success from small-group sessions? If these are the reasons, they should be given our support, for to equip a young man with the skills to make a useful life is, in my opinion, to start him on the road to a happy life.

WHAT THE "SCHOOL" LOOKS LIKE

Let me tell you a little bit about the school. It will represent a pioneer approach by the Federal Government in rehabilitating a good percentage of our nation's youthful offenders. It will be located on a campus shaded with towering elm and hemlock trees; and it will be equipped with all the facilities which are usually associated with the free hours of young boys of the age group 16 through 19.

There are some people who believe the National Training School will look more like a prep school than a correctional institution.

It will be made up of seven separate housing units to accommodate a maximum enrollment of about 350 boys. To serve the boys, the Department of Justice has provided for the construction of a junior high school, a senior high school, a chapel, and a clinical center as well as an outdoor recreational area on the campus.

Library facilities, a hobby shop and gymnasium will compose an activity complex which will serve as the central core of a community square. Vocational training shops and the laundry will be located within the square but outside the center of the principal circulation.

I have been asked several times why $9 million is being spent for boys who have, heretofore, lacked respect for the law. My answer is that they must someday be returned to society, and the investment made in their care at this time may possibly be returned in the future in better lives for themselves and for others who come into contact with them.

URGED LOCATION IN STATE

As a member of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee which votes funds for the U.S. Office of Education, I have been pleased to lend my support to new school legislation. And as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee which appropriates funds for the municipal government of the District of Columbia, I found four years ago that the existing National Training School was in a state of physical disrepair, taxing both the educational and rehabilitation programs in use. I urged the late President John F. Kennedy that a site somewhere near West Virginia University be considered as its new home. In August, 1962, the President agreed to my request and since then the plans for its development have moved at a swift pace.

For the boys to be assigned there, about two-thirds are received under sentences for violation of the Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act. The average age is 17 years, and they will come for such offenses as car theft, mail theft, forgery, and other crimes involving property.

It has been found that the boys are generally products of disrupting experience, of neglect, conflicts of loyalty, of erroneous thinking, both by themselves and by others who have influenced their lives, and of family breakdown, with all its hardships, such as a lack of adequate supervision and direction.

As in similar situations elsewhere, each boy will be interviewed by counselors to diagnose the trouble areas, to rank him for educational and vocational training and to group him with other boys of equal abilities. Then the training will begin. If his primary interests are vocational, there will be instructors and equipment to teach him all phases of automobile maintenance and repair, and other instructors for electrical installation and repair, and metal, painting, plumbing and the many associated phases of construction.

Cooking and baking, laundry work, farm and landscape work are other activities to be offered. Some boys will study the trades of shoe repair and barbering. Several will be trained in operating data processing machines—an ever-expanding field for young people.

TO BE CLOSELY OBSERVED

These vocational classes and those that I shall write about now will comprise the "educational laboratory" experiments which will be closely observed. It is extremely fortunate, and perhaps one of the reasons why the school was located at Morgantown, that instructors and graduate students from West Virginia University will be within walking distance to assist in the educational programs. One of the key experiments will be a project named CASE which carries a more impressive title in full—Contingencies Applicable to Special Education.

Developed by the Institute of Behavioral Research at Silver Spring, Maryland, under a grant from the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, it was launched at the National Training School in the District of Columbia in February, 1965. It was begun as a 210-minute daily experiment in motivation for youngsters and was expanded into a 24-hour program in November, 1965, for 28 youngsters and will be transferred with the student body to the new campus.

Its success is told in a report by Harold L. Cohen at the Washington campus that several youngsters have been able to complete two and one-half years of school in only four months. The 28 juveniles enrolled in this project are averaging more than a year's educational growth in an 18-week period.

HOW THE PROGRAM WILL WORK

The program operates on a merit system for voluntary study and development. Points are given to students for successful work, I am told, and a copper penny is presented for each point. It is my understanding that they may earn as much as $40 in one week. The boys pay for their own private rooms, their own food, their recreation, their books, their toiletries, their schooling, and decorations for their rooms.

As may be expected, many of these boys have been only slightly intellectually stimulated, but their performances in the CASE project have been rated by the staff members as "nothing less than phenomenal."

The CASE staff, as educational researchers, has as its interest, the measurement of behavior and increased learning through environmental procedures. One special cottage at the new school has been set aside for the 28 boys in the project. The philosophy of the program is based on the belief of the counselors that a "well-designed environment can, by offering selected and well-designed choices, help direct the behavior of the students to those academic and social goals which are necessary for successful participation in our democratic society."

Students in the program are employed as Student Educational Researchers. They are placed on different levels—apprentice 1, apprentice 2, 3, 4, et cetera—according to their educational backgrounds. Each level receives a specific base pay of $10, $15, or more per week. After qualifying for this base pay by achieving 90 percent correct responses to examinations, and upon completing a certain proportion of hours of work, the student can earn additional pay for doing extra educational and vocational work during his lecture time and through other outlined methods.

I am told that the program will endeavor to duplicate within the special cottage an environment designed to approximate a standard American society where each must earn the right to participate. Studies of the CASE project showed that inmates prefer to buy their own clothing, food, soap, toothpaste, and other personal items rather than be dependent upon, what the staff calls, a welfare society, which exists in conventional institutions where residents are provided three meals a day, dormitory styled sleeping quarters, and institutional clothing.

The student-participant is not required to work, but, if he does not, he must manage on his meager sums. The rewards of the CASE project are, therefore, quite similar to those in the "outside" society; and lack of initiative penalizes in CASE much as it does "outside." The project therefore, is dedicated to finding the best means of preparing youngsters to successfully participate in our American society by duplicating that society as nearly as is possible and by seeking the best guidance principles through research and imagination.

The youngsters assigned to the school will be in the critical development period of their lives; most of them will be from 14 to 17 years of age, a time when the transition from boy to man must be a guided one. I believe that their minds are most open to proper direction at this time, and education appears to be the soundest approach to reaching them. I, as well as law enforcement officials around the nation, will be watching the success of the National Training School for Boys.

FOOD FOR PEACE LEGISLATION—THE EXPLOSIVE POPULATION GROWTH MAKES SUPPORT FOR FAMILY PLANNING PROGRAMS IMPERATIVE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I wish to commend all the members of the Senate and House Committees on Agriculture and Forestry for their wisdom in recognizing and doing something about a problem so immense that it staggers the imagination. I am speaking of the population explosion.

Just to consider the study of a few years back by the United Nations requires a strong constitution and a suspension of disbelief. The U.N. study found that if the present trend of population growth continues, the population of the world will reach 7.4 billion by the year 2000. This is a gain of 4.1 billion people in 35 years. It exceeds the present world population of 3.3 billion by nearly a billion people. And over 85 percent of the population increase will be in the high birth rate, low productivity countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

To allow such a thing to happen would be a sheer unmitigated calamity.

The food for peace bill will allow the funds which accrue in foreign countries from the sale of agricultural commodities for foreign currencies, to be used for financing, at the request of a foreign country, "programs emphasizing maternal welfare, child health and nutrition, and activities, where participation is voluntary, related to the problems of population growth." This is only a beginning, but it is an important beginning. I am proud to have been able to offer this provision as a Senate amendment. The distinguished Senators GRUENING, TYDINGS, and METCALF were my cosponsors.

Congressman PAUL TODD, JR., sponsored a similar amendment in the House, which was adopted in that body.

But today most credit should go to the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. The hearings which he has been conducting for the past 2 years have brought the population explosion problem home to the American people. The American people are waking up to the enormity of the problem and the disaster which awaits us unless we take effective action. Unless we act now, all the things we have worked for, all the advances of civilization, will have gone for naught.

Mr. President, I also wish to voice my support for the whole food for peace program. This bill improves it in many ways, especially by removing the surplus requirements, and by emphasizing self help.

It is morally right that America share her bounty with the starving multitudes of the world. Further, we work toward world peace when we take steps to reduce the ever-growing gap between the rich nations and the poor nations. There can never be stability so long as so much of the world cannot feed itself.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a compilation entitled "Population Information for 129 Countries," compiled by the Population Reference Bureau.

There being no objection, the compilation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

World population data sheet—Population information for 129 countries*

Continent and country	Population estimates, mid-1964 (millions)	Annual rate of increase since 1958 (percent)	Birth rate per 1,000 population (latest†)	Death rate per 1,000 population (latest†)	Population projections, 1980 (millions‡)
Africa:					
Northern Africa			(45.0)	(22.0)	
Algeria	12.0	2.1	45-49.0		19.5
Ethiopia	21.0				29.0
Libya	1.3	1.9			1.9
Morocco	13.1	3.0			22.4
Somalia	2.3				2.9
Sudan	13.2	2.8	50-56.0		19.3
Tunisia	4.7	1.4	45-49.0	25-27.0	6.5
United Arab Republic (Egypt)	28.7	2.6	40-44.0	22-24.0	46.8
Tropical and southern Africa			(47.0)	(24.0)	
Angola	5.1	2.1			6.0
Burundi	2.7				4.2
Cameroon	4.6	1.9	36-44.0	24-30.0	5.4
Central African Republic	1.3	1.9	39-47.0	26-32.0	1.6
Chad	2.8	1.1	44-52.0	25-31.0	3.8
Congo (Brazzaville)	.9	1.3			1.1
Congo (Léopoldville)	15.4	2.4	40-46.0		21.5
Dahomey	2.3	2.3	45-53.0	20-26.0	3.0
Gabon	.5	2.1			.5
Ghana	7.5	2.7	48-54.0		12.3
Guinea	3.5	3.0	53-57.0	33-35.0	5.0
Ivory Coast	3.7	2.2	49-55.0	33-37.0	5.0
Kenya	91.0	2.9	46-54.0		13.6
Liberia	1.0				1.2
Madagascar	6.1	2.8	43-49.0	17-21.0	7.6
Malawi [1]	3.8	2.1			6.1
Mali	4.5	2.1	55-63.0	26-32.0	6.4
Mauritania	1.0				
Mauritius	.7	3.1	39.9	9.7	1.1
Mozambique	6.9	2.0			9.1
Niger	3.2	3.0	49-57.0	24-30.0	4.5
Nigeria	56.0		45-53.0		91.0
Rwanda	2.9	2.6			3.5
Senegal	3.5	2.7	39-47.0	23-29.0	4.4
Sierra Leone	2.2				3.7
South Africa	17.5	2.6			26.8
Southern Rhodesia	4.1	3.3			7.1
Tanzania [2]	10.3	1.9	46-50.0		14.4
Togo	1.6	2.6	51-59.0	26-32.0	2.3
Uganda	7.2	2.5	46-50.0		10.0
Upper Volta	4.8	3.3	43-49.0	27-31.0	6.3
Zambia [3]	3.6	2.8			5.7
Asia:					
Southwest Asia			(47.0)	(24.0)	
Cyprus	.6	1.0	24-28.0		.7
Iran	22.6	1.9	42-48.0	23-27.0	33.1
Iraq	7.0	1.8	47-51.0		13.8
Israel	2.5	3.5	24.6	6.2	3.1
Jordan	1.9	2.3	43-47.0		3.4
Kuwait	.3		37-43.0		.3
Lebanon	1.8				3.1
Saudi Arabia	6.6				9.4
Syria	5.4	3.2			9.3
Turkey	30.8	2.6	44-48.0		48.5
Yemen	5.0				6.9
South-central Asia			(43.0)	(21.0)	
Afghanistan	14.9		45-53.0		22.1
Bhutan	.7				1.0
Ceylon	10.9	2.7	35.8	8.5	18.3
India	468.5	2.3	39-43.0	21-23.0	661.5
Nepal	9.9	1.6	46-54.0	34-40.0	14.1
Pakistan	100.7	2.1	43-46.0	16-17.0	153.6
Southeast Asia			(49.0)	(23.0)	
Burma	24.2	2.1	47-53.0	33-37.0	35.0
Cambodia	5.9		47-53.0		9.8
Indonesia	102.2	2.2	40-46.0	19-23.0	152.8
Laos	2.0	2.5			2.9
Malaysia	10.9	3.3	40.9	8.6	18.1
Philippines	31.2	3.2	44-48.0		55.8
Thailand	29.7	3.0	40-44.0	19-21.0	47.5
Vietnam, North	17.8	3.4			24.5
Vietnam, South	15.9	3.7	40-48.0		21.9
East Asia			(42.0)	(19.0)	
China (Mainland)	690.0	2.1			840.0
China (Taiwan)	12.1	3.6	36.3	6.1	17.2
Hong Kong	3.8	4.5	32.1	5.5	5.5
Japan	96.8	.9	17.2	7.0	111.1
Korea, North	10.7				15.4
Korea, South	28.0	3.3	39-43.0	11-13.0	43.4
Mongolia	1.1	3.1			1.7
America:					
Northern America:					
Canada	19.3	2.1	24.8	7.8	26.3
United States	192.1	1.6	21.6	9.6	240.9
Middle America:					
Costa Rica	1.4	4.3	49.9	8.5	2.4
Cuba	7.3	2.0	30-34.0	9-13.0	10.0
Dominican Republic	3.5	3.6	48-54.0	16-20.0	6.2
El Salvador	2.8	3.6	48.6	10.8	4.6
Guatemala	4.2	3.2	47.7	17.3	6.9
Haiti	4.5	2.2			6.9
Honduras	2.1	3.0	45-50.0	15-20.0	3.7
Jamaica	1.7	1.5	39.6	9.1	2.1
Mexico	39.6	3.1	45.0	10.4	70.8
Nicaragua	1.6	3.5	45-52.0	12-17.0	2.8
Panama	1.2	3.3	40.1		2.0
Puerto Rico	2.6	1.7	30.9	6.9	3.1
Trinidad and Tobago	.9	3.2	35.6	7.3	1.5
South America:					
Argentina	21.7	1.6	21.8	7.9	29.0
Bolivia	3.7	1.5	41-45.0	20-25.0	6.0
Brazil	79.8	3.0	43-47.0	11-16.0	123.7
British Guiana	.6	3.0	42.3	7.9	1.0
Chile	8.4	2.4	34.2	11.8	12.4
Colombia	15.4	2.2	43-46.0	14-17.0	27.7
Ecuador	4.8	3.2	45-50.0	15-20.0	8.0
Paraguay	1.9	2.4	45-50.0	12-16.0	3.0
Peru	11.9	3.0	42-48.0	13-18.0	17.5
Uruguay	2.6		21-25.0	7-9.0	3.1
Venezuela	8.4	3.4	45-50.0	10-15.0	14.9
Europe:					
Northern and Western Europe:					
Belgium	9.3	.5	17.2	12.7	10.1
Denmark	4.7	.8	17.7	9.9	5.2
Finland	4.6	.8	18.1	9.3	5.3
France	48.4	1.2	18.2	11.7	53.3
Iceland	.2	1.9	25.8	6.8	.2
Ireland	2.8	-.3	22.2	11.8	2.9
Luxembourg	.3	.9	16.0	12.5	.4
Netherlands	12.1	1.3	20.9	8.0	14.1
Norway	3.7	.8	17.5	10.0	4.3
Sweden	7.6	.5	14.8	10.1	8.4
United Kingdom	54.1	.8	18.5	12.2	57.3
Central Europe:					
Austria	7.2	.6	18.7	12.7	7.3
Czechoslovakia	14.0	.7	16.9	9.5	15.8
Germany, East	16.1	-.3	17.5	13.7	17.6
Germany, West [4]	56.2	1.3	18.5	11.4	58.5
Hungary	10.1	.4	13.1	9.9	10.7
Poland	31.1	1.3	19.0	7.5	38.0
Switzerland	5.9	2.1	18.9	9.6	6.3
Southern Europe:					
Albania	1.8	3.2	39.3	10.7	3.0
Bulgaria	8.2	.9	16.4	8.2	9.3
Greece	8.5	.8			9.5
Italy	50.8	.6	19.1	10.2	56.4
Malta	.3	.5	20.4	8.9	.4
Portugal	9.1	.7	23.5	10.8	9.8
Rumania	19.0	.9	15.7	8.3	22.3
Spain	31.3	.8	21.5	9.0	36.0
Yugoslavia	19.3	1.1	21.4	8.9	22.8
Oceania:					
Australia	11.1	2.1	21.6	8.7	14.6
New Zealand	2.6	2.2	25.5	8.8	3.7
U.S.S.R	228.6	1.7	22.4	7.5	277.8

NOTES

Italic indicates non-self-governing countries.
Parentheses indicate regional vital rates.
Blank space indicates lack of reliable statistics.
*Compiled from United Nations and other sources.
† Latest available year. In no case before circa 1960.
‡Medium projection (provisional U.N. estimates, 1964).

[1] Formerly Nyasaland. Gained Independence July 6, 1964.

[2] Formerly known as the United Republic of Tanganyika and Zanzibar.

[3] Formerly North Rhodesia. Gained independence Oct. 24, 1964.

[4] Excludes West Berlin, population 2,200,000 (1964).

Source: Information Service, Population Reference Bureau, 1755 Massachusetts Ave. NW., Washington, D.C., December 1964.

WORLD AND CONTINENTAL POPULATION ESTIMATES

[In millions]

	Mid-1964	1980 projection ‡
World total	3,283	4,274
Africa	303	449
Asia	1,843	2,404
North America	211	267
Middle and South America	236	374
Europe	443	479
Oceania	18	23
U.S.S.R.	229	278

‡ Medium projection (provisional U.N. estimates, 1964).

POPULATION INCREASE AT VARIOUS RATES OF GROWTH

Annual increase rate	Number of years to double population	In 1 century 10,000,000 increases to—
0.5 percent	139	16,000,000
1 percent	70	27,000,000
1.5 percent	47	44,000,000
2 percent (world rate)	35	72,000,000
2.5 percent	28	118,000,000
3 percent	23	192,000,000
3.5 percent	20	312,000,000
4 percent	18	505,000,000

A TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE ROSS BASS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Ross Bass, a veteran of 10 years in the House of Representatives and 2 in the Senate, will leave the Congress of the United States at the end of this session. I rise now to salute him for those 12 years of industrious service.

Senator Bass, whom I have come to know as a friend, has been a concerned spokesman for the people of Tennessee. He has sponsored and supported legislation vital to the needs of his State and the Nation—including the antipoverty, civil rights, medicare and Appalachian bills. He has interested himself in the problems of American agriculture and with the needs of the small family farmer—the neglected but very vital man in the American economy. And, as a member of the House Ways and Means Committee, he has tutored himself in the fiscal policies of the country and made himself a useful member of both the House and the Senate.

I have enjoyed his friendship, Mr. President, and will miss both his candor and his company when he goes.

THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT CONTRIBUTES TO ITS OWN CRISIS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I have today sent a self-explanatory letter to the Postmaster General. In it I inquire of Mr. O'Brien as to why the Post Office Department has picked this time to flood the mail with nearly 100 million items of junk mail in which postal patrons are asked to list out-of-town addresses which they want ZIP coded.

This junk mail, which is sent under postal frank at the displacement of some $5 million of postage-paid mail, is contributing to the massive breakdown in mail service. My suggestion to Mr. O'Brien is that this type of service by the Post Office Department be suspended, at least until after the Christmas mail rush.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
October 21, 1966.

Hon. LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN,
The Postmaster General,
Post Office Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. POSTMASTER GENERAL: As you are well aware, the Post Office Department is suffering the most severe breakdown in mail service in the past quarter century. This breakdown, which is being felt severely in Chicago and may soon be felt in New York City, is certainly caused to a large extent by a sharp upsurge in third class mail—Christmas shopping catalogues, etc. It probably relates also to the difficulty the Department has had in effectively automating and in a certain reluctance of Congress to provide funds for overtime pay.

I have received through the mail evidence that there may be additional causes for the mail tieup however. I think that the Department has picked a most unpropitious time to flood the mails with nearly 100 million junk mail cards which solicit from postal patrons lists of various out-of-town and local addresses which the Department is offering to ZIP Code free of charge. Certainly the ZIP Code concept has benefited the Department, but why you selected this particular time in the mailing season to glut the mails with these little double-faced postcards boasting that "the Post Office will ZIP Code the addresses that you use most often" remains a mystery to me.

I think the Department would be well advised to suspend the mailing of this type material, at least until after the Christmas mailing rush has been dealt with.

With warmest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
U.S. Senate.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MAURINE NEUBERGER

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, for the past 6 years, the U.S. Senate has been fortunate enough to have two lovely, intelligent, articulate, and dedicated women Senators grace this Chamber.

Unfortunately, one of them, Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER, has chosen to retire and not run for reelection.

MAURINE NEUBERGER's decision to devote all of her time to being Mrs. Philip Solomon is an understandable one, because a woman's rightful place is to be with her husband.

But it will be a great loss to the public.

For who can forget the many courageous battles she has fought in behalf of the American housewife and the American consumer.

And who can forget her tenacious efforts to expand and step up cancer research

I, for one, will never forget the Saturday in 1962, when MAURINE NEUBERGER, as one of the small band of Senators who filibustered the communications satellite bill, held up the Senate so nothing could be done for that whole day. She did this all by herself, by twice insisting on a live quorum before she would give her speech.

Much to our embarrassment, we failed to obtain the second live quorum and she never had to give her speech, a clear victory for the lady from Oregon.

But I do not have to recount her many notable accomplishments in public life.

We all know what a fine person and what an outstanding legislator MAURINE NEUBERGER has always been.

I wish her every happiness and success in the years to come.

THE LATE SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, when our friend the late Senator Harry Flood Byrd, Sr., was elected Governor of Virginia I was a student at the University of Virginia Law School. I remember so well being attracted to him and his campaign, and felt a sense of triumph when he was elected. I followed his administration there with the utmost interest and among many other constructive things that he accomplished, I remember with the utmost satisfaction his rewriting and modernizing of the Constitution of Virginia through a series of well chosen amendments which he got submitted to the people and adopted by the people. Thus he launched Virginia into a new course and launched himself into a position of national influence.

Later, it was my privilege to join him here in the Senate, where his counsel and advice and leadership has been valuable indeed to me, as well as to many other Senators.

I shall remember him most pleasantly for his many achievements, but more than that, I shall remember him and respect his memory because of his high course of honor, his utmost integrity, and his unfaltering loyalty to the causes in which he believed.

I have never known a man in public life who scored any higher than he did in his record of voting exactly what he thought was right and sound in the long run on every single issue presented, both large and small, regardless of personal consequences then or in the future. God give us more men like Harry Byrd.

His work will live. His influence will be felt for a long, long time in many of the policies of our Government; his principles will continue to prevail so long as men are free.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered, the Senate will stand in recess subject to the call of the majority leader.

Thereupon (at 3 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the majority leader.

At 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.:

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to suspend the recess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). The Senate will come to order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has no pending business.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair when asked by the leadership.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair when asked by the leadership.

At 6 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.:

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to suspend the recess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). The Senate will come to order.

DESIGNATION OF FEBRUARY OF EACH YEAR AS AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate, Senate Joint Resolution 133.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 133) designating February of each year as American History Month, which were, on page 2, line 3, strike out "of each year", and insert ", 1967"; on page 2, line 5, strike out "annually"; strike out the preamble.

And to amend the title so as to read: "Joint Resolution designating February, 1967 as American History Month."

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the Senate resolution was cosponsored by 45 Members of the Senate, including the majority leader, and favorably reported from the Committee on the Judiciary by the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN].

When the Senate passed the joint resolution, Senator COOPER pointed out that the idea for designating February as American History Month originated in Kentucky among the Daughters of the American Revolution and, since that time, has attracted support until the Governors of nearly every State issued such a proclamation annually. The resolution asks that the President issue a similar proclamation, inviting the people of the United States to observe February as American History Month in schools and other suitable places with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

We are glad that the resolution has attracted the interest and approval of historical associations, schools and patriotic groups, and others. Its purpose is made clear by the text of the resolution itself, and I ask unanimous consent that the resolution as passed by the Senate be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution (S.J. Res. 133) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 133

Joint resolution designating February of each year as American History Month

Whereas the study of history not only enlivens appreciation of the past but also illuminates the present and gives perspective to our hopes;

Whereas a knowledge of the growth and development of our free institutions and their human values strengthens our ability to utilize these institutions and apply these values to present needs and new problems;

Whereas Americans honor their debt to the creativity, wisdom, work, faith, and sacrifice to those who first secured our freedoms, and recognize their obligation to build upon this heritage so as to meet the challenge of the future; and

Whereas it is appropriate to encourage a deeper awareness of the great events which shaped America, and a renewed dedication to the ideals and principles we hold in trust: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That February of each year is hereby designated as American History Month, and the President of the United States is requested and authorized to issue annually a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to observe such month in schools and other suitable places with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Mr. KUCHEL. In adopting the resolution, the House of Representatives amended Senate Joint Resolution 133 to make it applicable only to February of next year, and also struck the preamble, similar to the action it took on several other resolutions. The designation of February 1967 as American History Month will, however, call attention to the traditional values our Nation cherishes—and during the month in which we celebrate the birthday of the Father of our Country and Lincoln's birthday. I think those who sponsored Senator COOPER's resolution will join me in expressing the hope that this may become an annual event.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to Senate Joint Resolution 133, so that the resolution may be enacted before the Congress adjourns, and sent to the President for his approval.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1001) for the designation of the month of May 1966 as "Steelmark Month."

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 18381) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 13, 25, 29, 30, and 43 to the bill and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 9, 19, 34, 35, and 38 to the bill and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5950. An act to permit duty-free treatment of limestone, when imported to be used in the manufacture of cement, pursuant to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962;

H.R. 7030. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a farmer an amortized deduction from gross income for assessments for depreciable property levied by soil or water conservation or drainage districts;

H.R. 8244. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for rounding the amount of State and local taxes for purposes of computing tax on cigars;

H.R. 9280. An act relating to the excise tax on shells and cartridges;

H.R. 11158. An act to establish a working capital fund for the Department of the Treasury;

H.R. 11753. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Indiana University;

H.R 12110. An act to provide for the free entry of one ship model for the use of the Lutheran Church of the Covenant, Maple Heights, Ohio;

H.R. 12197. An act to provide for the free entry of one rheogoniometer for the use of Tufts University, Boston, Mass.;

H.R. 13035. An act to provide for the free entry of a triaxial apparatus and rheogoniometer for the use of Northwestern University;

H.R. 13116. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on certain nonmalleable iron castings;

H.R. 13190. An act to provide for the free entry of a four octave carillon for the use of the Northfield and Mount Hermon Schools, East Northfield, Mass.;

H.R. 13363. An act to extend the time within which certain requests may be filed under the Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act of 1965;

H.R. 13739. An act to provide for the free entry of one broad-range multigap magnetic spectrograph for the use of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.;

H.R. 14388. An act to provide for the free entry of certain articles for the use of Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.;

H.R. 14610. An act to provide for the free entry of a double neutron diffractometer for the use of the University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.;

H.R. 14893. An act to provide for the free entry of an ionosonde for the use of the University of Illinois;

H.R. 15888. An act to provide for the free entry of a carillon for the use of the University of California at Riverside;

H.R. 16077. An act to permit duty-free treatment of dicyandiamide pursuant to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962;

H.R. 16160. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the classification of Chinese gooseberries; and

H.R. 17271. An act to amend section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $200 to $500 the monthly combat pay exclusion for commissioned officers serving in combat zones.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

S. 2751. An act for the relief of David R. Slemon; and

S.J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to enable the United States to organize and hold an International Conference on Water for Peace in the United States in 1967 and authorize an appropriation therefor.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Finance:

H.R. 5950. An act to permit duty-free treatment of limestone, when imported to be used in the manufacture of cement, pursuant to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962;

H.R. 7030. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a farmer an amortized deduction from gross income for assessments for depreciable property levied by soil or water conservation or drainage districts;

H.R. 8244. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for rounding the amount of State and local taxes for purposes of computing tax on cigars;

H.R. 9280. An act relating to the excise tax on shells and cartridges;

H.R. 11158. An act to establish a working capital fund for the Department of the Treasury;

H.R. 11753. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Indiana University;

H.R. 12110. An act to provide for the free entry of one ship model for the use of the Lutheran Church of the Covenant, Maple Heights, Ohio;

H.R. 12197. An act to provide for the free entry of one rheogoniometer for the use of Tufts University, Boston, Mass.;

H.R. 13035. An act to provide for the free entry of a triaxial apparatus and rheogoniometer for the use of Northwestern University;

H.R. 13116. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on certain nonmalleable iron castings;

H.R. 13190. An act to provide for the free entry of a four octave carillon for the use of Northfield and Mount Hermon Schools, East Northfield, Mass.;

H.R. 13363. An act to extend the time within which certain requests may be filed under the Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act of 1965;

H.R. 13739. An act to provide for the free entry of one broad-range multigap magnetic spectograph for the use of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.;

H.R. 14388. An act to provide for the free entry of certain articles for the use of Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.;

H.R. 14610. An act to provide for the free entry of a double neutron diffractometer for the use of the University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.;

H.R. 14893. An act to provide for the free entry of an ionosonde for the use of the University of Illinois;

H.R. 15888. An act to provide for the free entry of a carillon for the use of the University of California at Riverside;

H.R. 16077. An act to permit duty-free treatment of dicyandiamide pursuant to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962;

H.R. 16160. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the classification of Chinese gooseberries; and

H.R. 17271. An act to amend section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $200 to $500 the monthly combat pay exclusion for commissioned officers serving in combat zones.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the conference report on the foreign investors' tax bill will not be taken up until tomorrow morning. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns tonight, it adjourn until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GORE. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I merely wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the supplemental appropriations bill conference report is now before the House. It is an urgent matter, and I suggest to the distinguished majority leader that I would be fully prepared and hopeful that it could be taken up and disposed of expeditiously.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I appreciate the gracious remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee.

This matter has been discussed with various parties, but it is the intention of the leadership to first call up the conference report on the foreign investors' tax bill, to be followed by the conference report on the supplemental appropriations bill.

I hope that will be satisfactory to the Senator.

Mr. GORE. I have always followed the majority leader in the scheduling of business before the Senate. I shall approach the disposition of the business of the Senate as it is brought before the Senate by the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is most kind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following measures: Calendars Nos. 1696, 1722, 1761, 1811, 1815, 1817, 1819, 1837, and 1850 to 1884, inclusive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL COMMUNITY SENIOR SERVICE CORPS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2877) to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Older Americans Act of 1965 is amended by redesignating title VI as title VII and sections 601, 602, and 603 as sections 701, 702, and 703, respectively, and by adding after title V a new title as follows:

"TITLE VI—OLDER AMERICANS COMMUNITY SERVICE PRORGAM

"Statement of findings and purpose

"SEC. 601. The Congress hereby finds and declares—

"(1) that there are millions of Americans aged sixty or over who are forced into idleness and inactivity by unemployment, compulsory retirement policies, or lack of opportunities for meaningful community service projects;

"(2) that certain grave consequences of such enforced idleness are impaired morale and physical, mental, and psychological health among members of this age group who are forced to endure the frustration, feeling of futility, and loss of self-respect;

"(3) that another consequence of such enforced idleness is inadequate incomes for this age group, many of whom receive pensions and other retirement incomes which are totally inadequate, and others of whom have not yet reached ages of eligibility for such pensions;

"(4) that there are needs in every community and area of the Nation which are not now being met, not because of the lack of manpower to meet those needs, but rather because of the lack of adequate arrangements for utilizing available manpower to meet them;

"(5) that individuals aged sixty or over are capable and qualified to perform services which would meet many of those needs and that there is an important potential national asset in the talents, abilities, experience, training, and energy of Americans in that age group who have been forced into unwanted inactivity; and

"(6) that providing this age group with opportunities for service will better their morale, will benefit their physical, mental, and psychological health, can, in many cases, provide them with needed income supplementation, and will be a means of providing services needed by all age groups which are not now being provided.

"Development of programs

"SEC. 602. (a) In order to carry out the purpose of this title the Secretary is authorized to assist and cooperate with State agencies designated pursuant to section 303(a)

(1) in developing programs meeting the requirements of section 603.

"(b) The Secretary's functions under this title shall be carried out through the Commissioner.

Authorization for older American community service program

"SEC. 603. (a) The Secretary may enter into agreements providing for the payment by him (subject to subsection (b)) of part or all of the cost of older Americans community service programs, approved by the State agency designated under title III, if he determines, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, that—

"(1) only individuals aged sixty and over will provide services in the program (except for administrative purposes) and such services will be performed in the community where such individuals reside or in nearby communities either (A) on publicly owned and operated facilities or projects, or (B) on local projects sponsored by private nonprofit organizations (other than political parties), other than projects involving the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship;

"(2) the program will permit or contribute to an undertaking or service in the public interest that would not otherwise be provided;

"(3) the program will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services;

"(4) the program includes such short-term training as may be necessary to make the most effective use of the skills and talents of those individuals aged sixty and over who are participating;

"(5) any rates of pay and other conditions of service, which may be fixed by the sponsor of each individual project, will be appropriate and reasonable, and except in unusual circumstances no individual will receive payments in excess of $1,500 per annum;

"(6) the program is being established and will be carried out with the advice of competent specialists in problems of older persons;

"(7) the program provides that the State agency will administer or supervise its administration, will make such reports to the Secretary, in such form and containing such information, as may reasonably be necessary to enable him to perform his functions under this title, and will keep such records and affords such access thereto as the Secretary may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports;

"(8) the program is closely coordinated with, wherever appropriate, and makes the most efficient use of the experience and programs of, the Department of Labor, and the Office of Economic Opportunity, and any other relevant Federal and State programs; and

"(9) the program is developed, conducted, and administered with maximum feasible participation of persons who have attained sixty years of age.

"(b) The Secretary shall not pay, pursuant to an agreement entered into under subsection (a), more than 90 per centum of the cost of any program which is the subject of such agreement out of funds which are appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this title for any fiscal year which begins after the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967. In determining, for purposes of the preceding sentence, the cost of any such program, the Secretary shall attribute fair market value to services and facilities contributed to such program from non-Federal sources.

"Participants in older Americans community service programs are not Federal employees

"SEC. 604. Individuals providing their services under any State program pursuant to this title shall not be Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of law relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits.

"Equitable distribution of assistance

"SEC. 605. The Secretary shall establish criteria designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance under this title among the States.

"Payments

"SEC. 606. Payments under this title may be made (after necessary adjustment on account of previously made overpayments or underpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments, as the Secretary may determine.

"Appropriations authorized

"SEC. 607. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1966, $9,000,000, and for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1967, $15,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this title."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

J. M. PENDARVIS, JR.

The bill (H.R. 9036) for the relief of J. M. Pendarvis, Jr., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1753), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation, is to pay J. M. Pendarvis, Jr., of Edgefield, S.C., $15,000 in full settlement of his claims against the United States based upon injuries and disability he suffered as a result of an assault by members of the U.S. Army on August 6, 1963.

STATEMENT

The facts as related to the House of Representatives are as follows:

A subcommittee hearing was conducted with reference to this bill on July 28, 1966. The testimony at that hearing indicated that on the evening of August 6, 1963, Mr. J. M. Pendarvis was at home when a friend, Mr. Albert Kelly, arrived to visit him at about 10:30 p.m. Mr. Kelly stated that he saw what appeared to be prowlers in the area. Mr. Pendarvis stated at the hearing that when he went out to investigate, someone grabbed at him and he was struck in the face and that it all happened so quickly that he really did not see anyone prior to being seized. Mr. Kelly, who followed him out the door, was also seized by the individuals who were subsequently identified as Army men engaged in a counterinsurgency exercise in connection with the Army exercise Swift Strike III.

As a result of these events, the blow Mr. Pendarvis received on the side of his face caused injuries which were the subject of committee investigation at the time of the hearing. The Army report in this connection states that the allegations of serious injuries are not justified by any information in the official records of the Army, and the report further indicates that the X-rays taken by Army personnel did not disclose any fractures of facial bones.

At the hearing, Dr. W. A. Carr, of Augusta, Ga., testified concerning the injuries. Dr. Carr testified that he was a specialist in oral surgery and had practiced in Augusta, Ga., since 1952. Dr. Carr testified that when he first saw Mr. Pendarvis, he had a large amount of "edema" or swelling on the left side of his face. He stated that his left eye was partially closed. He fixed the date of his first examination on August 9, 1963. He treated him as an outpatient until the swelling had subsided and then took more X-rays which disclosed a fracture of the anterior wall of the antrum, a depressed fracture of the zygomatic arch, and a fracture of the infraorbital rim. In layman's terms, these are fractures of the facial bones.

Mr. Pendarvis was placed in a hospital and was operated upon to repair the damage to the facial bones and other related damage. The injury to the side of Mr. Pendarvis' face affected his sinuses. At the hearing, the members were particularly interested in the degree of permanency of disability resulting from this injury. Mr. Pendarvis testified that the side of his face is still affected by a numbness. He describes the effect as being as if his face feels "like leather." He stated at the hearing that when he shaves, his face has a "funny feeling like there is no control or nerve in this side of my face." Dr. Carr stated that the degree of recovery of this circumstance will depend upon whether the nerve in the side of the face is actually torn apart or not. Dr. Carr further stated that a change in the facial contours may change in a period of years or may remain relatively permanent. Further, the nerve damage is a factor because if the nerve does not regain its function, it will have an effect on the appearance of the face.

The Army report to the committee details the circumstances which resulted in Army personnel being in the Edgefield, S.C., area. The Army in that report and in testimony indicates that Army personnel had reason to believe that Mr. Pendarvis was cooperating with certain Army personnel who were simulating the role of guerrillas for the Army exercise. The testimony on this point is somewhat conflicting but the committee has concluded that however this may be, the facts do demonstrate that Mr. Pendarvis did suffer and the injury was suffered in a manner which imposed a moral obligation upon the United States to compensate him for that injury. The committee, therefore, must disagree with the conclusion in the Army report that he had in effect "assumed the risk" of any injury which might result. Even if the Army assumption of his being a civilian cooperating with guerrilla forces is correct, it cannot be assumed as a corollary that a citizen must bear the risk of uncompensated injury. Accordingly, it has been determined that this is a proper subject for legislative relief, and the committee has fixed compensation in the amount of $15,000 as an adequate award in this case. It is therefore recommended that the bill, as amended, be considered favorably.

The committee concurs in the action of the House of Representatives and recommends that the bill be considered favorably.

GEORGE R. LORE

The bill (H.R. 3536) for the relief of George R. Lore was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1792), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay $6,889 to George R. Lore, of Baudette, Minn., a member of the Coast Guard Auxiliary, for the loss of or damage to his aircraft while on a search and rescue mission.

STATEMENT

The incident upon which the private relief legislation is based occurred in the Lake-of-the-Woods area in northern Minnesota on Sunday evening, July 2, 1961. After some 48 hours of stormy weather characterized by high winds, some men were stranded on one of the thousands of islands in the Lake-of-the-Woods. Toward evening, George R. Lore, head of the search and rescue committee of U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary Flotilla 28-05, received a telephone call requesting that he utilize his aircraft in an attempt to rescue or drop food to the men. Because of the high wind velocity, Mr. Lore, a veteran of many rescue missions, decided the weather would not permit a rescue attempt, but did fly to the area where the men were stranded for the purpose of dropping food. Just as the food was dropped, mechanical failure caused the airplane to lose altitude and crash. Mr. Lore was seriously injured and the loss to his uninsured airplane amounted to $6,889. No claim is made for medical expense, pain and suffering, or time lost from work.

The Treasury Department, in commenting on the proposed legislation, raises questions as to the authority for the rescue mission, and the eligibility of the aircraft involved for official rescue mission operations. Regulations concerning Coast Guard Auxiliary operations provide that any member of the Coast Guard Auxiliary who desires to make his aircraft available for use must submit an "Offer of Use" form to the appropriate Coast Guard commander. Inspection of the aircraft is required and thereafter such aircraft may be used on Coast Guard missions only when specifically authorized by Coast Guard orders.

The Treasury Department has expressed the opinion that the Government has no legal liability for the damages incurred as a result of the incident. This may be so, yet it seems clear that Mr. Lore attempted the food-drop mission on an "errand of mercy" within the scope of his voluntary responsibility and experience on search and rescue missions for the Coast Guard Auxiliary. Under these circumstances, it is concluded that the matter is an appropriate one for legislative relief and that, in good conscience, Mr. Lore should be compensated for the damage to his aircraft suffered on the mercy mission. Accordingly, it is recommended that the bill be considered favorably.

Coast Guard records establish that the aircraft used by Mr. Lore had passed annual inspections both in 1960 and 1961 so that it was an approved aircraft. There is some conflict as to whether the proper "Offer of Use" form had been submitted for the aircraft which crashed. The General Counsel of the Treasury stated that the Coast Guard records show that Mr. Lore had filed an "Offer for Use" form with respect to two other aircraft he owned, "* * * but the Coast Guard had not found an 'Offer for Use' form on file with respect to the particular aircraft used on this rescue mission."

Information was submitted to the committee that Mr. Lore had filed an "Offer of Use" for the aircraft used. It was explained that perhaps no "Offer of Use" was found for 1961 because the form permits the applicant to indicate the offer is good until withdrawn and "* * * the Coast Guard Auxiliary Manual, page 44, makes no mention of the fact that the 'Offer of Use' form C.G. 2746 must be executed every year."

The evidence in the record concerning the rescue mission which resulted in the aircraft damage indicates that Mr. Lore proceeded without specific orders or prior clearance from Coast Guard headquarters. It is contended that a telephone call from Baudette, Minn., on that Sunday evening could have, and most likely would have, delayed the search until the following day. Moreover, time is of the essence in any search and rescue mission. It appears to the committee significant that Mr. Lore himself decided that the weather conditions, time, and other circumstances did not permit a rescue attempt that day, and so decided only to make a food drop to be followed, no doubt, by a properly authorized rescue mission when the weather permitted.

The committee is of the opinion that this legislation is a proper vehicle to make some adjustment for loss suffered on a food drop mission which was voluntarily made under unusual circumstances but within the scope of the claimant's responsibility and experience on search and rescue mission for the Coast Guard Auxiliary. The committee believes it worthy of note that the claimant endeavored to charge off the value of the plane as tax loss but this was denied by the Internal Revenue Service. The committee believes the equities of the situation require some compensation for this errand of mercy and believes that favorable consideration of this legislation in some way compensates the claimant for his losses. Accordingly, the committee recommends favorable consideration of H.R. 3536, without amendment.

TIMOTHY JOSEPH SHEA AND ELSIE ANNET SHEA

The bill (S. 3621) for the relief of Timothy Joseph Shea and Elsie Annet Shea was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Timothy Joseph Shea and Elsie Annet Shea, husband and wife, of Orlando, Florida, the sum of $2,000, in full satisfaction of all their respective and joint claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries and suffering incurred by the said Elsie Annet Shea, and damages to their residence and property sustained by the said Timothy Joseph Shea and Elsie Annet Shea, incident to an accident which occurred on October 1, 1960, when two civil aircraft collided near their residence as the result of negligent landing instructions given to the pilots of such aircraft by operators of the Federal air traffic control tower, Herndon Air Port, Orlando, Florida: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1840), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of S. 3621 is to pay Timothy Joseph Shea and Elsie Annet Shea, husband and wife, of Orlando, Fla., the sum of $2,000 in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States for personal injuries suffered by Elsie Annet Shea and for damages to their property, incident to the collision of two civil aircraft as the result of negligent landing instructions given to the pilots of such aircraft by the operators of the Federal air traffic control tower, Herndon Airport, Orlando, Fla.

STATEMENT

The Federal Aviation Agency opposes the bill on the routine grounds of the bar of the statute of limitations as contained in the Federal Tort Claims Act, but makes the statement that "perhaps there are certain mitigating circumstances in this case."

The facts of the case contained in the agency report are as follows:

"The incident which gave rise to S. 3621 was a midair collision of a Beechcraft Bonanza and an Eastern Airlines Martin 404 on October 1, 1960, while both aircraft were approaching Orlando, Fla., Municipal Airport. The airliner was damaged, but was able to land safely without injury to the crew or passengers. The Bonanza, however, crashed and the pilot sustained fatal injuries.

"On August 6, 1963, Timothy Joseph Shea and Elsie Annet Shea instituted a suit in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida against the United States, Eastern Airlines, and other defendants alleging that as a result of the negligence of the defendants, Mrs. Shea sustained personal injuries in the amount of $10,000 by reason of the inhalation of noxious fumes, smoke, and gases emitted by the wreckage of the Bonanza aircraft which had fallen on the Sheas' place of residence. Damages of $3,000 were also claimed to compensate the plaintiffs for alleged property damage. Pursuant to a motion by the Government, the suit against the United States was dismissed on the grounds it was barred by the statute of limitations. We are not aware of the outcome of this litigation against the other defendants.

"The aircraft accident also gave rise to another suit against the United States and Eastern Airlines. That case (*Ayers* v. *United States et al.*) involved a wrongful death action brought by the widow of the deceased pilot of the Bonanza aircraft. Eastern Airlines was dismissed as a defendant on jurisdictional grounds. However, in the trial against the United States, the court found that Federal Aviation Agency controllers stationed at the Orlando Airport control tower were negligent and that such negligence was the proximate cause of the accident. The court also ruled that the Bonanza pilot was not contributorily negligent.

"The bill provides for the payment of $2,000 to cover the claims of the Sheas against the United States. Inasmuch as the Sheas were not involved in the *Ayres* case and the suit brought by the Sheas against the United States was dismissed on procedural grounds, we cannot make any comment with respect to the amount of damages they may have suffered or the validity of a payment of $2,000. Also, as we mentioned above, we do not know whether any recovery was made by the Sheas against parties other than the United States.

"A final issue which merits attention in this matter is the failure of the Sheas to avail themselves of the judicial remedies provided by law. The Federal Tort Claims Act provides a means of relief of persons sustaining personal injuries or property damage against the United States resulting from the negligence of Government employees acting within the scope of their employment. The suit brought under that act by the Sheas was not timely. Perhaps there are certain mitigating circumstances in this case, but we know of no reason why the standard provided by law should be disregarded and the special relief provided by S. 3621 enacted by Congress."

The committee disagrees with the conclusion of the Federal Aviation Agency and believes that the facts of this case justify a waiver of the statute of limitations. A court of record has found that the Government was negligent and that such negligence was the proximate cause of the accident giving rise to this claim. As shown by the letter from the claimants' attorney, the existence of the Government's negligence was unknown and thus the claimants could not have filed suit within the statutory period.

LOUIS T. MILLER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2024) for the relief of Louis T. Miller which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, after the name "Wisconsin", to strike out the comma and "and (2) to award to the said Louis T. Miller any compensation to which he would have been entitled had such claim been filed within the time and in the manner provided by such sections"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the Federal Employees Compensation Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 765–770), the Secretary of Labor is authorized (1) to receive and consider any claim filed within one year after the date of enactment of this Act by Louis T. Miller, of Kaukauna, Wisconsin, for compensation for disability resulting from an injury sustained by him during the year 1923 while performing services as an employee of the United States Corps of Engineers at the Combined Locks at Little Chute, Wisconsin. No benefits shall accrue pursuant to this Act for any period prior to the date of its enactment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1864), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is that, notwithstanding the provisions of sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the Federal Employees Compensation Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 765–770), the Secretary of Labor is authorized (1) to receive and consider any claim filed within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act by Louis T. Miller, of Kaukauna, Wis., for compensation for disability resulting from an injury sustained by him during the year 1923 while performing services as an employee of the U.S. Corps of Engineers at the Combined Locks at Little Chute, Wis. No benefits shall accrue pursuant to this act for any period prior to the date of its enactment.

STATEMENT

The facts of the case are found in an affidavit of the claimant and are as follows:

"Louis T. Miller, being first duly sworn on oath, deposes and says that he is presently 61 years of age and resides at Route No. 1, Kaukauna, in the village of Little Chute, Wis.; that he is married; that on or about the middle August 1923, while an employee of the U.S. Government under the U.S. Corps of Engineers in charge of the operation of navigation on the Fox River and the locks located thereon, and while operating the lock more specifically located at the Combined Locks in Little Chute, Wis., and while then and there attempting to allow a coal tug called the *George D. Ryan* through the locks, and while in the process of closing the middle gates in the lock and while in charge of the operation of the tripods operating the gates the action of the tug caused an unexpected speed up of the tripods and threw him onto the side of the locks on rocks causing him to sustain a severe injury to the right tibia. That he was taken to Dr. Boyd, of Kaukauna, for emergency treatment and continued under his care until it necessitated to operate upon him at which time Dr. Boyd called in Dr. V. F. Marshall of the city of Appleton, and with the additional assistance of Dr. Guy W. Carlson, who was then associated with Dr. Marshall and with also the presence of Dr. Boyd, surgery was performed upon Mr. Miller in the region of the right tibia. That the initial injury and surgery that followed caused him to be hospitalized for a period of approximately 3 months and in the St. Elizabeth Hospital of Appleton, Wis. That he was unable to return to his employment until the following spring; that the operation in 1923 did not completely remove the disability and did not heal completely. That infection appeared to have set in and continued thereto cause Mr. Miller a lot of pain and disability. That he was under doctor's care continuously and from time to time was obliged to submit to further surgery. That the record of Dr. V. F. Marshall, who performed the surgery on September 7, 1923, and subsequently again on September 28, 1923, is attached hereto and made a part hereof. That hospital records are available at St. Elizabeth Hospital, Appleton, Wis., and at the Wisconsin General Hospital, Madison, Wis., where he had the services of Dr. Robert Burnes, orthopedic specialist and Dr. Werka, also an orthopedic specialist. That on information and belief, Dr. Burnes diagnosed the infection of the tibia of the right leg as osteomyelitis of the bone and it became necessary to amputate the right leg about 4 inches above the knee on March 13, 1964. That Dr. George Behnke assisting Dr. Gordon H. Hardie of Neenah, performed the last surgery to amputate the leg. That he has since acquired the use of an artificial leg for replacement of the right leg.

"Affiant further alleges that he had received no information or any literature from the Government or from any other source, informing him of his rights to file a claim for workmen's compensation or other benefits. That the first time that he was informed he might have had a proper claim for workmen's compensation benefits was when a mutual friend of the late A. M. Miller and the father of this affiant and this affiant came to visit him at the hospital when the leg was amputated. This mutual friend, Attorney Samuel Sigman of Appleton, Wis., having had experience of serving as secretary to Hon. George J. Schneider, late Congressman from this district, and presently a practicing attorney, advised him that he might be able to get some relief if he could obtain the interest and cooperation of his Congressman or U.S. Senator. That upon such advice your affiant began his efforts toward this end.

"Affiant further alleges that he has ample proof to establish the accident and the facts concerning the medical treatment, hospitalization, from the time of the injury to the amputation of the right leg as testified to above."

The committee believes that it would be fair to waive the statute in this case and thus permit this claimant an opportunity to secure the benefits due him under the law. Evidence in the committee's files indicates that the claimant was injured while employed by the Government and that this injury is compensable under the law. In addition, the affidavits filed with this report indicate that the claimant was never notified of his rights.

In view of the foregoing the committee recommends favorable action.

MARTHA BLANKENSHIP

The bill (S. 3750) for the relief of Martha Blankenship was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Martha Blankenship of Meador, West Virginia, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of $1,887.86, representing the amount of survivor benefit payments which were erroneously paid to the said Martha Blankenship under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 incident to the death of her brother, Hasten Daniels, such payments having been used by the said Martha Blankenship to pay the funeral expenses and debts of her deceased brother prior to a determination by the Railroad Retirement Board that such payments should have been made to the surviving children of the said Hasten Daniels. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Martha Blankenship, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from her on account of the payments referred to in the first section of this Act.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1846), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to relieve Mrs. Martha Blankenship of Meador, W. Va., of her liability to the United States in the amount of $1,887.86, which is the total of the "insurance lump sum" and the "residual lump sum" paid her under sections 5(f) (1) and (2) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, 50 Stat. 307, as amended (45 U.S.C. 228a–228z–1), with respect to the death of the railroad employee, Hasten Daniels.

STATEMENT

The facts of the case contained in the report from the Railroad Retirement Board are as follows:

"The payment of the lump sums was made to Mrs. Blankenship solely by virtue of the fact that she filed an application for such sums with respect to the death of Mr. Daniels, her brother, of whose estate she is the administrator, and gave the answer 'None' to the question therein requesting the names of and other information about the employee's children, '* * * including illegitimate, adopted children, and stepchildren * * *.” Under the law, the existence of minor children, eligible for monthly annuities, had the effect that the lump sums were not payable. Mrs. Blankenship’s asserted use of the money to pay debts of the decedent, or to pay his burial expenses, is not relevant.

After the lump-sum payments were made to Mrs. Blankenship, the Board was informed that the employee was survived by two minor children. It was developed that these children were born to Mabel Jones, the divorced wife of the deceased employee, while she was still married to him. Mrs. Blankenship’s attorney contended that the children were nevertheless illegitimate; but the Board’s Bureau of Retirement Claims notified her on November 16, 1965, of its determination that the children were legitimate, and after protest and some further correspondence with her attorney the Bureau adhered to its position. No appeal has been taken from that determination.

“The Board is opposed to any essentially private relief bill which, like S. 3750, would waive recovery of benefits erroneously paid under the Railroad Retirement Act through the fault of an individual in giving inaccurate or misleading information on the application form submitted by the individual. The answer “None” to the question respecting the employee’s children was erroneous since these children were born to the employee’s wife during the existence of their marriage, before they were divorced. The question on the application is expressly phrased so as to make clear that it is for the Board, not the applicant, in case of any question, to determine whether a child is the child of the employee and is legitimate.

“To grant relief in these circumstances by way of a private bill would establish a precedent which would lead to demands from other persons for similar relief in similar circumstances. The volume of cases in which misstatements of this character result in payments not due, which have to be recovered, while small in a relative sense to the Board’s overall volume, is not inconsiderable in terms of absolute numbers. Congress has authorized the Board to waive overpayments, payments of amounts not due, in cases where, in the judgment of the Board, first, the individual paid was without fault and, second, recovery would be contrary to the purposes of the act or against equity or good conscience. The Board had made no such determinations here. The enactment of this bill would in effect circumvent the requirements for waiver now in the law. The Board opposes any such bill, the purpose of which is to extend to certain individuals benefits or privileges not available to all others similarly situated.”

The committee disagrees with the conclusions of the Railroad Retirement Board and finds that the bill, S. 3750, should be recommended favorably.

MISS ELISABETH VON OBERNDORFF

The bill (H.R. 3901) for the relief of Miss Elisabeth von Oberndorff was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1848), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize and direct the alien property custodian to return the funds vested by the Office of Alien Property belonging to Miss Elisabeth von Oberndorff, vested under order No. 4115, dated October 2, 1944.

STATEMENT

The facts of the case as found in House Report No. 1768, are as follows:

“The bill would make it possible to return the proceeds of the assets of Miss Elisabeth von Oberndorff which were vested by the Office of Alien Property by order No. 4115 of October 2, 1944. As is stated in the report of the Justice Department to the committee on the bill, the proceeds of these assets are estimated to approximate $185,000. The vesting order vested all of the outstanding capital stock of the Gardes Realty Corp., a New York corporation, and consisting of 3,250 shares of stock on October 2, 1944. That order found that the stock registered in the name of Fortunata Societe Anonyme, a Luxembourg corporation, was beneficially owned by Elisabeth von Oberndorff. The vesting was based on the fact that Miss von Oberndorff was a German citizen residing in Luxembourg, which was then enemy occupied territory.

“Miss von Oberndorff sought the return of the stock in a proceeding under section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act on the ground that she was the victim of enemy oppression. A hearing was conducted on her claim and the hearing examiner concluded in a decision dated October 6, 1952, that Miss von Oberndorff was not entitled to a return of her stock. It appears that the hearing examiner concluded that Miss von Oberndorff failed to establish that she was denied the full rights of German citizenship as a result of the application of German laws, decrees, or regulations discriminating against political, racial, or religious groups.

“A subcommittee hearing was conducted on this bill on March 17, 1966. At that time, reference was made to the findings of the hearing examiner in the hearing which resulted in the decision of October 6, 1952. The hearing examiner found that Miss von Oberndorff was the owner of all of the outstanding shares of the Luxembourg corporation and, therefore, was the beneficial owner of the stock in question. It was established that Miss von Oberndorff resided in her father’s house in Diekirch, Luxembourg, continuously between 1934 and 1950. In 1950, she first entered the United States. On January 23, 1951, she went to Canada and returned the same day as a non-preference-quota immigrant. Subsequent to that date, she has resided in New York. The hearing examiner found that following the occupation of Luxembourg by German forces during World War II, she refused to take a position in the German Nazi women’s organization. She was required to work in a factory, and was subsequently directed to work in a rag processing factory; however, she was able to avoid this work by working as a medical assistant and driver for Dr. Joseph Sinner. While she was so employed, she drove the doctor to places where political refugees were hidden who were receiving medical treatment. The following findings of the hearing commissioner as contained in the copy filed with the committee contain material which the committee feels is relevant to the question of relief as provided in the bill:

“ ‘17. In 1944, a fugitive from the German SS Corps was given meals and a hiding place in claimant’s home. A statement from the fugitive, Jean Roeder, in part is as follows:

“ ‘But also here it was already an open secret that I had slain two SS men. I had to keep myself completely under cover. In this I succeeded in the castle of Count von Oberndorff at Moestroff, where I received meals and a safe hiding place with permission of the Count and his daughter, Countess Elisabeth von Oberndorff. Well aware of the danger to be executed with me, if I would be found in the castle, they nevertheless did not push me back nor did they surrender me, although it would have been very easy for them to denunciate me to the Gestapo, which was constantly passing by.’

“ ‘18. The claimant gave 1,000 francs to the leader of the resistance movement in Luxembourg and after he was arrested by the Gestapo she gave his wife 2,400 francs.

“ ‘19. The occupation authorities were unaware of the aid the claimant gave to the Luxembourg resistance movement.

“ ‘The comprehensive statement of Dr. J. Sinner concludes as follows: .

“ ‘ “Also, she continued to carry on her relationship with the Luxembourg resistance movement, in spite of the risk, well known to her, that if discovered she would be tried for high treason.” ’

“ ‘20. Throughout the war claimant maintained a friendly, sympathetic attitude toward Luxembourg and the United States.’

“As has been noted, this record was found not to be sufficient to authorize relief under the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act authorizing the return of vested property. The Justice Department in its report states that enactment of the bill would accord her a preferential treatment and adds that there appears to be no reasonable basis for granting this preference. The committee feels that this record does provide a basis for legislative relief by the Congress. A similar bill for the relief of the same claimant was reported by the committee in the 84th Congress (H. Rept. No. 2457, 84th Cong., 2d sess.). At the hearing on the bill, it was stated that Miss von Oberndorff was the daughter of a German diplomat who left the diplomatic service in 1920 and was opposed to the rise of nazism in Germany. He left Germany and moved to the Saar. When the Saar was occupied by the Germans, the family moved to Luxembourg. Her brother became a Dutch citizen and was commended and cited by the Government of the Netherlands for his heroism in connection with his activities against the Nazis. Under the circumstances, the committee feels that legislative relief is justified and recommends that the bill be considered favorably.”

In agreement with the views of the House, the committee recommends the bill favorably.

CHARLES BERNSTEIN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3301) for the relief of Charles Bernstein which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment on page 1, line 10, after the word “offense”, to strike out “of which he was innocent” and insert “for which he subsequently received a full and unconditional pardon from the President of the United States”; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles Bernstein of Washington, District of Columbia, the sum of $10,000. Such sum shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of the said Charles Bernstein against the United States for damages sustained by him as the result of his arrest, arraignment, trial, conviction, and incarceration for an offense for which he subsequently received a full and unconditional pardon from the President of the United States; and such sum shall not constitute income for Federal income tax purposes: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1868), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles Bernstein of Washington, District of Columbia, the sum of $10,000. Such sum shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of the said Charles Bernstein against the United States for damages sustained by him as the result of his arrest, arraignment, trial, conviction, and incarceration for an offense of which he was innocent; and such sum shall not constitute income for Federal income tax purposes:

STATEMENT

The Department of Justice interposes no objection to the bill.

The facts of the case as found in the departmental report are as follows:

"The crime for which Charles Bernstein was convicted and sentenced was a murder which occurred in the District of Columbia, in April 1932. As a result of information received from a confidential informant, the Washington police caused Charles Bernstein to be arrested in Philadelphia, in June 1932. Mr. Bernstein, under the name of Charles Harris, was indicted and convicted of murder in the first degree in the District of Columbia and in October 1933, he was sentenced to be electrocuted. The evidence against him consisted of the testimony of two witnesses, one of whom identified him as the murderer, and the other of whom identified him as having been parked in the murder car at the scene on the preceding day.

"On appeal, the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia affirmed the judgment in May 1934, and the Supreme Court denied certiorari in October of that year. The mandate of the court of appeals was filed in October and the execution was set for January 11, 1935.

"Charles Bernstein's case interested a number of Washington citizens who believed that the evidence on which he was convicted was inadequate and that he had not been proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. Subsequently the Federal Bureau of Investigation conducted an investigation of the case which disclosed, among other things, that several other individuals who lived on the street where the murder took place were awakened by the shotgun blasts and saw the murderer. However, none of these persons were able to identify Mr. Bernstein. One witness, after having gone to the District jail and looked at Mr. Bernstein, stated that the man she had seen was taller, of lighter complexion, and lighter in weight. It was further disclosed that both the automobile dealer who sold the vehicle in which the murderer escaped and his secretary stated that Charles Bernstein was not the purchaser.

"In view of the doubts surrounding this case, President Roosevelt granted Charles Bernstein several reprieves, and in May 1935 commuted his sentence to life imprisonment. In June 1940 the President made a conditional commutation of sentence to the time served, the condition being that Mr. Bernstein remain under supervision similar to parole. In April 1954 President Truman granted Charles Bernstein a full and unconditional pardon.

"The bill on page 1, line 10, states that the offense which occasioned Mr. Bernstein's imprisonment was one 'of which he was innocent.' We point out that Mr. Bernstein's pardon contained no statement of his innocence. Further, since 34 years have elapsed since the occurrence of the crime, there would appear to be no way, at this time, in which his innocence can be conclusively and unquestionably established. However, it is generally agreed that the evidence and information which has accumulated in the intervening years since his conviction and appeal casts doubt on the credibility of the witnesses and whether Mr. Bernstein was guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. Therefore, if in view of the time he spent under sentence of death, the time served in prison, and the resultant hardship and anguish endured by him, the Congress wishes to award Charles Bernstein the sum of $10,000, the Department of Justice will interpose no objection."

In argeement with the views of the Attorney General, the committee recommends that the bill be favorably enacted.

MARIA ROSSI

The bill (H.R. 2129) for the relief of Maria Rossi was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1882), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant first preference status to Maria Rossi, who is to be adopted by citizens of the United States, which is the status normally enjoyed by the alien sons and daughters of U.S. citizens.

DR. ERIC J. LAZARO

The bill (H.R. 3526) for the relief of Dr. Eric J. Lazaro was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1883), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable Dr. Eric J. Lazaro to file a petition for naturalization.

DR. JULIO CESAR MUNIZ Y SOTOLONGO

The bill (H.R. 3531) for the relief of Dr. Julio Cesar Muniz y Sotolongo was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1884), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Dr. Julio Cesar Muniz y Sotolongo as of November 7, 1960, in order to permit him to file a petition for naturalization.

JAMES S. KAHRIMAN

The bill (H.R. 3756) for the relief of James S. Kahriman was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1885), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant first preference status to the adopted son of U.S. citizens, which is the status normally enjoyed by the alien sons and daughters of U.S. citizens.

ERNEST BUILLET

The bill (H.R. 3879) for the relief of Ernest Buillet was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1886), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to qualify for immediate relative status as the adopted son of citizens of the United States.

DR. JORGE IGNACIO MIQUEL FRANCA

The bill (H.R. 5622) for the relief of Dr. Jorge Ignacio Miquel Franca was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1887), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Dr. Jorge Ignacio Miquel Franca as of July 23, 1961, the date on which he was admitted to the United States as a visitor.

DR. JOSE A. G. MENDOZA

The bill (H.R. 6115) for the relief of Dr. Jose A. G. Mendoza was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1888), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Dr. Jose A. G. Mendoza as of September 2, 1960.

DR. BIENVENIDO BENACH CARRERAS

The bill (H.R. 6226) for the relief of Dr. Bienvenido Benach Carreras was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1889), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

DR. ANTONIO U. CATASUS

The bill (H.R. 6443) for the relief of Dr. Antonio U. Catasus was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1890), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Dr. Antonio U. Catasus as of September 3, 1959, the date on which he was admitted to the United States as a visitor.

DR. MYRIAM DE LA CARIDAD ARES Y FERNANDEZ DE BOSCH

The bill (H.R. 6899) for the relief of Dr. Myriam de la Caridad Ares y Fernandez de Bosch was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No.1891), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

DR. RICARDO R. FUSTE

The bill (H.R. 7341) for the relief of Dr. Ricardo R. Fuste was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1892), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent resident in the United States to Dr. Ricardo R. Fuste as of September 12, 1961, the date on which he was paroled into the United States.

MISS RAJKA SODA

The bill (H.R. 8614) for the relief of Miss Rajka Soda was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1893), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant second preference status to the alien child adopted by a lawful resident alien of the United States.

DR. LUIS E. BENCOMO

The bill (H.R. 10253) for the relief of Dr. Luis E. Bencomo was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1984), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Dr. Luis E. Bencomo as of June 5, 1961, the date on which he entered the United States as a visitor.

DR. ALLAN BAUMAL

The bill (H.R. 10259) for the relief of Dr. Allan Baumal was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1895), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable Dr. Allan Baumal to file a petition for naturalization.

GLORIA ALESNA RELAMPAGOS

The bill (H.R. 10832) for the relief of Gloria Alesna Relampagos was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1896), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate the admission into the United States in an immediate relative status of the alien child adopted by citizens of the United States.

DR. PEDRO RAPHAEL

The bill (H.R. 11224) for the relief of Dr. Pedro Raphael was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1897), explaining the purpose of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Dr. Pedro Raphael as of August 17, 1961, the date on which he was paroled into the United States.

JULIETA GLORIA BERSAMIN

The bill (H.R. 11254) for the relief of Julieta Gloria Bersamin was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1898), explaining the purpose of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate the admission into the United States in an immediate relative status of the alien child adopted by a citizen of the United States.

DR. JACINTA LLORENS

The bill (H.R. 11590) for the relief of Dr. Jacinta Llorens was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1899), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Dr. Jacinta Llorens as of June 13, 1960, the date on which she entered the United States as a nonimmigrant visitor.

DR. JUAN ANTONIO DUMOIS

The bill (H.R. 11640) for the relief of Dr. Juan Antonio Dumois was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1868), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Dr. Juan Antonio Dumois as of August 19, 1961, the date on which he was paroled into the United States.

MARIA KARIDAKIS

The bill (H.R. 11952) for the relief of Maria Karidakis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1901), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate the admission into the United States in an immediate relative status of the minor child adopted by citizens of the United States.

MURIEL WILLIAMS

The bill (H.R. 11957) for the relief of Muriel Williams was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1902), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to transmit U.S. citizenship to her daughter.

DR. AUGUSTO J. FERNANDEZ-CONDE

The bill (H.R. 12317) for the relief of Dr. Augusto J. Fernandez-Conde was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1903), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

DR. MARIO ORLANDO SANTOS-ESTEVEZ

The bill (H.R. 12781) for the relief of Dr. Mario Orlando Santos-Estevez was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1904), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

ALEXANDER FRANCIS SAKER, M.D.

The bill (H.R. 12920) for the relief of Alexander Francis Saker, M.D., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1905), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

MARIO P. NAVARRO, M.D.

The bill (H.R. 13101) for the relief of Mario P. Navarro, M.D., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1906), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

ANTONIO BARQUET CHEDIAK

The bill (H.R. 14173) for the relief of Antonio Barquet Chediak was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1907), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

RENATO CAMACHO CASTRO

The bill (H.R. 14984) for the relief of Renato Camacho Castro was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1908), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Renato Camacho Castro as of February 20, 1958.

DR. ALI HAJI-MORAD

The bill (H.R. 15488) for the relief of Dr. Ali Haji-Morad was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1909), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Dr. Ali Haji-Morad as of June 28, 1956, and to deem his residence and physical presence since that date to meet the naturalization requirements of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

VICENTE FERNANDEZ MARINO

The bill (H.R. 16522) for the relief of Vicente Fernandez Marino was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1910), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

DR. ANTONIO RONDON DELGADO

The bill (H.R. 16610) for the relief of Dr. Antonio Rondon Delgado was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1911), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

DR. FIDEL RODRIGUEZ-CUBAS

The bill (H.R. 18033) for the relief of Dr. Fidel Rodriguez-Cubas was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1912), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

DR. MIGUEL ANGEL MARTINEZ Y CORPAS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 3530) for the relief of Dr. Miguel Angel Martinez y Corpas, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Miguel Angel Martinez y Corpas shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of October 25, 1960.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1913), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Dr. Miguel Angel Martinez y Corpas as of October 25, 1960. The bill has been amended in accordance with established precedents to merely grant lawful residence as of the date of a prior admission in a temporary status, rather than to waive the naturalization requirements of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

DR. ANTONIO B. SANTILLANO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 10288) for the relief of Dr. Antonio B. Santillano, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Antonio B. Santillano shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on December 3, 1957, and the periods of time he has resided in this country since that date shall be held and considered to meet the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the said Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1914), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Dr. Antonio B. Santillano as of December 3, 1957, and, based on his residence and physical presence since that date, to file a petition for naturalization. The bill has been amended in accordance with established precedents to grant lawful residence as of the date of a prior admission in a temporary status, rather than to waive the naturalization requirements of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

NERMIN DEMIRBAG LAVAPIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 13192) for the relief of Nermin Demirbag Lavapies, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Nermin Demirbag Lavapies shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of June 26, 1957.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1915), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Nermin Demirbag Lavapies as of June 26, 1957. The bill has been amended in accordance with established precedents to merely grant lawful residence as of the date of a prior admission in a temporary status, rather than to waive the naturalization requirements of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

DISPOSAL OF NICKEL FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

The bill (H.R. 17376) to authorize the disposal of nickel from the national stockpile was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1916), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This measure would grant congressional approval to dispose of approximately 24.5 million pounds of stockpile grade nickel from the national stockpile and waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before such disposal could be started.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Why congressional approval is required

Under existing law, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in both the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile except in those instances where the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use during time of war.

Since the proposed disposal of these materials is not based on obsolescence, the proposed disposal requires the express approval of the Congress.

In addition, the bill would waive the procedural requirements of section 3 of the Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98b), with respect to publication and transmittal of notice and the 6-month waiting period. The bill would, however preserve the substantive requirements of section 3 with respect to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets. Thus, the waiver will permit the immediate disposal of nickel upon enactment of this measure.

Why disposal is proposed

The nickel to be disposed of is surplus to stockpile requirements and there is a serious shortage of nickel among the industrial users due to a disruption to the principal source of supply in Canada.

As of June 30, 1966, Government inventories of nickel totaled 128,759,932 pounds and the stockpile objective, established July 18, 1963, is 100 million pounds leaving a total excess of 28,759,932 pounds. Of this total authority exists for the disposal of 3,388,406 pounds from the Defense Production Act inventory and 876,526 pounds from the national stockpile. This bill covers the remaining excess of approximately 24.5 million pounds.

The approximately 24.5 million pounds covered by this bill and the 4.3 million pounds currently authorized for disposal would together, provide sufficient material to satisfy full industry requirements for a period of 1 month. This quantity, under a carefully controlled allocation program together with other potentially available supplies, should be sufficient to cover urgent domestic industry requirements for as much as 60 to 90 days.

Information on nickel

In 1965 U.S. mine production of nickel was approximately 32 million pounds. Primary plant production was approximately 27 million pounds and secondary and byproduct production 39 million pounds. Canada produced approximately 538 million pounds of the world total of 944 million pounds.

U.S. consumption of nickel in 1965 was approximately 344 million pounds. Imports for consumption, of which 90 percent was from Canada, were approximately 526 million pounds. U.S. exports of nickel were approximately 42 million pounds, primarily in nickel-alloy metals, nickel scrap, and nickel catalysts.

FISCAL DATA

The average acquisition cost of the nickel in the national stockpile was 54.67 cents per pound. The present market value is about 77.75 cents per pound.

FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 3254.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3254) to amend sections 2072 and 2112 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the scope of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and to repeal inconsistent legislation which was, on page 2, lines 19 and 20, strike out "Section 11 of the Act of December 29, 1950 (ch. 1189, 64 Stat. 1132; 5 U.S.C. 1041), is", and insert "Section 2352 of title 28 of the United States Code and item 2352 in the analysis of chapter 158 of title 28 of the United States Code, are".

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on the motion of the Senator from Florida that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to S. 3254.

The motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 6 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, until tomorrow, Saturday, October 22, 1966, at 9 o'clock a.m.

* * *

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 21, 1966

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed is everyone that feareth the Lord; that walketh in His ways.—Psalm 128: 1.

O God, who art the Creator and the sustainer of all mankind, without whose benediction all our labor is in vain and with whose blessing we walk the way to life and light—we pause before Thee this moment seeking strength and peace and guidance from Thee.

Strengthen us when we are weak. May the peace of Thy presence still the turmoil in our hearts and when we would go astray or stumble on the way make straight our paths before us and give us courage to walk with Thee.

For our loved ones, for our Nation and for the whole world of persons we pray. Together may we be led from war to peace, from fear to faith, from ill will to good will, from the depths of shallow living to the heights of a noble and sincere devotion.

So may a new world be born, even in our day. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PRINTING OF COMMITTEE ACTIVITY REPORTS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the printing of committee activity reports for the session, I wish to remind the chairmen of all committees that the Joint Committee on Printing has very properly ruled that the printing of such reports both as committee prints and in the RECORD is duplication, the cost of which cannot be justified.

It is requested that committee chairmen decide whether they wish these reports printed as committee prints or in the RECORD since the Government Printing Office will be directed not to print them both ways.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15183) entitled "An act to adjust the status of Cuban refugees to that of lawful permanent residents of the United States."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1319. An act to authorize a work release program for persons sentenced by the courts of the District of Columbia; to define the powers and duties in relation thereto, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to enable the United States to organize and hold an International Conference on Water for Peace in the United States in 1967 and authorize an appropriation therefor.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the bill S. 1674 entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make disposition of geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources, and for other purposes," with amendments in which concurrence of the House is requested.

ELECTION OF AGNES M. WALDRON—MINORITY EMPLOYEE

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution, House Resolution 1071.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1071

Resolved, That pursuant to the Legislative Pay Act of 1929, as amended, Agnes M. Waldron is hereby designated a minority employee effective October 15, 1966 (to fill an existing vacancy), until otherwise ordered by the House, and shall receive compensation at the basic rate of $7,000 per annum.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD]?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I objected when the attempt was made to send the bill, H.R. 14643, the International Education Act, to conference.

Of course, the reason for my doing that is that such action would prevent the House of Representatives from considering and debating such Senate amendments in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union as provided by rule XX of the rules of the House.

Rule XX of course has a specific purpose and it provides that the House of Representatives in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union may consider Senate amendments to bills passed by the House which Senate amendments substantially revise and change bills as passed by the House.

I might say that this measure was passed under the suspension rules of this House. It has never been debated fully either in this House or in the Senate.

I read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Senate proceedings. There appeared to be three Senators on the floor of the Senate at the time the bill was considered over there.

Mr. Speaker, this is an extremely important measure which involves $156 million, as far as I can see. There are grave questions as to the wisdom of the legislation. I am not trying to be an obstructionist. I would like to contribute to the end result of the legislation. I do think it is the better part of wisdom not to act on the legislation at this session but to have it held over until early next session. At that time we would be able to consider the subject fully and to produce constructive legislation to carry out the purposes which the President pronounced in his great Smithsonian speech, and which I know the Congress of the United States wants to enact.

But the legislation which is now on the Speaker's desk is not the legislation that the Congress should consider at this session.

Let me state further that my experience with international education has been primarily as a U.S. delegate to the Interparliamentary Union meetings for the last 3 years. In these meetings with Members of Parliament from the nations of Western Europe and those within the Soviet orbit as well as from the developing nations of Asia, Africa, and Central and South America, I came to appreciate the dire need for literacy training in the developing countries. In this hour when we are seeking means for greater international understanding and peace and when our Nation is striving for friendships, particularly among the developing nations, I cannot help but feel that the objective of promoting literacy among the 700 million adult illiterates around the world is of major importance.

Indeed, this was recognized by President Johnson in his historic message on the occasion of the bicentennial celebration of the Smithsonian Institution in September 1965. He stated enthusiastically that—

> This Nation's dream of a great society does not stop at the water's edge.

His first great recommendation, therefore, was to assist the education effort of the developing nations and the developing regions. He vowed to establish a task force in which he said that, in addition to Secretary of State Rusk and Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Gardner, he would call on leaders of both public and private enterprise to join in mapping the great effort which he there announced.

Thereafter the President did appoint members of a task force. Of the 11 citizens appointed, 8 were administrators or professors of colleges and universities. Another was the president of Education and World Affairs. In my view there was not a single representative from the private sector who possessed credentials which would identify him as an expert or even moderately interested in the subject of world literacy.

Nevertheless, in his remarks on the dedication of the Harry S. Truman Center on January 21, 1966, the President declared that the International Education Act of 1966 which he would soon put before the Congress would launch a series of projects to attack illiteracy.

In having some knowledge of this subject, as I have indicated, and knowing of the yearning of people in the developing countries for leadership and support from the Congress, I took occasion to outline a statement and recommendations which I presented to the President's Task Force on International Education.

When the President delivered his special message to the Congress on February 2, 1966, he made mention of a number of subjects which were included in his Smithsonian address and referred to some of the items which I had included in my recommendations—particularly the cooperation with UNESCO's world literacy program, the Peace Corps school-to-school program, and some other subjects. However, world literacy had at that time assumed a secondary or even a tertiary role.

That message, of course, made its first reference to strengthening our capacity for international educational cooperation and, with one exception, made reference to an entirely internal program in our American educational system. The reference to assisting the progress of education in developing nations was relegated to third place and contained no reference to legislation—and emphasizing primarily an increase in financial foreign aid support. There was, for instance no reference to the assumption of responsibility for carrying out any of the UNESCO pilot projects nor for the development of similar projects for literacy training in the developing nations. Another exciting and imaginative program looking toward improved educational programs for the developing nations involves the establishment of regional educational centers where potential teachers and educators in the developing nations may gather for instruction on how to improve the quality of primary and secondary education in their own countries with emphasis again on instruction in literacy.

It was disappointing that no exciting new program looking toward helping the 700 million adult illiterates in the developing nations was outlined. Of course, the continuation and even the expansion of foreign aid is of interest to some. However, it is also a source of criticism both here and abroad. The people in the developing nations want something more than American dollars and, in my opinion, they deserve something more than a domestic program of international education.

As the Washington Post said editorially, the title of this bill is somewhat misleading:

> It has nothing whatever to do with improving the educational facilities of foreign countries.

It is designed solely to promote American understanding of foreign lands. My colleague from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] said this:

> Those of you who are disturbed about the President's Message on International Education feel that this is a way whereby we are going to educate the world. Allay your fears, because this has nothing to do with that.

This legislation is probably unnecessary except with regard to the proposed amendment of the National Defense Education Act to permit expanded language instruction. I would strongly support those provisions as I believe the unanimous House and Senate would. Beyond that, I believe that existing law would permit the programs which this legislation purports to authorize. Certainly the enlargement of areas of international studies in the undergraduate branches of our colleges and universities, as well as graduate centers of international studies, would seem to be possible under existing law affecting higher education. The only reason I can see for this measure is to increase the authorization for higher education through legislation which purports by its title to do something which it does not do and to fulfill promises made by the President to this Nation and to the rest of the world which, indeed, are not fulfilled in any sense by this measure.

The International Education Act of 1966 gives emphasis at this time to a subject of low priority in virtual disregard of a subject of the highest priority—the literacy training of the people of the developing nations.

I urge that action on this measure be deferred until the 90th Congress at which time it may be considered in conjunction with a comprehensive legislative and administrative program for carrying out the great objectives of educational assistance to the needy illiterates of the world—a most noble objective which this Nation should undertake. The cause of long-range international understanding and peace depends upon such a program. This bill does not accomplish that; neither does it tend in that direction. In fact, it may contribute to the delay of achieving the ultimate goal which we should be seeking.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. TUTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 397]

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adams
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashley
Aspinall
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Belcher
Berry
Blatnik
Bolling
Bow
Bray
Brock
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Byrne, Pa.
Callaway
Carey
Carter
Cederberg
Clawson, Del
Clevenger
Cohelan
Colmer
Cooley
Corman
Craley
Culver
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Delaney
Denton
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dorn
Duncan, Oreg.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Gettys
Gilligan
Grabowski
Gray
Greigg
Griffiths
Gross
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Howard
Hungate
Huot
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Kastenmeier
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kornegay
Kupferman
Laird
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
MacGregor
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mailliard
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Matsunaga
May
Meeds
Michel
Miller
Mink
Minshall
Moeller
Moore
Morrison
Morse
Moss
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Nelsen
Nix
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Pepper
Pool
Powell
Pucinski
Purcell
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roncalio
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
St Germain
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Scott
Senner
Shipley
Sisk
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Stafford
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Toll
Trimble
Tunney
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vivian
Waldie
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watts
Weltner
White, Idaho
Whitener
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Yates
Younger

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 217 Members have answered to their names. The Speaker is present. Two hundred and eighteen Members are present, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that Mr. MONRONEY be appointed a conferee on the bill (H.R. 18381) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes" in lieu of Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia.

HIGHER EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1966—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 14644) to amend the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 to extend it for 3 years, and other purposes; and to authorize assistance to developing institutions for an additional year, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2326)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14644) to amend the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 to extend it for 3 years, and other purposes; and to authorize assistance to developing institutions for an additional year, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment to the text of the bill insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Higher Education Amendments of 1966'.

"EXTENSION OF GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF UNDERGRADUATE ACADEMIC FACILITIES

"SEC. 2. (a) Section 101(a) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended by striking out 'four succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'seven succeeding fiscal years'.

"(b) Section 101(b) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

" '(b) for the purpose of making grants under this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $230,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for the succeeding fiscal year, $460,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $475,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $728,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $936,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969; but for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and the succeeding fiscal year, only such sums may be appropriated as Congress may hereafter authorize by law. In addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year for which an appropriation is authorized by the preceding sentence, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for that fiscal year for making such grants the difference (if any) between any specific sums authorized to be appropriated under the preceding sentence for the preceding fiscal year and the sums which were appropriated for such preceding year under such sentence.'

"(c) Section 102 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

" 'ALLOTMENTS

" 'SEC. 102. The following percentage of the funds appropriated pursuant to section 101 for a fiscal year shall be allotted among the States in the manner prescribed by section 103 for use in providing academic facilities for public community colleges and public technical institutes:

" '(1) In the case of fiscal years ending before July 1, 1967, 22 per centum.

" '(2) In the case of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, 23 per centum.

" '(3) In the case of fiscal years ending after June 30, 1968, 24 per centum.

The remainder of the funds so appropriated for any fiscal year shall be allotted among the States in the manner as prescribed in section 104 for use in providing academic facilities for institutions of higher education other than public community colleges and public technical institutes.'

"(d) Sections 103(c) and 104(c) of such Act (relating to the reallotment of appropriations) are each amended by striking out 'for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and the succeeding fiscal year,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'for any fiscal year'.

"PAYMENTS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES AND FOR PLANNING

"SEC. 3 (a) Subsection (b) of section 105 of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended to read as follows:

" '(b) The Commissioner is authorized to expend not exceeding $3,000,000 during the fiscal years ending June 30, 1965, and June 30, 1966, and not exceeding $7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years, in such amounts as he may consider necessary (1) for the proper and efficient administration of the State plans approved under this title, and under part A of title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965, including expenses which he determines were necessary for the preparation of such plans, and (2) for grants, upon such terms and conditions as the Commissioner determines will best further the purposes of this Act, to State commissions for conducting, either directly or through other appropriate agencies and institutions, comprehensive planning to determine the construction needs of institutions (and particularly combinations and regional groupings of institutions) of higher education. Not more than $3,000,000 may be expended in any fiscal year for the purposes set forth in clause (1). For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and the succeeding fiscal year, the Commissioner may expend for purposes of this subsection only such sums as Congress may hereafter authorize by law.'

"(b) Section 601 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended (1) by striking out subsection (d) thereof and by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (d), and (2) by striking out 'subsections (b), (c), and (d)' in the subsection redesignated as subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof 'subsections (b) and (c)'.

"EXTENSION OF GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF GRADUATE ACADEMIC FACILITIES; EXTENDING AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 4. Section 201 of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended to read as follows:

" 'APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

" 'SEC. 201. In order to increase the supply of highly qualified personnel critically needed by the community, industry, government, research, and teaching, the Commissioner shall, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and each of the seven succeeding fiscal years, make construction grants to assist institutions of higher education to improve existing graduate schools and cooperative graduate centers, and to assist in the establishment of graduate schools and cooperative graduate centers of excellence. For the purpose of making grants under this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, the sum of $60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, the sum of $120,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, the sum of $60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the sum of $120,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for the succeeding fiscal year; but for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and the succeeding fiscal year, only such sums may be appropriated as Congress may hereafter authorize by law. In addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year for which an appropriation is authorized by the preceding sentence, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for that fiscal year for making such grants the difference (if any) between any specific sums authorized to be appropriated under the preceding sentence for the preceding fiscal year and the sums which were appropriated for such preceding year under such sentence. Sums appropriated pursuant to this title for any fiscal year shall remain available for grants under this title until expended.'

"EXTENSION OF LOANS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF ACADEMIC FACILITIES

"SEC. 5. Section 303(c) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'four' in the first sentence and inserting 'seven';

"(2) by striking out in the second sentence '; but for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967,' and inserting in lieu thereof ', the sum of $200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the sum of $400,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for the succeeding fiscal year; but for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970,'; and

"(3) by amending the third and fourth sentences to read as follows: 'In addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year for which an appropriation is authorized by the preceding sentence, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for that fiscal year, for making such loans, the difference (if any) between any specific sums authorized to be appropriated under the preceding sentence for the preceding fiscal year and the sums which were appropriated for such preceding year under such sentence. Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection for any fiscal year shall be available without fiscal-year limitations for loans under this title.'

"AMENDMENT TO DEFINITION OF DEVELOPMENT COST

"Sec. 6. Subsection (c) of section 401 of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended (1) by inserting '(1)' immediately after '(c)', (2) by redesignating clauses (1) and (2) as clauses (A) and (B), respectively, (3) by redesignating subclauses (A) and (B) as subclauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and (4) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(2) In determining the development cost with respect to an academic facility, the Commissioner may include expenditures for works of art for the facility of not to exceed 1 per centum of the total cost (including such expenditures) to the applicant of construction of, and land acquisition and site improvements for, such facility.'

"REPEAL OF AUTHORITY TO PRESCRIBE A SCHEDULE OF FEES FOR CERTAIN INSPECTIONS AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

"Sec. 7. The Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended by striking out subsection (b) of section 304 and by redesignating subsection (c) and references thereto as subsection (b).

"PROVIDING THAT ACADEMIC FACILITIES WILL BE USABLE BY HANDICAPPED PERSONS

"Sec. 8. Section 401(a)(1) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended by inserting after the period at the end thereof the following: 'Plans for such facilities shall be in compliance with such standards as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may prescribe or approve in order to insure that facilities constructed with the use of Federal funds under this Act shall be, to the extent appropriate in view of the uses to be made of the facilities, accessible to and usable by handicapped persons.'.

"REVISION OF MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT REQUIREMENT FOR COLLEGE LIBRARY ASSISTANCE

"Sec. 9. Effective for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1966, clauses (a) and (b) of section 202 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 are each amended by inserting after 'June 30, 1965' the following: ', or during the two fiscal years preceding the fiscal year for which the grant is requested, whichever is the lesser'.

"TWO-YEAR EXTENSION OF ASSISTANCE TO DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS

"Sec. 10. Paragraph (1) of section 301(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by inserting after 'June 30, 1966,' the following: 'the sum of $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the sum of $55,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968,'.

"INCREASE IN MINIMUM ADVANCES FOR RESERVE FUNDS FOR INSURED LOAN PROGRAM

"Sec. 11. The second sentence of section 422(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended to read as follows: 'The amount available, however, for advances to any State for each fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1968, shall not be less than $25,000, and any additional funds needed to meet this requirement shall be derived by proportionately reducing (but not below $25,000 per year) the amount available for advances to each of the remaining States.'

"AMENDMENT TO HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 TO AUTHORIZE THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO ESTABLISH A LOAN INSURANCE PROGRAM FOR THE PURPOSES OF SUCH ACT AND THE NATIONAL VOCATIONAL STUDENT LOAN INSURANCE ACT OF 1965

"Sec. 12. The Higher Education Act of 1965 is further amended by inserting after section 435 a new section as follows:

"'DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STUDENT LOAN INSURANCE PROGRAM

"'Sec. 436. (a) The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia is authorized (1) to establish a student loan insurance program which meets the requirements of this title and the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965 for a State loan insurance program in order to enter into agreements with the Commissioner for the purposes of this title and such Act, (2) to enter into such agreements with the Commissioner, (3) to use amounts appropriated to such Board for the purposes of this section to establish a fund for such purposes and for expenses in connection therewith, and (4) to accept and use donations for the purposes of this section.

"'(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of any applicable law, if the borrower, on any loan insured under the program established pursuant to this section, is a minor, any otherwise valid note or other written agreement executed by him for the purposes of such loan shall create a binding obligation.

"'(c) There are authorized to be appropriated to such Board such amounts as may be necessary for the purposes of this section.'

"STUDY TO DETERMINE MEANS OF IMPROVING LOAN INSURANCE PROGRAM

"Sec. 13. The Commissioner of Education shall make an investigation and study to determine means of improving the loan insurance program pursuant to part B of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, particularly for the purpose of making loans insured under such program more readily available to students. The Commissioner shall report the results of such investigation and study, together with his recommendations for any legislation necessary to carry out such improvements, to the President and the Congress no later than January 1, 1968.

"REVISION OF MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT REQUIREMENT FOR COLLEGE EQUIPMENT PROGRAM

"Sec. 14. Effective with respect to applications filed after December 30, 1966, section 604(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by striking out the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'An institution of higher education shall be eligible for a grant for a project pursuant to this part in any fiscal year only if such institution will expend from current funds for instructional and library purposes, other than personnel costs, during such fiscal year an amount not less than the amount expended by such institution from current funds for such purposes during the previous fiscal year.'

"INCREASE IN AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FEDERAL CAPITAL CONTRIBUTIONS FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE STUDENT LOANS

"Sec. 15. Section 201 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out 'and $195,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968' and inserting in lieu thereof 'and $225,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968'.

"LOAN CANCELLATION FOR TEACHING HANDICAPPED CHILDREN, AND FOR TEACHING IN THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

"Sec. 16. (a) Section 205(b)(3) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out 'and (B) for the purposes of any cancellation pursuant to clause (A)' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '(B) such rate shall be 15 per centum for each complete academic year or its equivalent (as so determined by regulations) of service as a full-time teacher of handicapped children (including mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed or other health impaired children who by reason thereof require special education) in a public or other nonprofit elementary or secondary school system, and (C) for the purposes of any cancellation pursuant to clause (A) or (B)'.

"(b) Section 103(a) of such Act is amended by inserting after 'except that' the following: '(1) as used in section 205(b)(3) such term includes the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and (2)'.

"(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to teaching service performed during academic years beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, whether the loan was made before or after such enactment.

"ASSISTANCE IN INDUSTRIAL ARTS ADDED TO TITLE III OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

"Sec. 17. (a) Effective for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1967, clauses (1) and (5) of section 303(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 are each amended by inserting 'industrial arts,' after 'economics,'.

"(b) Section 301 of such Act is amended by striking out 'and $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof '$100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for the succeeding fiscal year and $110,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill, and agree to the same.

Adam Powell,
Edith Green,
John Brademas,
Carlton Sickles,
Sam Gibbons,
Hugh Carey,
William D. Hathaway,
Phillip Burton,
William H. Ayres,
Albert H. Quie,
O. R. Reid,
John Erlenborn,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Wayne Morse,
Lister Hill,
Ralph W. Yarborough,
Joseph Clark,
Jennings Randolph,
Robert Kennedy,
Harrison Williams,
Winston Prouty,
J. K. Javits,
Peter Dominick,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Statement

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14644) to amend the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 to extend it for 3 years, and for other purposes; and to authorize assistance to developing institutions for another year, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment to the text of the bill strikes out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserts a substitute. The House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment. The differences between the text of the House bill and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted below except for clerical corrections, incidental changes made necessary by reason of agreements reached by the conferees, and minor drafting and clarifying changes.

AMENDMENTS TO HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963

Section 2. Extension of grants for construction of undergraduate academic facilities

Section 2 of the conference substitute amends title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 (referred to in the analysis of secs. 2 through 8 of the conference substitute as "act"). Section 101 of the act established a program of grants to institutions of higher education for the construction of undergraduate academic facilities. The program presently expires on June 30, 1968, but for the last 2 fiscal years of the program no appropriations have been authorized to carry it out. Present law (sec. 102), moreover, requires that 22 percent of the total appropriation for any fiscal year be allotted among the States for use in providing academic facilities for public community colleges and public technical institutes, and the remainder for use in providing academic facilities for other institutions of higher education.

The amendment made by the House bill would have extended this program for 3 years, until June 30, 1971, and would have authorized appropriations for the fiscal years ending in 1967, 1968, and 1969, of $453, $700, and $900 million, respectively.

The Senate amendment would have—

(1) extended the duration of the program for 3 fiscal years;

(2) terminated, beginning with the fiscal year ending in 1967, the requirement that 22 percent of the total appropriation under title I of the act for any fiscal year be allotted for academic facilities for public community colleges and public technical institutions;

(3) authorized, for construction of academic facilities for public community colleges and public technical institutions, appropations of $140 million for the fiscal year endng in 1967, $182 million for the fiscal year ending in 1968, and $234 million for the fiscal year ending in 1969;

(4) authorized, for academic facilities for other institutions of higher education, appropriations of $420 million for fiscal year 1967, $546 million for fiscal year 1968, and $702 million for fiscal year 1969; and

(5) made applicable to allotments made for any fiscal year the provisions of present law (secs. 103(c) and 104(c)) authorizing reallotment of the unused portion of allotments, which at present applies only to allotments made for the fiscal years 1965 and 1966.

The conference substitute authorizes appropriations of $475 million, $728 million, and $936 million for the fiscal years ending in 1967, 1968 and 1969, respectively. Of the sums appropriated pursuant to this authorization, public community colleges and public technical institutes will receive 22 percent in fiscal years ending before 1968, 23 percent in the fiscal year ending in 1968, and 24 percent in fiscal years ending thereafter. The conference substitute also includes the provision of the Senate amendment relating to reallotments (described in paragraph (5), supra).

Section 3. Payments for administrative expenses and planning

This section of the conference substitute differs from the House bill in that under the substitute, sums authorized to be appropriated by section 105(b) of the act will be available for administration of State plans approved under the program for financial assistance for the improvement of undergraduate instruction established by part A of title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965. In addition, the Senate amendment and the conference substitute repeal the authority in part A of title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965, which authorized an appropriation of funds for the administration of State plans approved under that title.

Section 4. Extension of grants for construction of graduate academic facilities; extending availability of appropriations

The House bill amended section 201 of the act (which authorizes appropriations for the program of assistance for the construction of graduate academic facilities) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years ending in 1967, 1968, and 1969 of $60, $90, and $120 million, respectively. The Senate amendment authorized $120 million for each of these years. The conference substitute authorizes $60 million for the fiscal year ending in 1967, and $120 million for each of the 2 succeeding fiscal years.

Section 5. Extension of loans for construction of academic facilities

The House bill amended section 301 of the act (which presently authorizes appropriations to a revolving fund out of which loans are made to institutions for the construction of academic facilities) to authorize appropriations of $200 million yearly for the fiscal years ending in 1967, 1968, and 1969. The Senate amendment authorized $400 million yearly for these fiscal years. The conference substitute authorizes $200 million for the fiscal year ending in 1967, and $400 million for each of the 2 succeeding fiscal years.

Section 8. Providing that academic facilities will be usable by handicapped persons

The Senate amendment contained a provision, not present in the House bill, which would add to section 401(a)(1) of the act (which defines the term "academic facilities") a requirement that plans for such facilities comply with such standards as the Secretary may prescribe or approve to insure that facilities constructed with Federal aid under the act be accessible to and usable by handicapped persons to the extent appropriate in view of the uses to be made of the facilities. The conference substitute includes this provision of the Senate amendment.

AMENDMENTS TO HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Section 9. Revision of maintenance-of-effort requirement for college library assistance

The Senate amendment contained a provision, not present in the House bill, which modified the maintenance-of-effort requirements for eligibility for basic grants under part A of title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (relating to grants for college library resources). Under present law (sec. 202 (a) and (b)), an institution or combination of institutions, in order to be eligible for basic grants for books and other library resources and materials, must provide satisfactory assurance that the applicant will, during the fiscal year for which the grant is requested, expend from funds other than those received under part A, (1) for all library purposes (exclusive of construction) and (2) for books and other library materials, respectively, amounts not less than the average amounts it respectively expended for such purposes during the 2-year period ending June 30, 1965. (These requirements are in addition to a matching requirement in the act.) The Senate amendment would, as an alternative to the use of the average annual amount expended during the 2-year period ending June 30, 1965, as a measure of the required effort, have substituted the average annual amount expended by the applicant during the 2 fiscal years preceding the fiscal year for which the grant is requested if that amount is less. The conference substitute includes this provision of the Senate amendment.

Section 10. Two-year extension of assistance to developing institutions

The House bill extended the program of assistance to developing institutions under title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 for 1 fiscal year, until June 30, 1967, and authorized an appropriation of $30 million for that year. The Senate amendment extended the program for 3 fiscal years, and authorized an appropriation of $55 million for each year. The conference substitute extends the program for two years and authorizes $30 and $55 million for the fiscal years ending in 1967 and 1968, respectively.

Section 11. Increase in minimum advances for reserve funds for insured loan programs

Part V of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 provides—in addition to a standby Federal student loan insurance program—for making advances, from Federal appropriations, for the reserve funds of State and nonprofit private student loan insurance programs.

Section 421(b) of that act authorizes aggregate appropriations of $17,500,000 for making such advances, such appropriations to remain available for advances through the fiscal year 1968. Section 422(b) requires that the total of such advances may not exceed an amount which bears the same ratio to $17½ million as the population of the State aged 18 to 22 bears to the total population of all, the States in this age group, but that if the amount so determined for any State is less than $25,000 it shall be increased to $25,000, with proportionate reduction (but not below $25,000) in the amount determined for each of the remaining States.

The Senate amendment contained a provision, not present in the House bill, which would amend the provision for a minimum advance to each State, so that the minimum advance to a State would be an annual minimum of $25,000 for each fiscal year (prior to the fiscal year 1969) rather than a minimum of $25,000 in the aggregate. The conference substitute includes this provision of the Senate amendment.

Section 12. Authorizing District of Columbia to establish a federally assisted student loan insurance program

The Senate amendment contained a provision, not present in the House bill, which would amend part B of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 adding thereto a section 436 authorizing the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish a student loan insurance program meeting the requirements of such part B and the requirement of the National Vocational Student Insurance Act of 1965 for a State loan insurance program and to enter into agreements with the Commissioner of Education for the purposes of these Federal programs. This provision of the Senate amendment further provides that a minor obtaining a student loan insured under the program established by the Board of Commissioners pursuant to this section shall be legally bound by any note or other written agreement executed by him for the purposes of such loan, regardless of whether under other applicable law a binding obligation would otherwise be created. The conference substitute includes this provision of the Senate amendment.

Sec. 13. Study to determine means of improving loan insurance program

The Senate amendment contained a provision not present in the House bill directing the Commissioner of Education to make a study of means of improving the loan insurance program under part B of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and to report to the President and Congress before

1968 on the results of his study. This provision is included in the conference substitute.

Section 14. Revision of maintenance-of-effort requirement for college equipment program

Under part A of title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965, providing for grants to institutions of higher education for equipment for undergraduate instruction, an institution of higher education is eligible for a grant for a project in any fiscal year only if it will expend during such year, "for the same purposes as, but not pursuant to" such part A, an amount at least equal to the amount expended by such institution in the previous fiscal year. Under a provision of the Senate amendment, not present in the House bill, this provision (sec. 604(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965) would be amended effective with respect to applications filed after December 30, 1966, so that the institution would be eligible if during the fiscal year involved it would expend "from current funds for instructional and library purposes, other than personnel costs," an amount not less than that expended by the institution from current funds for such purpose during the previous fiscal year. The conference substitute includes this provision of the Senate amendment.

AMENDMENTS TO THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

Section 15. Increase in apppropriation authorization for Federal capital contributions for national defense student loans

The Senate amendment amended the first sentence of section 201 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 so as to increase from $190 to $220 million for the fiscal year 1967, and from $195 to $225 million for the fiscal year 1968, the authorization for appropriations under that section of the national defense student loan program. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference substitute increases the authorization for the fiscal year ending in 1968 from $195 to $225 million.

Section 16. NDEA loan cancellation for teaching handicapped children, and for teaching in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands

The Senate amendment amended section 205(b)(3) of the NDEA to provide up to 100 percent cancellation of a student loan at the rate of 15 percent for each year of service by the debtor as a full-time teacher of handicapped children in a public or other nonprofit elementary or secondary school system. (Under existing law, this particular loan cancellation provision applies only to those who teach in elementary or secondary schools with high concentrations of children from low-income families.) In addition the Senate amendment had a provision which would close a gap in existing law by extending the benefit of the loan cancellation provisions of the NDEA to borrowers teaching full time in public or nonprofit private elementary or secondary schools in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. The House bill contained no comparable provisions. The conference substitute includes these provisions of the Senate amendment.

In light of the absence of evidence that the cancellation provisions in the student loan program have attracted any sizeable number of people into the teaching profession, it was further agreed that the loan cancellation provisions be reconsidered next year after the House and Senate, independently, make a study of the impact of these provisions on the teaching profession.

Section 17. Assistance in industrial arts added to title III of National Defense Education Act of 1958

The Senate amendment added industrial arts to the list of critical subjects in which the quality of instruction may be improved through financial assistance under title III of the NDEA, and authorized an appropriation for the purposes of title III of the NDEA, of $110 million for the fiscal year 1967 and an equal amount for fiscal year 1968. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference substitute contains this provision of the Senate amendment, but delays its effective date for one year, until the fiscal year ending in 1968.

It was also agreed that before the effective date of this provision further consideration will be given to an expansion of the scope of title III either through the deletion of categorical limitations or by the inclusion of additional categories and that detailed consideration will be given to the question of whether, and to what extent, priorities for such assistance should be determined by the Commissioner of Education in view of the desirability of insuring maximum freedom of choice in such matters at the State and local levels.

The House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill, and agrees to the same.

ADAM C. POWELL,
EDITH GREEN,
JOHN BRADEMAS,
CARLTON R. SICKLES,
SAM M. GIBBONS,
HUGH CAREY,
WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY,
PHILLIP BURTON,
WILLIAM H. AYRES,
ALBERT H. QUIE,
OGDEN REID,
JOHN ERLENBORN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from Oregon is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, on May 2 when the House considered the 1966 amendments to the Higher Education Act, we did so under suspension of the rules and approved the legislation without a dissenting voice. Today we are considering the conference report on the 1966 amendments and I hope that again we can approve this legislation without a dissenting vote.

First, the conference report contains every provision of the House approved bill. Second, even though the Senate version of the 1966 amendments authorized sums far in excess of the House bill, I report back to the House that the conference report contains an authorization for the current fiscal year which is only $22 million more than what the House approved last May. With respect to the 1967 authorizations, the Senate version carried $462 million more than the House bill—and, I repeat, the conference report contains only $22 million of that extra amount—I repeat, for fiscal year 1967.

Lastly, because the Senate did not act on the higher education amendments until just recently, their version of the bill contained a number of perfecting amendments to legislation we approved last year. In those instances where there was clear justification for the amendments, the House conferees have provided for their inclusion in the conference report.

The primary purpose of H.R. 14644 is to amend and extend the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963. Both the House and Senate bills were in agreement with respect to the length of the extension. However, there was considerable difference between the amount proposed to be authorized for the three titles of the act. During the House consideration of the authorization for the Facilities Act, the House committee was very sensitive to, not only the projected need for academic facilities in higher education, but also to the budgetary limitations brought about because of other Federal commitments. With respect to the current fiscal year, fiscal year 1967, the House bill followed the President's budget exactly and with one exception the conference report does also. The exception I speak of is title I of the Facilities Act under which grants are made available to colleges and universities for the construction of academic facilities in the undergraduate level. The authorization for this program will be $475 million which is $22 million in excess of the President's budget and the House bill.

With respect to authorizations for programs carried on in fiscal year 1968 and 1969, the conference report contains the Senate recommendations. For title I of the Facilities Act the differences were very slight and in accepting the Senate recommendations the conference report adds only $64 million more than the House bill. With respect to graduate facility construction, the conference report authorizes $120 million for each of these two fiscal years, and for loans under title III of the act, $400 million is authorized for each of the 2 years.

With regard to the program of grants to assist in raising the standards of developing institutions, it was the House's position that the program should be extended for 1 year only with an authorization of $30 million. The conference report extends the program for 2 years with the House-approved authorization for fiscal year 1967 and the Senate-recommended authorization of $55 million for fiscal year 1968.

The Senate bill proposed a substantial revision in the Higher Education Facilities Act—in recommending that a specific sum be authorized for grants for the construction of facilities for public community colleges and institutes. This is a departure from the existing provisions of the act under which one amount is authorized with a reservation of 22 percent for community colleges and technical institutes. The amounts authorized by the Senate were such that they equaled 25 percent of the total amount for title I rather than the presently authorized 22 percent. The House succeeded in maintaining its position that there should be one authorization with a fixed percentage being reserved for the public community colleges and technical institutes. It was agreed that for the current fiscal year the percentage should remain at 22 percent but for the next fiscal year it shall be 23 percent and for fiscal year 1969 it shall be 24 percent.

Mr. Speaker, the above-mentioned provisions are the principal parts of the conference report. I urge—let me just briefly mention the remaining amendments.

The conference report provides for an increase in fiscal year 1968 of $30 million for the national defense education act title II student loan program. Also the loan cancellation provisions for this program have been broadened slightly. With respect to the guaranteed-reduced-interest student loan program, the conference report provides for a much-needed study on how to make improvements in the program. Amendments have also been included to facilitate participation by the District of Columbia in the program and to provide for a more realistic allocation of advances to reserve funds of State guaranteed programs. Title III of the National Defense Education Act has been amended to include industrial arts in the program of equipment grants. The inclusion will not be effective until fiscal year 1968 at which time the authorization will be increased by $10 million—from $100 million to $110 million.

The conference report also contains the following Senate amendments which were not present in the House-approved bill. These provide for:

First. Making permanent the reallotment authority for title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act.

Second. The use of certain funds to cover administrative expenses incurred in the administration of State plans under title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Third. An improvement in the maintenance of effort requirements in titles II and VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

And, lastly, that academic facilities constructed with Federal funds be accessible to and usable by handicapped persons.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not go further into the details of this legislation. However, if there are questions about it I shall be very happy to respond to those questions.

However, Mr. Speaker, I do urge the Members of the House to adopt the conference report which was agreed to by the House conferees unanimously.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I want to say for our side that we are in complete support of the conference report.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, as the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon said, that there is a $22 million authorization in title I over the President's budget. But in the conversations that I have had with educators, with some of our colleagues and with administrators of various universities and colleges, the program to which they look and which gives them the greatest benefit is the Academic Facilities Act. They are in dire need of expansion of facilities.

Mr. Speaker, there is a vast increase in enrollment which hits institutions of higher learning each year and the increase is expected for years to come. If they receive assistance to construct facilities, they will be able to find the faculty or at least have the means of finding the faculty and other personnel.

Mr. Speaker, we can be confident in the academic facilities program of the assurance that there is no Federal—direct Federal influence—upon the program which we feel would be unwarranted.

Mr. Speaker, this represents an excellent program and I feel that I can say to the Members of the House with complete confidence that it will represent a wise expenditure of money.

Also, Mr. Speaker, there was an amendment to title III of the National Defense Education Act, which amendment will go into effect in fiscal year 1968, which will include industrial arts in the equipment title.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the time has come when we ought to drop the categorical approach and that every discipline that is taught in our elementary and secondary schools will have the benefits of title III.

Mr. Speaker, I might point out that contained in the conference report is the language which provides that consideration will be given by both the House of Representatives and the other body to the deletion of the categorical limitations, and also look into the relationship of the U.S. Office of Education with the States and with the local communities. I feel very strongly about this and I know this is true with my colleagues who participated in the conference as well, that the priorities in the determination of which equipment should go to the schools ought to be left to the local communities and to the States.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that such a study should be made by both bodies as the conference report indicates and thereby we shall be able to enhance this legislation and its benefits in years to come and provide next year strengthening legislation which will protect the integrity of local school districts and the State on education matters.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, let me add that the National Defense Education Act student loan program has worked well and it has the support of everyone with whom I have talked except the administration.

Mr. Speaker, the guaranteed loan program that we enacted last year has not worked well I am glad that the conferees on the part of the other body agreed to drop the revolving fund proposal which would have made or created a third and different kind of loan program in the National Defense Education Act program. In my opinion this latter approach was just a step to finally phase out the old National Defense Education Act student loan program.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government's assistance to our educational institutions have increased at such a rapid rate in recent years that I believe we must seriously question the Federal influence on these varied and diverse institutions. Recently, Stanley Wenberg of the university made a provocative and courageous statement which I commend to all of my colleagues. The following is the speech of Stanley J. Wenberg, vice president for educational relationships and development, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn., at the 13th biennial school for executives at Northern Michigan University, Marquette, Mich., August 23, 1966:

COORDINATION AND EMERGING INSTITUTIONS

I'm grateful for the chance to share in this School for Executives, especially during the year my long-time friend, John King, is president of the AACTE.

And Ed Harden hit a tender spot, too, when he called to invite me to speak on the subject of coordination in higher education. I have taken considerable license with the assignment, so I'm really dealing with the subject of inter-institutional cooperation, rather than state plans for coordination.

For almost 15 years I've pursued the notion that colleges and universities could work together and that states, too, can work together effectively in higher education. Moreover, it has seemed this working together can be achieved voluntarily, even though there is a legislative tradition established in the SREB pattern.

For almost 12 years I have served with the Midwestern Office of the Council of State Governments, on the Midwestern Higher Education Advisory Committee, and have chaired this committee the last four or five years. I have been a member of CIC since its beginning, eight years ago. CIC is the Committee on Institutional Cooperation of the Big Ten and the University of Chicago. During this time I've also worked with clusters of institutions in the same community, with some of our foundations, and with some of our midwestern state legislatures.

The basic mission in all of these endeavors has been to foster cooperation among higher educational institutions. Such a commitment starts from the premise that we need to break down the parochial barriers that separate us, and that in joining together we foster shared strength, rather than individual weaknesses.

I'm impressed with the fact that most of the academic autonomy we seek to preserve and talk about today was talked about back in the 14th, 15th, and 16th centuries. It is a philosophy that advocates total self-sufficiency for each unit. We can go back to medieval universities and find their supporters were so determined to maintain their self-sufficient autonomy they built moats and bastions around their universities to withstand attack. Many of us were very much inclined toward this point of view in our institutions until the end of World War II. Even now the degree of willingness to break down the barriers is highly erratic. But the threatening fact of the contemporary scene is that, if we're not willing to break down the barriers ourselves, others are going to do it for us.

We used to discuss coordination among institutions as if it were an option we could consider at our leisure. But there are at least three factors that impinge on both the optional status and the pleasure of the pace.

But let me describe the three factors:

As all of you know, Mr. James Conant, former president of Harvard University, wrote another book a year or so ago, this one called, "Shaping Educational Policy." He came to the conclusion that we need a new system of nationwide educational policy. He made a great deal of the distinction between national policy and nationwide policy. He believed national policy was imposed from above, while nationwide policy emerged from grass roots.

The compact is now in being, and tomorrow our mutual friend, Wendell Pierce, will discuss this on the program. We are going to have the opportunity to observe the emergence of nationwide educational policy.

But I worry a bit when Mr. Conant suggests that one mission of a nationwide educational policy ought to be to dispose of unevenness in educational opportunity—that perhaps it might be desirable even to set some national standards for the Ph. D.

He has numerous other proposals that will help our political leaders choose among policy alternatives affecting higher education. One wonders how many of these proposals he himself would have been receptive to while he was still active as a college president.

The simple fact is the compact does constitute an external force affecting the bastions of educational autonomy to which I've referred. Maybe the force will be good for us. Many doubt this. It is clear one new check on our freedom as educational institutions is now in being. I cite this first illustration merely to underscore my point that the world will not stand still while we contemplate our autonomous institutional navels.

But I believe the attack on autonomy that we are feeling and will feel even more directly will be mobilized through some of the current thinking in Washington. I say this as a firm believer in that the federal government has a responsibility to assist higher education. But a good deal of the educational legislation of the 89th Congress actually ignores the fact that there are educational voices that ought to be heeded in this country.

I do concede, as the then secretary of HEW Ribicoff sharply pointed out at an annual ACE meeting, that occasionally the voice of education is a din of conflicting positions, that cooperative instincts are buried in competitive claims for dollars and conflicting conceptions of solutions to problems. But a good deal of the legislation in the 89th Congress was written by professionals in administration or by lawyers unacquainted with educational institutions and their missions whose assignment was to innovate and who have given very little thought to the effect of such legislation on the educational enterprise in America.

The record underscores my point, I believe. Three major laws that had almost universal support in higher education have suffered or squeaked through in this Congress:

NDEA student loans were on the administration "scuttle" list.

The college student housing loan program is being run through the mangle and no one knows where we'll come out.

The academic facilities bill, one of the soundest pieces of educational legislation since the Land-Grant Act of 1862 is already old hat, and many of its old friends are off romancing new constituencies with new bills.

Meanwhile, some approved recipients of academic facilities grants are experiencing unexplained hold orders that seems to bear more relationship to the politics of inflation than to the needs of education. On the opposite side of the picture we've had added to our state agricultural extension programs, new programs in business extension and something called Title I of a higher education act—an Act that, except for misuscule library and equipment grants, seems to be designed to help almost everyone and everything except our higher education institutions in getting their main business done.

For our present discussion, that fact is, with the Technical Services Act, the poverty related acts, the cultural development acts, and a host of other legislation, the administration and the Congress are shattering our old notions of policy making autonomy in our institutions.

So busy has the administration and the Congress been, dreaming up short-term, new idea legislation, they have done almost nothing to strengthen our basic, long-term teaching obligation. The programs demand matching funds we must reassign from needed institutional uses, programs are fragmentary and, most of all, in general, they have no durability whatsoever in our fiscal pictures.

Most state legislatures will probably have to coordinate us, if they haven't already, just to find out how much is left of what they thought they were sponsoring as state colleges and universities.

The perplexing thing to me is that why, with this wholesale invasion of our campuses, with this nationally directed distraction from our solemn declarations of institutional purpose, we continue to resist one of the most obvious courses for the mutual strengthening of our institutions that lies before us: *interinstitutional cooperation*.

Let me repeat, I am no opponent of federal funds for higher education. I am a most ardent advocate of federal participation, a point I will touch on briefly before I close this paper.

Here I seek only to underscore the point that there are forces invading our autonomy, directing our course and enforcing a measure of external pressure that makes our resistance to voluntary inter-institutional cooperation nothing more than a totally inconsistent anachronism.

The third force is within our states: One major force here that is eroding autonomy is legislated coordination. In some states, such as Ohio, we see state plans that seek to detail even the most minute element of direction. It remains to be seen whether the rhetoric that claims cordination in such instances is not control, actually conceals or reveals the truth.

There is another state factor to which we should all be alert. Congress, in its haste to correct the impression that is abroad—that *it* is now running local school districts and welfare boards, literally operating state educational and mental institutions, etc.—is now fostering an intergovernmental relations concept that may make any strands of federal control that have appeared up to now, wane into a merest blush alongside the state bureaucratic machinery that we could see developed to order all of the relationships within a state to the federal government. We could see a backlash of reaction to federal controls develop within our states that would make our present federal relationships look like the Heyday of freedom.

I have spent a great deal of time on these three factors because they force a new framework around our topic. Inter-institutional cooperation is no longer a leisurely-paced academic exercise, if we are fully sensitive to the forces I have described.

I reiterate this point because, in fifteen years of working closely with the subject, it has become abundantly clear that the absence of understanding of the need to cooperate is infinitely greater than the absence of understanding of how to cooperate.

Now what are some of the courses open to us?

In the first place, we must convince our constituencies, internal and external, of the futility and waste of administrative competition. Intellectual competition is what we are seeking to preserve. Conflict of ideas in the classroom and laboratory. This does not require competition for bricks or books. It does not require competition for students or staff. The competition we seek is that of intellectual ferment, and all of us—junior college, state college, and university—need strong legislative support to accomplish this, and a mutually supportive role would reflect the fact that the eggs of education are in one basket. We all need each other as strong sister institutions.

Next, clearly each of us must identify our mission and seek to excel at it. You have heard T. R. McConnell's delightful quote on the "pecking order" too often for me to repeat it here. But escalation of the pecking order efforts and consciousness of the past decade ought to be brought back to earth. Moreover, we must re-examine philosophies of the open door for all, for every institution. Institutional purposes should not be hampered by a concept that may not be appropriate to every institution. At the same time, we must do a better job of identifying gaps in our respective state's post-high school educational opportunity.

For example, most of our states have failed miserably to fill the crying need for public educational opportunity between the high school diploma and the college degree. Great areas of America have no commitment whatsoever to technical institutes, terminal certificate programs at the 1, 2, or 3-year level. Mission identification with subsequent commitment to performing that mission well is one of the crying needs of our emerging institutions and of our state plans and patterns.

We must sort out responsible institutional aspirations from local chamber of commerce type promotions. We must sort out valid concerns for economy from external pressures that seek only to control. As responsible administrators we must sort out and have the courage to defend those planks of a program to which faculties can honestly object as erosion of faculty freedom, from those that in a real world temporarily seem expedient, but ultimately insure greater institutional strength and freedom.

Many schools and states are doing all of these things. On the credit side, the growing evidence of inter-institutional cooperation, some legislated, some initiated voluntarily by the institutions, sets out broad guidelines for action.

Some parts of the country have developed regional educational patterns through formal legislated, interstate compacts, actually involving another level of administration for education just above the state level. And in most instances there have been special reasons why this is appropriate, as in the South, New England, and in the Western mountain country.

In the Middle West we are experimenting with many patterns of interstate and inter-institutional cooperation that involve a minimum of legislated regulation.

The Midwestern Conference of the Council of State Governments (consisting of five senators, five representatives, and five state administrators from each of the twelve midwestern states) is one vehicle for stimulating such cooperation. The Conference has a Standing Committee and a professional Advisory Committee on Higher Education. Our host, Ed Harden, is a member of this latter committee, for example.

During recent years the professional advisory committee has worked on the location and distribution of certain high cost educational opportunities in the twelve-state area. We have prepared detailed reports on the migration patterns of all higher education students in the twelve-state area. We have collected and are studying the laws in the twelve states that encourage or make possible interstate cooperation in higher education. We have prepared reports on our legislative asking procedures, state budget analysis procedures for higher education, and we are working on reports on costs in graduate education and on the various forms two-year, post-high school programs take in our region.

We have studied existing interstate, inter-institutional arrangements in higher education in our twelve-state area, and the bulk of my comments on coordination and cooperation arise from a ten-year surveillance of these practices.

All existing formal and informal compacts and arrangements have as one of their base purposes the sharing of some intellectual or institutional strength. Whatever the section of the country, in inter-institutional cooperation the name of a school is less important than the quality of the education the student receives, or the quality of the research or service mission being performed.

Genuine cooperation seeks to remove parochial barriers, to enrich intellectual opportunities, as well as to produce helpful economies both in dollars and talent. All of these can be and are being accomplished.

One of the missions of our Midwestern Advisory Committee is to identify the characteristics of successful cooperative enterprises, and then to so merchandise the product that more institutions will want to try the formulae that emerge.

One characeristic seems quite clear. Similar colleges and universities can cooperate most effectively. In most forms of cooperation proximity of institutions to each other and their being within a single state are less important than similarity in organization, offerings, and purpose.

It is also commonly true that cooperative patterns can be developed with a minimum of legislative machinery. Some of our states, such as Iowa, have adopted broad legislation encouraging inter-institutional arrangements as declared state policy.

Another important characteristic that has emerged, also as a *sine qua non*, for successful cooperation is the necessity on the part of a faculty to agree (1) that some other faculty can effectively contribute to a joint program, and (2) that each institution does not have to be totally self-sufficient.

Among the types of cooperation that are working are these:

Institution with institution. An example is a doctoral program in the Classics, among the Universities of Iowa, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. The student studies one year at each of the three universities, benefiting from the strengths of all three, getting his degree from the university where he started in this rotating program. Yet no one school has to maintain a full complement of staff on a permanent basis to offer the Classics doctorate.

Another example is student exchange in forestry, mining engineering, wild life management, architecture, dentistry, and pharmacy between the University of Missouri and the University of Nebraska. Under this program out-of-state tuition fees are waived to Nebraska students in forestry, mining engineering, and wild life management at the University of Missouri, while University of Nebraska reciprocates by waiving out-of-state tuition fees to Missouri students studying pharmacy, architecture, and dentistry.

Unfortunately, this latter program has been a bit slow in getting to work effectively. But the idea is there. And there are many other university-with-university arrangements that are starting to work. Indeed, they develop quite easily once faculties of two institutions find that their shared strength exceeds separate strengths.

Probably the most common type of cooperation here is sharing of curricular strengths among like institutions in the same community. Illustrations are legion. In Minnesota the University of Minnesota, Duluth, exchanges students with St. Scholastica. The College of St. Teresa and St. Mary's College in Winona bus students between campuses for classes. In most cases no dollars are exchanged. Books are kept so that credit hours approximately balance out and grades are reported to the home institution. The development of such intellectual communities is so simple, one wonders why they have been so long in coming.

If institution A will hire professor X from institution B, why can't institution A use professor X via closed-circuit TV while he is still at B?

Is not the competition in results from use of an electron microscope infinitely more important than who owns the microscope, or the computer, or the telescope?

The opportunities for college community union library catalogs is only now emerging in the Middle West. In many cases colleges in the same town are no further from each other than buildings at opposite ends of some large state university campuses. Why must libraries be totally independent and self-sufficient?

Why shouldn't two or three colleges in the same community join their acquisition programs to develop strengths rather than to proliferate and duplicate on the same plane? But this is not a traditional library practice, and it is finding rough going in many quarters.

Many foundations across the nation have sought to encourage cooperation through the sharing of outstanding scholars among two, three, or four institutions.

The opportunities here are almost endless; joint student newspapers, for example, sharing the news of neighboring campuses, helping advertiser and student life alike; the shared use of costly recreation facilities—swimming pools, indoor practice areas, stadiums, etc.—in most multi-college communities scarcely has even been explored.

Much of this kind of cooperation should be faculty generated and directed, but much calls for determination and courage at the administrative level to minimize obstacles and red tape, to create the conditions conducive to cooperation. I have heard of student interchanges being opposed because they upset the tuition collection record or the registrar's head count system. Let me asure you it is very simple to stifle cooperative instincts with such lock-step administrative objections.

This relatively simple type of cooperative arrangement represents one of the easiest coordination efforts open to emerging institutions. It should be *ad hoc*. It should follow natural lines. I believe it is a mistake to assume this kind of relationship should develop only among a system of public colleges or that participating schools must all be within a single state. These are handy administrative obstacles that can easily be introduced to kill the idea.

Essentially, and easily bridged geographical relationship or curricular void matched with a strength present also the easiest climate within which to build this first type of relationship.

Collective Inter-Institutional Planning. The second type of cooperation has less to do with geography and more to do with homogeneity of purpose. There are numerous examples of such cooperation: The new Mississippi Valley College Association, the Committee on Institutional Cooperation of the Big Ten and the University of Chicago, and the Mid-America State Universities Association of ten universities in Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Colorado. These are collections of reasonably homogeneous institutions that work together to produce an almost infinite range of cooperative arrangements.

The basic essential here does not run to whether the schools are public or private, cooeducational or separated, within a single state, or neighbors, or any such artificial barriers. The essential is that in most characteristics the missions of the institutions are basically similar. The experience becomes mutually useful, stimulating, and advantageous, thereby.

The most successful program in the CIC picture, which includes two private schools and nine public—one of which is the University of Minnesota—is something we call the CIC Traveling Scholar Program. Under this project the graduate school programs of all eleven participating universities are available to any graduate student needing offerings of one or more universities other than the one in which he is basically registered for his degree.

This new arrangement is generally regarded as one of the significant recent breakthroughs in higher education. We have overcome not only notions of institutional self-sufficiency, but what to some students appears to be endless miles of administrative red tape, to bring to our graduate students a powerful eleven-university intellectual opportunity second to none in the world today.

For two years we debated all the problems our business offices, legal advisers, and registrars could conceive of. Then, quite simply, we placed the interchange responsibility in our graduate school offices. A doctoral adviser at School A writes a faculty member at School B. If the visit of Student X can be arranged for a quarter or a semester, it is largely settled at that level. All the graduate schools need to do is be certain the sought after experience fits the student's degree plan, and then keep the record. No dollars change hands. The receiving institution even agrees to provide health service at no cost. The interchange is a model of simplicity, and this autumn there will be over 100 students on other campuses than their own as CIC Scholars.

But I underscore the point that this type of cooperation works best among like institutions. In CIC we believe it has great promise. This is a type of cooperation that can develop among emerging institutions. We have CIC Scholars only at the doctoral level now, but great pressure is being brought on us to expand the program to our Masters and undergraduate honors programs.

Let me remind you that this program takes place among two private universities and nine other universities scattered over seven states. Of the nine public universities, only two are constitutional bodies, and seven are statutory—very much as most emerging institutions are. In this picture of diverse legal and fiscal authority, all eleven schools are actively participating in this student exchange program.

CIC offers a whole host of other illustrations that can be adapted to similar consortiums.

Representatives of our geology faculties meet regularly and are discussing common components of an introductory course, the joint development of TV units, film strips, and other teaching aids. They are among the most active users of the CIC scholar program. They are working on development of a common field laboratory in Montana to be used by all member institutions.

Our geography departments have joined together to develop shared field camps.

Our Far Eastern language people this year sponsored the fourth annual Far Eastern language institute, shared in by all of our schools. Each year the institute, Office of Education sponsored, is on a different campus. It has moved from Michigan to Indiana, to Ohio, to Minnesota.

I see no reason why like consortiums of state colleges, teachers colleges, emerging state universities, with interested and like-programmed private colleges, cannot develop and flourish.

In such consortiums you will soon find your business officers, librarians, registrars, deans of students, as well as academic deans and department heads, holding joint meetings within your consortiums, developing new shared strengths. The desirable number of schools per consortium appears to run between eight and twelve, but there is no magic number. The formula must have appeal, because there must be at least fifteen such groups in existence today.

Consolidation of Function. A third type of cooperation runs to consolidation of resources to develop a particular function.

Quite a number of universities have joined together to form the Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy to operate Kitt Peak National Observatory at Tucson, Arizona. Many other observatories, nuclear and biological laboratories operate on the same basis, as you know.

Such arrangements obviously add to the strength of all participating faculties and institutions. Emerging institutions should continuously explore participation possibilities in existing projects, as well as development of new projects.

That's the real trick: to create good new ones. There is a high rate of failure, I warn you. Very frequently, of course, this failure is due to half-hearted commitment and paper promises in the first place.

Some of your institutions are members of MILC—the Midwest Inter-Library Corporation. The basic idea here is good: put into common storage little used library materials. But many schools put into this storage *never* used materials, and then tried to judge the usefulness of the arrangement by their volume of use of the materials. That's like having the defendant kill his victim in front of the jury, before the pre-arranged murder trial begins.

That's an illustration of weakness of commitment, not necessarily of project weakness. An illustration on the other side of the ledger is a CIC generated project: the development of a federal water pollution laboratory.

Among the interested CIC universities we agreed we needed such an installation in the Great Lakes Basin area, for shared use by our faculties. At the outset several of our schools thought they should have the facility. Only after months of negotiation did we, and some of our sister institutions outside CIC, present a united front to the U.S. Public Health Service—we supported a University of Michigan location, and a grateful USPHS made the allocation to the University of Michigan. Now a joint management advisory committee, drawn from all of our public health facilities, shares in plans for the laboratory.

Very often such limited use, high cost facilities can be realized only if separate institutions put aside their desire to possess, to own, to control such a project. It is relatively easy to federal money flow into these projects. Most recently we have the example of the regional education laboratories. But, more and more, we should encourage both our faculties and our legislatures to have even our state money flow into such projects, even when the arrangement involved crosses state lines. Such arrangements typically run to a single purpose, and in most cases the number of participating institutions seems almost immaterial, so long as the number is adequate to justify the function.

Two other types of cooperative patterns bear mention—these are "state with out-of-state institution" and "state to state" arrangements.

Both forms of cooperation underlie our regional educational compacts. But it is a serious mistake to believe either form of cooperation cannot emerge without a formal regional compact.

The State of North Dakota has a contract with the University of Minnesota for training some of its post-basic science medical students. Wisconsin has made similar provisions for training Veterinary Medicine students. The important point here is compacts may be used, but they are not essential.

In the state-to-state arrangement, northwestern Minnesota has what might be called a higher educational void beyond the junior college year. We are at work to try to arrange for a relationship with North Dakota so upper division Minnesota students could finish their degree programs at the University of North Dakota, across the Red River, if they so choose.

Such an arrangement involves two states where the objective is to remove a political boundary as a block to a border institution's service to a geographic region. Such an arrangement would permit a state border institution to serve a student population that live across a state line. The host state would charge these non-resident students regular resident tuition with the neighboring state paying the non-resident increment directly to the host state, or the host institution.

In these latter two cases of cooperation, I have used limited illustrations because I think the broad implications here are far more important than the illustrations.

In these two types of cooperation an absolute essential is the recognition by administrations and faculties that an institutional strength in one area may emerge by actually yielding something in another area. The argument suggests that Wisconsin's not training veterinarians may give strength to the University of Wisconsin. It suggests that North and South Dakota's not training medical doctors and dentists through their clinical years may give strength to the universities of those two states.

This casts institutional self-surveys and even regional and professional accreditation into a new light. Expansion of this concept of cooperation would make it no longer adequate to survey the competence of a separate institution. The philosophy could permit multi-institutional and multi-state strengths to become the wave of the future in higher education. This could mean that, rather than being all things to all men, colleges and universities would seek excellence in the performance of their respective missions, and these would be under constant review and revision.

These five types of inter-institutional cooperation in higher education are all directed not merely toward getting more mileage for the educational dollar, but toward getting greater strength and academic excellence through cooperative solutions to educational needs. I believe they are also devices through which we can encourage a minimum of enforced coordination—if we are wise enough and selfless enough in our approach to our task.

It is an interesting geographical fact that in the Midwest, at least, where rivers from many of our state boundaries, early teacher training institutions started in towns along these rivers. Today no group of emerging institutions has a greater opportunity to experiment with educational relationships across state borders.

A concommitant essential to educator-developed *interstate* cooperation in higher education is the conviction on the part of governors, state officers, and legislators, that the spending of some money in the state next door on a cooperative basis may achieve a necessary and significant gain for both states involved.

One notable inconsistency in many public body positions on this matter of better planning for higher education through interstate cooperation should be noted.

Very often the non-resident student is a target in legislative hearings and taxpayer statements as a taxpayer liability. Yet this student is the living expression of successful interstate cooperation. It is sheer inconsistency to advocate effective interstate cooperation in higher education and yet oppose the admission of non-resident students to our public institutions. This the public will gradually come to understand as the fruits of cooperation are more evident.

Now let me return briefly to the role of federal money in this developing higher education scene.

That there is a role for federal dollars in higher education is questioned by fewer people each year. There is a strong case for federal funds to assist higher education within the inter-institutional and interstate nature of much of our current higher education development. What state needs a high energy, quarter-billion dollar nuclear accelerator for its local use? What separate state has a stake in the stars?

Beyond this, the almost incredible mobility of our college and university alumni presents a compelling argument. Few graduates in any state can any longer be conceived of as a state resource. They're a national, and even an international resource. Neither scholarship nor talent can be confined by state borders. Nor can any industry that is dynamic afford the inbreeding risk of employing only the engineers or technicians or scientists of a single institution, no matter how great and distinguished it may be.

This incredible and necessary mobility of the professional sector of our labor force provides powerful focus for the necessity of federal money in the higher educational picture. Added to this argument is the national enrichment that flows from much of what our colleges and universities do.

Our problem is the tremendous confusion and pulling and hauling that exists in federal policy with respect to this important matter. I go back to my argument at the outset for greater cooperation within education. The current paucity of hard core cooperation and intrastate struggling for position has helped lay the groundwork for some of our current difficulties.

We have seen institutional priorities in equipment and buildings juggled—to the disadvantage of the whole institution—so some eligible department can take advantage of federal matching funds. We have seen federal funds introduced as bait to stimulate abnormal expansion of programs with subsequently abnormally large drains on the institution's operating resources.

You know such illustrations are legion. But I would come back to the unwavering conclusion that the funds are necessary, appropriate, and useful. What is needed is a fresh, healthy look at how these funds should be deployed. The federal government, with the support and encouragement of the people back home, needs to help build the totality of higher education, with a sense of responsibility for its total success. It needs to cease this tapping of tiny segments with a golden wand as just some expedient resource that accomplishes some narrow objective.

Universities and colleges must shift from selling services and accepting aid to positive recognition of the federal government's responsibility for certain kinds of activities in our institutions, a responsibility that covers both adequate and continuing support for these activities.

If broad areas of federal responsibility can be identified, federal funds can be interspersed with state funds to produce even stronger intellectual machines on our campuses. It does not seem unreasonable to expect that ultimately there would be no more control over the federal funds than there is over the state funds once the general areas being supported are defined. It would seem reasonable and consistent that neither level of government would have any more right to abdicate general responsibility for the funds than it would have to control their precise use. What is called for here is acceptance of the possibility that the same pattern of relationships that exists at the state level can exist at the federal level.

In all of this, the centuries-old traditions of institutional self-sufficiency are crumbling. Faculty membership on national commissions and study committees, joint institutional efforts such as I have described above, membership on foundation and federal visiting committees, and a much greater mobility within the academic marketplace—these are all factors breaking down the walls of institutional self-sufficiency.

But the greatest challenge to the ages-old philosophy of institutional self-sufficiency grows out of the increasingly evident need for wise distribution of resources in such a way that both greater efficiency and excellence can be achieved in an expanding higher education. It may be that regional centers in certain fields and disciplines where staff and students are interchanged between institutions can become the device for spreading both talent and dollars in such a way that excellence becomes a more constant thing throughout higher education.

Certainly we are headed for dramatic changes in library functions, information retrieval and dissemination. In none of this can any one of us hope to go it alone. Nor do I see cooperation yielding uniformity. Diversity in cooperative enterprises will strengthen institutional diversity if they strengthen excellence. The cooperation of which I speak is not to remove unevenness and difference in missions. It is to remove unevenness and inequality in ability to perform one's mission well.

In the 1920's and 1930's the deployment of education resources was relatively simple. Teachers colleges and normal schools had a teacher training function. The land-grant university was essentially an agriculture and engineering institution, while the state university developed the liberal arts and professional and graduate programs.

In the 1940's this pattern was no longer adequate. And through the second half of the decade, and into the 1950's, under the pressure of the Veterans bulge, we witnessed the emergence of the state college with heavy enrollments, relatively low admissions standards, the capacity to respond quickly to changing demands, and a rapid expansion into graduate work. During this period we saw, also, the development of some regional compacts in regions where there was sparse development of major public universities as a cooperative device to manage the training of students in high-cost curricula.

By the late 1950's and early 1960's we reached a kind of undergraduate equilibrium as more undergraduate institutions were brought into closer conformity with generally prevailing standards of quality. With the search for a more clear definition of what offerings should be developed at the more costly graduate and professional level, states have moved increasingly toward devices aimed at both internal regulation of program proliferation and sound expansion of opportunity with built-in protection of quality. New patterns of cooperation between institutions and between states are emerging. In the early 1960's the state university branch, the extension center, and the junior college were given new shots of adrenalin. Clarification of function and the state plan became the order of the day.

I believe the era of the 1970's will be characterized by an inter-institutional dependence. Inter-institutional energy will be spent on building intellectual strength rather than on generating administrative competition and friction. The consortium will be the pattern of the 1970's, emerging from the conviction that excellence of intellectual performance for all is more important than administrative independence from each other.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I was glad to hear that the conferees had kept the appropriations to a sum close to the President's budget.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that this is only $22 million above the anticipated amount. Would the gentlewoman tell me what is the total amount appropriated for fiscal year 1967?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I will be glad to. The President's budget was $750 million. The total amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1967 is $772 million.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman.

How does this compare with the 3-year operation? What is the total for the measure?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. There is an increase in the authorization for fiscal year 1968 and for fiscal year 1969. I would say to the gentleman that for the 3 fiscal years the total authorization of appropriations is slightly over $3½ billion—$3,585 million.

Mr. PICKLE. May I ask the gentlewoman how this compares then with the budget as submitted?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. As I indicated for the current fiscal year the authorization exceeds the budget request by only $22 million.

Mr. PICKLE. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, my question is this. I want to see every child in this country educated and this is a broad educational bill. I understand that this is for public as well as private schools that may be individually owned, it is also for parochial, religious and nonsectarian schools; is it not? It includes every school?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. During the 100 years of Federal aid for higher education the Congress has never treated the private colleges and universities any differently than the State-owned and tax-supported institutions. This bill does not depart from that procedure.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Does it mean that colleges or universities with religious affiliations will be excluded?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. No. All of the accredited private colleges are included. There is a limitation that the funds cannot be used for religious or sectarian instruction.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. But otherwise there is no limit on the particular type of college or university if it is a public school admitting everybody?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is right.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I rise in support of the conference report on the higher education amendments of 1966. I think it is a good report.

I believe further as the gentlewoman has already stated that after the series of trips around the country by the Special Subcommittee on Education that it will be sensible for the next Congress to take a hard look at the priorities of higher education to see those areas that most need support, to see whether in fact we are doing enough for teachers, and further—the relationship between graduate and undergraduate courses of education and between 2- and 4-year colleges—such as to enrollment needs in the years ahead and the quality instruction. I would ask the gentlewoman if she would comment just briefly as to the points her subcommittee are to look into in her judgment.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I believe the gentleman from New York has stated well a number of the areas the subcommittee will turn to during our study of the U.S. Office of Education. I think all members of the subcommittee, on both sides of the aisle, agree that the question of priorities in education legislation, that is where are the greatest needs and how they can best be met, should be one of our foremost concerns. Closely related to this is taking a long-range look at what the needs are going to be in higher education 10 years from now or 20 years from now, so that we can be sure that we are providing programs that will assist youngsters in answering the questions of the 21st century

More specifically, we will study and evaluate the organization of the U.S. Office of Education and the relationship of the Office to the Federal departments and agencies, including the all important question of coordination, not only at the Federal level but at the local level as well. This will be in an effort to prevent overlapping and duplication so that we will obtain the maximum benefit from every Federal dollar expended. We will study the staffing and recruitment policies of the Office, the implementation of new programs, and whether the administration of such programs are carrying out congressional intent. We will study how rules, regulations, and guidelines are developed and evaluate the dissemination process. We will be looking at the appointment, the staffing, and the roles of advisory councils in the U.S. Office of Education and examining the extent to which the Office is providing adequate audit services and surveillance of federally assisted education programs.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I strongly concur with the gentlewoman, and I would urge that Members on both sides of the aisle support the Higher Education Amendments of 1966.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

May I inquire if the other side have any requests for time?

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, we have no requests for time.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, since there are no further requests for time——

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 14644, popularly known as the Higher Education Act Amendments of 1966.

This act amends the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, the Higher Education Act of 1965, and the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Unlike the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, passed earlier this week, which exceeded the budget by nearly $600 million, the Higher Education Act Amendments of 1966 only slightly exceeds budget estimates—as I understand it, about $22 million.

Mr. Speaker, since H.R. 14644 passed the House earlier this year without a record vote, I shall ask for a record vote on the adoption of the conference report. Even though a number of Members are absent, those of us present should have an opportunity to express our approval or disapproval of this highly significant legislation. I do this reluctantly, knowing of the difficulties in maintaining a quorum during the closing hours of this session, but would add, Mr. Speaker, that it will represent the first record vote I have requested since coming to Congress.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I move the previous question.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 222, nays 13, answered "present" 1, not voting 196, as follows:

[Roll No. 398]

YEAS—222

Adair
Addabbo
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ayres
Bandstra
Barrett
Battin
Beckworth
Bell
Bennett
Betts
Bingham
Boggs
Boland
Bolton
Brademas
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Cameron
Casey
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Collier
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Daddario
Dague
Dawson
de la Garza
Dent
Derwinski
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Tenn.
Edwards, Calif.
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Flood
Fogarty
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Grider
Grover
Gubser
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hardy
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hechler
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hutchinson
Irwin
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kee
Keogh
Kluczynski
Krebs
Kunkel
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lipscomb
Long, Md.
Love
McClory
McDade
McGrath
MacGregor
Machen
Mahon
Marsh
Mathias
Matthews
May
Mills
Minish
Mize
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Price
Pucinski
Quie
Quillen
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rodino
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stubblefield
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thomas
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Utt
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Watson
Weltner
Whalley
White, Tex.
Widnall
Wolff
Wright
Wydler
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—13

Andrews, George W.
Ashmore
Curtis
Gathings
Henderson
Herlong
Lennon
Passman
Rivers, S.C.
Tuck
Waggonner
Whitten
Williams

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Buchanan

NOT VOTING—196

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adams
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Aspinall
Baring
Bates
Belcher
Berry
Blatnik
Bolling
Bow
Bray
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Byrne, Pa.
Callaway
Carey
Carter
Cederberg
Clawson, Del
Clevenger
Cohelan
Colmer
Cooley
Corman
Craley
Culver
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Delaney
Denton
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dorn
Duncan, Oreg.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flynt
Foley
Fountain
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Gettys
Gilligan
Grabowski
Gray
Greigg
Griffiths
Gross
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Howard
Hungate
Huot
Ichord
Jacobs
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Kastenmeier
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kornegay
Kupferman
Laird
Long, La.
McCarthy
McCulloch
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mailliard
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Meeds
Michel
Miller
Mink
Minshall
Moeller
Moore
Moss
Murray
Nelsen
Nix
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
Philbin
Pool
Powell
Purcell
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
St Germain
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Scott
Senner
Shipley
Sisk
Slack
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Stafford
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Toll
Trimble
Tunney
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Waldie
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watts
White, Idaho
Whitener
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wyatt
Yates
Younger

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Martin of Nebraska for, with Mr. Buchanan against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. King of California with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Miller with Mr. Stafford.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Albert with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Daniels with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Keith.
Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Whitener with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Reinecke.
Mr. McFall with Mr. Stanton.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Robison.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Dyal with Mr. Martin of Alabama.
Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Stratton with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Denton with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Clarence F. Brown.
Mr. Foley with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Glenn Andrews.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Schmidhauser with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.
Mr. Senner with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Callaway.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Adams with Mr. Younger.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Roush with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Schisler with Mr. Madden.
Mr. Hicks with Mr. Hall.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Kupferman.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. McVicker with Mr. Trimble.
Mr. Mackay with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Haley.
Mr. Clevenger with Mr. Grabowski.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Pool.
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Hansen of Iowa.
Mr. Gilligan with Mrs. Mink.
Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Hungate.

Mr. Randall with Mr. Huot.

Mr. Resnick with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.

Mr. Olsen of Montana with Mr. Jones of North Carolina.

Mr. Nix with Mr. Kastenmeier.

Mr. Moeller with Mr. McCarthy.

Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. McDowell.

Mr. Meeds with Mr. Tunney.

Mr. Mackie with Mr. Van Deerlin.

Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Todd.

Mr. Fisher with Mr. Ullman.

Mr. Fountain with Mr. Walker of New Mexico.

Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Charles H. Wilson.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Greigg.

Mr. Purcell with Mr. Hanna.

Mr. Reuss with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.

Mr. Duncan of Oregon with Mr. Gettys.

Mr. Scott with Mr. Bow.

Mr. Roncalio with Mr. Bates.

Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Waldie with Mr. King of New York.

Mr. Roberts with Mr. Gurney.

Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Moore.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Yates.

Mr. Olson of Minnesota with Mr. McMillan.

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Culver.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Watts.

Mr. Toll with Mr. Redlin.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Dorn with Mr. Macdonald.

Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Rostenkowski.

Mr. Carey with Mr. Ichord.

Mr. Blatnik with Mrs. Griffiths.

Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Philbin.

Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Slack.

Mr. St Germain with Mr. Ronan.

Mr. Rogers of Florida with Mr. Gray.

Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Race with Mr. Murray.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MARTIN]. If he were here, he would vote "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote "nay" and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report just adopted.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1966

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 14643) to provide for the strengthening of American educational resources for international studies and research, with an amendment of the Senate thereto, and consider the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That this Act may be cited as the 'International Education Act of 1966'.

"Findings and declaration

"SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that a knowledge of other countries is of the utmost importance in promoting mutual understanding and cooperation between nations; that strong American educational resources are a necessary base for strengthening our relations with other countries; that this and future generations of Americans should be assured ample opportunity to develop to the fullest extent possible their intellectual capacities in all areas of knowledge pertaining to other countries, peoples, and cultures; and that it is therefore both necessary and appropriate for the Federal Government to assist in the development of resources for international study and research, to assist in the development of resources and trained personnel in academic and professional fields, and to coordinate the existing and future programs of the Federal Government in international education, to meet the requirements of world leadership.

"TITLE I—GRANT PROGRAMS FOR ADVANCED AND UNDERGRADUATE INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

"Centers for advanced international studies

"SEC. 101. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') is authorized to arrange through grants to institutions of higher education, or combinations of such institutions, for the establishment, strengthening, and operation by them of graduate centers which will be national and international resources for research and training in international studies and the international aspects of professional and other fields of study. Activities carried on in such centers may be concentrated either on specific geographical areas of the world or on particular fields or issues in world affairs which concern one or more countries, or on both. The Secretary may also make grants to public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations, including professional and scholarly associations, when such grants will make an especially significant contribution to attaining the objectives of this section.

"(b) Grants under this section may be used to cover part or all of the cost of establishing, strengthening, equipping, and operating research and training centers, including the cost of teaching and research materials and resources, the cost of programs for bringing visiting scholars and faculty to the center, and the cost of training, improvement, and travel of the staff for the purpose of carrying out the objectives of this section. Such grants may also include funds for stipends (in such amounts as may be determined in accordance with regulations of the Secretary) to individuals undergoing training in such centers, including allowances for dependents and for travel for research and study here and abroad. Grants under this section shall be made on such conditions as the Secretary finds necessary to carry out its purposes.

"Grants to strengthen undergraduate programs in international studies

"SEC. 102. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to institutions of higher education, or combinations of such institutions, to assist them in planning, developing, and carrying out a comprehensive program to strengthen and improve undergraduate instruction in international studies. Grants made under this section may be for projects and activities which are an integral part of such a comprehensive program such as—

"(1) planning for the development and expansion of undergraduate programs in international studies;

"(2) teaching, research, curriculum, development, and other related activities;

"(3) training of faculty members in foreign countries;

"(4) expansion of foreign language courses;

"(5) planned and supervised student work-study-travel programs;

"(6) programs under which foreign teachers and scholars may visit institutions as visiting faculty; and

"(7) programs of English language training for foreign teachers, scholars, and students.

The Secretary may also make grants to public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations, including professional and scholarly associations, when such grants will make an especially significant contribution to attaining the objectives of this section.

"(b) A grant may be made under this section only upon application to the Secretary at such time or times and containing such information as he deems necessary. The Secretary shall not approve an application unless it—

"(1) sets forth a program for carrying out one or more projects or activities for which a grant is authorized under subsection (a);

"(2) sets forth policies and procedures which assure that Federal funds made available under this section for any fiscal year will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available for purposes which meet the requirements of subsection (a), and in no case supplant such funds;

"(3) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this section; and

"(4) provides for making such report, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may require to carry out his functions under this section, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Secretary may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(c) The Secretary shall allocate grants to institutions of higher education under this section in such manner and according to such plan as will most nearly provide an equitable distribution of the grants throughout the States while at the same time giving a preference to those institutions which are most in need of funds for programs in international studies and which show real promise of being able to use funds effectively.

"Method of payment; Federal administration

"SEC. 103. (a) Payments under this title may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

"(b) In administering the provisions of this title, the Secretary is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution, in accordance with written agreements between the Secretary and the head thereof published in the Federal Register three weeks prior to the date on which any such agreement is to become effective.

"Federal control of education prohibited

"SEC. 104. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution, or the selection of library resources by any educational institution or over the content of any material developed or published under any program assisted pursuant to this Act.

"Authorization and reports

"SEC. 105. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated $1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, which shall be available only for the purpose of preparing the report provided for in subsection (b) of this section. There are authorized to be appropriated $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $90,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title. For the fiscal years thereafter there shall be appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title only such amounts as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

"(b) The Secretary shall prepare, with the advice of the Advisory Committee appointed pursuant to section 106, a report containing specific recommendations for carrying out the provisions of this title, including any recommendations for amendments to this title and to portions of other laws amended by this Act, and shall submit such report to the President and the Congress not later than April 30, 1967.

"(c) Prior to January 31, 1968, and prior to January 31 in each year thereafter, the Secretary shall make a report to the Congress which reviews and evaluates activities carried on under the authority of this Act and which reviews other activities of the Federal Government drawing upon or strengthening American resources for international study and research and any existing activities and plans to coordinate and improve the efforts of the Federal Government in international education.

"National Advisory Committee on International Studies

SEC. 106. (a) The President is authorized to establish in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a National Advisory Committee on International Studies, consisting of the Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Education who shall be Chairman, and not more than fifteen additional members appointed by the President so that a majority shall constitute a broad representation of higher education in the United States and the remainder shall include representatives of the general public and individuals experienced in foreign affairs.

"(b) The Advisory Committee shall advise the Secretary in the preparation of the report provided for in section 105(b) of this Act, and thereafter shall advise the Secretary in carrying out the provisions of this Act. The recommendations of the Advisory Committee shall be included in the report provided for in section 105(b) of this Act and in the annual reports provided for in section 105(c) of this Act.

"(c) Members of the Advisory Committee who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on business of the Committee, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the President, but not exceeding $100 per day, including traveltime; and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code for persons in Government service employed intermittently.

"(d) The Advisory Committee is authorized to appoint without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, covering appointment in the competitive service, and fix the compensation of, without regard to chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title, such professional and technical personnel as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its duties.

"TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO OTHER LAWS

"Amendments to strengthen title VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958

"Removing Requirement for Area Centers That Adequate Language Instruction Not Be Readily Available

"SEC. 201. (a) (1) The first sentence of section 601(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out '(1)' and by striking out ', and (2) that adequate instruction in such language is not readily available in the United States'.

"(2) The first sentence of section 601(b) of such Act is amended by striking out '(with respect to which he makes the determination under clause (1) of subsection (a))' and inserting in lieu thereof '(with respect to which he makes the determination under subsection (a))'.

"Removing 50 Per Centum Ceiling on Federal Participation

"(b) The third sentence of section 601(a) of such Act is amended by striking out 'not more than 50 per centum' and inserting 'all or part' in lieu thereof.

"Authorizing Grants as Well as Contracts for Language and Area Centers

"(c) Section 601(a) of such Act is amended further by inserting 'grants to or' after 'arrange through' in the first sentence, and by inserting 'grant or' before 'contract' each time that it appears in the second and third sentences.

"Vesting Authority for Language and Area Programs in Secretary

"(d) Section 601 of such Act is further amended by striking out 'Commissioner' each time such term occurs therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'Secretary'.

"Amendments to strengthen title XI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958

"SEC. 202. Title XI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended—

"(1) by inserting after the title the following: 'PART I—GENERAL';

"(2) by striking out the word 'title' in section 1102 and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'part'; and

"(3) by adding at the end thereof a new part as follows:

" 'PART II—INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

" 'International affairs institutes for secondary school teachers

" 'SEC. 1111. There are authorized to be appropriated $3,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and $6,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, to enable the Commissioner to arrange through contracts with institutions of higher education for the establishment and operation of short-term or regular-session institutes for teachers in secondary schools in order to give them a broader understanding of international affairs. Any such arrangement may cover the cost of the establishment and operation of the institute with respect to which it is made, including the cost of grants to the staff of travel in the foreign areas, regions, or countries with which the subject matter of the field or fields in which they are or will be working is concerned, and the cost of travel of foreign scholars to enable them to teach or assist in teaching in such institute and the cost of their return, and shall be made on such conditions as the Commissioner finds necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

" 'Stipends

" 'SEC. 1112. The Commissioner is authorized to pay stipends to any individual to study in a program assisted under the provisions of this part upon determining that assisting such individual in such studies will promote the purpose of this part. Stipends under the provisions of this section may include allowances for dependents and for travel to and from the place of residence.'

"Amendments to Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961

"SEC. 203. (a) Section 102(b) of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2452) is amended (1) by striking the period at the end of clause (9) and substituting a semicolon and the word 'and'; and (2) by adding at the end thereof a new clause as follows:

" '(10) promoting studies, research, instruction, and other educational activities of citizens and nationals of foreign countries in American schools, colleges, and universities located in the United States by making available to citizens and nationals of less developed friendly foreign countries for exchange for currencies of their respective countries (other than excess foreign currencies), at United States embassies, United States dollars in such amounts as may be necessary to enable such foreign citizens or nationals who are coming temporarily to the United States as students, trainees, teachers, instructors, or professors to meet expenses of the kind described in section 104(e)(1) of this Act.'

"(b) Section 104 of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

" '(g)(1) For the purpose of performing functions authorized by section 102(b)(10) of this Act, the President is authorized to establish the exchange rates at which all foreign currencies may be acquired through operations under such section, and shall issue regulations binding upon all embassies with respect to the exchange rates to be applicable in each of the respective countries where currency exchanges are authorized under such section.

" '(2) In performing the functions authorized under section 102(b)(10) of this Act, the President shall make suitable arrangements for protecting the interests of the United States Government in connection with the ownership, use, and disposition of all foreign currencies acquired pursuant to exchanges made under such section.

" '(3) The total amount of United States dollars acquired by any individual through currency exchanges under the authority of section 102(b)(10) of this Act shall in no event exceed $3,000 during any academic year.

" '(4) An individual shall be eligible to exchange foreign currency for United States dollars at United States embassies under section 102(b)(10) of this Act only if he gives satisfactory assurances that (A) he will devote essentially full time to his proposed educational activity in the United States and will maintain good standing in relation to such program; (B) he will return to the country of his citizenship or nationality prior to coming to the United States and will render such public service as is determined acceptable for a period of time determined reasonable and necessary by the government of such country; and (C) he will not apply for an immigrant visa or for permanent residence or for a nonimmigrant visa under the Immigration and Nationality Act after having received any benefits under such section for a period of time equal to the period of study, research, instruction, or other educational activity he performed pursuant to such section.

" '(5) As used in section 102(b)(10) of this Act, the term "excess foreign currencies" means foreign currencies, which if acquired by the United States (A) would be in excess of the normal requirements of departments, agencies, and embassies of the United States for such currencies, as determined by the President, and (B) would be available for the use of the United States Government under applicable agreements with the foreign country concerned.'

"(c) Section 105 of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

" '(g) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of making currency exchanges under section 102(b)(10) of this Act, not to exceed $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and not to exceed $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.'.

"Extending the benefits of the loan insurance program under title IV–B of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to students studying abroad

"SEC. 204. The second sentence of section 435(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by inserting after 'Such term' the following: 'includes any institution outside the States which is comparable to an institution described in the preceding sentence and which has been approved by the Commissioner for the purposes of this title, and'.

"Amending title VII of the Public Health Service Act so as to authorize direct student loans to be made to certain students studying outside the United States

"SEC. 205. (a)(1)(A) Section 741(g) of the Public Health Service Act is amended by inserting 'from a loan fund established' before 'under this part'.

"(B) Section 741(h) of such Act is amended by inserting 'from a loan fund established' before 'under this part' the first time it appears therein.

"(2)(A) So much of the first sentence of section 742(b)(2) of such Act as precedes clause (A) is amended by inserting '(other than the portion thereof available only for purposes of section 746)' before 'for that fiscal year'.

"(B) Clause (B) of such first sentence of section 742(b)(2) is amended by inserting '(other than the portion thereof available only for purposes of section 746)' after 'the amounts appropriated'.

"(b)(1) Section 742(a) of such Act is amended by inserting immediately before the last sentence thereof the following new sentence: 'Of the sums appropriated under this subsection for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, or for any fiscal year thereafter, an amount equal to 5 per centum of such sums shall be available only for the purpose of making loans under section 746.'

"(2) The last sentence of section 742(a) of such Act is amended by striking out 'Sums' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Except as is otherwise provided by the preceding sentence, sums'.

"(c) Title VII of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding after section 745 the following:

" 'Direct loans to students in foreign schools

" 'SEC. 746. (a)(1) From the sums made available under section 742(a), the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make direct loans to students who are citizens of the United States and who are pursuing a full-time course of study, at a school of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, or optometry which is located outside the United States and which is approved by the Secretary, which course of study leads to a degree of doctor of medicine, doctor of dentistry or an equivalent degree, doctor of osteopathy, or doctor of optometry or an equivalent degree.

" '(2) The Secretary shall not approve any school for purposes of this section unless he determines that such school offers training of a type and quality substantially similar to that offered by similar schools in the United States which are accredited as provided in section 721(b)(1)(B).

" '(b) Such loans shall, to the extent feasible, be made on the same terms and conditions as are required with respect to loans made to students from loan funds established under this part.'

"TITLE III—STUDY BY THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

"Authorization for a study on ways to reduce the drain from developing countries of professional persons and skilled specialists whose skills are urgently needed

"SEC. 301 (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall conduct a study and investigation to determine (1) the total number of individuals who enter the United States from developing countries annually to further their education, and who remain in the United States; (2) the reasons for their failure to return to their home countries; and (3) means of encouraging the return of such individuals to the countries of their last residence or nationality, so they may put their education and training to work in the service of their homelands.

"(b) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall report to the President and to the Congress as soon as practicable on his findings and conclusions together with such recommendations for any legislation he deems desirable to encourage the return of such individuals to such countries.

"(c) It is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $50,000 for the purpose of carrying out this study.

"TITLE IV—AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF CERTAIN LAND AS RECREATION AREA

"Authorization

"SEC. 401. The Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized to transfer jurisdiction over the land at First and C Streets Southeast in the District of Columbia, being the land on which the Madison Memorial Library is proposed for construction, to the Board of Commissioners of the District government, to be operated for recreation purposes only, and without any improvement to said land, for such period of time as said land is not required for building or other purposes by the Architect of the Capitol."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, my earlier objection to a unanimous-consent request to send the International Education Act to conference was based on the proposition that the Senate amendments have had no hearing in the House nor by a committee of the House. As I understand the purpose of rule XX, such a hearing is clearly indicated. It is my further understanding that a meeting of the Education Committee was held this morning and that the committee has now given some cursory consideration to these subjects. Let me point out some of the various subjects covered in the Senate amendments. They include amendments to the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961—a subject which I believe falls within the jurisdiction of the Foreign Affairs Committee; an amendment to the Public Health Services Act—including direct loans to students of the professions of medicine, dentistry, and other categories for study in foreign schools—a subject which I believe falls within the jurisdiction of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee; and authority to transfer certain land in the District of Columbia—which I believe falls within the jurisdiction of the District of Columbia Committee.

In general, I feel that the legislation falls far short of the objectives set forth in the paragraph entitled, "Findings and Declaration." It will have a very limited value insofar as gaining an understanding of foreign countries is concerned and will do little or nothing insofar as aiding the people of the developing countries in their quest for learning.

Let me state initially, however, that the provision for amending the National Defense Education Act to permit language centers for the study of French, German, Italian, and Spanish would seem to be most desirable. This, together with provisions for expanding the Federal support of undergraduate and graduate programs in international studies, would seem to be available through simple amendments to the NDEA and the Higher Education Act.

I feel that there are grave questions raised by the new section proposed by the Senate authorizing $10 million during the coming fiscal year and $15 million during the second year which may be exchanged for local currencies at our American Embassies to enable a total of 8,300 additional foreign students to come to our country for study in U.S. colleges and universities. It may be doubted that the local currencies will be as valuable as the dollars for which they are exchanged.

Nevertheless, as the legislation itself appears to concede, there is a minimal value to such programs. While more than doubling the number of foreign students who may come to study in our country, section 301 of the bill authorizes $50,000 to carry on a study to determine the reason why such a large number of individuals who entered the United States from developing countries annually remain in the United States or at least fail to return to their home countries. The study is intended to develop ways and means for encouraging the return of such individuals to their countries so that they may put their education and training to work in the service of their homelands.

Mr. Speaker, a far better idea for educating and training persons from the developing countries would be to train and educate them in their own areas or homelands through the development of local or regional educational centers. If this legislation contained such authorization, our American colleges and universities could greatly expand their facilities abroad and serve many times the number of persons who may be benefited from this legislation.

In addition, it would seem important to determine why American students of our secondary schools should not be accepted for study in the public schools of foreign lands. It must be recognized that the exchange student program is primarily a one-way street with foreign students accepted in our own public institutions—but with little or no exchange student programs in reverse.

Certainly if we want to gain a greater understanding of the language, habits, culture, history, and economic and social structure, of foreign lands, we are not going to be able to do it through the importation of a few persons from those countries whether they are highly educated or not—and no matter how many domestic graduate or undergraduate centers we may establish. Our opportunities for gaining the knowledge which we require are going to have to come from extensive study in the foreign lands in question.

The proposal for regional centers would seem also to fill this vacuum as American students and educators who would serve at such foreign centers would themselves receive a comprehensive education of the type which is desired.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great and widening gap between the well-educated citizens of the developed countries and the disadvantaged and uneducated people of the developing lands. I am fearful that this legislation may widen the gap between the highly educated and the uneducated. Perhaps if this legislation merely helps to educate us to this underlying fact, it may have served its purpose. However, I would have preferred a far more comprehensive program of international education—not more expensive but broader in its scope and impact. Indeed, I believe a far better job could be accomplished for much less money if the emphasis were on studies abroad instead of a purely domestic program of studies at home.

I am hopeful of producing early in the next session some constructive amendments to this legislation, H.R. 14643, and would welcome the support of the Committees on Education and Foreign Affairs at that time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Brademas] is recognized.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Indiana yield to me?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to do so immediately after offering a motion.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BRADEMAS

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Brademas moves to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the Senate insert the following:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'International Education Act of 1966'.

"Findings and declaration

"Sec. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that a knowledge of other countries is of the utmost importance in promoting mutual understanding and cooperation between nations; that strong American educational resources are a necessary base for strengthening our relations with other countries; that this and future generations of Americans should be assured ample opportunity to develop to the fullest extent possible their intellectual capacities in all areas of knowledge pertaining to other countries, peoples, and cultures; and that it is therefore both necessary and appropriate for the Federal Government to assist in the development of resources for international study and research, to assist in the development of resources and trained personnel in academic and professional fields, and to coordinate the existing and future programs of the Federal Government in international education, to meet the requirements of world leadership.

"TITLE I—GRANT PROGRAMS FOR ADVANCED AND UNDERGRADUATE INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

"Centers for advanced international studies

"Sec. 101. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to arrange through grants to institutions of higher education, or combinations of such institutions, for the establishment, strengthening, and operation by them of graduate centers which will be national and international resources for research and training in international studies and the international aspects of professional and other fields of study. Activities carried on in such centers may be concentrated either on specific geographical areas of the world or on particular fields or issues in world affairs which concern one or more countries, or on both. The Secretary may also make grants to public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations, including professional and scholarly associations, when such grants will make an especially significant contribution to attaining the objectives of this section.

"(b) Grants under this section may be used to cover part or all of the cost of establishing, strengthening, equipping, and operating research and training centers including the cost of teaching and research materials and resources, the cost of programs for bringing visiting scholars and faculty to the center, and the cost of training, improvement, and travel of the staff for the purpose of carrying out the objectives of this section. Such grants may also include funds for stipends (in such amounts as may be determined in accordance with regulations of the Secretary) to individuals undergoing training in such centers, including allowances for dependents and for travel for research and study here and abroad. Grants under this section shall be made on such conditions as the Secretary finds necessary to carry out its purposes.

"Grants to strengthen undergraduate programs in international studies

"Sec. 102. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to institutions of higher education, or combinations of such institutions, to assist them in planning, developing, and carrying out a comprehensive program to strengthen and improve undergraduate instruction in international studies. Grants made under this section may be for projects and activities which are an integral part of such a comprehensive program such as—

"(1) planning for the development and expansion of undergraduate programs in international studies;

"(2) teaching, research, curriculum, development, and other related activities;

"(3) training of faculty members in foreign countries;

"(4) expansion of foreign language courses;

"(5) planned and supervised student work-study-travel programs;

"(6) programs under which foreign teachers and scholars may visit institutions as visiting faculty; and

"(7) programs of English language training for foreign teachers, scholars, and students.

The Secretary may also make grants to public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations, including professional and scholarly associations, when such grants will make an especially significant contribution to attaining the objectives of this section.

"(b) A grant may be made under this section only upon application to the Secretary at such time or times and containing such information as he deems necessary. The Secretary shall not approve an application unless it—

"(1) sets forth a program for carrying out one or more projects or activities for which a grant is authorized under subsection (a);

"(2) sets forth policies and procedures which assure that Federal funds made available under this section for any fiscal year will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available for purposes which meet the requirements of subsection (a), and in no case supplant such funds;

"(3) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this section; and

"(4) provides for making such report, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may require to carry out his functions under this section, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Secretary may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(c) The Secretary shall allocate grants to institutions of higher education under this section in such manner and according to such plan as will most nearly provide an equitable distribution of the grants throughout the States while at the same time giving a preference to those institutions which are most in need of funds for programs in international studies and which show real promise of being able to use funds effectively.

"Method of payment; Federal administration

"Sec. 103. (a) Payments under this title may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

"(b) In administering the provisions of this title, the Secretary is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution, in accordance with written agreements between the Secretary and the head thereof published in the Federal Register three weeks prior to the date on which any such agreement is to become effective.

"Federal control of education prohibited

"Sec. 104. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution, or the selection of library resources by any educational institution or over the content of any material developed or published under any program assisted pursuant to this Act.

"Authorization and reports

"Sec. 105. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated $1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, which shall be available only for the purpose of preparing the report provided for in subsection (b) of this section. There are authorized to be appropriated $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $90,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title. For the fiscal years thereafter there shall be appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title only such amounts as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

"(b) The Secretary shall prepare, with the advice of the Advisory Committee appointed pursuant to section 106, a report containing specific recommendations for carrying out the provisions of this title, including any recommendations for amendments to this title and to portions of other laws amended by this Act, and shall submit such report to the President and the Congress not later than April 30, 1967.

"(c) Prior to January 31, 1968, and prior to January 31 in each year thereafter, the Secretary shall make a report to the Congress which reviews and evaluates activities carried on under the authority of this Act and which reviews other activities of the Federal Government drawing upon or strengthening American resources for international study and research and any existing activities and plans to coordinate and improve the efforts of the Federal Government in international education.

"National Advisory Committee on International Studies

"Sec. 106. (a) The President is authorized to establish in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a National Advisory Committee on International Studies, consisting of the Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Education who shall be chairman, and not more than fifteen additional members appointed by the President so that a majority shall constitute a broad representation of higher education in the United States and the remainder shall include representatives of the general public and individuals experienced in foreign affairs.

"(b) The Advisory Committee shall advise the Secretary in the preparation of the report provided for in section 105(b) of this Act, and thereafter shall advise the Secretary in carrying out the provisions of this Act. The recommendations of the Advisory Committee shall be included in the report provided for in section 105(b) of this Act and in the annual reports provided for in section 105(c) of this Act.

"(c) Members of the Advisory Committee who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on business of the Committee, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the President, but not exceeding $100 per day, including traveltime; and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code for persons in Government service employed intermittently.

"(d) The Advisory Committee is authorized to appoint without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, covering appointment in the competitive service, and fix the compensation of, without regard to chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title, such professional and technical personnel as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its duties.

"TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO OTHER LAWS

"Amendments to strengthen title VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958

"Removing Requirement for Area Centers That Adequate Language Instruction Not Be Readily Available

"Sec. 201. (a)(1) The first sentence of section 601(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out '(1)' and by striking out ', and (2) that adequate instruction in such language is not readily available in the United States'.

"(2) The first sentence of section 601(b) of such Act is amended by striking out '(with respect to which he makes the determination under clause (1) of subsection (a))' and inserting in lieu thereof '(with respect to which he makes the determination under subsection (a))'.

Removing 50 Per Centum Ceiling on Federal Participation

"(b) The third sentence of section 601(a) of such Act is amended by striking out 'more than 50 per centum' and inserting 'all or part' in lieu thereof.

"Authorizing Grants as Well as Contracts for Language and Area Centers

"(c) Section 601(a) of such Act is amended further by inserting 'grants to or' after 'arrange through' in the first sentence, and by inserting 'grant or' before 'contract' each time that it appears in the second and third sentences.

"Vesting Authority for Language and Area Programs in Secretary

"d) Section 601 of such Act is further amended by striking out 'Commissioner' each time such term occurs therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'Secretary'.

"Amendments to strengthen title XI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958

"Sec. 202. Title XI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended—

"(1) by inserting after the title the following: 'Part I—General';

"(2) by striking out the word 'title' in section 1102 and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'part'; and

"(3) by adding at the end thereof a new part as follows:

" 'PART II—INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

" 'International affairs institutes for secondary school teachers

" 'Sec. 1111. There are authorized to be appropriated $3,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and $6,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, to enable the Commissioner to arrange through contracts with institutions of higher education for the establishment and operation of short-term or regular-session institutes for teachers in secondary schools in order to give them a broader understanding of international affairs. Any such arrangement may cover the cost of the establishment and operation of the institute with respect to which it is made, including the cost of grants to the staff of travel in the foreign areas, regions, or countries with which the subject matter of the field or fields in which they are or will be working is concerned, and the cost of travel of foreign scholars to enable them to teach or assist in teaching in such institute and the cost of their return, and shall be made on such conditions as the Commissioner finds necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

" 'Stipends

" 'Sec. 1112. The Commissioner is authorized to pay stipends to any individual to study in a program assisted under the provisions of this part upon determining that assisting such individual in such studies will promote the purpose of this part. Stipends under the provisions of this section may include allowances for dependents and for travel to and from the place of residence.'

"Amendments to Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961

"Sec. 203. (a) Section 102(b) of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2452) is amended (1) by striking the period at the end of clause (9) and substituting a semicolon and the word 'and'; and (2) by adding at the end thereof a new clause as follows:

" '(10) promoting studies, research, instruction, and other educational activities of citizens and nationals of foreign countries in American schools, colleges, and universities located in the United States by making available to citizens and nationals of less developed friendly foreign countries for exchange for currencies of their respective countries (other than excess foreign currencies), at United States embassies, United States dollars in such amounts as may be necessary to enable such foreign citizens or nationals who are coming temporarily to the United States as students, trainees, teachers, instructors, or professors to meet expenses of the kind described in section 104(e)(1) of this Act.'

"(b) Section 104 of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

" '(g)(1) For the purpose of performing functions authorized by section 102(b)(10) of this Act, the President is authorized to establish the exchange rates at which all foreign currencies may be acquired through operations under such section, and shall issue regulations binding upon all embassies with respect to the exchange rates to be applicable in each of the respective countries where currency exchanges are authorized under such section.

" '(2) In performing the functions authorized under section 102(b)(10) of this Act, the President shall make suitable arrangements for protecting the interests of the United States Government in connection with the ownership, use, and disposition of all foreign currencies acquired pursuant to exchanges made under such section.

" '(3) The total amount of United States dollars acquired by any individual through currency exchanges under the authority of section 102(b)(10) of this Act shall in no event exceed $3,000 during any academic year.

" '(4) An individual shall be eligible to exchange foreign currency for United States dollars at United States embassies under section 102(b)(10) of this Act only if he gives satisfactory assurances that (A) he will devote essentially full time to his proposed educational activity in the United States and will maintain good standing in relation to such program; (B) he will return to the country of his citizenship or nationality prior to coming to the United States and will render such public service as is determined acceptable for a period of time determined reasonable and necessary by the government of such country; and (C) he will not apply for an immigrant visa or for permanent residence or for a nonimmigrant visa under the Immigration and Nationality Act after having received any benefits under such section for a period of time equal to the period of study, research, instruction, or other educational activity he performed pursuant to such section.

" '(5) As used in section 102(b)(10) of this Act, the term "excess foreign currencies" means foreign currencies, which if acquired by the United States (A) would be in excess of the normal requirements of departments, agencies, and embassies of the United States for such currencies, as determined by the President, and (B) would be available for the use of the United States Government under applicable agreements with the foreign country concerned.'

"(c) Section 105 of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

" '(g) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of making currency exchanges under section 102(b)(10) of this Act, not to exceed $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and not to exceed $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.'.

"Extending the benefits of the loan-insurance program under title IV-B of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to students studying abroad

"Sec. 204. The second sentence of section 435(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by inserting after 'Such term' the following: 'includes any institution outside the States which is comparable to an institution described in the preceding sentence and which has been approved by the Commissioner for the purposes of this title, and'.

"TITLE III—STUDY BY THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

"Authorization for a study on ways to reduce the drain from developing countries of professional persons and skilled specialists whose skills are urgently needed

"Sec. 301. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall conduct a study and investigation to determine (1) the total number of individuals who enter the United States from developing countries annually to further their education, and who remain in the United States; (2) the reasons for their failure to return to their home countries; and (3) means of encouraging the return of such individuals to the countries of their last residence or nationality, so they may put their education and training to work in the service of their homelands.

"(b) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall report to the President and to the Congress as soon as practicable on his findings and conclusions together with such recommendations for any legislation he deems desirable to encourage the return of such individuals to such countries.

"(c) It is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $50,000 for the purpose of carrying out this study.

"TITLE IV—AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF CERTAIN LAND AS RECREATION AREA

"Authorization

"Sec. 301. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Act of April 29, 1876 (19 Stat. 41; 40 U.S.C. 214) and the provisions of the Act of July 31, 1946 (60 Stat. 718; 40 U.S.C. 193a–193l), the Architect of the Capitol is authorized to permit the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to operate for recreational purposes only, and without any improvement to said land, that part of the United States Capitol Grounds known as Square 732 in the District of Columbia, bounded by Independence Avenue, Southeast, Second Street, Southeast, C Street, Southeast, and First Street, Southeast, and intersected by Carroll Street, for such period of time as said land is not required for building or other purposes by the Architect of the Capitol."

Mr. BRADEMAS (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Indiana.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word for the purpose of explaining the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The matter is completed. Does the gentleman from Indiana ask unanimous consent to extend his remarks?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, this bill is the International Education Act which the House passed with strong bipartisan support on June 6, 1966. It was unanimously approved by the members of the Task Force on International Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, which group I had the honor to serve as chairman. The majority members of the task force are: Mr. Hawkins, Mr. Sickles, Mr. William D. Ford, Mr. Hathaway, and Mrs. Mink. We were joined by my esteemed colleagues from the other side of the aisle, the distinguished ranking minority member of the Education and Labor Committee, Mr. Ayres, Mr. Quie, and Mr. Bell in support of this bill, which was approved by the full committee without dissent.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to say special thanks to Dr. Herman Wells, chancellor of Indiana University, who served as consultant to the task force. His counsel and knowledge of the entire field of international education were invaluable and his good humor irreplaceable. I also want to thank Mr. Peter Gillingham, who served tirelessly and most ably as counsel to the task force, and Mr. Walter McCann, my legislative assistant, who worked closely with the task force and contributed much to framing this important legislation. I also want to give special thanks to Dr. Gunter Matthew, education adviser to the full committee, who has given us continuing and able counsel.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to strengthen colleges and universities here in the United States in the field of international studies and research.

It is not a foreign aid bill.

The Senate has adopted the House bill practically in toto and has added certain amendments, none of which changes the principal thrust of the bill, which is, as I have said, to strengthen American colleges and universities—both at the undergraduate and graduate levels, in international studies.

Let me briefly review the Senate amendments:

First, the Senate has authorized for a period of 3 years the following amounts: $1 million for fiscal 1967; $40 million for fiscal 1968; $90 million for fiscal 1969, for a total of $131 million. The House bill provided $10, $40, and $90 million over the same 3-year period, for a total of $140 million.

The Senate bill differs from the House bill in the first year in that, rather than funding grants in fiscal 1967, the $1 million authorized is to be used primarily to finance study by a presidentially appointed National Advisory Committee on International Studies, which is established by the Senate amendments. The Secretary of HEW, with the advice of the National Advisory Committee is directed to prepare for Congress and the President a report which will contain specific recommendations for carrying out the programs authorized under this act. The Advisory Committee will consist of 15 members, a majority of whom shall be broadly representative of higher education in the United States, and shall be chaired by the Assistant Secretary of HEW for Education.

The Senate also added language designed to assure the independence of our colleges and universities from the slightest hint of Federal control by adding the selection of books and library materials to the anti-Federal control section of the bill. It also requires the Secretary of HEW to publish in the Federal Register any agreements related to the programs under this act made with other Federal agencies. This provision will help insure that the funds under this bill and in related programs will be used for educational purposes only and will not support activities which touch upon matters more within the jurisdiction of agencies whose primary concern is with national security questions.

Although the House bill would neither have countenanced Federal control of any sort nor the support of other than educational activities, these amendments underline those caveats and are in no way objectionable.

The Senate also added, at the request of Senator Prouty, language which would permit the teaching of English to foreign students as part of a comprehensive plan for undergraduate international studies. This amendment makes specific authority which is already contained in the House bill and is acceptable to the Committee.

In addition to specifying and listing authorities and prohibitions already implicit in the House bill, the Senate added several amendments to other statutes which are related to the purposes of the International Education Act.

Primary among them is a broadening of title XI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to provide for teacher training institutes in international studies for secondary school teachers. The Senate authorizes $3.5 million and $6 million in fiscal years 1967 and 1969 for this purpose. This amendment will make clear that our commitment to international studies, as the President indicated in his February message, extends throughout the educational system and also our recognition that the quality of international education will depend largely upon the quality of the teachers we prepare in that field. The Senate also transfers authority for the conduct of the title VI, National Defense Education Act language and area study program to the Secretary in order to facilitate coordination between that program and the grants under the International Education Act.

Second, the Senate amended the Higher Education Act to permit students who obtain loans under the guaranteed loan program to use those loans at institutions overseas. This amendment will bring the guaranteed loan program into line with the provisions of the student assistance programs, such as the three GI bills, all of which permit a similar use of funds.

Third, the Senate modified the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act to permit students from friendly developing countries, in which the United States does not own excess currencies, to exchange their currency more freely into dollars if they do so for the purpose of studying in the United States and returning to public service in their own country. The students would, of course, make their own arrangements with American colleges and universities and this provision would simply remove a possible technical barrier to their studies in this country. Each student would be limited to $3,000 in exchange in an academic year and the Senate has placed a $10 million limit on the program for its first year of operation, fiscal 1968.

Related to this amendment is the authorization for the Secretary of HEW, proposed by Senator MONDALE, to make a thorough study of the situation of foreign students from developing countries who are studying in the United States and what can best be done to encourage them to return to their own countries and use the skills gained here to further the development of their own nations.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate also added an amendment in which the committee does not concur and I therefore have placed with the Clerk an amended version of H.R. 14643 which strikes out section 205, beginning on line 10 of page 16 of the engrossed Senate amendments and ending with line 11 on page 18.

This section would have required the Secretary, under the Public Health Service Act, to make direct loans to students pursuing certain medical studies outside the United States. It would have placed the Secretary of HEW in the awkward position of approving or disapproving foreign medical schools when there is no professional body in the United States, either private or governmental, which is presently willing or prepared to make such judgments. Moreover, the distinguished chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS], in whose jurisdiction this legislation falls, has indicated that he would prefer that his committee make an independent study of this matter before the House acts. Consequently, I urge that the House not concur in this amendment and therefore the amendment at the Clerk's desk deletes it.

The last of the Senate amendments to H.R. 14643 has perhaps little to do with international education, but I support it wholeheartedly for it puts us squarely on the side of the angels.

The angels in this case are the St. Peter's Angels, a football team of youngsters coming largely from St. Peter's Church on Capitol Hill. This team, which had been practicing on the vacant lot proposed as the location for the Madison Memorial Library, has been forced to search for another place to practice due to certain regulations which the Architect of the Capitol must enforce. Since the playground where they normally play is closed, the team is without a home.

The Senate has therefore attached an amendment to the International Education Act authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to permit the use of this vacant lot, as is, for recreational purposes, under the supervision of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, for such time as the Architect of the Capitol determines that the land is not required for other purposes. The language in the amendment at the Clerk's desk has been cleared with the offices of both the Speaker and the Architect of the Capitol.

Mr. Speaker, as a resident and Representative of South Bend, Ind., the site of the University of Notre Dame, the Nation's No. 1 team, I am aware of the importance of football in this country. I hope, therefore, Mr. Speaker that we shall pass this act and restore their field of honor to St. Peter's Angels.

Mr. Speaker, the amended International Education Act will bring new strength to the international studies capacities of American colleges and universities. It will help assure that American students have an opportunity for the high quality education which the times so clearly demand. I urge that my colleagues join me today in voting to approve this measure.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on the International Education Act of 1966.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota who has been so helpful on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request is granted.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I know the bill has already been passed, so I shall not take any time.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York, but I have no time.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered, under the circumstances.

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the graciousness of the Speaker. There is one provision in this bill, the international education bill, that is unrelated to international education. It provides for the utilization of square 732, where the Madison Library will be situated eventually, providing that the Architect may permit the District of Columbia to utilize this area for a playground, in effect, for the children in the area. I just wanted it clear in the legislative history—and I think we are in complete agreement on it—that we intend that the Architect shall have full discretion as to the appropriate circumstances for the utilization of this plot, and that he shall have authority to determine the conditions under which it will be used appropriate to Capitol Hill.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I agree with the gentleman's interpretation.

Mr. GOODELL. I thank the Speaker and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak briefly in defense and support of the International Education Act of 1966.

Let me hasten to assure you that my brevity is no measure of the depth of my support for this bill, for I believe it is of vital importance to American higher education and to coming generations of American students.

In 7 days of hearings, Mr. Speaker, the task force learned that although great strides have been made in the past decade, the scope and depth of international studies in the United States are both still woefully inadequate. We received persuasive testimony from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John W. Gardner, Assistant Secretary of State Charles Frankel, university administrators and scholars and representatives of several private foundations and scholarly organization deeply concerned with international education. They were unanimous in their support for this measure. The task force took over 600 pages of testimony, 620 to be exact, and considered over 40 formal and informal suggestions for amendments. More than a dozen of these were incorporated in an amended version of the bill which was passed unanimously by the task force and was approved without dissent by the full House Education and Labor Committee.

I want to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to commend the distinguished chairman of the task force on international education, my colleague from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS], for the tireless and outstanding job which he has done in order to bring this legislation to the floor today. I know for that he was ably assisted by Dr. Herman Wells, chancellor of Indiana University, who was consultant to the task force, and by Mr. Peter Gillingham, who served as our counsel, and Dr. Eunice Matthew, education advisor to the Education and Labor Committee. I want to thank them also for the help which they gave to the members of the task force.

Mr. Speaker, the need for this bill is great and the record is clear for those who will take the time to read it with an open mind. The report on this bill includes "that the Federal Government has a clear responsibility to support and strengthen the capabilities of our colleges and universities for international studies and research." Let us fulfill that responsibility. Let us move to do first things first and strengthen our own universities and students, as well as invite others to join us in the enterprise of international education. I urge my colleagues to support this needed legislation.

DISPOSITION OF GEOTHERMAL STEAM AND ASSOCIATED GEOTHERMAL RESOURCES

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 1674) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make disposition of geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments to the House amendment, and concur in the Senate amendments to the House amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

> Page 3, line 11 of the House engrossed amendment after "bidding." insert: "Notwithstanding the foregoing, at any time within one hundred and eighty days following the effective date of this Act:
>
> "(a) with respect to all lands which were on September 7, 1965, subject to valid leases or permits issued under the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.), or under the Mineral Leasing Act of Acquired Lands, as amended (30 U.S.C. 351, 358), or to existing mining claims filed on or prior to September 7, 1965, the lessees or permittees or claimants who are qualified to hold geothermal leases shall have the right to convert such leases or permits or claims to geothermal leases covering the same lands;
>
> "(b) where there are conflicting claims, leases, or permits, therefor embracing the same land, the person who first was issued a lease or permit, or who first recorded the mining claim shall be entitled to first consideration;
>
> "(c) with respect to all lands which were on September 7, 1965, the subject of applications for leases or permits under the above Acts, the applicants may convert their applications to applications for geothermal leases having priorities dating from the time of filing of such applications under such Acts;
>
> "(d) no person shall be permitted to convert any mineral lease or permits, or application therefor, or mining claims for more than twelve thousand eight hundred acres in any one State; and
>
> "(d) the conversion of leases, permits, and mining claims and applications for leases and permits shall be accomplished in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary. No right to conversion to a geothermal lease shall accrue to any person under this section unless such person shows to the reasonable satisfaction of the Secretary that substantial expenditures for the exploration, development, or production of geothermal steam have been made by the applicant who is seeking conversion, on the lands for which a lease is sought or on adjoining, adjacent, or nearby Federal or non-Federal lands."
>
> Page 8, line 21 of the House engrossed amendment strike out "latter".
>
> Page 13, line 20 of the House engrossed amendment strike out "ninety" and insert: "one hundred twenty".
>
> Page 14, line 17 of the House engrossed amendment strike out "Act." and insert: "Act: *Provided*, That upon an authoritative judicial determination that Federal mineral reservation does not include geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources the duties of the Secretary of the Interior to report and of the Attorney General to institute proceedings, as hereinbefore set forth, shall cease."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments to the House amendment were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1674 and the Senate amendments thereto.

Two of these amendments are of a purely clerical and technical nature; the other two are of substance, and it is to these that I address these remarks.

The first amendment adopted by the Senate would reinsert the so-called grandfather clause which was contained in the original Senate-passed version but which was deleted in committee when considered by the House. This is a preference right provision which would protect those individuals who have gone out on the public domain in good faith and expended funds for the development of geothermal resources. These pioneer developers, due to the absence of appropriate legislation, filed mining claims or obtained oil and gas leases in order to proceed with their exploration activities. While legally they may not have gained title to the geothermal steam resources, they have established certain equities by their pioneering effort which should not be ignored. In my opinion the new grandfather clause as adopted by the Senate recognizes these equities but still retains sufficient safeguards and protective features to adequately protect the public interest.

It has always been my position that to be acceptable a grandfather clause must contain three limiting or restricting features to protect the public interest. First, a grandfather clause must contain an early cutoff date for the conversion of leases, permits, or claims to geothermal steam leases. This would afford protection to the pioneer developers of geothermal steam but would prevent latecomers or speculators from reaping the benefits of the pioneer developer. While I personally would have preferred a date somewhat earlier than September 7, 1965, as adopted by the Senate, I am convinced that this date, when taken together with the two other features, will adequately protect the public interest and permit early development of this resource.

Second, a grandfather clause must require a showing by the individual seeking conversion that substantial expenditures have been made for the development of geothermal steam. The Senate has adopted such a provision. This will limit the right of conversion to those individuals who have in good faith expended time, effort, and money in the development of this resource. It will prevent the wholesale conversion of the 72 million acres of public domain land now under Federal lease, as well as the additional millions of acres of land under application for lease and in mining claims, unless it can be clearly shown that substantial expenditures have been made for the development of geothermal steam by the individual seeking conversion. While the term "substantial expenditures" has not been defined it is my opinion that this certainly must be much more than the mere payment of lease rentals, lease acquisition costs, or the costs of filing or holding a mining claim by the performance of the minimum annual assessment work. As indicated by the Senate language these expenditures must be for the actual exploration, development, or production of geothermal steam.

The third provision which I have always felt essential to a grandfather clause is an overall acreage limitation on the amount of acreage that can be converted from leases, permits, or claims to geothermal steam leases.

Again the Senate has adopted such a limitation by providing that not more than 12,800 acres in any one State may qualify for such conversion. As the total permissible geothermal steam lease acreage that may be held in any one State is 51,200 acres, this limitation means that only one-fourth of the total State acreage may be acquired by conversion. This is a further safeguard to prevent monopoly of favorable acreage by a few individuals notwithstanding the fact that they may be pioneer developers of this resource.

With these three features, which tend to carefully limit and restrict the otherwise wide open grandfather clause, I can lend my support to this bill.

The other amendment of substance adopted by the Senate is intended to clarify certain language contained in the House-passed version directing the Attorney General to initiate court action whenever geothermal steam development is begun on lands where the title to the surface has passed from Federal ownership but where mineral rights have been reserved to the Federal Government. The House language could have been interpreted as being totally mandatory and as a continuing obligation upon the Attorney General notwithstanding any finding of the courts. The Senate amendment removes this question raised by the administrative agencies.

Mr. Speaker, extended hearings were held by our Committee on this proposal and a great deal of effort and consideration has been given to this matter by both Houses of Congress. I lend my support to the adoption of these amendments and urge enactment of this proposal.

FOOD FOR PEACE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 14929) to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

Conference Report (H. Rept. No. 2304)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14929) to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'Food for Peace Act of 1966'.

"Sec. 2. The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, is amended—

"(A) By amending section 2 to read as follows:

" 'Sec. 2. The Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to expand international trade; to develop and expand export markets for United States agricultural commodities; to use the abundant agricultural productivity of the United States to combat hunger and malnutrition and to encourage economic development in the developing countries, with particular emphasis on assistance to those countries that are determined to improve their own agricultural production; and to promote in other ways the foreign policy of the United States.'

"(B) By amending title I to read as follows:

" 'TITLE I

" 'Sec. 101. In order to carry out the policies and accomplish the objectives set forth in section 2 of this Act, the President is authorized to negotiate and carry out agreements with friendly countries to provide for the sale of agricultural commodities for dollars on credit terms or for foreign currencies.

" 'Sec. 102. For the purpose of carrying out agreements concluded under this Act the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to finance the sale and exportation of agricultural commodities whether from private stocks or from stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

" 'Sec. 103. In exercising the authorities conferred upon him by this title, the President shall—

" '(a) take into account efforts of friendly countries to help themselves toward a greater degree of self-reliance, including efforts to meet their problems of food production and population growth;

" '(b) take steps to assure a progressive transition from sales for foreign currencies to sales for dollars (or to the extent that transition to sales for dollars under the terms applicable to such sales is not possible, transition to sales for foreign currencies on credit terms no less favorable to the United States than those for development loans made under section 201 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and on terms which permit conversion to dollars at the exchange rate applicable to the sales agreement) at a rate whereby the transition can be completed by December 31, 1971: *Provided*, That provision may be included in any agreement for payment in foreign currencies to the extent that the President determines that such currencies are needed for the purpose of subsections (a), (b), (c), (e), and (h) of section 104;

" '(c) take reasonable precautions to safeguard usual marketings of the United States and to assure that sales under this title will not unduly disrupt world prices of agricultural commodities or normal patterns of commercial trade with friendly countries;

" '(d) make sales agreements only with those countries which he determines to be friendly to the United States: *Provided*, That the President shall periodically review the status of those countries which are eligible under this subsection and report the results of such review to the Congress. As used in this Act, "friendly country" shall not include (1) any country or area dominated or controlled by a foreign government or organization controlling a world Communist movement, or (2) for the purpose only of sales of agricultural commodities for foreign currencies under title I of this Act, any country or area dominated by a Communist government, or (3) for the purpose only of sales of agricultural commodities under title I of this Act, any nation which sells or furnishes or permits ships or aircraft under its registry to transport to or from Cuba or North Vietnam (excluding United States installations in Cuba) any equipment, materials, or commodities so long as they are governed by a Communist regime: *Provided*, That with respect to furnishing, selling, or selling and transporting to Cuba medical supplies, non-strategic raw materials for agriculture, and non-strategic agricultural or food commodities, sales agreements may be entered into if the President finds with respect to each such country, and so informs the Senate and the House of Representatives of the reasons therefor, that the making of each such agreement would be in the national interest of the United States and all such findings and reasons therefor shall be published in the Federal Register, or (4) for the purposes only of sales under title I of this Act the United Arab Republic, unless the President determines that such sale is in the national interest of the United States. No sales to the United Arab Republic shall be based upon the requirements of that nation for more than one fiscal year. The President shall keep the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives fully and currently informed with respect to sales made to the United Arab Republic under title I of this Act. Notwithstanding any other Act, the President may enter into agreements for the sale of agricultural commodities for dollars on credit terms under title I of this Act with countries which fall within the definition of "friendly country" for the purpose of such sales and no sales under this Act shall be made with any country if the President finds such country is (a) an aggressor, in a military sense, against any country having diplomatic relations with the United States, or (b) using funds, of any sort, from the United States for purposes inimical to the foreign policies of the United States;

" '(e) take appropriate steps to assure that private trade channels are used to the maximum extent practicable both with respect to sales from privately owned stocks and with respect to sales from stocks owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation and that small business has adequate and fair opportunity to participate in sales made under the authority of this Act;

" '(f) give special consideration to the development and expansion of foreign markets for United States agricultural commodities, with appropriate emphasis on more adequate storage, handling, and food distribution facilities as well as long-term development of new and expanding markets by encouraging economic growth;

" '(g) obtain commitments from purchasing countries that will prevent resale or transshipment to other countries, or use for other than domestic purposes, of agricultural commodities purchased under this title, without specific approval of the President;

" '(h) obtain rates of exchange applicable to the sale of commodities under such agreements which are not less favorable than the highest of exchange rates legally obtainable in the respective countries and which are not less favorable than the highest of exchange rates obtainable by any other nation;

" '(i) promote progress toward assurance of an adequate food supply by encouraging countries with which agreements are made to give higher emphasis to the production of food crops than to the production of such nonfood crops as are in world surplus;

" '(j) exercise the authority contained in title I of this Act to assist friendly countries to be independent of domination or control by any world Communist movement. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing sales agreements under title I with any government or organization controlling a world Communist movement or with any country with which the United States does not have diplomatic relations;

" '(k) whenever practicable require upon delivery that not less than 5 per centum of the purchase price of any agricultural commodities sold under title I of this Act be payable in dollars or in the types or kinds of currencies which can be converted into dollars;

" '(l) obtain commitments from friendly purchasing countries that will insure, insofar as practicable that food commodities sold for foreign currencies under title I of this Act shall be marked or identified at point of distribution or sale as being provided on a concessional basis to the recipient government through the generosity of the people of the United States of America, and obtain commitments from purchasing countries to publicize widely to their people, by public media and other means, that the commodities are being provided on a concessional basis through the friendship of the American people as food for peace;

" '(m) require foreign currencies to be convertible to dollars to the extent consistent with the effectuation of the purposes of this Act, but in any event to the extent necessary to (1) permit that portion of such currencies made available for payment of United States obligations to be used to meet obligations or charges payable by the United States or any of its agencies to the government of the importing country or any of its agencies, and (2) in the case of excess currency countries, assure convertibility by sale to American tourists, or otherwise, of such additional amount (up to twenty-five per centum of the foreign currencies received pursuant to each agreement entered into after the effective date of the Food for Peace Act of 1966) as may be necessary to cover all normal expenditures of American tourists in the importing country;

" '(n) take maximum precautions to assure that sales for dollars on credit terms under this Act shall not displace any sales of United States agricultural commodities which would otherwise be made for cash dollars.

" 'Sec. 104. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may use or enter into agreements with foreign countries or international organizations to use the foreign currencies, including principal and interest from loan repayments, which accrue in connection with sales for foreign currencies under this title for one or more of the following purposes:

" '(a) For payment of United States obligations (including obligations entered into pursuant to other legislation);

" '(b) For carrying out programs of United States Government agencies to—

" '(1) help develop new markets for United States agricultural commodities on a mutually benefitting basis. From sale proceeds and loan repayments under this title not less than the equivalent of 5 per centum of the total sales made each year under this title shall be set aside in the amounts and kinds of foreign currencies specified by the Secretary of Agriculture and made available in advance for use as provided by this paragraph over such period of years as the Secretary of Agriculture determines will most effectively carry out the purpose of this paragraph: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may release such amounts of the foreign currencies so set aside as he determines cannot be effectively used for agricultural market development purposes under this section, except that no release shall be made until the expiration of thirty days following the date on which notice of such proposed release is transmitted by the President to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and to the House Committee on Agriculture, if transmitted while Congress is in session, or sixty days following the date of transmittal if transmitted while Congress is not in session. Provision shall be made in sale and loan agreements for the convertibility of such amount of the proceeds thereof (not less than 2 per centum) as the Secretary of Agriculture determines to be needed to carry out the purpose of this paragraph in those countries which are or offer reasonable potential of becoming dollar markets for United States agricultural commodities. Such sums shall be converted into the types and kinds of foreign currencies as the Secretary deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this paragraph and such sums shall be deposited to a special Treasury account and shall not be made available or expended except for carrying out the provisions of this paragraph. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if sufficient foreign currencies for carrying out the purpose of this paragraph in such countries are not otherwise available, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to enter into agreements with such countries for the sale of agricultural commodities in such amounts as the Secretary of Agricuture determines to be adequate and for the use of the proceeds to carry out the purpose of this paragraph. In carrying out agricultural market development activities, nonprofit agricultural trade organizations shall be utilized to the maximum extent practicable. The purpose of this paragraph shall include such representation of agricultural industries as may be required during the course of discussions on trade programs relating either to individual commodities or groups of commodities;

"'(2) finance international educational and cultural exchange activities under the programs authorized by the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2451 et seq.);

"'(3) collect, collate, translate, abstract, and disseminate scientific and technological information and conduct research and support scientific activities overseas including programs and projects of scientific cooperation between the United States and other countries such as coordinated research against diseases common to all of mankind or unique to individual regions of the globe, and promote and support programs of medical and scientific research, cultural and educational development, family planning, health, nutrition, and sanitation;

"'(4) acquire by purchase, lease, rental, or otherwise, sites and buildings and grounds abroad, for United States Government use including offices, residence quarters, community and other facilities, and construct, repair, alter, and furnish such buildings and facilities;

"'(5) finance under the direction of the Librarian of Congress, in consultation with the National Science Foundation and other interested agencies, (A) programs outside the United States for the analysis and evaluation of foreign books, periodicals, and other materials to determine whether they would provide information of technical or scientific significance in the United States and whether such books, periodicals, and other materials are of cultural or educational significance, (B) the registry, indexing, binding, reproduction, cataloging, abstracting, translating, and dissemination of books, periodicals, and related materials determined to have such significance; and (C) the acquisition of such books, periodicals, and other materials and the deposit thereof in libraries and research centers in the United States specializing in the areas to which they relate;

"'(c) To procure equipment, materials, facilities, and services for the common defense including internal security;

"'(d) For assistance to meet emergency or extraordinary relief requirements other than requirements for food commodities: *Provided*, That not more than a total amount equivalent to $5,000,000 may be made available for this purpose during any fiscal year;

"'(e) For use to the maximum extent under the procedures established by such agency as the President shall designate for loans to United States business firms (including cooperatives) and branches, subsidiaries, or affiliates of such firms for business development and trade expansion in such countries, including loans for private home construction, and for loans to domestic or foreign firms (including cooperatives) for the establishment of facilities for aiding in the utilization, distribution, or otherwise increasing the consumption of, and markets for, United States agricultural products: *Provided, however*, That no such loans shall be made for the manufacture of any products intended to be exported to the United States in competition with products produced in the United States and due consideration shall be given to the continued expansion of markets for United States agricultural commodities or the products thereof. Foreign currencies may be accepted in repayment of such loans;

"'(f) To promote multilateral trade and agricultural and other economic development, under procedures, established by the President, by loans or by use in any other manner which the President may determine to be in the national interest of the United States, particularly to assist programs of recipient countries designed to promote, increase, or improve food production, processing, distribution, or marketing in food-deficit countries friendly to the United States, for which purpose the President may utilize to the extent practicable the services of nonprofit voluntary agencies registered with and approved by the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid: *Provided*, That no such funds may be utilized to promote religious activities;

"'(g) For the purchase of goods or services for other friendly countries;

"'(h) For financing, at the request of such country, programs emphasizing maternal welfare, child health and nutrition, and activities, where participation is voluntary, related to the problems of population growth, under procedures established by the President through any agency of the United States, or through any local agency which he determines is qualified to administer such activities;

"'(i) For paying, to the maximum extent practicable, the costs outside of the United States of carrying out the program authorized in section 406 of this Act; and

"'(j) For sale for dollars to United States citizens and nonprofit organizations for travel or other purposes of currencies determined to be in excess of the needs of departments and agencies of the United States for such currencies. The United States dollars received from the sale of such foreign currencies shall be deposited to the account of Commodity Credit Corporation: *Provided*, That—

"'(1) Section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, shall apply to currencies used for the purposes specified in subsections (a) and (b).

"'(2) Section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, shall apply to all foreign currencies used for grants under subsections (f) and (g), to not less than 10 per centum of the foreign currencies which accrue pursuant to agreements entered into on or before December 31, 1964, and to not less than 20 per centum in the aggregate of the foreign currencies which accrue pursuant to agreements entered into thereafter: *Provided, however*, That the President is authorized to waive such applicability of section 1415 in any case where he determines that it would be inappropriate or inconsistent with the purposes of this title,

"'(3) No agreement or proposal to grant any foreign currencies (except as provided in subsection (c) of this section), or to use (except pursuant to appropriation Act) any principal or interest from loan repayments under this section shall be entered into or carried out until the expiration of thirty days following the date on which such agreement or proposal is transmitted by the President to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and to the House Committee on Agriculture, if transmitted while Congress is in session, or sixty days following the date of transmittal if transmitted while Congress is not in session,

"'(4) Any loan made under the authority of this section shall bear interest at such rate as the President may determine but not less than the cost of funds to the United States Treasury, taking into consideration the current average market yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having maturity comparable to the maturity of such loans, unless the President shall in specific instances after consultation with the advisory committee established under section 407 designate a different rate:

Provided, further, That paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of the foregoing proviso shall not apply in the case of any nation where the foreign currencies or credits owned by the United States and available for use by it in such nation are determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be in excess of the normal requirements of the departments and agencies of the United States for expenditures in such nations for the two fiscal years following the fiscal year in which such determination is made. The amount of any such excess shall be devoted to the extent practicable and without regard to paragraph (1) of the foregoing proviso, to the acquisition of sites, buildings, and grounds under paragraph (4) of subsection (b) of this section and to assist such nation in undertaking self-help measures to increase its production of agricultural commodities and its facilities for storage and distribution of such commodities. Assistance under the foregoing provision shall be limited to self-help measures additional to those which would be undertaken without such assistance. Upon the determination by the Secretary of the Treasury that such an excess exists with respect to any nation, the President shall advise the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the House Committee on Agriculture of such determination; and shall thereafter report to each such Committee as often as may be necessary to keep such Committee advised as to the extent of such excess, the purposes for which it is used or proposed to be used, and the effects of such use.

" 'SEC. 105. Foreign currencies received pursuant to this Act shall be deposited in a special account to the credit of the United States and shall be used only pursuant to section 104, and any department or agency of the Government using any of such currencies for a purpose for which funds have been appropriated shall reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation in an amount equivalent to the dollar value of the currencies used. The President shall utilize foreign currencies received pursuant to this Act in such manner as will, to the maximum extent possible, reduce any deficit in the balance of payments of the United States.

" 'SEC. 106. (a) Payment by any friendly country for commodities purchased for dollars on credit shall be upon terms as favorable to the United States as the economy of such country will permit. Payment for such commodities shall be in dollars with interest at such rates as the Secretary may determine but not less than the minimum rate required by section 201 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for loans made under that section. Payment may be made in reasonable annual amounts over periods of not to exceed twenty years from the date of the last delivery of commodities in each calendar year under the agreement, except that the date for beginning such annual payment may be deferred for a period not later than two years after such date of last delivery, and interest shall be computed from the date of such last delivery. Delivery of such commodities shall be made in annual installments for not more than ten years following the date of the sales agreement and subject to the availability of the commodities at the time delivery is to be made.

" '(b) Agreements hereunder for the sale of agricultural commodities for dollars on credit terms shall include provisions to assure that the proceeds from the sale of the commodities in the recipient country are used for such economic development purposes as are agreed upon in the sales agreement or any amendment thereto.

" 'SEC. 107. (a) It is also the policy of the Congress to stimulate and maximize the sale of United States agricultural commodities for dollars through the private trade and to further the use of private enterprise to the maximum, thereby strengthening the development and expansion of foreign commercial markets for United States agricultural commodities. In furtherance of this policy, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to enter into agreements with foreign and United States private trade for financing the sale of agricultural commodities for export over such periods of time and on such credit terms as the Secretary determines will accomplish the objectives of this section. Any agreement entered into under this section shall provide for the development and execution of projects which will result in the establishment of facilities designed to improve the storage or marketing of agricultural commodities, or which will otherwise stimulate and expand private economic enterprise in any friendly country. Any agreement entered into under this section shall also provide for the furnishing of such security as the Secretary determines necessary to provide reasonable and adequate assurance of payment of the purchase price in dollars with interest at a rate which will as nearly as practicable be equivalent to the average cost of funds to the United States Treasury, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having maturities comparable to maturities of credits extended under this section. In no event shall the rate of interest be less than the minimum rate, or the delivery period, deferral of first payment, or term of credit be longer than the maximum term, authorized in section 106. In carrying out this Act, the authority provided in this section for making dollar sales shall be used to the maximum extent practicable.

" '(b) In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Secretary shall take reasonable precautions to safeguard usual marketings of the United States and to avoid displacing any sales of United States agricultural commodities which the Secretary finds and determines would otherwise be made for cash dollars.

" '(c) The Secretary shall obtain commitments from purchasers that will prevent resale or transshipment to other countries, or use for other than domestic purposes, of agricultural commodities purchased under this section.

" '(d) In carrying out this Act, the provisions of sections 102, 103(a), 103(d), 103(e), 103(f), 103(j), 103(k), 110, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 407, 408, and 409 shall be applicable to sales under this section.

" 'SEC. 108. The Commodity Credit Corporation may finance ocean freight charges incurred pursuant to agreements for sales for foreign currencies (other than those providing for conversion to dollars as described in section 103(b) of this Act) entered into hereunder only to the extent that such charges are higher (than would otherwise be the case) by reason of a requirement that the commodities be transported in United States-flag vessels. Such agreements shall require the balance of such charges for transportation in United States vessels to be paid in dollars by the nations or organizations with whom such agreements are entered into.

" 'SEC. 109. (a) Before entering into agreements with developing countries for the sale of United States agricultural commodities on whatever terms, the President shall consider the extent to which the recipient country is undertaking wherever practicable self-help measures to increase per capita production and improve the means for storage and distribution of agricultural commodities, including:

" '(1) devoting land resources to the production of needed food rather than to the production of nonfood crops—especially nonfood crops in world surplus;

" '(2) development of the agricultural chemical, farm machinery and equipment, transportation and other necessary industries through private enterprise;

" '(3) training and instructing farmers in agricultural methods and techniques;

" '(4) constructing adequate storage facilities;

" '(5) improving marketing and distribution systems;

" '(6) creating a favorable environment for private enterprise and investment, both domestic and foreign, and utilizing available technical know-how;

" '(7) establishing and maintaining Government policies to insure adequate incentives to producers; and

" '(8) establishing and expanding institutions for adaptive agricultural research; and

" '(9) allocating for these purposes sufficient national budgetary and foreign exchange resources (including those supplied by bilateral, multilateral and consortium aid programs) and local currency resources (resulting from loans or grants to recipient governments of the proceeds of local currency sales).

" '(b) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, in agreements with nations not engaged in armed conflict against Communist forces or against nations with which the United States has no diplomatic relations, not less than 20 per centum of the foreign currencies set aside for purposes other than those in sections 104 (a), (b), (c), and (j) shall be allocated for the self-help measures set forth in this section.

" '(c) Each agreement entered into under this title shall describe the program which the recipient country is undertaking to improve its production, storage, and distribution of agricultural commodities; and shall provide for termination of such agreement whenever the President finds that such program is not being adequately developed.

" 'SEC. 110. Agreements shall not be entered into under this title during any calendar year which will call for an appropriation to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation in an amount in excess of $1,900,000,000, plus any amount by which agreements entered into under this title in prior years have called or will call for appropriations to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation in amounts less than authorized for such prior years.'

"(C) By amending title II to read as follows:

" 'TITLE II

" 'SEC. 201. The President is authorized to determine requirements and furnish agricultural commodities, on behalf of the people of the United States of America, to meet famine or other urgent or extraordinary relief requirements; to combat malnutrition, especially in children; to promote economic and community development in friendly developing areas; and for needy persons and nonprofit school lunch and preschool feeding programs outside the United States. The Commodity Credit Corporation shall make available to the President such agricultural commodities determined to be available under section 401 as he may request.

" 'SEC. 202. The President may furnish commodities for the purposes set forth in section 201 through such friendly governments and such agencies, private or public, including intergovernmental organizations such as the world food program and other multilateral organizations in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate. The President shall, to the extent practicable, utilize nonprofit voluntary agencies registered with, and approved by, the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid. Insofar as practicable, all commodities furnished hereunder shall be clearly identified by appropriate marking on each package or container in the language of the locality where they are distributed as being furnished by the people of the United States of America. The assistance to needy persons shall insofar as practicable be directed toward community and other self-help activities designed to alleviate the causes of the need for such assistance. Except in the case of emergency, the President shall take reasonable precaution to assure that commodities furnished hereunder will not displace or interfere with sales which might otherwise be made.

" 'SEC. 203. The Commodity Credit Corporation may, in addition to the cost of acquisition, pay with respect to commodities made available under this title costs for packaging, enrichment, preservation, and fortification; processing, transportation, handling, and other incidental costs up to the time of their delivery free on board vessels in United States ports; ocean freight charges from United States ports to designated ports of entry abroad, or, in the case of landlocked countries, transportation from United States ports to designated points of entry abroad; and charges for general average contributions arising out of the ocean transport of commodities transferred pursuant thereto.

" 'SEC. 204. Programs of assistance shall not be undertaken under this title during any calendar year which call for an appropriation of more than $600,000,000 to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for all costs incurred in connection with such programs (including the Corporation's investment in commodities made available) plus any amount by which programs of assistance undertaken under this title in the preceding calendar year have called or will call for appropriations to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation in amounts less than were authorized for such purpose during such preceding year. In addition to other funds available for such purposes under any other Act, funds made available under this title may be used in an amount not exceeding $7,500,000 annually to purchase foreign currencies accruing under title I of this Act in order to meet costs (except the personnel and administrative costs of cooperating sponsors, distributing agencies, and recipient agencies, and the costs of construction or maintenance of any church owned or operated edifice or any other edifices to be used for sectarian purposes) designed to assure that commodities made available under this title are used to carry out effectively the purposes for which such commodities are made available or to promote community and other self-help activities designed to alleviate the causes of the need for such assistance: *Provided, however,* That such funds shall be used only to supplement and not substitute for funds normally available for such purposes from other non-United States Government sources.

" 'Sec. 205. It is the sense of the Congress that the President should encourage other advanced nations to make increased contributions for the purpose of combating world hunger and malnutrition, particularly through the expansion of international food and agricultural assistance programs. It is further the sense of the Congress that as a means of achieving this objective, the United States should work for the expansion of the United Nations World food program beyond its present established goals.'

"(D) By changing the designation 'TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS' to 'TITLE III' and by striking out sections 304, 305, 306, 307, and 308.

"(E) By amending title IV to read as follows:

" 'TITLE IV

" 'Sec. 401. After consulting with other agencies of the Government affected and within policies laid down by the President for implementing this Act, and after taking into account productive capacity, domestic requirements, farm and consumer price levels, commercial exports, and adequate carryover, the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine the agricultural commodities and quantities thereof available for disposition under this Act, and the commodities and quantities thereof which may be included in the negotiations with each country. No commodity shall be available for disposition under this Act if such disposition would reduce the domestic supply of such commodity below that needed to meet domestic requirements, adequate carryover, and anticipated exports for dollars as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture at the time of exportation of such commodity.

" 'Sec. 402. The term "agricultural commodity" as used in this Act shall include any agricultural commodity produced in the United States or product thereof produced in the United States: *Provided, however,* That the term "agricultural commodity" shall not include alcoholic beverages, and for the purposes of title II of this Act, tobacco or products thereof. Subject to the availability of appropriations therefor, any domestically produced fishery product may be made available under this Act.

" 'Sec. 403. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act including such amounts as may be required to make payments to the Commodity Credit Corporation, to the extent the Commodity Credit Corporation is not reimbursed under sections 104(j) and 105, for its actual costs incurred or to be incurred. In presenting his budget, the President shall classify expenditures under this Act as expenditures for international affairs and finance rather than for agriculture and agricultural resources.

" 'Sec. 404. The programs of assistance undertaken pursuant to this Act shall be directed toward the attainment of the humanitarian objectives and national interest of the United States.

" 'Sec. 405. The authority and funds provided by this Act shall be utilized in a manner that will assist friendly countries that are determined to help themselves toward a greater degree of self-reliance in providing enough food to meet the needs of their people and in resolving their problems relative to population growth.

" 'Sec. 406. (a) In order to further assist friendly developing countries to become self-sufficient in food production, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, notwithstanding any other provision of law—

" '(1) To establish and administer through existing agencies of the Department of Agriculture a program of farmer-to-farmer assistance between the United States and such countries to help farmers in such countries in the practical aspects of increasing food production and distribution and improving the effectiveness of their farming operations;

" '(2) To enter into contracts or other cooperative agreements with, or make grants to, land-grant colleges and universities and other institutions of higher learning in the United States to recruit persons who by reason of training, education, or practical experience are knowledgeable in the practical arts and sciences of agriculture and home economics, and to train such persons in the practical techniques of transmitting to farmers in such countries improved practices in agriculture, and to participate in carrying out the program in such countries including, where desirable, additional courses for training or retraining in such countries;

" '(3) To consult and cooperate with private non-profit farm organizations in the exchange of farm youth and farm leaders with developing countries and in the training of farmers of such developing countries within the United States or abroad;

" '(4) To conduct research in tropical and subtropical agriculture for the improvement and development of tropical and subtropical food products for dissemination and cultivation in friendly countries;

" '(5) To coordinate the program authorized in this section with the activities of the Peace Corps, the Agency for International Development, and other agencies of the United States and to assign, upon agreement with such agencies, such persons to work with and under the administration of such agencies: *Provided,* That nothing in this section shall be construed to infringe upon the powers or functions of the Secretary of State;

" '(6) To establish by such rules and regulations as he deems necessary the conditions for eligibility and retention in and dismissal from the program established in this section, together with the terms, length and nature of service, compensation, employee status, oaths of office, and security clearances, and such persons shall be entitled to the benefits and subject to the responsibilities applicable to persons serving in the Peace Corps pursuant to the provisions of section 612, volume 75 of the Statutes at Large, as amended; and

" '(7) To the maximum extent practicable, to pay the costs of such program through the use of foreign currencies accruing from the sale of agricultural commodities under this Act, as provided in section 104(1).

" '(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $33,000,000 during any fiscal year for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section.

" 'Sec. 407. There is hereby established an advisory committee composed of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Administrator of the Agency for International Development, the chairman, the vice chairman and the two ranking minority members of the House Committee on Agriculture and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the chairman, the next ranking majority member and the two ranking minority members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. The advisory committee shall survey the general policies relating to the administration of the Act, including the manner of implementing the self-help provisions, the uses to be made of foreign currencies which accrue in connection with sales for foreign currencies under title I, the amount of currencies to be reserved in sales agreements for loans to private industry under section 104(e), rates of exchange, interest rates, and the terms under which dollar credit sales are made, and shall advise the President with respect thereto.

" 'Sec. 408. The President shall make a report to Congress not later than April 1 each year with respect to the activities carried out under this Act during the preceding calendar year. Such report shall describe the progress of each country with which agreements are in effect under title I in carrying out its agreements under such title.

" 'Sec. 409. No agreements to finance sales under title I and no programs of assistance under title II shall be entered into after December 31, 1968.

" 'Sec. 410. The provisions of section 620(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (referring to nationalization, expropriation, and related governmental Acts affecting property owned by United States citizens), shall be applicable to assistance provided under title I of this Act.'

"Sec. 3. (a) Section 9 of the Act of September 6, 1958 (7 U.S.C. 1431b), is amended, effective January 1, 1967, by deleting the symbol '(1)', by changing the semicolon to a period and by striking out all of the language in the section after the semicolon.

"(b) Section 709 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 (7 U.S.C. 1446a–1) is amended, effective January 1, 1967, by striking out 'foreign distribution,'.

"(c) Section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1431) is amended, effective January 1, 1967, by striking out the following: 'and (4) to donate any such food commodities in excess of anticipated disposition under (1), (2), and (3) above to nonprofit voluntary agencies registered with the Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid of the Foreign Operations Administration or other appropriate department or agency of the Federal Government and intergovernmental organizations for use in the assistance of needy persons and in nonprofit school lunch programs outside the United States'; 'and (4) above'; ', in the case of commodities made available for use within the United States, or their delivery free alongside ship or free on board export carrier at point of export, in the case of commodities made available for use outside the United States'; and 'The assistance to needy persons provided in (4) above shall, insofar as practicable be directed toward community and other self-help designed to alleviate the causes of the need for such assistance.'

"(d) Section 8 of Public Law 85–931 (72 Stat. 1792) is amended (1) by inserting a period in lieu of the colon after the word 'Act' and striking out the proviso; (2) by inserting after the word 'manufactured' the word 'entirely'; and (3) by inserting before the comma following the words 'surplus supply' the words 'in the same manner as any other agricultural commodity or product is made available'.

"(e) Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking the period at the end of the third sentence thereof and adding the following: ': *Provided*, That whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determines that the carryover at the end of any marketing year of a price supported agricultural commodity for which a voluntary adjustment program is in effect will be less than 25 per centum (35 per centum in the case of wheat) of the estimated export and domestic consumption of such commodity during such marketing year, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not sell any of its stocks of such commodity during such year for unrestricted use at less than 115 per centum (120 per centum in the case of wheat whenever its carryover will be less than 25 per centum of such estimated export and domestic consumption) of the current price support loan plus reasonable carrying charges.'

"Sec. 4. Commercial sales of agricultural commodities out of private stocks on credit terms of not to exceed three years may be financed by Commodity Credit Corporation under its Export Credit Sales program. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation annually for its actual costs incurred or to be incurred under its Export Credit Sales Program.

"Sec. 5. This Act shall take effect as of January 1, 1967, except that section 4 shall take effect upon enactment."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Harold D. Cooley,
W. R. Poage,
E. C. Gathings,
Harlan Hagen,
Graham Purcell,
Page Belcher,
Albert H. Quie,
Catherine May,
Managers on the Part of the House.
Allen J. Ellender,
Spessard L. Holland,
Herman E. Talmadge,
B. Everett Jordan,
George McGovern,
George D. Aiken,
Milton R. Young,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Statement

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill, H.R. 14929, to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in accompanying conference report.

The amendment of the Senate struck out all after the enacting clause of H.R. 14929 and substituted a new bill which differed from the House bill in some 38 different provisions. Following are the substantive differences between the House bill and the substitute agreed to by the conferees.

Short title.—The Senate amendment changed the short title of the bill to "Food for Peace Act of 1966" instead of "Food for Freedom" as in the House bill. The conferees have agreed to the amendment made by the Senate but point out that this short title applies to this act only. It does not change the title of the basic legislation which remains "The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954."

(All the changes in the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, commonly called Public Law 480, are contained in sec. 2 of H.R. 14929. For easy reference, therefore, changes in the House bill discussed here will be identified by sections and subsections in the revised text of the basic law and the basic law will be referred to as Public Law 480.)

Transition from soft currency sales.—Both the House bill and the Senate amendment contained a provision (sec. 103(b)) directing the President to take steps to insure a progressive transition from sales for foreign currency to sales for dollars at a rate whereby the transition could be completed by December 31, 1971. To this language the Senate added a sentence providing that, to the extent transition to dollars under the terms applicable to dollar sales (secs. 106 and 107) is not possible, transition may be made to sales for foreign currency on credit terms no less favorable to the United States than those for development loans made under section 201 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and which would permit conversion to dollars at the exchange rate applicable to the sales agreement. This provides for convertible currency credit sales on terms similar to those in the House bill for dollar credit sales.

Sales to countries dealing with Cuba or North Vietnam.—The House bill (sec. 103 (d)) prohibited the making of sales agreements for foreign currencies or dollar credit under Public Law 480, with any nation which "sells or furnishes or permits ships or aircraft under its registry to transport to or from Cuba or North Vietnam (excluding U.S. installations in Cuba) any equipment, materials, or commodities, so long as they are governed by a Communist regime."

Pursuant to the instruction of the House, the committee of conference has retained the exact House language and has added to it the following:

"*Provided*, That with respect to furnishing, selling, or selling and transporting to Cuba medical supplies, non-strategic raw materials for agriculture, and non-strategic agricultural or food commodities, sales agreements may be entered into if the President finds with respect to each such country, and so informs the Senate and the House of Representatives of the reasons therefor, that the making of each such agreement would be in the national interest of the United States and all such findings and reasons therefor shall be published in the Federal Register."

This retains without change the House prohibition against any kind of a sale under Public Law 480 to a country which is doing any kind of business with North Vietnam. In the case of countries doing business with Cuba, sales under Public Law 480 are also prohibited unless: (1) the business with Cuba consists only of medical supplies, non-strategic raw materials for agriculture, or non-strategic agricultural or food commodities; (2) the President finds with respect to each country and each transaction that it is in the national interest to make a sale under Public Law 480; and (3) such finding is transmitted to the House and Senate and published in the Federal Register.

There is no exception to the House provision that a country which transports to or from North Vietnam or Cuba any equipment, materials, or commodities to or from a third country is ineligible for a sale under Public Law 480.

Publicizing foreign currency commodities.—The House bill (sec. 103(l)) required the President to obtain commitments from purchasing countries that, insofar as practicable, food commodities sold for foreign currencies would be marked or identified at the point of distribution or sale as being provided on a concessional basis through the generosity of the people of the United States. The Senate amendment struck out this provision and required that the President obtain commitments from purchasing countries to publicize widely to their people by public media and other means, that the commodities are being provided on a concessional basis through the friendship of the American people as food for peace. The conferees have agreed to retain the language of both the House and Senate bills.

Currency conversion.—The Senate amendment (sec. 103(m)) added two provisions with respect to convertibility of foreign currencies received under Public Law 480. The first is that such currencies should be made available for payment of U.S. obligations or charges payable to the government of the importing country or any of its agencies. This is intended to cover payments such as canal tolls for vessels owned by the U.S. Government and similar charges. It is consistent with existing law and was accepted by the House conferees.

The second convertibility requirement was that such additional amount of the foreign currency paid for Public Law 480 commodities as might be necessary to cover all normal expenditures of American tourists in the importing country (up to 25 percent of the foreign currencies received pursuant to each agreement) should be convertible. The House conferees accepted this amendment, also, with an amendment limiting its application to excess currency countries. Since all of the currencies involved in the convertible currency sales authorized in section 103 (b) are fully convertible, this provision will not apply to such transactions.

Displacement of cash sales.—The House conferees accepted a Senate amendment (sec. 103(n)) requiring the President to take maximum precautions to assure that sales for dollars on credit terms under this act shall not displace any sales of U.S. agricultural commodities which would otherwise be made for cash dollars. The House bill already contained a similar provision with respect to foreign currency sales and private dollar credit sales, which was retained by the conference.

Release of market development funds.—The House bill (sec. 104(b)(1)) contained a provision (which is a restatement of present law) that the Secretary of Agriculture may release such amounts of foreign currencies set aside for market development purposes as he determines will not be needed within a reasonable period of time for such purpose. The Senate amendment would have permitted such a release only after notification by the President to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the House Committee on Agriculture of the proposed release and then only if neither committee adopted a resolution stating in substance that the committee did not favor such release. The committee of conference has accepted the Senate amendment as to that part requiring a report to be made to the two committees but eliminated that portion giving the committees the authority to veto the proposed release.

Emergency relief uses.—The House bill authorized (sec. 104(d)) the use of foreign currencies to meet emergency or extraordinary relief requirements overseas. The Senate added an amendment limiting this authority to requirements for other than food commodities and limited the amount which might be used to $5 million in any fiscal year. This amendment was accepted by the conferees.

Planning food and nutritional programs.—The conferees did not accept a Senate amendment authorizing the use of foreign currencies for financing planning of national food and nutrition programs because they believe that this proposal is adequately covered by section 104(h) of the House bill.

Approval of grants.—The Senate added an amendment to section 104 subjecting certain foreign currency grants and uses of foreign currency loan repayments to appropriation act or committee approval. The amendment required that (*a*) subject to Presidential waiver, appropriation act authorization is required for grants under sections

104 (f), and (g) and for use of 10 percent of the foreign currencies under agreements prior to December 31, 1964, and 20 percent under agreements thereafter; and (*b*) it also required that grants (other than military assistance) of any foreign currencies, or any use of loan repayments could be made only after notice to, and the absence of disapproval action by, each of the congressional Agriculture Committees. The conferees have accepted this Senate amendment with an amendment striking out the authority of the congressional Agriculture Committees to veto a proposed grant but requiring Presidential notification to such committees in advance with respect to each such proposed action.

Interest on foreign currency loans.—The conferees accepted a modified Senate amendment requiring that interest rates on any loan made under the authority of section 104 of Public Law 480 should be not less than the cost of funds to the U.S. Treasury unless the President should designate a different rate after consultation with the advisory committee established under section 407 of the act.

Excess currency countries.—The conferees also accepted a Senate amendment which would exempt excess currency countries from the requirements described in the two preceding paragraphs. An excess currency country for the purposes of this section is one in which the Secretary of the Treasury determines that the foreign currency or credits owned by the United States and available for use in such nation are in excess of the normal requirements of the Departments and agencies of the United States for expenditures in such nation for the 2 fiscal years following the fiscal year in which such determination is made. The amendment provides that the amount of any such excess currency shall be devoted, to the extent practicable and without regard to the requirements of section 1415 of the supplemental appropriation act, to the acquisition of sites, buildings, and grounds and to assist the purchasing nation in undertaking self-help measures to increase its production of agricultural commodities and its facilities for storage and distribution of such commodities. The President is required to advise the House and Senate Agriculture Committees of a determination by the Secretary of the Treasury that a country has become an excess currency country and to keep such committees advised as to the extent of such excess, the purposes for which it is used or proposed to be used, and the effects of such use.

Terms of dollar credit sales.—The House bill (sec. 106) permitted sales on long-term dollar credit on the same terms authorized for development loans under section 201 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended. This is presently a 40-year repayment period with a 10-year grace period during which no payments on the principal would have to be made, with interest at 1 percent during the grace period and 2½ percent thereafter. The Senate amendment reduced the payment period to 20 years and the grace period to 2 years and limited the delivery period of commodities under such an agreement to not more than 10 years. This is substantially the provision of the present law. In view of the provision in section 103(b) for foreign currency credit sales with the requirement that the currency be fully convertible to dollars, and with a maximum term similar to that in section 106 of the bill as passed by the House, the House conferees accepted the Senate amendment to section 106.

This amendment also requires that local currency proceeds of sales of commodities on long-term dollar credit be used in the recipient country for economic development purposes agreed upon between the two governments at the time the sale is made and written into the sales agreement.

Long-term dollar credit sales by the private trade.—Although the Senate amendment had substantially altered section 107, dealing with long-term dollar credit sales by the private trade, the conferees adopted substantially the House language on this section. The language adopted by the conference requires that the provisions of section 106 should apply to private trade dollar credit with respect also to the 10-year maximum delivery period and the 2-year deferral of the first payment. It also added to section 107(b) the requirement that the Secretary should take reasonable precautions to safeguard the usual marketings of the United States.

Section 107(d) stipulates the other sections of the act which are applicable to private trade agreements and to those listed in the House bill were added: Section 103(a) requiring the President to take self-help efforts into account; section 110 bringing private trade agreements within the total authorization of $1.9 billion in any year, plus carryover; section 401 providing for determination by the Secretary of Agriculture of commodities available for export and prohibiting disposition which would result in a shortage; section 404 providing that assistance be directed toward humanitarian objectives and U.S. interests; and section 405 providing for assistance to countries helping themselves to meet their food needs and population growth problems. Those provisions of section 103(d) which relate only to foreign currency sales do not, of course, apply to this section.

In agreeing to the House language of section 107, with the amendments noted, the conferees make the following observations about this section:

First, the agricultural commodities which may be exported under the authority of this section include livestock, if the particular livestock to be exported meet the requirements set out in section 401 with respect to available agricultural commodities generally; second, the term "private economic enterprise" in section 107(a) is intended to include private housing developments.

CCC commercial export credit.—Section 107 of the House bill also contained a provision permitting CCC export credit (now limited to CCC stocks) to be used also in the export of private stocks, and authorizing appropriations to CCC to reimburse it for credits extended under such program. The conferees have deleted this from section 107 of the revised language of Public Law 480 and have made it a separate section of the bill, appearing near the end as a new section 4.

Ocean freight charges.—The conference adopted, with an amendment, the Senate language of section 108, dealing with payment of ocean freight charges. This provides that CCC may finance ocean freight charges for sales of agricultural commodities for foreign currencies only to the extent that such charges are higher than would otherwise be the case by reason of the requirement that commodities be transported on U.S.-flag vessels. The balance of such charges for transportation in U.S. vessels is to be paid in dollars by the recipient nation or organization. This limitation does not apply to sales for dollar credit under sections 106 or 107 or sales on foreign currency credit terms (requiring full convertibility to dollars) under section 103(b).

Self-help for agriculture.—The conferees adopted a Senate amendment making it clear that the proviso in section 109, relating to self-help for agriculture in recipient countries, is to be a positive requirement that 20 percent of certain currencies be set aside for the self-help purposes described in section 109, rather than a standard suggested for the President's consideration.

Stipulation of self-help program in agreements.—The conferees also accepted a Senate amendment to section 109 which provides that each agreement entered into shall describe the programs which the recipient country is undertaking to improve its production, storage, and distribution of agricultural commodities and for termination of such agreement whenever the President finds that such a program is not being adequately developed.

Authorization for title I.—The House bill provided an annual authorization of not to exceed $2.5 billion, plus carryover, for title I. The Senate reduced this authorization to $1.9 billion, plus carryover, and the conferees have agreed to the Senate figure.

Assistance to needy persons.—The conferees accepted a Senate amendment making it clear that assistance to needy persons authorized in section 201 is limited to agricultural commodity assistance. This is consistent with the intention of the House language.

Authorization for title II.—The House bill authorized programs of assistance (donations) under title II of not to exceed $800 million per year, plus carryover. The Senate reduced this figure to $600 million per year, plus carryover, and the committee of conference has accepted the Senate figure.

Assistance of other countries.—The committee of conference accepted a Senate provision stating that it is the sense of Congress that the President should encourage other advanced nations to make increased contributions for the purpose of combating world hunger and malnutrition, particularly through the expansion of international food and agricultural assistance programs. The section also states that it is further the sense of Congress that as a means of achieving this objective, the United States should work for expansion of the United Nations world food program beyond its present established goals.

Guidelines as to "availability."—The conference agreed to a Senate amendment to section 401 establishing guidelines as to the availability of commodities for export under Public Law 480 and providing that no commodity shall be available for such distribution if it should reduce the domestic supply of such commodity below the quantity needed to meet domestic requirements, adequate carryover, and anticipated exports for dollars. The conferees did not agree to a Senate amendment to section 401 which would have placed in the Secretary of Agriculture (instead of the President) the authority to determine the countries with which sales agreements would be made.

Agricultural commodity.—The conference agreed to a Senate amendment making it clear that the term "agricultural commodity" as used in this act means only agricultural commodities produced in the United States. This is merely a clarification of the intent of the House.

Alcoholic beverages and tobacco.—The conference also agreed to a Senate amendment prohibiting the sale or donation of alcoholic beverages under this act and the donation of tobacco or tobacco products. This is a restatement of the existing policies under which Public Law 480 is operated. No alcoholic beverages have ever been exported either by sale or through a donation program and tobacco has never been included in any donation program. In accepting this amendment the conferees intend that the Department of Agriculture shall continue its efforts to export tobacco as part of the sales programs authorized under title I of this act.

Budget presentation.—The conference agreed to a Senate amendment to section 403 requiring that the President, in presenting his budget, shall classify expenditures under this act as expenditures for international affairs and finance, rather than for agriculture and agricultural resources.

Advisory committee.—The conferees agreed to a Senate amendment to section 407, establishing a joint legislative-executive advisory committee on Public Law 480, which would add to the membership of the committee the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the two ranking majority and minority members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Annual report.—The conferees agreed to a Senate amendment requiring the President's annual report to be made not later than April 1, and to describe the progress of each country's self-help program.

Cotton products.—The House bill contained an amendment to section 8 of Public Law 89–931 (not a part of Public Law 480) providing that cotton products could be exported under Public Law 480, if cotton constituted a "substantial portion" of the sales price. The conference committee has agreed to the Senate wording of this provision, with an amendment, providing that cotton products may be financed under Public Law 480 "in the same manner as any other agricultural commodity or product is made available" if the product to be financed is manufactured "entirely" of cotton. This would permit cotton product exports to be financed under the same circumstances as the products of other agricultural commodities.

Adjustment programs.—The House bill contained a provision requiring the Secretary of Agriculture, in planning voluntary production adjustment programs, to plan for a carryover at the end of the marketing year of not less than 25 percent of the total estimated requirements of such marketing year. The conferees agreed to strike this provision of the House bill.

CCC resale price.—The House bill contained a provision (not a part of Public Law 480) that whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determines that the carryover at the end of any marketing year, of a price supported agricultural commodity for which a voluntary adjustment program is in effect, will be less than 25 percent of the estimated export and domestic consumption of such commodity, the CCC would be prohibited from selling any of its stocks of such commodity during such year for unrestricted use at less than 115 percent of the current support loan plus reasonable carrying charges (instead of 105 percent of the support loan plus carrying charges, as provided in existing law). The Senate amendment changed the 115-percent resale price to 120 percent and put in a special provision with respect to wheat that the higher resale price should become effective if the carryover dropped below 35 percent (instead of 25 percent as for other commodities). The conferees agreed to the House language with respect to commodities other than wheat and for wheat agreed that the 115-percent resale minimum should become effective if the carryover dropped below 35 percent and that the CCC resale minimum should be 120 percent if the supply dropped below 25 percent.

Harold D. Cooley,
W. R. Poage,
E. C. Gathings,
Harlan Hagen,
Graham Purcell,
Page Belcher,
Albert H. Quie,
Catherine May,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, this is the conference report on the food-for-peace bill.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important bill. It provides for the sale or donation of up to $7.5 billion worth of the produce of our farms to our friends abroad over the next 2 years. It is important to our farmers. It is important to the countries that need our help. It is important to the advancement of our foreign policy and the peace and tranquility of the world.

This bill was reported from the Committee on Agriculture by a vote of 33 to 2 and passed the House by a vote of 333 to 20.

The House agreed to a conference on September 8, and your conferees have worked diligently from that time to uphold the House position. The report which is before you today is the second report the conferees have filed. The first was filed on September 23 and considered by the House on October 5. All but one of the approximately 38 points of difference were satisfactorily resolved by the first conference substitute. The one point that was not satisfactorily settled was that concerned with the treatment of countries dealing with North Vietnam and Cuba.

The House bill contained a provision which had been proposed by the gentleman from California [Mr. Teague] prohibiting sales for foreign currencies or dollar credit under Public Law 480 with any nation which sells or furnishes or permits ships or aircraft under its registry to transport to or from Cuba or North Vietnam—excluding U.S. installations in Cuba—any equipment, materials, or commodities, so long as they are governed by a Communist regime.

To this provision the Senate had added a proviso permitting sales to such nations if the President determined such sales to be in the national interest of the United States. It also provided that he might use funds appropriated to carry out Public Law 480 for the formulation and administration of such agreements, notwithstanding the requirements of any appropriation act.

The first conference report dropped all of the Senate language I have just described and adopted the House language with an amendment striking out the words "equipment, materials, or commodities," and inserting in lieu thereof the materials covered by the Battle Act, which prohibits U.S. assistance to nations shipping strategic materials to certain countries.

This was not as good a compromise as your conferees desired, but it was the best to which we were able to obtain the agreement of the Senate conferees at that time.

On October 5 the House strengthened the position of the House conferees by recommitting the conference report with instructions to insist on the specific language of the House provision on this subject.

The conference report which is before the House today is identical to the conference report submitted on September 23, except as to the provision concerning nations dealing with North Vietnam and Cuba. On that provision we have maintained the language and the substance of the House provision.

The conference substitute contains the House language, plus a proviso giving the President very limited discretion with respect to countries dealing with Cuba. No exception is permitted with respect to countries dealing with North Vietnam. The limited exception would permit sales to countries dealing with Cuba only if:

First, such dealing is limited to furnishing, selling, or selling and transporting medical supplies, nonstrategic raw materials for agriculture, or nonstrategic agricultural or food commodities;

Second, the President finds with respect to each such agreement with each such country that the agreement is in the national interest of the United States;

Third, the President informs the Senate and the House of Representatives of such finding and the reasons therefor; and

Fourth, such finding and the reasons therefor are published in the Federal Register.

The substitute is satisfactory to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] who was the author of the House provision. I understand that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] will insert in the Record a letter from him to that effect.

The substitute is also satisfactory to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Belcher] who made the motion to recommit the original conference report. Mr. Belcher joined in the conference report. The report is signed by all of the conferees for the House.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I wish to say, for the gentleman from Oklahoma, Page Belcher, that he is in agreement with the compromise which we reached with the Senate. If he were here, he would so state. He gave me full authority to say so.

Also, as Members will recall, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley], was the author of the original amendment. I have a letter from him, which I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point, showing his support for the action we have taken. So far as I know there is no one on this side who is opposed to what we are doing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The letter is as follows:

House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., October 17, 1966.

The Honorable Albert H. Quie,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Al: I have just learned of the compromise language which may be proposed to the House in respect to trading with the enemy provisions of the Food-for-Peace extension.

Although not as unequivocal as the original House version—and not as precise as I would personally prefer—it is nonetheless in substantial fulfillment of the House instructions. I am glad to give it my support. I do so, hopeful that the President will use the set-aside authority for Cuban trade only in the most extraordinary circumstances.

The Food-for-Peace program is an important arm of our foreign policy, and the changes made in it in the legislation presently before the Congress are forward-looking and promising.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL FINDLEY,
Representative in Congress.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD].

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the House conferees on this conference report. The compromise language goes a long way toward sustaining the position of the House.

As you will recall, the original conference report on this bill prevented Public Law 480 concessional sales for soft currency on long-term dollar credit to countries which sold or furnished Battle Act commodities to North Vietnam or Cuba. Battle Act items are those which have military or strategic significance.

This provision was unacceptable to the House as was evidenced when the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER] prevailed by a 306 to 61 vote on October 5.

The House instruction to the conferees called for an absolute ban on these sales to nations doing business with North Vietnam or Cuba.

The revised conference report carries an absolute ban on soft currency and dollar credit sales to nations which carry on any kind of commerce with North Vietnam. This action alone was enough to justify the recommittal of the original conference report. We must always do our very best to support our troops in South Vietnam.

As I say, this conference report goes a long way toward upholding the House position. Personally, I would have preferred the original House language, but in order to extend and amend this vital program, it was necessary to make some concession to the other body.

The concession is this: The President may, if he finds such action to be in the national interest, permit Public Law 480 sales to nations which sell, or furnish, or sell and transport three types of items to Cuba. These three excepted categories are: First, medical supplies; second, nonstrategic raw materials for agriculture, such as fertilizers; and third, nonstrategic agricultural or food commodities. If the President finds that it is in our national interest to continue our Public Law 480 sales program in a nation that carries on commerce in these three excepted classes of goods, he must so inform the Congress of his findings and his reasons therefor prior to granting this waiver. These findings and reasons will also be published in the Federal Register.

In other words, the House position was completely sustained on these three points:

First. In regard to North Vietnam it is absolutely clear that any nation which carries on commerce with the Ho regime will be ineligible for either soft currency sales or for dollar credit sales during the 2-year duration of this bill.

Second. In regard to all items other than the three excepted categories, the President would have no discretion or power to waive the application of the prohibition. This clearly means that any country selling to or furnishing Cuba with nonagricultural items such as, for example, chemicals, manufactured goods, or machinery would automatically become ineligible for new title I agreements under the act.

Third. In regard to shipping the three categories of excepted materials, only those nations which both sell and ship—or furnish and ship—them would be eligible for the Presidential waiver. Other nations which carry to or from Cuba anything including the three excepted items on their ships or aircraft would automatically become ineligible for new title I agreements under the act.

In addition, the waiver authority is strictly limited to medical supplies, nonstrategic agricultural and food commodities, and nonstrategic raw materials for agriculture. This is the only area where the House conferees receded.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a good bill. It is a much better bill than the one originally brought back from conference. It is a bill that strengthens our international efforts to isolate both North Vietnam and Cuba. It permits the continuation of a great program that benefits everyone in the free world. I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I merely wish to state, as author of the original amendment in the committee, that I also concur with the agreement which has been reached, and I urge all Members to support the conference committee.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in support of the conference report. It is a distinct improvement over the agreement which was reached earlier and then rejected by the House. There can be no doubt that the Congress intends to isolate both Ho Chi Minh and Fidel Castro. This bill now carries an absolute ban on commerce with North Vietnam. It also carries the clear implication that the very limited exceptions that are set forth in regard to Cuba are to be strictly construed.

This bill, which extends Public Law 480, will in the years ahead be a very useful legislative instrument of foreign policy and a very important program to millions upon millions of people throughout the world. The emphasis on self-help will, I hope, begin to produce some results by the time we get around to another extension of the act in 1968.

Included in this self-help category is the farmer-to-farmer program in which I have a great deal of interest.

Mr. POFF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. POFF. I wish to take just a moment here to compliment my colleague, the gentleman from Kansas, for his industry and his perseverance, as well as his vision and his humanitarianism in working so effectively this year for an expanded agricultural technical assistance activity under Public Law 480. The farmer-to-farmer program in this bill is the direct result of the gentleman's many efforts and as time goes on, I am confident it will prove to be one of the most valuable provisions in the program.

Mr. DOLE. I wish to thank my friend from Virginia, Mr. POFF, not only for his kind words here today but also for his help, together with the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] in preparing and cosponsoring the original "bread and butter" legislation this year. I join with him in the expectation that this program will now be fully implemented and executed in a most expeditious and efficient manner.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I favor the conference report.

The ability of the developing nations to feed themselves has been on a steady decline in the past few decades as populations have been outstripping food production. In India alone the population of 432.7 million in 1960 is expected to grow to 1,233.5 million by the year 2000, which virtually triples India's present population numbers. Birth control, food from the U.S. production capacity, as well as greatly expanded production in grain in the years ahead, are vitally needed to prevent the starvation of millions of people. In addition, distribution and marketing systems are antiquated which has resulted in great losses in many countries by spoilage of perishable and other food items. The proper application of water and fertilizer and scientific use of lands are other needs in so many areas where there is inadequate food supply. Food production and greatly increased population in areas of Asia, Africa, and various South American countries is a catastrophic problem which urgently needs a solution. The food and agricultural organization has made a survey and has found that there will be 6 billion people to be fed at the turn of the century. The great part of this 6 billion population lives in the areas where food production fails to attain the actual requirements of their peoples. This situation is in reverse from a few decades ago in that these poorer countries not only fed themselves then, but exported large quantities of grain.

According to the Department of Agriculture, 3.8 million tons of grain each year were exported by these developing nations in the years 1934 through 1938. That situation began to change very fast when it was necessary for these nations to import 2.6 million tons of grain a year for the 4 years 1948 through 1952. In the years 1957–60 these same nations were importing 5 million tons of grain each year. The last figures available, 1964–65, show that these same countries are importing 19.3 million tons of grain a year.

The total production on all of the usable agricultural lands over the world could not meet the needs for food of these developing countries within a few years unless a reversal in the present trends is made.

The primitive farm methods employed in many of the areas where there is a deficit in food production affects most seriously this overall problem. Technical assistance to these nations, as well as know-how in farming techniques, would aid appreciably in solving the food shortages which they suffer. In addition to their lack of modern machinery for use in their operations, there exists also a very poor system of marketing and distribution of food commodities at all levels. Nutritional deficiencies are a major cause of millions of people—infants and grownups alike—being handicapped for life, either mentally or physically. Malnutrition makes for difficulty for a child in mastering his school work. This weakens the ability of the nation to look and move forward. The food-for-peace conference report if approved by the Congress and signed into law by the President would be instrumental in alleviating suffering, hunger, and food shortages. It would encourage self-help on the part of developing nations. The legislation would promote the development of trade in the sale for dollars of our agricultural commodities. I trust that the conference report will be agreed to.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks on the food-for-peace bill at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

NARCOTIC ADDICT REHABILITATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 9167) to amend title 18 of the United States Code to enable the courts to deal more effectively with the problem of narcotic addiction, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2316)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9167) to amend title 18 of the United States Code to enable the courts to deal more effectively with the problem of narcotic addiction, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act may be cited as the 'Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966'.

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 2. It is the policy of the Congress that certain persons charged with or convicted of violating Federal criminal laws, who are determined to be addicted to narcotic drugs, and likely to be rehabilitated through treatment, should, in lieu of prosecution or sentencing, be civilly committed for confinement and treatment designed to effect their restoration to health and return to society as useful members.

"It is the further policy of the Congress that certain persons addicted to narcotic drugs who are not charged with the commission of any offense should be afforded the opportunity, through civil commitment, for treatment in order that they may be rehabilitated and returned to society as useful members and in order that society may be protected more effectively from crime and delinquency which result from narcotic addiction.

"TITLE I—CIVIL COMMITMENT IN LIEU OF PROSECUTION

"SEC. 101. Title 28 of the United States Code is amended by adding after chapter 173 thereof the following new chapter:

" 'CHAPTER 175. CIVIL COMMITMENT AND REHABILITATION OF NARCOTIC ADDICTS

" 'Sec.
" '2901. Definitions.
" '2902. Discretionary authority of court; examination, report, and determination by court; termination of civil commitment.
" '2903. Authority and responsibilities of the Surgeon General; institutional custody; aftercare; maximum period of civil commitment; credit toward sentence.
" '2904. Civil commitment not a conviction; use of test results.
" '2905. Delegation of functions by Surgeon General; use of Federal, State, and private facilities.
" '2906. Absence of offer by the court to a defendant of an election under section 2902(a) or any determination as to civil commitment, not reviewable on appeal or otherwise.

" '§ 2901. Definitions

" 'As used in this chapter—

" '(a) "Addict" means any individual who habitually uses any narcotic drug as defined by section 4731 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, so as to endanger the public morals, health, safety, or welfare, or who is so far addicted to the use of such narcotic drugs as to have lost the power of self-control with reference to his addiction.

" '(b) "Surgeon General" means the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service.

" '(c) "Crime of violence" includes voluntary manslaughter, murder, rape, mayhem, kidnaping, robbery, burglary or housebreaking in the nighttime, extortion accompanied by threats of violence, assault with a dangerous weapon or assault with intent to commit any offense punishable by imprisonment for more than one year, arson punishable as a felony, or an attempt or conspiracy to commit any of the foregoing offenses.

" '(d) "Treatment" includes confinement and treatment in an institution and under supervised aftercare in the community and includes, but is not limited to, medical, educational, social, psychological, and vocational services, corrective and preventive guidance and training, and other rehabilitative services designed to protect the public and benefit the addict by correcting his antisocial tendencies and ending his dependence on addicting drugs and his susceptibility to addiction.

" '(e) "Felony" includes any offense in violation of a law of the United States classified as a felony under section 1 of title 18 of the United States Code, and further includes any offense in violation of a law of any State, any possession or territory of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, which at the time of the offense was classified as a felony by the law of the place where that offense was committed.

" '(f) "Conviction" and "convicted" means the final judgment on a verdict or finding of guilty, a plea of guilty, or a plea of nolo contendere, but do not include a final judgment which has been expunged by pardon, reversed, set aside or otherwise rendered nugatory.

" '(g) "Eligible individual" means any individual who is charged with an offense against the United States, but does not include—

" '(1) an individual charged with a crime of violence.

" '(2) an individual charged with unlawfully importing, selling, or conspiring to import or sell, a narcotic drug.

" '(3) an individual against whom there is pending a prior charge of a felony which has not been finally determined or who is on probation or whose sentence following conviction on such a charge, including any time on parole or mandatory release, has not been fully served: *Provided*, That an individual on probation, parole, or mandatory release shall be included if the authority authorized to require his return to custody consents to his commitment.

" '(4) an individual who has been convicted of a felony on two or more occasions.

" '(5) an individual who has been civilly committed under this Act, under the District of Columbia Code, or any State proceeding because of narcotic addiction on three or more occasions.

" '§ 2902. Discretionary authority of court; examination, report, and determination by court; termination of civil commitment

" '(a) If the United States district court believes that an eligible individual is an addict, the court may advise him at his first appearance or thereafter at the sole discretion of the court that the prosecution of the criminal charge will be held in abeyance if he elects to submit to an immediate examination to determine whether he is an addict and is likely to be rehabilitated through treatment. In offering an individual an election, the court shall advise him that if he elects to be examined, he will be confined during the examination for a period not to exceed sixty days; that if he is determined to be an addict who is likely to be rehabilitated, he will be civilly committed to the Surgeon General for treatment; that he may not voluntarily withdraw from the examination or any treatment which may follow; that the treatment may last for thirty-six months; that during treatment, he will be confined in an institution and, at the discretion of the Surgeon General, he may be conditionally released for supervised aftercare treatment in the community; and that if he successfully completes treatment the charge will be dismissed, but if he does not, prosecution on the charge will be resumed. An individual upon being advised that he may elect to submit to an examination shall be permitted a maximum of five days within which to make his election. Except on a showing that a timely election could not have been made, an individual shall be barred from an election after the prescribed period. An individual who elects civil commitment shall be placed in the custody of the Attorney General or the Surgeon General, as the court directs, for an examination by the Surgeon General during a period not to exceed thirty days. This period may, upon notice to the court and the appropriate United States attorney, be extended by the Surgeon General for an additional thirty days.

"'(b) The Surgeon General shall report to the court the results of the examination and recommend whether the individual should be civilly committed. A copy of the report shall be made available to the individual and the United States attorney. If the court, acting on the report and other information coming to its attention, determines that the individual is not an addict or is an addict not likely to be rehabilitated through treatment, the individual shall be held to answer the abeyant charge. If the court determines that the individual is an addict and is likely to be rehabilitated through treatment, the court shall commit him to the custody of the Surgeon General for treatment, except that no individual shall be committed under this chapter if the Surgeon General certifies that adequate facilities or personnel for treatment are unavailable.

"'(c) Whenever an individual is committed to the custody of the Surgeon General for treatment under this chapter the criminal charge against him shall be continued without final disposition and shall be dismissed if the Surgeon General certifies to the court that the individual has successfully completed the treatment program. On receipt of such certification, the court shall discharge the individual from custody and dismiss the charge against him. If prior to such certification the Surgeon General determines that the individual cannot be further treated as a medical problem, he shall advise the court. The court shall thereupon terminate the commitment, and the pending criminal proceeding shall be resumed.

"'(d) An individual committed for examination or treatment shall not be released on bail or on his own recognizance.

"'(e) Whoever escapes or attempts to escape while committed to institutional custody for examination or treatment, or whoever rescues or attempts to rescue or instigates, aids, or assists the escape or attempt to escape of such a person, shall be subject to the penalties provided in sections 751 and 752 of title 18, United States Code.

"'§ 2903. Authority and responsibilities of the Surgeon General; institutional custody; aftercare; maximum period of civil commitment; credit toward sentence

"'(a) An individual who is committed to the custody of the Surgeon General for treatment under this chapter shall not be conditionally released from institutional custody until the Surgeon General determines that he has made sufficient progress to warrant release to a supervisory aftercare authority. If the Surgeon General is unable to make such a determination at the expiration of twenty-four months after the commencement of institutional custody, he shall advise the court and the appropriate United States attorney whether treatment should be continued. The court may affirm the commitment or terminate it and resume the pending criminal proceeding.

"'(b) An individual who is conditionally released from institutional custody shall, while on release, remain in the legal custody of the Surgeon General and shall report for such supervised aftercare treatment as the Surgeon General directs. He shall be subject to home visits and to such physical examination and reasonable regulation of his conduct as the supervisory aftercare authority establishes, subject to the approval of the Surgeon General. The Surgeon General may, at any time, order a conditionally released individual to return for institutional treatment. The Surgeon General's order shall be a sufficient warrant for the supervisory aftercare authority, a probation officer, or any Federal officer authorized to serve criminal process within the United States to apprehend and return the individual to institutional custody as directed. If it is determined that an individual has returned to the use of narcotics, the Surgeon General shall inform the court of the conditions under which the return occurred and make a recommendation as to whether treatment should be continued. The court may affirm the commitment or terminate it and resume the pending criminal proceeding.

"'(c) The total period of treatment for any individual committed to the custody of the Surgeon General shall not exceed thirty-six months. If, at the expiration of such maximum period, the Surgeon General is unable to certify that the individual has successfully completed his treatment program the pending criminal proceeding shall be resumed.

"'(d) Whenever a pending criminal proceeding against an individual is resumed under this chapter, he shall receive full credit toward the service of any sentence which may be imposed for any time spent in the institutional custody of the Surgeon General or the Attorney General or any other time spent in institutional custody in connection with the matter for which sentence is imposed.

"'§ 2904. Civil commitment not a conviction; use of test results

"'The determination of narcotic addiction and the subsequent civil commitment under this chapter shall not be deemed a criminal conviction. The results of any tests or procedures conducted by the Surgeon General or the supervisory aftercare authority to determine narcotic addiction may only be used in a further proceeding under this chapter. They shall not be used against the examined individual in any criminal proceeding except that the fact that he is a narcotic addict may be elicited on his cross-examination as bearing on his creditibility as a witness.

"'§ 2905. Delegation of functions by Surgeon General; use of Federal, State, and private facilities

"'(a) The Surgeon General may from time to time make such provision as he deems appropriate authorizing the performance of any of his functions under this chapter by any other officer or employee of the Public Health Service, or with the consent of the head of the Department or Agency concerned by any Federal or other public or private agency or officer or employee thereof.

"'(b) The Surgeon General is authorized to enter into arrangements with any public or private agency or any person under which appropriate facilities or services of such agency or person will be made available, on a reimbursable basis or otherwise, for the examination or treatment of individuals who elect civil commitment under this chapter.

"'§ 2906. Absence of offer by the court to a defendant of an election under section 2902(a) or any determination as to civil commitment, not reviewable on appeal or otherwise

"'The failure of a court to offer a defendant an election under section 2902(a) of this chapter, or a determination relative to civil commitment under this chapter shall not be reviewable on appeal or otherwise.'

"TITLE II—SENTENCING TO COMMITMENT FOR TREATMENT

"SEC. 201. Title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding after chapter 313 thereof the following new chapter:

"'CHAPTER 314—NARCOTIC ADDICTS

"'Sec.
"'4251. Definitions.
"'4252. Examination.
"'4253. Commitment.
"'4254. Conditional release.
"'4255. Supervision in the community.

"'§ 4251. Definitions

"'As used in this chapter—

"'(a) "Addict" means any individual who habitually uses any narcotic drug as defined by section 4731 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, so as to endanger the public morals, health, safety, or welfare, or who is or has been so far addicted to the use of such narcotic drugs as to have lost the power of self-control with reference to his addiction.

"'(b) "Crime of violence" includes voluntary manslaughter, murder, rape, mayhem, kidnaping, robbery, burglary or housebreaking in the nighttime, extortion accompanied by threats of violence, assault with a dangerous weapon or assault with intent to commit any offense punishable by imprisonment for more than one year, arson punishable as a felony, or an attempt or conspiracy to commit any of the foregoing offenses.

"'(c) "Treatment" includes confinement and treatment in an institution and under supervised aftercare in the community and includes, but is not limited to, medical, educational, social, psychological, and vocational services, corrective and preventive guidance and training, and other rehabilitative services designed to protect the public and benefit the addict by correcting his antisocial tendencies and ending his dependence on addicting drugs and his susceptibility to addiction.

"'(d) "Felony" includes any offense in violation of a law of the United States classified as a felony under section 1 of title 18 of the United States Code, and further includes any offense in violation of a law of any State, any possession or territory of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, which at the time of the offense was classified as a felony by the law of the place where that offense was committed.

"'(e) "Conviction" and "convicted" mean the final judgment on a verdict or finding of guilty, a plea of guilty, or a plea of nolo contendere, and do not include a final judgment which has been expunged by pardon, reversed, set aside, or otherwise rendered nugatory.

"'(f) 'Eligible offender" means any individual who is convicted of an offense against the United States, but does not include—

"'(1) an offender who is convicted of a crime of violence.

"'(2) an offender who is convicted of unlawfully importing or selling or conspiring to import or sell a narcotic drug, unless the court determines that such sale was for the primary purpose of enabling the offender to obtain a narcotic drug which he requires for his personal use because of his addiction to such drug.

"'(3) an offender against whom there is pending a prior charge of a felony which has not been finally determined or who is on probation or whose sentence following conviction on such a charge, including any time on parole or mandatory release, has not been fully served: *Provided,* That an offender on probation, parole, or mandatory release shall be included if the authority authorized to require his return to custody consents to his commitment.

" '(4) an offender who has been convicted of a felony on two or more prior occasions.

" '(5) an offender who has been committed under title I of the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966, under this chapter, under the District of Columbia Code, or under any State proceeding because of narcotic addiction on three or more occasions.

" '§ 4252. Examination

" 'If the court believes that an eligible offender is an addict, it may place him in the custody of the Attorney General for an examination to determine whether he is an addict and is likely to be rehabilitated through treatment. The Attorney General shall report to the court within thirty days; or any additional period granted by the court, the results of such examination and make any recommendations he deems desirable. An offender shall receive full credit toward the service of his sentence for any time spent in custody for an examination.

" '§ 4253. Commitment

" '(a) Following the examination provided for in section 4252, if the court determines that an eligible offender is an addict and is likely to be rehabilitated through treatment, it shall commit him to the custody of the Attorney General for treatment under this chapter, except that no offender shall be committed under this chapter if the Attorney General certifies that adequate facilities or personnel for treatment are unavailable. Such commitment shall be for an indeterminate period of time not to exceed ten years, but in no event shall it exceed the maximum sentence that could otherwise have been imposed.

" '(b) If, following the examination provided for in section 4252, the court determines that an eligible offender is not an addict, or is an addict not likely to be rehabilitated through treatment, it shall impose such other sentence as may be authorized or required by law.

" '§ 4254. Conditional release

" 'An offender committed under section 4253 (a) may not be conditionally released until he has been treated for six months following such commitment in an institution maintained or approved by the Attorney General for treatment. The Attorney General may then or at any time thereafter report to the Board of Parole whether the offender should be conditionally released under supervision. After receipt of the Attorney General's report, and certification from the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service that the offender has made sufficient progress to warrant his conditional release under supervision, the Board may in its discretion order such a release. In determining suitability for release, the Board may make any investigation it deems necessary. If the Board does not conditionally release the offender, or if a conditional release is revoked, the Board may thereafter grant a release on receipt of a further report from the Attorney General.

" '§ 4255. Supervision in the community

" 'An offender who has been conditionally released shall be under the jurisdiction of the Board as if on parole under the established rules of the Board and shall remain, while conditionally released, in the legal custody of the Attorney General. The Attorney General may contract with any appropriate public or private agency or any person for supervisory aftercare of a conditionally released offender. Upon receiving information that such an offender has violated his conditional release, the Board, or a member thereof, may issue and cause to be executed a warrant for his apprehension and return to custody. Upon return to custody, the offender shall be given an opportunity to appear before the Board, a member thereof, or an examiner designated by the Board, after which the Board may revoke the order of conditional release.'

"TITLE III—CIVIL COMMITMENT OF PERSONS NOT CHARGED WITH ANY CRIMINAL OFFENSE

"Sec. 301. For the purposes of this title, the term—

"(a) 'Narcotic addict' means any individual who habitually uses any narcotic drug as defined by section 4731 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, so as to endanger the public morals, health, safety, or welfare, or who is or has been so far addicted to the use of such narcotic drugs as to have lost the power of self-control with reference to his addiction.

"(b) 'Treatment' includes confinement and treatment in a hospital of the Service and under supervised aftercare in the community and includes, but is not limited to, medical, educational, social, psychological, and vocational services, corrective and preventive guidance and training, and other rehabilitative services designed to protect the public and benefit the addict by correcting his antisocial tendencies and ending his dependence on addicting drugs and his susceptibility to addiction.

"(c) 'Surgeon General' means the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service.

"(d) 'Hospital of the Service' means any hospital or other facility of the Public Health Service especially equipped for the accommodation of addicts, and any other appropriate public or private hospital or other facility available to the Surgeon General for the care and treatment of addicts.

"(e) 'Patient' means any person with respect to whom a petition has been filed by a United States attorney as provided under subsection (b) of section 302 of this title.

"(f) 'Posthospitalization program' shall mean any program providing for the treatment and supervision of a person established by the Surgeon General pursuant to section 307 of this title.

"(g) 'State' includes the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"(h) 'United States' includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"(i) 'Related individual' means any person with whom the alleged narcotic addict may reside or at whose house he may be, or the husband or wife, father or mother, brother or sister, or the child or the nearest available relative of the alleged narcotic addict.

"Sec. 302. (a) Except as otherwise provided in section 311 of this title, whenever any narcotic addict desires to obtain treatment for his addiction, or whenever a related individual has reason to believe that any person is a narcotic addict, such addict or related individual may file a petition with the United States attorney for the district in which such addict or person resides or is found requesting that such addict or person be admitted to a hospital of the Service for treatment of his addiction. Any such petition filed by a narcotic addict shall set forth his name and address and the facts relating to his addiction. Any such petition filed by a related individual with respect to a person believed by such individual to be a narcotic addict shall set forth the name and address of the alleged narcotic addict and the facts or other data on which the petitioner bases his belief that the person with respect to whom the petition is filed is a narcotic addict.

"(b) After considering such petition, the United States attorney shall, if he determines that there is a reasonable cause to believe that the person named in such petition is a narcotic addict, and that appropriate State or other facilities are not available to such person, file a petition with the United States district court to commit such person to a hospital of the Service for treatment as provided in this title. In making his determination with respect to the nonavailability of such facilities, the United States attorney shall consult with the Surgeon General and other appropriate State or local officials.

"(c) Upon the filing of any such petition by a United States attorney, the court may order the patient to appear before it for an examination by physicians as provided under section 303 of this title and for a hearing, if required, under section 304 of this title. The court shall cause a copy of such petition and order to be served personally upon the patient by a United States marshal.

"Sec. 303. The court shall immediately advise any patient appearing before it pursuant to an order issued under subsection (c) of section 302 of his right to have (1) counsel at every stage of the judicial proceedings under this title and that, if he is unable because of financial reasons to obtain counsel, the court will, at the patient's request, assign counsel to represent him; and (2) present for consultation during any examination conducted under this section, a qualified physician retained by such patient, but in no event shall such physician be entitled to participate in any such examination or in the making of any report required under this section with respect to such examination. The court shall also advise such patient that if, after an examination and hearing as provided in this title, he is found to be a narcotic addict who is likely to be rehabilitated through treatment, he will be civilly committed to the Surgeon General for treatment; that he may not voluntarily withdraw from such treatment; that the treatment (including posthospitalization treatment and supervision) may last forty-two months; that during treatment he will be confined in an institution; that for a period of three years following his release from confinement he will be under the care and custody of the Surgeon General for treatment and supervision under a posthospitalization program established by the Surgeon General; and that should he fail or refuse to cooperate in such posthospitalization program or be determined by the Surgeon General to have relapsed to the use of narcotic drugs, he may be recommitted for additional confinement in an institution followed by additional posthospitalization treatment and supervision. After so advising the patient, the court shall appoint two qualified physicians, one of whom shall be a psychiatrist, to examine the patient. For the purpose of the examination, the court may order the patient committed for such reasonable period as it shall determine, not to exceed thirty days, to the custody of the Surgeon General for confinement in a suitable hospital or other facility designated by the court. Each physician appointed by the court shall, within such period so determined by the court, examine the patient and file with the court, a written report with respect to such examination. Each such report shall include a statement of the examining physician's conclusions as to whether the patient examined is a narcotic addict and is likely to be rehabilitated through treatment. Upon the filing of such reports, the patient so examined shall be returned to the court for such further proceedings as it may direct under this title. Copies of such reports shall be made available to the patient and his counsel.

"Sec. 304. (a) If both examining physicians (referred to in section 303) conclude in their respective written reports that the patient is not a narcotic addict, or is an addict not likely to be rehabilitated through treatment, the court shall immediately enter an order discharging the patient and dismissing the proceedings under this title. If the written report of either such physician indicates that the patient is a narcotic addict who is likely to be rehabilitated through treatment, or that the physician submitting the report is unable to reach any conclusion by reason of the refusal of the patient to submit to a thorough examination, the court shall promptly set the case for hearing. The court shall cause a written notice of the time and place of such hearing to be served personally upon the patient and his attorney. Such notice shall also inform the patient that upon demand made by him within fifteen days after he has been served, he shall be entitled to have all issues of fact with respect to his alleged narcotic addiction determined by a jury. If no timely demand for a jury is made, the court, in conducting such hearing, shall determine all issues of fact without a jury.

"(b) In conducting any hearing under this title, the court shall receive and consider all relevant evidence and testimony which may be offered, including the contents of the reports referred to in section 303. Any patient with respect to whom a hearing is held under this title shall be entitled to testify and to present and cross-examine witnesses. All final orders of commitment under this title shall be subject to review in conformity with the provisions of sections 1254 and 1291 of title 28 of the United States Code.

"(c) Any patient with respect to whom a hearing has been set under this title may be detained by the court for a reasonable period of time in a suitable hospital or other facility designated by the court until after such hearing has been conducted.

"(d) Witnesses subpenaed by either party under the provisions of this title shall be paid the same fees and mileage as are paid to other witnesses in the courts of the United States.

"Sec. 305. If the court determines after a hearing that such patient is a narcotic addict who is likely to be rehabilitated through treatment, the court shall order him committed to the care and custody of the Surgeon General for treatment in a hospital of the Service. The Surgeon General shall submit to the court written reports with respect to such patient at such times as the court may direct. Such reports shall include information as to the health and general condition of the patient, together with the recommendations of the Surgeon General concerning the continued confinement of such patient.

"Sec. 306. Any patient committed to the care and custody of the Surgeon General pursuant to section 305 of this title shall be committed for a period of six months, and shall be subject to such posthospitalization program as may be established pursuant to section 307 of this title; except that such patient may be released from confinement by the Surgeon General at any time prior to the expiration of such six-month period if the Surgeon General determines that the patient has been cured of his drug addiction and rehabilitated, or that his continued confinement is no longer necessary or desirable.

"Sec. 307. (a) Whenever any patient under the care and custody of the Surgeon General pursuant to this title is to be released from confinement in accordance with the provisions thereof, the Surgeon General shall give notice of such pending release to the committing court within ten days prior thereto and shall, at the time of the patient's release, promptly return him to that court. The court, after considering the recommendations of the Surgeon General with respect to posthospitalization treatment for any such patient so returned may place such patient under the care and custody of the Surgeon General for the three-year period immediately following the patient's release, for treatment and supervision under such posthospitalization program as the Surgeon General may direct.

"(b) If, at any time during such three-year period, any patient (1) fails or refuses to comply with the directions and orders of the Surgeon General in connection with such patient's posthospitalization treatment and supervision, or (2) is determined by the Surgeon General to be again using narcotic drugs, the Surgeon General may order such patient's immediate return to the committing court which may recommit such patient to a hospital of the Service for additional treatment for a period of not to exceed six months, and may require such patient thereafter to submit to a posthospitalization program in accordance with subsection (a) of this section.

"Sec. 308. The court, upon the petition of any patient after his confinement pursuant to this title for a period in excess of three months, shall inquire into the health and general condition of the patient and as to the necessity, if any, for his continued confinement. If the court finds, with or without a hearing, that his continued confinement is no longer necessary or desirable, it shall order the patient released from confinement and returned to the court. The court may, with respect to any such patient so returned, place such patient under a posthospitalization program in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) of section 307 of this title.

"Sec. 309. Any determination by the court pursuant to this title that a patient is a narcotic addict shall not be deemed a criminal conviction, nor shall such patient be denominated a criminal by reason of that determination. The results of any hearing, examination, test, or procedure to determine narcotic addiction of any patient under this title shall not be used against such patient in any criminal proceeding.

"Sec. 310. Any physician conducting an examination under this title shall be a competent and compellable witness at any hearing or other proceeding conducted pursuant to this title and the physician-patient privilege shall not be applicable.

"Sec. 311. The provisions of this title shall not be applicable with respect to any person against whom there is pending a criminal charge, whether by indictment or by information, which has not been fully determined or who is on probation or whose sentence following conviction on such a charge, including any time on parole or mandatory release, has not been fully served, except that such provision shall be applicable to any such person on probation, parole, or mandatory release if the authority authorized to require his return to custody consents to his commitment.

"Sec. 312. Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, no patient shall be committed to a hospital of the Service under this title if the Surgeon General certifies that adequate facilities or personnel for treatment of such patient are unavailable.

"Sec. 313. Physicians appointed by the court to examine any person pursuant to this title and counsel assigned by the court to represent any person in judicial proceedings under this title shall be entitled to reasonable compensation, in an amount to be determined by the court, to be paid, upon order of the court, out of such funds as may be provided by law.

"Sec. 314. (a) The Surgeon General may from time to time make such provisions as he deems appropriate authorizing the performance of any of his functions under this title by any other officer or employee of the Public Health Service, or with the consent of the head of the Department or Agency concerned, by any Federal or other public or private agency or officer or employee thereof.

"(b) The Surgeon General is authorized to enter into arrangements with any public or private agency or any person under which appropriate facilities or services of such agency or person will be made available, on a reimbursable basis or otherwise, for the examination or treatment of individuals pursuant to the provisions of this title.

"Sec. 315. Whoever escapes or attempts to escape while committed to institutional custody for examination or treatment under this title, or whoever rescues or attempts to rescue or instigates, aids, or assists the escape or attempt to escape of such a person, shall be subject to the penalties provided in sections 751 and 752 of title 18, United States Code.

"Sec. 316. Any person who knowingly makes any false statement to the United States attorney in any petition under section 302(a) of this title shall be subject to the penalty prescribed in section 1001 of title 18, United States Code.

"TITLE IV—REHABILITATION AND POST-HOSPITALIZATION CARE PROGRAMS AND ASSISTANCE TO STATES AND LOCALITIES

"Sec. 401. The Surgeon General is authorized to establish, as an integral part of the program of treatment for narcotic addiction authorized by section 341 of the Public Health Service Act, outpatient services to (1) provide guidance and give psychological help and supervision to patients and other individuals released from hospitals of the Service after treatment for narcotic drug addiction, utilizing all available resources of local, public and private agencies, and (2) assist States and municipalities in developing treatment programs and facilities for individuals so addicted, including posthospitalization treatment programs and facilities for the care and supervision of narcotic addicts released after confinement under this or any other Act providing for treatment of drug addiction. The Surgeon General shall take into consideration in supplying such services the extent of drug addiction in the various States and political subdivisions thereof and the willingness of such States and subdivisions to cooperate in developing a sound program for the care, treatment, and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts.

"Sec. 402. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1966, and for the succeeding fiscal year, the sum of $15,000,000 to enable the Surgeon General (1) to make grants to States and political subdivisions thereof and to private organizations and institutions (A) for the development of field testing and demonstration programs for the treatment of narcotic addiction, (B) for the development of specialized training programs or materials relating to the provision of public health services for the treatment of narcotic addiction, or the development of in-service training or short-term or refresher courses with respect to the provisions of such services, (C) for training personnel to operate, supervise, and administer such services, and (D) for the conducting of surveys evaluating the adequacy of the programs for the treatment of narcotic addiction within the several States with a view to determining ways and means of improving, extending, and expanding such programs; and (2) to enter into jointly financed cooperative arrangements with State and local governments and public and private organizations and institutions with a view toward the developing, constructing, operating, staffing, and maintaining of treatment centers and facilities (including posthospitalization treatment centers and facilities) for narcotic addicts within the States.

"(b) Payments under this section may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, as determined by the Surgeon General, and shall be made on such conditions as the Surgeon General determines to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

"(c) The Surgeon General is authorized to issue appropriate rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this title.

"TITLE V—SENTENCING AFTER CONVICTION FOR VIOLATION OF LAW RELATING TO NARCOTIC DRUGS OR MARIHUANA

"Sec. 501. Section 7237(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(d) No Suspension of Sentence; No Probation; Etc.—Upon conviction—

"'(1) of any offense the penalty for which is provided in subsection (b) of this section, subsection (c), (h), or (i) of section 2 of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, as amended, or such Act of July 11, 1941, as amended, or

"'(2) of any offense the penalty for which is provided in subsection (a) of this section, if it is the offender's second or subsequent offense.

the imposition or execution of sentence shall not be suspended, probation shall not be granted and in the case of a violation of a law relating to narcotic drugs, section 4202 of title 18, United States Code, and the Act of July 15, 1932 (47 Stat. 696; D.C. Code 24–201 and following), as amended, shall not apply.'

"Sec. 502. The Board of Parole is hereby directed to review the sentence of any prisoner who, before the enactment of this Act, was made ineligible for parole by section 7237(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, and who was convicted of a violation of a law relating to marihuana. After conducting such review the Board of Parole may authorize the release of such prisoner on parole pursuant to section 4202 of title 18, United States Code. Action taken by the Board of Parole under this section shall not cause any prisoner to serve a longer term than would be served under his original sentence.

"TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

"Sec. 601. Section 341 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. § 257), is amended to read as follows:

"'Sec. 341. (a) The Surgeon General is authorized to provide for the confinement, care, protection, treatment, and discipline of persons addicted to the use of habit-forming narcotic drugs who are civilly committed to treatment or convicted of offenses against the United States and sentenced to treatment under the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966, addicts who are committed to the custody of the Attorney General pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Youth Corrections Act (chapter 402 of title 18 of the United States Code), addicts who voluntarily submit themselves for treatment, and addicts convicted of offenses against the United States and who are not sentenced to treatment under the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966, including persons convicted by general courts-martial and consular courts. Such care and treatment shall be provided at hospitals of the Service especially equipped for the accommodation of such patients or elsewhere where authorized under other provisions of law, and shall be designed to rehabilitate such persons, to restore them to health, and, where necessary, to train them to be self-supporting and self-reliant; but nothing in this section or in this part shall be construed to limit the authority of the Surgeon General under other provisions of law to provide for the conditional release of patients and for aftercare under supervision.

"'(b) Upon the admittance to, and departure from, a hospital of the Service of a person who voluntarily submitted himself for treatment pursuant to the provisions of this section, and who at the time of his admittance to such hospital was a resident of the District of Columbia, the Surgeon General shall furnish to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent, the name, address, and such other pertinent information as may be useful in the rehabilitation to society of such person.'

"Sec. 602. The Surgeon General and the Attorney General are authorized to give representatives of States and local subdivisions thereof the benefit of their experience in the care, treatment, and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts so that each State may be encouraged to provide adequate facilities and personnel for the care and treatment of narcotic addicts in its jurisdiction.

"Sec. 603. The table of contents to 'Part III.—Prisons and Prisoners' of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after

"'313. Mental defectives.............. 4241'

a new chapter reference as follows:

"'314. Narcotic addicts.............. 4251'

and the table of contents to 'Part VI.—Particular Proceedings' of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting after

"'173. Attachment in postal suits.... 2710'

a new chapter reference as follows:

"'175. Civil commitment and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts................ 2901'.

"Sec. 604. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of such provision to other persons not similarly situated or to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

"Sec. 605. Title I of this Act shall take effect three months after the date of its enactment, and shall apply to any case pending in a district court of the United States in which an appearance has not been made prior to such effective date. Titles II and V of this Act shall take effect three months after the date of its enactment and shall apply to any case pending in any court of the United States in which sentence has not yet been imposed as of such effective date. Title III of this Act shall take effect three months after the date of its enactment.

"Sec. 606. The provisions of this Act shall be subject to the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1966.

"Sec. 607. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Emanuel Celler,
Robert T. Ashmore,
Jacob H. Gilbert,
William M. McCulloch,
Robert McClory,
Managers on the Part of the House.

J. W. McClellan,
Sam Ervin,
Thomas J. Dodd,
Roman L. Hruska,
J. Javits,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Statement

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9167) to amend title 18 of the United States Code to enable the courts to deal more effectively with the problem of narcotic addiction, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The conference report recommends that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and agree to the same with an amendment. The amendment is to insert the language agreed to by the conferees in lieu of the matter inserted by the Senate in its amendment to the House bill.

The bill, H.R. 9167, passed the House in a form which included as titles I, II, III, and IV substantially the language now set forth as titles I, II, V, and VI in the conference report. The Senate substituted the provisions of a Senate-passed bill, S. 2191, for the provisions of H.R. 9167 by striking the language following the enacting clause and inserting all of the provisions of S. 2191. As has been noted, the conference report restores the language of H.R. 9167 as titles I, II, V, and VI in the form in which it passed the House with the changes which are explained below.

Section 1 of the conference substitute retains the House language providing that titles I and II are to be known as the "Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966" with a change which adds a reference to titles III and IV which include language from the Senate version.

Section 2 of the conference substitute provides a rewritten statement of policy. Title I of the conference substitute is headed "Civil Commitment in Lieu of Prosecution" and contains the language of the House-passed bill with minor technical amendments and a modification of the definition of "crime of violence" as contained in section 2901. The amendment to the definition of "crime of violence" includes "housebreaking" only if committed in the night.

The substitute modified the language in 2101(g)(5) concerning the eligibility of persons previously civilly committed. In the House version two previous commitments would render a person ineligible for civil commitment. The substitute raised this number to three.

Title II of the conference report retains the language of title II of the House-passed bill except for the modification already discussed with reference to the definition of "crime of violence" in title I, and except for the same change in the number of previous civil commitments which would bar consideration as an "eligible offender" under this title. Thus in section 4251(f)(5) the number is increased from two to three.

Title III of the conference substitute contains the language of title III of the bill, S. 2191, which was included as title III of the Senate's amendment to the House bill. Title III provides for the civil commitment of addicts not charged with any offense and provides for a program of treatment and rehabilitation for them under the supervision of the Surgeon General of the United States. The conference substitute includes in this language the definitions previously contained in title II of the Senate amendment to the House bill which are now made applicable to title III. The change in the definitions made in conference was to conform the definition of "narcotic drug" to that contained in the House language by using the House definition of "narcotic addict." Four new sections were added which provide language which would amplify and assist in the administration of the other provisions of the title. Since the language of this title was not included in the bill as it passed the House, a full description of each section is included in this statement. This title contains 17 sections.

Section 301: Section 301 contains the definitions applicable to the title.

Section 302: Subsection (a) of section 302 provides that any narcotic addict desiring to obtain treatment for his addiction may file a petition with the U.S. attorney requesting that he be admitted to a hospital of the Public Health Service for treatment under this title. It is also provided that certain related individuals who have reason to believe that another person is a narcotic addict may file with the U.S. attorney a petition to require such alleged addict to undergo treatment under this title. Any such petition would be filed with the U.S. attorney for the district in which the addict or alleged addict resides or is found. A petition filed voluntarily by an addict must set forth his name and address and the facts relating to his addiction. A petition filed by an individual for the compulsory commitment of another person believed to be an addict must set forth the name and address of the alleged addict and the facts or other data on which the petitioner bases his belief that the person is a narcotic addict.

Section 302(b) provides that if the U.S. attorney, after considering such petition and consulting with appropriate Federal, State, and local officials, finds (1) that there is reasonable cause to believe that the person named in such petition is a narcotic addict, and (2) that appropriate State or other facilities are not available to such person, he shall file a petition with the U.S. district court to commit such person to a hospital of the Service for care, protection, and treatment as provided in this title. The requirement that the U.S. attorney consider the availability of State or local facilities before petitioning to commit the alleged addict to Federal facilities is to insure that the Federal commitment procedure will not preempt the primary responsibility of those States which are equipped to handle some or all of their addiction problems. The requirement that the petition for a court order of commitment be filed by the U.S. attorney is to insure that the commitment proceeding will be an adversary proceeding in which both the addict or alleged addict and the United States are represented and entitled or required, as the case may be, to establish that the necessary basis for commitment does or does not exist.

Section 302(c) authorizes the court, upon the filing of any such petition, in its discretion, to order the patient to appear before the court for an examination by physicians, as provided in this title, and for a hearing, if required by this title. If the court makes such an order, a copy of the petition and the order is required to be personally served upon the patient by a U.S. marshal.

Section 303: Section 303 provides that the court shall immediately advise any patient appearing before it, pursuant to an order to appear for an examination, of his right to have counsel at every stage of the proceedings, and that the court will assign counsel to represent him, if for financial reasons he is unable to obtain counsel. The court is also required to warn the addict as to the consequences if he is committed. The court is required, in addition, to advise such person of his right to have a personally retained physician present at any examination conducted under this provision. Such physician may consult with the court-appointed examining physicians, but he may not otherwise participate in the examination and may take no part in the preparation of any report required under this section with respect to the examination. Such personally retained physician may, however, testify at any subsequent hearing ordered by the court to determine whether the person examined should be committed for treatment.

Upon so advising the patient, the court is authorized to appoint two qualified physicians, one of whom must be a psychiatrist, to examine the patient. For the purpose of the examination the court may order the patient committed to the custody of the Surgeon General for confinement in a suitable hospital or other facility designated by the court for a reasonable period, not to exceed 30 days, during which time each physician is required to examine the patient and file with the court a written report with respect to such examination. Each report, which shall be made available to the patient and his attorney, shall include a statement of the examining physician's conclusion as to whether the patient is a narcotic addict and is likely to be rehabilitated through treatment. At the conclusion of the examination, the patient must be returned to the court for such further proceedings as may be required under this title.

Section 304: Subsection 304(a) provides that the patient shall be immediately discharged and the proceedings dismissed if both examining physicians conclude that the patient is not a narcotic addict or is a narcotic addict who is not likely to be rehabilitated through treatment. If, however, either physician's written report indicates that the patient is a narcotic addict who is likely to be rehabilitated through treatment, or that he is unable to reach a conclusion by reason of the refusal of the patient to submit to a thorough examination, the court shall promptly set the case for a hearing and cause a written notice of the time and place of such hearing to be served upon the patient and his attorney. Such notice must inform the patient that upon demand made within 15 days after he has been served, he shall be entitled to have all issues of fact with respect to his alleged narcotic addiction determined by a jury. In the absence of demand for a jury, the court shall determine all issues of fact without a jury.

Subsection 304(b) governs the admissibility of evidence by the court in conducting a hearing under this title. It is provided that the court shall receive and consider all relevant evidence and testimony which may be offered, including the contents of the written reports referred to in section 303 of this title. All final orders of commitment to a hospital of the Service for treatment under this title are reviewable in accordance with sections 1254 and 1291 of title 28 of the United States Code.

Subsection 304(c) authorizes the court to order the patient's detention in a suitable hospital or other facility designated by the court for a reasonable period of time beginning at the conclusion of the examination provided for in section 303 of this title until a hearing ordered under subsection (a) has been concluded.

Subsection 304(a) provides for the payment of the same fees and mileage to witnesses subpenaed by either party as are paid to other witnesses in the courts of the United States.

Section 305: Section 305 concerns the disposition of the case upon a finding by the court that the patient is a narcotic addict who is likely to be rehabilitated through treatment. The court is required in such case to order the patient committed to the care and custody of the Surgeon General for confinement, care, protection, and treatment in a hospital of the Service. The Surgeon General is required to submit such periodic written reports as the court may direct, setting forth the health progress and general condition of the patient and the recommendations of the Surgeon General concerning the continued confinement of such patient.

Section 306: Section 306 provides that any patient found to be a narcotic addict and committed to the custody of the Surgeon General shall be committed for a period of 6 months and shall be required to submit to such posthospitalization treatment and supervision program as the Surgeon General may establish under section 307 of this title. A patient may be released from hospital confinement prior to the expiration of the 6-month period in the event the Surgeon General determines that the patient has been cured of his addiction and rehabilitated or that the continued confinement of the patient is no longer necessary or desirable.

Section 307: Section 307 is concerned with the authority and responsibility of the Surgeon General when it is determined that a patient should be released from confinement and placed under a posthospitalization treatment program.

Subsection 307(a) provides that the Surgeon General shall give notice to the committing court of the pending release of a patient within 10 days prior thereto and return the patient to the court, and shall make recommendations to the court with respect to posthospitalization treatment. The court then may place the patient under the care and custody of the Surgeon General for the 3-year period immediately following the patient's release from confinement. During the 3-year period the patient remains in the legal custody of the Surgeon General and is subject to such posthospitalization treatment and supervision as the Surgeon General may direct.

Subsection 307(b) sets forth the authority of the Surgeon General in the event a patient in his legal custody under a posthospitalization treatment program, pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, fails or refuses to comply with the directions and orders of the Surgeon General or is determined by the Surgeon General to again be using narcotic drugs. In either event, the Surgeon General is empowered to order such patient's immediate return to the committing court for recommitment to a hospital of the Service for a period of not more than 6 months, following which such patient shall again be required to submit to posthospitalization treatment and supervision in accordance with subsection (a) of this section.

Section 308: Section 308 provides that any patient, after being confined pursuant to this title for a period in excess of 3 months, may petition the court which shall thereupon inquire into the health and general condition of the patient and the necessity for his continued confinement. Upon a finding by the court that the patient's continued confinement is no longer necessary or desirable, the patient must be returned to the court which may place him under a posthospitalization program in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) of section 307 of this title.

Section 309: This section affirmatively states that any determination of narcotic addiction shall not be deemed a criminal conviction, nor shall the patient be denominated a criminal by reason thereof. Furthermore, the results of any hearing, examination, test, or procedure to determine narcotic addiction of any patient under this title shall not be used against such patient in any criminal proceeding.

Section 310: This section provides that any physician conducting an examination under this title shall be a competent and compellable witness at any hearing or other proceeding conducted pursuant to this title and that the physician-patient privilege shall not be applicable.

Section 311: This section excludes from the benefits of this title any person who is charged with a criminal offense, whether by indictment or by information, or who is under sentence for a criminal offense, whether he is serving the sentence or is on probation or parole. Probationers and parolees may be eligible, however, if the proper authority consents.

Section 312: Section 312 insures against exceeding the capacity of the hospitals of the Service by providing that no patient shall be committed if the Surgeon General certifies that adequate facilities or personnel are not available to treat such patient.

Section 313 grants authority to pay for physicians required by the court in accordance with section 303 of title III and the compensation of counsel assigned by a court in accordance with the authority also provided in section 303.

Section 314 provides for authority on the part of the Surgeon General to utilize any Federal or other public or private agency to perform his functions when the head of the department or agency concerned or their personnel gives consent to such use. The section further authorizes the Surgeon General to enter into arrangements with public or private agencies or persons for appropriate facilities or services required under this title. This language is similar to section 2905 of title I of the House-passed bill, H.R. 9167.

Section 315 provides for penalties for persons escaping or attempting to escape while committed to hospitalization under the title and similarly for penalties for individuals who might attempt to instigate or aid in such an escape or attempt. The penalties provided are those found in sections 751 and 752 of title 18 of the United States Code.

Section 316 provides penalties for falsely supplying information concerning the alleged addiction of another person and for petitioning falsely for the civil commitment of a person on grounds that he is a narcotic addict.

Title IV of the conference report provides for posthospitalization care programs as provided for in title III and provides for assistance to States and municipalities in developing their own treatment programs and facilities for narcotic addicts. The Senate amendment to H.R. 9167 authorized an appropriation of $15 million for each of 3 fiscal years to enable the Surgeon General to make grants to States, municipalities, and private institutions for the purpose of developing, constructing, operating, staffing, and maintaining treatment centers and facilities for narcotic addicts within the States.

The conference substitute modifies the Senate language to provide for "outpatient services" in lieu of "outpatient units of hospitals" of the Public Health Service. This change is necessary to provide the Surgeon General with the flexibility to provide for services and assistance as contemplated by the section in the program of treatment for narcotic addiction as authorized in section 341 of the Public Health Service Act. The substitute reduced the authorization to $15 million for each of 2 fiscal years, and granted the Surgeon General authority to promulgate appropriate rules and regulations.

Title V contains the language of title III in the form that it passed the House in H.R. 9167.

Title VI contains the miscellaneous provisions formerly contained in title IV of H.R. 9167 as it passed the House. The effective date provisions now contained in section 605 have been modified to provide for a 3-month delay in the effective date of titles I, II, III, and V. The delay is necessary in order to make it possible to provide the necessary services and facilities required for the rehabilitation of persons covered by the substitute contained in the conference report.

Section 606 added to this title merely provides that the Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1966 which relates to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will be applicable to the provisions of the act. This reorganization plan which bears upon the functions of the Public Health Service has become effective since the bill was originally introduced.

Section 607 contains the same appropriation authorization as originally set forth in title IV of H.R. 9167 as it passed the House.

EMANUEL CELLER,
ROBERT T. ASHMORE,
JACOB H. GILBERT,
WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH,
ROBERT MCCLORY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. ASHMORE (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement of the managers be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 9167, as it passed the House, contained four titles. The conference substitute contains these titles with just a few modifications of language; therefore, the language set forth in the conference report as a substitute for the Senate amendment contains as titles I, II, V, and VI the substance of the language of the House passed bill. The language in titles III and IV of the conference substitute includes the language originally contained in the Senate version. The Senate provisions in title III provide for the civil commitment of individual narcotic addicts for treatment when they are not accused of any criminal offense. Title IV provides for an authorization of a grant program to the States to assist them in providing for facilities and for personnel to be used in the treatment and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts.

I have indicated that there are modifications to the House language and these involve a minor change to the description of the offense of "housebreaking" as included in the definition of a "crime of violence." A change in the number of previous civil commitments which will have the effect of barring the consideration of an individual for an additional civil commitment under the provisions of this legislation, and other minor changes in the language which, in the opinion of the conferees, preserve the basic intent of the original House-passed bill.

The grant and aid program in the Senate amendment provided for an authorization of $15 million for each of 3 fiscal years. In conference, this was reduced to that amount in 2 fiscal years.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCCLORY].

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report now before us represents what in my judgment will be recorded as one of the outstanding achievements of the 89th Congress. The completed Narcotic Addict Reform Act of 1966 represents not only a timely and vigorous escalation of the war on narcotic addiction, it represents as well the humanitarian reaching out of the helping hand unto a segment of our society that is trapped, and helpless in the grip of one of the most merciless and vile diseases of our society.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that when the Congress is taken to task on the score of erosion of its reputation as a deliberative body, this act might well be cited in defense of the continuing role of the Congress as a source of well-developed and polished legislation for the people. On July 14 of last year and continuing through January of this year, Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary held hearings on this measure. After due deliberation the full committee sent it to the floor. I am sure my colleagues will recall the vigorous debate prior to passage of the measure on June 1 of this year.

In the other body, hearings were held over an extended period ending in passage of a bill on October 6 in a somewhat different form from that passed by the House. What is presently before the House is the product of a conference in which I believe the most effective measure that could have been developed has emerged.

Mr. Speaker, it is a considerable source of satisfaction to me that the House provisions of the law have been retained unchanged. Great credit is due the effective leadership of our distinguished chairman who so ably advocated these provisions in the recent conference. I believe the House conferees were also able to make a number of very desirable refinements to the Senate provisions which were adopted in conference.

As agreed to by the conference, the measure before us is a truly comprehensive plan. Titles I and II are the first two titles of the original House bill. These provide civil commitment before and after criminal conviction. They are drafted in frank recognition of the incipiency of criminal involvement which is a fact of life, not only for most addicts, but for the society which presently suffers the effects of their illness. Where crime is produced by addiction, the remedy is rehabilitation rather than incarceration in appropriate cases. That is the underlying rationale as well as the operation of these first two titles.

Title III of the bill is a Senate proposal. It provides civil commitment programs complementary to existing State programs for the noncriminal addict, on both a voluntary and involuntary basis. Federal jurisdiction will be available for noncriminal commitments in those States which have no developed addict programs or where there are inadequate facilities for the care of voluntarily committed addicts. The measure thus holds out the prospect of self-help for many addicts who retain or can muster the resolve to make the first step to cure themselves. It further provides the means whereby other persons related to the addict can initiate steps toward his cure.

Title IV of the bill provides augmentation for the treatment of narcotic addicts as presently authorized by the Public Health Services Act. Authorization is also contained to provide for grants to the States to assist them in developing and maintaining specialized services and programs for addicts, and for joint Federal-State participation in construction and maintenance of addict-treatment facilities.

In the final substantive title of the act, provision is made for ameliorating the present parole restrictions on marihuana offenders. I am anxious to assure that the mandatory sentencing provisions for narcotics offenders, and which the House insisted on in floor action in June in voting affirmatively on a motion to recommit, are retained in full in the compromise.

Mr. Speaker, to those who will still insist that the criminal laws are too hard on narcotics sellers, let me say this. Federal law will now provide that any narcotic addict who has any gumption at all will have the opportunity to voluntarily commit himself to a rehabilitation program to get this dreadful affliction off his back. If he himself does not have the courage or the will to help himself, a close relative or someone who maintains close contract with him will have the opportunity to start him on the way to cure.

It should be clear from this that the Federal Government should not and will not permit the addicted seller of drugs to continue contaminating others by introducing them to these noxious substances, and then condone his crime on the grounds that the seller could not help himself because of his own addiction. It must never be forgotten that we are dealing in a very real sense with a contagious disease when we are dealing with narcotics. And the disease is every bit as deadly and as harmful to our society as has been in the past the great plagues and other afflictions from which society has long sought to protect itself. I hope, therefore, that our action on this conference report will stand as a milestone along the road to progress in curing our society of the scourge of narcotic addiction. At the same time, I would hope it stands as a monument to the efforts of those who have urged that we not succumb to pity and let up our efforts to punish and deter by criminal laws those who have contributed to the dehabilitation and destruction of their fellow man.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I cannot begin to say how pleased I am that the conference committee on H.R. 9167 has seen fit to include in the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966 provisions for civil commitment of certain persons addicted to narcotic drugs who are not charged with the commission of any offenses and to provide assistance to the States and municipalities in developing their own treatment programs and facilities for narcotic addicts.

Mr. Speaker, this is largely what my bill, H.R. 10762, provided and, in my opinion, is necessary if we are to eradicate the narcotic menace facing us today and which is spreading rapidly from the big cities to the suburbs and has become a real problem on college campuses.

We have seen that punishment for offenders of present narcotic laws is not doing the job which must be done. If we are to wipe out the illegal traffic in narcotics we must get rid of its market. We know that once a person becomes addicted that addict becomes a potential recruiter for another addict as he tries to find ways to secure the money necessary to satisfy his own craving and need for the expensive narcotics.

Coming from Queens County, N.Y., I must report that I have seen and have firsthand knowledge of this grave problem. A few years ago narcotics addiction was mainly a problem in the lowest socioeconomic group, but this is no longer true today. The tentacles of this monster have reached out to the middle-income and upper-income brackets.

We know that treatment alone is not sufficient in breaking the narcotics habit. In this legislation we make provisions for the necessary aftercare and rehabilitation. We have these provisions in New York State, but our program has not had an opportunity to prove its effectiveness because of the lack of funds to fully implement it. It is for this reason that I am so pleased that we have included provisions for assistance to the States to develop their programs.

Section 312 of title III reads as follows:

> Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, no patient shall be committed to a hospital of the Service under this title if the Surgeon General certifies that adequate facilities or personnel for treatment of such patient are unavailable.

This language points up one of our shortcomings and an area where we must give immediate attention. Certainly, we must have more facilities or I fear that our Federal program will run into the problem we have in New York—lack of physical quarters and personnel to do the job. As you know, we have only one Federal hospital for treatment of narcotics addicts in the East and that is the one at Lexington, Ky. It is inadequate now and this new legislation makes it even more imperative that we start a construction program to provide the necessary hospitals.

I am pleased to see that, under this section, provision is being made to give attention to drug addicts before they commit crimes and corrects one of the shortcomings of the previous programs in that once an addict or his family has the addict civilly committed the addict cannot voluntarily sign himself out of the treatment center. The fact that an addict could commit himself but then turn around and sign himself out of a treatment center has been one of the greatest shortcomings of the voluntary commitment procedure.

Mr. Speaker, I shall continue to devote my time and energies to this problem of narcotics and, if reelected, will be cooperating with my colleagues in the 90th Congress as we continue to work to obtain the necessary legislation and appropriations to help bring about the solution of this problem.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, it is a great source of satisfaction to me that we now have before us for final approval this conference report. It represents a major product of this Congress in my judgment. It is the result of long and painstaking work in the Committee on the Judiciary—and especially subcommittee 2 thereof—as well as in this Chamber at the time of its passage in June of this year.

I am gratified to report to my colleagues that under the effective leadership of our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], ably assisted I must say by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLORY] your House conferees preserved intact the provisions of the bill as it was amended on the floor of the House. While we accepted two titles of the measure passed by the other body, several modifications were made to improve them, which have resulted in strengthening and I believe perfecting the final product.

Mr. Speaker, passage into law of this measure will signal a new phase in the war on narcotic addiction and narcotic trafficking. Federal determination to give no quarter to the insidious peddler as expressed in the strong penalty structure of our laws will be reinforced by the provisions of the Narcotic Addict Reform Act of 1966. At the same time—and for the first time—the laws will hold out a helping hand, and encourage addicts to help themselves to rehabilitation and cure. To those shackled in the toils of addiction, this measure will offer hope to society it will offer increased protection. It is grounded on one of the basic principles of the republic, Mr. Speaker, the principle of self-help.

Titles I and II of the compromise measure relate to the addict who has run afoul of the law. Under title I, the addict can accept civil commitment in lieu of criminal prosecution for certain nonviolent crimes. Title II provides for postconviction commitment for treatment in lieu of criminal punishment for the same class of addicts. Both of these titles recognize the close relationship between crime and addiction, reflecting the concern of Congress for the near-billion-dollar theft problem created by the Nation's estimated 100,000 active addicts.

Title III of the conference report provides a plan of voluntary and compulsory civil commitment for noncriminal addicts. It differs from the present Federal voluntary commitment, however, in two vital respects.

First, the commitment is for a definite term of treatment for 42 months. No longer can the addict commit himself for brief periods to hold his addiction at a manageable level. The Surgeon General will enjoy the advantage of having the addict for a predictable, programed time within which to treat him, and the addict will benefit accordingly.

Second, the addict may be civilly committed at the instance of a third person related to him. This provision frankly recognizes that in some cases the addict may have lost the resources to make the first step toward cure and redemption from his curse of addiction. Under title III, those innocent members of his family who are the most likely to be victimized by the helpless addict's plight may take steps to help him. All the due process protection the law can provide cloaks the commitment proceedings, as title III is now designed.

I am persuaded, Mr. Speaker, that since the Federal commitment under title III will be available only where no State program or facilities can be made available, the States will not be discouraged from instituting and perfecting their own programs.

Title IV of the conference report provides for assistance to the States in the matter of developing programs, services and facilities for the treatment and cure of narcotic addicts. This will assure a cooperative effort as research and experience show us more certain methods of treatment in the fight on addiction and drug abuse.

In the last substantive title of the report, title IV, present restrictions on parole for marihuana offenders are somewhat relaxed. Since marihuana is not an addictive drug, and since treatment for its use is not as difficult, the incentive of parole was urged as necessary to rehabilitation and effective to that end. I am confident the parole boards will not need any reminder that marihuana offenses are serious and severe crimes, and that this new amnesty is not lightly to be dispensed.

Mr. Speaker, the final narcotic law we have now before us is a balanced product. It includes attention to those areas of concern—commitment, grants-in-aid and penalties—to which my bills of last session, H.R. 8892 through H.R. 8895, and the companion measures of several of my colleagues were addressed. We can be well pleased that the Congress has seen fit to work upon them so diligently, and so fully in keeping with the finest traditions of the great deliberative legislative body.

Mr. Speaker, I urge approval of the conference report in the hope that in later years we may look back and see that this was a decisive step in the struggle to rid our Nation of the disease of narcotic drugs. There are few accomplishments that would better credit the 89th Congress, than that we reduced narcotic addiction to the point where it would no longer be a national problem.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF TRUSTEES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 647) to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to permit the appointment of new trustees in deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by agreement of the parties, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

Conference Report (H. Rept. No. 2330)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 647) to amend the Act of March 3, 1901, to permit the appointment of new trustees in deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by agreement of the parties, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, and 4, and agree to the same.

Abraham J. Multer,
Howard W. Smith,
William L. Springer,
Ancher Nelsen,
Managers on the Part of the House.
Tom McIntyre,
Wayne Morse,
Peter H. Dominick,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Statement

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 647) to amend the Act of March 3, 1901, to permit the appointment of new trustees in deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by agreement of the parties, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Senate amendments numbered 1, 2, and 3 made technical, clerical, clarifying, and conforming changes. With respect to these amendments the House recedes.

Senate amendment numbered 4 deleted the provision in the House bill which authorized the owner of a debt secured by a deed of trust to unilaterally appoint a new trustee. The House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, so as to permit further extensive study, as recommended by the Senate, to provide effective procedures for the unilateral substitution of trustees in deeds of trusts in the District of Columbia.

Abraham J. Multer,
Howard W. Smith,
William L. Springer,
Ancher Nelsen,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MULTER (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement of the managers be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill H.R. 647, introduced by me, is to provide for the substitution of trustees under deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by means of a written instrument entered into by all parties or their successors in interest, notwithstanding any provision of the deed of trust to the contrary.

The bill, as passed by the House, February 8, 1965, affects two situations whereby new trustees to a deed of trust can be appointed. One is where the parties to a trust agree in writing to the appointment. Provision is included that before any such instrument is effective, notice of the appointment of the new trustee, bearing the signatures under seal of the parties, and acknowledged by them, shall be recorded among the land records in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds. This affords notice to other parties not having actual notice of the designation of the new trustee.

The other situation covered by the bill is where the owner of the debt secured by a deed of trust may, unilaterally, acting on his own, and without the prior agreement of other parties to the deed of trust, appoint a new trustee by written designation signed, sealed, and acknowledged by said owner of the debt. However, in such case, such appointment of new trustee is effective only after the lapse of a 10-day period following the filing of such designation with the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia and service thereof on the debtor. If the debtor within the 10-day period files an objection to the appointment of such trustee, court proceedings would follow as are provided under the District of Columbia Code for appointment of a substituted trustee in the event of death of the designated trustee, under which proceedings the court may appoint a new trustee.

This bill is identical to my bill, H.R. 682 of the 88th Congress—House Report No. 74—which passed the House on March 11, 1963. The Commissioners, by letter to the chairman of the committee, expressed their approval of the House bill.

The committee was informed that of the some 200 cases per year in the District of Columbia involving questions of trustee substitution, nearly 80 percent involve the issue of obtaining a deed of release from a trustee who has disappeared, become disabled, or is deceased. A great number of these cases involve a homeowner of limited means who, under existing law, might have to undertake expensive litigation to obtain a deed of release on property that he has already paid for in full.

This bill, as amended, will avoid any such needless expense and litigation by establishing a simple procedure through which the parties to the deed can consent in a written document to the substitution of a trustee.

SENATE AMENDMENTS

The Senate made three technical, clerical and clarifying amendments, with respect to which the House recedes.

Senate amendment No. 4 deleted the provision in the House-passed bill which authorized the owner of a debt secured by a deed of trust to unilaterally appoint a new trustee.

As stated, under the proposed unilateral substitution provision, as included in the House-passed bill, the owner of the debt would appoint in writing a substitute trustee and file such designation in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. Ten days after the designation was served on the debtor, it would become effective unless the debtor filed an objection in such court to the appointment of the substitute trustee. The court would then resolve the dispute in accordance with procedures set out in existing law.

Representatives of the District of Columbia Bar Association testified before the Senate District Committee that the proposed unilateral substitution provision of the House-passed bill needed substantial modification in order to assure the debtor being adequately protected. The representatives of the bar association further advised the committee that when such safeguards for the debtor are combined with the language of the House bill, no material simplification of existing law and procedures results. Accordingly, it was their view that the bill in large measure would be nothing more than a duplication of existing law. District of Columbia Code—sections 45-611, 45-614, and 45-619—provides procedures for substituting trustees upon the death of the original trustee, or the refusal or inability of the trustee to act, or for enforcing the release of property secured by a deed of trust when the trustee is dead, disabled, or has disappeared.

Additionally, the right and power to unilaterally substitute a trustee in a deed of trust can be, and, the committee was informed, is being extensively reserved by parties to deeds of trust executed in the District, obviating, in those cases, the need for supporting legislation.

In view of the testimony presented by the various witnesses who apeared at the public hearings and testified on H.R. 647, it was the considered opinion of the Senate committee that the provision providing for unilateral substitution of trustees should be held in abeyance until the next Congress when further study should be given to provide effective procedures in connection therewith.

The House recedes from its disagreement to the Senate amendment so as to permit the further recommended extensive study of this procedure.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD on the conference report just adopted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ROLLA JEWEL BEARING PLANT

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3466) to change the name of the Rolla Jewel Bearing Plant at Rolla, N. Dak., to the William Langer Jewel Bearing Plant.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 3466

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Jewel Bearing Plant operated and maintained by the General Services Administration at Rolla, North Dakota, shall hereafter be known as the William Langer Jewel Bearing Plant, and any law, regulation, document or record of the United States in which such plant is designated or referred to shall be held to refer to such plant under and by the name of the William Langer Jewel Bearing Plant.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO SET ASIDE FUNDS FOR RESEARCH INTO SPINAL CORD INJURIES AND DISEASES

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 203) to amend title 38, United States Code, to set aside funds for research into spinal cord injuries and diseases, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That section 216 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

" '(c) For each fiscal year in the period beginning July 1, 1966, and ending June 30, 1972, the Administrator shall set aside not less than $100,000 of funds appropriated for medical research, authorized by section 4101 of this title, for the conduct of research into spinal cord injuries and diseases, and other disabilities that lead to paralysis of the lower extremities.' "

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I simply want to say that this matter has been discussed with the minority and we are strongly in favor of it and urge the adoption of the proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I simply wish to say to my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR], that I concur wholeheartedly in the amendment that has been offered and I am in support of the entire purpose of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the gentleman's motion. I was pleased to have supported the bill when it passed the House on February 2, 1965. I have examined the Senate amendment and find that it is not substantive, but is technical.

This bill will set aside not less than $100,000 for research into spinal cord injuries and diseases and other diseases that lead to paralysis of the lower extremities. The bill does not add any cost to the veterans' benefit program, but merely earmarks at least $100,000 for research into spinal cord injuries.

I am particularly interested in this bill, Mr. Speaker, because I suffered an injury to the spinal cord in combat during World War II. I have witnessed at first hand the effect of such injuries upon many of my less fortuate comrades in arms. If we can do anything to assure that the vast research facilities of the Veterans' Administration will be utilized in alleviating the plight of the paralyzed veteran, then I am in favor of it. This bill will assure that the splendid research accomplished in the past in the Veterans' Administration hospital system for spinal cord injuries will continue in the future. I urge my colleagues to support the gentleman's motion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO CLARIFY THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION WITH RESPECT TO THE TRAINING AND EDUCATION OF HEALTH SERVICE PERSONNEL

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 11631) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to clarify the responsibility of the Veterans' Administration with respect to the training and education of health service personnel, with Senate amendments thereto, and consider the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"SECTION 1. That this Act may be cited as the 'Veterans Hospitalization and Medical Services Modernization Amendments of 1966'.

"TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 73 OF TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE—DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY

"Training and education of health service personnel

"SEC. 101. Section 4101 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting '(a)' immediately before the first sentence and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

" '(b) In order to more effectively carry out the functions imposed on the Department of Medicine and Surgery by subsection (a) of this section, the Administrator shall carry out a program of training and education of health service personnel, acting in cooperation with schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, and nursing; other institutions of higher learning; medical centers; hospitals; and such other public or nonprofit agencies, institutions, or organizations as the Administrator deems appropriate.'

"Departmental divisions

"SEC. 102. Section 4102 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting 'Medical Service, Dental Service, Nursing Service, and Auxiliary Service' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'a Medical Service, a Dental Service, a Nursing Service, and such other professional and auxiliary services as the Administrator may find to be necessary to carry out the functions of the Department'.

"Associate Deputy Chief Medical Director; additional Assistant Chief Medical Director

"SEC. 103. (a) Section 4103(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

" '(a) The Office of the Chief Medical Director shall consist of the following—

" '(1) The Chief Medical Director, who shall be the Chief of the Department of Medicine and Surgery and shall be directly responsible to the Administrator for the operations of the Department. He shall be a qualified physician, appointed by the Administrator.

" '(2) The Deputy Chief Medical Director, who shall be the principal assistant of the Chief Medical Director. He shall be a qualified physician, appointed by the Administrator.

" '(3) The Associate Deputy Chief Medical Director, who shall be an assistant to the Chief Medical Director and the Deputy Chief Medical Director. He shall be a qualified physician, appointed by the Administrator.

" '(4) Not to exceed six Assistant Chief Medical Directors, who shall be appointed by the Administrator upon the recommendation of the Chief Medical Director. One Assistant Chief Medical Director shall be a qualified dentist, who shall be responsible to the Chief Medical Director for the operation of the Dental Service.

" '(5) Such Medical Directors as may be appointed by the Administrator, upon the recommendation of the Chief Medical Director, to suit the needs of the Department. A Medical Director shall be either a qualified physician or a qualified dentist.

" '(6) A Director of Nursing Service, who shall be a qualified registered nurse, appointed by the Administrator, and who shall be responsible to the Chief Medical Director for the operation of the Nursing Service.

" '(7) A Chief Pharmacist and a Chief Dietitian, appointed by the Administrator.

" '(8) Such other personnel and employees as may be authorized by this chapter.

As used herein, the terms "qualified physician" and "qualified dentist" refer to a physician or dentist who has the qualifications prescribed in section 4105 of this title.'

"(b) Such section 4103 is further amended by amending subsection (b) thereof to read as follows:

" '(b) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section—

" '(1) any appointment under this section shall be for a period of four years, with reappointment permissible for successive like periods,

" '(2) any such appointment or reappointment may be extended by the Administrator for a period not in excess of three years, and

" '(3) any person so appointed or reappointed shall be subject to removal by the Administrator for cause.'

"(c) The compensation of the Associate Deputy Chief Medical Director of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration shall be the same as that of an Assistant Chief Medical Director in such Department.

"Deletion of obsolete language

"SEC. 104. Section 4104 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting '(2) Managers, pharmacists' and inserting in lieu thereof '(2) Pharmacists', and deleting 'pathologists,' in subparagraph (2).

"Citizenship requirements applicable to physicians, dentists, and nurses

"SEC. 105. Section 4105 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

" '§ 4105. Qualifications of appointees

" '(a) Any person to be eligible for appointment to the following positions in the Department of Medicine and Surgery must have the applicable qualifications:

" '(1) Physician—

" 'hold the degree of doctor of medicine or of doctor of osteopathy from a college or university approved by the Administrator, have completed an internship satisfactory to the Administrator, and be licensed to practice medicine, surgery, or osteopathy in a State;

" '(2) Dentist—

" 'hold the degree of doctor of dental surgery or dental medicine from a college or university approved by the Administrator, and be licensed to practice dentistry in a State;

" '(3) Nurse—

" 'have successfully completed a full course of nursing in a recognized school of nursing, approved by the Administrator, and be registered as a graduate nurse in a State;

" '(4) Director of a hospital, domiciliary, center or outpatient clinic—

" 'have such business and administrative experience and qualifications as the Administrator shall prescribe;

" '(5) Optometrist—

" 'be licensed to practice optometry in a State;

" '(6) Pharmacist—

" 'hold the degree of bachelor of science in pharmacy, or its equivalent, from a school of pharmacy, approved by the Administrator, and be registered as a pharmacist in a State;

" '(7) Physical therapists, occupational therapists, dietitians, and other employees shall have such scientific or technical qualifications as the Administrator shall prescribe.

" '(b) Except as provided in section 4114 of this title, no person may be appointed in the Department of Medicine and Surgery as a physician, dentist, or nurse unless he is a citizen of the United States.'

"Grade and salary adjustments

"SEC. 106. Section 4106 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by—

"(a) deleting the words 'Automatic promotions' in the second sentence of subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'Advancement', and

"(b) adding at the end thereof the following new subsection (e):

" '(e) In accordance with regulations prescribed by the Administrator, the grade level and salary of a physician, dentist, or nurse changed from a level of assignment where the grade level is based on both the nature of the assignment and personal qualifications, may be adjusted to the grade and salary otherwise appropriate.'

"Pay grade—Hospital, domiciliary and clinic directors

"SEC. 107. (a) Section 4107 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by—

"(1) deleting 'and Deputy Chief Medical Director' in the first sentence of subsection (a), and substituting therefor, ', Deputy Chief Medical Director and Associate Deputy Chief Medical Director,'.

"(2) deleting 'or the position of clinic director at an outpatient clinic,' in the second sentence of paragraph (2) of subsection (b), and

"(3) adding at the end thereof the following new subsection (c):

" '(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the per annum salary rate of each individual serving as a director of a hospital, domiciliary, or center who is not a physician shall not be less than the salary rate which he would receive under this section if his service as a director of a hospital, domiciliary, or center had been service as a physician in the director grade. The position of the director of a hospital, domiciliary, or center shall not be subject to the provisions of the Classification Act of 1949 as amended.'

"(b) Any physician or dentist in the executive grade on the date of enactment of this Act by virtue of his holding the position of clinic director at an outpatient clinic may be continued in such grade so long as he continues to hold the same position, notwithstanding the amendment made in section 4107(b) of title 38, United States Code, by section 106(b) of this Act.

"Technical amendment—Deletion of obsolete language

"SEC. 108. Section 4111 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting '(a)' in the first line and subsection (b) in its entirety.

"Special medical advisory group; other advisory bodies

"SEC. 109. (a) Section 4112 of title 38, United States Code, is amended (1) by amending the catchline thereof to read '§ 4112. Special Medical Advisory Group and Other Advisory Bodies', (2) by inserting '(a)' immediately before the first sentence thereof, (3) by deleting 'conduct regular calendar quarterly meetings.' in the second sentence thereof, and substituting therefor, 'meet on a regular basis as prescribed by the Administrator.', and (4) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

" '(b) In each case where the Administrator has a contract or agreement with any school, institution of higher learning, medical center, hospital, or other public or nonprofit agency, institution, or organization, for the training or education of health service personnel, he shall establish an advisory committee (that is, deans committee, medical advisory committee or the like). Such advisory committee shall advise the Administrator and the Chief Medical Director with respect to policy matters arising in connection with, and the operation of, the program with respect to which it was appointed and may be established on an institutionwide, multidisciplinary basis or on a regional basis whenever such is found to be feasible. Members of each such advisory committee shall be appointed by the Administrator and shall include personnel of the Veterans' Administration and of the entity with which the Administrator has entered into such contract or agreement. The number of members and terms of members of each advisory committee shall be prescribed by the Administrator.'

"(b) The analysis at the head of chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting:

" '4112. Medical advisory group.'

and inserting in lieu thereof:

" '4112. Special Medical Advisory Group; other advisory bodies.'

"Travel expenses for part-time employees

"SEC. 110. Section 4113 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting 'and paragraph (1) of section 4104' and inserting in lieu thereof ', paragraph (1) of section 4104 and physicians, dentists, and nurses appointed on a temporary full-time or part-time basis under section 4114'.

"Waiving licensure requirements for part-time employees

"SEC. 111. (a) Section 4114 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting the words 'or part-time' in paragraph (a) (1)(A) and inserting in lieu thereof ', part-time, or without compensation'.

"(b) Such section 4114 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

" '(d) The Chief Medical Director may waive for the purpose of appointments under this section the requirements of section 4105(a) of this title that the licensure of a physician or dentists, or the registration of a nurse must be in a "State", if—

" '(1) in the case of a physician, he is to be used on a research or an academic post or where there is no direct responsibility for the care of patients; or

" '(2) in any case, where the individual is to serve in a country other than the United States and his licensure or registration is in the country in which he is to serve.'

"(c) The catchline of such section 4114 is amended to read 'Temporary full-time, part-time, and without compensation appointments; residencies or internships'.

"(d) The analysis at the head of chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting:

" '4114. Temporary and part-time appointments, residencies and internships."

and inserting in lieu thereof:

" '4114. Temporary full-time, part-time, and without compensation appointments; residencies or internships."

"Contracting for scarce medical services

"SEC. 112. (a) Chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

" '§ 4117. Contracts for scarce medical specialist services

" 'The Administrator may enter into contracts with medical schools and clinics to provide scarce medical specialist services at Veterans' Administration facilities, (including, but not limited to, services of radiologists, pathologists, and psychiatrists).'

"(b) The analysis of such chapter 73 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

" '4117. Contracts for scarce medical specialist services.'

"TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 81 OF TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE—ACQUISITION AND OPERATION OF HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY FACILITIES; PROCUREMENT AND SUPPLY

"Acquisition, maintenance, and charge for parking facilities

"SEC. 201. (a) Section 5004 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

" '§ 5004. Garages and parking facilities

" '(a) The Administrator may construct and maintain on reservations of Veterans' Administration hospitals and domiciliaries, garages for the accommodation of privately owned automobiles of employees of such hospitals and domiciliaries. Employees using such garages shall make such reimbursement therefor as the Administrator may deem reasonable.

" '(b) (1) The Administrator may establish, operate, and maintain, in conjunction with Veterans' Administration hospitals and domiciliaries, parking facilities for the accommodation of privately owned vehicles of Federal employees, and vehicles of visitors and other individuals having business at such hospitals and domiciliaries.

" '(2) The Administrator may establish and collect (or provide for the collection of) fees, for the use of the parking facilities, authorized by subsection (b) (1) of this section, at such rate or rates which he determines would be reasonable under the particular circumstances; but no fee may be charged for the accommodation of any privately owned vehicle used in connection with the transportation of a veteran to or from such a hospital or domiciliary for the purpose of examination or treatment or in connection with a visit to a patient or member in such hospital or domiciliary.

" '(3) The Administrator may contract, by lease or otherwise, with responsible persons, firms or corporations, for the operation of such parking facilities, under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, and without regard to the laws concerning advertising for competitive bids.

" '(c) Money received from the use of the garages and from the parking facilities operations authorized by this section, may be credited to the applicable appropriation charged with the cost of operating and maintaining these facilities. Any amount not needed for the maintenance, operation, and repair of these facilities shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.'

"(b) The table of sections, appearing at the beginning of chapter 81 of such title 38, is amended by deleting therefrom:

" '5004. Garages on hospital and domiciliary reservations.'

and inserting in lieu thereof:

" '5004. Garages and parking facilities.'

"Negotiations for laundry and other common services

"SEC. 202. (a) Section 5012 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding a new subsection (c) thereto to read as follows:

" '(c) The Administrator may procure laundry services, and other common services as specifically approved by him from nonprofit, tax-exempt educational, medical or community institutions, without regard to the requirements of section 302(c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (41 U.S.C. 252 (c)), whenever such services are not reasonably available from private commercial sources. Notwithstanding this exclusion, the provisions of section 304 of that Act shall apply to procurement authorized by this subsection.'

"(b) The catchline of such section 5012 is amended to read: 'Authority to procure and dispose of property and to negotiate for common services'.

"(c) The table of sections at the head of chapter 81 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting:

" '5012. Authority to procure and dispose of property.'

and inserting in lieu thereof:

" '5012. Authority to procure and dispose of property and to negotiate for common services.'

"Sharing of medical facilities, equipment, and information

"SEC. 203. Chapter 81 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subchapter as follows:

" 'Subchapter IV—Sharing of Medical Facilities, Equipment, and Information

" '§ 5051. Statement of congressional purpose

" 'It is the purpose of this subchapter to improve the quality of hospital care and other medical service provided veterans under this title, by authorizing the Administrator to enter into agreements with medical schools, hospitals, and research centers throughout the country in order to receive from and share with such medical schools, hospitals, and research centers the most advanced medical techniques and information, as well as certain specialized medical resources which otherwise might not be feasibly available or to effectively utilize other medical resources with the surrounding medical community, without diminution of services to veterans. Among other things, it is intended, by these means, to strengthen the medical programs at those Veterans' Administration hospitals which are located in small cities or rural areas and thus are remote from major medical centers.

" '§ 5052. Definitions

" 'For the purposes of this subchapter—

" '(a) The term "research center" means an institution (or part of an institution), the primary function of which is research, training of specialists, and demonstrations and which, in connection therewith, provides specialized, high quality diagnostic and treatment services for inpatients and outpatients.

" '(b) The term "specialized medical resources" means medical resources (whether equipment, space, or personnel) which, because of cost, limited availability, or unusual nature, are either unique in the medical community or are subject to maximum utilization only through mutual use.

" '(c) The term "hospital", unless otherwise specified, includes any Federal, State, local, or other public or private hospital.

" '§ 5053. Specialized medical resources

" '(a) To secure certain specialized medical resources which otherwise might not be feasibly available, or to effectively utilize certain other medical resources, the Administrator may, when he determines it to be in the best interest of the prevailing standards of the Veterans' Administration medical care program, make arrangements, by contract or other form of agreement, as set forth in paragraphs (1) and (2) below, between Veterans' Administration hospitals and other hospitals (or medical schools or other medical installations having hospital facilities) in the medical community:

" '(1) for the exchange of use of specialized medical resources when such an agreement will obviate the need for a similar resource to be provided in a Veterans' Administration facility; or

" '(2) for the mutual use, or exchange of use, of specialized medical resources in a Veterans' Administration facility, which have been justified on the basis of veterans' care, but which are not utilized to their maximum effective capacity.

The Administrator may determine the geographical limitations of a medical community as used in this section.

" '(b) Arrangements entered into under this section shall provide for reciprocal reimbursement based on a charge which covers the full cost of services rendered, supplies used, and including normal depreciation and amortization costs of equipment. Any proceeds to the Government received therefrom shall be credited to the applicable Veterans' Administration medical appropriation.

" '(c) Eligibility for hospital care and medical services furnished any veteran pursuant to this section shall be subject to the same terms as though provided in a Veterans' Administration facility, and provisions of this title applicable to persons receiving hospital care or medical services in a Veterans' Administration facility shall apply to veterans treated hereunder.

" '§ 5054. Exchange of medical information

" '(a) The Administrator is authorized to enter into agreements with medical schools, hospitals, research centers, and individual members of the medical profession under which medical information and techniques will be freely exchanged and the medical information services of all parties to the agreement will be available for use by any party to the agreement under conditions specified in the agreement. In carrying out the purposes of this section, the Administrator shall utilize recent developments in electronic equipment to provide a close educational, scientific, and professional link between Veterans' Administration hospitals and major medical centers. Such agreements shall be utilized by the Administrator to the maximum extent practicable to create, at each Veterans' Administration hospital which is a part of any such agreement, an environment of academic medicine which will help such hospital attract and retain highly trained and qualified members of the medical profession.

" '(b) In order to bring about utilization of all medical information in the surrounding medical community, particularly in remote areas, and to foster and encourage the widest possible cooperation and consultation among all members of the medical profession in such community, the educational facilities and programs established at Veterans' Administration hospitals and the electronic link to medical centers shall be made available for use by surrounding medical community. The Administrator may charge a fee for such services (on annual or like basis) at rates which he determines, after appropriate study, to be fair and equitable. The financial status of any user of such services shall be taken into consideration by the Administrator in establishing the amount of the fee to be paid.

" '§ 5055. Pilot programs; grants to medical schools

" '(a) The Administrator may establish an Advisory Subcommittee on Programs for Exchange of Medical Information, of the Special Medical Advisory Group, established under section 4112 of this title, to advise him on matters regarding the administration of this section and to coordinate these functions with other research and education programs in the Department of Medicine and Surgery. The Assistant Chief Medical Director for Research and Education in Medicine shall be an ex officio member of this Subcommittee.

" '(b) The Administrator, upon the recommendation of the Subcommittee, is authorized to make grants to medical schools, hospitals, and research centers to assist such medical schools, hospitals, and research centers in planning and carrying out agreements authorized by section 5054 of this title. Such grants may be used for the employment of personnel, the construction of facilities, the purchasing of equipment when necessary to implement such programs, and for such other purposes as will facilitate the administration of this section.

" '(c) (1) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated an amount not to exceed $3,000,000 for each of the first four fiscal years following the fiscal year in which this subchapter is enacted for the purpose of developing and carrying out medical information programs under this section on a pilot program basis and for the grants authority in subsection (b) of this section. Pilot programs authorized by this subsection shall be carried out at Veterans' Administration hospitals in geographically dispersed areas of the United States.

" '(2) Funds authorized under this section shall not be available to pay the cost of hospital, medical, or other care of patients except to the extent that such cost is determined by the Administrator to be incident to research, training, or demonstration activities carried out under this section.

" '(d) The Administrator, after consultation with the Subcommittee shall prescribe regulations covering the terms and conditions for making grants under this section.

" '(e) Each recipient of a grant under this section shall keep such records as the Administrator may prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such grant, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such grant is made or used, and the amount of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such records will facilitate an effective audit.

" '(f) The Administrator and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access, for the purpose of audit and examination, to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient of any grant under this section which are pertinent to any such grant.

" '§ 5056. Coordination with programs carried out under the Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke Amendments of 1965

" 'The Administrator and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall, to the maximum extent practicable, coordinate programs carried out under this subchapter and programs carried out under title IX of the Public Health Service Act.

" '§ 5057. Reports to Congress

" 'The Administrator shall submit to the Congress not more than sixty days after the end of each fiscal year separate reports on the activities carried out under sections 5053 and 5054 of this subchapter, each report to include (1) an appraisal of the effectiveness of the programs authorized herein and the degree of cooperation from other sources, financial and otherwise, and (2) recommendations for the improvement or more effective administration of such programs.'

"SEC. 2. The section analysis at the beginning of chapter 81 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

" '*Subchapter IV—Sharing of medical facilities, equipment, and information*

" '5051. Statement of congressional purpose.

" '5052. Definitions.

" '5053. Specialized medical resources.

" '5054. Exchange of medical information.

" '5055. Pilot programs; grants to medical schools.

" '5056. Coordination with programs carried out under the Heart Disease, Cancer and Stroke Amendments of 1965.

" '5057. Reports to Congress.'

"TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS

"Correction of administrative error

"SEC. 301. Section 210 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding '(1)' immediately after '(c)' and the following new paragraph:

" '(2) If the Administrator determines that benefits administered by the Veterans' Administration have not been provided by reason of administrative error on the part of the Federal Government or any of its employees, he is authorized to provide such relief on account of such error as he determines equitable, including the payment of moneys to any person whom he determines equitably entitled thereto.'

"Lease of motor vehicles or aircraft

"SEC. 302. Section 213 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding the following sentence: 'The Administrator may also enter into contracts or agreements with private concerns or public agencies for the hiring of passenger motor vehicles or aircraft for official travel whenever, in his judgment, such arrangements are in the interest of efficiency or economy.'

"Transportation of employees in emergencies

"SEC. 303. (a) Section 233 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting '(a)' at the beginning thereof, and by adding a new subsection '(b)' to read as follows:

" '(b) The Administrator, when he determines that an emergency situation exists and that such action is necessary for the effective conduct of the affairs of the Veterans' Administration, may utilize Government-owned, or leased, vehicles to transport employees to and from their place of employment and the nearest adequate public transportation, or, if such public transportation is either unavailable or not feasible to use, to and from their place of employment and their home. The Administrator shall establish reasonable rates to cover the cost of the service rendered, and all proceeds collected therefrom shall be applied to the applicable appropriation.'

"(b) The catchline of such section 233 is amended to read:

" '§ 233. Employees' apparel; school transportation; recreational equipment; visual exhibits; personal property; emergency transportation of employees.'

"(c) The analysis at the head of chapter 3 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting:

" '233. Employees' apparel; school transportation; recreational equipment; visual exhibits; personal property.'

and inserting in lieu thereof:

" '233. Employees' apparel; school transportation; recreational equipment; visual exhibits; personal property; emergency transportation of employees.'

"Authorizing treatment of non-service-connected disability of veteran hospitalized for service-connected condition

"SEC. 304. That section 610 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

" '(c) While any veteran is receiving hospital care in any Veterans' Administration facility, the Administrator may, within the limits of Veterans' Administration facilities, furnish medical services to correct or treat any non-service-connected disability of such veteran, in addition to treatment incident to the disability for which he is hospitalized, if the veteran is willing, and the Administrator determines that the furnishing of such medical services (1) would be in the interest of the veteran, (2) would not prolong the hospitalization of such veteran, and (3) would not interfere with the furnishing of medical services to other veterans under authority other than this subsection.' "

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to clarify, improve, and add additional programs relating to the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object and I shall not object, I rise in support of the request of the gentleman from Texas.

The Senate amendments to H.R. 11631, Mr. Speaker, have stricken all language after the enacting clause and have consolidated into the revised bill the provisions of the House passed version of H.R. 11631 which gives statutory authority for training and educating health service personnel as an integral part of the established missions of the Veterans' Administration hospital system; the provisions of H.R. 197 which passed the House on May 16, 1966 and provides, first, specific authority for the Veterans' Administration to enter into contracts with medical schools and clinics for scarce medical services; and second, authority for the Veterans' Administration to furnish medical services to correct or treat any disability in addition to treatment of a disability for which a patient is hospitalized; the provisions of H.R. 7728, which passed the House on May 16, 1966 and authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into agreements with medical schools and, public or private hospitals for the exchange or use of specialized medical facilities.

Some of the changes proposed by the Senate amendment involve substantive changes in the law relating to the operation of the Veterans' Administration Department of Medicine & Surgery which experience has demonstrated to be desirable. Many of the proposed changes, however, reflect improvements in terminology of existing law or mere clarifications in language to reflect current conditions or circumstances.

One portion of the Senate amendment would change the language with respect to the qualifications for the Chief Medical Director, the Deputy Chief Medical Director and the Assistant Chief Medical Directors and establish a new position of Associate Chief Deputy Administrator. Under the Senate amendment all of these positions would require that the person filling them be a qualified physician. It is the opinion of the Veterans' Administration, shared by our committee, that the language of existing law which requires that such positions be filled by qualified doctors and medicine is more precise and better describes the necessary qualifications of persons to fill these positions. The gentleman's amendment to the Senate amendment, therefore, would retain the new position created by the Senate amendment, but would revert to the language of the existing law and require these positions be filled by "qualified doctors of medicine" rather than "qualified physicians."

I urge my colleagues to support the gentleman's motion.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. **SAYLOR.** Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I rise in support of the gentleman's motion. I request permission to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

On February 7 of this year, Mr. Speaker, the House approved H.R. 11631. The bill as it passed the House provided statutory authority for the Veterans' Administration to engage in education and training of health service personnel. This mission, of course, is being accomplished in the Veterans' Administration hospital system today. Every good hospital that enjoys any prestige in medical circles must necessarily have a threefold mission—patient care, research, and education. This bill will add the statutory authority for education to the already existing authority for patient care and research in the Veterans' Administration medical system.

Now, the House earlier this year had passed legislation that would authorize the Veterans' Administration to enter into contracts with medical schools and clinics for scarce medical services and to enter into agreements with medical schools and hospitals for the exchange or use of specialized medical facilities. The Senate amendment has added the substance of this House-approved legislation to the bill.

In addition, they have added language, some substantive and some merely clarifications, which will improve the operations of the Veterans' Administration hospital system.

The gentleman's motion will place the House in disagreement with the Senate on one provision. Existing law, in establishing the qualifications for the Office of Chief Medical Director and his principal assistants, states that they shall be qualified doctors of medicine. The Senate, for reasons best known to themselves, has changed that terminology to "qualified physicians." I believe the language of existing law is sufficiently clear and precise while the language employed in the Senate amendment is vague and too generalized. I, therefore, support the motions of the gentleman from Texas in their entirety and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. **TEAGUE** of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 11631, as it passed the House unanimously February 7, 1966, had as its purpose the clarifying of the responsibility and activity of the Veterans' Administration with respect to the educational program operated throughout the medical system under the direction of the Department of Medicine and Surgery.

There has been great interest in this program, particularly from all of the medical schools which are affiliated with the Veterans' Administration hospitals. It writes into law what has long been the practice of the Veterans' Administration, and gives it specific standing in title 38. I hope that the Bureau of the Budget will provide adequate funding for this important program and realize the unique and large-scale contribution which the Veterans' Administration is making in the field of education and training of health service personnel.

The amendments which the Senate has added largely embody the provisions of H.R. 197 and H.R. 7728 which also relate to the operation of the Department of Medicine and Surgery, and which were passed by the House on May 16, 1966. In addition, sections of H.R. 11657, which I introduced some weeks ago at the request of the Veterans' Administration, has been incorporated in H.R. 11631. I think the bill should be speedily enacted into law, and I hope that the President will promptly approve this measure.

The amendment to the Senate amendment, which I have just offered, restores the proposed language to conform with the existing law by restricting the appointment of the Chief Medical Director and his immediate assistants to those individuals who are qualified doctors of medicine.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. TEAGUE OF TEXAS

Mr. **TEAGUE** of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 11631), with an amendment which I send to the desk.

The **SPEAKER.** The Clerk will report the motion and the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas moves to concur in the Senate amendment, with an amendment, beginning with line 20 on page 2 of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out all down through line 9 on page 4 of the Senate engrossed amendments and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 103. (a)(1) Section 4103(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by redesignating paragraphs (3), (4), (5), (6), and (7) as paragraphs (4), (5), (6), (7), and (8), respectively, and inserting a new paragraph (3) to read as follows:

"'(3) The Associate Deputy Chief Medical Director, who shall be an assistant to the Chief Medical Director and the Deputy Chief Medical Director. He shall be a qualified doctor of medicine, appointed by the Administrator.'

"(2) Such section 4103(a) is further amended by deleting 'five', immediately preceding 'Assistant Chief Medical Directors,' in the first sentence of redesignated paragraph (4), and substituting therefor, 'six'."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO LIBERALIZE THE PROVISIONS FOR PAYMENT TO PARENTS AND CHILDREN OF DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. **TEAGUE** of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 14347) to liberalize the provisions for payment to parents and children of dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and consider the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. **ADAIR.** Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I support the series of motions offered by the distinguished chairman of our committee. If adopted, these motions will place the House of Representatives in agreement with a Senate amendment that will permit monthly pension payments to be excluded as income in computing the income of a dependent parent for entitlement to Dependency and Indemnity Compensation payments. A parent may be in receipt of veterans' pension based upon wartime military service. Upon the death of a son in military service, this parent may be denied service-connected death benefits because the pension payments based upon his own military service cause his income to exceed the limitations established by law for entitlement to survivor benefits. This is an inequity that should be corrected and the Senate amendments will do so.

The House, in supporting the gentleman's motions, also will concur in a Senate amendment to make any reduction or termination of pension resulting from a change in retirement income effective on the last day of the calendar year in which the change occurs. If this amendment is adopted, it will defer any immediate reduction in pension benefits resulting from a change in income until the end of the calendar year. This will ordinarily give a veteran some time to adjust to the changed income. I believe it is a good amendment.

The gentleman's motions will also place the House in disagreement with Senate amendments dealing with increases in monthly social security benefits enacted after July 1, 1965, as related to two types of monthly Veterans' Administration benefits. The Senate amendment would exclude the social security increases from income in determining entitlement of parents to dependency and indemnity compensation or the entitlement of veterans, widows, and children for disability and death pension purposes. The exclusions would apply only to individuals on both the social security rolls and the Veterans' Administration rolls during the month in which the social security increase becomes law. Since there has been only one increase in social security benefits since July 1, 1965—the across-the-board 7-percent increase authorized by Public Law 89-97 enacted July 30, 1965—the amendment will affect only those who were on the pension rolls during the month of July 1965. Under the Senate amendment, persons who came on the pension rolls in August 1965, September 1965, or any other month since July of 1965 would not be entitled to exclude the 7-percent increase in social security benefits which they also received.

I am confident that proponents of these amendments were well intentioned. It was their purpose to lessen the adverse effects of the recent social security increase upon the veteran pensioners. They have, however, in these amendments created a highly discriminatory situation among pensioners—a situation that will create an administrative nightmare. Under the terms of the Senate amendment, a new income limitation will be established for a small segment of pensioners who are in receipt of both pension and social security at the time a social security increase is authorized. To illustrate the discriminatory aspects of this bill, let us assume that social security is increased by 5 percent next year and then by an additional 5 percent in 1969, for a total increase of 17 percent since July 1965. Now, under the Senate amendment, a veteran who is on the rolls prior to the first 7-percent increase, will be permitted to exclude from his income for pension purposes the entire 17 percent represented by the three social security increases. The veteran who came on the rolls after July of 1965, but prior to the initial 5-percent increase, will then be permitted to exclude only 10 percent. A third veteran who came onto the rolls after the first two increases but prior to the third, would be permitted to exclude only 5 percent of his social security payments. A fourth veteran who came on the rolls after all three increases would not be entitled to any exclusions under the Senate amendment. Yet, Mr. Speaker, all four of these veterans would be receiving exactly the same amount of social security. Each time thereafter that social security was increased, a different income level would be established.

Aside from this discrimination among pensioners who are receiving social security, the Senate amendment will discriminate against pensioners with incomes from sources other than social security. The pensioner who derives income from a private or State government retirement plan; Federal civil service retirement; part-time employment, or interest on a small savings account will not be permitted to exclude any increase in these sources of income.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the Senate amendments on this subject. I, therefore, support the series of motions offered by the gentleman from Texas and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I rise in support of the series of motions offered by the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. I request permission to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, the bill, H.R. 14347, as it passed the House, is basically a bill to liberalize the survivor benefits that are payable to dependent parents and children of veterans who die in military service or as the result of service-connected disabilities. Monthly dependency and indemnity compensation is payable to parents only if they are dependent. Dependency is determined by the amount of income from other sources. Various income levels have been established under the law and entitle a parent to varying rates of pension. The House-passed bill provides modest increases in both the income limitations and the monthly dependency and indemnity compensation payments of existing law. In addition, the monthly payments to children of service-connected deceased veterans are increased under the bill.

Now the Senate has added a series of amendments to this bill, some good and some leaving much to be desired. Under the terms of the gentleman's motions, the House would agree to a Senate amendment which would defer any reduction or discontinuance of monthly benefits resulting from an increase in retirement income until the last day of the calendar year. This will provide some opportunity for a veteran receiving pension to adjust to the reduced income. Under existing law, such a reduction would be immediate with no warning.

Under the gentleman's motions, the House would also agree to exclude monthly pension payments as income in computing a parent's entitlement to monthly service-connected death benefits. Again, I believe this provision has considerable merit.

Earlier this year, Mr. Speaker, a law was approved that authorized a $5,000 death gratuity payment to the survivors of certain veterans who died on active duty during the period between January 1, 1957, and September 29, 1965, when Government life insurance was not available to servicemen. To be entitled to this gratuity, a survivor was required to waive any future entitlement to monthly dependency and indemnity compensation payments. The Senate amendment would remove this waiver requirement and the gentleman's motion would concur with this amendment. Again, I believe this amendment will eliminate an inequity not intended by Congress.

Now the gentleman's motion will place the House in disagreement with Senate amendments that provide that increases under the Social Security Amendments of 1965 or under future social security increase legislation shall not be counted in determining annual income of persons entitled to either Veterans' Administration pension or dependency and indemnity compensation payments. The exclusion would apply only to those individuals who were in receipt of both social security and a Veterans' Administration benefit during the month in which the social security payments were increased.

Now, I am confident that the drafters and sponsors of this amendment were well intentioned. They wanted to rescind the adverse effect of the last social security increase upon veteran pensioners and dependency and indemnity compensation payees and preclude any possibility of an adverse effect being created by future social security increases. I share their concern and am equally motivated. I am opposed to any provisions of law that permit a veteran to receive a modest increase in social security and a far greater reduction in veterans' pension all at the same time. This Senate amendment, however, does not provide an equitable solution to this problem. Instead, it will create more problems than it solves. Under this amendment if a veteran is fortunate enough to have been on the rolls prior to the last social security increase, he will be able to exclude all future social security increases in computing his income for pension purposes. If he comes on the rolls after the next three or four increases in social security payments, he cannot exclude any of the increases that were granted prior to the beginning of his entitlement to social security and Veterans' Administration pension. Yet, in both cases, the social security benefit is exactly the same. Each time that social security payments are increased in the future, we will have established a new amount of excluded income for a new and in each case different group of pensioners. In short, we will have a group of veterans all receiving the same amount of social security but each entitled to count a different portion of that social security in determining entitlement to pension.

Now, if the veteran pensioner is unfortunate enough to derive his income from sources other than social security, such as a union retirement plan, the Senate amendment does nothing for him, he must count all of his retirement income.

This amendment, Mr. Speaker, is unfair and will present administrative difficulties that are almost insurmountable. The only way to provide relief from the adverse effects of a past or future increase in social security benefits is to increase the income limitations that control the rate of pension generally and across the board. This proposition will treat all pensioners equitably and fairly. The chairman of our committee has given us assurances that the committee will address itself to this problem early in the next session.

I therefore support the gentleman's motions and urge my colleagues to join me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 2, strike out "income" and insert "annual income as".

Page 4, strike out lines 1 and 2, and insert:

"Sec. 2. Section 415(g) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'chapter 11' in paragraph (1)(C) and inserting in lieu thereof 'chapters 11 and 15';

"(2) by striking out the period at the end of clause (E) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon;

"(3) by adding at the end of paragraph (1) thereof the following new clauses:"

Page 5, line 7, after "duties."" insert: "; and".

Page 5, after line 7, insert:

"(4) by adding a new paragraph as follows:

"'(3) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection, in determining the annual income of any person for any year there shall not be included in such income the amount of any increase in monthly insurance benefits payable to such person for such year under section 202 or 223 of the Social Security Act, if—

"'(A) such increase resulted from provisions of law enacted after July 1, 1965, providing increases in the schedule of benefits under either such section with respect to one or more categories of beneficiaries under title II of such Act, and

"'(B) for the month (or any portion thereof) in which the Act containing such provisions of law was enacted, such person was entitled to (i) a monthly insurance benefit under section 202 or 223 of the Social Security Act, and (ii) dependency and indemnity compensation under the provisions of this section.'"

Page 5, lines 13 and 14, strike out "of payments under chapter 13 of this title" and insert "resulting therefrom".

Page 6, after line 10, insert:

"Sec. 6. Section 503 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'In' at the beginning of such section and inserting in lieu thereof '(a) In'; and by adding a new subsection as follows:

"'(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, in determining the annual income of any person for any year there shall not be included in such income the amount of any increase in monthly insurance benefits payable to such person for such year under section 202 or 223 of the Social Security Act, if—

"'(1) such increase resulted from provisions of law enacted after July 1, 1965, providing increases in the schedule of benefits under either such section with respect to one or more categories of beneficiaries under title II of such Act, and

"'(2) for the month (or any portion thereof) in which the Act containing such provisions of law was enacted, such person was entitled to (A) a monthly insurance benefit under section 202 or 223 of the Social Security Act, and (B) pension under the provisions of this chapter, or under the first sentence of section 9(b) of the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959.'"

Page 6, after line 10, insert:

"Sec. 7. (a) Subsection (a) of section 3 of the Act entitled 'An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, in order to provide special indemnity insurance for members of the Armed Forces serving in combat zones, and for other purposes', approved September 29, 1965 (79 Stat. 886), is amended by striking out the remaining portion of such subsection beginning with 'but only if' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'but only if application is made for such death gratuity within one year after the date of enactment of this Act.'.

"(b) Paragraph (1) of section 3(c) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(1) The death gratuity authorized by this section shall be $5,000 reduced by the aggregate amount of United States Government Life Insurance and National Service Life Insurance paid or payable on account of the death of such veteran.'

"(c) Paragraph (2) of section 3(c) of such Act is repealed.

"(d) Paragraph (3) of section (3c) of such Act is redesignated as paragraph (2).

"(e) Any waiver of future benefits executed by any person under section 3(a) of the Act of September 29, 1965 (79 Stat. 886), as in effect prior to the date of the enactment of this Act, shall be of no effect.

"(f) In any case in which the death gratuity paid to any person under section 3 of the Act of September 29, 1965, was reduced pursuant to clause (B) of subsection (c)(1) of such section, as in effect prior to the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall pay to such person an amount equal to the amount by which such death gratuity was reduced.

"(g) Notwithstanding the time limitation prescribed in section 3(a) of the Act of September 29, 1965, any application for death gratuity filed under such section shall be valid if filed within one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

Page 6, line 11, strike out "Sec. 6." and insert "Sec. 8."

Page 6, line 11, strike out "as otherwise provided herein," and insert "section 7 and as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section,".

Page 6, line 14, strike out "Section" and insert "Paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section".

Page 6, line 16, after "by" insert "paragraph (3) of".

Page 7, after line 2, insert:

"(c) No benefits shall be paid to any person for any period prior to the effective date specified in subsection (a) of this section on account of the amendments made by section 2(4) and section 6 of this Act."

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Teague of Texas moves to concur in Senate amendments numbered 1 and 5.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Teague of Texas moves to disagree to Senate amendments numbered 3, 4, 6, 10, 11 and 12.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Teague of Texas moves to concur in Senate amendment numbered 2 with the following amendment: The first page of the Senate engrossed amendments in the seventh line of Senate amendment numbered 2, after "semi-colon;" insert "and."

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Teague of Texas moves to concur in Senate amendment numbered 7 with the following amendment: On page 4, line 2, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "Sec. 7" and insert "Sec. 6."

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Teague of Texas moves to concur in Senate amendment numbered 8 with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken by the Senate amendment, but in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "Sec. 7."

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Teague of Texas moves to concur in Senate amendment numbered 9 with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken by the Senate amendment, insert the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, and on page 5, line 18, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "section 7" and insert in lieu thereof "section 6."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the motions which I have just made in connection with the bill generally accept the amendments of the Senate with the exception of the so-called Curtis or Miller amendment, which relates to the 7-percent social security increase of Public Law 89–97, and its effect on a limited number of non-service-connected VA pensioners or their dependents. The amendments I have offered concur in the gratuity changes adopted by the Senate.

The death gratuity feature which provides a $5,000 payment for parents or widows whose husbands were ineligible for group life coverage has been amended, by the Senate amendment and accepted under the terms of my motion, to provide that such payment of $5,000 may be made without waiving any rights to death compensation or dependency and indemnity compensation or any offset against such compensation. The net increase of this Senate amendment in the cost of the gratuity program is $17 million. This would be in addition to the $20-million cost previously attributable to the death gratuity program.

Mr. Speaker, the motions I have made reject the so-called Curtis amendment which asks preferential treatment for some 27,000 non-service-connected pension beneficiaries. This motion is consistent with the action of the House on three previous occasions—October 19 and 21, 1965—of the last Congress in regard to the bills H.R. 168 and H.R. 227 of the 89th Congress, which became Public Law 89–311 and Public Law 89–349, respectively.

Members of Congress have received considerable correspondence concerning the effect of the increased social security on the non-service-connected pensions which approximately 2 million people are receiving today under the non-service-connected pension program. Perhaps it is well to bear in mind in the beginning that out of this 2 million we are talking about a group of approximately 27,300—15,400 veterans and 11,900 widows.

In the closing days of the 88th Congress there was enacted Public Law 88-664. It is not necessary in this connection to go into all the details of this legislation. It did increase the rates of pension and provided for the first time a 10-percent exclusion from retirement income in determining the annual income which is countable toward eligibility of a pensioner. The 10-percent exclusion to which I referred permits any individual who is receiving social security, civil service retirement, teacher retirement, railroad retirement, State, municipal, or county retirement, or a retirement annuity from any other source to exclude 10 percent of such amount in determining eligibility under the Veterans' Administration pension program.

There are 1,219,000 veterans receiving disability pension today. Of this number 805,000 or 66 percent, also receive Social Security; 36,000, or 3 percent, receive railroad retirement; 28,000, or 2.3 percent, receive civil service retirement; and 168,000, or 13.8 percent, receive other retirement from commercial sources.

In the case of death pension, there are currently 936,000 widows and children cases on the rolls—576,000, or 61.5 percent receive Social Security; 39,000, or 4.2 percent, receive railroad retirement; 33,000 or 3.5 percent, receive civil service retirement; and 27,000, or 2.9 percent, receive retirement from other sources.

It is readily apparent to me the injustice these veterans and widows will suffer if we adopt a preferential amendment such as the Curtis-Miller proposal.

While its application is broad, as I have indicated, it was inspired by the belief that there was to be in the 88th Congress a 7-percent increase in payments being made to beneficiaries under the Social Security Act. All of us know that this expected social security increase legislation did not materialize in the 88th Congress. The pension bill, Public Law 88-664, however, was passed with this 10-percent exclusion factor.

There is a new social security law today which was effective October 1, 1965. It is Public Law 89-97, and while its main emphasis in the press was on medicare, it did provide a 7-percent increase in social security payments.

The first thing that is evident in this allegation of some pensioners that they have been mistreated is that the 10-percent exclusion is greater than the 7-percent increase.

The second thing that needs to be said is that most of the people who are complaining today about having to take a reduction in their Veterans' Administration pension as a result of moving from one income bracket to another have enjoyed a higher rate of pension for 9 months, higher than they would have received had the Congress not enacted Public Law 88-664.

Other additional factors need to be made crystal clear at this time. These are that in comparing 1964 with 1965: Every person gets more pension; everyone gets more social security; a few, approximately 1½ percent, got an additional windfall; everyone continues to get more pension and more social security than they got in 1964; everyone in 1966 will get more pension than he did in 1964.

The amendment added by the Senate would protect forever this discriminatory windfall for these favored-few 28,000 pensioners.

It has been the consistent policy of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to recommend to the House, and I am glad to say that the Congress has followed this policy, of endeavoring to make uniform all of the benefits applicable under the pension and compensation programs. We pay these benefits on the basis of proven need and proven disability. If this amendment should be written into law it would be grossly unfair, in my opinion, to the thousands of others who are on the pension rolls who are receiving civil service retirement; railroad retirement; city, State, or county retirement; retirement from a teaching position; or retirement from one of the corporations that has its own retirement program. These programs are, as we all know, increased from time to time. Inevitably such change makes a man who is receiving a pension under the Veterans' Administration pension system move from one bracket to another automatically when a change in his income occurs, with the resultant reduction in most instances of his Veterans' Administration pension because of increased income from other sources.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have heard many eloquent pleas in behalf of widows who have allegedly suffered under enactment of these two laws. I feel that the net result of these two laws is a great benefit for all concerned and not a mistreatment. All widows will have more income in 1966 from pension and social security than they had in 1964. Benefits for widows will be greatly increased by H.R. 17488 now pending in the Senate.

It is for this reason that I have made the motion to disagree that this particular Senate amendment—or series of amendments—which is certainly unfair to over 98 percent of the non-service-connected pensioners. I include at this point a statement prepared by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs regarding this social security amendment:

> At the end of the 88th Congress, when it was thought that social security rates would be increased, Congress amended the VA pension law to permit a 10-percent retirement income exclusion which was designed to offset the proposed social security increase. Originally it was thought that both the VA pension amendment and the social security rate increase would become effective at the same time. The social security increase was delayed until September of this year; however, the VA pension amendments became effective January 1, 1965. For a period of 9 months, certain veterans and widows gained a temporary advantage by using their 10-percent exclusive while waiting for the social security increase to become effective. Comparing 1964 with 1965, we find that—
>
> 1. Everyone gets more pension;
> 2. Everyone gets more social security;
> 3. A few, 1½ percent, get an additional windfall because of the 9 months difference in the effective dates of the two provisions;
> 4. Everyone continues to get more pension and more social security in 1966 than they received in 1964. It is not true that the social security rate increase has caused VA pensioners to get less money. All pensioners will get more money as a result of the pension and social security amendments.
>
> The amendment which has been proposed would protect the 1½ percent who have enjoyed the windfall for 9 months.
>
> These points can be demonstrated by reviewing a typical case. This is the case of a single veteran whose only other income, other than pension, is social security:
>
> In 1964, he received $648 per year social security, $840 per year VA pension, with a combined annual income of $1,488 per year.
>
> In 1965, his social security was increased to $696, his veterans' pension was increased to $1,125 as a result of the 9-month windfall which he gained by applying his 10-percent exclusion before the social security amendment took effect. His combined annual income for 1965 is $1,821.
>
> In 1966, social security will be $696, his VA pension $900, and his combined annual income, $1,596.

In comparing income expected in 1966 with income in 1964, we see that this veteran gets $48 per year more money from social security, he gets $60 per year more money from his VA pension, and his total income for 1966 will be $108 per year more than it was in 1964. In addition, for the first 9 months of 1965, he got an extra $225 while waiting for his social security rates to become effective. This is the kind of case that some are saying is losing money, and it is not true.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the veterans bills, which were just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DUTY-FREE ENTRY OF MASS SPECTROMETER FOR INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 11753) to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Indiana University, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to address a question to the gentleman from Arkansas.

It is my understanding that none of these bills that the gentleman from Arkansas is going to call up have previously come up for consideration and that there has been no objection at any time to the consideration of these bills by unanimous consent.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman is correct. All of the bills that I propose to call up at this time are being called up for the first time in this session of the Congress and no objection has occurred to any of them during this session.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Mills]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 11753

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty one mass spectrometer for the use of Indiana University.

Sec. 2. If the liquidation of the entry of any article described in this Act has become final, such entry shall be reliquidated and the appropriate refund of duty shall be made.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 11753 is to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Indiana University. This bill introduced by the Honorable William Bray, of Indiana, would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to admit free of duty a mass spectrometer for Indiana University. The bill also provides that if liquidation of the entry has become final, the entry is to be reliquidated and appropriate refund of duty made.

A mass spectrometer is a scientific device used to provide chemical analyses, measurements, and other research features. The mass spectrometer purchased by Indiana University is made in England by Associated Electronic Industries. The Committee on Ways and Means has been advised that the British instrument can perform a number of research functions that cannot be duplicated by domestically produced mass spectrometers of this type. In this connection, the Department of Commerce advised the committee that no domestically produced instrument of equivalent scientific value to such instrument was available.

In the circumstances, the Committee on Ways and Means is of the opinion that this legislation is meritorious and consistent with prior legislation of this nature, and unanimously recommends its enactment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11753, a bill to provide for the duty-free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Indiana University.

The committee has been advised by the Department of Commerce that there is no domestically produced mass spectrometer of equivalent scientific value to the instrument being imported by Indiana University.

It has been the practice of the Congress in the past to make specific provision for duty-free entry of scientific instruments when there are no domestically produced instruments of equivalent value. It may also be noted that this is in line with the general policy developed by Congress earlier this year in enacting legislation to implement the Florence Agreement. However, this legislation, which has now been signed into law, is not as yet effective and specific exception for duty-free entry in this case is therefore required. The bill was unanimously reported by the Ways and Means Committee, and I recommend favorable action by the House.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DUTY-FREE ENTRY OF SHIP MODEL FOR LUTHERAN CHURCH OF THE COVENANT, MAPLE HEIGHTS, OHIO

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 12110) to provide for the free entry of one ship model for the use of the Lutheran Church of the Covenant, Maple Heights, Ohio, and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 12110

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty one ship model imported for the use of the Lutheran Church of the Covenant, Maple Heights, Ohio, which was entered on November 30, 1965, pursuant to Consumption Entry 5096.

(b) If the liquidation of the entry of the article described in subsection (a) of this section has become final, such entry shall be reliquidated and the appropriated refund of duty shall be made.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 12110 is to provide for the free entry of one ship model for the use of the Lutheran Church of the Covenant, Maple Heights, Ohio.

H.R. 12110 introduced by the Honorable William E. Minshall, of Ohio, would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to admit free of duty one ship model for the use of the Lutheran Church of the Covenant, Maple Heights, Ohio. The bill further provides that if the liquidation of the entry of the article has become final, such entry shall be reliquidated and appropriate refund of duty made.

The Committee on Ways and Means has been advised that the ship model, which was made in Denmark, is a replica, approximately 53 by 40 inches in size, of the German ship *Olbers* which in 1839 brought from Europe a group of immigrants who established the Missouri Synod of the Lutheran Church. The model is to be hung in the nave of the church and is intended to serve as a memorial to these founders. The Committee on Ways and Means was further advised that the model was given to the church by its pastor and that the pastor had attempted without success to have a model of this particular ship made in the United States.

In the circumstances, the Committee on Ways and Means is of the opinion that this legislation is meritorious and consistent with prior legislation of this nature, and unanimously recommends its enactment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12110, which is designed to provide for the duty-free entry of one model ship for use of the Lutheran Church of the Covenant, Maple Heights, Ohio.

This ship is a replica of the ship which brought to this country in 1839 a group of immigrants who established the Missouri Synod of the Lutheran Church. The model of this ship was given to this church by its pastor. The pastor attempted, without success, to have a model of this particular ship made in the United States. The ship will be hung in the nave of the church as a memorial. The Tariff Schedules of the United States contain many provisions permitting the duty-free entry of items designed to adorn churches. However, there is no specific provision relating to ship models. This bill is in harmony with the general intent of the Tariff Schedules of the United States and I strongly urge the House to pass it.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DUTY-FREE ENTRY OF RHEOGONIOMETER FOR TUFTS UNIVERSITY

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 12197) to provide for the free entry of one rheogoniometer for the use of Tufts University, and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 12197

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty one rheogoniometer (including all accompanying equipment, parts, accessories, and appurtenances) for the use of Tufts University, Boston Massachusetts.

Sec. 2. If the liquidation of the entry of any article described in the first section of this Act has become final, such entry shall be reliquidated and the appropriate refund of duty shall be made.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 12197 is to permit the free entry of one rheogoniometer for the use of Tufts University of Boston, Mass.

H.R. 12197 introduced by the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to admit free of duty one rheogoniometer—including all accompanying equipment, parts, accessories, and appurtenances—for the use of Tufts University, Boston, Mass. The bill further provides that if liquidation of the entry has become final, the entry is to be reliquidated and appropriate refund of duty made.

Rheogoniometers are high-precision devices originally developed by a research engineering concern in England. The Committee on Ways and Means has been advised that this instrument is not commercially produced in the United States. In this connection, the Department of Commerce informed the Committee on Ways and Means that "Tufts University tried without success to purchase the instrument from domestic suppliers."

In the circumstances, the Committee on Ways and Means is of the opinion that this legislation is meritorious and consistent with prior legislation of this nature, and unanimously recommends its enactment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DUTY-FREE ENTRY OF TRIAXIAL APPARATUS AND RHEOGONIOMETER FOR NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 13035) to provide for the free entry of a triaxial apparatus and rheogoniometer for the use of Northwestern University, and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 13035

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty a Norwegian triaxial apparatus and a Weissenberg rheogoniometer (including all accompanying equipment, parts, accessories, and appurtenances), imported for the use of Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, which were entered September 22, 1965, pursuant to consumption entry numbered 53568.

SEC. 2. If the liquidation of the entry of any article described in the first section of this Act has become final, such entry shall be reliquidated and the appropriate refund of duty shall be made.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, beginning in line 8, strike out "September 22, 1965, pursuant to consumption entry numbered 53568." and insert "during July and September 1965 pursuant to consumption entries numbered 1816 and 53568, respectively."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 13035 is to provide for the free entry of a triaxial apparatus and rheogoniometer for the use of Northwestern University, of Evanston, Ill.

H.R. 13035 introduced by the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable DONALD RUMSFELD, would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to admit free of a duty a Norwegian triaxial apparatus and a Weissenberg throgoniometer—including all accompanying equipment, parts, accessories, and appurtenances—imported for the use of Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. The bill further provides that if liquidation of the entry of any of the articles concerned has become final, the entry is to be reliquidated and appropriate refund of duty made.

The rheogoniometer purchased by Northwestern University is manufactured by Farol Research Engineers, Ltd., of England. The Department of Commerce advised the Committee on Ways and Means that it "knows of no other commercial instrument, manufactured in the United States or elsewhere, that is capable of meeting the university's requirements for which the British instrument was purchased."

The triaxial apparatus purchased by the university is a Norwegian instrument used for soil testing. The Committee on Ways and Means was advised that there is no known soil testing apparatus produced in the United States which has the required characteristics.

In the circumstances, the Committee on Ways and Means is of the opinion that this legislation is meritorious and consistent with prior legislation of this nature, and unanimously recommends its enactment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13035, a bill to provide for the free entry of a triaxial apparatus and rheogoniometer for the use of Northwestern University.

The committee has been advised by the Department of Commerce that there are no domestically produced triaxial apparatus and rheogoniometer of equivalent scientific value to the instruments being imported by the Northwestern University.

It has been the practice of the Congress in the past to make specific provision for duty-free entry of scientific instruments when there are no domestically produced instruments of equivalent value. It may also be noted that this is in line with the general policy developed by Congress earlier this year in enacting legislation to implement the Florence agreement. However, this legislation, which has now been signed into law, is not as yet effective and specific exception for duty-free entry in this case is therefore required. The bill was unanimously reported by the Ways and Means Committee, and I recommend favorable action by the House.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DUTY-FREE ENTRY OF CARILLON FOR NORTHFIELD AND MOUNT HERMON SCHOOLS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 13190) to provide for the free entry of a four-octave carillon for the use of the Northfield and Mount Hermon Schools, East Northfield, Mass., and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 13190

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty a four octave carillon for the use of the Northfield and Mount Hermon Schools, East Northfield, Massachusetts.

SEC. 2. If the liquidation of the entry of the article described in the first section of this Act has become final, such entry shall be reliquidated and the appropriate refund of duty shall be made.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 13190 is to provide for the free entry of a four-octave carillon for the use of the Northfield and Mount Hermon Schools, East Northfield, Mass.

This legislation introduced by the Honorable SILVIO CONTE, of Massachusetts, would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to admit free of duty a four-octave carillon for the use of the Northfield and Mount Hermon Schools, East Northfield, Mass. The bill further provides that if liquidation of the entry has become final, such entry is to be reliquidated and appropriate refund of duty made.

It is the understanding of the Committee on Ways and Means that the carillon being imported for the Northfield and Mount Hermon Schools is being cast in France, a portion of the bronze for the bells having been obtained from eight bells which were shipped from Northfield to France for recasting. In the absence of legislation, the carillon would be classified under the provisions of item 725.38 of the tariff schedules of the United States and dutiable at the rate of 6.5 percent ad valorem.

The Ways and Means Committee has been advised that there is no domestic production of carillon bells and that domestic firms contracting for installations of carillons are dependent on imports of tuned bells to be used in such installations. The Tariff Commission, in reporting to the Committee on Ways and Means on H.R. 13190, stated that the information available to it "indicates that no carillon bells have been produced in the United States since 1950."

The Committee on Ways and Means is of the opinion that this legislation is meritorious and consistent with prior legislation of this nature, and unanimously recommends its enactment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13190, a bill to provide for the free entry of a four-octave carillon for the use of the Northfield and Mount Hermon Schools, East Northfield, Mass.

The Department of Commerce has advised the committee that no carillons have been produced domestically in this country since 1930. In fact, the firms which install the carillons and tune them are dependent on imports.

The committee unanimously reported this legislation, and I recommend favorable consideration by the House.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DUTY-FREE ENTRY OF BROAD-RANGE MULTIGAP MAGNETIC SPECTROGRAPH FOR UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 13739) to provide for the free entry of one broad-range multigap magnetic spectrograph for the use of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I just want to ask the gentleman from Arkansas if the gentleman has obtained permission for Members to extend their remarks prior to the passage of these bills.

Mr. MILLS. It was my intention to make such a request in behalf of the authors of the bills when all of the bills on this list were considered.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 13739

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty one broad-range multigap magnetic spectrograph for the use of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

(b) If the liquidation of the entry of any article described in subsection (a) of this section has become final, such entry shall be reliquidated and the appropriate refund of duty shall be made.

Mr. MILLS. Speaker, H.R. 13739 introduced by the Honorable ROBERT N. C. NIX, of Pennsylvania would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to admit free of duty one broad-range multigap magnetic spectrograph for the use of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. The bill further provides that if liquidation of the entry has become final, such entry shall be reliquidated and appropriate refund of duty made.

The instrument being imported by the University of Pennsylvania is a broad-range multigap magnetic spectrograph which is especially designed for use with a tandem atomic energy accelerator apparatus, and is being purchased from the British equivalent of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atomic Weapons Research Establishment, Aldermaston, England. The Committee on Ways and Means has been advised by the Department of Commerce that:

> It has been determined that no domestic manufacturer has demonstrated the ability to manufacture a device to meet the specifications required by the University. Therefore, within the context of the needs of the University of Pennsylvania, this Department must conclude that, at the time the university purchased this instrument, no instrument of equivalent scientific value was available from domestic manufacturers.

In the circumstances, the Committee on Ways and Means is of the opinion that this legislation is meritorious and consistent with prior legislation of this nature, and unanimously recommends its enactment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13739, a bill to provide for the free entry of one broad-range multigap magnetic spectrograph for the use of the University of Pennsylvania.

The committee has been advised by the Department of Commerce that there is no domestically produced broad-range multigap magnetic spectrograph of equivalent scientific value to the instrument being imported by the University of Pennsylvania.

It has been the practice of the Congress in the past to make specific provision for duty-free entry of scientific instruments when there are no domestically produced instruments of equivalent value. It may also be noted that this is in line with the general policy developed by Conrgess earlier this year in enacting legislation to implement the Florence agreement. However, this legislation, which has now been signed into law, is not as yet effective and specific exception for duty-free entry in this case is therefore required. The bill was unanimously reported by the Ways and Means Committee, and I recommend favorable action by the House.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DUTY-FREE ENTRY OF MASS SPECTROMETER AND RHEOGONIOMETER FOR PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 14388) to provide for the free entry of certain articles for the use of Princeton University, Princeton, N.J., and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 14388

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty one mass spectrometer and one rheogoniometer imported for the use of Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey.

(b) Section (a) of this bill shall apply to the articles described therein whether such articles were entered before the date of enactment of this bill, or are entered on or after such date. If the liquidation of the entry of any article described in section (a) has become final, such entry shall be reliquidated and the appropriate refund of duty shall be made.

With the following committee amendment:

The amendment is as follows:

Beginning on page 1, strike out line 7 and all that follows through line 2 on page 2 and insert:

"(b) If the liquidation of the entry of any article described in subsection (a) has become final, such entry shall be reliquidated and the appropriate refund of duty shall be made."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 14388, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, is to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer and one rheogoniometer for the use of Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.

This legislation introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey, the Honorable FRANK THOMPSON, JR., would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to admit free of duty one mass spectrometer and one rheogoniometer for the use of Princeton University. The bill also provides for reliquidation with an appropriate refund of duty should the articles be covered by an entry the liquidation of which has become final.

The Weissenberg rheogoniometer is a unique instrument for measuring fluid viscosity. The instrument purchased by Princeton University is a Weissenberg Model R 16 rheogoniometer manufactured by Farol Research Engineers, Ltd., of England. The Department of Commerce advised the Committee on Ways and Means in its report that "it knows of no other commercial instrument, manufactured in the United States or elsewhere, that is capable of meeting the university's requirements for which the British instrument was purchased."

A mass spectrometer is a scientific device used to provide chemical analyses, measurements, and other research features. Ordinarily, they are built to specifications to meet the particular requirements of the user. In the use of this instrument, the material to be studied is subject to an ionizing process after which the ions formed are physically separated according to mass by electromagnetic means so that a mass spectrum is produced. The mass spectrometer purchased by Princeton University is an A.E.I. Model MS9 mass spectrometer made in England. The Committee on Ways and Means is advised that the British instrument can perform a number of research functions that cannot be duplicated by domestically produced mass spectrometers of this type.

The Committee on Ways and Means is of the opinion that this legislation is meritorious and consistent with prior legislation of this nature, and unanimously recommends its enactment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 14388, a bill to provide for the duty-free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Princeton University.

The committee has been advised by the Department of Commerce that there is no domestically produced mass spectrometer of equivalent scientific value to the instrument being imported by Princeton University.

It has been the practice of the Congress in the past to make specific provision for duty-free entry of scientific instruments when there are no domestically produced instruments of equivalent value. It may also be noted that this is in line with the general policy developed by Congress earlier this year in enacting legislation to implement the Florence agreement. However, this legislation, which has now been signed into law, is not as yet effective and specific exception for duty-free entry in this case is therefore required. The bill was unanimously reported by the Ways and Means Committee, and I recommend favorable action by the House.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREE ENTRY OF A DOUBLE NEUTRON DIFFRACTOMETER FOR THE USE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI, COLUMBIA, MO.

Mr. MILLS. Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from consideration of the bill (H.R. 14610) to provide for the free entry of a double neutron diffractometer for the use of the University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo., which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, and for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill by title.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> H.R. 14610
>
> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That (a) the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty one double neutron diffractometer (including all accompanying equipment, parts, accessories, and appurtenances) for the use of the University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.
>
> (b) If the liquidation of the entry of any article described in subsection (a) has become final, such entry shall be reliquidated and the appropriate refund of duty shall be made.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 14610 introduced by the Honorable RICHARD ICHORD, of Missouri, would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to admit free of duty one double neutron diffractometer—including all accompanying equipment, parts, accessories, and appurtenances—for the use of the University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo. The bill further provides that if liquidation of the entry of any of the articles described has become final, the entry is to be reliquidated and appropriate refund of duty made.

The neutron diffractometer being purchased by the University of Missouri is an apparatus which utilizes neutrons emitted from an accelerator for the investigation of the structural and chemical properties of solids. The Committee on Ways and Means was advised that the Mitsubishi Electric Manufacturing Co. of Japan was the only firm, in the United States or elsewhere, to respond to the university's advertisement for bids to supply the subject instrument. In this connection, the Department of Commerce advised the Committee on Ways and Means:

> It has been determined that no domestic manufacturer has made or is willing to make a neutron diffractometer of the type required by the University.

In the circumstances, the Committee on Ways and Means is of the opinion that this legislation is meritorious and consistent with prior legislation of this nature, and unanimously recommends its enactment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 14610, a bill to provide for the duty-free entry of a double neutron diffractometer for the use of the University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.

The committee has been advised by the Department of Commerce that there is no domestically produced double neutron diffractometer of equivalent scientific value to the instrument being imported by the University of Missouri.

It has been the practice of the Congress in the past to make specific provision for duty-free entry of scientific instruments when there are no domestically produced instruments of equivalent value. It may also be noted that this is in line with the general policy developed by Congress earlier this year in enacting legislation to implement the Florence agreement. However, this legislation, which has now been signed into law, is not as yet effective and specific exception for duty-free entry in this case is therefore required. The bill was unanimously reported by the Ways and Means Committee, and I recommend favorable action by the House.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, as the author of H.R. 14610, I would like very much to take this opportunity to explain the purpose of this legislation.

The bill authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Treasury to grant tariff exemption on one double neutron diffractometer, including all accompanying equipment, parts, accessories, and appurtenances, for the use of the University of Missouri at Columbia, Mo. Scientific equipment of this nature is classified under the provision for electrical measuring and analyzing instruments and apparatus in item 712.50, Tariff Schedules of the United States, with duty at the rate of 12 percent ad valorem.

This instrument is valued at $124,855, and is an apparatus to be used in conjunction with atomic reactors to measure the structural and chemical properties of solids. The Mitsubishi Electric Manufacturing Co., of Japan, was the only film to respond to the university's advertisement for bids to supply the subject instrument. In the report of the Department of Commerce it was determined that no domestic manufacturer has made or is willing to make a neutron diffractometer of the type required by the University of Missouri.

Agency reports from the Department of State, Department of Commerce, Department of Labor, and U.S. Tariff Commission do not oppose H.R. 14610 although all point out, including the Department of the Treasury that legislation to implement the Florence agreement would be preferable to private legislation for individual purchase. The Florence agreement, however, which is now Public Law 89–651, would not extend to waive the importation duty in this case because of the effective date of the agreement. This purchase has already been consummated and the Florence agreement is not retroactive. This purchase does, however, meet all the criteria and standards of the Florence agreement for the free entry of "education, scientific, and cultural material" imported for the use of any "institution, whether private or public, established for educational or scientific purposes, if no instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value is being manufactured in the United States."

With all expediency I urge the passage of H.R. 14610.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREE ENTRY OF AN IONOSONDE FOR THE USE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from consideration of the bill (H.R. 14893) to provide for the free entry of an ionosonde for the use of the University of Illinois, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 14893

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty one ionosonde (and accompanying spare parts) for the use of the University of Illinois.

(b) If the liquidation of the entry of the article described in subsection (a) of this section has become final, such entry shall be reliquidated and the appropriate refund of duty shall be made.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 14893, introduced by the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to admit free of duty one ionosonde—and accompanying spare parts—for the use of the University of Illinois, and further provides that if the liquidation of the entry of the article involved has become final, the entry is to be reliquidated and appropriate refund of duty made.

An ionosonde is a scientific instrument used for upper atmosphere weather research. The instrument imported by the University of Illinois is a model J-5 ionosonde manufactured by Magnetic A.B., a Swedish firm. The Committee on Ways and Means was advised that no domestically produced instrument of equivalent scientific value was available at the time the instrument was purchased.

In the circumstances, the Committee on Ways and Means is of the opinion that this legislation is meritorious and consistent with prior legislation of this nature, and unanimously recommends its enactment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 14893, a bill to provide for the duty-free entry of one ionosonde for the use of the Unisity of Illinois.

The committee has been advised by the Department of Commerce that there is no domestically produced ionosonde of equivalent scientific value to the instrument being imported by the University of Illinois.

It has been the practice of the Congress in the past to make specific provision for duty-free entry of scientific instruments when there are no domestically produced instruments of equivalent value. It may also be noted that this is in line with the general policy developed by Congress earlier this year in enacting legislation to implement the Florence agreement. However, this legislation, which has now been signed into law, is not as yet effective and specific exception for duty-free entry in this case is therefore required. The bill was unanimously reported by the Ways and Means Committee, and I recommend favorable action by the House.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREE ENTRY OF A CARILLON FOR USE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT RIVERSIDE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from consideration of the bill (H.R. 15888), to provide for the free entry of a carillon for the use of the University of California at Riverside, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, and for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The bill was read by title.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 15888

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty a carillon imported May 16, 1966 (entry number 66-271902), for the use of the University of California at Riverside, California.

SEC. 2. If the liquidation of the entry of the article described in the first section of this Act has become final, such entry shall be reliquidated and the appropriate refund of duty shall be made.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 15888 is to provide for the free entry of a carillon for the use of the University of California at Riverside, Calif.

This legislation, introduced by the Honorable JOHN V. TUNNEY, of California would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to admit free of duty a carillon imported for the use of the University of California at Riverside, Calif., and further provides for reliquidation of the entry and appropriate refund of duty in the event liquidation of the entry has become final.

The Ways and Means Committee is advised that the carillion, which was purchased from Les Fils de Georges Paccard in France, will serve as the esthetic focal point of the University of California at Riverside campus, and will also be used for educational purposes by the music department of the university. In the absence of legislation, the carillon would be classifiable under the provisions of item 725.38 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States and dutiable at the rate of 6.5 percent ad valorem.

In its report to the Ways and Means Committee on H.R. 15888, the Department of Commerce stated:

> There is no domestic production of carillon bells and * * * domestic firms contracting for installations of carillons are dependent on imports of tuned bells to be used in such installations.

The Ways and Means Committee is of the opinion that this legislation is meritorious and consistent with prior legislation of this nature, and unanimously recommends its enactment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 15888, a bill to provide for the free entry of a carillon for the use of the University of California at Riverside.

The committee has been advised that the carillon will serve as an esthetic focal point on the University of California Riverside campus. It will also be used for educational purposes by the music department.

The Department of Commerce has advised the committee that no carillons have been produced domestically in this country since 1930. In fact, the firms which install the carillons and tune them are dependent on imports.

The committee unanimously reported this legislation, and I recommend favorable consideration by the House.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, that concludes the call of the instrument bills. I ask unanimous consent that I and other Members who desire to do so may extend our remarks immediately preceding the passage of each of these instrument bills.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INCREASE FROM $200 TO $500 OF THE MONTHLY COMBAT PAY EXCLUSION FOR COMMISSIONED OFFICERS SERVING IN COMBAT ZONES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from consideration of the bill (H.R. 17271) to amend section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $200 to $500 the monthly combat pay exclusion for commissioned officers serving in combat zones, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objections to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object and I shall not object, I do so to ask the chairman for a brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I did not think my friend would object to this bill because he is the author of it, and I appreciate knowing that it has his enthusiastic support, as it does mine, and I am sure all other Members. It was introduced at the request of the President.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] and I introduced bills on this subject matter.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 17271, which was introduced at the request of the President, increases the special exclusion granted to commissioned officers serving in combat zones and, therefore, directly affects our fighting men in Vietnam.

Present law exempts from Federal income tax up to $200 monthly of pay received by commissioned officers for serving in a combat zone or while hospitalized as a result of wounds received while serving in a combat zone. However, combat pay received by enlisted personnel is fully exempt from Federal income tax.

Mr. Speaker, when these exemptions were set—during the Korean conflict—it was felt that they would benefit commissioned and senior noncommissioned officers equally. However, the seven military pay raises which have been enacted since these exemptions were set have upset the intended balance. Currently, some senior noncommissioned officers receive up to $500 completely exempt from tax. This means that in some cases officers receive a smaller tax exemption than some of the men they lead.

This bill would raise the combat pay tax exemption for officers to $500, and, I believe, that this increase would restore the traditional balance between an exemption of commissioned officers and enlisted men.

Basic fairness would prompt us to correct this inequity regardless of the affected parties. However, the fact that this inequity exists among Americans currently in combat is even further inducement for this Congress to restore the traditional balance by raising the combat exemption for officers.

The Department of Defense strongly supports this legislation and the Bureau of the Budget indicates that the bill is in accord with the President's program.

This legislation effects a truly desirable change in the tax law and I urge all Members to support it.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 17271. This bill amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $200 to $500 the monthly combat pay exclusion for commissioned officers serving in combat zones.

Under present law, the combat pay received by enlisted personnel, including noncommissioned officers, is fully exempt from the Federal income tax. However, the pay of commissioned officers, while sometimes less than the $500 a month received by some senior noncommissioned officers, is taxable to the extent it exceeds $200 per month.

The last time these exemptions were revised was during the Korean war. At that time, it was intended that the exemption would benefit senior noncommissioned officers and commissioned officers in approximately the same manner. However, intervening military pay raises have upset the balance in these provisions. When our men are fighting in Vietnam and daily risking their lives for their country, the Congress has an obligation to insure that the tax laws affect them fairly and impartially.

This legislation was reported unanimously by the Committee and is supported by the interested executive agencies. I strongly urge its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 17271

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (b) of section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out "$200" and inserting in lieu thereof "$500".

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to compensation received in taxable years ending after December 31, 1965, for periods of active service after such date.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROUNDING THE AMOUNT OF STATE AND LOCAL TAXES FOR PURPOSES OF COMPUTING TAX ON CIGARS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 8244) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for rounding the amount of State and local taxes for purposes of computing tax on cigars, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I believe we should have a brief explanation of the bill by the chairman.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8244 relates to the treatment of State and local taxes in determining, for Federal excise tax purposes, the retail price at which cigars are sold.

The Federal excise tax on large cigars—those weighing more than 3 pounds per 1,000 cigars—is imposed on a bracket system, with the rate of tax depending upon the retail price of the cigar. The tax is $2.50 per 1,000 on cigars retailing for not over 2½ cents each, $3 per 1,000 on cigars retailing for not over 4 cents each, $4 per 1,000 on cigars retailing for not over 6 cents, $7 per 1,000 on cigars retailing for not over 8 cents, and so on.

Before 1960, the retail price, for Federal excise tax purposes, included any State taxes that were passed on to the consumer. As a result, a cigar whose principal market was in a State which imposed a tax large enough to put the retail price into the next Federal excise tax bracket was subject to a higher Federal tax than an essentially similar cigar whose principal retail market was in a lower tax State. In 1960, the Congress sought to end this competitive disadvantage by providing that the retail price for this purpose was not to include the amount of the State or local tax imposed upon cigars as a commodity.

It now appears that a substantial element of the discrimination we thought we did away with in 1960 nevertheless remains. If a cigar is made to retail at 6 cents and the State imposes a tax of 1 cent, the 1 cent is disregarded and the retail price for Federal excise tax purposes is 6 cents. The tax imposed is $4 per 1,000. However, if the State imposes a tax of only 0.5 cent, making the price 6½ cents and the retailer rounds up the price to 7 cents, then the State tax is excluded from the retail price for Federal excise tax purposes but the retailer's rounding up is not. In this illustration, the retail price for Federal excise purposes is 6½ cents resulting in a Federal excise tax of $7 per 1,000 upon the manufacturer. This is true even though the retailer keeps the additional 0.5 cent and the manufacturer receives no part of this rounded amount.

The bill provides that, in such cases, the amount of the State tax to be excluded will be rounded up to the next whole cent. In this way, the relief which we had intended to grant in 1960 but which we had not been fully successful in granting, will be made available and the Federal excise tax will not be made to depend upon the rates at which States chose to tax cigars.

This rule will not be applied, however, if rounding would result in reducing the Federal excise tax to a level below that which would be imposed in the absence of State or local taxes.

This provision is to become effective with respect to removals of cigars made on or after the first day of the first calendar quarter which begins more than 30 days after this bill's enactment. The Committee on Ways and Means has voted unanimously to report this bill and the Treasury Department has indicated that it does not oppose its enactment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 8244. This bill is addressed to a peculiar problem arising from the Federal excise tax imposed on cigars.

Briefly, the Federal excise tax is imposed on the ordinary retail price of a cigar. The amount of a State or local tax imposed on the cigar is excluded in computing the ordinary retail price.

It has been called to the committee's attention that a State tax often amounts to a fraction of a cent per cigar, and that the retailer adds the State tax to the basic price of the cigar and then rounds the resulting fraction to the next highest full cent. Thus, if a State imposes a 0.5 cent tax on a cigar selling for 6 cents, the retailer will normally sell the cigar for 7 cents. When the State tax of 0.5 cent is deducted from the 7-

cent retail price, the Federal tax is imposed on the basis of 6½ cents.

Since the Federal tax is imposed on various categories of cigars grouped according to their selling price, a cigar selling for 6½ cents will bear a tax nearly twice as high as a cigar selling for 6 cents. The sharp variation in tax that is attributable to the retailer rounding his price after State taxes distorts the economics of the market, and imposes a severely discriminatory burden in certain cases.

To rectify this situation, the committee bill provides that where the State imposes a tax that is a fractional part of a cent and the retailer rounds it to a full cent in computing his retail price, the rounded amount—the full 1 cent—may be excluded from the retail price in computing the amount on which the Federal tax is based.

In the interest of fairness, I urge the House to support this proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 8244

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 5701(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to rate of tax on cigars) is amended by adding after the penultimate sentence the following new sentence: "For purposes of the preceding sentence, the amount of State or local tax excluded from the retail price shall be the actual tax imposed, except that if the combined taxes result in a numerical figure ending a fraction of a cent, the amount shall be rounded to the next highest full cent."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this bill shall be effective with respect to liabilities for tax on cigars incurred on or after July 1, 1965.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That (a) section 5701(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to rate of tax on cigars) is amended by adding after the penultimate sentence the following new sentence: 'For purposes of the preceding sentence, the amount of State or local tax excluded from the retail price shall be the actual tax imposed; except that, if the combined taxes result in a numerical figure ending in a fraction of a cent, the amount so excluded shall be rounded to the next highest full cent unless such rounding would result in a tax lower than the tax which would be imposed in the absence of State or local tax."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to the removal of cigars on or after the first day of the first calendar quarter which begins more than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. MILLS (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the committee amendment and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO EXTEND THE TIME WITHIN WHICH CERTAIN REQUESTS MAY BE FILED UNDER THE TARIFF SCHEDULES TECHNICAL AMENDMENT ACTS OF 1965

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 13363) to extend the time within which certain requests may be filed under the Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act of 1965, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I ask the chairman for a brief explanation, and I yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 13363 is to continue until the close of December 30, 1966, the time in which importers may request reclassification of imports under certain lower tariff rate provisions provided by the Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act of 1965.

Members of the House will recall that the Technical Amendments Act of 1965 was designed in part to correct certain inadvertent rate increases which resulted from the adoption of the new Tariff Schedules of the United States. The act thus provided for the restoration of certain lower rates of duty which had obtained prior to the adoption of the new schedules.

In order for an importer to receive the benefit of the restorations in duty rates, however, it was necessary under the act for him to file with the appropriate customs officer a request for such changed tariff treatment within 120 days after the act was approved by the President. The last date for applying for this treatment was February 4, 1966.

The Committee on Ways and Means subsequent to the adoption of the Technical Amendments Act of 1965 received numerous complaints indicating that the 120-day period was not sufficient for the gathering of the material necessary to the filing of their applications. The Committee on Ways and Means was unanimous in recommending enactment of the pending bill, H.R. 13363, which will extend the time for making such requests for reclassification until the close of December 30, 1966. The Department of the Treasury provided the committee with a favorable report on this legislation and advises that it anticipates no unusual administrative problems should the period be extended until the close of December 30 of this year, as provided in H.R. 13363.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 13363, a bill to extend the time in which importers may request reclassification of imports under certain tariff rate provisions provided for in the Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act of 1965.

Under the Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act of 1965, the lower rate of duty applicable to certain articles prior to enactment of the Tariff Schedules of 1963 was restored. It was also provided that the restoration of these rates would be retroactive to August 30, 1963, if such articles were entered or withdrawn from warehouses for consumption after that date, and if the importer filed a request for such changed treatment within 120 days after the act was approved by the President.

The last date for applying for this treatment was February 4, 1966. The committee has received numerous letters from various importers stating that the 120-day period for filing was insufficient for them to process all of their claims. The committee is therefore extending the time until the close of December 30, 1966.

The Treasury Department issued a favorable report on this legislation and advised the committee that it will encounter no inordinate administrative problems. The committee was unanimous in recommending extension of this filing period, and I urge favorable action by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection of the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 13363

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (b) of section 2 of the Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–241; 79 Stat. 933) is amended by striking out "on or before the 120th day after the date of the enactment of this Act," and inserting in lieu thereof "on or before December 30, 1966,".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO ESTABLISH A WORKING CAPITAL FUND FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 11158) to establish a working capital fund for the Department of the Treasury, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I ask the chairman for an explanation of the bill, and yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, at the present time, a working capital fund method of financing for centralized services is used by a number of agencies of the Government, including the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Health, Education, and Welfare, Interior, Labor, and State. The recently enacted bills creating the new Department of Transportation also provide for the creation of a similar fund. The experience of those departments with the working capital fund method of financing has demonstrated the value of this method of managing and financing for services.

Presently, the Department of the Treasury is performing, through its salary and expenses appropriation for the Office of the Secretary, various centralized services which benefit a number of Treasury Bureaus financed by separate appropriations.

The Committee on Ways and Means believes that the working capital fund established by this bill would bring the financing, managing, and accounting operations of the Treasury Department in line with the operation of the other departments. The fund established by the bill would consolidate the Treasury Department's operations, place them on a more systematic and businesslike basis, and assist the Department in presenting a more accurate cost-based budget.

The working capital fund, which would be a revolving fund, would finance the central buying of materials, supplies, labor, and other services, the holding and issuing of material and supplies, and the processing of materials into other forms for use. It would also provide a means for accumulating reserves to cover the cost of repairing and replacing equipment and the stocking of supplies under the most advantageous conditions.

So that the Committee on Ways and Means and the Appropriations Committee may be kept informed of the activities of the fund, an annual business-type budget would be prepared by the Treasury Department for submission to the Congress and would be included in the President's budget. The bill also places a limitation of $1 million on the capital in the working fund.

Your committee is unanimous in recommending enactment of H.R. 11158.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 11158, a bill to establish a working capital fund for the Department of the Treasury.

Several agencies of the Government, including the Department of Agriculture, Department of Commerce, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of Interior, Department of Labor, and the Department of State, already have statutory authority to use a working capital fund to finance centralized services. Centralized services include such practices as central buying of materials, supplies, labor, and other services, for the various bureaus that make up a department. The services provided or the supplies procured for the various bureaus at the expense of the working capital fund are reimbursed from appropriations attributable to the various bureaus and their activities.

At the present time the Department of the Treasury is performing various centralized services, on a reimbursable basis, using its salaries and expense appropriation attributable to the Office of the Secretary. The working capital fund established by this bill would permit the Treasury to operate these services on a basis similar to the other agencies listed above. This bill will permit a more businesslike and systematic operation of these functions.

The bill contains provisions that insure that the Appropriations Committee will be kept fully informed of the activities of the fund and the reimubursements made to the fund by the various operating bureaus of the Department of the Treasury.

In order to permit the Treasury Department to bring its operations into line with the prudent businesslike practices now being followed by other departments, I recommend enactment of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 11158

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby established a working capital fund for the Department of the Treasury, which shall be available, without fiscal year limitation, for expenses and equipment necessary for maintenance and operation of such administrative services as the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, determines may be performed more advantageously and more economically as central services. The capital of the fund shall consist of the amount of the fair and reasonable value of such supply inventories, equipment, and other assets and inventories on order, pertaining to the services to be carried on by the fund, as the Secretary of the Treasury may transfer to the fund, less the related liabilities and unpaid obligations, together with any appropriations made for the purpose of providing capital. The fund shall be reimbursed, or credited with advance payments, from applicable appropriations and funds of the Department of the Treasury, other Federal agencies, and other sources authorised by law, for supplies and services at rates which will recover the expense of operations, including accrual of annual leave and depreciation of plant and equipment of the fund. The fund shall also be credited with other receipts from sale or exchange of property or in payment for loss or damage to property held by the fund. There shall be transferred into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, as of the close of each fiscal year, earnings which the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be excess to the needs of the fund. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to provide capital for the fund.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 11, before "shall", insert "shall not exceed $1,000,000 and"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING THAT DICYANDIAMIDE BE ADMITTED DUTY FREE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from consideration of the bill (H.R. 16077) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that dicyandiamide be admitted free of duty and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so only so that the chairman might give us an explanation of the bill, and I yield to the chairman of the committee for that purpose.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, dicyandiamide covered by this bill is used mostly to make melamine, which in turn is reacted with formaldehyde to make plastics used principally in the manufacture of moldings—mainly tableware, laminates, and coatings. Dicyandiamide is not produced in the United States, but is obtained principally from a Canadian plant which is the only producer of this product in North America. Most of our imports of this product come from Canada, Japan, and Norway.

There presently is imposed on imports of dicyandiamide a rate of duty of 10½ percent ad valorem, and the maximum that the rate of duty on dicyandiamide could be reduced by the President pursuant to his trade agreement authority under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 would be 5 percent ad valorem in gradual stages over a period of 4 years.

This bill would authorize the President in a trade agreement to eliminate the duty or to provide for its reduction without staging.

The Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in recommending enactment of H.R. 16077.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 16077, a bill to permit duty-free treatment of dicyandiamide pursuant to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

Under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, the duty on dicyandiamide may be reduced to 5 percent ad valorem in gradual stages over a period of 4 years. This bill would permit the duty to be reduced to zero under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and make the staging requirements inapplicable. However, the remaining provisions of the Trade Expansion Act—relating to requirements concerning negotiations, and so forth—will remain applicable to any reduction of the duty on dicyandiamide.

Your committee was advised that dicyandiamide is used primarily in the manufacture of plastic, used principally in the manufacture of moldings, laminates, and coatings. The committee was also advised that dicyandiamide is not produced in the United States but is obtained principally from a Canadian plant, which is the only producer of dicyandiamide in North America. This bill was unanimously reported by the Ways and Means Committee and I recommend that the bill be passed.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subpart B of part 1 of the appendix to the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C., sec. 1202) is amended by inserting immediately preceding item 911.70 the following new item:

"	911.25	Dicyandiamide (provided for in item 425.40, part 2D, schedule 4) . .	Free	25% ad val.	On or before 6/30/68	"

SEC. 2. (a) The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) Duty-free treatment with respect to dicyandiamide provided for in item 425.40 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States shall not apply after June 30, 1968, except pursuant to a trade agreement which is entered into under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 before the expiration of the authority therein contained or any extension thereof. For purposes of section 201(a)(2) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C., sec. 1821(a)(2)), in the case of such a trade agreement the duty-free treatment provided by item 911.25 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States shall be considered as existing duty-free treatment.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That, for purposes of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, sections 201(b)(1) (relating to limit on decrease in duty) and 253 (relating to staging requirements) of such Act shall not apply with respect to dicyandiamide provided for in item 425.40 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to permit duty-free treatment of dicyandiamide pursuant to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DUTY TREATMENT OF LIMESTONE FOR CEMENT

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from consideration of the bill (H.R. 5950) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to provide for the duty-free entry of limestone, when imported, to be used in the manufacture of cement and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so only that we may have an explanation of the bill, and I yield to the chairman of the committee for that purpose.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the limestone covered by this bill is a commodity of relatively low unit value, and the cost of transportation restricts its movement to short distances.

At the present time, imports of this type of limestone are localized along the Canadian border, principally in the region of the Great Lakes and the State of Washington, and do not move in significant quantities any great distance inland. Presently, limestone imported to be used in the manufacture of cement or for any other purpose, with certain exceptions, is dutiable under the Tariff Schedules of the United States, item 513.34 or item 514.11, depending on the form in which it is imported.

This bill would permit reduction of duty with respect to limestone when imported to be used in the manufacture of cement, provided for in these items of the Tariff Schedules, in accordance with the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, except with respect to staging and the 50-percent limitation.

Your committee is unanimous in recommending enactment of H.R. 5950.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5950

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 201 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1201) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"PAR. . Limestone, when imported to be used in the manufacture of cement."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this section shall apply to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, on or after the date of enactment of this Act, and to articles covered by entries or withdrawals which have not been liquidated or the liquidation of which has not become final on such date of enactment.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That, for purposes of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, sections 201(b)(1) (relating to limit on decrease in duty) and 253 (relating to staging requirements) of such Act shall not apply with respect to limestone, when imported to be used in the manufacture of cement, provided for in item 513.34 or 514.11 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to permit duty-free treatment of limestone, when imported to be used in the manufacture of cement, pursuant to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TARIFF CLASSIFICATION OF CHINESE GOOSEBERRIES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 16160 to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the classification of Chinese gooseberries, and ask for its consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I do not intend to object, I do so in order that the chairman may give the House a brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the fresh Chinese gooseberries covered by this bill, which are unlike the common American gooseberry in physical appearance, were historically traded as berries, and they are botanically classified as berries. Such berries are believed to have originated in China as is suggested by their botanical name, *Actinidia Chinensis*. Imports of the berries, which are now primarily from New Zealand, are small in volume, are relatively high in price, and do not directly compete with any domestic product.

In recent years Chinese gooseberries have been exported from New Zealand under the designation, "Kiwi fruit," in order to associate the product with New Zealand, rather than China, as the country of origin. Because of this appellation, there has developed a trade acceptance of the Chinese gooseberries as fruit rather than as berries, and they have been held technically classifiable for tariff purposes as nonenumerated fresh fruit.

The Committee on Ways and Means, however, believes that the tariff rate applicable to Chinese gooseberries should be more in line with those rates generally applicable to fresh berries than the rates generally applicable to fresh fruit, and is unanimous in recommending enactment of H.R. 16160, as reported, to accomplish this purpose.

Favorable reports on this legislation were received by the Committee on Ways and Means from the Department of the Treasury and the Department of State. An informative report was received from the U.S. Tariff Commission.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 16160

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That schedule 1, part 9, subpart B, headnote 1, of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) is amended by redesignating paragraphs (d) and (e) thereof as paragraphs (e) and (f), respectively, and by inserting immediately after paragraph (c) the following new paragraph:

"(d) the term 'berry' includes the Chinese gooseberry (Actinidia Chinensis Planch.);".

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, on or after the thirtieth day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That schedule 1, part 9, subpart B of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C., sec. 1202) is amended (1) by striking out "Fresh" in item 149.50 and inserting in lieu thereof "Other fruits, fresh", and (2) by inserting immediately before such item the following new item:

149.48	Chinese gooseberries (Actinidia Chinensis Planch.), fresh..	0.75¢ per lb.	1.25¢ per lb.	"

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, on or after the thirtieth day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO ALLOW A FARMER A DEDUCTION FROM GROSS INCOME FOR WATER ASSESSMENTS LEVIED BY IRRIGATION DITCH COMPANIES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 7030) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a farmer a deduction from gross income for water assessments levied by irrigation ditch companies, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to thank the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means for bringing up this bill. I am sure the gentleman has an explanation of it which the gentleman would like to present.

Mr. Speaker, this bill amends the Internal Revenue Code to allow a farmer an amortized deduction from gross income for assessments for depreciable property levied by soil or water conservation or drainage districts.

Under present law, if a farmer incurs capital expenditures for soil or water conservation, he is permitted a deduction up to 25 percent of his gross income from farming. Expenditures for grading and terracing, contour furrowing, and digging drainage ditches would be deductible under this rule. However, expenditures for the acquisition of depreciable property or machinery, even though designed for soil or water conservation purposes, are not deductible, but must be capitalized and depreciated over the useful life of the property.

If a farmer is a member of a soil or water conservation or drainage district, he is permitted to deduct assessments attributable to expenditures for soil or water conservation purposes providing a deduction would have been available if he made the expenditure himself. However, if the district makes an assessment that is attributable to expenditures for the acquisition of depreciable machinery or property, the farmer is not allowed to recover the cost of this assessment through depreciation.

It is believed that the cooperative efforts of farmers to conserve water and soil should be encouraged. The present rules, by disallowing depreciation where the farmer's investment is through a soil or water conservation district, discourages these cooperative endeavors. In order to remedy this defect in our tax laws I recommend that the House act favorably on H.R. 7030.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Montana for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN] is the author of the bill, H.R. 7030.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Montana has had this matter pending before the Committee on Ways and Means since April 1965 join me in apologizing to the gentleman, as the author of this bill, for the delay in its consideration, as we apologize to other authors of bills for the delay that they have encountered in getting to the consideration of their respective bills.

Mr. Speaker, under present law, a farmer can elect to deduct expenditures he pays for items such as grading, contour furrowing, digging of drainage or irrigation ditches, the construction of earthen dams, and so forth. However, in the case of depreciable items such as irrigation pumps or concrete dams, the farmer is allowed deductions only through depreciation allowances.

Where a farmer is a member of a soil or water conservation or drainage district, he may deduct his payment of assessments to the district only in those cases where he could have deducted the item had he paid it currently. As a result, if part of the assessment covers the cost of acquiring depreciable property by the district, this part is never deductible by a farmer member paying an assessment to the district to cover his cost.

Your committee concluded that this was unfair to farmer members of these districts. For that reason, it reported this bill which provides that if a farmer pays an assessment levied by a soil or water conservation or drainage district which is attributable to the acquisition by the district of depreciable property, the amount paid can be deducted for income tax purposes by the farmer on an amortized basis over 10 years. However, if the farmer's share of the assessment for the depreciable assets is more than 10 percent of the total amount assessed against all members, his deduction is limited to 10 percent of the total assessment.

A "soil or water conservation or drainage district" includes a nonprofit irrigation company operated on a mutual basis. It also includes watershed improvement districts, flood control districts, and conservancy districts. This amendment applies to assessments levied after the date of enactment of this bill.

The Treasury Department has indicated that it does not object to the enactment of this bill and the bill has been reported unanimously by your committee.

I urge your support for the adoption of this bill.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, you will agree that the discussion in committee and as stated in the report was that an irrigation company is also covered by the language used in the bill?

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman is right, as I have stated in previous remarks on the bill.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 7030

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to itemized deductions for individuals and corporations) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 183. Expenditures by farmers for assessments levied by irrigation ditch companies.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—A taxpayer engaged in the business of farming may elect to treat water assessments levied upon him by an irrigation ditch company or similar entity in respect of land used in farming and paid by him during the taxable year, where a portion of any such assessment represents capital expenditures, as assessments not including any payment for capital expenditures. To the extent that any assessment so treated is not otherwise allowable as a deduction under section 162, such assessment shall be allowed as a deduction under this section.

"(b) LAND USED IN FARMING.—For purposes of subsection (a), the term 'land used in farming' means land used (before or simultaneously with the assessments described in subsection (a)) by the taxpayer or his tenant for the production of crops, fruits, or other agricultural products or for the sustenance of livestock.

"(c) ELECTION.—The election under subsection (a) for any taxable year shall be made within the time prescribed by law (including extensions thereof) for filing the return for such taxable year. Such election shall be made in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate may by regulations prescribe. Such election may not be revoked except with the consent of the Secretary or his delegate."

(b) The table of sections for part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"Sec. 183. Expenditures by farmers for assessments levied by irrigation ditch companies."

SEC. 2. Section 175 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to soil and water conservation expenditures) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) CROSS REFERENCE.—

"For deduction for expenditures by farmers for assessments levied by irrigation ditch companies, see section 183."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The Clerk read the committee amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That (a) section 175(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to soil and water conservation expenditures) is amended by striking out the third sentence and by inserting in lieu thereof the following new sentences:

"'Notwithstanding the preceding sentences, such term also includes any amount, not otherwise allowable as a deduction, paid or incurred to satisfy any part of an assessment levied by a soil or water conservation or drainage district to defray expenditures made by such district (i) which, if paid or incurred by the taxpayer, would without regard to this sentence constitute expenditures deductible under this section, or (ii) for property of a character subject to the allowance for depreciation provided in section 167 and used in the soil or water conservation or drainage district's business as such (to the extent that the taxpayer's share of the assessment levied on the members of the district for such property does not exceed 10 percent of such assessment). For purposes of this section, in the case of any property described in clause (ii) of the preceding sentence, any amount paid or incurred by the taxpayer during the taxable year and attributable to such property shall be treated as paid or incurred ratably over the taxable year and each of the 9 succeeding taxable years.'

"(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to assessments levied after the date of the enactment of this Act in taxable years ending after such date.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a farmer an amortized deduction from gross income for assessments for depreciable property levied by soil or water conservation or drainage districts."

EXCISE TAX ON SHELLS AND CARTRIDGES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 9280) relating to the excise tax on shells and cartridges, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so to ask the gentleman for an explanation of the bill.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, present law imposes an 11-percent excise tax on the sale by the manufacturer, producer or importer of shells and cartridges.

H.R. 9280 would exempt from this excise tax bird-scaring-type shells and cartridges which are used by farmers and others to protect growing crops from wild birds, for herding wild birds into State and Federal bird sanctuaries, for frightening birds from airports, and for other similar purposes. An example of the type shell which this bill would exempt is a shotgun shell primed with black powder which contains a firecracker rather than steel pellets in its projectile tube. When fired from a gun, the firecracker is propelled a predetermined distance and explodes with a loud report. Obviously, such a shell is useful only in frightening game and would not be used in hunting.

It is felt that devices of the type described were not intended to be included under the excise tax imposed on ordinary shells and cartridges.

Neither the Treasury Department nor the Internal Revenue Service has raised objection to the enactment of this bill and it is believed that the revenue loss resulting from the enactment of this bill would be negligible.

I urge support for the passage of H.R. 9280.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 9280

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 4181 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the excise tax on shells and cartridges) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "For purposes of this part, the term 'shells' and the term 'cartridges' shall not include shells or other devices that contain delayed action explosives and that are specifically designed for use in preventing depredation on agricultural crops by birds."

(b) The amendment made by this Act shall apply to articles sold by the manufacturer, producer, or importer after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The Clerk read the committee amendment, as follows:

Page 1, lines 9 and 10, strike out "preventing depredation on agricultural crops by birds" and insert: "frightening or herding birds without injuring them".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill, as amended, was engrossed and ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DUTY ON CERTAIN NONMALLEABLE IRON CASTINGS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 13116) to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on certain nonmalleable iron castings, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would ask the chairman of the committee for an explanation of the bill.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 13116, introduced by the gentlewoman from Michigan, Hon. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, is to restore to certain unfinished nonmalleable cast-iron machine parts the tariff rate which was applicable to such parts immediately prior to the effective date of the Tariff Schedules of the United States; that is, August 31, 1963.

Unfinished nonmalleable cast-iron parts were dutiable under a general provision of the Tariff Act of 1930 at the rate of 3 percent ad valorem. The general provision for cast-iron castings was not continued in the Tariff Schedules of the United States because it was ambiguous in certain respects. In the tariff classification study preceding the adoption of the Tariff Schedules, the Tariff Commission made a survey to determine the major imports which were being afforded the 3-percent-tariff treatment and created special provisions for such cast-iron products in order to continue the substance of the past tariff treatment. No special provision was created to cover the aforementioned unfinished parts. Moreover, the special provision for unfinished nonmalleable parts for machine tools excludes such parts as are advanced by normalizing by heat treatment.

The Committee on Ways and Means has been informed that significant imports of articles falling within this tariff classification description and the expanded tariff classification description were made prior to August 31, 1963, the effective date of the Tariff Schedules of the United States, and were subject to a 3-percent duty. Testimony before the committee indicated that there is now a substantial amount of import trade in such articles.

The Committee on Ways and Means is of the opinion that the 3-percent tariff rate should be restored to the products covered by this bill, H.R. 13116, and is unanimous in recommending its enactment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 13116

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) schedule 6, part 4, subpart A of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C., sec. 1202) is amended by striking out item 662.20 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"	Other:		
662.18	Cast-iron (except malleable cast-iron) parts, not alloyed and not advanced beyond cleaning, and machined only for the removal of fins, gates, sprues, and risers, or to permit inspection or determination of compliance with specifications, or to permit location in finishing machinery, or painted only for protection from oxidation..	3% ad val.	10% ad val.
662.20	Other................	11.5% ad val.	35% ad val. "

(b) Item 674.51 of such Schedules is amended by striking out "or to permit location in finishing machinery" and inserting in lieu thereof ", or to permit inspection or determination of compliance with specifications, or to permit location in finishing machinery, or painted only for protection from oxidation".

SEC. 2. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), the amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) Upon request therefor filed with the collector of customs concerned on or before the 120th day after the date of the enactment of this Act, the entry or withdrawal of any article—

(1) which was made after August 30, 1963, and before the day after the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(2) with respect to which the amount of duty would be smaller if the amendments made by the first section of this Act applied to such entry or withdrawal.

shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 or any other provision of law, be liquidated or reliquidated as though such entry or withdrawal had been made on the day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The Clerk read the committee amendment, as follows:

Page 1, strike out line 3 and all that follows through line 8 on page 2 and insert:

"That (a) schedule 6, part 4, subpart A of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C., sec. 1202) is amended by striking out item 662.20 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

" '	Other:		
662.18	Cast iron (except malleable cast iron) parts, not alloyed and not advanced beyond cleaning or normalizing by heat treatment, and machined only for the removal of fins, gates, sprues, and risers or for the determination of the porosity of the casting, or to permit location in finishing machinery, or painted only for protection from oxidation..........	3% ad val.	10% ad val.
662.20	Other................	11.5% ad val.	35% ad val. '

"(b) Item 674.51 of such Schedules is amended by inserting before the comma immediately after 'cleaning' the words 'or normalizing by heat treatment' and by striking out 'or to permit location in finishing machinery' and inserting in lieu thereof, 'or for the determination of the porosity of the casting, or to permit location in finishing machinery, or painted only for protection from oxidation'."

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13116, a bill to restore to certain unfinished nonmalleable cast-iron machine parts the tariff rate which was applicable to such parts immediately prior to the effective date of the Tariff Schedules of 1963.

Prior to the enactment of the Tariff Schedules of 1963, unfinished nonmalleable cast iron parts of machinery for labeling or cleaning bottles and containers and for other purposes were dutiable at 3 percent ad valorem under a general provision of the tariff schedules. The Tariff Schedules of 1963 contained this 3-percent treatment under newly enacted special provisions for the major import items that had been receiving the 3-percent-tariff treatment. The major import items included in the new special provisions were based on the tariff classification study conducted by the Tariff Commission prior to the enactment of the Tariff Schedules of 1963.

The committee has been informed that there were significant imports prior to 1963 of the nonmalleable cast iron machine parts with which this bill is concerned. This bill therefore will restore to these unfinished nonmalleable cast iron machine parts the tariff rate which was applicable to such parts immediately prior to the effective date of the Tariff Schedules of 1963. I urge that the House pass this measure.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks with respect to the bills that have just been passed and that the authors of the bills may do likewise and also that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] may likewise extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PRIVATE PENSION PLANS AND THE SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable discussion concerning a recent announcement by the Department of the Treasury involving private pension plans and their relation to the social security system.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a full explanation of this matter for the purposes of clarification for the benefit of the membership of the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable discussion concerning a recent announcement by the Treasury Department involving private pension plans and their relation to the social security system. Unfortunately, many of the statements give a misleading impression of what the Treasury Department is doing. I think it is important, therefore, that the record be set straight on this important matter so that it may be considered in a careful and rational manner.

The Internal Revenue Code prescribe certain standards which must be met by a company's pension plan in order for it to qualify for the special tax rules applicable to so-called qualified plans. One of these standards is that the plan must not provide a higher level of benefits, in relation to salary, for the company's highly paid employees than are provided for the rank and file of employees. In determining whether this statutory nondiscrimination test has been met, a company is permitted to take credit for the social security benefits it provides for its employees through the social security taxes it pays.

In applying this credit for social security benefits, it is necessary to determine not only the total value of an employee's social security benefits but also what portion of that value may fairly be considered to be provided by the company, in the light of the fact that the social security benefits are jointly purchased through a tax on both the company and the employee. It is this computation that is the subject of the recent Treasury annoucement.

The Treasury Department regulations presently contain a mathematical formula for computing the portion of an employee's social security benefits for which the company may take credit under its pension plan. Since the formula is based on the benefits and wage levels under the social security system, it has had to be revised each time there is a change in these elements of the social security system. Because of the gradual nature of the social security changes prior to 1965, there has not been any major change in the results under the formula.

However, the Social Security Amendments of 1965 represented the most comprehensive changes which have ever been made at one time in our social security system. That act included significant changes in both the contribution and benefits structure and the level of wages subject to the social security tax. In view of the great significance of these changes and their direct relation to the formula which has been used for some time for integrating pension plans, the Treasury Department decided recently that an examination of its prior approach in this area was necessary and desirable. As the first step in this examination, the Internal Revenue Service published an announcement—No. 66–58, dated September 19, 1966—requesting background information and suggestions for its use in developing an appropriate formula for integrating pension plans with social security to take into account the 1965 social security amendments.

Mr. Speaker, the Treasury Department should be commended for taking this sound and careful approach to the problem. It will give the many pension experts in this country an opportunity to present their ideas to the Treasury Department before it arrives at any proposed rule. Similarly, it will give the thousands of companies with pension plans an opportunity to supply data as to the cost impact of possible changes in the social security integration formula. I believe this is an excellent opportunity for interested companies and pension experts to take a constructive part in the development of the rules in this area.

As part of the background material—designed to be helpful to those interested in presenting their views—the Revenue Service included in the September 19 announcement the details of the calculation of a formula based on a mathematical approach largely following concepts used in the existing regulations. Unfortunately, many persons have gotten the impression that this formula represents the rule the Treasury intends to adopt. This clearly is not the case, as evidenced by a recent Revenue Service release—Technical Information Release No. 859, October 5, 1966—specifically stating that the formula does not represent a proposed rule but was merely included for the purpose of furnishing data to enable interested persons to be informed of the possible results of applying mathematical concepts in the light of the 1965 Social Security Amendments.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Treasury Department and the Revenue Service have done their best to clear up any misunderstanding about this matter—so that interested companies and pension experts may direct their thinking toward developing constructive ideas and furnishing helpful data. The Treasury Department's careful approach in this area gives those interested an excellent opportunity to take a meaningful part in the development of new rules. I hope they will take advantage of it and not merely take the negative step of arguing against any change. I am advised that interested parties have until November 30 for the submission of their comments.

After the Treasury Department has had an opportunity to examine the ideas and data it receives as a result of this announcement, it will then, I understand, publish a proposed rule and invite comments on it.

The Internal Revenue Service release and announcement follow:

Technical Information Release, October 5, 1966

The Internal Revenue Service today emphasized that the purpose of Announcement 66–58, Internal Revenue Bulletin 1966–38, 87, was to seek background information for use in developing the formula for integration of pension, annuity, profit-sharing, and stock bonus plans with old-age and survivor insurance benefits as changed by the 1965 amendments to the Social Security Act.

The formula set forth in Announcement 66–58 should not in any way be construed as one which is being proposed at this time. The Revenue Service stated that it included this formula in the announcement merely for the purpose of furnishing data to enable interested persons to be informed of the possible results of applying traditional mathematical concepts in light of the 1965 Social Security Amendments.

In the announcement, the Revenue Service requested that written statements be submitted to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Attention: CC:LR:T, Washington, D.C. 20224, as soon as possible but no later than October 21, 1966. The Revenue Service has extended the time for submitting written comments until October 28, 1966.

Part VI. Items of General Interest Except Those Relating to Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms Taxes, Which Are in Part III

INTEGRATION OF PENSION PLANS, ETC., WITH SOCIAL SECURITY—ANNOUNCEMENT 66–58

The Internal Revenue Service desires background information for its use in developing the formula for integrating pension, annuity, profit-sharing, and stock bonus plans with the old-age and survivors insurance benefits provided under the Social Security Act as amended in 1965 [P.L. 89–97, C.B. 1965–2, 601].

This information should be submitted in the form of written statements addressed to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Attention: CC:LR:T, Washington, D.C. 20224. A public hearing may be held for the purpose of further developing matters raised in the statements. The statements should be submitted no later than October 21, 1966.

The following material is set forth for use in connection with the preparation of the statements.

Pertinent statutory and regulations provisions

Section 401(a)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 contains provisions which are intended to permit the qualification under section 401 of pension, annuity, profit-sharing, and stock bonus plans (hereinafter referred to as employee plans) which supplement the old-age and survivors insurance benefits under the Social Security Act.

Section 1.401–3(e) of the Income Tax Regulations provides that, in determining whether an employee plan meets the nondiscrimination tests of section 401, the Commissioner will consider whether the total benefits resulting to each employee under the plan and under the Social Security Act, or under the Social Security Act, or under the Social Security Act only establish an integrated and correlated retirement system satisfying the tests of section 401(a). In amplification of this provision, the regulations presently establish the general formula for the integration of employee plans with benefits provided by the Social Security Act as amended through 1958 [P.L. 85–840, C.B. 1958–3, 85]. Underlying this formula are the assumptions that the total old-age survivor insurance benefits with respect to an employee are considered to be 150 percent of the employee's old-age insurance benefits and that the proportion of such total benefits which is attributable to employee contributions is considered to be approximately 22 percent of such total benefits.

As an example of the application of this formula, the regulations provide that a classification of employees under a noncontributory pension or annuity plan which is limited to employees earning in excess of $4,800 a year (the maximum amount of wages subject to the social security tax prior to the 1965 amendments) will not be considered discriminatory if normal annual retirement benefits for any employee cannot exceed 37½ percent of his average annual compensation in excess of $4,800 and the plan meets the other specifications set forth in subdivisions (i) through (vi) of § 1.401–3(e)(2) of the Regulations.

Effect of 1965 Social Security Amendments

The Social Security Amendments of 1965 raised the maximum amount of wages subject to the social security tax from $4,800 to $6,600 and, in addition, made changes in both the contribution and benefit structure. In view of the significance of these changes, which are considerably greater in amount and scope than any prior change, and their direct relation to the formula for integrating employee plans, the Revenue Service believes that a comprehensive review of the existing integration formula and its application is necessary. It is within this context that the Service desires the views of interested persons on what the appropriate standard should be and how it should be applied on a transitional basis.

Formula using mathematical approach

As further background material, there are described below the details of the calculation of a revised integration formula which would appear to result if a mathematical approach were adopted which largely follows concepts used in the existing regulations.

Under the Social Security Act as amended in 1965, the maximum old-age insurance benefit, payable in the case of an eligible employee who retires in 1966, is $132.70 per month, or 34.5 percent of average monthly wage. For an eligible employee who retires in the year 2004 (the first year in which an employee could receive the maximum old-age insurance benefits payable under the act), the maximum old-age insurance benefit will be $168, or 30.5 percent of average monthly wage. The average of these two percentages (representing the benefits payable to the average employee now in the work force) is 32.5 percent.

The total old-age and survivor insurance benefits with respect to an employee continue to be approximately equal in value to 150 percent of his old-age insurance benefits. Thus, the total maximum OASI benefits with respect to the average employee now in the work force may be considered as equivalent to a straight life annuity beginning at age 65 (or at later retirement) of 48.75 percent of average monthly wage (150 percent times 32.5 percent).

In the past, it has been the practice to compute the percentage of the cost of the social security benefits which is contributed by the employee and to attribute the remainder to the employer. Data indicate that the average employee now in the work force will retire in 1990. Moreover, such data indicate that such an average employee who is eligible for the maximum benefits will contribute 52.5 percent (assuming a 3½-percent interest rate) or 56.8 percent (assuming a 3¾-percent interest rate) of the cost of his social security benefits. These figures would lead to the conclusion that under the traditional approach, less than 50 percent of an employee's social security benefits is attributable to the employer.

However, there is considerable doubt as to whether this is a realistic method for allocating benefits between the employer and employee, especially in view of the fact that the social security system is funded through equal contributions by the employer and employee. For purposes of the calculations set forth in this release, 50 percent of the total benefits is attributed to the employee and 50 percent to the employer.

Example of application of mathematical formula

On the basis of these calculations and following the rationale that the employer is to be given credit for his share of his employees' total old-age and survivor insurance benefits, a classification of employees under a noncontributory pension or annuity plan which, with respect to service prior to January 1, 1966, limits coverage to employees earning in excess of $4,800 a year and, with respect to service on and after such date, limits coverage to employees earning in excess of $6,600 a year, would not be considered discriminatory where:

(1) Normal annual retirement benefits for any employee cannot exceed the sum of (*a*) 24 percent of his average annual compensation in excess of $4,800 multiplied by his pre-1966 service percentage, and (*b*) 24 percent of his average annual compensation in excess of $6,600 multiplied by his post-1965 service percentage. For this purpose, an employee's "pre-1966 service percentage" is the percentage of his total service with the employer which was performed before January 1, 1966, and his "post-1965 service percentage" is the percentage of his total service with the employer which was performed after December 31, 1965.

(2) Average annual compensation is defined to mean the average annual compensation over the highest 5 consecutive years.

(3) There are no benefits payable in case of death before retirement.

(4) The normal form of retirement benefit is a straight life annuity, and if there are optional forms, the benefit payments are adjusted so that the total value of the optional form is the same as the value of the normal form of retirement benefits.

(5) Normal retirement benefits for employees who reach normal retirement age before completion of 15 years of service with the employer cannot exceed 1.6 percent of average annual compensation in excess of $4,800 for each year of service before January 1, 1966, and 1.6 percent of average annual compensation in excess of $6,600 for each year of service after December 31, 1965.

(6) Normal retirement age is not lower than age 65.

(7) Benefits payable in case of retirement or severance of employment before normal retirement age cannot exceed the actuarial equivalent of that proportion of the maximum normal retirement benefits, which might be provided in accordance with (1) through (6) above, earned to the date of actual retirement or severance, where such proportion is determined by the ratio that the actual number of years of service of the employee at retirement or severance bears to the total number of years of service he would have had if he had remained in service until normal retirement age.

Treatment of existing integrated plans

In view of the fact that such a mathematical formula would result in a significant change in the permissible integration percentage, it would seem appropriate to consider transitional arrangements so as not to substantially affect benefits already earned. As further background material, the following possible transition provision could be provided in connection with a mathematical formula of the type described above or any formula resulting in a significant change in the integration percentage:

A plan which, on the day before the enactment of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 [P.L. 89–97, C.B. 1965–2, 601], was properly integrated with old-age and survivor insurance benefits as in effect on such day would be considered to be properly integrated with the Social Security Act after such day if the benefits for any employee could not exceed the sum of—

(1) The benefits to which he would be entitled under the plan as in effect on the day before the enactment of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 multiplied by his pre-1966 service percentage (as defined above); and

(2) The maximum benefits to which he would be entitled by applying the above described revised integration formula (computed as if all his service with the employer was performed after December 31, 1965) multiplied by his post-1965 service percentage.

Type of information and comments desired

As indicated above, the integration formula set forth in this announcement is what would appear to result from applying mathematical principles to the new Social Security structure. The written statements would be most helpful if directed to:

(1) Commenting on whether this formula is mathematically sound;

(2) Describing how specific plans would adjust to meet a new integration formula of this nature and its transitional application with a specific indication of the cost implication;

(3) Discussing the reasons (if any) why a mathematical approach should not be adopted, together with an indication of an alternative or alternatives and their cost implications;

(4) Discussing other possible transitional arrangements and the extent to which a transitional arrangement is needed under any suggested alternative approaches.

In view of the importance of prescribing the new integration formula, persons desiring to submit written statements are urged to do so as soon as possible.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1967

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 14745) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies. for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2331)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14745) "making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 18, 53, 60, 66, 67, 68, and 69.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 16, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48, 50, 51, 52, 54, 55, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63, and 71; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$17,922,000 which may be expended from the employment security administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund, of which not to exceed $1,725,500 shall be available for activities of the farm labor services, and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$278,016,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$208,225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$383,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$35,150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$164,770,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,858,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 5, 15, 32, 45, 65, and 70.

JOHN E. FOGARTY,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS,
BILLIE S. FARNUM,
GEORGE MAHON,
MELVIN R. LAIRD,
ROBERT H. MICHEL,
GARNER E. SHRIVER,
Managers on the Part of the House.
LISTER HILL,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOHN STENNIS,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
NORRIS COTTON,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14745) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Manpower Administration

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2: Appropriate $390,044,000 for Manpower Development and Training Activities as proposed by the Senate instead of $400,044,000 as proposed by the House, and provide that these funds will remain available until June 30, 1968 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 3 and 4: Appropriate $30,900,000 for the Office of Manpower Administrator, Salaries and Expenses, as proposed by the Senate instead of $35,900,000 as proposed by the House, and provide that these funds will remain available until June 30, 1968 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Employment Security

Amendment No. 5: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which appropriates $524,000,000 for Grants to States for Unemployment Compensation and Employment Service Administration instead of $508,950,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 6: Provides that $12,000,000 of the immediately preceding appropriation shall be set aside for the contingency fund as proposed by the Senate instead of $10,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 7: Deletes the appropriation for Advances for Employment Services as proposed by the Senate instead of appropriating $23,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 8 and 9: Appropriate $90,000,000 for Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees and Ex-servicemen as proposed by the Senate instead of $100,000,000 as proposed by the House, and provide that not to exceed $5,000,000 of the amount appropriated shall be available for benefit payments for trade adjustment activities as authorized in the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965.

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates $17,922,000 for Salaries and Expenses instead of $18,172,000 as proposed by the House and $17,222,000 as proposed by the Senate, and provides that not to exceed $1,725,500 shall be available for activities of the Farm Labor Services instead of not to exceed $1,475,500 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Food and Drug Administration

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates $60,000,000 for Salaries and Expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $63,454,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $3,130,000 for Buildings and Facilities as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,080,000 as proposed by the House.

Office of Education

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates $278,016,000 for Expansion and Improvement of Vocational Education instead of $290,041,000 as proposed by the House and $272,291,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14: Provides that $208,225,000 of the appropriation for Expansion and Improvement of Vocational Education shall be for programs under section 4 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 instead of $220,250,000 as proposed by the House and $202,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which will make $198,225,000 of the appropriation for Expansion and Improvement of Vocational Education available for grants to States under section 4 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 instead of $192,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16: Provides that not to exceed $10,000,000 of the appropriation for Expansion and Improvement of Vocational Education shall be available for research and special project activities under section 4 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21: Appropriate $383,900,000 for Higher Educational Activities instead of $403,900,000 as proposed by the House and $373,900,000 as proposed by the Senate, and allocate funds within this appropriation as follows: $10,000,000 shall be for grants for college and university extension education under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 as proposed by the House instead of "not in excess of $10,000,000" as proposed by the Senate $114,500,000 shall be for programs under Part A of Title IV of that Act as proposed by the Senate instead of $122,000,000 as proposed by the House; $112,000,000 shall be for educational opportunity grants as proposed by the Senate instead of $119,500,000 as proposed by the House; and $30,000,000 shall be for the program under Part C of Title V of that Act as proposed by the Senate. The House had no specific allocation for the last program which would have resulted in $42,500,000 being available for it.

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $7,500,000 for the National Teacher Corps as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23: Provides that no part of the appropriation for Payments to School Districts shall be available to carry out the provisions of legislation enacted after June 30, 1966, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 24, 25, and 26: Appropriate $446,357,000 for Defense Educational Activities as proposed by the Senate instead of $431,357,000 as proposed by the House; allocate $88,200,000 for grants to States and loans to non-profit private schools for equipment and minor remodeling under Title III of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, as amended, as proposed by the Senate instead of $63,200,000 as proposed by the House; and provide that allotments under sections 302(a) and 305 for equipment and minor remodeling shall be made on the basis of $79,200,000 for grant to States as proposed by the Senate instead of on the basis of $54,200,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates $70,000,000 for Research and Training as proposed by the Senate instead of $80,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates $1,000,000 for Educational Research (special foreign currency program) as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,800,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates $3,000,000 for Foreign Language Training and Area Studies as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates $35,150,000 for Salaries and Expenses instead of $39,095,000 as proposed by the House and $33,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31: Provides that $100,000 of the appropriation for Salaries and Expenses shall be available only for the National Advisory Committee on Education of the Deaf as authorized by P.L. 89–258.

Amendment No. 32: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which will retain the Senate amendment language that provides that $100,000 of the appropriation for Salaries and Expenses shall be available only for the National Conference on Education of the Deaf and adds language that provides that $150,000 of this appropriation shall be available only for transfer to the appropriation "Office of the Secretary, Salaries and Expenses" for a comprehensive study of the administration of training programs financed partially or wholly with Federal funds. The conferees do not intend that this study include training programs that agencies operate for their own employees or training of professional personnel but rather training under such programs as Vocational Education, institutional and on-the-job training under the Manpower Development and Training Act, Apprenticeship and Training Program, Job Corps, specialized training programs under Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act, Work Experience Program, Work-Study Program, Neighborhood Youth Corps, etc.

This study is to have as its principal purposes to determine if there is waste, duplication, and inefficiency in administering these programs as many individual programs and, if this determination is in the affirmative, to make recommendations for correction. The study is to be made by a committee of experts in the field, none of whom are to be Federal Government employees, to be appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare after consultation with the Secretary of Labor and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. It is the opinion of the conferees that it would be preferable if the committee's staff was also selected from outside the Federal Government.

Vocational Rehabilitation Administration

Amendments Nos. 33 and 34: Appropriate $244,060,000 for Grants for Rehabilitation Services and Facilities as proposed by the Senate instead of $259,060,000 as proposed by the House, and allocate $221,000,000 for grants under section 2 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act as proposed by the Senate instead of $236,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates $3,000,000 for Research and Training (special foreign currency program) instead of $4,000,000 as proposed by the House and $2,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Public Health Service

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates $91,614,000 for Chronic Diseases and Health of the Aged as proposed by the Senate instead of $90,614,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates $124,280,000 for Community Health Practice and Research as proposed by the Senate instead of $124,190,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 38 and 39: Appropriate $21,597,000 for Control of Tuberculosis as proposed by the Senate instead of $20,597,000 as proposed by the House, and allocate $14,950,000 for project grants as proposed by the Senate instead of $13,950,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 40: Appropriates $9,693,000 for Dental Services and Resources as proposed by the Senate instead of $9,193,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 41: Earmarks $27,000,000 of the appropriation for Construction of Health Education Facilities to be available for the purposes authorized by subsection (2) of section 720 of the Public Health Service Act as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 42: Appropriates $6,592,000 for Occupational Health as proposed by the Senate instead of $6,342,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates $20,895,000 for Radiological Health as proposed by the Senate instead of $20,395,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates $145,113,000 for the National Institute of General Medical Sciences as proposed by the Senate instead of $142,613,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 45: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which provides that $1,000,000 of the appropriation for the National Institute of General Medical Sciences shall be available for the training of clinical anesthesiologists.

Amendment No. 46: Appropriates $64,922,000 for the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development as proposed by the Senate instead of $61,422,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 47: Appropriates $175,656,000 for the National Cancer Institute as proposed by the Senate instead of $170,656,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 48: Appropriates $264,119,000 for the National Institute of Mental Health as proposed by the Senate instead of $258,119,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 49: Appropriates $164,770,000 for the National Heart Institute instead of $154,770,000 as proposed by the House and $169,770,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 50: Appropriates $135,687,000 for the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases as proposed by the Senate instead of $133,687,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 51: Appropriates $90,670,000 for the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases as proposed by the Senate instead of $88,670,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 52: Appropriates $116,296,000 for the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness as proposed by the Senate instead of $111,296,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees are agreed that not less than $1,000,000 of the increase shall be for activities in the field of Parkinson's disease.

Amendment No. 53: Appropriates $56,000,000 for grants for Construction of Health Research Facilities as proposed by the House instead of $81,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 54: Appropriates $10,000,000 for Scientific Activities Overseas (special foreign currency program) as proposed by the Senate instead of $19,217,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 55: Appropriates $20,192,000 for the National Library of Medicine as proposed by the Senate instead of $20,092,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 56: Appropriates, $7,858,000 for Salaries and Expenses, Office of the Surgeon General instead of $8,069,000 as proposed by the House and $7,648,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Water Pollution Control Administration

There are no differences between the House and Senate bills with regard to the appropriations for the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration. However, the conferees are taking this opportunity to make it a matter of formal record that the House and Senate approve the exact amount of the budget requests with the expectation that the breakdown of the requests by project and activity that appear in the justifications submitted to the two committees on appropriations would be followed. The conferees are agreed that this shall be done.

Saint Elizabeths Hospital

Amendment No. 57: Appropriates $2,298,000 for Buildings and Facilities as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,138,000 as proposed by the House.

Social Security Administration

Amendment No. 58: Appropriates $43,189,000 for Construction as proposed by the Senate instead of $26,250,000 as proposed by the House.

Welfare Administration

Amendment No. 59: Appropriates $3,700,000,000 for Grants to States for Public Assistance as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,746,400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 60: Appropriates $3,150,000 for Cooperative Research or Demonstration Projects as proposed by the House instead of $2,650,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees reached this agreement with the understanding that these funds are to be used for effecting economies in the welfare programs.

Amendment No. 61: Appropriates $1,500,000 for Research and Training (special foreign currency program) as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Special Institutions

Amendment No. 62: Appropriates $2,520,000 for Gallaudet College, Salaries and Expenses, as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,485,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 63: Appropriates $70,000 for Gallaudet College, Construction, as proposed by the Senate instead of $50,000 as proposed by the House.

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 64: Appropriates $7,350,000 for Salaries and Expenses instead of $7,531,000 as proposed by the House and $7,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 65: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which provides that the position now designated as Comptroller shall hereafter be designated as Assistant Secretary, Comptroller. No salary adjustment is involved.

General provisions

Amendment No. 66: Deletes language proposed by the Senate and restores the language proposed by the House regarding the requirement for cost sharing on the part of research grant recipients.

There have been allegations of pirating of research personnel and research grants among institutions of higher education by one institution outbidding others with regard to the amount of their own funds they would contribute under the granting agency's cost sharing requirements.

The principal of cost sharing was never intended to result in such practices. The conferees deplore such practices and are very pleased that an investigation has revealed no evidence that this has happened in connection with grants by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. It is directed that procedures be developed that will prevent such practices elsewhere in connection with Federal grants.

Precisely the same language requiring cost sharing was included in the three appropriation bills for 1966 covering most of the research grant funds of the Federal Government. The obvious objective of Congress was to achieve uniformity in cost sharing policies and requirements. The conferees have found that there is a great disparity rather than uniformity among the departments and agencies involved due to great differences in regulations established to carry out this uniform language of the appropriation laws.

The conferees will expect immediate action by the Bureau of the Budget to secure uniformity in the Executive Branch's policies and requirements with respect to cost sharing and will expect that they will be such as to eliminate the possibility of cost sharing requirements being used as a mechanism for the pirating referred to above.

Amendment No. 67: Restores language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate regarding the collection of interest earned on Federal grant funds.

Amendment No. 68: Adjusts section number.

Amendment No. 69: Strikes language proposed by the Senate pertaining to segregation of hospital patients. The managers on the part of the Senate receded only after receiving the following letters on this subject from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare:

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., October 12, 1966.

Hon. LISTER HILL,
Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY,
Managers of the Conference Committee on the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, Fiscal Year 1967, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: At your request I have again reviewed Section 206 of the HEW Appropriations Bill (H.R. 14745) as passed by the Senate on September 27. This letter will supplement and clarify my letter of October 7 addressed to each of you, in which I recommend deletion of this section. As indicated in my earlier letter, it is our policy to permit either attending physicians, the medical staff, or the hospital administrator's designee to make segregated room assignments wherever, in their judgment, there are valid medical reasons or special compelling circumstances that indicate need to segregate a patient on an individual basis.

In carrying out the provisions of Title VI cf the Civil Rights Act of 1964 during this current fiscal year, you can be assured that I and the staff responsible for this activity at all levels will honor determinations made by physicians that are based on a valid medical reason for making room assignments in a hospital on a segregated basis. We will consider this determination to be conclusive as it applies to a specific patient. We will disregard patient assignments made in accordance with a medical determination in evaluating the hospital's compliance with the provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act subject only to the qualification set forth below.

If it appears that over a period of time segregation is being practiced as a matter of policy by the flagrant misuse of medical determinations, we would be obligated to review and make a determination as to whether Title VI was being complied with.

We share with you the concern that the health of the patient be uppermost in our considerations and we assure you that we will endeavor to administer our responsibilities governed by this policy.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. GARDNER, *Secretary.*

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., October 18, 1966.
Hon. LISTER HILL,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and Related Agencies Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HILL: I appreciated the opportunity to meet with you and your colleagues to discuss the administration of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as it applies to hospitals. I would like to use this opportunity to confirm our discussions and to summarize the several letters, memoranda, and documents which we have made available to you on this subject.

It is our policy to permit either attending physicians, the medical staff, or the hospital administrators' designees to make segregated room assignments wherever in their judgment there are valid medical reasons or special compelling circumstances that indicate need to segregate a patient on an individual basis.

In carrying out the provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 during this current fiscal year, you can be assured that I and the staff responsible for this activity at all levels will honor determinations made by physicians that are based on a valid medical reason for making room assignments in a hospital on a segregated basis. We will consider this determination to be conclusive as it applies to a specific patient. We will disregard patient assignments made in accordance with a medical determination in evaluating the hospital's compliance with the provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act subject only to the qualification set forth below.

If it appears that over a period of time segregation is being practiced as a matter of policy by the flagrant misuse of medical determinations, we would be obligated to review and make a determination as to whether Title VI was being complied with.

We not only have no plans for modifying the regulations or guidelines that pertain to physician determinations but we do not contemplate any other change in regulations or guidelines affecting hospitals for the remainder of this fiscal year under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act.

A hospital's participation in the Medicare program is of course wholly voluntary. The method of effecting participation is the submission of an agreement signed on behalf of the hospital, relating to the acceptance of the Government payments in satisfaction of the hospital's bills to Medicare beneficiaries. Even though the hospital has been found to meet the quality standards of the Medicare program, its agreement is not accepted and countersigned on behalf of the Government unless the hospital has signed also the necessary civil rights assurance and has been found to be in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Once a hospital's agreement to participate has been countersigned and returned to the hospital, it is entitled to participate in the program and to receive payment for services to Medicare beneficiaries. If thereafter a question of its compliance with Title VI arises, the hospital continues to be entitled to participate and to receive payment while the various steps outlined in Title VI and our procedural regulations are in process. Once a hospital has received the countersigned agreement, in other words, its participation in the Medicare program or its right to payments cannot be terminated on civil rights grounds until it has been accorded opportunity for hearing in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act, administrative review has been completed, and an adverse decision has lain for thirty days before the appropriate Congressional committees. An alternative to this procedure would be consideration of a case by the courts rather than use of our administrative procedures. Under such circumstances, payments would of course continue.

Where the hospital's application fails to include the required assurance or the assurance is inadequate on its face or where it appears that the assurances are untrue or not being followed, every effort is made to effect corrective action by voluntary compliance. If this is not successful, the hospital is notified in writing of the reasons action on the application is being deferred. The procedures provide that promptly following the notice of deferral, the applicant will be given an opportunity to respond in writing and will be given an opportunity for a hearing under the Administrative Procedure Act, and that any final decision to deny the application will be delayed until it has lain for 30 days before the appropriate congressional committees. With respect to those instances where voluntary compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act fails and it becomes necessary to go to a hearing, it is estimated that it will take five to six months or longer to accomplish all of the various procedural steps provided for in the regulations.

As you know, we have not had sufficient experience thus far to arrive at a specific period of time but on the basis of other activities where comparable procedures subject to Administrative Procedure Act are used, this would appear to be a reasonable approximation of the necessary time.

You raised questions about the phraseology used in the assurance form and indicated concern that it might be misinterpreted. I am requesting the General Counsel to look into the terminology used on this form. I will keep you informed of the results of this exploration.

We are pleased that it has been possible to enter into agreements with 97 percent of the hospitals, to participate in providing services to Medicare beneficiaries. We are hopeful that the experience of the participating hospitals will encourage the nonparticipating hospitals to take such steps a may be necessary to effect voluntary compliance with Title VI. It is our purpose to extend the benefits of public programs to all of our citizens and to accomplish the purpose of the Civil Rights Act of assuring nondiscrimination in the administration of these programs. It is not our intent to establish a system of quotas but rather to assure nondiscriminatory treatment for all persons without regard to race, color or national origin.

We share with you the concern that the health of the patient be uppermost in our considerations and we assure you that we will endeavor to administer our responsibilities governed by this policy.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. GARDNER, *Secretary.*

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., October 19, 1966.
HON. LISTER HILL,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HILL: In my letter to you yesterday dated October 18, 1966, I indicated that I had requested the General Counsel to look into certain terminology used in the assurance form.

I am pleased to report that we have completed the review of one of the aspects of this assurance form which concerned you. You indicated concern that the first sentence of the Assurance (Form No. HEW-441, 12-64) might be interpreted as an agreement not only to comply with the present Regulation but with subsequent modification to this Regulation. General Counsel advises me that it is clear that the assurance relates only to the Regulation in effect at the time the agreement is entered into. The Acting Attorney General concurs in the view.

You also indicated concern with the meaning of the term "immediately" as used in the first paragraph of the Assurance Form. We are exploring the points you have raised as to the interpretation and application of this term. We will be working with the Department of Justice and other relevant officials in this review. We want to respond to your inquiry in a thoughtful and thorough manner and to see that our administration of the Civil Rights Act is uniform and consistent among government agencies and programs. Thus, it will probably take a week or so to complete our consultations and reviews. You can be assured that we will actively pursue this point and inform you of the results of our review as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. GARDNER,
Secretary.

Amendment No. 70: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which inserts language limiting the number of permanent Federal positions in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the Washington, D.C. area.

Amendment No. 71: Makes $7,500 available to the Secretary of Labor and to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for official reception and representation expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $5,000 as proposed by the House.

JOHN E. FOGARTY,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS,
BILLIE S. FARNUM,
GEORGE MAHON,
MELVIN R. LAIRD,
ROBERT H. MICHEL,
GARNER E. SHRIVER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on this conference report.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, with the exception of Senate amendment No. 69, the Stennis amendment, there was less controversy regarding the Senate amendments to the Labor-HEW bill this year than there has been for many years. While there were 71 Senate amendments, the differences were relatively small in most instances.

If the conference action is adopted, which I am sure will be the case, the final bill will be under both the House and the Senate. It will be under the House by

$110,028,000 and under the Senate by $10,650,000. It is over the budget estimate by approximately $380 million but this is only true as a result of reductions which were made in the President's budget on the assumption that certain authorizations would be cut back—primarily the aid to schools in federally impacted areas legislation and the legislation authorizing direct student loans. This proposed legislation was not enacted.

I will include as a part of my remarks a table which will show the conference action compared with the 1966 appropriation, the 1967 budget estimate, the House bill, and the Senate bill:

	1966 appropriation	1967 budget estimate	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						1966 appropriation	Budget estimate	House	Senate
Department of Labor	$707, 666, 400	$696, 480, 000	$686. 220, 000	$638, 220, 000	$638, 220, 000	−$69, 446, 400	−$58, 260, 000	−$48, 000, 000	
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	8, 101, 148, 500	9, 329, 740, 500	9. 830. 088, 500	9, 778, 125, 500	9, 768, 060, 500	+1, 666, 912, 000	+438, 320, 000	−62, 028, 000	−$10, 650, 000
Related agencies	54, 244, 100	56, 964, 000	56, 964, 000	56, 964, 000	56, 964, 000	+2, 719, 900			
Total	8, 863, 059, 000	10,083,184,500	10,573,272,500	10,473,309,500	10,463,244,500	+1, 600, 185, 500	+380, 060, 000	−110, 028, 000	−10, 650, 000

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier, the only real controversy between the House and the Senate was on amendment No. 69, the so-called Stennis amendment. I do not intend to take any more of the time of the House unless there are questions on the rest of the bill, but I do think in view of the publicity this particular amendment has received as well as because of its controversial nature, I should take 2 or 3 minutes to explain the situation with regard to the final conference action.

The Senate conferees agreed to recede on this amendment following letters from Secretary Gardner of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which described and clarified present policies and practices. Three of these letters appear in the statement of the managers on the part of the House. A careful consideration of the Stennis amendment, together with the letters from Secretary Gardner, resulted in a helpful understanding of the Department's policies regarding hospital desegregation. The Secretary clarified for all the Departments' policy of permitting due consideration to valid medical reasons as special compelling circumstances in the assignment of patients.

I want to stress that this correspondence from the Secretary did not change, did not modify, did not qualify, and did not amend in any way the present title VI policies of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Department will continue to discharge its responsibilities under title VI of the Civil Rights Act as required by that landmark legislation. The law, the title VI regulations, the guidelines for hospital compliance, and all other requirements imposed by the Department remain the same.

In the conference, I opposed the inclusion of the Stennis amendment for several reasons: First, it is unnecessary, undesirable, based on lack of understanding of present policies and practices, and would give rise to misunderstanding as to why it was adopted; second, it would have imposed a great burden of paperwork on doctors and hospitals with its certification provision; third; it would have placed the responsibility of desegregating hospitals on the doctors who are already overburdened by simply caring for the ill; fourth, it would have resulted in confusion of the present policies of HEW; and finally it was not a suitable provision for an appropriations bill.

I am pleased that the conferees have agreed to strike this amendment, and I am certain the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will continue to conduct its hospital compliance program with the purpose of assuring that public programs are available without discrimination based on race, color, or national origin.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good conference report. It is one that all Members should support. I trust that it will be unanimously adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I shall not take the time of the House at this hour in the closing moments of the Congress to repeat and to emphasize what the chairman has just outlined. But I would call attention again to the fact that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], and I, members of the minority of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare of the Committee on Appropriations, all signed this report and agreed that it is the best possible compromise of the differences between the two bodies. This compromise bill is under both the House and the Senate bills previously passed. It is $110 million under the House-passed version and $10,650,000 under the Senate bill.

The largest reduction, I should call to the attention of the House, was in the Public Assistance allocation. The Senate cut back $46,400,000, and I predict that there will be a supplemental early in the next session of the Congress to take care of this matter. This has been cut out, but undoubtedly will be needed before the end of fiscal year 1967.

The next highest amount that was reduced by the other body was out of the "Advances for employment services" in the amount of approximately $23 million. It is my understanding from the conference that $7,500,000 is the final appropriation for the National Teacher Corps in a phasing out of this program.

The Senate report explained the allowance of the $7,500,000 in this way by saying:

> The committee recommendation will provide for payment of 90 percent of salaries of corps members, estimated at 1,387, in the employ of school districts through fiscal year 1967, the payment of administrative costs to the local school districts, and payment of transportation of corps members, including dependents and household goods, to teaching assignment as provided by title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

The House bill contained no funds for the National Teacher Corps. The 1967 budget estimate was $31,372,000. The amount contained here is $7,500,000 for the phasing out of that program.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to commend the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and the conferees for insisting upon disagreement to amendment No. 69. This language, which was legislation on an appropriation bill, known as the Stennis amendment, was added by the other body as new section 206. The Senate has receded because of the strong position taken by the conferees.

Under the Senate amendment, segregation in hospitals could be perpetuated upon certification of the attending physician and chief medical officer that it was in the interest of the patient's physical or mental well being.

This amendment would be an open invitation for wholesale evasion of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1966. I commend the conferees for refusing to accept it. The record should show that it is the intent of the Congress that title VI be vigorously enforced by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Commissioner of Education.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 5: Page 3, line 17, strike out "$508,950,000" and insert "$524,000,000".

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 15, page 14, line 8, insert ", of which $192,500,000 shall be available for grants to States."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Fogarty moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "$198,225,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 32, page 21, line 6, insert: ", and $100,000 to be available only for the National Conference on Education of the Deaf."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Fogarty moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ", $100,000 to be available only for the National Conference on Education of the Deaf, and $150,000 to be available only for transfer to the appropriation 'Office of the Secretary, Salaries and Expenses' for a comprehensive study of training programs financed in whole or in part with Federal funds."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 45, page 36, line 7, after the figure, insert: ", of which $1,000,000 shall be available for the training of clinical anesthesiologists."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Fogarty moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 65, page 53, line 5, after "Welfare", insert ": *Provided*, That the position now designated as Comptroller, level V, shall hereafter be designated as Assistant Secretary, Comptroller, level V.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Fogarty moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 70, page 57, after line 2, insert:

"Sec. 207. None of the funds contained in this title shall be available for additional permanent Federal positions in the Washington area if the proportion of additional positions in the Washington area in relation to the total new positions is allowed to exceed the proportion existing at the close of fiscal year 1966."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Fogarty moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and on the several motions was laid on the table.

CORRODING THE MORAL FIBER OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the September 16, 1966, issue of U.S.A. by Alice Widener, who attended the Second Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars at the Hotel Commodore in New York City on the weekend of September 9–11, recounts for us the tenor of the conference and the nature of the proposals advanced by the various speakers. For example, Polish-born Isaac Deutscher, of London, advocated "complete freedom of sexual life that will abolish the family."

The youth of this Nation was advised to "turn on, tune in, drop out" through use of the hallucinogenic drug LSD and marihuana.

Another source of wisdom and counsel urged: "We must develop the moral-sexual rebellion of the youth."

As only the full text of the above-mentioned issue can do justice to the new and old left program for America, I request that the special report of U.S.A. entitled "In the West and West Ballrooms," by Alice Widener be inserted in the Record at this point.

[From the publication U.S.A., Sept. 16, 1966]

IN THE EAST AND WEST BALLROOMS

(A special report by Alice Widener on the second annual conference of Socialist Scholars)

> "The temptation of our day is to accept the intolerable, for fear of still worse to come."
>
> —"The Revolution of Nihilism," 1939, by Hermann Rauschning, former President of the Free State of Danzig.

"Only the clunks stay in the clink," said the Socialist Scholar, in the West Ballroom of the Hotel Commodore, New York City, Sunday, September 11, 1966. "Fortunately—as at Berkeley, for example—the parents of middle class and wealthy students in our movement bail them out."

REGISTRATION

While ordinary travelers from out of town were registering at the reception desk in the main lobby at the Hotel Commodore in New York City, Friday evening, September 9, 1966, more than two thousand members of the Old and New Left were registering at tables set up in ballroom floor hallways to attend the Second Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars.

The New Left movement in our country is generally described by misinformed or misleading members of the press as a spontaneous, amorphous grouping of rebellious youth. It is not. Any non-Socialist who attended the evening and daytime panel sessions of the Socialist Scholars during the week-end of September 9–11, would have been forced to recognize, as did I, that most members of the New Left are activists instigated, controlled and manipulated by disciplined members of the Communist Party working in a united front with Marxist ideologues.

Was it to foster illusion or misconception that the big press—the wire services, broadcasting networks, big circulation magazines and newspapers—stayed away from the conference? It is hard to find a satisfactory explanation of why they granted it privileged sanctuary in the East Ballroom and West Ballroom of the Hotel Commodore in the center of the city.

There were no TV cameras to film the arrival from London of white-bearded radical Marxist zealot Isaac Deutscher, invited by the Socialist Scholars to open their conference with a discourse "On Socialist Man." Nor were there any cameras turned on 54-year-old Victor Perlo, identified in Congressional hearings as a member of a Soviet espionage ring while he was in U.S. Government employ during World War II. No well known reporter was present to interview conference panelist Communist Herbert Aptheker, age 51, now running for Congress in Brooklyn, N.Y., who last year told the First Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars, "Of course, Watts was *glorious!*"

For some inexplicable reason it seems that nowadays our communications media personnel report graphically only on the effects of the Leftist radicals' activities—on the bloody race riots, street demonstrations, disrupting and costly acts of civil disobedience—but stay away from the gatherings where plans for such activities are hatched, though most meetings, as this one was, are publicly announced.

Last September, after *Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly* reprinted my article about the First Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars at Columbia University, the UPI wire service got in touch with *Barron's* to request quotation rights. The request was immediately granted. But not a single word about the Socialist conference went out over UPI or any other wire service, though no statement or quotation in my article ever was challenged for accuracy. Soon after *Barron's* carried my article, however, several of the leading Socialists figuring in it—such as Prof. Staughton Lynd of Yale—made national and international headlines for radical activities that aided our Communist enemies in Hanoi and were conducted in total defiance of the U.S. Government.

Unquestionably, even before the end of 1966, several of the registrants at the Second Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars will make headlines and TV camera appearances as friends of our enemies, enemies of our friends, and as subverters of our American way of life.

BOLSHEVIK NEW LEFTISM

There was not an empty chair in the 800-seat Windsor Ballroom at the Commodore when the Socialist Scholars and their radical Leftist audience gathered to hear Polish-born Isaac Deutscher of London. He was introduced by Prof. H. H. Wilson of Princeton University, who described Mr. Deutscher as "a contributor to *The Economist* and *The Observer*." This is a fact, though most Deutscher articles in those publications were unsigned.

When Deutscher went to the rostrum, the audience stood to honor him; they did so again after his address. Whether the huge overflow audience of more than 700 in adjoining rooms and hallways did likewise I do not know. Deutscher's appearance as the featured guest was illustrative of the "Socialist Unity" of the conference; he is the authentic biographer of Leon Trotsky, but even the Stalinists in the crowd gave him a big hand and the young New Leftists hung on his every guttural word.

The essence of Deutscher's speech was extreme Marxism-Leninism in its original Bolshevik form. It had strong theoretical and practical relationship to policies and programs urged today for America by the Socialist Scholars and activists. To watch and listen to this man, who looked and sounded like 1920 newspaper caricatures and actors' imitations of the fiery radical haranguing crowds at Union Square on the Lower East Side of New York, or on a soap box in Hyde Park, London, it seemed preposterous that an audience in 1966 could listen to such evil tripe without bursting into derisive laughter turning into catcalls of indignant repudiation.

Yet it became clear, during subsequent panel sessions of the Socialist Scholars' conference, that the New Leftist radicalism of today is in no way different from the Old Bolshevism of half a century ago. To anyone believing that the family as a social unit is essential to maintenance of a decent society, there was little difference between Isaac Deutscher's call, September 9, 1966, for "complete freedom of sexual life that will abolish the family," and Brooklyn Polytechnic Asst. Professor of Economics Shane Mage's call from the same dais for youth to follow today the advice of convicted marihuana handler Timothy Leary (ousted from the Harvard faculty) to "turn on, tune in, drop out" through use of the hallucinogenic drug LSD and marihuana. Nor was there substantial difference between Deutscher's call for "destruction of the monogamic bourgeois family as we know it," and the statements in a paper read for the absent 70-year-old Prof. Herbert Marcuse (unable to attend because he was at a Communist meeting in Prague) of the University of California in San Diego. After having declared "the Marxian idea of socialism is not radical enough," Prof. Marcuse urged, "We must develop the moral-sexual rebellion of the youth."

When dark-haired Prof. Shane Mage, speaking in a nasal voice with Adam's apple twitching in his thin throat, urged the young people present to take LSD in order "to create a free society," neither white-bearded Isaac Deutscher nor any Socialist professor from Yale, Princeton, Columbia or non-Ivy League university rose to utter a word of protest against this deliberate corruption of the young. Yet only a few days earlier, there had appeared in the press everywhere an official warning against LSD by the International Association of Chiefs of Police who called for international legislation against its non-medical use.

Just how much stress the Socialist Scholars and their activist pupils in the New Left place on use of LSD as a means of breaking down middle class customs and morality may be seen in the text of the Radical Education Project (REP) sponsored by Students for Democratic Action. Many SDS leaders were present at the conference and their REP document was widely circulated there. It urges as part of an "on-going examination of the value bases of the new radicalism" a study of the questions: "Are all existing instances of private enterprise antithetical to our values? How do we relate to riots? to the sexual revolution? to pornography? to LSD? . . ."

Disdaining "bourgeois" manners and culture, the young radicals in REP and dozens of other Leftist groups in the ballroom at the Commodore gave rapt attention to aging Marxist-Leninist-Trotskyite Deutscher as he criticized certain brutalities and failings of the Red regimes in Russia and East Europe, then wholly excused them by shouting out: "We of the West have been the ultimate cause of the failures of socialism in those countries." The whole trouble with the world—said Deutscher—is that "unsocial private property disunites society." There is no need, he said, for man to concern himself with "an ultimate metaphysical purpose" in his existence. "Socialist man," he ranted, "will be exempt from worship and awe." After fatherhood has come to be regarded only as biological, and "paternal authority" as a mere social institution to be gotten rid of, then the "bourgeois form of the patriarchal family" will be obliterated, and infants brought up "in a communal nursery, after the destruction of the family as we know it, will be free of aggressive tendencies."

ONLY THE CLUNKS

In what the Socialist Scholars describe as "the transition period to revolution," it appears, however, that the family as we know it, well fed on the good fruits of free enterprise, plays today a most helpful role in aiding the authors of its destruction. Thus in the East Ballroom panel discussion on Saturday morning, which dealt with "Components of Contemporary Revolutionary Movements," panelist James Petras, a leader of the riotous Free Speech Movement at the University of California at Berkeley, described as a main helpful component the role of "the sons of professional and aristocratic families in Latin America as revolutionary guerrilla warfare leaders in the countryside." Mr. Petras said Lenin has been proved entirely right in saying that "in the dissolution of the ruling class, a small section cuts itself adrift and joins the revolution" as the wave of the future.

Afterwards, in the hallway outside the East Ballroom, a Socialist Scholar expressed his support of Petras' paper and stressed the importance of leading the bourgeoisie on toward suicide. "Only the clunks stay in the clink," he said. "Fortunately—as at Berkeley, for example—the parents of middle class and wealthy students in our movement bail them out."

A fat male "clunk" with shoulder-length hair, thick beard, leather jacket, laced boots and filthy fingernails shoved a mimeographed sheet into the Ivy League Socialist Scholar's hand.

I received one, too. It read:

"The John Brown Coordinating Committee, deeply concerned with the growing violence of the attacks by the White Power structure on the developing militant black peoples movement as exemplified by recent attacks in Chicago and the arrest of Stokely Carmichael in Atlanta urge participants in the Socialist Scholars Conference to stage a march from—Hotel Commodore to Rockefeller Plaza—time—5:30 p.m.—to demonstrate our concern and solidarity with the Afro-American people and against white supremacy. After the march you are invited to attend a buffet dinner at 8 p.m. at 100 West 82nd St. (West of Columbus) Tel. 362–4954."

The "clunk" put a hand on the Socialist Scholar's arm. "You with us?" The Scholar smiled, said a noncommittal "maybe," and turned ingratiatingly to a good-looking young man with short cut smooth black hair, blue eyes, clean shaven face and a neat navy blue suit. "How are things at Yale?" said the Scholar. "You're a student of Woodward's, aren't you?"

The "Woodward" referred to is Prof. C. Vann Woodward of Yale University who, on Sunday afternoon in the Windsor Ballroom, described himself as "a liberal," but began his discussion of an inter-Socialist controversy between Communist Herbert Aptheker and Prof. Eugene D. Genovese with the statement, "I identify with Aptheker."

STOKELY, NOT BOBBY

All during the Socialist Scholars' discussion in the Commodore over the week-end, it was obvious that Stokely Carmichael of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee—jailed in Atlanta on a charge of "inciting to riot"—was the revolutionary hero. Mention of his name during panel or floor discussion brought loud cheers and crashing applause. There was talk by some Socialist Scholars and youth group leaders in various radical organizations of "running a radical ticket in 1968—Staughton Lynd for President, and Stokely for Vice President." One of the youth leaders explained, "Not that we'd expect to get any big amount of votes—but it would give us entry into places on and off campus where we couldn't usually operate. It would be very useful for contacts-making."

A most dramatic political happening took place on Sunday afternoon. Just as a group of young New Leftists were milling around through the main lobby toward elevators to the ballroom floor, a procession of Democratic political leaders in New York hurried through on the way to a TV interview. Gubernatorial candidate Frank D. O'Connor led the way, followed by Howard Samuels, candidate for lieutenant-governor. Next in line was Senator Robert F. Kennedy.

"How does Kennedy stand with your group, Paul?" said a young man with an SDS (Students for a Democratic Society) label on his jacket to another SDS member. "Well, he thinks he can use us and that he's persuaded us he's really with it. We can use him a while. But when time comes for a real struggle, he'd be superseded."

THE RED NETWORK

There is not the slightest doubt about what the Socialist Scholars and their students, followers and supporters mean by "a real struggle." They mean the overthrow of the United States Government as we know it; the destruction of what most citizens enjoy as "the American way of life," and the abolition of all our existing economic and social institutions. Moreover, they have established an international intelligence network that reaches up into guerrilla headquarters in the Peruvian mountains, into the African rebel enclaves in Angola and Mozambique, into countryside insurgency camps in Guatemala, into Vietcong strongholds in Vietnam, to bring about a successful Marxist world revolution that could isolate, overtax and bring down the U.S. Government.

How do I know this? Because I heard it and read it. That is what the Second Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars was about. In precisely the same manner as Lenin and Stalin put all their plans in writing, and as Hitler did, so do our American revolutionists put down everything in black on white today. For the intellectual elite, they put it down in academic papers and esoteric magazines; for the masses, they put it down in inflammatory, crudely-worded tracts, "folk" songs, and slogans.

Hermann Rauschning, former President of the Danzig Free State before World War II and a main enemy of Hitler and Stalin, described in a chapter headed "The March to Revolution" in his book "The Revolution of Nihilism" (1939), how the revolution is brought about. He wrote:

"The most candid of revelations . . . have been dismissed as "going off the deep end" by the very people who, for their own sakes, had the best of all reasons for listening with careful attention. . . . The listener finds it inconceivable that anyone really entertaining such plans could have the innocence to avow them. But it is not innocence. It is the subtlest of cunning. It is just as effective in the opposite direction as the practice of the famous maxim in 'Mein Kampf' that any lie will be believed if it is big enough.

Any truth will be disbelieved if it is big enough."

THE REVOLUTION

Three main facts emerged clearly from the Second Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars in New York City, September 1966: The American Marxists are abandoning their pretense of non-violence for open advocacy of violence; (2) they have successfully linked the American Marxist revolutionary movement with its counterparts throughout the world; (3) they are drunk with success and have cast away former caution about their real objectives.

At the Socialist Scholars' discussion of "Poverty and Powerlessness," panelist James Haughton, director of the Harlem Unemployment Center, ranted into the microphone on the dais, after Prof Richard A. Cloward of Columbia University had branded our welfare system in our welfare state as "lawless,":

"Specifically, yes, the welfare system is rotten, but so is the whole American system rotten. You can't look anywhere in this country and see anything but rottenness. The Democratic and Republican parties offer no hope for the American people whether they run Bobby Kennedy for President or not.

"We must force this murderer Johnson and the people around him to discontinue their genocide against Vietnam. We must pinpoint the enemy of poor people—American imperialism. Wherever the American octopus reaches out its tentacles, there you will find exploitation, cruelty, poverty, mass impoverishment."

Dr. Haughton called for "revolutionary change, not reforms," and he predicted that "the black Uncle Tom flunkies, like those in the NAACP and Urban League, will ultimately be kicked out."

Dr. Haugton said, "We had a march against war in in Vietnam, and we got some data from Prof. Melman (Seymour D., Professor of Industrial Engineering) at Columbia University. I've been in touch with him and put his conclusions in factsheets to workers."

Dr. Haughton said Prof. Melman had told him the dollar will be devalued in 1967 and 25 per cent of the Negro people will be unemployed. Dr. Haughton continued, "Then those people in the Administration will learn about riots in the streets. They rioted in the 1930's but that won't be anything compared to '67!"

The applause in the ballroom was deafening.

BLOWING THE FUSE

Haughton's impassioned speech had followed a calmly academic but insidiously dangerous paper presented by Prof. Richard A. Cloward of Columbia, whose work in sociology has greatly influenced the scandal-ridden, multi-million dollar Mobilization for Youth program in New York City, and also the multi-billion dollar federal Poverty Program and Job Corps project. Dr. Cloward is a member of Citizens Crusade Against Poverty, the group organized by Walter Reuther.

Written with associate sociologist Frances Piven of Columbia, Dr. Cloward's paper for the Socialist Scholars opened with a call for a systematic strategy of "irregular and disruptive tactics" among the poor, urging them to overburden city and state governments with their "demands" as a means of forcing these government to turn to the federal government for more and more funds.

Prof. Cloward said, "We need to devote more attention to disrupting corporate power." He described the poor as mere "supplicants" in the welfare state, and said they have most to gain "from a major upheaval in our society." He said our welfare system is "lawless" and violates human and civil rights. He called for welfare recipients' forcing city welfare departments to impose the labor union "check-off system" for welfare clients, by withholding 50 cents to a dollar for each client as dues to a fund for unionization of welfare clients to impose their demands for special benefits.

Prof. Cloward explained that each welfare client in New York City is entitled under existing law to special benefits for clothing, blankets, etc. He said that in 1965 city special benefits welfare payments amounted to "about $40 per client" and he called for each welfare client to demand $100 to $1,000 in such benefits. He said there are now 550,000 welfare clients in the city, but that by 1967 there probably will be 600,000. The poor, said Dr. Cloward, could become a stake and powerful organization "in small portions of power" within the context "of a broader point."

Dr. Cloward said he had consulted with legal experts and "we estimate that $200 million in special grants" could be obtained in New York City alone. Dr. Cloward said that in Cleveland, on June 20, 1966, 30 to 35 welfare recipients were joined by others in a demonstration that included the Hough area. In early August, he said, he himself had taken part in "a national conference to organize the welfare recipients movement." Dr. Cloward said he personally had taken part in Wednesday night meetings with welfare clients "week after week, month after month," and that as a result, "Next Monday there will be a demonstration of welfare recipients at City Hall."

He was a prophet of sharpest vision, as TV watchers soon would learn.

Dr. Cloward read his paper to the Socialist Scholars Conference in the East Ballroom of the Hotel Commodore on Saturday afternoon, September 10. On Monday night, September 12, CBS and NBC TV newscasts showed the demonstration of screaming welfare recipients that took place right on Cloward schedule. They shouted demands for more "special benefits," though the present city general welfare budget (including hospital services, etc.) is almost a billion dollars annually, the Mayor says the city is "broke," and New Yorkers were hit this year with a city income tax in addition to state and federal taxes to pay for it all.

On Tuesday, September 13, the *New York Daily News* reported, "About 500 welfare recipients picketed the Department of Welfare building . . . and staged sit-downs and sit-ins yesterday. . . . As police called reinforcements, the demonstrators blocked one of the two entrances to the building and marched along the sidewalk."

Socialist Scholar Prof. Cloward of Columbia certainly was right about the success of his Wednesday night meetings. Evidently his strategy of "disruptive tactics" will require costly police reinforcements at city welfare departments throughout our nation.

The prospects delighted Prof. William Ryan, formerly of Harvard now of Yale, who described himself to the audience as "a radical without portfolio." He said, "I have been enchanted with the Cloward strategy of blowing a fuse in the welfare agencies, housing developments, and among unmarried mothers. I wonder what would happen if there was a really systematic overload."

Sherman Barr, of Mobilization for Youth, said that through the techniques used in his organization for welfare, "further demand is stimulated rather than decreased." Mr. Barr called for "indoctrination in group methodology" and said that on the lower East Side, for a group of 350, they had been able to get $85,000 for "an extremely expensive operation requiring money for phones, mimeographing, etc."

When a member of the audience went to the floor microphone during the question period to ask whether Dr. Cloward's strategy is a substitute for "Socialist organization of the proletariat, the industrial factory workers," Dr. Frances Piven of Columbia replied from the dais: "I really only want to make one point—the disruption of the system. Welfare rolls will begin to go up; welfare payments will begin to go up—the impact will be very, very sharp. The mounting welfare budget will increase taxes, force cities to turn to the federal government. We have to help people to make claims; for this they will organize and act."

What the entire strategy amounts to is a diabolical Socialist plan to increase the number of welfare clients through systematic overloading, to instigate "the poor" to make bankrupting demands, and thus wreck the existing financial structure of our society. There was no talk at all at the conference of improving the present welfare system, of decreasing the number of welfare recipients, or the number of unmarried mothers. All the emphasis was on "disruption" for the purpose of forcing chaos and conditions making our society ripe for the radical overthrow of existing institutions and a Socialist take-over. Much of this was made perfectly clear in Prof. Cloward's plan to disrupt private enterprise and "release the flow of rewards to the poor" by increased taxation on corporations that will "disrupt corporate power" and end "by disrupting production."

The big press coverage of the welfare recipients' demonstration at City Hall was at the wrong time in the wrong place. NBC and CBS cameras should have been focused on Prof. Richard A. Cloward as he read his scholarly Socialist paper in the ballroom at the Commodore. The TV newscasters would have gotten a beat on news about to burst into print. And if the U.S. Attorney General had been present at the Second Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars, he might have obtained most useful information about who are the real agitators in our midst.

No decent American lacks sympathy for the poor or is reluctant to help them and make sacrifices for them. But for so long as a free enterprise society exists in the United States, the Socialist Scholars, bent on overthrowing it, will find cause for agitation and protest. They are against reform and evolution; they are for abolition and revolution; they regard even our modern American "welfare capitalism" as an enemy to be killed off.

THE "RIGHT TO TRAVEL"

The kind of citizenship admired by the Socialist Scholars was depicted by James Petras of the Free Speech Movement at the University of California at Berkeley, who described to the conference audience his recent voyages to Latin America, his contacts with Marxist and Communist revolutionary forces there. Petras said that in Latin America today, "revolutionary guerrilla warfare in the countryside fosters citizenship."

All during the Commodore conference, many Socialist Scholars and members of the audience talked openly about their direct contacts with guerrilla warfare leaders in Asia, Africa and Latin America. They discussed recent visits to Havana, Hanoi, Moscow, Prague and other Red capitals.

Like many citizens, I have puzzled over how young campus radicals and academicians manage to travel from continent to continent with the greatest of ease, often in defiance of State Department regulations and of Passport Division security provisions. At the Second Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars this month, I learned how they do it.

The young radicals travel along the smooth rails of an underground campus shuttle system that transports them, armed with highest academic credentials given by sponsoring Socialist professors, from California to Tanzania, from Michigan to guerrilla camps in Peru and Chile, from Massachusetts to African bush rebel enclaves in Mozambique and Angola. Often the bills are footed by tax-exempt foundations.

Robert Fitch, a young radical present at the conference, told friends on Saturday morning, "I have an appointment Monday morning with someone in the Department of

African Affairs at New York University to arrange for a trip to Mozambique to see Mondlane."

"Wonderful," they said.

Dr. Eduardo Mondlane is head of the Mozamique Liberation Front.

REP NETWORK

During the Socialist Scholars' business meeting on Sunday afternoon in the East Ballroom at the Commodore (at which the notorious Prof. Eugene D. Genovese of Rutgers University presided), there took place in the West Ballroom a meeting of leaders in the Radical Education Project (REP), an enterprise of Students for a Democratic Society. REP, with headquarters at Ann Arbor, Michigan, sent out a letter, August 18, 1966, that stated:

"The Socialist Scholars Conference looms as a significant event in the development of the Left in America."

The letter was accompanied by an outline of REP projects. Among them is listed "International Intelligence Network." The ensuing text boasts of "a network of people in the U.S. and abroad, closely tuned to international events, who will serve the movement as quick, incisive sources of intelligence. . . . Such a network, including scholars, journalists, leftist youth leaders, government officials [sic!], guerrilla leaders, etc., can provide us with first hand reports and analysis of the action of insurgent movements, the workings of the foreign policy apparatus, kinds of impending developments. . . . Already we have contacts in Japan, most European countries, Canada, and with Guatemalan guerrillas, Vietnamese rebels and neutrals, African nationalists, and others. These contacts are being extended, and to them we must add American scholars with specialized knowledge and contacts. . . . By maintaining regular correspondence with radical groups and scholarship abroad, we can increase the degree of coordination between their work and that of the American movement."

On reading the foregoing, I understood how it happened that Communists parading in the Place Bruckère on May Day in Brussels last year, and "Peace Parade" marchers along Fifth Avenue in New York City this year, carried identical hideous effigies of Uncle Sam, identical banners and placards, shouted identical slogans in Flemish, French and English.

The Second Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars in New York City this month showed conclusively that the American campus-based radical international intelligence network exists and is a menacing threat to the internal and external security of the United States. I wish some high-ranking members of our judiciary had been present to hear the Socialist Scholars discuss their new "five year plan" to cooperate with "national revolutionary liberation wars" in three continents to put "unbearable strain" on the U.S. Government "to bring it down." Perhaps our judiciary would be more sympathetic with the State Department's effort to restrict the jaunts abroad of American subversives, and to enforce the passport regulations deemed necessary for protection of our country by Frances Knight, able and patriotic head of the U.S. Passport Division.

I understand fully now why the Leftists have battled so hard in our courts for what they describe as "the right to travel."

ADVANCE TOWARD NIHILISM

Prof. Gaylord LeRoy of Temple University urged on the youth of the New Left the necessity to study "more seriously the advances made by the Socialist countries of the world."

The kind of "advances" promoted by the Socialist Scholars in our own country—with not a single objection voiced from dais or ballroom floor—was enough to send shivers down the spine of any American devoted to law, order and decent morality.

In the Sunday afternoon Windsor Ballroom panel session on "The Legacy of Negro Slavery," the main paper was delivered by "I would welcome a Vietcong victory" Prof. Eugene D. Genovese of Rutgers. He urged on American Negroes a policy of black nationalism. In the course of his remarks, Prof. Genovese talked about Karl Marx' theory of surplus value and said, "We ought to be delighted every time a worker steals something from his plant."

Though Genovese's fellow panelist Communist Herbert Aptheker opposed the policy of black nationalism, lauded the late Negro Communist W. E. B. DuBois (for whom the campus DuBois Clubs are named), and called for Negro-White radical unity, he agreed with Prof. Genovese's point of view on theft. "There is a whale of difference," said Aptheker, "between the stealing by a worker and the wholesale stealing by General Motors."

The inter-Socialist dispute over Black Nationalism versus Negro-White radical unity was fairly sharp but not really antagonistic. Prof. C. Vann Woodward of Yale University commented on the Genovese paper and on Aptheker's remarks, referred to himself as "a liberal," but hastened to add: "I identify with Aptheker."

At the Socialist Scholars' business meeting in the East Ballroom, Sunday afternoon, it was decided the conference is to become a permanent, dues-collecting membership organization. Prof. Genovese was elected president of the steering committee for next year. From the dais, Paul Sweezy, gray-haired editor of the radical *Monthly Review* and member of the Socialist Scholars steering committee, commented on "the amazing progress we have made since our First Conference at Columbia, last September, progress far beyond our expectations."

Late Sunday afternoon, as the conference neared its end, I looked around at the pastel walls of the ballroom, the crystal chandeliers, the ornate ceiling with classical motifs set in graceful medallions. What bourgeois surroundings for revolutionaries, I thought. The Hotel Commodore, solidly built in the Grand Central commuter complex in the center of Manhattan, is the very symbol of middle class America, the hated enemy of the Socialist Scholars, the constant object of their vituperation, derision, subversion and denigration.

Tired and dizzy with dismay, I shut my eyes. It seemed the ballroom floor was sliding from beneath me, the ceiling was about to fall, the walls were crumbling. Yes, indeed, the Socialist Scholars and New Left have made amazing progress in America since their first meeting only a year ago. LSD extolled in *Playboy* by a man found guilty in court of transporting marihuana, fined $30,000 and sentenced to 30 years' imprisonment. LSD "art" lauded in *Life*. Vietnik pickets across from the Cathedral in Washington, D.C. when the President's daughter was married there. Race riots and bloodshed in Cleveland, Chicago, Atlanta, Brooklyn, Baltimore. A witness before a committee of the United States Senate boasting of his eight illegitimate children by different mothers.

"Nihilism," said Nietzsche in the late 19th century, "is for the supreme values to be rendered worthless." He predicted nihilism would prevail during the 20th and 21st centuries.

The remembered sound of Isaac Deutscher's thick Polish-accented English with an Oxonian overlay was again in my ears and they hurt with the echo of his call for "the destruction of the monogamic bourgeois family as we know it."

Though the air-conditioning was blowing cool air into the ballroom, the atmosphere grew more and more oppressive—heavy and ominous as before a storm.

I gripped the sides of a straight chair to steady myself. How right Hermann Rauschning was, I thought, having recently studied his "The Revolution of Nihilism" (1939) and "The Redemption of Democracy" (1941) in which he explained, better than almost any other author, how the Russian and German people fell prey to Marxism-Leninism and Hitlerism. He showed that Communism and National Socialism were only symptoms of a world revolution in which a few intellectuals pretend to be able to create "a new society" in order to seize totalitarian power over the masses.

Again I looked up at the beautiful ceiling, this time remembering things past—the sound of Mussolini's voice thundering out to the Roman masses from the balcony of the Palazzo Venezia; the sound of glass crashing on a Berlin pavement as young Nazi brownshirts smashed the show windows of Wertheim's department store; the sound of Nikita Khrushchev's banging his shoe on a desk at the United Nations; the sound of Communist Herbert Aptheker's voice at the First Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars, at Columbia University last year, as he shouted raucously, "Of course, Watts was *glorious!*"

Quietly, I made my way through the crowded aisle in the ballroom. It seemed I was being swept away into the crashing cacophony of the finale in Maurice Ravel's symphonic work "La Valse," the most prophetic artistic creation of the 20th century, in which dancers sway gladly to the rhythm of a waltz in a ballroom with mirrors, candelabra, and doors opening into formal gardens, but are caught in an inexorable force whirling faster and faster until the floor vanishes beneath their feet, the mirrors splinter, the doors fly off their hinges in the gusts of a terrible wind, and nothing remains but destruction and chaos.

Is this to be the fate of our society, of the American way of life? If the Socialist Scholars and the New Left have their way, it will be.

LIST OF OFFICIAL PARTICIPANTS IN THE SECOND ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF SOCIALIST SCHOLARS

Robert S. Cohen, Boston University; Shane Mage, Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn; Donald McKelvey, Student Union for Peace Action; Robert Paul Wolff, Columbia University; H. H. Wilson, Princeton University; Irving Markovitz, Queens College; Franz Schurmann, University of California, Berkeley; James Petras, University of California, Berkeley; Gordon Lewis, University of Puerto Rico; Robert Wolfe, New York University; Robert S. Browne, Fairleigh Dickinson University; Victor Perlo, New York; Allen Solganick, University of Maryland; Alexander Erlich, Columbia University;

Harry Braverman, New York; Lynn Turgeon, Hofstra University; Lee Baxandall; Norman Rudich, Wesleyan University; Harvey Blume, Columbia University; Gaylord Leroy, Temple University; Vernon K. Dibble, Columbia University; Richard A. Cloward and Frances Piven, Columbia University; Sherman Barr, Mobilization for Youth; James Haughton, Harlem Unemployment Center; Oscar Lewis, University of Illinois; William Ryan, Yale University; Judith Mage, Social Service Employees Union;

Karl Niebyl, Temple University; Russ Nixon, New York University; James O'Connor, San Jose State College; John Owen, Johns Hopkins University; Paul M. Sweezy, Monthly Review; Conor Cruise O'Brien, Albert Schweitzer Professor of Humanities, New York University; Warren I. Susman, Rutgers University; Ronald Radosh, Queensborough Community College; Martin J. Sklar, Rochester University; Philip S. Foner, New York; Gabriel Kolko, University of Pennsylvania; James Weinstein, Studies on the Left; Robert Engler, Sarah Lawrence College; John M. Cammett, Rutgers University; Leslie; Derfler, Carnegie Institute of Technology;

Robert G. Colodny, University of Pittsburgh; Helmut Gruber, Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn; Manuela Dobos-Schleicher, Columbia University; Eugene D. Genovese, Rutgers University; Harry Magdoff, New York; James F. Becker, New York University; Brijen Gupta, Brooklyn College; Michael A. Lebowitz, Simon Fraser University; Herbert Aptheker, American Institute for Marxist Studies; Frank Kofsky, University of Pittsburgh; C. Vann Woodward, Yale University; Nathan Hare, Howard University.

REPORT ON EDUCATION

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, no subject deserves more of our attention and interest than that of strengthening educational opportunities in our Nation. As one who has served on an education committee for 10 years, it certainly has been one of my foremost concerns. I served for 4 years on the Education and Labor Committee of the Ohio Legislature and during the past three sessions of Congress it has been my honor to be a member of the Education and Labor Committee.

During these past 10 years it has been my observation that there is an unquestioned desire on the part of the U.S. Office of Education that it extend its controls over local schools. In 1961, I first pointed out the blueprint which USOE had prepared under the name "A Federal Education Agency of the Future." It is now amazing how much of this program has either been implemented or the ground work has been laid. Only recently we received another indication of this direction which will come from the USOE. On October 4, 1966, I inserted in the RECORD a comprehensive report on a current proposal to bus students to achieve what they call racial balance in local schools. Harold Howe, U.S. Education Commissioner recently stated:

> For Example, traditional school district boundaries often serve education badly and may have to be changed. . . . We could alter political boundaries to bring the social, economic and intellectual strengths of the suburbs to bear on the problems of the city schools. Building programs for the future could be planned so that new schools break up, rather than continue, segregation of both the racial and economic sort.

It can easily be seen that he has big plans for local school districts. This has been going on in many areas. This 16-page speech on busing school students is available by writing my office.

The source of this club, of course, is the Federal collection of tax dollars and the disbursement of it to local government or groups with bureaucratic strings. It goes without saying that local school districts are having their share of money problems. The Federal tax take scoops most of the available tax money and leaves State and local government with little left. For that reason, I was one of the early supporters of the tax remission concept which is now gaining support among the governors and many educators. In 1961, I introduced legislation which would return 2 percent of our Federal individual income tax to the States for educational purposes. There would be no Federal controls of any kind since the Federal Government would serve only as the collecting agent. I believe that the support for this concept is growing. This bill has been reintroduced in the 88th and 89th Congresses.

OTHER EDUCATION BILLS

To assist teachers and encourage them to improve their educational training, I joined with Representative GRIFFITHS of Michigan and others in an effort to amend the Internal Revenue Code to authorize and facilitate the deduction from gross income by teachers of the expenses of education—including travel—undertaken by them and to provide a uniform method of proving entitlement to such deduction. For some reason or another, the teacher is not treated like a skilled worker, businessman or other professional person in income tax treatment of these legitimate expenses.

At the time my bill was introduced, I stated, in my opinion, that this legislation was necessary if qualified and experienced teachers were to be encouraged to continue in the teaching profession. My H.R. 3915 was introduced on February 1, 1965. Some 140 Congressmen joined us later to push for this same concept.

A year and one-half later, on July 7, 1966, the Internal Revenue Service published proposed regulations in the Federal Register which would virtually wipe out what small gains had been made in providing tax justice for teachers. Since publication of the proposed regulations, several other bills have been introduced, generally seeking the same objectives of my bill.

REVISED PROPOSAL

As a result of strong objections from Members of Congress, teachers' organizations, and individual teachers, the Internal Revenue Service on October 1, 1966, withdrew its proposed regulations and issued a revised proposal. This will offer some relief but, in my opinion, further changes are needed.

I submit for the RECORD a letter from Mr. Stanley S. Surrey, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Tax Policy, and a summary of the proposed new regulations so that all interested parties may be apprised. The proposed regulations were published in the Federal Register of October 1, 1966, and hearings on them were to commence on November 15, 1966.

The letter and summary follow:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D.C., October 1, 1966.

Hon. JOHN M. ASHBROOK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ASHBROOK: Since you have sponsored legislation which would affect the Federal income tax treatment of educational expenses incurred by teachers, I thought you would be interested that the Treasury Department has withdrawn its proposed regulations in this area and has issued a revised proposal in its place. This action resulted from a careful re-evaluation of the proposed rules in the light of the many comments we have received and the important issues involved. In this regard, the views you have expressed and the points raised in your bill were helpful to us. I am attaching a memorandum which explains the revised proposal in some detail.

Sincerely yours,
STANLEY S. SURREY.

The regulations are long and detailed. I will gladly furnish a copy to any teacher who would like the full text. A summary of the regulations is as follows:

> Basically, the revised rules would permit an income tax deduction for an individual's education expenses where the education serves to maintain or improve skills required in his present position or is undertaken to fulfill additional educational requirements imposed on him by his employer.
>
> Under this general provision, if a state requires its teachers to continue to take educational courses or to obtain a higher level of education, the costs of this education will ordinarily be completely deductible for income tax purposes. Similarly, the cost of specialized courses which a state may require its teachers to take will usually be deductible if the teacher otherwise meets the basic level of education required for her position. If a teacher or other taxpayer voluntarily undertakes additional education to improve his skills, the costs he incurs for this will also generally be deductible. Moreover, unlike the first set of proposed rules, the revised rules do not measure the tax deductibility of particular educational courses by whether or not they will lead to a degree. In this regard, the proposed regulations recognize that continuing education is, in many instances, an essential tool in an individual's trade or business.

As one who supports the vocational education concept and guidance counseling I am nonetheless equally concerned with the practices in some States and local areas to use questionnaires and tests to invade the privacy of the home and the religious belief of the student. My H.R. 3912 would limit Federal money being used for testing to the purposes which HEW proclaim. Despite all of their regulations, there is a mounting evidence of abuse in this area and my legislation, when it becomes law, would strengthen these regulations. Federal money should not be used, as it has in some areas, to develop information regarding the economic, political, social and sexual ideas of the student. Questions like "Is your father a tyrant?" or "Do your father and mother fight?" have no place in sound guidance programs.

HIGHER EDUCATION

In the field of higher education, the same self-help principle has been extended in legislation I have introduced and worked for. My H.R. 5785 would allow an income tax credit for tuition expenses of the taxpayer or his spouse or a dependent at an institution of higher education and make an additional credit for gifts or contributions made to any institution of higher education. This would encourage tens of thousands of Americans in their efforts to secure higher education. It would be self-help and not require burdensome Federal programs.

In addition, it would encourage the private contributions to our colleges and would be of particular assistance to smaller, private colleges. The larger, tax-supported colleges will gradually squeeze out our small and independent colleges unless some means is found to help and encourage their operation. My bill was drafted in cooperation with the presidents of seven independent colleges as was H.R. 13107 which would exempt from income tax interest all obligations issued by colleagues and universities for their building programs.

These are but a few of the constructive proposals I have made in the field of education. It is my sincere belief that most Americans want a strong and healthy educational development in our country. It is also my conviction that they want this accomplished as free as possible of outside interference. There is no question in my mind that political decisions will gradually become the most important factor in the administration of any school if we continue our present course. Educators, not politicians should determine what constitutes educational excellence and develop these policies and programs in cooperation with local parents and taxpayers who, after all, must pay the bills. To substitute our system of local government for one of bureaucratic supervision from Washington will not, in my opinion, answer the real needs of the day and will indeed cause more problems.

One of the most pleasant aspects of being a Member of Congress is the fact that we work with so many high school students and their teachers. I endeavor to visit all of our local high schools and, in the course of the year, we will receive many hundreds of inquiries from 17th District students who are seeking information. In addition, I have made a policy of inviting high school students to participate in my annual questionnaire which is sent out every January. A Congressman's office is a clearinghouse for information and we are always ready to help in any way possible.

HARRY FLOOD BYRD

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, when a neighbor dies the blow is felt in our own household. When that neighbor is one for whom we have felt admiration and affection over a long period of years we not only sense the loss, but recognize that a change has taken place, and that things will never be quite the same again.

So it is that many Marylanders not only extend their condolences to our friends across the Potomac, but also mourn with them the death of Harry Flood Byrd. Senator Byrd was a familiar figure on our horizon and he will be missed.

I am personally deeply conscious of the debt that we owe to Senator Byrd. That is not to say that I always agreed with him on specific questions. But regardless of the current issues that have come and gone, I have always supported and respected Senator Byrd's stanch stand for the principles in which he believed and which he virtually personified. We of Maryland like a man who is true to himself, and we liked Harry Byrd.

The beautiful Shenandoah Valley that Senator Byrd loved so deeply is closely related to western Maryland, and his people are much like our people. We value the qualities of industry, integrity, and frugality that he made his trademarks. We hope to keep these characteristics as a part of our bone and fiber and we are grateful for this strong example.

In today's Washington Post Benjamin Muse says:

> His most precious legacy—is the high standard of governmental integrity that he set and the memory of his sterling character and stout heart.

TRIBUTES TO THE HONORABLE PAUL B. DAGUE, THE HONORABLE JOHN C. KUNKEL, AND THE HONORABLE WILLARD S. CURTIN ON THEIR RETIREMENT

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I have the unusual regret to talk about three of our colleagues from the State of Pennsylvania who are retiring at the conclusion of this session. The three gentlemen—the Honorable Paul Bartram Dague, the Honorable John Crain Kunkel, and the Honorable Willard S. Curtin—have a combined service here in the House of 48 years.

Mr. Dague has been here continuously for 20 years, having first been elected in 1946. He attended Downingtown High School, in a city where he still lives.

He did special studies at West Chester State Teachers College, and electrical engineering at Drexel Institute at Philadelphia.

He was sheriff of Chester County in the years 1944 to 1946.

He served in the marines during World War I, and has been an official of the American Legion since the war closed.

He married Mary Virginia Williams.

He came to Congress in the 80th Congress and has served continuously since.

Mr. Dague, as all of us know, has had a very distinguished record here. He has not been a vigorous orator, but his judgment in committee and in the Pennsylvania delegation has been very highly regarded. We are going to miss Paul, and we hope he will have many pleasant years in retirement and that he will come back to visit us frequently.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

I wish to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks concerning my good friend Paul Dague.

Paul Dague has been a tower of strength on the Committee on Agriculture. He has been a stalwart soldier on our side of the aisle. Paul Dague has done a great job for his district, his State of Pennsylvania, and our Nation. All of us will miss him, but we wish to him and his family a happy, healthy, and prosperous future.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The great State of Pennsylvania has sent many fine men to the Congress, but none finer than the three whom the gentleman honors today. In particular, I rise to pay tribute to our beloved colleague, Paul Dague. He is a man of great stature, and a Christian statesman. It has been my privilege to know him but briefly, but I feel I know him well. I think of him as St. Paul because of his unusual Christian character. Certainly the Congress will suffer a loss at his departure this year.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like also to say that we have three gentlemen here being considered together, but there is a very unusual situation which I would like to bring up about our colleague John Kunkel.

John lives in Harrisburg. He is married and has served 18 years in this body with considerable interruption. The most interesting thing about John Kunkel's career, though, is probably something that will never be matched again and has never been matched in the history of the Congress. He is the grandson of John C. Kunkel who was a Member of the 34th and 35th Congresses. He is a great-grandson of John Sergeant, who was a Member of Congress for 8 terms. He is the great-grandson of Robert Whitehill, a Member of Congress in the 9th through the 13th Congresses and a great-great-grandson of Jonathan Dickinson Sergeant who was a member of the Continental Congress.

John has a very fine education, having gone to Yale University and Harvard Law School. He was first elected to the Congress in 1938. I had the pleasure of coming here with him. He became the head of what we refer to as the Wednesday Night Club. We met regularly on Wednesday nights and had good speakers addressing us. John served in this capacity, as head of this club, extremely well until he left Congress at the end of the 81st Congress. He came back in the 87th Congress, at the time of the death of the Hon. Walter M. Mumma, and has served here ever since. His total service comprises approximately 18 years.

Mr. Speaker, the third gentleman who is leaving from the great State of Pennsylvania is Willard S. Curtin, who lives in Morrisville, in Bucks County. He attended Morrisville High, Penn State University, and the University of Pennsylvania Law School. As all of you know, Willard has been a most active and vigorous individual, always pleasant, and one who seems to be leaving here at almost the height of his career. But, he feels that his 10 years of service here are adequate.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to miss him, along with Representatives Dague and Kunkel.

So, Mr. Speaker, I cannot but emphasize the fact to the membership that we Pennsylvanians certainly are going to miss these three fine gentlemen, as we know all of the other Members of this great body will miss them.

Mr. Speaker, the country is better for them having served here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Corbett] has taken this time in which to pay tribute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Kunkel].

Mr. Speaker, John Kunkel has served for a great many years in the House of Representatives, with conviction and dedication.

Mr. Speaker, the work of John Kunkel on the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Public Works has been of the highest order. All of us shall miss John Kunkel, his steadying influence and his cooperation with those of us in the leadership. John Kunkel has superbly represented his district, his State of Pennsylvania, and our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I wish for John and his lovely and charming wife the very best in the days and years ahead.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Corbett] for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I did not want this occasion to pass without joining my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Corbett] in his accolades to the three gentlemen from Pennsylvania who are retiring from the Congress of the United States, particularly my friend, John Kunkel.

Mr. Speaker, John has served as the ranking minority member on the subcommittee which I have the honor of chairing, the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. Speaker, I have never found a more fairminded and able gentleman than the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Kunkel]. The gentleman represents a true bipartisan approach to the consideration of legislation and he always considers the welfare of the country ahead of party.

Mr. Speaker, we on the Committee on Public Works shall miss his service. We wish him Godspeed in his retirement.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I am glad to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I share the personal views expressed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Gray] concerning our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Curtin].

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to have an office located next to the office occupied by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Willard Curtin], for a number of years.

Mr. Speaker, as a consequence we became well acquainted and I developed a great admiration for Willard Curtin. I came to know Willard Curtin as a gentleman of the highest order and a legislator who has performed a wonderful job during his service in the House of Representatives. Willard Curtin has done a great job on his committee for his district, his State of Pennsylvania, and his Nation.

Mr. Speaker, we shall miss him greatly. We wish him Godspeed in the years ahead with the best of future health, happiness, and success.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I am glad to yield to the distinguished minority whip, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Arends].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, one of the great rewards of serving in the Congress is the friendships that develop. Whatever the future may bring for any one of us, we cannot look back upon these years in Congress without reflecting on the times of crisis, at least seemingly so, the failures and the successes that we share with our colleagues.

As anxious as I am for adjournment and to return to my district, I cannot but hesitate when I know that this means "goodbye" to some of my colleagues and friends. Among these are the three distinguished gentlemen from Pennsylvania, Willard S. Curtin, Paul B. Dague, and John C. Kunkel. I am truly proud of the friendship that developed between us over the years.

Their leaving the Congress is a great loss to the State of Pennsylvania and to the Congress. All three hold a senior position on their committees: Curtin on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Dague on Agriculture, and Kunkel on Public Works. The Keystone State of Pennsylvania certainly has had in them all that the term "keystone" implies in the quality of representation they have given their State and respective districts. They have proven themselves to be outstanding legislators.

By virtue of Paul Dague being the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and my being the minority whip, I have had occasion to closely associate with him on many legislative issues. He has been a part of our party leadership. And he has done a remarkable job toward advancing our party principles and policy in the field of agriculture. He has been in the forefront of the fight to take our farm program out of the hands of politicians and put it in the hands of those who really understand the lot of our farmers.

It is my privilege to represent a district that is predominantly agricultural. I know I speak for the farmers I represent when I say, "Thanks, Paul Dague, for your courageous efforts in our behalf."

I thank all three of my friends from Pennsylvania—Curtin, Dague, and Kunkel—Willard, Paul, and John—for their cooperation and their assistance. Whatever you do, whatever you undertake, and wherever you go, my very best personal wishes go with you.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Schweiker].

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and to say that it has been a privilege and a pleasure to know these fine gentlemen, experienced legislators, and dedicated public servants.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join my colleagues in the Pennsylvania delegation in paying tribute to three retiring Members of Congress from our State, Willard S. Curtin, Paul B. Dague, and John C. Kunkel.

I have had the honor of serving with all three of these men in the 87th, 88th, and 89th Congresses. Mr. Dague's record of service spans every Congress since the 80th. Mr. Kunkel first came to Capitol Hill in 1939, as a Member of the 76th Congress, and altogether has an 18-year record. Finally, Mr. Curtin has served in the last five Congresses.

The combined work of these three exemplary Congressmen would total 48 years. They have made valuable contributions not only to the welfare of the districts they represented, but to the security and vitality of our entire Nation.

These three gentlemen and myself have not always agreed on what positions should be taken, but I have valued their wise and experienced counsel and admired their sincerity and the excellent way that they have represented their districts.

I know I speak for every other Member of the Pennsylvania delegation in this Congress when I thank them for their dedication to this Nation's interests and wish them happiness in the coming years.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in the compliments being paid to these fine gentlemen from Pennsylvania, these gentlemen who will not be with us next year, John Kunkel, Willard Curtin, and Paul Dague.

Mr. Speaker, Paul Dague has been my leader during the 89th Congress on the House Committee on Agriculture. Permit me to say on behalf, not only of the Republican members of that committee, but on behalf of all the Members, that his wise counsel and leadership will be sorely missed by all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we Republican members of the delegation from Pennsylvania are proud to be Members of the Congress of the United States and we have endeavored during this 89th Congress to work together in the best interests of our State and Nation.

We have held regular delegation meetings and have exchanged information as to important legislation moving in our committees and have analyzed its effect on the State in which we live and represent. This cooperation has always been the case and we feel that our delegation is probably the most closely knit delegation in the entire Congress.

This has resulted in some of the Members in the past going on to higher things; for instance, Senator Hugh Scott was a former Member of the House of Representatives and was one of its outstanding Members; and we are proud that the present Governor of Pennsylvania, the Honorable William W. Scranton, was a member of our delegation.

There comes a time in the life of a Congressman when he has a decision to make whether to continue in his role as Congressman or to retire to private life or to seek a different office. This decision this year faced three of the valued members of our delegation; namely, Paul B. Dague, John C. Kunkel, and Willard S. Curtin.

Unfortunately for our delegation they have decided to retire from the Congress. This is not only a very serious blow to our group but it is also a great loss to the State of Pennsylvania, the Nation, and to their respective congressional districts.

Paul Dague has served in the Congress of the United States for 10 terms and rose to become the ranking minority member of the great Committee on Agriculture. He is a man possessed of a very fine keen mind, a tremendous amount of commonsense, and is interested in agriculture and also in the farmer and the well-being of our Nation. It has made him a valuable Member of this body.

John C. Kunkel was first elected to Congress in 1939 and served six terms. He then was later elected to the 87th Congress in May 1961. As a Member during both of these terms of service in the Congress he served with great distinction. He has great capability, a charming and pleasing personality and is much beloved by the people of his district. He has been a valued and highly respected member of the Public Works Committee and has been assigned although a member of the minority, very important tasks in committee work.

Willard Curtin was first elected to Congress in 1956 from the 8th District of Pennsylvania. Before coming to the Congress he was a very prominent and highly successful attorney in his home town and achieved distinction as district attorney of Bucks County. When a vacancy occurred in his congressional district, he was the natural person to be elected to the job. He has served on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and also on the Committee on House Administration.

Willard Curtin is noted for being a very cautious person who studies very carefully a problem or program presented and after due deliberation and thought then proceeds in the best interests of his district, State, and Nation. All Members of Congress look up to Willard Curtin as a man of high integrity, great ability, and he is an indefatigable worker.

Yes, there is a new group of men running for the Congress to fill the seats being left by these three very highly capable men. They will be very hard to replace. Our Pennsylvania delegation in Congress has lost a great deal and these men will be sorely missed by every Member of this Congress. I wish them well in any of their future endeavors and wish them all a long and happy life.

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Whalley].

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to retiring Congressmen Paul Dague, Willard Curtin and John Kunkel.

It has been my privilege to serve with these gentlemen from Pennsylvania and to learn to know them well. They have compiled an enviable record and won the respect and admiration of their constituents and the Members of this great body.

We need more men like these three outstanding Members in high Government office. Their services and personal friendships will long be remembered and the House will miss them very much.

As these men leave the Congress, they can carry with them the deep sense of satisfaction of having done a very fine job.

Mr. Speaker, I take the opportunity to wish Congressmen Dague, Curtin and Kunkel and their families the best of everything.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, as regards the three men, the Pennsylvania delegation, the Congress, their constituents and the citizens of the United States can give them the final accolade of having done their job well.

We wish them the best of health and God's blessing.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I should like to add just a word and say that I thoroughly agree with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania and the previous speakers with regard to the three distinguished Pennsylvanians who are retiring from the House of Representatives. John Kunkel, Paul Dague, and Willard Curtin have been three of the finest Members we have had over the years that I have been in the House of Representatives. I will wish them many future years of health and happiness.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and fellow Pennsylvanian, Paul Dague, is now retiring after continuous service in the House of Representatives since January 1947—a period of 20 years of devoted, steadfast service to his ideals.

Paul is, I would say, one of the most respected Members of Congress. I think this is because to know him is to become aware that he is humble in his approach, respectful while at the same time highly respected, and dedicated to his ideals. This is recognized by his colleagues, who are wont to say of him, "You always know where Paul Dague stands. He's as solid as a rock."

From his quiet and unassuming manner, one would hardly know of his many accomplishments and of the worthwhile activities with which he has associated himself. Over a period of time and through my association with him I have become aware of some of these. I know, for example, that he had uninterrupted service of more than 25 years as a Sunday school teacher in his Presbyterian Church in his home town of Downingtown, that he allowed nothing to interfere with the regularity of this responsibility, and missed only one Sunday in 25 years. While in the House, he has been a regular member of the Thursday morning prayer breakfast for many years.

I think Paul may well be proud of his service as a Marine in World War I and as head of the Reserve unit here on Capitol Hill. He has been an intimate friend of the several recent Marine Corps commandants and is highly respected by Capitol Hill marines. He has participated, too, in American Legion activities in Pennsylvania, and has served as chairman of several State committees in the Legion over the years.

Paul has a fine sense of humor, and I believe he will be long remembered on the Hill as one of our best "story-tellers". He and Ernie Petinaud, the House Restaurant major domo, exchange jokes daily, and he has several stories for every situation and occasion.

The Members of the Pennsylvania delegation, and all his many friends in the Congress, are going to miss Paul, a capable and dedicated gentleman of high ideals and an engaging sense of humor, who has served his country well both as a member of the armed services and as a Member of this body.

Mr. Speaker, paying tribute to our good friend and colleague, John Kunkel, is an occasion of mixed emotions. On the one hand this is a sad observance for so many of us who have served with him and, on the other, we are happy that he will be enjoying a well deserved retirement.

John Kunkel has carried on a family tradition that I believe is unequalled in the Congress, having had a grandfather, two great-grandfathers, and a great-great-grandfather who preceded him as Congressmen. His great-great-grandfather, Johnathan Dickinson Sergeant, was a Member of the Continental Congress. John has lived up to this fine heritage and ancestry in his hard work and devotion to his duties as a Member of the House.

When he came to the House he brought with him one of the finest of educational backgrounds. This the result of early schooling at Phillips Andover Academy, then as a Yale undergraduate, followed by his law degree from Harvard.

John is held in deep respect and high esteem by his constituency and by his colleagues as well. In fact, his retirement may not be entirely realized by many of the residents of the 16th Pennsylvania Congressional District since it is not often that a Member retire as JOHN KUNKEL is doing. He is working almost like a campaigner. Since announcing plans to retire last spring, JOHN has continued the same full schedule as he did before. It has been more like the schedule followed by those seeking reelection. In this, his 6th year of his present tenure of service in the Congress, he has assumed as much responsibility as possible for a Member of the minority side. He continues to write his weekly newsletters and tape radio broadcasts to keep his constituents well informed of the happenings here. JOHN, therefore, is probably one of the most active incumbents who is not campaigning for reelection.

JOHN will probably now find more time to pursue his avid avocation—bridge playing. In this field, too, he excels, together with his wife, Kitty. He is known as one of the country's best bridge players.

We shall all miss him but JOHN has certainly earned his retirement by his effectiveness and hard work in the Congress of these United States.

With four voluntary retirements this year, our great State of Pennsylvania is losing more men than any other State, not the least of whom is my good friend, WILLARD S. CURTIN.

Congressman CURTIN has had a record of continuous service since January, 1957—10 years as an effective leader in Congress. He is a graduate of Penn State University and University of Pennsylvania Law School who plans to retire to spend some casual time with his large law firm in Morrisville, Pa., of which he is senior partner.

Congressman CURTIN has been an effective member of the important Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee where he has maintained a deep and active interest—always with a searching and inquiring mind.

His joys and pleasures have been delight in going to southern Maryland to enjoy hard-shelled crabs with his colleagues—whenever the few occasions permit him to get away from the Capitol for a short time. He is an exceptionally good family man and more recently, a very proud grandfather of a little girl.

All of us in Congress are going to miss WILLARD—his enthusiasm and zest for living—his cheerful presence in these Halls always brightened our days.

We all know how fully he has earned this leisure time, but Bucks County is not so far away that we do not anticipate occasional visits from Gerry and WILLARD. We understand the Curtins are going to be doing a lot of traveling upon retirement and we hope they make Washington a port of call. It is my sincere hope that the years to come will bring peace and contentment to both of them.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, as this session draws to a close, I want to take this opportunity to express my regret that my dear friend and colleague, WILLARD S. CURTIN, is retiring from this body and will not be among those of us who may be reelected to serve in the 90th Congress.

Congressman CURTIN has distinguished himself during his 10 years of service in this House as a dedicated public servant of great ability. WILLARD came to the Congress well qualified for his legislative responsibilities through his practice of law and his service as district attorney of Bucks County in Pennsylvania. Although he is a member of the minority party, I have long had occasion to note his fairness in debate and his desire to cast his votes in a manner which he conscientiously believed would best serve the interests of his State and Nation. The Congress is enriched and the American people benefit from the service of legislators like WILLARD S. CURTIN, and because he is still a young man, as years are counted these days, I feel assured that he will maintain his strong interest in public affairs and I hope that we will have the pleasure of seeing him here in this hall many times in the future. For there will be many more occasions when it will not only be pleasant to see him but helpful to have the benefit of his wise counsel on legislative problems.

I wish him the best of continued success and happiness for many years to come.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, what does one say about such noble men as PAUL DAGUE, JOHN KUNKEL, and WILLIARD CURTIN, who have decided to leave these legislative halls after long, impressive records and seek the groves of retirement? Their records are eloquent evidence of their long devotion to public service and their character shines like a star in the heavens.

PAUL, JOHN, and WILLARD all have always exhibited a decent respect for others. They are religious men who know the existence of God in the American tradition.

Long will the achievements and personalities of these men hover in this Chamber as an inspiration to all who shall sit in these seats when they are gone to a richly deserved retirement.

To Messrs. DAGUE, KUNKEL, and CURTIN I say congratulations, we shall miss you, and come back to see us in the future. America cannot afford to lose the services of these men.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to report that this House is losing, through retirement, the services of my dear friend and distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, the Honorable PAUL BARTRAM DAGUE, who has served continuously since the 80th Congress.

I have been honored and proud to number myself among PAUL's friends and I know that I speak for all of us when I say we shall all very much miss his sage counsel and his peerless skill as a legislator.

PAUL's life has been noted for his dedication to the service of his fellowman. He served with distinction in the U.S. Marine Corps and later as a law enforcement officer before coming to the Congress in 1947. PAUL DAGUE has been an outstanding Member of the minority party and one who will be remembered in the annals of the Congress as a legislator who contributed greatly to the enactment of constructive and progressive legislation throughout the years of his service.

We shall all miss PAUL and I do want to continue to maintain the friendship that we have had for so many years. He has my admiration, esteem, and lasting friendship. I wish him every success and happiness for the future.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, the retirement of our distinguished colleagues from Pennsylvania, PAUL DAGUE, JOHN KUNKEL, and WILLARD CURTIN leaves me with mixed emotions. I am pleased that they can now enjoy some well-earned rest with their wonderful families. On the other hand, the House of Representatives will be a lesser place because of their absence. At all times they have demonstrated to me, as a newer Member of this body, the intelligence, the integrity, and the intense devotion to their country that all America hopes to find in its Representatives in the U.S. Congress. And they have done more. I suppose that only a Member of Congress can fully appreciate the almost insatiable demands placed on one's time once a session starts. Yet, through it all, these men always had time to offer me counsel and guidance, to give me the benefit of their experience, and to afford me the kindness that is the essence of human existence.

I shall never forget them. Nor will the Congress, for they leave with the highest respect and esteem of their colleagues. There is no greater tribute than this.

God grant to them and their loved ones a long, fruitful, and joyous life—till we meet again.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, as the 89th Congress draws to a close, I would like to take this opportunity to commend several of my fellow members of the Pennsylvania delegation for their efforts and service in the Congress, and extend best wishes for their retirement.

HERMAN TOLL, a member of my own party—whose ill health has unfortunately prevented him from serving actively in this Congress—has been a faithful, loyal Representative of the Fourth District of Pennsylvania since the 86th Congress. A practicing attorney and member of the Philadelphia, Pa., and American Bar Associations, Representative TOLL has been active in civic, religious, and humanitarian groups in Philadelphia and will be remembered as a hardworking, conscientious member of the Judiciary Committee and the House of Representatives.

The other three Pennsylvania gentlemen who have decided to return to private life are PAUL DAGUE, WILLARD CURTIN, and JOHN C. KUNKEL, all men of integrity and judgment whose views have sometimes been different than mine, but whose opinions and friendship I value.

PAUL DAGUE has served 10 terms in the Congress and is a senior member of the Agriculture Committee. He has served Pennsylvania's Ninth District with distinction. WILLARD S. CURTIN, a former district attorney from Bucks County, has been a valued member of the House Administration and Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees, serving the Eighth District of Pennsylvania since the

85th Congress. The congressional heritage of JOHN C. KUNKEL goes back to our country's Continental Congress. I believe this is unique in these Halls. He has been an able Representative of the 16th District of Pennsylvania for 18 years and is a ranking member of the Public Works Committee.

All of these men have been a credit to our State of Pennsylvania and to the country. I congratulate them on their achievements and wish them good fortune.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

REMARKS OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON AT NATIONAL SHRINE OF OUR LADY OF CZESTOCHOWA, DOYLESTOWN, PA., OCTOBER 16, 1966

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on last Sunday, October 16, President Johnson participated at the millennium of Poland's Christianity ceremony and the dedication of Our Lady of Czestochowa Shrine at Doylestown, Pa.

Over 140,000 Polish-Americans who gathered on that occasion applauded the President frequently and enthusiastically. The President was warmly introduced by His Excellency Archbishop Krol of Philadelphia. At the end of the ceremony the President was presented with a gold medallion of peace by the Reverend Michael Zembrzuski, who expressed the hope that the President would carry this ancient Polish symbol of peace and freedom on his present Asian tour.

The President was accompanied by Mrs. Johnson, their daughter Lynda, former Governor David Lawrence of Pennsylvania, and former Governor Farris Bryant of Florida. I was happy to note that the President invited along as his personal guest on his plane, Air Force 1, my good friend Michel Cieplinski, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Administrative Affairs.

Under the permission heretofore granted I shall now insert the President's remarks which were enthusiastically received by all those present on this important occasion:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT NATIONAL SHRINE OF OUR LADY OF CZESTOCHOWA, DOYLESTOWN, PA., OCTOBER 16, 1966

Thank you very much Archbishop Krol.

Bishop Rubin of Rome, who is representing Cardinal Wyszinski, Bishop Young of Philadelphia, Father Michael Zembrzuski, Members of Congress, my beloved friend Governor David Lawrence, ladies and gentlemen:

Mrs. Johnson and my daughter Lynda and I are delighted we could have this opportunity on the last day that we are in this country to come here and visit with you good people in the State of Pennsylvania.

This is a proud day for all Americans of Polish descent.

For what we are dedicating this afternoon is more than a beautiful structure of stone and glass.

It is a symbol of 1,000 years of Polish civilization and Polish Christianity. And to me, it is also a symbol of millions of men and women who have come to our shores as immigrants in search of a better way of life in America.

They were poor, most of them, and had to take what they could get. Life was hard at its best.

Many of them were illiterate, and the language barriers seemed almost impossible for most of them to surmount.

They were no strangers, of course, to discrimination. Their names were hard to pronounce, they spoke with a strange accent, and they did not come from the "right" part of Europe.

But they did have faith, and having that, they overcame every barrier that confronted them. And looking back now, we, all of us, realize how very much they contributed to the richness and to the diversity of the United States of America.

They brought their culture—and that has enriched us. But they brought more. They brought brawn to our industrial might. They brought scholarship to our universities. They brought music to our concert halls. And they brought art to decorate our walls.

And most of all, they brought a love of freedom and a respect for human dignity that is unsurpassed by any in America.

I expect that it is a little known fact of history, but it was a group of Polish-Americans who conducted America's first recorded labor strike. And they did it for the right to vote.

The first Polish immigrants landed at Jamestown, Virginia, in 1608. They followed the usual practice of paying for their passage by working for the company after their arrival. But in the process, they discovered that the company authorities had disenfranchised them because they were "foreigners". And so, in 1619, they simply stopped working. And in a very short time thereafter, they won their rights as free citizens.

This is the spirit of Polish-Americans.

You just really don't know how glad I am that you won that first strike.

This is not an isolated example. The freedom that we have enjoyed for nearly 200 years was bought not only with American blood, but it was bought—our freedom—with Polish blood as well. Casimir Pulaski once pledged himself before the high altar of a church to defend faith and freedom to the last drop of his blood. And he redeemed that pledge at Savannah, so that a young nation could choose its own destiny.

This is the spirit of Polish-Americans.

Another great man was Thaddeus Kosciusko. Like Pulaski, he came here to help us win our freedom. When the war ended, a grateful Congress gave him American citizenship, a pension with landed estates in Ohio, and the rank of Brigadier General.

But he was much more than a professional soldier. He was a great and outstanding humanitarian. And before he returned to Europe in 1798, he drew up his will that placed him at the forefront of the movement to abolish slavery and discrimination.

This was almost 60-odd years before the Emancipation Proclamation.

Here is what he wrote in his will: "I Thaddeus Kosciusko hereby authorize my friend Thomas Jefferson to employ the whole of my property in the United States in purchasing Negroes from among his own or any other and giving them liberty in my name. . . ."

This, too, is the spirit of Polish-Americans.

We need that spirit in America today—perhaps more than we have ever needed it before. We need the spirit that says that another man's dignity is more precious than life itself.

We need the spirit that says a man's skin shall not be a bar to his opportunities—any more than a man's name or a man's religion, or a man's nationality.

And finally, we need the spirit that says, as Pulaski said nearly two centuries ago, "Wherever on the globe men are fighting for freedom, it is as if it were our own affair."

For today, when we pray here on this peaceful Sabbath day, this Sunday afternoon, in this beautiful green valley, there are millions of our fellow citizens who are fighting for freedom—millions in this country and hundreds of thousands across the water.

Millions of our fellow citizens here are fighting for freedom:

Freedom from want.

Freedom from ignorance.

Freedom from fear.

And most of all, freedom from discrimination.

And I hope that each of you will understand that their struggle is your affair, too. So let us make it our cause as well.

As we dedicate this magnificent shrine here this afternoon, let us not be ashamed to say that we are generous or that we care about human beings. When we reach out to help those who are less fortunate than ourselves, let us remember the words of Christ: "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me."

Now as we are striving to expand the horizons of 20 million Americans, we have not forgotten the urgent pleas of millions of others throughout the world. They, too, are our brothers—all of them, in all directions. "Love thy neighbor as thyself."

In the morning, we will leave to visit six countries in Asia. We will go to an area of the world where more than half of the people live. We will go to an area of the world where in some parts of it the life expectancy is only 35 years of age, where the per capita income per year is $65.

They are fighting their battle for freedom:

Freedom to determine who shall govern them.

Freedom from want.

Freedom from hunger.

Freedom from disease.

Freedom from ignorance.

They are now carrying on their battle against all the ancient enemies of mankind. They need your blessings, they need your prayers, and they need your help.

And I am going to carry all of them with me on your behalf.

We must not forget your friends and your relatives in Poland. We have not forgotten the traditional bonds that have united our peoples since our earliest days as a nation.

We intend to strengthen those bonds. As I said at the Virginia Military Institute in an address in 1964, we intend to build bridges to Poland; bridges of friendship, bridges of trade, and bridges of aid. And following through, last year, it was my privilege to appoint one of the outstanding living Polish-Americans as our Ambassador to Poland to help start building those bridges: John A. Gronouski. He is writing a great record for himself and for his nation.

We have not been idle here at home.

Our post-war contribution to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration in Poland has now exceeded $360 million.

Many Poles have had a better diet, thanks to what you in America have done for them through America's Food for Peace program.

We have donated $37 million in food through CARE and other private organizations. Through these organizations, we have been able to provide hot meals to hundreds of thousands of children in schools and summer camps and to the sick and aged in hospitals and institutions.

Last December, a great children's hospital, a gift from the American people, was dedicated in Krakow.

Last week, in New York, I announced further steps that the American Government plans to take.

We will press for legislative authority to negotiate trade agreements which could extend most-favored-nation tariff treatment to Eastern European States, including Poland.

We are instituting a program to strive for closer cultural relations with Poland.

We have reduced export controls on East-West trade in the last few days with respect to hundreds of non-strategic items that they would like to have from America.

On behalf of your Government, we have extended to Poland an invitation to cooperate with America in our satellite program.

We have taken steps to allow the Export-Import Bank to guarantee commercial credits to four additional Eastern European countries—including Poland.

We are now carefully looking at ways in which we may use some portion of our Polish currency balance for the benefit of both countries—ways which will symbolize America's continuing friendship for Poland.

We are trying to determine ways and means to liberalize our rules on travel in our two countries in order to promote much better understanding and increased exchanges between our people.

And, finally, I am quite hopeful that I will be able to arrange to send to Poland a mission of leading American businessmen and others to explore ways to widen and to enrich the ties between Poland and the United States of America.

My fellow Americans, we are living in times of ferment and unrest—both at home and abroad. But I genuinely believe—I truly know—that there is more in America that unites us than there is to divide us. I believe that our generation now has the opportunity to establish a new era of friendship and cooperation with the peoples of the world. I believe we have the power to eradicate ancient injustices and to ease traditional tensions.

When I leave tomorrow, I shall say that my purpose will be not to accomplish any miracles, but to tell the people of the countries that I visit that the best way to judge America's foreign policy is to look at our domestic policy.

Our domestic policy here at home is to find jobs for our men at good wages, education for our children, a roof over their heads, and a church where they can worship according to the dictates of their own conscience, adequate food for their bodies, and health for their families. Because with food, income, education, health, and with a strong defense that will protect our liberty, if we can do that here at home, we can set an example that all the people of the world will want to emulate.

We would like to see all of the three billion people have the blessings, advantages, freedom, and prosperity that we have here in America in Pennsylvania this afternoon.

And while we cannot wave any wand and we do not expect to achieve any miracles, we do expect to tell them what interests our people, what we want, and what we would also want for them. We want to assure them that we do not look at self alone. We "love thy neighbor as thyself."

Yes, our ultimate task is reconciliation—to bring us all to perceive, at home and abroad, regardless of our faith or where we worship, regardless of our sex or our religion, regardless of our color, whether it is white or brown or black or green, to gring to all of us at home and abroad, that men are children of God and brothers.

Yes, we are living in an exciting age. Much is at stake. The fabric of our whole society is at stake. The future of all civilization is at stake. But remembering the words, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," I have great hopes for the future. And I believe you do, too.

Thank you very much.

AUTHORIZING ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES TO LEASE CERTAIN PROPERTY IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 15024) to amend section 8 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 to authorize the Administrator of General Services to lease certain property in the District of Columbia, with amendments of the Senate thereto and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Administrator of General Services, in consultation with the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, is authorized to—

"(1) select, with the approval of the Government department or agency administering the site, a Government-owned site within the District of Columbia which is appropriate for a temporary heliport;

"(2) construct on such site necessary minimum heliport facilities; and

"(3) lease, by negotiation or otherwise, and at the highest obtainable rental, such site and facilities on an annual basis to any person who will operate such heliport in accordance with such rules and regulations as are established by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

"SEC. 2. There are authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $100,000 for the purposes of this Act.

"Amend the title so as to read: 'An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to select an available Government-owned site in the District of Columbia and to improve and lease such site for a temporary heliport.'"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has this been cleared with the minority Members?

Mr. GRAY. I am glad to respond to the distingnished minority leader by stating, yes, it has been cleared with all members of the House Committee on Public Works. I have spoken to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] and he has no objection to agreeing to the Senate amendments. The bill passed the House unanimously. It passed the other body unanimously. In the testimony that was taken on the need for a heliport for Washington, all agencies of the Government that were interested in this matter testified in favor. Scheduled helicopter service is badly needed to our outlying airports.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

There was no objection.

Accordingly, at 1 o'clock and 1 minute p.m., the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14644) entitled "An act to amend the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 to extend it for three years, and for other purposes; and to authorize assistance to developing institutions for an additional year."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14929) entitled "An act to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17607) entiled "An act to suspend the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3689. An act for the relief of Juanita Cereguine de Burgh;

H.R. 7973. An act to amend section 4339 of title 10, United States Code;

H.R. 9778. An act to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to codify recent military law, and to improve the Code; and

H.R. 17451. An act to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to authorize certain rank, pay, and retirement privileges for officers serving in certain positions, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following

titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 982. An act for the relief of Maj. Robert G. Smith, U.S. Air Force;

S. 2147. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Samuel J. Cole, U.S. Army (retired);

S. 2222. An act for the relief of Susan Jeanne Clynes;

S. 2798. An act for the relief of CWO Glen Zeigler, U.S. Navy (retired); and

S. 3747. An act to designate the dam and reservoir to be constructed on the Sangamon River near Decatur, Ill., as the Henry Bolz Dam and Reservoir.

PRESERVE ACCESSIBLE ESTUARINE AREAS OF THE NATION

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 13447) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior in cooperation with the States to preserve, protect, develop, restore, and make accessible estuarine areas of the Nation which are valuable for sport and commercial fishing, wildlife conservation, recreation, and scenic beauty, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will withhold his objection and will reserve the right to object.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

PRESERVATION OF WETLANDS AREAS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am very much saddened to see my good friend from Maryland object to this important piece of legislation. It was reported unanimously from the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation of the Committee on Merchant Marines and Fisheries and reported unanimously from the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to the House of Representatives. A rule has been granted on this legislation. This bill received very large support, failing a two-thirds majority recently by only three votes. Most of the national conservation organizations are in favor of enactment of this legislation. It is viewed as being an important step to preserve a great natural resource of the United States, the rapidly dwindling wetlands areas of this country.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TENZER] worked diligently and hard to resolve the objections that might exist and to work out a piece of legislation that would be in the public interest and one on which all Members of this body could get together. In addition to this, the gentleman from New York worked diligently to resolve difficulties which existed with this legislation with regard to persons who live in and around the area from which he comes where this had been previously a matter of some controversy. All of the citizens and all of the Members of Congress who come from the area most immediately affected by this legislation are strongly in support of it.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation has been worked out with the consent of the committee and, as I say, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TENZER] has put great effort into this matter.

Mr. Speaker, this represents a matter of paramount importance to the gentleman from New York in the congressional district which it is his honor to represent.

Mr. Speaker, I want this House of Representatives to know that when this reconvenes in January of next year, the chairman of this subcommittee, at the request of my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TENZER] shall schedule this legislation as one of the first actions to be taken by that subcommittee and I as chairman of that subcommittee, will bring up the legislation which has been introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TENZER], who has so diligently worked in behalf of this legislation. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TENZER] has reflected great credit upon himself and upon this House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that my good friend and colleague, the able and distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON] for whom I have the greatest affection and highest regard, has objected to this request.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I regret that my dear friend and distinguished colleague from Michigan, for whom I have great respect, happens to differ with me as to the passage of H.R. 13447.

The passage of this bill in its present form would be of great concern to me. Though the bill is of noble purpose and seeks to protect a valuable natural resource, many aspects of it need more work by the committee and a great deal more study by the Department of the Interior itself.

The rights of the States in which the estuarine areas lie are not fully protected by the language of this legislation. There are literally thousands of families who make their living from the fisheries of which the estuarine areas are a part. This bill does not fully protect the rights of these people. To me, the rights of the States, and particularly the protection of the watermen, are a paramount part of a conservation program.

Certainly I will join the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TENZER], and all other interested Members of this House in working out a constructive program that will guarantee the preservation and conservation of our estuarine areas. But before the States have been fully heard, and before I am assured that the rights of my State and of the watermen of my district are fully protected, I regret, Mr. Speaker, that I must object to this 11th-hour effort to pass this legislation.

The bill authorizes the Secretary to conduct a comprehensive, nationwide study for the purpose of evaluating and identifying potential estuarine areas of the United States. The legislation should be limited to just that. However, also authorized by this bill is the establishment of a system of Federal land ownership and/or management, known as a system of estuarine areas. In addition, the Secretary is authorized to usurp local zoning jurisdiction over these areas. The acquisition of these lands—marshlands and adjacent waterways—is authorized without requirement of the Secretary to come back to the Congress.

Already in the Department of the Interior we have a variety of federally owned land systems, including national parks, national seashores and lakeshores, national monuments and historical sites, national recreation areas, fish and wildlife refuges, and the like. I firmly believe that to establish a new system of Federal ownership and Federal land management is redundant.

Within the capability of the Department of the Interior and within the appropriations available to the Secretary, the estuarine areas about which we are concerned can be studied and can be evaluated without the necessity of special legislation such as this.

When such an evaluation is developed, it could very well be that the proper solution for the preservation and management of these estuarine areas would be to include them by act of Congress in one or more of the Federal systems already existent. The creation of another system of federally owned special purpose real estate will inevitably involve additional overhead and the complexity of a new managerial organization.

This legislation could lead to the confiscation of land already being managed in the best interests of conservation and wildlife preservation. Such action in no way would further the cause of conservation, but conversely could dampen the enthusiasm for it by many dedicated private citizens.

It could lead to the confiscation of properties which have been developed under private ownership for shooting and recreation. Such a move by the Federal Government could very well jeopardize the care and husbandry which is now being given to literally thousands of square miles of wetlands and wildlife habitat by private citizens and private organizations.

Let us consult with the several States, which we have not done, before we give the authority willy-nilly to the Secretary to acquire land and put it into a new system of Federal ownership and Federal management. Let us consult with the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, which has a specific interest in this matter. After such consultation, and after full identification of the areas involved, we can then determine if there is a real necessity for Federal acquisition and Federal management to ensure and guarantee the conservation and preservation of the estuarine lands and waterways.

Not on the grounds of conflict with protection and conservation do I oppose this bill, but more on the procedure which it sets up, more because here we relinquish the duty of the Congress in the matter of acquiring lands into the public domain, and more because we fail to protect fully the rights of the States that I must object.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1967, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MAHON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 18381) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes:

Conference Report (H. Rept. No. 2333)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 18381) "making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 10, 12, 15, 16, 17, and 21.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 14, 18, 20, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 31, 32, 33, 36, 39, 40, 41, and 42; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

"For an additional amount for 'School Lunch Program', including $2,000,000 for the pilot school breakfast program, and $750,000 for the nonfood assistance program, $2,750,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$70,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$80,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,612,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$6,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 5, 6, 9, 13, 19, 25, 29, 30, 34, 35, 38, and 43.

George Mahon,
Jamie L. Whitten (with reservation),
John J. Rooney,
John E. Fogarty,
Otto E. Passman,
Edward P. Boland,
Managers on the Part of the House.

John O. Pastore,
Spessard L. Holland,
Carl Hayden,
Allen J. Ellender,
Lister Hill,
Mike Monroney,
Milton R. Young,
Leverett Saltonstall,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Statement

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 18381) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

CHAPTER I—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Research Service

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $300,000 for "Salaries and expenses", instead of $800,000 as proposed by the Senate, for development of plans and regulations for handling of laboratory animals, to be submitted to the appropriate committees of Congress by February 1, 1967.

Consumer and Marketing Service

Amendment No. 2: Inserts heading.

Amendment No. 3: Eliminates funds inserted by the Senate for the Special Milk Program.

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $2,750,000 for the School Lunch Program instead of $4,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount agreed to includes $2,000,000 for the pilot school breakfast program and $750,000 for food service equipment for needy schools.

CHAPTER III—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

General Services Administration

Construction, Public Buildings Projects

Amendment No. 5: Reported in technical disagreement.

Commission on Political Activity of Government Personnel

Amendment No. 6: Reported in technical disagreement.

Department of Housing and Urban Development

Urban mass transportation grants

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates $70,000,000 for urban mass transportation grants instead of $65,000,000 as proposed by the House and $85,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Administrative expenses, urban transportation activities

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates $80,000 for administrative expenses, urban transportation activities, instead of $75,000 as proposed by the House and $99,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Comprehensive city demonstration programs

Amendment No. 9: Reported in technical disagreement.

Grants to assist in planned metropolitan development

Amendment No. 10: Deletes $12,180,000 proposed by the Senate for grants to assist in planned metropolitan development.

CHAPTER IV—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES

Amendment No 11: Appropriates $1,100,000 for "Salaries and Expenses, National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, and Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources", instead of $800,000 as proposed by the House and $1,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Chapter V—Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Office of Education

Amendment No. 12: Restores language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate pertaining to the allocation of funds appropriated for Elementary and Secondary Educational Activities.

Amendment No. 13: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which provides that not more than $30,000,000 of the appropriation for Elementary and Secondary Educational Activities shall be available for carrying out the Adult Education Act of 1966,

Amendment No. 14: Makes technical change in language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 15, 16, and 17: Appropriate $76,000,000 for Grants for Libraries as proposed by the House instead of $57,500,000 as proposed by the Senate; provide that $35,000,000 of the appropriation shall be for grants for public library services under Title I as proposed by the House instead of $27,500,000 as proposed by the Senate; and provide that $40,000,000 of the appropriation shall be for grants for public library construction under Title II as proposed by the House instead of $29,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Public Health Service

Amendment No. 18: Inserts heading as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which will have the effect of appropriating $4,000,000 for Community Health Practice and Research instead of $6,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Freedmen's Hospital

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates an additional amount of $1,000,000 for Salaries and Expenses as proposed by the Senate.

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 21: Strikes paragraph proposed by the Senate which would appropriate $500,000 for International Educational Activities.

Executive Office of the President

Office of Economic Opportunity

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $1,612,500,000 for the Economic Opportunity program instead of $1,562,500,000 as proposed by the House and $1,662,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23: Inserts language proposed by the Senate which provides that not more than $500,000 of this appropriation shall be available to carry out the purposes of Part D of Title III.

Amendment No. 24: Provides that amounts transferred to the Economic Opportunity Loan Fund for loans under Title III shall be available for 24 months as proposed by the Senate instead of being available until expended as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 25: Reported in technical disagreement.

Amendment No. 26: Strikes language proposed by the House imposing limitations on the amount of the appropriation that might be utilized for several Office of Economic Opportunity programs.

CHAPTER VI—LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Amendments Nos. 27, 28, 29, 30, 31 and 32: Appropriates $67,650 for various Senate items as proposed by the Senate. Amendments Nos. 29 and 30 reported in technical disagreement.

CHAPTER VII

Department of State

Amendment No. 33: Inserts chapter number.

International Organizations and Conferences

Amendment No. 34: Reported in technical disagreement.

Department of Justice

Law Enforcement Assistance

Amendment No. 35: Reported in technical disagreement.

Department of Commerce

Amendment No. 36: Inserts heading.

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates $6,750,000 for "HemisFair 1968 Exposition" instead of $7,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center

Amendment No. 38: Reported in technical disagreement.

CHAPTER VIII—CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

Amendment No. 39: Inserts chapter number.

CHAPTER IX—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 40: Inserts chapter number.

Amendments Nos. 41 and 42: Inserts section numbers.

Export-Import Bank

Amendment No. 43: Reported in technical disagreement.

GEO. MAHON,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN (with reservation),
JOHN J. ROONEY,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 18381) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include tables and other extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

THE APPROPRIATIONS BILLS, 89TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, today we are considering the 15th and last appropriation bill of this session of the Congress. It is therefore timely to take stock of the appropriation record of this session of Congress.

The Congress, of course, has again deliberated at length this year. Many of us have been impatient with the length of the session. However, there is a very strong likelihood that had we rushed forward with our business and adjourned much earlier, our authorizations and our appropriations might have been much larger. So by taking our time and proceeding with all deliberate speed we may very probably have brought about a reduced program and lower appropriations than otherwise.

As you will remember, along in late spring, and subsequently, the President spoke out against the actions of the Congress in some respects in increasing his authorization requests above the President's budget, and against certain actions taken on appropriations above the President's budget. This set in motion in this body and in the other body, and in the executive branch a stronger determination to try to hold spending in line as nearly as possible under the circumstances.

It looked for a time as if we might possibly be far above the budget in appropriations for secondary and elementary education, and in the poverty program, and in some other programs, but we are not.

For the information of Members and others, let me give a brief résumé of the appropriation totals of the 2d session of the 89th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in this session, the House considered budget requests for appropriations of $130,791,000,000 and cut them by $260,000,000, net.

The Senate, in this session, considered budget requests for appropriations of $131,165,000,000 and cut them by $508,000,000.

Including the supplemental today, Congress, in the 15 appropriation bills of the session, has enacted appropriations of $130,282,000,000, which is, in total, $883,000,000 below the President's budget requests for appropriations. We are within the budget; we are below the budget—in total—on the appropriation requests considered in the appropriation bills this session—$883,000,000 below.

Very broadly, that breaks down this way:

3 defense bills (includes the defense supplemental last spring; the regular defense bill, 1967; and the military construction bill, 1967)	+$268,000,000
12 nondefense bills	−1,151,000,000
Net reductions in appropriation requests, 15 bills	−883,000,000

Adding permanent appropriations, such as interest on the public debt, of roughly $13,800,000,000—and you must do that to get a full picture—appropriations this session will approximate $144,100,000,000. That is some $24,800,000,000 above last session, mostly for defense but not entirely so.

Last session was about $13,200,000,000 above the year before.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to make two special points about these figures:

First, the basis of these figures—and this is important, because there is much confusion—understandably—about what Congress has done to the President's budget:

These figures are on the old, traditional, generally well-understood "appropriation" basis of counting. Thus they are a bit at variance with the "new obligational authority" basis used in the President's budget, and in fact used by the President himself. Not at variance much; not at variance often, but occasionally at variance. The confusion comes especially when we try to state the change Congress has made in the President's budget requests. The "appropriation" basis of counting may be superior, but there are some who think otherwise.

I do not have a final figure on the "new obligational authority" basis, but it now looks like a certainty that even on the "new obligational authority" basis of counting, Congress, in these 15 appropriation bills of the session will, in the aggregate, be slightly below—I repeat, slightly below—the President's new obligational authority requests. Not much below; not $883,000,000 below as we show on the appropriations basis, but below, nevertheless.

In the circumstances of the times; in the light of the ebullient fiscal tendencies of the people generally, I regard that as a reasonably good record.

The second point I want to emphasize is that this is not the whole budget story. Some parts of the budget are initially processed, not through the appropriation bills, but through various legislative bills. And it is especially in some of those, Mr. Speaker, that Congress has gone above the President's "new obligational authority" requests.

Of course, we also went above the President's budget in some respects in certain appropriation bills, but in total, as I have said, the appropriation bills are below the President's total requests considered in those bills.

Some instances of where the President's budget was exceeded in legislative bills are as follows:

Bill	*Above the President's NOA budget requests (round figures)*
New GI bill of rights	+$246,000,000
Civilian pay raise	+294,000,000
Military pay raise	+180,000,000
Housing mortgage credit (backdoor features)	+610,000,000
Federal Aid Highway Act (charges to general fund rather than trust fund as President had budgeted)	+226,000,000
Highway safety (somewhat similar situation as on highway aid)	+177,000,000
Military medical benefits	+73,000,000

There would probably be a few others, but these are the main ones. And a distinguishing feature of most of them is that they mandate expenditures. There is little or no budgetary or appropriation discretion as there is, for example, in aid to elementary education, or higher education, where the authorization bills are above the President's authorization requests but where we have the discretion not to appropriate to the full amount—and where, in fact, we have not appropriated above the President's budget NOA request.

Then, too, Mr. Speaker, the President's budget figures assumed enactment of some additional revenues and transportation user charges that Congress has not adopted. And some other technical bills dealing with revolving funds and how they get reflected in the budget figures have not been enacted. These things probably aggregate several hundred millions of dollars.

The complete facts will be cast up in the final appraisal of congressional action on the total of the President's budgetary recommendations.

HOUSE ACTION ON THE BILLS

Mr. Speaker, it might be helpful to submit more details to House action on the appropriation bills.

In summary, the House, in all 15 bills of the session—both supplementals for fiscal 1966 as well as bills for the current fiscal year 1967—considered budget requests for appropriations aggregating $130,791,000,000—a sum about $25 billion more than the House was asked to consider last session. I am using round numbers. This total divides as follows: $15,949,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, and $114,842,000,000 in bills dealing wholly or primarily with fiscal year 1967.

The House approved $130,531,000,000—a net reduction of $260,000,000.

Twelve bills showed net reductions from the budget requests for appropriations.

One bill was adopted at the budget amount.

Two bills showed net increases above the budget request for appropriations.

In the Defense bill, the House was $952,000,000 above the budget, the principal item being $569,000,000 for pay of some 108,000 military personnel on duty at July 1, 1966, that was not provided for in the budget request.

The Labor-HEW bill was passed $490,000,000, net, above the budget request for appropriations. I regret that it was not possible to hold the line on that bill, but, of course, I also recognize that it is sometimes necessary to exceed individual budget requests. Significant in the increase over the budget on that bill was $232,000,000 to pay 100-percent entitlements to federally impacted school districts. The budget requested less than half the amount necessary to pay the full cost of this popular program. An increase of $157,000,000 was also provided for defense education direct loans to students. This was added only after we were told that the Committee on Education and Labor did not plan to report the administration bill that would have converted this program from a direct loan basis to a guaranteed loan basis. The risks of the Government would be similar under both methods but, under the direct method, the initial appropriation for loans shows as a budget increase.

Three of the fifteen appropriation bills of the session related to defense—that is, the defense supplemental last spring, the regular defense bill for 1967 and the military construction bill for 1967. Twelve are classed as nondefense bills.

In the three defense bills, the House made net additions of $857,000,000 to the budget requests for appropriations. Thus, excluding these, the House reductions, overall, from the budget requests for appropriations in the 12 nondefense bills of the session aggregate $1,117,000,000.

Although some would have preferred greater cuts on the nondefense side of the budget, myself included, this is a fairly good record in the circumstances.

Changes were made on the House floor in 5 of the 15 bills—3 were increased and 2 were reduced. There was a net floor reduction of $69,776,200.

There were record votes in the House on final passage of every appropriation bill this session with the single exception of this closing supplemental. Only 2 bills had more than 100 votes registered against them. One hundred and forty-one negative votes were cast against the foreign aid bill. One hundred and twenty-two Members voted against the second supplemental for 1966 earlier this year; it contained the controversial rent supplement proposition.

SENATE ACTION ON THE BILLS

In virtually every session of Congress, the President sends some additional budget requests to the Senate after the House has acted on the bills. This year was no exception.

The Senate considered budget requests for appropriations of $131,165,000,000, which was some $373,000,000 more than the House considered. As passed by the other body, the bills totaled $130,657,000,000, a reduction of $508,000,000 from budget requests for appropriations. The Senate bills aggregate $126,000,000 more than the House bills but it must be remembered that the Senate considered more in budget requests for appropriations.

On the 15 bills of the session, the Senate figure was over the House in 8 instances; under on 6; 1 bill was unchanged from the House amount.

TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Total appropriations for the session tentatively aggregate $144,082,000,000 including the permanent appropriations. The great bulk of the permanent appropriation total is for interest on the public debt, which is subject to some revision, probably upward, but using the $13,800,000,000 estimate for 1967 in the January budget, the tentative total of $144,082,000,000 breaks down as follows:

1. For fiscal 1966	$15,924,000,000
2. For fiscal 1967 (including $13,800,000,000, tentatively, for permanent appropriations)	127,283,000,000
3. For fiscal 1968 (advance funding for urban renewal and mass transportation)	875,000,000
Total for session	144,082,000,000

Total appropriations of all kinds—those in annual bills, supplemental bills, and the permanent appropriations, all of which constitute a license to draw on the Treasury—have exceeded $100 billion in each of the last five sessions, as follows:

87th, 2d (1962)	$102,661,000,000
88th, 1st (1963)	103,798,000,000
88th, 2d (1964)	106,070,000,000
89th, 1st (1965)	119,310,000,000
89th, 2d (1966)	144,082,000,000

Mr. Speaker, I include two tabulations. If Members wish more details, we will be glad to assist in any way we can.

Summary of totals of appropriation amounts in the appropriation bills, 89th Cong., 2d sess.

[Does not include any back-door appropriations, or permanent appropriations [1] under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills]

	Bills for fiscal 1966	Bills for fiscal 1967	Bills for the session
A. House actions:			
1. Budget requests	$15,949,000,000	$114,842,000,000	$130,791,000,000
2. Amounts in 15 bills passed by House	15,701,000,000	114,830,000,000	130,531,000,000
3. Change from corresponding budget requests	−248,000,000	−12,000,000	−260,000,000
B. Senate actions:			
1. Budget requests	16,157,000,000	115,008,000,000	131,165,000,000
2. Amounts in 15 bills passed by Senate	15,937,000,000	114,720,000,000	130,657,000,000
3. Change from corresponding budget requests	−220,000,000	−288,000,000	−508,000,000
4. Compared with House amounts in these 15 bills	+236,000,000	−110,000,000	+126,000,000
C. Final actions:			
1. Budget requests	16,157,000,000	115,008,000,000	131,165,000,000
2. Amounts approved in 15 bills	15,924,000,000	[2] 114,358,000,000	[2] 130,282,000,000
3. Comparisons—			
(a) With corresponding budget requests	−233,000,000	−650,000,000	−883,000,000
(b) With bills of the 1st sess., 89th			+23,244,000,000

---

[1] Permanent appropriations were tentatively estimated in January budget at about $13,800,000,000 for fiscal year 1967.

[2] Includes $875,000,000 for fiscal 1968 (grant for mass transportation and urban renewal).

NOTE.—All figures are rounded amounts.

Summary of action on budget estimates in appropriation bills, 89th Cong., 2d sess.

[Does not include any back-door appropriations, or permanent appropriations [1] under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills]

	Budget estimates to House	Passed House	Budget estimates to Senate	Passed Senate	Enacted	Increase (+) or decrease (−), compared to budget
BILLS FOR FISCAL 1967						
Interior	$1,329,960,500	$1,295,169,500	$1,340,260,500	$1,329,755,000	$1,321,615,800	−$18,644,700
Loan authorization	(26,000,000)	(26,000,000)	(26,000,000)	(26,000,000)	(26,000,000)	
Treasury-Post Office	7,246,720,000	7,210,177,135	7,246,720,000	7,210,049,135	7,196,429,135	−50,290,865
Agriculture	7,022,638,000	6,876,027,000	7,022,938,000	7,064,343,300	6,994,590,150	−28,347,850
Loan authorization	(702,100,000)	(852,000,000)	(702,100,000)	(932,000,000)	(932,000,000)	(+229,900,000)
Labor-HEW	10,083,184,500	10,573,272,500	10,083,184,500	10,473,309,500	10,463,244,500	+380,060,000
Independent offices	14,319,611,291	14,017,299,000	14,329,863,291	14,118,607,000	14,065,851,000	−264,012,291
Legislative	173,793,578	172,146,333	214,749,763	214,418,213	214,463,913	−285,850
Defense	57,664,353,000	58,616,445,000	57,664,353,000	58,189,872,000	58,067,472,000	+403,119,000
District of Columbia:						
Federal funds	53,394,000	52,394,000	53,394,000	53,394,000	53,394,000	
Loan authorization	(26,225,000)	(23,000,000)	(38,225,000)	(37,527,500)	(37,527,500)	(−697,500)
Military construction	1,114,947,000	1,019,340,000	1,114,947,000	986,518,000	979,570,000	−135,377,000
Foreign assistance	3,945,095,000	3,604,048,800	3,945,095,000	3,493,473,500	3,493,473,500	−451,621,500
Public works	4,167,073,000	4,110,932,000	4,167,073,000	4,139,244,000	4,134,511,000	−32,562,000
State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary	2,598,638,500	2,364,008,600	2,634,405,000	2,350,941,600	2,347,826,600	−286,578,400
Supplemental	5,122,760,629	4,919,076,929	5,191,413,629	5,096,338,579	5,025,264,579	−166,149,050
Subtotal, 1967 bills	114,842,168,998	114,830,336,797	115,008,396,683	114,720,263,827	[2] 114,357,706,177	−650,690,506
SUPPLEMENTALS FOR FISCAL 1967						
Defense supplemental (Vietnam)	13,135,719,000	13,135,719,000	13,135,719,000	13,135,719,000	13,135,719,000	
2d supplemental	2,813,552,168	2,564,872,568	3,020,810,903	2,801,226,003	2,788,143,303	−232,667,600
Subtotal, 1966 bills	15,949,271,168	15,700,591,568	16,156,529,903	15,936,945,003	15,923,862,303	−232,667,600
CUMULATIVE TOTAL FOR THE SESSION						
House	130,791,440,166	130,530,928,365				−260,511,801
Senate			131,164,926,586	130,657,208,830		−507,717,756
Enacted			131,164,926,586		[2] 130,281,568,480	−883,358,106

[1] Permanent appropriations were tentatively estimated in January budget at about 13,800,000,000 for fiscal year 1967.

[2] Includes $875,000,000 for fiscal 1968 (grants for mass transportation and urban renewal).

PENDING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION CONFERENCE REPORT

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make specific reference to the bill before us today.

We considered a number of budget estimates in the House version of the bill, but we stopped taking requests from the President as a cutoff date in order to be able to report the bill to the House a few days ago.

Then certain budget estimates went to the other body.

The figures with respect to this bill are as follows:

The conference report totals $5,025,264,579.

This is $166,149,050 below the President's requests.

It is $106,187,650 above the House figure, but bear in mind that many of the budget requests not considered by the House were first considered by the other body.

This conference bill is $71,074,000 below the Senate version of the bill.

Now, where are these approximately $5 billion allocated? The major amounts go to the antipoverty program, the education programs, both secondary and elementary and higher, to urban renewal, and the new veterans' bill of rights.

I shall not try to belabor the actions of the committee of the conference, but you might want to know some of the things we did, and since you do not have a printed copy of the conference report, I will give you information that can be supplied very quickly.

Copies of the bill considered in conference are at the committee table here for anyone who would like to check further.

For the special milk program, we eliminated the $4 million added by the other body.

We allowed $2,750,000 for the special school lunch and pilot school breakfast program.

We provided $11,320,000 to begin construction of the building for the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

We allowed $70,000,000 for urban mass transportation grants.

For the demonstration cities program, which is very controversial and against which many of us voted, there was a request sent to the other body for $12 million for planning and for $12,180,000 for grants to assist planned metropolitan development which they approved in full. We struck out all of the grants for the planned metropolitan development, and we struck a million dollars from the planning money for the demonstration cities program, leaving $11,000,000 for the purpose.

In other words, the other body added $24,180,000 in total for demonstration cities, and we reduced that figure to $11,000,000.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I should like to point out at this point while I did not agree with the action of a majority of the conference committee concerning amendments in disagreement numbered 9 and 10 which relate to the demonstration cities program, I did without reservation, sign the conference report. I had to do this or we would not, under the rules, be here at this moment with this conference report which was not signed by the three minority members of the House conference committee. The distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] had previously signed it with reservations. Since five nonreservation signatures are required under the rules I had no alternative but to sign without reservations in order to bring back the conference report to the House.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I made note in the conference report that I held reservations on the appropriations carried in this report. I do not approve funds in this bill for programs where I opposed the authorization legislation—which means practically all of the bill. We did what we could to get amounts scaled down in the conference and had some success.

I support the House provision prohibiting aid to Communist countries and shall so vote. I shall vote against any motion to recede from the House position.

Mr. MAHON. On community health medical research the other body cut the budget in half and allowed $6 million. We cut it by $2 million more.

For Freedmen's Hospital, the Senate added and we agreed to $1 million as requested.

For international educational activities, we struck out the $500,000 added in the other body.

For the Office of Economic Opportunity the House had cut the amount requested by $187,500,000. The other body restored $100,000,000 of that amount. We split the difference with the other body, allowing $1,612,500,000.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BELL. I noted what the gentleman said in relation to the matter pertaining to elementary and secondary education that there was a change made. As you know, there was a change made when the adult basic education program was transferred out of the Poverty Act into the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. In H.R. 18381 you provided for funding $30 million for the adult basic education program. Is there provision for funding in this bill?

Mr. MAHON. We provided that this $30 million had to be taken out of the total of $1,342,410,000 provided for elementary and secondary education.

Mr. BELL. In other words, you did not provide any funds specifically for adult basic education that was moved into the elementary and secondary education program. Did you leave funds in the Poverty Act for the adult basic education program?

Mr. MAHON. No, we left no money in the poverty program. We transferred that responsibility to the Office of Education.

Mr. BELL. I am kind of curious. I do not want to dispute the gentleman, because you obviously know of what you speak. But it was my understanding that you left the money, approximately $30 million, in the Poverty Act even though you did not actually provide in language that that money would be available for the Poverty Act. Yet you did not transfer any money into the elementary and secondary education program for adult basic education?

Mr. MAHON. We did not.

Mr. BELL. But you placed language in it that said you would.

Mr. MAHON. The language provides that this must be funded from the elementary and secondary education funds provided in the bill—within the total of $1,342,410,000.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GIBBONS. As I understand the action of the conferees on the poverty program, the basic authorization as passed in H.R. 15111 was for $1,750,000,000. The recommendation of the conferees at this time is for $1,612,500,000. My question is this: This leaves the poverty program with considerably less money than is authorized to begin with. Most of the money in the poverty program and the basic authorization act was earmarked. It was our intention in passing the basic authorization act and earmarking these specific figures that these would be the amounts that would be funded first, and that these were the programs that had the highest priority.

I just want to repeat that now so we would get it basically in the fundamental history of this legislation that it was the intention of H.R. 15111 to fund, first of all, those programs we had earmarked, and these fundings were the ones we wanted the money spent on first. I wonder if the gentleman would like to comment on that.

Mr. MAHON. I do not know that I could add anything in regard to that suggestion by the gentleman.

Mr. GIBBONS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. It is true that the poverty program got a windfall, so to speak, as a result of our action, but the poverty program had already been cut in the House by $187 million plus, and the education program had not been reduced.

With respect to HemisFair and Interama, which have been discussed at considerable length during the session, the amounts inserted by the other body were reduced by 10 percent in the conference.

The most controversial thing in the bill occurs on page 21, in which the Senate struck out the language of the House with respect to the Export-Import Bank and reinserted that language plus a proviso.

That will come up under a separate motion to recede and concur in amendment No. 43, so I will withhold discussion on that issue until we reach that particular item.

There were, in total, 43 amendments to the House bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I did not sign the conference report for a number of reasons which I shall explain during the course of my remarks concerning actions taken in conference.

First let me say I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, that the way we figure appropriations is more realistic than the way it is done in the Budget Bureau.

Regardless of how they figure these things downtown, the RECORD shows that during the course of the year Congress has reduced budget requests on all bills by $883 million. If we include bills for only fiscal year 1967 the reduction is $650 million below the budget.

It is also accurate to say that for the first time in history, with the exception on during the height of World War II, Congress has this year appropriated as large an amount as $144 billion.

Members will recall that only a few years ago there was considerable comment in the press and elsewhere about the magic figure of $100 billion. A great fanfare arose over efforts to keep the budget under $100 billion.

Now, just a few years later we are approaching $150 billion. If we keep on at the rate we are going it will not be long until the magic sum will be $200 billion.

I do not have the figures before me, but my recollection is that the $144 billion appropriated during this session of Congress exceeds the amount appropriated last year by some $20 billion. If we continue to increase our appropriations at the rate of $20 billion a year it will not take us long to be knocking at the $200 billion figure.

With respect to the present bill, the figures I have coincide with those announced by the chairman of the committee. I will repeat them only for emphasis.

We considered in this bill budget estimates amounting to $5,191,413,629.

The House bill contained a total of $4.919 billion. The Senate bill contained $5.096 billion. The conference report contains a total of $5.025 billion. So this conference report is $71 million below the Senate bill. It is $106 million above the House bill. But it is $166 million below the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that one reason the conference report is above the House bill is because the Senate considered for the first time, without any consideration being given to it by the House, a sum of approximately $66 million in requests that were sent straight to the Senate and did not clear through the House and, therefore, were not in the bill as it passed the House.

There are some things in this bill, I think, that we need to have attention directed to, in addition to the provision with respect to the Export-Import Bank about which there will be some discussion when the motion is made to recede and concur in the Senate amendments. There are some other items which will at least indicate why I am not happy with this conference report.

For example, in the funds provided for the poverty program—what we did in conference was merely split the difference between the Senate and House figures. We reduced the Senate figure by $50 million, which amounted to an increase in the House figure by $50 million. So the conference figure is $1,612,500,000 for the war on poverty. That is too much. It is above the sum we considered proper in the House and accepted here on the floor. I am disappointed that we were not able to hold the figure to the House-passed amount. But, in addition to that, the conference did something that may have been a serious mistake. It agreed with the Senate in eliminating the earmarking of funds for the Job Corps, the Youth Corps, and impact program, VISTA, the Scherer amendment, and the Nelsen amendment. When we put those limitations in the bill or earmarked the funds for those programs, we were undertaking to exercise some degree of responsibility about how this $1.5 billion should be spent. I think it was a mistake to eliminate the earmarking because I think Congress should be the one to say how the poverty money shall be allocated.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I am glad to yield to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and chairman of the conference.

Mr. MAHON. The authorization bill, which had not been finally approved when the House considered the poverty appropriation, now has been approved by this body, and the authorization fixes the allocation of the funds. So while this would be a lump-sum appropriation for poverty, the allocation of funds would be controlled by the authorization, as I understand it.

Mr. JONAS. I read what the Senate did in the bill, amendment 26, where it says, "Provided further, that the funds appropriated shall be limited as follows: $200 million for the Jobs Corps," and so forth, and so forth, and so forth. Those limitations were stricken.

Mr. MAHON. But the basic law has now been approved by both bodies, I believe, and the basic law will control the allocation of the funds provided, as I understand it.

Mr. JONAS. The conference report does not make that clear, and the bill itself does not make that clear.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make the record clear, so that all of us understand it——

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Landrum). The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but please do not consume all of the 3 minutes which have been yielded to me, because I have three or four other points to make.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I want to make the record clear, and make it now, because if it is not clear—if the record is not clear, then I am going to demand that we do not vote upon this bill in the future under similar circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the conferees' interpretation of OEO lump-sum funding is the proper way in which to fund this program.

Mr. Speaker, as we have described the funding to be, I do not see how this changes that procedure.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that the allocation of the total sum of money authorized by the Subcommittee on Appropriations, will be expended, as directed by the conference report on the poverty bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon] if that is the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, this is my understanding. We are not certainly giving the Office of Economic Opportunity a blank check to expend these funds, except under the guidelines laid down in the authorizing legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this procedure is spelled out and appears on page 27412 of the Congressional Record of October 18, 1966.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that interpretation is correct. We should make it crystal clear that the poverty funds cannot be allocated at will but only in accordance with directives written into the law. That is the only way Congress can retain any control over amounts to be expended.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be much better to have left this language in the bill.

Certainly, it would not do any harm, but it would make crystal clear the fact that we do not mean to issue a blank check to anyone to the extent of $1.5 billion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may make one other comment, there is another item in this conference report which should be noted.

The regular independent offices appropriation bill, which was passed earlier in the session struck out two public buildings proposed to be constructed in the District of Columbia, one being the Department of Labor building, which involves a total cost estimated at $38 million, and the FBI building which involves an estimated total cost of $45 million.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Jonas].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, the House passed the bill with those deletions. The reason we deleted them in the committee is that we have under construction in the District of Columbia now a number of public buildings—the Court of Claims Building, the Forrestal Building, and a number of others that are under construction.

Mr. Speaker, the other body went along with the House in respect to the FBI building, but insisted upon going ahead with the construction of the Labor Department building. We agreed to that in conference.

But, Mr. Speaker, here we come along with a supplemental bill which reverses action taken by both Houses and inserts funds to begin the construction of another public building, in addition to those already under construction and also in addition to the $38-million Department of Labor building already funded in the regular bill enacted earlier in the year.

Mr. Speaker, I do not understand the urgency which justifies this unusual action. Someone has set aside the request of the President of the United States that we hold down construction to absolutely necessary items, in view of the tight money situation which now exists.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, after both the House and the other body had rejected the FBI building for this year, there is no justification for funding it in this supplemental bill which should only contain emergency items.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this item, and others I would list if time permitted, should have gone over until next year's budget. I believe that they should be considered in a regular appropriation bill, along with other construction items.

I might add that in the regular bill we have funded a new academy for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I think we ought to exercise a little prudence about this and not try to fund everything in 1 year.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out to the Members of the House that there is an annual expenditure at the present time for the FBI for rent here in the area of the District of Columbia, amounting to $3,300,000 a year. This means that if we go ahead with the construction of this building downtown and put them all together, then we will have space for the Department of Justice which is sorely needed in the present building and will gather together all the units of the FBI into one place.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, my point is not that the FBI does not need a new building. My only point is that we are beginning a new project which will cost $45 million when the budget is already unbalanced, when there is a war on inflation underway and when the President is calling upon Congress, upon Governors and upon mayors to curtail spending, in an effort to curb the inflationary pressures existing today. In this instance I think the conferees should have supported the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Whitten].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I made note in the conference report that I held reservations against approving appropriations carried in this bill and conference report. I do not approve funds in this bill for programs which I voted against when they were authorized, which means practically all the programs in this bill. In conference we did what we could to get the amounts scaled down and had some success.

I support the House provision prohibiting aid to Communist countries and shall so vote. I shall oppose any motion to recede.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Rhodes].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take the full 5 minutes, but I want to say some things about this type of bill, things that I would like to call to the attention of the House.

This is called a supplemental appropriations bill. It used to be called, as I recall, a deficiency appropriation bill. We always got them just before adjournment. But we have gotten into using the name "supplemental"—and it is well used, because it is exactly what this bill is.

In this bill we second-guess the Committee on Appropriations and the subcommittees thereof. The gentleman from North Carolina has very well pointed out one instance of it. The Independent Offices Subcommittee, although recognizing the worth of the FBI and its need for a new building decided that in the best interests of the Government, the building should not be built this year. Yet, the agency went to the Senate, the building was put in the Senate bill, and the conferees have accepted it. There is a stampede philosophy in the executive department which causes them to feel it is absolutely necessary to fund every program just as soon as it is authorized.

I personally do not see what the hurry is. I do not see why it is not possible for the people downtown to wait until the regular appropriation bill comes up. This would give the appropriation subcommittees the time to do the meticulous job which they always do in looking into new programs and helping the people who are administering them to plan wisely. But instead of this, we get these hurry-up requests—hurry-up, give us money now—do not look at what we are going to do now. Pay now, look later.

All of us know what happens when a new activity is immediately funded after it has been authorized. It starts off in the direction it desires to assume, without further guidance. Everyone knows how hard it is to get a bureau to veer from a course it has assumed.

I hope some day we will get back to the idea of deficiency appropriations rather than supplementals.

I think it should be pointed out to the House that one item in this bill is not even authorized because the President has not had time to sign the bill. It is an item of $11 million which is planning grants for demonstration cities. I repeat, it is not authorized as yet by law. If it were brought on the floor of the House in an appropriation bill, it would immediately be subject to a point of order.

So, Mr. Speaker, my only plea is for the Members of the House in general, and the members of the Committee on Appropriations in particular, to take a good long look at this system we have lapsed into. I think it is a wrong system. We must try to once again regain the fiscal reins of this Government by giving very clear and concise instructions to the Executive Department as to what we expect in the way of funding new programs, and that we do not expect them to use the other body as a court of appeals for items which the House in its wisdom has turned down.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the controversy about aid to Communist countries raised by proposed amendments to this bill, I think it is appropriate to set forth the fact that there is already law on this subject that clearly indicates that this Nation is not allowing the Export-Import Bank to guarantee the payment of any obligation of any Communist country, or in any other way participating in the extension of credit to any such country, agency, or national, except when the President determines that such guarantees would be in the national interest and reports such determination to the House and Senate within 30 days after the determination.

It should be noted that the motion to recommit presented with reference to this bill is intended to deny the President the standby option which the law enacted by Congress has provided since 1963. Certainly this is no time to deny or withdraw this power which we have repeatedly given to the President.

I am not criticizing those who are trying to bar loans, credits, or trade with Communist countries because I think these are matters that should be handled with greatest care, prudence, and restraint. Generally, I do not favor such trade or loans. However, I do not believe that the President's hands should be tied in the conduct of our foreign policy, particularly at this time of crisis, and I want to make it clear to the House that I believe it to be very unwise and unsound to put such check and restraint upon the President at this time.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, at this extremely late hour, we are confronted with a responsibility as heavy as it is crystal clear; the responsibility of completing final action on this conference report, which may somehow be able to keep the war on poverty alive until next year, when I am going to demand vastly increased funds for this absolutely crucial program.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak with pride or satisfaction on behalf of this report, which provides $1,612,500,000 to finance the entire war on poverty in fiscal 1967. Very frankly, this sum is grossly inadequate. It will not permit the war on poverty to effectively pursue its enormously difficult mission. Since the total of the appropriation is even less than the authorization it necessarily follows that some programs are going to have to be financed at less than the full authorization. It is my hope and expectation and I believe it is the opinion of the conferees, that in allocating the funds special consideration should be given to the Neighborhood Youth Corps and to the community action program to be sure these programs are not cut in order to make funds available for others.

I do not say that $1.6 billion-plus is nothing: but in the context of the fantastic needs it is supposed to meet, it seems to me to be an example of the worst sort of false economizing. Mr. Speaker, a little over a year ago the Office of Economic Opportunity proposed to the Bureau of the Budget that $3.4 billion be allocated to the war on poverty. This was a responsible request, Mr. Speaker, and represented the best estimate of Mr. Shriver and his staff of what the program needed to do a really effective job. Unfortunately, in my view, the administration aproved a budget of only $1.75 billion—only slightly over half what OEO requested. That figure has been defended on the ground that our effort in Vietnam will not permit a greater effort among 32 million poor Americans here at home. While I have some reservations in that regard, I was prepared to reluctantly accept the administration figure, which was approved by both the House and, after heated debate over a committee amendment to add nearly $750 million, by the other body as well.

However, due to what I consider to be the extremely unfortunate failure of either this body or the other body to approve appropriations equal to the authorization figure, we have before us a compromise between two entirely inadequate sums—the $1.56 billion approved by the House, and the $1.66 billion approved by the other body. It is my task to defend this unsatisfactory compromise, not because I like it, but because without it the war on poverty has ended in surrender and humiliation.

Mr. Speaker, over the next several months we are going to rue the day we failed to insist upon an adequate antipoverty budget for fiscal 1967. Sums far in excess of what the President requested as a barebones absolute minimum for the war on poverty have been approved in this session for foreign aid, for public works, and for many other programs, all of them worthy, but hardly any of them as desperately needed or as crucial to the common good as the war on poverty in this country. Mr. Speaker, by the time the 90th Congress convenes in January we are going to be swamped in a great, rising chorus of demand from all across the Nation for far more community action funds, for far greater Headstart and Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollment, for legal services projects, VISTA projects, neighborhood health centers, and the whole array of antipoverty programs.

Mr. Speaker, the poor of this Nation will not be put off. We are going to hear from them come January, mark my words, and we are going to have to answer in the next session for our parsimony in this one.

Mr. Speaker, it does not seem to me that, at this point in time, it can be argued in good faith that the war on poverty is not working. Not when locally developed and administered community action programs are making progress against poverty in 1,000 cities, towns, and rural communities all across the Nation. Not when the demand—from governors, mayors, business, labor, and religious leaders, volunteer groups, and millions of the poor themselves—for expanded and increased antipoverty programs continues to skyrocket. Not when America's greatest corporations have joined as enthusiastic war on poverty allies in making the Job Corps a growing success. Not when the Neighborhood Youth Corps is reaching hundreds of thousands of disadvantaged teenagers with a massive "earn and learn" effort. Not when this program has reached, involved, and begun to transform the lives of over 8 million poor Americans, who are being helped to help themselves unlock and open the golden doors to opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, the war on poverty is a success, it is working, it is overcoming the ancient enemies of man in thousands of local, grassroots encounters virtually every day of the year. So while I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that we should be providing substantially more money to finance this noble war, and while I deeply regret that the meager budget before us will not permit nearly as much progress in this fiscal year as we should insist on, I call upon the House to discharge its urgent and critical responsibility by approving this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to say a few words in behalf of one of the finest and most distinguished gentlemen it has ever been my pleasure to know, or the good fortune of the American people to have at their service. I am speaking of my good friend Sargent Shriver, the brilliant Director of OEO.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no man who has served the New Frontier and the Great Society with more distinction than Sargent Shriver. Heeding President Kennedy's call, he transformed the Peace Corps from an initially ridiculed campaign pledge into a universally acclaimed living monument to the finest and best in American life. As President Johnson's Director of the War on Poverty, Sargent Shriver has successfully launched and inspired as crucially important a national program as any ever approved by the Congress. Under his leadership, the war on poverty has become a vital, dynamic force for a better America in thousands of communities and in millions of lives. As the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee responsible for passing on OEO's budget, I can categorically state that he has been a tremendously effective and entirely fair administrator, and a Federal official of whom every Member of this body may be justly proud.

I therefore view it as deplorable that certain groups and individuals, whose sense of moral superiority or desire for headlines far exceed their knowledge of OEO programs and achievements, have seen fit to call into question Mr. Shriver's motives and the integrity of the poverty program. We have learned to expect the baseless, cynical attacks of those who have always opposed progress in our democratic society, as well as the destructive partisan machinations and maneuverings of irresponsible political figures. But I am truly dismayed that those who should count themselves among Sargent Shriver's strongest allies have been misled into uniformed, knee-jerk criticism of a man whose tremendous commitment to the poor and disadvantaged is matched by a singular devotion to the integrity of our tax dollars.

So, Mr. Speaker, I give to my friend Sargent Shriver and to the war on poverty my warmest support and praise, and ask that my distinguished colleagues grant me the favor of their expeditious approval of the pending conference report.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. LANDRUM). The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 5, on page 3, line 18, insert:

"GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

"Construction, public buildings projects

"For an additional amount for 'Construction, Public Buildings Projects', for construction of substructure of Federal Bureau of Investigation building in the District of Columbia, $11,320,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 6, on page 4, line 8, insert:

"COMMISSION ON POLITICAL ACTIVITY OF GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL

"Salaries and expenses

"For expenses necessary to carry out the Act of October 3, 1966 (Public Law 89-617), including hire of passenger motor vehicles, $100,000, to remain available until June 30, 1968."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "$75,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 9, on page 5, line 22, insert:

"COMPREHENSIVE CITY DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS

"For financial assistance and administrative expenses in demonstration programs, as authorized by the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, $12,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed $750,000 of this appropriation shall be available for administrative expenses during the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of S. 3708, 89th Congress, or similar legislation."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"COMPREHENSIVE CITY DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS

"For financial assistance including not to exceed $750,000 for administrative expenses in connection with planning and developing comprehensive city demonstration programs, as authorized by the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, $11,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1968: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of S. 3708, 89th Congress, or similar legislation."

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 13, on page 11, line 3, insert: *"Provided*, That not more than $30,000,000 of the sums contained herein shall be available for carrying out the Adult Education Act of 1966 including obligations incurred for this purpose under the provisions of Public Law 89-481, as amended: *Provided*".

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 19, on page 13, line 5, insert:

"COMMUNITY HEALTH PRACTICE AND RESEARCH

"For an additional amount for 'Community Health Practice and Research', $6,000,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be effective only upon enactment of H.R. 13196, 89th Congress, or similar legislation."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "$4,000,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER**. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 25, on page 14, line 21, insert: *Provided further*, That none of the funds contained in this Act shall be used to make indemnity payments, authorized by part D of title III, to any farmer whose milk was removed from commercial markets as a result of his failure to follow the procedures prescribed by the Federal Government for the use of the offending chemical:".

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER**. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 29, on page 16, line 11, insert:

"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"For an additional amount for the Office of the Secretary, $10,790: *Provided*, That effective January 1, 1967, the basic allowance for clerical assistance and readjustment of salaries in the Disbursing Office is increased by $7,680."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29 and concur therein.

The **SPEAKER**. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] is recognized on the motion.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FARNUM], a member of the committee.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, before we adjourn this session, I would like to point to a fact of life that seems to have been forgotten during the emotionally charged hearings on school desegregation a few weeks back. Remember that the responsibility for desegregating the schools was dropped into the lap of Commissioner of Education Harold Howe II by a commitment that was born legitimately in the chambers of the Supreme Court 11 years ago. Congress made the Commissioner of Education its guardian when it passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

For his efforts to comply with the law, Commissioner Howe, a schoolman with impeccable credentials, has been subjected to some nasty abuse. He has been labeled "an idiot, a misfit and ignorant." He has been called "a man who talks like a Communist" and he has been flagrantly misquoted, either through carelessness or by intent.

Just what is it that Mr. Howe has been saying and toward what goals has he been working? His speeches and his articles are a matter of public record. Much of what he has to say concerns his law enforcement duties and much of his time has been taken with clarifying the guidelines for compliance with title VI as set down by his office. The Brown against Board of Education decision of the Supreme Court in 1954 forbids schools to be racially segregated. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 directs the Office of Education to cut off Federal funds if they are. Both these laws of the land were handed to Mr. Howe to enforce.

The controversial guidelines were developed when school officials needed to know what they must do to be in compliance with the law. They were devised as an automatic measuring instrument, and schools not meeting their requirements became subject to investigation. But the truth of the matter is that any school judged to be working toward compliance in good faith has been certified as being in compliance.

The subject of civil rights, however, is only one of the matters concerning Mr. Howe as he discharges his duties as Commissioner. His main function is to preside over an office that is making education, in the words of President Johnson, "the first work of our times and the first work of our society."

Under his general direction, over $3 billion a year is being plowed into research, experimentation, and some 100 programs that will help local school systems and institutions of higher learning develop their resources. He has a mandate from the Congress and from the people to help this country provide quality education not only for a growing population, but for the large numbers of young people who have remained almost untouched by traditional schooling.

If he has ambitions of becoming a "commissar of education," he is going about it in a strange way. He is seeking ideas and proposals from school systems all over the country—on programs for teaching disadvantaged and handicapped children, on improving teacher education, on curriculum revisions, on school construction. Just this month, he prodded college and university presidents to take more responsibility for improving college teaching in their own institutions.

For a man who is supposed to "talk like a Communist," Mr. Howe has surprising confidence in the role business must play in improving education. Right now about 20 management executives are serving on his executive committees. Last summer, he invited industry to join with educators and public officials in developing a set of standards for the marketing of new learning materials.

Apparently the abuse heaped upon Mr. Howe was not taken too seriously by our colleagues familiar with the work his office is doing. The two giant aid-to-education measures we've just passed bespeak a confidence in him that he has earned. As for me, I am inclined to go along with an editorial in the Louisville Courier-Journal on October 3 which called him "one of the most competent, literate, and imaginative Commissioners of Education ever to serve in Washington."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the pending motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 30, on page 16, line 16, insert:

"ADMINISTRATIVE AND CLERICAL ASSISTANTS TO SENATORS

"For an additional amount for administrative and clerical assistants to Senators, $13,860: *Provided*, That the clerk hire allowance of each Senator from the State of North Carolina shall be increased to that allowed Senators from States having a population of five million, the population of said State having exceeded five million inhabitants."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 34, on page 18, line 19, insert:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

"International organizations and conferences

"International Conference on Water for Peace

"For necessary expenses incident to organizing and holding the International Conference on Water for Peace in the United States, including not to exceed $20,000 for official functions and courtesies, $750,000, to remain available until December 31, 1967: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available only upon enactment into law of S.J. Res. 167, 89th Congress, or similar legislation."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF STATE

"International organizations and conferences

"International Conference on Water for Peace

"For necessary expenses incident to organizing and holding the International Conference on Water for Peace in the United States, including not to exceed $10,000 for official functions and courtesies, $500,000, to remain available until December 31, 1967: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available only upon enactment into law of S.J. Res. 167, 89th Congress, or similar legislation."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 35, on page 19, line 5, insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

"Law enforcement assistance

"For grants and contracts to provide assistance in training State and local law enforcement officers and other personnel, and in improving capabilities, techniques, and practices in State and local law enforcement and prevention and control of crime, for technical assistance and departmental salaries and other expenses in connection therewith, $8,000,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available only upon the enactment into law of H.R. 13551 or S. 3063 or similar legislation."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$7,250,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 38, page 19, line 21, insert:

"INTER-AMERICAN CULTURAL AND TRADE CENTER

"For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of February 19, 1966 (Public Law 89–355), without regard to the provisions of law set forth in 40 U.S.C. 278a; 41 U.S.C. 5, 8, 10a, 13 and 252–255; and 44 U.S.C. 111, 322, and 324, $6,520,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That appropriations heretofore made to the Department of Commerce to carry out the provisions of the Act of February 19, 1966 (Public Law 89–355), shall be merged with this appropriation."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"INTER-AMERICAN CULTURAL AND TRADE CENTER

"For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of February 19, 1966

(Public Law 89-355), without regard to the provisions of law set forth in 41 U.S.C. 13, $5,870,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That appropriations heretofore made to the Department of Commerce to carry out the provisions of the Act of February 19, 1966 (Public Law 89-355), shall be merged with this appropriation."

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER**. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 43, on page 21, line 21, strike out:

"SEC. 803. None of the funds made available because of the provisions of this bill shall be used by the Export-Import Bank to either guarantee the payment of any obligation hereafter incurred by any Communist country (as defined in section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended) or any agency or national thereof, or in any other way to participate in the extension of credit to any such country, agency, or nation in connection with the purchase of any product by such country, agency or nation."

And insert in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 903. None of the funds made available because of the provisions of this Act shall be used by the Export-Import Bank to either guarantee the payment of any obligation hereafter incurred by any Communist country (as defined in section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended) or any agency or national thereof, or in any other way to participate in the extension of credit to any such country, agency, or national, in connection with the purchase of any product by such country, agency, or national, except when the President determines that such guarantees would be in the national interest and reports each such determination to the House of Representatives and the Senate within thirty days after such determination."

Mr. **MAHON**. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43 and concur therein.

Mr. **MAHON**. Mr. Speaker, I ask for recognition.

The **SPEAKER**. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. **MAHON**. Mr. Speaker, this is the final motion to be considered in connection with this bill. Are there any requests for time?

Mr. **LIPSCOMB**. Mr. Speaker, I request time.

Mr. **MAHON**. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB].

Mr. **LIPSCOMB**. Mr. Speaker, the Senate deleted the House language which prohibited the Export-Import Bank from using funds in this bill to guarantee the payment of obligations for or to extend credit to any Communist country, agency, or national thereof. Then they inserted the identical language but with a proviso that such guarantee should be permissible if the President determines that such action is in the national interest and reports such determination to the Congress in 30 days.

If the House recedes and concurs, we will be supporting a watered-down, practically meaningless version of the previous action of the House. If we vote to recede and concur, we will be putting the stamp of approval of this House on a new policy of the Export-Import Bank of granting credits to Communist countries, granting loans to the very nations which are presently supporting North Vietnam.

Each time the House has originally acted on a matter such as this the House has supported a strong position. Then for some unknown reason there is a strong drive to weaken the House position, either in the other body or in the conference.

This time the House should stand up and uphold the House original position, and slow down the full speed drive to build the economic and military capability of the Communist nations, until we know where we are going.

Let us find out what kind of trade the Export-Import Bank intends to finance. Let us find out on what terms. Let us find out what the President had on his mind when he made the determination on October 7, 1966, to allow the Export-Import Bank to extend credits to Eastern European Communist countries.

Can any Member of this body today deny that these Eastern European countries are not now helping North Vietnam? If they can, I wish they would tell the House which Eastern European Communist countries are not now helping North Vietnam.

Can anyone in this House tell us what could possibly be gained in our national interest now to loan money to Communist-bloc countries to purchase hard goods which can be used and shipped to North Vietnam?

Can anyone in this House explain what there is to our national interest in this policy?

On October 7, 1966, the President said:

I have today signed a determination that will allow the Export-Import Bank to guarantee commercial credits to four additional Eastern European countries—Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia. This is good business. And it will help us build bridges to Eastern Europe.

A Hanoi radio broadcast on October 17, 10 days after President Johnson's statement, issued a text of a joint North Vietnamese-Bulgarian communique signed October 15. Bulgaria is one of the countries which the President mentioned. This communique said:

The Bulgarian delegation warmly hailed the great victories recorded by the people of North Vietnam in their heroic struggle against the U. S. aggressors.

The Bulgarian delegation reaffirmed that in accordance with the declaration on the U. S. aggression in Vietnam adopted at the Bucharest conference of the Warsaw Treaty countries in July 1966 Bulgaria will extend to the DRV its assistance in all fields to defeat the U. S. imperialists.

Prague radio, in Czechoslovakia, another country the President mentioned, in a Czechoslovakian language radio broadcast, on September 15, 1966, said:

At Zbraslav Castle near Prague an agreement was signed on 15 September on the exchange of goods and payments between Czechoslovakia and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. We shall deliver to Vietnam apart from other goods, machines and equipment, means of transportation, rolled goods, medical supplies, and consumer goods.

From Budapest, in a Hungarian language radio broadcast, on September 13, 1966, another country mentioned in the President's determination, they said:

An agreement under which the Hungarian People's Republic will provide aid, long-term interest-free credit, and training of experts for the Democratic Republic of Vietnam has been signed in Budapest.

Rumania is another one of those countries helping North Vietnam. I could go on with Rumania and any other of these Communist-bloc countries and show you why at this time we should not be granting loans to the Communist countries through the Export-Import Bank.

What is it that causes this drive to trade with and finance the Communists? What is it in this program except perhaps for a few dollars that some American manufacturers might make? It is not worth the dollars to endanger our national security and our country's welfare. I believe that the House should support the original House position today and not vote to recede and concur. Let us hold up this action until the House can go into what this situation is coming to.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully urge the House to support its position and not vote to recede and concur.

Mr. **CHAMBERLAIN**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **LIPSCOMB**. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. **CHAMBERLAIN**. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In the light of the watered-down language that comes back to us now giving the President the authority to make these loans should he determine it to be in the national interest, and in the light of the statement made by the President that the gentleman referred to, on October 7, would it not be fair to assume that the President has already made a determination that this is in the national interest?

Mr. **LIPSCOMB**. That is exactly why the Senate position is meaningless. The President on October 7 already made the determination. So the language that the Senate put in is absolutely meaningless.

Mr. **GERALD R. FORD**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **LIPSCOMB**. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. **GERALD R. FORD**. I wish to associate myself with the views of the gentleman from California. To clarify the parliamentary situation, if we want to insist on the House position on the motion to recede and concur with the weakened Senate amendment, Members of the House should vote "No." Is that correct?

Mr. **LIPSCOMB**. That is correct.

Mr. **GERALD R. FORD**. And, if someone wishes to vote for the Senate position, the vote is "Yes."

Mr. **LIPSCOMB**. That is correct.

Mr. **BRAY**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **LIPSCOMB**. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. **BRAY**. I want to commend the gentleman for what he said. I think it is very fine to return good for evil, but it is certainly stupid to give the enemy the weapons to destroy us.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, this motion to recede and concur should be defeated.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from California made very clear, the question of Presidential discretion is entirely moot. Those who vote for the motion will in fact be voting to provide credit to Communist countries.

It may well be that some Members, through some strange course of reasoning, will come to that conclusion, and decide that the American taxpayers should, indeed, be required to both finance and fight the Communists at one and the same time.

But before that vote is taken and before the Members answer "yea" or "nay" on the question, I would like to call attention to a table which was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a week ago Wednesday, at page 26202. The facts in it are supplied by the Department of State.

This table makes it clear that the level of trade between Poland and North Vietnam and between Czechoslovakia and North Vietnam doubled in the year of 1965.

No figures are available as yet for 1966. However, there is no reason to suspect that this volume of trade has slackened. And for the information of the Members of the House, I point to page 26202, for the complete set of statistics provided with reference to trade with North Vietnam on the part of these two countries involved.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion this has great significance.

Also, I call to the attention of the Members of the House another table which has been supplied to me by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress which lists ships serving the port of Haiphong in North Vietnam recently. It is identified as only a partial listing. In it are included Polish ships operating in and out of the harbor of Haiphong and the dates thereof. Polish ships were observed entering Haiphong on July 10, 1966; July 16, 1966; March 23, 1966; and July 7, 1966.

Mr. Speaker, this represents only a partial listing.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that if there are Members in this House of Representatives who do not know the extent of the Eastern European Communist bloc trade and other trade with North Vietnam, I hold in my hand certain classified information, which reflects that there have been more than a score of vessels that have already called in North Vietnam already this year. I will make it available to any interested Member.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his contribution, and I ask if anyone can supply the answer as to why this information should be classified. There are of course certain sensitive areas in which information should be classified, but why should facts on Communist shipping to North Vietnam?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. If it were not classified, this bill would not pass; it could not.

Mr. FINDLEY. I am sure the gentleman from Michigan is correct. I am also sure that the Members of the House, like myself, are anxious to be done with this session of Congress and get back home to campaign.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that there are a lot of boys now serving in North Vietnam who are anxious to get home, and a lot of people in these United States, who would like to get them back home. Many of our military men have recently had their tour of duty in that area extended for a year.

I am sure that this extension is a matter of great regret on the part of many of these servicemen.

So we are not alone in wanting to get home, but I can think of no question more far reaching to our security and to our prosecution of the war in North Vietnam, than the one presently pending before us.

Mr. Speaker, the question is:

Should we try to fight and finance the Communists at one and the same time?

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I shall be delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN].

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to rise in wholehearted and full support of the position which has been taken by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY], the gentleman in the well, and I know the argument is going to be made that the hour is late, and we do not want to get involved in a legislative tangle, but that we want to go home. But, Mr. Speaker, I for one, hope that we shall be able to complete this bill and the conference report thereon, if we never get out of this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, that is the least which we should do for our men who are now fighting in Vietnam.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, we stayed in session until Christmas Eve of 1963 while deliberating upon a very similar point and, for myself, I am willing to stay until Christmas Eve of this year again.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, we had a Christmas Eve session one time giving Mr. Khrushchev a credit card. I did not like it then. I do not like it now. As far as I am concerned, I think we are engaged in a great worldwide struggle with the Communist conspiracy. I do not like this business of trying to pick out the good guys and the bad guys. I do not know whether we are just fighting the Vietcong or we are fighting the North Vietnamese. How many of these people are we fighting? Does it go clear all the way to Moscow?

So far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote against this motion to recede and concur as I voted for the amendment originally, because I think it is something that we ought to do in order to make it very clear that in this great struggle which has broken out between the Communist nations and the free we are fighting them all the way.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in answer to my friend the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], former majority leader who is presently on the minority side, I should like to point out that we had three Democratic Congresses in 6 of the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration. They elected a Republican Congress in the first 2 years of that administration, and that was the end of Republican leadership here in the House. Apparently the citizens of the United States have not trusted them since the 83d Congress. Were they afraid that Republicans would play politics with our foreign policy at the moment our President is out in the Pacific trying to bring an end to the cold war and to prevent a nuclear hot war?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have great respect for our distinguished friend from New York [Mr. ROONEY], but he completely misses the point.

The gentleman referred to me as a one-time majority leader. I was. But when he says the Republican Party has not been for foreign policy, just let me tell the gentleman and everybody else that when we thought we were fighting communism, the Republican 80th Congress, which had Mr. Truman as the President, brought out the Greek-Turkey bill, the interim aid to France and Italy bill, and the Marshall plan, and I might say that the Democrats have not approximated that since.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I might also point out to my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], that on several occasions when several of us have been invited to the White House for leadership meetings, the whole purpose of the meeting called by the President of the United States was to convince the Members on the gentleman's side of the aisle that they, the Democrats, ought to support the President like the Republican side of the aisle was doing.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I want the Members of the House to realize that this is taxpayers' money they are dealing with. While this is not an appropriation in the strict sense of the word the money actually comes from the Treasury, and from the pockets of the taxpayers, just like any money which we appropriate or which we take into the General Treasury. So guard it well, because it is your trust to do so.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what choice does the House have? The choice that the House has is either to see loans made by the Export-Import Bank with taxpayers' money to Communist nations or not to have such loans made.

The language now in the bill gives the President the determination as to whether such loans will be made. But as it has been pointed out, that question is moot. The determination has been made. It was decided on October 7, that such loans would be made. If the House does not insist upon its position at the present time, then presumably the administration will make such loans. I say "presumably" because you will recall that in 1963, although the House finally receded and gave the President the authority to make loans to Soviet Russia from the Export-Import Bank to buy wheat, the loans were not actually made. Why? Because of the fight which was made on the floor of the House of Representatives, and the fact that the Members of this House made it abundantly clear to the President of the United States that it did not want those loans to be made.

So this is a very important vote that we are going to cast here. It is our choice. If we vote to recede and concur, then the taxpayers' money undoubtedly will be used to lend money to Communist nations.

Now—lend money to what Communist nations? Why to any Communist nation, whether it be Bulgaria, Rumania, Communist China, or even to Soviet Russia.

There are those who perhaps feel that it may be all right to make loans to Soviet Russia. I am not one of them.

Let me look at the record of the loans that we have made to Soviet Russia. We made a lot of loans to them during World War II. How have they done in repayment? Well, they still owe $10 billion or $11 billion and the amount that they have repaid to us in infinitesimal.

So far as I am personally concerned, the credit of any nation or of any individual is based upon his ability to repay and the record for repayment.

In this instance the ability to repay—if measured by the record, is not very good.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I just want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact, and I am sure that he is already aware of it, that the President did make a determination of national interest, and authorized the Export-Import Bank to grant credit to Communist Rumania—credit which was used to finance a petroleum cracking mill, which obviously has a very important role in war munitions.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. If we are going to have some sort of detente with the Communist world, then to me it should be a two-way street, with the guidelines well understood.

There have been no overtures on the part of the Communist world, indicating a desire to come closer to us.

We make all of the overtures. I say, if we are going to trade with the Communist world, then let us do it only after a careful, cash and carry approach. Let us let them indicate some desire for normal relations first. Let us not make a gigantic leap forward into the great unknown by beginning this trade relationship with loans. They might come later, after a history of satisfactory dealings, but they should not be allowed—with taxpayers money—in the first instance. As we do so often, we are rushing into a situation which we should approach with caution.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, this reminds me of Christmas Eve, 1963, when we were faced with this same identical situation. Today, let us review the facts involved in this matter.

Article II, section 1, of the Constitution states:

> The executive power shall be vested in the President of the United States.

The foreign policy of the United States is by practice and by tradition regarded as an executive function.

In recent months there have been literally millions of words carried in public pronouncements by members of both the legislative and executive branches about the need for a bipartisan foreign policy. Such statements have been made by Members from either side of the aisle.

I am not an advocate of foreign aid, and on this occasion I am not discussing foreign aid as such. I am discussing the language in the bill that many Members of the Congress in both branches and of both parties consider essential if the executive branch is to formulate and conduct our foreign policy.

Since December 24, 1963, the following language, which is the law today, has been carried in the annual foreign assistance appropriation bills:

> None of the funds made available because of the provisions of this Title shall be used by the Export-Import Bank to either guarantee the payment of any obligation hereafter incurred by any Communist country (as defined in section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended) or any agency or national thereof, or in any other way to participate in the extension of credit to any such country, agency, or national, in connection with the purchase of any product by such country, agency, or national—

That is the present law. That language is also in the bill that is before you today. All the arguments today are over one brief clause, and I quote:

> Except when the President determines that such guarantees would be in the national interest and reports each such determination to the House of Representatives and the Senate within 30 days after such determination.

I strongly support this provision. I am wondering what the American people are thinking this afternoon, on the eve of adjournment, when our President is overseas trying to work out an honorable settlement of the war in Vietnam. How can Democrats and Republicans, or the Democratic Party and the Republican Party, go back on the President and say, "We do not support your foreign policy"? That is a matter of record for Senator DIRKSEN, Mr. Nixon, and other Republicans. They have said, "We support the President in his Vietnam policy."

My friends, let me ask this question: How can you in one breath say, "We support the President in his foreign policy and his efforts to conclude the war in Vietnam," and in the next breath say, "The President of the United States should not be trusted to run our foreign policy. We should not give him the right to obligate this country in any place where it may help our foreign policy"? In effect, you are accusing him of financing the Communists so that they could in turn ship goods to North Vietnam. Do not be inconsistent.

Only last Saturday the President signed into law a bill calling for approximately $5.6 billion in foreign assistance of every type—including $2,108,241,000 for the Export-Import Bank and this same Presidential determination, that is in dispute this afternoon, was in that bill. I did not hear any objection when that bill was before the House. But we do now because we are getting ready to adjourn, and we are a little bit closer to the day of election.

Let us be realistic. This is just as political as anything that has ever been before the House of Representatives. But you know that we are going to have to support our President in his foreign policy.

With privileges come responsibilities. The Members know I do not like foreign aid. I would like to eliminate it. But you know and I know that the Export-Import Bank is used for only one thing, and that is to finance the export of American commodities, and without exception these loans are hard-dollar loans.

I asked the State Department to furnish me a letter stating its opinion about this proposal and may I read a few brief excerpts:

> H.R. 18381, as passed by the House on October 18, eliminating the President's power to authorize the Export-Import Bank to guarantee private credits to Communist countries, has the effect of repudiating the foreign policy objectives the President is pursuing in regard to Europe, and more specifically Eastern Europe.

The letter goes on to say:

> The President is calling in unmistakable terms for the nations of Eastern Europe in their own self-interest to cease the fruitless support of aggression in Asia and to grasp instead the opportunity for a better and more prosperous life for their own people which the prospect of greater trade with the East and the easing of international tensions offers them.

I asked them a specific question about giving the President the right to make this determination and reporting such determination to the House of Representatives and to the Senate. I asked the question so as to be able to respond intelligently to any questions relative to the language in the President's determination clause, which reads as follows:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. PASSMAN. The language is as follows: "except when the President determines that such guarantees would be in the national interest and reports each such determination to the House of Representatives and the Senate within 30 days after such determination."

The executive branch stated that after they report each determination to the Congress, if either the Senate or the House of Representatives should protest, they would cease negotiations then and there.

I asked permission to quote that response. And I repeat, if we protest, either the House or the Senate, the negotiations will cease.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I endorse what the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana has said. I find nothing difficult about supporting the language which the conferees have agreed upon, which is now before us.

I recall that all through the years when Mr. Eisenhower was our President we gave him power equally as broad as this, and possibly broader. We never had occasion to distrust his use of that power nor did we find that he had used that power in an improper way.

I also recall that we had crises during that time, including the Berlin crisis. I recall that the Communist threat in Europe was much greater then than it is now.

So I say again, I see no difficulty in supporting this proposal and I hope it will be approved.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that I do not accept verbatim everything that comes from the executive branch of this Government. I have looked with suspicion on a lot of proposed legislation.

But I have read this language. I see the similarity in this bill to the language in many other bills. I cannot, to save my life, see, at this late hour, where questioning the President's honesty is in good grace.

This language will guarantee to the Congress that we will be kept advised. I cannot see any inconsistency. Were there any inconsistency I would not support this proposition.

I cannot see anything here inconsistent with the floods of bills that have been passed in this area.

The Constitution gives the President something we cannot take away from him—that is, dealing with other governments. We are on diplomatic terms with these countries, and there is nothing we can do about it.

The language is as follows: "Except when the President determines that such guarantees would be in the national interest and reports each such determination to the House of Representatives and the Senate within 30 days after such determination."

What else do we want?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has again expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. If there is one man in this Congress who has been careful in examining every facet of foreign aid program, it is the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

I can say here and now that I support his position on this proposition. He has made an eloquent plea. In justice to our President, whoever he may be, this authority should be given him.

I say that I will support this proposal because it is right.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, at the expense of being repetitious may I say again that all of the language suggested by my friends to the left of the House is contained in the bill before us. We have not deleted one word. We have merely added the one clause that we have been carrying in the foreign assistance appropriation bill with respect to funds for the Export-Import Bank since 1963. It is the same provision that my good friends on the left supported just a few days ago in the foreign assistance appropriation bill for fiscal 1967, which the President signed only last Saturday.

What has happened all at once since then? Let me quote you the exact clause: "except when the President determines that such guarantees would be in the national interest and reports each such determination to the House of Representatives and the Senate within 30 days after such determination."

May I say, incidentally, to those of you who may think I am being inconsistent, that I have taken the same position on this matter since 1963. I have not changed my position one iota.

Mr. Speaker, I have one final statement. We either support the President in his foreign policy or we do not. You make up your mind on that. But how could we, in good conscience, with this country at war, and the leaders of both parties in both branches of Congress supporting the President and even advocating that he even step up the war effort, how could we turn around and say that the President of the United States would start making loans and giving grants to Communist countries for the purpose of shipping goods to North Vietnam so as to defeat our efforts in that country? I could not make that statement in good conscience under any circumstances.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD].

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in the Constitution which precludes the Congress from having an impact on or playing a role in the determination of foreign policy. As a matter of fact, since dollars have become so involved in the execution of our foreign policy through foreign aid legislation, the Congress has a specific responsibility to help guide and direct foreign policy. Over the years the Congress, whether there was a Democratic or a Republican President, has helped to shape foreign policy by the use of the various foreign aid programs.

Let me say in addition that under the Constitution the Congress has the authority, and I quote, "to regulate commerce with foreign nations." This particular issue today, in part, involves the regulation of commerce with foreign nations. So we have the right and, as a matter of fact, the obligation to make up our own minds on what we are going to do on this particular issue.

I do not think the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] can question the support of the Members on this side of the aisle for the President in the conflict in Vietnam. The record is clear. We have voted for every appropriation act. We have publicly expressed our support. I might add that a number of the Members on the other side of the aisle, members of the gentleman's party, have been very critical. Some have sought to undermine the President's policy in Vietnam and have advocated withdrawal. Some have advocated solutions that are not in our best interests and are contrary to the views of the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no Republican who has done so.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that the conflict in Vietnam should be prosecuted strongly and effectively. But we reserve unto ourselves the right to make the decision as to whether the money of the taxpayers of the United States of America should be used for the purpose of supporting commercial transactions with the Soviet Union or other Communist nations.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, this vote will decide whether we will take American credit, credit which comes from the taxpayers of the United States of America, to assist in the production and transport of machinery, equipment, and other supplies of war to the benefit of Communist countries whether behind the Iron Curtain or the Bamboo Curtain.

Mr. Speaker, that is the issue. There is nothing else to be considered.

Mr. **MAHON**. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY].

Mr. **CASEY**. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the statement just made that foreign policy and its formulation is not the exclusive responsibility of the executive department and that we in the legislative have a right to become involved.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House will recall that in 1962, it was I who authored the amendment which is referred to in this bill as 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act.

You will recall further that this amendment was designed to stop all aid to Communist countries, and in 620(f), I name 18 of them, to be specific, so that there will be no doubt as to which countries were involved.

To further refresh your memory, you will recall that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] placed some discretionary language at the bottom of my amendment, and the conferees that year took the Senate language and the gentleman from Pennsylvania's language and added it to my amendment. Their language is very much the same as is found at the bottom portion of the amendment before this House.

I was very disturbed at that time that my amendment had been weakened, in this regard by giving the President some discretionary authority. But I wish to tell the Members of this House that this amendment, 620(f), has worked well, and to my knowledge, aid in the form of grants and soft loans has been stopped to Communist countries because the "bug" has been placed upon the President to make this determination and to make it public by advising the House and the Senate of any such action.

The amendment before us places the full responsibility upon the President in making a determination as to whether or not the Export-Import Bank shall grant credit for sales to Communist countries, as described in section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act.

For 15 years prior to the adoption of my amendment, outright grants and other aid had been going to Communist countries, particularly Yugoslavia, Poland, and Czechoslovakia, and this was done under the Eisenhower administration as well as the Democratic administrations, but this is now stopped.

Let us look at what we are talking about in this particular amendment. We are not talking about grants. We are talking about hard loans. We are talking about where a particular industry located in the United States is endeavoring to compete in the sale of its products, machinery, and other items, with competitors from other countries. A manufacturer who wishes to sell machinery on long-term credit, where he cannot hold the notes himself, calls upon the Export-Import Bank for help. The Export-Import Bank says, "Sure, we will help you. We'll take on the loan." And they pay the money to the manufacturer, and he delivers his equipment to the foreign buyer.

If we are to stop the outflow of gold and dollars from the United States, we must place our exporters in a competitive position, and this is one way of overcoming the balance-of-payments problem by stimulating our exports through use of the Export-Import Bank.

I want to call to the attention of the House the fact that we have export controls. From the speeches made here today about supplies going to Communist countries, it might be interpreted by the news media throughout the country that we would be shipping them arms. And there has also been reference made on the floor to a petroleum cracking plant exported to a Communist country.

We have these export controls which prohibit the export of arms and certain types of chemical and petroleum plants to any Communist country. So, this matter is well under control.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that we should adopt the language, as proposed by the conferees, and grant to the President of the United States this discretion in dealing with the sale of our products in this regard.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I hope that I can clarify this situation a little further, although I believe it has been well clarified already.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas yield before he starts his presentation?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, it seems very unusual to hear the debate on this question coming from the other side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I want to note some earlier history with reference to past actions along this line. I cite, for instance, the food-for-peace program which was modified to enable us to sell food to Communist bloc countries.

We went further than that in 1956. In that year extension of the Public Law 480 program was supported by 187 Republicans. Only one Republican voted in opposition. In the following year 167 Republicans voted for it and 26 against.

The Export-Import Bank also made a $60 million loan to Poland, and we sold them a tinplate mill. It seems to me the basic question is simply whether we trusted President Eisenhower and whether we trust President Lyndon B. Johnson.

As the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I strongly supported President Eisenhower in every issue of this program, because I felt he was responsible for the conduct of our foreign policy, and I went along with him.

Let us take a look at the record in the Senate. In 1957 Senator Knowland tried to knock this out, but 19 Republican Senators stood up and supported President Eisenhower in those days.

I think this issue has boiled down to "Are we with our President or are we against him?"

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for his splendid contribution.

We did not shackle President Eisenhower in this way on Export-Import loans. But the proposal now before us is that we shackle President Johnson.

Let me say this: We Democrats did not call President Eisenhower soft on communism when he, as the Commander in Chief, took steps to trade with nations in Eastern Europe. We knew that he had information not available to the public generally, and not available in all cases to all Members of Congress. And he acted in the best interests of the country when he took these actions.

So, I cannot think of anything much more preposterous than to try to undercut the President of the United States when he is on a mission of peace to the most explosive area of the world. How ridiculous can we be?

Talking about aid to communism, would there be any greater aid and comfort to communism than sending a message to the world that we do not trust the President in international matters; that we are not behind him in his peace mission; and that we are going to pull the rug out from under him when it comes to dealing with the countries of Eastern Europe? It is absurd.

Mr. **BOGGS**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **MAHON**. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. **BOGGS**. Mr. Speaker, just as a matter of record, the gentleman is the distinguished chairman of the committee, and of course this proposal is different from what we had the other day in that it writes in the responsibility of the President, which is totally different from the language before us the other day.

Is it not a fact that the other body, the conferees of the other body, are insisting on the language that we now have before us?

Mr. **MAHON**. The gentleman is correct. Senator SALTONSTALL, a distinguished Republican, is perhaps as strongly for the language in this motion as anyone.

Mr. **BOGGS**. So we are in a position where the other body, which of course does not control this body, but nevertheless you have a bipartisan expression from the other body on this issue.

Mr. **MAHON**. The gentleman is entirely correct.

But let me make a special point on this: No one who votes with the committee on this matter will be switching his vote. I am not asking anybody to vote any differently from the way he voted the other day when the matter was before us. The other day you voted for the motion to recommit and put the paragraph in the bill. And what you are doing when you vote today, as I know you will, you are voting for that same paragraph that was in the motion to recommit—plus the language which gives the President discretion.

And I say that this is also the way you would have voted the other day but for a technical parliamentary situation that precluded my offering the discretionary language as an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois; the discretionary language would have been subject to a point of order if offered on an appropriation bill. So you did not have a chance to vote on it. There was not a proviso in the language the other day, but today the proviso is there.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Is it not true that they have some convertible foreign exchange to spend, and to the extent that they spend it for nonstrategic materials, they will not have it available to buy more materials to send to Vietnam. Denying them any right to buy nonstrategic materials from us under the proposed amendment would increase the amount of money left to buy war materials from others. The position the opposition takes is the same as the Chinese Communists take relative to trade, and that is that there should be no trade of any kind between the East and West. This Presidential discretion is in our interest and should be granted.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I want to also point out—and this is important—that language identical to that now pending before us has been carried in the annual foreign assistance appropriation bills for 4 years—for the fiscal years 1964, 1965, 1966, and 1967. So it is not something new.

So, the people who voted against the motion to recommit and the people who voted for the motion to recommit the other day should, today, vote to support the conference position on this matter.

Let me say this about trading with Eastern Europe: The President, I think, wants to infiltrate Eastern Europe insofar as he possibly can with the free enterprise ideas of the American people. The information I have is that countries of Western Europe are doing $8 billion a year in total business with Eastern Europe. We are doing only $250 million worth of business.

This is giving the American businessmen in our country a chance to participate in this trade and try to wean away the peace-loving people in those countries of Eastern Europe who are in some cases under the domination of Communist governments.

So I sincerely hope and believe that, just as you did not vote to cripple previous Presidents in their efforts to promote the welfare and security of the United States, you are not going to do it today. You are going to vote for the language that was put in the motion to recommit, and you are going to vote for the clause that has been carried for years, to give the President some discretion when he deems it in the national interest. And you and I know that he is not going to take any action that he does not believe leads toward peace and the strengthening of the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would like to ask the gentleman a question because I am becoming a bit confused by the gentleman's argument. I do not want to vote to make it possible under any circumstances, whether the President approves or disapproves, for the Communist countries or countries that are trading with the enemy to get one single nickel of the American taxpayers' money. Now, how should I vote?

Mr. MAHON. I am talking about trade, not aid. This does not cost the taxpayer the nickel. The Export-Import Bank makes money. At the present time we are doing a little business with the countries of Eastern Europe—and we are doing a little business with Russia.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Did the gentleman understand the question? Was my question clear?

Mr. MAHON. And they are doing business with us. The President is undertaking to draw away from the Communist orbit all the satellite countries, insofar as he can, by trying to set up some degree of trade relationship which is in the interest of the United States. But this is a very modest program, so I would think that you could afford to vote—as this House voted only a short time ago—to continue the language which is recommended in this bill and which we have enacted for several years.

My time is running short and I am going to yield to our distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would like to know what the answer to the question is. I do not want them to get one single nickle under any circumstances, directly or indirectly, whether the President approves or disapproves.

Now, how can I vote in order to carry that out?

Mr. MAHON. It is a decision which the gentleman himself must make.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I mean unequivocally I do not want to give them one nickle.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman must decide that for himself. I have no difficulty in making that decision for myself.

I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, ours is a constitutional government. It is not a parliamentary government. We have a separation of the powers of government and the several branches that constitute our Government each have their duties and responsibilities.

The distinguished gentleman from Michigan, and my dear friend, the minority leader, a few moments ago made a statement, and I have no quarrel with that statement, and he said that it is the duty and the right of the Congress to make an impact on our foreign policy and help to form our foreign policy.

But surely we know that it is not the duty of the Congress to say to the President of the United States, "Your hands are tied so far as our foreign policy is concerned—and that our foreign policy is frozen."

The matter before us recognizes our constitutional form of government and the separation of powers under our form of government.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] recognizes the impact of the Congress in the forming of foreign policy but the Senate amendment also recognizes the executive branch of the Government, and the motion that is now before us harmonizes and reconciles the duties and responsibilities of both the legislative and the executive branch of our Government. So anyone who voted for the Findley amendment the other day could vote for this motion and be completely consistent.

Might I say that there is nothing in the bill which says that a penny of the money will go, directly or indirectly, to any Communist country.

We served here for 8 years under the administration of President Eisenhower. He is one of my dear friends, and I admire and respect him very much. He was my President. We never undertook to take away completely his power in the field of foreign affairs. I remember what my dear friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] said when he got into a little pleasant colloquy with JOHNNY ROONEY—and those exchanges are nice—but on two occasions, at least, I said to President Eisenhower, with all due respect that I would have for any President, not only for the Office but the man, "Mr. President, you know you have more friends among the Democrats in Congress than you have among the Republicans." That was when he made a progressive recommendation once in a while, and I would get the Republican repercussions. I cannot conceive of any President doing anything that he does not think is consistent with the best interests of our country.

I might disagree with him in whole or in part, but I would never impugn the motives of any President of the United States as to what he thinks is in the national interest of our country.

There is nothing I said that the gentleman from Indiana need be disturbed about. I was complimenting the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. I understood it that way. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. McCORMACK. Briefly. I cannot say no to you. I will come closer to you to see the deviltry in your eyes.

Mr. HALLECK. Thank you.

Mr. McCORMACK. We Democrats supported President Eisenhower; that is true, is it not?

Mr. HALLECK. That is correct. Now I want to point out a slight distinction: Under Eisenhower we were not at war for 8 years.

Mr. McCORMACK. Wait a minute.

Mr. HALLECK. Let me say one other thing.

Mr. McCORMACK. Have you a question to ask? Have you a question to ask, CHARLIE? Be a good boy now.

Mr. HALLECK. I will ask a question. Were you as a leader of the Congress among the small group, in which I was included, at the White House when President Kennedy was there and we were told, not asked, that we were sending 10,000 troops to Vietnam, and who was the first man who said, "Mr. President, the decision has already been made and since it's made I stand with you"?

Mr. McCORMACK. And I give you credit.

Let me say to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] without in any way having any reference to any other body—and I have said it publicly—I am proud of the House of Representatives, both parties, in supporting the President of the United States in this particular period of the world's history. I will be prepared if my Republican friends to my left will support President Johnson, giving him at least the minimum of discretion to exercise his duties and responsibilities in the field of foreign affairs in connection with the question that is before the House today.

So again I applaud you, CHARLIE, for what you said. And keep up the good work.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be reread at this time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will reread the motion.

The Clerk reread the motion, as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43 and concur therein.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 129, nays 102, not voting 201, as follows:

[Roll No. 399]

YEAS—129

Addabbo
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Barrett
Beckworth
Bingham
Boggs
Boland
Brademas
Brooks
Burke
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Cameron
Casey
Clark
Conte
Conyers
Daddario
Dawson
de la Garza
Dent
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Downing
Dulski
Edwards, Calif.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Flood
Fogarty
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Grider
Hamilton
Hanley
Hardy
Hathaway
Hechler
Holland
Irwin
Joelson
Karsten
Karth
Kee
Krebs
Landrum
Long, Md.
Love
McDowell
McGrath
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Matthews
Minish
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morrison
Morse
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Price
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Rodino
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Sickles
Sikes
Smith, Iowa
Stalbaum
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thomas
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Vanik
Vigorito
Weltner
White, Tex.
Wolff
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—102

Adair
Andrews, George W.
Arends
Ashmore
Ayres
Bates
Battin
Bennett
Betts
Bolton
Bray
Brock
Broomfield
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Collier
Conable
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Derwinski
Dole
Dowdy
Duncan, Tenn.
Everett
Findley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fulton, Pa.
Gathings
Grover
Gubser
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Halpern
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Henderson
Herlong
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hutchinson
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Kunkel
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
McClory
McDade
MacGregor
Marsh
May
Mize
Moore
Morton
Mosher
Natcher
Pelly
Pirnie
Poff
Pucinski
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rogers, Fla.
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Saylor
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Springer
Stubblefield
Taylor
Tuck
Utt
Waggonner
Watson
Whalley
Whitten
Williams
Wydler

NOT VOTING—201

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adams
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashbrook
Aspinall
Bandstra
Baring
Belcher
Bell
Berry
Blatnik
Bolling
Bow
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Broyhill, N.C.
Burton, Calif.
Callaway
Carey
Carter
Celler
Clawson, Del
Clevenger
Cohelan
Colmer
Cooley
Corman
Craley
Culver
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Delaney
Denton
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dorn
Duncan, Oreg.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Feighan
Fino
Fisher
Flynt
Foley
Fountain
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Gettys
Gilligan
Goodell
Grabowski
Greigg
Griffiths
Gross
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Howard
Hungate
Huot
Ichord
Jacobs
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Kastenmeier
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kupferman
Laird
Leggett
Long, La.
McCarthy
McCulloch
McEwen
McFall
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
Mackay
Mackie
Mailliard
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Meeds
Michel
Miller
Mills
Mink
Minshall
Moeller
Morris
Moss
Murray
Nelsen
Nix
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
Peage
Pool
Powell
Purcell
Race
Randall
Redlin
Rees
Reinecke
Reuss
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Roncalio
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Scott
Senner
Shipley
Sisk
Slack
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Toll
Trimble
Tunney
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vivian
Waldie
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watts
White, Idaho
Whitener
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wyatt
Yates
Younger

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Callaway.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Adams with Mr. Younger.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Roush with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Schisler with Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina.
Mr. Hicks with Mr. Hall.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Kupferman.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. McVicker with Mr. Trimble.
Mr. Mackay with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Haley.
Mr. Clevenger with Mr. Grabowski.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Craley with Mr. Pool.
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Hansen of Iowa.
Mr. Gilligan with Mrs. Mink.
Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Hungate.
Mr. Randall with Mr. Huot.
Mr. Widnall with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.
Mr. Olsen of Montana with Mr. Jones of North Carolina.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Kastenmeier.
Mr. Moeller with Mr. McCarthy.
Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Schneebeli.
Mr. Meeds with Mr. Tunney.
Mr. Mackie with Mr. Van Deerlin.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Todd.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Ullman.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Walker of New Mexico.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Charles H. Wilson.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Greigg.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Reuss with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. King of California with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Miller with Mr. Stafford.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Gurney.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Albert with Mr. Goodell.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Daniels with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Keith.
Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Whitener with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Reinecke.

Mr. McFall with Mr. Stanton.

Mr. Shipley with Mr. Robison.

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Nelsen.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Bob Wilson.

Mrs. Kelly with Mr. McEwen.

Mr. Dyal with Mr. Martin of Alabama.

Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Stratton with Mrs. Dwyer.

Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Denton with Mr. Belcher.

Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Clarence J. Brown, Jr.

Mr. Foley with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.

Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Glenn Andrews.

Mr. Sisk with Mr. Smith of New York.

Mr. Schmidhauser with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.

Mr. Senner with Mr. Wyatt.

Mr. Duncan of Oregon with Mr. Gettys.

Mr. Scott with Mr. Bandstra.

Mr. Roncalio with Mr. Blatnik.

Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Ichord.

Mr. Waldie with Mr. King of New York.

Mr. Roberts with Mr. Adair.

Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Bow.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Yates.

Mr. Olson of Minnesota with Mr. McMillan.

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Culver.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Watts.

Mr. Toll with Mr. Redlin.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Mathias.

Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.

Mr. Leggett with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Macdonald.

Mr. Dorn with Mrs. Griffiths.

Mr. Morris with Mr. Rees.

Mr. Vivian with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Slack with Mr. Rostenkowski.

Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. King of Utah.

Mr. Carey with Mr. Burton of California.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Staggers.

Mr. Race with Mr. Mills.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Murray.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference and the several motions was laid on the table.

LEAVE TO REVISE AND EXTEND AND INCLUDE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that those Members speaking on the conference report may have permission to revise and extend their remarks and insert pertinent excerpts and tabulations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just adopted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 21, 1966.
Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Please consider this my resignation from the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The members of this Committee have been extremely courteous to me and patient with me.

It is my firm conviction that this is the finest committee of the Congress of the United States and is inhabited by the finest men of that Congress.

I beg to remain, sir,

Your most humble and obedient servant,
CHARLES FARNSLEY.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 21, 1966.
Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It is with considerable regret that I submit my resignation as a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, effective immediately.

It has been a high privilege and an honor for me to work with the Chairman and the many fine members of this Committee during the past two years. My association with and participation in the deliberations of the Science and Astronautics Committee will always remain a pleasant and rewarding experience.

With highest esteem, I am,

Yours sincerely,
WILLIAM R. ANDERSON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 1072

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Agriculture: WALTER B. JONES, of North Carolina;

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: WILLIAM R. ANDERSON, of Tennessee.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 21, 1966.
Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Please accept my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Public Works, effective immediately.

With kindest regards, I am,

Respectfully yours,
JIM MARTIN.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 1073

Resolved, That JOHN J. DUNCAN, of Tennessee, be and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Public Works.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO ADJUST THE STATUS OF CUBAN REFUGEES TO THAT OF LAWFUL PERMANENT RESIDENTS OF THE UNITED STATES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. GILBERT filed the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 15183) to adjust the status of Cuban refugees to that of lawful permanent residents of the United States:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2334)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15183) to adjust the status of Cuban refugees to that of lawful permanent residents of the United States, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the same with amendments as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate Amendments insert the following:

"That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 245(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the status of any alien who is a native or citizen of Cuba and who has been inspected and admitted or paroled into the United States subsequent to January 1, 1959 and has been physically present in the United States for at least two years, may be adjusted by the Attorney General, in his discretion and under such regulations as he may prescribe, to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence if the alien makes an application for such adjustment, and the alien is eligible to receive an immigrant visa and is admissible to the United States for permanent residence. Upon approval of such an application for adjustment of status, the Attorney General shall create a record of the alien's admission for permanent residence as of a date thirty months prior to the filing of such an application or the date of his last arrival into the United States, whichever date is later. The provisions of this Act shall be applicable to the spouse and child of any alien described in this subsection, regardless of their citizenship and place of birth, who are residing with such alien in the United States.

"SEC. 2. In the case of any alien described in section 1 of this Act who, prior to the effective date thereof, has been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence, the Attorney General shall, upon application, record his admission for permanent residence as of the date the alien originally arrived in the United States as a nonimmigrant or as a parolee, or a date thirty months prior to the date of enactment of this Act, whichever date is later.

"SEC. 3. Section 13 of the Act entitled 'An Act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes', approved October 3, 1965 (Public Law 89–236), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

" '(c) Nothing contained in subsection (b) of this section shall be construed to affect the validity of any application for adjustment under section 245 filed with the Attorney General prior to December 1, 1965, which would have been valid on that date; but as to all such applications the statutes or parts of statutes repealed or amended by this Act are, unless otherwise specifically provided therein, continued in force and effect.'

"SEC. 4. Except as otherwise specifically provided in this Act, the definitions contained in section 101 (a) and (b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall apply in the administration of this Act. Nothing contained in this Act shall be held to repeal, amend, alter, modify, affect, or restrict the powers, duties, functions, or authority of the Attorney General in the administration and enforcement of the Immigration and Nationality Act or any other law relating to immigration, nationality, or naturalization."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to adjust the status of Cuban refugees to that of lawful permanent residents of the United States, and for other purposes."

And the Senate agree to the same.

EMANUEL CELLER,
MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN,
JACOB H. GILBERT,
WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH,
ARCH A. MOORE, JR.,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
SAMUEL J. ERVIN, JR.,
EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN,
HIRAM L. FONG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15183) to adjust the status of Cuban refugees to that of lawful permanent residents of the United States, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House passed H.R. 15183 and the provisions of S. 3712 were substituted for the provisions of the House bill. The House disagreed with the Senate amendments and requested a conference; the Senate insisted upon its version and then agreed to the conference. The conference report recommends that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate version and agree to the same with an amendment, the amendment being to insert in lieu of the matter inserted by the Senate amendment the matter agreed to by the conferees, and that the Senate agree thereto. The conference report contains substantially the language of the Senate version with certain exceptions, as explained below.

(1) As passed by the Senate the bill made adjustment of status available for certain persons from the Dominican Republic who had been displaced from their usual place of abode because of military operations as well as refugees from Cuba. The conferees agreed to the deletion of the provision pertaining to the Dominican refugees.

(2) The conferees agreed to adopt the House provision that only those refugees from Cuba who had arrived in the United States subsequent to January 1, 1959, would be eligible for adjustment of status under this Act.

(3) The Senate amendment provided that a refugee from Cuba must have been physically present for at least two years in the United States before his status may be adjusted to that of a permanent resident by the Attorney General. The conferees agreed to adopt this Senate provision.

(4) The Senate amendment provided, upon approval of an application for adjustment of status filed by a refugee from Cuba, the Attorney General is authorized to create a record of the alien's admission for permanent residence as of the date of his last arrival into the United States. As passed by the House the bill provided that the Attorney General is authorized to create a record of lawful admission as of the date of approval of the application. The conferees agreed to adjust the date provided in the Senate amendment so that on approval of an application for adjustment of status the Attorney General is authorized to create a record of lawful admission as of thirty months prior to the date of the filing of such application for adjustment of status, or as of the date of the alien's last arrival into the United States, whichever date is later.

(5) Section 2 of the Senate amendment was modified to conform with the provisions of Section 1 with respect to the creation of the record of the alien's admission for permanent residence.

(6) Section 3 of the Senate amendment provides that any application for adjustment of status under Section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act filed with the Attorney General prior to December 1, 1965, may be adjudicated notwithstanding the provisions of section 245(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. This objective is identical with H.R. 12596, which was approved by the House of Representatives August 1, 1966. The language of the Senate amendment with respect to this provision is slightly different from the House version but accomplishes the same objective. The conferees agreed to adopt the Senate provision.

EMANUEL CELLER,
MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN,
JACOB H. GILBERT,
WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH,
ARCH A. MOORE, JR.,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 15183) to adjust the status of Cuban refugees to that of lawful permanent residents of the United States, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. GILBERT (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation which will provide a means whereby the Cuban refugees in the United States may adjust their present immigration status in order that they may acquire the status of a lawfully permanent resident alien.

It is now a matter of history that in January 1959 Fidel Castro commenced operations by a revolt which soon was revealed in its true colors—a Communist seizure of one of our neighboring independent countries. Those Cubans who could, immediately began to flee from their native country to the United States to seek a refuge from Communist oppression. For about 2 years they were able, as far as the U.S. law was concerned, to obtain permanent immigration visas from the U.S. consul in Cuba with which they could come to the United States for permanent residence. Some came with visitors' visas and have since remained here.

On January 3, 1961, the United States severed diplomatic relations with Cuba and there were no longer available U.S. consuls to whom they could apply for visas whether permanent or temporary.

The Cubans continue to flee to the United States in every variety of transport. In the fall of October 1962 commercial air flights from Cuba were suspended making it even more difficult for them to come here.

When the President approved the act of October 3, 1965, he announced that special provisions were being made to accept Cubans in the United States who were seeking asylum. Shortly thereafter a special airlift was inaugurated by which Cuban refugees were able to be brought to the United States.

However, those who came, and are still coming, totaling at present approximately 170,000, now in an indefinite and nonpermanent status, find themselves in the position, technically, of being visitors who have remained longer than the period for which their visitors' visas were issued, or in a position of parolees without any semblance of permanent residence or even the appearance thereof.

As a result, many highly skilled Cuban persons are, by virtue of various State laws, unable to practice their skilled professions because of requirements relating to permanent residence or even U.S. citizenship. You know that the United States has expended and continues to spend, vast sums of money to care for these and the other classes of impoverished homeless people from Cuba.

Why have they not been able, heretofore, to adjust their status in the United States and thus acquire permanent residence? The answer is simple: under a provision of law in effect for many years, a native of Cuba, as are natives of other adjacent islands and the contiguous territories, is ineligible to adjust his immigration status in the United States. The only means now available for them is to leave the United States, go to some foreign country and apply to a U.S. consul stationed abroad for an immigrant visa with which they can return to the United States and be admitted as permanent residents. Even to suggest such a necessitous procedure for the Cuban refugee is absurd on its face. Obviously, they have been deprived of every worldly possession by Castro and his Cuban gang. They simply do not have the money to take a trip abroad with their families to acquire an immigrant visa. The situation is even more striking when it is recalled that a native of Cuba is a "special immigrant" under the law and is not subject to the numerical limitations contained in the law applicable to natives of other countries.

The legislation now before this body would permit a Cuban to apply for adjustment of status in the United States without leaving this country. There is nothing automatic or mandatory about the process. It is strictly permissive and the adjustment of status will be discretionary with the Attorney General. Acquisition of permanent residence status by those who apply and are granted this privilege would place them in a position ultimately to acquire the necessary years of residence in the United States which is a prerequisite to naturalization as a U.S. citizen.

It seems crystal clear to me, and I am sure to all of you, that enactment of this bill will be of the highest benefit not only to the Cuban refugee concerned but, even more important, to the national interest and welfare of the United States. Every Government agency, including the Departments of State, Justice, and Health, Education, and Welfare, has recommended enactment of this legislation. The State Department has carefully pointed out that this legislative proposal, if adopted, will not constitute a recognition by the United States, as a matter of public policy, that there is any permanence in the Castro regime. On the contrary, enactment by the U.S. Government of this legislation is a sure sign to the world at large that the United States still performs its traditional role as a place of welcome and aid to those who are in distress and oppressed by conditions beyond their control. Mr. Speaker, I urge the prompt and wholehearted adoption of the conference report now before us.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my distinguished colleague, a member of the Subcommittee on Immigration [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the conference report on H.R. 15183, the Cuban refugee bill, with some reluctance.

I have no quarrel with the basic humanitarian objective of this bill.

Passage of this bill will ameliorate the plight of thousands of Cubans who find it difficult to obtain suitable employment or who are unable to travel outside the United States because of the indefinite nature of their status as refugees or financial disability. Under present law to attain permanent resident status they must leave the United States, apply at a U.S. consular office in another country for an immigrant visa and reenter the United States. This procedure is designed to prevent visitors from misusing their nonimmigrant admission to gain admittance ahead of those applying for immigrant visas in the regular manner in their native countries.

However, the Cuban refugees obviously are unable to apply in Cuba for a visa since we have no U.S. consulate there. The trip abroad to Canada or Mexico after arrival in Florida as refugees is costly and unreasonably burdensome for those who have been stripped of their property by the Communist Cuban Government. Since only a small proportion of the refugees have been able to finance a trip abroad for reentry as immigrants, the result has been that a considerable number have been forced to take employment in lower paying jobs than those for which their training and experience qualify them. This is so because permanent resident or citizenship status is often a requirement for practice of a profession—medicine, dentistry, law, teaching, accounting, and so forth.

As an example, 1,700 Cuban doctors have come to this country in the refugee influx. Many of these highly skilled persons have been with us for a period of 3 to 4 years. They cannot enter their chosen fields of work, with rare exceptions, and they just cannot qualify in the majority of our States for the required licenses or certificates due to the lack of permanent immigration status. As a result of this situation one finds these trained people working as parking lot attendants, bus boys, and in other menial services. Our country is the loser for we could well use these skills particularly in the field of medicine.

My first reaction to this situation is that the various States, each of which sets its own licensing requirements for medicine, teaching and other professional occupations should be able to modify and adjust their laws to meet the situation. Temporary or emergency legislation is possible at the State level as well as at the Federal. If a State has a desperate shortage of doctors, for example, it should be flexible enough to adjust its own licensing requirements, not as to qualifications and training, but as to length of residence when a supply of qualified foreign doctors is available.

In my own State of West Virginia, for instance, I was able to arrange for an extension of temporary licenses for foreign doctors who are performing invaluable services in my State. Under temporary licensing, time is permitted to pass, looking toward qualification for citizenship. The community benefits from the doctor and the doctor is permitted temporarily to practice his profession.

However, other States have displayed reluctance, inflexibility and shortsighted stubbornness in this matter. Rather than permit the talents and experience of many Cuban refugees to go to waste when an urgent need exists, I have supported this legislation. It is a matter of economics—the Cubans should be permitted to use their skills and professional training and our country should be able to profit from their work.

As I explained on this floor previously, I was also hesitant to support this legislation because of the possible foreign policy implications inherent in the Cuban refugee program.

We pray for the day these people will be able to return to their native land. It is our continuing goal and strong desire that Cuba shall be freed from Communist domination and shall return again to the free world family of nations. I do not want Castro or anyone else to think for one minute that passage of this bill means that we accept the Castro regime as a permanent fixture.

We have been assured by the Department of State and the Justice Department that the policy of opposition to the Communist regime in Cuba remains unchanged. The OAS countries, the free world, and Castro should understand that this special help to Cuban refugees is given for purely humanitarian and practical reasons and in no way reflects any change in our attitude or lessening in our determination.

My third reason for reluctance is that the executive branch has reported no progress whatsoever toward securing the release of the 800 or more U.S. citizens in Cuba. A total of at least 2,700 persons, including spouses and children, languish in Cuba—many in dungeons—while our Government pours millions into the care and training of Cuban refugees. With approximately 300,000 Cubans welcomed to this country since 1959 and $214 million spent—with 4,000 more coming each month—with at least 250,000 to 300,000 Cubans waiting their turn to come—why cannot our Government free its own citizens?

I do not begrudge the aid and support we are giving to the unfortunate Cuban refugees—but it is a question of priorities. And I happen to believe our own citizens should be our first concern. The more we do to help Castro rid his country of those who do not support his regime, the more we weaken our bargaining position with respect to release of our own U.S. citizens from Cuba.

I call again for a complete stoppage of the Cuban airlift until Castro frees our citizens. Let our President deliver an ultimatum to Castro—no more air lift until every American is back on American soil.

My final concern is that the conference report provides for a less strict residency qualification than did the House version of the bill. The main objective of the original bill was to permit those Cubans who wished to apply for permanent residence status to do so without leaving the country.

The House version provided that if he was found eligible, his resident status dated from the date of such approval.

Thus, under our naturalization law, a 5-year period thereafter would be required before he could become a U.S. citizen.

The other body proposed that the Cuban's permanent resident status be retroactive to the date he arrived in this country. This would amount to instant citizenship for many—all who came before 1962, for example, would have been credited with 5-year permanent residence.

My objection to this provision is that the refugees did not come as intending permanent residents—they came with an intent to return to their homes in Cuba. Until the intent was changed, and I concede that a great many have come to this change in their plans, the refugee could not be considered as one who had elected to become a permanent resident of the United States. And our laws provide that in order to apply for citizenship, 5 years in such elected permanent resident status is required.

Your conferees were not able to sustain the House position on this point, but we did secure a compromise under which the absolute maximum anyone can have by way of retroactive permanent resident credit is 30 months. This figure, 30 months, is the same amount of continuous physical presence in the United States as required under present law during the 5-year permanent resident period for citizenship. I emphasize that 5 years of permanent residence is still required for qualification for U.S. citizenship.

The bill was strengthened in conference by adoption of the requirement that the Cuban refugee cannot apply for adjustment of status until he has been in the United States for 2 years.

The Senate provision for refugees from the Dominican Republic has been eliminated. The House conferees have agreed that this matter will be the subject of investigation and study early in the next Congress.

The bill was also strengthened by incorporation of the House date limitation so that only Cubans who have entered since January 1, 1959, are eligible for adjustment.

In my judgment the House position on the bill has been more nearly preserved than that proposed by the other body. I believe that the basic merits of this legislation justify favorable action on the conference report.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I support the conference report on H.R. 15183, the Cuban refugee bill and favor its passage.

This bill will make it possible for natives or citizens of Cuba who were inspected and admitted or paroled into the United States subsequent to January 1, 1959, to apply for adjustment to permanent resident status without leaving the United States.

It will not mean that all Cuban refugees will automatically qualify for permanent resident status. Those who elect to apply may be adjusted at the discretion of the Attorney General, if they are otherwise eligible to receive an immigrant visa and admissible to the United States. This means they must meet the health and security tests for admission and are not disqualified by reason of any of the grounds for exclusion listed in our immigration law.

This bill creates no precedent, for the same thing was done in 1958 for the Hungarian refugees; in 1960 for refugee escapees within the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees; and the 1965 amendments to the immigration law contain a provision for adjustment of status for refugees from communism from outside the Western Hemisphere.

This bill will assist many Cubans to make a greater contribution to our economic life and reduce the costs of our Cuban refugee program since it will permit a faster adjustment to self-supporting status for many families.

The talents and experience of many Cuban refugees are presently going to waste because the professional licensing laws of most of our States prohibit those without permanent resident status from practicing their skills and professions. With the urgent need in our society for professional skills, particularly in medicine, it is to our economic advantage to permit the Cubans to exercise their highest talents. Not only will their skills be preserved to the advantage of our economy, but the faith and belief in democracy of these refugees from communism will be strengthened.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report does provide for a shorter residency qualification than did the House version of the bill.

The House version provided that if the Cuban applicant was found eligible, his resident status dated from the date of such approval. Thus, under our naturalization law, a 5-year period thereafter would be required before he could become a U.S. citizen.

The other body proposed that the Cuban's permanent resident status be retroactive to the date he arrived in this country. This would amount to immediate citizenship for many—all who came before 1962 would have been credited with 5 years of permanent residence.

Your conferees were not able to sustain the House position on this point, but we did secure a compromise under which the absolute maximum anyone can receive by way of retroactive permanent resident credit is 30 months. This figure, 30 months, is the same amount of continuous physical presence in the United States as required under present law during the 5-year permanent resident period for citizenship.

In my judgment, the bill was strengthened in conference by adoption of a requirement that the Cuban refugee cannot apply for adjustment of status until he has been in the United States for 2 years.

The bill was also strengthened by incorporation of the House date limitation so that only Cubans who have entered since January 1, 1959, are eligible for adjustment.

In my opinion, the House conferees have obtained as strong a position with reference to the original House bill as was possible. In view of the humanitarian objectives of this bill, I favor its adoption.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I trust that the conference report on H.R. 15183 will be speedily adopted. The bill, as reported by the conference, is substantially the legislation as it passed the House. The principal area of disagreement between the two bodies was the question whether the refugees from Cuba would have a record of lawful admission for permanent residence created as of the date of approval of their application—the House version; or whether the record would be created retroactively to their date of arrival into the United States.

The conferees agreed to a compromise which would authorize the Attorney General to create a record of lawful admission 30 months prior to the date such a refugee filed an application for adjustment of status to remain here permanently, or as of the date of the alien's arrival into the United States, whichever is later.

Before a refugee from Cuba is eligible to apply for adjustment of status he must have been physically present in the United States for at least 2 years. Thus, the refugee will gain 6 months, as a maximum, of permanent residence status.

The great majority of refugees from Cuba have been in the United States for many years and the conferees thought it would only be equitable to give them some retroactive status as permanent residents, but not going so far as to make them automatically eligible to apply for naturalization.

The Senate receded on two areas of disagreement; the House accepted a Senate proposal not contained in the House bill; and the major issue was resolved by a compromise.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the adoption of the conference report on H.R. 15183 will result in uncomplicated, simple legislation, but legislation with a tremendous humanitarian impact. The beneficiaries of our action today are refugees from Cuba, stripped by the Castro Communist regime of all of their possessions except their desire for freedom and liberty, who have sought haven and sanctuary in the United States. With the sympathetic aid from our Government and dedicated assistance from the voluntary agencies, these unfortunate, but courageous, people have made an excellent adjustment in communities throughout the United States. They desire to become fully productive members of our society and to give them this opportunity not only serves their interests, but serves as well the best interests of the United States.

Under the provisions of existing law, natives of the Western Hemisphere are precluded from adjusting their status to permanent residence while in the United States and consequently must journey to a consular post abroad, secure an immigrant visa, and be readmitted for permanent residence. For a refugee who has entered our country without fortune, it is a tremendous burden on him, in both time and money. This legislation merely relieves the Cuban refugee of this burden and authorizes the Attorney General to adjust his status in the United States.

The Cuban refugees have good work records. But, in many instances, they are underemployed. Time and again employers have prompted the Cubans to become permanent residents so that they can offer them better job opportunities and thereby give them a definite sense of belonging.

Many years ago, in July 1958, the Congress enacted legislation, which I had introduced, to authorize adjustment of status for Hungarian refugees who came to the United States after the gallant, but unsuccessful, revolt which took place in that country exactly 10 years ago this week. These likewise unfortunate persons were unable to return to their country. We offered them new opportunities which they quickly seized and, in the light of history, our action not only benefited the United States domestically and proved to the world our hospitality for victims of tyranny, but also further reaffirmed our position as the leader of the free world.

The Cuban people are, and always have been, our close friends. It was natural that they would come to our shores. By this action, we demonstrate once again to all who watch that we will find a way to help the deserving and we will extend the benefits of our freedom to all who seek liberty.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was orderd.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PANAMA CANAL CASH RELIEF ACT

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 5990) to grant increased benefits to persons receiving cash relief under the Panama Canal Cash Relief Act of July 8, 1937, and to extend cash relief benefits to widows of recipients, with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, strike out all after line 9 over to and including line 16 on page 3.

Page 3, line 17, strike out "3." and insert "2."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to grant increased benefits to persons receiving cash relief under the Panama Canal Cash Relief Act of July 8, 1937."

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. OLIBIO S. RODRIGUEZ-EIRAS

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2109) for the relief of Dr. Olibio S. Rodriguez-Eiras.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

S. 2109

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Olibio S. Rodriguez-Eiras shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 6, 1961.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FUN WAT HOY

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2010) for the relief of Fun Wat Hoy.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. LANDRUM). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 2010

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Fun Wat Hoy shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARGARET LEE WEIL

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2451) for the relief of Margaret Lee Weil.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. LANDRUM). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 2451

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, the provisions of section 101(b)(1)(F) and section 204 shall be available to Margaret Lee Weil for a period of three years from the effective date of this Act, notwithstanding the fact that the said Margaret Lee Weil is a single person.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MOORE

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Che Yim Loh may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, and a petition filed in behalf of the said Che Yim Loh by Margaret Lee Weil, a citizen of the United States, may be approved pursuant to section 204 of the Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "For the relief of Che Yim Loh."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. JUAN FEDERICO ANTONIO LAMAS Y PARRA

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2491) for the relief of Dr. Juan Federico Antonio Lamas y Parra.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 2491

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Juan Federico Antonio Lamas y Parra shall be held and considered to have been admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 22, 1961.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YOU I SOUK

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2750) for the relief of You I Souk.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 2750

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, section 204(c) relating to the number of petitions which may be approved in behalf of orphans, shall be inapplicable in the case of a petition filed in behalf of You I Souk by Mr. and Mrs.

Charles Busalacchi, citizens of the United States.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ZOFIA ZYCH

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3209) for the relief of Zofia Zych.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 3209

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as aended, Zofia Zych may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b) (1) (F) of the said Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Mr. and Mrs. John Jadack, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the said Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DUSKO DODER

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3222) for the relief of Dusko Doder.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 3222

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dusko Doder shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of February 1, 1960.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YUNG MI KIM

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3318) for the relief of Yung Mi Kim.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 3318

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, a petition may be filed by Mr. and Mrs. Charles G. Hood in behalf of Yung Mi Kim, and the provisions of section 204(c) of that Act relating to the number of petitions which may be approved in behalf of children defined in section 101 (b)(1)(F) of the said Act shall not be applicable in this case.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DENIZ HIKMET SEN MANES

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3258) for the relief of Deniz Hikmet Sen Manes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

S. 3258

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, Deniz Hikmet Sen Manes may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b) (1) (F) of that Act upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Staff Sergeant and Mrs. Ralph M. Manes, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the said Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THEODORA BEZATES

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3358) for the relief of Theodora Bezates.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 3358

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, Theodora Bezates may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b) (1) (F) of that Act, and a petition may be filed in her behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Gus Bezates, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION IN CERTAIN ALIEN CASES

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (S. Con. Res. 99):

That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a) (2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended (66 Stat. 204; 8 U.S.C. 1251):

A–4839402, Goldberg, Meyer.
A–6741048, Cassar, Lewis.
A–13696909, Lee, Hing Nom.
A–13525402, Young, Bok Jim.
A–8862836, Pollock, Benjamin.
A–4419302, Estes, Leon Morris.
A–13710436, Gee, Kim Heung.
A–11425282, Gee, Loy Sun.
A–5433779, Alesi, Anthony Angelo.
A–3977065, Diamond, George.
A–7077231, Mielzynski, Felix Christopher.
A–1465952, Villegas-Arrellano, Fidel.
A–2710178, Chee, Tong.
A–13702123, Ow, Hoy Kee.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I take this time to direct a question to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. Speaker, these bills have been previously passed over because of the objections of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] with reference to certain unanimous-consent proceedings which were held a few days ago.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I would say that these bills and resolutions and House action with respect thereto, have been pending and held up as a result of action on the part of the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the other body acceded, as it is my understanding they told the members of the Committee on the Judiciary they would.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, we have every hope that by the time the sine die resolution is adopted that final action upon these bills will have been implemented.

A part of it has been implemented. Part of it has not. But we have reason to believe the other body can come through with our demand.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 99

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a) (2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended (66 Stat. 204; 8 U.S.C. 1251):

A–4839402, Goldberg, Meyer.
A–6741048, Cassar, Lewis.
A–13696909, Lee, Hing Nom.
A–13525402, Young, Bok Jim.
A–8862836, Pollock, Benjamin.
A–4419302, Estes, Leon Morris.

A-13710436, Gee, Kim Heung.
A-11425282, Gee, Loy Sun.
A-5433779, Alesi, Anthony Angelo.
A-3977065, Diamond, George.
A-7077231, Mielzynski, Felix Christopher.
A-1465952, Villegas-Arrellano, Fidel.
A-2710178, Chee, Tong.
A-13702123, Ow, Hoy Kee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOR THE RELIEF OF SUSAN JEANNE CLYNES

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2222) for the relief of Susan Jeanne Clynes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 2222

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for purposes of any application for child's insurance benefits under section 203(d) of the Social Security Act filed after the date of enactment of this Act by or on behalf of Susan Jeanne Clynes, of Webster Springs, West Virginia, on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of the late George I. Clynes (social security account numbered 114-30-3984), the said Susan Jeanne Clynes shall be held and considered to be the child of the said George I. Clynes and to have been dependent upon him at the time of his death.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read a third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOR THE RELIEF OF CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER GLEN ZEIGLER, U.S. NAVY (RETIRED)

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2798) for the relief of CWO Glen Zeigler, U.S. Navy (retired).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 2798

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Chief Warrant Officer Glen Zeigler, United States Navy (retired), of Bremerton, Washington, is hereby relieved of all liability to repay to the United States the sum of $8,111.42, representing the amount paid him as salary for the period from September 9, 1963, through November 30, 1964, while he was employed at the United States Naval Torpedo Station, Keyport, Washington, in violation of section 2 of the Act of July 31 1894 (28 Stat. 205), which prohibited the employment of certain retired military officers in Federal civilian positions, the said Glen Zeigler having been advised by Government personnel that his employment was legal. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officers of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Glen Zeigler, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act.

SEC. 3. For pay purposes, including retirement and leave, the period from September 9, 1963, through November 30, 1964, shall be deemed to be creditable service.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read a third time, and passed. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOR THE RELIEF OF DR. DEAN H. GOSSELIN

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2040) for the relief of Dr. Dean H. Gosselin.

The Clerk read the title of the bill .

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 2040

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress hereby finds that Doctor Dean H. Gosselin, a commissioned officer in the United States Public Health Service, was separated from active duty on July 6, 1964, that within three months of such date he was found to have a brain tumor which has totally disabled him, that the condition which has resulted in this disability was initially incurred while he was on active duty, and that the Public Health Service is now precluded by law from considering him for disability retirement.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Public Health Service may consider Doctor Gosselin for disability retirement in accordance with chapter 61, title 10, United States Code, and section 221(a)(2) of the Public Health Service Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 213a(a)(2)), based upon those disabilities, and the degree thereof, which existed at the time he was separated from active duty and which are determined to have been incurred in line of duty. If Doctor Gosselin is found eligible for disability retirement, his retirement and retired pay shall be effective from and after July 7, 1964.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND SECTION 4339 OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk, the bill (H.R. 7973) to amend section 4339 of title 10, United States Code, with Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That section 4339 of title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

"SEC. 2. The organist and choirmaster and the civilian instructors in the departments of foreign languages and tactics at the United States Military Academy who are serving under appointments made prior to January 17, 1963, are entitled to public quarters without charge, and to fuel and light without charge when they occupy public quarters."

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND TITLES 10 AND 37, UNITED STATES CODE, TO AUTHORIZE CERTAIN RANK, PAY, AND RETIREMENT PRIVILEGES FOR OFFICERS SERVING IN CERTAIN POSITIONS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 17451) to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to authorize certain rank, pay, and retirement privileges for officers serving in certain positions, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"(a) An officer who on the day before the effective date of this Act was serving as the Chief of the Bureau of Ships or the Bureau of Yards and Docks, and who on that effective date was detailed to serve as the commander of one of the six principal subordinate commands of the Naval Material Command, continues, from that date, to be eligible for the rank, pay, and retirement privileges he was entitled to receive as a bureau chief under chapter 513 of title 10, United States Code, and under section 202(h) of title 37, United States Code. If any such officer is retired while serving in the office to which so detailed, he may be retired in the grade of rear admiral, with retired pay based on the upper half of that grade; if retired after serving in that office, his eligibility for the retirement privileges authorized by chapter 513 of title 10, United States Code, is to be determined by adding his service as a bureau chief and all service performed in the office to which detailed on the effective date of this Act.

"(b) An officer who on the day before the effective date of this Act was serving as the Deputy Chief of the Bureau of Ships, the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, or the Bureau of Yards and Docks, and who on that effective date was detailed to serve as the vice commander of one of the six principal subordinate commands of the Naval Material Command, is entitled to the pay authorized by section 202(i) of title 37, United States Code, from the effective date of this Act and as long as he continues to serve in the office to which then detailed.

"SEC. 2. This Act shall be effective on May 1, 1966."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to preserve the pay and retirement privileges for certain former chiefs of Navy bureaus and to preserve the pay privileges of certain former deputy chiefs of Navy bureaus."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND TITLES 10 AND 37, UNITED STATES CODE, TO CODIFY RECENT MILITARY LAW, AND TO IMPROVE THE CODE

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 9778) to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to codify recent military law, and to improve the code, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, after line 2, insert: "that section 123 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out '5907,'."

Page 1, line 3, strike out "That section" and insert: "Sec. 2. Section".

Page 1, after line 4, insert: "Sec. 3. Sections 564(a), 1164, 1221, 1255(a), 1263(a), 1305(a), 1404 (including the catchline), 3883, 3884, 3885, 3886, 3913(a), 3915, 3916(a), 3921(a), 3922(a), 3923, 8883, 8884, 8885, 8886, 8913(a), 8915(a), 8916(a), 8921(a), 8922(a), and 8923 and the item relating to section 1404 in the analysis for chapter 71, of title 10, United States Code, are each amended by striking out the figure '47a' wherever it appears and by inserting in place thereof the figure '3301'.

"Sec. 4. Sections 591(a) and 5792 of title 10, United States Code, are each amended by striking out the figure '16' and inserting in place thereof the figure '3331'.

"Sec. 5. Section 651(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'enlisted under section 1013 of title 50 or'.".

Page 1, line 5, strike out "2." and insert: "6."

Page 4, line 3, strike out "per centum" and insert: "percent".

Page 4, line 15, strike out "per centum" and insert: "percent".

Page 4, after line 17, insert:

"Sec. 7. Section 717(b) of title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

"Sec. 8. (a) Sections 802(8), 1072(1), 1073, 1208(a)(2)(B), 1213, 1444(a), 2733(f), 2771(b), 4537, 7204(a)(1)(D), 7205(a)(4), 7211(a)(4), 7218(b), 7571(a)(3), 7572(a)(3), 7576(a)(3), and 9537 of title 10, United States Code, are each amended by striking out 'Coast and Geodetic Survey' and inserting in place thereof 'Environmental Science Services Administration'.

"(b) Section 1208(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding the following sentence flush at the end thereof: 'For the purpose of clause (2)(B) of this subsection, active service as a member of the Environmental Science Services Administration includes active service as a member of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.'

"Sec. 9. Chapter 57 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by redesignating section 1124, relating to the gold star lapel button, as section '1126', redesignating the corresponding item in the analysis as item '1126', transferring the section to follow section 1112, and transferring the analysis item to follow that for section 1125.

"Sec. 10. Section 1124(g) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'program report' in the last sentence and inserting in place thereof 'progress report'."

Page 4, line 18, strike out "3." and insert: "11.".

Page 4, after line 20, insert:

"Sec. 12. (a) Chapter 77 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

"(1) By adding the following new section:

'§ 1524. Posthumous commissions and warrants: determination of date of death

"'For the purposes of sections 1521 and 1522 of this title, in any case where the date of death is established or determined under sections 551–558 of title 37, the date of death is the date the Secretary concerned receives evidence that the person is dead, or the date the finding of death is made under section 555 of title 37.'.

"(2) By adding the following new item in the analysis:

'1524. Posthumous commissions and warrants: determination of date of death.'

"(b) Section 5 of the Act of July 28, 1942, ch. 528, as added by section 1(e) of the Act of July 17, 1953, ch. 220, 67 Stat. 177, is repealed.

"Sec. 13. The analysis of chapter 81 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out the item relating to section 1580.

"Sec. 14. Section 1583 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

"(1) By striking out the designation '(a)' at the beginning thereof.

"(2) By repealing subsection (b).

"Sec. 15. Section 1586 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out the reference 'section 12 of the Act of June 27, 1944 (5 U.S.C. 861)' wherever it appears and inserting in place thereof 'sections 3501–3503 of title 5'.".

Page 4, line 21, strike out "4." and insert "16."

Page 5, line 6, strike out "5," and insert: "17."

Page 5, line 8, strike out "6," and insert: "18."

Page 5, after line 10, insert:

"Sec. 19. Section 2237(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks of the Navy' and inserting in place thereof 'the head of such office or agency in the Department of the Navy as the Secretary of the Navy may designate'.

"Sec. 20. Section 2680(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out '1001 and 1003–1011' and inserting in place thereof '551–559 and 701–706'."

Page 5, line 11, strike out "7." and insert: "21."

Page 5, line 21, strike out "8." and insert: "22."

Page 6, after line 23, insert:

"Sec. 23. Sections 3017 and 8017 of title 10, United States Code, are each amended by striking out the figure '6' wherever it appears and inserting in place thereof the figure '3347'."

Page 7, line 1, strike out "9." and insert: "24."

Page 7, line 8, strike out "10." and insert: "25."

Page 7, line 12, strike out "11." and insert: "26."

Page 7, line 15, strike out "12." and insert: "27."

Page 7, after line 17, insert:

"Sec. 28. Sections 4540(c), 7212(a), and 9540(c) of title 10, United States Code, are each amended by striking out '1071–1153' and inserting in place thereof '305, 3324, 5101–5115, 5331–5338, 5341, 5342, and 7154'."

Page 7, line 18, strike out "13." and insert: "29."

Page 7, line 21, strike out "14." and insert: "30."

Page 8, line 3, strike out "15." and insert: "31."

Page 8, line 6, strike out "16." and insert: "32."

Page 8, after line 9, insert:

"Sec. 33. Chapter 509 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'and Chief of Naval Material' in the catchline of section 5082 and in the corresponding item in the analysis and by amending section 5082 (a) to read as follows:

"'(a) To coordinate military operations and their support effectively, the Chief of Naval Operations, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, shall—

"'(1) determine the personnel and the material requirements of the operating forces, including the order in which ships, aircraft, surface craft, weapons, and facilities are to be constructed, maintained, altered, repaired, and overhauled; and

"'(2) coordinate and direct the efforts of the bureaus and offices of the executive part of the Department of the Navy as may be necessary to make available and distribute, when and where needed, the personnel and material required.'

"Sec. 34. (a) Chapter 511 of title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

"(b) The chapter analysis of subtitle C of title 10, United States Code, and the chapter analysis of part I of subtitle C of title 10 are each amended by striking out the following item:

"'511. Office of the Chief of Naval Material .... 5111'.

"Sec. 35. Chapter 513 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by—

"(1) striking out clauses (3)–(6) in section 5132;

"(2) amending the catchline of section 5133 and the corresponding item in the analysis by inserting 'and Judge Advocate General' after 'Bureau Chiefs' in each case;

"(3) striking out 'Chief of the Bureau of Naval Weapons' in section 5133(a) and inserting in place thereof 'Judge Advocate General';

"(4) inserting 'or the Judge Advocate General' after the words 'chief of bureau' wherever they appear in the first sentences of sections 5133(a) and 5133(b) and

"(5) repealing sections 5145, 5146, 5147, and 5154 and striking out the corresponding items in the analysis."

Page 8, line 10, strike out "17." and insert: "36."

Page 8, after line 12, insert:

"Sec. 37. Subsections (b) and (c) of section 6970 of title 10, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"'(b) Under such regulations as the Secretary prescribes, the storekeeper shall make quarterly returns of the property to the head of such office or agency in the Department of the Navy as the Secretary may designate. The officer so designated shall report annually to the Secretary the receipts and expenditures under this section.

"'(c) The storekeeper's accounts shall be inspected quarterly by the inspector general of the Supply Corps. A report of the inspection, with any recommendation of the inspector general, shall be made to the person designated by the Secretary under subsection (b).'

"Sec. 38. Section 6971(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'Bureau of Supplies and Accounts' and inserting in place thereof 'person designated by the Secretary of the Navy under section 6970(b) of this title'.

"Sec. 39. Section 7083 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'through the Chief, Field Branch, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts,'.

"Sec. 40. Section 7086(g) of title 10,, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'sections 751–756, 757–791, and 793' and inserting in place thereof 'chapter 81'.

"Sec. 41. Section 7308(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'The

Bureau of Ships' and inserting in place thereof 'An office or agency in the Department of the Navy designated by the Secretary of the Navy'.

"Sec. 42. Section 7306 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

"(1) By striking out the designation '(a)' at the beginning thereof.

"(2) By repealing subsection (b).

"Sec. 43. The analysis of chapter 643 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out the item relating to section 7474.

"Sec. 44. Section 7604(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'Bureau of Supplies and Accounts' and inserting in place thereof 'office or agency in the Department of the Navy designated by the Secretary'.

"Sec. 45. The last sentence of section 8031 (c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'quarterly' and inserting in place thereof 'annually'."

Page 8, line 13, strike out "18." and insert: "46."

Page 8, line 16, strike out "19." and insert: "47."

Page 8, line 23, strike out "20." and insert: "48."

Page 9, after line 3, insert:

"Sec. 49. (a) Title 37, United States Code, is amended as follows:

"(1) Sections 101(3) and (5)(E), 201 (third column of table), 205(a)(5), 403(e), 501 (b) and (e), 502(a), 503, 706 (catchline and text), 801(c), and 1001(b) are each amended by striking out 'Coast and Geodetic Survey' and inserting in place thereof 'Environmental Science Services Administration'.

"(2) Section 414(a)(2) is amended by striking out ', or as Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey'.

"(3) The analysis of chapter 13 is amended by striking out the following item:

" '706. Commissioned officer of Coast and Geodetic Survey.'

"and inserting in place thereof:

" '706. Commissioned officers of Environmental Science Services Administration.'

"(b) Section 205(a) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by adding the following sentence at the end thereof: 'For the purpose of clause (5) of this subsection, periods during which a member was a deck officer or junior engineer in the Environmental Science Services Administration includes periods during which a member was a deck officer or junior engineer in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.'

"Sec. 50. Section 202 of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

"(1) by striking out the words 'or as Chief of the Bureau of Naval Weapons' in subsection (g); and

"(2) by striking out clause (2) in subsection (h)."

Page 9, line 4, strike out "21." and insert: "51."

Page 9, after line 14, insert:

"Sec. 52. Section 301(a)(2) of title 37, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

" '(2) as determined by the Secretary concerned, on a submarine (including, in the case of nuclear-powered submarines, periods of training and rehabilitation after assignment thereto), or, in the case of personnel qualified in submarines, as a member of a submarine operational command staff whose duties require serving on a submarine during underway operations—

" '(A) during one calendar month: 48 hours;

" '(B) during any two consecutive calendar months when the requirements of clause (A) above have not been met: 96 hours; or

" '(C) during any three consecutive calendar months when the requirements of clause (B) above have not been met: 144 hours;

as a prospective crew-member of submarine being constructed, and during periods of instruction to prepare for assignment to a submarine of advanced design or a position of increased responsibility on a submarine;'."

Page 9, line 15, strike out "22." and insert: "53."

Page 9, line 18, strike out "23." and insert: "54."

Page 10, line 7, strike out "24." and insert: "55."

Page 11, after line 14, insert:

"Sec. 56. Section 404(e) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'Military Air Transport Service' and inserting in place thereof 'Military Airlift Command'.

Page 11, line 15, strike out "25." and insert: "57."

Page 11, line 18, strike out "26." and insert: "58."

Page 12, after line 2, insert:

"Sec. 59. The last sentence of section 406(g) of title 37 (United States Code, is amended by striking out 'members' " and inserting in place thereof 'members's'."

Page 12, line 3, strike out "27." and insert: "60."

Page 12, line 7, strike out "28." and insert: "61."

Page 12, after line 9, insert:

"Sec. 62. Section 409 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'forty-eight' in the last sentence and inserting in place thereof '48'."

Page 12, line 10, strike out "29." and insert: "63."

Page 12, line 13, strike out "30." and insert: "64."

Page 12, after line 15, insert:

"Sec. 65. The last sentence of section 501(d) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'sixty' and inserting in place thereof '60'.

"Sec. 66. The catchline of section 604 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'the'."

Page 12, line 16, strike out "31." and insert: "67."

Page 12, line 20, strike out "32." and insert: "68."

Page 13, line 1, strike out "33." and insert: "69."

Page 13, after line 3, insert:

"Sec. 70. Section 1006 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by redesignating subsection '(g)' (relating to advance payment of pay and allowances to members of the armed forces), as subsection '(h)'.

"Sec. 71. Section 1007(a) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out the figure '82' and by inserting in place thereof the figure '5512'."

Page 13, line 4, strike out "34." and insert: "72."

Page 13, line 7, strike out "35." and insert: "73."

Page 13, after line 21, insert:

"(c)(1) Section 461 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking out the designation '(c)' and by amending the catchline to read as follows:

" '§ 461. Remission of indebtedness of enlisted members upon discharge'.

"(2) The item in the analysis of chapter 13 of title 14, United States Code, relating to section 461 is amended to read as follows:

" '461. Remission of indebtedness of enlisted members upon discharge.' "

Page 13, line 22, strike out "36." and insert: "74."

Page 14, line 9, strike out "37." and insert: "75."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey if this is not the bill that passed the House on September 7, 1965?

Mr. RODINO. This is the bill.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, may I further inquire were the amendments adopted by the other body in any way substantive in nature?

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I will inform the gentleman that the amendments that were adopted by the other body are in no way substantive amendments. The Senate amendments do not affect the substance of the bill in any respect. They are only clerical amendments and do not make any changes in substantive law. The original bill passed this body unanimously. It passed the other body unanimously. The amendments were adopted by the other body unanimously. The amendments largely are necessary because of the enactment of Public Law 89–554, while this bill was pending in the other body and to bring titles 10 and 37 up to date.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE 89TH CONGRESS: ACHIEVEMENT AND CHALLENGE

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, just a year ago I stood in the well of the House and commended the 1st session of the 89th Congress as the Congress of fulfillment, of accomplished hopes and realized dreams.

Today we may take pride that the 1st session was not the peak of our effort, not the pinnacle of our achievement. The 2d session has not been marked by the great breakthroughs that so distinguished the first; it could not be so because so many of the enactments of 1965 were of proposals and programs which had been under consideration for a number of years.

In 1965 their time had come.

Under the strong, dynamic leadership of President Lyndon Baines Johnson and with the cooperation of a membership more closely attuned to the will of the people than any other Congress in recent years, we loosed the long pent-up proposals to cope with many of our most nagging problems.

To meet the long recognized problem of the inability of millions of our elder citizens to afford adequate medical and hospital care, we enacted far-reaching amendments to the Social Security Act—medicare.

To meet the ever-growing problem of the lack of first-rate, quality education in our inner cities and poor rural areas, we enacted a broad-gaged program of aid to improve the opportunities for all our children, in both public and private schools, to develop the best that is in them—the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

To meet the financial problems of our colleges and the students bound for them, we enacted a program of loans and grants for scholarships and construction—the Higher Education Act.

To remove the stain on our national honor put there by the denial of suffrage to citizens because of their race and color, we enacted the most comprehensive legislation in 90 years to remove the impediments to the exercise of citizenship—the Voting Rights Act.

To coordinate the large number of Federal programs designed to halt the decline of our great cities and to make realizable the dream of the good life in an urban setting, we enacted a bill to create an 11th Cabinet post—the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

To develop, improve, and foster the bettering of man's environment so that we are not submerged in a self-created miasma of blight assaulting all our senses, we enacted measures designed to give us a start on the road to improvement—measures designed to cope with water and air pollution, with highway billboards and junkyards, and with our lag in recreational areas.

The 1st session of the 89th Congress did much more. So much more in fact that on October 7, 1965, the President was prepared to say:

> Tonight, the President of the United States is going on record as naming this session of Congress the greatest in history. . . . From your committees and both your houses have come the greatest outgrowing of creative legislation in the history of this nation. . . . This has been the fabulous 89th Congress.

The President was unable to deliver those remarks; first, because this House was busy justifying his words by staying in session past midnight to pass the highway beautification bill, and, second, because the President entered Bethesda Naval Hospital for his operation.

It might be expected, then, that a Congress which had done so much, which had earned so much praise, might "take a breather" during the second session, might rest on its laurels.

On the contrary, it has been a productive Congress, responsibly engaged in fortifying the legislation passed last year and previous years, improving and adding to enacted programs, and carrying out one of its least celebrated and least obtrusive functions—that of overseeing the administration and execution of its legislative enactments.

Only in this way can Congress contribute to its fullest extent to its responsibilities under the Constitution. Only in this way will Congress be fully apprised of the success or failure of its solutions to the Nation's problems.

For we do not consider ourselves infallible. We have not always made the right choice, not always responded to a problem in the best way.

Because we will make mistakes, however, does not deter us from acting. Unlike some of our citizens who respond to any answer with the timidity that paralyzes, who cry "wait, wait," when affirmative response is necessary, the majority in this Congress has analyzed problems, searched for solutions, developed remedies. Having prepared well, we have acted well.

And without hesitation I affirm that in the great majority of instances we have acted wisely and well; our response has been addressed to the right problem in the right manner to the right degree.

No, my friends, we have not feared to act. And that is why the 2d session of the 89th Congress has been every bit as outstanding, has been the scene of as much achievement, as the 1st session.

Because the problems we faced were newer and more complex than many of those on which we legislated in the first session, however, many people who only saw the surface suggested that we had turned into a do-nothing, or at least a do-little, Congress. They talked of wasted time, of the absence of bold new initiatives.

These are the people who view the legislative process in the same way that they watch an athletic event. Something has to be going every moment; there has to be flailing of legs and arms and the exciting confrontation of sharply opposed sides. Unfortunately, even some Members seem to feel this way.

Most of us, however, know that action and confrontation on the floor is only the culmination of weeks and months and perhaps years of study and research and investigation, of concentrated and serious consideration of proposals and alternatives, of the coming together of diverse tentative answers until a workable, sound solution is distilled from the collective wisdom of Members and staff and others.

That is partly the story of this Congress. It is a story of pragmatic men seeking pragmatic solutions within the context of a philosophy holding that government is not alien to the individual, that in our complex and confusing society national policies are often the only feasible policies. It is a philosophy that recognizes that freedom and prosperity and enlargement of individual opportunity are not solely the responsibility of government but are unlikely of attainment without it. It is a responsibility that fears the terrible power of government for the harm its exercise could do but which seeks the security from its fears not in the denial of that power but in the harnessing of that power through democratic processes and the restriction of that power by constitutional sanctions.

And that is partly the story of this Congress.

But the core of the story of this Congress is achievement. Achievement which will inevitably foster a better life for our urban and rural poor, for our farmers and farmworkers, for our laboring people, for our businessmen, for our children and our aged, and for all those countless people on this globe who look to the power and integrity and honor of the United States of America to keep burning the beacon of freedom around the world.

This session of the 89th Congress was troubled by the conflict in that tiny country halfway around the earth. Vietnam has never been far from our minds. It has colored our actions in many fields distantly related to it. Some have begrudged our money spent there, feeling that it should be spent here at home.

But the overwhelming number of Members stand behind the President of the United States. We regret that we have to be there. So many things could be done to the betterment of mankind with the money and time and energy being invested there. But the choice is not ours. As the President said at his news conference of September 21 of this year:

> We seek peace. We would like to talk this thing out instead of fight it out. But as I have said so many times: unless the aggressor is willing to give up his aggression, and sit down and talk, we have no choice except to try to defend and to protect these liberty-loving, free people. We are going to do that. How long the aggressor will maintain his aggression will depend on his decision more than ours.

One thing we do know. To appease an aggressor is to encourage him to further aggression. We give him a bigger appetite by letting him savor a little piece of territory—inhabited, never let us forget, by people who live and breathe and dream and aspire as we do—while he grows stronger and able to bite off a bigger piece.

Do we forget Munich? Do we forget how little time the West bought by our sacrifice of the peoples of Eastern Europe? How much did the world gain by sitting idly by while Ethiopia was so obscenely gobbled up? The people of China suffered for more than a decade before the Western powers joined the conflict.

Were these "little" concessions so beneficial to the world that we want to do the same thing now?

As much as we like peace, as much as we want to dwell in a world in which we are spared the burden of sending our young men to war and our riches to support them, as much as we are a people content to go our way and let others do likewise, we know that to be able to live in peace, to let our young men develop their minds and bodies in peaceful pursuits, to mind our own business, we must not let aggression run rampant across the seas.

When missiles based halfway round the globe are less than 30 minutes from this Chamber, we are not safe in withdrawal. When a supposedly civilized nation, which possesses a rudimentary atomic bomb, is so irresponsible as to loose perhaps a million young hooligans onto its citizens to root out every sign of dissent, yes, even onto humiliating and ultimately destroying those dedicated to God's work in their country, can we sit back and allow that country to conquer its neighbors by proxy?

This Congress has made clear that it knows the answer to these questions. By its actions, by its deeds, it has said to friends and foe alike—"this Congress backs our President."

It has done so by providing for a strong Defense Establishment.

Both Houses have early agreed on the figure for the fiscal 1967 defense appropriation bill, H.R. 15941, and only a disagreement over a subsidiary matter stood in the way of sending it to the President. The amount appropriated was $58,067,412,000, which may be compared with the largest single money bill ever voted, that for the fiscal 1944 defense appropriation of $59.34 billion. Only a portion of these funds will directly support our effort in Vietnam, of course, but every penny of it strengthens our country's ability to keep the peace through deterrence.

The overwhelming vote in both Houses surely demonstrated to anyone who needed it that while a few Members have lingering doubts as to certain phases of the Vietnam situation, those doubts do not and will not stand in the way of unanimity in support of our boys in the field.

As to that matter of the subsidiary disagreement, the authorization for the President to call up certain reservists, our enemies and the doubters may derive no comfort on that score either. The House of Representatives passed a bill empowering the President to call up about 197,000 members of the Ready Reserve to meet the needs of the Vietnam situation without declaring a national emergency.

The Senate added an amendment to the defense appropriation bill to empower the President to call almost 500,000 reservists.

Thus, the differences that dviided us were related to the number of reservists we would empower the President to call up and the manner in which we would do it; the difference did not relate one iota to whether we want to authorize action in this vital area. The problem having been resolved agreeably, the bill is now with the President.

Let there be no mistake as to that.

Other indications of our overwhelming support for the President in the resolute stand against Chinese and North Vietnamese aggression are not hard to find.

In March, we passed bills authorizing supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1966—$4.8 billion for military procurement and $415 million for economic assistance, $275 million of the latter intended for Vietnam.

Members could have had no doubt as to the effects of our votes and neither could the Communists. As I said during the debate on the military procurement supplemental:

> [I]n voting for this bill today, I am voting not only for this bill but am also voting again for the resolution that we adopted on August 10, 1964, which was adopted by an overwhelming majority of both branches of Congress. Thus, we will convey to the actual and potential enemy and also the rest of the world that America is united.

Later in March, we enacted a supplemental defense appropriation measure for fiscal 1966, totaling $13,135,719,000. Again, there could have been no doubt that our vote was one to strengthen the President in his quest for peace in Vietnam. In requesting the funds, he noted that $12.3 billion would go to provide for the operations of our men in Vietnam and he reiterated what he had said before:

> Until peace comes, or if it does not come . . . we will give our fighting men what they must have: every gun, every dollar, and every decision—whatever the cost or whatever the challenge.

A major nonmilitary step to help secure the peace in Asia this year was our enactment of a bill providing for U.S. participation in the Asian Development Bank, which will foster economic growth and stability in that area by making and guaranteeing loans for private enterprise and public facilities in Asian countries. There will be particular attention paid to those countries along an arc of freedom that borders the Soviet Union and Communist China from the Caspian Sea to Korea.

It is too well known that communism and other totalitarian forms of governments thrive on the want and despair so prevalent in the underdeveloped areas. The Development Bank, a truly multilateral agency, will be one unit in the continuing struggle to alleviate the sufferings of the millions and to help make realizable the revolution of rising expectations.

In that effort, we have continued to support our program of military and economic assistance to the underdeveloped areas of the world. We have not permitted the occasional error in judgment, inevitable in a program of this magnitude, to deter us from persevering in our utilization of this type of assistance in striving for peace. By and large, the record is a splendid one.

This year witnessed what appears to be a growing frustration with the program by some Members. Consequently, the total appropriated was $2.94 billion, the lowest in the last 9 years and $443.4 million below what the President asked.

The reductions should not prove harmful, however, and if the Agency for International Development draws the proper conclusions for our actions and redesigns and reshapes the program so as to meet the criticisms directed to it, the overall effect may well be salutary and lead to greater congressional support.

There seems little doubt that in the years ahead, as the world economy grows more complex and more interrelated and the interdependency of the world's peoples continue to increase, we will be called upon to step up our efforts, not solely by spending money because money without well thought out programs will be self-defeating. The success of the Peace Corps, one of the memorials to President John F. Kennedy, demonstrates beyond all doubt the benefits to be derived from a teaming of American idealism and pragmatism. This Congress continued strongly to support our Peace Corps personnel in their diverse pursuits.

The food-for-peace program—Public Law 480—which the President this year proposed to revise and redesign as the food-for-freedom program, has a number of purposes—again a combination of U.S. idealism and pragmatism supported by this Congress. It is designed to foster rising incomes for American farmers, to stimulate an abundance of food at fair prices for American consumers, and to foster and encourage the development abroad of a balance between agricultural productivity and population growth. The revision of the program was designed to encourage the developing countries to improve their agricultural production and to prevent a reliance upon U.S. exports which would only postpone the day of reckoning. Because the administrations of President Kennedy and President Johnson have been so successful in formulating policies to reduce the large stores of surplus agricultural commodities maintained by the Government, the new program did away with the emphasis on surplus commodities.

In the past, hundreds of millions of people in more than 100 nations have participated in this program. Our surpluses, the result of our God-given bounty, have staved off famine and starvation.

Although this Congress modified the President's proposals on this program, in the exercise of our constitutional prerogative, we developed a sound Food for Peace Act.

With, regrettably, I must say, one exception. Undoubtedly, because of the high feeling brought on by the Vietnamese situation, this body voted to tie the hands of the President of the United States in the administration of this program by prohibiting the making of sales agreements for foreign currencies or dollar credits with any nation selling or furnishing or permitting its ships to transport any equipment, materials, or commodities to or from Cuba or North Vietnam.

In the final version of the bill, the conference committee softened this ban by granting the President authority to waive the prohibition on such aid to countries carrying on nonstrategic trade with Cuba. Thus, India or Morocco could furnish Cuba with medical supplies, raw materials for agriculture, and agricultural products and still be eligible for aid under the food-for-peace program. The ban, however, makes no exceptions for countries engaging in trade with North Vietnam.

But although the conference committee made this "11th hour" move to soften the ban on countries trading with Cuba, it remains an unwise and shortsighted policy to attempt to limit, by legislative fiat, the President's authority to conduct relations with other nations; and I could not agree more with the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN] when he commented:

> I wish to reiterate that it is foolhardy to tie the President's hands in our relationship to a country so important as India over an item of trade which has only marginal significance on the issues of whether or not we will ultimately defeat communism in Cuba. If we can trust the President to conduct our military operations in Vietnam and elsewhere we should most certainly trust him on this issue in this area of the world.

Lastly, I would call attention to congressional passage of the cold war GI bill, which authorized a permanent program of educational and other benefits for Armed Forces veterans who served after January 31, 1955. The effect of this act is, of course, domestic, but it constitutes notice that the Government of the United States stands ready and able to express its gratitude to all those young Americans who have ungrudgingly given up several years of their lives, out of their most productive years, to serve this Nation in the cause of peace. Just as in wartime—and for those youngsters who went to Vietnam and to the Dominican Republic and other hot spots, there was no cold war—these Americans have earned our fullest respect and we are indebted to them.

But, of course, they went, not for respect and gratitude, but because as Americans, as free men, they had a duty, a sense of honor that impelled them to express by their actions their boundless fortune of birth in this great land.

When I contrast their selfless action with that of the few in the newspapers and on television of whom we have seen quite a bit in the last few months—the draft card burners, the troop train blockers, the inciters of insubordination, the draft dodgers both subtle and blatant—I am compelled to wonder what enormous shortcoming, what terrible lack, there is in these few that they make a mockery of the sacrifice of so many and I more than wonder why the newspapers and television give this type such wide coverage which is an encouragement to them to defy and break the law.

It is fitting, I think, that the thrust of Public Law 89-358 is to enlarge the educational opportunities for these young Americans, to foster the fullest development of their capabilities.

This Congress has been referred to by many as the "Education Congress." While the appellation describes too narrowly the range of our achievements, it does point up our extraordinary contributions to learning. Last year, Lyndon Baines Johnson starkly emphasized to us the importance of education:

> Nothing matters more to the future of our country: not our military preparedness, for armed might is worthless if we lack the brain power to build a world of peace; not our productive economy, for we cannot sustain growth without trained manpower; not our democratic system of government, for freedom is fragile if citizens are ignorant.

Our former Commissioner of Education, Mr. Francis Keppel, has told us that the first goal of our educational programs must be to raise the quality of education in our schools everywhere and for everyone; we cannot tolerate second-class education if we intend to remain a first-class Nation.

This Congress, the 1st and 2d sessions, and the 88th Congress made an impressive start toward achieving that goal.

The Headstart program has been an enormous success. It is designed to reach preschool children in the 3-to-5 age group who come from backgrounds which deny them an equal start with other children at the beginning of school. In order to break the cycle of poverty, the program provides these children from economically deprived neighborhoods with the educational, social, cultural, and medical attention needed to bring them up to the starting level of more advantaged children.

The results have been startling in terms of the increased IQ rates, increased learning ability, self-confidence, and classroom adjustment.

These results are, however, only the beginning. Less than 30 percent of our poor children were affected last year by Headstart. Consequently, this year the Congress substantially increased the funds under title II of the Economic Opportunity Act and authorized $352 million for Headstart. Yet, all the children who should be reached will not be; but, as in so many areas, one cannot solve every problem in one year, and we must start somewhere and proceed.

As the late President Kennedy was so fond of saying, we must remember that a journey even of a thousand miles begins with one step.

Turning from Headstart to the next stage of educational advance, we have confronted the problem of the quality of education in our poor areas, in the inner city, the ghetto, the rural school—a depressed area. Our public services, especially our schools, ought to be progressive in incidence; that is, the benefits bestowed upon the poor, the children of the poor, should be inversely related to the contribution of these people to the funds supporting these schools and other services. As Commissioner of Education, Mr. Harold Howe, has told us:

> This is not now the case. Buildings are older, teachers are less experienced and not as well trained, the turnover of staff is higher, and in many cases equipment, books and special services are less adequate in those where the child has special handicaps to overcome.

Our answer to this growing problem was the enactment last year of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

This year we revised the act in accordance with the first year's experience. That experience was well summarized by a reporter in the May 12, 1966, Washington Post:

> [T]he Act has had considerable impact in focusing the attention of school officials on the problems of the have-not schools. Instead of being the last schools to get a new piece of equipment of a flashy program, they are now the first. And the scene of the most exciting experimentation in the schools has shifted from the suburbs to the inner city.

A major beneficial effect of the act has been to begin assistance to educationally deprived children in nonpublic schools. Through such means as dual enrollment, special remedial classes, loans of textbooks and other printed materials, and the use of mobile equipment, all educationally and economically deprived children have benefited.

This session of Congress just recently acted on the 1966 amendments to the act. The House of Representatives passed a bill authorizing $5.8 billion for the next 2 years while the Senate bill authorized $6.4 billion for the same period. The conferees settled on a final figure of approximately $6 billion, and these increases will enable us to reach more pupils, to help more schools, and to enlarge educational opportunities.

With these funds, schools in poor areas will be equipped to offer better and more complete services to children in terms of books and audiovisual materials, special remedial classes, and supplementary communitywide educational centers. Additionally, communities will be helped to strengthen their educational system by grants to help plan for construction and to encourage innovation in meeting a host of handicapping problems.

We also acted this session to deal with a shocking problem that plagues so many schools serving economically disadvantaged areas—the stark problem of hungry children. The school lunch program was strengthened and continued and the special milk program through which milk at reduced prices is made available to children in schools, summer camps and other institutions was continued for 3 years.

Evidence had accumulated that innumerable children were arriving at school hungry. This, of course, was detrimental both to their health and their learning ability. Many of the children had working mothers who could not provide breakfast; others had to travel long distances to school, which reduced the opportunity for breakfast.

Therefore, this Congress authorized a 2-year pilot program to assist schools in carrying out a school breakfast program in much the same manner as the lunch program.

The importance of higher education has long been recognized by our governmental leaders. There were proposals in the Constitutional Convention to authorize seminaries for the promotion of literature, the arts, and the sciences and there was thought given to a national university in the District of Columbia. President Washington in his first annual message to Congress said:

> There is nothing which can better deserve your patronage than the promotion of science and literature. . . . Whether this desirable object will be best promoted by affording aids to seminaries of learning already established, by the institution of a national university, or by any other expedients will be well worthy of a place in the deliberation of the legislature.

Congress has also considered amendments to the Higher Education Act. In 1963, we authorized a 5-year program of grants and loans for the construction of undergraduate and graduate facilities. Last year, Congress enacted the Higher Education Act of 1965 which not only provided a program of grants to assist in the strengthening of developing higher education institutions, but presented a broad-gaged challenge to all colleges, and assistance in meeting the challenge, in the areas of community service and continuing education, college libraries and library training and research, financial assistance to students, teacher programs, improvement of undergraduate instruction and academic facilities. This year the President proposed a 3-year extension of the 1963 act; and in action taken shortly before adjournment, the Congress voted a $3.97 billion authorization that extends and broadens these programs of assistance for graduate and undergraduate facilities.

Importantly, the President asked for a step-up in the program of assistance to developing institutions, those which our Education and Labor Committee described as "struggling for survival" and "isolated from the main currents of academic life." As Secretary Gardner says, this is "a program to help only the most grievously afflicted minority of a very large and important category of institutions."

Thus, we are striving to improve at every level the educational opportunities of our children and young people. When we hand the reins over to them, we want to know that we have given them every chance to prepare for the challenge ahead of them, a challenge far larger than what we now face.

But we have not stopped there. Too many adults for one reason or another have never completed their schooling. Under the Economic Opportunity Act, with administration by the Office of Education, a comprehensive program of adult basic education has been authorized. This is designed to strike particularly at the inability to read and write English that impairs their opportunities in our society.

Many more citizens, especially youngsters who may have dropped out of school have been and are being reached through the Economic Opportunity Act's Job Corps program. It provided education, vocational training, and useful work experience for men and women between the ages of 16 and 22 in residential centers throughout the country.

This session of Congress substantially strengthened the Job Corps in recognition of its services in transforming many young men and women into confident seekers of employment with the ability to perform. A leveling off of the costs of the program allowed a modest reduction in the total authorization to accompany the strengthening.

Too, Congress continued this year to support vigorously, through the appropriation process, the Vocational Education Act of 1963.

The Manpower Training and Development Act of 1962 has since its enactment developed a constantly growing support for its principles and its purposes, so much so that in both Houses last year there were only 8 votes cast against substantial amendments of it, with a total of 468 in favor. This year, Congress worked on amendments to establish new training programs, broaden eligibility for referral to existing programs and provide greater flexibility in the allocation of training allowances. This House passed an amending bill which was adopted unchanged by the Senate. These amendments will facilitate a more effective effort in dealing with the manpower problems of the Nation, problems of the disadvantaged and the hard-core unemployed and the growing problem of skill shortages in some areas and some occupations.

Having moved by degrees from the area of education to the area of labor, it gives me great pleasure to contemplate a major achievement of the 2d session of the 89th Congress, the revision of the Fair Labor Standards Act to bring its provisions into accord with present economic reality.

On February 1, 1967, the Federal minimum wage will increase from the present $1.25 to $1.40, and a year later it will go to $1.60. Coverage under the act was extended to about 8.1 million additional workers, including those on corporate farms. Thus, for the first time, those seemingly always forgotten Americans, the people who labor in our fields, harvest our crops, and are in part responsible for the benefits of our agricultural abundance, are to be reached by the Federal wage law.

Of all workers, agricultural workers have been the most neglected in terms of laws dealing with wages and hours, health and sanitation, unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation, and collective bargaining. That is changing. As Secretary Wirtz said recently:

> There may have been sounder reasons in some earlier period for the arguments that agriculture deserves, for some unidentified reason a government-guaranteed foreign labor supply, that normal personnel policies don't apply here, that the farm produce market won't support fair wages, that farm employment must be excluded from the coverage of laws regarding employment generally. But if there once were good reasons for these attitudes, they are now covered deep with history's dust.

This Congress, and the last, have taken momentous steps to alleviate the farm labor problems and to right the historic wrongs. This minimum wage extension is only the latest example. The Migrant Health Act, first enacted in the 87th Congress, and substantially amended last year, has been instrumental in establishing and upgrading family health clinics for migratory farmworkers and their families and in generally improving health services and conditions. The Housing Act of 1965, continued this year, provided Federal assistance for construction of low-rent housing for American farmworkers. The Economic Opportunity Act has been instrumental in improving education, day care for children, housing and sanitation. The VISTA program authorized under the act has been extremely important in reaching farmworkers.

All these efforts testify to the nature of the congressional commitment to these workers of the field.

Overall, enactment of the minimum wage amendments demonstrates the congressional intent to keep current our pledges of a guarantee for fair working conditions to American working men and women. The increase in the minimum wage will bring innumerable workers above a poverty level wage and will play a major part in our continuing efforts to abolish poverty.

This session of Congress also witnessed a major effort to update our unemployment compensation program. This House passed a bill expanding coverage under the program, but in the Senate the proposal of the President to require the States to meet minimum Federal standards for the amount and duration of unemployment compensation benefits was adopted.

Frankly, I had high hopes that we could hammer out a bill in conference; but, regrettably, we adjourned before final action was taken. I want to emphasize, however, that we will be back in the 90th Congress with a better bill that will provide significant relief for those Americans who are plagued by the nagging problem of unemployment.

Before leaving this area, it is gratifying to me to note that this session of the 89th Congress enacted the first Minimum Wage Act of general application to cover the District of Columbia. The wage base is to be pegged first at $1.25 and is to rise to the Federal minimum over a period of time. Thus, Congress demonstrates its continuing interest in District affairs.

Members I am sure do not need to be told, after my references to it in a number of other contexts, of my pleasure in reporting on our activities on behalf of what the Washington Post, in a stimulating series, called "The Better War"—the war on poverty. Our support this session has been undiminished for the programs authorized under the act—Headstart, VISTA, the Job Corps, the large number of community action programs. Under the latter, in so many places, we are discovering and fostering latent talents in the poor themselves to plan and administer and to take an active part in a program that seeks not to do for them but to assist them in helping themselves.

We have been told for years by the skeptics among us that these programs would not work because people needed incentive, needed motivation, before their lot could be improved and that our programs would only destroy incentive and motivation.

Well, this Congress showed the skeptics, confuted those who would do nothing. We developed programs which are working to stimulate incentive and motivation. For how much motivation can a slum dweller have when he knows that no matter how hard he tries, he will stay in the slum? How much incentive can a man have whose fingers get stepped on every time he puts them on the first rung of opportunity?

This Congress has had the foresight to begin to change all that. We have initiated programs to show the poor that they can achieve, and then offer a helping hand not a crutch. We show that striving can lead somewhere, that effort can and will pay. Hope is the stimulant and that is what we have provided.

The "better war" has also provided us with another example of American idealism, especially by our youth. To those who complain about the general decadence, the drugs, the promiscuity, the cynicism, and the apathy, I point to the response to the VISTA program under which volunteers have gone into the urban slums, the poor rural areas, the Indian reservations, and elsewhere to serve. Like the Peace Corps, VISTA demonstrates that we are a dynamic people, a giving people, a good people. Let those who bemoan the new generation do so; while they moan, the new generation is at work.

The record of this and the last Congress has been good in the field of civil rights, human rights. Our legislative output to protect the right of suffrage, to insure nondiscrimination in the expenditure of the public dollar, the guarantee of equal service in public accommodations, and the drive to eradicate employment bias stand as monuments to congressional concern. I was profoundly disturbed by the failure of this Congress to complete action on the House-passed Civil Rights Act of 1966. That act would have removed artificial barriers to the right of every man to the opportunity for decent housing in a decent setting. This defeat by a minority of the other body also means that we will not be able to provide for nondiscrimination in Federal and State jury selection, nor afford Federal protection to those Americans whose sense of duty impels them to assist fellow Americans to obtain their rights in some parts of this country, often at substantial risk to their lives. But the fight for progress will go on.

The areas of civil rights, education, and poverty, are closely alined with the challenge of the urban setting, the problem of arresting urban blight and the rotting away of the inner core of our cities.

We know now that piecemeal efforts may slow the decay down, but not halt it. We know now that uncoordinated programs will not get at the myriad of problems brought on by our urbanization—problems of housing, of transportation, of water and air pollution, of crime.

Last year, we began to coordinate. We enacted a bill creating the Department of Housing and Urban Development. This year, we passed a bill creating a Department of Transportation, bringing under one Cabinet officer practically all the varied agencies and boards in the executive charged with transportation policy, including the Office of the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, the Bureau of Public Roads with its Federal-aid highway programs, the Federal Aviation Agency, the Coast Guard, the safety functions of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the safety functions and car service functions of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and a host of other, less well known instrumentalities of Federal policy.

The Federal Government supports or regulates almost every means of transportation. Last year alone, more than $5 billion in Federal funds were invested in transportation—highway construction, river and harbor development, airway operation and airport construction, maritime subsidies.

Now, coordination will be exercised. Conflicting policies will be resolved. A balanced transportation system can be the result. The problems can now be attacked—the crowded freeways and clogged downtown streets, the disappearance of passenger service on trains when there is hope for highspeed rail transportation between our large cities, the overcrowded skies, the state of our merchant marine. Now there is hope.

The Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 provided, for the first time, for Federal grants to State and local bodies to help in purchasing facilities necessary for urban mass transportation. This year, Congress extended the act for 3 years and authorized appropriations of $150 million in each of the fiscal 1968 and 1969. We also expanded the act by authorizing more basic research and planning in the field, and we also authorized the Secretary of HUD to prepare a research and demonstration program of improved mass transportation systems.

Millions of Americans who daily fume in enormous traffic jams will look to us in relief and gratitude.

They will look to us for another reason alone. This year, Congress made a concerted attack on the problem of automobile safety. We directed the Secretary of Commerce to establish Federal motor vehicle standards, which will be effective for 1968 models. There will also be Federal standards for tires.

Far too many people are killed and maimed in this country each year by the automobile. By this act, Congress has made clear that it expects effective action.

The success of the bill also points up something else. It demonstrates how untrue is the contention of the uninformed that our country has grown so big, our Government so remote, that the ordinary citizens can no longer be heard. Although the auto safety bill had its genesis in hearings in this House as long ago as 1956, it was the crusading spirit of one individual who believed he could do something that encouraged the passage of a strong bill. I refer, of course, to Mr. Ralph Nader.

This has been a bad year for cynics.

As a companion bill to the auto safety measure, we established a 3-year program to assist the States in reducing traffic accidents and to provide for Federal highway safety research.

In combination, these two acts should lead to a significant decline in auto deaths and injuries.

A major Presidential request this year was for the "demonstrations city" bill, to authorize a concentrated and coordinated attack on urban blight. Again, the Congress responded to the President's request by passing the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966. This bill incorporates most of the proposed 1966 amendments to the Housing and Urban Development Act. It permits financing of "new towns" outside metropolitan limits, and it launches a concerted attack on a multitude of urban problems by demonstrating how renovations, welfare, transportation planning, and other activities can revitalize our cities.

This piece of legislation is long overdue, but, with an initial authorization of $1.2 billion, we can begin to pump a new life and a new spirit into our cities and make them a more pleasant and rewarding place to live.

In a closely related area, Congress, after much controversy, has accepted a rent subsidies program which I believe is a major innovation, and which I hope will have a great impact on helping poorer Americans find decent housing without the necessity of packing large numbers of units of public housing into small areas.

The quality of American life has often been impaired by progress in economic and related areas. Thus it is that our burgeoning industry has contaminated our air and water, and not only in the city. The suburbanite who has sacrificed the close-in living of the city for fresh air finds that he has not escaped, that freeways and streets bring him air pollutants—automobile exhausts—and factory fumes spread farther and farther into the countryside. Rural areas no longer find their streams flowing cleanly. Industrialization has overtaken them.

With the growing water shortage in several sections of the country and the ever-growing demand for more water, it is critical that we conserve and make pure our rivers and streams. The interests of people, the demands of industry, of recreation, and of wildlife make clear that to do too little would be criminal.

This Congress passed bills to increase substantially Federal water pollution control programs. We have provided for grants to build waste treatment plants, for a clean rivers restoration program through pollution control and abatement basin plans, and for research and demonstration grants to both public agencies and industries.

Air pollution, too, has been the subject of legislation by this Congress. We have extended the Clean Air Act and increased the authority of the Federal Government to make grants to air pollution control agencies and we have made more funds available for this purpose. Coupled with our bill of last year authorizing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish standards for automobile exhausts, I think we have made a good beginning to rid ourselves of this menace.

Incidentally, it should be noted that, when the House passed the Investment Credit Act, suspending the investment credit allowance, we exempted from that suspension spending on air and water pollution devices.

In addition to traffic jams, dirty air and water, and other detriments, our increasingly urban society with its complex economies has led to a growing problem to which every housewife could eloquently address herself, I am sure. This involves the so-called packaging revolution. Packaged and processed foods, quick frozen and prepared foods, numberless things in packages, and the concomitant advertising have brought us mixed blessings. On the one hand, they are a source of great convenience and saving; on the other hand, trying to sort out which is the best buy and trying not to get burned by packaged frauds is a continual frustration.

To give the housewife a hand, the Congress passed truth-in-packaging legislation, and while it may not go as far as some wish, it does authorize the establishment of Federal standards to prevent unfair or deceptive packaging and labeling practices. It should prove beneficial in helping our womenfolk in the family shopping.

I have heard with some amusement the claims by industry representatives that we did not need to pass this legislation because, after all, women are shrewd and crafty shoppers who could not be taken in. Without in any manner doubting that the average woman shopper is indeed the model of the good shopper, it remains a source of puzzlement to me why industry is willing to spend millions of dollars each year in order to fool the ladies if they really believe it cannot be done.

In the area of crime, President Johnson has established a national commission, and we in Congress eagerly await its report to assist us in formulating national policies.

Because the omnibus farm bill enacted last year was a 4-year program, this session of Congress has had no occasion to consider major farm legislation. Rising farm income has demonstrated the essential soundness of last year's legislation.

As Vice President HUMPHREY told an audience of agricultural editors a few weeks ago:

> Our American farmers will enjoy one of their most prosperous years in 1966. . . . Net income per farm and personal income per capita of farm people will be the highest on record this year. Farm prices are up. Net farm income is up. Agricultural exports are up, and farm surpluses are down.

And if the skeptics of the other party prefer not to rely on this authority, let me cite them to a source more congenial to this philosophy. In the September 17 issue of Business Week, it is noted that American agriculture has "suddenly" found "that it's in clover." The magazine reports that total net form income this year is estimated at $15.7 billion, up more than 33 percent since 1960, that wheat is selling at $1.70 a bushel, 35 cents above a year ago, while corn is at $1.34 a bushel, up from $1.18 last summer.

All this just did not happen.

It resulted from sound legislative enactments and sound administration. Both will continue.

This year represented a period in which Congress waited to see what changes we should make in last year's programs.

We did, however, establish a new program of cotton research, development, and promotion that will permit cotton to compete with synthetic fibers in the market. And we enacted a program to permit farmers to plant alternate crops on lands on which natural disasters had prevented the planting of cotton, wheat, of feed grains, and still remain eligible for Federal support payments.

The food-for-peace program will prove even more beneficial to American farmers in the future in its stimulus of new foreign markets.

This Congress has made other advances, initiated other legislative activities, plowed new ground.

We granted pay raises to Federal employees.

We enacted a comprehensive freedom of information bill so that citizens may have access to Government information that concerns them.

We amended the Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act of 1960 to protect the health and safety of our children.

We passed an act to protect our pets from thievery which had been increasing as unscrupulous dealers met the growing demands of medical research, and to establish humane standards in the care of research animals.

We provided for increased assistance for library services and construction, both in rural and urban areas.

We enacted the Metal and Nonmetallic Mine Safety Act to extend protection to workers in small mines.

We authorized a study of the scenic and economic effects of overhead electric power transmission towers and lines with a view toward their eventual burial underground.

We directed the development, encouragement, and maintenance of a comprehensive national program in marine science.

And we passed the Bail Reform Act of 1966, permitting the release of an accused person from jail without bail pending trial under certain conditions. We approved the Metropolitan Washington transit compact which will make possible sound comprehensive planning and development of the area's transportation potential. With our strong backing of the subway system, there is hope that Washington's traffic problems may be ameliorated.

And, in the last days of the fabulous 89th, the Congress again demonstrated its willingness to try something new—to experiment with a new concept—a new idea. For the first time, we passed legislation that will provide for the financing of presidential campaigns from voluntary tax revenues. This revolutionary plan permits the individual taxpayer to divert $1 of his annual tax payment toward the financing of the next presidential election.

It is a totally new proposal, and it is a useful one. The average man and woman in this country is too often cut off from the electoral process. We must begin to encourage the small contributor to take an active interest in the party of his choice. For too long our political parties have relied on large contributions by the "fat cats." This bill will help to change that trend, and let me say—I welcome it.

Lastly, this Congress met our responsibilities in the area of Government finance. Early in the year we enacted a measure to make withholding taxes progressive, which accomplished the dual purposes of adding to the Government's revenues then and of avoiding the burden on most taxpayers of paying one lump sum at the end of the year. And we deferred the reduction of some excise taxes.

And just recently we passed a bill temporarily suspending the investment credit and depreciation schedules so as to dampen down possible inflationary pressures.

I defy anyone to point to another Congress of comparable achievement, of more responsible attention to both the large and the small problems of our times. I could cite other measures passed, our solid record of accomplishment in appropriations to support our programs for instance. But enough has been said to point up the range and depth of our work.

Only the first Congress of President Franklin D. Roosevelt approaches this record of achievement, and there the driving force was economic crisis—severe, racking crisis. This Congress proceeded differently. It studied the problems and formulated solutions. And it wrote these solutions into statutory language. The driving force was intelligent concern.

Indeed, this has been a conservative Congress in the highest sense of that word. By our efforts, by our laws, we have sought to conserve and make secure the miracle that is America by adapting our institutions to new challenges. We have sought to keep the American dream bright and clear by eradicating from our political and economic system the barriers that result from poverty, racial discrimination, lack of education, and the like.

We have sought to conserve the best of our Nation and of our system, by opening that system to all Americans, by opening new avenues to progress for all our citizens.

With this record of achievement, many might be tempted to sit back and be smug. Already, some voices are suggesting that too much has been attempted, that we are done with our legislative effort.

But each time I hear these siren words, these soothing syllables, these invitations to apathy, I recall the words of the great historian Macaulay, published in that troubled year of 1848. He wrote:

> It is in some sense unreasonable and ungrateful in us to be constantly discontented with a situation that is constantly improving. But, in truth, there is constant improvement precisely because there is constant discontent. If we were perfectly satisfied with the present, we would cease to continue, to labor, and to save with a view to the future.

There is constant improvement precisely because there is constant discontent. Exactly. So that while I am proud and while you are proud of how much we have accomplished, never let us forget that there is so much more to be undertaken. One Congress cannot do it all. There is not enough time. Much depends upon continued revising of first and second and later efforts. Only session after session of Congress—a discontented Congress, discontented because we have done so much and there is so much more to do—only such a Congress is capable in this 6th decade of the 20th century of giving America dynamic, successful government.

Therefore, let us not look back in self-satisfaction; let us not look ahead with despair. There is challenge in all we have done, challenge in what there is to do.

What are some of the things still to be done? Many are obvious.

We must remove the artificial barriers that prevent Negroes and other minorities from seeking and obtaining the best housing they can afford. We must rid our jury system of the evil of racial discrimination. We must protect civil rights workers from locally permitted violence.

We have done much for the District of Columbia. But home rule still eludes us. We must act and act soon to give the citizens of our Nation's Capital local suffrage. And we must also seriously consider providing them with voting representation in Congress.

We must revise the level of social security benefits payable to our people. In Baltimore, the President showed us his thinking—a proposed increase of at least 10 percent with proportionately larger increases for those receiving the smaller payment; and a guarantee that every worker who has participated in the social security program for 25 years would receive a minimum monthly benefit of $100. In addition, the President also suggested liberalizing the annual income ceiling affecting social security beneficiaries. The current annual maximum is $1,500.

Now, with all the fervor of new religious converts, a number of our colleagues wanted to take immediate action.

Perhaps we should have—but then again perhaps we should take more time.

But, whatever, we will move on in this field. We will expand coverage and benefits. We will improve the system.

A number of promising programs still in infancy are in danger and must be given sustenance. I think particularly of the Teacher Corps; I think of rent supplements.

Our start in preserving the natural beauty of this God-blessed country must be continued and intensified. We must preserve our vanishing wildlife and resuscitate our land, expand outdoor recreation and make clean our waters, transform our cities and suburbs into good places in which to live.

We must strive constantly on many fronts to help States, localities, and private institutions improve the health care of the American people and to alleviate the serious shortage of health services personnel.

We must proceed to make our laws concerning our working people more equitable, in particular, removing the barriers that prevent and hamper free collective bargaining between employees and employer.

We must exert ourselves to bring into the 20th century our laws concerning our farmworkers and eradicate the decades of neglect.

As a growing and dynamic Congress, we recognize that from time to time, improvements can be made in our procedures. We are not a static Congress. Therefore, next year I look forward to considering the recommendations of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. It may be that some of these proposals we can all agree upon and adopt; on other proposals, there may well be much debate. But whatever the eventuality, the fact that we established the committee and will consider its report conclusively demonstrates the congressional determination to meet fully our responsibilities.

There are many more challenges. Future Congresses, if they care as much as this Congress, if they work as hard as this Congress, will meet them all. Much depends upon the upcoming elections.

I urge all who recognize the achievements of this Congress, who see the vital concern with which we have met our responsibilities, who know what surely will be the result of a Congress less attuned to the urgencies of this Nation's challenges, I urge each and every one to go forth across this land, and tell our story. Tell it in the city and the hamlet, tell it in the suburb and on the farm. Tell it and describe the challenge. Call on the people. Let them see the challenge.

And they will respond. They will continue the mandate of 1964. In this I am confident because I agree with Abraham Lincoln who said in his first inaugural:

> Why should there not be a patient confidence in the ultimate justice of the people? Is there any better or equal hope in the world?

LAUDS EUGENE KEOGH

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, over the past 30 years, one of the strong voices for compassion, humanitarian ideals, and progress in Government has been the gentleman from New York, the Honorable Eugene J. Keogh. As this session comes to a close, it is only fitting that we attempt to express a small quotient of our feeling of esteem, affection, and high regard for this distinguished gentleman.

Unfortunately, we will not hear from this respected Member on this last day of the 89th Congress. He has declined to address us.

Representative Eugene Keogh has been here to the last day, fulfilling the great responsibilities of his office to the people of his constituency, in the same manner in which he has always worked since he was first elected to Congress in 1936.

Chairman of the Democratic Caucus; New York member of the Committee on Ways and Means: Chairman of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission; second vice chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee; respected Member of Congress from the 11th Congressional District of New York; member of the executive committee of that county organization; valued friend of virtually every political leader in the United States—it is a great loss to the County of Kings, to the State of New York, and to the country as a whole that after 30 years of dedicated public service, Eugene Keogh will no longer sit in the Halls of Congress.

The Democratic leadership has called on him to chair the Committee of the Whole House on the most significant legislation of our times. He has been the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole which deliberated for three-quarters of a trillion dollars in defense appropriations in recent years. Every Member of this body will long remember and will always revere the ability of Chairman Keogh, standing erectly in the Speaker's place, as he ruled so expertly on the points of order and procedures of our body.

As chairman of the Committee of the Whole, Gene Keogh was an example to every Member. His attention to detail, his vast knowledge of parliamentary procedures and his impeccable adherence to the rules of the House, his courtesy to every Member, will be engrained in those future chairmen who will carry on the traditions, example, and standards that he has set for all of us.

I will always remember Gene Keogh rising to his feet whenever a Member sought recognition. As chairman of the Whole House on the State of the Union, he felt every Member requesting recognition deserved that tribute from the Chair.

His greatest contribution to my mind, came during the civil rights debate of 1964 when after months of deliberation in committee the bill finally came to the floor and the leadership selected Gene Keogh to be its chairman for what resulted in the longest debate in the history of our body. During those 11 days the culmination of 30 years experience and knowledge were put to the most severe test. His demeanor, his expert rulings, his consideration of Members expressing all points of view, were largely responsible for preserving order in the heated, turbulent last minutes of debate.

Off the floor of Congress, Gene Keogh has always been a source of counsel to the legislative and executive bodies who have come to rely on his judgment and expertise in the great issues of our country. He has always sacrificed his personal time and convenience to accommodate Representatives in this body and in the executive as well, giving them the advantage of his vast background and great experience.

Few know that Gene Keogh was born in Brooklyn on August 30, 1907. He was a graduate of Public School 85; Commercial High School; received a degree of B.C.S. from the School of Commerce, New York University; and a degree of LL.B. from the School of Law, Fordham University.

He is a member of the law firm of Halpin, Keogh & St. John, with offices at 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York City. He is a member of the Brooklyn Bar Association, Association of the Bar of the City of New York, New York State Bar Association, American Bar Association, Bar Association of the District of Columbia, and the Federal Bar Association.

His political career started when he was elected to the State assembly, representing the 20th assembly district in 1935. In 1936 he was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives and has been elected consecutively since that time.

He is presently a member of the Committee on Ways and Means; chairman, Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission; member, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; chairman, Democratic caucus.

He was formerly a member of:

Claims Committee, the chairman, Committee on Revision of the Laws; the Education Committee, Elections No. 3, the Small Business Committee, the Select Committee on Foreign Aid, the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, the Board of Visitors, U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point, the Board of Visitors, U.S. Coast Guard Academy, the Subcommittee on Excise Taxes of the Ways and Means Committee, and the Subcommittee on Internal Revenue Administration.

Congressman KEOGH, my close personal friend, the good friend of every Member of this body, we regret your leaving us, but we are thankful for that which you leave behind—an example, and a trail of devoted dedication to the United States of America.

Good luck and Godspeed.

REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF THE 8TH DISTRICT, FLORIDA, ON THE 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, one of my responsibilities as a Member of Congress is to report to my constituents from time to time on the actions of Congress and on my activities as their Representative in Washington. In the past, I have made periodic reports to the people whom I have the privilege of representing in Congress. I take this opportunity to once again join many of my colleagues who, at the end of a session of Congress, place in the RECORD for the benefit of their constituents a summary of the activities of Congress and the part their Representative played in those activities.

This report is being made in line with my most sincere belief that the people have a right to know what their Congressman is doing in their behalf, to know the votes he has cast on major legislation, and to know the nature of the bills which he has introduced and on which he has been most active.

SENIORITY

Congress operates on the seniority system. After 12 years of continuous service, I will be the chairman of the Public Works Committee if the Republicans gain control of Congress; or, in the alternative, will continue as minority leader on that committee if the Democrats retain control. This committee has jurisdiction over all Federal-aid highway programs, rivers and harbor projects, flood control works, public buildings, small watershed improvements, and Federal water pollution control programs, all of which have great importance to the continued orderly growth and development of the Sunshine State.

I have also served for the past 12 years on the Judiciary Committee. This committee handles legislation dealing with constitutional amendments, antitrust laws, immigration, interstate compacts, patents and trademarks, claims against the Government, and Supreme Court decisions. As the third highest ranking Republican member on this committee, I have been successful in helping to make many constructive changes in laws dealing with our judicial system and individual liberties to better protect the rights of private citizens against arbitrary encroachments by the Federal Government.

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

As a member of this committee, I have been active in the following areas:

ANTICRIME LEGISLATION

I have sponsored bills which have since become law, outlawing: the transportation of wagering paraphernalia in interstate commerce; interstate travel in aid of syndicated crime; and the transmission of gambling information over State lines. I have also successfully introduced bills which have tightened laws on interstate transportation of gambling devices; and extended the provisions of the Fugitive Felon Act to include syndicated criminal activities.

During this Congress I have supported and voted for laws to establish a National Commission on Reform of Criminal Laws, to reform and improve the bail system in Federal courts and to strengthen the narcotics laws, to establish a Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, and to provide for additional Federal district and circuit court judges to reduce the burdens on our Federal court system and to provide for more expeditious justice.

I have consistently pressed for remedial legislation in cases where I believed Supreme Court decisions concerning criminal justice needed clarification, and I will continue doing so.

ANTICOMMUNIST LEGISLATION

I have been particularly concerned over the failure of the United States to impose more effective controls on the Communist Party in the United States.

In the 85th Congress, I cosponsored the bill which resulted in closing the FBI files to Communists and criminals. My bill to redefine the Communist Party in the United States to include local and State cells also became the law of the land.

I shall continue to press for legislation aimed at restraining Communist activities in this country.

ANTIRIOT LEGISLATION

Following reliable evidence that the race riots in Chicago, Cleveland, New York, Jacksonville, and Baltimore, as well as other major American cities, are in part the work of outside agitators who came to these cities with the express intent of causing such riots, I introduced an amendment to this year's civil rights bill which would make it a Federal offense to travel in or use a facility of interstate commerce with the intent of inciting a riot or any other form of violent civil disobedience.

My antiriot amendment to the 1966 civil rights bill was favorably acted upon in the House by a vote of 389 to 25. The death of the civil rights bill in the Senate led me to introduce a separate antiriot bill to accomplish the purpose of my original amendment. The Judiciary Committee has held hearings on my bill and I pressed for action this year. I believe it is time this Congress began doing something about protecting the civil rights of innocent bystanders, property owners, and small businessmen who are suffering untold losses as a result of these riots. With the Congress failing to act this session, I intend to bring up this matter as one of the first orders of business in the next Congress.

BAIL REFORM

Bail procedures in our Federal courts have been outmoded, inequitable, and in need of reform for many years. As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I have supported reforms in bail procedures, and I am pleased to report that a bail reform act embodying many of the changes I felt essential was enacted this year.

FREEDOM OF PRAYER

Following the 1962 Supreme Court decision outlawing prayer in public schools, I introduced a proposed constitutional amendment providing for voluntary, nonsectarian prayer and Bible reading in public schools. The Judiciary Committee's standing subcommittee on which I serve held months of hearings on this matter but to no avail. I will continue to press for the right to acknowledge and express thanks to our Maker in schools and public places. This Nation was founded with a deep and abiding belief and trust in God, and the right to express one's religious convictions should not and must not be curtailed.

VOTING RIGHTS AND VOTE FRAUDS

For many years I have waged a battle against vote frauds, vote stealing, ballot box stuffing, and falsification of voting records. My anti-vote-fraud legislation became law this Congress as an enacted amendment to the Voting Rights Act. The amendment makes it a crime to give false information in connection with registering to vote, to pay or accept payment for registering to vote or for voting, and to alter any ballot or voting record with respect to a Federal election. I am happy to report that my amendment is now law.

With the belief that the right to vote and have that vote counted is a basic right in a democracy, I supported the 1965 Voting Rights Act.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND OPEN HOUSING

The 1966 civil rights bill came before the Congress in the heat of the hot civil rights summer when feelings were high and when reasonable consideration of the legislation was almost impossible. This was most unfortunate because hasty consideration makes for bad legislation—and certain titles of this bill were bad.

Title IV, the open housing provision, was the most objectionable title and is a case in point. Ambiguously worded and hastily drafted, the provision could be construed to cover any individual who rents out rooms in his own house where the guests share common facilities such as bathrooms, dining rooms, or living rooms. If this section was so construed, an individual homeowner who wished to rent a room in his house would be compelled to rent the room to anybody who wants it. Because many rooms are rented for companionship purposes as well as for income, the bill not only destroyed long-adhered-to concepts of property rights, but attacked one's freedom of association as well. The proposal applied to the sale of housing as well.

Repugnant also was a provision in the bill which would deny an accused property owner a trial by jury if the fine is less than $300 or is punishable by less than 45 days in jail. This meant that a homeowner could actually lose his freedom for up to 45 days and be fined up to $300 without a trial by jury.

Although the bill was passed by the House, it failed in the Senate. I voted against passage in the House.

I was successful in getting 8 out of 9 major amendments I offered in the House adopted in an effort to improve the bill.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

As the senior Republican member of the Public Works Committee, I have become intimately acquainted with and have helped to draft bills to meet the need for better and safer highway systems, for adequate Federal office facilities, for improved rivers and harbors and flood control works, for more comprehensive beach erosion control, for greater water and air pollution control, and for water resources development. Following is a summary of my activities in these areas:

PUBLIC BUILDINGS

Under the Jones-Cramer Public Buildings Act of 1959, the construction of public buildings throughout the United States has been progressing at an orderly rate. However, recent actions of the President threaten the orderly continuation of this program. The President has ordered that such essential public projects as Federal office buildings within which are housed the very agencies which serve our people will have to be seriously curtailed to give him additional revenue to finance such Great Society ventures as the so-called war on poverty, foreign aid to nations trading with Communist countries—including North Vietnam and Cuba—and so forth. The St. Petersburg Federal Building, already under construction, is not affected by this order. Furthermore, he has threatened the program by asserting that Congress is infringing on his powers by requiring Public Works Committee approval of public building plans. I believe Congress has a supervisory responsibility in this area and will do all within my power to see that it is preserved.

ST. PETERSBURG FEDERAL BUILDING

Pinellas County's $5.3 million Federal office building is now under construction. A modern, seven-story structure, it will house all the Federal agencies in Pinellas County and thereby provide Pinellas residents with a centralized location to conduct their business with the Federal Government. The building will also contain Federal district court facilities as the result of a successful amendment I introduced on the floor of the House. This will be the first time in history that Federal court facilities will be available in Pinellas County.

HIGHWAY INVESTIGATING AND ROADS SUBCOMMITTEES

This Congress I continued as the ranking Republican member on both the Highway Investigating Subcommittee and on the legislative Roads Subcommittee. The Highway Investigating Subcommittee is charged with the responsibility for uncovering wrongdoings in the Federal-aid highway programs. I am happy to be able to report to you that much fraud, graft, and corruption have been ferreted out and substantial corrections have been made in the programs thereby saving tax dollars and protecting the safety of American motorists.

The roads subcommitte is charged with the responsibility of acting upon legislation on the Federal-aid highway programs for construction and improvement of the highways of the Nation.

My positions on these two subcommittees has enabled me to work for the enactment into law of many proposals which will result in the more orderly development of highway programs throughout the Nation.

INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS

The 1956 National Interstate and Defense Highway Act, which I had the privilege of helping to draft and which I cosponsored, provides for a pay-as-you-go-toll-free 41,000 mile, limited access highway system in the United States including almost 1,300 miles in Florida and at a cost of $3 billion annually now. The system links every major population area in the United States. When completed, it will save over 8,000 lives per year by the reduction of traffic accidents. Authorized under this act have been the Howard Frankland Bridge, the St. Petersburg Expressway, the Tampa Expressway, Route 4 to Orlando, and Route 75 heading north from Tampa, to mention but a few routes which affect Pinellas. With what appears to be little regard for the safety of the motoring public and for their convenience, and with reckless abandon of the national aspects of the system, the President is devoid of leadership in providing necessary funds to complete the system by 1972 as the road users are expecting and even though the system continues to be paid for daily by gasoline and other road user taxes. Under Johnson administration policies, Americans will probably have to continue driving on many already overcrowded, two-laned roads until at least 1975. It is estimated that 14,000 more Americans will lose their lives in highway accidents as a result of the unwarranted delay in completing the system.

ST. PETERSBURG EXPRESSWAY

Our fight for the extension of Interstate 4 from the Howard Frankland Bridge through downtown St. Petersburg to Tenth Avenue South and for an expressway to the Sunshine Skyway has been successful. Efforts to acquire additional mileage for this expressway resulted from a meeting I arranged in Washington where local and State authorities presented to the Bureau of Public Roads, Pinellas County's case for additional mileage. Approval of this additional mileage by the Bureau of Public Roads has allowed the State Highway Department to go forward with plans for construction of the expressway and engineering studies are now underway.

HIGHWAY AUTHORIZATION ACTS

This Congress, as in past ones, I have successfully cosponsored the semiannual authorizations for the Federal-aid highway system which amounts to about $1 billion per year exclusive of the Interstate System. These authorizations provide necessary funds for construction of primary, secondary, and urban extension highways on a 50-50 matching basis. The orderly growth and development of Florida's highway systems has been greatly aided by the passage of these acts.

HIGHWAY SAFETY ACT

The Committee on Public Works reported out a highway safety bill this year, now a Federal law, which should greatly enhance safety on our Nation's highways by improved safety features on the highways themselves and by the improvement of driver and pedestrian performance. As much as 40 percent of the funds for the program are to be spent at the local level and 60 percent at the State level, all coordinated through the Governor, so the benefits should be direct and come soon to the drivers and pedestrians of Florida. These programs are expected to save thousands of lives each year.

TRAFFIC SAFETY ACT

The Congress also enacted the National Motor Vehicle and Traffic Safety Act. It is designed to protect the public against risk of accidents occurring as a result of the design, construction, and performance of motor vehicles, and to minimize deaths, injuries, and property damage resulting therefrom. It provides for a coordinated national safety program and for the establishment of safety standards for motor vehicles. I supported both the Highway Safety Act and the Motor Vehicle and Traffic Safety Act.

ALCOHOLISM AND HIGHWAY ACCIDENTS

At my request and on my motion, the Committee on Public Works wrote into the Highway Safety Act a provision requiring the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a full investigation of the relationship between alcoholism and motoring safety. We have ignored the problems of alcohol and accidents too long, and my amendment, which is now law, should result in constructive action to reduce traffic accidents resulting from alcoholic consumption.

TOLL ROADS AND BRIDGES

I have persisted in my efforts to prevent toll traps from being inserted in the otherwise free Interstate Highway System and have introduced legislation to accomplish this objective. In the omnibus bill my motion to recommit with an amendment became a part of the act and prevented the division of funds from two toll bridges across the Mississippi, thus requiring that they be free bridges as soon as possible.

Although my efforts have not been successful in all instances, it gives me great pleasure to report that I have been successful in helping to prevent the construction of Interstate 95 in Georgia as a toll road connecting with Florida's Interstate 95 as had been considered by some officials in Georgia. The construction of a toll trap on I-95, one of the major arteries leading to and from Florida, would have been both unfortunate and, in my judgment, contrary to the intent of the Interstate Highway Act. It is my belief that toll-free highways should be constructed wherever possible.

AFTER 1972 HIGHWAY STUDY

I have introduced bills for several years which would require the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a study to determine what the Federal role will be in the construction of highways after 1972. I am pleased to report that provisions requiring such a study to be conducted were enacted this session. I have elicited assurances from the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads that the States will be consulted in the drafting of this report and in considering new mileage, so we can be assured that the traditional Federal-State partnership approach to highway programs will be preserved.

ST. PETERSBURG TO MIAMI INTERSTATE LINK

I have introduced bills for several Congresses to authorize the construction of an Interstate Highway between Pinellas and Hillsboro Counties and Miami. The after-1972 future highway-needs study referred to above will include the feasibility of this highway and should contain recommendations for the inclusion of this vital link as part of any increase of interstate mileage. The construction of this link will open up Florida's west coast to greater tourist travel and will provide more rapid access from central west Florida to southeast Florida.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

This year the Congress enacted legislation creating a Cabinet-level Department of Transportation to coordinate national transportation policies. I supported the creation of this new Department after making sure of congressional review of policies to be established. Such a department was first proposed by the Eisenhower administration.

WATER AND AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

The Public Works Committee handles Federal water pollution control bills. In 1956 I helped draft and cosponsored the first Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and have been active in all efforts to bring about a balanced and Federal-State-local approach to the control of water pollution by all levels of government ever since. At the insistence of the Republicans on the committee, the amended law now provides for State participation in the costs of constructing necessary sewage treatment works. Florida has received many grants under this program; and St. Petersburg, Clearwater, Belleair Beach, and Jungle Terrace have received grants or loans under various Federal pollution control programs during the past year as examples.

At my insistence and consistent with the bill I introduced, the committee also adopted provisions to provide for procedures for reimbursements to States and municipalities which wish to proceed with construction of sewage treatment works in the advance of the availability of Federal participating funds.

As in past Congresses, I once again supported legislation to strengthen the Federal clean air program. The control of pollution of our air is as critical to our survival as is the control of water pollution.

A Republican amendment to the administration's bill removing the 7-percent tax investment credit to industries provided for the exclusion of the costs attributable to the construction of industrial facilities to control air and water pollution from the suspension of the credit. The amendment passed overwhelmingly.

KEY PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS IN FLORIDA

As the only member of the Florida delegation in Congress on the Public Works Committee, it is my duty to work for sound public works projects in the entire State. Since 1955, the year I came to Congress, $384 million has either been authorized or expended for water resources development in Florida. This ranks Florida among the highest States in the Nation. These funds have gone toward flood control projects, harbor developments, intracoastal waterway improvements, channel clearings, control of beach erosion, and many other types of related projects. As examples, some of the major projects recently enacted or for which funds have been appropriated include the following:

FOUR RIVER BASINS FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT

Funds are being steadily advanced toward the final completion of the Four River Basins flood control project in Pinellas, Hillsborough, and Hernando Counties. The total Federal cost of the project is $56.3 million. Work will include improvements to Anclote River and Lake Tarpon. Construction is now underway on the Lake Tarpon flood control drainage channel.

CENTRAL AND SOUTH FLORIDA FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT

This is not only one of the largest and most comprehensive public works undertakings in the world but also one of the most necessary. It will result in greatly enhanced flood control in central and southern Florida including the Lake Okeechobee-Everglades area's valuable farmlands and the protection of populated areas on the east, southern, and west coasts. The total appropriations to date for the district are over $143 million including maintenance costs.

INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY

A survey of the missing link of the Intracoastal Waterway from the Anclote River to St. Marks, just south of Tallahassee, is scheduled for completion in 1967. The construction of this vital missing link in the Intracoastal Waterway system which runs along the Atlantic and gulf seaboards from New England to the Texas-Mexico border is highly important to both shipping and recreation in the State. Work on the Intracoastal Waterway from the Caloosahatchee River to the Anclote River has cost $5.8 million since 1960 for construction and maintenance. The Intracoastal Waterway has been completed in Pinellas.

CROSS-FLORIDA BARGE CANAL

I was able to win needed Republican support to begin construction on the Cross-Florida Barge Canal which will link the west coast to Jacksonville via an overland canal. The total Federal cost of the project, which will bring many economic benefits to the State, is $145.3 million.

FEDERAL IMPACT ON EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

For the purpose of providing my constituents with a thorough understanding of the extent of programs of progress in recent years in Pinellas County, I offer the following information:

Recent Pinellas programs of progress

Project	Status	Federal cost
Highways:		
Howard Frankland Bridge (90 percent Federal funds)	Completed	$12,952,000
St. Petersburg Expressway:		
Interstate 4 extension	Corridor approved	33,800,000
Limited access highway to Skyway	do	[1] 6,900,000
Waterways:		
Intracoastal Waterway (Pinellas link)	Completed	1,676,000
St. Petersburg Harbor	do	40,000
4 river basins flood control project for Pinellas, Hernando, and Hillsborough Counties (including Anclote River improvements and Lake Tarpon drainage canal).	Underway	56,300,000
Johns Pass survey	Completed	33,000
Pass-a-Grille survey		
Ozona Harbor	do	106,000
Clearwater Little Pass	do	46,000
Anclote (Tarpon Springs)	do	267,000
Frenchman's Creek—Gulfport	do	33,000
Largo Sound channel	do	36,000
Johns Pass channel improvement	do	124,000
Pass-a-Grille Pass channel improvement		
Intracoastal Waterway study from St. Marks to Anclote	Underway	347,000
Anclote River channel project	Construction to start in 1967	48,000
Johns Pass erosion control, stabilization, and revetments	Authorized, 1966	100,000
Drainage study in Pinellas, Hernando, and Hillsborough Counties	Underway	100,000

See footnotes at end of table.

Recent Pinellas programs of progress—Continued

Project	Status	Federal cost
Beach erosion control:		
Mullett Key (Fort DeSoto Park) study	Completed	$34,000
Study for beach erosion control on all Pinellas beaches	do	28,000
Mullett Key beach erosion control construction project	Authorized, 1966	286,000
Pinellas County beach erosion control construction project	do	3,040,000
Bay Pines:		
164 new beds	Completed	34,000
New operating rooms	do	262,000
New cafeteria and laundry	do	888,000
Modernization and expansion of facilities	Appropriated	1,722,000
50 new nursing home beds	Completed	[2] 75,000
War Veterans' Memorial Park (370 acres)	Enacted	[3]
Post offices:		
St. Petersburg, main post office	Completed	1,913,000
Dunedin	do	111,000
Clearwater new post office	Construction to commence soon	[4]
St. Petersburg—Euclid Station	Completed	106,000
Tarpon Springs	do	88,000
St. Petersburg—Winston Plaza Station	do	80,000
Largo	do	77,000
Largo-Seminole	do	67,000
Maderia Beach	do	27,000
Palm Harbor	do	23,000
Ozona	do	11,000
Safety Harbor	do	16,000
Safety Harbor (modernization)	Authorized	
Pinellas Park	Completed	13,000
St. Petersburg Central Plaza self-service post office	do	
Clearwater Beach	do	43,000
St. Petersburg Beach	do	[4]
Federal agencies relocated in Pinellas:		
Southeast regional commercial fisheries office (Don-Ce-Sar)		[5] 126,000
Fishery Research Laboratory (red tide and estuarine research) (Don-Ce-Sar)		[5] 225,000
Atomic Energy Commission (General Electric Plant)		[6]
Recent new construction		1,361,000
Senior Citizens Accident Research Center (St. Petersburg) (Division of the National Institutes of Health)		[7] 71,000
Area growth projects:		
Tampa Bay area urban planning assistance	Plan underway	[8] 35,000
Pinellas County Science Center	Grant approved	[9] 226,000
Florida Presbyterian College:		
New music center building	do	118,000
New residence halls	do	327,000
Fellowships	do	31,000
Dunedin park and recreational area	do	55,000
St. Petersburg's "Childs" and "Southside" park and recreational facilities	do	331,000
Manpower retraining and development and vocational rehabilitation in Pinellas County (not war on poverty programs).	do	1,037,000
Clearwater sewage treatment works expansion (2 projects)	do	123,000
St. Petersburg sewage treatment facilities expansion	do	600,000
Modernization of St. Petersburg bus system	do	72,000
Expansion of nonprofit nursing home facilities	do	300,000
Public Health Service project on chronic diseases	do	21,000
Flight service station facilities at St. Petersburg-Clearwater International Airport	Completed	[5] 172,000
Operation of 2d control tower facility at Albert Whitted Airport (St. Petersburg)		[5] 75,000
Belleair Beach municipal sewage facilities	Pending (advance approved)	650,000
Jungle Terrace construction of sewage treatment works	Loan approved	148,000
St. Petersburg apartment building for elderly residents	do	2,760,000
Tarpon Springs housing for the elderly	do	1,047,000
St. Petersburg public housing units (funds for preliminaty planning)	do	30,000
Purchase and rehabilitation of low-rent houses (St. Petersburg)	Grant approved	761,000
Representative national defense contracts awarded in county (partial list):		
Inspection and repair of C-130 aircraft		2,428,000
Ground communication and equipment production		2,317,000
Production of aircraft altimeters		9,375,000
Antenna test sets		2,190,000
Radio sets and related equipment of U.S. naval ships		1,455,000
Production of communications and electronics equipment for KC-135 aircraft		1,018,000

[1] Construction, exclusive of right-of-way acquisition and relocation, estimated to be $5,000,000. Costs to be borne by Federal, State, county, and city funds.

[2] Estimate.

[3] No expense to Federal Government.

[4] Lease arrangement.

[5] Annual payroll of employees.

[6] Cost classified.

[7] Annual operational costs expended to increase.

[8] Includes entirety of Tampa Bay region.

[9] Constitutes request only—not funds received.

BAY PINES—A PERMANENT FACILITY

Our efforts to preserve Bay Pines as a permanent facility have been successful. The controversy over the permanence of Bay Pines was ended when the Veterans' Administration Administrator, in testimony before the Appropriations Committee, pledged that "it will be our definite policy to continue Bay Pines ad infinitum." In addition, the VA Administrator has gone on record in advising that the Bay Pines modernization program will be undertaken.

WAR VETERANS MEMORIAL PARK—BAY PINES SURPLUS LAND

My bill providing for the reconveying of the 370 acres of surplus land at Bay Pines to Pinellas County passed this session and is now law. This results in a $1 million land gift or return of land to Pinellas County. My bill provides that the land shall be used for park, education, health, and recreation purposes and that the park shall be known as the War Veterans Memorial Park. In line with the education purposes to which this land may be put, I have suggested the establishment of a national veterans museum on a portion of the land, and I am pleased to report that this has met with wide approval from many veterans and other interested citizens in Pinellas.

VETERANS

Meeting the needs of the ever-growing veterans population on Florida's west coast has been one of my principal concerns. In line with this goal, I have introduced and voted for the non-service-connected pension act of 1965 for veterans of World Wars I and II and the Korean war; signed a discharge petition, as well as introduced bills, providing benefits for World War I veterans, their widows, and dependents; introduced a bill to provide for outpatient treatment for veterans of World War I; introduced a bill providing for a national veterans cemetery in the central west coast area of Florida and have fought for the expansion of the veterans cemetery at Bay Pines which has reached capacity; introduced a bill for senior citizens geriatric center at Bay Pines; fought successfully for the first new Veterans' Administration beds program for Florida in many years—started with the Eisenhower administration in 1957; fought for a Spanish-American War Memorial at Fort DeSoto Park; and introduced a bill to provide that a portion of the compensation of chaplains employed by the VA shall be considered as a rental allowance.

In addition, I have also introduced bills in this Congress to authorize the construction of an additional 1,500 bed VA hospital at Bay Pines. Other bills to aid veterans which I have introduced and fought for include one to increase the rate of pension to certain veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, their widows and dependents, by increasing the amount of outside earnings permitted to be earned without deduction from benefits; and, very importantly, one to waive certain overpayments of veterans pensions resulting from the enactment of the social security amendments of last year and to permit waiver of certain retirement or annuity payments under programs administered by the Federal Government in counting outside earnings for veterans' benefits pensions.

COLD WAR GI BENEFITS ACT

As a longtime sponsor of legislation to provide a GI bill for our "peacetime" veterans, I was very pleased to give my support to this bill which I consider to be one of the most significant achievements of this Congress.

The act provides for a permanent program of educational and other assistance for individuals serving in the armed forces discharged after January 31, 1955.

SENIOR CITIZENS

With tens of thousands of senior citizens in my district, I have been in the forefront in battling for legislation which affects their welfare, and I will always remain dedicated to the interests of our elder Americans. Although the problem of senior citizens living on a fixed retirement income is not as pronounced in areas in which a large and young working force is able to earn pay increases when prices rise, I have had an intimate knowledge of the sad effects of inflation on retirees. To a retiree living on a fixed retirement income, with little or no chance of earning additional money, inflation, which robs the retiree of purchasing power, is public enemy No. 1.

My opposition to inflation is a matter of record and explains, in a large part, why I have consistently opposed this administration's big, free-spending programs in which an absolute need was not established and which have contributed to an unbalanced budget. The fiscal policies of the present administration have lead to a rapid rate of inflation so as to seriously jeopardize the very means of support for many of our retirees.

SOCIAL SECURITY ANNUITANT LEGISLATION

During the past several years I have introduced and supported legislation to provide for a number of improvements to the social security system to better aid our social security annuitants.

I have introduced bills to:

Provide for 7-percent increase in all benefits, passed;

Provide child's insurance benefits beyond age 18 while in school, passed;

Liberalize the retirement test, passed;

Reduce retirement age for women from 62 to 60;

Provide that an individual shall not be deprived of monthly insurance benefits under the Social Security Act solely because of marriage or remarriage if such marriage or remarriage occurs after such individual attains age 55;

Provide benefits for certain disabled widows without regard to their age—passed;

Increase the amount of earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits; and

To provide for cost-of-living automatic increases in benefits.

Social security problems will continue to receive the maximum amount of my time and attention.

In addition to bills to improve the social security system, I have introduced bills for the benefit of railroad retirees which include ones to provide for a 7-percent increase in all annuities and pensions and to provide for cost-of-living increases in benefits.

SENIOR CITIZENS LEGISLATION

In addition to the legislation specifically for social security annuitants, I have introduced bills or voted for bills in behalf of senior citizens which would:

Amend labor laws so as to prohibit discrimination in employment because of age;

Increase civil service retiree benefits—passed;

Provide for private health insurance plans for Government employees and retirees;

Create a Bureau of Senior Citizens in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare;

Provide for senior citizens' housing and nursing homes, passed;

Increase in research funds for diseases of the aging;

Allow people over 65 to take 100-percent tax deductions for medical services and drugs, and;

Create the medicare program and extend the period for enrollment in it, passed.

MEDICARE

For several Congresses, I have introduced legislation providing for a medicare bill which, in my judgment, would have provided benefits far superior to the medicare bill which was enacted by this Congress and which would have been financed through general revenue funds. My medicare bill, known as the Cramer-Bow medicare bill, forced the administration to include, in the present medicare law, a provision for voluntary insurance to cover the cost of doctor's bills. This provision, and others I supported that were absent from the administration's initial medicare proposal, led me to vote for the medicare bill financed through the social security system.

CIVIL SERVICE AND POST OFFICE EMPLOYEES AND RETIREES

During this Congress, I have continued my efforts on behalf of the civil service and postal employees and retirees. Last year I voted for a 3.6-percent pay increase for Federal employees and postal employees, and this year I voted for a 2.9-percent pay increase and extension of fringe benefits for Federal and postal employees. I also voted for increases in retirement annuities for Federal and postal employees.

These past 2 years, I have introduced bills to eliminate reduction in annuity elected for a spouse when such spouse predeceases the person making the election; to provide for a 10-percent increase in annuity, up to $3,000, and a 5-percent increase of the remainder of annuity; to extend the benefits of the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act to certain retired employees entitled to deferred annuities, and to provide for the recomputation of annuities of certain employees who elected reduced annuities at the time of retirement in order to provide survivor annuities for their spouses and for the recomputation of survivor annuities for the surviving spouses of certain former employees who died in service or after retirement.

ARMED SERVICES

This Congress, I have supported bills to increase the pay of members of the Armed Forces; to improve the health benefits programs for members of the armed services and their families, to strengthen laws making it a crime to destroy or mutilate a draft card; to liberalize mailing provisions of servicemen overseas; to provide for a group life insurance program for members of the Armed Forces; and, as previously mentioned, supported the cold war GI bill.

EDUCATION

Worthwhile education acts which do not invite the Federal Government to control or dictate the operations of the State and local school systems have consistently received my support. I have supported bills to provide financial assistance for international studies at U.S. colleges and universities; to extend the Library Services and Construction Act through 1971; to assist the reconstruction of schools in areas affected by disasters; to provide for a program of grants to expand and improve training of persons in the health profession and to assist health students; the National Sea Grant College Act; the Vocational Rehabilitation Act; the National Arts and Cultural Development Act; and appropriations for the Department of Education.

I also voted for the Higher Education Act 1965, and the Higher Education Act Amendments, 1966, to maintain the school milk lunch program; to maintain the direct-loan National Defense Education Act program for students rather than let it lapse as the President recommended; and to continue assistance to federally impacted school areas which the President had recommended be reduced.

Furthermore, I have introduced bills to provide a credit against the individual income tax for certain expenses of higher education; to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing training programs for employees and prospective employees; and to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including travel expenses. On this latter point, I am happy to report that the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury credited my bill with forcing the Internal Revenue Service to reverse itself and allow the deduction by regulation.

LABOR

AIRLINE STRIKE

I introduced legislation providing for the establishment of an arbitration board to settle the disputed issues in the airline strike when it appeared that the public interest was being adversely affected nationally.

SECTION 14(B)

This Congress I voted against the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act which permits States to pass or retain right-to-work laws. I believe that American laborers should be protected against unwarranted encroachments of their liberties.

This Congress I voted to increase the minimum wage law and to extend fair labor standards; to extend and improve the Federal-State unemployment compensation programs; to establish adjustment boards under the Railway Labor Act; and to extend and strengthen the manpower development and retraining program.

SMALL BUSINESS

The small businessman needs the support of all Americans. I have introduced legislation to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans for self-employed persons which became law. I have also introduced a small business tax reform bill which would allow small businesses to enjoy the tax advantages of large corporations.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

I have consistently supported a strong anti-Communist foreign policy. I have opposed giving foreign aid to Communist countries, although I have supported reasonable economic and military assistance for friendly nations. In good conscience, I could not and did not support the foreign assistance acts of this Congress which requested more funds than this country could afford, which requested Congress to give over too much power to the Executive to carry out the acts and which did not adequately restrict aid to Communist nations, or to nations aiding North Vietnam. I opposed the administration's request for a 5-year authorization rather than the annual authorization believing that Congress has a duty to closely oversee the foreign aid program on an annual basis. I also voiced strong objections to aid going to our enemies including nations trading with North Vietnam and Cuba.

CUBA AND LATIN AMERICA

As a bastion of militant communism, Cuba continues to pose a danger to the peace and stability of the Western Hemisphere.

As Chairman of the GOP Task Force on Latin American Subversion, I have proposed the following 11-point program to deal with this latest Communist threat to the Western Hemisphere:

First, reaffirm the applicability of the Monroe Doctrine to Communist intervention in the Western Hemisphere; second, declare that the governments of the Western Hemisphere will not accept as permanent the present fate of the Cuban people who are suffering under the yoke of Communist rule; third, obtain an effective free world political and economic boycott of Cuba; fourth, assume leadership in revitalizing the Organization of American States to deal with political aggression and subversion; fifth, broaden the guarantees covering U.S. overseas investments to include Communist sabotage and destruction; sixth, protect Puerto Rico from its becoming a center of Communist agitation; seventh, increase the training courses of the AID Police Academy, and increase its readiness to response to requests from Latin American governments for assistance; eighth, the recognition of a free, non-Communist Cuban government in exile; ninth, reexamine the amount of United Nations aid to Communist Cuba, and the U.S. share in this aid; tenth, prosecute any illegality arising from the traveling to Cuba by U.S. citizens; eleventh, initiate intensive cooperation among the other hemisphere countries with the goal of plowing under the seedbed of Communist aggression that is located in Cuba.

SOUTH VIETNAM AND SOUTHEAST ASIA

There is no more important international problem in the world today than the war in South Vietnam. It has been a source of deep concern to me that the President has refused to take the Congress and the American people into his confidence as to our objectives in Vietnam while at the same time committing thousands of American boys to a ground war in that southeast Asian country. It has also been a source of very real concern to me that the administration has, on a number of occasions, managed the news and refused to make known all the facts with respect to the U.S. commitment in South Vietnam. I support steps to ward off Communist aggression in southeast Asia and to provide ample support for our fighting men and for this reason have consistently supported appropriations for the war in South Vietnam. I will not hesitate to criticize the conduct of the war, however, when such criticism is justified. A just and honorable peace preserving the integrity and freedom of South Vietnam should be our ultimate goal.

COST OF LIVING RISE MUST BE HALTED

As far back as last January, I warned that the President's state of the Union message contained many programs and proposals which were dangerously inflationary. This prognostication has proven to be true. Hand-over-fist Great Society spending, pushed every step by this Democratic Congress, continues at a reckless pace. Runaway inflation is hurting everyone. It hurts most the senior citizen pensioner and social security recipient living on a small, fixed income. I will continue fighting against the programs and policies that are causing inflation. I will vote "no" on nonessential spending. The integrity of the dollar must be preserved.

TAXES

It now appears likely that the President will call for a tax increase in January as the Great Society's answer to inflation. I will vote against a tax increase so long as I believe that there were other avenues which could reasonably accomplish the same objective. The administration must cut back on nonessential domestic and foreign aid spending before it proposes steps to impose additional hardships on the already overburdened American taxpayer.

This Congress I voted against the Tax Adjustment Act which resulted in increased withholdings from individual paychecks. I also opposed the Participation Sales Act which will permit the Federal Government to go deeper in the red. President Johnson disbanded these sales only a few months after the law was enacted, thus substantiating my position. I voted against the measure to provide the President with standby authority to issue regulations to control extension of consumer credit. I also opposed the 7-percent tax investment credit suspension, feeling that other means could be devised for slowing down the inflationary spiral—mainly curtailment of rapid Government spending—and knowing it would have little immediate anti-inflationary effect and much unemployment effect.

POVERTY

I opposed the so-called war on poverty bill this session and will continue to do so until it is demonstrated that the program is properly managed and the funds Congress appropriates are going to help those in need. To date, the war on poverty program has been riddled with scandal, unjustifiable high salaries are being paid to people involved in the program, and tremendous sums of moneys continue to go into misdirected and unworkable programs. Most of the poverty programs offer no permanent solution to the root causes of poverty. I have supported programs such as vocational retraining and rehabilitation; special education programs, job retraining, programs to help relocate the unemployed in overemployment areas and bills to provide incentive to private enterprise to expand and thereby increase employment.

HIGHER AND HIGHER

If any one single characteristic has marked the Great Society, it has been its proclivity, not to "greatness" but to "highness." It is truly the "high society." Higher interest rates, approaching higher taxes, higher draft calls, higher cost-of-living, higher expense for foreign commitments, higher crime rates, higher number of riots in the streets, higher number of Federal employees, higher Federal budget, higher Federal debt are trademarks of the Great Society. About the only things which have dropped are the purchasing power, America's gold reserves, and our prestige abroad. I will continue in my efforts to curtail the continuation of policies and programs which are destroying the value of the dollar, undermining our prestige abroad, and allowing the streets of America to be turned into asphalt jungles of crime and riots.

CONCLUSION

In the 89th Congress, as during the preceding 10 years during which I have had the privilege of serving in Congress, I have continued my fight for the fundamental principles which are the touchstone of this Nation's greatness—strength, moral determination, and freedom. Our Nation is and must remain the freest, strongest, and most productive nation in the world. We will remain free and strong only so long as our people resolve that we are to remain free.

I shall continue my fight for these principles. I will fight to preserve our free enterprise system. I will fight to preserve a strong anti-Communist policy at home and abroad. I will fight for the continuation of efforts to secure freedom throughout the world. I will fight to protect and preserve the dollar. I will fight for prudent, responsible Government spending, and for an end to deficit spending and unbalanced budgets. I will adhere to basic constitutional concepts with a recognition of the responsibilities and rights of the States.

Major legislation this Congress

Issue	*My position*
National defense:	
Appropriations for national defense:	
Fiscal year 1966 appropriation for $58,800,000,000	Supported.
Fiscal year 1967 appropriations for $59,900,000,000	Supported.
Appropriations for $2,995,000,000 for necessary military construction	Supported.
Supplemental appropriations of $13,100,000,000 for U.S. military operations in southeast Asia	Supported.
Armed services:	
Pay increases for members of the armed services:	
1965 increase of 10.7 percent	Supported.
1966 increase of an additional 2.3 percent	Supported.
Cold War Veterans' Benefit Act, GI bill, to provide for a program of educational and other benefits for cold war veterans	Supported.
Improve health benefits programs for members of the armed services and their families	Supported.
Liberalize mailing privileges of servicemen overseas	Supported.
Provide for group life insurance programs for members of the Armed Forces	Supported.
Strengthen laws making it a crime to destroy or mutiliate a draft card	Supported.
Education:	
Provide assistance to colleges and universities (Higher Education Act of 1965)	Supported.
Extend the life of the college and university assistance program through 1969	Supported.
Extend Federal Government's role in education over the elementary and secondary schools	Opposed.
Extension of Library Services and Construction Act through 1971	Supported.
Assistance to construct schools in areas affected by disasters	Supported.
Construction of a 3d Library of Congress building to include additional stack and research room	Supported.
Provide financial assistance for international studies at U.S. colleges and universities	Supported.
Provide program of grants to expand and improve training of persons in the health profession and to assist health students	Supported.
Provide assistance to medical libraries to expand and update facilities	Supported.
Health and welfare:	
Expand community mental health centers program	Supported.
Legislation to control drug abuses	Supported.
Appropriations for various health programs	Supported.
Authorize civil commitment of narcotic addicts for treatment up to 3 years if charged with a Federal crime	Supported.
Social security, pensions, and retirement:	
Medical care for the aged and other important social security amendments of 1965	Supported.
Extend period for enrolling for medical insurance benefits under medicare	Supported.
Provide for contributions toward pension funds by self-employed individuals	Supported.
Federal civil service and postal employees:	
Provide 3.6-percent pay increase and fringe benefits for civil service and postal employees (1965)	Supported.
Provide 2.9-percent pay increase and fringe benefits for civil service and postal employees (1966)	Supported.
Increase in retirement annuities for Federal and postal employees	Supported.
Veterans Affairs:	
Increase compensation for service-connected disabilities	Supported.
Improve health benefits program for retired members of the uniformed services	Supported.
Veterans Readjustment Benefit Act of 1966 to aid veterans	Supported.
Convey land to Pinellas County to establish a war veterans' memorial park at Bay Pines to provide convenient recreational, health, and educational area for residents	Supported.
Anticrime:	
Establish a National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws	Supported.
Reform and improve the bail system in our Federal courts	Supported.
Establish a Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice	Supported.
Provide for additional Federal circuit and district judges to reduce burden on courts	Supported.
Salary increase for justices of the U.S. Supreme Court	Opposed.
Labor:	
To extend and improve Federal-State unemployment compensation program	Supported.
To increase the minimum wage and to extend fair labor standards provisions	Supported.
To extend and strengthen the manpower development and retraining program:	
1965	Supported.
1966	Supported.
To repeal sec. 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act which presently permits States to pass right-to-work laws	Opposed.
To declare a "bill of rights" for the American laborers to provide certain guarantees	Supported.
To establish adjustment boards under the Railway Labor Act	Supported.
Public works, transportation, and related programs:	
Appropriations for necessary Florida water resources development projects	Supported.
Spend Federal money on highway beautification when construction money needed worse	Opposed.
1965 and 1966 Federal-Aid Highway Acts to provide moneys for highway systems	Supported.
Establish highway safety program to assist States in reducing safety hazards on highways	Supported.
Establish Federal safety performance standards for motor vehicles and tires	Supported.
Increase authorizations for construction of sewage treatment works and for research and development	Supported.
Establish a Cabinet-level Department of Transportation to coordinate national transportation policies	Supported.
Extend urban mass transportation program	Supported.
Conduct research on high-speed ground transportation	Supported.
Conduct research on air pollution from motor vehicles for cleaner air	Supported.
A $750,000 mansion for the Vice President	Opposed.
Voting rights:	
Adoption of my amendment to include antivote fraud provisions in the Voting Rights Act	Supported.
Voting Rights Act of 1965 to guarantee everyone the right to vote	Supported.
Civil rights:	
Adoption of my amendment to the Civil Rights Act of 1966 to make it a crime to incite riots or commit acts of violence under name of civil rights	Supported.
Adoption of amendment to weaken the open housing provisions by permitting real estate brokers to comply with instructions of property owners in sale, rental, or lease of dwelling.	Supported.
Civil Rights Act of 1966	Opposed.
Agriculture:	
Appropriations limitation on export subsidies to Red bloc countries	Supported.
Subsidies for crops (increases consumer costs)	Opposed.
Sugar Act amendments which kept the price of domestic sugar at high level	Opposed.
Foreign aid and international affairs:	
Foreign aid appropriations:	
$4,200,000,000 for 1966 for unsound economic programs	Opposed.
$3,600,000,000 for 1967 for the same type of programs	Opposed.
$415,000,000 supplemental for specific economic programs	Opposed.
Food-for-peace authorizations to aid food supplies of agriculturally depressed nations	Supported.
Arms control and disarmament amendments without proper procedures to guard against Soviet chicanery	Opposed.
Asian Development Bank under which the administration has even extended Communist North Vietnam an invitation to participate in this U.S.-financed program.	Opposed.
Expressing the sense of the House that international communism must be soundly defeated	Supported.
Strengthen the foreign agents registration program in the United States	Supported.

Major legislation this Congress—Continued

Issue	*My position*
Federal spending policies:	
Tax adjustment to increase the amount of withholding from individual's paychecks	Opposed.
Participation Sales Act which will permit Federal Government to go further in debt	Opposed.
Provide President with standby authority to issue regulations to control extension of consumer credits	Opposed.
Permit Federal Government regulation of maximum rates of interest	Supported.
Suspend 7-percent tax investment credit which has aided the growth of business and prosperity	Opposed.
Debt increases:	
1965, from $324,000,000,000 to $328,000,000,000	Opposed.
1966, from $328,000,000,000 to $330,000,000,000	Opposed.
Permit devaluation of U.S. coins by decrease in silver content	Opposed.
War on poverty:	
1965, $1,500,000,000	Opposed.
1966, $1,700,000,000	Opposed.
Rent supplements for many who do not have adequate need	Opposed.
Appalachian special assistance program which gave it special treatment over the rest of Nation	Opposed.
Federal housing and urban development programs which refuse to take account of existing public housing	Opposed.
Older Americans Act to create a division of the Government to look into problems of aging	Supported.
Freedom of Information Act to provide for greater public access to nonsecurity Federal records	Supported.
Create a Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development	Opposed.
Tighten restrictions on obscene mail	Supported.
4-year term for Members of Congress	Opposed.
Constitutional amendment providing for olderly succession of President and Vice President	Supported.

EDUCATION

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKLE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, in recent years, there has been a tremendous amount of discussion and debate on the subject of "Education." This has taken place all over the country. It has echoed and reechoed through this Chamber as the Congress has enacted one bill after another in this field. A great many measures have been passed. I have supported practically every one of them.

But a Congressman's thoughts are not always on legislating. He has other thoughts, too, at the times these measures are considered.

In the midst of all of the discussion and debate—inside or outside of the Congress—it has occurred to me that we often overlook a most important point or two. This has to do with the individual's own responsibility for getting an education. It is a responsibility he has not only to himself but to his country. It is completely aside from what the Government does or does not do. If it is not energetically exercised, then, for the individual, what the Government does is really of little meaning—of little avail.

In two of my radio broadcasts and newsletters around the first of the year, I explored this subject in the context of the need for every young person to get an education equipping him for college—and to go to college if at all possible.

During my 18 years in the Congress, many young people have come to me seeking advice. They have been trying to decide upon a career, or how far to go on with their schooling—any number of things. The best advice I can give is contained in those two newsletters. I submit them for the RECORD:

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON, CONGRESSMAN, 16TH DISTRICT, PENNSYLVANIA

EDUCATION—PART I

DECEMBER 30, 1965.—The Congress—particularly over the last two or three years—has considered and enacted a great deal of legislation in the field of education. This has stimulated much thinking among Members of Congress on this subject, and in this report and in my next one I would like to convey just a few of my own thoughts to you. Two aspects stand out most clearly in my mind. I will confine my comments to them.

The first has to do with the fact that it is tremendously important in these times for every youngster to get all of the education he possibly can—and in large part I mean a broad education which develops within him the ability to think, and to learn, and therefore to adjust himself readily to changing situations. This goes for those youngsters who will not be going to college as well as for those who will. For the future lives of all of our young people are going to be profoundly affected by the swift and almost revolutionary changes taking place in our society and in our economy, and these changes will continue with ever increasing rapidity.

The ways in which these changes could reshape our nation in the next ten, twenty, or thirty years are practically beyond imagination. For that reason, it is my further contention that right from the start—regardless of his supposed capabilities—each and every young man or woman should have it in his head that he is going to go to college.

Now I do not offer this thought as an educator or as a sociologist, for I am neither. I offer it simply as a Member of Congress, part of whose job over the years has been to observe the changes occurring in our economy. You know, it is said that a Member of Congress is a jack of all trades—a master of none. That is certainly true, and I can tell you that nowadays a Congressman has to be a jack of many, many more trades than he used to be.

To give you an idea of what I mean: When I first entered Congress some years ago, automation was no great problem. The fight against unemployment then was an exercise in trying to stimulate the economy and, in the meantime, providing temporary jobs through make-work programs. Hardly a thought was given to upgrading people's skills to fit jobs going begging. Why? Because there were no jobs going begging. The closest we were getting to outer space was in an airplane flying at maybe 15,000 feet. Computers? Electronics? Never heard of those words. Education? That was of little concern then at the Federal level. A young man in those days could leave high school early and expect eventually to fit into a trade that would keep him going a lifetime.

But all of this soon changed radically. The Second World War touched off a whole broad range of technological and scientific advancements. The progress of the past quarter of a century has brought us into what some call the "space age". Others call it the "second industrial revolution". The new age is epitomized by our employment of nuclear energy, by our launching of men into space—by our preparations to go to the moon—and beyond. Even more important for the average person is the fact that the spectacular events we read about in these fields today are backed up by a gigantic new complex of research and aerospace and electronics industries. Moreover, the products of these new industries reach into our everyday lives as well as into space, and the job opportunities that have opened up were never even dreamed of a few short years ago.

But the transition into this age has been a painful one, and undoubtedly still more agonizing adjustments lie ahead. New industrial processes and fuels are replacing the old. Machines increasingly are taking over many of the jobs formerly performed by people. Even new machines are out-moded in short order. All over the country—and Pennsylvania is no exception—we have seen the adverse effects these changes can have on the lives of people. Many men trained for only one job, and who held that job for a number of years, have been thrown out of work. Their families have suffered. This has happened in many industries since World War II, but let me mention just three. For example, in the soft coal industry—partly because the production of each worker has risen nearly 100%—there are now some 260,000 fewer coal mining jobs than there were twenty years ago. During a short span of ten years, although steel production remained at approximately the same level, the number of jobs in that industry declined by 80,000, or about 14% of the total labor force. Within a period of fifteen years, employment in the railroad industry was cut nearly in half. The number of railroad jobs fell from 1,400,000 down to about 730,000.

While all of this has been happening, many new jobs—probably more than enough to fill the gap—have been opening up in our new industries. But these jobs require different education and newer skills. So the emphasis of the Federal government, so far as the unemployment problem is concerned, has shifted to retraining programs—in other words, upgrading the skills of people so that they can fill the new jobs that are open and waiting. This will go on and on. That is why I have supported our training programs so consistently and so vigorously.

For much the same reason, greater emphasis has come to be placed in recent years upon education. The changes in our economy have created a huge demand for professional people—for people with managerial ability—for scientists and technicians and for people to operate the new machines, just to mention a few. The fact is that white collar workers—from medical doctors and nuclear physicists all across the spectrum through stenographers and file clerks—have been in the majority since 1956—just nine years ago—and the trend is accelerating. It is estimated that within the next five years, they will outnumber blue collar workers by more than 25%.

For young people, there are important lessons in all of these developments—the main lesson being that our economy and its job patterns are changing swiftly, and anyone who is not prepared to adjust to these changes is going to be left in the dust. Relating this fact of life to the question of education, it seems to me, first, that it is unwise to try to gauge a youngster's capabilities at an early age and to direct him in a narrow channel toward any particular type of occupation. For what we might think is the practical thing to do in that respect today may turn out ten or twenty years from now to have been completely impractical and possibly tragic.

The wiser course, I believe, is to prepare our young people for any eventualities they may face as young adults or in later years. This requires a broad education—first, of the type that develops the ability to think and to adjust to new situations quickly, and second, of the type that stimulates the desire to learn and widens the horizons of the mind. In my estimation, the most important part of this foundation is the ability to read and to comprehend. If a youngster gained nothing more from his early training than an ability to read well and a desire to read widely, he would be well on his way toward becoming an educated citizen.

In addition to equipping a young person for the problems he will face in the workaday world, a broad education is an important step toward college. Many youngsters, of course, may feel now that they are not college material or will not want to go to college. My feeling is that this is a decision they should forever postpone—and furthermore, that they should stop selling themselves short. Their goal—if not to go to college—should at least be to get the kind of training that is necessary for entering upon a higher education. It will stand them in good stead no matter what the future brings. What is more, in these changing times, the aptitudes and interests they develop as they go along are quite likely to fit right in with future career opportunities which do require a college education. Many of these opportunities undoubtedly are not even foreseen today, and many jobs in existence now are going to require more education in the future.

It is one thing for a youngster to prepare himself for college and then decide not to go. But it is quite another thing—and a tragic thing, indeed—if he fails to prepare himself and then decides he wants a college education or learns that the career which interests him requires it. For that youngster, it may be too late, and the world may have passed him by.

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON, CONGRESSMAN, 16TH DISTRICT, PENNSYLVANIA

EDUCATION—PART II

JANUARY 6, 1966.—Not long ago, I received a wonderful letter from one of my young appointees to the Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs. He told me about the progress he is making, and I would like to present part of his letter to you: "When I arrived at the Academy," he wrote, "I thought I was fully prepared for everything and anything that could happen. I soon realized that I was very unprepared. The trick of getting through the Academy is being able to adjust easily and quickly to the changing environment. Initially," his letter goes on, "I had a difficult time but after a short period of time I found myself doing all right. During these last three months I have been accomplishing tasks that I thought I never had the capacity to do. . . . Conditions here are rough and trying but I have the confidence in myself that I can succeed in anything I undertake. I will be here as long as the 'Class of 69' is."

In answer to his letter, I wrote to him as follows: "Being able to adjust easily and quickly to a changing environment is not only important at the Academy, but it is essential in almost every phase of your life. This is particularly true in this day and age when everything is changing with such startling rapidity. If you have learned how to do this, you have taken a long step forward in making your whole career a success."

For several reasons, it seemed to me that this exchange of letters would be appropriate for leading off this week's report, which is the second of two I have prepared on the subject of education.

First, this young man at the Academy apparently is learning a lesson significant for all young people, and that is the necessity of being able to adjust quickly to new situations. Last week, I discussed this in the context of the astounding changes taking place in our economy and the need for every youngster to get a broad education and to go to college if at all possible. Second, the letter from this young Academy cadet reflected a desire to learn. It is a quality I am sure we want to see in all of our young people. Finally, his letter reflected, in my judgment, a sense of personal responsibility, which is terrifically important. It is this attribute which I want to explore with you today.

First, let me say that I suppose it would be easier for me—and require less thought—if I simply told you about the various education programs enacted by this Congress. However, information of that kind is easy to come by, and if you would like to read about these programs, I will certainly be only too glad to send you material on them. But my point is this: When we talk in those terms—in terms of what the government is doing about education—I think we are too apt to forget the really vital thing. And that is the individual role which each of us personally must play in this matter of education. For when you really think about it, education is the personal responsibility of each and every one of us—from kindergartners all the way up through the teachers and parents and, indeed, even the grandparents.

I am sure our teachers and our school boards fully recognize their responsibilities. They are doing a marvelous job day in and day out—often in the face of difficult circumstances. I am sure, also, that parents and grandparents need not be reminded that part of their responsibility is to support our schools in every way possible. So let me go one step further. It seems to me that parents make their greatest contribution when they create an attitude and an atmosphere in the home that encourages their children to acquire knowledge and, above all, to think. Now I know this is not easy for many parents because it requires a desire to learn on their own part, and it can be difficult to find the time and energy for re-introducing oneself to the world of knowledge and ideas after a long, hard day's work has left you tired mentally and physically. But in my judgment, it is extremely important. It can take the form, for example, of reading a book or magazine or just the newspaper, next thinking about what you read and then discussing it with your children—not with the purpose of instilling opinions but with the purpose of learning with them and training them to form their own opinions intelligently and with discrimination.

But the greatest responsibility of all rests upon our young people themselves. Our teachers can do their job. Parents can provide all of the encouragement it is possible to give. Our schools and our government can provide the best education programs and equipment imaginable. But education still cannot be handed to anyone on a silver platter. It is a thing that cannot be given so much as it can be acquired. And after all is said and done, it is up to the student himself. Nobody can get an education for him.

I have previously discussed the need for education primarily in terms of developing the ability to adjust in a swift-moving economy. For the young person who still wonders whether getting an education is worth the effort, let me reduce it to more practical terms.

Most of us remember just a few years ago when it used to be said that for the average youngster a high school diploma was the key to a good job and a reasonable degree of success and security. Well, the ante now has been upped by four years to a college degree—or to at least two years of college combined with intensive vocational training. Indeed, for many occupations which formerly were not looked upon as professions, four years of college nowadays is not enough.

From the standpoint of earning capacity and material well being—if from no other standpoint—young people surely owe it to themselves to get as much education as possible. For the statistics show that for every additional year of schooling, future earnings go up. According to the latest figures I obtained from the United States Office of Education, the average college graduate will earn about $452,000 during his lifetime, while the average high school graduate is earning $272,000. The difference is $180,000, or about $4,000 a year—and that is not peanuts. In other words, the college graduate will be earning $5.00 in the same time it takes a high school graduate to earn $3.00.

Now I do not mean to indicate that money is everything. But in connection with this practical, down-to-earth business of making a home and raising a family, I do mean to say that the opportunities for education that are lost today can certainly compound a family's financial problems a hundred-fold in future years. It is no wonder that just a year or so ago, for the first time in history, more than half of our high school graduates entered college. When the fall semester began this September, the figure was over 53%. While not all of these young people will complete four years of college, it is estimated that nearly 22% of this year's crop of high school graduates will receive bachelor degrees. And that percentage is going up fast.

Not only do young people owe it to themselves to get a good education. They owe it to their country as well. The destiny of the United States is going to lie in the degree to which our people are educated, as much as anything else, and the great accomplishments of our country in future times are going to require an educated citizenry. You no doubt have heard it said that the quality and strength of a society is the sum total of the qualities and strengths of its individual members.

To that I would add the thought that the way for a nation to progress is for individuals to progress. Surely there shall be no occasion for future historians to say of the United States that we were like that former king of beasts—the dinosaur—which could not adapt when the climate changed and, therefore, became as extinct as the dodo. Nor do we ever want it said that any of our young people now coming up became dinosaurs in a modern civilization.

THE UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, with the adjournment of the 89th Congress, we hear many accolades for its accomplishments. During these last weeks, we heard repeatedly that the Congress was putting the finishing touches on its work for the year. Certainly there have been many accomplishments. Much good has come out of the past 2 years.

But what I wish to speak about today is the unfinished business of this Congress, and those aspects of its record—combined with failures on the part of the administration—that constitute sad neglect of one of the biggest tasks of all. That unfinished business has to do with the grave challenge of inflation confronting our country.

Inflation not only is working a present hardship on our people by reducing the purchasing power of the dollar; it is also threatening the future economic health of the Nation—and therefore our ability to sustain our position of world leadership. This broad, general problem should be deserving of as much concern by the next Congress as any other it faces.

Late last year, the foremost symptoms started appearing. The cost of living began rising at an unusually rapid clip. The war in Vietnam was growing. Defense expenditures were multiplying. It seemed obvious to me—as I am sure it must have to most people—that a considerable degree of restraint was needed in the fiscal policies of our Government. Wars have always forced curtailment of domestic programs.

It was therefore with a feeling of great shock and wonderment that I sat in this Chamber on the evening of last January 13 and heard the President deliver his annual state of the Union message. That message utterly failed to give recognition to the country's true situation.

Prior to this occasion, there was much newspaper discussion as to how the President might handle the question of "guns or butter." Frankly, I did not see how he could possibly offer much domestic butter. But the next day, I was compelled to make the following statements about the President's message in my weekly report to my constituents:

> As it turned out, he didn't even choose to strike a moderate balance between the two. Instead, he emphasized both. He went "whole hog" for guns on the one hand and butter plus cheesecake and ice cream on the other. His speech was basically a campaign document for next November's elections. It promised everything for everybody. In general terms, it spoke not only of economizing but also of fully implementing and financing programs both old and new. It avoided any clear recognition of the likelihood that, at some places along the line, there would have to be some "give."

Mr. Speaker, I will say this to the credit—or should I say discredit—of the administration and its heavy majorities in the Congress. They have pretty well kept faith with the spirit of the President's message of last January. But in doing so, to what a sorry pass they have brought us. Into what a deep, dark hole of trouble they have dug this Nation.

In my judgment, they have led us to the verge of a domestic crisis overshadowing even our international crisis—assuming, as I think we must, that the Vietnam war will continue for some time. By their fiscal profligacy—almost totally unbalanced by measures of restraint—they have brought us to the point where drastic action is going to have to be taken to keep our economy from flying completely out of hand. Essentially, we have three choices.

One course we can follow is that of fiscal austerity—a cutback of Federal spending. A large dose of this is what I have been advocating for many months. Republicans generally in the Congress have been advocating the same thing, but to no avail. Unfortunately, we are to the point now where—if this were the only course taken—it would require by far the grandest and most severe austerity measures any government ever imposed upon itself. It is questionable whether this is in the cards politically.

A more likely prospect is a mammoth increase of taxes on personal and corporate income. Even this will not dampen inflation unless the revenue is used to reduce borrowing and to place us on more of a pay-as-you-go basis rather than being thrown into more new programs. A third alternative is the imposition of a statutory system of wage and price controls. This is a possibility I do not rule out at all, if the demands of the war upon our economy continue growing at the present rate much longer.

That sad part of it is that drastic action—when finally forced upon the Nation—can have particularly adverse effects—upon certain groups of individuals—marginal businesses and low-income taxpayers, for example—and can cause dislocations from which some segments of our economy may be a long time recovering. This is one of the ironies in the administration's failure to face the problem. Had it applied restraints gradually and progressively over these months, it would not now be confronted with such hard choices. Instead of that, the administration has been living on dreams and hopes—dreams that Vietnam would go away soon and hopes that it could avoid tramping on any toes before the November elections and at the same time avert any serious consequences. I submit that the day of reckoning has just about arrived.

From the time the United States started moving into Vietnam on a massive scale in the spring of 1965, the heating up of our economy became virtually inevitable. The first clear danger signals showed up around the turn of the year. The cost of living began a steady, rapid climb. In August, the last month for which figures are available, the Consumer Price Index was 3.8 points higher than in August of 1965. This is the biggest year-to-year increase since the Korean war, 15 years ago.

Consumer prices since January have been increasing at a ruinous annual rate of nearly 4 percent. That is about three times as fast as the average increase for the years 1960 through 1965. Food that cost the housewife $10 in March of 1965 cost her $10.72 in March of this year. For that same food, she now has to pay upward of $10.90—almost 10 percent more than a year and a half ago.

Wholesale prices also have been advancing at an annual rate of approximately 4 percent this year—10 times as fast as they advanced between 1960 and 1965. This is laying the groundwork for still more increases in retail prices.

The jumps in the cost of living are the same thing as a hidden tax. They reduce the value of the disposable income and savings of our wage earners and all other people. Our retired persons living on fixed incomes—social security, pensions, and so on—are the hardest hit of all. They have no real opportunity to go out and earn more money to make up the difference. Think, too, of the people the poverty programs are supposed to help. With prices going up, they are shoved back one or two steps in their standard of living every time they take a step forward.

A continuation of escalating prices also holds the danger of a slowdown of consumer buying that could lead us into a recession. Present interest rates—the highest in 45 years—already have discouraged buying in many fields and have brought depression upon the homebuilding industry. In addition, higher costs here at home are pricing more American-made products out of the world market. When these goods cannot be sold abroad, the people in our own industries who produce them are thereby priced right out of their jobs. Our economy is further threatened, as a result, by the increasing deterioration of our international balance-of-payments position and the depletion of our gold stocks which now amount to less than half of what we owe abroad. All of this undermines confidence in the dollar and brings into question our ability to maintain economic stability in the future.

Mr. Speaker, the 89th Congress may go down in history as one of the most productive of all. Legislative quality in too many instances has been nothing to write home about, but there is no question about quantity. There have been some accomplishments in which I was more happy to take part.

But the 89th Congress also may be distinguished by the blame it shares with the Johnson administration for the neglect of a most basic and overriding problem—inflation. Since that problem became obvious at the beginning of this year, the record of the administration and the Democratic majority in this Congress has been to aggravate it on all occasions except those few when it chose to temporize. A review of that record is instructive. It involves approximately two dozen pieces of legislation and key rollcall votes bearing upon fiscal policy.

In February, the House passed the Tax Adjustment Act, increasing the withholding of personal income taxes on a graduated scale, accelerating payment of corporation taxes, and suspending the previously enacted reductions of excise taxes on automobiles and telephone service for 1966 and 1967. This bill did not increase income taxes. It merely sped up their collection on a nonrecurring basis. It was billed both as a method of paying for Vietnam war costs and as an anti-inflation measure. I felt there was no choice but to support it, although I did vote for a recommittal motion to delete the automobile and telephone taxes as being unnecessary to the objectives. The bill was designed to increase Government revenues by some $1.1 billion this year and by $4.8 billion in fiscal 1968.

Hardly had this bill cleared the House, however, before the administration was asking us for special appropriations which, for 1 year, would total more than three times the amount brought in by the Tax Adjustment Act for 2 years.

First, there was a supplemental appropriation of $4.8 billion for Vietnam that cleared the House on March 1. Then, only 2 weeks later, came another supplemental of $13.1 billion. This one, too, was primarily for military needs in Vietnam, although it also included $415 million in foreign aid funds for Vietnam, Laos, Thailand, and the Dominican Republic. In addition, by the end of March, the House had passed a supplemental appropriation of nearly $2.8 billion to meet shortages in domestic programs. I should point out that all of these bills were completely outside of the regular appropriations process. They were emergency requests for extra funds above and beyond those anticipated in the budget.

So, within a month and a half, the House had acted to increase Government revenues by not quite $6 billion over a period of 2 years. But it had also acted to increase expenditures by nearly $21 billion for 1 year. Surely, the handwriting should have been on the wall for everybody to see. Our outgo was far exceeding our income. The 37-day pause in our bombing of North Vietnam had ended. War costs were soaring. Prices were on their way up. We had definitely entered an inflationary period.

Soon thereafter, there began a series of Republican moves to cut back on Government spending. In part, these took the form of recommittal motions on regular departmental appropriation bills. The motions were designed to hold expenditures to a level 5 percent below budget estimates.

The first two tests in this drive came on April 6. The motions were offered on the appropriation bills for the Department of the Interior and for the Treasury and Post Office Departments. I supported these moves. But they were defeated. I supported identical motions later in the session on appropriation bills for the District of Columbia and for the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments. But they also were defeated. In each case, the more than 2 to 1 Democratic majority in the House worked for the administration, as it did almost without exception throughout the whole 89th Congress. It was simply too much of an advantage to overcome.

Late in the session, on the public works appropriations bill, a different kind of attempt was made to cut expenditures. This was a motion essentially to delete items added to the House bill by the Senate and thereby reduce the total amount by $23.6 million. I supported this, too. It was rejected like all the rest.

On only one occasion did I break away from the Republican position on these bills. That was on May 5, when the appropriation measure for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare came before the House. In that case, I pondered this question right up to the last minute—in fact, to such a late stage of the proceedings that it required me to go to the Speaker's desk to change a vote I had cast.

The thing that had me worried on this bill was the section providing the impacted areas funds for school districts in which there are large numbers of Federal employees and servicemen. This has been an excellent program over the years. I know from my own experience how vital it is for schools throughout the country and how they have come to rely heavily on these funds year after year. It has been a great help to schools in my own district, particularly the Middletown schools. But the President requested only $183 million for it. The Appropriations Committee recommended $416 million in order to keep the program operating as it has in the past. My concern was that the motion for a 5-percent reduction, although it applied to the whole bill overall, would be used by the administration as an excuse to make an especially drastic cutback on impacted areas aid to the schools, as it had already proposed to do.

With few exceptions, Members seldom vote against appropriation bills on final passage. But in this case I did. This measure totaled $10½ billion. Unlike the other bills I have mentioned, which were below the amounts requested by the administration, this one was $490 million above the request. Certainly here was an instance where we could reject a bill and force the committee to come back with a more reasonable figure. It included funds for a number of new programs as yet untried and untested. Particularly at a time like this, we can well afford to go slow in getting such programs started. The impacted areas program, on the other hand, is one of long-proven merit. It should not be sacrificed. On final passage of the bill, however, I was on the short end of the vote.

There was only one other appropriation bill against which I voted. This was for the independent agencies and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. It came up on May 10. It included only $2 million for rent supplement payments in fiscal 1967, but it increased the contract authority—in other words, our commitment of funds in the future—from $12 million to $32 million. This is one of those schemes which, when once started, is likely to mushroom practically out of sight. Again, I felt we could ill afford it.

When the Senate-House conference report on this bill came before us on August 18, another Republican move was made that had my support. This was a motion to delete language authorizing sale of $3.2 billion of participations in pools of Government assets—mainly loans—held by the agencies covered by the bill. This motion was defeated by administration forces despite the fact it was clear by that time that such sales were ill advised and harmful to the economy.

This harks back to what I consider the greatest debacle of this session of Congress—an act which, in the midst of growing inflation, found the Democratic Party retreating under the pressures of that problem rather than advancing against it. This was the Participation Sales Act, passed by the House on May 18 and opening the door to a whole new system of back-door, deficit financing. It gave approval to an administration plan to place $4.2 billion worth of Government loans and similar assets in a pool and then sell participations from that pool to private investors. This extra revenue would make the budget deficit picture look considerably brighter.

But, besides other dangers in the plan, it was obvious that the high interest rates under which these participations were to be sold would attract investment funds away from other segments of the economy, including the homebuilding industry which already was in deep trouble as a result of tight money. As it turned out, interest rates on these participation offerings soared to nearly 6 percent, the highest in history on Government paper. This caused further turmoil in the investment market. The embarrassment was too much, and the Administration suspended the sales. No one likes to say "I told you so," but to my recollection this was the only bill this year on which the Republicans united solidly in opposition to an administration measure without the loss of a single vote.

But still, as matters went from bad to worse, the administration continued to postpone and avoid making hard decisions. It continued failing to deal effectively with the root causes of our economic chaos. It resorted to piecemeal measures and patchwork, attempting only to cover up the symptoms.

An example of this was a bill the Congress processed during August to permit the Federal National Mortgage Association to purchase up to $4.8 billion of additional FHA and VA mortgages. In that the FNMA must borrow funds to do this, it puts a further drain on the Treasury. But the homebuilding industry had sunk into a depressed condition. High interest rates, siphoning investment funds into other fields, had caused a severe shortage of mortgage money. The idea of the additional FNMA mortgage purchases was to set free large amounts of private investment funds which would be ploughed back into financing still more mortgages. Hopefully, this will help get the industry back on its feet. While it is far from being a final solution, this measure had my support.

But the next attempt at treating symptoms, approved by the Congress during September, consisted of completely artificial devices for limiting interest rates paid by banks and certain other financial institutions on deposits and share accounts. This bill, to remain in effect only 1 year, did not have my support. Like water finding its level, many of the savings and investments affected by the measure will go seeking higher rates of return in other markets. What great panacea the administration will offer for these dislocations is yet to be seen.

Amid much sound and fury, the administration early last month offered still another piece of patchwork. This was the bill, passed by the House on September 30, to suspend until 1968 the 7-percent investment tax credit on industrial machinery and equipment, as well as the provisions for accelerated depreciation on new industrial and commercial buildings. It was trumpeted as an anti-inflation measure in that it would dampen the capital-goods boom.

Exactly what results will flow from it, however, are questions wide open to debate. Only one thing is certain. It will not place any immediate curb on inflation. Its real effects will not actually be felt for at least 8 months or more. This is because of the long leadtimes involved in the capital goods market—in other words, the long period between the time machinery is ordered and the time it is delivered and paid for. The same applies to industrial and commercial buildings. Thus, for the latter half or possibly two-thirds of next year, the measure undoubtedly will have an effect. But also undoubtedly during that period, industries will be placing large batches of orders for deliveries early in 1968 when they will be able to take advantage of restoration of the tax credits. This slowdown of purchases, followed by a sudden speedup could cause dislocations we cannot foresee now—not to mention the inflationary impact of the resumption of these provisions. Weighing the lack of immediate advantages of this bill with respect to the inflation problem—and considering also the possible long-term disadvantages—I decided to oppose it.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to be able to support many of the major legislative accomplishments of this Congress during the past session—particularly in those areas where we were building upon long-established programs of proven merit. These included the amendments to our higher education, library services and construction, food-for-peace programs, the Allied Health Professions Training Assistance Act, U.S. participation in the Asian Development Bank, the new provisions for equal employment opportunity, for rejuvenation of the Small Business Administration, and the bill to encourage studies and research in the international field.

From my own committee—the Committee on Public Works—there was considerable legislation with which I was proud to be associated. This included the new water pollution control measure, the bill accepting the marvelous Hirshhorn art collection and authorizing a museum and sculpture garden for it, the Highway Safety Act, the amendments to the Federal-aid highway program, and the Disaster Relief Act.

Just a few of the other measures that had my support were these: The new program of educational and other assistance for veterans, establishment of a Cabinet-level Department of Transportation, the Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act, pay raises for Federal workers, veterans' pension increases, the freedom of information bill, and the truth-in-packaging legislation.

Our foreign assistance program was another of our continuing efforts which I supported. Over the years, our aid programs abroad, on the whole, have been highly successful. They have contributed greatly to peace by helping to create stability in many countries. There is a continuing need for them in view of persistent Communist subversion, particularly in the underdeveloped regions of the world. Certainly, in the absence of the program, we would have spent much more money—and moreover, lost many more lives—stopping Communist aggression by military means. The program has helped to make the recipient countries much less vulnerable to such aggression. A number of them now are not only self-supporting but are making contributions of their own to the underdeveloped nations. This further strengthens prospects for stability and peace.

But on the foreign-aid measures, as on a number of other programs I supported on final passage, attempts to tighten the pursestrings had my backing. One of these attempts was a recommittal motion on the foreign-aid authorization bill in July. It was designed to limit authorizations to 1 year instead of 2 years for all programs except the Alliance for Progress and the Development Loan Fund—also to cut $250 million from the $1 billion proposed for each of the next 5 years of the Development Loan Fund. Although this motion was defeated, its purposes were substantially upheld, as was my position, after the bill had gone through the Senate and was put in final form. The Development Loan Fund authorization was reduced to $685 million for 1967. That Fund and the Alliance for Progress gained authorizations for only the next 3 years instead of 5, and all other programs were placed on a 1-year instead of 2-year basis.

In September, a recommittal motion on the foreign aid appropriations bill, to reduce total economic assistance by 10 percent, also had my support. It passed by a count of 187 to 182. Out of all the skirmishes on the House floor over appropriation matters, this was practically the only Republican victory of major consequence during the entire 2d session of the 89th Congress. I voted for it because it seems to me the tighter we can make the foreign aid budget, the better. It forces the administrators of the program to establish stricter priorities, to cut out waste, and to get finer results out of every dollar spent. The difficulty of doing this was highlighted again, however, when even this $45 million cut was restored in the final bill.

One of the hardest decisions for me during the entire second session concerned my position on the amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act. These include an increase of the minimum wage from $1.25 to $1.60 an hour on February 1, 1968, for workers presently covered. They bring some 8 million employees under minimum wage coverage for the first time. In view of the inflation problem, it seemed to me that extension of coverage to additional workers was as far as we should have gone.

Even the President, in his original message on this subject, recommended only that coverage be extended to 4½ million additional workers. Extremely cautious on the question of boosting the minimum, he said:

> The Congress should consider carefully the effect of higher minimum wage rates on the incomes of those employed and also on costs and prices and on job opportunities likely for the flood of teenagers now entering our labor force.

Unquestionably, the increase will limit job opportunities. Past experience with this tells us that many employers will have difficulty meeting the higher rates. They will try to get by with fewer employees and will look for other ways, including automation, to get production out.

But my primary concern was with the inflationary impact. Here there was the question of whether the upward pressures on costs and prices will still exist when this sizable boost of 35 cents an hour in the minimum rate goes into effect early in 1968. An important factor in this question is whether the Vietnam war will still be raging at that time, with all of the heavy expenditures that entails.

One problem is that the increase of the minimum will mean salary increases reverberating all the way up through our wage structure. When workers at the bottom of the scale receive a raise, then those at the level just above them, having more skills and more job responsibility naturally will expect a raise also. It will work this way all along the line, up to the top. This will drive production costs and prices still further upward.

Never before in our history has the national minimum wage been increased during a time of inflation or a time of war. When past minimum wage laws were enacted—in 1938, 1949, 1955, and 1961—we were in periods of relative price stability. There were no wars in progress. Military expenditures were not putting a heavy strain on our economy. In my judgment—particularly since the new increase will not take effect until February of 1968, anyway—we would have been well advised to delay this action until inflationary pressures have abated, or at least until the situation in Vietnam becomes more clear and we have a better idea of what our military requirements are going to be.

The question of how long the war will last, of course, has an important bearing on all of the issues I have raised. I hope and pray the war will end quickly. I wish the administration could have assured us many months ago that the conflict would be over soon. The problem of inflation—the problem of heavy Government expenditures contributing to inflation—would not have caused me such grave concern in that case. My attitude on certain pieces of legislation that have come before this 89th Congress would have been different.

But we have received no such assurances. The fact is that no one can tell us when the war will end. General informed opinion in Washington is that the war will continue to escalate for some time to come. No one can say with certainty that the inflationary pressures upon our economy will fade away in the near future. To assume that this problem will somehow take care of itself would be folly. Unless there is a sudden, favorable break in the Vietnam war picture, restraints of an exceptionally harsh and severe nature will have to be applied to the economy by the next Congress. I hope this will not be necessary. I am afraid it will be.

BOX SCORE

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, repeatedly over the past 3½ years the House Republican Committee on NATO and the Atlantic Community has warned of the disarray, discord, and fragmentation in the Western alliance. We have called for affirmative action to meet these problems, and have warned against administration policies which tend to weaken the alliance. Unfortunately—except for occasional gestures which have little substance—these recommendations have gone unheeded. Even when our proposals have been echoed by Democratic administration spokesmen, the follow-through has been almost nonexistent.

During the first year and one-half, I served as chairman of the group and since then it has been led by Representative Paul Findley, Republican, of Illinois. Present committee members are: Representatives Adair, Chamberlain, Clausen, Cleveland, Ellsworth, Findley, Keith, Martin, Morton, Pirnie, Quie, and Reid.

Here is the "box score." It includes excerpts from committee statements, statements of the chairman, and statements by Republican House Members as individuals, together with excerpts from subsequent parallel statements by Democratic administration spokesmen and other influential persons and, if any, followthrough action:

RESISTING COMMUNIST EXPANSION MUST BE A JOINT EFFORT OF FREE NATIONS

Republican conclusions or recommendations

"We need not take on the Communists alone. The United States, France, Britain and other free nations actually have identical long-range goals in foreign policy, and they should stand together. We have failed to bring them together to share in decision-making, military action and cost-sharing."

(Rep. Findley in Press Release, May 5, 1965.)

Subsequent parallel statements by Democratic administration spokesmen and other influential persons

"The plain truth is the day is coming when no single nation, however powerful, can undertake by itself to keep the peace outside its own borders. Regional and international organizations for peace-keeping purposes are as yet rudimentary; but they must grow in experience and be strengthened by deliberate and practical cooperative action."

(Sec. McNamara in address to American Society of Newspaper Editors, Montreal, Canada, May 18, 1966.)

(Source: News release, Office of Asst. Sec'y of Defense (Public Affairs), May 18, 1966.)

"If there is anything that has been made crystal clear by the grim experience of half a century, it is that neither peace nor security, nor prosperity can be achieved or maintained by national action alone—or by national policy alone."

(Prime Minister Pearson of Canada in address at Atlantic Union Award dinner, Springfield, Ill., June 11, 1966.)

(Source: Congressional Record, June 14, 1966, pp. 13113–13115.)

Republican conclusions or recommendations

"Today the alliances are a shambles. . . . To an alarming degree the United States is trying to fill the power vacuum. . . . As the free world alliances have weakened and broken apart, our role as world policeman has become all the lonelier.

(Rep. Findley in address to American Academy of Political and Social Science, Philadelphia, Pa., Apr. 15, 1966.)

(Source: Congressional Record, April 25, 1966, pp. 8799–8801.)

Subsequent parallel statements by Democratic administration spokesmen and other influential persons

"The United States has no mandate from on high to police the whole world, and no inclination to do so."

(Secretary McNamara, address to American Society of Newspaper Editors, Montreal, Canada, May 18, 1966.)

(Source: News Release, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs), Washington, D.C., May 18, 1966.)

Republican conclusions or recommendations

"The free nations of NATO should act as one when they are confronted with foreign-policy problems of common concern like the Communist threat in South Vietnam.

* * * * *

"We urge that NATO be used automatically to develop unified free-world policy on all critical problems which, like Vietnam, have worldwide importance."

(Reps. Adair, Chamberlain, Cleveland, Ellsworth, Findley, Keith, Martin, Morton, Pirnie, Quie, and the late Rep. Baldwin, in a Press Release, April 6, 1965.)

"Our most urgent need is to get the free nations to act together. This calls for imaginative leadership to rebuild our principal and most promising free-world alliance, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. NATO should be used automatically to develop unified policy in problem areas like Vietnam."

(Reps. Adair, Chamberlain, Cleveland, Ellsworth, Findley, Keith, Martin, Morton, Pirnie, and Quie, in a Press Release, April 8, 1965.)

"So far as I can determine we have not tried to stop free-world shipping to North Vietnam, and of course economic sanctions against Cuba fell apart when our administration insisted upon selling wheat to Russia.

* * * * *

"NATO should be used automatically to develop unified policy in problem areas like Vietnam and Dominican Republic."

(Rep. Findley in Press Release, May 5, 1965.)

Subsequent parallel statements by Democratic administration spokesmen and other influential persons

"NATO should adapt to the changing needs of the times . . . Consultation not isolation is the route to reform. We must not forget . . . that we have one common danger—diversion; and one common safety—unity."

(President Johnson, in address, "Our View of NATO," to the Foreign Service Institute, Department of State, Washington, March 23, 1966.)

(Source: The Department of State Bulletin, Vol. LIV, No. 1398, April 11, 1966, Pg. 555.)

Republican conclusions or recommendations

"Propose that NATO speak with one voice in regard to a pact on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, and with that in mind, announce that the United States will place the pact question before the NATO Council and delay further discussions of the proposal at Geneva until NATO has reached a policy position."

(Reps. Findley and Ellsworth in a letter to President Johnson, Dec. 17, 1965.)

Source: News Release by Rep. Findley, Dec. 17, 1965.)

Subsequent parallel statements by Democratic administration spokesmen and other influential persons

"A decision should be delayed no longer on the issue of nuclear sharing within NATO. We must make up our minds whether to give priority to binding West Germany more tightly into the remnants of the NATO organizational structure or whether to seek further agreements with the Soviet Union in the field of nuclear arms control. If a consultative arrangement, along the lines contemplated by the McNamara Committee, is settled upon with West Germany, then the way may yet be open to reach agreement with the Soviet Union on a non-proliferation treaty. I strongly recommend this course as best suited to our highest national interests."

(Senator Church in *Europe Today* report to the Senate Foreign Relations Comm. on a study mission to Brussels, Paris, London, Bonn, Berlin and the Eighteen Nation Conference in Geneva, May 1966.)

(Source: Committee Print, 89th Congress, 2d Session, May 1966, Pg. 6.)

"I would like to emphasize that there is no conflict between United States' non-proliferation policy and possible nuclear arrangements proposed for the NATO alliance. No one in NATO has been talking about any arrangement which would involve the proliferation of nuclear weapons. No NATO nuclear sharing proposal would increase the number of independent nuclear weapon entities."

(Secretary Rusk in statement, "Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons," made to Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Feb. 23, 1966.)

(Source: The Department of State Bulletin, Vol. LIV, No. 1394, March 14, 1966, Pg. 407.)

NATO MUST BE REFORMED

Republican conclusions or recommendations

"The fundamental bases of the alliance have changed so extensively that a thorough re-evaluation of American policy is required."

(Rep. Findley, Ch. and Reps. Pirnie, Keith, Martin, members of Republican Fact-Finding Mission on NATO in a report to the Republican Conference, U.S. House of Representatives, June 30, 1965.)

Subsequent parallel statements by Democratic administration spokesmen and other influential persons

"We do not believe in standing pat. If an organization is alive and vital, if it is to have any meaning for all time as well as for any particular time, it must grow and respond and yield to change . . . the North Atlantic Treaty is more than just a legal document. It is the foundation of a living institution . . ."

(President Johnson in an address, "Our View of NATO," to Foreign Service Institute, Department of State, Washington, March 23, 1966.)

(Source: The Department of State Bulletin, Vol. LIV, No. 1398, April 11, 1966, Pg. 555.)

Republican conclusions or recommendations

"We strongly urge a NATO 'hot line' in addition to the Washington-Moscow 'hot line.' It would connect all NATO capitals so they could instantly communicate with each other. It would also have a listening device which would also automatically relay to NATO capitals all messages carried over the separate Washington-Moscow 'hot line.' "

(Representatives Quie, Adair, Curtis, Findley, Ellsworth, Keith, Goodell, Ford, Morton, Cleveland, Pirnie, and the late Rep. Baldwin in a letter to Pres. Kennedy, August 24, 1963.)

Subsequent parallel statements by Democratic administration spokesmen and other influential persons

"The purposes of communication with our allies are entirely different from those of the 'hot line,' being directed toward consultation rather than toward the prevention of catastrophe in a moment of crisis. We have an extensive network of communication channels with our allies, both military and diplomatic.

"However, I entirely agree with you on the importance of even speedier communications with our NATO allies and with the assistance of the Department of Defense we are exploring the technical feasibility of installing even more direct communication links with the NATO governments."

(Secretary Rusk in a letter to Rep. Findley, Sept. 26, 1963.)

Action taken

"The United States is prepared to propose to its European allies the establishment of an intricate net of 'hot lines' that would allow instantaneous consultations among the leading NATO capitals in crisis situations.

"Such a set of hot-line links was described by officials here as one of the objectives of the four or five-power defense ministers' committees proposed by the United States at the NATO meeting in Paris over the weekend."

(Howard Margolies, Washington Post Staff Writer, in an article on June 2, 1965, Wash. Post, page 1.)

Republican conclusions or recommendations

"As you consider the establishment of a net of hot lines which would permit instantaneous consultation among the NATO capitals, we hope you will have the opportunity to review our initial suggestion to President Kennedy in August 1963 which stresses the importance of having our allies 'listen in' on the Washington-Moscow line to allay any suspicions they might have of U.S.-Soviet dealings to which they are not privy."

(Rep. Paul Findley in letter to President Johnson, June 2, 1965.)

Subsequent parallel statements by Democratic administration spokesmen and other influential persons

"The European role in SHAPE should be sharply upgraded. Since the headquarters exists for the defense of Europe, I would recommend establishing a hot line communications system, linking together the heads of the NATO governments, to enable immediate consultation in cases of emergency."

(Senator Church in Europe Today, report to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on a study mission to Brussels, Paris, London, Bonn, Berlin and the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Conference, Geneva.)

(Source: Committee Print, 89th Congress, 2d Session, May 1966.)

* * * * *

"There is every good reason why the allied capitals in Europe and North America should be linked by the most effective communications arrangements that modern technology has made possible. There is still much to be done to update present arrangements."

(Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations in the *Atlantic Alliance: Basic Issues*, a study submitted to the Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate, Feb. 18, 1966.)

(Source: Committee Print, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, 1966.)

U.S. IS NEGLECTING NATO—IS PREOCCUPIED WITH VIETNAM

Republican conclusions or recommendations

"The Atlantic is neglected. It must have immediate attention."

(Rep. Findley, chm., and Reps. Pirnie, Keith, and Martin of the Republican Factfinding Mission on NATO in a report to the Republican Conference, U.S. House of Representatives, June 30, 1965.)

Subsequent parallel statements by Democratic administration spokesmen and other influential persons

"We cannot afford to be totally preoccupied with the conflict in Vietnam. The North Atlantic area is still the decisive area and it needs our immediate attention."

(Senator Henry M. Jackson in foreword to *The Atlantic Alliance: Basic Issues*, a study submitted by the Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations to the Committee on Government Operations of the United States Senate, Feb. 18, 1966.)

(Source: Committee Print, 89th Congress, 2d Session, 1966.)

Republican conclusions or recommendations

"On June 26, 1965, the House Republican Factfinding Mission on NATO, which had just completed a study in Paris, presented to the Johnson Administration a series of recommendations aimed at improving relationships with France and strengthening NATO.

"That was more than two months ago. Two months of inaction. Had these suggestions been acted upon promptly, I am confident that President de Gaulle would have had no reason to speak today as he did. Now the U.S. must react, instead of act—or still worse, continue to ignore this growing problem. If President Johnson continues to neglect NATO, we will soon face grave problems."

(Rep. Paul Findley in Press Release—Sept. 9, 1965.)

Subsequent parallel statements by Democratic administration spokesmen and other influential persons

"The problems of the Atlantic Alliance call for more and better attention on the part of our government than they are receiving."

(Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations in *The Atlantic Alliance: Basic Issues*, a study submitted to the Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate, Feb. 18, 1966.)

(Source: Committee Print, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, 1966).

"We should have acted earlier and not under the compulsion of events. We should have tried to move forward together to a closer international association in order to remove the risk of sliding backwards."

(Prime Minister Pearson of Canada in address at Atlantic Union Award dinner, Springfield, Ill., June 11, 1966.)

(Source: Congressional Record, June 14, 1966, pp. 12501–2.)

Republican conclusions or recommendations

"President Johnson should have recognized long ago that the structure was outdated and unrealistic, and acted accordingly. Instead the Administration has simply expressed satisfaction with things as they are."

(Rep. Paul Findley in Press Release, Sept. 9, 1965).

Subsequent parallel statements by democratic administration spokesmen and other influential persons

"NATO policy, NATO organization, and NATO armaments are completely antiquated."

(Former Chancellor Konrad Adenauer of West Germany in speech at Bonn, May 16, 1966) (Source: Washington Post, May 16, 1966.)

Republican conclusions or recommendations

"I respectfully urge that you send Secretary of State Rusk, as originally planned, as the United States Delegate to the NATO Ministerial meeting which begins tomorrow in London.

"In substituting an undersecretary for our top foreign policy official, you imply a greater concern for the Dominican crisis than for the problem of NATO unity."

(Rep. Findley in telegram to President Johnson, May 10, 1965).

Subsequent parallel statements by democratic administration spokesman and other influential persons

"The President has asked me to acknowledge your telegram of May 10. As you will have seen by the time this message reaches you, the Secretary has been able to leave this evening to attend the last half of the NATO meeting."

(Mr. McGeorge Bundy's letter to Rep. Findley, May 11, 1965).

U.S. MUST LEAD IN SEEKING NATO REFORM

Republican conclusions or recommendations

"President Johnson is the ex-officio leader of the alliance because present circumstances center all of its real authority in his hands. He alone controls the nuclear weapons on which all NATO nations depend. He personally selects the supreme commanders of the alliance. Therefore, he alone is in a position to bring about effective reforms quickly. He must act, or nothing of consequence will happen."

(Rep. Findley in statement to House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe, June 1, 1966.)

(Source: Findley press release June 1, 1966.)

Subsequent parallel statements by Democratic administration spokesmen and other influential persons

"I believe that only the United States can give the effective lead required for Atlantic Unity. Without her active participation and support, nothing can be done; at least on the broad front which is essential."

(Prime Minister Pearson of Canada in address at Atlantic Union Award dinner, Springfield, Ill., June 11, 1966.)

(Source: Congressional Record, June 14, 1966, pp. 13113–13115.)

Republican conclusions or recommendations

"Some observers attribute de Gaulle's words and actions to a desire to wreck NATO . . . The important question today is what the United States will do: ignore the challenge and pursue our present passive and uncreative course, talking affirmatively but acting negatively? Or, take forward action to meet legitimate complaints?

"The latter course is the wise one. It might bring to the surface and clarify de Gaulle's true intentions. It would provide our other NATO allies the opportunity to establish their rightful position within NATO, without having to submit to the exclusive dominance of one man or nation. Certainly, it would make NATO stronger no matter which way France ultimately turns."

(Rep. Paul Findley, in statement on "De Gaulle's Unanswered Challenge," October 15, 1965.)

"News reports today indicate the United States will soon demand that NATO political offices be withdrawn from France. I hope the reports are unfounded. If the proposal should come up for review, I urge that it be rejected. As leader, I hope you will not only reject this negative approach but step in personally with affirmative action to bridge the growing chasm between these historic friends before it is too late."

(Rep. FINDLEY in letter to President Johnson, March 30, 1966.)

Subsequent parallel statements by Democratic administration spokesmen and other influential persons

"President Johnson has spoken of the need for 'building bridges' to Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. De Gaulle's initiative makes it more urgent that we assume our natural position of leadership in this vital endeavor."

Senator CHURCH in "Europe Today," report to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, on a Study Mission to Brussels, Paris, London, Bonn, Berlin and the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Conference, Geneva, May 1966.)

(Source: Committee Print, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, May 1966.)

"If the reason for General de Gaulle's action is his belief that the other allies will not consider any change to NATO to meet new conditions, let's take positive action about the necessary reforms."

(Prime Minister Pearson of Canada in address at Atlantic Union Award dinner, Springfield, Ill., June 11, 1966.)

(Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 14, 1966, pp. 13113–13115.)

Republican conclusions or recommendations

"We . . . urge that you invite former Presidents Dwight D. Eisenhower and Harry S. Truman to head a blue-ribbon delegation of United States citizens to meet with similar groups from other NATO nations for the purpose of formulating and proposing for ratification improvements in the structure of NATO."

(Reps. QUIE, CHAMBERLAIN, RHODES, KEITH, MORTON, PIRNIE, ADAIR, CLEVELAND, CURTIS, FINDLEY, FORD, ELLSWORTH, and the late Rep. Baldwin in a letter to President Johnson, May 14, 1964).

(Rep. GOODELL joined these in a similar recommendation, Dec. 25, 1964)

"We strongly urge the President to appoint a blue-ribbon group of U.S. citizens to meet with similar groups from other NATO nations. The purpose of the meeting would be to study the alliance structure and recommend improvements."

(Rep. FINDLEY in Press Release, April 6, 1965).

Subsequent parallel statements by Democratic administration spokesmen and other influential persons

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That, (1) the Congress hereby creates an Atlantic Union delegation, composed of eighteen eminent citizens, and authorized to organize and participate in a convention made up of similar delegations from such North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies as desire to join in this enterprise, to explore the possibility of agreement on:

(a) A declaration that the eventual goal of their peoples is to transform their present alliance into a federal union; . . .

"(5) The Congress hereby requests former Presidents Dwight D. Eisenhower and Harry S. Truman to serve as co-chairmen of the delegation."

(16 senators and 81 representatives sponsored the above beginning Oct. 18, 1965. 23 additional representatives agreed to support it).

". . . the President should promptly seek to establish a Special Government Commission composed, in the first instance, of representatives of NATO nations to study and recommend concrete steps toward the attainment of:

1. Development, by exploration and agreement with our Allies, of an Atlantic Community adequate to meet the political, military and economic challenges of this era.

2. Such a community to be composed of nations which share our basic ideals of freedom, democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law and as are willing to accept the benefits and responsibilities of close political, military and economic ties.

3. Such a Community to be conceived and developed in the interest not only of its own peoples but of all free peoples and to be open to the admission of others as and when their governments become willing and able to assume the benefits and responsibilities of membership."

(Senator CHURCH, joined by Senators CARLSON, CASE, CLARK, COOPER and DODD, in a resolution introduced July 12, 1965).

(Representatives CLEVELAND, ELLSWORTH, FINDLEY, GOODELL, KEITH, MARTIN, PIRNIE, QUIE, REID and the late Rep. Baldwin introduced identical resolutions in the House July 13, 1965).

Republican conclusions or recommendations

"We urge the President to issue a call for an immediate top-level NATO conference to . . . (increase) the authority of NATO . . . so that it . . . (could) strengthen and develop . . . competitive practices in world commerce and . . . resist any monopolistic state-dominated trade warfare of the Communists."

(Reps. ADAIR, CURTIS, ELLSWORTH, FINDLEY, FORD, GOODELL, KEITH, MORTON, PIRNIE, and the late Rep. Baldwin in a memorandum to Republican delegates to the NATO parliamentarian Conference, about Sept. 1964.)

"NATO is of paramount importance to the future security of the free world and I hope to see the problems of NATO given major attention by . . . (a) Blue Ribbon Commission."

(Representative MELVIN LAIRD in a statement to the House June 28, 1966), (Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 14534, June 28, 1966).

". . . President Kennedy (should) call for the establishment of a committee within NATO to study the matter of economic warfare and to act as a regulatory body empowered to restrict trade between NATO nations and the Soviet Bloc when such restrictions appear to be to the advantage of NATO in the cold war."

(Reps. ADAIR, CURTIS, ELLSWORTH, FINDLEY, FORD, GOODELL, KEITH, MORTON, PIRNIE, and the late Rep. Baldwin in a memorandum to Republican delegates to the NATO parliamentarian conference, about Sept. 1964.)

U.S. DOMINATES NATO BUT SEEKS GREATER COMMITMENT BY ALLIES

Republican conclusions or recommendations

"United States dominates the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to an unnecessary degree.

"Now all of these proud nations deserve a more important role in NATO. One of them—France—is plainly demanding changes. Prompt action is needed to keep NATO from falling apart. The NATO facts-of-life must be faced squarely and chief among them is that the U.S. does indeed dominate the military structure."

(Rep. PAUL FINDLEY, Press Release, October 15, 1965).

Subsequent parallel statements by Democratic administration spokesmen and other influential persons

"France is not, has not been, and will not be satisfied with an Atlantic organization, or an Atlantic alliance of independent states, dominated by America."

(Prime Minister Pearson, of Canada, at the Atlantic Union Award dinner, Springfield, Ill., June 11, 1966). (Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 14, 1966, pp. 13113–13115.)

"France, and not only France, feels that Continental Europe is now strong enough . . . to be given its rightful share in the control of the policies of the Alliance."

(Prime Minister Pearson of Canada in address at Atlantic Union Award dinner, Springfield, Ill., June 11, 1966.)

(Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 14, 1966, pp. 13113–13115.)

"Canada and the European allies need greater access to the policy counsels of the United States, and vice versa, not just regarding the more remote contingencies of nuclear war, but also the ambiguous challenges that a flexible communist strategy makes probable. What the allies, including West Germany, need is confidence that they are, in fact, involved in major issues of strategic and political planning in such ways as to influence the actions of the United States government in a crisis."

(Subcommittee on Nat'l. Security and Int'l. Operations in *The Atlantic Alliance: Basic Issues*, a study submitted to the Committee on Gov't. Opers., U.S. Senate, Feb. 18, 1966.)

(Source: Committee Print, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, 1966.)

Republican conclusions or recommendations

". . . the renewed strength of our European allies suggests that they are now ready to assume a larger share in the responsibilities of the alliance.

"We welcome this increased capability and we should recognize the contributions our European partners can make and should gladly grant them more responsible roles in the alliance."

(Rep. FINDLEY, Ch. and Reps. PIRNIE, KEITH, and MARTIN, members of the Republican Fact-Finding Mission on NATO in a report to the Republican Conference, U.S. House of Representatives, June 30, 1965.)

Subsequent parallel statements by Democratic administration spokesmen and other influential persons

"We want no satellites. What we prefer most as partners are strong nations which are at once dependable, independent, but interdependent allies. What we have long sought is an equal partnership with a Europe moving toward unity."

(Secretary Rusk, in interview with Paris-Match for publication in the April 16 issue of that magazine.)

(Source: The Dept. of State Bulletin, Vol. LIV, No. 1401, May 2, 1966, page 695.)

". . . the time has become ripe to reevaluate, in a fundamental sense the structure of NATO . . . it appears to me that far greater responsibility than in the past, under the treaty, can and should devolve on the European members of the alliance."

(Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, April 25, 1966.)

(Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Republican conclusions or recommendations

"Yield some of the U.S. command positions in NATO to make possible a more reasonable division of them among officers of other nations. Former President Eisenhower recently suggested that a French officer be named SACEUR. Certainly the key positions should be more fairly distributed—perhaps rotated—thus creating a command structure that reflects a greater degree of partnership."

(Rep. PAUL FINDLEY, in a statement on "De Gaulle's Unanswered Challenge," October 15, 1965.)

Subsequent parallel statements by Democratic administration spokesmen and other influential persons

"It is not for the United States to 'give' any command to any NATO member. The command arrangements of NATO are for all the NATO members to consider and decide among themselves, not just one or a few."

(Secretary Rusk in interview with Paris-Match for publication in the April 16 issue of that mag.)

(Source: The Dept. of State Bulletin, Vol. LIV, No. 1401, May 2, 1966, p. 697.)

"The European role in SHAPE should be sharply upgraded. Since the headquarters exists for the defense of Europe, I would recommend appointing a European general to serve as SACEUR, under a command arrangement which would leave control of our nuclear weapons in the hands of the President of the United States."

(Sen. CHURCH in *Europe Today*, report to the Sen. Foreign Relations Committee on a Study Mission to Brussels, Paris, London, Bonn, Berlin, and the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Conference, Geneva, May 1966).

(Source: Committee Print, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, May 1966, p. 6.)

Republican conclusions or recommendations

"We suggest the following unilateral actions be undertaken by the United States in order to alleviate some of the most pressing difficulties of the Atlantic Alliance:

3. Propose the establishment of a Diplomatic Standing Group . . . (to) aid the NATO Council in political matters in much the same way the Military Standing Group now aids the Council in military affairs."

(Rep. FINDLEY Chm., and Reps. PIRNIE, KEITH, MARTIN, members of Republican Fact-Finding Mission on NATO in a report to the Republican Conference, U.S. House of Representatives, June 30, 1965.)

Subsequent parallel statements by Democratic administration spokesmen and other influential persons

"What is required is access of key men to key men, at the North Atlantic Council and by new consultative arrangements close to, or closely linked with the centers of national decision-making."

(Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations in *The Atlantic Alliance: Basic Issues*, a study submitted to the Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate, Feb. 18, 1966.)

(Source: Committee Print, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, 1966.)

U.S. MONOPOLIZES NUCLEAR CONTROL AND RESTRICTS ROLE OF ALLIES—ESPECIALLY FRANCE

Republican conclusions or recommendations

"We suggest the following unilateral actions be undertaken by the United States in order to alleviate some of the most pressing difficulties of the Atlantic Alliance:

Clarify our policy with respect to employment of nuclear weapons . . .

We should reaffirm our determination to participate fully in the joint defense of Europe, and at the same time declare our desire to work out a means for more fully sharing decision-making with our allies."

"As a minimal first-step toward strengthening NATO, we should abandon . . . the obsolete policy (of denying our allies information which the enemy possesses) and share weapons and know-how with our allies. . . . without further delay, we should provide them with tactical nuclear weapons."

(Rep. FINDLEY, Press Release, November 19, 1963).

(Rep. FINDLEY, Chm., and Reps. PIRNIE, KEITH and MARTIN, mbrs. of Repub. Fact-Finding Mission on NATO, a report to the Repub. Conference, U.S. House of Repres., June 30, 1965.)

Subsequent parallel statements by Democratic administration spokesmen and other influential persons

"Common planning and consultation are essential aspects of any sensible substitute to the unworkable and dangerous alternative of independent national nuclear forces within alliance.

"However, the European members of the alliance have a natural desire to participate more actively in nuclear planning. A central task of the alliance today is, therefore, to work out the relationships and institutions through which shared nuclear planning can be effective."

(Sec'y. McNamara in address to American Society of Newspaper Editors, Montreal, Canada, May 18, 1966.)

(Source: News release, Office of Asst. Sec'y. of Defense (Public Affairs), May 18, 1966.)

Republican conclusions or recommendations

"Gestures of friendship are not signs of weakness. President Theodore Roosevelt once said, 'Magnanimity is more becoming in the strong than in the weak.' If this be true, any overtures of friendship in this hour of America's greatest power will be warmly received . . .

"It has taken many years to develop Franco-American friendship, but considering the impact of today's press, radio and television, the goodwill of centuries can be destroyed in a very brief period."

(Rep. FINDLEY, Ch. and Reps. PIRNIE, KEITH, MARTIN, members of Republican Fact-Finding Mission on NATO in a report to the Republican Conference, U.S. House of Representatives, June 3, 1965.)

Subsequent parallel statements by Democratic administration spokesmen and other influential persons

"I think that no resentment of ours or of any other NATO member should be expressed publicly against France, nor should any economic or political set of ours deepen the rift that has developed.

"I would do nothing whatsoever to antagonize the French people. That nation is our traditional friend. I believe we should take the attitude that while we are saddened that France has seen fit to act independently of all other nations in the alliance, all are still ready to accept her back into the fold whenever she might desire to return."

(Former President Eisenhower, in a letter to Rep. EDNA KELLY, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe of House Foreign Affairs Com., May 17, 1966.)

(Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 23, 1966, pp. 11129–11131.)

"In no case should we disparage the greatness of France, our oldest ally, or engage in any sort of political guerrilla war against the French Government; such tactics should be reserved for our enemies.

"Accordingly, in lining up 14 to 1 against France in the current dispute over the command structure of NATO, we should strive to avoid any rupture between France and her European neighbors so bitter as to propel the French toward neutralism or vengeance."

(Senator CHURCH in *Europe Today* report to the Senate Relations Committee on a study mission to Brussels, Paris, London, Bonn, Berlin, and the Eighteen Nation Conference in Geneva, May 1966.)

(Source: Committee Print, 89th Congress, 2d Session, May 1966, p. 6.)

Republican conclusions or recommendations

". . . the United States should immediately reexamine its policy on technological and scientific cooperation. We should take full advantage of any discretionary provisions of our Atomic Energy Act, and if need be amend it, to the end that the nuclear capabilities of France and the United States may be fully coordinated."

(Rep. FINDLEY, Ch. and Reps. PIRNIE, KEITH, MARTIN, members of Republican Fact Finding Mission on NATO in a report to the Republican Conference, U.S. House of Representatives, June 30, 1966.)

Subsequent parallel statements by Democratic administration spokesmen and other influential persons

"It seemed to me strange that even though the Soviets long ago succeeded in developing a nuclear capability of great strength and efficiency we have been forced by law (Atomic Energy Act) to keep any useful knowledge about the science from most of our partners in NATO."

(Former President Eisenhower, in a letter to Rep. EDNA KELLY, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe of House Foreign Affairs Committee, May 17, 1966).

(Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 23, 1966, pp. 11129–11131.)

FRENCH-UNITED STATES RIFT ENDANGERS NATO—UNITED STATES SHOULD BE CORDIAL AND LEAD IN SEEKING SOLUTIONS

Republican conclusions or recommendations

"We believe it is high time for the Presidents of the two great republics to confer with each other. We urge that you be the one to break the ice, and make the kind of visit to President de Gaulle that President Kennedy originally planned but failed to carry out.

"We urge that you go to Europe at the earliest possible date for the single purpose of conferring with the French executive."

(Rep. FINDLEY, Chm., and Reps. ADAIR, CHAMBERLAIN, CLEVELAND, ELLSWORTH, KEITH, MARTIN, MORTON, QUIE, PIRNIE, and the late Rep. Baldwin, mbrs of the House Repub-Comte on NATO in a ltr to Pres. Johnson, Apr. 20, 1965.)

"We suggest the following unilateral actions be undertaken by the United States in order to alleviate some of the most pressing difficulties of the Atlantic Alliance:

"Demonstrate our continuing friendship for France. The most impressive demonstration would be a trip to Europe by the President of the United States for the single purpose of visiting the French President."

(Rep. FINDLEY, Ch. and Reps. PIRNIE, KEITH, MARTIN, members of Republican Fact-Finding Mission on NATO in a report to the Republican Conference, U.S. House of Representatives, June 30, 1965.)

"Because of the enormous importance to the United States of French participation in the Atlantic Alliance, I respectfully urge that you arrange to visit Paris at the earliest possible date for the single purpose of meeting with President de Gaulle.

"Therefore, I once again urge that you visit Paris as soon as possible for a long overdue meeting with the French President."

(House Republican Committee on NATO, in a letter to President Johnson, Press Release, March 18, 1966).

"At this late hour, can anything be done to save the alliance from further fragmentation? A personal trip to Paris by President Johnson still might salvage NATO, if he were prepared to discuss specific proposals which would assure NATO-wide cooperation in technology of all sorts—including nuclear matters, as well as a partnership system for making alliance policy and carrying it out, and a joint arrangement for handling worldwide matters like Vietnam."

(Rep. PAUL FINDLEY to the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe, June 1, 1966).

(Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 11912–11913.)

Subsequent parallel statements by Democratic administration spokesmen and other influential persons

"It is crucial that effective communication be restored between the French and American governments. If a summit meeting between the two presidents is not now feasible then consideration should be given to the appointment of a special American emissary who will endeavor to act between President Johnson and General de Gaulle as Harry Hopkins acted between President Roosevelt and Winston Churchill. His purpose would be to reopen and develop a dialogue to the point where a summit meeting between the two presidents would seem likely to bear fruit."

(Senator Church, in *Europe Today,* report to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, on a study mission to Brussels, Paris, London, Bonn, Berlin and the Eighteen Nation Conference in Geneva, May 1966.)

(Source: Committee Print, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, May 1966, p. 6.)

"Perhaps the best way to preserve NATO is through a person-to-person visit. . . . I would hope that he (Johnson) could find the time to go to Paris, and only Paris, to sit down with President de Gaulle and talk over the problems of NATO."

(Senator Thruston Morton at University of Ky., Alumni Day, April 2, 1966.)

"Sooner or later you are going to meet with De Gaulle."

(Vice President Humphrey, Northern Virginia Sun, July 1, 1966.)

Republican conclusions or recommendations

"Had . . . (De Gaulle) not invoked latent forces that were potent and durable, not only in France but also in the rest of Western Europe, the French effort would not have succeeded."

(Rep. Findley, Ch. and Reps. Pirnie, Keith, Martin, members of Republican Fact-Finding Mission on NATO in a report to the Republican Conference, U.S. House of Representatives, June 30, 1965.)

Subsequent parallel statements by Democratic administration spokesmen and other influential persons

"We should not try to throw all the blame on France and General de Gaulle for recent NATO developments."

(Prime Minister Pearson of Canada in address at Atlantic Union Award dinner, Springfield, Ill., June 11, 1966.)

(Source: Congressional Record, June 14, 1966, pp. 13113–13115.)

Republican conclusions or recommendations

"Regardless of what his intentions may be, the French president has rendered a service in focusing attention on weaknesses in NATO. Real integration of at least a portion of NATO's impressive military might is urgently needed."

(Rep. Paul Findley in statement on "De Gaulle's Unanswered Challenge," October 15, 1965.)

Subsequent parallel statements by Democratic administration spokesmen and other influential persons

"If there must be a unique role ascribed to President de Gaulle, it is that of opening the valve to release the pressures for change in NATO which have been building for many years. Now that it is open, the valve is not likely to be closed again until there has been a thorough consideration of the premises as well as the present relevance of the bureaucratic structure which underpins the Atlantic Alliance . . ."

(Senate Majority Leader Mansfield, Apr. 25, 1966.)

(Source: Congressional Record.)

"While France is not alone in this feeling (of strength), only De Gaulle has translated it into policy and action."

(Prime Minister Pearson of Canada in address at Atlantic Union Award dinner, Springfield, Ill., June 11, 1966.)

(Source: Congressional Record, June 14, 1966, pp. 13113–13115.)

Republican conclusions or recommendations

". . . Gemini is the culmination of a long era of scientific and technological progress that has been by no means exclusively American. It is to the broader Atlantic civilization that the credit must be given . . .

* * * * *

"French, German, British, Scandinavian, Italian, and scientists of other nationalities have earned honored places alongside American aeronautical and space pioneers in the history of Gemini. Each of the countless systems that make up a successful launch and flight has reached its present development through the work of men and women from every quarter of the western world."

(Rep. Findley, at a luncheon sponsored by the France-American Committee, Paris, June 16, 1965.)

(Source: Press Release, June 16, 1965.)

Subsequent parallel statements by Democratic administration spokesmen and other influential persons

"The United States does not regard its accomplishments in space exploration as narrow national achievements. The eight countries that cooperate in our manned flight networks have played a vital part in the Gemini flights. The three countries that cooperate in our deep space tracking and data acquisition network can feel that they, too, have made the acquaintance of our neighbor Mars."

(Arthur J. Goldberg, U.S. Representative to the U.N. General Assembly, in a statement to Committee I [Political and Security], Dec. 18, 1965.)

NEW APPROACHES ARE NEEDED—A FEDERATION OF FREE NATIONS SHOULD BE CONSIDERED

Republican conclusions or recommendations

"Today, as in 1862, the dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. . . . We must think anew and act anew . . .

"The people of the United States should offer . . . common citizenship to freedom-loving people beyond our borders . . . by inviting the people of other free nations to join with us in establishing a new federal union government . . ."

(Rep. Findley in address to American Academy of Political and Social Science, Philadelphia, Pa., April 15, 1966)

(Source: Congressional Record, April 25, 1966, pp. 8799–8801.)

Subsequent parallel statements by Democratic administration spokesmen and other influential persons

". . . I pay my humble tribute to those . . . who are working . . . to lay the foundation . . . (for) a union of peoples for peace and freedom.

"What we seek is new and unprecedented. But so is our world. Abraham Lincoln once said: 'As our case is new, so we must think and act anew.'

"Today, we must think anew and act anew."

(Prime Minister Pearson of Canada in address at Atlantic Union Award dinner, Springfield, Ill., June 11, 1966.)

(Source: Congressional Record, June 14, 1966, pp. 13113–13115.)

VIETNAM ALLIES SHOULD BE CONSULTED ON PLANNING

Republican conclusions or recommendations

"I take the liberty to transmit the suggestion that you invite the chiefs of state of Australia and South Korea—the only other nations with combat troops in South Vietnam—to join your strategy discussions with Premier Ky. The suggestion was made earlier today by House Minority Leader Ford."

(Rep. Paul Findley in telegram to President Johnson, February 6, 1966.)

"I respectfully suggest that you arrange at the earliest possible date a conference which will let the world know that this is and must increasingly become a team effort.

". . . invite the chiefs of state of Australia and South Korea and perhaps others like the Philippines from whom we seek increased support.

"Such a conference might well lead to the support which Secretary of State Rusk recently sought from our NATO allies."

(Rep. Findley in a letter to President Johnson, February 8, 1966.)

"Your October meeting with the leaders of Asian countries which share our burden in Vietnam presents an excellent opportunity to broaden support for the war both at home and abroad. To that end we respectfully suggest:

"1. That the focus of the discussions be on current military plans and policy as well as future economic development. This would demonstrate our desire for help at the strategy table as well as on the battlefield and hopefully encourage other nations to lend military support. As noted in a telegram to you February 6 in connection with the Honolulu conference, we can more reasonably expect help in the fighting if our allies take part in the planning.

"2. That, in advance, you express the hope that this conference will be the beginning of joint policy development concerning all vital problems in Southeast Asia.

"Otherwise, it may be construed as a mere gesture intended to win support for our present go-it-alone posture.

"3. That your team of advisers include bipartisan Congressional representation.

This would help to assure broad public support for whatever measures are undertaken and also would counter possible criticism that the conference—timed as it is—has partisan overtones." (Representatives Findley, Andrews, Brown, Burton, Clausen, Collier, Conable, Erlenborn, Fulton, Hosmer, Keith, Mize, Quie, Reid, Schneebeli, Shriver, Skubitz, and Thomson, in a telegram to Pres. Johnson, Sept. 28, 1966.)

Subsequent parallel statements by democratic administration spokesmen and other influential persons

"On behalf of the President, in response to your telegram to him dated February 6, I would like to express his appreciation for your highly constructive proposal for broadening the Honolulu conference to include the leaders of South Korea and Australia." (Don Ropa of the White House staff, in a letter to Representative Findley, Feb. 7, 1966.)

"I am sure that the President will be grateful for the benefit of your advice." (Henry H. Wilson, Administrative Assistant to the President, in a letter to Representative Findley, Sept. 30, 1966.)

Action taken

President Johnson accepted the invitation of President Marcos of the Philippines—issued as the latter ended a formal visit to the U.S.—to confer with leaders of Asian nations involved in the Vietnam war. He departed October 1966 with a large entourage.

THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS AND GOLD DRAIN

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on October 3, the Republican Coordinating Committee reissued the report of its task force on Federal fiscal and monetary policies, entitled "The Balance of Payments, the Gold Drain, and Your Dollar," with an accompanying statement outlining the gravity of the situation, the failure of the present administration and Congress to take constructive action, and reemphasizing the validity of the recommendations approved by the coordinating committee on August 31, 1965.

International monetary affairs are so far removed from the everyday cares and interests of most of our lives that few people are keenly aware of the severe consequences that can follow from continued inept management of these policies.

This further warning from the coordinating committee is very timely in view of the recent meeting of international monetary officials in Washington in late September.

Should anyone suspect the seriousness of the problem and the action of the coordinating committee are only partisan cries of alarm, I should like to quote briefly from a report dated September 21 from the Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments of the Joint Economic Committee. This bipartisan group, in its report, "Twenty Years After: An Appeal for the Renewal of International Economic Cooperation on a Grand Scale," says among other things:

> But the spirit of 1947 and the determination to solve vital problems are missing today . . .
>
> The world is in trouble—deep trouble—in at least five different areas of economic negotiation and policy . . .
>
> Lipservice to interdependence is common, but actual international cooperation fades hourly into the background . . .
>
> The larger countries pledge international cooperation but practice national parochialism . . .
>
> Psychologically the world is on a dangerous skid toward international chaos.

In short, we have here another situation where our Government is called on for vision and leadership, but so far has miserably failed to meet the test. Continued failure to anticipate developing problems and deal with them while there is still time is the hallmark of this administration. It reacts only to felt political needs. Its vision extends only as far as the next election. Its actions are generally more for appearances than for results. Expedients and palliatives rather than definitive remedial action are the order of the day.

Rather than a "great" society, history may well judge it a "too little and too late society," or possibly, just the "late society."

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert into the RECORD the coordinating committee statement released October 14, together with the full text of the original report, "The Balance of Payments, the Gold Drain, and Your Dollar."

THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS AND GOLD DRAIN

(By the Republican Coordinating Committee, Oct. 3, 1966)

A MESSAGE FOR EVERY AMERICAN

Relentlessly, the economic and political forces operating in the world today appear to be driving the United States toward a financial crisis in its international accounts. Many other free nations would be pulled into any such malestrom. Those forces can be observed at work in:

The continuing drain on the gold supply backing our currency.

The continuing excessive deficit in our international balance of payments.

The weakened position of our exports in relation to our imports (balance of trade).

The pressing demands for restructuring international monetary arrangements which are caused by an increasing lack of confidence in the dollar as a stable medium of international exchange.

Our continuing massive military expenditures and foreign aid commitments abroad.

The present and growing inflation in the United States.

The Democratic Administration and its Democratic Congress—either through their inability to observe these forces, their incapacity to understand the consequences, or their willful refusal to take effective action—are risking a serious deterioration of our whole international economic, diplomatic, and military situation.

The gravity of our situation became humiliatingly apparent at the September meeting of the Board of Governors of the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and other related international financial organizations.

There, the spokesmen for two other major nations made two points clear: (1) the United States must get its financial house in order if it is to regain for the dollar the confidence it formerly enjoyed; and (2) if the United States is to participate constructively with other nations in strengthening the present system of international trade and exchange, we must first follow ourselves the basic fiscal and monetary disciplines without which a stable and viable currency is impossible.

The reply of our Secretary of the Treasury consisted of recounting the half measures, Administration-imposed restrictions amounting to economic isolationism, and the United States evasion of the central problems of controlling inflation.

Just over one year ago, this committee approved a report, "The Balance of Payments, the Gold Drain and Your Dollar," prepared by our Task Force on Federal Fiscal and Monetary Policies. This report analyzed the problem in detail: its causes, the inadequacy of the "remedies" being applied by the Democratic Administration, and made nine proposals for correcting the situation.

These nine Republican Recommendations are as valid today as they were a year ago.

The Democratic Administration and Congress have acted on none of them.

The situation continues to deteriorate.

We have, therefore, reassessed that report for its validity and present applicability.

The only significant step taken in over a year has been taken independently by the Federal Reserve Board over Administration protest and in the face of opposition from Democratic Congressional leaders.

We are therefore today reissuing that report and urge every citizen to familiarize himself with this explosive problem which threatens destruction of our position of world leadership in the fight for peace and freedom by jeopardizing the economic strength which is the precondition for our military and diplomatic posture.

No nation can maintain world leadership if it is dealing from economic weakness.

Short-term liabilities to foreign sources in relation to U.S. gold stocks, 1960–66

[In billions of dollars]

Yearend [1]	Liabilities	Gold stock	Deficiency
1960	$21.3	$17.8	$3.5
1961	22.5	16.9	5.6
1962	25.0	16.0	9.0
1963	26.0	15.5	10.5
1964	28.9	15.4	13.5
1965	29.1	13.7	15.4
1966 (June) [2]	29.7	13.3	16.4

[1] All figures are yearend figures with the exception of the June 1966 figures.

[2] Preliminary.

Source: Federal Reserve Bulletin.

U.S. share of world trade, 1948–65

[Dollar amounts in billions]

Year	Total world exports (f.o.b.)	U.S. exports		U.S. share of world exports (percent)	
		Total	Excluding Government-financed exports	Total	Excluding Government-financed exports
1948	$53.3	$13.2	(1)	24.7	(1)
1949	53.9	12.1	(1)	22.4	(1)
1950	55.2	10.1	(1)	18.3	(1)
1951	74.8	14.1	(1)	18.9	(1)
1952	72.4	13.3	(1)	18.4	(1)
1953	73.4	12.3	(1)	16.8	(1)
1954	76.2	12.8	(1)	16.8	(1)
1955	83.0	14.3	(1)	17.2	(1)
1956	92.3	17.4	(1)	18.9	(1)
1957	99.1	19.4	(1)	19.6	(1)
1958	94.6	16.3	(1)	17.2	(1)
1959	100.3	16.3	(1)	16.3	(1)
1960	112.3	19.5	$17.5	17.4	15.6
1961	117.4	19.9	17.7	17.0	15.1
1962	123.6	20.6	18.2	16.7	14.7
1963	134.8	22.1	19.3	16.4	14.3
1964	151.2	25.3	22.5	16.7	14.9
1965	164.7	27.4	23.6	16.6	14.3

[1] Not available.

Source: International Monetary Fund, International Financial Statistics and U.S. Department of Commerce, Survey of Current Business.

THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS, THE GOLD DRAIN, AND YOUR DOLLAR

A MESSAGE FOR EVERY AMERICAN

(By the Republican Coordinating Committee task force on Federal fiscal and monetary polices)

On March 10, 1965, the Republican coordinating committee met for the first time. It decided that one of the most urgent matters of public business facing the United States was, and will continue to be, competent management of our balance of payments, gold outflow, and international monetary problems.

With money, as with dynamite, there is tremendous potential for good, or for disaster, depending on how it is managed—not just for the United States, not just for the citizen and his family, but for the whole world.

Successful management will help bring us all increasing prosperity with economic stability, and brighten the prospects for lasting peace. Poor management will result in pronounced inflation, recessions, or even a worldwide depression of severe proportions, should the present arrangements for international monetary exchange deteriorate.

Since World War II the United States has been the leading diplomatic and military power of the free world. In this role it has worked diligently and successfully for peace and the material well-being of people everywhere. This is the essential precondition to individual dignity and freedom.

But the diplomatic and military strength needed for the United States, or any nation, to maintain leadership depends on its economic health and the strength of its currency. No nation can long endure as a first-class power dressed in a shabby currency.

Today, the dollar is still the strongest currency in the world. But there is apprehension that it will not remain so. The present administration's fiscal and monetary policies create doubts. The financial burden of shouldering the free world's responsibilities—especially to wage limited wars and police actions in trouble spots such as Vietnam and Santo Domingo—give rise to further apprehension. The continuing preference of foreign creditors for payment in gold rather than dollars is the acid test of the strength of the dollar.

It should be a matter of concern to all that in the bigtime game of international finance and power politics, the present administration is putting us in a position of dealing from weakness rather than strength.

The United States should not take this risk. The stakes are too high.

For these reasons, the Republican coordinating committee enlisted a special task force of distinguished citizens and eminent authorities, each experienced in the problems of economics, finance, or public affairs to investigate the present conduct of U.S. policy in this critical area. Their report follows. We endorse it as a statement of Republican policy. We urge everyone to read it carefully not just as an interested citizen in behalf of himself and his family, but also as a citizen who is concerned for the well-being of his country and all the people of the free world.

The report is summarized as follows:

SUMMARY

I. The U.S. balance-of-payments position and loss of gold evidence a critical situation.

THE FACTS

The gold supply of the United States has dwindled from $23 billion to under $14 billion in the last 8 years.

In the first 6 months of 1965 the loss of gold was $1.2 billion, exclusive of a transfer to the International Monetary Fund.

The country is committed to keep approximately $9 billion in gold to back its currency, leaving less than $5 billion of gold to use in foreign payments.

For the last 7 years American dollars have been flowing overseas (for investments, imports, loans, foreign aid, tourism, military purposes and other spending) at a rate that has exceeded the inflow of dollars from other countries by an average of about $3 billion a year.

As a result, the country now owes $28 billion in short-term dollar balances held by foreign claimants, for which they can demand payments, directly or indirectly, in gold.

The margin of our exports over imports has shrunk alarmingly in recent months, at the rate of about $2 billion per year, from earlier levels.

In early 1965, the net outflow of dollars was stemmed only by the Government's admittedly temporary expedient of harshly restricting American direct business investments abroad and limiting private lending overseas.

The significance

The United States has failed to bring its international balance of payments into even temporary equilibrium except by the imposition of ultimately self-defeating Government controls.

The Government's management of the Nation's monetary and fiscal affairs has shaken the confidence of other nations in our ability to find lasting solutions to our balance-of-payments problem.

The international monetary system, which relies heavily on the dollar as the key international reserve currency, has been impaired by the U.S. balance-of-payments deficits to the point where drastic changes in the system are being called for.

Unless these conditions are corrected promptly, they can lead to loss of value for the dollar, loss of American strength at home and leadership abroad, loss of vigor in our economy, and loss of jobs, welfare and security for individual Americans.

II. The Democratic administration has not only failed to deal effectively with these conditions but has contributed to making them worse.

It has attempted to reassure the public with unwarrantedly optimistic statements instead of facing the problem with appropriate action.

It has consistently opposed the use of time-proven methods of monetary and fiscal restraint.

It has adopted artificial controls over the outward flow of capital as an expedient to avoid the decisive steps needed for an effective long-term solution.

Its major actions, which restrict American investment in foreign countries, are such as to be ultimately self-defeating.

Many of its efforts and proposals have been so picayune as to be meaningless, such as cutting down the small amount of goods American tourists can bring back from overseas without payment of duty.

It has persisted in out-of-date programs which involve excessive military spending in Europe.

It has allowed foreign aid programs to cause an excessive drain of our dollars.

It has allowed the balance-of-payments difficulties to grow to a point where proposals are being made for changes in the international monetary system which seem destined to reduce the role of the dollar as the principal international reserve currency.

It has followed monetary and fiscal policies which impair the Nation's capability to deal constructively with economic recessions.

III. The Repubican Party recommends that the following measures be adopted by the administration and the Congress without delay.

1. Give top priority to developing a solution to our balance-of-payments problem which will be lasting and constructive for the rest of the world as well as for ourselves.
2. Jointly, with our allies among the major industrial and trading nations, work aggressively to strengthen international monetary arrangements along noninflationary lines.
3. Lend support to a monetary policy which will narrow interest rate differentials between the United States and other countries.
4. Adopt domestic fiscal policies which avoid inflation and which preserve an ample reservoir of strength to deal with any unexpected crisis or unfavorable economic development.
5. Enlarge efforts to build export trade, including tax, depreciation, and other economic policies, and the encouragement of technological and productive superiority to enhance the competitive position of American business and labor.
6. Increase promotional efforts to encourage foreign tourism in the United States, with greater reliance on private agencies.
7. Redetermine the extent of need, under present conditions, for U.S. military forces in the European theater, with the objective of reducing our expenditures there.
8. Confine American military assistance generally to countries committed to the side of the free world in the struggle against Communist subversion and aggression.
9. Reduce the cost of foreign economic aid programs, primarily by directing assistance to those countries which maintain a hospitable climate for private investment capital, and by stimulating private initiative here and abroad to lead in their development.

This Republican program calls for the responsible use of fiscal and monetary policies, for realistic reductions of Government overseas economic and military programs, and for steps to increase the return flow of dollars. It would provide a fundamental and lasting solution to our balance-of-payments problems.

Once a program of this character took hold it would be possible to discard the administration's expedients. The recent restrictions on duty-free imports by American tourists could be relaxed immediately. The stopgap measures to limit private overseas investment—the interest equalization tax and the so-called voluntary restraint program—could be dismantled at an early date.

Adoption of this Republican program would serve notice to the world of our determination to manage our financial affairs constructively, to defend the dollar, to build our national vigor, and to enhance our moral, military, and economic power to outperform and outlast world communism.

It would allay concern over the adequacy of international liquidity and provide a solid foundation for world economic stability, development, and prosperity.

In addition, it would enable the United States, as the possessor of the world's strongest economy, to deal from a position of rebuilt and growing strength in negotiations to improve the international monetary system.

All Americans can proudly and confidently support this program and its objectives.

THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS, THE GOLD DRAIN, AND YOUR DOLLAR

The balance-of-payments problem in the international accounts of the United States, and the outflow of gold from the United States, are symptoms of a danger affecting every American's job and income, the future prosperity of the rest of the world as well as the United States, and, in the larger picture, the question of whether the free world will maintain the economic strength to prosecute and eventually to win the cold war.

Continued failure to deal adequately and promptly with the problem could contribute to a breakdown in the international monetary system with the possibility of bringing to the United States and other free nations a depression of serious proportions and duration. In such circumstances, everyone would suffer.

This paper analyzes the problem as follows:

1. Evidence of the problem.
2. How the situation developed.
3. The problem today.
4. The failure of the Democratic administrations' attempted solutions.
5. The Republican recommendations.
6. The urgency of achieving a lasting solution.

EVIDENCE OF THE PROBLEM

Existence of the problem is confirmed by the volume of material appearing in the public press about it, the profusion of speeches being given by administration officials telling what they are doing about it, their claims that their efforts are working, their explanations of failures, and their attempts to answer criticisms of their policies. Repeated warnings by monetary organizations, experts and officials abroad indicate their concern.

Only this year the administration recommended, and Congress passed, a bill which eliminated the requirement for gold as a backing for the deposit liabilities of our Federal Reserve banks, retaining only the

25 percent gold requirement against the note liabilities of the Federal Reserve system. This was an emergency measure to free more of our gold stock for payment of foreign claims. The administration had allowed itself to be forced into a position where it had to change the law or break it. The move postponed an eventual reckoning, but contributed nothing to finding a solution for the basic problem or to stopping the demand for gold.

Dramatic, objective evidence is also available in the economic statistics:

1. Beginning with 1958, the United States has had a large international payments deficit every year, which means that more dollars have flowed out of the country than have come back into it. (See table 1.)

2. Gold has been moving overseas to finance part of these deficits, with the result that the country has lost about one-third of its gold stock of 8 years ago. (See table 2.)

3. The short-term claims of foreign holders against the United States are now twice its gold stock, and if all the holders of these claims were to demand payment in gold we could not pay half of them. (See tables 3 and 4.)

In short, there is widespread agreement among authorities, among leaders of both political parties, within the Government of the United States and among officials of other countries, that the United States' international finances are in disorder. The statistics show clearly that this is the case.

Balance of payments

[In millions of dollars]

	Surplus	*Deficit*
1957	520	
1958		−3,529
1959		−3,743
1960		−3,881
1961		−2,370
1962		−2,186
1963		−2,660
1964		−3,053

U.S. gold stock

[In millions of dollars]

June 1957	22,625
December 1957	22,781
June 1958	21,356
December 1958	20,534
June 1959	19,746
December 1959	19,507
June 1960	19,363
December 1960	17,804
June 1961	17,603
December 1961	16,947
June 1962	16,527
December 1962	16,057
June 1963	15,830
December 1963	15,596
June 1964	15,623
December 1964	15,471
June 1965	13,934

TABLE 3.—*Short-term liabilities to foreign sources in relation to U.S. gold stocks, 1957–65*

[In billions of dollars]

	U.S. gold stock	Short-term liabilities to foreign sources
1957	22.8	15.2
1958	20.5	16.2
1959	19.5	19.4
1960	17.8	21.3
1961	16.9	22.5
1962	16.1	25.0
1963	15.6	26.0
1964	15.5	28.8
1965	[1] 13.9	[2] 27.4

[1] June.

[2] May.

TABLE 4.—*Excess or deficiency of gold stock in relation to foreign dollar liabilities*

[In millions of dollars]

	Surplus	Deficit
1957	7,699	
1958	4,423	
1959	118	
1960		−4,423
1961		−5,586
1962		−8,962
1963		−10,346
1964		−13,363
1965		−13,550

HOW THE SITUATION DEVELOPED

For many years prior to World War I, and until the depression of the 1930's, England was in effect the world's banker. The pound sterling was recognized everywhere as the preferred medium for payment of international debts, transfers of capital across national borders, and for foreign exchange uses generally. In the thirties, this international payments system broke down and balances began to be settled in many different currencies with continually fluctuating rates—a condition which in itself hampered international trade and was an obstacle to general worldwide recovery from the great depression.

Following World War II, the United States emerged as the world's strongest economy. The economic strains of war were less severe on it than on other combatant nations. Its industrial plants were not damaged as were those of other countries. The accumulated demand of the war years resulted in a rapid expansion of our industrial plant and brisk economic activity.

At the same time, the United States assumed responsibility for helping to repair the destruction in other countries. The wartime "arsenal of democracy" for western civilization converted itself into the peacetime supplier of goods, services, and capital to rebuild the ravaged economies of our friends and enemies alike. In this, the efforts of private capital were supplemented by Marshall plan grants and by other foreign aid programs.

This employment of national strength and wealth resulted in the establishment of the dollar as the world's principal reserve currency. It was an accidental benefit. It was unplanned. But it helped the world, and it bestowed prestige on the United States as the world's financial and economic leader.

During much of this postwar period the United States ran a deficit in its balance of payments, as dollars flowed abroad to help rebuild the world. The dollar was in demand everywhere. It was not just "good as gold," it was better. The United States became the world's banker, providing its international currency needs. Its balance-of-payments deficits, if held within reasonable limits, would not have been dangerous; they would, up to a point, have merely offset the surpluses of the war years, while helping to meet the world's need for international financial liquidity.

But by the late 1950's things were beginning to change. The "dollar gap" had disappeared. We were faced abroad by rebuilt industrial nations competing with the United States for export markets and investment opportunities. Deficits continued, however, as did foreign military and economic assistance commitments, the latter with emphasis transferred largely to underdeveloped and Communist-threatened nations.

As the finances of industrial nations improved, it was only natural that their officials and bankers felt it wise to build their gold holdings. This, too, would not have been harmful to the United States if it had been held within reasonable bounds. Unfortunately, that has not been the case. Failing to respond adequately to our gold losses and our balance-of-payments deficits, the Democratic administrations since 1960 have not applied the measures necessary to maintain the Nation's gold supply and the future strength of the dollar.

In 1959 and 1960, when the balance-of-payments deficit first became a matter of concern, the Eisenhower administration had responded promptly, as noted in the January 1961 Economic Report of the President:

"The effort centered on measures to increase United States exports and to reduce the balance-of-payments impact of Government military and economic programs abroad in a manner consistent with our responsibilities."

Specifically, the Eisenhower action included these steps: (a) A national export expansion program, including improved arrangements for guarantee of short and intermediate-term export credits by the Export-Import Bank, and active governmental support for reduction of foreign discriminatory restrictions on U.S. goods and services; (b) reorientation of activities of commercial attachés of our embassies abroad and State Department policy generally, from one of assisting foreign businessmen in selling to the United States, to a policy of promoting export sales of American products; (c) measures, as early as October 1959, to tie military and economic assistance activities of the Department of Defense, International Cooperation Administration and Development Loan Fund to procurement in the United States; (d) an Executive order in January 1961 prohibiting U.S. citizens and organizations from holding gold abroad; (e) measures in 1960 to effect a progressive reduction in the number of military dependents in Europe; (f) initiation of negotiations with Germany that eventually resulted in that country assuming a major share of the cost of maintaining U.S. military forces there; (g) appropriate monetary and fiscal policies to provide incentives to attract foreign funds and to keep dollars at home, as well as to avoid the potential inflationary pressures that could have developed in the course of financing a large public debt increase in 1959.

This multipronged approach, which was accepted in the United States and abroad as both timely and effective, was inadequately followed up by the succeeding Democratic administration. It even blithely reversed some of the most effective measures.

So now a truly ironic situation has developed. The revitalized and financially stronger European governments have grown alarmed at our lack of financial discipline and have decided that gold bars may prove a better long-term investment than dollars. This conviction on their part has been affirmed by their concern about present U.S. policies of stimulating growth by artificially low interest rates and unduly expanded credit.

Whatever the motivation of other governments, the result has been that they have put pressure on the dollar, exchanging it for gold. The consequence, for which our own Government's policies are responsible, has been an undermining of the dollar's standing as the world's leading reserve currency.

The administration's attitude of nervous disapproval of foreign gold demands, its meager palliatives, and harshly restrictive efforts to remedy matters, together with its continuing barrage of publicity to bolster domestic political confidence, have caused growing concern. Actually, the administration's attempts to deal with the problem are compounding it rather than solving it.

THE PROBLEM TODAY

Few people realize fully the extent to which the prosperity of the United States, and of all other nations, is dependent on the exceedingly complex arrangements for the international flow of money and gold, whether as payments for imports and exports, as investment capital, as intergovernmental loans and grants or as changes in the reserves backing an individual country's currency.

Nor are they fully aware of how easily and rapidly that whole system, which is based primarily on confidence, càn deteriorate through poor management.

The key to understanding the situation created by the deficit in the U.S. balance of payments and loss of gold lies in understanding how the world's money supply is provided and how that supply is used to fuel the world's economic machinery.

There is not enough gold in the world to handle all the transactions for which a medium of exchange is needed. Faced with this situation, creditors in international trade will accept "hard" currencies in lieu of gold. A "hard" currency is one that is both in good supply and is well-managed by its country of origin, so that people have faith that it will remain "hard" and not deteriorate through inflation.

When the supply of gold to handle world transactions is inadequate, an additional medium of exchange—a hard currency—is needed to supply "liquidity." The liquidity for world use today is supplied principally by the U.S. dollar. The British pound has been in second place as a "key currency."

Currencies get into world circulation through their home country running a balance-of-payments deficit, more dollars, for instance, flowing out each year than flowing in.

In the postwar period, the world looked to the dollar with confidence; the willingness of foreigners to hold the increasing amount of dollars resulting from the recurring annual deficit in the U.S. balance of payments was a sign of the dollar's stable value and acceptability as a dependable medium of exchange. But these accumulated deficits have now built up to $28 billion worth of dollar claims against the United States with only about $14 billion in gold stock to pay them (of which only $5 billion is now legally available for such use).

So, the problem resolves itself into four critical aspects:

1. How to manage our economic affairs to merit and retain a role of world financial leadership.

2. How to manage the world's key currency, the dollar, so as to maintain confidence in it.

3. How to maintain adequate but not excessive international liquidity.

4. How to strengthen present world monetary arrangements.

The problem of confidence in the management of the dollar is central. If other countries regain confidence in that management, a balance-of-payments deficit of reasonable size can be a symptom of strength, not of weakness. Dollars bearing interest will again be in more demand than noninterest bearing gold. And the gold drain will either terminate or reverse itself.

Under these circumstances, the United States, with its house in order, and its currency the strongest in the world, can take the lead in improving international monetary arrangements to achieve world economic growth and stability for the years ahead.

THE FAILURE OF THE DEMOCRATIC ADMINISTRATION'S ATTEMPTED SOLUTIONS

The Democratic administrations have had almost 5 years to solve the problem but have failed to do so, because they have attempted to deal with symptoms rather than underlying causes. Like treating a patient with a fever by putting him into a tank of cold water, this may alleviate some of the discomfort, but it is no substitute for a good antibiotic to kill the germ responsible for the ailment.

The Democratic administrations have tinkered with the difficulties by attempting to adjust some items of inflow and outflow of payments. They have not gotten at the basic causes, the principal ones of which are their own monetary and fiscal policies. In seeking to achieve political objectives by easy money policies, and by entering into large governmental spending commitments, they have sown the seeds of future economic weakness. These policies do not inspire confidence at home or abroad.

Most of the direct steps the administration has taken have been too little and may also have been too late. Some have been of so little consequence as to have negligible effect. The measures that have had some effect are of a short-run type, sure to be destructive in the longer run of our national and international interests.

Here are the principal measures undertaken by the administration:

1. Reduction of duty-free allowance for American tourists returning from other countries.

2. Export trade promotion and assistance.

3. Promotion of foreign tourist travel in the United States.

4. An interest equalization tax.

5. The President's "voluntary program" to reduce private U.S. investments abroad.

6. Partial tying of foreign aid to exports; and steps to offset overseas military costs by sales of military material to other countries.

There have been other steps, too, but they are miniscule. For example, tours abroad by West Point and Annapolis undergraduates were canceled; this will save less than $1 million in a multibillion-dollar problem, at the loss of familiarizing our future officers with military installations and terrain in countries where they may some day be called upon to defend American interests. An item like this, which reduces the average annual dollar outflow by about one-hundredth of 1 percent at a cost in future military advantage, is a "little think" approach.

The widely publicized recent move to reduce further the duty-free allowance to returning American tourists is an unnecessary harassment of the citizenry to give the appearance of action in the hope that time will make a real effort unnecessary. The administration in 1965 proposed the momentous step of reducing the allowance from $100 to $50. The Congress wisely rejected this bit of silliness.

Promoting export trade is sound policy. At present only 4 or 5 percent of the American gross national product goes into export channels. Much more needs to be done to build our export markets.

Increasing foreign tourist travel in the United States is highly desirable. Reducing our present "tourist gap" (what our tourists spend abroad less what foreign tourists spend here) of $1.6 billion or more annually could help our balance of payments and stimulate better international understanding in the process. However, coupling such a program with injunctions to Americans to stay home is international doubletalk not conducive to achieving either objective. Cultural isolationism is a poor weapon with which to advance the cause of a free society against the aims of communism.

Twice the administration has attempted to stem the adverse balance-of-payments tide by major expedients. In 1964, it requested and secured from Congress an interest equalization tax to reduce American portfolio investment overseas. When this failed to produce all the desired results, it adopted in 1965 a "voluntary program" for restriction of private U.S. investment abroad. These measures turn back the clock on 30 years of progress from isolationism and protectionism toward progressive reduction of barriers and toward an expanding world movement of capital and trade. They are steps backward, inviting retaliation in kind, for which this country and the rest of the world will suffer.

Actually, one of the largest continuing and expanding sources of dollar inflows is the returns on investments made in earlier years. A study made by the Brookings Institution estimated that, on a cumulative basis, the dollar outflow initially entailed in new direct foreign investment and loans is fully offset in 5 years by the dollar inflow it produces, and that by the 10th year it has produced inflows more than twice the amount of the initial outflow. The administration's policy of restricting foreign investment means that in future years this increasing return flow is sacrificed to the expedient of temporary relief from tough decisions that ought to be made in other areas. This is penny-wise, pound-foolish government.

Apart from the potential loss in investment income, the administration's restrictionism entails other major fallacies. It is hostile to business freedom, it militates against international cooperation, it inhibits growth of free markets, it reduces export opportunities, it tends to cause balance of payments problems for other countries, it invites retaliatory protectionism, and impedes the development of economies in other free world countries by denying to them the capital to build the stability and strength to withstand Communist enticements. It is contrary to all that America stands for.

Another serious concern relative to the so-called voluntary controls is the sanctions available to the Government for enforcing "voluntary compliance and the possibility that under the stress of some future temporary emergency such voluntary controls might be hardened into compulsory controls. Undesirable as controls by government intrinsically are under a free enterprise economy, their imposition on international commercial and financial exchanges has the added penalty that they are interpreted abroad as possible signs of a deteriorating economic position.

When so much of the problem has to do with maintaining the confidence of the financial community at home and abroad in the management of our monetary affairs, such measures, or even indications that such action may be considered, have a strong tendency to compound the problem rather than contribute to its solution.

The Democratic administration concedes that the restrictions on foreign investments are intended as temporary measures, not a permanent solution. It hopes that a permanent solution will somehow happen, but it has no evident program for causing it to happen. It has freed some domestic gold reserves by getting Congress to withdraw part of the requirement of gold as a backing to our monetary and banking system, but this merely bought time—it created no more ability to pay international debts.

The deficits of recent years would have been even larger except for the fact that some foreign countries have made prepayments on their postwar debts to the United States. It is doubtful that this can be relied upon much longer as a significant source of payment inflows, in view of the relatively small remaining amounts that are likely to be collected from the countries that have made such prepayments.

The United States cannot solve this problem by reducing gold reserves, nor by a facade of restrictive, short-run, penny-wise, little-think isolationist measures. Such measures may cover the problem up for a short time, but are misleading none of the experts at home or abroad. It is their confidence, in this case, that is the key to the problem.

Neither will the American people be satisfied for long with little more than good intentions. They will look for careful analysis, depth of understanding, discrimination between cause and symptom, and purposeful and determined actions.

THE REPUBLICAN RECOMMENDATIONS

Top priority must be assigned to restoring and maintaining a reasonable balance in the Nation's international payments through genuinely effective, long-range policies. To this end, the Republican approach rests on the following premises:

The solutions should be directed at underlying causes, not merely at symptoms.

They must contribute to both domestic and international economic stability and growth.

They must help to provide adequate but not excessive international liquidity and world monetary reserves.

They should make possible the prompt withdrawal of restrictive Government controls over American investments in foreign countries.

They should foster expanding international trade, travel, investment and cooperation among free world nations and people.

They must be aimed at strengthening, and then maintaining, the United States position of international financial leadership.

The Republican Party recommends that the following measures be adopted by the administration and the Congress.

1. Give top priority to developing a solution to our balance-of-payments problem which will be lasting and constructive for the rest of the world as well as for ourselves.

2. Jointly, with our allies among the major industrial and trading nations, work aggressively to strengthen international monetary arrangements along noninflational lines.

The role of the United States should be to lead in consideration of any changes in the world monetary system. It cannot permit other countries to usurp its position as the world's banker or to lead it into unwise compromises.

International meetings are timely from the standpoint of the present need for improved world monetary arrangements. Prospects for the success of such meetings will be greatly improved, however, when the United States can participate from a position of leadership based on management of its international payments through sound long-range policies rather than on expedients such as so-called "voluntary" controls of capital outflow.

The United States should develop its positions and its plans for strengthening the world's monetary relationships. The objectives should be:

1. The supplying of adequate but not excessive world liquidity.

2. The providing of a means of discipline to assure adjustments by countries when needed to keep their international accounts close to balance.

3. Maintaining of adequate facilities for emergency coping with temporary balance-of-payments deficits of individual countries.

4. The providing of policies and means to promote expanding and competitive trade and unrestricted movement of capital.

5. The assuring of arrangements to reduce the possibility of individual countries disrupting the international monetary structure through unsound domestic economic policies.

The International Monetary Fund has met these requirements with a laudable degree of success. Further improvements to maintain that record and to augment the capability of the fund to achieve these objectives are now in order and preferable to radical plans for change or to creation of wholly different experiments through new international systems.

Changes in the world monetary system should be evolutionary and gradual, to minimize speculation and instability. They should progress in orderly fashion. The present system, stemming from the Bretton Woods agreement, has bridged the transition from World War II's ravaged world to today's vastly expanded international trade and capital development. It can be adapted to present world needs without revolutionary change. The United States should point the way.

3. Lend support to a monetary policy which will narrow interest rate differentials between the United States and other countries.

The administration's failure to encourage use of corrective monetary policy is a major underlying cause of the balance-of-payments problem. Its rigid and uncompromising commitment to easy money as a magic key to domestic expansion is a poor choice of means as opposed to wise and flexible policies serving all the valid goals of domestic and international expansion. Our European creditors are watching with increasing impatience for the United States to exercise the monetary discipline which alone can establish their confidence in the continued soundness of the dollar.

The administration has consistently favored a policy of artificially low-interest rates, regardless of cost to other national objectives. Low interest rates are appropriate in a period of economic slack; they are wholly inappropriate during a period of high economic activity marked by inflationary warnings and accompanied by an unsolved balance-of-payments problem. Interest rates which are market determined, rather than politically determined, will rise in periods of high demand. In so doing they act as a brake on reckless expansion of credit, curb the tendency to excesses in the business cycle, apply restraint over the outflow of funds from the country, attract inflows from other nations, and moderate inflationary tendencies. This administration's policy of insistence on artificially low-interest rates is damaging to our national interests both in courting domestic inflation and in contributing directly to our balance-of-payments problem.

In the past 4 years, the administration's easy money policies have expanded credit twice as fast as the rise in real production. Interest rates are well below those in other industrial countries, and the amount of personal, private and government (local and State as well as national) debt in the United States is so high as to be cause for comment if not general concern.

All of this risks loss of confidence in the dollar. Foreign holders of dollars know by bitter experience that sooner or later credit inflation brings price inflation. They know that failure to use monetary and fiscal policy properly has been a major cause of every devaluation of currencies in history.

Further credit inflation in the United States could involve the heavy risk of a boom and bust pattern which would be damaging at home as well as abroad. Responsible use of credit policy can help avert such developments, and contribute to balanced expansion in both domestic and international economic sectors.

4. Adopt domestic fiscal policies which avoid inflation and which preserve an ample reservoir of strength to deal with any unexpected crisis or unfavorable economic development.

The administration's fiscal brinkmanship can lead to disaster. The Vietnam situation, for instance, will involve many billions of dollars in increased military spending, and may provide a severe test of whether we have the reserve economic strength to provide adequate flexibility with which to meet this heavy increased burden on the budget without pronounced inflation.

A nation, like an individual, should preserve a reserve of strength, because it can never know when emergencies will develop. It is unwise to assume that new economic nostrums can repeal the ups and downs of the business cycle or immunize us from the fiscal demands of military emergencies. The overstimulation of growth by excessive Government spending, with deliberate deficits in times of unprecedented prosperity, are an invitation to crisis.

The administration claims credit for having held the budget deficit to $3½ billion in the last fiscal year; but this is after crediting $3 billion of largely nonrecurring receipts from Federal Reserve bank surplus, liquidations of Government stockpiles, and sales of loans and mortgages. A minor recession like that of 1958, with the budget already so overburdened, could result in a deficit of $20 to $30 billion or more, under the present administration's policies. This would not only be inflationary; it would very likely ignite already apprehensive feelings in world financial circles and could result in a run on the dollar that would play havoc with our whole economy and hopes of continued progress. The adjustments for every person from such a consequence could be unbelievably harsh. They would mean vastly higher costs of living, reduced hours of work, fewer jobs and less income, the wiping out of savings, pensions and insurance, and the decline of morale and purpose.

This is not a prediction that these things will happen. It is a warning that they can happen. The safe course is to avoid economic fantasies that rigidly deny common sense and the repeated experience of history. Our Government spending policies must not reject entirely the proven worth of capital creation through savings, building reserves for emergencies, and maintaining a long-run balance between income and expenditures.

5. Enlarge efforts to build export trade, including tax, depreciation, and other economic policies, and the encouragement of technological and productive superiority, to enhance the competitive position of American business and labor.

One of the most favorable factors of inflow in our balance-of-payments equation in recent years has been the excess of our exports over imports. American technology has outpaced the world and its products are in high demand.

Notwithstanding this, American exports are a very low percentage of our national output and are exceeded in this proportion by many European countries and by Japan. The potentials are much greater than we have achieved, and our present Government activities to induce increased trade could be improved. Our share of total world export trade has not kept pace with the growth of world exports since formation of the European Common Market. (See table 5.) Here again, improved results can be obtained through coordinated private and Government action.

Independent committees of economists, businessmen, labor leaders, export-import bankers, and marketing experts, cooperating with the Government, should be encouraged to devise and promote new and imaginative practical means for increasing sales of American products and services abroad. This should include stimulating, and removing impediments to, American private investment in other countries. Such investment builds markets for American-made goods. Private enterprise needs only to be unleashed and made aware of the existence and location of markets, for our exports to mount under the stimulus of private motive.

The Government can help by adopting tax depreciation and other economic policies that enhance the competitive position of American business and labor. It can further relax depreciation allowances to encourage plant modernization. It can stimulate industrial research. It can gradually reduce the tax burden within responsible fiscal policy. It can aid in locating potential markets and communicating that information to appropriate industries. It can help by increased dissemination in diplomatic circles of the truth that freedom of enterprise in all nations will build an expanding economy and trade from which every nation will be the better and stronger.

The administration should particularly address itself vigorously to negotiating reduced barriers to trade with European countries. It should make a determined effort to further enhance the status and responsibilities of State Department commercial attachés.

Purposeful measures to reorient policies and personnel consistent with the changes in international trade conditions of the past 10 years are urgent. The situation is no longer one of the "dollar gap" and world recovery, but one of brisk competition with other revitalized nations.

In recent months the margin of exports over imports has shown an alarming drop. While some of this can be attributed to temporary conditions, it appears likely that the favorable 1964 margin of our foreign trade will not be repeated in the near future unless more aggressive and effective governmental action is applied.

TABLE 5.—*U.S. share of world trade, 1948–64*

[Dollars in billions]

	World trade [1]	U.S. trade	Percent of U.S. trade to world trade	U.S. trade excluding AID-financed exports	Percent U.S. trade excluding AID-financed exports
1948	$53.7	$13.2	24.6		
1949	54.5	12.1	22.2		
1950	56.1	10.1	18.0		
1951	76.1	14.1	18.5		
1952	73.3	13.3	18.1		
1953	74.3	12.3	16.6		
1954	77.1	12.8	16.6		
1955	83.9	14.3	17.0		
1956	93.2	17.4	18.7		
1957	100.1	19.4	19.4		
1958	95.4	16.3	17.1		
1959	101.2	16.3	16.1		
1960	113.1	19.5	17.2	$17.6	15.6
1961	118.2	19.9	16.8	17.7	15.0
1962	124.4	20.6	16.6	18.2	14.6
1963	135.5	22.1	16.3	19.3	14.2
1964	151.9	25.3	16.7	22.5	14.8

[1] Excludes Communist bloc countries and Cuba.

Source: International Monetary Fund, "International Financial Statistics" and U.S. Department of Commerce "Survey of Current Business," adapted from International Economic Policy Association.

6. Increase promotional efforts to encourage foreign tourism in the United States, with greater reliance on private agencies.

Americans spend billions of dollars touring in other countries, and this undoubtedly contributes in many ways to improved understanding among peoples. Contrary to administration policy, American tourism abroad should not be discouraged.

Other nations might well benefit, too, if more of their residents knew the United States at first hand. Expenditures by foreign tourists in this country are now around a billion dollars a year, less than 40-percent of what American tourists spend abroad. With increased prosperity around the world, many more foreigners could be attracted to this country, especially if they could be made confident as to costs, facilities, and attitudes. The administration's efforts at improvement have been marginally effective.

This is a job that can be done best by private action with effective Government support. Independent committees of travel agencies, hotel and motel owners, transportation companies, the press, and others should be encouraged to develop programs for enticing tourists to this country. The effective operation of such programs will do more for the United States by word of mouth good will from satisfied visitors than any amount of official Government propaganda. Our balance of payments can be improved in this manner while the people, customs, and intentions of our country are appreciated by more and more friends from other nations.

7. Redetermine the extent of need, under present conditions, for U.S. military forces in the European theater, with the objective of reducing our expenditures there.

The time has long since arrived when a substantial reduction of our Military Establishment in Western Europe would appear to be wise if not necessary. Approximately 700,000 military and associated personnel are still being maintained in Europe, at a net outflow in the balance of payments of about $1.5 billion (approximately half the recent annual balance-of-payments deficits). A force of this size was unquestionably desirable 15 years ago, as an emergency protective matter, when our European allies were weak and relatively defenseless. But with their economic recovery, the Western European countries should be able to marshal their own conventional forces against invasion, backed by our continuing firm commitment to assist in their defense. A small detachment of our forces can serve as evidence of this commitment, backed by our newly demonstrated ability to airlift reinforcements swiftly to any place in the world from central bases in the United States, and by our strategic air and missile striking forces.

An immediate reappraisal of the extent and character of our European-based military forces and financial commitment in the light of these changes in conditions should be undertaken both in our country and with our friends abroad as a matter of urgency. The results should substantially reduce our expenditures there.

These observations are backed by military experts and have been enunciated by both Democratic and Republican leaders. They were expressed by the Democratic majority in a 1965 report of the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress:

"The Committee urges that the review of Government expenditures abroad focus particularly on the possibility of reducing our troop commitments in Europe. Our overseas manpower was not cut back to the extent which the massive increase in our airlift capability would have permitted. We must reduce our military expenditures in these countries."

There is no reason why our European friends, given a full appreciation of our views, should continue to depend on us to carry such large forces on their soil. Our commitment to the preservation of freedom in Western Europe will not be reduced by a return of a considerable portion of these forces to our shores.

8. Confine American military assistance generally to countries committed to the side of the free world in the struggle against Communist subversion and aggression.

Last year American military assistance was given to more than 60 countries. In some nations American-supplied arms were used in local revolutions by forces inimical to free world interests. A more discriminating selection of military and beneficiaries is necessary.

Our military assistance programs should be limited generally to countries and administrations which are clearly committed to the free world and opposed to international communism. Military aid should consist almost exclusively of equipment produced in American plants, and should be directed to the free nations surrounding the Communist orbit, who are our first line of defense, and nations seriously threatened with Communist takeover by subversion or revolution. Any exceptions should be rare and should be required to be clearly justified in terms of our own overriding national interests. It is unsound to give weapons to nations when we cannot be sure that they will be used in our common defense, or to nations from whose hands they may proceed into the possession of enemy forces.

More realistic overseas military assistance programs will reduce the burden they impose on our balance-of-payments problem. (See table 6.)

9. Reduce the cost of foreign economic aid programs, primarily by directing assistance to those countries which maintain a hospitable climate for private investment capital, and by stimulating private initiative here and abroad to lead in their development.

There is little doubt of the basic desirability of our foreign economic aid objectives. In their 17 years many of these programs have served effectively in building the free world and promoting the development of emerging nations. But this does not necessarily warrant their continuance at present levels.

In fiscal 1965, loans, grants, and other assistance of various kinds were made to an approximate total of 100 countries. There is little doubt that close examination will show incredible inefficiency, waste, mismanagement, and misdirected effort in many of these programs. Some loans are made in dollars on terms which clearly indicate that neither the principal, nor interest is ever going to return to this country. Some grants merely help to support local political objectives or to pay running expenses of insolvent governments. Some programs support foreign government-owned projects which ought to be done by private agencies under appropriate local incentives and encouragement. Many are of doubtful value to the country intended to be benefited. Many should be ended. A realistic evaluation of these facts would result in a significant reduction in foreign aid costs.

The growth of industry and capital in the developing nations would be achieved more efficiently and more effectively under the discipline of the profit system than under any other form. This is the secret of our unparalleled American material progress and it should be exported with confidence and conviction.

Private initiative, both from the United States and within the underdeveloped nations should be recognized and encouraged as the key to sustained growth and development. Private capital can perform far more effectively than government socialism. Our aid ought to be directed to nations that accept this philosophy.

Furthermore, other industrial nations of the free world should be induced to shoulder a larger share of the burden of assistance to developing countries, both directly and through United Nations multilateral programs. Their efforts in this respect should be commensurate with their capabilities.

TABLE 6.—*Private and Government sectors in the U.S. balance of payments*

[In billions of dollars]

	1960-61 average		1964	
	Private	Government	Private	Government
Exports	17.6	2.1	22.4	3.6
Income on investments	3.2	0	4.7	0
Services	3.9	0	5.1	0
Other	.4	1.2	.2	1.8
Total receipts	25.2	3.3	32.4	5.4
Imports	−14.6	0	−18.6	0
Services	−5.2	−.9	−6.5	−1.2
Private investment	−4.6	0	−7.3	0
Military cash outflow	0	−3.0	0	−2.8
Government economic aid	0	−3.8	0	−4.3
Total	−24.4	−7.7	−32.4	−8.3
Balance	+.8	−4.4	0	−2.9

Source: Adapted from International Economic Policy Association.

Assistance to other nations by the U.S. Government should be limited largely to our foodstuffs, fibers and goods—and only to the extent needed by them in excess of their ability to pay. The United States should and can also provide technical assistance in solving problems of agriculture, industry, commerce and Government in accordance with the proven procedures evolved in our own country.

Such measures would benefit other nations more in the long run because we would be showing them the solid way to development and growth, within the potentials of their own resources and capabilities, rather than stimulating the illusion that largess from the American taxpayers will bring instant progress.

The administration position appears to be that all such expenditures are absolutely necessary, and that every effort is being made to minimize their balance-of-payments impact. It argues that 80 to 85 percent of economic aid purchases are tied to exports and that more than one-third of military expenditures are offset by military exports from the United States.

While much of foreign aid is tied to specific exports, in many cases such aid releases dollars which otherwise would be spent in the United States, to be spent instead in Western Europe. Some experts maintain that this occurs to such a degree that our economic foreign aid is effectively tied to net exports to the extent of only 50 to 60 percent. A more realistic policy would concentrate our efforts in countries where help can be used soundly and stop the flow of dollars to areas and for purposes which merely support purchases from other nations. Such a policy need not damage our economic development efforts.

As part of foreign aid reforms, the number of beneficiary nations should be reduced. Commitments by recipients to free enterprise principles should be a precondition to economic aid wherever possible.

Finally, the various aid expenditures—for grants, loans, international loan funds, agricultural products, Peace Corps, United Nations multilateral programs, refugee relief, and others—should be brought together into a single appropriation request for consideration by the Congress each year, so the American public is fully informed as to the total involved.

These measures would reduce the drain of our dollars and make the entire program more effective as an instrument of foreign policy, as a contribution to world progress, and as an aid to individuals and nations in learning that solid lasting growth is best attained by responsibility, planning and work under the incentive of private ownership and competition.

An analysis of the derivation of balance-of-payments deficits (table 6) shows clearly that the international transactions of the private sector in this country are regularly in balance. The Government's outlays for military and economic aid programs overseas exceed its receipts of dollars from foreign countries, and in that sense account for the entire balance-of-payments deficits of recent years.

It is ironic that, under these conditions, the administration's major actions to deal with the problem have been restrictive measures directed at the private sector. Clearly, a major review of Government spending overseas is in order, and recommendations 6, 7, and 8 are directed at that objective.

THE URGENCY OF ACHIEVING A LASTING SOLUTION

Apprehension about the future of the international monetary situation is increasing. The United Kingdom is facing a severe monetary crisis. France is converting more and more of its liquid holdings to gold. These events have raised storm signals for countries all over the world. The result could be a serious contraction of world liquidity and economic activity. This must not happen.

Whether the problem is an immediate one of impending economic dislocation, or the longer range one of strengthening the international monetary system, in both cases management of the dollar and maintenance of confidence in it are central to achieving successful solutions since it is the world's principal medium of exchange.

The Republican Party would be derelict if it did not raise its voice to call attention to an extremely serious situation in time for effective action.

The dollar is still the world's strongest currency. The United States is still the leader of the free world. There is yet probably enough time for prompt action successfully to correct the present deteriorating situation and maintain our position as the leader in building a world society where every man can share in the material benefits that are a precondition to individual freedom, dignity, and opportunity to lead the good life.

In publishing this paper, the Republican Party serves notice to the party in power that it must be responsible for the consequences of continuing failure to take prompt and suitable action to solve this vital problem.

Members of the task force on Federal fiscal and monetary policy are:

Maurice H. Stans, chairman, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, 1958–61.

George Champion, vice chairman, chairman of the board, the Chase Manhattan Bank, New York City.

William H. Avery, Governor of Kansas.

Julian B. Baird, Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs, 1957–61.

FRANK T. BOW, Representative from the 16th Congressional District of Ohio.

George S. Eccles, president of First Security Corp., Salt Lake City, Utah.

Mrs. Rosemary Ginn, Republican national committeewoman for Missouri.

Cliff Hansen, Governor of Wyoming.

Kenneth C. Kellar, Kellar, Kellar & Driscoll, attorneys, Lead, S. Dak.

Peter O'Donnel, Jr., chairman of the Republican Party of Texas.

Clarence B. Randall, special assistant to the President on Foreign Economic Policy, 1956–61.

Raymond J. Saulnier, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, 1957–61.

Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of Atomic Energy Commission, 1953–58.

Robert D. Stuart, Jr., national committeeman for Illinois.

Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce, 1953–58.

JOHN J. WILLIAMS, U.S. Senator from Delaware.

Staff secretary to the task force, Biehl P. Clarke.

Members of the Republican Coordinating Committee are:

Presiding officer: Chairman, Republican National Committee.

Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Former presidential nominees Barry M. Goldwater, Richard M. Nixon, Thomas E. Dewey, and Alf M. Landon.

Senate leadership: EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, minority leader; THOMAS H. KUCHEL, minority whip; BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, chairman, policy committee; LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, chairman, Republican conference; THRUSTON B. MORTON, chairman, senatorial campaign committee.

House of Representatives leadership: GERALD R. FORD, minority leader; LESLIE C. ARENDS, minority whip; MELVIN R. LAIRD, chairman, Republican conference; JOHN J. RHODES, chairman, Republican policy committee; BOB WILSON, chairman, congressional campaign committee.

Republican Governors Association: John A. Love, Governor of Colorado; Robert E. Smylie, Governor of Idaho; George W. Romney, Governor of Michigan; Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of New York; William W. Scranton, Governor of Pennsylvania.

Republican National Committee: Ray C. Bliss, Ohio, chairman, Republican National Committee; Mrs. C. Wayland Brooks, Illinois, assistant chairman; Mrs. Collis P. Moore, Oregon, vice chairman; Donald R. Ross, Nebraska, vice chairman; Mrs. J. Willard Marriott, District of Columbia, vice chairman; J. Drake Edens, Jr., South Carolina, vice chairman.

Staff coordinator: Dr. Arthur L. Peterson.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE IN THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, rates of capital expenditure by industry have been significant indicators of economic expansion. For the textile industry in particular such indicators are important, because, for at least the cotton and cotton-blends sector of the textile industry, expansion is based on a questionable structure of import quotas, which prevent the textile market from reflecting actual economic forces.

According to statistics prepared by the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Federal Trade Commission, the worth of total textile plant and equipment in the first quarter of 1966 was $4.3 billion. This compares with $3.7 billion in the first quarter of 1966. The June 1966 Survey of Current Business said:

> Textile companies are planning substantial advances—30 percent—in capital expenditures for 1966. Last year, textile companies also increased their capital spending 30 percent.

The Commerce Department's Office of Business Economics has estimated capital spending for 1966 of $1.34 billion. This estimate has been revised downward to $1.2 billion, partly, it is believed, because of entreaties by the President's Council of Economic Advisers for restraint on capital spending. Further drops have been reported, but the annual rate will likely remain high.

The textile industry has rightly tried to distinguish between expenditures for modernization—keeping plant up to date—and those for new capacity—expansion of facilities to produce more. The industry has tentatively estimated that only 10 percent of its capital spending is for new capacity, the rest for modernization.

But in practice the line between spending for modernization and new capacity is very hard to draw with accuracy. What may appear to be an expenditure for modernization may also actually increase output. Take, for example, the case of the replacement of a 5-year-old machine with a new machine. The old machine may be depreciated over a longer period of time than 5 years, and may therefore be considered to be usable still. But in fact the machine performs a function or functions that can be more quickly and more cheaply performed by a new machine. For one thing, the new machine may require a lower percentage of down-time than the older machine. Is the replacement of the old machine an expenditure for modernization or for new capacity? A modern machine has been purchased but it results in greater productivity.

Another example is spending for air-conditioning installation. This can be considered modernization, but in southern plants air conditioning may likely result in increased production. Therefore, air conditioning is an expenditure resulting in increased production, or output.

The difficult distinction between the two types of expenditure may actually be impossible to make accurately. But drawing a line between expenditures promoting productivity, and expenditures not resulting in increased productivity is useful for the reason that many industry expenses, that are not expenditures for machines or buildings, affect productivity. For example, take the costs of providing up-to-date safety systems in plants. Such systems can be costly but actually impinge on productivity. On the other hand, expenditures to provide healthful working conditions, and minor health services on the plant site, can be costly, but probably will reflect in increased productivity per worker.

I am interested in pursuing the matter of costs and productivity further with the textile and other industries, to understand better the complex relationships I have speculated on here.

WHAT U.S. SUGAR QUOTA PROGRAM COSTS THE CONSUMER

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, October 19, the international price of sugar for future delivery in March 1967, fell to a price of 1.65–1.67 cents a pound, f.o.b. foreign port, a price said to be a 25-year low.

But on the same day the U.S. price, which reflects the U.S. sugar quota program, was 7.12 cents a pound for March delivery—duty paid at New York. This means that the U.S. consumer is paying an additional 5.47 cents per pound as a subsidy, part of which is paid to foreign suppliers of sugar, and the remainder of which is in effect a subsidy to domestic beet, cane, and corn sugar producers. Every American consumes an average of about 96 pounds of sugar each year. Each pound purchased reflects the subsidy, an additional margin of cost to the consumer at a time when consumer prices are already too high.

RED CHINA: A STUDY IN SELF-ISOLATION

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BUCHANAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, a great and mischievous deception is being pressed upon the American public by a clique of self-proclaimed "experts" in this country. These misguided, myopic experts are attempting to persuade the American public that U.S. diplomacy has isolated Red China, and that if only we will hold out the olive branch, Red China will eagerly grasp it. This is not true and never has been the truth. The facts of history do not support any such supposition, and I think it is time we tear down the psychological guilt screen that has been erected by this clique and remind them and the American public of the facts of history.

First. In October of 1949 when Mao Tse-tung proclaimed the People's Republic of China, the United States did not break diplomatic ties with Red China—the Chinese Communists booted out our diplomatic representatives.

Second. American journalists, physicians, scientists, businessmen, athletes, and cultural representatives have been granted permission by the U.S. State Department to travel to Red China. But, Red China will not let them in.

Third. The United States has had and continues to have high level contact with Red China through our Ambassador in Warsaw. In fact, we have met with the Red Chinese 132 times in order to seek settlement of major issues—and yet not one meeting has produced any tangible evidence that Red China is ready to abandon her self-isolation.

Has the United States been isolating Red China? To the contrary: Red China has been isolating Red China ever since 1949.

For the last 12 months, officials of the Johnson administration have given Red China every opportunity to come out of the cocoon which she has built. In every instance, she has emphatically refused.

Mr. Speaker, the following statements by U.S. officials and the invariably belligerent replies of Red China leaders are excerpted from an admirable study of the Committee of One Million entitled "Who Is Isolating Red China?" and they demonstrate conclusively that Red China wants to isolate and is isolating herself:

SPEECH BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ROBERT S. M'NAMARA TO AMERICAN SOCIETY OF NEWSPAPER EDITORS IN MONTREAL, NEW YORK TIMES, MAY 19, 1966

> There are practical alternatives to our current relationships with both the Soviet Union and Communist China.
>
> There are many ways in which we can build bridges toward nations who would cut themselves off from meaningful contact with us. We can do so with properly balanced trade relations, diplomatic contacts, and in some cases even by exchanges of military observers.

Reply by New China news agency, May 20, 1966

> His remark is just a rehash of the "containment without isolation" idea recently put forth by the U.S. ruling clique. It shows that "containment" is real and "without isolation" is false.
>
> Actually, the American policy of hostility towards China has in fact isolated U.S. imperialism itself and not China. China has friends all over the world while U.S. imperialism is at odds even with its allies.

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY DEAN RUSK BEFORE THE FAR EAST SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE, MARCH 16, 1966

> It was our hope that by direct, systematic communication we might be able to reduce the sharpness of the conflict between us. There now have been 129 of these meetings (at the ambassadorial level), the latest of which took place in Warsaw today . . . I think it is accurate to say that no other non-Communist nation has had such extensive conversations with the Peiping regime as we have had . . . .
>
> We should continue our efforts to reassure Peiping that the United States does not intend to attack mainland China.
>
> We must avoid assuming the existence of an unending and inevitable state of hostility between ourselves and the rulers of mainland China.
>
> We should continue to enlarge the possibilities for unofficial contacts between Communist China and ourselves—contacts which

may gradually assist in altering Peiping's picture of the United States.

We should keep open our direct diplomatic contacts with Peiping in Warsaw.

We are prepared to sit down with Peiping and other countries to discuss the critical problems of disarmament and nonproliferation.

Reply by New China News Agency, April 18, 1966

In his statement, Rusk persisted in the policy of hostility and aggression towards China while talking no end of "increasing contacts" and "restoring friendship" with China, in an attempt to play before American and world public opinion the counter-revolutionary dual-tactics of sham peace but real hostility.

The ten elements are a mixture of hostility to China and deception. The real aim is to be hostile to and launch aggression against China and to contain and encircle it.

SPEECH BY PRESIDENT JOHNSON BEFORE THE AMERICAN ALUMNI COUNCIL, IN WHITE SULPHUR SPRINGS, W. VA., JULY 12, 1966

And there is a fourth essential for peace in Asia which may seem the most difficult of all: Reconciliation between nations that now call themselves enemies. A peaceful mainland China is central to a peaceful Asia. A hostile China must be discouraged from aggression. A misguided China must be encouraged toward understanding of the outside world and toward policies of peaceful cooperation.

For lasting peace can never come to Asia as long as the 700 million people of mainland China are isolated by their rulers from the outside world.

But we have also learned that the greatest force for opening closed minds and opening closed societies is the free flow of ideas and people and goods.

For many years now the United States has attempted in vain to persuade the Chinese Communists to agree to an exchange of newsmen as one of the first steps to increase understanding between our people.

More recently, we have taken steps to permit American scholars, experts in medicine and public health and other specialists to travel to Communist China.

And only today we here in the government cleared a passport for a leading American businessman to exchange knowledge with Chinese mainland leaders in Red China.

All of these initiatives except the actions today have been rejected by Communist China.

Reply by New China News Agency, July 13, 1966

The U.S. President's apparent saber-rattling statement is in fact an indirect revelation of the nature of the United States as a paper tiger in a world where the four seas are rising, clouds and waters raging, the five continents are rocking, wind and thunder roaring.

Johnson made it clear that the losing war of aggression in Vietnam had become problem Number One tormenting the U.S. ruling circles.

NEW YORK TIMES, OCTOBER 14, 1965

Senator Robert F. Kennedy proposed today that the United States explore new avenues to world disarmament by inviting Communist China to participate in the 17-nation Geneva disarmament conference."

Statement by Peiping's Foreign Ministry, New York Times, December 1, 1965

Under the United States control the United Nations has all along maintained a hostile attitude toward our country.

China will never enter into any relations with the United Nations and any conference connected with it before restoration of her legitimate rights in the United Nations and the expulsion of the Chiang Kai-shek clique from the organization.

NEW YORK TIMES JUNE 27, 1966

Senator Robert F. Kennedy proposed yesterday that the United States take "some initiatives" toward getting Communist China into the United Nations.

Statement by Peiping's Foreign Minister Chen Yi, September 29, 1965

The United Nations must rectify its mistakes and undergo a thorough reorganization and reform. It must admit and correct all its past mistakes. Among other things, it should cancel its resolution condemning China and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea as aggressors and adopt a resolution condemning the United States as the aggressor: The U.N. Charter must be reviewed and revised jointly by all countries, big and small; all independent states should be included in the United Nations; and all imperialist puppets should be expelled.

NEW YORK TIMES, APRIL 15, 1966

The State Department disclosed today that several American universities had been notified that scientists and scholars from Communist China would be permitted to visit the United States.

The move represents another step in the quiet, cautious attempts by the Johnson Administration to broaden the scientific and cultural contacts with Communist China. Thus far, according to officials, the overtures have not been met with any favorable response.

Statements by Peiping's foreign ministry, New China news agency, April 16, 1966

The spokesman of the U.S. State Department has come out to say on 14 April that the U.S. government would permit some American universities to invite Chinese scientists and scholars to visit the United States.

Earlier, the same spokesman also indicated that American scientists and scholars would be permitted to visit China.

Obviously, these statements are nothing but a fraud.

It is obvious that its aim is to deceive American people and world opinion and exploit the American people's friendly sentiments for China in the interest of its policy of hostility toward China.

NEW YORK TIMES, DECEMBER 30, 1965

The State Department in announcing its new policy (on travel to Red China) said it was an exploratory move toward closer scientific cooperation with the Communist bloc. Under the new regulations, doctors and scientists in the field of public health will be granted passports to make professional visits to the five Communist countries.

Reuters, January 1, 1966

"The State Department's action easing passport restrictions on travel to Communist China and four other countries is nauseating hypocrisy," Jenmin Jih Pao (People's Daily), the Communist Party newspaper, said today . . . "The U.S. imperialists conducted chemical warfare against the Vietnamese people. What consideration have they ever had for humanity?"

NEW YORK TIMES, JULY 12, 1966

In Washington the State Department in a new relaxation of travel restrictions, said it would permit travel of businessmen and athletes to China and four other Communist countries.

Christian Science Monitor, July 26, 1966

Communist China regards the relaxing of the United States ban on travel of United States citizens to the mainland of China as a trick, according to an official of the Chinese consulate here (Geneva).

It will not accept travelers cleared by the United States, he added.

He added, the hostile posture of the American government means that it will misuse the friendly persons who might seek to go to China.

It would make no difference whether the applicant for travel were a doctor, reporter or professor, said the official.

NEW YORK TIMES, JULY 17, 1966

The State Department is prepared to permit tourist travel to Communist China but only by prominent American citizens.

SPEECH BY WILLIAM P. BUNDY, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FAR EASTERN AFFAIRS, POMONA COLLEGE, POMONA, CALIF., FEBRUARY 12, 1966

We have tried unsuccessfully to arrange with the Chinese (Communists) either a formal or informal exchange of newsmen and more recently we have indicated to them our willingness unilaterally and without reciprocity to see Communist Chinese newsmen enter the United States.

Reply reported by New York Times, July 12, 1966

Communist China has closed its doors to most categories of foreign visitors while the country is going through its political purge.

Reports reaching Hong Kong say that the Peiping regime evidently wishes to conceal the extent of the upheaval caused by the denunication of hundreds of party officials and educators on charges that they had manifested "bourgeois" or Soviet "revisionist" tendencies.

NEW YORK TIMES, JULY 22, 1966

The State Department has told Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas that it will approve his request for permission to travel to Communist China, officials said today.

Justice Douglas has said he has been invited by the Communist Chinese Government to visit Peiping late this year.

Associated Press, July 23, 1966

A news dispatch from Tokyo said that Red China denied Douglas had ever been invited. Communist Chinese Foreign Ministry sources were quoted as saying: "Indeed, it's a laughing matter. It simply can't be."

SECRETARY OF STATE DEAN RUSK IN TESTIMONY BEFORE THE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE FAR EAST, MARCH 16, 1966

We have searched year after year for some sign that Communist China was ready to renounce the use of force to resolve disputes . . . We would welcome an era of good relations . . . (but) today we and Peiping are as far apart on matters of fundamental policy as we were 17 years ago.

Lin Piao in "Long Live the Victory of People's War!" September 3, 1965

The sacrifice of a small number of people in revolutionary wars is repaid by security for whole nations, whole countries and even the whole of mankind; temporary suffering is repaid by lasting or even perpetual peace and happiness. War can temper the people and push history forward. In this sense, war is a great school.

Let us have an end to deception and cant about who or what is the cause of Communist China's self-imposed exile. Like Greta Garbo, Red China wants to be alone. And she deserves to be left alone, to be treated like a pariah, like an outlaw, because her inflexible attitude has been that of a barbarian country which will not abide by the rules and laws of civilized society.

Red China, it is clear, believes that she is a law unto herself. And we have seen in this country, Mr. Speaker, the tragic events caused by those who believe they are above the law. Let us not encourage

Red China to practice civil disobedience on a gigantic international scale. Let us hold firm to the principle that those who will not live within the law must remain in exile and isolation until they have shown by deed and word that they will conduct themselves as honorable members of society. To date, there is nothing in the record of Red China to suggest even remotely that she is ready for membership in the United Nations or any other international organization of civilized nations.

WHAT MORE CAN YOU ASK?

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SKUBITZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, before we close the doors on this, the great 89th, I must, in the true spirit of the Great Society make one observation. President Johnson, in his sincere benevolence, wants to provide us with free medical services, free and equal education, job opportunities, subsidized housing, rent allowances, better transportation services, guaranteed minimum incomes, and subsidized cultural advantages. He wants to rid us of poverty, of slums, of polluted water and air, of unsightly, ugly, landscapes, of fear, or want, or worry. He wants to make our streets safe for demonstrations. He offers to feed and clothe and protect the outside world so that they will not feel the neglect that leads to wars. Now I ask you all: What more can you ask?

This is what you can ask—you can ask to rid ourselves of the burdensome task of paying salaries and wages, figuring income tax—corporation and personal tax—or sales tax. Perhaps the administration should have industry turn over its profits, labor its wages, and white collar workers their salaries. Could we not implement all our programs more easily and efficiently by issuing credit cards?

I feel confident that this Great Society Congress, this body which has surpassed all others in proving its concern for all people, this Congress which has done so much for so many with so little, would, no doubt, at the request of the President, concede to his insight and pass one simple piece of legislation to make this possible. I was talking to a friend of mine the other day—I know he would agree with this proposal. He received his pay envelope last Friday, opened it up only to find it empty and exclaimed—"My God, the deductions finally caught up with my salary." Well, with credit cards—every person would get his free and equal fair share to everything our "democratic" society has to offer.

The transition from a cash to credit basis would be amazingly smooth. You all know that the people of this country are not accustomed to operating on a cash basis—they are operating on credit now. And who is more experienced in credit operation than the Federal Government.

I repeat, gentlemen, that this is the only step left for this administration to take in completing the course it has so valiantly charted for our society. And who of you would hesitate in giving this "Great Society" the boost it needs by making it also the "credit card" society; that it may be cited by the world as the epitome of free man's efforts to guarantee equality and honor, freedom and justice for all.

DE GAULLE'S ULTIMATUM IMPERILS THE DEFENSE OF WESTERN EUROPE

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in these closing hours of the 89th Congress to express to my colleagues my great concern with the action of French President Charles de Gaulle in demanding that NATO forces be removed from France by next spring. Notwithstanding the activities already underway to establish headquarters in the off-the-beat hamlet of Casteau near Brussels, De Gaulle's ultimatum imperils the defense of Western Europe.

Aside from the more important problems of the effect of the French President's eviction notice, his decision is a portrait of arrogant ingratitude. While there has been considerable attention given to the ouster of all NATO forces, it might be hard for many Americans and other NATO allies to conceive the vastness and the implications of the move. More than 70,000 Americans, plus about 700,000 tons of materiel worth near $1 billion are all part of the forced exodus. Nine airbases and an ammunition depot, as well as 17 Army depots, must be relocated to provide a common defense system. In addition, an intricate communications network which stretches from Turkey all the way to the Scandinavian Peninsula must be recast. Bases in other countries will be affected, as will present oil pipelines and storage facilities, all part of a system which up to this time has provided a deterrent to an attack on any of the NATO countries by an aggressor.

Perhaps De Gaulle feels that he is now on good enough terms with the Communist nations, and indeed he has done enough courting in this regard, to tell his erstwhile allies that he does not need them any more. God forbid the day that he is proven wrong, but history has already repeated itself on one occasion since the turn of the century.

While we can probably sum up De Gaulle's attitude by his advice to his Foreign Minister that—

> No nation worthy of the name has friends—only interests.

But then one wonders whether the French President is not slyly aware of the fact that the United States would have no choice but to defend France from any aggression from the East because he knows that we cannot defend West Germany without forming a wall of protection for his country.

Perhaps there is something to be learned from De Gaulle's type of nationalism, but perhaps it would be a costly lesson. The fact remains that NATO was established because we wanted an insurance policy against any future Pearl Harbors or Dunkirks. But the net result is that NATO will be weakened and, for that matter, is being weakened at the present time.

I should point out in substantiating my reference to "a portrait of arrogant ingratitude" that on two occasions since the turn of the century U.S. fighting forces saved France from capitulation. And while France has been paying recently on World War II loans made by the United States, it has not paid a dime on its World War I debt.

Today, with the exception of Great Britain, France is farther in debt financially to the United States than any other nation in the world. To reflect even further the De Gaulle attitude, it must be remembered that only recently France made a demand upon the United States of its dollar credits for gold, thus adding to our own critical reserve problem. The record will show that De Gaulle has been converting about $34 million in American currency monthly into U.S. gold at $35 an ounce.

Perhaps it would be well for our policymakers to made a counter-demand of payment on the long-overdue French debt from World War I before we submit to any further conversions. That is about all we can do in the light of De Gaulle's eviction notice to NATO.

For the future, however, it seems that we have a further obligation to see that those nations with whom we enter into agreements as allies are prepared to carry out the spirit of such alliances in good faith.

FLORIDA WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT: A DECADE OF PROGRESS

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, during this century, and particularly during the past decade, the citizens of the State of Florida have witnessed a phenomenal growth of water resources development projects and activities throughout the length and breadth of the State.

With its hundreds of miles of shoreline and beaches in need of protection against erosion and hurricane damages; with its thousands of miles of streams in need of constant maintenance; with its hundreds of lakes, ponds, and estuaries which offer fishermen and sporting enthusiasts some of the best sports activities in the world; with its shipping and barge channels, canals, and waterways in need of constant maintenance; and with its ports and harbors for the vast amounts of commerce and trade with the nations of the world in need of expansion and improvement, the Sunshine State is surely one of the States of the Union which should receive primary attention in the development of water resources.

The marshlands of Florida need more effective drainage systems to prevent them from flooding the valuable agricultural lands of the State. Dikes and floodwalls must be improved to hold back lake waters and to prevent high tides and hurricane waters from rushing over our valuable land, destroying public and private properties. Harbor and port channels and turning basins must be constantly deepened to obtain the necessary depths for ever-increasingly large vessels, and the entrance channels to those harbors and ports must be maintained and deepened to remove silt and debris which constantly raise the sea floor toward the water's surface. Dams must be constructed to prevent the encroachment of salt water into the reserves of fresh water in the State. Revetments must be constructed to hold the shifting sands of the beaches back from filling the sealanes into harbors, ports, and bays. Groins must be constructed to prevent the erosion of the beaches. New and ingenious methods must be devised for hurricane protection.

Although there is much to be done which will require the expenditure of millions of dollars by all levels of government—Federal, State, and local—over many more years for necessary works of improvement, Florida is moving ahead and is meeting its responsibilities in the development of our water resources. Florida is moving ahead, but we must not be content with the accomplishments of the past alone, however great they may be. We must look to the future and to a continued growth of water resources activities in the State.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE POSITIONS

Since 1955, I have had the privilege of serving on the powerful House Committee on Public Works and its Subcommittees on Rivers and Harbors, Roads, Public Buildings and Grounds, and the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program. During my 12 years in the Congress, I have witnessed a phenomenal growth in public works in Florida, and I am sincerely pleased to have had a part in the legislative aspects of those developments. As the ranking Republican member of the full committee this Congress, I have been especially pleased at the progress of water resources developments in the State. If the Republicans gain control of the 90th Congress which convenes this coming January, I will become the chairman of the full committee. As the only Member of Congress from Florida on this influential committee, the development of public works projects in the Sunshine State is my responsibility.

PROJECTS COMPLETED

A recent summarization of the status of Florida's water-related public works projects revealed that 49 Corps of Engineers projects relating to channels and harbors have been completed at a Federal cost, including maintenance, of nearly $80.7 million, of which some 27 projects at a Federal cost, including maintenance, of over $67.3 million have been completed since January 1, 1955, the starting point of this remarkable decade of progress.

This same survey of corps projects revealed that no less than $8 million of Federal funds, including maintenance, had been expended for projects related to navigation locks and dams during the same period; $6.7 million, or almost 84 percent of these funds, have been for projects completed since the first of January of 1955.

Furthermore, almost 83.5 percent of all corps projects completed in the State have been completed during this decade of progress; $74 million of the total cost of $88.7 million has been expended for projects completed during the past 12 years. I am sure that there are few States which can boast of such an outstanding accomplishment. These figures, at least in my opinion, are astounding, and they clearly reveal the extent of water resources developments in the State.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in my remarks today, I wish to read into the RECORD a list of these completed projects to which I have just made reference with pertinent information relating to those projects according to the latest information from the Corps. This listing also indicates whether the projects were completed before or after January 1, 1955.

Corps of Engineers projects completed

I. NAVIGATION—CHANNELS AND HARBORS

Project	*Federal cost (including maintenance)*
Johns Pass	[1]$124,000
Pass-a-Grille Pass	
St. Petersburg Harbor	274,000
Clearwater Pass (Little Pass)	46,000
Ozona Harbor Channel and turning basin	110,000
Anclote River	361,000
Fernandina Harbor	4,672,000
Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway between Norfolk, Va., and St. Johns River, Fla., Jacksonville district section	1,186,000
Jacksonville Harbor	[1]26,750,000
St. Johns River, Jacksonville to Lake Harney	1,773,000
Rice Creek, Putnam County	[1]186,000
Lake Crescent and Dunns Creek	[1]18,000
St. Augustine Harbor	1,830,000
Courtenay Channel	23,000
Eau Gallie Harbor	10,000
Melbourne Harbor	18,000
Fort Pierce Harbor	1,327,000
St. Lucie Inlet	124,000
New River	[1]36,000
Port Everglades Harbor	[1]9,484,000
Bakers Haulover Inlet	[1]454,000
Everglades Harbor, Collier County	[1]251,000
Channel from Naples to Big Marco and Gordon Pass	[1]252,000
Fort Myers Beach	[1]105,000
Orange River	20,000
Charlotte Harbor	[1]1,645,000
New Pass (Sarasota)	[1]$45,000
Manatee River	[1]226,000
Kissimmee River	49,000
Homosassa River	6,000
Crystal River	45,000
Cedar Keys Harbor	177,000
Suwanee River	178,000
Horseshoe Cove	[1]397,000
Steinhatchee River	138,000
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway between Apalachee Bay, Fla., and the Mexican border, Florida section	[1]5,940,000
St. Marks River	[1]1,730,000
Panacea Harbor	[1]123,000
Carrabelle Harbor	304,000
Apalachicola Bay	[1]1,758,000
Port St. Joe Harbor	[1]2,511,000
Panama City Harbor	[1]3,376,000
Choctawhatchee River	172,000
Intracoastal Waterway, Miami to Key West	[1]6,218,000
Pensacola Harbor	[1]4,774,000
Largo Sound Channel	[1]38,000
La Grange Bayou	337,000
East Pass Channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Chotawatchee Bay	504,000
Blackwater River	198,000
Escambia and Conecuh Rivers	[1]376,000
Total	80,699,000
Total for projects on which work has been completed since Jan. 1, 1955	67,334,000
II. NAVIGATION—LOCKS AND DAMS	
Oklawaha River	1,316,000
Okeechobee Waterway	[1]6,706,000
Total	8,022,000
Total for projects on which work has been completed since Jan. 1, 1955	6,706,000
Total for all navigation projects completed	88,721,000
Total for all navigation projects on which work has been completed since Jan. 1, 1955	74,040,000

[1] Projects on which work has been completed since Jan. 1, 1955.

As the years go by, there will be a need for many more works of improvement in the State. There are many projects which are now in the process of construction, and there are many other projects which have been authorized by the Congress but on which no construction has commenced. I would like to address myself at this point to the first of those other categories, the projects underway.

PROJECTS UNDERWAY

Mr. Speaker, the $88.7 million which has been expended for projects completed is small in comparison to the amount of money being expended on projects presently underway. There are presently 16 projects underway with a projected total Federal cost, including maintenance of $509.2 million, or over a half billion dollars; $95.6 million is being expended on channel and harbor navigation projects underway, while another $145 million is being expended for canal locks and dams. Multiple-purpose projects underway total $64.4 million, and flood control projects for the Central and South Florida Flood Control District total some $143 million, to date, which will be, by far, the largest investment in any one group of associated and coordinated projects when it is eventually completed.

Although beach erosion control projects underway total nearly a million dollars, there is still a great need in the State for many more beach erosion control projects and for additional construction funds to complete those projects now underway. The bill which the House has considered today includes an additional three beach erosion control and related projects, but I will discuss those projects later in today's remarks.

Obviously, all of these projects will be completed after the beginning of this decade of progress and will be a further indication of what this decade of progress has brought to the Sunshine State.

A listing of water resources projects presently underway follows for the benefit of all interested in these developments:

Corps of Engineers projects underway

Project	*Projected Federal cost (including maintenance)*
I. NAVIGATION—CHANNELS AND HARBORS	
Intracoastal Waterway, Jacksonville to Miami	$25,300,000
Canaveral Harbor	5,000,000
Palm Beach Harbor	13,200,000
Miami Harbor	11,500,000
Key West Harbor	1,400,000
Intracoastal Waterway, Caloosahatchee River to Anclote	5,300,000
Tampa Harbor	28,700,000
Withlacoochee River	900,000
Removing the water hyacinth throughout Florida's waters	2,100,000
Aquatic plant control	2,200,000
Subtotal	95,600,000
II. NAVIGATION—CANAL LOCKS AND DAMS	
Cross-Florida Barge Canal (12 percent complete to date)	145,300,000
III. MULTIPLE PURPOSE	
Four River Basins (Green Swamp area)	57,800,000
Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint Rivers, Fla. and Georgia (Florida portion)	6,600,000
IV. FLOOD CONTROL	
Central and South Florida Flood Control District (appropriations to date)	143,000,000
V. BEACH EROSION CONTROL	
Palm Beach County from Lake Worth Inlet to South Lake Worth Inlet	[1] 500,000
Key West	[1] 400,000
Total for all projects underway	509,200,000

[1] Estimated Federal shares.

In addition to the many projects completed or underway, there are many projects in Florida which have been authorized but on which no construction has yet commenced.

ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZED CORPS PROJECTS

Including the Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Act of 1965, Public Law 89-298, there are 11 projects in Florida which have been authorized by an act of Congress but on which no construction work has started. Five of these projects are navigation ones; two are for flood control; and four are for beach erosion control. Eight of these projects were authorized by last year's Omnibus Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Act. All but one of the projects were authorized for construction after January 1, 1955; therefore, the estimated total Federal first cost for projects authorized but on which no construction has commenced which have been authorized since the beginning of our decade of progress is 98.7 percent of the total cost for all projects in Florida authorized but on which no construction has commenced.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in my remarks, I include a tabulation of these projects on which no construction has commenced for the benefit of anyone who seeks to accurately determine the status of such projects.

Corps projects authorized but on which no construction has commenced

Project	*Estimated Federal cost*
I. NAVIGATION	
Hudson River	$304,000
Broward County and Hillsboro Inlet	[1] 1,093,000
East Pass Channel of Gulf of Mexico	[1] 1,151,000
Jacksonville Harbor	[1] 8,884,000
Ponce de Leon Inlet	1,104,000
II. FLOOD CONTROL	
Biscayne Bay	[1] 1,954,000
Phillippi Creek	[1] 4,592,000
III. BEACH EROSION CONTROL	
Palm Beach County from Martin County line to Lake Worth Inlet and from South Lake Worth Inlet to Broward County line	[1] 193,000
Virginia Key and Key Biscayne	[1] 462,000
Duval County Beach Erosion Control	[1] 2,266,000
Fort Pierce Beach Erosion Control	[1] 220,000
Total	21,913,000
Total for all projects authorized after Jan. 1, 1955	21,519,000

[1] Projects authorized since Jan. 1, 1955.

Funds to initiate construction on the Virginia Key and Key Biscayne beach erosion control project were provided for in the 1967 budget request, and the House-passed public works appropriations bill contained $200,000 to initiate construction. The 1966 appropriations act included funds for preconstruction planning for the Fort Pierce beach erosion control project. The House-passed public works appropriation bill for fiscal year 1967 provided $80,000 for planning for the Jacksonville Harbor project, and $60,000 for planning for the Ponce de Leon Inlet navigation project. which have been authorized but on which no construction has commenced can be advanced to the construction stage, the better the water resources development

The sooner that all of these projects program in Florida will be. I hope that these worthwhile projects will soon be advanced to a construction stage.

THE OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS ACT OF 1966

The Omnibus Rivers and Harbors Act and Flood Control Act of 1966 which has now been favorably acted upon by both the House and the Senate contains a number of important projects and one survey in the State of Florida. These projects and survey in the 1966 act are the Gulf County Canal navigation project, the St. Lucie Inlet navigation project, the Mullet Key beach erosion control project, the Pinellas County Beaches beach erosion control project, the Johns Pass protective measures project, and a survey at Mexico Beach. These projects total $989,000 in Federal contributions.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1967

Mr. Speaker, the public works appropriations bill for fiscal year 1967 which the House passed on September 21, 1966, and the conference report on which was adopted by the House on October 11, 1966, provided for funds for a number of general investigations in the State of Florida and for a number of worthwhile projects there. These funds will enable many of these important projects and general investigations in the Sunshine State to proceed.

The conference report on the bill having now been acted upon favorably by the House, I think it is important to take a brief look at the projects and general investigations which were included in the bill and the purposes and amounts provided of and for each of those projects.

Florida surveys and projects in 1967

Survey or project and purpose	*Amount provided*
I. GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	
Anclote River (navigation)	$10,000
Apalachicola River "308" report, Georgia and Florida (navigation)	23,000
Blackwater and Yellow Rivers (flood control)	40,000
Brevard County (beach erosion)	13,000
Blackwater River and East Bay (navigation)	[1] 16,000
Central and southern Florida locks (navigation)	10,000
Econlockhatchee River (central and southern Florida project) (flood control)	50,000
Everglades National Park (flood control)	54,000
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway—Carrabelle to St. Marks River (navigation)	22,000
Indian Pass, Apalachicola Bay (navigation)	[1] 10,000
Intracoastal Waterway — St. Marks River to Tampa Harbor (navigation)	27,000
Lee County (beach erosion)	50,000
Panama City Harbor (navigation)	20,000
Pensacola Harbor (navigation)	20,000
Port Everglades (navigation)	30,000
Reedy Creek Basin (flood control)	[1] 126,000
Sarasota County (beach erosion)	50,000
South New River Canal (central and southern Florida project) (flood control)	34,000
Tampa Harbor (navigation)	[2] 135,000
Subtotal	740,000

Florida surveys and projects in 1967—Con.

Survey or project and purpose	*Amount provided*
II. PROJECTS	
Aquatic plant control (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas) (navigation)	$882,000
Apalachicola River, channel improvement (navigation)	350,000
Canaveral Harbor (navigation)	100,000
Central and southern Florida (flood control)	[3] 13,700,000
Cross-Florida Barge Canal (navigation)	16,000,000
East Pass Channel at Destin (navigation)	150,000
Four River Basins (flood control)	2,000,000
Intracoastal Waterway—Caloosahatchee River to Anclote River (navigation)	648,000
Jacksonville Harbor (for planning) (navigation)	[1] 80,000
Key West Harbor (navigation)	[1] 600,000
Palm Beach County, Lake Worth Inlet to South Lake Worth Inlet (reimbursement) (beach erosion)	10,000
Palm Beach Harbor (navigation)	1,800,000
Ponce de Leon Inlet (navigation)	[1] 60,000
Virginia Key and Key Biscayne (beach erosion)	200,000
Subtotal	36,580,000
Total	37,320,000

[1] Unbudgeted.

[2] Includes increase above budget request.

[3] Original budget amount revised as shown in budget amendment submitted in H. Doc. 441.

Mr. Speaker, the signing into law of this highly important public works appropriations bill will greatly enable the State of Florida to move forward with the necessary financing of projects. The Corps of Engineers should utilize the funds provided to it for this civil works construction in this bill as soon as possible. The construction of badly needed navigation, flood control, and beach erosion projects in the State will be another step in the goal toward full water resources development.

HURRICANE PROTECTION STUDIES

Mr. Speaker, there are six hurricane protection studies being carried out in Florida pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 84–71. These protection studies are being carried out at Charlotte Harbor—survey report completed, coastal areas—report completed, Fort Lauderdale and the Stranahan River—report completed, Hillsborough Bay—report completed, Naples—report completed, and the northwest Florida coast—report submitted.

Hurricane protection and beach erosion prevention are two major aspects of water resources developments in any State bordering on the sea. Hundreds of miles of Florida's shoreline are in danger of being lost forever, unless adequate means are undertaken to prevent this beach erosion. Of course, the most serious beach erosion occurs during the storms and hurricanes of the tropics which ravage the coasts of the State during the late summer and fall months. One storm can take away the land which nature has worked for thousands of years to take from the sea.

The sea attacks the land of Florida relentlessly, marshaling the force of its powerful waves and tides against the land. Our valuable coastline is eroded into the sea filling channels and harbors with silt. Valuable property, public and private, is washed away never to be reclaimed in many instances. Public buildings and private dwellings are endangered and property values sharply decline.

Adequate hurricane protection measures are essential to preserve the coast of Florida and the shoreline of America. It is vital to the economy that we do not lose valuable ocean front property. It will be a massive undertaking to prevent beach erosion or to adequately control it in Florida, but we must soon begin positive moves toward such prevention and control, if we are to save our land from the sea.

UNCOMPLETED CORPS SURVEYS IN FLORIDA

Mr. Speaker, there are numerous uncompleted surveys of the Corps of Engineers throughout Florida. These surveys are for project enlargements, additional boat basins, comprehensive appraisal of shoreline conditions, navigation improvements, flood control enhancements, beach erosion control and hurricane protection, conservation, reduction of salt water intrusion, better drainage, reduction of storm-tide and wave damage, and hydroelectric power development.

While some of these surveys are being completed and while some of them are being funded toward completion in the relatively near future, many of them have not been funded and for varying reasons have been in an inactive state.

To give a detailed indication of the extent of these uncompleted surveys, their purposes, and their statuses, as nearly as I can determine them, at this point in my remarks today, I wish to include a tabulation of these surveys:

Status of Corps of Engineers surveys in Florida

Surveys	Purpose	Status
Anclote River	Project enlargement	Being funded.
Apalachicola River in the vicinity of Bristol and in the vicinity of Blountstown	Additional boat basins	Do.
Appraisal report on beach conditions in Florida	Comprehensive appraisal of all shoreline	Completed.
Streams and harbor facilities at Bayport	Navigation	Indefinite.
Blackwater River and Yellow River	Flood control	Scheduled for submission in 1967.
Boca Raton Inlet	Navigation	Indefinite.
Boot Key Harbor side channel and basin, Intracoastal Waterway from Miami to Key West.	do	Do.
Brevard County beach erosion	Beach erosion and hurricane protection	Scheduled for completion in 1967.
Streams in Brevard County and Volusia County	Flood control and drainage	Indefinite.
Carrabelle Harbor	Navigation	Awaiting submission.
Cedar Keys Harbor and Channel	do	Do.
Charlotte Harbor	do	Indefinite.
Chipola River (Dead Lakes)	Conservation	Do.
Choctawhatchee River and tributaries	Navigation	Do.
Cross Bayou Canal	do	No funds available.
Crystal River	do	Awaiting submission.
Waterway from East Bay across Santa Rosa Peninsula to Gulf of Mexico	do	Do.
Escambia and Conecuh Rivers	do	Submission to have been in 1965.
Estero River, et al.	Flood control	Indefinite.
Fenholloway River Basin	do	Do.
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Carrabelle to St. Marks	Navigation	Do.
Intracoastal Waterway, St. Marks to Tampa Bay	do	Submission to be in 1967.
Joes Bayou	do	Indefinite.
Jupiter Inlet	do	Completed.
Jupiter Island	Beach erosion control	Completed in 1966.
Side channel at Lake Worth	Navigation	Indefinite.
Lanark Village to St. George Sound	do	Do.
Little Gasparilla Pass, Charlotte City	do	Do.
Little Manatee River	do	Do.
Channel from Lynn Haven Bayou into North Bay	Small boat navigation	Do.
Manatee River (including Braden River)	Flood control and reduction of salt-water encroachment.	Do.
Miami Beach side channel	Navigation	Do.
Miami Harbor	do	Near completion.
Miami River locks and dams	Navigation and prevention of salt-water intrusion.	Completed.
Mills Creek (Callahan)	Drainage, flood control, and navigation	Indefinite.
New River	Navigation	Do.
Okeechobee Waterway—Side channel and turning basin at Clewiston	do	Do.
Orange Lake Basin	Flood control and water conservation	No funds available.
Palatka side channel	Navigation	Indefinite.
Pensacola Bay—channel at B Street	do	Do.
Boat basin and channel connecting Bayliss Memorial Wayside Park with the authorized channel in Pensacola Bay.	do	Do.

Status of Corps of Engineers surveys in Flordia—Continued

Surveys	Purpose	Status
Pithlachascotee River	Navigation	Completed.
St. Augustine and vicinity	Flood control and reduction of storm-tide and wave damage.	Do.
Streams in St. Johns, Flagler, and Putnam Counties	Flood control and drainage	Indefinite.
St. Johns County	Beach erosion control	Completed.
St. Petersburg Harbor additional depth	Navigation	Indefinite.
Sanford to Indian River	do	Do.
Satilla River, Ga.; St. Marys River, Ga. and Fla.; and Suwanee River, Ga. and Fla.	Flood control, navigation, and hydroelectric power.	Completed.
Sebastian Inlet	Navigation	Indefinite.
Streams in Seminole County	Water conservation	Do.
Stock Island (safe harbor)	Navigation	Do.
Coastal streams betweeen Suwanee and Apalachicola Rivers	Navigation and flood control	Do.
Suwanee River to St. Johns Waterway	Navigation	Do.
Tampa Bay fresh-water lake	Water supply and conservation	Do.
Tampa Harbor deepwater channel	Navigation	Do.
Waccasassa River	Flood control and navigation	Abridged report completed.

Mr. Speaker, the advancement of those surveys which are uncompleted in the State, which surveys are demonstrably worth while and which are desired by local interests to a stage of actual investigation should be undertaken as rapidly as possible. The future development of many areas of the State may well depend upon the rate at which the corps undertakes these surveys. As a matter of procedure alone, these surveys must be completed and favorably acted upon before the Congress can take any decisive steps toward actual authorization of the needed works of improvement.

CORPS WORK UNDER SPECIAL AUTHORITIES

Mr. Speaker, there have been several projects carried out or in the process of being carried out which are under special authorities. The Lynn Haven Bayou project, which provides for a small-craft channel, has been completed as have others. The emergency work for beach restoration under the provisions of Public Law 875 has been completed. The flood plain information studies in Broward, Charlotte, and north Lee Counties under the authority of Public Law 645 of the 86th Congress are in process.

THE FUTURE: WATER RESOURCES AND FLORIDA

Mr. Speaker, as the information that I have set forth in the RECORD indicates, there has been a phenomenal growth of water resources development activities in Florida during the past 10 to 12 years. The totality of these projects, including navigation channel and harbor and navigation locks and dams, multiple-purpose projects, flood control projects, beach erosion control projects, surveys, special authority projects, and hurricane protection projects, amounts to a total Federal expenditure for completed, underway, and not-yet-started projects of $620,823,000, or over two-thirds of a billion dollars. No less than $605,748,000 or 97.5 percent of the $620.8-plus billion has been for projects completed after January 1, 1955, for projects authorized after January 1, 1955, and for projects still in the construction stages which obviously will be finished after the beginning of our decade of progress.

There remains much to be done. We must not rely upon the laurels of the past in our water resources development program, while we are enjoying the benefits of those past projects. We must look to the future in Florida, and we must strive with all of our energies to bring about the realization of necessary construction on projects in the State.

Florida looks forward to a future of substantial development of its water resources. The cooperation of all levels of government—Federal, State, and local—along with the cooperation of all interested organizations and citizens toward such a goal as full development of our water resources will be essential for the orderly construction of these projects and for the orderly development of the State's water resources.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to serve as the only member of the congressional delegation from Florida on the Committee on Public Works and I am proud to have had a hand in the development of Florida's water-related public works during my 12 years in Congress. We in Florida look forward to continued development of water resources not only in our State but throughout the Nation.

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, several months ago, one of the most dedicated and conscientious Members of Congress that I have ever known announced his intention to retire from this body at the end of this session. After 18 years of outstanding public service to his State and to his Nation, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHN C. KUNKEL, will retire at the end of this Congress.

As a Member who has served with him in the House and on the Public Works Committee alike, it saddened me to hear that we would lose his valuable services in the years to come. JOHN is retiring as every Member should retire—not as a sulking politician, but rather as one still wholely dedicated to his Nation, his State, and his political party. Few Members have ever retired as JOHN KUNKEL is retiring, for he has devoted every minute of his life during the past few months, despite his impending retirement, to his congressional responsibilities. He has covered his congressional district as well as any man running for reelection. He has continued to inform the people of his district on the activities of Congress and on his role in those activities. He has made practically every rollcall in this House. He has not missed a single session of the Committee on Public Works on which he has served with distinction. He has assumed as much responsibility in the handling of legislation in which he has an interest as any Member ever could assume.

This is not unusual, however, for JOHN KUNKEL. Public service has been a continuing and major part of his life.

JOHN KUNKEL's family tree is profuse with ancestors who devoted their lives to public service. His heritage in responsible government is almost without equal in the Congress. His grandfather was a Member of the 34th and 35th Congresses. He is the great-grandson of John Sergeant, who was a Member of this body for eight terms and a candidate for the Vice Presidency of the United States. He is also the great-grandson of Robert Whitehill, who was a Member of Congress from the 9th through the 13th Congresses. Furthermore, he is the great-great-grandson of a Member of the Continental Congress.

JOHN KUNKEL did not let the family tradition down but rather he enhanced it even more.

Born in Harrisburg, Pa., which he represents in this body today, he was educated at Harrisburg Academy, Phillips Academy, Andover, Yale University, and Harvard Law School. He followed a varied business career which included the practice of law, banking, and farming. He has been admitted to practice before the bar from Dauphin County to the Supreme Court of the United States. Following in the footsteps of his family stalwarts, he was first elected to Congress in 1938 and served from the 76th through the 81st Congress. He began his second congressional career in May 1961 when he was elected Congressman from Pennsylvania's 16th District to fill the unexpired term of the late Walter M. Mumma.

JOHN's public service extends far beyond elected office. He has always been a vigorous participant in community activities in the Harrisburg area. He is a member of the board of directors of the Harrisburg Public Library; the Boys Club of Harrisburg, of which he has been president for the past 3 years; the Family and Children's Service of Harrisburg, and a host of other various organizations, fund drives, and institutions. His interest in the educational institutions of his State never waned, and he serves today on the board of trustees of Wilson College in Chambersburg, and Franklin and Marshall College in Lancaster. He is a life vestryman of St. Stephen's Episcopal Church of Harrisburg.

Mr. Speaker, JOHN KUNKEL's most outstanding service to his State and to his Nation has been his dedicated service in the Congress. While in Congress his first time he served as the chairman of the Herter committee, a subcommittee of the then Committee on Finance, which subcommittee laid the foundation for the Marshall plan. He was president of the 76th Club, which was composed of Republican Members elected to Congress in 1938.

During his second congressional career, JOHN has served as a member of the Republican policy committee and as a member of the Committee on Public Works.

It was through his outstanding service on the Committee on Public Works that I got to know JOHN best. His dedication and zeal to improve legislation pending before that committee and to insure the soundness of any measures reported by that committee endeared him to the hearts of his fellow committee members, Democrat and Republican alike. He has served on the Subcommittees on Flood Control, Watershed Development, and Economic Development Programs, but his most outstanding service has been on the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds. During the past 2 years, JOHN has served as the ranking Republican member of that subcommittee, and his efforts in behalf of the public buildings program of the Federal Government will long contribute to the stability of the program.

Last spring, upon the death of our late colleague from California, John F. Baldwin, JOHN was asked to serve as the ranking minority member on the highly important Subcommittee on Flood Control. Sensing a need for learned members on the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds to remain on that subcommittee to thwart any attempts by the executive to detrimentally slash the authority of the committees of Congress to approve public building prospectuses before construction could be commenced on public buildings and to seek an orderly continuation of the worthwhile program at a time when the executive was beginning to call for a cutback in the construction program, JOHN declined the opportunity, which was rightly his, to become the ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on Flood Control. This was one of many times that JOHN KUNKEL demonstrated his dedication to the people of this Nation.

The Committee on Public Works has jurisdiction over the Federal-aid highway programs, rivers and harbors and flood control works of improvement, public buildings and grounds, watershed development, certain economic development programs, water pollution control, and several other highly important activities of the Federal Government. JOHN KUNKEL's service on the committee has done much to strengthen and improve those important programs.

One of the lasting achievements of the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be his activities in this Congress to make certain improvements in the Federal water pollution control program. Not only as a member of the committee, but also a member of the conference committee which worked out the differences between the House and Senate versions of the legislation, JOHN's untiring efforts to improve the program, particularly by bringing the States more actively into it, was evident to all. The inclusion of many worthwhile provisions of this year's amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act will stand as a testament to JOHN's determination to clean up the rivers of America.

Mr. Speaker, JOHN's activities have not been confined solely to public service, for he has found escape from the troubles of the world in becoming one of this Nation's great bridge players. Only a few weeks ago, local newspapers heralded his achievements in tournament bridge competition. He has not only won the national bridge championship, but he and his lovely wife, Kitty, have placed third in the national mixed pairs competition three times. JOHN has always found delight in traveling to my hometown, St. Petersburg, Fla., and in walking away with the many bridge tournament championships which have been awarded there. A busy congressional schedule has precluded JOHN and his wife from bridge tournaments over the past few years, but I am confident that upon his retirement we will hear of him many times winning more tournaments.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a rewarding experience to me to have served and to have known JOHN KUNKEL during the past 5 years. I think I can rightly speak for all of the Republican members of the Committee on Public Works on which I have served with him in saying that his service will be sorely missed in sessions to come. We are heartened, nevertheless, by our awareness of JOHN's devotion in the past to his State and his Nation and by our awareness that his interests will continue to bring success to the people who put their trust in his service. He is a great Congressman.

ANTIRIOT BILL PERMITTED TO DIE WHILE RIOTS CONTINUE

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, again riots in America capture the headlines of the papers and Congress is heading for adjournment without taking action on the Cramer antiriot bill.

It is unconscionable that the House leaders in control of the legislative machinery should permit the session to end without taking action on the vital antiriot legislation which I and nearly 100 other House Members introduced and containing the language of an amendment to the civil rights bill that passed on a record vote by 389 to 25.

The responsibility for not providing the necessary Federal action to curb these riots rests squarely on the shoulders of those who have permitted this bill to remain bottled up in the Committee on the Judiciary and on those who bottled up my motion before the Rules Committee to discharge the Judiciary Committee and adopt a rule for consideration of the bill.

Oakland, Calif., is seething with riots and San Francisco recently was stricken by rampaging rioters. Molotov cocktails are the order of the day. Evidences of professional riot agitators exist in California and in many other States, inciting and egging on rioters.

Federal action is needed to act as a nationwide deterrent to those who use interstate facilities and travel in interstate commerce for the purpose of inciting these riots. The FBI needs authority to investigate what individuals and groups are fomenting these riots, who is teaching these people to make Molotov cocktails, who is encouraging otherwise peaceful citizens to loot stores, to attack the "whiteys," to shout hate slogans, to preach against our efforts in South Vietnam, and to disrupt the domestic tranquility of so many of our cities.

Congress is to be judged by what it does not do as well as by what it does do. Congress is derelict in not enacting needed antiriot legislation this year. Promises of hearings next year do not act as deterrents to those rioters who continue to disrupt our cities. I am deeply disturbed that action was not taken on my bill.

TEACHERS DESERVE TAX JUSTICE

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, on May 6, 1965, I introduced H.R. 7950, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which would allow more definitive and extensive tax deductions for educational expenses incurred by teachers. In my opinion, such legislation is necessary if qualified and experienced teachers are to be encouraged to continue in the teaching profession.

Congress is adjourning without taking action, but nonetheless, Members of Congress can still render a vital service to the teachers of the Nation by expressing their objections to the regulations proposed October 1 by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On July 7, 1966, the Internal Revenue Service proposed regulations which would virtually eliminate the small gains which had been made to provide tax justice for teachers. As a result of these discriminatory proposed regulations, a great number of Congressmen voiced strong objections, and many introduced remedial legislation. As a result, the Revenue Service withdrew its proposed regulations on October 1, 1966, and issued a revised proposal. The revised proposal, at first glance, appeared to provide some relief, but after careful study, it is obvious it contains numerous serious discrepancies which would, in effect, discriminate against members of the teaching profession, and other taxpayers who pursue additional education in connection with their employment or profession.

Today I have written a letter to Mr. Sheldon S. Cohen, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Department of the Treasury, expressing my views. I urge my colleagues to do the same prior to November 15, the deadline for receipt of comments prior to issuing final regulations.

The text of my letter is as follows:

Reference: CC:LR:T; Comments Proposed Regulations; 26 CFR Part I; Proposed Rule Making, Published October 1, 1966, Federal Register at page 12843.

DEAR COMMISSIONER COHEN: I understand that the new proposed IRS regulations concerning the deduction of educational expenses as printed in the Federal Register for October 1, 1966, are the latest effort of IRS to meet the conditions which have caused considerable confusion, especially to members of the teaching profession.

The October 1 proposed regulations are far superior, of course, to those proposed in the July 7, 1966, Federal Register. However, I wish to urge further consideration for inclusion of additional features in these latest proposals as follows:

1. Elimination of such language as permits subjective judgements on the part of IRS agents in dealing with individual taxpayers. The regulations should be phrased in such language that the taxpayer cannot be subjected to whimsical interpretations based on the attitude of the IRS agent who may review his returns.

2. The discrimination against a teacher who, while presently employed as a teacher, has not yet earned the Bachelor's Degree should be eliminated. The authority to decide who is or who is not qualified for employment as a teacher is clearly not a matter for decision at the federal level, certainly not by IRS officials. The determination of the right to teach is made by the State or institution of higher education in which the teacher is employed, not the federal government. The regulation as written is a matter, intentional or not, of an invasion of the State's right to control education.

3. The new regulations are indefinite as to the types of educational expenses which are deductible. It seems reasonable that these should be specifically enumerated to include tuition, books, fees, supplies, materials, and traveling expenses. Such specific provision again would assist the taxpayer in knowing clearly just what items are deductible. As presently written, the regulations seem to leave this matter to the discretion of the IRS agent.

4. The right to deduct expenses incurred for education which may qualify a teacher to move into a principalship should be retained by the teacher. Principals are considered part of the instructional faculty in most schools. Also, while a teacher may take courses leading to qualification as a principal, these same courses may well be those which improve the taxpayer's competence as a teacher. The practice of IRS agents of analyzing college transcripts and deciding which courses are deductible and which are not is the basis of much of the understandable discontent of teachers with the present procedure.

I hope, before final regulations are adopted, that the improvements herein suggested may be included.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING ROLLCALLS

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am not recorded on several rollcalls and wish to announce my positions with respect to each vote so that my record in the 89th Congress will be complete:

Rollcall No. 244 I would have voted "yea."

Rollcall No. 245 I would have voted "nay."

Rollcall No. 274 I would have voted "yea."

Rollcall No. 722 I would have voted "nay."

Rollcall No. 346 I would have voted "nay."

Rollcall No. 374 I would have voted "nay."

Rollcall No. 375 I would have voted "nay."

Rollcall No. 378 I would have voted "yea."

Rollcall No. 379 I would have voted "yea."

Rollcall No. 380 I would have voted "yea."

Rollcall No. 381 I would have voted "nay."

Rollcall No. 385 I would have voted "nay."

Rollcall No. 386 I would have voted "yea."

VIRGIN ISLANDS GOVERNORSHIP LEGISLATION

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, October 18, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my reasons for not taking further action on the legislation which would provide for the elected governorship of the Virgin Islands at this time. I feel that the actions of the Governor and the majority of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands in considering the reapportionment issue last August, left much to be desired as mature and responsible legislators.

As I stated at that time, I was joining the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs [Mr. ASPINALL] in recommending that the Senate amendments to the legislation be passed over until the 90th Congress.

In view of my opposition to the enactment of this legislation, the issue has become a partisan matter in the coming elections in the islands, thereby doing a disservice to the residents and voters of the islands. However, these actions further substantiate my belief that this legislation is deserving of more complete consideration and this can only be done in the new 90th Congress.

On this same date, October 18, there appeared an editorial in the Daily News of the Virgin Islands, entitled "Place the Blame Where It Belongs" and I wish to incorporate the same as a part of my remarks.

PLACE THE BLAME WHERE IT BELONGS

The bill which would permit popular election of a governor of the Virgin Islands and Guam is stalled at this point between the Senate and the House of Representatives in Washington. Rep. LEO O'BRIEN, who has been pushing home rule for the territories, has almost succeeded in achieving this portion of his goal, "not quite."

Apparently opposition to the bill from Rep. JOHN P. SAYLOR of Pennsylvania is reported to be keeping the measure from a speedy acceptance by the House. The two versions contain major differences, and the Quaker State congressman seems determined that a conference of committees be held.

Since the session is close to adjournment, his actions may end the possibility of the passage of the bill for this year. The gentleman from New York blames apparent failure of the bill on party politics. Mr. O'BRIEN claims that this is an excellent opportunity for opponents of the bill to make it a party issue.

Not so.

If the elected governor bill fails of passage, blame for such a failure can be laid squarely at the door of the power-drunk majority in the Virgin Islands Legislature.

For a long time congressmen have looked with high favor upon this territory, and its needs were considered non-partisan. What soured many senators and representatives was the incredible attitude of majority members of the legislature on the question of reapportionment. Before the reapportionment bill could be signed into law by the President of the United States, the governor of the Virgin Islands summoned a special session of the legislature and rammed through an "at large" requirement for the new 15-member legislature. The measure was justified by the governor, who signed the bill into law (as well as the Mississippi oath bill, too.)

Remember?

Although the "at large" requirement was hastily repealed in another special session, the damage had been done, and several key congressmen openly charged the ruling faction here with "immaturity."

Whether or not the elected governor bill passes at this time, the current crisis over its passage should be a clear indication to the voters that the Mortar Pestle faction, in their ill-timed efforts to perpetuate themselves in power, have failed the islands.

Let the voters consider this well.

PUERTO RICO

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on September 22, I and a number of our colleagues, including Representatives O'BRIEN, MORTON, RIVERS of Alaska, CRALEY, CAREY, WRIGHT, MOSHER, and HALPERN introduced into the Congress legislation which would provide for the admission into the Union, on an equal footing with the original States, of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

This legislation was introduced following the submission of the long-awaited report of the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the status of Puerto Rico. Obviously the sponsors of the bills were not so naive to believe that action would be taken during the closing weeks of the 89th Congress. We did, however, want to indicate to the more than 2 million American citizens living in Puerto Rico that the door for Puerto Rican statehood is open whenever they ask for it. We want them to know that the Congress of the United States is ready to offer them the same privileges and obligations that are accorded other citizens of the United States. We want them to feel they are wanted in the same manner that the American citizens of Alaska and Hawaii were wanted before they achieved statehood. We want them to feel that Puerto Rico is a part of the United States and they are invited to make their wishes known when they are ready for statehood. My colleagues and I extend a hand of friendship to our Puerto Rican brethren and are ready to welcome them to full citizenship when by plebiscite they ask for statehood. We do not want to discriminate against Puerto Ricans any more than we discriminate against Negroes, Indians, or other minority groups. We recognize that a great majority of Puerto Ricans want to be U.S. citizens in the fullest sense and that to be a member of the sisterhood of States is a goal that can be achieved. The mere fact that the incorporated territory of Puerto Rico is separated from the mainland by water is no reason why the Puerto Ricans cannot strive for and seek statehood. Hawaii too is separated from the continental United States, but it has not found it difficult to play the role of the 50th State.

No one of the sponsors of this Puerto Rican statehood legislation wants to coerce our island friends to accept a status they do not want, but we do want them to know the invitation has been issued. We would welcome other sponsors either in the 89th or 90th Congress, when our legislation will be reintroduced.

I want to commend the members of the Status Commission for the thoroughness of their report and for equal consideration that was given to statehood, the continuation of commonwealth, and independence. May I quote from page 14 of the status report wherein it states:

> It is the belief of the Commission that Puerto Rico is at a stage in its history where the question of status should be elevated above partisanship. No area has ever achieved statehood without a broad public demand transcending party lines—Puerto Rico is a stable political community fully capable, by virtue of its demonstrated capacity for democratic self-government, of assuming the responsibilities of statehood.

Mr. Speaker, I again invite other Members of Congress to join in sponsoring statehood legislation for Puerto Rico, but with the understanding that no further congressional action will take place until the voters of the Commonwealth have approved the proposition found in section 7 of my bill, H.R. 17918, which reads:

> Shall Puerto Rico immediately be admitted into the Union as a State?

CONGRESSMAN HENRY S. REUSS URGES AN END TO TAX-FREE MUNICIPAL INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BONDS

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, many of us in the House have been waging a protracted fight to abolish the financing of business facilities with tax-exempt municipal bonds—a privilege given to municipalities for use in financing public facilities like schools, roads, and hospitals. In this Congress, Congressman HENRY S. REUSS and I have joined in cosponsoring two bills offering alternatives for ending this raid on the U.S. Treasury.

Congressman REUSS recently addressed the biennial Municipal Conference of the Investment Bankers Association in San Francisco on why we can do without these bonds. He has again made a strong and well-documented case for abolishing this financing.

As Congressman REUSS points out, the 90th Congress may at long last have the opportunity to pass on this important and complex issue. I think his remarks, which follow, will be of interest to other Members of this body.

MUNICIPAL INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BONDS—WE CAN DO WITHOUT THEM

For three years I have been fighting to end the federal tax exemption from municipal industrial development bonds.

In 100 speeches I have pointed out that they are not in the interest of a sound economy. So one more speech won't hurt, particularly when it is given in San Francisco, and particularly when it is given before the Investment Bankers Association.

I would like to pay tribute to the public-spirited opposition which the IBA has taken to these development bonds. Your short-term self-interest might have swayed you to support this form of financing: after all, investment bankers make money on municipal industrial development bonds, so why rock the boat?

But instead, you have gone counter to your own short-term economic interest. This places you in the Pantheon with such groups as America's dentists, who have fought for fluoridation of public water supplies in order to prevent tooth decay. Dentists make a living filling people's cavities, and there must have been those among the dentists who resisted efforts to cut down on decay.

Just like the dentists, you are trying to wipe out the decay in our federal financial system. If that makes us abolitionists, so be it. If we lack some of the fervor of that earlier abolitionist, William Lloyd Garrison, it is because we are dealing with a war between the states that is, happily, a bloodless one.

A bloodless war between the states it has, until recently, assuredly been.

The Southern states—mainly Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Tennessee and Kentucky—have been the leaders in issuing these bonds. Between 1951 and 1962 nearly 90 percent of this financing was done by localities in these states.

But now many other states have entered the competition. In the first six months of this year, in addition to these five states, Oklahoma, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Nebraska, Georgia, Delaware, West Virginia and Ohio have recorded these issues.

Today municipal industrial development bonds can be issued in thirty-three states. Pennsylvania is preparing authorizing legislation. Texas and Florida barely escaped last legislative session from joining the list; the question will undoubtedly be renewed there. And this November 8, the voters of Massachusetts will decide whether their constitution should be amended to permit issuance of these bonds.

In early June, New York City formed a Public Development Corporation, headed by General Lucius D. Clay. Clay presumably was called upon to prevent the attrition of embattled New York as he saved embattled Berlin seventeen years ago. The city is fighting back to curtail the net average annual loss of 10,000 jobs which it has experienced since 1950. Of course, municipal industrial development bonds are the prime weapon in General Clay's arsenal.

We are now witnessing the final maneuverings in what promises to be a costly and self-defeating battle royal among the states.

A certain winner will be the corporations who use the subsidized, bond-financed facilities. A sure loser will be the U.S. Treasury.

Nor will the states who are now greatly benefiting from the sales of these bonds fare well. For now that the highly developed areas which enjoy natural economic advantages for plant location are joining the fray, the advantage of tax-exempt financing will be nullified.

If this beggar-thy-neighbor competition were taking place among nations, it would be roundly condemned by all (but the French) as the worst sort of economic nationalism. And so it should be among states.

The explosive growth in recent years of municipal industrial development bonds can be judged from these conservative IBA figures: 1950—$7 million of municipal industrial development bonds issued; 1960—$40 million issued; 1962—$85 million issued; 1965—$210 million issued; first nine months of 1966—$439 million issued.

Eastman Dillon Union Securities & Co., moreover, place the figure for sales of these bonds much higher. It estimates that, in 1965, $1 billion worth were sold.

At $1 billion, which will probably be a conservative figure for sales of these bonds in 1966, this giveaway financing is huge by any measure. It is more than 20 percent of the $4.7 billion of new corporate bonds issued by all manufacturing firms in 1965. It is about 10 percent of the $10 to $11 billion annual totals of all state and local securities marketed.

Defenders of this financing would have us believe that: (1) the typical municipal industrial bond issue is floated by a small town in a poverty-stricken area which is suffering from high unemployment; (2) it is a small bond issue of several hundred thousand dollars, and (3) a small company of limited financial resources receives the subsidy.

Let's look at the facts:

In the first six months of 1966, 61 municipal industrial development bond issues totalling over $325 million were recorded by the IBA. Individual issues ranged from a low of $60,000 to a high of $70 million. Approximately one-third of the issues exceeded one million dollars, one-third fell between $500,000 and $1 million, and the remaining one-third were less than $500,000.

In dollar amount, however, $269 million of the $325 million of bonds sold, over 80 percent, were accounted for by just six bond issues, all of which exceeded $20 million.

Of the six localities benefiting from these large bond issues, only two are in areas in which unemployment was greater than 6 percent and median family income was below $2,264—the criteria for qualification for federal aid from the Economic Development Administration. Of the seven corporations which will be subsidized—Skelly Oil Company, American Can Company, United Fruit Company, Phoenix Steel Corporation, Air Reduction Corporation, Armco Steel Corporation, and Nekoosa-Edwards Paper Company—five are listed on the New York Stock Exchange and one on the American Stock Exchange. Only one corporation is not listed on either of these two major exchanges.

The true picture of municipal industrial development financing is that it is dominated by multi-million dollar issues for the benefit of industrial giants which are in most cases not locating in areas of high unemployment and low income.

And the record $70 million Camden, Alabama, issue of last April will soon be toppled by an $80 million issue by Middletown, Ohio. It will finance another expansion of Armco Steel Corporation.

I would expect to see bond issues exceeding $100 million floated before the year is out. The list of companies now taking advantage of this Federal subsidy reads like a *Who's Who* of American corporations—corporations like American Machine and Foundry; Armour, Cutler-Hammer, General Tire and Rubber, Olin-Mathieson, and U.S. Rubber. A $100 million plant could be built by any of them.

Any community with the power to issue revenue bonds in 33 states is a potential front for these issues. They are sold solely on the credit of the corporation which will lease or buy the plant. How else would the Village of Champ, Missouri, be able to float a $12.5 million bond issue this last spring in order to lure three companies, then operating elsewhere, to locate there? It has only 50 residents and 14 qualified voters.

We can do without this bizarre bonanza—and the sooner it is ended the better.

The gains which have been made by a few communities who have pulled in big fish with this sophisticated industrial lure are far outweighed by the harm which results from municipal industrial development bond issues. Here is the bill of particulars—

1. These bond issues use public credit for essentially private purposes. The function of state and local governments is to provide for public needs—schools, hospitals, roads, waste treatment facilities—not to finance spark plug factories or greeting card plants.

Today the municipalities build and own manufacturing plants. Tomorrow they may be operating them. In fact, the City of Deming, New Mexico is doing just that. It operates two tool companies, a maker of oil-well test equipment and a toy factory. All are run under contract to private business. The combined sales of these four enterprises total about $4.5 million. And the City of Deming is the biggest employer in town, employing some 600 people.

2. They compete unfairly. I know of only one proposed municipal industrial development bond issue which has been defeated. On February 1, 1966, the voters of Siloam Springs, Arkansas rejected a proposed $1.2 million issue to expand the poultry-producing capacity of the firm Pius Poultry, Inc. A group of over 200 independent poultry growers of the County was organized to protest the granting of this subsidy to Pius Poultry, Inc.—a subsidy which was not available to the independent growers. They succeeded.

Unfortunately, not many corporations locate so close to existing competitors that this kind of local pressure can be brought to bear. But more-distant competitors suffer just the same.

And now municipal industrial development bonds are being used to purchase existing property for lease-back to the original owner. In Great Bend, Kansas, J.C. Penney recently benefited from such abuse of the tax-exemption privilege. $35 million of bonds of the Northern Delaware Industrial Development Corporation were floated last April to refinance the existing foundry of Phoenix Steel Corporation. The possibilities for use of these bonds to subsidize businesses with an in at city hall are endless once this bridge is crossed.

Another abuse is already widespread. A corporation can increase its windfall by purchasing the tax-exempt bonds which the municipality has issued to finance the plant. This provides a ready market for the bonds, and it enables the corporation to earn tax-free income at the same time that it enjoys lower rental cost due to tax-exempt financing.

3. They hurt legitimate municipal borrowing. Municipalities using their borrowing power and tax-exemption privilege to finance needed public facilities are beginning to suffer from high interest rates made higher and scarce credit resources made scarcer by the flood of municipal industrial development bond issues. The New York State Comptroller has recently said that "some states are already finding interest rates prohibitive as a result of the general practice of exploiting the tax-exempt status [of municipal bonds] and they have been forced either to pay higher interest rates or abandon much current capital construction."

4. Municipal industrial development bond financing is a sophisticated means of pirating plants. I first became interested in municipal industrial development financing when, in March 1964, Cutler-Hammer Corporation of Milwaukee announced that it would pull up stakes and move a part of its operations to Bowling Green, Kentucky. Bowling Green built Cutler-Hammer a new plant with the proceeds of a $6.5 million bond issue. And Milwaukee lost 750 skilled labor jobs as a result—an annual payroll of over $5 million.

Manufacturing plants must remain mobile—moving in relation to hard economic facts such as sources of raw material, labor supply and market outlets. But, for the lure of subsidized financing to tip the balance, as in the Cutler-Hammer case, is capricious and damaging to general economic efficiency.

5. Municipal industrial development bonds permit inflationary, federally-subsidized, back-door financing of business investment which it is now federal government policy to discourage.

Congress has just responded to a request by the President to suspend the seven percent investment tax credit and accelerated depreciation until January 1, 1968. The purpose of this legislation is to apply the brakes to booming business investment expenditures in order to relieve the pressure of demand for capital goods and on the general resources of the economy.

In addition, the Federal Reserve has seen fit to discourage investment by raising the rediscount rate, and tightening money generally. As a result, interest rates are at their highest level in 40 years. Prime long-term industrial bond issues are selling for over 5½ percent and the bank prime rate is 6 percent.

It is anomalous indeed for the Treasury at the same time to be allowing corporations to finance $439 million of new plant in the first 9 months of this year at low rates through the sale of municipal industrial development bonds.

Uncle Sam allows the back door to stand wide open while he carefully guards the front.

6. These bonds conflict with Federal economic programs for local development.

The federal government has long been concerned with the economic development of areas of high and chronic unemployment. In the last six years, for example, Congress has established the Area Redevelopment program, the accelerated public works program, the Appalachia progrgam, and the Economic Development program. It is the aim of all of these programs to encourage industrial development in economically underdeveloped areas. But this is to be done in an orderly fashion which will not cause distress to other areas.

For example, the first statutory restriction upon Economic Development Administration loans to corporations to construct plants and to purchase machinery is that these loans not "be extended to assist establishments relocating from one area to another."

Another restriction is that these loans not be extended "unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available from private lenders".

And, of course, these loans can only be made to businesses establishing plants in EDA areas—areas of low income and chronically high unemployment.

None of these reasonable conditions apply to the marketing of municipal industrial development bonds. As I have already pointed out: plant pirating is a frequent occurrence; large corporations with high bond ratings and with shares traded on the New York Stock Exchange are the largest beneficiaries of these subsidies; and the major share of the money is not spent in areas of low income and chronic unemployment.

In short, fostering economic development through municipal industrial bond issues is at best an uncontrolled, hit-or-miss device.

7. This continued raid on the Treasury is itself disruptive of government policy. At a time when we may be called upon to increase taxes to pay for the Vietnam War, these subsidies, which cost the federal government somewhere in the neighborhood of $35 to $75 million annually, should be stopped.

What is to be done?

The American Bar Association's Committee on Taxation of Municipal Bonds recently recommended that this abuse of the tax exemption privilege should be curbed—but by the 50 states individually; and not by the federal government.

This is an appealing position, especially to those who fear that a move against municipal industrial development bonds could materialize into a wholesale attack on the municipal bond exemption.

Unfortunately, the states individually cannot come to grips with this problem. As in other areas of fierce competition among the states, the prize goes to the swiftest and the devil take the hindmost. Any state which prohibits or responsibly restricts the issuance of municipal industrial development bonds is simply asking for its industry to be raided.

To eliminate unfair competitive advantage among the states, federal legislation is necessary.

In the 89th Congress I introduced two bills which offer alternative ways of eliminating this abuse; and I plan to reintroduce this legislation in the 90th Congress next January.

One bill would abolish these bond issues by indirection. It provides that whenever proceeds from a tax-exempt bond issue are used to construct facilities for sale or lease to private profitmaking corporations, these corporations may not deduct rental payments for the use of these facilities in figuring their federal income tax. Your organization has endorsed this bill.

The second bill takes the direct approach. It would remove the tax exemption from state and local bonds to the extent that the proceeds are used to construct industrial or commercial facilities for sale or lease to private profitmaking corporations. Purchasers of such bonds can be assured of the extent to which tax exemption applies through a certification procedure provided for in the bill.

The bill states explicitly that the removal of tax exemption in no way encroaches upon the general privilege of states and localities to issue tax-exempt bonds.

I hope that 1967 will be the year of decision. The Treasury is now carefully considering what stance it will take on the issue. We should expect to hear from it early in the next session.

The legislative fight promises to be an uphill struggle. Each day, as more states authorize these bonds and more municipalities float them, additional Congressmen find that their district has benefited from them. So I hope—in the interest of free enterprise and a sound economy—the IBA will stand fast.

SPEECH BY THE HONORABLE ARTHUR LAING, MINISTER OF NORTHERN AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL RESOURCES, TO THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION—MONTREAL, AUGUST 9, 1966

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Arthur Laing, Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources, delivered an address to the American Bar Association at their annual meeting in Montreal. Since his address concerned water, a matter with which our country is greatly concerned, and since Canada is the source of much of the fresh water on this continent, Minister Laing's words should be noted by all Americans who are cognizant of the growing water needs of our country.

Mr. Laing's speech follows:

I shall be forever grateful for the very great honor accorded me to speak to the members of this distinguished Association. It will be my purpose to interpret my person and my position to a body of intellect as respected as any that could be assembled on earth. My trepidation I shall attempt to overcome with the hope of success. If successful I expect to be much the gainer in the transaction.

I am a Minister of the Government of Canada. Our nation is second only in size to the U.S.S.R., covers almost four million square miles and when it is twelve noon in the Yukon it is five-thirty in Newfoundland. Our twenty million people hold almost 6 per cent of the worlds land mass with one half of one per cent of its population. Our potential wealth, largely natural resources, makes us on a per capita basis unquestionably the richest nation on earth. Canadians like Americans, are an industrious people. We once said we were quieter than Americans but latterly we have been gaining a hopefully transient fame in the world's newspapers. Our politics are not dull!

Almost 70 per cent of us live within 100 miles of our common boundary and 83 per cent live within 200 miles. There are 10 Americans for every Canadian. You are the most powerful nation on the face of the earth. The things that you do are disproportionately important to us as compared with our importance to you. You would be surprised if there were not amongst us, from time to time some sensitivity about your country. When Canadians ask themselves "What other nation on the globe would you sooner have for a neighbor" no answer is ever forthcoming. But most of our people believe that since the end of the war the assumption of Western World leadership by the United States has been characterized by a competence and generosity unequalled in all the pages of human history. We are aware that we live in a society that refutes the theory that we can strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. But we have national ambitions, we are on a quest for identity, we want the same standards as you enjoy. We sometimes think we stand in the shadow of the giant and that our presence is not acknowledged. If your presence in Montreal appears to demolish that argument let me say we are honored and proud to have you—and may we hope that you enjoy yourselves sufficiently to return next year for our 100th birthday celebration and to visit Expo '67 in Montreal.

My portfolio in the Government of Canada is Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Because I propose to discuss resource development my remarks shall involve as well some of the policies administered by my colleague Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin who is Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Taken together our Departments span approximately the responsibilities of your Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Udall who I am delighted to see is also speaking to your Conference.

Mr. Chairman, I have never before faced an audience of such accumulated talent. You are custodians and interpreters of the rules governing the most complex society in all history. You have particular interest and responsibility in the fields of resource law, international law, comparative law, and public utilities law. I have no competence to deal with the legal aspects of these fields. But these interests parallel those possessed by persons in public life. They are important areas of public concern.

Because I propose to speak about resources I must first stress their importance to our economies. There are some nations in the world which have become great without a large resource base—England and Japan come to mind—but their success has rested upon huge importations of resources as raw materials. It is significant that the relative value of productive capability and raw materials is gradually changing. Productive capability is becoming more universal, more efficient and generally speaking cheaper. Resources on the other hand are becoming less common, relative to demand, and therefore relatively more expensive. Any reasoned prediction for the next 50 years would give a definite edge in race to nations with large quantities of resources within their borders. Both of our countries seem to be amply blessed.

Resources are the inputs of industry—they have built our modern cities and fashioned our dynamic economy. It was the unremitting search for resources that threw back our frontiers, built the rails, and dug the mines—and most importantly of all, planted the seeds of both adventure and self reliance in our people.

Resources also have an enormous impact on the quality of life in an aesthetic sense. Never before have men been so concerned with the purity of their environment, or with a compatibility with nature. The problem appears to have been recognized in time in both our countries. There is a vast social concern with air pollution, water pollution, and the fast disappearing landscape of our countries. Increasingly we are setting aside wilderness and scenic areas as well as nature reserves for the enjoyment and recreation of our people. Man cannot live by skyscraper alone. The primeval forest with its myriad of living things, the open fireplace, the flower and kitchen garden, to walk under the stars at night and wonder—all these have no value in money but they are as indispensable to the fullness of life as food and raiment.

The new challenge is to somehow find the laws, policies, and institutions to manage our resources and our environment and to conserve them to the greatest benefit of all our citizens. In this task there are a number of recurring themes. The first is planning, no longer a philosophic argument, but a fact. Gratefully, the degree of planning, whether public or private, is determined no longer by dogma but by what works best for the individual and society.

The next important question in resource management is breadth of view. There are all kinds of points of view—parochialism, regionalism, nationalism, continentalism and even "worldism". None has a monopoly of usefulness. Nevertheless the emphasis is gradually shifting to the broader end of the scale and this disturbs many people. Having regard for increasingly sophisticated information systems, tools for the formation of policy, and the increasing complexity of the society in which we live, this trend is likely inevitable.

Hand in hand with the question of the point of view goes the question of jurisdiction over resources. If we lived in an ideal world a multiplicity of jurisdictional units would offer themselves—some would be State lines, some would be based on river basins or communication lines. There are many variants on the jurisdictional patterns that might be ideal and the units change but slowly. This is natural because men want to know they are moving to something better before they move at all—but the moves are often slower because of vested interests. In the long run mutual self-interest probably prevails and the right changes come about. We may find it necessary in the future to accelerate the accommodation of jurisdictional units to new conditions—by cooperation in most cases by persuasion in some, and, in rare cases by fiat of senior governments. The formulation of optimum jurisdictional units must be increasingly studied.

Discovery might well describe the next recurring theme. Ordinarily discovery means new identification and this, of course, continues but in recent history discovery has often meant new evaluation of long existing resources—now we know recreational resources have a value, parks, and freedom from pollution have value. On the economic side low grade iron has value, copper ore below 1 per cent, once despised, now has value. Exploding populations and diminishing or elusive resources will provide us all with some astonishing surprises of this sort as the century moves on. Nothing could be of more value to us than a current inventory of resources. Knowledge is still the mother of wisdom.

Conservation is not a new theme in resource discussion but in the last decade it is acquiring an all pervasive impact. Since 1900 both our countries have produced notably great conservationists but their efforts were sporadic outbreaks. Conservation means planning for continued supply at an acceptable level, by regeneration or by rationing. Mostly, but not always, the market mechanism looks after this. Irrigation in many parts of our continent is a good example. It is seldom charged for at a compensable rate and spirited frontier expansion has often distorted the economic allocation of water resources. There is no way to put a price tag on National Parks or wilderness and political action has had to supplant the market mechanism. Governments have made lots of mistakes in this field but in fairness they have most often been the product of an information lack than perverseness. We must now go as far in the conservation of resources as our technical tools will allow. We shall henceforth be safe to stand on the "doctrine of caution" in this field—if we are to err, better to err in waiting, especially for those resources that are irreplaceable or which can be replaced only at great cost.

The theme of ownership will open great fields of controversy in the balance of the century. Here is a field to tax the minds of lawyers and trouble those of politicians. Resources are so much the character of the nation, the state, or the Province, so much the sinews of their ambition, that the claim of a public equity is rapidly revealing itself. In most cases it will not be expedient to directly exert controls with respect to fundamental ownership and a continuing scale of taxes and royalties will satisfy the public interest. Discovery must confer benefits on the explorer and upgrading must always confer a money return. I am enunciating no government policy but merely making a prediction that in the generations ahead there will be a heavy qualification of the historic appreciation in value of resources simply through the passage of time and without efforts to work any improvement. This prediction does not destroy my conviction that the sphere of natural resources presently in the private sector will substantially remain there. The field of so called "natural monopolies" like power generation, long distance transmission, waterways, and recreational resources already appear to have established well understood operating rules and, whether government or private, can be expected to ensure both regulation and efficiency to satisfy the public interest.

Technology is a major theme. It is about to force an incredible impact on every sector of our economy including the resource sector. Yesterday's technology is astonishing, tomorrow's unimaginable. It is hatching great problems for lawyers and politicians alike and promising wondrous potentials for mankind. It will bring cheaper production of all things and production of new things to replace them. We shall have material substitution, energy substitution, transportation to make remote areas economic, and a new understanding of our environment and our control over it.

The foregoing are some of the great themes and principles that seem to characterize the field of resource management. My false courage is going to persuade me to say a few words about the role of law in this field. I shall stick closely to the Canadian experience though some of the problems affect the United States as well. You in law and we in public affairs have here a common interest. Our task is to make resource management run smoothly and fairly and at the same time provide for orderly change in progress.

Of special interest to me because of the portfolio I held up to January 1st of this year has been the subject of water and international law. International law is scarcely the applicable description here because what realistically seems to matter between our two countries is what we *agree* upon—from that point on we simply honor our commitments—and no two nations have a finer record of keeping our pledges.

Clean fresh water is undoubtedly Canada's greatest resource. It is the first fundamental to human existence. Its use in industry, transportation, power generation, agriculture and civic development are about to place upon it the topmost priority. Canada has between 25 per cent and one-third of all the fresh water in the world. The annual runoff of our rivers to the seas, on a per capita basis, is ten times that of the United States. Gigantic proposals have been advanced to divert Canadian waters into the United States though I should make it clear that none of these proposals have originated or been endorsed by the Government of the United States. Mr. Udall has been very careful to say that such questions remain for the future. As a resident of British Columbia where water is indigenous and where we think our water is the chief magnet for industry and population, I am in full agreement with him. Nevertheless some of your engineers and some of your prominent legislators have seriously suggested plans costing up to 100 billion dollars for the diversion of Canadian waters. When we talk in terms of such financial astronomy you may agree with me that water will come to rank with trade in importance between our two countries. I am on record as saying that Canadian water is not now negotiable, and I am not certain that it ever will be. We have our arid areas too, and until we satisfy all our current requirements and protect all our future, we lack proper engineering knowledge to know how we can divert our Northern rivers which alone could provide us with any surplus. Even the Columbia River negotiations which involved no diversion but only extension of natural annual flow took us 20 years to negotiate. Canadians have no complaint over that agreement but it cost the Government of Canada alone over 15 million dollars in studies to ensure the protection of our interest.

Water provides some interesting problems in our national law as well. I am sure you will be astonished to know that there is no interprovincial forum for the arbitration of water disputes between our provinces. Your Supreme Court has jurisdiction in similar questions but ours does not and such jurisdiction over inter-provincial waters as may lie in the Federal Government has never been clearly defined. We rely upon the good common sense of provincial neighbours, though a clearer definition may some day be necessary. Even more, we have not yet tested the limits of whatever powers might be conferred by international agreements in respect to water as in the case of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 which has an overriding effect on the division of powers as described by the British North America Act. Water is, broadly speaking, a provincial resource in Canada and successive governments have chosen to leave it (except in some respects such as fisheries and navigation) entirely in the hands of the provinces as owners. You who have had an older experience than we in water matters would probably advise us on the basis of your experience that we will one day require machinery for the reconciliation of water differences between the several regions of Canada. Meanwhile my colleague the Minister of Resources enjoys a commendable degree of cooperation from the Resource ministers of the Provinces and a number of extremely valuable cooperative studies are underway.

Water and the law of private ownership is much more of an issue in the United States than in Canada. Private ownership of water and riparian rights are vexing questions in areas of scarcity but we have noticed some of your States are making commendable progress in revision. These questions may well harden in Canada in those areas of aridity and we shall be studying your progress.

We are having complex but amicable discussions with you on fisheries. The question in context is, as you know, that of historic rights and the demarcation of territorial waters for fisheries purposes. Conservation, fortunately, is well looked after, being governed by a group of international commissions whose performance has been nothing short of superb. These bodies, and we have a number, have been of extraordinary usefulness to both our nations. The outstanding example is the International Joint Commission with its magnificent record on boundary waters extending over almost 60 years. These commissions, adequately supplied with facts upon which to base sound and fair judgments would seem to demonstrate that when the spirit is right there need be no insoluble differences between us. Navigation has never been a serious problem between us and we have been able to cooperate well on such gigantic international undertakings as the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Technology has produced a brand new area of international law in the question of resources of the sea bed. We are both signatories to an international convention on this matter which answers some questions but leaves others open. Your Association, no doubt, has somewhere provided a sub-committee to study the problems in this area. This so-called "Hydro space" is likely to contain even more resources than our land mass and the most advanced methods of exploitation are being quickly devised. Questions of ownership both National and individual are bound to arise where regulation and control in a medium where surveillance, at least with present techniques, is inherently very difficult.

The management of public lands would no doubt provide some fascinating comparisons between our two countries. As a broad generalization there is a significant evolution over time with respect to the degree of retained control by the public authority. In Canada, more and more, the attitude is not to alienate government lands outright. Some resources, as oil and timber, are subjected to specific retained controls. In many parts of Canada we have tree farm licenses providing for general management by private companies but subject to government conditions regulating allowable cut, public access, reforestation, and forest fire control. We have cases where governments delegate the management and the allowable crop to the operating company, but not the ownership of the land nor even the resource thereon. Another degree of public control is exemplified in the concession system where government actually constructs and invests in the asset and charges a fee to private management on a short term basis. You are using this device in your National Parks. We are studying the progress of your system very carefully.

I have spoken at length on conservation. There are areas where exploitation should be encouraged in the public interest. We Canadians share with the Soviet Union 90 per cent of the Arctic area. This vast region embrases 1.7 million square miles—40 per cent of the land mass of Canada. There is little evidence of much resources above the ground—recent discoveries suggest that below it is incredibly rich. North of latitude 60° we have a population of only 40,000 people. The volume of sedimentary rocks indicate we *could* have something like 30 billion barrels of oil in the Arctic Islands. In the North, we have a portion of the Canadian Shield equivalent to that in our Provinces and this later section even in its undeveloped state produced last year 1.6 billions of dollars in minerals. Mineral production in the Northwest Territories grew from $17 millions in 1964 to $70 millions in 1965 and I am hopeful it will this year exceed $100 millions. Best of all the rate of exploration is increasing. We now have a mine where open pit development is producing ore of over 50 per cent combined lead and zinc. We must develop our nation in depth and we cannot afford to leave the resources in cold storage. We are engaged in a major road building program of $100 millions, we participate with industry in the building of airstrips, we create townsites and provide schools and hospitals. We have just recently announced a subsidy for mineral and oil exploration. To see how others develop their remote areas I, last year, visited the Soviet Union and spent 14 days in Siberia travelling some 13,000 miles. It was the most fascinating experience of my life. The Soviets have 6,000,000 people living above latitude 60° and 800,000 above the Arctic Circle. Under the new dispensation incentive is the order of the day. 30 percent of the construction budget of the Soviet Union is being placed in Siberia for 6 per cent of its population. The land is indescribably harsh and incredibly rich. They have there over 50 per cent of the world's soft woods, vast quantities of lead, zinc, copper, asbestos and nickel, and oil and gas in abundance. They have bauxite, gold and diamonds. They also have recorded winter temperatures of 90 degrees below zero F. The new enticements include Moscow wages plus up to 80 percent, cheap housing, and subsidized food. 3,200 miles east of Moscow I saw a cellulose plant in which half a billion dollars had been invested. They have an excellent inventory of their resources and one cannot help but admire their difficult but courageous attack on the frontier.

It is reassuring to find that the qualities of the enquiring mind, the inventiveness, the accommodation to conditions, and the persistence and industry of the peoples of our countries remain as valid on this continent as they have ever been.

Mr. Chairman, I am a resident of Vancouver in the few short periods of the year that I can now remain at home. My city's first asset is its beautiful Stanley Park. Within that park is a beautiful column of stone marking the spot where a President of the United States spoke in the 20's. He was not one of your greatest Presidents but there was nothing wrong with his message nor the impeccable English with which he delivered it. Of our two nations he said "Our mutual friendship and respect arises not from documents written on perishable parchment but in a history of fair and honorable dealings which God grant shall continue for all time."

You have done me great honor in your invitation. Your association does honor to Montreal and to Canada by your presence in our midst.

CARL S. WEYANDT SCIENCE COMPLEX DEDICATION

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago a very impressive service was held in Indiana, Pa., at the Indiana University of Pennsylvania, where a new science complex building was dedicated. This building was dedicated to the late Carl S. Weyandt, who was Treasurer of the university from the time of his appointment until his untimely passing.

This building is the very latest addition to the growing university and fulfills a need which will enable that university to provide the very finest facilities for those students and graduate students.

It was indeed a pleasure for me to be present and hear the dedicatory address by the Honorable Earl Handler, together with the response of Mr. Weyandt's son, John J. Weyandt.

Mr. Handler's dedication speech and John Weyandt's response are as follows:

DEDICATION SPEECH

We are here today to put into service for the use of this University and the people it serves, the Carl S. Weyandt Science Complex. In this year 1966, the implications of what this building must stand for are of great importance in the lives of all of the people who must be served by it. The role of the scientist, whether teacher or researcher has ever been one of curiosity, observation, and contemplation, always tempered with infinite patience quietly driving for valid conclusions. There was a time when those who devoted their lives to science could work unhampered in places such as this without being called on for more than to defend their conclusions. But this all changed over some twenty years ago, when the first mushroom cloud of an atomic explosion appeared on the horizon.

From that moment the scientist found himself in the main stream of national and international affairs. From that time he has been called on to advise heads of state and the leaders of great financial and economic aggregates. His decision now is not so much whether to discover, to develop, or to make, but whether to use the products of his genius and for what purpose. Those who work in this building, devoting their lives to science, whether as teachers, researchers, or participants in the scientific world, will never be permitted the simple luxury of merely finding the answer without the attendant burden of responsibility for the reaction of the answer on the world.

It is entirely fitting therefore that this building be dedicated in the name of Carl S. Weyandt, a man who devoted his entire productive years to the modern world of science. Born at Duncansville, Pennsylvania, a member of a family whose roots were deep in that beautiful part of Pennsylvania, he passed his early years at Elwood City where he received his education through high school. His boundless energy brought him to Pittsburgh, then in the ferment of industrial progress, where he worked at Westinghouse and educated himself by attending night classes at Carnegie Tech, now Carnegie University, and from which he graduated with a degree in Electrical Engineering. Shortly after he conceived a system of Electric Synchronization from which he invented and developed an electric power hammer. Since he was a man who understood practicable application, he promptly helped to organize a company in Pittsburgh known as National Electric Manufacturing Company, for the purpose of producing the machine. This company was the forebearer of Syntron Company, which today is a part of the Link Belt Organization and which maintains manufacturing plants at Homer City and Blairsville, Pennsylvania, and at Stonycreek, Ontario.

Although Mr. Weyandt was a person of scientific nature, observant, curious, and contemplative, he was extremely successful in the competitive environment of the business world. As Chief Engineer and later President of Syntron, his driving force made it a success as a business enterprise and his imagination and ability to take risks put it in the forefront of diversified electrical and electronics companies. Always a man of the spirit, he created the Syntron Foundation, which contributed to many worthwhile educational and charitable projects, including some at this University; and he always had time to serve worthwhile charitable organizations, such as the Indiana County United Fund and the Indiana Hospital, of both of which he was a member of the Board of Directors. It would be impossible to enumerate all of the public and charitable organizations which he served, because they were numerous, and many of his gifts were anonymous, which was in keeping with his modest nature.

He was appointed a member of the Board of Trustees of this University in 1956 and served continuously with great distinction as Treasurer of the Board until the time of his sad passing. Having had the privilege of serving for a time with him, I personally know that his advice was always sound, his actions decisive, and his contributions, whether of his time or his material things, great.

I would not close this without a brief reference to the relationship of science to religion, which is really the value of humanism on the interplay of science with the life of man. A great man—a great scientist of our time, Albert Einstein, in discussing science and religion, said, and I quote:

"If one conceives of religion and science according to these definitions, then a conflict between them appears impossible. For science can only ascertain what is, but not, what should be and outside of its domain value judgments of all kinds remain necessary. Religion on the other hand deals only with evaluations of human thought and action; it cannot justifiably speak of facts and relationships between facts—. Though religion may be that which determines the goal, it has, nevertheless, learned from science in the broadest sense what means will contribute to the attainment of the goals it has set up. But science can only be created by those who are thoroughly imbued with the aspiration toward truth and understanding. This source of feeling, however, springs from the sphere of religion. To this there also belongs the faith in the possibility that the regulations valid for the world of existence are rational, that is, comprehensible to reason. I cannot conceive of a genuine scientist without that profound faith. The situation may be expressed by an image; science without religion is lame, religion without science is blind."

In my personal relations with the late Carl S. Weyandt, I knew him to be a man impressed with the scientific method, observant, curious, practicable, always wanting to know how something worked and willing to take the time no matter how long, to find out. Overshadowing all of this, he was a man of great faith, a humanist within the real meaning of the word. So let us this day dedicate the Carl S. Weyandt Science Complex of this University to the uses of science, but always guided by the greater uses of humanism.

REMARKS BY MR. JOHN J. WEYANDT

Dr. Pratt, members of the Board of Trustees, and honored guests; there is another here whom I would like to mention, Mr. Lloyd Randolph, who graduated with my father from Ellwood City High School in 1910. I appreciate his attending this dedication service.

I believe my father would have been amazed had he been here to witness this momentous occasion, for he was a man who did not expect rewards and honors for time freely given.

He was interested in civic affairs, but I am sure that no project was dearer to his heart than the college. He served the college as a trustee until his death, and, he was proud of the growth of the student body and the enlargement of the academic sphere.

He believed in education, dedicated to the idea that those who are qualified should have an opportunity to acquire an education. To this end, he was instrumental in setting up the Syntron Foundation, providing scholarships to help deserving and qualified students.

He would have been most honored that a wonderful Science building, such as this, bears his name—and so, for the Weyandt family, my Mother, Dr. and Mrs. Arthur Weyandt, Mr. and Mrs. James Rohrich, Mrs. Edna Cheesemandand, and Mrs. Gilbert Miller—we thank you for the honor being paid to the memory of my father.

POLLUTION CONTROL IN THE LAND OF THE PHARAOHS

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Thé SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Edward J. Cleary, executive director of the Ohio River Valley Sanitary Commission, recently published an article in the Journal American Water Works Association. This article is of extreme interest to everyone in this country who is interested in water. I recommend this reading to all modern Americans.

The article follows:

POLLUTION CONTROL IN THE LAND OF THE PHARAOHS

(By Edward J. Cleary)

Much of what is said today concerning water pollution implies that it is a relatively new subject, about which little has ever been done. Actually, the pollution problem and the panaceas offered for its solution have, in one form or another, claimed the attention of society for a much longer time than most people may suspect.

English history provides classical references to the subject. Thus Henry VIII, some 400 years ago, prescribed a penalty of 100 shillings be paid "by any person annoying the Thames or casting dung into the river." Apparently this royal order was not observed any better than the democratic prohibitions of a more recent day. At least this must be the assumption, because some three centuries after King Henry made his pronouncement the English Parliament expressed frustration with the current state of affairs by lamenting that "India is in revolt and the Thames stinks."

Although this experience in England spans four centuries, it can be regarded as only one of the more recent manifestations of governmental concern with the pollution problem. What is now to be recounted goes back much farther. It is a reconstruction of events that took place in the land of the Pharaohs some 4,400 years ago.

REMARKABLE DOCUMENT

The source material is a carbon copy of what Egyptologists have identified as an account of events associated with the Pyramid Conference on Water Pollution at Giza in 2760 BC. It is believed that this copy is extant only because it was illicitly removed from the Royal Archives, which were later destroyed by fire. The document was found in a remarkable state of preservation at the site of an ancient sanitary landfill. Its good condition is attributed to a protective covering of Papyrus-Pack, a household item widely advertised at that time under the slogan, "It keeps the freshness in."

POPULAR CONCERN

This document reveals that dissatisfaction over the condition of the Nile had become a major public issue. With completion of the pyramids, many people who never had time even to look at the river now found new leisure, and their recreational interests were water oriented. Not the least of the influences that helped to put people on the river was the introduction, by Phoenician traders, of a low-cost family boat made of bullrushes ingeniously woven together and sealed with bitumen. Some historians regard this as a forerunner of today's plastic-hulled boats.

Particularly vociferous were the residents of the lower region of the Nile. Not everyone can live upstream, they pointed out, and they were irked because communities and factories in upper Egypt were doing virtually nothing to prevent the discharge of untreated wastes.

Rather inelegantly, but with considerable forcefulness, one outraged citizen vented his ire in this fashion: "We folks in Cairo can no longer tolerate visible reminders of what the people at upstream Luxor have had for dinner the night before." At that time, Luxor was the capitol of the kingdom; one might have expected that there, at least, the sensitivities of downstream neighbors should have been a matter of concern. As a federal district, Luxor, it was felt, should be setting an example for all other communities in the kingdom in pollution control.

BASIC ISSUES

As the land of the sun god became clouded with debate, two basic issues emerged, namely:

1. Which level of government should be exercising what responsibilities for the abatement of pollution?
2. How clean should a stream be?

As a matter of background, it should be mentioned that in this period the government of Egypt was decentralized. Much virtue was attributed to administrative arrangements whereby affairs could be conducted, as it was phrased then, on a "papyrus roots level." Accordingly, the kingdom was divided into 40 districts or provinces, called nomes. Presiding over each of these nomes was a nomack. His responsibilities were twofold: to exercise sovereignty over the affairs of his district and to be prompt in forwarding tax collections to the Pharaoh.

ROLE OF NOMACKS

Among other things, the Pharaoh had once declared it was his policy to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the nomacks in controlling water pollution. Now the Pharoah was being pressured to review the validity of this policy. An editorial in the influential *Egyptian News and Observer* put it this way: "The condition of the Nile is a national disgrace, and nothing short of national control can be expected to remedy this unhappy situation."

Because the Pharaoh had been preoccupied with pyramid building, he had never really acquainted himself with the problems faced by the nomacks in dealing with pollution. In the first place, after meeting the Pharaoh's assessment on tax funds, the nomacks never had much left in their treasuries for supporting an adequate regulatory program and staff. Even more frustrating was the fact that communities were either unwilling or unable to raise local money for pollution control facilities. This does not imply that the Egyptian citizenry objected, in principle, to keeping streams clean. They simply found it more convenient, and certainly a lot cheaper, to put their waste into the river and forget it.

Meantime, the factory owners held to the position that too rigid enforcement of anti-pollution measures would hamper economic development. They claimed that, unless they were dealt with patiently, they would either close their establishments or move them to another district where the nomack would not be unreasonable. Although there is no record of such threats actually being carried out, their effect was that factories were dealt with considerately.

Despite these handicaps, many nomacks, using a skillful blend of persuasion and compulsion, were making progress in curbing pollution. But this did not comfort an ardent and articulate group called "Preservers of the Waters of the Nile." Their viewpoint on pollution was simple and direct. They were against it. And the way to stop it, they insisted, was to place control in a national authority.

The nomacks hardly endeared themselves to this group by insisting that such a move would be a departure from established doctrine and would constitute an invasion of their sovereignty. Nor were matters helped any by the EAM, the Egyptian Association of Manufacturers, which echoed similar statements but had displayed little success in arousing many members to hasten compliance with district regulatory measures.

GREAT PCWP DEBATE

This was the setting for the Pyramid Conference on Water Pollution, when it convened in 2760 B.C.

It was opened by a spokesman for public health, the Pharaoh's personal physician. Quite prophetically, he spoke about the probability that sicknesses were transmitted through water, and declared that pollution control should be regarded as a "biologic imperative." Aware that the Pharaoh already was suffering from too many administrative headaches, he ended his remarks with this statement: "The fundamental responsibility for control rests with the communities and the factories that are the sources of pollution. And the nomacks must continue to promote the exercise of this responsibility. Their strength will be the major determinant of success in this effort."

WILY CONSERVATISM

The next speaker was introduced as "one of the fat cats of private enterprise." No greater accolade could be bestowed, because in Egyption religion the cat was regarded as sacred. This gentleman unctuously assured the audience that factories as well as humans required good water for survival. He further sought to identify himself as a champion for clean streams by observing that, although Egypt was well prepared to bequeath to its children pyramids and temples, it was time that thought be given to preserving water quality.

After he advanced this lofty theme, however, it became apparent that what the factory manager really advocated was nothing more strenuous than deliberation on the pollution problem. Hasty actions, he cautioned, might be so upsetting to industrial production that the economy of the kingdom would be jeopardized. What was needed, he asserted, was an expanded national program of research and a reaffirmation of faith in the administration of control programs by the nomacks.

A representative from the Egyptian Anglers Society was next on the rostrum. Mincing no words, he proclaimed that unless the waters of the Nile were fit for fish, they were fit for nothing. Therefore, he concluded, the previous speaker's insinuations that the Pharaoh had to choose between factories and fish was demagoguery of a sinister sort.

PROFESSIONALS' ADVICE

The scientists were more oblique in their pronouncements. They declaimed lengthily about the need for the multi-disciplinary approach. In addition, they called for development of more meaningful parameters for quality evaluation, along with a broadening of the entire spectrum of basic research.

Not at all impressed by these views were the sanitary engineers. "We're not being called upon to apply what we already know," they announced with commendable candor. They said that it was not lack of technology but lack of motivation, money, and public support that was hindering stream cleanup.

Seizing on this theme, the economists pointed out that it was obvious that orthodox regulatory practices were quite inadequate. They conceptualized an approach wherein pollution abatement would be related and made responsive to market values. This called for procedures to internalize the external diseconomics imposed by waste discharges—in other words, creating incentives to prevent passing the buck. Among other things, they envisioned employment of a schedule of effluent charges, the application of which would result in optimizing uses of the waters of the Nile.

Admitting that such proposals had academic merit, the political scientists asserted that to translate theory into practice called for a new type of regional institution, one wherein interdependencies could be identified and subjected to operations research and centralized management techniques. "Having the analytic tools is important," they observed, "but there must also be the means to wield them."

What is more, the social scientists were prepared to describe the proper structure of the new institution. They chose as their model the Cretan cooperatives. These were river basin organizations that had been developed on the Aegean island of Crete, agencies that allowed regional representatives of those who had a stake in water use to determine how the resource should be managed. In brief, the parties most intimately concerned were given responsibility for making decisions and allocating the costs for executing them. As a result, the Cretans displayed great ingenuity in extracting maximum net benefits from the use and reuse of a limited resource.

Although assurances were given that everybody in Crete seemed happy with this arrangement, the practical politicians at the conference felt less than inspired. Privately, they told one another that it was just too neat and orderly; furthermore, it entrusted local constituencies with more power than was desirable.

QUALITY QUANDARY

The conference now proceeded to an exchange of viewpoints on how clean a stream should be. This generated more heat than light. One school of thought maintained that no human activity should be permitted to influence the quality of the river. At the opposite extreme were those who questioned the need for any action until waste discharges created a nuisance. The Pharaoh's daughter, who attended this session, later asked her father: "Isn't it odd that no one offered a definition of pollution? Unless you know what you are trying to control, how can you carry out a remedial program?"

"Well spoken," said the Pharoah, beaming with parental pride. "Now you will understand why I called the conference. I hope these learned men will reason together and come forth with an acceptable consensus."

Unfortunately, this sanguine estimated proved unjustified. The two major policy recommendations that stemmed from the conference were flatly contradictory. The first stated that users of public waters had a responsibility for returning them as clean as technically possible. But the second recommendation asserted that there should be a systematic approach to an evaluation of water pollution control, and that a framework of analysis had to be developed to provide an understanding of benefits and costs as a basis for the design of public policies.

CLEAN WATERS EDICT

After the Pharoah had reviewed these recommendations and other conclusions that emanated from the conference, he called together his court advisors, the Honored Ones. "I am sorely puzzled," he said. "Although I am not convinced that water pollution presents an actual crisis, there is little doubt that my kingdom is faced with a revolution of rising expectations. Therefore, gentlemen, address yourselves to drawing a Clean Waters Edict. Meantime, I'm going to slip off for a few weeks of fishing and swimming in that unspoiled stretch of the Nile above the Second Cataract."

Now, the Honored Ones recognized the political potency of being identified with rising expectations, but they also were sensitive to the conflicting ideologies of various power groups within the kingdom. Accordingly, they prepared a document calling for national leadership in pollution control, with primary responsibility for execution on the district and local levels. Informed of this development, the nomacks and their municipalities scornfully cried out: "We don't need leadership half so much as we need money. Our substance is being siphoned away by the Pharoah's tax collections."

Thereupon, the edict was modified to provide for the central treasury to allocate funds for administrative grants to the districts as well as to provide construction subsidies to the municipalities. But the total authorized for these purposes seemed rather meager, compared to that allotted for the conduct of a program of national leadership.

What really baffled the Honored Ones, however, was how they could enunciate a policy that might satisfy both the pristine-purity advocates and those who persisted in the view that expenditures for pollution control should bear some relationship to the benefits derived. Finally, it was decided that the way out of this dilemma would be the establishment of river quality standards. This was promptly denounced by the clean-as-possible proponents as thinly disguised strategy for legalizing a ceiling on waste discharges.

As a consequence, the edict was prefaced with a phrase declaring that the objective to be sought in setting standards was to "enhance quality." This semantic sleight-of-hand was unacceptable to the cost-benefit proponents, who wanted the addition of a "clarifying" provision to the enforcement section of the edict. This provision instructed the high priests of the Pharaoh's court that, in any disputes on the application of a standard, they were to make a judgment giving due consideration to the practicability and to the physical and economic feasibility of complying with the standard, as well as the equities involved. It will be recognized that these judicial guidelines required the weighing of many factors in setting standards in addition to the enhancement of quality.

EDICT REVIEWED

When the Pharaoh returned from his holiday he quickly spotted deficiencies in the Clean Waters Edict that was handed to him.

He said to his Honored Ones: "You have done well, as far as you have gone; but you haven't gone far enough. Just because everybody seems to be in a dither about an alleged crisis, don't lose your sense of perspective. Your program isn't well rounded.

"For example, add a section on comprehensive planning; somebody should be thinking 1,000 years ahead, because the Pharaohs expect to be in business for a long time. Obviously, if we are going to have a vast program, we cannot be satisfied with half-vast plans."

"All of which reminds me," continued the Pharaoh, "there is nothing in your edict for establishing a Royal Water Quality Network. Every program needs to be supported with basic data. Neither do I see any reference to the integration of pollution control with multiple-use reservoirs. You should know that it is becoming more and more difficult to justify construction of dams. Therefore, if you can include something in that edict about the nonreimbursable benefits of low-flow augmentation, it might be possible for me to get started on my monumental Aswan Dam project.

"And finally, how could you have overlooked that proposal about applying a tax on waste discharges? Gentlemen, think big! Don't regard those waste discharges as mere pollutants—they can be a source of gold."

UNHAPPY FATE

After these remarks, the Pharaoh invited the Honored Ones to join him in consultation at a seashore resort on the Mediterranean, near the mouth of the Nile. Here they had occasion to partake of a feast that featured a delicacy of the region—raw clams. Shortly thereafter, they all contracted a fatal illness. From a description of the symptoms it is believed that it might have been viral hepatitis.

Nobody, of course, associated this unhappy event, with pollution of the Nile. And when a new Pharaoh ascended to the throne, he found more important things to do than promulgate a Clean Waters Edict. Like his predecessors, he became preoccupied with preparations for his ultimate journey to the hereafter. Whereupon all the manpower and resources in the kingdom were mustered once again for building another pyramid. And no longer did the Egyptian people have any leisure time to spend on the river or even to think about pollution control.

EPILOG—PRESENT SITUATION

If this fanciful account of water pollution control efforts in the land of the Pharaohs has suggested some contemporary issues, this is no mere coincidence. For it has, in fact, been inspired by a review of the proceedings that have emanated from recent legislative hearings, conferences, seminars, symposiums, clinics, and colloquiums.

The Egyptian dilemma—wherein pyramids claimed priority over privies—is not without parallel in the experiences shared by many members of the water field today. Water pollution control is a form of social endeavor that has had to compete strenuously for attention and support. This situation appears to be undergoing change. Recently, the author attended a meeting on river cleanup in which the participants included a member of the President's Cabinet, a state governor, several members of Congress, and an equally distinguished group of civic leaders. After listening to many eloquent expressions of concern for intensifying pollution abatement, he reflected that there was really nothing new in what he had heard. What was different, however, was the cast of actors participating. The stage was now occupied by people whose prestige should add luster to advancing a task that has commanded the best efforts of sanitary engineers and public health workers for half a century.

Although it is gratifying that the problem is now receiving recognition from those in high places, this should not suggest that the United States is on the threshold of instant abatement of pollution, of easy solutions promptly applied. As the Pharaoh discovered, the problem is fantastically complex. It encompasses policy, jurisdictional, financial, institutional, and technologic issues whose reconciliation will require accommodation to a variety of social, economic, and political responses.

UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

The following is but a sampling of questions associated with these issues:

1. What should be the goal of pollution control? Is it prohibition on discharge of any amount of any substance into a body of water, or is the objective the pursuit of quality management for extracting greatest utility from the use of water?

2. Are quality criteria to be recognized as guides for the evaluation and prescription of remedial measures, or are they to be regarded as immutable standards to be met regardless of circumstances?

3. Are the jurisdictional activities of the federal government being appropriately executed to supplement, rather than supersede—to stimulate rather than attenuate—the execution of state responsibilities?

4. Are the states taking adequate steps, notably with respect to providing financial support, for strengthening their capabilities to satisfy current and anticipated commitments?

5. Is the allocation of federal pollution control funds realistically geared to enhance the effectiveness of state agencies when only $5,000,000 of the $44,500,000 budgeted for administrative purposes is made available for distribution among 54 state and territorial agencies and eight interstate commissions?

6. Are multimillion-dollar comprehensive planning endeavors justified in view of the fact that many federal decisions on pollution control requirements are being handed down without awaiting completion of findings from such studies?

7. Is preoccupation with state and federal regulatory activities preventing demonstration of the potentialities of other institutional arrangements, such as conservancy districts and watershed authorities, for designing, financing, and operating water quality management programs?

8. Must there be a continued exclusive reliance on the promulgation of regulations governing discharge of effluents at individual sources for the mitigation of pollutional effects when there are a variety of technologic means, such as low-flow augmentation, mechanical aeration of streams, and programed discharge of effluents, which alone or in combination offer promise of providing desired quality conditions at lower social costs?

Much more could be said about these and other questions that surround the issues involved in the advancement of water pollution control. What has been sketched is intended merely to suggest the scope and nature of the challenges associated with the task. Indeed, when these are considered, one is prompted to applaud how much has been accomplished with so little in the past, and to express the hope that the record of those who are guiding present efforts in pollution control may justify a similar accolade.

PUERTO RICO STATEHOOD

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER pro tempore.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on September 22, 1966, a number of Members of the House of Representatives introduced bills providing for statehood for Puerto Rico. Several days later the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, the Honorable Santiago Polanco-Abreu, issued a statement ridiculing the introduction of these bills. Senator M. A. Garcia Mendez, the Republican leader of the Puerto Rican Senate, has issued a statement in answer to the Resident Commissioner's comments. Senator M. A. Garcia Mendez' statement is worthy of attention, not just by the people of Puerto Rico, but by all the citizens of the United States and all of the people throughout the free world who believe in representative government.

Senator Garcia Mendez' statement follows:

Statement of Senator M.A. Garcia Mendez

The Resident Commissioner for Puerto Rico in Washington, the Hon. Santiago Polanco-Abreu, some days ago performed a signal disservice to his people and to the Commonwealth which he represents before the Congress of the United States. His action was so malevolent, his words so at odds with the facts, that I feel compelled to set the record straight:

Following introduction in the House of Representatives of bills offering statehood to Puerto Rico—identical bills formally sponsored by five prominent Republican Members and five equally influential Democrats—Mr. Polanco issued a public statement which scorned and belittled the generous effort of important Members of the House to formally begin the inevitable, however time-consuming, movement of this Island Commonwealth toward Statehood.

Beyond this, Mr. Polanco's statement contained untruths. He referred at its outset to "confusion" and misinterpretation which he stated that introduction of the statehood bill would generate in Puerto Rico. On the contrary, it is Mr. Polanco's statement that may cause confusion, and result in misinterpretation of the new statehood bill. Let us review and analyze, in some detail, the Honorable Mr. Polanco's declarations:

He declared that the statehood bills "merely reflect the personal feelings of some Congressmen and in no way demonstrate the general mood of the Congress." I would remind our people, and the Hon. Mr. Polanco, that all bills introduced in the House "reflect the personal feelings of some Congressmen." The question whether any bill introduced in the House reflects "the general mood of the Congress" is, and can only be, determined when Congress votes.

Mr. Polanco disdainfully states that introduction of the Puerto Rico statehood bills "has no historic meaning for Puerto Rico." Does Mr. Polanco really mean to say that introduction in the United States Congress of legislation wholly changing the status of Puerto Rico—bills backed by five Republicans and five Democrats, for the first time in our history—is not historic? Certainly, no such concerted and bi-partisan congressional action, lifting the Puerto Rico status issue altogether above partisan politics, has ever before been taken in the United States Congress.

Representative Leo W. O'Brien of New York, chairman of the House Interior Committee's Subcommittee on Territories—the man who successfully led the fight for admission of both Hawaii and Alaska, and led as well the contingent introducing the new statehood bills for Puerto Rico—made this statement in a speech on the floor of the House as he introduced the statehood legislation:

"There is no thought on the part of any of us to thrust statehood upon anyone, but if the people of Puerto Rico in their wisdom decide to apply for permanent membership in the family of American states, then I think they are entitled to know . . . that there is a welcome mat ready for them . . ."

Fighting shadows, Mr. Polanco's statement declared that "no status not of our choice will ever be thrust upon us," and added that the political destiny of the Puerto Rican people "rests in their own hands . . . ours is the basic right of willful determination . . ."

In the first place, Rep. O'Brien's statement in his House speech, and the statehood bills themselves, explicitly offer statehood when, and only when, the people of Puerto Rico ask for it.

In the second place, when the Hon. Mr. Polanco stated that "ours (the Puerto Rican peoples') is the basic right of willful determination," was he not forgetting that action by the United States Congress is necessary in order for Puerto Rico to become a state?

Mr. Polanco stated that the new statehood bills would not be approved by this Congress, which expires at the conclusion of the 1966 session. Rep. O'Brien and Rep. Rogers Morton of Maryland who joined him in a press conference and joint statement on introduction of the statehood bills, very plainly stated that they expected no action this year.

But as for Resident Commissioner Polanco's statement that "the statehood bills were dead before they were introduced," I suggest that he postpone any such erroneous remarks until a time when—and if—they should become truth.

I can advise our people, and Mr. Polanco, that the Statehood Republican Party has already been assured that the statehood bills will be re-introduced in the new session beginning next January. I can assure him further, that bi-partisan forces in the House will again bring to bear all of the influence we command, in order to bring our fight for statehood to a successful culmination.

COMMEMORATING THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION OF 1956

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Grabowski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER pro tempore.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on October 23 it will be 10 years ago that the Hungarian people, provoked by the shooting of innocent demonstrators before the radio building, and the massacre of unarmed demonstrators before the Parliament the next afternoon decided to rise against their Communist masters with arms and to force the establishment of a representative government and the withdrawal of Russian troops from Hungary.

Their heroic deeds, often done by young men and women in their midteens enriches European and Hungarian history with new legend of courage, willingness to sacrifice, and death-defying conviction in the righteousness of human rights, national freedom, and individual dignity. Unfortunately, the Hungarian nation, which in its history together with the Polish nation remains the most freedom-loving people of the Continent, was not successful in the final analysis and after a temporary victory, cunning and overpowering military superiority enabled the Soviet Union to restore the silence of the graveyards to Hungary.

However, even in the silence the sullen defiance of the working population had to be contended with by the new quislings of Moscow. As a result, in the last few years there were some concessions made to the people on the economic level and in regard to travel restrictions. However, the basic issues of the absence of free elections, economic initiative, and police state methods which are implicit in the Hungarian regime have not changed. Hungary still does not enjoy as the United Nations General Assembly put it in the Resolution 1005 of November 9, 1956, "a Government responsive to its national aspirations."

The main reason for this state of affairs lies in the continued presence of Russian troops—some 70,000 to 85,000—in Hungary, not counting those engaged at the missile installations. Their withdrawal was demanded not only by the last legitimate government of Hungary during the fight for freedom, not only by the United States and the western allies, but by more than 60 nations of the United Nations General Assembly in 23 different resolutions between November 4, 1956, and 1962.

Our President has spoken on October 7 on building bridges to Eastern Europe and engaging in peaceful engagement with the area and the Soviet Union. It would be fitting and proper to press the Soviet Union as a sign of real good will to withdrawal its troops from Hungary where they fulfill no military security needs for the Soviet Union and represent only too clearly the repressive and aggressive side of the U.S.S.R.

CANAL ZONE: SEPULCHER OF OUR HEROIC DEAD

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in a statement to the House on May 31, 1966, entitled "Panama Canal: 'Why Open Pandora's Box,' " and on many previous occasions, I have stressed the diplomatic hazard of reopening the Panama Canal Treaty situation and steadily opposed the surrender to Panama, or to any other governments or agency, of our country's sovereignty over the U.S.-owned Canal Zone territory. The magnitude of the Pandora's box at Panama has not yet been disclosed to the Nation.

As all students of Panama Canal history know, the isthmus has been the scene of tragedy as well as of success, and many have lost their lives through yellow fever, other tropical diseases, accidents, and violence. Canal Zone cemeteries are filled with heroic dead from many countries, including, of course, the United States.

In all official discussions concerning the current canal treaty negotiations that I have read in the mass news media of the United States and in the Spanish language press of Panama, I have seen no reference to the subject of cemeteries. In consequence, I have wondered whether the remains of the forgotten martyrs of the ditch would receive any protective care if Panama should take over the Canal Zone.

In other lands, we have cemeteries where our soldiers died and we regard those places as consecrated soil. Those who gave their lives in constructing the Panama Canal and its subsequent maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection were also soldiers of our Nation; and their hallowed dust should receive the same attention by our Government as soldiers who have fallen in battle in other areas of the world.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I would quote the noble sonnet by Rupert Brooke 1887–1915 who, himself, was of the flower of English soldiery and gave his life in battle during World War I:

> If I should die, think only this of me:
>   That there's some corner of a foreign field
> That is forever England. There shall be
>   In that rich earth a richer dust concealed;
> A dust whom England bore, shaped, made aware,
>   Gave, once, her flower to love, her ways to roam;
> A body of England's, breathing English air,
>   Washed by the rivers, blest by suns of home.
> And think, this heart, all evil shed away,
>   A pulse in eternal mind, no less
> Gives somewhere back the thoughts by England given;
>   Her sights and sounds; dreams happy as her day;
> And laughter, learnt of friends; and gentleness,
>   In hearts at peace, under an English heaven.

Mr. Speaker, what this young British soldier so beautifully expressed for his own country, I am sure is the sentiment of all civilized nations as to their fighting sons lost in war on distant fields. Especially is this true of our own country, our own people, and certainly of the Members of the Congress. We should be solicitous for those who, while serving our Government, have given their lives and, indeed, should feel that their graves are, and must ever be, portions of our soil.

To bring this aspect of the Pandora box at Panama to the attention of proper authority, I wrote the Secretary of the Army, the official of our Government currently charged with supervisory responsibility over the Panama Canal enterprise, requesting information as to what steps are being taken to protect our cemeteries in the Canal Zone.

Whether my inquiries induced the consideration of the Department of State, or otherwise, I do not know. In any event, the remains of our sacred dead, wherever they found sepulture, should be protected. It is, I believe, significant that in this case the Department of the Army seems to have no voice and defers altogether to the State Department.

As my correspondence on the indicated subject will be of interest to the Congress and the Nation, especially the families of our dead in Canal Zone cemeteries, I quote the entire exchange of letters as part of my remarks:

August 30, 1966.

Hon. Stanley R. Resor,
Secretary, Department of the Army,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: In all the public discussions about the proposed new treaties with Panama that I have read there has been no mention of whether there is any provision for our sacred dead who found burial in various cemeteries in the Canal Zone.

Not only are the graves of U.S. citizens to be found there but also of many French, West Indians and other alien workers. All of these burial spots have been safeguarded by our government and Canal Zone authorities from the creation of the Canal Zone territory; and all nations represented in them will scan the treaties when published to find out if the graves have the guaranty of perpetual care and protection.

Certainly the citizens of the United States have a deep concern for the situation thus presented as well as the other nations likewise represented in these places of sepulture. Moreover, virtually all the occupants of the Canal Zone graves are truly "martyrs of the ditch" and have earned the utmost that can be done in reverence and respect.

Information is desired as to what steps are being taken by our government in the premises.

Sincerely yours,

Daniel J. Flood,
Member of Congress.

Department of the Army,
Office of the Under Secretary,
Washington, D.C., September 19, 1966.

Dear Mr. Flood: This letter is in response to your letter of 30 August 1966 to Secretary Resor requesting information on the provision being made in the proposed new treaties with Panama for the care and protection of cemeteries in the Canal Zone. Inasmuch as the negotiation of the new treaties is the primary responsibility of the Department of State, I have forwarded your inquiry to that department for consideration and direct reply to you.

Sincerely,

Thaddeus Holt,
Deputy Under Secretary of the Army
(International Affairs).

Department of State,
Washington, October 4, 1966.

Hon. Daniel J. Flood,
House of Representatives.

Dear Congressman Flood: The Department of the Army has requested the Department of State to reply to your letter to Secretary Resor of August 30, 1966, requesting information about the measures being taken to ensure that cemeteries in the Canal Zone continue to receive suitable care and protection under the new treaties with Panama.

Because the treaty negotiations with Panama have not yet been concluded, it is not now possible to report in detail on the provisions which will be made for the cemeteries located in the present Canal Zone. However, this is one of several matters not directly related to the operation and protection of the canal to which the United States treaty negotiators are giving careful attention. You may be assured that every effort will be made to provide suitable arrangements for the future care and protection of the Canal Zone cemeteries.

If I can be of any further assistance to you in this matter, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

Douglas MacArthur II,
Assistant Secretary for
Congressional Relations.

CANAL ZONE: PANAMA DEMANDS EFFECTIVE AS WELL AS TITULAR SOVEREIGNTY

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the relations between the United States and Panama, an outstanding characteristic in recent years has been the failure of any official in the executive branch of our Government to defend publicly our indispensable sovereignty over the Canal Zone territory. In contrast, Panamanian authorities never lose an opportunity to advance the interests of their country in the United States as well as in Panama.

The latest example of this pattern was a statement by Foreign Minister Fernando Eleta on October 7, 1966, at the United Nations. Though this contains little that is new, I wish to list some of its main points:

First. That the "only real natural resource" of Panama is "her geographical position."

Second. That Panama's purpose is the "abrogation of the 1903 treaty," based upon "completely different principles."

Third. That Panama demands "effective as well as titular sovereignty" over the Canal Zone territory.

Fourth. That the "considered opinion" of the Panamanian Government is that "Panama offers the best site" for a new canal.

Did any members of our delegation to the United Nations reply publicly to Minister Eleta? They have not. This emphasizes again that the Congress must save the Panama Canal.

Mr. Speaker, for those who wish to go more deeply into the canal question, I would invite attention to my addresses in the House on April 1 and July 29, 1965, on the subject, "Interoceanic Canal Problem: Inquiry or Coverup?" also to my statement to this body on September 29, 1966, on "Panama Canal: U.S. Sovereignty or Communist Control?" These and other statements of mine since 1958 will be published as House Document No. 474, 89th Congress.

It is appropriate at this time, Mr. Speaker, to ask again, why it is that no Member of the Senate, which is a part of the treatymaking department of our Government, speaks out on this vital and complicated matter? For Members of that body to wait until the treaty is called up for consideration before studying the canal problem invites disaster, because they will not have time to qualify themselves to meet specious but cleverly framed arguments supporting the treaty now being prepared by the negotiators.

In these general connections, Mr. Speaker, I note in Minister Eleta's statement that he describes the 1955 treaty as a "very minor" revision of the 1903 treaty but neglects to mention the 1936 treaty altogether. In the debate in the Senate on July 29, 1955, over ratification of the 1955 treaty, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations made this assertion in urging prompt ratification:

> It is a good treaty and one which should endure for many years. (Congressional Record, vol. 101, pt. 9, p. 12006.)

Now, Panama wishes to abrogate all three Panama Canal treaties.

In order that the Congress and the Nation may know the current status of the canal treaty situation as described by Foreign Minister Eleta, I quote his statement as part of my remarks:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 9, 1966]

Panama Pleased on Treaty Talks—Minister Reports Progress on New Canal Code

(By Sam Pope Brewer)

United Nations, N.Y., October 8.—Foreign Minister Fernando Eleta of Panama said Friday that talks were well on the way toward a new Panama Canal treaty with the United States that would replace the 1903 pact with "a completely new set of rules."

Negotiations in Washington are to reopen early next week. They were interrupted briefly while the Panamanian delegation came here to confer with Mr. Eleta on what he called "crystallization of ideas."

"We have good reason to feel optimistic as to the successful outcome of negotiations," the Foreign Minister said.

"Panama wishes to exercise effective sovereign rights over her entire territory," he continued. "The 1955 revision of the Canal treaty was very minor. It dealt fundamentally with economic aspects, such as increasing local purchase of supplies for the Canal Zone.

"This time, it is something different. We want a completely new set of rules, an abrogation of the 1903 treaty, not a revision. We want it to be based on completely different principles, in accordance with the thinking of today and not that of 1903."

The 1903 treaty, in the words of a United States Government background paper, "gives to the United States all the rights, powers and authority in the Canal Zone which it would have if it were the sovereign of that territory . . . while titular sovereignty over the zone rests with Panama."

In practice, United States citizens working and living in the Canal Zone have had complete extraterritorial rights, such as freedom from Panamanian tax laws and customs duties. The privileges have been reduced somewhat in recent years, but they are still extensive.

Panama's demand is for effective as well as titular sovereignty. Mr. Eleta would not discuss details of the demands since the matter is under active negotiation, but he said the spirit of negotiations was not to wrest concessions from Washington but to work toward "a lasting atmosphere of cordial cooperation."

He called the United States attitude "most encouraging," but said he could not set even an approximate time for conclusion of the new treaty. Mr. Eleta remarked that if anybody were to guess at a date, any unexpected delay might cause unjustified disappointment.

The Foreign Minister said a thorough survey had shown that Panama's only real natural resource was her geographical position.

"This adds more force," Mr. Eleta said, "to our determination" to capitalize on this one resource "for the utmost benefit of our people."

"We do not propose to do this by trying to extract from the Canal the last drop of profit," he continued. We are studying all aspects of the matter, such as possible building of drydock facilities or processing, or partial processing, of goods that must transit the Canal anyway.

Asked about the status of studies for a second Atlantic-Pacific canal at sea level, he said: "Our considered opinion is that Panama offers the best site."

Demands for revision of the 1903 treaty have been made for many years. Rioting over the question of Panamanian sovereignty has taken place several times in recent years, and 20 were killed in riots in January, 1964.

Diplomatic relations between the two nations were interrupted from January to April, 1964. Negotiations on the Canal treaty were resumed when relations were restored.

VIETNAM WAR: COMMUNISTS AND WAR CRIMES

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the Congress who participated in the investigation of the World War II massacre of Polish Army officers by Soviet power at Katyn, I read with the keenest interest a recent revealing article by Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle about atrocities committed by Red forces against our soldiers in the Vietnam war.

In order that the indicated news story may be more widely known, I quote it as part of my remarks:

[From the Torrance (Calif.) South Bay Daily Breeze, Sept. 7, 1966]

Communists and War Crimes

(By James D. Hittle, Brigadier General, USMC, retired)

Washington.—All the talk and warning about what the United States will do if the Communists try and execute U.S. prisoners of war in Vietnam is out of date.

U.S. prisoners have already been executed.

Remember U.S. Army Sgt. Harold G. Bennett? He was a prisoner of war. The Communists took him out and executed him. It was just a little over a year ago.

It would be wrong to assume that the execution of Harold G. Bennett by the Viet Cong was an isolated episode.

Rather, it appears to have set a Communist pattern of atrocity. Deliberate maltreatment, mutilation and murder have been going on ever since.

Example: Late last November during the 1st Cavalry Division's tough fighting in the central highlands, there were repeated reports of Communist troops deliberately searching out and killing wounded U.S. troops.

Army Sgt. John Eade miraculously lived. He was wounded three times. The action moved on. Before our medics arrived, a Communist patrol moved in and methodically went about the grim business of slaughtering our wounded.

Sergeant Eade said a Communist officer came up to him and fired a pistol directly into his face. By rare chance he survived to give this testimony of enemy war crimes.

Another example: Just about a month later, U.S. officials disclosed that three U.S. Marines and eight South Vietnamese soldiers were executed and mutilated after an ambush by Communists.

A U.S. Special Forces officer said the 11 all had disabling wounds when they were killed. Nor should there be any doubt that they were prisoners at the time of their executions. Several, he said, had their hands tied behind them.

And that's not all of the melancholy examples of slaughter of our captured fighting men.

While Ho Chi Minh was hinting that he wouldn't—at least now—try our captured fliers, his troops were executing wounded captive Marines.

Even now the full story of the butchery of our wounded troops during Operation Hastings is hard to piece together. According to press reports, a survivor told how Hanoi's regulars shot and bayonetted any Americans who showed signs of life.

Then, too, there is the account of the U.S. Navy flier who escaped with a fellow prisoner from Ho Chi Minh's prisoner of war camp. The fellow prisoner, according to news accounts, was recaptured by the relentlessly pursuing North Vietnamese. While the helpless survivor watched from hiding, the North Viet Reds beheaded their recaptured prisoner.

All of which makes it seem quite meaningless to try long-distance and indirect efforts to persuade the Vietnamese Communists to treat our captured fighting men humanely. It's a waste of time. They don't know the word.

What should be done? The United States should serve formal notice on the Viet Cong, Hanoi—and to their Peking and Moscow backers—that before we consider the Vietnamese war finished business, we will insist that those responsible for the brutal killing of U.S. prisoners get prompt and full punishment for their war crimes.

We tracked down and brought to justice the Nazis and Japanese who committed similar atrocities against our men in World War II.

Not to do the same in the Vietnamese war might be interpreted that slaughter of U.S. prisoners by Viet Nam Communists isn't as serious as when it was done by our World War II enemies.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, of all the momentous events that have occurred since the end of World War II, the Hungarian revolution of October and November 1956 stands out as the most courageous single act undertaken by an entire nation. In standing up to Soviet totalitarianism, the Hungarian people added a significant chapter to the story of man's struggle for individual liberty. That is why we honor, 10 years later, those freedom fighters who pitted flesh and stones against Soviet steel.

In 1956, the leaders of the Soviet Union viewed a genuine war of national liberation in Hungary; they did not like what they saw. Thousands of ordinary Hungarians rose up against Soviet domination and Communist rule. At first it appeared as if a new dawn might emerge in that troubled land. Moscow's Communist puppets proved ineffective in suppressing the revolt and had to yield to the insurgents' demand for liberty and self-government. One dark question remained, however: Would the Soviet Union accept the will of the Hungarian people? The Soviets soon made known their answer. Red tanks and troops poured into Hungary and, after days of bitter fighting, destroyed the Revolution. Thousands of freedom fighters were killed in the bloodbath, and thousands more left their homes and fled westward into Austria.

The Communists still rule Hungary today, but they rule remembering those days 10 year ago. The people remember too. Though they must often despair over the failure of their efforts, they must gain inspiration and hope from the memories of those courageous days. In this sense, the Revolution lives on unextinguishable. It is only fitting that we commemorate those courageous days in the hope that the light of freedom which dawned so briefly in the autumn of 1956 will reemerge to cast a permanent glow over Hungary.

THE CONGRESS OF 1965–66 AND THE VETERAN: A CONSTRUCTIVE PARTNERSHIP

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, as the 89th Congress nears the completion of its business, it becomes a time of reevaluation of the accomplishments that have been made. I am particularly proud of the fine record that we have achieved in behalf of our 25 million veterans. With the conflict in Vietnam, where over 300,000 American youths are taking part and risking their lives, it is encouraging to note that the Congress of the United States not only provides the funds to make our fighting men the best equipped in the world—but that when they have finished serving this Nation on the field of battle, they can return to America and be assured that our concern does not end with their discharge.

LONG TRADITION OF GRATITUDE TO VETERANS

It has been the tradition of this Nation that our soldiers be remembered long after the cries of battle have subsided. The sacrifices made by men who answer the call to duty could be forgotten, but this has never been the case in America.

Even before we became a nation in 1789, even before the Declaration of Independence in 1776, the colonists of Plymouth declared that those men who had served as soldiers would "be maintained" during their lifetime.

The 89th Congress has continued this country's acknowledgment of our obligations to our ex-servicemen. I am proud to have served as a Member of this body that has recognized the needs, and acted to show our gratitude to these men who have served.

NEW GI BILL

Without question the most important piece of legislation passed by this Congress has been the new GI bill, of which I was proud to be a sponsor. This bill places all of those men who have served since the Korean conflict on a standing with other veterans in regard to the benefits and privileges afforded to these veterans. It provides for education, home loans, and other benefits. This law will provide $333 million during the first year for our veterans of this era.

We have learned that the cost of a GI bill is not an actual cost at all—for the educational benefits prepare our veterans for better and higher paying jobs—and they in turn pay back in taxes alone many times the money expended for this benefit.

AN INVESTMENT IN EDUCATION

Judging by our past experience with the World War II and Korean GI bills, the new bill will return far more to the taxpayer than it will cost. The World War II bill helped educate and train 450,000 engineers, 300,000 teachers, hundreds of thousands of mechanics and metalworkers, tens of thousands of doctors, dentists, and other professionals in serious short supply. Many of these men could not have gone to school or college without the GI bill, and we would be in deep trouble today without their skills, knowledge, and expert services.

The median family income of veterans, $7,861, is a full 30 percent higher than the average for nonveterans. The unemployment rate for veterans in recent years has been consistently only half of that for nonveterans, which means lower welfare costs and higher labor productivity. Veterans, because of their increased earning power, contribute an estimated $1 billion more each year to the economy than they would have done without the GI bills to help them go to school.

The Veterans' Administration estimates that over 500,000 veterans will enter school during this first year since the new law was enacted. The number of veterans entering school is expected to increase to 600,000 by the fifth year of the bill's operation.

These veterans—not included for veterans benefits before this Congress took action—now have hospital care available and civil service preferences, as well as the education benefits.

MILITARY PAY

The first session of this Congress was also active in passing veterans' legislation. The Congress last year authorized pay increases for the military personnel which resulted in an increased dependency and indemnity compensation for nearly 123,000 widows receiving such payments. These increases total almost $17 million a year for the victims of wars' tragedies.

DISABLED VETERANS AND WAR ORPHANS

Two other bills passed earlier in the Congress are of particular interest to disabled veterans. The first increased the subsistence allowance to certain seriously disabled veterans receiving vocational rehabilitation training. The other extended time for seriously disabled veterans to obtain benefits of vocational rehabilitation training.

Congress also liberalized the program of war orphans benefits by increasing the education assistance program to include the children of deceased or totally and permanently disabled veterans of the cold war periods. This action was taken because it would be unfair to provide for veterans and not for the families of these men who make the greatest sacrifices.

DISABILITY AND INSURANCE

Another new law became effective last December and increased payments for disability compensation for service-connected veterans, ranging from $1 to $125 per month. The basic rate affected almost 2 million veterans by increasing their payment over $136 million the first year. This law also liberalized other provisions of the compensation and pension law and created additional nursing beds for veterans.

Another bill which became law—and which affects both servicemen and veterans—provides $10,000 of insurance from the first day of active service for all servicemen and continues for 120 days after discharge. It costs the serviceman or veteran $2 per thousand dollars of insurance. Ninety-eight percent of all men and women in service are taking advantage of this insurance. Through June of this year, over $56 million had been paid to the beneficiaries of these policies.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation enacted by the 89th Congress on behalf of the American Veteran already reinforces this Nation's longstanding tradition of gratitude toward its fighting men.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

In listing these new laws, I also feel that it is proper to mention the hard work of the Government agency that administers these programs, the Veterans' Administration headed by William J. Driver. Of the over $6 billion appropriated for the Veterans' Administration, only 2.6 percent of this is used by the organization for administration. While taking on some 4 million new veterans for service by the new GI bill, the VA was able to provide the same personal service to our 25 million living veterans and still cut $5½ million from their operating budget. They have been able to cut down on employment, saving the taxpayers money, while still rendering valuable service.

We can pass the laws, but unless they are well administered, we would accomplish far less for our veterans. I am happy to say that the Veterans' Administration is doing its job and doing it well.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has passed more than two dozen significant laws to help veterans—from home mortgage assistance to increased allowances for the disabled, from education benefits to hospital care, from loan guarantees to direct loans. I am proud to have played a part in shaping this pattern of thanks to its servicemen from a grateful country.

THE EDUCATION CONGRESS OF 1965–66

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has truly been an education Congress for all Americans. We have enacted more than two dozen important education measures—the greatest legislative commitment to improve education ever made by the Federal Government. The actions of this Congress will be evident in our schools and colleges for generations to come. As we prepare to adjourn, I would like to review briefly our major accomplishments in the field of education.

TO HELP PROVIDE BETTER SCHOOLS

To help provide quality schools for all children, the 89th Congress recognized the following:

Five and a half million children from low-income families need special assistance in school to overcome the disadvantages of their poor rural or urban slum environment. Congress authorized over $1 billion for the first year—fiscal 1966—of a 3-year program to help local school districts broaden and enrich the learning experience of these deprived children—Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Nearly a third of the Nation's elementary and secondary children attend schools without libraries. Libraries in many other schools have inadequate resources. Congress therefore authorized a program to help school systems acquire more books, maps, films, and related materials. This program serves more than 49 million schoolchildren from all walks of life—Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

New teaching concepts and methods have no practical value unless put to use in the classroom. To bridge the gap between educational research and practical application, Congress authorized the development of supplementary centers to provide on a communitywide basis the psychological testing, cultural programs, outdoor education, and similar services not adequately available to children in their own schools. Supplementary centers already serve over 10 million children—Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

We need to speed educational progress in the Nation's schools. Congress provided funds for a national network of regional educational laboratories. Twelve of these laboratories are now in operation; eight more are under development. The 20 laboratories serve every State, assuring that results of educational research and development are made available to all our schools. A Midwestern laboratory has its major offices in Indianapolis and Chicago—Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Without trained personnel, there can be little improvement in the techniques, methods, and programs for educating our children. Congress thus made funds available to train more than 2,600 researchers in education and develop programs to provide for their training. These researchers will assure a continuing flow of new ideas and new materials for the improvement of education at all levels—Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Basic research is needed in education as in other fields to provide the groundwork for future innovations. Congress made funds available for research and development centers which bring together specialists in many fields to delve into such fundamental questions as how children learn—Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Public education is a responsibility of individual States and of local school districts. Congress thus provided funds to strengthen State departments of education—Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

TO EXPAND EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE HANDICAPPED

To expand the educational opportunities of the handicapped, the 89th Congress acknowledged the following:

The communications problems of the 37,000 deaf children in our schools call for coordination of heretofore scattered sources of support, whether local, State, or Federal. To the parents, teachers, and others who work with the deaf, as well as the deaf themselves, Congress made available educational and training films, tapes, transparencies, and other teaching aids—Captioned Films for the Deaf Act.

The United States has only one institution of higher learning for the deaf—Gallaudet College—and this institution, for lack of facilities, must turn away each year over half of those who apply for admission. Congress authorized a National Technical Institute to train young people with a hearing handicap for successful employment in other than manual work—the National Technical Institute for the Deaf Act.

Teachers need special training to work effectively with mentally retarded children and those with physical impairments. Congress authorized funds for teacher training, and for research and development projects to improve the educational opportunities for such children—Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act Amendments of 1965.

Congress also provided for the establishment and operation of a model secondary school of the deaf to be operated by Gallaudet College—Model High School for the Deaf Act, 1966.

TO IMPROVE HIGHER EDUCATION

To improve higher education, the 89th Congress recognized the following:

Our universities and colleges should be an integral part of the community, providing extension and continuing education programs that are within the economic and geographic reach of more people.

Congress approved a program to help finance such community-oriented programs as training in consultative services to local, State, and Federal governments, services related to labor and management education and courses for women who want to reenter the labor market. This year $10 million is being spent by 389 institutions in 46 States and 2 territories—Higher Education Act of 1965.

Based on the number of volumes in their libraries, half of our 4-year college libraries and nearly three-fourths of our 2-year institutions fall below accepted standards. In addition, the ratio of librarians per student is rapidly decreasing. Congress authorized $50 million for each of the first 3 years for the purchase of books, periodicals, documents, magnetic tapes, phonograph records, and other resources; another $15 million to train students in librarianship and information science; and for research and demonstration projects in areas relating to the improvement of libraries, including development of new techniques, systems and equipment for processing, storing, and distributing information. To date 1,830 college and university libraries have participated in the program and 139 fellowships have been awarded for graduate study in library and information science.

For every four American colleges, one is not good enough to be accredited by a regional agency. Congress authorized $55 million for the first year to raise the academic quality of the smaller developing colleges. Over 200,000 students are enrolled in such institutions—Higher Education Act of 1965.

An academically qualified young person should not be denied a college education because he lacks the financial resources. The Congress authorized $70 million for educational opportunity grants to needy but able students to attend college and $129 million for work-study programs. These programs combined have made over 250,000 awards to needy students. In addition, $17.5 million has been allotted to help States establish or strengthen guaranteed loan programs to come to the aid of hard-pressed middle-income families with children who want to go to college. A survey of 22 States reveals that over $48 million was loaned to students under this program in September 1966—Higher Education Act.

We need more teachers with better training to help children realize their full educational potential. The Congress authorized the creation of a National Teacher Corps to work by invitation in impoverished school districts. It also provided a program, which I sponsored, of fellowships to persons who want to work toward a master's degree in their subject work fields and who plan to teach in elementary or secondary schools. The program has special provisions for experienced teachers who wish to return to school to update their knowledge and improve their teaching. Over 2,500 fellowships for advanced study have already been awarded—Higher Education Act of 1965.

Improvement of laboratory equipment, maps, audiovisual units, and other teaching aids in colleges has not kept pace with progress in secondary schools. Congress provided funds for the purchase of teaching aids, including television equipment, and for the training of people who intend to use the equipment in college teaching—Higher Education Act of 1965.

We Americans live in a world of over 120 nations with differing cultures and aspirations. To help prepare young people for an understanding of world affairs, Congress authorized grants for colleges and universities to plan and carry out comprehensive programs for undergraduate studies. Congress also provided for the development and strengthening of graduate centers of research and training in international studies.

I have the honor to be the sponsor in Congress of this significant measure—International Education Act of 1966.

To meet the Nation's health needs we will have to educate 50 percent more doctors and double the present annual graduation rate of dentists by 1975. Congress, therefore, authorized a new 4-year program of improvement grants to schools of medicine, dentistry, and related specialties to aid them in increasing the scope and quality of teaching programs. It also provided a new program of scholarships for students in medical and related programs and extended the current program of student loans—Health Professions Educational Assistance Amendments of 1965.

TO AID OUR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

To expand and improve the physical plant of our colleges and universities, the 89th Congress did the following:

Removed restrictions imposed by the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, so that Federal grants may now be used to build any type of classroom or library facility for undergraduate use—Higher Education Act of 1965.

Extended the college housing loan program through 1968 at the rate of $300 million a year—Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965.

Extended for 3 years the current program of matching grants to help build or rehabilitate facilities for the training of physicians, dentists, professional public health personnel, pharmacists, and other medical personnel—Health Professions Educational Assistance Amendments of 1965.

Provided construction assistance for research facilities in new medical and dental schools—Health Research Facilities Act, 1965.

Authorized grants to build new and remodel existing medical library facilities and train medical librarians—Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965.

TO TRAIN PEOPLE FOR BETTER JOBS

To assist people who need training for new or better jobs, the 89th Congress did the following:

Expanded the job training program to include professional employees whose specialized work requires continuing education in their field and increased financial benefits to trainees—Manpower Act of 1965.

Authorized direct loan insurance and a supplementary system of direct loans to assist students who attend post-high-school business, trade, technical, and other vocational schools—National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965.

Liberalized Federal financing of vocational rehabilitation programs—Vocational Rehabilitation Act, 1965.

Provided more funds for adult Indian vocational education—Indian Adult Vocational Education Act, 1965.

TO HELP VETERANS OBTAIN AN EDUCATION

To help veterans continue their education, the 89th Congress did the following:

Authorized as the education provision of a new GI bill a monthly allowance of $100 or more to veterans who attend full time an approved high school, business school, college, or graduate school—the cold war GI bill.

Increased subsistence allowances to disabled veterans who are taking vocational rehabilitation training—Veterans Trainees Subsistence Allowance Act, 1965.

TO ADVANCE OUR CULTURAL HERITAGE

To advance our cultural heritage and broaden our opportunities for self-education, the 89th Congress did the following:

Established a national endowment for the arts and a similar endowment for the humanities to promote the creative and performing arts and support research, training, and scholarly publications in the humanities—the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965.

Doubled the funds from $35 million in fiscal 1967 to $75 million in 1971 for public libraries to use for books, salaries, equipment, and materials. Congress also doubled funds for public library construction. Finally, it approved new grants to encourage cooperative networks of libraries among communities and between States—the Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1966.

CONGRESS CLOSES SESSION ON EDUCATION BILLS

Mr. Speaker, just today Congress cleared for the President's signature significant extensions of three major education laws, the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, the Higher Education Act of 1965, and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Extension of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is particularly noteworthy, for its overwhelming endorsement by both Houses of Congress is eloquent testimony to the solid support throughout the country for this landmark legislation.

Congress today extended the School Act for 2 years and authorized $6.1 billion for programs which will help children in practically every school district in the country.

In the Higher Education Act amendments, we endorsed and extended laws which will provide $3.2 billion over the next 3 years to build the classrooms, libraries, and laboratories which our overcrowded campuses, both established and developing, must have to make room for our exploding college population and the growing demand of the American people for more and better education.

A TRIBUTE TO THE LEADERSHIP OF PRESIDENTS JOHN F. KENNEDY AND LYNDON B. JOHNSON AND U.S. EDUCATION COMMISSIONERS FRANCIS KEPPEL AND HAROLD HOWE II

Mr. Speaker, I could not describe the extraordinary record of education legislation compiled by this Congress without paying due credit to the vital contributions made by four men who are not Members of Congress.

John F. Kennedy is no longer with us, but in the last year of his Presidency he helped set the agenda for education legislation and reminded us with characteristic eloquence that "Education is the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress." And Lyndon B. Johnson's fervent commitment to education and hard-driving leadership have helped make firm that keystone.

Second, we have had the good fortune to work with two outstanding and extremely able U.S. Commissioners of Education. Francis Keppel, former Commissioner and later Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Education, brought his great knowledge and talents to bear effectively on the development of much of the recent legislation. And Harold Howe II, the able and dedicated present Commissioner, has tackled the difficult task of administering these new laws with enthusiasm, honesty, and skill.

Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has said that "this Nation is determined to give all of our youth the education they deserve." The 89th Congress of 1965–66 has gone far to turn that determination into reality. It has truly been an "education Congress."

MRS. FRANCES HUMPHREY HOWARD DELIVERS ADDRESS TO ATHENS SYMPOSIUM OF GREEK HERITAGE FOUNDATION

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Brademas] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues a most thoughtful and perceptive address delivered by Mrs. Frances Humphrey Howard at the symposium of the Greek Heritage Foundation in Athens on September 30.

Mrs. Howard, sister of Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, is a career servant in the Agency for International Development of the Department of State. As program liaison officer with the U.S. voluntary agencies, she serves as a bridge between the Government's foreign aid program and those of private organizations such as CARE, the Church World Service, the Catholic Relief Services, the American Friends Service Committee, and more than 50 other private and voluntary agencies.

In 1960 Mrs. Howard received the Business and Professional Women's National Business Week Award for her outstanding professional achievements and community service.

In her address to the Athens symposium, Mrs. Howard clearly sets forth the great relevance of Hellenic ideals for contemporary American society:

Hellenic Ideals in the Great Society

(By Dr. Frances Humphrey Howard)

It is a great pleasure for me to accept the invitation of the Greek Heritage Foundation to be one of the speakers to address this symposium and to give me this opportunity to share ideas with you. I plan to talk about ancient Athens and the Great Society today, and I realize that here—in the cradle of Western civilization—I am suffering under a certain handicap. My problem is an obvious one. It is simply this: I am a woman, an American woman of the twentieth century—and I know how the ancient Athenians regarded women.

The Greek lyric poet Anacreon summed up that feeling in this line: "Nature has given horns to bulls, hoofs to horses, swiftness to hares, the power of swimming to fishes, of flying to birds, understanding to men. She had nothing more for women."

So I am in a spot. I have to prove Anacreon wrong. I shall try.

I am not here to say that the United States owes all or even most of its concepts and heritage and philosophies to the ancient Greeks. I've just cited one instance in which I think the United States has done far better than the Greeks ever did: the emancipation of women, the recognition that they are people and citizens too, and capable of far more than just comforting their men and bearing their children. If the United States were limited to the ancient Greek concept of the role of women, I would probably be back in Huron, South Dakota, right now, doing what the ancient Greeks thought came most naturally to women—and not daring to address this formidable assemblage.

But it was 2,500 years ago and more that Greece discovered freedom, a very long time ago in the recorded history of man, and we must make allowances for differences in concept and attitude. And we must, by all means, give the genius and wonder of ancient Greece its due.

TRUE FREEDOM IN GREECE

There were great civilizations before Greece but there was no freedom before Greece—freedom as we recognize it today. Before Greece, the rulers of the great empires had insisted, in the main, upon absolute obedience from the masses of the ruled. Athens was the first city to say that there must never be absolute obedience to a man except in war—instead there must be willing obedience to what is good for all. Athenians willingly obeyed their written laws, which they themselves wrote, and their unwritten ones—which had to be obeyed if men are to be free and live together. They knew they had to show each other humanity and goodness and other qualities which make life tolerable. And each man felt responsible for the welfare of Athens—not because someone made him do so—but because Athens was his pride and his refuge.

I am indebted to the works of the late Edith Hamilton, American educator and lover of Greece and its culture, for the reminder that the English word "idiot" has a Greek origin—it comes from what the Athenians called a man who took no part in public affairs. It is a good thought to remember. The creed of the first free government in the world, Miss Hamilton once wrote, was liberty for all men who could control themselves and would take responsibility for the state. And this conception was at the bottom of the lofty reach of Greek genius.

I have no wish to claim too much for Greece, to suggest that American democracy—as we know it today—stems directly from the lessons and advances of ancient Athens. American society and civilization is enriched by many main streams; by Hellenic concepts, by the Judaeo-Christian tradition, by the gifts and contributions of literally hundreds of different ethnic, racial, and religious groups. But the concept of a *United* States—a united republic, a union—that we can trace back to Greece. There would have been no union without Thomas Jefferson's Declaration. And Jefferson's precedent was the precedent of Pericles. The philosophy of "all men are created equal" in Jefferson's preamble had been historically true of every man—or at least every citizen—in the Athens of Pericles. The citizens of Athens were not subjects of the state; they were men inviolable in their quality as men. And this, in Jefferson's Declaration of Independence, was the way Americans were intended to be.

How did the miracle of Greece come about? How did the Greeks do so much, contribute so much, that today—2,500 years later—we stand here in awe and appreciation?

Let us go back to Toynbee's theory of *challenge* and *response*. The miracle of Greece is not explainable as a mere response to certain difficulties and necessities. Far more compelling is Professor Jaeger's interpretation: that there arose out of Homeric times the ideal of excellence or virtue—*arete*. It was not any uniquely useful obstacle which produced the Greek ideal; it was the ideal of *arete* which coped with the primitive local material and, centuries after Ajax and Achilles, produced Pericles and Praxiteles.

The history of Kellenism is the discovery of *arete* of human virtue.

This idea of virtue seems very elementary. Yet it is extraordinarily strong and fruitful. Out of it came a noble human ideal.

There is nothing fixed or static in this virtue. Implicit in it, too, is an impulse to progress. The definition of *arete* grows with the growth of the intellect and rises as high as the imagination can take it.

The athlete is rewarded by the perfection of his bodily powers—and not by prize, or applause. The poet or scientist is rewarded by his own supreme achievements—and not solely fame or money. It is enough for the thinker to see the world as it is, for the artist to enjoy for itself. So with every faculty: its perfect exercise is its own reward.

The story of Greece is much more than one of war and economic growth and political experiment and artistic achievement. It is the story of the making of an ideal of human life: an ideal which has all the cardinal features of a great moral system, which is disinterested, progressive, free from narrowness, and which compels men to accept, desire, and pursue it.

Whom did the Greeks regard as the perfect man?

Different ages would have given different answers, according to the changing views of human virtue. The ideal of the Fifth Century B.C. as Pericles says in Thucydides' report of his Funeral Speech, was a man versatile and intensely active, both in public duty and in his private occupation, combining practical pursuits with intellectual interests and artistic enjoyment.

Pericles describes the ideal man as public-spirited, respecting the law of the land and, above all, the unwritten moral code, living in a state which is prosperous, rich in noble buildings and in festivals and recreations; which oppresses neither poor nor rich, but gives all full opportunity to make the best of themselves.

In this then we have a rich conception of human nature and the state. In the next century the philosophers developed the subject with method and logic.

Aristotle has enumerated the qualities which, in his opinion, compose the perfect character, and his list reveals the generous and ample ideal of life to which the conception leads us.

There are the *intellectual virtues:* wisdom, intelligence, and the practical wisdom which is the virtue of a ruler, of Prime Ministers and Presidents, of Congressman, and Members of Parliament.

There are the *moral virtues:* not only the four cardinal virtues of courage, wisdom, temperance, and justice, which Plato recognized, but truthfulness, liberality, good temper, amiability, and two qualities which may be roughly translated as "magnificence" and "greatness of soul."

These are things which make the complete man. If we knew nothing else of Greek civilization, this list would be sufficient to reveal the breadth and richness of its existence.

Pride in man and in his achievement and a sense of infinite vistas opening before him have constituted the very heart of Greek philosophy. "There are many wonderful things, and nothing is more wonderful than man." These words are the epitome and explanation of the Greek achievement. If anyone wants a motto for a history of civilization, they might serve his purpose.

The Greeks were the first to conceive the idea of civilization and of progress based on human effort and advancing knowledge. It is the essential spirit of the modern world.

The ideal man regarded *Honor* above all things. The word that Aristotle uses here is *Time,* and it is significant that this word is also the normal Greek for "price" or "value." (The same root, in fact, turns up in our word "estimate.")

This indicates the importance which the Greek attached to public acknowledgment of one's qualities and one's services. The Greek had a lively sense of his own worth and felt that "honor" was due to him, that justice should be done to him. (Unless this is understood, modern Greek politics are unintelligible.)

But "honor" or "time" usually went to the winner, to the one who excelled. So, at every hand we meet the idea of "contest," "agon." These things that we weakly translate "games" were, in Greek, "agones."

The dramatic festivals were agones—contests in which poet was pitted against poet, actor against actor, sculptor against sculptor. Our word "agony" is the direct development from agon: it is the anguish of the struggle that reveals the man.

It was *arete* that the games were designed to test—the *arete* of the whole man, not merely specialized skill.

COMPLETE MAN IS IDEAL

The ideal was the complete man, the all-rounder—a man like Achilles, the most formidable of fighters, the swiftest of runners, and the noblest of soul; and Homer tells us, in one notable verse, how Achilles was educated. His father entrusted the lad to old Phoenix and told him to train Achilles to be "A maker of speeches and a doer of deeds."

The Greek made physical training an important part of education, not because he said to himself "Look here, we mustn't forget the body," but because it could never occur to him to train anything but the whole man.

It was as natural for the polis to have gymnasia as to have a theatre or warships, and they were constantly used by men of all ages, not only for physical but also for mental exercise.

Yet the Greek was wary of becoming too proficient in *one* sport or one *single* profession. Such specialization was perhaps appropriate for a slave. The skill shown by modern champions in games like golf or billiards, in the Greeks' minds would have been an admirable thing—in a slave, supposing that one had no better use for a slave than to train him in this way.

The Greek felt that it would be impossible to acquire skill like this and at the same time to live the proper life of a man and a citizen. It is this feeling that underlies Aristotle's remark that a gentleman should be able to play the flute—but not too well.

In his city a craftsman did a whole job—made the whole of the thing, not a minute bit to fit into a thousand other little bits made by a thousand other men; he had to think of the whole thing at once and to think of the whole thing all the time.

An important trait of the Greek was his young-mindedness and unbounded curiosity. "Ah! Solon, Solon!" said the old Egyptian priest to the Greek visitor, "you Greeks are always children; there is not an old man among you. You are all young in your souls."

So they were; they kept the freshness and curiosity of the child. They must meddle with things; they can't let them alone; they keep asking questions. "A question?" says one of them, "why, isn't a question a sort of education?"

This Greek view of life should be a challenge to us in all sorts of ways. We far too often are prone to accept one another's ideas today, almost without examination; but the Greek held that "the unexamined life is not livable for a human being."

He was keenly interested in the ways of man, in human life, in the ironies of life, in human suffering, in the triumphs of the human brain, of the human mind, of the human soul.

Another great concept which helped forge the character of the Greek and stood him in good stead in all his efforts is the famous doctrine of the Golden Mean—"Pan Metron Ariston"—an ideal now governing the lives of sane people throughout the world.

The doctrine of the Mean is indeed characteristically Greek, but it should not tempt us to think that the Greek was one who was hardly aware of the passions, a safe, placid, middle-of-the-road man. On the contrary, he valued the Mean so highly because he was prone to the extremes.

He sought control and balance because he needed them; he knew the extremes only too well. When he spoke of the Mean, he thought of the tuned string of a musical instrument. The Mean did not imply the absence of tension and lack of passion, but the correct tension which gives out the true and clear note.

The value of the Golden Mean stands in bolder relief especially when we consider some irrational factual or philosophical excursions into extremes, especially during the past two centuries.

To depart from the Mean is to forsake reason and thus to court disaster. The fruits of adherence to the Golden Mean are good health, good family relations, social justice, and smoother international relations.

LAW A CARDINAL PRINCIPLE

Respect for law was a cardinal principle in the Greek view of life. The Greeks considered themselves beings created in a universe where law reigns. This law of nature can neither be cheated, evaded, nor turned aside.

The Greek believed, as we ourselves believe today, that we can discover this law of nature, live in accordance with it, observe it, and develop and succeed; or, we can disregard it, violate it, defy it, and fail.

In Aristotle's view, the law of nature, as distinguished from "political" or positive or statute law, prevailed universally; it could not be subjected to various interpretations; it was the same everywhere and was accepted by all men of good will. It was the law to which Antigone so dramatically appealed. This was what later became known as the "Higher Law" or "common law" or "equity."

It is the concept upon which the English Chief Justice Coke's famous dictum in Dr. Bonham's case (1610) was based: That "When an Act of Parliament is against common right and reason, the common law will control it and adjudge such act to be void."

In the agitation leading to the Revolution, this principle was repeatedly invoked by Americans. Arguing for the Boston merchants against the practice of authorizing searching of their cellars and warehouses without a warrant, James Otis asserted: "An Act of Parliament against natural equity was void."

The natural law concept often guides judicial review by our own Supreme Court, when called upon to enforce a legislative act in deciding a case. The Court can decide whether such act is valid under a higher law which is deemed to be binding on both the court and the legislative.

This concept is also applicable to cases involving acts of the Executive Branch of our Government which purport to proceed directly from authority conferred by the higher law, such as President Truman's order in April, 1953, seizing the steel industry in order to head off a strike which would have disastrously affected the general welfare.

The Greek appealed to the higher law, but at the same time he respected and obeyed the positive law of the polis.

Who can forget the imperishable admonition Socrates gave to his disciples who offered to free him from his prison: You are perfectly free to attempt to persuade the authorities that the law is unjust, he said. But if you fail to persuade them, then you must obey the laws. "Either persuade, or do what the country orders."

The rule of law, in the Greek view of life, as it is in ours, is the source of order, of freedom, or righteous authority, or organized society, and also of success and prosperity. To disregard it is to perish, to observe it is to live, physically, mentally, morally and spiritually.

The proud inscription on our federal courts—Equal Justice Under Law—remains our goal and we aim to have it fully secured to all our citizens. Our legal system is woven around the freedom and dignity of the individual.

But the rights promised to all our people by our Constitution are not yet perfected. Some of the defects in our system are inherited; others keep creeping in. Justice like freedom needs constant vigilance. Justice, freedom, and equality will be maintained by unremitting effort on the part of all our citizens. Solon, asked how justice could be secured in Athens, replied, "If those who are not injured feel as indignant as those who are."

Three years ago, an International Congress of Jurists, composed of lawyers, judges, and teachers from forty-nine nations met here in Athens and formulated the so-called *Act of Athens,* defining the basic characteristics of a free system under law. Our own delegation was headed by Chief Justice Earl Warren. This document certainly sounds like a distillation of Greek legal concepts and philosophy.

The Act of Athens declared that the state is subject to the law, and owes its citizens the means to enforce their rights; that judges should uphold the rule of law in entire political independence; that lawyers of the world should insist on a fair trial for every accused; and that the rights of the individual, to be protected by the rule of law, include freedom of speech, press, worship, assembly, association, and free elections.

In Justice Warren's words, "if this writ should run through all the nations whose lawyers helped frame it, then indeed the great tradition of government under law will be established beyond challenge in our world."

As for the concept and reality of freedom, the Greek felt that there is no such thing as liberty without restraint. My rights are always represented by the duties of others. My freedom is always represented by the obedience of others. Their rights and their freedoms are represented by my duties and my obedience.

Throughout Greek literature and philosophy, the chief stress and emphasis had been put upon freedom and liberty—freedom of mind and heart.

INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM ESSENTIAL

The unflagging devotion of the Greeks, both ancient and modern, to the cause of individual and national freedom is known and admired everywhere. Through the centuries, whenever the issue has been freedom versus slavery, the Greeks, true to their traditions of three thousand years, have always chosen the path of freedom and honor.

The idea of democracy—indeed, the very word itself—originated in Greece. This is how it is set forth in the Funeral Oration of Pericles:

"Because in the administration it has respect not to the few but to the multitude, our form of government is called democracy . . . In election to public office we consider neither class nor rank, but each man is preferred according to his virtue or the esteem in which he is held for some special excellence . . ."

Not all Greeks favored this. In Plato's views, for example, democracy is "a form of government full of variety and disorder, and dispensing a sort of equality to equals and unequals alike."

In subsequent eras there has been a continuing contention between those who, like Plato, held that a government by the elite is best, and those who strongly believed with Aristotle, that "liberty and equality . . . will be best attained when all persons alike share in government to the utmost."

Democracy has its shortcomings, of course. It was Sir Winston Churchill, I believe, who once said, "Democracy is the worst form of government except all the others."

What are the alternatives to democracy? The alternatives to political democracy have been tried, and it was because they had been tried unsuccessfully that political evolution among free peoples up to our time has been and still is moving in the direction of democracy.

It is a curious thing that those who turn in their thoughts from democracy to dictatorship forget that dictatorship consists to a large extent in the shortcomings of democracy without its merits.

If democracy declines, if freedom is lost, if the dignity of man is destroyed, advances on the material plane will not be "progress," but a reversion to a new dark age.

In all these inestimable gifts from Greece, in these fundamental conceptions of Hellenism, in these eternal Hellenic ideals, we recognize a kinship with our inner spirit. That kinship is easily explained. It is based on the common human intelligence given to us all by God.

But the Greeks have pioneered. They took reason as their guide, and by use of critical intelligence and methodical inquiry explored both the material universe and the capacities of man. And so in ancient Greece today we see a mirror of America—indeed, a mirror of free mankind.

Hellenic ideals continue to guide our paths. They are like a Polar Star in our journey toward progress and the full realization of Man's place in the meaningful scheme of things. In Washington, D.C., on Constitution Avenue, the entire facade of the magnificent building of the National Academy of Sciences is covered by a long quotation in the original Greek from Aristotle's masterpiece on physics—a quotation which is a real Aristotelian gem on the search for truth and scientific research. Truth, justice, and freedom was the passion of the immortal Aristotle. Truth, justice, and freedom continue to be our goals in both our domestic and foreign policies.

We review the past of Hellas not in order that we may return to it but that we may find in what direction, straight and clear, it points into the future.

MANY AMERICAN PARALLELS

There are many parallels to be drawn from comparison to our American system today with the Athenian society of old. History does not repeat itself, but it does produce images of striking similarity.

One of these is the image of Athens twenty-five centuries ago, in its Golden Age. That image bears a striking resemblance to America today. Like the Athenians, we rightly take pride in our social system that permits full individual freedom, and is so obviously well suited to the development of the human spirit.

Twenty-five centuries ago, Pericles spoke of Athens as an "open society," affording the opportunity to other states to copy it or criticize it. In recent years, both President Kennedy and President Johnson have used the very same words of Pericles to describe our American society as an "open society" which is subject to the scrutiny of friend and foe.

In this connection, our Presidents reminded Americans that in these days of almost instantaneous communications, events in this country are absorbed and debated on all shores of every ocean—only a few hours after the event. Ordinarily these events enhance the image of the United States but there are times when they do not.

We must learn the lessons of history and avoid, for instance, the self-satisfaction and complacency which leads to apathy. These same conditions ruined ancient Athens and gave victory to Sparta, the authoritarian state of those times.

As I have said, I do not wish to claim too much for Greece. Ancient Athens lost her freedom forever for a variety of reasons. But freedom was not lost forever to the world. Aristotle once said that "the excellent becomes the permanent." The great and good idea of Athens—the excellence of Athens—can never be lost. The excellent becomes the permanent.

But Athens did not resolve all conflicts or, indeed, show us the way in all things. From the earliest time, Greece had a basic conflict between those who thought that the good and free life could only be achieved for an elite—if at all—and those who sought the same life for a broad society. The early Greeks hoped for the achievement of the good life by an elite and the rule of society by philosopher kings—they did not, for the most part, extend the span of it or hope beyond Greece itself. Later Greek ideas, we have seen, spread throughout the Roman Empire and formed the base for a good share of Western culture. But the resolution of the elite versus the egalitarian struggle never did come to pass.

And throughout history—until this time—the outcome of the struggle has always been in doubt. Up until the past few years, there was, indeed, serious question whether or not more than a few people at any given time on earth could achieve the richness, fullness, and freeness of life.

In these past few years we have made clear our national commitment to programs which may free man—ordinary man—from the everyday burdens of eeking out an existence. Our national investments in health and medical care . . . in education . . . in urban renewal . . . in mass transportation . . . in an agriculture which produces an abundance of goods at low cost to the consumer . . . in broadly based economic growth . . . in elimination of injustice and discrimination . . . in modern housing—all these things are part of the concept of "the Great Society" and of the liberation of men and women from everyday burdens.

I should say at this point that I think one of the best American characteristics is our willingness to examine ourselves, to join together to correct our errors, to refine and improve our ways. For many years we had saddled ourselves with customs and laws which, we concede, were discriminatory. We have improved. Our immigration laws are one of our worst—and best—examples. Our new liberalized, more humane, immigration laws have been in effect only a short time, but they have been so effectively implemented that in the short space of one year our total number of visas issued for immigration from Greece to the U.S. have increased over 200%.

END OF DISCRIMINATION VITAL

I think this honesty about past and present errors is one of our basic assets. In another area—that of discrimination—we must continue with honesty. Those of us, Americans travelling abroad, know how often the issue of America's race relations comes up in discussion. The very best thing the American abroad can do is to be sure that he is truly informed about race relations in the United States and can speak about the subject with knowledge and conviction. If the person he is speaking to is open-minded, and his questions are honest, the American must be equally honest—both in admitting that the problem exists, and in telling of the progress we've made. His honesty will be appreciated. Americans can well make the point that prejudice and scapegoating are universal problems and that no people or nation is beyond reproach. And they can emphasize that the United States is trying, sincerely and realistically, to solve its own problems as well as to give world leadership in this sphere.

What are our other advances? Now, in the United States, we have also committed ourselves as well to national investment in the arts and humanities. This is certainly an advance far beyond the dreams of the visionaries at the time of the early days of the American Revolution.

And now, in our wealth and power, our nation has extended these commitments of "the Great Society" beyond its own borders. It was Toynbee who once said that "our age will be well remembered, not for its horrifying crimes nor its astonishing inventions, but because it is the first generation since the dawn of history in which mankind dared to believe it practical to make the benefits of civilization available to the human race."

Our times may not be remembered as the atomic or space age so much as the age in which one-third of the human race banded together to help the other two-thirds. For today, as we envisage the "Great Society," we recognize that we cannot be secure in our wealth and power if the rest of the world is impoverished. I said I would not be excessively kind to ancient Athens; this is a concept that did not, could not, have occurred to the philosophers of 2,500 years ago. It is new and unprecedented, a uniquely American contribution to the world.

The great nation of modern Greece has known the meaning of our friendship and aid intimately—any how well it has responded. Addressing the national banquet of the Order of AHEPA (the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association) last month in Washington, the Vice President of the United States paid tribute to "the valor with which the Greek people, with timely and effective help from the United States under President Truman, defended their liberty and averted a Communist attempt to take over.

"It is tragic when any country succumbs to totalitarianism—but it would have been doubly tragic for this fate to befall the birthplace of democracy," the Vice President said.

But he went on to say that our purpose in foreign aid has not been just to fight a Cold War or to combat an ideology. It has been to build a better world. Our aid programs express the true voice of America, the spirit of our continuing revolution. Today, we have gone from aid to trade with Greece—a tribute to the capacity and resourcefulness of both of our nations.

What are our goals for the future—we who have so liberally drawn upon Hellenic ideals. They are many and basic. They are the attainment of freedom for ourselves as individuals and for other peoples; they are for social justice and the dignity of the individual everywhere.

Of course, the safeguarding of American liberty and the protection of world freedom has demanded sacrifices. From Valley Forge to Vietnam, there is an unbroken pattern of heroic sacrifices to maintain freedom as we understand it, as we cherish it.

We fervorently hope and pray that aggression and the threats of aggression will stop and peace—or at least a real and sincere peaceful coexistence—will be established.

Humanity must give its undivided attention to problems of food production; population explosion control of disease, and spreading of educations.

AMERICAN GOALS ABROAD

We are doing much in these directions, but much more is needed and the responsibility for assistance must be more widely shared. And, in the words of President Johnson, "surely the works of peace can bring men together in a common effort to abandon forever the works of war." The material triumphs of our century must be translated into a happier life for mankind everywhere.

In our relations with other nations around the world, we are working to achieve—

a world free of aggression committed to the simplest possible prescription for peace, namely, "leave your neighbor alone";

a world of independent nations, each with the institutions of its own choice;

a world of economic and social advance for all peoples;

a world which provides sure and equitable means for the peaceful settlement of disputes;

a world in which the powers of the state over the individual are limited by law and custom, in which the personal freedoms essential to the dignity of man are secure;

a world free of hate and discrimination based on race, or nationality, or color, or economic or social status;

and a world of equal rights and equal opportunities for the entire human race.

Our basic national policies are designed to move us and the rest of mankind toward that kind of world.

America, the traditional land of technology, enjoys the largest freedom from destitution, ignorance, and disease, along with political rights and social improvements unique in history. This liberation from want is a testimony to the enduring vitality of the American free enterprise system. But many of our problems are those created by scientific achievement itself.

Science and unfettered thought—these twin children of Greece—have created a civilization which puzzles us by its complexity and appalls us by its tendency to escape our control.

Like the imprisoned djinn in the casket of the "Arabian Nights," science, once released, has become almost too powerful for its liberator. Mankind cannot have too much of material resources, material power—but only if it remains their master, if at each moment it can say to them, "I possess them, not they me."

That is where we can learn from Greece, where its example can correct us. We have realized the Greek dream; we have our applied science, the "arts," as the Greeks called them, carried to great perfection.

Every achievement on the physical plane, however, packs danger as well as opportunity. It is the ancient dilemma posed when Prometheus gave man the fire that both warms and consumes. Pyromaniacs, however, cannot be blamed upon Prometheus, any more than Hitler's Panzer divisions could be blamed on the invention of motorcars.

We must make sure that atomic energy is forever used for peaceful purposes and for the good of humanity. As you know, the meaning of the Greek word "atom" is undivided or indivisible. Well, now that the atom has been split, humanity had better remain united and return to reason or perish.

Some twenty-four centuries ago, Sophocles wrote: "When Divine power plans evils for a man, it first injures his mind." Longfellow's variant of the same thought was, "Whom the Gods would destroy they first make mad."

I find it inconceivable that man is about to destroy himself with the products of his own God-given genius. Man will find the way to sanity, understanding patience, courage and faith.

Some years ago, Dr. Albert Einstein, while toying with the potentialities of nuclear physics at Princeton, said that once the atom is split, the salvation of humanity will lie in the transcendental norms and principles of justice which existed from time immemorial and were instilled into man's heart by the Creator.

These norms and principles, Dr. Einstein said, were clearly defined in Aristole's conception of the law of nature as being immutable and eternal, and universally accepted. We must go back to them, the great scientists said, if we are to survive.

Indeed, in this nuclear age, in which, as Sir Winston Churchill put it, "safety has now become the twin brother of annihilation," there remains no alternative but to return to fundamental morality and brotherhood and to the Hellenic concepts of justice and the Higher Law, the Golden Mean, and the other precious Hellenic ideals which gave birth to Western civilization and now give promise not only to save the world from holocaust, but to bring the human mind to even greater flowering and more abundant fruition.

We see, in the America of tomorrow, the true spiritual and cultural capital of the world. It will be a heir to man's loftiest hopes and achievements. It will be a land of many races and religions, of peoples cosmopolitan and understanding of each other—yet each cherishing their unique traditions. It will be a land such as never existed before—and it will vibrate with the creativity and unleashed talents of millions.

And the world will see in America an even greater fulfillment of Hellenic Ideals in the "Great Society."

OUTSTANDING NEWSPAPER SERIES ON IMPORTANT NOTRE DAME STUDY OF CATHOLIC EDUCATION

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Brademas] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant reports on American education in recent years is the comprehensive study of Catholic education financed by the Carnegie Corp. and concluded earlier this year at the University of Notre Dame. This excellent study has been carefully analyzed in an outstanding series of articles in the South Bend Tribune by education writer Roger Birdsell. I strongly commend them to the attention of my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent to include this series in the Record at this point.

[From the South Bend Tribune, Aug. 29, 1966]

Notre Dame Specialists View Rise in Catholic Enrollment

(By Roger Birdsell)

The nation's Catholic elementary and secondary schools have been unable to serve all Catholic students who seek admission, let alone all students who are baptized Catholics, despite a strong school growth pattern.

The dimensions of this problem for Catholic educators are spelled out in the comprehensive study of Catholic schools recently reported by the University of Notre Dame.

The Notre Dame investigators looked at the enrollment statistics accumulated by the National Catholic Welfare Conference from 1953 to 1962 to survey the dimensions of the enrollment problem.

During this nine-year period, elementary enrollments increased by 1,248,047 for a total of 4,472,375 students in the fall of 1962. Secondary school enrollments rose 371,048 to a 990,513 total.

DIFFERENT PATTERNS

The growth rate of the secondary schools, 62.8 per cent, was greater than that for elementary schools, 38.7 per cent. Moreover, there were different patterns of growth between the first six years and the last three years.

During the earlier period, the growth rates for elementary and secondary schools were about equal, 27.2 and 29.9 per cent, respectively, but during the later period, the elementary rate dropped to 9 per cent while the secondary rate slowed to a lesser amount, to 20.2 per cent.

The report notes that total population growth rates do not account for this change of emphasis to the secondary schools and concludes that it represents cumulative decisions by Catholic educators either "to catch up to secondary school needs" or "to make a greater effort to provide for secondary school pupils rather than for elementary pupils."

CONSIDERABLE VARIATIONS

Considerable variations by nine geographic regions were found in these growth patterns. The five-state Midwest region, which includes Indiana and Michigan, was fairly close to the national pattern, however.

To determine how many of the eligible Catholic children were actually attending Catholic schools, the investigators turned to the infant baptism figures reported in "The Official Catholic Directory."

These figures for each year were projected to the school age level and adjusted by standard survivorship ratios for the entire population. It was assumed that enrollment of all baptized Catholics is a legitimate aim for Catholic schools.

The conclusion of this investigation was that in 1962, the Catholic schools enrolled 52.21 per cent of the eligible elementary students and 32.22 per cent of the eligible secondary students.

POPULATION UNDERESTIMATED

The report noted that existing diocesan census records tends to underestimate the Catholic population. It commented that this "surely has some relationship to the fact that there is provision for less than 50 per cent of all Catholic youth to attend Catholic schools, which are nevertheless very highly regarded."

The investigators also looked at the rate of rejections of applications for admission to Catholic schools as reported both in the fall of 1961 and the fall of 1962. This involved responses to the study questionnaire by 92 per cent of the elementary schools and 84 per cent of the secondary schools in the country.

In the fall of 1962, the respondents reported that 110,000 elementary applicants were denied admission, a total equal to 20 per cent of the first grade enrollment for that year. Secondary schools rejected 86,787 applicants, a total equal to 30 per cent of the ninth grade enrollment.

Moreover, the rate of rejection increased from 1961 to 1962. The elementary schools rejected 20 per cent more applicants the second year and the secondary schools, 14 per cent more.

The schools were asked to identify the policies by which they limited admissions. For the elementary schools, by far the most prevalant standard for admission was membership in the parish which the school served.

This parish membership test commonly was refined further by such devices as measurement of parental financial support of the church, longevity of parish membership, general parish membership, general parish activity of the family and previous enrollment of other members of the family.

Secondary schools made some use of the parish membership standard but more commonly relied on admissions tests of student aptitude and achievement. Admissions tests at the elementary level usually were used for placement in the school rather than admission as such.

The study report noted that diocesan rules governing class size are becoming more prevalent and contribute to the rejection rate. The Catholicism of the applicant as such is not a widely used admissions criteria.

Admissions also are affected by direct tuition charges, it was reported. Fifty per cent of the elementary schools charged tuition, the median being $25 a year or less. Fees outside of tuition were charged by 69 per cent of these schools.

Of the secondary schools responding, 77 per cent charged tuition, the median being $76–$100, and 79 per cent had fees in addition to tuition. Private schools operated by religious communities rather than parishes or dioceses had a median tuition of $150–$200.

At the elementary level, it was a common practice to scale down the tuition charge with the second child in the family in the school or more.

FACE SERIOUS PROBLEM

Catholic schools not only fail to enroll all eligible Catholic children and all who apply for admission, but they face a serious problem merely in attempting to maintain the percentages of children they do serve.

The study illustrated this latter problem by projecting to the fall of 1968 on the basis of baptismal records the Catholic school enrollments required just to continue to serve slightly more than half the eligible elementary students and a third of the eligible high school students, which was the situation in 1962.

Thus, in that six-year period, the Catholic schools would have to enroll 758,700 more elementary students and 329,363 more high school students. The problem was further dramatized by translating the enrollment needs into teaching staff and physical facility needs.

WOULD NEED 21,089 MORE

Assuming maintenance of the student-staff ratios existing in 1962, the Catholic schools would need 21,089 more religious teachers and 10,545 more lay teachers by 1968. This is in addition to normal replacement needs for the 1962 staff.

Assuming conservative 1962 cost figures for construction, additional classrooms valued at $721,610,000 are needed by 1968 to handle such an enrollement.

Last week, at the New York news conference announcing the study report, Reginald A. Neuwein, study director, said there is evidence that Catholic schools are not keeping pace with the population growth but are, in fact, falling farther behind.

He said enrollment figures for the fall of 1964, the latest available, indicated only 42 per cent of eligible Catholic youth in Catholic schools, a distinct drop from the 46.74 per cent enrolled in 1962.

The same point is illustrated by enrollments reported by principals of Catholic schools in metropolitan South Bend between 1962 and 1965.

The total enrollments in these schools dropped from 10,423 to 9,128 in this period. The latter figure should be adjusted upward by about 300 for a truer figure because of the opening of Marian High School in Mishawaka, which serves parts of the community previously served by St. Joseph's High School.

This net loss of about 1,000 students in South Bend came in a period characterized by a declining kindergarten program, no new classroom construction and a firm diocesan policy limiting class sizes.

[From the South Bend Tribune, Aug. 30, 1966]

CATHOLIC SCHOOLS' FACILITIES SURVEYED

(By Roger Birdsell)

The bedrock of Catholic education in America is the parish operated elementary school serving 301 to 400 students on the average and with an average class size of 46 to 50 pupils.

This generally accepted picture has been confirmed by the pioneering study and report, "Catholic Schools in Action," just issued by the University of Notre Dame.

The simplicity of the elementary school organization is not continued by Catholic secondary schools. They display more diversity in ownership, in size and in other factors.

GRADES SPLIT 8 AND 4

The so-called 8–4 grade organization prevails in Catholic education below the college level. The 6–3–3 plan or elementary-junior high-senior high organization popular in many public school systems is practically non-existent.

Of the 9,451 elementary schools reporting in 1962 to the study questionnaire, 92 per cent of the total in the country, 86.9 per cent were parish owned and operated.

Of the rest, 4.2 per cent were privately owned, usually by religious communities; 3.8 per cent were diocesan owned; 8 per cent were owned by more than one parish, and 4.3 per cent were in an institutional or no response category.

Most of the private schools represented downward extensions of secondary schools, the report noted. Kindergarten programs were maintained by 22 per cent of the elementary schools. Almost all of the schools were co-educational.

THREE HUNDRED AND ONE TO FOUR HUNDRED STUDENTS

The size of the average elementary school was 301 to 400. Thus, the report said, the typical Catholic parish school has eight classrooms and eight grades.

However, 8.6 per cent of the schools had 100 students or less and accounted for 1.1 per cent of the total enrollment. A considerably smaller number of schools, 256, had more than 1,200 students.

The study found little evidence of inter-parish or diocesan planning for larger elementary schools, the report said.

The study attempted to measure school physical facilities outside of standard classrooms in terms of five groupings ranging from the most to the least extensive facilities.

FOUR PERCENT AT TOP

The result placed 63 per cent of the elementary schools in the two least extensive groupings: multipurpose, cafeteria and library facilities. Only 4 per cent were in the most extensive group. The smaller the school, the less extensive were these extra facilities, the report said.

While 70 per cent of the elementary schools reported having libraries, "a general observation by the study staff was that library collections in many schools were very modest, and there was little evidence of the use of loan collections or library service from local public libraries."

In approaching the determination of elementary class size, the questionnaire responses established a ratio of staff to students of 1 to 36–40. In the Midwest region, this median was 41–45.

The staff-student ratio is not an accurate measure of class size, the report explained, because it included part time teachers on the same basis as full time teachers.

FOUND IN ALL REGIONS

The basic figures were correlated with reports on policies controlling class size, and the median class size nationally and in the Midwest was established at 46–50. The report noted that very large classes, 60 students and above, were found in all regions and in most dioceses.

As to secondary school ownership, the study found 37.1 per cent to be parish; 36.8 per cent, private; 16.6 per cent, diocesan; 5.1 per cent, inter-parish, and 4.4 per cent, institutional and no response. Responses were received from 2,075 schools, 84 per cent of those in the country.

This ownership pattern varies significantly when the total secondary enrollment is broken down by type of school. Diocesan schools then take 30.8 per cent; private, 38.6 per cent; parish, 23.5 per cent, and inter-parish, 4.4 per cent.

Thus, a characteristic pattern of a relatively large number of smaller parish schools and a relatively small number of larger diocesan schools emerges. Other figures show parish schools to be older and diocesan schools, younger.

The average size of the secondary schools is 201–300 students, but 12.9 per cent of the schools had 100 students or less and 22.4 per cent, 101 to 200 students. The two smaller school groups accounted for 10 per cent of the total enrollment.

Medium sized schools, 201 to 600 students, handled 38 per cent of the enrollment, and larger schools, only 21.8 per cent of those reporting, accounted for 52 per cent of the enrollment.

The smaller schools "are seriously handicapped in attempting to provide a broad curriculum," the report stated. Complementary problems in libraries and other specialized facilities and specialized staff are also present, it was added.

"In a number of dioceses, long-term plans have been implemented to develop central schools and to replace small parish high schools with new interparish schools," the report continued. It cautioned, however, that a large size itself does not guarantee a quality educational program.

SPECIAL FACILITIES CHECKED

The problems of high school size were dramatized in the report by responses of the schools to questions of special academic and special "program support" facilities. As in the elementary survey, five groupings were used.

The results showed a pattern of fewer special facilities the smaller the school. Parish schools had the least extensive facilities and diocesan and private schools, the most. Private schools were particularly strong in support facilities.

In a general comment, the report said there was little evidence of unused classroom space or double sessions in either the elementary or secondary schools. The unused space reported was in elementary schools serving declining residential areas or in secondary schools just starting operation.

While elementary schools are almost entirely coeducational, the mixing of the sexes in the classroom occurs in only 44.8 per cent of the high schools. All-girl schools are 33.3 per cent of the total; all-boy schools, 14.5 per cent, and co-institutional, 3.4 per cent.

KEEP SEXES SEPARATE

Co-institutional schools put both sexes in the same building but maintain the sex separation in the classes. Such schools are a post-war development designed to ease cost burdens. The report said the study indicated a general resistance to this trend.

Co-education is the prevailing pattern in parish schools, 73.6 per cent, and inter-parish schools, 83.8 per cent, but not in private schools, 9.7 per cent. In the private schools, 60.9 per cent are for girls and 24.8 per cent for boys.

Diocesan schools are more divided in sex organization. The breakdown is coeducational, 48 per cent; boys only, 22.7 per cent; girls only, 13.7 per cent, and co-institutional, 13.4 per cent.

The secondary schools did not report the pattern of large class sizes found in the elementary schools. The staff-to-student ratio was established at 1 to 21.9 and the median academic class size, at 33.6 students.

[From the South Bend Tribune, Aug. 31, 1966]

Catholic Students Score Above "Norms"

(By Roger Birdsell)

Catholic school students scored above national "norms" in both aptitude and achievement in academic comparisons made by the University of Notre Dame study of these schools.

The study report, "Catholic Schools in Action," assigned three factors—admissions selectivity, curriculum concentration, and the tuition burden—in attempting to explain these superior results.

"Some of the reason for this indicated superiority can be traced to the relative selectivity of the admission policies of the Catholic elementary schools," the report commented.

BECOME MORE SELECTIVE

"At the secondary level, the admissions become more selective in a number of ways." Admissions tests measuring academic potential are almost always used by the private schools and frequently by the diocesan schools, it was noted.

"Another factor in the selectivity of Catholic high school enrollment is the strong academic emphasis of the curriculum—with very little emphasis on vocational and prevocational training—which tends to attract the college-bound student.

"Many Catholic high schools have a high rate of academic failure, resulting in withdrawals and transfers to other schools.

"Tuition payments are another factor: 76 percent of these high schools have tuition charges and other fees. There is no indication of an attempt to admit only an academic elite; rather, lack of space and other factors make it impossible to admit all applicants."

SEVEN THOUSAND TAKE TESTS

To measure the potential and performance of high school students, early 7,000 seniors in 41 schools in 13 representative dioceses took the Otis Mental Ability Test and the Metropolitan Achievement Test: High School Battery, both well-accepted measurements.

In both tests, the students on the whole were "significantly above" the median or norm, the report stated. The norm is the average score of all students who have ever taken the test.

High school students, it was concluded, "are meeting their indicated potential in a more than satisfactory degree."

The achievement test broke down to measurements by general subject fields, and the study report noted that all-girl and co-educational schools tended to be particularly strong in language arts; all boys schools, in social studies, and co-educational schools, in mathematics and science.

TAKE RESULTS OF STUDY

The study took exsting results of three tests given students in 192 elementary schools in the 13 dioceses to measure academic outcomes. They were the Stanford Achievement Test and the Otis and Kuhlman-Anderson mental ability tests.

The results of about 26,000 students taking the achievement test showed all grades significantly above the norm except the second grade. The range was six months ahead of grade level at the end of the first grade to a year and two months ahead of grade level at the end of grades seven and eight.

The ability tests indicated the students should be reaching this potential, and the report concluded "This group of elementary schools shows superior student results and challenging efforts by the schools."

The academic coloration of the Catholic high schools was reflected by principals' reports throughout the country that 64.15 per cent of their boys and 46.52 per cent of their girls planned college level education.

PERCENT TO CATHOLIC COLLEGES, 48.46

Of those going on to college, 48.42 per cent were expected to go to Catholic colleges; 35.97 per cent to public coleges; 9.2 per cent to non-Catholic private colleges, and 5.8 per cent, into religious training.

(The study also looked at plans for eighth grade graduates of elementary schools, and 61.9 per cent were expected to go to Catholic secondary schools. The private schools expected to send 73.9 per cent on to further Catholic education.)

Strong efforts by Catholic high schools to guide their graduates into Catholic institutions of higher learning were noted, but there was no information on the effectiveness of these efforts.

The principals' reports of college aspirations made in 1962 were confirmed by following studies of student attitudes in the 13 dioceses when 66.3 per cent of the senior boys and 49.6 per cent of the senior girls said they valued a college education highly.

GIVE COLLEGE HIGH MARK

More students in all-boy and all-girl high schools gave a college education high marks than did their peers in co-educational schools. The higher the social class and the more the parents' education, the more value placed on college, the report said.

Beyond the general ability-achievement tests, the study did not attempt to measure the effectiveness of academic programs in the schools. No statistics were gathered, for example, on curriculum offerings and instruction programs.

The study made no substantial effort to get information on the financing of Catholic education below the college level. However, this sort of study is established as the next major goal.

In the 1962 questionnaire, principals were asked to estimate the major sources of financial support for their schools.

Elementary principals said they depended largely on parish subsidy, except for the private schools, which relied on tuition. Diocesan support was reported a minor factor.

At the secondary level, the diocesan schools depended on tuition and parish subsidy, in that order; parish schools, on parish subsidy and then tuition, and private schools, on tuition, subsidy from the religious community and miscellaneous income.

[From the South Bend Tribune, Sept. 1, 1966]

Catholic Schools Use More Lay Teachers

(By Roger Birdsell)

The nun, the sister teacher, remains the symbol of Catholic education, but every third teacher at the elementary level and every fourth teacher at the secondary level today is apt to be a lay person.

The 1962 study of Catholic schools by the University of Notre Dame, on which a report has just been issued, established a lay-religious staff ratio of 1 to 2.24 at the elementary level and 1 to 2.64 at the secondary level.

The elementary questionnaire, answered by 92 per cent of the schools in the country, established the staff at 66.2 per cent sisters; 27.9 per cent lay women; 2.7 per cent lay men; 2 per cent, priests; 0.5 per cent brothers, and 0.8 per cent, no response.

STAFF 49.5 PCT. NUNS

The secondary questionnaire response, 84 per cent of the schools, put this staff at 49.5 per cent sisters; 12.2 per cent lay women; 14.9 per cent lay men; 13.8 per cent priests; 8.4 per cent brothers, and 1.1 per cent, no response.

There were some regional variations in these responses—New England has more religious teachers and the South, fewer—but the Midwest conforms closely to the national average.

The median age for all teachers was established at 35–44. Brothers and lay men teaching in the elementary schools averaged somewhat younger. Sisters in the secondary schools averaged somewhat older. Lay women teaching in the secondary schools were younger than their counterparts in the elementary schools.

Catholic elementary schools, as was noted earlier in this series, are characterized by relatively large class sizes, at least by general public school standards. The study established the median class size at 46–50.

MINIMIZE PROBLEMS

This is undoubtedly a problem over which there is growing concern, the study report commented, but the report also noted teacher "techniques for minimizing the problems in such large groups."

One such technique, often observed, the report stated, was division of the class into several reading groups with the teacher working with each in turn while the other studied independently.

This technique appeared effective, the report commented, as was the "cathechetical framework" frequently employed in the upper elementary classes. Order prevailed in most of the large classes observed, the report stated, and this order "did not seem oppressive."

Nevertheless, the report concluded, "The observer cannot help wondering how much more these same teachers could do with smaller classes and the opportunity to give more attention to the individual."

SECONDARY LOAD LIGHTER

The teacher load problem did not appear as severe at the secondary school level, the report said, where the student-staff ratio was 1 to 21.9 and the medium academic class size, 33.6 students.

The average teaching load was five teaching periods plus one additional assigned period a day in a six or seven-period day. However, 35 per cent of the schools had six or more assigned teaching periods and 35 per cent, seven or more total assigned periods, which was called excessive.

If Catholic teachers have problems in student and class loads, they also perform with a distinct minimum of administrative and clerical assistance, the study showed.

Of the 9.451 elementary schools responding, only 1,752 had full-time principals and another 303, part time principals. The rest were headed by principals carrying a full teaching load.

Of the 2,075 secondary schools responding, only 1.077 had full time principals and 213, part time principals. Assistant principals were reported by 29.2 per cent of the secondary schools and 4.7 per cent of the elementary schools.

SHORT ON GUIDANCE STAFFS

Secondary schools were asked about their guidance staffs. No guidance staffs were reported by 44.3 per cent of the schools; up to one full time person, by 30.4 per cent, and more than one full time person, by 25.3 per cent.

Queried about clerical help, 86.1 per cent of the elementary schools reported no full-time help and 80.9 per cent no help at all. Of the secondary schools 53.7 per cent had no full-time clerical help.

The most striking differences between the lay and religious teaching staffs were in their professional preparation and in their experience.

Overall, 50.2 per cent of the elementary teachers reported having a bachelor's degree or better and the rest, less than that degree. Sisters, 56.7 per cent with a bachelor's degree or better were significantly better trained than lay women.

NUN TRAINING LEVEL HIGHER

The general training level was higher at the secondary level, with the bachelor's degree being much more of a norm. However while 47.7 per cent of the sisters had a master's degree or better, only 15.1 per cent of the lay women were in the same position.

Training at a Catholic institution was almost invariably the case for the religious teachers, but little better than half of the lay teachers went to such institutions. Non-Catholic lay teachers were 4 per cent at the elementary level and 6.8 per cent, men, and 15.1 per cent, women, at the secondary level.

In total years of teaching experience, the lay teacher median was 3–4 whatever the grade level. Sisters had an experience median of 15–19 at the elementary level and 20–29 at the secondary level.

Catholic schools are marked by a rapid turnover of staff in individual buildings, both religious and lay. This turnover was somewhat less pronounced at the secondary level than the elementary level, where only 20 per cent of the staff had been in the same school more than four years.

More than a third of the lay women and nearly a fourth of the lay men teachers reported some experience in public schools.

[From the South Bend Tribune, Sept. 2, 1966]

(By Roger Birdsell)

Catholic school progress is slow toward the goal of the Sister Formation movement, to give a bachelors degree to each nun before she begins her teaching career.

Since sisters form the bulk of religious teachers in the schools, the University of Notre Dame study of the schools in 1962 was concerned to measure their training and experience for the teaching profession.

In its report on the study, just released, Notre Dame established that while sisters in the elementary schools were better trained than the lay teachers, still only 56.7 per cent had a bachelors degree or better.

PERCENT MASTERS, 7.7

The masters degree or better was held by only 7.7 per cent of the elementary sisters. Below the bachelors level, 35.8 per cent of the total sisters had two years of college or better and 7 per cent, less than two years.

At the secondary level, the training figures for the religious teachers improve. A bachelors degree or better was held by 93.9 per cent of the sisters, and figures for teaching brothers and priests were comparable.

Figures for sisters above the bachelors degree level, the percentages reflecting the total staff, were bachelors degree plus, 38.2 per cent; masters degree, 29.8 per cent, and masters degree plus, 17.8 per cent.

CONTINUE EDUCATION

The study developed evidence that sisters at the elementary level, while they are apt to start teaching without a college degree, are also accustomed to continuing their education and eventually securing their degree.

Thus, the median preparation level for sisters in the 20–24 age group was two years of college, but by the time they reached the 35–44 age group, the median level was a bachelors degree plus.

The study measured the years of experience in teaching and determined that for elementary sisters the median is 15–19 years and for secondary sisters, 20–29 years.

Those who conducted the study considered the preparation of teaching sisters to be a basic concern, and the report includes a section written by Sister Mary Emil, I.H.M., president of Marygrove College, Detroit, on the history and impact of the Sister Formation movement.

STANDARD MINIMUM

Sister Emil considers the Sister Formation drive to parallel the effort in the public school area led by the National Education Assn. to make the bachelors degree the standard minimum preparation for every teacher.

The public school drive did not start until 1956, she noted, and by 1961, only 44 states had established a strict bachelors degree standard. In the same year, 1 out of 15 public school teachers were teaching on substandard or emergency certificates.

The Catholic decision, which was influenced by the public school movement, to establish the bacheors degree a standard for teaching sisters, was made at the 1954 Sister Formation Conference.

FIVE-YEAR PROGRAM

As a result of the conference, Sister Emil said, "The standard acceptable program for the training of sisters is now a five-year program consisting of various combinations of postulancy, novitiate and juniorate.

"This five-calendar-year period includes four academic years, leading to a bachelors degree. The extra calendar year, that of the canonical novitiate, is largely devoted to spiritual training.

"The five-year period usually includes a number of summer sessions, so that most of these programs total more than the number of credit hours usually considered minimal for a bachelors degree."

Sister Emil pointed to the interval of only eight years between the Sister Formation Conference and the Notre Dame study and concluded the "study cannot reflect, statistically, much change brought about by the Sister Formation movement."

SHOULD SHOW RESULTS

While prepared to accept this statistical conclusion, Sister Emil was bothered by the fact that the figures for the 20–24 age group did not differ materially from those for the 25–34 group.

The younger group should begin to show of the impact of the Sister Formation movement, she stated. She looked at another study, by Sister Rose Matthew, and concluded there is some indication of improved preparation of sisters between 1956 and 1962.

Nevertheless, Sister Emil called the fact that only 1,168 of 7,967 elementary sisters in the 20–24 age group in the Notre Dame study had bachelors degrees "the single most disturbing figure revealed by this study."

She went on to explain that the various religious communities cannot be expected to implement the Sister Formation program overnight. She noted the difficulties of implementation, particularly the pressure by schools with a chronic teacher shortage to put sisters in the classroom as soon as possible.

"As a matter of fact, the unwritten understanding—neither canonical nor logical, but almost unbelievably strong—was that the young sisters belonged to the works of the diocese or parish, if not from the day of her entrance into the convent, at least from the end of her novitiate on; time devoted after that to education was seen as somehow 'taken' from the children waiting to be taught," she commented.

Sister Emil also cited severe problems in operating Sister Formation programs by orders without four-year colleges of their own, which presents severe financial problems, and by orders without the canonical authority of their own to start them.

EXPECTS CHANGE

If the 1962 figures are disappointing, she concluded, "a similar study for 1965 should show a remarkable change, and the present decade should bring median preparation at the bachelors level down into the 20–24 group."

"There is a clearly discernible pattern of study through a lifetime, hampered by a late start," she said of the preparation of Catholic teaching sisters.

"The Sister Formation movement proposes to eliminate the late start, but to cherish and retain the habit of continuing education."

[From the South Bend Tribune, Sept. 4, 1966]

LAY TEACHER PROBLEM CRITICAL

(By Roger Birdsell)

The lay teacher—her training, experience, salary and morale—emerged as the most critical problem in Catholic education in the just released University of Notre Dame study and report.

The lay teacher problem emerged as so critical, in fact, that the only specific recommendations for action in the otherwise factual study were in this area.

The raw statistics collected in 1962 of little training, little experience and little pay for the lay teacher were so impressive—or depressive—that study officials conducted a series of small group interviews to get a better understanding of the problem.

These interviews were conducted in 218 elementary schools and 104 secondary schools in 13 selected dioceses, including the Diocese of Fort Wayne-South Bend. Lay and religious teachers were interviewed separately.

FIND MORALE LOW

The interviews showed lay teachers' morale to be as low as their experience training and salary. Moreover, the religious teachers were largely unaware of this low morale.

"In general, the lay teachers felt that they were accepted kindly and with gratitude by the religious teachers, but they also felt that they were not accepted as professional coequals by these same teachers," the report stated.

"Many of the lay teachers pointed out that the faculty meetings they attended were administrative routine; at other faculty meetings which they did not attend development and school policy were discussed, and they were informed of the outcomes."

The report went on to say only "a small segment" of secondary teachers felt they were fully accepted by the religious teachers. "Parents were grudging in their acceptance of lay teachers," lay teachers believed.

SEE STATUS AFFECTED

"A number of lay teachers in the elementary schools felt that their status was affected negatively when completely unqualified lay teachers were employed merely to fill vacancies. In their view, lay teachers were hired only because of the unavailability of sufficient religious teachers to staff the schools."

Lay teachers saw little effort to provide special in-service training for them or to use their specific talents as lay teachers in Catholic schools. Many felt, for example, they could "provide examples of Christian life in a way different from and beyond that of the religious."

With a few exceptions in the high schools, lay teachers did not consider Catholic school teaching as a career. Reasons cited were "low salaries, lack of job security, absence of fringe benefits including retirement programs and small opportunity for promotion."

BELIEVE TEACHERS ACCEPTED

The responses of the religious teachers to the lay teacher problem were strikingly different. "They were firm in their belief that lay teachers were fully accepted in the schools," the report stated.

"They pointed out that the lay teacher was at some disadvantage in participating fully in the school operation because religious community life provided an opportunity of continuing school interests long after the school day had ended and when the lay teacher was not available.

"Many of the religious in the elementary schools felt that low salaries affected the supply of lay teachers, making it necessary to employ inadequately prepared people; this in turn affected the acceptance of lay teachers by parents.

"There was almost general agreement that no special orientation or in-service programs were provided for lay teachers, and the religious did not feel that such programs were necessary. The religious further stated that adjustment to the purposes of the Catholic schools developed in the day-to-day contacts within the school."

MENTION GUIDANCE FUNCTIONS

Some religious teachers did recognize the possibility of special functions for lay teachers and mentioned certain guidance functions and the example of good Christian living, the report said.

In measuring lay teacher training, the study found 23.2 percent of the elementary staff to have one year of college or less and only 31.8 percent, a bachelors degree or better.

The lay teacher training situation was better at the secondary level, most of these teachers having a bachelors degree or better. However, only 19.5 percent of the lay men and 15.1 percent of the lay women had a masters degree or better.

At the elementary level, the study showed no appreciable difference in lay teacher training by various age groups. A striking difference from the sisters, whose median level of training increased the older the age group.

EXPERIENCE IS LESS

In experience, the statisics showed the median for lay women to be 3 to 4 years total at both the elementary and secondary levels, a striking difference from the much more experience median of the religious teachers.

Median annual salary levels for lay teachers were established by the study for 1962. They were $3,145, elementary woman; $3,555, elementary man; $4,010, secondary woman, and $4,803, secondary man.

The report said that despite the claims of many principals, little statistical evidence was found of correlation of salary with training and experience, though, it was recognized, this might have been the result of little spread between minimum and maximum salaries.

The lay teacher problem is critical for Catholic schools because more and more lay teachers are being used. Between 1950 and 1961, the report said, lay teachers increased by 589 per cent at the elementary level and by 169 per cent at the secondary level.

VARY BY SCHOOLS

In 1962, the national ratios of lay to religious teachers were 1 to 2.24 at the elementary level and 1 to 2.64 at the secondary level. These ratios varied widely from school to school. At the elementary level, for example, 7.8 per cent of the schools had more lay teachers than religious and 19.8 per cent had all religious staffs.

The study also found only a very small number of lay staff members who could be classified as administrators, a reflection of the almost complete lack of opportunity for promotion for lay teachers in Catholic schools.

The report made five recommendations on the lay teacher problem.

1. "As the number of lay teachers continues to grow, greater effort must be made to provide more adequate salaries to attract and retain better trained teachers."

FIND LACK OF ORIENTATION

2. "There is a general lack of organized orientation and in-service programs for lay teachers to assist them in reaching a level equal to that of the religious.

"The training of religious teachers prepares them to work toward the specific goals of the Catholic schools that are the only reason for their existence. To work effectively toward these goals the lay teacher must first be made aware of them and then be assisted in developing the methods by which they can be achieved."

3. "Almost always the number of lay teachers in a given school is the result of a problem of numbers (lack of available religious teachers) . . . To improve the position of lay teachers in Catholic schools and to capitalize best on their potential, an evaluation should be made of those contributions that are peculiar to them and those they can accomplish more effectively than could the religious."

4. "The negligible participation by lay teachers in the administration of Catholic schools strongly affects the status of the lay teacher. Careful consideration should be given to determining whether a lay principal is anomalous to the concept of a Catholic school staffed by lay and religious teachers."

5. "In the elementary schools particularly, parents do not understand or accept fully the concept of the lay teacher. If the lay teacher is accepted by Catholic school leadership as something more than a necessity, a program informing parents of the true place of these teachers should be developed."

[From the South Bend Tribune,
Sept. 6, 1966]

Study Effectiveness of Church School

(By Roger Birdsell)

Catholic school students questioned on their understanding of their faith "as a whole did well" in the estimation of University of Notre Dame study officials who looked into the matter.

The Notre Dame study, in addition to gathering a mass of statistics about the composition and organization of American Catholic elementary and secondary schools, also sought to measure their effectiveness in religious education.

"If there is any one chief reason for the existence of a separate Catholic school system," the recently issued study report commented, "It is religious education in its broadest dimensions."

USE THREE MEASURES

Consequently, those who conducted the study developed three instruments, each called an Inventory of Catholic School Outcomes (ICSO), designed to measure the effectiveness of this religious training in three ways.

One instrument, ICSO–1, measured religious understanding; another, ICSO–2, religious attitudes in day-to-day living, and the third, ICSO–3, opinions concerning religion and education in Catholic schools.

Each of these instruments or inventories was administered during the 1963–64 school year to 14,519 students in the eighth grade of 218 elementary schools and the 12th grade of 104 secondary schools in 13 representative dioceses. The Diocese of Fort Wayne-South Bend was one of the 13.

LIMITATIONS NOTED

As the study report cautioned, there are inherent limitations which must be borne in mind in evaluating the responses obtained.

First, the inventories made no effort to separate and identify the contributions of the school as such from those of the church, the family and other factors.

Second, the inventories were administered only to children in Catholic schools. They were not given to Catholic children attending public schools or to non-Catholic children.

Indeed, in releasing the report, study officials recognized that further study of this whole area of religious outcomes requires a comparison of Catholic school students with those in other types of schools.

SEEK TO MEASURE DEPTH

ICSO–1 was designed to measure not just religious understanding as such but the depth or sophistication of that understanding, specifically in terms of the teachings of the church which have been emphasized since World War II.

The post-war emphasis is termed catechesis or kerygmatic and seeks to combine older emphases on the intellectual and the practical understanding of the faith with a new emphasis on certain emotional understandings.

"It emphasizes," the report explained, "that the Christian religion is not something simply to be known or even merely to be practiced; it is rather a total spirit, or better, an inspiration or a life process."

This new understanding is distinguished historically from the approach epitomized in American Catholicism by the "Baltimore Catechism" dating from the 19th century with its concentration on rote answers to specific questions.

ICSO–1 was composed of 50 questions touching religious understandings in three broad areas—Catholic doctrine, Catholic law and Catholic worship. Each question was answered by choosing one of five answers.

None of the answers was "wrong," but one was squarely in the new tradition of the church and was labelled for study purposes an "advanced" response.

The other four responses to each question were either "moderate," or part way toward the new tradition; "conventional," or squarely in the tradition of the Baltimore Catechism; "moralistic," or emotional in connotation, and "nominalistic," or rationalistic in connotation. The last two answers, while not "wrong," were "not acceptable" by the standards of the study.

EXAMPLE GIVEN

Illustrative of the way ICSO–1 worked is a question in the area of Catholic doctrine—Item 23 in the test.

"The chief value of the life, sufferings, and death of Our Lord is that He thereby:

"a. earned for us God's grace and everlasting life (advanced response)

"b. showed His unlimited love for us (moderate response)

"c. taught us how to live, suffer, and die (moralistic response)

"d. set us free from sin and sin's penalty (conventional response)

"e. proved to doubters that he was a real man (nominalistic response)."

The actual responses by the students in the study to this particular question broke down to advanced, 36.74 per cent; moderate, 40.57 per cent; conventional, 8.26 per cent; moralistic, 13.4 per cent; nominalistic, 1.44 per cent, and no response, 2.59 per cent.

By further analysis of this particular question, differing patterns between elementary and secondary students, between boys and girls and between types of high school organization were determined.

Taking all responses to all 50 questions in ICSO–1, the report concluded the students "as a whole did well," because 56 per cent selected advanced and moderate responses combined; 32 per cent, conventional responses, and 12 per cent, moralistic and nominalistic responses combined.

"There was no distinguishable pattern among the responses of the group as a whole, based on the type of item—those relating to Catholic belief, those to Catholic moral teaching and those to Catholic worship.

"The difference between the performances of the eighth and 12th grade students was, in general, statistically significant but not as great as might be expected."

GIRLS DO BEST

The average margin between the younger and older students was reported at 5 to 10 per cent, and in response to some questions the younger students indicated more advanced understandings than the older students.

"As a group, the girls in all girl schools showed the best understanding of their religion" because they picked the advanced response more often and with more consistency throughout the test.

If the responses can be taken as a reasonably accurate reflection of what is being taught in the Catholic schools, and the report accepts that assumption, the study demonstrates an emphasis on the new catechesis direction in religious instruction.

However, the report also called attention to the sizable group of students still selecting the conventional responses, 32 per cent of the total responses to all 50 questions. There remains, it remarked, "a significant amount of teaching at the conventional level."

Finally, the report concluded, ICSO–1 has been demonstrated to be an effective tool with continuing improvement and refinement for further testing of religious understandings by Catholic educators.

[From the South Bend Tribune, Sept. 7, 1966]

MORE GIRLS CONFORM TO CATHOLIC IDEALS

(By Roger Birdsell)

Girls have a greater conformity to Catholic ideals than boys and elementary students have a greater conformity than high school students.

These not unexpected conclusions were reached by directors of the University of Notre Dame study of Catholic elementary and secondary schools when they evaluated a questionnaire completed by 14,519 selected students during the 1963–64 school year.

This particular Inventory of Catholic School Outcomes (ICOS–2) sought to measure how students might apply their religious training to day-to-day problems. Students were queried in 13 representative dioceses, including the Diocese of Fort Wayne-South Bend.

Students who took the Catholic position in meeting such problems, the just issued study report said, were "likely to have had all or most of their education in Catholic schools and plan to continue their education in Catholic institutions."

CHOSE SIMILAR ASSOCIATES

"They perceive themselves," it continued, "as successful in school, rating themselves as A or B students, and their afterschool and weekend associates are selected chiefly from among other Catholic school students.

"They are not satisfied with attending Mass regularly on Sundays and holy days, but attend several times weekly in addition to Sundays.

"As for their families, most of these students have two Catholic parents, one or both of whom have had considerable education, either in Catholic or in secular schools and colleges."

In assessing Catholic school student attitudes, ICOS–2 asked a series of questions to which the students could strongly agree, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, strongly disagree, or react with uncertainty.

PLACE FAMILIES IN CLASSES

In a further elaboration for analysis of variant factors in the responses, each student placed his family in one of three social classes based on paternal occupation; classified his family religious background by six classes, and assessed his own academic rating in school by letter grade.

The report said support of Catholic attitudes by social class varied with the nature of the question. Generally, students taking the Catholic stand came from families which took considerable interest in religion and expressed this interest through prayer and discussion of religious topics in the home.

Many of these trends can be seen in responses to questions which dealt with Catholic positions in regard to family values.

The students were asked to react to the statement, "Even when there are serious difficulties in the family, I still believe that divorce with remarriage is always wrong."

BOYS AGREE LESS

The statement expresses the Catholic position on the subject and 70.6 per cent of the students agreed strongly with it and another 10.1 per cent agreed somewhat.

High school boys were inclined to agree somewhat less than the others. The greater the self-ranking of academic achievement, the greater the agreement with the Catholic position.

Social class differences did not affect the answer, but there were significant variations depending on religious background. Thus, the child with a non-Catholic parent was more likely to disagree, as was the child with associations with non-Catholic as opposed to Catholic friends.

Another measure of the value of the family tie was a question whether personal ties were more important than money and possessions in family life.

Agreeing with the importance of personal ties, the Catholic position, were 54.9 per cent of the students, strongly, and another 24.9 per cent, somewhat.

GIRLS TAKE CATHOLIC SIDE

More girls lined up on the Catholic side than boys, and the older students were more supportive than the younger students, an interesting reversal of the pattern of responses by age groups to most of the questions.

Students were asked whether they would insist on marrying a Catholic, and 23 per cent said their mate must be a Catholic. Other responses were "most likely," 24.9 per cent; "preferably," 36 per cent; "no difference," 4.4 per cent, and no marital intentions, 11.7 per cent.

Girls were more committed to a Catholic marriage than boys, girls in all girl high schools particularly. Students in co-educational high schools were more committed than those in all boy high schools.

The lower the social class, the more commitment there was to a Catholic marriage. On the other hand, religious background and academic achievement were also positive factors.

The study report noted that, overall, students in Catholic schools were more opposed to divorce and remarriage than they were to the idea of marriage outside the church.

Asked about the qualities they valued in a prospective spouse, the Catholic students valued morality more than spirituality. On the other hand, two-thirds agreed in some degree that material things can harm spiritual life.

The study discovered that one of three students in Catholic high schools "go steady." Boys were more inclined to go steady than girls. They were also more permissive toward "petting."

SIGNIFICANCE NOTED

The lower the social class, the greater the tendency to go steady. The more Catholic the religious background, the greater the academic achievement and the more the parents' education, the less tendency to go steady.

The authors of the study considered the variations of steady dating patterns with academic achievement to be significant and an excellent area for further study by Catholic educators who may be concerned over the situation.

In response to a sort of catch-all question, only one-third of the students claimed complete understanding of Catholic teaching on personal morality. High school students admitted more uncertainty than elementary students, 62 per cent as compared with 50 per cent when grade and sex were constant.

[From the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune, Sept. 8, 1966]

ABSENTEEISM LOW AMONG CATHOLICS

(By Roger Birdsell)

Only 4.1 percent of Catholic school students are irregular in attendance at mass and 52.4 per cent more than meet their religious obligation in this regard.

How much of this religious behavior is the result of education in a Catholic school and how much is the result of Catholic training in the home is a question not resolved by the recently issued University of Notre Dame study which reported the behavior.

The Notre Dame study of student religious attitudes conducted in 1963–64 as part of its study of Catholic elementary and secondary schools did stress the importance of the family background.

"Parents can hardly be uninterested in the obviously strong relationship between active encouragement of religion in the home and the attitudes of children as revealed by the study," the report commented.

TYPES OF ENCOURAGEMENT

"The types of encouragement specified in the questionnaire were family prayer, commemoration of religious feasts and discussion of religion.

"The families where these are a part of daily life or where they occur very frequently are represented in the study by children whose attitudes and values set them apart from those in whose home religion is relatively weak.

"Parents who may have expected the Catholic school to assume full responsibility for the total religious formation of their children will perceive how essential is the collaboration of home and school."

Another study recently issued, "The Education of American Catholics," the work of Rev. Andrew M. Greeley and Peter H. Rossi of the National Opinion Research Center in Chicago, goes more directly to the question of Catholic school influence on religious behavior.

BACKGROUND TOP FACTOR

That study attempted to measure the religious behavior and attitudes of Catholic adults, not students, but concluded that while a Catholic education is significant, the strongest factor is a religious family background.

"Apparently the religiousness of the family of origin predisposes a child to influence by the religious education he receives in school," the Chicago study concluded.

"Only those having at least one parent who went to communion every Sunday seem to show notable signs of improving their religious behavior as a result of Catholic education."

In commenting about his study, Father Greeley has said it does not provide sufficient evidence either to abandon the Catholic schools or to end the alternative for many Catholic children who attend public schools—religious training through the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine (CCD) program.

NO ATTEMPT AT COMPARISON

The Notre Dame study made no attempt to compare Catholic school and CCD students in any of its investigations, though study officials agreed such comparisons are logical in future studies.

The Notre Dame report, in discussing religious attitudes, does mention a pilot study in which "more Catholic students in CCD classes expressed uncertainty about their feelings over a friend's vocation to the priesthood than did students enrolled in Catholic schools."

"A worthwhile goal might be the development of a broader and more informed view of vocations for all Catholic students, those attending CCD classes as well as those enrolled in Catholic schools," the report commented.

The questionnaire used to measure religious attitudes (ICSO-2) was answered by 14,519 eighth and 12th grade students in schools in 13 representative dioceses, including the Diocese of Fort Wayne-South Bend.

DRAW STRONG REACTION

Outside of measuring religious-moral values in terms of mass attendance, the questionnaire explored student attitudes in terms of helping others and in terms of religious vocations.

Students reacted to the statement, "To reach heaven, it is enough to live our own lives without looking for ways of helping others."

This runs counter to Catholic teaching, and 55 per cent of the students took the firm Catholic position by strongly disagreeing with the statement while another 28 per cent disagreed somewhat.

In this as in many other attitudes, the girls were "more Catholic" than the boys. For example, strong disagreement was expressed by 67.1 per cent of the girls in all-girl high schools; 61.2 per cent of co-educational school girls; 45 per cent of boys in all-boys schools, and 41.6 per cent of co-educational school boys.

DIFFERENT APPROACHES

In assessing this difference between boy and girl responses, the study report said, "This may suggest that different approaches be religious and moral questions may be indicated for boys and for girls, especially at the high school level.

"Those responsible for Catholic secondary education may wish to conduct further comparative inquiries into the non-academic outcomes of co-educational, co-institutional and single-sex school organizations."

The generally stronger Catholic stand taken by elementary students than high school students may result from "greater idealism on the one hand or greater sophistication on the other, but it does suggest areas of inquiry," the report stated.

SIGNIFICANT CHANGE SEEN

In recognizing the religious value of helping others, the study showed a trend toward more support of this stand by students in the higher social classes and those who rank themselves higher academically.

If more than 82 per cent of the students supported the need to help others, 13.1 per cent did not support this ideal and 4.2 per cent were uncertain about it.

When it comes to helping others on the international level, there was a significant change in the student responses. Asked about using tax money to help other nations, only 8 per cent were strong in their support.

This level of strong support for helping others internationally, when expressed in terms of "charity" to help "oppressed people," rose to 55 per cent, however.

MOST REACT POSITIVELY

The questionnaire asked students how they felt about the decision of a close friend to enter a religious order. Nearly 85 per cent reacted positively, while 5.5 per cent were negative in their response and 10 per cent, uncertain.

Whereas the lower social classes were less responsive than the higher in supporting the necessity to help others, they were more supportive than the higher classes in this question of a friend's vocation.

Again, girls gave more support than boys, and the elementary students gave more support than the secondary students.

"Although only 5.5 per cent of the respondents indicated opposition to a friend's vocation, roughly twice that many expressed uncertainty about their own feelings over such an eventuality," the report noted.

"The subject of a religious career considered as a value in itself, not simply in reference to the student's own life plans, may not have received adequate attention, leaving some of them without sufficient information or conviction to form a judgment."

[From the South Bend Tribune, Sept. 9, 1966]

N. D. REPORT SHOWS SOME RACIAL BIAS

(By Roger Birdsell)

One out of four students in Catholic schools said they would, or might be, bothered if required to sit next to a person of another race in school.

One out of three either agreed or failed to disagree with a stereotype of the Negro as mentally and physically fitted only for manual labor and unskilled jobs.

Only one out of two could bring themselves to disagree with a characterization of Jews as "strange and different" and hard to know and understand.

MOST DISTURBING

Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., president of the University of Notre Dame, called this evidence of racial prejudice in Catholic schools one of the most disturbing results of the Notre Dame study of these schools.

Father Hesburgh, a member of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, said new efforts in Catholic education to eradicate racial prejudice obviously are needed.

The existence of racial prejudice as an important minority attitude was revealed in responses to a questionnaire, (ICSO-2), completed by 14,519 eighth and 12th grade students in 13 representative dioceses, including the Diocese of Fort Wayne-South Bend, during 1963-64.

RESPONSES ANALYSED

The study report analysed responses to three questions in detail as indicative of attitudes toward minorities in Catholic schools which, by accepted observation, are overwhelmingly white in their racial composition.

Statements were presented and the student asked to agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree strongly, disagree somewhat or register uncertainty. Agreement in the two categories combined was taken to reflect bias and combined disagreement, unbias.

The questions and responses were:

"Manual labor and unskilled jobs seem to fit the Negro's mental and physical ability better than more skilled or responsible work." Agree, 7.6 per cent; agree somewhat, 14.9 per cent; uncertain, 10.7 per cent; disagree somewhat, 20.9 per cent, and disagree, 45.9 per cent.

SIT NEXT TO NEGRO

"It would bother me to sit next to or near a person of another race in school." Agree, 7.3 per cent; agree somewhat, 8.7 per cent; uncertain, 8 per cent; disagree somewhat, 15 per cent, and disagree, 61 per cent.

"There is something strange and different about Jews; it is hard to know what they are thinking or planning, or what makes them tick." Agree, 6.9 per cent; agree somewhat, 13 per cent; uncertain, 32.7 per cent; disagree somewhat, 15.8 per cent, and disagree 31.6 per cent.

As in other attitudes, the girls were more inclined to take the Catholic attitude than boys. For example, in general, girls were 12 per cent less biased than boys in sitting next to a Negro and 10 per cent better in rejecting the Jewish stereotype.

BOYS MOST BIASED

High school boys were the most biased in their racial attitudes, with boys in co-educational high schools leading the pack, more than half of them disliking sitting next to a Negro.

"A substantial proportion of the high school boys, who will enter colleges, occupy administrative positions, serve the professions or join the labor force in the next decade, will carry with them anti-Negro prejudice or at least convictions of Negro inferiority," the study report concluded.

The study found some lessening of the amount of racial prejudice with the amount of years of Catholic schooling, but it was so slight and uneven that the report said figures "cast some doubt on the influence of Catholic schooling in reducing the amount of prejudice."

STRONGER TENDENCY

There was a somewhat stronger tendency for the acceptance of the Catholic position on Jews with increased years of Catholic schooling.

In breaking down responses by the three social classes into which the students divided themselves on the basis of parental occupation, the study found a definite increase in racial bias the lower the social class.

The report found evidence this lower social class bias is rooted in the potential threat of job competition. The stereotype of Negro "inferiority" was agreed with more than distaste for sitting next to a Negro.

EFFECT UNEVEN

The effect on bias of the student's religious background is uneven, the report stated. About the only conclusion offered was that having a non-Catholic mother may lessen prejudice on the question of sitting next to a Negro.

Academically talented students displayed less bias. Also, the amount of education of the parents was a factor in lessening bias. This was total education of the parent not just Catholic education.

The study found "that Catholic education of parents is not as important a variable in the family's influence on attitudes toward race as the degree of interest in and encouragement of the practice of religion within the family."

NO DISCERNIBLE EFFECT

This family religious practice does appear to be a factor in lessening prejudice against the Negro but has no discernible effect on attitudes towards Jews, the report said.

In looking at the Jewish question, the report concluded, "Apparently Catholic school children do not so much have an unfavorable image of Jews as that they have no image at all. This may be accounted for to some extent by infrequency of social contacts between Catholics and Jews."

The study found the frequency of attendance at mass by the student to be a reliable barometer of racial prejudice. The more frequent the attendance the less racial bias.

TEST OF DEVOTION

As a test of religious devotion in the face of prejudice, the students were asked if it made a difference whether they took communion from Negro priest and 81 per cent of the total said it made absolutely no difference.

There were significant variations in the responses to the questions of racial prejudice from diocese to diocese among the 13 involved in the study.

While the individual dioceses are not identified by name in the report, the report said "it is clear that the degree of bias expressed is related to the proportion of the minority group in the diocese."

REPORT SUMMARIES

"The Christian teaching of the value of every human person in the sight of God appears to be inoperative for this minority of students in Catholic schools," the report stated in summary.

"Perhaps a deep diagnostic look is called for by Catholic schools and their leadership, at how or whether these principles are being presented. Indeed such an analysis would be beneficial to all schools in the United States, private or public."

[From the South Bend Tribune, Sept. 12, 1966]

CATHOLIC STUDENTS PUT MORAL-RELIGIOUS GOAL FIRST IN IMPORTANCE

(By Roger Birdsell)

Students in Catholic elementary and secondary schools, asked their opinions about the goals of their schools, gave the moral-religious goal a clear first place in importance and second in success.

The intellectual-academic goal was in a virtual tie for second place in importance with the occupational-vocational goal but placed last in the success column of all five defined goals.

Those who conducted the University of Notre Dame study which sampled these student opinions called the success rating of the intellectual-academic goal "most surprising" in their recently released report.

RANK FIVE GOALS

The opinions were taken from 14,519 students in the eighth and 12th grades in schools in 13 representative dioceses, including the Diocese of Fort Wayne-South Bend.

In ranking the five goals of Catholic schools, first place was given to the moral-religious goal by 60.5 per cent; occupational-vocational, 14.3 per cent; intellectual-academic, 12.5 per cent; friendship-social, 6.4 per cent, and civic-patriotic, 6 per cent.

The report said the overwhelming rank given the religious goal complicated differentiation of the other goals. When all rankings were assayed, the report gave a narrow second place to the academic over the occupational.

Boys tended to give more weight to the occupational goal and girls to the moral goal. High school girls tended to give more weight to the academic goal than any other subgroup.

NO TREND TO ASSIGN

There was no trend to assign more importance to the academic goal with more years of Catholic schooling. On the other hand, students of parents with a non-Catholic schooling tended to give more weight to the academic goal.

Some other trends noted were the greater emphasis on occupational, social and patriotic goals by the lesser talented academically and greater weight given the moral goal by the academically talented and those with strong Catholic backgrounds.

In ranking the success of the Catholic schools, superior ratings were given the occupational goal by 42 per cent of the students; moral, 36 per cent; social, 30 per cent; patriotic, 27 per cent, and academic, 26 per cent.

While only 26 per cent of the students gave a superior rating to success in meeting the academic goal, a larger group gave it a very good rating for a combined 66 per cent assigning the schools a better than average achievement in this area.

BOYS TAKE DIMMER VIEW

As might be expected, the greater the academic achievement of the student, the greater success he accorded the schools in this area. The same relationship applied to the success rating of the moral goal.

Boys took a dimmer view of the success in the occupational goal than girls and high school boys, the dimmest. Students who ranked the occupational goal the highest tended to be the most critical of performance.

In assessing achievement in the realm of morals, the high school seniors gave lower marks to the Catholic schools than the elementary students.

The report noted that "in general the students were very satisfied" with success in meeting social goals. It commented this affords little support to the common belief that "strict regimes for social activities produce dissatisfaction among Catholic school students and parents."

Whatever their evaluation of Catholic school goals and success in meeting them, students in these schools are clearly convinced of the desirability of a Catholic school education.

Asked if they would still choose to attend a Catholic school if given a choice, 48.69 per cent of the students said definitely yes; 29.22 per cent, probably yes; 9.68 per cent, uncertain; 7.65 per cent, probably no, and 4.76 per cent, definitely no.

The yes answers increased with academic success and high school girls were the most positive in choosing Catholic schools. There were some significant variations among the 13 dioceses surveyed.

This acceptance of Catholic education by the great majority of the students has been cited by Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., president of Notre Dame, as perhaps the greatest single argument produced by the study for the continuation of Catholic schools.

RATE TEACHER EFFICIENCY

The students were asked to rate the performance of their teachers. Religious teachers were given an exceptional ranking by 42.7 per cent and lay teachers, the same ranking by 35.4 per cent. Combining the two top performance rankings, religious teachers scored with 76.4 per cent and lay teachers, with 70.1 per cent.

The performance scores for both religious and lay teachers dropped from the overall picture in the responses of boys and with the secondary schools as compared to the elementary schools. Girls in all girl high schools gave high marks.

The students were asked to evaluate the interest of their parents in their Catholic schools, and 34.09 per cent rated this interest as extremely strong. Other responses were strong, 27.75 per cent; average, 29.13 per cent; below average, 5.11 per cent, and weak, 3.92 per cent.

Student perceived parental interest in the schools grew with the higher social class and the Catholic education of the parents. There was a distinct drop in assigned parental interest, 14.53 per cent in the extremely strong category, between the elementary school and the high school.

Students were also asked to rank five sources of influence on their religious development. First ranks were assigned by 48.3 per cent to parental example; 22.3 per cent, school instruction; 12.6 per cent teachers' example; 11.8 per cent, parish and church instruction; and 5 per cent, classmates' example.

[From the South Bend Tribune, Sept. 13, 1966]

RELIGIOUS TRAINING FIRST WITH PARENTS

(By Roger Birdsell)

Parents of students in Catholic schools tend to rate the inculcation of religious and personal virtues in their children as more important than academic training.

Moreover, they tend to give the Catholic schools higher success marks in training in the religious and personal virtues than they do academic training.

The recently reported University of Notre Dame study of Catholic elementary and secondary schools in this country sent a questionnaire to 24,502 parents of students in 218 representative elementary schools and 104 representative high schools.

The solicited responses to 31 statements designed to measure what parents expect of Catholic schools and how they measure their success. The study report noted that more than half of these parents had more than half their education in non-Catholic schools.

READING, WRITING RATE HIGH

In an analysis of those goals named by the parents most often, only one academic goal, reading and writing well, appeared in the first 10. It was placed seventh in the importance column and fourth in the success column.

On the other hand, the goal of preparing the student for college, while not categorized as an academic goal in the analysis, ranked high in importance with 85 per cent of the parents, and 61 per cent gave the schools high marks for success in this effort.

Science and mathematics and social studies ranked close behind the language arts in parental importance in the strictly academic goals, each getting 86 per cent high marks. The high success marks were 48 and 53 per cent, respectively, however.

The fine arts, on the other hand, ranked comparatively low. Only 46.1 per cent of the parents gave this field high importance and 29.8 per cent, equal success marks.

YOUNG PARENTS CRITICAL

The study report noted a trend of parents in the younger age groups and the professional-executive occupational classification to be more critical of the success of the Catholic schools in meeting academic goals.

The parents thought the helping of the particularly gifted and the slow learners to be relatively important goals, but less than a third saw high success in this effort. The same pattern followed a question on provision for physical fitness.

Relatively few parents expressed great concern that the schools provide all religious teachers, but the provision of qualified teachers, lay and religious, was given high marks.

However, while 63 per cent of the parents were willing to give the schools high marks in providing qualified religious teachers, only 45 per cent were willing to do so for lay teachers. Younger parents and the professional-executive group were the most critical.

FOR SMALLER CLASSES

Large classes are a frequent complaint against Catholic schools, and 77 per cent ranked elimination of these class sizes as an important goal. Realistically, only 23 per cent saw much success in this area.

The study showed that less than half the baptized Catholic children are in Catholic schools, but 82 per cent of the parents thought space for all should be an important goal. Again, realistically, only 29.4 per cent saw much success in this.

Tax aid for Catholic schools has become a public issue, but only 66 per cent of the parents thought federal support for their schools to be a goal of high importance.

With parents giving strong support to the importance of teaching religious virtues as a general goal, teaching the child to know about God, Christ and the church has received top billing.

CHURCH TRAINING IS GOAL

Training the child to practice his religion was considered a goal of almost equal importance, but here the parents were less inclined to accord success than they were the other goal.

Mothers of the students assigned considerable importance to the schools as a means of giving their children Catholic friends. The fostering of religious vocations was rated of high importance by only 57.9 per cent of the parents, and many were not certain of the success in this effort.

Personal virtues which received considerable support as goals by parents were honesty, truthfulness and morality; training the child to think, and selfdiscipline and hard work. They were not as generous in according success, however.

The social virtues most desired by parents were good citizenship and respect for parents and property. The schools were also given high success marks in these areas.

The goal of teaching children to get along with other faiths and races trailed in fourth behind producing leaders in the social virtues sought by parents. Lowest on the totem pole in importance was helping others in foreign countries.

SOUTH-WEST AFRICA

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago seven members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee sent a telegram to President Johnson urging U.S. support for a United Nations Administering Authority for South-West Africa. These members, including myself, stated their belief that South Africa in her administration of South-West Africa has violated two interests vital to the United States and other members of the United Nations: the principle of self-determination of peoples and the authority of the United Nations itself. We urged strong U.S. support for the resolution that the United Nations assume direct responsibility for the administration of South-West Africa.

I am enormously pleased by the responsible and forthright position taken by the U.S. delegation at the United Nations on this very important question. The stand taken by Ambassador Goldberg is thoroughly consistent with the imperatives of morality and our commitment to the principles of free government.

At this point in the RECORD, I insert Ambassador Goldberg's speech before the United Nations General Assembly on October 12, 1966.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS, IN PLENARY SESSION ON THE QUESTION OF SOUTH-WEST AFRICA, OCTOBER 12, 1966

We of the United States Delegation have listened with close attention to this debate on the future of South West Africa. The extraordinary importance attached to this issue was dramatically demonstrated by the General Assembly when it decided to begin the debate without delay and to hold it in plenary session. We share the general view of the importance of the issue, and we believe this may prove to have been one of the truly decisive debates of the United Nations—if, as we earnestly hope, it results in effective action.

I should like to pay tribute to you, Mr. President, and to the participants in this debate, for the seriousness with which this very difficult question has been treated. My Delegation has great respect for the views expressed, both in the statements made and in the 54-power draft resolution.

We are encouraged to find that, as regards the status of South West Africa, virtually all of the membership, with very few exceptions, is in agreement. This near unanimity finds strong support in the legal framework clearly defined by the three Advisory Opinions of the International Court of Justice, which remain an authoritative statement of the law on this matter.

It may be useful at this stage of our debate to sum up, at this point, the essential elements of this broad agreement, which we believe exists in this Assembly.

First, the people of South West Africa, like all peoples, have the right to determine their own future.

Second, South West Africa is a territory having an international status, and will remain so until its people exercise this right of self-determination.

Third, South Africa's right to administer the territory arose solely from the Mandate.

Fourth, as the mandatory power, South Africa incurred certain obligations toward the people of the Territory including the promotion of their material and moral well being and their social progress. It has not fulfilled these obligations. Indeed, it has even gone so far as to impose on the Territory the abhorrent system of racial segregation known as apartheid.

Fifth, as the mandatory power, South Africa incurred certain obligations to the international community, for which the General Assembly has supervisory responsibilities. Among these are obligations to report annually on its administration of the Territory and to transmit petitions from the inhabitants. South Africa has repeatedly refused to carry out these obligations. We are thus confronted with a continuing material breach of obligations incumbent upon the mandatory power.

Sixth, South Africa itself has disavowed the Mandate, asserting that it ceased to exist upon the dissolution of the League of Nations.

Seventh, by virtue of the breach of its obligations and its disavowal of the Mandate, South Africa forfeits all right to continue to administer the Territory of South West Africa. Indeed, it is because of South Africa's own actions that it can no longer assert its right under the Mandate, and apart from the Mandate, South Africa has no right to administer the territory.

Eighth, in these circumstances the United Nations must be prepared to discharge its responsibilities with respect to South West Africa.

On these eight points, Mr. President, we believe all but a very few Members are in essential agreement. We agree on the nature of the problem. We agree on the objective. It is highly important that our near-unanimity on these fundamentals should be made manifest.

This is all the more true when we come to decide on the best means of implementing our common aim. To be effective in this most important issue, we need more than world opinion voiced by words in a resolution. We need world cooperation manifested by concrete action.

And with this in mind, the United States is prepared to work with all delegations committed to our common goal.

In our view, the General Assembly should begin by expressing explicitly the decision with respect to the status of South West Africa, in a form acceptable to virtually all the membership. Having done this, it should create a practical instrumentality to give effect to its decision.

In considering what form this instrumentality should take, we are very much helped by the eminently sensible suggestion made by a number of representatives during this debate: namely, the establishment of a United Nations Commission for South West Africa. The United States would be glad to serve on an appropriately representative body if that is the desire of the General Assembly.

This Commission, it seems to us, should have very explicit and strong terms of reference. It should be asked to recommend means by which, in accordance with a prescribed timetable, an administration for South West Africa can be set up which will enable the people of the Territory to exercise their right of self-determination. The Commission should report as soon as practicable, and in any event not later than a specific and early date to be agreed upon—a date consistent both with the urgency of the matter and with the need for effective discharge of its important responsibility. All principal Organs of the United Nations should be asked to take appropriate action with respect to the Commission's report, and the cooperation of all Members in its work should be requested.

This, let me emphasize, Mr. President, is an action proposal. It contemplates steps which can be immediately and practically implemented, and which lie within the capacity of this Organization. It is designed to provide the community of nations promptly with a considered blueprint for united and peaceful action for the benefit of the people of South West Africa.

It is extremely important, Mr. President, that the action which the General Assembly takes on this transcendently important issue should be both intrinsically sound and widely supported. This is necessary in the first place for the sake of the people of South West Africa, who have a right to expect from us not only words, but also concrete, helpful and meaningful actions. And it is equally necessary for the sake of the United Nations itself—for the authority and prestige of this world body.

These are the views of the United States on this important subject. We do not suggest that we have spoken the last word on this matter. We are flexible in our approach. But we are also firm in our determination that the United Nations, with all the unanimity and effectiveness we can

muster, shall proceed to bring practical relief to the people of South West Africa in their time of need.

A discussion of the background of the problem in South-West Africa may be of interest to Members.

The question of the status of South-West Africa and the condition of her people has been an issue before the United Nations since its founding. In addition, the rapid achievement of African independence has generated even greater concern on the continent for the fate of the still dependent territories in southern Africa. Because these areas are dominated by white governments, they have been a constant irritant and threat to peace in Africa and the world.

Since the end of World War I, the nations of the world have subscribed to a concept of the non-self-governing territories which is now endangered by the South African example. Signatories of the Covenant of the League of Nations asserted their responsibility for the "just treatment of the natives of the territories which they controlled." The league established a system of collective responsibility for the development of the territories which had belonged to the defeated nations in World War I. Rather than being divided among the victors, the areas which were not yet ready for independence were assigned as mandates to advanced nations under league supervision.

Responsibility for the well-being and development of peoples of the mandates was given as a sacred trust of civilization by the league to the mandatories. In 1920 South-West Africa, a German colony since 1884, was entrusted to the Union of South Africa under the mandate for German South-West Africa.

After the demise of the League and the end of World War II, the international community reasserted and strengthened its belief in worldwide responsibility for the development of these territories. Chapter XII of the United Nations Charter provided for the transfer of League mandates to an international trusteeship system, South-West Africa now remains the only territory which was a mandate under the League of Nations and has not been transferred to the trusteeship system.

For the past 46 years the South African government has flaunted international opinion and norms regarding the administration of South-West Africa. The terms of the original mandate agreement obligate South Africa "to promote to the utmost the material and moral well-being of, and the social progress of the inhabitants of the territory." She has not fulfilled her responsibility.

To the contrary, she has imposed the oppressive, discriminatory system of apartheid on the territory. Although the statistical averages of conditions in the territory look progressive in relation to other countries in Africa, these figures do not reflect the actual conditions for the majority of the population.

In 1960 the population was approximately 526,000 including 74,000 whites, 24,000 colored, and 430,000 indigenous Africans. The whites are predominantly African-speaking with substantial minorities of German- and English-speaking groups. The coloreds include about 11,000 Rehoboths who are of Afrikaner and Nama descent. The Africans are primarily Bushmen, Nama, Damara, Ovambo, and Herero. The Ovambo constitute about 45 percent of the total population of the territory.

The territory is divided into two basic areas following earlier German divisions. The police zone, consisting of the central and southern two-thirds of the territory, is the white area. No nonwhites are allowed to own land there and may only live in special native reserves, segregated settlements near urban areas, or on farms, depending on their areas of employment. The northern portion of the territory is reserved for Africans. All nonresidents are barred from it. Fifty-five percent of the total population lives in the northern region on only 31 percent of the land. Forty-five percent lives in the police zone. Yet even in the police zone two-thirds of the population is nonwhite, and these nonwhites are considered transients with no more rights than migratory workers.

In response to international criticism of the South African Government's administration of the territory, the Government commissioned the Odendaal report to evaluate the development of South-West Africa and plan for its future. The 5-year plan would establish African homelands, supposedly increasingly self-ruled and an extension of the South African bantustan policy, and would add 11 million hectares of land to the African area. But 8½ million hectares of the additional land would come from "unsurveyed government land" including portions of game reserves, while the remainder would come from surveyed government land and white-owned or white-leased lands. Even at the completion of the plan, however, the nonwhites would still have only about 40 percent of the total land mass. All important economic resources of the territory—the diamond mines at Oranjemund, the metal mines at Tsumeb and Grootfontein, the fisheries at Walvis Bay and Luderitz, and the commercial and industrial complexes at Windhoek and Walvis Bay—would remain in the white zone. Land distribution takes the most productive and developed parts of the country for the white man and leaves the Africans unexplored lands and portions of game reserves.

The inequities produced by land distribution in South-West Africa are compounded by the discriminatory employment system. As in South Africa, whites have priority for the highly skilled jobs in the territory. Nonwhites are excluded from these positions by law, by lack of opportunity for training, and by lack of capital for investment. The system is perpetuated by differential wages for whites and nonwhites. A European male teacher in African schools earns between £435 and £1,000 per annum. A male African teacher can earn a maximum of only £230 per annum. In 1962 white miners earned £1,200 per year, but African miners earned only £100 per year.

Discrimination extends beyond wages. African trade unions are not recognized. Strikes by Africans are a criminal offense. Thus, outlets for peaceful expression of dissatisfaction with employment are barred to Africans. Further, because of the labor needs in the white zone, Africans from the northern region are offered contracts to work in the police zone for from 6 to 18 months. After returning to the homelands for 6 months the worker may sign a new contract. The men must have passes authorized by the Government to go into the white areas. Their families are not allowed to accompany them to the white areas, thereby disrupting African family life and social structures.

The notorious pass laws of South Africa which prevent nonwhites from moving from place to place without Government approval have also been applied to South-West Africa. Africans are restricted from being in public places during certain evening hours. The nonwhites are denied effective political representation and are only given token consideration through native advisory boards. Those nonwhites who do become politically active are soon placed under detention or arrested.

Social conditions are no better than economic or political ones. Although the South African Government boasts that the territory has 94 medical practitioners, 87 of these are in the police zone. Only 7 practitioners are in the northern zone, and 4 serve all of Ovamboland—203,000 people. Since all medical practitioners are white, it is even doubtful that nonwhites in the police zone have adequate access to them. The average expectation of life for the African population has been estimated at about half that of the whites.

Separate schools have been established for Europeans, Africans, and coloreds. Standards, quality, and variety of courses differ for each group. Education is compulsory for European children until the age of 16 and the completion of standard VIII—the 10th year of school. Despite requests by some Africans and coloreds for a compulsory educational system for their children, none exists. Ninety and seven-tenths percent of the Africans in school are in the four lower primary levels. Only 0.3 percent of the Africans in South-West Africa attended secondary schools in 1962 while the percentage in the other African territories ranged from 1 percent in Somalia to 10 percent in Algeria. The per capita expenditure on African pupils has decreased from R17.08 in 1953–54 to R13.37 in 1963–64. In 1963–64, 75 percent of the total estimated expenditure on education went to support white education, although only 14 percent of the population is white. Higher education is unavailable in South-West Africa except for one European agricultural college and several teacher-training institutions. Non-Europeans have encountered difficulties obtaining passports to study outside the territory, and some have been refused passports.

Future prospects for education in the territory are dark. While governing bodies of the African communities are to be allowed some voice in the control of their educational system, previous experience in south Africa shows that often government influence in selection of African board members destroys any value in their participation. Although plans are being made to increase the number of students served by the African school system, the entire African system will be transferred to the control of the South African Department of Bantu Education, further increasing apartheid. The Department will require the Africans, whose incomes are already inadequate, to assume even greater financial responsibility for their schools.

Despite the presently worsening conditions for the nonwhites in South-West Africa, the territory could become economically viable. At present, the export surplus of the territory is about 40 percent of the gross domestic product. The surplus could be used to develop the territory, but currently it is being drained off into foreign coffers. Mineral resources, which provide some of the export surplus, may be exhausted in 25 years. If South-West Africa is to become economically viable as an independent state, action must be taken now to save the territory from destruction by the apartheid system.

South Africa, while violating the spirit and principles of article 2 of the mandate and article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, has refused to place the territory under United Nations trusteeship. In the hope of clarifying the international status of the territory, the United Nations in 1950 asked the International Court of Justice for an advisory opinion. The Court stated that South Africa was still bound by the mandate and that the United Nations had inherited the supervisory functions over the administration of the territory. The Court later advised that South Africa could not alter the status of the territory without the consent of the United Nations. South Africa has ignored the Court opinions and maintains the mandate has lapsed although she still insists South-West Africa is administered in the spirit of the mandate. She has not submitted annual reports to the United Nations on conditions in the territory and has not transmitted petitions from the inhabitants of the territory to the United Nations. South Africa has treated the mandate as an annexed territory, even giving voting representation to white South-West Africa in the South African Parliament.

In 1960 Ethopia and Liberia submitted the case of South-West Africa to the International Court of Justice for a legally binding decision as to first whether the mandate is in effect, second, whether South Africa must accept United Nations supervision of its administration of the mandate and, third, whether the South African imposition of apartheid in the territory is violating South Africa's obligations to promote the well-being of the inhabitants of the territory. This year the Court avoided ruling on the substantive issues by deciding the case against Ethopia and Liberia on a very technical procedural issue. The failure of the Court to act in 1966 did not discount its earlier advisory opinions. In his address to the opening session of the United Nations on September 22, Ambassador Arthur Goldberg asserted:

> South Africa's conduct remains subject to obligations reaffirmed by earlier advisory opinions of the Court whose authority is undiminished. Under these opinions, South Africa cannot alter the international status of the territory without the consent of the United Nations; and South Africa remains bound to accept United Nations supervision, submit annual reports to the General Assembly and "promote to the utmost the material and moral well-being and the social progress of the inhabitants" . . . The time is overdue—long overdue—for South Africa to accept its obligations to the international community in regard to South-West Africa.

South Africa has not accepted its obligations to South-West Africa or to the international community. The international community must accept its responsibility for the development, or lack of development, of South-West Africa. The United Nations must respond to the just pleas of petitioners to remove the authority of South Africa over South-West Africa.

The leadership of South Africa has consistently rejected all efforts by the international community to negotiate the status and condition of the territory. This is a critical time. There is a new Prime Minister in South Africa and heightening crisis in Rhodesia. Meanwhile, two more southern African territories—the High Commission Territories of Bechuanaland—Botswana—and Basutoland—Lesotho—became independent this year. Failure to act now could lead to a confrontation far worse than the present conflict in Vietnam. Positive steps to assure the fulfillment of the terms of the mandate could provide the opportunity for unified international action.

MINNESOTA ALLIANCE PARTNERS

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the Partners of the Alliance, begun in 1964 under the Alliance for Progress, has been highly successful. Today more than 30 States are linked with Latin American countries, promoting development in Latin America on a community-to-community and people-to-people as well as a country-to-country basis.

I have before me an article, entitled "Alliance Program Furthers Minnesota, Uruguay Ties," from the Minneapolis Tribune of October 13, 1966. The author, David Mazie, describes the growing partnership between Minnesota and Uruguay, both agricultural areas.

The Partners of the Alliance, by bringing Americans into contact with their Latin American neighbors and demonstrating their shared interests, increases our understanding of the world beyond our borders. Mr. Mazie points out:

> The initiative for forming a partnership program can come from any source, even a private individual. Projects have been launched by labor groups, universities, junior chambers of commerce, the League of Women Voters, a school superintendent.

The benefits of the partnership are thus by no means onesided. And yet the major benefits will be longterm benefits. As Mr. Mazie concludes:

> There may be no great overnight changes, but the program will draw the Americas closer in generations to come.

Under unanimous consent, I insert Mr. Mazie's article at this point in the RECORD:

ALLIANCE PROGRAM FURTHERS MINNESOTA, URUGUAY TIES

(By David Mazie)

MONTEVIDEO, URUGUAY.—Nearly half a hemisphere separates the fertile farmlands of Uruguay from those of Minnesota.

But the distance is being bridged by a growing partnership and friendship.

Uruguay and Minnesota are linked as Partners of the Alliance, a grass-roots offshoot of the Alliance for Progress.

Although their co-operative efforts are just getting started, some of the results and hopes are already apparent.

Visitors to the Minnesota State Fair this year could see a display of Uruguayan products, arts and crafts. It's hoped that someday a few of the artists who produced those items will be in Minnesota in person.

Within a few weeks the people in a small Uruguayan community will have a "little library" of novels, technical literature and other books to read, thanks to the Minneapolis Junior Chamber of Commerce.

The Partners of the Alliance began in 1964 as a program to put the Alliance on a people-to-people, community-to-community basis. Today more than 30 states are linked with Latin American areas.

While the Alliance itself deals in million-dollar projects, the partners are concerned with only a tiny fraction of that amount.

Sixth graders in San Rafael, Calif., for instance, bought blackboards for a school in Peru with the $50 they earned washing cars. Colorado Springs, Colo., donated $25 to buy equipment for a playground in Chile.

The initiative for forming a partnership program can come from any source, even a private individual. Projects have been launched by labor groups, universities, junior chambers of commerce, the League of Women Voters, a school superintendent.

Co-ordinating the program is the Partners' national office, which operates under the Agency for International Development.

One of its officers has described the office's role as something like that of a marriage broker. "We introduce them and try to get them off to a good start, but success depends on the individuals involved."

The matchmaker who brought Minnesota and Uruguay together made a likely pairing.

Both are agricultural areas with one large center of population. (And both have a "Montevideo," though Uruguay's is pronounced with the accent on the "vid-AY-oh.")

Minnesota and Uruguay's shared interest in agriculture may prove to be the area in which the partnership is at its best.

Uruguay is beginning to develop dairy and cheese cooperatives and could use technical advice from Minnesota's many successful organizations in these fields.

The South American nation also would welcome Minnesota know-how in setting up rural canneries and storing wheat (Uruguay has no grain elevators.)

Both Uruguyans and Minnesotans stress the importance of developing a real partnership.

"We want a truly reciprocal program, one in which we share interests and knowledge and from which both Uruguay and Minnesota will benefit," says Clifford Whitehill, international attorney for General Mills and president of the Minnesota Partners group.

The major benefits, he adds, will be those that come in the long run. "There may be no great overnight changes, but the program will draw the Americans closer in generations to come."

RAILROAD GRADE CROSSINGS, A CONTINUING HAZARD TO OUR SUBURBAN COMMUNITIES

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Wolff] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, we live in an age of rapid technological development in every field. Progress in transportation is no exception. Yet in many instances progress in safety does not keep pace with improved equipment and service. This is abundantly clear in the continued existence of our grade crossings in New York State and across the Nation.

The citizens of the village of East Williston and neighboring communities located in the congressional district I represent are to be commended for taking the initiative in trying to get action to eliminate a dangerous grade crossing in their area.

I believe that the depressed railway concept is the approach that holds the most promise, both from the point of view of safety and preservation of the beauty of both of our rural and suburban areas. Furthermore, below ground level stations would eliminate the grade crossing hazard, provide for parking space at ground level above the station, and would not compromise the integrity of the surrounding neighborhood by bisecting it with an elevated line.

When the Long Island Expressway was built depressing the road bed was the technique widely employed rather than elevated construction, and New York City got rid of its elevated railway years ago, which resulted in greatly enhancing the Third Avenue and Lexington Avenue areas. An elevated railway through a town is like a Chinese wall which rends the community in twain, wreaking havoc with local efforts toward neighborhood beautification. The twin objectives in replacing grade crossings are the safeguarding of lives and the preservation and enhancement of property and the below ground level rail line concept meets both criteria. Nassau County Executive Eugene Nickerson has long been a champion of this approach to the elimination of dangerous grade crossings, as has John A. Occhiogrosso, a candidate for the State senate from the Fifth District. Grade crossings are a dangerous anachronism that have claimed many a life, and a concerted effort should be made to secure their replacement. I stand ready to use my office to call for Federal assistance in this important effort and have called upon Governor Rockefeller to urge that the New York State government move with all possible speed toward a long overdue solution to this urgent suburban problem:

Hon. Nelson A. Rockefeller,
Governor, State of New York,
Albany, N.Y.

Dear Governor Rockefeller: I strongly urge that you use the full prestige of your office to work out in cooperation with local officials a practical and economic way to eliminate dangerous grade crossings throughout our State. These crossings have claimed many a life and are a hazardous anachronism in this day of greatly improved transportation. I believe that the below ground level railway is a practical and economic approach, and I urge that it be given every consideration. I hope you will take an active interest in this matter. If I can be of any help at the Federal level, please call upon me.

Representative Lester L. Wolff.

THOUSANDS OF TENNESSEANS HONOR JOE EVINS

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Anderson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago our esteemed colleague, Representative Joe L. Evins, was honored by thousands of his loyal constituents who gathered on the campus of the Tennessee Technological University to pay tribute to him and to express their appreciation for his achievements and accomplishments as their representative in Congress.

At Cookeville, Tenn., it was known as "Joe Evins' Day" and throughout this daylong celebration, Representative Evins heard both dignitaries and other devoted friends praise him for his outstanding work in the Congress and thank him for the able and dedicated manner in which he has represented his district for the past 20 years.

Under unanimous consent, I insert news items and editorials appearing in the Nashville Tennessean and the Nashville Banner to be reprinted in the Congressional Record as follows:

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Oct. 19, 1966]

CONSTITUENTS LIKE HIS MEDICINE: FOURTH DISTRICT PULSE BEATS FOR EVINS

(By Bill Kovach)

Cookeville.—U.S. Rep. Joe L. Evins likes to "feel the pulse" of his district, but he didn't need a doctor's touch yesterday to learn how the people of the 4th District felt.

It was Joe L. Evins Day here, honoring the Congressman for 20 years of service to his district, and the program of tributes ran late into the night.

A persistent rain cancelled a planned parade and forced a barbecue dinner indoors, but it did little to dampen the district's enthusiasm for their man in Washington.

Hundreds of political and business leaders from around the district mingled with governors and ex-governors and some of Washington's top brass throughout the day's celebration.

The center of attention was Evins and his wife, Ann.

A dormitory at his alma mater, Tennessee Technological University, was named for the Congressman; a special edition of The Cookeville Citizen was published in his honor filled with glowing tributes; a special luncheon and supper barbecue in his honor were held and a plaque from the people of his district was presented.

As one ad said:

"Things go better with Coke; Things go better with Joe L. Evins."

"I have always tried to feel the pulse of our district." Evins said in response to the honors heaped upon him. "I have tried to translate the pulse—the consensus—the will of our people—into action and service. I want to renew tonight only one pledge that, God willing, I shall continue to serve you with all the commitment of my being."

The people were honoring the congressman who represents the largest district with the fewest people in the state, a congressman who has become one of the most influential men in Washington—an influence that stems from the positions he holds in Congress:

Senior member of the House Appropriations Committee.

Chairman of the subcommittee on independent offices appropriations which appropriates funds for 23 agencies, including the new Department on Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

Ranking member of the subcommittee on public works appropriations which provides money for TVA.

Chairman of the House Small Business Committee.

His influence in Washington was reflected in the list of dignitaries present from the Nation's capital to pay tribute to the Tennessean.

This list included:

David Thomas, Federal Aviation Agency deputy administrator; Robert C. Wood, undersecretary, HUD; James E. Webb, administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Charles S. Murphy, chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board; Dr. Leland J. Haworth, director, National Science Foundation; Dr. Edward C. Welsh, executive secretary, National Aeronautics and Space Council; Frank Weitzel, assistant comptroller general.

John Sweeney, federal cochairman, Appalachian Regional Commission; U.S. Rep. Mike Kirwan, D–Ohio; W. J. Driver, administrator, Veterans Administration, and Col. Bernard T. Franck III, deputy to Gen. John Hershey.

Evins' first honor came at a landmark ceremony at TTU where he was joined on the platform by all of Tennessee's living former governors. As part of the ceremony, a building on the university's campus was dedicated to each special guest.

Dormitories were named for former Govs. Buford Ellington, Gordon Browning, James McCord and Prentice Cooper. An engineering building was named for Gov. Frank Clement.

Lt. Gov. Jared Maddux, a Cookeville resident, was honored also with a dormitory named in his honor.

The complex of buildings have been designated The Capitol Quadrangle of TTU.

The congressman and his wife visited with friends and colleagues during an open house that followed the dedication ceremonies and then attended a barbecue in his honor.

Entertainment was provided by Lester Flatt and Earl Scruggs, recording star Dottie West and others.

Circuit Judge John A. Mitchell paid tribute to Evins for his work for the Fourth District, and veteran State Rep. James Cummings, D-Woodbury, presented him with a plaque.

In the principal address of the day, Mitchell saluted Evins as the coming dean of the Tennessee congressional delegation and a man who "well may" become speaker of the House of Representatives.

"By his determination, his vigor, his untiring efforts and his ardent devotion to the people of his district, he has gradually risen to a position of enormous power and influence in the Congress of the United States," said Mitchell.

"We all recognize our congressman as a champion of small town and rural America, and of the small businessman in particular," Mitchell said.

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Oct. 20, 1966]

Joe Evins Day Honors a Champ

If U.S. Rep. Joe L. Evins had been running for something Tuesday, he probably would have been elected by acclamation.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Evins is running for re-election from the Fourth District. But as anyone passing through Cookeville Tuesday could plainly see, his popularity in the district is such that no one yielded to an urge to challenge him.

That is why the tribute paid to the congressman in Cookeville was so meaningful. Joe L. Evins Day was not a campaign gimmick cooked up for the purpose of helping some fading candidate hold onto his job. It was a spontaneous expression of gratitude by a district which Representative Evins has served so well for 20 years.

Joining to pay tribute to the congressman were numerous officials from Washington, the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee of which Mr. Evins is a ranking member, every living Tennessean who has held the office of governor, and—most important—the people of the Fourth District who appreciate the wise use which their congressman makes of his growing seniority in Washington.

It was a glowing tribute which was well-deserved by a capable and hardworking servant of the people.

[From the Nashville Banner, Oct. 19, 1966]

Old Friends, Ex-Governors Fete Evins at Cookeville

(By Ken Morrell)

Cookeville.—Thousands of Middle Tennesseans from all walks of life came here Tuesday to honor their "champion" in Congress, Rep. Joe L. Evins of Smithville.

Honoring Evins for his 20 years of service to the Fourth Congressional District, the day-long program of activities brought together many of the Congressman's old friends from home, high-ranking federal officials who work with him in Washington and all five of Tennessee's present and former governors.

"I shall always remember this as a golden day," Evins said happily. "This has been our day together. I shall remember it as long as I live."

While the colorful activities were designed to pay tribute to Evins, the veteran congressman instead said he wanted to express his gratitude to "the people of the district—the heartland of Tennessee—who opened their hearts to me 20 years ago."

"I've always tried to feel the pulse of our district and I've always tried to translate the pulse—the consensus—the will of our people—into action and service," Evins continued.

Renewing a pledge he made to the voters when he first went to Congress in 1946, Evins said:

"God willing, I shall continue to serve you with all the commitment of my being."

"Whatever service I have been able to render has been done by you through me as your representative. Together we have come a long way. We have fought our battles together . . . Together we have accomplished much . . . There is still much to be done. Happiness is being your congressman."

Evins' remarks came Tuesday night as more than 4,000 friends and supporters assembled in the Tennessee Technological University gymasium for the concluding program of "Joe L. Evins Appreciation Day."

Criminal Court Judge John Mitchell, the principal speaker, praised Evins for his "vigor and untiring efforts and his devotion to the district."

SINCERE

"Occasionally there appears on the horizon a man who catches the imagination of the people," Mitchell continued, "a man who has a sincere desire to render service to his country—a man who is willing to work harder, longer and more diligently than others. Such a man is Joe L. Evins."

Mitchell traced Evins' rise in Congress to what he called "a position of enormous power and influence" and said:

"We shall not be surprised if some day he shall be speaker of the House of Representatives."

Evins, who will become dean of the Tennessee congressional delegation in January, received similar tributes earlier in the day from many other governmental officials.

The Fourth District congressman obviously was grateful for the fact that all of those who have served as governor of Tennessee during the past 27 years were on hand for the observance.

These included Gov. Frank Clement, former Gov. Buford Ellington, the Democratic nominee for a second term; former Gov. Gordon Browning, former Gov. Jim McCord and former Gov. Prentice Cooper.

BUILDINGS NAMED

During the afternoon, Tennessee Tech named dormitory units and other buildings in honor of the five governors, another for Evins and a seventh in honor of Lt. Gov. Jared Maddux of Cookeville, who also appeared on the program.

McCord took time out from his response to urge support in the Nov. 8 general election for Clement, who is the Democratic nominee for the U.S. Senate.

And Evins, who faces only token opposition at the polls, said, "We look forward to welcoming our present, great governor to Washington next year."

Ellington, Browning, Cooper and Maddux expressed their appreciation for the honor bestowed upon them.

While rain forced officials to cancel a parade and re-arrange a barbecue indoors, an estimated 4,500 persons—many of them students at Tennessee Tech—attended the afternoon program.

Among the numerous federal officials on hand for the event were Congressman Michael Kirwan of Ohio, chairman of the public works subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee and representatives of many federal agencies which work with congressional committees on which Evins serves.

These included James E. Webb, administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Dr. Edward C. Welsh, executive secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council; David Thomas, Federal Aviation Agency deputy administrator; Robert C. Wood, under secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development; Charles S. Murphy, chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board; Dr. Leland J. Haworth, director of the National Science Foundation; Frank Weitzel, assistant comptroller general; Col. Bernard T. Franck III, deputy to Gen. John Hershey; John W. Bush, chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission and others.

Also participating were State Education Commissioner J. Howard Warf and members of the State Building Commission, the State Board of Education and other state officials, along with the mayors and county judges of many of the cities and counties in the Fourth Congressional District.

[From the Nashville Banner, Oct. 18, 1966]

Best Wishes, Representative Joe L. Evins

The tribute accorded Rep. Joe L. Evins today is not confined to Cookeville—where "Joe L. Evins Day" is being observed—nor to the Fourth District which he has represented in Congress since his election 20 years ago. It extends throughout an area of personal friendship, acknowledging ability and official service.

Constituents esteem him for tireless address to the interests of his region—in no detail better illustrated than the successful battle he waged for the Tims Ford Dam project finally authorized, under his leadership, by the 89th Congress.

He is respected by colleagues in the National Legislature, where he serves on such key bodies as the Committee on Appropriations, and the House Select Committee on Small Business—of which he is chairman. Responsibilities met comprise the record about which this special day has been arranged, a gathering of home-folk to bestow an honor earned.

State and national officials share the occasion where, on the Tennessee Tech campus, a dormitory is to be named for him. Others similarly honored will be Gov. Frank Clement, the four living former governors—Buford Ellington, Jim McCord, Prentice Cooper, and Gordon Browning, and Lt. Gov. Jared Maddux.

It is the center of Middle Tennessee attention today, and the region extends congratulations to Joe L. Evins, with best wishes for the happiest of Homecomings.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON VISITS DELAWARE

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDowell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, October 13, President Johnson visited Delaware where he was warmly and enthusiastically received. The magnitude of the President's reception by my fellow Delawareans can best be stated by this description from Newsweek magazine of October 24:

> It is estimated that the President had seen a million New Yorkers. But he saw nothing that compared with his next day in Delaware. Mr. Johnson was all but overwhelmed in Wilmington, a stop that he made to spark the campaigns of Congressman Harris B. McDowell, Jr., and underdog senatorial candidate James M. Tunnell. Some 75,000 Delawareans thronged Wilmington's North Market Street to view the Presidential parade. Fully 15,000 jammed the space around his platform. At departure time well-wishers mobbed Mr. Johnson's motorcade so repeatedly that the President finally had to lift a loudspeaker and plead: Let me go, let me go, let me go! You can see me on television at 3:30.

I submit herewith the text of the President's address in Wilmington's Rodney Square:

Governor Terry; Congressman McDowell; my dear friends of many years in the Senate, Senator Allen Frear and Mrs. Frear; Lieutenant Governor Trivett; distinguished Mayor, the next Democratic Senator from the great State of Delaware, James Tunnell; your able candidate for Attorney-General, Sid Balick; my fellow Democrats and my fellow Americans:

I won't be here long. I can't speak as much as I would like to, but you are here today because you, I think, care about Delaware. And I am here because I care about Delaware.

You came here today because you care about your country. And I am here today for that same reason. I care for our country, too.

I believe that most of you are here because you believe in the Democratic Party. You want a party that has a program for all the people. You believe in action. And you believe that we are going to get that action when you elect Democrats November 8.

Now in four days' time I shall be departing on a long journey. I am not a candidate for any office this year. But I did not want to leave and be in the Pacific area for almost three weeks without fulfilling my promises to Governor Terry and to Congressman McDowell to come here and talk a few minutes to every Delaware family in the sound of my voice about matters that mean a lot to every mother, every father, every boy, and every girl in this fine State.

You are going to be hearing a good many complaints and a good many claims between now and November 8. There are always people who know how to do it better. There are always the critics and complainers. They will have a good many things to say about your President and your Congress. But we have the right of free speech in this country and people will exercise it. And your President has the right of free speech, too.

I remember the darkest days when they tried to hoodwink the folks, when they tried to mislead the people, that President Roosevelt used to go on the radio and say, "My friends."

So I came here today to talk to "my friends," because I may not be able to have enough money to tell you over the television, for there are two or three men who determine what goes on the television in this country.

I may not be able to tell you all that I want to tell you by television. And the newspapers don't always publish everything I would like for them to publish.

So I am going to tell you in a very few minutes some of the things that I think you ought to know. You ought to know it for your own good. I want you to know what your President thinks about the 89th Congress.

Now since the first Congress met 174 years ago, we have had 89 sessions of Congress. History records only a few Congresses that earn the mark of greatness.

The first Congress in 1789 clearly deserved that label—for that first Congress helped create our American Government and that first Congress gave meaning to our Constitution.

Another great Congress was the 59th Congress when Theodore Roosevelt was President. That Congress served the needs of all the people and that Congress made the Constitution a living document for all the families of this land.

Now we all know that the 63rd Congress in Woodrow Wilson's time and the 73rd Congress under that great leader, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, earned the badge of greatness. They extended freedom from economic want and from fear and they gave hope to all the people.

But I want to say this today and I want history to remember it: When the future historians gather, I believe and I predict that they will put this Congress—the 89th Congress, the Congress to which you sent us Harris McDowell, one of the finest Congressmen in Washington today—at the top of the list. And we are going to be justified in teaching our children and our children's children it was—The Great Congress.

If you remember nothing else that I say today, I beg you to remember these six things—and when you go home this evening you tell your family what your President told you here at high noon today.

My first point is education.

Education for our children, for tomorrow.

In the 174 years before I became President, 88 Congresses passed only six education bills.

Since November 1963 Congress has passed not six bills as the first 88 Congresses did, but 18 educational bills for the benefit of your children.

In the first 174 years of this government, Congress appropriated $5 billion 800 million for education, or about $33 million per year.

The 89th Congress will spend $900 billion-plus—more than twice as much as all the other 88 Congresses put together or almost $4 billion 800 million per year.

So for 174 years we spent $33 million educating our children. In the last two years we have spent $4 billion 800 million per year on our children. And I don't think I have to spell out any further what that is going to mean for the education, prosperity and well-being of every child in Delaware.

That is education.

My second point is health.

There is nothing more important than learning for your mind and health for your body.

In 1960, the last Republican Administration appropriated $841 million for health.

This year, this Congress will spend not $841 million but $8 billion 200 million, including Medicare payments, which is ten times as much this year as health got in the last Republican year.

Ten times as much for health. Twice as much for education in all the history of the government.

We have passed 24 health measures all the way from hospital construction, to dirty air and pollution control, to mental health, to heart, cancer and stroke, and finally the granddaddy of them all—Medicare.

It will take care of our grandfathers and our grandmothers and we will no longer have to worry about what is going to happen to them when they pass 65—their hospital bills and their doctors.

I don't want you to forget this November 8, nine out of every ten Republicans in the House voted to recommit Medicare and to kill that bill.

Now my third point is food.

Education, health, food. Food for the hungry people.

Hunger poisons the mind; it saps the body. It destroys man's hope.

This year, the Congress provided assistance to more than five million needy Americans.

Food for freedom, friends, during the six years of the Kennedy-Johnson Administration practically doubled those of the last six years of the Republican Administration.

Twice as much food, twice as much education in all history, ten times as much health care.

In two years we saved the taxpayers of this nation $400 million in dead storage costs storing agricultural commodities. We saved $400 million. We put food in hungry stomachs instead of hungry contractors' concrete storage bins.

Education, health, food.

My fourth point is conservation, recreation, and beautification.

The 89th Congress passed 20 major conservation measures. This week, I will sign, as President, 7 acts to extend to our parks where our children can play, to build scenic waterways, to save our historic sites in our cities, to preserve our national seashores, to open up some land where the people from the city can take their little children on Saturday afternoon and Sunday and their day off.

This year, this Congress will help bring more than one million acres into parks and playgrounds—and many of them are going to be near our cities where the people live and where they work. They can't go all the way to Wyoming, all the way to Montana, all the way to Colorado, to take their children to the park on Saturday afternoon. So we are putting the parks where the people are instead of where they are not.

Now my fifth point is income.

Education, health, recreation, and income.

The Republicans talk about inflation. They have been talking about inflation lately. Well, they ought to talk about it because they are experts on inflation. They are experts on fear and inflation.

In the final 67 months of the Republican Administration, the last almost six years of the last Republican Administration—some of you haven't forgotten it yet, six years ago—prices went up 11 percent.

In the 67 months of the Kennedy-Johnson Administration, since 1960, prices have gone up. Employment has gone up ten million. Wages have gone up. Disposable income has gone up 20 percent after you allow for the high prices.

But our prices have not gone up yet 11 percent. They have gone up 9 percent compared to their 11 percent.

But listen now—here is the clincher: During the final 67 months of the Republican Administration, your personal income—after the high prices—increased a little over 2 percent.

In the 67 months of the Kennedy-Johnson Administration, after paying the high prices, you had enough to spend and enough to save at a personal income increase of not 2 percent but 20 percent.

Now, wouldn't you rather have an income increase of 21 percent to pay a 9 percent price increase than to have to pay an 11 percent price increase with a 2 percent income?

I don't think you have to be a Mellon or a Pugh or a DuPont or Rockefeller or anything to figure that one out. You don't have to know any high mathematics. You don't even have to be successful in business.

The average American would rather pay 9 percent higher prices with 21 percent more income than to pay 11 percent prices with 2 percent more income.

And I believe the average Republican would rather do it. That may be why 30 percent of the Republicans supported us in 1964. And we invite all of them to come help us build a better America by voting Democratic this year.

Now the sixth and final point—and this is it—is peace.

Your 89th Congress has supported your President's efforts to try to find a lasting peace in the world. Everybody wants peace. Everybody hates war. Every boy is afraid to die. All of us want to live as long as we can. But we found in World War I that when dictators were on the march and jumping on helpless people that sometimes you had to have some help. You find it which is why you have a sheriff and why you have enforcement officers. You found it when Hitler went through Poland. We sat back and did nothing for a while. But finally, to save ourselves we had to go in. So we believe we must have a lasting peace. By being strong we believe we must have a lasting peace by keeping our word to 100 little countries that we have told that, "We are not going to stand by and let them burn your house down and eat you up."

We believe we should honor our commitments. We believe that we should show the Communists in North Vietnam that they cannot, by aggression, take over their neighbors.

We believe that we should go the last mile to search for the first faint sign to end hostilities.

If anyone asks you the question: "Why don't we go from the battlefield to the conference table?" you can look them straight in the face and say, "I will have our President and our Secretary of State at any conference table any day you can get Mr. Ho Chi Minh and the Communists in Hanoi to go there."

We have said and said and said, in every capital in the world, that we are ready to go from the battlefield to the conference table. But it doesn't do us any good to go into an empty room and talk to ourselves.

Ask some of these friends of yours who find what is wrong with your boys, what is wrong with your country, what is wrong with your government and what is wrong with your Secretary of State.

Admit for the sake of argument that we make a lot of mistakes. But say to them: "I looked in their eyes and I believe they will go to a peace conference." Now can't you get some of the folks you are talking about to go there and meet them? I will deliver my man if you can deliver yours.

Now at this moment, right now, another night has fallen out there in Vietnam. There are mothers and fathers in this audience who have boys there. These American fighting men went through another day of testing—not resting and not complaining. They do not shrink from their responsibility because they know that their country keeps their promises. And I am proud to tell you, as their Commander-in-Chief, that there never was a more patriotic, able, or better-equipped man who put on the uniform than the American serviceman in Vietnam.

He knows that we keep a promise and the complaints don't come from him—not from those that are out there.

We have promises that we must keep, though, and we must keep them here at home: Promises to educate our children, promises to the poor, who need hope; promises to the old, who need comfort; promises to small nations, 100 small nations, who want to be free from the aggressor's heel and from the tyrant's demand. Now you are going to make a choice 26 days from now. But many choices like this have been made in our history and the issues are simple.

I hope that you will vote to return a Democratic Congress to Washington to work with your President instead of working against your President. I believe that you want your Government to function efficiently, effectively and economically. I believe you want to say to the other 120 nations in the world that we are proud of our President and proud of our Congress.

Now, you can't do that if you have a President going in one direction and a Congress going in the other direction. You can't do that if everything your President does the Congress finds something wrong with or everything the Congress does your President finds something wrong with.

I just want to leave this thought with you now: I have talked to you about a six-point program. You can add that up, I guess, if you want, in one word and that would help you to remember it:

Food—that is "F". Recreation—that is "R". Jobs and wages and income—that is "I". Education that is "E". Increased Social Security, Medicare, and health and nursing homes for our older folks—that is "N". And a strong nation that will defend us and help us get peace—defense—that is "D". That means food and recreation and income and education and nursing homes and defense and that spells out what the Democratic Party stands for: That spells "friend".

Friend of whom? Friend of all American families. So go and vote for the "friends" November 8. Vote for food and recreation. Vote for income, high wages and full employment. Vote for education, health, peace and defense.

Vote "friend" by sending back to Washington one of the greatest Democratic Congressmen you ever sent to Washington, Harris McDowell. And by sending—at least give us one Democratic. Senator—Senator Tunnell from the State of Delaware.

HONOR CONFERRED UPON DR. MAX JACOBSON OF NEW YORK

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I was very much pleased that on July 6 of this year, one of my devoted and distinguished friends, Dr. Max Jacobson, of New York, one of the great physicians of the world who has contributed immeasurably to the saving of human life and the alleviation of suffering in many lands, was decorated in London at the Spanish Embassy by His Excellency, the Panamanian Ambassador, Sr. Don Eusebio Antonio Morales, with the Panamanian Order of Manuel Amador Guerrero, conferred upon Dr. Jacobson by the President of Panama.

A report of the delightful occasion upon which Dr. Jacobson was so signally honored, and of the decoration conferred, appears in the August 1966 issue of the Diplomatist. I have unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that this article appear in the Record following my remarks:

Princes and Princesses of different nationalities, film and stage stars by the dozen (Vanessa Redgrave and Lee Marvin amongst them) and lovely women, cute, attractive, dishy and elegant by the score—intermingled with ambassadors and other diplomats at the party which H.E. the Panamanian Ambassador, Sr. Don Eusebio Antonio Morales (Tony to his friends) gave on July 6 at 17 Grosvenor Square in honour of Dr. Max Jacobson, the famous doctor from America. Dr. Jacobson came all the way from the U.S.A. to be decorated by H.E. Sr. Morales with the Panamanian order of Manuel Amador Guerrero conferred upon him by the President of Panama. He has been of outstanding service to Panama having often given his advice and treatment without charge. But then, and here everyone agrees with Sr. Morales, Dr. Jacobson has been of outstanding service to humanity as a whole. His merits are known throughout the world and amongst his patients he has had the late President Kennedy and still has Princess Lee Radziwill. And also Sr. Morales. Which explains in more ways than one why the Ambassador looks under-forty when in fact he is a grandfather of nearly 57. Amongst those who saw the Ambassador decorating the Doctor was also the Maharajah of Baroda and the General Shanker of Nepal, a former Ambassador to London, Washington and Paris, as well as the whole corps of Latin American Ambassadors.

MIAMI'S DECISION: A BLEND OF CULTURES

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the Cuban children came to school with a throng of cultural complications in their wake—and the problem was for Dade County to solve. Its school system, ranking seventh in the Nation, was equipped, but nevertheless somewhat unprepared, to cope with the influx of fresh new worries as to how to accommodate these children in a school system incongruous to both the language and backgrounds of these Cuban children. Harmony, and even more important, mutual advantages were outgrowths of the skill and ingenuity shown by the Dade County School Board.

The following, taken from the October Southern Education Report, describes the unique program set up for a cultural compatibility on the primary school level:

MIAMI'S DECISION: A BLEND OF CULTURES

(By Bert Collier)

(NOTE.—Bert Collier, an editorial writer for the Miami Herald, is Florida correspondent for Southern Education Reporting Service.)

"Buenos dias, Senora Cinco Centavos," chorused the class when the teacher said "good morning." Then came giggles and laughter.

It was a joke between the teacher, Mrs. Florence Nichol, and the Cuban-born pupils under her care at Citrus Elementary School in Miami. The youngsters had learned quickly that a nickel is a spendable coin good for bubble gum or candy at the corner store, and they delightedly translated their teacher's name into its Spanish equivalent.

This bilingual punning was no happenstance. It illustrated the result of a calculated approach to a unique problem presented the Dade County school system when a flood of Spanish-speaking children—refugees from Communist Cuba—began to engulf the classrooms shortly after Fidel Castro came to power.

At the peak, upward of a hundred children, speaking not a word of English, sought to enroll in the public schools every day. At one point, more than 18,000 refugee youngsters—about one-tenth the total enrollment—were clamoring for an education. Compounding the problem, most were concentrated in the older schools around the deteriorating downtown section of Miami.

There were no guidelines for such a situation. It was the first time so many alien children had to be taken so quickly into a school system. The differences in language and background resulted in an inevitable collision of cultures.

The alternatives seemed painful. Should the older schools be allowed to become all-Spanish-speaking, with their own teachers perpetuating the old Cuban ways? Or should the children be expected to fit into the established American pattern, speaking only English in the classrooms and using only the conventional textbooks and materials?

The Dade school people decided to do neither. They chose a middle way, believing that both the native-born and the Cuban children had something of value to share. From this conviction came a number of "multi-cultural" schools in which the

American system of education was blended with efforts to instill appreciation of Cuban culture, music, art, history and literature.

It worked so well that today, with the total number of Cuban-born children almost as great as at the peak, and the inflow continuing at a lesser but steady rate, there is no "Cuban problem" in the Dade schools. American-born and Cuban-born children study and play side by side, and to the casual observer it is hard to tell which is which. By and large they speak alike, they act alike and—as various tests indicate—they tend to think alike.

But this is not all the story. In learning how to absorb this large influx of non-English-speaking children, the Dade schools discovered ways to help any child who has difficulty based on a failure to comprehend what he hears or sees. This may be a child who never spoke English until he set foot in a Miami school. Or it may be a child who speaks a dialect that sets him apart from others in his class.

Methods developed in the Dade program are now being used in other school systems where children of different backgrounds—cultural, national or racial—are learning together.

This came hard in Dade County, which moved into the program from necessity. In the first days of the almost unmanageable Cuban influx, the area accepted the situation as a temporary hardship that would resolve itself with time, and there was little planning. But the need was soon apparent. At Citrus Grove Elementary, for instance, Cuban children went to school with vacuum bottles of strong coffee in their lunch boxes, to the wonder of their classmates. The efforts to explain and adjust such differences snagged on the language barrier.

Recruitment of displaced Cuban teachers as aides in the mixed classrooms bridged the first gaps, and the resilience and eagerness of the Cuban children helped greatly. But more things were needed. Step by step, through classroom experience and experimentation at the administrative level, the present total bilingual program emerged. It has three aspects:

The bilingual school, the first of its kind in the country, in which native-born and refugee children learn together in two languages.

The development of special textbooks and other materials for use in such schools and for any students who have little or no knowledge of English.

Courses in Spanish for native speakers of the language, to preserve and broaden the use of their traditional tongue.

The program began to take shape in 1963—three years after the influx began. It was then that Miami's Coral Way Elementary was transformed into a bilingual school. The program at Coral Way called for all children from the first through third grades to be taught to read, write, figure, and even think, in both English and Spanish.

This required careful preparation. Twelve classes were organized, each with a controlled enrollment of 30. There were 12 specially trained bilingual teachers, six of them North American, six Cuban. Because Coral Way's Cuban enrollment was not enough to balance the classes volunteers were sought from nearby schools.

This was well enough, but even in the planning stage the staff realized the serious lack of textbooks and other materials to make it possible for the children to be at ease in two languages and two cultures.

A second project resulted. Under a $278,000 Ford Foundation grant, a special task force began to develop these aids to teaching English as a second language. Dr. Pauline Rojas, director of the Ford Foundation project, was made consultant at the Coral Way school, becoming the prime link between the two related activities. "It was a question of starting from scratch," says Dr. Rojas, whose background includes service with the U.S. Office of Education.

Experience gained in actual classroom work at Coral Way was used by Dr. Rojas in preparing a series of new textbooks. She discarded old symbols and used what is officially described as "cross-cultural, high-interest content written in the natural language of children."

The 22 Dade County schools that had heavy Spanish-speaking enrollments were natural testing grounds for the new books. They also were tried, with good results, at 10 predominantly Negro schools. In addition they were used experimentally in a number of schools in Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, New York, Puerto Rico and Texas which had migrant, foreign-born or mixed enrollments. This year they are available nationally as the Miami Linguistic Readers, through D. C. Heath and Co.

"While developed primarily for Spanish-speaking children," says Paul Bell, supervisor of bilingual education for the Dade schools, "the new materials also are applicable to non-English speakers from other language backgrounds and to any child—including English speakers—with markedly different language habits. Quite aside from the bilingual aspects, they are good for any child with language handicaps."

Some children hear sounds differently and speak them differently. For instance, the Spanish speaker tends to hear and pronounce the word "live" as if it were "leave." For such, according to Bell, the new books provide a controlled introduction of grammatical patterns which start simply and build. "They repeat and stress the same grammatical pattern; they concentrate on the vowel sounds. This regularly helps the children discover spelling patterns, too."

So, while the program was developed to help Cuban refugees, it has a far wider application.

"The true significance of the total program," Bell says, "is that it is a concerted effort to help students with language and reading difficulties to move forward more quickly. It is designed to develop materials and discover methods to help nonstandard students with difficulties in dialect and language. We knew about this problem long before the Cubans arrived. It was found in early-grade children unable to comprehend the traditional symbolism and word patterns, who were unable to understand the language they heard in the classroom."

The Coral Way Elementary bilingual program has developed a few bugs. Some parents whose children were (at their request) taught only in English complained last year they were "education orphans" because of the emphasis on the bilingual effort. As a result, the nonparticipators were falling behind.

This was a separate problem and was attacked separately by transferring children who were unhappy in the bilingual atmosphere. As for the other students, Dr. Joe Hall, county school superintendent, was able to report recently that they were, on the average achieving above the countywide norms, "and doing it in two languages."

This September, a second bilingual school was opened at Central Beach Elementary in Miami Beach. Instead of the carefully controlled situation that was tried at Coral Way, Central Beach is open to children from all parts of the county, regardless of cultural or economic background, who want a total school experience in two languages.

Dr. Hall says bilingual schools are no longer considered a device to preserve the Cuban culture among refugee children and instill appreciation of it among native children with whom the newcomers are growing up. The schools, Hall believes, provide "a tremendous opportunity to learn to operate really efficiently in two languages." The superintendent hopes bilingual training eventually will be available to children in all major areas of the county.

For adults who intend to go back to Cuba some day, Lindsey-Hopkins Technical High School offers courses in Spanish language and literature. Several hundred persons have enrolled in these classes, which are roughly comparable to English courses taught in the freshman or sophomore years of college.

The accomplishments of the bilingual program were recognized recently by the National Education Association and Parade magazine. They jointly selected the Dade system for the 1966 National Pacemaker Award for Florida. The NEA called it "an imaginative program of bilingual instruction." A citation said: "School officials seized the opportunity to develop creative programs to benefit not only the Cuban pupils but also the native-born whose first language was English."

Mrs. Lyle Roberts, chairman of the Dade school board, firmly supports the program and is working for its expansion. "We certainly are pleased that while doing a grassroots job of meeting what we considered a major need in Dade County," she says, "we have made a national contribution to education. In nearly every metropolitan area there are many school children from non-English backgrounds. Forced to conform to an educational pattern geared completely to English-speaking, they may fall behind, grow discouraged and give up. In addition, with the world growing smaller and smaller, the United States needs people who can operate effectively in more than one language."

This is being provided in Dade County, which is taking advantage of the strong infusion of Cuban culture. It has been discovered that when youngsters use the same symbols and communicate in the same terms, they become *muy simpatico*.

CRISIS AND COMMITMENT

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'Hara] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on October 17, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Scheuer] called our attention to a statement that had appeared in the New York Times, signed by seven distinguished leaders of civil rights organizations. I too consider that this statement, "Crisis and Commitment," was of major importance to every American citizen, and like my colleague from New York, I too welcome its publication.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues, one of the first responses to that statement—a response which I consider no less important than the original document.

On the same day that the statement appeared, the President of the AFL–CIO, Mr. George Meany, hailed it with warmth and enthusiasm, to use Mr. Meany's own words.

He wrote to one of the distinguished signers of the statement which had appeared in the New York Times, Mr. A. Philip Randolph, a vice president of the

AFL–CIO, and president of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters.

Mr. Randolph is one of the most distinguished leaders of the civil rights movement and I was delighted to read of Mr. Meany's letter to him with its immediate and wholehearted support of the principles contained in the New York Times statement Mr. Randolph had signed.

I was especially delighted with Mr. Meany's restatement of the AFL–CIO:

> We reject out of hand the concept that there can be any first-class or second-class citizenship in the United States. In our country there can be only one class—citizen—the highest and most meaningful title in a democracy.

Because of my strong belief that Mr. Meany's statement should be widely read, I request unanimous consent that it be put in the RECORD for the consideration of my colleagues in the House.

TEXT OF A LETTER SENT OCTOBER 14, 1966, BY AFL–CIO PRESIDENT GEORGE MEANY, TO A. PHILIP RANDOLPH, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE AFL–CIO

> It was with warmth and enthusiasm that I read the advertisement in the New York Times this morning, signed by yourself and your fellow leaders of the Civil Rights movement.
>
> Please extend to each of them my warm thanks and congratulations for they have in this restatement of principles and commitments summed up, in admirable fashion, the problems, the aspirations, the needs of America in this crucial moment in history.
>
> I know that you need no reassurance of the AFL–CIO's intentions but I would appreciate it if you would convey to your colleagues the AFL–CIO's firm and unswerving determination to achieve full equality in America in all fields—education, employment, accommodations, housing and justice.
>
> Your restatement of commitment to the attainment of racial justice by the democratic process, your repudiation of the strategies of violence, reprisals or vigilantism, your reaffirmation of the goals of integration commends itself to every thinking American.
>
> There is, in America today, a so-called "white backlash." It is deplorable. It was born out of the ability of demagogues to capitalize upon rioting. It stems from unreasoning fear stimulated by the reckless cries of "black power."
>
> It thrives on the ignorance of many citizens as to the real issues involved in equal rights controversies.
>
> You and I agree that extremism is the antithesis of democracy and extremism by advocates of justice for America's minority population cannot be countenanced any more than extremism by advocates of white supremacy. In my book, the advocates of black supremacy and white supremacy belong in the same camp and the American trade union movement opposes both equally.
>
> I know we are also in agreement that the problems faced by the civil rights movement cannot be resolved in an economic vacuum. As the AFL–CIO has repeatedly said, equal opportunity in employment is meaningless unless there is full opportunity; equal housing is impossible until we eliminate the slums and build the homes America needs for all its population—black or white; equal education is impossible until America puts its money where its mouth is and builds the kind of schools and supplies them with enough well-paid teachers to do the job of providing good education for every one of our children.
>
> The AFL–CIO is dedicated to building the kind of America which will supply the answers to all of these problems. Our goal is to provide the schools, provide the jobs, provide the homes, provide the health care and provide the understanding that it is poverty and ignorance and despair that are the real root causes of all of America's domestic problems.
>
> The AFL–CIO will not retreat from its commitment to the cause of civil rights any more than it would retreat from its commitment to abolish poverty, illness, suffering, and want in this nation.
>
> You and I agree, I know, that a vital first step to the achievement of our goal must be a massive turnout of every registered voter on November 8, voting for those who back our program, voting in opposition to those who would delay or destroy it. We know both the friends and the enemies of the civil rights movement and of the labor movement in the Congress of the United States.
>
> In the crucial elections of 1966, it behooves both the civil rights movement and the labor movement to support our friends and defeat our enemies. Those who counsel a boycott of the polls this year are either deliberately or mistakenly aiding only the enemies of both civil rights and the labor movements, and are playing into the hands of the demagogues who would use the white backlash to halt social progress in America.
>
> No one could honestly pretend that the road to the achievement of full civil rights for all will be an easy one but it is a road America must traverse for it leads to a goal we must achieve.
>
> In the achievement of that goal, the labor movement marches side by side with the leaders of the civil rights movement, like yourself, who joined in today's restatement of the policies and commitments of the civil rights movement.
>
> Let me reiterate the AFL–CIO's position: We reject out of hand the concept that there can be any first-class or second-class citizenship in the United States. In our country there can be only one class—citizen—the highest and most meaningful title in a democracy.

CONGRESSMAN O'HARA REPORTS ON THE 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, after the remarkably productive 1st session of the 89th Congress, I suppose we should have anticipated something of a legislative letdown in the 2d session.

It would have been difficult indeed to sustain the 1965 level of activity for 2 years. I think it can truthfully be said that the 1st session of the 89th Congress was the most productive in our Nation's history.

The second session had a tough performance to follow.

The 1965 session had turned out the first general education measure in history; expanded the social security system to help senior citizens meet the costs of health care; passed a Voting Rights Act protecting the right to vote for all Americans; established a Department of Housing and Urban Development, giving the cities and suburbs of America the same standing in the President's Cabinet that agriculture had enjoyed for a century; enacted far-reaching legislation to help local communities in building needed public facilities; increased Federal assistance to higher education; reduced excise taxes; reformed our immigration system to make it more equitable and passed a water pollution control measure.

To this list of major legislation could be added other new laws—the highway beautification program, Federal and military pay bills, the Appalachian Regional Development Act, and the Economic Development Act which extended the Appalachian Act concept to other regions experiencing economic difficulty.

There are several reasons for the outstanding legislative record compiled during the 1965 session of the 89th Congress.

One reason was the overwhelming victory of President Johnson at the polls in 1964. The American people not only gave him the largest vote any President has ever enjoyed, but they turned to the Democratic Party at other levels as well.

When the smoke of the election campaign had cleared and the votes were counted, the Democratic Party had control of the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate by substantial margins, and the balance of power was held by Congressmen and Senators who were committed to such programs as aid to education, medicare, and community development.

RULES REFORMS HELP

Another reason for the 1965 record of Congress was the action of the House of Representatives in reforming its rules to eliminate several procedural obstructions from the legislative pipeline. The rules changes have made Congress more responsible in meeting today's needs and more responsive to the wishes of the American people. It is easier now for a majority of the House to work its will.

Although the 2d session of the 89th Congress may not measure up to the 1st, its record compares favorably, I think, with most years. It suffers by comparison only when measured against the most productive session in history.

As I look back over the last 10 months, there are a couple of things about the 1966 session of Congress which stand out in my mind.

For one thing, it was dominated in many ways by the war in Vietnam. For another, the state of our domestic economy has been an important consideration in many of the actions we have taken.

In reality, these issues are one and the same. It is the war in Vietnam and the expenditures because of it which are the principal causes for the overheating we have experienced in our economy.

GUNS AND BUTTER

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that there was a great deal of talk early this year about "guns and butter"—the "guns" a symbol for our military needs and the "butter" our domestic programs. There were those who felt that because of the costs of our military activities in Vietnam and defense commitments in other parts of the world, we could not afford to move forward with needed domestic programs.

In his state of the Union message, the President came down on the side of those who believed that we could have both "guns and butter" so long as we exercised restraint.

I think this Congress has demonstrated that we can maintain a military and defense establishment strong enough to cope with any external threat and still move toward our goals at home—educating the young, improving medical care for the elderly, stepping up the attack on poverty, cleaning up our lakes, rivers, and streams and the air we breathe and the other programs which, taken together, make up what our late President Kennedy called the New Frontier and what President Johnson calls the Great Society.

In the opening weeks of the 1966 session of Congress, it seemed that the only kind of legislation which could pass was related either to the situation in Vietnam or to our general military needs. We passed a supplemental defense procurement bill and followed that up with an economic assistance measure to bolster the economy of South Vietnam.

Later, Congress approved the tax adjustment legislation, but this too was Vietnam related, since it was designed in part to provide additional revenue to help finance our Vietnam operations. It also was hoped that this action would dampen down some of the inflationary pressures in our economy.

EDUCATION DEVELOPMENTS

Another bill to pass Congress in the first weeks of 1966—and one of the most important of the year—was the so-called cold war GI bill. Although this legislation also was military related, its impact—like that of the World War II and Korean war GI bills—will be felt for years to come.

I was pleased with the approval of the cold war GI bill—known formally as the Veterans Readjustment Benefits Act. This law extends education, housing, and other benefits to veterans with a minimum of 180 days of active duty since January 31, 1955, the expiration date of the Korean war GI bill.

In addition to enacting the cold war GI bill with its educational benefits for veterans, Congress took other steps to build upon the solid education foundation it had laid in 1965 with the passage of the landmark Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Higher Education Act. The 1966 amendments to these two laws extend and improve programs started last year to assist education at all levels—grade school, high school, and college.

The 12th Congressional District of Michigan, which I am privileged to represent, includes all of Macomb County and a small part of Detroit. I have done a little research into the impact of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 on Macomb County and have discovered that this legislation already has meant a great deal.

In the fiscal year 1966, which ended on June 30 of this year, 21 Macomb County school districts received a total of $998,237 in Federal funds under the major section of the act. Three other sections of the act brought Macomb County schools an additional $238,019 for a total under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in the last fiscal year of $1,236,256.

This represents a rather substantial boost to our efforts to provide quality education for young people. Under the act, as amended by Congress, Macomb County stands to benefit just as much this year and next year.

ONE MAN, ONE VOTE

One of the more important legislative developments of 1966, in the opinion of many observers, was a negative action—the Senate's refusal, for the third and final time, to approve a constitutional amendment proposal to upset the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote decisions on apportionment of State legislatures.

It was in the reapportioning of Michigan on the one-man, one-vote basis that Macomb County doubled its representation in the State legislature. Before reapportionment on an equal representation basis, Macomb County had three State representatives and one State senator. Now it has six State representatives and two State senators.

What happened in Macomb County also occurred in other areas of Michigan in which population growth had not been reflected by increased representation in the legislature. We have now had an opportunity to evaluate the legislative record compiled by our one-man, one-vote legislature.

The legislature has come to grips with many problems which had plagued our State for years but which had been largely ignored. As Harper's Magazine commented about Michigan's legislature:

> Educators, labor leaders, conservationists and agricultural groups were all pleased with the most productive legislative session since the 1930s.

With the failure of the amendment proposal for the third time, it appears that the efforts to circumvent the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote rulings through a constitutional amendment are dead. Most of the States have now reapportioned on a fair representation basis, and I expect that they will experience the same kind of needed legislative action that Michigan has had. It only stands to reason that State government will be more responsive to the needs of the people if legislatures accurately reflect the distribution of a State's population.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS

The 1966 session of Congress passed the most important minimum wage legislation since the Fair Labor Standards Act became law during President Franklin Roosevelt's second administration in 1938.

This year's amendments will increase the minimum wage for persons now covered from the existing $1.25 an hour to $1.40 an hour in February 1967, and $1.60 an hour a year later. More importantly the new law extends minimum wage protection to some 8 million workers who were not previously covered. Included among the 8 million working men and women are many types of service employees, tipped employees—and for the first time—certain agricultural workers.

Congressional approval of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1966 must rank among the most important actions of the year. They will raise the standard of living for literally millions of our fellow citizens at the bottom of the economic ladder who now live on less than subsistence wages.

As a member of the Education and Labor Committee, it was my pleasure to play an active role in the House consideration of the minimum wage bill. Another bill to pass Congress this year in which I had a particular interest was the mine safety bill.

This legislation, bearing my name as author, improves the health and safety standards for Americans who work in the mining industry. Passage of the bill marked the culmination of a decade-long campaign in Congress for effective Federal legislation to help protect the miners of America.

At the end of the 1st session of the 89th Congress—just about a year ago—another bill I had sponsored in the House was signed into law by President Johnson.

I refer to the Service Contract Act, which I cosponsored with the late Michigan Senator, Pat McNamara. This measure—known as the McNamara-O'Hara Act—extended labor standards protection to thousands of service workers. The act applies to workers employed under Federal service contracts and provides that they must be paid the prevailing wage—and not less than the minimum wage—for comparable work in their areas.

There were other noteworthy developments during the 2d session of the 89th Congress.

AUTO, HIGHWAY SAFETY

An attorney tried his hand as an author and helped set in motion a chain of events which led to approval by Congress of auto and highway safety laws.

It was Ralph Nader's "Unsafe at any Speed," which touched off the demand for legislation to require that motor vehicles meet certain safety standards. Congress responded by enacting the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act which provides—among other things—for Federal safety performance standards for motor vehicles and tires.

Recognizing that there are many factors contributing to the mounting toll of deaths and injuries on our Nation's highways, Congress also approved the Highway Safety Act of 1966, establishing a 3-year program to assist the States in reducing traffic accidents and authorizing research aimed at making highways more safe.

With these two actions, Congress has done about all it can legislatively to reduce traffic accidents. The rest is up to the States and local communities which must enforce traffic laws and to the individual driver upon whom the ultimate responsibility for traffic safety rests.

Congress took another significant step relating to the field of transportation. It approved legislation setting up a Cabinet-level Department to coordinate the many transportation activities of the

Federal Government—activities which had previously been diffused through numerous Federal agencies.

ANTI-INFLATION MOVES

During President Kennedy's administration, when the Federal Government was adopting policies designed to speed up economic activity in this country and cut down on unemployment, Congress enacted legislation providing a 7-percent investment tax credit. This was offered as an inducement to business and industry to purchase new plant and equipment. The theory behind this action was that with the business expansion would come increased employment opportunities.

Even before President Kennedy took office, Congress had approved an accelerated depreciation schedule for commercial buildings. This was also designed as a stimulant to business activity.

These measures worked—especially the investment tax credit. It, along with other economic policies of the last few years, have led to the longest, strongest peacetime expansion of our economy in history.

Our economic growth rate is at a high level, and unemployment is below 4 percent. This spurt of economic activity has led to rising prices and concern about inflation.

So, in another anti-inflation move, the President asked Congress to suspend temporarily the 7-percent investment tax credit and the rapid depreciation allowances. Congress has complied with the President's request, and hopefully, it will have the desired effect of cooling off the economy and helping to keep prices in line.

AIR AND WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

The 1966 session of Congress took several other actions which deserve special mention—among them the air and water pollution control amendments. These laws improve the Federal air and water pollution control programs in a number of ways, raising the amount of assistance for local communities and adopting more effective approaches toward meeting and solving these pressing problems.

The Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, outlining a blueprint for an effective, coordinated effort to improve communities, was among the more important actions of Congress this year. It authorizes "demonstration city" grants for community renewal, incentive grants to encourage comprehensive metropolitanwide planning, Federal Housing Administration mortgage insurance for developers of new communities, FHA mortgage insurance to finance and equip facilities for group medical and dental practice and a variety of other programs of housing and community development assistance.

Congress also passed legislation to increase the pay of Federal employees—civilian and military alike. Although the boost in pay fell short of what many feel is needed, it was another step in the right direction. It marked the third time in 3 years that Congress has raised the pay of members of the armed services and Federal civilian employees.

TRUTH IN PACKAGING

For years, we have heard about the need for truth-in-packaging legislation to help curb deceptive and misleading packaging and labeling. But it was a little like the weather—everyone talked about it, but no one seemed to be able to do anything about it. Michigan's Senator Phil Hart never stopped trying though.

Senator Hart, along with his Senate colleagues, finally did something about it this year.

Largely, as a result of the Senator's persistence, the Senate passed a truth-in-packaging bill which should be a help to the housewife as she does her weekly shopping and also to the great majority of manufacturers who want to package and label their products clearly so as to avoid confusion.

Senate approval of the bill was followed later by House passage of a somewhat different version. The differences now have been resolved, and the bill has been sent to the White House for President Johnson's signature.

PICTURED ROCKS

Of particular importance to those of us who live in Michigan was one of the conservation-recreation actions taken by Congress this year. I refer to approval of legislation creating the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore along Lake Superior in Michigan's Upper Peninsula.

This action will be important to this generation, to be sure, but even more important, it will assure that the picturesque Pictured Rocks area of Michigan will be preserved for the enjoyment of future generations when our population will be even greater and the demands for recreation opportunities much more pressing.

We were disappointed that the bill to create the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore on Lake Michigan failed to pass Congress. It did get through the Senate—thanks largely to Senator Hart—but was not taken up by the full House of Representatives, even though it had been favorably reported by the Interior Committee. Hopefully, this important and needed measure will be one of the early ones to be considered after Congress reconvenes in January.

In this report to the people of Michigan's 12th Congressional District, I have reviewed only the highlights of the legislative year in Congress.

All in all, the 2d session of the 89th Congress worked hard and, I think, did a good job. It's legislative output was not so spectacular as the 1965 session of Congress. There was no medicare bill, no Voting Rights Act, no historic breakthroughs in the field of education.

But Congress did take important steps to meet a number of major problems. It appropriated the funds needed to meet our military and mutual security commitments, and still it maintained our forward motion on the challenges we face at home.

It has, in short, been a gratifying session of Congress, and I was pleased to have taken part in building its record. I look forward to picking up in January of next year where we leave off today.

PRIVACY SUBCOMMITTEE BRINGS A SENSE OF BALANCE TO TECHNOLOGICAL GROWTH AND THE RIGHT TO PRIVACY

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Gallagher] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, today marks the conclusion of the first full Congress during which the Special Subcommittee on Invasion of Privacy of the House Government Operations Committee has been in operation.

I am proud to serve as chairman of this subcommittee and would like to thank its members, the gentlemen from New York, Hon. Benjamin S. Rosenthal, and Hon. Frank J. Horton, for their outstanding contributions to the subcommittee's activities.

The country owes a special debt of gratitude to the gentleman from Illinois, Hon. William L. Dawson, who, as chairman of the Government Operations Committee, authorized the creation of the special subcommittee in 1964.

Support for the subcommittee's endeavors, I am pleased to report, has come from throughout the Nation's press and broadcasting media. An example of this support is evidenced by the hundreds of editorials, articles, and broadcasts stimulated by the recent hearings of the subcommittee into a proposed Federal Data Center.

These commentaries, I believe, Mr. Speaker, cite a danger to individual privacy which concern all Americans. A sampling of these comments follows:

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post, July 31, 1966]

COULD BE CITIZEN'S NIGHTMARE—WHAT DATA BANK FUSS IS ABOUT

(By Franklin Reed)

Washington.—What's all this fuss about a centralized government computer operation?

Clearly, it would be a statistician's dream. Would it also be a citizen's nightmare? Clearly, it would give increased efficiency to the government. Is efficiency, for the first time, under attack as a goal of government?

What is in fact a complex social issue, and not strictly a problem in computer science, began unfolding before a special subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee last week.

Here, in Q-and-A form, are some of the issues and some of the problems as they were examined in three days of subcommittee hearings chaired by Congressman Cornelius E. Gallagher, D-N.J.

Q) Exactly what is being proposed by the executive branch of the government?

A) Some 20 government agencies have all sorts of information, much of it highly personal (income tax returns for example) and most of it on file and instantly retrievable in the form of magnetic tape in separate computer installations.

The proposal is to tap this vast reservoir of information with a central computer, or Data Bank as it is now called, tying the 20-odd computers together.

Q) How would they be tied together?

A) Government witnesses insisted that no decision has been reached. Gallagher says it would be done by telecommunication. The witnesses would not deny this statement.

Q) What kind of information would the central computer turn out?

A) Suppose someone wanted to know how many ex-army corporals who now earn more than $10,000 a year and who have an FHA loan on their homes beat their wives in April of 1964.

With proper programming, the Data Bank would consult one computer and obtain a list of men with incomes of more than $10,000; it would consult another computer and eliminate those who had never been an army corporal; another computer would eliminate those who do not have an FHA loan; another computer would eliminate those who were not convicted of wifebeating in April of 1964.

Q) As long as the Data Bank turned out only numbers instead of names, how could anyone's privacy be violated?

A) It couldn't, of course. But that's not the point that GALLAGHER and his subcommittee are making.

The Data Bank would have access to what computer men call "raw data." The government witnesses conceded this fact. In the same way that a computer could be programmed to turn out useful statistics, it could be programmed, say, to produce a personal dossier on John Q. Public.

Q) Without the Data Bank, and with the present system, couldn't the same thing be done?

A) Yes, but it would be very costly and very time-consuming. It is not impossible, but as a practical matter is extremely improbable.

In effect, the inefficiency of the present system gives the citizen great protection from such invasion.

Q) Has proposed efficiency in government ever been attacked before?

A) Probably with about the same frequency as politicians attack motherhood or George Washington.

Q) Instead of feeding the Data Bank with raw data, couldn't it be fed instead with statistical summaries?

A) Yes, but the government men said such a crash-diet would make it of little use, since only questions which were anticipated at the time the summaries were prepared could later be asked.

Q) Couldn't the computer be infused with the human characteristics of forgiving and forgetting?

A) Unlikely, GALLAGHER says. He cited the example of a 23-year-old man who, in his judgment, is fine officer material for the Armed Forces.

The young man applied to the Marine Corps for a commission, GALLAGHER said, but was rejected because he had six parking tickets from six years before.

Then he applied to the Navy, GALLAGHER continued, but a computer turned up the fact that he had been rejected by the Marine Corps; as a result, the Navy wouldn't have any part of him.

The subcommittee made a point of the all-seeing, unforgiving and unforgetting aspect of a computer installation.

The feeling seemed to be that computers are unexcelled at storing and recalling facts but that they seem to have no ability to weigh one fact against another and render a judgment and no ability to assess the value of a single fact.

For example, GALLAGHER said, even if parking tickets were significant in the above case, there would need to be a judgment of whether the would-be Marine officer got the tickets himself or merely loaned his car to someone else who got them.

More than one witness saw the Data Bank as possibly producing a tremendous waste of manpower by exhuming facts either insignificant or out-dated and causing talented people to be rejected for jobs.

Q) Why shouldn't Congress pass a law making it a high crime to give out anything from the Data Bank other than statistics?

A) Everyone at the hearing who was asked this question agreed that such a law should be passed.

But GALLAGHER's position is that this would not be enough.

The keeper of the keys, as GALLAGHER put it, would have an unbearable burden, possessing such a storehouse of valuable information.

"What worries me is that some dropout from Internal Revenue's lock-picking school might end up in charge of the data center," GALLAGHER said.

Further, a law at best can only punish a guilty party after someone has been injured. GALLAGHER wants the additional protection of preventing the injury in the first place.

Finally, under the proposal a single breakdown in security would have far-reaching effects. At present it would take 20 breakdowns in security to have the same effect.

The protection of disclosure laws tends to erode with time, two witnesses said, as additional needs arise for new information—all for a worthy purpose and all seemingly devoid of long-range consequences.

As an example, the originally strict law against disclosure of income tax records has eroded to the extent that the Bureau of the Census now uses them and individual states have access to them.

Q) If scientists are working to build a "clean" bomb, why can't other scientists work to build a "clean" computer?

A) Two witnesses said the computer industry, if it wishes to avoid strict government policing in the matter of invasion of privacy, should take the lead itself in building safeguards into the machines, even though it will necessarily mean higher price tags on the machines.

Another witness, however, said there is no scheme devised by man that can't be broken by man.

Q) Whether the proposed government Data Bank is started or not, isn't there a similar danger from private computers being tied together in networks?

A) Two witnesses said this is a very definite danger and that Congress really should address itself to the larger problem of invasion of privacy and not confine itself strictly to any dangers from the proposed government Data Bank.

One witness said the government Data Bank could exist in fact if not in name, agencies exchanging compatible computer tapes without the various computers actually being connected in a network.

Q) Is there a need for the Data Bank?

A) The government already produces masses of statistics, and no one argues that many of them are useful to various segments of the economy—business, universities, government itself, etc. The Data Bank would clearly enable the government to produce more statistics and produce them faster.

But the government witnesses couldn't satisfy GALLAGHER that there is a demonstrated need for greater speed or greater volume.

The statisticians didn't have any statistics on how many requests there are for the information that is already available and how many requests have to be turned down because of the absence of the proposed Data Bank. Hence there can be no cost-benefit ratio, a favorite government measuring stick.

GALLAGHER suggested that the government men go back to their computers and computerize whether a need exists for the data center.

Himself, he sees a mass of statistics emerging—an "electronic garbage pail," as he put it.

One witness saw, along with garbage, the ominous sign of "electronic blackmail."

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post, July 27, 1966]

HOUSE PANEL OPENS HEARINGS ON COMPLEX PROBLEMS—WILL COMPUTER BANK DESTROY PRIVACY?

(By Franklin Reed)

WASHINGTON.—Axiom: Information is power; more information is more power; a great mass of information, instantly retrievable, is great power.

Postulate: Twenty federal agencies collect a great mass of information about private individuals and groups, but the right to privacy is fairly well protected, not so much by law or custom as by the fragmentation of the facts, the unmanageable nature and the inefficiency of the process.

Hypothesis: If the government stores this information in a computer complex, thereby making the process efficient and thus saving money, someone (the programmers, the button-pushers) will have great power.

Question: Would the savings be worth the cost in loss of privacy, in fear to speak out lest some impersonal computer take note of the event, in a mistrust of government, in a great reluctance of citizens to give any kind of information whatever to the government?

Question: If safeguards were built into the computer process to protect the right to privacy, what safeguards are needed? Since safeguards add to the cost, would the expense of them offset the potential savings?

These were the issues defined, the questions asked, as a subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee set forth Tuesday to examine a broad, touchy and complex problem, one of the great social issues of the day.

The subcommittee is considering an Executive Branch proposal to combine the government's storehouses of information into a single computer bank, a proposal that has given rise to eerie visions of an all-seeing eye that collects many facts about individuals and spews them out in personal dossiers.

Subcommittee Chairman CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER suggested that the main problem may be that the country's technology is far outrunning its laws.

A witness, Prof. Charles A. Reich of the Yale Law School, agreed. A computer manufacturing executive told him, "Don't blame the machines; they will do as little or as much as society demands. Blame the laws."

The other witness, author Vance Packard, who wrote "The Naked Society," among other works on invasion of privacy, said:

"Let us remember that 1984 is only 18 years away. Big Brother may come not as a power-greedy despot but rather as a relentless bureaucrat obsessed with efficiency."

Packard saw the possibility of the "ultimate of horrors, a humanity in the chains of plastic tape."

If the proposal must come to pass, he said a necessary safeguard must be that information fed into the computers not be identifiable by person.

Reich fears the proposal might make the U.S. "a nation of people who are afraid. We'll lose what we like best in the American people—they speak up."

Saying that the writers of the Constitution protected the citizens against all invasions of privacy that they knew of at that time, he suggested laws to extend the protection into modern times, namely:

1) The asking of certain types of questions by the government should be prohibited outright.

2) Information given for one purpose should not be used for another purpose, unless there is "a re-justification of the need for it."

3) Citizens should be able to find out what is in government files pertaining to them and to rebut any derogatory information.

"This proposal would tie a tin can around all kinds of people," Reich said, making it impossible for them to get a fresh start, to live down the past. It may cause a great waste of human resources. "There are many people, including some saints, who did something wrong but went on to higher things."

To Reich's tin can remark, GALLAGHER added, "Yes, like the scarlet letter."

The hearing will continue Wednesday.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post, July 28, 1966]

POSSIBILITY DISTURBS HOUSE PROBERS—IS COMPUTER-TAPPING IN OFFING?

(By Franklin Reed)

WASHINGTON.—Wire-tapping, electronic snooping . . . and now there's computer-tapping.

So said Congressman CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER as his subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee continued its probe Wednesday of a proposal to set up a central federal data processing system.

Raymond T. Bowman, assistant director of the Bureau of the Budget, was asked by GALAGHER how information from computers in the various agencies—much of it confidential—would be transmitted to the central computer.

Bowman, one of three government witnesses favoring the so-called "data bank," said the decision had not been reached, and he suggested the hand-carrying of magnetic tape as one means.

GALLAGHER responded that this capability exists now, and he asked if linking the computers in a telecommunications system is not what is really in the offing. Bowman insisted that no decision has been reached.

Chairman GALLAGHER said it is a matter of great concern in the Department of Defense to make its computers secure against what he termed "radiation transmission," whereby someone perhaps parked in a truck a block away can pick up electronic emissions from a computer and translate them into useable data.

The committee's concern is that information (such as income tax returns and census reports) given to the government in confidence could, in a centralized system, be instantly retrievable to embarrass, harass, or otherwise invade the privacy of citizens.

Another witness, research analyst Edgar S. Dunn, said a central computer could be and should be self-policing. "You can tell a computer what not to do, just as you can tell it what to do."

The committee members made these points and got these answers:

1) Assurance should be given that the proposal will not be put into effect without congressional approval. Bowman gave such assurance.

2) The proposal should be submitted to a panel of constitutional experts. Bowman thought it was a good idea but said the director of the Bureau of the Budget would have to give any assurance.

3) The source material fed into the computer should be limited in nature, as well as the statistical end-products. Bowman agreed.

"Are we not . . . placing an unbearable burden of temptation on the keeper of the keys?" GALLAGHER asked, since a small group would possess the great power of a great mass of information, instantly retrievable.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post, July 29, 1966]

DATA BANK SECURITY URGED

(By Franklin Reed)

WASHINGTON.—Without stretching the imagination too far or changing too many words, a person listening to Thursday's testimony on possible invasion of privacy from a computer data-bank could imagine himself as a spectator at the recent automobile safety hearings.

As a subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee concluded its hearings on a proposed central data processing system for the federal government, the group heard from two witnesses, who might be called the Ralph Naders of the computer industry.

They were Paul Baran and Burton Squires of the University of Illinois.

The gist of their testimony was that computers have a great capacity for good and a great capacity for harm; that laws to regulate their use could be helpful but the laws alone will not do the job.

Their suggestion: The industry which created this great advancement must now address itself with equal vigor to equipping it with safety devices.

The same line of reasoning was recently applied to the auto industry.

Squires doubted that the industry will take this step on its own initiative, but Baran said it should be given a chance to do so. In effect he said that federal regulation should be a last step.

"I see a small but growing group within the computer profession beginning to get concerned with invasion of privacy," Baran said.

Because of this hearing, he said, "many of my colleagues will go back to the drawing board."

There is an economic problem, though, Baran said. Safety devices would make computer installations more expensive, and manufacturers would fear losing out in bidding.

Neither witness saw the proposed new federal data bank as truly basic, however; the problem is much larger than that.

With the present exchange of computer tapes that is now going on between government agencies that would be tied into the central data bank, "such a data center would come into existence in effect even if not in name," Squires said.

Just as many short line railroads in the 1800's eventually merged into a vast rail network, and just as many telegraph lines merged into Western Union, there is already a marked trend toward computer systems being wired into each other, even when they are separated by great distances, Baran said.

He suggested that the basic issue is invasion of privacy in the larger sense, not whether a particular proposed computer system would invade privacy.

This analysis so startled the subcommittee chairman, CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, that he said:

"Big Brother appears to be an infant in 1966."

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 5, 1966]

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK—TOO PERSONAL BY FAR

"Monster," "octopus," "a great, expensive electronic garbage pail"—these are among the choicer epithets members of Congress are hurling at the Federal Government's plan to set up a central "data bank" containing lots of information on each and every one of us. In this newspaper's view, the scheme deserves the abuse.

The proposed National Data Center is being pushed by the Budget Bureau ostensibly for the sake of efficiency; centralizing, coordinating and expanding information in the files of various Federal agencies would make the stuff easier to handle and get at. Which, according to a good many opinions expressed at the recent hearings of a House subcommittee, is a large part of the trouble.

The group's chairman, Rep. CORNELIUS GALLAGHER of New Jersey, noted that the pooled information could include a man's schooling, grades, personality traits, credit rating, income, employment and "practically any other aspect of his life." Such a wealth of information in Federal hands is frightening enough, Mr. GALLAGHER thinks, but to make it worse computers are untrustworthy guardians for it.

As a couple of witnesses explained it, the machines lack judgment; they can't take account of changes in people or their motivations or extenuating circumstances in their behavior. Yale Professor Charles Reich observed that information gets less reliable the further it gets from its source in time and distance and is ultimately "petrified" in computers.

The more fundamental objection, of course, is that a central data bank would be a flagrant invasion of privacy and hence an affront to individual liberties. Both Congressmen and several witnesses cited the danger of its getting out of hand and being used for evil purposes.

Federal spokesmen naturally are concerned to change the unfavorable image of their pet project; a Budget Bureau consultant, for example, insisted that the public's idea of the data center computers as some kind of all-seeing Orwellian Big Brothers is nonsense. The rebuttals, though, are anything but reassuring.

Thus the consultant argued that the machines could be told not to blurt out confidential information and could be taught to disguise identities with a special code and sort out trick questions that pose as statistical inquiries but are actually intended to elicit information about individuals.

The disturbing thing about the explanation is that if the machines can be taught all those lessons, somebody has to do the teaching—namely, Government officials would be programing the computers. In other words, if the officials were so inclined they could reverse the safeguards allegedly built in. Depending on who was in control, the machines could indeed become Big Brothers.

We do not suggest that many officials would attempt to abuse the power. Yet the fact is that even as it is, Federal agencies have been known to harass individuals or businesses, just as some of them have not been above electronic prying and other violations of privacy.

In any event, it is a cardinal requirement for a free society that the people do not entrust their liberties to the whims of men in power but rely rather on wise laws to protect them from oppression. Unfortunately, this principle has been much eroded in recent years, and its degeneration tells a good deal about what is wrong in the relationship between individual and Government today.

What is chiefly wrong is that the people have permitted their Government to grow so excessive in size and power that it can hardly help being a threat to them even if it doesn't want to. A Government that taxes so hugely and harshly must acquire a vast amount of information about the citizens. A Government that seeks to subsidize practically every segment of the population must acquire still more. No one can safely assume the information will not be harmfully employed.

Bigness being the trend, we see little likelihood that the Federal obsession with accumulating personal information will be curbed in any near future. But at least it need not be further encouraged. Congress should promptly and emphatically dispatch the Budget Bureau's incipient octopus.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Aug. 9, 1966]

To Preserve Privacy

Can personal privacy survive the ceaseless advances of the technological juggernaut? Many in public and private life now fear to use telephones for conversations they would keep confidential, while the variety of electronic "bugs" available to eavesdrop on even whispered communications staggers the imagination. And young lovers would be well-advised to remember that the skies are increasingly full of sputniks equipped with cameras capable of taking extraordinarily detailed pictures of what transpires under the moon as well as on it. George Orwell foresaw the logical end of this trend in a device that would enable "Big Brother" to keep an eye on everyone anywhere.

The Orwellian nightmare would be brought very close indeed if Congress permits the proposed computer National Data Center to come into being. We already live with the fact that from birth to grave Federal agencies keep tabs on each of us, recording our individual puny existence, monitoring our incomes and claimed deductions, noting when we are employed or jobless, and—through the F.B.I. and similar agencies—keeping all too close watch on what we think or say, what we read and what organizations we belong to.

If this situation is still somewhat tolerable, it is because each agency keeps separate files and it takes some considerable effort to find and bring together all that is known about a particular individual. What is now proposed is the amalgamation of these files, and the creation of a situation in which the push of a button would promptly dredge up all that is known about anyone.

Understandably, this idea has brought vigorous protest, in which we join. Aside from the opportunities for blackmail and from the likelihood that the record of any single past transgression might damage one for life, this proposed device would approach the effective end of privacy. Those Government officials who insist that the all-knowing computer could be provided with safeguards against unauthorized access are no doubt of the same breed as their brethren who "guaranteed" that last November's Northeast electric blackout could never occur. Even the Swiss banks have learned to their own and their clients' sorrow that the device of numbered accounts is inadequate to frustrate determined would-be blackmailers.

Perhaps in the long run the fight to preserve privacy is a vain one. But, like the struggle to preserve life, it must be continued while any shred of privacy remains.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, July 29, 1966]

Tyranny of the Statistic

We are frankly repelled by the proposal to feed to a centralized computer in Washington all the information which 20 government agencies and departments have collected about American citizens.

For one thing, some aspects of a man's life are no business of government. And for another, in this age of the statistic, we must guard most carefully against the temptation to reduce men to a bundle of statistics.

For one or another reason, government agencies increasingly gather information about the personal lives of Americans. This information exists in the individual's dossiers in various government departments. The proposal by the Bureau of the Budget to create a National Data Center would make much more widely available any personal information the various agencies have managed to collect.

Whatever advantages officials may see in such a centralized "dossier bank," the dangers inherent in it are obvious. It would constitute a monstrous invasion of privacy and a threat to the liberties of every American.

One way that the government goes about its task of information gathering is to approach acquaintances of the one under investigation. It is not difficult for a malicious or mistaken impression of another to slip into one's dossier. And once there, however false or misleading, it is the way the computer describes him to all who may have the occasion and opportunity to consult it.

Thus any prejudicial information can be used against the individual without his knowledge or consent. He doesn't know what is in his dossier and so has no opportunity to rebut it. He is, in effect, condemned without due process of law. This situation exists now. The proposed move would merely compound the dangers.

Also repugnant is the fact that dossier information seldom if ever changes, while the individual it purports to describe may have, in the meantime, undergone a radical transformation of character. As Vance Packard put it, "The Christian notion of the possibility of redemption is incomprehensible to the computer."

Still another objection is the conceivable misuse of this information on a grand scale. We don't envision "1984" as the American future, but we do believe that bureaucratic pressure for a National Data Center, unless resisted, could take us a big step down that road.

[From Systems, September 1966]

Computer Abuse Threatens Privacy

Perhaps the most abusive use of the computer yet conceived is being debated in Washington, D.C.—the National Data Center. (See Systems News, Page 9.) This 20 agency pool on the vital cradle-to-the-grave statistics of millions of Americans represents the greatest actual threat to individual privacy yet conceived. It further entwines the citizen's life with his government's to the point of strangulation. It is the apex of bureaucracy and entirely totalitarian in conception.

Since this is the age of protest it is the responsibility of these intimately involved in this industry, both manufacturers and users alike, to be heard in this vital issue. The most dramatic protest would be for computer manufacturers to refuse to bid on this system.

Private industry has shown great integrity in the use of vital computerized statistics. Why can't the independent government agencies collect only the information needed for its particular purpose the way business does? Is it necessary for the Internal Revenue Service in checking Joe Doe's 1984 income tax return to know that in 1966 he missed a payment on his car?

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Daily News, Aug. 2, 1966]

The Big Brother Threat

Big Brother has not actually arrived on the American scene but he is well on the way and should arrive long before George Orwell's fictional 1984. And never mind about Big Daddy.

Down in Washington they are talking about plans for a computerized center that would gather together all the statistics and information the bureaucrats have on all of us—good, bad and indifferent.

At a House subcommittee hearing the other day, voices of alarm were raised by a number of witnesses who branded the plan as a "threat to individual liberty."

Charles A. Reich, Yale professor on constitutional law, argued that without new laws to protect the right to privacy, "we will begin to lose what we like best in the American character: people who are willing to speak up."

There is some hope amid the gloom.

Rep. Cornelius Gallagher (D., N.J.) chairman of the subcommittee and old foe of Government snooping, disclosed at the hearings that the subcommittee was considering legislation that would give individuals the right to inspect what dossiers the Government has on them, both to check them for accuracy and to provide an opportunity to rebut derogatory information.

Now that's more like it—a chance for us little people to talk back to Big Brother—if and when he arrives.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, Aug. 15, 1966]

Big Brother Never Rests

A proposal for a massive centralized computer system in Washington, which ultimately would be able to provide an electronic "dossier" giving everything from an individual's kindergarten grades to his sex habits, is under heavy attack from lawmakers who still place a value on privacy.

The system is advocated by the Bureau of the Budget. Under the plan 20 Federal departments and agencies which now have their own data would pool it in the centralized computer, making the pooled information available to all.

Federal officials favoring the system deny it would be a "Big Brother" device, or that it would invade individuals' privacy.

But this claim was greeted by skepticism in Congress, where many lawmakers recall the numerous "temporary" taxes that have become permanent and the scores of "emergency" government bureaus that have become self-perpetuating, ever-growing monstrosities.

Proponents of the "master system" give assurances that the data would not be given to all comers, but would be restricted to the use of the agencies contributing to the pool. But that adds up to 20 agencies getting new sources of data.

Opponents fear the temptation of bureaucrats to extend the system and eventually abuse it. President Johnson already is relying to a certain extent on computers to locate "the right man for the right job" in his administration. Congressional opponents of the "master computer system" have expressed fears that it may make individuals prisoners of their past, even of a single youthful misstep. They fear it will keep them from "getting a second chance," that stealing a gum drop at the age of 5 will be a permanent blot on their records in the unforgiving computer, and keep them from obtaining and holding jobs.

Representative Cornelius F. Gallagher, of New Jersey, chairman of the House Operations Committee on the invasion of privacy, said the Federal pool could include data on a person's education, grades, credit rating, income, military service, employment and almost anything else. It is the "almost anything else," plus the potentiality of misuse, that leads to nightmarish conjectures.

A similar computer system is being put into effect in Santa Clara County, California, a community of nearly a million, to "save government costs." County officials have made numerous talks praising the anticipated economies, efficiency and speed of the system. Karl Sheel, a data processing division official sometimes called "the father of the Santa Clara system," said the persons worrying about invasion of privacy are "the higher educated people—you might call them dreamers."

No resident has anything to fear, he said, "if you have no arrests, no outstanding warrants against you or if you're not on welfare or if you've stayed out of the clutches of adult probation."

But Clarence Wadleigh of Palo Alto, a graduate student in education at Stanford University, who has studied the program, offered this warning:

"Unlimited capacity for information storage combined with instantaneous retrieval would seem almost irresistible temptation to 'record' more than is warranted and 'retrieve' for unethical or illegal purposes. The toy could easily become a monster."

Critics of massive computerized "dossier" systems have a good point. Most bureaucracies begin as tiny, toddling infants and grow into insatiable monsters. The Internal Revenue Service is one example.

Dossier-keeping was a principal business of the governments of Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy. And it is an all-important function of the governments of Soviet Russia and Red China today.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette, August 1966]

COMPUTER AS BIG BROTHER

(Big Brother, if he ever comes to the United States, may turn out not to be a greedy power seeker, but rather a relentless bureaucrat obsessed with efficiency.)

The above pithy comment was made by Vance Packard in speaking against a huge computerized dossier bank proposed for the federal government by the Budget Bureau. Packard, author of The Naked Society and other books, was one of several witnesses testifying on the proposed dossier bank before a House subcommittee on invasion of privacy.

Fortunately, members of the House group, Democrats and Republicans alike, seem to be against the Budget Bureau plan under which some 20 federal departments and agencies would channel their information on citizens into a centralized computer, which would then make some or all of the consolidated data available to the contributing agencies as well as to state and local governments, research and business concerns and scholars. The pooled information might cover a man's schooling, grades, military service, credit rating, income, employment and even personality traits, according to Congressman CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, the subcommittee chairman.

The evil potential of a centralized electronic card file for Americans is obvious. As Mr. GALLAGHER observed, "We cannot be certain that such dossiers would always be used by benevolent people for benevolent purposes." And Professor Charles A. Reich of the Yale Law School testified pertinently that the dossier bank would be a step toward condemnation without trial, with a great deal of adverse information being supplied without the subject having a chance to answer. Much of the early data on an individual, once it is frozen into the system, would militate against allowances being made for youthful errors, for extenuating circumstances, and for the fact that people change. The data bank has been aptly compared to an unforgetting, unforgiving judge who doesn't give a person a second chance.

Even when it is granted that the pooled information may have some positive uses and may enable the agencies involved to do their jobs more efficiently, the risks of misuse and abuse of a centralized card file seem to us to outweigh the advantages of efficiency. Mr. GALLAGHER was right when he remarked that the government's existing records on individuals, scattered among and guarded by different agencies, are "frightening enough" already without bundling them all together where snoopers can see more in one look.

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News, Aug. 3, 1966]

PERIL TO PRIVACY

Hazards to individual privacy come in many guises: in the increasing availability of devices for probing human behavior and attitudes; in the refinement of electronic "bugging" gadgets; in the flourishing business of prying and peeping carried on by government agencies and business firms; in the spread of psychological tests that demand to know about the individual's inmost thoughts.

The fear of such pervasive threats is by no means academic. That is especially so in an era when the computer, with its incredible capacity for information storage, can become an instrument for dehumanizing men as well as a marvelous technological blessing.

Attesting to the potential for subverting traditional values is the innocent-sounding proposal by the Bureau of the Budget to create a national data center. Under this plan, data now gathered by 20 federal agencies would be fed into a centralized computer.

This enormous statistics pooling has the makings of a massive "dossier bank"—a repository of information of every sort about a man's schooling, military service, personality traits, credit rating, income, employment record, and scores of other normally confidential details.

What is so frightening about this to Rep. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER (D., N.J.) is not merely the bundling of statistics on millions of Americans, but the uncertainty "that such dossiers would always be used by benevolent people for benevolent purposes." Rep. GALLAGHER is chairman of a House subcommittee on invasion of privacy.

Especially disturbing is the possibility that gossip or prejudicial information could become permanent entries in individual case histories, subject to distortion or abuse without an individual's knowledge or opportunity for rebuttal. Computers have long memories. They can't compensate for human errors of judgment, unverified rumors, the redeeming of youthful mistakes, or the obvious risk that unfavorable impressions could lend themselves to condemnation of men without trial.

To Vance Packard, author of "The Hidden Persuaders," a centralized computer recalls the tyranny of existence pictured in George Orwell's "1984." Should Big Brother ever come to these United States, said Mr. Packard, he "may turn out not to be a greedy power seeker, but rather a relentless bureaucrat obsessed with efficiency."

Such fear might seem exaggerated, but there is an undeniably growing tendency in our society to intrude upon individual privacy in the name of antiseptic efficiency, or the welfare of the state, or the refinement of investigative techniques. The potential for mischief conjured up in a national dossier is too repugnant to American traditions for anything but the most scrupulous caution by Congress in writing effective file-gathering safeguards.

[From the Providence (R.I.) Journal, Aug. 1, 1966]

NATIONAL DATA CENTER HAS FRIGHTENING IMPLICATIONS

The presence in the files of the U.S. government of detailed pieces of information about individual citizens "is frightening enough," said Rep. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, D–NJ, the other day. "The thought of them neatly bundled together into one compact package is appalling. We cannot be certain that such dossiers would always be used by benevolent people for benevolent purposes."

Mr. GALLAGHER is chairman of the House subcommittee on invasion of privacy. His comment referred to a specific proposal by the Budget Bureau to gather into a single giant "dossier bank" all the information various government agencies possess about any American citizen.

The idea is certainly attractive from the standpoint of efficiency. Assuming that the information would be properly used at all times with no danger of inflicting harm on anyone, a National Data Center seems an appropriate modernization of the government's record keeping system. Undoubtedly it would simplify the costly, time-consuming, tedious process of gathering information from far-flung sources. There is no question that it would make life easier for harried government officials and their subordinates. It might also facilitate the selection of superior individuals for government job openings. To these might be added numerous other benefits by a National Data Center.

However, the dangers of such a collectivization of personal information are frightening.

For two years congressional committees have been probing the problem of invasion of privacy. Among the government devices that have been used for developing information about individuals are wiretapping and an astonishing assortment of sophisticated electronic instruments, peepholes, lie detectors, personality and psychological tests and monitoring of mail. A number of abusive practices already have been curtailed or eliminated. A number of others are likely to be, or should be.

The right of privacy is one of the most cherished rights of the American society. The Fourth Amendment to the Constitution says: "The right of people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized."

In his book, "The Bill of Rights," Irving Brant, a distinguished historian and journalist says, "It is to guard the privacy and other social rights of every individual, as much as to prevent compulsory self-incrimination, that search warrants are required and the indiscriminate seizure of private papers is forbidden. Such rights and immunities are expressed in the maxim that 'Every man is considered innocent until proven guilty,' and in the aphorism, 'An Englishman's home is his castle.' Procedural due process covers these rights."

Privacy is an established right of all Americans. It does not follow per se that a National Data Center would violate this right. The danger is that existing information and data collected in the future may be employed in a way harmful to the subject, that collated pieces of information may create an incorrect and harmful picture of the subject and that information sought for the center may be collected by methods and for purposes that in themselves may be in violation of the individual's right's.

An infant begins life by having his footprint taken. Throughout life he is fingerprinted and photographed and analyzed beyond any means of prevention. Sometimes it is voluntary, often inducements reduce the exercise of choice, frequently it is without his knowledge. Progress has brought computers and automatic data processing, and logical adaptation is the automation of government personnel records.

The principal concern Americans should have about a National Data Center is that reasonable and effective safeguards for the individual's right of privacy be legislated before such a center becomes operative. The question is highly complex. The subleties are legion. All aspects of the proposal should be studied thoroughly and with the utmost seriousness before anyone is permitted to press a button for easy access to a man's life history.

[From the Arizona Republic, Aug. 7, 1966]

BIG BROTHER WANTS YOU

Most educated Americans are familiar with the grim picture of government bureacracy drawn by George Orwell in his "1984."

But how many know that, as Orwell told English critic Malcolm Muggeridge, the model for his fictionalized Big Brother state was not Soviet Russia, but the British Broadcasting Corporation?

Bureaucracy wears many faces—cumbersome, inefficient, power hungry, stupid, vindictive. But rarely is bureaucracy, in fiction or in fact, other than a necessary evil at best, an unnecessary evil at worst.

The U.S. Budget Bureau's proposed National Data Center is a perfect example of the latter definition.

The bureau has appropriated several hundred thousand dollars to plan the center, whose function would be to collect, record, and file on every American information presently contained in tax records, census questionnaires, military forms, social security records, and documents of the Federal Reserve Board.

In all, data from 20 separate government bureaus will be collected for what the budget bureau's Raymond Bowman straight-facedly maintains would be information for statistical use only.

Imagine the power bureaucracy would have if ever a central clearing house in Washington had access to every item of information, from an individual's credit rating and religious affiliation to his traffic violations and school records.

Much of this information is unevaluated data. But even that which is accurate—for example, items about youthful indiscretions—is, as author Vance Packard noted, incompatible with the Christian notion of the possibility of redemption.

Unless citizens favor federal snoopers prying into every nook and cranny of their private lives, they better make their feelings known. Rep. CORNELIUS GALLAGHER is chairman of the House subcommittee investigating the invasion of privacy, and a card or letter to him will help. Or send your protest to your own senators or representatives.

Otherwise, 1984 may be a lot closer than 18 years away.

[From the Paterson (N.J.) Evening News, Aug. 8, 1966]

A GIANT PEEPING TOM

Twenty Federal departments and agencies now collect and guard the data they hold on every American. The information describes the people from the cradle to the grave. The proposal is to pool all this information in a giant dossier so that everything known about every American will be made instantaneously available.

The pooled information could include a man's schooling, grades, military service, personality traits, credit rating, income, employment and practically any other aspect of his life.

Think of gathering that all and feeding it to a computer and asking it to tell what kind of a man is involved. Rep. CORNELIUS F. GALLAGHER, Hudson Democrat, chairman of a House subcommittee on invasion of privacy, called the presence of such records in government files frightening enough without putting them in an information center to be made available to all government agencies and possibly to private ones as well.

What right should any government agency have to have access to all a man's personal history? Computers are not thinking machines. They report little mistakes made in childhood without explanation of the future that has seen them corrected.

Invasion of privacy, indeed. Such a pool of information would give the government a stranglehold on every one of the population. In the interest of personal freedom it should not be permitted.

[From the Asheville (N.C.) Citizen, Aug. 1, 1966]

WASHINGTON CONSIDERS A PACKAGED DOSSIER

Privacy is no longer possible in America. On a child's application for a college loan or scholarship, a father must reveal information about his financial status that he doesn't even divulge to his wife.

The U.S. Census forms are searching and inquisitive. So are federal tax returns.

An insurance application probes deep into what may be physiological secrets—have you ever had a venereal disease, ever been treated for alcoholism, ever had an insane relative?

Of course, all this information is normally so dispersed that it would be difficult for anybody—a prospective employer, for example, or the FBI—to assemble it on short notice. The fact is mildly comforting.

Comes now, however, some "brain" from the Bureau of the Budget who is proposing that 20 federal agencies feed all their information on individuals into a National Data Center where computers could digest it, compile it, store it, and make it available on request to anybody deemed eligible to receive it.

The plan has some element of economic value—if it were confined to legitimate government purposes. The danger is that it would not be so-confined.

Such a program would create greater distrust than already exists in the public mind about the federal motive and purpose. Inevitably, the assembled information would lead to unauthorized inquisitors.

The proposal goes too far.

Man is a changing animal. He may, in time, rectify his early mistakes of judgment, improve his financial status, cure his diseases. He may revise, and in truth reverse, his juvenile philosophy. But if all his lifetime errors were recorded permanently in the coldly inhuman tape of a mechanical robot, a fair assessment of his worth would be impossible.

Congressman CORNELIUS GALLAGHER, chairman of a House subcommittee on invasion of privacy, calls the presence of these records in government files "frightening enough."

And he adds:

"The thought of them neatly bundled together into one compact package is appalling. We cannot be certain that such dossiers would always be used by benevolent people for benevolent purposes."

The Budget Bureau undoubtedly eyes the plan as a cost-saving move, which it would clearly be. But it has all sorts of implications that Americans generally, in their relative freedom, probably would not accept willingly. Nor do we.

[From the New London (Conn.) Day, Aug. 1, 1966]

RECORDING YOUR LIFE

You'd be surprised—maybe—at how much the government knows about you. You may be even more surprised how blandly certain government officials propose to register every innermost detail of your past in master files, so the whole story can be instantly produced in years to come via a computer.

Rep. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER (D-N.J.) is understandably indignant over a move to gather together all the data the government has, in various files, on individuals—to place these facts in individual all-inclusive files.

Present records are admittedly sketchy, complete in some cases, poor in others. The government has much more general information on persons who have served in the armed forces—or even those examined by draft officials and turned down—than it has about many others.

Yet it still has much intimate information via income tax returns, Social Security records, census blanks, and so on. Others, who have been in trouble with the law, are on file cards in government offices often enough. There are many more sources of information, in fact, in government files. Why gather all this data together—for what purpose? No one seems to have any sensible answer.

Persons who have the strange notion that some details of their lives are their own business, and who also have an abhorrence of nosiness, certainly will agree with the New Jersey congressman that this is an unthinkable suggestion.

[From the Jamestown (N.Y.) Post-Journal, Aug. 8, 1966]

THIS IS JUST DOWNRIGHT SNOOPING

A monstrous "data bank" in which minute information of the greatest personal concern for every individual in the nation would be filed, is being planned by the federal government. The idea, to be known as the National Data Center, is being pushed by the Budget Bureau, but it is bringing epithets down on its head which way up here sound like "monster," "octopus," "a great expensive electronic garbage pail," and some other nasty words. Frankly, we think those choice names are well earned.

It is probably true that some of the information is available in various government offices and supposedly kept in the strictest confidential files. But the assembling of all this data about each of us in a central bank which could on the slightest excuse be made available to most everyone is another matter.

From reports seeping out of Washington the "data bank" would have information on each of us concerning our schooling, our grades, our personality traits, credit rating, income, employment and "practically any other aspect" of our lives, according to Rep. CORNELIUS GALLAGHER of New Jersey. All of this information about us would be poured before the eyes of most anyone seeking it by computers which have no sense of respect for confidential information.

Most of us have a distaste for a computer judgment of our personality traits and we have more than a distaste for a computer telling the world about our incomes or wages and the grades we achieved in school. Except for the requirement to pay our income taxes, we can see no justification for anyone in the government knowing what our income is. From the very beginning of the income tax law this information was supposed to be a secret between the internal revenue department and ourselves. That it has leaked to some others from time to time, under the prying of the more recent government concept of its place in our lives, has brought violent opposition.

Once this "data bank" is established, there is no telling where the accumulation of information about our private lives will end. We hope the members of Congress will rise up in righteous indignation for the people of the nation to stop this Budget Bureau snooping.

[From the Winston-Salem (N.C.) Journal and Sentinel, July 31, 1966]

AN ALL-KNOWING COMPUTER

If the zealots in the Bureau of the Budget are allowed to have their way, we will one day find ourselves at the mercy of a National Data Center. At the outset, this "dossier bank" will consolidate in one centralized computer the personnel record of every government employe. Ultimately, the computer will be expanded to include the life history of every citizen: his schooling, grades, military service, personality traits, police record, employment, income, credit rating and every other item of information alleged to be pertinent or revealing.

Fortunately, this monstrous scheme has encountered the determined opposition of Congressman CORNELIUS GALLAGHER, chairman of the House subcommittee on privacy. In his view, the mere existence of personnel records distributed throughout the various departments of government is already frightening enough. "But the thought of them neatly bundled together in one compact package," he says, "is appalling. We cannot be certain that such dossiers would always be used by benevolent people for benevolent purposes."

Vance Packard, the popular sociologist, seconds this view. When invited to testify before the committee, he complained that "The Christian notion of the possibility of redemption is incomprehensible to the computer." If a man takes one false step in life, the computer will record the error but not the extenuating circumstances that led to it or whether the sinner became any the wiser for having made a mistake. "My own hunch," said Mr. Packard, "is that Big Brother, if he ever comes to the United States, may turn out not to be a greedy power seeker but rather a relentless bureaucrat, obsessed with efficiency."

The Bureau of the Budget is welcome to all the efficiency it thinks necessary to the management of its own affairs, but it can leave the rest of us alone. Congressman GALLAGHER has the right idea. Privacy and dossier banks are incompatible. The bank we can do without.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) Post, Aug. 1, 1966]

PUNCH-CARD DOSSIERS

Government dossiers on private citizens, the historians tell us, originated under the czars of Russia as early as the 18th Century. The Bolsheviks inherited this tradition, improved the old methods of record keeping and passed the knowledge on to Hitler's Gestapo. But it was left for Americans of the mid-20th Century to give this tool of the secret police its ultimate refinement: the punch-card, turned out in infinite quantities by a tireless computer.

While Washington has yet to convert entirely to the automated dossier, it plans to do so. Several hundred thousand dollars, say Rep. CORNELIUS GALLAGHER of New Jersey, have been allotted for the purpose. Hearings on the subject are now being held by Mr. GALLAGHER's subcommittee on government operations.

The case against the computerized Government Data Center, which the Budget Bureau hopes to create, was well summarized in testimony by Charles A. Reich, a Yale professor on constitutional law. It is not enough, Mr. Reich observed, to have the government's solemn promise never to abuse the power it possesses. "Real protection in this world," he cautioned, "comes not from people's good intentions, but from the law. My own hunch is that Big Brother, if he ever comes to these United States, may turn out to be, not a greedy power seeker, but a relentless bureaucrat obsessed with efficiency."

It is this obsession that has led to the proposal of which Mr. Reich complains. Government agencies—in particular, the Bureau of the Budget—insist that a central file must be maintained for efficiency's sake. They are quick to point out that considerable savings will result. And they are full of promises and guarantees designed to set public fears at rest.

As Mr. Reich suggests, promises are not enough. The bureaucrats of tomorrow may or may not feel bound by their predecessors' word. Once the dossiers have been punched out and filed away for ready reference, the temptation to use them will be hard to resist. Mr. Jones is suspected of having seditious inclinations. One little peek at his income tax returns can't hurt.

Then, too, a computer's capacity for knowledge is almost limitless. If efficiency brings this monster forth, will efficiency not also require that the monster's capacity be put to use? All that unused filing space will seem an awful waste. The conscientious bureaucrat's inclination will be to fill it up, and new data will be sought. This, in turn, will make poor Jones' file all the more tempting.

No one wishes to handicap the government by imposing unreasonable restraints. A certain amount of record-keeping is inevitable. But much of what passes for inevitable is not. It is doubtful, for example, that any compelling public need is served by a national census—like that in 1960—of bathrooms and TV sets. Yet the government engages in this sort of impertinence with scarcely a thought. The only restraint on its curiosity seems to be the limited ability of its files to absorb.

Amid the quest for knowledge—any knowledge, all knowledge—it is easy to lose sight of overriding considerations. The government needs vital information, to be sure. But the citizen needs to have his rights protected, too. And among these is the right not to have his private affairs folded, mutilated, and spindled.

[From the Benton Harbor, News-Palladium, Aug. 1, 1966]

CENTRALIZED COMPUTER THREAT TO FREEDOM?

New Jersey Rep. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER is rightfully worried about what could be a great wrong. The Democrat congressman is concerned that somehow, some way, some day the government may gather together into one computerized system all of the information on individual citizens it now has available in separate departments. And fanciful though it may sound, the congressman has a point.

For instance: on one person the government may have collected statistics from sources as diverse as social security files, military records, census responses, credit reports, tax returns, insurance forms, police files, court records, payroll records, and more. The list of information sources to the government is almost endless and includes such supposedly "secret" information as civil service background checks on everybody who has ever applied for a government job. The hitherto "confidential" F.B.I. files are full of absolutely unsubstantiated accusations, consisting at least partially of mere gossip, against thousands of perfectly good, loyal citizens.

"Now what would happen," the lawmaker wants to know, "if somebody fed all of this stuff into one computer system instead of the myriad of places it now reposes?" And he has a point.

The man who held the key to extracting all of this collected material from the "super brain" would have more power at his command than almost any other person in government. Need campaign contributions? Then let's see what the computer has to say as a result of the confidential business information collected by the census bureau. Ah, here it is. Either he kicks in or we "leak" this secret to his competitors and put him out of business.

Or maybe a senator's vote is needed on a key issue. The obliging computer tells all—and it tells that back in 1944 the senator was involved in some kind of a vice-ring investigation by the F.B.I. during which it was alleged that he took a cut of the cake. Obviously he'll see it wise to vote our way.

As Rep. GALLAGHER points out, the threat is not so much in the information itself as in the way access to it is provided. The information now serves a useful, legitimate purpose to each department of government where it is kept. But should it become centralized—and the trend to centralization is clear—then the danger to individual liberty and free government of men under the law is clear.

The congressman will be holding hearings on the issue in search of a solution. It seems one is needed.

Of course, if no one cared about his or her reputation, that would be a different matter. Or if all the truth were told about all of us, then, too, the situation would not represent a threat. Anyone with a reasonably good batting average for moral conduct, would have nothing to fear.

But that's not the way society works.

[From the Kalamazoo (Mich.) Gazette, Aug. 19, 1966]

BUDGET BUREAU SHOULD ABANDON NATIONAL DATA CENTER IDEA

The Budget Bureau in Washington claims to be investigating "many ways" to reduce the costs and inconvenience of numerous federal statistical inquiries.

Any time a federal agency embarks on a cost-saving project, it is news. It makes welcome reading for the taxpayer, even if he is cynical enough to expect that funds saved in one federal bureau will be spent by the next one down the hall.

Not as welcome in the reports of the Budget Bureau's study is the announcement that it is considering establishment of something called the National Data Center.

Rep. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, D-N.J., chairman of a special House subcommittee on invasion of privacy, says he is concerned at the implications of a centralized computer facility "into which would be poured information collected from various government agencies and from which computers could draw selected facts."

We believe his apprehension to be well-founded and hope that the New Jerseyite will persevere in his efforts to "create a climate of concern" about the possibility of a massive storehouse of facts dealing with confidential information about individual citizens.

Some 20 federal departments or agencies now collect and publish data. Included are the Internal Revenue Service, the Census Bureau, the Office of Education, the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Bureau of Old Age and Survivors Insurance.

Americans have been dutifully supplying such agencies with information for years with the understanding that it would be used only by the receiving agency, for a specific purpose and usually on a confidential basis.

Now it is suggested that much of this material be pooled in a central source. Presumably, disclosure restrictions would be adhered to. But as Rep. GALLAGHER says: "The effectiveness of these laws in some cases, is dubious." He said he considers the national data bank as a possible first step toward establishment of individual dossiers on every person in federal records, a prospect he feels to be "appalling."

One of the witnesses called to testify before the Gallagher subcommittee late in July was author Vance Packard, whose book "The Naked Society" dealt with invasion of privacy. Packard was opposed to the National Data Center idea.

"The file keepers of Washington have derogatory information of one sort or another on literally millions of citizens . . . My own hunch is that Big Brother, if he ever comes to these United States, may turn out not to be a greedy power seeker but rather a relentless bureaucrat obsessed with efficiency."

The Budget Bureau is to be commended for its announced intent to increase efficiency and save money. But it should abandon its flirtation with the computerized data center idea.

We don't believe the people—or their elected officials—would go along with it.

[From the Hornell (N.Y.) Tribune, Aug. 15, 1966]

Too Much Intrusion

Many government officials regard efficiency as a one-way street. They are horrified by the mere suggestion their own bailiwicks might need streamlining or perhaps should be eliminated.

But let anything—including a system of checks and balances—stand in the way of their professional ambitions and they love to fall back on the cause of efficiency to justify removal of the obstacle.

An example is the proposal to establish a central "data bank" in the federal government. This would consist of a computerized depository of information about each citizen.

Although witnesses appearing before a House subcommittee in defense of the proposal by the Budget Bureau have been hazy about just what kind of information the bank would contain, the purpose would be to collect information now on file in hundreds of government offices.

This could include everything from medical records to grades earned in school from the earliest years through college—and much more. According to Rep. Cornelius Gallagher, chairman of the subcommittee which considered the proposal, personality traits, credit rating, income, employment and "practically any other aspect of his life" of each American would be on file for federal officials, and possibly state and local counterparts as well, to use at will.

Congressman Gallagher thinks, as do many of his colleagues and every freedom-loving American, that such a Big Brother concept is dangerous to individual liberties. But the New Jersey Congressman's objectives go beyond principle to the practical operation of such an all-knowing information center.

Computers are not fit guardians of personal histories because they lack judgment in at least two important respects: they divulge their data to anyone able to push the correct button, and they lack the human quality of being able to evaluate the information they contain.

Individual personality traits, interests, ambitions, desires and talents change over the years, but these changes escape the coldly accumulated and perpetually stored data in a computer. Efficiency in this case would be bought at a dear cost to individual privacy.

[From the Shenandoah (Pa.) Herald, Aug. 4, 1966]

Data Center Dilemma

On the face of it, the idea of a federal computerized data center packed with information about all American citizens may seem rather attractive. There is little doubt that such a center, providing ready access to all sorts of data about individuals and groups, would improve governmental efficiency and cut down on the wasteful business of having information duplicated in various agencies.

A crucial question must be asked, however: How much of a price do we want to pay for efficiency? Before Congress takes any steps toward approval of the proposed data center, it should do some careful thinking about the result.

Valuable cautionary observations on this subject have been made by Rep. Cornelius Gallagher of New Jersey. Gallagher, who is chairman of a special House subcommittee on invasion of privacy, has warned that there can be no guarantee that confidential information stored in a computerized data center "would always be used by benevolent people for benevolent purposes." It is a warning to be pondered.

Gallagher notes that records in such a data center might include such items about an individual as personality traits, credit status, employment history "and practically any other aspect of his life." As he said, "the presence of these records in government files is frightening enough, but the thought of them neatly bundled together into one compact package is appalling."

It does not follow that one who feels anxieties of this kind is against progress—against government use of technological advances. But in using the fruits of technology to progovernment has a prime responsibility to protect hard-won individual rights. Gallagher put it well: "We simply want to make sure that human dignity and civil liberties remain intact." That is the heart of the problem.

[From the Danville (Ill.) Commercial-News, Aug. 2, 1966]

Our Opinions—"Big Brother" Peril to Public

If the Bureau of Budget has its way, a hungry computer in Washington soon will gobble up information about you and others.

That may include facts about your schooling, grades, military service, personality traits, credit rating income, employment and, according to one congressman, "practically any other aspect of your life."

Then, on command, some or all of that information will be spewed out again to any of 20 federal agencies, plus scholars, state and local government, research and business concerns.

"The thought of (this information) neatly bundled together in one compact package is appalling," said Rep. Cornelius Gallagher, D-N.J. "We cannot be certain that such dossiers would always be used to benevolent purposes." Gallagher is chairman of the House subcommittee on invasion of privacy which is investigating this National Data Center plan.

One of the dangers cited by Gallagher and other witnesses is that catalogued individuals can't be certain that information stored away on them is accurate, even though it may be used by any number of persons or agencies to judge them.

To offset this, Gallagher may introduce legislation which would permit individuals to see some of the personal investigation reports poured into government computers. Necessary exceptions would include reports affecting national security or a government employer-employe relationship.

But even that suggestion falls short of fully protecting the individual. A citizen also should have the chance to challenge an inaccurate report before an impartial board established by legislation.

If the "Big Brother" data center is approved, at least these legislative safeguards should be invoked. The U.S. Constitution gives a citizen the right to confront witnesses against him in a trial. Surely he also has the right to set the record straight if some bureaucratic computer is fed a false fact that could gravely affect his life.

[From the Greeley (Colo.) Tribune, July 30, 1966]

Computerized Citizens

Computerization is a tremendous assistance in making both business and government more efficient. But apparently this technological marvel, unless used with discretion, can become a monster that might eventually turn on man and deprive him of his individual freedom.

The possible danger in computerization has been pointed up by hearings before a House subcommittee on a proposal to establish a computerized data center for the federal government. The center would consolidate information on Social Security and income taxes and possibly even such things as school children's family background, employment records and even credit status.

Vance Packard, author of "The Hidden Persuaders" and "The Naked Society" spoke rather vividly about the danger, saying that "a relentless bureaucrat obsessed with efficiency," aided by increased computerization of American life, "could lead us to that ultimate of horrors, a humanity in the chains of plastic tape."

Packard warned that increased computerization tends to "encourage a depersonalization of American life" and might affect the "life chances of people * * *. The computor," he said, "is incapable of making allowances for early errors or indiscretions." He opposed the data center, he said, unless individual identities were separated from the data.

The subcommittee chairman, Rep. Cornelius E. Gallagher of New Jersey said there is concern about the data being brought together for "a composite picture of an individual recorded in a single informational warehouse, where the touch of a button would assemble all the governmental information about the person since his birth."

The government, Gallagher said, cannot be certain that the data center will always be used by persons with proper motives. Earlier he had said: "People worry about who has the button on nuclear weapons. We've got to start worrying about who has the button on the computer."

The proposed data center would doubtless be a great convenience for government agencies and a big help to them in stepping up efficiency and reducing the wastefulness of overlapping efforts to gather information about Americans.

Nevertheless, for the sake of safeguarding civil liberties and human dignity, the subcommittee should give careful consideration to the words of Sen. Edward V. Long of Missouri. "Somewhere along the line toward government efficiency," he said, "we must cease pushing our citizens into the computer."

Computerized Man

During the past year, no less than half-a-dozen congressional subcommittees have investigated some phase or other of issues concerning invasion of privacy. As a result, corrective measures were taken.

However, a new and reportedly more insidious kind of snooping may soon find a niche in the American way of life.

This latest threat to an individual's rights involves governmental plans for establishment of a computerized federal data center which would assume the role of "Big Brother" to every American citizen.

The plan calls for a computerized federal data center which would keep a dossier on every individual. Initially, the proposed data center would bring together in one place all the statistics collected today by more than 20 federal agencies. With computers and central files under one federal bureau, it would take only a split second to tap the store of data on virtually any person in the country—federal employee or otherwise.

No sooner did word leak out of the proposed data bank center than a House subcommittee on invasion of privacy, headed by Rep. Cornelius E. Gallagher (D., N.J.)—who for a long time has been relentlessly fighting all kinds of snooping—announced it was about to begin hearings on the hotly-contested issue.

Warning against the dangers of what he described as a "computerized man," GALLAGHER has expressed fears that unless proper safeguards are taken, such a data bank conceivably could dwarf anything stemming from electronic eavesdropping and other modern snooping devices.

Hopefully—with GALLAGHER's committee in action again—this latest threat to an individual's right to privacy may be checked in the spawning stage. Or should the need for such a center be genuine, then perhaps the government should prepare safeguards now as to who would have the power to push what computer buttons under what conditions.

Already, society requires extensive record-keeping on every individual. This process begins at birth with the foot-printing of a newborn infant and ends with the cause-of-death notation on the death certificate.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post, July 24, 1966]

DOSSIERS BY COMPUTER

Viewed one way, the present method of federal record-keeping is an inefficient mess.

Faced with an enormous, expanding population, the more than 20 federal agencies which collect information about individual American citizens keep their own sets of records. Duplications occur. Information needed by one agency might be held by another. Most of these agencies guard their data zealously to prevent prying. Quite obviously, a system such as this could take a good deal of streamlining.

One way to make things run more efficiently would be to establish a federal data center and to centralize records, put the records on computer tapes so that at a push of a single button information could be made available swifty and accurately.

Such is the case for efficiency, and such is the burden of a proposal to establish a new federal data center, a proposal that must be studied with great caution. For although it may be much easier to centralize records for a 200-million population than to have them scattered about the countryside, it would also conceivably be less difficult to violate the rights of 200 million with considerable ease and efficiency.

Rep. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, D–NJ, who has scheduled hearings late this month on the proposed data center, considers the proposal a great potential danger.

Says GALLAGHER:

"As time goes on, there will be great pressure to include more and more individual data in the computers. Theoretically, it would be possible to press a button and obtain an instantaneous dossier on any one of millions of people."

This information, deposited in a central location, could come from federal tax returns, census reports, Social Security data, military records, security files, fingerprints, mortgage guarantee and other federal sources. GALLAGHER warns that if local and state information were included the computers could produce school records, police files, records of traffic violations and property holdings. It would be no more difficult to include credit and bank reports.

Cautions GALLAGHER:

"Our government should decide now just who will have the power to push what computer buttons under what conditions. We cannot safely presume that all of this information will always be used by benevolent people for benevolent purposes.

"The technology of computerization has raised new horizons of progress. It also brings with it inherent dangers. The greatest of these dangers is that we allow ourselves to drift into a course that will substitute a computer for man's free will."

Government agencies have a right to a limited amount of personal information so that they may conduct the public's business. They are entitled to no more. Even those records are and should be stringently kept from prying eyes.

The problem, however, is even larger than this. Just because it is possible for a computer to do something is not a complete reason for its being allowed to do it. The present system is obviously flawed, but in the very character of its imperfections there are protections against unwarranted snooping.

If the problem of record-keeping is large, and important, the problem of protecting individual rights is larger.

Efficiency is not the answer to every problem.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 29, 1966]

CENSUS OUT OF HAND

How much money do you make? What's the condition of your plumbing? Does any member of your family suffer physical or mental handicaps? Did you vote in the last election? Oh yes, just so our computer can keep track of you, what's your social security number? Failure to answer is punishable by fine and imprisonment.

No, that's not a police state. It's just the U.S. census in action, as the outlook for 1970 was described by Census Bureau Director A. Ross Eckler before a Congressional committee the other day.

Mr. Eckler, of course, defended the whole thing. He even added that the Bureau would like to ask questions about religion, but probably won't. Not many people would object, he guessed, except that publicity by opponents of the idea has made it an "emotional" issue.

The Census Bureau, Mr. Eckler assured everyone, does not make information on individuals available to outsiders or other agencies. Therefore personal records could not be used against anyone, nor could its computer tapes wind up in any national dossier bank.

Maybe so, but the story has a familiar ring. Look up what Government bureaucrats have said about wiretapping and what was subsequently revealed in court. And just how can Mr. Eckler be so confident about what his successor will do in, say, 1984?

Dossier banks and computers aside, it seems to us the Census Bureau is badly out of hand. A census is necessary to reapportionment, and few citizens probably would object to most questions pertinent to legislation and other necessary government functions. But the Bureau's criterion for questions apparently is not why?, but why not?

It intends, for example, to study the spread of color television. It wants to know more about the assimilation of the foreign born. Religious questions, their advocates say, would tell a lot about interfaith marriage.

None of this has much pertinence, much less necessity, to proper government. True, it may be nice for the Census Bureau to provide such information for business and academic interests. But data often can be gathered well enough for these purposes through sample surveys relying on voluntary cooperation.

With the spread of governmental and other violations of privacy and common decency, the Bureau's broad power of compulsion seems ripe for Congressional review. What kind of society would propose to send someone to jail for refusing to say if he voted or whether his children are retarded?

[From the Tyler (Tex.) Telegraph, July 25, 1966]

IF YOU'RE STORED IN THE COMPUTER—

Government files are packed with information about millions of citizens. This data is scattered among record-keeping sections of the various federal agencies. Generally, under the present governmental structure, the presence of such a growing mass of information, some of it rather personal, can be called necessary—if properly controlled.

But at least one public official in Washington sees in the accumulation the omen of possible intimidation in the future.

That grim possibility is sensed by Congressman GALLAGHER, New Jersey Democrat.

He's uneasy lest the great mass of data on the citizenry will someday be centralized and stored in computers.

GALLAGHER's concern is summed up in The Milwaukee Journal:

"Various agencies already are the dumping ground for everything from the most innocently routine information to confidential, derogatory and sometimes wholly unsubstantiated gossip about millions of citizens. The civil service commission has the results of background checks on everybody who ever applied for a government job. Confidential business information is collected by the census bureau. The internal revenue service squirrels away masses of data on taxpayers. Enforcement agency files bulge with dossiers, many of them unchecked."

Consider, then, the possible consequences if this flood of facts and unverified claims ever get into the wrong hands. That's the possibility that is upsetting the New Jersey congressman. The potential for intimidation and blackmail is indeed present and it is disturbing to think about.

GALLAGHER properly is doing more than thinking about the possibilities. He and his House government operations subcommittee have plans to look into the whole matter, beginning in the next few weeks, at public hearings. The whole unsavory prospect needs to be aired out for the peace of mind of all citizens.

[From Computing Newsline, July 29, 1966]

COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY RECEIVING ITS FIRST INVESTIGATION IN REGARD TO THE NEED FOR ESTABLISHING ETHICAL AND LEGAL PROTECTION AS WELL AS TECHNOLOGICAL SAFEGUARDS FOR CERTAIN SYSTEM APPLICATIONS

Newsline believes the issues involved are vital concern to the computer community. It is not enough for us to assure the public-at-large that we are "good for you." It is essential that this community assume its burden of responsibility in making certain that the technology is not advertently or inadvertently applied to the harm of individuals and individual businesses. Social responsibility is no longer an abstract term. The hearings reported here are the first of their kind to ever be held. They will not be the last.

House of Representatives Government Operations special subcommittee on invasion of privacy held three-day hearings this week on potential dangers of a centralized "electronic dossier" Data Bank. Headed by CORNELIUS GALLAGHER (Dem.) New Jersey, purpose of the hearings was to establish a "climate of concern" regarding Bureau of the Budget proposal for a Data Bank that would combine all personal and business files now being maintained by different government agencies. Motive? Efficiency.

Rep. GALLAGHER's concern is that there is presently some protection of invasion of privacy inherent in the fact that the files are decentralized. But that bringing all data together, plus pressures to add new information, could result in a breakdown of privacy protection and a potential misuse of the information to exercise power and control over individuals and businesses. For example, FHA files include confidential information on the marital stability of applicants, Civil Service Commission files cover a widely disparate range of information, to quote one columnist, the FBI includes ". . . raw files (that) contain unsubstantiated gossip against many thousands of perfectly good citizens . . .", IRS holds detailed financial and business data. Etc., Etc., Etc., through agency after agency. Many have reciprocity with credit companies, industry personnel files and other private "data" records.

The hearings saw government spokesmen assume committee that they were men of good faith, that of course they would hold faith with the individual's rights, and how could the committee possibly not have faith in their good faith? When asked what information would be included in the proposed Data Bank, what protection of privacy would be built into the system, who would have access to what information—the Data Bank men could not give specific answers. The committee wasn't impressed. Representatives from the computer community who were invited to testify expressed concern over what would be a natural and unavoidable trend towards multiplicity of data once a system was established, and over expansion of multiple access to the data. They also stated that present hardware is not sufficient safeguard against unauthorized persons tapping into the files. The committee understood what they were talking about.

"A priori" to any of the above concerns, is a constitutional and legal test of the unbridled "investigating" being done by government and industry, the practices used in obtaining the information, and the disposition of the "data." In Newsline's opinion, it is in most cases a gross violation of basic human rights and dignity as guaranteed by the Constitution. Further, the files are used in such a way as to become trial without representation, trial largely by hearsay, trial without recourse, trial conducted under deceitful and deceptive cover-ups. ("You've been investigated before, you just never knew it." * * * "Saying he (the investigator) is representing an automobile insurance company is just a door-opener." Etc., Etc., Etc. "Confidential" information on individuals, and undoubtedly on businesses, is for sale by government agencies and private agencies. It is impossible to conceive of any practice in sway today that could possibly be more contemptible and rottenly offensive to every sensitivity of human ethics. And it places the person or the business being investigated completely on the defensive. "You don't h-a-v-e to answer the questions." "You c-a-n object."—and then where do you get a job, where do you get insurance—or whatever is involved. *"What's the matter, aren't you perfect?"* "You are? Then you don't have anything to w-o-r-r-y about do you?" This is the way it sometimes goes.

Newsline touched on this subject in issues 12 and 13. We believe that the matter being investigated by Rep. Gallagher's committee is only a scratch on the surface. It is a considerable relief that men of good faith are aware. It is a considerable relief that members of the computer community feel that this community has a full burden of share of responsibility. However, their sincere and considerable efforts to ensure safeguards in the system, will be of no avail if the individual and the individual business is not legally protected, and if the information in the files should not be there in the first place.

Further reading: Big Brother Computer—Henry C. Wallich, Newsweek, July 25. A Clear and Future Peril—Ernest Conine, Los Angeles Times, July 19. Does The Interconnected Computer Network Pose a Hidden Threat of Invasion of Privacy?—Testimony by Paul Barron, Rand Corp., Santa Monica, Calif. Before the Special Subcommittee on Invasion of Privacy of the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Government Operations.

Some quotes: ". . . The federal government's chief personnel investigator, Kimbell Johnson of the Civil Service Commission, is conscious of the power he and other investigators wield. 'Whenever a bureaucracy amasses files about its citizens an inherent threat to liberty exists.' . . . To Walter Skallerup, deputy assistant secretary of defense, the whole process of personnel investigation is distorted by the preoccupation with turning up 'dirt.' He urges a system aimed at discovering talent, rather than spotless mediocrity . . ." Federal Snooping and Search for Certitude—Los Angeles Times, May 29.

"This may sound pessimistic, but if one can save money automating a data system it is only a matter of time until it happens. The only questions are when and how. I would like to add the further distressing thought that we may already be well along in the creation of the very system whose needs and dangers we are discussing today . . ." Paul Barron testimony.

NEWSLINE admits to no compromise on this issue—government or industry. The prime target so far has been government. We suggest that industry be subjected to equal scrutiny. Just possibly, they could make government practices look like the work of ingenues. We further completely refute the protestations of men who say they are "of good faith and will protect invasion of privacy." The very atmosphere and methods used for collecting information are directly inconsistent with any awareness or adherence to the principles of "good faith."

Edward P. Morgan and the News, July 26, 1966

Economy and efficiency are bywords of the materialistic American dream. They are the touchstones in the foundations of success, the keystones in the arches of progress. And now they threaten, after a fashion—and a sinister fashion at that—to collapse an individual's world about him and leave him as nothing but a squashed statistic in the rubble.

At least that is the fear of some people, including Congressman Cornelius E. Gallagher of New Jersey who has been conducting a House Government Operations subcommittee investigation of government's alleged invasion of privacy. The subcommittee's inquiries so far have divulged some shockingly arrogant practices—including probes of the sex life of prospective stenographers—and have produced some heartening promises.

In starting a new phase of hearings today, Congressman Gallagher announced that many federal departments and agencies have either abandoned the use of objectionably intimate personality tests, put them on a voluntary basis or greatly modified their use. Also government contractors are being urged to use the same restraint the Civil Service Commission now employs with such testing of federal personnel. And the Census Bureau, he said, has adopted new procedures to protect the privacy of farmers, their families and hired hands in answering questions on the farm census.

But the federal government has already collected such massive data on American citizens that creation of a national data center, or what Gallagher calls a central dossier bank, has been suggested for the swift interchange of information. This is the subject which now holds the subcommittee somewhat anxiously trans-fixed. One of its first witnesses today, possibly outdoing the committeemen's own anxiety, was Vance Packard, author of "The Hidden Persuaders." "The Naked Society," and other books about the threat to individual freedoms.

"In recent years," he said, "we have seen an enormous growth in techniques for observing, assessing, controlling, keeping track of and exchanging information about people . . . We have the hidden tape recorders, the lie detectors, the undercover agents, the personality assessors and the bureaucratic investigators." And their roles have been vastly simplified by the proliferation of records, the ingestion and regurgitation of these data by computers. Records on individual Americans, he said, now number in the billions.

Under the pressures alone of more economy and efficiency in government—without any Big Brother motivations at the outset—it was natural, logical and inevitable that federal agencies would look around for ways to pool their data on people. It is not generally known but the Johnson administration is using computers to aid in the discovery of talent for federal jobs. The Budget Bureau has a committee studying the feasibility of a computerized government data center, plucking information from separate files at 20 different government offices, the International Revenue Service, the Census Bureau and the Social Security Administration among them.

But Sociologist Packard saw the grim prospect here, not of a deliberately totalitarian-minded type with an eye on everything, everywhere as in George Orwell's "1984," but of a "relentless bureaucrat obsessed with efficiency" leading us into "that ultimate of horrors, a humanity in the chains of (a computer's) plastic tape." He opposed a national data center without assurances that individual identities would be separated from the data.

Congressman Gallagher, however, rejoined darkly that cost-conscious bureaucrats might settle for what he called "quick and dirty" computer systems—quickly put together without safeguarding the individual's privacy—because experience at the Pentagon showed that such safeguards increased the cost of the system from three to 10 times.

Packard observed that people are "increasingly and rightly" resentful of being treated as computer-controlled numbers. "This resentment," he added, "is believed to be a factor in the student unrest at the vast state universities, where the student's exams may be machine-graded and his ID number is often printed twice as large as his name."

"What we are looking for," said Chairman Gallagher at the outset, "is a sense of balance. We do not want to deprive ourselves of the rewards of science; we simply want to make sure that human dignity and civil liberties remain intact."

They are not entirely intact at the moment and whether a computer can be taught to be tender with them remains to be seen, especially when man himself can't seem to learn to be reasonable with his fellow-man.

This is Edward P. Morgan saying good night from Washington.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sentinel,
Aug. 18, 1966]

Capitol Spotlight—What Is Jewish View on New U.S. Electronic "Invasion of Privacy"?

(By Milton Friedman)

Should Jewish and other religious groups be concerned about proposals for a national data center or "data bank," electronically offering the most intimate computerized details on all citizens?

A Congressional special subcommittee on invasion of privacy is deeply concerned about the implications of an automated data bank. The three members are troubled lest individual rights are brushed aside as automated machinery advances to general public.

The subcommittee chairman, Rep. Cornelius E. Gallagher, New Jersey Democrat, said the systematic accumulation and use by the government of personal information "strikes at the core of our Judeo-Christian concept of forgive and forget, because the computer neither forgives nor forgets."

THREAT TO MINORITIES

Another member, Rep. Benjamin S. Rosenthal, New York Democrat, said: "Jews and other minorities must face the challenge of a threat to the fabric of democracy and the dignity of the individual. The data bank envisaged could become a Gestapo-concept, furnishing by push-button from coast to coast a complete list of all Zionist, integrationists, pacifists, Seventh Day Adventists, or Roman Catholics. Such information could be exploited by a police state or by unscrupulous individuals even in the free society we now enjoy."

Rep. ROSENTHAL called for "a system of safeguards as sophisticated as the most advanced computer data concepts." He said that he considered the problem appropriate for consideration by the major religious faiths because of the moral and ethical issues involved.

The third member of the subcommittee, Rep. FRANK J. HORTON, New York Republican, said that "advanced technology must not be paid from the accounts of individuality. For, as Justice Brandeis said, 'we are all entitled to be let alone.' "

Rep. HORTON appealed to Jewish and other religious leaders "to take a long look at tendencies that would undermine individuality and privacy."

Rep. GALLAGHER saw the prospect of a "computerized man." "Through the standardization ushered in by technological advance," he said, man's "status in society would be measured by the computer, and he would lose his personal identity. His life, his talent and his learning capacity are reduced to a tape with very few alternatives available."

A complete new environment is being produced by the computer. The government is already using "heuristic machines" that learn. Others devise their own route to a goal or solution, and devise strategies for the Near East or Viet Nam. The military-industrial complex has been strengthened by the computer. National computer power is doubling every year. In 1956, there were fewer than 1,000 computers. Today, there are 30,000. By 1967, according to the forecast of the computers themselves, there will be 100,000.

A decade ago, such machines were capable 12 billion computations per hour. Now they can do 20 trillion. In another 10 years, they will attain 400 trillion—or about two billion computations per hour for every man, woman and child. The government will be in a position to know the name of every book a person has borrowed from a public library, every organization or cause he supported, or his grandparents' names, religion and country of origin—all available on five minutes notice.

Rep. GALLAGHER is troubled that "Big Brother" will be here even before "1984" and that George Orwell's projection might prove modest. The congressman wants to create a climate of concern now "in the hope that guidelines can be set up which will project the confidentiality of reports and prevent invasion of individual privacy, while at the same time allowing the government to function more efficiently and facilitating the necessary research of scholars in statistical analysis."

He said: "The problem is potentially serious; its advance solution urgent. It has been designated in the 1967 U.S. budget to start a data bank program."

CENTRAL DATA POOL

Information on every citizen, from cradle to grave, would be pooled in one big central source. Records would cover ancestry, schooling, military service, medical and mental treatment, employment, personality traits, religious and political affiliations, credit status, and virtually every aspect of human existence.

Rep. GALLAGHER said: "The presence of these records in government files is frightening enough, but the thought of them neatly bundled together into one compact package is appalling. We cannot be certain that such dossiers would always be used by benevolent people for benevolent purposes."

He cited the danger of overzealous or unethical officials learning "the inner secrets of an individual." He asked: "Shall we create an elite who can narrow and dominate the corridor of power?"

[From the Evansville (Ind.) Courier,
Aug. 5, 1966]

BEHIND THE NEWS—BIG BROTHER NOT HUMAN

(By Andrew Tully)

WASHINGTON.—I will appear a frightened append to author Vance Packard's assertion that the American people should be "scared stiff" of big government's proposal to pull together all the scattered bits of information about them in one giant "dossier bank." It is an affront to the individual's constitutional right to confront his accuser and a step toward condemnation without trial.

Packard, one of the witnesses at hearings before a House subcommittee headed by Rep. CORNELIUS GALLAGHER, D.-N.J., is speaking for mankind's right to be left alone when he warns that if Big Brother ever materializes in this country he will turn out to be "a relentless bureaucrat obsessed with efficiency." For it is in efficiency's name that the figure-mad Budget Bureau seeks to feed information from 20 federal agencies into a gargantuan centralized computer.

As Packard and other expert witnesses have noted, the dossier bank would establish a doctrine of no second chance for the individual who might have pilfered a candy bar when he was 8 years old. Indeed, Packard has told the story of a man who couldn't get a job in a department store because his record showed he had stolen $2 worth of fishline when he was 13.

What the Budget Bureau has neglected to mention—if it gives a hoot—is that the computer lacks a quality basic to the American system of justice, to wit, it is not human.

No matter how efficient a computer may be, it cannot comprehend the Christian notion of the possibility of redemption. Moreover, there is no guarantee even in this best of all possible worlds, that as GALLAGHER put it, "such dossiers would always be used by benevolent people for benevolent purposes."

There are jokers in Washington political jobs I wouldn't trust with the information that I have read the Bobbsey Twins.

Besides, the government already knows too much about us—its purported proprietors. Those sly file keepers and political voyeurs have collected tens of millions of derogatory pieces of information on the citizenry. And although our Social Security numbers are supposed to be secret, they are used every day to check on our movements.

Contemplating this latest invasion of privacy, the average taxpaying sucker must wonder what porcine mind has taken over in the nation's capital. The pooled information would include not only data on a man's schooling, grades, credit rating, military service and job history but sordid little comments on his "personality traits."

If at any time of his life a citizen is regarded by a nosy neighbor as a trifle giddy he is labeled giddy until he dies by the computer.

This violates not only the citizen's right not to be defamed, but his right to know what is being said about him so he can correct any inaccuracies or libels. Once the information goes to the government, it is filed away, and even if it becomes outdated no one can change it. In the words of another witness, Yale Law Professor Charles Reich, the information literally is "petrified" by that unforgiving, unforgetful judge—the computer.

The average American has rocks in his head if he believes Big Government's assurances that these dossiers will be used only to oil the machinery of government. That government is operated by people and both Hitler and the Communist bosses have revealed what too much power does to people. I will listen to a bureaucrat's protestations of his good intentions, but for protection I want a law that says in bold print he can't take advantage of his position.

Reich has a point when he urged laws prohibiting questions, "nobody has a right to ask" and permitting an individual to examine his own dossier. But I've got a better idea, to wit, that Big Government forthwith cease and desist its busybody and sordid adventures in political blackmail.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, July
17, 1966]

A CLEAR AND FUTURE PERIL

(By Ernest Conine)

Rep. CORNELIUS GALLAGHER, a crusading New Jersey Democrat, is working hard to head off what he considers an even greater potential threat to individual rights than bugs, wiretaps and the reckless use of lie detectors.

His target is the electronic dossier which, if it ever came to pass, would store up the pertinent details of every citizen's life history.

He fears that data from social security files, military records, census responses, credit reports, tax returns, insurance forms, police files and court records will be fed into government computers.

The information—some of it capable of wrecking lives, careers or businesses if it got into the wrong hands—could be extracted from the computer at the push of a button.

Whoever controlled that button would have tremendous powers of intimidation at his fingertips—powers which are unprecedented in a democracy.

No such computerized dossier exists at present, it must be emphasized, and no federal official has given any public indications that one is planned.

But the idea is technologically feasible, and GALLAGHER sees signs that the government, in a well-intentioned search for efficiency, is already drifting toward such a system.

His House Government Operations subcommittee will explore these suspicions in hearings slated later this month.

Their use ranges from payroll-handling to such hush-hush jobs as code-breaking. Mostly, the government buys computers for the same reason as General Motors: to save money.

The computer's role as the taxpayer's friend—a role which GALLAGHER does not deny—is perhaps best demonstrated at the Internal Revenue Service.

By next year, the tax history of every individual American and every business firm will be filed on tape at the National Computer Center at Martinsburg, W. Va.

The computers will enable IRS to do a faster and more accurate job of checking tax returns with only a fraction of the 12,000-man work force which was used before.

Equally important, the electronic brain will make tax-dodging an exceedingly dangerous enterprise—which is certainly good news for honest taxpayers.

So far so good. But GALLAGHER and his investigators fear there will be pressure to feed more and more information into the computers—all in the name of efficiency, of course.

Washington already is the depository for a massive amount of confidential and/or derogatory information about U.S. citizens.

The raw files of the FBI contain unsubstantiated gossip against many thousands of perfectly good citizens.

The Civil Service Commission has the results of background checks on everybody who ever applied for a halfway-sensitive job in government or for a defense contractor.

In addition to financial information, the files of the Federal Housing Administration contain investigative reports on the marital stability of millions of homeowners.

Confidential business information which would be of immense value to competitors is collected by the U.S. Census Bureau and squirreled away under lock and key.

Other examples could be cited.

Already, then, a frightening potential exists for intimidation and blackmail—political or otherwise—if this kind of information gets into the wrong hands. But at least the information is scattered now.

The dangers of abuse would multiply if the government's dossiers on its citizens were centralized and stored into computers.

Just imagine the extra havoc which the late Senator Joseph McCarthy might have wrought if he could have gained access to such handily centralized files.

The executive branch has not admitted any plans for computerizing dossiers on individuals. But the possibility is there and Gallagher wants to stir a "climate of concern" before the genie gets out of the bottle—or, failing that, to improve the chances of proper control.

He suggests that every citizen might be allowed "to inspect his own dossier to make certain it is completely accurate." And, "Our government should decide now just who will have the power to push what computer buttons under what conditions."

Otherwise, we could wake up some morning and find that Big Brother not only sees all, but has a very long and dangerous memory.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) News, Aug. 2, 1966]

"Big Brother" Creeps Up

The Budget Bureau of the federal government has modestly proposed a National Data Center in Washington, D.C., which would feed into hungry computers all the vital statistics, and several insignificant ones, of each American citizen. The computers would then cough up detailed dossiers at the request, or whim, of federal agencies.

Every American, obviously, would surrender a good measure of his privacy, but in return he would be forever protected, of course, against being folded, bent, spindled or mutilated.

Not everyone is convinced that this is sufficient protection.

"We cannot be certain," warns Rep. Cornelius E. Gallagher of New Jersey, the chairman of a congressional subcommittee concerned with invasion of privacy, "that such dossiers would always be used by benevolent people for benevolent purposes."

The dossiers would document each person's education, grades, military service, credit rating, income, employment history and personality traits, down to and including, presumably, his personal likes and dislikes. If he happens to hate machines, the computers might not be understanding. They might take it personally, and retaliate.

And, computers, being such delicate machines, one speck of dust in the works might do more harm to a man's career than a felony conviction, or more good than a Harvard degree.

Charles A. Reich, professor of constitutional law at Yale University, appeared before Rep. Gallagher's subcommittee and argued for laws to protect the individual against the machines.

He argued for, among other things, a law that would give each person, with certain exceptions, the right to examine his own dossier and, if he chooses, to rebut the contents, even though it is very difficult to debate with a machine.

Prof. Reich also advocated a law that would declare certain information off-bounds, including a man's religious beliefs and what goes on between a man and his wife.

I think Prof. Reich means well, but he is asking too much. I think that wives should be allowed to program the dossiers of their husbands and vice versa. This system would feed so many minor worries and complaints into each machine that the computer would soon develop an ulcer and break down, guaranteeing privacy to everyone.

The National Data Center seems to be the logical outgrowth of the current trend toward computerized dating. Once the federal dossier bank is fully stocked with information, the government can wage computerized romance on a national scale.

Each computer will be staffed by an engineer and a technician, for programming and repairs, and by a rabbi, a minister and a priest, for wedding ceremonies. Who can imagine anything more enduring than a marriage made in Washington?

The next inevitable step is two-way television in every home.

[From the Federal Times, Aug. 10, 1966]

Subcommittee Probes National Data Center

(By Bill Andronicos)

Washington, D.C.—Any plans federal officials might have had about creating a National Data Center have run into a Congressional snag—at least for the time being. Members of a House Subcommittee on Invasion of Privacy were not too receptive about the proposed establishment of a "dossier bank" which would bring together under a single roof all the scattered statistics collected today by more than 20 federal agencies.

Opponents to proposals for a computerized government data center denounced the plan as a threat to individual liberty, a harbinger of Big Brother, and a mechanized suffocation of the American dream.

Headed by Rep. Cornelius E. Gallagher, Democrat of New Jersey, the subcommittee indicated it was not adverse to technological progress. Rather, it simply looked askance at a proposal which lacked safeguards that would protect an individual's right to privacy.

"Today's push-button telephone will be tomorrow's contact with the dossier bank," Gallagher warned. "We're worried about the dropouts of today, but I'm worried about the computer rejects of tomorrow."

Rep. Gallagher described the presence of records kept on individuals today as "frightening enough." He added that the thought of such records neatly bundled together into one compact package is "appalling."

Similar fears were expressed by a number of witnesses testifying before the Subcommittee.

For example, Vance Packard—author of "The Naked Society" and "The Hidden Persuaders"—cautioned that "without proper control, the computers could convert our society into the Big Brother regime predicted in the book '1984.'" And, Packard grimly reminded the Subcommittee that 1984 is only 18 years away.

So serious did Packard consider the dangers that could arise from a data bank center that at one point during the hearings when Rep. Gallagher said that perhaps the Subcommittee was getting prematurely "overheated" over the issue, Packard replied: "I think you should be scared stiff."

Another anti-data center witness, Charles A. Reich—professor of constitutional law at Yale University—agreed both with Gallagher and Packard that computers would hold early mistakes against job-seekers.

"We are establishing a doctrine of no second chance, no forgiveness, one life, one chance only," Professor Reich said. As an example, he cited the story of a man who could not get a job in a department store because his record showed that he had stolen $2 worth of fishline at the age of 13. Similarly, he also pointed out that anyone characterized by a computer as a "nervous" person because he seemed so on one occasion, remains a nervous person forever, insofar as the computer is concerned.

Gallagher, Packard and Reich all agreed that the computer fails to take into consideration that people do change.

"If the data computer says a man is bad," Reich said "he is bad forever. This is a very terrible punishment indeed."

Reich also noted that the Supreme Court has been "scrupulous" about assuring an individual's right to a lawyer, "yet here we have people who are not charged with a crime, and are about to be punished severely for life without the right to rebuttal, lawyer, or due process of law."

Both Packard and Reich joined Subcommittee members in demanding controls on federal personnel-keeping practices. Reich contended that most information available on individuals is useless in predicting how a man will perform in a government job.

Representatives of the federal government tried to dispel fears—but without avail—that a national data center would be used to invade people's privacy.

Raymond T. Bowman, assistant director for statistical standards of the Bureau of the Budget, expressed the opinion that a national data center could be devised with a fully secure confidentiality system.

Bowman insisted that the government harbored no plans to start an electronic card file on every American. However, he and other advocates of the data center agreed that such an information center would be useless and could not be created without the basic "building blocks" of individual names or identification numbers.

Subcommittee members repeatedly chastised data center proponents for failing to consider safeguards that would eliminate the possibility of invasion of privacy. On one occasion, Rep. Gallagher described the proposed center as "a great, expensive, electronic garbage pail" into which would be placed much useless information. The center was also referred to as a "monster" or "octopus."

Rep. Benjamin S. Rosenthal (D., N.Y.), said he had "grave doubts and deep reservations" that a national data center can be established without infringing on people's right to privacy—unless Congress enacts laws.

Rep. Frank J. Horton (R., N.Y.) said: "It seems to me that what you are proposing for the sake of efficiency is a source of information that may very well get out of hand and be used for evil purposes." He also expressed the opinion that Congressional law should control the kind of information that goes into a data bank, as well as what comes out.

After repeated clashes between Subcommittee members and advocates of the national data center, Bowman agreed that steps should be taken to enact legislation that would safeguard an individual's right to privacy.

"I feel you have failed to realize the potential of a computer," Rep. Gallagher told Bowman. "I don't think we ought to abandon computers, but we must be aware that a computer can also serve as a mechanism for totalitarianism if it falls in the wrong hands."

Gallagher also suggested that the Bureau of the Budget seek congressional approval before going ahead with plans to establish a national data center. Bowman agreed to this request and replied that the proposal would probably be made as a "budgeted item."

Another pro-data center witness, Dr. Edgar S. Dunn Jr., a research analyst for Resources for the Future—the Budget Bureau's consultant on the project—said the public's vision of such "Big Brother" computers was nonsense. He argued that machines could be told not to spill out confidential data. Subcommittee members, however, were not convinced.

Also unconvinced were two computer experts. One of them, Paul Baran, of the Rand Corp., Santa Monica, Calif., suggested that the computer industry itself should take the initiative and the responsibility of building the needed safeguards within computer machines "before Big Brother is forced to do it himself and we may not be too happy with the way he might want to do it."

[From the Houston (Tex.) Sunday Post, July 10, 1966]

Use of Computer Data Growing—Uncle Sam May Know All About You

"If information is power, Americans should be uneasy about the amount of information the federal government is starting to file on its citizens in its blinking memory banks. Whatever the benefits, the marvelous new electronic devices with memories or ears or eyes are serving to push back the boundaries of each individual's privacy."—Vance Packard, The Naked Society.

(By Charles Culhane)

Washington.—How much does the federal government know about your private life?

If you are over 21, the chances are the government knows a great deal about you and will learn much more before you die. Much of this information is stored in files in Washington, some of it in the form of computer punch, cards or computer tapes.

If you file a federal income tax form, the Internal Revenue Service knows how much you earn each year, how many dependents you have, what your job is and where you work.

If you have ever taken a physical examination for military service, the Selective Service System has a detailed report on the state of your health at that time.

Each year you live, various agencies of the federal government probably will acquire more detailed information on one aspect or another of your private life.

Much of this information is classified by law as confidential and is zealously guarded against disclosure not only to the public but to other federal agencies.

But this is the age of electronic computers, and various federal officials have been quietly studying ways to make those computers more efficient and how to store more and more data on American citizens in one centralized computer system.

Even now a government task force is studying proposals to establish a federal data center which would have the authority to obtain computer tapes and other data from all of the more than 20 federal agencies which collect information about American citizens.

Rep. Cornelius E. Gallagher, D.-N.J., recognizes the benefits which could result from improvement of the government's computer systems, but he also sees serious dangers in centralizing information about Americans in one federal data center.

Gallagher, who led a successful fight last year against government invasion of the privacy of its own employees, has scheduled hearings for the last week of July on the possibility that a federal data center could lead to what he calls the danger of developing "the computerized man."

"As time goes on there will be great pressure to include more and more individual data in the computers," Gallagher said in a speech in the House of Representatives. "Theoretically it would be possible to press a button and obtain an instantaneous dossier on any one of millions of people."

Gallagher cited the huge store of information about individual elements which could be dredged from federal tax returns, census responses, Social Security data, military records, security files, fingerprints, mortgage guarantee and other federal sources.

The congressman also warned that if information from state and local governments were tied into the federal data center, the computers could produce school records, police files, records of driving violations and property holdings.

"It might even be possible to pump credit reports and bank accounts into the computer. The proposed establishment of a federal data bank poses dangers to the privacy of our citizens which could dwarf anything stemming from electronic eavesdropping and other modern snooping devices."

Gallagher noted that the confidential nature of many federal records is recognized and protected by law, but he cautioned:

"Our government should decide now just who will have the power to push what computer buttons under what conditions. We cannot safely presume that all of this information will always be used by benevolent people for benevolent purposes."

"The technology of computerization has raised new horizons of progress. It also brings with it inherent dangers. The greatest of these dangers is that we allow ourselves to drift into a course that will substitute a computer for man's free will."

Edgar S. Dunn, Jr., a research analyst who made a study as a consultant for the U.S. Bureau of the Budget of the possibility of establishing a federal data center, recommends such a center. He discounts the possible dangers which could stem from centralizing government records in one computer system.

"It would be both technically and economically impossible in the foreseeable future to put all existing records into some George Orwellian information system even if it were desirable as a matter of public policy to do so," Dunn told a Senate subcommittee investigating the invasion of privacy.

But a spokesman for the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics who prepared a memorandum which was included in Dunn's report to the Bureau of the Budget said, "A federal (data) center could be stocked with a respectable volume and variety of data relatively quickly for about $260,000."

He said such a center could be set up in about a year and would include about 9,000 reels of computer tape which would include the equivalent of a billion computer punch cards.

The information would include, he said, details on federal tax data, Social Security, consumer expenditures, census data and files from other sources. He also suggested the data center itself could assume the responsibility for keeping information on individuals confidential.

The House special subcommittee on the invasion of privacy which Gallagher heads will call both advocates and critics of a federal data center for its hearings at the end of July in an effort to air the possible dangers in such a system.

"The potential dangers to a U.S. citizen at the mercy of a computerized society are appalling," Gallagher said. "It is quite conceivable that a potential Big Brother could make excellent use of a big button on a dossier bank for his own purposes. This would strike at the very fundamentals of our governmental structure and society."

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, Aug. 4, 1966.]

You're on File—Like It or Not—Life's Becoming a Fishbowl

(By Rose DeWolf)

Oh, boy, what they know about you.

If your whole life isn't actually an open book it is at least—like it or not—a pretty complete dossier in a lot of office files.

Many people are becoming concerned at just how much information once considered personal and private, is now collected by both business and government.

Consider just a few examples:

Retail Credit Co., Inc., which has four offices in the Philadelphia area will investigate you for a lot of reasons. Perhaps you took out a big fire or life insurance policy. Among the things one of their agents then will look into are—in the words of a company official—"your family life and home surroundings, your reputation and associations, your health, your employment record and your hobbies."

The Federal Housing Administration hires private investigators to check out prospective home-buyers who want mortgages, included in the check is information on your domestic bliss or lack of same. FHA says this is necessary because one of the leading causes of mortgage foreclosure is divorce.

The Philadelphia Credit Bureau has on file the names and credit histories of three million persons in the Delaware Valley. Any one of 1200 member businesses (department stores, retail outlets, banks, finance companies) can call there to find out how much money you owe, how fast you pay bills, your largest credit purchase—and more.

In these instances, the investigations are going on, presumably without your knowledge.

But of course, you also give away a lot of information about yourself. You fill out applications for work and take intelligence and psychological tests.

You file income tax returns and Social Security papers. You have recorded with the military and with the school system. You answer questions for the Census Bureau and for credit managers.

The spotlight was focused on all these personal revelations for public purposes earlier this year during the hearings before the House special subcommittee on the invasion of privacy headed by Rep. Cornelius Gallagher (D., N.J.).

The subcommittee was perturbed at a suggestion by the Bureau of the Budget that the Federal Government could save some money by establishing a "National Data Center."

All the information collected by some 20 Federal agencies would be fed into a single set of computers for easy access.

Gallagher concluded this was a horrible idea.

"It would be possible," he said, "to press a button and obtain an instant dossier on any one of millions of people.

"It should be apparent to anyone the great power that would exist behind the Federal official who has the authority to push the button that would produce such a dossier instantly."

This wasn't the only facet of the data center that bothered Gallagher.

"We are particularly concerned," he said, "with the threat which a Federal dossier bank represents to the right to make amends for mistakes and begin again. Man can forgive and forget but a machine cannot."

And would a Federal dossier bank be content with just those voluminous statistics fed into by the Census, the FBI, the Defense Department, Civil Service, and the like?

Once it got going, would it not be a simple matter to program into credit reports and bank accounts, local police records and school files, driving violations and property holdings?

Government and business are already adept at swapping information.

Take the little matter of your car registration. Every State in the union sells all car registration information to the privately-owned R. L. Polk Co. of Detroit. (Except, New Jersey, that is, which swaps that information for services rather than cash.)

R. L. Polk compiles lists of your name and address, car make and model and license number and sells it to anybody who wants it.

It is because of these lists that your friendly car dealer knows your Buick is now two years old . . . or a seat cover company knows you just bought a car and might want their product.

Civil service and the Credit Bureau long have worked together in discussing job prospects. And FHA naturally makes its reports on applicants for housing loans available to mortgage lenders (at $1.50 a report).

"We are rapidly becoming a naked society," complains State Senate majority whip Herbert Fineman, Democrat, Philadelphia. "There is no facet of our lives that is a private affair. It is a situation which erodes our democratic safeguards.

"They say if you have lived a good, honest and moral life you have nothing to worry about. I say: bunk. There are things even a good, honest and moral man doesn't want his neighbors to know about."

Fineman's fight for the right of privacy in Pennsylvania took the form of exposing illegal wiretapping by the State police and introducing a bill to outlaw all electronic snooping or bugging devices in this State. (The bill passed the House, died in the Senate.)

"There is some basis for investigating someone who wants credit from you or a job," said Fineman. "But there has to be a line drawn against snooping that is just outrageous."

What is outrageous? The American Civil Liberties Union contends that much of the data accumulated by the Government is unreliable, anyway. In some cases, it amounts to no more than neighborhood gossip—but it is all filed away.

"The pooling of inaccurate and prejudicial data will compound the injustice," said an ACLU statement.

Gallagher thinks almost any amount of information can be outrageous if it gets into unscrupulous hands.

Retail Credit acknowledges that some of the information it has (and it has information on 42 million Americans) would be dynamite in the hands of a blackmailer. The information is kept under lock and key in executive offices.

"The integrity of the files is all important," says M. E. Arnold, director of the Philadelphia Credit Bureau. "We feel it is extremely important never to go into the files for personal reasons."

But Arnold cannot guarantee that every one of the 1200 members of the Credit Bureau feel exactly the same way.

Even without a National Data Center, information about you is pooled.

At the request of any Government agency, the Post Office Department will supply a "mail cover" investigation. That is, they will make note of the addresses of all mail coming from you and the return address or postmark of all mail sent to you.

At the request of the Credit Bureau in Los Angeles, our Philadelphia file would be forwarded immediately.

At the request of the personnel department of one big company, another big company often will ship along your answers to a psychological test or what the company investigator thought about the suitability of your spouse as an executive's wife.

There is no getting away from it, says Gallagher, we are just a Nation of snoopers.

After a campaign by the New Jersey Congressman, several Government departments toned down their personnel quizzes, eliminating such questions as "My sex life is satisfactory. True or False?"

He also succeeded in eliminating a section of the 1964 Farm Census which asked detailed questions about the outside income and background of all persons living in each farmhouse.

His current campaign is to combat Government proposals to tie in your Social Security number with your census questionnaire and to add questions about religion to the standard census format.

The odds against personal privacy are great. Government is complex. This is a credit society. Snooping is becoming easier and more sophisticated with transistorized devices to help out. The computer stands ready to sort and select.

It may be that at some future time you will have one consolation about all this. You won't have to take the time to write an autobiography—the computer will do that for you.

OUR FISHBOWL SOCIETY

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rosenthal] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, a recent five-part series written by Erwin Knoll, a Washington correspondent with the Newhouse National News Service, titled "Our Fishbowl Society," alerts the public to the various ways in which our traditional right to privacy is being eroded by certain practices of the Federal Government.

In Mr. Knoll's articles, which were carried in the Long Island Press and Long Island Star Journal which serve my congressional district, he points out that the House Special Subcommittee on Invasion of Privacy, of which I am a member, is in the forefront of the efforts to repel these invasions.

The chairman of the subcommittee is the Honorable Cornelius E. Gallagher, of New Jersey. Commenting on the series, the Jersey, N.J., Journal said:

> One man who is fighting determinedly to see that government does not go that way (invading our privacy) is Congressman Charles E. Gallagher of Bayonne, representing New Jersey's 13th District. If he appears in our series from time to time as a champion of the people against governmental "big brother" snooping, it is because he has been a champion of the people in this cause.

Because I believe this series to be of vital concern to all our citizens, I would like to have the articles included in the Congressional Record at this point:

Our Fishbowl Society—Prying and Privacy

(It's more than Big Brother watching, the Orwellian concept . . . there is a growing army of Little Brothers, professional and amateur, officials and private citizens, some highly motivated, others prompted by greed or morbid curiosity. This troubling portrait of American society is etched in a series of articles by correspondent Erwin Knoll.)

(By Erwin Knoll)

Half way to 1984, some alarmed observers see signs of the realization of George Orwell's gloomy prophecy—the creation of a society in which no shred of personal privacy remains.

In fact, the dark portrait of the ultimate totalitarian state that Orwell painted 18 years ago is already outdated in several respects.

Writing in 1948, Orwell did not foresee the swift and ingenious developments of modern technology—the tiny cameras and listening devices, the self-starting recorders that can be used to spy on anyone anywhere; the huge computers that can sort and classify the most detailed personal data and spew them forth at the press of a button.

Preoccupied with the dangers of absolute dictatorship, Orwell did not note that even in a democracy, mounting bureaucratic pressures for "useful information" can subject citizens to demands for the most intimate facts about their private lives.

Nor did he expect that industry as well as government would adopt with enthusiasm the surveillance techniques that once were confined to the cloak-and-dagger world of Balkan intrigue, or that private citizens would join the snooping game on a grand scale to spy on relatives, friends and neighbors.

Those who nervously watch the erosion of privacy in our lives think Orwell's chilling fantasy missed the mark in one significant respect: it isn't just Big Brother who is watching, but a growing army of Little Brothers—professionals and amateurs, officials and private citizens, men motivated by patriotism and high virtue as well as others prompted by greed or morbid curiosity.

The reasons for invading privacy are infinitely varied and complex. Creditors have an understandable curiosity about the financial responsibility of borrowers. Government and private employers want to be sure their workers are loyal and honest. Storekeepers are eager to guard their merchandise against shoplifting and pilferage. Social workers and counselors, teachers and psychologists all feel that to do their jobs effectively they must know more and more about the individuals they deal with.

On a less lofty plane, husbands and wives resort to the new technology of snooping to check up on their spouses' fidelity. Businessmen get the drop on their competitors by "tuning in" on new products or promotion campaigns. Blackmailers and thrill-seekers are about to widen their activities with the techniques of privacy invasion now available.

Sen. Edward V. Long (D-Mo.), whose Senate subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure has been looking into government surveillance, industrial espionage and private snooping, recently gave an audience of Houston businessmen a rundown on a potential "typical day for you, now."

"When you wake up in the morning, and are still in bed, every word you say may be overheard and recorded. (There was a recent case in New Hampshire involving a landlord who placed a microphone which would overhear the bedroom activities of a young couple renting a house from him.)

"When you make your first phone call of the day (or your last), there are a hundred ways in which your line may be tapped or bugged. Even if you have the phone company check and they find a bug, usually they won't tell you. And if your line is clear today, it can easily be bugged tomorrow.

"When you get into your car to drive into the office, there may be a transmitter hidden in it. Or it may have a 'bumper beeper' which is attached and which permits a snoop to easily follow you anywhere in the city.

"When you get to your office, you can be bugged a hundred ways. There may be a microphone planted in your wall, in your desk or in your phone. There may be a miniature transmitter hidden in a thousand places. Hidden by whom, you ask? By your competitor, your employer, a salesman, an employee. To paraphrase an old canard, miniature transmitters are within the reach of everyone today—$39.50 at your friendly corner electronics store—no questions asked.

"When you go to lunch, the jukebox outlet at your table may well contain a listening device as well as a speaker.

"And so the day goes," Long continued. "How about your wife, does she fare any better?

"When she goes shopping at the supermarket, chances are that she is being constantly watched by hidden closed-circuit TV.

"When she goes to the department store to try on a new dress, chances are that the mirror in which she admires herself is a two way mirror installed to discourage shoplifting.

"When she looks at the desk calendar to see what date to put on her check to pay her telephone bill, chances are that behind the front of the calendar is a hidden microphone.

"When she goes to a neighbor's house to play bridge, the built-in intercom system will permit people to eavesdrop throughout the house."

LONG's recital was, he said, both frightening and realistic. But it was far from all-inclusive as a catalog of the assaults on privacy to which his listeners might be subjected.

On that same "typical day," for example, a member of his audience could have the names and addresses on his first-class mail transcribed at the local post office. Financial data that he submitted on his tax return, or on a mortgage application, or on a credit form, might be divulged without his knowledge or permission.

In school, his child might be asked on a standardized test how he feels about God, or about his parents, or about sex. The parent might be given the same type of test in applying for a job, or in seeking a promotion. Somewhere between home and the local dump, someone might be sifting through his trash.

LONG and other members of the House and Senate who have addressed themselves to the problem believe it would be all but impossible to compile a definitive list of the ways in which privacy is being attacked.

But they are convinced that a profound and dangerous transformation of American society is taking place before our eyes—and that most of us are unaware of it.

"The direction of drift is perfectly clear," says Rep. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER (D-N.J.), who heads a special House subcommittee on invasion of privacy.

"You don't have to be very intelligent to see that if this drift toward more and more intrusive action by private groups and organizations of all kinds, and by government, isn't checked, in 20 or 30 years no one will bother asking questions about privacy, and we will take it for granted that we live in a fishbowl and that we are not free men, but fish."

OUR FISHBOWL SOCIETY—SOMEBODY HAS A FILE ON YOU!

(By Erwin Knoll)

WASHINGTON.—Unless you're a life-long hermit dwelling in a well-hidden cave, somebody, somewhere has a file on you.

It may be just a collection of vital statistics—your name and address, date of birth, place of employment.

Or it may be a fat dossier containing a full life history complete with accounts of your financial status, political and religious beliefs, friendships, sexual habits, personal eccentricities and other intimate details.

Chances are that you will never get to see your file to verify the contents or ascertain how they are being used.

If you have ever been arrested, served in the Armed Forces, taken a draft deferment test or applied for a job requiring security clearance, yours is probably one of the 175 million sets of fingerprints indexed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It may be accompanied by a "raw file" containing unevaluated reports on your past activities and associations.

If you are a prospective home buyer, the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) may have a report in its files on the stability of your marriage. More than one million such reports were obtained last year from private investigators because, the FHA explains, "one of the leading causes of (mortgage) foreclosure is divorce."

Scores of government agencies, aided by an army of private sleuths, are in the business of collecting personal information.

The Social Security Administration has accounts—and earnings data—on 166 million Americans. The Defense Department maintains 14 million life histories on individuals who have been subjected to security investigations.

COULD RUIN LIFE

The Federal Civil Service Commission has files on some eight million Americans who have been investigated for government employment. In the files are allegations of criminal, immoral or "infamous" conduct that could ruin the lives and careers of many citizens.

The Passport Office requires detailed personal histories from applicants who have been married more than twice. Officials recently confirmed that they maintain a system of surveillance on potentially troublesome travelers—critics of the Vietnam war, for example.

The government's need—real or imagined—for more and more information on the private lives of citizens proliferates on an almost daily basis.

RELIGIOUS QUERY

The Census Bureau now is pondering suggestions by some church groups that it include a question on religious affiliation in its 1970 decennial census. The U.S. Office of Education plans to assess the effectiveness of various education programs by making a detailed study of 300,000 school children whose personal histories, family backgrounds and educational achievements are to be surveyed.

"Any time you start delving into a child's family background you get into the area of invasion of privacy," concedes Assistant Commissioner of Education Alexander M. Mood. "But we just can't deal with these problems without information. It boils down to the integrity of the federal agency in seeing that the information given by individuals is protected."

The record on protection of individual data varies widely among agencies. Highest marks for integrity generally go to the Social Security Administration and the Census Bureau, whose employees are prohibited by law from disclosing personal information in the files.

NO LEAKS

Census Director Ross Eckler, who has been with the Bureau since 1939, says he has never encountered an instance of improper divulgence, though he has had to fight off requests for individual data from the FBI and other law enforcement agencies.

"If the President himself asked me, I'd have to say no," Eckler says. "I might not stay here long, but I'd have to say no."

But no matter how closely guarded personal information may be—and the record of many agencies is not nearly as reassuring as that of census—growing numbers of Americans resent the persistent intrusions of official and unofficial snoopers and surveyors.

And those who have paid close attention to the problem of privacy invasion believe the worst is still to come. An idea that has caught the fancy of government statisticians—and that gravely troubles some members of Congress—is the creation of a "federal data bank" to combine various government records in one huge, computerized information retrieval system.

The advantages of such a system are obvious: records now scattered, duplicated and largely inaccessible could be combined, cross-filed, coordinated and made almost instantly available.

Edgar S. Dunn, Jr., a Budget Bureau consultant who has explored the possibilities of the data bank, believes the usefulness of federal records could be "considerably increased without unduly jeopardizing personal privacy."

NOT SO SURE

Others are not so sure. In a penetrating article on "Privacy and Behavioral Research" that appeared last fall in the Columbia Law Review, Oscar M. Ruebhausen and Orville G. Brim, Jr., noted:

"Computerized central storage of information would remove what surely has been one of the strongest allies of the claim to privacy—the inefficiency of man and the fallibility of his memory."

Modern strides in recordkeeping have already affected the right of privacy. The ex-convict who once was able to pay his debt to society, move to another community and make a fresh start, now finds that his record is likely to follow him and keep him from obtaining employment.

A government worker in Washington was recently discharged because the Civil Service Commission discovered that she had failed to disclose on her job application a shoplifting arrest that occurred many years ago. Such incidents could multiply under the all-encompassing efficiency of a federal data bank.

"We're about to make a fundamental change in our society," warns Rep. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER (D-N.J.). "We've always had a philosophy of letting a man start anew if he makes a mistake. But computers don't forget and don't forgive.

"We're concerned about school dropouts now. What about the computer rejects of tomorrow?"

WHO PUSHES BUTTON?

GALLAGHER, whose special House Subcommittee on Invasion of Privacy has scheduled hearings on "the broad implications" of the data bank idea, believes it is crucial to determine in advance "who will have the power to push what computer buttons under what conditions."

"We cannot safely presume that all of this information will always be used by benevolent people for benevolent purposes," GALLAGHER has cautioned.

"It is quite conceivable that a potential Big Brother could make excellent use of a Big Button on a dossier bank for his own purposes which strike at the very fundamentals, of our governmental structure and society."

FISHBOWL SOCIETY—YOUR BUSINESS IS NOT YOUR OWN ANYMORE!

(By Erwin Knoll)

WASHINGTON.—In the traditional concept of the right of privacy, a man's financial status is nobody's business but his own.

The ragged miser who keeps a jug of gold coins in the basement or a collection of bankbooks under the mattress is part of American folklore. So is the apparently affluent citizen who skimps on groceries to keep up appearances.

MOST OBJECT

Confronted with a direct question about his income or net worth, the man who values his privacy is likely to ask, "what's it to you?"

That is the tradition—but in our credit card and charge account society, the reality is something else again. As taxpayer and consumer, as tenant or homeowner, as inventor or borrower, as employer or employee, the average citizen is called on many times each year to furnish financial data that he once might have shared only with his wife—and not necessarily with her. More often than not, the data became available to many agencies or individuals beyond those who originally established their "need to know."

"Anybody who can't find out how much his neighbor's worth just isn't trying very hard," says a man who has made a close study of the credit and collection field.

By far the greatest repository of income information is the Internal Revenue Service (IRS), whose files bulge with the tax returns submitted by about 67 million individuals this year, as well as with more than 50 million corporate and employe tax returns.

Contrary to a widespread public impression, tax returns are not treated as top-secret information by IRS.

"Your Federal tax return is supposed to be confidential, but you're wrong if you think you and your friendly Internal Revenue agent are the only ones who ever look at it," says Rep. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER (D-N.J.), one of several members of Congress who are seriously concerned about the erosion of privacy.

"Every federal agency and every state as well as several committees of the Congress can ask to examine your return," GALLAGHER notes. "Sometimes they do."

The uses to which tax return data are subjected range far afield from the government's revenue-raising function. The Veterans Administration has gone into IRS files to check the validity of pension claims. The Agriculture Department has used returns to help determine rice acreage allotments. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare relies on tax information in Social Security investigations. The Tennessee Valley Administration has used tax returns in property condemnation proceedings. Most federal agencies screen tax returns in investigating employes or applicants for employment.

In its extensive investigation of invasions of privacy by government agencies, the Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure found that in one recent two-year period, state and local officials in 17 states obtained access to federal tax returns. The stated purposes for examining the returns ranged from investigations of gambling, narcotics and liquor violations to state disbarment proceedings or kickback inquiries.

LEGAL HASSLE

Whether the income data submitted by a taxpayer in accordance with the law ought to be used against him in unrelated investigations is a matter on which reasonable men—including lawyers—disagree.

There can be no disagreement, however, about some of the other uses and abuses to which the availability of tax returns has given rise.

In several states, for example, politicians running for office have managed to obtain tax returns for use in attempts to discredit their opponents. Enterprising businessmen have been known to gain access to tax data on competitors.

Yet IRS information is closely guarded, compared to the casual availability of financial information obtained by other government and private agencies.

The comprehensive and officially "confidential" reports compiled by the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) on applicants for housing loans can be obtained by any mortgage lender for $1.50. The financial status of welfare recipients is, by law, a matter of public record in a number of states and localities.

Many banks will, as a matter of course, report a depositor's balance to anyone who takes the trouble to place a telephone call. And increasing use of automatic data storage and retrieval for bank records makes it possible to produce, on a moment's notice, a copy of a check or deposit slip that may have been written years ago.

The private credit and collection bureaus that now flourish in virtually every American community constitute a huge reservoir of personal financial data on about 100 million Americans—a reservoir that is tapped far more often than most citizens suspect. The housewife who casually opens a department store charge account is, in effect, disclosing her credit status to thousands of enterprises around the country. She also makes the information available to official investigators who may have good reason—or no reason—for being curious about her.

The Retail Credit Co., the largest of the private investigative firms, has 7,000 investigators and maintains files on 42 million Americans. Its clients include many who have no connection with retail credit. Though this company, like others in the field, insists that its files are carefully protected against unauthorized scrutiny, the claim runs head-on into the basic fact that credit agencies exist for the prime purpose of furnishing information.

Notices of overdue bills are mailed out by the hundreds each day by credit bureaus. The citizen threatened with identification as a deadbeat to "every bank, catalog store, dentist" etc. in his community may have failed to pay a $3 bill, or he may be the victim of an error by a human or computerized bookkeeper.

In some instances, he may never find out that he has been blacklisted as a poor credit risk. And if he does find out, he has little recourse.

OUR FISHBOWL SOCIETY—YOUR THOUGHTS ARE SCRUTINIZED

(By Erwin Knoll)

WASHINGTON.—In the fishbowl society, not only your words and deeds but your innermost thoughts are apt to be under scrutiny.

If you work for a government agency or private firm that has adopted the most sophisticated techniques of personnel screening your secret fears and aspirations, your attitudes toward God and man—and woman—have been recorded, evaluated and filed away for future reference.

If your son or daughter attends a school that offers the best in modern guidance counseling, similar information has been compiled—perhaps by use of personality tests identical to those administered to adults.

Elaborate testing instruments, encompassing hundreds of questions and adapted to "objective" scoring by machines, have been developed to meet the needs of those who claim—in fact, insist—that they must, for one reason or another, get to know all about you.

LIE DETECTORS

In some instances, the examinations are accompanied by "in-depth interviews," and by polygraph tests or other lie-detection techniques.

Development of "personality inventories" for mass use in government, industry, education and other fields is a relatively recent science—and some experts contend it is not a science at all.

LITTLE ACCURACY

"I take a dim view of personality tests and I think the general public is being much too frequently taken in by the mumbo-jumbo that goes with them," says Dr. Henry S. Dyer, vice president of the Educational Testing Service of Princeton, N.J.

"The inventories, the projective tests—all of them—are scarcely beyond the tealeaf reading stage."

Dr. John Dollard, professor of psychology at Yale University, has charged that "generally speaking, projective tests, trait scales, interest inventories or depth interviews have not proved to be useful in selecting executives, or salesmen, or potential delinquents, or superior college students."

Some critics—notably William H. Whyte Jr., author of the 1957 best-seller, "The Organization Man," and Martin L. Gross, who wrote a scathing critique called "The Brain Watchers," a few years ago—have come up with manuals for "cheating" on the personality tests by giving deliberately misleading (but acceptable) answers.

GROWING STEADILY

Despite such criticism, however, and despite the anguished protests of those who feel the tests constitute prying intolerable to free men, use of the psychological instruments is growing steadily.

Experts have estimated that about half of the large corporations in the country use psychological testing in one way or another. Increasingly, colleges rely on the tests to tell them about candidates for admission. The federal government has used the tests in screening its employes, and has fostered school use through such national research programs as "Project Talent."

"During the more than three years that I investigated personality testing in this nation," Gross told a House subcommittee probing invasions of privacy, "I was constantly amazed at the callous indiscretion of testers in seeking out the most sacred details of a person, including his sexual life, religion, political beliefs—as if it were necessary to eliminate human dignity in order to be employable in our country.

SOME QUESTIONS

"Commonly administered tests ask such impertinent questions as:

" 'Do you often feel just miserable?'

" 'Is your sex life satisfactory?'

" 'About how many people have you disliked (or hated) very much? (A) none; (B) 1 to 3; (C) 4 to 10; (D) 11 to 50; (E) over 50.' "

Among the most widely used of the personality tests is the Minnesota Multiphasic Inventory, known in the trade as the MMPI. Its publisher, the Psychological Corp. of New York, sells almost a million copies a year to schools and colleges, government and industry, hospitals and physicians.

The MMPI, developed more than 20 years ago at the University of Minnesota, consists of 566 brief statements requiring answers of "true," "false" or "cannot say." The inventory, according to the test manual, is "designed ultimately to provide, in a single test, scores on all important phases of personality."

TYPICAL ITEMS

About three dozen of the MMPI test items deal directly with sexual matters or religious attitudes. Some typical items are these:

"My father was a good man."

"I am worried about sex matters."

"During one period when I was a youngster I engaged in petty thievery."

"I believe in the second coming of Christ."

"I dream frequently about things that are best kept to myself."

"I pray several times a week."

"I am against giving money to beggars."

"There is something wrong with my sex organs."

GRAVE CONCERN

Extensive use of such tests by federal agencies has prompted Sen. SAM J. ERVIN JR. (D-N.C.), the chairman of the Senate subcommittee on Constitutional rights, to voice grave concern about "the massive surrender of individual privacy to which the government is subjecting its civil servants by the use of various questionnaires and scientific instruments."

Rep. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER (D-N.J.), who has led a crusade against use of the tests by government agencies, has warned of "the jeopardy in which one is placed when this type of test remains part of a federal employe's file . . . one can have no real assurance that his written answers to such intimate questions won't come back to haunt him in the future. There is no guarantee that these files will not fall into the wrong hands five, 10 or 20 years from now."

Under pressure from Congress and government workers' unions, some federal agencies have curtailed their use of the tests within the past year. But reliance on the personality probes dies hard. The Peace Corps, sharply criticized for using the MMPI to screen applicants, insists that the test saved it from costly and embarrassing selection errors.

ACLU'S COMPLAINT

Only recently, the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) complained that a "sixteen personality factor test" administered by the Federal Aviation Agency to 20,000 air traffic controllers contains questions on political, racial and religious opinions. The fact that an employee is asked such questions by his government, the ACLU argued, "may quite understandably cause him to refrain from joining organizations or voicing his views on political and other controversial issues."

Those who devise and administer personality tests and other mind-probing techniques tend to dismiss such protests as old-fashioned and unscientific. The individual's traditional right of privacy, they contend, must be "balanced" against the public purpose served by the information. Furthermore, they argue, no one is compelled to submit to personality screening.

But troublesome questions are raised by the issue of voluntary consent. The permission of parents is generally sought, for example, before school children are subjected to personality testing. But even if a parent knows to what he is consenting—an assumption that cannot be taken for granted—a problem remains.

CONSIDERATION

"Should not a child, even before the age of full legal responsibility, be accorded the dignity of a private personality? Considerations of healthy personal growth, buttressed with reasons of ethics, seem to command that this be done," Oscar M. Ruebhausen and Orville G. Brim Jr. wrote last November in the Columbia Law Review.

How much freedom has an adult to refuse to submit to when doing so may jeopardize his application for employment, promotion or security clearance? A job applicant who was subjected to an exhaustive battery of personality tests by a private employer commented afterward, "The worst part was that I wanted the job badly enough to put up with the humiliation."

Even the surface semblance of consent is far from universal. In their article on "privacy and behavioral research," Ruebhausen and Brim commented:

"Examples of 'forced' submission to privacy probes can be found in our hospitals, our schools, our colleges, our social welfare programs, our research institutes, and our institutions for the disturbed, handicapped or retarded. Such a disregard for the dignity of personality—occasional though it may be—must be guarded against and eliminated by the social scientists themselves.

"If they fail or refuse to exercise self-control, then the community will inevitably feel compelled to act for itself and legislate for the protection of personal privacy."

Our Fishbowl Society—Eavesdropping Industry Sets New Sales Records

(By Erwin Knoll)

Washington.—Official and private snooping, practiced by high-priced experts or do-it-yourself amateurs, ranks with the fastest-growing industries in the United States.

Bernard Spindel, A New York private investigator who specializes in guarding business clients against the incursions of eavesdroppers and wiretappers, believes that industrial espionage alone "has been growing at the rate of three times more each year than the previous year."

John W. Leon, a Washington private detective who sells a $400 bugging-and-hidden-camera kit, which he calls "The Ten-Day Blitz," says business is booming— especially among husbands who want to spy on their wives. He thinks the birth-control pill may account for many sales.

VOLUME MULTIPLIES

Ben Jamil, whose Continental Telephone Supply Company started out as a New York retail shop for decorator phones, has multiplied his volume many times since branching out four years ago into "sophisticated surveillance, monitoring, security and anti-bugging devices." They include "sugar cube microphones" and electronic bugs concealed "on a seemingly innocent picture frame."

"While the majority of what we sell in the security and surveillance field is purchased by private investigators, law enforcement agencies, business and industry," Jamil says, "there is a definite market for it among private citizens."

Nobody knows exactly how many millions of dollars are spent on snooping each year, or how many citizens' privacy is being violated. But the experts agree—with equanimity or alarm, depending on their point of view—that prying is at an all-time peak and still increasing.

DAILY OCCURRENCE

"The average urban citizen can't go a single day without being spied on, listened to or peeped at," says Bernard Fensterwald Jr., chief counsel on administrative practice and procedure. The subcommittee has conducted extensive hearings on government and private snooping under the championship of Senator Edward V. Long (D-Mo.)

You need not be a tycoon or a foreign agent, an underworld kingpin or an errant wife in order to come under someone's covert scrutiny.

You may be a prospective auto purchaser whom an enterprising salesman has invited to sit down in a floor model and "talk it over with your wife." Your conversation may be picked up by a microphone concealed in the car's cigaret lighter and transmitted to the salesman, who learns that you will buy if he "throws in the whitewall tires."

COMMENTS OVERHEARD

You may be a department store shopper whose comments at the counter are relayed by a hidden transmitter to a store executive eager to gage customer reaction to the merchandise.

You may be the innocent user of a public pay telephone that has been tapped by law enforcement agents because it is frequently used by a suspected gambler. A survey showed that of 3,588 wiretaps placed by the New York police in one year, 1,617 were on public phones.

Your home telephone conversations may be overheard by an operator who is assigned by the telephone company to monitor the quality of service. A special Massachusetts legislative committee on wiretapping recently found that about 2,400 calls a month were being monitored in the Greater Boston area without the knowledge of telephone subscribers.

DETECTION COSTLY

No telephone lines were exempt from such "service observing," said State Sen. Mario Umana. Though the operators were merely supposed to check the connections and voice levels, "there was nothing to prevent them from listening to entire calls."

If you are important enough to merit the most sophisticated surveillance—if you are, for example, an executive, an executive in a highly competitive industry such as drugs, cosmetics or alcoholic beverages—your every word may be recorded by ultramodern snooping devices miniaturized and concealed so as to defy detection. Spindel says detection equipment needed to find such gadgets costs more than $100,000.

The law on wiretapping and bugging is vague and only rarely enforced—"both a legal desert and a legal jungle," says Long.

Wiretapping is illegal under Section 605 of the Federal Communications Act of 1934, but the Justice Department ruled long ago that the law is broken only when the contents of an intercepted conversation are divulged. This interpretation, says "debugging" expert Spindel, is "like saying it's no crime to rob a bank, so long as you don't spend the money."

The Justice Department admits to placing wiretaps in national security cases—an estimated 50 to 100 a year. It has been embarrassed by recent disclosures that FBI agents made free-wheeling use of eavesdropping devices in investigations of Las Vegas gamblers and of Washington Rep. Fred Black, who figured in the Bobby Baker case.

Nor is the FBI the only government agency that resorts to the use of covert listening devices. Long's investigation found, for example, that the Internal Revenue Service ran a wiretapping school for its agents and used eavesdropping gear to overhear conversations between citizens and their lawyers.

Local law enforcement agencies are even less inhibited than federal investigators, for state courts—unlike the federal judiciary—have freely admitted wiretap information as evidence. Informed of the extent of wiretapping in New York City, Long wondered aloud whether residents of the city "wouldn't be apprehensive about even having a telephone."

ORDER ISSUED

Last February, the Federal Communications Commission issued an order barring the use of radio transmitters for eavesdropping by private citizens. The new rule, the commission said, reflected "growing public indignation with increased intrusion into the traditional right of privacy through the use of microphones."

But Sen. Clifford P. Case (R-N.J.) has pointed out that the new FCC order "is still inadequate. By specifically exempting all law enforcement agencies, the order leaves a gaping loophole for invasions of an individual's privacy. And, because the order is almost impossible to enforce, it has more surface than substance."

Case's appraisal is supported by the men whose business it is to sell and install snooping gadgets. Though they claim that they advise customers of the new FCC regulation, they also note that sales have not been hurt. And they concede that they don't ask too many questions about the uses to which their merchandise is applied.

Jamil, whose Continental Telephone inventory includes an electronic stethoscope that can be used to amplify an unborn baby's heartbeat—or a neighbor's private conversation—says with a grin that "most of the people who come in to see us say they are doctors."

"Naturally, the fact that a few people misuse some of the devices we market concerns me," Jamil told Long's subcommittee. "But it concerns me the same way the manufacturer of razor blades, kitchen knives or high-powered automobiles would be concerned if his product were used for illegal acts for which they were not intended."

From his own profit statements, Jamil has concluded that the American people have become "fascinated with electronic spy gimmicks. The adult comic book world of James Bond and Napoleon Solo (has) captured the imagination of the man-in-the-street."

One of his catalogs is headed, "To Satisfy the Spy in You."

The fascination extends beyond subtle gadgets designed to overhear and record the spoken word. Miniaturized cameras and TV transmitters are being manufactured, sold and secretly installed.

Equipment is available that permits unobtrusive observation of a darkened room. Retailers of telescopes and field glasses report handsome sales to urban and suburban apartment dwellers whose evening pastime is watching their neighbors.

At the request of IRS and other government agencies, the Post Office maintains "mail covers" on some citizens, recording the names and addresses of their correspondents. But the snooping industry goes this practice one better. Investigator Spindel says he can "take the contents of an envelope—read the letter, photograph it—without even breaking the seal."

Perhaps the most troubling aspect of the Fishbowl Society is that most of those who live in it seem to view it with equanimity. There has been no great public outcry in response to disclosures of mounting invasions of privacy.

"People have to learn that they can say no to these things," says Rep. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER (D-N.J.). But LONG warns that "by the time the people finally become indignant enough to demand that something be done, it will be too late."

In one of the definitive legal statements on the right of privacy, Samuel D. Warren and Louis D. Brandeis wrote in the Harvard Law Review the "modern enterprise and invention have, through invasions upon his privacy, subjected (the individual) to mental pain and distress far greater than could be inflicted by mere bodily injury."

Their article appeared in 1890. Modern enterprise and invention have come a long way since.

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, while this unhappy world continues to be embroiled in dissension, misunderstanding and armed conflicts, and while we continue in the ancient way of concentrating most of our attention on the hostilities which scar the lives of all, and committing—with little question—a vast part of the resources of our earth to the art of warfare, there has been, nevertheless, an international agency which has gone about the earth—quietly, persistently, and effectively—promoting those programs which contribute to the art of peace. For two decades the United Nations Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization has dedicated its efforts toward international understanding and it has done so through sponsoring projects, such as cultural exchange programs which bridge the differences between us and reveal the common humanity we share. UNESCO has accomplished this with amazingly little in the way of financial aid. Yet I venture to say these are among the most famous and revered initials in the world, and for justified reasons. What a different world this might be today had all nations, in these past two decades, contributed as much in the way of effort and resources to UNESCO's purposes, as they have toward creating the vast, efficient, and deadly machinery of war. It is my belief that many of those components in our existence—poverty, ignorance, disease—which contribute to human misery, would now be near control.

About a year ago, Mr. Speaker, President Johnson delivered what I consider to be one of his most deeply moving and eloquent speeches. On the occasion of the Smithsonian Institution's bicentennial celebration he said "For we know today that certain truths are self-evident in every nation on this earth: that ideas, not armaments, will shape our lasting prospects for peace; that the conduct of our foreign policy will advance no faster than the curriculum of our classrooms; and that the knowledge of our citizens is the treasure which grows only when it is shared." Just as James Smithson, who was honored on this occasion, wished to serve his fellow man through the "increase and diffusion of knowledge among men," so does UNESCO support the same goal. On November 4 this organization will celebrate its 20th anniversary. It richly deserves the congratulations and gratitude of us all and at this point I would like to place in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, the President's proclamation regarding the anniversary, the statement of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO and, in addition, the full text of the speech which President Johnson gave at the Smithsonian Institution on the value of international education and understanding:

[From the Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents]

TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF UNESCO

[Proclamation 3741. August 31, 1966]

By the President of the United States of America a Proclamation

On November 4, 1946, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) officially came into being as one of the specialized agencies of the United Nations.

UNESCO was created for the purpose of contributing to peace and security "by promoting collaboration among the nations through education, science and culture in order to further universal respect for justice, for the rule of law and for the human rights and fundamental freedoms which are affirmed for the peoples of the world, without distinction of race, sex, language or religion, by the Charter of the United Nations."

Our Government was active in the founding of UNESCO. It has continued to support the Organization in its effort to create a climate in the world in which a just peace may prevail.

UNESCO has a critical role to play in bringing the educational techniques of the developed world to the newly emerging nations of man's family. Its mission should embrace the simplest teaching, and the most sophisticated arts and sciences of which our species is capable.

As we work to build in America a truly great society, it is with hope and satisfaction that we look upon the work of UNESCO in its effort to advance the common welfare of mankind:

Now, THEREFORE, I, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, President of the United States of America, do hereby call to the attention of the people of the United States that November 4, 1966, is the Twentieth Anniversary of UNESCO and call upon them to observe the occasion with appropriate ceremonies and manifestations of support for the Organization.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

DONE at the City of Washington this 31st day of August in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-six, [SEAL] and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and ninety-first.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

By the President:

DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 1:50 p.m., September 2, 1966]

ACHIEVEMENT AND CHALLENGE: THE UNITED STATES AND UNESCO

(A statement by the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO in connection with the 20th anniversary of UNESCO)

Twenty years ago a bold idea was put to the test: whether the world can pursue peace and the betterment of mankind more effectively by an intensive cooperative effort which harnesses education, science and culture to the task.

The United National Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization was born of that idea. UNESCO was conceived as the home of international intellectual cooperation for the benefit of all humanity. Through UNESCO the brainpower and the strength of all civilizations would be mobilized in the service of world peace.

Now, twenty years later, new challenges to peace and new world alignments make even more crucial the role assumed by UNESCO. It is ever clearer that a worldwide flowering of education, science and cultural resources is necessary to make a world in which all men can live in amity.

We have learned, in those twenty years, that knowledge of one's cultural heritage and of its contribution to the progress of all the world is vital to national dignity; that international understanding of others must supplement generosity in sharing one's own gifts; that self-help is the first requisite for accepting, as it is for giving; that the combined strength of the nations of the world has vastly greater potential than the piecemeal efforts of single nations or small groups of nations for achieving improvement of the lot of man everywhere and increasing respect of man for man, regardless of where he lives and how he chooses to fulfill his destiny.

UNESCO has been at work on these goals for the short period of two decades. Its resources have been uneven. Intellectually wealthy, it has depended upon meager budgets smaller even than those of major universities. Nevertheless, it has made noteworthy progress in the arts of peace.

It has battled against illiteracy. It assisted European nations devastated by World War II to rebuild their educational facilities. It has established training centers for leaders from developing countries to teach their peoples the art of living. New cadres of educators and scientists have been created in countries old and new. UNESCO has assembled the world's first armada of peace—scores of vessels under many flags to study the recesses of the oceans for man's benefit. It has sought to develop understanding between East and West through interchanges of peoples, literature and art. Its sponsorship of international conferences has regularly brought together the leaders of mankind's intellectual and artistic endeavors. It has sought to preserve, for the inspiration of future generations, the priceless art of ancient civilizations. It has encouraged creativity in contemporary arts and humanistic scholarship.

The achievement of so much with so little of the resources of UNESCO members has demonstrated beyond doubt that with truly adequate support this agency could go far to realize man's persisting dreams of a secure world peace. Adequate support is essential for UNESCO to contend successfully with long persistent problems or awesomely threatening new ones which all but engulf the considerable achievements thus far. Illiteracy has been reduced in some areas, but it has not been rolled back. More than half of the people of the world—young and old—can barely read or write. Each year, growing populations require more food, more schools, more teachers, more housing. At the same time, these same peoples experience a keener desire for the products of modern science and technology, and for those joys which come from stable governments.

In the decades ahead, we see tasks which can be effectively tackled only by the comity of states—by increased collaboration among nations and governments.

Educators, scientists, artists, writers, and others in the world intellectual community are not willing to leave man's destiny solely in the hands of political leaders. The intellectual community believes it can join with enlightened political leadership in helping to shape man's better destiny and to contribute not only to his progress but to his very survival.

This Commission is not content merely to say "Happy Birthday, UNESCO, on your twentieth anniversary." We publicly affirm our faith and our hope in UNESCO. We call upon the people of the United States to join us in study of UNESCO's potentials and its challenges. We request the Congress and other agencies of our government to continue and, indeed, to increase their support for UNESCO and its objectives.

We urge our colleges and universities to extend their international dimensions. We recommend that elementary and secondary schools, public and private, sharply increase the resources devoted to the study of world affairs. We especially call upon the great voluntary nongovernmental organizations, with their millions of members, to extend and accelerate activities in promoting understanding of the world's peoples and of the work of UNESCO and in increasing their educational, scientific and cultural contribution to the advancement of people everywhere.

The nations of the world have much to learn from each other—much to receive as well as to give. Each is richer for the combined efforts of all to reach and understand others. Our hope for the future lies in the close cooperation of governments, individuals and organizations freely working together for the larger goals of peace and prosperity for all mankind.

William Benton, New York, New York.

Bruno V. Bitker, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

Kenneth E. Boulding, American Economic Association.

Waldo G. Bowman, Engineers Joint Council.

Harvie Branscomb, Nashville, Tennessee.

A. Marvin Braverman, Washington, D.C.

Ben Brodinsky, Educational Press Association.

Mrs. R. Max Brooks, Austin, Texas.

Mrs. Lisle C. Carter, National Council of Negro Women.

Ewan Clague, American Statistical Association.

Mrs. Elizabeth N. Erlanger, U.S. Committee of the International Association of Arts.

Alvin C. Eurich, Aspen, Colorado.

Herbert E. Evans, National Association of Broadcasters.

Merle Fainsod, American Political Science Association.

William J. Farson, American Newspaper Guild.

Lewis E. Hahn, American Philosophical Association.

Barrett Hollister, American Friends Service Committee.

Robert B. Hudson, National Educational Television.

Sarah T. Hughes, Dallas, Texas.

Eugene H. Jacobson, American Psychological Association.

Howard L. Kany, Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

John E. King, American Council on Education.

Douglas M. Knight, Durham, North Carolina.

Joseph B. Koepfli, American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Clyde F. Kohn, Association of American Geographers.

Walter H. C. Laves, Bloomington, Indiana.

Helen R. Le Baron, American Home Economics Association.

Brunson MacChesney, American Society of International Law.

Raymond F. McCoy, National Catholic Educational Association.

Shannon McCune, Burlington, Vermont.

Thomas F. Malone, American Geophysical Union.

John D. Millett, Columbus, Ohio.

Jennelle Moorhead, National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

Raymond D. Nasher, Dallas, Texas.

William H. Nicholls, Social Science Research Council.

C. Joseph Nuesse, National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Donald M. Oenslager, American National Theatre and Academy.

Edward Papantonio, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

G. Baley Price, American Mathematical Society.

Mrs. Leon K. Richards, League of Women Voters of the United States.

Ben H. Radcliffe, National Farmers Union.

John S. Richardson, National Science Teachers Association.

Mrs. Gloria Schaffer, Woodbridge, Connecticut.

Edgar F. Shannon, Jr., Charlottesville, Virginia.

Lawrence M. C. Smith, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Mrs. Robert E. Speer, Department of Classroom Teachers, National Education Association.

J. Edward Sproul, National Council of Young Men's Christian Associations.

George Winchester Stone, Jr., American Council of Learned Societies.

Raynard C. Swank, American Library Association.

Mrs. M. L. Taymor, West Newton, Massachusetts.

Haydn Williams, San Francisco, California.

Robley C. Williams, National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council.

Andrew H. Berding, Washington, D.C.

Walter Orr Roberts, Boulder, Colorado.

Mrs. Ella Stewart, Toledo, Ohio.

On the afternoon of September 16, 1965 President Lyndon B. Johnson delivered the following remarks at the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., on the occasion of the institution's bicentennial celebration:

Distinguished scholars from 80 nations:

Amid this pomp and pageantry we have gathered to celebrate a man about whom we know very little but to whom we owe very much. James Smithson was a scientist who achieved no great distinction. He was an Englishman who never visited the United States. He never even expressed the desire to do so.

But this man became our nation's first benefactor. He gave his entire fortune to establish this Institution which would serve "for the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men."

He had a vision which lifted him ahead of his time—or at least of some politicians of his time. One illustrious United States Senator argued it was beneath the dignity of the country to accept such a gift from foreigners. Congress debated eight long years before deciding to receive Smithson's bequest.

Yet James Smithson's life and legacy brought meaning to three ideas more powerful than anyone at that time ever dreamed.

The first idea was that learning respects no geographic boundaries. The Institution bearing his name became the first agency in the United States to promote scientific and scholarly exchange with all the nations in the world.

The second idea was that partnership between Government and private enterprise can serve the greater good of both. The Smithsonian Institution started a new kind of venture in this country, chartered by act of Congress, maintained by both public funds and private contributions. It inspired a relationship which has grown and flowered in a thousand different ways.

Finally, the Institution financed by Smithson breathed life in the idea that the growth and the spread of learning must be the first work of a nation that seeks to be free.

These ideas have not always gained easy acceptance among those employed in my line of work. The government official must cope with the daily disorder that he finds in the world around him.

But today, the official, the scholar and the scientist cannot settle for limited objectives. We must pursue knowledge no matter what the consequences. We must value the tried less than the true.

To split the atom, to launch the rocket, to explore the innermost mysteries and the outermost reaches of the universe—these are your God-given chores. And even when you risk bringing fresh disorder to the politics of men and nations, these explorations still must go on.

The men who founded our country were passionate believers in the revolutionary power of ideas.

They knew that once a nation commits itself to the increase and diffusion of knowledge, the real revolution begins. It can never be stopped.

In my own life, I have had cause again and again to bless the chance events which started me as a teacher. In our country and in our time we have recognized, with new passion, that learning is basic to our hopes for America. It is the taproot which gives sustaining life to all of our purposes. And whatever we seek to do to wage the war on poverty, to set new goals for health and happiness, to curb crime, or try to bring beauty to our cities and our countryside—all of these, and more, depend on education.

But the legacy we inherit from James Smithson cannot be limited to these shores. He called for the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men, not just Americans, not just Anglo-Saxons, and not just the citizens of the western world—but all men everywhere.

The world we face on his bicentennial anniversary makes that mandate much more urgent than it ever was. For we know today that certain truths are self-evident in every nation on this earth: that ideas, not armaments, will shape our lasting prospects for peace; that the conduct of our foreign policy will advance no faster than the curriculum of our classrooms; and that the knowledge of our citizens is the treasure which grows only when it is shared.

It would profit us little to limit the world exchange to those who can afford it. We must extend the treasure to those lands where learning is still a luxury for the few.

Today, more than 700 million adults—four out of ten of the world's population—dwell in darkness where they cannot read or write. Almost half the nations of this globe suffer from illiteracy among half or more of their people. And unless the world can find a way to extend the light, the forces of that darkness may ultimately engulf us all.

For our part, this Government and this Nation is prepared to join in finding the way. During recent years we have made much hopeful beginnings. But we can and we must do more. That is why I have directed a special task force within my Administration to recommend a broad and long-range plan of world-wide educational endeavor.

Secretary of State Rusk has accepted my request to chair this task force. Secretary John Gardner of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has agreed to serve on it. Both these men have proved, in their past careers, how great is their devotion to international education.

I intend to call on leaders in both public and private enterprise to join with us in mapping this effort.

We must move ahead on every front and every level of learning. We can support [the] dream of creating a center here at the Smithsonian where great scholars from every nation will come and collaborate. At a more junior level, we can promote the growth of the school-to-school program started under Peace Corps auspices so that our children may learn about—and care about—each other.

We mean to show that this nation's dream of a Great Society does not stop at the water's edge. And that it is not just an American dream. All are welcome to share in it. All are invited to contribute to it.

Together we must embark on a new and a noble adventure:

First, to assist the education effort of the developing nations and the developing regions.

Second, to help our schools and universities increase their knowledge of the world and the people who inhabit it.

Third, to advance the exchange of students and teachers who travel and work outside their native lands.

Fourth, to increase the free flow of books and ideas and art, of works of science and imagination.

And, fifth, to assemble meetings of men and women from every discipline and every culture to ponder the common problems of mankind.

In all these endeavors, I pledge that the United States will play its full role.

By January, I intend to present such a program to the Congress.

Despite the noise of daily events, history is made by men and the ideas of men. We—and only we—can generate growing light in our universe, or we can allow the darkness to gather.

DeTocqueville challenged us more than a century ago: "Men cannot remain strangers to each other, or be ignorant of what is taking place in any corner of the globe." We must banish strangeness and the ignorance.

In all we do toward one another, we must try—and try again—to live the words of the prophet: "I shall light a candle of understanding in thine heart which shall not be put out."

THE FAIR PACKAGING AND LABELING ACT

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GILLIGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, when the Senate approved the conference report on S. 985—the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act—Senator PHILIP HART, of Michigan, noted that the bill "was a strong, effective act—far stronger than most people think" and generously gave credit to the House for improving the bill that had passed the Senate.

I compliment Senator HART on his unremitting fight for consumers for more than 5 years which has now culminated in the passing of this legislation and I agree that it is "a strong, effective act" of which Congress may be proud.

I find myself in disagreement with the distinguished Senator from Michigan, however, over his interpretation of the House amendment changing the phrase "price comparison" to "value comparison" in the statement of policy and elsewhere throughout the act.

I am the author of this amendment in the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It is designed to insure that the Government agencies and officials charged with enforcing the law and issuing regulations thereunder do not exercise the powers conferred upon them, particularly by section 5, for the sole purpose of facilitating a mathematical computation; that is, a price comparison, in the supermarket aisle. Price is only one element in a consumer value decision; other factors of equal or greater importance are product performance, the convenience of the package, and the suitability of the size or quantity of the product in satisfying a consumer's personal desire or need. Obviously what constitutes value is highly subjective. It is a decision that must be made by each individual and is a personal judgment of the kind the Federal Government is ill-equipped and should not be asked to make for the consumer. In sponsoring the change from price comparison to value comparison it was never my intention to intrude the Federal Government into quality determinations, or "grade labeling and Government testing of consumer products," as Senator HART has suggested.

In short, the amendment was conceived to avoid having this new statute mislead consumers by overaccentuating price at the expense of other and often more important elements of true value, rather than opening broad new areas of regulatory control or experimentation. I am sure I can fairly say that all members of the House committee had this understanding when I offered the amendment and obtained its approval.

THE 89TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION—A RECORD OF ACCOMPLISHMENT

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, much has been said during the past few months about the accomplishments of the 1st session of the 89th Congress. There is no question about the great outpouring of farsighted and beneficial legislation approved by Congress during 1965, but any Congress must be evaluated as an entire unit. Therefore, what we have done here during the past 10 months of 1966 is of equal importance to accomplishments of the first session. First of all, we have perfected and refined some of the legislation enacted during the first session. Even more important, we have provided the appropriations with which to actually implement these programs which will prove of tremendous value to the people of this Nation. It is my desire to review some of these accomplishments of the second session of the 89th Congress.

First of all turning to my own legislative program, 1965 was indeed a memorable year. The Congress enacted and the President signed into law legislation authorizing construction of the $425 million Auburn-Folsom South project, thereby realizing a goal for which I have worked the entire 25 years I have been privileged to serve in local, State and Federal legislative capacities. The Congress and the President quickly came to the aid of our northern California regions by enacting into law the Pacific-Northwest Disaster Act which I drafted even before the Christmas 1964 floods subsided. The Congress established the Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area, a major national park facility which I proposed. The year 1965 was one of the outstanding legislative years of my life; however, there was no time to relax for there were many other challenges to be met and legislation to move ahead.

In the closing days of the 89th Congress this week, final action was taken to provide a permanent program of Federal assistance for areas suffering a major disaster. It is hoped that this legislation will preclude the necessity of introducing special legislation every time tragedy hits an area, such as the floods of northern California and the hurricanes of the South. This legislation was, in part, an outgrowth of my efforts to seek permanent solutions after the enactment of the Pacific Northwest Disaster Act.

This year, the President signed into law another bill of mine which has national significance, the Small Reclamation Projects Act which extends and expands a program helpful to Nevada Irrigation District and other California water districts.

Ever since I first came to the House of Representatives 8 years ago I have been driving forward on a massive effort to expand the road and trail development in our national forests. In 1959, the annual authorization was less than $30 million. We have expanded the program steadily and surely. We had increased the annual authorization to $85 million in 7 years, but the authorization was doubled this year to a total of $170 million, the amount required to keep the program for national forests moving ahead.

These and a $55 million water and power development program for the Second Congressional District were enacted into law during the 2d session of the 89th Congress. Another of my bills which did not become law but which achieved its purpose was that to force the Post Office Department to provide door-to-door service to new subdivisions. Introduction of the bill by myself and others, and continuing discussions convinced Postmaster General Larry O'Brien the post office must provide the service our people deserve. Just a few days ago, Mr. O'Brien advised me that he has removed the ban against door-to-door delivery in new subdivisions throughout our Nation. Our complaints convinced him of the inequities of this policy which he had inherited when taking office. I should also note here the attack made this year on our summer post offices. It was planned to abandon all of them. By personal intervention with the Postmaster General and at the White House, we were able to save them. We cannot relax, however. We must continue to hold the post offices we have and also to expand and improve them. I am pleased to report that, during the past 2 years, 55 Second District post offices have been expanded or modernized.

Other portions of my long-range legislative program made substantial progress, but considerable effort must be expended yet to achieve final victory in future sessions of Congress. These include legislation to clarify and protect the rights of special-use permittees on national forests to their improvements. At the present time, holders of these permits face the complete loss of their improvements, without compensation, if the land is recovered by the Forest Service. Legislation to correct this gross inequity has been drafted, introduced, and now is moving through the legislative process.

One of my first efforts upon coming to Congress in January 1959 was to start a move to reopen our gold mines. While the road has been slow and difficult—facing consistent opposition from the executive agencies of government and especially the Treasury Department—we have made great progress. This year both the House and Senate Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs endorsed legislation which I had drafted and introduced, Senator GRUENING of Alaska sponsoring the companion bill in the Senate. Hopefully we can achieve final victory in the 90th Congress.

Turning to other legislation of national and international significance enacted this year, I would like to note the accomplishments of the two major committees on which I am privileged to serve—the Committee on Public Works and Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Public works: A $7.2 billion interstate highway construction program was authorized for the next 2 years with the deadline for completion being extended until 1973. A $2 billion program of aid to State highways was approved. A 3-year, $332 million cooperative highway safety program was created in an effort to reduce the tragic highway traffic toll. An omnibus rivers and harbors flood control act including the $132,900,000 Marysville dam and reservoir to be constructed by the Army Corps of Engineers on the Yuba River and other California projects, was voted. Federal assistance to communities combating water pollution was expanded and extended.

Interior and insular affairs: The authorization for a national program of water research was increased to provide $85 million in 10 years for grants and contracts. The Secretary of Interior was authorized to complete studies of various reclamation projects, including the Pleasant Oak unit in El Dorado County and the Allen Camp project on the Pit River. National shore status was given to the Indiana dunes, North Carolina's Cape Lookout, and the authorization for the Point Reyes National Seashore in California was increased to permit continued development. The Congress took appropriate steps to preserve historic sites of national importance and in the closing days enacted legislation to permit the development and harnessing for beneficial use of power generated by geothermal steam on public lands.

The responsibility of a Representative in Congress is not limited to the matters strictly relating to his district or to his committee assignments. He, of course, has national and international responsibilities. This means that he must participate actively in the debates on all the issues brought before the Congress for consideration and, to the best of his ability, vote his own conscience on all of them.

The spectrum of legislation before the 1966 session of Congress has been broad, as is indicated from the bills mentioned above. Overshadowing much of the debate, however, has been the question of Vietnam. The vast majority of the Congress has supported the President's efforts to seek peace in the troubled lands of southeast Asia and at the same time supported the needs of our servicemen who are fighting to keep an ally from falling under the heel of Communist aggression.

In the field of national and international defense and security, the Congress took the following steps:

Authorized $17.8 billion for fiscal 1967 for Armed Forces' procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, including nuclear-powered frigate and two destroyers.

Authorized $4.8 billion supplemental funds for fiscal 1966 for aircraft, missiles and combat vehicles, naval vessels, research and military construction due to Vietnam conflict.

Authorized $1.05 billion for military construction for fiscal 1967 at Armed Forces bases at home and abroad, including Beale and McClellan AFB's and Sierra Army Depot.

Authorized supplementary $415 million foreign aid funds in fiscal 1966 for Vietnam and other southeast Asia nations.

Authorized U.S. participation in newly created Asian Development Bank.

Authorized $500 million emergency food assistance to India, partially donated.

Authorized $3.5 billion for foreign economic and military aid, including technical assistance, to limited number of countries.

Extended the Peace Corps.

Expressed sense of the Congress against Soviet Russia persecution of persons because of their religion.

In the field of national economy, the Congress took these steps:

Established new and uniform standards for bank mergers.

Increased borrowing authority of Federal National Mortgage Association to stimulate homebuilding and the mortgage market.

Amended Fair Labor Standards Act to step up minimum wage in interstate commerce from $1.25 to $1.60 an hour by 1968 for workers presently covered and by 1971 for 8 million additional workers newly covered in this act.

Covered 2.3 million more workers under unemployment compensation system, fixed minimum standards, provided under certain conditions, for additional 13 weeks' benefits after expiration of normal period, with Federal and State Governments sharing cost equally.

Permitted self-employed to take tax deduction for full amount of contributions to their individual pension fund.

Raised limit of Small Business Administration business loans by $125 million to $1.5 billion and set up separate disaster loan revolving fund.

The 2d session of the 89th Congress completed the record on several social security, health and welfare programs, including the following:

Provided social security benefits to persons not otherwise eligible who are 72 or over by 1968 and receive no other pension or relief.

Required mandatory Federal safety standards for all new cars, buses and trucks.

Authorized 3-year $155 million program to help meet shortage of health professions personnel through grants for: Construction of facilities, improvement and expansion of curricula, traineeships for technicians, therapists and others in specialized duties; provided loans for students at schools of medicine, dentistry, nursing, and other allied professions.

Extended for 3 years through fiscal 1969, provisions of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963. Authorized $2.06 billion for grants and loans for construction of academic facilities, and $160 million for student scholarships under National Defense Education Act.

Extended Library Services and Construction Act of 1964 for 5 years; authorized $88 million for fiscal 1967.

Extended to May 31, 1966, time to register for voluntary supplementary medical benefits under Social Security Act.

Extended for 2 years and authorized $5.7 billion through fiscal year 1968 for aid to elementary and secondary schools in districts of low-income families and areas providing school service to children of Federal employees.

Expanded National School Lunch Act to include 2-year trial child-nutrition program of breakfast for pupils in poor economic areas or who must travel long distances. Authorized $465 million for 4 years through June 30, 1970, for special milk program and $63 million for 3 years to help schools purchase food preparation and service equipment.

Permitted setting aside Federal public lands for needed school sites. Permitted leasing Federal public lands to local governments for up to 25 years for recreational or school sites.

And among the other important legislation enacted were the new Federal judicial district to serve eastern and northern California, a Federal employee pay increase, a cold war GI bill of rights, a military pay increase, a program of expanded oceanographic research, and establishment of a Department of Transportation.

On each and every one of the issues brought before the House of Representatives for action, I have made my beliefs well known, a policy which I have followed throughout my legislative career. In accordance with this policy, I respectfully request authority to insert at this point in the RECORD my rollcall votes on issues before the 89th Congress.

Voting record of Congressman Harold T. (Bizz) Johnson, 89th Cong.

1ST SESSION

My stand	Issue	Status
For	Election of John McCormack as Speaker of the House of Representatives	McCormack elected.
For	To authorize swearing in of Mississippi delegation	Approved.
For	To adopt rules for 89th Cong. insuring smoother flow of legislation	Approved.
Against	To restrict Presidential authority in food for peace program	Approved.
Against	To restrict Presidential discretion in granting aid to United Arab Republic	Rejected.
Against	To eliminate gold cover requirements on Federal Reserve bank certificates	Public Law 89-3.
Paired for	To continue Arms Control and Disarmament Act	Public Law 89-27.
Paired for	To increase U.S. participation in Inter-American Development Bank	Public Law 89-6.
For	To authorize funds for House Un-American Activities Committee	Approved.
For	To assist rebuilding Appalachian economy	Public Law 89-4.
For	To control abuses in manufacture and sale of drugs, especially "goof balls," etc	Public Law 89-74.
For	To establish standards for congressional redistricting	Passed House.
For	To provide $3,000 annual pay increase for Supreme Court Justices	Rejected.
For	To provide acreage-poundage quotas for tobacco	Public Law 89-12.
Against	To substitute an unrealistic formula of grant-in-aid for Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965	Rejected.
For	Passage of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965	Public Law 89-10.
For	Passage of Older Americans Act of 1965	Public Law 89-73.
For	Passage of Water Resources Planning Act of 1965	Public Law 89-80.
For	Extension of Manpower Development and Training Act for 2 years	Public Law 89-15.
For	To crack down on distribution of obscene mail	Passed House.
For	To rebuild the bombed chancery at Saigon, Vietnam	Public Law 89-22.
For	To appropriate funds for Treasury and Post Office Departments and Executive Offices	Public Law 89-57.
For	To appropriate emergency funds for northern California flood relief and other programs	Public Law 89-16.
Against	To substitute weaker, inadequate program for medicare	Rejected.
For	To provide health insurance program for aged under social security (medicare), increase social security payments and expand child health and other programs.	Public Law 89-97.
For	To authorize constitutional amendment on Presidential succession	Approved.
For	To authorize an investigation of the Ku Klux Klan	Approved.
Against	To increase by $1,000,000,000 U.S. quota of International Monetary Fund	Public Law 89-31.
For	To authorize broad program of Federal assistance to curb water pollution	Public Law 89-234.
For	To assist helicopter companies serving metropolitan areas	Rejected.
For	To continue National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964	Public Law 89-125.
Paired for	To extend health services to migrant workers, vaccination of preschoolchildren, and expand community health services	Public Law 89-109.
For	To authorize Federal assistance for community mental health centers	Public Law 89-105.
For	To appropriate funds for southeast Asia defense efforts	Public Law 89-18.
For	To authorize purchase of ships, aircraft, and other military equipment	Public Law 89-37.
For	To appropriate funds for National Aeronautics and Space Administration	Public Law 89-53.
For	To extend for 3 years and expand existing assistance for health research facilities program	Public Law 89-115.
For	To meet obligations under International Coffee Agreement	Public Law 89-23.
Paired against	To prevent Atomic Energy Commission from cooperating in nuclear reaction construction project	Rejected.
Paired for	To appropriate funds for Atomic Energy Commission	Public Law 89-32.
Against	To curtail Agency for International Development authority in Middle East and South America	Rejected.
Against	To restrict exports of agricultural products	Rejected.
For	To appropriate funds for Department of Agriculture	Public Law 89-316.
For	To appropriate funds for Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and judiciary	Public Law 89-164.
For	To broaden Federal Coal Mine Safety Act to increase accident prevention efforts	Public Law 89-376.
For	To eliminate or reduce excise taxes	Public Law 89-44.
For	To authorize appointment of Gen. William F. McKee, Federal Aviation Administrator	Public Law 89-46.
For	To permit wives of retired railroad employees to receive social security and retirement annuities under railroad retirement if eligible for both.	Public Law 89-212.
Against	To block appropriations for legislative branch of Government	Rejected.
For	To extend Export Control Act	Public Law 89-63.
For	To authorize temporary increase in public debt limit	Public Law 89-64.
For	To permit showing of John F. Kennedy film in United States	Approved.
Against	To establish Office of Urban Affairs under President	Rejected.
For	To establish Department of Housing and Urban Development	Public Law 89-174.
For	To authorize congressional student intern program	Approved.
For	To provide assistance to students attending advanced business, trade and other vocational schools (National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act).	Public Law 89-297.
For	To amend Agriculture Adjustment Act to take into consideration floods and other natural disasters	Public Law 89-112.
For	To request President to insure equal rights and self-determininiation for the people of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia	Approved.
For	To appropriate funds for Department of Defense	Public Law 89-213.
For	To extend Area Redevelopment Administration for 2 months	Public Law 89-55.
For	To commence debate on Housing and Urban Development Act	Approved.
For	To impose income ceilings on rent subsidies in Housing and Urban Development Act	Approved.
For	Passage of Housing and Urban Development Act	Public Law 89-117.
Against	To provide excessive penalties for falsifying voting information	Approved.
Against	To provide escape clause in voting rights bill	Rejected.
For	To accept completion of 6th grade in American schools where Spanish is spoken to qualify for voting under voting rights bill	Rejected.
Against	Proposed substitute voting rights bill	Rejected.
For	Passage of voting rights bill	Public Law 89-110.
For	To clarify Atomic Energy Commission regulations, and Federal, State, and local powers to regulate electricity generated, sold, or transmitted by AEC.	Public Law 89-135.
For	To require that temporary summer jobs in District of Columbia be apportioned among the States	Passed House.
Against	Final passage of Federal Cigaret Labeling and Advertising Act	Public Law 89-92.
For	To retain 40 percent silver in dimes and quarters	Rejected.
Against	To mint dimes and quarters of copper-nickel alloy	Public Law 89-81.
For	To increase pay of men serving our nation in the Armed Forces	Public Law 89-132.
Against	To reinstate individual Governor's veto over poverty programs	Rejected.
For	To extend Economic Opportunity Act of 1964	Public Law 89-253.
For	To repeal sec. 14(b) of Taft-Hartley Act to permit national policy concerning labor-management relations	Passed House.
For	To amend Atomic Energy Act of 1954 as it relates to power transmission lines	Public Law 89-135.
For	To apportion Federal highway funds among 50 States, and to require safety program for highways	Public Law 89-139.
For	To provide Federal support for training local law enforcement officers	Public Law 89-197.
For	To provide for rehabilitation of Federal prisoners	Public Law 89-176.
For	To increase annuities to retired civil service employees	Public Law 89-205.
For	To authorize construction needed at military installations, including Sierra Ordnance Depot, Beale AFB, McClellan AFB, and Mather AFB.	Vetoed.
For	To amend International Bank for Reconstruction and Development program and the International Finance Corporation	Public Law 89-126.
For	To extend for 2 years the interest equalization tax	Public Law 89-243.
For	To require an uninsured motorist fund in District of Columbia	Passed House.
For	To appropriate funds for military construction, 1966	Public Law 89-202.
For	To increase Public Works and Economic Development Act authorization	Approved.
Against	To eliminate commercial loan program from Public Works and Economic Development Act	Rejected.
For	Passage of Public Works and Economic Development Act	Public Law 89-136.
Against	To admit certain forms of nickel free of tariff	Public Law 89-204.
For	Final passage of Foreign Assistance Act of 1965	Public Law 89-171.
Against	To approve the farm subsidy and control bill for 1965	Public Law 89-321.
Against	To prevent funding of manpower retraining, school assistance programs, recruitment of farmworkers and to combat heart disease, cancer, and stroke.	Rejected.
Against	To impose artificial and unrealistic limitations upon immigration by Western Hemisphere neighbors	Rejected.
For	Passage of Immigration and Naturalization Act	Public Law 89-236.
For	Passage of Higher Education Act of 1965	Public Law 89-329.
For	To extend Federal financial aid to public elementary and secondary schools affected by a major disaster	Public Law 89-313.
For	To consider Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965	Approved.
For	To extend and expand Federal assistance to schools training health personnel and also student loan programs	Public Law 89-290.
For	To authorize research on high-speed ground transportation	Public Law 89-220.

Voting record of Congressman Harold T. (Bizz) Johnson, 89th Cong.—Continued

My stand	Issue	Status
For	To pass new military construction bill modified to remove language which caused veto	Public Law 89-188.
For	To increase compensation rates for veterans with service-connected disabilities	Public Law 89-311.
For	To authorize funds for the President's Crime Commission	Public Law 89-196.
For	To consider Equal Employment Opportunity Act	Approved.
For	Resolution to take up Bank Holding Company Act	Approved.
For	Resolution to take up bill establishing National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities	Approved.
For	Resolution to take up Federal pay bill	Approved.
Against	Motion to kill proposed rules governing national parks' concession policies	Rejected.
Against	Motion to kill economic opportunity amendments	Approved.
Against	Motion to prevent establishment of National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities	Rejected.
For	Motion to end debate over summer postal employees	Approved.
For	Extension of Federal indemnification which exceeded private insurance on private nuclear reactors	Public Law 89-210.
For	Final passage of appropriations for Department of Defense	Public Law 89-213.
For	To dismiss challenge against Mississippi delegation to House of Representatives	Approved.
For	To make available $10,000 in life insurance for members of armed services on active duty	Public Law 89-214.
For	Declaring that intervention of international Communism in any nation of Western Hemisphere must be prevented	Approved.
For	Final passage of Water Pollution Control Act which should assist 2d Congressional District public agencies in combating pollution.	Public Law 89-234.
Against	To eliminate integral unit of St. Johns River project, in Maine	Approved.
For	To authorize participation in Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Florida	Public Law 89-355.
Against	To eliminate several exemptions from Bank Holding Act	Approved.
For	Rule to consider Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act	Approved.
For	To provide for water and sanitary facilities loans through Farmers Home Administration	Public Law 89-240.
Paired against	To eliminate research provision of Clean Air and Solid Waste Disposal Act	Rejected.
For	Passage of Clean Air and Solid Waste Disposal Act	Public Law 89-272.
For	To discharge District of Columbia Committee from further consideration of home rule for District of Columbia and to take up bill.	Approved.
Against	To substitute weaker system of home rule for District of Columbia	Approved.
For	Final passage of home rule legislation	Passed House.
For	Final passage of Immigration and Naturalization Act	Public Law 89-236.
Against	To deprive Government employees salaries comparable to those of private enterprise	Rejected.
For	Passage of Government Employees Salary Comparability Act	Public Law 89-301.
For	To authorize construction of 3d Library of Congress building	Public Law 89-260.
For	Final passage of foreign assistance appropriations	Public Law 89-273.
Paired for	Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965	Public Law 89-291.
Paired for	To construct Jefferson National Memorial in St. Louis, Mo	Public Law 89-269.
For	To compensate citizens of Ryukyu Islands for damages during post-World War II occupation	Public Law 89-296.
For	To authorize southern Nevada water project	Public Law 89-292.
For	Passage of Highway Beautification Act	Public Law 89-285.
Against	Final passage of farm control legislation	Public Law 89-321.
Against	To establish special import fees on sugar	Rejected.
For	Passage of Sugar Act, establishing domestic and foreign quotas	Public Law 89-331.
Against	Motion to delete rent supplement funds from supplemental appropriations bill	Approved.
For	Passage of supplemental appropriations providing funds for Auburn Dam, small business loans, and other projects	Public Law 89-309.
Against	Effort to defeat Federal assistance to colleges and universities	Rejected.
For	Final passage of Higher Education Act, 1965	Public Law 89-329.
For	Final passage of Rivers and Harbors Act authorizing Federal assistance to Bullard's Bar and other projects	Public Law 89-298.
	2D SESSION	
For	To provide operational funds for House Un-American Activities Committee	Approved.
For	To find Ku Klux Klan in contempt of Congress	Approved.
For	To authorize U.S. participation in Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center	Public Law 89-355.
For	To enact cold war GI bill of educational and other benefits	Public Law 89-358.
For	To establish new standards for consideration of bank mergers	Public Law 89-356.
For	To authorize President to accept U.S. membership in Asian Development Bank	Public Law 89-369.
For	To establish special adjustment boards under Railway Labor Act to settle disputes	Public Law 89-456.
Against	To kill continuation of certain excise taxes needed due to Vietnamese war	Rejected.
For	Passage of Tax Adjustment Act	Public Law 89-368.
Against	To impose unwise limitation on Foreign Assistance Act	Rejected.
For	To pass supplemental foreign assistance, including funds for Vietnamese war	Public Law 89-371.
For	To appropriate additional funds for purchase of ships, aircraft, and other equipment for Vietnamese war	Public Law 89-367.
For	To establish new Federal court districts in California, including new court to serve much of 2d Congressional District	Public Law 89-372.
For	To promote economic development in Alaska	Public Law 89-375.
Against	To impose unfair Cotton Research and Promotion Act voting requirements	Rejected.
For	To pass Cotton Research and Promotion Act	Public Law 89-502.
For	To provide supplemental funds for the Department of Defense	Public Law 89-374.
For	To provide uniformity in adoption of daylight savings time	Public Law 89-387.
For	To provide airmail service to servicemen throughout the world	At White House.
For	To provide official residence for Vice President	Public Law 89-386.
Against	To delete housing funds from supplemental appropriation bill	Rejected.
For	To pass 2d supplemental appropriation bill	Public Law 89-426.
For	To establish separate loan and disaster funds, Small Business Act	Public Law 89-409.
For	To extend until May 31 enrollment under medicare program	Public Law 89-384.
For	Passage of Federal pay bill	Public Law 89-504.
Against	To make arbitrary cuts in Interior Department appropriation	Rejected.
For	Passage of appropriation bill financing Forest Service, Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, and Department of the Interior.	Public Law 89-435.
Against	To make arbitrary cuts in Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriations	Rejected.
For	Passage of Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriations	Public Law 89-474.
For	To authorize construction on 3d powerplant at Grand Coulee Dam	Public Law 89-448.
Against	To disapprove Reorganization Plan 1, relating to Community Relations Service	Rejected.
Against	To inject foreign policy decisions into Agriculture Department appropriations bill	Approved.
For	Passage of Agriculture Department appropriations bill	Public Law 89-556.
For	Passage of Equal Employment Opportunity Act	Passed House.
For	To protect dogs and cats used for research purposes from suffering in sale and handling	Public Law 89-544.
Against	To spend $20,000,000 in National Aeronautics and Space Administration money to cut aircraft engine noise	Rejected.
For	To authorize National Aeronautics and Space Administration programs	Public Law 89-528.
Against	To make arbitrary cuts in Departments of Labor and HEW appropriation	Rejected.
For	To appropriate funds for Departments of Labor and HEW	At White House.
For	To appropriate funds for rent support programs	Public Law 89-555.
For	To appropriate funds for Independent Executive Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development	Public Law 89-555.
For	Health benefits for retired members of the Armed Forces	Public Law 89-614.
For	To provide adequate supply of national railroad freight cars	Public Law 89-430.
For	To strengthen Foreign Agents Registration Act	Public Law 89-486.
Against	To limit interest rates in Participation Sales Act to unrealistic level	Rejected.
For	Passage of Participation Sales Act	Public Law 89-429.
Against	On amendment to minimum wage preventing coverage of retail-services employees	Rejected.
Against	On amendment to minimum wage postponing increase of $1.60 from 1968 to 1969	Approved.
Against	To delete agricultural and food processing employees from minimum wage bill	Rejected.
For	Passage of minimum wage extension legislation	Public Law 89-601.
Against	To make sellers of narcotics ineligible for rehabilitation	Approved.
For	To enable courts to deal more effectively with problem of narcotic addiction (Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act)	At White House.
For	Passage of Library Services and Construction Act for aid to county libraries	Public Law 89-511.
For	To strengthen American educational resources for international studies	At White House.

Voting record of Congressman Harold T. (Bizz) Johnson, 89th Cong.—Continued

My stand	Issue	Status
For	To approve tax retirement benefits legislation for self-employed	Passed House.
For	To appropriate funds for legislative branch, fiscal year 1967	Public Law 89-545.
For	Passage of Bail Reform Act	Public Law 89-465.
For	Passage of debt ceiling limitation increase	Public Law 89-472.
For	Amendment to Food for Freedom Act providing long-term dollar credit sales	Approved.
Against	To kill a bill to promote international trade in farm goods and combat hunger	Rejected.
For	Passage of Food for Freedom Act	Approved.
For	Passage of Foreign Service Buildings Act Amendments of 1966	Public Law 89-636.
For	To procure aircraft, missiles, naval vessels and other military equipment	Public Law 89-501.
Paired for	To limit funds for joint committee on defense production	Rejected.
For	To protect right of the public to information about Federal agencies	Public Law 89-487.
For	To permit States to sell oil confiscated in interstate commerce	Public Law 89-644.
For	Final passage of Unemployment Insurance Act amendments	Died in conference.
For	Passage of Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act	At White House.
Against	On resolution to consider revision of rates on certain 4th-class mail	Public Law 89-593.
Against	To kill legislation prohibiting Washington, D.C., common-law marriages	Rejected.
Against	To reduce from 2- to 1-year foreign aid authorization	Rejected.
For	Passage of Foreign Assistance Act	Public Law 89-583.
For	Passage of appropriations for Department of Defense	Public Law 89-687.
For	To extend to all 50 States the small reclamation projects program as contained in my bill	Rejected.
For	On resolution to consider Civil Rights Act	Approved.
For	On amendment to Civil Rights Act permitting rental agents to act for individuals	Approved.
For	On amendment to civil rights making it a crime to incite riots and violence	Approved.
Against	On amendment to Civil Rights Act making it more difficult to file complaint concerning loss of rights	Approved.
Against	To eliminate from Civil Rights Act housing provisions even after single family and small apartment units were exempt	Rejected.
For	Passage of Civil Rights Act	Passed House.
For	Passage of military construction appropriation bill	At White House.
Against	To eliminate beautification provisions from the Federal Aid Highway Act	Rejected.
For	Passage of Federal Aid Highway Act, containing authorizations for interstate and State highways, forest and park highways, roads and trails.	Public Law 89-574.
For	To increase borrowing authority of Federal National Mortgage Association	Public Law 89-566.
For	To correct employment inequities for Federal firefighters	Passed House.
For	To authorize study of Facilities and Visitors Services, Washington, D.C	Rejected.
For	To authorize Chamizal Memorial Highway	Rejected.
Against	To reduce severely funds authorized under Urban Mass Transportation Act	Approved.
For	Passage of Urban Mass Transportation Act	Public Law 89-562.
Against	To appoint a Safety Advisory Council as a new unneeded bureau to conduct traffic safety program	Rejected.
For	Passage of Traffic Safety Act	Public Law 89-563.
Against	To block funding of Sales Participation Act	Rejected.
For	Passage of Highway Safety Act	Public Law 89-564.
For	Final passage of Small Reclamation Projects Act, my bill	Public Law 89-553.
For	To prohibit picketing within 500 feet of a church	Passed House.
For	To authorize President to call military reservists who have served less than 24 months on active duty	Public Law 89-687.
For	Passage of joint resolution for continuing appropriations, 1967	Approved.
Against	Excluding maritime activities from proposed Department of Transportation	Approved.
Against	To prevent Department of Transportation from investigating aircraft accidents	Rejected.
For	Passage of Department of Transportation Act	Public Law 89-670.
For	To extend the Peace Corps	Public Law 89-572.
For	To permit U.S. participation in HemisFair Exposition, 1968	Public Law 89-685.
For	To establish a National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws	At White House.
Against	To weaken Fair Labor Standards Act	Rejected.
For	Final passage of Fair Labor Standards Act	Public Law 89-601.
For	To kill legislation providing temporary interest rate control	Rejected.
For	Passage of legislation providing temporary interest rate regulations	Public Law 89-597.
Against	To reduce District of Columbia appropriations by 5 percent	Rejected.
For	Passage of District of Columbia appropriations bill	At White House.
For	Passage of Department of Defense military construction appropriation	At White House.
For	To establish "Pictured Rocks" National Lakeshore	Public Law 89-668.
For	To increase disabled veterans pensions and widows pensions by average of 5.4 percent	Passed House.
For	To give permanent resident status to Cuban refugees	At White House.
For	To approve World Water for Peace Conference	At White House.
For	To establish Wolf Trap Farm Park, Virginia	Rejected.
Against	To reduce arbitrarily economic assistance in the Foreign Assistance Appropriations Act	Approved.
For	Passage of Foreign Assistance Appropriations Act	Public Law 89-691.
For	To pass Public Works Appropriations Act, including $55,000,000 for 2d Congressional District	Public Law 89-689.
For	To authorize Reserve Forces callup and giving status to National Guard technicians	Passed House.
Against	To kill Chamizal Memorial Highway proposal	Rejected.
For	To approve the Tiajuana River international flood control project	Public Law 89-640.
Against	To kill extension of Economic Opportunity program	Rejected.
Against	To place arbitrary restrictions on number of top economic Opportunity employees	Approved.
For	Passage of Economic Opportunity Amendments Act	At White House.
For	To exclude pollution control facilities from suspension of investment credit restrictions	Approved.
For	Passage of investment credit and allowance of accelerated depreciation bill	At White House.
For	Passage of Water Pollution Control Act	At White House.
For	To authorize Atomic Energy Commission to participate in nuclear power desalting project	Approved.
For	To authorize Secretary of Interior to preserve, protect, and develop river mouth areas of the Nation	Rejected.
Against	To reduce State, Justice, Commerce Departments appropriations by 5 percent	Rejected.
For	Passage of State, Justice, Commerce Departments Appropriations Act	At White House.
For	To insist that subsidized food-for-peace shipments not be made to nations aiding North Vietnam or Cuba	Approved.
For	To prevent Commissioner of Education from arbitrarily withholding Elementary and Secondary Education Act funds because of failure of schools to meet Civil Rights Act requirements.	Approved.
Against	To reduce funds for school districts most in need	Rejected.
For	Passage of Elementary and Secondary Education Act to strengthen programs of elementary and secondary schools	At White House.
For	Final passage of Defense Department appropriations	Public Law 89-687.
Against	Reduction of public works appropriations bill	Rejected.
For	Passage of Internal Security Act	Passed House.
Against	To add 478 acres to proposed Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore	Approved.
For	To establish Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore	At White House.
Against	To eliminate metropolitan planning section from demonstration cities proposal	Rejected.
For	Passage of Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act	At White House.
For	To amend International Claims Settlement Act to provide for claims of U.S. nationals against Chinese Communists	At White House.
For	Final passage of Fair Packaging and Labeling Act	At White House.
For	To prevent Export-Import Bank from making loans to Communist countries	Approved.
For	To hold Jeremiah Stamler in contempt of Congress for refusal to testify	Approved.
Against	To kill contempt citation against Milton Mitchell Cohen for refusal to testify before a congressional committee	Rejected.
For	Passage of legislation to help curb crime in District of Columbia	At White House.
Paired for	Approval of final supplemental appropriations	At White House.
For	To authorize a study of standards and conduct of Members of Congress	Approved.
For	Final passage of rivers, harbors, and flood control authorizations, including funds for construction of Marysville Dam and Reservoir, relocation of the town of Klamath, and other California projects.	At White House.
Paired for	Final passage of Higher Education Act, 1966	At White House.

MASSACHUSETTS LEGISLATURE CONGRATULATES ON PASSAGE OF CLEAN WATERS RESTORATION ACT OF 1966

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the House on Monday of this week, October 17, accepted a House-Senate conference report on the Clean Waters Restoration Act of 1966. The New York Times said that this "is a good piece of legislation." It is a good piece of legislation because it is forward looking and far reaching.

To provide for a continued fight against water pollution in all of the Nation's waterways, this legislation authorizes $3.4 billion for construction grants for sewage treatment plants for the fiscal years 1968 through 1971; $450 million for fiscal year 1968; $700 million for fiscal year 1969; $1 billion for fiscal year 1970, and $1,250 million for fiscal year 1971.

Mr. Speaker, this represents an increase of $1 billion over the total amount originally authorized by the House on September 30 for 4 fiscal years. The dollar limitation on individual grants and combined grants is done away with and in all cases the amount authorized for a Federal share for a single project or a combined one is 30 percent of the total cost.

This legislation also provides incentives to make the States partners in the program to clean up water pollution. If a State agrees to match 30 percent of the total cost of an individual or combined project, the Federal share is increased by 10 percent to 40 percent, and the municipal share, in turn, becomes the remaining 30 percent. We then have a Federal-State-municipal partnership.

Further, if a State will match 25 percent of the total cost of an individual or combined project and agrees to establish intrastate standards covering streams flowing wholly within its boundaries under rules and regulations to be established by the Governor of the State or a State water pollution control board and not subject to review by any Federal agency, then in that case the Federal share of an individual or combined becomes 50 percent and the local share is 25 percent.

Mr. Speaker, this is another move forward to bring about a working combination so that all levels of government throughout this great country can participate in this major effort to clean up our streams. I am pleased that the House conferees agreed to an additional $1 billion over the $2.4 billion bill originally passed by the House on September 30.

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to have included with my remarks at this point in the RECORD a telegram I received Monday night from State Senator Joseph D. Ward of Fitchburg concerning passage by Congress of the Clean Waters Restoration Act of 1966. Senator Ward is the chairman of the Massachusetts Select Senate Committee studying pollution in the rivers of Massachusetts. The telegram of congratulations to Congress reads as follows:

BOSTON, MASS.,
October 17, 1966.

Hon. Congressman EDWARD P. BOLAND,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Congratulations are in order for the big breakthrough accomplished at the Federal level in the fight against water pollution. The $3.4 billion program will mean much to Massachusetts cities and towns and your efforts in this great humanitarian venture will not go unnoticed here in the Bay State. Only recently, the Massachusetts legislature enacted the most realistic anti-pollution measures ever to come before the great and general court. Massachusetts stands ready and able to receive Federal aid, for with it, this commonwealth will be the first of the fifty States to complete an all-embracing pure water program, as the chairman of the Select Senate Committee studying pollution in rivers and river networks of Massachusetts, I will go anywhere and give all of my efforts to further the cause of pure waters.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH D. WARD,
Senator, Third Worcester District.

TRIBUTE TO REPRESENTATIVE EUGENE J. KEOGH OF NEW YORK

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, 30 years in Congress deserves praise from anyone, and praise is what I ask that EUGENE KEOGH accept from me as he takes his departure from the House of Representatives where he has served so long and so well.

He was born in Brooklyn, N.Y., on August 30, 1907. He was graduated from the School of Commerce and Finance of New York University in 1927. He received a law degree from the Fordham University Law School in 1930 and was admitted to the bar in 1932.

He practiced his profession in New York City and was also elected to the New York State Assembly from the 20th district of Kings County. He was elected to the 75th Congress and has been continuously reelected ever since. That is quite a record. The retirement that he has now chosen instead of the reelection that would surely have been his, is one which is thoroughly well-earned, richly deserved, and, knowing him, will be productive, prosperous, and happy.

In everything that I have ever seen of GENE KEOGH he has been a man worthy of friendship and respect. When I came to Congress as a freshman member of the 83d Congress, he was helpful, courteous, and kind to me in ways that I have never forgotten and am glad to be able to acknowledge today. He has never ceased to be helpful and his counsel has always been wise and just.

In his committee assignments, in his relationships with his constituents, in his dealings with colleagues in the House, he has been a personable and capable Representative, true to his word and true to his background.

He has done much for his district, his State, and his country. I am proud to have known him, and those whom he represented here were fortunate that this dedicated and hard-driving man at all times had their problems uppermost in his mind, and their interests uppermost in his heart.

I do not merely wish him well in a formal way, I wish him the very best that life can have in store for anyone. After 30 years he deserves some peace and privacy, surcease from care, and the pride of a job well done and completed at long last.

He has been a true and loyal friend to all who know him. I am proud to have been one of the thousands who are his friends. A fond farewell, then, to a fine man, an able legislator, a stalwart friend.

THIS IS WASHINGTON

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FARNSLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD the 11th—and last—of the series of articles that recently appeared in the Washington Post entitled "This Is Washington."

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 12, 1966]

THIS IS WASHINGTON—XI: CITIZENS SEE CAPITAL AS MANY CITIES IN ONE

Washington is a tale of many cities.

The Negro day maid who waits to change buses to go to Georgetown or Cleveland Park has her city. So has the white suburbanite who gets in his car (leaving the older model for his wife) and drives to his middle-income Government job in the District.

On P Street near Dupont Circle, the car of a high-level Government official may pass the Negro maid waiting for the bus. That is about as close as their Washingtons ever come. And a Government job is all that the official has in common with the middle-class suburbanite.

Washington is a tale of many cities—the Negro and the white, the city dweller and the suburbanite, the rich and the poor, the college graduate and the grade-school dropout, the Old Right and the New Left, the Southern-style segregationist and the civil rights militant.

And without going to extremes, it also is the city of the middle-class, middle-salary earner, the moderate—the vast body of in-betweens on statistical tables.

A composite cannot catch the full flavor of the individual pieces. So it is with the group portrait of the Washington area and its 2.5 million people assembled in The Washington Post survey.

But the self-portrait drawn by those interviewed by Louis Harris and his public opinion firm does reveal a great deal about the people who make up the Nation's Capital. Interviewers talked to 1500 people 16 years and over and came up with this profile:

The Washington area is a comparatively youthful urban center (40 per cent of the population is under 35). It has the average number of Catholics, little less than a quarter of the population.

But there are more single people (18 per cent) than in most other places and also more widowed and divorced (10 per cent).

The affluence of Washington shows in the high ownership of stock—38 per cent for the area. Yet home ownership is relatively low at only little better than half (52 per cent).

The contrasts can be sharp in the different cities of Washington.

Certainly one of the most powerful single groups of men in the world is assembled in the Nation's Capital. Here also live Negroes of extraordinary cultivation and personal attainment.

Yet there is also a ghetto of poor, submerged Negroes (about one in every seven families falls below the arbitrary $3000-a-year poverty line). There are also whites who haven't made it (4 per cent of the area's white families—13 per cent in the District—are in the poverty bracket; nearly one-third of District whites dropped out of school by the eighth grade).

Nowhere are the contrasts sharper than those drawn between the whites and Negroes.

Education: Nearly four in ten whites have had some college. Nearly five in ten Negroes (45 per cent) haven't gotten beyond eighth grade. One of every five whites is a college graduate compared with about 1 of 12 Negroes.

Family Income: The average white family interviewed earned $10,350. This compares with $6650 for the Negro families.

There is a substantial middle-income group of both Negroes and whites—half the white families earn $10,000 or over and a third of the Negro families have an income of $8000 or over. But while one in five white families has an income of $15,000-plus, only 1 in 20 Negro families are in the same bracket.

Home ownership: Of the whites, 57 per cent owned their homes. It was 35 per cent for Negroes.

Stock ownership: Nearly half the whites (44 per cent) own stock or bonds compared with 13 per cent of the Negroes.

Car ownership: Nearly nine of every ten whites own one car or more. Forty-five per cent of the Negroes have no car.

Working women—wife or female head of household: More than half the Negroes work. Three of four white women do not.

There are also other split personalities in Washington.

Take the suburbanite and the city dweller.

If you live in the District, you probably rent (70 per cent do), are more likely to be single (23 per cent are), probably live in a household with one or two people (more than half do), and are less likely to own a car (40 per cent don't).

If you live in the suburbs, you are probably married (more than three in every four are). The chances are that you belong to a family with children with three or four people in the household (nearly half do). You probably own your home (72 per cent in suburban Maryland, 57 per cent in suburban Virginia do) and may manage to support two cars (more than a third of the suburban families do).

There seems to be a form of self-segregation of views in the Washington area.

Prince George's County residents are most predictable of all in conservative attitudes—against home rule, the least in racially tolerant, the most suspicious of the survey interviewers who knocked on the door.

Arlington and Fairfax often are not far behind Prince George's in their conservatism. Montgomery County, often twinned with District whites, has liberal-leaning people, always ready to espouse liberal issues like home rule and Negro causes.

What people do in their spare-time leisure gives a feeling for the flavor and pace of life in a city.

Washington is essentially a community of stay-at-homes. The center for leisure for most people is their home.

Three of four spend time during the week watching television. In the suburbs, there must be the best-tended lawns and best-repaired homes in the Nation. During an average week, half the people report doing chores around the house and nearby half working in the yard.

The city-dwellers in the District take more walks, play more golf and tennis, and go out more than the suburbanites.

The area party-going rate (21 per cent) is below the national average. But the Washington reputation is upheld by the hectic pace in the District, where 43 per cent of the whites (led by those in the $15,000-plus bracket) joined in the whirl of semi-public functions that make up a good part of the Capital's social life.

You could hardly call Washington a town of big spenders for leisure or night life, where admittedly the opportunities are limited. The weekly average spent of leisure was $16, the biggest item being restaurant bills.

Outside the home, church-going drew more than 44 per cent, above the national average. But there are far fewer church-goers among Washington white residents (29 per cent) than among suburbanites or Negroes (49 per cent).

REVIEW OF THE 2D SESSION, 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the last session of the just-completed 89th Congress, the most productive Congress in history, reflected our Nation's continuing rapid transition to a highly urbanized, industrialized, mobile society. It represented a continuation of the previous session's accomplishments which produced landmark legislation in the fields of health, education, and human rights. It was a time when we focused our attention on programs designed to improve the quality of our environment, the betterment of our lives. With the help of the more than 70 freshman Congressmen elected in 1964, the 89th Congress forged into law many new programs dealing with the problems of our country's increasing urban-oriented population.

Although the second session might not have measured with the first in number of major legislative enactments, there were several very important proposals shaped into law and several more that will probably be acted upon in the near future. While it was a period of consolidation, extension, and refinement of existing programs, a time when we sought to improve upon our previous efforts, groundwork was laid for new programs to meet mounting social and economic pressures associated with urban society.

We were concerned too with improving our own machinery to better deal with the problems of the future. A joint committee on the organization of Congress was created by a resolution I cosponsored. The committee later recommended the adoption of various procedures for more effective legislation oversight and congressional expertise.

We also established a permanent House Committee on Standards and Conduct.

Vietnam was the major issue and of primary concern to everyone. Congress supported the President by authorizing and appropriating the requested funds needed for our efforts to help the Vietnamese. We also authorized U.S. participation in the Asian Development Bank, an international funding organization that will make and guarantee loans to promote the economic development of Asia. One of the primary objectives would be the development of the Mekong River Delta in Vietnam, an integral part of our pacification efforts there.

It is appropriate I think to comment briefly on Vietnam. As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I am keenly aware of our activities there. Our efforts in Vietnam reflect the very complex social and economic problems which are present. We are confronted not only with military problems but with the monumental task of helping the Vietnamese build a free and independent nation. This "other war" as it has come to be known is the war against hunger, disease, poverty, and illiteracy. It is being waged against great odds, under extremely adverse conditions. Yet it is being fought with determination and vigor, as an expression of the continuing commitment to the Vietnamese.

That commitment to Vietnam initially affirmed by President Eisenhower, and reaffirmed by Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, is based on our belief of the right of self-determination. A political vacuum exists in Vietnam. There is no real social and economic framework in which a stable society can emerge. Through our joint military and pacification efforts we are seeking to offset Communist aggression and subjugation so that the nation-building process in Vietnam can progress.

The Dominican Republic is another example of where the United States, in cooperation with the Organization of American States, assisted a developing nation threatened with aggression. Today, the Dominican Republic has a democratic and progressive government. Free and fair elections were held last June 1. It is a great tribute to the Dominican people that they not only went to the polls in record numbers but they went to the polls peacefully and with the dignity of freemen.

According to a recent U.S. News & World Report, the record of success is elsewhere. U.S. News & World Report observed that almost overlooked in U.S. preoccupation with Vietnam is mounting evidence that things are going America's way in the world generally. That is the story in Africa, Asia, Latin America, Middle East, everywhere. Communists are stopped. Serious threats to peace are almost nonexistent at this point. There is widespread agreement that President Johnson's policy of firmness and patience is paying off for the United States.

Vietnam's impact on our economy saw increased defense outlays, a leveling and scaling down in some nondefense areas, and increased inflationary pressures; nonetheless, our economy remained strong and viable.

To stem inflationary trends and stabilize prices, we enacted legislation suspending for 15 months certain forms of accelerated depreciation allowances and modifying the 7-percent investment tax credit. The tax credit would still be applied to the first $20,000 outlay for equipment and machinery. This latter is important to purchasers and manufacturers of farm equipment. Enacted in 1962 as part of President Kennedy's legislative program, the tax credit has proven extremely beneficial for capital expansion and improvement. After the 16-month moratorium, the credit will be restored with a larger write-off permitted for machinery and equipment.

In response to the needs of the homebuilding industry we voted additional funds for mortgage operations to help offset increased interest rates on home loans. We approved supplementary legislation arresting the interest war among financial institutions for the savings dollar in order to lower interest rates.

A tax adjustment act was passed containing graduated payroll withholding rates. With graduated rates, taxpayers would not face possible large deficiencies due April 15. This improved tax collection system does not raise taxes; it merely adjusts withholding rates to more accurately reflect taxpayers' earnings.

The act also amended the social security laws making benefits available to any person age 72 or over who is not entitled to other retirement benefits.

With a growing, vigorous economy, with more prosperity than ever before, we faced the much-desired prospect of full employment for the first time in many years. Congress and the President moved forward to stabilize the situation. Added emphasis was placed on job development and training programs, on employment recruitment and placement, particularly among our youth, to protect against deterioration of the favorable employment picture.

Our own area received a $600,000 grant for an on-the-job training program for 500 trainees. In addition, St. Clair County was designated by the Economic Development Administration to receive public works grants which should help our area's employment situation.

Special attention was focused on consumer protection and public safety legislation. Modified truth-in-packaging legislation was enacted and the truth-in-lending measure gained support to where consumers may reasonably expect a vote on it in the near future. The truth-in-packaging law requires accurate labeling of package contents to protect consumers from deceptive merchandising. Truth in lending would require full disclosure of financial charges and true interest rates borrowers would pay on loans, thus protecting them from usurious practices. Each has been sought for some time; one has been realized; the other will be realized.

We did not stop there, however. In an effort to reduce the present annual rate of 50,000 traffic fatalities, comprehensive highway and auto safety bills were enacted. The highway safety law includes a cooperative Federal-State highway safety program covering driver training, traffic control and highway design, maintenance, and lighting. Traffic accident research programs would also be undertaken.

The auto safety law provides for mandatory safety performance standards beginning in 1968 on all motor vehicles including trucks. Tire safety standards are also prescribed. A national driver register will be maintained to include the name of every person who has been denied a driver's license or has had his license suspended or revoked.

For these actions various observers have labeled the 89th Congress "the consumer Congress."

In the field of education, we passed the International Education Act which provides for a 5-year grant program to improve research and training in international studies in the United States at graduate and undergraduate levels.

We extended veterans' education benefits to those servicemen who served after January 31, 1955. This new GI bill provides up to $150 monthly for full-time students. An estimated 10,575 veterans in Madison and St. Clair Counties will be able to take advantage of the bill.

Our commitment to improving education meant additional student loan funds; adequate financing of the special milk and hot lunch programs, and enactment of a new child nutrition act setting up a pilot breakfast program for needy students.

We voted funds to get the National Teachers Corps off the ground. Teachers, who would be paid by the Government, would teach in areas requesting them. The program is designed to see to it that depressed areas, rural and urban, have adequate numbers of schoolteachers. The teachers would be under the jurisdiction of local school officials.

The antipoverty program was continued, with special attention given to two of its education programs: Headstart, the preschool educational opportunity program for needy preschoolers, and the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the employment-education opportunities program for needy students and dropouts. Funds were added to them to insure their operations to at least the same levels as in the preceding fiscal year.

A special word might be said here about the poverty progam. Probably no program has received more scrutiny or more publicity. Yet, the program as originally conceived 3 years ago has remained virtually intact, with certain modifications designed to improve its administration. The important thing, though, is that it continues to represent local, State, and Federal efforts to fight poverty. This three-way partnership has the Federal Government providing the wherewithal, the hardware, while the State and local agencies operate the programs. It also has shown that private industry and the Federal Government can and do cooperate. The Job Corps centers are the primary example of this, many of which are administered by private industries and institutions.

The war on poverty embodies many programs. Congress approved legislation extending the time for medicare enrollment to enable greater participation among our elderly in the supplemental medical benefits program. An estimated 90 percent of our citizens 65 and over signed up for it, which costs them $3 monthly, plus a deductible, for 80 percent coverage of physician fees and related costs.

We increased the minimum wage and extended its coverage to an additional 8 million workers. For those presently covered, the minimum wage would go to $1.60 in 1968. For those covered the first time, the minimum wage would be $1.00 an hour, going to $1.60 in 1971.

Our cities, where there is the greatest concentration of population and poverty, the greatest demand for health, public welfare and safety services, and where there are in many instances declining tax bases, received help through the Demonstration Cities Act. That legislation seeks to coordinate the myriad of Federal programs into meaningful efforts to help cities rebuild and rehabilitate through human and urban renewal. Grants were authorized covering up to 80 percent of the costs of the local government's share for such programs, provided the local governments establish community development programs.

Increased Law Enforcement Assistance Act funds were approved to help States and communities combat crime.

Mass transit funds were voted to help cities plan and build needed rapid transit systems to relieve urban congestion.

A Cabinet-level Department of Transportation was established to coordinate Federal activities in the transportation field.

Additional air pollution control funds were voted.

Solution to growing water pollution problems was sought by Congress through the enactment of legislation authorizing additional grants for sewage treatment plants, with the Federal share increased from 30 to 40 percent of the cost. Water pollution abatement of river basins was acted on for the first time. Grants were authorized covering up to 50 percent of the cost of control programs to the States participating in river basin plans.

Development and protection of our area's natural resources played an important part in the 2d session, and I am pleased to report that construction funds were secured for the following navigation and flood control projects:

Kaskaskia Navigation project, $3.5 million.

Richland Creek Flood Control project, $200,000.

Prairie Du Pont Levee and Sanitary District interior flood control project, $300,000.

New Athens flood control wall, $1.2 million.

Mississippi River regulating works, $2 million.

Chain of Rocks navigation project, $250,000.

It is especially gratifying to me that $3.5 million was approved for the $77 million Kaskaskia Navigation project since the budget had recommended $1.5 million. Also, the budget had not recommended any funds for the Prairie Du Pont project.

Another conservation program affecting our area in which I was particularly interested and sponsored was the State of Illinois' participation on the Lewis and Clark Trail Commission, which has the authority to mark and develop the trail of the Lewis and Clark expedition. Because Wood River played such an important role in the history of the expedition, serving as its headquarters and training camp in the winter of 1803, I was glad to sponsor legislation authorizing Illinois' membership on the Commission and directing the Commission to give the Wood River area appropriate national recognition.

This review does not of course cover all the bills Congress enacted, or those not enacted, but sufficiently important to note:

The Food for Freedom Act, which expands the old food-for-peace program.

The Animal Welfare Act, which controls and regulates the transportation and sale of dogs and cats used for medical research.

The Freedom of Information Act which requires public access to all information not considered essential to the national security.

The Participation Sales Act which encourages private investment in Federal programs.

Coal Mine Safety Act Amendments, extends safey regulations and Federal inspection to small mines previously exempt.

Military and Civil Service Employees Pay Raise Acts.

Veterans Pension Act, increased nonservice-connected pension benefits and medical benefits.

Parcel Post Act, reforms parcel post system and increases parcel post rates to make postal system more solvent.

National Oceanographic Council Act, establishes various Federal agencies to accelerate and improve Nation's oceanographic research and development efforts.

The Civil Rights Act of 1966, passed by the House, not acted on by the Senate. It included provisions against discrimination in jury selections and the sale or rental of property or dwellings.

Equal Employment Opportunity Act, passed by the House, not acted on by the Senate, prohibits employment discrimination because of race, color, sex, or religion.

As many know, much of the real work in Congress is done in committees. This past Congress, as for some time, I served on the House Armed Services Committee and the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, having the honor of serving as chairman of each committee's subcommittee on research and development, which has me responsible for reviewing and approving over two-thirds, approximately $10 billion, of the Federal Government's expenditures for research and development.

This report marks the completion of 22 years in Congress for me. During that period of time, much change has occurred in our daily lives, for the better I believe. We have improved our living standards, our educational standards, our health standards.

The 89th Congress, I feel, has been responsible for a significant degree of that improvement, much of which is still to be realized. There have been shortcomings of course, but with the rapidity of change which confronts us, the intent of the programs we enact might be altered somewhat. We have, nonetheless, sought to approve legislation that we feel will effectively meet our problems.

WINGS OF THE TIGER

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, "Wings of the Tiger" is a book written by Carl Krueger of Los Angeles and has just been published by the Frederick Fell Co., of New York. It is about the war in Vietnam and the important part the Air Force plays in it is forcefully portrayed in this hard-hitting novel which is based on actual facts. The current scene in Vietnam is vividly and graphically described bringing out the history and culture of this war-torn country. When I read it I could not sleep that night until I had finished the entire book. I then sent it to the President, who was equally pleased by it.

The role of that incredible fighter-bomber, the famed Phantom II, is dramatically shown against the Vietnamese background and the conflict that is raging there.

Here is an exciting story of our Air Force and the amazing air war of a type never fought before—air battles that are not battles in the context of our previous wars—planes being shot down by the most sophisticated ground-to-air missiles—by torrid flak that riddles the sky—by Vietcong peasants who get in haphazard shots with battered bullets fired from old rusty rifles—aerial dogfights that are no longer dogfights but long-range superiority combats between the highly sophisticated jets traveling 1,600 miles an hour and firing missiles that lock onto each other with radar that is ruthless and inescapable.

"Wings of the Tiger" is dedicated to the quietly gallant service men and women who actually live, love, and fight and sometimes die for the verities of the American way of life. It has been received with great acclaim as the first book to be published which accurately shows Vietnam as it really is and why we are there. The book has gone into its third printing before publication which is personally gratifying to me as it is patriotic, supports our President, and our Government's policy in no uncertain terms. This book is must reading.

Carl Krueger, the author, is a screen writer who has parlayed two intense boyhood interests into notable Hollywood pictures.

As a youth in Sioux City, Iowa—the home of Sitting Bull and Buffalo Bill—he was fascinated by Indian lore. An end result of his abiding interest in all things Indian was United Artists' release "Comanche," in CinemaScope and DeLuxe color, with a cast of thousands. Mr. Krueger both wrote and produced the film.

Aviation was his other principal interest. In 1925 he enlisted in the Air Corps to satisfy his burning desire to fly. Serving 6 years, he gained a world of experience and firsthand knowledge of aviation. Krueger's 3 additional years of flying in World War II proved invaluable when he wrote and produced his first air spectacle in color—the highly successful "Sabre Jet." He has always been a patriotic American whose books and film productions have constantly supported the American ideal; the American way of life. If he is chauvinistic, it is American chauvinism he displays in his work; and that is good for our country.

Other fine novels written by Carl Krueger are: "Saint Patrick's Battalion," "Back to the Indians," "Red Runs the Sugar," and "Son of the Star."

Screenplays by Carl Krueger are: "Golden Gloves," "The Challenger," "The Continental Attitude," "Test Flight," "The Honor and the Glory," "Tomorrow the Moon," "Sabre Jet," "Comanche," "Saint Patrick's Battalion," "Son of the Star," "Lost Victory," "Wings of the Tiger."

PROFESSOR YADIN, FAMED ARCHEOLOGIST, ADDRESSES WASHINGTON CHAPTER, AMERICAN FRIENDS OF HEBREW UNIVERSITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be a guest of the Washington chapter of the American Friends of Hebrew University on Tuesday, October 18, 1966, at the Mayflower Hotel, to hear the world-famed archeologist, Prof. Yigael Yadin, deliver a stirring illustrated report on his excavations and findings of the Biblical fortress of Masada, located at a strategic point in the Dead Sea area.

The findings of Professor Yadin represent a monumental step in confirming and verifying the writings of the Roman historian, Josephus, before the Christian era.

Mr. Speaker, on that occasion I learned of the exciting plan of the Washington community to sponsor a Washington Quadrangle at the Hebrew University, to be comprised of 2 residence centers to house 200 students and 60 visiting professors from various parts of the world and including the United States. This ambitious undertaking will provide one 14-story structure and one 8-story structure at a cost of $1 million. Dedication of these unique facilities is scheduled for May 1967.

Mr. and Mrs. Leopold V. Freudberg, well-known members of the Washington community, are serving as chairmen of this project. Mr. Sheldon Magazine, newly installed president of the Washington chapter of the American Friends of Hebrew University, presented Professor Yadin to an enthusiastic audience of over 350 persons prominent in all phases of Washington life. David Garrison Berger, immediate past president and a founder of the Washington chapter, took a leading role in the arrangements for this great event in our Nation's Capital.

Mr. Speaker, because of the importance of this occasion for the cultural and intellectual life of Metropolitan Washington, a number of stimulating articles have appeared in the press describing the importance of the archeological findings of Professor Yadin. At the conclusion of my remarks, I include a selected number of these articles.

The Washington community has carried on a dedicated campaign to raise the necessary funds to insure the completion of this unique project. The campaign will conclude with a dinner at the Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C., on January 8, 1967. I am confident this will be a victory dinner for all those who have worked so hard to build a suitable living memorial to the spirit of the Washington community in the ancient land of Israel.

The articles mentioned above follow:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 19, 1966]

Archeologist Yadin Confirms the Annals of Historian Josephus

(By Alfred Friendly)

Speaking as one Jewish general about another, Yigael Yadin offered a mixed verdict yesterday on Yoseph ben Matatyahu:

"He was a wretched Jew but a great historian."

Fortunately for his reputation, Yoseph—better known by his Roman name, Josephus—is remembered today almost solely as a historian, and Yadin has had no small part in the recent enhancement of his fame.

As a general, Josephus was a commander of forces in Galilee at the time of the great Jewish revolt of A.D. 66. He copped out and went over to the Roman enemy. As a general, Yadin was Chief of Operations in the Israeli War of Liberation in 1948, and didn't cop out. He won.

Josephus turned to writing history; Yadin returned to archeology, which was his business. But on his most recent and most famous undertaking, the excavation of Masada, last great mountain stronghold of the Jewish revolt, Yadin took Josephus with him.

"He was the sole source," Yadin told a luncheon here of the American Friends of the Hebrew University. "There was no other chronicler—Greek, Roman, Jew, anybody—of that tremendous episode."

Yadin followed Josephus's account to the letter; what is more, his excavations proved Josephus right on every major point.

"In modern terms," Yadin observed in an interview, "Josephus was a real scholar. He had a real scientific conscience. He reported the truth even when it hurt himself. After all, we knew he was a renegade Jew only because he himself recounted his crossover to the Romans."

A scholar who appreciates scholarship, Yadin is a professor of archeology at Hebrew University and was made director of the Masada expedition, carried out from 1963 to 1965. It laid bare the top of a huge mesa, rising 1300 feet above the Dead Sea, southwest of Jerusalem.

SITE OF HEROD PALACES

It was there that Herod had constructed two huge palaces before the beginning of the Christian era, and where 960 members of a Hebrew sect, the Zealots, held out for three years, A.D. 70 to 73, after the Romans put down the Jewish revolt and conquered the rest of Palestine.

The Zealots were, literally, die-hards.

When they saw that defeat was certain, they killed their wives and children, and drew lots for ten men who were to kill the rest. The ten men then drew again for a final executioner, who did his task, set the palaces afire and then killed himself.

Two women hid out and survived to tell the story to Josephus.

To Yadin, the most exciting discovery on Masada was 11 *ostraca*—small shards of pottery commonly used for voting or drawing lots—inscribed with men's first names. Written on one was the name "Ben Ya'ir." By Josephus's account, the commander and hero of the defense was Eleazar ben Ya'ir.

Yadin cannot prove the obvious deduction, but he cherishes it.

SHOVEL AND BIBLE

In his new book, "Masada," Yadin has described the expedition and its sensational discoveries.

Yadin is often described as an archeologist who carries a shovel in one hand and a Bible in the other. He is one of the group of scholars, beginning with Heinrich Schliemann, discoverer of Troy, who refuse to dismiss the classic ancient writings as pure myth and fiction.

"What Homer was to Schliemann," Yadin explains, "the Bible is to me. Part of it is mytho-religious, of course. But some of it—the geography, the geneology, the annals, the kings and prophets—is fact, and one may act on it. In the old traditions there is always the embryo of historical fact."

[From the Jewish Week—National Jewish Ledger, Oct. 20, 1966]

Yadin Reports Excavating Site of Zealots' Last Stand

(By Joseph M. Hochstein)

An army general turned archeologist held a Washington audience spellbound Tuesday afternoon with his report of the excavation of a 1,900-year-old fortress.

The soldier-scholar is Yigael Yadin, chief of staff of the army of Israel during its war of Independence and now professor of archeology at The Hebrew University in Jerusalem. Spectators at his slide-illustrated lecture in the Mayflower Hotel were members and guests of the Washington chapter of the American Friends of the Hebrew University.

The fortress excavated between 1963 and 1965 by Yadin and the members of his archeological expedition in the Masada, a 1,300-foot high cliff of solid rock in the barren hills of Judea, within sight of the Dead Sea.

SITE OF ZEALOTS' LAST STAND

Yadin's digging force of 25 professionals and 4,000 volunteers, Jews and non-Jews from 28 countries, uncovered on the Masada the site of the last stand of the Zealots, a band of 960 Jewish men, women, and children who committed suicide there in 73 C.E. rather than surrender to the encircling Roman legions.

Their findings of armor plate, clothing, the braided hair of women defenders and even Hebrew-inscribed shekels struck by the Jews during the long seige, confirmed, Yadin said, contemporary reports of the battle by the Jewish historian Josephus Flavius.

Josephus, a partisan leader in the Jewish revolt against the occupying Roman army in 66 C.E., went over to the Romans after the fall of Jerusalem to Titus in 70 C.E. and, in later years, wrote about the rebellion and the final stand of the Zealots at Masada in a book called "The Jewish Wars."

MISERABLE JEW, GREAT HISTORIAN

"Josephus was a miserable Jew but a great historian," Yadin said, in describing the artifacts he had unearthed which corroborated the early accounts of the Zealots' final battle. "It was almost a case of being able to work with a copy of Josephus' book in one hand and a spade in the other, so accurate were his facts."

Yadin said his expedition of enthusiastic volunteers accomplished in 11 months of dedicated work what might have taken 25 years by normal methods of digging. "We promised our crew three things," Yadin said, "no money, bad food and crowded living quarters; and we kept all our promises, even to putting up ten workers in each tent."

BLUE JEANS AND BIKINIS

Yadin's was a motley crew of bearded professors and bearded beatniks, girls in blue jeans and girls in bikinis ("Exposing more of the present than of the past"), a French cab driver and his seamstress wife ("We apologized to the French for our bad cooking but they assured us they had joined the expedition just to lose weight").

Nevertheless, their unorthodox methods turned up proof not only of Josephus' account of the siege of the Zealots but also the historian's report of the first fortification of the area 90 years earlier by King Herod the Great of Judea.

Josephus wrote that Herod had built a royal asylum on the rock, fearful of rebellion by his own oppressed people and of a takeover of his kingdom by the Roman Mark Anthony, who reputedly had promised to give it to his mistress, Cleopatra of Egypt.

ITALIANS RESTORE FRESCOES

The expedition unearthed the ancient palace of the king, complete with storehouses, water cisterns, and even fresco paintings, exactly as Josephus had described them.

"We had to send the paintings to Rome to have them restored," Yadin said. "The Italians are the most expert in these matters; and I took a certain pleasure in realizing that the descendants of the armies which had vandalized our art works were now engaged in bringing them back to life."

An important discovery Yadin said, was a scroll linking the Masada with the Essenes, the sect which had left similar scrolls at Qumran near the Dead Sea.

RESTORE THE DESECRATED CEMETERIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Kupferman], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the question of restoration of the cemeteries in Eastern Europe, desecrated and destroyed by the Nazis in World War II, is not a new one in this body.

It has been discussed heretofore by, among others, Congressman Multer—see Congressional Record of June 16, 1966, page 13454.

I have only recently seen in New York City and again been in communication with Dr. Rainer Barzel, a member of the German Bundestag and deputy party chairman of the Christian Democratic Party which is the party now in power in West Germany, on the question of what assistance will be forthcoming to remedy this sad situation, and he has assured me of his personal interest and desire to be helpful.

Last year in response to an inquiry by the senior Senator from New York, the Department of State noted that before any further action could be taken it was necessary to have the list of cemeteries involved.

The letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 4, 1965.

The Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: Thank you for your communication of May 12 transmitting a letter about the interest of the World Center of European Rabbis in the restoration of Jewish cemeteries in Europe.

Representatives of the World Center of European Rabbis talked to German officials last year in Bonn about German financial assistance in restoring destroyed Jewish cemeteries. These talks were, to the best of our knowledge, inconclusive. At the same time, this group called on the American Embassy at Bonn to outline their objectives. They did not, however, ask for United States Government assistance.

We note in the letter from the World Center of European Rabbis that the West German Government has asked, before it comes to any decision, for a list of the names of the destroyed cemeteries, the extent of the damage, and the sum necessary for their restoration. It would therefore appear that the next step would be for the World Center of European Rabbis to respond as fully as possible to this request.

If the Department can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely yours,
DOUGLAS MACARTHUR II,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

I have been able to obtain such a list from Rabbi Moses Joseph Rubin, president of the World Center of European Rabbis, which I herein set forth at length together with the additional comments of Rabbi Rubin, so that my colleagues and all those who obtain this RECORD may know the enormity of the desecration and the need for mankind to join in the task of restoration.

Locality	*Square yards*
Andrzejewo	300
Augustow	2,300
Bakalarzewo	200
Bialystok	40,000
Bielsk	2,400
Bocki	800
Branszczyk	200
Bransk	2,200
Brok	900
Brzostowica Wielka	800
Choroszoz	500
Ciechanowiec os.mi	1,000
Ciechanowiec m-to	2,000
Czerwin	300
Czyzewo st.kol	100
Czyzewo os.m	1,600
Dabrowa	1,300
Dlugosiodlo	800
Drohiczyn	900
Druskieniki	300
Filipow	300
Gac Sokola Laka	300
Goniadz	1,200
Goworowo	1,100
Grajewo	3,000
Grodno	19,000
Grodek m-tko	1,500
Holobudy	100
Indura	1,800
Izabelin	300
Jablonka Koscielna	200
Jalowka m-ko	600
Janow	2,000
Jasionowka	1,400
Jedwabne	800
Jeleniowo	200
Jeziory	900
Kadzidlo	200
Kamionka m-ko	3,000
Kleszozele	700
Knyszyn	1,300
Kolno	2,300
Kolonja Izaaka	200
Korycin	300
Kossewo	200
Krynki	3,500
Kulesze Koscielne	200
Kuznica	500
Lapy	700
Lomza	10,000
Lunna	1,400
Lyskow	500
Malkina Gorna	300
Michalowo m-ko	900
Mielnik	300
Milejczyce	700
Modzele-Wygoda	200
Mosty m-ko	200
Mscibow	300
Myszyniec	1,000
Narew	500
Narewka Mala	800
Niemirow	200
Nowogrod	600
Nowy Bwor m-to	500
Nowy Dwor m-tko	200
Nur	400
Odelsk	200
Orla	1,200
Ostroleka m-to	3,400
Ostroleka stacja kol	200
Ostrow Mazowiecka	7,000
Piaski m-ko	1,300
Platnica	600
Pieniazki wies Pow. Bialow	200
Poreba-Koceby	200
Poreba Srednia	200
Porozow	600
Porzecze	200
Przerosl	200
Punsk	300
Racski	600
Radzilow	700
Rajgrod	800
Ros m-ko	400
Rutki	800
Sejny	700
Sidra	500
Siemiatycze m-to	3,800
Skidel m-to	2,300
Sokoly	1,600
Sokolka	2,900
Sopockinie	900
Stawiski	2,000
Stoczek	200
Suchowola	1,300
Suprasl	400
Suraz	200
Suwalki	5,800
Szczuczyn	2,600
Szumowo Nowe	200
Sniadowo	400
Swislocz m-ko	2,000
Trzcianka	200
Trzcianne	1,500
Tykooin	1,000
Wasilkow	1,000
Wasewo	300
Wasosz	400
Wisna	800
Wizajny	400
Wolkowysk	5,200
Wolpa	1,000
Wysokie Mazowieckie	1,900
Wyszonki Koscielne	200
Zabludow	1,900
Zambrow	3,300
Zareby Koscielne	1,300
Zawisty Dzikie	200
Zbojna	200
Zelwa	1,300
Bedzin	18,000
Bialaczow	200
Bialobrzegi os. miej	1,400
Bialogon	300
Bodzentyn	1,000
Bogarja	500
Brzesko Nowe	500
Busk	1,500
Charsznica	500
Checiny	2,900
Chmielnik	6,000
Ciepielow	400
Czeladz	800
Czestochowa	22,700
Cmielow	700
Daleszyce	400
Dandowka	200
Dabrowa Gornicza	4,400
Denkow	300
Drzewica	1,100
Dzialoszyce	5,700
Garbatka	200
Gielniow	200
Glowaczow	1,500
Gniewoszow	600
Gowarczow	600
Granica w	200
Granics os.m	700
Grodziec	200
Ilza	1,600
Iwaniska	1,600
Janowiec	300
Jedlinsk	800
Jedrzejow pow.m	4,600
Kamienna m-to	1,600
Kamyk wies pow. Czest	400
Kazanow	400
Kazimierza Wielka	300
Kielce	15,600
Klimontow os.m	2,700
Klwow	300
Klobucko	1,700
Konskie	5,100
Koprzywnica	900
Koszyce	700
Kozieglowy	400
Kozienice pow. m-to	3,900
Krajno	200
Kromolow	300
Krzepice	1,800
Ksiaz Wielki	900
Kunow	600
Kurozweki	300
Kurzelow	200
Lasocin os.m	200
Lelow	700
Lipskie Budy	200
Lipsko	1,400
Lagow	1,300
Lazy	300
Lopuszno	400
Magnuszew	800
Maleniec	200
Makocice	200
Miechow	2,400
Miedzno	200
Mniszew w	100
Mniszew fol	200
Mstow	700
Myszkow Nowy	600
Niemce	200
Niwka	300
Nowy Korozyn	2,500
Odrzywol	400
Oleszno	200
Olkuss	2,800
Olsztyn	100
Opatow	5,500

Locality	*Square yards*
Opoczno	3,400
Osiek	600
Ostrowiec	10,100
Ozarow	2,300
Pacanow	1,700
Paradyz	200
Pierychnica	200
Pilica	1,900
Pinczow	4,400
Piotrkowice	300
Polaniec	1,100
Porabka	200
Poswietne w.pow.kozien	100
Proszowice	1,400
Przedborz	3,800
Przyrow	900
Przysucha	2,200
Przytyk	1,900
Radom	24,500
Radoszyce os.m	1,300
Rakow os.m	1,200
Rakow os.fabr	200
Sandomierz	2,700
Secemin	300
Sedziszow	500
Sieciechow	200
Sienno	800
Siewierz	300
Skalbmierz	700
Skala	600
Skaryszew	900
Skrzynno	200
Slawkow	700
Slomniki	1,500
Slupia Nowa	1,000
Sobkow os.m	400
Solec os.m	900
Sosnowiec	13,700
Staszow	4,800
Stopnica	3,400
Stromiec Zagajnik	200
Strzemieszyce Wielkie	1,400
Suchedniow	1,000
Szczekociny	2,600
Szydlowiec	5,500
Szydlow	700
Tarlow	1,100
Truskolasy	300
Wasniow	200
Wachock	500
Wierzbnik	2,200
Wloszczowa	3,000
Wodzislaw	2,900
Wolanow	400
Wolbrom	4,300
Wyslica	1,400
Wysmierzyce	200
Zacheta	300
Zagorze w.	300
Zawichost	1,500
Zawiercie	7,100
Zabkowice	300
Zwolen	3,800
Zarki	2,600
Zarnowiec	1,000
Zarnow	1,000
Andrychow	500
Bagienica	200
Biala pow. m-to	1,400
Biecz	700
Bochnia	2,500
Brzezinka	300
Brozostek	500
Chrzanow	7,400
Czarny Dunajec	400
Czchow	200
Dabrowa Pow. m-tko	3,100
Debica	1,600
Dobra	200
Dobrzyce	400
Gdow	300
Gorlice	2,400
Gromnik	200
Grybow	900
Jaslo	2,500
Jaworzno	1,400
Jordanow	300
Kalwarja Zebrzydowska	500
Kaweczyn Debicki	200
Kety	400
Klasno	400
Klucznikowice	200
Kobierzyn	200
Kolaczyce	100
Krakow	45,300
Kroscienko	300
Krynica Zdroj	1,100
Krzeszowiee	600
Limanowa	1,000
Labowa	300
Lapanow	200
Lacko	300
Makow	200
Mielec	2,900
Milowka Pow. Zywiec gm.	200
Mszana Dolna	500
Myslenice	700
Niepolomice	500
Nowy Sacz	9,100
Nowy Targ	1,400
Ochotnica	100
Olpiny	200
Osiek n-to	300
Oswiecim	5,000
Pilzno	700
Piwniczna	300
Pradnik Czerwony	200
Przeclaw	200
Rabka	200
Radgoszoz	200
Radlow	200
Radomysl Wielki	1,500
Rajoza	200
Ropczyce	900
Ryglice	300
Rzepiennik Strzyzewski	300
Sedziszow	900
Skawina	300
Sowliny	200
Stary Sacz	600
Sucha	400
Szozakown	500
Szozawnica Wyzna	200
Szozurowa	200
Tarnow	15,700
Trzebinia Miasteczko	1,000
Trzebinia Miasteczko	1,000
Tylicz	200
Wadowice	1,500
Wampieruow	100
Wieliczka	1,200
Wielopole	600
Wisnicz Nowy	1,300
Wojnicz	200
Zakliczyn m-ko	300
Zakopane	600
Zator	500
Zawada gm.pow. Nowy Sacz	100
Zabno	400
Zmigrod Nowy	1,000
Adamow	700
Annopel os.m.	1,300
Baczki os.fabr.	200
Baranow	1,100
Belzyce	1,900
Biala Podlaska	7,900
Bilgoraj	3,800
Biskupice	200
Biszoza	200
Bobrowniki	200
Budziska pow.Wegrow Wies	200
Bychawa	1,900
Chelm	12,100
Chodel	700
Chrzanow pow Janow wies	200
Cycow	200
Czemierniki os.m.	1,004
Dubeczno	500
Dubienka	1,300
Firlej	200
Frampol	1,500
Garwolin	2,500
Glusk	400
Gorzkow	500
Grabowiec os.m.	1,800
Holeszow	200
Horodlo	800
Hrubieszow	5,700
Irena os.m.	2,700
Izbica os.m.	2,900
Jablonna Lacka	200
Janow m-to	2,900
Janow Podlaski	1,700
Jarczow	200
Jozefow pow.Bilg. os.m.	1,100
Jozefow pow. Pulawy os.m.	800
Kamionka os.m.	600
Kazimierz Dolny	1,400
Kock	2,100
Koden	600
Kodeniec	100
Komarow os.m.	1,800
Komarowka	500
Komora	200
Konstantynow	800
Konskowola	900
Kossow	1,400
Kotun	200
Krasnobrod	1,200
Krasnystaw	1,800
Krasniczyn	600
Krasnik	4,300
Krylow os. m.	700
Krzeszow	300
Kurow os. m.	2,300
Lubartow	3,300
Lublin	37,400
Laskarzew	1,400
Laszczow	1,100
Leczna	2,100
Lomazy os. m.	900
Lopianka	300
Losice	2,800
Lukowa	200
Lukow	6,200
Lysobyki	500
Maciejowice	800
Markuszow os. m.	1,100
Michow	1,800
Miedzyrzec	9,500
Modliborzyce	1,000
Mokobody	300
Mordy	1,800
Naleczow uzdr.	300
Nowiny Pokarozmiska	200
Okrzeja	200
Opole os.m.	3,800
Osieck	400
Ostrow m-to	1,300
Parczow	4,100
Parysow	2,000
Piaski Luterskie	2,700
Pilawa	200
Piszczac	400
Poberezany	200
Pulawy m-to	3,300
Radzyn	2,900
Rejowiec	1,900
Rossosz Ruda	400
Ruda B	300
Rudka pow.Zamosc wies	500
Ryki	2,500
Sabinka	200
Sadowne	300
Saranaed	1,200
Sawin	400
Serokomla	200
Siedlce	14,700
Siedliszcze	800
Sielec	300
Skierbieszow	200
Skryhiczyn	200
Slawatycze	1,000
Sobienie-Jeziory	1,500
Sobolew-Place	600
Sokolow	4,500
Sosnowica	300
Stanin	200
Sterdyn	800
Stezyca	200
Stoczek m-to	2,000
Stoczek os.m.	1,300
Stok	200
Sucha	300
Szczebrzeszyn	2,700
Swierze os.m.	300
Tarnogora os.m.	200

Locality	*Square yards*
Tarnogrod	2, 300
Terespol	1, 100
Tomaszow	4, 700
Trzebinia Wies	200
Turobin	1, 000
Tyszowce	2, 500
Uchanie os.m	1, 100
Urzedow	300
Wawolnica os.m	1, 100
Wegrow	5, 200
Wisznice	900
Wlodawa	4, 200
Wohyn	1, 100
Wojslawice	900
Wysokie os.m	300
Zaklikow os.m	1, 500
Zakrzowek Majoracki	200
Zakrzowek	500
Zamosc	10, 000
Zbuczyn	200
Zelechow	4, 900
Zolkiewka	1, 400
Baligrod	600
Bania Kotowska	300
Baranow	800
Batiatycze	200
Belz	2, 200
Belzec gm	200
Bircza	1, 100
Blazowa	1, 000
Boryslaw	7, 200
Bobrka pow.m-to	1, 500
Brzozdowce mia. to	500
Brzozow	1, 200
Bukowsko Miasto	500
Bukowsko Wies	200
Cewkow gm	200
Chlewczany gm	200
Chodorow	1, 300
Chyrow	1, 000
Cieplice	200
Cieszanow	1, 000
Cisna	200
Czarna gm	200
Czudec	400
Dobromil	2, 200
Dolhe Podbuskie	200
Domaradz	200
Drohobycz	11, 900
Dubiecko	1, 000
Dukla	1, 600
Dynow	1, 300
Dzikow Stary gm	400
Dzwinogrod	200
Felsztein	600
Frysztak	1, 100
Glinsko	200
Glogow	700
Grebow	200
Grodzisko Miasteczko	400
Grodek Jagiellonski	2, 600
Grodzisko Dolne	200
Horyniec	200
Hruszow gm.pow.jaworow	200
Hubicze	300
Huczko	300
Hussakow	300
Janow m-tko	500
Jaroslaw	6, 600
Jaryczow Nowy	1, 000
Jasienica	500
Jasliska	300
Jawornik Polski (Szklarski)	200
Jawornik Ruski gm	200
Jaworow Pow.miasto	2, 500
Jedlicze	200
Jezowe	200
Kamien	300
Kleparow	1, 200
Kolbuszowa	1, 500
Komarno	2, 100
Kanczuga	1, 000
Korczyna	800
Krakowiec	600
Krosno	1, 800
Kroscienko	300
Krukienice m-ko	300
Krystynopol m-ko	2, 100
Krzywcza	300
Kulikow	600
Kulparkow	400
Kurylowka	200
Lesajsk	1, 600
Lipsko m-tko	300
Lisko (Lesko)	2, 400
Lubaczow	1, 800
Lubella	200
Lubien Wielki gm	200
Lubycza Krolewska Miasteczko	700
Lutowiska m-ko	1, 300
Lwow	76, 900
Lancut	2, 000
Laka Rustykalna	200
Magierow	700
Majdan m-tko	600
Majdan Sieniawski	200
Markowa	200
Medenice gm	200
Medyka	200
Mikolajow	400
Mosty Wielkie	1, 200
Mosciska	2, 400
Mraznica	200
Nahaczow gm	200
Narol	800
Nawarja m-tko	400
Niebylec	300
Niemirow	1, 300
Nisko gm	500
Nizankowice	500
Nowe Miasto os. m	300
Nowe Miasto m. -to	300
Nowe Siolo-Pow. Cieszanow	200
Oleszyce	1, 600
Oleszyce Stare	200
Orow	200
Padbuz	300
Platbowa Pow. Dobromil gm	200
Podhorodyszcze	200
Posada Olchowska	400
Potylicz	300
Pruchnik Miasto	900
Przedmiescie Pow. Lancut gm	200
Przemysl	17, 400
Przeworsk	1, 500
Pysznica gm	200
Radomysl nad Sanem	400
Radymno	900
Ranizow	300
Rowa Ruska	6, 100
Rozwadow	1, 800
Rudki	1, 900
Rudnik	900
Rymanow	1, 500
Rzeczyca gm	200
Rzeszow	11, 400
Sambor	6, 100
Sanok	4, 100
Sadowa Wisznia miasto	1, 100
Schodnica	700
Sielec pow. Sokal gm.	200
Sieniawa pow.Jaroslaw m-ko	1, 100
Skoloszow	200
Sokal	4, 400
Sokolow	1, 400
Sosnica gm	100
Stara Sol	300
Stary Sambor	1, 600
Stebnik Pow.Brohobycz gm	200
Strzeliska Nowe m-ko	800
Strzylki	300
Strzyzow	1, 200
Sygniowka gm	200
Szczerzec m-to	800
Tarnobrzeg	2, 200
Tartakow Miasto	1, 100
Telesnica Oszwarowa ob.dw	100
Truskawice	200
Turka	4, 200
Turze gm	200
Tustanowice wies	2, 900
Twierdza pow. Strzyzow gm	200
Tyczyn	1, 000
Tyrawa Woloska	300
Uhnow	1, 900
Ulanow	900
Ulucz	300
Ulazow	200
Ustrzyki Dolne	1, 800
Warez Miasto m-ko	600
Werchrata gm	200
Wielkie Oczy m-ko	500
Winniki Pow.Lwow gm	300
Wojtkowa	200
Wola Michowa	200
Wola Zarczyska	200
Wulka Mazowiecka	200
Wybranowka gm	200
Zagorz	400
Zamarstynow	3, 000
Zarszyn	200
Zniesienie	2, 000
Zolynia Miasteczko	600
Zolkiew	3, 800
Zoltance gm	300
Aleksandrow m-to	2, 700
Babiak	300
Belchatow	3, 700
Bedkow os.m	300
Blaszki	2, 200
Boleslawiec	600
Brudzew	200
Brzeniny	5, 000
Brzeznica	500
Burzenin	300
Chojyn N-we B	200
Dabie miasto	1, 200
Dobra	1, 300
Dzialoszyn	2, 000
Gidle	200
Glowno	1, 500
Golina	700
Gomunica	300
Gorzkowice	700
Grabow os m-ka	1, 000
Grodziec	200
Izbica	1, 400
Jezow	1, 100
Kalisz	15, 600
Kamiensk	900
Kielczyglow wies	300
Kleczow	900
Kleszczow	300
Klodawa	1, 200
Kolo	5, 200
Koniecpol	1, 100
Konin	3, 000
Konstantynow	1, 000
Kozminek	800
Kraszewice pow.WielunWies	200
Lutomiersk	800
Lututow os.m	1, 500
Lask	2, 700
Leczyca	4, 100
Lodz	156, 200
Opatowek	200
Ozorkow	5, 000
Pabjanice	7, 300
Pabjanice Folwark	200
Pajeczno	700
Parzeczew	200
Platek	1, 300
Piotrkow	11, 700
Plawno	600
Poddebice	1, 400
Praszka	1, 700
Pyzdry	500
Radomsko	7, 800
Rogow	200
Rozprza	600
Ruda-Pabjanicka	300
Rychwal	300
Rzasnia	200
Sieradz	2, 900
Skulsk	300
Slupca	1, 500
Sompolno os. miej	1, 200
Stawiszyn	700
Strykow	2, 000
Sulejow	2, 200
Sulmierzyce	200
Sulmierzyce	200
Szadek	600
Szczercow	1, 600
Slesin	400
Tomaszow Rawski Maz	10, 100
Tuliszkow	300

Locality	*Square yards*
Turek	2, 700
Tuszyn	1, 300
Ujazd	800
Uniejow	1, 100
Warta	2, 100
Widawa	800
Wielun	4, 900
Wieruszow	2, 000
Wilczyn	200
Wladyslawow	300
Wolborz	500
Zagorow	900
Zdunska Wola	7, 900
Zelow	1, 900
Zgierz	3, 900
Zloczow	2, 000
Baranowicze	7, 800
Bielica	500
Byten	800
Delatycze	200
Dereczyn	1, 400
Derewna Pow. Wolozyn M-k to	300
Dworzec	400
Ejszyszki	1, 600
Holynka m-tko	300
Horodyszcze	800
Horodziej	800
Iwieniec	1, 000
Iwje	2, 100
Jeziernica m-ko	200
Kleck	4, 200
Korelicze	600
Koslowszczyzna	400
Lachowize m-to	1,700
Lida	5, 500
Lipniszki	400
Lubez	500
Lotwa Mala	100
Mir m-to	2, 100
Molczadz m-tko	1, 100
Naliboki m-tko	200
Niedzwiedzica	200
Niehniewicze m-tko	200
Nieswiez	3, 400
Nowa Mysz	700
Nowogrodek	3, 500
Nowojelnia	200
Nowy Dwor m-tko	400
Orla	200
Ostryna	1, 100
Polonka	300
Radun	700
Rakow	1, 400
Rozanka	600
Rubiezewicze m-ko	1, 000
Siniawka m-tko	400
Slonim	7, 000
Snow	400
Stolowicze	300
Stolpce	1, 500
Szczuczyn	1, 100
Swierzen Nowy	500
Traby	600
Turzec	500
Wasiliszki	1, 300
Wiszniew	600
Wolma m-ko	200
Wolozyn	1, 500
Woronow	1, 000
Wsielub m-ko	300
Zdzieciol	2, 400
Zoludek	1, 100
Antopol	1, 800
Bereza Kartuska	2, 200
Bereznica	1, 400
Blezowo	100
Bluden m-tko	200
Brzesc nad Bugiem	15, 700
Chomsk	1, 100
Czarnawczyce	500
Czerniany	200
Dawidgrodek	2, 900
Dabrowica m-ko	2, 600
Domaczow	1, 400
Drohiczyn	1, 600
Dywin	800
Glinka w	100
Horodec m-tko	300
Horodno	600
Horodziec pow.Sarny w	200
Iwaniki gm.Stawek w	300
Janow	2, 000
Kalaniec Litewski	2, 000
Kamien Koszyrski	700
Kobryn	5, 500
Konstantynowo	300
Kossow m-to	1, 500
Kozangrodek	800
Lenin	1, 000
Lachwa	1, 200
Lohiszyn	200
Luniniec	2, 100
Malecz m-tko	500
Maloryta	800
Mikaszewicze	200
Motol	1, 200
Olizarka	400
Pawlowo	300
Pinsk	17, 600
Plotnica	300
Pniowno	200
Pohost Zahorodny	600
Pohost Zarzeczny	300
Powicie	200
Pruzana	4, 200
Rafalowka m-tko	300
Rafalowka kol	400
Rokitno m-tko	600
Rozana	2, 400
Rubiel	400
Sarny	2, 900
Serniki m-tko	1, 000
Sielec m-tko	300
Stachow	200
Stolin	3, 000
Szereszow	1, 400
Swieta Wola	200
Telechany	500
Tomaszgrod m-tko	200
Wielka Hlusza	300
Wlodawka	300
Wlodzimierzec	1, 300
Wolczyn	200
Wysock	900
Wysokie Litewskie m-tko	2, 000
Zamosty	400
Zabinka	500
Zoludzik	500
Chojnice	200
Golub	200
Grudziadz	300
Kocborowo	200
Sepolno	200
Starogard	200
Swiecie	200
Torun	400
Tuchola	200
Bydgoszcz	800
Czarnkow	400
Gniezno	400
Inowroclaw	300
Jarocin	200
Kepno	300
Kozmin	200
Krotoszyn	200
Leszno	300
Oborniki	200
Ostrow (Wielkopolski)	200
Ostrzeszow	200
Pleszew	200
Poznan	2, 100
Rawicz	200
Rogozno	300
Szamotuly	300
Srem	200
Wagrowiec	300
Wronki	200
Wrzesnia	200
Znin	200
Bohorodczany pow. m-to	800
Bolechow	2, 400
Bolechow Ruski	600
Bolszowce	900
Borynia gm	300
Broszniow gm	300
Bukaczowce m-tko	700
Bursztyn m-to	400
Butla	200
Chocimierz	200
Czernelica m-tko	600
Czerniatyn gm	200
Czerniejow	200
Czolhany	200
Czortowiec gm	400
Delatyn	1, 600
Demycze	500
Dolina pow. m-to	2, 100
Dolzka pow Dolina gm	200
Dzurkow gm	100
Dzwiniacz Gorny	200
Grabowiec	200
Gwozdziec Miasto	1, 300
Halicz	600
Hnizdyczow	100
Holyn gm	200
Horodenka pow.m-to	3, 100
Ilnik gm	300
Jablonka Nizna gm	300
Jablonow m-tko	900
Jablonow pow.Turka gm	200
Jasieniow Polny gm	200
Jezupol	200
Kalusz	3, 200
Kalusz Nowy	200
Kniazdwor	200
Kniaze	200
Knihinin	6, 500
Knihinin Kolonia	1, 000
Knihynicze	500
Kolomyja	18, 300
Kosmacz pow.Peczenizyn gm	300
Kosow	2, 200
Kosow Stary	200
Krechowice	200
Kulaczkowce	200
Kuty	2, 700
Ladzkie Szalcheckie	200
Libuchora	300
Lisiatycze gm	200
Lanczyn	400
Lawoczne	200
Lomna	300
Lysiec	300
Mielniczne	200
Mikolajow	500
Mikuliczny	600
Mizud Stary	200
Moskalowka	200
Nadworna	2, 100
Nizniow	500
Obertyn m-tko	1, 200
Oslaw Bialy	200
Ottynia	1, 800
Pasieczna pow. Nadworna gm	200
Peczenizyn	1, 500
Perehinsko	700
Pistyn	600
Pniow	300
Pobereze gm	200
Podkamien	200
Porohy	200
Rohatyn pow. m-to	2, 300
Rosulna	200
Rozdol m-to	1, 800
Rozniatow	1, 400
Roznow	500
Sadzawka	100
Sianki	200
Skole	2, 500
Smorze Miasteczko	200
Sokoliki gm	300
Sokolow	300
Solotwina m-tko	700
Spas	200
Stanislawow	23, 300
Starunia	200
Stecowa w	200
Stratyn Miasto	200
Stryj	11, 000
Synowodzko Wyzne	400
Sniatyn	3, 300
Tarnawa Nizna gm	200
Tatarow	200
Tlumacz	2, 100
Tlumaczyk	200
Turka m-to	4, 300
Turza Wielka gm	300

Locality	*Square yards*
Tyszkowce	200
Tysmienica m-to	1, 100
Urycz	200
Weldzirz	300
Wierzbowiec	200
Wojnilow m-tko	1, 000
Woloska Wies	300
Worochta	200
Wysocko Nizne gm.	200
Wysocko Wyzne	300
Zablotow	1, 500
Zagorze	200
Zalukiew	200
Zarzecze pow. Bohorodcz gm	200
Zawaj	200
Zielona	200
Zabie	700
Zurawno	900
Zurow	200
Zydaczow	900
Bielsko	4, 000
Cieszyn	1, 600
Czechowice	200
Dziedzice	300
Kamienica	200
Olszowka Dolna	200
Skoczow	300
Ustron	200
Barysz m-to	300
Bialy Kamien m-tko	300
Bilcze Zlote	200
Borszczow Pow m-to	1, 700
Brody	7, 300
Brzezany	3, 600
Buczacz	1, 900
Budzanow	1, 200
Burkanow gm	200
Busk m-to	1, 600
Cholojow	800
Chorostkow m-tko	2, 000
Cygany gm	200
Czortkow	3, 400
Czortkow Stary	800
Darachow gm	200
Dobrotwor m-tko	300
Gliniany	1,700
Gologory m-tko	600
Grzymalow	1, 500
Husiatyn	400
Jagielnica	1, 000
Jazlowiec	500
Jezierna m-tko	900
Jesierzanka	200
Jezierzany m-tko	1, 400
Kamionka Strumilowa	2, 700
Kamionki gm	200
Kopyczynce gm	2, 500
Korolowka gm	1, 200
Koropiec w	200
Kozlow m-tko	800
Kozowa m-to	1, 400
Krzywcze Gorne m-tko	400
Laskowce Pow.Trembowla gm	200
Leszniow	200
Lopatyn m-to	400
Losiacz gm	200
Mielnics	1, 500
Mikulince	1, 900
Monasterzyska	1, 200
Nagorzanka gm.Pow.Buczacz	300
Narajow Miasto gm	800
Nowe Siolo gm	200
Oleski	700
Podhajce	2, 900
Podkamien	900
Podwoloczyska	2, 300
Pomorzany	800
Ponikowica	200
Potok Zloty	900
Probuzna m-ko	1, 300
Przemyslany	2, 100
Radziechow	2, 000
Sasow	1, 100
Skala m-to	1, 600
Skalat	3, 000
Sokolowka	500
Stanislawczyk	200
Stare Brody gm	200
Stojanow m-tko	700
Strusow m-tko	600
Suchostan	400
Szczurowice	100
Swirz m-tko	200
Tarnopol	13, 700
Tarnoruda	200
Tluste Miasto	1, 200
Tluste Wies gm	200
Toporow	700
Touste	200
Trembowla	1, 500
Trybuchowce gm. pow. Buczacz	200
Ulaszkowce	200
Usznia	200
Uscie Zielone	600
Uscieczko	300
Wasylkowce gm	200
Witkow Nowy	1, 000
Wygnsnka	700
Zaleszczyld	2, 500
Zaleszczyki Stare	200
Zaloscie	600
Zawalow	200
Zbaraz	3, 000
Zborow pow. m-to	1, 200
Zloczow	5, 800
Zlotnild gm	200
Aleksandrow m-to	1, 000
Biala Rawska	1, 500
Bielsk	300
Biezun	800
Bledow	900
Blonie	1, 300
Bodzanow	900
Bolimow	300
Brzesc Kujawski	800
Cechowka	200
Chodecz	500
Chorzele	1, 000
Ciechanow	4, 500
Ciechocinek	800
Czerwinsk	400
Dabrowice	200
Dobre pow. Minsk Maz. wies	400
Dobrzyn nad Drweca	2, 000
Dobrzyn nad Wisla	800
Drobin	1, 100
Falenica	1, 200
Gabin	2, 600
Gostynin	1, 900
Goszczyn	200
Gora Kalwarja	3, 000
Grodzisk Pow.m	2, 800
Grojec	5, 000
Henrykow wies	300
Ilow osada miejska	400
Inowlodz osada miejska	500
Jablonna wies	600
Jadow	1, 500
Jeziorna Krolewska	200
Kaluska Wola	300
Kaluszyn m-to	5, 100
Kaluszyn kol	300
Kamienczyk	200
Karczew	900
Kiernozia	300
Kikol os.m	300
Kolbiel	1, 200
Konstancinek	400
Kowal	1, 300
Krasnosielc	1, 000
Krosniewice	1, 300
Kutno pow. m-to	6, 800
Latowicz	400
Leoncin	200
Leszno pow. Blonie wies	300
Lipno	2, 500
Lubicz	400
Lubien	800
Lubraniec	900
Lomianki Gorne	200
Lowicz	4, 600
Lyszkowice	600
Makow	3, 400
Marki	200
Miedzeszynek Wille Zerz	100
Milosna	200
Minsk Mazowiecki	4, 200
Mlawa	6, 000
Mogielnica	2, 800
Mrozy	400
Mszczonow	2, 200
Nadarzyn	500
Nasielsk	2, 700
Nieszawa	300
Nowe Miasto m-to	1, 700
Nowe Miasto os.m	800
Nowy Dwor	4, 000
Oknniew	500
Osieciny os.m	500
Otwock	5, 500
Piaseczno	2, 300
Piotrkow Kujawski	800
Plock	7, 400
Plonsk	4, 500
Pomiechowek	300
Popowo Koscielne	200
Pruszkow	1, 000
Przasnysz	2, 200
Przedecz	900
Przyborowice Gorne	200
Przybyszew	200
Pultusk	6, 000
Pustelnik	400
Paciaz	1, 700
Radznow	400
Radziejow	600
Radzymin m-to	2, 300
Rawa Mazowiecka	3, 100
Rembertow	400
Rozan	1, 700
Rutka	200
Rypin	2, 800
Sanniki	400
Serock	2, 300
Siennica	600
Sierpc	2, 900
Skeppe	300
Skepe	300
Skierniewice	4, 400
Sluzewo	300
Sobota	400
Sochaczew	2, 500
Sochocin	500
Stanislawow os. miejska	500
Strzegowo	600
Szelkow Nowy	200
Szrensk	700
Tarczyn	1, 500
Tluszcz os.m	500
Walewskie	200
Warka	2, 200
Warszawa	310, 400
Wiazowna w	300
Wiskitki	1, 000
Wloclawek	9, 600
Wloki Male	200
Wloki Piaski	200
Wolomin	3, 100
Wyszkow	4, 500
Wyszogrod	2, 500
Zakroczym	1, 900
Zielun os. m	400
Zuromin	2, 000
Zychlin	2, 800
Zyrardow	2, 600
Braslaw	1, 200
Budslaw m-tko	200
Dokszyce	2, 100
Dolhinow	1, 800
Druja	1, 100
Drujsk	500
Dubinowo	400
Dukszty	500
Dunilowicze	700
Dzisna	2, 800
Glebokie	2, 900
Grodek	1, 000
Hermanowicze	300
Holubicze Pow.Dzisna m.Tko	200
Ilja	600
Jejse	200
Jody	300
Krasne m-tko	400
Krzywicze	300
Kurzeniec	1, 200
Lebuedzuew	800
Leonpol	200

Locality	*Square yards*
Luzki	500
Miadziol Nowy	200
Miory	400
Molodeczno	400
Opsa	400
Orzechowno	100
Plissa	400
Pbhost Nowy	200
Postawy m-tko	400
Prozoroki	200
Radoszkowicze	1, 300
Rakow	1, 500
Rymszany	200
Postawy m-tko	400
Prozoroki	200
Radoszkowicze	1, 300
Rakow	1, 500
Rymszany	200
Slobodka m.ko	200
Szarkowszczyzna Nowa	700
Wiazyn	200
Widze	400
Wilejkn	800
Wilno	55, 100
Aleksandrja	1, 300
Antonowka w.	500
Beresteczko	2, 000
Berezce w.	100
Berezne m-ko Pow Rowne	2, 400
Bialozorka m-tko	900
Czartorysk	300
Czeremoszno	200
Demidowka m-tko	600
Derazne	700
Druzkopol	800
Dubno	5, 400
Glinki	400
Holoby	300
Horochow	2, 400
Horyngrod	400
Hoszcza m-tko	800
Ignatowka	600
Jezierzany	400
Jozefin	400
Katrynburg m-tko	400
Kiwerce folw. m-tko	200
Klewan m-tko	1, 600
Kolki m-tko	800
Kopaczowka Nowa	300
Kortelisy	200
Korytnica	300
Korzec	3, 900
Kostopol	1, 200
Kowel	12, 800
Kozin m-tko	600
Krasne Kol	400
Kryczylsk	100
Krzemieniec	6, 700
Kupiczow	300
Luboml Powiatowe miasto	3, 200
Luboml wies	300
Ludwipol	1, 000
Lenowce m-tko	700
Lokacze	1, 300
Luck	14, 900
Maciejow	2, 300
Michalwoka m-tko	900
Mielnica m-tko	900
Miedzyrzec	1, 800
Miedzyrzecz	300
Mizocz m-tko	900
Mlynow	700
Moczulki kol	200
Murawica	200
Niesuchojeze	500
Nowy Korzec	300
Olyka	2, 100
Opalin	600
Osowa Wyszka	700
Ostrozec m-tko	700
Ostrog	8, 000
Ozdziutycze	800
Ozierany	800
Piaseczno wiesgm. Poworsk	100
Poczajow Nowy	1, 100
Porysk	1, 300
Radziwillow	2, 100
Ratno	1, 600
Rozyszcze	2, 700
Rowne	21, 800
Siedliszcze Male wies	700
Sokul	200
Stepan m-tko	1, 400
Szack	300
Szumsk	1, 800
Swiniuchy m-tko-u	200
Targowica m-tko	700
Torczyn	1, 500
Trojanowka	300
Tuczyn	2, 200
Turzysk	1, 100
Uscilug	2, 800
Warkowicze	900
Werba m-tko	300
Wisniowiec Nowy	2, 900
Wlodzimierz	6, 000
Wolnianka Wielka	200
Wyzgrodek	1, 000
Wyzwa Nowa	400
Zawale	200
Zdolbunow	1, 300
Zofjowka m-tko	1, 600
Aizpute	600
Aknistes	200
Aluksne	200
Auce	200
Baivu	400
Baltinavas	300
Bauska	800
Cesis	200
Daugavpils	11, 600
Dagdas	700
Griva	300
Grobinas	200
Jaunjelgavas	700
Jekabpils	800
Gelgavas	2, 000
Karsavas	900
Kaunatas	200
Kraslava	1, 600
Krustpils	1, 200
Kuldiga	800
Liepaja	7, 900
Limbazi	200
Livani	1, 100
Ludza	1, 700
Maltas	400
Pasienes	500
Piedrujas	300
Plavinu	700
Preilu	900
Rezekne	3, 600
Riga	43, 600
Rigas-Jurmala	300
Rugaju	200
Sabiles	400
Saldus	400
Silajanu	400
Silenes	300
Skaistkalnes	200
Smiltene	300
Subatas	500
Talsi	700
Tukums	1, 000
Vainodes	200
Valdemarpils	200
Valmiera	200
Varaklanu	1, 000
Ventspils	1, 300
Viesites	200
Vilakas	600
Vilenu	400
Visku	600
LITHUANIA	
Airiogala	500
Akmene	400
Alsedziai	200
Alunta	300
Alytus	1, 800
Antaliepte	400
Antanava	200
Anyksciai	1, 800
Aukstadvaris	300
Babtai	200
Balteriskis	600
Balninkai	300
Beisogala	200
Birzai	1, 900
Butrimoniai (Butrimonys)	1, 000
Cekiske (Cekiskis)	400
Darbenai	700
Daugai	400
Dabeikai	200
Dotnava	300
Dusetai	800
Erzvilkas	300
Gargzdai	1, 100
Garliava (Garleva)	400
Gelvoniai (Gelvonis)	500
Giedraiciai	500
Grinkiskis	300
Girkalnis	300
Gruzdziai	200
Gudeliai I	200
Gudziunai	200
Jeznas	300
Jonava	200
Jonava (g.)	2, 800
Joniskelis (g.)	200
Joniskis	1, 000
Joniskis	200
Josvainiai	400
Juodupis	200
Jurbarkas	1, 900
Kaisiadoris	600
Kaltinenai	200
Kalvarija	1, 300
Kamajai	400
Kapciamiestis	200
Kaunas	25, 100
Kedainiai (g.)	100
Kedainiai	4, 100
Kelme	2, 000
Kiduliai	400
Kovarskas	500
Krakiai	700
Krakinava	600
Kraziai	700
Kretinga	1, 000
Kriukai	200
Kruonis	300
Kuktiskiai	200
Kuliai	200
Kupiskis	1, 500
Kurkliai	200
Kursenai	900
Kurtavenai	200
Kvedarna	400
Kybartai	1, 300
Laizuva	200
Laukuva	400
Lazdijai	1, 200
Leipalingis	200
Linkuva	700
Liskeva	200
Luoke	600
Lygumai	300
Maletai	1, 400
Mariampole (Marijampolis)	2, 600
Mazeikiai	700
Memel (Klaipeda)	2, 500
Merkine	1, 500
Miroslavas	200
Mosedis	200
Musninkai	400
Naujamiestis	200
Naumiestis (Kudiskas)	1, 000
Naumiestis	700
Nemaksciai	800
Nemunaitis	200
Nemunelio-Radviliskis	300
Obeliai (Abeliai)	700
Oniskis (Onuski)	400
Paezereliai	200
Pakroujas (Pakrojus)	500
Palanga	500
Pandelis	700
Panemunelis	200
Panemunis	400
Panevezis	6, 900
Papile	300
Pasusvis	100
Pasvalys	800
Pasvitinys	300
Pikeliai	300
Pilviskiai	1, 000
Plateliai	200

Locality	*Square yards*
Plunge	1, 900
Prienai (Prenai)	1, 000
Pumpenai	400
Pusalotas	300
Radviliskis	900
Raguva	600
Ramygala	500
Raseiniai	2, 100
Raseiniai (g.)	200
Razalimas (Rozalinas)	200
Rietavas	900
Rokiskis	2, 100
Rokiskis (g.)	200
Rumsiske	300
Sakiai	1, 300
Salakas	1, 000
Salantai	700
Salociai	200
Saukenai	400
Seda	900
Seduva	1, 000
Seirijai	900
Semeliskiai	300
Seredzius	500
Sesuoliai (Sesoliai)	200
Seta	500
Siaulenai	300
Siauliai	5, 400
Siesikai	200
Silale	700
Silava	400
Simnas	700
Sirvintai	1, 100
Skapiskis	300
Skaudvile	1, 100
Skemoniai	200
Skoudas	1, 400
Stakliskis	400
Subacius	400
Surviliskis	200
Svedasai	300
Sveksna	600
Taurage	1, 800
Tauragnai	500
Telsiai (g.)	200
Telsiai	1, 600
Tirksliai	200
Troskunai	500
Tryskiai	400
Tverai	200
Tytavenai	300
Utena	2, 500
Uzpaliai	600
Uzventis	200
Vabalninkas	500
Vaiguva	200
Vainutas	400
Varena	400
Varniai	900

U.S.S.R.

Locality	*Square yards*
Babinovichi	400
Banovichi	400
Belynichi	900
Berezino	1, 600
Beshenkovichi	1, 500
Bobr	1, 100
Bobruysk	21, 600
Bogushevkoye	400
Borisov	8, 400
Bragin	2, 200
Chashniki	1, 700
Chausy	1, 800
Checheresk	1, 400
Chereya	1, 100
Cherikov	1, 600
Cherven	2, 100
Dobrush	400
Dribino	700
Drissa	1, 300
Dubrovno	3, 200
Glussk	2, 600
Gomel	37, 800
Gorki Orshansk obl	2, 400
Gorodets	700
Gorodok Vitebsk. obl	2, 700
Gory	400
Gresak	400
Grozovo	800
Kaidanovo	1, 800
Kalinkovichi	3, 200
Kamen	500
Khoiniki	2, 100
Kholopenichi	900
Khotimsk	1, 800
Klimovichi	2, 600
Kokhanovo	500
Kolyshki	1, 100
Kopatkevichi	900
Koptsevichi	300
Kopyl	1, 700
Kopysh	900
Korma	1, 300
Kostyukovichi	1, 700
Krasnaya Sloboda /Lyzna/	700
Krasnopole	1, 800
Krichev	1, 600
Krucha	300
Krugloye	500
Krupki	900
Kublichi	600
Lyady	2, 100
Lapichi	800
Lepel	2, 000
Lipen	500
Logoisk	1, 100
Loyev	1, 100
Liozno	1, 300
Luban	1, 100
Minsk	53, 700
Minsk/village/	400
Mogilev	17, 200
Monastyrshchina	1, 400
Mozyr	6, 000
Mstislavl	3, 400
Narovl	1, 400
Orsha	6, 800
Osipovichi	1, 200
Ostroshitz	700
Osveya	700
Ozarichi	1, 300
Parichi	2, 600
Petrikov	1, 800
Pleshchenitsy	800
Poddobryanka	1, 200
Polotsk	8, 200
Propoisk/Slavogrod/	1, 600
Pukhovichi	1,000
Rechitsa	7, 400
Rogachev	5, 400
Ryasno	800
Samokhvalovichi	300
Samoteyevichi	400
Senno	1, 900
Shamovo	700
Shatsk	700
Shchedrin	1, 800
Shklov	3, 200
Shumilino	500
Sirotino	700
Skrigalovo	900
Slutsk	8, 400
Smilovichi	1, 800
Smol'any	1, 000
Smolevichi	1, 600
Starobin	1, 500
Starye Dorogi	1, 100
Staryi Bykhov	2, 600
Streshin	1, 300
Surazh	700
Sverzhen	500
Svisloch	800
Tikhinichi	500
Timkovichi	1, 100
Tolochin	2, 000
Trudy	200
Turov	2, 200
Ulla	1, 200
Urechye	200
Ushach	900
Uzda	1, 600
Vetka	2, 100
Vitebsk	37, 100
Volyntsy	500
Yanovitchi Mogilovsk. obl	1, 400
Yasen'	300
Yukhovichi	400
Yurevichi	1, 200
Zaslavl'	400
Zembin	900
Zhitkovichi	1, 000
Zhlobin	3, 600
Zhuravichi	1, 200
Andreapol'	400
Belev	300
Belgorod	700
Bezhitsa	800
Borovichi	400
Bryansk	2, 600
Chudovo	200
Churovichi	300
Demidov	500
Detskoe Selo	600
Dmitriev	200
Dorogobuzh	300
Dubrovka	600
Dukhovshchina	200
Fokinsk	300
Cusino	500
Gzhatsk	300
Ilino	400
Izdeshkovo	200
Kaluga	900
Karachev	600
Khislavichi	2, 200
Kholm	200
Klimov	500
Klintsy	5, 300
Komarichi	200
Kozel'sk	200
Krasnodar	1, 800
Krasnyi	300
Kursk	4, 200
L'gov	200
Livny	400
Luban'	200
Lubavichi	1, 100
Luga	400
Ludinka	400
Ludinovo	200
Malaya Vishera	200
Maloyaroslavets	200
Mglin	1, 300
Mikulino	500
Movorzhev	300
Mtsensk	200
Nelidovo	200
Nevel'	6, 200
Nowgorod	1, 000
Novorossiysk	2, 000
Novosokl'nik	400
Novozybkow	4, 900
Oboyan'	200
Oposhka	600
Oryol	3, 600
Ostrogozhsk	300
Ostrov	500
Pesochnya	200
Petrozavodsk	400
Pochep	3, 700
Pochinok	600
Pogar	700
Porkhov	300
Pskov	1, 400
Pustashka	1, 000
Roslavl'	3, 300
Rostov n/Donom	26, 400
Rudnya	2, 300
Ryl'sk	300
Rzhev	800
Sebyezh	1, 900
Sevsk	300
Shumiachi	1, 400
Shuvalovo-Ozerki	200
Slutsk	300
Smolensk	12, 900
Sol'tsy	200
Spas-Dement	200
Stalingrad	2, 000
Staraya Russa	1, 400
Starodub	3, 400
Stary Oskol	200
Stavropol'	1, 400
Stodolishche	400
Surazh	2, 200
Svyatsk	600
Sychevka	400
Taganrog	2, 700

Locality	*Square yards*
Tatarsk	900
Tikhvin	200
Toropets	1,200
Trotsk	200
Trubchevsk	200
Tver'	1,500
Unecha	1,500
Velikye Luki	1,700
Velizh	3,300
Volodarsko-Tolstovski	1,000
Vyaz'ma	600
Yartsevo	600
Yefremov	200
Yelets	1,100
Yel'nya	600
Zapadnaya Dvina	500
Zhukovka	700
Zhuzdra	600
Zlynka	600

Following the attached list of Jewish Cemeteries in Soviet Russia, Poland, Rumania, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, the World Union of European Rabbis is taking the liberty of submitting the following remarks:

All the Cemeteries mentioned in the attached list have been destroyed by Nazi occupation troops. Special units, called "Friedhof Battalions" have been given this task. These battalions have had their headquarters in Janov, at Lemberg.

The destruction was planned and precise. The fences were torn down and the tombstones removed. Only some of these Cemeteries, some of the tomb-stones escaped the destructive fervor of those battalions. The tomb-stones were either given away, sold to the local population for building purposes, or used for street paving. We are enclosing copy of a newspaper which reports on a trial against a Nazi group leader accused of selling tombstones.

The fact that an overwhelming majority of Jewish inhabitants of the quoted towns were exterminated by the Nazis and the few left alive have emigrated to almost every country on the globe makes impossible a precise description of the dimensions of each Cemetery, the radius of their fences as well as the exact number of tomb-stones which disappeared.

It is on the background of such circumstantial difficulties that we had to prepare these lists. We had to rely partly on remaining Jewish Community registers and partly on depositions of survivors originating from the communities.

Among the tombstones on those cemeteries some were millennia old. They harbor the remains of Jewish personalities which have achieved a position of prominence in the millennia old history of our people.

The fact that on those Cemeteries have found their eternal peace relatives of the millions of Jewish living all over the world, makes it obvious that the condition of these Cemeteries agitate the innermost feelings of those people. They certainly will find no peace until this situation will be changed and until the damage will not be redressed.

As the majority of the Cemeteries is to be found in Poland, we are taking the liberty of submitting a cost estimate of re-fencing, prepared by a certified engineer from Cracov.

The signed are well aware of the fact that present day Germany condemned the Nazi acts, as we well know of the extent of financial effort made by Germany to alleviate financially the sufferings of the survivors. But stating this we must, unfortunately dwell on a moral, human and religious problem concerning the results of the Nazi destruction which has not found its solution, and namely the problem of the over 2000 Jewish cemeteries destroyed in Eastern Europe.

Unfortunately our years-long appeals to the Finance Ministry in Bonn remained unheeded. According to the Ministry of Finance the 450 million dollars assigned by the Haag Protocols to the Claims Conference should have provided as well the necessary means for the restoration of the Cemeteries. When our delegation visited, December last year, Dr. Martin Hirsch and Professor Boehm of the Indemnification Committee of the Bundestag, these two authorities on indemnification problems and legislation have stated, that after studying the Haag Protocols they arrived at the conclusion that these Protocols do not provide for the restoration of the Jewish Cemeteries destroyed by Nazi units.

Among the many tragic experiences our people suffered at the hands of the Nazi regime, there are only very few which could be redressed. The restoration of the Cemeteries is one of the few aspects of this tragedy which can still be remedied. But that this happens not much time can be lost. In case such restoration will not take place in the nearest future, nothing will be left of those 2,000 Cemeteries, the remnants of old millennia Jewish culture in Europe.

The plan of action which we are envisaging would entail:

1. The reconstruction of the fences around the Jewish Cemeteries.
2. The restoration of the desecrated tombstones.
3. The erection of monuments to replace those grave stones which can no more be restored.
4. The establishment of a Fund which will help in the guarding of the restored cemeteries.

We hope and believe that your Excellency will agree with us that the surviving European Rabbis, the spiritual leaders of their Communities have a sacred, moral and religious mission to do their utmost, not to rest until the desecrated Cemeteries of our brothers are restored to their identity and honor.

In fact this mission is the central task of our organization in which 900 surviving Rabbis, originating from the countries of destruction are organized. Chartered legally by the New York State authorities our Organization is the sole public body concerned with this problem, and is sponsored by the Union of Rabbis (Agudath Harabanim), the Organization of Rabbis, Young Israel of the U.S.; the Chief Rabbis of Israel Unterman and Nissim; the Chief Rabbi of the British Commonwealth Brodie, Chief Rabbi of France Kaplan and the Chief Rabbi of Geneva.

We sincerely hope that your Excellency who manifested so deep an understanding in matters of reparation will give proper attention to this problem and cause a positive response to our pleas.

Rabbi MOSES JOSEPH RUBIN,
President; of the World Center of European Rabbis.

If I am returned to Congress, I shall pursue this matter and will plan, at my own expense, a trip to Bonn, Germany, to assist in rectifying in some small measure this grievous wrong that was perpetrated and I know that all men of good will join me in the hope for a proper solution.

RETIREMENT OF SENATOR LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this special order today to provide my colleagues with an opportunity to pay tribute to a great man and a distinguished Member of the other body who, with the adjournment of Congress this weekend, will retire after a career of nearly 45 years in the public service.

Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL is one of Massachusetts' most distinguished sons. He has served in the Senate for the past 22 years, as Governor of Massachusetts for three terms, as speaker of the Massachusetts House of Representatives for 8 years, and as an alderman in Newton, Mass. At every level of our government LEVERETT SALTONSTALL has served with integrity and distinction.

It has been characteristic of him and his rich New England heritage that he saw public service as a job to be performed with as much conscientiousness and dedication as possible. I am reminded of the evening when the Senator was accompanied by an assistant after a particularly grueling day. The aid said, "Well, Senator, this was one of the toughest days we've had." The Senator replied, "You're right, it was, but this is the job we hired out for."

This simple phrase in its modesty and sense of dedication characterizes superbly the conscience and career of Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.

I had the good fortune of serving on the Senator's staff from 1953 to 1958. It was a lesson in what public service is all about: devotion to duty, integrity, and total concern for the public good.

No commentary about Senator SALTONSTALL's career would be complete without referring to his lovely wife Alice, who has stood at his side throughout his years of public service. Together they have represented the finest that New England has to offer America and the world.

With the adjournment of the 89th Congress, Senator SALTONSTALL will end his public career. We expect that he will miss public service for a time, and we will surely miss his advice and counsel here on Capitol Hill.

Characteristically, the Senator has already agreed to serve Massachusetts in his retirement as chairman of a committee to encourage travel in our State. I feel sure that he will not be idle, but will continue to contribute to our Commonwealth.

I have asked several of the Senator's former staff members to add their own comments today. Under unanimous consent I include the letters of Henry Minot, John B. Fisher, Charles W. Colson, and John Jackson at the conclusion of my remarks:

OCTOBER 21, 1966.

Hon. F. BRADFORD MORSE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR BRAD: Over the years, indeed over a lifetime, I have never known a finer person, a more devoted public servant than LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.

Both in example and in precept he has been, professionally an inspiration, and more personally, a good counselor and friend without a peer.

To him, to Mrs. Saltonstall and to all the family, Mrs. Fisher and I send our affectionate regards and warm good wishes for many more happy years together, years that will now be rich in recollection of duty superbly done and splendid results achieved.

Sincerely,

JOHN B. FISHER.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

OCTOBER 21, 1966.

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR BRAD: There will probably never be another LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.

He is the one person who will not be forgotten for many long years to come either in Massachusetts or in Washington. In nearly forty-five years of public service, he has represented the very best New England qualities.

Neither I nor any who have been associated with him personally or professionally could ever have hoped for a better colleague or co-worker. As you know, we not only liked him but truly love him as a wonderfully fine human being.

Sincerely,

HENRY W. MINOT.

BROOKLINE, MASS.

OCTOBER 21, 1966.

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE,
Member of Congress,
259 House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BRAD: I appreciate your giving me the opportunity, in connection with your remarks on the House floor, to express a few personal sentiments about the forthcoming retirement of Senator SALTONSTALL.

Much has been said and more will be written about the Senator's lifetime of service to the Commonwealth and the Nation, his devotion to the Senate, his great accomplishments as a Governor and a Senator. What I could add to this would be superfluous indeed for I am no different from any other citizen of the Commonwealth when I express my deep pride in and admiration for the Senator and his many years of service to us. I have been privileged, however, to work closely with him and therefore, I believe, to know him—perhaps better than most—an experience in my life that I shall always treasure.

From LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, I learned much—

Much about honor and integrity in the conduct of one of the highest offices in the land;

Much about compassion and understanding for one's fellow man. I remember well when the Senator took several hours from a tremendously busy schedule to listen to and help a widow who was being displaced from her family's home of many years by an urban renewal project;

Much about courage. When he lost two sons without ever inflicting his grief on others or seeking self pity;

Much about dignity and decency in personal and public life.

Every man's stature is measured in different ways. Senator SALTONSTALL never sought headlines or public acclaim; he never engaged in a single act of political demagoguery for his own political gain; he never once compromised with his conscience; he never willingly even spoke of his own accomplishments—vast though they were. Historians will measure LEVERETT SALTONSTALL's greatness, not only by his achievements, but by the dignity, modesty, self-restraint, and humility which characterized every private and public act. I would like to think—and I believe it is so—that particularly in this respect LEVERETT SALTONSTALL's service will have left a lasting imprint on the ways of American political life. I have many times on the floor of the Senate heard his colleagues, in the manner and custom of the Senate, refer to him as the "gentleman from Massachusetts." No man who has served in that body has ever more richly deserved that title.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. COLSON.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
October 21, 1966.

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BRAD: I am glad that you plan to lead a tribute to Senator SALTONSTALL in the House on the final day of the last session that the Senator will be representing Massachusetts here in Washington.

As you know, I started working for the Senator while I was still in school and have been with him since. President Kennedy considered the Senator a great teacher in the ways of the Senate. This, of course, is true, for I can think of no one who has been more effective in his quiet way in getting members of the Senate of divergent viewpoints to agree on an acceptable compromise. But I think just as important has been the example that he has set for all those who have worked for him over the years of what a true gentleman is and what a life of public service means.

One need only look at the roster of those who have had the unique experience of working for Senator SALTONSTALL in the past and the roles which they are playing in society today. Alumni of this office are running for Congressional, State, and local offices. They have served as advisors to presidents, members of the cabinet, Congressional leadership and our best universities.

The Senator has become an institution in Massachusetts and here in Washington. But unlike some institutions, he has continued to be an effective instrument in the lives of countless people with whom he has come into contact but most especially for those of us who have had this unique opportunity to work closely with him over the years.

Fortunately, as he himself says, this is not "good-by" but merely "adieu," for we can be sure that his enlightening influence will continue to be felt for a great many years and generations to come. I am proud to be able to have shared with you in working with Senator SALTONSTALL and joining you in this salute to him.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. JACKSON,
Administrative Assistant to
Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to sum up in a few moments the long and glorious career of LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, but as his 21 years as Senator from Massachusetts come to an end, we are all acutely aware of one thing—"We shall miss LEV SALTONSTALL," and in those words is a message from the hearts of all who have been privileged to work with this great statesman. Though he was never a Member of this body, we all know him for his name is synonymous with the dignified image of integrity in which we would like to cast every legislator who enters these halls. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL will remain with us for, like Henry Clay, he is the modern day symbol of quiet deliberation and sage compromise. How many conference committees have been blessed by his presence, and how can we ever measure the impact on legislative history of his wise counsel. He has been called upon by Presidents, and relied upon by all of us, for there is none who has ever found duplicity in his utterance nor personal motive in his actions. In his own State of Massachusetts there is not a man or woman who has less than total confidence in their senior Senator, and this trust is certainly the most profound tribute a public official could hope for.

Senator SALTONSTALL embodies the finest qualities of the old New England tradition from which he springs—rich in wisdom and thrifty in words: and, in the noisy heat of battle all ears turn to his moderate voice for a fair resolution.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in these historic times when the race for outer space monopolizes the minds of men, there may be a tendency to forget that computers do not build computers—men do.

With all deference to the wonders of the modern world in this jet-propelled age, the greatest asset that any nation can possess is the character of the men who lead it.

In war and in peace, the Nation in general and Massachusetts in particular has been blessed by the caliber of the representation afforded it in the person of the Honorable LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.

Those of us who saw the manner in which he accepted the loss of his son in World War II and the way in which he conducted himself in some of the most difficult periods of our early history are quick to recognize the fact that this Congress will be the loser when he retires, and this is said in all deference to the person who will succeed him.

With the same manner that made him a favorite at Boston's classic Clover Club dinners and which merited the affection of the marchers and the viewers in South Boston's traditional St. Patrick's Day parade, this rugged New England Yankee has endeared himself to his colleagues from all parts of the Nation and to leaders from foreign lands.

Too often you note the expression "a great American" being deprecated in its significance by an all too frequent usage of the label against the name of one unworthy of it. Those of us whose privilege it has been to serve with LEVERETT SALTONSTALL feel that in the finest and most profound sense of the term he adds a dignity and a dimension to the expression "a great American." The term tends to mean more when it is used sparingly and when it is applied properly to one whose record in his chosen field has earned him this exceptional accolade.

With the tenacity which helped him propel the Harvard crew to world recognition a few decades ago, with the charm which make the Boston Irish claim him "as one of us," with the dedication to duty which earned him the respect of people of both parties, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL has become a legendary figure in our times.

It is with sadness that we see him leave but his memory will never die as long as any Members of this Congress are still alive.

The grand old Bay State which has contributed Presidents of the Nation and Speakers of the House to the Halls of Congress has never sent a more dedicated representative to our Nation's Capitol than the retiring senior Senator raised in the Yankee tradition and blessed by his association with and his devotion to the people of many racial backgrounds.

Speaking from the heart on behalf of my colleagues as well as myself, the privilege of serving with LEVERETT SALTONSTALL has been one of the most richly rewarding experiences of our lives. It truly has been a plus value of election to membership in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is especially fitting that our dear friend and able distinguished colleague, BRAD MORSE should initiate the program we dedicate today to our beloved and distinguished friend Senator SALTONSTALL, because the gracious able gentleman from Lowell had the high privilege of working with our great Senator before he came to this body and is a very close friend of his as well as a sincere admirer.

Mr. Speaker, as we come to the close of this session of Congress, those of us from Massachusetts and many others who serve here are moved by regret because of the departure from the other body of the very able, distinguished, senior Senator from Massachusetts, the Honorable LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.

I have known Senator SALTONSTALL for many years and have had the honor, satisfaction, and pleasure of working with him in the Congress in the interest of our great Commonwealth and our beloved Nation.

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL has had a magnificent career in public life, covering a long span of years during which he held some of the highest offices within the gift of the people—speaker of the Massachusetts General Court, Lieutenant Governor and Governor and U.S. Senator for virtually a quarter of a century.

Admirably trained for the public service at Harvard College and Harvard Law School, long experienced in the art of government, keen, alert student of public questions, dedicated to serving the people, Senator SALTONSTALL has enjoyed a truly remarkable and illustrious career.

He has contributed in many fields and in many ways to building the strength and well-being of the Nation, and his work in the field of national defense in which he has been so very active and effective has been particularly noteworthy.

We who know and have worked with LEVERETT SALTONSTALL in the Congress well understand and appreciate the great ability, dedication, and devotion he has given to his work and his very important duties as a great senior Senator of the State of Massachusetts. We know well the diligence, interest, and painstaking attention that our beloved friend has unceasingly given to every facet of his official duties, and indeed to all matters presented for his consideration.

I would speak also of that exceptional, deep dedication our dear friend, Senator SALTONSTALL has exemplified in his illustrious service for State and Nation.

He never faltered in the performance of his duties. He was on the job morning, noon, and night no matter what the occasion or how heavy the demands, and he never spared himself.

On the contrary, he frequently went out of his way, and as I mentioned above, went beyond the scope of his duty to make sure that, insofar as he was concerned, everything possible was done that could be done to contribute to proper solutions of the matters at hand, and zealously to seek the ends sought.

This is the kind of faithful service and fine Americanism that I like and admire, and that the American people like and admire, because it represents heart service, not lipservice, and it shows the high, patriotic motivation that permeates the spirit and the activity of one who serves his country and the people the way Senator SALTONSTALL has done, regardless of class, race or creed, or political ideologies, or party affiliation.

It is generally recognized that in his long career Senator SALTONSTALL has notably met the most exacting and highest standards of public service, and I think this is not only a tribute to him personally, but also a tribute to his family background, the fine colonial American stock from whom he has sprung, as well as the great Harvard University where he received his education and where I can testify of my own knowledge that he was stimulated and encouraged to consider honorable, faithful, public service as a primary aim in life, and I am also naive enough to believe very wholeheartedly that the athletic background LEVERETT SALTONSTALL enjoyed at Harvard as a member of the Harvard crew that won the great Henley Regatta years ago, and the only one to do it, was without a doubt another very substantial contributing element in the great success he has achieved in the public service.

I think that from his athletic experience the senior Senator drew much inspiration and benefit, and learned valuable lessons of what dedication, teamwork, courage, and determination could do, as well as the value of strong, loyal friends working together toward common goals, and, admittedly, these are great lessons for anyone to learn early in life.

The people of Massachusetts on innumerable occasions and in many ways have shown how they feel about LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, because they have repeatedly elected him to high public positions in elections in which it would normally be expected that the trends were running against him, and this evidences the great respect, high regard, confidence, and appreciation that the Bay State electorate has felt and should, toward their outstanding senior Senator.

I would stress that this feeling and sentiment crosses party lines, just as was the faithful service of our senior Senator, and he is esteemed and loved, not only by his colleagues and by the people, without regard to race, creed, party, or station in life.

One thing is certain: that we are going to miss LEVERETT SALTONSTALL here in Washington and that goes for all of us who know him and his warmhearted service, and it is especially true of those like myself who have had the honor and privilege of working closely with him through the years in defense and military matters, where we have worked together so often.

We will certainly miss the counsel, cooperation, and assistance of this dear friend and most distinguished public servant. We shall miss his knowledgeable understanding, the benefit of his rich experience and sound judgment, and valuable contributions he has always made to our deliberations.

Surely, there will be a great void left in the Capitol as a result of his departure from public life—one that could never be precisely filled. But we hope to see him often and that he will keep in touch with us about matters in which he is interested and continue to let us have the benefit of his views, opinions, and recommendations. And we will also miss his gracious, devoted wife and helpmate, Mrs. Saltonstall, who has made such a deep impression among us and with us, and I wish for the Senator and his beloved lady many more happy years together with their devoted family and dear ones and hope and pray that the Good Lord will bring them choicest blessings in the future for many years to come.

"Ad multos annos" to both of them and to their lovely family.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to again rise and join my distinguished colleagues from Massachusetts in paying tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts, the Honorable LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, who is about to close out his long and noteworthy career after 22 years in the Senate, three terms as Governor of Massachusetts, 8 years as Speaker of the Massachusetts House of Representatives, and service as alderman in the city of Newton, Mass.

I said on Wednesday, in commenting on Senator SALTONSTALL, that his 46 years of public service had been brilliant, capable, and dedicated. But one cannot talk too often nor too long about the many years of Senator SALTONSTALL's service to his community, his State, and his Nation. During his 22 years of service in the Senate, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL has become widely respected as an authority on the problems of national security and governmental finance. As the 89th Congress adjourns sine die, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL holds the ranking minority position on the Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committee, and is chairman of the Senate Republican conference.

Again, I take pleasure in paying tribute to Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, an outstanding public official, and I wish him many years of happiness and good health in retirement.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it is, indeed, a great pleasure to join with the Members here in this preeminently merited tribute to my dear friend and colleague, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, the senior Senator from Massachusetts, as he is about to complete some 46 years of distinguished public service to his Nation, his State, and his community.

Few men can attempt to match the illustrious career of this stalwart son of the Old Bay State which consists of 22 years in the U.S. Senate, three terms as

Governor of Massachusetts, 8 years as speaker of our State House of Representatives, and a term as alderman in his hometown of Newton.

Throughout every day of the many years he has served in these various public offices, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL has been a living symbol of patriotic loyalty and unswerving industry in the discharge of his welcomed but burdensome duties.

In his most responsible position as the ranking minority member of the Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committees few, if any, men have ever contributed so much to wise solutions of our national security problems and the prudent stability in governmental finance.

In these challenging areas of congressional service, as well as in so many others, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL'S persevering dedication and devotion in legislatively promoting the patriotic interests of this Nation mark him as one of the most effective Federal legislators of modern time.

Above all other things LEVERETT SALTONSTALL has, by his consistent demonstration of personal integrity and legislative knowledge, courage and diligence, earned a lasting place in the brightest pages of the highest congressional accomplishments of our times.

This Congress and this Nation will remain forever indebted to him for the permanent inspiration of fidelity and excellence in the performance of public duty he is leaving for us, and all who will come here after us, to follow.

As Senator SALTONSTALL voluntarily retires from the Congress, I know we all join in our prayers that Divine Providence will bestow the great blessings of good health and good fortune upon him, and his most gracious wife, Alice, in all their further endeavors through many happy years ahead.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and proud to join with my colleagues on this occasion to offer a few humble words of tribute and esteem for our colleague in the other body, the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.

This is the second such occasion for me since I also took the floor to offer some thoughts on behalf of "LEV" SALTONSTALL on the opening day of the present session—the last such session in which our deliberations and decisions will be enriched by the contributions of the distinguished Senator.

It is for me the second occasion in a year in which I have tried to focus on the hard fact that "LEV" SALTONSTALL is stepping down from public office after nearly half a century of devoted service to the people of Massachusetts and the Nation. In a sense, we have come to think of "LEV" SALTONSTALL'S career the way a man thinks of his own life. We can never quite resign ourselves to the certainty that someday it must end.

"LEV" SALTONSTALL has become almost a living institution, the symbol and personification of both the Senate and the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts. He has attained a unique stature in his 20 years on Capitol Hill so that those of us who have come here in the meantime find it difficult to conceive of a time when he was not a part of the legislative process.

Much has already been said, and much will continue to be said of the man and of his singular career. But it seems that too much will never be said of him.

In January I tried to express my personal impression of this man who has proven both a warm friend and a valued counsellor to me throughout my career in public life. My feelings have hardly changed since then, and I might only restate just a portion of my remarks at that time to reaffirm my regard and personal esteem.

Senator SALTONSTALL'S record is not marked with blazing innovation. He is not a fiery frontiersman, surging forward with a crusader's sword in one hand and the head of his enemy in the other. He is not a man of bombast or flamboyance. He has left sensationalism and false bravado to those who have not yet found in their own character the same honest bedrock upon which "LEV" SALTONSTALL has always stood.

And yet he is a progressive, he is a man totally committed to improving the lot of those he serves. He is also a moderate in that he is able always to perceive the middle ground, able always to temper enthusiasm for one cause with consideration for another, perhaps conflicting, point of view. He has never shaken his New Englander's concern for fiscal integrity. And yet he has tempered this with the realistic knowledge that true progress can often be a costly proposition.

His manner, his immense dignity, his unwavering integrity, his unhesitating commitment to the principle that his first allegiance and responsibility lay with the people; these are the hallmarks of Senator SALTONSTALL'S nearly half-century of public service.

I shall always deem it a high honor and a singular distinction to have served alongside "LEV" SALTONSTALL as a citizen of Massachusetts, as a fellow Republican, and as a Member of the U.S. Congress.

I join with all of his colleagues and friends in the hope and prayer that the years of his retirement will bring him the satisfaction and happiness he so richly deserves.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished American, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, after dedicating his life to public service, decided he would not seek reelection this year to the U.S. Senate. One would have to be demanding and selfish not to accept such an announcement with understanding. Yet, in these turbulent days of world history, this Nation and the world can ill afford to lose the experience and ability of this great son of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

There have been those occasions, Mr. Speaker, when the spotlight of adverse publicity was directed toward our State. Whether the accusations leveled at a few of our public servants were justified, is not now before us for consideration. However, among those whose personal integrity gave consolation to a concerned people, none stood taller in defense of high principles than our illustrious senior Senator, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL. People crossed party lines in large numbers to vote for him because in doing so they walked along a road that was built by dedication and high purpose.

His biography will enumerate a wide list of offices he held and honors he attained. He has been speaker of the House of Representatives in Massachusetts; he served as Governor longer than any other man; and he has been U.S. Senator since he succeeded Henry Cabot Lodge in 1944, when the latter resigned to enter the Armed Forces.

In recent years, as the ranking Republican on the House Armed Services Committee, it has been my pleasure to participate in conferences with the Senate Armed Services Committee, where Senator SALTONSTALL holds the corresponding position which I hold in the House. He was always a most valuable member of these conferences and when an impasse on a matter was reached, it was generally Senator SALTONSTALL who provided the language which all sides of the issue could accept. While he was not a professional military man, as a legislator he was intimately informed on military matters, and the Reorganization Act of the Department of Defense contains the expression of many of his ideas.

Most men in public life are known for that which is related to the office they hold, but somehow in all his dealings, the personal character of this man was in the forefront. I admire him for many reasons, but generally when I think of him, my mind runs back to the war years. He was to make an address to the Gold Star Mothers on the Boston Common. Just before he left his home, he was advised that his son, Peter, a marine, was killed in action on the island of Guam. One would have every reason to expect that his program, at least for that day, would be canceled. His was a close-knitted family and the loss very deeply felt. Yet, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL had an obligation to fulfill that day and he assumed that obligation. I doubt, Mr. Speaker, if I could have spoken to the Gold Star Mothers that day, and I suspect few in this Chamber could have assumed such a difficult task. He was a true soldier, in the very highest sense, on that occasion and it reflects his lifetime of dedication to his country and to his fellowman.

The Saltonstalls have deep roots in my home city of Salem, Mass., where both my family and his have been active in political life. His great-grandfather, Leverett Saltonstall, was the first mayor of Salem, served in the Massachusetts House of Representatives and later served in the U.S. Congress. Approximately a hundred years later, my own father also served that area in the same capacities. The burial grounds of both our families are in Salem, not very far apart.

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL has never followed the easy road, but the road he has taken has been made smoother by the presence of his lovely lady: a devoted wife, a fine mother, and a wonderful person, she has always been a great source of his strength. My life is richer because I have known them and their family. May they all be blessed with good health and happiness for many years to come.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, President Roosevelt was enormously popular in Massachusetts. In 1944 he carried the State by 114,000 votes. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL was elected a Republican Senator from Massachusetts that year by a very much larger plurality. He has been a Senator since then, and today he takes his departure from Congress. His is a well-earned retirement, and I wish many happy and productive years ahead for my dear friend, the senior Senator from Massachusetts.

A record of distinguished public service began with his election to the Newton Board of Aldermen in 1920. He became an assistant district attorney of Middlesex County, was elected to the Massachusetts House of Representatives in 1923, and served as that body's speaker for 8 years. He became Governor of Massachusetts in 1938, and was reelected in 1940.

His election in 1944 as a U.S. Senator was to fill an unexpired term. He was resoundingly reelected in 1948, 1954, and 1960. In the Senate of the United States he has displayed the same qualities of integrity, ability, candor, and courage that he showed as a public official in Massachusetts.

During his long lifetime of public service, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL has come to occupy a very special place in the political history of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and in the affections of the citizens of the Bay State of all parties, sections, ages, and backgrounds.

A public life as long, as distinguished, and as vigorous as his necessarily has given rise to a whole inventory of stories about him. I can mention only a few, those that seem to reflect most clearly his character and principles.

An Irish political opponent once said that Mr. SALTONSTALL would not dare show his Yankee face in heavily Irish South Boston. Of course, Mr. SALTONSTALL immediately did so, won a lot of Irish votes, and became a featured attraction of each year's St. Patrick's Day parade through South Boston.

The reason that he has given for his decision not to seek reelection is entirely in keeping with his character. He said:

> I feel that it would be difficult for me to serve for another 6-year term with the zeal, ability, and conscientiousness with which I would want to serve.

He once wrote:

> I am proud to be a Senator of our great country and while I know any part I can play is a very small one, I want to make it one that will help our State and our country prosper so that our children may enjoy what we have enjoyed and a little more, too.

These are the sentiments of an honest man and a patriotic American. His legislative wisdom is the product of his years of experience. He has written:

> My years in public office have taught me to be exceedingly careful how I express an opinion in advance of a vote on any specific measure, since the bill on which I may vote may be substantially different from the one on which I have been asked an opinion. I recently received a letter from an engineer condemning me for not taking a definite stand on a particular bill as it was introduced in the Congress. No hearing had been held. No committee had reported on it, yet he wanted me to state my position unequivocally. In reply, I asked him if he gave expert opinion on an engineering problem before all the blueprints of the proposition were before him.

In his personal life, he has suffered deep bereavements. In these, as in every crisis and trial of his public life, he has shown the courage and reticence of his Yankee forbears. They were made of stern stuff, those men who settled the wintry Atlantic coast of the New World, and so is he made of the same iron will, personal bravery, and utter and complete integrity.

It has been one of the cardinal principles of his long public life to give another man the benefit of the doubt.

I have found—

He once said—

> that you get further with a fellow if you assume his motives are as honorable as yours, than if you play him slippery.

He is a courteous, gentle, and unpretentious man who has always been a tireless doer of small kindnesses of the sort that are rarely forgotten. His tastes are simple; he likes codfish balls, apple pie, and Indian pudding. He used to wear his father's pants to the very few parties he attended at some of the embassies when he first came to Washington. That is the kind of aristocrat we have in Massachusetts.

It is time to say a fond farewell to him. I am proud to have served in the Massachusetts congressional delegation with him. I am proud to have known him.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, for about 20 years in the course of Appropriations Committee business I have had the distinct pleasure of working with the senior Senator from Massachusetts, the Honorable LEVERETT SALTONSTALL. Senator SALTONSTALL is retiring this year, however, bringing to an end a distinguished and outstanding career as a public servant. His career in public office began long before he joined the other body 21 years ago. He served three terms as Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, a record still unbroken, and provided it with efficient and progressive leadership. Aside from serving as Governor and Senator he has also filled a variety of State offices—and filled all of them well. In all, Senator SALTONSTALL has compiled a record of 41 years in public office. His patience, wit, and counsel will be missed by all of us, both here and in the other body. We wish him many happy years as he starts a retirement justly deserved.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I recall meeting Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL when he was Governor of Massachusetts. I visited his office there.

Through the years I have known Senator SALTONSTALL well. He is one of the finest and most outstanding Senators I have ever met. He is a real gentleman in every respect. We all know he is and has been one of the most courageous and dedicated Members of the U.S. Senate.

I wish for Senator SALTONSTALL and his family every happiness and success in the future.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a great privilege to have this opportunity to pay tribute to one of the great public men of our time. Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL's long service to the people of Massachusetts, and to the country—beginning over 46 years ago as alderman of Newton, then in the Massachusetts Legislature, next as Governor, and finally as Senator—was of the highest order—unselfish, dignified, and noble.

The people of Massachusetts recognized these qualities in him, electing and reelecting him to office even in times when the opposition party was sweeping other offices. People of all political persuasions were proud to have LEVERETT SALTONSTALL as their spokesman.

We shall miss him, his devoted and dedicated service, when the 90th Congress convenes in January 1967. I believe that the highest tribute any man in any work can receive is the acknowledgement by his colleagues that his has been a service of excellence. Senator SALTONSTALL has earned this. I sincerely hope that we shall not see the end of his service after he retires from the Senate and I hope that he will continue to give all of us the benefit of his wisdom and counsel.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, it was a sad day for Massachusetts, the Republican Party, and the Nation when Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL removed the codfish from the door of his Washington office as a prelude to his retirement from public life.

The Senator's wisdom and integrity have long been a byword in the Congress and the country and in particular the 12th District of Massachusetts. We will remember him for his contribution to the creation of the Cape Cod National Seashore and for his stanch defense of the cranberry growers during the "cranberry crisis" of 1959 when the Food and Drug Administration wrongly recalled cranberries from the marketplace.

In the Congress, we work in teams. It is the "we," not the "I," that is important. The Massachusetts congressional "team," thanks to the untiring efforts of its captain, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, has been extraordinarily effective in dealing with the multitude of problems facing the Commonwealth. We will sorely miss his able leadership.

Senator SALTONSTALL has given me invaluable assistance in my work for the 12th District. In the 89th Congress, we began working together to establish a national memorial at Plymouth Rock and is now playing the lead role in the effort to bring the proposed center of the Environmental Sciences Services Administration to Massachusetts. I only wish that he would be here in the 90th Congress to see these projects brought to their successful conclusion.

However, this distinguished veteran of public service certainly deserves the unpressured pace of retirement. He has been serving the Commonwealth constantly since he was elected to the Massachusetts House of Representatives in 1923. He served as speaker of the Massachusetts house for 8 years and then as Governor, he gave the State one of the best administrations in its history.

He has given this same untiring service to the Nation during his 22 years in the Senate. As ranking minority member of both the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees, he has made contributions to the Nation's welfare that will be long remembered. The name of SALTONSTALL has become a synonym for leadership.

The senior Senator from Massachusetts is a member of the 14th generation of Saltonstalls, many of whom also dedicated their lives to public service. As many of my colleagues are aware, the Senator has a son, Bill, who assisted his father in Washington and has recently been elected to the State senate. I know that he will carry on the noble tradition his father has enhanced so well.

I will miss Senator SALTONSTALL, as will every other Congressman, Senator, and every citizen of Massachusetts. I will always be grateful for his wisdom and for the hand he offered in friendship.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SIXTH ANNUAL WEST SIDE COMMUNITY CONFERENCE—"THE CHALLENGE OF THE DEVELOPING NATIONS"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, a citizenry, alert to the problems and complexities of the modern world and sufficiently informed to give both intelligent support and criticism to the policies of our Government, is an essential ingredient in our democracy. I have always believed that Members of Congress have a special responsibility to involve constituents in dialog on the issues, for citizen participation in government is urgently needed.

It is with this in mind that during each year of my tenure in Congress I have sponsored an annual daylong community conference in New York City. This conference, free of charge, free of partisan orientation, and freely attended by the public at large, brings together leaders in government and the academic world with the citizenry to whom they are responsible. At this forum they exchange their knowledge, ideas, and interests.

I am very fortunate in that the Reform Democratic Clubs of Manhattan's West Side as well as a wide variety of individual community sponsors join me in presenting these forums.

On March 12, 1966, we held our sixth annual conference entitled "The Challenge of the Developing Nations." More than 2,000 people attended and participated in six panels and a plenary session at Barnard College and Columbia University. Government officials, diplomats, economists, trade unionists, businessmen, and other experts contributed to an enlightening and provocative discussion of the problems confronting the developing world.

A superlative plenary session was addressed by U.S. Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY and Luis Munoz-Marin, member of the Senate of Puerto Rico, and former Governor of Puerto Rico.

The outstanding list of panelists included:

Chief S. O. Adebo, Ambassador to the United Nations from Nigeria.

Irving Brown, representative to the United Nations, International Confederation of Free Trade Unions; executive director, American-African Labor Center.

Irving Crespi, vice president, the Gallup Organization, Inc.

Gabriel D'Arbroussier, Under Secretary of the United Nations; Director, United Nations Institute for Training and Research.

Dr. Candido Mendes de Almeida, director of the faculty of political and economic sciences of Rio de Janeiro; professor, Catholic University.

Mohammed El-Badry, Population Branch, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, the United Nations.

H. Field Haviland, Jr., director of political studies, Brookings Institution.

Dr. Samuel P. Hayes, president, Foreign Policy Association.

Julia J. Henderson, Director, Bureau of Social Affairs, United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs.

Roger Hilsman, professor of government, Columbia University; former Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs.

Ernest Howell, Asia Foundation.

David E. Lilianthal, chairman, Development and Resources Corporation; former Chairman the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Salvador P. Lopez, Ambassador of the Philippines; permanent representative to the United Nations.

Robert R. Nathan, economist.

Frank Pace, Jr., president, International Executive Service Corps; former Secretary of the Army.

Felipe Pazos, Organization of American States.

Richard W. Reuter, Director, U.S. food-for-peace program.

Eduardo Schijman, press attaché of the Chilean Mission to the United States.

Reuben Sternfeld, Alliance for Progress, U.S. Department of State.

Gideon Strauss, senior officer, Bank Leumi Le-Israel.

Irene B. Taeuber, senior research demographer, office of population research, Princeton University.

Immanuel M. Wallerstein, professor of sociology, Columbia University.

Harris L. Wofford, Associate Director for Planning, Evaluation, and Research, the Peace Corps.

Howard Wriggins, member, Policy Planning Council, U.S. Department of State.

An excellent group of journalists and experts in foreign affairs, law, and economics lent invaluable service as panel moderators. They were:

Pauline Frederick, United Nations correspondent, NBC News.

Richard N. Gardner, professor of law, Columbia University; former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State.

Robert B. Goldmann, economics editor, Vision magazine.

Darius Jhabvala, United Nations correspondent, the New York Herald Tribune.

William V. Shannon, the New York Times editorial board.

Emil Starr, Foreign Policy Association.

Mr. Speaker, I wish it were possible to acknowledge by individual name every one to whom I am deeply indebted for the success of this conference, but I do want to thank the following for the important part they played. The cochairmen were Susan Cohn and Jack Rennert, who organized and coordinated the entire conference, and who were assisted by the tireless efforts of the following: Secretary, Anna Lou Pickett; club coordinator, Judy Joseph; treasurer, Ira Zimmerman; public relations, Burt Solomon; chairman for arrangements, Barbara Jeffers; assistant chairman for arrangements, Carlton Carl; registration chairman, Ruth Fuhrman; lunch and reception chairman, Joan Buckley.

The devoted panel coordinators were: Brooke Aaronson, Betty Jo Bailey, Ada Bass, Scott Clark, Eva Popper, and Irving Wolfson, who helped insure that each panel would be stimulating and present diverse points of view.

The club representatives were: Mark K. Benenson, Leona Brin, Carlton Carl, Harriet Cohen, Michael Farmer, Ruth Levy, Fred Nichols, Peter Osman, and Nieves Rodriguez.

I want to thank all the foregoing and all the unmentioned others, once again, for their irreplaceable energy and efforts without which the conference could not have taken place.

The participating clubs were: Ansonia Independent Democrats, Columbia-Barnard Democratic Club, F.D.R.-Woodrow Wilson Democrats Inc., Fort Washington-Manhattanville Reform Democrats, Heights Reform Democrats, J.F.K.-Mid-City Democrats, New Chelsea Reform Democratic Club, Reform Independent Democrats, Riverside Democrats Inc., West Side Democratic Club.

I am also deeply grateful to the large number of community sponsors whose generous contributions enabled this conference to be held.

Mr. Speaker, the plenary session began with a highly informative and moving speech by Governor Munoz-Marin. I cannot express sufficient gratitude not only for his contribution but for the lengthy trip that the Governor undertook in order to appear at our conference. He spoke about the path upon which Puerto Rico has embarked, the decisions which led to this path, and the directions for tomorrow.

Senator Robert F. Kennedy followed with a memorable speech about our relations with Latin America. He spoke of the quest for knowledge and achievement which stirs the young not only here but in Latin America as well.

The final speech was my own—presenting and developing my proposal for an International Development Corps—a body of technically trained men and women whose careers would be devoted to service in developing nations—careers in which they would live abroad and help share the information and techniques of our industrialized society.

I include at this point in the Record the remarks of the three speakers at the plenary session:

Address of Luis Munoz-Marin, Former Governor of Puerto Rico to the Sixth Annual West Side Community Conference, March 12, 1966

Puerto Rico is a small island with a good people capable of producing in microcosm, and working toward producing a society of excellence, and so can project some significance beyond itself. The island people have a modest protagonist role to play in the violent, confused, fearful, tragic and, even so, hopeful contemporary drama. What has developed and is developing there can be meaningful to others. I am referring not only to the action of its government but also to an instinctive emotional adaptation of the people to values without which a truly great society cannot emerge from the travails and confusion of the present. I refer specially to the simultaneously anti-colonial and non-nationalist attitude of the people—a paradox, apparently, everywhere except in Puerto Rico.

The world is engaged in a "cold war" and, at the same time, in what has the clear potential of one of the greatest and deepest adventures of all times. The communist-capitalist cold war, with all its tremendous vigor, is the obsolescent container within which the greatest creative effort is taking place to liberate all peoples of the ancient shackles, of poverty, ignorance, injustice, indignity. The real revolution is not the class war. It is the revolution of the mind of man in its vertiginous scientific revolt against the avarice of nature, wresting from her, and putting at the disposal of all men, increasing and soon abundant power and increasing and soon abundant wealth, at a continuously accelerating pace. It is this tremendous acceleration of scientific knowledge and its technological application that is making less and less meaningful a war between systems of distributing scarcity when it is abundance that could be distributed in the not too distant future. The cold war is a tragic symptom, on the other hand, of the widening gap between scientific knowledge and political wisdom. Perhaps the danger of humanity destroying itself with what it knows is now somewhat less than it was before October 1962, and its opportunity to save itself with it somewhat better. But we can see as yet no assurance that the mere saving of our skins from nuclear destruction would of itself release us into the potentials of civilization that that knowledge offers us. The forms of political unwisdom are many, but none as menacing as nationalism.

In the Puerto Rican microcosm we have tried to deal with that dichotomy through what we have called Operation Bootstrap, Operation Commonwealth, and Operation Serenity. Between them they include what we have called The Purpose of Puerto Rico. Operation Bootstrap is the effort to abolish poverty through industrialization, general economic development and social justice. Operation Commonwealth has been a continuing working-out of a new form of political freedom by exploring fully new potentials of federalism. Operation Serenity is the attempt, still wistful, to give to economic effort and political freedom objectives that can commend themselves to the spirit of man in its function as leader of, rather than servant to, the economic process. Through Serenity we hope to keep kind and unruffled in our understanding of values while strenuously using all the complex tools of modern civilization to abolish scarcity. In other words, how to be wide-awake without contracting insomnia. The constituent elements of The Purpose of Puerto Rico are:

(1) Education—the fullest possible quantitative and qualitative development of it: no man to receive less education than he can use not only as breadwinner but as man, and placing the teaching profession, from kindergarten to university, in the high level of competence, responsibility, prestige and remuneration that wisdom demands of it;

(2) Health: full and equal facilities, for all, tolerating between persons only differences in luxuries, not in scientific treatment, and reducing smog, murder and other causes of death to the lowest possible point;

(3) elimination of poverty by diminishing its causes, as in the Johnson program, but also, for as long as necessary, by supplementing a minimum income so that;

(4) outside of those totally incapacitated, (who of course must be taken care of) the whole of society from age four on, shall, as soon as feasible, be composed only of those who work and those who study or retrain themselves; (this implies the abolition, not only of unemployment but of the very concept of unemployment);

(5) a balance—I would say an eventual balance—between external and internal investment in the economy (it is to the public good that the decision-makers in the private economic sectors of a society be largely a genuine or immigrant cultural part of that society: since their decisions are only partly controlled by processes of law, they should be at least partly prompted by their membership in a culture and their resident responsibility to a community;

(6) balance between the rural and the urban: (we should never resign ourselves to be exclusively encased in stone, glass, steel and traffic, and rural life should be not only a way of life to the workers of the land, but also a release to the workers of the offices and machines, increasingly including the automation complexes. Each man and woman whose life is other than rural should have a plot of land somewhere if only just to keep in touch with deeply needed simplicities. This feeling may be as reactionary as nostalgia itself, but the land is probably going to be the last do-it-yourself opportunity left to us; and no society can be great, or a civilization really good, that is exclusively, or even mainly, economically motivated.

Operation Commonwealth being concerned with the relationship of Puerto Rico to the United States and to the world at large, is a key to the others, to the whole purpose of Puerto Rico, and is a suggestion for an expanded manner of federalism in the United States, the hemisphere, and beyond. "Commonwealth," in the U.S.-Puerto Rico sense, is association by compact, based on common citizenship, common defense, common currency, common market.

The history of this political status, not independence, not assimiliation to a larger state as in U.S. classic Statehood, not dominion status as Canada knew it, is briefly as follows:

Puerto Rico was the only Latin-American people which did not take during the 19th Century the dramatic spectacular role toward independence and what is called sovereignty. In this it initiated the development of its own talent for political realism and creativity. Puerto Rico took the patient, unspectacular, at times, morally anguishing road of relentless civil pressure, of logic and debate. It sought practical economic and political formulae that could assist the growth of a society and economy in freedom within a larger unit. Neither the idea of assimiliation to Spain or separation from it struck deep roots in Puerto Rico. Assimiliation to attain a position similar to that of Spanish provinces, was barred by the fact that conditions were sufficiently different on the Island to have made equality, in the sense of flat sameness, rather than in the higher sense of equivalent dignity, unworkable and therefore unjust.

Puerto Rico had in fact become a differentiated cultural nationality. Puerto Ricans spoke the same language, professed the same religion, shared the same basic racial origins as the Spaniards and at the same time had a creole personality of their own. They were fairly similar to Venezuelans, Dominicans, and other Latin American societies which had become political as well as cultural nationalities. But, again, the vast majority of Puerto Ricans retained the loyalty to Spain and the crown to which they had sworn allegiance. Here we see an emergence of a new attitude, a departure in the manner of feeling nationality; not a deliberate one perhaps: it is possible that the leaders thought that they were merely being shrewd.

Hindsight allows us to say, however, that they were being faithful if unwitting servants of a deeper historical current—a current deviating from hardened 19th century nationalistic attitudes. When a Puerto Rican pronounced the word "patria" (country in the sense of fatherland) he some times meant Spain but he was more often referring to Puerto Rico. This phenomena continued to be true under the United States regime. Both under Spain and the United States Puerto Ricans have sought a new manner of political freedom. Under Spain they began to develop it in the Autonomous Charter of 1897; in their relationship to the United States they developed it, in different form, of course, when the Commonwealth was created—or perhaps I should say when it began to be created—between 1950–1952.

This Puerto Rican historical manner has been defined as an unacceptance of extremes, an expression of political realism, an instinct for the middle road. It can be all this, but I, for one, do not believe that is the deeper meaning. It was clear to many Puerto Ricans that the autonomy idea during the Spanish regime was, and the Commonwealth idea in the America regime is, more creative than a mere compromise, although compromise was undoubtedly in the minds of some of the promoters of each. It is a new non-colonialist, non-nationalist, non-assimilist way of developing freedom within a larger sphere. The internal dynamic of the Commonwealth idea is not to evolve into assimiliation as a classical state of the American Union nor into a separate independent republic. There are those in Puerto Rico who would try to swerve it to one side or the other, but I believe that it cannot, and certainly should not, be swerved. That would be a loss not only to Puerto Rico's originality and manner of growth but to the need for new and constant federalist thinking in our complex and fast-moving time.

The first civil government established by the United States in Puerto Rico was a throwback from the autonomy charter granted by Spain shortly before the Spanish-

American War. It took away practically all self-governing power from Puerto Rico. But on the other hand, it was economically liberal. Fiscal autonomy was established for Puerto Rico. Federal taxation did not apply.

This was made possible legally because Congress legislated a constitutional status with regard to the new territory under American jurisdiction without the benefit of a specific amendment, but only—or I should say no less than—through Supreme Court approval. It created the concept of unincorporated territory. Had it not been for this new concept, Puerto Rico would have suffered an economic breakdown and the Commonwealth idea could not have been developed fifty years later. Only through the flexibility derived from the fact that it was an un-incorporated territory not subject to the uniformity of federal taxation could Puerto Rico have maintained itself or developed, with Congress, the Commonwealth relationship.

Felix Frankfurter once said: "One of the great demands upon inventive statemanship is to help evolve new kinds of relationships so as to combine the advantages of local self-government with those of a confederated union. Luckily our Constitution has left this field of invention open."

The Congress of the United States and the people of Puerto Rico moved into this field of political invention. What did we invent?

Between 1950 and 1952 the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was created through a law approved by the Congress of the United States "in the nature of a compact" and ratified by the voters of Puerto Rico in referendum. Under the terms of the law so approved bilaterally the people of Puerto Rico are governed in all their internal affairs by their own constitution. Civil liberties are guaranteed by both the United States and Puerto Rico constitutions, fiscal autonomy is maintained, and pertinent federal laws, other than the tax laws, apply. The United States represents Puerto Rico internationally.

The U.S.-Puerto Rico relationship can no longer be justly said to be based on a military occupation or a treaty of peace ending a war between two other nations. It is the idea of "compact" that is significant in the relationship. It removes from the very basis of the relationship—although perhaps not yet entirely from its terms—the onus of colonialism. The United Nations recognized the validity of the U.S.-Puerto Rico relationship as a non-colonial one in 1953.

At that time, as a response to objections of the Communist Bloc and some Latin American and neutralist countries, President Eisenhower sent a message to the Assembly of the United Nations in which he stated that at any time that the Legislature of Puerto Rico should wish for a more perfect autonomy or even complete independence, he would immediately send a message to Congress supporting that demand. The Legislature at that time answered Eisenhower's message making it clear that neither Independence nor Statehood was the goal of the Puerto Rican people as expressed through substantial majorities.

There are, to be sure, other possible and necessary developments. Nothing can be added to the idea of compact, but the compact itself can and should be modified, again by act of Congress and of the Puerto Rican electorate. The principle of the relationship is valid. After thirteen years of experience, we should take a look at the terms of the relationship with a view to making any good and needed changes beneficial to both the United States and Puerto Rico.

By what standard should the "good" be judged in this connection? No standard could be more fruitful than one that bestows maximum consideration to the spiritual satisfaction and further economic interest of the people of Puerto Rico and the greatest prestige of the policies of the United States. Included in these changes should be: the gradual abolishment of any privileges enjoyed by Puerto Rico, justified only by economic need, or by the United States, justified only by the fact that they had been existing before.

It is with this standard in view that the Legislature of Puerto Rico, in a joint resolution approved in 1962, proposes to the Congress an affirmation of the 1962 compact the basis of which is common citizenship, common defense, common currency, common market; that the Federal powers of the United States with respect to Puerto Rico would be exclusively those essential to the Union and that all other powers be exercised by the constitutional organisms of the people of Puerto Rico; participation by the people of Puerto Rico in those powers exercised by the Federal Government that directly affect the Commonwealth; and the adoption of a formula under which the people of Puerto Rico would increasingly contribute to the general financial burdens of the Union in a manner compatible with the continued stability and economic growth of Puerto Rico.

It is on the basis of this resolution that a joint U.S.-Puerto Rico Commission is now meeting and its report will probably be made shortly to the President and Congress of the United States and to the Governor and Legislature of Puerto Rico. It is expected that whatever changes may be proposed in the Commonwealth will be put to the vote of the Puerto Rico people along with statehood and independence.

The supporters of Commonwealth, have proposed this plebiscite in an attempt to clear the air of political debate. We hold that Statehood, by destroying the fiscal autonomy of Puerto Rico, would overthrow its economic development and is therefore a practical impossibility. Independence is proposed by a still smaller minority of the people; we holld that by deviating from the deep non-isolationist current of Puerto Rican history, as well as for economic reasons, it too is impossible. If votes mean anything, Puerto Ricans have demonstrated repeatedly at the polls that they share this conviction.

I have described the process of Puerto Rico's breakthrough from nationalism emotionally, philosophically, politically and juridically, a breakthrough in microcosm that somehow the world must make if it is to free itself from the constant threat of another breakthrough; an always imminent military technological one, dramatically destructive of the gigantic and delicate balance of nuclear power to which the whole world is today entrusting the keeping of the peace—and its very existence.

This process has been intimately interwoven with that of economic development. This economic development itself is, I believe, of substantial significance to the developing nations of Latin America and of other parts of the world. That this is widely understood is shown by the fact that over twenty-seven thousand persons, from more than a hundred countries have visited Puerto Rico since 1952 as guests of the Point IV and other programs cooperatively instituted by the U.S. government and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. In this respect, it is significant to note that economic development in Puerto Rico has been flexible and certainly undoctrinaire.

We began our program with state-owned industry as well as ownership of practically all public utilities, excepting the telephone. We did not change the emphasis to private initiative until experience persuaded us that it would be an impossible task to make densely-populated Puerto Rico an industrial country without the pluralistic energies, managerial and financial, of private enterprise. Still electric power, the aqueduct and sewer service and the San Juan public transportation system are operated by public corporations wholly owned by the Commonwealth government. In our philosophy we do not hold private enterprise to be a sacred cow but we do treat it as a healthy, efficient and contented one.

Private enterprise receives much aid and encouragement from the Commonwealth government, including tax exemption for a number of years. One demonstration of the non-doctrinaire character of our government is that it sold the factories originally built and operated by the state—and to the chief political opponent of the government, at that—and employed the recovered funds in developing factory sites and constructing factory buildings as an added incentive for the establishment of new privately-owned industries. Today wages in Puerto Rico are approximately three times as high in actual purchasing power as they were when Operation Bootstrap began; and Puerto Rico has become the second largest market for United States goods in the Western Hemisphere, ahead of all Latin America and second only to Canada, and the fifth largest market in the world, after Canada, Great Britain, West Germany and Japan.

As relates to Latin America, the experience of the relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico, a people of Latin American origin, obviously should not be considered a blue-print, but as tangible proof of the viability of original political thinking in the Americas, as well as a dramatic refutation of the communist propaganda that the United States position is narrow and reactionary and that it wants to remake the world in its own capitalist image, as the communists would certainly like to remake it in their own communist image.

At this very moment, when decisions are being developed regarding a new international oceanic canal in Central America, I believe that most careful thought should be given to associating that important purpose with another most important purpose: an arrangement, not only with the country through which the new canal is to be built, but with the whole Central American common market, involving free trade (with limitations mostly for the benefit of Central Americans) as well as technical and economic assistance. Democracy would be truly strengthened in the whole region, and economic progress would be greatly accelerated.

While the Puerto Rican experience does not, and should not, of course provide a blue-print for others, yet, in a broad sense, it points out certain things. I would list them as follows:

(1) That it is fruitful to keep new forms of self-government and of political association constantly under practical as well as theoretical exploration. The Puerto Rican Commonwealth status is itself dynamic and capable of further growth within its own nature as a new political form. Many are the roads to liberty if the imagination is not weak and the spirit is willing.

(2) That toleration of differences in social and economic ideas, in a world where science is rendering old politics obsolescent, is a practical working reality, if they be founded on respect for the freedom and dignity of the individual. The United States has not only supported Puerto Rican development plans, both under public and private initiative, but has provided as well as a substantial measure of financial aid to those plans and to the general progress of Puerto Rico.

(3) That the policy regarding financial and technical assistance to areas of Asia, Africa and other parts of the world can and should be based on the concept "we will support your efforts for economic sufficiency no matter what your preference as to economic systems may be, if only they be founded on the basic dignity of man".

(4) That anti-colonialism need not depend for its spiritual energy on narrow nationalism. Nationalism can be by-passed on the road from colonialism to wider political organization.

(5) That, in spite of its growth in Africa and Asia, and its intensification in Latin America, nationalism is not the wave of the future; its vigorous claim masks a hidden obsolescence of its historical justification; it is the European common market, the Central American common market, the incipient Latin American Free Trade Association, other new and imaginative forms of federalism that may and can be developed, that ride the wave of the Future.

Address of Robert F. Kennedy to the Sixth Annual West Side Community Conference, March 12, 1966

Mr. Chairman, Governor, Ladies and Gentlemen, I am delighted to be here. I have a certain reluctance about coming in and speaking this afternoon on Latin America with the Governor here on the platform, and having heard him just a week ago down in Puerto Rico and then listening to him today. I'm reminded a little bit of the man who survived the Johnstown flood. Whenever he could get a group of people together he used to tell them about the Johnstown flood, and if he could get two or three people, he told them about the Johnstown flood, and if he could ever get sort of a luncheon audience he got very excited and told them about the Johnstown flood. So finally he died, and he went to heaven, and St. Peter said to him, "Well, what would you like to do? You have led such an exemplary life that we're going to give you one wish." And he said, "Well, I think, if you could get everybody together, I'd like to tell them about the Johnstown flood." So, St. Peter said, "That's fine, you come back at noon tomorrow. It's a rather unusual request, but I'll see what I can do." So it was noon the next day; they came back; and there they were all seated around, or whatever they do. So he said, "Gosh, you don't know how grateful I am to you." And St. Peter said, "Well, that's perfectly all right. You just go right up there and you address them, you tell them. There's only one thing I want to tell you before you begin." The fellow said, "What's that?" And he said, "I just want to tell you Noah's in your audience."

So, that's a little bit the way I feel with the Governor being here today, and having to talk on Latin America with a person who is such an expert as he is. I want to thank, however, Congressman Bill Ryan for inviting me. I think that these forums that he's run and operated have been most constructive, most worthwhile, not only for the City but for the State and, of course, the country. And his energy and his talent once again is exhibited by the efforts that he puts in to making these forums a success and bringing us all together.

I also would want to ask you to bear with me for one moment, one more moment. I would like to introduce to you a gentleman who is really as responsible as anybody else within the government for the development of our Alliance for Progress program. President Kennedy gave him really the major credit for developing the concept. And that's Mr. Dick Goodwin, who came with us today and is somewhere around here. I guess he got up and waved to everybody, but I can't see him. He was not only responsible for that, but really for the development of so much of our Latin American policy during those critical months and years of 1961 and 1962, and then served with great loyalty and dedication for President Kennedy, and then for President Johnson. So he was interested when I told him that this program was proceeding here, and he was interested in the fact that the Governor was going to speak, so I prevailed upon him to come, and I'm delighted to have him here.

It has been said that the future of a nation is to be found in the opinions of its young men under the age of 25. Today I would like to talk with you about the young men of Latin America. The young men who are the future, not only of their own country, but really of this whole hemisphere. Young men who will therefore play a great role in determining the kind of world in which all of our children will live. To understand these young people is to better understand Latin America as a whole and the kinds of problems we will face in the years and the decades ahead. For the young men of Latin America are the essence of their country. They contain in themselves all the contradictions and all the dilemmas, all the frustrations and the resentments and the hatreds, all the shame of the past, and really all the hope of the future. That makes Latin America at once the most depressing and exhilarating of continents.

Perhaps the most important thing to know is that we know about such a minescule fraction of Latin American youth. We read about the students, particularly the university students, who lead revolutions, overturn governments, spit or throw stones at visiting dignitaries. But let us remember also that it is the students who also become the presidents and the counsellors, the bankers and the generals and the diplomats of their respective countries. They are all of these things, because really there is no one else. They are the very, very fortunate few. The university students of Latin America, the young Latin Americans we see, are the products of one of the most limited educational systems. In northeastern Brazil, for example, where I traveled, there are primary schools for only a fourth of the children. In none of the five countries which I visited were there schools available for all of the children above the third grade. Once past grade school, free education virtually ends. High schools are predominantly private and extremely expensive and there are no university places for most of those who graduate from high school. Of the 1,500 Latin American children who survive the first few years, one will graduate from a university. So to talk about the university students of Latin America is to talk about a very, very small group and it is also to recognize how small the visible Latin America really is.

The other Latin America, the invisible continent, the continent of the poor and the uneducated and the unheard, that continent is more than a thousand times larger than the Latin America that we see. The two Latin Americas are separated, of course, by more than education. The history of the continent is a history ratification and inequality.

As Theodore Moscoso has written, and I quote from him, "The roots of Latin America's underdevelopment go back to the days of the Conquest." In fact, the very term "conquest" points to the motivation of the men under the Spanish and Portuguese flags who sailed to the shores of Central and South America. They were conquerors. Their quest was for gold and for the many other riches of the New World. The conquerors pried loose the wealth of indigenous empires and they shipped it to their mother country. And they established in their new world the authoritarian rule of the elite which was the mode of government at home. So North America, except for ourselves, was engaged in building a family farm agriculture and erecting a substructure of its industrial development; Latin America was slumbering away in its comfortable feudal cocoon. Indians in the western country and Negroes in the shores of the Caribbean and the Atlantic were serving as workhorses on plantations and rocky farms while the landlords enjoyed the finer things of life. They whiled their time away in Paris and Rome and Madrid, and sometimes London, and occasionally one might even stoop to dropping by briefly on uncultured New York. That's all changed. They produced bananas and sugar, wheat and meat, metals and other food, and raw material that industrializing nations in Europe were eager to buy. In short, economically they were very much like the African and Asian possessions of the European nations. But this did not disturb the Latin American elite except when somebody was uncomplicated and frank enough to raise a question. Then they would rise up in anger and wave the flag of their nominal independence. Even the fights were independent. Because in most countries they struggled by established groups to prevent the Spanish Crown from liberalizing the treatment of the Indians and the Negroes. It was somewhat as if the South had won our Civil War and preserved slavery in its independence.

The legacy of this history, as Mr. Moscoso described it, is all through Latin America. It is in the villages of northeast Brazil where 7 out of 10 children die before the age of one. It is in the fields that I visited in that same part of that country where men cut cane from 6 o'clock in the morning till 6 o'clock at night, 6 days a week, for $1.50 a week. The legacy is across the Andes in Peru where we meet peasants working their master's land for a few cents a day who have never even heard of the United States of America.

But history and social structure are far from explaining Latin America or its students. For these students in large part are also the engines of radical change in their countries. Their action takes many forms. In Venezuela, it was students who led the rioting against Richard Nixon in 1958. Students from the upper classes led the gangsters who terrorized the 1964 election. Caracas University is still the center of terrorist activities in that country. But students also are leading social action projects in the barrios of Caracas. In Peru and Chile some students are engaged in popular action programs similar to our own Peace Corps and VISTA work. Building schools and building roads and clinics. The first generation of Latin American students to soil their hands and to bend their backs. The overwhelming majority of students, however, are not active. They are revolutionaries of the coffee table; yet they are not, as we will see, very different from their more active brothers. What is behind such radicalism among the sons of the class which has been privileged for the last 300 years? Partly, I think it is simply nationalism. The nationalism that the Governor spoke of.

For most of their history the upper classes of Latin America have neglected their own nation preferring to share the benefits of a cosmopolitan European culture. But the post War II period has seen a resurgence of national feeling all over the globe and the birth of dozens of new nations from the former colonies of the great powers. It is not so easy now to be without a nation in which to take pride. The Latin American countries are weak and poor and not modern. No man is insensitive and young men are particularly sensitive-to justice, to the demands of the landless, the demands of the sick, and to the untaught. More than anything else, I think they act out of a desire not only to equal, or to resemble, but to excel—the desire which, John Adams said, next to self-preservation, will forever be the great spring of human action. They want to excel. They want to be, not just equal to their neighbors, they want to be better than their neighbors, and they want to be better than the United States. The students I saw seemed to have sensed that in their society as presently constituted they have not enough room for achievement. That there is no way to pursue the idea and ideal of happiness as defined by the Greeks for all men.

For the students of Latin America, the privileged one percent, the cream of the elite, are no less than their unfortunate countrymen prisoners of circumstances. We regard them, for example, as being poorly educated. Their professors teach only part-time and must moonlight to earn a living wage. The university facilities are in many cases dismal. In Buenos Aires is the best medical school in South America—one microscope, one cadaver must be shared by 40 students. The universities are frequently governed by the students themselves with very little, if any, discipline. The result is often an emotional approach to the world—an approach often disdainful of lodging and ignorant of facts. Students in Chile were convinced almost to a man that it was the United States which incited the Argentinian border guard to shoot a Chilean policeman in the remote Andes and that this incident was only the prelude to a United States backed conquest of Chile by Argentina. For often they had little knowledge of their own economies. None, for example, knew the actual dollar percentage amount of United States investment in their country though all were sure that it was overwhelming. In fact, only in Venezuela does United States capital play a determining role. And few could do more than repeat rumors about conditions in other Latin American countries—even their neighbors. This ignorance of fact has a serious effect on their political attitude. Knowing virtually nothing about the United States politics or United States economies, most are deeply suspicious of "Capitalism" which they identify only with their colonial economy in their history. They identify themselves more than anything else as Socialists. Though their Socialism is in fact usually less daring than the platform of the Democratic Party, and I might say even far less daring than the platform of the Reform Movement of Bill Ryan here in the United States. So the fact of what the United States does or is is unknown. A self-description of Capitalism means to them something like Fascist might mean to us. Our standing among these leaders of these countries is determined by their response merely to this meaningless slogan.

Further standing here in New York, it is almost impossible to appreciate how large the United States looms in Latin America. But from there we seem a colossus which blocks out the light, a colossus which determines with only the slightest move every event of any significance in Latin America.

Everywhere I went in Latin America and saw students, newsmen and government officials they raised approximately the same questions with me. They were usually asked in the form of declarations. The United States intervened in the Dominican Republic, they said, to deliberately crush a popular democracy. The foreign policy of the United States is determined by Wall Street. The United States companies bleed the economies of sorely needed capital. The internal economic policies of Latin American countries are determined by Wall Street. The Pentagon controls all of the Latin American military and overthrows governments which disobey Washington. Interestingly enough, these questions were, except for the Dominican Republic, exactly the same questions that I was repeatedly asked by students in Indonesia, in Japan, and all through Asia two years before—though students in Indonesia laid a greater emphasis on the activities of the CIA than they did on the Pentagon. I don't know why. But the fact is that these were deeply held beliefs by all of the students, all of the future leaders of Latin America and, as I say, by students really across this globe. They thus frequently see politics, our politics, and the politics to some extent in their own countries, as a meaningless array. So their tendency is rather to ignore politics entirely. Many of them see moderate change as completely impossible. And only sweeping change, they think, can affect such a system.

Now what does this all mean as far as the United States is concerned? For one thing it clearly indicates that we are going to be held responsible for the failures and the difficulties of Latin America. In many cases this will be justified. We are further advanced; we are more fortunate; and we do have a responsibility. But we are also going to be held accountable for far more than can fairly be laid at our door, and we must face that fact and accept it. This is a fact of life. It is important to understand that, given the problems of Latin America's educated class, there can at the present time be no other way. So one consequence is that, if we are to judge our own actions fairly, Latin American criticisms of the United States should be placed in a public perspective. Another consequence is that we cannot judge the effect of our words or actions just by how they seem to us. We must be conscious always of the prism through which we are viewed. If we would appear as we truly are, we must look at the sound of our words and actions on their ears, not just on ours. This is not to say that we should ignore the criticism of Latin America, or that by the use of proper words we can solve our problems or theirs. We should indeed pay far greater attention to their criticisms than we do now, but in my judgment in a different way. The important thing is for us to realize the frustrations and the ignorance and the difficulties out of which their criticisms arise. And to help Latin America attack the real problems which underly what must seem to us to be irrelevant criticism. Take just one example. Latins blame the Pentagon for every act of their own military establishment. Now the Pentagon is not responsible for all of the military takeovers in Latin America. I am delighted to have the opportunity to have made that statement. It was cleared at the State Department, though.

But the Latin American military itself is a serious problem and one which our actions here in the United States can affect. We can exert our influence against unnecessary military spending in Latin America. We can help to strengthen the forces of democratic and legitimate government within the hemisphere. In summary, we can begin to take the advice of the former Governor of Puerto Rico. We can do these things, and we should do them. Another consequence of the situation that I have described is that our assistance policy should attempt as much as possible to deal directly with the invisible Latin America that we seek to aid. As to the students themselves, I believe that our aid should emphasize to a far greater degree than it does now programs both to bring Latin American students here and to help build up Latin American universities and the educational system generally. Let me emphasize that this is not just a question of training manpower for development. Rather it is also a question of directly affecting the most important body of opinion in these nations in the coming years. At the college level this means a major expansion of exchange programs which emphasize direct contact between Latin American students and Americans of all kinds—students, teachers, government officials, and ordinary citizens. And it also means partnership between universities here and universities in Latin America which would make scholarships and administrative knowledge available to them.

Let me say that education is not only important to understanding the world and each other. It is the key to the future. It's the foundation of economic progress in the modern world. No nation, not one, has entered the ranks of modern economic society without training and educated people to run the factories, manage institutions, guide governments, draw plans, etc. Without it all, the money, the loans, the plans that we made are completely worthless. That is why we welcome the increased emphasis on our aid program on education this year. In my judgment it is not simply important. It is the only key that fits the lock of the key to progress. As Thomas Jefferson once said, a nation which expects to be ignorant and free expects what never was and never will be, and I think that is true for the United States, and I think it's also true for the countries of Latin America.

And in all of this, I would add only one word of caution—all the misunderstandings do not flow in one direction. We know less than the Latin Americans, and we must learn to look at facts and not just at words. We must study and make an effort to understand them. Understand what they're trying to do. Understand that the slogan of "Anti-Communism" is not going to feed the children.

You can see half your children dying before the age of one, and you can see the fact that there is no education for your children and there is no possibility of education in the future. You can see that you don't have adequate housing to house your family. But you're anti-communist and that's what's important. That's not going to be sufficient in the future because just as you wouldn't accept it, and I wouldn't accept it, the people of Latin America and the people around the world are not going to accept the fact that they cannot have a better life. They are going to attain a better life through free institutions. But if through free institutions they cannot attain that life, they're going to attain it in some other way, and we have to recognize that here.

In conclusion, I would like to pause for a moment for a question which has troubled us for many years. Ever since the onset of the cold war we have been asked to develop a concise and exciting American manifesto—a platform which would compete with the simple and the rousing calls of the communists. Such an effort, I think, is pointless. For what matters about this country cannot be put in simple slogans. It is a process, a way of doing things, and dealing with people. It is, in fact, a way of life. There are two major ways to communicate with the people of other countries. To bring people here, and then to bring Americans to those countries. That is why, in my judgment, the Peace Corps has been so important. For it sends abroad our very best, the essence of what this country should all be about. Beyond our future action toward Latin America there are lessons here for ourselves. For there is no fault or feeling to be seen in men which all of us do not possess, in heart. Criticism without factual information can be temptation for all. It is often easier in the United States or in the State of New York to call for sweeping change which is practically unobtainable than to work for the practical changes within our means. It is often easier to issue ringing manifestos than to actually go into the schools and the houses of the poor and to help the depressed, actually to work and change the lives of individual human beings as that counts here in the State of New York, as it counts in the City of New York. It also counts in Latin America.

There is a universal community which is represented by students and their universities which must have our support in their search for truth. In our generation the universal community is combined with needed action, with a quest for knowledge. In our country, it is no longer enough to count the poor and sympathize with the Negroes' struggle for equality, to watch with sadness the decay of our urban life. We must seek knowledge—do something to change the facts of the present. But this is what the young men and young women of Latin

America also want to accomplish. In every nation in this hemisphere, certainly in the five that I visited in November, we will find strong allies in our battles for social justice. We will find young men and women proud of their country but also aware that a century of progress must now come in a decade. They will watch carefully what we do to make our own democracy work, to make it a reality. They will welcome, as we must welcome, the revolution of our time—the revolution of rising expectations—of human rights—of social equality—and they will seek as individuals what we here also seek. To be relevant; to be active; and to be effective. Through the Peace Corps, through that organization, and through the Civil Rights movement, through your example, through your efforts, they will find support and encouragement.

Thank you.

THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT CORPS

(Remarks of Congressman WILLIAM F. RYAN, at the Sixth Annual West Side Community Conference on "the Challenge of the Developing Nations," held at Columbia University, New York City, March 12)

We are gathered here today—in the panels and at this plenary session—to talk about various aspects of the challenge facing all of us in the developing nations.

It is a tremendous challenge.

The people who live in the developed countries—one out of every five human beings—own more than 90 per cent of the world's automobiles, more than 70 per cent of its trucks and more than 85 per cent of its telephones and television sets.

What about the rest of the world?

Today, citizens of many developing nations walk in the shadow of starvation and misery.

Half the adults have never been to school. Half the people are hungry or malnourished. Food production per person is falling.

And this situation is going to get worse.

I am a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics. In January we sponsored a two-day discussion in Washington on Government, Science and Public Policy.

The experts emphasized their concern about the growing spread in riches and poverty between the developed and the developing nations.

As Lord C. P. Snow put it, "The rich counries will get richer."

"I wish," he added, "I could believe that the poor countries would not get relatively poorer."

At the present rate of growth the population of the developing nations will double by the year 2,000.

Considering population and economic factors, every indication today is that living levels in most of the developing nations are going to continue much as they are now for many, many years.

In some developing areas, even present minimal standards of living may deteriorate.

The rich are going to get richer. The poorer are going to get relatively poorer.

As President Johnson has said, "These are the dominant facts of our age. They challenge our own security. They threaten the future of the world."

Only when we have a world which is economically stable, will we have a world which is politically stable. And only international political stability will avert international disaster.

No nation has attempted to meet the challenge of the developing nations with more determination than the United States, particularly under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

It was inspiring to be in Congress when President Kennedy called on the nation to look afresh on our global responsibilities and opportunities with such programs as the Alliance for Progress.

President Johnson has continued to emphasize the need for aid to developing nations and to put forth new ideas and new programs.

In his foreign aid message, he said our mission is to "help give the people of the less developed world the food, the health, the skills and education, and the strength to lead their nations to self-sufficient lives of plenty and freedom."

But for all foreign aid economic assistance, the President has proposed a total of $2.5 billion dollars in fiscal 1967.

We must spend more.

The United States endorsed a United Nations Resolution in 1960 that each industrialized country spend the equivalent of one per cent of its gross national product on development assistance. By that standard we should now be spending at least $7 billion on economic assistance—about three times the present amount.

But money is only part of the need.

Fundamentally, it is skills put to use by people which enable an economy to produce wealth.

Technology is the most difficult and expensive of skills to develop. But it is one of the easiest and most productive skills which can be translated from one economy to another.

And technology and science are the very fundamentals of every hope for better standards of living.

They provide the means for more productive agriculture. They provide the means for developing industry, for transportation, for housing, for construction and the formation of capital.

In the United States and other industrial nations, we have developed stores of scientific knowledge.

We also have the abilities and the resources to carry out all kinds of difficult research projects.

These skills and research can help meet the problems and needs of developing nations.

With perhaps the least possible expenditure of funds, they can provide the greatest possible benefits.

But in order to put our technological and scientific skills, and our research, to work, we must:

First—survey and understand the technical needs and opportunities in various areas.

Second—spend adequately for research programs.

Third—put technology and new research to work effectively and efficiently in the developing nations.

The Agency for International Development now does not have enough professionals on the staff to locate the areas in which research is needed. It employs fewer than twenty-five trained scientists to work on research.

Yet the United States now gives economic assistance to some 70 nations—all of which confront myriad scientific and technological problems.

In 1961, when President Ayub Khan of Pakistan visited the United States, he told President Kennedy that increasing salinity, or salt content, was destroying about one per cent of Pakistan's farm land every year.

At the same time, the population was growing three per cent a year. Pakistan faced a billion dollar reclamation program to save its land and its people from starvation.

President Kennedy's scientific advisor, Dr. Jerome Weisner, assembled a panel to study the problem. The panel concluded that the problem was broader than increasing salinity—and the solution was the application of a broad range of technologies new to Pakistan.

Pakistan's agricultural production per acre was remaining static while its population grew. For every person deprived of food by increasing salinity, Pakistan had ten new people to feed because of increasing population.

The panel suggested not only methods to desalinize the land but a full scale program to develop a million acres a year with new techniques, crops, fertilizers, pest controls and land management—all new to Pakistan.

With help from the Agency for International Development Pakistan is now increasing agricultural production four per cent a year. The increase is expected to reach seven per cent per year by 1961. Thus Pakistan has begun to catch up on her food deficiency. It should be agriculturally self-sufficient by 1972.

The Pakistan story points up one of the great needs in our foreign aid program. We have the technologies and the research skills—but we don't always know where or how they can best be used.

The Agency for International Development should have a world-wide network of technically trained men and women living and working in developing nations, analyzing, exploring and seeking out problems and opportunities which scientific skills might meet.

But even when we do know a problem in developing areas, we don't have the research funds to find the answers. AID's research funds are severely limited, and only a few serious, long-term projects can be carried out.

Yet research can find dramatic answers.

Recently, for instance, AID contracted out a project to develop a system of teaching new mathematics to students in English-speaking African nations. It also contracted out a project to eliminate the tse-tse fly from Southeast Africa.

The new mathematics program may revolutionize the educational system of several African nations. It can launch the training of a whole generation of scientists.

The tse-tse fly program may, for the first time, make it possible to breed and raise cattle in vast areas of Africa.

For this kind of project, with this kind of result and impact, an annual expenditure of $10 million is hardly enough.

But there is a third essential need in our program to help the developing nations—and that is a programmed method to put present technologies and the results of research to efficient use.

Although the new math and the tse-tse fly program are nearing completion, no one is sure just who will undertake the task of putting them into effect in Africa.

At the present our economic aid program is ill equipped to handle a full-scale program of disseminating technologies and research findings.

Yet disseminating new knowledge is often more difficult than developing the information itself, both in developed as well as developing nations. It took almost a decade, for instance, to persuade American farmers to use hybrid corn.

For an efficient aid program, we must have technically trained career men and women who know the culture, the society, the language and the people—the individuals and the groups—of the developing nation in which they work.

These career men and women can see and understand technical problems like those of Pakistan. They can make use of present knowledge and technology. They can propose and help guide research programs to find new answers.

Most important, these same career men and women can put technologies to use. They can take the new math to Africans they know and work among. They can organize the actual program to wipe out tse-tse flies.

Thus I am proposing that the United States set up an international career service of technically trained men and women.

It would be called the International Development Corps.

The Corps would seek out problems and opportunities which technology could help solve. It would be dedicated to spreading useable and essential skills throughout the under-developed world.

The Corpsmen should be technically trained because such people can best understand and survey problems, and can best put technological skills to work.

They should be career men and women because it will take years to live, to learn and to build the kind of relationships and knowledge necessary to get new technologies adopted in a society.

It should be possible to recruit idealistic men and women bent on international careers. Many returning members of the Peace Corps have been seeking careers in international development. With technical and scientific training, many would make outstanding career members of the International Development Corps.

Under an organized and aggressive program, the Corps would train and send career members into developing areas to seek out problems and opportunities.

They would be trained to draw on present scientific information. If present technologies could not meet the problems, they would propose research projects.

We would continue to contract out research problems. But in those projects, scientists would be able to call on expert guidance of career international officials with technical training.

Most important, in every instance we could be confident that the new research or technologies would be implemented as efficiently as possible in the developing nations.

We face a tremendous challenge in the challenge of the developing nations.

It is a challenge that we must meet in our time—or we may never have the opportunity to meet it.

If we are to end the widening gap between the rich and the poor, we must help developing nations from our storehouse of science and technology. We must help other people adapt the best of our science and technology to their cultures, their soils, their climates, their societies, their nations, and their hopes for agricultural and industrial development.

To do it we must be bold. We must cease to think of foreign aid as a group of temporary and unpleasant stopgap measures. Rather, we must think of it as a long-range challenge to give the developing nations the means to begin to lift themselves out of poverty and into increasing standards of living and opportunity.

Nothing would be able to give so much to developing nations for such relatively little expenditures as a career service dedicated to providing new skills, technology and science—an International Development Corps.

Mr. Speaker, students at the Columbia School of Journalism very generously devoted their talent to reporting the proceedings. I am grateful to David A. Andelman, James H. Beaumont, Stephen Clapp, John English, and Edward W. Knappman for their able coverage of the panel sessions. Betty Jo Bailey also reported on one of the panels. I wish to express our appreciation for the high caliber of their efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the Record the report on the morning panel on "Internal Politics" which was prepared by James H. Beaumont:

The panel was moderated by Emil Starr, of the Foreign Policy Association. Panel members included Gabriel D'Arboussier, Under Secretary of the United Nations; H. Field Haviland, Jr., director of political studies at the Brookings Institution; Felipe Pazos of the Organization of American States; and Howard Wriggins, member of the Policy Planning Council of the U.S. Department of State:

Report on "Internal Politics"

(By James H. Beaumont)

The panelists agreed that political aspects of the developing nations have been grossly underplayed, while too much attention has been paid to economic and military matters. They also cited a need for much greater emphasis on political education for civilian and military leaders as well as for the people of the developing lands.

In the course of the panel presentations, Gabriel D'Arboussier directed his remarks to the complicated problem of military takeovers in many African countries.

"We should not be discouraged by what is happening in Africa today," Mr. D'Arboussier said. "Military leaders have historically had great roles to play in national politics." In view of the power of the military and the fact that the army may be a political force, "the officers must be trained politically." Mr. D'Arboussier also said that he believes the military leaders of Africa are dedicated to eventual civilian rule.

Howard Wriggins noted some of the complicating factors of social and political development. First, it is easily seen that a developing nation has a "mosaic society"—that is, made up of little bits and pieces. For instance, there may be many languages and many tribes in a single country. There exists, also, a tremendous gap between the leaders and the mass of people.

Moreover, the quality of human relationship in the developing nations is marked by a high degree of suspicion in contrast to the highly developed countries where the quality of life includes a great degree of mutual trust.

Regarding politics in the developing nations, Mr. Wriggins noted that the sovereign character of the leaders is often in doubt and the channels for exerting political will are not clear. The emerging game of politics is extremely passionate, and the stakes of political races are higher than in the United States.

Felipe Pazos noted that in Latin America, unlike Africa, the military has sided with the right wing. In opposition to the rightist armed forces, he said, we have a wide spectrum of people on the left. As soon as the democratic left gains power, it faces the difficult problem of formulating an economic program that encourages rapid change and reform and, at the same time, savings and investment.

So long as the democratic left is able to insure higher productivity and there is a working economic and political system, he said, the people will support it. However, Mr. Pazos continued, when there is no success, the army of a dictator takes over. "The onus of the responsibility is on the economist to supply the politician with an economic program," he said.

H. Field Haviland, Jr., suggested a five-point practical action program in order to work more directly on political development in the emerging nations. He said the initiative for the program must come from the developing nations themselves.

The elements of the political development program which Mr. Haviland suggested, are: (1) civic education; (2) development of the role of mass media; (3) development of major interest groups; (4) development of political parties; and (5) increasing the role of governmental career personnel in politics.

In reply to a question concerning the extent to which the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency has had a part in some of the recent coups d'etat, Mr. D'Arboussier said, "I know secret services exist, but I have been in politics so long that I know two or three men could not overthrow a government by subversion. There are more basic reasons for revolutions. Even though the United States is a big and powerful country, it cannot rule the world."

Mr. Wriggins added that it is "naive to think the C.I.A. could do all the things attributed to it. I find very little sympathy with this view."

In relation to Latin America, the question was raised as to what right the peoples of the developing nations have to determine their own governments as against outside intervention. Mr. Pazos answered by saying, "The principle of self-determination is recognized, but the extent to which the U.N. or O.A.S. can intervene is a delicate problem which should be determined in the individual cases."

Replying to the same question, Mr. Wriggins said that many of the developing nations have huge economic needs, which are presently supplied largely by outsiders. These outsiders, he noted, now argue that the range of their influence should be slight with regard to internal politics. However, he said, "there is a growing agreement that more influence is needed by outsiders."

It is on the request of the governments of the developing nations that assistance is granted, he pointed out. The assistance will probably help those governments stay in power, so some influence is exerted. One problem, he noted, is that "economic assistance is more or less legitimized but political assistance is not."

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the Record the report on the morning panel on "Population" which was prepared by John English.

The panel was moderated by Richard N. Gardner, former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, and currently a professor of law at Columbia University. Panel members were: Mohammed El-Badry, of the Population Branch, Department of Economic and Social Affairs at the United Nations; Julia J. Henderson, Director of the Bureau of Social Affairs, United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs; Richard W. Reuter, Director of the U.S. food-for-peace program; and Irene B. Taeuber, senior research demographer, Office of Population Research, Princeton University:

Report on "Population"

(By John English)

All five population authorities stated that their presence in a public forum on "The Challenge of the Developing Nations" marked a significant change in attitude toward a serious development problem.

Panel moderator Gardner cited a growing awareness of a population problem in five United States policy statements by President Johnson. He listed the State of the Union address, Foreign Aid message, Food for Peace message and International and Domestic Health and Education statements.

Dr. Taeuber praised the developing nations for recognizing their own population problems, establishing policies and initiating plans of action. She warned that there was no quick solution to the world population boom which may bring a rise from the current three billion population to more than 8 billion if the trends continue.

Dr. Taeuber stressed the magnitude of the population increase by discussing the situation in India. She said that, if the death rate remains the same and the birth rate continues to be curbed, the population of that Asian nation will still more than double within 35 years. She stressed that "economic development will have to be rapidly expanded to keep up with a population that expects to reach 900 million by the turn of the century. Thus a dilemma."

In a brief summary, Dr. Taeuber stated that:

There is no immediate demographic solution to hunger and malnutrition.

Starvation is not a solution. A long-range solution would be a substantial decline in the birth rate.

Efforts to secure health and long life must continue. Medical care must be improved and expanded.

The forces of modernization, urbanization, and so forth, have aided government to work toward raising the average marriage age.

Population growth as now occurring cannot continue without serious consequences, which will have to be dealt with in the near future.

Family planning in the developing nations is now becoming available to the masses.

The possibilities toward solving the social and economic problems of developing areas are linked to population control.

Dr. Mohammed El-Badry outlined the history of concern about population control. He said the problem exists because the mortality rate has decreased, while the fertility rate has remained the same.

Dr. El-Badry said the real challenge of expanding existing programs is in communicating policies and plans to those who are poor, unhealthy and uneducated. He cited programs in Taiwan and Korea as remarkable achievements. He said the work in India and Pakistan is being revitalized. He also commented on family planning programs in the Philippines, Malaysia, Turkey, Tunisia, the United Arab Republic, Venezuela and Peru.

The United Nations official briefly told what he thought should be done to improve work done in this area:

Improve medical care of infants so infant mortality will drop and a decrease in fertility will follow.

Raise the status of women in many of the developing nations.

Set up well-organized family planning agencies.

Utilize the mass media of the developing nations to help spread information.

Continue research.

Dr. Julia Henderson said that last year was "Population Year in the U.N." She traced the U.N.'s interest in population control to 1946 when the Population Commission of the Economic and Social Council was established. During the next seven years, she said, the U.N. worked in the area of scientific research and demography. In 1955, it began training new demographers at centers in Chile, India and Egypt.

The real breakthrough, according to Dr. Henderson, came when the 1962 General Assembly expanded the role of the U.N. in population control policy. An inquiry among the developing nations laid the base for future action.

Last March, an advisory team set up a five year program, which is currently in effect. Dr. Henderson also gave a report of the work of the other international organizations in the field: World Health Organization, UNICEF, UNESCO, FAO, and the World Bank.

Richard W. Reuter, cited revolutionary developments in the U.S. attitude toward food and population. "Previously we have been concerned with a food surplus and forgotten that the world has a food problem," he said.

"Before the war, the underdeveloped countries were the graineries of the world and they exported grains to the developed nations. Now that situation is reversed and the Western countries are the exporters," Mr. Reuter said. "This trend will continue because the population rate continues to go up in these areas faster than the food production."

"The United States could grow enough food to fill the gap," Mr. Reuter continued, "but this wouldn't solve the problem. In 20 years, we wouldn't be able to keep the pace and it would then be too late to develop a plan."

Mr. Reuter said the U.S. has taken a 180 degree turn in attitude—Congress now insists that developing nations find solutions for agricultural production before U.S. surpluses will be sent to support that program. Mr. Reuter also urged that the American know-how and experience be translated into practical application for the developing countries. He praised the increased productivity of American farmers over the last 25 years. He pondered the moral dilemma of the U.S. ability to eliminate starvation and the fact that without U.S. aid more people will die of hunger this year than ever before.

The final speaker, Mr. Gardner, spoke of his role in formulating the current U.S. policy on population control.

Mr. Gardner said the U.S. position had been "hands off" before the Kennedy Administration took office, but that in 1961 an active program of aid to developing nations was begun. The Agency for International Development now earmarks some $10 million a year for population control and supports programs in South Korea, Taiwan, Turkey, Honduras, Pakistan, Tunisia, and India.

"The U.S. is not in the business of producing contraceptives," Mr. Gardner emphasized. "A developing nation must have a program in operation before A.I.D. will lend support." He stirred a mild controversy by stating that "population control will probably be based on ideological, national and racial lines, not religious ones."

Mr. Gardner warned citizens not to be confused or deluded by "Neo-Malthusian doctrines." He also said the U.S. should not require countries to limit their size as a condition of foreign aid, that the U.S. should extend health and birth control information only on request and should work only through existing local agencies.

In a lively question and answer period, the panel offered the following statements:

In the developing nations, there must be alternatives to child-bearing such as education, participation in public life, extension of the role outside the family in such activities as community centers and politics.

The United States offered to donate food to Communist China in 1962 when that country was faced with a famine, but the offer wasn't accepted.

If voluntary family planning fails, political leaders will be faced with the decision about coercing people to limit their families or face extinction.

Since 1957 the American birth rate of both Negroes and whites has been going down.

Population control is an important factor in the quality of life of the world's citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the Record the report of the morning panel on "Economic Development" which was prepared by Stephen Clapp.

The panel was moderated by Robert B. Goldmann, economics editor of Vision magazine. Panel members included: David E. Lilienthal, chairman of the Development & Resources Corp. and former chairman of TVA and the AEC; Robert Nathan, economist; Ruben Sternfeld, Alliance for Progress; and Gideon Strauss, senior officer of the Bank Leumi Le-Israel:

REPORT ON "ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT"

(By Stephen Clapp)

The economists agreed that recent cutbacks in American foreign aid are widening the gap between "have" and "have not" nations.

"Unless we stir ourselves, you and I may see the death by starvation of tens of millions of people," said David E. Lilienthal.

He feels that increased food production should receive the highest priority among economic goals in the developing countries. Plans for other forms of development would make little difference if agricultural yield per acre were not increased. "Two thirds of the people in these countries live as farmers," he noted.

Robert B. Goldmann told the panel that Americans cannot decide whether foreign aid is a moral duty, an agent of foreign policy, or a means of creating a secure world climate. "We've usually shifted from one purpose to another, confusing everyone," he said.

Mr. Goldmann said further that foreign aid cutbacks had resulted from a combination of frustration and Cold War relaxation. Since we no longer need to compete with the Russians for the favor of the Third World, he said, economic aid has become "a casualty of the thaw."

Robert R. Nathan said that current economic aid programs have failed largely because so few resources have been committed. He compared the present foreign aid effort to anti-Depression programs of the 1930s and recalled that "it took the massive spending of World War II to bring us out of the Depression." "Right now in foreign aid we are trying to plug a big hole with a little finger. The size of our aid is so small we should be ashamed of ourselves."

Mr. Nathan told the panel that narrow national boundaries should be transcended in order to deal with economic problems on a wide basis. "What is it that sets a boundary that allows people in our country to be helped while those next door are starving?" he asked.

Gideon Strauss, offered Israel's experience as a model of the rewards and pains of economic development. He said that the price of development includes the using up of resources through inflation and devaluation, and that a country must also be prepared to lay down a disciplined tax burden and give priority to development projects over consumption demands. "Honesty and a willingness to inflict self-discipline" are essential preconditions for growth, he said.

Mr. Strauss said that government initiative often must substitute for private capital in the developing countries, and that nationalization of industry is sometimes unavoidable.

Like Mr. Strauss, Ruben Sternfeld stressed internal conditions as a vital factor in economic development. He stated that "there must be a commitment by a society to reform and development. Otherwise, it will not matter what comes in from outside, either in technical assistance or financial capital."

Mr. Sternfeld said that the State Department's recent emphasis on health and welfare is not a mere "fad" in foreign aid thinking, "but a finding that human capital is basic to development."

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the Record the report on the afternoon panel on "External Politics" which was prepared by David A. Andelman.

The panel was moderated by Pauline Frederick, United Nations correspondent for NBC News. Panel members were

Chief S. O. Adebo, Ambassador to the United Nations from Nigeria; Roger Hilsman, professor of government at Columbia University, and former Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs; and Salvador P. Lopez, Ambassador to the United Nations from the Philippines; Eduardo Schijman, Press Attaché of the Chilean Mission to the United States:

REPORT ON "EXTERNAL POLITICS"

(By David A. Andelman)

Roger Hilsman said that the United States and China are presently on a collision course, and the outcome of that course is war.

"The Red Chinese regime is there to stay," Professor Hilsman continued. "The fundamental question is, are we going to reach an accommodation with Communist China or are we not?"

Professor Hilsman also discussed the Johnson administration's policies in Vietnam.

"We should not withdraw precipitously from Vietnam," Hilsman told the conference. "Disaster is doing anything precipitously there."

Later, during a question-and-answer session, Professor Hilsman said that "under certain conditions China would enter the war. If we begin to threaten the existence of North Vietnam as a Communist regime, Red China will enter the war. We are not now that much of a threat."

Asked if he would favor the admission of Communist China to the United Nations, he replied that under the right conditions, he would support the admission of Communist China.

But he scolded the audience for their vigorous applause of his statement, saying "we must view this issue without emotion." He said that it was this type of emotional response which made the issue so difficult.

"It is a long hard path we must follow. It is not a simple matter of deciding to admit Red China or not—rather, it is a matter for long and difficult negotiations not complicated by emotionalism."

The other three participants on the panel generally concurred with Professor Hilsman's belief that the United States must adopt a rational attitude toward Communist China. Ambassador Lopez noted that he is opposed to admitting China to the United Nations, but added that it is a "mistake for the United States on the other hand to take a patronizing attitude toward China. We must recognize China as a great power with central importance in Asia and the rest of the world."

Ambassador Lopez said, "China is a wounded bull. Asia fears being trampled under its feet. China cannot go West—for there lies the Soviet Union. It cannot go East for there lies the China Sea and the U.S. Seventh Fleet. It cannot go Southwest for there lie the impassable Himalayas. There remains, therefore, Southeast Asia."

"The rise of Communist China as a world power," the Ambassador concluded, "is why Asia today has become a seething cauldron of mutual fears, suspicions, and enmities."

Chief S. O. Adebo was the only panelist who strongly favored Red China's admission to the United Nations.

The afternoon panel on External Politics opened with each of the experts giving a brief analysis of interregional relationships in his own particular area of specialization.

Chief Adebo had hopeful words for the future of Africa under the Organization for African Unity—an organization of African states which have banded together, according to Chief Adebo, "to promote greater unity among countries and promote the economic and social uplifting of all Africa."

He noted many hardships faced by the organization and the member states—many a result of their long history. "Our education," he said, "is outdated and not conditioned to the problems of Africa."

Chief Adebo cited the example of his own country where a complete constitutional revision was recently proclaimed. "We have failed," Chief Adebo concluded, "and we are starting aagin. But we are not discouraged."

The Ambassador said that much of his faith about the future of his country and Africa in general springs from the fact that the young people of Africa want the continent and their countries to succeed.

"We shall have more shocks and the future will be difficult," Chief Adebo concluded. "But I think it will survive because the young people want it to."

Mr. Schijman, addressing himself to the problems of Latin America, noted that after a history of 73 years of independence Latin America is "at the present moment starting all over again. The key factor is the ability to start over again."

Mr. Schijman urged the complete reorganization of the Organization of American States (OAS), saying that it is "weak and inefficient." He particularly disliked the organization's tendency to settle down comfortably in Washington. "It is growing too fat for its own good," he said. "We need an organization capable of functioning in Chile, La Paz (Bolivia), or anywhere else."

Mr. Schijman concluded by examining current United States attitudes toward Latin America. "The question is the posture the United States should have toward these problems. It is often difficult for Latin Americans to swallow being looked at by the United States and saying, 'copy me.' "

Ambassdor Lopez cited the chief aspiration of his country, the Philippines, as "trying to find its way back to Asia and achieve standing among Asians."

Then moving to the general Asian scene, he noted three "facts of life in Asia today:"

1. "In Asia over half the human race lives; a vast conglomeration of races, religions, languages.

2. "In Asia, the revolution of rising expectations shows its most acute manifestations.

3. "There has existed there since the end of World War II a great power vacuum. There is tension there due to the fact that the centers of power in Europe, Asia and America are contesting the right to fill the power vacuum."

Ambasador Lopez urged the development in Asia of a regional organization, comparable to the OAU in Africa and the OAS in the Americas.

Professor Hilsman also spoke on the problems of Asia and like Ambassador Lopez cited the "long and ominous shadow of Communist China" as the chief problem of the region. "It is a very grave matter," Professor Hilsman said. "It is not just a question of time and it goes much deeper than Communism alone."

The former assistant secretary of state also cited three other keys to the understanding of the area:

1. Ancient interrelationships and rivalries between the different countries growing out of a common and distant past.

2. Former colonial relationships which now often determine cultural and political ties.

3. A search for identity: "an inchoate groping for nationhood."

"They can reach this identity over our dead bodies," Professor Hilsman concluded, "or with our help."

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD the full text of remarks prepared for the Conference by Gabriel d'Arboussier, United Nations Under Secretary:

THE IMPACT OF AFRICAN INTERNAL POLITICS ON THE PROCESS OF DEVELOPMENT

(An introductory statement by Mr. Gabriel d'Arboussier, United Nations Under Secretary and Executive Director of UNITAR, Columbia University, Barnard Hall, March 12, 1966)

Mr. Starr, Mr. Haviland, Mr. Wriggins, Ladies and Gentlemen, I am indeed honoured to be invited by the Sixth Annual West Side Community Committee to take part in the deliberations of this distinguished panel and in its Conference.

In this introductory note, I shall be brief. In discussing the problem of internal politics and its impact on development generally, I shall address my comments specifically to Africa, leaving my broad conclusions to be applicable to the developing nations generally, whether in Africa, Asia or Latin America.

With regard to the problem of internal politics in the broad sense, I shall endeavour to emphasize what I consider the central aspect of it, namely political development. I have been immersed in the internal politics of West Africa over a long period of time, gaining varied lessons out of this lifelong experience. In sharing this experience with you to-day, I might say that I have found it most difficult to reach a precise definition of what is meant by political development. We know that it involves the creation of a constitutional framework based on equal protection by law. We know that it has something to do with economic development and progress towards an economic situation in which African material needs are sufficiently satisfied. Furthermore, we know that the process of political development involves the creation of an efficient and effective administration capable of maintaining law and order. Political development is also immediately related to the evolution of a social system which facilitates popular participation in governmental and political processes and is capable of eliminating the differences in religion, tribe, language and tradition, within the borders of a single State.

The difficulty of defining the concept of political development is represented by the fact that it cannot even be made to convey what is generally meant by democracy. A writer has recently stated that, and I quote: "Neither number of parties nor parliaments are by themselves very good indicators of political development. A one-party system can be more conducive to political development than a multiparty system."

Despite these difficulties of defining political development, as a vital aspect of the whole process of development as affected by internal politics, it should be borne in mind that there is a set of circumstances which affect almost all of Africa at the present time. All countries of the continent have been subjected to foreign rule over a long period of time. Under this rule, traditional differences of ethnic, religious and linguistic nature have persisted. With the sudden departure of the colonizer, the new African nations were confronted with the need to fill the leadership vacuum and to catch up with the nuclear age almost simultaneously.

The political structure on which the new African leaders based their power remained, for the most part, fragile. Its weakness can be directly attributed to the divisive forces of African tribalism. Most governmental systems, although inheriting from the former foreign rule certain democratic attributes, gradually shifted to authoritarian rule. This has largely been considered a way by which the power vacuum could be filled while material progress could be attained in a relatively short period of time. Most of the outside world felt that the emergence of these types of authoritarian rule might represent the best hope for political stability and economic progress.

However, the process of development in Africa, as in other developing continents, is a continuous one. It is a permanent revolution. In several countries of Africa the power structure tended to be fossilized in a few years after it had emerged. It could not evolve with the changing circumstances of this permanent revolution of development. It could not remedy the economic and social dislocations produced by the revolt of rising expectations. While urban workers continued to suffer from underemployment and inflation, the educated élite remained without jobs. There was no foreign rule to heap the blame on. Thus the discontent at the haphazard manner of economic and social development was focused on the men in power. The result is well known. While 1960 was called "Africa Year", 1965–66 has been called "Africa's Year of the Generals". The record actually indicates that since 1960 coups d'état have taken place in the following countries: Algeria, Central African Republic, Dahomey, Ghana, Congo Republic, Nigeria, Republic of the Congo, Togo and Upper Volta. This does not take into account the coups d'état and plots which, since 1960, have been attempted in Burundi, Chad, Ethiopia, Gabon, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Niger, Senegal, Tanzania and Uganda.

Under these conditions, I may say that development in Africa, whether political or nonpolitical, depends to a great extent on attaining progress simultaneously on all fronts. This overall development, which might be termed the process of modernization, should involve enhancing the capability of the various political systems to cope with the burdens placed upon them by rapidly changing economic, social and educational requirements.

Such a process of development might be enhanced through new and bold approaches to the issue of African federation, or confederation. The purpose, as I had indicated in my book "L'Afrique vers l'Unité," should be the creation of viable entities. Such an approach would take cognizance of African tribal realities. It had actually proved its worth when it was attempted along economic lines.

But I may also say that we should not be discouraged by what is happening in Africa today. The revolutionary process in which the entire continent is engaged will last for years; the involvement of the military therein is, for reasons both general and specific, quite normal.

Since Caesar, Cromwell, Bonaparte—not to mention de Gaulle—and, on this continent, Washington, Grant and Eisenhower, Perôn and Jimenez, military officers have had great roles to play in internal politics.

For Africa, I have my own explanation which I shall reserve for our discussion period. Yet we must remember that long before 1965, we have seen in Egypt as well as in Japan and elsewhere that young colonels have played portentous national roles. War, after all, as Clémenceau said, is too important to be entrusted to the military; therefore may not government be too serious a matter to be handled only by civilians?

Before I end this introductory note, I should like to stress that the relationship between internal politics and development in Africa is of paramount importance to the cause of international peace. Almost 23 years ago, the late Cordell Hull, as United States Secretary of State, said in a radio address broadcast on 12 September 1943: "The success of an organized system of international co-operation, with the maintenance of peace as its paramount objective, depends to an important degree upon what happens within as well as among nations" (end of quote). This interdependence of political, economic and social elements of development is best reflected by the emphasis in the majority of United Nations General Assembly resolutions, including those by which the Institute of which I am the Executive Director was created, on the interrelationship between peace and security, on the one hand, and economic and social development, on the other.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the Record the report on the afternoon panel on American Attitudes which was prepared by Betty Jo Bailey.

The panel was moderated by William V. Shannon, of the New York Times editorial board.

Panel members included: Irving Brown, representative to the U.N., International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, and executive-director, American-African Labor Center; Irving Crespi, vice president of the Gallup Organization, Inc.; Dr. Samuel P. Hayes, president of the Foreign Policy Association; and Frank Pace, Jr., president of the International Executive Service Corps, and former Secretary of the Army.

Report on "American Attitudes"

(By Betty Jo Bailey)

Irving Brown discussed the activities of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions in promoting non-Communist trade unionism throughout the world. He emphasized the role of American labor in influencing the trade union movement in Germany after World War II.

He also spoke about his work with trade union movements in African nations. It is Mr. Brown's assessment that these nations are hampered not so much by lack of capital as by lack of indigenous, skilled manpower. He referred both to the lack of managerial expertise, which he felt to be the area of greatest need, as well as to the lack of skilled laborers and technicians. Therefore, emphasis should be put on manpower training, particularly the training of foremen and industrial managers.

According to Irving Crespi, Gallup Polls over the past 8 years have registered consistent over-all majority approval of the principle of the United States Foreign Aid program—by ratios of about five to three.

Only about one person in ten has a reasonably accurate idea of the size of the foreign aid budget which has averaged about $3–4 billion or 5% a year recently. About half thought that foreign aid accounted for ¼ up to as much as ½ of the Federal budget.

In one survey with no information provided, those who felt that foreign aid should be kept at its existing level were outnumbered 2 to 1 by those who favored a decrease. In contrast, when people were first told the dollar amount and proportion of the budget allocated to foreign aid, those in favor of the existing level were outnumbered by only 5 to 4.

Two important factors bearing upon support for foreign aid are (1) a concern that such aid might not really be deserved by recipient nations and (2) the benefits that might accrue to the U.S. as a result of the program.

In a survey just completed, a majority expressed the view that lack of effort on the part of the governments of underdeveloped countries explained, at least in part, their economic condition. However, by a margin of 2 to 1, the opinion is held that the interests of the U.S. have actually been helped by the foreign aid program, and, by a margin of 3 to 1, that communism would have been in a greater position of world power but for our annual expenditure of from 3–4 billion dollars in foreign aid.

Dr. Samuel P. Hayes said that public opinion on issues of foreign policy is frequently expressed in demonstration, legislative hearings, opinion polls, letters to the editor, and in other ways. He asked how much weight government officials should give to such expressions of opinion.

Dr. Hayes pointed out that in considering this question it is pertinent to find out what proportion of the public has reasonably strong opinions on a given issue; and how frequently these opinions are based on substantial knowledge and reasonably thoughtful analysis. He averred that most opinion polls ask questions and report replies in such a way that it appears that as much as 80 to 90 percent of the public have opinions on specific issues of foreign policy. On the other hand, national surveys using interviews that get below superficial responses make it very clear that only a minority of the general public—35% at the most, and frequently less than 20%—have opinions of any strength and stability; and only a much smaller number—perhaps 1 to 5 percent—know enough and have thought enough about particular issues so that one would want to give serious weight to their views.

Dr. Hayes said that the widely published national opinion polls could perform a major service by tabulating the views of those having considerable information about a particular issue separately from those having little or no information about that issue. He indicated that a pilot-test of this differential reporting has been carried on in Minnesota where the views of the two groups were quite different on a number of important issues of foreign policy.

Frank Pace discussed the International Executive Service Corps of which he is the President. This organization grew out of a series of discussions between private individuals and members of government who felt that the talents and energies of retired executives could well be put to use.

The International Executive Service Corps program recruits not only retired American businessmen, but also others who are interested to take leaves of absence in order to assist business firms in other nations. The volunteers work directly with an individual corporation but only in response to a specific request by the company involved.

The foreign company may request any type of technical or planning assistance. The Corps does make a charge for the services of its members, but these are generally at the local rate and not comparable to American levels. They certainly are not sufficient to finance the operations of the organization. The federal government, through A.I.D., is financing about ¾ of the program. However, the plan and expectation of all concerned is that private industry's percentage of support will steadily increase while the government's proportion of the funds will correspondingly lower.

Mr. Pace pointed out that one of the Corpsmen's greatest problems is to translate American experience into methods and proposals relevant to a foreign country.

Mr. Pace said he is enthusiastic about the growing number of volunteers from the American business community. It was suggested that there might be areas for cooperation with ICFTU on African manpower training programs that should be explored.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the Record the report of the afternoon panel on the Human Problems of Change which was prepared by Edward W. Knappman.

The panel was moderated by Darius Jhabvala, United Nations correspondent for the New York Herald Tribune. Panel members were: Dr. Candido Mendes De Almeida, director of the faculty of political and economic sciences of Rio de Janeiro, and visiting professor, Latin American Institute, Columbia University; Ernest Howell of the Asia Foundation; Immanuel M. Wallerstein, professor of sociology at Columbia's Institute of African Studies; and Harris L. Wofford, associate director of the Peace Corps for Planning, Evaluation, and Research.

Report on "Human Problems of Change"

(By Edward W. Knappman)

Dr. De Almeida began by saying that, if American aid to developing nations is to have any salutary effect, it will have to be channeled through and to the people rather than through elite-controlled governments.

A former Chief of Technical Staff of the Brazilian government, Dr. De Almeida warned that Western aid programs confuse development with Anglo-Saxon notions of progress.

"What we want," he said, "is development. We don't want progress—a concept from 19th century liberal philosophy which has led to cultural alienation."

"African countries achieved independence because the United States and the Soviet Union were forced to actively compete for the favor of the people they expected to come into power," he continued.

"These international levers no longer exist. The competition has ceased since the Soviets have been integrated into the industrialized world. They have ceased to put the favor of these new nations ahead of their own relations with the West."

Dr. Wallerstein compared the present positions of the developed and underdeveloped countries to the positions of employers and workers before the days of the trade unions.

"Today, we are the mill owners and they are the individual workers and there's not going to be a shift in the division of world income until they follow the example of the trade unions by organizing and demanding it." . .

Dr. Wallerstein contended that prior to the army coup which brought the government of Castillo Branco to power in Brazil, that country had been the nucleus of an incipient alliance of underdeveloped countries to demand a better deal in world trade arrangements. Since the coup, which President Johnson characterized as a return to democracy, Brazil has reversed her positilon on trade policies.

The African affairs expert warned that dramatic changes in the social structure or economic position of these countries cannot be expected in the near future.

"Those people in whose interest it is to change the system are weak," he declared. "Those in whose interest it is to maintain it are strong."

Dr. Wallerstein predicted that African countries will be shaken by more coups similar to those which overthrew the governments of Ghana and Nigeria in recent weeks.

Instability, he said, is unavoidable in countries with new and fragile political structures, low levels of economic development and educated but unemployable middle classes.

Dr. Wallerstein cautioned against the assumption that development is the natural state of affairs.

"In the history of the world," he said, "development is not the normal circumstance."

"It is false," he added, "to have a systematic optimism which says that every day in every way things are getting better and better.

Dr. De Almeida said that the rich nations do not want to acknowledge the steady deterioration in the terms of trade between the exporters of raw materials and the exporters of industrial goods.

He predicted that meaningful development programs will not be implemented until the West shakes off the stereotypes and cliches of foreign aid.

The necessity of free enterprise and the supposed inefficiency of state control, he said, are among the most damaging stereotypes.

Although acknowledging that the Peace Corps has done considerable good, Dr. De Almeida said that it is oriented too much toward the "boy scout approach."

Referring to a remark made earlier in the day by Senator Robert Kennedy that Latin American students spends too much effort in polemics and not enough in dirtying their hands in development work, Dr. De Almeida said, "It is extremely important that the students have the freedom to denounce the vested interest."

"It's important to be polemic" he said, "sometimes more important than going out and dirtying one's hands. For if there is to be a democratic revolution, free speech must be established and used."

Dr. De Almeida argued that too often American development programs are funneled through urban elites which have little or no communication with rural peasants.

He said that there is a fundamental misunderstanding in the United States of the nature of elites in the developing world.

"We are in a hopeless war for development," he added, "if we don't understand the difference between a nation controlled by an elite and a nation with new popular based institutions."

Mr. Howell of the Asia foundation said that in his experience with development programs he has seen too little emphasis placed on personal aspirations and ambitions both by the United States and by other governments.

"We Americans," he said, "still lack a close understanding of the political, economic and social realities in the countries in which we work."

As an example, he cited the recent ouster of General Thi from the ruling coalition in South Vietnam. In disposing of Thi apparently with U.S. approval, he said, the country has lost the services of "the one man in that coalition of generals who understood and had the confidence of the people who carried out the actions which led to the overthrow of Diem."

Mr. Howell said that the most successful development programs are those which reach out to rural farmers directly and ask him what help he needs.

He added that American attempts based on economic development in the United States suffer from the fact that we ourselves don't know exactly how we achieved economic development.

Harris Woffard, Associate Director of the Peace Corps, declared that, "the means exist to help every human being to enter the 20th century."

Mr. Woffard contended that development requires a challenge from the outside, "a person coming in who hasn't been depressed by the difficulties."

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection the House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired at 6 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m., the House was called to order by the Speaker.

MRS. LYLE ROBERTS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding citizens of the Miami metropolitan area and of the State of Florida is the distinguished chairman of the Dade County School Board, Mrs. Lyle Roberts.

Mrs. Roberts is a great lady, an outstanding citizen, and a powerful force for better education in our State. She is a warm human being, a woman of remarkable commonsense, and the symbol of integrity and effective good government in our community.

Recently, Mrs. Roberts announced that she would not be able to continue as chairman of our Dade County School Board and in characteristic fashion announced her retirement from the chairmanship and her decision not to run for another term on the board in time for the community to seek a replacement.

Many of us feel that Jane Roberts is irreplaceable, and this is strikingly indicated in the comments upon her career which appeared in our newspapers. So that my colleagues and all who read this Record may know of this remarkable public servant, I include, following my remarks, these newspaper articles and an article which appeared on Mrs. Roberts in the publication of our county schools:

[From the Miami News, Oct. 20, 1966]

School Board Head Won't Run Again

(By Louise Blanchard, reporter of the Miami News)

School Board Chairman Jane Roberts said today she will not seek reelection when her terms ends in two years and that she will not serve as chairman when the board reorganizes in January.

She has served on the board since August 1957 and as chairman since January 1961.

The two announcements are expected to touch off political maneuvering in two areas among possible candidates throughout Dade County for Mrs. Roberts' at-large position on the board; and among the other six board members for the chairmanship.

"I'm anxious to go ahead and say it because I'm definitely going to do it," Mrs. Roberts said.

She suggested that the interval of nearly two years before the next Democratic primary will provide an opportunity "to get some capable people" as candidates for the board.

Mrs. Roberts, president-elect of the Florida School Boards Association, is slated to take office Nov. 13 in Cocoa.

"I can't do both jobs, especially in a legislative year," she said.

The 1967 Legislature will convene April 3. Its 60-day session will be followed by a constitutional revision session. Both the school boards association and the Dade board will seek specific legislation at both sessions, a fact that means a great deal of work for the chief officer of each group.

Mrs. Roberts is one of two at-large members of the seven-member board. All members are elected by countywide vote, but five are required to live in specific residence districts. The other two may live anywhere in the county. Mrs. Roberts' decision not to run removes formidable opposition and clears the way for any Dade resident who feels qualified to seek the position. In the first Democratic primary in 1964, Mrs. Roberts far outdistanced five opponents.

[From the Miami Herald, Oct. 21, 1966]

CHAIRMAN SAYS SHE'S TIRED—MRS. ROBERTS WON'T RUN FOR NEW SCHOOL BOARD TERM

(By Jeff Antevil, Herald staff writer)

Mrs. Jane Roberts, blunt-spoken leader of Dade's School Board for the past four years, said Thursday she will not seek another two-year term as chairman.

"I am tired," Mrs. Roberts said, confirming that she will bow out when the seven-member board reorganizes in January.

The veteran board member also repeated publicly what she has been saying in private for many months—she will not seek reelection to the board when her present four-year term expires in 1968.

"I am announcing my decision this early," she said, "to give other people a chance to consider running for the board."

Mrs. Roberts stressed that she is not unhappy with Dade's school system or with her experiences since she was named to the school board in 1957.

"I've gotten a tremendous amount of satisfaction from serving on the board," she declared. "I have loved every minute of it and expect to continue loving every minute until my term expires."

The chairman, who served as one of two members-at-large on the board, won election in 1958, 1960 and 1964. She is the wife of contractor Lyle Roberts.

Only two board members—Mrs. Anna Brenner Meyers and Mrs. Helene Vosloh—have served longer on the policy-making board for Florida's second-largest governmental operation.

Mrs. Roberts said her duties as president of the Florida School Board Assn. next year also influenced her decision not to continue serving as chairman.

She said she will make no recommendations on a possible successor.

C. T. McCrimmon, a hospital administrator, is presently serving as vice-chairman of the board.

[From the Miami Herald, Oct. 22, 1966]

A LOSS FOR ALL FROM SCHOOL BOARD

The decision of Mrs. Jane Roberts to step down as chairman of the School Board in January and not seek reelection when her term expires in 1968 is regrettable.

Mrs. Roberts has been an outstanding board member since 1957. As chairman she has given sensible and tactful leadership through a trying period, with an eye on the pupils' welfare as well as the interest of the public which pays the bills.

With two more years remaining, Mrs. Roberts will continue to help direct one of the nation's largest school systems. If events do not change her plans to retire to private life, the loss will be a large one.

[From the Miami News]

TIME TO SAY "THANK YOU"

(By Jack Kassewitz, chief editorial writer of the Miami News)

Jane Roberts has had an uncounted number of telephone calls in the week since she announced she would not seek reelection as chairman of the Dade School Board. But not a single call has been from a parent with a child in the public schools.

All of the callers have been other public servants, expressing their regret over her decision but telling her they "fully understand." And while perhaps the elected officials do understand, we have the strange feeling the public doesn't.

Too often the public thinks it "owns" its officials. In her 10 years of service to the community on the School Board, (and at no salary!) Mrs. Roberts learned that a telephone call in the middle of the night is a form of harassment practiced widely by irate parents. She has been the butt of scurrilous mail and garbage heaped upon the front lawn of her Coral Gables home.

MANY COMPLAIN

Parents telephone to complain about poor bus service, about the quality of food in the cafeterias, library fines, or perhaps a shortage of parking spaces for their children's cars. But no one ever says "Thank You" for leading the school system to a point of excellence enjoyed by no other Florida community—and by few others in the nation.

We wouldn't be so naive as to think Jane Roberts did it all herself. She had help from a majority of the board members and successfully met the challenge of a social revolution. First there was integration and then there was the influx of Cuban children.

In between were the controversies over textbooks, sometimes with the noisy right wing element in Dade County, other times with the equally noisy liberals of the left. On several occasions the board was forced to raise taxes. And then there was the Bible-reading suit which split the county. All this time the telephone calls in the night never stopped.

To her great credit Mrs. Roberts, the mother of four children, stood firm. She is not exactly the silent type and she offered leadership which brought dramatic progress in the decade. During this time the school system grew from 128,000 students to 208,000 students. In 1957 Dade was spending $47 millions on its education. Today the figure is close to $125 million. We had 137 school buildings. Today the total is 208, and still growing. Classroom teachers have increased in number from 5,300 to almost 9,000.

THANKLESS JOB

Mrs. Roberts conceived and established the Quality Education Committee, which studied the needs of curriculum, manpower, and housing, and pressed for implementation of the recommendations. The board brought into being the Miami-Dade Junior College which not only enjoys national recognition but provides a new source of education for thousands of young people who might have quit upon graduation from high school.

A public official's lot is a thankless one. Jane Roberts' experiences make understandable why more outstanding people refuse to offer themselves to the electorate. The abuse isn't worth it. And we write this with the knowledge of 10 years' personal friendship.

[From the Miami News]

JANE ROBERTS

(By Bill Baggs)

A lady, Jane Roberts, sits in what many of us believe is the most important public chair around here.

Mrs. Roberts is chairman of the School Board.

The mere size of the work is suggested by the School Board budget, $125,000,000, which is the second largest budget in the state. Only the budget of the state itself is larger.

More vital, the board oversees what kind of schoolhouse is there for your child. This year, 208,000 young people are seeking education in the public schools.

Mrs. Roberts sits on top of all this.

And now she intends to be chairman no more.

SINCE 1961

Her reasons are various. She dislikes the idea of the annual squabble to determine who gets to be chairman, although she probably would be renamed again. She's been chairman since 1961. She is probably tired of the late night calls from irritated parents. She is president-elect of the Florida School Boards Association and possibly thinks her influence in smaller counties could improve the state of education there.

A testimonial to Jane Roberts was made last year by a brace of touring scholars from the University of Chicago. They were examining the school districts of the South, and one explained:

"The two excellent large school districts we found were in Miami and Atlanta. Miami was at least a shade the better of the two."

As much as anyone, Jane Roberts is responsible.

One of her finest gifts to the children and parents here was the idea of a Quality Education Committee. It was Jane Roberts' idea. The work of the committee didn't draw the headlines of, say, the Sheriff's Department, but its influence is far greater in the life of Dade County.

RACIAL ISSUE

And the committee came to the board with several recommendations to make better the school system here. It also was critical of the board, from time to time, and only a few months ago, a member of the Quality Education Committee was up before the board with warm criticism of how the board permitted a poor use of television in the schools.

Jane Roberts came to the board as the racial issue was nudging the public schoolhouse. She led the integration of the first school. No speeches. No explanations. She was obeying the law. The school was integrated without incident and set the pattern for an honest application of the pupil assignment law.

The public offices which get the attention can be found in City Hall or the Courthouse.

But the ladies and gentlemen of the School Board have the greatest duty of all . . . the minds and bodies of the young. No political work is more vital.

And for many seasons now, Mrs. Roberts managed this delicate work with a sense and commitment which has distinguished her. The children have had a splendid advocate in this lady.

[From the Miami News]

A CHANGING SCHOOL BOARD

(By Louise Blanchard, education writer of the Miami News)

Officially and unofficially, the School Board has long taken the position that its job is to educate children and everything else is secondary.

Look for a change in that policy.

The change will not mean that education is neglected. State law says it's illegal for a school board to spend tax money for anything that isn't directly related to the educational program. The law stands, and the board members know it.

But the board is likely to give weight to some other factors in a community—and a world—where everything changes faster than ever before.

Superintendent Joe Hall hinted at this possibility last month. Board Chairman Jane Roberts came right out and said it a few days ago.

After a long meeting with parents, Dr. Hall suggested a new approach in school desegregation:

In a given area of the county, white and Negro pupils would be assigned to each school in about the same proportion. He said he would oppose such a policy on a countywide basis because it would mean too much school bus transportation.

Dr. Hall emphasized that he was not recommending the new approach "as a policy the School Board should adopt this day," but as something citizens and the board should think about.

Previous decisions about school desegregation have been based largely on educational factors.

The decision to phase out several small Negro high schools, for example, was made in part because it is not possible to provide so good an education in a small high school as in a larger one. (But nobody knows exactly how large a high school should be, or whether there is an ideal size.)

Last week the Miami Housing Authority asked the Community Relations Board to call for a top-level, countywide study to deal with Miami's urban problems. It said the school system should be included among those making the study.

Mrs. Roberts said she strongly favored the proposal and predicted the School Board will cooperate. Then she went on:

"We've always said the school system was only responsible for educating children. But the problems of big cities are growing. Schools are going to have to be responsible for more than just education."

She said she did not know whether Dr. Hall "would feel he could move into this area unless the board took a definite stand."

There's no getting away from this:

Housing patterns are affected by the school sites the board chooses and by the school attendance boundaries it draws. The board certainly should have enough information so that it can judge what results each such decision is likely to have.

To get this information, it will need to work with the Community Relations Board and the other agencies involved in the proposed study.

A change in emphasis, at least, is necessary.

Mrs. Roberts said last week that she will not serve as chairman after next January and that she will not seek reelection when her term ends in two years.

In nine years as a board member, Mrs. Roberts has never been a candidate for "Florida's Most Tactful Politician."

She has a mind of her own and is usually willing to express it in public. She is rarely taken in by sham.

Despite these apparent political disabilities, she was reelected to the School Board every time she ran. Some of Florida's less outspoken politicians might want to think that over.

KNOW YOUR SCHOOL BOARD: "THE CHILD IS WHAT IT'S ALL ABOUT"

(NOTE.—This is the first in a series of profiles on members of the Board of Public Instruction. These seven men and women devote countless hours to the task of setting policies for a school system that is seventh largest in the nation and which comprises the largest business operation in Florida . . . outside the state government itself.

(Quest, the superintendent's newsletter, Dade County Public Schools. Dr. Joe Hall, superintendent. Editorial staff: Director of Public Information, Joy Reese Shaw; Editor, Kenneth J. Smith; Staff Assistant, Pauline Wilson; Production, Lois Griffin, Duplicating Dept. Head.

(Board of Public Instruction: Mrs. Lyle Roberts, Chairman; G. Holmes Braddock; Jack D. Gordon; James H. Hendrie; C. T. McCrimmon; Mrs. Anna Brenner Meyers; Mrs. Helene Vosloh.)

At a recent national education meeting, the chairman of Dade County's school board was on the podium making a major address.

She was tired from a heavy schedule. She had rushed to make the plane. And prepared texts are not her favorite cup of tea.

Suddenly she paused, looked at the audience, and declared: "I'm sorry but I've just got to take off my shoes."

This is Jane Roberts—direct, unpretentious, and, right, wrong or indifferent, always herself.

Being true to oneself is important to the woman who became the first member of the distaff sex to serve as chairman of Dade's school board and who will become the president of the Florida School Board Association in November.

"If I think I'm right . . . even if I'm wrong . . . if I have voted or taken an action that I honestly believed to be the best possible under a given set of circumstances at a given time regardless of whether it was a popular action, then I am content with myself. If I feel uncertainty about an issue, then I realize I should look deeper."

Being a member of a school board with the complexities of Dade's is a heavy responsibility. Being chairman is even more so.

Of the public, Mrs. Roberts says: "My theory is that people—even if they disagree violently—believe me to be sincere. Sincerity—that's the important thing."

In private life, Jane is Mrs. Lyle Roberts, wife of a Coral Gables contractor, secretary-treasurer of the contracting firm, and mother of four. She has a married son and daughter, and two school-age children, Anne . . . a senior at Gables who wins plaudits as a tennis star and plans a teaching career . . . and Peggy, a seventh grader at Ponce who wants to become a journalist.

Jane Roberts is as full of surprises as a pinata.

Daughter of a doctor, she was born in the mining town of Eckman, West Virginia.

"We came with the Hatfields and the McCoys," she kids.

She has two brothers, both doctors, and she herself packed many a miner off to the hospital by ambulance when her father wasn't there, but never entertained Florence Nightingale ambitions.

She loves business, bookkeeping . . . . . and music.

She is a skilled pianist . . . . . studied piano and organ at the University of Miami and before that at Hannah More Academy in a program then under the direction of Peabody Conservatory . . . . . once won a music scholarship . . . . and came close to making a career of music.

"I took honest stock of my talent and found it was not of professional calibre."

Her mother was a gifted vocalist and one of Jane's prize possessions is the concert grand piano which was her father's engagement gift to her mother. And it is there, on those keys, that she sometimes plays away the inevitable cares and anxieties that accompany public life.

The board chairman attributes whatever success she has enjoyed—and it has been considerable—to the fact that she could never outsmart anyone "so I just outdumbed them."

She "out-dumbed" her teachers so effectively in Eckman that she skipped the second grade, did the third and fourth in one year, and was ready for high school at 12.

From there, she was sent to Hannah More Academy, a girls' school in Baltimore, where she graduated, despite her insistence that "70 was passing—I usually made 69½."

In Eckman, Jane Stevens was one of three students in her class whose parents spoke English. The rest only spoke Polish . . . . . Italian . . . . . Mexican . . . . . Hungarian.

Jane and her brothers wanted to be, tried to be and were part of the town and environment. But it wasn't always easy.

When she had to be driven 40 miles away to music lessons—by a chauffeur, Jane would lie down on the floor in the back of the car until she got out of town because she was embarrassed.

She credits her father's philosophy with helping her and her brothers to keep perspective.

"He always taught us that we were the oddballs." He himself would go out with the drivers of the mine mules and learned to speak their language "so he could tell them to take two teaspoons after meals."

Though she ponders educational problems seriously, the board chairman has an irrepressible sense of humor which frequently pops out at board meetings. She is an inveterate reader, switching off to biographies and novels when she occasionally feels inundated with the floodtides of educational reading now necessary to keep abreast. She doesn't play cards, but loves crossword puzzles.

She can be tough and she can be tender. Though she hides the tenderness on the floor of the car. "It embarrasses me to pay compliments. It's one of my faults."

She is so direct, she can be blunt. "I really don't mean to be." But there is a quality of shyness in her. She shuns TV cameras most of the time . . . . . "and I hate prepared speeches." While she acquits herself well, she prefers to and fro with people—questions and answers.

Above all, she is an action-oriented woman. Grass does not grow where her feet tread, even though she may kick off her shoes for a spell.

Next year, Mrs. Roberts will round out a full decade of board service. She was appointed to the school board in 1957 by Governor LeRoy Collins, after two years of service as the first woman to be named to the Dade County Budget Board. She was elected to the school board in 1958 and again in 1960, becoming chairman in 1961.

It has been a ten-year period which might well be termed the "Dynamic Decade," the "Dramatic Decade" or the "Dynamite Decade," both nationally and locally.

During the ten-year period, Mrs. Roberts has seen the school system leap from 128,042 children to an enrollment of more than 204,000. The year she came on the board, Dade enrolled 13,482 new children and built 20 new schools. It was a little like parachuting into a hurricane which never really stopped blowing.

Hard on the heels of this spectacular growth came integration . . . . . the now famous Bible-reading suit . . . . . the textbook controversy. And, as if things weren't rocking enough on these shores, there came the Cuban crisis with the dramatic influx of refugee children into local schools.

All of these have taken patience, wisdom and constant planning on the part of school board members, and administrators . . . . . and strong leadership. But if Jane Roberts has picked up migrains during these pressure years, she also has picked up acclaim for her efforts. In 1960, she was named Dade's "Outstanding Woman of the Year" by the Miami News and joined its permanent Hall of Honor. In 1962, she was voted Theta Sigma Phi's "Headliner Award" followed by the David H. Hendrick "outstanding citizen" award presented by the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Coral Gables. In 1963, she was voted a commendation award in general education by the Dade County Classroom Teachers Association and an Honorary Life Membership in the Congress of Parents and Teachers.

"It has been a trying time—but it has been an exciting time," sizes up the chairman.

Among the most significant accomplishments of her board terms, she sees establishment of the citizens Quality Education Committee and implementation of many of its recommendations, and the acquisition of government property for Miami-Dade Junior College and the launching of an institution which has rocketed to national recognition and an enrollment of some 20,000 students.

From her vantage point behind the gavel, what does she see as the greatest strength of the school system? "Our flexibility—the ability to change and meet change. And people—staff people who are able to see beyond themselves and their own opinions or prejudices."

Its greatest danger? "Probably the same. We can move too fast in too many directions and lose our basic bearings. We must never take our focus off the child. The child is what it's all about."

Her viewpoint on teacher militancy which is claiming national attention: "Sometimes teachers ask too much and sometimes school boards give too little. The problem is to know the difference."

And what, if she had to spell it out, would be her greatest current concern in education?

"The child in the middle. So much attention is being given the gifted, the disadvantaged, that I worry about the child in the middle—the solid child—the child who grows up to be the bulwark of our American society, to be a member of the majority who will be called upon to make the sound, common-sense decisions of the future. Are we giving enough attention to the average child?"

She paused and a smile broke across the features which had grown suddenly serious with the subject.

"You know what I always say? The least common of the senses is common sense."

CONGRESSMAN GALLAGHER SPEAKS ON DIPLOMATIC MISSION TO ISRAEL

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to the attention of the Congress a recent speech by my good friend and distinguished colleague from New Jersey, the Honorable CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, to the 25th Annual Conference of the New Jersey Region, Jewish National Fund, on October 15, 1966, in Atlantic City, N.J.

In discussing his impressions from a recent trip as part of a distinguished group, headed by Vice President HUMPHREY, that represented the United States at the dedication of the Knesset—Israel's new Parliament building—NEIL GALLAGHER has eloquently cited the historical strength of the Jewish people that has formed the foundation for the great, modern state of Israel.

The speech, Mr. Speaker, follows:

TEXT OF THE SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, DEMOCRAT, OF NEW JERSEY, BEFORE THE 25TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE NEW JERSEY REGION, JEWISH NATIONAL FUND, OCTOBER 15, 1966

I had the good fortune to visit Israel as an American parliamentarian and as a congressional representative to the opening of the new Knesset, and I came away convinced that at no time since the American Revolution had a more resolute and dynamic spirit been manifested among a people. It is right and logical that we, as a democratic nation, were the first to recognize a government with which we share so many experiences, so many ideals and so many aims. We have in common with Israel the experience of mass immigration and a great variety of immigrant traditions, tongues, and experiences which furnish the nucleus of a culture both unified and distinctive.

Israel has constructed a unity out of diversity. She has built strong bulwarks of freedom and independence. Modern day Israel is a tribute to the courage and determination of her people and a monument to the many free peoples around the world who have given her moral and financial support.

I received from my travels in Israel a sense of history and dedication which could only be found embodied in a people who have fought hard to achieve the realization of an idea, a people who, as pioneers, fought against enormous odds to achieve both personal and national dignity.

I traveled those ancient valleys thinking of the age-old stories and I recall walking in the Valley of Elath where David met Goliath. I picked up a stone from the very stream where David selected his five. He defeated Goliath and changed the course of history that day. David and Goliath—this is the story of the new nation of Israel. This morale, this purpose, this sense of destiny are evident in traveling among the young people of Israel.

These were the people of the Book—they had scattered by the Book, and they have been gathered by the Book.

This people in the long years of the diaspora always fought for freedom and justice for others. Now, in their own land, they have achieved it for themselves.

And though I am not a Biblical scholar, it seems to me that the "Book" has been and is as accurate in its foretelling as it is beautiful in its poetry.

For it is written in Isaiah that when Zion is regained the Lord "will set a sign among them." Well, it struck me in Israel, and it has been with me ever since, that the finding of the Dead Sea Scrolls in 1948 coincided with the founding of the State of Israel for more reason than just historical accident. And so too, the strength of law and respect for democratic institutions is not mere chance.

The new Knesset Building is a symbol of the rising of this new nation, and it represents a challenge to all legislatures of the world—It is a challenge to justice, a challenge to excellence.

The heritage of democratic institutions goes far back in Jewish history. The long effort of the Israeli people has been marked by a ceaseless endeavor to safeguard its spiritual identity, not only when it dwelt in the Land of Israel in independence, but also when it was under domination.

The name Knesset was taken from an institution called the Knesset Hag-Dolah, the great Knesset, which was the legislative body of Israel during the second Temple over two thousand years ago. It was set up, under Persian rule, by Ezra the Scribe, and it consisted of some one hundred twenty members. It was both a legislative and a juridical institution. It was in the light of this tradition that the present parliament is named, and it is with the same number of members, derived from this great Knesset.

Thus in spite of the youth of the nation, there is a great parliamentary heritage here—only, it had to wait many years before it could reach physical fruition in this new Knesset.

This heritage reminded me, as I was touring Israel, of our American institutions and laws. Even in America, with our great reputation for a democratic heritage. We must still keep in mind that our laws are always in the process of creation and reevaluation, and that no country can lie back on its previous accomplishments when the world around it is constantly changing.

Israel can stand as an example both to us and to the rest of the world, that the strength of the law is only measured by the strength of the people, and that we must continue to endeavor to propagate and expand the rule of law in the community of nations.

My stay in Israel began in Jerusalem with a realization of the harsh realities that face Israel in her relations with her neighbors, and ended with my firm determination to press harder for a peaceful solution to the problems confronting Israel.

In Jerusalem, I met with Mayor Kollek who told me of the forty centuries of history, and of its present divided status. He explained to me the problems he had to face in light of the fact that the old city—with its rich religious significance—is in Jordanian territory, inaccessible to the Jewish people. We visited Mount Zion where we stopped at the Tomb of King David.

Later we went to Mount Herzl, in Judea, where we were greeted by representatives of the World Zionist Organization. This mountain, I learned, stands as a monument to Doctor Theodore Herzl, who in 1896, rekindled the dream of the State of Israel. We laid a wreath in his memory, and we planted a tree to mark our visit to Israel. I was reminded, at this time, of the remarkable reforestation effort that the Jews of America, through this organization, have accomplished with the monies they send to Israel in seeing the splendid conversion that the Israeli people have accomplished in turning the desert into farmlands and gardens.

But the highlight of my trip to Israel came on the day of the dedication of the Knesset Building. It was a very moving ceremony, from the moment it was begun by five trumpeters sounding a fanfare from the top of the structure overlooking a crowd of five thousand people, to the moment it closed with the lighting of a beacon which signaled the lighting of a chain of beacons all across the Land of Israel.

It was as the whole nation—every man, woman and child—rose up at that moment in thanksgiving for the freedom that they enjoy.

As the searchlights symbolically formed a temple overhead in the dark blue sky, the new building in its purpose seemed to be searching heavenward.

Problems still exist for Israel—it has not yet overcome the heritage of oppression that has plagued it since the beginning of time. It is still confronted with barbed wire and police guards, small wars and the threat of big ones, diplomatic intrigue and jealousy and mistrust. But the hope and spirit of the Israeli people responds to every challenge to its integrity with an even greater respect for and use of law and justice.

It seemed to me very significant that at the opening of the new Knesset so many new African nations should be present. It is only natural that it should be Israel where the old nations meet the new in a parliamentary convention whose goal was to announce for all to hear the belief in the rule of law and justice, the furtherance of knowledge and understanding, and the pursuance of peace and tranquility.

With a name such as Gallagher, it is obvious that I am not Jewish, and yet, I can think of no one people who have made a greater contribution to our civilization and to our society.

Our thoughts of God, our attitudes toward our neighbor, our concept of faith and hope, all of these things took root in the ancient tribes of Hebrews, in the land of Israel. These forefathers of today's citizen of Israel.

And here, as I speak before this organization—The National Jewish Fund—I am made more intensely aware of the contribution of these people in the evolution of the concept of charity.

For even with a name like Gallagher, I can attest that no better investment was ever made in our fellow man than was the money raised to make the dream of this new nation possible.

And I was reminded, in conclusion, as I left Israel of the beauty of one of Solomon's Songs, and how apt a description it was of all we peace-loving peoples of the world felt at that moment:

"For, lo, the winter is past,
The Rain is over and gone,
The flowers appear on the earth,
The time of the singing of birds is come,
And the voice of the turtle-dove is heard
on our land."

Let us pray that soon the voice of the turtle-dove will be heard in our land and in every land by all men. Thank you, Shalom.

MERRILL C. FULTZ

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute today to a grand gentleman who has devoted his life to helping young boys—Merrill C. Fultz.

Today, Mr. Fultz is in semiretirement at Lancaster, Pa. It was in his hometown of Lewistown that Mr. Fultz first became involved with the Boys Clubs of America. He was well qualified to lead young men, having won three letters in basketball, track, and football during his school years.

But it was in my hometown—Bayonne, N.J.—that Mr. Fultz, popularly known as "Shorty," made his mark. As boys' work secretary of the YMCA in Bayonne, he built the membership from 30 to 370 boys; set up leadership, swim and youth citizenship programs; established clubs, and opened a summer camp for youngsters in the New Jersey forest lands. For his efforts in behalf of the underprivileged boys of the city, he was honored with a distinguished service award by the junior chamber of commerce.

From Bayonne, Mr. Fultz went to the Lancaster Boys Club of America, then to Cincinnati, Ohio, as director of the boys club in that city. But he never forgot Bayonne, and Bayonne has never forgotten him. He still corresponds with boys he helped in the New Jersey city.

Merrill C. Fultz continues to spend considerable time with young people—his sons and grandchildren—and can still be seen at summer camps, guiding tomorrow's young men with his wise and generous counsel.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for this opportunity to commend this fine man for his lifetime dedication to the youth of America.

A REAL NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the other day I called to the attention of the House the fact October 12, popularly known to us as Columbus Day, was not being sufficiently emphasized; and what is more important, it is not being properly commemorated inasmuch as the role and function of Spain has either been overlooked or underestimated.

I also stated that October 12 is a great day in all of Hispanic America, it is a real national holiday.

In this connection I read a most interesting, informative, and eloquent pair of articles published in Mexico in the publication of the Sembradores De Amistad, a great organization that has a chapter in San Antonio, and whose principal aim and purpose is to foster good relations among the countries of the Western Hemisphere.

I ask unanimous consent to set forth these articles, translated from the Spanish.

[Spanish translation by J. Richard Avena, Library of Congress]

SOWING . . .

(By Dr. Alfonso Garza)

October the 12th is once more commemorated as the day Christopher Columbus, a European, Mediterranean and Catholic, first set food on land in the New World.

Fifty years ago no one would have thought that this day would be honored as the celebration of the "Hispanicism." However, since 1917 when the Argentine President, Hipólito Irogoyen named it the "Day of the Race" this date has acquired a strong human meaning. Since most of the national celebrations in Latin America coincide with the date of their independence and emancipation from Spain, this day, the day of "Hispanicism" leans towards the renewal of the ties with the Mother Country. These are the words of Irigoyen: "Spain, mother of the nations to which it gave a lasting heritage, the vitality of her blood and the beauty of her language, should be honored on this day." At that time there was no thought given to the formation of a third force to side with the contenders in the first world conflagration, but that in a moment of desolation and destruction thought be given to the defense of the traditions and the safeguarding of the ethnic values which were in danger.

Among the great accomplishments of 1492, there is also highlighted the appearance of the first grammar of a modern language: "The Castillian Grammar," of the great humanist, Antonio de Nebrija. In his dedication written to Queen Isabella, there sparkles a brilliant intuition: "The kingdoms and their tongues are born and disappear; after Egypt and Israel, Greece and Rome, the time has come for the government we call the Kingdom and Republic of Castilla to become known. Above the political order of the law, the base of our solidarity, is the order of the language that is being initiated, so that men will be able to understand each other and establish the peaceful arts among themselves. Furthermore this will abound in goodness for the people that your Majesty would add to her Crown."

The prophecy of Nebrija has been fulfilled; Spain, with Portugal at her side, extended, over the length of a dramatic period, her political dominion to vast continents, and the peaceful arts in their "Golden Age", reached a flourishing that contributed in a definite way to the consolidation of European history in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. The words that are attributed to the great Captain Gonzalo de Cordoba "Spain to Arms and Italy to the letters" lost their validity for the epoch immediately following. Cervantes, Lope de Vega and Calderon, El Greco, Zurbaran, Rivera and Velazquez; and the cathedrals of Mexico, Quito and Lima represent for us today undying testimonies of an epoch constituted by Spain in the government of arms and letters.

But also the prophecy of the disappearance of great empires that Nebrija mentions in his dedication to the Queen, was fulfilled in the case of Spain. In the same measure in which she had exhausted her expansive capacity, the directives of the world in turn passed judgment on her adversaries to the north of the Pyrenees.

In the field of philosophy, learning and criticism bring discredit to the Spanish metaphysics. In the field of political propaganda and the popularization of history, the veil of the Black Legend falls over the Colonies of Spain. Everyone outside Spain who thought of her from the Seventeenth Century on, mostly only saw the fanatic friar, the Inquisitor, and cruel conquerers with their thirst for gold and abusive colonialism.

Feeding on the emancipative examples of Saxon Protestantism, those same anti-Spanish sentiments were reflected in the political independence movements of America. The belief in a Saxon and Protestant America, as a spiritual guide for the world possessed the conscience of the new Republics.

Mexico is honored by the fact that it was a Mexican, Carlos Pereyra, who first raised his voice in defense of Spain and her culture, of her generosity and her contribution to America; and that this was continued by another Mexican, José Vascocelos, that at present our friend and collaborator, Alfonso Trueba Olivares, is the standard bearer of that defense.

There is much that can be said in favor of Spain but it is enough to remember the fact mentioned by Pedro Ramirez Vázquez, an architect: Only in Mexico did Spain build in three centuries, fifteen thousand cultural edifices; temples, hospitals, universities, colleges and missions; that is to say, one per week.

[Translated by J. Richard Avena, Library of Congress]

COLUMBUS AND THE SPANISH SPIRIT

(By Nicolás Nava Vázquez of the Puebla Chapter)

If the concept of Christianity comprises and characterizes all of the Christian people Why not coin another word such as "Hispanicism" which will also comprise and characterize all of the peoples of Spanish origin.

I shall attempt to make a brief ideological dissection of the term "Hispanicism." "Hispanicism" of course, is not a race.

"The Echo of Spain" had reason to say that the name "The Day of the Spaniard" was badly used, for the 12th of October. This is a concept which could be taken as an attempt to prove that importance is not given to the somatic characteristics of the blood, nor to the color of the skin, or other analogues; but what we want to project today is not constituted by those characteristics that are transmitted through protoplasmatic darkness. What we understand as race is that combination of human characteristics which are the light of the spirit: creed, tongue, culture and a common destiny.

Because "Hispanicism" signifies a composition of men and races; it is not tied to any one determined geographic place. "Hispanicism" does not inhabit one land but extends over the four cardinal points, it is somewhat multiform and seems heterogeneous in its integral elements but in reality it is one and homogeneous in its essence: as if not being a product of nature it is not the result of a territory, a climate or of a determined race.

It is the essence of a civilization; tears from the same pain; awakening from the same dream; vision of the same future.

It is the simple effect of a combination of historic phenomenon that are fused into one and the same crucible (melting pot): All of the people of Hispanicism governed by the same monarchs from 1580 to 1640 when Portugal separated itself from Spain, and after by the peninsular monarchies until the emancipation of America which in synthesis owes its culture, language and its spiritual development to Spain and Portugal.

That feeling of unity that does not consist only in believing in the same God and in having the same language, constitutes a permanent and unalterable purpose of unity and a conscience will of a common destiny. In my judgment this is the Hispanicism which we celebrate today. But how foolish I would feel if I continued to echo the ingratitude that year after year seems to forget he who on this date pulled back the veil and laid the first foundation of our Hispanicism, he who was chosen by destiny: Christopher Columbus.

What Marcelo Griaule says is true; that the discovery of America was an unforseen result of an expedition which was in search of India. In effect Columbus took part in a colossal error based on the old truth transmitted by Eratosthenes who had received it through Thales of Miletus, a learned Greek who died in the Sixth Century B.C. Eratosthenes, like all the other scholars of his time, admitted the sphericity of the "Earth" and in the Second Century Ptolemy was of the same opinion. But the Calculations of Eratosthenes concerning the earth's circumference, which, that he had surprisingly given as 42,000 kilometers, separated India on the East from the Mediterranean world. In the second century the illustrious geographer Ptolemy makes the error his, and passes it on 1,500 years later to the learned Toscanelli, technical advisor to Columbus. Paolo Toscanelli (1379–1482), a Florentine doctor and eminent geographer had drawn a map of the known and imagined world; on it China was at about the height of California—the exaggerations in longitude of Marco Polo and the oral declarations of the Venetian Nicolo Conti.

Another astonishing traveller who went from Egypt to the Ganges and to Borneo stretched the Asiatic continent in longitude and on the other hand shortened the supposed distance on the West between Europe and India.

In the eyes of Toscanelli the writings and sayings of these two men were worth proving. In the eyes of Columbus, Toscanelli's documentation was indisputable to the point that the Historian "Las Casas" said: I am convinced that his entire trip was based on that map.

More than the carved wood found at 450 leagues from the Cape of San Vicente, more than the enormous bamboos tangled up in Port Santo, more than the cadavers thrown by the West wind over the Azores, this map sustained Columbus as well in the preparation as in the execution of his plan.

Without doubt the preparation was the most difficult period in that life which is now almost legendary, and of which we know almost nothing until the great accomplishments at the end of the Fifteenth Century.

According to what is said Columbus was born in Genoa in the year 1446 or 1447. In 1470 participated in the wine traffic of the Mediterranean. In that year he went to Portugal where he married a noble Italian girl whose family had settled in that country. He established his residence in Lisbon, the greatest maritime center of Europe where one could best study astronomy and geography. He learned a lot from the Portuguese, devouring the literature concerning his interests and especially the first edition (1483) of the "Imago Mundi" of the Cardinal of Lilly. He reads the opinions of Ptolemy and of Martin of Tyre, of Aristotle and Seneca who affirmed the proximity of Asia through the West. He also lost no time in relating himself to Toscanelli.

In that time the Portuguese and the Spanish dominated the seas; every year far away regions entered the picture of the known world and the news was published on printed sheets and sold to the public. An atmosphere of struggle and adventure prevailed sustained by those who governed for different reasons, among them was gold. The highway to the continents had been opened . . . This metal was found in India, in Japan whose "temples and public buildings—wrote Toscanelli—are covered with pure gold" and it would have been beautiful to have convinced his detractors at once because—writes Toscanelli to Columbus—"those princes and kings we reach should be a lot happier than we to come in contact with the Christians of our countries, since there are quite a few among them and since in this way they will have the opportunity to talk about science and religion with our wise and able men." Notwithstanding the noble intentions, Columbus' plan, presented by Ferdinand the Catholic to a commission, is rejected, "as a simple bubble of air," the great men of science of Salamanca did not admit to the sphericity of the Earth and preferred the system of Cosmas Indicopleutes who draws a universe in the form of a coffer with a bulging top.

In 1492 after the fall of Granada Columbus returns to his task of preparations and on the 17th of April of that year the Catholic Monarchs Fernando and Isabella signed the desired capitulation.

On August 3, 1492, before dawn the small flotilla leaves Palos. It is made up of the following: "The *Niña*" the *"Pinta,"* ships with three masts of 140 and 100 tons respectively, under the command of the Pinzón brothers who have a homogeneous crew well known by them; the *"Santa Maria,"* under the Admiral, of 280 tons serviced by a group of galley slaves and adventurers, the majority of whom had never sailed before.

On the third day at sea, the helm of the Pinta breaks down, possibly as the consequence of sabotage. It touches at the Canary Islands. Its unenthusiastic crew takes four weeks to repair the damage. On the 8th of September it puts out to sea. Columbus steers toward the West, aloof from a patrol made up of three Portuguese ships who do not wish him well and for this reason do not assist the only spectacle of the party which is making the first transatlantic crossing taking to the Great Khan letters from the Catholic Kings. Strange mail indeed since Khan had been gone from the throne of China for a century.

This is where the problems begin for the Admiral. Among the one hundred and twenty men in the convoy he is the only one who believes in what he is doing. From the first day of sailing doubt is lodged in the minds of all. In order to attenuate the fear he feels increasing around him, he sets up two logs of the distance covered: one for himself according to the true data; another recording lesser distances to show his men, whose thoughts are every day closer to their homeland.

On the 13th of September, to the great surprise of all, the needle of the compass, "turns toward the Northeast, pointing to the left of North". The following day it points "to the Northeast pointing to the right of North". Columbus calms his men down, now truly terrified, by telling them that the North Pole has been displaced.

On the 17th he navigates through great floating masses of weeds from which a live crab is taken. Albatrosses are seen in flight. Excitedly all believe these are signs of the proximity of land.

On the 18th Pinzón thinks he sees from the Pinta a vigorous flock of birds flying to the West. But he sees only clouds.

On the 19th Columbus mistakes a curtain of clouds for land. His observation shows 400 leagues, 420 for the Pinta and 540 for the Niña.

For three days the seaweed is so thick it is feared it may force the ships to run aground.

On the 23rd it is necessary to fight against a head wind. The low morale of the men overcomes them; they are convinced of the consistency of the wind from the East which would prevent their return to Spain.

On the 24th restlessness reaches its peak in spite of the many birds that are sighted. The crew of the Admiral's ship talk of mutiny; they plan to throw their leader overboard.

On the 25th in the afternoon, Pinzón shouts that he has land in sight, the men shout the good news. Columbus kneels and the entire flotilla sings "Gloria in Excelsis". They figure they are 25 leagues from the edge.

At daybreak, the land disappears.

On the 1st of October the false chart shows 584 leagues; the true one 707.

On the 7th of October the Niña hoists a banderole and fires a cannon, believing land was sighted but that later vanishes. On the 10th, the rebellion on board takes on new life. On the 11th a carved piece of cane and some red berries are fished out of the water. Isabel has promised 10,000 gold coins and a velvet coat to the first man who sights land. During the night the Admiral stays on the bridge scanning the West. Suddenly he sees a brilliance, he calls an officer who also sees it.

At two in the morning a shout comes from the Pinta which is sailing in the lead: seaman Rodrigo de Triana has just won his velvet coat.

On the morning of October 12th, Columbus disembarks followed by his men. He is wearing a scarlet cape on his shoulders and has the royal flag in his hand. He takes possession of the new land which is nothing more than a small island which he names San Salvador (today known as Watling).

During the annexation ceremony, some naked men with short and thick hair like the mane of a horse, congregate around the Spaniards; by their color they look like the inhabitants of the Canary Islands; they are not white but neither are they black; they touch the clothing of the sailors and admire the scarlet cape. They take the newly arrived for gods, fallen from the skies . . ."

". . . realizing that it would be easier"—writes Columbus—"to conquer these people for our holy Faith through kindness instead of force, I gave several of them red caps, glass necklasses and other trinkets, gifts which brought them great joy and for which they showed a great deal of astonishment. They could serve as good and useful slaves, since they easily and rapidly understood everything we told them. It also seemed to me that they could easily be converted to Christianity because they seemed deprived of all religion."

From the above narrative it seems as though Christopher Colombus always wanted to "Christianize" the newly discovered people. He was a man who had to face the most adverse circumstances to accomplish his plans and because of his tenacity, will and conviction he was singled out by the finger of God to open to history, the most glorious of its pages.

There are some historians who have not wanted to see more than common passions in him; they insult the truth and take away from justice.

It is up to us as "Sowers", even though it is through these words that we wish to interpret our concepts, to honor the memory of the discoverer of America, the Great Christopher Colombus.

EAST-WEST CENTER

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, 6 years ago the U.S. Congress created the East-West Center in Hawaii. Its avowed function was, and is today, to bring East and West together to make friends and overcome ignorance and prejudice. I am proud that along with the then Senate majority leader, Lyndon B. Johnson, and the then delegate from Hawaii to Congress, John A. Burns, to have been able to play a part in the founding of this institution. On the last Monday, President Johnson stopped at the Center on his way to southeast Asia. Chancellor and former Ambassador Howard P. Jones, of the Center, introduced the Governor of Hawaii, the Honorable John A. Burns. His remarks on that occasion follow as do two letters from Mr. Norman C. C. Fu, president of the East-West Center Grantees Association, which express the fervent hopes of us all that the President is successful in his quest for an honorable and lasting peace:

Introductory Remarks by Chancellor Howard P. Jones, October 17, 1966

Mr. President, Mrs. Johnson, Mrs. Burns, President and Mrs. Hamilton, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, the East-West Center is honored today by the visit of the man whose vision gave it birth.

That vision grew from a simple conviction: If, in the future, man is to forestall the wars that have darkened the past, intellect must replace emotion, knowledge must overcome ignorance, understanding must conquer prejudice.

To these ends, the East-West Center was established by Act of Congress. Bringing together scholars and students from Asia, the Pacific Islands, and the United States, the Center cultivates the science of cross-cultural communication, and pursues the arts of peace.

Here all cultures, all races, all creeds are equally honored, the wisdom of each civilization adding its wealth to the rest.

Here today, to introduce its founding father, is another of that inspired group of legislators, University of Hawaii faculty members, other men and women in the worlds of government and education, to whom this institution owes its life.

As Hawaii Delegate to Congress, and in association with Senator Lyndon Baines Johnson of Texas and Congressman John J. Rooney of New York—three men whose names are engraved on the plaque soon to be unveiled as part of this occasion—he envisaged Hawaii as the site of this Asian-American bridge, and helped to father the enabling legislation.

As Governor of the Fiftieth State, he remains a staunch supporter of the ideals on which the East-West Center rests, exposing the poverty of human prejudice, exalting the power of human understanding.

No man can better express the hopes of the multi-racial peoples who inhabit these islands—the hopes that accompany our President on his mission of peace.

It is a privilege to present to you—Governor John A. Burns.

East-West Center
Grantees' Association,
Honolulu, Hawaii, October 17, 1966.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President, the United States of America.

Dear Mr. President: On behalf of the grantees of the East-West Center, the East-West Center Grantees' Association wishes the President, an acknowledged friend, success in his quest for peace.

Respectfully yours,
Norman C. C. Fu,
President.

East-West Center Grantees' Association,
Honolulu, Hawaii, October 17, 1966.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President, the United States of America.

Dear Mr. President: We, the members of the East-West Center Grantees' Association, on behalf of the student body of the East-West Center wish to express our sincere appreciation for the vital role you have played in the creation of this unique institution and the continued support which you have contributed throughout its growth. We, too, believe in the East-West Center and its goal of mutual understanding and "cultural and technical interchange between peoples of East and West."

Each of us in his own way is striving to achieve the realization of the Center's goals in his own life and for his own country.

The Center is young and so too are we; yet, hopefully, the role the Center has played in molding our lives will contribute to the building of a better world in which there is no East or West, but one world in which all men may live in harmony.

Respectfully yours,
Norman C. C. Fu,
President.

POVERTY BILL CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dent] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] saw fit to question the authenticity of remarks I made on the floor yesterday on the poverty bill conference report with regard to supergrades in the Office of Economic Opportunity. He questions the basis of my information relating to supergrade and supergrade equivalent figures. The gentleman from Minnesota reveals his sources to be the Appendix to the Budget of the United States for fiscal year 1967 for his FBI figures and P–31 of a report of hearings conducted by the Subcommittee on Manpower, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for all others.

I used the Appendix to the Budget. My objective was to present an accurate reflection of the total senior staffing of the agencies under consideration. The point made by the Republican members was that OEO was overpaid and topheavy with 53 supergrades. It was advocated that one supergrade per each 100 employees would be more than enough to manage this program. To substantiate this, they cited various ratios showing that OEO at 1 to each 100 was getting a very favorable balance. The figures as presented to this body by the gentleman were and are misleading. These agencies cited have access either through "excepted" appointments such as Foreign Service officers or special legislation to supergrade equivalents.

Certainly, none of us believes that the Peace Corps only has 3 equivalent supergrades to compare to OEO's 53. Using the same source as the gentleman from Minnesota, the Appendix to the Budget of the United States for fiscal year 1967, pages 1117 and 1118, reflects three special positions established by the Director of the Peace Corps and 88 Foreign Service Reserve officers at class 1 and 2 which are, in rank and salary, equivalent to supergrades.

That document reflects a total permanent staff estimated for 1967 as 1240 as I reported. Anyone who believes that the Peace Corps could do the job it is doing with just three supergrades—as the gentleman claimed—just does not know what is going on. The difference here, Mr. Speaker, is one of definition.

The object of the gentleman was to show an inordinate ratio of high level staff in OEO. To do this, a table was used from the Subcommittee on Manpower which was accurate for the purpose of that subcommittee but not at all for the objective of the gentleman and his associates. The table referred to by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] relates only to one type of supergrade—those positions controlled by the Civil Service Commission—and is, therefore, not a true picture of the senior management of such agencies as the Peace Corps, NASA, AID, or others having access to other types of supergrades under Foreign Service appointments or special administrative authorities. OEO has neither of these latter authorities.

A last word about accuracy, Mr. Speaker. You all have the letter of October 14, 1966, on this subject signed by Messrs. Ayres, Quie, and Goodell. In the first paragraph, I quote:

> This would mean about 24 positions in GS–16, 17 and 18 . . . with salaries ranging from $19,619 to $25,325.

I have looked over the authorized salaries for GS–16, 17 and 18 and find them to be from $20,075 to $25,890. The rates appearing in the letter are the old rates which expired when we passed the Salary and Fringe Benefits Act of 1966. Perhaps those gentlemen voted against that bill also and refuse to recognize the fact that it has been enacted. In any event, their reliance upon obsolete salary levels is rather indicative of the uninformed nature of their entire position.

I am afraid the Republican opposition to the poverty program causes them to grasp any straw in an effort to impede its drive to eradicate the misery and degradation of poverty in our midst.

It has been said that a lie repeated often enough becomes the truth to the liar. The facts can be disregarded but not disproven.

COUNTRY'S NATIONAL HERITAGE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions I have had the honor of bringing to the attention of my distinguished colleagues many of the significant contributions made by our citizens of various ethnic backgrounds to this country's national heritage.

At this time, I am proud to bring you word about one of the Vidov-Dan celebrations in the great city of Chicago this year by members of the Serbian community. This most important national-religious holiday in the Serbian calendar commemorates the anniversary of the 14th-century battle of Kossovo. Though that conflict was a defeat for the Serbs, over the years it has been considered a spiritual victory by the Serbian people and is celebrated because they preferred to fight against overwhelming odds for their principles and defeat rather than to accept surrender and dishonor.

It is especially pertinent to note the 577th anniversary of the historic event this year for it is clear that the voice of liberty against tyranny is needed as much today as it ever has been in the past. And it is especially pertinent also because of the clarion call for unity in the commitment to freedom which was a highlight of the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, Senator PAUL A. DOUGLAS, at the anniversary program sponsored by the Serbian Orthodox Church in Chicago on June 28.

Before several thousand Americans of Serbian descent, the spirit of Kossovo was reflected in his memorable words as principal speaker at the Vidov-Dan event. This longtime champion of equal rights for all Americans cited the Serbian national epic poem, "The Legend of Kossovo," as one of the most inspiring stories of total dedication to freedom that has come from any nation. Senator DOUGLAS reminded his audience of how the Serbs again had courageously demonstrated their commitment to freedom in World War I on the Salonika front and in World War II by their heroic resistance to both the Nazis and the Communists.

Sharing the speakers' platform with the Senator was Prince Tomislav, scion of the exiled royal family of Yugoslavia, and Princess Margarita who have been living in exile in Great Britain for many years. In his reference to their presence, Senator DOUGLAS stated:

> It gives me pleasure today to pay tribute to the royal family of Yugoslavia for the role it played in inspiring and giving leadership to this resistance.

In their nationwide tour under the auspices of the Serbian Orthodox Church, the Prince and Princess visited congregations throughout the United States and Canada to assist in developing scholarship programs for young Serbian Orthodox seminarians. Particularly in these clouded times, helping to strengthen moral and religious fiber is a meaningful mission, one quite in keeping with the standards stated so eloquently in the ancient Serbian national motto: "For the Sacred Cross and Golden Liberty."

The importance of this fine project, it seems to me, was poignantly underlined by Senator DOUGLAS when he observed:

> The tremendous intellectual ferment now going on all through communist Europe demonstrates once again that no tyranny can forever suppress the human will to freedom. And I am as certain as I ever have been of anything that the Yugoslav peoples who have over the centuries fought so hard and sacrificed so much for freedom will someday liberate themselves from the tyranny which now oppresses them and achieve that liberty to which all men, everywhere, aspire.

Leading seminarians and high-ranking officials of the Serbian Orthodox Church in the United States and Canada also participated in the celebration, as did the personal chaplain of the Prince and Princess, the Very Reverend Archpriest Miloje Nikolich, vicar general of the Serbian Orthodox Church in Great Britain.

It gives me pleasure to report to the Members of the House that, during the brief visit of the royal party to our Nation's Capital, they were the guests at a luncheon held in their honor by a number of our colleagues, including the distinguished Speaker, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK. The Prince and Princess made a profound impression on those they met, due in large measure to their unassuming and straightforward manner. It was refreshing, indeed, that their message included no news of political activities, no requests for arms shipments, no loan requests.

I understand that the Prince is a hard-working man in his apple orchards in England, and that he has earned deep respect for the continued interest he has shown in the welfare of his former countrymen and for the sincere, responsible attitude he holds toward his church. The Princess, a state registered nurse in Great Britain, is active in humanitarian endeavors and serves as a volunteer member of the St. John's Ambulance Brigade.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Senator DOUGLAS' remarks on the occasion of the memorable Vidov-Dan holiday in Chicago merit the careful attention of my distinguished colleagues. They are a fitting and eloquent example of his deep understanding and concern for his fellow citizens. A guideline of principles, his statement serves to clearly emphasize to all the responsibilities of cohesive dedication and action if liberty and freedom are to prevail.

Under unanimous consent I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the notable and inspiring address of the eminent senior Senator from Illinois, the Honorable PAUL H. DOUGLAS:

STATEMENT OF U.S. SENATOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS TO AMERICANS OF SERBIAN DESCENT, CHICAGO, ILL., VIDOV-DAN, JUNE 26, 1966

I was pleased to accept your invitation to be with you today because of the great respect I have for the Serbian people and for the Serbian American community.

Ours is a country that has been made strong by immigrants, and the various Slavic groups have all contributed in full measure to the building of the America of today. As a student many years ago, one of my heroes was Dr. Michael I. Pupin, the great physicist, as was Nikola Tesla, the inventor.

The Serbian people have also made a rich contribution to the literature of freedom which belongs to all mankind. Your national epic poem, "The Legend of Kossovo," is one of the most inspiring stories of total dedication to freedom that has come from any nation. Indeed, I have heard that the immortal German poet, Goethe, taught himself the Serbian language simply so that he would be able to read "The Legend of Kossovo" in its original idiom.

The Serbs again demonstrated their commitment to freedom in World War I, when their stubborn heroism assured the success of the Salonika front. And they demonstrated this commitment again in World War II in their splendid resistance to both the Nazis and the Communists. It gives me pleasure today to pay tribute to the royal family of Yugoslavia for the role it played in inspiring and giving leadership to this resistance.

Unfortunately, during World War II, the American and British governments were guilty of a terrible blunder affecting your country. For reasons which have never been explained, we abandoned the nationalist resistance forces led by General Draza Mihajlovic and threw our support behind the Communist forces of Marshal Tito. It saddens me to think that in doing so we made ourselves partially responsible for the installation of a Communist dictatorship in your country. In a few weeks we will mark the 20th anniversary of Mihajlovic's death, honoring his memory and grieving at the terrible injustice of his execution by the Tito government.

"The tremendous intellectual ferment now going on all through Communist Europe demonstrates once again that no tyranny can forever suppress the human will to freedom. And I am as certain as I ever have been of anything that the Yugoslav peoples who have over the centuries fought so hard and sacrificed so much for freedom will someday liberate themselves from the tyranny which now oppresses them and achieve that liberty to which all men, everywhere, aspire."

I am distressed to know that a division has recently arisen in the Serbian-American religious community which had over the years been so wonderfully united. I am all the more saddened because I am convinced that the people on both sides are decent, patriotic Americans who cherish all that America stands for and who are staunchly opposed to the Communist government which now holds power in their ancestral fatherland.

Into the merits of the dispute I am not competent to enter and it is not proper for me to do so. It is my hope that the differences which now divide the Americans of Serbian origin will be overcome. If I may say so, I cannot escape the feeling that these differences somehow reflect the exaggerated conflicts of a national religious nature which have plagued Europe through the centuries.

It is altogether proper that Americans of Polish descent or Serbian descent or Hungarian descent should seek to keep alive and cherish their ancestral culture and that they should keep warm the memories of the land in which they were born or from which their parents or grandparents came. Part of our country's greatness can be attributed to a blending of the ancient cultures of Europe and the blood of all the peoples of Europe. But there is such a thing as overdoing the emphasis on one's ancestral fatherland. We are all Americans, whatever our ancestry. And it is as American citizens that we must all live and think.

As far as the future is concerned, therefore, I should like to suggest the following advice to both groups: (1) Where there is litigation between the two churches, let the courts decide. And, as the good Americans I believe you to be, let both groups follow loyally whatever final decision may be reached. (2) Let us reiterate our unity in our commitment to freedom and in our opposition to tyranny. The police state is alien to American ideals, no matter what national cap it may wear. Life has dealt all of you a special understanding of what it means to have government be the servant of the people rather than the people being servants of the government. (3) We are agreed, and I think we should restate this agreement, that Communist aggression is the great threat to the peace of the world and to the ultimate security of this beloved country of ours. We should never allow Communist aggression—whether overt as in Korea or disguised as a so-called "war of national liberation" as in Vietnam—to have either our sympathy or our tolerance.

Subject to these principles people should be free to worship God in their own way and to adopt that form of church government which they desire and of which the courts approve.

As citizens of the United States let us do our best to make this an even more just and humane country. Despite differences, can we not all join hands to work together in this worthy cause?

ADJOURNMENT TO SATURDAY

Mr. **BOGGS.** Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to announce to the House that the other body has adjourned until tomorrow, to meet at 9 a.m. Therefore, I am constrained at this time to move that the House adjourn to meet tomorrow.

Mr. **ARENDS.** Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **BOGGS.** I am very happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. **ARENDS.** At what time will the House meet tomorrow?

Mr. **BOGGS.** At 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. **ARENDS.** I thank my colleague.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MILLS (at the request of Mr. FRIEDEL), from 2:55 p.m., for the remainder of the day, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MORSE (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee), for 60 minutes, on October 21; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RYAN, for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. FOGARTY to revise and extend his remarks and to include tables in his remarks made on HEW conference report today.

Mr. PHILBIN.

Mr. VIGORITO and to include a speech by Vice President HUMPHREY.

Mrs. REID of Illinois (at the request of Mr. RUMSFELD).

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KUNKEL in two instances.

Mr. QUILLEN.

Mr. GURNEY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ANNUNZIO) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DOWNING.

Mr. WOLFF.

Mr. HAGEN of California.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BOGGS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CASEY.

Mr. TAYLOR.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 982. An act for the relief of Maj. Robert G. Smith, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2147. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Samuel J. Cole, U.S. Army (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2222. An act for the relief of Susan Jeanne Clynes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2798. An act for the relief of CWO Glen Zeigler, U.S. Navy (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3747. An act to designate the dam and reservoir to be constructed on the Sangamon River near Decatur, Ill., as the Henry Polz Dam and Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 195. An act for the relief of Sunnyside Seed Farms;

S. 1661. An act for the relief of Samuel C. Neiburg;

S. 2751. An act for the relief of David R. Siemon;

S. 3708. An act to assist comprehensive city demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and service necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in those areas, to assist and encourage planned metropolitan development, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to enable the United States to organize and hold an International Conference on Water for Peace in the United States in 1967 and authorize an appropriation therefor.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. **BURLESON,** from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 13161. An act to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for elementary and secondary schools, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. **BOGGS.** Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, October 22, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2832. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriations for the Department of the Interior for "Management of lands and resources," Bureau of Land Management, for the fiscal year 1967 has been reapportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

2833. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of the Interior for "Management and protection," National Park Service, for the fiscal year 1967, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

2834. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of the Interior for "Resources management," Bureau of Indian Affairs, for the fiscal year 1967, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

2835. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report of contracts negotiated during the period January–June 1966, pursuant to the provisions of section 2304(e) of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2836. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting an application by the Yolo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District of Woodland, Calif., for a loan and grant, pursuant to the provisions of 70 Stat. 1044, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2837. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting an application by the West San Bernardino County Water District of Rialto, Calif., for a loan, pursuant to the provisions of 70 Stat. 1044, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2332. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MAHON: Committee of conference. H.R. 18381. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2333). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee of conference. H.R. 15183. An act to adjust the status of Cuban refugees to that of lawful permanent residents of the United States (Rept. No. 2334). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on Un-American Activities. H.R. 16606. A bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2335). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. U.S.-owned foreign currencies, 46th report (Rept. No. 2336). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 18532. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that an employer's returns of social security taxes and income tax withholding shall be made on an annual basis, and to require that all such taxes deducted or paid (without regard to their amount) be deposited in a Government depository at least once each month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 18533. A bill to amend the administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and other customs laws, and to repeal obsolete provisions of such laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 18534. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 10-percent across-the-board increase in the benefits payable thereunder, wtih subsequent cost-of-living increases in such benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 18535. A bill to establish a Commission on Trading Stamp Practices to provide for the regulation of trading stamp companies; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 18536. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual may be entitled to child's insurance benefits based on a disability which began at any time before he attained age 22 (instead of only if the disability began before he attained age 18 as under present law); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 18537. A bill to amend and extend the District of Columbia Election Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 18538. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to extend financial and other assistance to industrial, commercial, processing, and marketing establishments in rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 18539. A bill to amend and extend the District of Columbia Election Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 18540. A bill to provide Federal grade standards for bacon; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HECHLER:

H.R. 18541. A bill to establish a Commission on Trading Stamp Practices to provide for the regulation of trading stamp companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 18542. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jinks Einstein Walter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 18543. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Angela (Angelina) Merola Squitieri and daughter Ida Squitieri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 18544. A bill for the relief of Conchita L. Feria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.R. 18545. A bill for the relief of Amelia Rodrigues Amaral; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 18546. A bill for the relief of Maria and Cercolo Ferrigno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18547. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Armetta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18548. A bill for the relief of Vito Ferrante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18549. A bill for the relief of Petronilla Adragna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VIVIAN:

H.R. 18550. A bill for the relief of Maxino Galvez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Hon. Santiago Polanco-Abreu Made Honorary Citizen of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 21, 1966

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Texas delegation in the Congress, I take this opportunity to inform the House that we have gained another member. It is my pleasure to inform you that recently my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. de la Garza] presented to the distinguished and very able Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, the Honorable Santiago Polanco-Abreu, a certificate of honorary citizenship of the great State of Texas—said certificate issued and properly signed by our great Governor, the Honorable John B. Connally. Among the outstanding qualifications which entitle our colleague, the gentleman from Puerto Rico [Mr. Polanco-Abreu] to Texas citizenship were the following:

He was elected to the House of Representatives, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, for the terms 1948, 1952, 1956, 1960. He was a member of the constitutional convention of Puerto Rico, 1951–52; chairman of the committee on finance; vice chairman of the Committees on Interior Government, Appointments, and Impeachment Proceedings and member of the Committee of Rules and Calendar. On January 17, 1963, the gentleman from Puerto Rico [Mr. Polanco-Abreu] was appointed speaker of the house, and served as a member ex officio of all house committees. Our colleague is also a member of the American Bar Association, Bar Association of Puerto Rico, Puerto Rican Atheneum, Association of American Writers, Lion's Club, and Pan-American Gun Club. His greatest asset is his charming and gracious wife, Viola.

Texas could not in good grace pass up such a distinguished career without making Mr. Polanco-Abreu one of our own. We welcome him.

Salute to the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 21, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, this week has marked the annual observance of National Business Women's Week by the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., throughout the country.

I am aware of the many groups in my district that are associated with the federation and of the wonderful work they continually do for our communities.

This week was first observed in 1928. The membership of the federation has now grown to 177,500 with over 3,750 local clubs in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Their growth is a testimony to the success and progress of women in business and the professions, as well as in civic and community activities.

I salute the members of the federation in my district and in every part of the Nation on their outstanding achievements and extend my best wishes for continued success in their future endeavors.

Basic Protections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 21, 1966

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, the genius of our system of Government rests in large part upon the free and constant vent it gives to the expression and implementation of all attitudes and interests. One key to this is in the protections afforded to individual rights and to the minority in every phase of our national life.

The U.S. House of Representatives is a place where this expression takes on full bloom. New problems in our society—new developments and new trends of thinking—all receive immediate attention and a sympathetic hearing in the House. Much of the reason for this stems from the frequent election of House Members. We must be constantly attuned and responsive to the rapid changes taking place across the country and, indeed, throughout the world.

With that in mind, it is with a feeling of great satisfaction that I call attention today to the demise, at least for this year, of proposals to lengthen the term of office of House Members—most notably the proposal enunciated by the President last January to extend the term from 2 to 4 years. This matter received hearings in the Judiciary Committee, but the committee did not act upon it.

Among other things, the frequent election of all House Members provides a restraint upon the majority and a curb against the abuse of power by the executive branch of our Government. The effect of it, in my estimation, is to protect the rights of the individual and of the minority in much the same way as do the first 10 amendments to our Constitution—the Bill of Rights.

In my newsletter of last January 27, I offered some of my views on the proposal for a 4-year term for House Members. This called to mind my newsletter of March 5, 1964, in which I discussed the ban on Bible reading in the schools in the context of the protections afforded to the minority by the Bill of Rights. In the thought that the interrelationships of these two discussions may be of interest, I submit for the RECORD my newsletter of January 27, 1966, and the relevant portion of my newsletter of March 5, 1964:

[News Letter No. 3, Jan. 27, 1966]

A FOUR-YEAR TERM?

(Congressman JOHN C. KUNKEL reports from Washington)

In my report to you today, I will discuss President Johnson's proposal to lengthen the term of office for Members of the United States House of Representatives from two years to four years. At the outset, I should make it clear that I favor retaining the two-year term. Perhaps I would best support my position by signing off right away with some kind of slogan like "Democracy is not advanced by holding fewer elections." However, the issue is far more complex than that. In fact, it may well be the most serious and far-reaching question that has confronted the country in many years—even more serious than the question of whom we elect as President or whether or not we pass this or that piece of legislation. For the decision we make on it could have a tremendous influence on the kind of government, as well as laws, we are to have in the years ahead. In that light, it deserves the widest possible discussion and argument.

When they wrote our Constitution in 1787, our Founding Fathers wisely attempted to create a system of limited government. They employed a number of checks and balances to insure its permanence. For example, they attempted to assure that the legislative, executive and judicial branches of government would remain independent of each other. They carried this idea of checks and balances over into the make-up of the Congress. They agreed upon representation of state interests in the Senate and upon lengthy terms of service—six years—for Senators. On the other hand, they agreed that the House of Representatives, as James Madison put it, "should have an immediate dependence on, and an intimate sympathy with, the people. Frequent elections," Madison added, "are unquestionably the only policy by which this dependence and sympathy can be effectually secured." Actually, the two-year term for House Members resulted as a compromise between those advocating a one-year term and those advocating a three-year term. So there is no magic in the number "two."

However, I submit that there is magic, or the closest thing to it, in the principle of "frequent" elections. That principle was important then and is important now. The Constitutional Convention gave no serious consideration to what President Johnson now proposes—that we elect House Members to four-year terms at the same time that we elect a President. That is a fact well worth noting.

Limited government depends greatly upon the restraints placed upon the executive branch—upon the President. One of the most important restraints has been the requirement that all House Members be elected in the middle of each President's four-year term of office. In large part, this has given the people the opportunity to voice approval or disapproval of the policies of the Administration in power. If the electorate feel the President is going too far too fast in one direction they may wish to place a brake on him. They have an opportunity to elect to the House those people most likely to apply that brake.

Our Presidents should know from our history that they must proceed with caution and with careful deliberation. This is an additional restraint upon executive power. For in the 44 Congressional elections which have taken place in the middle of Presidential terms ever since 1790, the party in power has lost seats in the House of Representatives 26 times. In addition, twelve Presidents have suffered the even greater blow of losing majority control of the House to the other party in the middle of their terms.

These restraints would be removed if House Members were to be elected only every four years at the same time we choose a President. This change would greatly strengthen the President's hand for pursuing whatever course he desired for four years, regardless of public opinion. In some cases, with heavy majority control of both houses of Congress, he could assume practically dictatorial powers over a considerable period of time. You can see evidence of that right now and during the past year. Now it may be argued that under this system, the President's party would not necessarily control the House of Representatives—as the Republican Party did not during six out of Dwight Eisenhower's eight years in office. However, history tells us that this is a poor argument. In 39 out of our 45 Presidential elections, the party whose candidate won the Presidency also has obtained a majority of seats in the House.

This strong tendency for the President to carry House Members into office with him raises still other dangers. First, if Mr. Johnson's proposal were adopted, there would be less chance than there is now for a House Member to be elected primarily on the basis of his own qualifications and merit. This factor of individual merit—in addition to the electorate's judgment on Administration policies—has a fairly good chance of coming into play at the present time in our mid-term Congressional elections. It would be smothered if House Members were chosen only in Presidential election years.

Secondly, Mr. Johnson's proposal seriously narrows the public's choices and its ability to correct what it later finds to be mistakes. For example, a President may be elected not so much on the basis of his own popularity as upon his opponent's lack of popularity. Many people look upon the Johnson-Goldwater contest of 1964 as an illustration of this. Yet the complexion of the House of Representatives might be based for four whole long years upon just such a quirk of circumstance. If the independence of the Congress is not to be blotted out altogether, then the make-up of its membership must be based upon many factors and choices and not so much upon the single choice of a President.

In additon, a House Member put into office on the President's coattails may quickly prove to be a completely unsatisfactory public servant. As it is now, the electorate can replace him in two years. Under Mr. Johnson's proposal, the electorate would have to wait four years, and it is conceivable that this same House Member might squeak by again on the President's coattails.

But the really ironic thing—for those who advocate a four-year term as a means of promoting harmony between the Congress and the President—is that once in a while majority control of the House might fall to the party in opposition to the President. In that case, the obstruction and bitterness we have seen in recent times during two-year periods could extend over a period of four years and do great damage to the country. There would be no mid-term election in which the President could attempt to win back control of the House. The President would be blocked for his entire term of office.

Our present system places restraints not only upon the President but upon the House Members themselves. While it is true that many Members owe their election in part to their adherence to a President, it is also true that they may have to deviate from that adherence at times or else face ouster from office. This is because, with an election facing them every two years, they must be immediately responsive to the needs and wishes of their districts. In my estimation, a four-year term would tend to make House Members less responsive and therefore, in many cases, much more likely to yield to pressures of the Administration in power. At least for the first two or three years of such a term, there would be much less urgency upon a Member to keep well informed, to perform his duties competently and to serve the needs of his constituents.

Certainly the figures relating to length of service indicate that the great majority of House Members are responsive to the people. The average Member is now in his tenth year of service, and 286 of the 435 Representatives have served more than two terms. By the same token, obviously the argument about Members needing more time to learn their jobs applies almost solely to the 88 Members who are now in their first term. The fact is that by the end of their second term, most Members have acquired sufficient competence that campaigning every other year becomes almost second nature to them and need not unduly interfere with the performance of their duties.

I wish there were time and space in this report to discuss some of the many other factors bearing upon this issue—also some of the alternatives to the four-year term as proposed by President Johnson. Probably there will be an opportunity to discuss a few of these things in future reports. However, for the most part, they are side issues, and many of them are quite inconsequential when measured against the central point. The real nub of it is the concept of frequent elections of House Members as a restraint upon executive power and as one of the keys to limited government.

In terms of serving and responding to the forces and conditions of our society which are changing ever more rapidly as time marches on, I believe our present system is the best yet devised.

[News Letter No. 8, Mar. 5, 1964]

Bible Reading

(Congressman John C. Kunkel reports from Washington)

Many of the letters from my friends back home on the Supreme Court's Bible reading decision, ask questions like these:

How can nine men over-rule the majority of the people in the nation? Isn't this a Democracy where the majority rules?

These are penetrating questions. They should have an answer.

So let me take a few minutes to explain why the Supreme Court could not consider the wishes of the majority in deciding these cases and why the Court had to rule out any consideration of this point in its deliberations.

The minority in our country does not rule except in certain specific instances provided for in our Constitution. Our Constitution was finally adopted and ratified only on the promise that certain amendments to it would be adopted immediately thereafter. These are the first ten amendments. They are known as the "Bill of Rights". In the main, these ten amendments were designed to protect certain rights which our forefathers had fought and secured for themselves by blood, sweat, and tears. They held them to be inalienable possessions. They wanted to make sure that these same rights and privileges would forever remain the exclusive possession of every single one of their descendants forever. Therefore, they wrote it into the Constitution that these rights could not be taken away from any individual by either the President, the Congress, or by a majority, no matter how large that majority might be. Under the Fourteenth Amendmen, it was further provided that these same rights and privileges would be protected to individual citizens from any usurpation by State Legislatures, or by State action. If you will re-read the first ten amendments, I am sure you will agree that you would not like to have anyone or any huge majority able to deprive you of these rights. You would not give them up voluntarily. In fact, you would fight "tooth and toe nail" to retain them. The Bill of Rights is the keystone in our protection of personal liberty.

The courts were given the duty of deciding how far these rights and privileges evtended. The courts also were given the power to protect them and to define them. That is what the Supreme Court did in its decisions in the Bible ban cases. Whether the Court's decision was right or wrong, is clearly open to argument. You can contend that the Court construed the Establishment Clause too broadly. But the decision remains the law of the land until changed by the Court or by constitutional amendment. In any event, it is clear that the Court's decision had to be based on what the particular individual's right was and on whether prayer in the schools was an infringement of it. The Court, under our Constitution, could not take into account the wishes and desires of the majority. In *West Virginia Board of Education v. Barnette*, 319 U.S. 624, 638 (a decision in 1943), Justice Jackson stated this proposition very clearly.

"The very purpose of a Bill of Rights was to withdraw certain subjects from the vicissitudes of political controversy, to place them beyond the reach of majorities and officials and to establish them as legal principles to be applied by the courts. One's rights to . . . freedom of worship . . . and other fundamental rights may not be submitted to vote; they depend on the outcome of no elections."

I trust this little discourse on the subject will be of value in your thinking on this fundamental issue.

I am quite positive in my own mind that my friends who want a suitable amendment would be just as firmly opposed as I am to any impairment of the Establishment Clause. Such an impairment would open the door for a State-backed religion. History has shown that a union of government and religion tends to destroy government and to degrade religion. In addition, whenever government has aligned itself with any particular form of religion, the result has been that it incurred the hatred, disrespect, and even contempt of those who held contrary beliefs. That same history shows that many have lost their respect for any religion that relied upon the support of government to spread its faith. Also, governmentally-established religions, and religious persecutions go hand in hand.

There are many established religions in various countries throughout the world today. The most glaring example is in the Soviet Union. Perhaps an established "irreligion" would be a more accurate term. It is atheism—the belief that there is no God at all. And under this, the Russians use the establishment to crush out all other religions and to do everything possible to prevent the recognition of God throughout the length and breadth of their vast domain. They persecute the Jews and the Christians and even the old, established Russian Orthodox Church. I do not want any established religion in this country. Consequently, any proposed amendment, in my judgment, should accomplish the dual purpose of providing for the recognition of God and at the same time should not in any way impair the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment of the Constitution.

Got Any News for Me Today?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 21, 1966

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, as the 89th Congress draws to a close, there will be numerous statements recounting the many major and significant achievements of this great Congress. It is a time to reflect back upon the fruits of our labor with a great deal of satisfaction and pride in the legislative accomplishments of the past 2 years. Unfortunately, for myself and other members of the Virginia delegation, the progress of the 89th Congress has not been without its price, since on August 24 of this year we suffered the loss of a dear friend and a highly respected newspaperman, Mr. Clarence G. Marshall, at the age of 81.

Affectionately known to most of us as "Marsh," Clarence Marshall was a familiar figure around Capitol Hill, covering the Washington news scene for the Daily Press and the Times-Herald of Newport News, Va. At a time when most men would have contemplated retirement and resting upon the laurels of significant accomplishments over more than three-score years of activity in the field of journalism, Marsh was still on the job of reporting the news to the people of the Tidewater area up to the very moment of his death. As a matter of fact, when Marsh was stricken with the fatal heart attack which took his life, he was in my office discussing with me the current proceedings of our Committee on Merchant Marine, an area in which he maintained a vital and continuing interest.

Marsh was a newspaperman's newsman. He had a distinguished writing career which commenced 65 years ago as a cub reporter on the Times-Herald. Later he served as the first managing editor for the U.S. Daily, now known as U.S. News & World Report. He also served as senior editor of Kiplinger's Changing Times. He was a charter member and assisted in the founding of the National Press Club, and he was the mentor of many newsmen whose careers he helped to shape.

The 19th century poet and philosopher, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, once stated that:

> In every man's writing, the character of the writer must lie recorded.

So, too, is the character of Clarence Marshall recorded in his conscientious pursuits to serve the readership of the Tidewater area. The esteem in which he was held by his associates is exemplified by the following memorial resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Daily Press, Inc., on September 26, 1966:

> Whereas an association together that dated back 65 years came to an end on August 24, 1966 in the death of Clarence G. Marshall, Washington Editor of The Daily Press and The Times Herald, and

Whereas through the years Mr. Marshall gave freely of his time and effort to the interests of these two newspapers as a faithful employe and official as well as when he was employed by other organizations, and

Whereas Mr. Marshall served for 31 years as a Director of The Daily Press, Inc., and for shorter periods as director of the subsidiary Hampton Roads Broadcasting Company and Southern Colorprint Corporation, giving valuable advice and important and wise counsel due to his intense interest in these organizations, and

Whereas Mr. Marshall was a personal friend to stockholders, officers, executives and the personnel generally of The Daily Press, The Times-Herald, and WGH, all of whom miss him very much, now, therefore be it

Resolved by the Directors of The Daily Press, Inc., That through unanimous action taken at the regular board meeting in August, 1966, they express to his widow, Mrs. Alice Marshall, their sincere and heartfelt sympathy in her personal loss, and be it further

Resolved, That these resolutions be inscribed in the minutes of The Daily Press, Inc., to show the formal expression of the Board of Directors in lamenting the death of Mr. Marshall, a long-time associate and genuine friend, who did so much for these newspapers over the years and who served them so faithfully and fully as an employe, a director, executive and lastly as Washington Editor.

The loss of Clarence Marshall from the Capitol Hill news beat is particularly distressing to me. The halls of these buildings will seem a little bit emptier knowing that this distinguished newspaperman from Virginia will no longer be in our midst. No longer will we be able to anticipate seeing the approach of this eldest member of the Fourth Estate with the inquiry that had become his trademark "Got any news for me today?" It is a loss which the English poet, Robert Southey, probably best expressed in representing my feelings over the death of Clarence Marshall when he said, and I quote:

> The loss of a friend is like that of a limb; time may heal the anguish of the wound, but the loss cannot be repaired.

H.R. 17777

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY A. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 21, 1966

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that Congress is adjourning without taking action on H.R. 17777 which I introduced, making it a violation of Federal law, punishable by 5 years imprisonment or $10,000 fine or both, for a person to cross State lines or use interstate commerce with the intent of inciting or participating in a riot. A hearing was held on this bill by the House Judiciary Committee, but no action was taken. Since such language was added to the civil rights bill by an overwhelming vote of the House it is evident that it is supported by most of the House membership.

The time has come for Congress to speak up on the side of law and order in America. We must arrest and reverse the trend toward lawlessness.

There is a grassroots demand coming from all sections of America for action of this type by Congress. It is obvious that race riots of the type that we have had in many American cities this summer are un-American and are damaging to both races and to all participants. They have been embarrassing to law-abiding citizens everywhere. They have seriously damaged race relations and the civil rights movement. They have created a distorted and unfortunate image of America as seen by people of other nations.

The Supreme Court has made certain that the criminals receive all of the protection to which they are entitled under the Constitution. It is time for Congress to protect the constitutional rights of the law-abiding citizens.

I plan to reintroduce this bill at the beginning of the next session of Congress, and recommend its enactment to my colleagues.

MERBISC—An Important Breakthrough in Community Recreation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN HAGEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 21, 1966

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I would like to call to your attention an important breakthrough in community recreation in Kern County, Calif., located in my congressional district. California City has just announced a phenomenal plan for maximizing community recreational participation. The plan is called MERBISC which stands for most extraordinary recreational bargain in southern California.

The MERBISC plan is the product of the joint efforts of a city and a private developer. It is a most exciting experiment in recreational planning and deserves our thoughtful study and our warm recognition.

California City was designed by its developers as a completely planned city in Antelope Valley which comprises North Los Angeles and East Kern Counties. California City, planned as a recreation and open space-oriented community, is an example of the type of new town development urged by administration leaders to slow the suburban sprawl and central city core decay characteristic of so many of our older cities.

Six years ago, voters in California City approved a $1 million bond issue to finance public recreational facilities. First built were two lakes, an island, a 42 feet high desert waterfall, an 18-hole, 3-par and night-lighted golf course, tennis courts, swimming pool, ball field, picnic areas and miscellaneous quiet sports. This was followed recently with creation of a 12-mile long parkway along the path of the historic 20-Mule Team Road which has been dedicated to public use in perpetuity and will be preserved in its original unpaved condition for equestrian and pedestrian uses. Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall has appealed for preservation of just such meaningful open space.

In addition, a new park in California City is being created near Galileo Hill, a beautiful landmark butte in the middle of this dramatic high desert area. This regional park, Galileo Park, will have pasture and barn facilities for horses, trailer and other camp facilities, a sanctuary for birds and other high desert wildlife, and, in general, make available—inside city limits—the wide-open Western way of life so easily lost in the rush to build out our existing communities to take care of America's exploding population.

Here, in eastern Kern County, in southern California, a city has boldly accepted the challenge and has declared itself as determined to build a new community centered around the needs of its people. Presently boasting a modest population of only 1,000, this California city looks confidently toward its ultimate potential size, estimated at 1 million people.

Mayor James Riley—just 10 years ago a resident of Boston, Mass.—and his city councilmen, Joseph Brockway, Ivan Manzer, Glenn Metzger, and Ted Sutherland, have retained planning and engineering experts to establish now the safeguards which will insure a continuing healthy climate of family-centered recreation and open space-oriented land uses for decades to come. The culmination of this work is the announcement by California City of a new idea to be known as MERBISC.

The MERBISC plan provides that a whole family can use all of the recreation facilities in California City for the total sum of $10 per year. And a MERBISC card insures that price for a full 10-year period. What makes this remarkable community step possible is the large scale on which California City was achieved. Through a unique arrangement between the city and the private development company, adequate revenues are guaranteed so that the city can operate the extensive recreation facilities without loss, and without taxation of its 20,000 property owners.

We all know that the cost of decent family recreation to the average American family runs to many hundreds of dollars per year. The MERBISC plan suggests the exciting possibility that, with proper planning and community concern, such cost can be tremendously reduced. In effect, California City has created an income boost for those families who subscribe to the MERBISC plan.

What makes California City's MERBISC idea especially noteworthy is that it comes not from the lead of a governmental agency, Federal or local, but rather springs from the feelings and action of the ordinary citizens of a young, thriving American community. What it announces to the world is that it is possible to provide the richest qualities and varieties of recreation experience to our populations right within their city limits. It proves that it is not, and should not be necessary for people to have to travel a great distance from their homes, and at great cost in time and money, to enjoy a full measure of family recreation.

If more communities could learn from the lesson of California City, if the idea of MERBISC could spread, there might be less need for the creation of more and more State and Federal parks. Indeed, much of the effort now expended on acquisition, development, and maintenance of new regional parks could be directed to encouraging more communities to develop within their own boundaries a new horizon of recreation availability which will make it possible for people to literally vacation at home. And perhaps most important, such vacationing may not be a matter of 1, 2, or 3 weeks per year, but a day-to-day experience and a better way of life for average American families.

Vice President Hubert Humphrey Speaks at Gannon College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. VIGORITO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 21, 1966

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY AT GANNON COLLEGE, ERIE, PA., OCTOBER 11, 1966

When I'm with young people, I like to talk about the future.

I know you're far more interested in the good new days than the good old days, and so am I.

Today I want to talk about something of vital concern to all of you—the air you are going to breathe and the water you are going to drink . . . and swim and water-ski in as well.

Back in my home state of Minnesota, they tell a story about an old farmer and his mule. The mule stalled right in the middle of the road one day.

First the old man took a two-by-four and smacked the mule between the eyes. Then he shouted: "Giddup!" and the mule got.

"Why the two-by-four?" a bystander asked. The old man answered, "The first thing I've got to do is get his attention."

I sometimes think we Americans are a little like that mule. Often, we don't seem to get going until something hits us between the eyes.

That has been particularly the case when it comes to our natural heritage. We have been blessed with so rich an endowment that we sometimes have been deluded into seeing it as limitless.

We took our forests for granted until they were threatened with exhaustion.

We misused our high central plains until they began blowing away as dust in the wind.

In both these cases, we did wake up and take remedial action—but, as in the old-time movie serials, it was just in the nick of time.

Now another crisis of immense proportions has hit us squarely between the eyes—the galloping deterioration of our Great Lakes.

These magnificent inland seas contain a third of all the fresh water on the world's surface. They are an asset of incalculable value to the nation.

We have carelessly treated them as inexhaustible—and now we are finding they are not. By using them as a dumping ground for all the wastes that our civilization produces, we have done grave damage to them.

You here in Erie know this all too well. For it is not too much to say that Lake Erie is dying before our eyes. Large areas of it are already as lifeless as a desert.

My good friend Secretary of the Interior Udall has said: "To fly over Lake Erie and look down into the cloudy mess of murderous pollution is like reading the flyleaf of a book on the end of civilization."

Last month I convened a Great Lakes Conference on Water Pollution, in Chicago, to bring to national attention what we see happening.

If we permit this to go on, it will be a tragedy of vast proportions. For there will not be another Lake Erie in this geologic age.

And this is more than a matter of sentiment and esthetics. It would be an immense economic disaster for the 25 million people who live and work on the Lake's shores—and for the nation as a whole.

I am confident that we can save Lake Erie. I have enough faith in the ingenuity of our scientists and engineers to believe that they can devise the means to do the job. And I have enough knowledge of the power of an aroused public opinion to believe that it will be done.

At Put-In-Bay there is a great monument to our victory in the first Battle of Lake Erie, back in 1813. I hope that, before too many years, we shall be able to celebrate victory in the second Battle of Lake Erie—the battle to make it fit—and keep it fit for our children and our children's children.

Lake Erie is by all odds America's number one water pollution problem. But Lake Michigan and Lake Ontario are also in bad shape. The experts say that, even if all the pollution of Lake Michigan were controlled, it would still take 500 years to make its water really clean again.

Congressman Vigorito has been one of the most diligent and effective Members of Congress in pushing for action to scrub the Great Lakes clean—notably in his bill to secure Congressional consent for the Great Lakes Basin Compact. Under this Compact, the eight states and two Canadian provinces bodering the Lakes can plan together and work together for their conservation—and their continued uses for the many purposes of our civilization.

This problem of water pollution is nationwide in scope, and it is getting worse—a sharp reminder to us that, in this changing world, not all change is for the better.

Indeed, the first man to identify change as the most pervasive element in life—the ancient Greek philosopher Heraclitus—put it in words that make sadly ironic reading today. He wrote:

"You cannot step twice into the same river, for fresh waters are ever flowing upon you."

All too often nowadays, the waters that flow upon us are the very opposite of fresh. They are laden with industrial and human debris. The U.S. Division of Water Supply calculates that 1900 communities, where 20 million Americans live, have inadequate facilities for the treatment of waste. In many, raw untreated sewage flows into the municipal fresh water supply every day.

The Hudson River is so badly polluted that, if absolutely no more sewage were dumped into it, the experts say it would still continue to contaminate itself for the next 15 years. That's a measure of the filth that has become an integral part of the river's bed. It used to purify itself every 15 miles. Now it repollutes itself every seven miles.

The Potomac River, which flows right past the doorstep of our nation's capital, is another case in point. President Theodore Roosevelt used to swim it regularly. Even in the heat of the Washington summer, no one in his right mind would do that today.

At long last—but far better late than never—we in America are beginning to tackle head-on the job of cleaning up our rivers and lakes—a task comparable, in classic mythology, to Hercules cleansing a thousand Augean stables.

Some 300 communities—and a great many industries—have in recent years joined in an all-out war against pollution. We are already up-grading the water used by more than 40 million people.

The combined efforts of federal, state, and local governments—and of many other public and private institutions—are being concentrated on this urgent task.

Scientists and technologists, supported by federal funds, are working out new ways of disposing of waste. They are sorely needed because, in important respects, our methods have hardly improved during the past generation.

Federal grants available to help municipalities construct new sewage facilities have been greatly stepped up.

We are also in process of establishing federal standards for water quality—recognizing that the waters of a single river often serve the needs of several states.

These standards will be particularly valuable to industry as guidelines for action. Many of our newest plants do a remarkable job in reducing and treating their wastes. Others do far less well—some very badly. Standards applied to everyone, across the board, will spur those who are lagging to catch up.

Maybe we would have acted more promptly if, like fish, we'd actually been living in waters which were gradually becoming deadly to us. Or maybe not.

For it is only very recently that our smarting and watery eyes have opened up to the fact that many of us are living at the bottom of another kind of ocean—the atmosphere—which is becoming more and more contaminated and inimical to our health.

Only a few years ago, smog was regarded as an affliction peculiar to Los Angeles—and a favorite target of comedians' jokes. Now, the laugh is on the rest of us—and, if we're laughing at all, it's often through smog-induced tears.

The kind of clear day when one can see forever is, for many of us, increasingly rare. Already air pollution has increased to such an extent that, according to the United States Public Health Service, no fewer than 7,300 communities are affected to varying degrees. And they include desert and mountain cities which most of us still associate with the most sparkling crystal-clear kind of air.

We owe a very great debt to the harassed citizens of Los Angeles. They were the first to be hit by smog—and the first to react to it. They are responsible for a great deal of the technological and administrative know-how for fighting air pollution—including the kind of pollution-controlling devices which, under new federal law, will be mandatory equipment on all 1968 automobile models.

Other new federal programs are designed to develop more effective methods to control air pollution, and train hundreds of sorely-needed technicians.

Towns afflicted by air pollution generated in another state can now call for federal help—as can any city which isn't able to deal with its own problem. Federal grants are available to pay two-thirds of the clean-up costs, but most cities are still unwilling to chip in their share.

According to a recent Public Health Service survey, there are only some 130 city, county, and regional air pollution programs in operation—and some of these are token in character.

It's clear that, before much more can be done, a number of city halls will need a good swift kick in the seat of their apathy. That can only come from an aroused citizenry. And a great many people need to be aroused. A nation-wide survey undertaken by the chemical industry last year found that four-fifths of those interviewed did not consider air pollution a major community problem.

That kind of complacency is dangerous—and not only to property, but to life itself.

There is no doubt that air pollution is a contributing factor to the rising incidence of chronic respiratory diseases, like lung cancer, emphysema, bronchitis and asthma.

We often speak of individuals as being spoiled by success. It is our own spectacular economic success, particularly in recent years, which has resulted in the massive spoilage of our air and water. As industry has boomed, as cars and freeways and people have multiplied—so the wear and tear on our natural environment has doubled and re-doubled.

Unfortunately, as Justice Douglas has put it, our affluent society has also been an effluent society.

Where do you come in? As alert, active, and well-educated citizens, you have a vital and individual responsibility.

Experience shows that, in our American democracy, there are two essential pre-conditions to dealing with problems, like air and water pollution, which are nationwide in scope—and you can help with both of them.

First, the public must become informed about the nature of the problem. Here's a job for you. Get the facts—there are many more than I've been able to give you today—and see that they get around.

When people generally are aware of the problem, it can be said to have entered the public *consciousness*.

Second, the public must become sufficiently aroused to insist upon a solution. Don't wait for George to do that—get in and pitch yourselves.

When people get up on their hind legs and holler, the problem has not only entered the public consciousness—it has also become a part of the public conscience. At that point, things in our democracy begin to hum.

As I get around campuses, I run into many students who think that the individual has become the helpless victim of forces too vast for him to affect in any way.

Don't ever think you are merely fodder for some computing machine.

Archimedes said: "Give me but one firm spot on which to stand, and I will move the earth." And Americans have again and again proved this in ways that Archimedes never dreamed.

Upton Sinclair revolutionized the packing industry with his novel, THE JUNGLE. Rachel Carson forced us to take a fresh, hard look at the use of pesticides with SILENT SPRING.

These people had to start from scratch, or very near to it. Things are already moving, and legislation now going through Congress will put a great deal more federal muscle into the fight.

The job here is to get things moving much further and faster—and in thousands of towns and cities where lethal garbage is still being dumped into the water and the air.

There is need for every concerned citizen—for people like yourselves—to speak up loud and clear. For American public opinion is like an ocean—it cannot be stirred by a teaspoon.

Man is the only animal who has succeeded in contaminating virtually every square inch of his surroundings. But what he has done, he is surely capable of undoing. So let us here and now resolve not to rest until we have cleansed our waters, so that we can use them in safety—and cleared the air, so that we can all breathe easier.

The Truth About Busing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 21, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, first let me say as a strong advocate of civil and human rights for all Americans, I unequivocally oppose the forced busing of schoolchildren, for I do not believe it either accomplishes the aim of civil rights or adds to the improvement of our educational system. Equally I am firmly opposed to any Federal control over our education system since I believe that local autonomy must be maintained.

However, the false issue of an alleged plan by Federal education authorities to impose a nationwide policy of forced busing on local school districts has been brought into sharp focus of recent date by many extremist groups whose only interest is personal gain.

In true fashion these "fear merchants" have enlisted front organizations like the so-called Committee for the Preservation of Suburban Schools in my district to give an aura of civic respectability to a cynical, unethical, and demogogic attempt to win votes.

They have not hesitated to employ the most reprehensible fear-and-scare tactics in their attempt to deceive the people that such a threat to traditional local school autonomy really exists.

The threat of Federal interference in local school autonomy to correct racial imbalance or for any other purpose is the "bogeyman" invoked by those who seek to incite the so-called backlash.

The hard truth of the matter is that, even if the Federal education authorities wished to impose a busing policy on local school districts, they could not do so.

They could not do so because there exists, in the Constitution of the United States and in the Federal law, every possible safeguard against Federal interference in local school autonomy.

The 10th amendment of the Constitution unequivocally states that "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Complete control of schools and education is one of the powers reserved to the States and the people by our Founding Fathers.

The Congress of the United States, anxious to reassure the people of the absolute sanctity of the traditional principle of local school autonomy, has taken measures to reinforce it.

The Civil Rights Act of 1966 specifically states:

> Nothing in this title [tile IV] shall be construed to authorize action by any department or agency to require the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 contains a specific provision reaffirming the intent of Congress to preserve local control. Title I of that law provides:

> On the administration of this section, the Commissioner shall not exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the personnel, curriculum, or program of instruction of any school or school system.

The 1966 Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which I voted for in the House, contains two more restricting amendments, further underlining the prohibition against any kind of Federal interference or control of local school systems.

The first of these amendments adds the following definitive language to sections 604 and 605 of the 1964 act:

> * * * or to require the assignment or transfer of students or teachers in order to overcome racial imbalance.

The second amendment to the 1966 act has the effect of removing any conceivable possibility that the racial composition of any school could be the criterion for eligibility of that school for Federal funds.

I have supported these amendments.

Moreover, I am on record as having repeatedly stated, on the floor of the House and in numerous public utterances, my unqualified opposition to forced interdistrict busing as a means of redressing racial imbalance or for any other reason.

Furthermore, when first made aware of something that "fear peddlers" called the Educational Opportunity Act of 1967, I questioned U.S. Commissioner of Education Howe, who stated that his department had neither the jurisdiction nor intent of interfering with local control and supervision of schools.

At this point, since the power to "bus" resides solely with the States and the Commissioner of Education, I directed the attention of Governor Rockefeller of New York to the fact that the people in my district are concerned lest their children be forced to transfer to schools outside their district. He had already indicated a willingness to bus our children. However, he passed the onus and responsibility to New York State Education Commissioner Allen, who has also indicated he favors the busing of schoolchildren.

In a telegram to the Commissioner on October 3, 1966, I passed on to him the desires of my community which is to preserve the character of our schools:

> Dr. James E. Allen, Jr.,
> *Commissioner of Education,*
> *Education Building,*
> *Albany, N.Y.*
>
> It has come to my attention that rumors are being circulated concerning an alleged proposal for the forced exchange and busing

of New York City and Nassau County school children.

If such a plan were to be seriously advanced by the Federal Government I would be unalterably opposed to it as I do not believe this approach would provide a cure for the evils of discrimination. The truth however is that upon checking I find that the Federal Government has made no such proposal, in spite of careless charges to the contrary. US Education Commissioner Harold Howe II has stated flatly the position of his agency and the Administration that educational decisions and control reside exclusively in the local community and State and that no Federal legislation is under consideration that would include any provisions for busing.

Therefore, Mr. Commissioner, if the Federal Government has not advanced such a proposal, any decision on such a plan must rest with you as our State Commissioner of Education and our State's Chief Executive, Governor Rockefeller. I call upon you to take whatever steps are necessary to prevent the destruction of our suburban school systems and to see that high education standards are maintained in our State.

Congressman LESTER WOLFF.

I informed these "front" committees that I had sent this telegram and suggested that they direct an inquiry regarding alleged school busing plans to these officials, inasmuch as the power to bus schoolchildren was theirs, not the Federal Government's. And, as I had done on previous occasions, I informed my constituents, through the press and by direct mail, of my position and the actions I had taken to remove any doubt about that position.

But, I regret to report, even in the face of these measures taken to dispel the fear and confusion wrought among my constituents by the irresponsible, unethical, and reprehensible extremist smear tactics, the rumors, baseless and iniquitous in their falsity, continue to be spread abroad.

They are being spread because demagogs persist in circulating them. Nothing, apparently, is too base and unconscionable in their minds.

In their desperate attempt to throw the populace into a confused state they have registered a new low in American politics.

I appeal to my constituents to reject this scurrilous attack on their good sense, and I appeal to my House colleagues to condemn this outrageous insult to the intelligence of all Americans.

Inflation Hits Those Who Cannot Strike Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 21, 1966

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, concerned at the number of letters I had been receiving from my older constituents about the rising cost of living, I recently conducted a poll of retired people in my district. My purpose was to determine the effect that inflation was having on them and on their way of life.

The results have been eye opening and at times heartbreaking. So far nearly 700 people have answered my questionnaire, many adding letters to explain their answers.

Some have lived on fixed incomes only 4 months, others as long as 48 years. The average is 10½ years.

Each one of these questionnaires tells me the story of a man or woman who has worked hard through his or her working years to provide for their retirement. Nearly all of them retired knowing that their income would be less than when they worked, but believing it would be enough to provide for their modest needs and give them security and independence in their remaining years. Almost no one anticipated what was to happen to them in these last few years.

The stories these people write tell of pensions and retirement annuities eaten away by high prices, of savings dwindling away to pay for food, of homes sold, of moving in with their children, of appealing to public welfare agencies, of eating two meals a day and meat once a week.

Mr. Speaker, this is a generation of men and women who have seen two World Wars and a depression. They are a proud generation of people who rolled up their sleeves instead of putting out their hands. They took up arms to protect this country when we needed them. They did without when they had to and they saved when they could.

All they ask now is that the money they have saved and the retirement incomes they have earned be worth what it was when they retired.

Almost without exception the replies to my poll tell me of economizing on an already tight budget, of buying the bare essentials of food, housing, and medicines. The bare essentials to which some of them have cut do not include clothes or meat every day, or eggs, or drugs and medical care. For most it means no car, no movies, not even trips by bus to visit their children.

Perhaps the most heartbreaking of all—and nearly everyone has reduced their standard of living drastically—are those who have sold the homes they spent most of their working lives paying for. Now, after retiring in a home they owned, they cannot make shrinking pension checks cover taxes and upkeep. Some move to trailers, some to apartments, some to undesirable neighborhoods and some to live with children.

Several of them are supporting other members of their family who have no income—an aunt, an orphaned grandchild.

They unanimously agreed that the biggest squeezes on their pocketbooks have come from food, medicine, and real estate taxes, in that order.

At a time in their lives when proper diet is essential, they can eat meat only once or twice a week. They report trying to sleep later so they can cut to two meals a day. Several are diabetics, for whom a high protein diet is a must; they have also cut down on meat although they know it will shorten their lives.

They have postponed needed medical attention, not taken drugs prescribed because they could not buy them, done with old glasses prescriptions, not had needed dental work.

Often they told of trying to get a job but being refused, or losing their social security or pension because of a little added income.

Many of them laugh at the President's "poverty level" of $3,000 a year and wish they had that much, or that $3,000 would buy what it did 3 years ago.

The constructive suggestions these people made particularly interested me, for they sound very much like the report and recommendations of the Republican Task Force on Problems of Aging.

A tremendous number of my constituents have asked for an automatic cost of living increase for social security and railroad retirement whenever the cost of living index rises above a certain percent. Civil service retirees already have this assurance that their income will at least in part keep stride with the cost of living.

As it is now, the retiree on social security is a pawn in a game of politics where each increase must be begged and bargained for. We have just seen the results of this—an increase promised just before elections that will go into effect during another election year.

Over 100 GOP Congressmen, myself included, have introduced such legislation and the GOP task force made this recommendation several months ago.

A large number of my retired constituents either work or would like to work to supplement their income and contribute to their own support. They are able-bodied, willing, and interested and can make an immeasurable contribution to our Nation's productivity. These people face two problems.

First, they have a very difficult time finding a job. Employers refuse to hire them strictly on the basis of their age. The GOP task force has urged that the Administration on Aging initiate an educational and informational program to reduce the resistance to employment due to age. The Department of Labor should step up its efforts to provide specialized placement services for older workers through its employment offices. Private employment services should be encouraged to do the same.

The second problem the older worker faces is the loss of his social security due to excess income. The social security laws restrict the amount of outside earnings to $1,500 a year without loss of social security benefits. The retiree and the Republican task force both realize that this is too low. A worker who has contributed to social security for most of his productive years is entitled to receive these benefits without being heavily penalized for his willingness and ability to continue working.

But like so many sound Republican proposals this year, my bills to increase income limitations for both social security benefits and veterans' pensions, and countless other similar bills have lain unheeded.

Several of my constituents have suggested tax relief for those over 65 in both income taxes and taxes on the property they live on. Both of these areas should, I think, be carefully explored by the appropriate taxing governments.

In nearly every questionnaire returned, people expressed not only a concern for the effects of inflation, but a good understanding of its causes. They protested the Federal Government's unbridled spending on nonessentials while supporting a war. They feel cheated when they read of billions of dollars of their money spent in unsound programs benefiting people better off than they, when the expense of these programs is what is making the value of their limited income shrink.

They have a right to feel cheated. The deliberate planning of inflation by the administration and the reckless fiscal policies of the spend, spend, spend majority in this rubberstamp Congress has put these people in the plight they are in. Promises of increases for some in 1968 will not get them out.

What these people need and deserve is a sound, well-run economy to live in. They need an economy where a dollar is a dollar, not 75 cents, not 89 cents, not 99 cents, but a dollar that will buy a dollar's worth of food and rent and clothing and medicine.

Mr. Speaker, the kind of people who wrote to me can perhaps best be summed up in one sentence repeated in over half of the letters returned. It was worded in many ways and it followed many different stories of doing without such as I have described here. It was usually as a note at the bottom of the page: "but I'm lucky—a lot of my friends are worse off than I am."

Mr. Speaker, I am ashamed of a Government that would deliberately take advantage of these people.

The 50th Anniversary of Millville, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 21, 1966

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include herein part of a speech which I recently delivered on the occasion of the 50th anniversary celebration of the great town of Millville, Mass., in my district.

This event was largely attended by the townspeople of Millville and by many dignitaries too numerous to mention, including the very able and distinguished Speaker of the Massachusetts House of Representatives, the Honorable John F. X. Davoren, a dear friend and outstanding leader.

This event was one of the most unusual and impressive that I have ever had the honor, privilege, and pleasure to attend, and I will long remember the depth of feeling and the enthusiasm expressed by the many who gathered for the anniversary dinner at the old historic town hall of Millville, where fond memories of the past combined with the heartening realities of the present to make a very memorable occasion for all those fortunate enough to be in attendance:

REMARKS IN PART OF CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN AT ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION OF TOWN OF MILLVILLE, MASS., SUNDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1966

It is a great pleasure, a very happy privilege and a high honor for me to join you on this 50th birthday celebration of the beautiful and great town of Millville.

I want to congratulate all of you—your distinguished committee and officials, your religious, civic and business leaders and all the people of Millville upon this splendidly conducted anniversary and to wish for you a truly glorious future.

From early days, this community has been noted, as it is today, for its religious and patriotic dedication. This town was founded by resolute, God-fearing people, hardy souls who did not know the meaning of the words fear or doubt, determined pioneers, unalterably devoted to belief in Divine Providence, and determined to live under conditions of freedom, liberty and peace.

Like every community, Millville has had its problems and its struggles. But it has also had its gains and its victories. They have been many and significant, and they have contributed greatly, not only to the well-being and happiness of this wonderful community, but also to the great life-stream of national strength which is represented by our country.

Thanks to that spirit and the labors, the loyalty and the devotion of our people throughout the years with the Lord's blessings we have become the giant of the North American Continent, the most powerful, richest and most advanced nation in the world, rich almost beyond contemplation, powerful in ways that stagger the imagination, rich with accumulations of industry and the returns of commerce and the highest standards of living the world has ever known.

With material progress has come unprecedented progress in the arts, sciences, civilization, religion, spiritual development, scientific progress, and all of these have their proud temples in this beautiful town, and the towns, villages and cities spread from coast to coast, north, south, east and west all over this great nation.

The people of Millville have recognized the responsibilities and duties that go along with strength and power and the endowments of free government.

In war and peace, you have shared the great sacrifices that have been made, you have lived by the principles, ideals and values from which our national strength and greatness have been drawn, and the urgent need for resolutely guarding them, so that the precious blessings of liberty might be assured for this nation and the free world.

Today, we must be thankful, with hearts overflowing with everlasting gratitude, for the blessings of the Creator and the marvelous work of those who have preceded us, and whose cherished memory we honor.

Today, we must draw inspiration from this great and glorious past history, even as we realize that we can never turn back the clock, that the nation and the world must go forward, must go upward to broader and higher goals, must adapt to the almost incredible changes that are taking place and are made necessary by the demands and needs of the nuclear jet age and the fabulous times in which we live.

Each generation of Americans must labor to keep the lamps of freedom burning, and, if necessary, it must meet every and any test to preserve human liberty and freedom, and the right to enjoy free, democratic government, free enterprise, free religious worship and individual rights.

In this dangerous world, where aggression and tyranny challenge the sacred rights of free peoples, we must stand as we have always stood, with courage and high purpose, unalterably committed, to defend the security of the nation and uphold the principles of truth and justice and ordered liberty upon which our great free system is based.

And as we do this, determined to preserve, our heritage we must and will continue to, strive with all our hearts and energies for a just and honorable peace in Vietnam and in the world, a universal peace that will permit all human beings to live under the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man free from dictatorship and tyranny and the dreadful scourge of war.

Let us rededicate ourselves and resolve: never to oversimplify or overcomplicate our problems, or to abandon the principles and values that made us a great God-fearing nation, always to stand with courage, faith and determination in the struggle to preserve and advance the cause of freedom, always to remain firm, without fear or doubt, in the spirit of the Founding Fathers, and those who preceded us, to keep this nation what it was intended to be: a safe, free, secure dwelling place for the human spirit, a sanctuary for those dedicated to human freedom and unalterably pledged to human peace and progress.

I commend and congratulate all the leaders and people of Millville on this historic anniversary of this beautiful community and hope and pray that in the time to come the good Lord will bring you all choicest blessings of good health, prosperity, happiness and peace.

Let me assure you, my friends, that I am exceedingly proud of the very high honor of representing this great community in the Congress of the United States, and I am extremely grateful for the strong loyal support in my official work that you have always rendered me and many evidences of warm friendship you have so generously extended me.

I have every confidence that this fine town of Millville with its superb leadership and loyal people, will move forward in the future to even greater heights of accomplishment and well-being and success in your endeavors, and that you will zealously preserve and enhance here in the time to come, as you have done in the past, the quality of spiritual dedication, patriotism and zeal for achievement, prosperity, progress and brotherhood, for which you have always been noted.

In this way, you will always maintain the close ties of loyalty, mutual respect and affection which are so essential to human relations and American community life, and so valuable in building the strength of the Nation and safeguarding the fountainhead of enterprise and freedom.

Thank you all very much for giving me the high privilege of being with you on this great and memorable occasion.

A Report on the 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 21, 1966

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am setting forth herewith my 89th Congress Report to the residents of the 15th Congressional District of Illinois:

DEAR FRIENDS: The second session of this 89th Congress will, at long last, have drawn to a stormy end by the time you receive this report—and when the final tally of bills enacted into public law is made, the number will surpass the 349 public laws enacted in the first session. As you know, this 89th Congress has been controlled by the Democrats who have a 2 to 1 majority in both the House and the Senate. Thus, I thought you might be interested in what two of the Democrat Leaders had to say when they spoke of the accomplishments of this 89th Congress under their leadership. These remarks are taken from the Congressional Record for October 17.

The Speaker of the House said: "I can sum up the record of the 89th Congress of this House of Representatives in just one word—fabulous." Perhaps he is right! Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, 1961 edition, defines the word fabulous as meaning "feigned, as a fable; fictitious. Like a fable, esp. in exaggeration; astonishing.—Syn. See fictitious." Fictitious, in the dictionary, is defined as meaning "feigned; imaginary; not genuine."

On the other hand, the Senate Leader had this to say: "In these two sessions, we have written into the statute books legislation whose scope and excellence have never been equaled in the history of the Republic." I think you will agree that his use of the word "excellence" this fall is in direct contrast to his analysis of the legislation when he remarked at the end of the first session: "We have passed a lot of major bills at this session, some of them very hastily, and they stand in extreme need of a going-over for loopholes, rough corners, and particularly for an assessment of current and ultimate cost in the framework of our capacity to meet it."

"Excellent" might be just the word to describe the accomplishments of this 89th Congress if one is talking only in terms of quantity. However, some might feel that the term "fabulous" as defined in the dictionary might be more apropos when speaking of quality. Personally, I have faith in the ability of the residents of the 15th District of Illinois to judge the accomplishments of the "Great Society" and the 89th Congress for themselves on the basis of the facts and the record established under both. Therefore, I am setting forth just a few of these facts so that you can draw your own conclusions.

The first session of this 89th Congress appropriated some $119 billion. On October 14, the House Appropriations Committee Chairman warned: "it now looks like appropriations this session will roughly approximate $144–$145 billion." The actual National Debt has increased by over $8 billion in the last two-year period. The interest cost alone on the National Debt has risen by about $2 billion in the same period. Interest rates are the highest they have been in 45 years, and because of the "tight money" situation the private housing industry is in a slump. The cost of living has increased by leaps and bounds—as you all know only too well from experience without my having to set forth any statistics. This rising cost of the necessities of life causes hardship for everyone—but particularly for those who are retired and trying to manage on small fixed incomes, for those in the lower income brackets, and for the young married couples trying to establish homes and raise children. Billions of dollars have been poured out to eliminate poverty—and still, according to figures used by the Administration, the multi-billion crash "war against poverty" program has failed to reduce the actual number of poor. Also, almost every day we read of some new scandal, another case of mismanagement, and another instance of gross waste of the American taxpayers' dollars in the poverty program. It has been costing the American taxpayers over $9,000 per year for each job corps trainee—more than most parents spend to send a child to college for four years! The farmers—like everyone else—have been caught in the price-cost squeeze, and the total farm debt has increased some $6 billion since 1964 despite costly farm programs which are supposed to help the farmer. Social Security taxes have been increased, certain excise tax cuts granted in 1965 and the investment tax credit have been rescinded—and there is more and more talk that individual income taxes will be increased after the election. There is a serious balance of payments problem and our gold supply has dwindled over $2 billion.

Crime has increased 8 percent the first six months of 1966 over the same period in 1965. There have been approximately 50 riots throughout the land since 1964. The teacher shortage is reaching the critical stage and there is more and more evidence that the Office of Education hopes to use the leverage of Federal funds to expand Federal control over our schools and textbooks. The number of our brave men fighting in Vietnam against the Communist aggressors has risen from 23,000 at the end of 1964 to 324,000 at the present time—and while our men are fighting the Communists, the Administration is increasing its aid and trade to Russia and her satellites who in turn are helping the North Vietnam aggressors.

It did not take me long to learn after first coming to the Congress in 1963 that the quality of a legislative proposal cannot be judged simply on the basis of an appealing or fancy title or by the fact that billions of dollars are provided—just as one cannot judge a book by its cover. I have, therefore, endeavored to study each bill line by line—keeping in mind the best interests of all American citizens when so doing, and voting for passage of those measures which I considered were in the best interests of all American people and were not merely raising false hopes. Those of us who are concerned over the failures and the inadequacies of various legislative proposals have diligently and constantly sought to improve such legislation through amendments or through offering alternative plans—only to have our proposals rejected time and time again. I, myself, have introduced legislative proposals which I consider to be constructive alternatives to Federal control and Federal handouts. These include my bill to allow tax credits for parents who pay for their own children's higher education, a tax credit for teachers seeking to improve their skills, a tax credit to private industry desiring to train the workers they need so desperately. None of these, however, was even brought up for consideration by the Democrat leadership. I have also introduced a number of other bills seeking to solve various problems facing the Nation. At least, I am pleased to reiterate the fact that the Freedom of Information Bill which I co-sponsored did become law and will become effective next year.

I have been submitting regular reports through my newsletter and the news media relative to my stand on various major legislative proposals considered during this 89th Congress so I will not attempt to go into detail in this report. I would reiterate, however, that I did support many, many measures which I considered to be in your best interest—including air and water pollution control bills, veterans benefits, narcotic drug control legislation, various health measures, highway and motor vehicle safety, grants to help older people, vocational and manpower training programs, voting rights bill, proposals seeking to prevent aid being given to Communists, free mailing privileges for Vietnam servicemen, bail reform, legislation aimed to help small business—just to name a few.

If you have any questions regarding my stand on any specific issue or bill, please do write to me. Also, I shall be glad to provide future issues of my newsletter upon request to anyone not already receiving it. Finally, I do hope I can count on your continued counsel which has been so helpful in the past.

Sincerely,

Charlotte T. Reid,
Your Member of Congress.

Public Works Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 21, 1966

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, this 2d session of the 89th Congress has been a marvelously productive one for our House Committee on Public Works. I would be remiss if I did not express my gratification over the year's accomplishments and my deep appreciation of the fine work performed by all of my colleagues on the committee.

A number of measures of great importance to the future well-being of the Nation were produced by our committee and enacted into law. Those of most significance were in the fields of water pollution control and highway construction and safety. As enhancements of other programs of long standing in the public works field, these will contribute much to strengthening the foundations and further laying the structural groundwork so essential to a healthy economy and the future progress of the Nation.

Out of our committee also have come important measures to provide relief from the ravages of natural disasters, to continue the development of our water resources, and to enrich the cultural and educational assets of the Nation's Capital.

However, it was not so much the quantity of our committee's accomplishments this year as it was the quality, in which I believe considerable pride can be taken. By not trying to do too much all at the same time, our committee, in my judgment, produced legislation of far higher caliber than that generally coming before the 89th Congress. A fine spirit of cooperation on both sides of our committee—and a willingness to listen to and to accept ideas proffered—largely accounts for this. In that connection, I wish to pay my respects particularly to our chairman, the gentleman from Maryland, George H. Fallon, and to our ranking minority member, the gentleman from Florida, William C. Cramer. My grateful thanks go to all members for helping to make my final year of committee work in the Congress a memorable and pleasant one.

In my estimation, one of the great landmarks of the 89th Congress will always be the Clean Waters Restoration Act of 1966. Really for the first time, through this act, the Congress gave due recognition to the immense building job that must be done to protect our sources of clean water. It did this by greatly increasing the authorizations of funds to be made available for sewage and waste treatment and disposal works—from a current level of $150 million to an average annual level of $850 million for fiscal years 1968 through 1971.

There are other aspects of this legislation of particular interest. It gives financial encouragement to basinwide pollution control planning. By increasing the Federal share where there is substantial participation in local projects by the States, it will stimulate a broader effort at all levels of government. It provides grants for experimentation and research in methods of treating industrial wastes. It authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to study and recommend ways of encouraging greater participation by industry itself in controlling industrial wastes. These could include such incentives as tax credits on control equipment. In this field, particularly, much remains to be done. There is a pressing need for this kind of program.

In addition to pollution control, the development of our water resources has required more and more of the time and attention of our committee. Normally in the past, projects in this field have been authorized only once every 2 years or so in an omnibus rivers and harbors bill. To keep abreast of the urgent needs, however, our committee went ahead and produced a $670 million measure including 40 projects only 1 year after the $1.9 billion Omnibus Rivers and Harbors Act of 1965. This year's enactment includes a breakwater and channel project at Elk Creek on the Pennsylvania coast of Lake Erie. It will save lives by providing refuge for small craft during storms.

As these needs for river and harbor development, flood control, and water conservation intensify, it may well be wise for the committee to act every year upon them. Indeed, we found it necessary last year, in order to keep up with construction schedules, to enact emergency authorizations for 10 river basins. This had my support, for otherwise work could not have been completed this year on the Curwensville Dam and Reservoir on the west branch of the Susquehanna River, and there might have been a 1-year delay in starting construction of the Blanchard Dam and Reservoir in the same basin. In combination with other west branch projects, these dams will greatly reduce potential flooding along the entire lower Susquehanna, including the Harrisburg area.

In the field of water resource development, it was a pleasure for me this year to see the first $1.5 million of construction money appropriated for a Pennsylvania project in which I have taken a great deal of interest. That is the Raystown Dam and Reservoir on the Juniata River in Huntingdon County. It originated in our committee several years ago. It will be some 4 years under construction. But when it is completed, it will provide a host of recreational opportunities for our people in central Pennsylvania, not to mention the protection it will afford against flooding along the Juniata and the lower Susquehanna.

The long-range planning necessary to the proper use of resources—including water resources—of the entire Susquehanna River Basin also is proceeding on schedule. That was assured this year by the appropriation of $590,000 to continue the Federal-State Susquehanna Basin study toward its anticipated completion in 1969. Altogether, it will have cost around $3 million. It will provide an invaluable guide for future public works endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, the 1966 session was marked by a cultural event of great magnitude for our Nation's Capital. This was the acceptance of the splendid art collection offered to our Government by Mr. Joseph H. Hirshhorn. As ranking minority member of our Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, I was privileged to have an active part in the legislative effort culminating in authorization of a museum and sculpture garden for this gift. It is one of the great private art collections in the world and contains what is undoubtedly the largest assemblage of American art in existence. It will be housed on the Mall between the Capitol and the Washington Monument and will be administered by the Smithsonian Institution. Through Mr. Hirshhorn, Lady Fortune indeed has smiled upon our Nation and its Capital.

Our subcommittee also produced the bill establishing a Commission to study the need for a visitors' center and other facilities—including local transportation and parking—to better accommodate the millions of people coming to see Washington every year. The Commission is to make its recommendations next October. Our Capital's historical and educational possessions are in superabundance. But for the average visitor, there is far too little time in which to see them. Facilities providing information and expert guidance will help many visitors make the very most of every minute they are here.

Practically without exception, measures reported by our Public Works Committee this year found favor with me on final passage. A bill that did not was the one authorizing an official residence for the Vice President on the grounds of the U.S. Naval Observatory. The cost: $750,000. I agreed that establishment of such a residence is long overdue. But with a war going on, with heavy Government expenditures contributing to the inflationary spiral, this seemed to me to be one of those projects we could postpone as not being absolutely essential at this time. Even the Vice President was perfectly willing to get along without it. My position on this was upheld when the President, although he signed the bill, agreed there should be no money appropriated for it this year.

Certainly, the circumstances of this situation were far different from those surrounding the legislation last year authorizing a third Library of Congress building. That structure, to be known as the James Madison Memorial Building, is desperately needed now. Library services for the whole Nation are being adversely affected by the appalling lack of space and facilities for the Library of Congress. The circumstances also were far different in the case of the measure authorizing the Hirshhorn Museum. Either this had to be done or else our Government risked losing these art treasures, quite possibly to some other country. I have taken a great deal of pride in being associated with both of these projects through my service on the Public Buildings and Grounds Subcommittee.

It was in this subcommittee, by the way, where the authorizing legislation originated for the new Federal office building and courthouse in Harrisburg. The first project I undertook upon returning to the Congress in 1961 was that of gaining approval of the study which led to erection of this building. The $6.4 million appropriation for construction was voted last year. It is a great source of satisfaction for me to see this building starting to rise toward its place in the Harrisburg skyline. It will provide a central location and much better working space for a number of Federal agencies now scattered around the city. It will help greatly to improve Government services in central Pennsylvania. Also, it will go a long way toward assuring that Federal agencies now in Harrisburg and the immediate vicinity will remain there. There were always rumors and threats about removing some of these agencies to other cities up to the time this building was approved and construction was started.

Mr. Speaker, our committee also this year took a most important step toward rounding out the forms of Federal assistance available to communities and individuals when natural disasters strike. The Disaster Relief Act of 1966 extends and makes more effective the measures enacted piecemeal and under emergency conditions following the Alaska earthquake of 1964, the Pacific Northwest floods of winter before last, the upper Plains flooding and Midwest tornadoes of 1965, and Hurricane Betsy which swept across the South last year. All wrought extensive and severe damage. This year's act fills a number of gaps. It includes provisions for adjusting repayment of certain Government loans where extreme financial hardship for borrowers otherwise would result, for FHA-insured disaster loans, for assistance to unincorporated communities and to colleges and universities, for restoration of public facilities and for better coordination of efforts and warning of impending disasters. It ties together what will be an effective program providing a breather for careful study of future recommendations.

Two vital measures in the highway field were produced by our committee this year. One is the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966. The major provisions of this act increase by $5.2 billion the authorizations for the Interstate Highway System through 1972 and authorize $1 billion as the Federal share for primary, secondary, and urban-extension roads and highways in each of the fiscal years 1968 and 1969. Besides the necessity of extending the time for completion of the Interstate System by 1 year to 1973, a matter of growing concern is the administration's continuing failure to make adequate financing provisions for completing the system on schedule. However, that is a matter for the Committee on Ways and Means. They raise the taxes. Aside from this problem, excellent progress is assured in most other fields of highway and road construction and repair under the 1966 act.

This session also saw the passage of a Highway Safety Act which hopefully will do much to reduce the toll of accidents and deaths and injuries on the Nation's thoroughfares. It authorizes $267 million over a 3-year period for assistance to the States and localities for such programs as driver education and testing, highway design and maintenance, accident investigation, vehicle inspection, and traffic control. Over the same period, it provides for $55 million worth of research and development in highway safety and accident investigation.

The roads and highways of this country are becoming more dangerous every day. They are now traveled by 90 million cars and trucks, and it is anticipated they will be clogged by 120 million vehicles by 1975. Last year, 49,000 people died in auto accidents in the United States. That is more fatalities in 1 year than our country suffered in battle in Korea in 3 years. It is estimated the annual death toll on our highways will mount to 100,000 by 1975 unless the tide is reversed by determined measures. Let us hope and pray that this year's act starts reversing it.

SENATE

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1966

The Senate met at 9 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by Hon. BIRCH BAYH, a Senator from the State of Indiana.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, as in reverence we hallow Thy name, so may we hallow our own, keeping our honor bright, our hearts pure, and our devotion to the Nation's welfare high and true.

As this hallowed Chamber so soon will be empty and silent, as the tumult and the shouting dies, breathe in our hearts the prayer—

"Still stands Thine ancient sacrifice, an
humble and a contrite heart,
Lord, God of hosts, be with us yet, lest
we forget, lest we forget."

And now may the Lord bless you and keep you; may the Lord lift up the light of His countenance upon you and give you peace—peace in your own hearts, peace in this dear land of ours, and a just peace throughout all the earth, now and evermore.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., October 22, 1966.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. BIRCH BAYH, a Senator from the State of Indiana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BAYH thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

PRINTING OF COMMITTEE ACTIVITY REPORTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with reference to the printing of committee activity reports for the session, I state, on behalf of the chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing (Mr. HAYDEN), that the Joint Committee on Printing has very properly ruled that the printing of such reports, both as committee prints and in the RECORD, is duplication, the cost of which cannot be justified.

It is requested that committee chairmen decide whether they wish these reports printed as committee prints or in the RECORD, since the Government Printing Office will be directed not to print them both ways.

AUTHORIZATIONS FOR INSERTIONS IN THE RECORD FOLLOWING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD following the adjournment of Congress until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published; but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred or to any speech delivered subsequent to the adjournment of Congress.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SITUATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before I ask that the Journal be considered as read, I should like to make a brief statement about the events on yesterday.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As the Senate knows, a number of conferences were held yesterday in my office, in the Vice President's office, which we usurped for the moment, and in the cloakroom. At those conferences were the distinguished and able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]; the distinguished and able Senator from Louisiana, the chairman of the Finance Committee [Mr. LONG]; the distinguished and able senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]; the distinguished and able Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and from time to time other Senators. The purpose of these meetings was to discuss the conference report on the foreign investors' tax bill, which had passed the House and Senate, which had gone to conference, which had been agreed to, as far as the conference report was concerned, by the House, and which was eligible for immediate consideration on yesterday by the Senate.

On yesterday morning, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], who has been most considerate and understanding throughout all this, called up the 7-percent investment tax bill; and when that was agreed to by the Senate and sent to the White House, he called up the conference report on the Foreign Investors' Tax. At my request, he withdrew his proposal, which was perfectly in order; and, at my further request, he allowed a number of other bills and conference reports to be considered while attempts were being made to find out if there was any area of agreement between the differing parties on the foreign investors' tax legislation.

I must admit, Mr. President, that I put in 6 of the most exhausting hours of my life, and certainly the 6 toughest hours during my service in the Senate. The end result, despite evidence—sound evidence—of some give and take, was absolutely nothing. Because of that, we will be faced with a situation which may well keep the Senate in session for some time, I am deeply and personally sorry to say.

I know that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] feel just as deeply and personally regretful about this development as I do. But, because of the fact that there was no area of agreement, despite the fact that some most substantial concessions had been offered by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, the chairman of the Finance Committee, there was no possibility of agreement; and last night I sent telegrams to all Democratic Members requesting their presence today.

I am happy to report that, on the basis of the evidence which we have accumulated today, if we do not have a quorum at the moment, we will have one by 12 o'clock.

I see, also, the distinguished secretary for the Democratic conference [Mr. SMATHERS] in the Chamber, who likewise participated in some of these conferences, and I want to give him full credit, also.

I feel especially sorry for those Senators who are running for reelection. Many of them are coming back. Some of their colleagues, who are not running for reelection, will be a little late in arriving.

I want to express, on the floor of the Senate, my deep and personal appreciation to the distinguished minority leader, who is now in Walter Reed Hospital, and who of his own volition called me on yesterday and said that if we needed another body, he was ready, able, and available. We will not call on him, nor will we call on certain other Senators nearby, because of events which have happened in their families.

But I do want to say, Mr. President, that I have nothing but admiration and affection for the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. He is exercising his rights as a Senator; and while it may cause some inconvenience to the rest of us, nevertheless, I have nothing but praise for his tenacity, his determination, and his belief that what he is doing is the right thing to do.

By the same token, I have just as much, if not a little more, praise for the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] who found himself in the dual capacity of being the deputy majority leader, trying to bring this Congress to a close, and, on the other hand, being the chairman of the Finance Committee, in charge of a bill which had passed both bodies, which had been agreed to in conference; and the conference report itself had been agreed to in the House. I want to express my deep personal thanks for the understanding he has shown, and to say that on yesterday he showed a great deal more leadership and understanding than did the Senator from Montana.

I also thank the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], who is opposed to the conference report and intends to fight it and speak against it. He has always, and especially in this case, been most considerate and understanding and very helpful in trying to work a way out of the impasse in which we find ourselves.

I am also deeply grateful to the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] who participated actively in these discussions and who is fully aware of the situations which developed, the possibilities which were considered, and the conclusions which were reached. I cannot thank him enough for the courtesy, the consideration, and the kindness which he has shown toward the Senator from Montana, because he, likewise, is in a particularly difficult spot after having had his supplemental bill passed by the Senate, agreed to in conference, and ready to be taken up on the floor. It is a bill which is very important. It has to do with funds for education, for veterans, for health, and other related matters, and which will not be forthcoming until the supplemental bill is passed.

I am aware of the situation which confronts this body at this time. Some of us have personal problems, others have election problems, and every Member, I am sure, has had to cancel engagements of some degree of significance. That is all right. We are paid to be Senators. We are paid to be on the job, and every Senator involved in this situation is acting within the rules and regulations of the Senate. I find fault with no one for what is being done, but I did think that this situation should be brought to the attention of the Senate and the public so that the cards would be laid on the table. Every time we have meetings of the sort we had yesterday, rumors and innuendoes and things of that sort spread and it is better that what can be done be done in the open, what can be said be said for all to hear.

We are in for a long session before we adjourn. I only express the hope that enough Senators will remain on hand so that we can attend to the business and vote this matter up or down.

I think that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is entitled to and will give this body a full explanation. I know that, being the man of honor and integrity he is, he will operate within the rules and regulations of the Senate and will keep me informed, insofar as he can, of what he intends to do, as he has done thus far, and I, in turn, will do my best to keep him informed of anything I intend to do before it is done.

Again, I am most sorry for those who have difficult campaigns and who have come back, or are on their way back, but I am deeply appreciative to them for what they are doing.

I now yield to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the reason that we cannot take up the supplemental appropriation bill first, on which there is general agreement, and then take up the controversial issue which seems to block us?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The reason is a practical one. I hope—and I stress the "I"—that we can keep enough Senators here so that we can pay proper attention to both of these bills, because both of them are important.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I want to say to the distinguished leader that no one has been more inconvenienced by the tactics being employed, and I use the word "tactics" advisedly and with no meanness, than has the Senator from Rhode Island. As a matter of fact I stayed up nights reviewing the record made on the appropriation bill, both on the floor of the Senate and in the House, so that I would be prepared and be able to expedite the adjournment of this Congress sine die, and so that I would not be held at fault because of delay on the part of our subcommittee.

We held hearings on the supplemental appropriation bill under strenuous and pressing circumstances. We came to the floor, and the Senate was very cooperative. We passed a bill in a very short time. We went to conference and resolved all of our difficulties.

I want to say to the distinguished leader that even I suggested to him the possibility of bringing up the supplemental appropriation bill before we discussed the foreign investment bill, and he explained his position well and explicitly to me. I realize the realities of the situation. If we passed the supplemental bill we could not get 20 Senators back to pass this other important bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Or to defeat it.

Mr. PASTORE. I realize that.

I paid my price. I do not know how many engagements I had back home. I have been inconvenienced, too. The trouble with the majority leader is that he is too genteel; he never pushed anybody; he never pressed anybody, he never raised his voice to anybody, and he has always gone that extra mile to be chivalrous and a gentleman.

There is not a blessed thing in this bill holding us up that has not been considered and voted by the Senate. We are entitled to a second look but we have to take into account the interest and comfort of other Members of this body, and the fact that there are a lot of Members here in marginal States where it is absolutely necessary for them to go back home and fight the battle that needs to be fought so that they may return to Congress in January.

If the bill that is holding us up contained anything that was added by the House, I think we would have every right to say we never considered that matter before, and you could stay here and delay and delay and delay, and you would be right in doing so.

I understand the matters that are the bones of contention, and I voted against the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And so did I.

Mr. PASTORE. I understand the matters that are bones of contention are matters passed upon not only by the committees, but also voted upon on this floor and overwhelmingly passed. This is nothing new.

The people who are holding up the Senate knew that there was a lack of a quorum yesterday afternoon. While the majority leader said that it is within every Senator's right to exercise his prerogatives—I am not critical of that—this is most unfair to the men who are struggling to be reelected and have to be carried all the way across the country to say, "I am present," because when the smoke clears from the battlefield, whether it is tonight, whether it is next week, or whether it is next month, the situation that exists today will be the same situation: that conference report is going to be approved as it is. I know that just as sure as the Lord made little apples.

That is all I have to say. No one is suffering more because of this than is the Senator from Rhode Island. We were ready to go last night. I would hope that the Senator will keep us here around the clock until we vote to adjourn sine die.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to say in the very tense moments in the Senate that we ought to pause a moment to appreciate our blessings. One of our great blessings, to which I call attention, and a great source of inspiration for all of us, is to see a man with us today who, I suspect, should not be with us for his own good—the fact that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is back.

The Senator from Arizona is a veteran of many battles, over the years, such as the one we are now confronting. His presence here should stimulate us this morning as we seek to get together to resolve the parliamentary situation which confronts us.

I am sure that the Senate wishes to join me in expressing that view, when we welcome our very dear friend the Senator from Arizona back to the Senate this morning. [Applause.]

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I realize that there are Senators on both sides of the aisle who have a critical need to be home campaigning.

Heretofore, I have never supported all-night sessions, or continuing sessions, but it seems to me, in simple justice to the many Senators on both sides of the aisle who have critical problems at home which require them to be there, that we should terminate this business, whether it go one way or the other—and I am not committed on either side—and do it as quickly as possible.

I hope that the distinguished majority leader will depart from his normal practice and keep us here, all night if necessary, and for such time as may be necessary tomorrow, until we can get through with this business.

I remind the majority leader that this is a matter on which no amendments can be offered. It is a matter on which two speeches on an issue are involved. It has application to a matter on which we can come to a head one way or the other and which can be disposed of in a brief time.

I think that in justice to the many Senators running for reelection and the difficult races which are confronting some of them, we should dispose of this matter in the shortest possible time.

My own strong recommendation—and this is a departure from everything I have done heretofore—is that we should stay here continuously until we dispose of the business before us. This may call for a Sunday session—I hope not—but I think we should get rid of this business and let Senators who have critical problems of campaigning go home and get back into the business of campaigning.

I hope that the distinguished majority leader will depart from his normal practice for the reasons which I have mentioned.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me say to the Senator from Florida that that matter is being given the utmost consideration.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I offered to yield everything in the bill that was my handiwork.

Not only in my judgment, but in other judgments—those of the Secretary of the Treasury and of many of his assistants, and I think I could confidently say in the judgment of the President—the proposal to finance presidential campaigns by a $1 designation from every taxpayer is the best thing in the bill. It is the best thing we will have done in years for good government. It will avoid the necessity of either party having to be dependent upon large contributions from corporation executives in order to present properly their case before the people and to be heard in political campaigns.

I offered to yield on that. I am not offering any more.

I am through bending the knee, Mr. Leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think the RECORD should explicitly show that the Senator from Louisiana did that. He did offer to yield on the campaign contribution amendment, which we all know is very dear to his heart.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would have been willing to yield on everything in the bill which was my own handiwork, even as Senator in charge of the bill and as chairman of the committee from which the bill was reported. But, I have no right to yield on things which the Senate and the House of Representatives care to do.

I did not vote for H.R. 10, but the House agreed to it by a unanimous vote. The House is determined that that matter should go to the President for his signature. I have no right to yield on that—none whatever. The House would not let me do that if I tried, and I do not think I could obtain unanimous consent if I did try.

I am not going to bend my knee any longer. We can vote one way or the other on it.

I appreciate the kind consideration which the majority leader has given me, as well as others.

I approve completely of the right of every Senator to do what his conscience tells him is right. I point no finger of scorn at anyone who would filibuster on a conference report. I have done it myself. I have held the Senate in session for 3 days past midnight. But, I repeat, I do not point the finger of scorn at others. They have that right and that privilege.

All I want is the right to have the power of the majority exercised to bring this matter to a vote. I know that no matter how long I spoke against a bill, the Senate always worked its will.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, first, I wish to express my deep gratitude for the generous remarks of the able and distinguished and beloved majority leader.

Next, I wish to express appreciation for his deeds of consideration and kindness.

Third, I wish to thank all of those who, individually and collectively, participated in the conferences yesterday, for the spirit of gentility which prevailed.

There is no animus in this issue, Mr. President. The senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and I suggested several ways in which the public interest portion of the bill under question could be brought to enactment—and quickly, leaving the nonessential, unrelated, controversial, and questionable features of the bill to be dealt with in January—only a few weeks away.

I shall not detail the suggestions which the Senator from Delaware and I made, but there were many. There are ways yet available in which the foreign investors portion of title I of the bill can be sent to the President within the hour, and the Senate can adjourn by noon.

But, Mr. President, if the novel and bizarre provision in the bill, and the tax favoritisms in the bill are insisted upon at this late hour, then the Senator from Tennessee is duty bound to resist its passage.

Let me say that on day before yesterday, I made a statement with respect to the bill in the hope that the following morning Members of the Senate who were not present when I spoke, it being late in the afternoon, could read my remarks.

However, because of the pressure of business and the long hours in session, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was in two volumes. It was possible to print only one volume yesterday—the second volume not being available anytime during the day. I was ready to speak all day yesterday on the issue, if brought up. There was no opportunity.

It is with regret that Senators are called back. But, it is not the senior Senator from Tennessee who has provided that the Senate can operate only with a quorum. It is not the responsibility of the senior Senator from Tennessee that the bill, which was worthwhile in its original form, was loaded, or was brought here at this time. I have no voice in scheduling.

My duty is to support or oppose issues as they come to the Senate. It is, of course, a matter of disappointment when my sense of duty leads to the disappointment, the displeasure, or the discomfort of any other Member of the Senate. No one can regret that more than I, but conscience bound, I shall attempt, when I have the opportunity, to present the issues in this bill.

Instead of making a point of no quorum—which I have not yet done—I would suggest that the clerk read the Journal of yesterday as our colleagues gather into the Chamber.

I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], with whom I have served in Congress for nigh onto 24 years—he has served longer than I—knows how highly I think of him and how much I appreciate his friendship and understanding, as I have down through the years, in this instance as in all the others.

It is true there were various proposals made yesterday by both the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. Those proposals were given every possible consideration. I was in touch with the chairman of the Finance Committee, on several occasions, to try to see if something could be worked out on the only matter which could be worked out, which the Senator from Louisiana has mentioned. That proposal was to drop the campaign contribution provision from the conference report and to have it accepted in the other body. On the other proposal made to drop H.R. 10, it was an impossibility. On the other suggestions there was no chance, because we would have too many roadblocks.

If there is a corporal's guard at the other end of the building I would be surprised, but I can say this: There will be no more conferences. We have received that word from the Speaker.

So we have a conference report before us. We have two choices, and we are going to make them. We will either adopt that conference report or defeat it, and I hope those who are opposing it will not be unduly harsh on those in this body. I hope they will avail themselves of every opportunity to express their viewpoints, and I am sure they will; but I hope, in good conscience, they, too, will recognize that there is such a thing as coming to the point of no return and will let Senators have a chance to vote their convictions. If the conference report is defeated, that is the end. If it is carried, that is the end. But it is going to be defeated or carried just as it is before this body at this moment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I took part in those conferences yesterday. I want to say I have never worked with a man who was more gracious or who worked harder to reach an agreement than the majority leader. I want to join with other Senators in paying respects to him.

As Members of the Senate know, when the bill was before the Senate, I opposed the so-called grab-bag amendments in titles II, III, and IV and tried to have them deleted in the Senate. I was supported in my opposition to many of them by the majority leader as well as by other Members of the Senate, but not by enough, and so the bill was passed.

Recognizing that I had opposed the amendments that had been adopted by the Senate I stepped aside as a conferee because I did not think it would be proper to go to conference on the bill when I did not support the position of the Senate.

When the conference report was agreed upon earlier this week, I mentioned to the majority leader that when the report was brought before the Senate I wanted an opportunity to state my opposition before it was acted upon. He most graciously said he would not take it up until I was notified and had that opportunity. I appreciated very much his cooperation.

At the same time, while I told the majority leader that I wanted to express my opposition to the conference report when it came up I told him I was always able to express my opposition in a rather brief time, and that it would probably not take over 30 minutes. I repeated again yesterday that it was my intention to express my opposition to the conference report that I wanted a chance to express my opposition to it, that I did not care to have an extended debate and that I could express my opposition in a reasonable time.

Right or wrong, I have reasons why I believe this conference report should not be adopted, and I wanted an opportunity to express those reasons. That is all that I am asking for today.

In all fairness, I think it will be recognized that Members of the Senate have a right to express their views and exercise their rights under the rules of the Senate and take advantage of parliamentary situations. I suggest that we would proceed much more harmoniously if we could proceed without threats of a long session.

Why is there so much interest in laying aside an important bill dealing with financing the war in the interest of approving certain proposals that will benefit a handful of corporations in a special interest bill passed in the closing days of the Senate?

If the Senate, by a majority vote, wants to pass such a bill I shall go home and sleep as well as the rest of them, but I want a chance to outline what is in the bill and why I object to its enactment.

I shall not go into details at this time, but one particular point I want to bring out is, why, in the closing days of the session, does Congress propose to pass retroactively tax legislation benefiting one corporation by giving it a $2 million retroactive tax reduction? I refer to the special provision in this bill benefiting the Harvey Aluminum. I want an answer to that.

I want to express my opposition to this proposal made in the closing days of the session. I shall not be unduly long but I will insist upon my right to be heard.

I repeat what I said earlier this week and what I told the majority leader yesterday. I will try not to take too long in expressing my opposition. I will try to be brief in giving my reasons, but I do want the Senate to have a clear understanding of what is in this bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, let me just make this point clear: The Treasury opposed approximately five amendments which the Senate added to this bill. The other 18 amendments were either things the Treasury thought provided more equity for taxpayers, or were matters to which the Treasury had no objection whatever, feeling that they were problems which it would be well for Congress to resolve.

The conference modified the five amendments Treasury had opposed so that the Treasury objections were met in every way that the conference thought it could compromise. We were so successful that the Treasury now strongly supports this bill. It feels it is a very good bill, providing more equitable tax treatment for the many taxpayers effected. There is only one thing now in the bill to which Treasury strongly objects as a tax proposition, H.R. 10, the amendment which provides a large tax deduction for self-employed people. This will help doctors, lawyers, accountants, and other self-employed people.

Mr. President, I agree with the Treasury position. But it has passed the House by a vote of 291 to 0. I did all I could to defeat the measure as did the majority leader. The Treasury itself made a determined effort led by the Secretary, the Under Secretary, and the Assistant Secretary. Notwithstanding all pleading with Senators we failed, it passed the Senate by a margin of eight votes. In view of this history, I say it is the will of the Senate; and it is the will of the House.

That is the only thing in the bill that Treasury thinks is not good tax legislation. Mr. President, the Treasury Department, as I am, is prepared to admit that sometimes we in the minority have to recognize that the majority has a right to legislate.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] thinks it is a wonderful amendment. He has been working for it for many years. The Senator from Louisiana does not agree. But when the House votes 291 to 0, together with a majority of the Senate, we have no right to tell them they cannot legislate.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Will the Senator not agree that there has never been a piece of legislation more cussed, discussed, debated, written about and held up to the light of public scrutiny, than that provision known as H.R. 10, which would establish the right of self-employed people to set up pension plans for themselves, and given the same right as millions of men and women employed in the business community. Whether you agree with it or not, it has been discussed, and everyone knows all about it—and has known for many, many years.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That item has been discussed pro and con, it has been held up to more opprobrium on one side and more approval on the other, than any other feature of the measure. But when the other body votes the way it has, it is beyond our ability to change.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The only trouble with H.R. 10 is that it gives the poor working stiff, who really needs it, no help.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am against H.R. 10.

Mr. MANSFIELD. So am I.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Did the Senator vote against it?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes, I voted against H.R. 10. I spoke against it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The majority leader has the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield first to the Senator from Florida. Then I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I should like to say that H.R. 10 is not designed to take care of the poor as such. We have hundreds of programs from welfare to poverty programs which are calculated to take care of the poor. I have supported, sponsored, and voted for those programs—we have not had one to provide the same opportunities for retirement for the self-employed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not like H.R. 10.

Mr. SMATHERS. I disagree with the majority leader. There is no purpose served in debating the matter again at length, but if you are the president of the largest corporation, or any corporation that wants to provide a pension for its employees, you can set aside tax-free, for yourself and members of your family, and your employees as much as $50,000 a year for one individual, and it is tax free. This exemption for the self-employed is limited to $2,500 a year, and is designed for the self-employed people. And it is not as generous as any of the present pension programs already approved by the Treasury. More than that, it requires that the self-employed establish a pension program for their employees who are now uncovered—and number about 15 or 20 million. Indeed these employees cannot, in the greatest stretch of imagination, be called rich people.

I love the majority leader. I respect his objectivity. I think he is fair, and I admire his patience and diplomacy. But I completely disagree with him on the statement that H.R. 10 does not provide for the poor stiff.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The poor working stiff. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMATHERS. The poor working man. Actually, the farmer—the individual, self-employment farmer, the barber, the small grocery operator, and others—for the first time, will be able to provide for himself and herself a pension, something he was never before able to obtain. He contributes all the money himself—no one adds anything to his pension. But we allow him to lay this money aside for his old age—tax free.

This was the whole argument. This is why a majority of the Senate and the House voted for it, and all the conferees.

But the matter has been debated up and down and back and forth. The Senator from Rhode Island put his finger on it earlier when he stated that these matters have all been discussed and voted on. Nobody has sought to bring anything in here on a dark night, under cover, and not been willing to discuss it. All these matters have been debated in public for all to see.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Of course, they have.

Mr. SMATHERS. They have been discussed and argued back and forth in our committee, on the floor of the Senate, in the House, in the House committee, and in conference; and the majority of Congress has apparently had its say. There are a few people who apparently disagree with that position. They have the right to disagree, but now they want to follow every stratagem and tactic available—as they have the right to do—in an attempt to defeat it. But I think the majority will ultimately prevail, if we will stay here and do our duty and vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We will. But let me say that the Senator from Montana, notwithstanding his position on any measure, accepts the will of the majority, whether he likes it or not. As far as I am concerned, it is in and will stay in, and be a part of this bill.

Now I should like to end my personal filibuster but first I shall yield once more to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, earlier I put the question, why can we not take up the supplemental appropriation bill, upon which there is general agreement, and after that has been decided, take up this foreign investment bill?

The answer to that question was that if we dispose of the supplemental appropriation bill, no one will pay any attention to the foreign investment bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not at all. The Senator is incorrect.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That was implied in the answer.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio now and again, as we all do, makes statements which call for correction, and this is one. That statement was not made.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Well, the statement implied that there would not be a quorum present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Exactly. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I submit that in principle there is not much difference between the two. That means, Mr. President, that there is no faith nor desire to pass this foreign investment bill.

It was not the Senator from Montana who yesterday motioned up the foreign investment bill before the supplemental appropriations; it was the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And he withdrew it at my request.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But insist that it be brought back prior to the bringing up of the supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator yield right there?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes, I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is the Senator aware of the fact that had the Senator from Louisiana desired to do so, he could have held up four other bills, because his matter was privileged at 10:30 yesterday morning?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes, I understand that. But the point I am trying to make, Mr. President, is that I cannot subscribe to a procedure which contemplates taking up, in advance, what seems to be an unacceptable bill, and holding in abeyance a bill that is important to the Nation, and upon which there is no disagreement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I say, before I ask that the Journal be considered read——

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I finish my remarks?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Oh, I thought the Senator had concluded. Surely.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Louisiana, in discussing the merits, urged that Senators should vote for it because it contained provisions to take care of the aged.

That was the argument that was made, and that was the argument that was intended to overpower the thinking of the Members of the Senate. That provision is now out. All that is left are these very controversial provisions.

I desire to make one remark before I close. Tomorrow the Nation will be honoring in final words the great services rendered by the late Harry Byrd as a Member of the Senate. He was chairman of the Committee on Finance. Respect will be shown to him because of his courtesy to his fellow members of the committee and his fidelity to service to the country. Not one implication will be made that he used his chairmanship to promote what was of interest to his State and of unconcern to the people of the country.

Mr. President, I think the time is today to serve notice upon the chairman of the Committee on Finance that as chairman of that committee he has an obligation to the Nation not to promote what is of special interest to his State.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I think I have yielded enough. I would hope that the Senator from Ohio would be a little more considerate in his remarks, because on occasion I have listened to him wound Members of this body, singly or the body collectively. I know he does not really mean to do so, because I feel that he believes, as I do, that every Member of this body is a Senator in his own right.

I do not doubt the integrity of any Member of the Senate, on either side of the aisle, either directly or indirectly. If there is any question about a Senator's standing or his integrity, he should be called before the bar of this body. I would hope that Senators would be a little more understanding of their fellows and recognize that all of us are here not because we are great men, but because, by and large, we happen to be lucky and were elected at the right time because of a certain set of circumstances. There are far smarter people back in all of our States than any of us, and we know it.

So let us recognize the fact that we are human beings and that we are each trying to do his job in the best possible fashion in the interest of the State and Nation.

That is all I have to say.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am speaking, of course, about oyster shells and clam shells. How did they get into the bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. When it comes to projects such as the Hungry Horse Dam, the Yellowtail or Libby Dam on the Kootenai River in Montana, I am right in there with everybody else. When it comes to Montana, it is going to be my number one interest all the time because I would not be back here if the people of Montana had not sent me back here.

I am first and foremost a Senator from the State of Montana and that is true of every other Senator with respect to his own State. I think that what is good for my State is good for the United States. I find no difference between the two, and I do not ever intend to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I finish?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio may proceed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in conclusion I cannot subscribe to the program of bringing up the foreign investment bill first and the supplemental appropriations bill second.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Journal of yesterdays' proceedings shows that the supplemental conference report did not come to the Senate until 6:02 p.m. just as we were ready to adjourn last night. That is when it was received from Mr. Harris. The foreign investment bill was received in the Senate at 9:03 a.m., yesterday morning.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I say to the Senator that I am not going to return these insults in kind. Sometimes these insults pass from Senator to Senator when people get carried away with their own self-righteousness.

As much as I want the bill, as hard as I have worked on it, and as hard as the House, the Senate, the President, and the Secretary of the Treasury have worked on the bill, which is a good bill, I do not think enough of the bill to have a mutual heart attack with anybody. As far as I am concerned, I will just debate the bill.

Sometimes, when intensely fighting a bill, I have inferred that someone was corrupt because he was supporting the bill. I have later found it necessary to offer my most contrite apologies for my action. The rules do not permit such action and I will not engage in it.

If somebody wants to insult me, let him go ahead and I will try to let it roll off my back like water off a duck's back.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I want the Senate to know that as far as I am concerned, and I think I can speak for the minority leader, we approve the procedure suggested.

I wonder if it would be helpful, since it has been said that there would be a quorum call in an hour or two, if the majority leader would consider asking the Senate to approve a unanimous-consent request to vote on the matter 6 hours after a live quorum has been obtained.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I would be delighted to do so, but I think it would be a futile gesture.

I have raised the suggestion and been turned down in no uncertain terms.

In response to a question that has been raised by the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], there will be no power play; nothing will be done outside of the rules and ordinary procedures of the Senate.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, October 21, 1966, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I wish to contribute briefly to an understanding of the program.

As I understand the program, after the Journal has been read and the morning hour concluded, the distinguished chairman of the committee will call up the conference report. Thereafter, as is appropriate, the senior member of the committee will respond.

It is then the right of the senior Senator from Tennessee to insist that the Journal be read. Because of the conference report and the technicalities involved yesterday, that could consume a large portion of the day. I shall not insist upon that procedure.

I have sought to obtain a hearing on the bill. I am convinced, deeply convinced, that if a majority of the Members of the U.S. Senate would hear the views of the senior Senator from Delaware and of the senior Senator from Tennessee with respect to the non-public-interest portion of the bill, the conference report would be rejected.

A quorum is in prospect. I shall desist and listen to the presentation by the senior member of the committee, and then I shall seek recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to dispensing with the reading of the Journal?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

FOREIGN INVESTORS TAX ACT OF 1966—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill, H.R. 13103, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide equitable tax treatment for foreign investments in the United States. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of Oct. 20, 1966, pp. 28241–28242, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, H.R. 13103 is the bill which the Senate passed on October 13, of this year. The bill as passed by the Senate, and approved by the conferees contains four titles. The first title concerns the Foreign Investors Tax Act of 1966. The remaining titles relate to Internal Revenue Code amendments, the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act, and other amendments, respectively.

Mr. President, as to the so-called extraneous amendments, permit me to say that the Constitution does not permit the Senate to originate revenue legislation. Senators well know that such legislation must originate in the House of Representatives. The Constitution says that the Senate may amend, and it does not limit how we may amend, revenue legislation. We can put any amendment we wish on a revenue bill. But the Senate is bound to amend bills that were revenue bills when they came from the House, because that is the only way we can act on revenue bills. There is nothing new about this.

I think it is fair to say that every member of our committee and almost every Member of the Senate at one time or another has offered an amendment to a revenue bill. As chairman of the committee, my recollection is that the amendments have been irrelevant as often as they have been relevant.

For 2 years this Senator has been asking Senators to withhold their amendments. For example we asked them not to put them on the debt limit bill, because we wanted the debt limit bill to go directly to the President and to be signed into law.

Senators also were requested not to offer amendments to the excise tax extension legislation. There was a need for haste in passing that legislation so that people would know where they stood.

So we asked Senators to withhold their amendments until this bill came before the Senate, and at that time we indicated would consider their amendments. We followed this procedure. We gave the amendments our best judgment and voted on them.

So the newspaper accounts of this bill as being a Christmas tree is in poor taste. These are good amendments. As the bill comes back from conference there is only one fundamental objection the Treasury has to the bill. They do not like H.R. 10. In the past we have often added amendments to bills. My recollection is there were 212 amendments to the Revenue Act of 1964 of which perhaps 100 were important substantive amendments.

The bill as passed by the Senate contained 49 substantive amendments to the House bill. Your conferees receded on four of these amendments without change and two of these amendments with changes. In addition, the Senate conferees accepted amendments on six of its amendments to which the House receded.

The two Senate amendments upon which your conferees receded with changes were the floor amendments offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]. These Senate amendments altered the provisions of the Foreign Investors Tax Act relating to the income and estate taxation of the bank deposits and the interest derived from those deposits of nonresident aliens and foreign corporations.

The effect of the Senate receding on those two amendments was to tighten up on the tax laws. In the future they will force foreigners to pay taxes they do not presently owe on income and on their estates.

The managers on the part of the House were willing to recede to 23 other Senate amendments made to the Foreign Investors Tax Act, but they insisted that this provision of the act contain the principles present in the bill as it passed the House. Although your conferees receded to the House provision, we were able to persuade the House conferees to extend the exemption of present law until 1973, which is 1 more year than that provided by the House bill. Therefore, the permanent exemption that would have been granted by Senator Yarborough's amendments is to be continued until 1973. Moreover, postponing the date when these funds are taxed until 1973 will give Congress ample opportunity in the future to consider the impact of this provision on our balance of payments and on the gold flow. Should circumstances require, there will be plenty of time to reconsider the effective date of this provision. Your conferees receded on four amendments, one of which related to deductions of medical expenses of individuals age 65 or over.

Mr. President, next year we may well enact this provision. But the House conferees were adamant on it. It was an amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers]. It was a good amendment. But the House wants more time to think about this matter.

I have no doubt that after the House conferees have gone back to their people, in November or December—if they ever get there—and have an opportunity to discuss with the old folks, the increase in tax that the aged people will have to pay, they will return in January and go along with the Senate on this matter on which we had to recede. That was one of the most expensive items in the bill. It would have cost about $180 million.

We also had to recede on Senator Douglas' amendment to provide for coverage of expenses of certain drugs under supplemental medical insurance benefits. The House conferees said they will study this entire matter next year. In addition they will study a plan to increase social security benefits that would dwarf this proposal; and when the House sends us a social security bill, if we still wish to provide for drugs for the elderly we can provide them. We were told that it would take quite a while, probably more than a year, to work out the details of this matter, because it will be necessary to analyze the various drugs that would be provided to aged people and to determine how much should be paid for each one of the drugs when it is provided. The technical aspect of the matter, we were advised, would delay it for a long time.

Another amendment on which the Senate conferees receded related to social security benefits regarding certain illegitimate children. We were required to drop that item. The House will study it next year and see what they can do about it.

The fourth amendment on which the Senate conferees receded related to the minimum amount to be treated as earned income for retirement plans of certain self-employed individuals. The reason why we found it necessary to drop this amendment was that we took all of H.R. 10. That was offered by Senator Hartke, on behalf of himself and Senator Smathers. The result was that all of H.R. 10 was agreed to by the House conferees. Therefore, this other amendment which had been put in by the Senate committee and which provided a small part of H.R. 10, was not needed.

The action of your conferees on this latter amendment was only technically a recession. It was necessary that we recede to this amendment since the benefits provided by it also were provided on a much more liberal basis in the Senate amendment which provided for the removal of the special limitations with respect to the deductibility of contributions to pension plans of self-employed individuals. This is the so-called H.R. 10 provision. The House accepted that amendment, as they well should, because the House had passed the bill unanimously.

Your conferees were most reluctant to recede on the amendment which would have provided the old folks with coverage of expenses of drugs under supplemental medical insurance benefits. Although I was not the primary sponsor of this amendment, I feel very personally the deletion of this provision from the bill. In my judgment, this is a benefit which should be granted to the old folks, and I believe that the only major obstacle which kept it off this bill was the question of its timeliness. The Senate should remember that the President recently announced that he will request legislation early in the next Congress which will provide increased social security benefits, the House conferees had just finished two strenuous days of discussion in the Ways and Means Committee regarding increased social security benefits, and, additionally, this is a time when we must hold down on Government expenditures.

As I indicated, the President plans to request legislation early in the next Congress which will provide increased social security benefits. As the chairman of the Committee on Finance, I think I can assure the Senate that we will reconsider this matter next year either in that, or in separate, legislation. I need only remind the Senate that this amendment was approved by almost all of the members of the Finance Committee, and it is my belief that these same votes will remain favorable when we reconsider this measure next year.

The Senate conferees also were most reluctant to come back from conference without the amendment removing the 3-percent and 1-percent limitations on medical expenses for those 65 and over. We fought long and hard for this provision but the House conferees simply would not yield. While I do not agree with them, their view is that the provision of benefits under part B of the medicare bill at Government expense compensated the elderly for this loss of deduction. I doubt very much whether this view will be generally accepted by the public, and I expect the House itself next year to send us legislation removing this limitation.

The Senate conferees accepted modifications to three of the Senate amendments dealing with depletion. The amendments accepted by your committee would delete from these provisions the features granting the depletion allowance with respect to processes not presently classified as mining processes. The two depletion amendments which relate to shale, clay, and slate used as a light-weight aggregate and clay and shale used in the making of sewer pipe and brick were altered by the conference to provide a minimum 7½-percent depletion allowance in these cases. This was in lieu of changing the processes treated as mining processes for these minerals.

Mr. President, in connection with that subject, I wish to point out that the Treasury Department usually disagrees with liberalizing depletion amendments. They recognize the validity of allowing cost depletion, but they have been critical of percentage depletion. As a policy, they consistently tend to say they do not want to expand percentage depletion in any field. But on these amendments as agreed on in conference, they said, as a practical matter, that for the most part justice and equity would indicate that the products involved should receive the treatment accorded by the amendments to equate them with the treatment received by competitive products.

Mr. President, much has been said about oyster and clam shells. If those shells, which have been building up for perhaps a million years off the coasts of Louisiana, Florida, Georgia, Texas, Alaska, and any other State that borders on an ocean or major body of water, are to be used in competition with limestone, it seems only fair that they get the same treatment as limestone. Moreover, these are dredged from the sea under leases from the Government. So they do have economic interests which are depleted.

The Treasury Department objected to any modifications of the principle of the Gore amendment, and won on this point. The Senator from Tennessee labored a number of years ago to see that depletion does not apply to a manufactured or finished product, but relates only to the value of the product before the application of any processes generally considered to be "manufacturing" as distinct from "mining."

The Senate conferees yielded on this matter of deleting any liberalization of the so-called "cutoff point." Unfortunately, not doing anything about the cutoff point for depletion, allowance, merely raising the rate will, I understand, be of little help in Georgia in making alumina from clay.

Minor modifications were also accepted by your conferees to the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act. These amendments raised to 15 million the number of votes a party must receive to be classified as a major party. In addition the conferees raised from 1½ to 5 million the number of votes a minor party must receive to be eligible for a distribution under this fund. They also extended the application of this 5 million "deductible" rule to the major parties as well. In other words, no party, major or minor, is to receive any reimbursement from the fund for its first 5 million votes. With respect to the definition of major and minor parties, the amendments provide that a party must receive 15 million votes to constitute a major party and 5 million votes to constitute a minor party. The effect of these amendments is that a party will not qualify for a proportionate share of the fund unless it receives 15 million votes and it will receive nothing from the fund until its total votes exceed 5 million. Those receiving between 5 and 15 million votes in the last election, however, will continue to be eligible to receive $1 for every vote they received over 5 million.

Mr. President, I drafted this proposal with the assistance of the Treasury Department, the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and our own fine staff of the Senate Committee on Finance. Much of the thinking that caused me to come up with this proposal came from speeches made by the late Senater Richard Neuberger in the Senate when he would quote something that Theodore Roosevelt said over 60 years ago. Theodore Roosevelt said that the only way to have honest elections is for the Federal Government to find a way to help pay for the expense of a man running for the Presidency of the United States.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] carried on investigations in this field to point out the situation was bad. Practically the only source of financing for campaigns had to come from large corporation executives or labor unions, and it would be well if there could be another way devised.

While this proposal is not perfect, after having studied it and discussed it with people who have the responsibility of managing campaigns for the Republican Party and for the Democratic Party, I felt this would probably provide the money it would take to see that both campaigns are adequately financed so that both sides could make their case before the people.

This proposal would authorize every taxpayer to designate $1 of his tax liability to be placed in a presidential election campaign fund. This would have the effect of assigning 50 cents to the Democratic campaign and 50 cents to the Republican campaign. In other words it is financing of good government on a bipartisan basis. Every man elected would be equally obligated to everyone. This is a clean election bill. It is a good-government bill.

The President sent down his own election proposal that included a $100 tax deduction provision. This item has appealed to Senators, including the great Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. We studied it and the committee did not think it would reduce undue influence. But the proposal we approved would help prevent improper influence in Government because the money goes to both sides. It also does not give the wealthy, to whom deductions are worth more, a greater incentive to give than the less fortunate.

When someone runs for office and has to go hat in hand from one group of wealthy individuals to another, pleading for money to help finance the campaign, that candidate is not as free as if his campaign were financed equally by every citizen. Then he will not be obligated to any special group.

There has been discussions of amending the corrupt practices law. If we do pass such amendments, it is not necessarily going to clean up anything. It would compel people to find more sophisticated ways to finance their campaigns than they have to date. After all they must obtain the money from somewhere. The wealthy can finance their own campaigns, but what about candidates of moderate means?

Here in the bill before us is a way to eliminate the need for those running for office to be under the compulsion of making a commitment they do not wish to make in order to get campaign funds.

A fraud provision was suggested for the presidential election campaign fund provisions. I thought about it and had our staff draft one up in case anyone cared to offer it. One was drawn up as tight as "Dick's hatband," but we think that there is no need for it.

Let me read the broad statute that would be applicable under present law, in any event:

> § 1001. Statements or entries generally.
>
> Whoever, in any matter within the jurisdiction of any department or agency of the United States knowingly and willfully falsifies, conceals or covers up by any trick, scheme, or device a material fact, or makes any false, fictitious or fraudulent statements or representations, or makes or uses any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any false, fictitious or fraudulent statement or entry, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both. (June 25, 1948, ch. 645, 62 Stat. 749.)

The provision before us provides that there is to be a bipartisan board composed of two Republicans and two Democrats, who will proceed to pick three other impartial men—so that the Republicans will watch the Democrats and the Democrats will watch the Republicans. Each party will watch the other party, to make sure that no one receives a distribution of a cent for funds not properly spent.

Every Democrat and every Republican has a responsibility to report on his own candidate and the other candidate, in case anyone uses any of the money improperly, so that every dollar of the campaign fund should be accounted for, both as it comes in and as it is expended.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am happy to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. Is there presently a ceiling on what can be spent by the national committees?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I think there is one.

Mr. MURPHY. I think it is $33 million.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I think it is $3 million.

Mr. MURPHY. How would we appropriate the money, which, as I understand it, would go to the national committees? How would we get around that?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, let me comment on the question of limitations on receipts of contributions and their expenditures by political committees.

The bill before us is carefully drafted in terms of "political parties," not "political committees." This was purposefully done in order not to conflict with the limitation in the law.

The bill before us is also carefully drafted so that the amounts paid into the treasury of political parties do not become "contributions" which might make them subject to the $3 million limit.

The special limitations on the amounts paid into the treasury of political parties under this bill were drafted in full recognition of the $3 million limit.

We wrote our limitation in terms of amounts spent by a political party for two reasons. First, to make sure that it was different from the limitation now in the law, and second to provide an after-enacted limitation which would have to be interpreted apart from the $3 million limit.

This special limitation in the bill, indeed the bill itself, has nothing to do with contributions at all. The purpose of the bill is to free presidential candidates from having to seek contributions—to free political parties from having to create a plethora of political committees in order to get around the $3 million limit.

The $3 million limit now in the law is not affected by this bill. It will continue to apply to the cases to which it applies today. However, it will not limit the disbursements made under the bill because these disbursements do not involve "contributions" and they are not made by "political committees."

Mr. MURPHY. In other words, this would wipe out the limitation which presently exists?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No, as I indicated I think this provision avoids any conflict with present law. Let me say that the limitation in present law doesn't work in any case. I will tell the Senator why.

Mr. MURPHY. I was not questioning whether it was a farce or a fraud. I just asked the question as to whether that would——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No, as I have said, this provision of the bill does not affect the limitation.

Mr. MURPHY. It does not affect the limitation?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Not in my judgment.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] compiled a "best seller" on this subject. He did quite a bit of investigating on this subject. I wish I could be favored with a copy of it. Perhaps additional copies should be reprinted—I do not have one of them.

Mr. GORE. We have had that request.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am having difficulty getting reprints. I should like to have a copy of the lists published in his document because inasmuch as it deals with private financing, I might find a few prospects myself when I run again for office.

The Senator from Tennessee has kindly handed me a list which he compiled of those who contributed to President Eisenhower's campaign and also to Adlai Stevenson's campaign. If the Senator will pardon me for saying it, I do not find it all here, I find about only half.

Mr. GORE. I think it is $33 million.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. $33 million. I asked the Senator for an educated guess on what he thought President Eisenhower's supporters had spent in the Republican campaign, and how much he would guess Adlai Stevenson had spent. I must say that at that time the Democratic Party was the loser. We did not do too well. The Senator's guess, as I recall it, was that the Republicans spent about $40 million in the campaign and the Democrats about $12 million.

Mr. MURPHY. Does that include expenditure of union funds?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Union funds?

Mr. MURPHY. I am talking about the figure the Senator just quoted, $12 million opposed to $40 million.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It was the best guess of the Senator from Tennessee. The Democratic Party finds itself in the position of being for the poor man, the common man—so that it does not always have sufficient funds, which was true in that campaign.

With expenses going up, it was estimated that as an educated guess about $52 million was spent by the two parties. I heard an estimate that in the last presidential election for all candidates, everyone running for office from constable up to President, about $250 million was spent that year. I would assume that about $55 million to $60 million was spent in the Johnson-Goldwater campaigns.

Mr. MURPHY. Has there been consideration—because campaigns are sensitive to rising costs—to possibly using television?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let me talk about that for a moment, because I think that the bill helps that. I will tell the Senator why. There is a provision in law which states that if a television network donates free time, it has to provide equal time for all. So that if President Johnson and the fine gentleman whom the Republicans will nominate for President at the next election, are put on television, the TV networks have to include the minority parties as well, unless the law is amended.

If we bypass those small parties, there would still be the problem that while it might be all right to request one big television network to provide equal time, it would seem to me to be unfair to require it of a little television station, because such a station would lose needed revenues by having to provide to other political candidates free time which it otherwise could have sold to paying sponsors.

The proposal before us, however, would provide that whoever could pay for time would pay for it, in order to present his case to the American people.

Mr. MURPHY. In other words, it would eliminate the smaller parties, and only those who had an allocation from the contribution of that dollar could use the air?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It would not eliminate them. They would have to finance themselves; the way they do now. However, funds are provided for minor parties when they have polled over 5 million votes in the last election.

Mr. MURPHY. Would it not be feasible to allocate time on the air instead of charging the American people $1 apiece, and allocate the time on the air, which belongs to the people in the first place, on the same basis which the Senator suggests as to dividing up the money?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Well, the Senator——

Mr. MURPHY. This would eliminate the cost and save the taxpayer a dollar.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator would simply make the television stations foot the bill. Does the Senator think it is fair to make a small television station lose money in order to make free time available, when the station could be using that time to make a few dollars to pay off its debts?

It seems to me it is better to provide both sides with money so they can buy time during the campaigns and make their case to the American people. The television station would be required to treat everybody the same way. Some of the small parties would have to finance themselves, but if they obtained 5 million votes they would get financial assistance from the fund. It has been suggested that this is discriminatory. But under the proposal as agreed on in conference, the major parties also will get no reimbursement for the first 5 million votes they garner.

I point out that there are all kinds of deductible items in the law. There is a $100 deductible allowance for casualty losses; a deduction of 3 percent from the income with regard to medical expenses before any of these expenses are allowed; and a 1 percent deductible in the case of drugs. There are all sorts of exemptions and deductions.

Mr. MURPHY. There are so many and it is so confusing that I am afraid the poor, general citizen has no knowledge of them and needs an accountant, a lawyer, and specialist to tell him what his rights are. I do not know, and I consider myself a normal citizen. I have been around half a century. The longer I stay, the more complicated and confusing it all becomes. That is one reason why I question this part of the bill.

May I say that I voted for the bill, but as it comes back in the condition it was returned, I would have to oppose the bill, because the most eloquent presentation the Senator made with reference to helping the poor folks get medicine was what persuaded me to vote for the bill, and that provision has disappeared.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I regret to say we could not hold that provision in conference. We expect to get it passed next year. I regret that it failed. But there were other provisions in the bill. There was the self-employed retirement provision, for example, in which doctors, lawyers, and other self-employed have been interested for years. This will help them in their old age when they retire. I have been opposing it, but there are so many good provisions in the bill that each Senator should be able to think that even though there might be one or two items in the bill with which he does not agree, there are enough good provisions that he should vote for it. I am not only interested in seeing that the poor man's party is put above improper influence, but I should like to see the Republican Party put above improper influence also.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Speaking of party, would this provision include deductions for members of the President's Club, or would that be a separate matter?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. May I say that I am a member of the President's Club and proud to be, but I am not too happy about the $1,000 a year it costs me. It is hoped that this provision would eliminate the need for such clubs. I would hope to get the support of many persons in and around Louisiana who now contribute to the President's Club. I shall be running at the same time the President is. It is always difficult to finance campaigns for Members of the Senate and of the House at a time when the President is running. But now he will have perhaps $30 million to finance his campaign.

If a presidential candidate can obtain $30 million to finance his campaign, maybe members of the President's Club, including myself, would be relieved of the $1,000 contribution, and that money could go to finance the campaigns of candidates for the Senate and the House of Representatives. Some of us have great difficulty raising money to finance our campaigns.

Mr. MURPHY. That does not answer my problem. I ran at the time when everybody was talking about Goldwater and Rockefeller and I could not get anybody on the phone. I financed my campaign at the cost of a package of cigarettes for all of the people who voted for me in the primary. I recommend it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Senators and Representatives do not have the terrible problem of financing a campaign that is presented to a man running for the Presidency.

With reference to the subject previously discussed of the penalties applying under present law, here is another statute that is now on the books. This statute is so broad that it covers almost anything. Let me read it:

> § 1002. Possession of false papers to defraud United States.
>
> Whoever, knowingly and with intent to defraud the United States, or any agency thereof, possesses any false, altered, forged, or counterfeited writing or document for the purpose of enabling another to obtain from the United States, or from any agency, officer or agent thereof, any sum of money, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

So that provides for 5 years in jail and a $10,000 fine. The Comptroller General would be responsible for checking into every single item of expense certified by the political parties under the proposal before us.

Someone has suggested that perhaps we could set standards as to how much should be spent in every single State. If anybody wants to work it out, I shall be glad to consider it, or we could have the staff work it out. But I do not think it is necessary, because no question is raised as to the percentage of the money raised by the people of New York, for example, as compared with Louisiana.

The remaining Senate amendments to which your conferees accepted changes were those dealing with swap funds and the provision requiring reports to clarify the national debt and tax structure. Changes made to this latter amendment are minor and represent changes suggested by the Bureau of the Budget to make the reporting system practical.

You will recall the discussion on the Senate floor with respect to swap funds. Under section 351 of the Internal Revenue Code, transfers of property to a corporation by one or more persons in exchange for stock in a corporation does not result in gain or loss if immediately after the exchange the person or persons in question are in control of the corporation. On July 14, 1966, the Treasury Department issued a proposed regulation indicating that the exchange of appreciated stock for shares in an investment fund—where immediately after the exchange the persons who transferred the stock to the corporation are in control of it—does not qualify for this provision. The Senate added an amendment to the bill providing that section 351 applied to corporate investment funds.

The conferees considered this provision at length and concluded that, at least at this time, they did not believe that stock or real estate investment funds should be eligible for this tax-free treatment under section 351. It was recognized, however, that in view of the past experience under this provision it probably would have been unfair to cut these funds off immediately. As Senators will recall from the Senate discussion in 1960, the Internal Revenue Service ruled that these funds did come under section 351, and while it is true that since that time they have refused to so rule, nevertheless, private tax counsel has so ruled for many funds since that time. In view of these considerations, the conferees provided that these investment funds should come within section 351 only with respect to transfers to stock to the funds prior to July 1, 1967. Moreover, funds required to register with the Securities and Exchange Commission under either of the two applicable laws, to be eligible for this treatment must file their registration applications with SEC by January 1, 1967; the prospective shareholders must have deposited their stocks with the fund by May 1, 1967; and the actual transfers must have occurred before July 1, 1967. Where registration application set a maximum dollar amount for a fund, this may not revised upward after January 1, 1967. Any additional amount would not qualify for the tax-free treatment under this provision. This latter limitation, of course, applies only to those funds not already established.

I believe that the bill as revised by the conferees is a good bill and should be approved by the Senate.

I have a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, who says this is a good bill and that it should be agreed to by the Senate. The Treasury Department did have some concern about some of the provisions in the bill as passed by the Senate, but they are satisfied with the conference agreement. The only provision they really take exception to is H.R. 10. The revenue loss of the bill as passed by the Senate was put at approximately $470 million a year.

As we bring it back from conference, the cost of it is about $80 million a year.

So the cost of this bill to the Treasury is only about 15 percent of what it would have been as passed by the Senate. The only very expensive item in the bill is the one provision, H.R. 10, the self-employed retirement provision. That provision, as I have stated, Mr. President, is something I have fought against for many years, and if it were here on its own merits alone, I would still be fighting it. But the House passed it 291 to 0. And in spite of my best efforts, all the arguments I could make, all the arguments the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] could make, all the arguments the Secretary of the Treasury could make in talking to Senators, all the arguments the Under Secretary, the Assistant Secretary could make, and all the arguments that our staff could help us make, we simply lost. We did not have the votes to outvote them. So this provision, which is of interest to doctors, lawyers, accountants, and other self-employed people, is still in the bill.

But the bill in its present form should at least be much less objectionable than the bill which Senators opposed when it was brought to the floor of the Senate, because every agreement in conference, and every action by the conferees, had the effect of reducing or eliminating the cost of something which those Senators who had opposed the bill did not want to do, anyway. So it would seem to me, Mr. President, that even Senators who voted against the bill originally would be well justified in voting for the conference report, because even if they did not like the bill originally, what we present here from the conference is much better, from their point of view, than what the Senate passed. If they were worried about the expense, this measure will only cost 15 percent as much as the bill we passed. If they are worried about some provision which might have given the Treasury a problem, the Treasury now feels, as a practical matter, that this is a fine bill, that it will help tremendously with our balance-of-payments problem, and it is one of the few things we will have passed in this Congress that will help our balance-of-payments problem. From the point of view of a number of people in the Johnson administration—and I say it would be fair to say this is probably an opinion shared by the President himself—this bill is even more important to the Nation than the supplemental appropriation bill which waits right behind it, which provides funds for almost everything. We have enough money on hand to operate the Government for a little while, but we have a very serious problem with our balance of payments, and need to do something immediately to help with that matter.

Most of the amendments retained in conference were amendments the Treasury was asking for, or did not oppose, because the Treasury Department felt that those matters involved fairness and equity, and followed the principle of treating all taxpayers alike and impartially. Therefore, Treasury wanted almost everything in this bill except for about five of our amendments; and the two that cost the greatest amount of money—that would have cost $385 million out of the total $470 million cost to the Government of this bill—the two that Treasury was most worried about because of their cost, we were compelled to recede on.

So Treasury feels it is a good bill, the President feels it is a good bill, the House feels it is a good bill by a 3 to 2 margin, the Senate voted for it by a vote of 58 to 18, and insofar as someone who does not like it is concerned, if there is some principle or some effect here that offends him, every compromise we made in conference moved in his direction, to make the bill at least less objectionable, I think, and represented what he would have done himself if he did not like the bill to begin with.

Mr. President, I urge that the conference report be agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I rise to object to the conference report. As I stated earlier, when the bill was before the Senate I was wholeheartedly in support of title I of the bill, that phase which dealt with the foreign investors' tax. As the bill was passed by the House and as title I, which dealt with that subject, was reported by the Senate committee, I felt it was a constructive proposal. I would have supported, and will support today, title I as it is before the Senate. That is supposedly the matter that is now before the Senate—the question of the Foreign Investors' Tax Act. But this bill has gone far afield. Yesterday it was suggested to the Treasury Department and to the leadership that we take title I of the bill and attach it to another bill which is presently on the Senate Calendar and which was reported by the Senate Finance Committee. This bill was reported unanimously by the Finance Committee and had the approval of the Treasury Department. It would be a very convenient vehicle. We could put title I in its entirety on that bill and send it to the House, carrying these other so-called grab-bag proposals over until next year for debate.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator believe that the public interest would be adversely affected by postponement of these nongermane amendments?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I certainly do not. In fact, I think the public interest would be better protected if they were defeated. Certainly title I is all the administration was asking for.

As to the major amendments which are in controversy here, when the Treasury Department witnesses were before our committee they were unalterably opposed to each of those amendments. They described one of the amendments as the greatest loophole that had ever been proposed by the Finance Committee. That amendment, Mr. President, is in the bill before us now; and I regret to say that the Treasury Department has swallowed it, because they say, "Well, we will cut off this loophole after July 1, 1967, with the proviso that they must file their report with the Securities Exchange Commission by January 1." I do not question the motives of anyone who supports these proposals, but I do disagree with their conclusions.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Just a moment. I do not question the motives of the Treasury Department in this flip-flop. It is not the first time they have suddenly changed positions. I am not unmindful that in late August, the Secretary of the Treasury said he was unalterably opposed to suspension of the 7-percent investment credit, and 10 days later he was for it. He had a right to change his mind on that issue, and he has a right to change his mind now and ask for this bill.

I now wish to discuss some of the features in the bill to which I object and express my opinion as to why I think it would be better if it were not enacted at this time.

I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Of course, the Senator is entitled to his opinion.

Those of us who voted for the swap fund amendment felt that if we looked at the law, we would find that the present law permits the tax-free transfer of securities to investment companies. The Treasury felt that this was something of a loophole, and wanted it to be closed. The Treasury proposed to close it by an administrative regulation; but it seemed to us that it ought to be done by law. We believe that Congress ought to act, rather than to have the Treasury act administratively. The Treasury is pleased that the conferees have closed the loophole affirmatively.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I know that the Treasury is apparently pleased today to accept a proposal which only 1 week ago they denounced as the most glaring loophole ever proposed by Congress.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. What we have before us is a different proposal. This is a proposal that the Treasury helped us to draft. The Treasury feels that it is a good proposal.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall yield in a moment.

The only change that has been made is that we have fixed the final termination date as July 1 of next year.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The SEC registration must be filed before January 1, 1967, and the funds must be deposited by May 1, 1967.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Application must be filed in December but July 1 is the final date.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. And cannot be amended to raise the amount.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. After January.

I shall discuss the merits of the proposal later. When the committee had this particular proposal before it, the representatives of the Treasury Department said it was a glaring loophole and even indicated that if that one amendment alone were in the bill, they would have to recommend its veto. But now we are told they are willing to accept it. That is the Treasury flip-flop about which I am talking.

I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Delaware keeps quoting the Treasury; but the Senator himself knows that it was not a glaring loophole. He knows better.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I agreed with the Treasury that it is a loophole.

Mr. McCARTHY. But not the largest loophole in the tax code. The Senator would not commit his reputation in support of the Treasury official he quotes and say that this was the most glaring loophole in the whole tax code. He will quote the Treasury official as saying that, but he himself will not say that it is.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I concurred in what the Treasury representatives said to our committee, and no one has caused me to change my mind. I respect the opinion of the Senator from Minnesota even though he differs with me.

Mr. McCARTHY. No one can prove that a penny of revenue would be lost if the amendment is adopted; neither can the Senator prove that there would be a loss of a nickel of taxes in that "glaring loophole," that a nickel's worth of taxes would be lost. In fact, the record shows that it might bring in revenue, if anything. This is a loophole through which the Treasury could get revenue. The Treasury ought to be for that kind of loophole.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not want this debate to get to the silly stage. Certainly there is a loss in revenue.

Mr. McCARTHY. Who ever heard of a loophole through which the Treasury would make money? Who ever heard of the Treasury closing a loophole or asking the taxpayers to close a loophole because the Government was making money?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Let us not get this to the ridiculous stage. The Treasury agreed that there was a loophole, and in my opinion, there is a loophole now. Perhaps it would be just as well to proceed to show how this is tax relief for a certain group so that there can be no misunderstanding.

This proposal legalizes a method by which those who have a sizable block of securities or real estate which has been secured at a very low cost in relation to its present market value can, by forming a group or a fund, diversify their investments by turning their stock over to a fund and taking stock in the newly formed corporation, thus avoiding the payment of capital gains tax.

They cannot do this under existing law without paying a capital gains tax. It is something which they will not be able to do after July 1, 1967, but the supporters of this bill say, "We will legalize what you have done heretofore and give you until January to get your house in order; you will not have to pay any taxes on what you have done."

This tax-free exchange of securities is a loophole that benefits only seven or eight operations in America.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, am I correct is my understanding that all that has been done to supposedly improve the original bad provision is to establish a cutoff date as of July 1?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. That would be July 1 of next year. However, it contains a January 1 date by which they must file with the Securities Exchange. They must file at the end of this year with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The situation is that the Treasury Department concluded that there was a loophole that had to be blocked, and they proceeded to do so. Along came the Senate committee, and the Senate, with this new legislation to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from blocking the loophole.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. The Secretary said that under the existing law he could stop this practice. This provision would prohibit him from issuing rulings against the past practices or any other exchange made prior to next July. It would give a clear ruling to all of those who have not been able to get a favorable ruling. It would also include all transactions that took place hereafter, up to the date mentioned.

This is a loophole with a termination date of next July.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, is it not correct that the Secretary felt that the practice in effect cheated the taxpayer because of the loophole that existed in the law? He concluded that he could block the loophole, and when he reached such conclusion, the Senate committee adopted an amendment to stop him from doing what he thought was in the best interest of the taxpayer.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. I will cite an example of how this would work.

We will assume that there are four investors. This could only operate with relation to larger interests because the average fellows could not get together to form such a group.

Suppose that Mr. A has $1 million worth of bonds. Mr. B has $1 million worth of a certain stock acquired at a cost of $100,000, and Mr. C has $1 million worth of General Electric or General Motors stock.

If these three men get together and contact Mr. D, who has very large holdings in real estate and would like to diversify his holdings, exchanging his land for bonds and securities, they could not do so under the present law without paying a capital gains tax.

Under the present law any of the individuals whom I have mentioned, if he wanted to diversify, would have to sell a part of his holdings and pay a capital gains tax on the portion which he sold. He could then invest the remainder after the payment of taxes in other corporations.

Under the present proposal, these four gentlemen could get together and put up their securities and real estate. They could then issue shares out of a new fund in proportion to the amount that had been put up.

These men would thus have diversified their interests and the man who owned the real estate would own a percentage of those bonds and securities and the other men would be the owners of the real estate. No capital gains tax would have been paid under this transaction.

The pending measure would provide that that procedure would be permissible on former transactions and new transactions until next July.

A few of these corporations have been formed, and the Treasury Department ruled that such procedure was an avoidance of the capital gains tax and that a capital gains tax must be paid.

This provision would overrule the ruling of the Secretary of the Treasury and provide that such transactions would be tax exempt. In effect, it would say: "Keep on doing it until this next July and then go and sin no more."

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Treasury Department said that the scheme of setting up a pool and then taking stock in the pool enabled those investors to escape the payment of a capital gains tax and that this procedure was illegal. A ruling was issued.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senate committee, however, through the provision in the pending bill is attempting to prevent the Secretary of the Treasury from issuing a regulation that would prevent such practice.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. The Senate committee's first proposal would extend this in perpetuity. The conference report does contain a termination date, but it does at the same time legalize all of these pending transactions which have heretofore been rejected by the Treasury Department.

The pending measure would allow these people to keep their tax-free exchange status up to next July.

This is the proposal which the Treasury Department described as one of the most glaring loopholes ever proposed by the Senate Finance Committee.

All the conferees did was to place a termination date on such transactions. That is better than permitting this to be done in perpetuity, but nevertheless it is still unfair to other taxpayers who must pay the tax.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, if the argument of the Senator from Minnesota is sound, that there was no tax loss suffered by the Government, I ask the Senator from Delaware why the committee proceeded to place such a provision in the bill. What was the need of placing such a provision in the pending bill if it meant nothing?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In saying there would be no tax loss, they proceeded on the premise that these same people would not sell and diversify. Conceivably, they would not sell, but if they did sell they would have to pay the capital gains tax just the same as any one of the 90 million Americans had to do up to this point and will have to do from now on. They are not being excused.

This provision excused no one, as near as I can determine, but seven small groups that are operating these funds. They are the only ones that are involved or benefited here.

This section is certainly not general tax legislation.

Congress here is legalizing what seven small outfits were trying to do, and trying to do in the face of a warning that the Treasury Department would not approve it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to repeat my question: If there was no loss in taxes suffered by the Government, what was the need of the Senate committee putting into the bill this provision?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. None whatever. Certainly there is a loss in revenue.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Who was sought to be protected? It was not the Government. And if the provision was placed in there, one would contemplate that the committee did not intend doing a futile act. They wanted to affect someone. Who was to be affected and how, I ask?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It affected, to the best of my knowledge, seven operations, and certainly there would be loss suffered. It would be ridiculous to argue otherwise. Who ever heard of a loophole that did not cause the loss of revenue? I did not coin this word—the Treasury Department coined the word describing this section as one of the most glaring loopholes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If there was not a loophole, why did the Secretary of the Treasury and the conference committee finally agree to put a cutoff date in the present bill? The cutoff date undoubtedly was put in there under the confession that the taxpayer generally was being despoiled or robbed for the benefit of a few.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I could not answer that.

But the representative of the Treasury Department, who, by the way, was Mr. Surrey, the high official who used the words that this particular section was a most glaring loophole.

Nothing has been changed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am not attempting to change the Senator's mind, but I want the RECORD to show what the facts are, from the standpoint of those of us who think that this provision should be agreed to.

At this time, there is no question that if you have a business purpose, you can diversify by just putting business assets into a corporation, which gives you the effect of diversification, and no taxes are owed. The Treasury is not seeking to change a word of that. But until July 14 of this year, Treasury also did not take a published position in opposition to the tax-free exchanges called swap funds.

If what Treasury did not oppose until July 14 of this year was wrong, we only extend it by this bill for 6 more months. So if what we are doing is questionable, we are only permitting this questionable practice to go on for a very short time and after all the Treasury did not challenge this scheme for years.

The Treasury sought to cut off tax-free exchanges in investment funds by regulation. The Treasury thought it was a loophole, and we have closed the loophole for them. We do give these people 6 more months. But they have to file their plan by December 31, 1966, and have to consummate the whole thing by July 1 of next year.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I have expressed my opinion about this proposal. The Under Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Surrey, denounced this section, and quite a few members of the committee staff, as well, concurred in the opinion that this was and is a loophole, only with a termination date.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I wish to congratulate the able Senator for his lucid explanation of this particular amendment in the bill. The senior Senator from Delaware has served a number of years as a member of the Senate Committee on Finance. I want to compliment him upon giving an explanation of this bill that would be a credit to any expert tax lawyer, accountant, or both.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator for his comments. I do not claim to be an expert. This is just a simple, straight mathematical computation.

Much has been said about what this bill proposes to do for the average American. I just wish to dispel that fact.

To the best of my knowledge there are seven companies or funds that will be given tax exemption under this proposal, and if the proposal is rejected those seven will have to pay capital gains tax on their stock exchanges. It is that simple.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The discussion of this point, in the debate thus far today, illustrates my conviction that if this bill were thoroughly discussed before a quorum of the Senate, it would be rejected. As a result of the discussion thus far, I have heard two Senators say that they have changed their view and would now vote against the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There are many more reasons than this point. Some of them in themselves are enough to justify rejecting this report so far as I am concerned.

Mr. GORE. It is regrettable that this kind of bill comes here in the closing hours of the session. The Senator from

Delaware no more welcomes than does the Senator from Tennessee the duty of having such a discussion in the Senate on Saturday afternoon, when football games are being played. But we did not bring the bill before the Senate in the closing hours of this session.

However, I wish to proceed to this point: The exchange between the senior Senator from Ohio and the senior Senator from Delaware clearly brought out that the Treasury Department had, by regulation, closed this loophole. The Senate Committee on Finance, by its amendment, overruled the ruling of the Secretary of the Treasury, and reopened the glaring loophole, as Under Secretary Surrey described it, according to the senior Senator from Delaware.

The conference report represents—I wish to be fair in saying this—an improvement over the original Senate bill; because, as the senior Senator from Delaware has said, though it still overrules the ruling and the regulation of the Secretary of the Treasury and leaves the door wide open for a while, it does fix a terminal date. This is an improvement.

But why do we come here with an amendment, in the closing days of the session, on a foreign investors tax bill, and adopt an amendment to give tax reduction and tax relief and tax exemption to certain groups of people—some of whom I can now identify—and then leave the door open for all those who wish to get in under the wire between now and December 31?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Identify them.

Mr. GORE. I am asked by the senior Senator from Ohio, to identify them. Will the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. GORE. This is not secret information. I have obtained this information from the Securities and Exchange Commission.

I shall read three items—the date of the filing, the name of the fund, and the dollar amount of registration.

October 18, 1965, Science & Technology Exchange Fund, $5 million. December 20, 1965, Third Presidential Fund, $20 million. December 20, 1965, Fourth Empire Fund, $20 million. March 3, 1966, Second Federal Street Fund, $50 million; March 22, 1966, Life Stock Exchange Fund, $25 million—and Senators will note that they are coming fast in the early part of this year—May 23, 1966, Industries' Exchange Fund, $20 million; July 8, 1966, Putnam Exchange Fund, $30 million; July 12, 1966, Fifth Empire Fund, $14 million; July 14, 1966, Exeter Second Fund, $40 million; July 15, 1966, First Atlantic Fund, $1 million; July 25, 1966, Second Diversification Fund, $29,999,900. And the door is left open for others to come in.

Who knows, when we give absolute assurance by law that they will be excused from payment of any tax whatsoever upon their capital gains, how many are now standing by, just waiting for the President to sign the bill, then to file their plans and to take advantage of this loophole we would write into law for this definite period?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I wonder if the Senator would be so kind, since he has read off the list of swap funds, to disclose how many were covered in the regulations put out by the Treasury, and, therefore, are not involved in this legislation at all? The Senator said that there is a loophole. Would the Senator explain how many were approved by the Treasury?

Mr. GORE. I do not have that information.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Senator does not know, why does he—

Mr. GORE. I have here the date of filing of the registration statement with the Securities and Exchange Commission, the name of the fund, the shares registered, the price per share, and the dollar amount of registration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table to which I have referred be printed in the Record.

This is the source of my information.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Number	Date of filing registration statement with SEC	Effective date	Name of fund	Shares registered	Price per share	Dollar amount of registration
1	Oct. 18, 1965	None	Science & Technology Exchange Fund	250,000	$20	$5,000,000
2	Dec. 20, 1965	Mar. 10, 1966	Third Presidential Fund	400,000	50	20,000,000
3	do	do	Fourth Empire Fund	1,000,000	20	20,000,000
4	Mar. 3, 1966	May 11, 1966	Second Federal Street Fund	2,000,000	25	50,000,000
			Second Federal Street Fund (posteffective amendment)	2,000,000	25	50,000,000
5	Mar. 22, 1966	None	Life Stock Exchange Fund	1,250,000	20	25,000,000
6	May 23, 1966	do	Industries' Exchange Fund	1,000,000	20	20,000,000
7	July 8, 1966	do	Putnam Exchange Fund	1,200,000	25	30,000,000
8	July 12, 1966	do	Fifth Empire Fund	700,000	20	14,000,000
9	July 14, 1966	do	Exeter Second Fund	800,000	50	40,000,000
10	July 15, 1966	do	First Atlantic Fund	40,000	25	1,000,000
11	July 25, 1966	do	Second Diversification Fund	299,999	100	29,999,900

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Would the Senator explain how many were taken care of by that Treasury regulation?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not have a list; but it is my understanding that seven would be involved in this matter. Whether there are others in the same category if approved, I do not know. It is my understanding that one, similar to the seven, had been approved. The Treasury Department thought that it had made a mistake. My opinion was that if the Department had made a mistake it should reverse itself and not expand that error.

The Treasury said there definitely were seven funds that had reached the stage with application status that they would be affected by what we are doing here today.

Mr. GORE. I shall consult with the staff to get that information.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The information could be placed in the Record.

We were told that there were seven that were involved.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the Senator going to proceed to another subject?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I was going to proceed to another part of the bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I wish to make a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I can give the information. Will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore].

Mr. GORE. I am advised by the technical staff that three of these funds have an effective date and only three. They are: Third Presidential Fund, Fourth Empire Fund, and Second Federal Street Fund.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the Senator going to turn to another subject?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to ask the Senator if this is one of the Christmas gifts or one of the grab bags that have been included in the bill, and which have been discussed by Senators and by newspaper columnists?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Are there other Christmas gifts and grab bags?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There are, and by no line of reasoning could they be pictured as important to the balance of payments or having anything to do with the Foreign Investment Tax Act of 1966. It is for that reason I have said that these amendments should be left and that we should go about the business of the Senate, except as to title I, on which there is complete agreement. As to the loss in revenue, the chairman has pointed out that as the bill came from the House there is about a $40 or $50 million loss in revenue, but title I provides for increased revenues of $26 million. In effect, the titles we are discussing would lose around $75 million. That does not include any estimate whatsoever for loss in revenue in the swap section we have just finished discussing.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not a fact that when the bill came to us, under title I, the argument was that it would give equitable treatment to foreign investors with respect to their tax liabilities, and secondly, if the proposal of the administration was accepted there would be an increase in the tax revenues?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Those are the two main arguments. How does the bill end up?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The conference report estimates a $50 million deficit instead of a $26 million increase in revenue in title I. The bill as introduced provided $26 million in revenue although it was not advanced by the Treasury as a revenue-producing measure. It was advanced by the Treasury as equalization of the tax liability of foreign income and bringing it more into conformity with treaties and our arrangements with other countries.

I am in complete agreement with that title of the bill as it has been worked out. The conference report is even better, and it strengthened the bill. I am in complete agreement with that phase of the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What will be the loss of revenue from that standpoint when there is taken into account all titles of the bill? Would the Senator say that the amount is about $44 million?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. H.R. 10 would cost about $40 to $60 million. One could only guess in that connection. There are several other sections here which would run the loss figure up $15 or $20 million, and then there is the $26 million increase revenue in title I.

I would not quarrel with the estimate of the chairman that the net result of the adoption of the package, as a whole, would be in the neighborhood of $50 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I commend the Senator from Delaware. I request that he continue his discussion, describing the other Christmas gifts made to special taxpayers by this bill, and the grab bags.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, would the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield. I had told the chairman that I would not be too long.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I appreciate the opportunity to affirmatively explain why we do not agree with the Senator's view that there is a revenue loss from the operation of swap funds.

If one man holds a share of stock which he bought for $1, which is now worth $100, and he puts it in a common fund with another man who had a share of stock in a different company which he bought for $1, which now sells for $100, and they have to pay a 25-percent capital gains tax, they are not going to put the stock in a common fund, but rather, they will hold it in their safe deposit boxes. That being the case, the Government would get no revenue at all. If they put it in a common fund, the fund would be likely to sell some of it and then the Government gets revenue from the fund. The fund would have the same cost basis as the shareholders when they contributed the stock.

Those who argue for the swap funds contend that it makes money for the Government, but the Treasury did not like it and thought it might be a loophole because it permits stock diversification without the payment of capital gains tax. They sought any regulation to correct this. All we did was to attempt to affirm at a date beginning 6 months to a year later what the Treasury sought to do by its own regulation. The Treasury now supports this provision.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I should like to point out to the Senator from Louisiana clearly what is involved here. Say that A has a million dollars in stock which cost him $1 a share and which on the market today is worth $100 per share. Say that B has a similar investment in another company which cost him $1 a share and its market value is 100 times that. Each wants to diversify his holdings so that he will own half the stock of A and half the stock of B. Under existing law if they sell they have to pay a capital gains tax. Under the so-called loophole, by joining together in an exchange stock fund they will be diversified, each owning a half million dollars of each company. They pay no capital gains tax. There is no possible way to make an estimate as to what would be lost or gained under this loophole. There is no possible way to estimate what any man would do, if. But the point I am making is that there are 90 million Americans today who pay taxes. All except those who are in these seven combines will have to pay the capital gains tax. They want to diversify, and what this bill is saying is, "You seven can go ahead and diversify your real estate holdings, your bonds, and your stocks, and the capital gains tax is waived. They can diversify and will have no capital gains tax to pay.

Mr. President, I do not think it is right.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield right there?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I think we have debated this phase long enough. I promised the majority leader that I would confine my remarks to the question before the Senate today, but I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana further. However, I want the RECORD to show that I am not delaying this colloquy.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I should like to read into the RECORD section 351(a). I should like to read what the law states:

> (a) General Rule.—No gain or loss shall be recognized if property is transferred to a corporation by one or more persons solely in exchange for stock or securities in such corporation and immediately after the exchange such person or persons are in control (as defined in section 368(c)) of the corporation. For purposes of this section, stock or securities issued for services shall not be considered as issued in return for property.

Many tax lawyers think that means these swap funds are legal. The Treasury wanted to stop the establishment of these funds and its regulations seem to have had that effect since no one can arrange to have the question litigated without risking large amounts of money.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not want to discuss this all day long. I should like to hurry along and comply with the desire of the majority leader for adjournment. I am well aware of that section of the law. The Under Secretary of the Treasury quoted that same law the time he said it was not applicable to these swap funds on securities but that the section was intended to deal with the situation where one corporation would organize another corporation and receive its stock in exchange for property it contributes to the new corporation. Under Secretary Surrey said it was in no way related to the problem we are discussing today. I think we have debated this point long enough.

It is a loophole to aid a very small group to avoid its tax obligation.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator from Delaware yield to me long enough to make this observation? I have listened with great interest to the explanations of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota and the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. Their explanations of how the Treasury is not going to lose money by this amendment remind me of that intrepid merchant down my way who was not quite satisfied with the condition of his business, so he put on a big sale. During the sale, one of his neighbors came by and said to him, "How are you getting along?"

The merchant replied, "Oh, fine. I am losing money on every item I am selling, but I am making it up on volume."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I next want to discuss section 201 of the conference report. This deals with the application of investment tax credit to property used in possessions of the United States. That is the title of the section. When the 7-percent investment tax credit was first enacted, Congress intentionally and very clearly confined it to purchases of equipment used in the continental United States. It did not apply to any equipment used by American corporations abroad.

There is no argument about that. Congress did that, clearly and intentionally. Right or wrong, that is the law. As evidence of that point there are pending before the Committee on Foreign Relations one or two treaties which the Treasury Department first approved, but in light of the recent suspension I think it has withdrawn its support. These treaties would have extended the investment tax credit to American corporations for their investments in certain countries—Pakistan was one, and Israel another. Several others were waiting in line in case one treaty was approved.

This bill deals with investment tax credit on property used by American corporations in possessions of the United States.

The section which is before us now carries retroactivity.

Let me quote from the summary in the committee report concerning section 201:

> *1. Application of the investment credit to certain property in U.S. possessions.*—The investment credit is extended to property located in U.S. possessions provided the property is owned by a U.S. company or citizen,

subject to U.S. tax on its income from possessions, would otherwise have qualified for the investment credit, and is not owned or used by U.S. persons who are presently exempt from U.S. tax. This amendment is effective with respect to property placed in service after December 31, 1965.

Mr. President, construction of this property started prior to that date and it was put into use after December 31, 1965. Why did they pick this one date, and why was that section so designed? Because it fits exactly one company. It fits, to my knowledge, just one company, the Harvey Aluminum Co., which will get a windfall of about $2 million in tax credit. The tax credit which goes to that company would be retroactive in that this amends the old law to apply to investments of American companies abroad.

In other words, at the same time Congress is suspending the 7-percent investment credit for other taxpayers the bill provides a retroactive $2-million investment credit for another company. Under the law they could not have obtained such credit, but now it is proposed to permit it retroactively.

In addition, I should like to point out the other concession that this company already gets with its investment in the islands. This company in the Virgin Islands has already had approved a 75-percent rebate on its tax on income from its plant in the Virgin Islands for 16 years. That tax subsidy in the Virgin Islands had already been approved.

It will be noted that the language of the bill cleverly states that the $2 million bonus in this bill is deductible from the income of the parent organization in the United States. The company has shipped equipment to the Virgin Islands, so that means that the bulk of $2 million windfall will be deducted from the top obligation of the parent organization in the United States. The plant itself is already exempt from income taxes to the exent of 75 percent by virtue of an agreement it has in the Virgin Islands government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a series of correspondence concerning this project, including one letter from the Secretary of the Interior, one letter from the General Services Administration, and one letter from the Treasury Department.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D.C., March 8, 1962.

Hon. John J. Williams,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Williams: The Governor of the Virgin Islands, the Honorable Ralph Paiewonsky, signed an agreement with a subsidiary of the Harvey Aluminum Company on February 8, 1962, looking toward that firm's locating an alumina plant on St. Croix. This agreement, about which you wrote on February 15, does contemplate a plant costing about $25,000,000 to reduce bauxite to alumina; the alumina would be subsequently shipped to Harvey's plant at The Dalles, Oregon, for reduction to aluminum. The Legislature of the Virgin Islands ratified this agreement on February 19, 1962, which step was a prior condition to its becoming binding on either party.

Contrary to the information which you have received, this move was not made under my sponsorship, at my suggestion, or with my approval. I hasten to add, of course, that the foregoing statement does not imply any disapproval on my part, but simply that this was a matter wholly within the competence of the local government. Governor Paiewonsky has kept me informed since negotiations with Harvey became serious last summer, but we both recognized that the decisions involved could and indeed must be made by the Virgin Islanders' own Governor and their elected representatives. This Department has long shared Governor Paiewonsky's concern about the lack of sufficient industrial and commercial enterprises in the Virgin Islands to afford an adequate living to its population, but decisions on the type of industry to seek, the particular firms, and the specific details of an agreement, are all local matters.

As to whether the United States Government has given its approval to such a project, I would say "No" insofar as the specific agreement mentioned above relating to the project's location in the Virgin Islands is concerned. However, Harvey did enter into a still valid contract with the United States in September 1955 which, among other things, provides for the construction of a facility of this nature somewhere.

Regarding your questions 1, 2, and 4, we suggest that you may wish to ask these of the Defense Materials Service, General Services Administration, which is administering the subject contract, DMP–78, because that is the agency with complete, first-hand information on these matters.

You ask, in question 3, if there is any tax advantage to Harvey's locating in the Virgin Islands as opposed to locating in the United States. We assume you mean as opposed to locating "elsewhere" in the United States, since the Virgin Islanders are not only just as American as any other of our citizens, but probably need economic development worse than most of our other communities.

Insofar as local tax advantages are concerned, we would be unable to make any comparisons, since we take for granted that whatever alternative sites Harvey may have considered in the United States for its plant would also have involved considerable local tax concessions, in accordance with usual industry-attraction practices of many states and local communities. However, we do believe there are two potential financial advantages of a non-local nature which should be mentioned.

The first potential advantage is that should the United States import duty on alumina, now suspended, be reinstated, savings would accrue to Harvey through its not having to pay such impost on this alumina. This result would follow from the fact that the Virgin Islands are outside United States Customs area.

The second potential tax advantage of a non-local nature would materialize if Harvey (a) invests at least $15,000,000, (b) produces at least 50,000 short tons of aluminum, and (c) has a net profit on operations in the Virgin Islands. Under such circumstances Harvey would pay, constructively although this would not be the precise technical position, an income tax which would be but 25 percent of the Federal income tax it would pay were it to locate in the mainland of the United States.

Lastly, you ask if the contract were approved by Interior would it have been done on the basis of need for increased facilities for producing aluminum. Of course Interior has not and will not approve the contract for location in the Virgin Islands. If this contract were subject to our approval we would not have given such approval on the basis of present need for more aluminum facilities. We would have referred a decision on such a limited basis to the Office of Emergency Planning, even though we are well aware that there seems to be no need at the present time for increased facilities for producing aluminum. However, this proposed plant will only produce alumina, replacing that which is presently being purchased abroad, and will not increase at all Harvey's capacity for producing aluminum.

If, however, you are referring to the contract executed in September 1955, while Interior was not involved in such contract, it is our understanding that it was entered into by the United States because of the then existing or anticipated need for increasing facilities for producing aluminum.

Sincerely yours,
Stewart L. Udall,
Secretary of the Interior.

General Services Administration,
Washington, D.C., May 2, 1966.

Hon. John J. Williams,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Williams: Your letter of April 4 requests information concerning Government purchases from the Harvey Aluminum Company, now known as Harvey Aluminum (Incorporated), during the past 15 years. We believe you have reference only to those purchases with respect to which General Services Administration has cognizance, and the information contained herein has been prepared accordingly.

Aside from the possibility of routine supply contracts covering aluminum extrusions which, in any event, would have been on a competitive bid basis and with respect to which we doubt that you have any interest, there have been only two contracts with the Harvey Company during this period. One of these contracts was evidenced only by a Letter of Intent issued December 19, 1950 and accepted by Harvey on January 4, 1951 providing for the construction of primary aluminum reduction facilities in Kalispell, Montana with alumina facilities at a point to be determined in the Northwest and bauxite facilities, capable of producing 72,000 short tons per annum of primary aluminum, the Government agreeing to purchase if tendered up to 360,000 short tons of aluminum, representing 5 years of production. The letter of intent was to be followed by a formal contract but such formal contract was never executed within the time limit prescribed, and accordingly the letter of intent expired by its terms. We are informed that the primary aluminum reduction facilities were installed in Montana by a company in which Harvey and the Anaconda Copper Mining Company had interests but such facilities were not covered by any Government contract.

The principal contract in which we believe you are interested is numbered DMP–78 and was effective September 13, 1955. It superseded, however, a letter of intent issued May 15, 1953, and accepted by Harvey on May 19, 1953.

This contract was awarded incident to the third Government-sponsored aluminum expansion program and was designed to bring into existence primary aluminum reduction facilities capable of producing 54,000 tons of aluminum pig per annum. The primary reduction facilities have been completed and are capable of producing something more than than 60,000 tons per annum, so that the primary purpose of the contract has been accomplished. As part consideration the Government agreed to purchase if tendered by Harvey, up to 270,000 short tons of primary aluminum pig over the life of the contract, this representing 5 years of production, if not utilized or otherwise disposed of by Harvey.

As of December 31, 1961 the Government had purchased 114,068 short tons at a cost of $57,798,000. Harvey at that date had lost the right to tender 46,130 short tons which tonnage had been used or otherwise disposed of by the contractor, which left the Government's remaining exposure at 109,802 short tons. Our best estimate, however, based upon Harvey's historic consumption of aluminum in its integrated operations is that we shall be required to purchase only 101,948 tons of this remainder.

The price paid by the Government is in effect market price. While the contract calls for the lowest published price of the contractor, it provides that if the prices published by any of the three principal producers, the Aluminum Company of America, Kaiser Aluminum and Chemical Corporation or Reynolds Metals Company are lower, the weighted average of the prices published by those 3 companies averaged over the 90 day period preceding delivery shall be the effective price.

Under the date of December 24, 1952, Harvey was issued necessity certificate TA-NC-20722 by the Defense Production Administration covering 85% of the cost of construction of aluminum, alumina and bauxite facilities estimated at $65,250,000. The financial assistance extended by GSA aside from providing a market for up to 270,000 short tons of aluminum, took the form of a guarantee of bank loans up to $65,000,000 for the construction of the primary reduction facilities at the Dalles, Oregon, and facilities for the production of alumina and bauxite if the latter two are undertaken by Harvey. The bank loans covering the cost of constructing the primary reduction facilities amounted to $44,000,000. The Government obligation to guarantee loans obtained to finance the cost of the alumina plant and bauxite facilities is to guarantee an amount the Government participation in which, in the event of loss, shall not exceed $21,000,000. The contractor has elected to construct such facilities and under the terms of the contract such construction must commence by June 30, 1962. Incident to negotiations concerning the election to construct, GSA has substantially completed arrangements to be discharged of the guarantee of the reduction portion of the loan, originally $44,000,000, as of March 31, 1962.

As you have indicated, the alumina facilities we understand are to be constructed in the Virgin Islands, with the bauxite facilities in all probability to be constructed elsewhere. It is these two facilities which would be the subject of the guarantee up to $21,000,000 of bank loans for construction, if requested by Harvey. That company, however, has agreed to use its best efforts to accomplish the construction without the guarantee of loans by GSA.

This was a negotiated contract and did not involve competitive bids.

Harvey Machine Company, the predecessor of the present contractor, applied for a contract during the third Government sponsored aluminum expansion program in 1952. The company had experience in the aluminum industry and had obtained a firm power contract and a supply source of alumina. The development of competition in the primary aluminum production field was considered extremely advisable. Accordingly, and upon certification of Harvey by the Office of Defense Mobilization, the contract was executed. In essence the contract terms, particularly as to price and principal features are the same as the terms included in expansion contracts awarded to Alcoa, Kaiser and Reynolds.

If we can be of any further assistance please call upon us.

Sincerely yours,

Bernard L. Boutin,
Administrator.

Treasury Department,
Washington, May 17, 1962.

Hon. John J. Williams,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Williams: This is in response to your question at the hearings Friday, May 11, 1962, on whether the Virgin Islands could be used as a tax haven. You were concerned in particular about Harvey Alumina Virgin Islands, Inc., a Virgin Islands corporation which is a wholly owned subsidiary of Harvey Aluminum, a domestic corporation. The subsidiary has entered a contract with the Virgin Islands under which the inducements, such as free land, and exemption from real estate tax, commonly offered by local governments in the United States are granted. One of the additional inducements granted by the Virgin Islands is a subsidy based on income tax liability.

In general, the Virgin Islands taxes corporations created in the Virgin Islands at full Internal Revenue Code rates on the income from all sources. Under section 934, added in 1960, however, the Virgin Islands may grant subsidies based on the tax liability of a Virgin Islands corporation 80 percent of whose gross income is from sources within the Virgin Islands and 50 percent of whose gross income is from the active conduct of a trade or business in the Virgin Islands. Although section 934 in itself would not preclude all tax haven operations, Virgin Islands law provides that the subsidy based on income tax liability can be granted only with respect to income from the construction, ownership, or operation of new housing projects, factory buildings or hotels. In the case of the Harvey Aluminum subsidiary a nontaxable subsidy equal to 75 percent of the income tax liability over a period of 16 years is granted on the condition that the subsidiary construct and operate a plant costing $15 million and produce at least 50,000 tons of alumina from bauxite ore.

Such substantial production is not considered a tax haven operation in the case of foreign countries even though the country in which the production takes place grants special write-offs, or reduced rates. Such operations in foreign countries would continue to obtain deferral under H.R. 10650. The Virgin Islands incentive program is comparable to those provided by many foreign countries.

A problem will exist, however, in making certain that the prices paid by the domestic parent corporation to the subsidiary for alumina to be further processed in the United States will not shift to the Virgin Islands income which is properly attributable to the United States. This problem, just as in the case of transactions between other related domestic and related foreign corporations, will be dealt with under the amendments to section 482 made by section 6 of the bill. The Virgin Islands government cooperates completely in providing the necessary information.

Sincerely yours,

Stanley S. Surrey,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall quote from the letter from the Treasury Department, in the case of a Harvey Aluminum Co., subsidiary, a nontaxable subsidiary:

> In the case of the Harvey Aluminum subsidiary a nontaxable subsidy equal to 75 percent of the income tax liability over a period of 16 years is granted on the condition that the subsidiary construct and operate a plant costing $15 million and produce at least 50,000 tons of alumina from bauxite ore.

Mr. President, in addition, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a statement issued by the St. Croix Chamber of Commerce released at the time the tax exemption was granted. The chamber of commerce of St. Croix vigorously denounced the special tax benefits being given to this plant and pointed out that the company was receiving an outright option on 700 acres of land which belongs to the people of the Virgin Islands.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

St. Croix Chamber of Commerce.

Re Contract with Harvey Aluminum, St Croix, Inc.

To the Legislature of the Virgin Islands,
In Committee of the Whole,
Government House,
Christiansted, St. Croix:

The St. Croix Chamber of Commerce is vitally concerned with the welfare of the Virgin Islands, and especially with the island of St. Croix. We have assisted the promotion of industries for St. Croix, and have on file letters of appreciation from many organizations that we have assisted in their efforts to come here and establish their businesses.

Thus, it cannot be said that we are against industry coming to St. Croix. But, when a company does indicate its intention to come here, we investigate its plans and determine that its operation will be beneficial to the economic and overall structure of our island. Such an investigation requires a full knowledge of the company, its products, the process that will be engaged in here, and if it will be good for St. Croix now and for future generations. The Chamber of Commerce wholeheartedly indorses the principles outlined by the Governor in attempting to upgrade the employment available to our native sons and daughters, and will do everything in its power to help them advance in the economic and social scale. However, we have grave fears that the Governor may be badly mistaken in the results to be achieved by this particular contract. You, the legislators, are the ones who must answer to posterity and bear full responsibility for the results.

In the case of the present industry, Harvey Alumina of St. Croix, Inc., we have sought detailed information many times from the Governor of these Virgin Islands; from the company direct through Vice President S. Keith Linden; and from you gentlemen. Thus far, we have had a summary of the contract furnished as a press release, talks with Mr. Linden, talks with the Governor, all about generalities—and no detailed information, no copy of the contract and the supporting documents. Mr. Linden tells us that he is dealing with the Government of the Virgin Islands, not the Chamber of Commerce; the Governor says that certain matters in the contract are confidential, and that he must protect the interests of the Company against information that might leak out to their competitors; and further, that he cannot release to us and to the people of St. Croix, the contract and documents until they have been released first to the Legislature—and then become public property. We were last told this on Tuesday, February 6th, and since that time it has become apparent that delivery of the documents has been delayed from day to day. Last schedule we received was that they were to be presented to you on Tuesday, February 13th. It is very apparent that this move was to prevent free access to these documents until too late to study them carefully before tonight's hearing.

The Governor says that the Chamber of Commerce should have had a survey made long ago, in response to our request that time be granted now for research by the

Arthur D. Little Co. He well knows that the facts from the principals were not made available to anyone. These facts are the basis from which the survey could be made.

Now, if this alliance of the Virgin Islands Government and a private enterprise was an outright straight business deal, in which the company proposed to pay a fair price for what the Virgin Islands has to offer and they were prepared to establish themselves in accordance with our laws controlling industry, availing themselves only of such tax advantages as are open to all that qualify under our tax exemption program—there would be little reason to question their motives. But when the transaction involves an outright donation of 700 acres of land belonging to the people of the Virgin Islands, as well as Krause Lagoon—another area of 150 acres more, payment of 3 million dollars of taxpayers' money for a channel to be dug and maintained and used principally by the recipient of the gift of land; and generous tax exemption for a period of 16 years—it becomes a matter of great interest to all the people of St. Croix—and should have more than a passing glance by *all* Virgin Islanders.

What do Cruzans get in return for this 3 millions of dollars and large area of land? Promises of jobs in an alumina processing plant:

1. If there are Virgin Islanders qualified and available and seeking those jobs—Harvey agrees that 75% of the entire work force shall be island residents.

On opening day, how many island residents will be qualified, trained workers for anything but common labor?

But we are told that Harvey will have a vocational training school that will be open to all comers, whether they are to be employed at the Harvey plant or not. That they will furnish scholarships to top students whose interest lies in the field of chemistry or engineering. But these promises are not in the Summary of the contract release to the Press. However, we must remember that a vocational school will offer on the job training. So the plant will have to be in operation months before any Cruzan will be sufficiently trained to be useful. By that time, the entire staff that had to be on hand at the beginning of the operation, because of 6 months residence, will have become Virgin Islands residents by virtue of living and working here. How then can they be displaced? Of course, if the individual is an imported alien, and that may be the case since Harvey representatives have asked our local Virgin Islands employment office for the necessary forms to be filled out to bring aliens in—it will be an easier substitution. But if the job-holder is from the States, or from Puerto Rico, and is performing his work satisfactorily and well—will Harvey be ready and willing to fire a trained man and take on a green hand? So—the Cruzan waits for a vacancy! Also, will the labor union allow this to take place to their members? Perhaps, within a generation, Mr. Linden will realize his ideal to have the plant manned 100% by Virgin Islanders—will we, who are here tonight, live to see his dream come true?

2. We can hope to start receiving full tax payments from the Company after 16 years have passed, and the year 1978 rolls around. In the meantime, we get fractional income taxes from Harvey and the income taxes from the employees. Of course, if the employees are Virgin Islanders we would get their taxes from their present source of employment, since there is no unemployment here at present. Immediately, on the start of construction, we can anticipate greater loads on our school, medical and police facilities—so any taxes we get will be consumed at once in this expansion.

Weighing the cost of these *presumed* benefits in terms of land and money—can we afford to have Harvey Alumina on St. Croix with us?

The Governor states that these concessions are in order because Harvey will spend 25 million dollars for the construction of their plant. The plant will belong to Harvey—not the people of the Virgin Islands. It seems that a better bargain could be driven than is represented by the present contract. Eliminate the gift of land and the costly channel—the tax incentive is sufficient. We strongly suggest that you refuse to ratify this contract, and attempt to get more for the people—not give away their heritage.

The people of St. Croix are entitled to be fully informed on all things that the Government undertakes to do for them. These islands are still supposed to be operating as a Democracy—we even refer to the Virgin Islands as "The Show Place of Democracy". In a democracy, the people share in self-government, and in self-determination toward shaping their future. The aura of suspicion and mystery that surrounded these negotiations from the very beginning makes us wonder if Democracy here is something you can find only in the dictionary!

You, our legislators, still have time to restore the right to the people to proceed in enlightenment—let them know in detail what this deal involves—then hear their opinions and be guided by them. They will accept your decision more readily if this matter is not rushed through. What we ask for is time!

St. Croix Chamber of Commerce,
John L. Colby.

February 14, 1962.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, has Congress not done enough for this company? It is already being granted entrance of its products into this country duty free. In addition, the company is excused from 75 percent of its tax liability in the islands. Now Congress provides retroactively $2 million in investment credit, which the company could not receive if this section were not included and which could not be received under existing law.

The argument is made that it has since been proposed that perhaps the provision should be extended to the islands. Perhaps so; I do not argue that. I personally would support such a proposal, prospectively. I so stated in committee. But I do not agree that retroactively such favoritism should be shown to one company. The argument that this provision is tailored for the benefit of other investments in the islands is not correct. If it were, why is the effective date for the completion of the buildings after December 31, 1962?

Certainly this is tailor made for Harvey Aluminum.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I promised to yield to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche].

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator asked a question. I would like to answer it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will yield to the Senator in a moment, but I yield first to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche].

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I shall ask several questions, trying to punctuate what the Senator from Delaware has said. When the 7-percent investment tax credit was adopted, it was specifically intended to have it applicable only to operations within the United States, and not in our territorial possessions. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That has been the law ever since the tax credit bill was passed. This year, in this session, we have suspended the operation of the 7-percent investment tax credit by appropriate legislation. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In spite of the suspension of that law, this bill contemplates to expand the operation of it, going back to December 31, 1965. Is that correct?

Was it ever mentioned by the Treasury Department until the committee wrote the provision in the bill, as far as the Senator knows?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. To my knowledge, it was not mentioned. The Treasury Department was strongly opposed to this proposal when it was put in the bill, although as the Senator from Louisiana has pointed out, the Treasury Department later reversed its position. I understand the Treasury Department yesterday endorsed the whole package; I have not heard what their position is today.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Has the Senator identified who the specific beneficiary of the provision is?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Harvey Aluminum Co., in the Virgin Islands, was the particular beneficiary of this provision, and it was so tailored to give them a $2-million windfall.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the Senator have any knowledge of anyone else who is to have the benefits from the provision, so far as the testimony now shows?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Under this section, so far as I know, there are no others. I shall yield to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] in a moment. He may know of others, but I do not.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is this another one of what we call gifts that are to be put under the Christmas tree of 1966 for specific enterprises that are contemplated to be benefited?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. This is the big red ball we see over on the side of the tree.

Mr. LAUSCHE. This is that gift. So the Senator has identified two instances.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes. I am not sure whether the Senator from Louisiana supported this when it went into the bill.

I yield now to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long].

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware says he does not think it is necessary to have this for our possessions. I did not know that the Harvey Aluminum Co. was the beneficiary. It does not have investments in Louisiana that I am aware of, and I do not know the president of the company. I understand the Treasury has negotiated tax treaties with two less developed countries and are in the process of negotiating more which will grant this benefit to other less-developed countries. If this benefit is going to be given to less-developed countries I think we may as well give those benefits to our possessions—Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands. Whenever such a bill is passed, it is usually made effective January 1, even though the law is not passed until July, August, or September. I remind the Senator that the same thing was done for the chickens. When that law was passed it was made effective retroactively, because that was the logical and convenient way to do it. In that case it was retroactive more than a year if I remember correctly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have no objection to bringing a few chickens into this discussion. Maybe we could give the taxpayers who were forgotten a good chicken dinner. The Senator from Louisiana may have forgotten, but the measure he refers to dealt with an exchange in Selbyville, which is a cooperative and which has first been determined to be a tax-exempt cooperative. Suddenly the rules were changed. The total amount involved was around $30,000. Those proceeds of this organization go to the University of Maryland and the University of Delaware. There are no stockholders involved, and no salaries paid to the officers. The Treasury Department supported the correction. That proposal had nothing to do with the poultrymen in Delaware.

So let us get back on the subject of the pending grab bag or Christmas tree bill, as it has been designated.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. There was a retroactivity problem in that bill. That is all I was saying. When we fix an effective date, it is not unusual—in fact, it is almost typical—that it be effective the first of the calendar year in which we take the action.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I want to hasten with my statement, in line with my agreement with the majority leader that I would not take long. I have already taken longer than I had intended. I shall conclude as fast as I can.

I repeat, this tailor-designed piece of legislation is designed to take care of one company on a retroactive basis, estimated to involve $2 million to be applied as a credit against the tax on earnings created in the United States. This credit is on an investment the company is making in the islands, where it already has a 75-percent exemption on income taxes as well as a very favorable duty treatment. This represents the big red ball we see on this Christmas tree. This section has nothing to do with the balance of payments. It has nothing to do with taking care of the elderly people, who were paraded on the floor when the bill was passed, all of whom were forgotten in the conference. It has nothing to do with the average American taxpayer, except that the 90 million taxpayers will make up the $2 million being given to this one company.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Since the intended beneficiary of the amendment under discussion has been identified, I would like to remark that it is a fine company. I do not wish my remarks in any way to be considered as critical of that company. The company has a large operation in the State of Tennessee. Many of its officials are my personal friends. Some are my political supporters.

I decline, however, to support the amendment. I consider the amendment special interest legislation—only one interest being the beneficiary.

The fact is that the plant on which this amendment would retroactively give to this corporation the investment credit is already completed, already in operation. It was constructed without the expectation of this benefit, and without relationship to the benefit being in existence within the continental United States. So this is, it seems to me, clearly unjustified tax favoritism to one corporation; and I say that in view of the fact that its officials are friends of mine, and it has operations in the State of Tennessee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Tennessee, and I concur. What I am saying is not criticism of the corporation itself; it is criticism of the Congress if it sees fit to make this gift, because there is no logical reason for it that I can see. This plant is already constructed. It is ready for operation. It was constructed by the company with the full knowledge and understanding that under the law they would not receive the investment credit.

Now, since we are approaching the Christmas holidays, in a spirit of great generosity Congress apparently proposes to give that company $2 million which they never even expected and for which there is no basis whatsoever.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, we made the original investment tax credit provisions in the Revenue Act of 1962 effective as of January 1, 1962, the beginning of that year—although the measure was not enacted until about 9 months later. To that extent, the original investment credit provisions themselves were retroactive.

I voted for this provision in the committee. But I was voting for it having no idea who might have built a plant in the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, or Guam. If the Senator is in a position to assure us that nobody except one company has built anything in the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, or Puerto Rico that qualifies for this credit provision, if he is in a position to assure us that nobody else has built a plant in any one of those American possessions before October 10 of this year, he is certainly more knowledgeable than I am.

It never occurred to us to look into it. It seemed to us that if Americans are to receive the credit for investing money in underdeveloped countries, in justice and equity, we ought to treat Americans who invest money in our own possessions just as fairly. But I repeat, if the Senator has found out that only one company has built anything subject to the investment credit in the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, or Guam, he is more knowledgeable than I on this subject.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, all I am saying is that I have checked and been advised by the Department that as far as it is aware there is only this one company involved.

At least I will say this: It is tailor designed to fit the pattern of this one company. As to the Senator's argument of why not give the investors in these American possessions the benefits we give under treaties to investors in foreign countries, I should like to point out to the Senator that not one treaty has been ratified wherein we give the 7-percent investment credit to investors in foreign countries. We rejected one, the treaty with Pakistan, in our committee. That argument is not valid.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Of course, those treaties are pending before the Foreign Relations Committee, in the subcommittee so ably headed by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

But let me point out to the Senator that he may be in error when he says he is sure——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I beg the Senator's pardon. If there is another company for which the amendment would provide a $2 million gift, I should like to know who it is. The Department has advised me that they know of only one.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Perhaps the Treasury knows of only one now; but should other builders come in and apply for the investment credit, the Treasury may become aware of more than one. I know we have had some watch assembly people going over to Guam; we just passed a bill relative to their quota.

I would think we would find a number of people who have put people to work building plants in the Virgin Islands or Puerto Rico—there are a lot of small industries going up there. But I take the Senator's word for it that there is one company for sure which has invested some money and put people to work down there. I understand that is the Harvey Aluminum Co. My only regret is that they did not do it in Louisiana.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator mentions the watch company. This is another red herring. It makes no difference whether they own a company in Guam or anywhere else; the investment credit has been suspended as of October 9, 1966. No one can question but that this amendment is tailor designed to fit one company, the Harvey Aluminum, which stands to receive about $2 million.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will yield to the Senator, but I do not want him later to be saying that I delayed the adoption of the conference report because I am yielding to him all the time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is most kind. This amendment is not tailor made to fit one company. In general, any company, as I understand it, that builds a building in those American possessions gets the same type of consideration as far as investment credit is concerned that it would get if it had built it in the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall not argue with the Senator whether it is tailored desiged or not. I will say most emphatically that the date selected fits exactly that one case. It would be a series of strange coincidences if all of that just accidently happened exactly that way. I repeat: It did not leave them out.

Mr. President, I see no need to pursue the question any longer. We have discussed it in detail. This was to be a Foreign Investors' Tax Act. I cite just a few other examples of special treatment. Increased depletion allowances for clam and oyster shells, gravel and slate, and certain types of alumina-bearing clay are all in this grab bag. Those are examples of many presents in this bill, every one of which is tailor designed to fit specific cases. Such matters do not belong in general legislation; they should be handled as private bills, if at all, and voted on as such.

When I objected to these extraneous matters during the debate on the bill when it was before the Senate I was described as the most hardhearted individual in the Senate. The Senator from Louisiana asked how one could oppose a measure which would do so much for the old people. For a while I thought we were going to turn the Senate into an old folks home, so many examples were brought forth of these elderly people, starving to death, needing doctors, medicine, drugs, and unable to get them without the original bill then before us. That was the argument then.

Mr. President, what happened? They deleted every one of these items in the bill. Even the provision dealing with the elderly people was deleted. The conferees kept every item in the bill that takes care of some special individual or company, such as the gift of $2 million to the Harvey Aluminum Co. and other such special group amendments.

This is a special bill for special groups. I guess that the elder citizens will have to wait until another election approaches, and then they will hear more concern expressed for them, or perhaps if we adjourn between now and election day they will hear much said on the campaign trail about how the administration wanted to do something for them. Such promises and expressions are a political farce.

They traded off and deleted every item that would benefit the elderly people in return for the acceptance of these grab bag amendments. The conferees brought back every item that takes care of some special interest or some special group by way of a tax reduction. Such hypocrisy.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, is it not a fact that when the Senator offered his amendment to strike from the bill all of the titles except title I, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], I believe, suggested that he carry that amendment into effect except that he allowed to remain in the bill the section providing aid to the aged in the purchase of drugs and medicines, and that in pursuance to that suggestion the Senator from Delaware persisted in his amendment but agreed to allow the provision for the aged to remain in the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. My first proposal was to strike the three titles which did not deal with the Foreign Investment Tax Act. However, after I had heard all the eloquent pleas to take care of these elderly people and after I had seen so many crocodile tears shed, I thought perhaps the situation was so bad that we ought to yield and permit them to keep in the provision for the elderly people.

Accordingly my amendment was amended to strike out all except that part pertaining to the elderly people. We lost on that amendment. The measure went to conference, and, lo and behold, the conferees took out all the provisions benefiting the elderly, which they had argued for, and they retained all of the special privilege amendments. I repeat, they dropped out every single item dealing with the elderly people.

Frankly, I do not know if they have stopped their shedding of tears or not. Perhaps they are trying to forget their own speeches.

After reading the RECORD I was amazed when I learned that they had deleted that section.

Why do we place top priority on a depletion allowance for clay, clam shells, and oyster shells and include a special provision for a $2 million gift and to just one company, then another provision to save taxes for seven special operations in the stock "swap" arrangements?

Why are these special provisions included in a bill which deals with the Foreign Investment Tax Act?

The Senator from Tennessee is going to discuss H.R. 10. But that proposal represents a $60 million tax reduction at a time when we are talking about increasing taxes after the election. Let us face it, we are operating today with an average deficit of approximately $600 million or $700 million per month.

There is no question in the minds of many that as soon as the votes have been counted the President will suddenly decide that he has information which will necessitate his increasing taxes.

Yet, today Congress is reducing taxes for certain special groups. I think it is wrong.

Earlier I supported a tax increase bill providing for the suspension of investment credit because I thought we had to do something to combat this inflation.

I think inflation is a serious threat. I think that the President has not gone far enough to combat this threat. My criticism does not concern what he did, but it does concern his failure to recognize the actual situation which exists and the cost of the war, and so forth. Why should we vote here for a tax reduction for a handful of people who happen to have lobbyists in the corridors to get their proposals presented before the committee when we all know that in a very short period the chances are 10 to 1 that the administration will be increasing the taxes for the rest of the people?

That is the reason that the pending bill has been referred to as a grab bag. I did not coin the word. The Wall Street Journal, which is certainly not unfavorable to business, referred to the measure before us as a grab bag. That reflects on the committee that reported the measure. The measure has also been referred to as a Christmas tree. I have tried to outline and describe some of the balls that are on this tree.

In my 20 years of service in the Senate this is the most indefensible measure ever reported by the Finance Committee.

In another section $60 million is provided for presidential elections. We already have on the books a proposal providing that no political party can spend more than $3 million. That provision applies to any political party. If a party were to spend more it would be in violation of the law.

The pending bill does not change that law, yet it would supply $60 million, $30 million for each party, for campaign expenses. The statute says that it would be illegal if a political party were to spend more than $3 million on such a campaign.

Certainly the measure should wait until next year and be given more careful study.

The provision does nothing to take care of the needed election reforms. The measure does nothing whatsoever about this.

I know, and the Senator from Ohio knows, that the mood of Congress is such that they are never enthusiastic about passing election reform measures. The only way to get a reform measure through Congress is to tie it to the money. I say that as one who feels that we need some kind of legislative proposal to finance the Federal election campaigns.

I think the Federal Government has a responsibility, and I think that a meaningful law could be worked out.

In addition, I disagree completely with the theory, advanced under this proposal.

If an individual citizen wants to contribute to the Republican Party in order to do so he must contribute an equal amount to the Democratic Party and 50 cents to the Republican Party. If a Democrat wants to contribute to the Democratic Party he must contribute an equal amount to the Republican Party.

I have advocated laws which would encourage greater participation in the general elections on the part of the small wage earners of America.

I have been sponsoring a proposal to encourage greater participation in the general election. I think it would be helpful not only to raise money but, even more important, I think it would be healthy in that it would encourage the

American people to take a greater interest in their government.

If we are going to do that, why should John Doe not have the right to make a contribution to the political party of his choice?

If a man wants to contribute to the Democratic Party, he has a right to contribute to the Democratic Party, and I think he is a better citizen for having contributed to the national elections. I would, of course, rather that he contributed to the Republican Party, but I know that he is a better citizen if he takes an interest in the campaign and contributes to the party of his choice.

Why should we provide by law that one cannot contribute to his own party without contributing to the other party? Furthermore, we do nothing in the pending bill concerning the reform measures or the accounting of expenditures. We do nothing to change the law that limits the amount of money that can be spent, the $3 million, in the presidential campaign, and we do nothing about the abuse in congressional elections.

The Senator from Louisiana points out that if he could get the presidential campaign financed he may pick up the various $1,000 contributions now being made to the presidential campaign.

This is not solving the problem. We are merely moving the problem around.

We need a general revision of our election laws in the country. However, let us do it from the bottom up and put some teeth in the measure. Let us not pass a bill to provide that an additional $60 million could be spent in the same loose manner. This measure would only aggravate the current situation.

I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I want to get back to the argument made on the measure when it was before the Senate several weeks ago.

I contemplate, before this debate is concluded, reading the Record showing that the principal argument was made for the bill because it contained provisions giving relief to the aged in their buying of medicines and drugs.

I ask the Senator from Delaware whether it is not a fact that practically every argument made in support of the bill several weeks ago highlighted the fact that it contemplated helping the aged.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And because of those arguments, Senator Gore, Senator Williams of Delaware, and others concluded to challenge the bill, but not to challenge the provision giving aid to the elderly. Now, what has become of the main part of the argument—that is, that we will help the aged? How are they helped by the bill as it has been brought back by the conferees?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There is not a single comma or a single word in the bill which would in any way help them at all. Quite the contrary. As taxpayers they will have to pay additional taxes to make up for these Christmas gifts that are being given to the select groups.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is, the section of the bill that provided help for the aged is gone?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. They are the forgotten people of the Johnson administration.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What has happened to the other sections of the bill which provided special grants to privileged taxpayers?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Every one of the so-called special privilege amendments was retained in the bill in some form.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And the Senator discussed the sections of the bill that place the mineral depletion formula within the principle for the purpose of paying taxes. Is it not a fact that there is now in the bill an expansion of the grants made to the harvesters of minerals?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct—to those producing or processing clam shells, oyster shells, and various types of clay.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And tile?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. And tile. All are the beneficiaries of a tax reduction in the form of additional depletion allowances in this bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Did the administration originally oppose the expansion of that principle, or at least did not request that it be in this bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. They opposed it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. They opposed it. So that now the fishermen, the harvesters of oysters and clams, and the miners of clay and the manufacturers of tile are given a special tax consideration by the bill as we passed it and as recommended by the conferees?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

To illustrate how absurd this situation is, why would anyone claim a depletion allowance on clam and oyster shells? If that is to be allowed why not claim the depletion allowance on the clams and the oysters? Why not claim it on fish? They can be depleted the same way.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will yield in a moment. I realize the sensitivity of clam and oyster shells to the Senator from Louisiana, and I shall yield in a moment.

The depletion allowance might just as well be claimed on fish.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And on lobsters.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. And lobsters.

But I say that I see no argument for it. To the extent that the depletion rates are changed in this bill it represents a reduction in the tax liability for those particular companies that are engaged in that operation. There is no argument about that.

Personally, I think it is wrong. This is initiating a tax reduction for these companies on the eve of an election, when we all know that shortly after the election Congress may be confronted with a Presidential request for a tax increase for all other taxpayers. Count the votes and then raise taxes is the slogan of this Great Society.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator has made statements about a Christmas tree with its colored bulbs. On this Christmas tree are there or are there not colored bulbs paying tribute to the harvesters of oysters and clams, the miners of clay, and the manufacturers of tile?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There are.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is this another of those grab bags which are written about in the newspapers?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. This is the "Grab Bag Act of 1966."

However, I think I made one statement earlier that perhaps should be corrected to a certain degree. I said that there was nothing in this bill that would affect the elderly of America, and that is 99.9 percent correct because the conferees struck out of the bill all those provisions which would help them.

But there is one section, section 214, in which the committee did reduce the excise taxes on hearses by 3 percent as compared with existing law, and perhaps that is the contribution to which the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] was referring.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I did not hear what the Senator said.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The conferees reduced the excise tax rate on ambulances and hearses by 3 percent as compared with existing law, and that is the only contribution that they made to the elderly.

Mr. LAUSCHE. A final question: The provision dealing with health to the old is gone?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It is gone, yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But the provisions dealing with help to the harvesters of oysters and clams, the miners of clay, and the manufacturers of tile is still in?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Those provisions are still in.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And those provisions provide added tax relief to those special groups?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. They do. To begin with, it was not proper that these items be inserted as a rider to a bill which was designed to amend and modify our method of taxing income of foreign investors.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

(At this point Mr. Inouye assumed the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I should like to straighten out a few matters on which there seems to be misunderstanding.

The Senator made the statement that this bill provides ambulances and hearses an additional tax break. Perhaps he would like to revise his remarks to correct himself.

Ambulances and the ambulance-hearse combinations already have the benefit of the 7-percent excise tax rate that passenger cars have. But if a man buys a straight hearse, which is not part ambulance and part hearse, he must pay a 10-percent tax.

It was the thought of the Senator from Indiana that we ought to give to a man who buys a hearse the same tax treatment that we give to someone who buys an ambulance or a combination ambulance-hearse. So, in justice to undertakers, we accepted the amendment of the Senator from Indiana. The Treasury thinks that it is only fair that these vehicles should be taxed alike, and so do we.

Mr. SMATHERS Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Does this constitute relief for a dying industry?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I suppose it would be viewed that way.

Perhaps the Senator from Ohio would like to revise his remarks. He referred to the harvesters of oysters.

Mr. President, we do not do anything in the bill for the harvesters of oysters. Involved here, so far as oysters are concerned, are not the oyster shells that have oysters in them, but the ones who have not seen an oyster for many a year. These are the empty shells beneath the sand that someone digs up, washes and cleans, crushes and from which cement is made. We would give them this consideration, which amounts to about a half million dollars in revenue.

Mr. President, the reason that we give them this consideration is that the people who are taking these oyster shells and making cement from them are competing with people who make cement from limestone. It is a matter of granting the same depletion allowance to minerals which are used for the same purposes.

Both are depletable and both should have the same allowance. The Treasury Department said if there is going to be depletion at all, this arrangement would be about as good as any. It provides tax equity between the industries.

Mr. President, with respect to this talk about discriminating in favor of the Harvey Aluminum Co., I wish to say that no one raised the point at the time we were passing the investment tax credit law in 1962 and the amendment to it in 1964. I do not recall if any one from any U.S. possession protested the exclusion of the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, and Guam.

I wish to ask the junior Senator from Florida if he has any recollection of such a protest.

Mr. SMATHERS. I do not recall any such protest. As a matter of fact, it has been amazing to some that this legislation has not been passed before. We have many programs calculated to assist our possessions and we have provided programs calculated to help the development of Puerto Rico. We have our FHA program there. Most of the bootstrap operation in Puerto Rico which was so ably run by former Governor Marin was successful and most of that success resulted not only from his leadership but from the fact that the United States was very generous in its programs directed toward Puerto Rico.

We did not give to the people who made investments in Puerto Rico the advantage of the 7-percent investment tax credit when we instituted the program in 1962. An amendment in the bill before us would propose that we give the same consideration to those people operating in Puerto Rico.

This provision was discussed in our committee in connection with H.R. 13103 and we took action on it. The House conferees accepted the provision. Nobody charged that one company was going to benefit over another company. Anybody who operates in Puerto Rico or any U.S. possession would get the same consideration.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I cannot recall anyone raising the point on when this bill was pending on the floor that this matter would benefit the Harvey Company. So far as I am concerned it does not make any difference who is going to be benefited. It is a matter of tax equity. The Treasury Department and the State Department have negotiated treaties with less developed countries, trying to give the same consideration to Americans who invest money there. I am sorry that we cannot vote on those treaties in this Congress. The Senator from Tennessee kept that inside his subcommittee for quite a while, which he is privileged to do, and I respect his rights to disagree and to study it as long as he desires.

Mr. President, there are one or two other points that should be made. The Virgin Islands has its own tax system and in this it presently allows exemptions to some companies to encourage them to operate there. This provision would not help these companies because they pay no tax to the United States.

This provision would, however, make the investment credit available to U.S. companies owning property used in the possessions and receiving rental income from this property.

The investment credit, in effect, helps only when the income from the property is included in the U.S. tax return. A limitation in the bill denies the investment credit to any U.S. corporation which presently receives the benefit of income tax exemptions under the present law.

It is said that this provision is retroactive. It goes back only to the first of this year. This is customary in revenue legislation. This is also true when we passed the investment tax credit originally, it was retroactive to January 1. It was effective as of the first of the year, even though we passed the law later in the year.

Mr. President, every provision here is general law. It is not tailored to anybody.

The presidential campaign financing proposal would not make anybody put $1 in a campaign fund, but it would permit him to do so if he wants to put in a dollar which would be divided 50-50 between the major parties. This would help to assure that a presidential candidate would not be subject to any improper influence of the large money interests who otherwise would contribute to his campaign. If, under this proposal, taxpayers wish to share the burden of the cost of government and make a good government contribution, fine.

As a matter of fact, my thoughts on the subject had received inspiration from the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], who now seems to be so strongly opposed to this proposal, although he did support it in committee at one time. The proposal is the result of our committee meetings. We studied the matter, conducted hearings, and promised the Senate that we would report such a bill. Senators will recall that when the debt limit bill was before the Senate, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] made a strong argument for the President's suggestion of a $100 tax deduction for persons who contributed to campaigns. That would have cost much more money than the solution that the committee recommended. The estimate was at least $100 million. The Senator from Delaware chastized some of us, in a quiet, friendly way, saying that we were not supporting the President's recommendation of a $100 deduction. But some of us felt that that would not do anything but give some of the wealthy who were already financing campaigns an advantage that they did not need. So we rejected that idea; we turned it down. I believe that at one time the Senator from Delaware offered me a compromise: that he would take half of my proposal if I would take half of his.

This provision has been studied by the President and the administration, who I think feel that it would be a good way to proceed. Perhaps it can be improved upon. Anyway, I hope we can make a start. The plan can be studied for imperfections, and refinements can be made if they are desirable and can be included in the law in the future. There are already general criminal prohibitions in the Federal statutes to cover a situation of this sort.

Any little thing that might have been overlooked could be perfected. Not the slightest bit of difference would be made, revenuewise, until September, 1968. Then if it is thought that a fraud statute should be enacted, especially tailored to presidential election campaign fund arrangements, one could, of course, be drafted to take into account every possibility that the mind of man could conceive.

If someone had an idea that perhaps the President should not be permitted to say something nice about a Senator or a Representative, or even something that might hurt him in some areas, that could be suggested as a refinement.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] who is a cosponsor of the proposal thinks that all private contributions to major parties in a presidential campaign should be outlawed. That might very well be a good suggestion; but we need not cross that bridge just now. We can take a good look at it and let the committees of the Senate and House consider it, knowing that we have initiated a plan to improve election campaigns by eliminating improper influence and permitting income-tax payers to make a contribution.

It is felt by the administration and by a majority of Members of the Senate and House that this is the most constructive step that has been made along this line in a great number of years. It is one thing we will have done to help to prevent improper influence in government.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator from Louisiana well knows my views on the subject, but I should like, once again, to commend him for having taken the initiative in this particular matter. It is a proposal that has been discussed for years in an effort to determine how we can remove suspicions of bad influence from presidential campaigns.

Different people have come in with different ideas. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee, as I remember, several years ago, had a suggestion along this line. I had one. Hearings were held, but on that day I was unable to be present so I presented a statement as to how I thought it should be done. Other Senators presented their views. The distinguished Senator from Delaware was one of those most enthusiastic about a tax incentive approach. He adopted the same approach which the President himself had sent over. After much give and take, the Senator from Louisiana came in with what everyone finally concluded was a most workable and a most practical solution to the problem. It was to be totally voluntary, yet it would do the job and make it possible for men running for high office to be absolutely free from the suspicion that some one individual or some segment of the economy, or some person—if I may be permitted to suggest it—with an ulterior motive had come in and contributed a large sum of money and made it possible, because of that contribution, to influence the outcome of an election.

That can no longer happen with this kind of legislation.

Thus, I highly commend the Senator from Louisiana. In all candor, I think that this is almost the most important part of the bill. If we had not done it this way, it is my humble judgment we would be debating this kind of thing for the next 10 years.

For years, the Senate has been talking about the need to change the electoral college system, which everyone knows is outmoded and outdated and leads to all kinds of injustices. Every Senator thinks it should be changed according to his way of thinking, and I think that if this situation prevails, we will never get it corrected.

It will be my prediction that if we did not pass this campaign financing proposal now, we would be debating it for the next two generations, and probably would never accomplish anything along that line. So I am happy that it is being done. If, in practice, evidence develops that it is not working as well as we like, then, on the basis of experience, we can correct it. I happened to be the chairman of Democratic campaigns on three occasions for a period of 6 years, and I can testify to the fact that we need something in this field. This is a major start. While it does not yet go down to the areas of the congressional level, nevertheless, when it goes into effect at the highest level, the No. 1 level, the level of a presidential campaign, I think it will give us experience so that in time we might be able to place it into the law with respect to other political campaigns.

Thus, I want to commend the Senator from Louisiana again for his energy in pursuing this particular program, and I know that it will redound to the betterment of this Republic.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator very much. Let me just make a few brief references to what I believe to be the completely erroneous statements which have been made here. I would like to say that the rules require me to accord Senators due consideration in this regard as to their being in error.

A Senator said that those of us voting for the bill admitted that everything in it was special privilege. We do not admit any such thing.

As a practical matter, we could say that every facet in life has its special privilege. If we do something only for women, we discriminate against men. That involves them, but not everyone. If we are doing something to limit the tax liability of a particular industry, that involves a special group. There is no way to draw up any tax laws which do not involve one group or another. There are married couples who have children and there are married couples who have no children. There are married couples whose children go to college and there are married couples whose children do not go to college. All revenue laws involve the question of groups. There is no other way to write revenue laws.

It has been said that we should not put these amendments in a bill that the President has to sign. My understanding is that the President wants to sign this bill the way it is. He wants everything that is in the bill, with the exceptions of one thing. My understanding is that he is not particularly happy about having to sign a bill to include a liberalization of the tax treatment of private retirement plans for self-employed individuals.

Mr. President, the President of the United States once served in the House of Representatives. He once served in the Senate, where he was majority leader at one time, and whip as well. The President thus understands that this legislative process is a matter of give and take, and sometimes one has to give some ground. We have to take something in order to obtain something. I had to do that when we voted on this bill. I do not like H.R. 10. I fought it. But I am man enough to take a beating and go on to the next thing.

I thank the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] for their support of me.

Mr. SMATHERS. Again I want to commend the Senator from Louisiana. I know that he was opposed to H.R. 10, as were several members of the committee, and many Members on the floor of the Senate. I myself was opposed to some of the amendments which are still in the bill; but, as I understand the working of the democratic process, there is such a thing as majority rule. When I had made my argument and had done everything I could to defeat the amendments with which I did not agree in committee, I felt it was necessary for the legislative process to get some kind of expression to the President, and that I would therefore go ahead and be outvoted. The same thing happened on the floor, and the same thing happened in conference.

One of the problems which seems to surface right here at the end of the session, is that those people who now oppose what has been done by committees of both Houses of Congress, and by both the House and Senate, apparently do not particularly like majority rule. In other words, they are now going to say that a minority that lost after fair and free discussion of all these matters somehow will still win. They have every right to do it. I do not for one moment try to say that they do not have the right to do it. I know as a matter of fact that we are in the closing stages of this session.

I have done the same thing, and the Senator from Louisiana has done the same thing. We have tried to negotiate to get something that perhaps suited what we wanted, but which did not suit the majority.

We have the same thing here. All these matters have been fully discussed and aired. No suggestion has been made by anyone that anything has been done in an improper fashion, but the will of the Congress has been stated and expressed. Congress would like to go home. Its Members would like to have an opportunity to go home as soon as we can get a quorum. Those matters which have already been approved will be approved again. No change will be made. All we will have done is lost a Saturday, and maybe a Sunday, and perhaps lost the opportunity to watch a good football game, or perhaps campaign. That is all right. We all do that in order to accommodate Members. The Senator from Tennessee has accommodated me. More remarks will be made this afternoon, but finally it will be passed. That is the legislative process, and it is the way it should work.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, this measure has been referred to as a grab bag. Much time has been spent discussing so-called "swap" funds. A large number of tax lawyers believe that this tax-free exchange arrangement is clearly within the present law, and that those firms that are furnishing such arrangements have the law on their side. The Treasury did not like it. It felt that it amounted to some kind of loophole. The Treasury sought changes, well realizing that the law might be against it.

In the committee, I voted against the proposal to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit swap funds to be treated as tax-free exchanges. Those now in business will continue to operate, but I voted against the provision to permit others. I was against it, but when my committee, on which I am proud to serve, thought about it and voted for it, I felt I could support my committee. I am happy, when we got back from conference, that we had worked it out in a way that I think is a good settlement. The Treasury did not like the committee's original decision. Now that we have worked it out as we have in conference, the Treasury feels the compromise is all right and that it is a fair decision.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. With respect to the swap fund, I, like the distinguished chairman of the committee, felt it was time that the practice be brought to an end, but there is no question that the law as presently written providing for swapping of stocks in a mutual or other fund without a tax liability. As we said in the committee, though it may be legal, there may be some question as to its merits, and we decided that as of July 1967, it will come to an end. So, for practical purposes, we have closed that loophole, if it was a loophole. We felt the Treasury Department should not be able, without legislative direction, to change the law on its own.

So we have provided that those who are now in business must file on January 1, 1967, a registration statement with the SEC and they must have deposited the stock by May 1, 1967, and they must have concluded their transfers by July 1, 1967.

Those who do not think the tax-free exchange of securities with respect to investment funds is a good practice—and I happen to be one of those—have provided for its end in July 1967. It seems to me that is a fair and logical way to handle the matter.

To get up on the floor and say something that should not have been done has been done, when there have been written approvals of such transactions by the U.S. Government, is not a fair statement. I do not know where anyone got that notion. But we are going to stop the practice completely as of July 1. We felt it should be stopped, and we so provided.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Treasury Department wanted to provide by regulation that if the fund had been organized and the stocks had been deposited by July 14, 1966, those transfers prior to that would be all right and would not be taxed on those exchanges, but if such a transfer were to take place July 15 or later, a capital gains tax would have to be paid on the appreciation in value of the property transferred.

Frankly, it seemed fairer, since Treasury did not see fit to take a published position on this problem until July of this year to provide that firms would have until January 1, 1967, to file their registration statements and then 6 months later the tax-free exchanges would stop.

Mr. SMATHERS. Let me read the present law on this matter. I read from section 351(a):

> SEC. 351. TRANSFER TO CORPORATION CONTROLLED BY TRANSFERROR.
>
> [Sec. 351(a)]
>
> (a) GENERAL RULE.—No gain or loss shall be recognized if property is transferred to a corporation by one or more persons solely in exchange for stock or securities in such corporation and immediately after the exchange such person or persons are in control (as defined in section 368 (c)) of the corporation. For purposes of this section, stock or securities issued for services shall not be considered as issued in return for property.
>
> Source: Sec. 112(b) (5), 1939 Code.

There is the law, and there is no way it can be changed by Treasury regulation. It must be changed by Congress. That is what we are now going to do. We are not going to let Treasury usurp our legislative responsibility.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, I have heard many complaints today about the many provisions in this bill. There are many good, structural changes in the bill which will basically improve the tax laws. They are good changes:

First, there is the section broadening the application of the provision where one corporation acquires the assets of another corporation.

The law provides that when one acquires 80 percent of a corporation he does not have to pay a tax, but if he acquires 60 percent from one source and indirectly acquires 40 percent from another source where he has acquired control of a company, he must pay a tax because he acquired this stock from a controlled corporation other than by purchase. It is a technicality. It is a trap some people fall into. It is much like a manhole cover being left open to trap the unwary. So we have taken care of that technicality.

Another provision is the one excluding rents from property manufactured by a taxpayer from the personal holding company tax.

A third provision is the one improving the tax treatment of straddles.

That is another good, constructive change.

Another provision is the one dealing with the taxation of cooperatives and patrons with respect to per-unit retain certificates, making their treatment comparable to that of patronage dividends under present law.

That is a matter which has been studied for some time, and it is a good structural change in the law.

There are three provisions removing discrimination in the case of the interest equalization tax. These are provisions very much needed by businessmen and companies abroad, which help bring the services of banks to visiting American company representatives and Americans who have investments there.

Then there is the Williams amendment, offered by the Senator from Delaware, providing for a new type retirement savings bond for those holding bonds 10 to 30 years, which should also improve the balance of our debt between long- and short-term obligations.

Here is an amendment by the same Senator who made that charge about special interests. His amendment provides for a bond bearing a higher interest rate, designed to attract retirement money into the purchase of those bonds.

The Treasury thinks this is a good amendment.

The Senator stated that everything in this bill was for special interests. How about the Williams amendment, the amendment of the very Senator who made that statement?

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it not the belief of many of us, even though we finally voted for it, that this particular Williams amendment would do more to freeze high interest rates in the country than anything else we have done this session?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I was not too happy about that one, because I favor low interest rates, and some of us feared that it might be regarded as congressional approval of higher interest rates, but in the spirit of getting on with the business, since the Treasury thought the Senator had a good point, I did not vote against it.

The amendment was agreed to by a small majority, and we, as sincere conferees speaking for the Senate, fought to retain it and did retain it in the bill, because the Senate accepted the amendment. And so it is there.

Then there is another amendment, by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] which requires that we have reports on the contingent liabilities of the U.S. Government which it was felt would be useful in helping to understand the nature of our U.S. obligations.

The Senator from Massachusetts retires this year. He has been working in that vineyard for more than 12 years, trying to get a statement somewhere of all the contingent liabilities of the United States, so we could know what they are.

The Senator from Massachusetts accepted an amendment I suggested to his amendment to get a statement of what assets we have available to us, even on a contingent basis, to meet these liabilities.

As I recall, the amendment was offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] in behalf of Senator SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Delaware has said, "We admit that everything in here is a special privileged matter." But I suppose that here is another Williams amendment—though offered on behalf of the Senator from Massachusetts by the fine Senator from Delaware—which I am sure does not meet the Senator's description of everything being an item of special privilege, for the special advantage of some special group, of everything being tailor made.

In fact, Mr. President, there is nothing in the bill that meets that standard at all.

The Foreign Investment Tax Act should be adopted. It is highly desirable. It will help our balance-of-payments problems and will also help improve the equity in our tax laws, as they apply to foreign corporations and nonresident aliens who invest money here.

We need this bill. It is badly needed to attract foreign money and foreign investments into the United States, to help in our balance of payments and to help our total situation around the world.

Mr. President, I very much hope that the conference report will be agreed to.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, before suggesting the absence of a quorum, I wish to advise the Senate that I shall withdraw the proceeding under the quorum call after it has gone on for a sufficient time to advise Senators that at least there has been another Senator recognized to speak.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that without it being counted as a speech by the Senator from Tennessee, I may suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am pleased that finally I am recognized to address the Senate upon the pending conference report, even though it be Saturday afternoon, October 22.

It is not a new experience, Mr. President, for the Senate to face a complicated, technical tax bill, or a sugar bill, in the dying hours of a session.

Admittedly, this renders debate and meaningful consideration most difficult. For this circumstance, which I regret, I neither claim nor accept responsibility.

Mr. President, I wish to advise that from here on, though in the past I have done so, I shall not diminish the exercise of my duty and responsibility because of either the lateness of the day on the calendar or the lateness of the hour on the clock.

One's responsibility as a Senator does not diminish by the length of the term nor the duration of the session.

This is an important measure. I find myself in agreement with the opinion expressed by the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] that the provision in the bill having to do with the use of public money for political campaigns is the most important part of the bill. It surely is the most ingenuous, novel, bizarre, and, I think, the most unwise and dangerous.

Mr. President, I would like to make a preliminary statement before proceeding to discuss this feature of the bill.

My address will be divided roughly into two parts: One, a discussion of this most important part of the bill, the campaign contribution section; and two, the tax favoritism in the bill.

The senior Senator from Delaware, assisted so ably by the senior Senator from Ohio in interrogation, covered several of the tax favoritism amendments so ably and concisely that I am persuaded to begin my address by a discussion of this part of the bill which, according to the junior Senator from Florida, constitutes the most important part of the bill.

In the beginning, I state that I recognize that I believe the suggestion of the use of public funds to defray the cost of the conduct of our elections merits careful consideration.

I have suggested in previous speeches modes of such consideration.

I have always felt though, Mr. President, that the provision of public funds for campaign expenses must be tied closely and intimately with amendment of the Corrupt Practices Act and with a carefully considered bill for election reform.

Indeed, Mr. President, I doubt if any Member of either body of the Congress has devoted the time and study to the question of clean elections that the senior Senator from Tennessee has.

I wish to approach the subject on this basis. It is said that money is the root of all evil. Money is the root of political corruption. Money is the root of political influence. The use and volume of that money constitute the greatest danger in our elective system.

There is nothing evil per se about the expenditure of funds on elections. Indeed, if the electorate is to make a wise choice, then the issues, the records, and views of opposing candidates in a contest should receive wide dissemination.

This requires money in increasing amounts as our population increases and as mass communication media for hire become more widely used.

The evil which threatens our elective processes arises from the improper use of money, money in excessive amounts, sometimes from questionable sources and heavily in favor of special interest candidates or without full disclosure to the public.

If we are to eliminate or even minimize this evil and danger, then existing law affecting the use of money in Federal elections must, in my view, be substantially revised. Existing law is wholly inadequate, outmoded, and unrealistic. For the most part, it was enacted more than 40 years ago.

The inadequacies of existing law were fully illustrated by the report of the elections subcommittee on the 1956 general election campaign.

Earlier today reference was made to the investigation of that subcommittee, of which I was chairman, and the report which was filed. I have a copy of the report. Copies are no longer available. More than 1,000 requests for copies came after the supply was exhausted. It is the largest committee report that the Government Printing Office has ever printed, and it is factual.

We tabulated $33 million, the source of the money, the recipient of the money, and the purposes for which the money was expended.

So, Mr. President, I speak on this subject with some experience and knowledge and, even more, with conviction that reform of our election laws, amendment of our Corrupt Practices Act, now more than 40 years old, is urgent.

The freedom and the sanctity of the ballot box is at the very heart of our system of self-government.

One of our goals in world affairs is to assure to people the right of self-determination. We had better look about ourselves and assure our own people of a right of untrammeled determination without the undue influence of money.

The need for election law reform is widely recognized. The senior Senator from Tennessee is by no means the only one who recognizes this. While there is substantial agreement as to the need for election reform, there are differing views as to the details of what should or can be done.

In view of the failure of Congress to act in this field in more than a quarter of a century, I think it fair to say that the sense of urgency for measures to protect our elective process from corrupt practices, which I feel so keenly, must not be shared by all. As I see it, the cause of clean elections is a very important cause, indeed.

Mr. President, despite the studies that have been made, despite the fact that a clean elections bill is now dying on the calendar, we are here on Saturday afternoon, October 22, asked finally to approve, to take the last step, and to send to the White House, a bill containing a provision on which there has not been one day of hearings, on which not one witness testified, but which, instead of being accompanied with safeguards and protection, adequate amendment of the Corrupt Practices Act, merely pours more millions of dollars into the political pot. Does this make for clean elections?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to straighten out the record?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Would the Senator not agree that there was a public hearing on this particular proposal, on which the Under Secretary of the Treasury testified, and on which several Senators testified with respect to their own proposals? I offered one proposal. The matter was pretty well discussed. There was considerable public discussion about it.

Mr. GORE. I agree that the Committee on Finance had a day of hearing on the general subject of campaign contributions and election reform. Indeed, there have been many such hearings, one of which, as I have said, I conducted over a period of months.

Mr. SMATHERS. I should like to commend the Senator. I stated earlier that I think that the most thorough hearing I have heard about on this particular subject was that conducted by the Senator in 1956, and I think that the recommendations that he made at that time are excellent. The Senator knows a great deal about this subject. The point is that that was 10 years ago. I am afraid that if we do not pass some sort of legislation which all of us will agree is at least a step in the right direction, we will be debating for another 10 years on this matter, before we will ever get it enacted into law. Ten years later, after the Senator's thorough and lengthy and excellent hearings, we still do not have anything. I think we have to take this as a step in the right direction, hoping that after we have tried it for some time, we might be able to steer it forward, if it needs to be steered to a higher ground.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator for his generous comments.

I must say that I cannot feel, after careful consideration, that this would be taking a step in the right direction, if this is the only step we take. Indeed, this step, taken without safeguards, in my opinion would be a very bad step. It would make the situation far worse.

Just as tax reform, from a practical standpoint, can only successfully be coupled with tax reduction, I think that if we provide Government funds for campaign expenses, without tying to those benefits to our political process the necessary safeguards and protection, then protection is out the window, the benefits are in hand, and the cause of election reform and clean elections will have been dealt a death blow.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I, too, have a great deal of sympathy with the point of view which has just been expressed by the Senator from Tennessee with respect to election reform. I, too, should like to assure that the record is straight.

While I do not purport to be the expert on the subject that the Senator from Tennessee is, I have, nonetheless, done a good deal of research work on the subject. Election reform, to be adequate, requires the collaboration of three committees of the Senate.

The first is the Committee on Finance, where provisions must be passed which, unfortunately, must originate in the House or, in the alternative, be tacked onto some other bill, as was done with the current proposal, by which the financing aspects of campaigns, insofar as there may be any participation by the Government, must be worked out and determined. With regard to that, there was at least 1 full day of hearings, I think, before the Committee on Finance.

Some time ago, the President of the United States did me the great honor of asking me to introduce his bill dealing with clean elections and campaign financing, and I did so. The bill was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, the second committee concerned. For reasons best known to themselves, that committee refused to hold hearings on the President's bill, and I must say that I can find little favor with their decision. Instead, they reported to the calendar an utterly inadequate bill, on which no hearings have been held for 6 years, and which was clearly obsolete, inadequate, and inappropriate for the purpose. That is the bill which is now on the calendar, to which the Senator referred. It was not brought up on the floor, and I rather regret that, because, inadequate as the bill is, it would have given us the opportunity to amend it on the floor and provide some kind of decent vehicle for campaign financing and election reform. However, the leadership, in its wisdom, did not see fit to bring that bill up.

A third aspect of campaign reform and financing, in my opinion, is in the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce. That has to do with the extent to which the communications media, primarily radio and television, should be called upon to contribute some part of the cost to conduct an honorable financial campaign. Next year, I propose to introduce separate bills:

First, a bill which will be referred to the Committee on Finance, for financing along the lines which the Senator from Tennessee is now discussing.

Second, a bill to be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, which will deal with the administrative aspects of campaign practices, the Corrupt Practices Act, and the other aspects of campaign financing which are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration under our rule 25.

Third, a bill to be referred to the Committee on Commerce, which will deal with the part that radio and television should be called upon to play in this area.

The reason why I make these statements is that I was a witness before the Committee on Finance on this measure and said in substance what I have said just now on the floor of the Senate in this regard.

When the bill that is now under consideration first came before the Senate for consideration, I felt that it was a half-baked measure. I still think it is a half-baked measure. But I voted for it. Why did I vote for it? Because it seemed to me that it was one foot in the door in an area where many honorable Senators, including particularly the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], had been laboring for 10 years, and we had not got to first base. We had not, as the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] said, come to the point where Congress had seriously considered how to remedy one of the great failures in our democracy.

So I felt, under the circumstances—and I honor the Senator from Tennessee for his differing view—that it was better to vote for this measure and get something started than not to vote for it at all.

I apologize to the Senator from Tennessee for this interjection, but I wanted the Record to show the current status of the problem. It is a problem we must deal with, and I hope we shall deal with it at the next session of Congress. We must seek a method of comprehensive election reform and a revision of the Corrupt Practices Act, through some sensible approach provided by the legislature, with the aid of the executive, to deal with a vexing problem which is one of the great failures in our American democracy.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania need not apologize for his interjection. I appreciate it. It is an able observation. The Senator has devoted much time and study to the subject. He has confessed that he considered this a half-baked measure when he voted for it on the floor of the Senate.

I wish to make a confession. When the proposal came to a vote in committee, out of love and respect for the chairman, against whose amendment we naturally did not like to vote, I did not vote on the first rollcall; but then when I discovered that all Democrats except me had voted for it and that all Republicans had voted against it, I suppose that a little partisan spirit of the occasion arose and I made a statement. I said, "Mr. Chairman, I wish now to be recorded, but before doing so I wish to state my reasons." I expressed the view then that this was not a measure of which I could fully approve but that it had the merit, I thought, of provoking discussion upon a very vital problem of our Republic. On that basis I voted to bring it to the floor of the Senate with no thought whatsoever that the Senate would seriously consider its adoption without other provisions being added. But here we are. I was perfectly astounded by the vote in the Senate. I was more astounded when the conference committee accepted it. Now, we are asked to take the last act before this really revolutionary political concept in our body politic becomes law.

Mr. President, I say that the measure needs reconsideration. "Half-baked" is not a sufficient adjective to describe the measure. Before I go into the measure in detail, which I shall now do, I wish to say, while the distinguished majority leader is on the floor, that I am grateful that several Senators have been listening to the debate and within a reasonable, but fairly brief period of time, after he is able to assure me of a yea-and-nay vote, I shall ask for a vote on a motion which I shall then present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I cannot begin to express my deep appreciation to the Senator for what he has just said, because I had no idea what the situation would be. Therefore, I am all the more grateful, especially for notifying the Senate in advance.

Mr. GORE. Throughout our years of service, I have kept the Senator advised of my attitudes and moves. Although he has not always found himself in agreement, he has always been advised of them.

I want to be explicit. This may not be the last vote we will have, but I shall be prepared to ask for a vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the Senator from Tennessee want the Senator from Montana to state a specific time?

Mr. GORE. I would prefer to proceed. Is the Senator prepared to do so?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Before the Senator leaves the matter of financing presidential campaigns——

Mr. GORE. I am only now coming to it.

Mr. MONRONEY. In the Senator's discussion thus far, no mention has been made of the inadequacy of the bill with respect to preconvention activities of presidential candidates.

Is this not one of the wide-open areas: influence of large sums of money unaccounted for, unreported, not required to be reported for participation in capturing delegates of various States, or even in the act of campaigning in presidential primaries which are conducted in many States?

It seems to me that had hearings been held there would have been a greater focus on the full aspects of the financing of presidential campaigns instead of only November elections and the general elections.

Mr. GORE. I was going to point that out. I appreciate the suggestion of the able Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Not only does the measure omit any reference to conventions, party caucuses, or primaries for presidential campaigns, it also omits any reference to senatorial or congressional campaigns. Yet most of us are members of one of the two major political parties.

That brings up a point I had not intended to mention at this time, but let us consider the question of parties.

Suppose Senator STROM THURMOND wants to run for President again. After all, he ran at one time on the Dixicrat ticket and I believe he won a majority in seven States. Now, should Senator THURMOND, or Governor Wallace, or some other public figure wish to run for President again in 1968 on the Dixiecrat ticket, or some other ticket, there would be this situation: Whoever is the nominee of the Republican Party, and President Johnson, if he be the nominee of the Democratic Party, I assume would be the beneficiaries of this vast amount of money. But the other candidate or candidates would be penniless except for dependence upon private sources.

I do not wish to be sectional in this presentation.

Suppose there is a Bull Moose movement in the Republican Party. I think it would be a good thing for the Republican Party. They need a little new life. At least, they had such a movement at one time, and a candidate for President on that ticket. Suppose there is another Burton K. Wheeler from the Senate, from the Rocky Mountain region, who wants to run for President. But he will find we have passed a bill to finance the campaigns of President Johnson and Mr. Romney or Mr. Nixon, but which would render penniless and place at great disadvantage any other man who might aspire to the Presidency of our country. Is this the kind of immobility that we wish to freeze into our political system?

What do we think the Supreme Court would hold in this regard? Is this fair protection of the laws, or is this discrimination? I say to the Senate that we are dealing with something fundamental to the Republic, something basic to the conduct of our system of government.

We are asked to pass this bill on a Saturday afternoon just before adjournment. I have not suggested the absence of a quorum, and under the arrangements I have worked out with the majority leader, it is going to be unnecessary for me to do that, I think. At least, this subject deserves careful and serious consideration because once the step is taken, it may be irreversible except by the Supreme Court.

That brings up several questions, to one of which I have already referred, the equal protection of the laws. We would protect two candidates for President, with all the millions of dollars of a political slush fund out of the public Treasury, but we would deny any support at all to the candidate of a new party or of an independent group. How can a liberal support that political philosophy? How can a conservative? How can a Republican who believes in the republican form of government? How can a Democrat, dedicated to the tenets of our society?

Equal opportunity for political advancement is as fundamental to our political system as is equality of opportunity for employment, education, or other rights and privileges which we seek to promote.

I started to refer to one other of the several questions of legality and constitutionality that come to mind with respect to this unusual proposal. This amendment proposes to permit a private citizen to appropriate public funds for a purpose of his own choosing.

I hold in my hand a tax form. For years we have sought to simplify the income tax return. Now we propose to start on a course which would surely complicate it further.

To get to the question of appropriation, here is a tax return, and let us make it simple—suppose that John Doe owes $1 of income tax to the U.S. Government. That is his total tax liability, but it is his liability and he owes it. He attaches $1 in currency to his tax form and posts it to the Internal Revenue Service.

Is that his dollar, or is that the property of the U.S. Government?

That is a dollar owed the U.S. Treasury, and constitutes public funds. Yet by this amendment he would have the privilege of appropriating that dollar for a political purpose.

Under the Constitution, the appropriation of funds is the responsibility of Congress.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If a taxpayer is given the right by statute to designate how his dollars shall be spent, and has the right to direct that it shall be spent in political operations, would it not follow that at some subsequent time Congress would enact a law giving the taxpayer the right to designate how his money shall be spent for other purposes? Therefore, if we embark upon that kind of program, where are we likely to end?

Assume someone comes into the Senate next year and proposes a similar procedure to designate how his tax money shall be spent, not related to elections but related to some other operation of the Government. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] mentions designating that the money should be applied to retirement on the national debt.

I ask, what is the danger of establishing this kind of precedent?

Mr. GORE. If the precedent should be held constitutional, which I doubt, then it would be a dangerous one and, ere long, this tax form which we have sought to simplify would have a number of boxes on it. Suppose we had a box giving a taxpayer the election of whether any part of his funds could be used in the Vietnam war? There are a number of pacifists in this country who stoutly contend that it is immoral and illegal to require them to pay taxes to support a war which is contrary to their religious or their moral concepts.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] made, I thought, a novel suggestion, that the way to end the Vietnam war was for the Senate to pass a resolution declaring that the United States had won the war. This may not be without merit but, at least, I found it amusing, as I am sure the author did, with his fine sense of humor; but I do not think it would be humorous at all to have a referendum of American taxpayers declaring whether their funds should be used in support of the Vietnam war. But my point is, which the Senator from Ohio has brought up—and his point, too—that if we can give the taxpayer an election in one respect, then we can give him an election in many other respects.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. That is, if it is constitutional to allow him to specify that one dollar of his tax money shall be used to promote political campaigns, then it would follow that it is constitutional, too, to declare that he may designate what part, if any, of his money shall be used for the payment of the national debt, participation in the Vietnam war, earmarking money for the help of the aged, earmarking money for education, and every other aspect of governmental operations. I do not believe that can be done.

Mr. GORE. Well, if it can, then this is a very dangerous precedent.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes, that is, even if it can.

Mr. GORE. If it can, then the precedent is all the more dangerous.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I congratulate the Senator on the comprehensive and light manner in which he is discussing this proposal. Is it not a fact, however, that the proposal which was made by the President to permit a $100 tax incentive for the purposes of financing the political campaigns of both parties, and others—the one I had was for $50—was calculated to encourage the taxpayer to give money so that the financing of political campaigns could be removed from the charge that too many wealthy people and too many wealthy organizations were putting up all the money?

We are trying to make it possible to distribute the costs of campaigns over as wide a group as is possible, so that, in truth and fact, nobody, or no one group, or no one segment of our economy, can say, "We are the ones who financed the campaign," thereby having a hold on the one who got elected.

Is it not a fact that these proposals start out with the idea that there is going to be a benefit to the taxpayer if he makes the deduction? He gets a certain amount of reduction in his taxes. Is that not a fact?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, there is a vital and a legal difference between funds remaining in the hands of the taxpayer as a result of a legal deduction against his taxable income or against his tax liability, which Congress could by law provide and, on the other hand, money which legally belongs to and becomes a part of the U.S. Treasury. The sums from which the taxpayer is allowed a deduction or a credit against his tax liability are still his. They never become public funds. The reverse is true in the instance provided here. These are public funds over which the taxpayer is given an election to appropriate for a specific purpose, or to deny the appropriation for a specific purpose—a very vital and legal distinction.

It has been suggested that this provision is copied after the procedure involving funds earmarked for the highway trust fund. I want to draw a clear line of differentiation there. When I drive up to a filling station and buy gasoline, I pay taxes on that gasoline. I have no choice. There is an excise tax upon my purchase. The Congress has passed a law which earmarks the receipts from those taxes into a highway trust fund.

Here, however, the taxpayer does the earmarking, not the Government. There is a delegation of appropriating responsibility which I do not think can meet the test of legality and constitutionality. But even if it does meet it, as I said earlier, then the precedent is the more dangerous.

If this amendment is enacted into law, it will add an estimated $60 million to the sums available to the major political parties for use in presidential campaigns without any provision whatsoever to safeguard funds from corrupt practices.

While a clean elections bill dies on the calendar, we have this measure, as I said, to pour many millions of public funds into the political pot. The bill provides no protection against fraud or misappropriation of these public funds, to say nothing of inadequate safeguards surrounding the use of additional funds which the parties would continue to be free to raise and spend.

A great deal has been said on the floor of the Senate about how this is a clean elections bill. By what right is this called a clean elections bill? How does it clean the elections? Is there any provision here to safeguard the use of the money? Is there any inhibition therein as to the receipt and expenditure of other money from questionable sources? Not on your life, Mr. President. Indeed, the situation is made worse and the identity of the money is made more difficult because there is provided the commingling of public money with private money, good money with bad money. I think it makes more difficult the accomplishment of election reform, and yet this is called a step in the right direction. I say it would be a dangerous step to our elective process.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does this bill guarantee at all that there will be less money spent privately to win an election?

Mr. GORE. Not at all.

Mr. LAUSCHE. All that it does is state that the Federal Government shall provide about $70 million a year, $35 million for each of the parties, to conduct a presidential election after the parties have nominated their candidates in June or July of the election year. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does it in any manner prohibit the parties that have received the $35 million each in the election year from continuing the solicitation of contributions from private sources?

Mr. GORE. That subject has not even been touched. I believe it will result in pouring many millions of dollars into the major political parties' pots.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And if money impliedly wins elections, all this bill will do is give to the parties $35 million in an election year and allow them to go out and solicit, with all their ardor and efforts, additional private contributions. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. That is true, and there are no safeguards as to its use.

Suppose we were in a presidential year now and these funds were available and the Democratic Party felt very strongly that a candidate for Governor on the Republican ticket, in a pivotal State, must be defeated, or that the Republican Party felt that a Democratic candidate for Governor, who had great prospect for being President in the future, or that a particular Senator, must be defeated. They could spend the entire amount of the slush fund in one State.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I concur in what the Senator has stated. His description of what might be done is an illustration of the lack of consideration and study which has been given to the broad ramifications involved in such a program.

Mr. GORE. It illustrates the need for careful consideration of the enactment of a measure so new and revolutionary as this is and so big and important as this is.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not a fact that the proponents of this measure state, "Allow us to spend about $70 million of the taxpayers' money in an election year, and take our word that we will support needed reforms at a later time"?

Is it the thought of the Senator that the reforms ought to be adopted concurrently with the proposal that we spend $70 million of the taxpayers' money before we go forward?

Mr. GORE. If we do not achieve reforms and protection concurrently with the extension of the use of public funds for our elections, then the difficulty of achieving reforms is increased, if not made almost impossible.

I am one who believes in the principle of one man, one vote. I have resisted amendments here to overturn the reapportionment decision, even though my State legislature passed resolutions asking me to vote the other way. I believe in the dignity of man and in the equality of man, the equality of opportunity, rights, and privileges. One of the rights which I believe should be equal is the right to aspire to political preferment, to which I have already referred. Another is the right to have an equal influence on the selection of public officials.

We know, of course, that a man with vast financial means, under our present system, can exercise far more influence upon the outcome of an election by the use of his pocketbook than can the lowly citizen by the use of his one ballot. I think that argues well for the use of public funds. But, ah, Mr. President, when we but add public funds to and commingle them with the campaign money now obtained from special interest sources, we make the situation worse instead of better, and we will lose, perhaps, the opportunity of making necessary corrections.

In my view, this Congress has not dealt with a subject more fundamental to our society and to our system of government than that which is under consideration now. I trust that this expression on my part will indicate to my fellow Senators why I have insisted upon the right to debate this subject, and the right to have the Senate—well, it is not my right to have the Senate reconsider, I suppose, but it is my right to seek reconsideration, on the part of the Senate, of a measure on which I think it acted too hastily, and a measure which received no public hearings in the House of Representatives, but was carried there in a conference report to be voted up or down.

If this provision is enacted, I do not know just how one conflict is to be resolved. We have an existing law which limits the Republican National Committee or the Democratic National Committee to an expenditure of $3 million. Yet we are asked here to write into law a provision that will give each of them an estimated $30 million to $35 million in a presidential year.

How can the Senate do that? How can we do so without amending the Corrupt Practices Act, unless by so doing we condone illegal practices, and encourage and entice our two major political parties to violate the Corrupt Practices Act?

Of course, $3 million is inadequate; we recognize that. I have said it many times. But it is the law. We condemn violations of law and order. But now we would provide $35 million to the Democratic National Committee, and leave untouched a law which limits its expenditures to $3 million.

Mr. President, I am advised by the majority leader that in his opinion, a quorum of the Senate is available for a yea and nay vote. Therefore, I shall conclude with a few summary paragraphs, and then present to the Senate a motion.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. GORE. Money is a threat to clean elections, a threat to our entire elective process. Money is used to manipulate elections, to thwart public will, and to defeat worthy purposes, as well as to elect good candidates and to promote worthy causes. The lack of proper controls over the raising and spending of money in political campaigns poses the greatest danger to the democratic elective process. This danger arises from the sources from which such money is obtained and the uses for which it is obtained, and also from the amount of money spent in an election.

It is said that this measure would provide a clean source of campaign funds, free from the taint of special interest. Perhaps that is so. But the availability of large sums of Federal tax money for political campaigns would do nothing at all to restrict parties and candidates from raising additional sums, in whatever amounts and from whatever sources they see fit, however questionable. Indeed, as I have said, good money would be commingled with bad money. Federal tax money would merely be added to what is otherwise available. Thus, the bill would increase rather than decrease the influence of money in Federal elections, multiply its abuses, and make more difficult the enactment of a clean elections bill.

Mr. President, the Foreign Investors Tax Act, as proposed by the administration and as passed by the House of Representatives, was a good bill, designed to improve the U.S. balance-of-payments situation by attracting more foreign capital to this country.

Unfortunately and unwisely, as I have said at some length, the Senate Finance Committee and the Senate itself added numerous nongermane amendments, which converted a good bill into a grab bag special interest tax measure, which in my opinion was unworthy of the Senate. The bill as approved by the conference committee, I wish in fairness to say, represents some improvement over the bill as passed by the Senate, but it is still a bad bill, and should not be enacted into law. The bill still contains a large number of provisions which grant tax favoritism to certain types of income and to certain special-interest groups.

As I said in the beginning, this has been ably discussed in part already. Unless the motion I shall soon make is carried, I shall wish to discuss other points in the bill.

I note, in passing, that the part of the bill which had wide appeal to Senators, which would provide aid to many needy old people, was dropped from the bill. Their voices, the voices of the needy, went unheeded. In this respect, the bill is a less meritorious measure.

I plead with the Senate to take a course of action which would bring to enactment the one feature of the bill that is in the public interest, in my view, that part of the bill which deals with foreign investors, contained in title I of the bill. How can that be done? That can be accomplished by tabling the conference report and quickly calling up for consideration a minor revenue measure already passed by the House and on the calendar of the Senate, and attaching title I to that bill as an amendment and dispatching it to the House.

No conference would be necessary. In addition to the other strictures under which we operate, we are advised by our majority leader that the other body will have no more conferences with the Senate. However, here is a bill that will not require a conference. All that the House must do is accept a noncontroversial measure which has already passed the House without objections, along with title I of the bill, to which no objection was raised during the consideration of the bill by the other body.

Mr. President, the senior Senator from Delaware and the senior Senator from Tennessee, instead of being obstructionists and trying to prevent public interest legislation, have offered to cooperate in this respect and in many other respects.

Here is a method and procedure that could bring the foreign investors portion of the bill to enactment within an hour's time, and the Senate and the House could adjourn and go to the people before sundown on this Saturday afternoon.

I ask how the country would be ill served by postponing until January for further study this bizarre——

Mr. LAUSCHE. Monstrosity.

Mr. GORE. Amendment with respect to campaign expenditures out of the Public Treasury.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, not being on the committee, I am not too familiar with the ramifications of this legislation, but from the slight exposure that I have had, I think it is the most odoriferous bill I have seen in many years. I think it is utterly indefensible. I think it stinks to high heaven. The bill contains various ramifications, and much log rolling has gone into the legislation.

I commend the Senator from Tennessee for his valiant fight. I do not know that anything can be done now, but this legislation is not good in the interest of reliable or honest public legislation.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his encouragement.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. My encouragement will not do the Senator any good.

Mr. GORE. It may.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I merely commend him for his fight on this measure. This bill has many facets. I do not see how it could be consented to by any stretch of legislative imagination.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator concur that the procedure I have suggested, and which was previously suggested by the senior Senator from Delaware, offers an acceptable and a rapid way to achieve the worthy purposes here sought?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think so, in the main. I think the facets of the bill are worthy, but it is, like many other bills, a pork barrel bill. Certain things are worthy, but certain other things cannot stand the light of analysis.

Mr. GORE. If we must take it all or leave it all, I think we should leave it all on the table of the Senate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is the way I will vote, for the information of the Senator, but I am not sure that we have any leeway in the matter now. I think we are handicapped. I think we are circumscribed.

Mr. GORE. We are. It is a difficult circumstance under which to wage a parliamentary fight or legislative battle.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I congratulate the Senator on his worthy fight.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. I hope that the motion which I shall soon offer will receive a rollcall vote and be approved. If not, I shall proceed to discuss some of the other features of the bill to which I have not had time to make reference.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, when the bill was originally before the Senate, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] offered an amendment to strike all but title I from the bill.

I remind the Senator from Tennessee that he suggested to the Senator from Delaware that the amendment be modified so as to permit the retention in the bill of the aid contemplated for the old.

The Senator from Delaware responded to the suggestion made by the Senator from Tennessee. The Senator from Tennessee is aware that that most vital provision—the provision which would help the old—which was argued vigorously when the bill was before us a few weeks ago, is no longer contained in the bill.

Mr. GORE. The Senator is correct. I regret that it is not.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Senator stated a moment ago that certain provisions in the bill are good. However, it seems to me that the proponents of this logrolling, pork-barrel bill used the bait of aid to the old and got the bill passed. They have since stricken from the bill the provision for aid to the old and have in the bill nothing but unjustified tax grants to privileged groups.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to modify the observations of the senior Senator from Ohio to this extent: I am sure that members of the Senate conference committee were earnestly and sincerely in favor of the provisions that would have been so beneficial to many needy, old people. It was the conferees representing the other body who would not accept it, and the Senate conferees yielded.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes, they yielded; but does not that mean that if we thought aid to the old was the only amendment that should be added to the objective of imposing equitable taxes on foreign investors, the bill had better be defeated in its whole, rather than to go along with what it now contains?

Mr. GORE. I regret that that provision is out of the bill; and when measured as a whole, if that must be the measurement, then the bill is bad. It has good features, but the bad features outweigh the good, and the bill should be defeated. But there is a way—and I have suggested it—to accomplish the worthy purposes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And I agree with the Senator. I have one further question.

Thus far we have established, I think, about six instances in which special-privilege tax relief is given to special groups. No extended discussion has been had about H.R. 10, which contemplates giving to lawyers, doctors, and other self-employed individuals certain tax privileges. My question is: If H.R. 10 is contained in the final version of the bill, will it give to the self-employed—

that is, lawyers, dentists, doctors, and others—greater tax privileges than are accorded to the members of the social security system?

Mr. GORE. Oh, yes; vastly greater. They are given the unusual privilege—and it is a privilege which only the well-to-to, people having substantial income, will find attractive—of deducting from their otherwise taxable income $2,500 a year to be invested in a pension plan for their own personal benefit. In other words, the Treasury of the United States will be paying part of their insurance premiums. I shall not discuss this point at length now.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But the fact is that members of the social security system will have to pay a greater tax percentage than will members of the H.R. 10 program.

Mr. GORE. The most eloquent speech made in opposition to this proposal was made by the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] on October 12. I shall not take the time of the Senate, since I am advised that a quorum is in town, to read it. However, I ask unanimous consent that the speech against H.R. 10, delivered by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. MANSFIELD. This amendment would double the tax benefits now available for the retirement savings of doctors, lawyers, and other self-employed individuals. Under present law, a self-employed individual may contribute 10 percent of his earnings—up to $2,500—to his pension plan and take a tax deduction for one-half of this contribution. The proposal—which was the main purpose of H.R. 10 passed by the House in June—would make the full contribution tax deductible.

This amendment would result in an estimated revenue loss for the first year it is effective of up to $30 million. For the second year, the estimated revenue loss would be increased to about $50 million.

This amendment would divert substantial Federal tax revenue to provide tax reductions for a very narrow group of highly paid professional people, at a time when the possibilities of a general tax increase are very much in the public mind. Revenue-losing measures such as this could well push the President and Congress closer to such a general tax increase.

In more detail—

The experience to date clearly indicates that self-employed pension plans represent a tax reduction arrangement for the better-off professional man, with doctors heading the list. Over 75 percent of the revenue loss involved in the amendment would go to doctors, lawyers, and dentists. Indeed, one-half of the total revenue loss would go to individuals in these professions with incomes over $25,000.

The amendment would represent an automatic tax reduction for those self employed already making pension contributions since, without any change in their contributions, their tax deductions will double. Two-thirds of the revenue loss—about $20 million—for the first year would be directed to this automatic tax reduction—of which $15 million would go to better-off professional people.

For the future, it is likely that the increased tax benefits will only serve to attract more of the same class of high income self-employed into pension plans. These plans by their very nature can have only limited value to the plumber, the small shopkeeper, or the farmer—the savings of these people are needed for their businesses, to meet the social security tax on their self-employment income, and for their family obligations—and therefore are not generally available to be set aside in private retirement plans, and none at all for the ordinary laborer, the fellow we used to call the "working stiff." It is apparent that self-employed pension plans are attractive only to a class with liquid assets and already possessing sufficient security so that some assets can be set aside permanently until retirement. The only class meeting these conditions is the better-off professional group. This has been borne out by the Canadian experience over more than 6 years under a similar pension arrangement for the self-employed. The benefits of this arrangement have been highly concentrated in the upper income groups.

I would suggest, with no disrespect to the distinguished Senator from Indiana, that if he wishes to pursue H.R. 10 as such, it ought to be considered separately, and not as a part of the measure pending before us.

Mr. LAUSCHE. As I understand, H.R. 10 now is fully in the bill.

Mr. GORE. H.R. 10 now is fully in the bill. I might say, in conclusion, that as this bill worked its tortuous way through the Senate, it became increasingly bad, and finally became so bad that both the majority leader and the minority leader voted against it.

Mr. President, I am advised by the distinguished and able majority leader, whom I have found most cooperative in this battle, that he is now prepared to ask for yeas and nays on a motion which I send to the desk and ask to be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the motion.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] moves that the conference report on H.R. 13103 be laid on the table.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of the death of his father.

I further announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho would vote "nay" and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea" and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senators from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senators from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON and Mr. PEARSON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS and Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] are absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay" and the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea" and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea" and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr.

GRIFFIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea" and the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 15, nays 37, as follows:

[No. 309 Leg.]

YEAS—15

Fannin
Gore
Harris
Hickenlooper
Kennedy, Mass.
Lausche
McClellan
Monroney
Morse
Murphy
Simpson
Stennis
Thurmond
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—37

Anderson
Bayh
Bennett
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Clark
Dodd
Ellender
Fulbright
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Kuchel
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
Metcalf
Montoya
Morton
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Smathers
Smith
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—48

Aiken
Allott
Bartlett
Bass
Bible
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ervin
Fong
Griffin
Gruening
Hruska
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
McGovern
McIntyre
Miller
Mondale
Moss
Mundt
Neuberger
Pearson
Prouty
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Scott
Sparkman
Symington
Talmadge
Tower

So the motion to lay on the table was rejected.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may we have order? And, most important, will Senators please remain within shouting distance?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair.) The Senate will be in order.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I should like to explain what the conference report contains. The Senate voted to adopt 49 amendments, when the floor amendments accepted by this body are included. Of the 49, the Treasury felt that only 5 were not good amendments. The rest of the amendments were recommended by or subscribed to by the Treasury.

The bill passed the Senate by a vote of 58 to 18. Every agreement between Senate and House in the conference moved the bill more toward the position favored by the Treasury and the position of those who had at first objected to the bill. So from the point of view of those who objected at first, the bill is a much better bill.

The revenue loss is reduced by 85 percent.

Of the amendments that the Treasury objected to, four were drastically modified or dropped completely, and the only one we could not modify drastically was H.R. 10, which happened to be an amendment adopted unanimously by the House. It was a Senate amendment; therefore, we had no power to reverse the judgment of the House on that matter.

Mr. President, this is a good bill. The President thinks it is a good bill. The House by its vote thinks it is a good bill. When the House voted to take 49 Senate amendments and agree to the conference report, it seems to me that it is a report that can be agreed to.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to express appreciation to the leadership and the membership of the Senate for the consideration which this issue has been given. I do not aspire to be the conscience of the Senate nor thus to hold myself out.

I, and other Members of this body, felt very deeply about this issue—so deeply that we felt in duty conscience bound to make a fight against the final congressional step in passage of a bill which, in one instance, provides numerous examples of stark tax favoritism, and in the other, a bizarre, unwise, and, I think, dangerous innovation of the use of public money for political campaigns and the commingling of public money with private money, at the election of private citizens, in the appropriation of public funds.

But I feel that with this brief statement I have performed my duty. I am still convinced that had the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and I had the audience of the Senate, which now seems impossible, this measure would be defeated. But this is not the last day in the history of our Republic. Congress will be back soon to correct mistakes that may have been made, or perhaps make others, as well as to accomplish good.

I know that there are present, in or-order to achieve a quorum, Senators whose health is not well served by this exercise.

I am advised that other Members of the Senate have deaths in their families, that loved ones are in critical condition. I shall not personalize, but I feel for those friends.

So, with appreciation, I wish to make a brief statement and then ask for the yeas and nays on adoption or rejection of the conference report. It shall be divided into two parts, but I assure Senators again it will be brief.

The distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] spoke of certain provisions which the Treasury favors. I wish to suggest to Senators, not all of the instances of rank, stark favoritism, but just two or three to illustrate the point.

The senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] referred to one at some length earlier. Let me just read from page 7 of the conference report:

> The Senate amendment (in proposed section 201) amends section 48(a) (2) (B) to include among the exceptions from the general rule with respect to property used predominantly outside the U.S. property which is owned by a domestic corporation (other than a corporation entitled to the benefits of section 931 or 934(b)) or by a U.S. citizen (other than a citizen entitled to the benefits of sec. 931, 932, 933, or 934(c)) and which is used predominantly in a possession of the United States by such a corporation or such a citizen, or by a corporation created or organized in, or under the law of, a possession of the United States. Under the Senate amendment, this provision was effective with respect to property placed in service on or after January 1, 1966 (but no carryback of an investment credit attributable to this provision was permitted).

I read this language to illustrate how difficult it is for Senators, and more particularly citizens unlearned in tax law, to read the technical terms of conditions set forth in a committee report or conference report and detect what has been done.

Now, what, in laymen's language, does this provide? It provides a tax benefit retroactively to one large United States corporation, in excess of $2 million.

What is its justification? There is none, in my view, it extends the investment credit retroactively for a large aluminum plant, already constructed and already under operation, in the Virgin Islands.

When we passed the Investment Credit Act, it was for the stated purpose of encouraging development in the United States—modernization of our plants, Senators will remember—in order to meet competition from overseas. We did not extend it beyond the limits of the United States proper. So this company built its plant there, in the full awareness that it was to be built with no expectation of receiving the benefit of the investment credit.

As I said, the investment is already made, and the plant is already operating.

This amendment which has been attached to the bill is, as has been stated, one of the Christmas packages, because it gives more than $2 million for no purpose in which there is a public interest.

That is the first point. I could discuss it more fully, but let me go to another.

I refer now to another amendment. I shall not undertake to read the technicalities of it. It is even more technical than the one I have just referred to, but what does it do? It provides for a swap, a merging of a diversity of assets, without the payment of the capital gains tax. Several organizations are already underway. They have made their applications. They have filed their plans with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The Treasury Department issued a regulation which would have outlawed—maybe that is the wrong term; would have closed a glaring loophole, from which concerns sought to obtain benefit. And what did the Senate committee do? It put in an amendment outlawing the Treasury regulation. Why? I do not know why. The Treasury was opposed to it. The Under Secretary of the Treasury was there. He referred to the provision as one of the most glaring loopholes that he had ever seen.

The conference committee enlarged the loophole, in a sense. It opened it wide in the amendment now before the Senate, in which the conference report repeals the Secretary of the Treasury's regulation, thus taking the course of those who sought to take advantage of the loophole, which the Treasury sought to close, giving them a free ticket and permitting them to say, "Let us move before it is too late." Any company that qualifies between now and January 1 can have free entry into the loophole.

What is the justification for that? I do not think there is any, in good conscience.

I could detain the Senate from now until midnight with a discussion of the inequities and the unfairness of the tax amendments that are tacked onto this bill. I shall resist the temptation to do so.

I should like to refer to H.R. 10 just briefly. For years the House of Representatives has passed this bill. The Senate has resisted. But when this grab bag comes along, providing a 150-percent increase in the depletion for the processors of oyster shells and clam shells, providing all these unwarranted benefits, the temptation is great for the Senate to vote to extend benefits to the high-income doctors, dentists, and lawyers, who, as stated in the majority leader's speech, will receive 70 percent of the benefits under the H.R. 10 amendment.

Mr. President, this is no bill for the benefit of the average workingman. This is a special interest bill insofar as the taxpayers are concerned. Yet we are one vote from sending it to the White House.

I would now like to make some brief references to the provision with respect to campaign financing. Unfortunately, I was unable to talk to several Senators who are now here. I wish to suggest to those to whom I did not have the privilege of speaking earlier that this is not a clean elections bill. This makes the situation worse. The danger to our elective process is the use of money, the volume of money, and the sources of the money.

Granted this comes from a good source, it is commingled with all the private financing. How will you differentiate? It permits private citizens to appropriate public funds for purposes of their own choosing. Is not that unusual?

I am not sure that Congress can delegate such a responsibility, under the Constitution. If it can, the precedent is all the more dangerous. Because if a citizen can, by a checkmark on his tax return, appropriate money for political campaigns or deny it to a political campaign, he can deny it for the war in Vietnam; he can deny it for the war on poverty; or he can appropriate it for another particular purpose.

So I say if this is constitutional—which I challenge—then it is all the more dangerous. Because once we are on this road, the tax forms which we sought to simplify will have one more option after another. It may be that consumers will want the right to deny the use of their tax money for a farm program, or that farmers will want to deny the use of their tax funds for urban renewal.

What are we doing at a quarter to 3 on Saturday afternoon, October 22, when, after Herculean efforts, we have managed to obtain a quorum?

I plead with the leadership of the Senate, and more particularly with the leadership of the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee, to stop this annual practice of bringing sugar bills and technical tax bills before Congress in the closing hours, when there is no time for adequate consideration. This is when unworthy purposes can most easily be accomplished.

But we are not here to accomplish unworthy purposes, though admittedly there are differences of opinion as to what purposes are worthy or unworthy.

Mr. President, I am prepared to ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator has made a good argument about the lateness of the hour on these bills coming into the Senate, and I assure him that I intend to do everything I can from now on to insure that that practice is discontinued.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I can respond in 1 minute to certain statements which have been made which I think reflect on the honor of my committee, and I believe that I should.

Reference has been made to the fact that the amendment dealing with investment credit in U.S. possessions would be retroactive to a January date. Mr. President, when we first put the investment tax credit in the law, we had a January 1 date, though the investment tax credit law went into effect about the following August. As a practical matter, it was retroactive, and it went into effect the same day for every corporation in America.

All the amendment says is that companies doing business in American possessions such as the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, Guam, and American Samoa receive the same treatment as companies doing business in the United States. We have negotiated tax treaties with first one underdeveloped nation and then another, saying that American people doing business there get the same tax treatment which this amendment provides for our own island possessions. It is customary, when you pass a tax bill, to make its effective date either January 1 or the end of the fiscal year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have explained these other items in great detail, and I shall not go into them now, because Senators wish to vote. I am prepared to explain it in greater detail after the vote is over.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, may I have 2 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not wish to leave the RECORD confused. The effective date, as applied to the Virgin Islands refers to buildings completed after December 31, 1965, but the tax credit is allowed on machinery which went into the buildings in 1963 and 1964, or prior to that date. This bill provides a retroactive $2 million tax reduction for one company only—Harvey Aluminum Co. Why?

In that connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a list of contributions officers of this company made to the President's Club. In addition, the record shows that Harvey Aluminum was the purchaser of a $15,000 full-page ad in the 1965 Democratic ad book.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Sept. 1–Dec. 31, 1965:	
H. Harvey, 19200 Southwest Ave., Torrence, Calif	$1,000
L. M. Harvey, 19200 Southwest Ave., Torrence, Calif	1,000
L. A. Harvey, 19200 Southwest Ave., Torrence, Calif	1,000

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to read into the RECORD a short quotation which seems to be particularly appropriate at this time when Congress seems to be in such an extravagant mood. This statement was made 175 years ago by Dr. Alexander Tytler, professor of general history, of the University of Edinburgh. I think it would be well for Senators to take heed to these words. This statement was made at the time when our Government was first established, and was Dr. Tytler's comment upon this new democracy:

> A Democracy cannot exist as a permanent form of government. It can only exist until the voters discover that they can vote themselves largess out of the public treasury. From that moment on the majority always votes for the candidate promising the most benefits from the public treasury, with the result that a democracy will always collapse from a loose fiscal policy (burden of large public debt), always to be followed by a dictatorship.

Mr. President, I hope Congress will take heed to this statement before we go too far down the road of taking care of special interests in special interest legislation on the eve of elections. It would be well to remember that as Members of the Senate we are supposed to pass tax legislation which benefits the American people as a whole and not just the few who happen to have a special pipeline into the Treasury.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, all Americans are concerned about the astronomical cost of presidential elections. Private citizens, journalists, legislators, historians, political scientists, and other students of government have all recognized that presidential campaign costs have gotten out of line and that ways must be found to reduce them. A great deal of this added cost has resulted from the use of television.

It seems clear that unless Congress acts, the already astronomical campaign costs of television and radio will continue to soar. The Federal Communications Commission estimated that the total campaign expenditures for local, State, and national offices amounted to $200 million in 1964. This figure represents a 25 percent increase from 1960. For television and radio alone, the Federal Communications Commission estimated for 1964 a cost that amounted to $35 million, and the Broadcasting magazine estimated that the combined radio and television costs for 1964 was $40 million, of which approximately one-half was for presidential election.

Mr. President, there is little question that the networks and stations using the airways occupy a special trust and owe a special duty to the American people. They are issued a license by the Federal

Communications Commission and must serve the general public. In my judgment, both the Congress and the FCC should explore the possibility of requiring networks and stations to make available free time to the major parties on an equal time basis. I am convinced that the networks would be willing to do this and by so doing not only will they help to reduce the astronomical campaign costs but also would help to formalize the presentation of candidates and issues to the American people. Donated time for presidential elections should help to elevate the campaign dialog, clarify the issues, better inform the American people and, hopefully, eliminate some of the bad judgment and poor taste that have appeared in political advertisements over the past years.

Mr. President, I, as much as any Member of this body, would hope that the Congress would focus its attention on the increasing cost of financing campaigns. I speak from experience. In representing the great and large State of California and having had to campaign on a shoestring, I fully realize the urgency of the problem and the need for immediate reform. Yet, I do not approve of the hasty manner in which we approved of the new method of financing campaign elections as an amendment to a bill that had nothing to do with campaign expenditures. Most Members of the body, I feel certain, did not have an opportunity to study and reflect on this issue as much as we would like. The end of a session, when legislation is coming out of committees so rapidly and it is almost impossible to study completely all of the hearings, reports, and bills, is not the time to pass a measure dealing with a subject that is so important.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, for 12 years the very able and distinguished Congressman from New York [Mr. Keogh] and myself have worked diligently to bring about an effective retirement plan for some 18 million self-employed and their employees.

We were successful in bringing about the enactment of what is known as the Self-Employed Individuals Tax Retirement Act in 1962. This was progress, but not progress enough. The act fell short of providing equality of treatment compared to that accorded corporate employees in the same income bracket.

This year the House of Representatives by a unanimous vote passed an amendment that would permit the self-employed to deduct 100 percent of their pension fund contributions for themselves and their employees for the purpose of putting these individuals on a parity with others.

The Senate adopted an amendment to the Foreign Investors Tax Act containing the same provisions as passed by the House with one exception, and that is that the plan would become effective after the taxable year ending December 31, 1967. Because Congressman Keogh and myself have served long enough in Congress to become conferees we were successful in getting the conference committee to accept this amendment.

Our hopes and dreams over the years have now been realized because the objective for which we worked has been achieved.

I sincerely trust that the President will waste no time in signing the Foreign Investors Tax Act with this amendment which now provides equality of treatment to those who have been discriminated against over the years.

This measure will be helpful to the farmer, the small businessman, doctors, lawyers, certified public accountants and many others, together with their employees and the Treasury will suffer only a modest loss of revenue that it will recoup to a major extent when the self-employed and their employees draw their retirement.

I urge the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], is absent because of the death of his father.

I further announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Mondale], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea" and the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], the Senators from Colorado [Mr. Allott and Mr. Dominick], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs], the Senators from Kansas [Mr. Carlson and Mr. Pearson], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton], the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis and Mr. Hruska], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Griffin], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] are absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis] is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Idaho would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea" and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea" and the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Griffin] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall]. If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea" and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 22, as follows:

[No. 310 Leg.]

YEAS—31

Anderson
Bayh
Bennett
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Dodd
Ellender
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Holland
Inouye
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
Metcalf
Montoya
Morton
Muskie
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Smathers
Stennis
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough

NAYS—22

Clark
Fannin
Fulbright
Gore
Harris
Hickenlooper
Hill
Kennedy, Mass.
Kuchel
Lausche
McClellan
McIntyre
Monroney
Morse
Murphy
Nelson
Simpson
Smith
Thurmond
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—47

Aiken
Allott
Bartlett
Bass
Bible
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ervin
Fong
Griffin
Gruening
Hruska
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
McGovern
Miller
Mondale
Moss
Mundt
Neuberger
Pearson
Prouty
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Scott
Sparkman
Symington
Talmadge
Tower

So the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to read a statement entitled "Private Pension Plans for the Self-Employed," prepared by my distinguished colleague [Mr. RANDOLPH], who could not be present in the Chamber this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR RANDOLPH READ BY SENATOR BYRD OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is pleasing that the Senate has seized an opportunity to help many of our fellow countrymen make more adequate provision for their financial security in retirement. The Self-Employed Individuals Tax Retirement Act has been liberalized and will stimulate and assist self-employed individuals in establishing private pension plans for their own benefit as well as for that of their employees.

As Chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment and Retirement Incomes of the Senate Special Committee on Aging, I have been deeply interested in adequacy of retirement incomes. During the early part of 1965, our subcommittee held a series of hearings and issued a report on the subject of extending private pension coverage. In our report, we noted that during the past 30 years there has been a remarkable increase in the number of active workers covered by private pension plans and in the amounts of annual benefits paid under such plans. Between 1930 and 1962, the number of workers covered increased from 2,700,000 to 23 million, an increase of almost tenfold. Annual benefits paid moved up from about $90 million in 1930 to approximately $2,160 million in 1962. However, we found that the least progress in providing private pension coverage has been made in businesses and professional units with the fewest employees, most of which are owned and managed by those who are self-employed.

At our hearings, we were told that very few private pension plans have been adopted as a result of the Self-Employed Individuals Tax Retirement Act of 1962, due principally to the restrictions in that act which make pension plans unattractive to self-employed individuals. One witness testified that only 15,000 persons have been covered by plans under that act, compared with the 7 million which the Treasury Department estimated could be covered by such plans. Today, we have an opportunity to remove those restrictions and to make it possible for millions of self-employed persons and their employees to have the benefit of private pensions.

The only logical argument which can be presented against the progressive amendments to the Self-Employed Tax Retirement Act is that it would entail some revenue loss. We of the Subcommittee on Employment and Retirement Incomes believe it is more accurate to consider this not as a revenue loss, but as a wise investment in the material well-being of America's elderly and in the prosperity and health of the Nation's economy as it affects Americans of all ages. A pension expert testified at our hearing that each dollar of Federal revenue loss from funding private pensions contributes to the production of a minimum of $5.50 and a maximum of $12.20 of pension income in retirement. If any of us had an opportunity to buy a piece of land or purchase stock with the assurance that each dollar invested would be transformed into at least $5.50, we certainly would not consider that we were wasting dollars without any return. We would consider that we were making a wise and sound investment. And that is how we should regard the so-called revenue loss.

By stimulating the adoption of private pension plans, we not only help the elderly who will receive the supplementary retirement income, we improve economic conditions for Americans of all ages. We do so, first, by encouraging the savings which go into pension plans, which finances an expansion of productive capacity. This, in turn, raises the standard of living. Furthermore, we make the Nation's elderly a buoyant influence upon the economy. This is especially helpful in times of depression and economic distress, when enhanced purchasing power of the Nation's elderly can help to improve the economy. On the other hand, in times like the present when inflation threatens, contributions to pension plans can prevent overheating the economy. In these ways, there is an improvement in the health of the economy as it affects Americans of all ages.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 2010. An act for the relief of Fun Wat Hoy;

S. 2040. An act for the relief of Dr. Dean H. Gosselin;

S. 2109. An act for the relief of Dr. Olibio S. Rodriguez-Eiras;

S. 2222. An act for the relief of Susan Jeanne Clynes;

S. 2491. An act for the relief of Dr. Juan Federico Antonio Lamas y Parra;

S. 2750. An act for the relief of You I Souk;

S. 2763. An act for the relief of Dr. Marcial Alfredo Marti Prieto (Alfredo Marti);

S. 2798. An act for the relief of Chief Warrant Officer Glen Zeigler, U.S. Navy (retired);

S. 3209. An act for the relief of Zofia Zych;

S. 3222. An act for the relief of Dusko Doder;

S. 3258. An act for the relief of Deniz Hikmet Sen Manes;

S. 3318. An act for the relief of Yung Mi Kim; and

S. 3358. An act for the relief of Theodora Bezates.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 99) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2451) for the relief of Margaret Lee Weil, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H.R. 5990. An act to grant increased benefits to persons receiving cash relief under the Panama Canal Cash Relief Act of July 8, 1937, and to extend cash relief benefits to widows of recipients; and

H.R. 7973. An act to amend section 4339 of title 10, United States Code.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H.R. 9778. An act to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to codify recent military law, and to improve the Code; and

H.R. 17451. An act to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to authorize certain rank, pay, and retirement privileges for officers serving in certain positions, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15183) to adjust the status of Cuban refugees to that of lawful permanent residents of the United States.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1319) to authorize a work release program for persons sentenced by the courts of the District of Columbia; to define the powers and duties in relation thereto, and for other purposes.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 18381) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The assistant legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of Oct. 21, p. 28589, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the following is a summary of the results arrived at in the conference report and the accompanying motions from the House:

For the Office of Economic Opportunity, $1,612,500,000—an increase of $50 million over the House bill and a reduction of that amount from the Senate version; elimination of limitations on amounts for certain activities;

Earmarking $30 million in elementary and secondary education funds for the Adult Education Act of 1966, an activity previously funded and authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act;

For urban mass transportation grants, $70 million—1968 funding—instead of the $85 million in the Senate version and $65 million in the House bill;

For grants for libraries, $76 million, instead of the $57,500,000 in the Senate version of the bill;

For comprehensive city demonstration programs, $11 million, instead of the $12 million in the Senate version; elimination of $12,180,000 in the Senate version for grants to assist in planned metropolitan development.

In conclusion, the conference version totals $5,025,264,579; this is $166,149,050 under the budget estimates; $106,187,650 over the House version; and $71,074,000 under the Senate version.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 18381, which was read as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 13, 25, 29, 30, and 43 to the bill (H.R. 18381) entitled "An Act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes", and concur therein.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "$75,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"COMPREHENSIVE CITY DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS

"For financial assistance including not to exceed $750,000 for administrative expenses in connection with planning and developing comprehensive city demonstration programs, as authorized by the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, $11,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1968: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of S. 3708, 89th Congress, or similar legislation."

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "$4,000,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF STATE

"*International organizations and conferences*

"International Conference on Water for Peace

"For necessary expenses incident to organizing and holding the International Conference on Water for Peace in the United States, including not to exceed $10,000 for official functions and courtesies, $500,000, to remain available until December 31, 1967: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available only upon enactment into law of S.J. Res. 167, 89th Congress, or similar legislation."

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert: "$7,250,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

"INTER-AMERICAN CULTURAL AND TRADE CENTER

"For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of February 19, 1966 (Public Law 89-355), without regard to the provisions of law set forth in 41 U.S.C. 13, $5,870,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That appropriations heretofore made to the Department of Commerce to carry out the provisions of the Act of February 19, 1966 (Public Law 89-355), shall be merged with this appropriation."

Mr. PASTORE. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 9, 19, 34, 35, and 38.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a tabulation on this bill reflecting the amounts in the budget estimates for each item, the amounts agreed to in the House, the amounts agreed to in the Senate, and the final conference figure.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Supplemental appropriations bill, 1967 (H.R. 18381)—Comparative statement of budget estimates and action taken on items in the bill

H. Doc. No.	Item	Budget estimate	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference allowance compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House version of bill	Senate version of bill
	CHAPTER I							
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE							
	AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE							
	SALARIES AND EXPENSES							
505	Plant and animal disease and pest control	$1,650,000		$800,000	$300,000	−$1,350,000	+$300,000	−$500,000
	CONSUMER AND MARKETING SERVICE							
	Special school milk program			4,000,000				−4,000,000
S. 117	School lunch program	9,000,000		4,500,000	2,750,000	−6,250,000	+2,750,000	−1,750,000
	FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION							
505	Limitation on administrative expenses	*(39,000)*	*($39,000)*	*(39,000)*	*(39,000)*			
	Total, chapter I	10,650,000		9,300,000	3,050,000	−7,600,000	+3,050,000	−6,250,000
	CHAPTER II							
	FOREIGN OPERATIONS							
	EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON							
505	Limitation on operating expenses	*(600,000,000)*	*(600,000,000)*	*(600,000,000)*	*(600,000,000)*			
505	Limitation on administrative expenses	*(128,000)*	*(128,000)*	*(128,000)*	*(128,000)*			
	Total, chapter II	*(600,128,000)*	*(600,128,000)*	*(600,128,000)*	*(600,128,000)*			

***Supplemental appropriations bill, 1967 (H.R. 18381)—Comparative statement of budget estimates and action taken on items in the bill*—Con.**

H. Doc. No.	Item	Budget estimate	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference allowance compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House version of bill	Senate version of bill
	CHAPTER III							
	INDEPENDENT OFFICES							
	GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION							
	Construction, public buildings projects			$11,320,000	$11,320,000	+$11,320,000	+$11,320,000	
	VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION							
505	General operating expenses	$19,320,000	$19,320,000	19,320,000	19,320,000			
505	Readjustment benefits	327,000,000	327,000,000	327,000,000	327,000,000			
	Total, Veterans' Administration	346,320,000	346,320,000	346,320,000	346,320,000			
	COMMISSION ON POLITICAL ACTIVITY OF GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL							
S. 117	Salaries and expenses	200,000		100,000	75,000	−125,000	+75,000	−$25,000
	SELECT COMMISSION ON WESTERN HEMISPHERE IMMIGRATION							
505	Salaries and expenses	900,000	800,000	800,000	800,000	−100,000		
	DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT							
505	Urban renewal programs, 1968	750,000,000	750,000,000	750,000,000	750,000,000			
335	Urban mass transportation grants, 1968	95,000,000	65,000,000	85,000,000	70,000,000	−25,000,000	+5,000,000	−15,000,000
505	Administrative expenses, urban transportation activities	110,000	75,000	99,000	80,000	−30,000	+5,000	−19,000
S. 117	Comprehensive city demonstration programs	12,000,000		12,000,000	11,000,000	−1,000,000	+11,000,000	−1,000,000
S. 117	Grants to assist in planned metropolitan development	12,180,000		12,180,000		−12,180,000		−12,180,000
505	Federal National Mortgage Association, limitation on administrative expenses	*(850,000)*	*(850,000)*	*(850,000)*	*(850,000)*			
	Total, Department of Housing and Urban Development	869,290,000	815,075,000	859,279,000	831,080,000	−38,210,000	+16,005,000	−28,199,000
	Total, chapter III	1,216,710,000	1,162,195,000	1,217,819,000	1,189,595,000	−27,115,000	+27,400,000	−28,224,000
	CHAPTER IV							
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR							
	BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT							
505	Management of lands and resources	1,300,000	800,000	800,000	800,000	−500,000		
	BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS							
505	Education and welfare services	2,500,000	1,250,000	2,150,000	2,150,000	−350,000		
	OFFICE OF TERRITORIES							
S. 117	Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	2,444,000				−2,444,000		
	BUREAU OF MINES							
505	Health and safety	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000			
	FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE							
	BUREAU OF SPORTS FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE							
505	Construction	1,685,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	−185,000		
	Total, Department of the Interior	8,129,000	4,650,000	4,650,000	4,650,000	−3,479,000		
	RELATED AGENCIES							
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE							
	FOREST SERVICE							
505	Forest protection and utilization:							
505	Forest land management	2,300,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	2,300,000			
505	State and private forestry cooperation	540,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	−340,000		
	Total, Department of Agriculture	2,840,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	−340,000		
	FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW							
505	Salaries and expenses	117,000	117,000	117,000	117,000			
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE							
	PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE							
505	Construction of Indian health facilities	1,025,000	1,025,000	1,025,000	1,025,000			
	EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT							
	NATIONAL COUNCIL ON MARINE RESOURCES AND ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT, AND COMMISSION ON MARINE SCIENCE, ENGINEERING AND RESOURCES							
505	Salaries and expenses	1,300,000	800,000	1,300,000	1,100,000	−200,000	+300,000	−200,000
	Total, chapter IV	13,411,000	9,092,000	9,592,000	9,392,000	−4,019,000	+300,000	−200,000

Supplemental appropriations bill, 1967 (H.R. 18381)—Comparative statement of budget estimates and action taken on items in the bill—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Item	Budget estimate	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference allowance compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House version of bill	Senate version of bill
	CHAPTER V							
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE							
	OFFICE OF EDUCATION							
335	Elementary and secondary educational activities	1,342,410,000	1,342,410,000	1,342,410,000	1,342,410,000			
335	Higher educational activities	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000			
335	Higher educational facilities construction	722,744,000	722,744,000	722,744,000	722,744,000			
521	Grants for libraries	57,500,000	76,000,000	57,500,000	76,000,000	+$18,500,000		+18,500,000
	PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE							
S. 117	Community health practice and research	11,768,000		6,000,000	4,000,000	−7,768,000	+$4,000,000	−$2,000,000
	SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS							
	FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL							
S. 96	Salaries and expenses	1,123,000		1,000,000	1,000,000	−123,000	+1,000,000	
	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY							
S. 117	International education activities	5,000,000		500,000		−5,000,000		−500,000
	Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	2,170,545,000	2,171,154,000	2,160,154,000	2,176,154,000	+5,609,000	+5,000,000	
	EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT							
	OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY							
335	Economic opportunity program	1,750,000,000	1,562,500,000	1,662,500,000	1,612,500,000	−137,500,000	+50,000,000	−50,000,000
	Total, chapter V	3,920,545,000	3,733,654,000	3,822,654,000	3,788,654,000	−131,891,000	+55,000,000	−34,000,000
	CHAPTER VI							
	LEGISLATIVE BRANCH							
	SENATE							
	SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES							
	Office of the Secretary			$10,790	10,790	+10,790	+10,790	
	Administrative and clerical assistants to Senators			13,860	13,860	+13,860	+13,860	
	CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE							
	Inquiries and investigations			25,000	25,000	+25,000	+25,000	
	Total, Senate			49,650	49,650	+49,650	+49,650	
	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES							
505	Office of the Sergeant at Arms	341,700	[1] 318,000	[1] 318,000	[1] 318,000	−23,700		
506	Committee employees	200,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	−100,000		
505	Members' clerk hire	900,000				−900,000		
	Total, House of Representatives	1,441,700	418,000	418,000	418,000	−1,023,700		
	JOINT ITEMS							
505	Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation	23,000	23,000	23,000	23,000			
	ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL							
	CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS							
505	Capitol Buildings	18,000		18,000	18,000		+18,000	
	LIBRARY OF CONGRESS							
	BOOKS FOR THE BLIND							
505	Salaries and expenses	1,497,000	1,497,000	1,497,000	1,497,000			
	Total, chapter VI	2,979,700	1,938,000	2,005,650	2,005,650	−974,050	+67,650	
	CHAPTER VII							
	DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE							
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE							
	INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES							
S. 117	International Conference on Water for Peace	900,000		750,000	500,000	−400,000	+500,000	−250,000

Footnote at end of table.

***Supplemental appropriations bill, 1967 (H.R. 18381)—Comparative statement of budget estimates and action taken on items in the bill*—Continued**

H. Doc. No.	Item	Budget estimate	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference allowance compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House version of bill	Senate version of bill
	CHAPTER VII—Continued							
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE							
	LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION							
	Law enforcement assistance	*($13, 695, 000)*		$8, 000, 000	$7, 250, 000	+$7, 250, 000	+$7, 250, 000	−$750, 000
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE							
S. 117	HemisFair 1968 exposition	7, 500, 000		7, 500, 000	6, 750, 000	−750, 000	+6, 750, 000	−750, 000
S. 117	Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center	520, 000		6, 520, 000	5, 870, 000	−650, 000	+5, 870, 000	−650, 000
	Total, Department of Commerce	14, 020, 000		14, 020, 000	12, 620, 000	−1, 400, 000	+14, 000, 000	−1, 400, 000
	Total, chapter VII	14, 920, 000		22, 770, 000	20, 370, 000	+5, 450, 000	+20, 370, 000	−2, 400, 000
	CHAPTER VIII							
	CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS							
522	Claims and judgments	12, 197, 929	$12, 197, 929	12, 197, 929	12, 197, 929			
	Grand total	5, 191, 413, 629	4, 919, 076, 929	5, 096, 338, 579	5, 025, 264, 579	−166, 149, 050	+106, 187, 650	−71, 074, 000

---

[1] Of which not to exceed $23,000 may be transferred to the current appropriation for "general expenses," Capitol Police.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I will answer any questions.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, would the distinguished chairman of the conference committee yield, so that I may propound a question to the distinguished chairman of the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MONRONEY. In connection with amendment No. 1, appropriating $300,000 for the Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research, this being the amount agreed to by the conference on specified amounts for the enforcement of the humane care of laboratory animals and the registration of dealers in research animals, I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Agricultural Subcommittee if there is not a residue of funds amounting to approximately $330,000 that might also be added to this $300,000 at the discretion of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HOLLAND. In reply, I wish to say that while I cannot fix the exact amount of the residue available the budget itself proposed the application of $350,000 for this purpose out of funds heretofore appropriated under the general appropriation bill for other purposes in addition to the additional funds which were asked for by the budget.

The chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations of the other body and I, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for this body, are in accord that there is substantial additional money available to add to this $300,000 to carry out the objective which must be carried out under the bill by February 24, and for which the conference has directed that the work be performed by February 1, and that the Department transmit by that time to the committees of both Houses its proposed regulations.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Florida, for clarifying this matter. This could be added to the $300,000 cash appropriated.

Mr. HOLLAND. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in connection with the same subject, I wish to say that the matter was exhaustively discussed by the conferees, and it was generally the unanimous opinion of all that this objective that has just been expressed be carried out by the Department.

I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to make a few comments in regard to the conference agreement on amendment No. 1. Public Law 89–544 authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals intended to be used for research and other experimental purposes.

The Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Supplementals, under the able chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], gave careful consideration to the supplemental estimate submitted in House Document 505 in the total amount of $2 million, of which $350,000 was proposed to be transferred from funds available in the regular Appropriation Act for the Department of Agriculture as follows:

Hog cholera eradication, $150,000.

Witchweed eradication, $200,000.

The other body denied the entire request for an appropriation and recommended that it be deferred until the regular appropriation bill for fiscal year 1968. The Senate recommended only $800,000 which the members of the committee believed to be the minimal appropriation required to enable the Department to discharge the responsibility imposed under section 24, which requires that regulations be issued not later than next February 24.

In the give-and-take of the conference committee, an appropriation of $300,000 has been agreed upon with the understanding, as stated in the conference report, that the Department will transmit to the committees of both bodies its proposed regulations not later than next February 1. I have serious doubt that the requirements of section 24 can be carried out with $300,000, but I strongly urge the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out this responsibility within the amounted provided, if possible. In the event, after careful study, the Secretary finds that some additional funds are needed, speaking as one Member of the Senate and as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture, I would not object to the expenditure of additional funds for this purpose, provided the Secretary notifies the regular subcommittees in both bodies, and sets forth in his letter of notification the specific need for additional funds, as well as the use being made by the Department of $300,000 appropriated in the supplemental appropriation bill.

MARGARET LEE WEIL

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendment of the House to S. 2451.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2451) for the relief of Margaret Lee Weil which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

> That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Che Yim Loh may be clasisfied as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, and a petition filed in behalf of the said Che Yim Loh by Margaret Lee Weil, a citizen of the United States, may be approved pursuant to section 204 of the Act.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An Act for the relief of Che Yim Loh."

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to.

TABULATION OF ALL APPROPRIATION BILLS HANDLED DURING THE 2D SESSION OF THE 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be included at this place in the RECORD a tabulation of all appropriation bills handled during the 2d session of the 89th Congress. Among other things, this table shows direct appropriations totaling $130,281,568,480 made during this session. This amount is $883,358,106 below the budget estimates submitted to the Senate. However, Mr. President, the Congress has provided loan authorizations totaling $995,527,500 which is $229,202,500 over the budget estimates submitted by the President.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The appropriation bills, 89th Cong., 2d sess.

[Does not include back-door appropriations, or permanent appropriations[1] under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills]

Title and bill No.	Budget estimates to House	Amount as passed House	Budget estimates to Senate	Amount as passed Senate	Final action	Final action compared with latest budget estimates
1966 SUPPLEMENTALS						
Supplemental, Defense (H.R. 13546)	$13, 135, 719, 000	$13, 135, 719, 000	$13, 135, 719, 000	$13, 135, 719, 000	$13, 135, 719, 000	0
2d supplemental (H.R. 14012)	2, 813, 552, 168	2, 564, 872, 568	3, 020, 810, 903	2, 801, 226, 003	2, 788, 143, 303	−$232, 667, 600
Total, 1966 supplementals	15, 949, 271, 168	15, 700, 591, 568	16, 156, 529, 903	15, 936, 945, 003	15, 923, 862, 303	−232, 667, 600
1967 APPROPRIATIONS						
Interior (H.R. 14215)	1, 329, 960, 500	1, 295, 169, 500	1, 340, 260, 500	1, 329, 755, 000	1, 321, 615, 800	−18, 644, 700
Loan authorizations	(26, 000, 000)	(26, 000, 000)	(26, 000, 000)	(26, 000, 000)	(26, 000, 000)	0
Treasury-Post Office (H.R. 14266)	7, 246, 720, 000	7, 210, 177, 135	7, 246, 720, 000	7, 210, 049, 135	7, 196, 429, 135	−50, 290, 865
Agriculture (H.R. 14596)	7, 022, 638, 000	6, 876, 027, 000	7, 022, 938, 000	7, 064, 343, 300	6, 994, 590, 150	−28, 347, 850
Loan authorizations	(702, 100, 000)	(852, 000, 000)	(702, 100, 000)	(932, 000, 000)	(932, 000, 000)	(+229, 900, 000)
Labor-HEW (H.R. 14745)	10, 083, 184, 500	10, 573, 272, 500	10, 083, 184, 500	10, 473, 309, 500	10, 463, 244, 500	+380, 060, 000
Independent offices (H.R. 14921)	14, 319, 611, 291	14, 017, 299, 000	14, 329, 863, 291	14, 118, 607, 000	14, 065, 851, 000	−264, 012, 291
Legislative (H.R. 15456)	173, 793, 578	172, 146, 333	214, 749, 763	214, 418, 213	214, 463, 913	−285, 850
Defense (H.R. 15941)	57, 664, 353, 000	58, 616, 445, 000	57, 664, 353, 000	58, 189, 872, 000	58, 067, 472, 000	+403, 119, 000
District of Columbia (H.R. 17636)	(423, 903, 800)	(380, 650, 600)	(428, 170, 600)	(406, 739, 200)	(404, 598, 200)	(−23, 572, 400)
Federal payment	53, 394, 000	52, 394, 000	53, 394, 000	53, 394, 000	53, 394, 000	0
Loan authorization	(26, 225, 000)	(23, 000, 000)	(38, 225, 000)	(37, 527, 500)	(37, 527, 500)	(−697, 500)
Military construction (H.R. 17637)	1, 114, 947, 000	1, 019, 340, 000	1, 114, 947, 000	986, 518, 000	979, 570, 000	−135, 377, 000
Public works (H.R. 17787)	4, 167, 073, 000	4, 110, 932, 000	4, 167, 073, 000	4, 139, 244, 000	4, 134, 511, 000	−32, 562, 000
Foreign assistance (H.R. 17788)	3, 945, 095, 000	3, 604, 048, 800	3, 945, 095, 000	3, 493, 473, 500	3, 493, 473, 500	−451, 621, 500
State, Commerce, Justice, and judiciary (H.R. 18119)	2, 598, 638, 500	2, 364, 008, 600	2, 634, 405, 000	2, 350, 941, 600	2, 347, 826, 600	−286, 578, 400
Supplemental, 1967 (H.R. 18381)	5, 122, 760, 629	4, 919, 076, 929	5, 191, 413, 629	5, 096, 338, 579	5, 025, 264, 579	−166, 149, 050
Total, 1967 bills to date	114, 842, 168, 998	114, 830, 336, 797	115, 008, 396, 683	114, 720, 263, 827	114, 357, 706, 177	−650, 690, 506
Total, all appropriations to date	130, 691, 440, 156	130, 530, 928, 365	131, 164, 926, 586	130, 657, 208, 830	130, 281, 568, 480	−883, 358, 106
Total, loan authorizations	(754, 325, 000)	(901, 000, 000)	(766, 325, 000)	(995, 527, 500)	(995, 527, 500)	(+229, 202, 500)

---

[1] Permanent appropriations estimated in January budget at about $13,800,000,000 for fiscal year 1967.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H.R. 3530. An act for the relief of Dr. Miguel Angel Martinez y Corpas;

H.R. 3689. An act for the relief of Juanita Cereguine de Burgh;

H.R. 10288. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio B. Santillano; and

H.R. 13192. An act for the relief of Nermin Demirbag Lavapies.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 6958. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to promote savings under the Internal Revenue Service's automatic data processing system;

H.R. 9167. An act to amend title of the United States Code to enable the courts to deal more effectively with the problem of narcotic addiction, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11216. An act relating to the tariff treatment of articles assembled abroad of products of the United States, and for other purposes;

H.R. 17607. An act to suspend the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property;

H.R. 17636. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activites chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes;

H.R. 18119. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 18233. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

PROGRAM FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES FOR THE TEACHING OF VETERINARY MEDICINE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I request that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House on H.R. 3348.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 3348, which was read as follows:

Resolved, That the House concur in the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, to the bill (H.R. 3348) entitled "An Act to authorize a program for the construction of facilities for the teaching of veterinary medicine and a program of loans for students of veterinary medicine."

Resolved, That the House disagree to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 2 to aforesaid bill.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede from its amendments No. 1 and 2.

This is a bill, Mr. President, to further veterinary medicine education in the United States.

VETERINARY MEDICAL BILL MUST PASS

Mr. President, this meritorious bill amends the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act to provide assistance in the construction of teaching facilities at schools of medicine and loans for students at these schools on the same basis as is presently provided for students of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, optometry, pharmacy, and podiatry.

There are 18 colleges of veterinary medicine in 17 States which provide veterinarians to serve all 50 States. One of the finest of these schools is at Texas A. & M. University. Last year, at least four qualified applicants were turned away for each one accepted by these colleges because of a shortage of facilities; yet today we are suffering from an acute shortage of veterinary personnel. The American Veterinary Medical Association estimates that there are approximately 24,000 veterinarians in the United States. To maintain the present ratio, it is conservatively estimated that we will need 31,000 veterinarians by 1980.

Veterinarians play an important part in the Armed Forces, in the Federal and State departments of agriculture, in the Public Health Service, and Food and

Drug Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and in State and local health departments. They direct meat and poultry inspection programs for Federal, State, and local governments. Veterinarians are also engaged in the production and evaluation of drugs and pharmaceuticals. Veterinarians are urgently needed to maintain the health of laboratory animals so as to make more useful research conducted using these animals. These needs will increase under the legislation passed by Congress this year to improve the treatment of laboratory animals.

Too often the role of the veterinarian is considered exclusively in terms of caring for our animal pets or in association with our fine agricultural colleges. Yet the accomplishments of veterinary medical scientists in solving problems of human disease illustrates the distinguished role of this one factor in the total health team.

Historically, the discoveries of the veterinary medical scientist are indeed noteworthy:

Dr. Karl F. Meyer's work on botulism virtually eliminated this highly fatal food-borne disease.

Dr. Franz Benesch, who while working with horses and cattle perfected the spinal anesthesia.

Dr. Frank Schofield, who discovered dicumarol, the anticoagulant widely used in treating heart disease.

Dr. Fred Kilborne, who observed that insects could transmit disease between animals and men and laid the ground work for Reed's conquest of yellow fever.

Benefits have accrued from the virtual eradication of bovine tuberculosis and the debilitating effects of hookworm and the use of cowpox virus to immunize against smallpox. All of these and others illustrate well the need to insure future contributions.

The veterinarian has been particularly helpful in the control of those diseases of animals which are transmissible to man. These include tuberculosis, rabies, anthrax, tularemia, psittacosis, and others. He, along with other disciplines, has contributed to progress in the control of communicable diseases.

The bill would provide assistance in the construction and renovation of schools of veterinary medicine by making these schools eligible for matching grants to pay up to two-thirds of the cost of new teaching facilities, and up to one-half the cost of projects for renovation of teaching facilities at schools of veterinary medicine.

The reported bill authorizes establishment of student loan funds at schools of veterinary medicine. Loans may not exceed $2,500 for any academic year, and are repayable over the 10-year period which begins 3 years after the student ceases to pursue a full-time course of study.

This is a bill of great merit and I strongly urge Senate approval.

Mr. President, the House has stricken out all the money for construction of these schools. The bill passed by the subcommittee provides for the construction of schools, for additional buildings, and for additional facilities for 18 of these schools. The House struck out the money and the administration said, "That is all right," so they put up a liability for building under the statute which the Senate passed 4 years ago to build more medical schools. This bill that Congress passed 4 years ago for the building of more medical schools provided for the building of 20 in this country, but the administration has built only 6. We are 14 schools short. The result is today that over 20 percent of all interns in hospitals in the United States are graduating from foreign medical schools. Twenty-seven percent of all residents in hospitals in this country are also being graduated from foreign medical schools. We are not adequately educating the youth of this country which is interested in medicine. Twelve percent of all Americans in studying medicine are now in foreign medical schools—which have inferior teaching—merely because America does not have the space for them.

I mention that because the administration through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has written a letter stating that they will divert money from the building of medical schools to the building of medical schools for veterinarians. We have had this experience before with the student loan fund where they promised education so that they would not try to get rid of the fund. But they reversed themselves.

I want to serve notice that I intend to come back next January and ask for a supplemental appropriation to build these veterinarian schools so that this money will not be diverted from the building of medical schools for human beings.

Mr. MORSE and Mr. HILL addressed the Chair.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I will yield to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], chairman of the Public Health Service Subcommittee, the author of the Hill-Burton Act, who has done so much to further medical education in this country. Then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I want to commend the distinguished Senator from Texas on the fine statement he has made. I join him in the definite assurance that there will be a separate budget set up for veterinarian schools. There is not only a shortage of medical schools for human beings, but for dental schools and nursing schools as well. There must be a supplemental budget sent in for veterinarian schools.

I join wholeheartedly in endorsing the statement of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Before the bill was called up, in colloquy between the distinguished chairman of the Public Health Subcommittee, the chairman of the Education Subcommittee, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], and myself, we agreed that the legislative history on this bill should be made, to serve notice on the administration and the House that we do not intend to have money diverted from the construction of medical schools in America to build schools for veterinarians. We do not intend to pull down and rob American boys and girls of the opportunity to become doctors by the diversion of such funds.

I am happy now to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I want the attention of the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], and also of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], because it is very important that we make this legislative history. It is also very important that when the Senator from Oklahoma goes back to his State, he be equipped with the facts in regard to this legislative history, because the veterinarian groups that had responsibility in behalf of veterinarians in connection with seeking to get authorization for the objectives of the bill are headed by Dr. Home, of the great veterinarian school in Oklahoma.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough], the Senator from Alabama and I did everything we could to get the bill in the position it is now. I want the legislative history to be as clear as the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] have already made it, but I want to reinforce it. I know how to make legislative history, as does the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Texas.

I want the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to understand, when they read this Record, that it was the intent of the Senate, when it passes this bill this afternoon—and I am sure it will be passed—that not 1 dime—I am not talking about $1, I am talking about 1 dime—not 1 dime in their present funds shall be spent for the building of veterinarian facilities, although we are for those veterinarian facilities, but that they must come up here—and they should come up here—come January, asking for a supplemental appropriation to carry out the objectives of the bill.

I do think that it is important we get the authorization for the building of facilities on the statute books, but I think it would be a travesty if the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare interpreted the passage of the bill as any justification whatsoever for spending a single dime on the building of a veterinarian facility which, if it were built now, would be taking away from the hospitals of this country.

The chairman of the committee is entitled to be protected by the Senator from Texas and by me, here and now, on the floor of the Senate, because there could not be the slightest justification for siphoning off money for the building of hospitals which are so sorely needed.

Of course, we need veterinarian facilities, but they will have to wait, so far as I am concerned, for the building of hospitals until we can get a supplemental appropriation bill.

Thus, I say to Dr. Gardner, "Take note of the record, because we are going to hold you to an accountability in case you do not follow the legislative intent that the Senator from Texas, the Senator from Alabama, and I are making."

Mr. HILL. Let me commend the Senator from Oregon and say that I stand wholeheartedly—100 percent—behind the statements so ably made by the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the distinguished Senators from Oregon and Alabama. I think this is of prime importance because when the bill was heard before the Senate committee, I asked the Surgeon General of the United States why he had not built the 20 medical schools which Congress had authorized. He replied that 6 had been built and 14 were in the planning stage, and that he thought that was fine progress. Mr. President, I do not believe that is the kind of progress Congress called for. That is not the progress the country needs. But the Surgeon General of the United States indicated that he is satisfied. If he is satisfied, I think he should know that those of us serving on the appropriate committees are not satisfied, because he has been dragging his feet. He has built only 6 of the 20 badly needed hospitals. The Surgeon General recommended that the House plan be undertaken, that we take the money out of the moneys authorized by Congress to build medical schools and use it for the building of veterinarian schools. The country sorely needs these medical schools.

Mr. MORSE. Let the Record show that my reference in the legislative history refers to medical schools as well as hospitals for human beings.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Yes.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede from its amendments Nos. 1 and 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, what I shall say, rather briefly, will in no wise question the wisdom or the unwisdom of any of the requests made by the administration to Congress to which I shall refer.

I merely wish the Record to show that this session of Congress, more than any other in recent times, has shown independence and a willingness to operate, as it should, as a coequal branch of Government. This should instill a great deal of confidence in Congress by the people of the United States.

I have jotted down a few of the details which make clear that fact. This Senate has declined to pass the so-called Civil Rights Act of 1966.

This Senate has refused to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Both Houses of this Congress, one at a time, have refused to pass home rule for the District of Columbia.

In the case of these three matters, there have been five unsuccessful efforts at cloture here in the Senate of the United States.

There were numerous other proposals requested by the administration—and again I do not reflect upon the wisdom or unwisdom of the requests made of the Congress—which the Congress has refused to pass.

It refused to federalize State unemployment programs, which would have, in effect, made them creatures of the Federal Government.

I think the declination to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act and the refusal to federalize State unemployment compensation have reflected a desire on the part of Congress to preserve some degree of States rights and States responsibilities.

There are many other matters which I could mention.

For instance, one was a material change, which was made in the public interest, in the passage of the so-called food-for-peace bill. The administration requested a bill covering a program of 5 years at $2.5 billion a year. That was the authorization requested. The authorization which passed the Congress was for 2 years only, at $1.9 billion a year.

There are numerous instances in which the appropriations have been reduced below those requested.

The distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], in placing in the Record the compilation of all appropriation bills a few minutes ago, showed that the amount of total appropriations passed at this session is almost $1 billion below the requests contained in the budget items which reached us.

I am making this statement without reflecting in any way on the wisdom of any of us who may have taken one position or the other, or upon the wisdom of the administration. The point I am making is that once again Congress has shown itself as a coequal branch of the U.S. Government and has insisted on material independence in respect to its actions during this session. As a Member of the Congress, I am proud of that fact, and I think the people of the United States should and will take material comfort from that fact.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR MANSFIELD, MAJORITY LEADER, AND SENATOR DIRKSEN, MINORITY LEADER

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the majority leader of the Senate is one of the great leaders of all time of this country. Those of us who have served with him both love and respect him in every way it is possible for one to hold a man in high regard.

In addition to being thoughtful, sweet, lovable, and personable, the majority leader is also an effective leader.

It may be interesting to state that after the Senator from Tennessee made his very stirring speech against the tax bill, as did the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams], the Senator from Louisiana had notes ready to answer in detail the points made, because he believed that every Senator who had originally voted for the bill would vote again with him if they had the facts. The majority leader said, "Don't make the speech. You have the votes. If you make your speech, you won't have a quorum. You will have won the battle and lost the war."

So the Record does not reflect what I would have said if it had not been for the advice of the distinguished majority leader.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record the speech I would have made if the majority leader had not given me that advice.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record.

[The address will appear hereafter in the Record.]

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I believe that there is a unanimity of opinion in this body on the effectiveness, the gentility, and the friendship of the majority leader and that there is an equally unanimous view of the similar attributes of that fine gentleman who graces the position of minority leader. If it meets with the Senate's approval, I simply say to the American people, as well as to Members of the U.S. Senate, they have been graced by the wisdom, patience, guidance, devotion to duty, and American patriotism of the leader of the Democratic Party and the leader of the Republican Party. We are twice blessed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I think exactly the same thing. May I say, by way of an addendum, that some time ago I urged the minority leader to join with me in trying to pass a measure to protect the football teams. The minority leader is in the hospital. He is going to be asked to join the majority leader in calling the President to say that the Senate is ready to adjourn.

I understand it is almost impossible to get into his room at Walter Reed Hospital because there are so many flowers.

When it was suggested that the football amendment be attached to the tax bill, someone said, "Oh, my goodness, don't tell me you are going to attach this bill to a tax measure."

Well, it was. When that happened, every professional football team, I think, sent flowers. The Baltimore Colts sent a huge wreath shaped like a horseshoe. The Cleveland Browns sent a wreath shaped like a football. There are so many flowers there that it is almost impossible to get inside the room.

When the Senator from Illinois woke up and looked at the flowers, he said, "Apparently the bill must have passed." [Laughter.]

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to join in the merited encomiums of the majority and minority leaders, but I must say I draw a different conclusion on the vote just had from the Senator from Louisiana. I suppose it was due to the absence of his oratory. I wish to remind him that that is the only time when I have had more than a corporal's guard in the Senate to speak to. If I had thought it would have had that effect, I would have gone on for 10 more minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I hope at the next session the Senator from California, the minority whip, will stop stealing my speeches before I deliver them, because the one he just delivered was the one I was about to deliver. But I wish the Senator had talked longer. I thought we were gaining more votes as the Senator spoke.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. May I say that I think we could still have developed a quorum if I had spoken and answered all the points that had been made.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before the distinguished majority whip leaves, may I say that I was given the most thorough leadership lesson yesterday when the Senator from Montana proved himself to be 100-percent wrong and the Senator from Louisiana proved himself to be 100-percent right.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I wish to join other Senators who have complimented the majority leader. I have been in this body for 20 years, and I have never served under a greater leader than the present majority leader, a man who is always fair to members of the minority as well as members of the majority. In my opinion he is one of the great leaders of the U.S. Senate. I personally value his friendship. I respect him for the great contribution he has made not only to his State but also to the United States of America. I am very glad to join my colleagues in the comments they have made about the majority leader.

Senator MANSFIELD is a gentleman.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to join my fellow Senators in their tribute to the majority leader. I did not anticipate that they would at this moment pay tribute to the majority leader; but I had intended to do so, and this appears to be an appropriate time to do it.

Not only is he an effective majority leader as such, but I wish particularly to pay tribute to his good judgment in the field in which I have especial responsibility—foreign relations. I think the majority leader has given great leadership to this country, to the Senate, and to the thinking of the American people in this area, at what really is a most threatening and important time, I believe, in the history of our country.

The Senator has had long experience in that area as a senior member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I only hope the country as well as the Senate will give ever-increasing attention to the views of the majority leader. I consider him one of the most thoughtful of Senators, and one of the great statesmen of our era, in addition to being a truly effective majority leader.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I shall call up my bill in just a moment, but first I should like to join with the other Senators present in their justified plaudits of our distinguished majority leader. Certainly I join with and echo everything that they have said. I do not know when we have had a more effective majority leader than we have now. He operates in a mild-mannered way, and yet produces as many results as any leader I have ever heard of or read about. In addition to his being a great and effective statesman, I think the thing we like most about him is that he is always a patient and willing friend, and will help every individual Senator in a friendly and personal way.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I wish to be associated with all Senators who have spoken with respect to the parliamentary leader of the U.S. Senate. Nobody here—and I am sure I speak for every member of the minority—has less than complete respect for the kindness, the patience, the fairness, the honesty, and the integrity of the majority leader. He has certainly helped everybody on both sides of the aisle. In my book he is one of the greatest citizens of America—I am proud that he hails from the West.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. First, I observe that—

> The last part of any party is the best part of all,
> Playing pleasant love games till the wee hours start to fall.

I am reminded of that little couplet at the end of any session.

Sincerely, I could not let this occasion go by without paying my respects to a great American and a great leader, MIKE MANSFIELD. He has a combination, in great abundance, of those rare qualities which make for a leader. He has complete courage, unswerving honesty and integrity, and great kindness, and above all, the willing ability, on occasions when he feels that an injustice may be in the offing or may have been committed against a Senator, unthinkingly or unwittingly, to get up and defend that Senator and to correct that injustice, even though he may disagree with the position of the Senator to whom he is referring. That is an element and an evidence of his fairness.

The Senator from Montana and I have enjoyed not only an acquaintance, but a very close friendship, for many years, even before he came to the Senate.

I do not wish to prolong this session, though one could very easily do it. I merely wish to say that my respect for the Senator from Montana, for his leadership, his fairness, and his innate decency, is unbounded, and I wish him well. As our minority leader, EVERETT DIRKSEN, said in his closing remarks, as this Congress comes to an end, we all wish him Godspeed.

I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I yield first to the Senator from South Carolina, and then to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I join my fellow Senators in their remarks about Senator MANSFIELD. He possesses in abundance what have frequently been spoken of as the three C's: He is courteous, he is capable, and he is courageous. I am very proud of his friendship; I am proud of the manner in which he has handled the Senate as majority leader. I have always found him fair, and it has been a great pleasure to serve here with him in the U.S. Senate. Also, Mr. President, I want to pay my high respects to the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] for the great service he has rendered the country. He led the successful fight to retain section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, to prevent the passage of an unconstitutional so-called civil rights bill to prevent federalization of the unemployment compensation program, among the other outstanding contributions he has made as the leader of the Republican Party in the Senate.

Mr. SMATHERS. I now yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, it has been a great honor to share in this 89th Congress, which has passed more remedial legislation, I think, than any Congress in history. I want to give credit where credit is due. We have read that there was much arm twisting involved in getting the bills passed.

Mr. President, it has been my experience that it was not arm twisting from the executive department which got them passed, it was the courtesy, fairness, and consideration of the majority leader that got those bills passed, and it was the courtesy, fairness, consideration, and leadership of the majority leader, not only in working with us on this side of the aisle, but with our fellow Senators on the other side of the aisle. Members of the Senate trust MIKE MANSFIELD. The Members of both parties trust MIKE MANSFIELD. He works in close cooperation with the distinguished minority leader. We regret that the minority leader is in the hospital, and cannot be here. The confidence of the Senate in its majority leader, I think, Mr. President, has more to do, on this side of the Capitol, with the passage of this vast volume of progressive legislation than any other one factor. I think he should be given that credit.

We have enjoyed serving with him, we honor him as the kind of leader we like to serve with; he is a credit to the institution of the Senate, he is a credit to the legislative process, and he is a credit to the democracy to which we give lipservice, but sometimes fail actually to observe.

I also honor him for his courage in the field of foreign affairs. I think he has been a great leader, not only for the Senate but for the country, in both domestic and foreign affairs. I am proud that we have had a leader who stood up for what he believed in and what he thought was best for the country, whether it comported with the views of the other legislative House of the legislative branch, or with the executive department, or not.

I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield now to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say that I have always been proud of our majority leader, but I never was more proud of him than I was this morning, when he made his statement to the Senate. It was not only eloquent, but it was moving, and I turned to the Senator sitting next to me, when the majority leader had finished, and said, "MIKE

MANSFIELD has brought the Senate together, and it is only a matter, now, of a short time before we will vote."

I wish to say not only is this another manifestation of MIKE MANSFIELD's great qualities of leadership, but also, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, I wish, in behalf of my subcommittee and, I feel, in behalf of all the schoolchildren of America, to thank him once again for the cooperation and support that he gave to us as we took the education legislation through the Senate. Without that cooperation from the majority leader, no education bill would have been passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FANNIN. I thank the Senator. I join, Mr. President, in paying tribute to a great leader, our majority leader. I join my friends on both sides of the aisle in praising him for the outstanding services that he has performed in this, the 89th Congress, and also to express my great appreciation for his kindness and consideration, and the assistance that he has given to all of us, during this session of Congress.

He is a person who is admired and respected all over this great Nation, and also in many other nations of this world. I had the privilege of observing him at the Interparliamentary Conference in Mexico, when he led a group of Senators and Representatives working with our counterparts in Mexico. I observed how they loved and respected him just as we do.

I am very pleased to have this privilege of joining with my colleagues in paying tribute to him.

LIBERALIZATION OF PROVISIONS OF PAYMENT OF CERTAIN INDEMNITY COMPENSATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14347) to liberalize the provisions for payment to parents and children of dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes, which were, on the first page of the Senate engrossed amendments, in the seventh line of Senate amendment No. 2, after "semicolon;" insert "and"; on page 4, line 2, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "SEC. 7" and insert "SEC. 6".

In Senate amendment No. 8, strike out the matter proposed to be stricken by the Senate amendment, but in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert "SEC. 7".

In Senate amendment No. 9, strike out the matter proposed to be stricken by the Senate amendment, insert the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, and on page 5, line 18, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "section 7" and insert in lieu thereof "section 6".

And that the House disagreed to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 6, 10, 11, and 12.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the House has accepted H.R. 14347 with all the Senate amendments with one exception. The House deleted from the bill the Senate amendment which would have excluded social security increases from the veterans annual income.

The remainder of the bill, however, remains intact as passed by the Senate and provides for increasing dependency and indemnity compensation for parents and children of veterans whose deaths are service connected.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 112 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged from the further consideration of H.R. 14347, and that the Senate immediately proceed to the consideration of H.R. 17271.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, Mr. President, would the distinguished Senator indicate what the bill is?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the bill increases from $200 to $500 the monthly combat pay exclusion granted commissioned officers serving in combat zones or for related hospitalization.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 17271) to amend section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $200 to $500 the monthly combat pay exclusion for commissioned officers serving in combat zones.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida? The Chair hears no objection. The committee is discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 17271) and the Senate will proceed to its consideration.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the bill increases from $200 to $500 per month the special exclusion granted to commissioned officers for pay received for service in combat zones or for related hospitalization. Pay received by enlisted personnel for service in a combat zone already is fully exempt. Vietnam and its adjacent waters have been declared a combat zone already.

The bill was reported unanimously by the Ways and Means Committee of the House. It was before the Finance Committee. It has been approved by the Budget Bureau and recommended by the administration and by the Department of Defense.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 2270), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> II. GENERAL STATEMENT
>
> Present law exempts from Federal income tax up to $200 monthly of pay received by commissioned officers for serving in a combat zone or while hospitalized as a result of wounds, disease, or injury received while serving in a combat zone. However, combat pay received by enlisted personnel is fully exempt from Federal income tax.
>
> When these exemptions were last revised—during the Korean conflict—it was intended that the exemption would benefit commissioned and senior noncommissioned officers on an approximately equal basis. However, the seven military pay raises which have been enacted since the exemptions were last revised have upset the intended balance. Currently, some senior noncommissioned officers receive approximately $500 completely exempt from tax.
>
> This bill would raise the combat pay tax exemption for commissioned officers to $500 per month. This increase would restore the traditional balance between the combat pay exclusion for commissioned officers and enlisted men. The bill will also remove any possible tax impediment to the acceptance of battlefield commissions by eligible enlisted personnel.
>
> This bill is identical to the proposal made by the President of the United States in his August letter to the Congress. The Department of Defense strongly supports this legislation and the Bureau of the Budget indicates that the bill would be in accord with the President's program.
>
> This bill will correct an existing tax inequity which is not in keeping with sound tax policy. Moreover, your committee is further motivated by the realization that this bill deals directly with Americans engaged in combat in Vietnam.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

TRIBUTE TO MR. HARMON BURNS, JR.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have just learned that Mr. Harmon Burns, Jr., who was formerly affiliated with the legal department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, has been selected to serve as staff lawyer and administrative assistant for governmental relations of the National Catholic Educational Association.

I wish to congratulate him upon his appointment to this new position and to assure him that I shall always welcome the testimony and counsel which he may bring to the Subcommittee on Education in connection with pending legislation on behalf of the association.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR FULBRIGHT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a reader of the Miami News of Miami, Fla., has sent me a clipping from that paper. It is dated October 10, and is a column written by Bill Baggs, entitled "FULBRIGHT."

Mr. Baggs does a fine job of putting into perspective the purpose of the Senator from Arkansas in connection with our Vietnam policy when he writes:

> Much more love of country is required of a FULBRIGHT than of other men of influence who remain silent, but with doubts.

I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FULBRIGHT

(By Bill Baggs)

JAMES WILLIAM FULBRIGHT told a visiting reporter that he had reached the point where he really didn't care anymore.

Obviously, the senator from Arkansas meant the opposite.

In mental geography, Senator FULBRIGHT had arrived at a locale in life when he didn't give a tinker's dam about the political Apaches who wanted his scalp. Indeed, he was, in a sense, helping the fellows take his scalp, and he knew it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT was being generously condemned across the country, and certainly in Washington, because he questioned the wisdom and honesty of our engagement in Viet Nam.

SOCIAL LEPER

Lyndon Johnson, for instance, has been an intimate for many seasons. But criticism of American presence in Viet Nam had made FULBRIGHT a kind of social leper around the White House.

The Fulbright drama, which really has not yet been told, is a striking illustration of how intemperate we Americans have become of criticism. His obligation is to examine, criticize and advise on foreign policy. But the drums of propaganda have beat on so many ears in this country that you are suspect of being a traitor if you suggest that we are a foolish people indeed to send more than 300,000 of our young abroad to manage a war on the other side of the world without any allies.

What Senator FULBRIGHT realizes is that we are terribly alone in our involvement in Southeast Asia. Every old and reliable friend, including Britain and France, privately urge us to end the conflict. Despite the re-appearing messages of progress, we are not winning the war. A stalemate, maybe. At best.

But what distinguishes Senator FULBRIGHT from many of the other senators is that he has the courage to speak . . . to criticize a war when so many young Americans are dying in the war . . . to challenge the old myth that your country is right in war whether it really is right or wrong.

Much more love of country is required of a Fulbright than of other men of influence who remain silent, but with doubts. Indeed, you must care a great deal for the young men in the death jungles of Viet Nam to stand up and question our right to be there in the first place.

THE DANGER

To be sure, Lyndon Johnson has tried, and tried again, to find a diplomatic accommodation to the war. But he mixes his peace thrusts with bombings which, if you believe some military persons, accomplish very little.

The ultimate danger in the war out there is the presence of China.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as we are about to leave the Senate on a sine die adjournment, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], in my judgment, has proved that he is one of the great statesmen not only of this body but also, I think, in the history of this body. Would that we could all come back 25 years from today and read what history will record in regard to the leadership of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. President, it has been a great privilege for me to serve with the Senator from Arkansas on the Foreign Relations Committee.

I wanted, as we are about to adjourn, to pay this tribute to him, a tribute which I think is so highly deserved.

THE POLITICS OF ESCALATION—A CITIZENS' WHITE PAPER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there has just recently been released a booklet entitled "A Citizens' White Paper"—The Politics of Escalation," a study of U.S. responses to pressures for a political settlement of the Vietnam war: November 1963—January 1966.

This document was prepared by a working group organized by scholars at the University of California, at Berkeley, and Washington University, in St. Louis.

I urge my colleagues to read it over the recess.

The entire booklet is deserving of being read. It documents the position on our foreign policy in Asia that the senior Senator from Oregon, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and other Senators have been raising serious questions about for the past 3½ years on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD only the statement of the authors and the summary of conclusions consisting of some 12 pages.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUTHOR'S NOTE

The turbulent rush of events in a mounting crisis of national destiny so momentous as the war which engages the United States in Vietnam makes it difficult for even the best-informed individual to maintain a clear sense of direction. This is as true for policymakers compelled to respond to rapidly changing situations as for responsible citizens and scholars seeking to exercise an informed judgment on the actions of their leaders. Each is absorbed by the pressing claims of the immediate situation at the expense of his awareness of the larger trends.

The war in Vietnam has taught us that our nation has an urgent need to consider its recent experience in a larger perspective. The Great Debate concerning our involvement and our goals, enlightening as it has been, has not been informed by a secure sense of the patterns emerging from recent events. Accordingly, we offer this examination of the record with the specific purpose of defining one of these patterns.

Our purpose here is to describe significant American moves towards expansion and intensification of the war within the context of relevant political events, both Vietnamese and international, and by so doing to call public attention to the questionable relationship between American acts of escalation and specific initiatives by others for peaceful settlement of the conflict.

While we are acutely aware that we do not command all the evidence to construct a full and balanced picture of policy formation or its consequences, we hope that our construction, based on facts in the public record, will induce our political leaders either to correct our version where it may be in error, or, if it be found accurate, as we believe it is, to answer to its implications regarding United States policy. For the consequences of intensified warfare as a recurrent American response in a context of pressures for political accommodation have become sufficiently grave to call for a searching reassessment of U.S. policy.

* * * * *

The attached report contains studies of nine critical periods in the Vietnam war. In each of these periods the pattern of U.S. military escalation in the context of Vietnamese or international pressures for negotiations is shown to persist, despite the special character of each episode. Although in the first two of these periods military involvement is less prominent than in the later periods, all serve as background for an understanding of the Administration's proclivity to see as threat rather than as promise the emergence of Vietnamese or neutral initiatives for compromise political solutions. The effect of the American actions has been not merely to deepen our military commitment but also to weaken the credibility of United States government officials who publicly claim that they are searching for a real basis for negotiations.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Three major factors have affected the increasingly critical course of the Vietnam war: the indigenous politics of South Vietnam, the international pressures for a negotiated settlement, and the military actions of the belligerents. An examination of the interrelation of these factors in nine critical periods, beginning with the fall of Ngo Dinh Diem in November 1963, reveals a recurrent pattern. Movements toward a political settlement have been retarded or broken off by American interventions, most of which have taken the form of military escalation.

Available evidence does not prove that escalations were intended solely or primarily to counter efforts at compromise or negotiation. A study of the chronology of American escalations within the political context reveals, however, that the major American intensifications of the war have been preceded less by substantially increased military opposition than by periods of mounting pressure for a political settlement of the war.

The case studies presented here document a recurrent pattern in situations varying in their historical character. Sometimes overtures of pressures toward compromise solutions have emanated from political elements in South Vietnam or North Vietnam, sometimes from international powers. There have been repeated waves of Buddhist agitation against the South Vietnamese military dictatorship. These have inevitably extended into agitation for peace, since the war and the military dictatorship have been used to justify and reinforce each other. The United States has become equally identified with both as repeated indigenous efforts to liberalize the regime have raised the issue of a compromise settlement as the logical corollary of political self-determination. (See especially Sections II and IV).

Particularly during 1964, and again at the turn of the year 1966, efforts toward a negotiated settlement have emanated from international sources. The initiatives of President de Gaulle, Secretary General U Thant, the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, and Canada are notable among the repeated attempts, all of which were fruitless, to bring the belligerents to the conference table. Finally, there were initiatives from the National Liberation Front (Vietcong) and from Hanoi, as well as collaborations of either or both of these with non-belligerent initiatives, which likewise collapsed under United States escalation. (See sections II and III.)

The most disturbing finding of this study is thus the pattern in which moves toward political settlement are brought to a close with an intensification of the war by the United States. Even allowing for exclusively military considerations as motivating United States escalation, their repeated impact upon encouraging prospects of political solutions justifies the gravest concern. Should the pattern persist, escalations will continue to reduce the possibilities of a realistic political alternative to total victory, even while the United States professes its will to find one.

Military response to the peace moves of others has not been, of course, the only constituent in Untied States policy, though it has overshadowed its more promising concomitant—the search for a negotiated settlement. Yet even official efforts of the United States in this direction, as some of the case investigations show, have been terminated or disrupted by sudden United States military intrusions into the diplomatic process. (See Sections VI and IX).

Despite the massive and accelerating increase in American military operations over the past two years, the salient speeches and public diplomatic positions taken by both sides in the war suggest a pattern of movement, however uneven, toward a common basis for political solutions. At first, it was the Communists who tried to press for political discussions, often with neutral or United Nations encouragement. (January and July, 1964; February–March, 1965.) (See Sections II, III, and IV.) Since President Johnson's Baltimore speech of April 7, 1965, however, the United States has appeared more committed to the search for a negotiated solution than before, while its opponents have tended to place more demanding conditions in the way of negotiations. (See Sections V and VIII). The President's Baltimore speech seemed indeed like a turning point. Only a month before, Secretary of State Rusk had repeated his oft-stated position that "we are not going to negotiate to reward aggression." (TV interview, March 7, 1965). The Rusk doctrine of the "missing piece" asserted that no negotiations could be considered until some guarantee existed that Hanoi was "prepared to stop doing what it is doing against its neighbors." (Press conference, February 25, 1965). President Johnson, in his Baltimore speech, seemed to alter this doctrine when he called for "unconditional discussions." By December, 1965, the position of the United States was more explicitly accommodating to the Geneva-oriented position of the other side and important neutrals. Secretary Rusk proclaimed his unconditional willingness to "go to Geneva tomorrow." Finally, in its "fourteen points" of January, 1966 (Appendix A), the United States unequivocally accepted the possibility of peace on the "basis" of the Geneva Agreements of 1954 and 1962. Free elections in South Vietnam and the eventuality of reunification were now included in the American diplomatic perspective.

While the publicly-stated attitude of the United States toward a negotiated settlement became more flexible, the North Vietnamese appeared to grow more intransigent. In late 1964, as we now know, Hanoi accepted U Thant's idea of a secret diplomatic meeting, which the United States rejected. On April 8, 1965, at about the time of President Johnson's Baltimore speech, Premier Pham Van Dong of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam presented his "four points." They reiterated the specific demands of the 1954 Agreements for withdrawal of foreign troops and neutralization of the "two zones" during a temporary division, to be followed by "peaceful reunification" without foreign interference. The internal affairs of South Vietnam were to be settled "in accordance with the programme of the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation." The Premier claimed that his four points were the "basis for the soundest political settlement of the Vietnam problem," adding that "if this basis is recognized," an international Geneva-type conference could possibly be reconvened. Although these four points have remained the negotiating position of the North Vietnamese government, they have subsequently been presented in a more intransigent way. Specifically, the four points must now be "accepted," not merely "recognized," as a "basis" for negotiations. Furthermore, in accordance with the demands stated in the NLF "five points" of March 22, 1965, the National Liberation Front must be accepted as the "sole genuine representative" of the South Vietnamese people. Though the use of the word "genuine" suggests that Hanoi might recognize other "representatives" of the South Vietnamese, the position of the North has accentuated differences from the United States, while the expression of the American diplomatic position has evolved toward a less uncompromising tone.

So far, we have examined these contrary diplomatic motions, turning about the speeches of April 7 and 8, only as they appear in the words of the two contenders. If we turn to the context of actions, however, the emergent pattern is one not of progress toward negotiation, but of graded escalation. And if we look more closely at the pattern of United States policy, one sees that it has been not changing but recurrent. For the Baltimore speech represents a turning-point in our official rhetoric, but not, closer analysis suggests, any turning point in United States policy. Even within the Baltimore speech, the President expressed the premises which have formed his policy before and since: that the Vietnam war is a case of external aggression, and that external aggression must never be appeased. The practical correlate of this policy is to find the road to peace by intensifying war. In the President's own words:

"The central lesson of our time is that the appetite of aggression is never satisfied . . . We must say in Southeast Asia—as we did in Europe—in the words of the Bible: 'Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further.' Our objective is the independence of South Vietnam and its freedom from attack . . . We will do everything necessary to reach that objective . . . In recent months attacks on South Vietnam were stepped up. Thus it became necessary for us to increase our response and to make attacks by air. This is not a change of purpose . . . We do this in order to slow down aggression . . . We will not be defeated. We will not grow tired. We will not withdraw, either openly or under the cloak of a meaningless agreement. We know that air attacks alone will not accomplish all of these purposes. But it is our best and prayerful judgment that they are a necessary part of the surest road to peace."

In the attached memorandum, we have tried to show that the United States has placed its military policy of nullifying "aggression" ahead of a political means to a solution of the Vietnam problem. The April 7, 1965, speech served as justification for the February, 1965, escalation to the regular bombing of North Vietnam. It was also accompanied by press accounts which correctly predicted a significant increase in American troop commitments. More significant, President Johnson's speech came at a time when, in the words of the New York Times, "international pressures on the United States were growing to begin negotiating a settlement of the war." (NYT, April 2, 1965). The President addressed himself directly to three conditions which western newspapers had (correctly) associated with the North Vietnamese terms for a peace conference. The United States had reportedly been asked to accept at least an eventual withdrawal of its troops, an eventual reunification of Vietnam, and an immediate cessation of air attacks on North Vietnam. (NYT, April 1; London Times, April 1). The Baltimore speech rejected unambiguously all three of these conditions. The President's offer of "unconditional discussions" thus was made in a context of both rejection of the adversary's conditions for talks and of the first direct involvement of American troops in the ground war. In retrospect, escalation appears far more central to American purposes than the offer of "unconditional discussion," an offer almost certain to be rejected.

The case of the Baltimore speech, on its surface one of the clearest expressions of the American will to peace, dramatizes the pattern that we have explored in the attached memorandum. Like nearly all American escalation since the death of Ngo Dinh Diem, the one which came in April followed chronologically upon a period of growing pressures for a political settlement, to which the President's speech replied. Sometimes these pressures for negotiations were prominent (as in this case, in March, 1965) within the international community. Sometimes they emanated from the Saigon regime of the moment. Sometimes both international and local pressures developed at the same time.

In almost every case, such critical pressures for peace have issued in deepening United States commitment to the war in Vietnam. By the same token, each of the most dramatic escalations of the war by the United States has had the effect (if not the intention) of closing off such critical periods.

In the week of July 23, 1964, U Thant, President de Gaulle, and the Soviet government all called for a Geneva conference. In the week of August 2, the United States made its first overt attack on ships and territory of North Vietnam.

In January, 1965, anti-American strikes and demonstrations in South Vietnamese cities and the displacement of Chinese by presumably more moderate Soviet influence in Hanoi were followed by the beginning of United States air bombardment of North Vietnam on February 7.

Efforts of Italian intermediaries La Pira and Fanfani in November and December of 1965 were followed on December 15 by the first bombing of the Haiphong area, which the Administration had been told would close the door to negotiations.

Even the disturbing pattern, of which other examples will be given in the attached chronological survey, would not justify a simple argument for an inevitable causal connection between peace-making efforts of others and escalation by the United States. The peace missions of Ambassador Harriman in July, 1965, and the travels of Senator MANSFIELD and his colleagues must stand as genuine political attempts by the United States to break out of the military impasse. Yet the record would suggest that militant counsels have generally prevailed in Washington. They will undoubtedly do so as long as the simple political model of Munich continues to exercise its false analogical magic over the minds of our policy-makers. The widening of war seems to remain a consistently favored alternative to a serious political approach to disengagement. This is apparently true even when United States efforts have elicited from the other side of their preconditions for such disengagement, such as the recognition of the NLF as a negotiating party, or a cessation of bombing.

The sombre, recurring pattern of political exploration cut short by military escalation, until it is either altered or disproved, thus remains more significant than recent changes in the belligerents' announced negotiating positions. Seen as the concrete experience of the other side, it may also explain why United States peace initiatives have no longer been met by a corresponding interest. Secretary Rusk's hollow one-week peace ultimatum of May, 1965, offers a graphic instance of America's harsh combination of political and military practice. Similar episodes during the years 1964 and 1965, with massive

American escalations, produced that widespread skepticism with which our overtures of peace have been greeted, not only in Hanoi but elsewhere throughout the world. We do not wish to subscribe to Ho Chi Minh's description of these overtures as a "trick," but the military conduct which accompanied them reveals deficiencies in the United States position which must be understood. Only through such an understanding can we as American citizens discern the true conditions of peace and the obstacles to its restoration.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, come January the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will have its attention called to and work assigned to it in regard to many of the labor relations problems that exist in the field of Government employees, both Federal and State.

Mr. President, there is being held in Washington, D.C., over the weekend the annual meeting of the Assembly of Government Employees. We have a delegation from Oregon that will be attending that convention.

That delegation will be making a great contribution to the conference, because two members of our Oregon State Employees Association will be present. Incidentally, they are two very able lawyers who some years ago, I am proud to say, were members of my Senate staff. They are known to a good many of the Senators who were here and who worked with them at that time when they were members of my staff.

These two able lawyers have prepared a report for this convention. The report, written by Thomas C. Enright and Harold W. Adams, Jr., is entitled "Collective Bargaining in State Employment—Oregon's Experience."

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to say the following about the authors from the standpoint of putting a biographical sketch of the authors in the Record:

Authors

Thomas C. Enright has been Executive Secretary and General Counsel of the Oregon State Employees Association since December, 1963. A 1952 graduate of Willamette University (Salem, Oregon) College of Law, he has engaged in private law practice, during which time he was a Special Assistant Attorney General retained by the State Labor Elections Division, and, in 1954, spent a year in Washington, D.C., on the staff of U.S. Senator Wayne Morse. From 1957–1963 he was a trial lawyer and legislative specialist as an Assistant Attorney General assigned to the State Industrial Accident Commission.

Harold W. Adams, Jr., is OSEA Director of Law and Legislation. He is an Assistant Attorney General, assigned to the State Compensation Insurance Department. After graduation from Willamette University College of Law in 1949, he was an intern in the U.S. State Department in Washington, D.C., during which time he was assigned to the office of Senator Morse. He was Chief Rulings Attorney for the U.S. Wage Stabilization Board in Detroit in 1952, and after his return to Oregon in 1953, engaged in a private specialized practice and was the first counsel assigned to both the State Labor Elections Division and the Labor-Management Relations Board.

Mr. President, I am proud of the work of these two very able lawyers in the preparation of this report dealing with the problem of collective bargaining in regard to State employees.

I have scanned the report. I shall study it in depth. However, my scanning of the report satisfies me that it is a very valuable document and well worthy of the consideration of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare come January.

That is why I have welcomed this opportunity to make the report a part of the permanent Record of the U.S. Senate.

Collective Bargaining in State Employment—Oregon's Experience

(Prepared as a report to the Annual Meeting of the Assembly of Governmental Employees (AGE) in Washington, D.C., October 23–24, 1966, by Thomas C. Enright, Harold W. Adams, Jr.)

Authors

Thomas C. Enright has been Executive Secretary and General Counsel of the Oregon State Employees Association since December, 1963. A 1952 graduate of Willamette University (Salem, Oregon) College of Law, he has engaged in private law practice, during which time he was a Special Assistant Attorney General retained by the State Labor Elections Division, and, in 1954, spent a year in Washington, D.C., on the staff of U.S. Senator Wayne Morse. From 1957–1963 he was a trial lawyer and legislative specialist as an Assistant Attorney General assigned to the State Industrial Accident Commission.

Harold W. Adams, Jr. is OSEA Director of Law and Legislation. He is an Assistant Attorney General, assigned to the State Compensation Insurance Department. After graduation from Willamette University College of Law in 1949, he was an intern in the U.S. State Department in Washington, D.C., during which time he was assigned to the office of Senator Morse. He was Chief Rulings Attorney for the U.S. Wage Stabilization Board in Detroit in 1952, and after his return to Oregon in 1953, engaged in a private specialized practice and was the first counsel assigned to both the State Labor Elections Division and the Labor-Management Relations Board.

Introduction

As long ago as 1949, the respected Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, popularly known as the first Hoover Commission, recommended in its report that *"the heads of departments and agencies should be required to provide for the positive participation of employees in the formulation and improvement of* the Federal *personnel policies and practices*". (Emphasis supplied).

In the opinion of those of us in the Oregon State Employees Association, who were early among independent public employee associations to accept collective bargaining; who secured legislation to provide procedures to put it into practice; and who are now engaged in formal representation relationships with state employers, the principle stated by the Hoover Commission some 17 years ago is the essence of the "new" institution of collective bargaining in public service.

If one were able to approach each of the employee opponents of public employment collective bargaining and ask him whether or not he feels that public employees should have a say in the decisions which affect their employment destinies, it is likely that most of them would agree that employees should have such a right. Yet when one uses the "foreign" private-industry term "collective bargaining" to describe the desired employee-employer relationship, a negative reaction is frequently encountered.

It is interesting to note that in President Kennedy's Executive Order No. 10988 of January 17, 1962, the order which established collective bargaining in the Federal service and which serves as a model for many other public jurisdictions, the term "collective bargaining" is never used. All of the other essential terms are there—"appropriate unit", "exclusive recognition", "negotiated agreements", "fair labor practices" and the like—but the words "collective bargaining" are strangely missing.

It is our opinion that the time has come for public employee associations and public administrators to look behind the words and see what we are talking about when we speak of collective bargaining in the public service. Maybe it isn't so bad; maybe it isn't inconsistent with civil service. We in OSEA feel that it is not necessarily either bad or in conflict with merit system principles. It depends upon how you look at it and what you do with it.

Many of those who oppose collective bargaining in the public service seem to jump quickly to some rather far conclusions. The term is hardly mentioned before the discussion is turned to strikes, closed shops, union hiring halls, then on to labor organization graft, Jimmy Hoffa, labor dictatorship and similar irrelevancies. It is true that some of the "militant" union proponents of public service collective bargaining advocate that it take the place of civil service; that "union shops" in public employing entities be allowed; that strikes in the public sector be tolerated. But does this mean that public service collective bargaining must take such a course? Can we not assume that enlightened public employees can steer it on a course more reasonable and constructive?

It would be naive not to recognize that some unions who have pushed public collective bargaining legislation see it and attempt to use it as a means to secure entry into the public employment field to seek membership to replace losses they have suffered from automation and for other reasons, by claiming to employees that they must turn to these unions to conduct collective bargaining for them. But must it be assumed that the labor unions are the ones most equipped and qualified to make use of collective bargaining procedures? Is it not reasonable to assume that the organizations already in the field, the people who best understand the nature and structure of government, with all its differences from private industry, who know the aspirations and needs of public employees and the ways to solve their problems, can do the best job of collective bargaining?

It may be that some opponents of public service collective bargaining do not agree with the Hoover Commission that public employers should be "required to provide for the positive participation of employees in the formulation and improvement" of personnel policies and practices. Some may be satisfied with the employer's extension of courtesy to the employee organization to comment or make suggestions, with no guarantee that the organization's recommendations be given serious consideration. There are others of us, however, who are not satisfied with the "hat in hand" type of employee representation. We think employees have a right to be heard and their recommendations considered in good faith. We also think that the quality of public administration will be improved once the employer gets used to listening to the employees' viewpoint and working cooperatively towards solution of employment relations problems.

We in OSEA see collective bargaining as "another string in our bow," another tool to use in better representing employees. It will not replace the functions we have performed in the past. It will augment them. We feel that by getting in on the "ground floor" we can influence the course collective bargaining will take in our state, and make it something which will be of real benefit to state employees.

In a number of states the percentage of membership of state employees in the independent associations exceeds our 60-odd per cent. These associations should have no trouble, once they have decided that collective bargaining is "here to stay" (a conclusion which in the light of developments all over the country we find inescapable) and that it behooves them to get into it, to preempt the representation field by engaging in elections and becoming certified as the exclusive representative of the employees in the various state agencies. If they do this, they can control the course that collective bargaining will take. If they do not, they may find outside groups coming in to fill the collective bargaining vacuum and make it the thing they have feared it might be.

We have found that there are few good books and few reliable research sources regarding collective bargaining in public employment, other than the few mentioned in the material which follows. Most of the "conferences" on public employment collective bargaining which we have observed so far appear to be either cases of "the blind leading the blind" or people qualified in private industry labor relations feeling their way in an unfamiliar field. In the following material we will attempt to outline some of the history and problems which we have experienced and suggest some possible approaches and solutions. By no means, however, are we attempting to advance ourselves as authorities, for we too are still only feeling our way.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Oregon's public employment collective bargaining law was enacted in 1963. (Copy of Law, Appendix 1). Originally it applied to all employees of public employers, the latter defined as "the state, county or city or any political subdivision or agency thereof." In 1965 the school teachers secured an amendment that the law shall not apply to "certificated public school personnel." Teachers are now represented under a special "professional consultation" procedure.

A certain amount of confusion exists regarding legislative intent in exacting the law. There were some legislators who wanted collective bargaining in all areas of public employment. Many say, however, that they voted for the bill on the understanding that it would apply only in some of the special districts and towns where local officials desired to have the authority to bargain with some of the craft unions, and that their intention was to provide for collective bargaining only on a "permissive" basis. The law provides that public employees "have the right to form, join and participate in the activities of labor organizations of their own choosing for the purpose of representation and collective bargaining . . ." and "public employers shall have the right to enter into collective bargaining agreements . . .". There is no language in the statute expressly requiring anybody to bargain.

The lack in the statute of any procedure for the selection of collective bargaining representatives and the failure to delegate authority to any agency to promulgate procedures, plus common acceptance of the idea that the statute was only "permissive" resulted in little activity under the law for the next two years. Under the pressure of labor leaders, especially from the Teamsters Union, the Governor for some time considered the issuance of an executive order which would have provided collective bargaining procedures, going so far as to circulate a rough draft of a proposed order among state administators and employee orgnizations. Legal questions regarding the authority of the Governor to issue such an order, lack of a budget to implement it, and probably the opposition encountered among administrations and personnelists, resulted in the proposal being shelved.

As the 1965 legislative session approached, thinking in the Oregon State Employees Association began to jell in favor of getting into collective bargaining. The 1964 OSEA General Council gave direction to the association's Law and Legislation Committee to "study the matter of collective bargaining for state employees, and, if it is found necessary, to prepare amendments to ORS 243.710 to 243.760 which will provide for a workable system of employee representation in Oregon state government." (See OSEA "Position Paper" adopted by Board of Directors, Appendix 2). The committee subsequently drafted and had introduced in the legislature House Bill 1688, which had the effect of giving the State Civil Service Commission the authority to "establish, by rule, procedures for the selection and certification of the collective bargaining representative of the classified employees . . .".

The members of the 1965 Oregon Legislative Assembly, especially in the conservative-controlled Senate, were not expected to be especially friendly towards collective bargaining in public employment. In fact, movements were afoot, mainly among the school teachers and their friends, to launch a campaign for repeal of the 1963 law. To minimize controversy regarding collective bargaining, OSEA's bill did not attempt to deal with the substance of bargaining and confined itself to conferring authority upon those bodies which administered civil service systems to adopt procedural rules governing selection and certification of bargaining representatives. Counties, cities and districts which do not have civil service systems were therefore left out of the application of the bill's provisions, a matter which it was expected would be taken care of by persons from these groups by amendments offered when the bill received public hearings.

At the House of Representatives committee hearings on HB 1688, the Executive Secretary of OSEA stated for the first time publicly that it was the association's opinion that the 1963 law was not merely permissive; that collective bargaining in public employment was now mandatory in Oregon and procedures were neded to avoid further delay and confusion. Nobody appeared to oppose or amend the bill, and it quickly received committee approval and a favorable vote in the House. The opposition votes came mainly from representatives close to organized labor who favored a bill which the United Labor Lobby had introduced in the Senate, and a handful who were opposed to collective bargaining legislation of any kind.

The going was much rougher in the Senate. Labor's public employment collective bargaining bill, a lengthy document which went into great detail on matters such as unfair labor practices, good faith, etc., and which placed supervision of bargaining under the Labor Commissioner, received one hearing and was promptly shelved. It was at this hearing that the Oregon Civil Service Director stated the opposition of the Civil Service Commission to collective bargaining in state employment. OSEA's House-passed bill was not set for hearing and probably would not have received any further attention had it not been for an Attorney General's opinion solicited by a friendly legislator at the request of the association's Director of Law and Legislation.

On April 28, 1965, the Attorney General of Oregon issued an opinion that public employees had a "duty" to "meet at reasonable times and to bargain and negotiate over meaningful goals with organizations representing their public employes." (Copy of opinion, Appendix 3). In the closing days of the legislative session, with the Attorney General's opinion pointing the need for at least minimum procedural rules, and without any public hearing, OSEA's bill received committee approval and on May 4 passed the Senate by a 27–0 vote.

The State Civil Service Commission, still opposed to collective bargaining in state employment and apparently reluctant to accept the duties given to it by HB 1688, at its next meeting discussed the possibility of urging the Governor to veto the bill. However, it finally contented itself with raising with the Governor's legal advisor a question of the constitutionality of the proposed law.

It was at this point that the Political Education Director of the AFL–CIO accompanied OSEA's Executive Secretary on a visit to the Governor's office to urge that the bill not be vetoed, a matter of which OSEA made capital some months later when the same union executive filed suit in behalf of the AFL–CIO in an unsuccessful attempt to have the 1965 statute declared unconstitutional.

The Civil Service Commission, regardless of its previous opinions, shortly after the legislature adjourned went to work at drawing rules governing the selection and certification of collective bargaining representatives. Representatives of OSEA and the labor unions expressed a willingness to work together and with administrators and personnelists on rule proposals, however the Commission decided to draw the rules, then ask for comment at public hearings. After a series of hearings, some of a somewhat stormy nature, the Commission on December 16, 1965, adopted its rules, effective February 1, 1966, and collective bargaining in Oregon state employment was on its way.

OREGON COLLECTIVE BARGAINING LAW: DISCUSSION

(For copy of law, see appendix 1)

Born in uncertainty and amended under stress, the Oregon public employment collective bargaining statute is far from a model law.

Its basic provisions stated a public policy in favor of public employment collective bargaining and, according to the opinion of the Attorney General, a duty of public employers to bargain. But, outside of one section regarding mediation by the State Labor Conciliator (ORS 243.730) it provided little regarding the substance of collective bargaining or the means to effectuate it. The term "collective bargaining" is not even defined in the law.

Concerned primarily with providing a procedure for democratic selection of bargaining representatives and keeping collective bargaining compatible with civil service, the OSEA sponsors of the 1965 amendment (ORS 243.780), for reasons discussed in the previous section, provided in their bill only that boards or commissions which administered civil service systems were required to establish procedures for the selection and certification of bargaining representatives of classified employees.

Because these are areas of government in Oregon who do not have civil service systems, large numbers of state employees are in the "unclassified" category, and there may be a necessity for procedures short of the courts to enforce bargaining duties or to settle differences between employers and employees or between competing organizations, it can be expected that there will be a considerable amount of legislation on this subject proposed in future sessions of the legislature.

Bargainable items

Section 243.710, which defines "employment relations" matters subject to agreement as including, but not limited to, "wages, salaries, hours, vacations, sick leave, holiday pay and grievance procedures" is not to be taken to mean that all or any of these items are bargainable in state employment or even in all of the subdivisions of the state.

Whether the sponsors of the original law really were thinking of its application only in special districts, as some legislators state their understanding of the intent to have been, or whether it displays a lack of understanding of the workings of state government, which is quite possible, the fact remains that most of the above items cannot be bargained about directly by an employer and the representative of his (etc.) employees in state employment. This is because the legislature has either retained authority over those matters or delegated the power to make decisions regarding them to certain bodies of the state government.

An example is the matter of salaries: In state government salaries are set by a compensation plan evolved by the Civil Service Department, approved by the Department of Finance and Administration and the Governor, and funded by the legislature. The most that an individual state employer and the representative of his employees could do would be to agree to jointly recommend and support certain salary recommendations. Such an agreement would not be without significance, but is much different from the case of a school district, for instance, where the school board and the representative of the classified employees could make a binding agreement that salaries would be in certain amounts, subject only to availability of funds.

The matter of what can be bargained for will be touched upon again in the discussion of OSEA's proposed basic collective bargaining agreement which has been tendered to state administrators.

Who can represent employees?

Oregon's definition of "labor organization" (Section 243.710) has been interpreted to include all kinds of organizations, not only the independent employee associations and unions but also professional groups, the requirement being only that the organization "has as one of its primary purposes representing such employees in their employment relations with the public employer." (Emphasis supplied).

No attempt was made, as may have been the case in some other states, to "define away" the rights of the independent associations to represent employees, nor was it necessary for OSEA to ask for legislation, as some associations apparently had to do in other states, to spell out that the association could represent employees in collective bargaining. An interesting side light was the attempt by the unions, in the legislation in Congress which was introduced before the issuance of President Kennedy's executive order, to keep the independent groups out of bargaining in the Federal service by limiting representation rights to "unions of government employees", defined in the bill to mean only national organizations or their affiliates.

The top executive of the AFL–CIO who testified at the Oregon Civil Service Commission's hearings on its proposed collective bargaining rules raised the familiar question about the right of OSEA to represent employees because it included "supervisory" personnel in its membership. In response to his demands (joined in by an OSEA representative) the Commission solicited an opinion of the Attorney General on the question of whether OSEA could represent employees under the law. The answer was little more than a curt "yes".

Just to make certain there would be no question of its eligibility to represent employees in collective bargaining, OSEA, shortly after the passage of the 1963 statute, amended its Constitution to state in its preamble that one of its primary purposes was to represent state employees in their employment relations with their employer, and to include a provision that if at any time a competent tribunal or court finds that OSEA is not eligible to represent employees because of the active membership of managerial employees, such employees will be shifted automatically to associate membership.

Mediation

The only section of the original law which dealt with the actual bargaining procedure was Section 243.750, which provides that if the public employer and the labor organization cannot agree on terms for collective bargaining, the State Conciliation Service may be called upon and the parties may meet for mediation purposes with a person designated by the Labor Conciliator. It is unknown at this time what use may be made of this section, but its use probably would be preferable to going straight to court with a mandamus proceeding to enforce the legal duty of a reluctant employer to bargain.

Strikes

It is to be noted that Section 243.760, prohibiting strikes or recognition of picket lines by employees while in the performance of official duties does not provide a penalty against either the employee or his organization. OSEA's Constitution prohibits strikes. While organized labor tolerated this section in its 1963 bill, a resolution adopted by this year's AFL–CIO convention calls for legislation to remove prohibitions against public employee strikes except in cases of firemen and policemen.

Employees not covered by 243.780 procedures

The fact that Section 243.780 does not require the state to provide procedures for the selection and certification of bargaining representatives of unclassified employees, nor are the subdivisions of government who do not have civil service systems required to adopt rules establishing such procedures for their employees, does not take away from the employees the right to be represented in collective bargaining. A number of school districts, who do not have civil service systems, are in the process of adopting recognition procedures by school board resolution, and it is expected that even without further legislation, most cities, counties and special districts will eventually take similar action.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING REPRESENTATION RULES: DISCUSSION

(For copy of rules, see appendix 4)

The Civil Service Commission representation rules were drawn with care and adopted only after all points of view regarding them had been heard. Their shortcomings can be attributed mainly to a lack of practical experience with collective bargaining and the absence of legislative direction or examples from other states to guide their framers. It is hoped that this discussion will show how the representation procedure works, and at the same time describe some of the problems which can be incurred, with an eye towards helping others to avoid similar pitfalls.

Parties to bargaining

It was agreed early that bargaining in state employment would be on an agency by agency basis, with the bargaining taking place between the "appointing authority" of an agency and the employees serving under him. This decision may appear obvious, but it was not so to the many people who in the beginning questioned whether bargaining would be with the Governor's office, the Board of Control, Civil Service, or some other body. Problems may arise where the appointing authority has some other body of authority over him, and, in rare cases, where it is difficult to determine from the laws creating an agency, just who is the appointing authority.

The collective bargaining law provides in ORS 243.740 that "public employers shall have the right to enter into collective bargaining agreements with labor organizations". The rules do not repeat the statutory definition of "labor organization". Rule 98–200 states that a collective bargaining representative may be "a person, a group, an organization or a council of organizations". This conferring of the representation right upon "a person" or "a group" appears highly questionable, but it is doubtful that an occasion will arise to test its validity.

Bargaining unit

Before an organization to represent employees (bargaining representative) can be selected, it is necessary to determine the group to be represented (bargaining unit). Whether there will be only one unit in an agency or a number of units has much to do with who will represent the employees, so it is in connection with this determination that most controversy develops.

The first draft of Rule 98–100 provided that all the employees in an agency would be represented in one "total agency unit". Opposition to this proposal came mainly from professional and semi-professional organizations and craft unions, none of whom were in a position to represent all of the employees of an agency. It appeared at first that at least some of the professionals mainly desired to be left out of collective bargaining, and consideration was given to a possible provision similar to that contained in Federal Executive Order 10988, where professionals are excluded from bargaining units unless the majority of them vote to participate. The position of the professionals developed, however, into a demand for representation in separate units.

OSEA took the position that while it favored the total agency unit concept, and there was much precedent in private industry for a single unit in a plant, it would not object if separate units were established on valid professional or skilled craft grounds. It warned against opening the door to a multiplicity of units the only reason for which was a pocket of membership in some organization in the proposed unit. The rule finally adopted by the Commission allows the appointing authority "initially' to consider requests (presumably from employee groups but not so specified) for separate units and authorize them "if justified by professional, geographical, organizational unit or other considerations affecting employment relations." The rule has been criticized for furnishing a very loose guideline as to what kind of units may be created. It provides for an appeal of the appointing authority's determination to the Civil Service Commission by affected employees or the representatives.

A document which may be of interest to some readers is an agreement executed between OSEA and the Association of Engineering Employees of Oregon (See Appendix 5), in which after the engineering group had been granted a separate unit of "engineering and allied" employees, the two associations agreed to jointly represent the employees, AEE primarily responsible on professional matters and OSEA on non-professional subjects.

As will be observed in a tabulation of election results included in the appendix (Appendix 6), about a dozen separate units have been created and elections held within them. A few more have been authorized but petitions for elections have not been filed. The small number authorized is not the result of employer refusals but because the employees in most agencies have preferred to be represented in the unit. In the few cases where a request for a separate unit has been denied and an appeal filed, the Civil Service Commission in each instance has overruled the appointing authority and allowed the unit. OSEA has not contested the authorization of any of the special units.

The American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) requested authorization of 11 separate units in which it had strong membership, totalling about 300 employees at the University of Oregon Medical School. The appointing authority refused all of the requests but one and suggested that the union request a unit made up of the employees covered by the other ten requests, plus about 100 employees in related work. The union, which had more members in the proposed unit than any other organization (about half of the employees belong to no organization) made the request and it was granted. OSEA petitioned for a place on the ballot in the representation election and, in a hotly contested election, defeated the union by a 145–107 margin and was certified as representative of all 400 employees, a graphic illustration of the importance of the unit determination.

The day before the Commission rules went into effect, the Oregon State AFL–CIO filed a suit in Circuit Court, asking that the 1965 statute giving the Civil Service Commission the authority to adopt the rules be declared unconstitutional or that the rules be declared invalid on the ground that they were "arbitrary, unreasonable and unfair". OSEA entered the suit as an intervenor to defend the law. A panel of three judges dismissed the suit on the ground that it did not state a "justiciable controversy," holding in effect that the unions could not sue until they had been hurt. One of the judges commented from the bench that he had no doubt that the statute was constitutional.

The significance of the AFL–CIO suit with regard to the rules is that its main attack was on the provision that gave the appointing authority the power to authorize a separate unit only "initially." The labor groups argued that the rule creates a situation in which because an organization which has been certified as representative of all the employees continues as representative until the majority of the employees in the agency vote for decertification, a craft organization which has not obtained a separate unit in the beginning stands little chance of ever getting one.

It can be expected that this provision will be tested sometime after OSEA has been certified as total agency representative in an agency for a year (the time for which a certified organization is guaranteed recognition under Rule 98–500) and a craft union seeks to represent employees in a separate unit. It is repeated, however, that in private industry there are many cases where an industrial union represents all the employees in a plant and the craft unions cannot get into the picture, even to represent their own members.

Employees excluded from unit

It is reasonable that only regular employees should be included in bargaining units, and that a limited number of top management employees should be kept out of bargaining units for the purpose of assisting the appointing authority to carry out his bargaining responsibilities. This appeared to be the intent of section 2 of Rule 98–100. The rule allows the appointing authority to exclude from the bargaining unit "management and supervisory employees designated by the appointing authority to represent, assist or advise him in collective negotiations." (One of the idiosyncracies of the rules is the refusal of the Commission to use the word "bargaining", preferring the term "negotiating," even though the law refers to "collective bargaining".)

Most appointing authorities have been reasonable in the number of employees they have designated to "represent, advise or assist" them. Some, however, no doubt influenced by the private industry practice of excluding "supervisory" employees from bargaining units, placed their whole emphasis on the words "management and supervisory employees" in the rule and designated extreme numbers of employees for exclusion. Based on this experience, it is our recommendation that any rule dealing with exclusion on "supervisory" grounds be considered carefully, because the nature of supervision in public employment differs so much from private industry. As stated by N.Y.U. Professor Sterling D. Spero in a consultant's memo to the U.S. Department of Labor and the American Federation of Government Employees (AFL–CIO), a memo the conclusions of which were quoted with approval by the union to the U.S. Civil Service Commission in an argument over a suggestion by the latter that all supervisors be excluded from the union's units, it is necessary in government "to distinguish between the roles of true managerial officials and supervisory employees who do not really exercise managerial authority."

Rule 98–100 (3) provides that "an employee may appeal to the director regarding his exclusion from a unit". No provision for an appeal by the representative of employees is included. When excessive exclusion lists were posted, OSEA took the position that an individual should not be required to enter into conflict with management over his exclusion from a bargaining unit, that even though the rules provided for no appeal by the employee organization, it had an implied right to protect the integrity of the unit in which employees had petitioned for it to represent them. Although the Civil Service Commission refused to entertain a formal appeal by the association, it ordered investigations of the complained of exclusions, with the result that most of the appointing authorities were persuaded to shorten their exclusion lists.

Rather than go to court to prove its point in the cases where the employees refused to change their exclusions, OSEA has decided to make the matter of who is to remain excluded the subject of collective bargaining with the particular employers after its elections as bargaining representative of their employees. In one case, where the employer excluded around 25% of the employees, a request is in process for a separate "supervisor unit" made up of excluded employees, to be represented by OSEA.

Petition for elections

An organization may be certified as the representative of employees only after winning an election in which the ballot contains the choice between one or more organizations or "no representation". In order for an organization to initiate an election, it must file a petition containing the signatures of 30% of the employees in the proposed bargaining unit. (Rule 98–200). Other organizations may gain a place on the ballot with petitions bearing the signatures of 10%. (Rule 98–300).

Ordinarily the number of signatures required is not difficult to obtain, but real difficulty can be encountered and considerable work and expense be involved in a large department such as Highways, which has most of its thousands of employees employed in the field all over the state. Of advantage to the organization is the fact that when 30% or more of the employees have signed a petition stating that they desire to be represented by the organization, there is usually no need for a great deal of additional "campaigning" before the election.

Under the Commission's rules, an organization desiring to represent employees in a total agency unit has only the petition to Civil Service for the election to complete. An organization seeking to represent employees in a less than total agency unit must first request and secure authorization of the separate unit from the appointing authority, then secure the necessary number of signatures on a petition and file it with Civil Service.

Although an additional candidate is required to file its petition at least 15 days before a scheduled election, a serious deficiency in the rules was the failure to provide a time limit within which an organization seeking a separate unit must file its request with the appointing authority. This has resulted in some cases in separate units being allowed and the employees in these groups not being informed that they could not vote in the "main unit" election until they showed up at the polls. The most difficult situation arose when in a case involving Department of Agriculture employees, the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union wrote a letter to the Civil Service Department requesting information regarding how it could qualify to represent certain employees who worked alongside longshoremen as inspectors on grain ships. The letter was received on the last working day before the voting at the polls, and several days after mail ballots had been sent out to employees in the field and many of them marked and returned.

The Civil Service staff advised the union by phone that a request might be timely if filed with the Director of Agriculture that day. The ILWU failed to get in the request until after balloting had started on election day. OSEA won the election by a vote of 183–16. Nevertheless the Commission at its next meeting set aside the election and ordered the Director of Agriculture to rule on the union's unit request. The association immediately went to circuit court in a mandamus proceeding against the commissioners and Civil Service director. The court subsequently ordered the Commission and the director of its department to certify OSEA as bargaining representatives of all of the classified Department of Agriculture employees.

Recognition of representatives

When a candidate for representative has received a majority of the votes cast in an election, that organization is entitled to be certified as the representative of the employees in the unit. Rule 98–500 provides that such recognition will remain in effect for at least 12 months, unless the Commission for an undefined "proper cause" calls for a new election. After 12 months, on petition of 30% of the employees in the unit, a decertification election may be held. The election would be only on the question of continuing or discontinuing the present representation. If the vote were to be for discontinuance of the representation, presumably the situation in the agency would revert to its original status and requests for separate units or petitions for elections could again be filed.

Other matters

Although not specifically directed or authorized by statute to do so, the Commission adopted Rule 98–700 regarding good faith "negotiations", and 98–800 providing for written agreements. The authority to adopt these rules may be implied in the general authority to "establish for the state a system of personnel administration based on merit principles and scientific methods, governing . . . incidents of state employment". Perhaps future legislation will clarify this point.

REPRESENTATION ELECTIONS

Immediately after the effective date of the rules, and even though the AFL–CIO suit to invalidate the rules was pending in court, OSEA began to circulate petitions for representation elections. Priority was given to agencies where association membership was high, especially to the care institutions where membership was good but union activity is most likely to arise. In most cases the petitions were circulated by members among their fellow employees, but in agencies where large numbers of employees were situated in the field, an individual petition on a prepaid return postcard was sent to each OSEA member working away from agency headquarters. Even when sufficient signatures could be secured on group petitions circulated at the main office, cards were sent to field employees under a policy that all members of the association should be involved at every stage of the election process.

Despite months of discussion at chapter meetings and extensive educational material in the association newspaper, it could not be assumed that the majority of state employees were fully convinced in favor of collective bargaining. It was anticipated that most elections would be simply a choice between OSEA and "no representation", but that they would be a plebescite on collective bargaining. This made it important that decisive winning margins be secured in all elections.

Although in many cases more than 50% of the employees of the agency had signed petitions stating that they wanted to be represented by OSEA, nothing was taken for granted. Staff members worked overtime contracting employees, and special mailings stressing the reasons why they should turn out with a large vote for OSEA were sent to each member a few days before elections. A "vote OSEA today" poster on every bulletin board served as a final reminder of the election.

In the earlier elections supervised by Civil Service ballot boxes were used, with mail ballots sent to employees in the field. When it was shown that as many or more employees voted when furnished with mail ballots, voting by mail was adopted as the general practice in all elections.

As will be observed in the tabulation of election results to date (Appendix 5), OSEA has lost no elections and has so far won certification in 36 agencies. In all except one, the U of O Medical School, the election was for a total agency unit, although in a few instances there were small separate units carved out of the total unit. Two of the elections were contests with the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME AFL–CIO) at their only two state strongholds, the Oregon State Hospital and the U of O Medical School, with OSEA winning both elections, by votes of 316–116 and 145–107 respectively. An interesting sidelight is that in election after election, about 65% of the eligible employees voted, with OSEA receiving the vote of about 60% of the eligible employees and 5% voting for "no representation".

Petitions are now being circulated in a number more agencies, including the largest department, Highways, where there are two bargaining units, the "engineering and allied" unit and the general unit. It is assumed that it will take until the spring of 1967 before the association has been certified as representative in all of the state agencies.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING PROCEDURE

Before the representation elections were held, the Board of Directors of OSEA, in a policy statement given wide circulation among employees, made it clear that "representation by OSEA implies representation by the state association and its staff, in cooperation with the chapter and district organizations." An "Employment Relations Committee" was created, composed of two Board members, the Director of Civil Service and the Director of Law and Legislation, and three other members of the association, to make tactical decisions regarding elections and to coordinate all of the activities of the association regarding collective bargaining.

The following material taken from a "Summary of Collective Bargaining Procedures" sent to all chapter officers may best illustrate the questions which were faced and the manner in which representation will be organized.

"Because OSEA chapters in most cases are organized along lines different from the bargaining units, and because employees who will not be members of bargaining units (unclassified and "excluded" employees) are entitled to chapter membership, the role of the chapter in collective bargaining will be limited. The local organization of employees for collective bargaining purposes will be a new structure of "Collective Bargaining Representatives" and a "Collective Bargaining Council", made up of OSEA members within the bargaining unit and working with the state association and its staff on the representation of employees.

Role of the chapter

Collective bargaining is a new and important activity of the association, but it will be in addition to and not in place of the traditional functions of OSEA and its chapters. There will be no diminishment of the need for vigorous chapter organizations to carry on the legislative, political, social, educational and economic programs of the type they have carried on so successfully in the past. The chapter, through the association's General Council delegate system, will continue to be the basic policymaking unit of the association, guiding its activities through the resolutions which the delegates adopt and the officers whom they elect.

Chapters will be asked to assist in the initial selection of "Collective Bargaining Representatives." As collective bargaining progresses they can be expected to perform valuable functions as a sounding board for employee opinion and a forum for the exchange of general collective bargaining information.

Collective bargaining representatives

The foundation for democratic representation of employees will be a system of Collective Bargaining Representatives in every work area within the bargaining unit. Similar to the "shop stewards" in private industry labor representation, the Representatives will be the immediate contacts for employees who are seeking information on collective bargaining developments or who wish to make suggestions or recommendations for the consideration of the Collective Bargaining Council. They will be the "eyes and ears" of the association to secure information about work conditions and personnel administration of concern to employees in the unit, as well as to determine the attitude or desires of employees on particular subjects. Although they will not be expected to handle grievances, they should be prepared to advise employees regarding grievance procedures or other means to secure solutions to their employment problems.

The first groups of Representatives will be appointed after consultation with the chapters and approval by the Employment Relations Committee of the association. It is expected that thereafter the Representatives will be selected by means of elections among employees in the work areas.

Representatives will not be expected to hold regular meetings, although meetings may be held from time to time to elect the members of the Collective Bargaining Council or to determine employee attitude on a controversial matter of general interest to employees in the unit.

Collective bargaining council

In each bargaining unit there will be established a Collective Bargaining Council of from three to fifteen members, depending upon the size of the unit, which will meet at regular intervals to consider employment relations problems and employee suggestions and recommendations conveyed to it by the Representatives. The Council will serve as an advisory body to the Negotiating Team, and its members may be members of the team.

Each member of the Council will be given the responsibility of supervising a number of Representatives, who will report to the Council member any pertinent information received from employees in the unit. OSEA's proposed basic collective bargaining agreement calls for the Council being able to meet during duty hours for a limited period each month, although it is not known yet what type of agreement can be obtained on this point.

The members of the Council will elect a Chairman and Secretary from among themselves. Reasonable expenses for the conduct of their business, as well as necessary clerical and research assistance will be provided by OSEA.

Negotiating team

A survey taken among members and chapter leaders shortly after the promulgation of the collective bargaining rules showed that the great majority felt that, at least in the early stages of formal bargaining, negotiations should be handled by the professional staff of the association. This was primarily for three reasons: (1) need for uniformity, both as to subject matter and procedures, in the various agencies; (2) need for representation by persons experienced in dealing with state officials and trained regarding collective bargaining principles and practices; and (3) effectiveness of an independent person dealing with the employer, as compared to employees negotiating with persons having authority over them.

In the great majority of cases, bargaining will be handled by Negotiating Teams headed by a staff member but including employees selected from among or by the members of the Collective Bargaining Council or the association's Employment Relations Committee. Where practicable, the teams may be made up of employees in the bargaining unit. It is expected that as collective bargaining practices become established and employees gain experience on the Negotiating Teams, a greater part of the collective bargaining responsiblity will be assumed by employee members of the bargaining unit.

The basic contracts with employers will specify the number of members on Employer and Association negotiating teams. The proposed standard contract provides for five persons on each team, with appropriate consultants or advisors allowed to be present. Negotiating sessions generally will be held during duty hours. Necessary expenses and clerical and research assistance for the employee Negotiating Teams will be furnished by the association.

BASIC COLLECTIVE BARGAINING CONTRACT

(For copy of proposed contract, see appendix 7)

The first step in the collective bargaining relationship with the state employees is the tendering of a "ground rules" agreement to the appointing authority in each agency in which OSEA has been certified as collective bargaining representative. Before the proposed contract was adopted, it was discussed with some of more knowledgeable people in state government on the subject of collective bargaining, and after the adoption and before its presentation to the appointing authorities, it was discussed at meetings of the State Personnel Officers Association and the State Department of Justice Bar Association (where membership is all of the state attorneys), because it was expected that the appointing authorities would rely heavily upon the personnelists and state lawyers to advise them.

The proposed contract seeks to "break the ice" and establish the bargaining relationship between the association and the employer. As will be observed in the copy included in the appendix, it does not deal specifically with specific employment relations subjects. Article XI of the proposed contract accentuates that this is a basic agreement which is expected to be amended or supplemented from time to time as specific matters are negotiated.

At the time this report was prepared, no contracts have yet been entered into, although a few appointing authorities had indicated that they were willing to execute it after some minor adjustments were made. It is expected that with some of the agencies it will take some time before agreement can be reached. This is understandable because of the newness of the subject and the reluctance of officials to commit themselves until they are very sure of their ground. In a minority of cases there still remains opposition to the whole subject of collective bargaining and a certain amount of suspicion and resentment concerning it.

Those who are familiar with the contracts entered into initially in the Federal service will note that our purpose is very similar to those executed between the government agencies and the associations and unions. An article prepared for the August, 1965, issue of the Monthly Labor Review of the U.S. Department of Labor and included in Vol. 102 of the Government Employ a Relations Report, a weekly newsletter published by the Bureau of National Affairs, stated regarding the 209 agreements entered into in the Federal service up to the late summer of 1964 that, in general, it took from 4 to 9 months after the date of granting exclusive recognition to reach an agreement, in some cases taking as few as 3 months and in some as many as 19. As we break ground in Oregon state service we probably cannot expect substantially speedier acceptance.

The proposed contract has attempted to hold to a minimum the points of real controversy, it being our feeling that at this point the important thing is to get employers and the employee representation used to working together. At the same time we have included those things which are necessary to a meaningful relationship. The following material will briefly discuss some of the significant features of the proposal.

Article II: One of the most important aspects of "exclusive representation" is touched upon in this article and in articles VIII and X. This is the understanding that in being recognized as the exclusive representative of the employees in a unit, the association accepts the responsibility of representing all the employees, members and nonmembers of the association alike.

This of course is one of the least palatable aspects for employee organizations in such an arrangement and leads many of them to support the idea of the "union shop", or at least the "agency shop", because the idea of the non-member as a "free rider" receiving the same benefits as members is hard to accept. However, the responsibility of the exclusive representative to represent all employees alike was well settled in private industry in the Federal case of *Hughes Tool Co.* v. *NLRB*, 147 F2d 69 (1945), and can be expected to apply in public service as well.

It might be noted that in OSEA's procedure as outlined in the preceding section of this report, only association members are eligible to be collective bargaining representatives or serve on the employee councils or negotiating teams, and of course nonmembers are not extended such other association membership as participation in group insurance programs, so most of the main incentives for being a member still remain.

Article IV: The main provisions of this section are stated in the Federal executive order (10988) and are a part of all the Federal service contracts. They state the employer prerogatives with regard to firing, hiring, controlling work operations, etc., and are included to reassure employers that these rights are not being taken away from him by collective bargaining. It is important to realize, however, that the employer can agree not to exercise some of his prerogatives, or to agree to certain restrictions on his manner of exercising them.

Article V: Section 1 of this article includes a listing of some of the many items which can be bargained for in the state service, even after taking into consideration the limitations referred to in Article III, which recognizes that the legislature has seen fit to retain authority over certain employment matters or has delegated decision-making authority to state bodies such as the Civil Service Commission.

Article VI: The heart of the principle recommended in the 1949 Hoover Commission report, that government employers should be required to provide for the positive participation of employees in the formulation and implementation of personnel policies and practices, is contained in this and the following article.

One matter that it may be necessary to comment on, is that, for the time being at least, Section 2 of Article VI does not impede the employer from doing any of the things referred to in this section, but only requires him to involve the employee representative notice of the contemplated action. We have advised personnelists and administrators, however, that this is an area which employees may be expected to seek to strengthen in the future.

Article VII: Section 2 of this article is a provision which we have not seen in other contracts but which appeared to be a reasonable proposal to help clarify just what are the personnel practices in the agencies and what can be done to improve it. It has been interesting to note the various reactions to this. They go all the way from the feeling of the agencies that have clearly defined rules that it would be too time-consuming to review them in detail, to those who have little at all in writing and question that they should be required to set down their rules in such a manner that employees will know what they are! This has developed to be one of the most controversial articles, yet it is something which appears basic to any process of negotiating for improved conditions.

Article VIII: Much of what is contained in this article will already have been touched on in the preceding section of this report, on collective bargaining procedures, and in the discussion regarding Article II. In the preliminary discussion of the contract with the personnelists and employers, one of the things which has bothered them has been the idea of employees meeting on "state time" for their bargaining council and negotiating team pre-bargaining activities. They are willing to provide that actual bargaining shall be "on the clock," apparently because they will be part of this and would not expect to do it on their own personal time, but the idea of employees "planning strategy" etc., on state time seems to disturb them very much. One of our staff representatives recently suggested in a facetious manner to an employer that we would agree to waive this provision if the employer also agreed to do his planning with his subordinates off of state time.

The provisions in the proposed contract state a very small amount of activity of employees to be done on state time, as compared to some contracts we have seen. It is our position that collective bargaining must be recognized as part of the "business of the employer," the idea being that it is no different to allow the employees to perform their duties in this area on state time than to do many other things which are the business of the agency.

Article IX: This article is partly another facet of the foregoing matter regarding what can be done on company time, but it also raises the question of what privileges can be expected by the representative. In some of the Federal contracts we have seen provisions requiring that each new employee be introduced to his "shop steward," the representative organization being given the right to have a speaker address new employee indoctrination sessions, etc. To require that a notice regarding the fact that the association is his official representative be given to each new employee appears to be little to ask. Some personnelists have objected on the ground that this would "favor" one organization over another, but have appeared to understand it after being reminded that we are no longer in the era when all organizations are "equal"—that the election as representatives implies specific privileges as well as responsibilities.

Article X: Many persons still seem to think of collective bargaining only as some sort of a "super grievance procedure". The Federal court does a good job of distinguishing collective bargaining from a grievance procedure in the previously mentioned *Hughes Tool Co.* v. *NLRB* case in a footnote regarding other Federal cases. In *Steele* v. *Louisville and Nashville R.R. Co.*, 65 S. Ct. 226, the court twice likened collective bargaining to legislation, with grievances resembling cases to be decided according to the law.

Quite a few of the Federal contracts contain very complete sections on grievance procedures. In Oregon most departments have fairly satisfactory grievance procedures, because the Civil Service rules require them to establish grievance procedures. It is expected that one of the main matters of negotiating will be the strengthening of these procedures.

[Oregon Revised Statutes]

APPENDIX I—OREGON PUBLIC EMPLOYEE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING LAW

243.710 Definitions for ORS 243.710 to 243.760. As used in ORS 243.710 to 243.760, unless the context requires otherwise:

(1) "Employment relations" includes, but is not limited to, matters concerning wages, salaries, hours, vacations, sick leave, holiday pay and grievance procedures.

(2) "Labor organization" means any organization which includes public employes and which has as one of its primary purposes representing such employes in their employment relations with the public employer.

(3) "Public employe" means an employe of a public employer.

(4) "Public employer" means the state, county or city or any political subdivision or agency thereof.

243.720. Purpose. It is the purpose of ORS 243.710 to 243.760 to promote the improvement of the relationship between public employers and their employes by providing a uniform basis for recognizing the right of public employes to join labor organizations of their own choosing and to be represented by such organizations in matters concerning their employment relations with public employers.

243.730. Right of public employes to join labor organizations. (1) Public employes have the right to form, join and participate in the activities of labor organizations of their own choosing for the purpose of representation and collective bargaining with their public employer on matters concerning employment relations. (2) Public employers shall not interfere with, intimidate, restrain, coerce or discriminate against public employes because of their exercise of rights under subsection (1) of this section.

243.740. Right of public employer to enter into collective bargaining agreement. Public employers shall have the right to enter into collective bargaining agreements with labor organizations on matters concerning employment relations.

243.750 Use of State Conciliation Service. In the event that public employer and the labor organization cannot agree on terms for collective bargaining, the State Conciliation Service established under ORS 662.415 may be called upon to aid in arriving at an agreement and the public employer and the labor organization may meet for mediation purposes with the person designated by the Labor Conciliator.

243.760 Striking or recognizing picket line prohibited. No public employe shall strike or recognize a picket line of a labor organization while in the performance of his official duties.

243.770 Application of ORS 243.710 to 243.750 to teachers. ORS 243.710 to 243.750 shall not apply to certificated public school personnel.

243.780 Selection and certification of bargaining representative for classified employes; rules of procedure; enforcement. (1) Any board or commission which, pursuant to state law, administers a civil service system for public employes, shall establish, by rule, procedures for the selection and certification of the collective bargaining representative of the classified employes under such system.

(2) The rules shall include but not be limited to, provisions for the designation of the bargaining unit, to an election process for employe selection of the bargaining representative and to the specification of practices which will be prohibited as improper influences on that election process.

(3) Any board or commission which issues rules pursuant to this section may apply to and obtain from a circuit court of this state, court processes in enforcement of such rules and against any practice found to be in violation of such rules.

APPENDIX 2—OESA POSITION PAPER COLLECTIVE BARGAINING FOR STATE EMPLOYEES

Legal history

Prior to 1963, public employees in all categories were prohibited from entering into any binding agreement concerning employees rights or conditions. This resulted from an Attorney General's Opinion dated November 8, 1946 (Op. Atty. Gen. 1946–1948, p. 82). In 1962, however, another Attorney General's Opinion decided that public school boards could, without any new legislation, engage in collective bargaining and could make contracts concerning employees conditions and rights. (Op. Atty. Gen. No. 5523, October 30, 1962). This same opinion, however, questioned whether work conditions of state employees under civil service could be the subject of such contracts. ORS 243.710 to 243.760, Oregon's collective bargaining law, enacted in the 1963 session of the legislature, provides in ORS 243.740 that "Public employees shall have the right to enter into collective bargaining agreements with labor organizations on matters concerning employment relations."

Significance of term

Although the term "collective bargaining" is probably a misnomer when applied in public employment (a bargainer must have something which he can offer or withold, and public employees cannot legally withold their labor by striking), it can be accepted as a description of a process of negotiation which, among other things, can lead to agreements which are enforceable in a court or other forum.

Subjects for bargaining

Collective bargaining cannot infringe upon the salary-setting process controlled by the legislature, nor can it supplant the power of the Civil Service Commission to deal with those subjects entrusted to it by the legislature and backed up with rule-making authority. However, agreement reached by collective negotiation can deal with personnel matters less general than those covered by civil service rules.

Grievances that are a matter of administration can be handled in a broader manner, not requiring the individual employee to "stick his neck out" to accomplish a solution. Matters of work assignments, shift rotation and relaxation periods are only a limited number of examples of what is not covered by rule and could be covered by agreement. One reason why civil service rules have failed up to now to establish the 40-hour week in all areas of state employment is the difficulty of dealing with special circumstances with a general rule. This and many other matters could be settled by agreement with the agencies where the problems exist.

Although ORS 243.710 to 243.760 prohibits strikes or recognition of picket lines by public employees, arbitration by neutral parties could be invoked as an aid to reaching agreement.

Morale in the agencies and institutions could be improved and better administration achieved by regular meetings between administrators and employee representatives, resulting in improved up and down flow of communication, whether or not formal agreement is reached.

Other jurisdictions

1. Collective bargaining in the Federal service came with President Kennedy's Executive Orders 10987 and 10988, signed January 17, 1962. According to our information, independent associations in the federal service whose status was questionable before the Executive Order have been strengthened rather than weakened by being recognized as labor organizations.

2. In Canada, the strong independent associations have been in the forefront of the establishment of collective bargaining, apparently feeling that they were in a position to pre-empt the field while they were strong and competing organizations weak in numbers.

3. The State of Washington has collective bargaining, under rules and procedures set by the State Personnel Department (equivalent of our Civil Service Commission).

Weakness of Oregon law

A prerequisite to collective bargaining is recognition and certification (for a period of time) of an organization as representative of employees in a bargaining unit. Present Oregon law provides no recognition criteria or procedures, no certification period, no election process, none of the mechanics to effectuate the bargaining process. Nor does it give any official or body the power to promulgate rules or procedures. There is a possibility that this could be done by executive order, as in the Federal service, but this is subject to legal question and to the additional fact that the executive power, if it exists, might not extend to many of the important agencies and institutions under Oregon's system of government.

Conclusions

1. Collective bargaining in public employment is a fact of life and is "here to stay." How and under what terms it will be effectuated in the State of Oregon is of too much importance for OSEA to stand aside and leave its implementation to others.

2. The opportunities to be formally recognized in the various agencies as the official representative of employees; to meet and negotiate with administrators on a regular basis, as a matter of right rather than courtesy; to obtain written and enforceable agreements on special employment problems, are important to OSEA's objective of effectively representing the interests of state employees.

3. Collective bargaining in state government will be concerned primarily with classified employees, practically all of the unclassified and exempt employees being in professional and other areas of employment traditionally not subject to the collective bargaining process.

4. Supervision of collective bargaining under a civil service merit system should be in the hands of the agency which administers the civil service law and controls employee working conditions at the present time, the Civil Service Commission.

5. Procedures for recognition, certification and bargaining are too detailed for legislation but could be adopted as other rules are adopted, by the Civil Service Commission with direct participation by OSEA.

Recommendation

The Law and Legislation Committee, concurred with by the Employment Relations sub-committee, recommends to the Board of Directors of OSEA that it adopt these conclusions on collective bargaining in state employment, and that OSEA sponsor legislation referring the technical and procedural matters of collective bargaining in the classified service to the Civil Service Commission for the issuance of rules and regulations in connection therewith, after due consideration and consultation with all interested parties.

APPENDIX 3

[No. 5963]

STATE OF OREGON,
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Salem, April 28, 1965.

Hon. PHILIP D. LANG,
State Representative,
House of Representatives,
Capitol:

In view of Senate Bill 186, Senate Bill 377 and House Bill 1688, you have inquired as to whether a state agency is required to recognize and bargain collectively with its employes or the employes' representatives under ORS 243.710 through 243.760. You inquire further as to whether there is an obligation on the part of state agencies to negotiate with employe representatives for the purpose of recommending changes or modifications in areas of public employment in which the legislature has already established applicable and definitive law.

ORS 243.720 provides that the purpose of the public employes' collective bargaining Act is to provide a uniform basis for recognizing the right of public employes to join labor organizations of their own choosing and to be represented by such organizations in their relations with public employers.

ORS 243.730 (1) gives public employes the right to form, join and participate in the activities of labor organizations for the purpose of collective bargaining.

ORS 243.730 (2) prohibits public employers from interfering, intimidating, restraining, coercing or discriminating against public employes in the exercise of their rights under ORS 243.730 (1).

Two things are certain from the above mentioned provisions, i.e., public employes have a right to join labor organizations and said organizations have a right to bargain with public employers concerning employment relations.

The important thing about this recent legislation is that it recognizes that labor organizations representing public employes have the right to bargain with public employers. And the legislature in enacting the above provisions commended public employers not to interfere with or restrain this right.

There is a fundamental characteristic inherent in any legal right. That is that it is not a "right" unless it is enforceable. If it is not enforceable it is only permissive. The words "right" and "duty" are correlative terms. 37A Words and Phrases 361, "Right." In other words when a right is invaded a duty is violated.

Consider the alternative in determining legislative intent. If the term "right" was to have no legal consequences the "right" given to public employes and their representatives to bargain with public employers would appear meaningless.

And as stated in State v. Gates (1922) 104 Or. 112, 123, 206 P. 863:

"Statutes should be interpreted according to the legislative intent, to be ascertained from the whole statute and a consideration of the mischief which it was designed to remedy * * *."

Minnesota has recently enacted legislation providing for collective bargaining in public employment. Minn. Stat. Ann., § 179.52 (1960). In the Minnesota Act the legislature expressly spelled out the duty of the public employer to meet with labor organizations representing public employes, saying: "* * * Public employees shall have the right to designate representatives for the purpose of meeting with the governmental agency with respect to grievances and conditions of employment. It shall be unlawful to discharge or otherwise discriminate against an employee for the exercise of such rights, *and the governmental agency shall be required to meet with the representatives of the employees at reasonable times in connection with such grievances and conditions of employment*. * * *" (Emphasis supplied).

We believe that the emphasized requirement in the Minnesota law must be read into the Oregon Act to carry out the command by the legislature that the public employes' right to join an organization for the purpose of bargaining must not be interferred with, intimidated, restrained, coerced or discriminated against.

Your second question asks if there is also an obligation to negotiate for the purpose of making recommendations for changes in areas already defined by the legislature. It is anticipated that negotiation for recommendations to the legislature may well be the principal area upon which public employes and employers will get together at the conference table. For, in most cases, the public employer has no control over any matter fixed by statute. He must, in other words, operate within the powers granted by statute. Gouge v. David, (1949) 185 Or. 437, 202 P. (2d) 849. Thus the primary objectives to be gained by public employe organizations will most certainly rest, to a great extent, in persuading public employers to agree with them on joint recommendations to be made to the governmental agency or organ which has the authority to act in the matter.

You have also inquired as to the application of the present public employes' collective bargaining Act to the proposed legislation embodied in Senate Bills 186 and 377 and House Bill 1688. House Bill 1688 would add procedural requirements to ORS 243.710 through 243.760 which provide for rules establishing a system for the selection and certification of collective bargaining representatives for the classified employes under the Act. Any board or commission administering a civil service system for public employes under state law is directed to establish said rules. Such procedural rules would implement the duty of public employers to bargain, which duty was discussed in answer to your first question.

Senate Bill 186 would remove "certificated public school personnel" from the provisions of ORS 243.710 through 243.760. However, § 2 of this bill specifically provides that representatives of any organization selected to represent "certificated public school personnel" shall have the right to: "* * * confer and negotiate with the district school board by which they are employed, or a committee thereof, on matters of salaries and related personnel policies affecting professional services. * * *"

It is clear from the language of Senate Bill 186 that school boards would still have a duty to bargain under the provisions of ORS 243.710 through 243.760 with employes other than "certificated public school personnel" and to bargain with certificated public school personnel under the provisions of § 2 of Senate Bill 186, supra.

Senate Bill 377 would constitute a more far-reaching law governing public employer-employe relations. This proposal would provide for hearings before the Labor Commissioner where disputes arise. It also defines several acts constituting unfair labor practices by a public employer. Among the unfair labor practices a public employer could commit is that of refusing to meet with a designated representative of its employes and bargain in good faith (§ 6(4)).

In each of the proposed bills discussed herein there appeared an express recognition of the duty of the public employer to bargain in good faith with an organization representing its public employes. In our opinion this is a further indication that the legislative intent in enacting the present public employes' collective bargaining Act (ORS 243.710 through 243.760) was to place a duty upon public employers to meet at reasonable times and to bargain and negotiate over meaningful goals with organizations representing their public employes.

There is no doubt that the present omnibus legislation on collective bargaining in public employment provides nebulous guidelines. No conventional relationship exists here such as in grievances between labor organizations and private employers. It is thus expected that many questions will arise in the future concerning this unsettled area.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT Y. THORNTON,
Attorney General.
By WALTER L. BARRIE,
Assistant.

APPENDIX 4—OREGON STATE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—COLLECTIVE BARGAINING RULES

98–005 General

(1) Employees have the right to form, join and participate in organizations of their own choice for the purpose of representation and collective negotiation on matters concerning employment relations; employees also have the right to refrain from joining and participating in the activities of employee organizations.

(2) Nothing in these rules shall preclude an individual employee from representing himself in individual personnel matters.

(3) Employees shall not be interferred with, intimidated, restrained, coerced or discriminated against in the application of these rights.

98–100 Designation of negotiating unit

(1) In the exercise of the right to form and participate in an organization for collective negotiation as set forth in 98–005, all classified employees who are under the same appointing authority shall be deemed a single employee group for the purpose of forming and participating in a negotiating unit, except that an appointing authority initially may consider requests for and, if justified by professional, geographical, organizational unit or other considerations affecting employment relations, authorize negotiating units on other than a total agency basis. (a) At the time an appointing authority acts upon a request for a special negotiating unit, he shall post appropriate notice of his decision. (b) Any affected employee or employees or their representatives may appeal the appropriateness of the decision of the appointing authority to the Civil Service Commission by submitting in writing a request for review within 10 calendar days after the notice is posted. (c) The Civil Service Commission shall hold a fact-finding hearing within 40 calendar days after receipt of an appeal. However, nothing shall preclude the appointing authority and the appealing party from submitting the dispute to the commission as an agreed statement of facts and thereby waiving a hearing. (d) The commission may sustain or set aside the decision of the appointing authority.

(2) A negotiating unit shall not include those employees who otherwise would be in the unit but who are (a) management and supervisory employees designated by the appointing authority to represent, assist or advise him in collective negotiations; (b) employees who occupy a position of special trust and confidence involving matters of a confidential nature; and (c) temporary and emergency employees.

(3) At the time the director provides notice of representation election in a negotiating unit, the appointing authority shall post appropriate notice which shall list the employees who might otherwise be in the unit, but who will be excluded in accordance with (2) above. During a period of 10 calendar days after the notice is posted, an employee may appeal to the director regarding his exclusion from a unit. The director or his representative shall conduct a fact-finding hearing and submit his findings and recommendations to the Civil Service Commission. The commission may sustain or set aside the decision of the appointing authority.

98–200 Requests for representation election

A candidate for representative may be a person, a group, an organization or a council of organizations. A request for a representation election shall be submitted to the director in writing by the candidate for representative and must inlcude:

(1) The identity of the negotiating unit;

(2) If other than an agency-wide unit, evidence that the negotiating unit has been authorized;

(3) The identity of the candidate for representative;

(4) A statement by the candidate for representative pledging nondiscrimination in regard to race, color, creed, age and political affiliation;

(5) To be valid, a request for an election must be accompanied by petitions containing signatures of at least 30% of the employees in the negotiating unit indicating their desire to be represented by the candidate.

98–300 Procedure for representation election

(1) Upon receipt of a valid request, the director shall conduct a representation election. The election will be held within 60

calendar days from the time the request is received.

(2) The director shall provide notice of the election to employees in the negotiating unit and to the appointing authority at least 30 calendar days in advance of the election. The notice shall include the date or dates when the election is to be held, as well as the procedure to be followed. Every eligible employee in the negotiating unit shall have an opportunity to cast a ballot.

(3) The director will place the names of additional candidates for representation on the election ballot if they so request in writing at least 15 calendar days in advance of the election, pledge nondiscrimination in regard to race, color, creed, age and political affiliation and present petitions containing the signatures of at least 10% of the employees in the unit indicating that they desire to be represented by the candidate.

(4) Employees in the negotiating unit who will be eligible to vote will be those who are on a pay status 40 calendar days prior to the date of the election. A roster of such employees will be submitted by the appointing authority to the director 10 days prior to the election.

(5) Voting shall be by secret ballot and shall permit an opportunity to vote for any one of the candidates on the ballot or for no representation.

(6) The result of the election shall be reported to the appointing authority and to the candidates listed on the ballot within 10 calendar days after the balloting has been completed.

(7) In every election where there are more than two candidates and no choice receives a majority of the votes cast, a run-off election shall be conducted by the director. The run-off election ballot shall provide for a choice between the two candidates for representation receiving the largest and second largest number of votes cast in the election, as well as the choice of no representation.

(8) If no candidate for representation wins the election, a new election cannot be requested for 12 months from the date of the last election.

98–400 Improper election practices

(1) Any practice that interferes with, intimidates, restrains, coerces, promises preferential treatment to or discriminates against employees in their voting in a representation election is prohibited.

(2) Any charges of improper election practices must be filed with the Civil Service Commission no later than 10 calendar days following the date of the election. The person, persons, candidates or organizations being charged with improper election practices will be furnished with a copy of the charges. The Civil Service Commission will hear the party or parties making the charges in public hearing and the person, persons, candidates or organizations so charged will be given an opportunity to answer the charges. If the Commission finds that improper election practices were used, it may invalidate the election and it may order a new election.

98–500 Recognition of representative

When a candidate for representation receives a majority of the votes cast, the director shall certify and the appointing authority shall recognize that candidate as the representative for the unit. The certified representative shall serve without discrimination as to membership as representative for all employees in the negotiating unit. Such recognition will be in effect for at least 12 months except that the Civil Service Commission for proper cause may call for a new election.

98–600 Withdrawal of representation recognition

(1) After the certified representative has served for at least 12 months, its recognition may be challenged by petition to the director signed by at least 30% of the employees in the negotiating unit and attesting that they desire not to be represented by the present representative.

(2) Upon receiving such a valid petition, the director shall arrange for an election to be conducted within 60 days.

(3) The election procedure will be as stipulated under 98–300 (2), (4) and (5), except that the ballot shall provide for only the choices of continuing or discontinuing the present representative.

(4) If a majority of the votes cast is to discontinue the present representative, the director immediately shall decertify that representative and the appointing authority shall withdraw recognition.

98–700 Negotiations

(1) Appointing authorities and certified representatives shall negotiate in good faith on matters concerning employment relations. Good faith means that it is the mutual obligation of the appointing authority and the representative of the employees to meet at reasonable times and confer with the intent of resolving issues of employment relations.

(2) Charges of lack of good faith in negotiations shall be filed with the Civil Service Commission. The director will furnish the party complained against with a copy of the charges. The commission will hear the party making the charges in public hearing and at the same time, the party complained against will be given an opportunity to answer the charges.

98–800 Agreements

(1) Agreements between an appointing authority and certified representative shall be reduced to writing in the form of a memorandum of agreement or an exchange of letters. Appointing authorities will furnish the director with copies of all agreements.

(2) No agreements shall be made which will compromise or be in conflict with statutes and executive orders; or with rules, regulations and orders made pursuant to statutes.

98–900 Enforcement

The Civil Service Commission may apply to and obtain court process in enforcement of these rules and against any practices found to be in violation of the rules.

APPENDIX 5—AGREEMENT

The Oregon State Employees Association (OSEA) and the Association of Engineering Employees of Oregon (AEE), in order to provide for cooperation and coordination between them in their mutual efforts to effectively represent the interests of those employees in the separate negotiating unit established in the Oregon State Highway Department on March 21, 1966, commonly known as "engineering and allied employees," and in consideration of the rights and responsibilities referred to herein, agree as follows:

1. That the OSEA is and shall continue to be in the representative agency for state employees generally in respect to personnel and employment matters as provided in Article I of the OSEA Constitution.

2. That the AEE is and shall continue to be the representative agency for the engineering and allied employees in the aforesaid unit in respect to all matters relating primarily to engineering work and the profession of engineering.

3. For the purpose of collective negotiation representation of engineering and allied employees of the State Highway Department, OSEA and AEE will jointly circulate and file petitions for an election among the employees in the aforesaid unit, in which the two organizations will be a joint or council type of candidate for representative of the employees in the unit.

4. As joint representative of the employees in the aforesaid unit, OSEA will be the spokesman in matters pertaining to the general benefit and interest of all State Highway Department employees, and AEE will be the spokesman regarding matters primarily concerning engineering work and the engineering profession.

(a) If a matter to be negotiated is within the jurisdiction of one of the organizations but will have a substantial effect upon the employees for which the other organization is spokesman, concurrence of both organizations must be had before action on the matter is pursued.

(b) If a question arises regarding jurisdiction of a matter, the question shall be resolved by arbitration by a committee composed of one representative from each organization and a third person selected by the two representatives.

5. Each of the organizations will encourage all persons within its membership who are eligible to be members of the other organization to become members of that organization. Each will provide the other with information on the location, names, and similar information on such persons to the extent reasonably practicable.

6. It is not the intent of either organization to interfere with or influence the traditional policies or procedures of the other organization, but on the contrary, it is the intent of each to assist and encourage the other in the furtherance of programs and objectives in behalf of its members.

7. Any expenses incurred in the joint representation of employees in the bargaining unit shall be the joint responsibility of the two organizations, except that expenses of other than a purely routine nature which are incurred by one organization must first be approved by a representative of the other organization in order for it to be responsible for such expense.

8. In case of disagreement on the proper application or interpretation of this agreement, OSEA and AEE will, through their respective representatives, make every effort to settle their differences amicably.

9. If it should become apparent that joint representation of the employees in the bargaining unit is impractical or unworkable, or if it should become impossible for either organization to continue its performance under this agreement, either organization may undertake a petition for the decertification of the joint representative as negotiating representative for the employees in the unit. If decertification takes place, this agreement shall become void as of the effective date of decertification.

10. This agreement shall become effective upon ratification by the Board of Directors of OSEA and the governing body of AEE, and shall remain in effect until rescinded by either, or until decertification of the joint representative as referred to in paragraph (9).

Ratification

The duly authorized representatives of the Oregon State Employees Association and the Association of Engineering Employees of Oregon hereby ratify the agreement set forth in the preceding paragraphs 1–10:

For ASEA
OSEA ----------
For AEE

Dated July 8, 1966.

APPENDIX 6

Collective bargaining election results

Agency	Date of election	Eligible employees	Number voting	OSEA	Number of representatives	Other	Result
Treasury	Mar. 28, 1966	41	37	37	0	[1]0	OSEA.
PERS Board	Mar. 29, 1966	40	37	36	1	[1]0	OSEA.
Dammasch Hospital	Mar. 30, 1966	250	111	106	5	[1]0	OSEA.
Dental School	do	91	39	39	0	[1]0	OSEA.
Veterans' Affairs	Mar. 31, 1966	108	85	80	5	[1]0	OSEA.
PUC	do	156	112	106	6	[1]0	OSEA.
Hillcrest School	Apr. 1, 1966	101	68	65	3	[1]0	OSEA.
State Hospital	Apr. 5, 1966	662	430	316	7	116	OSEA.
Fairview Hospital	Apr. 7, 1966	850	407	388	19	[1]0	OSEA.
MacLaren School	Apr. 11, 1966	295	156	145	11	[1]0	OSEA.
Columbia Hospital	Apr. 12, 1966	147	92	73	19	[1]0	OSEA.
Board of Health	do	247	146	135	11	[1]0	OSEA.
Motor Vehicles	Apr. 14, 1966	572	294	278	16	[1]0	OSEA.
Compensation	Apr. 15, 1966	390	247	233	14	[1]0	OSEA.
Employment	Apr. 28, 1966	708	458	431	27	[1]0	OSEA.
Forestry	Apr. 29, 1966	369	265	254	11	[1]0	OSEA.
South Oregon College	May 3, 1966	113	60	60	0	[1]0	OSEA.
EOSH	May 5, 1966	389	137	133	4	[1]0	OSEA.
OLCC	May 12, 1966	354	202	179	23	[1]0	OSEA.
Public Welfare	May 25, 1966	875	737	603	134	[1]0	OSEA.
Fish Commission	May 26, 1966	191	120	108	12	[1]0	OSEA.
Agriculture	May 31, 1966	365	199	183	16	[1]0	OSEA.
Cosmetic Therapy	June 2, 1966	4	4	4	0	[1]0	OSEA.
Board of Pharmacy	do	4	3	3	0	[1]0	OSEA.
Blind Commission	June 3, 1966	17	11	10	1	[1]0	OSEA.
Forestry communication technology	June 6, 1966	9	9	[1]0	3	6	IBEW.
Fairview Hospital, occupational and physical therapy	do	3	3	[1]0	0	3	Council of Organizations.
Tongue Point Culinary Workers	June 7, 1966	28	24	[1]0	8	16	Culinary Alliance.
Tax Commission	June 13, 1966	519	236	215	21	[1]0	OSEA.
Deaf school	June 15, 1966	66	43	40	3	[1]0	Do.
Blind school	do	47	28	15	13	[1]0	Do.
OCI	June 16, 1966	166	102	99	3	[1]0	Do.
University of Oregon electric shop	do	7	5	[1]0	0	5	IBEW.
Tongue Point, physical plant	do	35	29	[1]0	5	24	Clat-Till, BTC.
University of Oregon, plumbing shop	June 23, 1966	12	10	[1]0	0	10	Plumbers Union, Local 481.
Workmen's Compensation Board, occupational and physical therapy and industrial field nurse.	June 21, 1966	7	7	[1]0	0	7	Council of Organizations.
OCE	June 28, 1966	122	26	25	1	[1]0	OSEA.
Workmen's Compensation Board	July 11, 1966	120	75	69	6	[1]0	Do.
State library	July 12, 1966	66	51	48	3	[1]0	Do.
T.B. Hospital	July 14, 1966	115	58	58	0	[1]0	OSEA.
T.B. Hospital, graduate nurses	Aug. 2, 1966	20	14	[1]0	0	14	Oregon Nurses Association.
University of Oregon, printing plant employees	Aug. 4, 1966	13	12	[1]0	1	11	Typographical Union, Local 496.
University of Oregon Medical School, watchmen and patrolmen.	Aug. 17, 1966	10	9	[1]0	0	9	A.F.S.C. & M.E.
F. & A., printing employees	Aug. 18, 1966	13	11	[1]0	0	11	Typographical Union.
Oregon State University, printing employees	do	5	5	[1]0	0	5	Do.
University of Oregon Medical School	Aug. 30, 1966	398	260	145	8	107	OSEA.
Bureau of Labor	Oct. 11, 1966	52	34	30	4	[1]0	OSEA.
Penitentiary	do	280	192	172	20	[1]0	OSEA.

[1] Election not contested.

APPENDIX 7—BASIC COLLECTIVE BARGAINING CONTRACT

This agreement is made by and between the ----------, an agency of the State of Oregon, hereinafter referred to as the "Employer", and the Oregon State Employees Association, hereinafter referred to as the "Association".

Preamble

Whereas the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon has enacted Sections 243.710 to 243.780, Oregon Revised Statutes, providing for collective bargaining between public employers and their employees, and

It is the intent of the parties to comply with said law and, through a system of employee-employer cooperation, to foster and improve the efficient administration of state service, provide for the well-being of employees, and maintain high standards of work performance in behalf of the public, and

The employees in the bargaining unit covered by this agreement have, by majority vote, stated their desire to be represented in their employment relations with their employer by the Association, and the Association has been certified by the director of the Civil Service department, in accordance with law and the rules of the Oregon State Civil Service Commission, as the representative of said employees,

The parties hereto, in consideration of the mutual covenants set forth, and intending to be bound by this contract and agreement, agree as follows:

Article I—Purpose

It is the purpose of this agreement to:

(a) Identify the parties and define their respective roles and responsibilities with regard to employment relations in the subject agency,

(b) State the policies, procedures and methods that will hereafter govern the working relationship between the Employer and the Association,

(c) Indicate the nature of the subject matter of proper mutual concern,

(d) Contribute to the effective conduct of public business by insuring employee participation in the formulation and implementation of employment relations policies and procedures,

(e) Promote systematic employee-employer cooperation on appropriate subjects,

(f) Provide for the highest degree of efficiency and responsibility in the accomplishment of the duties and functions assigned to the agency, and

(g) Reduce the number of employment relations disputes and employee grievances, and facilitate their adjustment after they have arisen.

Article II—Recognition and unit description

Section 1: The Employer recognizes the Association as the exclusive bargaining agent and representative for all employees in the unit who are not properly excluded by Civil Service rules, and the Association accepts the responsibility of representing the interests of all employees in the unit, whether or not they are members of the Association, with respect to matters concerning their employment relations with their Employer. Nothing in this agreement, however, shall preclude an individual employee from representing himself or having an individual represent him in his individual employment relations matters.

Section 2: The bargaining unit to which this agreement is applicable consists of

Article III—Restrictions of law and regulations

It is understood and agreed by the parties that this agreement is subject to all applicable existing or future laws or regulations of the State of Oregon, including rules and regulations issued by the Civil Service Commission, the Department of Finance and Administration or other agency of government pursuant to authority granted to it by the legislature.

ARTICLE IV—PREROGATIVES OF EMPLOYER

Section 1: The management of the agency concerned herein and the direction of its working force are vested exclusively in the Employer. This shall include, but not be limited to, the right to: (a) Direct employees; (b) hire, promote, transfer, assign and retain employees; (c) suspend, demote, discharge or take other proper disciplinary action against employees; (d) relieve employees from duties because of lack of work or other proper reasons; (e) maintain the efficiency of the operation entrusted to the agency; (f) determine the methods, means and personnel by which such operations are to be conducted; and (g) take any actions necessary in conditions of emergency, regardless of prior commitments, to carry out the mission of the agency.

Section 2: The right to make reasonable rules and regulations concerning employment relations matters in accordance with the authority it possesses is an acknowledged function of the Employer.

Section 3: In exercising the rights mentioned in this Article, the Employer shall give due regard and consideration to the obligations imposed by ORS sections 243.710 to 243.780 and the responsibilities outlined in this agreement.

Article V—Subjects for consultation and agreement

Section 1: It is understood and agreed that matters appropriate for consultation, negotiation and agreement between the parties are policies and procedures related to employment relations, as defined in ORS 243.710(1), which are within the discretion of the Employer, including, but not limited to, the matters mentioned in said section and such more specific matters as health and safety; training; insurance programs; workmen's compensation; employee-employer cooperation; employee services; methods of adjusting grievances; demotion, promotion, discipline, layoff, transfer and vacation practices; payroll deductions; travel and moving allowances; work environment; and employer recommendations regarding salaries and classifications. This listing does not constitute agreement that any of these individual matters will or will not be the subject of negotiation between the parties at any particular time.

Section 2: No obligation exists for the Employer to consult with the Association with respect to such areas of discretion and policy as the mission of the agency, its budget, its organization and assignment of its personnel, or the technology of performing its work.

Article VI—Consultation and notice

Section 1: The parties agree to consult, negotiate and bargain in good faith on appropriate subjects with the intention of reaching agreement, reducing such agreement to writing, and making such writing enforceable as a contract. To this end they agree to meet, personally or through representatives authorized to take effective action, at reasonable intervals and at reasonable times and places, at the request of either party.

(a) A party proposing a matter for negotiation shall give written notice to the other party, describing in detail the subject desired to be discussed, at least ___ days before the meeting, except in case of emergency or on waiver of notice by the other party.

Section 2: It is the intention of the parties that the Association be kept informed of matters having a substantial effect upon the employment relations of the employees it represents. To this end the Employer shall give the Association prior notice and an opportunity to comment on:

(a) Any non-routine layoff of a substantial group of employees, including the manner of determining which employees shall be laid off;

(b) Any proposal by the Employer to the Civil Service Commission for a change in its rules or adjustment of compensation or classification of any group of employees;

(c) Whenever practicable, any suspension or dismissal of an employee for disciplinary reasons.

Article VII—Agency personnel rules

Section 1: It is understood and agreed that there exist within the agency, in written and unwritten form, certain personnel rules, policies, practices and benefits which will continue in effect for the period of this agreement, unless or until changed by mutual agreement of the parties or by the Employer in accordance with his previously stated prerogatives or as required by appropriate laws, orders, regulations, official instructions or policies. In the cases of changes by other than agreement, the Association shall be notified as soon as practicable of a change or proposed change.

Section 2: Within thirty (30) days from the date of execution of this agreement, the Employer shall furnish to the Association a copy or copies of its existing written personnel rules and shall appoint a committee of three (3) employees excluded from the bargaining unit to meet and work with members of the staff or a committee of the Association on a review of said rules. The Employer committee and the Association staff or committee shall jointly report to the parties the present status of the rules and any suggestions which they might have for possible changes in, deletions from or additions to the rules, and their suggestions shall become the subject of collective negotiation between the parties.

Article VIII—Representation

Section 1: It is recognized that the right of exclusive representation of employees by the Association, previously referred to in this agreement, implies that the Employer will not enter into any consultations or agreements regarding employment relations matters with any other organization or individual purporting to represent any group of employees in the bargaining unit, and shall not engage in any type of conduct which would imply recognition of any group other than the Association as a representative of the employees in the bargaining unit.

Section 2: Reference to the "Association" as representative of the employees means the state organization of the Oregon State Employees Association, its Board of Directors and Headquarters staff, and the Employer shall have no obligation to consult with the chapter or district oragnizations of the Association or their officers or committes, unless such persons are designated by the Association as authorized representatives. Negotiations with the Employer shall be carried on by staff personnel or members of the Association designated by its Board of Directors to represent it, and persons so designated shall be recognized by the Employer.

Section 3: Formal negotiations between the Employer and the Association will be by negotiating teams of not more than five (5) members designated by each party. In addition to the negotiating teams, a reasonable number of qualified Employer and Association consultants may be permitted to attend negotiation meetings. The parties may agree to appoint other committees to perform specific tasks preliminary to or supplemental to negotiations.

Section 4: Consultation, negotiations and other activities necessary to the furtherance of the purposes of this agreement are recognized as a proper part of the conduct of the Employer's business and shall normally take place during duty hours. Employees representing either the Employer or the Assocation in these joint activities shall be given sufficient time during duty hours, without loss of pay or other benefits, to perform their functions, provided that the allowance of such time will not adversely affect the conduct of the agency's business.

Section 5: It is contemplated that there shall exist among the employees in the bargaining unit a Collective Bargaining Council, which shall have as its purpose advising the Association representatives of the attitudes and desires of employees and recommending subjects for negotiation. The Employer shall allow members of the Council, in a number not to exceed ____, to meet during duty hours ___ times per month for a period not to exceed ____ hours per meeting, without loss of pay or other benefits, for the limited purpose described in this section, provided that such a meeting would not adversely affect the conduct of the agency's business.

Article IX—Association limitations and privileges

Section 1: The Association agrees not to participate in any strike, slowdown or other work stoppage, and to serve as representative of the employees in the bargaining unit without discrimination on account of employee membership or non-membership, race, color, creed, sex, age or political affiliation.

Section 2: Except as may otherwise be provided in this agreement, the internal business of the Association shall be conducted by employees during their non-duty hours, unless by special permission of the Employer in limited instances involving the mutual benefit of the agency and employees.

Section 3: Chapters or committees of the Association shall be allowed the use of the facilities of the agency for meetings during the non-duty hours of the employees involved, when such facilities are available and the meetings would not conflict with the business of the agency.

Section 4: The Employer shall provide bulletin board space for the use of the Association in communicating with employees.

Section 5: The Employer shall advise present employees in the bargaining unit of the position of the Association as their collective bargaining representative and the execution of this agreement, and, whenever practicable, shall furnish each new employee with a piece of literature furnished by the Association, containing a notice that the Association is the collective bargaining representative and other pertinent information, including information as to how the employee may become a member of the Association.

Article X—Grievances

Section 1: While recognizing a difference between individual employee grievances and bargainable items, the parties agree that an employee in the bargaining unit may obtain the advice and assistance of the Association in grievance dealings with his employer, and the Association has a right to limited participation in a formal grievance proceeding in behalf of all the employees in the unit, whether or not it is representing the complaining employee.

Section 2: The Employer shall adopt and maintain a formal grievance procedure in accordance with the provisions of Civil Service rule 96–005. Every effort, however, shall be made to find solutions to grievances in informal conferences, without the necessity of formal filing of a grievance complaint.

Section 3: Whenever practicable, a grievance the subject of which also affects other employees shall be handled as a bargainable item, without necessarily revealing the identity of the complaining employee.

Section 4: An aggrieved employee may be represented by the Association, by himself, or by a friend, fellow employee, attorney or other individual, but not by another employee organization or a person speaking for or retained by another employee organization, except when permission is given by the Association for another organization to represent the employee.

Section 5: Participation by the Association in a grievance proceeding in which it is not representing the aggrieved employee shall be limited to observing the proceeding and submitting to the Employer or its representative a statement, oral or written, of its opinion of the merits or demerits of the grievance complaint and the effect of a proposed solution on the employment relations of other employees in the unit.

Article XI—Life of agreement

Section 1: This is a basic agreement between the parties, and it is expected that it will be amended from time to time without effect upon the life of the basic contract.

Section 2: This agreement shall go into full force and effect immediately upon its signing by the persons authorized to execute contracts in behalf of the parties.

Section 3. The duration of this agreement shall be one (1) year from the date of its execution, and it shall be renewed automatically each year for an additional year unless one party gives written notice to the other party, at least sixty (60) days and not more than ninety (90) days before its current expiration date, of its intension to terminate the agreement.

Section 4: This agreement shall be terminated automatically as of any time that the Association ceases to be certified as the representative of the employees in the bargaining unit.

Signed this ______ of ________________, 19____.

For the employer

______________________, agent.

________________, name and title.

For the association

OREGON STATE EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION

__________, name and title.

APPENDIX 8—RECOMMENDED READING

The following are recommended, not as a complete list of the "best" reading on the subject of collective bargaining in public employment, because there are undoubtedly many good works with which we have not become acquainted and more beginning to come off the presses each day as interest in the subject increases, but as a short list of items which proved to be of great benefit to us, and without which we would have been seriously handicapped.

"Government Employee Relations Report," a weekly newsletter published by the Bureau of National Affairs, 1231 24th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. This publication gives not only the latest news regarding happenings in Federal and state governments, but also articles and excerpts regarding public collective bargaining, important studies, and copies of contracts entered into in the various jurisdictions. Although expensive ($140 per year), we class it as something we would not do without.

"Management Relations with Organized Public Employees," edited by Kenneth O. Warner and published by the Public Personnel Association, 1313 East Sixteenth Street, Chicago 37, Illinois. A collection of essays by experts, giving theory, policies and programs. A "must" for gaining an understanding of what has gone on and what is going on in public employee collective bargaining.

"Developments in Public Employee Relations," also edited by Warner and published by PPA. This is, in effect, an up-dating of "Management Relations" and is equally important.

"Collective Bargaining in the United States Federal Civil Service," by William B. Vosloo, published by PPA. A full-scale study of labor relations in the Federal service, from the fresh and unbiased perspective of a South African writing it as a doctoral dissertation while teaching at Cornell University from 1962–1965. This book is readable enough for any interested layman; while containing much information that will not be found anyplace else.

"A Policy for Employee-Management Cooperation in the Federal Service," the Report of the President's Task Force on Employee-Management Relations in the Federal Service upon which President Kennedy's Executive Order 10988 was based. Printed by the U.S. Government Printing Office.

"Executive Order (10988) on Employee-Management Cooperation in the Federal Service, and Sectional Analysis of Executive Order 10988," a pamphlet provided for participants in the conference on Public Employment and Collective Bargaining by the Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., 1231 24th Street, NW., Washington, D.C., which still may be available on request to BNA. This publication contains a copy of the order, along with a comprehensive but very understandable discussion.

"Unions Are Here To Stay," a pamphlet written by Ann Holland, specialist, employee-management relations, Department of the Air Force, and published by the Society for Personnel Administration, 1221 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. Also discusses Executive Order No. 10988 and contains a copy of the order.

"A Layman's Guide to Basic Law Under the National Labor Relations Act," a pamphlet prepared by the office of the General Council of the National Labor Relations Board and available from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., for 25 cents. This 52-page pamphlet will be invaluable for anyone who wants a background of what goes on in collective bargaining in private industry and will provide a background regarding terms used in public employment collective bargaining.

"Collective Bargaining Agreements in the Federal Service, Late Summer 1964," a 90-page pamphlet prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor, for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. Price 50 cents.

CLARIFICATION OF RESPONSIBILITY WITH RESPECT TO TRAINING AND EDUCATION OF HEALTH SERVICE PERSONNEL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendments of the Senate to H.R. 11631.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11631) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to clarify the responsibility of the Veterans' Administration with respect to the training and education of health service personnel, which was, beginning with line 20 on page 2 of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out all down through line 9, on page 4 of the Senate engrossed amendments, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 103. (a)(1) Section 4103(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by redesignating paragraphs (3), (4), (5), (6), and (7) as paragraphs (4), (5), (6), (7), and (8), respectively, and inserting a new paragraph (3) to read as follows:

"(3) The Associate Deputy Chief Medical Director, who shall be an assistant to the Chief Medical Director and the Deputy Chief Medical Director. He shall be a qualified doctor of medicine, appointed by the Administrator."

(2) Such section 4103(a) is further amended by deleting "five", immediately preceding "Assistant Chief Medical Directors," in the first sentence of redesignated paragraph (4), and substituting therefor, "six".

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

CONTROL OF USE OF DESIGN OF GREAT SEAL OF THE UNITED STATES AND OF THE SEAL OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendments of the House to S. 2770.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2770) to control the use of the design of the great seal of the United States and of the seal of the President of the United States, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) chapter 33 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 713. Use of the great seal of the United States

"Whoever knowingly displays any printed or other likeness of the great seal of the United States, or any facsimile thereof, in, or in connection with, any advertisement, circular, book, pamphlet, or other publication, play, motion picture, telecast, or other production for the purpose of conveying and in a manner resonably calculated to convey the false impression that all or any part of such advertisement, circular, book, pamphlet, or other publication, play, motion picture, telecast, or other production, is sponsored or approved by the Government of the United States, or any department, agency, or instrumentality thereof, shall be fined not more than $250 or imprisoned not more than six months, or both."

(b) The analysis of chapter 33 of title 18, United States Code, immediately preceding section 701 of such title is amended by adding at the end thereof:

"713. Use of likenesses of the great seal of the United States."

And to amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to prohibit the use of likenesses of the great seal of the United States falsely to indicate Federal agency, sponsorship, or approval."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the House amendments.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO REQUEST THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO URGE CERTAIN ACTIONS IN BEHALF OF LITHUANIA, ESTONIA, AND LATVIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 1573, House Concurrent Resolution 416.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 416) to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to its consideration.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to say that I am delighted that this matter is being taken up. It deserves attention in this session as a mark of our continuing concern for those peoples who have been deprived of their democratic institutions and are unable to speak for themselves.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The qustion is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 416) was agreed to.

SENATE LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY REPORT FOR THE 2D SESSION OF THE 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate legislative activity report for the 2d session of the 89th Congress be inserted in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 22, 1966.

SENATE LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY THROUGH OCTOBER 21, 1966, SENATE DEMOCRATIC POLICY COMMITTEE, 89TH–2D

Days in session	167
Hours in session	849:08
Total measures passed	1,001
Treaties ratified	10
Confirmation	66,134
Public laws	344

Following is a brief summary of all major general bills upon which the Senate has acted this session, with Presidential recommendations and bills in accord with the President's program indicated by (PR). If there is no roll call vote breakdown, Senate action has been by voice vote.

AGRICULTURE

Child Nutrition Act: Expands National School Lunch Act to include 2-year child nutrition program of breakfasts for pupils in poor economic areas or who must travel long distances; authorizes $465 million for 4 years through 6/30/70 for special milk program and $63 million for 3 years to help schools purchase food preparation and service equipment. PL 89–642. (PR)

Vote: Senate passage 76(48D, 28R)—0.

Community District Development: Authorizes a 2-year $230 million program of grants for planning community district development in rural areas. S. 2934. Passed Senate 4/25. H. Cal. (PR)

Cotton Research and Promotion: Provides for a cotton research and promotion program financed by growers designed to improve cotton's competitive position and improve markets and uses. PL 89–502.

Vote: Senate passage 49(38D, 11R)—20(8D, 12R).

Disaster Areas Planting: Permits farmers who are prevented from planting wheat, feed grains, or cotton by flood or other natural disaster the same opportunity to plant alternative crops that the law now accords farmers whose crops have been destroyed by such a disaster after planting. PL 89–451.

Vote: Senate passage 56(41D, 15R)—10(1D, 9R).

Farm Credit: Provides for more flexible operation of the Farm Credit Administration. PL 89–525.

Farmers Home—Prepayments: Amends the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to hold prepayments made by insured loan borrowers and transmit them to the holder of the note in installments as they become due. PL 89–633.

Federal Intermediate Credit Banks: Deletes the interest rate limitation on debentures issued by Federal intermediate credit banks. PL 89–595.

Food for Peace Act of 1966: Extends PL 480 through December 31, 1968 and authorizes agreements for the sale of agricultural commodities for foreign currencies and dollar credit in each of those years in an amount requiring appropriations not exceeding $1.9 billion plus the authority carried over from the preceding year (estimated at $1.7 billion as of 12/31/66). Title II authority (donations) would be $600 million per year, plus the carryover from the preceding year (estimated at $772 million as of 12/31/66). HR 14929. PL 89– (PR)

Votes: Senate passage 74(52D, 22R)—2(1D, 1R).

Screw-Worm Eradication: Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico. PL 89–521. (PR)

Soil Information Assistance: Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with State and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural areas. PL 89–560.

Tobacco Allotment Leasing: Extends the time for filing tobacco allotment leases with the county committee until 7/31 of each year. PL 89–471.

APPROPRIATIONS

1966

Vietnam Supplemental: Appropriates an additional $13.1 billion. PL 89–374. (PR)

Vote: Senate passage 87(58D, 29R—2(2D)

2d Supplemental: Appropriates a total of $2.8 billion including $12.1 million for rent subsidies, $9.5 million for Teachers' Corps, and $12 million for Selective Service System for higher costs relating to an increase in induction needs. PL 89–426 (PR)

Vote: Senate passage 72(54D, 18R)—12 (10D, 2R).

1967

Agriculture Department and Related Agencies: Appropriated a total of $6,994,590,150. PL 89–556. (PR)

Vote: Senate passage 77(52D, 25R)—2 (2D).

Defense Department: Appropriated a total of $58,067,472,000 and authorizes the President to call to active duty for not more than 24 months any member in the Ready Reserves who has not served on active duty other than for training. PL 89–687. (PR)

Vote: Senate passage 86(56D, 30R)—0.

District of Columbia: Appropriated a total of $404,598,200. HR 17636. PL 89– (PR)

Vote: Senate passage 70(48D, 22R)—0.

Foreign Aid: Appropriated a total of $3,493,473,500. PL 89–691. (PR)

Vote: Senate passage 52(36D, 16R)—22 (14D, 8R)

Independent Offices: Appropriated a total of $14,065,851,000 for sundry independent agencies and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (includes supersonic transport and rent supplements). PL 89–555. (PR)

Vote: Senate passage 82 (53D, 29R)—2 (1D, 1R)

Interior Department and Related Agencies: Appropriated a total of $1,321,615,800. PL 89–435. (PR)

Labor-HEW: Appropriated a total of $10,463,244,500. HR 14745. PL 89– (PR)

Vote: Senate passage 65(48D, 17R)—3 (1D, 2R)

Legislative: Appropriated a total of $214,463,913 for the legislative branch. PL 89–545. (PR)

Military Construction: Appropriated a total of $979,570,000 for military construction for Defense Department. HR 17637. PL 89– (PR)

Public Works: Appropriated a total of $4,134,511,000. PL 89–689. (PR)

Vote: Senate passage 61(45D, 16R)—4 (2D, 2R)

State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary: Appropriated a total of $2,347,826,600, H.R. 18119. PL 89– (PR)

Supplemental: Appropriated a total of $5.025 billion. H.R. 18381. PL 89– (PR)

Treasury–Post Office: Appropriated a total of $7,196,429,135. PL 89–474. (PR)

ATOMIC ENERGY AND SPACE

AEC: Authorizes $1,964,128,000 for operating expenses and $295,830,000 for plant and capital equipment, or a total of $2,259,958,000 for fiscal 1967. PL 89–428. (PR)

Space Authorization: Authorizes a total of $5,000,419,000 to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1967. PL 89–528. (PR)

DEFENSE AND MILITARY

Academy Appointments: Makes the sons of all career members of the Armed Forces eligible for appointment to the service academies under the Presidential category and increases the annual number from 75 to 100. PL 89–650.

Air Force—Promotions: Increases the authorized number for the grades of major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel to provide the officers on active duty in the Air Force a promotion program comparable to the programs for the other military services. PL 89–606.

Airmail Service to Armed Forces: Broadens existing law to include sound-recorded communications within the free mailing privilege; provides for airlift of current news publications to combat areas; and provides world-wide airlift of letter mail and sound-recorded communications at surface rates to and from U.S. servicemen overseas in noncombat areas. H.R. 13448. PL 89–

Civil Defense Emergency Extension: Extends to June 30, 1970 the President's standby authority to invoke Civil Defense emergency powers in the event of an enemy attack on the U.S. PL–483. (PR)

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Provides authority during periods of national emergency for Presidential transfer of vessels, equipment stations, and commissioned officers of the Environmental Science Services Administration to the service and jurisdiction of a military department. PL 89–657.

Coast Guard Amendments: Increases the maximum authorized number of commissioned Coast Guard officers on active duty from 3,500 to 4,000. Increases the number of cadets to be appointed annually to the Coast Guard Academy from 300 to 400. PL 89–444.

Coast Guard Authorization: Authorizes $126 million for fiscal 1967 for the Coast Guard to procure vessels, aircraft and to construct shore and offshore establishments. PL 89–381. (PR)

Defense Production: Extends to June 30, 1968 the President's authority to fix priorities for and allocate defense materials and to expand industrial capacity under the Defense Production Act of 1950. PL 89–482. (PR)

Military Construction Authorization: Provides construction and other related authority for the military departments and the Office of the Secretary of Defense, within and outside the U.S., and authority for construction of facilities for the Reserve components in the total amount of $1,005,842,000. PL 89-568. (PR)

Military Medicare: Authorizes an improved health benefits plan for retired members and members of uniformed services and their dependents. PL 89-614. (PR)

Vote: Senate passage 87(56D, 31R)—0.

Military Procurement—Pay Increase: Authorizes $17,480,759,000 for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, research, development, test, and evaluation, and a 3.2% military pay raise. PL 89-501. (PR)

Vote: Senate adoption of conference report 81(51D, 30R)—1(1D).

Regular Commissions: Authorizes regular commissions for male officers in the Army Nurse Corps, the Army Medical Specialist Corps, the Navy Nurse Corps, and in the Air Force with designation as Air Force nurses and medical specialists. PL 89-609.

Renegotiation Act Extension: Extends to 6/30/68 the Renegotiation Act for recovery of excess profits on defense contracts. PL 89-480. (PR)

Special Allowances: Authorizes a 5-year extension of the authority to pay special allowances to dependents of members of the uniformed services who are evacuated because of emergencies. PL 89-608.

Trophy Awards: Authorizes all the Armed Forces to use appropriated funds to award medals, trophies, badges, and similar devices to members for excellence in accomplishments or competitions. PL 89-529.

Uniformed Services Savings Deposit Program: Authorizes up to 10% interest on savings deposit accounts for members of the uniformed services stationed overseas. PL 89-538. (PR)

Vietnam Leave: Authorizes an additional 30 days leave for servicemen who voluntarily extend their duty for an additional 6 months in Vietnam. HR 15748. PL 89–

Vietnam Supplemental Economic Aid: Authorizes for the current fiscal year additional economic aid in the amount of $290 million for Southeast Asia and $25 million for the Dominican Republic; plus an additional $100 million for the worldwide contingency fund. PL 89-371. (PR)

Vote: Senate passage 82(55D, 27R)—2(2D).

Vietnam Supplemental military authorization: Authorizes a total of $4.8 billion additional for fiscal 1966 for military activities in Vietnam. PL 89-367. (PR)

Vote: Senate passage 93(61D, 32R)—2(2D).

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Bail Agency Act: Establishes an agency in the District of Columbia to promote a system whereby worthy defendants and material witnesses will be able to secure their release from detention pending court appearances on nonfinancial conditions and to furnish a judicial officer with information about a person's background so he can made an appropriate bail determination. PL 89-519. (PR)

Capital Stock Requirements: Amends the D.C. Fire and Casualty Act to require that all domestic stock insurance companies authorized to do a fidelity or surety business in D.C. maintain a paid up capital stock of not less than $500,000 and a surplus of not less than $250,000. PL 89-399.

CPA Act of 1966: Provides for the regulation of the professional practice of certified public accountants in the District of Columbia, including examination, license and registration. PL 89-578.

Court Functions: Transfers numerous functions from the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to the D.C. Court of General Sessions, the Commissioners of D.C. and to the Recorder of Deeds. PL 89-493.

Court of General Sessions: Authorizes the expansion of the D.C. Court of General Sessions from 15 to 20 associate judges and establishes a Traffic Branch in this Court. PL 89-598.

Crime Bill: Improves the D.C. Criminal Code as an effective weapon in the fight against crime in the District of Columbia by providing procedures to bring the criminal to swift and sure justice. HR 5688. PL 89–. (PR)

D.C. Code: Makes technical amendments to titles 19 and 20 of the D.C. Code relative to the administration of decedents estates. PL 89-567.

14th Street Bridge: Authorizes the construction of an $11.8 million 6-lane bridge over the Potomac River at 14th Street. PL 89-627.

Foreign Corporations: Exempts from D.C. taxes real property investment income of certain foreign corporations. PL 89-591.

General John J. Pershing: Authorizes the erection of a memorial in the District of Columbia to General John J. Pershing. S. 2338. PL 89–.

Home Rule: Provides for an elected mayor, city council, and non-voting delegate to the House of Representatives for D.C. S. 1118. Senate requested conference 4/5; House D.C. Committee rejected motion to appoint conferees 5/11. Cloture rejected 10/10 when Home Rule was offered as an amendment to HR 14644, the Higher Education bill. (PR)

Vote: Senate passage 63(47D, 16R)—29 (15D, 14R)

Income and Franchise Tax Act: Restates section 4 of title I of the Income and Franchise Tax Act—relating to foreign corporations which have a place of business, an officer or representative located in D.C.—to make it clear that "non-commercial" activities will not subject persons or corporations to taxation. PL 89-585.

Injury Reports: Requires mandatory reporting by physicians, hospitals, or similar institutions in D.C. of injuries caused by firearms or other dangerous weapons. HR 9985. PL 89–.

Inmates Transfer: Allows the Attorney General to transfer an inmate of the D.C. Jail to any other institution under the control of the Director of the District of Columbia Department of Corrections notwithstanding the pendency of a petition for a writ of habeas corpus with respect to such inmate, or of an appeal from a denial thereof. S. 3404. Passed Senate 8/26.

Insurance Premium Finance Companies: Provides a requirement for licensing and a means for regulating the activities of premium finance companies in the District of Columbia. PL 89-403.

Judicial Retirement: Amends the D.C. Judges' Retirement Act of 1964 to make improvements in the retirement law as it affects the retired judges of the D.C. Court of Appeals, the D.C. Court of General Sessions, and the D.C. Juvenile Court. PL 89-587.

Life Insurance Act: Permits D.C. insurance companies to make prompt public announcement of their financial standing. PL 89-559.

Minimum Wage: Raises the minimum wage payable to almost all employees in the District to $1.60 an hour over the next 3 years and extends coverage to 280,000 men, women, and minors. PL 89-684. (PR)

Vote: Senate passage 60 (41D, 18R)—10 (6D, 4R)

National Visitor Center: Created a 21-member study commission to make a complete and thorough investigation of sites and plans to provide facilities and services for visitors and students coming to the National Capital. Report to be submitted by 3/15/67. HR 14604. PL 89–. (PR)

Old Georgetown Market: Authorizes the D.C. Board of Commissioners to preserve the old Georgetown Market, located at 3276 M Street, N.W., as an historic landmark and to operate and maintain it as a public market. PL 89-600.

Parking Facility Act: Provides for a parking program as part of a balanced transit system in the District of Columbia, and a unified planning program under the supervision of a Parking Board and Advisory Council. S. 2769. Passed Senate 6/21.

Pay Increase: Authorized an average 9.9% raise for D.C. firemen and police, and 8.9% for teachers and school employees. HR 15857. PL 89–. (PR)

Physical Abuse Reports: Requires mandatory reporting by physicians and institutions in the District of Columbia of physical injury inflicted upon children by other than accidental means. HR 10304. PL 89–

Practical Nurses' Licensing Act: Amends the D.C. Practical Nurses Licensing Act to permit licensing without any written examination of an applicant otherwise qualified to be a licensed practical nurse, who, for the year immediately preceding the effective date of this act, has resided in the District of Columbia and been actively engaged in caring for the sick in the Washington metropolitan area. PL 89-518.

Premarital examinations: Requires premarital examinations in the District of Columbia within 30 days prior to filing for a marriage license. PL 89-682.

Public Colleges: Establishes a District of Columbia Board of Higher Education to create a 4-year public college of arts and sciences and a 2-year public community and vocational college in the District. HR 16958. PL 89–. (PR)

Public School Food Services: Authorizes appropriations to pay for lunches furnished to all needy secondary public school children whose parents are not recipients of public welfare. S. 1312. Passed Senate 7/11.

Registration of Trade Names: Protects the general public and legitimate businesses in D.C. by requiring registration of assumed trade names, disclosure of principals and agents conducting business under such names, and requiring such principals and agents residing outside the District to constitute the D.C. Board of Commissioners as their attorney for service of process. S. 1717. Passed Senate 4/5.

Regulating Domestic Stock Insurance Companies: Provides D.C. with regulatory authority over domestic stock insurance companies to enable those companies, by coming under the regulatory jurisdiction of the Superintendent of Insurance for the District, to be exempt from regulation by the SEC. PL 89-402.

Revenue: Provides additional revenue of approximately $12.7 million to finance District government activities supported from the general fund which includes the cost of police, fire protection, education, health, welfare, courts, and other general government functions; provides an annual Federal payment of $60 million; provides a method for computing the annual borrowing authority for the general fund; and increases the highway fund following authority for highway construction by $25 million. PL 89-610. (PR)

School Census: Provides all children below the age of 18 be listed in the school census, instead of the present requirement that only those between the ages of 3 and 18 be listed. S. 2060. Passed Senate 7/11.

Selected Offenders: Authorizes the D.C. Courts to release selected offenders from prison at specified times to engage in gainful employment. S. 1319. PL 89–.

Shaw Junior High School: Authorizes the D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency to acquire real property for a new Shaw Junior High School, prior to the adoption of an urban renewal plan for the Shaw area. PL 89-569. (PR)

Student Loans—Insurance: Authorizes in the District of Columbia an increase from $5,000 to $10,000 in the maximum amount of credit life, health, and accident insurance with respect to debtors who have secured loans for educational or other purposes which are repayable in installments. PL 89-594.

Teachers' Retirement Increase: Provides a combined increase of 11.1% to teacher retirees whose annuities are based on the law in existence on or before October 1, 1956, and 6.1% to those retirees whose annuities were computed under the liberalized formula made applicable after October 1, 1956, by the 1956 retirement amendments to the Teachers' Retirement Act. Increases retroactive to 12/1/65. PL 89-494.

EDUCATION

Books for Handicapped: Extends to other handicapped persons the provisions of existing law which authorize that books and other materials be furnished to the blind. PL 89-522. (PR)

Elementary and Secondary: Amends the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and authorized $2.3 billion for fiscal 1967 and $3.3 billion for fiscal 1968. HR 13161. PL 89–. (PR)

Vote: Senate passage 54(41D, 13R)—16 (9D, 7R)

GI Benefits: Provides educational assistance for veterans who have served on active duty for more than 180 days since 1/31/55. PL 89-358 (PR)

Vote: Senate adopted House amendments 99(67D, 32R)—0.

Higher Education: Authorizes $3.085 billion and extends the program for 3 years. HR 14644. PL 89–. (PR)

High School for Deaf: Authorized Gallaudet College to establish and operate a model secondary school for the deaf to serve the National Capital region. PL 89-694.

International Education Act of 1966: Authorizes a 5-year program funded for 3 years at approximately $140 million to strengthen American educational resources for international studies and research. HR 14643. PL 89–. (PR)

Library Services: Extends the Library Services and Construction Act to June 30, 1971, and authorizes appropriations totaling $700 million. PL 89-511 (PR)

Salary Increase for Overseas Teachers: Provides for approximately a 10% increase for teachers in the overseas dependent school system. PL 89-391.

School Sites: Permits setting aside Federal public lands for needed school sites. PL 89-470.

Sea Grant Colleges: Establishes a $20 million, 2-year program of aid to sea grant colleges to further development of marine resources. PL 89-688.

ELECTION REFORMS

Campaign Financing: Provides for public support of presidential election campaign financing by permitting individual tax payers to designate on their annual tax returns that $1 of their income tax liability can be deducted for presidential campaign expenses. HR 13103. PL 89–.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Additional Supergrades: Provides for the establishment of certain management, administrative, scientific, and research and development positions in GS-16 through 18 and other comparable salary levels. PL 89-632.

Assistant PMG: Creates a sixth position of Assistant Postmaster General in the Post Office Department to be in charge of research, development, and construction engineering programs. PL 89-492.

Back pay: Consolidates and liberalizes existing law on the restoration of an employee to his position after an adverse action against him has been found by appellate authority to have been erroneous or unjustified. PL 89-380.

Botanic Garden: Amends the Civil Service Retirement Act to extend to employees of the U.S. Botanic Garden the formula used in computing the annuities of employees of the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the Office of the Architect of the Capitol. PL 89-604.

Civil Service Retirement: Permits the natural child of a deceased Federal employee who dies without survivors eligible to receive a survivor annuity from the civil service retirement and disability fund to share in the distribution of any money on deposit in the fund which belongs to the deceased employee. PL 89-407.

Commission on Political Activity: Creates a 12-member bipartisan commission to make a full and complete investigation and study of the Federal laws which limit or discourage the participation of Federal and State officers and employees in political activity with a view to determining the effect of such laws, the need for their revision or elimination, and an appraisal of the extent to which undesirable results might accrue from their repeal. PL 89-617. (PR)

Compensation Act: Increases payments under Federal Employees Compensation Act for on-the-job injuries or disability. PL 89-488. (PR)

Congressional Employees: Preserves the retirement, group life, and health benefits for congressional employees receiving fellowships from the American Political Science Association. PL 89-379.

Federal Work Week: Permits variation of the 40-hour work week of Federal employees for educational purposes. PL 89-478.

Foreign Service Retirement: Places annuitants of the Foreign Service retirement system on the same basis as civil service annuitants for purposes of computing future cost-of-living increases in annuities; provides retired personnel with the same percentage increase in their annuities as was authorized for the civil service retirement system. S. 3247. Passed Senate 10/5.

Government Organization and Personnel: Enacts into law title V of the U.S. Code, entitled "Government Organization and Employees," codifying the general and permanent laws relating to the organization of the Government of the United States and to its civilian officers and employees. PL 89-554. (PR)

Hazardous Duty Pay: Permits the payment of premium compensation (up to 25%) to Classification Act employees for periods of work involving hazardous conditions. PL 89-512.

Interior Employees Medical Expenses: Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to use appropriated funds for the payment of medical care of temporary and seasonal employees and employees located in isolated areas who become disabled because of injury or illness not attributable to official work. S. 2153. Passed Senate 3/4.

Lighthouse Service: Increases from $75 to $100 a month benefits payable to widows of certain former employees. S. 2980. Passed Senate 10/17.

Merchant Seamen: Authorizes 2 additional days of vacation leave for every 30 days at sea for federally employed merchant seamen. HR 18217. PL 89–.

Salary Act of 1966: Provides a 2.9% increase for Federal employees, Congressional, Foreign Service, and Judicial. Permits Federal employees to retire on a full annuity at age 55 after 30 years' service or at age 60 after 20 years' service. Effective July 1, 1966. PL 89-504. (PR)

Vote: Senate passage 81 (52D, 29R)—0.

Survivor Annuities: Amends the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for inclusion of certain periods of reemployment of annuitants for the purpose of computing annuities of their surviving spouses. S. 699. Passed House amended 10/11.

Travel Expenses: Provides for reimbursement of certain moving and storage expenses of Federal employees when transferred from one official duty station to another, in the interest of the U.S.; and provides for the payment of a cash allowance up to $632 to cover miscellaneous expenses of the transferred employees. PL 89-516.

FINANCE AND ECONOMY

Bank Holding Company Act Amendments: Eliminates two major open-end exemptions from the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (the exemption for long-term trusts and religious, charitable, and educational institutions and the exemption for registered investment companies and their affiliates) and brings up to date the regulatory and administrative provisions of the Bank Holding Company Act and related acts. PL 89-485. (PR)

Bank Mergers: Establishes new and uniform standards for bank merger approvals by regulatory agencies; requires that antitrust action be filed within 30 days; permits mergers on basis of community need and public interest if these factors predominate; exempts mergers completed prior to June 17, 1963. PL 89-356.

Bankruptcy Act Amendments: Amends chapter XI of the Bankruptcy Act to give the court supervisory power over all fees paid from whatever source. S. 1923. Passed Senate 3/4.

Bankruptcy Liens: Rearranges the priority of liens in bankruptcy to subordinate Federal tax liens to statutory liens. PL 89-495.

Bankruptcy Referees: Amends the Bankruptcy Act to prohibit referees or part-time referees from acting as trustee or receiver in any proceeding under the Bankruptcy Act. PL 89-414.

Bankruptcy—Tax Priority: Provides for discharge in bankruptcy of Federal taxes due more than 3 years except withholding taxes and income taxes where no return was filed, or where fraud is involved. PL 89-496.

Vote: Senate passage 69 (43D, 26R)—8 (7D, 1R).

Debt Ceiling: Provides a temporary debt limitation of $330 billion beginning on July 1, 1966 and ending June 30, 1967. PL 89-472. (PR)

Vote: Senate passage 50 (40D, 10R)—17 (8D, 9R)

Disaster Relief Act of 1966: Provides additional assistance for areas suffering a major disaster. S. 1861. PL 89–.

Federal Reserve Purchases: Extends until 6/30/68 the present authority of the Federal Reserve banks to purchase securities direct from the Treasury in amounts not to exceed $5 billion outstanding at any one time. PL 89-484.

Financial Institutions Supervisory Act: Authorizes the Federal authorities who supervise insured banks and savings and loan associations to issue cease-and-desist, suspension, and removal order to prevent violations of laws and regulations and unsafe and unsound practices. PL 89-695. (PR)

GATT Negotiations: Expresses the sense of Congress that our trade negotiators should limit their offers of concessions to authority prescribed by the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. S. Con. Res. 100. Passed Senate 6/29.

Hunting Stamps: Increased from $3 to $5 the fee for Federal migratory hunting stamps. H.R. 14136. PL 89–.

Interest and Dividend Rates: Provides for controls on dividend and interest rates payable by lending institutions. PL 89-597. (PR)

Participation Sales Act of 1966: Authorizes sale to private investors of $10 billion of assets held by the Federal Government as security for loans, $4.2 billion of it this year. PL 89–429. (PR)

Vote: Senate passage 39 (34D, 5R)—22 (2D, 20R). Senate adoption of House amdts. 50 (47D, 3R)—20 (2D, 18R).

Poverty Programs: Authorized $1,750 million for fiscal 1967 and extended the programs under the Economic Opportunity Act through June 30, 1970. HR 15111. PL 89–. (PR)

Vote: Senate passage 49 (37D, 12R)—20 (9D, 11R).

Football Merger: Clarifies the tax consequences of a merger of the professional football leagues and indicates that the antitrust laws are not to apply to a joint agreement by which member clubs of two or more professional football leagues combine their operations in an expanded single league. HR 17607. PL 89–.

SBA Authorization: Raises limit of Small Business Administration business loans by $125 million to $1.5 billion; sets up separate disaster loan revolving fund; and fixes overall total loan ceiling at $1.96 billion. PL 89–409. (PR)

SBIC Amendments of 1966: Grants to the Administrator of the Small Business Administration additional powers to enable him to supervise the small business investment company program more effectively. HR 18021. PL 89–.

Stockpile Disposals: (20) (PR)
Aluminum, PL 89–460.
Amosite Asbestos, PL 89–422.
Bauxite, PL 89–394.
Bismuth, PL 89–417.
Celestite, PL 89–461.
Chromite, PL 89–415.
Crocidolite Asbestos, PL 89–463.
Fluorspar, PL 89–416.
Metallurgical Grade Manganese Ore, PL 89–539.
Molybdenum, PL 89–413.
Muscovite Mica, PL 89–419.
Opium, PL 89–464.
Phlogopite Mica, PL 89–418.
Platinum, PL 89–390.
Rhodium, PL 89–420.
Ruthenium, PL 89–423.
Sisal, PL 89–462.
Thorium, PL 89–421.
Vanadium, PL 89–424.
Industrial Diamond stones, HR 13320: PL 89–.

Truth in Packaging: Fixes standards for labelling of net contents of food and other consumer goods; establishes procedures for developing uniform weight-quantity standards for packages. S. 985. PL 89–. (PR)

Vote: Senate passage 72 (56D, 16R)–9 (1D, 8R).

Use of foreign currencies: Permits the Government to improve balance of payment position by using reserved foreign currencies in lieu of dollars to meet current obligations abroad. PL 89–677.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Administrative Procedure Act of 1966: Revises and modernizes Administrative Procedure Act by separating adjudicative and policy-making functions as between hearing-examiners and members of regulatory agencies, boards, and Commissions; fixes procedural steps to expedite decisions and relieve the backlog of cases. S. 1336. Passed Senate 6/21.

Attorney's Fees: Removes arbitrary limitation on attorneys fees for services rendered in proceedings before administrative agencies of the U.S. S. 1522. Passed Senate 6/13.

Contract Exemptions: Permits the head of an agency to exclude an examination of records clause from a contract or a subcontract with a foreign contractor or subcontractor after determining that the inclusion of such a clause would not be in the public interest. PL 89–607.

Cuban Refugees: Adjusts the status of Cuban refugees to that of lawful permanent residents of the U.S. H.R. 15183. PL 89–.

Design Protection Act of 1966: Encourages the creation of original ornamental designs of useful articles by protecting the authors of such designs for a limited time against unauthorized copying. S. 1237. Passed Senate 7/27.

Freedom of Information: Revises section 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act to provide a true federal public records statute by requiring the availability, to any member of the public, of all of the executive branch records described in its requirements, except those involving matters which come under stated exemptions. PL 89–487. (PR)

Guam: Authorizes the legislature of Guam to provide by law for the election of its members from election districts. PL 89–552.

Guam: Extends coverage of the State Technical Services Act to the Territory of Guam. S. 2979. PL 89–.

Guam—Governor: Provides for the popular election of Governor and Lieutenant Governor for the territory of Guam. H.R. 11775. (PR) P/S amended Oct. 11.

Hirshhorn Museum: Establishes the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, and makes available to the Smithsonian the areas bounded by 7th Street, N.W., Independence Avenue, 9th Street, N.W. and Madison Drive in the District of Columbia as the permanent site of the museum and garden. S. 3389. PL 89–. (PR)

Obscene Commission: Establishes a Commission to explore methods of combating traffic in obscene and noxious materials. S. 309. Passed Senate 7/11.

Postal Savings: Discontinues U.S. Postal Savings System 30 days after enactment. PL 89–377.

Powers of Congress: Authorizes the chairman of Senate Judiciary Committee to appoint a special subcommittee to make a study of possible encroachments by the executive and the Judicial branches on the powers of Congress. S. Res. 305. Adopted 10/17/66.

Reapportionment of Virgin Islands Legislature: Enlarges the membership of the Virgin Islands legislature from 11 to 15 and permits its reapportionment in keeping with the recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions. PL 89–548.

Smithsonian: Authorizes the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian to negotiate cooperative agreements granting concessions at the National Zoological Park to certain nonprofit organizations and to accept voluntary services of such organizations or of individuals. S. 3230. PL 89–.

Trust Territory: Increases from an annual authorization of $17.5 million to $32 million for fiscal 1967 and $35 million for fiscal 1968 for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands for civil works. Designates the High Commissioner and Deputy High Commissioner as Governor and Lt. Governor and provides that future appointments to the office shall be made by the President and confirmed by the Senate. S. 3504. Passed Senate 8/26. (PR)

Uniform Time: Establishes uniform daylight saving time throughout the U.S. beginning in 1967 unless the State legislature votes to remain on standard time. Requires any state or subdivision using DST in 1966 to commence it on the last Sunday in April and end it on the last Sunday in October. PL 89–387.

Uniform Relocation Act of 1966: Establishes a uniform relocation policy for fair and equitable treatment of persons, businesses, or firms displaced by Federal or Federally assisted programs. S. 1681. Passed Senate 7/22.

Virgin Islands borrowing authority: Increases the special revenue bond borrowing authority of the Virgin Islands for governmental water and power projects and for limited expenditures for other governmental projects. PL 89–643.

Virgin Islands—Governor: Provides for the popular election of Governor and Lieutenant Governor of the Virgin Islands. H.R. 11777. (PR) P/S Amended 10/11.

Weather: Established a weather modification program to develop, encourage and maintain a comprehensive and coordinated program and to control or modify tornadoes, hurricanes, and other severe storms. S. 2916. Passed Senate 10/14.

HEALTH

Allied Health Professions: Authorizes $105 million to increase the training opportunities of medical technologists and personnel in other allied health professions and to improve the existing student loan programs for medical, osteopathic, dental, podiatry, pharmacy, optometric, and nursing students. H.R. 13196. PL 89–. (PR)

Child Protection Act of 1966: Bans the sale of toys and other children's articles containing hazardous substances, and creates a National Commission on Hazardous Household Products. S. 3298. PL 89–. (PR)

Clean Air Act Amendments: Amends the Clean Air Act of 1963, to provide a stronger and more effective air pollution control effort at the Federal, State, and local level, to consolidate appropriation authorizations, and to authorize $186 million through fiscal 1969. PL 89–675. (PR)

Vote: Senate Passage 80 (51D, 29R)—0

Comprehensive Health Planning: Authorizes a 3-year, $154 million, program in grants to assist in the extension and improvement of comprehensive health planning and public health services. S. 3008. PL 89–. (PR)

Food and Drugs: Allows manufacturers of candy to use ingredients which have been approved as safe by the Food and Drug Administration. PL 89–477.

Fish Protein and Concentrate: Inaugurates an accelerated 5-year program of fish protein concentrate research including authority to construct two demonstration plants to provide a new and effective weapon against world hunger. S. 2720. PL 89–.

Medicare: Extends from March 31 to May 31, 1966 the deadline for enrollment in the medical insurance portion of the social security health insurance program for the aged. PL 89–384. (PR)

Narcotics: Provides for treating and rehabilitating narcotic addicts. HR 9167. PL 89– (PR)

Health Service Personnel: Authorizes the Department of Medicine and Surgery to carry out a program of training and education of health service personnel, acting in cooperation with schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, and nursing; other institutions of higher learning; medical centers; hospitals; and other public or nonprofit agencies, institutions or organizations. HR 11631. Passed Senate amended 10/14.

Veterinary Medical Education Act of 1966: Authorized a 3-year, $3 million loan program for students in schools of veterinary medicine. HR 3348. PL 89–.

Water Pollution Control: Establishes the Clean Rivers Restoration Program as a supplement to the existing water pollution control program for planning and construction of treatment works on a river basin basis; authorizes a total of $3.4 billion for Federal sewage treatment construction grants through fiscal 1971; broadens the existing program; and strengthens other existing laws including the Oil Pollution Act of 1924. S. 2947. PL 89–. (PR)

Vote: Senate passage 90(59D,31R)—0.

HOUSING

Demonstration Cities, Metropolitan Planning, Housing and Urban Development: Establishes a new city demonstration program of Federal grants and authorizes $24 million for fiscal 1967 and 1968 for planning and $900 million for fiscal 1968 and 1969 for program assistance; $250 million additional for urban renewal for projects included within a city demonstration program; $75 million for fiscal 1967 and 1968 grants to State and local public bodies for metropolitan development planning programs; and $15 million for fiscal 1967 and 1968 grants to States and metropolitan area agencies to help finance information and technical assistance centers; and provides FHA insurance for new towns on an experimental basis through 6/30/72. S. 3708. PL 89–. (PR)

Vote: Senate passage 53(39D,14R)—22(9D, 13R). Adoption of conf. report 38(29D,9R)—22(13D, 9R).

Electric Transmission Study: Authorizes the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make a study of the impact of overhead electric transmission lines and towers on scenic assets, zoning and community planning, property values, and real estate revenue. S.J. Res. 189. Passed Senate 9/6.

FNMA Amendments of 1966: Gives Federal National Mortgage Association powers that will enable it to pump $4.7 billion into homebuilding industry by mortgage purchases. PL 89–566. (PR)

Vote: Senate passage 83(54D, 29R)—0.

Vice President's Residence: Authorizes an appropriation of $750,000 for the construction and furnishing of an official residence for the Vice President to be located on the grounds of the U.S. Naval Observatory. PL 89–386.

INDIANS

Civil Actions: Permits Indian tribes to bring civil actions arising under the Constitution, treaties, and laws of the U.S., without regard to the $10,000 limitation. PL 89–635.

Expert Assistance Loans: Increases from $900,000 to $1,800,000 the revolving loan fund for assisting Indian tribes to procure the assistance of expert witnesses in cases before the Indian Claims Commission. PL 89–592.

Indian Claims: Extends the life of the Indian Claims Commission to April 10, 1972. HR 5392. In conf.

Indian Revolving Loan Fund: Authorizes an increase of $35 million in the Indian revolving loan fund. HR 9323. In Conf.

Navajo Reservation: Provides that royalties from the Navajo Reservation payable to the State of Utah be used for the health, education, and welfare of the Indians on the reservation. S. 2535. Passed Senate 8/29.

INTERNATIONAL

Asian Development Bank: Authorizes the President to accept membership on behalf of the U.S. in the Asian Development Bank and authorizes an appropriation of $200 million. PL 89–369. (PR)

Beirut Agreement: Implements the Agreement for Facilitating the International Circulation of Visual and Auditory Materials of an Educational, Scientific and Cultural Character. PL 89–634. (PR)

Chamizal Boundary Highway: Authorizes not to exceed $6 million for the construction of the 12.5 mile highway, estimated to cost $12 million, on the U.S. side of the Rio Grande River channel in El Paso. H.R. 11555. PL 89. (PR)

China—Loan of Naval Vessels: Authorizes lending one destroyer and one destroyer escort to the Republic of China. PL 89–398.

Claims: Provides for the determination of the amounts of claims of U.S. nationals against the Chinese Communist regime. S. 3675. PL 89–.

Convention on Settlement of Investment Disputes Implementing Legislation: Authorizes the President to appoint a U.S. representative to the Administrative Council of the International Center for the Settlement of Investment Disputes and designates four persons for the Panel of Arbitrators to be established pursuant to the provisions of the convention and provides that U.S. district courts will have jurisdiction to enforce the pecuniary obligations of arbitral awards. PL 89–532. (PR)

Florence Agreement: Implements the Florence Agreement to facilitate the free flow of educational, scientific, and cultural materials by removing barriers that impede the international movement of such materials. PL 89–651. (PR)

Foreign Agents Registration Act Amendments: Protects the interests of the U.S. by requiring complete public disclosure by persons acting for or in the interest of foreign principals where their activities are political in nature or border on the political. Such public disclosures as required by the act will permit the Government and the people of the U.S. to be informed as to the identities and activities of such persons and thus be better able to appraise them and the purposes for which they act. PL 89–486.

Foreign Aid Authorization: Authorizes $3.5 billion for economic and military aid for fiscal 1967. PL 89–583. (PR)

Vote: Senate passage 66 (48D, 18R)—27 (15D, 12R). Conf. report adoption 33 (25D, 8R)—25 (15D, 10R).

Foreign Gifts and Decorations: Establishes uniform basic standards for the acceptance of gifts and decorations by persons employed by the U.S. Government under specified conditions. PL 89–673.

Foreign Service Buildings Act: Authorized $55,160,000 for construction and operation of Foreign Service buildings abroad. PL 89–636.

German Paintings: Authorizes the Attorney General to transfer, without cost, 3 German paintings to the Republic of Germany. PL 89–619.

Greek Loans: Authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to conclude the settlement of a debt arising from a U.S. loan to Greece in 1929 on which no payments have been made since the early years of World War II. S. 1760. PL 89–.

HemisFair: Authorizes $7,500,000 to carry out U.S. participation in the HemisFair Exposition in San Antonio, Texas, in 1968. PL 89–685.

Human Rights Committee: Creates an 11-member advisory committee to formulate plans for U.S. participation in the U.N. sponsored International Human Rights Year of 1968. S. 3101. Passed Senate 10/17. H. Cal.

India—Emergency Aid: To help India meet her pressing food shortages, this act makes available under PL 480 certain agriclutural commodities including food grain, corn, vegetable oils, milk powder, cotton and tobacco. PL 89–406. (PR)

Interama: Authorizes the President to provide for U.S. participation in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center, known as Interama, in Miami, Florida, a permanent international fair to serve as a meeting ground for the governments and industries of the Western Hemisphere and other areas of the world. PL 89–355.

Vote: Senate passage 56 (43D, 13R)—18 (6D, 12R).

International Conference on Water for Peace: Authorizes the U.S. to sponsor an International Conference on Water for Peace in Washington in 1967, and provides $900,000 for expenses incident to organizing and holding the conference. S.J. Res. 167. PL 89–. (PR)

International Organization Immunities Act: Provides for tax and customs exemption of the European Space Research Organization and for tax exemption of their foreign employees. PL 89–353.

International Petroleum Exposition: Authorizes the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign nations to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition to be held in Tulsa, Oklahoma, May 12 through 21, 1966. S.J. Res. 63. Passed Senate 2/10.

Lower Rio Grande Salinity Problems: Authorizes the Secretary of State to conclude an agreement, or agreements, with Mexico for the construction, operation, and maintenance by Mexico, under the supervision of the International Boundary and Water Commission, of a drainage conveyance channel through Mexican territory for the discharge of waters of El Morillo and other drains in Mexico into the Gulf of Mexico. PL 89–584.

National UNICEF Day: Requests the President to issue annually a proclamation designating October 31 of each year as National UNICEF Day. S.J. Res. 194. Passed Senate 9/21.

Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons: Expresses to the President that the Senate commends his efforts to negotiate an international agreement limiting the spread of nuclear weapons and supports the principle of additional efforts which the President deems appropriate and necessary in the interest of peace and for the solution of nuclear proliferation problems. S. Res. 179. Adopted 5/17.

Senate passage 84 (55D, 29R)—0.

Pan American Institute of Geography and History: Increases the ceiling on U.S. contributions to the Pan American Institute of Geography and History from $50,000 a year to $99,300 and authorizes appropriations for the expenses of U.S. participation in Institute activities (estimated at $3,000 a year). PL 89–646.

Peace Corps: Authorizes $110 million for fiscal 1967. PL 89–572. (PR)

U.S.-Mexico Flood Control: Authorizes conclusion of an agreement for joint construction by U.S. and Mexico of flood control project for the Tiajuana River. PL 89–640.

1972 Winter Olympics: Approves selection of U.S. Olympic Committee and supports its recommendation that Utah be designated as the site for the 1972 Winter Olympic Games. S. Con. Res. 71. Senate adopted 3/14; House adopted 4/4/66.

World Health Assembly: Authorizes an appropriation of not to exceed $500,000 to enable the U.S. to extend an invitation to the World Health Organization to hold the 22nd World Health Assembly in Boston, Massachusetts in 1969. PL 89–357.

JUDICIAL

Appeals in Patent and Trademark Cases: Simplifies the procedure in appeals from the Patent Office to the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals mainly by eliminating the existing requirement that the appellant set forth "reasons of appeal" when the appeal is filed. S. 2207. Passed Senate 8/26.

Court of Claims: Authorizes the President to appoint two additional judges for the U.S. Court of Claims, subject to Senate confirmation. PL 89–425.

Federal bail reform: Revises the practices relating to bail to assure that all persons, regardless of their financial status, shall not needlessly be detained pending their appearance to answer charges, to testify, or pending appeal, when detention serves neither justice nor public interest. PL 89–465 (PR)

Federal Claims Collection Act: Authorizes heads of agencies or their designees to compromise claims that do not exceed $20,000 and are claims for money or property arising out of activities of the agency or are referred to it. PL 89–508. (PR)

Federal Judgeships: Creates 45 new Federal judgeships, 10 circuit court and 35 district court. PL 89–372.

Federal Tort Claims Act Amendment: Provides authority to the heads of Federal agencies for administrative settlement of tort claims against the U.S. PL 89–506. (PR)

Habeas Corpus: Allows a person in custody under a judgment and sentence by a State court to petition for a writ of habeas corpus in the Federal district court of the district within which the State court was held that convicted and sentenced him. PL 89-590.

Judgments: Provides that in any action brought by or against the U.S. or any agency or official of the U.S. acting in his official capacity, costs may be awarded by the court to the prevailing party. PL 89-507. (PR)

Judicial Review: Removes any existing doubt as to the power of taxpayers, citizens, and institutions to obtain judicial review of the validity of Federal grants or loans under certain acts of Congress which include, by application, church-related institutions among their beneficiaries, S. 2097. Passed Senate 7/29.

Obstruction of Justice: Amends chapter 73 of title 18, U.S. Code, relating to obstruction of the administration of justice, by adding a new section prohibiting the obstruction of Federal criminal investigations. S. 2188. Passed Senate 8/26. (PR)

Puerto Rico: Provides the same life tenure and retirement rights for future judges appointed to the U.S. District Court for the District of Puerto Rico as the present judges of all other U.S. district courts. PL 89-571.

Uniform Civil Appellate Rules: Authorizes the Supreme Court to extend the scope of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to encompass practice and procedure in civil actions conducted before the U.S. courts of appeals. S. 3254. PL 89-.

Statute of Limitations: Establishes statutes of limitations which will apply to contract and tort action brought by the U.S. Government. PL 89-505. (PR)

U.S. Seals: Makes it a Federal crime to use the design of the great seal of the U.S. or the seal of the President without authority. S. 2770. Passed House amended 10/3.

Witness Immunity: Modifies the procedure for compelling a witness to testify or produce evidence in exchange for a grant of immunity from prosecution by requiring an application for a court order to that effect. S. 2190. Passed Senate 8/26. (PR)

Federal Criminal Laws: Establishes a National Commission on the Reform of Federal Criminal Laws. HR 15766. PL 89-. (PR)

Law Enforcement: Authorizes funds for law enforcement training. HR 13551, PL 89-. (PR)

LABOR

Coal Mine Safety: Extends the mandatory safety provisions of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act to mines regularly employing less than 15 men underground, and strengthens other provisions of the act to increase the protection of lives and property in all underground coal mines. PL 89-376. (PR)

Manpower Development Training Amendments of 1966: Amends the 1962 act to provide a needed flexibility to its programs and its administration which will permit a more effective method of dealing with the growing problem of skill shortages in certain areas and occupations. HR 16715. PL 89- (PR)

Metal and Nonmetallic Mine Safety: Directs the Secretary of Interior to develop and enforce mandatory health and safety standards for mining of metal and nonmetallic substances. Exempts coal and lignite mines and operations in which minerals are extracted in liquid form unless this required workers underground. PL 89-577. (PR)

Vote: Senate passage 57 (41D, 16R)—18 (7D, 11R).

Minimum Wage: Amends the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 by extending its benefits and coverage to an estimated 8 million workers and raising the minimum wage for workers now covered to $1.40 an hour beginning February 1, 1967, and $1.60 an hour beginning 2/1/68; newly covered workers will receive $1 an hour beginning 2/1/67 with the minimum rate raised in 4 annual increases to $1.60 an hour beginning 2/1/71. PL 89-601. (PR)

Vote: Senate passage 57 (42D, 15R)—17 (8D, 9R). Conference report 55) (45D, 10R)—38 (15D, 23R).

Older Americans: Authorizes the Administration on Aging in the Department of HEW to provide funds and technical assistance to nonprofit private organizations, municipalities, counties, and States for community service programs which utilize the abilities, enthusiasm, and energy of men and women of age 60 or over. S. 2877. Passed Senate 10/2.

Railroad Retirement: Provides survivor benefits to children aged 18 to 21 under the Railroad Retirement Act. HR 14355. PL 89-.

Railroad Retirement Annuities: Gives those people who did not share in the Social Security amendments of last year a 10% increase; sets up a supplemental annuity plan from $45 to $70 a month to be administered by the Railroad Retirement Board. HR 17285. PL 89-.

Railway labor: Eliminates the large backlog of undecided claims of railway employees pending before the National Railroad Adjustment Board, and provides equal opportunity for judicial review of awards by this Board to employees and employers. PL 89-456.

Unemployment insurance: Covers 2.3 million more workers under Federal-State unemployment compensation system, fixes minimum Federal standards, provides, under certain conditions, for additional 13 weeks benefits after expiration of normal period, with Federal Government furnishing the funds; raises tax rates and wage base. HR 15119. In conference. (PR)

Vote: Senate passage 53 (45D, 8R)—31 (12D, 19R).

MEMORIALS AND COMMISSIONS

American Revolution Bicentennial Commission: Establishes the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission to commemorate the great struggle for freedom which occurred nearly 200 years ago. Commission will be composed of Members of Congress and the Executive Branch, and distinguished and outstanding Americans appointed by the President. PL 89-491. (PR)

Bible Translation Day: Authorizes the President to designate the 30th of September, 1966 as Bible Translation Day. S.J. Res. 169. Passed Senate 8/26.

Chamizal Treaty National Memorial: Provides for the establishment of the Chamizal Treaty National Memorial in El Paso, Texas. PL 89-479. (PR)

Clark Park: Authorizes the Secretary of Interior to accept the donation from the State of Indiana of George Rogers Clark Memorial for the establishment as the George Rogers Clark National Historical Park in Vincennes, Indiana. PL 89-517.

Fort Union Trading Post: Authorizes the establishment of the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site, North Dakota and Montana, to commemorate the significant role of Fort Union as a fur trading post during the early history of our nation. PL 89-458.

International Literacy Day: Designates September 8, 1966, as International Literacy Day. PL 89-546.

Lewis and Clark Trail Commission Authorization: Adds Illinois to the list of States entitled to representation on the Lewis and Clark Trail Commission and increases the annual authorization from $25,000 to $35,000. PL 89-475.

National Air Museum: Provides for memorializing space flight as a part of the National Air Museum. PL 89-509.

Patrick V. McNamara Building: Provides that the Federal office building to be constructed in Detroit, Michigan, shall be named the "Patrick V. McNamara Office Building" in memory of the late Senator from Michigan. S. 3748. Passed Senate 8/31. H. Cal.

Pennsylvania Avenue: Provides for the administration and development of Pennsylvania Avenue in the District of Columbia as a national historic site. S.J. Res. 116. Passed Senate 6/8. H. Cal. PR

Preservation of Historic Properties: Authorizes the Secretary of Interior to maintain a national register of sites, buildings, and objects significant in American history and culture, including both historic and archeological sites. Establishes a program of matching grants to States and the National Trust for Historic Preservation in the U.S. for projects having as their purpose the preservation for public benefit of properties that are significant in American history and culture. PL 89-665. (PR)

Roanoke Island Memorial: Establishes the Roanoke Island Memorial Commission, North Carolina. S. Con Res. 39. Passed Senate 6/8.

San Juan Island National Historical Park: Authorizes $3,542,000 for the establishment of a national historical park on San Juan Island in the State of Washington. PL 89-565. (PR)

Sir Winston Churchill: Designates April 9, 1966 as Sir Winston Churchill Day, the third anniversary of the date U.S. citizenship was conferred on Sir Winston. PL 89-385.

REORGANIZATION

Reorg. Plan No. 1: Approved the transfer of the Community Relations Service from the Department of Commerce to the Department of Justice and the transfer of all its functions from the Secretary of Commerce to the Attorney General. Effective 4/22/66. (PR)

Vote: Senate rejected disapproval resolution: Yeas 32 (11 D, 21R); Nays 42 (42D).

Reorg. Plan No. 2: Approved the transfer of the water pollution control functions from HEW to the Department of Interior. Effective 5/10/66. (PR)

Reorg. Plan No. 3: Approved the transfer to the Secretary of HEW the functions now vested in the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. Effective 6/25/66. (PR)

Reorg. Plan No. 4: Vests all responsibility for the National Zoological Park in the Smithsonian Institution. Effective 8/23/66. (PR)

Reorg. Plan No. 5: Abolishes the National Capitol Regional Planning Council and vests its functions in the National Capital Planning Commission in order to improve existing organizational arrangements of and promote effective and efficient planning for the National Capitol region. Effective 9/8/66. (PR)

Reorganization of Congress: Provides that until 3/31/67, the six members of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress will be constituted as a Special Committee on the Organization of Congress with legislative authority to receive, consider, and report a bill designed to implement the recommendations of the joint committee. S. Res. 293. Senate adopted 8/26.

Reorganization of Navy Department: Effective 5/1/66. (PR)

RESOURCE BUILDUP

Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area: Authorizes $355,000 to establish the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area in Montana and Wyoming to provide for public outdoor recreation use and enjoyment of the proposed Yellowtail Reservoir and for the preservation of the scenic, scientific, and historic features of the area. PL 89-664. (PR)

Cape Lookout: Authorizes $3,200,000 for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in North Carolina. PL 89-366. (PR)

Contiguous Fishing Zone: Establishes a 12-mile fishing zone off the U.S. coast. PL 89-658.

Delmarva Peninsula Hydrological Study: Expresses Congressional approval of a 5-year hydrologic study and investigation of the Delmarva Peninsula located between the Delaware and Chesapeake Bays, to be carried out by the Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior, to determine the availability of adequate future water supplies. PL 89–618.

Feasibility Study: Authorizes the Secretary of Interior to study the feasibility and desirability of a Connecticut River National Recreation Area in the States of Connecticut, Massachusetts, Vermont and New Hampshire. PL 89–616.

Fishery Resources Survey: Directs the Secretary of Interior to conduct a survey on the extent and condition of the inland and coastal fishery resources of the U.S. S.J. Res. 29. Passed Senate 6/7.

Fur Seal Act of 1966: Implements the Convention on the Conservation of North Pacific Fur Seals and gives the Secretary of Interior broader discretion in the administration of the Pribilof Islands, encouraging self-government. S. 2102. PL 89–.

Geothermal Steam: Authorizes the Secretary of Interior to make disposition of geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources. S. 1674. PL 89–.

Grand Coulee—Third Powerplant: Authorizes $390,000,000 for Federal construction of a third powerplant at Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River in the State of Washington, which will add 3.6 million kilowatts of generating capacity to the 2 million kilowatts of the two existing plants, making it the largest single hydroelectric development in the world. PL 89–448. (PR)

Great Salt Lake: Authorizes immediate conveyance to Utah of 250,000 acres of Federal land which borders on the Great Salt Lake. PL 89–441. (PR)

Great Salt Lake Relicted Lands Act Amendment: Insures full protection to the contingent interests of the Federal Government in certain lands in the State of Utah relicted from the Great Salt Lake (PL 89–441). PL 89–542. (PR)

Guadalupe: Establishes the Guadalupe Mountains National Park covering some 77,582 acres in Culvertson and Hudspeth Counties, Texas. PL 89–667. (PR)

Hudson River Basin Compact: Directs the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores. PL 89–605. (PR)

Indiana Dunes: Authorizes the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore Recreation Area. S. 360. PL 89–. (PR)

Interior Research Contracts: Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts for scientific and technological research into problems confronting the department. PL 89–672.

Irrigation Project Feasibility Studies: Authorizes the Secretary of Interior to continue feasibility investigations of certain specified water resource proposals now pending and to authorize initiation of new ones. PL 89–561. (PR)

Manson Irrigation Unit, Washington: Authorizes the Department of Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Manson Unit, Chelan Division, Chief Joseph Dam Project, Washington. The estimated cost of $13,344,000 will be repaid within 50 years by the water and power users, with the exception of $150,000 to be used for fish and wildlife purposes. PL 89–557.

Marine Resources and Engineering Development: This bill furthers ocean engineering and exploration, expands marine science and technology, and intensifies development and utilization of ocean, Continental Shelf, and Great Lakes resources. PL 89–454.

Missouri River Basin Project: Increases by $60 million for fiscal years 1967 and 1968 the authorization for appropriations for continuing the work on the Missouri River Basin Project. PL 89–515.

Mount Rogers Recreational Area: Authorizes the establishment of the Mount Rogers National Recreation area in the Jefferson National Forest in Virginia. PL 89–438.

National Water Commission: Establishes a National Water Commission to review and advise on the entire range of water resource problems. S. 3107. Passed Senate 6/9. HR 4671. H. Cal. (PR)

Nuclear Desalting Plant: Authorized the AEC to participate in the construction and operation of a large-scale combination nuclear power desalting project in California. PL 89–648. (PR)

Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore: Establishes the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore in the State of Michigan. PL 89–668.

Point Reyes National Seashore: Increases from $14 million to $19,135,000 the authorization for establishing the Point Reyes National Seashore in California. PL 89–666.

Public Land Leasing: Authorizes the Secretary of Interior to enter into leases for a period of 25 years under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act which will permit States and local units of government to plan and develop Federal lands under lease to them with Federal participation as provided for in the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. PL 89–457.

Public Works Authorization: Authorizes $670 million for rivers and harbors and flood control projects. HR 18233. PL 89–.

Repeal of Railroad Coal Leasing Limitations: Removes an impediment to development on a large scale of the vast coal deposits on the publicly owned lands of the U.S., particularly in the western States, by repealing sec. 2(c) of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, which prevents railroad companies or corporations from obtaining or holding a permit or lease for any coal deposit, except for their own use for railroad purposes. S. 3070. Passed Senate 8/11.

Sleeping Bear Dunes: Authorizes the establishment of Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in the State of Michigan. S. 936. Passed Senate 8/26/65. H. Cal. (PR)

Small Reclamation Projects Act Amendments: Broadens and strengthens the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1950, which is designed to encourage State and local participation in the development and improvement of reclamation projects in their own localities. PL 89–553.

Southern Nevada Project Amendment: Repeals Sec. 6 of PL 89–292 authorizing $81,003,000 for the Federal construction of the southern Nevada water project. Sec. 6, because of being couched in general language, requires the Department of Interior to recognize the intra-state priorities of water rights to the use of water. PL 89–510. (PR)

Taylor Grazing Act: Facilitates the exchange authority of the Department of Interior under the Taylor Grazing Act. S. 3178. Passed Senate 8/29.

Tualatin Federal Reclamation Project, Oregon: Authorizes $22 million, plus increased cost, for the Federal construction of the Tualatin Federal reclamation project in Washington County, Oregon. PL 89–596.

Tva Financing: Increases by $1 billion (from $750 million to $1,750 million) the amount of revenue bonds that may be issued and sold by the Tennessee Valley Authority. PL 89–537. (PR)

Vega Dam and Reservoir: Authorizes the Secretary of Interior to make adjustments interests in land acquired for the Vega Dam and Reservoir, Colorado, through reconveyance of mineral interests to former owners. PL 89–579.

Water Resources Research Act Amendments: Enlarges the scope of the 1964 Water Resources Research Act by authorizing $85 million over a 10-year period in grant, matching and contract funds for assistance to educational institutions in addition to State land-grant colleges, to competent private organizations and individuals, and to local, State, and Federal agencies in undertaking special research in water resource problems. PL 89–404. (PR)

Wildlife Refuge: Authorizes the Secretary of Interior to initiate and carry out a program to conserve, protect, and restore selected species of native fish and wildlife, including game and nongame migratory birds, that are found to be threatened with extinction. PL 89–669. (PR)

Wild Rivers: Establishes a National Wild Rivers System and designates seven rivers to be preserved in their natural condition and provides for study and possible inclusion later of segments of 17 other rivers. Estimated cost is $16,067,000 for the 5-year program. S. 1446. Passed Senate 1/19. (PR)

Vote: Senate passage 71(45D, 26R)—1(1R).

Wolf Trap Farm: Provides for the establishment of the Wolf Trap Farm Park in Fairfax County, Virginia. PL 89–671. (PR)

TAXES AND DUTY

Armed Forces—Tax Treatment: Provides that retired servicemen are to be taxed only on the amount they actually receive as retired pay. The amount of any reduction to provide survivor annuities would be excluded. Estate and gift tax exclusions are also provided. PL 89–365.

Central Filing of Tax Returns: Alters present law specifying the place for filing tax returns in order to promote savings under the automatic data processing system of the Internal Revenue Service. HR 6958. PL 89–.

Copper Tariff Suspension: Suspends the present 1.7 cents per pound duty on unrefined copper (1.7 cents per pound plus 10% in the case of nickel silver waste and scrap) for the period 2/9/66 through 6/30/68. PL 89–468. (PR)

Disclaimers: Amends present law to allow an interest in property which a surviving spouse receives as a result of a disclaimer by a beneficiary under a will to qualify for the estate tax marital deduction where certain conditions are met. PL 89–621.

Estate Tax Deficiencies: Amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that if any part of a deficiency with respect to estate tax liability is due to fraud with intent to evade tax, the penalty to be imposed is 50% of the total amount of the deficiency rather than 50% of the total tax liability. PL 89–359.

Excise Tax on Tires and Tubes: Requires tire and tube manufacturers to pay the excise tax on such products at the time of delivery to manufacturer-owned retailers, conforming the excise tax treatment between manufacturer-owned retailers and independent retailers of tires and tubes. PL 89–523.

Expropriation Recoveries: Provides a new set of rules for the tax treatment to be accorded recoveries of foreign expropriation losses. Generally, the new rules limit the tax on the recovery to the benefit previously received in deducting the loss. PL 89–384.

Federal Tax Lien Act of 1966: Amends the Internal Revenue Act of 1954 relative to the priority of federal tax liens and brings that act more in conformity with the lien provisions of the Uniform Commercial Code. HR 11256. Passed Senate amended 10/13.

Foreign Investors Tax Act of 1966: Revises the tax treatment of nonresident aliens and foreign corporations who invest in the United States. HR 13103. PL 89–. (PR)

Guaranteed debt obligations: Permits a taxpayer who is a dealer in property to take an income tax deduction for reasonable additions to a reserve for bad debts which arise from his contingent liability as a guarantor, endorser, or indemnitor of debt obligations arising out of a sale by him of real property or tangible personal property in the ordinary course of the dealer's business. H.R. 11782. PL 89–

Income tax treatment—mining exploration: Allows an increased deduction for mining exploration expenses. PL 89–570..

Investment credit: Suspends the investment credit and allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property. Effective date October 10, 1966. H.R. 17607. PL 89– (PR)

Tax adjustment act: Increases revenues in 1966 and 1967 by approximately $6 billion to help finance the war in Vietnam; extends Social Security coverage ($35 minimum) to all who are or reach 72 by 1968 and are not receiving railroad retirement, Federal, State or local pensions; increases excise tax on automobiles to 7 percent and telephone service to 10 percent through March 31, 1968; increases withholding and accelerates corporate tax payments. PL 89–368. (PR)

Vote: Senate passage 79(55D, 24R)—9(5D, 4R). Conference report 72(49D, 23R)—5(1D, 4R).

Tax court: Liberalizes the computation of benefits for retired judges of the Tax Court by basing their pension on the salary of the "office" rather than actual salary at the time of retirement, thereby permitting pay raises to be passed on to retired judges. PL 89–354.

Tax Exempt. Savings Institutions: Provides income tax exemption for certain nonprofit organizations operated to provide reserve funds for savings and loan associations, and subjects them to unrelated business income tax. PL 89–352.

Tax Refunds—Interest: Provides that no interest is to be paid on refunds on overpayments of income tax if the refund is made within 45 days after the date the return is actually filed; and extends to taxpayers with an investment credit carryback the quick refund procedure presently available to taxpayers with a net operating loss carryback. H.R. 11660. PL 89–

Undistributed taxable income: Provides that undistributed taxable income made within 2½ months after close of taxable year to shareholders of certain small business corporations shall be considered to have been made before the close of the taxable year. PL 89–389.

Vacation pay: Permits accrued vacation pay to continue to be deducted until January 1, 1969, regardless of whether liability to a specific person for the pay has been established or whether the amount of liability to each individual can be computed with reasonable accuracy. PL 89–692.

DUTIES

Bauxite: Continues until July 15, 1968 the suspension of duty on certain alumina and bauxite. PL 89–440.

Chicory: Extends until June 30, 1969 the suspension of duty on crude chicory and the reduction in ground chicory. PL 89–439.

Copra: Makes permanent the duty-free treatment or lower rates of duty temporarily applicable to copra, palm nuts, and palm nut kernels, their oils, and specified fatty acids, salts, and other chemical products derived from the oils. PL 89–388.

Corkboard: Makes permanent the existing duty-free treatment for certain corkboard insulation. PL 89–431.

Electrodes: Extends until July 15, 1968 the suspension of duty on electrodes imported for use in producing aluminum. PL 89–434.

Graphite: Makes permanent the existing suspension of duty on certain natural graphite. PL 89–433.

Heptanoic Acid: Continues until 8/8/69 the existing suspension of duty on heptanoic acid. PL 89–432.

Household Effects: Makes permanent the existing duty-free treatment of personal and household effects brought into the U.S. under Government orders. PL 89–436.

Istle: Continues until 9/5/69 the existing duty suspension on processed istle fiber. PL 89–575.

Shoe Lathes: Continues until the close of June 30, 1969, the existing suspension of duty on certain copying shoe lathes. PL 89–437.

Tanning Extracts: Continues until September 30, 1969 the period during which certain extracts suitable for tanning may be imported duty free. PL 89–573.

Tariff Treatment of Certain Articles: Simplifies the requirements of the Tariff Schedules for qualifying imported articles for partial exemption from duty to the extent of the value of any U.S. components that have been assembled abroad. H.R. 11216. PL 89–

Tropical Hardwoods: Suspends the duty on tropical hardwoods until 1/1/68. PL 89–392.

Watches from Insular Possessions: Amends the Tariff Schedules with regard to the dutiable status of watches, clocks, and timing apparatus from insular possessions of the U.S. H.R. 8436. Passed Senate amended 10/11.

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS

Airlines Safeguard: Safeguards U.S. airlines against discriminatory acts of foreign air carriers. S. 3198. Passed Senate 8/29.

Authorization increase for airports: Increases the level of authorization from $2. million to $3.5 million for the purpose of developing or participating in the development of airports in or in close proximity to national parks, national monuments and national recreation areas. S. 476. PL 89–

Auto Safety: Provides for a coordinated national safety program and establishes safety standards for motor vehicles, highways, and tires. PL 89–563. (PR)

Vote: Senate passage 76 (52D, 24R)—0.

Bus Charter Service: Amends the Interstate Commerce Act to provide that future applicants for motor common carrier passenger certificates will be required to seek rights to engage in charter service and show a public need for such service. S. 2893. PL 89–.

Coast Guard—Navigation Services: Expands the authority of the Coast Guard with respect to the establishment of aids to navigation beyond the territorial limits of the U.S. and permits the Coast Guard to establish and operate various electronic aids to navigation. PL 89–562.

Compact Between Missouri and Kansas: Grants Congressional consent to a compact between the States of Missouri and Kansas creating the Kansas City Area Transportation Authority. PL 89–599.

Connally Hot Oil Act: Amends the Connally Hot Oil Act to permit any State to ship in interstate commerce oil which it has acquired through confiscation or otherwise because of violation of its laws. PL 89–644.

Construction Differential Subsidies: Extends for 2 years the present authority of the Secretary of Commerce to make construction differential subsidy payments of a maximum of 55% on new merchant vessel construction. PL 89–589.

Department of Transportation: Establishes a new Department of Transportation as a Cabinet-level agency to which are transferred the major transportation agencies and functions of the Federal Government. PL 89–670. (PR)

Vote: Senate passage 64 (48D, 16R)—2 (1D, 1R)

Federal Aid Highway Act: Authorizes $19.7 billion in Federal highway grants to the States over the next 5 years. PL 89–574. (PR)

Vote: Senate passage 85 (57D, 28R)—0.

Federal Airport Act: Extends the Federal aid to airports program an additional 3 years, expiring 6/30/70, at the existing $75 million annual level of authorization. PL 89–647. (PR)

Fire Companies: Authorizes special postage rates for volunteer fire companies. S. 390. PL 89–.

Foreign Air Carriers: Amends the Federal Aviation Act to authorize CAB to exempt one or more carriers from the provisions of sec. 401. S. 3197. Passed Senate 8/19.

Freight Car Shortage: Expands the present powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission to set daily rental rates paid by one railroad to another for the use of freight cars moving across the country, and includes considerations of the national freight car supply as a basis for setting rates. PL 89–430. (PR)

Government Inspections: Provides for inspections and quarantine service at ports and airports of entry without reimbursement of owners of the transportation facilities. S. 1956. Passed Senate 8/19.

Highway Safety: Authorizes a 3-year, $322 million national highway safety program. PL 89–564. (PR)

Obscene Telephoning: Makes it a federal offense to make obscene or harassing telephone calls in interstate or foreign commerce or within the District of Columbia. S. 2825. Passed Senate 6/29.

Parcel Post: This bill increases the rates and revises the size and weight limitations on parcel post packages. PL 89–593. (PR)

Pet Theft Bill: Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs and cats intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation. PL 89–544. (PR)

Pipeline Thefts: Makes it a criminal offense to steal or embezzle property from a pipeline. PL 89–654.

Pollution of Sea by Oil: Implements the provisions of the International Convention for the Prevention of the Pollution of the Sea by Oil. PL 89–551.

Radio Frequencies—Harmful Interference: Provides the Federal Communications Commission with adequate authority to deal with increasingly acute interference problems arising from expanded usage of electrical and electronic devices which cause, or are capable of causing, harmful interference to radio reception. S. 1015. Passed Senate 6/2.

Safety of Life at Sea: Requires evidence of adequate financial responsibility to pay judgments for personal injury or death or to repay fares in the event of non-performance of voyages, to establish minimum standards for passenger vessels and to require disclosure of construction details on passenger vessels. HR 10327. PL 89–.

Ship Mortgage Act Amendments: Amends the Ship Mortgage Act of 1920 to reduce the cost of obtaining certified copies of mortgages to owners of non-self-propelled vessels and to eliminate the requirement for retaining those copies on the vessels. PL 89–582.

Small Vessels: Simplifies the admeasurement of small vessels. P.L. 89–476.

Standard Container Acts: Repeals the Standard Container Acts of 1916 and 1928 which prescribe standard sizes and capacities for certain types of baskets and hampers used in the shipment of fresh fruits and vegetables. S. 17. Passed Senate 9/1.

Transportation to Airports: Authorizes Federal Aviation Agency to make a comprehensive study of high-speed ground transportation to Dulles, Washington and Friendship airports. S. 3523. Passed Senate 7/20.

Urban Mass Transit: Extends the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 through fiscal 1969; retains the existing grant authorization of $150 million for each fiscal year; requires research to develop new systems and provides two-thirds grants for planning, engineering, and designing. PL 89–562. (PR)

Vote: Senate passage 65 (48D, 17R)—18 (4D, 14R)

War Risk Insurance: Extends war risk insurance authority until September 7, 1970, which permits the Secretary of Commerce to provide war risk insurance for the protection of aircraft and persons together with other liabilities pertaining to aircraft when commercial insurance cannot be obtained on reasonable terms and conditions. PL 89-447.

Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority: Grants the consent of Congress for the States of Virginia, Maryland, and D.C. to amend the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Regulation Compact to establish an organization empowered to provide transit facilities in the National Capital region. See 3488. PL 89—. (PR)

TREATIES (PR)

Settlement of Investment Disputes. Vote: 72 (44D, 28R)—0. Exec. A: Ratified 5/16.

Supplementary income-tax convention with Netherlands. Vote: 83 (55D, 28R)—0. Exec. B: Ratified 6/21.

Supplementary tax protocol with the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland. Vote: 83 (55D, 28R)—0. Exec. C: Ratified 6/21.

Protocol to Mexican broadcasting agreement extending its provisions to December 31, 1967. Vote: 85 (55D, 28R)—0. Exec. D: Ratified 6/21.

Amendments to the Convention of the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization. Vote: 83 (55D, 28R)—0. Exec. H: Ratified 6/21.

Protocols to the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Convention. Vote: 87 (56D, 31R)—0. Exec. I: Ratified 7/19.

Protocol extending International Wheat Agreement to 7/31/67. Vote: 89 (58D, 31R)—0. Exec. F: Ratified 7/14.

Treaty of Amity and Economic Relations with Togo. Vote: 64 (43D, 21R)—0. Exec. E: Ratified 9/28.

International Convention on Load Lines. Vote: 76 (56D, 20R)—0. Exec. S: Ratified 10/13.

VETERANS

American Legion: Amends the American Legion charter to enable veterans serving in Vietnam to become eligible for membership. PL 89-550. (PR)

Amvets: Amends the charter of the American Veterans of World War II, to admit the cold war veterans to membership in Amvets. PL 89-576.

Burial allowances: Extends the statutory burial allowance to certain veterans whose deaths occur as a result of a service-connected disability. PL 89-360.

Disabled veterans—cars: Authorizes the VA to make grants toward the purchase of a car for certain veterans of the cold war who suffer serious service-connected disabilities. S. 1199. Passed Senate 6/9.

Disappeared Veteran: Provides that where a veteran receiving a pension disappears, the VA may pay his pension to his wife and children. PL 89-467.

Hospitalization: Restricts the conditions under which benefits are immediately reduced upon readmission of veterans for hospitalization or other institutional care. PL 89-362.

Hospital and Nursing Care in Alaska and Hawaii: Broadens the definition of the term "Veterans' Administration facilities" to include private contract facilities for war veterans in a State which is not contiguous to the 48 contiguous States (Alaska and Hawaii). S. 562. Passed Senate 6/8.

NSLI—Philippine Peso Payments: Provides for the refund of erroneous deduction for national service life insurance premiums from the pay of former members of the organized military forces of the Philippines, and provides the certain dependency payments be paid at the rate of 2 Philippine pesos for each dollar authorized. PL 89-641.

Philippine Hospitalization and Medical Care: Provides for extension and expansion of the program of grants-in-aid to the Republic of the Philippines for the hospitalization of certain veterans. PL 89-612. (PR)

Service Connected: Liberalizes dependency and indemnity compensation (DIC) to the surviving parents and children of a veteran who died as a result of service-connected causes by increasing the monthly dependency and indemnity compensation rates and the applicable annual income limitation provisions, and provides for certain exclusions from the computation of annual income in the case of dependent parents. HR 14347. Passed Senate amended 6/27.

Travel Expenses: Authorizes the payment of actual necessary travel expenses, or a mileage allowance in lieu thereof, to any person, to or from a Veterans' Administration facility or other place, in connection with vocational rehabilitation, counselling required pursuant to the war orphans educational assistance program, as well as for the purpose of treatment, examination, or care. PL 89-455.

Vietnam Readjustment Act: Provides additional benefits to veterans who have served in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam era, comparable to benefits now provided by Congress for veterans of World Wars I and II and the Korean conflict. S. 3580. PL 89–.

War Orphans' Educational Program: Extends the benefits of the War Orphans' Educational Assistance program to the children of those veterans of the Philippines Commonwealth Army who died or have become permanently and totally disabled by reason of their service during World War II. PL 89-613. (PR)

Widows: Allows the widow of a veteran, who died from a service-connected disability, left to care for eight or more children the same benefits that the children of a widow left in similar circumstances would receive under the pension program. PL 89-466.

Widow's Compensation: Liberalizes the requirements used in computing the compensation paid to the widow of a veteran. PL 89-622.

HEW "GUIDELINES" AND COMMISSIONER HOWE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a tough job needs a man of tough fiber. One of the toughest and most sensitive jobs in Washington today is the office of U.S. Commissioner of Education. Harold Howe fills this position with abundant fitness and great dedication.

When President Johnson chose Harold Howe to succeed Francis Keppel earlier this year, he picked a man eminently qualified to carry forward our Nation's vital and expanding education programs—a man whose youth and vigor belie an outstanding record of long service to the cause of better education. His quick grasp and willing advance of new and progressive ideas for improving the educational opportunities of American youth assure this country's educational superiority for years to come.

During the past several weeks, discussion of HEW "guidelines" for carrying out the mandate of the 1964 Civil Rights Act has turned, in some quarters, into a personal attack upon the character, allegiance, and integrity of Mr. Howe. Fortunately, Commissioner Howe is able to withstand these extreme attacks with no effect upon his performance.

I do not speak as an apologist for Harold Howe. I believe he requires no defense, no more, certainly, than that required of any other official of this Government saddled with the responsibility of implementing the law of the land. If his job is unique, the difference is in the nature of the problem—one permitted to linger unchecked for so long in our society.

Congress has enacted legislation to end the segregation by race in all public facilities. The law also places an additional task on the Commissioner of Education under title VI of the 1964 act. Commissioner Howe has attempted to carry out this added responsibility. It is obvious that his goal is nothing more than that stated by the Congress as the policy of the country. He is presently studying a proposal which would refer the responsibility for insuring the implementation of these guidelines to the States. But whether the State departments of education carry out the job or it is done in his office is of little significance to Commissioner Howe. His only concern is to get the job done properly. Neither he nor his office has designs upon the responsibilities of State departments of education or local school boards. His only purpose is to prevent the circumvention of the law over which Congress has made him responsible.

Harold Howe is not unaccustomed to conflict. His years as skipper of a Navy minesweeper speak abundantly for his courage and his unflinching willingness to face crises. This same spirit has been subjected recently to a test as severe as any witnessed in Washington in a long, long time. He is challenged first by those who would want to revert to or indeed even to decrease the slow pace of school desegregation following the 1954 Brown decision in the Supreme Court. Congress already has responded to that inadequate rate of speed by the 1964 act. In addition, Mr. Howe is challenged by those who advocate integration as an end in itself—to be accomplished arbitrarily and immediately, however great may be the disadvantage to the pupil. They would disagree that the primary purpose of our educational system is in providing the best education for every child.

Faced with these challenges, Harold Howe's unbending resolution to carry out the law, which Congress overwhelmingly passed, speaks best for his integrity and answers best the scorn of his self-appointed judges.

To Harold Howe my hope that from this encounter you find encouragement to achieve a solution reasonably and peaceably at this critical moment in our history.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish the Record to show that I associate myself with the remarks of the majority leader in regard to Commissioner Howe.

There is no question about Mr. Howe's integrity, and there can be no question about his carrying out the duties as he is satisfied the law dictates that he carry them out.

As I said the other day on the floor of the Senate, when we were dealing with one section of the education bill, he has acted, in regard to the so-called deferments and guidelines, under the legal instructions of the Department of Justice.

Mr. President, although there are grounds for the criticism of administrative policies of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the field of education, those criticisms bear not at all upon the character, integrity, and dedication to public service of Commissioner Howe, of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Dr. Gardner, of Dr. Halperin, or of their associates.

However, if the majority leader will permit me to make this brief comment, I think we have had considerable evidence this year that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare needs to reappraise its procedures for handling the projects that are coming in from the States, and that the Department needs to see to it that they streamline their procedures so that fewer decisions will be made at the Washington, D.C., level; because they are leaving themselves open to the criticism that they are seeking to determine policy in Washington which should be determined by State departments of education and local school districts in the States. That is why I was heard to say the other day, when I was handling the bill, that, as manager of these bills, I have pledged to the Senate and to the country that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will not be allowed to determine educational policy.

We can have our honest differences of opinion with Commissioner Howe and with Secretary Gardner, and many members of the committee do; and we have given them notice that, come January, we intend to survey their procedures and their administrative practices in order to make certain that the growing criticisms about their determining educational policy at the Washington, D.C., level, which should be determined by the local authorities, will have no basis in fact.

But let me join the majority leader by saying that I have a duty and my committee has a duty to disagree with Mr. Howe and Secretary Gardner on this issue of policymaking, but our disagreements do not in any way reflect any lack of confidence that we have in their ability, any lack of confidence we have in their integrity, or any lack of confidence we have in their dedication to public service.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would not disagree with what has just been said by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is "Mr. Education himself."

But I would point out that the Education Commissioner indicated that he is studying decentralization so that States can take over more. That is a step in the right direction. I do not think that a man who has carried out the law of the land, whether a given person likes it or not, should be subjected to the kind of abuse that this man has in the Congress. Hence my rising at this time.

I know Mr. Howe slightly. He appeared before the Subcommittee on Appropriations on which I serve. I watched him there. I have an idea of the difficulty under which he is working, and I believe he is trying to do the best that he can on the basis of a law which he has been asked to administer, and to do it in a reasonable and decent way.

I must say that I am delighted with his suggestion that he is seriously considering placing more responsibility on the State level and bringing about less responsibility in Washington.

Mr. MORSE. I agree with the statement of the majority leader. I did not want any impression left not intended by the Senator from Montana, I know, but which might be interpreted by the readers of the RECORD, that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, in connection with certain policies in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, reflected in any way any personal criticism of mine against either Secretary Gardner or Commissioner Howe.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not at all.

Mr. MORSE. I backed them to the limit on the matter of guidelines because I am the author of the proposal, and it is the law of the land in the civil rights bill that provided for the denial of Federal funds to any Federal project in which it was found that the State group was in violation of Federal policy. I have backed them in regard to that. My difference with them is with regard to administrative policy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And a justifiable and worthwhile difference. I hope that the Senator from Oregon, who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Education will continue his excellent surveillance.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MONRONEY, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Nine postmaster nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. Robert George MacDonnell to be a member and president of the Mississippi River Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY SAFETY AGENCY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William Haddon, Jr., of New York, to be Administrator, National Highway Safety Agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rutherford M. Poats, of Virginia, to the Deputy Administrator, Agency for International Development.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have been asked that this nomination go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be passed over.

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Emmett J. Rice, of New York, to be U.S. Alternate Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Samuel De Palma, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be an Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the nomination of Robert G. Neumann, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Afghanistan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNESCO REPRESENTATIVES

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for UNESCO representatives.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there are a number of other nominations at the desk. I ask that they be called up at this time.

ROUTINE NOMINATIONS OF POSTMASTERS AT THE DESK

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry routine nominations for postmasters at the desk, reported favorably earlier today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc. I do so at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, are there any other nominations at the desk?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is only the nomination of Mr. Poats.

Mr. MANSFIELD. He will be held over.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield in connection with the nominations?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. It is my understanding that the Senate has already confirmed the nomination of certain State Department nominees, including Robert G. Neumann, of California.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show that I heartily support those nominations. I was not here when they were passed upon, and I would like to have the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. FULBRIGHT] as I make this statement.

We had a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations in regard to these very late nominations sent over to us by the Department of State. We approved of the nominations. But we disapproved of the procedure followed by the State Department. Our committee served notice on the State Department that they are not going to get such approval again, no matter who is involved, in a dying session of the Congress.

The State Department waited until the last minute to send over nominations. They violated the 6-day rule, of which the State Department is well aware. They know that there is a rule that nominations have to be presented 6 days in advance of action. They open themselves to suspicion by this procedural course of action.

If this were the exceptional case it would be different, but sad as it is, this is the normal practice of the Secretary of State.

It is about time that this Secretary of State knows, and I give him notice now, that he has put through the Senate the last nomination in violation of the 6-day rule. Just let him try it again.

Also, I want to say to the Secretary of State that he had better do something about improving the liaison relationship between the Department of State and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate because I am one Senator on the Committee on Foreign Relations who does not hesitate to tell him what I think about the course of action. Their liaison is "lousy" and that is not a polite term, but a very descriptive term.

It is about time that this Secretary of State recognizes that the Senate, under the advise and consent clause of the Constitution, has an effective check on any executive branch of government. The senior Senator from Oregon has waived that rule and many other rules for the benefit of the State Department for the last time.

We are going to abide, Mr. Rusk, by the rules henceforth.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that a committee of two Members had been appointed by the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed their business of the session and are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 1048. Concurrent resolution providing for adjournment sine die; and

H. Con. Res. 1049. Concurrent resolution providing that during the sine die adjournment the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate be authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions.

The message further announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1322) fixing the time of assembly of the 90th Congress, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 1674. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make disposition of geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources, and for other purposes;

S. 2010. An act for the relief of Fun Wat Hoy;

S. 2040. An act for the relief of Dr. Dean H. Gosselin;

S. 2109. An act for the relief of Dr. Olibio S. Rodriguez-Eiras;

S. 2222. An act for the relief of Susan Jeanne Clynes;

S. 2491. An act for the relief of Dr. Juan Federico Antonio Lamas y Parra;

S. 2750. An act for the relief of You I. Souk;

S. 2798. An act for the relief of CWO Glen Zeigler, U.S. Navy (retired);

S. 3209. An act for the relief of Zofia Zych;

S. 3222. An act for the relief of Dusko Doder;

S. 3254. An act to amend section 2072 and 2112 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the scope of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and to repeal inconsistent legislation;

S. 3318. An act for the relief of Yung Mi Kim;

S. 3466. An act to change the name of the Rolla Jewel Bearing Plant at Rolla, N. Dak., to the William Langer Jewel Bearing Plant; and

S. J. Res. 133. Joint resolution designating February 1967 as American History Month;

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION—ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 116) establishing that when the two Houses of Congress adjourn on Saturday, October 22, 1966, they stand adjourned sine die, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT CONCERNING THE PROPOSED ADJOURNMENT OF THE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 318) appointing a committee to notify the President concerning the proposed adjournment of the session, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under a separate heading.)

AUTHORIZATION FOR PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE TO MAKE CERTAIN APPOINTMENTS AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KUCHEL submitted a resolution (S. Res. 319) authorizing the President of the Senate to make certain appointments after the sine die adjournment of the present session, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. KUCHEL, which appears under a separate heading.)

THANKS OF THE SENATE TO THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR HIS PRESIDING OVER THE DELIBERATIONS OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 320) tendering the thanks of the Senate to the Vice President for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner in which he has presided over the deliberations of the Senate, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under a separate heading.)

THANKS TO THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE FOR HIS PRESIDING OVER THE DELIBERATIONS OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 321) tendering the thanks of the Senate to the President pro tempore for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner in which he has presided over the deliberations of the Senate, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under a separate heading.)

THANKS TO THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE FOR HIS PRESIDING OVER THE DELIBERATIONS OF THE SENATE

Mr. KUCHEL submitted a resolution (S. Res. 322) tendering the thanks of the Senate to the Acting President pro tempore for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner in which he has presided over the deliberations of the Senate, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. KUCHEL, which appears under a separate heading.)

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of October 14, 1966:

S. 3913. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to facilitate the construction of nursing homes, the establishment of home health agencies, and the expansion of training, education, and research designed to meet the personnel needs for geriatric long-term care services: Mr. MCGOVERN.

Authority of October 18, 1966:

S. 3919. A bill to establish a Federal Motor Vehicle Insurance Guaranty Corporation, and for other purposes: Mr. MAGNUSON.

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY AND COMMITTEE ON AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE SCIENCES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter from the Honorable ALLEN ELLENDER, chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, together with a list of his committee's activity; and a summary of the activities of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Both committees have a splendid record and I commend them.

There being no objection, the letter, list, and summary were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,
October 15, 1966.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: During the second session of the 89th Congress the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry reported seventeen bills as shown on the attached list.

Twenty-nine days of hearings have been held in connection with these and other bills studied by the Committee. We considered and reported three nominations and approved 37 watershed projects with ten pending October 15. These will likely be approved before adjournment.

A few other pending bills may be reported and approved before adjournment.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman.

LIST OF MEASURES FAVORABLY REPORTED TO THE SENATE BY THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY, 89TH CONGRESS, 2ND SESSION

SENATE BILLS, CONCURRENT AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

S. 688. Authorizes additional means and measures for land conservation and utilization. Passed Senate Oct. 7, 1966.

S. 902. Authorizes Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with states and other public agencies in planning for changes in use of agricultural land—urban and other nonagricultural use areas. Approved Sept. 7, 1966 (P.L. 89–560).

S. 2264. Permits Secretary of Agriculture to accept a cash equalization of exchanges for lands under his jurisdiction. Referred to House Committee on Agriculture May 24, 1966.

S. 2822. To improve operations of laws administered by the Farm Credit Administration and to improve operations thereunder. Approved August 2, 1966 (P.L. 89–525).

S. 2934. To provide for community development districts to achieve equality of opportunity for residents of rural America. Reported to House June 25, 1966.

S. 3325. To authorize a cooperative screwworm eradication program in Mexico. Reported to Senate June 28, 1966 (See H.R. 14888 which was approved July 27, 1966) (P.L. 89–521).

S. 3421. Authorizes Secretary to convey certain lands and improvements to the University of Alaska. Approved Oct. 4, 1966 (P.L. 89–620).

S. 3467. To expand and strengthen food service programs for children. (School lunch programs). Approved Oct. 11, 1966 (P.L. 89–642).

S.J. Res. 149. India Relief Act. Reported to Senate and H.J. Res. 997 passed in lieu thereof. Approved April 19, 1966 (P.L. 89–406).

S. Con. Res. 88. Relative to parity prices for agricultural commodities. Referred to House Committee on Agriculture June 20, 1966.

S.J. Res. 178. Deletes interest rate limitation on debentures issued by Federal Intermediate Credit Banks. Approved Sept. 20, 1966 (P.L. 89–595).

HOUSE BILLS

H.R. 10366. Establishes Mount Rogers National Recreation area in the Jefferson National Forest in Virginia. Approved May 31, 1966 (P.L. 89–438).

H.R. 12322. Provides for a program of research and promotion to improve competitive position of cotton growers and enabling them to finance and carry out the program. Approved July 13, 1966 (P.L. 89–502).

H.R. 15124. Extends time for filing tobacco acreage allotment leases until July 31, of each year. Approved June 24, 1966 (P.L. 89–471).

H.R. 14929. Food for Peace Act of 1966. P.L. 89–

H.R. 15510. Authorizes Secretary of Agriculture to hold prepayments by insured loan borrowers for transmission to holder of note in installments as they become due. Approved Oct. 8, 1966 (P.L. 89–633).

H.R. 15662. To modernize the Federal Seed Act. House agreed to Senate amendments Oct. 5, 1966.

SUMMARY OF THE ACTIVITIES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE SCIENCES DURING 1966

The Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee during 1966 has continued its oversight of our national aeronautics and space programs. Beginning early in January, it held hearings to review the status of our national communications satellite programs. On January 25 and 26, it received testimony from Mr. James McCormack, Chairman of the Board, and Dr. Joseph Charyk, President, Comsat Corporation, Mr. James O'Connell, Director of Telecommunications Management, Executive Office of the President, Lt. General Alfred D. Starbird, Director, Defense Communications Agency, Department of Defense, and Mr. Earl Hilburn, Deputy Associate Administrator of NASA.

NASA's budget request for $5,012 million was submitted early in January and included in S. 2909 which was introduced by the Chairman (Senator ANDERSON) for himself and the Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH) on February 9, 1966. After a thorough and detailed analysis of NASA's budget by the staff, open hearings were held on February 28, March 1, 2, and 3, during which time Administrator James E. Webb, Dr. Robert Seamans, Deputy Administrator, and other NASA officials testified in connection with such budget request. On March 4, 1966, a classified hearing was held on the military space program. Testimony taken in connection with NASA's FY 1967 request was published in a volume which covered NASA's scientific and technological programs and program management; its program budget detail and a declassified discussion of the military space program. After several days of executive meetings to mark-up the bill, the Committee reported its recommendations as an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, to H.R. 14324. In acting on the House approved bill of $4,986,874,150, the Senate Committee recommended a total of $5,008,000,000. The Committees met in conference during the months of June and July and on July 19, 1966, agreed to an authorization totaling $5,000,419,000. NASA's appropriations for FY 1967 are contained in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act which subsequently appropriated a total of $4,968,000,000.

The Committee also held hearings on January 28 on the nomination of Dr. Robert C. Seamans who was appointed as Deputy Administrator of NASA upon the death of Dr. Hugh L. Dryden. The Committee subsequently reported favorably Dr. Seamans' nomination to the Senate.

The Committee also continued its interest in other aspects of our national space program. On February 24, the Committee met in classified session to hear testimony from the Department of Defense on the Manned Orbiting Laboratory. The Committee heard testimony from Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., Director, Defense Research and Engineering, Department of Defense, Dr. Alexander H. Flax, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Research and Development) and from Dr. Robert Seamans, Jr., Deputy Administrator, NASA. This hearing was subsequently published in declassified form.

The Committee also continued its interest in the international aspects of space and published a staff report in July of 1966 on space treaty proposals by the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.

The Committee, pursuant to S. Res. 260, published a staff report, Doc. No. 90, "Policy Planning for Aeronautical Research and Development." This comprehensive document surveyed the relationships of civil aviation to national transportation systems and policies, relationships between the Federal Government, industry, and the universities, and research and development necessary to advance this technology. The report was prepared by the Science Policy Research Division of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress in conjunction with the Committee's staff.

Continuing its deep interest in areonautical research and development, the Committee has also announced that it is planning hearings on the nation's research and development efforts in aeronautics as the first order of business during the Calendar Year 1967.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEW, AND HIGHER EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1966—STATEMENT BY SENATOR COOPER

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, our esteemed friend from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] is unavoidably absent, and he desires the Record to show his full approval of the Labor-HEW appropriations bill conference report and of the Higher Education Amendments of 1966.

I am very glad to comply with his request to include his statement on these bills in the Record, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement prepared by the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky be printed at this point in the proceedings today.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Cooper

I have been traveling in Kentucky, and I want the record to show my support of the appropriations bill providing funds for programs of the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

It has been my privilege to give testimony before the Appropriations Committee on budget items and on other requests, and I am very glad that the conference has agreed to maintain funds for projects and programs that are important to the people of my own home state, and to the whole nation.

I served in earlier Congresses for five years on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, and I have also spoken for the programs under these departments during the annual hearings before the Senate Appropriations Committee.

These programs affect nearly every person in the nation, and I very much appreciate the consideration that has been given to them, and to the need for their continuation.

I am glad to support the passage of the Conference Report, and I was glad to give my support to the bill to extend for three years the Higher Education Act and the Higher Education Facilities Act.

As one who spoke and voted for the Higher Education Act of 1965, I am very glad that the authorizations under this Act will be extended, and that the program of aiding smaller colleges through cooperative projects with larger universities has received such good atttention.

As one who also was a sponsor of the original National Defense Education Act, I know the great concern among students throughout Kentucky this year about the Administration proposal to phase out the NDEA program.

I am particularly glad that the Senate bill has extended the authority which I supported in the Higher Education Act of 1965, and that the Conferees have agreed to provide two hundred twenty million dollars for this student loan program in the current fiscal year.

These bills mean much to our youth and to education in this nation, and it has been my view that their enactment should be completed before the adjournment of the Congress. I am glad this has now been done.

THE URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1966

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, some confusion has apparently arisen among those charged with administering the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 as to the effect of certain technical changes made in that act by the 1966 amendments which were signed into law by President Johnson on September 8, 1966. As a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency and floor manager of these amendments to the act, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a memorandum further clarifying certain technical changes made in the labor protective provisions of the act.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Explanation of the Technical Changes Made by the Urban Mass Transportation Act Amendments of 1966 (Public Law 89–562) in the Labor Protection Provisions of the Act

On September 8, 1966, President Johnson signed into law amendments to the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 which extended the authorization provided by the Act through fiscal year 1969, and added several new programs, including grants for technical studies managerial training programs, research and training and for study and preparation of a "program of research, development, and demonstration of new systems of urban transportation." A number of technical amendments were also made in the Act, including the re-numbering of Sec. 10(c) as Sec. 13(c), and revising of the phrase "under this Act" used in the new Sec. 13(c) to read "under Sec. 3 of this Act."

It has been suggested that the effect of this last change may be to narrow the scope of the employee protective provisions so that they would no longer apply to demonstration projects undertaken pursuant to Sec. 6 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act, such as the operating experiments, inaugurating new bus service in the Watts area of Los Angeles, California, and between major medical centers in Nashville-Davidson County, Tennessee, referred to in the Committee reports. Prior to the 1966 amendments, suitable employee protective arrangements were attached to both of these projects, in accordance with the labor requirements of the 1964 Act.

The following analysis is submitted to establish that nothing in the 1966 amendments was intended to obviate the necessity for similar employee protection arrangements in connection with any future operating demonstration projects under Sec. 6, as shown by the language and logic of the statute as a whole.

Sec. 10(c) of the original Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 required, as a condition of "any assistance under this Act" that fair and equitable arrangements be made, "as determined by the Secretary of Labor," to protect the rights and interests of affected employees. Sec. 10(c) further required that the contract of assistance specify the terms and conditions of the particular protective arrangements.

Although the Secretary of Labor was given the authority and responsibility to determine what terms and conditions are necessary to provide this protection to employees, exclusive authority to determine whether assistance under the Act should actually be provided was lodged by other provisions of the Act with the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency (and more recently, with the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development). Accordingly, to assure proper implementation of the employee protective provisions in Sec. 10(c) (now section 13(c)), the Administrator's authority to award financial assistance was specifically limited by a prohibition included in Sec. 3(c) of the original and amended Act which states that "no financial assistance shall be provided under this Act" for the purchase, construction or "operation of mass transportation facilities or equipment" unless, among other conditions, "(4) the Secretary of Labor certifies that such assistance complies with the requirements of Sec. 13(c) of this Act." The effect of this condition is that before the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may approve any financial assistance under the Act, the Secretary of Labor must certify that the requirements of the labor protection provisions, included in Sec. 13(c) of the Act, are complied with. In other words, "fair and equitable arrangements" must be made, as determined by the Secretary of Labor, to provide such protection, and the contract for assistance must specify "the terms and conditions of the protective arrangements." Without such a certification the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development is powerless to award such assistance.

Sec. 3(c) applies broadly to all of the various types of financial assistance authorized by the Urban Mass Transportation Act. This is clear from the language used in this Section, which specifies that "no financial assistance shall be provided under this Act to any state or local public body or agency thereof for the purpose of, directly or indirectly" acquiring any facilities or property of a private mass transportation company, constructing, re-constructing or improving any facilities acquired from any such company, "or for the purpose of providing by contract or otherwise for the operation of mass transportation facilities or equipment in competition with or supplemental to, the service provided by an existing mass transportation company," unless certain conditions are met, including the certification of the Secretary of Labor required by clause (4), to assure compliance with the labor protection provisions.

There can be no doubt that the language in Sec. 3(c) is specifically applicable to demonstration grant projects undertaken under Sec. 6 of the Act because the *only* operating projects authorized by the Act, as a whole, which provide by contract or otherwise "for the operation of mass transportation facilities or equipment" are those undertaken pursuant to the demonstration grant authority contained in Sec. 6 of the Act.

Thus, a demonstration project making provision "by contract or otherwise for the operation of mass transportation facilities or equipment in competition with, or supplementary to, the service provided by an existing mass transportation company" is subject to the same terms and conditions as would be applicable to a project for a capital grant or loan under Sec. 3(a) of the Act, as amended. Moreover, as shown by the purposes of the Act stated in Sec. 2(b)(2) and (3) of the Act, and by the definition of "mass transportation" contained in the renumbered Sec. 12(d)(5), the term "mass transportation company" used in Sec. 3(c) refers without distinction both to public and private operations. Accordingly, the labor provisions as revised by the 1966 amendments continue to apply, as before, to all demonstration projects such as the Watts and Nashville projects. The Watts project involves supplementary services provided by a public operation which, to some extent, is competitive with other existing systems, both public and private, while the Nashville experiment is for supplementary service to be provided by a private operator in a non-competitive situation. Both projects would continue to be covered by the revised language in Sec. 13(c) when properly read in conjunction with the language contained in Sec. 3(c).

It can, therefore, be seen, in the context of the entire statute, that the added language in the new Sec. 13(c) stating that it shall be a condition of any assistance *"under Sec. 3 of"* the Act, was designed merely to clarify that employee protection arrangements are not required in relation to the non-operating progams undetaken by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. Thus, there is plainly no occasion for application of the labor protection provisions specified in Sec. 3(c) and 13(c) of the Act with respect to the new programs authorized by the 1966 amendments for technical studies under re-designated Sec. 9, managerial training fellowships under renumbered Sec. 10 and similarly, with respect to grants for research and training in urban transportation problems under the new Sec. 11.

The same is true as regards non-operational demonstration projects undertaken pursuant to Sec. 6 of the amended Act. This Section was amended in 1966 to direct the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce, "to undertake a project to study and prepare a program of research, development and demonstration of new systems of urban transportation that will carry people and goods within metropolitan areas speedily, safely, without polluting the air, and in a manner that will contribute to sound city planning." Obviously, to the extent that this amendment (Sec. 6(b)) simply provides for preparation as distinguished from *operation* of a research, development and demonstration program, there is clearly no occasion for application of the labor protection provisions specified in Sec. 3(c) and 13(c).

Sec. 6(a) of the Act, however, authorizes the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to "undertake research, development, and demonstration projects in all phases of urban mass transportation (including the development, testing, and demonstration of new facilities, equipment, techniques, and methods)." To finance such projects, Sec. 6(b) of the original Act (now Sec. 6(c)) provided that $10 million of the funds authorized under Sec. 4(b) to be appropriated to finance programs of mass transportation assistance might be made available for such projects. This amount was increased to $20 million on July 31, 1965, $30 million on July 31, 1966, and under the 1966 amendments to the Act, $40 million on July 1, 1967, and $50 million on July 1, 1968.

When projects undertaken under Sec. 6 (a) involve the operation of mass transit facilities and equipment to provide mass transportation service, the limitations of Sec. 3(c) will continue to require that employee rights and interests be protected.

In sum, the insertion in Sec. 13(c) of the words "under Sec. 3 of" the Act, was a wholly technical change in the labor provisions designed only to make plain that such provisions do not apply to non-operational programs having no possible impact upon employees. The labor protective provisions contained in the original Urban Mass Transportation Act continue to apply in the case of any project which can conceivably affect the rights and interests of employees.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, it should be perfectly obvious that the 1966 amendments, which extended the urban mass transportation authorization provided by the act through fiscal year 1969 and broadened its program, were not intended to make substantive changes in the protections which the 1964 act extended to labor. There is not the slightest suggestion by any administration official, by the leadership, or by any proponent or opponent of the bill during the committee hearings or in the floor debates that anything contained in the 1966 amendments was designed to alter or affect adversely in any way these labor protective arrangements. To the contrary, both the Senate and House committee reports specifically stated:

> Before Federal assistance may be provided, the Secretary must determine that all contracts contain the usual provisions relating to * * * labor * * * under criteria specified in the Act * * *.

It is to dispel any further suggestion that the amendments to the labor provisions were something other than technical, clarifying, and conforming changes," as stated by the conference report, that I have asked unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a statement explaining the effect of these amendments.

PRESIDENTIAL VETO OF GUAM'S RIGHT-TO-WORK LAW

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, by his quiet veto of the Guam right-to-work law, President Johnson has again shown his subservience to the labor union leaders. He has again demonstrated that his prime concern is to please big labor, notwithstanding its cost in terms of basic freedoms for individual Americans, including union members.

He has attempted in vain to force compulsory unionism on the American people, only to be rebuffed by the Congress responding to the will of an overwhelming majority of the American people. It is interesting to note that President Johnson's position in favor of compulsory unionism is in contrast to his record as a Member of Congress where he voted upon two occasions in favor of right to work. By this veto he has denied to the citizens of Guam the very right he voted for as a Texas Congressman and Senator.

The President states that we are fighting in Vietnam to secure freedom of choice for the people of this little country. He has underscored this with an extensive, well-publicized trip. Yet while he fights for self-determination for the people of Vietnam, he denies the same self-determination to 75,000 U.S. citizens. If there are no second-class citizens, why are the people of Guam denied this simple choice?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point two articles dealing with this Presidential action.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Oct. 19, 1966]

RIPS VETO OF GUAM'S RIGHT-TO-WORK LAW

(By Russell Freeburg)

WASHINGTON, October 18.—The National Right to Work committee charged President Johnson with being the servant of labor bosses today in criticizing his veto of a right to work law for the Island of Guam.

The committee issued a statement several hours after the White House acknowledged that the President had vetoed before leaving for Asia the measure passed by the Guam legislature. The President sent a letter to Gov. Manuel Guerrero of Guam explaining his action.

CALLS IT SUBSERVIENCE

"I am appalled that the President has denied the right of free choice to the 75,000 citizens of Guam," said Reed Larson executive vice president of the National Right to Work committee. "It is the most flagrant example in recent history of the subservience of a President of the United States to wishes of self-serving labor bosses who would like nothing better than to see all of the workers of the country enslaved by compulsory unionism."

Last July 12, the legislature of Guam overrode Guerrero's veto of a right to work law by a vote of 14 to 6. The legislature earlier had passed a measure prohibiting compulsory unionism, which the governor didn't like.

However, Guam is not a sovereign state but a territory, which means final action is up to the White House. Johnson vetoed the bill only a few days before a 90-day period when it would have become law without his signature. The 90 days began July 22. Without the Presidential veto, the measure would have become law tomorrow.

SAYS HE KNUCKLED UNDER

Larson said that the only conclusion to be drawn from Johnson's action is that he again knuckled under to the compulsory unionism demands of labor leaders.

"This action by the President should lay to rest for all time any speculation that he was less than deadly serious in his attempt to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley act in Congress," said Larson.

The right to work committee has led the fight to defeat the repeal, which would have nullified existing right to work laws in 19 states.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Oct. 19, 1966]

A PRESIDENTIAL CHOICE THAT COULDN'T BE RIGHT

(By Robert Walters)

On Monday morning, shortly after the President took off from Dulles Airport for his Asian tour, the unusual notice was posted on the bulletin board of the virtually empty White House press room:

"President Johnson has sustained Gov. Manuel F. L. Guerrero in disapproval of Guam Legislature bill number 279 . . ."

Behind that brief announcement was the story of a bill that traveled 9,000 miles and forced Johnson to make a difficult choice between the principles of self-determination and the union shop.

It was one of those million-to-one shots that nobody expected or welcomed—a presidential decision required under an obscure law that, regardless of which way he turned, would force him to rule against a principle in which he believed.

BILL PASSED AND VETOED

The unusual string of events began last July 8, when the Guam Legislature approved a "right-to-work" bill, similar to those in force in 19 states.

The bill simply stated that "no person shall be denied the opportunity to obtain or retain employment because of non-membership in a labor organization."

Guerrero immediately vetoed the measure, but four days later the legislature overrode his veto with more than the necessary two-thirds of the votes still in favor of the law.

In any state of the union, the bill would have become law, but Guam is a territorial possession of the United States and such situations are covered in a little-known law passed by Congress in 1950.

That law, the Guam Organic Act, for the first time gave Guam a large measure of self-rule, but it also contained a provision requiring the President to settle disputes where the legislature overrides a gubernatorial veto.

Johnson was a member of Congress when that home rule law was approved for the distant South Pacific island, and he has long advocated increased self-determination for all U.S. possessions.

SENSITIVE OVER CONTROL

Guam residents are particularly sensitive about control from the mainland. From 1898 to 1950, they were governed by the U.S. Navy, and they still are unhappy about their inability to vote in federal elections or be represented in Congress.

Moreover, they point out that Gov. Guerrero is a presidential appointee and their only truly representative voice, the 21-member legislature, twice voted in favor of the right-to-work bill.

Guam is being used as a principal staging area for B52s making bomb runs over Viet Nam and many of the island's men are fighting in Viet Nam. On the basis of those and other contributions, Guam citizens strongly believe they have a right to complete self-rule.

But the pressures on the other side are equally great. The AFL–CIO poured thousands of dollars and hundreds of man-hours into an unsuccessful effort this year and last to repeal Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law—the federal legislation which allows the states and territories to pass right-to-work laws.

Johnson, in two state of the Union messages and countless speeches to labor groups, supported that repeal drive, but when it failed many leaders of organized labor privately blamed Johnson for a lack of real White House enthusiasm.

The labor leaders argued that right-to-work laws give non-union members a "free ride" and allow them to receive the benefits and wage increases negotiated by unions without paying dues or supporting the unions.

ACTION CLOSELY WATCHED

Those on both sides of the right-to-work issue were watching Johnson closely on the Guam decision, which they believed would test his credibility in repeatedly supporting repeal of Section 14(b).

The 90 days the law allows the President to act would have run out late this week, but Johnson apparently decided to make the decision before leaving on his trip.

Although technically he sustained the governor's decision, in effect he also vetoed the legislature's action—and that veto is final.

Organized labor is happy for the small victory, but others are not.

Reed Larson, executive vice president of the National Right to Work Committee, issued a statement yesterday in which he said the action was "the most flagrant example in recent history of the subservience of the President to the wishes of the self-serving labor bosses . . ."

Larson added:

"Johnson's veto proves to the people of Guam that . . . autonomy exists only so long as the people of Guam, through their elected representatives, act and vote along the lines acceptable by the administration in Washington."

RESOLUTION OF THE FEDERATION OF CITIZENS ASSOCIATIONS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the District of Columbia Federation of Citizens Associations on October 13, 1966.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE FEDERATION OF CITIZENS' ASSOCIATIONS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, OCTOBER 13, 1966

Whereas the Federation of Citizens' Associations and its member bodies are interested in the maintenance of law and order in the District of Columbia, and are much concerned with the rising crime rate and with the activities of certain publicly supported organizations whose actions are contributing to the increasing lack of respect for constituted authority, and

Whereas over recent months numerous incidents have occurred in which employees of the United Planning Organization and employees of organizations, supported and funded by the United Planning Organization, have not only participated in, but have also encouraged and furnished aid and support to picketing, disturbances, rioting, marches, and attacks on police, precinct houses and civilians, all in the name of the "War on Poverty", the most recent and serious of which occurred in the Anacostia area and, according to the reports of both the police and the "Citizens' Committee" of the 11th Precinct, the uprising was fomented by the director of the Southeast Neighborhood House, who has a record of having belonged to numerous organizations listed as subversive: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved By the Federation of Citizens' Associations, in meeting assembled this 13th day of October, 1966. That the Congress of the United States be requested to conduct an investigation of the administration, activities, and programs of the United Planning Organization:

To determine the extent to which employees have participated in, or encouraged in any way whatsoever, activities such as picketing, marches, presentation of demands, etc., tending to create, or contribute to public disturbances or disorder; and,

To determine the guide rules used by the United Planning Organization in negotiating contracts with, and providing funds for organizations and individuals, performing services related in any way to the War on Poverty Program; and,

To determine what control and supervision is exercised over such agents as regards their conduct, and use of funds provided; and,

To insure that taxpayers' money is being used, not only for the obliteration of poverty, but also for the development of respect for law and order, rather than the utter disregard for lawful authority, as is being consistently demonstrated in the District of Columbia; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the chairmen of the House and Senate District Committees, the President of the United States, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and the Executive Director of the United Planning Organization.

MRS. E. W. HOWARD,
Chairman, Police and Fire Committee Federation of Citizens' Associations of the District of Columbia

Passed—D.C. Federation of Citizens' Association, October 13, 1966.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR BASS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, as the Senate nears its adjournment for the 89th Congress, it is with deep regret that one of our outstanding members, Senator ROSS BASS, the junior Senator from Tennessee, will not be here to continue his outstanding work.

Senator BASS, in his 2 years in the Senate, continued the effective drive that had marked his 10 years in the House. He was a leader in legislation for improving the level of education in our schools from the elementary level to the college level.

His continuing interest and determination to assist the rural electric cooperatives of the Nation proved of great value in his service here. Naturally the assistance to this phase of greater electric use on the farms of America found a continuing interest also in the great TVA projects to which he gave such effective support.

As senior Senator from Oklahoma I have greatly appreciated his efforts in public works development for our State.

I knew him best as a fellow member of the Committee on Commerce where he always took a strong lead in legislation in behalf of aviation and improved transportation in the Nation.

His loss is a severe one and the enduring friendships he has made here will continue through the years.

A SURVEY OF NEW JERSEY HISTORY

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, for a recent supplement to the New York Times, one of New Jersey's most distinguished historians, John T. Cunningham, has written a brief but informative survey of New Jersey history. Mr. Cunningham, as always, writes gracefully and well of my native State and I know his article will be of interest to my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent that his article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS IS A VERY GOOD LAND

(By John T. Cunningham)

Robert Juet, an English mate aboard Henry Hudson's Dutch ship, the *Half Moon,* penned an enduring accolade when he gazed ashore on September 2, 1609, at what is now New Jersey. He wrote:

"This is a very good land . . . and a pleasant land to see."

Juet's view was underscored by Dutch Captain Henry Jacobsen Mey when he eased his ship, the *Glad Tidings*, around New Jersey's southern cape in 1620. Captain Mey recorded the climate as charming—"like Holland" (to a Hollander, the ultimate in praise).

Midway between Maine and Florida, New Jersey has welcomed newcomers through all its history. They have found parts of it "like Italy," "like England," "like Japan," "like Argentina," "like Germany"—not in genuine Old World traditions or appearance, but in terrain.

New people still seek out New Jersey, at the rate of about 15,000 every month. They come from near and far, from other states and from far-away lands. Climate is not the main factor: these people seek—and find—opportunity, whether they be California Scientist or international industrialist.

Such things as excellent transportation, vast markets, favorable tax structures and the abundant availability of skilled labor are vital to business enterprise. These are vital matters of industry, however, for those who man the plants, as important is what beckons when each day ends.

Good living is the major New Jersey dividend, for owner and worker alike.

Northwestward are the mountains, not awesome when viewed in terms of the Alps or the Andes, but rugged nevertheless. Then, in the northern Highlands, cool lakes are cupped within the hard rock formations. Dairy herds graze on both mountain slope and Highland field and thick hardwood forests top the hills.

New Jersey's nickname, *The Garden State*, rightfully stems from its southern fields. Enough tomatoes are grown there to rank New Jersey third among states. So many vegetables are harvested that New Jersey places sixth—and Seabrook Farms, world's largest farming-freezing operation, is amid those fields.

East of the vegetables, nearly one-fourth of New Jersey is encompassed in the "Pine Barrens." The region is far from barren for there grow wild orchids, pixie moss and hundreds of other wild flowers and plants. Botanists throughout the world come each year to study the flora of this great pine woodland. Equally, campers, hikers, picnickers and canoeists enjoy other fine forest attractions.

Justly famed is New Jersey's 127 miles of seashore between Sandy Hook on the north and Cape May on the south. Here are the tinseled delights of Atlantic City, around-the-calendar home of some of America's largest conventions and birthplace each September of a new Miss America. Here are scores of other towns, spread along the strand like beads on a necklace. Here are the golden dunes of Avalon, the Victorian stateliness of Cape May, the fishing fleets of Brielle, the variety of New Jersey seaside resorts.

Nature spices life through changing seasons—the blossoming of 5,000 cherry trees in Essex County's Branch Brook Park in April, the flowering of summer's wild orchids in the Pinelands, the autumn foliage that paints northern forests red and gold, the winter snows that entice skiers to Great Gorge and other Highland slopes.

For those in tune with the outdoors. New Jersey has more than 375 species of birds, from the tiny hummingbird to the great bald eagle: more than 200 kinds of native trees, from the white pine to the red oak, and more than one thousand wild flowers, from the violet to the lady slipper.

History, too, is close at hand.

New Jersey is truly the story of all America. Washington spent one fourth of the American Revolution on New Jersey soil, but New Jerseyans also pioneered the transistor and streptomycin, Telstar and Tiros. America's first locomotive was built in Hoboken in 1825 and Edison perfected in New Jersey the incandescent lamp, the phonograph and movies.

Washington's campaign route can be followed, from the place where he crossed the Delaware on Christmas Day 1776, for the dramatic victory at Trenton to historic Morristown where he and his troops spent the dreadful winter of 1779–80.

The restoration of the town of Batsto, in Burlington County, depicts life in a 19th century iron and glass town. The historical village of Allaire in Monmouth County lives on in tribute to a bog iron town that died in the 1840s. Warren County's Waterloo Village relives the glory of bygone days on the Morris Canal. Dozens of old stone Dutch houses in Bergen and Morris Counties bespeak a colonial heritage and scores of decorated brick houses in Salem and Cumberland Counties bear pre-Revolutionary dates.

Yet, within a fifteen-mile-wide strip spread diagonally across the center of the state is the corridor that makes New Jersey a mighty industrial and business state despite its small size (fifth smallest among the fifty). Here is the reason why the state ranks seventh in industrial output, eighth in population and first in urban concentration.

Within this vibrant corridor are three-fourths of New Jersey's 6,800,000 people, three-fourths of its 14,000 industrial plants, all but three of its nearly forty colleges and universities and a high percentage of its nearly 700 research laboratories.

That corridor is the nerve center of transportation in the East. Its highways and railroads carry the heaviest density of traffic in the nation. Nearly all of the nation's major railroads feed into the mighty yards of Essex and Hudson Counties. The Arthur Kill between Perth Amboy and Elizabeth carries twice the annual tonnage of the Suez Canal.

Transportation's vigor is uniquely shown at Port Newark. There, side by side, are seaport, super highway, railroad and modern airport. Here are ships from nearly all the world, served by trucks, freight trains and airlines. Across state, Camden has a bustling port, and downstream on the Delaware River, refineries create heavy shipping on the river.

Day after day that vibrant corridor hums with the sights and sounds and action of a modern busy world. Then, after work, the people of New Jersey stream outward from the industries and the laboratories to the places where they dwell.

Within the busy corridor itself, good living is easy to find. Here are the residential regions of Bergen County, the growing numbers of new apartment complexes for those who like city life and the many fine suburbs fringing the cities. Princeton's exciting university-research-residential blend is entirely within the corridor.

Good roads lead outward and upward—up to the tree-shaded Watchung Mountains overlooking the valley, further upward to the lake-cooled Highlands, upward even to the mountains, only a quick highway ride away. The Garden State Parkway makes Monmouth and Ocean Counties close for those who like to dwell year-around close to the rolling Atlantic Ocean.

Southern New Jerseyans spend their leisure hours in the fast-growing suburbs immediately surrounding the city of Camden. They can find quiet each night in such towns as Haddonfield or Moorestown, filled with reminders of an old Quaker past, or they can ride on to scores of pleasant towns—some very old, some very new—ranged between Camden and Atlantic City.

New Jersey is tiny, as tiny as its 7,836 square miles, but as big as the world-wide markets it serves. It is as serious as its 14,000 active industrial plants and mills but as gay as its oceanside excitement. It is as old as its unsurpassed Revolutionary heritage but as new as the research facilitites which explore nuclear fission and outer space.

Robert Juet wrote well: New Jersey IS a very good land . . . and a pleasant land to see.

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a summary listing of measures acted on by the Committee on Foreign Relations during the 89th Congress.

For purposes of comparison I might add that our activities this Congress will result in 37 public and private laws as opposed to 29 in the 88th Congress. Fifteen treaties won Senate approval in comparison with 23 the previous Congress. Sixteen miscellaneous Senate and concurrent resolutions were agreed to as against 11 the last Congress. With respect to nominations, a total of 2,759 were approved of which 181 were major appointments and 2,578 Foreign Service appointments and promotions. The comparable figures for the 88th Congress were 128 nominations for appointments as Ambassadors, officials in the State Department, and so forth and 3,863 in the Foreign Service, for a total of 3,991.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

TREATIES APPROVED DURING THE 89TH CONGRESS

1. Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, together with the Optional Protocol Concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes, signed at Vienna under date of April 18, 1961. Approved, September 14, 1965, by a vote of 85–0.

2. Texts of amendments to the Charter of the United Nations adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on December 17, 1963. Approved, June 3, 1965, by a vote of 71–0.

3. Protocol for the Extension of the International Wheat Agreement, 1962, open for signature in Washington from March 22 until and including April 23, 1965. Approved, June 15, 1965, by a vote of 88–0

4. Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada concerning the establishment of an International Arbitral Tribunal to dispose of U.S. claims relating to Gut Dam, signed at Ottawa, march 25, 1965. Approved, August 30, 1965, by a vote of 74–0.

5. Protocol, signed at Brussels on May 21, 1965, modifying and supplementing the convention of October 28, 1948, between the United States and Belgium for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, as amended by supplementary conventions of September 9, 1952, and August 22, 1957. Approved, October 22, 1965, by a vote of 66–0.

6. Amendments to arts. 17 and 18 of the Convention of the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization, which amendments were adopted on September 15, 1964, by the Assembly of the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization at its 2d extraordinary session, held at London from September 10–15, 1964. Approved, June 21, 1966, by a vote of 83–0.

7. Protocol between the United States of America, and the Federal Republic of Germany, signed at Bonn on September 17, 1965, modifying the convention of July 22, 1954, for

the avoidance of double taxation with respect to taxes on income. Approved, October 22, 1965, by a vote of 66–0.

8. Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes Between States and Nationals of Other States which was approved on March 18, 1965, by the Executive Directors of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and which is open for signature at the Bank's headquarters in Washington. Approved, May 16, 1966, by a vote of 72–0.

9. Supplementary convention, signed at Washington on December 30, 1965, modifying and supplementing the convention between the United States of America and the Kingdom of the Netherlands with respect to taxes on income and certain other taxes signed at Washington on April 29, 1948. Approved, June 21, 1966, by a vote of 83–0.

10. Supplementary protocol, signed at London on March 17, 1966, between the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, amending the Convention for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion With Respect to Taxes on Income, signed at Washington on April 16, 1945, as modified by supplementary protocols signed at Washington on June 6, 1946, May 25, 1954, and August 9, 1957. Approved June 21, 1966, by a vote of 83–0.

11. Protocol between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, signed at Mexico City on April 13, 1966, amending the agreement concerning radio broadcasting in the standard broadcast band, signed at Mexico City on January 29, 1957. Approved June 21, 1966, by a vote of 83–0.

12. Treaty of amity and economic relations between the United States of America and the Togolese Republic, signed at Lomé on February 8, 1966. Approved September 28, 1966, by a vote of 64–0.

13. Protocol for the Further Extension of the International Wheat Agreement, 1962, open for signature in Washington from April 4 until and including April 29, 1966. Approved July 14, 1966, by a vote of 89–0.

14. Protocol to the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, Relating to Measure of Control, and Protocol to the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Relating to Entry into Force of Proposals Adopted by the Commission, dated November 29, 1965. Approved, July 19, 1966, by a vote of 87–0.

15. International Convention on Load Lines (international voyages), signed by U.S. at London on April 5, 1966. Approved October 13, 1966, by a vote of 75–0.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS APPROVED DURING THE 89TH CONGRESS

1. S. 693, to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended. Approved June 30, 1966. Public Law 89–486.

2. S. 1742, to authorize the U.S. Government to agree to amendments to the articles of agreement of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Finance Corporation, and for other purposes. Approved August 14, 1965. Public Law 89–126.

3. S. 1903, to amend the United Nations Participation Act, as amended. Approved September 28, 1965. Public Law 89–206.

4. S. 2054, to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, an for other purposes. Authorizes $115 million for fiscal year 1966. Approved August 24, 1965. Public Law 89–134.

5. S. 2463, to grant the consent of the Congress to the acceptance of certain gifts and decorations from foreign governments, and for other purposes. Approved October 15, 1966. Public Law 89–673.

6. S. 2540, to authorize the conclusion of an agreement for the joint construction by the United States and Mexico of an international flood control project for the Tijuana River in accordance with the provisions of the treaty of February 3, 1944, with Mexico, and for other purposes. Approved October 10, 1966. Public Law 89–640.

7. S. 2747, to authorize conclusion of an agreement with Mexico for joint measures for solution of the Lower Rio Grande salinity problem. Authorizes an appropriation of not to exceed $690,000 for costs of construction, and not to exceed $20,000 annually for costs of operation and maintenance. Approved September 19, 1966. Public Law 89–584.

8. S. 3418, to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, and for other purposes. Authorizes an appropriation of not to exceed $110 million for fiscal year 1967. Approved September 13, 1966. Public Law 89–572.

9. S. 3498, to facilitate the carrying out of the obligations of the United States under the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes between States and Nationals of Other States, signed on August 27, 1965, and for other purposes. Approved August 11, 1966. Public Law 89–532.

10. H.R. 30, to provide for participation of the United States in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla., and for other purposes. Authorizes an appropriation of $7,500,000 for U.S. participation in Interama, and $1,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 for maintenance of U.S. installations and activities. Approved February 19, 1966. Public Law 89–355.

11. H.R. 45, to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank. Authorizes $750 million without fiscal year limitation, in three annual installments of $250 million each beginning in fiscal year 1965. Approved March 24, 1965. Public Law 89–6.

12. H.R. 2998, to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to increase the authorization for appropriations. Authorizes $30 million for fiscal years 1966 through 1968. Approved May 27, 1965. Public Law 89–27.

13. H.R. 4170, to provide for adjustments in annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system. Approved October 31, 1965. Public Law 89–308.

14. H.R. 6497, to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize an increase in the International Monetary Fund quota of the United States. Authorizes an appropriation of $1,035 million to remain available until expended. Approved June 2, 1965. Public Law 89–31.

15. H.R. 7064, to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926, as amended. Authorizes additional $1 million for chancery in Saigon, South Vietnam. Approved May 21, 1965. Public Law 89–22.

16. H.R. 7750, to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes. Authorizes $3,360 million for fiscal year 1966. Approved September 6, 1965. Public Law 89–171.

17. H.R. 8715, to authorize a contribution by the United States to the International Committee of the Red Cross. Authorizes a contribution of $50,000 a year. Approved October 1, 1965. Public Law 89–230.

18. H.R. 8862, to amend the act of August 7, 1935, to increase the authorized annual share of the United States as an adhering member of the International Council of Scientific Unions and Associated Unions. Authorizes an annual contribution of $100,000. Approved August 3, 1965. Public Law 89–104.

19. H.R. 9247, to provide for participation of the United States in the HemisFair 1968 Exposition to be held at San Antonio, Tex., in 1968, and for other purposes. Authorizes an appropriation of not to exceed $125,000. Approved October 22, 1965. Public Law 89–284.

20. H.R. 9336, to amend title V of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 relating to certain claims against the Government of Cuba. Approved October 19, 1965. Public Law 89–262.

21. H.R. 10132, to authorize the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., of Massachusetts, former Speaker of the House of Representatives, to accept the award of the Military Order of Christ with the rank of grand officer. Approved September 1, 1965. Private Law 89–61.

22. H.R. 10342, to authorize the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON of Ohio, a Member of the House of Representatives, to accept the award of officer in the French National Order of the Legion of Honor. Approved September 11, 1965. Private Law 89–64.

23. H.R. 11227, to authorize the Honorable EUGENE J. KEOGH, of New York, a Member of the House of Representatives, to accept the award of the Order of Isabella the Catholic. Approved July 4, 1966. Private Law 89–260.

24. H.R. 12169, to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes. Authorizes an appropriation of $415 million. Approved March 18, 1966. Public Law 89–371.

25. H.R. 12563, to provide for the participation of the United States in the Asian Development Bank. Authorizes an appropriation, without fiscal year limitation, of $200 million. Approved March 16, 1966. Public Law 89–369.

26. H.R. 14019, to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes. Authorizes an apropriation of $55,160,000 for construction and operations of Foreign Service buildings abroad. Approved October 10, 1966. Public Law 89–636.

27. H.R. 15098, to amend Public Law 89-284 relating to participation of the United States in the HemisFair 1968 Exposition to be held in San Antonio, Tex., in 1968. Authorizes an appropriation of not to exceed $7,500,000. Approved October 15, 1966. Public Law 89–685.

28. H.R. 15750, to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes. Authorizes an appropriation of $3,500,735,500 for fiscal year 1967. Approved September 19, 1966. Public Law 89–583.

29. S.J. Res. 32, to authorize a contribution to certain inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands for death and injury of persons, and for use of and damage to private property, arising from acts and omissions of the U.S. Armed Forces, or members thereof, after August 15, 1945, and before April 28, 1952. Authorizes an appropriation of not to exceed $22 million. Approved October 27, 1965, Public Law 89–296.

30. S.J. Res. 71, to amend the joint resolution of January 28, 1949, providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission. Approved July 27, 1965. Public Law 89–91.

31. S.J. Res. 106, to allow the showing in the United States of the U.S. Information Agency film "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums." Approved October 20, 1965. Public Law 89–274.

32. S.J. Res. 108, to amend the joint resolution providing for membership of the United States in the Pan American Institute of Geography and History and to authorize appropriations therefor. Authorizes an increase in the ceiling of U.S. contributions to the Pan American Institute of Geography and History from $50,000 a year to $90,300 a year commencing in fiscal year 1967. Approved October 13, 1966. Public Law 89–646.

33. H.J. Res. 403, authorizing an appropriation to enable the United States to extend an invitation to the World Health Organization to hold the 22d World Health Assembly in Boston, Mass., in 1969. Authorizes an appropriation of not to exceed $500,000 for the purpose of defraying the expenses inci-

dent to organizing and holding the Twenty-second World Health Assembly in Boston, Massachusetts. Approved March 1, 1966. Public Law 89–357.

34. S. 1760, to authorize the acceptance of a settlement of certain indebtedness of Greece to the United States and to authorize the use of the payments resulting from the settlement for a cultural and educational exchange program. Authorizes about $13 million. Senate agreed to House amendment on October 18, 1966.

35. S. 3675, to amend title V of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 to provide for the determination of the amounts of claims of nationals of the United States against the Chinese Communist regime. Passed House on October 17, 1966.

36 H.R. 11555, to provide a border highway along the United States bank of the Rio Grande River in connection with the settlement of the Chamizal boundary dispute between the United States and Mexico. Conference report adopted in Senate and House on October 19 and 20, 1966, respectively.

37. S.J. Res. 167. To enable the United States to organize and hold an International Conferenece on Water for Peace in the United States in 1967 and authorize an appropriation therefor. Passed House on October 19, 1966.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS APPROVED DURING THE 89TH CONGRESS

1. S. Con. Res. 36, expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the 20th anniversary of the United Nations during International Cooperation Year, and for other purposes. Passed House June 22, 1965.

2. S. Con. Res. 71, to approve selecting of the U.S. Olympic Committee and to support its recommendations that the State of Utah be designated as the site for the 1972 Winter Olympic games. Passed House April 4, 1966.

3. S. Con. Res. 77, authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on supplemental foreign assistance for Vietnam for fiscal year 1966. Conference report passed Senate September 12, 1966.

4. S. Con. Res. 91, authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on U.S. Policy With Respect to Mainland China. Passed House June 2, 1966.

5. H. Con. Res. 282, expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the viewing of the U.S. Information Agency film entitled "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums" at the dedication of the new Civic War Memorial Auditorium in Boston, Massachusetts. Passed Senate without reference to Foreign Relations Committee February 11, 1965.

6. H. Con. Res. 426, expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the viewing of the U.S. Information Agency film "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," at the 25th class reunion of the Harvard class of 1940 in Cambridge, Mass. Passed Senate June 3, 1965.

7. H. Con. Res. 468, to recognize the World Law Day. Passed the Senate without reference to Foreign Relations Committee, September 10, 1965.

SENATE RESOLUTIONS APPROVED DURING THE 89TH CONGRESS

1. S. Res. 28, authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to examine and study the foreign policies of the United States. Agreed to February 8, 1965.

2. S. Res. 89, authorizing attendance at the next general meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, to be held in Wellington, New Zealand. Agreed to March 29, 1965.

3. S. Res. 145, to provide for responding to invitations from foreign parliamentary bodies. Agreed to September 23, 1965.

4. S. Res. 179, relating to nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. Agreed to May 17, 1966, by a vote of 84–0.

5. S. Res. 184, to authorize the printing of additional copies of the committee print "Vietnam: The Shadow and the Substance." Agreed to January 19, 1966.

6. S. Res. 214, to provide additional funds for the Committee on Foreign Relations for making certain studies. Agreed to February 17, 1966.

7. S. Res. 216, to print additional copies of a report by Senator Mansfield. Agreed to January 29, 1966.

8. S. Res. 256, relating to U.S. denunciation of the Warsaw Convention. Agreed to May 12, 1966.

9. S. Res. 276, authorizing the appointment of a Senate delegation to attend a meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. Agreed to July 28, 1966.

NOMINATIONS APPROVED DURING THE 89TH CONGRESS

The Committee has received and confirmed 181 nominations for appointments as Ambassadors, officials in the State Department and so forth. Of this number 75 were for Ambassadors, 20 for State Department officials, 37 for U.N. representatives, and 49 in "other" categories representing members to various government agencies and the elevation of senior foreign service officers to be career ministers or ambassadors. In addition, 2,578 routine foreign service nominations were also confirmed.

TREATIES, BILLS, AND RESOLUTIONS REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS ON WHICH FINAL ACTION WAS NOT COMPLETED

1. S. 1935. To amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the timely determination of certain claims of American nationals settled by the United States-Polish Claims Agreement of July 16, 1960, and for other purposes. Passed Senate, September 7, 1965.

2. S. 2064. To amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, relative to the return of alien property interests. Passed Senate, September 7, 1965.

3. S. 2138. To consent to an agreement between the State of Minnesota and the Province of Manitoba, Canada, providing for an access highway to the Northwest Angle in the State of Minnesota, and to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to pay Minnesota's share of the cost of such highway. Passed Senate, September 28, 1966.

4. S. 3101. To establish a U.S. Committee on Human Rights to prepare for participation by the United States in the observance of the year 1968 as International Human Rights Year, and for other purposes. Passed Senate, October 17, 1966.

5. S. 3247. To provide certain increases in annuities payable from the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund, and for other purposes. Passed Senate, October 5, 1966.

6. H.R. 10779. To authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of an international toll bridge at Pharr, Texas. Passed Senate, October 13, 1965.

7. S.J. Res. 63. Authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign nations to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition to be held at Tulsa, Oklahoma, May 12 through 21, 1966. Passed Senate, February 10, 1966.

8. S. Con. Res. 17. To express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion. Passed Senate, May 14, 1965.

9. H. Con. Res. 416. To request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia. Reported to Senate, September 19, 1966.

10. S. Res. 283. Creating a Committee on Intelligence Operations. Reported to Senate, July 14, 1966.

11. Protocol, dated at The Hague September 28, 1955, to amend the Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules Relating to International Carriage by Air, signed at Warsaw on October 12, 1929. Reported to Senate, June 29, 1965.

12. Consular convention between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, together with a protocol relating thereto, signed at Moscow on June 1, 1964. Reported to Senate, August 3, 1965.

NEED FOR INCREASED FOOD PRODUCTION

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, today's New York Times carries an important editorial dealing with the needs of greater production and utilization of fertilizer in order to produce the food that the expanding populations of the world require and will require in greater amounts in the coming years.

I ask unanimous consent that this fine editorial be printed in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WAR AGAINST HUNGER

Every fresh study reaches the same grim conclusion: The world is on a treadmill when it comes to feeding the growing population of developing countries. It must run hard to stay in the same place—and just to stay in the same place will not head off starvation and chaos.

The United States and other exporters cannot for long make up the food deficit from their own stocks. Birth control is imperative, but its effects will be felt only over the long term. Advanced countries must intensify efforts to help struggling nations transform their agriculture in many different ways.

There is broad agreement, however, that the best single method of lifting food production rapidly in needy lands during the next ten to fifteen years is through the vastly expanded use of fertilizer, of which a major component is nitrogen.

Senator McGovern of South Dakota has proposed that the Government launch comprehensive research on the world fertilizer prospect, with special emphasis on nitrogen needs of the Indian subcontinent, Latin America and Africa. Mr. McGovern, first administrator of the Food for Peace program, urges the United States to take the lead by offering to finance construction of three pilot plants in the developing countries for production of fertilizer from natural gas.

Colossal amounts of natural gas are still flared, and thus lost, in all major producing countries. The Senator says the United States should study the possibility of using part of the gas now being flared in the Middle East, Latin America and Africa. He points out that the use of low-cost natural gas has helped bring about a revolution in the fertilizer industry.

Senator McGovern estimates the over-all cost of the projected three pilot plants at $200 million and believes private foundations might help finance them. Eventually, he would hope to bring into an expanded fertilizer production program other governments, all relevant United Nations agencies and private enterprise.

This carefully prepared proposal merits the consideration not only of the United States but of all governments and organizations willing to join in a war against hunger, the dimensions of which can hardly be exaggerated.

TRIBUTE TO ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS, ARTHUR SYLVESTER

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, one of the distinguished citizens of New Jersey who is now serving with the Government here in Washington is Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs. Mr. Sylvester came to the Government with a distinguished background in journalism, having served as city editor and Washington editor of the Newark News. I think Mr. Sylvester has done an excellent job in an often difficult and controversial post. I was, therefore, delighted to see an editorial appear in the Paterson News of September 9 commending the excellent job that Arthur Sylvester has done. I know this praise must be particularly pleasing to Arthur Sylvester, as it comes from a newspaper in his home State.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GOOD MAN IN A VITAL POST

> There is an old saw about being bedeviled if you do and damned if you don't, and men in positions of significant responsibility are frequently in the middle of fire.
>
> Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs in Washington, is a case in point. He is accused on one hand of allowing too much news about the war in Viet Nam to filter through and on the other, not enough.
>
> Mr. Sylvester of course doesn't have to put up with this kind of annoyance since he could command much more substance in private life. But the fact he has the courage and devotion to do so is a good measure of the man. His calm demeanor in the face of invective hurled by the press, a few members of Congress and general critics-at-large is a reflection of his confidence in himself as a guardian at the gate.
>
> Mr. Sylvester has done a tremendous job in an unheralded post. People in the newsgathering, writing and editing fraternity, as well as in industry, are fully aware of his superb performance and frequently wonder why he continues to brook harassment.
>
> Mr. Sylvester has the responsibility—and a publicly avowed goal—of seeing to it that the news of military activities flows freely, without at the same time disclosing details vital to the national security.
>
> As a former city editor of a major metropolitan daily paper and as a tough reporter in Washington, he long ago earned a reputation that won him the respect and admiration of members of the Fourth Estate. He learned in that crucible the need to dig for the details, yet to exercise what is called editorial responsibility in the dispatch of his material.
>
> Newsmen, congressmen and the public at large accept without question the daily editing of news, particularly when some details deleted in this fashion are likely to have harmful side effects on the people involved.
>
> But let us speak of "managing the war news" and the national hackle rises; the defenders of our sacred right to know proliferate like algae in a bucket of dirty water.
>
> What Mr. Sylvester has to do may be simply stated: determine what is harmful and cannot be said at all; what may be harmful and may be said in part; what must be said, whether it be harmful or not; and what is not harmful at all and may be told in full and complete detail.
>
> And he must make these choices the hard way. He cannot hide behind the strictures of wartime censorship; nor can he take the opposite extreme that anything goes. His is a most exacting and critical post.
>
> Mr. Sylvester has admittedly made mistakes in the past; he is quite likely to make a few more in the future. He is neither Saint nor Solomon.
>
> But he is working at this job many nights when a goodly number of his critics are all jollied-up to the idiot box listening to some one trying to take him apart. It is most likely that these self-same critics never consider how things look from his point of view. We suspect that Mr. Sylvester had to be on the spot himself before he could fully realize the import of his task, and the obstacles to be faced in doing it.
>
> Mr. Sylvester strikes us as being something of an anachronism: a man with plain old-fashioned dedication and patriotism. Too many people these days consider these traits a bit on the "square" side.
>
> The country could use more men like Arthur Sylvester of demonstrated good judgment, patience, fortitude—and dedicated patriotism. He is an asset in difficult times and in a sensitive post.

SALUTE TO THE NATURAL GAS INDUSTRY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, during 1966 the Nation's natural gas industry has been honored on its 150th anniversary. The tribute is more than justified, for the industry has made outstanding contributions to America's economy and security since the first franchise was issued to the Gas Light Co. of Baltimore in 1816.

Today more than 34 million residential customers are served with natural gas. In addition, there are 2,712,000 commercial users and 159,000 industrial users. In terms of plant investment, natural gas is the sixth largest industry in the country.

This anniversary year has special significance for West Virginia. The first discovery of natural gas was made in our State more than four decades before the event that took place in Baltimore in 1816. For the RECORD, I cite this passage from the World Book Encyclopedia:

> The earliest known discovery of natural gas in the United States was in 1775, when a pioneer found a burning spring in what is now Kanawha County, West Virginia. In the same year George Washington dedicated it as a national park. Gas seepages also were found along Lake Erie and in various other places, and pioneer children delighted in setting fire to them and watching them burn.
>
> The first practical use of gas in the United States was of manufactured gas rather than natural gas. In 1806 David Melville of Newport, R.I., lighted his home and the streets in front of his house with gas manufactured from coal. He also lighted a factory at Pawtucket and made a contract with the United States Government to supply gas for a lighthouse at Beaver Trail in Rhode Island. In 1816, Baltimore became the first city in the United States to light its streets with manufactured gas. Rembrandt Peale and his associates formed the first gas company in the United States to light the city.
>
> Meanwhile, natural gas was discovered as early as 1815 during the digging of a salt brine well at Charleston, W. Va.

The American Gas Association, Inc., also describes West Virginia's role in the development of natural gas in its highly interesting booklet, "The Story of Gas." It explains that the discovery near Charleston was made by Capt. James Wilson, who struck gas-bearing rock at a depth that would be considered close to the surface by today's standards.

While production of natural gas in West Virginia is little more than 1 percent of the national total, the industry is nevertheless highly important to the State's economy. Employment is provided not only by local gas companies, and the pipeline transportation industry, but also by the many distributors of gas appliances.

Net production of natural gas amounted to 198,238 million cubic feet in West Virginia during 1965, the highest output since 1950. In that 15-year period, West Virginia's reserves have increased from 1,650,675 to 2,494,023 million cubic feet. Although the total reserves of natural gas in the United States are sufficient to last for many years into the future, the industry is already looking to the day when the demand will require new sources of fuel.

In search of a practical and economic method of producing synthetic natural gas from coal, the American Gas Association has joined with the Office of Coal Research in support of a project being conducted by the Institute of Gas Technology. Thus, the Association, in providing 50 percent of the funds required for the program, is exhibiting the same confidence in the future of the Nation that has been instrumental in establishing it as a vital component of America's economic and defense structures.

UNIONS AND CAMPAIGN SPENDING

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, now that the general subject of campaign financing has been raised, despite the lateness of this session and the overwhelming majority sentiment for immediate adjournment, the record should show that the amendment by the Senator from Louisiana aims at only one aspect of the problem.

Whatever the merits of the idea to finance the national campaigns of the two major parties through voluntary earmarking of income tax revenue—and the merits are indeed questionable—this amendment would do nothing about one of the major inequities which now exists.

If a debate is in order on the issue of campaign financing, then I submit that Congress should also be complete and fair about it. Let us do something about the tremendous political spending by union officials of funds collected from members under compulsory contracts.

There should no longer be any doubt anywhere as to the fact and scope of Big Labor's political contributions. Nor should anybody doubt that millions of dollars are being used against the individual political preferences of many union members.

As Mr. Justice Black pointed out in the opinion on International Association of Machinists against Street, and I quote:

> There can be no doubt that the federally sanctioned union shop contract here, as it actually works, takes a part of the earnings of some men and turns it over to others, who spend a substantial part of the funds

so received in efforts to thwart the political, economic and ideological hopes of those whose money has been forced from them under authority of law.

Mr. President, all of us know that we are not talking about peanuts when we look at union financial strength in the political arena.

The $3.8 million reported total of labor's political contributions in 1964 was only a drop in the bucket. This was only the so-called voluntary donations to candidates for Federal office, even though it did represent the largest single source of majority party support.

When you examine the overall picture, you find that the money available to union officials for political purposes runs into the hundreds of millions of dollars.

The combined annual dues income of all American labor organizations, according to the latest informed estimates, is now in the vicinity of $1 billion.

There is no way at present to determine the precise amount of this huge sum which is devoted to political activity—but some scholars and authorities in the labor field have estimated it may go as high as 40 percent in an election year.

This, of course, includes State and local candidate support, as well as the year-around voter registration and political organization activities.

The great bulk of this money comes from the paychecks of individual union members through the checkoff—men who must belong to the union in order to gain or maintain a job.

It is an established fact that many individual union members prefer the principles and candidates of the minority party—yet their money is steadily being used to finance the campaigns and support the programs of majority candidates who are diametrically opposed to the views of the forced contributors.

That is why, Mr. President, that I have cosponsored legislation at this session to prohibit the use of union funds received from dues for support of candidates. The majority saw fit not to consider this legislation.

I can assure the Senate, however, that such legislation will again be pressed in the next Congress as part of a bill I intend to introduce. This legislation will provide the complete revision of our national labor code which for too long has been weighted in favor of a few union officials and against the best interests of the many individual citizens who must contribute the money or lose their jobs.

DELAWARE WATER GAP NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, those of us who sponsored legislation establishing the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area have been deeply concerned at the speculation forcing land prices up in and around the proposed national park. Just recently I joined with the sponsors of the original legislation in offering a bill which would allow the Delaware River Basin Commission to issue a $30 million bond so that funds could be loaned to the Secretary of the Interior for land acquisition. Regrettably, I am informed that the Budget Bureau is opposed to this seemingly simple device to speed up land acquisition and reduce the ultimate cost to the Government in establishing this much needed park. I was very pleased to see that the Washington Star for October 2 carried a lengthy and informative editorial discussing the problems facing our national parks, and particularly the damage done to the park system by unnecessary delays in land acquisition which serve only to generate avaricious speculation.

I know that my many colleagues who are interested in the problems of conservation will find the commentary of the Star interesting and informative, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

DELAY IMPERILS OUR VANISHING PARK SITES

National parks are enjoying an unprecedented popularity. Last year more than 121 million visitors were recorded, an increase of nine percent from the previous year. And the forecast for 1966 is 137 million.

The government is correspondingly busy acquiring new parkland, while sites are still available, as an investment in recreation for future generations. But the greed of land speculators, encouraged by the glacial slowness of federal machinery in buying sites, is sending price tags up. In the long run, it's the taxpayer who will be hurt.

Consider the case of Point Reyes National Seashore north of San Francisco. When Congress authorized the acquisition of this rolling, windswept chain of headlands back in 1962, it approved what seemed to be adequate funds at the time—$14 million.

Under the plan, this would have provided for a seashore area of nearly 54,000 acres. The total included 26,000 acres remaining in private hands as ranch and dairy land, with the condition that it be left in a pastoral state.

The news of the program sent land prices skyrocketing. Private speculators and developers moved in. So sharp has been the increase in values that the government was able to buy only 16,000 acres before its funds were exhausted. Now the total for the park is estimated at $57.5 million, and officials have been obliged to go back to Congress for more money.

Nor is this an isolated case. According to testimony by Edward C. Crafts, director of the Interior Department's Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Congress has authorized $169 million for acquiring land in 48 areas in the national park system. Yet in the few short years since these various sites were approved for purchase, prices have escalated so fast that the government will need to add another $87 million just to keep pace with current land values in 18 of the areas. For another 22 areas, the Bureau frankly admits it doesn't know if there's enough money in the kitty now to buy the property.

A much-publicized example is the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area. Locally known as Tocks Island, this is a proposed park of breathtaking dimensions sprawled across 72,000 acres of lakes and forests in Pennsylvania and New Jersey. When completed it will serve a regional population of 30 million.

Since Congress gave the go-ahead on the area last year, costs have been spiraling. Private land within the proposed park is being carved up into lakefront lots, the bulldozers are flattening trees, and subdivisions are mushrooming. All this housing presumably will be torn down again in a few years after Uncle Sam gets around to buying the property—at a fancy price. And the wasted money will come out of your pocketbook.

President Johnson expressed concern about the problem last February in a message to Congress. While agreeing a landowner should get fair compensation for his property, he emphasized that "land for the use of the general public should not be burdened with the increased price resulting from speculative activities." At the President's order, the Interior Department is now looking into these "artificial price spirals."

The key to the problem is time. Once Uncle Sam makes known that a site will become a national park, the speculation begins. The machinery of hearings, authorization, appropriation and negotiation with owners all consumes years. In that time a speculator can lay out roads and erect houses, then sell off the improved property by the square foot at a huge profit. The developers of course claim they can't wait while Washington fiddles around with vague plans to acquire a park site. And with the postponements that often occur in any program that Congress must approve, they have a point. Both sides must share the blame.

Several proposals to remedy the situation are under study. Most of them are aimed at speeding up the acquisition process. One suggests a revolving fund set up by private foundations to buy land and hold it until federal money is available. Another calls for river basin authorities to issue bonds, backed by the federal government, to buy sites now. The bonds would be paid off gradually by Interior's land and water conservation fund. Such a plan, in fact, is now embodied in a bill by Representative SAYLOR of Pennsylvania to meet the crisis at Tocks Island.

One scheme that Interior might examine has been used successfully for years in Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties. The National Capital Park and Planning Commission, which must make do with limited park money, approaches farmers in outlying areas with a long-term deal. After agreeing on a price, it permits the owner to continue living on his land and pays him in installments spread over a period up to ten years. In return he agrees not to cut trees or change the land's contours. The counties get tomorrow's parks at today's prices.

America is rapidly running out of sites for future parks. The vast undeveloped tracts of public land that made possible the creation of Yellowstone and the Great Smokies Parks at nominal cost are vanishing.

The nation's population now stands at 197 million. At the present birth rate, it will increase by 24 million in the next decade. The total will reach 308 million by the year 2000.

With such population pressure, land prices are bound to keep on rising. Congress and Interior must work out a plan—and soon—for a faster, more efficient way to buy park sites. If the government fails to come up with a solution, tomorrow's generation will be burdened with exorbitant taxes to pay for the parks they need. Or, even worse, the public will find those once-available woodlands irretrievably blanketed with monotonous subdivisions.

THE LATE SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I want to associate myself with the many fine tributes given on the floor of the Senate to the Honorable Harry F. Byrd, Sr., who so eminently served this body and our Nation. There have been many eloquent expressions of admiration, respect and affection for this beloved public servant. I envy those who had the privilege of serving with him in this Chamber for many years, those who are counted among his most intimate friends, and especially those who fought with him to preserve the principles of sound government. In this age when heroes are going out of style, Senator Harry F. Byrd is mine. To me, and to all who know him, Harry Byrd exemplified the highest integrity and moral courage. The name Harry Byrd is a natural synonym for integrity, courage, foresight, dedication, statesmanship, and faithfulness.

Upon coming to the Senate, the admiration and respect I felt for Harry F. Byrd became an affectionate and warm personal regard. He had a genuine friendliness and an innate sense of fairness. It was apparent that he had a firm and continuous desire to render to everyone that which was his due. Some day historians will make proper note of the fact that he did unwitnessed what we should be capable of doing before all the world.

We have no gage by which to measure the benefit of his wisdom, far-reaching vision and the practical application of policies to achieve and to maintain our national fiscal responsibility. The great State of Virginia has given our Nation men of intelligence, rare judgment, ethical philosophy, courageous commitment, and men with a strong Christian faith. Virginia gave us Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Patrick Henry, Benjamin Harrison, Robert E. Lee, and to men of this stature, we must add Harry Flood Byrd. America mourns with the people of Virginia, the passing of this great American, and we are filled with gratitude for his life among us.

CHINA, THE U.N., AND THE UNITED STATES

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, a report by the National Policy Panel of the United Nations Association of the United States on "China, United Nations, and United States policy" was released yesterday.

This panel, comprised of eminent citizens, educators, and men of business and labor, spent a great deal of time and energy investigating the question of China's entry into the United Nations. They concluded that the time had come for a reassessment of the U.S. approach toward the China representation issue. It was their judgment that our position in world affairs would be strengthened if we acknowledged that "the China originally contemplated in the Charter has now been succeeded by two states, and that both states should be members of the United Nations."

Earlier this year I spoke on this issue, arriving at the same conclusion. It was my hope that those determining our policy in this area would find it possible to formulate a more constructive U.S. position on China and the U.N., and by so doing guarantee the preservation of Formosa; enhance our image in the capitals of the world, especially in Asia; and move us closer to the principle of universality in the United Nations.

Unfortunately, it has been determined that our position in 1966 is to be no different than it was 15 years ago. We had an opportunity this year to make a fresh start on an old matter, to reinforce our desires for peace in Asia with a recognition of the realities of life in Asia. We could have, at the time of China's most difficult foreign policy period, shifted the burden of her absence from the United States, from our shoulders to hers. Yet we chose not to make that move.

The report of the United Nations Association Panel and the views of the distinguished men who constructed it should be widely read by those interested in U.S. policy toward Asia.

Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[A report of a National Policy Panel established by the United Nations Association of the United States of America]

China, the United Nations, and United States Policy—An Analysis of the Issues and Principal Alternatives With Recommendations for U.S. Policy

RECOMMENDATION OF THE PANEL

The panel believes the time has come for a reassessment of the United States approach toward representation of mainland China in the United Nations. The United States' position in world affairs would be strengthened, we believe, by acknowledging that the China originally contemplated in the Charter has now been succeeded by two states, and that both states should be Members of the United Nations. The recent hardening of Maoist extremism in Peking and the xenophobic excesses of the Red Guards convincingly demonstrate, in our view, the need to provide this fresh and timely encouragement to those moderate influences that still remain in China.

We have weighed the alternatives over a period of several months. It is now our considered judgment that the United States should promptly begin consultations with those countries which have, in the past, joined this country in opposition to extending an invitation to Peking, in order to work toward the representation of mainland China in the United Nations. The first premise of such negotiations must be that Nationalist China will at the same time retain its membership. The aim should be membership by two Chinas. On the question of representation in the Security Council, the panel believes that if Peking failed to accept a two-China approach in the General Assembly, any consideration of her seating in the Security Council should be deferred.

Even though modifications in Peking's policies may be a long time in coming, it is in the United States' interest that any tendencies toward more moderate policies be encouraged by creating openings for increased international contact. Sustained exposure to the force of international opinion and of widened diplomatic contact may well, over the long run, effect some moderation of mainland China's present belligerency and promote peace. The People's Republic of China, with its vast land area and its 700 million people, is now an undeniable part of the international political scene—too formidable to attempt to ignore, and too important to remain in isolation.

The U.S. must continue to protect its Asian allies, several of them China's close neighbors, from military attack. We must give strong and effective support to those countries threatened by Peking's world-wide policies of subversion. It is of the greatest importance that mutual miscalculation in the conduct of U.S.-China relations be avoided. The panel believes that these objectives of increasing the exposure of Peking to the force of international opinion, effecting some moderation of her policies, protecting our allies, blocking subversion and avoiding miscalculation, can best be served by a policy which is designed to contain aggression without, however, isolating China from the rest of the world. If the people of mainland China are to remain isolated, the full responsibility should rest with the Peking regime.

We consider it essential that the Republic of China retain its UN membership—a membership which has been characterized by responsible participation in twenty UN bodies, significant contributions to the international community through its bilateral technical assistance programs, a strong loyalty to the UN Charter and the fact that it is recognized by fifty-five United Nations Members.

We have considered carefully the difficulties that Peking's participation in the United Nations would create for the operations of the Organization and for many of the other Members. Yet the United Nations cannot effectively carry out its responsibilities for international peace and security—fulfilling thereby the over-riding objectives of its Members—unless it can invite the world's most populous country to participate in the Charter undertakings to which all member states are now committed.

1. INTRODUCTION

A stable peace among self-governing independent states is the goal of United States Asian policy. Much of the recent debate over Vietnam and over United States-China policy has arisen from a search for the best means of achieving that goal.

In his address to the American Alumni Council on July 12, 1966, President Johnson, in calling for a reconciliation between countries that now consider themselves enemies, said:

"A peaceful mainland China is central to a peaceful Asia. A hostile China must be discouraged from aggression. A misguided China must be encouraged toward understanding of the outside world and toward policies of peaceful cooperation.

"For lasting peace can never come to Asia as long as the 700 million people of mainland China are isolated by their rulers from the outside world."

Since 1950, relations between mainland China and the U.S. have been characterized by an active hostility. The Korean War left its bitter aftermath, and the possibility of further armed conflict was present in the 1954–55 and 1958 Formosa Strait crises. Over the years the extremist statements by Peking and the accompanying efforts to promote revolution and subversion throughout the world have presented formidable barriers to any lessening of tension and improvement of relations. And now behind the war in Vietnam there lurks the threat of a massive confrontation between the United States and China.

During the past seventeen years, Peking would appear to have consolidated its control over the mainland. Industry is beginning to recuperate from the disruptive 1958–60 policies of the "Great Leap Forward". Many western specialists have been impressed by the sophistication of recent Chinese nuclear explosions.

Moving slowly over the last few years the United States has proposed a variety of exchanges with mainland China—exchanges of newsmen, of scholars and of experts in medicine and public health. Recently, the U.S.

has indicated that the passports of other leading Americans would be validated for travel to China. Thus far, none of these moves has brought a positive response from the Chinese side.

The ambassadorial talks in Warsaw between Washington and Peking provide both countries a limited but sometimes useful channel for communication, presentation of proposals, and evaluation of intentions. The dialogue has extended over eleven years and probably has been more extensive than that held between Peking and any other non-communist or western government. While it is an important line to keep open, it is not a substitute for exposure of Peking to the force of wider diplomatic contact.

The absence of effective general communication between Peking and large segments of the international community increases the difficulty for each in making accurate assessments of the other's intentions, as well as interpreting and predicting the other's behavior, at a time when miscalculations could lead to an Asian catastrophe. Periodic discussions in Warsaw, listening posts in Hong Kong, and reports of third-party conversations are not adequate substitutes for this wider range of direct and multilateral diplomatic relationship.

At the same time, it is important for the United States to maintain its commitments and to help support its Asian allies against military and subversive threats, and to assist them in their development of viable economic and political institutions.

The panel has looked at the question of Chinese representation at the UN in the context of simultaneously pursuing both goals—blocking mainland China's military threats to her neighbors, while at the same time seeking to maximize contact with the Chinese.

The United States approach to the question of China's representation in the United Nations is only one aspect of our China policy. Conversely, for mainland China, the question of whether to participate in international organizations is only one facet of her international involvement—or lack of it. But this particular aspect has now become important, both because it implies, for good or ill, an increase in Peking's exposure to international opinion, and because the shift of a few votes in the UN General Assembly, under present formulation of the issue, might lead to the seating of Peking and possibly to the ouster of the Republic of China.

This report takes a hard, and we hope a timely, look at this complex problem.

It projects no easy solution.

It takes as fundamental the continuance of U.S. commitments to Taiwan and support for her independence.[1]

It examines various alternatives that have been suggested to existing U.S. policy over recent years. It seeks the most effective way to serve U.S. interests—the way that can offer the best prospect for a mutual avoidance of miscalculation with Peking, for protection of Taiwan's membership in the UN, and for the peaceful evolution of prosperous and harmonious relations throughout the Far East.

The report is based on a conviction that a strong and effective United Nations is in the United States' interest. It recognizes that any course of action which led to the seating of Peking in the General Assembly, and particularly in the Security Council, would pose major new problems for the United Nations.

It does not assume that Peking would immediately accept seating in the UN, if that were offered under terms which would also keep the Nationalist Chinese in the Organization. Nor does it assume any early alteration of Peking's behavior, or of its hostility to the U.S., whenever she does accept seating in the UN. In the present-day multilateral diplomatic context, the soundness of a course of action cannot always be judged by the initial response of one of the principals. Its soundness must rather be judged by its consistency with political realities, by its probable and potential long term influence on the principals, and by its possible short and long term influence on third parties.

What this report—a precursor of further studies to be completed in 1967—does attempt to do is to take a thoroughgoing look at the problem of Chinese representation in the United Nations, to examine the courses of action that are open to the United States, and to make recommendations for United States policy.

The report distinguishes between the question of Chinese representation in the UN and the question of United States recognition of the Peking Government.

In the case of recognition, the United States can set forth its own terms under which it is prepared to enter into diplomatic relations. If these terms are not accepted, it is then up to the U.S. to decide on any further action to be taken. The decision on UN representation is a multilateral one, and therefore it would appear to require separate treatment. There are already four States (Albania, Cambodia, Cuba, and Outer Mongolia) that are Members of the United Nations with whom the United States does not maintain bilateral diplomatic relations. In addition, of course, the United States does not maintain diplomatic relations with the Byelorussian SSR or the Ukrainian SSR, each of which has a vote in the United Nations.

The panel is convinced that the great majority of the American public will support a change in U.S. policy on the Chinese representation issue only if the changed policy (1) improves the prospect of preserving Taiwan's membership in the UN and (2) may reasonably be expected to contribute to the development of a viable peace in Asia. These elements are essential ingredients of United States policy on this question. (See Appendix A for recent public opinion polls.)

2. THE PRINCIPAL ISSUES: HISTORY AND ANALYSIS

At the time of North Korea's invasion of South Korea in 1950, U.S. policy toward mainland China was still in the process of formulation.

In January 1950, only three months after the People's Republic of China was proclaimed, Washington announced a policy of non-intervention in the Chinese civil war. Many of our allies were considering recognition of the Peking Government and on January 6, 1950, the United Kingdom extended recognition. There was speculation that U.S. recognition would come in the near future.

The U.S. Government was understandably concerned about the strong anti-Americanism of the Peking regime and seemed to be withholding any definite policy commitment pending further developments, particularly the PRC's reaction to British recognition. This hesitation is perhaps further reflected in the position taken by the U.S. in January 1950 when the Chinese representation question was first presented in the Security Council. The U.S. voted against the seating of Peking's representatives, but care was taken to explain that we regarded the vote as a procedural one and that, therefore, our vote was not to be considered a veto. The Russian sponsored resolution was defeated by a vote of three in favor, six against and two abstentions. The U.S. vote was explained by the United States representative, not on moral grounds nor on the grounds that the Peking regime was unrepresentative or failed to observe the customary practices of international law; rather, the United States position against seating Peking was linked to its own views on recognition—which were not explained at the time in the Council.

The possibility of any early U.S. recognition of Peking was foreclosed when on June 25, 1950, North Korea invaded South Korea. Chinese involvement in the hostilities served as a catalyst and U.S. policy hardened against the Peking regime. By December 1954, the United States had signed a Treaty of Mutual Defense with the Republic of China, formally pledging to help defend Taiwan against Communist attack. The United States Congress in January 1955, adopted the so-called "blank check" resolution—further evidence of a hardening of the United States position. This resolution gave the President authority to act "as he deems necessary for the specific purpose of securing and protecting Formosa and the Pescadores".

China at the United Nations

From 1952 to 1960, voting in the UN on the representation question was based on United States' proposals, *not* to put the item on the Assembly's agenda. These proposals required only a simple majority for adoption.

However, by 1961, the views of certain new UN Members had made it more difficult to obtain a majority for this simple proposition and the U.S. did not advance its agenda proposal in that year. The Chinese representation question was, with U.S. support, included on the agenda of the 1961 General Assembly, but our Government successfully backed a resolution that any proposal to change the representation of China is an "important question". This resolution required only a simple majority and its adoption meant that a two-thirds majority would be required in order to seat the representatives from Peking. This two-thirds majority was not obtained in 1961. The vote was 36 votes for seating, 48 against and 20 abstentions.

In 1962 and 1963, votes were confined to the single issue of whether Peking should be seated, and in each year the proposals were defeated through failure to obtain a simple majority. The Article 19 issue (loss of vote over failure to pay assessments) dominated the truncated Assembly in 1964 and no vote was taken on the Chinese representation issue. In 1965, both the "important question" and the seating question were again put to a vote. The Assembly, by a 56–49 vote with 11 abstentions, decided again that the issue was an important question requiring a two-thirds majority. The Albanian draft resolution to seat Peking and oust the Nationalists was then defeated by a failure to obtain a two-thirds majority. The vote was 47 to 47, with 20 abstentions. (See Appendix C for the Albanian draft resolution and the "important question" resolution, and Appendix B for a complete tabulation of the votes on the Chinese representation question.)

The General Assembly thus in 1961 and 1965 decided that any change in Chinese representation was an "important question". while it may be possible for the Assembly to alter its determination in this respect, to do so would represent a major change.

The lessening support in the United Nations for the United States position in the early 1960's took place against a perplexing backdrop. Peking had set out both to woo and to subvert a number of African countries. Indonesia withdrew from the United Nations and rumors abounded that the withdrawal has been in the expectation of joining with Peking in the establishment of a rival organization. Both developments alienated many members of the United Nations who might have been more friendly to

---

[1] For comment by Mr. Everett Case, see page 28839.

Peking. Indonesia has, of course, since returned to the UN.

But balanced against these developments were the explosion by mainland China of her first atomic device, the belief by many UN Members that her participation in disarmament negotiations would somehow be made easier if she were in the United Nations, and the general and growing conviction that the 700 million Chinese on the mainland should have their own voice in the UN.

Some Members are not inclined to take seriously as does the United States the extreme and often outrageous statements made by the leaders in Peking—both on the virtues of revolutionary war, and on the need for reform of the United Nations. Nevertheless such statement and the policies which they reflect certainly are relevant to the present discussion.

In a press conference on September 20, 1965, Chen Yi, Vice Premier and Foreign Minister, said:

"The question now is how to reform the United Nations in accordance with the purpose and principles of its Charter and to free it from the control of the United States and other big powers. If the task of reforming the United Nations cannot be accomplished, conditions will no doubt gradually ripen for the establishment of a revolutionary United Nations. . . .

"The United Nations must rectify its mistakes and undergo a thorough reorganization and reform. It must admit and correct all its past mistakes. Among other things, it should cancel its resolution condemning China and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea as aggressors and adopt a resolution condemning the United States as the aggressor; the UN Charter must be reviewed and revised jointly by all countries, big and small; all independent states should be included in the United Nations; and all imperialist puppets should be expelled."

In responding to the vote on the representation question in 1965 at the 20th General Assembly, the Peking daily, *Jenmin Jih Pao* declared:

"To return to the path of its purposes and principles, the United Nations must free itself from the control of the United States, rectify all its mistakes and undergo a thorough reorganization and reform."

The editorial indicated that Peking would not be satisfied just to see the United Nations expel the Chinese Nationalist Government on Taiwan and give its seat to the Chinese Communists.

At the time of the opening of the 21st General Assembly in September 1966, Peking reiterated its demands for reorganization of the UN and denounced the UN as a place of collaboration between the U.S. and the Soviet Union.

Despite these extreme statements, many UN Members appear to be convinced that Peking might accept seating in the United Nations if the Nationalists were unseated. Few Members appear to believe that Peking would accept seating in the Assembly in the near future, if a seat for the Republic of China in the Assembly were retained. Nevertheless, there is substantial support in the UN for the continued membership of the Republic of China—and hence representation in the Assembly—even if this meant no early entry by Peking.

Taiwan has made an important contribution to the international community, both in its responsible participation in UN organs (see Appendix D) and in its recent bilateral technical assistance programs to many of the newer UN Members. It is presently a member of twenty UN bodies, twelve UN specialized agencies, and is recognized by fifty-five United Nations Members.

It has a thriving economy and a right to protection from threats to its existence—a protection by the international community which is implicit in its membership in the United Nations. (For a list of countries which have diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China and with the Republic of China, see Appendix E.)

3. ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO THE CHINESE REPRESENTATION ISSUE

There appear to be five principal policy options open to the United States on the question of Chinese representation in the United Nations: (1) a continuation of the present opposition to Peking's seating; (2) support for a successor state proposition leading to "two Chinas"; (3) acceptance of one China and one Taiwan; (4) urging the admission of several divided states, such as the two Koreas as well as two Chinas; or (5) accepting the outright replacement in the UN of Taiwan by Peking.

1. Continuation of present policy

Maintaining the present general policy requires that there be either a simple majority in the Assembly explicitly against the seating of mainland China, or a simple majority for some procedural variant, such as the decision that any change in Chinese representation is an "important question"—thus requiring a two-thirds majority for effecting a change.

In terms of total UN membership, support for the U.S. position on the "important question" issue dropped from 59% in 1961 to 48% in 1965. On the substantive issue, the percentage vote dropped from 46% in 1961 to 40% in 1965. The number of member states abstaining on these votes was large enough to be pivotal. That is, in 1965, had the abstentions been votes against the United States position, Peking could have been seated and Taiwan ousted.

While the voting trend is against the United States position, it is possible nonetheless that the present U.S. position could be maintained for at least another year. An indefinite continuation of the present policy, however, involves serious risks of the seating in the Assembly of the People's Republic of China with the unseating of the representatives of the Republic of China. This defeat could be administered by a one or two vote margin in the General Assembly. It would also be difficult, under these circumstances, to prevent an early seating of the People's Republic of China in the Security Council.

Should the Republic of China's representatives be ousted from the UN, the United States would certainly maintain its own treaties with Taiwan. No doubt a few other UN Members would continue to maintain diplomatic relations with that government. But the general political and representational disadvantages which would flow from such General Assembly action are obvious. Many UN Members that now recognize the Republic of China would probably shift their diplomatic recognition to Peking. The reaction in the United States to this kind of defeat could hurt U.S. support for the UN as well as its financial contributions to UN projects. The results could be damaging both to the United Nations and to the general prospects for the development of effective international organizations.

There are many who would challenge present United States policy on wider grounds.

Although Peking's isolation has in fact been largely self-imposed, continued opposition to seating Peking tends to limit the possibilities for changes in Peking's own policies, changes which could lead to more regular contact with the activities, procedures and interests of most of the rest of the world, and with the force of international public opinion.

It prevents development of the types of multilateral contact which can help greatly to avoid those possible mutual miscalculations of intentions, appraisals, or capabilities that can be so terrifyingly dangerous among atomic powers.

It curbs the two-way flow of information of all kinds that could be useful to the people themselves, in all walks of life in all countries.

2. A two-China solution

A two-China procedure for enabling the People's Republic of China to be represented in the UN would require General Assembly action to seat Peking while the membership of the Republic of China would simply be continued.

The most likely avenue to such an arrangement would be some version of the successor state formula. Under this formula, both the People's Republic of China and the Republic of China would be declared by the Assembly to be successor states, for the purposes of United Nations membership, to the China mentioned in the UN Charter. A political agreement on a two-China approach would be sought widely among the UN membership. Such an agreement would be important both as a prelude to any United States support for seating Peking in the Security Council, and as assurance against any future moves to unseat the Republic of China in the Assembly. Action on the representation question in the Council would only be taken after approval of the two-China approach in the Assembly.

The panel is aware of the differing opinions as to whether the representation question in the Security Council is procedural or substantive, and thus whether the veto would apply to a change in Chinese representation. It has not, however, attempted to come to any conclusion on this question. (For further comment on the veto and other procedural questions in the Council see Appendix F.)

It is often argued that Peking should be required to announce basic changes in her policies as a condition to United Nations membership. The panel believes, however, that such conditions, other than those imposed by the UN Charter and that of the acceptance by Peking of Taiwan's membership in the United Nations, are unlikely to be supported by the UN membership as prerequisites for Peking's being seated. It is equally unlikely, however, that the United Nations would accept Peking's own current conditions for her entry—that Taiwan be expelled, that the UN revise its Charter, and that it rescind its resolution condemning the People's Republic of China for aggression.

The seating of mainland China in the United Nations should not carry any implications regarding the disposition of the overseas Chinese assets as between Peking and Taiwan.

While a successful two-China approach could preserve Taiwan's membership in the United Nations, the viability of the approach would depend upon the composition of the coalition of countries taking the leadership for this solution in the General Assembly—as well as on the vigor and effectiveness of their efforts. There are some UN Members who believe it is too late for a two-China solution. It seems to us likely, however, that most UN Members would welcome an opportunity to vote on such a proposal rather than on the radical Albanian draft resolution which would seat Peking and oust Taiwan. Many of them would consider that a two-China proposal reflected the present political realities in the Far East.

3. A one-China, one-Taiwan solution

This approach would mean that Peking would assume China's seat in both the General Assembly and Security Council. The Republic of China would have a separate membership in the Assembly as "Taiwan".

Procedurally, the approach in this form has the serious limitation of necessitating a separate application for Taiwan's membership. This would require Security Council recommendation (subject to the veto) as well as Assembly approval.

Another consideration affecting the one-Taiwan, one-China approach would be the deference due the *Cairo Declaration* of December 1943, which declared the intention that Formosa be restored to China. The Declaration was signed by the United States, United Kingdom, and the Republic of China. The intention of restoration was reaffirmed by the *Potsdam Declaration* of 1945. No consensus having been reached among the Allied Powers by 1951 as to the disposition of Formosa, the Japanese Peace Treaty that year reads simply, "Japan renounces all right, title, and claim to Formosa and the Pescadores". The Cairo and Potsdam Declarations might be cited against any approach which required the admission of Taiwan to the United Nations as a new state—although their possible effect cannot at this stage be assessed.

The one-Taiwan, one-China approach would also require a willingness on the part of the Nationalist regime on Taiwan to change its name and to apply for United Nations membership.

While the Assembly might, through applying the successor state formula, decide to seat Peking and to provide membership for a "Republic of Taiwan", such a change in her position would certainly be unacceptable to the Republic of China.

4. Bringing all or most of the divided states into UN membership

Some students of the Chinese representation question have suggested that it be included in a more general move which would bring the divided states of North and South Korea, North and South Vietnam, and East and West Germany into UN membership. This could presumably be done under some version of the successor state approach or could be done as a purely political move, recommended by the Security Council and approved by the Assembly.

This approach remains a theoretical possibility, but it is doubtful that such a move would simplify the issues involved. Indeed it might complicate them. A case might be made for a representation and membership proposal which included North and South Korea and even North and South Vietnam. But the German situation is politically very different. It raises a complex and interrelated set of European problems which, if included in any package arrangement, would be likely only to complicate further the UN membership and representation questions.[2]

5. The replacement of the Republic of China in the UN by the People's Republic of China

This is the solution of the Chinese representation question which is favored by most of those countries which now recognize the Peking Government and which have no diplomatic relations with the Republic of China. It is the result which might well follow from a defeat of the United States position on the simple majority vote required for the "important question" approach now being taken in the General Assembly.

It is a solution which would adversely affect the United States' interests in the UN and in the Far East and might weaken the United States' military position and that of its allies in the western Pacific. We have referred earlier to the reaction that might in consequence take place in the United States both toward the United Nations and toward further development of effective multilateral organizations. Because we believe that continued separate representation of Taiwan in the United Nations should be a precondition for any acceptance of Peking in the United Nations, we found no support for this last approach from any member of our group.

4. IMPLICATIONS OF A CHANGE IN U.S. POLICY

1. Implications for the United Nations

Although Peking's participation in the United Nations would raise substantial new problems, these would not in the view of the panel lead to a major paralysis of the Organization. We are impressed that so few UN Members appear to have considered this likely. While the newer UN Members have distinct views of the way in which the Organization should function, they do have a basic loyalty to its continued functioning. The UN was, indeed, instrumental in the achievement of their statehood—and they prize their membership. The UN has survived walkouts by the Soviet Union and South Africa and, more recently, the Indonesian withdrawal. The United Nations probably has more resilience today to withstand the obstructions of an obstreperous new Member than it had some years ago.

Nevertheless, Peking's seating in the United Nations would introduce an abrasive new factor and impede great power unanimity in the Security Council.

The Security Council

The Charter gives the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. While over the last few years the Council has had limited effectiveness in dealing with problems involving important interests of major powers, more recently it has been able to take up some of these questions with reasonable assurance of useful consideration.

If Peking were in the Security Council, the Council as well as the Assembly might be in an improved position to take up other issues—such as Vietnam—now eluding effective UN consideration. However, once a permanent member of the Security Council, mainland China would of course possess veto powers. The Council would, as a result, be subject to the serious risk of intermittent paralysis—a risk that would no doubt be particularly severe during the early stages of Chinese membership.

Frequent Chinese use of the veto in the Security Council would almost certainly lead to much greater use of the *Uniting for Peace Resolution*. This resolution provides procedures for transferring matters which threaten or breach the peace, to the General Assembly when the Security Council fails to take action due to a lack of unanimity of the permanent members. Consequently, while the Assembly might be utilized to make recommendations on these important political questions, the Security Council would probably lose, on balance, at least for a substantial period, some of its present ability to take substantive decisions—most importantly those on the establishment of peacekeeping operations. Although the disruptive effects of seating mainland China in the Security Council are quite unpredictable, it is conceivable that the sources of constructive power within the UN might shift to such an extent as to indicate a need for some new organizational approaches.

The General Assembly

There are presently 119 Members in the General Assembly. Should mainland China be seated in the Assembly, one should not anticipate any early changes in Peking's policies or tactics. The policies would continue to be strident and extreme. The tactics would be obstructive. Over a period of time, with exposure to the views of other UN Members, as a result of extended experience with UN processes, and with changes in the governmental hierarchy in Peking, some moderating adjustments might come. The Peking regime would probably learn that in a political arena such as the UN, even the large powers must compromise on some issues. But until this lesson was learned, the Assembly as well as the Security Council would have rough passage.

Peking's ability to find obstructionist allies among smaller Members might be limited somewhat by the latters' desire to strengthen the Assembly, an organ in which they comprise the great majority and which they feel best serves their national interests.

At the present time the United States has to spend a great deal of political capital in maintaining support for its policy of excluding Peking. If the U.S. should move to a two-China policy, it could find itself in a better position to develop support for other intiatives in the Assembly. This stronger position for the United States coupled with the loyalty to the United Nations of the newer UN Members, could blunt the effect of Peking's obstructionist tactics. It should be noted that in order to prevent a peacekeeping operation established by the Assembly under the *Uniting for Peace Resolution*, Peking would need the support of one-third of the Members present and voting. To stop an operation underway, Peking would have the difficult task of obtaining the support of a two-thirds majority.

The Secretariat

If Peking were to insist upon China's full quota of Secretariat staff, her nationals would be able to assume between 40 and 56 posts. Chinese nationals presently hold 49 posts. It is possible, of course, if a two-China solution were reached, that the posts for Chinese nationals in the Secretariat might be divided—although not equally—between Peking and Taiwan.

The question arises to what extent Peking's nationals would be able to hinder the Secretary-General in the performance of his duties as chief administrative officer of the UN and generally impede the operations of the Secretariat.

Members of the UN Secretariat are international civil servants whose responsibilities, according to UN staff regulations, are not national but exclusively international. Since the Secretary-General has exclusive authority in staff appointments and in the determination of the organization of the Secretariat, he might be able to isolate those staff members who refused to abide by the rules of the international civil service. While this has been done in the past in several instances in which staff members failed to live up to their responsibilities under Article 100 of the Charter, the measures are not easy to apply and to maintain.

2. Implications for U.S. participation in the United Nations

Peking's participation in the UN would mean that the United States would find itself in competition with mainland China for influence and support throughout the UN membership. If Peking continued to maintain her present extreme policies, this could result in her isolation and in the development of even greater support for U.S. policies and initiatives. Much would depend upon the reaction of the smaller Members—and whether many of them felt impelled to move into a neutralist position vis-a-vis the United States and Peking.

The effects of mainland China's seating, however, would run a wide gamut of possibilities. An airing of the Sino-Soviet dispute within the Organization could either move the United States and the Soviet Union toward closer working relationships in the United Nations, or it could cause embarrassment to the Soviets and therby hinder cooperative efforts with the U.S. within the Organization.

It is possible that after an adjustment period for all concerned, Peking would enter into discussions and negotiations on several problems which the United Nations has thus far been unable to take up in a meaningful manner. The raison d'etre for many Members resisting United Nations involvement in these questions, including Vietnam, would at the least be gone—but with what consequences one could not foretell.

---

[2] For comment and reservation by Professor George E. Taylor, see page 28839.

3. Implications for Peking and Taiwan

A General Assembly resolution accepting representatives from two Chinas would be tantamount to international acceptance that the People's Republic of China exercises control over the mainland. The international position of Taiwan would be altered somewhat, but clarified. The claims of both Peking and Taiwan to represent all of China would of course have been rejected.

Taiwan's acceptance of a two-China formula would provide her greatest insurance for continued membership in the United Nations. It could also greatly increase her stature in the international community—especially among countries that do not now maintain relations with her—as a government with a population larger than that of most UN Member states. There are presently 85 Members of the UN with less than Taiwan's twelve million inhabitants.

However, if a two-China solution were adopted by the Assembly, the strong probability is that Peking would refuse to sit with the Republic of China in the Assembly, in which event any possibility of her seating in the Security Council would be deferred. Peking's seat in the Assembly might be vacant for a period of time. This might be a prolonged period, but it is not impossible that future leaders in Peking would reassess their interest and position and decide to occupy their seat.

The handling of China's seat in the Security Council would of course depend upon the precise formulation of the two-China approach. A rejection by Peking of a two-China approach in the Assembly might result in the Nationalist Government continuing to sit in the Council.

Under these circumstances some Members might wish to propose a Charter amendment which would permit the permanent seat in Security Council, presently held by the Republic of China, to be occupied, in series, by the larger Asian Members. Whether such a proposal would have any possibility of adoption would of course depend upon the circumstances at the time and upon whether the proposal would be considered as one which opened up the whole question of permanent membership in the Security Council.

We believe it is possible that offers from the UN to seat Peking in the General Assembly and in the Security Council could strengthen the position of moderate voices in Peking and thereby have some influence in the changes that will be taking place in post-Mao leadership.

5. A BALANCE SHEET: WITH RECOMMENDATIONS FOR UNITED STATES POLICY

In the preceding sections we have traced briefly the history of the Chinese representation issue, outlined what seem to us to be the principal policy options open to the United States, and considered some of the implications of a change in U.S. policy—for the United Nations, for Taiwan and Peking, and for our own participation in the UN.

The panel would anticipate no early moderation in Peking's policies if she were seated in the United Nations. It would expect formidable new difficulties in decision-making in each of the principal United Nations organs in which Peking was represented.

Nevertheless, we are convinced that the United States policy on the Chinese representation issue, recommended in this report, would be in our national interest.

It is essential that mainland China be exposed to the political force of a wider range of diplomatic contact. Peking's willingness to participate in this wider diplomatic contact has not been fully tested. It has been the opposition of the United States in past years to Peking's seating in the United Nations which has prevented that test.

The United States has made a very heavy expenditure of diplomatic capital in the effort to prevent Peking's entry. But despite that expenditure, which may well have been costly in the pursuit of other objectives, support for the U.S. position on this issue has declined. Indeed, we believe there is serious risk if we hold to the past position, that Taiwan might actually lose its seat in the Assembly.

The steady erosion of support for the U.S. position reflects the growing belief among the UN Members that it is in their national interest for mainland China to be less isolated and to participate more fully in international political life. They see their interests imperiled by the possibility, under present circumstances, of major miscalculation. Many of them believe that with Peking in the UN the Organization would be better able to deal with Peking-supported subversion, including the issue of Vietnam, and that such advantages would outweigh the difficulties for the UN which a change in representation would entail.

U.N. representation may or may not have a bearing on Peking's willingness to sign the *Test Ban Treaty* and to participate in negotiations looking toward comprehensive test ban and nuclear proliferation treaties. But it is certain that both signature of the Treaty and participation in disarmament negotiations are clearly in the United States interest—as well as in that of the other U.N. Members—and that an offer of representation in the U.N. would certainly not hurt the possibilities for participation and for signature. The conceptions of national interest as seen by other U.N. Members are, we believe, also important considerations to be taken into account in the determination of our own national interest.

The panel believes that the time has come for the United States to support some form of two-China solution to the representation question in the United Nations.

There are now two Chinas in fact. The twelve million people of Taiwan deserve their own representation. As we have pointed out, the Nationalist Government is now recognized by fifty-five U.N. Members, and has made important contributions to the work of the United Nations.

Peking's initial response to a two-China decision in the Assembly would probably be to reject the offer—even though the proposal included the possibility of seating in the Security Council. If Peking's present policies would not permit her to sit with representatives of Taiwan, that may prove to be only one of several policies now being pursued in Peking that will ultimately require modification to bring them into accord with present-day realities.

A two-China approach in the General Assembly would reflect present political realities in the Far East. Acquiescence in such an approach by Peking and Taiwan need not preclude decision at a later stage of political development in one or both countries for them to join forces and form a single entity for the purposes of U.N. representation and membership. One has only to recall the Egyptian-Syrian and Tanganyika-Zanzibar experience. In the case of Peking and Taiwan, acquiescence to a two-China approach need not be accompanied by forfeiture of any basic long-range claims. It could for each party reflect short-range political considerations.

The response of Peking and Taiwan to a two-China decision by the Assembly would provide some guidance for any subsequent action in the Security Council. The stakes here are much greater, both for the United Nations and for the parties directly concerned. If what we are proposing for the Assembly is adopted, any seating of Peking in the Security Council should be deferred pending Peking's acceptance of the two-China approach in the Assembly.[3] The panel does not believe the United States should support any change in Chinese representation in the Security Council unless Taiwan's membership in the Assembly is maintained.

A two-China decision by the Assembly, even though rejected initially by Peking, could open up lines of negotiation with importance for Peking's ultimate participation in the United Nations, in disarmament negotiations and in moves for the resolution of the current conflict in Southeast Asia.

The panel in this first report has preferred to deal with the basic question of United States policy toward Chinese representation in the United Nations. It is not suggesting the particular procedures by which the United States at this (the 21st) or another session of the General Assembly might move to implement that policy. Whether this should be pursued through a resolution or through diplomatic activity must remain a matter of governmental discretion.

It is essential, however, that in this matter the United States move in the closest consultation with those countries, including neighbors of China, whose national interests would especially be affected. The panel believes it is important that the United States move promptly to explore with her allies in particular, the possibility of implementing the policy suggested in this report.

The recent address made by Ambassador Goldberg to the United Nations General Assembly on September 22, 1966, may, we think, be the foundation on which can be constructed a new United States position of leadership of the kind proposed in this report.

That address included three pillars:

". . . it is not the policy of the United States to isolate Communist China from the world . . .

". . . the United States will vigorously oppose any effort to exclude the representatives of the Republic of China from the United Nations . . .

". . . the United States has the friendliest historic feelings toward the great Chinese people and looks forward to the occasion when they will once again enrich, rather than endanger, the fabric of the world community, and, in the spirit of the Charter, 'practice tolerance, and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors.' "

The hoped for reconciliation between the United States and China, of which President Johnson spoke to the American Alumni Council on July 12, 1966, would ultimately require the establishment of full diplomatic relations. While there is little prospect of any early decisive action in this field, the panel believes that our Government, in connection with moves to be made in the United Nations, should give further study to the possible terms under which it could enter into full diplomatic relations with Peking. Even if Peking should accept seating in the United Nations, that would only be a way station on a long, tedious and thorny path to peace in Asia. Those who travel that path should be in a position see the guide posts and understand the goals.

MEMORANDA OF COMMENT AND RESERVATION

Reservation by Messrs. Young, Pye, Lindsay and Dillard

We would prefer at this time making only a conditional amplification of United States policy regarding the issue of Chinese representation in the United Nations. Subject to several considerations briefly stated herein, we would favor a provisional two-stage modification of present United States policy which would (1) provide for dual representation of both the Republic of China and the Chinese People's Republic in the General Assembly, but (2) defer the complicated question of changing the representation of a permanent and veto-empowered member of the Security Council. In our opinion it is premature at this time to propose any ultimate resolution of the complex issue of membership in the Security Council, particularly as this may require an amendment of Article 23 of the Charter which would in turn open consideration of other possible candidates such as Japan, India, and even others.

---

[3] For reservation by Messrs. Kenneth T. Young, Lucian W. Pye, Franklin A. Lindsay and Hardy C. Dillard, see above, and for comment by Mr. Arthur H. Dean, see p. 28839.

We believe that opportunities should be made available for appropriate participation at the opportune time by the Chinese People's Republic in the United Nations and other international bodies. While we do not expect the present leadership of the Chinese People's Republic to use any such opportunities as provisionally made available, we are convinced that long range United States relations with and interests in Asia justify supporting the international community in making and keeping open the option for Peking's responsible membership and participation in the UN. The chief and perhaps sole reason for our supporting the principle of altering United States policy along these lines is our estimate that such an internationally supported change has some reasonable chance of encouraging the emergence of moderate leadership eventually in China. That, we feel, is the most important objective and consideration for the world community involved in this issue of Chinese representation. We also believe that the present leadership of the Chinese People's Republic, if seated in the Security Council, would do far more damage to the United Nations and international comity than is recognized in this report.

We are concerned about the incongruity of the United States and the United Nations considering or undertaking any change whatsoever in Chinese representation under current circumstances in view of the extraordinary internal and external actions of the present leadership in Peking. However, we believe that a provisional, two-stage amplification of United States policy, such as we recommend, would reconcile that immediate contradiction with long term requirements.

Comment by Mr. Dean on reservation of Messrs. Young, Pye, Lindsay and Dillard

I concur in the reservation of Messrs. Young, Pye, Lindsay and Dillard, with the following comment.

I believe the United Nations only functions effectively when the Members of the Security Council are in unanimous agreement. Korea is an exception because the USSR was, in June 1950, boycotting the meetings of the Security Council. I do not believe this will occur again.

When the General Assembly acts pursuant to the Uniting for Peace resolution of 1950, against the wishes of a Permanent Member of the Security Council, such a Permanent Member, as in the case of the USSR in the Congo peace-keeping operation, can withhold payment of its assessment for the peace-keeping operations, and can continue to issue propaganda and to harass the Secretariat. For these reasons I believe the granting of the Security Council's seat, presently held by Nationalist China, to Communist China should be deferred until such time as it is clear Communist China will be, and Nationalist China will continue to be members of the UN.

Then the question of the Security Council seat membership can be worked out more intelligently. If Communist China will not accept membership in the United Nations unless it becomes a Permanent Member of the Security Council then that fact will have to be faced and necessary adjustments made.

Comment by Professor Taylor on reservation of Messrs. Young, Pye, Lindsay and Dillard

While I am in general sympathy with the reservation made by Messrs. Young, Pye, Lindsay and Dillard, I feel that the representation of Communist China in the UN is no more or less important than that of other States not now members. We should move towards the position that membership in the UN is an obligation of any people claiming to have an independent government. Under the present ground rules representation of Communist China is unacceptable. But it could be discussed if it is understood that the Republic of China as a legal entity is not negotiable and that all remaining States not now members should be invited to membership of the Assembly at the same time. The question of the composition of the Security Council can be left to future negotiations, as Messrs. Young, Pye, Lindsay and Dillard suggest.

Comment by Mr. Case

In order to make clear that we are not in opposition to peaceful change, I would subscribe to the reference on page 28835, to "the continuance of U.S. commitments to Taiwan and our support for her independence" on the understanding that it included the right of self-determination.

UNA-USA National Policy Panel on China, the United Nations, and United States Policy

Robert V. Roosa, Chairman, partner, Brown Brothers Harriman & Company.

[1] Harding F. Bancroft, Executive Vice President, New York Times.

A. Doak Barnett, Professor of Government, Acting Director, East Asian Institute, Columbia University.

Robert S. Benjamin, Chairman of the Board, United Artists Corporation, President, UNA-USA.

Detlev W. Bronk, President, Rockefeller University.

Everett Case, President, Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, Former President of Colgate University.

Arthur H. Dean, Partner, Sullivan and Cromwell.

Hardy C. Dillard, Dean, School of Law, University of Virginia.

Leland M. Goodrich, Professor of International Organization, Columbia University.

Ernest A. Gross, Partner, Curtis, Mallett-Prevost, Colt and Mosle.

Joseph E. Johnson, President, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Harry M. Knight, Management Consultant, Member of the Board of Directors, Foreign Policy Association.

Arthur Larson, Director, Rule of Law Research Center, Duke University.

Franklin A. Lindsay, President, Itek Corporation.

Frederick S. Beebe, Vice Chairman, Chairman of the Board, Newsweek, Washington Post Company.

Jacob S. Potofsky, General President, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, Vice President, AFL-CIO.

[2] Herbert Prochnow, President, First National Bank of Chicago.

Lucian W. Pye, Professor of Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

[3] Marshall Shulman, Professor of International Relations, Tufts University, Russian Research Center, Harvard University.

Anna Lord Strauss, Former President, League of Women Voters.

[4] Jesse W. Tapp, Director, Bank of America.

George E. Taylor, Director, Far Eastern Institute, University of Washington.

Eleanor Davidson Worley, Founder and Former Publisher-Editor, Atlas Magazine.

Stephen J. Wright, President, United Negro College Fund.

Charles W. Yost, Senior Fellow, Council on Foreign Relations.

Kenneth T. Young, President, Asia Society.

Donald S. Zagoria, Associate Professor of Government, Columbia University.

Affiliations indicated for purpose of identification only.

WORLD FERTILIZER SITUATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "War Against Hunger," published in this morning's New York Times, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 22, 1966]

War Against Hunger

Every fresh study reaches the same grim conclusion: The world is on a treadmill when it comes to feeding the growing population of developing countries. It must run hard to stay in the same place—and just to stay in the same place will not head off starvation and chaos.

The United States and other exporters cannot for long make up the food deficit from their own stocks. Birth control is imperative, but its effects will be felt only over the long term. Advanced countries must intensify efforts to help struggling nations transform their agriculture in many different ways.

There is broad agreement, however, that the best single method of lifting food production rapidly in needy lands during the next ten to fifteen years is through the vastly expanded use of fertilizer, of which a major component is nitrogen.

Senator McGovern of South Dakota has proposed that the Government launch comprehensive research on the world fertilizer prospect, with special emphasis on nitrogen needs of the Indian subcontinent, Latin America and Africa. Mr. McGovern, first administrator of the Food for Peace program, urges the United States to take the lead by offering to finance construction of three pilot plants in the developing countries for production of fertilizer from natural gas.

Colossal amounts of natural gas are still flared, and thus lost, in all major producing countries. The Senator says the United States should study the possibility of using part of the gas now being flared in the Middle East, Latin America and Africa. He points out that the use of low-cost natural gas has helped bring about a revolution in the fertilizer industry.

Senator McGovern estimates the over-all cost of the projected three pilot plants at

---

[1] Mr. Bancroft: Participated in the work of the panel until his appointment to the U.S. Delegation to the 21st UN General Assembly.

[2] Mr. Prochnow: Not able to participate in the drafting of the report.

[3] Mr. Shulman: Unable to participate in the drafting of the report because of absence from the country.

[4] Mr. Tapp: Not able to participate in the drafting of the report because of illness.

$200 million and believes private foundations might help finance them. Eventually, he would hope to bring into an expanded fertilizer production program other governments, all relevant United Nations agencies and private enterprise.

This carefully prepared proposal merits the consideration not only of the United States but of all governments and organizations willing to join in a war against hunger, the dimensions of which can hardly be exaggerated.

NOMINATION OF THOMAS F. MALONE TO BE U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO UNESCO

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Committee on Foreign Relations has reported favorably on the appointment of Mr. Thomas F. Malone of Hartford, Conn., as U.S. representative to UNESCO. It is an appointment which I believe merits the unanimous confirmation of the Senate.

Thomas Malone is a scientist of note, an insurance executive, a lifelong apostle of international cooperation, a man who has devoted himself in many different ways to the advancement of science for the benefit of mankind.

He has served as director of research at Travelers Insurance Co. for more than a decade, and he now also serves as second vice president of this great organization.

The various positions he has held in the field of science are too numerous to list, but I wish to mention for the Record at least a few of the most important ones:

He has been a member of the Panel on Science and Technology of the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the U.S. House of Representatives; a member of the National Advisory Committee on Community Air Pollution of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and a member of the Scientific Information Council of the National Science Foundation.

He has also served as Chairman of the Committee on Natural and Social Sciences and as Chairman of the Committee on Meteorology of the National Citizens Commission for International Cooperation.

In the field of international scientific cooperation he has served as Secretary General of the Committee on Atmospheric Sciences of the International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics; as representative of the American Geophysical Union to the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO; and as president of the section on international participation of the American Geophysical Union.

The national recognition which he commands in his field is attested to by the fact that he was the recipient in 1960 of the Robert M. Losey Award of the Institute for Aeronautical Sciences.

In addition to his background of achievement, both in science and in business, I know from many years of friendship, that Thomas Malone will bring to his post a richly varied cultural background, a total dedication to the cause of international cooperation, and all the personal graces of the ideal diplomat.

I consider his appointment to UNESCO an exceptionally fortunate selection, and I strongly urge the unanimous confirmation of his nomination.

U.S. MILITARY POSTURE AND FUTURE URANIUM NEEDS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record a letter, and accompanying data, which I have today written to the Secretary of the Navy, suggesting that he take steps to initiate joint studies with the Atomic Energy Commission with regard to future uranium needs in order that the Nation's military posture may be safeguarded.

There being no objection, the letter and accompanying data were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

October 22, 1966.

Hon. Paul H. Nitze,
Secretary of the Navy,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: In August of this year the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy held hearings on the subject of proposed uranium enrichment criteria and related subjects. One of the related subjects which received a great deal of attention during those hearings was the adequacy of low cost uranium reserves, after a special report by National Coal Association aroused interest in that subject.

In the course of those hearings, Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, indicated that about 190,000 tons of uranium concentrates (U_3O_8, commonly known as "yellowcake") are known to be recoverable in the United States at a price of $10 per pound or less. Approximately 40,000 tons of these reserves are committed to Government purchase contracts, leaving about 150,000 tons available for commercial use. This amount will, of course, be supplemented by such additional amounts as may be found under the recently-renewed widespread search for uranium. In addition, it was indicated that some still-unknown amount might be made available from Government stockpiles of this material.

During the hearings, Dr. Seaborg indicated that defense needs of the future would be given full consideration in determining how much stockpiled uranium might be surplus, but he also indicated that at the present time he could not speak in quantitative terms because it is very difficult to determine future Government needs. The quantities in stockpile, and anticipated Government defense needs, are of course military secrets.

In addition to Government requirements, the AEC stockpile will be called upon to satisfy commitments already made and to be made in the future to supply uranium to foreign power reactors.

It seems to me that great care should be taken to see that an amount of uranium adequate for possible military needs is earmarked for that purpose and retained in the Government's stockpile. Included in "possible military needs" is, of course, the need for uranium to power nuclear submarines and to power the nuclear navy of the future. The needs are too vital to our country's defense to permit gambling that additional low-cost supplies will be found when needed.

Some idea of the adequacy, or inadequacy, of known reserves can be derived from a statement made by Mr. Rafford L. Faulkner, Director of AEC's Division of Raw Materials, on May 6, 1966. Mr. Faulkner said that on the average each electrical megawatt of installed atomic generating capacity requires about one short ton of uranium concentrates for the initial loading. Without plutonium recycling, he said, two-tenths of a ton is required each year for each megawatt as "make-up" fuel. If the plutonium is recycled, Mr. Faulkner stated, the "make-up" fuel requirement is reduced to fifteen-hundredths of a ton per year. Since most atomic power plants are designed to last at least 30 years, Mr. Faulkner's figures indicate a 30-year requirement of 7 tons of uranium concentrates for each megawatt if there is no recycling of plutonium, and a 30-year requirement of 5.5 tons of uranium concentrates for each megawatt if the plutonium is recycled rather than being saved to start "breeder" reactors.

While very few large atomic power plants are actually in operation at this time, a very great number are under construction or in the planning stage. Attached is a list of the major atomic power plants in operation, under construction, or planned, with a computation (based on Mr. Faulkner's statement referred to above) of the amount of uranium concentrates required to fuel such plants over a 30-year lifetime.

It will be noted that the total capacity of these plants is more than 31,800,000 kilowatts, or 31,800 megawatts, electric. Without plutonium recycle, these plants will need a total of more than 222,000 tons of yellowcake. If the plutonium produced is recycled rather than being saved for breeder reactors, these plants will need a total of more than 174,000 tons of yellowcake. Both figures are, as you will note, substantially in excess of the 150,000 tons of domestic reserves (190,000 available at $10 or less, minus the 40,000 tons committed to Government purchase) which are currently known to exist. It thus appears that the utility industry is willing to gamble that very substantial additional reserves of low-cost uranium will be discovered in the future. While that may be an appropriate gamble for the utilities to take, I believe it is not an appropriate gamble for defense purposes. We should take all steps necessary to assure retention in stockpile of an amount adequate for possible future defense needs.

The possible scarcity of low-cost uranium reserves was highlighted recently by Mr. Sidney Siegel, vice president of Atomics International and president of the American Nuclear Society. His remarks were summarized on page 5 of Nucleonics Week for October 13, 1966, as follows:

"We need fast breeders and we need them in a hurry, Sidney Siegel, Atomics International vice president and American Nuclear Society president, told the society's New York section Monday. What's more, he said, the low-performance fast breeder now in view won't produce enough plutonium to greatly relieve pressure on uranium reserves. He showed a graph depicting almost as much uranium needed in a light water & low-performance fast breeder technology as in just a light water reactor era. The graph also showed that, with an industry based on high-performance fast breeders, the fuel curve leveled off in 1985 with U_3O_8 requirements still in the $35/lb class. With such a technology, Siegel said, we could achieve an inexhaustible energy supply between the years 2010–2020. He defined the high-performance fast breeder as one with a 1.3 or 1.4 conversion ratio and power density of 1,000 lbs/gr Pu. This, he thinks, may be the only thing capable of keeping nuclear power competitive with fossil fuels as the reserves of low- and medium-priced uranium are exhausted. Siegel believes the accomplishment of the fast breeder is imminent and there are no big obstacles in the way . . ."

It will be noted from the above that Mr. Siegel believes that even with the early development of high-gain breeders, it will be necessary to use, in 1985, yellowcake costing $35 per pound. This is more than four times as much as the AEC is currently paying for yellowcake, and illustrates the wisdom—and the necessity—of keeping in stockpile supplies adequate for all possible future military needs.

It would appear that imports will not offer a reasonable alternative to adequate stockpiling. Information submitted in the August hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy indicated that the rest of the free world is in about the same position as the United States; that is, the ratio of known supplies to projected requirements is about the same. Indeed, the forthcoming shortage of low-cost uranium will, according to Professor Alexandr Ilych Leipunski, scientific director of the Physico-Energetics Institute of Russia's State Committee for the Utilization of Atomic Energy, be world-wide. According to Nucleonics Week of October 6, 1966, Professor Leipunski said that if thermal reactors are producing half of the world's power by the year 2030, the world will need a staggering 40 million metric tons of natural uranium. He compared this with the amount of 2 million tons which he believes can be obtained at a price of $30 per pound or less.

I am sure that the Atomic Energy Commission will take great care to safeguard the Nation's military needs. However, the Department of the Navy should collaborate with the Atomic Energy Commission in determining the possible extent of future needs for the purpose of furnishing power for submarines and for future nuclear warships. If you have not already taken steps to initiate joint studies with the AEC, may I respectfully suggest that you do so in the near future. It is important that full consideration be given to this matter before any uranium is released from Government stockpiles.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senator.

Major atomic powerplants in operation, under construction, or planned

Name	Size (kilowatts electric)	U_3O_8 requirements over 30-year period (in tons) (a) Without Pu recycling	(b) With Pu recycling
Dresden No. 1 (Commonwealth)	200,000	1,400.0	1,100
Yankee Atomic	175,000	1,225.0	962.5
Indian Point No. 1 (Consolidated Edison)	200,000	1,400.0	1,100
Consumers Power, Michigan	75,000	525.0	412.5
Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (Humboldt Bay)	60,900	426.3	334.95
Hanford (AEC)	800,000	5,600.0	4,400
Connecticut Yankee	462,000	3,234.0	2,541
Southern California Edison	375,000	2,625.0	2,062.5
Los Angeles Department of Water & Power	462,000	3,234.0	2,541
Jersey Central (Oyster Creek)	515,000	3,605.0	2,832.5
Niagara Mohawk (Nine Mile Point)	500,000	3,500.0	2,750
Rochester Gas & Electric	420,000	2,940.0	2,310
Dresden No. 2 (Commonwealth)	800,000	5,600.0	4,400
Indian Point No. 2 (Consolidated Edison)	873,000	6,111.0	4,801.5
Connecticut Light & Power	600,000	4,200.0	3,300
Florida Power & Light:			
1st unit	760,000	5,320.0	4,180
2d unit	760,000	5,320.0	4,180
Public Service of Colorado	330,000	2,310.0	1,815
Boston Edison	540,000	3,780.0	2,970
Carolina Power & Light	700,000	4,900.0	3,850
Dresden No. 3 (Commonwealth)	800,000	5,600.0	4,400
Consumers Power	770,000	5,390.0	4,235
Commonwealth & Iowa-Illinois (Quad City units):			
1st	800,000	5,600.0	4,400
2d	800,000	5,600.0	4,400
Maine Yankee	700,000	4,900.0	3,850
Northern States Power	520,000	3,640.0	2,860
Wisconsin Electric Power (Wisconsin-Michigan Power, substation)	450,000	3,150.0	2,475
Vermont Yankee	513,000	3,591.0	2,821.5
Delaware Valley (Philadelphia Electric and 3 others):			
1st unit	1,100,000	7,700.0	6,050
2d unit	1,035,000	7,245.0	5,692.5
3d unit	1,100,000	7,700.0	6,050
4th unit	1,035,000	7,245.0	5,692.5
Metropolitan Edison	700,000	4,900.0	3,850
Consumers Public Power District of Nebraska & Iowa Electric	700,000	4,900.0	3,850
Long Island Lighting	500,000	3,500.0	2,750
TVA:			
1st unit	1,064,500	7,451.5	5,854.75
2d unit	1,064,500	7,451.5	5,854.75
Omaha Public Power District	400,000	2,800.0	2,200
Virginia Electric Power Co.:			
1st unit	800,000	5,000.0	4,400
2d unit	800,000	5,600.0	4,400
Duke Power Co.:			
1st unit	822,000	5,754.0	4,521
2d unit	822,000	5,754.0	4,521
Pacific Gas & Electric Co.	850,000	5,950.0	4,675
Detroit Edison:			
1st unit	750,000	5,250.0	4,125
2d unit	750,000	5,250.0	4,125
Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (with 3 utilities)	1,600,000	11,200.0	8,800
Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority	450,000	3,150.0	2,475
Sacramento Municipal Unit District	500,000	3,500.0	2,750
Total	31,803,900	222,627.3	174,921.45

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on Saturday night, October 22, free Hungarians will meet in New York to commemorate the 10th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution.

It will be a sad, happy time for the people attending this banquet. Sad, because of all those left behind, living and dead. Sad, because they are forced to meet on foreign soil instead of remembering this noble event in familiar surroundings.

But there will also be happiness. The joy of being free cannot be matched by any other pleasure. And only those who have lived without it can fully appreciate the privilege of freedom.

I am proud of my Hungarian friends. They have prospered in America, and they have immeasurably enriched our culture with their presence.

And I am proud of my country for having welcomed these people with open arms. It is fitting that those who love liberty so dearly have chosen to settle in the birthplace of modern democracy.

I refuse to give up hope that someday a similar reunion will be held in Budapest. As lovers of freedom, our job will not be complete until those who embrace freedom are able to return to their native Hungary to plant again the seeds of democracy in this unhappy land.

LEGISLATIVE SUMMARY OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, is necessarily absent today. He has prepared a statement and a legislative summary of his committee, and has asked me to present it to the Senate for him. I therefore ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and summary were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE SUMMARY OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

(Statement by Senator JACKSON)

The 89th Congress has been a most meaningful and productive one for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which I have the honor to be Chairman. The Interior Committee, as the members know, is charged with primary legislative responsibility for the protection, development, and wise use of much of our Nation's great natural resources, including our water resources and hydroelectric power, minerals, reclamation, and the publicly owned lands of the United States.

Of major significance with respect to the latter category is the intensive program our committee has carried on for the development of outdoor recreational resources and the preservation of our many areas of outstanding scenic beauty and historic significance through the establishment of National Parks, National Sea and Lakeshores, Historic Sites, and Recreation Areas.

In addition, the Interior Committee has considered far-reaching legislation affecting the international obligations of the United States with respect to the Trust Territory of the Pacific, and with respect to our other off-shore dependencies, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

So broad and far-reaching are the responsibilities of the Interior Committee that I venture to state that we handle more pieces of substantive legislation of more varied a nature than any other single Committee of the Congress. The fulfilment of the responsibilities of the Committee for such a large number and great variety of bills requires a tremendous amount of hard work, both in the multitude of actual hearings and meetings of the Committee and on the part of the individual Senators. Also required is a high degree of cooperation, and of mutual trust and understanding.

It is a matter for pride that very rarely, if ever, does the Committee divide on a partisan basis. Only on very few occasions are bills reported with dissenting votes. Usually we are able to work out mutually satisfactory agreements.

At this time, I want to express, in my official capacity as Chairman, my thanks to my able, hardworking colleagues on the Committee on both sides of the aisle. Meriting special appreciation is the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from California, Senator Kuchel. While he is most assiduous in looking after the interests of the State he represents so well, and also fulfilling his duty as head of the Minority, Senator Kuchel has been a tower of strength in working out the constructive legislation that has characterized the Interior Committee in this Congress.

Most of the work of the Interior Committee, as is the case with that of most other Committees, is done through subcommittees. Usually, it is the Subcommittee that hold the hearings, analyze the evidence and points of view, and make recommendations to the full committee.

However, certain bills are retained in full committee without being referred to subcommittee, either because they cut across the jurisdiction of several subcommittees, or because of their nature they are better adapted to initial full committee consideration.

FULL COMMITTEE MEASURES

S. 3107, sponsored by Senator Jackson for himself and 45 other Senators of both parties, is a measure to establish a National Water Commission, composed of 7 non-governmental experts to be appointed by the President. The Commission would: (1) review present and anticipated national water resource problems, making such projections of water requirements as may be necessary and identifying alternative ways of meeting these requirements—giving consideration, among other things, to conservation and more efficient use of existing supplies, increased usability by reduction of pollution, innovations to encourage the highest economic use of water, interbasin transfers, and technological advances including, but not limited to desalting, weather modification and waste water purification and reuse; (2) consider economic and social consequences of water resource development, including, for example, the impact of water resource development on regional economic growth, on institutional arrangements, and on esthetic values affecting the quality of life of the American people; and (3) advise on such specific water resource matters as may be referred to it by the President and the Water Resources Council.

S. 3107 is a measure toward fulfillment of the national responsibilities of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for water resource development and increased supplies of water to meet our ever growing national needs. The bill was reported favorably with amendments after public hearings (which have been printed) and passed the Senate on June 9, 1966. In the House most of the substance of the measure was added as a Title II to H.R. 4671, the Lower Colorado River Basin project. H.R. 4671, with Title II was reported favorably by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on August 11, 1966, but no rule for consideration by the House was obtained.

S. 3823, sponsored by Senators Kuchel, Jackson, Anderson, and Murphy, would provide for the participation of the Department of the Interior in the construction and operation of a nuclear-powered, dual purpose, 150 million gallon a day saline water conversion plant in the Los Angeles area. In addition to the production of fresh water from the Pacific Ocean, the plant would generate 1,500 megawatts of net electrical energy. The facility would be built, at an estimated cost of $444 million, as a non-Federal undertaking by the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California in partnership with a group of public and private electric utility companies serving the area. Appropriations of not to exceed $57,200,000 for Interior's participation are authorized. Total Federal participation is limited to $72 million, of which the Atomic Energy Commission would contribute $15 million.

By joining in an effective partnership with public and investor-owned water and power utilities, significant advantages—not otherwise obtainable—will accrue to this important phase of the Government's desalting program. The plant is fitted into a realistic water need situation and thus will serve in the best possible way to meet the objective of demonstrating the technical and economic feasibility of such a facility. Its success will gain public acceptance and confidence in desalting as a dependable source of water supply.

S. 3823 passed the Senate without amendment September 21, 1966. No action was taken in the House.

S. 1761, by Senators Jackson and Magnuson, authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to construct and operate a third powerplant at the Grand Coulee Dam, Columbia Basin Project, State of Washington. The purpose of the measure is to meet the growing power needs of the Northwest, to provide additional peaking power for the Southwest, and to enable the United States to take full advantage of the additional water storage that will be available as a result of the Canadian Treaty proclaimed September, 1964. The plant authorized by S. 1761 will add 3.6 million kilowatts of generating capacity to the 2 million kilowatts of the two existing plants, making it the largest single hydroelectric development in the world.

In addition, a modified basin account for the Federal Columbia River power system was established.

The entire cost of the third powerplant, estimated at $364,310,000, will be repaid in full in 50 years, with interest, and revenues will exceed by nearly a million a year the annual amounts of such repayment.

The benefit-cost ratio is the exceedingly favorable one of 3.24 to 1.

S. 1761 passed the Senate, with an amendment, on June 16, 1965, and the House with substitute language on April 19, 1966. The Senate concurred and the measure became Public Law 39–448.

Subsequently, an amendment to Public Law 89–448 was made in another bill, S. 3034 (Public Law 89–561). The amendment to the Third Powerplant Act specifies conditions under which financial assistance may be given from the modified basin account of the Federal Columbia River power system to reclamation projects, and places a limitation upon the amount of such assistance. Reclamation projects hereafter authorized must be scheduled in such a manner that the required financial assistance for those projects, together with financial assistance for previously authorized projects, will not cause increases in the power rates of the Bonneville Power Administration. The amount cannot exceed an average of $30 million annually in any period of 20 consecutive years.

S. 1446, by Senator Church for himself and 31 cosponsors of both parties, to establish a National Wild Rivers System. The bill would save for this and future generations certain unspoiled, free-flowing rivers or river sections that symbolize and will perpetuate this vanishing heritage of our original American landscape. The System is initiated with segments of five rivers; the Salmon and Clearwater in Idaho, the Rogue in Oregon, the Rio Grande in New Mexico, the Eleven Point in Missouri, the Cacapon, West Virginia and the Shenandoah, West Virginia. Seventeen other rivers are listed for study as possible future inclusions, and a procedure for inclusion of these and other rivers is provided. States would be encouraged to cooperate in the planning and administration of wild river areas which include State-owned or county-owned land.

After extensive field hearings, S. 1446 was reported favorably, with amendments, on September 28, 1965 and passed the Senate on January 19, 1966, by a vote of 71 yeas to 1 nay. No action was taken in the House.

S. 1229, by Senator Jackson at the request of the Bureau of the Budget, is a measure to provide uniform policies with respect to recreation and fish and wildlife benefits and costs on Federal multipurpose water resource projects. The bill establishes a cost-sharing formula and sets up standards under which recreation and wildlife benefits may be included in all irrigation, flood control, hydroelectric, navigation and other water projects.

Among the amendments made by the Committee was one requiring that after July 1, 1966, no activity connected with feasibility reports under reclamation law with respect to any water resource project shall be carried on unless the preparation of such feasibility report has been specifically authorized by law.

S. 1229, as amended, passed the Senate on April 13, 1965; was further amended and passed the House on May 18, 1965. The conference report was agreed to and the measure became Public Law 89–72 on July 9, 1965.

S. 897, by Senator Nelson for himself and Senators Mondale, Douglas and Williams of New Jersey, to establish the St. Croix National Scenic Riverway in the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin. This measure is another action in furtherance of the Committee's responsibilities for outdoor recreation and protection of scenic beauty. It would authorize the setting aside of some 85,000 acres of land and 21,200 acres of water, including 152 miles of the St. Croix and 90 miles of the Namekagon Rivers for those basic purposes, including fish and wildlife preservation.

S. 897 with amendments passed the Senate on September 8, 1965; no action was taken in the House Interior Committee.

S. 2282, by Senator Nelson for himself and 10 co-sponsors, is the so-called "ecological research bill" to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a program of research and study on the natural environmental systems of the United States for the purpose of gaining a better understanding of our living natural resources and the forces responsible for their development and well-being and of providing a basis for the future use and development of these systems.

Public hearings, which have been printed, were held on the measure on April 27, 1966, but on the recommendation of the several executive agencies involved further action was deferred.

The Committee anticipates the holding of further hearings in the 90th Congress in connection with fulfillment of its responsibility for environmental and ecological research.

Extensive hearings and conferences were held in the State of Washington on the report of the North Cascades Study Team on the optimum uses of the North Cascades area. Involved also was a proposed revision of the boundaries of the Olympic National Park.

These hearings have been published and will form the basis for consideration of specific legislation which is expected to be submitted to Congress by the Bureau of the Budget.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS—SENATOR LEE METCALF, MONTANA, CHAIRMAN

The Subcommittee on Indian Affairs has legislative responsibility over matters involving the relations of the Federal Government with approximately 500,000 Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts, about half of whom reside on reservations; over Indian landholdings and reservations which, subject to varying degrees of Federal control, total approximately 52 million acres in 29 States; and over the administration of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. In addition, the Indian health and sanitation program supervised by the Division of Indian Health in the U.S. Public Health Service is of concern to the subcommittee, as is the Indian Claims Commission.

Of the 66 measures referred to the subcommittee, 28 were reported and passed and 22 were enacted into law.

The following Indian bills of general applicability throughout Indian country were acted upon during the 89th Congress:

H.R. 4778, Public Law 89–14: To increase the amounts authorized for Indian adult vocational education. The bill amends the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 986, 25 U.S.C. 309), entitled "An act relative to employment for certain adult Indians on or near Indian reservations," by increasing the amount authorized to be appropriated for the program from $12 to $15 million annually. This legislation is necessary in order to accommodate the large number of Indians who are seeking enrollment under the 1956 act. The response of Indians to the opportunities afforded them in vocational courses and on-the-job training has been most favorable. From its inception through 1964, 10,000 persons have enrolled in various vocational programs throughout the United States. More and more of the younger Indians are completing high school and will become available for these training programs in the near future.

S. 3068 (Jackson): To amend the Indian Claims Commission Act of 1946.

The purposes of S. 3068 are to provide for the adjudication or dismissal of all claims filed with the Indian Claims Commission and to extend the life of the Commission to April 10, 1972.

The Indian Claims Commission was established to provide for a final disposition of all claims of Indian tribes against the United States that existed on the date of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1049). The Indian tribes were given 5 years in which to file their claims, and the Commission was given an additional 5⅔ years within which to adjudicate the claims. The Commission was to terminate on April 10, 1957. The time allotted in the original act to adjudicate the many claims filed proved to be inadequate, and the Congress extended the life of the Commission for 5 years by the act of July 24, 1956 (Public Law 84–767), until April 10, 1962. This extension also proved to be inadequate, and Congress again extended the life of the Commission for 5 years by act of June 16, 1961 (Public Law 87–48), until April 10, 1967.

The Indian tribes filed a total of 852 separate causes of action with the Claims Commission. These claims have been consolidated into a total of 571 dockets. To date, 215 docket numbers have been adjudicated and the files sent to the National Archives. Of this number, 92 awards were made to Indian tribes for a total sum of over $185 million. There are 356 dockets now pending and active, some of which have been partly adjudicated and others of which are in early stages of processing.

The extension of the life of the Commission, as provided in S. 3068, is highly desirable in order that claims which the Indians have filed may be properly heard and decided. Otherwise, the Indians will again resort to petitioning the Congress for special jurisdictional acts to have their claims adjudicated, the very practice Congress sought to overcome in adopting the Indian Claims Commission Act of 1946.

The life of the Commission is extended an additional 5 years, but provision is made for determination of all cases by April 10, 1972. S. 3068, as amended, directs the Claims Commission to set a trial date for all cases not yet acted upon so that by January 1, 1969, all pending dockets will have entered the first stage of trial, or be dismissed for lack of prosecution. The bill also provides that if on the day set for a trial the claimant is unwilling or unable to present his case, the Commission shall enter an order dismissing the claim with prejudice unless upon motion of the claimant, and for good cause shown, the Commission grants a continuance. If at the end of the 6 months' continuance the claimant is still not able or willing to proceed, the case will be dismissed. Exception is provided in the event of good faith negotiation efforts on the part of plaintiff and defendant.

S. 3354 (Metcalf), Public Law 89–592: To amend the law establishing the revolving fund for expert assistance loans to Indian tribes.

S. 3354 would amend the act of November 4, 1963 (77 Stat. 301), establishing a revolving loan fund for the purpose of assisting Indian tribes to procure the assistance of expert witnesses in cases before the Indian Claims Commission, by increasing the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fund from $900,000 to $1,800,000.

The act of November 4, 1963, authorized the appropriation of $900,000 for the establishment of a revolving fund from which the Secretary of the Interior could make loans to Indian tribes for the purpose of retaining expert assistance, other than legal counsel, for the preparation and trial of claims pending before the Indian Claims Commission. Most of the 852 claims filed by 1951 involve compensation for land takings by the United States. Anthropologists, ethnologists, and experts in the history of tribal relations with the United States are necessary to determine ownership and value of the disputed land.

To be eligible for a loan, the applicant tribal group is required to have inadequate means to finance the preparation of its claims for adjudication. In addition, the Secretary is precluded from making the loan if, in his opinion, the fees to be paid for such expert assistance are unreasonable.

Under the terms of the basic law, unless the judgment is less than the amount needed to repay the loan and interest, the loans are required to be repaid, with interest, out of the proceeds of any judgment recovered by the tribe on its claim against the United States.

Since the establishment of the fund, the entire $900,000 has been appropriated and has been almost completely obligated. Needed loans exceed the amount which remains available in the fund.

Although repayments are expected once the claims are adjudicated, it is not anticipated that sizable returns will be forthcoming before the expiration of from 3 to 7 years.

The increased loan fund will materially contribute to the prompt consideration and determination of the remaining claims before the Indian Claims Commission.

S. 2196 (Metcalf, Mansfield) (H.R. 9323): Relating to the Indian revolving loan fund and the Indian heirship land problem.

The purposes of S. 2196, as amended, are to (1) authorize an increase of $35 million in the Indian revolving credit loan fund created by the act of June 18, 1934; (2) consolidate all existing loan funds presently authorized for loans to Indians into a single revolving fund and prescribe the administration thereof; and (3) provide the Secretary of the Interior with authority that will enable him to reduce the rapidly increasing number of Indian allotments in multiple ownership by—

(*a*) Partitioning or selling lands in heirship status, upon application of the requisite number of Indian owners, where such partition or sale is found to be in the best interest of the Indian owners, and not detrimental to the Indian tribe;

(*b*) Providing for judicial partition or sale where non-Indian interests so require;

(*c*) Authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to represent owners who are minors, non compos mentis, or are unlocatable;

(*d*) Establishing procedures for selling heirship lands that will afford the owners full opportunity to obtain fair market value for their property and give the Indian owners and tribes preference rights to purchase the land;

(*e*) Increasing the Indian revolving credit loan fund in order that individual Indians and tribes may borrow funds with which to purchase heirship tracts; and

(*f*) Providing for tribal land consolidation programs to permit maximum economic utilization of the land resource by Indians.

The provisions of this legislation are almost identical to those in S. 1049, 88th Congress, which passed the Senate on October 11, 1963.

The following Indian bills relating to specific tribes, bands, or groups were enacted or passed by the Senate during the 89th Congress:

S. 664. (Neuberger, Morse), Public Law 89–224: To provide for the disposition of judgment funds of the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians, and for other purposes. The purpose of S. 664 is to provide for the distribution of $2,500,000 in judgment funds recovered by the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 100, and all other funds heretofore or hereafter deposited in the U.S. Treasury to the credit of the Klamath Tribe or any of its constituent parts or groups. The judgment in docket No. 100 was the result of a compromise settlement approved by members of the Klamath Tribe over which Federal supervision was terminated in accordance with the act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 718), as amended.

S. 702 (Jackson), Public Law 89–28: To provide for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Quinaielt Tribe of Indians. The Indian Claims Commission has awarded the Quinaielt Indians $250,172.40 in settlement of the claim in docket 242. The Quinaielt General Council, through its business committee, has proposed tribal programing, in consultation with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for the use of the judgment funds. Projects to be initiated through use of the funds include the establishment of community facilities in cooperation with the U.S. Public Health Service, the improvement of fisheries resources, and the development of tourism and recreation potential. The proposed legislation will permit the Quinaielt business committee, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, to decide how the judgment funds will be programed.

S. 795 (Jackson, Magnuson), Public Law 89–190: To provide for the assessing of Indian trust and restricted lands within the Lummi Indian diking project on the Lummi Indian Reservation in the State of Washington, through a drainage and diking district formed under the laws of the State. The purposes of this legislation are to permit lands within the Lummi diking district to be included in a new district under the laws of the State of Washington and to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cancel all outstanding charges for construction and operation and maintenance and to use previously collected assessments to pay for assessments in the future by the new State district. Under the law, the Federal Government would be relieved of any responsibility for further operation, maintenance, betterment, or construction of this Indian project.

S. 893 (Mansfield, Gruening, Bartlett), Public Law 89–130: To amend the act of June 19, 1935 (49 Stat. 388), as amended, relating to the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska. The purpose of this legislation is to amend the 1935 act to define Tlingit and Haida Indians and to recognize a central council which would have authority to make plans for the use of judgment funds expected to be awarded the tribes in the very near future. It would also authorize the advancement and expenditure of any appropriation to satisfy the judgment for any purpose authorized by the official central council, including per capita payments, and for the preparation of a current roll of all Tlingit and Haida Indians. Under the law it is required that following appropriation of funds to satisfy the award, Tlingit and Haida Indians shall submit an additional legislative proposal providing for the use of their money, based upon approved plans and recommendations.

S. 1413 (Jackson, by request): To provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Confederated Tribes of Colville Indians located in the State of Washington and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes. As a result of a directive in section 5 of Public Law 772, 84th Congress, the Business Council of the Confederated Tribes of Colville Indians submitted proposed legislation providing for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the tribes. After hearings on the proposed legislation in the 88th Congress, Senator Jackson was requested to introduce S. 1413. As passed by the Senate, the bill provides for a referendum and the remaining provisions of the bill shall become effective only if a majority of the voting adult members of the tribes approve. The bill provides for the closing of the tribal rolls, the updating of all land records, and the appraisal by three qualified independent appraisers of all tribal assets. Thereafter, individual members of the tribes will be afforded a right to withdraw from the tribes and have their shares of tribal property converted to money and paid to them or to remain in the tribe and participate in a tribal management program. Such amounts of the tribes' timberlands as would be required to be sold would be purchased by the Secretary of Agriculture and designated as national forest lands. Other property would be sold on a competitive bid basis, except that property belonging to those remaining in the tribe shall be placed in the hands of a private corporation or trustee. This legislation is similar to the Klamath Termination Act of 1954. The House Interior Committee held further hearings during 1966.

S. 1904 (Anderson, Montoya), Public Law 89–363: To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to give to the Indians of the Pueblos of Acoma, Sandia, Santa Ana, and Zia the beneficial interest in certain federally owned lands heretofore set aside for school or administrative purposes. The purpose of S. 1904 is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to give in trust to the Pueblos of Acoma, Sandia, Santa Ana, and Zia in New Mexico the beneficial interest in certain federally owned lands and improvements when they are no longer needed. The lands (approximately 435 acres) were set aside for school or administrative use. The value of the lands and improvements is approximately $31,000. The bill also provides that the Indian Claims Commission shall consider the value of the property conveyed by the bill in connection with any claim which the named Pueblos may have before the Indian Claims Commission.

S. 1938 (Bible, Cannon), Public Law 89–408: To amend the Indian Long-Term Leasing Act. The purpose of S. 1938 is to permit leases of Indian land on the Pyramid Lake Reservation in Nevada for business and other purposes to be made for a term of up to 99 years. Enactment of S. 1938 is needed to permit a lease with a term long enough to enable a prospective lessee to obtain financing for the recreational development that is contemplated. The 175-square-mile lake, located entirely within the reservation, offers excellent potential for water-oriented recreational development.

S. 2535 (Moss): To amend the Act of March 1, 1933, entitled "An Act to permanently set aside lands in Utah as an addition to the Navajo Indian Reservation."

The purpose of S. 2535, as amended, is to amend the act of March 1, 1933 (47 Stat. 1418), to authorize expenditure of royalties from certain Navajo Indian lands for the health, education, and general welfare of the Indians living in San Juan County, Utah. Present law restricts expenditure of these royalties to Indian tuition in white schools and/or the building and maintenance of roads across the lands set aside for the Navajo Reservation in 1933.

S. 2535 passed the Senate on August 29, 1966, but was not acted upon in the House.

S. 2595 (McGee, Simpson): To place in trust status certain lands on the Wind River Indian Reservation in Wyoming.

The purpose of S. 2595 is to place in trust 15 acres on the Wind River Indian Reservation in Wyoming. The land is surplus to the needs of the Federal Government and would be used by the Indians for administrative purposes.

S. 2595 passed the Senate on June 1, 1966, but was not acted upon by the House.

S. 2948 (Metcalf, Mansfield), Public Law 89–524: To set aside certain lands in Montana for the Indians of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation.

The purpose of S. 2948 is to declare that the United States holds 487 acres on the Flathead Reservation, Mont., in trust for the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes.

The land covered consists of nine tracts. They are part of 577 acres which were bought from the tribes in 1904 for administrative purposes by the Bureau of Indian Affairs for $658.75. The 487 acres have been declared surplus to the needs of the Bureau. Some of the parcels involved are adjacent to trust land while others are contiguous to unrestricted land. All are within the boundaries of the reservation. The tribe plans to use the land for exchange, assignments, and leases to tribal members.

H.R. 70, Private Law 8925: To provide for the conveyance of approximately 80 acres of land to the heirs of Adam Jones, Creek Indian not enrolled. The subject land upon the death of the allottee became part of the Creek Reservation, subject to reassignment to a cooperative group of Creeks or to an individual Indian. The Tribe, by resolution dated July 27, 1963, waived whatever rights the Creek Nation might have in the land and recommended that legislation be introduced conveying the property to the heirs of the original allottee.

H.R. 5860, Public Law 89–107: To amend the law relating to the final disposition of the property of the Choctaw Tribe. The purpose of the bill is to extend by 3 years the time within which certain provisions of the act of August 25, 1959, as amended, relating to the termination of Federal supervision and control over certain Choctaw lands, would be completed. Problems have arisen in connection with title to various lands owned by the Indians, and it is believed that additional time should be provided to enable the Tribe to complete several lawsuits in which it is now engaged with respect to tribal lands.

H.R. 9041, Private Law 89–30: To restore to the heirs of the Indian grantor certain tribal land of the Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma. The purpose of H.R. 9041 is to grant a 2½-acre parcel of land to the heirs of Jack Small Lincoln, an Indian, who donated the same to the Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma. Since the tribe has no further need for the site, its business committee requested legislation conveying the land to Mr. Lincoln's heirs.

H.R. 10431, Public Law 89–459: To declare that certain Federally owned land is held by the United States in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe.

The purpose of H.R. 10431 is to declare that the United States holds in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe 40 acres of land which was acquired for administrative use by the Government but is no longer needed for this purpose.

H.R. 10476, Public Law 89–442: To retrocede to the State of Kansas concurrent jurisdiction over Haskell Institute.

The purpose of H.R. 10476 is to retrocede to the State of Kansas concurrent jurisdiction over the site of Haskell Institute at Lawrence, Kans., in order to provide adequate police and fire protection for the school.

H.R. 12264 (S. 2735, Anderson), Public Law 89–445: To declare that 99.84 acres of Government-owned land acquired for Indian administrative purposes is held by the United States in trust for the Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation.

The purpose of H.R. 12264 is to transfer the beneficial title to a 99.84 acre tract of land and the improvements thereon now owned by the United States to the Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Indian Reservation in New Mexico.

The tract was included within the boundaries of the Mescalero Indian Reservation as created by the Executive Order in 1873. The property, however, had been settled prior to that time by a non-Indian. The Government purchased the non-Indian's interest in the land in 1918 for $10,000, and title was taken in the name of the United States.

The land was used as an agency and Indian school until 13 years ago. The land is presently being used by the tribe for agricultural purpose on a permit basis. The tribe wishes to construct low-rent housing on this land.

H.R. 3596, Public Law 89–663: To provide for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Skokomish Tribe.

The Skokomish Tribe was awarded $373,142.40 by the Indian Claims Commission in its suit against the United States (docket 296). Funds to pay the judgment were appropriated by the act of January 6, 1964 (77 Stat. 857). Payment of $37,357.70 in attorney fees and $17,559.15 in additional expenses reduced the original sum to $318,660.15. This amount is on deposit in the U.S. Treasury and is drawing interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum. Enactment of H.R. 3596 is needed in order to permit the tribe to make use of this money.

The committee was advised that the Skokomish Tribe has very few resources—16 acres of tribal land and 2,900 acres of allotted lands. It has no approved roll. Fewer than 100 tribal members live on the reservation. The tribal council has several developmental programs in mind which will be recommended for approval of the Secretary of the Interior. Money that is distributed per-capita-wise will not be subject to Federal or State income tax.

H.R. 10633, Public Law 89–655: To provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Quileute Tribe of Indians, including the Hoh Tribe.

Funds were appropriated in 1964 to satisfy a judgment of the Indian Claims Commission in favor of the Quileute Tribe, including the Hoh Tribe, in docket 155. The judgment was for $112,152.60. From the award the sum of $11,215.26 has been paid for attorney fees. The remainder is on deposit in the Federal Treasury where it is drawing interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum.

Under this bill, the judgment fund and accumulated interest will become available for expenditure for any purpose authorized by the respective tribal bodies with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior. It is provided, however, that until the Hoh Indians establish a formal tribal organization their funds may be expended by the Secretary for the benefit of the Hoh Reservation and the Hoh tribal members upon his approval of plans adopted by a majority of the adult Hoh Indians voting at a general meeting called by him.

The Quileute tribal roll will be based on the 1938 Quileute census and the 1934, 1937, and 1940 Quinaielt tribal census. Persons born after December 31, 1940, will not be eligible for membership on the Quileute roll.

The Hoh tribal roll will include only the names of Indians whose names or names of whose lineal ancestors appear on the June 30, 1894, census of the Hoh Indians of Neah Bay Agency.

Per capita payments that may be made from the judgment will be exempt from Federal and State income taxes.

H.R. 10747, Public 89–660: To provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Duwamish Tribe of Indians in Indian Claims Commission docket 109, and for other purposes.

Funds were appropriated in 1964 to satisfy a judgment of the Indian Claims Commission in favor of the Duwamish Tribe in docket 109. The judgment was for $62,000. From the award, the sum of $7,765.77 has been paid for attorney fees and expenses. The remainder is in the Federal Treasury where it is drawing interest at the time of 4 percent per annum. Detailed figures are presented in the tabulation attached to the Interior Department communication.

Under this bill, the judgment fund and accumulated interest will be distributed on a per capita basis among eligible Duwamish tribal members inasmuch as the tribe has no reservation or tribal holdings.

The Secretary of the Interior will be authorized to prepare a roll of all descendants of members of the Duwamish Tribe as it existed in 1855, the date of the treaty under which the tribe ceded the lands in question to the United States.

Proportional shares of heirs and legatees amounting to $5 or less will escheat to the United States. Per capita payments will be exempt from Federal and State income taxes.

H.R. 12437, Public Law 89–656: To provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Nooksack Tribe of Indians.

Funds were appropriated in 1965 to satisfy a judgment of the Indian Claims Commission in favor of the Nooksack Tribe in its docket 46. The judgment was for $52,383.50, less offsets amounting to $3,000. From the award, the sum of $6,313.43 has been paid for attorney fees and expenses. The remaining $43,070.07 is in the Federal Treasury where it is drawing interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum.

H.R. 7466, Public Law 89–659: To provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Miami Indians of Indiana and Oklahoma.

Moneys have been appropriated to satisfy the judgments of the Indian Claims Commission in favor of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma and the Miami Tribe of Indiana, jointly, in docket Nos. 67 and 124; the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma, singly, in docket No. 251; and the Miami Tribe of Indiana, singly, in docket No. 124–A. The amounts appropriated were, respectively, approximately $4,647,500, $349,200, and $64,700. A portion of these sums has been paid out for attorneys' fees and expenses. The remaining amounts are on deposit in the Treasury where they earn interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum.

Under this bill, distribution of the funds appropriated to satisfy the judgments in docket Nos. 67 and 124 will be made to those Indians, living on the date the bill becomes law, whose names appear on a roll to be prepared by the Secretary of the Interior on the basis of four earlier rolls, identified in the bill, which were prepared between 1888 and 1895. The funds appropriated in satisfaction of the judgment in docket No. 251 will be made available to carry out plans formulated by the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. If, as expected, a per capita distribution is made of these funds, it will be made to those who are enrolled members of the tribe. The moneys appropriated to satisfy the judgment in docket No. 124–A will be distributed to individuals whose names appear on a roll of living Indians to be prepared by the Secretary of the Interior on the basis of three earlier rolls prepared between 1888 and 1895 excluding, however, any person who is now enrolled in the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma.

Provision is also made in the bill for the reservation of funds sufficient to meet the expenses of litigation in other cases which the Miamis have pending before the Indian Claims Commission; for the exemption from Federal and State income taxes of any moneys which are distributed per capita; and for the protection of payments which are to be made to persons who are under age or under legal disability.

H.R. 10674. Public Law 89–661: To provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Otoe and Missouria Tribe of Indians.

Under this bill, the judgment fund and accumulated interest will be distributed on a per capita basis among eligible Nooksack tribal members inasmuch as the tribe has no reservation, tribal land, or tribal assets.

There is not now in existence a list of living Nooksacks. The Secretary of the Interior, therefore, is directed by H.R. 12437 to prepare a roll of all descendants of members of the Nooksack Tribe as it existed January 22, 1855.

Proportional shares of heirs and legatees amounting to $5 or less will not be distributed but will remain to the credit of the Nooksack Tribe. Such sums as are not distributed to members of the Nooksack Tribe within 3 years after the date of enactment will escheat to the United States. Per capita payments will be exempt from Federal and State income taxes.

H.R. 8917, Public Law 89–   : To provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Omaha Tribe of Nebraska.

The purpose of H.R. 8917 is to authorize the disposition of judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Omaha Tribe.

The Omaha Tribe of Nebraska was awarded $1,750,000 by the Indian Claims Commission in its suit against the United States (docket No. 138). The award was for inadequate compensation originally paid for lands in western Iowa and northwestern Missouri. Funds to pay the judgment were appropriated by the act of June 9, 1964.

H.R. 8917 provides that the Secretary of the Interior, after the deduction of attorney fees litigation expenses, and distribution expenses, shall make a per capita distribution of not more than $270 to each person whose name appears on the tribal roll prepared pursuant to the act of September 14, 1961 (75 Stat. 508), and to each living child born after September 14, 1961, who possesses Omaha blood of the degree of one-fourth or more unless said child is enrolled with any other tribe of Indians. The balance of the judgment plus interest thereon may be expended for purposes authorized by the tribal governing body and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

Section 1 of the bill further provides that the sum of $150,000 plus interest shall be withheld from disbursement pending settlement of a claim of the Yankton Sioux Tribe presently before the Indian Claims Commission. Section 2 provides for payments to others on behalf of minors and persons under legal disability. It also provides that payments of less than $5 shall escheat to the tribe. Section 3 provides that per capita distributions will not be subject to Federal or State income tax, and section 4 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to prescribe rules and regulations to implement the act.

The Indian Claims Commission awarded $1,750,000 to the Otoe and Missouria Tribe on April 4, 1964, in docket No. 11–A, in recognition of the fact that the Otoe and Missouria Indians were inadequately compensated for the lands in western Iowa and northwestern Missouri which they ceded to the United States by the treaties of October 15, 1836 (7 Stat. 524) and March 15, 1854 (10 Stat. 1038). Funds to satisfy this judgment were appropriated by the act of June 9, 1964, and are on deposit in the U.S. Treasury to the credit of the Otoe and Missouria Tribe of Oklahoma, drawing interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum.

The Otoe and Missouri Reservation is located in northeastern Oklahoma and contains 1,400 acres of tribal and 33,437 acres of allotted land. Nearly 500 members of the tribe reside on or near the reservation. The total enrollment of the tribe, however, is somewhat in excess of this figure—probably in the neighborhood of 1,100 or 1,200 persons.

H.R. 10674 will permit the Otoe and Missouria tribal governing body, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, to determine how the judgment fund will be used. The amount appropriated to satisfy the judgment, however, is subject to deductions for attorneys' fees and expenses and, under the terms of the bill, $150,000 is to be withheld pending decision in Indian Claims Commission Docket No. 332–A which involves a conflicting claim of the Yankton Sioux Tribe. The Otoe and Missouria Tribe has not yet come forward with any formal proposals for use of its funds but it is anticipated that it will want all or most of the judgment moneys paid to members of tribe per capita.

H.R. 7648, Public Law 89–   : To authorize long-term leases on the San Xavier and Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Reservations, Arizona.

The primary purpose of H.R. 7648 is to provide long-term leasing authority for tribal and individual lands of the San Xavier and Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Reservations in Arizona for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, farming, or grazing purposes.

The San Xavier and Salt River Pima-Maricopa Reservations are adjacent to the cities of Tucson and Phoenix, respectively, two of the most rapidly expanding cities in the Southwest. In both instances the close proximity of city and reservation has created opportunities for profitable use of the Indian land if it can be leased for sufficiently long terms.

The maximum permissible term for which Indian land may be eased under existing general law is 25 years with a right of renewal for another 25 years. The Palm Springs, Navajo, Dania, Southern Ute, Colorado River, Fort Mojave, and Pyramid Lake Reservations have been granted longer lease terms because the 25-year authority is not sufficiently long to permit development loans in some instances and a clear 50-year minimum period plus an allowance of time for negotiations and construction is frequently required. In all of the instances just cited, legislative authority to lease for up to 99 years has been granted. H.R. 7648 does the same for the two reservations to which it applies, with, however, a limit of 40 years in the case of farming leases that require a substantial investment in the improvement of the land and 10 years in the case of grazing and other farming leases. The Secretary of the Interior will approve 99-year leases only if such extended period is absolutely essential.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ACTION RELATING TO INDIAN AFFAIRS

On August 25, 1965, the Senate Interior Committee adopted a Committee resolution concerning the Kalispel Tribe of Washington State.

The Indian Claims Commission awarded the Kalispels $2.7 million in compensation for lands taken by the United States; and by legislation enacted in the 88th Congress, the Tribe was authorized to use these funds for individual or tribal purposes with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior. The Committee's report accompanying the 1964 legislation suggested that before the Tribe's proposed plan for use of the judgment was implemented that the Bureau of Indian Affairs investigate the practicality of placing the administration of the program in the hands of a private state-licensed trustee. Negotiations have been under way during the past year with private trustees.

The resolution adopted by the Senate Committee recommends the use of a part of the tribal funds for family housing plans and tribal projects but specifies that approximately $1,700,000 of the total judgment should be placed with a corporate trustee for management purposes. This will be the first instance in which a judgment awarded a tribe is placed with a non-federal trustee, and it is expected that in the future similar recommendations will be made involving other tribes where that action would be appropriate. The Committee has expressed itself as being anxious to protect these large judgment funds from dissipation and to preserve the funds and the income for the benefit of the individual Indians.

The Kalispel Tribe consists of about 155 members, and the reservation of approximately ten thousand acres is located in the northeast section of Washington State. It is believed that a private trusee in managing the Tribe's funds will be able to invest in diversified stocks and bonds, thus assuring steady income, and will also be in a position to advise the Tribe on any business opportunities that may become available in the area of the reservation.

On April 1, 1966, the Committee held hearings on the nomination of Robert L. Bennett to be Commissioner of Indian Affairs. The nomination was approved unanimously and reported to the Senate on April 8, 1966. Accompanying the nomination was a Committee report (Executive Report No. 1) setting forth in detail Committee views on the programs, policies and general administration of Indian affairs in recent years. Additionally, the new Commissioner was requested to file a formal report within 90 days following his confirmation outlining the steps taken to begin to meet the problems referred to in Executive Report No. 1. Under date of July 11, Commissioner Bennett filed his written comments with the Committee and that document is currently under study in connection with legislative proposals to be introduced in the 90th Congress.

Subcommittee hearings

In addition to the foregoing actions, the Subcommittee held hearings on the following legislation:

S. 98 (Anderson): To amend the Indian Long-term Leasing Act.

S. 2197 (Metcalf, McGovern): To provide for guaranty and insurance of loans to Indians and Indian organizations.

S. 3085 (Anderson): To amend section 4 of the act of May 31, 1933, to add certain lands, including the Blue Lake area, to the Taos Pueblo, New Mexico.

S. 3228 (Mansfield, Metcalf): To grant minerals, including oil, gas, and other natural deposits, on certain land in the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation, Montana, to certain Indians.

H.R. 7028: To provide compensation to the Crow Tribe of Indians, Montana, for certain lands, for the validation of titles to those lands, and for other purposes.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MINERALS, MATERIALS, AND FUELS—SENATOR ERNEST GRUENING, OF ALASKA, CHAIRMAN

The Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels has initial responsibility for measures concerning "mineral interests generally," in the words of the Legislative Reorganization Act, the mineral resources of the public lands, and mineral land laws and claims and entries thereunder.

During the 89th Congress, the subcommittee devoted a considerable amount of time and effort to finding ways and means to stimulate domestic production of gold, reopen closed American gold mines, and put American gold miners back to work.

Three measures dealing directly with gold were considered: S. 1377, by Senator Gruening for himself and 8 other Senators; S. 2562, by Senator McGovern and 7 others; and Senate Resolution 83, by Senator Bartlett for himself and 14 others. All three measures had bipartisan cosponsorship.

S. 1377, which was based on Senator Gruening's S. 2125 of the 88th Congress as reported favorably to the Senate, provided for incentive payments to domestic gold producers on an individual basis of amounts predicated on the differences between their cost of producing gold in the last quarter of 1939, our last period of normal production, and average costs as of the last quarter of 1965.

The measure carefully refrained from any suggestion for any increase in the $35 an ounce price for gold established by President Roosevelt as a depression measure in 1934.

S. 2562 was introduced by Senator McGovern with 7 cosigners for the purpose of aiding and stabilizing the gold mining industry of the United States by maintaining the rate of gold production from currently operating gold mines and by stimulating increased gold production through the reopening of mining properties which have ceased operations prior to January 1, 1965. Exploration, development, and commencement of new gold mining operations would be encouraged through a Gold Mines Assistance Commission. The bill states that financial assistance payments to domestic gold producers under it shall have no relation to the monetary price of gold paid by the Treasury Department of the United States.

Senate Resolution 83 would have created a Select Committee of the Senate on Gold Production to study the problem in its entirety and report back to the Senate with recommendations.

The administrative agencies, led by the Treasury Department objected to all of the measures on the ground that any effort to do equity to our domestic producers and to stimulate domestic production would create a "two-price system for gold," and that such action would upset the international monetary market. After full and careful consideration, the Subcommittee found that the fears expressed were in fact groundless, and reported S. 1377 favorably to the full committee. The Committee reached the same conclusion, and S. 1377 was reported favorably on August 30, 1966 (Senate Report No. 1537).

Another subcommittee measure of far-reaching importance to the development of the mineral resources of the public domain and mining operations on it was S. 3485, amending the so-called "Common Varieties Act" (Public Law 167, 84th Congress). This measure, drafted by Senator Metcalf after public hearings in Butte and in Washington on the interpretation and administration of the law and co-sponsored by Senator Gruening, laid down specific guidelines and standards to be followed by the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service in determining what minerals were "common varieties," and specifically excluded certain minerals from the act. S. 3485 was favorably reported by Senator Metcalf and passed the Senate on September 21, 1966, despite unfavorable reports and testimony in opposition from the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management.

In addition, the subcommittee held hearings and considered, S. 2281, sponsored by Senator Cannon, which also would have amended the Common Varieties Act. Senator Cannon's bill, however, would have made substantive amendments to the mining law of 1872 as well, and in view of the study of the basic mining law under way by the Public Land Law Review Commission, no further action was taken on S. 2281.

Other legislation considered and acted upon by the subcommittee included:

S. 1378, by Senator Moss and five other Senators, to amend the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of 1961. The House companion measure, H.R. 5842, as amended, was substituted, and became Public Law 89–238. The law extends the lead-zinc small producers program for an additional 4 years, broadens the base for participation, and clarifies certain provisions of the parent act.

S. 1674, by Senator Bible, to authorize leasing by the Secretary of the Interior of geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources on the public lands, was favorably reported, with amendments, by Senator Gruening and passed the Senate on September 7, 1965. The bill opens the way to development of a new natural resource of our publicly owned lands. The steam itself has been proven valuable for production of electric energy. In a number of localities the superheated brines or gases contain mineral required by industry and agriculture. The proposed legislation is a leasing act, providing the Secretary with authority, which he does not now have, to permit development by private enterprise of geothermal deposits, and setting forth conditions and standards of leasing.

The House passed the measure with an amendment in the nature of a susbtitute. The Senate concurred in the House amendment with further amendments and returned the bill to the House which on October 21 concurred in the Senate amendments and cleared the legislation for the President.

The Subcommittee considered and acted favorably on several private bills to authorize reinstatement of oil and gas leases which had been cancelled by operation of law because of minor deficiencies in rental payments resulting from errors in tract description by the Bureau of Land Management. These included S. 1880, by Senators McGee and Simpson and S. 2918 by Senator Moss.

Other private bills authorized the sale to the surface owner of reserved Federal mineral rights in certain specified tracts of land.

S. 3070, by Senator McGee, to remove the limitation in the Mineral Leasing Act prohibiting railroads from holding Federal coal leases, was the subject of hearings, reported favorably, and passed the Senate on August 11, 1966.

Senator BURDICK's S. 526, to remove the special restriction in appropriation authorization in legislation authorizing three Bureau of Mines Experimental Stations, passed the Senate June 15, 1966. This measure makes the authorizing legislation consistent with other experimental station authorizations.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS—SENATOR FRANK CHURCH OF IDAHO, CHAIRMAN

The Public Lands Subcommittee has initial responsibility for legislation affecting hundreds of millions of acres of lands belonging to all Americans—one of our great national heritages. The administration of these lands has become an increasingly complex problem as is graphically illustrated by the legislation considered by our subcommittee during the Eighty-Ninth Congress. Members of the committee devoted long hours in both public hearings and executive sessions to legislation ranging from the relief of individuals innocently in conflict with the law, to bills to facilitate public land administration.

Few measures of the Eighty-Ninth Congress underwent more thorough study and examination by a committee than S. 265, a bill by Senator Moss of Utah to convey the State of Utah title to lands lying below the meander line of the Great Salt Lake to permit development of the tremendous mineral resources of the lake. The bill was the subject of field and Washington hearings and a number of executive sessions in both House and Senate. It was signed into law June 3, 1966. As approved (Public Law 89-441), the legislation authorizes the sale of Federal surface interest in lands to the State of Utah based upon fair market value. The measure will be a basis for substantial new industrial development and natural resource utilizations.

Of major importance to many western public lands States was a bill introduced by Senators Moss and FANNIN, S. 1883, to amend sections 2275 and 2276 of the Revised Statutes, as amended.

As the States entered the Union, the Federal Government granted them certain lands in order to promote the general welfare, and more specifically, schools. The grants usually took effect upon admission to statehood or at the time of the survey, whichever was later. Although rectangular surveys of the public land were initiated in each instance prior to statehood, large areas of the public lands are still unsurveyed. Because the surveys have not been completed, specific land areas were not identifiable and many of the sections that had been granted to a State were put to other uses, through no fault of the State. When this problem was brought to the attention of the Congress, legislation was enacted to permit the States to select other lands in lieu of the lands that had been granted but lost. These became known as the indemnity selection laws. The existing law, sections 2275 and 2276 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (43 U.S.C. 851, 852) provides for selection of indemnity lands to replace lands lost "prior to survey," the lieu selections must be made from "unappropriated, surveyed and public lands."

The Committee approved a House-passed companion measure, H.R. 5984, which became Public Law 89-470. This Act restores as eligible for indemnity selection lands utilized for other purposes before the title could pass to a State and permits selection of unsurveyed lands to supply deficiencies in lands granted a State.

Public lands problems in the new State of Alaska continued to receive attention by the subcommittee. A bill was introduced by Senators GRUENING and BARTLETT, S. 2366, to reform the method by which the University of Alaska may acquire land for its support. Involved are 100,000 acres of public land granted to the then Territory of Alaska for the use and benefit of a State University by the act of January 21, 1929. Some of the requirements involving the sale and lease of the lands were cumbersome and outmoded. The Committee decided these were unduly restrictive, and would hamper the State in managing and controlling the assets of the university. The bill eliminating these restrictive requirements became Public Law 89-588.

The subcommittee favorably reported H.R. 16813, a companion measure to S. 3692, introduced by Senator ANDERSON to provide for transfer, without reimbursement, to the Atomic Energy Commission of all interest in a tract of public domain land located in Santa Fe County, New Mexico. It became Public Law 89-693. The land was transferred to the administrative control of the Atomic Energy Commission for use in connection with the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory. A sewer plant and related facilities have been constructed on the 78 acres. The Atomic Energy Commission plans to donate these facilities to Los Alamos County. The legislation removes any doubt as to the Commission's authority to convey the land under the Atomic Energy Act or other appropriate authority.

Signed into law (P.L. 89-457) was H.R. 6646, a companion bill to S. 2327, introduced by Senator ANDERSON of New Mexico, to amend the Recreation and Public Purposes Act pertaining to the leasing of public lands to States and their political subdivisions. This will permit the Secretary of the Interior to enter into leases for a period of 25 years under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act—and thereby permit States and local units of government to plan and develop Federal lands under lease to them with Federal participation as provided in the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. The latter authorizes financial assistance in certain instances where Federal lands are under lease to States or their political subdivision for a term of 25 years or more. However, section 2 of the Recreation and Public Purposes Act, as amended (43 U.S.C. 869-1), authorized the Secretary to issue leases on public lands "for a period up to 20 years, and, at the discretion of the Secretary, for a privilege of renewal for a like period." This provision had been interpreted by the Secretary as precluding him from issuing a 20-year lease with a firm right of automatic renewal in the lease.

Our Subcommittee late in the Second Session reported out a bill Chairman JACKSON introduced by request, S. 3178, to amend section 8 of the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (43 U.S.C. 315g). The bill is designed to improve the Interior Department's land exchange authority under the Taylor Grazing Act, and to facilitate the consummation of such exchanges. It was submitted and recommended by the Department of Interior in an effort to resolve part of the burdensome and time-consuming problem of completing land exchanges in the West. The Subcommittee amended the bill to restrict exchanges for private lands to lands within the same State, thus assuring that similar geographical limitation on exchanges are provided both for State and privately owned lands.

Extensive consideration was given by the Committee to S. 3104, a bill by Senators HAYDEN, KUCHEL, FANNIN and MURPHY, and which is intended to permit a resolution of a dispute between certain private individuals and the Federal Government over ownership of specific tracts of land in the Palo Verde Irrigation District in Riverside County, California. After adopting substitute provisions, the Subcommittee reported the House bill, H.R. 13955, which was subsequently approved by the Congress. The bill would resolve the dispute by declaring that for the purposes of establishing any right, title or interest of the United States in or to such lands, the location of the Colorado River as determined by the Interstate Compact between Arizona and California is recognized as the present boundary of the river, and that all changes in the course of the river prior to the effective date of the act shall be conclusively presumed to be accretive changes.

S. 1764, adding lands to the Uinta National Forest in Utah, to save 10,000 acres of the drainage of the north fork of the Provo River to halt serious soil erosion and save the main source of the domestic water supply for the City of Provo. The measure became Public Law 89-226.

The Senate passed a bill, S. 1285, from the Interior Committee which took cognizance of the tremendous recreation pressures on the greatly expanded southwestern cities of Phoenix, Tucson, and Albuquerque, and authorized special conveyance of land under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act of 1926 to answer these burgeoning needs.

Two widely separated State universities, Maryland and Alaska, were benefited by Senate bills 1988 and 1190 which were enacted into Public Law (Public Law 89-227 and Public Law 89-223). Fourteen acres of land on the Maryland campus originally donated to the United States in 1935 were authorized to be returned to the State of Maryland for the fair market value of the fixed improvements. The State of Alaska was authorized to negotiate a sale of 153 acres of patented land in dispute between the University of Alaska and a mining corporation, which now wishes to purchase the property.

Of historic and recreational importance to the National Capital area was the bill, S. 1065, which was enacted by the Congress and became Public Law 89-255, authorizing the United States to acquire the scenic Great Falls tract on the Virginia side of the Potomac and administer it in connection with the George Washington Memorial Parkway. This will assure preservation of one of the Capital's beauty spots. It is of great geological interest, and contains the remains of the Potowmack Canal—a project in which George Washington was actively interested both before and after the American Revolution. The land had been under lease to the National Park Service, but the Government was without authority to place any permanent improvements upon it. Acquired by exchange, it will now be developed for the fullest public use. The remnants of the canal will be preserved as testimony to George Washington's great efforts to forge an early transportation and communications system which would lay the groundwork for a United States of America.

A bill, S. 435, to preserve in its natural setting one of the truly gem-like lakes of mountain West—Upper Priest Lake in the panhandle of northern Idaho—has been signed into law (Public Law 89-39). It authorizes the Department of Agriculture to acquire the few private holdings on the lakeshore and incorporate them into the Kaniksu National Forest. This lake has been referred to as one of the most beautiful in the world.

S. 625, a bill to permit the purchase of lands in Wyoming that had, through doubt of ownership, been fenced in with private holdings, has passed the Senate. This would permit clearance of title along section lines of small parcels formerly managed by the Bureau of Land Management.

The Public Lands Subcommittee also considered legislation dealing with scrip and similar rights relating to interests in public lands.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TERRITORIES AND INSULAR AFFAIRS—SENATOR HENRY M. JACKSON, CHAIRMAN

The Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs has responsibility for measures relating to the insular possessions of the

United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, except those measures affecting their revenue and appropriations.

Of the 11 bills referred to the subcommittee, 9 were reported and subsequently acted upon by the Senate. They are as follows:

Puerto Rico

S. 2154 (Jackson, Javits), Public Law 89-84: To amend the act establishing the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico. The purpose of S. 2154 is to amend the act of February 20, 1964, establishing the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico, by extending the date for the submission of the Commission's final report and increasing the funds authorized to be appropriated for the Commission's operation.

Public Law 88–271 established the United States-Puerto Rico Commission to study all factors which have a bearing on the future relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico. The 1964 act authorized an appropriation of $250,000 for the Commission to perform its task. The government of Puerto Rico appropriated an equal sum as its contribution to the Commission's work. The Commission's final report was to be submitted to the President, Congress, the Governor of Puerto Rico, and the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico not later than the opening day of the 2d session of the 89th Congress.

Because of the elections of 1964, both on the mainland and in Puerto Rico, the Commission was unable to begin its work as promptly as had been hoped. Following the elections there were 4 changes in the Commission's total membership of 13. While considerable work has been done in authorizing and preparing studies, these cannot be completed in the time authorized.

The additional funds are necessary in part because of the extension of time which the Commission requires to complete its work and because the studies authorized by the Commission are broader than originally envisioned.

S. 2154 would amend the existing law by authorizing a maximum appropriation of $460,000, an increase of $215,000. A similar increase in funds will also be authorized by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. The bill extends the time for submission of the final report until September 30, 1966, a period of 9 months beyond the present requirement.

The report has been duly submitted and is available for public use.

H.R. 3433: To provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

The purpose of H.R. 3433 is to convey to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico without monetary consideration a 1.4-acre tract of land owned by the United States in San Juan, P.R., for public purposes.

The 1.4-acre parcel in question, which is adjacent to the Capitol Building in San Juan, was acquired by the United States from Spain by the Treaty of Paris. It was, until recently, a part of the Fort Brooke Military Reservation, but the Department of the Army has declared it surplus to its needs and made it available for disposal. Although section 7 of the act of March 2, 1917, as amended (48 U.S.C. 747, 748), authorizes the President, in general terms, to convey surplus property within the territorial limits of Puerto Rico to the Commonwealth, the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior has held that tidelands, as this tract is, can be conveyed only under special legislative authority. Enactment of H.R. 3433 is therefore necessary to effect the conveyance. The Commonwealth government plans to use the land as a part of a public historical and recreational area to be developed according to the land use master plan prepared by the Puerto Rico Planning Board for Fort Brooke and its satellite installations.

The land is to be used for public purposes, and, if not, title shall revert to the United States.

Virgin Islands

H.R. 11777: To provide for the popular election of the Governor of the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes.

The primary purpose of H.R. 11777 as amended by the Senate is to provide for the election by popular vote of the Governor and Lieutenant Governor of the territory of the Virgin Islands. Other purposes which H.R. 11777, as amended, would accomplish are: (1) Create the office of Lieutenant Governor; (2) provide that the salaries and expenses of the executive and legislative branches be paid by the government of the Virgin Islands; (3) specify the powers, duties, and responsibilities of the Governor; (4) provide a method of recall for removal of the Governor; (5) set out the line of succession in the event the Governor is disabled; (6) clarify the powers, duties, responsibilities, and procedures of the office of the government comptroller; (7) provide that the expenses and salaries of the office of the government comptroller shall be paid by the United States from funds derived by transfer from the internal revenue collections appropriated for the Virgin Islands, thus resulting in a substantial savings to Federal Government; (8) extend the privileges and immunities clauses, the due process clause, and the equal protection clause of the U.S. Constitution to the people of the Virgin Islands; (9) make the Virgin Islands subject to the general military law of the United States; and (10) make certain technical changes in the revised organic act.

The Senate passed the bill as amended but the House declined to accept.

S. 3080 (Jackson), Public Law 89–643: To increase the special revenue bond borrowing authority of the Virgin Islands.

The basic purpose of S. 3080 is to increase the special revenue bond borrowing authority of the Virgin Islands for governmental water and power projects, and for limited expenditures for other governmental projects.

Section 8(b) of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 497, 500; 48 U.S.C. 1574) provides that the Legislature of the Virgin Islands may cause bonds to be issued under subparagraph (1) for specific public improvement or specific public undertakings authorized by an act of the legislature, and under subparagraph (2) for the establishment, maintenance, and improvement of other projects which will, in the legislature's judgment, promote the public interest by economic development of the Virgin Islands. The total amount of such revenue bonds which may be issued and outstanding for all such improvements or undertakings at any one time may not exceed $10 million. The bonds are to be redeemable after 5 years without premium.

S. 3080 would amend existing law so as to (1) preclude the issuance of bonds or other obligations for nongovernmental projects intended to promote the economic development of the Virgin Islands; (2) increase the outstanding revenue bond ceiling at any one time from $10 to $30 million; (3) exclude from the new bond ceiling these bonds or obligations which are held by the Federal Government as a result of a sale of property to the government of the Virgin Islands; (4) provide that not more than $10 million of such bonds or obligations may be outstanding at any one time for public improvements or undertakings other than water or power projects; (5) delete the word "specific" each time that it appears in the first and second sentences of section 8; and (6) provide that bonds may be redeemable (either with or without premium) or nonredeemable.

For power and water purposes alone, approximately $29 million in outside revenue-secured financing is estimated to be needed during the next 5 years in order to meet the average rate of growth in demand for electric power which has been experienced in the Virgin Islands during recent years. For the three islands—St. Thomas, St. John, and St. Croix—this growth rate is 20 percent, or almost three times the average growth rate on the U.S. mainland. Of this estimated total of $29 million, approximately $6 million in revenue financing is needed by September of this year for a new dual-purpose (water and power) plans for St. Thomas.

In addition to the revenue financing needed for water and power purposes, an estimated $5 million will be needed during the next 5 years for staff housing facilities for the new hospital centers in St. Thomas and St. Croix and for additional dormitory and other revenue-producing facilities for the College of the Virgin Islands.

Included in these projected financing needs is approximately $8 million for new water production facilities which can be financed either by the issuance of general obligation bonds under section 8(b)(ii) of the Organic Act or by the issuance of revenue bonds under section 8(b)(i). However, the issuance of $8 million in general obligation bonds for water purposes would—together with outstanding general obligation securities amounting to about $7,800,000—exceed the present general obligation bond ceiling of $14 million and, at the same time, foreclose general obligation financing for other necessary public purposes, such as the school and hospital construction programs.

In short, the increase in the revenue bond financing ceiling which S. 3080 would authorize is urgently needed to enable the local government to undertake self-liquidating projects.

H.R. 13277, Public Law 89–548: To amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the reapportionment of the legislature of the Virgin Islands.

The purpose of H.R. 13277 is to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the enlargement and reapportionment of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands.

The islands are divided into three legislative districts, St. Thomas, St. Croix, and St. John. Section 5(b) of the Revised Organic Act apportions two senators to the district of St. Thomas, two to the district of St. Croix and one to the district of St. John. The other six are elected at large. Under the present statute each elector is entitled to vote for two and only two of the at-large candidates.

H.R. 13277 will enlarge the membership of the legislature to 15, permit its reapportionment in keeping with the recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions enunciating the "one man, one vote" principle, and abolish the "two out of six" rule. Pending action by the legislature it will also fix the total number of members to be elected at large at four and allocate five each to St. Thomas and St. Croix and one to St. John.

The responsibility of the Congress for continuing the development of meaningful self-government for the Virgin Islands and, although the decisions of the Supreme Court in the recent reapportionment cases do not apply per se to the Virgin Islands, keeping it as consistent as possible with the principles of those cases and the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment require the enactment of the legislation.

The addition of four seats will, furthermore, enable the legislature to discharge its duties better than it now can. This will be particularly helpful in view of the rapid economic development that has taken place in the Virgin Islands in recent years and that requires the legislature to consider increasingly sophisticated and complex problems.

The provision in H.R. 13277 for reapportionment from time to time as the legislature sees fit, subject to the qualification that no person in the Virgin Islands be denied the equal protection of the laws by such reapportionment and that every voter be permitted to vote for the whole number of persons to be elected in any district or at-large election, will permit the wishes of the people of the Virgin Islands, as they may be expressed, to prevail. While H.R. 13277 does not follow a recommendation of a recent constitutional convention in the Virgin Islands that whatever reapportionment is agreed upon shall be frozen by Federal statute, it is believed that this should be adjustable as population shifts occur and that the local legislature is the proper body to make whatever reapportionment may be necessary, it in no way contravenes the basic principles which that convention recommended.

The bill becomes effective with respect to the legislature to be elected at the regular general election in November 1966, and thereafter.

H.R. 8721, Public Law 89–98: To amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the government of the Virgin Islands. The purpose of H.R. 8721 is to vest in the government of the Virgin Islands the power to fix the salaries and allowances of members of its legislature and to provide for the payment of the same from local revenues rather than from Federal appropriations.

Subsection (e) of section 6 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands (68 Stat. 487, 499), as amended (14 U.S.C. 1572(e)), fixes the basic compensation of each of the 11 members of the Virgin Islands Legislature at $600 per annum and provides for payment thereof by the United States. In addition, each legislator who is away from the island of his residence receives $20 per diem while the legislature is actually in session. These allowances are also paid by the United States.

The legislature of the Virgin Islands is charged with responsibility for enacting all local laws. Its regular sessions may continue for 60 days per year. Special sessions not in excess of 30 days a year may be convened by the Governor.

Enactment of H.R. 8721 will permit the Virgin Islands Legislature to determine its own salaries and allowances subject, of course, to the usual veto power of the Governor. This will result in a modest savings to the Federal Government of about $14,000 a year.

Guam

H.R. 11775: To provide for the popular election of the Governor of Guam, and for other purposes.

The primary purpose of H.R. 11775 is to provide for the popular election of Governor and Lieutenant Governor for the territory of Guam. Other purposes which H.R. 11775 as passed by the House of Representatives and as amended by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, would accomplish are: (1) Create the office of Lieutenant Governor; (2) provide that the salaries and expenses of the office of the executive and legislative branches be paid by the Government of Guam; (3) specify the powers, duties and responsibilities of the Governor; (4) provide a method of recall for removal of the Governor; (5) set out the line of succession in the event the Governor is disabled; (6) create the office of Government Comptroller and specify the powers, duties, responsibilities, and procedures of that office; (7) provide that the expenses and salaries of the office of the Government Comptroller shall be paid by the United States from funds to be covered into the treasury of Guam pursuant to section 30 of the Organic Act of Guam, thus resulting in a substantial savings to the Federal Government; (9) extend the privileges and immunities clauses, the due process clause, and the equal protection clause of the U.S. Constitution to the people of Guam; (10) make Guam subject to the general military law of the United States; and (11) make certain technical changes in the organic act.

The Senate passed H.R. 11775 with amendments but the House did not accept the bill in its amended form.

H.R. 13298, Public Law 89–552: To amend the Organic Act of Guam in order to authorize the legislature thereof to provide by law for the election of its members from election districts.

The Organic Act of Guam gave that island a substantial degree of local self-government and made Guamanians citizens of the United States. It provided for a unicameral legislature composed of 21 members to be elected at large biennially in even-numbered years. The powers of the legislature extend to "all subjects of legislation of local application" not inconsistent with the provisions of the organic act and other laws of the United States which are applicable to Guam. The members of the present legislature come from two parties—the Territorial Party and the Democratic Party of Guam.

At the present time the urban centers on Guam are able to dominate the voting on an at-large basis, and some rural areas lack representation. Though there are 19 voting districts in Guam, the at-large election system often means that the successful candidates come from a limited number of parts of the island. From the first to the incumbent eighth legislature, the average number of districts from which candidates have been elected to office stands at 11. The present legislature is composed of members from only 10 of the 19 districts. Removing the election-at-large requirement of the present statute and permitting election by districts will allow the legislature to bring about the greater equality of representation which, the committee was advised, is very much desired by the people of Guam. It will, in addition, allow the voters of each district to concentrate on the merits and demerits of the candidates from that district instead of having to try to assess those of every candidate for every seat in the legislature.

A solution to a further problem identified with the at-large election of all members of the Guam Legislature will result from districting. Under the present system a slight shift in the attitude or reactions of the electorate can produce a great and perhaps unwarranted change in whole membership of the legislature. It is possible under the present system for 51 percent of the voters to elect all of the legislature. Districting, whole or partial, will reduce the likelihood of this occurring in the future and will make more likely continuous representation of the minority.

H.R. 13298 will, permit the Guam Legislature to district the territory and apportion itself as it believes proper, subject to the provision that neither such districting nor such apportionment shall deny to any person in Guam the equal protection of the laws. Its requirement that every voter in every district shall be entitled to vote for the whole number of persons to be elected from the district at that election as well as the whole number of persons to be elected at large, if there are any such, is further assurance of the application to Guam of the "one man, one vote" principle.

Reasonable stability in the electoral process is provided by the prohibition against changing the manner in which members of the legislature are to be elected—that is, the distribution of seats between at-large members, if there are any, and district members—more often than once in 10 years. District lines will be subject to change from time to time to reflect population shifts.

H.R. 8720, Public Law 89–100: To amend the Organic Act of Guam to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the government of Guam. The purpose of H.R. 8720 is to vest in the government of Guam the power to fix the salaries and allowances of members of its legislature and to provide for the payment of the same from local revenues rather than from Federal appropriations.

Subsection (e) of section 26 of the Organic Act of Guam (48 U.S.C. 1421d(e)) fixes the basic compensation of members of the Guam Legislature at $15 per day while the legislature is in session and provides for payment of the same by the United States. All other legislative expenses are paid by the government of Guam.

The Guam Legislature is composed of 21 members who serve 2-year terms. The legislature is charged with responsibility for enacting all local laws. Regular sessions are held annually and may not exceed 60 calendar days. Special sessions of not more than 14 days in length may be convened by the Governor.

Enactment of H.R. 8720 will permit the Legislature of Guam to determine and pay its own salaries and allowances. This will result in a modest saving to the Federal Government of approximately $23,000 a year.

Trust territory

S. 3504 (Jackson): To amend the act of June 30, 1954, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The purpose of S. 3504 is to authorize increased appropriations for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands for civil works and administrative costs. The bill increases the present appropriation authorization of $17,500,000 annually to a maximum of $32 million for fiscal year 1967 and $35 million for fiscal year 1968. The bill also designates the High Commissioner and Deputy High Commissioner as Governor and Lieutenant Governor, respectively, and provides that appointment hereafter made to the office of Governor of the trust territory shall be made by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Since 1951, $121,905,000 has been appropriated for the trust territory, enabling important progress to be made in administration and capital improvements. Yet much remains to be done in developing public health and educational facilities, and the infrastructure of roads, harbors, water supplies, etc., without which the local economy cannot readily expand, elicit individual initiative, and attract private investment. The development of these basic facilities and services has been greatly complicated by factors such as the geographic dispersion of the inhabited islands, which means an uneconomic duplication of facilities for the population; the small total land area of the islands, the high birth rate, the large proportion of children in the population, and the low level of economic and social development. Past appropriations, in the face of steadily rising administrative costs, have not encouraged development of the full potential of the islands.

Increased appropriations for a 2-year program of capital improvements are vital if Micronesia is to rise above a low level of subsistence and take its place in a modern world. The money authorized to be appropriated by S. 3504 would bolster health, education, water, power, and sewage services; provide better air, ground, and water transportation; modernize and extend radio and telephone communications; and establish suitable buildings for executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the territorial government. At the same time, the higher level of economic development produced by these improvements would enable the territory to pay for a much greater portion of its financial needs.

The bill passed the Senate but died in the House.

FROM THE WATER AND POWER RESOURCES SUBCOMMITTEE—SENATOR CLINTON P. ANDERSON, CHAIRMAN

In the 89th Congress the responsibilities of the Subcommittee on Water and Power Resources became nation-wide in scope as the knowledge and experience of its members were called upon to help meet the water crises in the Northeast and elsewhere, and to plan for water resource development throughout the country.

Early in the session, the subcommittee held hearings on and piloted through the Congress S. 21, the Water Resources Planning Act, which became Public Law 89-80. This measure established the National Water Resources Council and authorized river basin planning commissions. It also provided for cooperation between the States and Federal Government, with financial aid to the States for water resource planning.

Thus, when the water shortage in New York, the Delaware Basin, and other areas of the East became acute, there was already in existence the organization and legal mechanisms for prompt action by the heads of the executive agencies concerned with water supplies.

Subsequently, the committee held an open hearing on the Northeast water crises specifically, reviewing the action that already had been taken and participating in planning future development, thus assuring close cooperation between the legislative and executive branches.

Another bill of national and international importance with respect to potable water for our cities and industries was S. 24, which became Public Law 89-118. This measure, transmitted to Congress by President Johnson and sponsored by Senator Anderson, provided for expansion and acceleration of the saline water conversion program, and provided for a total of new authorized appropriations of up to $200 million to further research and development in making useable sea and brackish water.

Another long-range water resource development measure which the committee reported favorably and the Senate passed after intensive study was S. 22, for promotion of a more adequate national program of water research. This amended the Water Research Act of the 88th Congress and became Public Law 89-404 on April 19, 1966. This law provides authorization for grant and loan funds to educational institutions and other centers of excellence, in addition to land grant colleges, for water research projects.

Other bills of major importance considered by the subcommittee in public hearings and executive sessions were:

S. 32, by Senators Bible and Cannon, to establish the Southern Nevada Water Project. It will provide gravely needed municipal and industrial water for the rapidly developing region in southern Nevada, of which Las Vegas is the center, from Nevada's share of Colorado River water. Present supplies for the area depend upon ground water, which is inadequate even for immediate needs, and is being mined at a rate that threatens depletion. The measure became Public Law 89-292 on October 22, 1965.

S. 34, by Senators Burdick, Young, McGovern, and Mundt, to provide for the Garrison Diversion Unit, Missouri Basin Project. The measure was amended and reported to the Senate by Senator Burdick, and its House counterpart substituted and passed to become Public Law 89-108. The Garrison diversion project will provide irrigation for some 250,000 acres of farmland, municipal and industrial water for 14 cities and towns, and make possible full development of one of the principal breeding grounds for waterfowl in the United States.

S. 254, by Senators Neuberger and Morse, to authorize the Tualatin Federal reclamation project, Oregon. This measure was reported favorably with amendments by Senator Jackson and passed the Senate on April 1, 1965. Tualatin is a multipurpose project for irrigation, municipal water supply, flood control, and recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement. It will bring gravely needed water to a rapidly growing area near Metropolitan Portland. This became Public Law 89-586 on September 20, 1966.

S. 490, by Senators Jackson and Magnuson, to construct the Manson Unit, Chelan Division, Chief Joseph Dam Project, Washington. This measure was favorably reported by Senator Jackson and passed the Senate on February 10, 1965. It would provide a new water collection and distribution system for some 5,770 acres of irrigated orchard lands in central Washington now being farmed by small, independent farmers to produce specialty crops. The benefit-cost ratio is the extremely favorable one of 6.5 to 1. The bill, S. 490, was signed by the President on September 7, 1966 and is now Public Law 89-577.

S. 355, by Senator Yarborough, for construction of the Columbus Bend, Tex., reclamation project. Extensive public hearings were held on the bill, but further study is required.

S. 553, by Senators Simpson, Hruska, and Curtis and McGee, to grant the consent of Congress to the Upper Niobrara River compact between the States of Wyoming and Nebraska. At the public hearings, amendments insisted upon by the Department of Justice and the Bureau of the Budget were submitted and discussed. The measure, S. 553, was approved by the Senate on August 9, 1966.

S. 599, by Senators Kuchel and Murphy, to authorize construction of the Auburn-Folsom south unit, American River division, Central Valley Project, California. It authorizes a huge multipurpose project for water, power, fish and wildlife preservation and recreational facilities in the great, fertile Central Valley of California in the vicinity of Sacramento. It will meet urgent needs in the Nation's most populous State, and permit expansion and growth. In addition, it will provide flood control in an area gravely threatened by floods earlier this year. The substance of this legislation was recommended to Congress by President Truman in January 1948 and has been under consideration since then. This legislation became Public Law 89-161 on Aug. 20, 1965.

S. 602, by Senator Moss for himself and 15 other Senators of both parties, to extend and broaden the Small Reclamation Projects Act. The measure was reported by Senator Moss, amended on the floor, and sent to the House on July 1. The other body amended the bill substantially. As approved by the Senate, S. 602 would provide additional funds for the successful small reclamation projects program, which assists and encourages action by State and local entities in solving their own irrigation problems. It would adjust the interest rate on future projects to the Water Supply Act formula and make other clarifying and broadening amendments to the act which experience has shown to be desirable. This bill finally became Public Law 89-553 on September 2, 1966 after a long series of conferences to resolve the differences in the Senate-House versions.

S. 794, by Senators Jackson and Magnuson, provides for construction of the Kennewick Division extension, Yakima Project, Wash. Reported, with amendments, by Senator Jackson and passed the Senate on February 10, 1965. It would bring an additional 6,300 acres under irrigation to southern Washington, making them especially suitable for fruits and row crops. Water for Kennewick extension is available from extra capacity built into the division's main canal, the construction of which was recognized as a deferred cost in the original authorizing legislation.

S. 1000, submitted by the Secretary of the Interior, will permit the Secretary of the Interior to transfer title to movable property to agencies which assume operation and maintenance responsibility for project works serving municipal and industrial functions. It became Public Law 89-48.

S. 1088, by Senators Jackson and Magnuson, authorizes construction and operation of the Touchet Division, Walla Walla Project, Oregon-Washington. Reported with amendments by Senator Jackson and passed the Senate on July 29. Touchet, which is entirely in the State of Washington, is a multipurpose project, bringing some 10,000 acres under full irrigation in its initial stages, with deferred storage for another 7,000 acres, and providing municipal and industrial water for the city of Dayton. Expert testimony at the hearing shows that Touchet will reestablish the anadromous fish run, particularly of salmon, on a scale comparable to that of the days of Lewis and Clark, and the reservoir will form the only sizable lake in timbered surroundings in the entire Walla Walla Basin. No action on the bill was taken by the House.

S. 1462, by Senator Anderson, authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for payment and operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands. It authorizes continuance of payment by the Federal Government of assessments against lands farmed by Indians in very small tracts (10 acres, on the average). The amounts involved are small, totaling only about $40,000 a year, and payment by the Federal Government is in furtherance of our Indian policy. This measure was approved on July 27, 1965 and is Public Law 89-94.

S. 1478, by Senators Curtis, Hruska, Mundt and McGovern, grants the consent of Congress to the Lower Niobrara River and Ponca Creek compact between Nebraska and South Dakota. At hearings on this measure recommendations by the administrative agencies for amendment were submitted. Some of these proposed amendments have met with opposition by the States concerned and further consideration is necessary.

S. 1582, by Senator Church, authorizes an increase in appropriations for the Mann Creek reclamation project, Idaho. Reported by Senator Church, with amendments. The House counterpart bill, H.R. 6032, was substituted, and became Public Law 89-60. The increase in appropriations from $3,490,000 to $4,180,000, is necessary because of geologic problems at the damsite which could not have been foreseen at the time of the original authorization. Also, new legislation with respect to relocation of roads delayed construction, and the delay has resulted in higher prices than estimated.

S. 2310, by Senators Jackson and Magnuson, to provide that certain pumping costs to maintain Banks Lake, Columbia Basin Project, Washington, shall be nonreimbursable for a limited period of time. Hearings were held on the measure on August 30, and it was favorably reported to the full committee.

S. 1464, by Senator Allott, provides adjustments in order to make uniform the estate acquired for the Vega Dam and Reservoir, Collbran project, Colorado, by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to reconvey mineral interests in certain lands. Hearings were held on the Senate measure, the full committee reported the House-passed bill, H.R. 399, to the Senate, and the measure has become Public Law 89-579.

S. 2287, a bill to authorize a 5-year hydrologic study and investigation of the Delmarva Peninsula, was the subject of hearings, was passed by both houses and is now Public Law 89–618.

Action also was taken on S. 2297, to amend the act of September 2, 1964, in connection with compensation for canals and ditches, and this bill is Public Law 89–624.

S. 2670, a bill sponsored by Senator YARBOROUGH to approve a contract negotiated with the El Paso County Water Improvement District No. 1 in Texas, was also the subject of subcommittee hearings, and its companion House-passed measure, H.R. 11671, was reported to the Senate and became Public Law 89–543.

Hearings were held on S. 3186, a measure submitted and recommended by the Interior Department to increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior. The measure was reported favorably by the full committee to the Senate, and the House-passed measure, H.R. 14312, was passed in lieu of the Senate bill. The legislation has been signed by the President and is Public Law 89–515.

S. 3075, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program, was the subject of subcommittee hearings, and the House-passed measure, H.R. 13508, was reported to Senate, passed the Senate on September 13 and became Public Law 89–605 on September 26, 1966. The purpose of this law is to encourage the States of the Hudson River Basin, with the assistance of the Secretary of the Interior acting on behalf of the United States, to enter into a compact relating principally to the natural, scenic, historic, and recreational resources of that basin, proper heed being given also to the basin's commercial, industrial, and other economic potentials.

S. 3034, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource development proposals, was submitted and recommended by the Department of the Interior, in accordance with the provisions of section 8 of Public Law 89–72, the Federal Water Recreation Act, which is explained under the heading of the Full Committee in this analysis. Public hearings were held on the measure, and it passed the Senate with committee amendments on July 12, 1966. The House passed the bill with further amendments, and after a conference the bill was sent to the President and is now Public Law 89–561. Under this law the Nation will be assured of continued Federal leadership in the planning and development of irrigated agricultural lands in a manner consistent with its economic growth, with Congress retaining responsibility for and control over the public policy involved.

S. 2875, by Senator ANDERSON for himself and 20 co-sponsors of both parties, would establish in the Department of the Interior a comprehensive program of scientific and engineering research, tests and operations directed at increasing the yield of water from atmospheric sources for beneficial uses in all regions of the United States. This weather modification bill is to be distinguished from measures concerning weather forecasting and storm tracking, hail and fog disperson and the like, in that it is directed to a primary responsibility of the Interior Committee, namely, water resource development for increasing supplies of water in the Nation.

S. 2875 is a direct outgrowth of studies of weather modification as a water resource undertaken by the Committee in the 82nd Congress when the subject was linked with saline water conversion in a single bill. The current measure was drafted to carry out recommendations of the National Science Foundation Special Commission and the Panel of the National Academy of Sciences.

Field hearings were held on the bill in South Dakota and New Mexico after exploratory hearings in Washington. These hearings have been published and will form an important source of information and considered judgment for future legislation. However, certain of the administrative agencies involved recommended action be deferred at this time pending resolution of Congressional and Executive departments reorganization problems.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PARKS AND RECREATION—SENATOR ALAN BIBLE, OF NEVADA, CHAIRMAN

On February 8, 1965, the President transmitted to the Congress "A Message on Natural Beauty of Our Country." This message provided the guidelines under which the Parks and Recreation Subcommittee has acted during the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

In his historymaking statement, the President said:

"In almost every part of the country citizens are rallying to save landmarks of beauty and history. The Government must also do its share to assist these local efforts which have an important national purpose. We will encourage and support the National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States, chartered by Congress in 1949. I shall propose legislation to authorize supplementary grants to help local authorities acquire, develop, and manage private properties for such purposes.

"Our present system of parks, seashores, and recreation areas—monuments to the dedication and labor of farsighted men—do not meet the needs of a growing population.

"The full funding of the land and water conservation fund will be an important step in making this a Parks-for-America decade.

"I propose to use this fund to acquire lands needed to establish:

"Assateague Island National Seashore, Md.-Va.

"Tocks Island National Recreation Area, N.J.-Pa.

"Cape Lookout National Seashore, N.C.

"Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, Mich.

"Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, Ind.

"Oregon Dunes National Seashore, Oreg.

"Great Basin National Park, Nev.

"Guadalupe Mountains National Park, Tex.

"Spruce Knob, Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area, W. Va.

"Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area, Mont.-Wyo.

"Flaming Gorge National Recreation Area, Utah-Wyo.

"Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area, California.

"In addition, I have requested the Secretary of the Interior, working with interested groups, to conduct a study on the desirability of establishing a Redwood National Park in California.

"I will also recommend that we add prime outdoor recreation areas to our national forest system, particularly in the populous East; and proceed on schedule with studies required to define and enlarge the Wilderness System established by the 88th Congress. We will also continue progress on our refuge system for migratory waterfowl."

I am happy to be able to report to the Senate that the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has acted on most of these requests as follows:

S. 20, to provide for the establishment of the Assateague Island National Seashore in the States of Maryland and Virginia, was the subject of open hearings, passed both Houses of Congress, and is now Public Law 89–195.

S. 36, to authorize establishment of the Tocks Islands National Recreation Area in the States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, was heard by the subcommittee, and the companion House-passed bill, H. R. 89, was passed by the Senate, and is now Public Law 89–158, now known as the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area.

S. 60, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to designate the Nez Perce National Historical Park in the State of Idaho, was passed by the Senate and House and is now Public Law 89–19.

H.R. 797, to establish the Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area has been passed by both Houses and is now Public Law 89–336.

S. 251, to provide for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in the State of North Carolina is Public Law 89–366.

S. 3007, providing for the establishment of the Chamizal National Memorial, Texas, was the subject of public hearings, and the House-passed measure, H. R. 7402 was reported to the Senate and subsequently became Public Law 89–479, with the amended title of Chamizal Treaty National Monument.

H.R. 3957, to authorize establishment of the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site in the State of North Dakota and Montana is now Public Law 89–458.

H.R. 9599, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept a donation by the State of Indiana of the George Rogers Clark Memorial for the establishment as the George Rogers Clark National Historical Park, was the subject of open hearings along with the Senate Companion measure, S. 2886, and the legislation has been signed into Public Law 89–517.

S. 489, to authorize the establishment of the Pig War National Historical Park in the State of Washington, was passed by both Houses and signed into Public Law 89–565. It now is known as the San Juan Island National Historical Park.

S. 295 and H. R. 698, bills to establish the Guadalupe Mountains National Park in Texas received favorable action by both Houses and was signed into law on October 7, 1966, as Public Law 89–677.

H.R. 13417, to amend the Act of October 4, 1961, to facilitate the efficient preservation and protection of certain lands in Prince Georges and Charles Counties, Maryland, was passed and is now Public Law 89–513.

S. 2057, to establish in the State of Michigan the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore, has become Public Law 89–668;

S. 360, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, has passed both Houses of Congress and is awaiting the signature of the President.

S. 491, providing for the establishment of the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area, passed both Houses and is now Public Law 89–664.

S. 3423, to provide for the establishment of the Wolf Trap Farm in Fairfax County, Virginia, was acted upon favorably by the committee, passed both Houses of Congress, and is now Public Law 89–671.

One of the final acts of the 89th Congress was to pass H.R. 14604, providing for a study of a National Visitor Center in the Nation's Capital. When the study commission makes its report to the Congress before next September, it is my hope and expectation that the authorization for this very worthwhile project will be forthcoming without delay.

S. 250, the Oregon Dunes National Seashore bill, was the subject of public hearings, and the House-passed bill, H.R. 7524, was reported to the Senate.

S. 936, the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore bill, passed the Senate and was favorably reported by the House Interior Committee.

Many national monuments and historic sites have been added to the system through the efforts of the subcommittee. They include: The Golden Spike Histric Site in Utah; the Hubbell Trading Post in Arizona; the Agate Fossil Beds National Monument in Nebraska; the Herbert Hoover National Monument in Iowa; the Pecos National Monument in New Mixico; the Alibates Flint Quarries and Texas Panhandle Pueblo Culture National Monument in Texas; the addition of Ellis Island to the Statue of Liberty National Monument; the Roger Williams National Memorial in Rhode Island and the Memorial to General John J. Pershing in the District of Columbia.

Extensive hearings have been conducted on S. 2962 the proposal to establish Redwood National Park in the State of California. Although no final action was taken in the 89th Congress, the Committee was successful in securing an agreement from the major timber companies in the Redwood area to cease cutting these unique trees pending final determination of the Congress in 1967 as to what areas for a park will be approved.

H.R. 2091, relating to the establishment of concession policies in the areas administered by the National Park Service, is designed to stimulate the development of better facilities for the tens of millions of Americans who enjoy our national parks each year. Its initial effect will permit the Service to enter into long-term contracts with concessioners, a practice that was suspended several years ago. This measure was signed into Public Law 89–249.

S. 3295, sponsored by the Senators from Idaho, Senators CHURCH and JORDAN, would set aside for outdoor recreation and historic preservation an area in the rugged, scenic Sawtooth Mountains of Idaho as a National Recreation area. Private enterprise, such as mining, timbering, and stockraising, which would not be inconsistent with the purposes of the recreation area would be permitted.

The Subcommittee held extensive field hearings in Idaho and obtained information and expressions of local views which are expected to form the basis for action on establishment of the Recreation Area in the 90th Congress.

The 89th Congress has authorized over $180 million to be spent for acquisition of land and development of national parks, historic sites, monuments and recreation areas.

Over half the money authorized was allocated to the populous states east of the Mississippi, principally for the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, the Assateague Island National Seashore, and the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore.

For too many years, the great parks were carved out of the tremendous public domain lands that are federally owned and required no funds for land acquisition. With the effective operation of the land and water conservation fund, created last year, moneys will be available to establish our recreation, seashore and lakeshore areas where they will be accessible to Americans who need them most and who, without great expense in the past, have not had an opportunity to enjoy this type of public outdoor recreation.

It would appear appropriate to close this report on the accomplishments of the Parks and Recreation subcommittee of the 89th Congress with the eloquent comments made by President Johnson when on October 15, 1966, at the White House, he signed into law most of the remaining park proposals considered by this Congress.

"We have come here this morning to give part of our country back to its people.

"When our forefathers came here they found nature's masterpiece. They found a beautiful, rich, varied, fertile land, a whole continent to farm and to hunt upon, and to explore.

"As Robert Frost said, 'The land was ours before we were the land's. She was our land more than a hundred years before we were her people.'

"Our pioneer fathers made this beautiful land a great nation. But when the wave of settlement reached the Pacific, it turned back upon itself. America began to exploit the land. We chopped down its forests. We abused its soil. We built upon its beaches.

"Some Americans realized our loss—Gifford Pinchot, John Muir, Theodore Roosevelt, Franklin Roosevelt, Harold Ickes. They saw that America could be great only as long as Americans could commune with the land. They were the architects of American conservation.

"Today our crowded country thanks them—thanks them for their courage and for their vision, and for their generosity.

"This year, we reach a milestone in the history of conservation. This year, thanks to the 89th Congress, we will restore more land for more parks, for more playgrounds for our children to use than we will lose to housing ventures, to highways, to airports, and to shopping centers.

"We are creating recreation areas where they will do the most good for the greatest number, for all of our people—near our cities, where most of our people live. We are putting national parks and seashores where a man and his family can get to them.

"The father that is the mechanic can load his five children in his car, and in an hour or two hours, or three hours, take them to a nearby playground.

"The 89th Congress has done all of this. It has enacted 20 major conservation measures.

"Today we pay tribute to that Congress.

"Today we establish by Act of Congress.

"— The Guadalupe Mountain National Park in Texas. That is a great tribute to the Senator from Texas, Senator YARBOROUGH, who has been the outstanding leader in conservation in that State.

"—The Pictured Rocks National Lake Shore in Michigan.

"— The Big Horn Canyon National Recreation Area in Montana.

"— The Wolf Trap Farm Park in Virginia.

"We increase the land in the Point Reyes National Seashore in California. And if we don't stop Mrs. Johnson going out there we will increase it some more, I am afraid.

"I am also signing today the Endangered Species Preservation Act and the National Historic Preservation Act. Both of these will help us to preserve for our children the heritage of this great land we call America that our forefathers first saw.

"The bills that I will now sign help enrich the spirit of America.

"These Acts of Congress help assure that this land of ours—this gift that is outright from God—shall be the most precious legacy that we leave.

"I want to express my gratitude to the leaders of the parks movements, the recreation areas, the State commissions and their executive directors, for their enlightened interest, for their support, and particularly for the presence of a good many of them this morning."

SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT OF THE 89TH CONGRESS—STATEMENT BY THE MINORITY LEADER

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is incapacitated in the hospital. He has prepared a statement in connection with the sine die adjournment of the 89th Congress and he has asked that I read it for him.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN READ BY SENATOR HICKENLOOPER

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, Senator HICKENLOOPER, distinguished majority leader, my colleagues in the 89th Congress, fellow workers on Capitol Hill, and fellow citizens: I am sorry that I shall miss the final session of the 89th Congress, but as you well know, it is not from choice but from necessity. I have seen 31 sessions conclude their labors and have seen 16 Congresses adjourn sine die. It is an occasion for fellowship, for comradeship, and for contemplation.

This marks the end of the 89th Congress since the Republic was launched. In that 178-year period neither war nor domestic turbulence, neither depression nor civil strife has interrupted the meeting and functioning of this the one exclusive lawmaking branch in our Nation. No other nation on earth can make such a claim.

When the labors of this Congress end the analysts and commentators will sally forth to make their appraisals. These may be kind or unkind. They may be harsh or gentle. They may be rough and filled with strictures or they may be generous and complimentary.

Too often in assessing the Congress, critics use as a measure of accomplishment strictly material criteria. Such a measuring rod is purely cold and factual. It concerns itself with the number of bills enacted and the number which died in the legislative process through inaction. They will point out the important problems and challenges which remain unresolved. They may concern themselves with the alleged dereliction of Members or they might invite invidious comparisons with other Congresses. Then again they may concern themselves with a breakdown of what economic group got what and what economic group got little. The trouble is that such an assessment tends to be superficial and misses the real mark.

Every Congress is faced with problems and challenges which are peculiar to its own time. All of these are presented for consideration. Solutions for such problems and challenges may fail entirely or may fail partially. Some may succeed and some but partially so. This is in the inherent harmonizing process which marks every Congress. No person, no group, no administration ever receives all that it requests or demands. All receive something. To be sure, they know there is another time.

In no country and in no generation has a legislative body so well articulated solutions for the pressing problems of the day and done so with so little rebellious outcry from the people than this the Congress in which we are serving. No legislative body has been so free from direct threat, violence, intimidation, and actual coercion as the Congress of the United States.

Frustrations we have had. Disappointments there have been. Disillusionment has been experienced. Discontent has been part of the process. There have been vapid threats. There has been full, free, and constant criticism, but when the day is done and the legislative labor has ended eyes are turned to the next Congress with faith and hope that it will produce what its predecessor Congress failed to accomplish.

And when the time for sine die departure comes there is no personal rancor or spleen, no hatred or base passion, no animosities or deep disaffection. Each Member prepares to return to those who sent him here to report in his own way on the triumphs and failures of the Congress and to criticize or applaud as he perceives and appraises the whole work of the body of which he is a Member. He may praise or attack the record according to his lights, but never in a spirit that dictates the destruction of our system of government or even its impairment by unwise restrictions.

Change is eternal and when the people—still the fountainhead of all power in this blessed land—have spoken, some familiar faces may fade from view and new personalities will take their places. The change will bring a transient chagrin and disappointment to those who fail to survive in the tough competition of the polls. Some will enjoy the eager exuberance that comes from victory. In due course as the new Congress convenes new Members will find their places and each will adjust to the rules and the assignments which will be his lot. From then on his own personal drive, capacity, team spirit, and ability to adjust will determine his influence and effectiveness in shaping the destiny of his country and of the world.

To you who if destiny is willing will be here in January, I wish for you a pleasant year—what there is of it. May life's choicest blessings be yours.

To you who for one reason or another may not return in January, let me say good luck and Godspeed. May you continue to enjoy the respect and esteem of your people back home and find comfort in the service which you are privileged to render.

And to those who shall come here for the first time in January, may pride in our traditions, respect for our free institutions, and a desire to serve according to their lights from the sense of conviction and deep devotion to this free land mark their service in the days ahead.

In the language of General MacArthur, I shall, God willing, return to these haunts minus crutches and a wheelchair and I trust untroubled in body and unvexed in mind or spirit ready to forge the anchors and spin the gossamers which mark the day-by-day work of this durable and imperishable legislative body—the very core of our Government—free and untrammelled, constant and responsive, combative and yet with rare restraint, cooperative and yet independent, and devoted to the preservation of freedom of this land where hope springs eternal and opportunity never ends.

To my own party colleagues my thanks and gratitude for your every kindness. To the Members of the majority my appreciation for your unfailing fairness and understanding. To the distinguished majority leader, MIKE MANSFIELD, my boundless gratitude for your understanding, forbearance, and cooperation. To the Senate staff, including the Official Reporters of Debates; the attachés and the pages, a warm salute as an evidence of my affection and esteem. To our Presiding Officer, the Vice President, may the autumn colors bring comfort to him as he orbits over the land, and may the judgment of the people on November 8 not unduly vex his spirit and may he continue to enjoy health and vigor.

And so, adieu.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, that is the statement of the distinguished minority leader, who is languishing in the hospital. I am sure that everyone joins me in wishing him well and success in the removal of the metal pins from his leg, so that when he gets out of the hospital he can bounce around without his crutches which have been so necessary in the last few weeks. I am sure that Senators join me in wishing him Godspeed.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we are in the final hours of the session. The end is not far off.

The last days have been long with waiting and it is not a time to burden with words. Nevertheless, some things must be said.

The books are closing on the 89th Congress. The record lists the immense achievements of the Senate in the past 2 years. But it does not tell the whole story.

It does not tell of the dedication of the President, Lyndon B. Johnson, whose dynamic leadership was felt in a great range of social and economic issues which were resolved into legislation during this Congress. Nor does it tell of his understanding relationship with the Senate. Nor does it tell of his cordiality to the leadership on both sides, of his cooperation with the Senate and his respect for its independent constitutional responsibilities. These considerations, Mr. President, are of the story of the Senate in the 89th Congress.

And the record does not reveal the contributions of the distinguished President of the Senate, the Vice President, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. His devotion to the Senate has been complete. He has given us of his time, wisdom and humor—in short, of himself. He has towered over the Senate from his seat as Presiding Officer. His elevation, however, has been undergirded with a gentle and irrepressible humanism which endears him to us now as it did in the past when he stood beside us. It is true that HUBERT HUMPHREY is the President's Vice President. But it is also true that, first and foremost, he is the Senate's President. In that capacity and as a colleague of many years, he holds our respect, affection and gratitude. That, too, is of the story of the Senate in the 89th.

And so, too, is the unheralded, day-in and day-out, nuts-and-bolts work of the committees and their chairmen and ranking minority members. Each group, in its specialty, has labored as servants of the Senate as a whole, to shape, to fit, and to rivet various segments of the great amalgam which is the legislative record of the past 2 years. Without the committees and their able staffs, there could not have been this record. That, too, is of the story of the Senate in the 89th.

Nor from that story should there be omitted the contribution of the majority whip who is also the chairman of the Finance Committee, the immensely able Senator from Louisiana, Mr. RUSSELL LONG. He has given much in the way of brilliance of mind, parliamentary skill, and outstanding legislative leadership, particularly in the field of finance. He has been willing, time and again, to restrain his personal views in order to help the Senate face and meet wider national needs and urgencies.

Coincident with this contribution, there has also been the support which has been given to me by the secretary of the conference [Mr. SMATHERS] and the inspiration of the distinguished President pro tempore [Mr. HAYDEN] who, time and again, has overcome physical indisposition in order to help. I would note, too, Mr. President, the great and energetic assistance of the four assistant whips on this side of the aisle, the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER]. They have shared in the burdens and responsibilities of the majority leadership and deserve great credit for the effective operations of these past 2 years. That, too, is of the story of the Senate in the 89th Congress.

Then there is the minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I said it to him personally a few days ago, before he went into the hospital. I say it again. He is a warm friend, a distinguished Republican leader, an outstanding Senator, and a great American. He is a tower of strength to the Government of the United States. His discernment and his willingness to put Nation before party and personal inclination, Mr. President, is also of the story of the Senate in the 89th.

Let me say that I deeply appreciate the cooperation and understanding shown by the distinguished senior Senator from California, the minority whip [Mr. KUCHEL], for what he has been able to do to bring about the remarkable results of the 89th Congress.

Finally, I want to say to every Member of the Senate, to Republicans and Democrats alike—your treatment of the leadership has been warm, more than considerate and more than fair. You have worked with the leadership and in so doing have made the Senate work in a most effective fashion. Your forbearance and your dedication, your ideas and your practicality have merged to produce in this institution during the past 2 years a vibrant and vital contribution to the political leadership of the Nation. In my judgment, that contribution shall be remembered for a long time to come.

To the President Lyndon B. Johnson, to the Vice President, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, to the House of Representatives and its distinguished Speaker, JOHN MCCORMACK, to all of my colleagues, to the officers and staff of the Senate, I express my personal thanks for what has been a deeply satisfying session of an outstanding Congress.

THE LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF THE 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the 89th Congress is about to adjourn sine die, which brings us to the time of assessment.

Both sessions of this Congress have been extraordinary in every sense of the word—and for different reasons. The first session adjourned with the distinction of having the most productive record in legislative history. Though not quite as monumental as the first, the second session has produced a record of accomplishment in which all of us can nevertheless take pride; together the two sessions of the 89th Congress produced a record of accomplishment which has led the President to call it the great Congress. This is particularly noteworthy since the second session was fraught with the disquieting pressures of the Vietnam conflict; the problem of balance of payments; the difficulties of holding the budget line in the face of increased expenditures—both domestic and international.

This Congress was unable to enact all the legislation introduced, but this is true of every Congress. But this Congress can place its record before the people with some sense of satisfaction. Its achievements are a testimonial to the vitality of the American system of government.

It was this Congress that—

Established mandatory Federal safety standards for all new cars, buses, and trucks, to be fixed by the Secretary of Commerce by January 31, 1967, and to apply to all 1968 models and, in addition, required similar standards for tires and used cars;

Authorized the 3-year, $322 million highway safety program;

Authorized the $150 million a year grant program for urban mass transportation;

Established a new Department of Transportation as a Cabinet-level agency;

Authorized $19.7 billion in Federal highway grants to the States over the next 5 years;

Authorized the $325.5 million program of highway beautification and scenic development of the interstate and primary systems and junkyard control;

Extended for an additional 3 years the Federal aid to airports program;

Authorized the ICC to fix rates for the rental of freight cars among railroads to encourage acquisition of an adequate supply of new cars; and

Authorized the 3-year, $90 million program of research and demonstration projects for the development of high-speed intercity railroad transportation.

It was this Congress that paved the way in the field of education by—

Charting the course for Federal aid to education—a course long overdue—by extending help to 13.8 million children of poor families to fulfill their desire to overcome poverty through the educational process; to accomplish this $1.5 billion was appropriated for fiscal 1966; $2.3 billion was authorized for fiscal 1967 and $3.3 billion for fiscal 1968;

Approving for the first time in U.S. history Federal scholarships for undergraduate students who desire to obtain an education beyond high school;

Establishing and appropriating funds for the National Teachers Corps to serve in poverty-stricken areas to improve educational opportunities for the less fortunate;

Expanding the National School Lunch Act to include a 2-year trial child nutrition program of breakfasts for pupils in poor economic areas or who must travel long distances, authorizing $465 million for 4 years through June 30, 1970 for the special milk program and the 3-year $63 million program to help schools purchase food preparation and service equipment;

Establishing a National Technical Institute to provide higher education for the deaf;

Authorizing educational and housing benefits, similar to the World War II GI bill of rights, to more than 3 million cold war veterans with a minimum of 180 days of active duty since January 31, 1955;

Extending the Library Services Act for another 5 years and authorizing appropriations totaling $700 million to aid this program;

Establishing the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities composed of two autonomous subdivisions, a National Endowment for the Arts and a National Endowment for the Humanities, to make grants in a wide range of activities, and authorizing an appropriation totaling $63 million through 1968;

Enacting the International Education Act which provides a 5-year program of grants funded for 3 years at approximately $140 million, to strengthen graduate and undergraduate programs in international studies;

Approving a $20 million, 2-year program of aid to sea grant colleges to further the development of marine resources; and

Implementing the Florence agreement to permit the free flow of educational, scientific and cultural materials by removing barriers that impede the international movement of such materials.

It was this Congress that took into consideration the health of the Nation and—

Gave new hope to millions of Americans over 65 by providing for their care in hospitals, skilled nursing homes, or in their own homes—a measure popularly known as medicare;

Enacted the Child Protection Act to bar from interstate commerce hazardous toys and other articles which could cause harm to children;

Authorized Federal assistance in the initial staffing of community mental health centers and expanded teacher training, research, and demonstration projects for the education of handicapped children;

Authorized the 3-year, $340 million program of grants to assist in planning, establishing and operating regional medical complexes for the purpose of combating heart disease, cancer, stroke, and other major diseases;

Increased the opportunities for training medical technologists and personnel in other allied health professions, and improved the educational quality of schools training such personnel;

Authorized $775 million for a 3-year extension of the matching grants program for construction of teaching facilities for physicians, dentists, professional health personnel, optometrists, pharmacists, and podiatrists;

Authorized a 3-year, $3 million, loan program for students in schools of veterinary medicine;

Authorized $154 million to cover 2 years of comprehensive health planning and 1 year of grants-in-aid for public health services;

Provided a 7 percent across-the-board increase for social security beneficiaries;

Authorized a 4-year program to improve the educational quality of schools of medicine, dentistry and osteopathy;

Enacted the Drug Abuse Control Act to prevent the misuse of the illicit traffic in potentially dangerous drugs;

Expanded and extended the air pollution control program;

Established the clean rivers restoration program as a supplement to the existing water pollution control program;

Inaugurated an accelerated 5-year program of fish protein concentrate research including authority for two demonstration plants to provide a new and effective weapon against world hunger;

Required every package and carton of cigarettes to bear a statement that cigarettes "may be hazardous to your health;" and

Provided for the treatment and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts.

It was this Congress that—

Enacted into law the most comprehensive Voting Rights Act to receive congressional approval in 95 years;

Ended the 40-year campaign by minority groups for a reform of the Federal immigration laws by abolishing the national origins quota system as the basis of immigration by persons born outside the Western Hemisphere;

Enacted the Pet Theft law to prohibit trafficking in animals to be used for scientific purposes;

Enacted the Truth in Packaging Act of 1966 to enable the consumer to know the actual weight and package content;

Established the new city demonstration program of Federal grants and technical assistance to help provide the incentive and the financial means for a city to plan and carry out a program for rebuilding and restoring entire sections or neighborhoods—now areas of slum and blight;

Enabled FNMA to pump $4.7 billion into the homebuilding industry to help finance 300,000 homes for needy Americans;

Assumed the initiative to provide an official residence for the Vice President on the grounds of the U.S. Naval Observatory;

Enacted and provided funds for the rent supplement program;

Created the new Cabinet Department of Housing and Urban Development to cope with urban problems; and

Authorized $1.1 billion in aid to Appalachia to initiate and coordinate public works and other programs in this 11-State region to revive the economy and to improve the skills and health of area residents.

It was this Congress that took cognizance of labor and—

Increased the minimum wage from $1.25 to $1.60 by 1968 and extended coverage to an additional 8 million workers;

Extended the mandatory safety provisions of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act to mines regularly employing less than 15 men underground;

Authorized the development and enforcement of mandatory health and safety standards for metal and nonmetallic mines;

Extended the Manpower Development and Training Act to June 30, 1969, and provided a needed flexibility in its program to permit a more effective method of dealing with the problems of the disadvantaged and the hard-core unemployed; and

Authorized $1.8 billion for fiscal 1966 for antipoverty programs and $1,750 million for fiscal 1967.

It was this Congress that—

Enacted the 2-year, $5 billion, food-for-peace program shifting the emphasis from disposal of surplus from commodities to planned production for those countries that improve their own agricultural production and undertake population control programs;

Enacted the Food and Agriculture Act designed to maintain farm income, stabilize prices and assure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, reduce surpluses, lower Government costs, and afford greater economic opportunity in rural areas;

Authorized $500 million in emergency food assistance to India;

Provided grants and increased loans for water facilities in rural agricultural areas;

Extended the domestic and foreign sugar programs for 5 years; and

Authorized additional means and measures for land conservation and utilization.

It was this Congress that—

Authorized an improved health benefits plan for retired members and members of uniformed services and their dependents;

Provided an average 10.4-percent pay increase in 1965 and a 3.2-percent increase in 1966 for the military;

Authorized $15.4 billion in fiscal 1966 for military procurement and $17.8 billion for fiscal 1967;

Authorized $1.78 billion for military construction in fiscal 1966 and $1.05 billion for fiscal 1967;

Authorized supplemental funds for fiscal 1966 for military activities in Vietnam, $4.8 billion in military aid, $415 million in economic aid, and appropriated $700 million for fiscal 1965 and an additional $13.1 billion for fiscal 1966;

To assure our continued dominance of space, $5.1 billion was authorized for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1966 and $5 billion for fiscal 1967; and

Extended to June 30, 1970, standby authority of the President to invoke civil defense emergency powers in the event of attack on the United States.

It was this Congress that—

Increased the authorization for a national program of water research to provide $85 million in 10 years for grants and contracts;

Authorized $364 million for construction of a third powerplant at Grand Coulee Dam;

Authorized preliminary studies of reclamation projects, on specific direction by Congress, to determine economic feasibility;

Removed the limit on tax exemption for exploratory expenses in mining;

Increased by $1 billion the borrowing authority of TVA;

Established a Federal Water Resources Council and River Basin Commission to coordinate planning for the maximum use of resources;

Authorized $944 million for flood control and navigation improvement projects in 13 river basins during 1966 and 1967;

Authorized $1.97 billion in 1965 and $670 million in 1966 for a program of navigation improvement, flood and beach erosion control, and hydroelectric power projects;

Extended the saline water program for 5 years, to June 30, 1972, and authorized $185 million for expanded research and development;

Extended the lead-zinc industry Stabilization Act for 4 years to December 31, 1969; and

Authorized the Assateague, Spruce Knob, Tocks Island, Bighorn Canyon, Cape Lookout, Guadalupe, Pictured Rocks, and Indiana Dunes National Recreation Areas.

It was this Congress that—

Provided a combined increase of 11.1 percent to teacher retirees in the District of Columbia;

Provided an overall salary increase of 9.9 percent for District of Columbia police and firemen, and an 8.9-percent increase for teachers and other school employees;

Authorized Gallaudet College to establish and operate a model high school for the deaf to serve the National Capital region;

Created the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority for improvement of transportation facilities;

Provided for the establishment in the District of Columbia of a public college of arts and sciences and a public community and vocational college;

Raised District of Columbia revenues by $12.7 million;

Raised District of Columbia minimum wage to $1.60 an hour over the next 3 years and extended coverage to 280,000 men, women, and minors; and

Created a 21-member Commission to make a study and investigation of sites and plants to provide a Visitors' Center in the Nation's Capital.

It was this Congress that—

Provided a 2.9-percent increase for Federal employees and permitted retirement on a full annuity at age 55 after 30 years' service or at age 60 after 20 years' service;

Authorized the payment of premium compensation to Classification Act employees doing hazardous work; and

Increased benefits under the Federal Employees Compensation Act for on-the-job injuries or disability.

It was this Congress that—

Fixed the scale of personal income tax withholding on a graduated basis from 14 to 30 percent; accelerated payments of corporate income tax; increased from 6 to 7 percent the excise levy on auto sales and from 3 to 10 percent on telephone service;

Enacted the Foreign Investors Tax Act to revise the tax treatment of nonresident aliens and foreign corporations who invest in the United States;

Suspended to December 31, 1967 the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property;

Increased rates on 4th class parcel post and catalogs and fixed standard maximum size for all parcels;

Established new and uniform standards for bank merger approvals by regulatory agencies;

Raised the limit of Small Business Administration business loans by $125 million to $1.5 billion, set up a separate disaster loan revolving fund, and fixed the overall total loan ceiling at $1.96 billion;

Authorized the sale to private investors of $10 billion of assets held by the Federal Government as security for loans;

Strengthened the authority of Federal regulatory and supervisory agencies over banks and savings and loan associations, and increased the insurance from $10,000 to $15,000; and

Authorized a 3-year, $60 million program of Federal matching funds to cooperate with universities, States, local governments, and private enterprise in establishing State or regional technical services center to disseminate findings of science and technology to commerce and industry.

It was this Congress that—

Authorized U.S. participation in the newly created Asian Development Bank and subscription to $200 million of its $1 billion capitalization;

Authorized $3.36 billion in foreign aid for fiscal 1966 and $3.5 billion for fiscal 1967;

Authorized $115 million for the Peace Corps in 1966 and $110 million for fiscal 1967; and

Strengthened the provisions of the Foreign Agents Registration Act by banning contingent fee contracts based upon success in political activities of the agent and prohibiting election campaign contributions by or for foreign principals.

It was this Congress that—

Created 45 new Federal judgeships, 10 circuit court and 35 district court;

Revised bail procedures in U.S. courts to assure that no person is unfairly detained;

Authorized Federal grants for training State and local law enforcement personnel;

Authorized $1.5 million for the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia;

Provided penalties for assassination, kidnaping, or assault of the President or Vice President; and

Proposed the constitutional amendment fixing conditions and procedures for succession of Vice President to the Presidency in the event of the Chief Executive's disability, and provided for filling a vacancy in the Vice-Presidency.

It was also this Congress that provided for public financial support of presidential candidates by permitting the taxpayer on his tax return that $1 be deducted for such purposes.

So it is only fair to say that the 89th Congress can take pride in these achievements and, as the bells signal sine die adjournment, the economy of the United States is at its highest peak in history—the gross national product has reached the staggering sum of $746 billion.

The attainments of the "enlightened 89th" were not limited to a few measures—the attainments are as broad as our Nation—and broader. Specific comments have not been made on all the accomplishments of this Congress but a careful reading of the summary to be submitted subsequently as a Senate document will reveal with startling clarity that it was a Congress with a mission—a goal, or series of goals which were fulfilled, to make the United States a better place in which to live and, to the extent possible, to contribute to the making of a better world.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 116) as follows:

> *Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Saturday, October 22, 1966, and that when they adjourn on said day, they stand adjourned sine die.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 318), as follows:

> *Resolved*, That a committee of four Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join a similar committee of the House of Representatives to notify the President of the United States that the two Houses have completed the business of the session and are ready to adjourn unless he has some further communication to make to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair appoints the following distinguished Senators as members of this committee: The Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield]; the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen]; the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers]; and the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as a matter of courtesy and friendship, it is our intention to proceed immediately to Walter Reed Hospital where the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] is incapacitated, but who, from there, will carry on a conversation with the President who, as we all know, is some distance away.

ORDER FOR RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE LEADERSHIP

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there will be some speeches made at this time, but I would ask unanimous consent that when all such speeches have been made, the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the leadership on its return from Walter Reed Hospital.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

RECESS SUBJECT TO CALL OF LEADERSHIP

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In accordance with the request of the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], the Senate will now stand in recess, subject to the call of the leadership.

Whereupon (at 4 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the leadership.

At 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.:

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to suspend the recess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Inouye in the chair). The Senate will come to order.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The statement will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> The Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], from the committee appointed to notify the President of the United States that the Congress has completed its business and was ready to adjourn unless he had further communications to make to them, reports that the committee has performed that duty, and that the President has informed the committee that he has no further communications to make to the Congress at this session.

RESOLUTION FOR ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a concurrent resolution coming over from the House, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1048), as follows:

> *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Saturday, October 22, 1966, and that when they adjourn on said day, they stand adjourned sine die.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

AUTHORITY TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a concurrent resolution coming over from the House, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1049), as follows:

> *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

RESOLUTION FIXING TIME OF ASSEMBLY OF 90TH CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate, House Joint Resolution 1322.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1322) to establish the date of assembly of the 90th Congress, which was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

> *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the Ninetieth Congress shall assemble at noon on Tuesday, January 10, 1967.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1322) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORITY OF PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE TO MAKE APPOINTMENTS TO COMMISSIONS OR COMMITTEES

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 319), as follows:

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the final adjournment of the present session of the Congress, the President of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized to make appointments to commissions or committees authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses, or by order of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

THANKS OF THE SENATE TO THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 322), as follows:

Resolved, That the thanks of the Senate are hereby tendered to the Honorable LEE METCALF, Acting President pro tempore of the Senate, for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner in which he has presided over its deliberations during the second session of the Eighty-ninth Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

THANKS OF THE SENATE TO THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read by the clerk.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 320) as follows:

Resolved, That the thanks of the Senate are hereby tendered to the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate, for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner in which he has presided over its deliberations during the second session of the Eighty-ninth Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

THANKS OF THE SENATE TO THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. 321), as follows:

Resolved, That the thanks of the Senate are hereby tendered to the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, President pro tempore of the Senate, for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner in which he has presided over its deliberations during the second session of the Eighty-ninth Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that long-awaited moment has arrived. In accordance with the terms of House Concurrent Resolution 1048, previously agreed to, I move that the Senate adjourn sine die.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned sine die.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 1049, 89th Congress, on October 25, 1966, the Secretary of the Senate received a message from the House of Representatives, which announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, on the following dates:

On October 24, 1966:

S. 2451. An act for the relief of Che Yim Loh;

S. 2770. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to prohibit the use of the likenesses of the great seal of the United States falsely to indicate Federal agency, sponsorship, or approval;

H.R. 1328. An act for the relief of Glenn D. Humes;

H.R. 1388. An act for the relief of Maj. Ralph D. Caldwell;

H.R. 2129. An act for the relief of Maria Rossi;

H.R. 2266. An act to provide for the settlement of claims resulting from an explosion at a U.S. ordnance plant in Bowie County, Tex., on July 8, 1963;

H.R. 3500. An act for the relief of Mrs. Emilie Boulay;

H.R. 3526. An act for the relief of Dr. Eric J. Lazaro;

H.R. 3530. An act for the relief of Dr. Miguel Angel Martinez y Corpas;

H.R. 3531. An act for the relief of Dr. Julio Cesar Muñiz y Sotolongo;

H.R. 3536. An act for the relief of George R. Lore;

H.R. 3689. An act for the relief of Juanita Cereguine de Burgh;

H.R. 3756. An act for the relief of James S. Kahriman;

H.R. 3879. An act for the relief of Ernest Buillet;

H.R. 3901. An act for the relief of Miss Elisabeth von Oberndorff;

H.R. 3993. An act to authorize the issuance of certificates of citizenship in the Canal Zone;

H.R. 4077. An act for the relief of Jean A. Quaintance;

H.R. 4454. An act for the relief of Herman Feldman;

H.R. 5622. An act for the relief of Dr. Jorge Ignacio Miquel Franca;

H.R. 5958. An act relating to applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody pursuant to judgments of State courts;

H.R. 5969. An act for the relief of Dr. Raul R. Moriff;

H.R. 6035. An act for the relief of the estate of Maj. John W. Roy, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6103. An act for the relief of the city of Umatilla, Oreg.;

H.R. 6115. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose A. G. Mendoza;

H.R. 6226. An act for the relief of Dr. Bienvenido Benach Carreras;

H.R. 6443. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio U. Catasus;

H.R. 6899. An act for the relief of Dr. Myriam de la Caridad Ares y Fernandez de Bosch;

H.R. 7026. An act for the relief of Nathan Levine;

H.R. 7341. An act for the relief of Dr. Ricardo R. Fuste;

H.R. 7382. An act to amend section 1391 of title 28 of the United States Code relating to venue;

H.R. 8358. An act for the relief of the Milan Compress Co.;

H.R. 8614. An act for the relief of Miss Rajka Soda;

H.R. 8937. An act for the relief of Charles A. Turner;

H.R. 9036. An act for the relief of J. M. Pendarvis, Jr.;

H.R. 9213. An act for the relief of William A. Buzbee;

H.R. 9217. An act for the relief of certain civilian employees of the Department of the Army at Fort Sam Houston, Tex.;

H.R. 9348. An act for the relief of Capt. Harold G. Wilmarth;

H.R. 10151. An act for the relief of Dr. Luis Crespo;

H.R. 10249. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elisabeth Manninen;

H.R. 10253. An act for the relief of Dr. Luis E. Bencomo;

H.R. 10259. An act for the relief of Dr. Allan Baumal;

H.R. 10288. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio B. Santillano;

H.R. 10662. An act for the relief of Leonard J. Dalton;

H.R. 10832. An act for the relief of Gloria Alesna Relampagos;

H.R. 10846. An act for the relief of Katherine Nabokoff and Emil Homoceanu;

H.R. 10876. An act to authorize and direct the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration to quit claim certain property in Jackson County, Ala., to Skyline Churches Cemetery, a corporation;

H.R. 11224. An act for the relief of Dr. Pedro Raphael;

H.R. 11254. An act for the relief of Julieta Gloria Bersamin;

H.R. 11256. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the priority and effect of Federal tax liens and levies, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11467. An act for the relief of CWO Joseph J. McGavin;

H.R. 11570. An act for the relief of James R. Kemp;

H.R. 11590. An act for the relief of Dr. Jacinta Llorens;

H.R. 11617. An act for the relief of Jun Becky;

H.R. 11640. An act for the relief of Dr. Juan Antonio Dumois;

H.R. 11676. An act for the relief of Johnny R. Bradley and others;

H.R. 11952. An act for the relief of Maria Kazidakis;

H.R. 11957. An act for the relief of Muriel Williams;

H.R. 12237. An act for the relief of Tri-States Construction Co., Inc.;

H.R. 12317. An act for the relief of Dr. Augusto J. Fernandez-Conde;

H.R. 12512. An act for the relief of Carl V. Elliott;

H.R. 12781. An act for the relief of Dr. Mario Orlando Santos-Estevez;

H.R. 12826. An act for the relief of Kim Kap Yung;

H.R. 12920. An act for the relief of Alexander Francis Saker, M.D.;

H.R. 13101. An act for the relief of Mario P. Navarro, M.D.;

H.R. 13192. An act for the relief of Nermin Demirbag Lavapies;

H.R. 13370. An act to authorize the disposal of fused crude aluminum oxide from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13551. An act to amend the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13661. An act to authorize the disposal of battery-grade synthetic manganese dioxide from the national stockpile;

H.R. 13682. An act for the relief of Donald E. Auseon;

H.R. 13683. An act for the relief of Robert A. Ivins;

H.R. 13800. An act for the relief of Sp5c. Ronald J. Olson, U.S. Army, retired;

H.R. 13935. An act to give the consent of Congress to the State of Massachusetts to become a party to the agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity as set forth in title II of the act of April 14, 1965 (79 Stat. 60), and consented to by Congress in that act and in the act of November 1, 1965 (79 Stat. 1157);

H.R. 13982. An act to amend the act of August 14, 1964, to authorize payments of any amounts authorized under the act to the estates of persons who would have been eligible for payments under the authority of the act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14075. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to settle and pay certain claims arising out of the taking of the 1960 decennial census;

H.R. 14173. An act for the relief of Antonio Barquet Chediak;

H.R. 14174. An act for the relief of Esteban Fernandez Noda;

H.R. 14233. An act for the relief of Beatriz Diaz;

H.R. 14525. An act for the relief of Thomas C. Macpherson, Jr.;

H.R. 14615. An act for the relief of certain members and former members of the Army on whose behalf erroneous payments were made for storage of household goods;

H.R. 14643. An act to provide for the strengthening of American educational resources for international studies and research;

H.R. 14741. An act to authorize an increase in the number of Marine Corps officers who may serve in the combined grades of brigadier general and major general;

H.R. 14749. An act for the relief of Katherine M. Perakis;

H.R. 14819. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. William Nussbaum;

H.R. 14864. An act for the relief of certain individuals;

H.R. 14920. An act for the relief of Marie del Carmen Bermudez;

H.R. 14984. An act for the relief of Renato Camacho Castro;

H.R. 14990. An act for the relief of Herman Adams, doing business as the Adams Manufacturing Co.;

H.R. 15014. An act for the relief of Henry P. Leonhardy;

H.R. 15183. An act to adjust the status of Cuban refugees to that of lawful permanent residents of the United States, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15251. An act for the relief of Walter W. Taylor;

H.R. 15297. An act for the relief of Leonard G. Duffy, lieutenant, U.S. Navy;

H.R. 15488. An act for the relief of Dr. Ali Haji-Morad;

H.R. 15766. An act to establish a National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws;

H.R. 16074. An act to cancel certain unpaid interest accrued after September 30, 1931, on loans made to World War I veterans upon the security of adjusted service certificates;

H.R. 16394. An act for the relief of certain enlisted members of the military services who lost interest on amounts deposited under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code, or prior laws authorizing members' deposits, and for other purposes;

H.R. 16522. An act for the relief of Vicente Fernandez Marino;

H.R. 16610. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio Rondon Delgado;

H.R. 16977. An act for the relief of Eugene G. Peterson, Harry E. Byers, and Russell W. Jordan;

H.R. 17260. An act for the relief of Robert A. Jellison:

H.R. 17261. An act for the relief of Augustus J. Theodore;

H.R. 17271. An act to amend section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $200 to $500 the monthly combat pay exclusion for commissioned officers serving in combat zones;

H.R. 17376. An act to authorize the disposal of nickel from the national stockpile;

H.R. 17451. An act to preserve the pay and retirement privileges of certain former deputy chiefs of Navy bureaus;

H.R. 17588. An act to amend section 8(g) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act with respect to assignments;

H.R. 17798. An act to provide that a judgment or decree of the District of Columbia court of general sessions shall not constitute a lien until filed and recorded in the office of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 18019. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct an addition at the Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, D.C.;

H.R. 18021. An act to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes;

H.R. 18033. An act for the relief of Dr. Fidel Rodriguez-Cubas; and

H.R. 18381. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

On October 25, 1966:

H.R. 203. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to set aside funds for research into spinal cord injuries and diseases;

H.R. 647. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to permit the appointment of new trustees in deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by agreement of the parties;

H.R. 872. An act to amend the provisions of title 18 of the United States Code relating to offenses committed in Indian country;

H.R. 1269. An act for the relief of H. Foster Hunter;

H.R. 3348. An act to authorize a program for the construction of facilities for the teaching of veterinary medicine and a program of loans for students of veterinary medicine;

H.R. 5990. An act to grant increased benefits to persons receiving cash relief under the Panama Canal Cash Relief Act of July 8, 1937;

H.R. 7973. An act to amend section 4339 of title 10, United States Code;

H.R. 8436. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the dutiable status of watches, clocks, and timing apparatus from insular possessions of the United States;

H.R. 9778. An act to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to codify recent military law, and to improve the Code;

H.R. 11475. An act to provide for the control or elimination of jellyfish and other such pests in the coastal waters of the United States, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11631. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to clarify, improve, and add additional programs relating to the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13103. An act to provide equitable tax treatment for foreign investment in the United States, to establish a presidential election campaign fund to assist in financing the costs of presidential election campaigns, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13196. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the opportunities for training of medical technologists and personnel in other allied health professions, to improve the educational quality of the schools training such allied health professions personnel, and to strengthen and improve the existing student loan programs for medical, osteopathic, dental, podiatry, pharmacy, optometric, and nursing students, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14347. An act to liberalize the provisions for payment to parents and children of dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14604. An act to authorize a study of facilities and services to be furnished visitors and students coming to the Nation's Capital;

H.R. 14644. An act to amend the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, the Higher Education Act of 1965, and the National Defense Education Act of 1958;

H.R. 14745. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14929. An act to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15024. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to select an available Government-owned site in the District of Columbia and to improve and lease such site for a temporary heliport;

H.R. 15111. An act to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty;

H.R. 17658. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the U.S. Naval Construction Battalions (Seabees) 25th anniversary and the U.S. Navy Civil Engineers Corps (CEC) 100th anniversary;

H.R. 18284. An act to authorize the Attorney General to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands within the Federal reformatory at Chillicothe, Ohio;

H.J. Res. 1001. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the month of May each year as "Steelmark Month"; and

H.J. Res. 1322. Joint resolution giving the time of assembly of the 90th Congress.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 319, 89th Congress, the Vice President made the following appointments subsequent to the sine die adjournment:

On November 3, 1966:

Hon. Francis R. Valeo to the Federal Records Council, to fill the vacancy caused by the retirement of Hon. Emory L. Frazier.

On November 4, 1966:

Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, of Kentucky, to be alternate delegate to attend the 12th NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, to be held in Paris, France, on November 14–19, 1966.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 1049, 89th Congress, on the following dates signed the following bills and joint resolutions, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

On October 24, 1966:

H.R. 14643. An act to provide for the strengthening of American educational resources for international studies and research.

On October 25, 1966:

H.R. 14355. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to make certain technical changes, to provide for survivor benefits to children ages 18 to 21, inclusive, and for other purposes;

H.R. 17285. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 18381. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

On October 28, 1966:

H.R. 203. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to set aside funds for research into spinal cord injuries and diseases;

H.R. 647. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to permit the appointment of new trustees in deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by agreement of the parties;

H.R. 872. An act to amend the provisions of title 18 of the United States Code relating to offenses committed in Indian country;

H.R. 1269. An act for the relief of H. Foster Hunter;

H.R. 1328. An act for the relief of Glenn D. Humes;

H.R. 1388. An act for the relief of Maj. Ralph D. Caldwell;

H.R. 2129. An act for the relief of Maria Rossi;

H.R. 2266. An act to provide for the settlement of claims resulting from an explosion at a U.S. ordnance plant in Bowie County, Tex., on July 8, 1963;

H.R. 2600. An act to provide for the acquisition and preservation of the real property known as the Ansley Wilcox House in Buffalo, N.Y., as a national historic site;

H.R. 3348. An act to authorize a program for the construction of facilities for the teaching of veterinary medicine and a program of loans for students of veterinary medicine;

H.R. 3500. An act for the relief of Mrs. Emilie Boulay;

H.R. 3526. An act for the relief of Dr. Eric J. Lazaro;

H.R. 3530. An act for the relief of Dr. Miguel Angel Martinez y Corpas;

H.R. 3531. An act for the relief of Dr. Julio Cesar Muniz y Sotolongo;

H.R. 3536. An act for the relief of George R. Lore;

H.R. 3689. An act for the relief of Juanita Cereguine de Burgh;

H.R. 3756. An act for the relief of James S. Kahriman;

H.R. 3879. An act for the relief of Ernest Buillet;

H.R. 3901. An act for the relief of Miss Elisabeth von Oberndorff;

H.R. 3993. An act to authorize the issuance of certificates of citizenship in the Canal Zone;

H.R. 4077. An act for the relief of Jean A. Quaintance;

H.R. 4454. An act for the relief of Herman Feldman;

H.R. 5622. An act for the relief of Dr. Jorge Ignacio Miquel Franca;

H.R. 5688. An act relating to criminal procedure in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 5958. An act relating to applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody pursuant to judgments of State courts;

H.R. 5969. An act for the relief of Dr. Raul R. Morffi;

H.R. 5990. An act to grant increased benefits to persons receiving cash relief under the Panama Canal Cash Relief Act of July 8, 1937;

H.R. 6035. An act for the relief of the estate of Maj. John W. Roy, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6103. An act for the relief of the city of Umatilla, Oreg.;

H.R. 6115. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose A. G. Mendoza;

H.R. 6226. An act for the relief of Dr. Bienvenido Benach Carreras;

H.R. 6443. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio U. Catasus;

H.R. 6899. An act for the relief of Dr. Myriam de la Caridad Ares y Fernandez de Bosch;

H.R. 6958. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to promote savings under the Internal Revenue Service's automatic data processing system;

H.R. 7026. An act for the relief of Nathan Levine;

H.R. 7341. An act for the relief of Dr. Ricardo R. Fuste;

H.R. 7382. An act to amend section 1391 of title 28 of the United States Code relating to venue;

H.R. 7648. An act to authorize long-term leases on the San Zavier and Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Reservations, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7973. An act to amend section 4339 of title 10, United States Code;

H.R. 8358. An act for the relief of the Milan Compress Co.;

H.R. 8436. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the dutiable status of watches, clocks, and timing apparatus from insular possessions of the United States;

H.R. 8614. An act for the relief of Miss Rajka Soda;

H.R. 8917. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Omaha Tribe of Nebraska, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8937. An act for the relief of Charles A. Turner;

H.R. 9036. An act for the relief of J. M. Pendarvis, Jr.;

H.R. 9167. An act to amend title of the United States Code to enable the courts to deal more effectively with the problem of narcotic addiction, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9213. An act for the relief of William A. Buzbee;

H.R. 9217. An act for the relief of certain civilian employees of the Department of the Army at Fort Sam Houston, Tex.;

H.R. 9348. An act for the relief of Capt. Harold G. Wilmarth;

H.R. 9778. An act to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to codify recent military law, and to improve the code;

H.R. 9985. An act to provide for the mandatory reporting by physicians and hospitals or similar institutions in the District of Columbia of injuries caused by firearms or other dangerous weapons;

H.R. 10151. An act for the relief of Dr. Luis Crespo;

H.R. 10249. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elisabeth Manninen;

H.R. 10253. An act for the relief of Dr. Luis E. Bencomo;

H.R. 10259. An act for the relief of Dr. Allan Baumal;

H.R. 10288. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio B. Santillano;

H.R. 10304. An act to provide for the mandatory reporting by physicians and institutions in the District of Columbia of certain physical abuse of children;

H.R. 10327. An act to require evidence of adequate financial responsibility to pay judgments for personal injury or death, or to repay fares in the event of nonperformance of voyages, to establish minimum standards for passenger vessels and to require disclosure of construction details on passenger vessels, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10662. An act for the relief of Leonard J. Dalton;

H.R. 10832. An act for the relief of Gloria Alesna Kelampagos;

H.R. 10846. An act for the relief of Katherine Nabokoff and Emil Homoceanu;

H.R. 10876. An act to authorize and direct the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration to quitclaim certain property in Jackson County, Ala., to Skyline Churches Cemetery, a corporation;

H.R. 11216. An act relating to the tariff treatment of articles assembled abroad of products of the United States, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11224. An act for the relief of Dr. Pedro Raphael;

H.R. 11254. An act for the relief of Julieta Gloria Bersamin;

H.R. 11256. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the priority and effect of Federal tax liens and levies, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11467. An act for the relief of CWO Joseph J. McGavin;

H.R. 11475. An act to provide for the control or elimination of jellyfish and other such pests in the coastal waters of the United States, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11555. An act to provide a border highway along the U.S. bank of the Rio Grande in connection with the settlement of the Chamizal boundary dispute between the United States and Mexico;

H.R. 11570. An act for the relief of James R. Kemp;

H.R. 11590. An act for the relief of Dr. Jacinta Llorens;

H.R. 11617. An act for the relief of Jun Becky;

H.R. 11631. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to clarify, improve, and add additional programs relating to the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11640. An act for the relief of Dr. Juan Antonio Dumois;

H.R. 11660. An act relating to interest on income tax refunds made within 45 days after the filing of the tax return, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11676. An act for the relief of Johnny R. Bradley and others;

H.R. 11782. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for additions to a reserve for certain guaranteed debt obligations, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11952. An act for the relief of Maria Karidakis;

H.R. 11957. An act for the relief of Muriel Williams;

H.R. 12237. An act for the relief of Tri-States Construction Co., Inc.;

H.R. 12317. An act for the relief of Dr. Augusto J. Fernandez-Conde;

H.R. 12360. An act to permit the sale of grain storage facilities to public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations;

H.R. 12512. An act for the relief of Carl V. Elliott;

H.R. 12781. An act for the relief of Dr. Mario Orlando Santos-Estevez;

H.R. 12826. An act for the relief of Kim Kap Yung;

H.R. 12920. An act for the relief of Alexander Francis Saker, doctor of medicine;

H.R. 13101. An act for the relief of Mario P. Navarro, doctor of medicine;

H.R. 13103. An act to provide equitable tax treatment for foreign investment in the United States, to establish a presidential election campaign fund to assist in financing the costs of presidential election campaigns, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13192. An act for the relief of Nermin Demirbag Lavapies;

H.R. 13194. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the opportunities for training of medical technologists and personnel in other allied health professions, to improve the educational quality of the schools training such allied health professions personnel, and to strengthen and improve the existing student loan programs for medical, osteopathic, dental, podiatry, pharmacy, optometric and nursing students, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13320. An act to authorize the disposal of industrial diamond stones from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13370. An act to authorize the disposal of fused crude aluminum oxide from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13448. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to mailing privileges of members of the U.S. Armed Forces and other Federal Government personnel overseas, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13551. An act to amend the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13661. An act to authorize the disposal of battery-grade synthetic manganese dioxide from the national stockpile;

H.R. 13682. An act for the relief of Donald E. Auseon;

H.R. 13683. An act for the relief of Robert A. Ivins;

H.R. 13800. An act for the relief of Sp5c. Ronald J. Olson, U.S. Army, retired;

H.R. 13935. An act to give the consent of Congress to the State of Massachusetts to become a party to the agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity as set forth in title II of the act of April 14 1965 (79 Stat. 60), and consented to by Congress in that act and in the act of November 1, 1965 (79 Stat. 1157);

H.R. 13982. An act to amend the act of August 14, 1964, to authorize payments of any amounts authorized under the act to the estates of persons who would have been eligible for payments under the authority of the act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14075. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to settle and pay certain claims arising out of the taking of the 1960 decennial census;

H.R. 14173. An act for the relief of Antonio Barquet Chediak;

H.R. 14174. An act for the relief of Esteban Fernandez Noda;

H.R. 14233. An act for the relief of Beatriz Diaz;

H.R. 14347. An act to liberalize the provisions for payment to parents and children of dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14525. An act for the relief of Thomas C. Macpherson, Jr.;

H.R. 14604. An act to authorize a study of facilities and services to be furnished visitors and students coming to the Nation's Capital;

H.R. 14615. An act for the relief of certain members and former members of the Army on whose behalf erroneous payments were made for storage of household goods;

H.R. 14643. An act to provide for the strengthening of American educational resources for international studies and research;

H.R. 14644. An act to amend the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, the Higher Education Act of 1965, and the National Defense Education Act of 1958;

H.R. 14741. An act to authorize an increase in the number of Marine Corps officers who may serve in the combined grades of brigadier general and major general;

H.R. 14745. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14749. An act for the relief of Katherine M. Perakis;

H.R. 14819. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. William Nussbaum;

H.R. 14864. An act for the relief of certain individuals;

H.R. 14920. An act for the relief of Marie del Carmen Bermudez;

H.R. 14929. An act to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14984. An act for the relief of Renato Camacho Castro;

H.R. 14990. An act for the relief of Herman Adams, doing business as the Adams Manufacturing Co.;

H.R. 15014. An act for the relief of Henry P. Leonhardy;

H.R. 15024. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to select an available Government-owned site in the District of Columbia and to improve and lease such site for a temporary heliport;

H.R. 15111. An act to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty;

H.R. 15183. An act to adjust the status of Cuban refugees to that of lawful permanent residents of the United States, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15251. An act for the relief of Walter W. Taylor;

H.R. 15297. An act for the relief of Leonard G. Duffy, lieutenant, U.S. Navy.

H.R. 15335. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish an Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations," approved September 24, 1959;

H.R. 15488. An act for the relief of Dr. Ali Haji-Morad;

H.R. 15727. An act to establish rates of compensation for certain positions within the Smithsonian Institution;

H.R. 15748. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize a special 30-day period of leave for a member of a uniformed service who voluntarily extends his tour of duty in a hostile fire area;

H.R. 15766. An act to establish a National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws;

H.R. 15857. An act to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 to increase salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan police force and the Fire Department, to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 to increase the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 16074. An act to cancel certain unpaid interest accrued after September 30, 1931, on loans made to World War I veterans upon the security of adjusted service certificates;

H.R. 16114. An act to provide for the inclusion of premium pay under section 5545 (c) (1) of title 5, United States Code, for the purpose of determining benefits under the civil service retirement, group life insurance, and injury compensation provisions of such title, and for other purposes;

H.R. 16394. An act for the relief of certain enlisted members of the military services who lost interest on amounts deposited under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code, or prior laws authoriling enlisted members' deposits, and for other purposes;

H.R. 16522. An act for the relief of Vicente Fernandez Marino;

H.R. 16610. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio Rondon Delgado;

H.R. 16715. An act to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962;

H.R. 16977. An act for the relief of Eugene G. Peterson, Harry E. Byers, and Russell W. Jordan;

H.R. 17260. An act for the relief of Robert A. Jellison;

H.R. 17261. An act for the relief of Augustus J. Theodore;

H.R. 17271. An act to amend section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $200 to $500 the monthly combat pay exclusion for commissioned officers serving in combat zones;

H.R. 17376. An act to authorize the disposal of nickel from the national stockpile;

H.R. 17451. An act to preserve the pay and retirement privileges of certain former deputy chiefs of Navy bureaus;

H.R. 17588. An act to amend section 8(g) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act with respect to assignments;

H.R. 17607. An act to suspend the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property;

H.R. 17636. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes;

H.R. 17637. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes;

H.R. 17658. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the U.S. Naval Construction Battalions (Seabees) 25th anniversary and the U.S. Naval Civil Engineers Corps (CEC) 100th anniversary;

H.R. 17798. An act to provide that a judgment or decree of the District of Columbia court of general sessions shall not constitute a lien until filed and recorded in the office of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 18019. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct an addition at the Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, D.C.;

H.R. 18021. An act to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes;

H.R. 18033. An act for the relief of Dr. Fidel Rodriguez-Cubas;

H.R. 18119. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes;

H.R. 18233. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbers for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes;

H.R. 18284. An act to authorize the Attorney General to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands within the Federal reformatory at Chillicothe, Ohio;

H.R. 18381. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 1001. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the month of May each year as "Steelmark Month"; and

H.J. Res. 1322. Joint resolution fixing the time of assembly of the 90th Congress.

On November 1, 1966:

S. 2102. An act to protect and conserve the North Pacific fur seals, to provide for the administration of the Pribilof Islands, to conserve the fur seals and other wildlife on the Pribilof Islands, and to protect sea otters on the high seas; and

S. 2720. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to develop, through the use of experiment and demonstration plants, practicable and economic means for the production by the commercial fishing industry of fish protein concentrate.

On November 2, 1966:

S. 84. An act to provide for reimbursement to the State of Wyoming for improvements made on certain lands in Sweetwater County, Wyo., if and when such lands revert to the United States;

S. 195. An act for the relief of Sunnyside Seed Farms;

S. 360. An act to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes;

S. 476. An act to amend the act approved March 18, 1950, providing for the construction of airports in or close proximity to national parks, national monuments, and national recreation areas, and for other purposes;

S. 688. An act to amend title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to provide for additional means and measures for land conservation and land utilization, and for other purposes;

S. 690. An act for the relief of Norman J. Pitman;

S. 769. An act for the relief of Dr. Marshall Ku;

S. 985. An act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes;

S. 1068. An act for the relief of Fred E. Starr;

S. 1101. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral interests of the United States in seventy-nine and one-hundred-and-eighty-four one-thousandths acres located near Orangeburg, S.C., to Allen E. Dominick, the owner of such property;

S. 1137. An act for the relief of Dr. Rafael Martinez Torres;

S. 1319. An act to authorize a work release program for persons sentenced by the courts of the District of Columbia; to define the powers and duties in relation thereto, and for other purposes;

S. 1349. An act to amend the inland, Great Lakes, and western rivers rules concerning sailing vessels and vessels under 65 feet in length;

S. 1496. An act to repeal section 3342 of title 5, United States Code, relating to the prohibition of employee details from field service to the departmental service, and for other purposes;

S. 1556. An act to authorize the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to delegate certain of its functions, and for other purposes;

S. 1572. An act for the relief of Merritt A. Seefeldt and August C. Seefeldt;

S. 1661. An act for the relief of Samuel C. Neiburg;

S. 1674. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make disposition of geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources, and for other purposes;

S. 1760. An act to authorize the acceptance of a settlement of certain indebtedness of Greece to the United States and to authorize the use of the payments resulting from the settlement for a cultural and educational exchange program;

S. 1861. An act to provide additional assistance for areas suffering a major disaster;

S. 2010. An act for the relief of Fun Wat Hoy;

S. 2040. An act for the relief of Dr. Dean H. Gosselin;

S. 2109. An act for the relief of Dr. Olibio S. Rodriquez-Eiras;

S. 2222. An act for the relief of Susan Jeanne Clynes;

S. 2338. An act to authorize the erection of a memorial in the District of Columbia to Gen. John J. Pershing;

S. 2451. An act for the relief of Che Yim Loh;

S. 2491. An act for the relief of Dr. Juan Federico Antonio Lamas y Parra;

S. 2500. An act for the relief of James A. Todd, Jr.;

S. 2621. An act for the relief of Ioannis A. Vasilopoulos and Chester (Abramczyk) Hill;

S. 2750. An act for the relief of You I. Souk;

S. 2751. An act for the relief of David R. Slemon;

S. 2763. An act for the relief of Dr. Marcial Alfredo Marti (Alfredo Marti);

S. 2770. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to prohibit the use of the likenesses of the great seal of the United States falsely to indicate Federal agency, sponsorship, or approval;

S. 2798. An act for the relief of CWO Glen Zeigler, U.S. Navy, retired;

S. 2801. An act for the relief of Helena Gilbert Maddagiri and Heather Gilbert Maddagiri;

S. 2829. An act to amend section 301(a) (17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act;

S. 2893. An act to amend section 209(c) to provide certificates issued to motor common carriers of passengers pursuant to future applications shall not confer, as an incident to the grant of regular route authority, the right to transport special or chartered parties;

S. 2947. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to improve and make more effective certain programs pursuant to such Act;

S. 2979. An act to extend coverage of the State Technical Services Act of 1965 to the Territory of Guam;

S. 3008. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to promote and assist in the extension and improvement of comprehensive health planning and public health services, to provide for a more effective use of available Federal funds for such planning and services, and for other purposes;

S. 3148. An act to provide for the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States reserved or retained in certain lands heretofore conveyed to the city of El Paso, Tex.;

S. 3209. An act for the relief of Zofia Zych;

S. 3222. An act for the relief of Dusko Doder;

S. 3230. An act to authorize the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to negotiate cooperative agreements granting concessions at the National Zoological Park to certain nonprofit organizations and to accept voluntary services of such organizations or of individuals, and for other purposes;

S. 3254. An act to amend sections 2072 and 2112 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the scope of the Federal rules of civil procedure and to repeal inconsistent legislation;

S. 3258. An act for the relief of Denis Hikmet Sen Manes;

S. 3298. An act to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act to ban hazardous toys and articles intended for children, and other articles, so hazardous as to be dangerous in the household regardless of labeling, and to apply to unpackaged articles intended for household use, and for other purposes;

S. 3318. An act for the relief of Yung Mi Kim;

S. 3358. An act for the relief of Theodora Bezates;

S. 3389. An act to provide for the establishment of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, and for other purposes;

S. 3391. An act to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended, to authorize exemption from the provisions of the act;

S. 3466. An act to change the name of the Rolla Jewel Bearing Plant at Rolla, N. Dak., to the William Langer Jewel Bearing Plant;

S. 3488. An act to grant the consent of Congress for the States of Virginia and Maryland and the District of Columbia to amend the Washington Metropolitan area transit regulation compact to establish an organization empowered to provide transit facilities in the National Capital region and for other purposes and to enact said amendment for the District of Columbia;

S. 3675. An act to amend title V of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 to provide for the determination of the amounts of claims of nationals of the United States against the Chinese Communist regime;

S. 3708. An act to assist comprehensive city demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and service necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in those areas, to assist and encourage planned metropolitan development, and for other purposes;

S. 3887. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit persons from countries friendly to the United States to receive instruction at the U.S. Military Academy, the U.S. Naval Academy, and the U.S. Air Force Academy, and for other purposes.

S.J. Res. 133. Joint resolution designating February 1967 as American History Month; and

S.J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to enable the United States to organize and hold an International Conference on Water for Peace in the United States in 1967 and authorize an appropriation therefor.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on the following dates, bills and joint resolutions of the following titles were presented to the President of the United States:

On November 1, 1966:

S. 2720. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to develop, through the use of experiment and demonstration plants, practicable and economic means for the production by the commercial fishing industry of fish protein concentrate; and

S. 2102. An act to protect and conserve the North Pacific fur seals, to provide for the administration of the Pribolof Islands, to conserve the fur seals and other wildlife on the Pribilof Islands, and to protect sea otters on the high seas.

The following communications from the Vice President of the United States

and the Secretary of the Senate were received relating to the presentation of the above-entitled bills to the President of the United States:

THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington, November 1, 1966.

Hon. FRANCIS R. VALEO,
Secretary of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: This is to advise you that at the request of Mr. Califano of the White House staff, I personally delivered S. 2102 and S. 2720 to the White House. In so doing I hope I have not caused you any difficulty in your record keeping.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

NOVEMBER 4, 1966.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: Thank you for your note apprising me that you personally delivered the enrollments of S. 2102 and S. 2720 to the White House on November 1, 1966, at the request of the White House staff.

Your communication to me is most essential to complete our records, the White House staff having subsequently declined to sign the Senate's time-honored receipt book for these two bills.

Consequently your letter and my response thereto are necessary to serve as the only entry in the Senate Journal showing the delivery of these two Senate bills to the White House for presentation to the President, and thereby establish the ten-day period for Presidential signature, beginning at midnight on November 1, 1966.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS R. VALEO,
Secretary of the Senate.

On November 2, 1966:

S. 84. An act to provide for reimbursement to the State of Wyoming for improvements made on certain lands in Sweetwater County, Wyo., if and when such lands revert to the United States;

S. 195. An act for the relief of Sunnyside Seed Farms;

S. 360. An act to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes;

S. 476. An act to amend the act approved March 18, 1950, providing for the construction of airports in or close proximity to national parks, national monuments, and national recreation areas, and for other purposes;

S. 688. An act to amend title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to provide for additional means and measures for land conservation and land utilization, and for other purposes;

S. 690. An act for the relief of Norman J. Pitman;

S. 769. An act for the relief of Dr. Marshall Ku;

S. 985. An act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes;

S. 1068. An act for the relief of Fred E. Starr;

S. 1101. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral interests of the United States in $79\frac{184}{1000}$ acres located near Orangeburg, S.C., to Allen E. Dominick, the owner of such property;

S. 1137. An act for the relief of Dr. Rafael Martinez Torres;

S. 1319. An act to authorize a work release program for persons sentenced by the courts of the District of Columbia; to define the powers and duties in relation thereto, and for other purposes;

S. 1349. An act to amend the inland, Great Lakes, and western rivers rules concerning sailing vessels and vessels under 65 feet in length;

S. 1496. An act the repeal section 3342 of title 5, United States Code, relating to the prohibition of employee details from field service to the departmental service, and for other purposes;

S. 1556. An act to authorize the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to delegate certain of its functions, and for other purposes;

S. 1572. An act for the relief of Merritt A. Seefeldt and August C. Seefeldt;

S. 1661. An act for the relief of Samuel G. Neiburg;

S. 1674. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make disposition of geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources, and for other purposes;

S. 1760. An act to authorize the acceptance of a settlement of certain indebtedness of Greece to the United States and to authorize the use of the payments resulting from the settlement for a cultural and educational exchange program;

S. 1861. An act to provide additional assistance for areas suffering a major disaster;

S. 2010. An act for the relief of Fun Wat Hoy;

S. 2040. An act for the relief of Dr. Dean H. Gosselin;

S. 2109. An act for the relief of Dr. Olibio S. Rodriquez-Elras;

S. 2222. An act for the relief of Susan Jeanne Clynes;

S. 2338. An act to authorize the erection of a memorial in the District of Columbia to Gen. John J. Perishing;

S. 2451. An act for the relief of Che Yim Loh;

S. 2491. An act for the relief of Dr. Juan Federico Antonio Lamas y Parra;

S. 2500. An act for the relief of James A. Todd; Jr.;

S. 2621. An act for the relief of Ioannis A. Vasilopoulos and Chester (Abramczyk) Hill;

S. 2750. An act for the relief of You I. Souk;

S. 2751. An act for the relief of David R. Slemon;

S. 2763. An act for the relief of Dr. Marcial Alfredo Marti (Alfredo Marti);

S. 2770. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to prohibit the use of the likenesses of the great seal of the United States falsely to indicate Federal agency, sponsorship, or approval;

S. 2798. An act for the relief of CWO Glen Zeigler, U.S. Navy (retired);

S. 2801. An act for the relief of Helena Gilbert Maddagiri and Heather Gilbert Maddagiri;

S. 2829. An act to amend section 301(a) (17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act;

S. 2893. An act to amend section 209(c) to provide that certificates issued to motor common carriers of passengers pursuant to future applications shall not confer, as an incident to the grant of regular route authority, the right to transport special or chartered parties;

S. 2947. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to improve and make more effective certain programs pursuant to such act;

S. 2979. An act to extend coverage of the State Technical Services Act of 1965 to the Territory of Guam;

S. 3008. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to promote and assist in the extension and improvement of comprehensive health planning and public health services, to provide for a more effective use of available Federal funds for such planning and services, and for other purposes;

S. 3148. An act to provide for the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States reserved or retained in certain lands heretofore conveyed to the city of El Paso, Tex.;

S. 3209. An act for the relief of Zofia Zych;

S. 3222. An act for the relief of Dusko Doder;

S. 3230. An act to authorize the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to negotiate cooperative agreements granting concessions at the National Zoological Park to certain nonprofit organizations and to accept voluntary services of such organizations or of individuals, and for other purposes;

S. 3254. An act to amend section 2072 and 2112 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the scope of the Federal rules of civil procedure and to repeal inconsistent legislation;

S. 3258. An act for the relief of Deniz Hikmet Sen Manes;

S. 3298. An act to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act to ban hazardous toys and articles intended for children, and other articles, so hazardous as to be dangerous in the household regardless of labeling, and to apply to unpackaged articles intended for household use, and for other purposes;

S. 3318. An act for the relief of Yung Mi Kim;

S. 3358. An act for the relief of Theodora Bezates;

S. 3389. An act to provide for the establishment of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, and for other purposes;

S. 3391. An act to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended, to authorize exemption from the provisions of the act;

S. 3466. An act to change the name of the Rolla Jewel Bearing Plant at Rolla, N. Dak., to the William Langer Jewel Bearing Plant;

S. 3488. An act to grant the consent of Congress for the States of Virginia and Maryland and the District of Columbia to amend the Washington metropolitan area transit regulation compact to establish an organization empowered to provide transit facilities in the National Capital region and for other purposes and to enact said amendment for the District of Columbia;

S. 3675. An act to amend title V of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 to provide for the determination of the amounts of claims of nationals of the United States against the Chinese Communist regime;

S. 3708. An act to assist comprehensive city demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and service necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in those areas, to assist and encourage planned metropolitan development, and for other purposes;

S. 3887. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit persons from countries friendly to the United States to receive instruction at the U.S. Military Academy, the U.S. Naval Academy, and the U.S. Air Force Academy, and for other purposes;

S.J. Res. 133. Joint resolution designating February 1967 as American History Month; and

S.J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to enable the United States to organize and hold an International Conference on Water for Peace in the United States in 1967 and authorize an appropriation therefor.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The Secretary of the Senate, on November 16, 1966, received a message from the President of the United States,

which announced, on the dates indicated, he had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolutions:

On October 19, 1966:

S. 3834. An act to amend chapter 141 of title 10, United States Code, to provide for price adjustments in contracts for the procurement of milk by the Department of Defense.

On November 2, 1966:

S. 2102. An act to protect and conserve the North Pacific fur seals, to provide for the administration of the Pribilof Islands, to conserve the fur seals and other wildlife on the Pribilof Islands, and to protect sea otters on the high seas; and

S. 2720. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to develop, through the use of experiment and demonstration plants, practicable and economic means for the production by the commercial fishing industry of fish protein concentrate.

On November 3, 1966:

S. 985. An act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes;

S. 2947. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to improve and make more effective certain programs pursuant to such act;

S. 3008. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to promote and assist in the extension and improvement of comprehensive health planning and public health services, to provide for a more effective use of available Federal funds for such planning and services, and for other purposes;

S. 3298. An act to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act to ban hazardous toys and articles intended for children, and other articles so hazardous as to be dangerous in the household regardless of labeling, and to apply to unpackaged articles intended for household use, and for other purposes; and

S. 3708. An act to assist comprehensive city demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and services necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in those areas, to assist and encourage planned metropolitan development, and for other purposes.

On November 5, 1966:

S. 84. An act to provide for reimbursement to the State of Wyoming for improvements made on certain lands in Sweetwater County, Wyo., if and when such lands revert to the United States;

S. 360. An act to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes;

S. 476. An act to amend the act approved March 18, 1950, providing for the construction of airports in or in close proximity to national parks, national monuments, and national recreation areas, and for other purposes;

S. 690. An act for the relief of Norman J. Pitman;

S. 769. An act for the relief of Dr. Marshall Ku;

S. 1068. An act for the relief of Fred E. Starr;

S. 1101. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral interests of the United States in seventy-nine and one-hundred-and-eighty-four one-thousandths acres located near Orangeburg, S.C., to Allen E. Dominick, the owner of such property;

S. 1137. An act for the relief of Dr. Rafael Pedro Martinez Torres;

S. 1349. An act to amend the inland, Great Lakes, and western rivers rules concerning sailing vessels and vessels under 65 feet in length;

S. 1496. An act to repeal section 3342 of title 5, United States Code, relating to the prohibition of employees detailed from the field service to the departmental service, and for other purposes;

S. 1556. An act to authorize the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to delegate certain of its functions, and for other purposes;

S. 1572. An act for the relief of Merritt A. Seefeldt and August S. Seefeldt;

S. 1760. An act to authorize the acceptance of a settlement of certain indebtedness of Greece to the United States and to authorize the use of the payments resulting from the settlement for a cultural and educational exchange program;

S. 3148. An act to provide for the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States reserved or retained in certain lands heretofore conveyed to the city of El Paso, Tex.; and

S.J. Res. 133. Joint resolution designating February 1967 as "American History Month."

On November 6, 1966:

S. 1861. An act to provide additional assistance for areas suffering a major disaster;

S. 2010. An act for the relief of Fun Wat Hoy;

S. 2040. An act for the relief of Dr. Dean H. Gosselin;

S. 2109. An act for the relief of Dr. Olibio S. Rodriguez-Eiras;

S. 2222. An act for the relief of Susan Jeanne Clynes;

S. 2451. An act for the relief of Che Yim Loh;

S. 2491. An act for the relief of Dr. Juan Federico Antonio Lamas y Parra;

S. 2500. An act for the relief of James A. Todd, Jr.;

S. 2621. An act for the relief of Ioannis A. Vasilopoulos and Chester (Abramczyk) Hill;

S. 2750. An act for the relief of You I. Souk;

S. 2751. An act for the relief of David R. Slemon;

S. 2763. An act for the relief of Dr. Marcial Alfredo Marti Prieto (Alfredo Marti);

S. 2798. An act for the relief of CWO Glen Zeigler, U.S. Navy, retired;

S. 2801. An act for the relief of Helena Gilbert Maddagiri and Heather Gilbert Maddagiri;

S. 2829. An act to amend section 301(a)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act;

S. 2979. An act to extend coverage of the State Technical Services Act of 1965 to the territory of Guam;

S. 3209. An act for the relief of Zofia Zych;

S. 3222. An act for the relief of Dusko Doder;

S. 3230. An act to authorize the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to negotiate cooperative agreements granting concessions at the National Zoological Park to certain nonprofit organizations and to accept voluntary services of such organizations or of individuals, and for other purposes;

S. 3254. An act to amend sections 2072 and 2112 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the scope of the Federal rules of civil procedure and to repeal inconsistent legislation;

S. 3258. An act for the relief of Deniz Hikmet Sen Manes;

S. 3318. An act for the relief of Yung Mi Kim;

S. 3358. An act for the relief of Theodora Bezates;

S. 3391. An act to amend the Shipipng Act, 1916, as amended, to authorize exemption from the provisions of the act;

S. 3466. An act to change the name of the Rolla Jewel Bearing Plant at Rolla, N. Dak., to the William Langer Jewel Bearing Plant;

S. 3488. An act to grant the consent of Congress for the States of Virginia and Maryland and the District of Columbia to amend the Washington metropolitan area transit regulation compact to establish an organization empowered to provide transit facilities in the National Capital region and for other purposes and to enact said amendment for the District of Columbia; and

S. 3675. An act to amend title V of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 to provide for the determination of the amounts of claims of nationals of the United States against the Chinese Communist regime.

On November 7, 1966:

S. 2338. An act to authorize the erection of a memorial in the District of Columbia to Gen. John J. Pershing; and

S. 3389. An act to provide for the establishment of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, and for other purposes.

On November 8, 1966:

S. 688. An act to amend title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to provide for additional means and measures for land conservation and land utilization, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to enable the United States to organize and hold an International Conference on Water for Peace in the United States in 1967 and authorize an appropriation therefor.

On November 9, 1966:

S. 3887. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit persons from countries friendly to the United States to receive instruction at the U.S. Military Academy, the U.S. Naval Academy, and the U.S. Air Force Academy, and for other purposes.

On November 10, 1966:

S. 195: An act for the relief of Sunnyside Seed Farms;

S. 1319. An act to authorize a work release program for persons sentenced by the courts of the District of Columbia; to define the powers and duties in relation thereto, and for other purposes.

S. 1661. An act for the relief of Samuel C. Neiburg; and

S. 2893. An act to amend section 208(c) to provide that certificates issued to motor common carriers of passengers pursuant to future applications shall not confer, as an incident to the grant of regular route authority, the right to transport special or chartered parties.

On November 11, 1966:

S. 2770. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to prohibit the use of likenesses of the great seal of the United States falsely to indicate Federal agency, sponsorship, or approval.

GEOTHERMAL STEAM ACT OF 1966—MEMORANDUM OF DISAPPROVAL

On November 15, 1966, the Secretary of the Senate received from the President of the United States the following memorandum of disapproval on Senate bill S. 1674, the Geothermal Steam Act of 1966:

MEMORANDUM OF DISAPPROVAL ON S. 1674

I am withholding my approval from the Geothermal Steam Act of 1966.

I am taking this action because many of the principles embodied in the bill violate the public interest.

Geothermal steam is produced by the internal heat of the earth. It is well known to every schoolchild in America under other names. Old Faithful at Yellowstone is one example of a geothermal steam spring.

We know very little about how extensive or valuable our geothermal resources are. They may be an inexhaustible supply of energy. Today, for example, the steam from a single geothermal spring is generating enough electricity to serve a community of 50,000 people. Geothermal springs may also hold untapped mineral wealth—such as gold, lithium, and silver.

These circumstances dictate a policy of prudence and reason in the leasing of Federal lands to develop this resource.

S. 1674 does just the opposite.

It ignores the basic lessons we have learned much to our sorrow—that our natural resources are priceless treasures which must be developed with wisdom and foresight.

The bill is flawed by six major provisions which run counter to sound public policy:

First. It provides for unfair and unlimited "grandfather" rights. The holders of mineral or mining leases on Federal lands as of September 7, 1965, would be automatically entitled to convert them into geothermal leases. This amounts to a free gift of valuable public property rights to these developers, and gives them an undue advantage over other prospective developers.

Second. It provides for maximum leases of 51,200 acres—an area four times greater than our experts say is needed for economical development. This could result in a single developer monopolizing the geothermal resources of entire States.

Third. It provides that royalties are payable only on steam "sold or utilized." This could encourage the wanton waste of a precious natural asset.

Fourth. It fails to provide specific and clear authority for the Government to readjust the lease terms and conditions at suitable intervals. The public deserves this protection because we still know so little about our geothermal resources.

Fifth. It provides for perpetual leases to the developer if steam is produced in commercial quantities. As a result, future generations of Americans will have lost their stake in the formulation of policies for a natural resource which may be inexhaustible, and whose potential we are only beginning to appreciate.

Sixth. It gives the developer 20 years in which to begin production. Our scientists and engineers say that this is too long a period and will encourage speculation.

In short, I have withheld my approval because this bill does not sufficiently protect the interests of the American people.

If these were only technical flaws in a measure providing for the necessary development of geothermal energy, I would gladly sign the bill. For I believe we must move vigorously to make use of this promising national asset.

But they are more than technical flaws. They represent a serious failure to protect the people's interest.

When we consider landmark legislation of this sort, dealing with a vast and little-known natural resource, we must remember that we are acting—not just for today or 5 years from today—but for decades to come. Once we have given away the people's interest in the wealth of their land, we cannot easily retrieve what has been lost. We must understand that we are trustees for 200 million Americans. All that we do must protect their interest—and the interest of their children and grandchildren—in the rich legacy with which nature has endowed us.

This bill does not do that. And because it does not, I will not give it my approval.

This does not mean we should delay the development and use of these resources. Wise and prudent trustees do not lose opportunities to increase the value of the estate they manage. But we must assure ourselves that we have first protected the people's interest before we make our geothermal springs available for productive development.

I have directed the Secretary of the Interior and the Acting Attorney General to prepare a new proposal to accomplish our objectives—one that eliminates the pitfalls of the present bill.

Next year we will ask Congress for legislation to transform the potential of this national treasure into a reality. We will ask for legislation that will protect the public interest, encourage economic and efficient development with a fair and just return to the developer, and conserve the benefits of that development in coming generations. When that legislation comes before me, I shall sign it enthusiastically.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 14, 1966.*

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 22, 1966:

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Thomas R. Holiman, Donaldson.
Roy L. Riales, Sr., Mena.

CALIFORNIA

Richard L. Waterbury, Gridley.

GEORGIA

Jerry E. Byers, Demorest.
Billy M. Daniell, Mableton.

ILLINOIS

Ernest Bickhaus, Jr., Quincy.

INDIANA

Edward P. Nonnweiler, Velpen.

KENTUCKY

Robert G. Hill, Florence.
Wendel R. Bridges, Morning View.

LOUISIANA

Kirby Allen, Clarks.

MASSACHUSETTS

Francis J. Morrison, Dalton.

MINNESOTA

Raymond H. Salzwedel, Lakefield.
Richard W. Brust, Olivia.
Gladys C. Johnson, Strandquist.

MISSISSIPPI

Isaac H. Whiteside, Ashland.

NEW JERSEY

Evelyn L. Bea, Dayton.
Joseph Sorelle, Glassboro.

NEW YORK

Gordon F. Hack, Beaver Falls.
Arlene H. Lockwood, Corbettsville.
Charles H. Knox, Copake.
John J. Lenhart, Hempstead.
Laura E. Maben, Jewett.
Sherman D. Dowie, Mexico.
Theodore A. Barkley, Salem.

PENNSYLVANIA

Ethel V. Zoltani, Conway.
Clifford P. Wenhold, Milford Square.
Richard J. Evans, Peckville.
Thomas V. Simonetti, Susquehanna.
Ann R. Daily, Wallingford.
Henry C. Slaczka, Wilmerding.

SOUTH CAROLINA

James R. Bennett, Blackstock.
Essie M. Eller, Hickory Grove.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Milton B. Severyn, Vivian.

TEXAS

Frank W. Hardesty, Big Spring.
Lowell C. Shuler, Bonham.
Wayne I. Burk, Dodd City.
August E. Hooge, Poteet.
William P. Smith, Queen City.
Maybelle J. Larsen, Rock Island.

WASHINGTON

Cleve R. Martin, Kettle Falls.

WEST VIRGINIA

Emmett A. Adler, Follansbee.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Maj. Gen. Robert George MacDonnell, O19361, U.S. Army, to be a member and President of the Mississippi River Commission, under the provisions of section 2 of an act of Congress approved June 28, 1879 (21 Stat. 37; 33 U.S.C. 642).

NATIONAL HIGHWAY SAFETY AGENCY

William Haddon, Jr., of New York, to be Administrator, National Highway Safety Agency.

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Emmett J. Rice, of New York, to be U.S. Alternate Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 2 years and until his successor has been appointed.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

Samuel De Palma, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be an Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Robert G. Neumann, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Afghanistan.

UNESCO REPRESENTATIVES

Charles Frankel, of New York, to be Representative of the United States of America to the 14th session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

William Benton, of Connecticut, to be Representative of the United States of America to the 14th session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

Thomas F. Malone, of Connecticut, to be Representative of the United States of America to the 14th session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

Nan Tucker McEvoy, of the District of Columbia, to be Representative of the United States of America to the 14th session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

Joseph R. Smiley, of Colorado, to be Representative of the United States of America to the 14th session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

Fredric R. Mann, of Pennsylvania, to be Alternate representative of the United States of America to the 14th session of the General

Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

Patrick E. Haggerty, of Texas, to be Alternate representative of the United States of America to the 14th session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

Whitney M. Young, Jr., of New York, to be Alternate representative of the United States of America to the 14th session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The Lord will give strength unto His people; the Lord will bless His people with peace.—Psalm 29: 11.

Our Father God, grant us Thy peace as we begin to tread our homeward way—peace in our own hearts, peace in our homes, peace in our Nation and in our world. Bless Thou our President as he visits countries in Asia seeking this peace. Grant unto him, and all who meet with him, the sense of Thy presence and the power of Thy spirit. Out of these endeavors may there come a greater peace to our planet and an increasing desire and determination to live together in greater harmony and finer accord.

May we meet the pressures of this present period with courage and faith through the presence of Thy spirit living in our hearts. In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2129. An act for the relief of Maria Rossi;

H.R. 3526. For the relief of Dr. Eric J. Lazaro;

H.R. 3531. An act for the relief of Dr. Julio Cesar Muñiz Sotolongo;

H.R. 3536. An act for the relief of George R. Lore;

H.R. 3756. An act for the relief of James S. Kahriman;

H.R. 3879. An act for the relief of Ernest Buillet;

H.R. 3901. An act for the relief of Miss Elisabeth von Oberndorff;

H.R. 5622. An act for the relief of Dr. Jorge Ignacio Miquel Franca;

H.R. 6115. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose A. G. Mendoza;

H.R. 6226. An act for the relief of Dr. Bienvenido Benach Carreras;

H.R. 6443. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio U. Catasus;

H.R. 6899. An act for the relief of Dr. Myriam de la Caridad Ares y Fernandez de Bosch;

H.R. 7341. An act for the relief of Dr. Ricardo R. Fuste;

H.R. 8614. An act for the relief of Miss Rajka Soda;

H.R. 9036. An act for the relief of J. M. Pendarvis, Jr.;

H.R. 10253. An act for the relief of Dr. Luis E. Bencomo;

H.R. 10259. An act for the relief of Dr. Allan Baumal;

H.R. 10832. An act for the relief of Gloria Alesna Relampagos;

H.R. 11224. An act for the relief of Dr. Pedro Raphael;

H.R. 11254. An act for the relief of Julieta Gloria Bersamin;

H.R. 11590. An act for the relief of Dr. Jacinta Llorens;

H.R. 11640. An act for the relief of Dr. Juan Antonio Dumois;

H.R. 11952. An act for the relief of Maria Karidakis;

H.R. 11957. An act for the relief of Muriel Williams;

H.R. 12317. An act for the relief of Dr. Augusto J. Fernandez-Conde;

H.R. 12781. An act for the relief of Dr. Mario Orlando Santos-Estevez;

H.R. 12920. An act for the relief of Alexander Francis Saker, doctor of medicine;

H.R. 13101. An act for the relief of Mario P. Navarro, doctor of medicine;

H.R. 14173. An act for he relief of Antonio Barquet Chediak;

H.R. 14984. An act for the relief of Renato Camacho Castro;

H.R. 15488. An act for the relief of Dr. Ali Haji-Morad;

H.R. 16522. An act for the relief of Vicente Fernandez Marino;

H.R. 16610. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio Rondon Delgado;

H.R. 17376. An act to authorize the disposal of nickel from the national stockpile; and

H.R. 18033. An act for the relief of Dr. Fidel Rodriguez-Cubas.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3530. An act for the relief of Dr. Miguel Angel Martinez y Corpas;

H.R. 10288. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio B. Santillano; and

H.R. 13192. An act for the relief of Nermin Demirbag Lavapies.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate to the bill:

H.R. 14643. An act to provide for the strengthening of American educational resources for international studies and research.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14745) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 3254. An act to amend sections 2072 and 2112 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the scope of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and to repeal inconsistent legislation; and

S.J. Res. 133. Joint resolution designating February of each year as "American History Month."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2024. An act for the relief of Louis T. Miller;

S. 2877. An act to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps;

S. 3301. An act for the relief of Charles Bernstein;

S. 3621. An act for the relief of Timothy Joseph Shea and Elsie Annet Shea; and

S. 3750. An act for the relief of Martha Blankenship.

TRIBUTES TO CONGRESSMEN

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Could the distinguished gentleman inform the House what the program might be for next week?

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, despite the strenuous session he has been through and the fine job he has done, retains his good sense of humor. I congratulate the gentleman.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to make some remarks about the fact that some of the very distinguished Members of our body who have served here for many years on both sides of the aisle will not be back with us when the 90th Congress convenes. In fact, only fate can determine who will be back and who will not. But we do know some who, either by voluntary retirement or by the fate of the primary system in our country, will not be with us next time. I do not have the full list before me on both sides of the aisle, but I know that includes many distinguished Members of our body.

Looking at the Members to my left, I cannot help but think about the distinguished former Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOE MARTIN of Massachusetts.

If my people honor me by returning me here to the 90th Congress, I know of no man I will miss more.

In the years I have been here I have served with JOE MARTIN, as a Member of the House, when he was minority leader and when he was Speaker of the House. He has indeed personified throughout many years of service here the tradition of this great representative body.

There are many others.

I think of JOHN KUNKEL, on the Republican side, who is retiring, and of others who have been defeated in primaries.

On my own side I think of "BILLY" MATTHEWS, of Florida, and many others whose names are well known to all of you. What I say applies to all of them, because I know of no man who serves here who does not serve with dedication.

In my own delegation, we will miss Congressman JIMMY MORRISON, who for many, many years has served here. It has been my great privilege to know Congressman MORRISON since we were boys together attending college. He has had, all of his life, a profound interest in the affairs of government and in the problems of his fellow citizens, particularly those endowed with less of the material goods than some others.

JIMMY MORRISON has devoted himself to public service and to this House. He loves this House. The work he did for the people who dedicate themselves to our national service in the Post Office Department and in every agency of the Government, in helping to bring dignity and status and retirement benefits and health insurance and all the other things that have helped those people, will live as a monument to him.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make these remarks about the Members who are retiring prior to making a very brief statement about this, the 89th Congress.

I observe that my colleague, Mr. MORRISON, has walked into the Chamber. I am sorry he did not hear the remarks I just made about him.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the statement of my beloved and distinguished friend, the acting majority leader, on the service in Congress of our distinguished colleague from Louisiana, JIMMY MORRISON. I have served with him for many years. I know him. I admire him greatly. I know of his outstanding contributions to the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I can say unqualifiedly that no man has done more to advance the interest of and to improve the life of those who work for the Government, particularly among the postal employees, than has JIMMY MORRISON. His work here will be remembered a long, long time, and we shall all miss him.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BROOKS. I want to say I believe it is highly appropriate that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], has taken this occasion to honor a friend of this Congress, JIMMY MORRISON. He is a man who has represented his people ably and represented them well, with courage and with dedication to the best interest not only of his people in Louisiana but also the best interest of this Nation. I believe it is proper and fitting that we honor him today.

I add my own commendation for the great record he has made in this Congress in behalf of the people of the United States.

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I have known JIMMY MORRISON in my capacity as a newcomer to this great body. It is difficult, under the best of conditions, for a seasoned legislator and chairman of an important committee to give time to his contemporaries. It is extremely unusual to find a man who is willing to give all the time required, all the courtesy and all the consideration that JIMMY MORRISON has given to me and, I add, based on conversations with other Members of the freshman class of the 89th Congress, to all Members.

The great breadth of this man is shown, it seems to me, most clearly in his willingness almost always to take a minute or half an hour or whatever time is required to do the favor and to give the advice and to listen to the problem in the way that JIMMIE MORRISON has. He has certainly inscribed himself in my heart, Mr. Speaker, and I join my colleagues in expressing deep regret at his leaving us today.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for his very appropriate remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to say that JIMMIE MORRISON has a wonderful family. His wife is one of the loveliest ladies in our State. He has two sons, both of whom have bright futures. I know they, like their illustrious father, will contribute greatly to our State and to our great country.

IN PRAISE OF THE 89TH CONGRESS, ITS MEMBERS, AND ITS SPEAKER

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, we now come to the end of the 89th Congress. The work of our body, of the House of Representatives, has been completed. We are here today awaiting action by the other body. I hope they will complete their work so that we can adopt a sine die resolution and all of us can go back to our respective constituencies and meet with our people prior to the general election on November 8. However, before we disperse to the far corners of this, the greatest nation on the face of the earth, I think it appropriate that we pay tribute to the people who have been Members of this Congress, all of whom have made a contribution to it, and that we make some reference to the accomplishments of this Congress.

I personally wish to express my debt of gratitude to the Speaker and to the Members on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, words are inadequate for me to express to you how grateful I, speaking for our side of the aisle and, I am sure, for the other side, am for your infinite patience and your love of this institution. You know, it was in the early days of our Republic when a great American named Alexander Hamilton was allegedly sitting in one of the galleries in the Chamber which was then in the main part of the Capitol rather than where it is now, and someone asked him to describe the House of Representatives.

He replied in one sentence.

"There, sir, the people govern."

And indeed they do now as in yesteryear.

But, Mr. Speaker, without the fairness, the dedication, the calm deliberation of the presiding officer of this great body, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, it would be very difficult indeed to maintain our noble traditions here. You, sir, have performed way beyond the call of duty. Serving in the House is hard work.

It is difficult work. It requires conciliation, understanding and, more than anything else, a love of this country. The hours are long. I have seen you, sir, sit in this Chamber from 10 o'clock in the morning sometimes until 10 or 11 o'clock at night, sitting in that chair and ruling time after time on difficult and controversial issues. I have never seen a time when the Members of this House have not accepted unanimously your judgment and your fairness.

So, Mr. Speaker, let me say to you first that I wish to pay tribute to you. Then, as the acting leader of my party, the Democratic Party, I want to say you have been kind to all of us. Sometimes, Mr. Speaker, as everyone knows, members of our party do vote in different ways, but the Speaker of the House looks on each Member of the House of Representatives in the Democratic Party and in the Republican Party as being the personification—the personification—of the people he represents. So, Mr. Speaker, there is a tinge of sadness indeed in being away from this body and especially away from you.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I will be happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful that the gentleman from Louisiana has yielded to me, because I want to join him on behalf of the Members of our side of the aisle, especially myself, in paying tribute to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. It has been a great experience for me personally to become well acquainted with the Speaker in the past 2 years.

I have come to the Speaker many times with problems that have been difficult. And, he has been most helpful and most cooperative in doing what he could to work out a solution that would be fair and proper for our side and for the House of Representatives as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot adequately express my deep personal gratitude to you for the wonderful help, assistance, cooperation and understanding that you have had for me personally in the last 20 months.

But, Mr. Speaker, I believe all of us on our side, even though we have some deep differences philosophically and politically, can look at the Speaker and say strongly and with conviction that the Speaker has been an outstanding presiding officer.

Mr. Speaker, we are indebted to you for your understanding and your fairness and we certainly hope and trust that in the months ahead you continue to have health, happiness, and success.

Mr. Speaker, we have to qualify the last to some extent, based upon or predicated upon an election—not in your own case, Mr. Speaker, but for the party that you represent.

Again, may I say, Mr. Speaker—and I say for all of us on our side of the aisle, we are grateful, we are appreciative. We are indebted to you for your help and assistance during the past many months. [Applause. Members rising.]

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana yield to me at this point?

Mr. BOGGS. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the minority whip.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, like the two gentlemen before me, the distinguished acting majority leader and the minority leader of the House, those two fine gentlemen, I would like to add my word of tribute to the Speaker of this House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, during these trying days of the Congress, particularly during the last year, you have so ably and efficiently worked as the presiding officer of this great body.

And, Mr. Speaker, I might add that you have carried on well in the great tradition of the Speakers immediately before you, the late Honorable Sam Rayburn of Texas and the Honorable JOE MARTIN of Massachusetts, the tradition which they enunciated to the effect that the minority party is to be protected, and this you have done, and I appreciate it. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your doing this and your kindness in carrying out your work.

Mr. Speaker, we wish to commend you, and as my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD], said a moment ago, we wish you the very best in the days ahead. But I hope you will brush up on looking at new faces, because we expect to have a lot of new people whom you do not even know.

And, I might say, Mr. Speaker, I have in mind introducing a resolution in the next session of Congress for which I would like to have your distinguished support, and I hope you will support it in January when I talk to you, and that is a resolution that we abolish the last 2 weeks of any session of Congress.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Louisiana yield to me again?

Mr. BOGGS. Of course; I am delighted to yield further to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry that I did not comment upon this a moment ago, but there is one person who is not here with us today, a person whom all of us honor and whom all of us respect, and that is the distinguished majority leader on the Democratic side, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. Speaker, we have missed CARL ALBERT in the last month or 6 weeks. All of us are glad to hear that he is progressing well. We hope and trust that his recovery will be rapid and complete and that we may look forward to having him in our midst on January 10, 1967.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is a very real privilege to me to be here to join with the others who have spoken of the Speaker, and I would like to associate myself with their words.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say something myself relative to the Speaker.

The Speaker has been very helpful to all the women in the House, of whom I am the dean, and I wish to say how much we appreciate his thoughtfulness to us. There was one little episode in the House that we took to the Speaker and several others, and he was so very understanding and he has apparently really covered the situation exceedingly well. We are deeply grateful, Mr. Speaker, that these things have been done, and that there is a new sense of security here in this building.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the Speaker is a most delightful person. He is so fair, he is so kind and, you know, he makes suggestions to us over on this side of the aisle. Maybe it is just because we are women, but he has helped us, and I want to thank him very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished majority leader, Mr. CARL ALBERT of Oklahoma, be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, we are now in the last day and in the concluding hours of the 89th Congress of the United States of America. This has been the greatest and most productive Congress in the history of our Nation. Indeed, it has been one of the most significant and historic legislative convocations in all history. Members can look with pride upon the legislative record we have compiled. Much has been accomplished in the 22 months since we first gathered in this great Hall to convene the 89th Congress.

Last year at this time, on nearly the same date, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a detailed statement of the accomplishments of the first session of the 89th Congress. It is my intent to provide a similar statement for the RECORD this year in which I will list comprehensively the major legislative enactments of these past 2 years.

So, today, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to recite a list of the bills which have been the concern of the House of Representatives in this historic session. Rather, Mr. Speaker, I desire to use this time to congratulate Members upon the contributions they have made to this outstanding legislative record. I believe that all Members have worked diligently, industriously, and courageously for the good of the country as they perceived that good. As I said last year, the 89th Congress is a monument to very Member who has served in it.

Our beloved and distinguished Speaker recently stated in his report to the President that—

> The Nation has never witnessed anything like the fabulous 89th Congress. Not because it has produced more legislation than any previous Congress, but because this legislation will have more meaning and deeper significance for every American than any in the past.

In almost every category of human need and of human endeavor, the 89th Congress acted wisely, acted courageously, and acted in the interest of the people of this great country. We can be proud of what we have done in defense of our Nation, in education, in social welfare, in health, in conservation, in agriculture, and toward the preservation of human dignity.

The record of achievement upon which we close the books today stands as a testimonial to the leadership and character and devotion to the House of the great American who has been our Speaker throughout these 2 years. Our beloved Speaker, JOHN MCCORMACK, has been the catalyst upon which the work of this House and of this Congress has moved forward in 1965 and 1966. To every Member the Speaker has been a warm and compassionate friend, a sagacious and interested adviser; he has been a considerate, courteous, and impartial arbiter of the disputes of the House.

In my duties as majority leader, the distinguished Speaker has been a rock offering steadfast support. My gratitude is beyond my ability to express and my devotion well deserved.

The accomplishments of this House reflect the great talent of JOHN MCCORMACK, and I know that all Members of the House, on both sides of the aisle, join me in paying tribute to his legislative skills, to his ability, his fairness and consideration.

I also want to thank my dear friend and strong right hand, the distinguished majority whip, HALE BOGGS, on whom I and indeed all the Congress, have leaned heavily these past few weeks. To him, also, I offer my deepest thanks for all that he has done for me. He has been unfailingly effective and kind. To the gentleman from Louisiana and to his outstanding assistant whips, I wish now to express my thanks. Without their efforts and determination, the Democratic leadership could not have functioned.

Mr. Speaker, I also take this time to tell my friend from Michigan, JERRY FORD, the distinguished leader of our great minority party, of my deep appreciation for the many kindnesses and courtesies he has shown me during these 2 years. We sit on opposite sides of the aisles and we often are on opposite sides of the issues before this House, but never have we opposed one another personally.

The gentleman from Michigan is my good friend, he is a prestigious member of this great body, and he is a great American. I thank him for the consideration he has extended to the Democratic leadership and to me personally. He has always demonstrated his willingness to cooperate in carrying forward the business of the House. In the trying days of the two sessions, as in these last few days he has cooperated in resolving problems and disputes which have arisen. He has indeed worked with us in expediting the business of the House.

Also, I extend my thanks to the distinguished minority whip who has faithfully served this House for many years, just as he has served his constituency in Indiana. All of us are fortunate to have the continued wise counsel and able leadership of LES ARENDS. He serves our country well as he serves the House. I am fortunate to number him as one of my dearest friends.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to express my gratitude and that of the leadership to the distinguished chairmen of the committees of the House of Representatives. Without these great Americans, most of whom are among the top experts in their respective fields, the future of the Congress, the country, and the world would be less hopeful than it is today. We are all indebted to them for the services they have performed.

And Mr. Speaker, our Parliamentarian, the man who, with his able assistants, helps keep us "on course" and on the "legislative track", certainly deserves the appreciation of this body. Lew Deschler is the outstanding Parliamentarian of the entire world. He is a priceless asset to the House and of this Congress. No officer of the House is more able or more dedicated to this great institution than Lew Deschler. The Members rely without question upon his advice.

To our distinguished Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, Doorkeeper, and all other officers and employees of the House I extend my thanks for a job well done. Without them and all who faithfully serve here, Members would face a more difficult task and our work would be much harder.

Again, to all Members, on both sides, my deepest and most sincere thanks for your friendship and for all you have done to assist me in my duties.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I join of course in the remarks made by the distinguished minority leader with reference to our majority leader. I am very happy to say that he has progressed very well. I have inquired of Dr. Pearson each day about his progress in the hospital. From all that I can ascertain he is well on the way to complete recovery, and can be back with us in January.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], has been a hard worker, and he has done so much hard work that he has ended up in the Bethesda Naval Hospital, as some of our other Members have done this year, because of the tremendous load, that the Members have had to carry in this session of the Congress.

I am sure that all Members of the House wish him Godspeed, a full recovery, and a very rapid one.

Mr. Speaker, the minority leader [Mr. GERALD R. FORD], and the minority whip [Mr. ARENDS], and so many others on the minority side, regardless of any differences we may have had in the approach to the problems of our great country, both at home and abroad, have been uniformly helpful, courteous, considerate, and understanding in setting the program, and getting the Members here in cooperation with the majority leadership, and we take this occasion to publicly thank Congressman GERALD R. FORD, the minority leader, and Mr. ARENDS, the minority whip, and wish them the very best of everything.

Also there is included in that wish right at the top of the list our distinguished Parliamentarian who, too, has just now returned from the hospital. He lost a few pounds. He looks very good. Without him it is difficult to understand how this body can function. I know that all of us are happy indeed that Mr. Deschler has successfully experienced his operation, and is back with us, and that he will be back with us, as I am sure he will, come the 90th Congress. His assistant Bill Cochrane was most helpful during Mr. Deschler's absence.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the kind words of the gentleman from Louisiana. I am certain Mr. ARENDS, of Illinois, also is grateful. We too want to express our appreciation for the work of Lew Deschler and Bill Cochrane. We are delighted to see Lew back.

May I say to the gentleman from Louisiana we are grateful for his help. We wish him the best of luck in the days ahead.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we must pay our respects of course to all of the employees here. I see Fishbait, who is everywhere, Turner Robertson, H. H. Morris, Colonel Emerson, the Postmaster, the Sergeant at Arms, these page boys, all these men who sit here behind this desk day in and day out, the people in the Press Galleries who so fairly and accurately report the proceedings of this body, and who watch us very carefully from day to day, and who keep us on the straight and narrow path—to all of them I say "Thank you very much."

In my own organization, the deputy whips, the people in my own office, the committee chairmen, all of them have contributed to this great representative body, the House of Representatives.

I will catalog, Mr. Speaker, not at this moment, but in the RECORD, the accomplishments of this Congress. I think they are fabulous indeed—both at home and abroad.

I would say as it has been said here, that this Congress has stood as one in support of the Government of the United States and in support of the President of the United States in the determination to secure an honorable peace in Vietnam.

I would say that on the domestic scene in the field of health and education, conservation, and research—just to mention a few—there has never been a Congress that comes close to the accomplishments of this Congress.

I think people in the generations to come will be grateful for the accomplishments of this Congress.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there has never been a busier Congress or a Congress where there was less acrimony despite the degree of controversy on so many of these measures that have been considered despite the fact that many of the measures were passed by a very narrow margin or were defeated by a very narrow margin.

There was no debate here in this 89th Congress that could be characterized as anything but as being on the highest level. There were many measures the consideration of which lasted for weeks, and the debate was high level informative, and in many cases inspirational.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion—there comes to my mind a statement that I heard the late great Speaker Sam Rayburn make on several occasions. He said that the greatest romance that could come to any man or to any woman was to be a part of the unfolding drama of this, the United States of America.

Most of us have had that experience tenfold. We have been a part, by serving in this body, of that unfolding drama of this, our great country. And I say to you that as we go home at the end of this session of the Congress, let us thank God humbly and joyfully that we have been a part of this body, and that we are citizens of this, the greatest country on earth.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ARENDS. I have listened with real interest to what the gentleman has said, and I do appreciate his kind remarks about me personally, and for his kind remarks with respect to the legislation considered by the Congress.

And is it possible to know now, if the gentleman will, with his fine analytical mind, make a statement if he cares to, on the state of the Union as it refers to the other body.

Mr. BOGGS. We would hope that the other body would come to a conclusion of its deliberations. There has been a considerable amount of debate in this Congress.

But we hope that sometime today, preferably within the next few minutes, they would act on the last two measures that are before that body and that we can adopt the sine die resolution for adjournment.

That is our situation, very simply.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, very shortly following unanimous-consent requests and any special orders that Members may have, it is the intention to ask for a recess.

A FAREWELL TO THE CONGRESS

Mrs. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mrs. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a touch of sadness that I address you and my other colleagues today—the last day of the 89th Congress. With it comes the end of 30 wonderful years.

To have been given the opportunity to round out Albert's 30 years of service in the House is the greatest honor that could have been bestowed upon me. Albert always held each of you in the highest esteem and, needless to say, I share his warm regard. Although my tenure here has been brief, believe me, it is a memory I shall always treasure.

I want to express to you and all my distinguished colleagues my heartfelt thanks for the helping hand and many courtesies all of you have extended me, and to wish you the best of everything. My heart is full, and I shall never cease to be grateful.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to express to our delightful and most attractive colleague Lera Thomas, who, certainly among other things, has improved the looks of the Texas delegation in the Congress, our appreciation and fondness for her. She has meant a great deal to all of us. We are all very fond of her as a person and as a Member of the Texas delegation.

We remember with deep affection her husband, our departed colleague, Albert. I regret exceedingly that she is leaving us which she does of her own accord. We hope we will have occasion to see her often.

We shall miss you. You have meant a great deal to us here in the short time you have served so ably in this great body. Most of us, of course, knew you long before as one of the prominent women in official Washington. Your charm and graciousness has been long appreciated and admired.

I trust you will find great satisfaction and happiness in your retirement.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BROOKS. We all love Lera Thomas. We loved her husband, Albert Thomas. He was a man of rare qualifications, determination, drive, and accomplishments.

Lera was with him during the 29 years he served in this House. Nothing would be more gratifying to Albert than to know that she, not only had the opportunity, but also the ability and ambition to continue where he left off and round out a full 30 years of service to the people of our Nation, the State of Texas, and the Democratic Party. She has earned our devotion and respect by her dedication and courage in behalf of the people of this country.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. THOMAS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. MAY. I would like to say on behalf of your women colleagues in the House how sincerely we welcomed you to this body, and how much we are going to miss you.

Speaking for all of us, perhaps the one message we would like to give you is that we know you have done great honor to the memory of your distinguished husband and his service to this House. You have also done great honor to yourself in the time that you have served with us—giving fine representation to your State and the Nation. We shall miss you. We wish you much happiness, and thank you for the great contributions that you have made to this legislative body.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the remarks that have been made about our lovely colleague from Houston. She has carried on with courage, and we are all very proud of her.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Mrs. Thomas, although she knew she would be here for only a short period of time, has been on the floor almost constantly. She has missed practically no rollcalls, and she has shown dedication to the people who sent her here. We shall all miss her, but we wish for her, her lovely daughters, and her family the best of everything in the years to come.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CASEY. I want the House to know that this distinguished Member, the gentlewoman from Houston, Tex., set a first in many ways. She, of course, is the first of the fair sex to represent any portion of Texas in this great Congress. She has also been a first in the State delegation to grace it with charm and with ability. We all knew and loved her great and distinguished husband, and we were pleased that she saw fit to round out 30 years of service for the great name of Thomas. She has done it well. She has done it with distinction and honor, and has reflected nothing but credit upon our State and our great city of Houston and the county of Harris.

It is indeed with regret I will see her leave, because, after all, she has had the experience of working with her late distinguished husband. She knows many Members of the House. She knows the problems of our growing community.

Although I know you are no doubt deserving a rest, Lera, we want you to know we will sincerely miss you here on the floor and in our delegation meetings. We do hope you will not forget us. We do hope you will come back and visit with us occasionally and will join us at our delegation luncheons.

To you and to your lovely daughters and your grandchildren we express the hope that you will enjoy a future of nothing but happiness and great pleasure.

Mrs. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Casey.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Lera Thomas has added grace, charm, and intelligence to this House. She has carried on the Thomas name and tradition in the highest manner. Our beloved colleague, the late Albert Thomas, was one of the strongest leaders this House has ever seen. He was a great leader, and his was a voice for the people. In this same tradition, Lera Thomas has carried on. She has attended nearly every session of Congress. She has worked harder than most Members, applying herself in the most effective manner possible. One would have thought she expected to stay in the House forever. Indeed, we wish that could be the case.

To this lovely lady—and her family—the Texas Members especially wish her "bon voyage," with the deepest appreciation for an excellent job. She has indeed been a great representative of the people in her own name.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I had been in Congress for 2 years when the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Thomas, came to Washington to represent the Houston district. Mrs. Mahon and I quickly established a warm friendship with Albert and Lera Thomas which continued through the years. It was a great satisfaction and pleasure to be associated with such a delightful and remarkably talented couple.

Of course, as you know, Mr. Thomas passed away earlier this year and Lera was elected to succeed him in this body.

Houston and the Nation have every reason to be proud of her. She has played an important part in the achievements not only of this Congress, but as an important partner with Albert since the days of the 75th Congress.

Mrs. Mahon and I wish you well, Lera, and we look forward to our continuing warm friendship through many years to come.

DR. MARCIAL ALFREDO MARTI PRIETO

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2763) for the relief of Dr. Marcial Alfredo Marti Prieto.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 2763

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Marcial Alfredo Marti Prieto (Alfredo Marti) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 15, 1961.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JUANITA CEREGUINE DE BURGH

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 3689) for the relief of Juanita Cereguine de Burgh, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Juanita Cereguine de Burgh shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act upon payment of the required visa fee."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. MIGUEL ANGEL MARTINEZ Y CORPAS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 3530) for the relief of Dr. Miguel Angel Martinez y Corpas, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Miguel Angel Martinez y Corpas shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of October 25, 1960."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. ANTONIO B. SANTILLANO

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 10288) for the relief of Dr. Antonio B. Santillano, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Antonio B. Santillano shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on December 3, 1957, and the periods of time he has resided in this country since that date shall be held and considered to meet the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the said Act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NERMIN DEMIRBAG LAVAPIES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 13192) for the relief of Nermin Demirbag Lavapies, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Nermin Demirbag Lavapies shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of June 26, 1957."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I take this time to direct a question to the gentleman from Texas.

Are these the last of the private bills which have been discussed from time to time on the floor during the past week?

Mr. BROOKS. It is my understanding this is the last of the private bills to be discussed by both sides of the House in the preceding weeks.

Mr. SAYLOR. These are the ones that have been held in abeyance up to now?

Mr. BROOKS. These have not been acted on. I do not think these are ones that have been in particular controversy.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING OF COMMERCIAL CREDITS TO COMMUNIST BLOC COUNTRIES

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, October 21, by a vote of 129 to 102 this House of Representatives put the stamp of approval on allowing the Export-Import Bank to guarantee commercial credits to Communist countries.

Headlines in this morning's newspapers throughout the country announced "House Drops Ban on Red Trade Aid." Buried deep in other sections of the same papers on the same day one can find headlines "Red Bloc Said To Plan New Hanoi Aid."

UPI in Moscow reported that Communist leaders ended a summit conference the same day with a new plan for aid to North Vietnam. It was reported they agreed to increase both military and economic aid to Hanoi in amounts at least sufficient to replace material destroyed by U.S. bombs. The report also stated that authoritative diplomatic sources in London said the aid plan was designed to put Hanoi on "an organized war footing" with a massive program designed to pour modern planes, rockets, radar, and aircraft into the country.

Communist countries gathered in Moscow who signed this agreement were Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Mongolia, Cuba, Rumania, and others.

On October 7, 1966, the President signed a determination which will allow the Export-Import Bank to guarantee commercial credits to four of the Communist countries which signed this Moscow agreement: Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Czechoslovakia.

It seems almost incredible that on the very same day the House was voting authority to permit loans to these countries, which will build up their military and economic capacity, those same nations were taking action which would be a detriment to our national welfare and security.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask the President to rescind his determination at once, and for his advisers to take a better look at the situation in our national interest.

The UPI article out of Moscow follows:

Red Bloc Said To Plan New Hanoi Aid

(By Richard C. Longworth)

Moscow, October 21.—Communist leaders ended a summit conference today with a new plan for aid to North Vietnam but without any agreement on what to do about Communist China and its "cultural revolution."

Informed sources said the meeting produced these decisions:

To abandon a plan made in Bucharest in July on unified aid to North Vietnam that assumed Chinese agreement and replace it with one that assumes Chinese interference.

To increase both military and economic aid to Hanoi in amounts at least sufficient to replace materiel destroyed by U.S. bombs.

To pigeonhole any consideration of a joint Communist move against China and its Red Guard movement.

(Authoritative diplomatic sources in London said the aid plan was designed to put

Hanoi on "an organized war footing" with a massive program designed to pour modern planes, rockets, radar and aircraft into the country.)

(Communist China will be asked to join the plan, the sources said, but it will go ahead without her if she refuses. They said Communist nations not belonging to Europe's Eastern Red bloc, such as Cuba, will be invited to join.)

[The willingness of the top leaders of Eastern Europe, Cuba and Mongolia to come to Moscow at a time of deep crisis between Russia and China must have strengthened Party chief Leonid Brezhnev's hand considerably, Reuters reported. Some diplomats foresaw a new flexibility in Kremlin diplomacy that could help the search for a Vietnam solution]

The summit participants were not expected to issue any anti-Chinese statement nor was there expectation of a call for an international Communist conference to declare China an outlaw. This apparently resulted from Rumania's threat to veto any such move.

The scrapped Bucharest agreement put Communist aid to Hanoi on a unified basis but Peking, jealous of Moscow's influence in North Vietnam, quickly jammed the pipeline by delaying or blocking both air and land shipments across her territory.

REGULATION OF TRADING STAMPS

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I feel that trading stamps are adding to the cost of food. These trading stamps are also inflating the prices of many commodities which are necessities to consumers.

This is why I have introduced, along with the gentleman from New York [Mr. Wolff], a bill to establish a nine-member Presidential commission to control the issuance and use of trading stamps. The number of my bill is H.R. 18541, and I hope that action may be had on this bill during the early months of the 90th Congress.

I feel that housewives and all people should have the chance to cash in trading stamps, if they prefer to do that rather than trading them in for premiums. To simplify the process and pin down the value of trading stamps, I believe that these stamps should have their monetary value surcharged on their face. Also, I believe that this Commission should have the authority to investigate the extent to which the fact a certain percentage of these stamps are not traded in many contribute toward loss of taxes for the U.S. Treasury. Trading stamp companies should not be getting a free tax ride.

Such a commission should insure through its investigation that trading stamps, if they remain in existence, should be dealt with in the public interest, should not contribute to inflationary pressures, and should pay their fair share of taxes.

ARE 64 CONGRESSMEN TRAITORS?

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, recently when the House voted on a bill to provide stiff penalties for our citizens engaged in various activities which might be interpreted as "aiding the enemy" in Vietnam, a rollcall vote was demanded and the bill passed by 375–64. A number of Members who voted in the negative have been attacked in strong terms.

One of the fairest and most respected newspapers in the Ohio Valley is the conservative Republican Parkersburg News. This newspaper has never endorsed me for election, and probably never will. This newspaper has rarely endorsed either my voting record or my opinions. But without direct relation to my vote on the so-called Pool bill, the Parkersburg News printed a very trenchant editorial on October 21, which I commend to the attention of my colleagues:

Appeal to Emotion, Not to Reason

> The overwhelming vote—375 to 64—by which the House of Representatives passed a bill aimed at those who obstruct the Viet Nam war effort in any way was, we suspect, a demonstration of flag waving rather than of serious legislative purpose.
>
> Administration spokesmen have expressed the opinion that the legislation is unneeded and probably unconstitutional, and there have been strong indications that it will not see the light of day in the Senate. So it seems quite likely that many of those who voted for the bill did so in the belief that nothing would come of it, so that no harm could result from their cashing in on whatever emotional appeal the measure might exert.
>
> What the bill undertakes to do is to make it an offense to solicit or send blood, money, medical supplies or anything else to North Viet Nam or the Viet Cong or to try to block the movement of U.S. troops or military supplies. The former offense would incur a maximum penalty of 20 years in prison and a fine of $20,000, the latter a fine of $10,000 and five years imprisonment.
>
> All of this makes for great hoopla but little else. Surely nobody is more interested in preventing interference with the war effort than those whose responsibility it is to direct it. So if they are satisfied with the law already on the books, why complicate things by writing some more?
>
> That the law is adequate and will be enforced is suggested by refusal of a U.S. Court of Appeals to interfere, on constitutional grounds, with the conviction of a Syracuse man for burning his draft card.
>
> If congressmen displayed more interest in the necessary business of government and less in emotional gestures they would command more public respect.

THE HONORABLE FRANK CHELF

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection and with the permission of the Members of the House who have previous special orders, the gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the retiring great Representative from the Fourth Congressional District of Kentucky, the Honorable Frank Chelf, of Lebanon, Ky.

The story of Frank Chelf is truly the American success story—the story of the great opportunities for service that lie in the path of he who is resolute in purpose and who appropriately utilizes the opportunities that this great republic and this great land affords its citizens.

The story of this great Kentucky statesman, Frank Chelf, began in an orphanage and today has reached the deanship of the Kentucky delegation to the U.S. Congress. Other facets of this statesman's career are marked with achievement and success.

From recruit to major in the U.S. Army Air Force in World War II.

From law student to a successful and vigorous prosecuting attorney being elected three consecutive times for 4-year terms.

From congressional freshman in the 79th Congress to second ranking Democrat on the House Judiciary Committee.

The entire career of this distinguished attorney and legislator is marked with success wherever he has chosen to turn his energy.

That he has chosen to turn his energies in the service of his country, we should be ever grateful. To the deliberations of this body and in particular to the legislation fashioned in the Judiciary Committee, he has brought his special talents and I am sure all will recognize the great quality of accomplishment which has resulted from his keen mind.

Frank Chelf, to me, is blessed with outstanding qualities of intelligence and character highlighted by his keen wit and his keen sense of humor, his great love for the Commonwealth of Kentucky and his country and his concerned dedication for his constituency.

It is with great reluctance that I wish Godspeed as he departs from this body to other, I am confident, successful pursuits. He will be greatly missed by his colleagues.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks which have been made by the distinguished Member from Kentucky [Mr. Perkins], and I am very sorry that our colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Chelf] is leaving this great body.

Mr. Speaker, Frank Chelf has been a hard worker, and a diligent Member; and it is my firm opinion that the gentleman would continue to make a great contribution to this body through his continued service.

However, Mr. Speaker, I know how hard and difficult the work is here and I know what a distinguished career the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Chelf] had prior to coming to this Congress. As well as during his distinguished service here.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman told me not only upon one occasion, but upon many occasions, that having worked so many years in the vineyard of public service, he found the burden here almost too heavy at his stage in life.

Mr. Speaker, all of us shall miss him and we wish for him the very best of everything in the years ahead.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to our distinguished Speaker of the House of Repersentatives, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I join with my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Perkins], and others of the Kentucky delegation in the remarks that my friend has just made, and which other Members shall make.

Mr. Speaker, Frank Chelf has made an outstanding record for himself in this great body.

Mr. Speaker, there is no one who has been more dedicated in the performance of his duties, one possessing that fine, exciting, dynamic temperament that is consistent with the performance of duties in a dedicated manner, and deeply interested in and fighting always for those things in which he believes whether it be a matter concerning the people of the congressional district which it is his honor to represent in his State, or our country; or some human being, in connection with legislation designed to bring about justice to an individual human being, and if such legislation did not pass, an unintentional discrimination would result.

Mr. Speaker, Frank Chelf and I became very close to each other during his service in this Congress. He has been one of my confidants. I have looked to him for advice upon many occasions. His judgment and his advice were always sound and logical. I, as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Perkins] has expressed, and as I am sure is true of all of our colleagues, am very sorry that Frank Chelf is not going to be with us, through his voluntary action in choosing to retire from this body.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize the considerations that entered into that decision, and I know I join with others in extending to Frank Chelf every future wish for happiness, success, and to assure him—sitting now within a few feet of where I am while addressing the Members of the House—that I shall always be glad to see him as long as I am in Congress and I know after retirement, as I live up in Boston, and that Frank will always occupy the uppermost thoughts in my treasured memory.

Mr. PERKINS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore].

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, at the end of every Congress when friends have decided that they, for one reason or another, will leave the Congress, it brings to all of our minds the appreciation that we have for the service that the individual has contributed in this body, and in behalf of many important matters, as far as our country is concerned.

With respect to Frank Chelf, it has been my privilege to serve on the Committee on the Judiciary with him for a period of 10 years. More than that, to serve on Subcommittee No. 1 with respect to immigration and nationality matters of our country.

Frank Chelf truly has been a dedicated Member of the U.S. Congress.

He has, Mr. Speaker, on many, many occasions—perhaps it was not the most popular position to take—spoken out on various matters in the field of his expertise in a frank and in a candid manner to the extent that this House and this country have benefited, from not only what he had to say, but with respect to the final judgment of the House relative to the matter pending.

Really, Mr. Speaker, in one way this is not a sad day to see Frank go from this Congress when we consider the contributions that Frank Chelf has made to the Congress through his work on the Committee of the Judiciary.

I wish to say to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Perkins], who has the floor, we will miss Frank Chelf more for his wonderfully relaxed speeches that had a way of bringing us all down to earth—sometimes perhaps a little closer than we all wanted to be—on many of the important issues debated on the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, Frank Chelf is indeed a great American, and it would be well, I believe, for every Member who comes to this House to read the Frank Chelf story, for truly it is a clear expression of everything that has made our country great.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege indeed to join with the members of the Kentucky delegation, the Speaker of the House, and other Members in this opportunity to say to Frank Chelf that we wish him well in the years ahead, and that we are very appreciative of the tremendous contributions that he has made over the years of his public service in behalf of his Nation.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join with the Members of the House in paying tribute to our grand friend and long-time legislator who is retiring voluntarily at the end of this session.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that I can speak in a relatively bipartisan capacity at this stage of the proceedings because I have served with Frank Chelf as a Democrat, and I have served with him as a Republican. And the esteem and respect that I held for him over there certainly has not waned as a result of my crossing the aisle over on this side.

There is a serenity, I am sure, which every person has as he seeks public office when faced with the realization that he is going to be reelected without any serious opposition or without opposition at all. That assurance would have been Frank's, had he offered this year. I am sure it is even a greater serenity that comes to the individual when he realizes that he not only has it made in this election, but he has no political worries for all time thereafter. That is the serenity that Frank has displayed as I have talked with him over lunch and heard him relate in happy tones his future plans to be a relaxed "gentleman lawyer."

Mr. Speaker, may I say in conclusion in commending Frank Chelf and the others who are retiring, voluntarily or involuntarily, that Kentucky is noted for having many colonels, but I believe they should elevate one man to a general—that man is Frank Chelf.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I certainly do appreciate the gentleman from Kentucky yielding to me in order that I might say a few words in behalf of my friend of many years, Frank Chelf.

He has always been kind and considerate to the members of our delegation. We shall miss him. We wish the best for him and his family in the many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to this great Kentucky American and warm personal friend of mine, the Honorable Frank Chelf.

In the first place, he is a gentleman of character. Mr. Speaker, by character we may think of one who is affable—one who is courteous—one who is personable. Truly the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Chelf], has these characteristics. But beyond that he is a gentleman of integrity and one who stands for something. Certainly when we think of character we think of a force that stands for something, and we think of integrity—the characteristics that this great gentleman possesses and for those characteristics we pay him tribute today.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Chelf], has been a great representative of his district. I want to report to him today, something that he knows already, and that is the fact as he knows, because of his kind invitation I went to his district this past week. There his friends talked so much about Frank Chelf, Mr. Speaker, I said to myself, "Well, gee, if I had had that many friends in my district talking about me, I never would have been retired involuntarily in this session of Congress."

Frank Chelf served his district well. We in the House of Representatives must serve our people—and no man has loved his people more and has given them better personal service than has the gentleman from Kentucky, Frank Chelf.

In the final analysis, Mr. Speaker, this gentleman is a statesman. I joined with him, as did many of you, in trying to start a procedure so that the Members of Congress can have a 4-year term. Although our friend is retiring this year, and I like to think of him as the father of this idea because he did father the idea—he has worked harder on this proposed amendment this year than ever before. I would suggest to our colleagues—and for all of you I wish many, many more years of service—that they take up that torch. I think the fact that we are here now at this time late in October is indicative of the fact that a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives should be favorably considered by the people, and I believe that the people will consider it favorably.

Frank Chelf has initiated and suggested and succeeded in getting legislation passed that brands him as a statesman.

More than anything else, and finally, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Chelf], is a gentleman, with everything that that implies. I appreciate his friendship. I love him. I say to him Godspeed, and many, many good wishes for the future.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Natcher].

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, it was with a deep feeling of sadness that I learned of the decision of my friend Frank Chelf, to relinquish his office as the Representative of the Fourth Congressional District of Kentucky.

In our time giants have walked the face of the earth and Frank Chelf will go down in history as one of this group. He has been a hard-working Congressman and has always labored with devotion, dedication, and with a passion on the ramparts of individual freedom, honesty, and constitutional government. He has served as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary for a great number of years and during his 22 years as a Member of Congress, has always served his country, State, and congressional district impressively.

His concept of public trust is without parallel and never has he hesitated to speak out against any proposal which he felt was not sound and to the best interest of our people. Mr. Speaker, words are inadequate to fully appraise Frank Chelf's tremendous capacity for loyalty and love of his country. In every position he has held, either private or public, he has achieved distinction. His service in all of his assignments is marked by a high sense of conscience and duty.

Our former President, the beloved Harry S. Truman, once said upon being informed that Frank Chelf was placed in an orphanage when he was 5 years of age that "it's a long, hard road from a seat in an orphanage to a seat in Congress and Frank Chelf has traveled that road well."

The great Fourth Congressional District of Kentucky has had 13 Representatives during the 100-year period from 1867 to the first day of next year. One of the former Representatives, Gov. J. Proctor Knott, for a number of years held the record for 16 years service in the Congress. Later, Ben Johnson served for a period of 20 years, with his service beginning in 1907 and extending to 1927. Frank Chelf has established the alltime record of 22 years service as the Representative of this congressional district. He was elected in 1945 and at the close of this, the 2d session of the 89th Congress, will have served 22 years. Representatives Knott, Johnson, and Chelf will have served 58 of the last 100 years' service in the Congress from the Fourth District.

Always friendly and in good spirits, Frank Chelf will not only be missed by the Members of Congress, but by all of the House officials and employees who have known him all down through the years. His character, his achievements, and his faithful service will be an inspiration to generations yet to come.

May God let the light of His countenance shine upon him and give him peace during the remaining days of his life.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. Pickle].

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, Members of this body know that Frank Chelf did not often go to the well of this House, but when he did, the House prepared itself for a great speech. The word was spread in the corridors, in the cloakroom, and in the House Office Building that Frank Chelf was speaking on the floor. It reminded me in a sense of the late Huey Long's ability for oration.

When I was a young man and the word passed that Huey was speaking on the floor, you could not get a seat anywhere. In these days when a man's reputation carries the same force of appeal that the late Huey had with respect to speaking to a body, I think it is quite a compliment to a Member of this House to carry such a great force with its Members.

He is a delightful individual, pleasant, cordial, and always helpful. No one in this House has been kinder to me than has the gentleman from Kentucky, and I will always remember his sincere desire to be of help to me. He has made a real contribution in the field of judiciary and other aspects of committee work.

So to this "Kentucky colonel" I want to say here is one man whose service we will miss, but he can say to the people of his State that he has rendered great and full service, and the people will always remember him.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from Kentucky [Mr. Stubblefield].

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, saying goodby to Frank Chelf as a distinguished Member of this body is an emotional experience for many of us and I am particularly sad to say farewell to one for whom I have the greatest respect and have been pleased to call a close personal friend for many years.

Frank Chelf has represented the people of his district and the people of our beloved State of Kentucky in an outstanding manner for the past 22 years. He is a great American whose dedication and devotion to our country stand out as an example worthy of emulation by all of us. The many worthwhile contributions made by Frank Chelf during his tenure here have earned for him a place in history as one of the great leaders of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to express deep appreciation to Frank Chelf for the valuable assistance he has given me over the years and to wish for him and his fine family the best of everything in the future.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Landrum].

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I join with our friends in paying respect to the fine and splendid service that our distinguished colleague, Frank Chelf, has rendered as a Member of this House.

It is my information that he is now going to apply his great talents as a legal scholar to the active practice of law. I hope in that process we may see him often in Washington and have the pleasure of his delightful personality when he comes to visit Washington from his home.

I join with all his colleagues from Kentucky and his other friends in the House in wishing him much success and Godspeed.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers].

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join in the well-deserved encomiums the gentleman from Kentucky has so deservedly placed on the shoulders of our departing comrade, Frank Chelf.

I met him when he came here. I have watched him since he has been here. I have noted his great successes and his incomparable ability.

Frank Chelf is not kind to us in leaving us when we need him, but he is kind to himself. We and the Nation will miss him.

As the poet has said, he walks humbly in the faith and in the fear of the Lord. And, Mr. Speaker, the elements are so mixed in him all of us can say, "there is a man."

We will miss him.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, it is not a happy thing to say farewell to a devoted and wonderful friend like Frank Chelf. I hope indeed we are not saying a permanent goodby but that Frank will be back and visit with us from time to time.

Frank Chelf can leave this body fully satisfied in the knowledge that he has rendered excellent and outstanding service to the people whom he represented.

We are going to miss Frank in this body. He is able. He is articulate. Most of all, Mr. Speaker, he is a man of integrity, and he possesses all the qualities that go into the making of a fine legislator.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Patten].

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleagues in paying respects to my cousin, Frank Chelf.

Everything I hear about Kentucky is good, whether in song or about some of his predecessors, such as Vice President

Barkley and that old baseball commissioner, former Governor Chandler.

You fellows seem to get a good political background.

I believe if we had a popularity vote in the House, come to think of it, Kentucky is so much in the mainstream that Kentucky might come off on top on a vote among the Members as to which is the best delegation.

I hate to lose your mayor, Brother Farnsley, too. He has been a good Member.

Frank, I was disappointed when I heard you were not going to run. I want you to know we will miss you. You are a good man from a good State. We all love you. You do not irritate the Members. You help to get the show on the road. At the same time, we all know you are a real politician. Congratulations.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, one of the most dynamic, one of the most lovable, and one of the most effective legislators in our midst is leaving the Congress. It is highly regrettable when men like Frank Chelf, our distinguished colleague from Kentucky, find that they can no longer pay the high price required of every Member for service in the Congress. This is a most exacting and arduous responsibility. Oftentimes it is a thankless responsibility. There are rewards, of course, and much of the reward comes from the association with dedicated and outstanding Americans who day after day give of their best for the cause of our country. Frank Chelf is one of these. He is a hardworking Member who has never been afraid to take a stand and he stands on the side of right as he sees it. Congress can ill afford to lose men like these and it is with genuine regret that I see him go. Our friendship has been close and warm. And my best wishes go with him and his family in all that they undertake in the years ahead.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the ability, integrity, and sincerity which have characterized Frank Chelf's years of dedicated service as a Congressman will be sorely missed by both the people of Kentucky and the Members of the House as he leaves Congress this year.

Frank Chelf always worked hard—in his law practice, as prosecuting attorney of Marion County, Ky., as an officer in the U.S. Army Air Force in World War II. His 22 years in Congress have certainly been no exception.

The people of Kentucky have come to love and respect this man who has worked so untiringly to understand and represent them. We have all come to admire him as a legislator and a public servant. We have all profited from his contributions to the House Judiciary Committee and to the House itself.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I share this with the people of Kentucky: we have often been inspired by the story of the boy orphaned at 5 who opened his own law practice with only 50 cents in his pocket and later became an outstanding Member of Congress. More than this, we have been personally inspired by him as a person.

We have been honored to know and work with Frank Chelf, Mr. Speaker. Our good wishes go with him in the future.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the retiring dean of the delegation from Kentucky. No Member of Congress has served his constituents more faithfully than has Frank Chelf. He is a real tiger when he gets his teeth into an issue and his tenacity is a landmark in the House of Representatives.

He has certainly earned the affection and respect of his colleagues and is going to be sorely missed. I wish for him the very best of everything in the years ahead.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, Frank Chelf. He has served our Nation, the State of Kentucky and his constituents in an outstanding manner as a Member of this House for 21 years. I have had the privilege of knowing him and serving with him for the last 14 of those years.

We have served together as members of the Committee on the Judiciary and I have always admired and respected him, as a legislator, as a politician, and as a gentleman.

I consider it an honor to call him my friend. His retirement will be a loss to the House of Representatives and to all of us who know him.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on many debates in this historic assembly I have watched and listened with keen interest to the vital and vigorous views that our beloved colleague, Frank Chelf, brought to the great issues of his days among us. As an orator he has few equals; as a gentleman he has our respect and our affection.

Frank Chelf, in debate, in our discussions, and in our casual moments, has always reflected kindness, warmth, and consideration.

When President John F. Kennedy was taken from us, Frank said of him:

> I am sure that he has said to Almighty God many times these words from the Book of Books: "Let the words of my mouth and the meditation of my heart be acceptable in Thy sight O Lord, my strength and my redeemer."

These words of the Book of Books apply with equal appropriateness to Frank Chelf. For, when he spoke it was with love for his fellow man, with consideration toward all, and with enmity toward no one.

May his shadow ever grow taller and the wind ever be at his back with happiness on every road he trods.

Mr. CELLER. Those who have served with Frank Chelf realize only too well his fine qualities as a man and as a public servant. It is said that, "to have a friend, you must be a friend." Frank was a friend to all of us and, hence, we are all friends of his. He always brought to play upon his work as a Member of this House, hard work, conscientious effort, and rare ability. I particularly know of his exemplary services, not only as a Member of the House but as a distinguished member of its Judiciary Committee. In that committee, he always worked diligently in the public interest and in the interest of the great State of Kentucky. He never failed me in any chore that I placed upon him. Indeed, he carried out his duties in a most effective manner.

Frank was ever genial, kindly, and tolerant.

We are sorry that he is leaving us and, wherever he goes, we wish him Godspeed, good fortune, and good health.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am proud and happy to join in paying tribute to our beloved and distinguished colleague, Frank Chelf. It was with great regret that I learned of Frank's decision not to seek reelection, and I realized we would lose from our midst a warm friend and a most able and dedicated legislator.

We all know of Frank's pioneering and courageous fight for legislation to lengthen the terms of U.S. Representatives to 4 years. This year his proposal was endorsed by President Johnson. While its fulfillment is still in the future, whenever it comes it will be in large part due to the often lonely, but always unceasing, fight which Frank has carried on.

I have had the pleasure and honor of serving with Frank Chelf on the Judiciary Committee. We are also both members of the Immigration Subcommittee, and in this capacity I have been privileged to work closely with him in the long and difficult task we undertook to update our immigration laws and bring them into conformity with our American ideals of justice and humanity.

I have also served with Frank on the Intergovernmental Committee on European Migration—ICEM. At our last meeting, I was happy to have the opportunity to address the ICEM delegates about our colleague and his important contribution to the success of ICEM's vital international role. What I said then to delegates of many nations applies equally well to Frank's outstanding record of service in the House and, under unanimous consent, I insert my address on that occasion in the Record at this point:

> I come before you today to perform a task which gives me a mixed feeling of sadness and a sense of friendly pride. For this session of the Council marks the last and final official appearance of one of ICEM's oldest and most fervent and distinguished supporters, my good friend and colleague, the Honorable Frank Chelf, Member of Congress from Kentucky, who has chosen not to seek re-election. Frank Chelf is without peer in the Congress with respect to humanitarian endeavours and experience in refugee matters. Frank Chelf was a member of the first special sub-committee that came to Europe in the summer of 1947 seeking a solution to the misery of the thousands of displaced persons. The recommendation that Frank Chelf prepared for the Congress became the foundation for the Displaced Persons Act that was enacted by the United States Congress in 1948 and gave relief to so many people in desperation. And again in Brussels in the year 1951 when the idea of this great Organization came into being and took shape, Frank Chelf was one of its chief and principal architects. I may add that your Deputy Director, Mr. Besterman, was counsel to that special sub-committee and he can well attest to the significant contributions of my beloved colleague.
>
> I could say much more but I will say only this: Frank Chelf is one of those rare humans who is made up of all heart. He flows over with the milk of human kindness; he learned well while still young the adage

that we are rich only for what we give, we are poor for what we refuse and keep. FRANK CHELF's life has been full of giving. He is rich. I know it is said that no one is indispensable but I am sure that FRANK CHELF is irreplaceable and I know too that I echo the sentiments of each of the Members of this Council when I say that we shall miss him and we wish him well. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I shall miss FRANK CHELF greatly, but I count myself fortunate to have had his friendship and counsel for so long. I wish him all happiness and a productive leisure in the years ahead. Although absent from us, he will certainly be in our thoughts. And we can hope he will return to visit often this legislative body which he has served with such honor and distinction.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Congress will lose the services of one of its most able members this year, with the retirement of FRANK CHELF, of Kentucky.

FRANK has served his district, State, and Nation since 1945 with honor and distinction. All of those who have served with him regret his decision not to seek reelection. He will be missed by all his friends and colleagues, who have joined in paying tribute to him today.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, Representative CHELF and I have served in Congress together many years. We all know him to be able, energetic, and fearless. He has done an unusually good job of work for his district, his State, and his Nation. America is stronger because of the courageous service of this outstanding Member. He will be missed by his friends when Congress convenes again.

My family and I wish for FRANK and his family every success, happiness, and joy in the future.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a very great personal pleasure to join with the Members here in this preeminently merited tribute to my dear friend and committee colleague, the Honorable FRANK CHELF, who is voluntarily retiring from the Congress after some 22 years of outstanding public service to his Nation, his State, and his community.

Few men can even come close to matching the illustrious career of this most talented and courageous son of the great State of Kentucky from a humble beginning up through the ranks of distinguished military service and recognition in World War II, acclaimed success in the demanding field of law and additional distinction as the dean of the House delegation in the Congress and the second ranking majority member on the House Judiciary Committee.

In his most responsible position as a top-ranking member of the Judiciary Committee few, if any, members before him have ever contributed so much to the wise and compassionate understanding of our immigration policies and all the other challenging quasi-judicial problems coming before this committee.

Mr. Speaker, as a fellow member on the Judiciary Committee these past several years and after having observed FRANK CHELF over a period of some 20 years here I very deeply believe that his persevering dedication and devotion in legislatively promoting the patriotic interests of this country mark him as one of the most effective Federal legislators of our times.

Above all other things FRANK CHELF, by his consistent demonstration of personal integrity and legislative knowledge and diligence, has earned a lasting place in the brightest pages of all congressional accomplishments.

This Congress and this country will remain forever indebted to him for the perpetual inspiration of fidelity and excellence in the performance of duty that he is leaving for us, and all who come after us, to follow.

As FRANK CHELF voluntarily retires from this Congress I know we all join in our prayers that Divine Providence will bestow His choicest blessings upon FRANK, and all his loved ones, in future endeavors through many, many years ahead.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the last day of the 89th Congress marked the end of 22 years service in the House of Representatives for Kentucky's FRANK CHELF. I have been extremely fortunate to be able to say I have spent 12 of those years serving alongside FRANK on the distinguished House Judiciary Committee. In that regard, let me say that the committee and the House of Representatives will not be the same without him. His sage advice, his humor, his warm friendship will be extremely missed. Kentucky and the Nation will lose the able services of an admirable statesman. I am sorry to hear of his decision to retire from public service. I am confident that, regardless of what side of the aisle he stands on, there is not an individual in this House who will not feel a vacuum when the name of FRANK CHELF fails to appear on the roll of the 90th Congress.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the famous Bluegrass Commonwealth of Kentucky has been the birthplace of great statesmen and great Americans. It has produced men of such stature as Abraham Lincoln, Jefferson Davis, Henry Clay, our beloved friend and colleague, Alben W. Barkley, and more recently, FRANK CHELF, who is now retiring from this body where he has served for 22 years as friend, mentor, colleague, and dedicated public servant.

When I was elected to the Congress from my own State of Maryland, I soon found a lasting friend in the very able and distinguished Representative from the Fourth District of Kentucky. He is a true gentleman and won the hearts of all of us, irrespective of political affiliations, by his graciousness, gentility, and charm.

During his 22 years in Congress, he has given unstintingly of himself to further the highest ideals of American democracy. He has championed many causes to bring a better life to all Americans. His keen legal mind, his outstanding ability as a legislator and statesman, his persuasiveness during debate have earned our respect and admiration.

After the 89th Congress has passed into history, we will no longer have the benefit of his counsel and experience. We will be poorer as a result of his absence. We will miss him sorely.

There is inspiration in the life of FRANK CHELF. His childhood began in an orphanage, and today he is the dean of the Kentucky delegation to the Congress. His career—as a student, a lawyer, a prosecuting attorney, a soldier, and a Congressman—is marked by success as a result of his ability and excellent character.

FRANK CHELF was the youngest man ever elected from the Fourth District of Kentucky during its 153 years as a political entity in Congress. In his last election, the people of his district gave him the largest majority ever accorded a candidate since 1813. He also carried every county in his district, even those formerly found in the Republican column. This, alone, is an outstanding tribute to a great and good man.

FRANK's record may be summed up in these words from the scriptures, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant." May God bless him abundantly with many more years of health, happiness, and success.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague from the Fourth District of Kentucky, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF], is retiring after having served 11 terms in the Congress.

I want to pay tribute to my colleague as he concludes a great record of service in the Congress. He has served capably and faithfully and has worked hard to make Congress an even more effective instrument of the people.

FRANK CHELF leaves the Congress with a great record of service and commitment to the Nation, to his district, and to his State. As second ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, he made great contributions to the development of legislation in matters within the purview of that committee.

The gentleman from Kentucky is a great friend, a distinguished colleague. We shall miss him. He carries with him our wishes for the best of good luck and for every success as he retires to his beloved and native State of Kentucky.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, after 22 years of faithful and dedicated service in the House of Representatives, my good friend and colleague, the Honorable FRANK CHELF, is returning to private life. Congressman CHELF is a sincere, warm, and friendly person whom I admire and respect. He is a gentleman who has served with integrity and devotion—and one who will be missed in these Halls of Congress. I shall always value his friendship, and shall never forget the many courtesies which he extended to me.

Therefore, it is with a feeling of deep regret that I say goodby to my friend, FRANK CHELF. It has been a pleasure for me to serve in the Congress with this distinguished legislator—and I wish him good luck, good health, and happiness in the coming years.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our good and valued friend, FRANK CHELF. I share with my colleagues deep regret that he has decided to retire and will not be with us next year.

I have admired Frank for his integrity, his forthrightness, and his depth of sincerity, but most of all I have appreciated him for his genuine friendship.

I join with others in wishing him unbounded personal satisfaction and a full measure of success in whatever undertakings he may pursue during the years ahead.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join in this well-deserved tribute to our distinguished colleague and my good friend, Frank Chelf, who has served the people of Kentucky faithfully and diligently for 22 years and who has made such a fine contribution to the work of the great Committee on the Judiciary.

Prior to his election to the House of Representatives, Frank Chelf served in the U.S. Army Air Force as a major in World War II and had a distinguished career as a prosecuting attorney. Facing life alone in an orphanage at an early age, his career as a respected member of the legal profession and rise to a position of influence and prominence in this great body should serve as an inspiration to every young person and bear testimony to the opportunities available in our country to those who are willing to study, to work and to strive earnestly toward the goals they have set for themselves.

Frank Chelf is an outstanding orator—a man of ability and integrity. A friendly, kindly person, he will be greatly missed by the people he has served so ably and well and by all who have come to know him and who have been privileged to serve with him. We can ill afford to lose Frank Chelf's experience and sound judgment, but I can well understand the reasons which prompted him to voluntarily retire from the House and to lay down the heavy burdens of public office and return to the active practice of the law. For my good friend, I wish a long and healthy life ahead and days filled with good fortune, happiness, and contentment.

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to my good friend and fellow Kentuckian, Frank Chelf. Frank has served his Nation, his district, and his State long and faithfully, and his record of achievement during his 22 years in the House is indeed impressive. Although I have been privileged to serve with him only during the past 2 years, I have always found him most helpful and cooperative.

He will be greatly missed by all his friends in the House next year, particularly on the Judiciary Committee where, as second ranking member, he has made great contributions in legislative matters coming before that body.

It has been a pleasure for me to serve in Congress with Frank, and I wish for him and his family good luck, good health, and the very best of everything in the years ahead.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I count it a privilege to have been associated with Frank Chelf in this Congress, and I want to join the many voices in paying tribute to a fine gentleman, a legislator of integrity and talent, and a warm friend. His eloquence on behalf of a just cause displayed a talent all could envy and few could emulate.

The Fourth District of Kentucky and this Congress will miss Frank Chelf, a Representative who has served with distinction and honor.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and fine colleague the Honorable Frank Chelf, of Kentucky, is bidding us farewell at the end of the 89th Congress, and it is with deep personal regret that I will see him return to the great State of Kentucky after 22 years in the House. His native State grows not only bluegrass but true-blue gentlemen and statesmen, and Frank is one of the most shining examples of Kentucky's gifts to the Nation.

Frank Chelf's friendship is a gift I will always cherish for its warmth, sincerity, and endurance. His departure from the House will leave a place not easily filled in the minds and hearts of his colleagues. He has given devoted and outstanding service to his district, State, and Nation. It has been a rich and rewarding experience to have served with him and to call him friend as well as colleague.

Because of his worth, his warmth, and his wit, Frank will always be welcomed in whatever path he may choose to follow after his retirement. I wish him abundantly well in all his future endeavors and I hope we will have the pleasure of seeing him often in future months and years.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Frank Chelf, and I have served together in the Halls of Congress for more than 20 years, and I have also had the privilege to serve with Frank on the Committee on the Judiciary as well as the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality. I consider Frank, first of all, to be my good friend. I have admired him for his dedication to the Nation, the State of Kentucky, and his constituents, and for his ability and accomplishments during his long service in the Congress. I regret that our colleague has decided to retire from Congress, but I am certain he has made his decision after deliberate consideration. I wish him and his family good health, good fortune, a long and happy life, and success in any venture he may undertake. I hope our paths may cross in the future.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride and pleasure that I join in the tributes to the Honorable Frank Chelf, who will certainly be missed in these Halls when the Congress reconvenes in January.

Frank Chelf had a distinguished career as a lawyer before coming to the Congress and was elected prosecuting attorney of Marion County four times. He attained the rank of major in the U.S. Air Force. He has represented the people of the Fourth District of Kentucky faithfully for 11 terms, and has been an able and influential member of the Judiciary Committee and the Joint Committee on Immigration and National Policy.

Accomplishing all this after being orphaned at an early age, Frank Chelf, by his own courage, wit, and effort, is an inspiration and example to all those who strive to make something of their lives and serve their fellowman. I can only wish this fine gentleman the best of health and happiness as he retires into private life.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed sorry that the 90th Congress will not see among us my dear friend and able colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Chelf]. He has worked long and hard for the best interest of the Bluegrass State and his retirement from Congress leaves a real void in that delegation. All of us who worked with him will surely miss him.

Mrs. Dorn and the family join me in wishing for him the very best always.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, even though Frank Chelf will no longer be with us in this body, we do hope to enjoy his pleasant association and continued advice on many important matters in the future.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the service of Frank Chelf.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, how can anyone fashion words in any language that would express adequately his wholehearted thanks for his genuine appreciation for such tributes and the high honor that has been heaped upon him? Never, Mr. Speaker, under the broad expanse of God's own blue canopy of Heaven have there lived such wonderful, magnificent, and generous Members of the U.S. House of Representatives. You all are my good and loyal friends.

Mr. Speaker, nobody knows any better than I that these approbations and compliments of my good colleagues are undeserving, but nobody knows any better than I that I would be grievously disappointed if they had not uttered them.

Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding my better judgment which prompts me to quit while I am ahead, I sincerely trust that you and all of my dear colleagues assembled in this Chamber will indulge an old, retiring Member a few brief minutes in which to attempt to put into words just what is on his mind and in his heart.

Twenty-two years ago, my good people sent a green, but ambitious, young man to Washington to represent them. Confidentially, I was, at that time, still "wet behind the ears," politically speaking. When I recall this, I marvel at the great gamble that my people took. There must have been many who voted for me with "tongue in cheek" and a prayer on their lips that I would not "gum up the works" before my first term was out. Mr. Speaker, I believe that I am the youngest man ever elected from the Fourth District of Kentucky during its 153 years as a political entity in Congress.

My people reelected me for 22 exciting, action-packed, historymaking years. They have retained me as their Representative longer than any other person, and in my last race, they not only gave me the largest majority ever accorded a candidate since 1813, but they carried every county in the district for me, including those that were normally Republican. I shall greatly miss serving my wonderful people who have trusted me over the years. I shall miss my devoted staff—the best on the Hill—the dedicated Members of the Kentucky delegation, along with all of you who serve here in the House of Representatives.

It has been my good fortune, Mr. Speaker, to have served with five Presidents of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy, and President Lyndon B. Johnson. The last two mentioned were my colleagues here in the House of Representatives. I have also served with three Speakers, the Honorable Sam Rayburn, the Honorable Joe Martin, and the present occupant of the chair, our dear friend, John McCormack.

I was a Member of this great body in 1954 when a band of misguided, misinformed Puerto Ricans fired wildly into those Members seated on the floor at the time. When the sound of the last shot was history, five of our colleagues were lying bleeding on the floor of this Chamber. I had just vacated my seat to go downtown to see my doctor about the removal of surgical stitches when this inferno broke loose. My leaving unquestionably saved my life, because the seat that I had just vacated minutes before, had been completely riddled by two bullets. It just was not my time to go. We all want to go to Heaven but nobody is in a big hurry to get there.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I could go on and on reminiscing but, due to the pressure of time, let me say that as I take my leave from this great and honorable House, the greatest deliberative body on the face of the earth today, I do so with humility and sadness. This Chamber has been my life for the past 22 years—and you, my colleagues, have been the fire that sustained and nurtured that life. Truly, you have been magnificent. I shall always refer to my service here as my greatest and richest blessing.

Mr. Speaker, I have done my very best to serve, fairly and adequately, my great district, my native Kentucky, and my beloved country in time of war and in peace. As to the measure of my success, only history can record.

Keep up the fight, my colleagues, for the 4-year term because I predict now that it will eventually become the law just as sure as we are assembled here together. The Gallup poll shows that the people of America want the legislation by a ratio of 3 to 1. Your letters to me especially indicate that you favor it 286 to 70 and, remember, this count was taken during an election year.

I deeply appreciate so many of you remaining to hear my swan song. After I practice law for a time here in the District of Columbia, it is my intention to return to my native Kentucky. If you ever come our way, please stop to see us, because I know that you will be inspired by the folklore, tradition, customs, hospitality, gracious living, the loveliness and beauty of the surrounding countryside of our Bluegrass State. You will like our famous country ham, "red eye" gravy, between biscuits, and a mint julep that is the nectar of the gods.

Yes, I know that you will become enthralled and enchanted by our picturesque Commonwealth and that you will enjoy feasting your eyes on the matchless scenic wonder of our gentle, rolling hills, the lazy, easy-flowing brooks of clear, fresh, sparkling water and the beautiful, colorful meadows lying like huge velvet carpets in the rich, fertile valleys.

Yes, come to Kentucky where Stephen Collins Foster penned the memorable lines of "My Old Kentucky Home." Come to the birthplace of Abraham Lincoln. See the birthplace of Jefferson Davis. These two distinguished sons of Kentucky were privileged to serve simultaneously as President of the United States and President of the Southern Confederacy between the years of 1861–65.

Please come to the land where Daniel Boone and other early scouts and Indian fighters blazed the trail into Kentucky in the year of 1775. Once there, you will envision in your "mind's eye" these intrepid pioneers coming through Cumberland Gap armed only with the Virginia statute book, the Holy Bible, a squirrel rifle and a bit of Kentucky bourbon to ward off the snakebites that were sure to occur.

Yes, my friends, come to "Derby-land" where for 93 years a race of thoroughbreds has been held on the first Saturday of each May in Louisville, Ky., at its famous Churchill Downs. The Kentucky Derby is a beautiful sight, a thrill, an adventure. While laughter and gaiety prevail throughout the day, suddenly at 5:30 p.m., a hush comes over the multitude of 100,000. As they stand with bowed heads amidst the profusion of May roses, there is an exciting expectancy charged like electricity in the atmosphere. The air is filled with the scent of sweet honeysuckle, your spine tingles, your muscles tighten, your throat goes dry, your eyes get misty, your lips taut, and while you desperately try to swallow that red-hot lump that seems to be everlastingly bouncing around your throat, the soft, melodious strains of "My Old Kentucky Home" flow through the air and rise to the wide blue yonder.

I now take my leave. May the Lord bless each of you on both sides of the aisle with good health, happiness, prosperity, reelection, and a peace that is as enduring as God's own love.

TRIBUTES TO THE HONORABLE CHARLES P. FARNSLEY

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Charles Farnsley, a distinguished Member of this body, has voluntarily decided not to seek reelection.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it was with sincere regret that I learned my good friend and colleague, Charles Farnsley, was retiring from the House at the end of this session. I would like to take this opportunity to join with my colleagues in paying respect and tribute to a fine gentleman and outstanding Representative.

Charles Farnsley is a man of ability and unquestioned honesty and integrity. Although he has been in the House for only 2 years, he has endeared himself to all of us. We will probably remember him best for his persistent and effective efforts to stimulate interest in improved street and highway lighting as a means of reducing accidents and combating crime. His scholarly thinking and original approach have been refreshing, and we will sincerely miss him next year.

Before coming to Congress Charlie served as a member of the Kentucky House of Representatives, State treasurer of the Democratic Party, trustee of the University of Louisville, curator of Transylvania University, and in numerous other civic capacities.

But he will always be remembered as one of the finest and most effective mayors the city of Louisville has ever had. His record as mayor was truly remarkable, and his outstanding accomplishments attracted national attention.

I would like to include an article from the Reader's Digest which summarizes many of the civic improvements and innovations he achieved while in office and commends his effective—but unconventional—approach to government:

[From the Reader's Digest, November 1949]

HERE'S A MAYOR WHO KNOWS HOW TO GET THINGS DONE

(Condensed from National Municipal Review)

(By George Kent)

When Charles Peasley Farnsley was a boy his mother sat him down in the parlor one day and said that this time, rather than spank, she was going to reason things out with him. Young Charlie retorted, "Just spank me, Ma!"

Today as mayor of Louisville, Ky., he displays the same impatience with words. "Let's just get things done," he says. And during his 20 months in office he has expedited a breath-taking total of civic improvements and innovations. Forty-two years old and a slouchy six feet two, with thinning carrot-colored hair, Charlie—everybody calls him Charlie—son of a Louisville judge, took his law degree from the University of Louisville. Later he went to the state legislature. All quite orthodox—but there's nothing ordinary in either the man or his career.

You see his unconcern with the conventions in the clothes he wears: the Robert E. Lee hat, the derby sack coat and that mark of the old South—the string tie. When he slumps into a chair he comes to rest in the middle of his back. In the words of a wag: "He sits up recumbently." After meals he stretches out on the floor—at home or in his office—covers his eyes and goes to sleep.

Charles Farnsley became mayor in February 1948 by a vote of the Board of Aldermen after the previous incumbent died. His first gesture was to establish something new in city government: the "beef session." Farnsley was disturbed over the great gulf dividing the city executive from the people. Except for a vocal minority, the people had no way of saying what worried them, what they wanted, what they were thinking. Charlie mentioned this to Ed Edstrom, reporter for the *Courier-Journal*, and Edstrom replied, "That's easy, give them a time and a place—and they'll tell you. They'll beef, all right."

"A wonderful idea," exclaimed His Honor, and a week later all Louisville was invited to the city's first beef session. The beefers have kept coming ever since, once weekly. Everything that goes on is reported at length in the newspapers. Farnsley presides, surrounded by his department heads, who answer specific complaints. The beefer comes up and sits in a chair alongside the Mayor, sharing the microphone with him. What they say goes out over the air through a local broadcasting station.

Most of the complaints deal with traffic and street maintenance, but Charlie listens to requests which range from finding a lost cat to getting a telephone for an invalid. Where possible, the grievances are promptly taken care of; and the Mayor later checks through to see that what has been promised is done.

Charlie exhorts his department heads to read the "letters to the editor" in the newspapers and to do something about complaints that appear there. He also invites citizens to telephone him, and he is trying to get the phone company to make it possible for anyone to reach him simply by dialing *m-a-y-o-r*. He created the Louisville Citizens Survey, which sends expert interviewers into homes to discover what the people are thinking. Completed surveys covering such subjects as traffic, taxation, schools and housing indicated that what the people wanted most were well-paved streets and recreation facilities for their children. Charlie saw that they had both in less than a year.

The paving problem was largely one of finances. There just wasn't enough money. Farnsley sat up nights reading reports from other cities and technical discussions of street maintenance. Finally he hit upon an unorthodox notion: instead of doing an expensive curb-to-curb job, pave only the driving portion of a street, leaving the parking lanes rough. In two months Farnsley resurfaced—"half-soled," he called it—42 miles of Louisville streets, more than had been done in 25 years. The saving was 30 percent of what a conventional job would have cost.

The same watchdog attitude toward the city pocketbook saved Louisville a million dollars when a pretentious four-lane outer drive was contemplated. Farnsley and his engineers drove slowly around the city, discovered that the old River Road, badly engineered and impeded by boulevard stops, was actually shorter in travel time than the projected highway. A few weeks later the old River Road had been repaved, the stops eliminated, for $125,000—far less than the original estimate for the outer drive.

In providing recreation Farnsley opened up more than 40 play streets, took over vacant lots, distributed play paraphernalia. He plans to roll obsolete streetcars into ten of these play areas for movies and for indoor playrooms on rainy days.

Balm to the Farnsley soul was the subsequent report of the chief of police; vandalism had decreased materially in every neighborhood where a play street had been established.

To protect children against traffic accidents Charlie invited women to serve as part-time crossing police. He put 48 of them through a training course, outfitted them with uniforms, paid them $50 a month. The women are doing an excellent job.

Louisville schools were unquestionably in poor condition, with just $600,000 available for improvements. The Mayor rounded up 20 of the town's leading architects and appealed to their pride as citizens. They coöperated by blueprinting 24 schools, outlining possible improvements and repairs. A survey of this kind would have cost $75,000. They did it for nothing. Today Louisville schools have been modernized to the limit of the money available.

Perhaps the most spectacular of all Farnsley's accomplishments are recent developments in higher education. One night, mulling over the crowding of the city's colleges, he had an idea. Although it was two in the morning he phoned Dr. John W. Taylor, president of the University of Louisville. Taylor came over and the pair worked out a scheme for Neighborhood Colleges—university classrooms in all the branch libraries. Taught by university professors, classes would be open to the general public and those attending would receive full university credit.

Charlie had classes in session within ten days. Shortly afterward he invited the educational director of the National Broadcasting Company to Louisville and offered to cooperate in NBC's project for a university of the air. The University of Louisville set up a course in the great novels. NBC stars dramatized them. The university issued assignments, corrected papers, gave examinations. For the first time a person could listen to a national hookup and—if he did the supplementary work—get college credit for his effort. The program, called the University Theater, is now broadcast over 131 stations.

In the Louisville library anyone can hear and borrow recordings of the program and other phonograph records. Special earphones enable you to listen without disturbing neighbors who are reading. The main library, nine branch libraries and several high schools are all linked by wire to a central studio which each day plays a request program of classical music and drama. A teacher, for example, who wants her class to listen to "Macbeth" has but to telephone and the play will come into her room. The library soon will be operating for the public an FM station that will accept no sponsors.

The Mayor has committed enough political suicide to inter a dozen ordinary officials. Twice he has demanded an increase in taxes on the eve of an election. To professional vote-getters this spelled sure political death. Charlie fooled them. Last November, running on the Democratic ticket to fill out the unexpired term of his predecessor, and making only two speeches, he polled a plurality of 11,500.

Shortly after taking office he announced that it was impossible for him to put his ideas into effect and at the same time sit at a desk puttering with papers. So he hired Roy Hamilton Owsley, famous as a city administrator, to take care of details. He called him a "consultant" and paid him $15,000 a year out of his own contingent fund. No one on the municipal payroll got as much money, not even the Mayor.

There was a row, of course. Who ever heard of two mayors? The politicians said that at last Farnsley had really cut his own throat. But less than six months later the Board of Aldermen approved Owsley's salary. They had found that the scheme actually saved the city cash.

It was another step in Charlie Farnsley's unconventional way of getting things done.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to express deep appreciation to Charles Farnsley for his help and cooperation during the past 2 years and to wish for him, Miss Nancy, and their fine family the very best of everything in the years ahead.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, as the Honorable Charles P. Farnsley leaves the House of Representatives, I want to take this opportunity to wish him the greatest pleasure and satisfaction in his future endeavors.

His term of office here has added dimension and luster to the record of the Kentucky delegation in the Congress.

Prior to becoming a Member of Congress, Charlie was a great mayor of the city of Louisville; and he has an outstanding knowledge of the field of safety.

His service to his district, our Commonwealth of Kentucky and the Nation has been characterized by enthusiasm and loyalty.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks on the service of the Honorable Charles Farnsley.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TRIBUTES TO J. RUSSELL TUTEN

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may revise and extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call the attention of the membership to the fact that one of our most distinguished Georgians is also retiring at the end of this Congress.

During the time that the Honorable J. Russell Tuten has been a Member of this body he has distinguished himself as a loyal, hard-working, conscientious public servant. He has served his constituency well. He has served his Nation well, and he has served the Democratic Party well. I know that all of his colleagues from Georgia as well as his many friends in this House of Representatives from other States wish him all the happiness and success that can come to him in the years that lie ahead of him.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have this opportunity to pay my respects to his dedicated efforts as a member of the Georgia delegation. I am delighted to pay my respects to his efforts to serve his party and his Nation, and I congratulate him on the quality of the service he has rendered.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDRUM. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to take this opportunity to join with my esteemed friend from Georgia in paying my respect and recognition to Russell Tuten. As I recall it, when I was honored to come to this body some 4 years ago, the first persons I met were Russell Tuten and his dear wife, even before the session when we were actually sworn in. I respect Russell as a man and as a legislator. I respect his humility and quiet manner but yet his dedication of purpose and his devotion to his duties as a Member of this body. I respect him as a family man. He and I happen to attend the same church out in Falls Church, Va., where he and his wife are beloved and respected. I am sure, as his colleagues from Georgia, we shall all miss him. But this body is the richer for having experienced his warm friendship and noble characteristics. As we miss him we shall certainly follow him and his future with interest. We wish for him and his fine family all good things in the years ahead.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be associated with the remarks of our colleague from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] in reference to Brother TUTEN of Georgia. We came to Congress together and we took a few trips together. We went down to the Cape to see a couple of the big firecrackers go off—the first few. I have watched him these 4 years, and I want to tell you that he has been a great Member. He makes a real Congressman, and I hate to see him go.

I would like to express my felicitations to Mrs. Tuten.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my remarks to those of the gentleman from Georgia with respect to our honorable colleague from Georgia [Mr. TUTEN]. RUSSELL TUTEN has been a very good friend of mine and has been an excellent Member of this body. I get a lot of kidding, since I am always associated in some respects with the gentleman from Florida because our names are PICKLE and PEPPER. I am delighted because the gentleman from Florida is a great friend of mine. Quite often they say "here is the bill which is offered by the gentlemen from Florida and Texas—the Pickle-Pepper bill."

And, Mr. Speaker, I might add that we have teamed up on some legislation which we believe has been helpful to the people. By the same token, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TUTEN] receives words of comparison because they often associate him with that great statesman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN] and as is referred to in this particular measure, the Dorn-Tuten bill. There are a lot of combinations, Mr. Speaker, of these names in the House of Representatives that we like to pleasantly recall.

Mr. Speaker, when I recall the name of RUSSELL TUTEN, I do it in the highest sense of public service, because he has been a great Member of this body and I have been proud to associate with him.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, may I add one word with reference to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TUTEN]?

All my life I have been hearing about campaign expenses and integrity in elections and proper official conduct in public office.

As one studies the primary contest in which Mr. TUTEN was engaged, it is almost impossible to believe the American people are smart enough to carry on our democratic processes. I, for one, am alarmed at the amount of money which I see being expended in some of these past elections, and some current elections this year around the country. If the stories I hear are true about the vast sums of money that were used in the gentleman's primary, then I believe democracy is a little shaky, and that this Congress should have the courage, and once and for all do something really effective about limiting campaign expenses.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATTEN. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF].

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey about our very real friend and colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TUTEN].

Mr. Speaker, RUSSELL TUTEN is an able man. I can say without equivocation that during the 22 years I have been here, I do not know of any of the freshman groups that have come here that have impressed me more than his group and more than he has by his honesty and sincerity and his dedication to public service.

Mr. Speaker, this man grows on you. He is a gem. Truly, it is a disastrous thing when this House has to forfeit the right to the ability of men of his character. He is a gentleman's gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in his home. He has entertained me there. When one goes to see him, there is nothing too good for one.

Frankly, RUSSELL, I hate with all my heart to see you go. But I want you to know that you have got one man who will be here practicing law, and if you ever need a lawyer and you do not have a fee, come to see old FRANK.

God bless you.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, a man like the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TUTEN] may not get up here and perform as a silver-tongued orator, but he is an asset based upon his background, a background as a building contractor, who goes to the bank in an attempt to borrow, say, $25,000, with which to put up a building, and meet the payroll in an area which is not rich, as you well know. He possesses some wonderful qualities that have been very helpful to us in the committee and upon many other occasions here during his work in the House of Representatives. He is what one calls a "good, solid citizen" with a definite background that is needed in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATTEN. I yield further to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. That is right.

I think this: You will find in the records that RUSSELL TUTEN is about the first bricklayer who ever laid enough bricks and got enough solid foundation to come to the Congress of the United States. More power to you, RUSSELL.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that RUSSELL TUTEN came to the Congress primarily because he is a good Baptist. The minister said, "TUTEN, you are a good Baptist and we shall nominate you." It went something like that, as I have heard the story told.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATTEN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words of respect for my dear friend, J. RUSSELL TUTEN, whose district lies to the north of the district I represent in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, when he first came here I recognized that here was a man who truly understood the people of the district from which he comes. I have long had great inspiration in traveling through his district which contains the Marshes of Glynn made famous by Sidney Lanier, and which contains Fort Frederica, the southernmost outpost of the British in the Western Hemisphere for a long period of time. It contains the homes of many great Americans. There were two signers of the Declaration of Independence who lived and were buried in his district, Button Gwinnett and Lyman Hall.

Certainly that area, from the time when George Washington visited it in the 1700's down to the present time, has produced many great Americans and great Georgians, and RUSS TUTEN is no exception.

He is a man who loves his fellow man, a man of understanding and of great heart. I do not know why he is not going to be back with us at the next session of Congress, but I know it is not because of any imperfection in his character or because of any imperfection in his work or leadership here in the Congress of the United States.

So, Mr. Speaker, as RUSS TUTEN goes back home he is going to go back with the feeling, I am sure, that everyone who has known him here in Congress has grown to love him and admire him, and our careers in Congress have all been enriched by him.

Mr. Speaker, I think every Member in Congress would join me in saying that the greatest rewards that come to a Member of Congress are the friendships made in the House. When we first come here we are concerned that the positions that other Members of Congress may take on different subjects may vary from ours, and that this will carry over and be held as something personal against us, but as we sit here we realize that each man must vote his convictions for his district, his State and his Nation, and demonstrate his courage for the things that he believes are right and best. Thus it is, Mr. Speaker, that we grow to admire our colleagues and to respect them.

It is a strong admiration, affection and respect which RUSS TUTEN has earned for himself in Congress. We are all richer here and our Nation is richer because of the fact that he has been here.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I know that the members of the delegation from a particular State always think that their delegation is the best and the strongest.

As a Texan I think it would be unbecoming if I did not boast publicly that the Members from my State believe that the Texas delegation has one of the best delegations in all the Congress.

I should like to point out to the House that in recent years this great body has had tremendous leaders from our State. President Lyndon Johnson served here in this House as one of its strongest leaders, and he is tendering superb service to his country in his present position. History will place him as one of the most effective and strongest Presidents this country has ever had.

The late Sam Rayburn, Speaker of this body, was perhaps one of the most beloved men in America. I know that the Speaker in the Chair now recalls Speaker Rayburn with deep affection because on many occasions I have heard Speaker McCormack say over and over that "Sam Rayburn was my friend, and we would work out problems together individually and as legislators."

Sam Rayburn did that in the high sense of public service.

We have had, just in recent years, such leaders in this body as Frank Ikard, who is now serving as president of the American Petroleum Institute.

Judge Homer Thornberry, now a Federal judge, and the individual whom I succeeded, and who is a great, good, and kind personal friend.

Judge Paul Kilday, who is serving now on the military court in Washington—a delightful, colorful, and brilliant individual.

The late Albert Thomas—a giant among men.

My good, dear, and gracious friend, Joe Kilgore, who is a prominent attorney in Austin, Tex.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to lose four members from the Texas delegation this session, and it is with genuine regret that I say that in the coming session the following members from the Texas delegation will not be with us:

Walter Rogers, Lindley Beckworth, Mrs. Lera Thomas, and Clark Thompson.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that Walter Rogers has served with great distinction on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and Interior Department. I believe it is safe to say, and I believe the members of that committee would be the first to admit, that Walter Rogers is perhaps the most capable overall member of that committee, and is possessed of great ability, intelligence, and wit.

His presence in the House of Representatives has meant a great deal to the American public. How we will miss him this coming year.

Lindley Beckworth is one of the most seasoned Members of this body and probably comes nearer to being a man of the people than any Member of our delegation. I suppose that he knows more people individually, and is conversant with more people probably than any Member of the Texas delegation. It is with sadness that we see Lindley leaving our midst.

Clark Thompson—If we were to have a vote on who was the most beloved member of our delegation, it would be Clark Thompson. He has been a member of the powerful Committee on Ways and Means and he has been a powerful Member representing his district, and the State of Texas. I am privileged the coming session, to represent five of the counties that Clark Thompson has represented in this body.

We all know with what wonderful dedication Mrs. Lera Thomas has carried on the name and the work of Mr. Albert Thomas, our former colleague, because she has applied herself and rendered a great service to the people of her district, and of our State.

Time does pass, Mr. Speaker, and though we have lost great leaders in the past, and with these four who will leave us this coming January, at this time we say to these four Members, we are proud of the services you have rendered, and we thank you in behalf of the people of Texas for the great work you have done.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKLE. I yield.

Mr. PATTEN. The gentleman left out the Texan that I admire the most, from the time I went to the Democratic National Convention in 1932—the Texan who was made Vice President.

Mr. PICKLE. If I left one out, Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. PATTEN. My friend, Vice President Garner, is the man I want to talk about.

Mr. PICKLE. If the gentleman will yield, I did leave out that gentleman, but I was referring to those of recent years and "Cactus" Jack has been gone for more than just a few years. He is a great and powerful individual and perhaps one of the most sterling and granitelike characters that we have ever had in my State.

Mr. PATTEN. If you ever get the Speaker started about Jack Garner, we will be here for another hour. I would like to say this about the former Vice President—what I like about him is that he is one of the few "ex's" who did not go out and write a book to cut the legs out from under the people who followed him.

I think the American people ought to appreciate that he sat down in his rocking chair and did not try to run something 20 or 30 years after he was out of office.

Mr. PICKLE. The gentleman is eminently correct. "Cactus" Jack has never been one to talk too much. But when he did talk, he accomplished a great deal in terms of concrete action. I do wish that we could get our distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack], to address the House to recall some of those anecdotes of "Cactus" Jack's, because it will be recalled that "Cactus" Jack was one of the most colorful characters who ever served our country.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in recognition of the great work in the Congress of my good friend, Russell Tuten.

Russell Tuten is a man with great ability. He came to the Congress with many years of experience in the business world. As such, he understood the problems of the small businessman, the farmer, and of many others. During his tenure in the House he devoted every effort toward improving our educational system. As a former schoolteacher, Russell is aware of the many problems that face us in educating our youth.

Mr. Speaker, I served with Russell Tuten on the House Public Works Committee. I know of the many hours he spent on this committee, always striving to improve the economic growth of his district and great State. No problem was too large for Russell Tuten. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, he always gave his attention to the small personal problems of his constituency.

We will miss Russell Tuten in the 90th Congress. It has been a distinguished honor and pleasure to serve with him. I predict that we will hear from this great legislator again in the future.

Mrs. Dorn joins me in wishing for Russell every continued success and much happiness.

A TRIBUTE TO HON. FRANK CHELF

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, although he has now left the floor of the House, I want to pay a brief tribute to Mr. Frank Chelf, of Kentucky. We have much in common. As a matter of fact, in his youth, in his early days, he used to do what we call "jerk sodas" down in Jacksonville, Fla., in Chelf's Drugstore down there. That was something I was doing at about the same time in another drugstore. The family of our distinguished colleague was an outstanding family in the State of Florida; and they have been an outstanding family in the State of Kentucky as well. This man is a man who has worked his way up and done an excellent job in everything that he has done.

We have seen him here in the Congress when his physical disability seemed to be more than any mortal could carry. But we have seen him overcome that as well as carry the heavy burdens of his legislative responsibilities on his shoulders. He worked his way out of that physical disability and now he is a healthy, buoyant individual, which only goes to show the great personal courage that he has in overcoming the physical pain and difficulties that he had earlier during his service here in the Congress.

I think all of us here in the Congress will remember Congressman Chelf primarily for his pointed and succinct statements made with enthusiasm and right to the point in the midst of a debate, and particularly his staccato observations—staccato both from the standpoint of his voice and also from the standpoint of their briefness and terseness and pointedness as his voice rang out in debate. We think of these when we think of you, FRANK CHELF.

Most of all we think of the wonderful work he has done in the committees of the Congress and on the floor of the House. All the Members of the Congress are deeply grateful for his service here and we shall miss him greatly when he leaves us.

A TRIBUTE TO BILLY MATTHEWS

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the membership that I deeply regret I was not able to be in the House of Representatives recently when a tribute was paid to the splendid services of the fine gentleman from Florida who is retiring, Mr. BILLY MATTHEWS. I think during the time I have been here—and BILLY and I came to the Congress at the same time—I have not known of any Member who so completely endeared himself to all of the Members as has that gentleman from Florida. He is a delightful personality, with a very searching and conscientious mind. His service to his constituents in Florida as well as to the Nation has been of a very outstanding quality. I join with those who have previously spoken about his fine service in paying my respects to him for the quality of that service and wishing him and his family godspeed and much happiness in the future.

TAX CHECKOFF PLAN TO FINANCE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGNS

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, during the final hectic and frustrating moments of a session of Congress, the world's greatest deliberative body often becomes an arena of legislative confusion. This is exactly what has happened in regard to the revolutionary proposal to finance presidential election campaigns.

Despite the fact that this proposal is a principal reason why a sine die adjournment is being delayed, I feel that to accept such a plan at the present time is to set a very dangerous precedent.

My opposition to the passage of this proposal is threefold:

First. The idea of funding presidential elections through a tax checkoff is completely unrelated to the principal purpose of the bill under consideration, which is the Foreign Investors' Tax Act. There can be no justification whatsoever for the inclusion of this tax amendment in the bill by the Senate. Call it an ornament on the legislative "Christmas tree" or simply a "grab bag" proposal, such an addition to the bill before us is an emasculation of the legislative process. If we are to do justice to the foreign investors' bill and an election proposal, it is our duty to consider each on its individual merits.

Second. A tax plan to fund presidential elections is serious business. There have been no hearings in reference to all the ramifications and implications of such a proposal. No one could possibly argue that this measure has been well thought out, and in the waning hours of the session we have not had time to debate the issue on the floor, since only 1 hour was allotted for its consideration. While having full confidence in the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the time set aside for deliberation of this proposal was under the control of its proponents, and the opposition did not have an opportunity to present the shortcomings of the measure.

Third. I am fearful of governmental subsidation of any private party. The use of public funds to subsidize private political parties could lead to outright manipulation of elections. After all, there is no real safeguard in this measure that would preclude the misappropriation of the taxpayer's dollars. All of us are aware of the adage, "He who pays the fiddler, will call the tune." Taken to its logical conclusion under such a plan, the Government could select candidates for us. After all, the possible expenditures brought about by this measure could result in about $200 million every 4 years. This is a heavy investment, even for our spendthrift Government.

We do appreciate the fact that campaigns are more and more costly, and virtually prohibitive so far as a person of limited means is concerned, and we appreciate the necessity for broadening the base of financial responsibility in campaigns; however, there can be no escaping the fact that this will result in forcing a taxpayer to give to a party not of his choosing.

While the initial checking of the block designating a dollar of your tax return for the presidential election campaign fund is a voluntary matter, thereafter, it ceases to be voluntary, but the disbursement of the funds is made on a compulsory basis, which I believe is inimical to the best interest of the contributor.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Chair will declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired at 3 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m., the House was called to order by the Speaker.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1310) entitled "An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide equitable tax treatment for foreign investment in the United States."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 18381) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes."

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 1074) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1074

That a committee of two Members be appointed by the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed their business of the session and are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members on the part of the House of the committee to notify the President, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

REPORT OF REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, before the 2d session of the 89th Congress draws to a close, as chairman of the House Republican policy committee, I would like to include a report regarding the activities of the Republican policy committee. During the 89th Congress the policy committee has prepared, discussed and adopted statements that set forth in some detail not only the committee's position with respect to certain legislation, but an explanation of that position. In all, there have been 58 meetings of the policy committee and 60 statements have been adopted. Each statement has been prepared in the form of a press release and also distributed to every Republican Member of the House and Senate, the committee staffs, and a selected outside mailing list.

Discussion at the policy committee meetings and the action taken have helped to formulate a solid Republican position for the subsequent floor debate. Key amendments have been agreed upon and motions to recommit have been clarified. To my knowledge, this is the first time that any policy group in either party has attempted to meet on a regular basis and not only discuss pending legislation, but reach a policy position and then state for the Record the position and the reasons for reaching such decision. Often this has not been easy and, in some cases, it has taken two or more meetings to hammer out an acceptable policy statement.

That the policy committee positions and statements on the legislative issues have found support among the Republican House Members is reflected by the fact that during the second session, in 20 cases where a rollcall vote was taken on the amendment or position supported by the policy committee, 94.4 percent voted in agreement with the policy committee.

Speaking for the members of the policy committee, I wish to express our gratitude to the minority members and the staffs of the various committees who have taken the time to come to the policy committee meetings to present the facts and background regarding particular legislation. Without their assistance, the work of the policy committee would have been most difficult, if not impossible.

A summary of the second session Republican policy committee positions, together with an analysis of the record votes that were taken on these measures follows:

REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE POSITIONS AND FLOOR VOTES, 2D SESSION, 89TH CONGRESS

1. January 26, 1966. Urged the immediate consideration and enactment of legislation that would establish a Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch (Hoover Commission).

2. January 26, 1966. Urged the immediate enactment of legislation that would authorize a program of education and training for veterans of the Vietnam conflict.

H.R. 12410 final passage: Yea 125, nay 0, not voting 14, percentage 100.

3. February 18, 1966. In connection with the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966, H.R. 12752, recommended a reexamination of the current budget and a reduction of government expenditures.

4. February 23, 1966. Adopted a statement opposing the transfer of the Small Business Administration to the Commerce Department and urged the Administration to continue the Small Business Administration as an independent agency and spokesman for the small businessman of the country.

5. March 2, 1966. Adopted a statement pointing out that the deep division within the Democratic Party over American policy in Vietnam is prolonging the war, undermining the morale of our fighting men, and encouraging the Communist aggressor.

6. March 9, 1966. Opposed Reorganization Plan No. 1 which would transfer the Community Relations Service from the Department of Commerce to the Department of Justice.

Resolution of Disapproval: Yea 109, nay 18, not voting 13, percentage 85.9.

7. March 15, 1966. Opposed the authorization of an official residence for the Vice President of the United States, S. 2394.

Final Passage: Yea 6, nay 125, not voting 9, percentage 95.4.

8. March 22, 1966. Adopted a statement with respect to the Second Supplemental Appropriations bill for fiscal 1966 which opposed the appropriation for the Federal Teacher Corps and the Rent Supplement program.

Motion to Recommit: Yea 125, nay 6, not voting 8, percentage 95.4.

9. April 20, 1966. Adopted a statement pointing out that America is facing a crisis of major proportions due to the deterioration of the Merchant Marine fleet and urged the Administration to take immediate action to correct this disastrous situation.

10. April 26, 1966. Adopted a statement on the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1965, H.R. 10065, which noted that this bill would transform the Commission into an agency that would rival the old National Labor Relations Board under the Wagner Act and that it would diminish the role of the States in unfair employment practice cases.

No record vote on motion to recommit.

11. May 10, 1966. Opposed the Participation Sales Act of 1966, H.R. 14544. Under this bill, the Administration could sell participations in a pool of government-held financial assets or loans which could total $33.1 billion. The money acquired through these "sales" would be paid directly to the pooling agency and used to offset expenditures that normally appear in the budget.

Final Passage: Yea 0, nay 126, not voting 13, percentage 100.

12. May 18, 1966. Adopted a statement supporting the Freedom of Information legislation, S. 1160. This bill clarifies and protects the right of the public to information that the various agencies and departments now refuse to disclose.

Final Passage: Yea 100, nay 0, not voting 40, percentage 100.

13. May 26, 1966. Adopted a statement urging the enactment of appropriate election reform legislation.

14. June 8, 1966. Opposed H.R. 15202, a bill that would increase the temporary limit on the public debt to $330 billion.

Final Passage: Yea 1, nay 121, not voting 17, percentage 99.1.

15. June 8, 1966. Supported the Food for Freedom Act of 1966, H.R. 14929, which extended and amended P.L. 480, but urged the rejection of the Committee amendment that would permit long-term dollar-credit sales.

Committee Amendment: Yea 2, nay 121, not voting 16, percentage 98.3.

Motion to Recommit: Yea 118, nay 6, not voting 15, percentage 95.1.

16. June 14, 1966. Supported the Extension of the Defense Production Act of 1950, H.R. 14025, but opposed the Committee amendment that would give the President standby authority to impose consumer credit controls.

Committee Amendment: Yea 2, nay 113, not voting 24, percentage 98.2.

17. June 21, 1966. Supported the amendments to the Unemployment Insurance Act contained in H.R. 15119. This bill rejected the Federal standards contained in the Administration bill, H.R. 8282, and preserved the present system of autonomous State programs of unemployment insurance.

Final Passage: Yea 121, nay 3, not voting 15, percentage 97.5.

18. July 19, 1966. Opposed the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1966, H.R. 15111. This bill authorizes the expenditure of $1.7 billion for fiscal year 1966 without attempting to correct the many abuses and mistakes that plague the present so-called War on Poverty. Urged the adoption of a Republican substitute bill that would correct the most serious abuses.

Motion to Recommit: Yea 115, nay 5, not voting 19, percentage 95.9.

19. July 27, 1966. Adopted a statement on the home building industry which called attention to the fact that home building and home buying, one of the Nation's largest industries, is facing a major crisis. In order to correct this serious situation, the Administration was urged to undertake immediately a six-point program. Opposed H.R. 14026, a bill that would place a ceiling of 4½ percent on the interest that commercial banks are allowed to pay on time deposits. No record vote on the adoption of a substitute bill.

20. August 1, 1966. Opposed title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1966, H.R. 14765, as proposed by the Administration and as amended and reported by the Committee.

Motion to Recommit: Yea 86, nay 50, not voting 3, percentage 63.2.

21. August 10, 1966. Supported the establishment of a Department of Transportation as proposed in H.R. 15963, but urged the adoption of amendments which would retain the independence of the accident investigation function of the Civil Aeronautics Board, delete section 7 of the bill which would permit the Secretary to adopt national transportation investment standards and criteria without seeking Congressional approval, include the urban mass transportation program within the newly-established Department, and establish the Maritime Administration as an independent agency.

Delete Maritime Admin.: Yea 111, nay 11, not voting 17, percentage 90.9.

Motion to Recommit: Yea 117, nay 5, not voting 17, percentage 95.9.

22. August 16, 1966. Opposed the Rural Community Development Act of 1966, S. 2934.

23. August 23, 1966. Adopted a statement regarding the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1966, H.R. 13161, which pointed out that obvious defects in the present Act had been ignored totally and urged the adoption of certain corrective Republican amendments.

Motion to Recommit: Yea 93, nay 13, not voting 33, percentage 87.7.

24. September 14, 1966. Supported the 1966 Amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, H.R. 16076.

Final Passage: Yea 101, nay 9, not voting 38, percentage 100.

25. September 14, 1966. Supported the Veterans Pension Act of 1966, H.R. 17488.

Final Passage: Yea 101, nay 2, not voting 36, percentage 98.

26. September 27, 1966. Adopted a statement on the Food for Peace Act of 1966 urging the rejection of the conference provision and the adoption of the strong and effective restriction on trade with the enemy contained in the House bill.

Motion to Recommit: Yea 118, nay 1, not voting 20, percentage 99.1.

27. September 28, 1966. Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, S. 3708. Recommended that the authorizations requested for the various programs, with the exception of the $24 million for planning funds, should be deferred until such time as the state of the economy will permit the consideration of the enormous increases visualized by this bill and realistic guidelines and standards can be prepared.

Motion to Recommit: Yea 85, nay 11, not voting 43, percentage 88.5.

28. October 6, 1966. Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Compact. Adopted a statement in support of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Compact, H.J. Res. 110.

No record vote.

29. October 10, 1966. Issued a statement urging the immediate consideration of the Legislative Reorganization recommendations contained in the final report of the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress.

Total Average: 94.4.

NATION NEEDS TOM CURTIS

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr.

Gerald R. Ford] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, all of us in this Chamber recognize the great contribution made to the Congress and to the country by our colleague, Tom Curtis of Missouri.

It is indeed gratifying when the folks at home know that their Congressman is one whom the Nation needs. In the St. Louis Globe Democrat of Wednesday, October 19, 1966, there appeared an editorial entitled "Nation Needs Tom Curtis."

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the editorial which I fully endorse.

Nation Needs Tom Curtis

One of Missouri's most important, if not paramount, contributions toward sensible government in Washington will be to re-elect Thomas B. Curtis, Republican of the Second Missouri District, for his ninth consecutive term in Congress.

During his 16 years in the House, Mr. Curtis has consistently built a record for personal and political integrity. His comment and debate from the floor are listened to closely on both sides of the aisle, because he knows what he talks about and possesses an acute, analytical mind, salted by sharp judgment.

The result: Tom Curtis is highly respected by Democratic as well as Republican conferees and has become one of the most influential figures on the Capitol scene. He is quoted in dispatches all over the country and in national magazines.

His kind is desperately needed in Congress, now perhaps more than at any time in recent decades. The dismal pliancy in Congress, its fear of balking at vast, deficit-embroidered handouts, the legislative path beaten to the pork barrel—all make the character of Tom Curtis a Gibraltar in a sea of political expediency.

Someone must burn midnight oil to study legislation, much of which is immensely involved and likely to cloak jokers. Congressman Curtis attacks this chore conscientiously; consequently he is one of the best informed men in the House.

He is a senior member of the powerful House Ways and Means Committee, ranking Republican on the Joint Economic Committee, a member of the Joint Committee on Internal Reveune Taxation and ranking GOP House member of the Joint Committee on Organization of Congress.

This is a fat packet of committee assignments, and he religiously attends to them all. In addition he is Congressional Advisor, by presidential appointment, to the chief trade negotiator, and has become the best authority in the House on international trade issues.

Meanwhile, he consistently attends to his Missouri knitting, never overlooking an opportunity to advance progress of his own district, his own state.

Little glamor attaches to intricate discussions of budgets, economic issues or how Congress could be better organized. In these areas Mr. Curtis is most knowledgeable. But he has an eye on almost every major problem and doesn't hestitate to speak out, regardless of what ripples of criticism or dissent he may stir. His contributions are reasoned, hard sense.

He would use the huge economic might of the United States to fight the war in Vietnam. He would hurl sanctions against all countries that directly aid our foes. He laments wasteful, bureaucratic costs of the War on Poverty, but is encouraged by some of the human resource development programs.

Among the many measures to which he has significantly contributed is the Human Investment bill, now before Senate and House committees. This is a proposal to obtain tax credits for concerns that train employes for better jobs to meet the unemployment and automation problems.

Mr. Curtis indicts the Administration for a sorry record against inflation, "robbing Social Security of its buying power." He vigorously opposes industry-wide strikes, which are against the public welfare and necessity. He is optimistic about international tariff negotiations.

Tom Curtis of Missouri cuts to the core of every issue. His speeches are conned in both chambers of Congress. It would be tragic were he not returned to the House, where his sheer ability is recognized—but a tragedy we do not fear.

Congressman Curtis has been a signal credit to his state for eight terms. He eminently deserves a ninth. The nation and Missouri need him.

REPUBLICANS AND THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: CONSTRUCTIVE MINORITY ACTIVITIES—REPORT OF RANKING MINORITY MEMBER, HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, as the 89th Congress prepares to adjourn, it is appropriate for the Record to reflect the extent of the constructive activities of the minority party in Congress over the past 2 years. The Republicans of the Public Works Committee have, in my opinion, been able to offer and have accepted many meritorious amendments to bills before the committee and to have adopted many proposals which have emanated from the Republican positions. As ranking minority member of this committee I am proud to make the following report for the Record on the 89th Congress.

TWO-PARTY COOPERATION MEANS BETTER LAWS

The success of the Republicans this Congress on the Public Works Committee is greatly attributable to the sincere cooperation of Members from both sides of the aisle, in most instances, to act in the best interests of the Nation's genuine needs. Republicans and Democrats have disagreed more than once this Congress on the methods to be employed to effectuate proposed Federal programs, but, by and large, committee members have set aside partisan politics and have worked cooperatively to improve legislation.

I think I can speak for all Republican members on the committee in saying that this spirit of cooperation among the committee members and the staff members alike is an encouraging sign. I hope this spirit of cooperation will continue in the years to come. I am confident that when the committee members can work their own will, without pressure from the outside, that this spirit will continue and better legislation will result.

COMMITTEE'S JURISDICTION DENOTES COMMITTEE'S IMPORTANCE

The jurisdiction of the Public Works Committee indicates the importance of this committee in Congress and the importance of an assignment on the committee. The committee rightly has jurisdiction over the Federal-aid highway programs, including investigations thereof; rivers and harbors and flood control works of improvement; Federal public buildings and grounds; small watershed development and flood prevention programs; Federal water pollution control legislation; public works for the benefit of navigation, including bridges and dams; and certain economic development programs.

The Republican members on the committee, Representative Bill Harsha of Ohio, Representative John Kunkel of Pennsylvania, Representative Jim Grover of New York, Representative Jim Cleveland of New Hampshire, Representative Don Clausen of California, Representative Charlie Halleck of Indiana; Representative Charlotte Reid of Illinois, Representative Bob McEwen of New York, Representative Jim Martin of Alabama, and Representative Joe Skubitz of Kansas, our newest Republican member, and myself, as the top-ranking Republican member, have adequately reflected an awareness of the committee's importance by the exercise of responsibility to work for better laws.

CONSTRUCTIVE GOP LEGISLATION AND PROGRAMS

The Republicans on the committee have advanced a responsible and active approach to the many issues involved in legislation before them this Congress. As members of the minority party, it has often been necessary for our proposals to come forth in the form of amendments to bills before the committee. In some instances, however, we have been able to have bills which were introduced by minority members included wholely in broader proposals reported by the committee. Many of these amendments and bills are now law.

At this point in the Record, I would like to set forth what I believe to be the major accomplishments of the Republicans on the Public Works Committee during 1965 and 1966.

SUPPORT OF BETTER NATIONWIDE HIGHWAY PROGRAMS

The Republicans have always been supporters of realistic Federal-aid highway programs. Improved construction means better highways for America. Better highways mean less congestion, enhanced safety design, more rapid travel, lives saved, and greater motoring convenience. There have been several important highway bills enacted this Congress. The Republicans have played an important role in the consideration of these bills.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1965

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1965 was cosponsored and supported by Republicans. The Interstate System became a full-fledged program during the Eisenhower administration. The act increased the amount authorized for construction on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways so as to permit more rapid and orderly construction; approved the apportionment of Interstate System funds to the States for construction; provided for a report on future highway needs to be made; and authorized State highway safety program provisions in Federal law.

BALDWIN HIGHWAY SAFETY AMENDMENT

The Baldwin highway safety amendment, named for its Republican sponsor, the late John Baldwin of California, provided that each State should have a highway safety program designed to reduce traffic accidents and deaths, injuries, and property damage resulting therefrom. The safety programs were to include, but not be limited to, measures to improve driver performance, vehicle safety, highway design and maintenance, traffic control, surveillance of traffic for detection and correction of high or potentially high accident locations.

The Baldwin amendment signaled recognition by the Congress of the need for improved highway and traffic safety programs. It was the impetus behind this year's safety crusade.

SUPPORT OF "AFTER 1972" HIGHWAY NEEDS STUDY

Construction on the existing Interstate Highway System's designated mileage should be completed around 1972. Many Republicans introduced bills this Congress to require a study to be conducted to determine the future highway needs of the Nation after 1972. Such an "after 1972" study was enacted with strong Republican and Democratic support last year.

ASSURED STATES WILL BE CONSULTED ON HIGHWAY STUDY

Highway programs have always been characterized by cooperation among all levels of government. With a fear that the growing Federal takeover of other programs might lead to a takeover of the nationwide highway programs when local highway officials know local needs better than any bureaucrat in Washington ever will, the Republicans were anxious to secure assurances from the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads that the States would be consulted in the formulation of the "after 1972" future highway needs study. I was able to secure the pledge that the States would be consulted in the study's formulation from the Federal Highway Administrator. This will result in a more effective nationwide highway program.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1966

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966 was also enacted with Republican support. The act provides for an increase in authorizations for the Interstate System of $5.2 billion through 1973 which is still not sufficient if we are to complete the system at the earliest reasonable date; extends the time for completion of the system by 1 year to 1973; authorizes $1 billion for each of the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 for primary, secondary, and urban extensions; authorizes $33 million for those years for forest highways; authorizes $14 million for 1968 and $16 million for 1969 for public lands highways; authorizes $170 million for those years for forest development roads and trails; authorizes $25 million for 1968 and $30 milion for 1969 for park roads and trails; authorizes $9 million for 1968 and $11 million for 1969 for parkways; and authorizes $19 million for 1968 and $23 million for 1969 for Indian reservation roads and trails. It authorizes an increase in funds for the emergency repair of highways; provides for a study of advance right-of-way acquisition; provides for a study on relocation assistance; requires consultation to minimize soil erosion from highway construction; and declares that the maximum effort must be made to preserve Federal, State, and local government parklands and historic sites. The act also requires that interstate routes be a minimum of four traffic lanes and prohibits the use of construction money for beautification programs. The minority helped write this bill and insisted on completing the system without unavoidable delays.

REALISTIC AND ADEQUATE HOUSE-PASSED AUTHORIZATIONS

The administration-recommended increases in authorizations for the completion of the Interstate System were in the opinion of many highway experts, inadequate to complete the system at the earliest possible date. With Republican urging that any additional authorizations be sufficient to complete the system on time, the Democrats and Republicans on the committee reported a bill, which the House subsequently passed, providing enough funds to do the job. Unfortunately, the Senate refused to accept the realistic House figures and this resulted in the enactment of a law which will not provide sufficient funds. The Republicans are concerned that this demonstrates a disregard on the part of the administration for the safety and convenience of America's motoring public. Because of the administration's inactions, motorists will have to continue driving on already overcrowded two-lane stretches for too many more years. The Republicans still want to remedy this situation.

ADVANCE HIGHWAY RIGHT-OF-WAY ACQUISITION WILL SAVE TAXPAYERS MILLIONS: REPUBLICAN STUDY BECOMES LAW

The minority members on the committee, having introduced separate similar bills, offered an amendment to the 1966 Highway Act which authorizes and directs a full and complete study and investigation of the advance acquisition of rights-of-way for future construction on the Federal-aid highway systems to be made. The GOP-offered amendment was accepted. It is now law. Advance acquisition of highway rights-of-way should save millions in tax dollars.

EMERGENCY RELIEF FOR HIGHWAYS INCREASED

The 1966 Highway Act increased the funds available for the emergency repair and reconstruction of highways damaged from disasters and extended the provisions of the emergency relief provisions of law to include parkways, public land highways, and public land development roads and trails. Highways, park roads and trails were already eligible for such emergency assistance. The Republicans supported this change.

NO HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION MONEY FOR BEAUTY

The Republicans feel strongly that there should be no diversion of money from the Highway Trust Fund, which money is used for construction on the interstate system, to the so-called highway beautification program, which, among other things, provides for planting pansies along the highways. The minority feels that we need to spend our money on highway construction for greater convenience and safety at this time. The 1966 Highway Act, consequently, contains a provision to prohibit use of trust fund construction money for beautification purposes and requires other funds to be spent if the program is to be implemented.

NATIONWIDE HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS LAUNCHED

The Congress has enacted legislation to provide for highway, traffic, and motor vehicle safety measures this year. The minority generally supported these measures, and helped redraft them, particularly those relating to highway safety. The minority recognizes that our highways need to be made safer, that our cars need to be made safer, and that our drivers and pedestrians need to be more aware of necessary safety measures.

SAFETY CRUSADE GREW FROM BALDWIN AMENDMENT

Witnesses before the committee agreed that this year's drive toward greater highway and motoring safety emanated from the Baldwin amendment. The safety programs will live as a testament to Republican Congressman Baldwin's sincere concern for greater highway safety.

MANDATORY STUDY ON MIXING DRINKING AND DRIVING

The minority offered an amendment to require a thorough and complete study of the relationship between the consumption of alcohol and its effects upon highway safety and drivers of motor vehicles to be made with recommendations for appropriate legislation to be made to the Congress. We feel that the serious problems resulting from mixing driving and drinking have too long been ignored, and the study will be a step toward solving this problem. The amendment is now law.

HIGHWAY SAFETY FUNDS MADE AVAILABLE FOR LOCAL PROGRAMS

The Republicans supported the requirement, first made in committee, that a percentage of funds to the States for highway safety programs be expended by the political subdivisions, cities and counties, of those States. Consequently, the Highway Safety Act provides that no less than 40 percent of highway safety funds to a State shall be apportioned to its political subdivisions. This is in keeping with the Republican position that all levels of government must share the responsibility for highway programs.

TOLL FACILITIES ON HIGHWAYS INVESTIGATED

Minority members of the committee have introduced legislation which would place certain restrictions on the construction of toll roads, bridges, and tunnels on the Interstate Highway System. The problems posed by toll facilities on highways on the Federal-aid systems are ones which need to be thoroughly reviewed by the Congress.

At the request of many Republican Members, the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program conducted 17 days of public hearings in this Congress on the role of toll facilities in our highway programs. Legislation should come forth next Congress on this subject, and the GOP intends to offer constructive proposals on this subject.

CONTINUED SUPPORT FOR CLEAN WATER

Controlling and abating water pollution is a responsibility which should be shared by all levels of government. The minority has supported measures to strengthen Federal water pollution control programs, but Republicans have also felt it essential to bring the States more fully into the program of constructing sewage treatment works. The GOP's record for cleaner water is long standing. The first water pollution control bill ever enacted by the Congress was during the Republican 80th Congress in 1948. Since then, Republicans have worked to strengthen programs to control water pollution on all levels of government.

This Congress enacted two important water pollution acts.

WATER QUALITY LEGISLATION SUPPORTED

The Water Quality Act of 1965 was the most important water pollution control law to have been enacted since 1956. It provided for the creation of a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, authorized research and development activities, increased annual authorizations for funds to construct sewage treatment works, offered inducements to the States to participate in the construction program, removed dollar ceiling limitations on projects in some instances and increased them in others, and provided additional enforcement measures for the maintenance of water quality with the States reserving their right to act on enforcing the standards first. Republicans supported the enactment of the 1965 act.

STATES RETAIN RIGHT TO ENFORCE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS FIRST

The most controversial aspect of the 1965 Water Quality Act were the enforcement provisions for maintaining water quality. The administration's recommendations were alarming to almost everyone. They would have made the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare a Federal czar over the waters of America and a Federal zoning czar over the lands adjacent to those waters. The Congress acted with greater responsibility for the maintenance of proper relationships between the governments. The Republicans fought for the measure to require that the States have the opportunity to establish and enforce water quality standards first before some bureaucrat in Washington had a go of it. This GOP-supported position was upheld in Congress, and requirements permitting the States to act first are now law.

HARD-FOUGHT-FOR GOP-PROPOSED STATE FINANCIAL PARTICIPATION BECOMES LAW

The Republicans have urged since 1959 that no increased annual authorizations for the construction of sewage treatment works by the Federal Government be enacted, unless they were coupled with inducements to bring the States into the construction program. Water will only be cleaned up if all levels of government meet their responsibilities, and there had been no inducements to the States to come into the program. The Republicans offered motions on the floor of the House in 1959 and in 1961 to bring the States into the problem, but the Democratic majorities defeated both motions. At last, vindication of the minority position came, for the Water Quality Act of 1965 contained such provisions for some of the annual appropriations.

This was a hard-fought-for provision by the Republicans, and we are glad that it became law. It is unfortunate that the Democrats did not agree with what we were able to see some 6 years before the provisions were accepted and became law.

CLEAN WATERS RESTORATION PROGRAM SUPPORTED

The Clean Waters Restoration Act of 1966 was supported by the GOP. This year's act is a very important one. Many GOP positions were upheld in it. The 1966 act provides for the financing of basinwide agencies upon the request of the State or States involved, expands grants for research and development and demonstration projects, brings the industries into the picture with grants for research on methods with industrywide application to treat industrial wastes, makes grants for an estuarine zone pollution study, provides grants for research and development on combined municipal and industrial sewage treatment operations, increases authorizations for funding the construction program, permits the States to come wholely into the program by providing inducements for all construction funds, eliminates the dollar ceiling limitations on single and joint projects, provides for bonuses of up to 50 percent of the total cost of construction projects, provides for reimbursement to State and local governments who wish to undertake the construction of sewage treatment works in the advance of the availability of Federal participating funds, and amends certain enforcement procedures. The act also amends the Oil Pollution Act of 1924 to tighten restrictions on those who pollute our navigable waters with oil discharges, authorizes the study of methods of bringing industry into the program by providing possible incentives, including tax incentives, for the construction of facilities to reduce or abate water pollution, and several other lesser measures.

EXPANSION OF REPUBLICAN-PROPOSED INDUCEMENTS TO STATES

While the 1965 water quality act made provision for waiving the dollar ceiling limitation on grants for the construction of sewage treatment works, if the State matched equally Federal grants from an additional authorization increase of $50 million per annum, which was the enactment of a long-held GOP position, the Republicans felt that Federal inducements to States to participate in the construction program needed to be expanded to cover all funds appropriated for the construction program.

The 1966 Clean Waters Restoration Act makes such a provision. Now the States have inducements to come into the construction program fully.

This was the final vindication of the Republican position. Our proposals will become the law of the land when the bill is signed.

REIMBURSEMENT TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS COME FROM GOP BILLS

Several minority members on the committee were the first to introduce legislation with nationwide application to provide for Federal reimbursement to State and local governments who wish to undertake the construction of sewage treatment works in advance of the availability of Federal participating funds. Such provisions were offered as amendments in committee. The GOP-introduced reimbursement provisions, upon the President's signing of the bill will be law. This was another realization of a GOP proposal.

ADDITIONAL HOUSE-PASSED AUTHORIZATIONS BASED ON REALISTIC NEEDS

In my opinion, it is fiscally irresponsible to authorize the appropriation of funds in excess of the ability of the program for which those funds are intended to absorb the increase effectively and efficiently. The Republicans on the committee urged the adoption of additional authorizations for the construction grant program only at the realistic level at which the program could be geared up to expend it wisely. The Senate had acted first and had provided much too high sums for the grant program. The fact that the House-passed authorizations were based on realistic needs and that the figures which will be law, when the President returns and signs the bill, are more realistic than those passed by the Senate is greatly attributable, I think, to the responsible position urged in the House by the GOP.

INCENTIVES TO INDUSTRY STUDY COMES FROM MINORITY

On the motion of a Republican committee member with solid GOP support behind him, provisions were written into the 1966 act to require an investigation and study by the Secretary of the Interior of methods for providing incentives to assist in constructing facilities and works by industry to reduce or abate water pollution, including possible use of tax incentives. This is already being done in many States, and it is time that the Federal Government recognize the need for incentives to bring the largest single source of pollution—industry—into the water pollution control and abatement effort.

This Republican amendment was passed.

REPUBLICAN AMENDMENT TO EXEMPT FROM THE SUSPENSION OF THE 7-PERCENT INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT PASSED BY CONGRESS

Legislation to suspend the 7-percent investment tax credit to industry was acted upon this year by the Committee on Ways and Means; however, a discussion of water pollution control measures would not be complete without a brief remark on this legislation.

On the motion of a Republican member of that committee, the legislation specifically exempts from the suspension those capital expenditures for facilities, installations, machinery, and equipment which contribute to the elimination, control, or prevention of air and water pollution.

The exemption had almost unanimous Republican support. That exemption will become law also.

SUPPORT FOR RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL WORKS

The Republicans on the committee have always been cooperative in efforts to improve the water resources development programs of this Nation. We have consistently supported realistic and feasible works of improvements for the benefit of navigation, for river and harbor improvement, and for enhanced flood control. We are proud to have a hand in the development of our valuable water resources.

FASTER CONSTRUCTION GO-AHEADS FOR WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS SUPPORTED BY GOP

The Democrats and Republicans alike on the committee agreed last year that some measure needed to be devised to permit more rapid construction of projects costing less than $10 million. Provisions grew from the discussions of the top-ranking Democrat and Republican Members which, when put into legislation, authorized the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, to construct, operate, and maintain any water resource development project, including single purpose and multiple purpose projects involving, but not limited to, navigation, flood control, and shore protection, if the estimated Federal first cost of construction of such project did not exceed $10 million.

Prior to the enactment of this provision, many worthwhile projects under $10 million had to wait as much as 2 years for enactment by Congress in an Omnibus Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Act. This new procedure, which the GOP strongly supported, will mean the advancement to construction of many projects throughout the Nation at a rapid pace, if the President abides by the law of the land and instructs the Secretary of the Army to implement the new provision.

The proposal, which has since become a reality, of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control that omnibus acts be considered on an annual basis rather than on the old 1-every-2-years basis was well received by the entire committee. This will also aid faster construction of projects.

REPUBLICAN-PROPOSED SMALL RIVER AND HARBOR PROJECT FUND INCREASE BECOMES LAW

One of the first bills introduced this Congress was one by a Republican Member to increase the authorizations for the funds available for the construction of small river and harbor projects. Inasmuch as that Republican happened to be the ranking Republican on the Flood Control Subcommittee at that time, it was proposed for consideration in the 1965 Omnibus Act. Increased authorizations for these small rivers and harbor projects became law with the enactment of last year's act, standing as another testament of the constructive action of the GOP. The fund was increased from $2 million annually to $10 million annually.

NEEDED MONEY AUTHORIZATIONS FOR CERTAIN RIVER BASIN PLANS SUPPORTED

The Republicans supported and some Republican Members cosponsored legislation this Congress to provide additional monetary authorizations for the prosecution of certain river basin plans for the enhancement of flood control, navigation, and other related features.

The important legislation contained additional monetary authorizations for the following basins: Arkansas River, Brazos River, Central and Southern Florida, Columbia River, Los Angeles-San Gabriel, Missouri River, Ohio River, Ouachita River, Upper Mississippi River, and the West Branch of the Susquehanna River. The Republicans consider the improvement of these basins to protect the health and welfare of our citizens to be very important.

PROHIBITION AGAINST UNFAIR COMPETITION

A highly important Republican amendment to legislation this Congress which has become law and which was offered by the minority provides that no financial assistance under the controversial Economic Development Act of 1965 shall be extended to any project when the result would be to increase the production of goods, materials, or commodities, or the availability of services or facilities, when there is not sufficient demand for such goods, materials, commodities, services, or facilities, to employ the efficient capacity of existing competitive commercial or industrial enterprises.

This is a highly important GOP amendment, for it prohibits the use of Federal tax dollars to set up facilities to compete with existing industries already suffering from the effects of an oversaturated market. If this GOP amendment had not become law, Federal tax dollars might have been used to put businesses out of business.

REPUBLICAN-PROPOSED SUBCOMMITTEE NOW WATCHDOGS ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

As headlines appeared throughout the Nation on irregularities in certain Great Society economic development and economic opportunity programs, the Republican members of the committee called for the creation of a Special Subcommittee on Economic Development Programs to provide continuing oversight of the administration of certain economic development programs under the committee's jurisdiction.

The Republican members on the committee urged the creation of the committee for many months, but at last it was created. If the special subcommittee is allowed to work its will, many improvements should be made in the programs.

FLOOD DISASTER RELIEF FOR PACIFIC NORTHWEST

The proposals made to aid the Pacific Northwest in recovering from the disaster of severe floods of late 1964 and early 1965, which were the ones enacted, had GOP support.

The Pacific Northwest Disaster Relief Act of 1965 provides for a number of measures to help the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho recover from the extensive property loss and damage as the result of the floods and highwaters of December 1964 and January and February 1965. Among the recovery measures provided for in the act are those for the repair and reconstruction of highways, roads, and trails damaged by the disaster; the reimbursement to timber sale contractors to bear road and trail construction and restoration costs incurred or to be incurred for restoring roads; the providing of funds for the construction, reconstruction, and repair of forest development roads and trails necessary because of the flood; the reduction of time required for the advance public notice in connection with the sale of timber from national forests; to provide public land entry; to restore works on the Eel River, Calif.; and to extend the maturity date of small business loans in the area.

HURRICANE DISASTER RELIEF FOR SOUTHEASTERN STATES

The Republicans supported and several Republican members cosponsored the Southeast Hurricane Disaster Relief Act of 1965 to aid the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi to recover from the extensive damages and loss of property as a result of Hurricane Betsy in 1965. The act permits the sale of trailers provided as temporary housing to the occupants thereof at fair and equitable prices; authorizes small business disaster loan changes; provides farmers emergency loan program alterations; and authorizes a highly important study of alternative methods of financing assistance programs.

The minority was pleased to lend its support to help the people of these States recover from the storm damages.

NATIONWIDE DISASTER RELIEF LAWS IMPROVED: GOP INSISTS ON NO GIVEAWAY PROVISIONS

The provisions of disaster relief and some related laws have been improved and made more effective by the enactment this year of the Disaster Relief Act. While some committee members sought to extend this year's legislation to include grant-in-aid measures, the GOP felt that no such action should be taken until the next session of Congress at which time the committee will have adequate time to study the recommendations embodied in the report of the Department of Housing and Urban Development on alternative methods of financing disaster assistance. The report encompasses information and recommendations on insurance and other programs for financial assistance to disaster victims. The Congress did not have adequate time to consider these complicated proposals this year. Rather than letting the proposed disaster relief legislation die, the GOP supported the consideration of disaster relief legislation to embody loans and improvements to existing law.

The Disaster Relief Act of 1966 was enacted with such provisions included therein.

The act, the enactment of which the Republicans supported, contains provisions for loan adjustments where an extreme financial hardship would result to borrowers under programs administered by certain Government agencies, for Federal Housing Administration-insured disaster loans, for assistance to unincorporated communities, for restoration of public facilities, for coordination of effort between the Office of Emergency Planning and other Federal and State agencies concerned with disaster, and for a study and investigation by the Office of Emergency Planning, in cooperation with other Federal and State agencies, into measures designed to prevent or minimize personal injury or death and loss or damage due to forest or grass fires. The act also makes available the civil defense communications system for use in warning of impending natural disasters, provides for assistance to higher educational institutions in major disaster areas, provides priority for applications for public facility and public housing assistance, and provides that no duplication of benefits can be received with respect to losses suffered in disasters.

The Republican members on the committee are satisfied that a workable disaster relief act could be enacted this year.

REPUBLICAN-PROPOSED MANDATORY STUDY ON DISASTROUS FOREST AND GRASS FIRES

On the motion of the minority, the committee accepted an amendment to the Disaster Relief Act which provides that the Office of Emergency Planning survey and study the need for additional or improved air operations which are needed to prevent or minimize the personal injury or deaths and property damage which could result from grass or forest fires. Recommendations are to be made to Congress on how best to cope with this form of natural disaster.

This Republican amendment was passed as part of the act by Congress and awaits the President's signature.

REPUBLICANS HELP INVESTIGATE NATURAL DISASTERS ACROSS THE UNITED STATES

During the past 2 years, the Republican members of the committee have traveled with the committee to the major disaster areas of the Nation to investigate the need for Federal assistance for such recovery measures as are necessary and to make recommendations thereon to the committee.

The minority remains alert to help the people of America in distress from the effects of a disaster.

PRESIDENT "ADOPTS" MINORITY POSITION ON VICE PRESIDENT'S MANSION

During committee and House debate on the legislation to build a mansion for the Vice President, the Republicans strongly urged the deferment of the construction of the mansion until such time as funds were not needed for programs of higher priority. Regardless of the need for an official residence for the Vice President, there is a time and a place for everything; and the GOP held that this time of mounting costs of the war in Vietnam, galloping inflation from Government spending, and the need for more funding for essential programs that this legislation should be deferred. The Democrats passed the bill anyway.

Much to our satisfaction, the President assumed the GOP-held position in signing the bill. The President told the Vice President that, while a Vice President's residence might be a worthwhile thing, pressures on the budget for the Vietnam war and certain domestic programs of higher priority precluded any consideration of building the Vice President his new home for the immediate future.

The minority position had been upheld once again, and this time it was at the White House level.

MINORITY SAVES $4 MILLION ON CHAMIZAL HIGHWAY

The minority offered during House debate and on the motion to recommit with instructions a requirement that El Paso observe the usual 50-percent participation rule for actual construction of the Chamizal Highway. The conference adopted the amendment despite failure of House motion to recommit and the bill passed thus saves some $4 million.

REPUBLICANS BATTLE DIVERSION OF TOLL BRIDGE REVENUES

In the 1966 omnibus rivers, harbers, and flood control bill, the minority fought against diversion of toll bridge funds and thus assured early freeing of tolls of two bridges at Chester and St. Louis, Ill., across the Mississippi. The amendment and motion to recommit with such instructions failed in committee and on the House floor, but was included in the conference report and is now in the bill passed by Congress.

This is consistent with the Republican position to assure freeing of existing toll facilities and of preventing unnecessary future toll rather than free road construction.

SUPPORT OF EXPANDED THIRD LIBRARY OF CONGRESS BUILDING FOR BETTER EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES

Several Republicans on the committee introduced legislation and the Republicans on the committee fully supported the enactment of legislation to provide for badly needed additional facilities for research and other educational uses at the Library of Congress, the Nation's storehouse of printed materials, available to all researchers. The legislation is now law, and planning funds have been appropriated.

This was another successful GOP-supported effort to provide adequate educational facilities for American scholars.

NEW NATIONAL ART MUSEUM AND SCULPTURE GARDEN SUPPORTED

The gift to the Government of the United States of one of the world's largest art collections recently lead to legislation to house these priceless works of art. Republicans voted for the enactment of legislation to authorize the construction of a Joseph Hirshhorn Art Museum and Sculpture Garden in Washington once it was made clear that no existing facilities would be detrimentally affected by necessary relocations. The museum and garden will provide another fantastic attraction for visitors to the Nation's Capital.

MANDATORY STUDY FOR A CENTER TO HELP VISITORS TO WASHINGTON

Soon after legislation was introduced this Congress to authorize the construction of a National Visitors' Center here in the Washington area to help tourist to the area, it became apparent that few people really knew what was wanted and what was needed to carry out such a worthwhile visitors' assistance program.

Greatly due to the insistence of the GOP that no authorizations be made for something that the Congress was not even clear on, the legislation was amended to provide for a study of the various alternatives for such a visitors' center. This is a highly more reasonable approach to the entire issue.

The construction of a National Visitors' Center in the future which meets the genuine needs of the area and provides visitors with exactly what services they truly need will be a testament to the forethought behind the study alternative.

SUPPORT OF INTEGRITY AND INDEPENDENCE OF CONGRESS

The President has made recommendations to Congress through the Bureau of the Budget this year that certain legislation needed to be amended, in his opinion, to remove so-called infringements on his Executive powers.

The Republican Members of the committee have remained in firm agreement with most of the majority Members on the recommendations he submitted to the Congress, that we ought to maintain present procedures. The GOP feels that the arguments of the President are without merit. By maintaining this posture, the GOP is helping to maintain the integrity and independence of Congress at a time when it needs it the most.

REPUBLICANS PREPARING CONSTRUCTIVE PROGRAMS FOR THE NEXT CONGRESS

Republicans are not content to rest upon the achievements of the past. We are looking toward legislation which may come before the committee during the next Congress as a result of the studies which we have authorized and as a result of independent action. We are already preparing what I feel to be constructive programs to be offered by the Republicans during the next Congress.

LOOKING TO THE FUTURE

Mr. Speaker, I think everyone can ascertain from my remarks today that the Republicans on the Public Works Committee have contributed mightily this Congress to the improvement of legislation. By alternatives, by amendments, by separate proposals, and by other means, the Republicans were able to offer a responsible, constructive, and positive effort.

Looking toward the future, we will offer many constructive proposals. The Republicans have demonstrated their ability to get things done despite the fact that we were the minority. What I have attempted to do here today has been to set before the House a record of constructive achievements. Toward such an end we shall continue to work in cooperation with all members of the committee and the Congress.

ANTIRIOT LEGISLATION

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the record of this Congress will be discussed for many years to come, its accomplishments and its shortcomings. I think one inexcusable shortcoming of this session of the Congress is the failure to act on antiriot legislation. Such a bill was passed on August 8 by this House as an amendment to the civil right bill by a vote of 389 to 25. Shortly thereafter I introduced legislation, and it remains bottled up in the Judiciary Committee, despite the fact that hearings were held, and constant requests that legislation be voted out.

The American people wanted antiriot legislation; they wanted this deterrent to be available. I think it is a shame that it was not acted upon. Congress was derelict in its duty, in my opinion, in not doing it. I think the Oakland riots and the recent riots in San Francisco are proof-positive that this deterrent is necessary and essential. The FBI would have been available during this recess or adjournment period for investigations into these riot situations that have occurred and might occur in the future.

I am hopeful that Congress will act on this legislation early next year. This is one of the gross shortcomings of this session of Congress which I believe is inexcusable.

REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF THE FOURTH DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, perhaps no Congress in the history of our Nation has done so much to meet the pressing needs of its time as has the 89th Congress.

On this last day of the second session, I would like to review the achievements of this Congress for my constituents in the Fourth District of Wisconsin.

THE 89TH CONGRESS

In the 89th Congress, large Democratic majorities, coupled with a procedural reform in the House, made possible the passage of laws which were long overdue but which had previously been blocked by the opposition of the conservative coalition.

The increasing urgency for action was highlighted by serious problems in fields such as the plight of senior citizens, urban stagnation, air and water pollution, transportation, auto safety, education, and the national economy. Even these vital domestic issues were at times overshadowed by constant congressional scrutiny of international affairs such as our efforts in Vietnam and our foreign aid programs in the underdeveloped nations of the world.

In all of these challenges the 89th Congress has been one of the most significant and productive. It recognized the need for new initiatives to meet the new challenges of an increasingly complex world. It attempted to meet the problems it faced. The 89th Congress worked hard during the first session so that it could move on to other important work in the second session and review the programs it had already enacted.

In order to make Congress even better equipped to meet future challenges, the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress recently recommended a series of reforms based on its long-term study of congressional operations. These reforms would greatly increase the efficiency of the legislative process. Unfortunately, their approval by the committee came too late for action now. Certainly they will be considered early in the next Congress, however.

EDUCATION

Recognizing that the education of our youth can be the key to solving many of our social ills, Congress placed unprecedented emphasis on the importance of top quality education. It achieved this goal by establishing bold new laws such as the National Teacher Corps and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Congress also designed programs aimed specifically at helping children of the poor break the cycle of poverty through education. In addition, it took action to improve the quality of college facilities and their community services and to alleviate critical shortages of health personnel and teachers.

At long last, approval was also won for a schedule of educational and housing benefits for our more than 3 million returning cold war veterans.

Veterans with more than 180 days of service since January 31, 1955, can now receive up to 36 months of educational assistance. The allowance for a veteran with no dependents attending school full time is $100 a month.

Unfortunately, apprenticeship training was not included as an eligible program. I have therefore introduced legislation to remedy this situation. In view of the shortage of qualified pilots available today, it may also be desirable to include flight training as an eligible program.

But even without these added provisions this legislation has already been of great help not only to those returning from military service, but more generally to the entire Nation.

AID FOR OLDER AMERICANS

Perhaps the most overdue legislation is that directed at helping our senior citizens.

In an expanding economy, with rising prices for food, rent, medical and other living expenses, our 18½ million older Americans are faced with the problems of living on a fixed retirement income.

The 89th Congress helped these people by enacting the long debated program of medical care for the aged which had first been proposed by President Truman. In addition, Congress raised social security benefits by 7 percent, extended benefits to those over 72—by 1968—who have no other pension or relief, established an Administration on Aging to deal with the problems of the elderly, and provided grants to the States for development of community programs for older Americans.

Much progress has been made in this field. In 1967, Federal benefits for the aged will total $26 billion, three times what they were in 1957. Yet even this tremendous effort appears inadequate. Social security benefits lag behind the needs of the retired. The President has recommended an additional 10-percent increase in benefits; some Members of Congress have proposed automatic cost-of-living increases for benefits. Consideration of these measures should be the first order of business in the 90th Congress.

LABOR

To help promote the welfare of working Americans, Congress approved an increase in the Federal minimum wage. The minimum will be raised in steps from $1.25 to $1.60 an hour by 1968 for those presently covered and by 1971 for the 8 million workers newly covered by the act.

Also, Congress considered legislation to extend the unemployment compensation system and expand the Federal-State employment service to coordinate it with other agencies.

The effort to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which allows States to outlaw the union shop, was passed by the House. A filibuster in the Senate, however, prevented its approval by that body.

THE ECONOMY

The amazing economic progress of this country has brought with it what has been called "the problems of prosperity." Although these are not the only economic problems we face—certainly the problems of poverty have not been completely eradicated—they are a very real and troublesome product of our economic well-being.

Among the chief of such problems is that of rising prices. While the level of real income has kept well ahead of rising prices, inflation remains a danger which must not be ignored.

This Congress has been acutely aware of our economic problems, particularly as they have resulted in a shortage of money to finance home mortgages. The flow of money to investments other than savings accounts and home mortgages has led to a slowdown in the homebuilding industry.

Already Congress has enacted such temporary measures as the strengthening of Federal supervisory authority over certain banks and savings and loan associations, the increasing of maximum insurance for savings and loan accounts from $10,000 to $15,000, and the suspending of the investment tax credit and some forms of accelerated depreciation on commercial building.

URBAN AFFAIRS

The concentration of population in our urban centers resulting from our economic progress has created enormous urban problems.

To attack these problems Congress has initiated a demonstration cities program which will coordinate Federal aid efforts to meet urgent urban problems. The hopefully dramatic results of this program in 60 or 70 urban problem areas are expected to demonstrate how effective such a concentrated attack can be.

All Federal aid to cities is now directed through the new Department of Housing and Urban Development created by this Congress.

Just as our advanced economy has brought the economic problems of prosperity and the decay of our cities, so our advanced technology has brought the problems of air and water pollution. To meet these challenges the 89th Congress enacted major Federal aid programs to assist communities in their fight against pollution. Certainly these measures are vital to the health and welfare of all Americans.

Another technological problem which affects many Milwaukeeans personally is that of aircraft noise. In response to the pleas of my constituents and many other afflicted citizens across the Nation, a House subcommittee has begun hearings on bills to combat aircraft noise. Included is my bill, H.R. 16024. It is my hope that this problem will be alleviated by coordinated Federal, State, and local action before it becomes as serious a threat as air and water pollution.

TRANSPORTATION

Congress has also taken steps to help provide badly needed transportation facilities.

In addition to authorizing $7.2 billion in Federal aid for the interstate highway system, Congress created a Cabinet-level Department of Transportation. This Department will coordinate the activities of more than 30 separate Federal agencies which now deal with transportation activities. Only the Maritime Administration will operate outside the new Department.

Development of urban mass transportation systems will be aided by a 2-year program of Federal grants.

CIVIL RIGHTS

During the first session Congress approved the Voting Rights Act to prohibit discrimination in voting.

In the second session the House approved legislation to prohibit incitement of a riot, discrimination in the selection of juries, and discrimination in the sale and rental of new houses or apartments. Excluded from this last provision were owner-occupied apartments with four tenants or less.

The bill passed by the House was the product of much thoughtful study and debate about the problems and rights involved. The merits of this legislation, however, were never even debated by the Senate. A filibuster which had the support of less than half of the Senators prevented any consideration of the bill. The responsibility for action necessary to protect the rights of minority groups must therefore fall on the shoulders of the 90th Congress.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Congress has continued to scrutinize the conduct of our foreign policy, particularly our involvement in Vietnam.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific, and by Presidential appointment, I traveled to the Far East twice in the past 2 years. The progress which I saw in these countries was encouraging. Many of the deficiencies which I noted in our military and economic efforts in Vietnam have since been corrected, thereby enhancing our hope for peace there.

The 89th Congress continued its strong support for our efforts to deter aggression in South Vietnam while remaining constructively critical of our efforts and concurring in every attempt which might bring about an early and equitable peace.

Similar support was given to our $3.5 billion assistance to underdeveloped countries. This aid is directed at achieving stability in these countries and lasting peace on the international scene.

More than ever before, our aid program is on a select basis with emphasis on self-help and loans rather than grants. For example, 84 percent of our development loans will go to eight countries in the coming year.

OTHER LEGISLATION

In many other long-neglected areas Congress also acted. Among these are revision of immigration quotas and copyright laws; standards for humane treatment of dogs, cats, and other animals in interstate commerce to be used for scientific purposes; provision of regional medical centers for research in heart disease, cancer, and stroke; aid to help communities provide legal services for the poor; standards for packaging and labeling to protect the consumer.

Let us hope that the initiatives taken by this Congress in meeting the challenges it faced will be the beginning of a stronger, more responsible role for Congress in the shaping of the truly great society of which this country is capable.

I include a self-explanatory tabulation with my remarks:

Voting record of Congressman Clement J. Zablocki, 89th Congress

Stand	Issue	Status
	INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS	
Voted for	$3,500,000,000 program of foreign economic and military assistance	Became law.
Voted for	Additional $415,000,000 for foreign aid to southeast Asia in fiscal 1966	Became law.
Voted for	U.S. participation in newly created Asian Development Bank	Became law.
Voted for	$110,000,000 for Peace Corps activities in fiscal 1967	Became law.
Voted for	Abolishing the national origins quota system of immigration	Became law.
Sponsored	Creation of an Atlantic Union delegation to meet with similar NATO country delegations regarding an Atlantic Union	Hearings in House.
Voted for	3-year extension of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	Became law.
Sponsored	Creation of an Academy of Foreign Affairs to train Government employees for overseas assignments	Pending in House.
Voted for	Congressional censure of Soviet Russia for acts of religious persecution	Approved by Congress.
Sponsored	Congressional consent for a Great Lakes Basin compact	Hearings in House.
Sponsored	Issuing of commemorative postage stamp honoring Poland's 1,000th anniversary as a Christian nation	Stamp issued.
Sponsored	Allowing the USIA film on President Kennedy to be shown in the United States	Became law.
Voted for	Establishing a 12-mile exclusive fishery zone for the United States in its coastal waters	Became law.
Sponsored	Creation of Byrd Commission to coordinate U.S. activities in Antarctica	Approved by subcommittee.
	NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY	
Voted for	$17,800,000,000 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels in fiscal 1967	Became law.
Voted for	Additional $4,800,000,000 to support U.S. efforts in Vietnam	Became law.
Voted for	$5,000,000,000 for National Aeronautics and Space Administration programs	Became law.
Voted for	$2,250,000,000 for Atomic Energy Commission in fiscal 1967, including $10,000,000 for underground tests of nuclear weapons.	Became law.
Sponsored	Prohibition of election campaign contributions by or for foreign interests	Became law.
Voted for	Making it a criminal offense to aid any foreign power or group engaged in armed conflict with the United States or to obstruct the movement of American military personnel or supplies.	Became law.
Voted for	Federal penalties for assassination, kidnaping, or assault of the President or Vice President	Became law.

Voting record of Congressman Clement J. Zablocki, 89th Congress—Continued

Stand	Issue	Status
	NATIONAL ECONOMY	
Voted for	Increase in the minimum wage to $1.60 an hour by 1968, extension of coverage to an additional 8,000,000 workers	Became law.
Voted for	Expansion of the unemployment compensation system	Died in conference.
Voted for	Repeal of sec. 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which allows States to outlaw the union shop	Passed by House.
Sponsored	Increase in the personal income tax exemption from $600 to $800	Pending in House.
Voted for	4-year extension of antipoverty effort, including programs for preschool children and older workers	Cleared for President.
Sponsored	Restricting the use of tax-exempt bonds by one locality in luring industry away from another	Pending in House.
Voted for	Extension of the training, counseling, and placement activities of the Manpower Development and Training Act	Cleared for President.
Voted for	Standards for packaging and labeling of food and other consumer goods	Cleared for President.
Voted for	Reform of the Parcel Post System	Became law.
Voted for	Raising limit of Small Business Administration loans by $125,000,000	Became law.
Voted for	Establishing uniform dates across the country for the period of daylight saving time	Became law.
Sponsored	Removal of antitrust exemption for organized professional baseball	Pending in House.
Voted for	Increased Federal aid for the Interstate Highway System	Became law.
Sponsored	Authorizing the sale of certain surplus Government property to local governments	Pending in House.
Voted for	Commission to coordinate economic development in the Appalachian region	Became law.
Voted for	$3,300,000,000 program of public works to develop industry and create jobs in economically depressed areas	Became law.
Sponsored	Small Business Conservation Act to preserve opportunity for free competition in business	Pending in House.
Voted for	Increase in the borrowing authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association to stimulate homebuilding and the mortgage market.	Became law.
Voted for	Temporary strengthening of the authority of Federal regulatory agencies over insured banks and savings and loan institutions.	Became law.
	EDUCATION	
Voted for	2-year $6,000,000,000 program to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education, including provision of textbooks and library resources in both public and private schools.	Cleared for President.
Voted for	3-year $3,970,000,000 program to help construct needed college facilities, strengthen libraries, and aid needy students	Cleared for President.
Voted for	5-year program to establish and support centers for advanced international studies	Cleared for President.
Sponsored	Extension of certain National Defense Education Act benefits to private schools	Pending in House.
Voted for	Expansion of health professions educational assistance programs to alleviate shortages of doctors, other health personnel.	Cleared for President.
Sponsored	Creation of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities; 3-year, $30,000,000 program of matching grants for support of the arts and scholarships in the humanities.	Became law.
Voted for	Expansion of the national school lunch program	Cleared for President.
Voted for	Insured low-interest loans to students attending vocational schools beyond the secondary level	Became law.
Voted for	Aid to community mental health centers and to train teachers of the handicapped and retarded	Became law.
Voted for	Extension of the Library Services and Construction Act	Became law.
Voted for	Creation of a National Teachers Corps	Became law.
	SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH AND WELFARE	
Voted for	Health insurance for the aged, 7-percent increase in social security benefits, other amendments to the Social Security Act	Became law.
Voted for	Social security benefits for persons 72 (by 1968) who have no other pension or relief	Became law.
Support	10-percent increase in social security benefits	Pending in House.
Sponsored	Reduction of social security retirement age to 60	Pending in House.
Voted for	Automatic cost-of-living increases for annuities of retired Government employees	Became law.
Supported	Demonstration cities program to rehabilitate slum areas, upgrade the educational, economic, and social conditions of their residents.	Cleared for President.
Voted for	Federal safety standards for new cars after January 1967	Became law.
Voted for	3-year highway safety program to encourage State, local, and private action	Became law.
Voted for	3-year program to help State and local authorities improve law enforcement, prevent crime	Became law.
Voted for	2-year extension of the Juvenile Delinquency Act	Became law.
Voted for	Special controls on the sale or distribution of stimulant or depressant drugs to those under 21	Became law.
Sponsored	Authorization of research and regulation to combat aircraft noise	Hearings in House.
Voted for	3-year program of grants for the control of air pollution	Became law.
Voted for	Voting Rights Act to authorize Federal voting registrars in areas of discrimination, bar literacy tests, direct elimination of poll taxes.	Became law.
Voted for	Civil Rights Act prohibiting incitement of a riot, banning discrimination in the selection of juries, and discrimination in the sale and rental of certain types of housing.	Passed by House.
Voted for	Revision of bail practices to assure that no person is unfairly detained	Became law.
Voted for	2-year, $300,000,000 program to stimulate development of urban mass transit systems	Became law.
Sponsored	Regulation of mailing lists to curb the flow of pornography	Pending in House.
Voted for	Regional medical centers to combat heart disease, cancer, and stroke	Became law.
Voted for	Expansion of health research facilities program of matching grants for construction	Became law.
Sponsored	Deduction from gross taxable income of expenses involved in adopting a child	Pending in House.
Voted for	Child Protection Act to ban hazardous toys and other articles from interstate commerce	Cleared for President.
Sponsored	Establishment of a residence for Capitol pages	Pending in House.
Voted for	Furnishing of books and other materials to handicapped persons besides the blind	Became law.
Voted for	Authorizing rehabilitation for narcotics addicts	Cleared for President.
	VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN	
Sponsored	Cold War GI bill authorizing educational and housing benefits for returning veterans	Became law.
Sponsored	Inclusion of apprenticeship training as an eligible program under the Cold War GI bill	Pending in House.
Voted for	Pay increases of approximately 10.4 percent for members of the armed services	Became law.
Voted for	Improved health benefits plan for members of the armed services, their dependents, and retired servicemen	Became law.
Voted for	Increase in veterans' disability compensation to reflect higher living costs	Became law.
Voted for	Special $10,000 life insurance for servicemen in combat areas	Became law.
Voted for	Equitable pay scales for teachers in Defense Department overseas schools for dependents of servicemen	Became law.
Sponsored	Veterans' medical benefits for American citizens who fought with allied armies in World Wars I and II	Pending in House.
Voted for	Increased allowances and training periods for disabled veterans pursuing vocational rehabilitation	Became law.
Voted for	Establishment of a new savings plan for servicemen overseas	Became law.
Voted for	Increased allowances under the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act	Became law.
	GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION	
Sponsored	Creation of a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress to study and recommend changes in legislative procedures.	Approved.
Voted for	Amendment of the House rules to permit consideration of a bill held more than 21 legislative days by the Rules Committee without action.	Approved.
Voted for	Creation of a bipartisan commission to study laws limiting political activities by Federal employees	Approved.
Voted for	Proposed constitutional amendment fixing procedures for Vice Presidential succession in case of Presidential disability.	Approved for ratification.
Sponsored	Proposed constitutional amendment abolishing the electoral college	Pending in House.
Voted for	Home rule referendum for the District of Columbia	House and Senate could not agree.
Sponsored	Creation of an Administration on Aging to coordinate information and services to State and local governments and promote research in the field of aging.	Became law.
Voted for	Creation of a Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development	Became law.
Voted for	Creation of a Cabinet-level Department of Transportation	Became law.
Voted for	Pay increase to make salaries of Federal employees comparable with those in private industry	Became law.
Sponsored	Creation of a Tercentenary Commission to commemorate the work of Father Jacques Marquette in North America	Became law.
Voted for	Federal standards for apportionment of congressional districts	Passed by House.
Sponsored	Creation of a Joint Congressional Committee on Central Intelligence	Pending in House.
Sponsored	Creation of a Joint Congressional Committee on Consumer Interests	Pending in House.

Voting record of Congressman Clement J. Zablocki, 89th Congress—Continued

Stand	Issue	Status
	AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES	
Voted for	2-year, $5,000,000,000 food-for-peace program	Cleared for President.
Opposed	Continued level of agriculture price support programs	Became law.
Sponsored	Establishment of the St. Croix National Scenic Riverway	Passed by Senate.
Voted for	Increased aid to communities in their effort to combat water pollution	Cleared for President.
Voted for	$1,970,000,000 program of navigation improvement, flood and beach erosion control, and hydroelectric power projects in 38 States including Wisconsin.	Became law.
Voted for	Continued study of the effects of insecticides, pesticides on fish and wildlife	Became law.
Voted for	Program of roadside beautification through control of billboards and auto junkyards	Became law.
Voted for	Expanded desalinization research and development program aimed at tapping new supplies of fresh water	Became law.
Voted for	Creation of Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore	Cleared for President.

Rollcall record of Congressman Clement J. Zablocki, 89th Congress

Session	Total roll and quorum calls	Rollcalls	Not voting [1]	Quorum calls	Absent on quorum [2]
1st	383	201	15	182	11
2d	399	193	32	206	24

[1] Paired on all rollcall votes that occurred on days absent and excused while on official business.

[2] Absence on quorum call does not necessarily mean an entire legislative day's absence.

IN DEFENSE OF THE AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION, OCTOBER 22, 1966

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Conyers] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, on September 15, John Herling, widely read columnist appearing in the Washington Daily News, wrote a critical column concerning the American Civil Liberties Union's "amicus curiae" brief in behalf of Teamsters President James Hoffa. As a member and supporter of the ACLU I have written the Washington Daily News to disagree with the position of this columnist regarding an organization which since 1920 has protected the rights and liberties of all Americans regardless of their popularity or unpopularity. In fairness to all concerned, I would like to insert in the Congressional Record Mr. Herling's column along with my letter to the Washington Daily News:

Shameful Story

(By John Herling)

The American Civil Liberties Union is fast becoming one of the most irresponsible organizations in the country. Its latest excursion into the fantasy of its civic virtue has led it to submit a brief "Amicus curiae" in defense of Teamsters President James P. Hoffa and one of his Tennessee lawyers Z. T. Osborn, both convicted of fixing juries.

The latter-day record of the ACLU is to my mind a shameful story of exploitation of the confidence that many liberals thruout the United States have placed in this organization. Ever since its creation right after World War I by Roger N. Baldwin, Norman Thomas, and Albert DeSilver, ACLU's courageous performance as a vanguard of liberties and its concern for basic human values were a torch of hope for the weak and defenseless. They talked up for the inarticulate.

As time went on, a slow accretion of respect began to develop around the country. In New York and Washington lawyers lent their services from time to time to the ACLU, not only out of compassion, but as a means to assuage their own guilt feelings about their normal course of conduct. It was a little like going to church on Sunday, a sort of act of self-forgiveness.

But under its early leadership there was a spine of sophistication in the posture of the ACLU and thrust, the ACLU was never meant to be a structure, but rather a network of service. You could disagree with Mr. Baldwin but he was—he is—an uncorrupted spirit. He kept the ACLU assertive, alive and responsive. It was never smug.

Today the ACLU is a changed thing. Many people today still regard it with the respect earned largely thru past performance. Today it has become a self-satisfied form of "establishment," a form of Madison Avenue-type establishment which provides little miracle packages of virtue.

So the ACLU has assumed a role, imbedded in a pattern of unctuousness. It said its outriders proceed with the assurance their motives are the purest, their intentions are the clearest and the answers they give are final and conclusive.

On the contrary, the ACLU has become a danger to civil liberties because it has sold too many people on the idea that it is the repository of virtue and disinterestedness. If the ACLU says so, it must be so!

This is a hoax of vast proportions like the sale of indulgences by the Vatican before the Reformation. The ACLU now finds itself often being used quite willingly as a service agency by groups and individuals that themselves abuse civil liberties and flout the law. For example, lawyers for Tony Provenzano, the Teamster vice-president in New Jersey, found guilty of felonies, sentenced to jail, used the technique of an ACLU brief to keep Tony Pro out of jail for years as a victim of violated civil liberties!

By the same dreadful token, when Jimmy Hoffa was convicted of jury tampering, the ACLU was inveigled, by one means or another, to submit a brief in Hoffa's defense to the Court of Appeals in Cincinnati. But shame was compounded here because it turned out to be a stupid and incompetent brief. With the case now backed up to the Supreme Court, the ACLU has come up in its hot hand with another brief in behalf of Hoffa.

The point I am making here is that the Hoffa combine—which includes lawyers of a certain sort, legislative lobbyists and a coterie of politicians who have gotten and will get Teamsters Contributions—believe, that the "amicus brief" submitted by the ACLU will influence the Supreme Court by the pressure of the hidden dimension in ACLU's past glory.

November 5, 1966.

Editor, Washington Daily News,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Editor: I would like to call your attention to the column by John Herling which appeared in this newspaper on the 15th of September which criticized the American Civil Liberties Union because it recently filed an "amicus curiae" brief in defense of Teamsters President James Hoffa. As a member of the Board of Directors of the Detroit Chapter of the ACLU I am distressed that a columnist would condemn an organization which has constantly fought for the civil rights and liberties of all Americans regardless of the popularity of their views.

If the defense of a person whose constitutional rights have been clearly violated is condemnable, then the ACLU stands convicted. However, during its entire 46 year history the Union has enjoyed ever increasing respect and confidence from members of the Bar, jurists from many different courts and the American public in general. This feeling toward the ACLU prevails because all Americans know that if they ever need a strong defense of rights which have been violated, they too can turn to the American Civil Liberties Union for help. President Johnson only recently said to the ACLU "All fair-minded Americans stand in your debt. They know that the test of our ability to preserve and expand freedom in the world rest on our success in protecting civil liberty at home."

In the Hoffa case, the ACLU contended that Edward Grady Partin, a Teamsters Union local official, was asked by the government to serve as an informer and report if he saw "any evidence of jury tampering or other illegal activities". Further, payments totaling $1,200 were made to Partin's wife under the authorization of a Department of Justice investigator. The information relating to the Hoffa case which was obtained in this manner constituted a clear violation of the fourth amendment proscription against unreasonable searches. The ACLU asserted that since the "consent" to enter Hoffa's private hotel room was procured by Partin's concealment of his role as a government spy and his passing himself off as a loyal friend, to make Hoffa "assume the risk that so abhorrent a search would be made by the government of a free country would sacrifice the fourth amendment."

The position of the ACLU is that the Federal Government encouraged certain persons to commit crimes in order to get enough information to convict Hoffa. There is a revulsion in our society against such "underhanded" tactics as were used in this case. The ACLU brief said that much of the revulsion is derived from a feeling "that a decent society does not tempt and solicit its people into crime, does not seek out, play upon and then punish the weak-willed and the susceptible. Few things cause greater resentment and, ultimately, contempt for the law than the use of an entrapper who may himself be a 'drug addict, pickpocket, pimp, or petty criminal' ".

I am hopeful that future columnists in your paper will study the merits of the case before any uninformed statements are made about an organization which has devoted its entire work to protecting the rights and liberties of us all, including Mr. Herling.

Sincerely,

JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

GONZALEZ PUBLISHES COMPLETE VOTING RECORD FOR 1966

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have already inserted in the RECORD my voting and attendance records for 1965 and for most of 1966. With this installment, my published voting record is complete for both sessions of the 89th Congress. It follows:

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
367	Oct. 17	Quorum call	Present.
368	Oct. 17	S. 3675, bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act to provide for determination of claims of U.S. citizens against China. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 249 to 3.)	Yes.
369	Oct. 17	S. 985, Fair Packaging Act, adoption of conference report. (Passed 242 to 6.)	Yes.
370	Oct. 17	S. 2947, bill to improve the Federal Water Pollution Act to strengthen the act, adoption of conference report. (Passed 247 to 0.)	Yes.
371	Oct. 18	Quorum call	Present.
372	Oct. 18	Quorum call	Present.
373	Oct. 18	H.R. 18381, supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1967, motion to recommit. (Passed 167 to 121.)	No.
374	Oct. 18	H. Res. 1060, resolution to approve contempt citation by HUAC against Milton M. Cohen, motion to recommit. (Failed 90 to 181.)	Yes.
375	Oct. 18	H. Res. 1062, resolution to approve contempt citation by HUAC against Jeremiah Stamler, motion to recommit. (Failed 54 to 182.)	Yes.
376	Oct. 18	H. Res. 1062, resolution to approve contempt citation by HUAC against Jeremiah Stamler. (Passed 174 to 37, but no quorum.)	No.
377	Oct. 19	Quorum call	Present.
378	Oct. 19	H. Res. 1062, resolution to approve contempt citation by HUAC against Jeremiah Stamler. (Passed 219 to 69.)	No.
379	Oct. 19	H.R. 5688, District of Columbia crime bill authorizing interrogation of suspects without benefit of counsel. (Passed 208 to 79.)	No.
380	Oct. 19	H.R. 18233, Public Works Act, motion to recommit	No.
381	Oct. 19	S.J. Res. 167, joint resolution to enable United States to hold an International Conference on Water for Peace. (Passed 196 to 79.)	Yes.
382	Oct. 19	Quorum call	Present.
383	Oct. 19	Quorum call	Present.
384	Oct. 19	Quorum call	Present.
385	Oct. 19	H. Res. 1013, resolution creating Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, without proper safeguards, motion to lay on the table. (Failed 24 to 238.)	Yes.
386	Oct. 19	H. Res. 1013, resolution creating Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, as amended to correct defects. (Passed 256 to 0.)	Yes.
387	Oct. 20	Quorum call	Present.
388	Oct. 20	Quorum call	Present.
389	Oct. 20	S. 3708, Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, adoption of conference report. (Passed 142 to 126.)	Yes.
390	Oct. 20	H.R. 15111, bill to amend Equal Opportunity Act, the war against poverty, adoption of conference report. (Passed 170 to 109.)	Yes.
391	Oct. 20	H.R. 18223, Public Works Act, on agreeing to Senate amendment relating to projects in Illinois and Missouri. (Passed 261 to 0.)	Yes.
392	Oct. 20	H.R. 13161, Elementary and Secondary Education Act amendments, adoption of conference report. (Passed 185 to 76.)	Yes.
393	Oct. 20	H.R. 17607, bill to suspend temporarily the business investment credit, motion to recommit conference report. (Failed 57 to 184.)	No.
394	Oct. 20	H.R. 17607, bill to suspend temporarily the business investment credit, adoption of conference report. (Passed 161 to 76.)	Yes.
395	Oct. 20	H.R. 13103, bill to provide equitable tax treatment for foreign investment in the United States, motion to recommit conference report. (Failed 95 to 127.)	No.
396	Oct. 20	H.R. 13103, bill to provide equitable tax treatment for foreign investment in the United States, adoption of conference report. (Passed 171 to 46.)	Yes.
397	Oct. 21	Quorum call	Present.
398	Oct. 21	H.R. 14644, bill to amend Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, adoption of conference report. (Passed 222 to 13.)	Yes.
399	Oct. 21	H.R. 18381, supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1967, motion to concur with Senate amendment. (Passed 129 to 102.)	Yes.

THE FRESHMAN CLASS OF THE 89TH

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I have been a Member of the House for 8 years and I have never known a more outstanding freshman class than those of the 89th. During this particular term I have felt an unusual pleasure in my association with these outstanding men and women. This class was headed by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, Mr. LEE HAMILTON, who brought great honor to Indiana by his outstanding leadership. I have heard so many members of the class express their gratitude to the leadership of the House for the cooperation they have received during these past 2 years and I think we should acknowledge their contribution to the welfare of the Nation. It has been great. I would hope that all of them would return, particularly on this side of the aisle. I do want to say, Mr. Speaker, that these people have been outstanding in their service, in their dedication, in their understanding of the workings of this House, and in their appreciation of the leadership. I wish every one of them well.

THE FRESHMAN CLASS OF THE FIGHTING 89TH

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, as perhaps the only member of the freshman class on this side of the aisle present at the moment, I feel an obligation to respond to the generous words of my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUSH]. Mr. Speaker, I am sure I speak for all those Members when I say we came to this House 2 years ago with some sense of trepidation and some sense of being a freshman in the House of Representatives. This would, it seemed to me, be not unlike the year 1932 when I was a freshman at the U.S. Naval Academy when we would be subjected to some hazing.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIDER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, most Members of the House know that the gentleman addressing the House is probably one of the greatest wartime heroes that this country has ever developed. Under his command his submarine sank more Japanese tonnage in World War II than any other. I find it a little hard to believe that he would come to the Halls of Congress and say that he came here with some type of trepidation.

Mr. GRIDER. I thank the gentleman for those generous remarks. I may say parenthetically, Mr. Speaker, that commanding a submarine and serving in the House of Representatives are two activities that are not altogether unlike. There is always the unexpected attack, the distant explosions, and the wonder as to what the enemy is doing.

Speaking as a Member who has completed his first term, let me say my experience here has been the great experience of my life. And I am sure the same would be said by all my freshman colleagues. This has been made so because of the cordial reception that we have received from everyone on both sides of the aisle—from the leadership, from the inspiration of the Speaker down to the assistance, the advice, help, and cooperation of every Member. I am hopeful that I will serve many terms in this House, Mr. Speaker, but I am certain that this 89th Congress will always retain a special place in the heart and memory of each of us who call ourselves the freshman class of 89.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Chair declares a recess of 10 minutes and the bells will not be rung.

There was no objection.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 3 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair will receive a report.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed to join a committee of the Senate to inform the President that the Congress is ready to adjourn, and to ask him if he has any further communications to make to the Congress, has performed that duty. The President has directed us to say that he has no further communication to make to the Congress.

DATE OF ADJOURNMENT OF THE 89TH CONGRESS SINE DIE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. Con. Res. 1048

Resolve, by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Saturday, October 22, 1966, and that when they adjourn on said day, they stand adjourned sine die.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE AUTHORIZED TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DULY PASSED BY THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. Con. Res. 1049

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIXING THE TIME OF ASSEMBLY OF THE 90TH CONGRESS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. Res. 1322

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America and Congress assembled, That the Ninetieth Congress shall assemble at noon on Tuesday, January 10, 1967.

The joint resolution was engrossed, ordered to be read a third time was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF THE RULES AND MANUAL OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR THE 90TH CONGRESS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. Res. 1075

Resolved, That a revised edition of the Rules and Manual of the House of Representatives for the Ninetieth Congress be printed as a House document, and that 1,600 additional copies shall be printed and bound for the use of the House of Representatives, of which 700 copies shall be bound in leather with thumb index and delivered as may be directed by the Parliamentarian of the House for distribution to officers and Members of Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the House, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS, APPOINT COMMISSIONS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the 2d session of the 89th Congress, the Speaker be authorized to accept resignations, and to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REPORTS OF THE 89TH CONGRESS, FOLLOWING SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that reports filed with the clerk following the sine die adjournment by committees authorized by the House to conduct investigations may be printed by the clerk as reports of the 89th Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS IN CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House shall have the privilege, until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published, to extend and revise their own remarks in the Congressional Record on more than one subject, if they so desire, and may also include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extensions of remarks; but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred, or to any speech delivered, subsequent to the adjournment of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman a question as to one part of his request.

The gentleman from Louisiana is asking that any Member may extend his remarks without regard to the number of times, is that correct?

Mr. BOGGS. I will reread the request.

It is "that all Members of the House shall have the privilege, until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published, to extend and revise their own remarks in the Congressional Record on more than one subject, if they so desire, and may also include short quotations."

This is the request that is made at the adjournment of every session of the Congress. It follows completely the procedure of the House of Representatives that has been followed for many, many years.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I will point out that that was adopted a few years ago. But I recall when I first came to the House of Representatives, there was a limitation in this kind of request.

As most of the Members of the House know, on many occasions I have expressed myself in regard to the wastefullness incurred as a result of the printing of the Congressional Record. Here on the last day of the session, Members, some of them who have not been here for many days, are seeking recognition and permission to extend their remarks without limitation.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to object to this request, but I am expressing the hope that with the beginning of the 90th Congress that we can adopt some rules governing the printing of this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that would be at least sane and sensible. The rules that we have now have been abused and in many cases that has cost the Government and the taxpayers many thousands of dollars. And as I have said before, the rules when so abused caused the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD many times to be not a record of the proceedings of this House of Representatives, but the record of what some members might wish the proceedings might have been.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO CHAIRMEN AND RANKING MINORITY MEMBER OF STANDING COMMITTEES AND SUBCOMMITTEES TO EXTEND REMARKS AND INCLUDE SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE WORK

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the chairmen of all the standing committees and subcommittees of the House may extend their remarks up to and including the publication of the last RECORD and to include a summary of the work of their committees; also that the ranking minority member of such standing committee or any subcommittee may have the same permission to extend their remarks and to include a summary, if they desire, from their point of view, separately from that of the chairman.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN TOM MURRAY, OF TENNESSEE

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I could not let this occasion pass without saying something about a Member of our Tennessee delegation, the Honorable TOM MURRAY, who is leaving this House after 24 years of excellent service. Those of you who have served longer than I know the excellent record that my friend, TOM MURRAY, has made.

The Murray family have contributed much to Jackson and Madison County, the Seventh Congressional District, the State of Tennessee, and the Nation as well. We wish for TOM the best of everything in the many years to come, as he retires back to his home community of Jackson, Tenn., there to enjoy the fine friendship and fellowship that he has made through the years, and as he sits on that park bench in front of his office and speaks to everyone, regardless of race, creed, or color, as they come by and greet him every morning that he is able to be down there.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVERETT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think it is quite appropriate that the gentleman has taken this moment to pay a tribute and a deserved honor to a great American who is retiring from this body. It is my privilege to have served for a year or so as a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service under its distinguished chairman, the Honorable TOM MURRAY. I always found him to be courteous, polite, and respectful to all the members on the committee.

He is a man who has rendered great service to his country, and I join with the gentleman in wishing him the very best of health and happiness in the years to come.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVERETT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Tennessee and the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi. We shall all miss TOM MURRAY a great deal. He has been a hard working, diligent Member of this body.

I might say that I got to know TOM MURRAY even before I came to this body. His uncle lived in the same apartment house in which my wife and I lived shortly after we were married, and I heard a great deal about Congressman MURRAY and got to meet him before I came here. We shall all miss him.

I hope he has a happy life and that he recovers his former robust health.

Mr. EVERETT. I thank the gentleman.

THE APPROPRIATION BILLS, 89TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House on yesterday, I submitted for yesterday's RECORD a summarized report on the appropriations business of the session, but it was apparently mislaid somewhere en route to the presses, because it did not appear in the proceedings of yesterday. An effort is being made by printing officials to find it and when it turns up, it will be printed. And we plan to insert in a later RECORD, within a few days, a more detailed report on the budget and appropriations business of the year.

But in the meantime, and in order that Members and others may have the precise figures available, I am inserting herewith two tabulations of the appropriation totals for the 15 appropriation bills of the session.

Summary of totals of appropriation amounts in the appropriation bills, 89th Cong., 2d sess.

[Does not include any back-door appropriations, or permanent appropriations [1] under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills]

	All figures are rounded amounts		
	Bills for fiscal 1966	Bills for fiscal 1967	Bills for the session
A. House actions:			
1. Budget requests	$15,949,000,000	$114,842,000,000	$130,791,000,000
2. Amounts in 15 bills passed by House	15,701,000,000	114,830,000,000	130,531,000,000
3. Change from corresponding budget requests	−248,000,000	−12,000,000	−260,000,000
B. Senate actions:			
1. Budget requests	16,157,000,000	115,008,000,000	131,165,000,000
2. Amounts in 15 bills passed by Senate	15,937,000,000	114,720,000,000	130,657,000,000
3. Change from corresponding budget requests	−220,000,000	−288,000,000	−508,000,000
4. Compared with House amounts in these 15 bills	+236,000,000	−110,000,000	+126,000,000
C. Final actions:			
1. Budget requests	16,157,000,000	115,008,000,000	131,165,000,000
2. Amounts approved in 15 bills	15,924,000,000	[2] 114,358,000,000	[2] 130,282,000,000
3. Comparisons—			
(a) With corresponding budget requests	−233,000,000	−650,000,000	−883,000,000
(b) With bills of the 1st sess., 89th			+23,244,000,000

---

[1] Permanent appropriations were tentatively estimated in January budget at about $13,800,000,000 for fiscal year 1967.

[2] Includes $875,000,000 for fiscal 1968 (grant for mass transportation and urban renewal).

Source: Prepared by Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

Summary of action on budget estimates in appropriation bills, 89th Cong., 2d sess.

[Does not include any back-door appropriations, or permanent appropriations [1] under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills]

	Budget estimates to House	Passed House	Budget estimates to Senate	Passed Senate	Enacted	(+) or (−), compared to budget
Bills for fiscal 1967:						
Interior	$1,329,960,500	$1,295,169,500	$1,340,260,500	$1,329,755,000	$1,321,615,800	−$18,644,700
Loan authorization	(26,000,000)	(26,000,000)	(26,000,000)	(26,000,000)	(26,000,000)	
Treasury-Post Office	7,246,720,000	7,210,177,135	7,246,720,000	7,210,049,135	7,196,429,135	−50,290,865
Agriculture	7,022,638,000	6,876,027,000	7,022,938,000	7,064,343,300	6,994,590,150	−28,347,850
Loan authorization	(702,100,000)	(852,000,000)	(702,100,000)	(932,000,000)	(932,000,000)	(+229,900,000)
Labor-HEW	10,083,184,500	10,573,272,500	10,083,184,500	10,473,309,500	10,463,244,500	+380,060,000
Independent offices	14,319,611,291	14,017,299,000	14,329,863,291	14,118,607,000	14,065,851,000	−264,012,291
Legislative	173,793,578	172,146,333	214,749,763	214,418,213	214,463,913	−285,850
Defense	57,664,353,000	58,616,445,000	57,664,353,000	58,189,872,000	58,067,472,000	+403,119,000
District of Columbia:						
Federal funds	53,394,000	52,394,000	53,394,000	53,394,000	53,394,000	
Loan authorization	(26,225,000)	(23,000,000)	(38,225,000)	(37,527,500)	(37,527,500)	(−697,500)
Military construction	1,114,947,000	1,019,340,000	1,114,947,000	986,518,000	979,570,000	−135,377,000
Foreign assistance	3,945,095,000	3,604,048,800	3,945,095,000	3,493,473,500	3,493,473,500	−451,621,500
Public works	4,167,073,000	4,110,932,000	4,167,073,000	4,139,244,000	4,134,511,000	−32,562,000
State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary	2,598,638,500	2,364,008,600	2,634,405,000	2,350,941,600	2,347,826,600	−286,578,400
Supplemental	5,122,760,629	4,919,076,929	5,191,413,629	5,096,338,579	5,025,264,579	−166,149,050
Subtotal, 1967 bills	114,842,168,998	114,830,336,797	115,008,396,683	114,720,263,827	[2] 114,357,706,177	−650,690,506
Supplementals for fiscal 1966:						
Defense supplemental (Vietnam)	13,135,719,000	13,135,719,000	13,135,719,000	13,135,719,000	13,135,719,000	
2d supplemental	2,813,552,168	2,564,872,568	3,020,810,903	2,801,226,003	2,788,143,303	−232,667,600
Subtotal, 1966 bills	15,949,271,168	15,700,591,568	16,156,529,903	15,936,945,003	15,923,862,303	−232,667,600
Cumulative total for the session:						
House	130,791,440,166	130,530,928,365				−260,511,801
Senate			131,164,926,586	130,657,208,830		−507,717,756
Enacted			131,164,926,586		[2] 130,281,568,480	−883,358,106

---

[1] Permanent appropriations were tentatively estimated in January budget at about $13,800,000,000 for fiscal year 1967.

[2] Includes $875,000,000 for fiscal 1968 (grants for mass transportation and urban renewal).

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the House will stand in brief recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills, a joint resolution, and concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 17271. An act to amend section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $200 to $500 the monthly combat pay exclusion for commissioned officers serving in combat zones;

H.J. Res. 1322. Joint resolution fixing the time of assembly of the 90th Congress;

H. Con. Res. 416. Concurrent resolution to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia;

H. Con. Res. 1048. Concurrent resolution providing for adjournment sine die; and

H. Con. Res. 1049. Concurrent resolution providing that during the sine die adjournment the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate be authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2451. An act for the relief of Margaret Lee Weil; and

S. 2770. An act to control the use of the design of the great seal of the United States and of the seal of the President of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendments numbered 1 and 2 on the bill H.R. 3348, entitled "An act to authorize a program for the construction of facilities for the teaching of veterinary medicine and a program of loans for students of veterinary medicine."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the House amendments to the Senate amendments numbered 2, 7, 8, and 9, and recedes from its amendments numbered 3, 4, 6, 10, 11, and 12 to the bill H.R. 14347, entitled "An act to liberalize the provisions for payment to parents and children of dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the Senate amendment on the bill H.R. 11631, entitled "An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to clarify the responsibility of the Veterans' Administration with respect to the training and education of health service personnel."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a resolution as follows:

S. Res. 318

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join a similar committee of the House of Representatives to notify the President of the United States that the two Houses have completed the business of the session and are ready to adjourn unless he has some further communication to make to them.

SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER. The Chair requests the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] to assume the chair.

Mr. BOB WILSON assumed the chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

COMMENDATION OF SPEAKER

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 1076).

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 1076

Resolved, That the thanks of the House are presented to the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives, for the able, impartial, and dignified manner in which he has presided over the deliberations and performed the arduous duties of the Chair during the present term of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, speaking for the Members on this side of the aisle, and I am sure that it is true that I also speak for those on the other side of the aisle, we heartily endorse the adoption of the resolution unanimously.

The Speaker has been outstanding in his performance as presiding officer of this House. As mentioned earlier today, he has been fair in protecting the rights of the minority on this side of the aisle, always looking to the practices and purposes of what minorities are for. We were pleased to see him handle in such efficient and fair manner all the operations of this great deliberative body.

I know the Speaker's great love for the House of Representatives, which many of us share. I have had the opportunity and the privilege of serving with the Speaker 32 years. Out of that has grown a warm friendship, which I am sure will be lasting.

As this session closes, may we say to the Speaker from the bottom of our hearts that we wish him well, and we hope he has a wonderful vacation and comes back here in January. As mentioned earlier, I do trust he will see many, many new faces when he comes back, and that they will be on this side of the aisle.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Except for the last part of the gentleman's statement I should like to concur fully in the very generous remarks made by the distinguished minority whip.

I said earlier today that all of us on both sides of the aisle are blessed indeed in the man who occupies the high office of Speaker of this House.

I know that this resolution, offered by the minority whip and the acting majority leader, expresses the sentiment of every Member of this body, although on cold type it really does not express the love all of us feel for JOHN McCORMACK.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

COMMENDATION TO THE 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, my very dear friends and distinguished colleagues, I would like at this time to express my great pleasure not only in working with you but in the personal friendships that have developed between us throughout the 89th Congress, and particularly the 2d session of the 89th Congress, and to note with satisfaction the many accomplishments of this session.

The overall spirit of the House since the session began in January of this year has been one of splendid cooperation and of reasonable and understanding give and take.

The party in power has resisted the temptation to break up into bickering factions and has worked with yeomanlike vigor in pushing through its program.

The minority party, on the other hand, has acted with equal maturity, avoiding the role of the caustic critic and assuming instead the position of a friendly adviser and a friendly opponent.

The leadership of both parties in the House has earned the praise of everyone concerned.

As Speaker of the House I have been honored to work with so remarkable a body of individuals primarily concerned with the public good. The splendid record established during this session of the Congress is fresh in the minds of all of us and there is no reason, therefore, to cite in detail our many and varied accomplishments.

All in all, I think it is safe to say that history will look back upon the 89th Congress, the 2d session, with a friendly eye, recalling with satisfaction what transpired and marking it up on the credit side.

In talking to many Members of the House over the past few months I have concluded that the general feeling is in keeping with my own. It is a pleasure to be working with so many who worked so hard and accomplished so much in behalf of worthwhile principles and policies.

I would like especially to pay my respects today to the distinguished and exceptionable majority leader CARL ALBERT—how happy we all are in the improvement of his condition—and the outstanding majority whip, HALE BOGGS, both of whom have served with remarkable ability throughout the session and whose loyality and devotion to me is most noticeable and which I shall never forget.

At the same time, I want to cite the extraordinary and remarkable minority leader, GERALD R. FORD, and the minority whip, LESLIE ARENDS, whose services to their party and the House and their friendship to me have rendered them of great importance in all that has transpired this year in the House.

The pure partisan politician will never pass up the opportunity to embarrass an opponent on any count and looks with joy upon the chance to cast discredit upon the opposition party as a whole whenever possible. It is an outstanding fact of this session that nothing of this nature marred the record of the House, and of this we can all be especially proud.

As Speaker, I have endeavored to play the role in an impartial way to the fullest extent possible. When I take that chair every day, I take it as the Speaker, not as JOHN McCORMACK, the Democrat and the leader of my party in the House. May I say that this task has been made considerably easier in this regard in consequence of the full cooperation and cordiality of everybody concerned. The many courtesies extended to me by Members on both sides of the aisle have eased the way to the smooth and satisfactory functioning of the many House procedures. My job as Speaker has been to apply the rules as fairly as possible to every Member of every party and at every level of importance.

My memory is long and I can recall my own experiences as a Member of the House, out of power, and as a junior Member of the congressional organization. Some of my fondest memories concern the friendly responses of the major officers of the House to my appeals as a young Congressman for aid and assistance in the promotion of the interests of my district and of my constituents.

As majority leader and more recently as Speaker, I have endeavored to provide a similar service to the younger Members of the House. I hope I have accomplished my purpose to the satisfaction of all.

In looking back on this session I also realize the great importance of the roles played by the many employees of the House who have performed their duties with diligence and, for so doing, deserve the thanks of every Member. I wish I could mention every name and everyone. I have in mind those from the pages up—not from the Parliamentarian down but from the pages up. The cleaners, and others, all human beings, like we are.

I want to pay my respects and address my thanks to the Clerk of the House, Mr. Roberts, to the inimitable Doorkeeper, Bill Miller, to the Sergeant at Arms, Zeake Johnson, to the Postmaster, Mr. Morris, and their associates to our acting Chaplain, Dr. Latch; but over and above all I want to extend my special thanks to that great human being, to the man with that mind of brilliance and commonsense, that mind of logic, that mind of wisdom, our great Parliamentarian, the No. 1 Parliamentarian of the world, Lewis Deschler. I also extend my sincere thanks to those associated with him.

It is highly important that in acting out the democratic thesis in this Chamber the Members keep in mind the high principles upon which the Nation stands. The record establishd by the 89th Congress, 2d session, makes clear the fact that this was paramount in the minds of everyone involved in our proceedings. There were many problems confronting the Nation. All of them needed solving posthaste. We had several different ideas as to how best to solve the problems, and we fought out each and every issue to the satisfaction of all participants. The results, I believe, are encouraging, revealing once again the basic strength of democracy in action.

It has often been observed that nothing is so quickly forgotten by a Congressman as a campaign promise. This, of course, is generally not the case. This assertion is incorrect in this particular year in almost every detail, for the Congress has worked mightily for months on matters involving all the campaign promises of both parties and all factions within both parties.

Mr. Speaker, the never-ending battle against poverty, ignorance, and disease, and racial justice is imperative in this country.

The 89th Congress, 2d session, performed brilliantly, because our Government is the sum total of the people which it serves.

The choices that we personally make and courses that we personally follow, the contests that we personally join, determine the nature of our place in history.

Mr. Speaker, the performance of the House of Representatives—and how I love the House of Representatives, as my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Arends], said—the performance of the House of Representatives of the past session gives to us every reason for hope in this respect, for here sitting are honorable men and women, devoted to honorable service and magnificent results.

Mr. Speaker, I deeply appreciate the manifestations of friendship and respect, not only upon this occasion but what has been extended to me throughout the years during which I have served in this great body and as majority leader, and now as Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the great record made by the House of Representatives and the 2d session of the 89th Congress.

Thank you very much. [Applause. Members rising.]

(Thereupon, the Speaker resumed the chair.)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. McCormack and to include a resolution.

Mr. Teague of Texas in five instances and to include extraneous material.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Duncan of Tennessee), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Laird.

Mr. Cunningham in three instances.

Mr. Conte.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Mahon) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey.

Mr. Fallon.

Mr. Garmatz.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2024. An act for the relief of Louis T. Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary;

S. 2877. An act to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor;

S. 3301. An act for the relief of Charles Bernstein;

S. 3621. An act for the relief of Timothy Joseph Shea and Elsie Annet Shea; and

S. 3750. An act for the relief of Martha Blankenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1319. An act to authorize a work release program for persons sentenced by the courts of the District of Columbia; to define the powers and duties in relation thereto, and for other purposes;

S. 1674. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make disposition of geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources, and for other purposes;

S. 2010. An act for the relief of Fun Wat Hoy;

S. 2040. An act for the relief of Dr. Dean H. Gosselin;

S. 2109. An act for the relief of Dr. Olibio S. Rodriguez-Eiras;

S. 2222. An act for the relief of Susan Jeanne Clynes;

S. 2491. An act for the relief of Dr. Juan Federico Antonio Lamas y Parra;

S. 2750. An act for the relief of You I. Souk;

S. 2763. An act for the relief of Dr. Marcial Alfredo Marti (Alfredo Marti);

S. 2798. An act for the relief of CWO Glen Zeigler, U.S. Navy (retired);

S. 3209. An act for the relief of Zoifia Zych;

S. 3222. An act for the relief of Dusko Doder;

S. 3254. An act to amend section 2072 and 2112 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the scope of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and to repeal inconsistent legislation;

S. 3258. An act for the relief of Deniz Hikmet Sen Manes;

S. 3318. An act for the relief of Yung Mi Kim;

S. 3358. An act for the relief of Theodora Bezates;

S. 3466. An act to change the name of the Rolla Jewel Bearing plant at Rolla, N. Dak., to the William Langer Jewel Bearing plant; and

S.J. Res. 133. Joint resolution designating February 1967 as American History Month.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 6958. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to promote savings under the Internal Revenue Service's automatic data processing system;

H.R. 9167. An act to amend title of the United States Code to enable the courts to deal more effectively with the problem of narcotic addiction, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11216. An act relating to the tariff treatment of articles assembled abroad of products of the United States, and for other purposes;

H.R. 17607. An act to suspend the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property;

H.R. 17636. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes;

H.R. 18119. An act making appropriations for the Department of State, Justice and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 18233. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. It is a very pleasant and delightful duty for the Chair to recognize the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 1048, the Chair declares the 2d session of the 89th Congress adjourned sine die.

Thereupon (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 1048, the House adjourned sine die.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the authority granted the Speaker by House Concurrent Resolution 1049, 89th Congress, he did on October 24, 1966, sign enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2451. An act for the relief of Che Yim Loh; and

S. 2770. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to prohibit the use of the likenesses of the great seal of the United States falsely to indicate Federal agency, sponsorship, or approval.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the authority granted the Speaker by House Concurrent Resolution 1049, 89th Congress, he did on the following dates sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On October 24, 1966:

H.R. 1328. An act for the relief of Glenn D. Humes;

H.R. 1388. An act for the relief of Maj. Ralph D. Caldwell;

H.R. 2129. An act for the relief of Maria Rossi;

H.R. 2266. An act to provide for the settlement of claims resulting from an explosion at a U.S. ordnance plant in Bowie County, Tex., on July 8, 1963;

H.R. 3500. An act for the relief of Mrs. Emilie Boulay;

H.R. 3526. An act for the relief of Dr. Eric J. Lazaro;

H.R. 3530. An act for the relief of Dr. Miguel Angel Martinez y Corpas;

H.R. 3531. An act for the relief of Dr. Julio Cesar Muñiz y Sotolongo;

H.R. 3536. An act for the relief of George R. Lore;

H.R. 3689. An act for the relief of Juanita Cereguine de Burgh;

H.R. 3756. An act for the relief of James S. Kahriman;

H.R. 3879. An act for the relief of Ernest Buillet;

H.R. 3901. An act for the relief of Miss Elisabeth von Oberndorff;

H.R. 3993. An act to authorize the issuance of certificates of citizenship in the Canal Zone;

H.R. 4077. An act for the relief of Jean A. Quaintance;

H.R. 4454. An act for the relief of Herman Feldman;

H.R. 5622. An act for the relief of Dr. Jorge Ignacio Miquel Franca;

H.R. 5958. An act relating to applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody pursuant to judgments of State courts;

H.R. 5969. An act for the relief of Dr. Raul R. Moriff;

H.R. 6035. An act for the relief of the estate of Maj. John W. Roy, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6103. An act for the relief of the city of Umatilla, Oreg.;

H.R. 6115. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose A. G. Mendoza;

H.R. 6226. An act for the relief of Dr. Bienvenido Benach Carreras;

H.R. 6443. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio U. Catasus;

H.R. 6899. An act for the relief of Dr. Myriam de la Caridad Ares y Fernandez de Bosch;

H.R. 7026. An act for the relief of Nathan Levine;

H.R. 7341. An act for the relief of Dr. Ricardo R. Fuste;

H.R. 7382. An act to amend section 1391 of title 28 of the United States Code relating to venue;

H.R. 8358. An act for the relief of the Milan Compress Co.;

H.R. 8614. An act for the relief of Miss Rajka Soda;

H.R. 8937. An act for the relief of Charles A. Turner;

H.R. 9213. An act for the relief of William A. Buzbee;

H.R. 9217. An act for the relief of certain civilian employees of the Department of the Army at Fort Sam Houston, Tex.;

H.R. 9036. An act for the relief of J. M. Pendarvis, Jr.;

H.R. 9348. An act for the relief of Capt. Harold G. Wilmarth;

H.R. 10151. An act for the relief of Dr. Luis Crespo;

H.R. 10249. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elisabeth Manninen;

H.R. 10253. An act for the relief of Dr. Luis E. Bencomo;

H.R. 10259. An act for the relief of Dr. Allan Baumal;

H.R. 10288. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio B. Santillano;

H.R. 10662. An act for the relief of Leonard J. Dalton;

H.R. 10832. An act for the relief of Gloria Alesna Relampagos;

H.R. 10846. An act for the relief of Katherine Nabokoff and Emil Homoceanu;

H.R. 10876. An act to authorize and direct the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration to quit claim certain property in Jackson County, Ala., to Skyline Churches Cemetery, a corporation;

H.R. 11224. An act for the relief of Dr. Pedro Raphael;

H.R. 11254. An act for the relief of Julieta Gloria Bersamin;

H.R. 11256. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the priority and effect of Federal tax liens and levies, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11467. An act for the relief of CWO Joseph J. McGavin;

H.R. 11570. An act for the relief of James R. Kemp;

H.R. 11590. An act for the relief of Dr. Jacinta Llorens;

H.R. 11617. An act for the relief of Jun Becky;

H.R. 11640. An act for the relief of Dr. Juan Antonio Dumois;

H.R. 11676. An act for the relief of Johnny R. Bradley and others;

H.R. 11952. An act for the relief of Maria Kazidakis;

H.R. 11957. An act for the relief of Muriel Williams;

H.R. 12237. An act for the relief of Tri-States Construction Co., Inc.;

H.R. 12317. An act for the relief of Dr. Augusto J. Fernandez-Conde;

H.R. 12512. An act for the relief of Carl V. Elliott;

H.R. 12781. An act for the relief of Dr. Mario Orlando Santos-Estevez;

H.R. 12826. An act for the relief of Kim Kap Yung;

H.R. 12920. An act for the relief of Alexander Francis Saker, M.D.;

H.R. 13101. An act for the relief of Mario P. Navarro, M.D.;

H.R. 13192. An act for the relief of Nermin Demirbag Lavapies;

H.R. 13370. An act to authorize the disposal of fused crude aluminum oxide from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13551. An act to amend the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13661. An act to authorize the disposal of battery-grade synthetic manganese dioxide from the national stockpile;

H.R. 13682. An act for the relief of Donald E. Auseon;

H.R. 13683. An act for the relief of Robert A. Ivins;

H.R. 13800. An act for the relief of S5c. Ronald J. Olson, U.S. Army, retired;

H.R. 13935. An act to give the consent of Congress to the State of Massachusetts to become a party to the agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity as set forth in title II of the act of April 14, 1965 (79 Stat. 60), and consented to by Congress in that act and in the act of November 1, 1965 (79 Stat. 1157);

H.R. 13982. An act to amend the act of August 14, 1964, to authorize payments of any amounts authorized under the act to the estates of persons who would have been eligible for payments under the authority of the act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14075. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to settle and pay certain claims arising out of the taking of the 1960 decennial census;

H.R. 14173. An act for the relief of Antonio Barquet Chediak;

H.R. 14174. An act for the relief of Esteban Fernandez Noda;

H.R. 14233. An act for the relief of Beatriz Diaz;

H.R. 14525. An act for the relief of Thomas C. Macpherson, Jr.;

H.R. 14615. An act for the relief of certain members and former members of the Army on whose behalf erroneous payments were made for storage of household goods;

H.R. 14643. An act to provide for the strengthening of American educational resources for international studies and research;

H.R. 14741. An act to authorize an increase in the number of Marine Corps officers who may serve in the combined grades of brigadier general and major general;

H.R. 14749. An act for the relief of Katherine M. Perakis;

H.R. 14819. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. William Nussbaum;

H.R. 14864. An act for the relief of certain individuals;

H.R. 14920. An act for the relief of Marie del Carmen Bermudez;

H.R. 14984. An act for the relief of Renato Camacho Castro;

H.R. 14990. An act for the relief of Herman Adams, doing business as the Adams Manufacturing Co.;

H.R. 15014. An act for the relief of Henry P. Leonhardy;

H.R. 15183. An act to adjust the status of Cuban refugees to that of lawful permanent residents of the United States, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15251. An act for the relief of Walter W. Taylor;

H.R. 15297. An act for the relief of Leonard G. Duffy, lieutenant, U.S. Navy;

H.R. 15488. An act for the relief of Dr. Ali Haji-Morad;

H.R. 15766. An act to establish a National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws;

H.R. 16074. An act to cancel certain unpaid interest accrued after September 30, 1931, on loans made to World War I veterans upon the security of adjusted service certificates;

H.R. 16394. An act for the relief of certain enlisted members of the military services who lost interest on amounts deposited under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code, or prior laws authorizing enlisted members' deposits, and for other purposes;

H.R. 16522. An act for the relief of Vicente Fernandez Marino;

H.R. 16610. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio Rondon Delgado;

H.R. 16977. An act for the relief of Eugene G. Peterson, Harry E. Byers, and Russell W. Jordan;

H.R. 17260. An act for the relief of Robert A. Jellison;

H.R. 17261. An act for the relief of Augustus J. Theodore;

H.R. 17271. An act to amend section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $200 to $500 the monthly combat pay exclusion for commissioned officers serving in combat zones;

H.R. 17376. An act to authorize the disposal of nickel from the national stockpile;

H.R. 17451. An act to preserve the pay and retirement privileges of certain former deputy chiefs of Navy bureaus;

H.R. 17588. An act to amend section 8(g) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act with respect to assignments;

H.R. 17798. An act to provide that a judgment or decree of the District of Columbia court of general sessions shall not constitute a lien until filed and recorded in the office of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 18019. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct an addition at the Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, D.C.;

H.R. 18021. An act to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes;

H.R. 18033. An act for the relief of Dr. Fidel Rodriguez-Cubas; and

H.R. 18381. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

On October 25, 1966:

H.R. 203. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to set aside funds for research into spinal cord injuries and diseases;

H.R. 647. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to permit the appointment of new trustees in deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by agreement of the parties;

H.R. 872. An act to amend the provisions of title 18 of the United States Code relating to offenses committed in Indian country;

H.R. 1269. An act for the relief of H. Foster Hunter;

H.R. 3348. An act to authorize a program for the construction of facilities for the teaching of veterinary medicine and a program of loans for students of veterinary medicine;

H.R. 5990. An act to grant increased benefits to persons receiving cash relief under the Panama Canal Cash Relief Act of July 8, 1937;

H.R. 7973. An act to amend section 4339 of title 10, United States Code;

H.R. 8436. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the dutiable status of watches, clocks, and timing apparatus from insular possessions of the United States;

H.R. 9778. An act to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to codify recent military law, and to improve the Code;

H.R. 11475. An act to provide for the control or elimination of jellyfish and other such pests in the coastal waters of the United States, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11631. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to clarify, improve, and add additional programs relating to the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the

Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13103. An act to provide equitable tax treatment for foreign investment in the United States, to establish a presidential election campaign fund to assist in financing the costs of presidential election campaigns, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13196. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the opportunities for training of medical technologists and personnel in other allied health professions, to improve the educational quality of the schools training such allied health professions personnel, and to strengthen and improve the existing student loan programs for medical, osteopathic, dental, podiatry, pharmacy, optometric, and nursing students, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14347. An act to liberalize the provisions for payment to parents and children of dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14604. An act to authorize a study of facilities and services to be furnished visitors and students coming to the Nation's Capital;

H.R. 14644. An act to amend the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, the Higher Education Act of 1965, and the National Defense Education Act of 1958;

H.R. 14745. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14929. An act to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15024. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to select an available Government-owned site in the District of Columbia and to improve and lease such site for a temporary heliport;

H.R. 15111. An act to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty;

H.R. 17658. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the U.S. Naval Construction Battalions (Seabees) 25th anniversary and the U.S. Navy Civil Engineers Corp (CEC) 100th anniversary;

H.R. 18284. An act to authorize the Attorney General to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands within the Federal reformatory at Chillicothe, Ohio;

H.J. Res. 1001. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the month of May each year as "Steelmark Month"; and

H.J. Res. 1322. Joint resolution giving the time of assembly of the 90th Congress.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did, on the following dates, deliver to the White House for forwarding or presentation to the President upon his return from abroad, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On October 24, 1966:

H.R. 14643. An act to provide for the strengthening of American educational resources for international studies and research.

On October 25, 1966:

H.R. 14355. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to make certain technical changes, to provide for survivor benefits to children ages 18 to 21, inclusive, and for other purposes;

H.R. 17285. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 18381. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

On October 28, 1966:

H.R. 203. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to set aside funds for research into spinal cord injuries and diseases;

H.R. 647. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to permit the appointment of new trustees in deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by agreement of the parties;

H.R. 872. An act to amend the provisions of title 18 of the United States Code relating to offenses committed in Indian country;

H.R. 1269. An act for the relief of H. Foster Hunter;

H.R. 1328. An act for the relief of Glenn D. Humes;

H.R. 1388. An act for the relief of Maj. Ralph D. Caldwell;

H.R. 2129. An act for the relief of Maria Rossi;

H.R. 2266. An act to provide for the settlement of claims resulting from an explosion at a U.S. ordnance plant in Bowie County, Tex., on July 8, 1963;

H.R. 2600. An act to provide for the acquisition and preservation of the real property known as the Ansley Wilcox House in Buffalo, N.Y., as a national historic site;

H.R. 3348. An act to authorize a program for the construction of facilities for the teaching of veterinary medicine and a program of loans for students of veterinary medicine;

H.R. 3500. An act for the relief of Mrs. Emilie Boulay;

H.R. 3526. An act for the relief of Dr. Eric J. Lazaro;

H.R. 3530. An act for the relief of Dr. Miguel Angel Martinez y Corpas;

H.R. 3531. An act for the relief of Dr. Julio Cesar Muniz y Sotolongo;

H.R. 3536. An act for the relief of George R. Lore;

H.R. 3689. An act for the relief of Juanita Cereguine de Burgh;

H.R. 3756. An act for the relief of James S. Kahriman;

H.R. 3879. An act for the relief of Ernest Buillet;

H.R. 3901. An act for the relief of Miss Elisabeth von Oberndorff;

H.R. 3993. An act to authorize the issuance of certificates of citizenship in the Canal Zone;

H.R. 4077. An act for the relief of Jean A. Quaintance;

H.R. 4454. An act for the relief of Herman Feldman;

H.R. 5622. An act for the relief of Dr. Jorge Ignacio Miquel Franca;

H.R. 5688. An act relating to criminal procedure in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 5858. An act relating to applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody pursuant to judgments of State courts;

H.R. 5969. An act for the relief of Dr. Raul R. Morffi;

H.R. 5990. An act to grant increased benefits to persons receiving cash relief under the Panama Canal Cash Relief Act of July 8, 1937;

H.R. 6035. An act for the relief of the estate of Maj. John W. Roy, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6103. An act for the relief of the city of Umatilla, Oreg.;

H.R. 6115. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose A. G. Mendoza;

H.R. 6226. An act for the relief of Dr. Bienvenido Benach Carreras;

H.R. 6443. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio U. Catasus;

H.R. 6899. An act for the relief of Dr. Myriam de la Caridad Ares y Fernandez de Bosch;

H.R. 6958. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to promote savings under the Internal Revenue Service's automatic data processing system;

H.R. 7026. An act for the relief of Nathan Levine;

H.R. 7341. An act for the relief of Dr. Ricardo R. Fusto;

H.R. 7382. An act to amend section 1391 of title 28 of the United States Code relating to venue;

H.R. 7648. An act to authorize long-term leases on the San Xavier and Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Reservations, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7973. An act to amend section 4339 of title 10, United States Code;

H.R. 8358. An act for the relief of the Milan Compress Co.;

H.R. 8436. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the dutiable status of watches, clocks, and timing apparatus from insular possessions of the United States;

H.R. 8614. An act for the relief of Miss Rajka Soda;

H.R. 8917. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Omaha Tribe of Nebraska, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8937. An act for the relief of Charles A. Turner;

H.R. 9036. An act for the relief of J. M. Pendarvis, Jr.;

H.R. 9167. An act to amend title of the United States Code to enable the courts to deal more effectively with the problem of narcotic addiction, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9213. An act for the relief of William A. Buzbee;

H.R. 9217. An act for the relief of certain civilian employees of the Department of the Army at Fort Sam Houston, Tex.;

H.R. 9348. An act for the relief of Capt. Harold G. Wilmarth;

H.R. 9778. An act to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to codify recent military law, and to improve the code;

H.R. 9985. An act reporting by physicians in District of Columbia injuries by firearms, etc.;

H.R. 10151. An act for the relief of Dr. Luis Crespo;

H.R. 10249. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Manninen;

H.R. 10253. An act for the relief of Dr. Luis E. Bencomo;

H.R. 10259. An act for the relief of Dr. Allan Baumal;

H.R. 10288. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio B. Santillano;

H.R. 10304. An act to provide for the mandatory reporting by physicians and institutions in the District of Columbia of certain physical abuse of children;

H.R. 10327. An act to require evidence of adequate financial responsibility to pay judgments for personal injury or death, or to repay fares in the event of nonperformance of voyages, to establish minimum standards for passenger vessels and to require disclosure of construction details on passenger vessels, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10662. An act for the relief of Leonard J. Dalton;

H.R. 10832. An act for the relief of Gloria Alesna Relampagos;

H.R. 10846. An act for the relief of Katherine Nabokoff and Emil Homoceanu;

H.R. 10876. An act to authorize and direct the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration to quitclaim certain property in Jackson County, Ala., to Skyline Churches Cemetery, a corporation;

H.R. 11216. An act relating to the tariff treatment of articles assembled abroad of products of the United States, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11224. An act for the relief of Dr. Pedro Raphael;

H.R. 11254. An act for the relief of Julieta Gloria Bersamin;

H.R. 11256. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the priority and effect of Federal tax liens and levies, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11467. An act for the relief of CWO Joseph J. McGavin;

H.R. 11475. An act to provide for the control or elimination of jellyfish and other such pests in the coastal waters of the United States, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11555. An act to provide a border highway along the U.S. bank of the Rio Grande in connection with the settlement of the Chamizal boundary dispute between the United States and Mexico;

H.R. 11570. An act for the relief of James R. Kemp;

H.R. 11590. An act for the relief of Dr. Jacinta Llorens;

H.R. 11617. An act for the relief of Jun Becky;

H.R. 11631. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to clarify, improve, and add additional programs relating to the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11640. An act for the relief of Dr. Juan Antonio Dumois;

H.R. 11660. An act relating to interest on income tax refunds made within 45 days after the filing of the tax return, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11676. An act for the relief of Johnny R. Bradley and others;

H.R. 11782. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for additions to a reserve for certain guaranteed debt obligations, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11952. An act for the relief of Maria Karidakis;

H.R. 11957. An act for the relief of Muriel Williams;

H.R. 12237. An act for the relief of Tri-States Construction Co., Inc.;

H.R. 12317. An act for the relief of Dr. Augusto J. Fernandez-Conde;

H.R. 12360. An act to permit the sale of grain storage facilities to public nonprofit agencies and organizations;

H.R. 12512. An act for the relief of Carl V. Elliott;

H.R. 12781. An act for the relief of Dr. Mario Orlando Santos-Estevez;

H.R. 12826. An act for the relief of Kim Kap Yung;

H.R. 12920. An act for the relief of Alexander Francis Saker, doctor of medicine;

H.R. 13101. An act for the relief of Mario P. Navarro, M.D.;

H.R. 13103. An act to provide equitable tax treatment for foreign investment in the United States, to establish a presidential election campaign fund to assist in financing the costs of presidential election campaigns, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13161. An act to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for elementary and secondary schools, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13192. An act for the relief of Nermin Demirbag Lavapies;

H.R. 13196. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the opportunities for training of medical technologists and personnel in other allied health professions, to improve the educational quality of the schools training such allied health professions personnel, and to strengthen and improve the existing student loan programs for medical, osteopathic, dental, podiatry, pharmacy, optometric and nursing students, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13320. An act to authorize the disposal of industrial diamond stones from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13370. An act to authorize the disposal of fused crude aluminum oxide from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13448. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to mailing privileges of members of the U.S. Armed Forces and other Federal Government personnel overseas, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13551. An act to amend the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13661. An act to authorize the disposal of battery-grade synthetic manganese dioxide from the national stockpile;

H.R. 13682. An act for the relief of Donald E. Auscon;

H.R. 13683. An act for the relief of Robert A. Ivins;

H.R. 13800. An act for the relief of S5c. Ronald J. Olson, U.S. Army, retired;

H.R. 13935. An act to give the consent of Congress to the State of Massachusetts to become a party to the agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity as set forth in title II of the act of April 14, 1965 (79 Stat. 60), and consented to by Congress in that act and in the act of November 1, 1965 (79 Stat. 1157);

H.R. 13955. An act to establish the past and present location of a certain portion of the Colorado River for certain purposes;

H.R. 13982. An act to amend the act of August 14, 1964, to authorize payments of any amounts authorized under the act to the estates of persons who would have been eligible for payments under the authority of the act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14075. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to settle and pay certain claims arising out of the taking of the 1960 decennial census;

H.R. 14173. An act for the relief of Antonio Barquet Chediak;

H.R. 14174. An act for the relief of Esteban Fernandez Neda;

H.R. 14233. An act for the relief of Beatriz Diaz;

H.R. 14347. An act to liberalize the provisions for payment to parents and children of dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14517. An act to amend Private Law 86–203 to permit the use of the vessel *John F. Drews* in the coastwise trade while it is owned by a citizen of the United States;

H.R. 14525. An act for the relief of Thomas C. Macpherson, Jr.;

H.R. 14604. An act to authorize a study of facilities and services to be furnished visitors and students coming to the Nation's Capital;

H.R. 14615. An act for the relief of certain members and former members of the Army on whose behalf erroneous payments were made for storage of household goods;

H.R. 14644. An act to amend the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, the Higher Education Act of 1965, and the National Defense Education Act of 1958;

H.R. 14741. An act to authorize an increase in the number of Marine Corps officers who may serve in the combined grades of brigadier general and major general;

H.R. 14745. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14749. An act for the relief of Katherine M. Perakis;

H.R. 14819. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. William Nussbaum;

H.R. 14864. An act for the relief of certain individuals;

H.R. 14920. An act for the relief of Marie del Carmen Bermudez;

H.R. 14929. An act to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14984. An act for the relief of Renato Camacho Castro;

H.R. 14990. An act for the relief of Herman Adams, doing business as the Adams Manufacturing Co.;

H.R. 15014. An act for the relief of Henry P. Leonhardy;

H.R. 15024. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to select an available Government-owned site in the District of Columbia and to improve and lease such site for a temporary heliport;

H.R. 15111. An act to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty;

H.R. 15183. An act to adjust the status of Cuban refugees to that of lawful permanent residents of the United States, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15251. An act for the relief of Walter W. Taylor;

H.R. 15297. An act for the relief of Leonard G. Duffy, lieutenant, U.S. Navy;

H.R. 15335. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish an Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations," approved September 24, 1959;

H.R. 15488. An act for the relief of Dr. Ali Haji-Morad;

H.R. 15727. An act to establish rates of compensation for certain positions within the Smithsonian Institution;

H.R. 15748. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize a special 30-day period of leave for a member of a uniformed service who voluntarily extends his tour of duty in a hostile fire area;

H.R. 15766. An act to establish a National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws;

H.R. 15857. An act to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 to increase salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department, to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 to increase the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 16074. An act to cancel certain unpaid interest accrued after September 30, 1931, on loans made to World War I veterans upon the security of adjusted-service certificates;

H.R. 16114. An act to provide for the inclusion of premium pay under section 5545 (c)(1) of title 5, United States Code, for the purpose of determining benefits under the civil service retirement, group life insurance, and injury compensation provisions of such title, and for other purposes;

H.R. 16394. An act for the relief of certain enlisted members of the military services who lost interest on amounts deposited under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code, or prior laws authorizing enlisted members' deposits, and for other purposes;

H.R. 16522. An act for the relief of Vicente Fernandez Marino;

H.R. 16610. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio Rendon Delgado;

H.R. 16715. An act to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962;

H.R. 16958. An act to authorize the establishment in the District of Columbia of a public college of arts and sciences and a vocational and technical institute;

H.R. 16977. An act for the relief of Eugene G. Peterson, Harry E. Byers, and Russell W. Jordan;

H.R. 17260. An act for the relief of Robert A. Jellison;

H.R. 17261. An act for the relief of Augustus J. Theodore;

H.R. 17271. An act to amend section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $200 to $500 the monthly combat pay exclusion for commissioned officers serving in combat zones;

H.R. 17376. An act to authorize the disposal of nickel from the national stockpile;

H.R. 17451. An act to preserve the pay and retirement privileges of certain former deputy chiefs of Navy bureaus;

H.R. 17588. An act to amend section 8(g) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act with respect to assignments;

H.R. 17607. An act to suspend the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property;

H.R. 17636. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes;

H.R. 17637. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes;

H.R. 17658. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the U.S. Naval Construction Battalions (Seabees) 25th anniversary and the U.S. Navy Civil Engineers Corps (CEC) 100th anniversary;

H.R. 17796. An act to provide that a judgment or decree of the District of Columbia court of general sessions shall not constitute a lien until filed and recorded in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 18019. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct an addition at the Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, D.C.;

H.R. 18021. An act to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes;

H.R. 18033. An act for the relief of Dr. Fidel Rodriguez-Cubas;

H.R. 18119. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes;

H.R. 18217. An act to provide home leave for Federal seafaring personnel, and for other purposes;

H.R. 18233. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes;

H.R. 18284. An act to authorize the Attorney General to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands within the Federal reformatory at Chillicothe, Ohio;

H.J. Res. 1001. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the month of May each year as "Steelmark Month"; and

H.J. Res. 1322. Joint resolution fixing the time of assembly of the 90th Congress.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Congress, notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On October 27, 1966:

H.R. 18381. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

On October 29, 1966:

H.R. 14643. An act to provide for the strengthening of American educational resources for international studies and research.

On October 30, 1966:

H.R. 14355. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to make certain technical changes, to provide for survivor benefits to children ages 18 to 21, inclusive, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 17285. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and for other purposes.

On November 2, 1966:

H.J. Res. 1001. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the month of May of each year as "Steelmark Month";

H.J. Res. 1322. Joint resolution fixing the time of assembly of the 90th Congress;

H.R. 203. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to set aside funds for research into spinal cord injuries and diseases;

H.R. 647. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to permit the appointment of new trustees in deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by agreement of the parties;

H.R. 872. An act to amend the provisions of title 18 of the United States Code relating to offenses committed in Indian country;

H.R. 1269. An act for the relief of H. Foster Hunter;

H.R. 1328. An act for the relief of Glenn D. Humes;

H.R. 1388. An act for the relief of Maj. Ralph D. Caldwell;

H.R. 2129. An act for the relief of Maria Rossi;

H.R. 2600. An act to provide for the acquisition and preservation of the real property known as the Ansley Wilcox House in Buffalo, N.Y., as a national historic site;

H.R. 3348. An act to authorize a program for the construction of facilities for the teaching of veterinary medicine and a program of loans for students of veterinary medicine;

H.R. 3500. An act for the relief of Mrs. Emilie Boulay;

H.R. 3526. An act for the relief of Dr. Eric J. Lazaro;

H.R. 3530. An act for the relief of Dr. Miguel Angel Martinez y Corpas;

H.R. 3531. An act for the relief of Dr. Julio Cesar Muniz y Sotolongo;

H.R. 3536. An act for the relief of George R. Lore;

H.R. 3689. An act for the relief of Juanita Cereguine de Burgh;

H.R. 3756. An act for the relief of James S. Kahriman;

H.R. 3879. An act for the relief of Ernest Buillet;

H.R. 3993. An act to authorize the issuance of certificates of citizenship in the Canal Zone;

H.R. 4077. An act for the relief of Jean A. Quaintance;

H.R. 4454. An act for the relief of Herman Feldman;

H.R. 5622. An act for the relief of Dr. Jorge Ignacio Miquel Franca;

H.R. 5958. An act relating to applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody pursuant to judgments of State courts;

H.R. 5969. An act for the relief of Dr. Raul R. Morfil;

H.R. 5990. An act to grant increased benefits to persons receiving cash relief under the Panama Canal Cash Relief Act of July 8, 1937;

H.R. 6035. An act for the relief of the estate of Maj. John W. Roy, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6115. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose A. G. Mendoza;

H.R. 6226. An act for the relief of Dr. Bienvenido Benach Carreras;

H.R. 6443. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio U. Catasus;

H.R. 6899. An act for the relief of Dr. Myrfam de la Caridad Ares y Fernandez de Bosch;

H.R. 6958. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to promote savings under the Internal Revenue Service's automatic data processing system;

H.R. 7026. An act for the relief of Nathan Levine;

H.R. 7341. An act for the relief of Dr. Ricardo R. Fuste;

H.R. 7382. An act to amend section 1391 of title 28 of the United States Code relating to venue;

H.R. 7648. An act to authorize long-term leases on the San Xavier and Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Reservations, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7973. An act to amend section 4339 of title 10, United States Code;

H.R. 8614. An act for the relief of Miss Rajka Soda;

H.R. 8917. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Omaha Tribe of Nebraska, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8937. An act for the relief of Charles A. Turner;

H.R. 9213. An act for the relief of William A. Buzbee;

H.R. 9217. An act for the relief of certain civilian employees of the Department of the Army at Fort Sam Houston, Tex.;

H.R. 9348. An act for the relief of Capt. Harold G. Wilmarth;

H.R. 9778. An act to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to codify recent military law, and to improve the Code;

H.R. 10247. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elisabeth Manninen;

H.R. 10253. An act for the relief of Dr. Luis E. Bencomo;

H.R. 10259. An act for the relief of Dr. Allan Baumal;

H.R. 10288. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio B. Santillano;

H.R. 10662. An act for the relief of Leonard J. Dalton;

H.R. 10832. An act for the relief of Gloria Alesna Relampagos;

H.R. 10846. An act for the relief of Katherine Nabokoff and Emil Homoceanu.

H.R. 10876. An act to authorize and direct the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration to quitclaim certain property in Jackson County, Ala., to Skyline Churches Cemetery, a corporation;

H.R. 11224. An act for the relief of Dr. Pedro Raphael;

H.R. 11254. An act for the relief of Julieta Gloria Bersamin;

H.R. 11256. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the priority and effect of Federal tax liens and levies, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11467. An act for the relief of CWO Joseph J. McGavin;

H.R. 11475. An act to provide for the control or elimination of jellyfish and other such pests in the coastal waters of the United States, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11570. An act for the relief of James R. Kemp;

H.R. 11590. An act for the relief of Dr. Jacinta Llorens;

H.R. 11617. An act for the relief of Jun Becky;

H.R. 11640. An act for the relief of Dr Juan Antonio Dumois;

H.R. 11660. An act relating to interest on income tax refunds made within 45 days, after the filing of the tax return, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11676. An act for the relief of Johnny R. Bradley and others;

H.R. 11782. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for additions to a reserve for certain guaranteed debt obligations, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11952. An act for the relief of Maria Karidakis;

H.R. 11957. An act for the relief of Muriel Williams;

H.R. 12317. An act for the relief of Dr. Augusto J. Fernandes-Conde;

H.R. 12512. An act for the relief of Carl V. Elliott;

H.R. 12781. An act for the relief of Dr. Mario Orlando Santos-Estevez;

H.R. 12826. An act for the relief of Kim Kap Yung;

H.R. 12920, An act for the relief of Alexander Francis Saker, doctor of medicine;

H.R. 13101. An act for the relief of Mario P. Navarro, M.D.;

H.R. 13192. An act for the relief of Nermin Demirbag Lavapies;

H.R. 13320. An act to authorize the disposal of industrial diamond stones from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13370. An act to authorize the disposal of crude aluminum oxide from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13448. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to mailing privileges of members of the U.S. Armed Forces and other Federal Government personnel overseas, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13661. An act to authorize the disposal of battery-grade synthetic manganese dioxide from the national stockpile;

H.R. 13682. An act for the relief of Donald E. Auseon;

H.R. 13683. An act for the relief of Robert A. Ivins;

H.R. 13800. An act for the relief of Sp5c. Ronald J. Olson, U.S. Army, retired;

H.R. 13935. An act to give the consent of Congress to the State of Massachusetts to become a party to the agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity as set forth in title II of the act of April 14, 1965 (79 Stat. 60), and consented to by Congress in that act and in the act of November 1, 1965 (79 Stat. 1157);

H.R. 13982. An act to amend the act of August 14, 1964, to authorize payments of any amounts authorized under the act to the estates of persons who would have been eligible for payments under the authority of the act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14075. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to settle and pay certain claims arising out of the taking of the 1960 decennial census;

H.R. 14173. An act for the relief of Antonio Barquet Chediak;

H.R. 14174. An act for the relief of Esteban Fernandez Noda;

H.R. 14233. An act for the relief of Beatriz Diaz;

H.R. 14347. An act to liberalize the provisions for payment to parents and children of dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14517. An act to amend Private Law 86–203 to permit the use of the vessel *John F. Drews* in the coastwise trade while it is owned by a citizen of the United States;

H.R. 14525. An act for the relief of Thomas C. Macpherson, Jr.;

H.R. 14741. An act to authorize an increase in the number of Marine Corps officers who may serve in the combined grades of brigadier general and major general;

H.R. 14819. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. William Nussbaum;

H.R. 14864. An act for the relief of certain individuals;

H.R. 14920. An act for the relief of Marie del Carmen Bermudez;

H.R. 14984. An act for the relief of Renato Camacho Castro;

H.R. 15014. An act for the relief of Henry P. Leonhardy;

H.R. 15183. An act to adjust the status of Cuban refugees to that of lawful permanent residents of the United States, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15251. An act for the relief of Walter W. Taylor;

H.R. 15297. An act for the relief of Leonard G. Duffy, lieutenant, U.S. Navy;

H.R. 15335. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish an Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations," approved September 24, 1959.

H.R. 15488. An act for the relief of Dr. Ali Haji-Morad;

H.R. 15727. An act to establish rates of compensation for certain positions within the Smithsonian Institution;

H.R. 15748. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize a special 30-day period of leave for a member of the uniformed services who voluntarily extends his tour of duty in a hostile fire area;

H.R. 16074. An act to cancel certain unpaid interest accrued after September 30, 1931, on loans made to World War I veterans upon the security of adjusted-service certificates;

H.R. 16114. An act to provide for the inclusion of premium pay under section 5545(c)(1) of title 5, United States Code, for the purpose of determining benefits under the civil service retirement, group life insurance, and injury compensation provisions of such title, and for other purposes;

H.R. 16394. An act for the relief of certain enlisted members of the military services who lost interest on amounts deposited under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code, or prior laws authorizing enlisted members' deposits, and for other purposes.

H.R. 16522. An act for the relief of Vicente Fernandez Marino;

H.R. 16610. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio Rondon Delgado;

H.R. 16977. An act for the relief of Eugene G. Peterson, Harry E. Byers, and Russell W. Jordan;

H.R. 17260. An act for the relief of Robert A. Jellison;

H.R. 17261. An act for the relief of Augustus J. Theodore;

H.R. 17271. An act to amend section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $200 to $500 the monthly combat pay exclusion for commissioned officers serving in combat zones;

H.R. 17376. An act to authorize the disposal of nickel from the national stockpile;

H.R. 17451. An act to preserve the pay and retirement privileges for certain former chiefs of Navy bureaus and to preserve the pay privileges of certain former deputy chiefs of Navy bureaus;

H.R. 17588. An act to amend section 8(g) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act with respect to assignments;

H.R. 17636. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes;

H.R. 17637. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes;

H.R. 17798. An act to provide that a judgment or decree of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions shall not constitute a lien until filed and recorded in the office of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 18019. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct an addition at the Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, D.C.;

H.R. 18033. An act for the relief of Dr. Fidel Rodriguez-Cubas;

H.R. 18217. An act to provide home leave for Federal seafaring personnel, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 18284. An act to authorize the Attorney General to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands within the Federal reformatory at Chillicothe, Ohio.

On November 3, 1966:

H.R. 13161. An act to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for elementary and secondary schools, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13196. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the opportunities for training of medical technologists and personnel in other allied health professions, to improve the educational quality of the schools training such allied health professions personnel and to strengthen and improve the existing student loan programs for medical, osteopathic, dental, podiatry, pharmacy, optometric, and nursing students, and for other purposes; and

H.F 14644. An act to amend the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, the Higher Education Act of 1965, and the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

On November 5, 1966:

H.R. 2266. An act to provide for the settlement of claims resulting from an explosion at a U.S. ordnance plant in Bowie County, Tex., on July 8, 1963;

H.R. 8358. An act for the relief of the Milan Compress Co.;

H.R. 12237. An act for the relief of Tri-State Construction Co., Inc.;

H.R. 12360. An act to permit the sale of grain storage facilities to public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations;

H.R. 14990. An act for the relief of Herman Adams, doing business as the Adams Manufacturing Co.; and

H.R. 15024. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to select an available Government-owned site in the District of Columbia and to improve and lease such site for a temporary heliport.

On November 6, 1966:

H.R. 6103. An act for the relief of the city of Umatilla, Oreg.;

H.R. 9036. An act for the relief of J. M. Pendarvis, Jr.;

H.R. 9985. An act to provide for the mandatory reporting by physicians and hospitals or similar institutions in the District of Columbia of injuries caused by firearms or other dangerous weapons;

H.R. 10304. An act to provide for the mandatory reporting by physicians and institutions in the District of Columbia of certain physical abuse of children;

H.R. 10327. An act to require evidence of adequate financial responsibility to pay judgments for personal injury or death, or to repay fares in the event of nonperformance of voyages, to establish minimum standards for passenger vessels and to require disclosure of construction details on passenger vessels and for other purposes;

H.R. 14615. An act for the relief of certain members and former members of the Army on whose behalf erroneous payments were made for storage of household goods;

H.R. 14749. An act for the relief of Katherine M. Perakis;

H.R. 17658. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the U.S. Naval Construction Battalions (Seabees) 25th anniversary and the U.S. Navy Civil Engineers Corps (CEC) 100th anniversary; and

H.R. 18021. An act to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

On November 7, 1966:

H.R. 11631. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to clarify, improve, and add additional programs relating to the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14604. An act to authorize a study of facilities and services to be furnished visitors and students coming to the Nation's Capital;

H.R. 14745. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes;

H.R. 16715. An act to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962;

H.R. 16958. An act to authorize the establishment in the District of Columbia of a public college of arts and sciences and a vocational and technical institute; and

H.R. 18233. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

On November 8, 1966:

H.R. 9167. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code to enable the courts to deal more effectively with the problem of narcotic addiction, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11555. An act to provide a border highway along the U.S. bank of the Rio Grande in connection with the settlement of the Chamizal boundary dispute between the United States and Mexico;

H.R. 13551. An act to amend the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15111. An act to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty;

H.R. 15766. An act to establish a National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws;

H.R. 17607. An act to suspend the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property; and

H.R. 18119. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

On November 9, 1966:

H.R. 10151. An act for the relief of Dr. Luis Crespo.

On November 10, 1966:

H.R. 8436. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the dutiable status of watches, clocks, and timing apparatus from insular possessions of the United States; and

H.R. 11216. An act relating to the tariff treatment of articles assembled abroad of products of the United States, and for other purposes.

On November 11, 1966:

H.R. 14929. An act to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes.

On November 13, 1966:

H.R. 13103. An act to provide equitable tax treatment for foreign investment in the United States, to establish a Presidential Election Campaign Fund to assist in financing the costs of presidential election campaigns, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 15857. An act to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 to increase salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department, to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' salary Act of 1955 to increase the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia; and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS AND A SENATE BILL DISAPPROVED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The message further announced that the President had disapproved the following House bills and Senate bill, of the following titles:

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CRIME BILL

Crime in the Nation's Capital affects every man, woman, and child who lives or visits here. Wealthy and poor, Negro and white, slum and suburban dweller—all suffer when our streets are not safe. For the sake of the whole community, we must do everything in our power to protect innocent people from those who seek to harm them.

I am acutely conscious of my responsibility as President to do all in my power to prevent crime. I mean to take any and all actions, within my power, which will help relieve today's unsatisfactory conditions.

I have before me the District of Columbia crime bill, passed in the closing hours of the Congress. It deals exclusively with rules for police and the courts. It does not touch the quality or quantity of law enforcement resources: more, better trained, better equipped and better paid police and corrections workers.

In my opinion, the present bill would create problems instead of solving them.

If I thought that this bill would diminish crime in the District of Columbia, I would sign it. I believe, however, that this legislation would add endless complications and confusion to an already complex situation. It would provoke years of litigation. It would make the job of the policeman on the beat and of the public prosecutor much more difficult.

I cannot approve it.

This bill provides that a policeman may pick up a person and question him for 4 hours without making an arrest—6 hours, exclusive of interrogation, after an arrest—perhaps 10 hours of questioning—without taking him before a judicial officer. No one doubts the necessity of the police questioning persons on the street with respect to criminal activities. The law has always permitted this. The law properly provides, however, that after a person is deprived of his freedom—after he is arrested—the police must take him before a magistrate who will determine whether his arrest is arbitrary or based on probable cause. This must be done without unnecessary delay.

I am advised that the periods of questioning provided in this bill go far beyond the necessities of interrogation in practically all cases.

In the case of a material witness, the bill contains provisions even more extreme than those applicable to suspects themselves. Any citizen at the scene of a crime—including the victim—can be taken into custody as a material witness. It is not necessary either to obtain a subpena, or to take the witness before a magistrate, until 6 hours after he is picked up. In effect, the person can disappear from sight merely on an individual policeman's judgment that he is a material witness. And that there is a reasonable probability that he will not be available to testify at the trial.

When the citizen is finally taken before a magistrate, he can be released only by posting bond or collateral as security. He cannot be released on his own recognizance. If he were under arrest as a suspected criminal, however, the Bail Reform Act, passed by Congress this year, would permit his release on his own responsibility. These provisions are much more severe than existing law. The U.S. attorney informs me that he can recall no case in which inability to detain material witnesses has resulted from the inadequacy of existing law.

The bill contains a provision intended to stop the traffic in obscene pictures and literature. No one can have sympathy for those who pander to degraded instincts in man. But this provision is phrased so broadly that it clearly threatens freedom of the press. It authorizes an official in the District of Columbia—the U.S. attorney—to seek the prior restraint of publications. If he thinks that a newspaper, magazine, or book is indecent, he may go to court and obtain, without a full hearing on the merits, a preliminary injunction authorizing him to restrain its publication or sale.

This section also provides for a permanent injunction, prohibiting the future use of any real or personal property involved in the publication or sale of obscene material.

This language is imprecise and confusing but at the very least, it would empower a court, using its contempt authority, to imprison or fine a previously convicted publisher of a book, magazine, or newspaper, if the court concluded that one of his new publications was also offensive—even though it had never been judicially found obscene in a full trial on the merits.

The Acting Attorney General informs me that this sort of prior restraint has been condemned by the courts as unconstitutional—in violation of the first amendment upon which our freedom to spread, to publish, to read and to exchange ideas is dependent.

The bill also would establish mandatory minimum sentences on conviction of certain crimes. This is a step backward in judicial and correction policy. Indeed it is directly contrary to previous action taken by the Congress. Under the indeterminate sentencing laws, the Congress has recognized that the potential for rehabilitation is increased when courts and correction systems are given flexibility to determine sentences on case-by-case basis. Moreover, there is no need for such mandatory minimum sentences in the District of Columbia. Sentences now being imposed in the District are among the highest in the United States.

I have given long and careful thought to this legislation.

I recognize that its sponsors believed it would arm the police and the courts with more effective tools in combating crime. Yet all agencies of government asked to comment on the bill—as well as the two civilian District Commissioners who live in Washington, and a majority of the District of Columbia Bar Association—have urged me to veto it.

They are convinced that it does not strengthen law enforcement in the District and does not meet the needs of the fight against crime, but rather introduces confusion and uncertainties into police and judicial practices.

The Acting Attorney General advises me that fundamental constitutional questions pervade the bill—four of its six titles raise the most serious doubts.

We are engaged in a great national effort to lift the blight of bad housing, poor education, and unemployment from our cities. This effort is attacking the conditions that nourish high crime rates. But, in addition, State and local officials, and the Federal Government in its limited sphere, must devise more effective ways of preventing crime and bringing criminals to account.

Better trained and better paid policemen are part of the answer to crime.

Last year Congress enacted the Law Enforcement Assistance Act, to finance pilot projects in the most modern police techniques. Today, I am signing into law a substantial—and well deserved—pay increase for District policemen.

Better police organization is part of the answer. Last year I appointed a District of Columbia Crime Commission and asked its members to recommend better ways of reducing crime in Washington. Many of the Commission's recommendations are designed to make the organization of the District Police Department a model for the Nation. Most are already being carried out. And the District of Columbia Commissioners have informed me that they have signed and are putting into effect the reorganization plan for the Police Department recommended by the District of Columbia Crime Commission.

Better staffed courts are part of the answer. This year, five new judgeships were added to the court of general sessions. They will help eliminate the delays which have impeded swift and effective Justice.

Each of these steps has the same goal: more effective prevention, detection, and punishment of crime in the District of Columbia.

The problem of crime outside of the District of Columbia must primarily be dealt with by local officials. I have promised them the complete cooperation of the Federal Government within its proper sphere. We have already begun that cooperation with the Law Enforcement Assistance Act. We are prepared to expand our cooperative efforts. I will act promptly on the recommendations of the National Crime Commission, which I appointed in July of 1965, when they are received.

We know that criminal behavior, and the conditions out of which it springs, will not yield easily to our efforts. But we have given the highest priority to an intelligent, relentless fight to make the streets of the District of Columbia safe for law-abiding people—and we shall make them so.

I renew my pledge to pursue every avenue, use every tool, support any law that holds promise of advancing us in our drive against crime. In doing so I will need the cooperation of every man and woman whose commitment—as is mine—is to a capital where civic order and social justice prevail.

GEOTHERMAL STEAM ACT OF 1966

I am withholding my approval from the Geothermal Steam Act of 1966.

I am taking this action because many of the principles embodied in the bill violate the public interest.

Geothermal steam is produced by the internal heat of the earth. It is well known to every schoolchild in America under other names. Old Faithful at Yellowstone is one example of a geothermal steam spring.

We know very little about how extensive or valuable our geothermal resources are. They may be an inexhaustible supply of energy. Today, for example, the steam from a single geothermal spring is generating enough electricity to serve a community of 50,000 people. Geothermal springs may also hold untapped mineral wealth—such as gold, lithium, and silver.

These circumstances dictate a policy of prudence and reason in the leasing of Federal lands to develop this resource.

S. 1674 does just the opposite.

It ignores the basic lessons we have learned much to our sorrow—that our natural resources are priceless treasures which must be developed with wisdom and foresight.

The bill is flawed by six major provisions which run counter to sound public policy:

First. It provides for unfair and unlimited "grandfather" rights. The holders of mineral or mining leases on Federal lands as of September 7, 1965, would be automatically entitled to convert them into geothermal leases. This amounts to a free gift of valuable public property rights to these developers, and gives them an undue advantage over other prospective developers.

Second. It provides for maximum leases of 51,200 acres—an area four times greater than our experts say is needed for economical development. This could result in a single developer monopolizing the geothermal resources of entire States.

Third. It provides that royalties are payable only on steam "sold or utilized." This could encourage the wanton waste of a precious natural asset.

Fourth. It fails to provide specific and clear authority for the Government to readjust the lease terms and conditions at suitable intervals. The public deserves this protection because we still know so little about our geothermal resources.

Fifth. It provides for perpetual leases to the developer if steam is produced in commercial quantities. As a result, future generations of Americans will have lost their stake in the formulation of policies for a natural resource which may be inexhaustible, and whose potential we are only beginning to appreciate.

Sixth. It gives the developer 20 years in which to begin production. Our scientists and engineers say that this is too long a period and will encourage speculation.

In short, I have withheld my approval because this bill does not sufficiently protect the interests of the American people.

If these were only technical flaws in a measure providing for the necessary development of geothermal energy, I would gladly sign the bill. For I believe we must move vigorously to make use of this promising national asset.

But they are more than technical flaws. They represent a serious failure to protect the people's interest.

When we consider landmark legislation of this sort, dealing with a vast and little-known natural resource, we must remember that we are acting—not just for today or 5 years from today—but for decades to come. Once we have given away the people's interest in the wealth of their land, we cannot easily retrieve what has been lost. We must understand that we are trustees for 200 million Americans. All that we do must protect their interest—and the interest of their children and grandchildren—in the rich legacy with which nature has endowed us.

This bill does not do that. And because it does not, I will not give it my approval.

This does not mean we should delay the development and use of these resources. Wise and prudent trustees do not lose opportunities to increase the value of the estate they manage. But we must assure ourselves that we have first protected the people's interest before we make our geothermal springs available for productive development.

I have directed the Secretary of the Interior and the Acting Attorney General to prepare a new proposal to accomplish our objectives—one that eliminates the pitfalls of the present bill.

Next year we will ask Congress for legislation to transform the potential of this national treasure into a reality. We will ask for legislation that will protect the public interest, encourage economic and efficient development with a fair and just return to the developer, and conserve the benefits of that development in coming generations. When that legislation comes before me, I shall sign it enthusiastically.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 14, 1966.*

ESTABLISHING THE PAST AND PRESENT LOCATION OF A CERTAIN PORTION OF THE COLORADO RIVER

I have withheld my approval from H.R. 13955, "Establishing the past and present location of a certain portion of the Colorado River for certain purposes."

This bill would have the effect of conveying 2,100 acres of public lands to a group of 19 individuals and corporations without payment of compensation. This bill comes at a time when the U.S. District Court in Arizona has, under active consideration, the complex and legal factual issues involving the ownership of these very lands. The bill comes after the Government's ownership has been established with respect to almost 1,000 other occupants of land in this area.

In the late 1950's investigation by the Department of the Interior disclosed that more than 1,000 persons were illegally occupying public lands along the lower Colorado River. Subsequently, the Department initiated actions under which most of these occupants either vacated the land or explicitly recognized Federal ownership. Other occupants were removed following successful legal action by the Government. Litigation in regard to others is still pending.

The courts are the traditional forum for determining legal questions relating to landownership and I see no reason for making a special exception here and interfering with the orderly judicial process. If the case is resolved in favor of the claimants, they will receive title to the land without the present bill. If the case is resolved against the claimants and the Congress believes that the equities were so compelling that relief should have been granted, the Congress can act after the factual issues have been fully litigated and a complete record has been assembled.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 14, 1966.*

H.R. 3901—ELISABETH VON OBERNDORFF

I must withhold approval from H.R. 3901, "For the relief of Miss Elisabeth von Oberndorff."

This bill would direct the Office of Alien Property of the Department of Justice to return to Miss von Oberndorff, a German citizen, approximately $185,000. This amount represents the proceeds from the disposition of certain property which she owned and which was vested in the Office of Alien Property during World War II.

Miss von Oberndorff resided during World War II in Luxembourg, a German-occupied country. Under these circumstances, the Trading With the Enemy Act required that the property covered by the present bill be vested in the Office of Alien Property.

When she came to this country in 1950, Miss von Oberndorff sought the return of her property. After a full hearing, her claim was denied by a hearing examiner of the Office of Alien Property because she failed to meet the strict conditions for relief for aliens established by the Congress. She was not a member of a political, racial, or religious group suffering deprivation of the rights of German citizenship by virtue of a law, decree, or regulation of the German Government. The examiner's denial was upheld on two separate occasions by the Director of the Office.

I am particularly concerned that this bill would encourage other claimants to seek similar relief. Such a result would be most unfortunate since the proceeds of vested property are, by law, deposited in the war claims fund primarily to compensate Americans for certain losses they sustained during World War II. That fund is not expected to be adequate to pay those claims in full.

The reports of the Judiciary Committees do not challenge the propriety of the denial of Miss von Oberndorff's claim on legal grounds. These reports, however, justify the award on equitable grounds because Miss von Oberndorff was not in sympathy with the Nazi regime and because she assisted a fugitive from that regime and members of the Luxembourg resistance movement.

Miss von Oberndorff's feelings and actions were clearly commendable. They do not, however, justify special relief from a limited fund available to pay Americans who hold valid claims and a carefully defined class of aliens.

For these reasons, I am compelled to disapprove this bill.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 14, 1966.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2838. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a plan for works of improvement on the watershed Rock Creek (Wells), Ind., pursuant to the provisions of 16 U.S.C. 1005, and delegated to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget by Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2839. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a plan for works of improvement on the watershed, Neshaminy Creek, Pa., pursuant to the provisions of 16 U.S.C. 1005, and delegated to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget by Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Public Works.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 18551. A bill, to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit States, under Federal-State agreements, to provide for coverage for hospital insurance benefits for the aged for certain State and local employees whose services are not otherwise covered by the insurance system established by such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 18552. A bill for the relief of Vasiliki Angelopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308(b), which provides as follows:

> (b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following reports for the second calendar quarter of 1966 were received too late to be included in the published reports for that quarter:

A. Charles D. Ablard, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $45.51.

A. Active-Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, Post Office Box 2169, South Portland, Me.

D. (6) $22. E. (9) $44.68.

A. Clarence G. Adamy, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $500.

A. Allen & Murden, Inc., 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee of European Shipowners, 30-32 St. Mary Axe, London EC 3, England, and Norwegian Shipowners Association, Post Office Box 1452, Oslo, Norway.

D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $471.65.

A. Allen & Murden, Inc., 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Informal Committee of 18 European and Other Foreign Cruise Ship Lines, care of Vincent Demo, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $8,750. E. (9) $1,855.74.

A. Nicholas E. Allen & Merrill Armour, 444 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Music Operators of America, Inc., 228 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $2,205. E. (9) $153.65.

A. The American Beekeeping Federation, Minco, Okla.

D. (6) $7,465.50. E. (9) $10,235.89.

A. American Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $405. E. (9) $291.

A. American Dental Association, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $4,830.42. E. (9) $4,830.42.

A. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $11,347.87. E. (9) $11,347.87.

A. American Humane Association, Post Office Box 1266, Denver, Colo.

E. (9) $1,687.37.

A. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,557.95. E. (9) $2,020.83.

A. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

D. (6) $6,829.13. E. (9) $35,057.23.

A. American Library Association, 50 East Huron, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $511.75. E. (9) $16,616.94.

A. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $235.97.

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

D. (6) $38,997.05. E. (9) $7,004.07.

A. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $11,821.10. E. (9) $11,821.10.

A. American Paper Institute, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $1,500.

A. American Surveyors, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Taxpayers Association, 326 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $7,380.45. E. (9) $1,552.97.

A. American Thrift Assembly, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $450. E. (9) $70.41.

A. American Vocational Association, Inc., 1025 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $66,234. E. (9) $500.

A. Robert E. Ansheles, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Consolidated International Trading Corp., 180 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $350. E. (9) $50.20.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Floor Covering Committee Affiliated with the National Council of American Importers, 295 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $6.82.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Margaret Lee Weil, 33 West 67th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $206.53.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $8,333.32. E. (9) $292.75.

A. The Arthritis Foundation, 1212 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,308.60.

A. The Associated General Contractors, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. A. V. Atkinson, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,280.02.

A. Atlanta Committee for Democratic Republican Independent Voter Education, 2540 Lakewood Avenue SW., Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $7,389.85. E. (9) $146.29.

A. Atlantic Richfield Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $300.

A. Automatic Car Wash Association, 4432 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $115. E. (9) $2,863.

A. Charles B. Bailey, Sr., 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $3,250.02. E. (9) $766. 41.

A. Baker, McKenzie & Hightower, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Clark Equipment Co., Buchanan, Mich.
D. (6) $2,395. E. (9) $480.50.

A. William G. Barr, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Parking Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Dita David Beard, 1707 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., 1707 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,200. E. (9) $2,925.

A. Daniel S. Bedell, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union, United Automobile Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $2,815.44. E. (9) $1,161.04.

A. Helen Berthelot, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communication Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $612.52.

A. Walter J. Bierwagen, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y., and 839 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Marine Underwriters, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Joel D. Blackmon, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Mailers Union, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $200.

A. Robert W. Blair.
B. New Process Co., Warren, Pa.
E. (9) $327.72.

A. C. S. Blankenship, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,585.62.

A. William Blum, Jr., 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,480. E. (9) $672.02.

A. Melvin J. Boyle, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,328.52.

A. Joseph E. Brady, 122 Sheraton Gibson Hotel, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Wally Briscoe.
B. National Community Television Association, Inc., 535 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $202.50. E. (9) $23.50.

A. Florence I. Broadwell, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,942.34. E. (9) $1,286.14.

A. W. S. Bromley, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Carl Bronn, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $35.85.

A. Robert J. Brown, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $67.

A. James E. Bryan, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Blue Shield Plans, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $1,549.68.

A. Lyman L. Bryan, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 666 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $10. E. (9) $16.23.

A. Lowell A. Burkett, 1025 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Vocational Association, 1025 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George B. Burham, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Numerous stockholders of the Burnham Chemical Co., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $105. E. (9) $105.

A. Charles S. Burns, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $584.50. E. (9) $350.83.

A. George H. Buschmann, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $3,333.33.

A. The Camping Club of America, Inc., 996 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10.

A. Canal Zone Central Labor Union-Metal Trades Council, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C.Z.
D. (6) $1,831.94. E. (9) $1,207.60.

A. Richard M. Carrigan, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,711.05. E. (9) $208.40.

A. Casey, Lane & Mittendorf, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. South African Sugar Association, Post Office Box 507, Durban, South Africa.
D. (6) $7,358.75. E. (9) $1,811.92.

A. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hal M. Christensen, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Dental Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12,536. E. (9) $11,605.20.

A. William F. Claire, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Paper Institute, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. James E. Clark, Jr., 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Oil Shale Corp., 680 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Collier, Shannon & Rill, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Footwear Manufacturers Association, Inc., 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $95.

A. Collier Shannon & Rill, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tool and Stainless Steel Industry Committee, care of the Carpenter Steel Co., Reading, Pa.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $275.

A. Nicholas S. Collins, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $278. E. (9) $15.71.

A. Paul G. Collins, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $125.

A. Colorado Open Space Coordinating Council, Inc., 2422 South Downing Street, Denver, Colo.

D. (6) $3,252.34. E. (9) $2,817.85.

A. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Committee for Time Uniformity, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Paul Conrad, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Newspaper Association, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $282.38.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Dental Association, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,531.

A. Harry N. Cook, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Waterways Conference.

A. Joy Coombs, 137 D Street SE., Washington, D.C.

B. Colorado Open Space Coordinating Council, Inc., 2422 South Downing Street, Denver, Colo.

D. (6) $400.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $974.03. E. (9) $974.03.

A. Leo J. Crowley, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.

B. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.

A. C. B. Culpepper, Post Office Box 1736, Atlanta, Ga.

B. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc.

A. Cuna International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.

D. (6) $1,585.35. E. (9) $377.02.

A. Michael P. Daniels, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Debevoise, Plimpton, Lyons & Gates, 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Edward G. Sparrow, 1 East 66th Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $37.45.

A. Ronald W. De Lucien, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $325. E. (9) $75.

A. Franklin W. Denius, Post Office Box 1148, Austin, Tex.

B. Texas Electric Service Co., Post Office Box 970, Fort Worth, Tex.; Dallas Power & Light Co., Dallas, Tex., and Texas Power & Light Co., Post Office Box 6331, Dallas, Tex.

E. (9) $862.36.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Department of Water Resources, State of California, Post Office Box 388, Sacramento, Calif.

D. (6) $2,175.26. E. (9) $250.26.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Engineering Co., Inc., 74 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $170.90. E. (9) $10.90.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Sacramento Municipal Utility District, 6201 S Street, Sacramento, Calif.

D. (6) $1,086.48. E. (9) $36.48.

A. R. Michael Duncan.

B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William E. Dunn, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $553.14.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $123.51. E. (9) $26.14.

A. Harold E. Edwards, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) $3,370. E. (9) $300.

A. J. C. B. Ehringhaus, Jr., Post Office Box 1776, Raleigh, N.C.

B. Southern Railway System, Post Office Box 1808, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $5,250. E. (9) $1,698.31.

A. Elliott & Naftalin, 1330 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Audio Visual Association, 3150 Spring, Fairfax, Va.

D. (6) $500.

A. Warren G. Elliott, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $475. E. (9) $149.93.

A. John W. Emeigh, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $303. E. (9) $11.35.

A. Employee Relocation Real Estate Advisory Committee, Inc., 333 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $16,500. E. (9) $5,331.44.

A. Edward L. Felton, Holland, Va.

B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

D. (6) $34.94. E. (9) $34.94.

A. Joe G. Fender, 2033 Norfolk Street, Houston, Tex.

B. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc.

D. (6) $809.29.

A. Mello G. Fish, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) $2,835. E. (9) $300.

A. Floyd O. Flom, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. American Paper Institute, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Frederick W. Ford.

B. National Community Television Association, Inc., 535 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $695. E. (9) $48.50.

A. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7278, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. Morley E. Fox, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

B. Central Arizona Project Association, Arizona Title Building, Phoenix, Ariz.

D. (6) $204.42. E. (9) $199.11.

A. Milton Fricke, Papillion, Nebr.

B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

D. (6) $47.88. E. (9) $47.88.

A. David C. Fullarton, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $136.

A. William A. Geoghegan, 1000 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Soap & Detergent Association, 295 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,500.

A. Mary Condon Gereau, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,114.71. E. (9) $391.12.

A. Harry J. Gerrity, 907 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Building Owners & Managers, 134 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $49.94.

A. Ernest Giddings, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Retired Teachers Association and American Association of Retired Persons, Executive Office, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $1,252.59.

A. Robert Gladwin, Fruit Street, Boston, Mass.

B. Massachusetts General Hospital, Fruit Street, Boston, Mass.

E. (9) $131.

A. Glenn F. Glezen, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert Glicker, 1642 South 52d Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

B. International Mailers Union, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.

A. John A. Gosnell, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,833.34.

A. Edward Gottlieb & Associates, Ltd., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Florists' Transworld Delivery Association, 900 West Lafayette Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. George Gross, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,375. E. (9) $43.62.

A. Harlan V. Hadley, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Taxation Committee, Automobile Manufacturers Association, 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) $1,250.

A. Harold F. Hammond, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation Association of America.

A. Eugene B. Hayden, Jr., 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Crop Quality Council, 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $4,125. E. (9) $508.66.

A. William H. Hedlund, 909 American Bank Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, San Francisco, Calif., et al.

A. Noel Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, 801 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Insurance Agents 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y., and 801 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $455.09.

A. Carey W. Hilliard, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $303. E. (9) $15.60.

A. Irvin A. Hoff, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $45.25.

A. Frank N. Hoffmann, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Lawrence J. Hogan, 1022 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Apartment Association of America, Inc., 1022 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $252.

A. Lawrence J. Hogan, 1022 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Specialty Contractors' Associations, Inc., 1022 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Home Manufacturers Association, 1119 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Harold A. Hosier, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.
B. International Mailers Union, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.

A. David P. Houlihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold K. Howe, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Laundering, Joliet, Ill.
D. (6) $1,598.27.

A. Harold K. Howe, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Automatic Merchandising Association, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Harold K. Howe, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Outdoor Power Equipment Institute, Inc., 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Floyd E. Huffman, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $303. E. (9) $16.40.

A. Meryle V. Hutchinson, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,828.

A. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $8.10.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $20,330.34.

A. International Mailers Union, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $207.81.

A. Ives, Whitehead & Co., Inc., 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Chas. E. Jackson, 715 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1.50.

A. Walter K. Jaenicke, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ralph K. James, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $440. E. (9) $39.16.

A. Charlie W. Jones, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $30.

A. Mrs. Fritz R. Kahn, 9202 Pence Place, Fairfax, Va.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $9.75.

A. Karelsen, Karelsen, Lawrence & Nathan, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $391.32.

A. Charles C. Keeble, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co. (a Delaware corporation), Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $112.15.

A. I. L. Kenen, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450.

A. John A. Killick, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12.50.

A. John A. Killick, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $270.83.

A. Kenneth L. Kimble, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $525. E. (9) $66.24.

A. James F. Kmetz, 1427 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,796.

A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $840. E. (9) $13.10.

A. Mrs. Thomas Kouzes, 3504 Barkley Drive, Fairfax, Va.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $3.50.

A. Germaine Krettek, 200 O Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Library Association, 50 North Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $5,471.19.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of ASCS County Office Employees, Jasper, Fla.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $125.

A. Robert J. Leigh, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $32.

A. Donald Lerch & Co., Inc., 1522 K Street NW., Suite 808, Washington, D.C.
B. Shell Chemical Co., 110 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,525.92. E. (9) $4,525.92.

A. John J. Linnehan, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,208. E. (9) $666.17.

A. John M. Lumley, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,173.10. E. (9) $360.

A. J. L. McCaskill, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, State and Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $100.

A. Alfred R. McCauley, 720 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Scientific Apparatus Makers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $192.11.

A. Joseph J. McDonald, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,370. E. (9) $300.

A. Stanley J. McFarland, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,182.73. E. (9) $421.23.

A. Mrs. Barbara D. McGarry, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. and its subcommittee, Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, 4107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William H. McLin, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,243.02. E. (9) $624.34.

A. C. W. McMillan, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $4,999.98. E. (9) $623.50.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $361.93. E. (9) $65.14.

A. Shane MacCarthy, 20 Chevy Chase Circle NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Printing Industries of America, Inc., 20 Chevy Chase Circle NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $475. E. (9) $861.05.

A. Jos. R. MacLaren, 4 Linden Drive, Hudson Falls, N.Y.
B. Potlatch Forests, Inc., 320 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $430.81.

A. James Mark, Jr., 1427 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,796.

A. Edwin E. Marsh, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $3,255. E. (9) $300.02.

A. Michael Marsh, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $396.16.

A. J. M. Massey, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $502.84.

A. Albert E. May, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $382. E. (9) $43.

A. Anthony Mazzocchi, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers International Union, 1840 California Street, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,437.50. E. (9) $227.50.

A. Robert A. Means, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald Melvin, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $622.80. E. (9) $281.82.

A. Joseph L. Miller, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Northern Textile Association and National Parking Association.

A. Clarence Mitchell, 422 First Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Stephen A. Mitchell, Post Office Box 486, Taos, N. Mex.

A. Mrs. Jennelle Moorhead, Eugene Continuation Center, Eugene, Oreg.

A. Jo V. Morgan, Jr., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Humane Association, Post Office Box 1266, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Curtis Morris, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Micah H. Naftalin, Elliott & Naftalin, 1330 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ethyl Corp., 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750.

A. Micah H. Naftalin, Elliott & Naftalin, 1330 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. South Potomac Citizens' Crisis Committee, 8701 Riverview Road, Oxon Hill, Md.
D. (6) $467.

A. National Associated Businessmen, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,717.80. E. (9) $1,600.67.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Association of Blue Shield Plans, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,549.68.

A. National Association of Building Owners and Managers, 134 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $103.06.

A. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $350. E. (9) $350.

A. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,156.30. E. (9) $15,220.13.

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, Inc., 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $455.09.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 155 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,450. E. (9) $35,648.32.

A. National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,490. E. (9) $2,490.

A. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Central Scientific Co., 1700 Irving Park Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $226.06.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for the Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $177.80.

A. National Community Television Association, Inc., 535 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $969.50. E. (9) $969.50.

A. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $116,699.03. E. (9) $12,151.07.

A. National Federation of Independent Businesses, Inc., 920 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $23,069.06. E. (9) $23,069.06.

A. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,615.05. E. (9) $2,068.80.

A. National Parking Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $625.

A. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $15,767.60. E. (9) $8,155.62.

A. National Rehabilitation Association, Inc., 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,724. E. (9) $1,117.

A. National Retired Teachers Association, and American Association of Retired Persons, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,431.45.

A. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $15,050. E. (9) $8,562.

A. National Small Business Association, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $2,562.52.

A. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $235.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $9,997. E. (9) $5,149.52.

A. Edward K. Nellor, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ivan A. Nestingen, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $21.70.

A. Robert W. Nolan, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. North Carolina Cotton Promotion Association, Inc., Post Office Box 5425, Raleigh, N.C.
E. (9) $68.

A. R. E. O'Connor, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper Institute, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles T. O'Neill, Jr., 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $64.60.

A. J. Allen Overton, Jr., 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Lew M. Paramore, Town House Hotel, Post Office Box 1310, Kansas City, Kans.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 225 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Geo. F. Parrish, Charleston, W. Va.
B. West Virginia Railroad Association, Post Office Box 7, Charleston, W. Va.
E. (9) $153.86.

A. Perry S. Patterson, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Automatic Phonograph Manufacturers.

A. A. Harold Peterson, 500 Minnesota Federal Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. National R.E.A. Telephone Association, 500 Minnesota Federal Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $2,637.60.

A. Andrew A. Pettis, 100 Indiana Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. I.U.M.S.W.A.-G.E.B., 534 Cooper Street, Camden, N.J.
D. (6) $4,956. E. (9) $3,288.59.

A. Joseph D. Phelan, 485 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Colorado River Association, 417 South Hill Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $3,100. E. (9) $855.

A. Pierson, Ball & Dowd, 1000 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Federal Cartridge Corp., 2700 Foshay Tower, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $237.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. J. Francis Pohlaus, 422 First Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. William I. Powell, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $12.70

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Bermuda Trade Development Board, Hamilton, Bermuda.
D. (6) $1,666. E. (9) $76.16.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bulk Food Carriers, Inc., 311 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $900.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sea-Land Service, Inc., Post Office Box 1050, Elizabeth, N.J.
D. (6) $900.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. South Atlantic & Caribbean Line, Inc., 250 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $200.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Stimson Lumber Co., Post Office Box 68, Forest Grove, Oreg.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $422.60.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Elisabeth von Oberndorff, 200 East 66th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Stanley Rector, 720 Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Robert E. Redding, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Time Uniformity, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert E. Redding, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. A. Reidelbach, Jr., 1119 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Home Manufacturers Association, 1119 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200.

A. John J. Riley, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $55.

A. John Rippey, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $662.55. E. (9) $73.50.

A. Nathaniel H. Rogg, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,312.50. E. (9) $95.

A. John F. Rolph III, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500.

A. Harland J. Rue.
B. New Process Co., Warren, Pa.
E. (9) $521.64.

A. Mrs. Edward F. Ryan, 110 Bridge Street, Manchester, Mass.
B. National Congress of Parents & Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $166.92.

A. Francis J. Ryley, 519 Title and Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, San Francisco, et al.

A. Stanley W. Schroeder, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Clayton A. Seeber, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,177.68. E. (9) $252.84.

A. Theodore A. Serrill, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Newspaper Association, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $93.14.

A. John J. Sheehan, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $300.

A. Laurence P. Sherfy, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $575.

A. Robert L. Shortle, 306 International Trade Mart, New Orleans, La.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 225 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.

A. A. Z. Shows, 1800 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Wilmac Corp., 1800 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $797.95.

A. Jack C. Skerrett, 717 19th Street South, Arlington, Va.
B. The Camping Club of America, Inc., 996 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10.

A. W. A. Smallwood, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Gordon L. Smith, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Edward Gottlieb & Associates, 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $15.35.

A. Dr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., 1709 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Va.
D. (6) $3,125.90. E. (9) $2,336.12.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, Post Office Box 3719, Georgetown Station, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,807.53. E. (9) $10,451.42.

A. Marvin J. Sonosky, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, Drawer 747, Durant, Okla.
E. (9) $161.

A. Lawrence Speiser, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Civil Liberties Union, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Chester S. Stackpole, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. State and Federal Relations, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $18,025.05.

A. Mrs. Nell May Ferguson Stephens, Post Office Box 6234, Northwest Station, Washington, D.C.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hamilton Watch Co. and Elgin National Watch Co.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $90.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Texaco, Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Mrs. Alexander Stewart (Annalee), 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $37,126.67. E. (9) $8,455.82.

A. Nelson A. Stitt, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Ad hoc group of publishers.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. New York Mercantile Exchange, 6 Harrison Street, New York, N.Y.

A. William A. Stringfellow, 6004 Roosevelt Street, Bethesda, Md.

B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 520 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $34.50.

A. Philip W. Stroupe, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $450. E. (9) $112.35.

A. Richard L. Studley, 1400 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1400 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Walter B. Stults, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $600.

A. Barry Sullivan, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of River & Harbor Contractors, 3900 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Md.

D. (6) $750. E. (9) $139.73.

A. Monroe Sweetland, 1705 Murchison Drive, Burlingame, Calif.

B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $335. E. (9) $50.

A. J. Woodrow Thomas, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Trans World Airlines, 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Julia C. Thompson, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $3,320.94.

A. Eugene M. Thoré, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. John N. Thurman, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Pacific American Steamship Association, 635 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $884.59.

A. Dr. Frank A. Todd, 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $531.60.

A. Dwight D. Townsend, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Cooperative League of USA, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $1,995.

A. Trade Relations Council of the United States, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Transportation Association of America, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $267.86.

A. Richard S. Tribbe, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Trans World Airlines, 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Paul T. Truitt, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Plant Food Institute, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Trustees for Conservation, 251 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $6,866.20. E. (9) $3,201.95.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc., 321 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $1,453.98.

A. United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $264.13.

A. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. F. Bourne Upham III, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $580.

A. Charles R. Van Horn, 17th and H Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. and Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co., Charles and Baltimore Street, Baltimore, Md.

A. Veterans of World War I, U.S.A., Inc., 40 G Street NE., Washington, D.C.

A. R. K. Vinson, 1400 20th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1400 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Volume Footwear Retailers Association, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $18,527.17.

A. Harold S. Walker, Jr., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Paul H. Walker, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $475. E. (9) $38.07.

A. Franklin Wallick, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) $3,570.35. E. (9) $1,092.34.

A. Water for the West, 485 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $6,244.43.

A. Weaver, Glassie & Molloy, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Atlantic-Richfield Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

D. (6) $300.

A. Dr. Frank J. Welch, 3724 Manor Road, Chevy Chase, Md.

B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John C. White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $318.03.

A. John C. White, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Private Truck Council of America, Inc., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Society of Travel Agents, Inc., 360 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $32.65.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Arapahoe Indian Tribe, Fort Washakie, Wyo.

E. (9) $1.30.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Quinaielt Indian Tribe, Tahola, Wash.

A. Robert P. Will, 487 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, 1111 Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) $3,600. E. (9) $1,036.67.

A. Harding deC. Williams, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,916. E. (9) $79.55.

A. John C. Williamson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,250. E. (9) $538.06.

A. Kenneth Williamson, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,405.38. E. (9) $586.25.

A. Morton M. Winston.

B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edmund N. Wise, 729 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Home Builders, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $705.10.

A. Richard P. Witherall, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.

B. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Venlo Wolfsohn, 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $300. E. (9) $1.50.

A. Nathan T. Wolkomir, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,692.34. E. (9) $1,383.27.

A. Sidney Zagri, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,998.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the third calendar quarter 1966:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE ONE COPY WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19______ ◄

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◄

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1◄

Note on Item "D."—(*a*) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302(a) of the Lobbying Act.

(*b*) **If This Report Is for an Employer.**—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(*c*) **If This Report Is for an Agent or Employee.**—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. Receipts (Including Contributions and Loans):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $--------Dues and assessments
2. $--------Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $--------Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $--------Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter
5. $--------Received for services (e.g., salary, fee, etc.)
6. $--------Total for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")
7. $--------Received during previous Quarters of calendar year
8. $--------Total from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(a).

9. $--------Total now owed to others on account of loans
10. $--------Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $--------Repaid to others during this Quarter

12. $--------"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more
(from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?

Please answer "yes" or "no": --------

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor*
	(*"Period"* from Jan. 1 through ________________, 19____)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N.Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	Total

Note on Item "E".—(*a*) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302(b) of the Lobbying Act.

(*b*) **If This Report Is for an Agent or Employee.** In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E 7").

E. Expenditures (Including Loans) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $--------Public relations and advertising services
2. $--------Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $--------Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $--------Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $--------Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $--------Telephone and telegraph
7. $--------Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $--------All other expenditures
9. $--------Total for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. $--------Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year
11. $--------Total from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(b).

12. $--------Total now owed to person filing
13. $--------Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $--------Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More

In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates—Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7–11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7–15, 8–15, 9–15: Britten & Blaten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D.C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	Total

A. Charles D. Ablard, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $26.40.

A. Robert L. Ackerly, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chemical Specialties Manufacturers Association, Inc., 50 East 41st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $114.84.

A. Francis L. Adams.
B. Pacific Power & Light Co., Public Service Building, Portland, Oreg.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $30.20.

A. Clarence G. Adamy, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Ad Hoc Committee of the Construction Industry Advancement Funds, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ad Hoc Committee of Electronic Component Manufacturers, Room 910, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $963.88. E. (9) $963.88.

A. Ad Hoc Committee on Paper Industries Machinery Tariffs, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,140. E. (9) $1,140.

A. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,349. S. (9) $5,349.

A. Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, 4650 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.
E. (9) $7,132.90.

A. Air Traffic Control Association, Inc., 525 School Street SW., Washington, D.C.

A. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,267.22. E. (9) $3,267.22.

A. Mrs. Donna Allen, 3306 Ross Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Committee to Abolish HUAC, 555 North Western Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,040. E. (9) $1,366.15.

A. Kenneth D. Allen, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $78. E. (9) $13.59.

A. Louis J. Allen, 1121 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Class I railroads in Tennessee.

A. Amalgamated Transit Union, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Aniline Products, Inc., 25 McLean Boulevard, Paterson, N.J.
E. (9) $1,525.14.

A. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street, Washington, D.C.

A. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway New York, N.Y.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill., and 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $32,199. E. (9) $32,199.

A. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $40,353.02.

A. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,170.20. E. (9) $3,966.61.

A. American Federation of Musicians, 641 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $331,861.71. E. (9) $6,415.35.

A. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Humane Association, Post Office Box 1266, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $1,500.

A. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,425. E. (9) $1,425.

A. American Insurance Association, 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,062. E. (9) $6,062.

A. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $346.27. E. (9) $678.20.

A. American Justice Association, Inc., Defense Highway, Gambrills, Md.
D. (6) $25. E. (9) $25.

A. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $409.49. E. (9) $15.07.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $13,511.09.

A. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $82.09.

A. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $11,030.76. E. (9) $11,030.76.

A. American Optometric Association, Inc., in care of Dr. Melvin D. Wolfberg, 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.
E. (9) $6,254.77.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $786.05. E. (9) $786.05.

A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and the subcommittee Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, 2107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $20,336.25. E. (9) $358.78.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,012. E. (9) $6,920.

A. American Podiatry Association, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,378.04. E. (9) $2,378.04.

A. American Restaurant Institute, 1414 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,950. E. (9) $5,918.06.

A. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,249.18. E. (9) $1,249.18.

A. American Stock Yards Association, 1712 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $900.

A. American Surveys, 2000 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Certain cement companies.

A. American Taxpayers Association, 326 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,130. E. (9) $1,679.79.

A. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $11,894.65. E. (9) $11,894.65.

A. American Transit Association, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $26,450. E. (9) $21,533.06.

A. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,290.06. E. (9) $15,113.30.

A. American Warehousemen's Association, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,036.64. E. (9) $2,036.64.

A. Cyrus T. Anderson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Football League, 1 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Cyrus T. Anderson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Spiegel, Inc., 2511 West 23d Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Jerry L. Anderson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Walter M. Anderson, Jr., Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.
D. (6) $351. E. (9) $699.90.

A. Mrs. Erma Angevine, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George W. Apperson, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division 689, Amalgamated Transit Union, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Carl F. Arnold, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $1,629.88.

A. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Railroad Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.

A. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $525. E. (9) $525.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $23,960.16. E. (9) $23,960.16.

A. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $316.79. E. (9) $638.33.

A. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. A. V. Atkinson, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,833.65.

A. Atlantic Richfield Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $300.

A. Robert L. Augenblick, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Richard W. Averill, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Michael H. Bader, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harry S. Baer, Jr., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National AeroSpace Services Association, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $80.50.

A. Douglas B. Bagnell, Post Office Box 486, Fairhope, Ala.
B. Maine Potato Council, Presque Isle, Maine.
D. (6) $300.

A. Charles B. Bailey, Sr., 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $3,250.02. E. (9) $1,907.19.

A. Donald Baldwin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Northern Pacific Railway Co., St. Paul, Minn.; Great Northern Railway Co., St. Paul, Minn.; Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $300.

A. Ernest L. Borcella, Washington, D.C.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Robert C. Barnard, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Barnes, Richardson & Colburn, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Diamond Conservation Committee.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $50.60.

A. Irvin L. Barney, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $3,600.

A. A. Wesley Barthelmes, 2133 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Insurance Co. of North America and Life Insurance Co. of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $597.30. E. (9) $206.36.

A. James P. Bass, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Airlines, Inc., 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Roy Battles, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Donald S. Beattie, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,050.

A. Lowell R. Beck, 1705 DeSales Street, Washington, D.C.
B. American Bar Association, 1705 DeSales Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $10.

A. Daniel S. Bedell, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $3,284.68. E. (9) $735.56.

A. John H. Beidler.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,690. E. (9) $526.17.

A. James F. Bell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $4.99.

A. Ernest H. Benson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $5,500.

A. Helen Berthelot, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $14.67.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,265. E. (9) $663.05.

A. Robert J. Bird, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Paul Revere Life Insurance Co., Worcester, Mass.

A. John H. Bivins, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert W. Blair.
B. New Process Co., Warren, Pa.
E. (9) $927.91.

A. Wm. Rhea Blake, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $3,062.50. E. (9) $1,243.86.

A. C. B. Blankenship, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,638.84.

A. Blumberg, Singer, Ross & Gordon, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,250. E. (9) $211.41.

A. Eugene P. Boardman, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,309. E. (9) $36.

A. Maurice G. Boehl, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Eugene F. Bogan, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for a Reasonable World Trade Center, 450 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Eugene F. Bogan, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $44.85.

A. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $105.25. E. (9) $101.50.

A. Robert T. Borth, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $71.75.

A. G. Stewart Boswell, 620 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Agricultural Employers, 620 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $138.21.

A. Melvin J. Boyle, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,328.52.

A. Samuel E. Boyle, 428 South Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $1,272.81. E. (9) $35.76.

A. Charles N. Brady, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Thomas C. Brickle, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Lumber and Building Material Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Parke C. Brinkley, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.

A. Wally Briscoe.
B. National Community Television Association, Inc., 535 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $202.50. E. (9) $27.

A. David A. Brody, 1640 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Anti-Defamation of B'nai B'rith, 315 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $200.

A. Carl Bronn, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,250.01.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $350.

A. Derek Brooks, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Furniture Association, 1150 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $860.

A. Joseph P. Brosnan, 406 West Market Street, San Antonio, Tex.

B. Air Force Sergeants Association, 130 North Carolina Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $100. E. (9) $100.

A. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express & Station Employes, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) $7,553.30. E. (9) $7,553.30.

A. J. Robert Brouse, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Animal Health Institute, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $85.

A. Robert J. Brown, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $424.

A. Brown, Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American & Foreign Power Co., Inc., 100 Church Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,624.99.

A. Brown, Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,478.81.

A. Robert W. Bruce, 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. The Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co., 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $374. E. (9) $512.

A. Lyman L. Bryan, 2900 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 666 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $11.23. E. (9) $39.43.

A. George S. Buck, Jr., Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

A. George S. Bullen.

B. National Federation of Independent Business, 15th Street, and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Norman D. Burch, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $54.87.

A. C. P. Burks, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $562.50.

A. George J. Burger, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. George J. Burger, 921 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. John J. Burke, Finlen Hotel, Butte, Mont.

B. Pacific Northwest Power Co., Post Office Drawer 1445, Spokane, Wash.

E. (9) $475.

A. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.

D. (6) $785.26. E. (9) $798.03.

A. David Burpee, Fordhook Farms, Doylestown, Pa.

A. Hollis W. Burt, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $62.50.

A. Herbert H. Butler, 438 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Independent Telephone Association, 438 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $75. E. (9) $108.

A. Monroe Butler, 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. The Superior Oil Co., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Robert B. Byrnes, 1514 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 2403 East 75th Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $300. E. (9) $50.52.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.

D. (6) $760.20. E. (9) $72.50.

A. Gordon L. Calvert, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $365.

A. Carl C. Campbell, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) $37.50.

A. The Camping Club of America, Inc., 996 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $10.

A. Canal Zone Central Labor Union-Metal Trades Council, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C.Z.

D. (6) $988.53. E. (9) $586.30.

A. Marvin Caplan, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,799. E. (9) $92.36.

A. Ronald A. Capone, 505 The Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Committee of European Shipowners, 30–32 St. Mary Axe, London, E.C. 3, England.

D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $238.23.

A. Michael H. Cardozo, 1521 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Law Schools, 1521 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James R. Carres, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,500.

A. Braxton B. Carr, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $220.72.

A. Blue A. Carstenson.

B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,492.59. E. (9) $121.73.

A. Eugene C. Carusi, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $100.

A. E. Michael Cassady, 225 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.

B. Mississippi Valley Association, 225 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Francis R. Cawley, 1015 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Label Manufacturers National Association, Inc., and Agricultural Publishers Association, 1015 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $250. E. (9) $52.69.

A. Central Arizona Project Association, 1124 Arizona Title Building, Phoenix, Ariz.

D. (6) $60,595. E. (9) $34,302.35.

A. Donald E. Channell, 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Bar Association, 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $500. E. (9) $25.50.

A. Alger B. Chapman, Jr., 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. James W. Chapman, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,708.50.

A. Chapman, DiSalle & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Alaska Pipeline Co., Post Office Box 6554, Houston, Tex.

D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $145.30.

A. Chapman, DiSalle & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Strohmeyer & Arpe Co., 139–141 Franklin Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $500. E. (9) $81.67.

A. Chapman, DiSalle & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Union Nacional de Productores de Azucar, S. A. de C. V., Balderas 36—Primer Piso, Mexico D.F., Mexico.

D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $58.63.

A. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.

E. (9) $905.26.

A. Chemical Specialties Manufacturers Association, Inc., 50 East 41st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. A. H. Chesser, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

E. (9) $200.

A. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Pennsylvania Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) $4,339.17. E. (9) $4,900.50.

A. Edwin Christianson.

B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $37,964.01. E. (9) $47.84.

A. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $37,964.01. E. (9) $668.21.

A. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,798. E. (9) $10,192.25.

A. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $7,352.77.

A. Citrus Industrial Council, Inc., Post Office Box 89, Lakeland, Fla.
D. (6) $6,781.15. E. (9) $1,593.14.

A. Allen C. K. Clark, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Earl W. Clark.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,294. E. (9) $54.40.

A. James B. Clark, Jr., 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert M. Clark, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Roger A. Clark, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Wine Conference of America, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Clay Pipe Industry Depletion Committee, Post Office Box 13125, Kansas City, Mo.
E. (9) $882.20.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Oil Shale Corp., 680 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association, 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $20.70.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Tobacco Co.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $175.08.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $175.08.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Liggett & Myers Tobacco Co.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $175.08.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. P. Lorillard Co.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $175.08.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philip Morris, Inc.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $175.08.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $175.08.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tobacco Institute.

A. Clay L. Cochran, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,030.42. E. (9) $66.12.

A. Edwin S. Cohen, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Committee for a Reasonable World Trade Center, 450 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $37.50.

A. Edwin S. Cohen, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $35.

A. Joseph Cohen, National Press Building, Washington D.C.
B. The National Association of Retail Druggists, 1 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $750.

A. Richard G. Cohen 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Universal Consolidated Industries, 1 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $150.

A. Cole & Croner, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Task Force of Small American Shipbuilders, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $2,000.

A. Cole E. Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Tanker Owners, Inc., 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. J. I. Collider, Jr., 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $212.50.

A. Collier Shannon & Rill, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Collier, Shannon & Rill, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Footwear Manufacturers Association, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $275.

A. Collier, Shannon & Rill, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tool and Stainless Steel Industry Committee, in care of the Carpenter Steel Co., Reading, Pa.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $400.

A. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $584.07. E. (9) $584.07.

A. Committee for Automobile Excise Tax Repeal, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. The Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Committee for a Free Cotton Market, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $200.

A. Committee for an Interstate Taxation Act, 1209 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. R. T. Compton, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Paul B. Comstock, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Raymond F. Conkling, 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Texaco, Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $115.50.

A. John D. Conner, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert J. Conner, Jr., 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $192. E. (9) $45.

A. Harry N. Cook, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Waterways Conference.

A. Edward Cooper.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John Shepherd Cooper, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,600. E. (9) $2,274.11.

A. Joshua W. Cooper, 626 South Lee Street, Alexandria, Va.
B. Portsmouth-Kittery Armed Services Committee, Inc., Post Office Box 506, Portsmouth, N.H.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $1,649.20.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Council of Forest Industries, 1477 West Penden Street, Vancouver, B.C., Canada.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $1.50.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Footwear Division, Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,250. E. (9) $2.50.

A. Council for a Livable World, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,428.64. E. (9) $22,919.35.

A. Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Council of Mutual Savings Institutions, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $314.09.

A. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, 29 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Edsall Lee Couplin, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
B. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,650. E. (9) $21.50.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Lightweight Aggregate Percentage Depletion Committee, care of John W. Roberts, Post Office Box 9138, Richmond, Va.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. A. P. Møller, 8 Kongens Nytorv, Copenhagen, Denmark.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Mortgage Insurance Companies, care of William A. Granberry, Post Office Box 2976, Raleigh, N.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Tool, Die & Precision Machining Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Wisconsin Corp., 500 Union Street, Seattle, Wash.

E. (9) $69.65.

A. Robert E. Cronin, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. H. C. Crotty, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. J. A. Crowder, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,500.

A. Leo J. Crowley, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.

B. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.

A. J. Steele Culbertson, 1614 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Fish Meal & Oil Association, 1614 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $150. E. (9) $29.10.

A. Joseph F. Cunningham, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John T. Curran, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Laborers' International Union of North America, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $5,250. E. (9) $2,598.44.

A. John R. Dalton, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

B. Associated Railways of Indiana, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. Michael P. Daniels, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles A. Darnell, 3129 Brereton Court, Huntington, W. Va.

B. Sheet Metal Workers International Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. F. Gibson Darrison, Jr., 1010 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. New York Central Railroad Co., 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Chicago Bridge & Iron Co., 901 West 22d Street, Oak Brook, Ill.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Inland Steel Co., 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $7.20.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $51.58.

A. Lowell Davis, 801 Ross Avenue, Mart, Tex.

D. (6) $180. E. (9) 180.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. D.C. Transit System, Inc., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Guild of Prescription Opticians, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $750.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Oceanic Properties, Inc., Post Office Box 2780, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Admiral Time, Inc., Belair Time Corp., Unitime Corp., St. Croix, V.I., and Multi-Jewell Corp., St. Thomas, V.I.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Air Transport Association, Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Nursing Home Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $65.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York N.Y.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Indian Sugar Mills Association, Export Agency Division, Calcutta, India.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Laundry-Dry Cleaning Association of D.C., 2401 Calvert Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Restaurant Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,750.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Peoples Life Insurance Co., Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co., and Equitable Life Insurance Co., Washington, D.C.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1518 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1518 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Responsive Environments Corp., 21 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Debevoise, Plimpton, Lyons & Gates, 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Edward G. Sparrow, 1 East 66th Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $19.13.

A. Tony T. Dechant.

B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $61.80.

A. L. E. Deilke, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

B. The Interstate Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

D. (6) $1,500.

A. L. E. Deike, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

B. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

D. (6) $3,000.

A. Ronald W. De Lucian, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $326. E. (9) $75.

A. Milton C. Denbo, 1341 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Automatic Car Wash Association, 4432 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $9.12.

A. Franklin W. Denius, Post Office Box 1148, Austin, Tex.

B. Texas Electric Service Co., Post Office Box 970, Fort Worth, Tex.; Dallas Power & Light Co., Dallas, Tex., and Texas Power & Light Co., Post Office Box 6331, Dallas, Tex.

E. (9) $52.06.

A. Max A. Denney, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $675.

A. John M. Dickerman, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Lumber and Building Material Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,762.50. E. (9) $180.81.

A. George S. Dietrich, 1741 DeSales Street, Washington. D.C.

B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., Washington, D.C.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Department of Water Resources, State of California, Post Office Box 388, Sacramento, Calif.

D. (6) $2,236.12. E. (9) $211.12.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Engineering Co., Inc., 75 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Sacramento Municipal Utility District, 6201 S Street, Sacramento, Calif.

D. (6) $1,096.24. E. (9) $46.24.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Yuba County Water Agency, Marysville, Calif.

D. (6) $1,252. E. (9) $52.

A. Disabled American Veterans, National Service Headquarters, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) $10,875. E. (9) $959.51.

A. Robert H. Distelhorst, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $14.75.

A. District of Columbia Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 710 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $125.

A. District No. 44, IAM/AW, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $11,950.44.

A. Division 689, Amalgamated Transit Union.

A. James F. Doherty, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,562. E. (9) $659.13.

A. Paul R. M. Donelan, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $250.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150.

A. Jasper N. Dorsey, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $207.60.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,514.69. E. (9) $151.

A. Leonard K. Dowiak, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $275.

A. P. Frederick Dryer, 3911 Madison Street, Hyattsville, Md.

A. Evelyn Dubrow, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,715.44. E. (9) $1,927.15.

A. R. Michael Duncan.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. D. Durand, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $305.

A. Walter A. Edwards, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $100.

A. George V. Egge, Jr., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James B. Ehrlich, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $516.25. E. (9) $285.05.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,950. E. (9) $301.62.

A. John M. Elliott, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clyde T. Ellis, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $65.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Basic Management, Inc., Post Office Box 2065, Henderson, Nev.
D. (6) $1,525.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Coachella Valley County Water District, Coachella, Calif.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 111 North Hope Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $2,400.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 2130 Adeline Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Las Vegas Valley Water District, 3700 Charleston Boulevard, Las Vegas, Nev.
D. (6) $900.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Signal Oil & Gas Co., 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,550.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $7,087.50. E. (9) $124.84.

A. Myles W. English, 202 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 202 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Grover W. Ensley, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $480. E. (9) $45.

A. Lawrence E. Ernst, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Star Route Mail Carriers Association, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $870.

A. John D. Fagan, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the U.S.A.
D. (6) $2,050. E. (9) $35.50.

A. Family Tax Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.
E. (9) $17.80.

A. William J. Fannin, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $80,377.25. E. (9) $23,586.48.

A. Joseph G. Feeney, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. REA Express, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $600.

A. Arthur S. Fefferman, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Bonner Fellers, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Maxwell Field, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
B. New England Shoe and Leather Association, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $78.39.

A. Herbert A. Fierst, 607 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Council of Forest Industries of British Columbia, 1477 West Pender Street, Vancouver, B.C., Canada.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $155.

A. William J. Flaherty, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $3,375.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
E. (9) $1,200.

A. Gordon Forbes, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B. Minnesota Railroads Association.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $769.74.

A. Frederick W. Ford.
B. National Community Television Association, Inc., 535 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $695. E. (9) $36.

A. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7278, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $2.92. E. (9) $2.92.

A. James W. Foristel, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,612.50. E. (9) $179.48.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $60.

A. Fowler, Leva, Hawes & Symington, 815 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Samson, Ltd., Christainsted, St. Croix, Virgin Islands.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $23.40.

A. John G. Fox, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $411.44.

A. Morley E. Fox, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Central Arizona Project Association, 1124 Arizona Title Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
D. (6) $361.55. E. (9) $179.45.

A. Charles A. Francik, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Corning Glass Works, Corning, N.Y.
D. (6) $420.

A. R. Frank Frazier, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. James H. French, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $51.50.

A. Joseph Freni, Jr., 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Philip P. Friedlander, Jr., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $22,375. E. (9) $12,202.

A. David C. Fullarton, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,064.

A. Garrett Fuller, 836 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Columbia Steamship Co., 1210 Standard Plaza, Portland, Oreg., and Columbia Plywood Corp., 1110 Standard Plaza, Portland, Oreg.
D. (6) $157.50. E. (9) $9.45.

A. John Baxter Funderburk, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Association of Retail Druggists, 1 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $500.

A. Gadsby Maguire, Hannah & Merrigan, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Aris Gloves, Inc., 10 East 38th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $749.98.

A. Gadsby, Maguire, Hannah & Merrigan, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cranbar Corp., Ponce, P.R.
D. (6) $1,375. E. (9) $233.91.

A. Henry E. Gardiner, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Anaconda Co., 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $709.09.

A. William B. Gardiner, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $2.40.

A. Gas Supply Committee, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $104,750.

A. Aubrey D. Gates, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $170.

A. Arthur P. Gildea, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink & Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $1,797.67.

A. Joseph S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
E. (9) $421.01.

A. Neal P. Gillen, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ginsburg & Feldman, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Tobacco Distributors, 360 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $45.68.

A. Robert Gladwin, Fruit Street, Boston, Mass.
B. Massachusetts General Hospital, Fruit Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Jay W. Glasmann, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Employee Relocation Real Estate Advisory Committee, Inc., 209 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $149.84.

A. Glenn F. Glezen, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Philip M. Glick, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District of Columbia Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 710 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $40.

A. Don A. Goodall, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. W. S. Gookin, 112 North Central Avenue, Phoenix, Ariz.

A. Edward Gottlieb & Associates, Ltd., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Florists' Transworld Delivery Association, 900 West Lafayette Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $500.

A. Government Employes' Council, AFL–CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,793.11. E. (9) $4,977.48.

A. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $71.62.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, 15401 Detroit Avenue, Lakewood, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $67,034.66. E. (9) $67,034.66.

A. George Grant, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $30.

A. Cornelius R. Gray, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James A. Gray, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Virginia M. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $101.25. E. (9) $153.45.

A. Samuel A. Grayson, 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho.
B. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.
E. (9) $863.28.

A. Dale Greenwood, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
B. Washington Railroad Association, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mutual Benefit Health & Accident Association, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Oceanic Properties, Inc., Post Office Box 2780, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. J. S. Grigsby, Jr., 1105 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103–1111 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $2,400.

A. Ben H. Guill, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association and American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co.
D. (6) $4,100. E. (9) $1,800.

A. Jerome R. Gulan.
B. National Federation of Independent Business, 15th Street and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert W. Haack, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $103.40.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,294. E. (9) $140.48.

A. Hal H. Hale, 421 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Randolph M. Hale, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Andrew G. Haley (deceased), 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc,. 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $321.54.

A. Harold T. Halfpenny, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. J. G. Hall, Detroit, Mich.

B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Wilfred H. Hall, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. E. C. Hallbeck, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $6,875.10.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chrysler Corp., Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) $3,600. E. (9) $124.31.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Comision Nacional Para el Estudio, de la Caña y el Azucar, La Paz, Bolivia.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Lake Carriers' Association, Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Tejon Ranch Co., Post Office Box 1560, Bakersfield, Calif.

D. (6) $1,800.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Watkins Products, Inc., Winona, Minn.

A. William R. Hardman, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Tool, Die & Precision Machining Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Bryce N. Harlow, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Procter & Gamble Manufacturing Co., 301 East Sixth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

E. (9) $252.

A. Mildred B. Harman, 212 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

D. (6) $797.49. E. (9) $472.44.

A. William B. Harman, Jr., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $70.42.

A. L. James Harmenson, Jr., 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $330.75.

A. R. A. Harris, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $3,750.

A. Burr P. Harrison, Graichen Building, Winchester, Va.

B. Savage Arms, Westfield, Mass., et al.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $75. E. (9) $12.07.

A. Eugene B. Hayden, Jr., 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

B. Crop Quality Council, 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

D. (6) $4,125. E. (9) $392.17.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hays & Hays, 920 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.

D. (6) $1,399.77.

A. John C. Hazen, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $103.95.

A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $420.71. E. (9) $420.71.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $200. E. (9) $49.30.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and the subcommittee Bipartisan Citizens' Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, 2107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $875. E. (9) $848.02.

A. Kenneth G. Heisler, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,000.

A. Noel Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edmund P. Hennelly, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Mobil Oil Corp., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $363.33.

A. John K. Herbert, 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Magazine Publishers Association, 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $191.57.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Football League, 1 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Savage Arms, Westfield, Mass., et al.

A. Hester & Stone, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Brewers Association, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $66.09.

A. M. F. Hicklin, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.

B. Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.

E. (9) $1,792.71.

A. John W. Hight, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $100.

A. Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Norman Hill.

B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $804.79.

A. Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle, USMC (retired), 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

D. (6) $1,166.67. E. (9) $85.85.

A. Ralph D. Hodges, Jr.

B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $61.10.

A. Irvin A. Hoff, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $91.20.

A. Hogan & Hartson, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Kaiser Industries Corp., Kaiser Center, Oakland, Calif.

D. (6) $2,050. E. (9) $46.15.

A. Hogan & Hartson, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Proprietary Association, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Hogan & Hartson, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Society of Independent Gasoline Marketers of America, Clayton, Mo.

D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $93.59.

A. Hogan & Hartson, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Territory of Guam, Agana, Guam.

A. Fuller Holloway, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Toilet Goods Association, Inc., 1270 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Lee B. Holmes, 829 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $6.90.

A. Edwin M. Hood, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald E. Horton, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. David P. Houlihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Thomas B. House.

B. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $100.

A. Charles L. Huber, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $959.51.

A. W. T. Huff, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $352.50.

A. Everett Hutchinson, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Philip A. Hutchinson, Jr., 1735 New York Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $1,012.23.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $5.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C.

B. Hugo W. Zugnoni, Rochester, N.Y.

E. (9) $436.

A. Frank N. Ikard, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Bernard J. Imming, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,227.50.

A. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $10,593.86. E. (9) $10,593.86.

A. Inland Steel Co., 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $13,410.12.

A. Institute of Appliance Manufacturers, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $300. E. (9) $12.51.

A. International Armament Corp., 10 Prince Street, Alexandria, Va.

E. (9) $1,500.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $41,143.80.

A. International Union of District 50, United Mine Workers of America, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $3,265.

A. The Interstate Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

D. (6) $2,975. E. (9) $3.75.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., 1000 First National Bank Building, St. Paul Minn.

D. (6) $15,425.88. E. (9) $7,950.50.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.

D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $99.

A. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Daniel Jaspan, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,500.51. E. (9) $43.16.

A. Chas. B. Jennings, 1712 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Stock Yards Association, 1712 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $400.

A. Robert G. Jeter, Dresden, Tenn.

B. H. C. Spinks Clay Co., Paris, Tenn., et al.

A. Glendon E. Johnson, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $271.25. E. (9) $3.74.

A. Reuben L. Johnson.

B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,716.99. E. (9) $213.14.

A. Spencer A. Johnson, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ned Johnston, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers & Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $850.29.

A. Geo. Bliss Jones, Montgomery, Ala.

B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.

D. (6) $176. E. (9) $364.96.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $15.25.

A. Karelsen, Karelsen, Lawrence & Nathan, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $226.82.

A. Allan M. Kearney, 1001 Broad Street, Johnstown, Pa.

B. Pennsylvania Electric Co., 1001 Broad Street, Johnstown, Pa.

D. (6) $464.54. E. (9) $22.17.

A. William J. Keating, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $24.

A. Howard B. Keck, 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. The Superior Oil Co., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.

E. (9) $300.

A. W. M. Keck, Jr., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.

E. (9) $275.

A. Charles C. Keeble, Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

A. Thomas John Kehoe & Associates, 1904 Rookwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.

E. (9) $475.

A. Robert H. Kellen, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Mayonnaise & Salad Dressings Institute, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert H. Kellen, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. National Preservers Association, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. James C. Kelley, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John T. Kelly, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.

A. Thomas A. Kelly, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,112.50.

A. I. L. Kenen, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $630. E. (9) $350.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Marathon Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.

E. (9) $115.20.

A. James J. Kennedy, Jr., 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $635.

A. William F. Kenney, New York, N.Y.

B. Shell Oil Co., 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. Don Kerlin, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Reuben H. Donnelley Corp., 235 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $300. E. (9) $100.

A. J. Don Kerlin, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $300. E. (9) $100.

A. J. Don Kerlin, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Time, Inc., Rockefeller Center, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $300. E. (9) $100.

A. William J. Kerwin, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,100.

A. Edward W. Kiley, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph T. King, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Associated Equipment Distributors & Sprinkler Irrigation Association.

E. (9) $732.20.

A. T. Bert King, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $750.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $690. E. (9) $57.69.

A. Ernest A. Kistler, 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
B. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
D. (6) $161.25. E. (9) $218.58.

A. Ralph W. Kittle.
B. International Paper Co., 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $83.20.

A. Robert E. Kline, Jr., 430 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Fishing Tackle Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $177.08.

A. Robert E. Kline, Jr., 430 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Bowling Proprietors Association of America, Inc., West Higgins Road, Hoffman Estates, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $98.88.

A. James F. Kmetz, 1427 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,802.

A. George J. Knaly, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,999.99.

A. John D. Knodell, Jr., 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $1,126.23.

A. Robert M. Koch, 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $36.90.

A. William L. Kohler, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $254.33.

A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,540. E. (9) $136.51.

A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $139.21.

A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Far East Line, Inc., 141 Battery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2,499.99. E. (9) $171.50.

A. Germaine Krettek, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $5,501.55.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,607.50. E. (9) $3,911.04.

A. June Kysilko, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Laborers' International Union of North America, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10,206.73.

A. Laborers' Political Action League, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,804.21. E. (9) $14,300.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,292. E. (9) $7,039.

A. Richard H. Lane, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing.

A. Reed E. Larson, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Right To Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Glenn T. Lashley, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. D. C. Division, American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. L. Edward Lashman, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,562. E. (9) $459.20.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $525.

A. George H. Lawrence, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $312.50. E. (9) $91.18.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $24.35.

A. League of Americans Residing Abroad, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert F. Lederer, 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $36.25. E. (9) $108.

A. Leonard F. Lee, 402 Solar Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Tenneco, Inc., Post Office Box 2511, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $83.60.

A. Ernest Leff, 9301 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, Calif.

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $17. E. (9) $118.

A. Legislative Committee, International Economic Policy Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,480.27.

A. Robert J. Leigh, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $187.

A. G. E. Leighty, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. E. Leitz, Inc., 468 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $2,992.91.

A. Nils A. Lennartson, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $9,249.96. E. (9) $60.

A. Donald Lerch & Co., Inc., 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shell Chemical Co., 110 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Roy T. Lester, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $206.25. E. (9) $10.20.

A. Morris J. Levin, 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Morris J. Levin, 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Hal Leyshon, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Federation of Musicians, 641 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,999.98. E. (9) $1,928.78.

A. Lightweight Aggregate Percentage Depletion Committee, care of John W. Roberts, Post Office Box 9138, Richmond, Va.
D. (6) $5,226.62. E. (9) $2,552.08.

A. Donald O. Lincoln, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Ad Hoc Committee of Electronic Component Manufacturers, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $63.88.

A. Lester W. Lindow, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $55.25. E. (9) $20.

A. Charles B. Lipsen, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retail Clerks International Association, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,826.87. E. (9) $1,425.01.

A. Zel E. Lipsen, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators & Paperhangers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,575.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $37.31.

A. Basil R. Littin, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
B. Continental Oil Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. John J. Long, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union of North America, Pressmen's Home, Tenn.
D. (6) $1,950. E. (9) $80.

A. Paul H. Long, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $156.80.

A. R. C. Longmire, Pauls Valley, Okla.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Harold O. Lovre, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $294.50.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.
B. Norfolk & Western Railway Co., Roanoke, Va.
D. (6) $600.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District of Columbia Bankers Association, 1706 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Robert W. Johnson, Jr., New Brunswick, N.J.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Medical Corp., 415–423 West Pershing Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Milton F. Lunch, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750.

A. John M. Lynham, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Charles and Katrushka J. Parsons, 310 Park Avenue, Pasay City, Manila, Philippines.
E. (9) $313.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., Eleventh & L Building, Sacramento, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2,812.50. E. (9) $777.57.

A. Breck P. McAllister, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert C. McCandless.
B. International Paper Co., 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $198. E. (9) $121.83.

A. John A. McCart, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Government Employes' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,019.22.

A. McCarty & Wheatley, 1200 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Evan Jones Coal Co., Jonesville, Alaska.
D. (6) $1,300.

A. McCarty & Wheatley, 1200 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Semitropic Water Storage District, 2714 L Street, Bakersfield, Calif.
D. (6) $1,100.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Coca-Cola Co., Post Office Drawer 1734, Atlanta, Ga.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mobile Oil Corp., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Richard J. McCooey, 1226 36th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Seventeen Eighty Nine, Inc., 1226 36th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $25.

A. E. L. McCulloch, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, B. of L. E. Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Albert L. McDermott, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $400.

A. Angus H. McDonald.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,646.14. E. (9) $127.32.

A. Joseph A. McElwain, 40 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
B. The Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.
E. (9) $426.39.

A. Mrs. Barbara D. McGarry, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and its subcommittee Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, 4107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Paul J. McGowan, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Virgin Islands Legislature, Charlotte Amalie, St. Thomas, Virgin Islands.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $295.38.

A. Marshall C. McGrath.
B. International Paper Co., 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $262.50. E. (9) $73.63.

A. Clarence M. McIntosh, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,095.29. E. (9) $69.99.

A. W. F. McKenna, 427 West Fifth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. California Savings and Loan League.

A. William F. McKenna, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,400. E. (9) $25.

A. William F. McManus, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $212.25.

A. Charles R. McNeill, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $7,260.45.

A. Shane MacCarthy, 20 Chevy Chase Circle NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Printing Industries of America, Inc., 20 Chevy Chase Circle NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $475. E. (9) $970.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc., care of Dr. Melvin D. Wolfberg, 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. John G. Macfarlan, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. REA Express, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,290. E. (9) $315.50.

A. Jos. R. MacLare, 4 Linden Drive, Hudson Falls, N.Y.
B. Potlatch Forests Inc., 320 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $950. E. (9) $420.65.

A. H. E. Mahlman, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc., care of Dr. Melvin D. Wolfberg, 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.
D. (6) $812.50. E. (9) $119.13.

A. Don Mahon, 1127 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $933.44.

A. Carter Manasco.
D. $5,400. E. $151.92.

A. Rufus W. Manderson, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $3,000.

A. Olya Margolin (Mrs.), 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,296.20. E. (9) $125.38.

A. James Mark, Jr., 1427 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,802.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $525. E. (9) $898.

A. Raymond E. Marks, 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. David M. Marsh, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Insurance Association, 85 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $20.58.

A. Edwin E. Marsh, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $3,255. E. (9) $46.30.

A. Michael Marsh, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $396.16.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $313.50. E. (9) $4.50.

A. J. Paull Marshall, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $266.14. E. (9) $343.10.

A. Thomas A. Martin, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $120.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japanese-American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Walter J. Mason, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Building and Construction Trades Dept., AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,999.93. E. (9) $1,059.45.

A. J. M. Massey, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $643.49.

A. Charles E. Mattingly, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $2,664. E. (9) $102.41.

A. Charles D. Matthews, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $18.25.

A. C. V. & R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Georgia Power Co., 270 Peachtree Street, Atlanta, Ga.

A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of North America, 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,625. E. (9) $735.

A. Mayonnaise & Salad Dressings Institute, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert A. Means, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John S. Mears, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $3,240. E. (9) $64.95.

A. Carl J. Megel, 1343 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Teachers, 716 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $8,800.

A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,952. E. (9) $284.34.

A. Lawrence C. Merthan, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chas. Pfizer & Co., Inc., 235 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $155.

A. Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. M. Barry Meyer, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $798.15.

A. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
E. (9) $1,651.87.

A. Midland Cooperative Dairy Association, Shawano, Wis., and Box 128, Cazenovia, N.Y.

A. Clarence R. Miles, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee, International Economic Policy Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,560.67.

A. Capt. A. Stanley Miller, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100.

A. Miller Associates, Inc., 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Telephone Answering Exchange, Inc., 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $937.50. E. (9) $90.

A. Miller Associates, Inc., 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Music Publishers' Association, Inc., 460 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $194.30.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Dallas, Tex., Chamber of Commerce.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Gulf Intracoastal Canal Association, 2211 South Coast Building, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $2,625.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Edwin Reid Miller, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Nebraska Railroads Legislative Committee, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $1,676.32.

A. Lloyd S. Miller, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $476.18.

A. Luman G. Miller, 912 Failing Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Oregon Railroad Association, 912 Failing Building, Portland, Oreg.
E. (9) $328.87.

A. Robert H. Miller, 402 Solar Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Tenneco, Inc., Post Office Box 2511, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $78.40.

A. Jim M. Milligan, 402 Barclay Building, Bala-Cynwyd, Pa.
B. National Water Company Conference, 402 Barclay Building, Bala-Cynwyd, Pa.

A. Othmer J. Mischo, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Missouri Railroad Committee, care of W. W. Dalton, Law Department, Frisco Lines, 906 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
E. (9) $419.34.

A. Clarence Mitchell, 422 First Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Thomas F. Mitchell, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Georgia-Pacific Corp., Box 311, Portland, Oreg.

A. Mobilehome Dealers National Association, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,812.57.

A. Willis C. Moffatt, 525 First Security Building, Boise, Idaho.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif., and others.
D. (6) $140.

A. G. Merrill Moody, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $59.92. E. (9) $181.01.

A. Joseph E. Moody, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $625.

A. Carlos Moore, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Mrs. Jennelle Moorhead, 1250 Emerald, University Campus, Eugene, Oreg.

A. Henry J. Moreschi, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Laborers' International Union of North America, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $533.29.

A. J. V. Morgan, Jr., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Humane Association, Post Office Box 1266, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Morison, Clapp, Abrams & Haddock, the Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $1,587.88.

A. John J. Murphy, Jr., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bricklayers, Masons & Plasterers International Union of America, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,925. E. (9) $618.90.

A. John J. Murphy, Wilelinor Estates, Route 2, Box 113–D, Edgewater, Md.
B. National Customs Service Association.

A. William E. Murray, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William E. Murtha, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., Post Office Box 7278, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7278, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. Kenneth D. Naden, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $286.84.

A. Augustus Nasmith, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.
B. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.

A. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Associated Businessmen, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,295.70. E. (9) $1,252.22.

A. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $15,000. E. (9) $7.75.

A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $823.72. E. (9) $15,495.85.

A. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $200.

A. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $42,983.33. E. (9) $2,196.71.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,639.24. E. (9) $1,639.24.

A. National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $808.66. E. (9) $808.66.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $25,000. E. (9) $8,619.19.

A. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $441.58. E. (9) $562.50.

A. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $1,660.06.

A. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $11,836.81. E. (9) $11,836.81.

A. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $550. E. (9) $550.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $609,229.80. E. (9) $8,420.94.

A. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $5,600.71.

A. National Committee To Abolish HUAC, 555 North Western Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1.366.15. E. (9) $1,366.15.

A. National Community Television Association, Inc., 535 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $960.50. E. (9) $960.50.

A. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc., 26 Auburn Avenue, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $2,775.

A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Post Office Box 23, Memphis, Tenn.

A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $12,901.97. E. (9) $12,901.97.

A. National Council of Agricultural Employers, 620 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,370.60. E. (9) $3,370.60.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,123.75. E. (9) $5,281.69.

A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $150.

A. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 239 Beach Road, Alameda, Calif.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $317.60.

A. National Council of Technical Service Industries, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $533.36. E. (9) $473.08.

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $40.39. E. (9) $40.39.

A. National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., 920 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $22,771.49. E. (9) $22,771.49.

A. National Fisheries Institute, Inc., 1614 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $136.34. E. (9) $118.16.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $11,944.09. E. (9) $21,896.53.

A. National Independent Dairies Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $206.96.

A. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,753.45. E. (9) $8,643.92.

A. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,893.95. E. (9) $1,893.95.

A. National Livestock Feeders Association, 309 Livestock Exchange Building, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $3,000.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,417.54. E. (9) $7,417.54.

A. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,680.

A. National Parking Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $951.66.

A. National Preservers Association, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $22,469.80. E. (9) $11,993.95.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 1150 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $5,851.53.

A. National Right To Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,842.15.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $106,314. E. (9) $3,232.

A. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,675.

A. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $618. E. (9) $618.

A. National Utility Contractors Association, Inc., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,100.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $24,139. E. (9) $4,784.74.

A. Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $11,850. E. (9) $7,030.32.

A. Robert R. Neal, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Alan M. Nedry, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Southern California Edison Co., Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $2,635.65.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $3,611.

A. New England Shoe & Leather Association, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $478.39. E. (9) $478.39.

A. Sarah H. Newman, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Consumers League, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,650.

A. Patrick J. Nilan, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Federation of Postal Clerks, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,999.98. E. (9) $723.22.

A. Stanley D. Noble, 29 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

B. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, 29 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert W. Nolan, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $100.

A. Charles M. Noone, 410 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $494.47.

A. Joseph A. Noone, 514 Madison Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $900. E. (9) $46.89.

A. North Carolina Cotton Promotion Association, Inc., Post Office Box 5425, Raleigh, N.C.

E. (9) $122.

A. North Carolina Railroad Association, Post Office Box 2635, Raleigh, N.C.

D. (6) $712.69. E. (9) $393.10.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers and Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $107.32.

A. Harry E. Northam, 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

B. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Graham T. Northup, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $5,350. E. (9) $5,355.

A. E. M. Norton, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $200. E. (9) $23.50.

A. Michael J. Norton, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $200. E. (9) $180.80.

A. Seward P. Nyman, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Podiatry Association, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $650. E. (9) $650.

A. Richard T. O'Connell, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,225.02. E. (9) $324.34.

A. William B. O'Connell, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, 2247 West Lawrence Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $600.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Transit Association, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $17,500. E. (9) $656.22.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.

B. El Paso Natural Gas Co., 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $5,000.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Upper Mississippi Towing Corp., 7703 Normandale Road, Minneapolis, Minn.

D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $481.20.

A. John B. O'Day, 11 East Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Insurance Economics Society of America, 11 East Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $10,962.79.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,200.

A. Jane O'Grady, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 15 Union Square, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,885. E. (9) $258.19.

A. Richard C. O'Hare and James H. Rowe, Jr., 1120 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Harness Tracks of America, 333 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

E. (9) $927.25.

A. Alvin E. Oliver, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $21.62.

A. Samuel Omasta, 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $14.30.

A. Order of Railway Conductors & Brakemen, O.R.C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

E. (9) $6,518.07.

A. Morris E. Osburn, Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.

B. Missouri Railroad Committee.

A. Kermit Overby, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $185.

A. John A. Overholt, 10400 Connecticut Avenue, Kensington, Md. Branch office, 1106 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,207.56.

A. Raymond S. Page, Jr., Mill Creek Terrace, Gladwyne, Pa.

B. Campbell Soup Co., 375 Memorial Avenue, Camden, N.J.

A. Walter Page, Post Office Box 128, Cazenovia, N.Y.

A. Lew M. Paramore, Mississippi Valley Association, Post Office Box 1310, Kansas City, Kans.

B. Mississippi Valley Association, 225 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.

A. J. D. Parel, 244 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $272.75. E. (9) $263.

A. James D. Parriott, Jr., 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.

B. Marathon Oil Co., 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.

A. Robert D. Partridge, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $295.

A. Michael Pasternak, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Union of District 50, United Mine Workers of America, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,265.

A. Lynn C. Paulson, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Independent Dairies Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $132.15

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.

B. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.

D. (6) $700.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.

B. Family Tax Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.

B. The Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.

A. D. V. Pensabene, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Oil Co. of California, suite 1204, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $75. E. (9) $75.

A. J. Carter Perkins, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Shell Oil Co., 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. A. Harold Peterson, 500 Minnesota Federal Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

B. National REA Telephone Association, 500 Minnesota Federal Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $2,691.54.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Drawer BS, Lakeland, Fla.

B. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.

D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $43.50.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Drawer BS, Lakeland, Fla.

B. Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association, Post Office Box 20155, Orlando, Fla.

E. (9) $16.69.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Drawer BS, Lakeland, Fla.

B. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.

D. (6) $600. E. (9) $21.

A. Kenneth T. Peterson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Hotel & Restaurant Employees & Bartenders International Union, 6 East Fourth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) $2,499.99.

A. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $18.65.

A. Joseph D. Pehlan, 485 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Colorado River Association, 417 South Hill Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) $3,300. E. (9) $850.

A. John P. Philbin, 510 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Mobil Oil Corp., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $247.75.

A. Richard N. Philleo, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,462.50. E. (9) $57.67.

A. Tom Pickett, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $10.68.

A. Bruce O. Pike, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $450.

A. James F. Pinkney, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $213.45.

A. T. E. Pinkston, 101 East High Street, Lexington, Ky.

E. (9) $278.68.

A. James H. Pipkin, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Texaco Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $700. E. (9) $1,460.

A. The Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.

E. (9) $56.48.

A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 1720 Avenue M, Lubbock, Tex.

D. (6) $18,364.89. E. (9) $1,350.

A. J. Francis Pohlhaus, 422 First Street SE., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. James K. Polk, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., 4 Irving Place, New York, N.Y.

A. John W. Pompelli, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $336.50.

A. Robert R. Poston, 908 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $900. E. (9) $180.98.

A. Ramsay D. Potts, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

R. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,666. E. (9) $17.46.

A. William J. Potts, Jr., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William I. Powell, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $7.60.

A. Thomas W. Power, 1414 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Restaurant Institute, 1414 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,000.

A. Graydon R. Powers, Jr., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $10.

A. William C. Prather, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $400.

A. William H. Press, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $7,500.

A. Forrest J. Prettyman, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $187.50. E. (9) $5.

A. Earle W. Putnam, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Amalgamated Transit Union, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William A. Quinlan, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,215.90. E. (9) $488.57.

A. Edward F. Ragland, 6917 Marbury Road, Bethesda, Md.

B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $256.56. E. (9) $256.56.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $75.31.

A. Carl R. Ramsey, 239 Beach Road, Alameda, Calif.

B. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 239 Beach Road, Alameda, Calif.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Silver Users Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $500. E. (9) $76.84.

A. James A. Ransford, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Tidewater Oil Co.

A. Edward M. Raymond, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,875.04. E. (9) $221.05.

A. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $11,328.81.

A. Otie M. Reed, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,150. E. (9) $1,568.

A. W. O. Reed, 6254 Woodland Drive, Dallas, Tex.

D. (6) $595. E. (9) $259.

A. George L. Reid, Jr., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $799.98. E. (9) $168.43.

A. Robert E. Reiser, 6649 Holland Street, McLean, Va.

B. National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $92,566.54.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $15,503.17. E. (9) $8,965.34.

A. Theron J. Rice, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Continental Oil Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. James W. Richards, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,133.34. E. (9) $16.63.

A. Dorsey Richardson, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. James W. Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Air Transport Association, Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. R. J. Riddick, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Freight Forwarders Institute, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $364.80.

A. Siert F. Riepma, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. William Neale Roach, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,200.

A. William Neele Roach, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Armament Corp., 10 Prince Street, Alexandria, Va.

D. (6) $1,500.

A. A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $250.

A. Austin L. Roberts, Jr., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $875.

A. Clyde F. Roberts, Jr., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Roberts & Holland, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Furman-Wolfson Corp., 1440 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $850. E. (9) $166.39.

A. Kenneth A. Roberts, 423 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Optometric Association, care of Dr. Melvin D. Wolfberg, 100 West Pine St., Selinsgrove, Pa.

D. (6) $1,500.

A. Kenneth A. Roberts, 423 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Podiatry Association, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,200.

A. Kenneth A. Roberts, 423 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Animal Health Institute, care of Robert Brouse, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,000.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $185.

A. Donald L. Rogers, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $562.50.

A. Frank W. Rogers, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Western Oil and Gas Association, 609 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) $526.

A. Royall, Koegel & Rogers, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Ad Hoc Committee of Publishing Companies, 60–62 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $1.76.

A. Royall, Koegel & Rogers, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Pinkerton's Inc., 154 Nassau Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Royall, Koegel & Rogers, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Power Authority of the State of New York, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $12.76.

A. Rubenstein, Wolfson & Co., Inc., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. National Independent Coal Operators Association, Pikeville, Ky.

A. John Forney Rudy, 902 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.

A. Harland J. Rue.

B. New Process Co., Warren, Pa.

E. (9) $773.02.

A. Albert R. Russell, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis Tenn.

D. (6) $513. E. (9) $181.52.

A. J. T. Rutherford, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $542.35.

A. William H. Ryan, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. District No. 44, I.A. of M. & A.W., 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,749.98. E. (9) $422.60.

A. Francis J. Ryley, 519 Title and Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.

B. Standard Oil Co. of California, San Francisco, Calif., et al.

A. Arthur A. Sandusky, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,750.

A. William H. Scheick, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $300.

A. Leslie J. Schmidt Associates, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Beer Wholesalers' Association of America, 6310 North Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $200.

A. C. Herschel Schooley, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Bankers Association of America, Sauk Centre, Minn.

D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $2,518.63.

A. Hilliard Schulberg, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Washington, D.C., Retail Liquor Dealers Association, Inc., 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $120.34.

A. Scribner, Hall & Casey, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee for an Interstate Taxation Act, 1209 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $20.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hollis M. Seavey, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ashley Sellers, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. General Time Corp., 355 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $566.30.

A. Seventeen Eighty Nine, Inc., 1226 36th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $35.

A. Leo Seybold, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $443.80.

A. Alvin Shapiro, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $238.55.

A. David C. Sharman, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Optometric Association, Inc., care of Dr. Melvin D. Wolfberg, 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.

D. (6) $1,093.75. E. (9) $617.82.

A. A. Manning Shaw, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brown, Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C., and National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $968.

A. Arnold F. Shaw, 503 D Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Comite de Productores De Azucar, Lima, Peru.

A. Kenneth D. Shaw, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) $474.99.

A. Shaw, Pittman, Potts, Trowbridge & Madden, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. League of Americans Residing Abroad, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Roderick K. Shaw, Jr., Post Office Box 2111, Tampa, Fla.

B. Citrus Industrial Council, Post Office Box 89, Lakeland, Fla.

D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $509.28.

A. Ira Shesser, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $75.

A. Max Shine, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $992. E. (9) $20.

A. Alvin V. Shoemaker, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $500. E. (9) $288.60.

A. Robert L. Shortle, 1147 International Trade Mart Tower, New Orleans, La.

B. Mississippi Valley Association, 225 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.

A. George Shuff, 1121 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.

B. Class I railroads in Tennessee.

A. Charles B. Shuman, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $800.

A. Sidley, Austin, Burgess & Smith, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Inland Steel Co., 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $12,800.

A. Silver Users Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,883. E. (9) $1,788.21.

A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) $36,000. E. (9) $7,087.50.

A. Jack C. Skerrett, 717 19th Street South, Arlington, Va.

B. The Camping Club of America, Inc., 996 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $10.80.

A. Harold S. Skinner, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

B. Continental Oil Co.

A. Carstens Slack, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla.

A. Harold Slater, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,462.50. E. (9) $15.30.

A. Stephen Slipher, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $34.75.

A. W. A. Smallwood, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald E. Smiley, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $283.27.

A. Frank Kingston Smith, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Aviation Trades Association.
D. (6) $937.50.

A. Gordon L. Smith, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Edward Gottlieb & Associates, Ltd., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $19.20.

A. Harold Arden Smith, 605 West Olympic Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Co., of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $36.45.

A. Irvin A. Smith, 418 East Rosser Avenue, Post Office Box 938, Bismarck, N. Dak.
E. (9) $146.29.

A. Milan D. Smith, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert B. Smith, 121 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Dr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., 1709 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Va.
B. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 712 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,231.90. E. (9) $2,271.43.

A. Wallace M. Smith, 829 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $75.19.

A. Wayne H. Smithey, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $1,598. E. (9) $594.

A. Lyle O. Snader, 244 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $431.87. E. (9) $279.

A. Frank B. Snodgrass, 1726 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc., Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $422.03.

A. Edward F. Snyder, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
E. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,432.

A. J. R. Snyder, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, Post Office Box 3719, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,864.50. E. (9) $9,021.69.

A. Carl A. Soderblom, 1 East First Street, Reno, Nev.
B. Nevada Railroad Association, 1 East First Street, Reno, Nev.

A. Stanley L. Sommer, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ad Hoc Committee on Paper Industries Machinery Tariffs, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $140.

A. Marvin J. Sonosky, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. W. Byron Sorrell, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mobilehome Dealers National Association, 39 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,725. E. (9) $87.57.

A. Southern States Industrial Council 1103–1111 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $42,821.58. E. (9) $5,651.94.

A. William W. Spear, 214 Fremont National Bank Building, Fremont, Nebr.
B. Standard Oil Company (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $729.17. E. (9) $9.41.

A. John F. Speer, Jr., 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers and Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $258.72.

A. Melvin L. Stark, 1729 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Insurance Association, 85 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,750. E. (9) $75.

B. Mrs. Nell May Ferguson Stephens, Post Office Box 6234, Northwest Station, Washington, D.C.

A. Russell M. Stephens, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $20.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hamilton Watch Co., and Elgin National Watch Co.
D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $116.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Texaco, Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $33.09.

A. Mrs. Alexander Stewart, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $29,561.58. E. (9) $5,332.75.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Aniline Products, Inc., 25 McLean Boulevard, Paterson, N.J.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $25.14.

A. Stitt and Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association to Acquire Compensation for Damages Prior to Peace Treaty, Naha, Okinawa.

A. Stitt and Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japan General Merchandise Exporters Association and Japan Rubber Footwear Manufacturers' Association of Tokyo, Japan.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $140.

A. Nelson A. Stitt, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States, Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
B. Waterman Steamship Corporation, 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.

A. Francis W. Stover, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $277.47.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Allied Printing Trades Association, 10 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $625.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation, Post Office Box 168, Peach Springs, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Speigelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Laguna Pueblo of New Mexico, Laguna, N. Mex.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Metlakatla Indian Community, Post Office Box 142, Metlakatla, Alaska.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. New York Merchantile Exchange, 6 Harrison Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Nez Perce Tribe, Lapwai, Idaho.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation, Pine Ridge, S. Dak.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Salt River Pima-Maricopa Community, Box 907–X, Route 1, Scottsdale, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Seneca Nation of Indians, Box 231, Salamanca, N.Y.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried Frank & Kampelman, 1709 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tuscarora Nation of Indians, Tuscarora Reservation, Lewiston, N.Y.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Wards Co., Inc., 1705 Brook Road, Richmond, Va.

A. Ronnie J. Straw, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Herald E. Stringer, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $4,624.98. E. (9) $219.25.

A. William A. Stringfellow, 6004 Roosevelt Street, Bethesda, Md.
B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 520 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $102.

A. Norman Strunk, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $297.39.

A. Barry Sullivan, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of River and Harbor Contractors, 3900 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Md.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $55.93.

A. Frank L. Sundstrom, 1290 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 1290 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. C. Austin Sutherland, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Gary Tabak, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Ralph L. Tabor, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles P. Taft, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee, Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Warren G. Taylor, 604–605 Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Railroad Committee, 604–605 Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
E. (9) $214.05.

A. Julia C. Thompson, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,273.50.

A. Wm. B. Thompson, Jr., Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of America Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $359.83. E. (9) $289.

A. William H. Tinney, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. E. Linwood Tipton, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers & Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $94.26.

A. M. S. Tisdale, 2355 Alameda Street, Vallejo, Calif.
B. Armed Services Committee, Vallejo Chamber of Commerce.
D. (6) 147.50. E. (9) $115.76.

A. Tobacco Associates, Inc., 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,412.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $150.86.

A. Dr. Frank A. Todd, 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $492.75.

A. John H. Todd, Post Office Box 23, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Box 23, Memphis, Tenn.

A. David R. Toll, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $66.39.

A. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,356.04. E. (9) $2,251.62.

A. F. Gerald Toye, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $16.75.

A. Trade Relations Council of the United States, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,772. E. (9) $1,342.

A. Glenwood S. Troop, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,107.50. E. (9) $82.

A. Paul T. Truitt, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Plant Food Institute, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Galen Douglas Trussell, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dick Tullis, 307 Maple Terrace, Dallas, Tex.
B. Superior Oil Co., Houston, Tex., and Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $100.

A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Range Association, 375 North Fulton Street, Fresno, Calif.
E. (9) $78.96.

A. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
E. (9) $833.70.

A. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $395,388.80. E. (9) $64,812.78.

A. United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $199.01.
A. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $28,252.99.

A. Theodore A. Vanderzyde, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District No. 44, IAM/AW, AFL–CIO, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,250. E. (9) $444.02.

A. George C. Van Nostrand, 1010 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eaton, Yale & Towne, Inc., 100 Erieview Plaza, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $6,500. E. (9) $7,480.43.

A. Mrs. Lois W. Van Valkenburgh, 1673 Preston Road, Alexandria, Va.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $171.

A. Richard E. Vernor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $67.82. E. (9) $11.33.

A. L. T. Vice, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $125.

A. Louis R. Vincenti, 315 East Colorado Boulevard, Pasadena, Calif.

A. E. R. Wagner, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Technical Service Industries, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $188.48. E. (9) $22.12.

A. Franklin Wallick, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $3,060.30. E. (9) $1,063.79.

A. Thomas G. Walters, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $2,464.83.

A. William A. Walton, 820 Quincy Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. Kansas Railroad Committee, 820 Quincy Street, Topeka, Kans.

A. Water for the West, 485 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,800.

A. Jeremiah C. Waterman, 205 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 205 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200.

A. Jeremiah C. Waterman, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $43.75. E. (9) $22.23.

A. Waterways Bulk Transportation Council, Inc., 1750 Brentwood Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Weaver, Glassie & Molloy, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Atlantic-Richfield Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $300.

A. Weaver Glassie & Molloy, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5. E. (9) $1.03.

A. Weaver, Glassie & Molloy, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. E. Leitz, Inc., 468 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,332.37. E. (9) $367.63.

A. Weaver, Glassie & Molloy, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $1.12.

A. E. E. Webster, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $3,558.65.

A. E. Jerome Webster, Jr.
B. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Clarence M. Weiner, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,461.52. E. (9) $49.20.

A. Clarence M. Weiner, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,461.52. E. (9) $15.60.

A. Dr. Frank J. Welch, 3724 Manor Road, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph E. Welch, 1630 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. Wellington Management Co., 1630 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.
E. (9) $601.30.

A. Don White, 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
B. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax Va.
D. (6) $681.25. E. (9) $296.10.

A. John C. White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $36.91.

A. Marc A. White, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Donald S. Whyte, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450.

A. Louis E. Whyte, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Claude C. Wild, Jr., 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $250.

A. Harding deC. Williams, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,916. E. (9) $129.96.

A. John C. Williamson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $293.04.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Travel Agents, Inc., 360 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $35.67.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Arapahoe Indian Tribe, Fort Washakie, Wyo.
E. (9) $1.40.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. KSL, Inc., 145 Social Hall Avenue, Salt Lake City, Utah.
E. (9) $1.96.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Quinaielt Indian Tribe, Taholah, Wash.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Automobile Excise Tax Repeal, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $0.57.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Safety Administrative Committee of the Automobile Manufacturers Association, 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $20,000. E. (9) $632.37.

A. Clark L. Wilson, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Lead-Zinc Producers Committee.
D. (6) $1,100. E. (9) $434.93.

A. E. Raymond Wilson, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,615.

A. Richard W. Wilson, 131 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. W. E. Wilson, 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
B. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $233.70.

A. Morton M. Winston.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Everett T. Winter, 225 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 225 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Robert N. Winter-Berger, 123 East 75th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. The World Calendar, Post Office Box 224, Lenox Hill Station, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $4,050.

A. John A. Wise, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee, International Economic Policy Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $919.60.

A. Richard F. Witherall, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $584.07. E. (9) $584.07.

A. Lawton B. Wolfe, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Venlo Wolfsohn, 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $1.50.

A. Russell J. Woodman, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation-Communication Employees Union, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $500.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Flying Tiger Line, Inc., Los Angeles International Airport, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Signal Oil and Gas Co., 1010 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Hal J. Wright, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. J. Banks Young, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $540.

A. Kenneth Young, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,692. E. (9) $528.71.

A. Sidney Zagri, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,998.

A. Gordon K. Zimmerman, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Zimring, Gromfine & Sternstein, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the third calendar quarter 1966:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE ONE COPY WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19______ ◀

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed; (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report. ◀

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1 ◀

A. Robert L. Ackerly, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chemical Specialties Manufacturers Association, Inc., 50 East 41st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Ad Hoc Committee of Electronic Component Manufacturers, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Ad Hoc Committee on Paper Industries Machinery Tariffs, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. William C. Baisinger, 2870 Arizona Terrace NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Baker, McKenzie & Hightower, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Clark Equipment Co., Buchanan, Mich.

A. Richard B. Barker, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. J. P. Stevens & Co., 1460 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Mark H. Berens, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Oscar Mayer & Co. Inc., 1241 Sedgwick, Chicago, Ill., and 910 Mayer Avenue, Madison, Wis.

A. Carl Bronn, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph P. Brosnan, 406 West Market Street, San Antonio, Tex.

B. Air Force Sergeants Association, 5103 11th Street NE., Washington, D.C., and 406 West Market Street, San Antonio, Tex.

A. George H. Buschmann, World Center Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Washington Psychoanalytic Society, 4925 MacArthur Boulevard NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dan L. Butler, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Harold K. Howe for American Institute of Laundering, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Dan L. Butler, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Harold K. Howe for National Automatic Merchandising Association, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Dan L. Butler, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Harold K. Howe for Outdoor Power Equipment Institute, Inc., 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Philip Carlip, 303 Beverly Road, Brooklyn, N.Y.

B. Seafarers International Union of North America, 675 Fourth Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y.

A. Francis R. Cawley, 15th & H Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Label Manufacturers National Association, Inc., 15th & H Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Chemical Specialties Manufacturers Association, Inc., 50 East 41st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Citrus Industrial Council, Inc., Post Office Box 89, Lakeland, Fla.

A. Richard Cohen, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. Universal Consolidated Industries, 1 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Colorado Open Space Coordinating Council, Inc., 2422 South Downing Street, Denver, Colo.

A. Joy Coombs, 137 D Street SE., Washington, D.C.

B. Colorado Open Space Coordinating Council, Inc., 2422 South Downing Street, Denver, Colo.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington. D.C.

B. Allentown Portland Cement Co. et al.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Union Tank Car Co., 111 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. John deLaittre, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Yuba County Water Agency, Marysville, Calif.

A. Elliott & Naftalin, 1330 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Audio Visual Association, 3150 Spring, Fairfax, Va.

A. Ely and Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Signal Oil and Gas Company, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Federation of American Hospitals, Inc., 1450 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Edward L. Felton, Holland, Va.

B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Fowler, Leva, Hawes & Symington, 815 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Samson, Limited, Christiansted, St. Croix, Virgin Islands.

A. Gadsby, Maguire, Hannah & Merrigan, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Federated Investors, Inc., 719 Liberty Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa., and Vance Sanders and Co., Inc., 111 Devonshire Street, Boston, Mass.

A. I. Leon Goodman, 1450 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. Federation of American Hospitals, Inc., 1450 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. W. S. Gookin, 112 North Central Avenue, Phoenix, Ariz.

A. George Grant, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Sheraton Time Corp., Agana, Guam.

A. Franklin Hardinge, Jr., 1444 Wentworth, Pasadena, Calif.

B. California Savings & Loan League, Post Office Box R, Pasadena, Calif.

A. John L. Harvey, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Drug and Allied Products Guild, Inc., 33 West 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. William Bentley Hitchcock II, 2413 Enfield Road, Austin, Tex.

B. International Public Relations, Inc., 315 First National Bank Building, Canton, Ohio.

A. Hogan & Hartson, 815 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. The Proprietary Association, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Fritz R. Kahn, 9202 Ponce Place, Fairfax, Va.

B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Cornelius B. Kennedy, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Kirkland, Ellis, Hodson, Chaffetz & Masters, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. George J. Knaly, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George W. Koch, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Pacific Far East Line, Inc., 141 Battery Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Mrs. Thomas Kouzes, 3524 Barkley Drive, Fairfax, Va.

B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. E. R. Krantz, 1410 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Pitney-Bowes, Inc., Stamford, Conn.

A. Ernest Leff, 9301 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, Calif.

A. Donald O. Lincoln, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Ad Hoc Committee of Electronic Component Manufacturers, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. William R. Lucas, Post Office Box 2268, San Antonio, Tex.

B. Non-Commissioned Officer's Association of the U.S.A., Post Office Box 2268, San Antonio, Tex.

A. Joseph E. McAndrews, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. J. P. Stevens & Co., 1460 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Alfred R. McCauley, Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Magnavox Co., Bueter Road, Fort Wayne, Ind.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Packers, Ltd., 410 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. E. L. McCulloch, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, B. of L.E. Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. W. F. McKenna, 427 West Fifth, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Harry J. Maginnis, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Neal B. Dunbar, Prudential Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

A. Seymour S. Mintz and Arnold C. Johnson, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Republic Steel Corp., Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Nixon Mudge, Rose, Guthrie & Alexander, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bulk Carriers, Inc., 201 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Non-Commissioned Officer's Association of the U.S.A., Post Office Box 2268, San Antonio, Tex.

A. Michael Pasternak, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union of District 50, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. T. Rutherford & Associates, Inc., 1555 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Central Arizona Project Association, 111 West Monroe Street, Phoenix, Ariz.

A. Scribner, Hall & Casey, 1209 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Roderick K. Shaw, Jr., Post Office Box 2111, Tampa, Fla.
B. Citrus Industrial Council, Post Office Box 89, Lakeland, Fla.

A. Donald E. Smiley, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

A. Mr. Stanley L. Sommer, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ad Hoc Committee on Paper Industries Machinery Tariffs, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Gary Tabak, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. United Association of Journeymen & Apprentices of the Plumbing & Pipe Fitting Industry of the United States & Canada, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John M. Vansant, Jr., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Louis R. Vincenti, 315 East Colorado Boulevard, Pasadena, Calif.

A. Jeremiah C. Waterman, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Jeremiah C. Waterman, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. W. H. Wheeler, Jr., Stamford, Conn.
B. Pitney-Bowes, Inc., Stamford, Conn.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. KSL, Inc., 145 Social Hall Avenue, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Norman L. Wolfson, 30 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Association of New York State Physicians and Dentists, 888 Old Country Road, Plainview, N.Y.

A. Robert C. Zimmer, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Mr. Nicholas J. Mercede Honored at Columbus Day Fete

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, on October 8, Mr. Nicholas J. Mercede was honored by the Italian Center of Stamford, Conn. The occasion was the center's 23d annual Columbus Day dinner dance.

Nicholas J. Mercede has given generously for 11 years in the crafting of a center which has met the hopes and dreams of many Stamford residents. The Italian Center is still growing, and most important, it always will be a dynamic institution by virtue of the limitless potential given to it by its founders and contributors. Already it has gone beyond its central facility to construct a summer day camp.

While Nicholas J. Mercede has been an essential element in the Italian Center's development, his civic contributions have not been directed to the Italian Center alone. He has assisted the United Fund in various capacities over the years, and was appointed by Governor Dempsey to the board of trustees of Fairfield State Hospital, Newtown. He is a director of the Atlantic Industrial Bank; a former member of the Building Board of Appeals; a member of the Stamford Exchange Club; a former president of the Associated Builders of Fairfield County; a member of the Gravinese Mutual Aid Society; a member of the Stamford Chapter of Unico National; a member of the Holy Name Society of St. Leo's Church; and a member of the Knights of Columbus.

Mr. Speaker, my praise and thanks to Nicholas J. Mercede for the work he has done and for effort he will continue to lend.

Senator Ross Bass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE

OF HAWAII

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, it was my good fortune to know and form a friendship with Ross Bass shortly after statehood for Hawaii when I first came to Congress and served in the House of Representatives. I have always been proud of that friendship and appreciated his warm and generous nature. He is a true Democrat, not only in the political sense, but also in his attitude toward men and issues. His record will show that consistently he has championed the rights of the underprivileged. He has held fast to his faith in the human potential and to his belief that our society has an obligation to provide our people an equal opportunity to develop this potential.

I regret that in the next session of Congress we will be deprived of his contributions but I hope and trust that he will continue to give his State and Nation the high quality of public service he has demonstrated during his past stay in Washington. He leaves with my good wishes and I am sure with the good wishes and respect of our colleagues here in the Senate.

Praise for Vice Chairman Andolsek, of Civil Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, as the 89th Congress draws to a close, it would be unfair not to single out the unceasing accomplishments of our hardworking, hardhitting Vice Chairman of Civil Service, Commissioner L. J. Andolsek. Few public servants approach their work with more determination and dedication than our former staff director of Public Works and now Commissioner of the Civil Service Commission.

His knowledge of the workings of Congress makes him a ready confidant of both Senators and Representatives. Thus, when the myriad of redtape is about to bog us down on an appointment or promotion or an appeals case is about to get the best of us, practitioner Andolsek can be counted on to come to the rescue with an equitable, yet workable solution.

His finesse and "let's get the job done" frame of mind does not stop with assisting Congressmen. As a former president of the Congressional Secretaries Club, Commissioner Andolsek keeps up an excellent rapport with the staff of Congress providing answers to the host of questions that daily come up concerning the millions of civil servants across the Nation.

As a longtime former AA to Minnesota's dean of the delegation, Congressman JOHN A. BLATNIK, Andolsek is a Capitol Hill veteran in the fullest sense.

Mr. Speaker, I think the best summary of this remarkable gentleman is an inscription in the hand of our Vice President, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, on a picture of himself that hangs in the Commissioner's office. The inscription reads:

> To Commissioner Andolsek—no one could have a finer friend.

This, in short, is the feeling of both staff and Members. On behalf of both, I want to publicly thank the Commissioner for his outstanding example of following our beloved late President Kennedy's mandate to strive for excellence. Though we miss him on Capitol Hill, we appreciate his not forgetting us.

Industrial Program for Rural America—Long Overdue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, it has been my privilege over these many weeks and months in this session of Congress to work for, unceasingly, the President's demonstration cities proposal. Much has been said during debate in the last several weeks as to the importance of this bill. It is clearly one of the most dramatic pieces of legislation enacted by this or any other Congress. In the years ahead, literally millions of Americans will benefit from the foresight displayed by the President. At long last, we have served notice that we do not intend to tolerate the deplorable conditions that are worsening every day in our Nation's metropolitan centers. Truly, we have struck a blow for the rebirth of America.

In the first session of this Congress we enacted into law the Housing Act of 1965 which furnished many of the basic tools that will be utilized by the Demonstration Cities Act in an overall coordinated approach. In addition, I have been a constant supporter of the Economic Development Administration and was glad to support needed changes to this most important act that means so much to the economic health of America.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the time has come for us to direct all of our energies to the forgotten sector of America—our rural farm communities. Those of us who are privileged to represent rural districts, the backbone of this great Nation, have been more than willing to support wholeheartedly our fellow Americans in the cities and suburban areas of this Nation.

The time has come to stop outmigration from rural areas which in all too many cases only contributes further to the problems of our cities. I believe that there are many steps at relatively modest cost, when compared to the cost of rebuilding our cities, that can and must be taken now. I have, today, introduced a bill which, in my opinion, when enacted will truly be a gigantic step forward in assisting in the orderly industrial development of our rural communities. Its passage will raise rural standards of living and attract many Americans from overcrowded metropolitan centers. New job opportunities for our most precious resources—our youth—will become available.

I have taken note of the many eloquent verbal expressions of concern with problems of rural America by responsible officials of government. The appointment on September 28 of a Committee on Rural Poverty was a welcome step, and the executive order of September 30, to coordinate Federal programs that affect agricultural and rural area development is salutary, but, Mr. Speaker, these steps are not enough. So today, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill for the creation of an industrial program for rural America. It is the first of a series of positive actions that I am confident will have the overwhelming support of my colleagues.

Very simply, the bill provides loans at interest rates not to exceed 4 percent for industrial development and related public facilities in and for rural areas. For those who would question the 4-percent interest rate, let me point out that the Housing Act of 1965 provided a statutory ceiling of 3 percent for Federal loans, for colleges, moderate-income families and for the elderly. This act has already done much to insure better housing and community life for so many Americans. I was proud to have been the sponsor of this act. But what has happened to the smalltown loan program, Mr. Speaker? I am advised that the interest rate established by formula by HUD under its public facilities loan program was 4 percent for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and in all likelihood will be increased to 4¼ to 4⅜ percent in the immediate future. Surely, Mr. Speaker, a small town, or an industry desiring to locate in a small town, is entitled to the same financial advantage as the superuniversities, some of which are heavily endowed.

Mr. Speaker, there must surely be some limit to the patience of the residents of rural areas, and, I hope, of their elected representatives. We have all of us cooperated with programs beneficial to the cities. We have stood by all too long while our rural areas have been neglected, ignored, and bypassed. In some cases, we have supported legislation which purported to help our rural areas only to find this purpose subverted by administrative circumlocution which, under one pretext or another, has phased out any meaningful application of these programs to our rural areas. My bill will provide direct, reasonable, and constructive assistance where it is now most needed for a balanced economy—rural America.

Converting Medical Science to Medical Service: A Realistic Approach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

CONVERTING MEDICAL SCIENCE TO MEDICAL SERVICE: A REALISTIC APPROACH

(Keynote address by Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY, the Institute on the Impact of Bio-Medical Instrumentation Research on Industrial Management, Washington, D.C., October 17, 1966)

During the past two decades medical research in this country has developed into one of our greatest national resources.

The excitement of scientific discovery has caught the popular imagination. The public is willing to support medical ventures into the unknown with more than a billion tax dollars annually. As a result, we have the most advanced laboratories and the best-trained and most productive medical research teams that can be found anywhere in the world.

The rewards from that system have been substantial. The richest reward has been new basic knowledge—knowledge about disease, knowledge of the normal functions of the human body, and deep insight into the chemical nature of heredity and life itself.

Rewards have also been substantial in the form of new drugs, devices, and techniques to prevent illness before it starts, detect it in its earliest, most curable form, diagnose it quickly and precisely, and heal the sick before the effects of the illness are irreversible. These great advances into fields barely known thirty years ago have brought hope to millions who had been without hope.

Yet with all of this progress in research, it has become increasingly evident that knowledge published in a scientific journal and hope aroused by a newspaper account are not enough by themselves. In the flurry of excitement over new discoveries and laboratory successes, it is too often overlooked that scientific medical discoveries are not translated automatically into medical services.

It sounds like an obvious truism to say that discoveries do not apply themselves—that equal money and effort are needed to close the gap between a medical discovery and its application to health services—but it is only in very recent years that this obvious truth has taken hold.

Most important medical discoveries eventually find their way to application in the nation's large urban medical centers. Whenever the transition from discovery to practical application involves only a variation on accepted medical techniques, the chances for a speedy trial are very good.

However, a new screening or diagnostic technique which requires development of a new system, design and production of complex, costly equipment, and extensive field testing, is adopted more slowly—if at all—even at the most advanced and well-staffed medical centers.

Since a lag exists at the most sophisticated centers, it is understandable that the gap will be many times wider at more modest facilities in smaller communities which also suffer from a shortage of qualified personnel.

In 1964 the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke assessed our national potential for dealing with major diseases and compared it with the extent to which this potential was being realized.

The Commission concluded that the toll of disease in this country could be sharply reduced with the proper utilization of present knowledge. Many deaths occur each year, not because of a lack of scientific know-how, but because the right care is not available at the right time. In the Commission's words, "for every breakthrough, there must be follow-through." It recommended Federal encouragement and support of regional medical programs.

I am proud that the 89th Congress acted swiftly and boldly to create this Federal role. Early in the congress's first session several bills were drafted and enacted—many of which I had the honor to introduce—to launch Federal-local partnerships for improving medical service. The major elements of this partnership involve support for planning regional medical cooperation, community assistance, professional education and retraining, and construction of new clinical research and library facilities.

Chief among these programs is the one which awards grants to assist the formation of regional medical programs. These programs are now being organized across the nation by regional groups representing medical schools, community hospitals, research institutions, the health professions, and community-minded citizens. These planners are now organizing cooperative programs of clinical research; measures to upgrade practice in community hospitals to medical-center levels; advanced, up-to-date training including continuing education for health professionals; and demonstrations of the best patient-care procedures. Under the regional medical programs community hospitals will in effect become teaching hospitals. Each member of the health team, whether he is based in a university medical center or in an outlying community hospital cooperating with the center in a regional plan, will be able to observe medical practice at the highest levels, to the ultimate benefit of patients everywhere.

Since many of the new activities in the regional medical programs require systems planning and the development of new equipment, many industrial firms have also taken an active interest in these programs.

Still, as far-reaching in their implications as this and the other new Federal programs are, several aspects of the medical-service gap require special, direct attention.

I have, for example, recently introduced a bill which is aimed at making the benefits of preventive medicine more widely available. There is hardly any treatable disease for which early diagnosis and subsequent early therapy will not greatly improve the changes of cure, or at least assure minimum impairment. Because of the insidious nature of diseases such as cancer, heart disease, forms of blindness and deafness, and other chronic disorders, early diagnosis of these diseases is often difficult. But because of their often irreversible nature, early diagnosis should be sought through a periodic thorough examination.

From time to time you may hear the opinion that the so-called yield of early disease discovered in periodic examinations is not worth the cost. The truth is that the yield is high at every age and becomes progressively higher with advancing age.

For example, a recent periodic examination of 1300 dentists showed some abnormal or questionable findings on the electrocardiograms of one-third of the dentists. The proportion rose from about one-quarter in the younger age groups to about one-half in those over age 60.

Also, you may hear doctors admit they are too busy taking care of the sick to spend much time on routine examinations. Since it is most unlikely that the doctor shortage will be overcome in the foreseeable future, routine examinations must be so organized that they require a minimum of physican time. He should be spared the routine work of administering tests, analyzing the raw data or asking routine questions.

My bill for preventicare would provide funds to assist the establishment and operation of regional and community adult health protection centers, organized on an efficient basis that economizes on doctor-time. These centers would specialize in the early diagnosis of the chronic diseases of older Americans.

The centers would employ the proven speed and accuracy of computerized tests and initial diagnosis—a technique which I am pleased to see will be demonstrated by the Public Health Service during these sessions. Thus the physician will have before him the integrated results of a battery of medical, physical, and laboratory tests, plus a basic history. These will aid him significantly in obtaining an accurate and comprehensive diagnosis.

At the same time, these methods offset the scarcity of professional health personnel. It is a much simpler matter to train nonmedical technicians to operate well-engineered automated diagnostic equipment than it is to develop large numbers of highly trained diagnostic specialists.

Therefore, training in the operation of such technical disease protection procedures, and research into new methods of diagnosis are also among the provisions of this bill.

I believe it will be clearly apparent to all of you that the new Federal programs passed during the present Congress, and those to be enacted in the near future, will stress upgrading the quality of medical service while making such service more widely and easily accessible.

Important in the provision of these services will be the development of integrated systems utilizing automation for care purposes. Computers will be used increasingly to make immediate analysis of the patient's body signals—such as the electrocardiogram, blood pressure, pulse rate, response to medication, and so on. As the physician indicates, this can be done at intertvals, or continuously—as it must for patients under constant monitoring in an intensive care unit.

Automated medical laboratories will reduce the costs of tests and speed the results back to the doctor. The development of a network of computer centers to process signals and laboratory tests will make it possible to bring the benefits of automation to the doctor's own office.

Once the primary problem of health care is planned for, an integrated system calls for automated information to aid hospital administration just as it now serves the insurance company and the bank.

Continuing emphasis will also be placed on the development of complex prosthetic devices like the artificial heart, and on the refinement and miniaturization of the artificial kidney.

Yet, as exciting as these prospects are, we need to take a realistic and balanced approach to our goal of converting medical science to medical service. Each of these innovations is at some stage of development—ranging from a gleam in the eye to a breadboard model that may still be too complex, too big, or too costly for widespread use. The great task of research and development to adapt modern technology and automation to the delivery of health services has just begun.

The American University is to be commended for its vision in planning and sponsoring the fine Institute we are attending today. These sessions are designed to help each of us to understand the role we will play in making high-quality health services available to all the people.

The program of this Institute refers to "industry, government, and academic frameworks." This phrase goes to the heart of the problem, since these are the frameworks in which our task will be accomplished—by industry, government, and academic research each fulfilling its appropriate role in a dynamic partnership.

The role of academic or basic research is well understood. It is interested in exploring the unknown, in adding to human knowledge. The researcher generally works under a grant, with a minimum of Federal direction and without thought of profit.

Government serves a middle-man function. The Congress and agencies like the Public Health Service consider the findings of basic research in terms of total needs, health priorities, and financial practicality. In this overview, they are helped immeasurably and receive guidance from the professional associations and the voluntary health agencies, which also cooperate in trials and demonstrations that indicate which research leads will pay off in better health services.

The role of industry is efficient design, followed by low-cost mass production of simple and reliable machines and systems. Industrial capability is too good to waste on undirected production of unrelated gadgets. The best use of this capability is in producing integrated, compatible systems. The developmental phase can be appropriately financed by government contracts, with direction from an agency with an overview of medical science and a goal of medical service.

The industrial managers attending this Institute represent a tremendous national resource, which can make as great a contribution to the efficient delivery of high-quality health services as it has made to high-quality steel and automobile production.

Many of you are here because your companies rightly sense that the design and production of efficient equipment and health systems will produce profits. I could not agree more. There is also profit to be made in an unceasing quest for improving existing instruments and equipment that have not kept pace with the advancing frontiers of medical engineering. The pressure for better medical products should not come wholly from the doctors, who would be the first to admit that their knowledge of engineering is less than yours.

I can sympathize with many of those in the scientific community who fear that the new emphasis on practical results may overshadow traditional concerns with basic research—that solid rock on which practical applications must firmly rest.

I know that all of you here this morning are aware of the necessity for continued research progress if your own efforts are to expand and profit over the long run. As a member of Congress long interested in the improvement of the Nation's health, I know that I can rely upon your support and strong advocation of continued basic research. For only by constantly replenishing the reservoir of new knowledge can be be assured of the continuing flow of medical progress which is essential to the national well-being, and in fact to the health of people all over the globe.

I also know that your industries are capable of meeting the challenge to produce the tools and systems needed for high-quality health services. Let us indeed match our potential with our performance.

The Population Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the 2d session of the 89th Congress may go down in history as the "Population Congress." We have done more to expand U.S. support for voluntary family planning programs at home and abroad in the past session than in all other previous years combined.

I. DOMESTIC FAMILY PLANNING PROGRAM

Heretofore the principal sources of governmental funds for domestic family planning programs were under maternal and child health programs—approximately $3 million this year—and the antipoverty program—approximately $2.4 million. In addition the National Institutes of Health spend about $2 million per year on fertility research.

This year a great breakthrough was achieved. The Congress enacted a bill, known as S. 3008, to provide Federal grants to carry out comprehensive health service programs, including family planning. The bill provides for formula grants to the States to implement comprehensive State health programs and project grants to meet specialized health problems. Project grants can be made to public agencies such as State, county, or metropolitan health departments, and to private, nonprofit organizations, including universities, hospitals, and voluntary organizations.

Official testimony before the House and Senate committees, the reports of both committees, and colloquy on the Senate floor made it abundantly clear that family planning programs would be funded under both the formula and project grants. Although the grant authorizations are only for fiscal years 1968 and 1969, there is every indication that the bill will be extended next year and become a permanent part of our health legislation.

Because this bill overlapped legislation I had introduced to finance voluntary family planning programs, I closely questioned the administration concerning its plans to implement its comprehensive health services bill. Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Wilbur Cohen assured me that if S. 3008 passed, the Department planned to spend substantial additional funds for domestic family planning programs. In a letter dated October 20, 1966, Under Secretary Cohen wrote:

> For the purposes of supporting programs under S. 3008 in the field of family planning, our present plans contemplate $20 million in fiscal year 1968, $25 million in fiscal year 1969, and $30 million in fiscal year 1970. We will review these figures in connection with our next year's program. In addition, funds are also being made available for family planning through Title XIX of the Social Security Act, Medical Assistance Program; Maternity and Infant Care project grants, and formula grants to the States for Maternal and Child Health Services.

I ask that the entire letter be reprinted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. TYDINGS. This projection of expenditures indicates that the Department has now recognized the dimensions of the family planning problem in the United States and its willingness to commit funds of sufficient magnitude to begin meeting that problem.

As I pointed out at the time I introduced my domestic family planning bill, we need to spend between $75 and $100 million each year to provide family planning services to the 5 million indigent women of childbearing age who can be expected to desire such services.

While the spending levels projected by the Department will not meet the whole need, they will go a long way, and are of an order of magnitude of 5 to 10 times the present spending levels. This is an important breakthrough.

Other significant developments in the domestic field include two amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act which, first, gives the local community action agency, rather than the Office of Economic Opportunity, the authority to determine whether unmarried women shall be eligible to receive family planning information; and, second, authorizes $61 million for neighborhood health centers, which may include family planning services.

The Congress also appropriated $2.5 million, over and above the President's budget requests, for the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development to conduct research "in the area of population dynamics with particular emphasis upon research on the comparative effectiveness and impact of various contraceptive devices" and for training in the field of reproductive biology.

II. FOREIGN FAMILY PLANNING PROGRAM

Significant breakthroughs were also achieved in the foreign field.

The food-for-peace bill establishes a 2-year program of food assistance to developing nations. It explicitly permits the local currencies generated by the sale of U.S. agricultural commodities to be used:

> For financing, at the request of such country, programs emphasizing maternal welfare, child health and nutrition, and activities, where participation is voluntary, related to the problems of population growth, under procedures established by the President through any agency of the United States, or thorugh any local agency which he determines is qualified to administer such activities.

The Foreign Assistance Act of 1966 incorporates an amendment, which I offered, which also authorizes the use of excess foreign currencies—counterpart funds—for voluntary family planning programs overseas. The definition of voluntary family planning programs includes "the dissemination of family planning information, medical assistance, and supplies to individuals who desire such assistance." During the consideration of the bill, the Congress affirmed that AID already possesses authority to use dollar funds, as well as local currencies, for "technical assistance and other activities in the field of population control."

Taken together, these bills provide a strong statutory basis for the expansion of federally supported family planning programs at home and abroad. There can no longer be any doubt in the administration or the country that this Congress was determined to defuse the population bomb.

The population clock ticks every hour of every day. There is not a moment to lose in dealing with what President Johnson has called the most profound challenge to the future of all the world. It now remains for the administration to provide the initiative, the energy, and the staff to implement these programs effectively.

EXHIBIT 1

OCTOBER 20, 1966.

Hon. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: Thank you for your letter of October 10 and for your interest in S. 3008 which would enable the Department to develop programs in family planning.

We have indicated in testimony in both the Senate and the House of Representatives that family planning programs can be developed as an integral part of comprehensive health services within the States. S. 3008 assures that comprehensive public health services, in which family planning would be included, can be developed through a flexible State grant program administered by the Public Health Service. This would be accomplished in two ways: first, by providing non-categorical formula grant support to localities and States for utilizing Federal assistance to meet their most important health problems; and secondly, by means of project grants for health services development which would enable the Public Health Service to award "grants to any public or non-profit agency, institution, or organization to cover part of the cost of (1) providing services to meet health needs of limited geographic scope or of specialized regional or national significance, (2) stimulating and supporting for an initial period new programs of health service, or (3) undertaking studies, demonstrations, or training designed to develop new methods or improve existing methods of providing health services." Project grant awards may be made to public agencies such as State, county or metropolitan health departments, universities, hospitals, and to non-profit private voluntary organizations such as universities, hospitals, and voluntary agencies.

In his recent testimony before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Surgeon General, Dr. William H. Stewart, in response to specific questions by Representative Samuel N. Friedel, indicated that both the formula grant to States for comprehensive public health services and the project grant for health services development can be used to support family planning activities.

For the purposes of supporting programs under S. 3008 in the field of family planning, our present plans contemplate $20 million in fiscal year 1968, $25 million in fiscal year 1969, and $30 million in fiscal year 1970. We will review these figures in connection with our next year's program. In addition, funds are also being made available for family planning through Title XIX of the Social Security Act, Medical Assistance Program; Maternity and Infant Care project grants; and formula grants to the States for Maternal and Child Health Services.

In view of your deep and continuing interest in family planning, I am enclosing a copy of the Departmental Report which summerizes the current activities of our operating agencies in this important field.

Sincerely yours,

———— ————,
Under Secretary.

Statement by Representative Gerald R. Ford, Republican, of Michigan, Regarding 2d Session, 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the 89th Congress had some successes in its 2d session, but it will be most remembered for one glaring failure.

That failure was the refusal of this Democratic Congress, this Congress with greater than 2-to-1 Democratic majorities, to come to grips with inflation and thus strike a blow for the little people and the aged.

The destructiveness of the inflation now plaguing this country is worsening. The cost of living is continuing its sharp and steady climb. Yet this Democratic Congress refused to help hold down prices by cutting several billions in unnecessary Federal spending. This Democratic Congress instead insisted on further inflating President Johnson's already-inflated budget.

The Nation has just suffered through a nearly 10-month legislative session with the "spendingest" President and Congress in our country's history. Together this combination spells Johnson-Democrat inflation, and that is the story of the 2d session, 89th Congress.

This Democratic Congress recorded another failure closely related to Johnson-Democrat inflation. The Congress did not increase social security benefits this year. Johnson-Democrat inflation demanded that there be action. Republicans urged passage of social security legislation at this session and introduced bills providing for automatic increases in benefits tied to the cost of living without a payroll tax increase.

President Johnson and Democrats in Congress ignored Republican pleas. Then Mr. Johnson suddenly—near the end of the session—called for congressional action next year on a benefits increase effective not now but in January 1968. It was an increase to be financed by a payroll tax boost. When Republicans then demanded an immediate 8-percent across-the-board increase in social security benefits without a payroll tax increase, Democratic leaders shrugged it off.

Please note the answer Republicans received when Representative JOHN W. BYRNES, Republican, of Wisconsin, proposed a $1.6 billion benefits boost without a payroll tax increase. HEW Under Secretary Wilbur J. Cohen said this could be done but it might contribute substantially to present inflationary pressures. The circle came right back to Johnson-Democrat inflation—the inflation which had created the need for a social security benefits increase in the first place.

Repeatedly during this session of Congress, President Johnson himself has hung a spender tag on his lopsided Democratic majorities. Yet in a recent campaign speech, Mr. Johnson said the historians would rate the 89th as "the great Congress." The President really ought to make up his mind. He cannot have it both ways.

At the end of the last session, Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD said the 89th Congress in its 2d session ought to "spend less time on new legislation and more time correcting oversights in legislation we have just passed."

Instead the Congress busied itself this year rushing through a whole new batch of legislation proposed by Mr. Johnson. Whatever loophole plugging and remedial action was taken resulted primarily because of Republican pressure.

You might call the tiny band of Republican Congressmen in the 89th the mighty minority because they—

Helped write into the foreign aid bill a strict prohibition against aid to any free world nation trading with North Vietnam or Cuba.

Helped hold the mass transit authorization to the $150 million figure asked by the President, reducing it from the $175 million sought by House Democratic leaders.

Gained a change in the investment tax credit suspension bill to let business firms take the 7-percent credit for investments in air and water pollution control.

Exerted pressure which resulted in a $7,500 ceiling on expenses for training a Job Corps enrollee.

Won approval of poverty war amendment requiring one-third participation by the poor in local community action programs.

Led a successful fight to include in the Food for Freedom Act a ban on subsidized food sales to countries trading with North Vietnam.

Succeeded in keeping the Federal Maritime Administration out of the new Transportation Department so that there can be a concerted effort in the years ahead to rebuild the U.S. merchant fleet.

Kept constant pressure on big-spending Democrats and thus kept their spending fever from getting worse than it was.

These were among the accomplishments of the 89th Congress, 2d session—improvements promoted by the mighty minority.

Senator Maurine B. Neuberger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE
OF HAWAII
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. INOYUE. Mr. President, I regret that MAURINE NEUBERGER will not be with us at the next session of Congress. Though women suffrage has long been a part of constitutional rights, convention has been slow in changing. She has demonstrated to the world the singular contributions women can make to the Government in our, or in any, free society. Not only is she a charming and gracious lady but an able legislator whose influence has served her State and Nation well.

While she turns now to a less public life, I am sure her broad interests and concern will continually lead her into public life and that any community in which she lives will derive great benefits from the talents this remarkable woman brings with her. I wish her every success and happiness.

Summary of Activities by the Senate Committee on Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a summary of activities by the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES BY SENATE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, 89TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

LEGISLATION

P.L. 89–367: Supplemental 1966 authorization for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, for research, development, test, and evaluation, and for military construction.

Authorizes appropriations for these purposes in the amount of $4,857,450,000.

P.L. 89–501: Authorizing appropriations during fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and for research, development, test, and evaluation for the armed forces, and military pay increase.

Authorizes appropriations for these purposes in the amount of $17,480,759,000.

Provides a pay increase for members of the uniformed services of 3.2 percent.

P.L. 89–568: Military construction authorization.

Authorizes military construction and provides authorization for housing construction and maintenance in the amount of $1,500,842,000.

P.L. 89–614: Military medical benefits.

Authorizes an improved health benefits program for members of the uniformed services and their dependents and for retired members by initiating a program of outpatient care from civilian medical sources for dependents of members and by providing a program of care in civilian facilities for retired members of the uniformed services.

P.L. 89–606: Increasing number of Air Force colonels and lieutenant colonels.

Provides an enhanced promotion opportunity for Air Force officers to the grade of colonel and lieutenant colonel by authorizing an increase in the number of officers that may hold these grades.

P.L. 89–650: Candidates for appointment to the military academies.

Permits the sons of Reserve officers who have been on active duty for more than eight years to be eligible to compete for Presidential appointments to the military academies and permits the sons of members of the uniformed services who were killed or totally disabled in the line of duty at any time to be eligible to compete for such appointments.

P.L. 89–608: Emergency evacuation allowance.

Extends authorization for the payment of special allowances to dependents of members of the uniformed services who are evacuated under emergency circumstances.

P.L. 89–538: Savings deposits for members of the uniformed services overseas.

To counter an adverse balance of payments and to encourage thrift, permits an interest rate as high as 10 percent to be paid on pay and allowances that are deposited by members of the Armed Forces overseas.

H.R. 15748: Thirty days leave and transportation extending service in Vietnam.

Authorizes 30 days leave and round trip transportation to the United States or to a place a member selects to a member of our armed forces in Vietnam who voluntarily extends his duty there for at least six months.

P.L. 89–534: Gold Star lapel buttons.

Authorizes gold star lapel buttons to the next of kin of members of the armed forces who lost their lives in Vietnam or as a result of cold war incidents.

H.R. 5297: Limiting revocation of retired pay.

Requires that reservists completing 20 years of satisfactory Federal service be furnished a certificate to this effect and that payment of retired pay beginning at age 60 based on such certificate may not be revoked except for fraud.

P.L. 89–490: Loan of equipment to Boy Scouts.

Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to lend equipment and to provide transportation and services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the Twelfth Boy Scouts World Jamboree and Twenty-first Boy Scouts World Conference to be held in 1967.

S. 2444: Alaska communications disposal.

Authorizes the disposal of the Government-owned long-lines communication facilities in the State of Alaska.

S. 3834: Price adjustments on Defense milk contracts.

Permits adjustment of contract price on certain milk contracts by the Department of Defense where the cost of milk was affected by marketing orders by the Department of Agriculture.

S. 3887: Attendance at military academies of certain foreign nationals.

Permits admission of a limited number of students from countries associated in the defense of South Vietnam to service academies of the United States.

H.R. 266: Extending time for selecting retirement home.

Permits an extension in the time allowed for selecting a home to which transportation allowances are paid upon release from military service.

P.L. 89–603: Grade of brigadier general in medical service corps of regular Army.

Permits officers in the medical service corps of the regular Army to be appointed to the grade of brigadier general.

P.L. 89–607: Exempting certain contractors from examination-of-records clause.

Facilitates certain procurement overseas by authorizing waiver of examination-of-records clause in circumstances in which it is impracticable to include such a clause.

P.L. 89–609: Male nurses.

Authorizes regular commissions for male nurses for the Armed Forces.

P.L. 89–483: Civil defense emergency authorization.

Extends the authority of the President to proclaim a civil defense emergency and to invoke emergency powers in such an event.

H.R. 16646: Exemplary rehabilitation certificates.

Permits the Department of Labor to award an exemplary rehabilitation certificate to a member of the Armed Forces who has received a less than honorable discharge and who can show that his post service conduct has been exemplary.

H.R. 14741: Marine Corps generals.

Increases the number of Marine Corps officers that can be general officers.

P.L. 89–536: Salary of academic dean of Naval Postgraduate School.

Amends a limitation on the salary of the academic dean of the Naval Postgraduate School.

P.L. 89–398: Loan of navy vessels the Republic of China.

Authorizes the loan of one destroyer and one destroyer escort to the Republic of China.

P.L. 89–533: Donation of obsolete weapon to Germany.

Permits the donation of an obsolete German artillery piece for display in the German Artillery School Museum.

Private Law 89–278; Reappointment of Colonel William W. Watkin, Jr., to Army promotion list.

Permits an officer who has been serving as a professor at the U.S. Military Academy to be reappointed to the promotion list of the regular Army.

S. 3500: Retirement of Lt. Gen. Robert Wesley Colglazier, Jr., in the grade of lieutenant general.

Avoids discrimination against a Reserve lieutenant general by extending to him the same retirement privileges enjoyed by a regular officer of the same grade.

H.R. 7973: Occupancy of public quarters by civilian instructors at the Military Academy.

Permits certain staff members at the Military Academy who were appointed before January of 1963 with the understanding that they would be entitled to public quarters without charge to continue to have this privilege.

H.R. 12822: Extension of existing ship loans.

Authorizes the extension for another five-year period of the loan of ten ships. The ships are now in the possession of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Korea, and Peru.

H.R. 16394: Relief under enlisted members deposit program.

Permits crediting of interest on savings deposits of members of the uniformed services and immediately reenlisted without their having to withdraw the savings and redeposit them.

H.R. 17451: Avoiding pay loss for certain former chiefs and deputy chiefs of Navy bureaus.

Avoids the loss in pay of five officers of bureaus that were abolished under a Department of the Navy reorganization.

H.R. 5990: Panama Canal employees relief.

Provides a $10 a month increase in the payments received by certain former employees of the Panama Canal.

H.R. 18019: Military construction at the Walter Reed Army Medical Center.

Authorizes $7,570,000 of construction to move the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology to the Walter Reed Army Medical Center. This move will vacate a site for a museum and sculpture garden to accommodate the Hirshhorn collection of contemporary art and sculpture.

P.L. 89–452: Land retrocession to the State of Washington.

Authorizes the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands near Fort Canby, Washington.

Considered and favorably reported 23 bills and resolutions authorizing disposal of 23 materials from the national and supplemental stockpile. The estimated value of the materials is $333,537,000.

NOMINATIONS

Considered 61,455 nominations. Nine Committee meetings were scheduled for the consideration of civilian and military nominations to statutory offices traditionally involving personal appearances by the nominees before the Committee.

SUBCOMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee

Concentrated attention on adequacy of our forces in Southeast Asia and whether they are properly trained, equipped, and supplied to perform their missions.

Began comprehensive examination of worldwide commitments of the United States and whether our military capability to support these commitments is sufficient.

Studied effect of our efforts in Southeast Asia on combat readiness and military preparedness of forces remaining in the United States and stationed at other locations in the world.

Continued monitoring implementation of the four nuclear test ban safeguards.

Continued examination of proposed merger of the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard.

(A more detailed report of the subcommittee's activities appears on page 27963 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for October 20, 1966.)

Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee

Held 8 meetings in exercising legislative review over the Central Intelligence Agency and the policies and programs being carried out by that Agency under the National Security Act and the Central Intelligence Act of 1949.

National Stockpile and Naval Petroleum Reserves Subcommittee

Considered and recommended 23 bills and resolutions authorizing disposals of materials from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile that are necessary to objectives. The estimated market value of the materials approved for disposal is $333,537,000.

Accomplished consultation for the Committee on Armed Services with the Department of the Navy on contracts affecting Naval Petroleum Reserves.

Status of Forces Subcommittee

Conducted hearings and issued report on that part of the NATO Status of Forces Treaty relating to criminal jurisdiction that is not waived by host countries in which United States forces are stationed.

Officer Grade Limitations Subcommittee

Considered reports submitted by military departments on officer grade distribution.

Considered and favorably reported H.R. 14741 relating to the authorized number of general officers in the Marine Corps.

Harry F. Byrd, Sr., of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEN B. JORDAN

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, Senator Harry Flood Byrd is a man who will continue to be revered for his role as a strong public servant as well as for his personal qualities of gentility and integrity. As a man he demonstrated a versatility of interests and capabilities much like another great Virginian, Thomas Jefferson. The hobbies he perfected ranged from writing to raising apples. I have enjoyed his warm hospitality at Berryville and know how he loved the beauty of his orchards and the Blue Ridge Mountains beyond.

As a statesman Byrd was devoted to principles of prudent Federal spending and maintenance of States rights within the Federal Union. He never wavered from his dedication to constitutional government. Toward this end, he thought, worked, and spoke for over 40 years as Governor of Virginia, as leader of a strong political organization in his State, as U.S. Senator, and as chairman of the powerful Finance Committee.

His influence on finance in the Senate and on government in his State will continue as positive marks of his effort in public life. As Governor, Byrd put Virginia on a pay-as-you-go basis and his scrutiny of expenditures continued in the Senate as he was recognized as chairman of the Finance Committee. The Senator's observation of the budget was magnified by his conception and leadership of the Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures, which he headed even during a Republican administration.

So the squire of Berryville, remembered by many who work in the Senate as the distinguished Senator often in a light suit and habitually accompanied by his dog Pam to and from the office building, has gone to join his beloved wife. His memory remains with proud Virginians, with friends and admirers in the Senate, and with many Americans who will continue to appreciate his work here.

Salute to National Mutiple Sclerosis Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY TO THE NATIONAL MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS SOCIETY, OCTOBER 15, 1966

I salute you on the occasion of your Twentieth Anniversary. This is a good year for commemorating past events and for setting new goals for the future. The twentieth year in the life of a young man or woman is a time of flowering, of promise, of coming more fully into adulthood. May this year for the National Multiple Sclerosis Society be one of realization for all of you—realization of the dreams you have worked so hard to bring to fruition. We are all heavily in your debt.

I want also to congratulate those of you who received awards tonight. Your time, your energies, your accomplishments are deeply appreciated by a grateful Nation.

And I would like to wish you luck in the forward step and new direction you are now undertaking—in establishing an international organization. Since this disease knows no boundaries and is found in countries around the world, a worldwide organization is needed to carry on the fight. Through an international society, you can share programs and accomplishments with the peoples of the world. In return, experience and new knowledge gained in other countries will be of benefit to the people of the United States. Working together, we may someday unearth those important clues which will unlock the secret of multiple sclerosis.

To speak before a voluntary health organization is always a great honor and pleasure for me. I find in these groups dedicated and informed people, people who do not need to be convinced of the importance of health to the strength of our Nation. Here I find people who know the vital role played by their organizations, by private industry, and by the Government in a ceaseless conquest of physical and mental disease.

The National Multiple Sclerosis Society has been an especially effective voluntary organization. Its accomplishments are too numerous for me to recite tonight. I would like, however, to make brief mention of some of the areas where it has provided invaluable service.

One of your most important accomplishments has been the provision of clinics for the care of multiple sclerosis patients. This is an area of endeavor in which your organization is particularly effective. It is most reassuring and comforting to me to know that you now have 55 clinics or treatment centers throughout the Nation.

Local clinics and patient services mean much to a person who needs continuing care. Families have to be helped with internal adjustments. Employment and social problems have to be solved. But research and patient care should not be considered separate entities, for they are, in fact, two aspects of the same program.

But while research is striving to find the prevention and cure of multiple sclerosis, there are thousands who already have the disease, many incapacitated for life, waiting, praying for a cure to be found. What would happen to them but for the patient services that the Society provides?

Like all successful voluntary agencies, the Society conducts large educational and informational programs. It has a vast information service to tell Americans what multiple sclerosis is and to enlist their active support in conquering it. This information activity serves to aid the Society in its drives to raise funds to support its programs. It also helps to further understanding and knowledge, and to create a mood favorable to Government support.

There is much proof that you have succeeded in enlisting the support of the American people to your cause. A good early example is the major role you played in the establishment of our National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness.

In May 1949, your president Mr. Ralph Strauss, together with your founder and Executive Director Miss Sylvia Lawry, Dr. Tracy Putnam, Dr. Houston Merritt, and others appeared before a Senate Committee to testify on the proposed National Multiple Sclerosis Act. Although this bill was not passed, considerable interest was aroused. In 1950, with the cooperation of various other voluntary health groups, the act creating the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness was passed.

Over the years, you have worked closely with the Institute. Especially notable has been your work and interest in joint research. The Society has collaborated with the NINDB on several significant research projects through the years—a demonstration of the partnership role of Government and voluntary health agencies in research.

A good example of such a joint program is one now being conducted. The Society has provided almost $60,000 to purchase viral antigens to detect virus antibodies and Institute scientists are using the test antigens of several viruses in their search for possible multiple sclerosis viruses. Collaboration by the Society and NINDB is enabling researchers to explore this promising new lead much more vigorously than might otherwise have been possible.

This is a good illustration of the vitality of the combined approach to the problems of human disease that has evolved in America. Voluntary agencies, such as the MS Society, and the Federal Government are concentrating their resources where they will do the most good in a complementary and highly effective effort. The Federal Government, by reason of its structure and resources, can play one of its most effective roles by concentrating its efforts on research.

From the earliest days of your organization, your leaders have worked closely with the Government agencies concerned. We deeply appreciate all the inspiration, help and cooperation you have given us and wish you well in your future program.

During my years in Congress as Chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee for health and related matters, I have continually emphasized the need for a partnership of Government and voluntary effort to strike against disease. I view the efforts of each as a sustaining force for the other.

As a partner in this combined effort you have served as an especially sustaining force in rallying support for the battle against MS. I am sure that you will continue your efforts in gaining support in the future. Knowing of your continual support has been important to me. I think it is important for each of you to write to your Congressman about your chapter activities and the great need for government support of research. Write not only at appropriation times but throughout the year. Keep up their interest in your great cause. Let them hear from all 180 of your chapters every year.

Do not doubt that your efforts will be rewarded. Over the past 20 years we have made considerable progress getting more support for health at all levels. There has been a truly revolutionary growth in expenditures for health and in the health consciousness of Americans.

Last year almost $2 billion were spent on medical research in this country. Such expenditures financed by Government and private agencies are 21 times greater than the sums expended for such research in 1947.

Federal support of medical research expanded rapidly following World War II. For years I have been privileged to have an active part in increasing the Federal role—and, in so doing, helping establish a truly national medical research and research training effort in this country.

Today, when we speak of Federal support of research in medicine, it is the NIH that comes first to mind. The NIH is now receiving a larger share of the Federal dollar for such research than are all other health agencies combined. Excluding construction grants, the NIH appropriations increased from $8.3 million in 1946–47 to more than $1 billion in 1966–67, while all Federal expenditures for medical research increased 44 times between 1947 and 1965.

I do not want any of you to think this growth rate was automatic or that it came about by someone waving a magic wand. Each year—during the years of the greatest growth in Federal (especially NIH) investment in medical research—some of us in the

Congress fought to accelerate the growth rate.

I am proud to have played a part in increasing the emphasis on our national health problems, on research to help to correct them, and on growth of NIH as the agency to conduct and administer that research.

And I am proud to have played a small part in the development of one Institute in particular. When Congress authorized the NINDB in 1950, it launched a continuing campaign against the widely varying neurological and sensory disorders. A vast medical frontier was established which is rapidly becoming one of the most important research areas in the field of medicine and public health.

Much progress has been made against the disease since the Society was founded in 1946. We are certain that prevention will one day become reality and eventually even a cure will be found. How soon this can be accomplished will depend on how effectively this Nation can mobilize its resources to undertake the task.

For your Twentieth Anniversary meeting, you have chosen the theme, "A World-Wide Rededication." I wish you success in marshalling new forces, inspiring veteran workers, adding stout hearts to our common cause. I, too, join with you in a spirit of rededication. I have faith that victory will be ours.

Auto Safety: New York Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, undoubtedly one of the major achievements of the 89th Congress was the enactment of the Auto Safety Act of 1966. The action of the Congress is long overdue. The figures for 1965 show that American deaths continued to rise on our highways at an even more alarming rate: 49,000 killed; 4½ million injured; $8.5 billion lost in property damage and man-hours.

The State of New York has made significant strides in seeking to find ways to meet this problem. One of our State senators, Edward J. Speno, has received wide recognition for initiating new developments in traffic safety.

Much of the thinking which he developed has become part of the automobile safety legislation passed this year by the Congress and signed into law by the President.

Senator Speno served as chairman of the New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Motor Vehicles and Traffic Safety in 1959. In that year he led the fight for passage of legislation which required certification of brake fluid by the motor vehicle department. This law made certain that no substandard fluid would be available in New York State.

In 1960, Senator Speno began the fight for mandatory seat belt installation in New York State motor vehicles. In 1961, the first law was enacted requiring anchorage points for seat belts. However, it was not until 1965 that seat belt installation became a legal requirement in New York.

The New York State safety car program, conceived by Senator Speno, was the first such program in the Nation. The New York State Legislature passed, and Governor Rockefeller signed into law in 1965, an appropriation to conduct a feasibility study to determine whether a safety car could be built. The answer came back as a resounding "yes." This program is now in full gear. This year more money was appropriated to actually construct a prototype safety car.

It is my hope that my amendment to this year's Auto Safety Act will allow New York State to receive Federal assistance to expedite this prototype safety car program. I am proud of the advancements made by our State and know that our leadership will be continued.

Social Security Act Amendments of 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, prior to the passage of the Social Security Act Amendments of 1965, our senior citizens were allowed to deduct all of their medical and drug expenses from their adjusted gross income.

Under existing law as it stands today these senior citizens, already suffering from the high cost of living, will only be able to deduct those medical expenses which exceed 3 percent of their adjusted gross income for drug costs which exceed 1 percent of their adjusted gross income. This provision of existing law becomes effective January 1, 1967.

When the Senate Finance Committee, of which I am a member, considered the Foreign Investors Tax Act, I proposed an amendment to continue to allow our senior citizens the right to deduct 100 percent of their medical expenses from their income tax. This amendment was adopted in committee and was passed on the floor of the Senate.

Unfortunately, in conference, the amendment was deleted, principally on the basis of the fact that social security legislation will be one of the first items on the agenda when the 90th Congress convenes in January. I was very disappointed that my amendment was not retained in conference.

From the mail which I have received, and which I am sure is also being received by many Members of this body, it is evident that our senior citizens are able to avoid extensive hospitalization only because they rely on medication and other medical treatment which often cost them several hundred dollars a year on fixed incomes. This was the reason why I proposed my amendment.

However there is a bright ray of hope that this proposal will carry when the Congress meets again in January at which time I will introduce the measure again and strive to make it retroactive to January 1, 1967.

I intend also to urge the Members of this body and the House of Representatives to introduce similar bills. I sincerely hope, too, that our senior citizens will take the time to write the members of the House Ways and Means Committee, and members of the Senate Finance Committee, urging support of my proposal.

I am confident that justice and equality in this area which means so much to so many of our senior citizens who have contributed greatly to the progress of this Nation will meet with favorable response by Congress.

Report to the People of the First Congressional District of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, in order to report to the people in the First District of Maryland whom it has been my privilege to represent during the 88th and 89th Congresses, I would like to cite various projects in which there has been or is to be the grant of Federal funds or the participation of Federal agencies.

These projects cover many aspects of life and community progress throughout the nine counties of the present First Congressional District. They are projects which have either been initiated, are underway, or completed. This work represents the cooperation and efforts of many individuals. These projects are to the credit of many people; officials of our county and town governments, hardworking Federal employees of the Government agencies, civic organizations, and private individuals. All have involved the time and energies of my office, including myself and my staff.

I want to congratulate and express my appreciation to the many people, both in and out of Government, who have contributed to this effort.

Mr. Speaker, may I add further that our district has received fair and equitable treatment from the officials of this administration in meeting their responsibilities to the taxpayers. A close examination and evaluation of all of these projects shows that our district, compared to others, has fared well.

Two major Federal projects, authorized and partially funded, include: First, the Assateague Island National Seashore—$16.5 million—$3.7 million currently funded—to establish a recreational area, encompassing conservation and utilization of 19,000 acres for the present and future generations; and second, the complete study and hydraulic model and technical center of the Chesapeake Bay Basin—$6 million—$100,000 currently funded—to effect short-term improvement and long-range planning for the great Maryland asset—the Chesapeake Bay.

Other projects include:

AGRICULTURE

Blackbird control: Federal assistance from Department of Interior to find solution.

Delmarva poultry industry: Inspection services changes opposed freight rate decrease—pending general assistance—all aspects.

Milk market order No. 4: Successful retention of handler pool to date has meant approximately $1 per hundredweight for all milk produced and shipped to Philadelphia from First District.

Maryland tobacco: Worked with Maryland tobacco interests to have 5-cent tobacco subsidy apply to Maryland tobacco exports.

Clarified school-lunch program administration favorable to area canners.

Aydelotte: Watershed project,[1] Wicomico County.

Passerdyke: Watershed project, Wicomico County.

Dividing Creek: Watershed project,[1] Wicomico County.

Sweet potato: Artificial coloring regulations, Wicomico County.

Upper Choptank watershed: Soil drainage program—18 percent in Caroline County—$4,908,150 total cost.

Marshyhope: Watershed project,[1] Caroline County.

Goldsboro: Watershed project,[1] Caroline County.

Middletown: Watershed project,[1] Dorchester County.

Upper Manokin: Watershed project,[1] Somerset County.

Coonsfoot: Watershed project[1]—$154,800 total cost; $104,600 Federal; soil drainage, Worcester County.

Franklyn Branch: Watershed project[1]—$164,520 total; $112,560 Federal grant; Worcester County.

Ninepin Branch: Watershed project,[1] Worcester County.

Shingle Landing: Watershed project,[1] Worcester County.

Corsica: Watershed project,[1] Queen Anne's County.

Long Marsh: Watershed project,[1] Queen Anne's County.

Rehobeth: Watershed project,[1] pending application, Somerset County.

Marumsco: Watershed project,[1] pending application, Somerset County.

King's Creek: Watershed project,[1] pending application, Somerset County.

Turkey Branch: Watershed project,[1] pending application, Somerset County.

CHESAPEAKE BAY POLLUTION CONTROL

Cecilton: Water and sewerage project: $203,500 Federal grant, Cecil County.

Elkton: Sewerage facilities: $485,032, Cecil County.

North East: Sanitary district sewerage facility: $148,250 grant; $613,000 total; Cecil County.

Port Deposit: Sewerage treatment project: $304,000 total; $74,750 grant; Cecil County.

Perryville: Sewerage facilities: $457,000 total; $223,000 grant; Cecil County.

Rising Sun: Sewerage system, Cecil County.

Denton: Sewerage project: $483,500 total; $112,120 Federal grant; Caroline County.

Greensboro: Sewerage disposal: Caroline County.

Preston: Sewerage facility: $93,500 total; $22,500 grant; Caroline County.

Cambridge: Sewerage facilities and other small projects: $174,250; Dorchester County.

Hurlock: Sewerage disposal system: $928,000 total; $72,300 grant; Dorchester County.

Secretary: Sewerage system: $435,000 total; $133,900 grant; Dorchester County.

Rock Hail: Sewerage disposal: $762,300 total; Kent County.

Chestertown: Sewerage project: $672,400 total cost; $47,700 Federal grant; Kent County.

Galena: Sewerage project: $160,000 total; $43,000 Federal grant; Kent County.

Kennedyville: Water and sewerage disposal—pending—Kent County.

Cecil County: Spoil disposal areas—negotiated minimum local damage and inconvenience.

Millington: Sewerage project: $179,200 total; $14,500 grant; Kent County.

Centreville: Water and sewerage: $120,600 total; $30,150 Federal grant; Queen Anne's County.

Queenstown: Sewerage project: $420,820 total; $84,700 grant; Queen Anne's County.

Deal Island: Beach erosion: stabilization assistance, Somerset County.

Crisfield: Sewer project: $820,859 total; $410,429 Federal grant; Somerset County.

Hebron: Sewerage treatment plant, Wicomico County.

Ocean City: Sewerage project: $3,700,000 total; $235,500 grant; Worcester County.

Snow Hill: Sewer project: $347,900 total; $86,600 Federal; Worcester County.

COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

Charlestown Bridge: Worked with State roads commission, Cecil County.

Elkton: Urban Renewal: $66,353 survey and planning grant, Cecil County.

Perryville: Water project, Cecil County.

Cambridge: Public housing project: $2 million Federal loan, Dorchester County.

Cambridge: Urban renewal: $1,137,000 Federal grant pending, Dorchester County.

Crisfield: Public housing project: $729,189 Federal loan, Somerset County.

Crisfield: Western Union office—retained open after Western Union Telegraph Co. advised it would be closed, Somerset County.

Easton: Memorial Hospital, expansion: $4,340,700 total; $625,000 Federal share, Talbot County.

Easton: Airport, resurfacing runways: $242,900 total; $121,450 Federal grant—complete, Talbott County.

Oxford: Beach erosion control, Talbot County.

St. Michaels: Housing project, Talbot County.

Easton: Talbot County Health Center: $300,000 total; $100,000 Federal, Talbot County.

Salisbury: Urban renewal: $1,010,102 total; $866,983 Federal, Wicomico County.

Elk Neck: Mosquito control project, Cecil County.

Berlin: Health Center: $35,000 Federal share, Worcester County.

Ocean City: Arranged for old Coast Guard station to be turned over to Town of Ocean City, Health Center, Worcester County.

Elkton: Court House: $187,642 Federal grant for expansion and renovation $1,595,083 total cost, Cecil County.

CONSERVATION, PRESERVATION, AND RECREATION

Court House Point: Recreational pond, Cecil County .

Elk Neck State Park: Swimming area permit expedited, Cecil County.

Pond Creek Area: Preserved for wildfowl—originally planned for dredged material disposal, Cecil County.

Denton: Diversion of farm land to golf course and country club: $151,190 Federal loan, Caroline County.

Blackwater Game Refuge: Visitors facility expansion, Dorchester County.

Eastern Neck National Wildlife Refuge, Kent County.

Restoration for fish and wildlife programs: $114,000.

Maryland water resources aid: Legislation authorizing hydrological study of Delmarva Peninsula.

Obtain transportation for grain for migratory birds during extensive snowstorm.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Bainbridge: Retention of training center, Cecil County.

Bainbridge: WAVE barracks construction: $1,091,000, Cecil County.

Chesapeake Clamchip Corp.: ARA loan, Dorchester County.

Bay Country Festival: Arranged Federal participation, Dorchester County.

Dorchester Industrial Development Corp.: Assisted in obtaining loan for starting of business to create jobs, Dorchester County.

Kent County: Planning grant: $27,650 grant, $41,475 total.

Crisfield: Maritime Industrial Park: $1.5 million grant, $3 million project, Somerset County.

Princess Anne: Custom pet foods: Assisted in establishing new business for creation of jobs: $710,000, Somerset County.

Worcester County: Chesapeake Corp.: Assistance in dredging Pocomoke Mudflats.

Delmarva Council planning grant: $87,200.

Friendship International Airport: Retention of existing schedules and addition of supplemental services.

Business: Government conferences: Held in Annapolis, Salisbury. and Elkton.

Button industry: Effect tariff change favorable to button industry.

EDUCATION

Elkton: Vocational and Technical Training Center, Cecil County.

Crisfield: Radar station—surplus property—arranged facility be turned over for local usage, Somerset County.

---

[1] All watershed projects deal primarily with drainage of farm land and conservation of natural resources.

Salisbury: Salisbury State College: Assisted in establishing the college library as a depository library in the First Congressional District Wicomico County.

Chesapeake College: Guidance for Federal assistance.

School superintendent assistance in meeting requirements of Office of Education.

Every public school in the First Congressional District received Federal assistance through the normal procedures established by the Maryland State Board of Education and Federal Government.

Impacted school assistance: $280,000 per year, Cecil County.

NAVIGATION AND UTILIZATION OF WATERWAYS

Susquehanna River debris: $14,000 study authorized for permanent correction of problem, Cecil County.

Susquehanna: Channel dredging to Havre de Grace, Cecil County.

Elk River: Dredging project, Cecil County.

Choptank River: Relocation of navigation devices, Caroline County.

Fishing Creek: Channel dredging, Dorchester County.

Church Creek: Dredging project, Dorchester County.

Deepwater Port: Arrange Federal maintenance, Dorchester County.

Farm Creek: Assistance in arranging sea wall through State cooperation, Dorchester County.

Choptank River: Additional navigational aids, Dorchester County.

Honga River and Tar Bay: dredging, Dorchester County.

Tyler Cove: Dredging, $24,100, Dorchester County.

Muddy Hook Cove: Dredging, $39,900, Dorchester County.

Rock Hall: Stone jetty repair making harbor useful, Kent County.

Kent County: Coast Guard station, assisted in site purchase, Kent County.

Wells Cove: Establish breakwater study, $17,000, Queen Annes County.

Crisfield: New Coast Guard station, Somerset County.

Crisfield: Harbor project, dredging, Somerset County.

Upper Thoroughfare: Repair stone breakwater, Somerset County.

Ewell: Channel dredging, Somerset County.

Ewell: Navigation aid—foghorn—Somerset County.

Ewell: Navigation aid—light—Somerset County.

Rumbley: Harbor project, Somerset County.

Tylerton: Dredging project, Somerset County.

Pocomoke Sound: Dredging, Somerset County.

Rhodes Point: Small boat harbor, Somerset County.

Crisfield: Weather equipment, Somers Cover Marina, Somerset County.

Mount Vernon-Websters Cove: Lighted navigation aid, Somerset County.

Black Walnut Point: Dredging, Talbot County.

Knapps Narrows: Purchase of Coast Guard site, Talbot County.

Neavitt Harbor: Project, $31,000, Talbot County.

Dogwood Harbor: Dredging, $40,000, Talbot County.

Tred Avon River: Dredging, $322,900, Talbot County.

Wicomico River: Dredging, $137,608, Wicomico County.

Ocean City: Coast Guard facility, Worcester County.

Chincoteague Bay-Pocomoke River Canal project: 5-year study nearing completion, Worcester County.

Ocean City: Sinepuxent Bay and Ocean City Harbor and Inlet dredging, $75,456, Worcester County.

Town House Creek: Added navigation aids, Worcester County.

Baltimore Harbor: 45-foot depth channel.

C. & D. Canal to Baltimore Harbor dredging: $100 million.

POST OFFICE SERVICE

Childs: Post office retention, after closing announced by Post Office Department, Cecil County.

North East: New post office facility: $61,000, Cecil County.

Hillsboro: Retain post office, Caroline County.

Andrews: Post office, helped keep it open, Dorchester County.

Hurlock: Post office, new facility, Dorchester County.

Crumpton: New post office facility approved, Kent County.

Centreville: Federal building: $337,000 total cost, Queen Anne's County.

Queenstown: New post office facility, Queen Anne's County.

Crisfield: Tangier mail route, retained and prevented relocation to Onancock, Somerset County.

Smith Island: Established door-to-door mail delivery at Ewell-Somerset Counties.

Salisbury: Federal building: $781,520 total cost, land and construction, Wicomico County.

Rhodes Point: Door-to-door postal service delivery, Somerset County.

SEAFOOD INDUSTRY

Choptank River: Oyster harvest, worked with State to correct pollution problems, Dorchester County.

Crisfield: Hard Crab Derby, assisted with Federal participation, Somerset County.

Anuga Trade Fair: Seafood promotion—Cologne, Germany.

Crab processing machine: $300,000 research and development grant.

Seafood market news office, retained in Chesapeake Bay area—Department of the Interior had announced removal.

GENERAL

Perry Point Hospital: Retention of complete facility for veterans service, Cecil County.

Bloodsworth Island: Commitment from Navy to decrease size of explosives used in target practice, Dorchester County.

Worcester County: Coastal stabilization study: 3-year program: $90,000, complete 1966.

University of Maryland: Authorized by Congress to allow university to purchase land and buildings from the Department of the Interior—located in center of campus.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Headstart, 1965: $130,027.

Headstart, 1966: $88,076.

Community action program: $738,658.

Small business, Farmers Home Administration, rural loans, 1965: $27,580; 1966: $42,670.

Adult basic education: $43,250.

Neighborhood Youth Corps: Cecil County included with seven counties, total, $166,410.

Total excluding Neighborhood Youth Corps: $1,070,261.

New Hospital for Boca Raton, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, adequate hospital facilities are of concern to communities throughout the Nation, and particular in south Florida where we are experiencing an increase in population, particularly among the senior-citizen age group, unlike that in many other localities. In light of this concern, I am especially proud of the efforts being made in Boca Raton, Fla., by leaders in the community to provide a modern, well-equipped hospital. This new $4 million facility is being constructed entirely from voluntary donations, and will open next spring.

As is so often the case in community benefits, the women of Boca Raton, through their Debbie Rand Service League, have led the way in constructive efforts to bring the hospital project to completion. Over the past 3 years, these hardworking women have given more than $240,000 to their hospital project, and all the money has been raised through voluntary work—all were volunteers working without remuneration and without special recognition. A special project, and one worthy of particular note, has been the annual pre-Lenten Fiesta de Boca Raton, which has required the help of some 3,000 people this year alone, and which produced almost $70,000 for the hospital.

The successful Boca Raton Fiesta will be presented again in 1967 on February 2. The authentic Spanish theme is most appropriate to Boca Raton, which is blessed with many fine examples of Spanish and Mediterranean architecture. The 4-day affair has become an annual event of interest to tourists and residents alike, and deserving of the continued support of all. From the advance planning, which calls for parades, arts and crafts, exhibits, fine entertainment, a grand ball, golf tournament, and a yacht-a-cade, it can be seen that this year's Fiesta de Boca Raton will be even more successful than those of the past, and will provide increased benefits for the community hospital. All those who plan to be in Florida this winter should include a visit to Boca Raton at fiesta time.

Boca Raton has every reason to be proud of the work being done by so many of its citizens for the hospital, and I commend them all.

Yearend Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the following yearend report is being mailed to many of my constituents today.

The report referred to follows:

DEAR FRIEND: Another year has gone by—my fourteenth as your Congressman. With the Congress now in recess, at least until after the November elections, this will be my last Washington Report until the new Congress convenes in January. Many feel the President will ask Congress immediately after the elections to approve an additional $13 billion for the Vietnam war and possibly will request a tax "package" including increases in personal income taxes.

As your voice in this 89th Congress, I have exercised my vote in the House of Representatives on the basis of what I thought was best for our District, our State and our Nation. I have never claimed that my judgment was infallible on any issue but have made each decision after careful and conscientious study. I have cast several thousand committee and House votes on legislation since being in public office.

If ever you have any question on why I voted as I did on any amendment, resolution, or bill, please drop me a postcard. I want you to have this information firsthand from me rather than accept a third party's explanation of my vote on any given piece of legislation.

The two years of the 89th Congress have been very busy ones for me. They have contained some frustrations and some successes in my attempts to represent the best interests of our district, our State, and our nation. In this Year-End Report, I would like to touch briefly on some of the highlights of those two years.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The provision of my bill to increase benefits across the board by 7% was enacted last year. With the cost of living rising so rapidly, however, another Laird bill was introduced this year that would automatically increase social security benefits each time the cost of living goes up. I am hopeful that next year's Congress will contain more members who will support this kind of legislation.

DAIRY PROBLEMS

Though successful in reversing the Johnson-Freeman decision to cut back drastically on the School Milk and School Lunch programs and to keep dairy price supports down, other efforts to improve the dairy situation have not been successful. Secretary Freeman still refuses to use his authority under the Agricultural Adjustment Act to restrict imports of cheese produced under unsanitary conditions abroad that compete unfairly with Wisconsin Cheese.

VETERANS PENSIONS

Another Laird-supported bill became law this year. It was the Veterans Pension Act which contained many improvements including a cost-of-living increase in benefits. Unfortunately, Republican amendments to increase the Veterans income limitation were defeated in Committee. Next year, I will continue my efforts to increase the amount of outside income both Veterans and Social Security beneficiaries may earn without losing pension benefits.

INFLATION

Despite the continued efforts of many of us in Congress to hold down government spending on domestic programs, we were unsuccessful in convincing the Administration that "business as usual" here at home while fighting a costly war abroad would lead to rapid rises in the cost of living. Inflation is a "national sales tax" levied on every man, woman, and child in America and hurts most those on fixed incomes and pensions.

MINIMUM WAGE

My vote was cast this year in favor of the Minimum Wage Bill. Four years ago, I opposed an amendment to this Act because it changed the definition of what constitutes interstate commerce. That was not an issue in the bill this year.

VIETNAM

All Americans support our fighting forces in Vietnam though many are confused and uncertain about the short-term aims and long-term objectives of our policy in Vietnam. More than anything else in these past two years, I have tried to get the Johnson Administration to define clearly what we are trying to accomplish and to spell out clearly the true costs of the war. Americans will make the necessary sacrifices in time of war. The Administration in power must provide effective leadership and direction.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Despite Administration attempts to scuttle experience rating which has worked so well in Wisconsin, we were successful in preserving experience rating in the Unemployment Compensation Amendments that were passed by the Congress this year. Every worker and employer in Wisconsin benefited by this victory.

MEDICAL RESEARCH

As ranking minority member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare, I have consistently supported increased funds for medical research. Higher priority is given by the Johnson Administration to space research than to human research. In my view, this is wrong and I will continue in my efforts to have medical research given a higher priority than is presently the case.

FEDERAL TAX SHARING

One of my greatest efforts in this 89th Congress has been to build support for enactment of the Laird Tax Sharing Program. Tax sharing is an alternative for the special categorical grant-in-aid programs. The increasing costs of education are a prime example of the need for a tax-sharing approach. Today there are well over 200 categorical federal grant-in-aid programs spending more than $14 billion annually. Yet our problems grow worse. Wisconsin sends $1.46 to Washington for every dollar it gets back in federal grants-in-aid. Tax sharing would do a better job at less cost and I intend to continue my efforts to enact the Laird Tax-Sharing plan into law.

DISTRICT CONFERENCES

In addition to my activities here in Washington, several conferences were held back in the District on vital problems that face our people. They included a Youth Leadership Workshop with representatives from each High School in the 7th District and an informational conference for our older citizens on the programs available to assist them on the federal and state level. My efforts to keep you, my constituents, informed and to obtain your views on public issues will continue in the 90th Congress beginning next January.

APPRECIATION

I want to express to each and every resident of the 7th Congressional District my deep appreciation for your support and cooperation during the 89th Congress.

Best regards,

MEL LAIRD.

Tribute to Representative James H. Morrison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is always painful to say goodby to a friend, but when that friend has been a colleague, a worker for the causes espoused by his party, and a strong helping hand at all times, it is more difficult than ever to say something that will accurately convey the sense of loss that is experienced.

Will I miss JIMMY MORRISON, of Louisiana? You can be sure that I shall indeed miss him. So will the civil service workers whose champion he was. So will the House Agriculture and Post Office and Civil Service Committees which he served with such energy and devotion. So will his many friends in the House of Representatives. So will the country and so will his district.

My high regard for him has not been a very well kept secret. I spoke at a testimonial dinner that was held for him here in Washington in March of 1964. The Washington Post said the next morning:

> Speaker McCORMACK, making a rare appearance, and a rare lengthy speech of considerable force, lauded MORRISON for his loyalty, dedication, and clear-mindedness on policies affecting the Nation.

I will not dwell at length on the outstanding qualities of my dear friend JIMMY MORRISON at this time, as I did then, because I feel such a deep and true sense of loss at his retirement from public life. But I hope that I do speak with the same "considerable force" mentioned by the Post when I say again that for loyalty, dedication, and clear mindedness on policies affecting the Nation he had no superior.

He has been the soul of kindness, courtesy, and fairness. Here was clearly to be seen a man dedicated to the public service, to the House of Representatives, to his constituents, and to his country.

JAMES HOBSON MORRISON was born in Hammond, La., on December 8, 1908. He attended the public schools of Hammond, and later was graduated from Tulane University Law School in 1935. He practiced his profession in Hammond, married Miss Marjorie Abbey, of Webb, Miss., in 1940, and was elected to the 78th Congress. For 11 more Congresses he was continuously reelected. After 24 years of service, he ranked 31st in seniority in the House of Representatives.

He was devoted to the interests of the Sixth District of Louisiana. A mayor who had good reason to know of his work for the Sixth District once said of him:

> The reason for his success has been hard work and dedication. No man tries harder or works harder to please his constituents. He is kind, good-hearted and generous, but, overshadowing all of this, the greatest attribute of all is the fact that JIMMY is the same fellow on all occasions and at all times. . . . I never called on him but that he didn't put forth a great and extra effort to help me. He doesn't just help elected officials like myself, but he helps every one of his constituents who calls on him, regardless of their walk in life.

He was always alert to protect the interests of the farmers of his district, and indeed there were all kinds of farmers in that district. There were strawberry farmers, vegetable and truck farmers, tung oil growers, dairy farmers, chicken and egg producers, rice farmers, sugarcane farmers, and beef cattle producers. All of them received the same treatment, that is to say, the very best treatment.

If anyone in Congress knew how to go about obtaining improvements in a congressional district's postal facilities it was JIMMY MORRISON. In the last 4 years alone he obtained the approval of Congress for the following new or expanded postal facilities: Bogalusa, $324,923; Hammond, $393,378; Madisonville, $12,000; Slidell, $115,000; Baton Rouge—Istrouma Station, $79,000; Tangipahoa, $12,000; White Castle, $77,000; Baton Rouge—Foster Drive Station, $34,000; Baton Rouge—University Station, $104,000; Abita Springs, $14,000; New Roads, $88,000; St. Francisville, $66,000; Livingston, $20,000; Pearl River, $40,000; Springfield, $17,000; St. Gabriel, $90,000; Mount Hermon, $17,000; Covington, $156,000. Port Allen has a beautiful post office, and a new one will be constructed at Holden. Pearl River's post office has been completed, and bids have been let for Plaquemine's post office.

I have compiled this rather tiresome list because it represents the kind of thing for which his district's constituents should be grateful.

My own gratitude for JIMMY MORRISON's work and spirit is not something that he can possibly doubt. I have expressed it before and I now express it again. A fond farewell, then, to a distinguished public servant, to a grand person, to a great Member of the House of Representatives.

United States Should Reaffirm Support for Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, once again there is tension in the Middle East. Recent newspapers reveal bloodshed at the Israel-Syria border. This is a situation that has been latent since the founding of the Israel nation in 1948, but there are indications that the current tension is more serious and may increase.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good time for Americans to reaffirm their commitments to the success of Israel as a nation, the only democracy in the Middle East. Americans led the long efforts to secure the creation of the State of Israel and the ties that bind our two peoples have been firm and warm.

Unfortunately, time has not diminished the hostility of the Arab States bordering Israel. Syria continues to harangue the Arab world against Israel. The world knows that if Nasser and the UAR thought they could succeed, they would invade Israel tomorrow.

Although I do not believe the United States should interfere with the relations of foreign nations with each other, our long and enduring friendship with the people of Israel calls for expressions of support during this period of increasing tension. Let those states who would plot to crush a small but brave nation know that Israel has a mighty friend in the United States and her people. Let them calculate well the response of this Nation to further bullying of the Middle East's only democracy and let them behave accordingly.

Better Social Security Coverage for Ministers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill in the House last spring to expedite fair coverage for ministers by correcting the fiction in the present law which enables ministers to be covered only as "self-employed" individuals. If in the next Congress my bill is reported favorably from the House Ways and Means Committee and subsequently enacted into law, roughly 150,000 ministers now covered by social security as well as the 10,000 legally eligible members of the clergy who have not yet elected the voluntary coverage available to them will be eligible for coverage as "employees" of the church which they serve.

The Social Security Act was enacted in 1935 to provide for "protection against the loss of earnings due to retirement in old age." As originally enacted this social security program covered only a small part of the Nation's working force; namely, commercial and industrial employees. In the intervening years, Congress has broadened the act through various amendments and increased its benefits. Today, the benefits of the Social Security Act extend to almost all employed and self-employed workers in the country. Under the amendments to the Social Security Act in 1965, some of the few remaining groups not previously covered were added to the rolls.

One of the basic premises of social security is that coverage is not voluntary. The reasons for this were pointed out by the Advisory Council on Social Security in 1965. The council said, in part, that voluntary coverage would prevent the program from effectively carrying out its primary aim of basic protection for all under a system which was actuarially sound. Only a few exceptions have been made to the mandatory contribution rule, and one of these is for ministers.

In 1954 when Congress was considering the amendments which first made ministers eligible for social security coverage, considerable hesitancy was expressed by everyone concerned that forcing churches to participate in the old age and survivors insurance program as employers of ministers might violate the traditional and well-established principle of separation of church and state. Opposition was also raised on the grounds that a minister who objected to being covered by the program for reasons of conscience should not be forced to participate. For these reasons, ministers were included as eligible for social security benefits, but only on a voluntary basis as "self-employed." Although nearly 150,000 ministers have elected to be covered under the provisions of the act, there are about 50,000 who have not done so. Of these, approximately 40,000 have allowed the deadline for waiving exemption from coverage to expire, so that under the present law, they are not legally eligible for benefits from the system. This is despite the fact that because of requests from clergymen who had not elected coverage within their allotted period, Congress has reopened this period on four occasions. The last such period, provided under the 1965 amendments, ran from July 31, 1965, through April 15, 1966. For all practical purposes then, some clergymen have had over 11 years—from 1955 to April 15, 1966—to elect coverage. That they have not done so is in part attributed to the fact that since classified as "self-employed" they must pay 1½ times the tax that a lay employee of the church would pay. As many churches do cover their lay employees, the inequity is all the more striking. Ministers are the only beneficiaries of the system discriminated against in this way.

It was in an effort to remove this disparity that I introduced my bill—H.R. 14200. This bill would provide that a minister who is an "employee" might be treated as such for coverage and tax purposes. The program would in no way be made mandatory; it would be the decision of the minister alone to decide whether or not he wished to be covered by social security. If his decision was affirmative, then he and his church together would decide if he should be treated as an employee or as self-employed.

If a decision was reached for coverage of the minister as an "employee," he and the church would file a joint certificate to this effect. The minister would pay his share of the tax, and the church would contribute an equal amount for the employer share. This joint certificate would be in effect for as long as the minister performed service for the particular church in question. The minister who changed churches would revert to his prior status as a "self-employed" person. If his new church wished to have him covered as an employee, a new joint certificate would be filed and employee coverage would be resumed. Once the minister has chosen to be covered under the old-age, survivors, disability, and health insurance program, he cannot withdraw from it. The church, however, has the option of not taking up coverage on any new ministers who work for it. Nor is it necessary for all ministers of a particular church to be covered as "employees" merely because one minister wishes to do so. This decision is a personal one and the arrangement is always between the individual and the church.

For a clear understanding of the effect that this bill would have, the following figures offer a graphic illustration. Under the present law, a minister earning the maximum amount that can be taxed under the old-age, survivors, and disability program—$6,600 per year—would pay a self-employed tax of $389.40 a year. The same earnings of an employed individual would only be taxed at the rate of $257.40 per year, a difference of $132. On a salary of $6,600 a year that is no small savings. The benefits of the employer-employee relationship would also extend to the tax rates for the new hospital and supplementary medical insurance program.

Besides being unfair to the individual minister-"employee" who pays the higher tax imposed on the self-employed, the present system is a liability to the entire social security trust fund, as the same benefits are paid to the ministers who are under coverage as to other employees, yet the ministers' contribution of $389.40 as self-employed is substantially lower than the $514.80 paid by lay employees of the church, or employees of nonchurch organizations, and their employers. If my bill is passed, the church itself will pay a share of the minister's social security tax, and the minister's share will be reduced to the level of other taxpayers, but the system as a whole will receive an increase in payment.

Since I introduced this bill on March 31, 1966, there has been a considerable amount of interest shown on the part of clergymen and church-affiliated organizations. Most are strongly in favor of the bill, feeling that the higher cost of living and the increase in the social security tax itself puts an obligation on the church to assist its minister in paying the tax. A minister's income is not large and the recent increase in social security tax has put an added burden on those who elect coverage. Clergymen from all over the country are strongly endorsing this bill.

From the tone of my mail, it also appears that there is little chance of any question being raised over a possible church-state conflict, due to the continued voluntary nature of the system under this bill. No church nor any minister not electing coverage would fall under the tax, and while a minister who has elected coverage cannot withdraw, a church which has done so may withdraw upon the departure of that particular minister.

Perhaps a greater evidence of interest in, and concern for, this bill by members of the clergy is the fact that many of them indicate that their churches are willing and interested in helping them to pay the social security tax, but this is illegal at present.

My bill was referred to the House Ways and Means Committee where it is now awaiting consideration. Under the procedure which is generally followed, reports have been requested from the major departments with a substantial interest in the passage of the bill. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which is responsible for the administration of the social security system, has been looking over the coverage afforded to ministers by the system to see if any changes should be recommended. It is hoped that they will adopt the attitude of the Advisory Council on Social Security which stated in 1965 that the coverage of ministers needed revision, and suggested in essence what my bill has proposed—"a plan under which ministers employed by churches or other nonprofit organizations would be covered as employees."

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has traditionally opposed the extension of voluntary provisions and hesitates to superimpose a voluntary provision—optional filing of joint certificates—over another voluntary provision—ministers electing coverage as "self-employed." There is also the possibility that problems might develop because this bill might reduce the incentive for a minister to elect self-employment coverage, and if a particular church refused to file a joint certificate the minister would be left without any coverage at all. These problems, however, would not appear to be important enough to thwart passage of H.R. 14200, as its benefit to the Nation's ministers is incontestable.

Although my bill was viewed with sympathetic interest by members of the Ways and Means Committee, it did not come up for consideration during this session of Congress. However, I pledge my wholehearted support of the bill and will reintroduce it for consideration by the 90th Congress if I am elected to return.

The Honorable Lindley Beckworth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHELF

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, as a colleague of long standing, I have the highest regard for the Honorable Lindley Beckworth and have enjoyed my years of association with him.

From my personal, firsthand knowledge, I know the value of Lindley's able and dedicated service not only to his district but to the State of Texas and the Nation, as well. His outstanding record in the Congress will remain as an everlasting tribute to this loyal and wonderful Representative and his commendable efforts and accomplishments.

As Congressman Beckworth leaves the Congress, I want to extend my best wishes for happiness and success in his every endeavor in the future.

Activities of the House Banking and Currency Committee in the 89th Congress, 2d Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting at this point the activities of the House Committee on Banking and Currency for the 89th Congress, 2d session. Included in this summary is a list of committee bills which became law and were otherwise acted upon. During this session, 21 bills were enacted into law with 4 other bills awaiting the President's signature.

With unanimous consent, I insert the list into the Record, as follows:

BILLS ENACTED

THE BANK MERGER ACT OF 1966

S. 1698 [H.R. 12173], to establish a procedure for the review of proposed bank mergers so as to eliminate the necessity for the dissolution of merged banks and for other purposes. Reported to Senate, S. Rept. 299, June 8, 1965. Passed Senate June 11, 1965. Hearings Domestic Finance Subcommittee August 11, 13, 16–20, 23–27, 30–31, Sept. 1, 2, 14–17, 22–24, 27 and 28, 1965. Reported with amendment to full committee October 1, 1965. Full committee executive sessions October 5, 8, 11, 1965. Full committee in executive session January 18–19, 1966, ordered reported to the House. H.R. 12173 passed the House by voice vote February 8, 1966; passage vacated and S. 1698 was passed in lieu after being amended to include House-passed language. February 9, 1966, Senate agreed to House amendment. February 21, 1966, signed by President, Public Law 89–356.

ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK ACT

H.R. 12563, to provide for the participation of the United States in the Asian Development Bank. [H.R. 12219.] Hearings held by Subcommittee on International Finance, January 26–27 and February 2, 1966. Full committee in executive session ordered reported H.R. 12563 to the House, H. Rept. 1267. Passed the House under suspension of rules February 9, 1966. Reported to the Senate February 24, 1966. Passed the Senate March 2, 1966, S. Rept. 1008, and signed into law by President March 16, 1966, Public Law 89–369.

THE 250TH ANNIVERSARY OF SAN ANTONIO

H.R. 7525, to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of founding of San Antonio. Full committee in executive session ordered reported to the House October 5, 1965. Reported to the House October 11, 1965. House Report 1136. Passed the House on Consent Calendar with amendment October 18, 1965. Reported to the Senate March 15, 1966, S. Rept. 1072, and passed the Senate March 17, 1966. Signed by President March 31, 1966, Public Law 89–382.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PURCHASE OF ALASKA

S. 2719, to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the purchase of Alaska by the United States from Russia. Reported to the Senate March 10, 1966, S. Rept. 1066; passed the Senate March 14, 1966. Full committee in executive session ordered reported to the House March 24, 1966. Reported to the House March 29, 1966, H. Rept. 1382. Passed House April 4, 1966, on voice vote. Signed by President April 14, 1966; Public Law 89–393.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF SCRANTON, PA.

S. 2831, to furnish to the Scranton Association, Inc. medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the city of Scranton, Pa. Reported to Senate March 10, 1966; S. Rept. 1067; passed the Senate March 14, 1966. Full committee in executive session ordered reported to the House March 24, 1966. Reported to the House March 29, 1966; H. Rept. 1383. Passed the House by voice vote on April 4, 1966, and signed by President April 16, 1966; Public Law 89–400.

THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF AMERICAN NUMISMATIC ASSOCIATION

S. 2835, to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the American Numismatic Association. Reported to the Senate March 10, 1966; S. Rept. 1068; passed the Senate March 14, 1966. Full committee in executive session ordered reported to the House March 24, 1966; reported to the House March 29, 1966; H. Rept. 1388. Passed the House by voice vote April 4, 1966, and signed by the President April 16, 1966; Public Law 89–401.

TO AMEND SMALL BUSINESS ACT

S. 2729, to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act, and for other purposes. Reported to the Senate March 4, 1966; S. Rept. 1057; passed the Senate March 8, 1966. Hearings held by Small Business Subcommittee March 23, 1966, and ordered reported to full committee. Full committee in executive session ordered reported to the House with amendments March 24, 1966; H. Rept. 1348. Rule granted March 29, 1966; H. Res. 802. Passed the House with amendment March 31, 1966. Senate concurred to House amendments numbered 8–14 April 15, 1966. House receded from its amendments numbered 1–7 April 18, 1966. Signed by President May 2, 1966; Public Law 89–409.

DESTRUCTION OF UNFIT CURRENCY

H.R. 5305 (S. 1308), to authorize revised procedures for the destruction of unfit Federal Reserve notes and for other purposes. Reported to the Senate August 2, 1965; S. Rept. 531; passed the Senate August 3, 1965. Hearings held by Subcommittee on Domestic Finance February 24, 1966. Ordered reported to the full committee March 8, 1966, as amended. Full committee ordered reported to the House April 21, 1966; H. Rept. 1449. Passed the House under suspension of rules May 2, 1966; passage vacated and S. 1308 passed in lieu after being amended to contain House-passed language. Senate concurred to House amendments May 5, 1966, and President signed into law May 20, 1966; Public Law 89–427.

PARTICIPATION SALES ACT

H.R. 14544 (S. 3283), to promote private financing of credit needs and to provide for an efficient and orderly method of liquidating financial assets held by Federal credit agencies and for other purposes. Hearings held by full Committee April 21, 1966, and reported in executive session amended on the same day; H. Rept. 1448. Rule granted May 11, 1966; H. Res. 852. Reported to the Senate April 28, 1966; S. Rept. 1140. Passed the Senate May 5, 1966. Passed the House, as amended, May 18, 1966; passage vacated and S. 3283 passed in lieu after being amended to contain the House-passed language. S. 2499, to amend the Small Business Act to authorize issuance and sale of participation interests held by the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes, incorporated into S. 3283 after being reported by the full committee on April 25, 1966; H. Rept. 1447. S. 3283 signed by President May 24, 1966; Public Law 89–429.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF U.S. SECRET SERVICE

H.R. 10357, to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the U.S. Secret Service. Full committee in executive session ordered reported to the House October 5, 1965; H. Rept. 1207; passed the House April 4, 1966. Reported to the Senate June 15, 1966; S. Rept. 1279; passed the Senate June 16, 1966, and signed by the President June 24, 1966; Public Law 89–469.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT

H.R. 14026, to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes. Hearings held by full committee March 29, 1966. Full committee in executive session ordered reported to the House with amendments March 30, 1966; H. Rept. 1411. Rule granted June 2, 1966; H. Res. 877. Passed the House, as amended, June 16, 1966. Reported to the Senate June 23, 1966; S. Rept. 1303; passed the Senate June 27, 1966, and signed by the President June 30, 1966; Public Law 89–482.

EXTENSION OF FEDERAL RESERVE DIRECT PURCHASING AUTHORITY

H.R. 15372 (S. 3368), to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended to extend for two years the authority of the Federal Reserve banks to purchase United States obligations directly from the Treasury. Reported to the Senate June 8, 1966; S. Rept. 1215; passed the Senate June 9, 1966. Full committee in executive session ordered reported to the House June 20, 1966; H. Rept. 1640. Rule granted June 22, 1966; H. Res. 894. Passed the House June 23, 1966 by voice vote, and signed by President June 30, 1966; Public Law 89–484.

TO AMEND THE BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT

H.R. 7371, to amend the Bank Holding Company Act. Hearing held by the full committee May 27, June 14 and 15, 1965. Reported to the House by full committee in executive session June 16, 1965, with amendment; H. Rept. 534. Pursuant to Clause 23, Rule 11, the House passed H. Res. 499 providing for four hours of debate by record vote, 201 yeas, 71 nays. Passed the House on voice vote after adoption of a committee substitute amendment that supplied a new text September 23, 1965. Provisions of H.R. 7372 included in H.R. 7371 as passed by the House. Reported to the Senate with amendment; S. Rept. 1179; May 19, 1966. Passed the Senate after adopting committee amendment in the nature of a substitute June 7, 1966. House concurred in Senate amendment June 21, 1966. Signed by President July 1, 1966.

THE 1,000TH ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF POLAND

H.R. 139, to provide for the striking of medals to commemorate the 1,000th anniversary of the founding of Poland. Full committee in executive session ordered reported to the House with amendment October 15, 1965, H. Rept. 1206. Passed the House with amendment April 4, 1966. Reported to the Senate July 11, 1966; S. Rept. 1369. Passed the Senate July 12, 1966. House concurred in Senate amendment July 21, 1966. Signed by the President August 5, 1966; Public Law 89–527.

URBAN MASS TRANSIT ACT

H.R. 14810 (S. 3700), to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, to authorize additional amendment for assistance thereunder, to authorize grants for certain technical studies, and to provide for a expedited program of research, development, and demonstration of new urban transportation systems. Full committee in executive session ordered reported to the House May 5, 1966; H. Rept. 1487. Rule granted August 1, 1966, H. Res. 948. Passed the House with amendment by a record vote of 235 yeas and 127 nays. Passage vacated and S. 3700 passed in lieu after being amended to contain House-passed language. Reported to the Senate August 8, 1966; S. Rept. 1436; passed the Senate August 16, 1966. Conference committee action August 24, 1966, on differences in the two bills; H. Rept. 1869. Senate adopted conference report August 25, 1966; House adopted conference report August 26, 1966, 156 yeas to 86 nays. Signed by the President September 8, 1966; Public Law 89–562.

FNMA BORROWING AUTHORITY

H.R. 15639 (S. 3688), to amend Title III of the National Housing Act to increase the authority of FNMA to obtain funds for use in its secondary market operations. Full committee in executive session ordered reported to the House June 20, 1966; H. Rept. 1647. Reported to the Senate August 3, 1966; S. Rept. 1428; passed the Senate August 11, 1966. Passed the House under suspension of rules with amendment by vote of 314 to 1. Conference report filed August 24, 1966; H. Rept. 1868. August 25 and 26 Senate and House agreed to conference report. Signed by President September 10, 1966; Public Law 89–566.

TO PROVIDE FOR CONTROLS ON DIVIDENDS AND INTEREST RATES

H.R. 14026, to provide for controls on dividends and interest rates payable by insured financial institutions. Hearings held by full committee May 9–12, 19, 24–25, 31, June 1, 2, 7–9, 16 and 23, 1966. Executive sessions June 13, 16, 20 and 23, 1966; adopted resolution asking Federal Reserve to stop excessive interest rate competition. Full committee in executive session July 25, 1966, ordered reported to the House with amendment, H. Rept. 1777. Rule granted August 31, 1966, making it in order to consider the committee's substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and further making it in order to consider H.R. 17255 as a substitute for committee amendment; H. Res. 993. Passed the House after striking all after enacting clause and substituting the text of H.R. 17255 with additional amendments September 8, 1966. Reported to the Senate September 14, 1966; S. Rept. 1601, and passed the Senate September 15, 1966. Signed by the President September 21, 1966. Public Law 89–597.

TO PERMIT EDWARD C. BOWER AS A DIRECTOR OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS NATIONAL BANK PRIOR TO HIS OBTAINING U.S. CITIZENSHIP

H.R. 13612 (S. 2973), to permit Edward C. Bower as a director of the Virgin Islands National Bank prior to his obtaining U.S. citizenship. Reported to the Senate September 1, 1966; S. Rept. 1584; passed the Senate September 6. Passed the House September 20, 1966. Signed by President October 4, 1966. Private Law 89–340.

ELLIS ISLAND COMMEMORATIVE MEDAL

H.R. 16923 (S. 3704), to provide for the striking of a medal in commemoration of the designation of Ellis Island as a part of the Statue of Liberty National Monument in New York City. Reported to the Senate September 20, 1966; S. Rept. 1616; passed the Senate September 21, 1966. House passed H.R. 16923 October 10, 1966; passage vacated and S. 3704 was passed in lieu after being amended to contain House-passed language. Signed by President October 15, 1966; Public Law 89-676.

FEDERAL LAND BANK SYSTEM COMMEMORATIVE MEDAL

S.J. Res. 153, to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the Federal Land Bank System in the United States. Reported to the Senate June 15, 1966; S. Rept. 1278; passed the Senate June 16, 1966. Full committee in executive session ordered reported to the House September 14, 1966; H. Rept. 2193; passed the House October 10, 1966. Signed by President October 15, 1966. Public Law 89-679.

THE FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS SUPERVISORY AND INSURANCE ACT OF 1966

H.R. 17899 (S. 3158), to strengthen the regulatory and supervisory authority of Federal agencies over insured banks and insured savings and loan association, to increase the maximum amount of insured accounts or deposits to $15,000, and for other purposes. Reported to the Senate August 18, 1966; S. Rept. 1482; passed the Senate August 22, 1966. Hearings held by full committee September 15, 16 and 22, 1966. Full committee in executive session ordered H.R. 17899, as amended, reported to the House September 22, 1966; H. Rept. 2077. Rule granted September 28, 1966; H. Res. 1033. Passed the House as amended October 4, 1966; passage vacated and S. 3158 was passed in lieu after being amended to contain House-passed language. Conference report filed October 11, 1966; H. Rept. 2232. House adopted conference report October 12, 1966, and Senate on October 13, 1966. Signed by President October 16, 1966. Public Law 89-695.

Bills Reported but Not Enacted

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD DELEGATION OF FUNCTIONS

S. 1556, to authorize the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to delegate certain of its functions. Reported to Senate August 2, 1965, S. Rept. 533. Passed Senate August 3, 1965. Full committee in executive session reported to House September 14, 1966, H. Rept. 2079. Passed House on Consent Calendar.

COMMEMORATION OF SEABEES AND NAVY CIVIL ENGINEERS

H.R. 17658, to provide for striking of medals in commemoration of the 25th anniversary of U.S. Naval Construction Battalions (seabees) and the 100th anniversary of the United States Navy Civil Engineer Corps (CEC). Reported to House October 14, 1966, H. Rept. 2287, and passed House October 19, 1966. Passed Senate under unanimous consent after being taken from desk, October 20, 1966.

SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT

H.R. 18021 (S. 3695), to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes. Reported to Senate Sept. 1, 1966, S. Rept. 1585, and passed Senate Sept. 6, 1966. Hearings by full committee Sept. 15, 1966. Full committee in executive session ordered reported to House in lieu of S. 3695, H. Rept. 2159. Passed House on voice vote Oct. 19, 1966. Passed Senate under unanimous consent after being taken from desk.

DEMONSTRATION CITIES AND METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1966, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1966

H.R. 15890 (S. 3708, S. 3711), to assist city demonstration programs for rebuilding slums and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and services necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in these areas, to improve and amend our housing programs, and for other purposes. Hearings held by Housing Subcommittee Feb. 28, 1966, March 1-4, 7-11, 14-18, 21, 24 and 25, 1966. Full committee in executive session ordered reported to House June 28, 1966. Reported July 15 with amendments; Parts 1 and 2, H. Rept. 1699. Part III filed July 28. August 25, 1966, Housing Subcommittee reported S. 3708 to full committee with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. The amendment included provisions of S. 3708, S. 3711 and H.R. 15890. Full committee in executive session August 30-31 and Sept. 1, 1966, ordered S. 3708 reported to House after striking all after enacting clause and inserting an amendment in the nature of a substitute, H. Rept. 1931. Rule granted Sept. 23, 1966, H. Res. 1023. Passed House Oct. 14, 1966, with amendments on vote of 178 yeas to 141 nays; conference requested. Conference report filed Oct. 18, 1966, H. Rept. 2301. Senate adopted conference report Oct. 18. House agreed to conference, Oct. 20, 1966, 142 yeas, 126 nays.

Bills Considered—No Action

FEDERAL CHARTERING OF MUTUAL SAVINGS BANKS

H.R. 11508, to authorize the establishment of Federal mutual savings banks. Subcommittee on Bank Supervision and Insurance, Feb. 10, 16 and 17, 1966, in executive session ordered public hearings. Hearings held by Subcommittee Feb. 23, March 1 and 2, 1966. Executive session held by subcommittee March 16, 17, 24, 30; April 6, 7, 26-28; May 4, 1966, ordered reported to full committee with amendments. Full committee in executive session August 24 and September 28, 1966.

FDIC BOARD OF DIRECTORS

H.R. 12904, to provide that the Board of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation shall consist of three appointive members, and for other purposes. March 3, 1966, hearings held by Subcommittee on Bank Supervision and Insurance. May 5, 1966, full committee in executive session ordered reported to House with amendments, H. Rept. 1510.

SILVER DOLLARS

H.R. 13150, to authorize the sale of standard silver dollars held by Treasury Department to American Cancer Society and American Heart Association. Hearings held by full committee July 26, 27 and 28, 1966.

BANKS PERFORMING NONBANKING FUNCTIONS

H.R. 112, to prohibit banks from performing certain non-banking services.

H.R. 117, to prohibit banks from engaging in the business of personal property leasing.

H.R. 1059, to prohibit banks from performing professional accounting services.

Hearings held by Subcommittee on Bank Supervision and Insurance, March 9, 10 and 15, 1966. Subcommittee in executive session, May 4, 10, and 11, 1966; no final action.

REVENUE BONDS

H.R. 14973, to assist cities and states by amending Sec. 5136 of the revised statutes, as amended, with respect to the authority of the national banks to underwrite and deal in securities issued by state and local governments, and for other purposes. Tabled by full committee in executive session, August 24, 1966.

Investigations

The Subcommittee on Domestic Finance continued its investigation into certain purchasing and sharp practice financing problems of servicemen with regards to finance companies with lines of credit from commercial banks. Held hearings in Newark, New Jersey, August 19, 1966.

Studies

INTERNATIONAL FINANCE

The Subcommittee on International Finance held hearings on August 29, 1966, on the Inter-American Development Bank's role in agricultural development in Latin America.

The Subcommittee on International Finance published a staff report on the Technical and Economic Assistance to Cooperative Enterprises under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, March 21, 1966.

BANK NOMINEE OWNERSHIP

The Subcommittee on Domestic Finance is in the process of conducting a study to determine the beneficial ownership of bank stock. This study is a continuation of the one conducted three years ago on the twenty largest stockholders of the Federal Reserve member banks.

BANK AUDITS

The Subcommittee on Domestic Finance published a staff study on the audits of banks by public accountants. Published April 22, 1966.

HOUSING

A summary of housing legislation was published Feb. 25, 1966, by the Housing Subcommittee, "Basic Laws and Authorities on Housing and Urban Development."

FEDERAL RESERVE

A study is presently being conducted by the Subcommittee on Domestic Finance on the operations of the Federal Open Market Committee from 1950 to present. The study has not been completed.

Dedication of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Building in the Government Center, Boston, Mass., September 9, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the dedication of the new John Fitzgerald Kennedy Building in the Government Center at Boston, Mass., took place on September 9, 1966. This magnificent building, which stands as a perpetual reminder of our late beloved President Kennedy's dedication to our country and to the citizens of his native city and State, was accepted by the General Services Administration for the U.S. Government.

Participating in the dedicatory ceremony were the late President's brothers, Senators ROBERT F. KENNEDY and EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts; Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK; members of the Massachusetts congressional delegation; Gov. John A. Volpe and Mayor John Collins, of Boston; Richard Cardinal Cushing, Roman Catholic archbishop of Boston; Rabbi Joseph Shubow, of Congregation B'nai Moshe in Boston; and the Right Reverend Anson Phelps Stokes, Jr., Episcopal bishop of Boston. Under permission granted, I include with my remarks at this point in the RECORD the transcript of the dedicatory ceremony, so that it may be preserved for posterity in the official records of Congress:

DEDICATION OF THE JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY BUILDING, SEPTEMBER 9, 1966, BOSTON, MASS.

Mr. WILLIAM FITZGERALD. Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen: I am most honored to have been chosen chairman for this occasion when we are gathered to honor our beloved late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. This building stands as a perpetual reminder of his dedication to our country and to the citizens of his native State and city. I should like now to introduce to you Congressman Edward P. Boland of the Second Congressional District who will be the platform chairman of the day. Congressman Boland.

Congressman Boland. Thank you, Chairman Fitzgerald. The place looks a lot better without the old Howard, the Crawford House, and the Casino. [Laughter.] The Colors will now be presented. Mr. James Herndon, the executive vice president of the J. W. Bateson Company, the contractor who completed this fine building, will present them to the General Services Administration, the agency responsible for the building. Mr. Paul Lazzaro, the regional administrator of the General Services Administration, will accept them and turn them over to the all-service color guard which will raise them. Mr. Lazzaro and Mr. Bateson. (Sic.)

Mr. Herndon. Mr. Lazzaro, it is indeed a pleasure to present this to you in the name of J. W. Bateson Company. It's been a pleasure working with you.

Mr. Lazzaro. Thank you. I accept this flag in the name of the United States Government for the General Services Administration. It will fly proudly over the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Building. [Applause and silence, followed by a band playing the National Anthem.]

Congressman Boland. Will you please remain standing while soloist Luigi Vina sings our National Anthem.

[National Anthem.]

Congressman Boland. Will you please remain standing while the invocation, to be delivered by our beloved Richard Cardinal Cushing, Archbishop of Boston and the personal pastor of President Kennedy.

Cardinal Cushing. Almighty God, Creator of all things, bless with Your Presence today this ceremony marking the dedication of a building placed forever at the service of society; protect by Thy help all those who have labored to bring it into being; guide always the hands and hearts of those who will spend here their working day. Let its newness be for us a symbol of a fresh beginning, its towering heights speak to us of exalted ideals, its place here in government's center remind us that it functions always as a ministry for the people. Let us rejoice especially that this building will stand among us for generations to recall the name of John Fitzgerald Kennedy. It was in this town that his short career had its commencement; it was here that he first learned the ways of good government; it was from here that he went out to become a citizen of the world. Here it was that he gave his youth to assist his country in peace; here it was that he accepted the summons to defend his country in war. From this city in his majority our nation called him to be its leader. And for this nation he gave his life. For our generation and the one that follows us, his memory will be a living thing. We talked to him; we laughed with him; we followed him; we prayed with him; and finally we wept over him. Nothing can erase the memory of his youthful grace and strength and beauty. But there will be other generations here for whom his name must be immortalized, and in this steel and stone, we make this monument. Let us pray that we will always find within these walls those who in the service of the civil order bring to their work the dedication he knew, the ideals he defended, and the hopes that he held for this nation and its people. Let us know that he lives among us just as long as we make our own that excellency of spirit which he symbolized not only at home but across the world. May the Lord with whom he lives today bless all of us who loved him and may this city which he loved always be worthy of his memory. [Applause.]

Congressman Boland, Eminent clergy, Speaker McCormack, Senator Edward M. Kennedy, Senator Robert Kennedy, Mrs. Joseph P. Kennedy, Senator Saltonstall, Governor Volpe, and Congressman O'Neill: If we can honor John Fitzgerald Kennedy with stone and steel, then it is most fitting that it be with a building such as this in this place, for he deeply believed in the role of the federal government in promoting the common good for all. He would be happy to see in this structure and the men and women who serve in it the means of implementing the programs for which he worked during his public life. And this is a good place, in his beloved Boston in the heart of the district which he first served in the Congress of the United States and at the foot of the hill where he so well defined the standards for those who govern in a democratic society. This is a building of great beauty and utility. God willing, it will stand to serve the people for decades to come. To those who will work within its walls I would say: Follow John F. Kennedy's dedication to public service as the fulfillment of man's commitment to the welfare of his fellow man. To those who come to this building to conduct business with federal departments and agencies I would say: Remember his admonition that this is the obligation of a citizen to give rather than to take. And to those who only pass by these doors I would say: Each time you pass this way think again of this man and his thousand days and know that an ounce of his devotion and purpose in each of us will surely make a better world.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, it is my pleasure to introduce some of the platform guests. I am delighted to present to this gathering Mr. Franklin Floete, a former Administrator of General Services who was intimately concerned with this project in its early stages. Mr. Floete is a Midwesterner, but, happily, he is also a Cape Codder. We are delighted to acknowledge his presence and his wife. Dr. Walter Gropius, a giant among modern architects, who heads The Architects' Collaborative in Cambridge, part of the venture which designed this building. Dr. Gropius is a fellow of the American Institute of Architects and has been the recipient of numerous gold medals and other honors. Dr. Walter Gropius. Mr. Samuel Glazer of Samuel Glazer Associates, part of the design team. Another leading architect in this nation and in this area, Mr. Glazer is also a member of the American Institute of Architects. Mr. Samuel Glazer. I am pleased to present a colleague in the Congress of the United States, a distinguished member of Congress, the Honorable William H. Bates of the Sixth Congressional District. I know that Senator Saltonstall will be pleased to know that the Postmaster General of the United States is out raising funds on the West Coast, but he sent his very attractive wife and his very talented son. I am delighted to present to this gathering Mrs. Lawrence F. O'Brien and Lawrence F. O'Brien, Jr. It is now my great pleasure and high personal privilege to present to this gathering His Excellency, the Governor of the Commonwealth, who will bring us the greetings as chief executive of this state, Governor John Volpe.

Governor Volpe. Thank you very much, Congressman Boland. Your Eminence, Cardinal Cushing, Bishop Stokes, Rabbi Shubow, Mrs. Kennedy, Senator Saltonstall, Senator Edward Kennedy, Senator Robert Kennedy—and you notice, Ted, that I gave you precedence—Speaker McCormack, Mayor Collins, Members of Congress, Mr. Knott, other distinguished guests, and my fellow citizens: We are gathered here today from many corners of this Nation for the dedication of this magnificent structure and for its dedication to the service of all of our people. For myself it is a great privilege and honor to participate in this ceremony, particularly because this splendid structure is being dedicated to the memory of a faithful and dedicated son of Massachusetts. We of Massachusetts have a great heritage—a great and sacred and noble heritage; one which John F. Kennedy kept ever fresh in his mind; one which ever guided him during those stirring years in which he gave so much of himself to our people and Nation. I can still recall vividly that day in January of 1961, ten days before his Inauguration as President of the United States, when I had the privilege of presenting him to the members of the Massachusetts Legislature. On that cold, wintry day, now nearly six years ago, the President-elect said of Massachusetts: "Its leaders have shaped our destiny long before the great Republic was born. Its principles have guided our footsteps in the times of crisis as well as in times of calm. Its democratic institutions have served as beacon lights for other nations as well as our sister states." And he also said in his memorable choice of words: "For what Pericles said to the Athenians has long been true of this commonwealth. We do not imitate, for we are a model to others." Prophetic words. For has any one man been a more perfect model to others of this day and this age than John Fitzgerald Kennedy? This truly has been the "Age of Kennedy." Even in death he is triumphant, for it is a fact that no man remains so admired anywhere in the world and no one is so consistently used as a model to emulate in the pursuit of excellence, achievement, and honor than our own President Kennedy. In his brief years of lightening this native son of this enduring commonwealth gave to us for all time a model of conduct and service that will persevere far longer than this four story building and its connected twenty-six story tower. "We must always consider," President Kennedy said, "that we shall be as a city upon a hill. The eyes of all the people are upon us." Irrefutable words. Today the eyes of all our people are upon this building, and their thoughts are on John F. Kennedy and all he will mean to us during all the days of our lives.

In the years to come, when we look upon this new federal building, we will see it as he would have seen it: one noble structure in our government center complex, a living monument to the vision of the planners to whom we owe its conception; a towering symbol of the men of government who helped to make it a reality; a selfless memorial of the spirit of our people; and a vibrant reflection of the society in which we live. On behalf of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts I wish to thank all those who contributed in any way to make this John Fitzgerald Kennedy Building a reality. We may truly say that this structure we dedicate today now is an integral part of that city upon the hill. May it ever serve our people as competently and as loyally as President John F. Kennedy. Thank you very much.

Congressman Boland. Thank you, Governor Volpe. Lawson B. Knott, Jr., is the Administrator of General Services. The General Services Administration is the housekeeping unit of this fantastic government and, also, the construction agency. He runs a very large agency which carries out many of the most difficult problems in our government. And he runs it well. Mr. Knott has long service in the federal government and was appointed Administrator early in 1965 after serving as Acting Administrator. I am calling upon Mr. Knott to speak now. At the end of his remarks, he has a presentation to make to Mayor John Collins, who will respond on behalf of the City of Boston. I am privileged to present General Services Administrator Lawson B. Knott.

Mr. Knott. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's a great privilege and pleasure for me to come to Boston today and to find myself among so many friends of the General Services Administration in Washington here. It's a rare thing that an agency such as ours in Washington has the almost daily wise counsel and advice such as we have from the distinguished members of Congress whom you have sent year after year to Washington. The federal building which we are dedicating today is many things to many people. First, it is the center of a federal service for the people of Boston and its environs, for, literally, to dedicate means to put to use. Secondly, it is an efficient place of work for twenty-six federal activities involving some four thousand men and women, your neighbors, who will be carrying out these programs day in and day out. Third, it is an integral part of Boston's new government center. And if there ever was a model for cooperation between federal, state and local governments, this is it. Fourth, it is a distinctive architectural addition to this city and, I think, will set the pattern for the things that will come hereafter.

And finally, and very importantly, by the name it bears—The John Fitzgerald Kennedy Federal Building—it will be a lasting reminder of the excellence which President Kennedy brought to government and to life itself. It seems to me appropriate that this building which will be a memorial to President Kennedy in his home city will be one filled with activity and dedicated to the public good, for those were the attributes of John F. Kennedy. Many men shared in the creation of this building—members of the Massachusetts congressional delegation, state and city officials, the architects, the contractor and his subcontractors. It was built by many hands. We of the General Services Administration are proud of the role that its dedicated men and women played in turning this project from a plan into the reality which rises behind this platform today. And I include in that General Services Administration family that great leader of the General Services back ten years ago when this building was planned, who has been introduced to you earlier, Mr. Franklin Floete, who was not only the leader of the Administration at the time this project was authorized by the Congress but was responsible for my initiation into this agency some ten years ago. As you tour this federal building following the ceremony, you will find many innovations and improvements that have been made in public buildings over the years. We find now that if we do not follow construction rapidly with design, new techniques, new materials take the place of those that were prescribed by the designing architects. So that you will find many innovations, many changes in this building. But I want to call your attention to two things in particular that you will find standard in the some three to four hundred buildings that either have been completed by the General Services Administration in the last ten years or will shortly be completed. That is, first, the Great Seal of the United States which you will find on the building at the entrance. And in the lobby of this building and each of the other buildings is what we call the "Charter of Freedom." This includes the copies of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights. They are displayed in the lobby as a reminder of the precepts which are our heritage of America, the past, our grounds for tackling with courage the problems of the current day, and our hope for the future.

Mayor Collins, if you will come forward, it will be my great honor and privilege to present to you a plastic-enclosed medallion copy of the Great Seal to which I have referred which I hope you will keep in your office, and that it may there serve to be a reminder of the significance of this great occasion.

Mayor COLLINS. Thank you very much, Mr. Knott. Mrs. Joseph Kennedy, the Senators KENNEDY, all other members of that illustrious family, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen: It's an honor, indeed, to accept this medallion on behalf of all of the people of our city and all of those who participated in making this day a reality. One might think that with his great sense of historicity, John Fitzgerald Kennedy might well have selected this precise spot, so very close to Faneuil Hall and yet so close to the vibrant city which he loved so dearly. I would like to tell you, ladies and gentlemen, that indeed he did have a voice in the selection of this precise site. Under my distinguished predecessor, Mayor Hynes, the concept of a Government center had been discussed, but its current status was to have been a building on Washington Street near the corner of Court Street. In early 1960, after I was first elected as mayor, I called upon our distinguished Speaker, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Senator KENNEDY, and Senator SALTONSTALL and Congressman O'NEILL and requested a conference with the gentleman who would have a great deal to do with the selection of the precise location, the gentleman who is with us today, Mr. Franklin Floete. We had a conference in Washington, and the unanimity of opinion of those distinguished federal leaders and every other element in our city convinced Mr. Floete that this precise spot, in which former President Kennedy had a particular voice, was the location to be selected. I know that every Bostonian—and everyone has a little of Boston in him wherever he may reside—that every Bostonian is proud of this day. We're proud that as Bostonians we've been able to make a minute contribution to keep alive the memory of this great man.

Congressman BOLAND. Thank you, Mayor Collins. It is fitting that this historic event be marked by words from a close intimate friend of our late beloved President. Many happy, carefree hours at school, college, and play, many days of hard work, many moments of advice and counsel—and all of this time and all of these experiences Congressman TORBERT MACDONALD would gladly relive again. I am privileged to present to this gathering my colleague in the Congress, close friend to the late President, Congressman TORBERT MACDONALD.

Congressman MACDONALD. Cardinal Cushing, Mrs. Rose Kennedy, distinguished other members of the Kennedy family, Speaker MCCORMACK, my colleagues from the Congress, distinguished guests here, ladies and gentlemen: It is indeed, as my good friend EDDIE BOLAND said, a distinct honor for me to come here to say just a few words to his friends here in the audience. As I'm sure is true with many of you, this occasion invokes mixed emotions in my mind and in my heart. Of course, we're all glad that the City of Boston and the Commonwealth has this wonderful edifice to carry on what was close to the President's heart—the more efficient development of good government—but also there is a tinge of sadness as well to this occasion, for in many of his friends' hearts and minds President Kennedy still lives on. It would have been much more fitting if, indeed, after President Kennedy had involved himself in the construction of this building, how glad we all would be to have him here today dedicating this building instead of some of us invoking his memory. I think one thing that hasn't been touched on that perhaps should be that I know of at least two other reasons why this location would be most pleasing to President John F. Kennedy. One, of course, is that it is not too far from 122 Bowdoin Street where he spent so many active hours in carrying on the work of government here in Boston. And the second one is—and I think many have forgotten—that many long years ago, in 1946—and I see some in the audience who worked with him at that time—he went from door to door in this area, shyly putting out his hand, saying, "Hello. My name is John F. Kennedy. I'm running for Congress." In those years that have passed since that time, there is more than word or tongue can tell. We all miss him. I'm sure we all, in our hearts, love him. I'm sure that the most important thing of the naming of this for the President is not for the people of our generation but for the generations to come who will and do, as we will and do, revere his name. Thank you very much.

Congressman BOLAND. Thank you, TORBIE. And if you will now rise, I'm going to ask a longtime personal and close friend of President Kennedy's to lead us in prayer. I'm asking Rabbi Joseph Shubow, who has led the congregation of B'nai Moshe since 1933 here in Boston, to lead us in prayer.

Rabbi SHUBOW. Our Father, who art in heaven, with hearts weighted down with the tragedy of three years ago when our unforgettable and beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, was martyrized like the immortal Abraham Lincoln about a century ago, we are now assembled to recall not only our irreparable loss and our unbearable sorrow of that day of horror, but we are especially gathered to dedicate this great government center to the immortal memory of the thirty-fifth President of the United States so that the name of John Fitzgerald Kennedy will ever live in our midst as a source of selfless public service, and as a wellspring of spiritual strength to serve God and country, our own beloved America, and all the world in a spirit of utter consecration, with exemplary courage, unimpeachable character, ever giving a full measure of devotion to the common welfare of the people and to the highest ideals of American public service.

As we have the historic privilege on this memorable occasion to dedicate this great sanctuary of governmental service to the public good and well being, may we who had the privilege and the merit to know Mr. Kennedy, to gaze upon his comely countenance which shone in the service of humanity in general and the American people in particular, and to benefit from his great courage, genuine faith, and unalloyed devotion and high sense of honor, may we thus rededicate ourselves to the ideals which he personified, to the imperishable principles which he cherished and to the divine vision which he saw from afar as the perpetual light of the Lord Creator of the universe and of the father of humanity for the benefit of all the children of mankind.

Thy ways, O Lord, are not our ways. And Thy mysteries are beyond our knowledge. As we catch a glimpse of the divine purpose and behold the ray of Thy light as it shines through even in that ineffable tragedy which will be with us for generations to come, may it be given to us to feel Thy divine presence which thus seeks to teach us the lesson that we are all children of the one true God, that we are all brothers even though we may seem to belong to different races, creeds, nations, and different colorations of the skin. Very few men in our time understood this divine truism as fully as did John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and none saw the implications of this immortal vision with greater clarity, with more genuine nobility, and with a fuller spiritual force. If the martyrdom of President Kennedy will serve as a sort of catalytic agent and thus accelerate an era of true love and friendship, genuine equality and justice, complete compassion and peace among the nations of the world and among the races and creeds that constitute our beloved America and the rest of the earth, then President Kennedy's martyrdom will not have been in vain.

If we thus are enabled to come nearer to this divine destiny of man and the proximated kingdom of heaven on earth, then as Abraham Lincoln said, in a premonition of his own martyrdom in those days: "Let the judgment of the Lord be done." And if we could but speak with our beloved John Kennedy, he would be the first to say: "Let the will of the Lord be done." For he knew, as he was supposed to have said in his great address at Dallas, quoting scripture: "Unless the Lord build the house, they who build it labor in vain."

We, therefore, pray that this great public edifice, built by the people and for the people, will become a public shrine and an American sanctuary ever reminding our illustrious lawmakers, our dedicated political leaders, our faithful public servants, and all our citizens, that politics is not only a great art and an arena for skillful administration, but that it implies always the welfare of the polis, the city-state, and the great community of all the citizens driving from our midst all selfish consideration and all petty, vain, personal ambition but rather calling upon our gifted sons and leaders and our truly dedicated public servants to look upon their government trust as a trust not only of the people but of God Himself. For it was in this spirit that our immortal, martyrized President served God and country with his last drop of precious blood. We must ever remember that any deviation from this exalted ideal that inspired President Kennedy will be a desecration of this shrine and of his good and blessed name. May the laws, ordinances, and administrative policies that will emanate from this august edifice ever be passed, proclaimed, and publicized in the image and spirit of the immortal John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and thus be a source of inspiration in the field of government throughout our blessed land and throughout the world so that we and our descendants may be enabled to build the City of God and the kingdom of heaven on earth. May this be Thy will, O Lord. Amen.

Congressman BOLAND. Thank you, Rabbi Shubow. Our next speaker closes out his elective public service this year. For forty-six years in the service of his community, his state, and his nation he has brought honor and distinction to himself and to his beloved Massachusetts. Serving with John Kennedy for eight years in the Senate, both cooperated to give unique, effective, and splendid service to their state and to their nation. I am honorded to present the senior Senator from Massachusetts, the Honorable LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Mr. BOLAND, Your Excellency, Cardinal Cushing, Rabbi Shubow, Bishop Stokes, Governor Volpe, Mrs. Kennedy and very distinguished members of the Kennedy family, Speaker MCCORMACK, Congressman O'NEILL, and my other colleagues in the United States Congress: This fine and entirely practical new federal government building in Boston is very properly named for our most distinguished Massachusetts citizen and an illustrious President of our country, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

A further reason for naming it in his honor is that it is situated in the congressional district which he ably represented before he became a member of the United States Senate. The need for a new federal building in Massachusetts became evident at least fifteen years ago. Federal agencies were scattered throughout the city, and the present building in Post Office Square was bursting its seams from the increased activities of the federal court and the Post Office Department. Consequently, Massachusetts Congressmen and Senators agreed to stimulate the federal government to build a new building. It was later demonstrated that a savings of approximately $900,000 a year would result by consolidating federal agencies in this building rather than continuing to rent space throughout Boston. Many public officials and civic groups, including the Chamber of Commerce, pleaded the need for a new government center that would provide much sought additional facilities for the city of Boston and the Commonwealth as well as for the federal government.

But where was this building to be placed? And would the three governments concerned cooperate in locating it? The question of financing the city and state buildings also created problems. Mr. Franklin Floete, whose name has been mentioned, the Administrator of GSA and a retired businessman of note from Iowa, with the cooperation and active interest of the late Senator Kennedy and myself in the Senate and Congressmen MCCORMACK and O'NEILL in the House determined that Scollay Square was the proper location provided we could make sure that the city and state would go along and not leave the federal government with a building quite far removed from the activities of the other governments.

The question of price and cost was involved. Some wanted the building to be placed in Post Office Square, and the federal government at that time considered property on Trinity Place because of easy access to public transportation and automobile travel. Finally, it was decided to settle on the Scollay Square location if and when it was clear that the state and the city would join. There were many hesitations, many difficulties with the state legislature, and the problem of necessary bond issues. Time was running out, and Administrator Floete stated that the GSA would go it alone if a decision was not made quickly. In the end, the city and the state were in a position to go ahead. They had the necessary funds in sight. Furthermore, real estate groups were stimulated to build a business block in close proximity to the government building.

During all this period, Senator John Kennedy and I worked closely together. I reported to him on my meetings with Mr. Floete and the difficulties involved. We cooperated enthusiastically. After working closely with the state, city, and federal officials to resolve the problem of which site to choose, the GSA submitted their prospectus to the US Congress in September of '59. In February of 1960, the Public Works Committees approved the building proposal, and almost three million dollars was voted to acquire the site and to start planning the building. In October of 1962, the United States Congress appropriated a little over twenty-seven million dollars to construct this building. Happily, a savings of over two-and-a-half million dollars was effected as a result of good bidding competition. So it is finally constructed at a cost of $24,588,400. Now Administrator Knott is efficiently carrying forward the work of this building, and I know he will for many years to come.

We are here with members of the Kennedy family and with state and city officials to dedicate this building in honor of one of our most distinguished citizens. Truly, this is a government center, and as government takes over more and more in our daily lives, it will assist our government officials at different levels to know each other, to understand each others problems, and, ultimately, to get action in a way that will benefit us all. This building means much to the future of Boston and of our state, so I am proud to be present at this dedication because it means the completion of a truly great enterprise in bringing the federal government closer to our state and to our city.

Congressman BOLAND. Thank you, Senator SALTONSTALL. We are delighted to have in our presence one of the most remarkable women of our time and one of the most remarkable women of this, or any other, land. No one has spent more time in the interest of human beings than has she; few have given more to mankind. We're delighted to acknowledge her presence, and I ask Mrs. Joseph P. Kennedy to stand.

From the small and neighboring state of New York, we're happy to have an enterprising, an ambitious, and a truly remarkable public servant—not a native son of New York but, proudly we say, a native son of this great state. But we're delighted to have him in the state of New York, and of course, we're proud to have him in the Senate of the United States. He makes his own way with his own ability, his own fire, his own vision! I'm proud to present to you the United States Senator from New York, ROBERT F. KENNEDY.

Senator R. F. KENNEDY. Thank you very much. EDDIE BOLAND, Cardinal Cushing, Governor Volpe, Mayor Collins, Mrs. Kennedy, distinguished members of Congress, and particularly the Speaker and my brother [laughter]: When we were sitting there and heard the hand my mother received, Teddy leaned over to me and said, "Aren't you glad you're not running against her?" [Laughter.] I'm delighted to be here; delighted to be back in Boston. I'm delighted to have an opportunity to participate in this dedication. The dedication really is more than just a building. I think of all the memorials here in the United States—and really across the world—that have been dedicated to President Kennedy in the last two-and-a-half years, I don't think that there is any one that would touch him more than this because this was his home, and you were his people. I look out at this group that are here today, and I think back of many warm moments President Kennedy had here in Boston and had in Massachusetts; listening to TORBIE MACDONALD, his old friend; seeing down there Ben Smith, the two oldest—TORBIE and Ben Smith—the two oldest friends that John Kennedy had; going back to the 1946 campaign and seeing people who were actively involved in it; seeing over there Judge Frank Morrissey—nobody was closer to John Kennedy, not only from the beginning when nobody knew where his career would lead but for a long period of time during all of his career here in Massachusetts, nobody was closer to him than Judge Frank Morrissey. [Applause.] And the others who made such a difference here in the second row—Grace Burke, who was his secretary and kept his light going here in Massachusetts, and Bob Morey, who is in the back there, who was also involved, Arthur Garrity. I think of our 1952 campaign and Pat Twohig, Polly Fitzgerald, Helen Lempart, Helen Keyes, who I don't believe is here, and many others of you who went out and rang doorbells and were actively involved and made John Kennedy what he was, made his career possible. When he was elected President of the United States, those who served with him in the White House—Dave Powers, who was such a close personal friend and was the one that made it possible for John Kennedy to smile even when the situation was difficult; Dick Donahue, Jerry Wiesner, John McNally, Pierre Salinger, and President Kennedy's old friend Kenny O'Donnell. To all those and to all they represent, and those that I have mentioned and those that I have not, and Speaker MCCORMACK who encouraged John Kennedy to run for Congress in 1946. To all of you who were so closely identified with him. This building is not, therefore, just a dedication to him; it's not just in his memory, but it's in memory of all of you. And it's in memory of all those who made such a contribution to his life. I think of what he said: "Problems in this world are made by man, and, therefore, they can be solved by man." What we have to dedicate ourselves is to turn this state, this city, this country—really mankind generally—over to the next generation, this world over to the next generation of mankind in a better way than we received it from the last. And I know that you who were his friends and all of us here and all of those in this commonwealth will dedicate ourselves to that proposition. Thank you very much.

Congressman BOLAND. Few men who have been elected to the United States Senate have entered that body bearing a heavier toll of tragedy, and few men have been more closely spotlighted and observed than the Democratic Senator from Massachusetts. Through sheer force of physical stamina, with intellectual brilliance and knowledge, by effective and magnificent articulation he has met the test, and he has met the challenge. No one has worked harder for his state and his people; no one has so sharply recognized the grave problems of our day; and no one has dared more to come to grips with them. How does he do it? Well, he's a Kennedy! Every inch of him! Senator Edward M. Kennedy!

Senator E. M. Kennedy. Thank you very much, Congressman Boland. His Excellency, Cardinal Cushing, Bishop Stokes, Rabbi Shubow, Governor Volpe, Mayor Collins, Speaker McCormack, my colleague in the Senate, Senator Saltonstall, Congressmen Macdonald and Boland, Congressman O'Neill, Congressman Bates, the members of the congressional delegation——

Senator R. F. Kennedy. You forgot me. [Laughter.]

Senator E. M. Kennedy. I did forget you. Senator Robert. Glad to have you back, Bobby. President Kennedy loved the city of Boston because it is unique, because it was his home. He loved the way it mixed the new with the old, history with progress; the way it made a place for people with every kind of background. He would appreciate the fact that here on this historic spot in view of our harbor, the Charles, and the Blue Hills, we have raised an impressive building which will be the symbol of our national government. President Kennedy's Administration was primarily concerned not with bricks and mortar but with people. And so today we are primarily concerned not so much with what we see here but what will be done here for this country, for the people of Massachusetts, and the people of New England. And President Kennedy knew that to achieve his goals for people would take the dedicated work of the members of the Civil Service, the Postal Service, and the federal establishment. He had worked with them as a congressman and as a senator and had been sympathetic to their problems, and he knew that no matter who was senator or who was president the work of this government could not really be successful without the help of the men and women of the federal service who work here because they strongly believe in their country and want to serve their fellow man. And so we carry on today with the work of government. We find this same holds true. We read about the courageous efforts of our boys in Viet Nam, but they are backed up by the work of the defense offices here in the Boston area; we read about our dramatic achievements in space, but these efforts could not succeed without the electronics research that is supervised by the federal establishment here. Our people have come to depend on Social Security, health care, and educational opportunities, and loans and grants for cities and buildings that the Government can supply. But behind these programs are the day to day work of processing applications and executing policies that go on in this building. And so it is with deep appreciation of their work, of the impetus this building will give to their effort in the future that I thank you in behalf of Mrs. Kennedy and all the members of the family. President Kennedy said: "Every man and woman who works in our national government may be able to say with pride and honor in future years, 'I served the United States government in that hour of national need.'" Let us hope that this can be the spirit of the work that will be done in this building in the years to come. Thank you.

Congressman Boland. Thank you, Senator Kennedy. When I mentioned a moment ago how he does it, let me also point to another part of the family who helps him to do it. The most gracious, and just as nice as she is nice-looking, Joan Kennedy.

Confidant of four presidents, originator of, participant in, and spokesman for most of the great social legislation enacted over the past thirty years, one who worked closely with President Kennedy, truly one of the great Americans of our time, and one of whom all of us in Massachusetts are particularly proud, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable John W. McCormack.

Speaker McCormack, Congressman Boland, Cardinal Cushing, Bishop Stokes, Rabbi Shubow, Mrs. Joseph P. Kennedy, Senator and Mrs. Edward M. Kennedy, Senator Robert Kennedy, Senator Saltonstall, my colleagues and friends in the House, Tom O'Neill, Torbert Macdonald, Bill Bates, Governor Volpe, and Mayor Collins, and ladies and gentlemen, and friends: It is with profound pleasure and gratitude that I join with you today in the dedication of the John Fitzerald Kennedy Federal Building. As we have continued to mourn the loss of our late President, at the same time you have been building, following out the words that he has left behind with us. This is what he would want you to do, this man of faith who took a lively pride in his native Massachusetts. Today this federal building is not just another structure in our fair city of Boston. But it is a beautiful memorial to the man who served his state and country so freely and so faithfully. If he were here among us today, I am certain he would summon us to further service in the cause of democracy and inspire us to higher service in the cause of freedom. John Fitzgerald Kennedy had a dream, a wonderful, magnificent dream, to bring America a little closer to the realization, the ideals set by the founding fathers of our country. His dedication to the cause of peace and the elevation of human dignity will always be remembered by this nation and by the world. He walked among the people trying to get them to do the right thing. He looked after all citizens; he looked after the freedom of men, women, and children whether they were black or white, Catholic or Protestant, Jew or Gentile, privileged or of low birth. But above all else, in everything he did John Kennedy gave proof of his supreme dedication to the cause of freedom and peace. To him these were the transcendent needs of our time at home as well as in the entire world.

Born in this city May 29, 1917, he was reared by strong and farsighted parents to be energetic, brave, industrious, knowledgeable, and wise. These were the traits which characterized every crowded hour of his full, rich, and warm personal and public life. January 9, 1961, as President-elect of the United States, he appeared before the state legislature of our commonwealth. In discussing the challenge before public officials, he summarized his own credo in these few lines as he approached the office which would lead ultimately to his death: "Of those of whom much is given, much is required. And when at some future date the high court of history sits in judgment on each one of us recalling whether in our brief span of service we fulfilled our responsibilities to the state, our success or failure in whatever office we may hold will be measured by the answer to four questions. Were we truly men of courage? Were we truly men of judgment? Were we truly men of integrity? Were we truly men of dedication?" The late President also stated in that address that courage, judgment, integrity, dedication were the qualities which, with God's help, he hoped would characterize our government's conduct in the four stormy years that lay ahead. And he humbly asked God's help in his undertaking. John F. Kennedy, my friends, brought to America a new compassion for the lot of his fellow men, a new respect for the rights of all men, and a new hope for the brotherhood and dignity of man. In President Kennedy's death we lost a friend; we lost a good man; we lost a great leader. But let us pray on this occasion that with the years we shall not lose the will which he awakened within us, the will to follow the course which he has set for us. This federal building will be a constant reminder of the fact that he told us in the cold day in January, 1961, and I quote: "Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country."

Congressman Boland. Thank you, Speaker McCormack. The dedicatory address could not have been more fittingly assigned than to the member of Congress who represents this district and who succeeded John Fitzgerald Kennedy from this district in the Congress of the United States. And with others, he has followed the progress of this building from its inception with personal interest and with great care. I've known him for thirty years, and I've shared living quarters with him in Washington over the past fourteen years. So I know him well, and I can say with certitude that I have never known a finer man, a harder worker for his district, or a more effective public servant. With pleasure I present the dedicatory speaker, Congressman Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.

Congressman O'Neill. Thank you Congressman Boland. His Eminence, Cardinal Cushing, Rabbi Shubow, Bishop Stokes, Mrs. Joseph P. Kennedy, the distinguished Senators, Senator Saltonstall, Senator Ted Kennedy, and Senator Bob Kennedy, Speaker McCormack, Governor Volpe, Mayor John Collins, my distinguished colleagues in government, and friends who have gathered here today: We have gathered here today to dedicate this building to the memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, late a President of the United States.

Throughout the country in the less than three years since his death, President Kennedy has been honored many times by the people of this nation. Schools, highways, bridges, scholarships, and hospitals bear his name as a tribute to the love and admiration people of this nation have for him. And now we, the people of the greater Boston area, add another tribute to this great man. We have many reasons for doing this. The first is a rather special one. John F. Kennedy was a leader of our nation and indeed a citizen of the world. But he was our own beloved son, born in Brookline, educated in Boston, graduate of Harvard. His roots are here. This was his home. So much that was John Kennedy was Boston and Massachusetts. It was here that he entered politics representing this area in the Congress of the United States. We, more than any other people, knew his quick smile, his ready wit. We knew his devotion to the people. He went on to represent Massachusetts in the Senate of the United States, and for eight more years he was our champion. In 1960, we went with him to the Democratic Convention, and from there on to become President of the United States.

For us he will always be more than a great President. He was a son of Boston and Massachusetts carrying on a tradition of public service great that was shown to him by his parents and his grandparents. So today in this dedication there is something very personal, very close to all of us as we remember him as one of our own. Many words have been said about the greatness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and many buildings have been dedicated. Why do we feel that we have the duty and the right to say more? Over one hundred years ago a great President dedicated a portion of a battlefield. He said: "We here rightly [sic] resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain." That is why we are here today.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was cut down in his youth, in his prime. He had just begun to find an end to the ancient injustices, to reach accord with his enemies, to envision a much better and a greater America and a much better and greater world. The enormity of this tragedy can only be measured when we look at his dreams and realize that they had only begun to be fulfilled. But there is a greater, yes, even a greater tragedy than his cold and untimely death. And that shall be if his death has served no purpose, has been of no avail; if it has no meaning in life. The dedication of this building to John F. Kennedy should be a rededication of ourselves to what he stood for and what he fought for.

In his Inaugural Address, President Kennedy said: "In your hands, my fellow citizens, more than in mine will rest the final success or failure of our course." It is up to us, the living, to continue the work which he has so nobly advanced. For President Kennedy, like President Lincoln, worked to hold our Union together. Through his program of equal rights he sought to end the injustices and the divisions within our country. He did the same for the world. The nuclear test ban which he brought about is an agent of peace. John F. Kennedy saw the sweet land of what America might become. It is now our turn to see that we do our part in bringing it to a reality. John F. Kennedy saw a vision of a peaceful and a just world, and we shall be judged by our dedication to his vision and to his work.

We must continue our work towards better education, fair housing, equal rights and protection under the law. We must not rest until there are no more people in our land who are hungry, who are jobless, who are uncared for or poorly housed. We must continue to seek an end to the arms race and fight for the self-determination of people. We must encourage higher education, space exploration, and the development of our natural resources. There is a great deal left to be done, and we should not tire or waver in our course.

President Kennedy, in January of 1961, said: "All this will not be finished in the first one hundred days, nor will it be finished in the first one thousand days, nor in the life of this Administration, nor even, perhaps, in our lifetime on this planet. But let us begin." We have begun, and now we must continue. We are continuing today by reminding ourselves of what this beloved President of ours stood for. We are doing so by dedicating a concrete object—this building to his great memory. There have been, and will be, other buildings—an arts center, a hospital, a school, a library, a stadium. And all of these are fitting, for part of the genius of John Kennedy was his variety. He was a scholar, historian, athlete, writer, statesman, and politician.

And this building, the new Federal Building, indicates another aspect of the man, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. He saw government as a means for achieving social standing. Arthur Schlesinger said this: "Statecraft was for him not an end in itself; it was a means of moving forward a spacious and splendid America." Here in this building, men and women will be implementing programs that legislators enact into law. Here much of the real work of government will go on. For John Kennedy, political position was not an end but a means for influencing the nature of government, for carrying out a political philosophy. We want this building that bears his name so that those people who work here and those people who will use this building will be reminded of that purpose. We do not give him only this marble monument, for that in itself means nothing. But with this building and these tributes today, we assure a more meaningful and more enduring monument in our hearts and in our minds to the causes for which he lived and died. As St. Paul said: "I have fought the good fight; I redeem the pledge." John Fitzgerald Kennedy fought the good fight much more than one man's share. In good conscience, can we do no less? Let us begin.

Congressman BOLAND. Thank you, Congressman O'NEILL, for a very moving and an inspiring dedicatory address. Before we ring down the curtain on this meaningful and remarkable afternoon—and we appreciate the magnificent attention of all of you who are here—I would like to invite you to go through the building after these exercises are over. At the request of Paul Lazzaro, the regional director for the General Services Administration, there will be guides in the building to take you through it. You will see a magnificent structure. May I also acknowledge on the platform the presence of the wife of Congressman O'NEILL, Mildred O'Neill. May I also acknowledge the wife of the Governor of Massachusetts, Mrs. John Volpe. And now, ladies and gentlemen, before I ask Bishop Stokes to give the benediction, I would like to read a communication from the President of the United States:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
September 8, 1966.

The dedication of the new John Fitzgerald Kennedy Federal Building is an event of significance not only for the city of Boston and the commonwealth of Massachusetts but for the entire nation. I would be pleased if you would tell the distinguished guests and the people of Massachusetts that I am with them in spirit as this new building is dedicated to the memory of President Kennedy.

It is particularly fitting that this memorial to him will provide continuing service to the people of the city and the state which he loved so well. Fruitful activity and constant concern for the well being of our citizens were characteristic of our late President. They will continue here in Boston in the building which bears his name. Almost 4,000 men and women will work in this new building carrying out the programs of the federal government for the benefit of the people of this area. They will work in a building which has been designed for efficiency as well as for architectural excellence.

The John Fitzgerald Kennedy Federal Building, moreover, is part of Boston's new government center in which the federal government is joined with the city and the state to provide a complex which has added to the beauty of the city as well as furnishing convenient and improved public services. This new structure bears the name of a great president. I know that those who work within it will assure that it will wear that name with honor and distinction in the years to come.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States.

[Applause.]

I would like to express special thanks to the two bands which have helped to make this occasion a memorable one. I ask the First Naval District Band to rise and take a bow. Are they still here? Will they please rise? [Applause.] Thank you very much. And I ask the Crusaders, the drum and bugle corps of young people, to rise and take a bow. [Applause.] And now for the closing prayer and benediction, I call upon the Episcopal Bishop of Boston, Bishop Anson Phelps Stokes, Jr., to deliver the benediction which will bring this dedication program to a close.

Bishop STOKES. May the Lord who rules in Heaven, rule in our hearts, in our homes, and in our marketplaces. Above all, may he rule our common life as to serve from this place. May this building, commemorating the one who in the highest office of our land sought to bear his responsibilities as a sacred trust, help others to find the same spirit in their tasks. So may ever increasing order, justice, and peace come to us in this country, and through us, to the people of the world. Amen.

Congressman BOLAND. Thank you, Bishop Stokes. Before we adjourn the meeting, I would like to present Mrs. Paul Lazzaro, the wife of the regional director of GSA. I'm single. I don't want to make the mistake of introducing a woman who was up here who was married. Thank you very much for coming. It was a lovely afternoon.

Booming Export Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, more than two decades ago farsighted and imaginative leaders in Mississippi initiated a series of bold new programs to improve the State's economic status by promoting industrial growth and development. The results have been phenomenal. The tangible achievements have transformed Mississippi into a State bristling with vitality where businessmen find an unusually receptive attitude from the public for progressive innovations and expansions.

The extent to which these development programs have attained results is best illustrated, perhaps, by the booming foreign export trade. As Carl McIntire, Sunday editor of the Clarion-Ledger published at Jackson, Miss., recently pointed out:

> Chickens are going to such widely separated places as Israel and Japan, tractors are heading for Germany, buses are supplied to 60 countries on every continent, chemicals are being shipped to almost every Latin American nation and around the world, including Viet Nam, India, Sweden, England, Nigeria and South Africa. And the list is just a starter. Hundreds of other items are going out almost daily to the remote spots of the globe as well as those that are nearby.

U.S. Department of Commerce statistics show the total of $260 million in exports from Mississippi during 1963—the latest year for which such figures have been compiled. At that time, Mississippi's increase in exports during the 3-year period from 1960 to 1963 was fifth of the 50 States.

Now, moves are underway to increase this tremendous sum by adding new markets and expanding the present outflow that meant Mississippi ranked 28th among all States for exports in 1963.

> Most interested persons are convinced that the real overseas market has only been scratched by Mississippi . . . a realistic goal seemingly would be to double the present outflow in only a few years—

Mr. McIntire said.

Playing a key role in opening new outlets abroad is the Mississippi Marketing Council which has inaugurated a series of foreign trade missions. A comprehensive report just released on the latest mission which carried representatives of 16 Mississippi firms to 4 Latin American countries and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico showed that sales by the group totaled $1,245,000 with estimates of a total of $4,750,000 in the next year.

Yet another progressive step was taken when the marketing council opened a new office in the still-to-be completed International Trade Mart in New Orleans, La. Early reports indicate this effort has already produced rich dividends in bringing together Mississippi producers and buyers from throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, there can be little doubt that Mississippi has an unusual opportunity for foreign export due to the several fine ports which serve the State. Among those are the State port of Gulfport the port of Pascagoula, both on the gulf coast; and the Mississippi River ports of Vicksburg, Greenville, and Natchez. These ports and others make transportation to a shipping point most favorable.

Even more important than transportation facilities and national resources are the enthusiasm and ambition of the people of an area. Contrary to the image of a backward State content with mediocrity, which is often projected by the national news media; the truth is that Mississippians are employing industry and initiative to make great strides forward. The time has come for the entire Nation to take a new look at the Mississippi of today which is fast becoming a leader among States because of its unrelenting pursuit of excellence.

Tributes to Congressmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHELF

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, it has been a real pleasure and a distinct privilege to have served with the Honorable CLARK THOMPSON many years here in the House of Representatives.

I know him as an able Congressman who has served his district in Texas in an admirable and efficient way and I know him as a fellow Member whose companionship I have enjoyed and whose friendship I shall always cherish.

CLARK THOMPSON has given unstintingly of his time, talent, and effort in patriotic service for his district, his State, and his Nation. The quality of his impressive record here in the House speaks eloquently for the caliber and the stature of this outstanding Representative who will be greatly missed by everyone who knows him.

Voting and Attendance Record of Hon. Gerald R. Ford, of Michigan, 89th Congress, 2d Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report of my voting and attendance record during the 2d session of the 89th Congress.

The record includes all rollcall votes and all quorum calls. The description of bills is for the purpose of identification only; no attempt has been made to describe the bills completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved.

The purpose of this report is to collect in one place information which is scattered through thousands of pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I want to be able to provide any interested constituent with a simple compilation of my voting and attendance record.

The report is as follows:

Voting and attendance record, 89th Cong., 2d sess., 1966

Rollcall No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1	Jan. 10	Quorum call	Present.
2	Jan. 27	Quorum call	Present.
3	Jan. 27	H. Res. 665: To authorize the expenditure of not more than $425,000 by the Committee on Un-American Activities for investigative purposes. (Passed 299 to 24.)	Yes.
4	Feb. 2	Quorum call	Present.
5	Feb. 2	Quorum call	Present.
6	Feb. 2	H. Res. 669: To adopt the resolution citing Robert M. Shelton for contempt of Congress. (Passed 344 to 26.)	Yes.
7	Feb. 2	H. Res. 700: On a motion to recommit to a select committee the contempt of Congress citation against Calvin F. Craig with instructions to examine the citation and the law relative to it and to report to the House. (Defeated 57 to 307.)	No.
8	Feb. 3	Quorum call	Present.
9	Feb. 3	H. Res. 706: To adopt the resolution to take up H.R. 30, the Inter-American Culture and Trade Center (Florida) and to agree to the Senate amendments authorizing $9,500,000 for the project. (Passed 201 to 140.)	No.
10	Feb. 7	Quorum call	Present.
11	Feb. 7	H.R. 12410 (S. 9): To suspend the rules and pass the bill providing educational benefits to veterans who entered service subsequent to Jan. 31, 1955. (Passed 381 to 0.)	Yes.
12	Feb. 8	Quorum call	Present.
13	Feb. 8	H.R. 12173 (S. 1698): To approve the bill designed to establish a procedure for the review of proposed bank mergers so as to eliminate the necessity for the dissolution of merged banks, and for other purposes. (Passed 372 to 17.)	Yes
14	Feb. 9	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
15	Feb. 9	H.R. 12563: To suspend the rules and approve the bill providing for the participation of the United States in the Asian Development Bank. (Passed 292 to 80.)	Absent.[2]
16	Feb. 9	H.R. 706: To approve the bill amending the Railway Labor Act to expedite action on disputes referred to the National Railroad Adjustment Board and to provide for judicial review. (Passed 380 to 0.)	Absent.[2]
17	Feb. 23	Quorum call	Present.
18	Feb. 23	H. Res. 736: To adopt the rule calling for consideration of the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966. (Passed 326 to 50.)	Yes.
19	Feb. 23	H.R. 12752: On motion to recommit the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966 in order to delete the provision increasing the excise tax on automobiles and telephone service to last year's levels. (Defeated 187 to 207.)	Yes.
20	Feb. 23	H.R. 12752: On final passage of the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966 with the increase in the excise taxes on automobiles and telephone service. (Passed 246 to 146.)	No.
21	Feb. 24	Quorum call	Present.
22	Feb. 24	H. Res. 742: To adopt the rule for consideration of H.R. 12169, the supplemental foreign assistance authorization bill. (Passed 359 to 11.)	Yes.
23	Feb. 24	H.R. 12169: On a motion to recommit to committee the supplementary foreign assistance authorization bill in order to earmark the amount of funds to go to each recipient country under the bill. (Defeated 169 to 213.)	Yes.
24	Feb. 24	H.R. 12169: On final passage of the $415,000,000 supplemental authorization for the economic assistance program of AID. (Passed 350 to 27.)	Yes.
25	Mar. 1	Quorum call	Present.
26	Mar. 1	H.R. 12889: To authorize appropriations for the current fiscal year of $4,800,000 000 for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, vessels, etc., for the Department of Defense. (Passed 392 to 4.)	Yes.
27	Mar. 2	Quorum call	Present.
28	Mar. 2	S. 1666: To approve the bill providing for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges. (Passed 371 to 23.)	Yes.
29	Mar. 2	Quorum call	Present.
30	Mar. 2	H.R. 9663: To authorize the expenditure of $4,600,000 to help Alaska celebrate its centennial as a part of the United States. (Passed 202 to 173.)	No.
31	Mar. 3	Quorum call	Present.
32	Mar. 3	Quorum call	Present.
33	Mar. 3	H.R. 12322: To recommit to committee the bill establishing marketing orders for cotton in order to allow each producer 1 vote in the referendum regardless of amount of cotton produced. (Defeated 185 to 191.)	Absent.[3]
34	Mar. 3	H.R. 12322: On final passage of the bill establishing a compulsory checkoff system of $1 a bale on cotton farmers to finance cotton promotion and research. (Passed 189 to 183.)	Absent.[3]
35	Mar. 15	Quorum call	Present.
36	Mar. 15	H.R. 12752: To adopt the conference report on the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966. (Passed 288 to 102.)	Yes.
37	Mar. 15	Quorum call	Present.
38	Mar. 15	H.R. 13546: To approve a $13,000,000,000 supplemental appropriation for the Department of Defense. (Passed 389 to 3.)	Yes.
39	Mar. 16	Quorum call	Present.
40	Mar. 16	H.R. 6785 (S. 1404): To adopt the bill on daylight saving time setting uniform dates for the changeover and requiring same time throughout each State. (Passed 292 to 93.)	No.

See footnotes at end of table.

Voting and attendance record, 89th Cong., 2d sess., 1966—Continued

Rollcall No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
41	Mar. 21	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
42	Mar. 21	H.R. 13448: To pass the bill designed to speed delivery of mail to servicemen overseas. (Passed 303 to 0.)	Absent.[2]
43	Mar. 22	Quorum call	Present.
44	Mar. 22	H. Res. 794: To adopt the resolution calling for consideration of S. 2394, a bill authorizing $750,000 for the construction of a home for the Vice President. (Passed 236 to 135.)	No.
45	Mar. 22	S. 2394: To approve the authorization of $750,000 for the construction of a home for the Vice President. (Passed 197 to 184.)	No.
46	Mar. 23	Quorum call	Present.
47	Mar. 29	Quorum call	Present.
48	Mar. 29	H.R. 14012: To recommit to committee the supplemental appropriation bill in order to strike out the $12,000,000 appropriation for rent subsidies. (Defeated 190 to 198.)	Yes.
49	Mar. 29	H.R. 14012: To approve the supplemental appropriation bill including funds to initiate the National Teachers Corps and rent subsidies. (Passed 269 to 122.)	No.
50	Mar. 30	S. 1404: To adopt the conference report setting date for daylight saving time and requiring such time in the State unless legislators exempt the State. (Passed 281 to 91.)	No.
51	Mar. 30	Quorum call	Present.
52	Mar. 31	Quorum call	Present.
53	Mar. 31	H. Res. 802: To adopt the rule under which to consider S. 2729, the bill amending the Small Business Act. (Passed 362 to 4.)	Yes.
54	Mar. 31	S. 2729: To adopt the bill authorizing an additional appropriation of $125,000,000 for SBA and increasing the amount of loans and commitments that may be outstanding. (Passed 362 to 4.)	Yes.
55	Apr. 4	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
56	Apr. 4	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
57	Apr. 5	Quorum call	Present.
58	Apr. 6	H.R. 14224: To extend through May 31, 1966, the initial period for enrolling under the program of supplemental medical benefits of medicare. (Passed 387 to 0.)	Yes.
59	Apr. 6	H.R. 14122: To approve the bill increasing the salaries of Federal employees by an average amount of 2.9 percent. (Passed 393 to 1.)	Yes.
60	Apr. 6	H.R. 14215: On a motion to reduce expenditures authorized the Department of Interior for 1967 by 5 percent. (Defeated 156 to 232.)	Yes.
61	Apr. 6	H.R. 14215: To approve the $1,170,000,000 1967 appropriation bill for the Department of Interior. (Passed 370 to 16.)	Yes.
62	Apr. 6	H.R. 14266: On a motion to reduce expenditures authorized the Post Office and Treasury Departments for 1967 by 5 percent. (Defeated 127 to 244.)	Yes.
63	Apr. 6	H.R. 14266: To approve the $7,000,000,000 1967 appropriation bill for the Post Office and Treasury Departments. (Passed 368 to 2.)	Yes.
64	Apr. 19	Quorum call	Present.
65	Apr. 19	H.R. 7406: To amend the bill providing for a 3d powerplant at Grand Coulee Dam in order to give recognition to basinwide accounting for the purpose of repaying obligations under the bill. (Passed 239 to 111.)	Absent.[3]
66	Apr. 19	H.R. 7406 (S. 1761): To approve the bill providing for a 3d powerplant at Grand Coulee Dam. (Passed 246 to 78.)	Absent.[2]
67	Apr. 20	Quorum call	Present.
68	Apr. 20	H. Res. 756: To disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 1 calling for the transfer of the Community Relations Service from the Department of Commerce to the Justice Department. (Defeated 163 to 220.)	Yes.
69	Apr. 26	Quorum call	Present.
70	Apr. 26	H.R. 14596: To recommit to committee the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill in order to prohibit the use of any appropriated funds for the sale of agricultural commodities to any nation which sells or furnishes to North Vietnam any equipment, materials, or commodities as long as North Vietnam is governed by the Communists. (Passed 290 to 98.)	Yes.
71	Apr. 26	H.R. 14596: To approve the $6,900,000,000 Department of Agriculture appropriation bill. (Passed 366 to 23.)	Yes.
72	Apr. 27	Quorum call	Present.
73	Apr. 27	Quorum call	Present.
74	Apr. 27	H.R. 10065: On final passage of the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1965. (Passed 299 to 94.)	Yes.
75	Apr. 28	Quorum call	Present.
76	Apr. 28	H.R. 13881: To approve the bill providing for the regulation of the sale, transportation, and purchase of dogs and cats for research purposes. (Passed 352 to 10.)	Yes.
77	May 2	Quorum call	Present.
78	May 3	Quorum call	Present.
79	May 3	Quorum call	Present.
80	May 3	H.R. 14324: To recommit to committee the NASA authorization bill in order to earmark $20,000,000 in research and development funds for research on the reduction of aircraft noise. (Defeated 90 to 271.)	Yes.
81	May 3	H.R. 14324: On final passage of the $4,900,000,000 authorization bill for NASA. (Passed 349 to 10.)	Yes.
82	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
83	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
84	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
85	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
86	May 5	H.R. 14745: To recommit to committee the appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor and HEW and related agencies in order to reduce expenditures by 5 percent. (Defeated 143 to 236.)	Yes.
87	May 5	H.R. 14745: On final passage of the $10,000,000,000 appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor, HEW, and related agencies. (Passed 354 to 27.)	No.
88	May 9	Quorum call	Present.
89	May 10	Quorum call	Present.
90	May 10	Quorum call	Present.
91	May 10	H.R. 14921: To add to the 1967 independent offices appropriation bill $20,000,000 to finance the rent subsidy program. (Passed 192 to 188.)	No.
92	May 10	H.R. 14921: To approve the 1967 independent offices appropriation bill of $14,000,000,000 including funds for the rent subsidy program. (Passed 296 to 82.)	No.
93	May 11	Quorum call	Present.
94	May 11	H.R. 14088: To pass the bill authorizing an improved health benefits program for retired members and members of the uniformed services and their dependents. (Passed 356 to 0.)	Yes.
95	May 12	Quorum call	Present.
96	May 12	Quorum call	Present.
97	May 12	S. 1098: To approve the bill authorizing the Interstate Commerce Commission to take certain actions to help alleviate the national freight car shortage. (Passed 306 to 27.)	Yes.
98	May 16	S. 693: To approve the bill designed to strengthen the provisions of the Foreign Agents Registration Act by requiring public disclosure by persons acting for a foreign principal when their activities are political in nature. (Passed 285 to 0.)	Absent.[3]
99	May 16	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
100	May 16	H. Res. 852: To adopt the rule providing for the consideration by the House of H.R. 14544, the bill relating to the sale of participations in Government agency loan pool. (Passed 184 to 120.)	Absent.[3]
101	May 16	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
102	May 17	Quorum call	Present.
103	May 17	Quorum call	Present.
104	May 17	Quorum call	Present.
105	May 18	H.R. 14215: To approve the conference report on the $1,300,000,000 1965 appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior and related agencies. (Passed 378 to 10.)	Yes.
106	May 18	H.R. 14544: To recommit to committee the Participation Sales Act of 1966 in order to limit the interest to be paid on the "participations" to 4¾ percent. (Defeated 180 to 218.)	Yes.
107	May 18	H.R. 14544: On final passage of the Participation Sales Act of 1966. (Passed 206 to 190.)	No.
108	May 24	Quorum call	Present.
109	May 24	Quorum call	Present.
110	May 25	Quorum call	Present.
111	May 26	Quorum call	Present.
112	May 26	Quorum call	Present.
113	May 26	H.R. 13712: On an amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1966 (minimum wage) to exempt certain small businesses from coverage under the law. (Defeated 195 to 200.)	
114	May 26	H.R. 13712: On an amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1966 to extend from 1968 to 1969 the effective date of the $1.60 rate for those presently covered under the law. (Passed 205 to 194.)	Yes.
115	May 26	H.R. 13712: On a motion to recommit to committee the Fair Labor Standards Act to 1966 in order to exempt farm labor from coverage under the law and to give agricultural processing plants a 20-week exemption from the overtime provisions of the law instead of 14 weeks as stated in the bill. (Defeated 168 to 231.)	Yes.
116	May 26	H.R. 13712: On final passage of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1966 (minimum wage). (Passed 303 to 93.)	Yes.
117	May 31	Quorum call	Present.
118	June 1	Quorum call	Present.
119	June 1	Quorum call	Present.
120	June 1	H.R. 9167: To recommit to committee the narcotic addict rehabilitation bill in order to make any narcotics seller, or offender, between 22 and 26 punishable under the regular criminal laws. (Passed 198 to 168.)	Yes.
121	June 1	H.R. 9167: To approve the narcotic addict rehabilitation bill as amended. (Passed 367 to 1.)	Yes.
122	June 2	Quorum call	Present.

See footnotes at end of table.

Voting and attendance record, 89th Cong., 2d sess., 1966—Continued

Rollcall No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
123	June 2	H.R. 14050: On final passage of the bill to extend and amend the Library Service and Construction Act. (Passed 336 to 2.)	Yes.
124	June 6	H.R. 14643: To suspend the rules and pass the International Education Act of 1966. (Passed 194 to 80.)	Absent.[3]
125	June 6	H.R. 10: To suspend the rules and pass the bill amending the law relative to private pension and profit-sharing plans. (Passed 291 to 0.)	Absent.[3]
126	June 7	Quorum call	Present.
127	June 7	H.R. 15456: To approve the legislative appropriation bill for 1967 in the amount of $172,000,000 (for items considered by the House). (Passed 341 to 2.)	Yes.
128	June 7	S. 1357: To approve with House amendments the Bail Reform Act of 1966. (Passed 319 to 14.)	Yes.
129	June 8	Quorum call	Present.
130	June 8	H. Res. 882: To adopt a closed rule for consideration of the bill increasing the debt limit to $330,000,000,000. (Passed 205 to 153.)	No.
131	June 8	H.R. 15202: To approve the bill increasing the temporary public debt limit from $328,000,000,000 to $330,000,000,000. (Passed 199 to 165.)	No.
132	June 9	Quorum call	Present.
133	June 9	H.R. 14929: To approve the amendment to the food for freedom bill providing for a 40-year repayment period to foreign governments for credit sales of surplus agricultural products. (Defeated 165 to 193.)	No.
134	June 9	H.R. 14929: On a motion to recommit to committee the food for freedom bill in order to prohibit long-term credit sales of surplus agricultural products to any Communist country and to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from dumping grain on the market at less than 80 percent of parity plus carrying charges. (Defeated 157 to 200.)	Yes.
135	June 9	H.R. 14929: On final passage of the food for freedom bill. (Passed 333 to 20.)	Yes.
136	June 13	Quorum call	Present.
137	June 13	H.R. 14019: To approve the bill authorizing an appropriation of $27,600,000 for acquisition and improvement of Foreign Service building overseas. (Passed 290 to 3.)	Yes.
138	June 14	Quorum call	Present.
139	June 14	Quorum call	Present.
140	June 14	Quorum call	Present.
141	June 14	S. 2950: To approve the bill authorizing appropriations of $17,800,000,000 for the procurement in 1967 of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and for research and development and other purposes within the Department of Defense. (Passed 356 to 2.)	Yes.
142	June 15	Quorum call	Present.
143	June 16	Quorum call	Present.
144	June 16	Quorum call	Present.
145	June 16	H.R. 14025: To approve an amendment to the Defense Production Act extension granting to the President standby authority to impose controls on consumer credit. (Defeated 73 to 275.)	No.
146	June 20	Quorum call	Present.
147	June 20	S. 1160: To suspend the rules and approve the freedom of information bill. (Passed 307 to 0.)	Yes.
148	June 20	H.R. 10860: To suspend the rules and approve the amendment to the Connally Hot Oil Act. (Passed 306 to 1.)	Yes.
149	June 22	Quorum call	Present.
150	June 22	H.R. 15119; To approve the Unemployment Insurance Amendments of 1966. (Passed 374 to 10.)	Yes.
151	June 23	Quorum call	Present.
152	June 23	H.R. 13196: To approve the Allied Health Professions Personal Training Act of 1966. (Passed 364 to 0.)	Yes.
153	June 27	Quorum call	Present.
154	June 27	H. Res. 875: To discharge Committee on Rules from further consideration of H.R. 14904, the bill to revise the rates and size of parcel post packages, and make it in order for the House to consider the bill. (Passed 222 to 148.)	No.
155	June 27	H.R. 5426: To recommit to committee the bill prohibiting common law marriages in the District of Columbia. (Defeated 39 to 328)	No.
156	June 28	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
157	June 29	Quorum call	Present.
158	July 12	Quorum call	Present.
159	July 12	S. 2950: To approve the conference report on the bill authorizing appropriations for the procurement of aircraft missiles, naval vessels, and for research and development. (Passed 358 to 2.)	Yes.
160	July 12	Quorum call	Present.
161	July 13	Quorum call	Present.
162	July 13	Quorum call	Present.
163	July 14	Quorum call	Present.
164	July 14	H.R. 15750: To recommit to committee the foreign aid authorization bill in order to require annual authorizations aid to reduce the total amount in the bill by $250,000,000. (Defeated 191 to 193.)	Yes.
165	July 14	H.R. 15750: On final passage of the $4,100,000,000 foreign aid authorization bill. (Passed 237 to 146.)	Yes.
166	July 18	Quorum call	Present.
167	July 19	Quorum call	Present.
168	July 19	Quorum call	Present.
169	July 19	Quorum call	Present.
170	July 20	Quorum call	Present.
171	July 20	H.R. 15941: To approve the bill appropriating $58,600,000,000 for the Department of Defense in fiscal year 1967. (Passed 392 to 1.)	Yes.
172	July 21	Quorum call	Present.
173	July 21	S. 602: To adopt the conference report on the bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956. (Defeated 136 to 204.)	Yes.
174	July 25	Quorum call	Present.
175	July 25	H. Res. 910: To adopt the resolution discharging the Committee on Rules from further consideration of H.R. 14765, the Civil Rights Act, and to provide for consideration of the bill with 10 hours of general debate. (Passed 200 to 180.)	No.
176	July 25	Quorum call	Present.
177	July 25	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
178	July 26	Quorum call	Present.
179	July 26	Quorum call	Present.
180	July 26	Quorum call	Present.
181	July 27	Quorum call	Present.
182	July 27	Quorum call	Present.
183	July 27	Quorum call	Present.
184	July 28	Quorum call	Present.
185	July 28	Quorum call	Present.
186	July 28	Quorum call	Present.
187	July 28	Quorum call	Present.
188	July 29	Quorum call	Present.
189	July 29	Quorum call	Present.
190	July 29	Quorum call	Present.
191	Aug. 1	Quorum call	Present.
192	Aug. 1	Quorum call	Present.
193	Aug. 1	Quorum call	Present.
194	Aug. 2	Quorum call	Present.
195	Aug. 2	Quorum call	Present.
196	Aug. 3	Quorum call	Present.
197	Aug. 3	Quorum call	Present.
198	Aug. 4	Quorum call	Present.
199	Aug. 4	Quorum call	Present.
200	Aug. 5	Quorum call	Present.
201	Aug. 8	Quorum call	Present.
202	Aug. 8	Quorum call	Present.
203	Aug. 8	Quorum call	Present.
204	Aug. 9	Quorum call	Present.
205	Aug. 9	Quorum call	Present.
206	Aug. 9	H.R. 14765: On the motion to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1966 in order to exempt from coverage the real estate broker or agent who has written instructions from the exempt person for whom he is acting. (Passed 237 to 176.)	No.
207	Aug. 9	H.R. 14765: On the motion to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1966 to make it illegal to use the facilities of interstate commerce to incite to riot or to commit any crime of violence or to assist or encourage other persons to do so. (Passed 389 to 25.)	Yes.
208	Aug. 9	H.R. 14765: On the motion to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1966 to require a written complaint by an individual before the Attorney General could file a school desegregation suit. (Passed 214 to 201.)	Yes.
209	Aug. 9	H.R. 14765: On a motion to recommit to committee the Civil Rights Act of 1966 in order to delete title IV relating to housing. (Defeated 190 to 220.)	Yes.
210	Aug. 9	H.R. 14765: On final passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1966. (Passed 259 to 157.)	Yes.
211	Aug. 10	Quorum call	Present.
212	Aug. 10	Quorum call	Present.
213	Aug. 10	S. 3105: To approve the military construction authorization in the amount of $1,060,000,000. (Passed 389 to 1.)	Yes.
214	Aug. 11	Quorum call	Present.
215	Aug. 11	H.R. 14359: To recommit to committee the bill authorizing appropriations for the construction of highways in order to delete the provisions relative to the $483,000,000 authorization for beautification in fiscal years 1968–69. (Defeated 173 to 175.)	Yes.

See footnotes at end of table.

Voting and attendance record, 89th Cong., 2d sess., 1966—Continued

Rollcall No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
216	Aug. 11	H.R. 14359: To approve the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1966. (Passed 341 to 1.)	Present.[4]
217	Aug. 15	Quorum call	Present.
218	Aug. 15	S. 3688: To suspend the rules and pass the bill increasing the authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association to obtain funds for use in its secondary market operation. (Passed 314 to 1.)	Yes.
219	Aug. 15	H.R. 16114: To suspend the rules and pass the bill designed to correct certain inequities in Federal employment with respect to overtime pay. Passed 313 to 0.)	Yes.
220	Aug. 15	H.R. 14604: To suspend the rules and pass the bill authorizing a study of facilities and services for visitors to the Nation's Capitol. (Defeated 209 to 108, a ⅔ majority being necessary.)	Absent.[3]
221	Aug. 15	H.R. 11555: To suspend the rules and pass the bill authorizing a border highway along the U.S. bank of the Rio Grande River in and about El Paso, Tex. (Defeated 174 to 133, a 2/3 majority being necessary.)	Absent.[3]
222	Aug. 16	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
223	Aug. 16	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
224	Aug. 16	H.R. 14810: On a motion to recommit to committee the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1966 in order to reduce the authorization from $175,000,000 for fiscal 1968 and subsequent years to $150,000,000 for 1968 only. (Passed 205 to 161.)	Yes.
225	Aug. 16	H.R. 14810: To approve the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1966 as amended to include $150,000,000 for fiscal 1968 only. (Passed 235 to 127.)	Yes.
226	Aug. 17	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
227	Aug. 17	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
228	Aug. 17	H.R. 13228: On a motion to recommit to committee the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act in order to require that members of the National Motor Vehicle Safety Advisory Council be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate instead of being selected by the Secretary of Commerce. (Defeated 168 to 205.)	Absent.[2]
229	Aug. 17	H.R. 13228: On final passage of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act. (Passed 371 to 0.)	Absent.[2]
230	Aug. 18	Quorum call	Present.
231	Aug. 18	H.R. 14921: To recommit to conference committee the independent offices appropriation bill to insist on the House's opposition to an amendment which calls for a permanent and indefinite appropriation of whatever seems to be necessary to subsidize the participation sales certificates. (Defeated 176 to 190.)	Yes.
232	Aug. 18	H.R. 13290: To approve the Highway Safety Act of 1966. (Passed 317 to 3.)	Yes.
233	Aug. 22	S. 602: To adopt the conference report on the bill to broaden the scope of the Small Reclamation Projects Act. (Passed 198 to 81.)	Absent.[2]
234	Aug. 22	H.R. 16340: To recommit to committee for the purpose of obtaining further views on the legislation to prohibit picketing within 500 feet of any church in the District of Columbia. (Defeated 55 to 237.)	Absent.[3]
235	Aug. 22	H.R. 16340: On final passage of the bill to prohibit picketing within 500 feet of any church in the District of Columbia. (Passed 249 to 44.)	Absent.[2]
236	Aug. 23	Quorum call	Present.
237	Aug. 24	Quorum call	Present.
238	Aug. 24	H.R. 14596: To adopt the conference report on the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture in the amount of $6,900,000,000. (Passed 325 to 28.)	No.
239	Aug. 24	Quorum call	Present.
240	Aug. 25	Quorum call	Present.
241	Aug. 25	H.R. 15941: To approve the conference report on the $58,000,000,000 Department of Defense appropriations bill except those amendments in disagreement. (Passed 383 to 1.)	Yes.
242	Aug. 25	H.R. 15941: On a motion that the House insist on its disagreement with the Senate amendment authorizing the President to call up individual members of the Ready Reserve. (Passed 378 to 3.)	Yes.
243	Aug. 26	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
244	Aug. 26	S. 3688: To adopt the conference report on the bill to extend the purchasing authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association. (Passed 234 to 1.)	Absent.[2]
245	Aug. 26	S. 3700: To adopt the conference report on the bill amending the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964. (Passed 156 to 86.)	Absent.[3]
246	Aug. 29	H.J. Res. 1284: To extend the "continuing resolution" relative to appropriations from Aug. 31 to Sept. 30. (Passed 323 to 6.)	Yes.
247	Aug. 29	Quorum call	Present.
248	Aug. 29	Quorum call	Present.
249	Aug. 29	Quorum call	Present.
250	Aug. 30	Quorum call	Present.
251	Aug. 30	H.R. 15963: On a motion to exclude jurisdiction of maritime activities from the Secretary of Transportation; to eliminate the Maritime Administration from the new Department. (Passed 261 to 117.)	Yes.
252	Aug. 30	H.R. 15963: On a motion to recommit to committee the bill establishing a new Department of Transportation in order to remove the responsibility for investigating air accidents from the new Department. (Defeated 143 to 238.)	Yes.
253	Aug. 30	H.R. 15963: On final passage of the bill to establish a Department of Transportation in the President's Cabinet. (Passed 336 to 42.)	Yes.
254	Aug. 31	Quorum call	Present.
255	Aug. 31	S. 3155: To adopt the conference report on the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1966. (Passed 359 to 1.)	Yes.
256	Aug. 31	Quorum call	Present.
257	Aug. 31	S. 3005: To adopt the conference report on the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966. (Passed 365 to 0.)	Yes.
258	Aug. 31	S. 3052: To adopt the conference report on the Highway Safety Act of 1966. (Passed 363 to 3.)	Yes.
259	Aug. 31	H.R. 16574: To amend the Peace Corps Act including authorization of $110,000,000 to finance the Corps in fiscal year 1967. (Passed 322 to 15.)	Yes.
260	Sept. 1	Quorum call	Present.
261	Sept. 1	H.R. 1575: To adopt the conference report on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966 in the amount of $3,500,000,000. (Passed 217 to 127.)	Yes.
262	Sept. 1	H.R. 15098: To recommit to the committee the bill relative to U.S. participation in the HemisFair 1968 Exposition in San Antonio and to authorize $10,000,000 for that purpose. (Defeated 147 to 184.)	Yes.
263	Sept. 1	Quorum call	Present
264	Sept. 6	Quorum call	Absent.
265	Sept. 6	H.R. 15766: To suspend the rules and pass the bill to establish a National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws. (Passed 259 to 0.)	Absent.[2]
266	Sept. 7	Quorum call	Present.
267	Sept. 7	H.R. 13712: On a motion to recommit to conference the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1966 (minimum wage) with instructions to insist on House provision that the effective date of the $1.60 minimum be Feb. 1, 1969, rather than Feb. 1, 1968. (Defeated 163 to 183.)	Yes.
268	Sept. 7	H.R. 13712: To adopt the conference report on the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1966. (Passed 259 to 89.)	Yes.
269	Sept. 7	Quorum call	Present.
270	Sept. 8	Quorum call	Present.
271	Sept. 8	H.R. 14026: To recommit to committee for further consideration the temporary interest rate control measure. (Defeated 130 to 214.)	Yes.
272	Sept. 8	H.R. 14026: To approve the temporary interest rate control bill as amended by the substitution of the Stephens' amendment for the proposal submitted by the committee. (Passed 271 to 68.)	Yes.
273	Sept. 12	Quorum call	Present.
274	Sept. 12	H. Res. 1002: To adopt the rule calling for consideration of H.J. Res. 638, to give effect to the Agreement for Facilitating the International Circulation of Visual and Auditory Materials of an Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Character. (Passed 242 to 2.)	Yes.
275	Sept. 12	H. Res. 1005: To adopt the rule calling for consideration of H.R. 11256, Federal Tax Lien Act of 1966. (Passed 243 to 9.)	Yes.
276	Sept. 12	H. Res. 1004: To adopt the rule calling for consideration of H.R. 8864, to implement the Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials. (Passed 241 to 7.)	Yes.
277	Sept. 12	H. Res. 976: To adopt the rule calling for consideration of H.R. 11555, providing for the Chamizal Memorial Highway in El Paso. (Passed 202 to 48.)	No.
278	Sept. 13	Quorum call	Absent.
279	Sept. 13	H.R. 17636: To recommit to committee the District of Columbia appropriation bill in order to make a 5-percent across-the-board reduction. (Defeated 103 to 217.)	Absent.[3]
280	Sept. 13	H.R. 17636: To approve the District of Columbia appropriation bill. (Passed 320 to 3.)	Absent.[2]
281	Sept. 14	Quorum call	Present.
282	Sept. 14	Quorum call	Present.
283	Sept. 14	Quorum call	Present.
284	Sept. 14	H.R. 17637: To approve the $1,000,000,000 military construction appropriation bill. (Passed 346 to 3.)	Yes.
285	Sept. 19	Quorum call	Present.
286	Sept. 19	H.R. 8678: To suspend the rules and pass the bill to establish in the State of Michigan the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore. (Passed 247 to 70.)	Yes.
287	Sept. 19	H.R. 17488: To suspend the rules and pass the bill to increase the rates of pensions payable to certain veterans, their widows, and other dependents. (Passed 315 to 2.)	Yes.
288	Sept. 19	H.R. 15183: To suspend the rules and pass the bill adjusting the status of certain Cuban refugees. (Passed 300 to 25.)	Yes.
289	Sept. 19	S.J. Res. 167: To suspend the rules and pass the resolution authorizing the United States to organize and hold an International Conference on Water for Peace in the United States in 1967 and authorizing $1,200,000 for the project. (Defeated 161 to 154, a ⅔ vote being necessary for passage.)	Absent.[3]
290	Sept. 19	S. 3423: To suspend the rules and pass the bill providing for the establishment of the Wolf Trap Farm Park in Fairfax County, Va. (Defeated 195 to 105, a ⅔ vote being necessary for passage.)	Absent.[3]
291	Sept. 20	Quorum call	Present.
292	Sept. 20	Quorum call	Present.

See footnotes at end of table.

***Voting and attendance record, 89th Cong., 2d sess., 1966*—Continued**

Rollcall No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
293	Sept. 20	**H.R. 17788: On a motion to recommit to committee the foreign aid appropriation bill in order to cut the economic assistance appropriation by $45,000,000 for a total of $212,000,000,000. (Passed 187 to 182.).**	Yes.
294	Sept. 20	H.R. 17788: On final passage of the $316,000,000,000 foreign assistance appropriation bill. (Passed 234 to 141.)	Yes.
295	Sept. 21	Quorum call	Present.
296	Sept. 21	H.R. 17787: On final passage of the $4,100,000,000 public works appropriation bill. (Passed 354 to 25.)	No.
297	Sept. 21	Quorum call	Present.
298	Sept. 21	H.R. 17195: To approve the Reserve Forces Bill of Rights and Vitalization Act. (Passed 332 to 6.)	Yes.
299	Sept. 22	Quorum call	Present.
300	Sept. 22	H.R. 1155: To recommit to committee the bill authorizing the construction of the Chamizal Memorial Highway in El Paso in order to require the city to pay 50 percent of the cost and to reduce the U.S. share from $12,000,000 to $8,000,000. (Defeated 149 to 199.)	Yes.
301	Sept. 22	H.R. 13825: To approve the bill authorizing the conclusion of an agreement for the joint construction by the United States and Mexico of a flood control project for the Tijuana River. (Passed 293 to 42.)	Yes.
302	Sept. 26	Quorum call	Present.
303	Sept. 26	Quorum call	Present.
304	Sept. 26	Quorum call	Present.
305	Sept. 26	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
306	Sept. 26	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
307	Sept. 27	Quorum call	Present.
308	Sept. 27	Quorum call	Present.
309	Sept. 27	Quorum call	Present.
310	Sept. 27	Quorum call	Present.
311	Sept. 27	Quorum call	Present.
312	Sept. 28	Quorum call	Present.
313	Sept. 28	Quorum call	Present.
314	Sept. 29	Quorum call	Present.
315	Sept. 29	Quorum call	Present
316	Sept. 29	Quorum call	Present
317	Sept. 29	H.R. 15111: On a motion to strike out the enacting clause of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966. (Defeated 156 to 208.)	Yes.
318	Sept. 29	H.R. 15111: On an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966 to limit the number of supergrade positions in the Office of Economic Opportunity. (Passed 257 to 108.)	Yes.
319	Sept. 29	H.R. 15111: On the motion to recommit to committee the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966 in order to substitute the Opportunity Crusade Act of 1966. (Defeated 162 to 203.)	Yes.
320	Sept. 29	**H.R. 15111: On final passage of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966. (Passed 210 to 156.)**	No.
321	Sept. 30	Quorum call	Present.
322	Sept. 30	Quorum call	Present.
323	Sept. 30	H.R. 17607: To amend the bill on the suspension of the 7-percent investment credit in order to continue the credit and current depreciation rules on facilities to further water and air pollution abatement. (Passed 330 to 2.)	Yes.
324	Sept. 30	H.R. 17607: On final passage of the bill to suspend the 7-percent investment credit provision of the Reserve Act of 1962. (Passed 221 to 118)	Yes.
325	Sept. 30	H.R. 16076: On final passage of the bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. (Passed 312 to 0)	Yes.
326	Oct. 3	S. 985 (H.R. 15440): To suspend the rules and pass the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act as amended by the House. (Passed 300 to 8)	Yes.
327	Oct. 3	S. 3807 (H.R. 17558): To suspend the rules and pass the bill authorizing the Atomic Energy Commission to enter into a cooperative arrangement for a large-scale nuclear-power desalting project. (Passed 316 to 1.)	Yes.
328	Oct. 3	H.R. 13447: To suspend the rules and pass the bill authorizing the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States in developing accessible estuarine areas valuable for fishing, wildlife, conservation, etc., at a cost of $15,000,000. (Defeated 208 to 108, a ⅔ vote being necessary.)	No.
329	Oct. 4	Quorum call	Present
330	Oct. 4	H.R. 18119: On a motion to recommit to committee the appropriations bill for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce in order to effect an overall reduction of 5 percent. (Defeated 152 to 201.)	Yes.
331	Oct. 4	H.R. 18119: To approve the $2,300,000,000 appropriations bill for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce. (Passed 319 to 38.)	Yes.
332	Oct. 4	Quorum call	Present.
333	Oct. 5	Quorum call	Present.
334	Oct. 5	Quorum call	Present.
335	Oct. 5	H.R. 14929: To recommit to conference the "Food for peace" in order to insist on the House opposition that no concessional sales of U.S. farm commodities be made to any nation which trades with Cuba or North Vietnam. (Fassed 306 to 61.)	Yes.
336	Oct. 5	Quorum call	Present.
337	Oct. 5	Quorum call	Present.
338	Oct. 5	Quorum call	Present.
339	Oct. 5	Quorum call	Present.
340	Oct. 6	Quorum call	Present.
341	Oct. 6	Quorum call	Present.
342	Oct. 6	Quorum call	Present.
343	Oct. 6	H.R. 13161: To amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to emphasize that there is nothing in the act requiring assignment or transportation of students to eliminate racial imbalance in order to qualify for benefits under the act. (Passed 221 to 116.)	Yes.
344	Oct. 6	H.R. 13161: To recommit to committee the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in order to limit the authorization for 1967 to $1,070,000,000 (the amount requested by the President) and to cut the amount for 1968 by about $1,000,000,000. (Defeated 150 to 185.)	Yes.
345	Oct. 6	H.R. 13161: On final passage of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1966. (Passed 237 to 97.)	No.
346	Oct. 7	H.R. 17788: To adopt the $2,900,000,000 conference report on the foreign aid appropriation. (Passed 189 to 8.)	Yes.
347	Oct. 10	Quorum call	Absent.
348	Oct. 11	Quorum call	Present.
349	Oct. 11	H.R 15941: To approve an amendment to the defense appropriation bill which would give the President the authority to call to active duty certain reservists under certain circumstances. (Passed 305 to 42.)	Yes
350	Oct. 11	H.R. 17787: On a motion to recommit to conference the public works appropriations bill in order to cut back total funds appropriated back to the amount originally approved by the House or a reduction of about $23,000,000. (Defeated 91 to 255.)	Yes.
351	Oct. 11	Quorum call	Present.
352	Oct. 12	Quorum call	Present.
353	Oct. 12	Quorum call	Present.
354	Oct. 12	Quorum call	Present.
355	Oct. 12	Quorum call	Present.
356	Oct. 12	Quorum call	Present.
357	Oct. 12	Quorum call	Absent.
358	Oct. 12	Quorum call	Present.
359	Oct. 13	Quorum call	Present.
360	Oct. 13	H.R. 12047: On the motion to approve the bill making it a Federal crime to aid a country with which we are in armed conflict or to obstruct the movement of personnel or supplies of the Armed Forces. (Approved 275 to 64.)	Yes.
361	Oct. 13	Quorum call	Present.
362	Oct. 14	H.R. 51: On an amendment to the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore bill to add 478 acres to the proposed park. (Passed 182 to 147.)	No.
363	Oct. 14	H.R. 51: On final passage of the bill to establish the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore. (Passed 204 to 141.)	No.
364	Oct. 14	Quorum call	Present.
365	Oct. 14	S. 3708: To recommit to committee the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act in order to strike $0,000,000 and title II (planned metropolitan development) from the bill. (Defeated 149 to 175.)	Yes.
366	Oct. 14	S. 3708: On final passage of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act. (Passed 178 to 141.)	No.
367	Oct. 17	Quorum call	Present.
368	Oct. 17	S. 3675: To suspend the rules and pass the bill to permit the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to handle claims of U.S. citizens against the Chinese Communist regime. (Passed 249 to 3.)	Yes.
369	Oct. 17	S. 985: To adopt the conference report on the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act. (Passed 242 to 6.)	Yes.
370	Oct. 17	S. 2947: To adopt the conference report on the bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. (Passed 247 to 0.)	Yes.
371	Oct. 18	Quorum call	Present.
372	Oct. 18	Quorum call	Present.
373	Oct. 18	H.R. 18381: To recommit to committee the supplemental appropriation bill in order to provide that no funds for the Export-Import Bank will be used to extend credit to Communist countries. (Passed 167 to 121.)	Absent.[3]
374	Oct. 18	H. Res. 1060: To recommit the resolution citing Milton M. Cohen for contempt of Congress to a select committee for further consideration of the matter. (Defeated 90 to 81.)	Absent.[3]
375	Oct. 18	H. Res. 1062: To recommit the resolution citing Jeremiah Stamler for contempt of Congress to a select committee for further consideration of the matter. (Defeated 54 to 181.)	Absent.[3]
376	Oct. 18	H. Res. 1062: On final passage of resolution citing Jeremiah Stamler for contempt of Congress. (No quorum.)	Absent.[3]
377	Oct. 19	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
378	Oct. 19	H. Res. 1062: To approve the resolution citing Jeremiah Stamler for contempt of Congress. (Passed 219 to 69.)	Absent.[3]
379	Oct. 19	H.R. 5688: To adopt the conference report on the bill relating to crime and criminal procedure in the District of Columbia. (Passed 208 to 79.)	Absent.[3]

See footnotes at end of table.

Voting and attendance record, 89th Cong., 2d sess., 1966—Continued

Rollcall No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
380	Oct. 19	H.R. 18233: On a motion to recommit to committee the rivers and harbors authorization bill in order to limit the use of tolls revenue from 2 bridges across the Mississippi in Missouri and Illinois for public purposes other than the operation and maintenance of the bridge to the period ending Jan. 1, 1968. (Defeated 89 to 196.)	Absent.[3]
381	Oct. 19	S. J. Res. 167: On adoption of the resolution to enable the United States to organize and hold an International Conference on Water for Peace in the United States in 1967. (Passed 196 to 79.)	Absent.[3]
382	Oct. 19	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
383	Oct. 19	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
384	Oct. 19	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
385	Oct. 19	H. Res. 1013: On a motion to lay on the table the resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct. (Defeated 24 to 238.)	Absent.[3]
386	Oct. 19	H. Res. 1013: On a motion to adopt the resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct as amended. (Passed 265 to 0.)	Absent.[2]
387	Oct. 20	Quorum call	Present.
388	Oct. 20	Quorum call	Present.
389	Oct. 20	S. 3708: To approve the conference report on the Demonstration Development Act. (Passed 142 to 126.)	No.
390	Oct. 20	H.R. 15111: To approve the conference report on the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966. (Passed 170 to 109.)	No.
391	Oct. 20	H.R. 18233: To agree to the Senate amendment to the rivers and harbors bill. (Passed 261 to 0.)	Yes.
392	Oct. 20	H.R. 13161: To agree to the conference report on the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1966. (Passed 185 to 76.)	No.
393	Oct. 20	H.R. 17607: To recommit to conference the bill on the suspensions of investment credit and accelerated depreciation. (Defeated 57 to 184.)	No.
394	Oct. 20	H.R. 1760: To approve the conference report on the suspensions of investment credit and accelerated depreciation. (Passed 161 to 76.)	Yes.
395	Oct. 20	H.R. 13103: To recommit to conference the Foreign Investors Tax Act of 1966. (Defeated 95 to 127.)	Yes.
396	Oct. 20	H.R. 13103: To approve the conference report on the Foreign Investors Tax Act of 1966. (Passed 171 to 46.)	Yes.
397	Oct. 21	Quorum call	Present.
398	Oct. 21	H.R. 14644: To approve the conference report on the Higher Education Amendments of 1966. (Passed 222 to 13.)	Yes.
399	Oct. 21	H.R. 18381: To accept the Senate amendment to the supplemental appropriation bill which gave the President authority to permit Export-Import Bank loans to Communist nations. (Passed 129 to 102.)	No.

[1] Speaking engagement.

[2] If present, would have voted "yes."

[3] If present, would have voted "no."

[4] Paired; would have voted "no."

Film America Foundation, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to inform my colleagues of a new foundation which I personally believe will sell to other peoples of the world—this is the Film America Foundation, Inc., which is an educational program to film and distribute to all Americans, and to peoples of all nations, a 47-film, classic series, color-sound, motion picture encyclopedic library, of the "American National Scenic and Seashore Park System."

Every civilized nation has made outstanding cultural and esthetic contributions which ultimately received worldwide recognition and acclaim.

A nation's good and ever-enduring works not only become points of pride for those in the countries which possess them, but, in a larger sense, they become the possessions of all of the peoples of the world who appreciate and cherish them, and make long journeys to view them.

On balance, and as time passes and as historical judgments are made of American accomplishments, our national parks, and our efforts to conserve and preserve our natural wonders for posterity, must rank foremost in a long list of achievements.

American land conservation progressed under successive, far-seeing Presidential leaders, with the approval of the majority of the American public. Nevertheless, the full import of our conservation efforts generally is not recognized even to this day. In short, all of us are aware of our bountiful heritage of vast areas of natural beauty to a degree, but few, either in our country or overseas, realize what our heritage adds up to in total.

Here are some benchmarks against which to measure the magnitude of this accomplishment.

The land areas preserved for American national parks, parkways, historic sites, and memorials, are equal to—

One-third the land area of Yugoslavia;

Three-fifths the land area of Greece;

Three-fourths the land area of Bulgaria;

As large as Scotland; larger than the Republic of Panama;

About the same as Portugal; equal to the land area of Austria;

Four times the size of the State of Israel;

Three times the extent of Belgium; they occupy more land than three Netherlands;

Twice as big as all of Switzerland; two times the size of Denmark.

The Film America Foundation, Inc., will produce 38 color-sound motion picture films, covering each of America's 32 national scenic parks, and the six national seashore parks. Top commentators will narrate the voice portions. Each film will run for one-half hour.

In addition to the individual park productions, there will be composite films of the parks covering the following:

"Green Sanctuaries"—the great forest parks;

"Fires Beneath the Earth"—park volcanic wonders;

"The Neverlasting Hills"—the mountainous parks;

"The Underground World"—the caves of the parks;

"Discipline of the Desert"—deserts of the parks;

"The Ice Moves Down"—the glacier parks;

"Savor of the Tropics"—Everglades National Park; and

"Freedom's Shores"—the seashore parks.

Titles for the above composite films, except "Freedom's Shores," are from the book, "The National Parks: What They Mean to You and Me," by Freeman Tilden, a renowned author on the parks.

Finally, a 47th film, an atlas composite of the park system in general, featuring the most inspiring grandeur and the most magnificent scenes of the outstanding parks, will be produced.

Film America Foundation, Inc., will produce the first complete educational color-sound film library of the natural beauty and wonders of all of America's national scenic and seashore parks.

The films will be presented to the U.S. Department of the Interior as an outright gift to the American people. A two-pronged program assures widespread distribution.

With an initial potential audience, at home and abroad, in excess of 200 million, the cost per viewer, of all 47 foundation films, will be a fraction of a cent.

Finally, in addition to reawakening pride in country at home, and demonstrating to Americans why we are what we are, the impressive impact of the films on audiences, at home and abroad, will stimulate travel within the United States, and will prompt more visits from those overseas.

Refutation of Certain Arguments Posed by the Republicans Against the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, during debate on the conference report on the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, there were basically three arguments posed by the minority against the bill which I feel called upon to answer:

First, is was asserted by the Republicans that the House conferees accepted Senate provisions which changed the concept of the demonstration cities program as passed by the House.

This charge is at complete variance with the facts. The demonstration cities provisions agreed to by the conferees are virtually identical to the provisions as passed by the House. There were four differences between the demonstration cities program authorized by the Senate bill and the legislation as approved by the House. These four differences are as follows:

The House bill contained a provision, not in the Senate bill, requiring, to the maximum extent feasible, the application of systems analysis techniques to the preparation of demonstration city programs.

The House provision was adopted by the conferees.

The House bill contained a provision, not in the Senate bill, prohibiting the Secretary from requiring the busing of schoolchildren into and out of demonstration areas.

The House provision was adopted by the conferees.

The House bill contained a provision, not in the Senate bill, limiting the authority of the Secretary to impose, in connection with city demonstration programs, requirements not related to the statutory criteria in the legislation.

The House provision was adopted by the conferees.

The Senate and House bills differed in that the Senate version required that the special grants authorized by the demonstration cities program would be used first to provide funds to carry out new and additional projects or activities that are part of the demonstration program and for which no assistance is presently available under Federal grant-in-aid programs, and only to the extent not needed to support such new and additional projects and activities could they be used to assist cities to provide their required share of the cost of projects or activities that are part of the demonstration program and are funded under existing grant-in-aid programs.

The House provision permitted the city to use the special grants authorized by the demonstration cities program either for federally assisted projects or for other projects undertaken as part of the demonstration program—without restriction as to the type of project for which the money had first to be used.

The Senate provision was adopted by the conferees.

This in no way changed the concept of the demonstration cities program. The original Senate and House bills contained identical provisions as to the formula for computing the amount of the grant, the content of the demonstration program, and the total uses of the grant funds authorized.

Having yielded on the three other principal differences between the Senate and House versions of the demonstration cities program, the Senate conferees were adamant on retaining the Senate version of the provision.

The Senate conferees stressed that the greatest benefits of this program would come from the experience of many cities with new projects and activities included within comprehensive city demonstration programs. The conferees pointed out that the best way to induce cities to experiment with new types of activities to remove slums and help people who live in those slums was to require a priority in the use of demonstration cities funds for projects not now assisted under an existing grant-in-aid program.

The conference committee adopted the Senate version because it wanted to achieve, in demonstration programs, a desirable balance between new types of activities, which are not now assisted under existing grant-in-aid programs, and the type of activities with which the Congress and the communities have had considerable experience.

The grant formula in the bill assures that communities which participate in the demonstration program will make use of existing Federal grant-in-aid programs. It does this by tying the amount of the supplemental grant available under the demonstration cities legislation to the aggregate amount of non-Federal contributions required to be made to those projects or activities carried out in connection with the demonstration program which are assisted under existing Federal grant-in-aid programs.

The grant formula in the bill and the priority provision for new projects which were adopted by the conferees combine to give Congress assurance that there will be a desirable balance in each city demonstration program between the benefits of innovation which can be gained from new programs and the lessons of experience already gained from the operation of existing Federal grant-in-aid programs.

Second, the Republicans argued that under the Demonstration Cities Act it would be mandatory for participants to have "metro government" for all standard metropolitan statistical areas in order to continue to obtain Federal grants under any of the programs listed in section 204 of the bill. Section 204 would require that, within metropolitan areas, an areawide planning body make recommendations regarding the consistency of proposed federally assisted projects with areawide local planning. These recommendations are to be taken into consideration by the Federal agency administering the Federal aid program involved, but there would be no requirement that the local planning have any particular degree of comprehensiveness or completeness. There is absolutely no requirement that the areawide planning body itself plan the project.

Certainly, there will be no need for any area to set up a "metro government." The areawide body will not, so far as Federal requirements are concerned, have any operational responsibilities at all.

It is anticipated that few, if any, metropolitan areas will need to take any special measures to meet this requirement. Primarily, its effect will be to assure better use of existing planning bodies and programs.

Third, it was argued that the Department of Housing and Urban Development permits high-income families to live in FHA (d)(3) below market housing and there should be a $10,000 ceiling on the incomes of families occupying the housing.

The $10,000 limit is entirely unnecessary and inappropriate. Under a few unusual circumstances, it would be harmful. The $10,000 limit is not needed to confine below-market housing to low- or moderate-income families. In some—a very few—high-cost areas, it would deprive large families from occupying the housing.

There is no city in the continental United States where the income limit has been set above $10,000 except where the family consists of seven persons or more. These are only in high-cost areas.

Out of 343 cities which have (d)(3) housing, only 25 cities have income limits above $10,000, and these are for families of seven or more. Nine of these are in California. California is unquestionably an area of high construction costs and high living costs. There is also a great influx daily of families putting high pressures on the amount of available housing.

It should also be pointed out that the law does not confine the (d)(3) program to low-income families, but states that it is to help in the provision of housing for low- and moderate-income families by private enterprise. Certainly, today a family composed of seven persons with an income of $10,000 is a moderate-income family.

Imposition of the $10,000 ceiling would deprive these families of the housing they desperately need.

Mr. Speaker, I believe these charges have been fully answered and it was felt that in order to set the record straight, this statement be made at this time.

Tribute to Congressmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as my congressional service draws to a close, I must give myself the pleasure of paying tribute to the hundreds of colleagues with whom I have been associated—some of them long ago in the 73d Congress, and the rest between my election in 1947 and the present.

First, let me express my very deep appreciation for the kind and generous sentiments uttered concerning me in the Congress. I cannot feel that I deserve all of the praise which has been given to me, but I truly appreciate it.

I keep recalling with growing appreciation the words of the immortal Speaker Sam Rayburn who said that the House of Representatives is the greatest deliberative body ever devised by man. He would generally go on to say that we were not perfect but that at least we strove for perfection and when we made mistakes we had the means of correcting them later.

Certainly, through the history of the country we have brought forth legislation which has contributed to making ours the greatest Nation in the history of the world.

I would also echo what Mr. Sam told us frequently and with the deepest of affection: "I love this House, and I love its Members."

And, now, my thanks to each one of you for your innumerable acts of friendship through the years, for your help whenever I have asked you for it, and for your sympathetic and friendly counsel in all of my problems. Association with you is the best memory I have.

Report of the House Majority Leader on the Accomplishments of the 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has termed the 89th Congress "fabulous." I am proud to have the opportunity to report on the legislative accomplishments of the past 2 years which have inspired the President's praise. In reviewing the record I think we may conclude that the President has measured this Congress and found that it has worked hard, has exercised unusual creativity, responsiveness, foresight, and responsibility. I believe that the people, too, will consider that we have measured up to the tasks of our day and given forethought to future generations.

In 1816 Thomas Jefferson wrote that "laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind." That admonition is one to which Congress has always been responsive and none more so than the 89th Congress. Technical analyses of national problems are meaningless unless synchronized with the ground swell of public need and demand. The 89th Congress has responded to the public pulse as no other in history; I think that time will prove it has made a sound diagnosis of human needs from the bottom to the top of American life.

Our people feel an intense desire for improvement and progress in many areas of their lives. The Great Society is a personal as well as a national concept. It expresses the hopes and dreams shared among all men—for all desire, dignity, recognition, and opportunity. All men wish to be a part of the life of their community, their society, their world. They hope to have the means to maintain their health, become educated and to educate their children, to work and progress in their jobs, to cast their ballots, to enjoy financial independence and some leisure in the later years of their lives.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The 89th Congress has designed legislation which we hope will blueprint a better, brighter future for our people. The momentum of the first session during which we enacted legislation to improve the quality of education, to expand suffrage, to cope with decaying cities, polluted air and water, was not lost in the second session. We continued our assault upon many entrenched human problems. We redoubled our efforts and doubled our achievements by attacking the problems of the poor in both our cities and rural areas, by improving the lot of the farmer and the farm laborer, by helping our people in factories and industries, our businessmen, our children, and our senior citizens.

Most importantly of all, and with recognition of the fact of dissent on technical points, we demonstrated that Congress backed our men in Vietnam by backing our President. Our unity in this instance symbolizes the deep unity which resides in our country, which is truly committed to creating great human beings in a great environment. The Congress stands foursquare behind the brave men on whom the world depends at this stage in its history to hold high the banners of freedom. We have backed the President and in so doing we have backed those whose dedication to our country and to liberty far outshines anything we can contribute to the perpetuation of man's right to choose the circumstances of his life, to live in peace and to die in freedom.

In that spirit we have during this session enacted much creative and positive as well as remedial legislation. We have expanded the war on poverty; we have extended and continued elementary and secondary education programs and higher education programs; we have turned our attention toward citizen care by enacting auto and highway safety legislation; we have authorized funds to conduct further water research programs to assure the existence of this vital resource for future generations; we have supplied library construction authorization to help provide the 40 million square feet of library space we desperately need for educational purposes; we have provided funds to maintain our national security and support our commitments abroad; we have aided our less blessed sister nations in terms of food, technical training, and moral support; we have asked our scientists to continue their efforts to know the seas as well as the skies.

These major legislative enactments have been accomplished during the 10 months of 1966. They required of us our utmost in consideration and deliberation. The Democratic leadership has not been intimidated by the problems of our time. I am especially proud that our majority party, true to its heritage, has designed new legislative formulas for "old" ideas, and has constructed suitable foundations for new ideas.

Accomplishment is impossible without the dedication and devotion of sincere and hard-working leaders. The gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives, enjoys the respect, admiration, and affection of all Members. He deserves also their thanks. His wisdom, kindly consideration, and guidance have benefited us all and have contributed immeasurably to the success of the 89th Congress. History will record JOHN MCCORMACK as one of the great legislative leaders of all time.

Members of the Democratic majority also hold our distinguished colleague from Louisiana, HALE BOGGS, in the very highest regard. His untiring efforts as majority whip have been of inestimable benefit to the leadership and to the House. His colleagues admire his great skills and appreciate his dedication and hard work.

To each Member of this House, regardless of political party and regardless of differing opinion, I would like to extend my deepest appreciation. The responsibilities with which we have been charged by the American people are not carried lightly. Our burdens have become increasingly weighty and our challenges vital. Every Member can be proud of the record of this House and of the part he played in the 89th Congress. As I have said before, the accomplishments of the 89th Congress stand as a monument to every person who has had the privilege of serving in it.

DEFENSE ACTIVITIES AND VETERANS

The 89th Congress has concentrated much effort in its examination of our commitments to the people of southeast Asia and South Vietnam and, indeed, to all the people of the free world. Our self-respect and security as a nation, the right of all peoples to self-determination, and the security of all free nations has been involved in our consideration of these commitments.

Early in the first session, the Congress responded quickly to President Johnson's request for additional funds to meet commitments in southeast Asia when it approved, in one of the first legislative actions of that session, a $700 million supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1965. Again, early this year the Congress responded quickly to the needs of our troops when President Johnson emphasized keeping our men prepared by stating:

> We will give our fighting men what they must have; every gun, every dollar, and every decision whatever the cost or whatever the challenge.

The Congress speedily approved the President's request for $13 billion-plus to carry on the war in Vietnam.

The bill provided $1,620 million for military personnel, $2,316,269,000 for operation and maintenance, $7,019 million for procurement, $151,650,000 for research and development, and $1,238 million for construction. It also provided $415 million for foreign aid to southeast Asia and an additional $375 million in military assistance to liquidate an existing contract authorization.

The bill also provided that funds appropriated to the Defense Department could be used for support of Vietnamese and other "free world forces in Vietnam" during fiscal year 1966. This in effect allowed a merger of military assistance funds for use in South Vietnam with regular Defense Department appropriations and contributed to our combined allied effort in that country.

In each instance the supplemental defense funds were approved speedily by almost unanimous rollcalls in both the House of Representatives and the Senate. These votes are a clear indication that a vast majority of the Members of Congress, and a vast majority of the American people, continue to support our President and our fighting men in their stand against those forces which seek to overrun southeast Asia and which strive to deprive the people of that area of their right to peace, freedom, and self-determination.

In 1965, the House and Senate appropriated $46,887,163,000 for 1966 fiscal year expenses of the Department of Defense. This past year, the Congress appropriated $58,067,472,000 for the Defense Department for fiscal year 1967. These appropriations reflect a continuing effort of the Congress to see that our military forces will be strong enough and adequate enough to maintain and support the basic foreign policy objectives of this country. Of the $58 billion plus appropriated this past year, $18,731,044,000 was allocated to military personnel. $15,703,321,000 is designated for operation and maintenance, while $16,641,800,000 is designed for military procurement. Of particular note are sums included in the bill for development of the Nike X missile defense system, nuclear powered surface vessels, and advanced manned bomber and other new weapons systems.

The Defense appropriations bill also authorizes the President to mobilize substantial numbers of U.S. reservists to meet manpower requirements for the Vietnamese war and for other military commitments without first declaring a national emergency. Reserve units eligible for call include all organized units of the Ready Reserve, individual members of Ready Reserve mobilization pools, and enlistees in the Reserve enlistment program. This is a total of about 789,000 men. This authority, which expires on June 30, 1968, would allow Reserve units to be called up and retained on active duty for a period of up to 24 months. An individual activated under this provision would be limited to the difference between 24 months and the amount of time spent on his previous tour of active service.

This past year, we also appropriated $979,570,000 for military construction which compared with an appropriation of $1,090,789,000 for military construction in fiscal year 1966. Of the total appropriated this year, $507,196,000 is allocated for maintenance, leasing, and debt retirement of military family housing.

Another significant enactment this past year, which will insure that our fighting men will have the very best of equipment, was the passage of a $17.8 billion military procurement measure for fiscal year 1967. This bill, Public Law 89-501, provides for increased procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, including nuclear-powered surface vessels. The $17.8 billion total includes $7.3 billion for research, development, tests, and evaluation of new weapons systems. Another significant provision of Public Law 89-501 was an across-the-board military pay increase of 3.2 percent, which became effective last July.

In August 1965, President Johnson signed Public Law 89-132, a bill which had provided an adjustment in rates of compensation to members of the uniformed services. The 3.2-percent pay increase contained in Public Law 89-501 was a continuing effort on the part of the Congress to see that those persons who have the responsibility of protecting this country's security receive an annual income and a standard of living comparable to that received by their civilian counterparts. To that end, the bill signed by the President in August 1965, had authorized an appropriation of $1,048 million for pay raises for military personnel, including active duty members of the Armed Forces, reservists, and retired personnel.

Basic pay adjustments for active duty members of the Armed Forces accounted for $809,855,000 of the total amount authorized by Public Law 89-132. Within that category, a 6-percent increase was granted to officers with more than 2 years' service; a 22-percent increase was granted to officers with less than 2 years' service; a 17.3-percent increase was authorized for enlisted men with less than 2 years' service, while enlisted men with more than 2 years' service received a total authorization in excess of $493 million.

But the morale boost offered by the pay raise has not been our only concern for these men who protect our national security. In order to assist our returning servicemen, we have passed what is usually referred to as the "cold war GI bill," which extends to veterans who have served since January 31, 1955, a number of benefits to aid them in their search for productive and rewarding civilian lives. Under terms of Public Law 89-358, veterans will be eligible to receive partial payment of education expenses, including the costs of personal and dependent subsistence, tuition, books, supplies, and similar costs. A cold war GI may receive 1 month of educational aid for each month, or part of a month, up to a maximum of 36 months, that he was on active duty after January 31, 1955.

As still another aid to the former soldier's civilian life adjustment, we have authorized VA home loan guarantees and home loans for eligible veterans. The preference extended to veterans in Federal Government hiring procedures will continue. Likewise the veteran will receive the benefits already offered by job counseling professional placement programs, and other facilities provided for eligible veterans.

Other enactments of the 89th Congress which have reflected the concern of this Government for members of the Armed Forces and for veterans include Public Law 89-149, which was a recommendation of the Department of Defense, and which authorizes an increase in the monthly pay of enlisted personnel and officers who are engaged in dangerous assignments on the flight decks of aircraft carriers. Enlisted men will receive an additional $55 a month while officers will receive $110 a month in hazardous duty pay.

Public Law 89-26 authorizes the payment of special allowances for dependents of members of the armed services who are ordered evacuated from an overseas danger zone. Under previous law, dependents who were ordered evacuated could receive per diem allowances and cost-of-living allowances only when they were evacuated to another oversea area. No special allowances were granted when they were returned to the United States. The serious financial hardships resulting from forced evacuations have been corrected by this bill.

Another bill of great importance to the widows and children of armed services personnel is Public Law 89-151, which provides that the survivors of a member of the Armed Forces who dies while on active duty may receive the monetary value of his unused and accrued leave at the time of his death. This is a provision which has been available to survivors of civilian employees for some time, but it was only extended to survivors of military personnel by action of this Congress in 1965. The Congress this year, in Public Law 89-614, extended eligibility for outpatient care in civilian hospitals to spouses and children of U.S. military personnel on active duty. This law also provides that military retirees and their spouses and children are also eligible for both inpatient and outpatient care at civilian facilities. In addition, the law provides a new program for the care of mentally retarded and physically handicapped spouses and children of active duty personnel. Under the bill, the Government will provide up to 80 percent of the cost of the care it authorizes. First year cost of this bill is estimated to be $142 million.

Last year, in Public Law 89-140, the Congress authorized transportation, at Government expense, of dependents accompanying members of the uniformed services at stations outside the United States who require medical attention, excluding elective surgery, unavailable locally or below standard in quality. This bill attempts to provide equal facilities for all dependents and to afford them access and use of first-class medical facilities regardless of the location in which they may be stationed.

Chapter 31, title 38 of the United States Code was amended last year to include an authorization for a 10-year extension, through June 30, 1975, of the period during which veterans seriously disabled in World War II or the Korean war would continue to be eligible for vocational rehabilitation and training. This act offers aid similar to that authorized for blinded veterans by Public Law 87-591, to disabled veterans whose service-connected disability has become progressively worse and who have consequently been prevented from pursuing occupational activities for which they had been previously prepared. This bill offers hope to veterans who have been hospitalized for a long period of time but who are now capable of participation in rehabilitation and training programs.

Public Law 89-137 authorized an increase in the subsistence allowance granted to disabled veterans receiving vocational rehabilitation and training. It also authorized an increase in cost of living allowances for children of disabled or deceased veterans receiving educational assistance under the war orphans' educational assistance program.

One of the last actions of the first session was passage of a bill providing an average 10-percent increase in monthly compensation payments for veterans with service-connected disabilities and their dependents. Veterans who are 50 percent or more disabled received the largest increase in monthly rates. The first year cost of this legislation was approximately $176 million.

Legislation—Public Law 89-214—was passed which authorizes the purchase of group life insurance for all active duty members of the armed services. Each active duty member will be insured against death in the amount of $10,000. An individual may waive all coverage or he may select insurance in the amount of $5,000. Premiums will be deducted from his monthly pay.

Widows, widowers, children, or parents of armed services personnel who died in the course of hostile action, as a result of military or naval accidents, or because of the extra hazards imposed by military or naval operations, will receive a death gratuity payment of $5,000. This death gratuity clause is retroactive and covers deaths occurring, in the circumstances stipulated above, on or after January 1, 1957, through the date when the terms of the group life insurance became operational.

This Congress has recognized that these various enactments little benefit the dependents of our military forces personnel serving overseas if those children do not have regular educational institutions and a well-qualified teaching staff available. In this session of the 89th Congress, we enacted Public Law 89-391, which adjusted inequities in the basic rate of pay of teachers and related personnel working under the Defense Department overseas school program. We recognize that these overseas teachers have not been able to command salaries commensurate with their contribution and with their training. In an effort to maintain the highest possible standards for the children in our overseas dependent school system, we have provided an approximate 10-percent salary increase for these dedicated teachers.

This Congress, in the past session, also recognized the debt that the people of the United States and this Government owe to the gallant veterans of the Army of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, who served side by side with U.S. forces in World War II. We acted this year to extend the benefits of several important acts to those veterans and their dependents. We extended the benefits of the War Orphans' Educational Assistance for grants-in-aid to certain veterans of the Philippine Army, and we provided for grants in aid to certain veterans of the Philippine Army. These enactments recognized the many sacrifices these people and their deceased comrades made for the cause of freedom in southeast Asia in World War II.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

In the years since World War II this country has come to realize that our security is closely bound up with the security and with the stability of other lands and other peoples. We have come to know that our future security and the maintenance of peace and freedom in this country depend upon the maintenance throughout the world of strong, free, and independent nations.

Since the days of the Marshall plan we have attempted to aid those governments who desire our assistance in establishing themselves as strong and stable nations. In the first session, under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1965, we appropriated $3,218 million to finance economic and military assistance programs and $714,188,000 in other funds for related programs. This year, under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966—Public Law 89-583—we authorized $3,500,735,500 in appropriations for foreign economic and military assistance during fiscal year 1967. This legislation contained authorizations for most programs of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, but it also gave 3-year authorizations to the respected Alliance for Progress and the Development Loan Fund projects. The appropriation for this area of Government was $2,936,490,500 for foreign aid and $556,983,000 for allied programs. Of this last figure, $110 million was for the Peace Corps.

Last year I reported that nearly 14,000 trainees and volunteers were serving this Nation through the Peace Corps. This year the Peace Corps ranks have swollen to 16,000 persons in 50 countries. In order to support their activities around the world, the $110 million mentioned above was appropriated for that agency for fiscal year 1967.

Not only are we concerned with the security and self-determination problems facing our fellow man in this 20th century, but we are also concerned with the economic and humanitarian needs of our sister nations' citizens.

One of the best evidences of constructive aid and an outstanding example of fiscal cooperation is Public Law 89-369, the authorization of the President to accept membership on behalf of the United States in the Asian Development Bank. An appropriation of $200 million is authorized for this purpose.

This farsighted proposal means that the cooperating nations will be charged with making loans to the less developed member countries in Asia. The Bank has 19 regional members and 12 nonregional members. Asian members have pledged $650 million of the Bank's capital. This new Bank will come into being when 15 signatories of the Bank's charter, 10 of them Asian, representing 65 percent of the subscribed capital, have ratified the Bank's charter. The charter was approved last December at Manila and that island city will be its chosen site.

The size of our pledge to the Bank's capital gives our country the right to elect 1 of the 3 non-Asian seats in the 10-man Board of Directors. These Directors will exercise day-to-day policy supervision of the Bank, although ultimate responsibility for the policies of this new institution will lie with the Board of Governors. Each member-nation has one Governor. In these, as in most other respects, the Bank's organization, lending policy, and administrative structure closely follows those of the World Bank.

This Development Bank is an example of mutual assistance. It is designed to permit long-range help. Any realistic deliberative body, however, must also be prepared to work on the short-range emergency front if it seeks to be truly effective in a humanitarian way.

The Members of this Congress, in the second session, proved their concern for the people of the world, and proved their ability to act quickly in face of need when they passed the Emergency Aid to India Act, Public Law 89-406.

Hunger is man's oldest, most shameful scourge. No man deserves to be hungry. A hungry human being is a shame on the whole human race. Hunger creates a breeding ground of discontent and a tool of potential exploitation.

It is fervently hoped that this new enactment will help India meet her pressing food shortages. It makes such commodities as food grain, corn, vegetable oils, milk powder, cotton, and tobacco available to India's needy. Certainly this is the least a land of milk and honey such as our own can do even as we seek to do for our own needy citizens. It has been aptly observed that no man has truly helped himself until he has helped another.

Food may always be our most effective and the most humanitarian form of assistance our productive and fortunate Nation can offer the people of this world. The annual report of the Food and Agriculture Organization disclosed that the world's food output failed to increase last year. The world population, however, rose by another 70 million. Figured on a per capita basis, this means that there was 2 percent less food available for everyone.

With this report in mind, we have enacted the Food for Peace Act of 1966, which extends the expiring foreign food aid program—Public Law 480—through 1968. The new act has changed the emphasis from one of surplus disposal to one of planned production for export. This new and expanded program also emphasizes that countries receiving U.S. aid must work to improve their own agricultural production and to control their populations. In addition, foreign currency acquired by the United States under this program will be made available, for the first time, for population control programs in developing countries. An annual expenditure of $2.5 billion is authorized by this expanded food-for-peace program.

These actions, which reflect U.S. concern for our neighbors and fellow citizens of the world in southeast Asia and in India are in consonance with similar enactments in the 1st session of the 89th Congress, in 1965, which reflected equal concern for our fellow citizens of this hemisphere. As I said last year in reporting on those developments, this country continues to act in good faith to build a hemisphere—and a world—"where all men can hope for the same high standard of living, and all can live out their lives in dignity and in freedom."

In 1965 the Congress approved three major enactments which indicated our strong feelings in behalf of our neighbors to the south. The Congress strengthened the International Monetary Fund by increasing by 25 percent the U.S. contribution to the International Monetary Fund pool. Public Law 89–31 authorized an increase of $1,035 million in the U.S. contribution, bringing the total U.S. share in the International Monetary Fund to $5.16 billion.

The Congress also acted to strengthen the Inter-American Development Bank which is the major cooperative banking instrumentality of the Alliance for Progress and which is one of the most vital links in the partnership which joins this country with other free nations of this hemisphere. The Congress authorized a $750 million U.S. contribution to an increase in the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank.

The third significant action we undertook last year was to authorize U.S. participation in the International Coffee Agreement, which was signed in 1962. Coffee, a primary commodity for many countries of this hemisphere, plays an important part in the lives of untold millions of persons. Instability of worldwide coffee prices poses a serious threat to social and economic betterment in many countries. U.S. participation in this agreement, which will tend to stabilize coffee prices, will greatly benefit our southern neighbors.

To further communication which will aid in maintaining good health around this planet, we have authorized an appropriation to enable the United States to host an international gathering of respected professional health workers in 1969 with Boston as the site.

We have also suggested the designation of a Federal agency to facilitate the exchange of scientific, educational, and cultural materials among nations. Provisions in Public Law 89–634 and similar legislation will be greatly appreciated by all scientists, artists, and educators throughout the world.

We have attempted to encourage mutual economic cooperation by encouraging international trade. Members of this congressional session have authorized the President to provide for U.S. cooperation in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center known as Interama. Located in Miami, Fla., this permanent international fair will serve as a meeting ground for the governments and industries of the Western Hemisphere and other areas of the world. By encouraging display and discussion, Public Law 89–355 will contribute toward international cooperation; and by stimulating trade it will contribute toward economic development.

In other important legislation affecting the U.S. position in international affairs, we authorized U.S. membership in the Pan-American Institute of Geography and History. We have provided for the determination of the amount of claims of U.S. nationals against Communist China. The Congress authorized conclusion of an agreement with Mexico for an international flood control project on the Tiajuana River in accordance with a 1944 treaty on this subject. Also, we agreed to join with the Republic of Mexico in joint action to solve the salinity problem on the lower Rio Grande. In addition, late in this session, the Congress enacted legislation which will provide procedures to enable certain Cuban refugees in this country to adjust their status to that of lawful permanent residents.

It has been observed that a knowledge of other countries is of the utmost importance in promoting mutual understanding between nations. Recognizing that our citizenry must be prepared to live their lives in an increasingly socially complex and culture-mixing planet, we have enacted a bold new comprehensive approach to world understanding. The International Education Act of 1966 establishes a grant program to various colleges and universities or similar institutions in an effort to strengthen international studies and research programs here in the United States.

The grant program is to be administered through a center established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is not, however, just another effort to aid education. It is creative legislative construction designed to fulfill the needs of the future. Since the needs of the future can only be observed dimly, we have made the grant programs as varied as possible. These grants can be utilized for student work-study travel projects; faculty planning to project new and expanded programs; curriculum development emphasis; teaching and research work; foreign teacher and visiting scholar proposals.

The advancement of our knowledge will in turn benefit the people of all nations. As we turn attention toward providing the tools of understanding to our students, we are likewise facing the fact that the United States cannot be secure in a world in which 50 percent of the residents are illiterate, poorly skilled, and untrained. This is the foundation upon which hunger, illness, frustrated hopes, and political instability are built. It is the foundation that demands our concentrated examination and aid. Access to professional health workers, nutritional food, including fish meal protein concentrates, is a comparatively short-term program. This is a long-term vision. It will provide the "hoe" and the "seed" to our students and eventually to our neighbors rather than simply the "corn" which the hungry eat today and seek again tomorrow.

As the President has stated:

> Over the past two decades, our universities have been a major resource in carrying on development programs around the world. We have made heavy demands upon them. But we have not supported them adequately.

Now we will offer new assistance and progressive potential.

TAXES AND ECONOMIC POLICY

The 89th Congress was continuously alert to the Nation's economic situation. In 1965 we acted to revise the Federal excise tax schedule through Public Law 89–44. This action, which was designed to reduce taxes by about $4.7 billion, was calculated to serve as additional stimulus to the economy to carry on the unprecedented economic growth which has been the good fortune of this country since early 1961. The Congress enacted in March of this year the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966. This law, Public Law 89–368, was another impressive step by this Congress to aid the economic situation of our country.

This step was necessary because increased expenditures for the Vietnamese war and the strong resurgence of our economy since the doldrums of the 1950's had caused us to experience some inflationary pressures. The timely, responsible, and effective action reflected by enactment of the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966 was expected to remove about $4 billion from the economy this calendar year. The act provides for the accelerated payment of corporate taxes, it provides a system of graduated withholding of individual income taxes, and it restores certain excise taxes which had been reduced in 1965. Increased payroll taxes for social security and medicare will take an additional $6 billion out of the economy this calendar year, thus having a substantial effect on inflationary trends in the economy.

The 89th Congress again moved, at the close of the session, to further curb these inflationary pressures. We enacted amendments to the Internal Revenue Code which temporarily suspend both the 7-percent investment tax credit on the purchase of machinery and equipment and certain methods of accelerated depreciation of industrial and commercial buildings. The suspensions will be effective from October 10, 1966, through December 31, 1967. Investors who have put in binding orders before the suspension date were to be entitled to the tax credit and accelerated depreciation was to be authorized on buildings whose construction was begun or was under contract as of the date the suspension was to go into effect.

The bill further provided that the suspension will not apply to investment of less than $20,000 or to depreciation on buildings valued at $50,000 or less. When the suspension is lifted on January 1, 1968, the maximum amount of tax credit allowed will be increased to 50 percent of tax liabilities above $25,000 and investors will be allowed to carry unused balances forward for a period of up to 7 years. This results in a substantial broadening of the credit over existing law.

But our concern over inflation must not be allowed to obscure our good fortune and our optimism. As the President observed in his economic report, the value of our Nation's annual output of goods and services rose more than one-third from 1960 to 1965. Last year alone our gross national products made a record advance of $47 billion. In addition, it is expected that the product of the American economy will increase by some $50 billion during calendar year 1967.

An economic policy is not sound or just if it ignores the concerns of the people, and particularly of the workingman.

Our minimum wage laws must be fair and in step with the economy. The 2d session of the 89th Congress passed a minimum wage law suited to the times. The major provisions of this legislation increased the $1.25 an hour nonfarm wage floor by stages to $1.60 an hour. The law also extends minimum wage coverage to an additional 8.1 million employees, including certain agricultural workers. The bill extends overtime pay protection to certain employees not previously covered and establishes a minimum wage of $1 an hour for the newly-covered farmworkers whose pay will then be gradually increased to $1.30 an hour.

The 2d session of the 89th Congress also continued to make provisions to aid the faithful public servants who carry out the policies as set forth in these laws discussed in this report. It has long been recognized that the programs which we design to aid the public will be effective only to the extent that the individuals charged with the administration of those proposals and programs are effective. To attract the most competent citizens among us and to retain those individuals already serving the 89th Congress, in the 1st session, enacted a 3.6-percent pay raise measure which was designed to benefit more than 1.6 million Federal civilian employees. In this second session we enacted a pay raise averaging 2.9 percent which will affect 1.8 million Federal civilian employees. The annual cost of the bill we passed this year is estimated to be $505.8 million.

In addition to this salary boost, Public Law 89–504 made Federal fringe benefits more attractive. It has been observed that the side advantages once claimed by the Government over the private employer have recently been permitted to decline. We have tried to make provisions accordingly; our Government demands and deserves the reputation of a "model employer." The fringe benefit portion of this act brings the total amount of benefit to the individual up around 3.2 percent. These provisions are already in effect as they were made July 1 of this year.

We also passed Public Law 89–478, which will permit variation of our 40-hour workweek to enable our employees to take advantage of educational opportunities. It has correctly been observed that education is and should be a continuing thing. Federal employees must be encouraged to learn and to grow. To deny the most ambitious this opportunity is to deny our Nation progress.

In our constant search for ways to balance the public and private sectors of our economy, create new programs to assist our citizenry while funding the old ones, and keeping wage levels and interest rates at reasonable and prudent points, we acted on various proposals. The Participation Sales Act of 1966, Public Law 89–429, authorizes six specified Federal agencies to place a part or all of the notes or obligations acquired by them through their loan program operations into pools. The Federal National Mortgage Association is authorized to act as trustee and sell investors participation certificates which are based on these pools. Under this act the Government was authorized to shift part of the burden of Federal credit to the private sector of the economy.

This Congress has also been concerned about the health of the financial institutions of our country. We enacted in February Public Law 89–356, which established new standards for the review of proposed bank mergers by Federal regulatory agencies in order to eliminate the necessity for the dissolution of merged banks. We also enacted the Financial Institution Supervisory Act of 1966. This act raised the maximum deposit insurance for bank and savings and loan association deposits on accounts insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation or the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation from $10,000 to a new maximum of $15,000. As another aid to the public, the Congress granted Federal bank regulatory agencies new powers to curb "unsafe" and "unsound" practices by banks and savings and loan associations. The new powers enabled the regulatory agencies to issue cease-and-desist orders against banks and suspension-and-removal orders against bank officials engaged in "unsafe" and "unsound" practices. Although the insurance increase is considered to be a permanent enactment, the regulatory authority granted by this act is to expire in 1972, thus giving "need" evaluations greater flexibility.

The Congress recognized that the amount of money available for home mortgages was not sufficient. We increased by $4.76 million the purchasing authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association in order to provide more mortgage capital. This additional authority should greatly assist the homebuilding industry which has severely felt the inflationary pressures in the economy.

Rising interest rates have necessitated our immediate action. This action is embodied in the interest rate control bill which President Johnson signed into law last September 21. In the signing ceremony, he pointed out what continually rising interest rates mean:

> First, they force lenders to charge even higher interest rates on the money they lend;
>
> Second, they divert funds away from homebuilding, making it very difficult for thousands of Americans to build, or buy, or to sell their homes;
>
> Third, they weaken some of our financial institutions.

This act will now enable the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to regulate the maximum rates of interest paid by banks and certain other financial institutions on deposit or share accounts. The bill will give the Federal Home Loan Bank Board the power directly to establish dividend rates which savings and loan associations may pay.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

In my previous report on the accomplishments of the 88th Congress and on the accomplishments of the 1st session of the 89th Congress, I have commented in detail on the many remarkable legislative achievements which have been accomplished in the field of education. The 88th Congress, for instance, passed the Higher Education Facilities Act which authorized Federal loans to public and private colleges for the improvement of educational facilities. That Congress also passed the Vocational Education Act which assisted States in modernizing and enlarging their programs for teaching job skills. In the 88th Congress the National Defense Education Act provided low-interest loans for deserving students who needed help in completing educational programs.

This Congress, however, has succeeded in outstripping the preceding Congress in the field of education. The Members of the 89th Congress have demonstrated their belief that all children should be able to achieve their full educational potential. Last year we enacted the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which became Public Law 89–10. That act was designed to benefit 95 percent of our counties, and it placed special emphasis on providing more complete and meaningful educational experiences for those persons from culturally deprived backgrounds.

Title I contains a $1.06 billion authorization for the fiscal year 1966 in grants to State educational agencies for payment to local school districts. To benefit from Federal grants, a local educational agency must belong to a school district in which the number of school-age children of low-income or relief families equals 100 or more or is equivalent to 3 percent of the total number of school-age children. School-age children are defined as those between 5 and 17 years of age; low-income families are families whose annual incomes are $2,000 or less. Qualifying local agencies will receive, at maximum, an amount equivalent to 50 percent of their State's average expenditures per schoolchild times the number of school-age children from the low-income factor families residing in the school district. Beginning in the 1967 fiscal year, eligible local educational agencies may be awarded special incentive grants to be applied to programs consistent with the basic aims of this legislation. The amounts of these awards will be determined by the percentage of increase in current agency expenditures over those for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965.

Subject to final approval by State and Federal educational agencies, local agencies will enjoy a high degree of flexibility in the uses to which these grants may be put.

Title II—School Library Resources and Instructional Materials—institutes a 5-year program for the allocation of funds to local educational agencies, via the States, for use in the acquisition of textbooks and school library resources. One hundred million dollars was authorized under title II for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966. Each State's share of the total monetary authorization will bear the same ratio as its number of public and nonprofit elementary-secondary school students bears to the national enrollment in such schools. Federal participation is limited to the role of providing funds for each of the States. State educational agencies, in cooperation with local public school agencies, will determine what types of printed instructional materials and library resources will be purchased. Federal funds will supply nonpublic schools with those books and materials which State educational agencies have approved for distribution in the public schools.

Title III—Supplementary Educational Centers and Services—establishes a 5-year program of Federal grants for supplementary educational centers and services. One hundred million dollars has been authorized under title III for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966. Each State will receive a basic allocation of $200,000. Remaining moneys will be distributed among the States on the following basis: 50 percent according to the number of school-age children in a State—compared to the national total—and 50 percent according to the total population of the United States. This title seeks to provide those educational services and facilities unavailable in quality and quantity in our Nation's elementary-secondary school system. Among the many programs for which these funds may be used are: guidance and counseling, remedial instruction, psychological and social work services to enable persons to participate in educational programs, special educational projects for nonschool session periods, academic and vocational education for adults, specialized equipment and instruction for advanced scientific subjects, foreign languages, and other courses not offered in the local schools, or which could be better taught in one central location, specialized equipment and instruction for the handicapped and for pre-school-age youngsters, specially qualified personnel for temporary teaching assignments, special programs for persons isolated from normal educational opportunities, including home-study courses, visiting teachers, and mobile education units, and the development of educational radio and television.

Title IV—Educational Research and Training—amends the Cooperative Research Act by authorizing the Commissioner of Education to make grants to colleges, universities, other public or nonprofit agencies, institutions, organizations, and to individuals for research, surveys, and demonstrations in the field of education and for the dissemination of information derived from this education research. Recipients of such grants may utilize these funds to establish and maintain research traineeships, internships, personnel exchanges, and predoctoral fellowships for training and research in the field of education.

Title V authorizes the establishment of a 5-year program of grants to stimulate and assist the States in strengthening the leadership resources of their educational agencies and to assist those agencies in the establishment and improvement of programs to identify and meet their educational needs. Ten million dollars in grants were authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966.

The 1966 amendments to Public Law 89-10 authorized $2.4 billion for fiscal year 1967 and $3.7 billion for fiscal year 1968. Fiscal 1967 appropriations were $1,342,000,410 for elementary and secondary education activities and $439,137,000 for impacted areas aid.

The major provisions of the 1966 amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act retain the basic aid formula for title I grants for fiscal year 1967. Grants were to equal 50 percent of the average expenditure per pupil in the State, multiplied by the number of 5- to 17-year-old children in the school district from families with incomes below $2,000 annually or with higher income resulting from payments under the aid to families with dependent children program. The formula must also take into account the number of children in homes for neglected or delinquent children, or in foster homes supported by public funds. The 1966 amendments repeal the incentive grants program of the 1965 act and also authorize grants to State educational agencies to establish or improve programs for children of migratory farmworkers. In the absence of satisfactory State programs, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make arrangements with other nonprofit agencies in the State for accomplishing the purposes of that title. The bill also requires that State programs under the aid for dependent children program provide that any person who is employed on projects under title I of the Education Act may disregard $85 of monthly earnings in establishing eligibility for the relief program.

The 1966 amendments raised the factor determining low income to $3,000 per family for fiscal year 1968 instead of the $2,000 annual income per family figure originally in the bill and retained in it for fiscal year 1967. The amendments also allow States, starting in 1968, to use the U.S. national average per pupil expenditure for education in determining title I grants if that average is greater than the State average per pupil expenditure. The bill also provides that local school districts with at least 10 qualified children will be eligible for title I assistance beginning in fiscal 1968 if their projects involve an expenditure of at least $2,500. It is estimated that these changes will require an authorization in fiscal year 1968 of about $2,290 million as opposed to $1,433,589,000 in fiscal year 1967.

The 1966 amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act authorize $125 million to library resources in fiscal year 1967 and $150 million in 1968. An additional 3 percent of the appropriation under this title shall be available to non-State areas, to the Department of the Interior, and to the Department of Defense, for use in schools operated by those agencies. The bill also authorizes $175 million for fiscal year 1967 and $500 million for fiscal year 1968 for grants to the States for supplementary educational services and centers under title III of the program. Again, 3 percent of this appropriation shall be used for special schools as provided in title II, described above. State departments of education are authorized to receive $30 million in fiscal year 1967 and $50 million in fiscal 1968 for grants to improve their departments. The Congress eliminated the provision requiring that States match Federal funds in this area.

The Congress also liberalized the provisions for school districts to receive aid to impacted areas under Public Law 81-874 by providing that districts with 400 federally connected schoolchildren will be eligible for such assistance even if they do not meet the requirement imposed by current law that 3 percent of the children be federally connected.

Handicapped children are also aided by this act. The Commissioner of Education is directed to establish a National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children to advise him on matters relating to the education of such children. The bill authorizes $50 million for fiscal year 1967 and $150 million for fiscal year 1968 to develop and improve programs for the education of handicapped children. These funds are allocated to the States on the basis of a ratio of handicapped children age 3 to 21 in each State to the number of such children in all States.

One other significant provision of the 1966 amendments was to transfer the adult basic education program authorized by the 1964 Economic Opportunity Act to the Commissioner of Education—$60 million in fiscal 1968 and $40 million for fiscal 1967 are authorized for these programs. The funds are allotted to the States on the basis of the number of adults who have not completed the first six grades of school. The President is authorized to establish a National Advisory Committee on Adult Basic Education to advise him on this subject.

HIGHER EDUCATION ACTIVITIES

The 89th Congress recognized the challenge of the times in the field of higher education. Harkening to the injunction of President Johnson when he reminded that education is always an unfinished task, the 1st session of the "fabulous 89th Congress" passed the Higher Education Act of 1965. With the passage of this act, the Congress renewed its commitment to equality of educational opportunity to all young persons of this great country.

Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 authorized a program of matching grants to assist colleges and universities in expanding adult educational opportunities. Title II of the act provided a program of grants to aid colleges and universities in improving their library resources. Title III of the act provided a 1-year program to improve the "developing institutions" on the Nation's higher academic scene. Title IV authorized a program of scholarships to academically qualified, needy students. Title V authorizes the release of Federal moneys for the establishment of State and nonprofit institution student loan insurance funds and it also provides for strengthening of the Defense Education Act of 1958. Title VI authorized a program of matching grants to colleges and universities for the acquisition of educational equipment and media.

This total commitment to higher education was continued by the Congress in its second session. In major amendments to the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, the Congress authorized $475 million for fiscal year 1967, $728 million for fiscal year 1968, and $936 million for fiscal year 1969 for the construction of undergraduate academic facilities. For this purpose we appropriated for fiscal year 1967 $453 million, 22 percent of which will go to public community colleges and public technical institutes. Also, the 89th Congress this year authorized $60 million in 1967, and $120 million in fiscal years 1968 and 1969 in grants for the construction of graduate academic facilities. We appropriated the full authorized amount of $60 million for this current fiscal year. We authorized, and appropriated, $200 million in fiscal year 1967 for loans for the construction of academic facilities—$400 million is authorized for this purpose in each of the fiscal years 1968 and 1969.

In this session of the Congress, we also amended the 1965 Higher Education Act to continue the program of assistance to developing educational institutions. We authorized $30 million for this purpose for fiscal year 1967 and appropriated that full amount for this fiscal year, and we authorized $55 million in 1968. In an amendment to the National Defense Education Act, we increased the 1968 authorization to $225 million. The 1967 figure is continued at $190 million. Also authorized for 1968 is an appropriation of $110 million for assistance in industrial arts.

In addition to those figures mentioned above, the Congress appropriated $383,900,000 this year for higher education activities.

LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS

Merely to care for the physical needs of our people is not enough. As Aristotle observed many years ago:

> Those who educate children well, are more to be honored than they who produce them; for these only gave them life, those the art of living well.

Thomas Jefferson once wrote to John Adams:

> I cannot live without books.

Educational materials are essential, and printed matter is at the very base of the educational media pyramid. Unless we also provide books to our populace, we provide inadequate educational opportunity.

The Rural Library Services Act began more than 10 years ago. Since that time, library services have been provided for 40 million rural and small town citizens; 27 million books have been placed on public library shelves; 75 million citizens are enjoying new or improved library facilities.

The first funds for the construction of public libraries became available in 1965—just last year. Today, nearly 700 communities are able to build new library facilities. This is a number that may soon be doubled as the Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1966—Public Law 89-511—take effect. This act will provide $310 million between now and 1971 to raise the physical standards of libraries, to replace outmoded buildings, and to implement the provision of the 40 million square feet of space we still desperately seek.

But this new law will do more than construct the buildings. It is a forward-looking enactment that recognizes the increasing need for programs to surpass the traditional dependence upon governmental unit boundaries. It establishes a $50 million program of grants to the States for the conception and maintenance of local, regional, State, or interstate cooperative library networks.

The act seeks to find new and more needy clients to use its services. It establishes a $75 million grant program to provide library services for our often-neglected citizens who reside in orphanages, hospitals, prisons, or training schools and to provide for those who are blind or for another reason are unable to read conventional printed matter.

The two new titles—Interlibrary Cooperation and Special Services—added to the previous act constitute the portion that so ably qualifies this legislation as creative, timely, and developmental. Interlibrary cooperation and specialized State library services are the provisions for the future—provisions commensurate with their times.

Another act, Public Law 89-1018, assures us that the nearly 1,600,000 persons among us with handicaps such as being bedridden or too weak to read, being almost blind, but not legally thus disabled, will soon be assured benefits from library services.

HEALTH AND MEDICAL CARE

The past session saw the Congress bring to final fruition proposals for medical care for the elderly which had been before it, in one form or another, for 20 years. Public Law 89-97—the medical care, social security bill—is one of the most significant and far-reaching measures ever considered by the Congress. This legislation, which greatly extends and expands social security coverage, will provide, with minor exceptions, basic health insurance financed by increased social security assessments. The basic health insurance section of this so-called medicare program will assume the cost of all ordinary, inpatient hospital services for up to 90 days per single illness. The patient pays the first $40 of cost and, if hospitalized more than 60 days, pays an additional $10 per day. Psychiatric hospitalization is also covered up to 190 days' maximum. A person is also entitled to 100 days of nursing home care after any illness period involving a minimum of 3 inpatient hospital days.

In addition to this basic health insurance protection, the law also makes provision for a supplementary health insurance coverage. Persons 65 years of age or older, in return for nominal premiums of $3 per month, are eligible to purchase the insurance. This supplementary voluntary service will pay for many medical costs not covered or only partially covered under the basic hospital plan.

The 1965 Social Security Amendments, however, do not concern themselves only with medical and health care, but they also provided an increase of 7 percent in monthly social security cash benefits effective from January 1, 1965. Other important amendments were made, including the extension of eligible insurance benefits to young people who are in the process of completing their formal education and who are, consequently, not completely self-supporting.

Disability insurance payments will be made to workers who have been incapacitated, or who may become incapacitated, for consecutive 12-month periods. Prior to this very important amendment, total and permanent disability was almost always required before social security benefits could be paid. The eligibility requirements for aged persons have been lowered under the act. Widows of eligible workers are now entitled to draw their benefits earlier. The retirement provisions of the present law have been made more flexible. As an example, the exemptions on annual earnings a person may have without losing his social security benefits have been significantly increased. Now, the first $1,500 of annual earnings are completely clear of social security benefit reductions.

The supplementary health insurance portion of the so-called medicare program was so popular that many persons were unable to enroll in it by the March 31 deadline. The Congress acted quickly this year to extend the deadline so that all who desired would have an opportunity to sign up for this helpful program.

However, legislative action relating to the health needs of the people of the United States did not stop with enactment of the Social Security Amendments. Other major bills were considered, and enacted, by this Congress. We have done many, many things which will move us along the way in our battle against disease and disability.

Allow me to outline some of the major bills which we have approved during the past 2 years which contribute to the health of our people.

Last year we expanded the provisions of Public Law 87-868 by renewing and continuing the Federal program which supports a mass vaccination program against a number of diseases which are major public health hazards. We have authorized grants to local communities and States through June 30, 1968, under which the Federal Government will provide funds for the purchase of vaccine against tetanus, poliomyelitis, whooping cough, diphtheria, and measles. Up until the time of the revision of the act last year, vaccine protection against measles was not included.

We extended Public Law 87-692, which provides health services for domestic migratory workers. The sum of $24 million was authorized for Federal grants to public and private nonprofit agencies to assist in meeting the needs of migratory workers by operating migratory worker family health centers at which a broad range of health services will be available.

The Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Act of 1963 was broadened. We enacted Public Law 89–239, which authorizes a 3-year program to establish regional medical programs in the field of heart disease, cancer, stroke, and related diseases. This program contemplates a broad program of cooperative research with hospitals, medical schools, and physicians clinics. We enacted Public Law 89–290, authorizing a $775 million, 3-year program for the construction of teaching facilities for physicians, dentists, professional health personnel, optometrists, pharmacists, and podiatrists. This year we approved the Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act of 1966. This bill is designed to provide more assistance in meeting the urgent needs for health professionals, such as physical therapists, dental technicians, and others of that type. In this bill we authorized improvement and construction grants to colleges and universities which offer degrees to students of the allied health professions. Also, the bill contained a provision offering full forgiveness of student loans made to doctors who practice in low-income rural areas. The bill also made students of medicine, dentistry, and the related fields eligible for the guaranteed loan program established in 1965 for college students.

Public Law 89–291 authorized $105 million in grants to improve medical library services and facilities over a 5-year period.

Late in the session this year, Congress enacted the Comprehensive Health Planning and Public Health Services Act of 1966. This bill considered the problems of public health and health planning on a broad scale and extensively revised Federal grant programs for public health services in the States.

The bill passed this year authorizes comprehensive planning of public health services on a State and areawide basis. This planning will serve to identify the most immediate public health problems and will establish priorities for public health services. The bill contains a new authorization of $9 million for public health planning in fiscal year 1967 and it keeps the $5 million authorization contained in existing law. Fifteen million dollars for this purpose is authorized for fiscal year 1968.

The bill revises the formula for Public Health Service grants. Under the new bill, $125 million will be authorized for fiscal year 1968. The bill repeals a number of the provisions of the Public Health Service Act. It is expected that the 90th Congress will give early consideration to additional funding for these important and worthwhile programs.

While not directly related to public health, in a related field the Congress passed legislation giving the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to impose standards governing the care, treatment, and transportation of animals used in medical research. The authority contained in the bill is designed to prevent the theft of dogs, cats, and other animals by professional animal dealers who then sell them for use in medical research.

CHILDREN

The Congress this year acted on two measures which reflect the concern of the Federal Government and of Members of the 89 Congress over the health and welfare of the Nation's children.

One of these measures was the Child Protection Act, which was sent to the President in mid-October. This bill allows the Food and Drug Administration to prohibit the sale of extremely dangerous children's toys and articles and other items intended for household use. The bill also requires that warning labels be attached to less hazardous, but still dangerous toys.

The Congress also recognized the fact that many of the Nation's schoolchildren suffer from nutritional deficiencies which can be remedied only by far-reaching programs designed to provide needed food to hungry schoolchildren.

Congress enacted a bill which continues the special milk program. It authorized appropriations of $110 million in fiscal 1967, $115 million in 1968, $120 million in fiscal 1969, and $120 million in 1970.

The bill instituted a new special breakfast program and authorized appropriations of $7.5 million during the current fiscal year and $10 million the next fiscal year to establish pilot programs for the serving of breakfasts to school students. The breakfasts will be served without charge or at a reduced charge to children who cannot pay the full cost. Other students, under this legislation, would be allowed to participate if they pay for their meal.

The bill strengthens and expands the school lunch program and authorizes appropriations of $63 million in the fiscal years 1967 to 1970 to aid public and nonprofit private schools in low-income areas in their efforts to acquire equipment for use in connection with federally aided school food programs. The bill provides that all Federal school programs are to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture.

In financing the school food programs for fiscal 1967 the Congress appropriated $104 million for the special milk program and $210.8 million for the school lunch program.

LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

The Congress, in both sessions, recognized the concern with which citizens of the United States view the increasing incidence of criminal acts. We have sought in 1965 and in 1966 to provide some of the means which will help combat the alarming number of criminal acts occurring daily throughout the Nation. We have recognized that the causes of crime are complex. No single act, or series of enactments, can completely or with certainty terminate criminal behavior. This has been with us since time immemorial and it will be with us until the very end of time.

We did, however, recognize the problem and attempt to find some new solutions to it. The first session, we enacted Public Law 89–69 which extends through June 30, 1967, the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act. That law authorized appropriations of $6.5 million for 1966 and $10 million for the 1967 fiscal year.

In the second session, the Congress extended the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965 for 2 years. Also, we increased the authorization for appropriations under that act to $15 million for the fiscal year of 1967 and $30 million for the fiscal year 1968. The Law Enforcement Assistance Act authorized the Attorney General to make grants designed to further the training of State and local law enforcement personnel and also to make grants for demonstrations and other projects which would help to improve State and local law enforcement agencies—$10 million for this purpose was authorized for fiscal year 1966.

We also enacted a bill establishing a National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws. Under this act, a commission composed of 12 members is set up and authorized to conduct a comprehensive study of Federal criminal laws and make recommendations for their reform and revision.

One of the most significant enactments with regard to criminal law is Public Law 89–465. This legislation revises our Federal bail procedures, thus emphasizing the character of the individual rather than his money-finding ability. The Bail Reform Act of 1966 requires that a person charged with a noncapital Federal crime be released on his personal recognizance or on unsecured bond at the time he comes before a judicial officer unless that officer makes the specific finding that such release would "not reasonably assure" the appearance of the accused as required. Judicial officers are empowered to place any one of the following conditions on a person released under these circumstances. The conditions are: Release to a designated person; restrictions on travel, association, or place of abode; appearance bond with no more than 10 percent cash deposit; bail bond or full cash deposit; or "any other condition being reasonably necessary to assure appearance as required, including the condition requiring that the person return to custody after a specified hour."

In an action related to modification and revision of criminal law, the Congress enacted the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966. This bill is an across-the-board attempt to rehabilitate those persons who have become addicted to narcotics.

Under this bill, an addict charged with certain nonviolent Federal crimes can elect, if he is a first offender, to take civil commitment for treatment of his addiction for a period of up to 36 months. If it is not his first appearance as a defendant, the court before which he is appearing can, in its discretion, still offer him the election of civil commitment. This provision does not apply to those persons who are charged with a crime of violence or with selling narcotics. Nor does it apply to persons against whom prior felony charges are pending, those who have had two or more felonies, or those persons who have been civilly committed for narcotics treatment on two or more occasions.

The bill also provides for the post-conviction commitment for treatment of narcotic addicts in lieu of criminal punishment. This applies to the same class of addicts that would be allowed to elect civil commitment before conviction.

The bill also provides for a voluntary, but compulsory, civil commitment for noncriminal narcotic addicts. Under existing law, an addict may voluntarily commit himself for treatment. However, in many instances, an addict who follows this procedure will remain in the hospital for treatment only a very brief period of time. Under the new law the term of commitment is for 42 months. The Surgeon General, who is entrusted with the responsibility of treating narcotic addicts, will have the advantage of knowing how long a person will be within his treatment. Also, an addict may be civilly committed at the instance of a third person related to him. This allows innocent members of an addict's family to assist him through civil commitment.

The bill also provides assistance to States in the developing of programs, services, and facilities for the treatment and cure of narcotic addicts. In addition, it relaxes restrictions on parole for marihuana offenders.

TRUTH IN PACKAGING

Although this country boasts educated and alert consumers, the Congress recognized this year that it is impossible for an individual to pursue a prudent purchasing policy unless accurate information concerning the contents of containers is available. We enacted what has come to be known as truth-in-packaging legislation designed to prevent deceptive packaging or labeling methods on certain commodities.

The bill requires clear, uniform labels which give the contents of closed packages in ounces, pounds, or liquid measure. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Federal Trade Commission are given the authority to regulate the use of package characterizations and to regulate label advertising promotions. The Secretary of Commerce is directed to attempt to set up voluntary standards for package sizes if he finds the consumer is confused due to the many and various sizes of packages.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

To provide greater public access to records of the Federal Government, the Congress this session enacted what is now Public Law 89-487, the Freedom of Information Act. This bill is the embodiment of the recognition that American people have the need, and the right, to know about the affairs of their Government.

The popular right to know must not be disregarded; it is a basic concept of our governmental structure. This new law emphasizes the right of citizens to obtain public information and once again asserts faith in our system of Government predicated upon respect for every man's informed opinion. Of course, the bill does not require disclosure of information which will jeopardize the national security of the United States.

AMENDMENTS TO THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964

In both 1965 and 1966 the Office of Economic Opportunity and the programs authorized by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 came under close and careful study by the Congress. In both years, drawing upon the lessons learned since the great war on poverty was instituted in 1964, the Congress reviewed, revised, and expanded the Economic Opportunity Act.

In order to place in perspective the most recent amendments and authorizations under that act, it is helpful to recall that the 1964 act authorized several programs designed to launch an across-the-board attack on the causes of poverty.

A Job Corps program was established for young men and young women between the ages of 16 and 21. Training was to be given both in rural conservation camps and in urban training communities to young people, most of whom lacked a high school education, in order to prepare them for taking their rightful place in society.

A Neighborhood Youth Corps program was instituted providing part-time or full-time work for young people, 16 to 21. In many instances, the modest salaries these young people receive determines whether or not they are able to continue their education. College work-study programs were instituted to allow college and university students from low-income families to be self-supporting and to remain as full-time students by providing on-campus and off-campus jobs sponsored by public and private organizations.

Community action programs were authorized to encourage local community action to fight the cycle of recurring poverty. Adult basic education was offered to train those who lacked the fundamental communicative skills necessary to productive living in our modern society. Job experience and training programs were instituted to give some hope to those who had been chronically unemployed.

A number of special programs were instituted, the most successful of them being Project Headstart, which provides learning experiences and much needed medical and dental care for preschool youngsters from disadvantaged families in communities across the Nation. A program of loans for low-income rural families and owners of small businesses was instituted. A special program to improve the quality of Indian communities and to provide assistance to the more than 2 million seasonal workers and their families was authorized.

These programs were put into effect and their many successes, as well as their failures and shortcomings, have been considered carefully, closely, and conscientiously by the Congress during the past 2 years. In each instance, this Congress resolved to carry on the war on poverty, recognizing that ours is a difficult and challenging task but understanding that it is neither an impossible one nor an unreasonable one.

This year, the Congress authorized appropriations of $1.75 billion for the war on poverty in fiscal year 1967. In a departure from previous authorizations, specific authorizations were provided for major programs in the youth employment and community action portions of the bill.

We authorized $696 million for title I of the Economic Opportunity Act for fiscal year 1967. Of that amount, $211 million is authorized for carrying on the program of the Job Corps and $410 million is authorized for the Neighborhood Youth Corps. This year the Congress set a limit of 45,000 on the number of persons in the Job Corps and also limited the cost per enrollee to $7,500. We also directed that a minimum of 23 percent of the persons enrolled in the Job Corps be women. We have required the Office of Economic Opportunity to undertake four pilot projects to provide youth employment and training on a combined residential and nonresidential basis. Also, we have provided for the establishment of standards of conduct for Job Corps enrollees and have directed that those enrollees who violate the standards shall be dismissed from the corps or transfered to another center.

In the Neighborhood Youth Corps, we revised the criteria for participation, providing that persons participating in the inschool work training program be in the 9th through the 12th grades of school, or have an equivalent age of persons in those grades. The 16- to 21-year-old criteria for out-of-school programs was retained. However, the language of the act was changed to make a clear distinction between programs providing work experience for unemployed persons and those programs which are designed to provide employment for students.

We authorized $75 million for a new provision which would allow the creation of special "impact programs" providing employment to youth and adults in areas of high, hard-core unemployment. Also we continued indefinitely the Federal payment of 90 percent for work training programs under this title, eliminating the requirement that the Federal share would drop to 50 percent in 1967.

In title II of the bill, the community action section, we authorized appropriations of $846 million. Of this, $352 million is authorized for continuation of the highly successful Operation Headstart. The bill also authorizes $22 million for legal services for the poor. This gives specific statutory authorization to a program already instituted by the Office of Economic Opportunity under its general authority. Other authorizations include $6.1 million of community action funds for operation of neighborhood health centers and narcotic rehabilitation programs; authorization of $7 million for an adult literacy program; authorization of $8 million for a program of low-interest emergency family loans which will provide assistance to low-income families confronted with financial emergencies. Three hundred and twenty-three million dollars of the total amount authorized for community action programs is not earmarked, and will be available for community action programs approved by the Office of Economic Opportunity in accordance with its established regulations and procedures.

Several other important changes were made in the community action portion of this act. Of major importance is the earmarking of $72 million in employment funds for a new subprofessional employment program for chronically employed adults not covered by other Federal programs. One-half of the $73 million is designated to continue community action programs now in existence which provide jobs on beautification projects. The Congress this year deleted the provision of existing law which would require that the Federal share of these programs be reduced to 50 percent on August 20, 1967, and replaced it with a provision that beginning July 1, 1967, the Federal share of most community action programs will be 80 percent. Certain procedures requiring that the poor themselves are properly represented in the community action program were written into the law. We also provided a provision limiting the amount of Federal funds which can be used to compensate local community action employees and we have provided means for accounting and auditing of grants made to public or private nonprofit agencies.

The Congress increased the ceiling on loans to low-income rural families under title III of the act from $2,500 to $3,500. We authorized $57 million for this program in fiscal year 1967. The small business loan provision of the act—title IV—was transferred to the Small Business Administration but the authority of the Office of Economic Opportunity to make grants to public or private nonprofit agencies for the purpose of carrying on the cost of an agency making such loans was continued—$5 million was authorized for this purpose during the next fiscal year.

Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act which deals with work experience programs was the subject of considerable attention and considerable change by the Congress in the last session. The program, which had been administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, was revised to divide operation of it between the Labor Department and HEW. HEW does, however, retain final control over all aspects of administration of the program. The Department of Labor has the responsibility of the manpower portions of the program, including testing, job training and job development, job referral and followup. The Federal share of the cost of work training programs will be 80 percent, beginning July 1, 1968. At the present time a 100-percent Federal participation is authorized. We provided authorization of $100 million for the program during fiscal year 1967.

Other important changes in the Economic Opportunity Act include several designed to improve administration of the act and to reduce administrative expenses. Under the 1966 amendments, administrative expenses will be limited to 10 percent of the total funds authorized under the act. The volunteers in service to America—VISTA—program was placed in a separate title VII and $31 million was authorized for its operation. The adult basic education program, previously included in this act, was transferred to the Office of Education by other legislation mentioned in this report.

Although $1.75 billion was authorized by the Congress for the war on poverty, appropriations to carry on this battle amounted to $1,612,500,000 contained in the Supplemental Appropriation Act passed in the last days of the 1966 session. The appropriation was $112,500,000 more than the Congress provided for the Office of Economic Opportunity in fiscal year 1966. The final appropriation measure, as approved by the Congress in the waning days of the session, did not specifically earmark funds for the Office of Economic Opportunity as provided in the authorization bill.

MANPOWER AMENDMENTS

This Government long ago recognized that an effort must be made to give those persons who never possessed usable and marketable skills an opportunity to join the ranks of the employed. Through the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 we undertook to produce from the unskilled unemployed, skilled workers who could take their place as productive members of our society.

That that act worked well is shown by the fact that in its first 2½ years, until January 1965, 305,000 persons had been approved for vocational training. Of these, 85,000 had completed their courses, and 73 percent of that number were at that time an integral part of the American working force.

However, Congress, in its first session, recognized that the Manpower Development and Training Act had to be extended and renewed and revised. Accordingly, we passed the Manpower Amendment Act of 1965 which extended the Manpower Development and Training Act to June 30, 1969, and authorized for fiscal year 1966 $454 million. That bill allowed the Federal Government to assume a larger share of the cost of training at a time when future participation by the States in this program seemed doubtful due to the likelihood they would be unable to meet the financial requirements of the act as it was then written.

In this session, we further amended the 1962 Manpower Development and Training Act to establish new programs, broaden eligibility for referral to existing programs, and provide more flexibility in distribution and allocation of training allowances.

The 1966 act authorized new programs to train and educate workers 45 years old and over to the labor market. It also authorized training of individuals in correctional institutions for employment upon their release, and it provides part-time courses to upgrade the skill of employed and unemployed persons to enable them to move into areas where there are critical skill shortages.

In another significant amendment to the original act, the bill passed by the Congress this year will provide training to those persons who have sufficient working skills but who, because of their inability to perform basic educational skills, are unemployable. This will be a major step forward in meeting the needs of those persons who heretofore have been unable to find jobs because of this problem.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

This Congress acted in the first months of its existence to expand our efforts to combat poverty by promoting economic development on a wide front. Public Law 89-4, was the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965. That bill authorized $1,092,400,000 for the cooperative development of the physical resources of 360 counties in 11 States in the Appalachian area. An Appalachian Regional Commission was created, composed of the Governor or his representative of each State and a Federal Cochairman appointed by the President. This Commission serves as a body to direct the economic development of the entire area on an areawide basis.

A principal factor in economic development is an adequate transportation system. In the Appalachian area, highways are urgently needed. The bill provided an authorization of $840 million for construction of 2,350 miles of development highways, together with 1,000 miles of local access roads. A comprehensive survey of the water resources of the Appalachian area is underway. This survey is being conducted by the Secretary of the Army and will serve to direct the attention of the Appalachian Regional Development Commission to problems and industrial development connected with the need for adequate water resources. Other programs are underway in the area to provide for land stabilization, health clinics, beautification projects, timber development, and restoration of abandoned mining areas.

This year the Congress appropriated $132,750,000 for continuation of the Appalachian development programs. Of this $100 million will be for the Appalachian development highway system, while the remaining $32,750,000 will be to carry on the other programs authorized by the Congress in 1965.

Also in 1965, we passed the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. Public Law 89-136 has used the experience of our past on which to build a more ambitious and more successful effort for economic development throughout the Nation.

Under the bill the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to make grants to States, political subdivisions, Indian tribes, or nonprofit representatives of redevelopment areas—those characterized by low incomes and high unemployment levels—which may be applied to the development of public works which are needed to promote industrial and commercial development in the area. An area may receive up to 80 percent of the total cost of a project in direct grants and supplemental grants; $500 million was authorized by the Congress in 1965 to meet the cost of this program in each of the years 1966 to 1969.

The Secretary of Commerce is also authorized to make loans to States, political subdivisions, Indian tribes, or nonprofit representatives of redevelopment areas, for application to public works or development facilities and for purchase and betterment of land and facilities earmarked for industrial and commercial use. In addition, the Secretary is authorized to guarantee loans made by private lending institutions to private borrowers for projects of this type—$170 million in each of the fiscal years 1966 to 1970 was authorized for this purpose.

In addition, technical assistance to the States and economic development areas is authorized to be made available by the Secretary of Commerce. Financial assistance up to 75 percent of the administrative expenses of economic development planning organizations can be furnished in this manner.

The Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 also authorized the creation of multistate regional action planning commissions to foster regional programs designed to bring about long-range economic development. Under the provisions of this act, several regional commissions have been appointed and are now in the process of developing plans for their regions similar to the work being undertaken by the Appalachian Regional Development Commission. The area included in the Appalachian Regional Development Commission is not eligible for assistance under the Public Works and Economic Development Act.

For fiscal year 1967, the Congress appropriated $290 million to carry forward the programs authorized by the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Charles Abrams, writing in "The City Is the Frontier," noted:

> A city, even an American city, is the pulsating product of the human hand and mind, reflecting man's history, his struggles for freedom, his genius—and his selfishness and errors. A city has values as well as slums, excitement as well as conflict; it has a personality that has not yet been obliterated by its highways and gas stations; it has a spirit as well as a set of arteries and a voice that speaks the hopes as well as the disappointments of its people.

Nevertheless, the residents of our cities or even of our countrysides—Americans all—have not yet been able to respond to the perplexities engulfing our urban centers and their fringes.

John F. Kennedy once summed it up:

> The cities—their needs, their future, their financing—these are the great unspoken, overlooked, underplayed problems of our times.

We must face these problems. By the time a baby born today reaches his productive years, chances are four out of five that he will be living and working in a city.

The 1st session of the 89th Congress recognized the many problems of the urban-suburban areas and enacted the comprehensive Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965. That bill provided for cooperative action among Federal, State, and local governments to enable us to improve the standards of living within our metropolitan areas.

The bill that we enacted in the first session was a bold approach to the problems of the metropolitan area. This comprehensive legislation provided, among other things, for expansion of the VA mortgage insurance program and of the Federal Housing Administration program of insured loans to armed services personnel. Urban renewal programs were continued with a 4-year authorization totaling $2.9 billion. Low rental public housing benefits were continued with authorizations of more than $47 million a year. College housing construction funds were greatly increased and vocational and technical institutions operating under the control of 4-year accredited degree-awarding colleges and universities became eligible for housing construction loans.

Grants to community agencies undertaking the construction of sewer facilities, water storage, distribution, and purification facilities, health, recreation, or social service centers, or related community facilities were authorized. An open land program was initiated whereby State and local agencies will be assisted in promoting and developing urban landscaping and beautification projects. The rural housing program was continued, and the Secretary of Agriculture was authorized to establish a low-interest, insured loan program for the improvement of rural dwellings.

Recognizing the need for a coordinating agency of Federal functions affecting urban-suburban areas and problems, the Congress, at the request of the President, established a new Cabinet position, that of Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and established a new Department of Housing and Urban Development. That Department directs and coordinates all Federal functions relating to housing and urban development.

A major provision of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 was the authorization for a "rent supplement" plan designed to improve housing conditions for low-income families. Under the provisions of this plan, the Federal Government will assist in assuring that families of low income have adequate housing by paying the difference between 25 percent of their income and their rent in standard housing. Although we authorized this provision last year, funds were not provided until the supplement appropriations bill early this year. In that bill we provided $12 million in contractual authority for rent supplement projects. We have provided $20 million for fiscal year 1967.

The most creative approach, the best contemporary concept, and the most effective "blueprint for action" is embodied in legislation adopted by the 2d session of the 89th Congress in its closing days. This legislation is designed to combat metropolitan social ills on numerous fronts. In the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, the Congress has tied together dozens of Federal programs into a coordinated effort to improve urban standards and to combat the problems of urban blight.

Under this far-reaching measure, participating cities will also be able to receive Federal funds for up to 80 percent of the required local share of program costs. Participating cities will be selected under strict Federal standards and it is estimated that 60 to 70 cities will be receiving assistance under the provisions of this bill.

Federal grants of $24 million will be available for planning the projects in fiscal 1967 and fiscal 1968. We have authorized the 2-year expenditure of $900 million for carrying out these plans in fiscal 1968 and 1969. Additionally, $250 million has been authorized for urban renewal funds for demonstration projects in fiscal year 1968.

Other major provisions of the bill include a program for Federal land development mortgage insurance for developers of entire "new cities." The bill limits to $250 million the maximum amount of all such insured loans that can be outstanding at any one time. The bill also provides incentive grants to encourage comprehensive areawide planning. Supplemental grants of up to 20 percent of project costs will be paid to cities meeting program standards for programs such as highway construction, airport development, mass transit, sewer and water facilities, open space land acquisition, and acquisition of land and water facilities.

The bill also broadens numerous other related programs. It provides a number of new Federal Housing Administration home mortgage insurance programs; it provides FHA mortgage insurance for group medical, dental, and optometrical facilities; it revises existing urban renewal laws to authorize preservation of historic sites as an eligible urban renewal cost, as well as many other important provisions.

Another important forward stride made this past year was in the establishment of a Department of Transportation. This Department will group together agencies that deal with such transportation-oriented topics as aviation, highway and railway planning, and the Coast Guard. This grouping or gathering of about 100,000 scattered employees will boost communication and coordination. It will permit the development of a plan to devise a national transportation policy, and will establish a National Transportation Safety Board—independent of the Secretary—to promote and coordinate safety activities without affecting economic regulatory functions presently assigned elsewhere.

This important area will command the attention of what will be our fourth largest department in terms of numbers, and fifth largest when based on annual budget expenditures.

The decline of the central city did not come quite as we had expected, and the urban sprawl passed all projections while we allowed our urban transit industry the luxury of decline in the past 20 years. In 1945 there were almost 19 billion revenue passengers carried by surface and elevated railways, trolley cars, and motorbuses. By 1950, the number of passengers had dropped to 13.8 billion, and by 1964, to 6.9 billion, only one-half the 1950 total.

Nevertheless, during the 1950's, population grew at a faster rate in the metropolitan areas than in the country as a whole. By 1960, the largest standard metropolitan statistical areas accounted for about 41 percent of the total population of the United States. While our total population grew 18.5 percent, these metropolitan areas grew 25.9 percent.

These statistics combine in a formula for disaster.

Our manufacturing of transportation equipment has tripled since 1947, but this is not enough. Even though the transportation industry in 1965 was representing $1 out of every $5 we produced, our problem was not solved. Solutions to counteract the imbalance between population and the means of public transport involve more than increasing the already high proportion expended by the transportation system in the American economy.

The Mass Transportation Act of 1964 was the beginning of a promising solution. It was the beginning of concentrated attention to urban problems; perhaps, even the birth of a new era. Our newly enacted Public Law 89-562 extends the program we began 2 years ago. It is intended to aid public and private transportation companies in improving existing facilities and to add new services.

The most important phase, however, centers on the funds put aside for research and development. Part of this program provides fellowships to encourage young men and women to train for professional work in this field. Exactly what types of professionals do we need? We do not know, but we shall find out.

We do not expect the $300 million provided in this bill for 1968 and 1969 to solve our urban transportation problems, but these efforts constitute a gigantic stride forward.

AUTOMOBILE AND HIGHWAY SAFETY

This past August the Senate and House authorized the establishment of Federal motor vehicle safety standards which direct the Secretary of Commerce to establish interim Federal standards by the end of this coming January. These standards will then be revised when more time and information is available to study the feasibility of these temporary standards. The standards will apply to all new vehicles, domestic and foreign. They will also cover equipment—including tires.

Tire safety emphasis is an essential portion of our legislative directives. We have decided that explanatory labeling is necessary. A uniform grading system for all tires will go into effect shortly. The development of tires meeting future standards will not be an easy task. In addition to carrying out the directives in setting up evaluation standards, the Secretary of Commerce has been directed to study the need for a Federal research project on tire safety, and to expand the National Driver Register to include the names of individuals reported to him by the States as having been denied drivers' licenses. This will better enable us to free our highways of the few citizens among us who are unable to drive in a reasonable manner and thus endanger us all.

The bill, Public Law 89-563, authorizes the following expenditures:

For the vehicle standards function, $11 million for fiscal 1967, $17 million for fiscal 1968, and $23 million for fiscal 1969 as the standards become more and more applicable and effective. It provides $2.9 million in 1967 and $1.45 million each in the following 2 years for tire safety functions. To provide for the future, and attempt to assure ourselves of continuous coordination of our efforts in these areas we have set aside $3 million for research.

But highway construction and design must also be coordinated with our auto safety procedures. The Highway Safety Act of 1966 authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to assist States in carrying out comprehensive highway safety programs. This legislation provides that at least 40 percent of the Federal safety grants to States must be expended by local subdivisions in carrying out local programs related to the statewide program and it authorizes the Secretary to conduct highway safety research projects through Federal agencies or by grants.

This legislation, Public Law 89-564, authorizes general fund appropriations for the highway safety program of $67 million in fiscal 1967 and $100 million in each of the fiscal years 1968 and 1969. It authorizes general fund appropriations for research of $10 million in 1967, $20 million in 1968, and $25 million in 1969.

Each of the automobile safety acts attempts to reconcile the differing needs and views of the industries and agencies involved. Guidance from all areas is sought.

The Traffic Safety Act of 1966—Public Law 89-563—directs the Secretary of Commerce to establish an advisory committee with a majority of members from the public and the others representing industry. The Secretary will consult with them as he formulates his vehicle standards.

A National Highway Safety Advisory Committee is also established. It is to be composed of the Secretary, or his designee as Chairman, the Federal Highway Administrator, and 29 members appointed by the President. Of these 29, 4 may be Federal officials, and the remainder must be selected from representatives of States and local governments, public and private interests, and specialists in the field.

Thus provisions have been made to establish direct working relationships with the departmental representatives charged with execution of the new acts and with representatives of those affected. By joining together all of the talent and resources available at the governmental, industrial, and personal levels, we hope to substantially improve automobile safety.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY AUTHORIZATION

Recognizing the continuing problems of motor vehicle transportation, the Congress this session enacted the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966 which authorizes a total of $19,236,200,000 in appropriations for highway construction in the fiscal years 1968 to 1972. Of the total authorized, a little more than $17 billion was earmarked for the Interstate Highway System in the 4 fiscal years 1968 to 1972. The bill also provided the regular authorization for construction of Federal-aid, primary, secondary, and urban roads. The sum of $2 billion is contained in the bill for this purpose in fiscal years 1968 and 1969.

The bill also extended authorizations for the Interstate Highway System through fiscal 1972, a 1-year extension. In addition it specified that all interstate highways shall contain at least four traffic lanes and directed the Secretary of Commerce to modify existing project agreements in order to enable him to carry out this requirement. Further, the bill authorizes 100-percent Federal financing of repair or reconstruction of damage occurring to parkways, public highways, and public lands development roads and trails which occur as the result of floods, hurricanes, earthquakes, and other disasters over a wide area.

NATURAL RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

In both 1965 and 1966 the 89th Congress acted strongly to enact urgently needed legislation to protect and promote the natural resources of our great country.

In both years we passed important and far-reaching legislation designed to increase the water pollution control activities of the Federal Government. Last year we passed the Water Quality Act of 1965—Public Law 89-234—which was a dynamic step forward in the control of water pollution. That bill established the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. A Presidential reorganization plan which became effective earlier this year, transferred the Water Pollution Control Administration to the Department of the Interior and made that Department responsible for all of the Federal Government's major water resource activities. Under the Water Quality Act, the States are required to set up satisfactory water quality standards for waters within the State boundaries. Provisions were also included in the bill for matching Federal grants to local governmental agencies in order that better techniques for preventing the discharge of sewage and other wastes into community water supplies may be evolved. A matching grant program for construction of sewage treatment facilities was also included in the bill.

This year, we enacted the Clean Waters Restoration Act of 1966, which increases to a total of $3.4 billion for fiscal years 1968 to 1971, the amount of Federal funds authorized for grants to communities for construction of sewage treatment plants.

This figure is broken down as $450 million for fiscal year 1968, $700 million for fiscal year 1969, $1 billion for fiscal year 1970, and $1,250 million for fiscal year 1971. The dollar limitation on individual grants and combined grants has been done away with, and in all cases the amount authorized for the Federal share of a project is 30 percent of the total cost. If a State agrees to match 30 percent of the total cost of an individual or combined project, the Federal share is increased to 40 percent and the municipal share, in turn, becomes 30 percent. A further increase in the Federal share will be made if the State establishes intrastate standards covering streams flowing wholly within its boundaries.

The Clean Waters Restoration Act amends existing legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make grants to States, municipalities, or intermunicipal or interstate agencies for the purpose of assisting and developing projects to demonstrate new or improved methods of controlling the discharge of untreated or inadequately treated sewage into storm sewers. The Secretary is also authorized to make grants to industries for research and demonstration projects for prevention of pollution of water by industry, including the treating of industrial waste.

However, these two acts were not the only embodiments of congressional concern for protection and development of our water resources. Public Law 89–80, the River Basin Planning Act, created a water resources council composed of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Interior, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Army, as well as a Chairman appointed by the President, whose purpose will be to conduct a continuing study and periodic assessment of the adequacy of regional water supplies. We enacted Public Law 89–118, which extends the life of the national saline water program through fiscal year 1972 and which authorizes a maximum of $275 million for the program during that period. The Federal Water Projects Recreation Act recognizes the importance of the inclusion of fish and wildlife enhancement measures in Federal water resource planning. Under the terms of that act, the Federal Government assumes a portion of the cost of project operations at fish and wildlife enhancement sites on Federal projects.

In order to provide for the water needs of generations to come, we have enlarged the scope of the Water Resources Act of 1964. We have authorized the expenditure of $85 million over a 10-year period to support various research agencies and groups. This act, Public Law 89–404, is another step forward in our long-range efforts to combat pollution and maintain a usable and adequate water supply. We have also enacted Public Law 89–561, which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource development proposals.

AIR POLLUTION

This Congress has been alert to the problems of air pollution and has worked in both sessions to expand efforts to reduce and eliminate contamination of the air we breathe. In 1965, the Congress enacted legislation authorizing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish workable standards for the control of dangerous substances from new motor vehicles. Included in the air pollution control legislation was provision for a nationwide research and development program designed to advance our methods of disposing of solid waste materials. Excluded from coverage of this legislation were polluting agents found in our Nation's water resources. Last year, appropriations of $10 million were authorized for 1966, $20 million for fiscal year 1967, $30 million for fiscal year 1968, and $32.5 million for fiscal year 1969.

This year, in mid-October, the Congress approved a bill expanding the existing programs for combating air pollution authorized under the Clean Air Act of 1963. The bill passed by Congress this year authorizes a new program of grants to State, local, and regional air pollution control agencies to help them maintain pollution control programs. These maintenance grants are designed to supplement the existing program of grants for developing, establishing and improving air pollution control programs. Removed from existing law was the provision that no more than 20 percent of the total amount appropriated under the Clean Air Act each year can be used for grants to support State, local, and regional air pollution control activities. Also this year, we combined the authorization sections in the existing law and set the total authorization for all programs and activities under the Clean Air Act at $46 million for fiscal year 1967, $66 million for fiscal 1968, and $74 million for fiscal 1969.

RIVERS, HARBORS, AND FLOOD CONTROL

The 89th Congress, in both its sessions, met its responsibilities to the Nation in the field of navigation, flood control, hydroelectric power, and beach erosion control. In both sessions, the Congress enacted rivers, harbors, and flood control legislation which allowed for the continued development of our natural resources. In 1965, the Congress authorized a total of $1,982,305,000 in funds for 47 navigation betterment projects, 9 land and beach stabilization programs, and 84 flood control undertakings. This year, in the waning days of the session, we enacted an omnibus bill authorizing $670 million for 42 projects.

OCEANOGRAPHY AND MARINE STUDY

The Congress this session realized that we have not yet begun to know or utilize the many resources which exist in the seas around us. While we have begun to exploit some of these resources, there is still a vast depth to be explored and vast fields to be harvested. The challenge of making sea water useful, minerals obtainable, seaweed and fish edible, and developing ocean bottom vehicles, are all significant and worthy challenges.

We know we have not yet begun to use these resources. There are 20,000 known species of fish, but only a few are sought as food. We took a significant step forward by funding roughly $136 million in fiscal year 1965 for the conduct of research, ship operations, the training of new staff, plus the construction of additional ships and shoreside facilities, but this was not enough.

This year the 89th Congress took another stride forward. The Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act—Public Law 89–454—is designed to further ocean engineering and exploration; expand the marine science and technology programs; intensify development and utilization of the ocean, Continental Shelf, and Great Lakes resources.

Under the terms of this act, a National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development is established within the Executive Office of the President. The Council will be responsible for the coordination of Federal activities relating to the marine sciences. We have also provided for the establishment of a 15-member Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources and challenged it to undertake a comprehensive survey of "all aspects of marine science" and make appropriate recommendations.

The unrealized potential of the sea to contribute to our national interest is becoming more accessible. The ocean's resources, its potential contributions, include: sea-based deterrents to enhance national security; fish protein to feed the undernourished peoples; minerals and fossil fuels to supplement continental reserves; expanded seashore recreational resources; and data to improve weather forecasting; the ocean, indeed, has become an available laboratory of natural diversity.

These vast opportunities—the chemicals the minerals, the protein, the data—must be exploited now. In the words of President Johnson as he stressed the challenges facing the world in a White House ceremony this year:

> So many sick to be cured.
> So many hungry to be fed.
> So many hopeless people to be given a helping hand.

The Congress also passed the National Sea Grant College and Program Act of 1966. This innovative measure offers a program of Federal grants to promote the development of marine resources. The National Science Foundation will disburse funds, either by grant or through contract, to higher educational institutions. Recipients of these grants or contracts would be known as sea grant colleges. The recipient institutions will be those which already conduct major oceanographic programs. The aid they receive under this bill will enable them to increase their work in this field, establish programs to disseminate marine information, and train marine technologists—$10 million is authorized for this new program in fiscal year 1967 and $15 million in fiscal year 1968.

AGRICULTURE

The 89th Congress acted strongly to maintain its commitment to American farmers. In both sessions we enacted legislation which will assist farmers in attaining and maintaining their rightful place in modern society. This Congress has given its support to President Johnson and his policies, which seek to gain parity of income and parity of opportunity to farm families throughout the Nation.

In the first session we enacted the 4-year omnibus farm program which combines income and price support programs with acreage allotments and land diversion measures. This 4-year program is aimed at establishing a workable relationship between the supplies of farm commodities and both foreign and domestic demand. This program, passed last year, was designed to assist wheat producers, cottongrowers, feed grain producers, wool producers, and ricegrowers. It also contained a provision providing for a 4-year program of land retirement.

Last year we also enacted Public Law 89–12, which effected needed changes in marketing quota procedures for American tobacco growers. Acreage-poundage quotas were provided in place of then existing acreage allotments.

The Congress also revised, and extended through December 31, 1971, domestic and foreign sugar quotas. We increased domestic mainland cane and beet sugar quotas and granted foreign quotas to 31 nations. This program guarantees the American consumer of an adequate supply of sugar at reasonable prices. In addition, it plays a most important role in American foreign relations, particularly with those countries who are members of the Alliance for Progress.

Apparently natural disasters are inevitable. Floods, hurricanes, earthquakes, and tornadoes will always threaten us. Twenty-four States asked for and received disaster declarations during fiscal 1965, and the total allocation for last year was over $78 million.

Sometimes, however, our present laws need to be changed in order to permit us to provide assistance to those just on the fringe of being able to benefit from the present programs.

Many disasters occur during planting time and during the time just preceding the actual planting. Our new legislation, Public Law 89–451, will provide farmers who are prevented from planting their crops of wheat, food grains, or cotton by a natural disaster the same opportunity to plant alternate crops now accorded farmers whose crops are destroyed "after" they are planted.

Those faced by disaster will also be able to obtain greater help from the Small Business Administration. The 89th Congress has increased the ceiling on loans and outstanding commitments for the regular business loan program as well as the disaster loan program and the loans previously made available from the Economic Opportunity Act. This legislation, Public Law 89–409, also increases the total amount which may be appropriated to the present revolving fund and establishes two additional revolving funds—one for disaster loans without an authorization ceiling and another to finance other SBA lending programs.

Our deliberations have turned to providing for the needs of our cottongrowers. We know that ever since World War II, U.S. cotton and cotton products have been confronted with intensive competition in the marketplace. This competition has come from foreign-grown cotton and from other fibers, primarily manmade fibers. The manmade fiber marketing research and techniques have not been matched by cotton research and promotion. Our new legislation—Public Law 89–502—will enable our cottongrowers to finance a nationwide cotton research and promotion program if they so desire.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Almost constantly since the early days of our country's history, Congress has been charged with the care and governing of the District of Columbia. This year we have turned our attention to the educational needs of our citizens residing in Washington by authorizing two new schools—one a 4-year college and the other a technical college.

The 4-year liberal arts school is to be called the Federal City College and will eventually provide instruction for about 4,000 students, with some enrolled in a 2-year junior college program. It will be governed by a nine-member board appointed by the District Commissioners.

Washington Technical Institute will be the name of the vocational school and we expect it to enroll 2,500 students. It will also have a nine-member governing board but its members will be appointed by the President with six of these nine members representing industry.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will enable the residents of the Nation's Capital to obtain higher education at modest tuition rates. It represents another step forward in our search to make educational opportunities available to all our citizens, and we can all take pride in being part of the body voting unanimously for this educational advancement.

In other action affecting the District of Columbia, we approved amendments to the District of Columbia-Maryland-Virginia compact on high-speed transit which provide for the creation of the Washington Area Metropolitan Transit Authority. Establishment of this areawide authority will allow cohesive and comprehensive planning of mass transit systems throughout the Washington area. The planning will eventually lead to high-speed mass transportation systems from the outlying suburbs into the central city area within the District of Columbia.

In other action, the Congress broadened the coverage under the District of Columbia Minimum Wage Act. The minimum wage will be increased in steps from its present $1 per hour to $1.25 per hour February 1, 1967. It will then be increased to $1.60 an hour February 1, 1969. This bill also improves the overtime provisions of the existing act.

MINE SAFETY

Congress in this session acted on two important bills designed to improve the working conditions and safety standards for mines operated in the United States.

In late August, the Congress adopted the Federal Metal and Nonmetallic Mine Safety Act. This bill directed the Secretary of the Interior to develop mandatory health and safety standards for the mining of metal and nonmetallic substances. Exempted from the coverage of this particular act were mines which produce coal and lignite and mining operations in which minerals are extracted in liquid form unless the type of operation requires underground workers. The bill provides for Federal and, in certain instances, State inspection to determine if the standards as set up by the Secretary are being complied with by the mine owners and operators. This act also establishes a five-member Federal Metal and Nonmetallic Mine Safety Board of Review. This Board will have the power to hear appeals from mine owners on orders closing mines or setting a deadline for compliance with standards.

We also extended the provisions of the 1962 Federal Coal Mine Safety Act to include small coal mines—those employing fewer than 15 persons underground—which were previously exempt from the provisions of the act. This act, Public Law 89–376, affects about 7,000 small mine operators. It brings to many thousands of miners the protection of the Coal Mine Safety Act which was previously denied them.

FOOTBALL MERGER

In the last hours of the second session, the Congress adopted an amendment to the investment tax credit suspension bill which exempts the proposed merger of the National Football League and the American Football League from prosecution under existing antitrust laws. The amendment provides that the exemption from prosecution under the antitrust laws is contingent upon expansion of the new league which will be formed by the merger of the two existing leagues to include more teams than had participated in the two separate leagues.

This measure represented the concensus of the Congress in the closing days of a long and hard-working session.

ELECTION FUNDS

To the Foreign Investors Tax Act of 1966, another bill considered by the Congress in its closing hours, we added a new and different plan to provide for the financing of presidential elections with Federal funds. Under this amendment, the Presidential Elections Campaign Fund is established. It provides that taxpayers each year may allocate $1 of their income tax for expenses of the next presidential campaign. Contributions under the plan would be evenly divided between the two major parties, but could not exceed actual expenses of the parties or $1 times the number of votes cast for the two presidential candidates in the previous election, minus $10 million.

Minor parties are also protected by the legislation. If any minor party polled over 5 million votes for its presidential candidate, it could receive, in the next election, $1 for each vote over 5 million.

Expenditures made by political parties in accordance with this legislation would be audited by the General Accounting Office.

The Foreign Investors Tax Act itself, is designed to induce additional foreign investment in U.S. stocks and bonds by providing more equitable tax treatment of foreign investments. In addition, the bill tightens a number of tax loopholes which, in the past, had permitted foreigners to escape the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. This measure, upon which the Congress agreed in the final moments of an arduous and demanding legislative session, does maintain its original purpose of providing investment incentives.

Another enactment of the first session of this Congress of overriding public concern is the Voting Rights Act of 1965. This bill was the latest in a series of legislative enactments which have taken place since the adoption of the 15th amendment to the Constitution in 1870.

The act we passed last year is directed to efforts which have been undertaken to disenfranchise American-Negro citizens. I outlined the provisions of this measure in some detail in my report on the 1st session of the 89th Congress. I mention it again here because of its position as one of the highlights of this monumental and historic Congress.

COSTS

The following agency appropriations are for the 1966 fiscal period: Agriculture, $6,242,929,500; Defense, $46,887,163, 000; Federal contribution of $46,122,000 to the approved $360,228,500 budget for the District of Columbia; $14,246,167,800 for the independent offices; $1,212,739,070 for the Department of the Interior; $8,011,331,500 for Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare; $189,993,297 for the legislative branch; $2,057,597,150 for State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary; $7,669,444,000 for the executive offices, Treasury, and Post Office Departments; $3,218 million for economic and military assistance programs and $714,188,000 in related foreign aid programs; $1,756,635,000 for the construction of military family housing units; $1,223,181,500 in supplemental funds for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare; $4,292,866,500 for public works; and general supplemental moneys totaling $4,741,644,602 to finance many of the proposals approved by the 89th Congress during its 1st session.

The following agency appropriations are for the 1967 fiscal period: Agriculture, $6,994,590,150; Defense, $58,067,472,000; Federal contribution of $53,394,000 to the District of Columbia; $14,065,851,000 for the independent offices; $1,321,615,800 for the Department of the Interior; $10,463,244, 500 for Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare; $214,463,913 for the legislative branch; $2,347,826,600 for State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary; $7,196,429,135 for the executive offices, Treasury, and Post Office Departments; $2,936,490,500 for economic and military assistance programs and $556,983,000 for related foreign aid programs; $979,570,000 for military construction; $4,134,511,000 for public works; and general supplemental moneys totaling $5,025,264,579 to finance many of the proposals approved by the 89th Congress during the 2d session.

Mr. Speaker, while this report has detailed the major accomplishments of the 89th Congress in its 2 historic years, it cannot, and does not seek to be, totally comprehensive. I would summarize our major enactments in this manner: Last year we provided a medical care-social security program, already in effect, enabling us to assure humanitarian help for our elderly; a special Administration on Aging to coordinate programs designed to revitalize our older citizenry; elementary-secondary education measures without precedent in emphasis or in structure; new funds and impetus to adult education and extension programs under the Higher Education Act; health hazard labeling protection to aid the consumer; correctional and general rehabilitation emphasis; metropolitan area assistance through the establishment of a new Department of Housing and Urban Development; the Appalachian Regional Development Act to invigorate and provide opportunity for the less fortunate among us; a Public Works and Economic Development Act to further wage war against the cycle of poverty and economic stagnation; assurance that all citizens are inherently endowed with certain voting rights; provisions for the bearing of responsibility should a President become disabled; a more workable relationship between farm produce supplies and projected demands; intensified studies in saline water conversion; air pollution abatement efforts; a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities; and emphasis on the value of landscapes unmarred by waste and other unnecessary disfiguration.

This year we turned our attention to these and other matters and enacted an entirely new and creative approach for metropolitan area aid through the enactment of demonstration cities legislation and transportation department authorization; numerous additions to our well-known national park system including authorization for several new national seashores; fund authorization for library construction and making educational materials more accessible to the isolated or disabled; expanded efforts in scientific research to permit all mankind to benefit from the progress we can obtain from knowing outer space and ocean depths; emphasis on water research projects to enable us to leave a legacy to future generations and provide for present needs; a flexible economic policy to assure our domestic stability and security; funds to support our commitments in Vietnam as well as considerable deliberation over our present policy; aid to our sister nations through our food-for-freedom legislation; and the establishment of a new program of international financial cooperation—the Asian Development Bank.

Mr. Speaker, many of these items mentioned in the two preceding paragraphs have been discussed in detail in this report. Others have been mentioned only briefly and more detailed discussions of them will be found in the report I presented to the Congress at the conclusion of the 1st session of the 89th Congress. Mr. Speaker, this has indeed been a "fabulous" session of Congress. All of us can be, and should be, proud of its accomplishments. As I said at the outset, its work stands as a monument to every person who has been a Member of this historic Congress.

"While America Sleeps—Foundations Crumble"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recommend as "must" reading for all Americans, a book which has just come off the press on the subject of immigration. This book, by Mary Barclay Erb, is entitled "While America Sleeps—Foundations Crumble," and may be obtained from the American Committee on Immigration Policies at 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. At the time of the passage of the 1965 amendments to the immigration law, those of us who opposed the amendments warned that the amendments would drastically change the heart of our immigration policy which had historically governed the admission of aliens; and that by adopting the first-come, first-served basis for immigration, the new law would provide for the admission of large numbers of aliens whose background and ideology might wholly be dissimilar to that of the overwhelming majority of Americans. Already we are witnessing the impact of the new law in the immigration flow and this impact, as pointed out by Mrs. Erb does not augur well for the future of this Nation. Although the book is sobering and will cause grave concern to all who read it, it ought to be in every library in America because it tells the truth as to what is happening now to our country as a result of the elimination of our immigration controls.

The President's Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I am enclosing in the RECORD at this point a list of contributors to the President's Club. The list has been compiled from the records of the Clerk of the House and shows contributions for the period June 1, 1966, to August 31, 1966.

The names have been arranged alphabetically by States.

This information supplements an earlier list of President's Club contributors inserted in the RECORD at page 21404 on August 31, 1966, and the President's Club of New York which was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for October 20, 1966, at pp. 28275–28292.

The list follows:

ARIZONA

Lewis W. Douglas, Southern Arizona Building, Tucson, July 13, 1966: $1,000.

CALIFORNIA

John Baluff, 121 E. 6th Street, Los Angeles, June 6, 1966: $1,000.

Cyril Magnin, 770 O'Farrell St., San Francisco, June 16, 1966: $1,400.

President's Club of California, 911 Foothill Rd., Beverly Hills, June 29, 1966: $5,000.

President's Club of California, 911 Foothill Rd., Beverly Hills, July 13, 1966: $30,000.

President's Club of California, 911 Foothill Rd., Beverly Hills, August 5, 1966: $12,500.

A. J. Rockwell, 111 Sutter Street, San Francisco, July 1, 1966: $1,000.

Walter H. Shorenstein, 111 Pine St., San Francisco, August 5, 1966: $3,500.

Kenneth Traude, 2832 Giant Road, San Pablo, June 6, 1966: $1,000.

Robert W. Walker, 114 Sausome St., San Francisco, July 1, 1966: $1,000.

COLORADO

Katherine Komfala, 607 Floral Ave., Canon City, June 16, 1966: $1,000.

Joseph K. Turecek, Byers, August 23, 1966: $1,000.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Clayton Burwell, 720 Federal Bar Bldg., Washington, D.C., July 15, 1966: $1,000.

True Davis, 2860 Woodlawn Avenue, Washington, D.C., July 28, 1966: $1,000.

Clyde T. Ellis, 2101 16th St., N.W., Washington, D.C., August 23, 1966: $1,000.

William L. Kohler, 1700 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., July 28, 1966: $1,000.

Joseph E. Mills, 1260 4th Street, N.E., Washington, D.C., August 12, 1966: $1,000.

Joseph J. O'Connel, 1001 Conn. Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C., July 28, 1966: $1,000.

FLORIDA

Arthur Courshon, 1701 Meridian Ave., Miami Beach, July 28, 1966: $1,000.

Linwood Willis, 411 East Monroe St., Jacksonville, July 22, 1966: $1,000.

GEORGIA

Wilfred J. Gregson, 622 Mortgage Guarantee Bldg., Atlanta, August 12, 1966: $2,500.

Eric Meyerhoff, 128 Habersham St., Savannah, July 22, 1966: $1,000.

ILLINOIS

Hugh Banner, 236 Ridgeland Avenue, Oak Park, June 10, 1966: $1,000.

Martin Gecht, 402 Sunset Lane, Glencoe, June 16, 1966: $1,000.

Andrew Machata, 5401 W. Shubert Ave., Chicago, June 6, 1966: $1,000.

Walter Murphy, 1937 Kennilworth Ave., Wilmette, June 10, 1966.

Clair Roddewig, 10128 S. Hoyne St., Chicago, June 6, 1966: $1,000.

Bernard Sack, 4950 Chicago Beach, Chicago, June 6, 1966: $1,000.

Alfred Shaw, One E. Wacker Dr., Chicago, July 13, 1966: $2,000.

IOWA

Andy Anderson, Denison, July 1, 1966: $1,000.

Mrs. Ramona Barry, Danbury, July 1, 1966: $1,000.

Carleton Beh, 832 Des Moines Bldg., Des Moines, July 1, 1966: $1,000.

E. C. Cappola, 934 Sixth St., Des Moines, July 1, 1966: $1,000.

R. J. Cashman, Charles City, July 1, 1966: $1,000.

John Chrystal, Coon Rapids, July 1, 1966: $1,000.

Hy Diamond, 934–6th Ave., Des Moines, July 1, 1966: $1,000.

Luther Glanton, 818–15th St., Des Moines, July 1, 1966: $1,000.

Kenneth Grandquist, 4108 Beaver St., Des Moines, July 1, 1966: $1,000.

John Grubb, 7400 Benton Drive, Des Moines, July 1, 1966: $1,000.

Max Guernsey, 415 Washington St., Waterloo, June 21, 1966: $1,000.

John Hanson, Manning, July 1, 1966: $1,000.

Harold Hughes, 2900 Grand Avenue, Des Moines, July 1, 1966: $1,000.

William Knapp, 4130 Beaver Ave., Des Moines, July 1, 1966: $4,000.

Allen Kroblin, 2125 Commercial St., Waterloo, July 1, 1966: $1,000.

Richard Levitt, 207 Ninth St., Des Moines, July 1, 1966: $1,000.

John Locher, 619 Highley Bldg., Cedar Rapids, July 13, 1966: $1,000.

R. Y. Long, 111–10th St., Des Moines, July 1, 1966: $1,000.

Gerald Mattox, Marshalltown, July 1, 1966: $1,000.

Max McCord, Indianola, July 1, 1966: $1,000.

Jake More, 419 Hotel Ft. Des Moines, Des Moines, July 1, 1966: $1,000.

H. C. Petersen, Mapleton, July 1, 1966: $1,000.

Joseph F. Rosenfield, 3500 Fleur Dr., Des Moines, July 1, 1966: $3,000.

Arthur Sanford, 1925 Summit St., Sioux City, July 1, 1966: $1,000.

William Wimer, 707 Central Nat'l Bank Bldg., Des Moines, August 23, 1966: $1,000.

Eldon Woltz, 4100 Oak Forest Dr., Des Moines, July 1, 1966: $1,000.

KANSAS

A. K. Blosser, Jr., 4100 Woodbury Court, Topeka, July 1, 1966: $1,000.

Floyd Breeding, P.O. Box 811, Elkhart, June 16, 1966: $1,000.

Ross Clemmons, 222 Westridge Drive, Topeka, June 21, 1966: $1,000.

Samuel Cohen, 4125 Gage Center Dr., Topeka, June 21, 1966: $1,000.

Norbert R. Dreiling, P.O. Box 367, Hays, July 13, 1966: $1,000.

Newell A. George, 1819 New Jersey St., Kansas City, July 28, 1966: $1,000.

Andrew Gray, Richland, June 21, 1966: $1,000.

Elmer Hoge, P.O. Box 4365, Overland Park, July 28, 1966: $1,000.

Robert Monroe, 6536 Grenada Drive, Prairie Village, June 21, 1966: $1,000.

Bruce Roberts, 201 Greenway Road, Salina, June 21, 1966: $1,000.

L. V. Thompson, 424 Westchester Rd., Topeka, July 1, 1966: $1,000.

MARYLAND

Charles Cavanagh, Jr., 2317 Arcola Avenue, Silver Spring, June 10, 1966: $800.

Charles Cavanagh, Jr., 2317 Arcola Avenue, Silver Spring, July 13, 1966: $200.

Joseph Goldstein, Cedar Beach Farm, Prince Frederick, June 24, 1966: $1,000.

Mark M. Mayers, 318 E. 25th St., Baltimore, July 28, 1966: $1,000.

Ed Melton, 9200 Rose Hill Dr., Bethesda, June 6, 1966: $1,000.

MASSACHUSETTS

Peter Cloherty, 12 South St., Brighton, June 21, 1966: $1,000.

Joseph Leone, Jr., 2 Powderhill Road, Methuen, July 22, 1966: $1,000.

Stanislaw Suchecki, 49 Franconia St., Dorchester, June 6, 1966: $1,000.

MICHIGAN

James Gerity, Jr., 121 West Maumee St., Adrian, August 12, 1966: $2,000.

James Livingston, 3107 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit: June 10, 1966: $1,000.

Malcolmn R. Stirton, 181 Lothrop Road, Grosse Pointe Farms, August 12, 1966: $1,000.

MISSOURI

Anthony Buford, 7 North Brentwood Blvd., Clayton, July 28, 1966: $1,000.

John Burke, 1242 Pierce Ave., St. Louis, July 28, 1966: $1,000.

James R. Downes, 4402 McPherson, St. Louis, July 28, 1966: $1,000.

John Lawler, 1242, Pierce St., St. Louis, July 28, 1966: $1,000.

Dan Long, 1242 Pierce Ave., St. Louis, August 12, 1966: $1,000.

John H. Lyons, 17 Devondale St., St. Louis, July 28, 1966: $1,000.

Joseph J. McGee, 4900 Oak St., Kansas City, August 12, 1966: $1,000.

Lloyd L. Ragsdale, 1904 Tower Grove, St. Louis, July 28, 1966: $1,000.

Mark Robeson, 92d at State Line, Kansas City, July 22, 1966: $1,000.

George Seaton, 1647 Hornsby St., St. Louis, July 28, 1966: $1,000.

Morris A. Shenker, 408 Olive St., St. Louis, July 28, 1966: $1,000.

Edward Steska, 6633 Tholozan St., St. Louis, July 28, 1966: $1,000.

MONTANA

Kenneth Knight, 111 W. Third St. N., Great Falls, June 7, 1966: $1,000.

NEBRASKA

John Atkins, 3820 California St., Omaha, July 1, 1966: $1,000.

Kenneth Clark, 1414 Sharp Building, Lincoln, June 29, 1966: $2,000.

Richard Drysdale, 173 S. 92d St., Omaha, July 1, 1966: $1,000.

John Mainelli, 8424 Loveland Drive, Omaha, July 1, 1966, $1,000.

John P. Munnelly, 5216 S. 38th St., Omaha, July 1, 1966: $1,000.

Julian Novak, 2525 Dody St., Omaha, June 21, 1966: $1,000.

W. A. Richardson, 1751 S. 87th St., Omaha, June 21, 1966: $1,000.

Theodore Richling, City National Bank Building, Omaha, June 21, 1966: $1,000.

Marvin Werve, Omaha National Bank, Omaha, June 21, 1966: $1,000.

Dick Youngscap, 1515 Sharp Building, Lincoln, June 29, 1966: $1,000.

NEW JERSEY

Elizabeth Seabrook, R.D. 1, Grissom Rd., Salem, July 15, 1966: $3,000.

John Seabrook, Bridgeton, July 16, 1966: $1,000.

Richard Switlik, 88 S. Main St., Allentown, August 12, 1966: $1,000.

Martin Weiner, 935 Allenwood Rd., Clifton, August 30, 1966: $1,000.

NEW YORK

Lester Avent, Time & Life Bldg., New York, July 13, 1966: $2,500.

Charles Bassine, 1 W. 34th St., New York, June 29, 1966: $5,000.

Mrs. Charles Bassine, 1 W. 34th St., New York, June 29, 1966: $5,000.

Robert Benjamin, 729 7th Ave., New York, June 16, 1966: $5,000.

George Bunker, 277 Park Avenue, New York, June 10, 1966: $1,000.

Milton R. Cohen, 200 E. 71st St., New York, June 24, 1966: $250.

Gardner Cowles, 488 Madison Ave., New York, June 24, 1966: $1,000.

David Fischoff, 162 Woodlawn Ave., New Rochelle, June 10, 1966: $2,500.

Mrs. David Fischoff, 162 Woodlawn Ave., New Rochelle, June 10, 1966: $2,500.

Jay Fischoff, 162 Woodlawn Avenue, New Rochelle, June 24, 1966: $1,200.

Richard Fischoff, 162 Woodlawn Ave., New Rochelle, June 24, 1966: $1,200.

Mrs. Eleanor Fitzsimmons, 60 E. 9th St., New York, July 28, 1966: $1,000.

George Frankel, 530 5th Avenue, New York, June 16, 1966: $5,000.

William Goldfine, 40 East 84th St., New York, June 24, 1966: $250.

Mrs. Ester Kay, 857 Fifth Avenue, New York, June 16, 1966: $2,500.

Manny Kay, 857 Fifth Avenue, New York, June 16, 1966: $2,500.

Edward Kean, 189–02 64th Avenue, Fresh Meadows, Queens, June 24, 1966: $100.

Arthur Krim, 729 Seventh Avenue, New York, June 16, 1966, $2,500.

Mrs. Mathilde Krim, 729 Seventh Avenue, New York, June 16, 1966: $2,500.

Mary Lasker, 29 Beekman Place, New York, June 7, 1966: $3,000.

Robert Lehman, 1 William Street, New York, June 21, 1966: $5,000.

Francis Levien, 200 Park Avenue, New York, June 16, 1966: $2,500.

Joseph Levy, 20 Broad Street, New York, June 7, 1966: $5,000.

Norman F. Levy, 1160 Park Avenue, New York, June 24, 1966: $500.

Joseph Love, 1333 Broadway, New York, June 24, 1966: $1,660.

William Luddy, 58 Gedney Park Dr., White Plains, June 7, 1966: $1,000.

Edward J. Mallin, 295 Madison Avenue, New York, June 24, 1966: $250.

Andre Meyer, 44 Wall Street, New York, June 7, 1966: $2,500.

Richard Meyro, 24 Westbrook Road, Kings Point, June 24, 1966: $1,000.

Mrs. Richard Meyro, 24 Westbrook Road, Kings Point, June 24, 1966: $1,000.

Joseph N. Pagliaro, 3 East 54th St., New York, June 24, 1966: $500.

Robert H. Pines, 2011 Ocean Avenue, Brooklyn, August 5, 1966: $1,000.

Meshulum Riklis, 711 Fifth Avenue, New York, July 15, 1966: $5,000.

Robert Simon, 941 Park Avenue, New York, June 6, 1966: $3,000.

Mrs. Robert Simon, 941 Park Avenue, New York, June 6, 1966: $2,000.

Herbert Singer, 10 E. 56th Street, New York, June 29, 1966: $3,000.

Stanley Stahl, 277 Park Avenue, New York, June 24, 1966: $500.

Ralph Stolkin, Hotel Carlyle, New York, June 21, 1966: $5,000.

Alfred Streslin, 595 Madison Avenue, New York, June 7, 1966: $2,500.

Mrs. Alfred Streslin, 595 Madison Avenue, New York, June 7, 1966: $2,500.

Sylvan Tizian, 202 East 44th Street, New York, June 6, 1966: $1,000.

Louis Weintraub, 635 Madison Avenue, New York, July 28, 1966: $1,000.

Mrs. Louis Weintraub, 635 Madson Avenue, New York, July 28, 1966: $1,000.

Mrs. E. Weisl, 120 Broadway, New York, June 6, 1966: $2,500.

Edwin Weisl, 120 Broadway, New York, June 6, 1966: $2,500.

NORTH CAROLINA

Dwight Phillips, 308 West Palmer Street, Charlotte, July 15, 1966: $1,000.

Asa Spaulding, 1608 Lincoln Street, Durham, August 5, 1966: $250.

OHIO

John Bentia, 2043 South Union Street, Alliance, July 28, 1966: $1,000.

Thomas J. Burke, 7778 Rock Hill Lane, Cincinnati, August 30, 1966: $1,000.

Joe Kanter, 690 Northland Road, Cincinnati, June 24, 1966: $1,000.

William C. Stafford, 2 Stanley Lane, Cincinnati, July 28, 1966: $1,000.

Ben D. Zevin, 502 Capital Bank Bldg., Cleveland, August 5, 1966: $1,000.

OKLAHOMA

George Blake, P.O. Box 708, Ponca City, July 28, 1966: $1,000.

OREGON

Kenneth Kadow, 2041 S.W. 58th Avenue, Portland, June 6, 1966: $1,000.

Jim Mitchell, 2300 N.W. 30th Avenue, Portland, June 6, 1966: $1,000.

PENNSYLVANIA

Dayl Dockey, Berwick, August 5, 1966: $1,000.

John F. Dockey, Berwick, August 5, 1966: $1,000.

Richard L. Dommel, 1172 South State Street, Ephrata, August 5, 1966: $1,000.

Robert W. Dommel, 1174 South State Street, Ephrata, August 5, 1966: $1,000.

George Ewing, Jr., 611 Maplewood Road, Wayne, June 10, 1966: $1,000.

Robert Vincent, Jr., Benton, August 5, 1966: $1,000.

RHODE ISLAND

Howard Holmes, Turks Head Building, Providence, June 21, 1966: $1,000.

TEXAS

George Allen, 2527 Ross Avenue, Dallas, June 16, 1966: $250.

Lorin Allen, 65 McCall Avenue, Memphis, June 16, 1966: $1,000.

Adrian Barnes, P.O. Box 146, Killeen, June 16, 1966: $1,000.

C. J. Clark, 1802 N. Washington, Dallas, June 16, 1966: $250.

T. C. Clark, 12703 Preston Road, Dallas: $250.

Ted Connell, Box 666, Killeen, June 16, 1966: $1,000.

David H. Foster, 7440 Stonecrest, Dallas, July 13, 1966: $1,000.

R. H. Fulton, 4915 19th Street, Lubbock, June 21, 1966: $1,000.

E. Wilson Germany, P.O. Box 12266, Dallas, July 13, 1966: $1,000.

Paul Goode, P.O. Box 633, Killeen; June 16, 1966: $1,000.

A. J. Hall, 906 Oakhill Drive, Killeen, June 16, 1966: $1,000.

Tom Hanley, 5635 Yolanda Circle, Dallas, August 12, 1966: $1,000.

Stanley Hansen, P.O. Box 633, Killeen, June 16, 1966: $1,000.

D. E. Hughes, Jr., P.O. Box 45911, Houston, August 12, 1966: $1,000.

John Jones, Jr., 74 Huntley Drive, Houston, June 24, 1966, $1,000.

Henry C. Josey, 829 N. Rosemary, Bryan, July 28, 1966: $1,000.

Dee J. Kelly, Petroleum Bldg., Fort Worth, June 16, 1966: $5,000.

Walter Lacy, Jr., Citizens Natl. Bank, Waco, July 22, 1966: $1,000.

Zac Lentz, 1304 N. Navarro St., Victoria, June 24, 1966: $2,000.

Mrs. Zac Lentz, 1304 N. Navarro St., Victoria, June 24, 1966: $1,250.

W. W. Lynch, 2010 Fidelity Union Life Building, Dallas, July 13, 1966: $1,000.

Frank Mayborn, P.O. Box 868, Temple, June 16, 1966: $1,000.

Jack Morriss, 1104 W. Highway, Killeen, June 16, 1966: $1,000.

T. O. Murphy, 3224 20th St., Lubbock, August 30, 1966: $1,000.

J. D. Nyquist, 7440 Stonecrest Dr., Dallas, July 15, 1966: $1,000.

Robert Phillips, 3900 Pinedale Place, Tyler, June 6, 1966: $1,000.

Carl L. Phinney, 1st Natl. Bank Bldg., Dallas, July 13, 1966: $1,000.

Clark Potter, 316 N. 34th St., Killeen, June 16, 1966: $1,000.

J. H. Roberts, Jr., 4225 Shenandoah, Dallas, August 12, 1966: $2,000.

W. W. Roodhouse, 7440 Stonecrest, Dallas, July 15, 1966: $1,000.

Roy Smith, P.O. Box 937, Killeen, June 16, 1966: $2,000.

Robert Storey, 2700 Republic Bank Bldg., Dallas, June 6, 1966: $1,000.

J. B. Thomas, 1st Natl. Bank Bldg., Fort Worth, July 13, 1966: $1,000.

William Yowell, P.O. Box 605, Killeen, June 16, 1966: $1,000.

VIRGINIA

Henry A. Florence, 2317 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, June 13, 1966: $1,000.

MISCELLANEOUS

Angier B. Duke, American Embassy, Madrid, Spain, August 12, 1966: $1,000.

Jacques Wolfgang, 10 Rue Guillaume Tell, Geneva, Switzerland, August 5, 1966: $1,000.

"While America Sleeps—Foundations Crumble"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, there has recently come to my attention an excellent little book which portrays the impact of the 1965 amendments to the immigration law. This book, "While America Sleeps—Foundations Crumble," by Mary Barclay Erb, confirms the warnings which a few of us gave at the time of the passage of the 1965 law; namely, that it would result in a shift of our immigration stream from northern and western Europe to southern and eastern Europe, Asia, and Africa. Although the 1965 law has been in effect only a year, Mrs. Erb dramatically reveals the consequences which we are beginning to experience by the admissions in disproportionate numbers of aliens from countries which have customs, traditions, and ideology totally different from our own. I strongly recommend this book for all who are concerned with the future of our Nation. It may be procured at nominal cost from the American Committee on Immigration Policies, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Education Legislation—Short Summaries of Principal Provisions and Funding Actions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in response to numerous inquiries from senatorial offices requesting information about the actions taken on educational bills in the final days of the 2d session of the 89th Congress, I asked that the Office of Education prepare for me a brief résumé on the matter.

Since it can be most helpful to offices and since it will also be of assistance to many educational organizations and leaders, I ask unanimous consent that the résumé to which I have alluded be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the résumé was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1966 AS PASSED BY THE CONGRESS

I. Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 extended for 2 years.

A. TITLE I—EDUCATIONALLY DEPRIVED CHILDREN

1. $2,000 income level for FY 1967 and $3,000 for FY 1968. Add-on of 3 percent provided for territories.
2. Most recent AFDC data for FY 1967 and FY 1968.
3. One-half national average expenditure per pupil or one-half State average, whichever is larger, to be used in FY 1968.
4. Indian children in schools operated by the Department of the Interior are included for FY 1967.
5. All projects must involve an expenditure of not less than $2,500 unless excepted.
6. All facilities constructed must be usable by handicapped persons and works of art may be included in cost of construction.
7. In FY 1967 no grant may exceed 50 percent of a school district's previous year budget.
8. Migratory, neglected and delinquent, and foster children covered.
9. Incentive grants repealed.
10. Administrative expenses for State set at a maximum of 1 percent of amount authorized rather than 1 percent of amount paid under grants.
11. Maintenance of effort determined on basis of the second preceding fiscal year rather than FY 1964.

12. Authority for reallocation within States and between States granted.

13. National Advisory Council must report by January 31 rather than March 31 of each year.

14. Definition of "current expenditures" made more precise to conform with current practices.

15. Exemption of first $85 of income earned under projects supported by this Act for persons receiving payment under Aid to Families With Dependent Children.

16. One percent of grant to a school district, or $2,000, whichever is greater, may be used for planning.

B. TITLE II—LIBRARY RESOURCES AND TEXTBOOKS

1. Authorizations of $128,750,000 for FY 1967 and $154,500,000 for FY 1968, including territorial add-on of 3 percent.

2. Indian children in schools operated by the Department of Interior and children in Department of Defense schools overseas are included for FY 1967.

3. Provides for sharing of administrative money with local school districts and sets level for State at 5 percent of allocation or $50,000, whichever is greater.

4. Requires assessment by State from time to time of library and textbook needs.

5. Requires coordination of this title with programs funded under the Library Services and Construction Act.

C. TITLE III—SUPPLEMENTARY CENTERS AND SERVICES

1. Authorizations (including 3 percent add-on for territories) of $180,250,000 for FY 1967 and $515 million for FY 1968.

2. Indian children in schools operated by the Department of the Interior and children in Department of Defense schools overseas included for FY 1967.

3. Special consideration to be given after June 30, 1967, to school districts with critical construction needs.

4. Construction to be accessible by handicapped and cost of construction may include excellence in architecture and works of art up to 1 percent of total.

D. TITLE V—STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION

1. Authorizations of $30 million for FY 1967 and $50 million for FY 1968 provided.

2. Matching requirement eliminated.

3. Technical amendment on Personnel Interchange.

4. Demonstration and evaluation projects to insure continuation of benefits of Headstart and other preschool programs may be funded.

E. NEW TITLE VI—HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

1. Authorizes grants of $51,500,000 for FY 1967 and $154,500,000 for FY 1968 including 3 percent add-on for territories.

2. Allocation made on basis of number of children aged 3–21 inclusive.

3. Reallocation authority included.

4. State plan required.

5. State expenses of 5 percent of allocation or $75,000, whichever is greater, are allowed for administration. $25,000 for each of the territories.

6. National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children created.

7. Bureau for Education and Training of the Handicapped must be created by July 1, 1967.

F. TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. Dissemination of information authorized with $1,500,000 for FY 1967 and $2 million for FY 1968 provided.

2. Prohibition of any requirement for the assignment or transportation of teachers or students in order to overcome racial imbalance.

II. Limitation of 90 days on deferral process under compliance procedures of the Civil Rights Act.

III. Modification of Cooperative Research Act to provide authority for training in research.

IV. Federal Impact Aid:

A. P.L. 874—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

1. Liberalized basis of qualifying for aid to 3 percent of student population or 400 students.

2. Adjustments for reduction in State aid.

3. Reductions where local agency cannot or will not educate children living on Federal property.

4. Other minor or technical amendments.

B. P.L. 815—CONSTRUCTION

1. Extended benefits for "B" category children to June 30, 1967.

2. Made provisions for Indians living on reservations permanent.

3. Reductions where local agency cannot or will not educate children living on Federal property.

4. Provision for works of art and handicapped in construction plans.

5. Other minor or technical amendments.

V. Adult Education:

A. Cited as "Adult Education Act of 1966."

B. Transfers adult basic education program from OEO to OE.

C. Authorizes $40 million for fiscal year 1967 and $60 million for fiscal year 1968.

D. 10 percent to 20 percent of basic authorization may be used for special experimental demonstration projects and teacher training.

E. A National Advisory Committee on Adult Basic Education is created, to be appointed by the President.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act—Authorization for fiscal year 1966, authorizations as proposed by the administration for fiscal year 1967, and authorizations as passed by Congress for fiscal years 1967 and 1968

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1966	Administration bill authorization	As passed by Congress, fiscal year 1967	As passed by Congress, fiscal year 1968
Grand total	1,548,078	1,754,958	2,355,588	3,745,571
I. Amendments to Public Law 89–10 (total)[1]	1,151,000	1,548,658	1,825,588	3,167,571
A. Title I (total)[1] [2]	959,000	1,271,658	1,433,588	2,291,571
1. Basic formula (children from low-income families, handicapped children, migratory children)	959,000	1,271,658	1,363,962	1,879,000
2. ½ national average current expenditure as a minimum rate	0	0	0	342,945
3. Orphans and delinquents	0	0	28,416	28,416
4. Foster children	0	0	41,210	41,210
B. Title II	100,000	105,000	128,750	154,500
C. Title III	75,000	150,000	180,250	515,000
D. Title IV (cooperative research)	0	0	0	0
E. Title V	17,000	22,000	30,000	50,000
F. Title VI (handicapped)	0	0	51,500	154,500
G. Dissemination of information	0	0	1,500	2,000
II. Federally affected areas	397,078	206,400	0	0
A. Public Law 874	347,000	183,400	432,000	460,000
B. Public Law 815	50,078	22,900	58,000	58,000
III. Adult education	0	0	40,000	60,000

[1] Columns do not necessarily add to totals because of rounding.

[2] Does not include State administrative expenses—slightly more than 1 percent of the title I total.

HIGHER EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1966 AS PASSED BY THE CONGRESS

I. Three year extension of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963:

A. Authorizations:

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1968	Fiscal year 1969
Title I: Undergraduate facility grants	475	728	936
Title II: Graduate facility grants	60	120	120
Title III: Graduate and undergraduate facility loans	200	400	400

B. Changed Provisions:

1. Junior colleges will receive the following percentages of Title I funds: 22 percent in 1967, 23 percent in 1968, and 24 percent in 1969.

2. Title I funds may be used to pay the administrative expenses of Title VI (Equipment) of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

3. All facilities must be accessible to handicapped persons.

II. Developing Institutions program (Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965) was extended for two years with authorizations of $30 million for FY 1967 and $55 for FY 1968.

III. Title II (Student Loans) of the NDEA was amended to increase the authorization for FY 1968 to $225 million instead of $195 million. Authorization for FY 1967 would continue at $190 million.

100 percent loan cancellation extended to teachers of the handicapped. Teachers in the Trust Territory of the Pacific are made eligible for forgiveness.

The Administration proposals for modification of the financing procedures for Title II were rejected.

IV. The Guaranteed Student Loan Program, Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, was modified to allow every State to receive a minimal *annual* advance of $25,000, rather than $25,000 in the aggregate, as is presently authorized. A study to determine means of improving the guaranteed loan program was authorized and must be reported no later than January 1, 1968.

V. The D.C. Commissioners were authorized to establish a student loan guaranty program to meet the requirements of Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965.

VI. Maintenance of effort provisions were liberalized under Title II (Library) and Title VI (Equipment) of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

VII. Buildings must be accessible to handicapped and works of art may be included in cost of facilities up to one percent of total.

VIII. Planning grants to State Commissions to determine construction needs authorized.

IX. "Industrial arts" is added for purposes of equipment purchases under Title III of the NDEA beginning in FY 1968. $10 million added to the authorization for that year.

Comparison of authorizations—Higher Education Amendments of 1966, H.R. 14644

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Administration recommendation, 1967[1]	As passed by the House			As reported by the Senate			As passed by Congress		
		1967	1968	1969	1967	1968	1969	1967	1968	1969
Grand total	780,000	750,000	997,000	1,227,000	1,212,000	1,350,000	1,518,000	772,000	1,350,000	1,463,000
I. Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 (total)	(720,000)	(720,000)	(997,000)	(1,227,000)	(1,087,000)	(1,255,000)	(1,463,000)	(742,000)	(1,255,000)	(1,463,000)
A. Title I (total)	460,000	460,000	707,000	907,000	567,000	735,000	943,000	482,000	735,000	943,000
1. Public community colleges and technical institutes	99,660	99,660	154,000	198,000	140,000	182,000	234,000	104,500	167,440	224,640
2. Other undergraduate facilities	353,340	353,340	546,000	702,000	420,000	546,000	702,000	370,500	560,560	711,360
3. State commissions	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000
B. Title II, graduate facilities	60,000	60,000	90,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	60,000	120,000	120,000
C. Title III, loans	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	200,000	400,000	400,000
II. Higher Education Act of 1965: Title III, developing institutions	30,000	30,000	------	------	55,000	55,000	55,000	30,000	55,000	------
III. National Defense Education Act of 1958 (total)	30,000	------	------	------	70,000	40,000	------	------	40,000	------
A. Title II, student loan programs (total)[1]	(30,000)	------	------	------	(60,000)	(30,000)	------	------	30,000	------
1. Loans to students[2]	------	------	------	------	30,000	30,000	------	------	30,000	------
2. Loans to institutions[2]	30,000	------	------	------	30,000	------	------	------	------	------
B. Title III, equipment[3]	------	------	------	------	(10,000)	(10,000)	------	------	10,000	------

[1] The administration recommendation did not contain specific authorizations beyond fiscal year 1967.

[2] New obligational authority; present law authorizes $190 million in fiscal year 1967 and $195 million in fiscal year 1968.

[3] New obligational authority; present law authorizes $100 million for fiscal year 1967 and fiscal year 1968.

The International Education Act of 1966, H.R. 14643

In his speech before the bicentennial celebration of the Smithsonian Institution on September 16, 1965, President Johnson said he planned to recommend to Congress a broad and long-range plan of worldwide educational endeavor. To shape recommendations, he appointed a Task Force headed by Secretary of State Rusk; Secretary Gardner of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare served on this Task Force.

Twenty recommendations were contained in the President's Message to Congress on International Education and Health. Some changed existing legislative authority of several agencies. Ten were delegated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and three needed new legislative authority.

These were contained in the International Education Act of 1966, H.R. 14643, which passed the House of Representatives on June 6 and the Senate on October 13.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Title I—Grant programs for advanced and undergraduate international studies

This title authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide grants to colleges and universities, nonprofit organizations, and scholarly associations for two distinct programs in international studies.

The first would authorize the establishment, strengthening and operation of Centers of Advanced International Study on the graduate level. These centers will be national and international resources for research and training in international aspects of professional and other fields of study. Centers could concentrate either on specific geographical areas of the world or on particular fields or issues in world affairs which concern one or more countries, or on both. Single universities or consortia of institutions would be eligible for these grants.

The second part of Title I would authorize a wide variety of undergraduate programs, diffusing international studies to a wide segment of the undergraduate college enrollment in this country.

Grants would assist universities and colleges in planning and carrying out comprehensive programs to strengthen and improve undergraduate instruction. Programs are encouraged to include students from all parts of an institution, including professional schools in which over 60 percent of the U.S. undergraduates are enrolled. Sample programs suggested in the legislation include teaching, research, curriculum development; training of faculty members in foreign countries; expansion of foreign language courses; student work-study-travel; programs under which foreign teachers and scholars may visit institutions as visiting faculty, and finally, a Senate amendment to include programs of English language training for foreign teachers, scholars and students.

This title constitutes the core of the Administration's proposal and while it was amended slightly by the House Task Force on International Education headed by Congressman John Brademas, it was not changed substantially by the Senate Subcommittee on Education chaired by Senator Wayne Morse.

Title II—Amendments to existing legislation related to the International Education Act

The Senate added a variety of amendments in Title II to the House-passed version of H.R. 14643. These include:

1. Broadening and strengthening of existing Title VI of the National Defense Educational Act in three ways. This program has provided financial assistance to 61 colleges and universities which have a total of 98 Language and Area programs in foreign studies. First, the Senate removed the requirement in existing law dealing with "critical languages" to include instruction in French, German, Spanish and Italian. This amendment would also allow West European Studies. Second, the Secretary was authorized to make grants as well as contracts for Language and Area centers and, third, the NDEA Title VI program was placed under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare instead of the Commissioner of Education.

2. New coverage under Title XI of the National Defense Education Act added a program of Institutes in International Affairs for secondary school teachers. It authorized new appropriations to carry out this purpose; $3.5 million for Fiscal 1967 and $6 million for Fiscal 1968.

3. The Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 was changed to permit foreign students from less developed countries to exchange their currencies for U.S. dollars. This exchange would finance their study in the United States. It excludes countries where the U.S. has a surplus of local funds under Public Law 480.

4. Title IV-B of the Higher Education Act of 1965 was changed to extend the benefits of the Guaranteed Loan Insurance program to American students studying abroad.

Title III—Study of the "brain drain" of talent from developing countries

Accepted during floor debate in the Senate, an amendment by Senator Walter Mondale of Minnesota authorized $50,000 to allow the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct a study of the "brain drain" from developing countries to the U.S.

The study would cover recommended courses of action to reduce the drain from developing countries of professional persons and skilled specialists whose talents are urgently needed.

International Education Act of 1966 as passed in Senate

[In millions of dollars]

	1967	1968	1969
Title I: Grant programs	[1] 1	40	90
Title II:			
NDEA institutes	3.5	6	-----
Currency exchange for foreign students	-----	10	15
Title III: Study of "brain drain"	.05	-----	-----
Total	4.55	56	105

[1] Study.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education—Fiscal years 1966 and 1967 appropriations

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1966 appropriation	Fiscal year 1967			
		President's budget	House allowance	Senate allowance	Appropriation
Expansion and improvement of vocational education	253,441	250,791	290,041	272,291	278,016
Grants to States under Vocational Education Act of 1963	159,750	159,750	198,225	192,500	198,225
Grants to States under Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965	----------	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000
Grants to States and possessions under George-Barden and supplemental acts	49,991	49,991	49,991	49,991	49,991
Research and special project activities	17,750	17,750	22,025	10,000	10,000
Work-study program	25,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
Residential vocational schools	----------	3,500	----------	----------	----------
Vocational student loan assistance:					
Advances for insurance reserve funds	850	1,025	1,025	1,025	1,025
Interest payments on insured loans	100	775	775	775	775
Elementary and secondary educational activities	1,151,000	1,342,410	1,342,410	[1] 1,342,410	[1] 1,342,410
Assistance for educationally deprived children:					
Grants to local educational agencies	949,505	1,059,104	1,059,104	1,059,104	1,059,104
Grants for State administration expenses	9,495	11,306	11,306	11,306	11,306
Grants to States for school library materials	100,000	105,000	105,000	105,000	105,000
Supplementary educational centers and services	75,000	145,000	145,000	145,000	145,000
Strengthening State departments of education:					
Grants to States	14,450	18,700	18,700	18,700	18,700
Grants for special projects	2,550	3,300	3,300	3,300	3,300
Adult basic education	(2)	(2)	----------	(1)	(1)
Higher educational activities	[3] 229,923	443,900	433,900	403,900	413,900
Grants to States for community service and continuing education programs	10,000	20,000	10,000	5,200	10,000
Library assistance:					
(a) Strengthening higher education resources	10,000	25,000	25,000	19,800	25,000
(b) Grants for training in librarianship	1,000	3,750	3,750	3,750	3,750
(c) Research and demonstration projects	----------	3,550	3,550	3,550	3,550
(d) Strengthening college and research library resources	300	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
Grants for strengthening developing institutions	5,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000
Student assistance:					
(a) Educational opportunity grants:					
(1) Grants to higher education institutions	58,000	119,500	119,500	112,000	112,000
(2) Identification and encouragement of educational talent	2,000	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500
(b) Insured loans:					
(1) Advances for reserve funds	7,500	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
(2) Interest payments on insured loans	2,000	33,000	33,000	33,000	33,000
(c) Work-study programs	[3] 99,123	134,100	134,100	134,100	134,100
Teacher programs:					
(a) Fellowships for teachers	15,000	37,500	37,500	25,000	25,000
(b) Strengthening teacher education programs	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
Improvement of undergraduate instruction:					
(a) Grants to higher education institutions for acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling:					
(1) Television equipment	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500
(2) Other equipment	13,500	13,000	13,000	13,000	13,000
(b) Institutes	----------	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500
National Teachers Corps	9,500	31,272	----------	7,500	7,500
Student loan insurance fund	550	3,200	3,200	3,200	3,200
Higher education student loans	[3] 500	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
Vocational student loans	[3] 50	200	200	200	200
Higher education facilities construction	632,700	722,744	722,744	722,744	722,744
Grants for construction of facilities:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes	100,760	99,660	99,660	99,660	99,660
Other higher educational facilities	357,240	353,340	353,340	353,340	353,340
Grants for construction of graduate facilities	60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000
Construction loans	110,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Grants for State administrative expenses	2,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000
Technical services	2,700	2,744	2,744	2,744	2,744
Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (grants to States)	11,950	----------	11,950	11,950	11,950
Grants for libraries	55,000	57,500	76,000	57,500	76,000
Grants for library services	25,000	27,500	35,000	27,500	35,000
Grants for library construction	30,000	29,000	40,000	29,000	40,000
Interlibrary cooperation	----------	375	375	375	375
Specialized State services:					
State institutional services	----------	375	375	375	375
Services for physically handicapped	----------	250	250	250	250
Payments to school districts	388,000	183,400	416,200	416,200	416,200
Payments to local educational agencies	366,000	158,900	391,700	391,700	391,700
Payments to other Federal agencies	22,000	24,500	24,500	24,500	24,500
Assistance for school construction	50,078	22,937	22,937	22,937	22,937
Assistance to local educational agencies	41,870	12,317	12,317	12,317	12,317
Assistance for school construction on Federal properties	7,500	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
Payments for technical services	708	620	620	620	620
Defense educational activities	412,608	273,544	431,357	446,357	446,357
Student loans:					
Contributions to loan funds	179,300	34,187	190,000	190,000	190,000
Loans to educational institutions	1,600	----------	2,000	2,000	2,000
Cancellation of student loans	650	----------	----------	----------	----------
Instructional assistance:					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling:					
Grants to States	79,200	54,200	54,200	79,200	79,200
Loans to nonprofit private schools	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500
Grants to States for supervision and administration	7,500	7,500	7,500	7,500	7,500
Graduate fellowships	55,961	81,957	81,957	81,957	81,957
Guidance, counseling, and testing:					
Grants to States	24,500	24,500	24,500	24,500	24,500
Institutes for counseling personnel	7,250	7,250	7,250	7,250	7,250

See footnotes at end of table.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education—Fiscal years 1966 and 1967 appropriations—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1966 appropriation	Fiscal year 1967			
		President's budget	House allowance	Senate allowance	Appropriation
Advanced training:					
Language and area centers	11,200	12,700	12,700	12,700	12,700
Research	2,800	3,100	3,100	3,100	3,100
Educational media research	4,000	4,400	4,400	4,400	4,400
Grants to States for statistical services	2,250	2,250	2,250	2,250	2,250
Institutes	34,897	40,000	40,000	30,000	30,000
Educational improvement for the handicapped	25,500	32,600	32,600	32,600	32,600
Training grants	19,500	24,500	24,500	24,500	24,500
Research and demonstrations	6,000	8,100	8,100	8,100	8,100
Research and training	70,000	80,000	80,000	70,000	70,000
Research, surveys, and demonstrations	42,000	59,600	59,600	51,600	51,600
Construction and equipment grants for research facilities	20,000	12,400	12,400	12,400	12,400
Research and training	8,000	8,000	8,000	6,000	6,000
Educational research (special foreign currency program)	1,000	1,800	1,800	1,000	1,000
Research in foreign education	500	765	765	500	500
Training, research, and study grants	500	1,035	1,035	500	500
Foreign language training and area studies: Research, training, and studies	2,000	3,500	3,500	3,000	3,000
Salaries and expenses	[3] 30,136	[4] 41,563	39,095	33,000	35,150
(Number of positions)	(2,192)	[4] (2,740)	(2,537)	(2,139)	(2,472)
Civil rights educational activities	8,000	11,115	8,000	8,000	8,000
Institutes for school personnel and grants to school boards	6,275	9,650	6,535	6,535	6,535
Administration	1,725	1,465	1,465	1,465	1,465
(Number of positions)	(90)	(92)	(92)	(92)	(92)
Arts and humanities educational activities	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Instructional assistance:					
Grants to States	440	440	440	440	440
Loans to nonprofit private schools	60	60	60	60	60
Teacher training institutes	500	500	500	500	500
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (permanent): Grants to States	2,550	2,550	[5] 2,550	[5] 2,550	2,550
Promotion of vocational education, act of Feb. 23, 1917 (permanent): Grants to States	7,161	7,161	[5] 7,161	[5] 7,161	7,161
Total Office of Education appropriations	3,342,097	3,513,087	3,926,445	3,865,300	3,901,675
(Total number of positions)	(2,282)	(2,832)	(2,629)	(2,231)	(2,564)

---

[1] Maximum of $30 million and 35 positions for adult basic education to be funded within total of $1,342,410,000.

[2] $21,100,000 appropriated in 1966 and $30 million included in President's 1967 budget under Office of Economic Opportunity, and transferred to the Office of Education.

[3] Adjusted appropriation.

[4] Included $1,615,000 and 103 positions relating to civil rights compliance activities which were transferred to "Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary" under the House and Senate action and appropriation.

[5] Permanent appropriation not requiring congressional action.

OCTOBER 21, 1966.

Congressman Lindley Beckworth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with genuine regret for me and the Members of the House to note the departure from this great body of our very esteemed colleague and dear friend, Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH, of Texas, who has served in the Congress with outstanding distinction for many years.

Certainly there could be no more devoted, patriotic, or able representative of the people than LINDLEY BECKWORTH. His record here, since he first came to serve in these historic Halls, has been one of great achievement and complete fidelity to duty.

He has served his constituency, his great State, and our beloved Nation with admirable ability and a spirit of dedication, patriotism, and loyalty second to none. He has been a real leader and a most effective legislator, keenly aware of contemporary problems and ever zealous in pursuing viable solutions for them in the interest of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, certainly, no one who has ever served in this body could possibly excel him in his long, sustained, very able labors for the people, and his many long-continued, noteworthy contributions to our deliberations and to the cause of God and country, to which we are pledged.

I know of no man who ever served here who was more genuinely and deeply respected, admired, and loved by the Members of this great body, and indeed by all who had the high privilege of working with him in the many important tasks to which he was committed and has performed with the highest sense of responsibility and outstanding ability.

LINDLEY BECKWORTH is a man of charming, friendly personal qualities, a truly magnetic personality, a warm-hearted companion, a considerate, gracious, and loyal friend and a great American.

We will miss him very much in this body and I hope we will have the pleasure of seeing him frequently.

As he leaves us, I am happy and proud to note, to recognize, and to laud the unforgettable record of accomplishment that he has made while a Member of the House.

The people of his district and State and of the Nation itself have been fortunate indeed to have such a fine, distinguished, gifted gentleman and such an effective, sound, wise, humane representative serving them in the Halls of Congress as LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

I heartily congratulate him upon his fine service and wish for him and his devoted family all choicest blessings of continued good health, happiness, and peace for many years to come.

Association for Allied Military Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. MOELLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of the 89th Congress, it has been my honor to be affiliated with a group of men who have undertaken to initiate a befriending program for the thousands of allied servicemen from 50 nations who are visiting and studying at 100 installations throughout this country under the military assistance program.

After meeting with hundreds of these men in the last 2 years, I completely concur with Defense Secretary McNamara's summation of the situation when he stated before congressional committees in 1963:

> In all probability the greatest return on our military assistance investment—dollar for dollar—comes from the training of selected officers and key specialists in the United States schools and installations. These students are hand-picked by their governments; they are the coming leaders in their nations. It is beyond price to the United States to make friends of such individuals.

To this end, I have joined with Mr. Hollis W. Burt, Bethesda, Md.; Col. James W. Milner, Arlington, Va.; Mr. Frank W. Mueller, Falls Church, Va.; Mr. Randolph E. Stime, Seattle, Wash.; and Rev. C. Parker Wright, Paradise, Pa., in forming the Association for Allied Military Friends. As a nonprofit, tax-exempt organization under the laws of the District of Columbia, the association has been primarily involved in overall research as to where best the civilian community may assist the Department of Defense in providing these guests with adequate information and personal friendships which lead to a balanced understanding of our American way of life.

During this time it has been gratifying to find hundreds of community groups assisting the local commanding officers in this befriending process. I believe that such action symbolizes and makes practical the American concern for, and interest in, its friends and neighbors from all over the world. To open one's home to a stranger is to open one's heart to a neighbor. I find personal satisfaction in this form of simple, yet meaningful, expression of true hospitality.

In closing, I want to commend such action as another means of building a better world.

Mainstay of Maritime Industry Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, on October 21, last, the maritime industry lost one of its most effective advocates with the retirement of Monro B. Lanier from Ingalls Shipbuilding Corp.—a division of Litton Industries, Pascagoula, Miss.

Mr. Lanier helped organize the corporation in 1938 and became its first president. He served in that capacity until 1957 when he was elected vice chairman of the board.

When Litton Industries acquired the Pascagoula Shipyard in 1961, Mr. Lanier was named honorary vice chairman of the board, and at the time of his retirement he was serving as a member of Ingalls' board of directors and as special consultant to the president, Ellis B. Gardner.

Over the past quarter of a century Mr. Lanier has been prominent in a number of national maritime organizations promoting a strong merchant marine as a vital arm of the Nation's security program. He is a vice president of the Society of Naval Architects & Marine Engineers. The society awarded him the coveted Vice Admiral "Jerry" Land Medal in 1962 for his outstanding accomplishments in the marine field. He has served as a director of the Shipbuilders Council of America and as a national director of the Navy League of the United States. He has been a member of the Advisory Council on Naval Affairs, 6th Naval District, U.S. Navy, and vice president and director of the Atlantic, Gulf & Great Lakes Shipbuilding Association, and one of the governors of the American Bureau of Shipping.

Monro Bannister Lanier was born in Huntsville, Ala., December 9, 1886. He was educated at the University of Alabama and the University of the South.

After serving in a managerial capacity with various Alabama coal companies and with the Freeport Sulphur Co. he accepted a position in 1937 as executive vice president of Ingalls Iron Works Co., Birmingham, Ala., in charge of sales, procurement, and the development of a shipbuilding division, which led to the establishment of the Pascagoula, Miss., Shipyard.

The Ingall's Shipbuilding Corp. played a vital role during World War II in the construction both of Navy and merchant ships. It has recently been engaged in constructing fleet type nuclear submarines, amphibious ships, including a helicopter carrier, and LSD's for the Navy, a new exploratory vessel for the Fish and Wildlife Service, and automated merchant ships.

Monro Lanier has been a guiding spirit in the growth of Ingall's Shipbuilding Corp. and of the economic development of southeast Mississippi. He has been a good citizen both of my hometown of Pascagoula and of his adopted State of Mississippi. We will all miss him and the benefit of his counsel.

Mr. Speaker, for a job well done as a responsible citizen of the business community of Mississippi and of the Nation, I salute Monro B. Lanier and wish for him bon voyage in the years ahead.

Unusual Flag Is Patriotic Harvest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED REINECKE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House of Representatives to the amazing and patriotic accomplishment of my constituent, Mr. Theophile Casaubon, of Van Nuys, Calif. Mr. Casaubon, who is now 60 years old, began as a boy of 9 to make a replica of the American flag from 33,000 equal-sized kernels of golden wheat. Each kernel of wheat was dipped in special oil paint, then put in place with tweezers.

This amazing work of art has won many prizes, and has been on display in Los Angeles in the public library, in the chamber of commerce, and in recruiting offices of the armed services.

The late Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt commended Mr. Casaubon for his efforts, and the unusual flag has been featured in Ripley's "Believe It or Not."

I wish to commend Mr. Casaubon for his creative and patriotic efforts. This unusual flag is made from the golden grain which represents the natural resources of our country. The grain was then colored and formed into the flag. This combination of natural wealth and creative development by man is what has made America great. Mr. Casaubon's flag, a patriotic harvest for our inspiration.

Naming of James J. Nance, of Cleveland, as 1966 Banker of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I call attention to the fact that James J. Nance, chairman and chief executive of the Central National Bank of Cleveland, has been named Banker of the Year for 1966, at the 92d Annual Convention of the American Bankers Association in San Francisco by Finance magazine. The Banker of the Year Award described Mr. Nance as a man who had demonstrated vision and performance, the basic criteria of the award, and to these points I wish to attest.

Jim Nance is not only a banker; he has had a great career as an industrialist in the appliance and automobile manufacturing fields. It should be recognized that this Ohioan, Mr. Speaker, has also been a success as an effective worker in civic and public affairs.

He has won the 50 Famous Sons of Ohio Award, and the National Horatio Alger Award, the Governor of Ohio's Award for outstanding achievements in business and industry, and the Appliance Man of the Year Award. Indeed, James J. Nance is a leading citizen of Ohio and Cleveland. Further distinction can be placed upon him for his role in founding the organization and programs for the Ohio Research and Development Foundation, now a State agency. As its president Mr. Nance led the plans for Ohio in stimulating research and development activities among Ohio's industry. Further, Mr. Speaker, Jim Nance helped draft plans for the Greater Cleveland Growth Board to work for the industrial and commercial growth of Greater Cleveland. Since then both Mr. Nance and the Central National Bank have worked with the Growth Board for the industrial advancement and prosperity of Cleveland.

Mr. Nance could also be awarded a community vote of thanks, it is my feeling Mr. Speaker, for his community spirit in sponsoring telecasts of complete performances of the world famous Cleveland Orchestra. He also helped bring international tennis matches to his hometown. He merits praise and commendation for his recent decision to build a new $22 million bank building to inspire the rejuvenation of downtown Cleveland. Finally, Mr. Speaker, I could praise Jim Nance for his unstinting efforts, and one of his greatest goals in getting a $200 million State university started in the heart of downtown Cleveland. I believe, along with James J. Nance, as the Central National Bank's chairman, and also as the chairman of the board of trustees of the Cleveland State University, that the most important industry in the Nation is education.

I take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to recognize and pay tribute to a fine gentleman whose service to his community as a civic leader and in his professional capacity has deserved and won the recognition and gratitude of his fellow citizens. Mr. Nance is a man of great wisdom, who has an aptitude for penetrating the future. His perspicacity has been a challenge to his associates—he has not only devoted his efforts to present-day problems, he peers into the future and plans for our future generations. I am happy to salute my fellow Clevelander, Mr. James J. Nance, upon the addition of his newest award as Banker of the Year.

Southbridge Post Office Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein my remarks in part at dedication exercises of the enlarged and modernized post office at Southbridge, Mass.

REMARKS IN PART OF CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN AT DEDICATION OF NEW POST OFFICE BUILDING, SOUTHBRIDGE, MASS., MAY 29, 1966

It is a very high privilege, honor and pleasure for me to join you today for the dedication of this beautiful new Southbridge Post Office and I want to assure you that I deeply cherish the opportunity afforded me to participate in these very impressive dedicatory exercises.

Southbridge is a truly great American community with fine traditions, dynamic economy, efficient public services and officials, sterling leadership at every level in the public service, industry, and business and the professional ranks, and loyal devoted people who could not be excelled anywhere. This town is beautiful beyond measure, known far and wide for its progressive outlook and public spirit and its loyalty to spiritual ideals.

And in the person of our distinguished friend, Hon. Paul Benoit, it has a very able, outstanding postmaster, and very capable, experienced, dedicated postal employees whom we highly esteem.

I think we can all agree, therefore, that Southbridge is entitled to this beautiful new postal facility that we so proudly dedicate today to the use and for the benefit of Southbridge postal patrons and the general public.

I want to compliment the Committee, the Postmaster, and our great Post Office Department for arranging this fine program to dedicate this new building to the service of the postal patrons and the people of Southbridge.

In a festive spirit, we may well rejoice in the completion of this beautiful building, and I take special pleasure in expressing my heartiest congratulations, great satisfaction and deep gratitude to all those who joined in making this worthwhile project possible.

As you all well know, I am especially happy today to witness the fulfillment of this very meritorious postal project which we have sponsored and promoted for some time past. And in that sense, today is the fulfillment of our dreams and our plans, and I want to extend special appreciation and thanks to every individual and group who participated in making this new post office a reality—government and local officials, the architects and contractors, the workers and all those who contributed to this very happy result. We have a fine well constructed building—well designed to provide the postal facilities we need for local postal services.

At the same time, we must note that buildings, equipment, appurtenances alone, however modern and well implemented, do not meet the total needs of the patrons and the people who require postal services.

Most important of all, is the assurance we have of capable, efficient, experienced, faithful postal workers at every level who are so essential in making this building and these beautiful postal facilities the meaningful effective public agency that it is, and will be, to provide the many indispensable services which our great Post Office Department provides for the American people.

It is appropriate to note that this great Department, now headed by a valued friend and a distinguished son of Massachusetts, the Hon. Lawrence F. O'Brien, and implemented by so many able distinguished leaders at the regional and local level, and dedicated personnel at every level, is without doubt the most efficient, most outstanding postal system in the entire world.

Notwithstanding the many problems occasioned by increased population, our expanding economy, the advance of science, and the need for new techniques, and we will have to meet and face these problems, it should be clearly understood that we, in and out of the Congress, propose in behalf of the people to maintain this great postal system of ours at maximum efficiency and usefulness—keep its leadership vigorous and progressive, its personnel well paid, efficient and helpful, and this entire system—the greatest in the world—I repeat, given that support by the Congress and the people which it is entitled to enjoy.

This, then, is a great occasion for Southbridge, and it marks a splendid advance in postal facilities here. We are all very grateful, and this is a good time, as we dedicate this beautiful building, to re-dedicate ourselves to the great government, of which it is a part, and the high ideals of freedom and justice for which our government stands.

We live in a time of turmoil and strife, but it must also be for us, and for the nation, a time of resolution and determination. Let it be clearly understood by those who assail and challenge us, and who are working so hard to undermine and destroy the foundations of this great citadel of freedom that it is our unswerving purpose to defend our rich heritage.

Let no one ever doubt or miscalculate, the loyalty, the devotion, and the firm, unalterable commitment of the American people to uphold our country and our free way of life and the cause of human freedom and justice.

As we strive for peace with all our hearts and energies, let us remain strong in every sense, militarily, economically and spiritually, and let us firmly embrace the truths, principles and blessings for which this nation stands, so that no power on earth can ever deprive us of the precious birthright of freedom that we cherish so deeply.

The mission of this bright, new facility is to serve the people of Southbridge and the general public. Let our mission be in these troublous days, unswerving, loyal devotion to the preservation and defense of the cause for which so many Americans have struggled and died—freedom, justice and peace in this country and the world.

And on this day before Memorial Day, a time dedicated prayerfully to our honored dead, a day of remembrance of our loved ones, let us solemnly resolve that the sacrifices of these great heroes, the dead and the living, the past and the present, shall not be in vain.

Tribute to Senator Saltonstall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I am sure all of us have much more than a tinge of sadness as we contemplate that the next session of the Congress will find us without the benefit of the presence of the senior Senator from Massachusetts.

There are periods in the life of any institution when it is graced by a person whose virtues are such that he earns a special place in the hearts of his contemporaries. The service of LEVERETT SALTONSTALL in this body covers such a period.

The coincidence of our committee assignments—to Appropriations, and to first, Naval Affairs, and then Armed Services—has caused the Senator from Georgia to enjoy an intimate association with the Senator from Massachusetts. During this association, the Senator from Massachusetts has been in the role of chairman and in the role of the ranking minority member. In both, he has been the exemplar of courtesy, cooperation, and constructive achievement. I hold for him a warm personal affection and a profound professional respect.

As one reflects on the qualities a great Senator should possess, it is hard to name one not personified in LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.

Certainly we understand and respect his reasons for not offering for reelection. He richly deserves a less strenuous and demanding life than a Member of this body can lead. But his decision deprives our country, the State of Massachusetts, and the U.S. Senate of a noble soul and heart and spirit.

No matter how earnestly or eloquently spoken, words of tribute are inadequate recognition for the hard work, the disappointments, and the frustrations that are a part of the life of a conscientious public official. The compensating rewards to men of high principle are inner satisfactions. In my almost 34 years of service in this body, I have had the pleasure of serving with more than 400 Members. As much as any one of them, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL has justification for feeling the satisfaction and the sense of accomplishment that comes from a job well done.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my opening statement at the last meeting of the Committee on Armed Services on Tuesday, October 18, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Perhaps it is unwise to begin any session of the Committee on a sentimental note, but the Chair must observe that this is probably the last meeting of the Committee where we will be blessed by the attendance of the senior Senator from Massachusetts.
>
> It is impossible for me to give expression to the affection, esteem, and respect in which this Senator is held by the Chair as well as all the members of this Committee.
>
> Senator SALTONSTALL has graced this Committee since it was created. Before that the Chair had the pleasure of serving with him on the Committee on Naval Affairs. Both as a ranking minority member and as a Committee Chairman, Senator SALTONSTALL could hardly have been more cooperative. The relations between us have been better than could be expected between any two men.
>
> His contributions to the work of this Committee and to the maintenance of our defense system are engraved on the statutes of the period that he has served in the Congress.
>
> Not only that, but his enrichment of our personal lives as a result of our association will be with us always.
>
> We wish for you, LEVERETT, and for Mrs. Saltonstall, peace of mind and good health in the less strenuous life that you so richly deserve. But we will keenly miss you here at this table.

Small Watershed Development and the 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, as the top-ranking Republican member on the Subcommittee on Watershed Development of the Committee on Public Works, I have had the privilege this Congress to participate in the approval of many work plans for small-watershed development and flood-protection projects, which work plans were transmitted to the Congress and referred to the committee for appropriate consideration. At the end of the first session of this Congress, I addressed the House on the committee's activities with respect to small-watershed development during that session, and I take this opportunity today to inform the members on the committee's watershed-related activities during the entire Congress.

During the past several years, the Congress has addressed itself to the many intricate problems of water supply and water purity, and Congress has proclaimed through the enactment of many important water resources bills that this Nation's water resources problems cannot be ignored. Similarly, the Committee on Public Works has acted upon a number of important water resources bills this Congress, including the Water Quality Act of 1965, the Omnibus Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Acts of 1965 and 1966, the Clean Waters Restoration Act of 1966, and various other measures. With the enactment of these and other related bills, the Congress and the committee have expressed the need for water supply, water purity, and waterway development programs which will meet the needs of the future.

In an attempt to act on major water resources programs, however, the Congress should not lose sight of the many smaller water resources programs, not the least of which is the small watershed development and flood protection program within the Soil Conservation Service, which program was established under Public Law 566, 83d Congress, known as the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954. When this law was enacted, it was expressed that the sense of Congress was that the Federal Government should cooperate with States and their political subdivisions, soil and water conservation districts, flood prevention or control districts, and other local public agencies for the purpose of preventing erosion, floodwater, and sediment damages in the watersheds of the rivers and streams of the United States and of furthering the conservation, development, utilization, and disposal of water and thereby of preserving and protecting the Nation's land and water resources.

The small watershed program has moved forward considerably since 1954, and the realization of the goals set out with the enactment of the organic act is closer to fruition today than ever before. Since its enactment, the act has fostered the growth of one of the most beneficial rural development programs in history. Erosion and flood damages in the watersheds of the rivers and streams of our Nation which cause loss of life and damage to property have been substantially checked by the projects constructed under the authority of the act.

During my service on the Subcommittee on Watershed Development I have seen not only the need but the necessity for the continuation and even the expansion of the small watershed development program.

Because the Congress, in its wisdom, enacted this valuable piece of legislation in 1954 and has continued it during subsequent years, the enhancement of the natural resources of America has been given a sizable boost. Millions of tons of silt from valuable and irreplaceable topsoil which erodes away to clog inland waterway channels and coastal harbors has been greatly checked. Ravaging flood waters which destroy practically everything on the flood plain have also been retarded by the construction of watershed projects. Water storage supplies have been increased for various uses.

During the 12 years since the enactment of Public Law 566, projects approved by Congress or the Department of Agriculture offer protection to over 42 million acres, with floodwater storage capacities of nearly 4 million acre-feet; with water storage supply for municipal, recreational, irrigational, and other related uses of nearly one-half million acre-feet; and with a sediment storage capacity of over 600,000 acre-feet. In addition to the nearly 800 watershed projects approved, there are over 1,200 projects which have been approved for planning but on which no construction has commenced. These additional projects encompass a drainage area of over 84 million acres. Furthermore, some 2,500 applications have been filed for even more watershed projects which would encompass a drainage area of an astounding 182 million acres. The construction of these projects to control floodwaters and to prevent erosion of our valuable land will be of great economic benefit to all sections of the Nation.

A nationwide program of construction of small watershed dams to retard the flow of waters in tributaries is an integral aspect of any basinwide flood control planning and operation. Rather than relying wholely on the larger dams on the main rivers, we must integrate measures to retard floodwaters where they start—in the upstream reaches of tributaries—with the overall flood control plan. The soil conservation benefits of stopping floodwaters in the upper reaches of the streams goes without comment, for everyone knows the detrimental effects of rushing water.

Mr. Speaker, Public Law 566 prescribes the procedure for the approval of watershed workplans by the appropriate committees of Congress. Under the law, if the plan involves any single structure of more than 4,000 acre-feet of total capacity, the workplan is sent to the Committee on Public Works of the House and Senate for appropriate action. If the total capacity of any single structure is less than 4,000 acre-feet, the workplan is transmitted to the House and Senate Committees on Agriculture for appropriate consideration. Inasmuch as the larger watershed projects become more intricately related to the construction of dams on rivers and streams, this procedure has proved itself to be not only a feasible one but also one which permits the Committees on Public Works to view the entire water resource development activities within a particular river basin.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, I would like to include in the summations of committee and subcommittee achievements during the 89th Congress which have been appearing regularly during the closing weeks of this session in the RECORD, a listing of the watershed projects, with appropriate information pertaining to Federal costs and the drainage area encompassed in each watershed project approved, for which the workplans were favorably acted upon by the Subcommittee on Watershed Development and subsequently the Committee on Public Works during the 89th Congress:

State and project	Drainage area (acres)	Federal cost
Alabama: Ketchepedrakee Creek	35, 110	$882, 740
Arkansas: Cooper Creek	40, 128	1, 274, 008
Delaware and Pennsylvania: Brandywine Creek (supplement)		2, 080, 978
Delaware and Maryland: Upper Choptank	57, 000	3, 045, 300
Georgia:		
Big Cedar Creek	133, 205	1, 946, 453
Bridge Creek-Ochlocknee Creek	158, 506	888, 059
Euharlee Creek	108, 919	1, 928, 300
Little River	28, 477	928, 378
Little Sandy and Trail Creek	27, 276	1, 286, 141
Lower Little Tallapoosa River	133, 218	3, 725, 322
Pine Log tributary	83, 900	2, 921, 306
Sallacoa Creek area	76, 600	3, 744, 150
Illinois: Coal and Crane Creeks	40, 200	719, 385
Indiana:		
Indian Creek	59, 160	1, 204, 499
Little Raccoon Creek	98, 306	2, 521, 448
Twin-Rush Creek	28, 099	1, 234, 620
Upper Big Blue River	124, 000	3, 560, 125
West Boggs Creek	14, 121	629, 198
Iowa:		
Badger Creek (supplement)		212, 965
Three Mile Creek	37, 320	1, 364, 490
Walter's Creek	31, 560	1, 074, 920
Kansas:		
Timber Creek	101, 700	3, 489, 300
Upper Black Vermillion	54, 886	3, 955, 200
Upper Wakarusa	234, 944	2, 814, 900
Louisiana:		
Bayou Boeuf	187, 974	3, 235, 327
Cypress Black Bayou	148, 500	4, 070, 885
Upper Bayou Nezpique (supplement)		4, 445, 248
Maine Limestone Stream	31, 542	791, 349
Michigan: East Branch of Sturgeon Creek	83, 960	198, 443
Minnesota: Tamarac River	234, 700	1, 177, 486
Mississippi:		
Houlka Creek	146, 805	3, 393, 227
Tallahaga Creek	79, 320	2, 387, 440
Long Creek	40, 306	1, 181, 041
Mississippi and Tennessee: Tuscumbia River	223, 146	4, 710, 602
Missouri: Grindstone-Lost-Muddy Creeks	209, 100	2, 744, 306
New Mexico: Crow and Broad Canyons and Placitas Arroyo	137, 932	2, 890, 885
New York: Conewango Creek (supplement)		4, 960, 674
North Carolina and Virginia: Stewarts Creek, Lovills Creek	72, 000	1, 519, 200
North Dakota:		
Boundary Creek	131, 520	1, 180, 899
Middle Branch-Park River	105, 600	2, 473, 091
Oklahoma:		
Caston-Mountain Creek	47, 853	1, 863, 379
Quapaw Creek	96, 560	3, 364, 609
Rock Creek	37, 997	1, 224, 703
Uncle John Creek	99, 584	1, 822, 313
Upper Elk Creek	248, 340	3, 386, 105
Pennsylvania:		
Mauch Chunk Creek	5, 790	444, 067
Middle Creek	84, 096	2, 076, 135
Oil Creek	112, 000	2, 241, 580
Tennessee: Wilson Spring Creek	40, 040	733, 523
Texas:		
Attoyac Bayou	213, 440	4, 142, 822
Castleman Creek	29, 850	816, 148
Choctaw Creek	82, 023	4, 837, 546
Donahoe Creek	98, 285	1, 362, 609
Duck Creek	133, 120	1, 810, 207
Rush Creek	37, 304	1, 961, 153
Utah: Ferron	191, 000	3, 892, 100
Virginia:		
Cherrystone	29, 400	581, 145
Potomac Creek	32, 160	656, 080
South Fork Roanoke River	88, 480	1, 950, 096
West Virginia and Pennsylvania: Wheeling Creek	191, 180	4, 979, 000
Wisconsin: Otter Creek	135, 680	866, 463

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Watershed Development, the gentleman from Texas, Representative JIM WRIGHT, has been most active in insuring the continuation of a comprehensive small watershed program, and I commend him for his attention and dedication to improving the water resources of the Nation. He has shown no signs of yielding to the executive on the controversy over whether or not the committees should have the privilege of approving or disapproving watershed workplans before construction can commence on the projects, and I am confident that he will remain firm in this position on behalf on the legislative branch of our Federal Government.

The minority has been active in the approval of these watershed workplans during this Congress, and the members of the minority party have shown a continuing interest in the development of small watershed projects. This is another indication of the responsible, active, and constructive approach which the minority members have taken on the committee with respect to workable Federal programs.

During the years to come, the small watershed development program will prove itself even more worthwhile as raging floods are retarded by water retention structures built under the authority of Public Law 566. I am pleased to have had a hand in the continuation of this most worthwhile program.

Achievements of the Senate Committee on Public Works, 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the outstanding achievements of the Senate Committee on Public Works during the 89th Congress.

Both the chairman and the committee are deserving of our sincere commendation.

There being no objection, the committee achievements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACTIVITIES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, 89TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

During 1965 the Committee considered five major pieces of legislation as well as numerous other bills of a lesser nature.

The five major legislative items are:

1. Appalachian Regional Development Act, PL 89-4: The purpose of the Act is to provide public works and economic development programs, and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region. Included under the Act is the establishment of a Regional Commission, the establishment of a development highway system for the region, the construction and operation of health facilities, land improvement and erosion control, timber development assistance, mining area restoration and a water resource survey. Including the highway funds of $840,000,000 for a six-year program, the total authorization for this Act is $1,092,000,000.

2. The Water Quality Act, JL 89-234: The purpose of the Act is to provide for a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration to administer the Act. It increases from $100 million annually to $150 million annually the grants for waste treatment facilities over the next two years and increases individual project grants from $600,000 to $1.2 million and multi project grants from $2.4 to $4.8 million. It sets up a four year, $80 million program for demonstration grants involving new or improved methods of controlling pollution from storm sewers or combined storm-sanitary sewers and it provides procedures for the establishment of water quality standards in interstate waters.

3. The Clean Air Act, PL 89-272: The purpose of the Act is to provide for the establishment of standards for automotive vehicle omissions, the establishment of a new Federal Air Pollution Control Laboratory to conduct a national research and development program, and for international control of air pollution where a foreign country is adversely affected by air pollution from sources within the United States. This law, also amended the Clean Air Act, contains Title II designated as the "Solid Waste Disposal Act." This Act authorizes a total of $92.5 million for four years to be used by the Departments of Health, Education and Welfare, and Interior for research, demonstrations and training in connection with disposal of garbage, refuse and other discarded solid materials.

4. Public Works and Economic Development Act, PL 89-136: The purpose of this Act is to provide grants and loans for public works and development facilities, and other financial assistance in conjunction with long term planning. It provides for technical assistance, research and information service in these areas, standards for area and district eligibility, and regional action planning commissions. It also includes the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions. It authorizes an annual appropriation of $570 million to carry out the purposes of this Act.

5. Omnibus Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Act of 1965: This Act authorizes the construction of 142 water resources projects throughout the United States, at a total cost of about $2 billion. The bill was passed by the Senate after the conclusion of extensive hearings by the Committee, spanning a period of over four months. In addition to the authorization of individual river and harbor flood control projects, the bill contains a number of general provisions relating to the conduct of this highly important program.

OTHER LEGISLATION

In addition to the major bills, the Committee considered legislation in the field of disaster relief for the Northwest area, the Hurricane Betsy Disaster Bill, and an overall Disaster Relief Bill which will eliminate the need for special Congressional action whenever a major disaster occurs. All three of these bills have passed the Senate.

The Committee considered legislation authorizing funds for the continuation of work by the Corps of Engineers on previously authorized comprehensive river basin plans for flood control and navigation purposes. This bill, which involves $263 million, has been enacted into law.

Under the Public Buildings Act of 1959 the Committee authorized the construction of 90 buildings at an estimated value of $240,507,909.

The Committee considered and authorized 38 proposals for watershed development at a total Federal cost of $80,382,531.

Highway Beautification Act, PL 89-285: This Act provides authorization of a $325,500,000 program of highway beautification and scenic development of the interstate and primary system for the control of outdoor advertising and junkyards.

Other road legislation included the approval of the apportionment of the Highway Trust Fund for fiscal year 1967.

Library of Congress Building, PL 89-260: This Act authorizes $75 million for the design and construction of a third Library of Congress building to be known as the James Madison Memorial Building. The building is to contain a memorial room dedicated to James Madison.

Official Residence for the Vice President: The Committee considered and reported to the Senate S. 2394 which provides for the creation of a three-member Commission to select and furnish a residence for the Vice President of the United States. It further authorizes $1 million to carry out the purposes of this Act. The bill was passed by the Senate on October 21, 1965 and is now pending before the House Public Works Committee.

Federal Installations, Facilities, and Equipment Pollution Control Act, S. 560: This Act, which has passed the Senate, is designed to provide for improved cooperation by Federal Agencies to control water and air pollution by Federal installations and facilities and to control automotive vehicle air pollution.

The Committee, during this 1st Session, held 63 days of public hearings and 14 days of executive sessions. As a result, 6139 pages of testimony, reports, committee prints and other similar documents were printed.

The Committee also completed its second documentary film in three years with this one dealing with the problems of air pollution. The film, "Ill Winds on a Sunny Day", is a thirty minute color film on the cause and effect of air pollution, narrated by film star James Garner.

This film depicts the growth of the problem as the result of our increasing industrialization and shows the effect of air pollution, and the efforts being made to contain and eradicate it.

DOCUMENTS OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, 89TH CONGRESS

Committee print, S. Doc. No. 7—Automotive Air Pollution. Report of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Jan. 15, 1965.

Water Quality Act of 1965. Hearing on S. 4, Jan. 18, 1965.

Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965. Hearings on S. 3, Jan. 19 and 21, 1965.

Federal Installations, Facilities, and Equipment Pollution Control Act. Hearings on S. 560, Feb. 23, 24, and 26, 1965.

Public Works Authorizations 1965—Rivers and harbors-flood control and multipurpose projects—Hearings, Mar. 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26, 1965.—Part I—New Projects and monetary authorizations.

1965 cost estimates for completion of Interstate and Defense Highway System. Hearings, Mar. 30 and 31, 1965.

Committee print—Compilation of Documents on Public Works and Economic Development—Apr. 14, 1965.

Northwest Disaster Relief Program. Hearing on S. 1638 and S. 327, Apr. 1, 1965.

Air Pollution Control. Hearings on S. 306, Apr. 6, 8, and 9, and Apr. 7, 1965, Detroit, Mich.

Public Works Authorizations, 1965—Rivers and Harbors—Flood Control and Multiple-Purpose projects—Hearings, Apr. 20, 21, 22, and 23, 1965.—Part II—New Projects and monetary authorizations.

Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. Hearings on S. 1648, Apr. 26, 27, 28, 29, and 30, and May 3, 1965.

Public Works Authorizations, 1965—Rivers and Harbors-Flood Control and Multiple Purpose projects. Hearings May 18, 19, 20, and 21, 1965.—Part III—New projects and monetary authorizations.

Veto message from the President of the United States on S. 327, Pacific Northwest Disaster Relief Act of 1965—June 7, 1965. (Printed as S. Doc. 34.)

James Madison Memorial Library of Congress Building. Hearings on S.J. Res. 69, May 28 and June 2, 1965.

Public Works Authorizations, 1965—Rivers and harbors flood-control and multiple purpose projects—Hearings, June 9, 10, 11, and 14, 1965.—Port IV—New projects and monetary authorizations.

Disaster Relief Act of 1965. Hearings on S. 1861, June 21 and 22, 1965.

S. Doc. 42.—Automotive Air Pollution. 2d report of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. June 1965.

Highway Beautification and Scenic Road Program. Hearings on S. 2084, S. 1974, and S. 2259, Aug. 10, 11, 12, and 13, 1965.

Nomination of Eugene P. Foley to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development. Hearings, Sept. 2, 1965.

Water Pollution—General hearings on progress and programs relating to abatement of water pollution, Part I, May 19, 20, and 21, 1965.

Water pollution—Field hearings on progress and programs relating to abatement of water pollution, Part II, June 2, 3, 7, 8, 15, 16, and 17, 1965.

Water pollution—Technical hearings on progress and programs relating to abatement, Part III, June 23 and 24, 1965.

Official residence for the Vice President. Hearings on S. 2394, Sept. 14, 1965.

U.S. Participation in the Alaska Purchase Centennial—Hearings on S. 2309, Sept. 16, 1965.

Long-Range Land Use Plan for the U.S. Capitol Grounds—Hearing on S.J. Res. 76, June 30, 1965.

Committee print, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. Annual Report of the Board of Trustees.

ACTIVITIES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, 89TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Official Residence of the Vice President: The Committee reported S. 2394, which provided for the creation of a three-member Commission to select and furnish a residence for the Vice President of the United States. It further authorized $1 million for this purpose. This bill passed the Senate on October 21, 1965. On March 22, 1966, the House passed the bill, as amended, providing that a site at the U.S. Naval Observatory be used, and that $750,000 be appropriated for planning, design, and construction, etc. On March 25, 1966, the Senate agreed to the House amendments, and the bill was approved on April 9, becoming Public Law 89–386.

S. 3031, the National Visitor Center: This legislation was introduced at the request of the President of the United States, and authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to construct or provide on a suitable site a National Visitor Center in the District of Columbia for the purpose of providing facilities and services for visitors and students coming to the Nation's Capitol. It was ordered reported favorably on May 16, 1966, and on May 17 reported, with amendments. The bill was then referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3389, Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden: This Act, introduced at the request of the President of the United States, provides for the establishment of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden on a designated Mall site, and authorized funds for the construction, upkeep, operation and administration of the Museum. It further provides a Board of Trustees to administer the Museum. On August 30, 1966, it was reported to the Senate, as amended, and was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. On August 31, the Rules Committee reported the Act without further amendments. On September 1, it passed the Senate and was referred to the House on September 6. It was reported on October 11th by the House Public Works Committee, and was passed on October 17 and forwarded to the President for his approval.

H.R. 14548, Extension of Leasing Authority of the Postmaster General: On July 22nd, this bill, which passed the House on July 18th, was referred to the Senate, which reported it on September 7th, as amended. On October 4th, the bill was, by unanimous consent, recommitted to the Committee, and an original bill, S. Res. 197, to extend the authority until April 30, 1967, for the Postmaster General to enter into leases of real property for periods not exceeding 30 years was introduced. This Resolution passed the Senate on October 4, was referred to the House, which passed it, without amendment, on October 5, 1966. On October 10, it was approved, and became Public Law 89–637.

H.R. 15024, Heliport Bill: On August 16, this bill, to amend Sec. 8 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 to authorize the Administrator of General Services to lease certain property in the District of Columbia, was referred to the Senate, after having passed the House on August 15. Hearings were held October 11, after which the bill was reported, as amended, on October 19. After being passed by the Senate it was referred to the House which, on October 20, agreed to the Senate's amendments, thus clearing it for the President's approval.

Public Building Prospectuses: Under the Public Buildings Act of 1959, the Committee authorized the construction or alteration of 51 buildings, at an estimated cost of $414,770,900.

Senate Film Reports Nos. 1 and 2: The Committee's first film report, "Troubled Waters", was revised and updated during this session, as was its second report, "Ill Winds On A Sunny Day."

Nominations: During the 89th Congress, the Committee reported fourteen nominations to the Senate, all of which were confirmed.

Name Changes, etc.: Seven bills for changes in names of locks and dams, and naming of public buildings, were reported.

Long-Range Land-Use Plan for the Capitol Grounds: S.J. Res. 76, was introduced on May 4th, 1965, to provide for the formulation, adoption, administration, and periodic updating of a long-range land-use plan for the U.S. Capitol Grounds and contiguous related and influencing areas. Hearings were held on June 30th, 1965, and the measure was ordered reported favorably, with amendments. On September 21st, 1966 it was reported to the Senate.

Miscellaneous: During the second session, the Committee held 39 days of public hearings, and 30 days of executive sessions. As a result, 3,215 pages of testimony, reports, committee prints, and other similar documents were printed.

The Highway Safety Act of 1966; Public Law 89–564: The purpose of this Act is to establish a comprehensive and coordinated National highway safety program. The Secretary of Transportation is directed to encourage and assist each of the States in the establishment of a highway safety program based on a comprehensive state-wide plan and in accordance with uniform standards to be approved by the Secretary. The Act authorizes $267 million for apportionment to States and communities for the fiscal years 1967, 1968 and 1969 for the establishment of State and local highway safety programs. It provides for apportionment of funds to the States on a 50–50 matching basis, with 75% of the total funds to be apportioned to the States on the basis of population and 25% at the discretion of the Secretary. The Act further provides for the establishment of a National highwey safety research and development program, for which funds are authorized in the sum of $10 million for fiscal 1967, $20 million for fiscal 1968, and $25 million for fiscal 1969.

Federal Aid Highway Act of 1966; Public Law 89-574: This Act authorizes appropriations from the Highway Trust Fund for the Interstate and Defense System and for the Federal aid primary and secondary systems, and general fund appropriations for several categories of public domain lands highways. For the interstate system the authorizations are $3.4 billion for fiscal year 1968, $3.8 billion for fiscal year 1969, $3.6 billion for fiscal year 1970, $3.6 billion for fiscal year 1971, and $2.665 billion for fiscal year 1972. For the Federal aid primary and secondary systems there are authorized $1 billion for fiscal year 1968, and $1 billion for fiscal year 1969. For such public domain highways as forest highways, parkways, forest development roads and trails and other categories, the Act authorizes $273 million for fiscal year 1968 and $288 million for fiscal year 1969. This legislation provides also for a study of the advance acquisition of rights-of-way, a relocation assistance study for persons displaced by highway construction projects, and a study of the highway needs of Guam, American Samoa and the Virgin Islands.

Clean Waters Restoration Act and Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1966: The purpose of this Act is to provide for more effective implementation of the Water Quality Act of 1965 by providing an expanded Federal commitment of $3.4 billion through 1971 to offset the cost of pollution control. Specifically the Act removes the dollar limitations on construction grants and provides a basic 30% Federal share regardless of total project cost; the Federal share increases to 50% if the state provides 25% of the cost and has established enforceable water quality standards on the waters into which the project discharges. The Act expands the research activities of the Administration and provides a three-year $308 million authorization to carry out the purposes set forth. The Act strengthens the enforcement procedure by providing a method to secure reports from alleged polluters and extends enforcement to international pollution. Also, persons affected by pollution will have the opportunity to make a statement at a conference or hearing. Studies of recreational watercraft pollution, cost of pollution control, industrial waste treatment incentives, and personnel needs are authorized. The Oil Pollution Act is amended to provide a penalty for failure to remove oil dumped on any navigable water of the United States. The Clean Waters Restoration Act provides a 50% Federal grant to those states which want to join together for basin pollution control planning.

The Clean Air Act Amendments of 1966: The purpose of this Act is to provide authorizations for the Federal air pollution control program. The Act provides for $186 million to carry out the purposes of the Clean Air Act through 1969. The Act also provides for 50% grants to state and local pollution control agencies to maintain programs and eliminates the 20% limitation on the amount of funds appropriated which can be used for grants to state and local pollution control programs. Finally, the Act provides for grants up to three-fifths of the cost of maintaining regional air pollution control programs.

The Federal Installations Facilities and Equipment Pollution Control Act, S. 560: The purpose of this legislation is to provide a means for the inspection of air and water waste discharge practices at Federal installations including the establishment of standards at such installations. The bill would authorize appropriations to install necessary facilities, assure their operation and maintenance, and to train operators. Also, automotive vehicles purchased for Government use would have to be equipped with air pollution control devices. S. 560 was passed by the Senate on March 25, 1965, but did not receive House action. In the interim the Administration issued Executive Orders relating to the pollution control responsibilities of Federal agencies.

Tennessee Valley Authority—Additional Authority to Issue Revenue Bonds (PL 89-537): The purpose of this Act is to permit the Tennessee Valley Authority to issue revenue bonds in excess of the present ceiling of $750,000,000. It increases the borrowing authority of the Corporation by $1 billion from $750 million to $1,750 million, for bonding purposes in order to assist in financing the power program of that agency. The additional bonding authority will cover the issuance of bonds for at least a 7 year period, through 1973.

Omnibus Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Act of 1966: This Act, as passed by both houses of Congress, authorizes the construction of 41 water resource projects throughout the Nation, in the interest of flood control, navigation, and other allied water purposes, at an estimated cost of $670 million.

The projects contained in this legislation will prove to be a valuable addition to the existing Federal water resource program. The projects have been conceived and recommended by the Corps of Engineers to prevent or reduce the damages caused by rampaging flood waters; to provide water for municipal, agricultural, and industrial use; to generate hydroelectric power for our cities and farms; to provide recreational facilities; and to develop and improve the Nation's navigation system.

The Act in addition to authorizing the construction of needed river and harbor and flood control projects, also authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to provide for construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge, with visitor facilities, over the Washington Channel, from the vicinity of 10th Street, S.W., to East Potomac Park in Washington, D.C. The Committee held public hearings on legislation relative to this proposition, prior to its inclusion in the omnibus rivers and harbors bill.

Also included in the omnibus bill are a number of general provisions relating to the conduct of the river and harbor and flood control program administered by the Corps of Engineers.

Disaster Relief Act of 1966: The purpose of this legislation is to provide needed relief to stricken areas in time of major disasters. Because such major disasters are completely unexpected and in most cases strike an area totally unprepared or capable of recovery without outside assistance, provision must be made to have assistance readily available for immediate relief. This legislation as passed by the Senate, removed the necessity for special authorization following natural disasters as has been the custom. It established a national policy for disaster relief.

Inspiring Celebration of Franco-American Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record, I include therein my remarks in part at the 20th anniversary banquet of the Franco-American War Veterans Post at Leominster, Mass., September 10, 1966.

This celebration was indeed a most remarkable occasion for me and the many others who were in attendance. The program was admirably conducted by Mr. Victor Leger, veterans' service agent at Leominster and an outstanding leader in veteran and civic affairs.

It was attended by noted spiritual leaders, able and distinguished dignitaries of local, State, and Federal governments including Hon. Laurie J. Cormier, former mayor of Leominster, now regional director for New England of civil defense, with headquarters at Harvard, Mass.; His Honor Mayor Ralph W. Crossman, State Representative Robert W. Mahan, member of the Massachusetts General Court; members of the city council; National and State commanders; president of the auxiliary and other high officials of the Franco-American War Veterans; and a host of fraternal, civic, business, and charitable leaders and a very large enthusiastic audience comprised of the members, and their families, and friends.

The program was in the best American tradition and I may say, also, in the best tradition of the beautiful city in which this event was held.

The program, which sounded a very high patriotic note, consisted of some very thoughtful, eloquent addresses interspersed with humorous references. The prevailing atmosphere was one of sober reflection on the serious problems of the country with emphasis on the principles, ideals, and objectives of the Nation and the rich contributions to our way of life of these wonderful Franco-American people.

It is in gatherings like this that one finds the positive side of American life, the pattern of patriotism and loyalty to country that have made us the great nation that we are, and above all, the spirit of devotion to our free institutions and the determination to defend and retain them that is so much a part of our way of life.

We can be grateful indeed that this spirit, vitalized by our veterans, lives in the hearts of the American people and exemplifies the unalterable resolution of our great, free people to safeguard their precious legacy of freedom and to face our problems, difficult as they are, with unflinching loyalty and devotion to this country and all it stands for.

My remarks follow:

Remarks in Part of Congressman Philip J. Philbin, at 20th Anniversary Banquet of Franco-American War Veterans Post 13, of Leominster, Mass., September 10, 1966

(At the celebration of the 20th anniversary of the Franco-American War Veterans at Leominster last night, Congressman Philip J. Philbin highly lauded the members of the Post for their patriotism, inspiring devotion to American institutions and outstanding service in war and peace.)

You and your comrades gallantly served in the past to defend this nation, end the scourge of war and establish lasting peace. For this, the American people will be forever deeply grateful. So this is an occasion of joyous celebration, gratitude and renewed faith for all of us.

With great patriotic devotion and sacrifice you fought to reach the great goals of freedom and to build a world in which the rule of law would prevail over selfish, territorial conquest and aggression, where war would be outlawed.

Yet the high hopes and oft-repeated assurances we had have not been realized in the modern world. Unfortunately, there are those animated by fierce desire and intent to dominate and control all other nations and impose their tyrannical will not only upon their own helpless subjects, but upon the freedom-loving peoples of the earth.

These ruthless well-organized forces seek to fasten their iron grip upon the weak and the helpless, believing that, by this strategy, in time they can make themselves masters of the entire world and bring every nation and every people under their cruel dictatorship.

What is happening today in Vietnam is merely a part of that plan. The same is true of the insurrections, revolutions and violent upsets that are being fostered in other parts of the world.

Our great nation seeks no domination over others, in fact, the contrary is true. We seek to live in peace, in amity and in friendship with all nations, especially those which are truly desirous of promoting friendly relationships and the climate of progress and plenty in which every nation can enjoy the cherished benefits of freedom, peace and justice.

The American people, like all freedom-loving peoples, must be deeply concerned by the designs and efforts of Communist aggressors, because our own security and our own freedom are challenged by those who are moving now in so many ways and places to destroy all freedom and to substitute violence, force and regimentation for law and order, and to make slaves and subjects out of free men and women everywhere.

By all means, let us continue to strive with all our vigor, energy and resource to establish just peace in Vietnam and throughout the world. While we have tried very hard, time and time again, to induce the Communists of Hanoi to come to the peace table and treat with us to stop fighting and settle existing problems on some honorable, decent basis, our earnest, repeated pleas for peace and justice still remain unanswered.

Let us hope and pray that the day will be soon at hand when this government in concert with other governments and the United Nations, will be able to prevail upon the aggressors to desist from their assaults on the helpless and the weak, upon the integrity and security of this nation and other nations of the free world, and join to institute a peace that will endure, so that all peoples everywhere can live in total peace and turn their attention to building a better world for all.

While the nation is enjoying unprecedented prosperity we are beset by vexing problems of inflationary surge, the high cost of living, high interest rates and other unwelcome conditions attributable to the rapid growth and expansion of the nation.

Government and the people must and will cooperate whole-heartedly to attack and solve these problems, and I think we must be especially careful in the process, so far as the federal government is concerned, that in our efforts to combat runaway inflation, we may avoid unloosing recessionary forces in the economy that could well work in the opposite direction and put a damper on present prospects for continued prosperity.

There has never been a time when we have been faced by so many perplexing problems, both international and domestic. But I think that we can rely on the people at every level, to join in an understanding way with the efforts that we will continue to make to maintain and project prosperity, balance in our economy, pursue sound, practical fiscal policies, concern for the problems of health, well-being and education, including the pollution of our streams, for the handicapped and the unfortunate that live among us, to fight discrimination, hatred and denial of common justice, and, above all, to make sure that our great nation is kept strong, vigorous and healthy in every respect, militarily, economically, spiritually and patriotically, so that we may grow and prosper in every way, and so that, above all, we may maintain, guard and protect the security and free institutions of this unequalled citadel of liberty.

As we work zealously and unceasingly for peace and justice in the world, and for that security and freedom for which you, your valiant comrades and so many Americans struggled and sacrificed since the very foundations of this government, let us renew and rededicate our faith and loyalty and stand firm for God and country.

I will always remember with deepest gratitude the honor you have paid me in inviting me here to this wonderful twentieth celebration of your outstanding organization and I want to assure you not only of my friendship and admiration but of my wholehearted cooperation with you in all your endeavors.

May you enjoy many more celebrations of your fine post and continue your great work for many years to come.

Tribute to Senators Saltonstall and Simpson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK R. MILLER

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I am saddened at the thought that when the 90th Congress convenes in January of 1967 the names of two of my colleagues will not be called.

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL first came to the Senate in January of 1945 and has served this body and his country ably and with distinction since that time. His name was a legend long before my arrival here in 1961. I have had the privilege of serving with him as a member of the Committee on Armed Services where he has given of himself tirelessly. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL has never sought glory for himself, or even thanks for his profound contributions, but because of his work in the Senate and on that committee, our entire Nation owes him a debt of gratitude.

I will personally miss his guidance that only years of devotion and experience can bring. I will miss his gentlemanly ways and his never ending search for the things that are best for this great country of ours. I only hope that those of us who remain can move forward, ever bearing in mind the courage, integrity, and faith which he has left behind.

Mr. President, another of the great public servants of our time is MILWARD SIMPSON. Although he has served for only 4 years in this body, that is merely the culmination of a long and brilliant career. He has been an educator and a practicing attorney. He has served in his State legislature and as Governor of Wyoming. He has served in the Senate with the same distinction that marks his devotion to the people of Wyoming.

The breadth of background and experience that MILWARD SIMPSON has brought to the Senate leaves us richer for his having been here. We will long cherish the warmth and friendship which he has shared with so many of us.

Eight Years of Unprecedented Achievement—The Greatest Progress in Alaskan History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST GRUENING

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, it has been almost a century since the American flag first flew over Alaska. For most of those 100 years Alaska was a neglected and forgotten territorial possession of the United States.

Alaska has now been a State for nearly 8 years; but in fact it has yet to achieve some of the accompaniments of full citizenship in the brotherhood of States. In all the years before statehood, when the other States were receiving vast amounts of Federal assistance to further their development, the Territory of Alaska was receiving practically nothing. In the years since statehood, Alaska has begun to receive a part of its long overdue share of Federal assistance, but much remains to be done if Alaska is to catch up, make up for the near century of Federal neglect and discrimination, and take its rightful place in the society of States.

AN AWESOME HYDROELECTRIC POWER POTENTIAL

Alaska holds within its borders an awesome hydroelectric power potential. Yet, only one-quarter of 1 percent of this potential has been touched. In the light of this fact, the building of the Rampart Canyon Dam in western Alaska and of the Snettisham Dam in southeastern Alaska, and of other hydro projects, is an obvious necessity.

Rampart's abundant and low-cost power would attract major new industries to Alaska and assist in the utilization of such known Alaskan raw materials as its iron, copper, lead, and zinc ores, and the vast and largely unutilized timber from the interior forests. It has been estimated that the industrial development resulting from the construction and operation of Rampart would provide full-year employment for at least 60,000 workers. It would rescue the native villagers along the Yukon from their abject poverty, give them year-round employment, far better homes and better community facilities in the relocations of their choice to which they would move, and put a stop to the almost annual partial flooding of their communities. In full operation, Rampart Dam would produce at the annual rate of over 34 billion kilowatt-hours. Despite the delays in the Department of the Interior which have held up the final report of the Corps of Engineers, and subsequent authorization and construction, the need for Rampart cannot be ignored, and grows daily more evident.

Snettisham, besides providing for the power needs of the area around the State's capital, Juneau, would enable Alaska to take advantage of the largest sale ever made by the U.S. Forest Service: 8.75 billion board feet of timber in Tongass National Forest. The pulp plant and other contemplated wood-processing industries there operating on Snettisham's power would add $30 million of end product to Alaska's economy, and supply materials already in short supply in the Nation.

Alaska needs Rampart and Snettisham, and needs them now. I have continually urged the Secretary of the Interior to loosen the bottleneck in the Department of the Interior over the building of Rampart. Over $1 million has been spent by the Corps of Engineers in studies on Snettisham and construction was slated to begin in the spring of 1966. The elimination of the appropriations for construction by the Bureau of the Budget was one of the inexcusable "economies" which may be ascribed to the folly of our ever deepening military involvement in southeast Asia which is causing our pressing domestic needs to be increasingly disregarded. However, the Alaska congressional delegation conducted a successful campaign to restore funds for Snettisham in the Federal budget for fiscal year 1967. The public works appropriations bill, H.R. 17787, Public Law 89–689, as approved in conference and signed into public law by President Johnson, includes $750,000 for the start of construction. A year has been lost, but construction should begin early in 1967.

MINERALS FOR THE MINING

Underneath Alaska's surface lie 31 of the 33 minerals of strategic importance to the United States. Yet there are only 7 mining operations of major importance in Alaska, as contrasted with 49 in adjacent Yukon territory and the upper third of British Columbia, smaller in area than Alaska, which are of a geological structure similar to Alaska's. The difference in achievement and activity lies in the fact that Canada has an enlightened Federal mining policy, and the United States does not.

It is clear, then, that Alaska has much to offer. But since this is 1 country, not 50, Alaska working alone cannot realize its full potential. Common progress will come about only through a partnership of Alaskan and Federal efforts. As Governor of the territory of Alaska and as a U.S. Senator, I have worked to help make this partnership real and productive.

PARTNERSHIP IN ACTION

Possibly the finest example of this partnership in action occurred as Alaska recovered from the devastating effects of the 1964 Good Friday earthquake. Two years after the terrible disaster President Johnson announced that over $350 million in Federal aid had been infused into Alaska to rehabilitate its stricken people and communities. Valdez, Seward, and Anchorage well deserved their designation as "All American Cities" for their heartening progress in rebuilding what had been destroyed by the earthquake. And Kodiak and Cordova have rebuilt with remarkable vigor.

Further evidence of the Federal Government's confidence in Alaska can be found in the table of Federal expenditures in Alaska since statehood (see table I). The $3.7 billion budgeted by Congress for Alaska represents an investment in the present and future of both Alaska and the United States.

THE 89TH CONGRESS AND THE NATION

In its 1st session the 89th Congress established itself as one of the most significant in the history of our Nation. It enacted a monumental body of legislation that has prescribed the course of our political society for years to come, covering such diverse fields as civil liberties, education, housing, and social security.

The Civil Rights Act of 1965 increased equality of opportunity for those Americans who had been too long denied it, although Federal civil rights law is not yet as farsighted and progressive as Alaska's.

The years of struggle to enact legislation providing hospital care under the social security system finally bore fruit. Over 5,000 Alaskans are benefiting from this program which will add dignity and comfort to the lives of our older citizens.

A Department of Housing and Urban Development was created, and a Housing and Urban Development Act was passed. Hopefully, the Federal Government will now be able to move quickly and efficiently to face one of the central and compelling facts of 20th century American society—namely, that the majority of Americans—including Alaskans—live in cities and must grapple with the incredibly complex problems that arise from urban living, such as providing decent housing and sanitation facilities, and planning and building recreational areas.

Alaska has already been helped by these new laws. For example, Cordova and Wrangell have received $917,708 for construction of low-rent housing units and will benefit from annual contributions by the Federal Government to keep rents within the means of low-income families; Anchorage has received a $1.9 million urban renewal grant; and the Department of Housing and Urban Development has approved a $34,000 grant to finance planning of a new hospital at Wrangell.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act provided Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools, and the Higher Education Act provided more Federal aid to colleges and college students. In fiscal year 1967 Federal elementary and secondary education aid to Alaska will total approximately $3 million and aid to higher education approximately one-half million dollars.

The Federal Government has mounted a war on poverty. Legislation was enacted to retrain men to give them marketable skills and to help Appalachia and other forgotten and impoverished sections of our country. Since May 1965, the Office of Economic Opportunity has spent over $2 million in Alaska for such fruitful projects as the Neighborhood Youth Corps in Sitka, Fairbanks, Nome, Juneau, and Anchorage; community action programs in Bethel, College, Nondalton, Yakutat, Mount Edgecumbe, and Anchorage; and Project Headstart in Haines, Hoonah, Kenai, Ketchikan, Kodiak, and Nome.

Congress as a whole has begun to realize that America's natural resources are not inexhaustible. It passed legislation to increase water pollution control and to establish Mrs. Johnson's highway beautification program.

The record reveals that the 1st session of the 89th Congress was a superlative chapter in U.S. history.

DOMESTIC VISTAS DARKENED BY VIETNAM'S COST

Unfortunately, the vistas opened up by the first session have been dimmed by the ever-enlarging war in Vietnam.

The war in that unhappy, divided country has caused the administration increasingly to divert the Federal Government's attention and resources from the problems and needs facing our own Nation at home.

One example was the school milk program. The President's budget proposed an 80-percent cut in the funding of this vital Federal activity. In Alaska alone the cutback would have affected 15,000 children who the previous year had been served 1.4 million one-half pints of milk. When I cosponsored S. 2921, a Senate measure introduced by Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin, which would have restored the cut, I noted that 1 day's cost of the war in Vietnam would make up the $80 million that the President proposed to delete from the milk program.

Fortunately, Congress did not bow to the presidential decision to procure warplanes, bombs, and napalms at the expense of buying milk for our children. With the passage of S. 3467, which I supported, Congress sought to make sure that the school milk program would be continued by authorizing $110 million for it in fiscal year 1967.

Funds for education were trimmed. The President's proposed budget cut grants to the States for equipment and minor remodeling under the National Defense Education Act by $25 million. Alaska's share under the act would have decreased from approximately $97,000 to $66,000.

The President would have eliminated entirely the national defense student loan allowance, replacing it with a program dependent on the private credit market. In fiscal year 1966, 167 Alaskan students borrowed $81,250 under this program, without which they could not have continued their education as they wished.

Furthermore, Alaska would have received only $8 million in Federal aid under the program to aid schools in federally affected areas as compared with the almost $12 million normally expected. This cutback would have affected numerous Alaskan communities, including Craig, Hydaburg, and Kake.

To its credit Congress restored most of these budgetary restrictions on American education, but the fact that the President proposed them is a grim reminder of the cost of the Vietnam war in terms of human values.

Proposed budgetary cutbacks which I have mentioned earlier also confronted the Snettisham Dam project in southeastern Alaska. Normal funding would have allowed $2.5 million to begin construction of this project to tame further Alaska's natural resources. Snettisham will mean more than 1,000 additional jobs for Alaskans and will inject millions of dollars into the State and National economies. But the budget provided nothing for it.

Happily the efforts of the Alaska congressional delegation have succeeded in partially correcting this sorry situation. By virtue of his position on the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senator BOB BARTLETT was able to have included in the Senate-passed public works appropriation bill a provision of $1 million for Snettisham. At the time the bill was considered in the Senate, I stressed the extreme urgency of the project, calling the Senate's attention to the fact that the dam must be built not merely to serve the State's capital and adjacent areas but to enable Alaska to take advantage of the largest sale of forest ever made in the United States. I further stated that the proposed pulp plant operation near Snettisham would mean $30 million to Alaska's economy and would generate tax revenue far beyond the costs of its construction and operation to both the Federal and State governments.

We retained $750,000 for construction after Senate and House conferees met—a victory for Alaska—but considerably less than the amount originally authorized and needed to move the project forward as fast as it should be.

Another example of the cost of the war in Vietnam is President Johnson's veto of H.R. 6926, which would have increased life insurance coverage for Federal employees by raising maximum coverage to $42,000. The President vetoed the bill on the grounds of economy, but the bill was essentially a moderate proposal which would have cost the Government only $78 million annually. I protested this veto and said on the Senate floor:

> I am opposed to unnecessary Federal spending as much as anyone else, but I cannot see economy being obtained at the expense of long-overdue benefits for Federal employees, to whom much is owed.

I further stated:

> The veto must be ascribed to the ever-rising costs of the tragic involvement of the United States in an undeclared war in Vietnam, the costs of which in terms not alone of money but of injured and dead American servicemen are steadily escalating.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE 2D SESSION OF THE 89TH CONGRESS

Although the 2d session of the 89th Congress labored under a cloud of uncertainty arising from the conflict in Vietnam, Congress did pass much legislation of importance to the Nation in general and to Alaska in particular.

MINIMUM WAGE EXTENSION

First. Minimum wage coverage was extended to 8 million more workers, including retail and construction workers, those engaged in restaurant and food service, and those who work in laundry and drycleaning establishments. Farmworkers on the largest farms, the so-called agribusinesses, also came under the new law.

The minimum wage itself was raised. By 1968, those covered by previous legislation will receive a minimum wage of $1.60 per hour, and those newly covered will be entitled to the same minimum wage by 1971.

Second. Federal employees received an average 2.9-percent pay increase along with more liberal retirement and fringe benefits. The new benefits allow retirement on full annuity at age 55 after 30 years' service, or at 60 after 20 years; liberalize survivors' annuity benefits for future widows of Federal employees and children of deceased Federal employees; provide a 10-percent increase in annuities of widows of Federal employees who died or retired prior to October 11, 1962; extend health insurance coverage to children up to 22 years of age rather than the previous limit of 21; and liberalize overtime pay for classified and postal supervisor employees.

LEGISLATION TO HELP VETERANS

Third. The cold war veterans bill—which I had advocated and cosponsored for the last three Congresses—was enacted. The legislation provides educational and home loan benefits for veterans who have served in the armed services since January 31, 1955. It was my feeling that the war in Vietnam is no less of a war than any other war we have fought, and that men who fight there deserve consideration equal to that extended to veterans of previous wars.

Legislation enacted during this Congress resulted in substantial increases for VA beneficiaries. Monthly rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to widows, parents, and children were significantly liberalized. Compensation rates for veterans with service-connected disabilities were increased by more than $176 million a year. A highly successful program of low-cost life insurance for servicemen was inaugurated, featuring cooperative Government-private industry administration. For the first time, educational benefits have been made available on a permanent basis for creditable service in the Nation's Armed Forces and for other-than-wartime service.

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Mr. William J. Driver, estimates that the veterans legislation approved by the 89th Congress will benefit 2,951 Alaskans and that the increase in benefits will total approximately $601,000. The estimated impact of the cold war GI bill will be assistance to 560 veterans in the State and the amount to be spent will be $356,430.

Fourth. Modest appropriations were provided for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, legislation for which I had originally sponsored at the beginning of the 1st session of the 89th Congress. At that time I said:

> In the sciences our progress has been aided greatly in recent years by a vast program of aids by the federal government to basic and applied science . . . but in directing our efforts to aid the sciences we have created an imbalance in the advances in the humanities and the arts.

This imbalance has been righted with the establishment and funding of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. However, full funding of the act is necessary if our arts and humanities are to be developed.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ESTABLISHED

Fifth. The administration and Congress acted to solve the problems of modern man in our rapidly evolving society by establishing a Department of Transportation. The implications of this legislation for Alaska are many. The new Department will embrace such important transportation activities as the Alaska Railroad, the Federal Aviation Agency, and the Bureau of Public Roads. As originally proposed by the White House, the plan of organization for the new Department would have provided for the transfer of the Alaska Railroad by Executive order after the bill became law. However, I stressed the importance of uninterrupted efficient operation of the railroad when the Government Operations Committee, on which I serve, considered the bill, and the transfer of the railroad was included in the legislation.

Transportation is vitally important to a State of Alaska's size and stage of economic development. The new Department of Transportation should give positive direction to Federal transportation in and for Alaska, the inadequacy of some sectors of which has long been known to Alaskans and has hindered development.

Sixth. Congress passed truth-in-packaging legislation, which fixes standards for labeling net contents of food and other consumer goods and establishes procedures for developing uniform weight-quantity standards for packages.

FUNDS FOR NATIVE HOUSING AUTHORIZED

Seventh. A demonstration cities bill was passed, which provides for a Federal program of grants for urban renewal and development.

The legislation includes Senator BOB BARTLETT's amendment authorizing $10 million in Federal funds for housing for Alaskan natives. Under the new law the State of Alaska will be able to initiate a statewide program of grants for native housing assistance. Each grant may be for up to 75 percent of the cost of housing whose average per-unit cost may not exceed $7,500.

The actions of the 2d session of the 89th Congress also did much to increase the Federal Government's partnership with Alaska by passing legislation of interest and importance to Alaska in particular.

CONGRESS VOTES $70 MILLION MORE IN ALASKAN HIGHWAY AID

This session saw the initiation of one of the most significant Federal programs in the history of Alaskan statehood with the passage of S. 3155, the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1966, which included my amendment to provide special and additional assistance to Alaska for construction and maintenance of highways. Under the legislation as passed and signed into Public Law 89-574, Alaska will receive $14 million annually for 5 years in addition to the $40 million already provided by existing legislation.

I have long advocated the need for Federal help to build an effective surface transportation system for Alaska. Without efficient transportation most of the great potential of our State will lie untapped and buried, without benefit to Alaskans and all other Americans.

Yet, in 1916 and for 40 years thereafter the Territory of Alaska was excluded from participating in the benefits of the Federal Aid Highway Act and not until 1956 was Alaska included in the Federal Highway Act, receiving only one-third the funding allowed other States. Alaska has too long been denied its rightful share of Federal funds for highway construction, as it has been too long denied a just share of Federal aid to meet its other needs.

In this session of Congress I introduced my amendment to S. 3155, the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1966, to provide an additional $10 million annually for 5 years over and above what existing highway funding legislation provided for Alaska. It was also providing the use of Federal funds for maintenance of highways by the State of Alaska a provision not granted any other State and use of Federal funds for construction of access and development roads.

In testimony before the Senate Public Works Subcommittee on Public Roads, of which I am a member, I noted that in 1959 the Bureau of Public Roads had estimated that Alaska would have received $575 million in the nearly 50 years before statehood had it been given equitable treatment by the Federal Government. I reminded my colleagues that Alaskans had proved that they were willing and able to do what they could to help themselves, as they demonstrated when the State floated a $23 million bond issue for the construction of the imaginative and highly valuable marine highway—which was built without $1 of Federal aid. This marine highway, which consists of three modern seagoing vessels carrying cars and passengers, and another ferry in Westward, Alaska, links southeastern Alaska cities from Ketchikan to Skagway, and provides a new approach to the interior of Alaska.

My amendment was included in the Senate version of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1966, and the conference of the Senate and the House resulted in the even more generous provisions for Alaska of $14 million annually for 5 years.

A start has been made. The $70 million additional authorized by the legislation is long overdue recognition that Alaska should have an equitable share of Federal money for construction and maintenance of highways and that it deserves special assistance.

ALASKA CENTENNIAL FUNDS APPROPRIATED

Alaska's 1967 centennial was assisted immeasurably by the action of the 89th Congress. The passage of S. 2614, signed into Public Law 89-375, which authorized $4.6 million in Federal funds for the centennial and the subsequent appropriation for that amount in the supplemental appropriation bill, H.R. 14012, Public Law 89-426, insure substantial Federal participation in the celebration.

The measure to provide for Federal participation in Alaska's centennial celebration was introduced by the Alaska congressional delegation and passed the Senate on the last day of the 1st session of the 89th Congress. At that time the authorization stood at $3.6 million.

Representative Ralph Rivers achieved a significant victory in the second session with the passage of H.R. 9963, his companion measure to S. 2614. Representative Rivers was able to increase the amount authorized by $1 million to $4.6 million.

The Senate agreed to the increase. Senator Bartlett, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, led the fight to retain the amount authorized by the House. The bill as finally passed allows the Federal Government to spend $4 million for matching grants to finance industrial, agricultural, educational, research, or commercial projects or facilities in Alaska which contribute to the economic development of Alaska. Public Law 89-375 also authorizes expenditure of $600,000 for Federal participation in ceremonies and exhibits for the centennial.

MINING INDUSTRY AIDED

Uncovering the vast mineral resources of Alaska is closer now that Congress and the President have approved H.R. 4665, Public Law 89-570, the Ullman-Gruening bill to liberalize tax-deduction provisions for mining-exploration expenditures. The passage of H.R. 4665, climaxed 3 years and 4 months of effort on my part to aid the mining industry, which should again play an important role in the development of Alaska.

The new law allows mining companies to take as current income tax deductions all costs of exploration for minerals without limitation. Previously deductions were limited to $100,000 annually or a total of $400,000 regardless of the mine operator's actual expense. The measure includes the provision that, when a mine becomes productive, the operator must forgo depletion allowances equal to the amount previously deducted as an expense, or include as income for the year production is reached an amount equivalent to the deduction.

Similar proposed legislation came before Congress initially in June 1963, when I introduced S. 1807. I reintroduced such proposed legislation in August 1964, in the 2d session of the 88th Congress. Finally, in the 89th Congress, I introduced S. 338. At the same time, Representative Al Ullman, Democrat, of Oregon, at my request, introduced H.R. 4665 as a companion bill to meet the constitutional requirement that revenue measures originate in the House of Representatives. Our bills were the basis for Public Law 89-570.

How can we best interest the Federal Government in the development of the neglected mining industry in Alaska? On-site inspection helps, and, in July 1966, I was successful in my efforts to persuade the highest ranking mining officials in the Federal Government to visit Alaska to acquaint them with our mining problems and potential. Making the trip were J. Cordell Moore, assistant Secretary of the Interior for Mineral Resources; Dr. William T. Pecora, Director of the Geological Survey; and Dr. Walter R. Hibbard, Director of the Bureau of Mines. Neither Cordell Moore nor Walter Hibbard has ever been to Alaska, and William Pecora not for 25 years.

Hopefully, these new contacts as well as the new law will mark the beginning of a more enlightened Federal mining policy, providing economic encouragement to the Alaskan mining industry to venture into hitherto unexplored areas to tap further Alaska's great potential.

TWELVE-MILE FISHING ZONE ESTABLISHED

This session Congress took a long-needed step to protect the rights of American fishermen by passing S. 2218, Public Law 89-658, Senator Bartlett's bill to establish exclusive rights to fishing in a 9-mile zone beyond the 3-mile limit. As a long-time advocate of such legislation, I was happy to add my name as a cosponsor of the measure.

More than 3 years ago, on June 28, 1963, I introduced S. 1816, a bill designed to extend our territorial waters to 12 miles. On January 7, 1965, I introduced similar legislation, S. 49. The 3-mile limit has been an albatross around the neck of American fishermen. It was an obsolete provision dating from the days when 3 miles was the approximate distance a cannon ball from a shore battery could hit a hostile vessel. The modern-day effect of the 3-mile limit was to allow the ships of foreign nations such as Japan and the Soviet Union to deplete our fish stocks.

The demands of economic competition and conservation make necessary the kind of control over U.S. fisheries established by Public Law 89-658. However, more technical and financial help for our neglected fishing industry must follow, so that communities such as Dillingham, Petersburg, and Seldovia may prosper.

ALASKA PUBLIC WORKS FUNDS APPROPRIATED

Public works provide an important economic stimulus to the economy. I have long supported an accelerated public works program by the Federal Government.

Although Alaskan employment statistics are generally encouraging, statistics are scant comfort to those who remain unemployed. Nothing can be more distressing than the plight of the breadwinner seeking employment and unable to find a job. Such an individual is not interested in high levels of gross national product or in total numbers of employed. He is interested in securing employment so that he can feed, clothe, and house his family.

This year public works appropriations for Alaska total more than $1.5 million. Funds have been appropriated for flood control investigations at Bethel, $29,000; Cape Nome, $6,000; Dillingham, $8,000; Fort Yukon, $10,000; Point Hope, $12,000; and on the Tanana River, $30,000. Navigation projects have been funded for

Dry Straits-Wrangell Narrows, $51,000; Gastineau Channel, $63,000; Humboldt Harbor, $23,000; Kobuk River, $28,000; Metlakatla Harbor, $22,000; Naknek Harbor, $20,000; and Turn Point, $7,000. General investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation will include the Lake Grace power project, $24,500; power marketing and transmission line studies, $100,000; resource development program and basin survey, $250,000; steam gaging and sediment sampling, $35,000; and the Takatz Creek power project, $35,500. Funds have also been appropriated for the maintenance and operation of Nome Harbor, $75,000; and for construction of the all-important Snettisham project, $750,000.

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA AIDED

The University of Alaska benefits from S. 2366, Public Law 89-588, which reforms the method by which the university acquires land for its support. The measure, which I introduced and Senator BOB BARTLETT cosponsored, authorizes the exchange of lands conveyed to the university for its support for other lands in cases where such an action would benefit both the university and the State. The law also nullifies restrictions concerning land conveyance contained in the original act of 1929 establishing the university.

PRIBILOF ISLANDS MANAGEMENT REORGANIZED

This Congress passed S. 2102, Senator BARTLETT's bill, to reorganize management of the Pribilof Islands.

It is my contention that residents of the Pribilof Islands and Alaska natives in general should handle their own property with ever-diminishing supervision by officials of the Bureau of Indian Affairs or other Federal agencies, and that every effort should be made to diminish the existing wardship.

To this end I introduced and the Senate approved an amendment to S. 2102 which would prohibit the issuance of restricted deeds on the islands 10 years after the bill became law. A restricted deed is one over which the Secretary of the Interior has final control and prevents any action by the native owner concerning his property without the Secretary's approval.

Although the House-Senate conference extended the time period to 20 years, I intend to continue my efforts to end the wardship of the Federal Government over our native people, and to enable residents of communities such as Angoon, Barrow, Klukwan, Tyonek, and Metlakatla, to achieve the equality in managing their own affairs enjoyed by nonnatives.

WORK IN COMMITTEES

Speeches and debate on the floor of the Senate compose only part of the activities of a Senator. Many of the efforts I have made to provide Alaska with Federal help have been made in the committees of the Senate, which comprise one of the most rewarding, yet time-consuming aspects of service in the Senate.

The committees decide the complex details of proposed legislation necessary to direct a modern political society such as ours.

The committee hearings help educate the American people on important issues on matters of public policy, by exploring subjects as fundamental as population control, as complicated as foreign aid, as neglected as mining, or as emotionally charged as racial relations.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I presided over numerous hearings this past Congress dealing with many of the most important problems of Alaska—those concerning mineral resources use and laws. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee also deals with the problems confronting Indian, Eskimo, and Aleut citizens of our State.

As a member of the Committee on Public Works and serving on its Subcommittees on Public Roads and Flood Control and Navigation, I look into proposals for highways, power dams, small boat harbors, public buildings, flood control, breakwaters, dredging, and air and water pollution.

The Senate Government Operations Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures, of which I am chairman, has responsibilities in overseeing the administration of our foreign assistance programs.

STUDY OF U.S. AID IMPACT ON CHILE

My view on foreign aid is that such a program has been necessary, but should be administered far more wisely and efficiently. This year I proposed six separate amendments to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966 to tighten the administration of the foreign assistance program.

My opinion of the continuing deficiencies in our foreign aid program was justified by a report which I submitted in June 1966, on the study by the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures of the use of our foreign aid in selected Latin American countries, with Chile the special subject of an in-depth analysis of the effects of U.S. aid upon recipient countries. Chile was selected because of all Latin-American countries, its conditions were most favorable for a successful aid program.

But facts found by the study, written objectively with ample documentation, necessitated the conclusion that there is little to indicate that U.S. assistance is having a meaningful impact on Chilean economic and social development. An excessive infusion of aid can be too much for the recipient nation to handle and can result in dissipating efforts with no permanent effects.

My study found that the most urgent requirement for a sound foreign assistance program is to dampen expectations all around with respect to what foreign aid can accomplish. So long as unrealistic assumptions prevail, plans will be mounted in haste, and the inevitable frustrations and failures will engender disappointment and mutual recriminations. Eventually, donors and recipients will become disillusioned with the aid program.

SURPLUS PROPERTY DISPOSAL PROGRAMS STUDIED

The Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures continued its study of the surplus property disposal activities of the U.S. Government which I had initiated in 1965.

Hearings held in May 1966, disclosed that the Department of Defense was disposing of large quantities of equipment at a time when there was a critical need for similar equipment in Vietnam. We discovered that lack of coordination within the Department allowed local overseas commanders to dispose of equipment without reporting such equipment to national inventory control points in the United States where needs in other areas would be known.

As a result of the hearings, the Defense Department initiated action to correct the situation disclosed by the investigation. Revised Department of Defense regulations now require that all excess property overseas be reported to inventory control points to ensure maximum utilization of needed property. It is estimated that many millions of dollars will be saved through increased utilization of equipment. Furthermore, combat and support units are now likely to have needed equipment more readily available than if they had to wait for new procurement.

The investigations of the Foreign Aid Expenditures Subcommittee in these areas led me to introduce two bills in connection with surplus Government property. One, S. 3385, would make greater quantities of equipment available to State health, education, and civil defense agencies. The bill would require the Agency for International Development to make available surplus property to those State agencies before it can be given to foreign countries under the foreign assistance programs of the United States.

Hearings were held on S. 3385 in June 1966, after which the subcommittee approved the bill and reported it to the full Government Operations Committee.

The other bill, S. 2610, introduced in 1965, would require executive agencies to give State and local agencies a chance to acquire surplus equipment before such equipment is traded in on new equipment. During the 2d session of the 89th Congress my bill was passed by the Senate and sent to the House of Representatives, which regrettably took no action. I shall reintroduce both bills in the 90th Congress.

PROBE OF POPULATION PROBLEM CONTINUES

The Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures held lengthy hearings on S. 1676, my bill to coordinate and disseminate birth control information upon request at home and overseas. The bill would create offices for population problems in the Department of State and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Each office would be headed by an Assistant Secretary for population problems. The bill would also authorize the President to call a White House conference on population in 1967.

Since June 22, 1965, the subcommittee has held 28 public hearings at which

98 distinguished men and women have presented their views on the population crisis.

The dialog which the subcommittee hearings began is helping to bring the population crisis to the attention of an increasing number of citizens, and has been the stimulus to recent positive steps taken by the executive branch. President Johnson since his election has made no less than 24 public statements stressing the importance of "bold and daring" responses to the "multiplying problems of our multiplying populations." In part as a result of these hearings, both the Department of State and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have budged slightly to make their programs in birth control both more public and more extensive. But there is much more to be done if the President's mandate is to be implemented properly, and this pressing problem is to have adequate response.

FOOD-FOR-PEACE PROGRAM INVESTIGATED

The Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures, of which I am chairman, completed its initial investigation of the administration of the Public Law 480 programs, popularly known as the food-for-peace program, and held hearings on the matters in June 1966.

The hearings brought out serious deficiencies in the way Public Law 480 programs were being managed. Data presented to the subcommittee showed that Public Law 480 food had been sent to foreign countries which had, in turn, sent their own production of the same or similar crops to Communist countries. Although this is in specific violation of the law, the Department of State has taken no action to correct the situation.

However, the House of Representatives did take note of the subcommittee's findings. The House voted to send the conference report on the Food for Peace Act of 1966 back to another conference, with instructions to include a provision prohibiting the United States from undertaking food-for-peace transactions with any country trading with North Vietnam or Cuba.

The conference committee agreed on a compromise which provided that no food assistance would be given to any country trading with North Vietnam, but left the discretion with the President as to whether food assistance should be given to countries trading with Cuba. The compromise was agreed to by the Senate and the House. Under this new legislation no new food-for-peace program can be given to the United Arab Republic as long as it continues its trade with North Vietnam.

Another of my major endeavors in the field of international relations has been to speak out publicly on the floor of the Senate in support of, or opposition to, administration foreign policy when this appears to me to be in the best interests of the people.

I have been concerned with other matters, including our commitments with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. I noted in a Senate speech that we can hardly base present-day policy on concepts and suppositions which were current in 1949 when NATO was formed and have long since lost their relevance. A serious examination of our position and policy in Western Europe is in order so that we may base our policy on contemporary reality rather than on obsolete assumptions.

For these reasons I cosponsored Senate Resolution 300, the Senate resolution calling for a substantial reduction in the number of American troops in Western Europe.

ADDENDUM: FEDERAL GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES IN ALASKA

The value of a government cannot be measured solely in terms of total money spent. The real question is whether those whom a government affects have become more free from physical burdens and economic hardships, and more free to be human beings.

Statistics tell at least a part of the story, however. The tables below of Federal expenditures in Alaska since statehood give evidence that Alaska has received a substantial and growing Federal investment. I am confident that America's northernmost State will repay many times this expenditure of Federal funds:

U.S. Department of Commerce: Expenditures in the State of Alaska

[In dollars]

Area Redevelopment Administration:	
1962	1,555,106
1963	2,514,209
1964	458,959
1965	3,739
Economic Development Administration:	
1965	246,000
1966	3,108,000
1967	(1)
Total	7,886,013
Domestic and International Business:	
1963	12,887
1964	26,118
1965	28,448
1966	29,743
1967 (estimate)	29,000
Total	126,196
National Bureau of Standards:	
1959	170,680
1960	171,003
1961	176,240
1962	167,849
1963	169,250
1964	202,218
1965	196,000
1966	(3)
1967 (estimate)	(3)
Total	1,253,240
Bureau of the Census:	
1960	179,402
1961	1,904
1962	2,006
1963	1,844
1964	3,074
1965	12,741
1966	3,997
1967 (estimate)	4,197
Total	209,165
Coast and Geodetic Survey:	
1959	930,300
1960	914,700
1961	1,283,000
1962	1,061,200
1963	923,100
1964	851,200
1965 (Environmental Science Services Administration)[2]	5,011,000
1966	5,879,000
1967 (estimate)	5,933,100
Total	22,786,600
Bureau of Public Roads:	
1959	15,402,904
1960	16,573,556
1961	12,600,117
1962	16,795,839
1963	19,631,902
1964	22,488,079
1965	62,635,460
1966	52,994,451
1967 (estimate)	54,530,000
Total	273,652,308
Weather Bureau:	
1959	2,292,000
1960	2,298,000
1961	2,164,000
1962	2,668,000
1963	2,474,000
1964 (Environmental Science Services Administration)[2]	2,902,000
Total	14,798,000
Office of State Technical Services:	
1965	----------
1966	25,000
1967	25,000
Total	50,000
Grand total	320,761,522

[1] Estimates for 1967 cannot be projected since approval of projects depends upon volume of projects received from all eligible areas and their comparative value in terms of economic impact.

[2] Reorganization of Coast and Geodetic Survey and Weather Bureau, and certain functions formerly performed by National Bureau of Standards.

[3] Functions were transferred to the Environmental Science Services Administration.

U.S. Department of Agriculture: Funds used in Alaska, by agencies, fiscal years 1959–67, estimated

[In dollars]

Department of Agriculture Agricultural Research Service:	
1959	342,786
1960	346,044
1961	384,674
1962	402,247
1963	422,399
1964	426,825
1965	474,013
1966	494,100
1967 (estimate)	63,200
Total	3,356,288
Soil Conservation Service:	
1959	132,356
1960	135,314
1961	159,933
1962	164,545
1963	181,869
1964	203,877
1965	227,211
1966	258,497

U.S. Department of Agriculture: Funds used in Alaska, by agencies, fiscal years 1959–67, estimated—Continued

[In dollars]

Soil Conservation Service—Con.	
1967 (estimate)	(1)
Total	1,463,602
Rural Electrification Administration:	
1959	875,000
1960	5,155,000
1961	2,524,000
1962	6,596,000
1963	6,338,000
1964	35,290,000
1965	4,080,000
1966	9,180,000
1967 (estimate)	(1)
Total	70,038,000
Forest Service:	
1959	2,390,665
1960	2,594,569
1961	3,661,012
1962	4,569,259
1963	5,805,867
1964	6,195,682
1965	6,592,512
1966	6,741,832
1967 (estimate)	6,154,100
Total	44,715,498
Farmers Home Administration:	
1959	131,708
1960	377,356
1961	459,063
1962	1,345,688
1963	1,306,235
1964	1,031,951
1965	1,183,902
1966	2,365,000
1967 (estimate)	2,200,000
Total	10,400,903
Federal Extension Service:	
1959	107,993
1960	107,993
1961	111,429
1962	138,190
1963	158,008
1964	174,422
1965	190,378
1066	221,920
1967 (estimate)	(1)
Total	1,210,333
Agricultural Marketing Service:	
1959	222,060
1960	249,696
1961	322,109
1962	320,204
1963	432,155
Consumer and Marketing Service:	
1964	590,081
1965	1,003,605
1966	495,844
1967 (estimate)	(1)
Total	3,635,854
Commodity Credit Corporation:	
1959	13,523
1960	20,909
1961	16,654
1962	33,659
1963	42,878
1964	37,000
1965	41,500
1966	38,800
1967 (estimate)	(1)
Total	244,923
Statistical Reporting Service:	
1961	21,224
1962	29,720
1963	21,799
1964	26,016
1965	35,220
1966	29,800
1967 (estimate)	30,000
Total	193,779
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service:	
1959	75,345
1960	84,078
1961	89,304
1962	115,254
1963	131,461
1964	144,776
1965	180,267
1966	184,700
1967 (estimate)	166,900
Total	1,172,085
Cooperative State Research Service:	
1959	218,143
1960	223,099
1961	225,773
1962	248,070
1963	250,938
1964	332,795
1965	326,283
1966	343,987
1967 (estimate)	(1)
Total	2,169,088
Grand total	138,600,353

[1] Estimates for 1967 cannot be projected since approval of projects depends upon volume of projects received from all eligible areas and their comparative value in terms of economic impact.

Department of the Interior, Office of Budget, Aug. 15, 1966: Expenditures in Alaska since Statehood (1959)

[In dollars]

The Alaska Railroad:	
1959	17,174,000
1960	17,464,000
1961	14,335,000
1962	14,480,000
1963	16,402,000
1964	15,800,101
1965	27,309,000
1966	24,900,000
1967 (estimated)	16,000,000
Total	163,864,101
Bureau of Commercial Fisheries:	
1959	4,655,797
1960	4,421,775
1961	5,264,781
1962	4,816,309
1963	3,456,000
1964	4,501,000
1965	5,833,000
1966	4,577,000
1967 (estimated)	4,984,000
Total	42,509,662
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife:	
1959	641,513
1960	801,506
1961	765,809
1962	919,050
1963	1,070,750
1964	766,000
1965	1,886,065
1966	1,952,709
1967 (estimated)	1,751,200
Total	10,554,602
Bureau of Mines:	
1959	420,169
1960	425,189
1961	418,320
1962	391,200
1963	388,000
1964	502,000
1965	519,000
1966	520,000
1967 (estimated)	492,000
Total	4,075,878
Bureau of Reclamation:	
1959	617,469
1960	504,026
1961	542,912
1962	643,700
1963	631,143
1964	1,192,912
1965	1,871,085
1966	1,933,527
1967 (estimated)	798,500
Total	8,735,274
Geological Survey:	
1962	3,020,000
1963	3,336,000
1964	3,614,000
1965	3,537,000
1966	3,629,000
1967 (estimated)	3,565,000
Total	20,701,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs:	
1959	8,703,083
1960	8,606,399
1961	9,851,590
1962	13,849,749
1963	15,500,437
1964	17,342,282
1965	23,777,003
1966	19,076,645
1967 (estimated)	28,293,459
Total	145,000,647
National Park Service:	
1959	1,829,044
1960	955,137
1961	1,387,294
1962	1,225,142
1963	623,801
1964	1,606,223
1965	1,347,188
1966	2,366,000
1967 (estimated)	1,780,350
Total	13,120,179
Bureau of Land Management:	
1959	4,892,140
1960	4,812,055
1961	4,682,014
1962	4,004,028
1963	4,428,354
1964	4,300,878
1965	11,100,497
1966	13,196,227
1967 (estimated)	13,075,400
Total	64,491,593
Bureau of Outdoor Recreation:	
1965	----------
1966	302,550
1967 (estimated)	1,130,735
Total	1,433,285

Department of the Interior, Office of Budget, Aug. 15, 1966: Expenditures in Alaska since Statehood (1959)—Continued

[In dollars]

Office of Minerals Exploration:	
1963	48, 218
1964	92, 000
1965	[1] 15, 000
1966	[1] 35, 000
1967 (estimated)	[1] 18, 000
Total	140, 218
Office of the Secretary:	
1963	32, 694
1964	36, 300
1965	38, 464
1966	38, 620
1967 (estimated)	40, 500
Total	186, 578
Office of the Solicitor:	
1959	114, 400
1963	98, 743
1964	117, 700
1965	89, 269
1966	108, 901
1967 (estimated)	119, 248
Total	648, 261
Office of Water Resources Research:	
1965	52, 297
1966	105, 185
1967 (estimated)	87, 500
Total	244, 982
Federal Water Pollution Control Administration (until May 1966 reported under Public Health Service, HEW):	
1959	[2] 421, 025
1960	[2] 437, 525
1961	[2] 440, 225
1962	[2] 599, 260
1963	[2] 709, 728
1964	[2] 1, 079, 063
1965	[2] 856, 680
1966	1, 059, 205
1967 (estimated)	1, 300, 834
Total	2, 360, 039
Office of Territories:	
1959	6, 001, 010
1960	4, 582, 783
1961	1, 667, 868
1962	----------
1963	1, 309
1964	595
1965	7, 525
1966	23, 833
1967 (estimated)	20, 203
Total	12, 305, 121
Total: Dept. of the Interior	490, 371, 420

[1] Included with Geological Survey.

[2] These amounts are nonadd.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Expenditures in the State of Alaska

[In dollars]

Food and Drug Administration:	
1959	1, 000
1960	1, 000
1961	1, 000
1962	1, 000
1963	2, 643
1964	3, 390
1965	1, 417
1966 (estimate)	1, 565
1967 (estimate)	2, 660
Total	15, 675

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Expenditures in the State of Alaska—Continued

[In dollars]

Vocational Rehabilitation Administration:	
1959	111, 151
1960	119, 464
1961	118, 966
1962	109, 912
1963	181, 764
1964	444, 379
1965	233, 653
1966 (estimate)	615, 859
1967 (estimate)	315, 197
Total	3, 310, 345
Welfare Administration:	
1959	2, 147, 648
1960	2, 216, 424
1961	2, 217, 717
1962	2, 257, 923
1963	2, 426, 215
1964	2, 670, 180
1965	3, 273, 355
1966 (estimate)	3, 118, 409
1967 (estimate)	3, 413, 568
Total	23, 741, 439
Office of Education:	
1959	5, 417, 941
1960	9, 132, 798
1961	10, 281, 275
1962	8, 683, 638
1963	12, 088, 118
1964	10, 292, 418
1965	13, 421, 601
1966 (estimate)	16, 985, 378
1967 (estimate)	12, 461, 465
Total	98, 764, 632
Public Health Service:	
1959	16, 633, 559
1960	19, 159, 681
1961	13, 684, 308
1962	13, 842, 013
1963	15, 681, 949
1964	21, 935, 708
1965	16, 477, 108
1966 (estimate)	17, 218, 734
1967 (estimate)	22, 064 ,097
Total	156, 697, 157
Social Security Administration:	
1959	3, 840, 474
1960	4, 321, 758
1961	4, 656, 569
1962	5, 339, 375
1963	5, 934, 338
1964	6, 178, 740
1965	6, 422, 703
1966 (estimate)	7, 772, 092
1967 (estimate)	11, 346, 100
Total	55, 812, 149
Administration on Aging (new):	
1965	(1)
1966 (estimate)	51, 000
1967 (estimate)	61, 200
Total	112, 200
American Printing House for the Blind:	
1965	88
1966 (estimate)	100
1967 (estimate)	100
Total	288
Grand total	338, 453, 855

[1] Program did not begin operation until fiscal year 1966.

NOTE.—Figures for the Social Security Administration represent old-age, survivors, and disability insurance trust fund payments. All others are obligations from appropriated general funds.

Department of Defense—Estimated expenditures and military prime contracts, Alaska

[In thousands of dollars]

Fiscal year	Military pay	Civilian pay	Military prime contract awards	
			Total	Construction [1]
1959	124, 022	43, 320	127, 724	80, 286
1960	127, 838	44, 098	78, 649	56, 918
1961	124, 143	44, 720	91, 797	40, 380
1962	128, 820	47, 780	63, 320	24, 706
1963	129, 484	46, 226	103, 476	22, 766
1964	132, 740	42, 112	101, 545	51, 572
1965	149, 543	47, 920	74, 175	32, 038
1966	163, 025	50, 567	71, 666	(2)
Total	1, 079, 615	366, 743	712, 352	308, 366

[1] Included in total.

[2] Not available at this time.

Total Department of Defense, $2,467,076,000.
Grand total, all departments, $3,755,263,150.

Remarks of the Honorable Eugene J. Keogh, of New York, on Retirement From Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, this moment is a momentous one. It encompasses much—it covers more—it is, for me, spontaneously studied. It is welcome and sad—but it will always be cherished.

It is fulsome because it recalls for me almost 30 years of a tremendous period of our country's great history—during which I have been privileged to work in the vineyard, yet sit with the mighty. The mighty who have been, are now, and always will be—the Members of the House of Representatives. Without this body and its great leaders—the Speaker, the majority and minority leaders and whips, the magnificent chairmen and ranking minority members—the untold workers in this great and changing vineyard, this would be just another country—not the great one it is.

This moment recalls and encompasses most of my adult and almost half my entire life but it also causes me to reflect on the great and terrible and awful and wondrous and jubilant and sad years that have passed so quickly since January 3, 1937, when I first arrived here to be sworn as a Member of this great body—ever changing, always continuing—but forever great—for in this Hall, in January of each odd year assemble the most complete and accurate cross-section of the diverse populace of our broad, ever-growing country. Truly a Hall of the House of Representatives, truly representative of its people.

Mr. Speaker, I shortly take my leave voluntarily, a moment to which I have looked forward for some time but not without mixed emotions. For I know in the future I shall ponder over the many great and pleasant experiences membership in this body brings. I shall always hold dear the countless acts of graciousness, kindness, and inspiration I have been accorded by you, Mr. Speaker, and those predecessors under whom I have served. I shall never forget your occasional admonition and paternal advice, always so humanly and gentlemanly administered. The majority leader and whip [Mr. ALBERT and Mr. BOGGS] have been my very good friends. The minority leaders of the House and the ranking minority members of the committees on which I have served have always been understanding and tolerant, even though adamant and worthy adversaries. I will not soon forget, but rather always will I appreciate, having been privileged to serve, since 1951—except for a short period—on the great Committee on Ways and Means and under the greatest of chairmen, Representatives Doughton, Reed, Cooper, and the present Chairman MILLS. Under the latter, I have served the longest and, thus, am privileged by that fact alone to attest to his eminent fairness, tremendous ability, and unbounded capacity. He truly merits his high standing among his colleagues with which I am in complete accord. The members of that great committee have uniformly been most sympathetic and understanding, and, frequently, quite helpful and cooperative, and I am appreciative. I should like to single them out for their individual and many acts but cannot do so. I am grateful to them all—to the very competent members of the staff of the committee—and particularly to Leo Irwin and John Martin, its chief counsel and assistant chief counsel—and of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation—and its staff directors, the late Colin Stam and, presently, Dr. Laurence N. Woodworth. I shall have many pleasant and grateful thoughts of their unending assistance and guidance.

To all my colleagues from New York—particularly the dean, Mr. CELLER—and elsewhere, the privilege of serving with you, working with you, worrying with you, will forever be cherished by me, whatever the future brings or wherever I may go.

The House of Representatives is your House, Mr. Speaker, and it is a great and noble body—honorable to enter—difficult to leave—but leave we will. I go with a realization of the great privilege that has been mine. Mr. Speaker, your House will ever be a place of honor for all good men to enter and serve.

Legislative Report of Senator Ralph Yarborough: 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to report to the people of Texas upon my activities on their behalf during the 89th Congress.

History reveals that progress comes not in measured cadence, but rather in sudden bursts of activity. We can find important historical watersheds embodied in a nation's progressive legislative landmarks. The English reform bills of the 1830's are a case in point. In our own country we can look to the Jefferson, Jackson, and Polk administrations of the last century.

We are still too close to the legislative events of our own century to know which will leave their mark upon history and which will fade away. However, certain candidates are already in the running. Certainly the New Deal legislation of the 1930's looms large in all our memories.

What of the 89th Congress? How will future generations view the work we have done here these last 2 years? Again, no one knows the answer to that question now. However, I cannot but believe that history will view the 89th Congress of the United States kindly and with admiration.

I am proud to report to the people of Texas on the accomplishments of my work that 1965 and 1966 have yielded. During these 2 years I introduced 53 bills and amendments in the Senate. The substance of 25 of these proposals was enacted into law. Three others were passed by the Senate but not by the House. In addition, I cosponsored 51 bills the substance of which was enacted into law. Nine other bills that I cosponsored passed the Senate.

Much of this legislation gives direction, emphasis, and aid to efforts at dealing with the great social problems of the day. Much of it is aimed at making America a Great Society in the truest sense of the word. I am proud to have been a cosponsor or the sponsor of medicare, the elementary-secondary education bill, the higher education bill, the cold war GI bill, the air and water pollution bills, the minimum wage bill, the Older Americans Act, the auto safety legislation, the arts and humanities bill, the economic development bill, the rural water supply bill, the wildlife conservation bill, the historic properties preservation bill, the demonstration cities bill, and many other important measures.

During this Congress, I served on three Senate committees, as the third ranking Democrat on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, second ranking Democrat on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and the most junior Democrat on the powerful Appropriations Committee. I spent many, many hours in hearings and discussion of important measures. This Congress has a fine record of progressive measures passed; I worked to insure that each bill before my committees was good for for America and good for the people of Texas.

I. EDUCATION

A. COLD WAR GI BILL

Among all the areas in which I have been active, none is more important than education. I am particularly gratified that after 7 long years of efforts to pass my cold war GI bill of rights, over the massed opposition of three different administrations, the Department of Defense, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Veterans' Administration, I was able to guide the bill through the Senate in 1965 and help secure favorable action in the House in 1966. This act of justice to America's fighting men was long overdue, and I have never felt so happy as when I stood at our President's elbow as he signed that bill last March.

Over 6 million veterans of the cold war will be eligible for benefits under my bill, S. 9. This first year alone, over 26,000 young Texas veterans will begin receiving benefits for entering programs of education and training. My bill should help put 1,500,000 veterans through college. I doubt if I shall ever be privileged to sponsor and pass a more beneficial, more just, more needed bill.

B. ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Elementary-Secondary Education Act of 1965 in the 1 short year of its existence has already made a major impact on American education. The purpose of the program is the improvement of education of children who come from low-income families.

This year Congress adopted my proposal to make the program more effective by removing an injustice to the low-income States, which need this program the most. The 1965 law gave the schools of each State a grant equal to the product of the number of schoolchildren from low-income families in the State times one-half the annual amount the State spends per pupil on education.

The trouble with that approach was that the rich States spend more on education because they can afford to spend more. But the figures show that most of the low-income States exceed the national average in the percentage of per capita income spent on education. In other words, the low-income States are trying harder.

My amendment will change the formula so that a State will receive one-half the State average or one-half the national average per pupil expenditure, whichever is higher. This will mean an additional $337 million for the low-income States in fiscal year 1968. Texas will be entitled to an additional $26 million.

Congress also adopted my proposal to start an information service. The coming of the elementary-secondary education program has meant a new lease on life for many school districts. They have a tremendous opportunity to improve their curriculums, but many of them need help in planning new programs so that they can make the best use of their money. My amendment authorizes the Office of Education to make the latest results of educational research available to these school districts so that they can develop the most up to date courses in the country.

The program is entirely voluntary, and the Office of Education can provide this service only if the school district asks for it. This type of assistance should be very valuable to school administrators.

Congress has provided over a billion dollars for elementary and secondary educational improvement, and it is only sensible to provide assistance to administrators so that they can get maximum advantage from the money.

C. THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT

In 1965, Congress adopted my proposal to provide financial assistance to colleges and universities, especially those in financial need, for the purchase of classroom equipment to upgrade the quality of college undergraduate instruction. Known as the Yarborough-Carey program—Congressman Carey was the House cosponsor—the proposal became title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Properly used, language labs, audiovisual equipment, closed-circuit TV, and other classroom equipment can enable a teacher to be more effective. No one should get the idea that it can or should replace the teacher, but one of the things it can do is free the teacher from many routine matters so that he can spend more time with individual students. The process of education can thus be kept on a personal, human level, and we can stay away from the specter of dehumanized mass education.

My amendment to add junior colleges to coverage under the allied health professions educational assistance bill was adopted by Congress this year. I have long supported efforts to expand and improve the educational opportunities at the fast-growing junior colleges.

II. AGRICULTURE

A. RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

The REA is very important to the people of Texas. The 99 REA borrowers in our State serve nearly 400,000 people.

REA has brought light and power to our farm and ranch people. Only those of us who know what it was like in the old days can fully appreciate the tremendous change which rural electrification has meant in the lives of farmers and ranchers. Therefore I am glad that I was in a position this year to save the REA from a danger which threatened the rural electrification program with extinction.

The trouble began when the General Accounting Office said that a reporting procedure, started in 1964 by the Senate and the House Appropriations Committees, required the REA Administrator to ask commercial power companies for bids before approving any major generation or transmission loan. Such a procedure would have been tantamount to asking the private power companies to approve the loans themselves. This would have placed the future of REA in the hands of its competitors. The effect would have been disastrous.

It seemed clear to me that the GAO had misread the intent of Congress. After a long and difficult struggle, with the able assistance of many Senators, I was able to persuade my colleagues on the Senate Appropriations Committee to clarify the requirements of the reporting procedure to make clear that commercial power companies needed to be contacted for bids only where new REA facilities were intended to replace generation or transmission services of commercial power companies.

I regret that we were unable to pass the REA bank bill for supplemental financing this year, but I am glad that I was able to do something to save REA from the disastrous consequences of the GAO report. I hope that next year we will be able to get the REA bank bill on the books.

B. APPROPRIATIONS

The budget which the Agriculture Department presented to Congress called for severe cuts in many important programs benefiting both the consumer and the farmer. As a member of the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee, I did all that I could to raise these onerous cuts back to decent levels.

The bill Congress finally sent to the President contained important increases for Farmers Home Administration loans, REA loans, agricultural research, extension services, watershed protection, consumer protective programs, the school lunch program, and special milk program, as well as other important programs.

C. COTTON RESEARCH AND PROMOTION

If cotton is to survive it must compete more effectively against synthetic fibers. In the last 35 years cotton's share of the total U.S. fiber market dropped from 85 to 53 percent, while manmade fiber's share increased from 3.9 to 42.5 percent. This is due in large measure to lack of research, development, and promotion of cotton. Only one-seventh as much is spent on cotton research and promotion as the big synthetic fiber manufacturers spend on their product.

The Cotton Research and Promotion Act which Congress passed this year will enable cotton to be developed and promoted more effectively. Although there was some controversy over the proposal in Texas, it was supported by the overwhelming majority of cotton farmers. I supported it after first making sure it would be producer-directed and producer-controlled, and that a producer would have no trouble getting his dollar a bale back if he wanted it.

The bill ran into some trouble in committee, and I am grateful that I was able to convince some of my colleagues to change their minds and support the bill in committee so that it could come to the floor and be passed.

The bill is very important to Texas since the cotton industry is Texas' biggest employer, providing jobs for 235,000 workers with a payroll of $322 million.

D. FOOD FOR PEACE

Except for the threat of nuclear annihilation, the greatest danger to mankind's future well being on earth is the grim specter of unchecked population growth.

Scholars estimate that there were about a quarter-billion persons on earth in the year A.D. 1. It took 1,650 years for world population to double to a half billion. It then took only two centuries more to add another half billion, and the world's population thus reached about a billion by the outbreak of the Civil War.

In only 70 more years the world's population doubled again, reaching 2 billion around 1930. Today the world's population has risen to 3.3 billion. A United Nations study found that if the present trend of population growth continues, the population of the world will reach 7.4 billion by the year 2000. This is a gain of 4.1 billion people in 35 years. Over 85 percent of the increase will be in the low productivity countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

To allow such a thing to happen would be a sheer unmitigated calamity. All the positive things we have worked for, all the advances of Western civilization will have gone for nought unless we can moderate this rate of population growth.

This is a problem that transcends partisan politics. It is a problem for all mankind. I believe that one of the most worthwhile things I have done in my years in the Senate, has been to offer and get adopted an amendment to the food-for-peace bill to allow the local currencies that accrue under that program from our foreign sales of agricultural commodities, to be used for financing, at the request of a foreign country, "programs emphasizing maternal welfare, child health and nutrition, and activities, where participation is voluntary, related to the problems of population growth." This is an important beginning, the first time Congress has authorized funds for this purpose.

I support the whole food-for-peace program. This year's legislation improves it in many ways, especially by removing the surplus requirements and by emphasizing self-help.

III. WAR ON POVERTY

I support the war on poverty, an effort to help people help themselves. I believe in taking people off the relief rolls and putting them on the payrolls.

In 1965 one of the hardest fought battles of the session was over my amendment to remove undue political influence from the program and turn it over to the local community, by removing the Governor's veto over locally initiated, locally sponsored community action and Neighborhood Youth Corps programs.

After four rollcall votes decided by only one or two votes, the Senate adopted my amendment. Although the proposal was altered somewhat in the Senate-House conference, the point had been made that Congress considered this a people's program and not a political relief program for a Governor and his cronies.

In 1966 Congress adopted two of my amendments to the war on poverty. The first was designed to increase the effectiveness of the war on poverty in rural areas, by requiring the Office of Economic Opportunity to deal with other public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations when it is not feasible to establish a community action agency within a reasonable period of time. OEO had up until now refused to deal with a rural area unless it had a CAA, and this had retarded the effectiveness of the program in rural areas.

Congress also adopted my amendment to allow groups representative of the poor who are not adequately represented on their local community action agency to gain representation by a suitable petition.

IV. MINIMUM WAGE

One of the biggest battles of 1966 was over the minimum wage legislation. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, it was my duty to guide this important legislation through subcommittee, full committee, the full Senate, the Senate-House conference, and back to the Senate for final action. There were battles and pitfalls at every step of the way, but the final product was the greatest advance for fair wages since the original minimum wage law was enacted back in 1938.

The bill will raise the minimum wage to $1.60 per hour by February 1, 1968, for the 29.6 million presently covered workers, and will extend the protection of the act to over 8 million newly covered workers.

For the first time the law covers agricultural workers. Coverage is limited to the largest farms—the so-called agribusiness enterprises—which use more than seven full-time employees. Only 1.6 percent of the farms in the Nation are covered, but because these are the Nation's largest farms, 39 percent of the farmworkers are covered.

This coverage will aid both the farmworker and the small farmer—the worker, because for the first time he will be protected against the exploitation of 50-cent-an-hour wages, and the small farmer because he will not have to compete against the 50-cent-an-hour wage that allows the large corporate agri-business enterprise to undercut him at the marketplace.

The Agriculture Department estimates that perhaps 3,500 of the large farms in Texas will be covered. This is a small percentage of the 227,000 farms in Texas, 179,000 of which do not use any hired workers. The following table shows the distribution of farms by number of hired farmworkers in the United States and Texas:

Number of workers	Number of farms in—	
	United States	Texas
Farms without any hired workers	3,160,000	179,000
Farms with 1 hired worker	303,000	24,000
Farms with 2 hired workers	113,000	10,000
Farms with 3 or 4	70,000	7,000
Farms with 5 to 9	38,000	4,000
Farms with 10 or more workers	24,000	3,000
Total	3,708,000	227,000

Source: Census of Agriculture, 1959 (Sept. 7, 1966).

The people of Texas are in favor of this coverage. In a recent poll 69 percent of those asked said that they were in favor of a minimum wage for farmworkers.

V. CONSERVATION

A. GUADALUPE MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK

The closing days of Congress saw the enactment of the Guadalupe Mountains National Park bill, joining Big Bend National Park and my previously enacted Padre Island National Seashore bill as the third congressional action authorizing national parks in Texas. I have introduced a bill to make the Big Thicket in east Texas a national park, and I hope it will be Texas' fourth.

The Guadalupe Mountains National Park will include 77,000 acres in west Texas, surrounding Guadalupe Peak, Texas' highest mountain, and El Capitan, the prominent landmark of the pioneer days. These cool forested mountains rising from the arid plains will be a dramatic and worthy addition to the national park system.

The year 1965 saw congressional approval of the bill to create the Alibates Flint Quarries National Monument, preserving these 10,000-year-old flint quarries on the shores of the new Sanford Reservoir in the Panhandle.

B. PRESERVATION OF PARKS AND HISTORIC SITES FROM DESTRUCTION BY HIGHWAYS

For some time now we have witnessed the sad spectacle of irreplaceable parks and historic sites being plowed under to make way for highways. We need highways, and we have the best in the world, but I think there are better places to put them than through parks or historic sites. Congress agreed with me and adopted my proposal declaring a national policy to save these treasures from destruction by highways. My amendment to the Federal-Aid Highway Act is now written into law.

VI. VETERANS

In addition to the cold war GI bill, I was able to get congressional approval for nine other veterans measures I sponsored in the Senate. Most noteworthy was the Veterans' Administration hospital improvement bill.

When the VA closed down a number of rural VA hospitals last year, using as an excuse the fact that the hopsitals were in remote areas, it occurred to me that the plight of the remote VA hospital was really the plight of all rural hospitals. How much more in keeping with the American tradition it would be to use American ingenuity and know-how to improve these hospitals rather than just cross them off our list. Those who live in rural areas are just as deserving of first-class medical treatment as anybody else.

I therefore introduced a bill—with our distinguished majority leader Senator MANSFIELD as my cosponsor—to enable the VA to use the wonders of modern communication to upgrade these hospitals. My bill authorized the VA to enter into agreements with medical schools, hospitals, and research centers for the purpose of setting up electronic two-way radio and TV hookups. These and other programs would be established at the remote VA hospital in cooperation with the medical school or research center. Then, in order to benefit the whole community, the programs thus established would be made available to the surrounding medical community at an appropriate fee.

No veteran could be deprived of a bed or services; the aim is to upgrade the quality of care provided veterans. In addition, the whole community will benefit.

Congress gave final approval to this bill on the last day of the session. It is the most important step forward for VA hospitals since they began their highly successful relationship with medical schools many years ago.

VII. FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

As ranking majority member on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, much time and effort went into furthering the progress of Federal employee legislation before that committee. I am pleased at the progress we are making toward bringing Federal employee pay and benefits in line with those received by employees of private industry. Much of my time was devoted to work on the bill increasing retired employee's annuities passed in 1965. This legislation is expected to produce a cost-of-living increase in annuities in the near future.

VIII. TEXAS PROJECTS

A. MANY, MANY TEXAS PROJECTS APPROVED

Over the past 5 years Texas has received more than $105 million in Bureau of Reclamation projects, almost $50 million in watershed protection and flood prevention projects, and over $226 million in Corps of Engineers projects. One of the most important projects in quite a while was the Trinity River project which I fought hard for last year and which was approved by Congress. Appropriations voted this year by the Appropriations Committee, on which I serve, are financing a restudy to insure maximum benefits from this giant flood control and navigation project.

Of special importance has been the legislation involving our policy of cooperation with our good neighbor Mexico. Passed this year was my bill authorizing the lower Rio Grande salinity control program, in which sharing of costs between Texas water users, the United States, and Mexico will divert saline waters from the Rio Grande into Mexico and benefit irrigated crops in our "magic valley."

Commemorating the friendly settlement of the Chamizal dispute after 100 years of controversy will be the Chamizal National Memorial in El Paso. As Senate sponsor of this proposal, I look forward to visiting this "park of peace" to be constructed on the banks of the Rio Grande River. Nearby will be the Chamizal Border Highway, to be constructed along the banks of the new rerouted Rio Grande, as authorized in a bill enacted this year that I sponsored in the Senate.

B. HEMISFAIR, 1968

Congress authorized and appropriated funds for Federal participation in the HemisFair 1968 exposition to be held in San Antonio. The legislation carried my amendments to insure preservation of the historic buildings in the fair area, to guard against conflict of interest, and to insure full community participation and open conduct of affairs.

Congress authorized and the Senate appropriated $7.5 million, but the House conferees insisted on cutting the figure slightly, and we eventually came out with $6.75 million. This is a lot of money, and I think that San Antonio and Texas are going to have a wonderful fair.

It goes without saying that none of this could have been possible without the wonderful cooperation that I have received from my colleagues in the Senate and House, and especially my fellow members of the Texas delegation. We have a strong and able team, and I am very grateful for the wonderful assistance I received from each and every one of my fellow Texans. Many of the bills I have discussed here were cosponsored by my House colleagues.

I am also grateful for the courtesy and support received from the Senate Democratic leadership, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD and Senator RUSSELL LONG.

LOOKING AHEAD

I am already at work on many new ideas for the 90th Congress. Three of the top items on my agenda are:

First. Improvements in the cold war GI bill of rights.

Second. My bill to provide compensation for losses suffered by innocent victims of crimes.

Third. My bill creating a Big Thicket National Park in east Texas.

I am looking ahead now to these and other proposals as part of my pledge to the people of Texas to provide enlightened, forward-looking leadership in Congress.

Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Philadelphia Fellowship Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on October 11, 1966, America's oldest citywide private human rights agency celebrated its 25th birthday. And after a quarter of a century of vigorous activity, the Philadelphia Fellowship Commission is still a leader in the field of intergroup relations.

As a former mayor of Philadelphia, I take a special pride in the achievements of this splendid organization. The list of its accomplishments reads like a catalog of every significant advance in the field of human rights. It was, for example, the Fellowship Commission which drafted and helped to enact Philadelphia's ordinances against anonymous hate propaganda, and against discrimination in public housing; which was instrumental in the enactment of the city charter human rights guarantees and the establishment of the Commission on Human Relations; which worked for the adoption of the fair employment practices law and the nondiscrimination provisions of Pennsylvania's redevelopment law; and which has helped to draft and enact, in all, 12 fair practices, fuller opportunities laws.

All of these activities, and many more in the fields of training and education and the expansion of opportunities, have been performed by the Fellowship Commission without the expenditure of $1 of public funds. Through its 9 constituent agencies and its 600 cooperating organizations—not to mention its more than 7,000 dues paying individual members—the Fellowship Commission has raised and spent more than $2½ million to eradicate discrimination and advance the goal of true equality of opportunity.

I wish to set forth these accomplishments in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because I believe that they are truly deserving of nationwide attention and acclaim. Moreover I think I can safely say that the achievements of the past quarter century are but a prologue to those which will be attained during the many years of fruitful activity which lie ahead for the Philadelphia Fellowship Commission.

Walnut Log Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BIRCH E. BAYH
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, let me call to the attention of the Senate a problem which, although considered by the 89th Congress, has not yet been solved. That problem concerns the export of American walnut logs and veneer.

Export controls on this fine wood were established in February 1964 by then Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges, who acted according to the following policy established by Congress in the Export Control Act of 1949:

> The Congress declares that it is the policy of the United States to use export controls to the extent necessary (a) to protect the domestic economy from the excessive drain of scarce materials and to reduce the inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand; (b) to further the foreign policy of the United States and to aid in fulfilling its international responsibilities; and (c) to exercise the necessary vigilance over exports from the standpoint of their significance to the national security.

The 1964 quota on the export of walnut logs, which was imposed after 2½ years of study, was removed a year later by Secretary of Commerce Connor. Despite efforts by industry, labor, and a number of Congressmen to restore these controls, such action has not been taken by the Department of Commerce, with the result that alarming quantities of this precious natural resource continue to be shipped overseas to meet foreign demand. Some estimates indicate that the supply of this fine wood, grown only in the United States, might be exhausted within a decade if cutting continues at the present rate. Unlike the United States nearly all hardwood source countries impose embargoes or quotas on exports of their valuable woods.

Walnut trees grow slowly. A tree does not reach top veneer quality for cutting until it has reached 50 years or more in age. The walnut grows mainly in the six Central States—Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Missouri, and Ohio. It is the trees raised in these States which are used for quality walnut furniture.

Walnut has been a favorite of the American consumer for many generations. The drain of this resource is felt especially in the furniture industry which also faces the problem of acquiring fine hardwoods from other countries now imposing strict quotas or embargoes.

When our quota was imposed in 1964, the domestic industry cooperated by adopting voluntarily imposed restrictions on its use of walnut. For the sake of conservation and to lessen the drain on the raw material, it agreed to manufacture a much thinner walnut veneer. This reduction required much technological adjustment and many complaints were received from customers, but the veneer manufacturers stuck to the program. It should be pointed out that the exercise of the Department's power to impose quota controls did not hinge upon a similar control over purely domestic consumption. Nothing in the relief statute requires this.

The domestic conservation program was self-imposed by the industry, which decided on its own to share in the program designated to minimize depletion of the walnut reserves of the United States. Nothing in the control order issued originally by the Department of Commerce under existing law required a cut in the U.S. consumption, but the industry decided itself to act in the national interest.

Still, the controls remain off and the exports of walnut log to foreign countries continue to rise. Hearings held in this Congress demonstrated the severe nature of the problem, but still no remedial action has been taken. This depletion will not diminish by itself; it must be listed in the unfinished business column until something is done to curb the drain on this unique and precious U.S. resource.

Tributes to Capitol Physicians Adm. George W. Calver and Capt. R. J. Pearson, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it was with deep regret that Members of Congress learned of the retirement of Adm. George W. Calver as Capitol Physician. For almost four decades, Dr. Calver ministered to our needs with devotion and skill. He has been a trusted friend and medical adviser to many legislators down through the years. His service was not only in the best traditions of the U.S. Navy, but of the Congress as well. Both institutions were fortunate to have had such a fine man and competent doctor in the Capitol. Dr. Calver will be missed on Capitol Hill, and he should know, as he departs, that he will take with him our deepest thanks for his outstanding service and our best wishes for his retirement years.

Dr. Calver's successor will be Dr. R. J. Pearson, Jr., a Navy captain, who is well qualified to serve as Capitol Physician. Captain Pearson received his medical degree from Emory University in Atlanta, interned at Kings County Hospital in Brooklyn, and trained in internal medicine at Grady Hospital in Atlanta. Subsequently, he spent a year at Massachusetts General Hospital where he received training in cardiovascular disease from Dr. Paul Dudley White.

Dr. Pearson's naval duties have included assignments as chief of the medical service at the naval hospitals in both Beaufort and Charleston, S.C., and in Portsmouth, Va., and as chief of the Cardiology Service at the National Naval Medical Center in Bethesda, Md. In addition, he has been a teacher on the cardiology staff of Georgetown University. He is a member of the College of Physicians, College of Cardiology, American Medical Association, and the American Heart Association.

I know my colleagues join me in extending to Dr. Pearson a cordial welcome to his new position as Capitol Physician. Hopefully, he will find his new job rewarding. Certainly, we look forward to his association with us in the Congress.

University of California (Berkeley) Address of Senator Robert F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Senator Robert F. Kennedy at the University of California at Berkeley, on October 22, 1966, be printed in the Record.

Senator Kennedy made several cogent points in this statement on civil rights that deserve the attention of his colleagues in the Senate.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by Senator Robert F. Kennedy, Berkeley Campus, University of California, October 22, 1966

I come here because I had heard this was a place whose name represents a deep belief in old traditions and values, a hatred of unnecessary ferment and agitation, a respect for morality and religion, admiration for traditional forms of education and the tribute of Yale and Harvard. I refer, of course, to Bishop George Berkeley after whom this city is named, although he pronounced it differently.

However, the man who said "Ferments of the worst kind succeed to perfect inaction," also advised us that "Our youth we can have but today. We may always find time to grow old." And even if all of you do not heed the first maxim, you seem to be busily following the second—or at least that's what my advisors tell me it says in the magazines.

After all, you are the first college to become a major political issue since George III attacked Harvard for being a center of rebellion and subversion. And he was right.

As for me I am glad of Berkeley, and I am glad to be here with you. For I am sympathetic, and I welcome, the passionate concern with the condition and future of the American nation, which can be found on this campus.

The future does not belong to those who are content with today, apathetic toward common problems and their fellow man alike, timid and fearful in the face of new ideas and bold projects. Rather it will belong to those who can blend passion, reason and courage in a personal commitment to the ideals and great enterprises of American society. It will belong to those who see that wisdom can only emerge from the clash of contending views, the passionate expression of deep and hostile beliefs. Plato said: "A life without criticism is not worth living."

This is the semnal spirit of American democracy. It is this spirit which can be found among many of you. It is this which is the hope of our nation.

For it is not enough to allow dissent. We must demand it. For there is much to dissent from.

We dissent from the fact that millions are trapped in poverty while the nation grows rich.

We dissent from the conditions and hatreds which deny a full life to our fellow citizens because of the color of their skin.

We dissent from the monstrous absurdity of a world where nations stand poised to destroy one another, and men must kill their fellow men.

We dissent from the sight of most of mankind living in poverty, stricken by disease, threatened by hunger and doomed to an early death after a life of unremitting labor.

We dissent from cities which blunt our senses and turn the ordinary acts of daily life into a painful struggle.

We dissent from the willful, heedless destruction of natural pleasure and beauty.

We dissent from all those structures—of technology and of society itself—which strip from the individual the dignity and warmth of sharing in the common tasks of his community and his country.

These are among the objects of our dissent. Yet we must, as thinking men, distinguish between the right of dissent and the way we choose to exercise that right. It is not enough to justify or explain our actions by the fact that they are legal or constitutionally protected. The Constitution protects wisdom and ignorance, compassion and selfishness alike. But that dissent which consists simply of sporadic and dramatic acts sustained by neither continuing labor or research—that dissent which seeks to demolish while lacking both the desire and direction for rebuilding, that dissent which contemptuously or out of laziness, casts aside the practical weapons and instruments of change and progress—that kind of dissent is merely self-indulgence. It is satisfying, perhaps to those who make it.

But it will not solve the problems of our society. It will not assist those seriously engaged in the difficult and frustrating work of the nation. And, when it is all over, it will not have brightened or enriched the life of a single portion of humanity in a single part of the globe.

All of us have the right to dissipate our energies and talent as we desire. But those who are serious about the future have the obligation to direct those energies and talents toward concrete objectives consistent with the ideals they profess. From those of you who take that course will come the fresh ideas and leadership, which are the compelling needs of America.

Devoted and intelligent men have worked for generation to improve the well-being of the American people, diminish poverty and injustice, and protect freedom. Yet even as we honor their accomplishments we know that our own problems will not yield to the ideas and programs on which past achievement has been built. Ideas are often more confining, more difficult to discard, in their success than in their failure. Yet we must now cast aside many tested concepts in the face of challenges whose nature and dimension are more complex and towering than any before. For this we must look to your generation, a generation which feels most intensely the agony and bewilderment of the modern age, and which is not bound to old ways of thought.

For all the ills of modern life, those we have inherited and those added by the furies of our times, your action and commitment are the medicine of cure and the hope of progress. In the villages of Northeast Brazil, where seven out of ten children may die in their first year, I saw Peace Corps Volunteers organizing villagers and farm laborers to assert their rights as men and fathers. In the Republic of South Africa, I saw university students who stand almost alone against the mighty oppression of a garrison state. In Brazil and Argentina, other students with whom I spoke seek to end military rule and return their nations to democracy. And here in the United States—in the Delta of Mississippi and in the ghetto of Oakland, young men and women have made their commitment, begun the long journey toward justice. The record of this university—in your tutorial programs for slum children; your scholarship efforts for youth rich only in talent; your participation in the Peace Corps and your participation of the struggles of our times—these efforts deserve our support and our thanks.

But still they must be only a token of what is to come—in the world or here at home. The great challenge before us is what you have gathered to consider. The revolution within our gates, the struggle of Negro Americans for full equality and freedom.

That revolution has now entered a new stage, one that is at once more hopeful and more difficult, more important and more painful. It is the effort to enforce newly won rights and give them content. It is to give every Negro the same opportunity as every white man to educate his children, provide for his family, live in a decent home, and win human acceptance as well as economic achievement in the society of his fellows. And it is to do all this in the face of the ominous growth of renewed hostility among the races.

This will not be achieved by a law or a lawsuit, by a single program or in a single year. It means overcoming the scarred heritage of centuries of oppression, poor education, and the many obstacles to fruitful employment. It means dissolving ghettos—the physical ghettos of our big cities and those ghettos of the mind which separate white from black with hatred and ignorance, fear and mistrust. It means a revolution which has spread from the deep South to the cities of the North, to every place, in fact, where black Americans seek to leap the gulf dividing them from the city of promise.

Some among us say the Negro has made great progress—which is true—and that he should be satisfied and patient—which is neither true nor realistic. In the past twenty years we have witnessed a revolution of rising expectations in almost every continent. That revolution has spread to the Negro nation confined within our own. Men without hope, resigned to despair and oppression, do not make revolutions. It is when expectation replaces submission, when despair is touched with the awareness of possibility, that the forces of human desire and the passion for justice are unloosed.

For the American Negro that time has come. Courts and Congresses and Presidents, in the name of the country, have said that the color of a man's skin shall no longer be a bar to the right to vote, or learn, or work, or enter a public place. We have held out the promise that color shall no longer stand in the way of achievement or personal fulfillment or keep a man from sharing in the affairs of the country. We have unveiled the prospect of full participation in American society, while television, radio and newspapers bring to every Negro home the knowledge of how rewarding such participation can be. With so bountiful a promise how much greater must be the frustration and the fury of the Negro—especially the young Negro—who, desperately wanting to believe, and half-believing, finds himself confined in slums, unable to get an education and a job, confronted by the open prejudice and subtle hostilities of a white world, and seemingly powerless to change his condition or shape his future. For him the progress of the past can count for little against the crushing awareness that his hopes for the future are beyond his reach for reasons which have little to do with justice or his worth as a man. Occasionally, broken hope and a deeply felt futility erupt in violence and extreme statements and doctrines. If we deny a man his place in the larger community then he may turn inward to find this manhood and identity, rejecting those he feels have rejected him. Therefore, far more impressive than the violence of a few is the fact that the overwhelming majority of American Negroes retain their faith in the good will of the nation and the possibilities of peaceful progress within the ordered framework of American politics and life.

But if any man claims the Negro should be content or satisfied, let him say he would willingly change the color of his skin and go to live in the Negro section of a large city. Then, and only then, has he a right to such a claim.

Yet however much the condition of most Negroes must call forth compassion, the violence of a few demand condemnation and action. In the streets of many of our cities, in recent months, we have seen riots and looting and even occasional murder. Still far more disturbing than the chaotic, self-destructive violence of Watts or Oakland are the statements of a very few Negro spokesmen—those who have called for hatred to fight prejudice, racism to meet racism, violence to destroy oppression. Here is the seed of tragedy for black and white alike.

To understand the causes is not to permit the result. No man has the right to wantonly menace the safety and well-being of his neighbors. All citizens have the right to security in the streets of their community—in Birmingham or in Los Angeles. And it is the duty of all public officials to keep the public peace and bring to justice those who violate it.

I know many of you understand the terrible frustration, the feeling of hopefulness, the passion for betterment which, denied to others, has turned to violence and hate. It is difficult to live in the shadow of a multimillion dollar freeway, to watch the white faces blur as they speed by the problems of the city, returning each evening to the pleasant green lawns of the suburbs. And it must be difficult beyond measure to share in America's affluence enough to own a television set—and to see on that set the hate and fear and ugliness of little Negro children being beaten and clubbed by hoodlums and thugs in Mississippi.

Some have turned to violence. And the question many Negroes surely ask themselves—the question many of you surely ask yourselves—is, why not?

Why not turn to violence?

After all, even humorous columnists are making jokes about the fact that poverty funds and municipal action seem to follow riots—that a community which wants a swimming pool need only start a riot, while a community which keeps the peace can take its place at the end of the line.

And how many, watching the faces of Grenada, must have asked again, how long—how long turn the other cheek, how long hold to the coursels of nonviolence?

But the course of violence would be terribly, awfully wrong: Not just because hatred and violence are self-defeating—though they are self-defeating, for they strike at the very heart of obedience to law, peaceful process, and political cooperation which are man's last best hopes for a decent world.

We must oppose violence not because of what violence does to the possibility of cooperation between whites and blacks; not just because it hampers the passage of civil rights bills, or poverty legislation, or open-occupancy laws.

The central disease of violence is what it does to all of us—to those who engage in it as much as to those who are its victims.

Cruelty and wanton violence may temporarily relieve a feeling of frustration, a sense of impotence. But the damage of those who perpetrate it—these are the negation of reason and the antithesis of humanity, and they are the besetting sins of the Twentieth Century.

Surely the world has seen enough, in the last forty years, of violence and hatred. Surely we have seen enough of the attempt to justify present injustice by past slights, or to punish the unjust by making the world more unjust.

We know now that the color of an executioner's robe matters little. And we know in our hearts, even through times of passion and discontent, that to add to the quantity of violence in this country is to burden our own lives and mortgage our children's souls, and the best possibilities of the American future.

If this is a challenge to the Negro community, and especially to the political courage of Negro leadership whose own position may be endangered by rising militance, the challenge to white America is equally great.

In recent months we have seen comment on what some have called the "backlash." Opposition to violence and riots and irresponsible action is the justified feeling of most Americans, white and black. But that "backlash" which masks hostility to the swift and complete fulfillment of equal opportunity and treatment, which contains opposition to demands for justice and freedom, which denies the need to destroy slums, provide education and eliminate poverty—that is wrong, shameful, immoral and self-defeating. And any leader who seeks to exploit this feeling for the momentary advantage of office fails his duty to the people of this country.

It would be a national disaster to permit resentment or fear at the actions of a few to drive increasing numbers of white and black Americans into opposing camps of distrust and enmity. Understandable alarm at sporadic turbulence and irresponsibility cannot be allowed to create new barriers of oppression, revive old hatreds, or cause us to falter for a single moment in our drive toward the day when the truths we held to be self-evident are as clear to black Americans as to whites. Some say that in the last analysis, after all, we need not fear injustice; that if our great common purpose divides into conflict and contest the whites will win. In one sense, that is true. We are far more numerous and more powerful. But it would be a pyrrhic victory. The cost would be decades of agony and civil strife, the sacrifice of our ideal of liberty, and ultimately the loss of the soul of our nation.

We can understand the apprehension of those white Americans who feel threatened in their persons or their property. Yet they are only being asked to permit others what they demand for themselves, an equal chance to share in the American life. The whole experience of our nation shows that as each minority emerged those who came before feared damage to their own way of life, and that each time they were wrong. The achievements of each group enlarged the prospects of all. In President Kennedy's words: "The rising tide lifts all the boats." That will be our experience with the Negro too.

Moreover, we must all understand that the problem will not go away. The twenty million Negro Americans are a reality. The slums and ghettos, unemployment and the denial of education, are all realities. Prejudice, discrimination and segregation are realities, as are frustrated expectations and disappointed hopes. Most importantly the awareness of injustice and the passion to end it are inescapable realities. No force in the world can wish these facts out of existence or abolish them. Thus we have only one choice. We can face our difficulties and strive to overcome them; or we can turn away, bringing repression, steadily increasing human pain and civil strife, and leaving a problem of far more terrifying and grievous dimensions to our children. Anyone who promises another course, who pledges a solution without cost or effort or difficulty, is deluding both himself and the people to whom he speaks.

Like other minority groups, Negroes will bear the major burden of their own progress. They will have to make their own way, as they are doing. But we must remember that other minorities, including my own, also make progress through increasing their political and economic power as well as by individual effort. Nor was that progress completely without violence, fear and hatred. Moreover earlier immigrants often began their cities by moving to the unsettled West, a door now closed; or finding unskilled labor, a door which is swiftly narrowing. Today to find a job requires increasingly complex skills, denied to those without education. Nor did other minorities suffer under the special handicaps of the Negro heritage—centuries of slavery and a century of oppression, an intricate web of legal disabilities, and the crushing forces of racial feeling from whose poisons few whites have fully liberated themselves.

Thus, the changed circumstances of modern life and the peculiar nature of the Negro experience make large-scale government action necessary if we are to crush the remaining barriers to equal opportunity and to lead an accelerating national effort to give Negroes a fair chance to share equally in the abundance and dignity of American life.

We must continue to enforce the command of the Constitution against racial discrimination, and the many laws passed to carry out that command. We can never move too fast by giving men the liberty they were guaranteed a century ago. And as new laws are needed to combat unequal treatment, they too must be passed.

We must also expand our programs for education, the rebuilding of our cities, manpower training, and all the rest; calling upon the help of private enterprise and local government as well as the nation. Recently we solemnly and dramatically declared an all-out War on Poverty. Yet in a country which will produce more than $700 billion of wealth this year, where $60 billion will be spent on defense, and where individuals spend $3 billion annually on dogs, we are devoting less than $2 billion to help eliminate American poverty. The War on Poverty is one war where success demands immediate escalation.

Even if we do all this and much more, if we act on an unprecedented scale, progress will still be slow. It is true, as Jefferson wrote, that "The generation which commences a revolution rarely completes it." The problem of giving content to equality is deeply embedded in the structure of American life. It cannot be swept away with a single blow. Yet we can create the steady, concrete and visible achievements which will justify and sustain the expectation that each year will bring greater opportunity than the last. And we can support and nourish the faith of Negro Americans that their country recognizes the justice of their cause and the urgency of their needs.

This is one of the many crossroads at which American life now stands. In the world and at home you have the opportunity and the responsibility to help make the choices which will determine the greatness of this nation. You are a generation which is coming of age at one of the rarest moments in history—a time when all around us the old order of things is crumbling and a new world society is painfully struggling to take shape. If you shrink from this struggle, and these many difficulties, you will betray the trust which your own position forces upon you. You live in the most privileged nation on earth. You are the most privileged citizens of that privileged nation; for you have been given the opportunity to study and learn, to take your place among the tiny minority of the world's educated men. By coming to this school you have been lifted, onto a tiny, sunlit island while all around you lies a dark ocean of human misery, injustice, violence and fear. You can use your enormous privilege and opportunity to seek purely private pleasure and gain. But history will judge you, and, as the years pass, you will ultimately judge yourself, on the extent to which you have used your gifts to lighten and enrich the lives of your fellow man. In your hands, not with Presidents or leaders, is the future of your world and the fulfillment of the best qualities of your own spirit.

Department of State Initiates Action To Prevent Further Shipments of Corn to Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST GRUENING

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I am pleased to be able to report that the Department of Agriculture and the Department of State have begun to take the necessary action to prevent situations in which foreign countries, to which we send food assistance under Public Law 480, sell the same or similar food commodities to Communist countries.

Hearings before the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures, of which I am chairman, disclosed that a number of countries receiving Public Law 480 commodities from the United States had engaged in large-scale food sales to Cuba, Communist China, and other Communist countries despite the provisions of the Public Law 480 agreements that they would not do so. In all of the cases disclosed in the subcommittee hearings, the Department of State had taken no action with respect to the countries involved or to devise means of preventing similar transactions with Communist countries from occupation in the future.

On September 19, 1966, I wrote to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of State calling their attention to yet another incident involving the sale of 8,000 tons of corn by Brazil to Cuba. I pointed out that none of the executive agencies responsible for the administration of Public Law 480 systematically accumulated data on the shipment of foodstuffs to Communist countries by countries receiving food shipments under Public Law 480 from the United States; nor did the subcommittee hearings disclose any evidence of an established policy which would deny such food shipments to any country shipping the same or similar commodities to nations unfriendly to the United States.

The instances of food shipments to Communist countries detailed in the subcommittee hearings and the facts contained in my September 19, 1966, letter received considerable attention in newspapers across the country. Subsequently, on October 18, 1966, the Senate-House conference on the food-for-peace bill agreed to an amendment which flatly prohibits sales of agricultural commodities under Public Law 480 to countries which trade with or whose ships carry supplies to North Vietnam and Cuba. The only exception provided is for trade in agricultural commodities, medical supplies and raw materials for agriculture between countries receiving Public Law 480 assistance and Cuba.

While this amendment represents a marked tightening of the limits placed on the executive agencies with regard to the countries which can receive Public Law 480 assistance, the restriction applies only to title I of the act—sales of agricultural commodities for local currencies or for dollars on long-term loans. Food donations authorized under title II of the act which are authorized in the amount of $600 million annually, are not covered by the prohibition. I was especially pleased, therefore, to receive replies to my September 19, 1966, letter from the Secretary of Agriculture and from the Department of State which indicated that these executive agencies were concerned about food donations as well as agricultural commodity sales in those cases where recipient countries sold similar commodities to Cuba, North Vietnam and other Communist countries.

The Department of State has informed me that it has taken up the matter of corn sales to Cuba with the Government of Brazil and it has been assured by the Brazilian Government that measures have been taken to prevent further shipments of this sort and to insure that the Brazilian trade with Cuba is effectively enforced.

The Secretary of Agriculture has advised me:

> While Section 304 of Public Law 480 does not apply specifically either to sales agreements under Title IV or to donations, we are concerned and seek to avoid a situation in which the furnishing of an agricultural commodity under P.L. 480 sales or donation programs could be said to result in exports of the same or similar commodities to any destination and, of course, more particularly to countries unfriendly to the United States. As you know, our sales agreements have specific provisions on this point and it is a matter of particular concern on our donation programs. An example of this is the termination of the donation programs to Mexico in view of Mexico's exports of commodities like those being received under our donation program. This termination was mutually agreed with by the Government of Mexico on the basis that Mexico could from its own production meet the needs of its population.

As I wrote the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Agriculture, I do not contend that the United States refuse to give assistance to the peoples of Communist countries when starvation threatens. The humanitarian impulse that compels us to assist people in desperate need of food would apply, I hope, to all mankind. I do contend that it is illogical and detrimental to our interests to ship food to a foreign country considered friendly to the United States thereby enabling it to send its domestic production of the same commodity to a Communist country. To permit this kind of trade benefits neither the country receiving our assistance nor does it benefit us in the Communist country. If Communist countries are to obtain greater supplies of foodstuffs, as a result of our food assistance programs, it would appear to be far more advantageous for us to deliver such foodstuffs directly to them in appropriately marked packages and with sufficient attendant publicity so that the peoples of these countries become aware of our generosity and concern over their well being.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the Congressional Record replies to my September 19, 1966, letter, from the Departments of Agriculture and State.

There being no objection, the letter and replies were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Department of State,
Washington, October 17, 1966.

Hon. Ernest Gruening,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures, U.S. Senate.

Dear Mr. Chairman: The Secretary has asked me to reply to your letter of September 19, 1966, concerning the shipment of corn from Brazil to Cuba. I appreciate your bringing to our attention your concern over this matter, which we share, and which also has been of concern to the Brazilian Government.

The Brazilian authorities are investigating this incident, and I hope very shortly to be able to furnish you with full details. In the meantime, we have been assured by the Brazilian Government that measures have been taken to prevent any further shipment of this sort, and to ensure that the Brazilian ban on trade with Cuba is effectively enforced.

As soon as possible I will send you further information. In the interim, if I can be of additional assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

H. G. Torbert, Jr.,
Acting Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C., October 7, 1966.

Hon. Ernest Gruening,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate.

Dear Mr. Chairman: We appreciate your calling our attention to the New York Times article on the shipment of 8,000 tons of corn from Brazil to Cuba.

We have been advised by the U.S. Embassy in Rio that when this matter came to the attention of the Government of Brazil, the Acting Foreign Minister announced to the press that the sale originally was authorized to a European destination. The Government of Brazil learned that the shipment was being diverted to Cuba while the vessel was being loaded, and although the shipment could have been stopped, the Brazilian authorities permitted the loading to go on, "moved by the spirit of charity in view of the difficulties of the Cuban people." The Minister declared, however, that "Brazil will not permit another similar operation to be carried out * * *."

We understand that the report you referred to in the New York Times was inaccurate in saying that this shipment was in violation of the embargo on Cuba agreed to by the Organization of American States. We are informed that this embargo exempts shipments of food and medicine sent for humanitarian reasons.

We note your reference to the hearings of the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures but are not commenting on them further since the points mentioned were gone into in detail during the hearings. We will only mention that we believe your reference to a security classification on the General Accounting Office reports applies to the Department of State rather than to the Department of Agriculture.

We cannot agree with your statement that it is apparent that the shipment of corn by Brazil is not an isolated case but is part of a much more widespread practice. While Section 304 of Public Law 480 does not apply specifically either to sales agreements under Title IV or to donations, we are concerned and seek to avoid a situation in which the furnishing of an agricultural commodity under P.L. 480 sales or donation programs could be said to result in exports of the same or similar commodities to any destination and, of course, more particularly to countries unfriendly to the United States. As you know, our sales agreements have specific provisions on this point and it is a matter of particular concern on our donation programs. An example of this is the termination of the donation programs to Mexico in view of Mexico's exports of commodities like those being received under our donation program. This termination was mutually agreed with by the Government of Mexico on the basis that Mexico could from its own production meet the needs of its population.

We maintain a systematic accumulation of data on imports and exports of countries receiving commodities under P.L. 480 under sales and donation arrangements as we do on other countries whose trade in agricultural commodities is of interest to the United States. Such a system, of course, does not guarantee that there might not be instances from time-to-time of exports of commodities which even the country receiving the P.L. 480 commodities might not be aware until after the fact. In such cases, as in the present case, we take remedial measures appropriate to the circumstances.

As your letter indicates, this is a difficult area because it involves humanitarian considerations. Our effort is to operate in each instance with due regard both to humanitarian considerations and to those of commercial and foreign policy.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE S. FREEMAN.

In Praise of "Southerner"—Hon. Charles L. Weltner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the first President of these United States said that important principles may and must be inflexible. In defense of principles which he felt could not be compromised, Congressman CHARLES L. WELTNER has decided not to run for Congress again this year. And it is our loss.

A practicing attorney, he was first sent to Congress in 1963 from Georgia's Fifth District, and in two terms he has made his mark as an articulate, liberal spokesman for the New South. It was my privilege to serve with him on the Banking and Currency Committee, and his intelligence, courage, and wit are known to this committee, and to those who served with him on the Select Committee on Small Business and Un-American Activities Committee.

I am certain there is a bright destiny for CHARLES WELTNER, and I wish him good fortune.

Miss Donna Dill: The 1967 March of Dimes National Poster Child

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, just recently, in Washington, D.C., I met one of the most delightful and inspiring young ladies I have ever encountered. She is a constituent of mine, Donna Dill, of Hillsboro, Tex., a beautiful, blonde girl of 5 years, who has been chosen as the 1967 March of Dimes Poster Child.

I have seen many examples of raw courage on the battlefield, but these were among grown men who were trained in the desperate business of fighting. I have never in my life seen greater courage than that which Donna Dill exhibits every day of her life.

Donna was born with an open spine—spina bifida. Thanks to the March of Dimes, which does a splendid job of trying to help the 250,000 American children who are born each year with birth defects, she has received the most skillful medical treatment in the world at the Houston Methodist Hospital, the Orthopedic Clinic of Houston, and the Texas Institute for Rehabilitation and Research.

Her life has been one long series of major operations. The doctors saved her life and prevented her from having to spend the rest of her days as an immobile, helpless cripple. But Donna still wears 4-pound braces on her legs which is about one-seventh of her entire weight and she must navigate on specially constructed crutches.

One would think that all this would turn a 5-year-old girl into a pathetic personality. Not a bit of it. Donna is a radiant personality, full of fun and affection, a perfect little hostess, who glows with inner strength and an insurmountable spirit. She captivated everyone who met her here in Washington and, indeed, seemed happily intent on putting us at our ease and taking our minds off her troubles.

The March of Dimes physicians say that there is hope that, when she is full grown, Donna will be able, after another operation, to discard one of her leg braces and lead a reasonably normal life.

Even today, despite her infirmities, she is able to ride her Shetland pony, "Popsy," and to help her mother with some of the household chores, such as washing dishes and making beds. She is looking forward to entering the first grade next year.

Donna says she wants to be a cowgirl, a momma, or a nurse, when she grows up. Knowing her, I feel certain she will be all three.

Her parents, David J. Dill and Jo Ford Dill, of Hillsboro, are themselves an inspiration in the way they have accepted the physical calamity visited upon their only child with Christian fortitude and enormous intelligence. They are worthy of much more than sympathy; they are worthy of universal admiration.

You know, Mr. Speaker, we all are inclined, upon occasion, to feel sorry for ourselves. We become preoccupied with our own troubles and fail to realize how lucky most of us really are, when compared to so many others of our fellow men. When I met Donna Dill, I could not help but be reminded of the words of the ancient philosopher:

> I cursed the world because I had no shoes, until I met a man who had no feet.

Surely, if this little 5-year-old girl can bear her own infirmities with such golden courage and grace, we all can stand a little stronger and taller under our comparatively lighter burdens.

May Almighty God, in His wisdom and mercy, prosper little Donna Dill and restore her to perfect health. And may every American see fit to make a special sacrifice to help the March of Dimes perform medical miracles for the many thousands of other American children who need help as much as Donna does.

The 1966 Omnibus River and Harbor and Flood Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the projects and related matters covered by the 1966 omnibus river and harbor and flood control bill will benefit many States by providing urgently needed navigation, beach erosion control, flood control, water supply, water quality control, recreation, and other services. These comprise a needed additional forward step in the conservation, development, and use of our water resources in the public interest.

This bill contains authorization for 42 new projects in 25 States at an estimated Federal cost of approximately $670 million.

We have had many favorable reports on worthy projects since enactment of the 1965 public works omnibus bill. Over the years studies made of projects of this kind by the Corps of Engineers have provided a basis for development of a highly effective public works program. The sheer volume of needs being met by this program is tremendous, and the needs are increasing with each gain in population and each increase in economic activity.

Furthermore, as our population and economic activity increase there is a continuing change in the complexity of the projects necessary to serve our people. It no longer is sensible to think in terms of single-purpose development.

The navigation projects are concerned primarily with improvement, extension, and maintenance of existing facilities so that they may better serve the Nation's commerce. They include channel deepening, widening, and realinement, harbor deepening, construction of protective jetties, and related works. In keeping with the concept of multiple-purpose developument, opportunities have not been lost to provide for fishing from project structures. Projects of this kind, previously authorized and constructed, are continuing to set new records in the handling of waterborne commerce. In 1965, 1,264 million tons moved on these projects.

The beach erosion control projects included in this act are necessary to avoid loss of beaches which are helping to meet our increasing public needs for outdoor recreational opportunities. The merit of projects of this kind is shown by the fact that the benefit-cost ratios of all are favorable and in the case of two of them are 6.4 and 8.5, respectively, representative of very high rates of return on the public investments involved.

Title I also provides for navigation surveys at several localities, interstate activities involving navigable waters of the United States, and restoration of flood and erosion damage involving existing navigation projects.

Although the projects contained in title I are small in relation to the average size for all projects in the act, they are no less urgently needed.

The projects contained in title II of the bill are equally attentive to current and expected future needs, and to opportunities for effective multiple-purpose development.

Flood control projects have prevented flood damages of about $14 billion since 1936. Recreational use of projects continues to set new records. Water supply and water quality control services are increasing significantly as storage projects for these purposes are being brought into operational status and storage conversions are made. Nevertheless, serious flood problems continue and droughts continue to plague major areas. The projects contained in this act will serve us by affording substantial reductions in flood and hurricane damage.

I concur fully in the concept that we must act with vigor and imagination to keep abreast and ahead of needs in the water resource field. The projects contained in this act are an important step in this direction, are compatible for projects already authorized and underway, and will be compatible with other projects to be proposed in future omnibus bills.

Retirement of Senator Leverett Saltonstall and Senator Milward Simpson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. PEARSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, a tremendous sadness has struck me with the realization that the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, will soon complete his 22d year of superb service in the U.S. Senate and will voluntarily retire from this body to return to his beloved New England home with his wife, Alice, to spend the remainder of their lives.

This saddens me especially because LEV SALTONSTALL took me aside and offered me the advice and assistance needed by all new Senators when I first entered this body only 5 short years ago. His counsel was experienced. But more important, it was sincere as only a true friend can be sincere. It shall always be appreciated, and it shall never be forgotten.

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL has been a true public servant, both to his home State and to the United States. He was born and reared a New Englander, and he was educated at Harvard. He has served Massachusetts as a State representative, as a three-term Governor, and finally, as a U.S. Senator. LEV has always displayed a deep belief in the constitutional convictions upon which this Nation was founded; and because of his service, the Constitution has stood that much stronger, and our Nation is truly that much greater.

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL is an honest man, a courageous man, and a gentleman and a scholar of government and the American way. He is a great Senator. But, more than this, he is a friend—a sincere and unselfish individual who has devoted his life to the public service of the citizens of Massachusetts and of our entire Nation.

I salute LEVERETT SALTONSTALL as he leaves the U.S. Senate and, with his gracious wife, Alice, returns to his true home. But I hope that he will return often to these floors to renew old acquaintances and to offer the wisdom which only experience can acquire. His friendship will be cherished, and his counsel will be welcomed—always.

Mr. President, it is also with sadness that I note the retirement of my friend, the junior Senator from Wyoming, MILWARD SIMPSON. Here is a man who has served in the U.S. Senate for only 4 years. Yet, in that 4 years, his accomplishments have been many. He has represented the interests of his native State well. Yet he has an endless record for voting by his convictions—not by political motive.

MILWARD SIMPSON has been singled out by his colleagues for his unequaled wit. Yet he is even more famous for his dedication, conscientiousness, integrity, and character. This seems like strong praise for one man. But, what else could we have expected from this man from a portion of that area of our Nation which has become known as the big country. He grew up in that combination of rolling plains and majestic mountains where the sky is an unsurpassed blue, the sun a sterling gold, the winters devastatingly severe, and the summers—fantastically beautiful. He is a former coal miner who worked his way through the University of Wyoming and later acquired a legal education at Harvard. He is a true public servant who turned down the post of Secretary of the Interior under President Eisenhower because he had a promise to keep with the citizens of Wyoming.

MILWARD SIMPSON returns now to the big country after a long life as a public servant. But his friendship, his wit, his convictions, and his character shall not be forgotten. I wish the best to he and his wife Lorna as they return home, and I know they will enjoy immensely their new life—free from political responsibilities—in their native Wyoming. We all hope that it will be only a short while before they return to pay us a visit.

International Conference on Water for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have this opportunity to express my enthusiastic support for the International Conference on Water for Peace scheduled to be held here in Washington during May 1967.

Such a world conference would focus universal attention on mankind's urgent need for water, and would stimulate practical cooperation among the nations of the world in meeting that need.

Moreover, it will bring together representatives and experts from many nations to discuss specific world water problems, explore opportunities and means available for attacking these problems, and outline effective international programs in all phases of water resource use and development.

All of us know, Mr. Speaker, that water is one of our most precious natural resources—and one which is growing increasingly scarce under the pressure of a rapidly expanding population. Shortage of clean water is directly responsible for problems of disease, malnutrition, and economic underdevelopment which plague the lives of many millions throughout the world. To combat hunger, to conquer disease, to make possible progress in education and industrialization, we must first solve the problems of water supply.

These problems are not limited to any single nation or a group of nations. As the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on House Joint Resolution 1169, authorizing the Conference, points out:

> Whether we address ourselves to the perennial floods in Waterloo, Iowa, the problems of the arid areas of California, the repeated

shortages of water in New York City, or the job of assuring an adequate supply of potable water for the villages of India, Peru, and of many other countries—the resolution of these problems and the alleviation of existing needs will task the ingenuity, the resourcefulness, and the energies of men of different nations for years to come.

The purpose of the Water for Peace Conference is to advance the solution of water problems through a cooperative international effort. The Conference will provide a forum for the exchange of information and experience between experts and government officials of many nations. In addition, it will focus attention on current and future water problems and—hopefully—contribute to the development of policies and programs necessary to meet these problems

By way of background, on October 7, 1965, President Johnson announced to the delegates at the First International Symposium on Water Desalination that the United States would "join in a massive cooperative international effort to find solutions for man's water problems." Among the specifics of his proposal was the suggestion that there be convoked a "great conference to deal with all the world's water problems."

On May 31, 1966, the Department of State transmitted to the Congress a proposed joint resolution which would enable the U.S. Government to organize and hold an International Conference on Water for Peace at Washington, D.C., during the month of May 1967.

Work on the development of the water for peace program has been underway in the executive branch of the Government since the first of this calendar year. It is being carried forward under the leadership of the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Interior. An Interdepartmental Committee on Water for Peace has been formed, chaired by the Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water and Power Development, consisting of sub-Cabinet-level representatives of the several U.S. departments and agencies having primary interests in water matters. These are: the Departments of Agriculture; of the Army; of Commerce; of Health, Education, and Welfare; of the Interior; and of State; together with the Atomic Energy Commission, the Agency for International Development, the Bureau of the Budget, and the President's Office of Science and Technology.

Under the direction of the Interdepartmental Committee, nine interagency working groups have been studying such topics as village and rural water supply, water treatment for urban and industrial purposes, water-related health and sanitation problems, water and agricultural production, irrigation and drainage, livestock production, fisheries, soil conservation, soil contamination, water management and supply, river basin surveys and planning, and others.

Responsibility for the preparation of the technical and substantive aspects of the International Conference has been assigned to the Department of the Interior. Organizational and administrative responsibilities for the Conference will be assumed by the Department of State. A Secretary General for the International Conference has been designated. His address is as follows: Secretary General, International Conference on Water for Peace, care of Office of International Conference, room 1316, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

Planning now calls for an International Conference on Water for Peace to be held at Washington, D.C., in May 1967. The proposed Conference would bring together representatives of governments with which the United States has diplomatic relations, and international organizations concerned with man's water activities. The latter would include, in particular, the United Nations and its interested specialized agencies. Also invited would be individual water experts. Some 1,200 accredited delegates, and approximately 2,800 observers, are expected to attend the Conference. The participants in the Conference will consider the world's water problems and focus attention on possible practical solutions to such problems. An agenda for the Conference is nearing completion.

In broad terms, the proposed International Conference will provide a forum for discussion and consulation which will help stimulate first, planning for water resource development at all levels of government; second, international cooperation and actions to solve water problems; and third, the possible establishment of a worldwide water-for-peace program.

Present planning provides for an international exposition on the world's water problems as part of the Conference program, to include exhibits from first, international organizations, both governmental and nongovernmental; second, governments participating in the Conference; and, third, private sources.

The Appropriation Business, 89th Congress, 2d Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, under general leave to extend, I am submitting a résumé of the appropriations business of the 2d session of the 89th Congress. It is somewhat more detailed than the one included in the Record of October 21, 1966, at pages 28590 to 28593. And it concludes a series of a dozen or so interim résumés that we have supplied in the Congressional Record throughout the session.

THE BUDGET IS THE BEGINNING PLACE

Mr. Speaker, preliminary to a precise résumé of the bills, may I say that our general point of departure in Congress for the consideration of fiscal matters is the President's annual budget, which this year came to us on January 24.

The budget is not simply a mass of figures. It is a program for action—for consideration and disposition by the Congress as it may decide.

The budget is the convening place for all the policies and programs of the Government. It is here that the whole complex range of governmental activities come into focus as they compete for a place and a share in the budget.

This year's budget dealt primarily with the financial needs, as the President saw them, for the fiscal year 1967 that began last July 1. But it also proposed substantial supplements to the fiscal 1966 operating budget. It even made some proposals for fiscal 1968, and beyond, mainly in the area of authorization legislation.

It embodied the first-year cost or other budgetary effect of new legislative proposals from the President—proposals that initially get considered outside the appropriations process. And it reflected the second-year cost of some new legislation adopted in the first session.

As with all budgets, it rested on a number of assumptions and hinged on a number of contingencies and uncertainties. It undertook to estimate budget revenues for fiscal 1967 and to reestimate the budget picture for the then current fiscal 1966.

It hinged on some new revenue legislation.

It hinged on some new user-charge proposals.

It hinged on proposals to create certain business-type revolving funds.

It proposed certain shifts between the so-called trust funds and general budget funds.

A budget has a lot of facets. It entails consideration, and hinges on action, by a number of committees of the Congress.

It represented what the President regarded as a balanced program. It bore, the President said, the strong imprint of the troubled world we live in.

Budgets represent a drawing of the line, so to speak, between our national wants and our national necessities. This budget represented the President's recommendations as to how and where that line should be drawn.

BUDGET RESTRAINT

It was a remarkable budget. It manifested a great deal of restraint through which and by which growth of expenditures were proposed to be contained.

It marked out big strides that could be taken, and that the President urged be taken toward balancing the budget. It held down the rate of advance that in less stringent times would probably have been urged to fertilize the great seedbeds of budget growth so generously sown by Congress in new legislative enactments in the first session.

It proposed to reduce or to eliminate a number of older programs which the President rated of lower priority. This is the classic way to put a budget together, because with public money never in ample supply to cover all that is wanted, choices have to be made. And generally speaking, only when the choices are painful and unpopular are they probably of the right class. Even lower priority defense spending did not escape the knife.

Of course, it went too far in some respects for many Members, myself included, but not far enough in certain respects for others.

It embraced a set of recommendations and estimates that projected a fiscal 1967 budget deficit considerably lower than was then foreseen for the preceding year.

Another noticeable feature of the 1967 budget was the much smaller number of propositions of legislation for new or extended activities calling for additional appropriations. It contained only a few—in sharp contrast to the much larger list of the first session.

Another striking thing about the list of proposed new legislation is that it included several items designed to diminish rather than increase budget totals, although several of them were either one-time or of short duration effect.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the overall 1967 administrative budget expenditure estimate showed up rather well in relation to the country's greatly enlarged and rapidly growing economy—its production of goods and services, or gross national product; at least in comparison to that relationship over the last 15 years. It was about 15 percent of the projected gross national product, virtually the smallest in 15 years.

Mr. Speaker, the dominant note struck by the 1967 budget and the message by which it was sent to Congress—in all but the most imperative and unassailable national security and defense necessities—was one of considerable restraint, moderation, discipline. That was the principal guideline—fiscal caution and restraint and discipline.

Of course, the budget called for higher expenditures than the year before. The long truth of history is that growth of the population and growth of the country and its economy ordain some automatic growth in public services. Public services cost money. Speaking of national appropriations way back in 1879, the distinguished Republican, James A. Garfield, then a Member of the House, made the same point. And he added that "war overturns all ordinary calculations." War has clouded and enlarged our current budgets.

President Eisenhower acknowledged very much the same fiscal phenomena in his own budget message to Congress for 1960:

> Moreover, inescapable demands resulting from new technology and the growth of our Nation, and new requirements resulting from the changing nature of our society, will generate Federal expenditures in future years. * * * We must not forget that a rapidly growing population creates virtually automatic increases in many Federal responsibilities.

And it is useful to a better perspective about our big budgets to point out that nearly 75 percent of current budget spending goes for objects considered appropriate Federal functions since the earliest days—national defense, the postal service, internal revenue operations, administration of justice, aid to veterans, conduct of foreign relations, and interest on the national debt.

SUMMARY OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON THE APPROPRIATIONS BUDGET

Congress has again deliberated at length this year. Many of us were impatient with the length of the session. However, there is a very strong likelihood that had we rushed forward with our business and adjourned much earlier, our authorizations and our appropriations might have been much larger. So by taking our time and proceeding with all deliberate speed we may very probably have brought about a reduced program and lower appropriations than otherwise.

In the early months of the year Congress, in a number of instances, tended toward more generous fiscal dispositions than the President had recommended—both in certain appropriation bills and in several authorization bills. Along in late spring, and subsequently, the President spoke out against the actions of the Congress in some respects in increasing his authorization requests above the President's budget, and against certain actions taken on appropriations above the President's budget. This set in motion in this body and in the other body, and in the executive branch a stronger determination to try to hold spending in line as nearly as possible under the circumstances.

It looked for a time as if we might possibly be far above the budget in appropriations for secondary and elementary education, and in the poverty program, and in some other programs, but we are not. I am speaking here of appropriations, not authorizations.

The great bulk of the outgo side of the budget is processed through the appropriation bills. But several budget items are first considered by the appropriate legislative committees—new legislative proposals, for example. There are still a scattering of back-door appropriations. The several annual authorization bills enter the picture to some extent. And, in a number of instances, action on legislative bills can, and this year have, affected the budget relationship where the legislation mandates obligations against the Treasury.

Then, of course, there are the proposals affecting the revenue side of the budget.

So, Mr. Speaker, the work of many hands and of several committees, and the minds and votes of all the Members are involved in processing the budget.

First, let me give a brief résumé of the appropriation totals of the 2d session of the 89th Congress, using the old, traditional, garden-variety "appropriation" basis of counting.

In this session, the House considered budget requests for appropriations of $130,791,000,000 and cut them by $260,000,000, net. I am speaking of the whole session, including supplementals voted earlier this session for fiscal 1966.

The Senate, in this session, considered budget requests for appropriations of $131,165,000,000 and cut them by $508,000,000.

Congress, in the 15 appropriation bills of the session, enacted appropriations of $130,282,000,000, which is, in total, $883,000,000 below the President's budget requests for appropriations. We are within the budget; we are below the budget—in total—on the appropriation requests considered in the appropriation bills this session—$883,000,000 below.

That divides between fiscal years, as the later detailed tabulations will show, as follows: Fiscal 1966 supplemental, a net reduction of $233,000,000; and the 13 fiscal 1967 bills, a net reduction of $650,000,000.

Very broadly, that also breaks down this way:

3 defense bills (includes the defense supplemental last spring; the regular defense bill, 1967; and the military construction bill, 1967)	+$268, 000, 000
12 nondefense bills	−1, 151, 000, 000
Net reductions in appropriation requests, 15 bills	−883, 000, 000

Adding permanent appropriations, such as interest on the public debt, of roughly $13,800,000,000—and you must do that to get a full picture—appropriations this session will approximate $144,100,000,000. That is some $24,800,000,000 above last session, mostly for defense but not entirely so.

Last session was about $13,200,000,000 above the year before. And in sharp contrast to the current session increase being mostly for defense, last session's increase over the year before was mostly in the nonmilitary areas. I will include a table that illuminates the point.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to make two special points about these figures. There is often much confusion—understandably—about what Congress does to the President's overall budget.

First, these figures are on the old-traditional, generally well-understood "appropriation" basis of counting. Thus they are a bit at variance with the "new obligational authority" basis used in the President's budget, and in fact used by the President himself. Not at variance much; not at variance often, but occasionally at variance. The confusion comes especially when we try to state the change Congress has made in the President's budget requests.

Second, the appropriation figures are not quite the whole budget story of the session. We must remember—as I mentioned earlier—that some parts of the budget are initially processed, not through the appropriation bills, but through various legislative bills. And it is especially in some of those, Mr. Speaker, that Congress went above the President's "new obligational authority" requests.

Of course, we also went above the President's budget in some respects in certain appropriation bills, but in total, as I have said, the appropriations in the appropriation bills are below the President's total requests for appropriations considered in those bills.

And I would emphasize this fact: Even on the "new obligational authority" basis of counting, Congress, in these 15 appropriation bills of the session is, in the aggregate, slightly below—I repeat, slightly below—the President's "new obligational authority" requests. Not much below; not $883,000,000 below as we show on the appropriations basis; but below nevertheless. We are below on the "new obligational authority" basis—for fiscal 1967, which is the main part of this year's budget—by some $139,000,000.

In the circumstances of the times; in the light of the ebullient fiscal tendencies of the people generally, I regard that as a reasonably good record.

I include a summary of the appropriation totals for the session:

Summary of totals of appropriation amounts in the appropriation bills, 89th Cong., 2d sess.

[Does not include any back-door appropriations, or permanent appropriations [1] under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills].

	Bills for fiscal 1966	Bills for fiscal 1967	Bills for the session
A. House actions:			
1. Budget requests	$15, 949, 000, 000	$114, 842, 000, 000	$130, 791, 000, 000
2. Amounts in 15 bills passed by House	15, 701, 000, 000	114, 830, 000, 000	130, 531, 000, 000
3. Change from corresponding budget requests	−248, 000, 000	−12, 000, 000	−260, 000, 000
B. Senate actions:			
1. Budget requests	16, 157, 000, 000	115, 008, 000, 000	131, 165, 000, 000
2. Amounts in 15 bills passed by Senate	15, 937, 000, 000	114, 720, 000, 000	130, 657, 000, 000
3. Change from corresponding budget requests	−220, 000, 000	−288, 000, 000	−508, 000, 000
4. Compared with House amounts in these 15 bills	+236, 000, 000	−110, 000, 000	+126, 000, 000
C. Final actions:			
1. Budget requests	16, 157, 000, 000	115, 008, 000, 000	131, 165, 000, 000
2. Amounts approved in 15 bills	15, 924, 000, 000	[2] 114, 358, 000, 000	[2] 130, 282, 000, 000
3. Comparisons—			
(a) With corresponding budget requests	−233, 000, 000	−650, 000, 000	−883, 000, 000
(b) With bills of the 1st sess. 89th Cong			+23, 244, 000, 000

[1] Permanent appropriations were tentatively estimated in January budget at about $13,800,000,000 for fiscal year 1967.

[2] Includes $875,000,000 for fiscal 1968 (grant for mass transportation and urban renewal).

NOTE.—All figures are rounded amounts.

The President's budget spending "new obligational authority"—NOA—concept is, as we said, slightly different in concept from the traditional "appropriation" method of tabulating. While it consists largely of appropriations it also omits, for example, "appropriations to liquidate prior contract authority." But unlike the appropriations basis, new obligational authority includes contract authority; it includes public-debt borrowing or loan authorizations; and it includes reappropriation of unobligated balances of prior appropriations. And, of course, the budget recapitulations and details about new obligational authority encompass that which is enacted through backdoor and other legislative bills as well as in the traditional appropriation bills.

A big item of difference, for example, is where the budget NOA totals count only the postal deficit whereas the appropriation tables count the gross amount of the postal appropriations; that is, both those chargeable to the postal revenues and those to the general fund.

To further illuminate the differences, of the $883,000,000 cut in "appropriations" in the 15 bills of the session, $650,000,000 is in bills relating to fiscal 1967—precisely, $650,690,506. Here is the "bridge" from that cut of $650 million on the appropriation basis to the cut of $139 million on the NOA basis of counting:

Fiscal 1967 "new obligational authority" (NOA) in the 13 appropriation bills for fiscal year 1967

	Budget estimates	Enacted	Congressional change
"Appropriation ' totals in the bills dealing primarily with fiscal year 1967	$115, 008, 396, 683	$114, 357, 706, 177	−$650, 690, 506
Add (to get to NOA basis):			
Interior bill:			
Loan authorization (helium fund)	26, 000, 000	26, 000, 000	
Indefinite appropriation for National Foundation on Arts and Humanities	2, 000, 000	2, 000, 000	
Agriculture bill:			
Contract authorization (agricultural conservation program)	100, 000, 000	220, 000, 000	+120, 000, 000
Loan authorizations (REA)	305, 000, 000	492, 000, 000	+187, 000, 000
Reappropriations for food stamp program and Appalachian region conservation program		31, 375, 000	+31, 375, 000
Independent offices bill:			
Rescission of—			
Part of permanent appropriation (FAA)	−21, 000, 000		+21, 000, 000
Permanent loan authorization (Veterans' Administration)	−100, 000, 000	−100, 000, 000	
HUD: Fellowships for city planning and urban studies		[1] 500, 000	+500, 000
Legislative branch bill: Reappropriations, partly estimated (Architect of the Capitol)		150, 000	+150, 000
Defense bill: Estimate for indefinite appropriation for claims	25, 000, 000		−25, 000, 000
District of Columbia bill: Appropriations for loan program	38, 225, 000	37, 527, 500	−697, 500
Foreign assistance bill: Reappropriation (HEW)		1, 032, 997	+1, 032, 997
Supplemental, legislative branch: New GPO plant	[2] 46, 663, 000		−46, 663, 000
Deduct (to get to NOA basis):			
Interior bill: Liquidating cash for Interior and Forest Service	152, 384, 000	151, 219, 000	−1, 165, 000
Treasury-Post Office bill: Appropriations from postal revenues	5, 004, 000, 000	5, 004, 000, 000	
Agriculture bill: Liquidating cash for agricultural conservation program, cropland conversion, and CCC	1, 295, 682, 000	1, 293, 182, 000	−2, 500, 000
Independent offices bill:			
Liquidating cash for CAB and HUD	154, 500, 000	119, 200, 000	−35, 300, 000
1968 appropriation (HUD)	55, 000, 000	55, 000, 000	
Foreign assistance bill:			
Appropriation of foreign currency (not dollars for purchase thereof) for American schools and hospitals abroad		1, 000, 000	+1, 000, 000
Fiscal 1966 estimate for pretreaty claims, Ryukyu Islands	21, 040, 000		−21, 040, 00
Public works bill: Indefinite appropriations for Reclamation and AEC	63, 331, 000	63, 331, 000	
State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary bill:			
Repayable advances to the highway trust fund	200, 000, 000	65, 000, 000	−135, 000, 000
Liquidating cash for Commerce	230, 275, 000	226, 275, 000	−4, 000, 000
Supplemental:			
1968 items (HUD)	845, 000, 000	820, 000, 000	−25, 000, 000
1966 item (legislative branch)		25, 000	+25, 000
Total "new obligational authority" for fiscal year 1967 in the 13 appropriation bills	107, 409, 072, 683	107, 270, 059, 674	−139, 013, 009

[1] NOA by virtue of conversion of 1967 liquidating cash enacted last session for urban renewal grants.

[2] Actually, was laid aside in connection with the legislative branch appropriation bill rather than the supplemental bill—but is listed this way just to account for the estimate in the totals.

SUMMARY OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON 1967 BUDGET ON "NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY" BASIS

Bills that do not actually appropriate additional funds but which mandate additional obligation or expenditure rates in advance of appropriation, such as general pay raise bills; bills with back-door spending characteristics; failure of propositions in the budget that were designed to reduce new obligational authority; or failure, or alteration, of other propositions of new legislation for which a first-year amount was in the budget; all these classes of items get into the calculations of what Congress has done to the President's overall budget spending requests.

Certain legislative authorizations mandate the obligation and the expenditure; they mandate the subsequent appropriation. Others do not. Where the expenditure is mandated—as, for example, in a general pay raise bill effective on a certain date—there is little or no budgetary or appropriation discretion as there is, for example, in aid to elementary education, or higher education, where the authorization bills are above the President's authorization requests but where we have the discretion not to appropriate the full amount—and where, in fact, we have not appropriated above the President's budget NOA request.

According to executive branch data on the new obligational authority basis as to the budget recommendations for fiscal 1967, the Congress exceeded the President's requests by some $2,304,000,000, net, in the aggregate.

NOA in the 13 general appropriation bills for fiscal 1967 was, in total, some $139,000,000, net, below the corresponding budget requests. Three bills were above the requests; 10 bills were below.

The Defense bill was above the NOA budget requests by some $378 million. The Labor-HEW bill was above the NOA budget requests by some $380 million. And the Agriculture bill was some $313 million above NOA budget requests—although, on the appropriation basis of counting, it was some $28 million below the appropriation requests. The other 10 bills were below the NOA budget requests by $1,210 million.

There was an addition of some $962,000,000 to the NOA budget recommendations in a number of legislative bills where, as I indicated, the appropriation or the obligation is mandated.

There were some "back-door" spending actions, and several went beyond the budget NOA requests. I will insert a more complete table later for general information on back-door items, but in respect to fiscal 1967 items, our information shows $1,300,000,000 enacted—an increase above the budget of $911,000,000. Parenthetically, I might say that there were also back-door amounts relating to fiscal 1968, of some $638,000,000—and that was some $461,000,000 above the related budget amounts.

Then, there were some legislative proposals in the budget designed to bring about a reduction in requests for new obligational authority. Several did not get enacted; that failure is counted by the executive branch as an increase above the budget new obligational authority request—in the current instance, some $570,000,000 above for 1967.

All these items add to some $2,304,000,000.

For example, in respect to enactments that mandate expenditures and license the agencies to incur deficiencies in anticipation of later supplemental funds, Congress exceeded the budget provision by some $246,000,000 for 1967 in the so-called GI bill of rights.

The President's civilian pay raise proposal: Congress advanced the effective date beyond what the President recommended, thus adding some $294,000,000 to the budget for 1967.

There was a similar situation on the military pay increase, in consequence of which $180,000,000 was added to the 1967 budget.

I am inserting the list based on figures as we now have them from the executive branch in support of the $2,304,000,000 net increase above the President's NOA budget requests for fiscal 1967. I point out that it does not include instances where discretionary type authorizations—elementary and secondary education, for example—were enacted in amounts above what the President had asked.

Summary of congressional action on fiscal year 1967 "new obligational authority" budget requests—Above (+) or below (−) the President's NOA budget requests

[Rounded amounts]

In the 13 appropriation bills for fiscal year 1967:	
Interior and related	−$17,000,000
Treasury, Post Office, and Executive Office	−50,000,000
Agriculture and related	+313,000,000
Independent offices	−208,000,000
Legislative	--------------
Department of Defense	+378,000,000
Foreign assistance and related	−431,000,000
Labor-HEW	+380,000,000
District of Columbia	−1,000,000
Public works	−33,000,000
Military construction	−135,000,000
State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary	−148,000,000
Supplemental	−188,000,000
Total, the 13 appropriation bills	−139,000,000

[Rounded amounts]

Additional appropriations required by congressional increases over administration proposals (mandated-type):[1]	
GI bill of rights (this was, however, actually subsequently requested and appropriated for in the closing supplemental appropriation bill)	+$246,000,000
Highway and Traffic Safety Acts (also in closing supplemental bill)	+14,000,000
Civilian pay raise	+294,000,000
Military pay raise	+180,000,000
Military medical benefits	+73,000,000
Parcel post rate increase not enacted as budgeted	+76,000,000
Liberalization of veterans' dependency benefits	+40,000,000
Other—Philippine war veterans' benefits, Federal Employees' Compensation Act and free airlift of overseas packages	+39,000,000
Total, these mandated types	+962,000,000

Summary of congressional action on fiscal year 1967 "new obligational authority" budget requests—Above (+) or below (−) the President's NOA budget requests—Con.

[Rounded amounts]

Backdoor NOA bills (fiscal year 1967 amounts only):[1]	
Housing mortgage credit	+610,000,000
Federal-Aid Highway Act	+$134,000,000
Highway safety	+167,000,000
Total, these 1967 backdoor amounts	+911,000,000
Congressional failures to enact proposed legislation which would have permitted a reduction in requests for new obligational authority:[1]	
Highway beautification	+92,000,000
User charges—inspection fees (meat, poultry, etc.)	+73,000,000
REA—revolving funds	+305,000,000
National Defense Education Act and Public Health Service—student loans	+55,000,000
Power marketing administrations	+45,000,000
Total, these items	+570,000,000
Grand total	+2,304,000,000

[1] Full year cost would be greater in most cases. For some items (e.g., pay raises) efforts will be made by the executive branch to obtain absorption of at least part of the increase, but the effect of the action in 1967 would still be the amount indicated.

BACK-DOOR SPENDING BILLS

Mr. Speaker, some back-door spending provisions are still being enacted. We have made progress in recent years in securing some abatement of the flow of money from the Treasury, or grant of new obligational authority through back-door features in nonappropriating bills.

We had thought, for example, that the urban renewal grant program, which for so long had been on a back-door contract authority basis, had been brought to an advance funding basis in the annual appropriation bill in the manner customary for most other programs of Goverment. But the newly enacted demonstration cities bill carries a special $250,000,000 contract authority for urban renewal grants for fiscal 1968. And it was not budgeted.

I have already mentioned some back-door items for fiscal 1967 that were above the NOA budget requests.

In summary, our information is that back-door provisions were $1,372,000,000 above the Executive requests for the 2 years of 1967 and 1968, combined.

As a general proposition of principle, back-door spending authorizations are in my judgment indefensible. It is a form of scattering of the money power, and the more we do of that the less we tend to know what the situation is and what is being done. No study of ways to strengthen congressional control of the purse can justifiably exclude the question.

I include a tabulation:

Backdoor type NOA authorizations provided in substantive bills, 89th Cong., 2d sess.

[In millions of dollars]

Bill	Item	Request	House	Senate	Enacted	Congressional change (final)
Public Law 89-537 (H.R. 15225).	Tennessee Valley Authority: Current borrowing authority, 1967	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	
Public Law 89-420 (S. 3283).	Participation Sales Act of 1966:					
	Current borrowing authority, 1967: [1]					
	Housing and Urban Development:					
	College housing loans	−300	−300	−300	−300	
	FNMA special assistance	−450	−450	−450	−450	
Public Law 89-574 (S. 3155).	Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966:					
	Current contract authority, 1967:					
	Agriculture	85	170	170	170	+85
	Commerce	*(40)	[2] 283	53	47	+47
	Interior	54	54	58	56	+2
	Total current, 1967	139	507	281	273	+134
	Permanent contract authority, 1968:					
	Agriculture	110	170	170	170	+60
	Commerce	*(40)	[3] 290	58	49	+49
	Interior	67	67	70	69	+2
	Total permanent, 1968	177	527	298	288	+111
Public Law 89-564 (S. 3052).	Highway Safety Act of 1966:					
	Commerce:					
	Current contract authority, 1967	*(100)	135	200	167	+167
	Permanent contract authority, 1968	*(60)	80	120	100	+100
Public Law 89-566 (S. 3688).	Housing mortgage credit:					
	Current borrowing authority, 1967:					
	Housing and Urban Development, FNMA:					
	Secondary operations		110		110	+110
	Special assistance			500	500	+500
S. 3711	Housing and Urban Development Act of 1966:					
	Housing and Urban Development:					
	Current borrowing authority, 1967:					
	College housing loans		(4)	300		
	FNMA special assistance		(4)	200		
	Permanent borrowing authority:					
	College housing loans, 1968		(4)	300		
	College housing loans, 1969		(4)	300		
S. 3708	Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966:					
	Permanent contract authority, 1968:					
	Housing and Urban Development: Urban renewal grants		250	250	250	+250
	Totals for 1967:					
	Current contract authority	139	642	481	440	+301
	Current borrowing authority	250	360	1,250	860	+610
	Totals for 1968:					
	Permanent contract authority	177	857	668	638	+461
	Permanent borrowing authority			300		
	Totals from 1969: Permanent borrowing authority			300		
	Totals for all years	566	1,859	2,999	1,938	+1,372

---

* Highway trust fund authorizations.

[1] Current because it requires current action by the Congress, but it rescinds permanent borrowing authority.

[2] Includes $243 million for highway beautification, stricken in conference.

[3] Includes $250 million for highway beautification, stricken in conference.

[4] This bill was not considered by the House. Although many of its provisions were incorporated in the demonstration cities bill (S. 3708) by the House, these Senate increases were omitted.

COMMITTEE AND HOUSE ACTIONS ON THE APPROPRIATION BILLS OF THE SESSION

Mr. Speaker, returning to the matter of the general appropriation bills of the session, the House, in all 15 bills of the session—both supplementals for fiscal 1966 as well as bills for the current fiscal year 1967—considered budget requests for appropriations aggregating $130,791,000,000—a sum about $25 billion more than the House was asked to consider last session. I am using round numbers, and I am using the traditional "appropriations" basis of reckoning, not the budget "new obligational authority" basis. This total divides as follows: $15,949,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, and $114,842,000,000 in bills dealing wholly or primarily with fiscal year 1967.

The House approved $130,531,000,000—a net reduction of $260,000,000.

Twelve bills showed net reductions from the budget requests for appropriations.

One bill was adopted at the budget amount.

Two bills showed net increases above the budget request for appropriations. It would be three rather than two if we momentarily switch to the NOA basis; the Agriculture bill was above the budget in respect to NOA, but not above in the traditional terms.

In the Defense bill, the House, on the recommendation of the committee, was $952,000,000 above the budget, the principal item being $569,000,000 for pay of some 108,000 military personnel on duty at July 1, 1966, that was not provided for in the budget request.

The Labor-HEW bill was passed out of committee and in the House some $490,000,000, net, above the budget request for appropriations. I regret that it was not possible to hold the line on that bill, but, of course, I also recognize that it is sometimes necessary to exceed individual budget requests. Significant in the increase over the budget on that bill was $232,000,000 to pay 100-percent entitlements to federally impacted school districts. The budget requested less than half the amount necessary to pay the full cost of this popular program. An increase of $157,000,000 was also provided for defense education direct loans to students. This was added only after we were told that the Committee on Education and Labor did not plan to report the administration bill that would have converted this program from a direct loan basis to a guaranteed loan basis. The risks of the Government would be similar under both methods but, under the direct method, the initial appropriation for loans shows as a budget increase.

Three of the fifteen appropriation bills of the session related to defense—that is, the defense supplemental last spring, the regular defense bill for 1967 and the military construction bill for 1967. Twelve are classed as nondefense bills.

In the three defense bills, the House made net additions of $857,000,000 to the budget requests for appropriations; $72,772,000,000 was passed in these three bills.

In the 12 nondefense bills, the House approved $57,759,000,000—a net reduction of $1,117,000,000 from the budget requests for appropriations:

	Amount	Increase (+) or decrease (−) budget
In the 3 defense bills	$72,772,000,000	+$857,000,000
In the 12 nondefense bills	57,759,000,000	−1,117,000,000
Total	130,531,000,000	−260,000,000

Changes were made on the House floor in 5 of the 15 bills—3 were increased and

2 were reduced. There was a net floor reduction of $69,776,200. The House tends to follow the recommendations of the 50-member Committee on Appropriations.

In virtually every session within memory—and in every modern session without exception in the case of the traditional appropriations process—the Congress, almost always on the recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations, finds itself in some disagreement on appropriation requests. This year was no exception. We did not agree with many of the President's budget requests, a circumstance wholly in harmony with our independent legislative responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of the pressures of increased authorizations and the general mood of the Congress with respect to some programs held down, and even cut back by the President in the budget, the House was able to hold the line in the appropriation bills in the aggregate, although this was a touch and go matter until the last days of the session. Although some would have preferred greater cuts on the nondefense side of the budget, myself included, the record in the circumstances is fairly good in the appropriation bills.

With a couple of exceptions, there was no great dissent to the broad dimensions and the big features of the appropriation bills—at least as measured by the votes on final passage in the House, there was not. Final passage votes are one indicator of the strength of sentiment about the course and direction of Federal affairs.

There were record votes in the House on final passage of every appropriation bill this session with the single exception of the closing supplemental. Only 2 bills had more than 100 votes registered against them. One hundred and forty-one negatives votes were cast against the foreign assistance bill. One hundred and twenty-two Members voted against the second supplemental for 1966 earlier this year; it contained the controversial rent supplement proposition.

Record Votes in the House on the Appropriation Bills, 89th Congress, 2d session

Bill	*Vote*
Fiscal year 1966:	
Supplemental Defense	389 to 3.
Second supplemental, 1966	269 to 122.
Fiscal year 1967:	
Interior	370 to 16.
Treasury-Post Office	368 to 2.
Agriculture	366 to 23.
Labor-HEW	354 to 27.
Independent offices	296 to 82.

Record Votes in the House on the Appropriation Bills, 89th Congress, 2d session—Con.

Bill	*Vote*
Legislative	341 to 2.
Defense	393 to 1.
District of Columbia	320 to 3.
Military construction	346 to 3.
Foreign assistance	234 to 141.
Public works	354 to 25.
State, Commerce, Justice, and Judiciary	319 to 38.

(NOTE.—The closing supplemental bill was passed on a voice vote.)

SENATE ACTION ON THE APPROPRIATION BILLS OF THE SESSION

In virtually every session of Congress, the President sends some additional budget requests to the Senate after the House has acted on the bills. This year was no exception.

The Senate considered budget request for appropriations of $131,165,000,000, which was some $373,000,000 more than the House considered. As passed by the other body, the bills totaled $130,657,000,000, a reduction of $508,000,000 from budget requests for appropriations. The Senate bills aggregate $126,000,000 more than the House bills but it must be remembered that the Senate considered more in budget requests for appropriations.

On the 15 bills of the session, the Senate figure was over the House in 8 instances; under on 6; 1 bill was unchanged from the House amount. This record represented something of a departure from the normal pattern of more generous allowances by the Senate.

TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS OF THE SESSION

Conference totals are nearly always compromised somewhere between the House and Senate positions—some give, some take. The whole complex range of governmental endeavors comes to a focus in the appropriations process and under our system inescapably invokes compromise in the resolution of differences.

As I noted a moment ago, the Senate bills were, in total, more below the budget requests than were the bills as passed in the House. The House was $260,000,000 below; the Senate was $508,000,000 below. By some diligence and application at the conference table, the final totals were brought to $883,000,000 below the budget—that is, lower than the totals of either House.

As finally enacted, the 15 bills carried $130,282,000,000 in appropriations. They were $883,000,000, net, below the requests for appropriations. The three defense bills, totaling $72,183,000,000, were $268,000,000, net, above the requests. But the 12 nondefense bills, totaling $58,099,000,000, represented a net reduction of $1,151,000,000 from the appropriation requests.

Total appropriations for the session tentatively aggregate $144,082,000,000, including the permanent appropriations that recur automatically under permanent law without necessity of annual action by Congress. The great bulk of the permanent appropriation total is for interest on the public debt, which is subject to some revision, probably upward, but using the $13,800,000,000 estimate for permanents for 1967 in the January budget, the tentative total of $144,082,000,000 breaks down as follows:

For fiscal 1966	$15,924,000,000
For fiscal 1967 (including $13,800,000,000, tentatively, for permanent appropriations)	127,283,000,000
For fiscal 1968 (advance funding for urban renewal and mass transportation)	875,000,000
Total for session	144,082,000,000

Total appropriations of all kinds—those in annual bills, supplemental bills, and the permanent appropriations, all of which constitute a license to draw on the Treasury—have exceeded $100 billion in each of the last five sessions, as follows:

	Actual (preliminary)
87th, 2d (1962)	$102,661,000,000
88th, 1st (1963)	103,798,000,000
88th, 2d (1964)	106,070,000,000
89th, 1st (1965)	119,310,000,000
89th, 2d (1966)	144,082,000,000

CHARACTER OF APPROPRIATION INCREASES IN THE 89TH CONGRESS

Thus, Mr. Speaker, total session appropriations this year are roughly $24,800,000,000 over last session. And last session's appropriations were roughly $13,200,000,000 over the appropriations of the 2d session of the 88th Congress. The major areas of increase are virtually reversed as between the two sessions.

Of the $24,800,000,000 appropriation increase this session over last session, all but about $1,500,000,000 is in national defense. National defense appropriations are up by $23,300,000,000.

Sharply contrasting, of the $13,200,000,000 appropriation increase last session over the session before, all but about $200,000,000 was in nondefense areas. In other words, nondefense appropriations were up by some $13,000,000,000.

I append a tabulation that shows some of the underlying details:

Nature of net increases in appropriations over previous sessions; 89th Cong., 1st sess., and 89th Cong., 2d sess.

[In billions of dollars]

Item	89th Cong., 1st sess. (increase over 88th, 2d)	89th Cong., 2d sess. (increase over 89th, 1st)
Appropriations, previous session (including tentative amounts for permanent appropriations)	$106.1	$119.3
Subsequent adjustment to interest on the public debt	+.1	+.5
Subtotal	106.2	119.8
National defense (includes military construction, Vietnam, and atomic energy)	+.2	+23.3

***Nature of net increases in appropriations over previous sessions; 89th, 1st, and 89th, 2d*—Continued**

[In billions of dollars]

Item	89th Cong., 1st sess. (increase over 88th, 2d)	89th Cong., 2d sess. (increase over 89th, 1st)
Selected major programs:		
Education (mainly elementary and secondary education; higher education; defense education; vocational education and rehabilitation; libraries; and impacted school district aid)	+1.3	+1.1
Welfare (mainly public assistance; maternal and child welfare; military service credits)	+.7	+.7
Health (mainly heart, cancer, and stroke including regional medical centers; waste treatment; drug abuse control; air and water pollution including waste treatment; hospital construction; staffing for community health centers; and construction of health educational facilities)	+.4	+.2
Medicare (includes extended coverage to all persons over 65 and voluntary supplemental insurance; also see entry below)		+.9
Housing (includes urban renewal; rural housing insurance; water and sewer grants; open space land and urban beautification; rehabilitation loans; and public housing)	+.6	
Economic opportunity (antipoverty)	+.7	+.1
Economic development (area redevelopment, Appalachia, accelerated public works)	+.6	−.1
Mass transportation (also see "programs involving 2-year advance funding" below)	+.1	
Land and water resources	+.1	
Highway beautification	+.1	
Supersonic transport development	+.1	+.1
Subtotal	+4.7	+3.0
Veterans	+.4	+.7
Post Office	+.5	+.6
NASA	−.1	−.2
Interest on the public debt (tentative, subject to revision; also see adjusting entry above)	+.3	+.7
Special-use fund financing (often tending to reflect changes in method or timing of financing rather than changes in level of activity; some are nonrecurring):		
Contribution to International Monetary Fund	+1.0	−1.0
Contribution to Inter-American Development Bank	+.5	−.5
Contribution to Asian Development Bank		+.1
Public Law 480 and other foreign export programs	+.2	−.5
Past obligations of the Commodity Credit Corporation (restoration of capital)	+2.3	−.3
Small business loan capital	+.4	−.4
Repayable advances to social security trust fund (medicare; also see entry above)		+.1
Repayable advances to highway trust fund	+.2	−.1
Programs involving 2-year advance funding, net (urban renewal including appropriation to eliminate "back door" in 89th, 1st; mass transportation; and airport grants)	+1.6	−1.3
Subtotal	+6.2	−3.9
All other miscellaneous (many scattered increases and decreases)	+.9	+.1
Net increases in appropriations in session over the previous session	+13.2	+24.8
Appropriations for the session (including permanent appropriations, the amounts for which are subject to revision)	119.3	144.1

DELAYS IN PROCESSING THE APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. Speaker, all 12 regular appropriation bills for the fiscal year 1967 were scheduled to clear the House well before the beginning of the fiscal year on July 1 under a program announced by the committee on March 15.

The committee's original plan was to bring all the regular annual bills to the House by June 16. As shown by the recapitulation that follows, 6 of the 12 regular bills were reported on schedule. But the schedule suffered considerable disruption, largely from delays in reporting or in otherwise processing several related annual authorization bills. We did not do as well as we did in the first session in this respect.

The Committee on Appropriations cannot within the rules report appropriations for any purpose not previously authorized by separate law. Hearings were virtually completed over 4 months ago. The committee marked time for weeks and weeks on several bills.

On the Defense appropriation bill, roughly $17 billion hinged on an annual authorization bill preceding it, which, however, was not processed in time to permit the appropriation schedule to be met. Nonetheless, the appropriation bill was reported June 24—while the related authorization bill was still in conference—so that the House would be in position promptly to pass it before the July 4 recess period if the authorization bill cleared in time. House floor action, in fact, was tentatively scheduled for June 28, but the conference report on the authorization bill did not clear both Houses until July 12.

The District of Columbia appropriation bill hinged greatly on the District of Columbia revenue bill pending in conference; after waiting many weeks, the committee finally decided to report the appropriation bill on September 9.

The foreign assistance appropriation bill was likewise dependent on the related authorization bills for the foreign assistance program and the Peace Corps, both of which were quite delayed—into September.

Military construction appropriations were in a similar status.

Some portions of the public works appropriation bill hinged on authorizations.

Until the latter part of September, the committee was not in position to report the State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary bill.

The delay is also well illustrated in respect to three large programs for which specific budget estimates were in the budget when it came on January 24. Because they lacked the necessary authorization, we left them out when we reported the Labor-HEW bill on April 28. They are the antipoverty program and the elementary, secondary, and higher education programs. We had to handle them in the always-hurried, closing days in the final supplemental bill.

Here are the dates on the authorization bills for them:

Economic opportunity (H.R. 15111):

Reported to House	June 1.
Passed House	Sept. 29.
Passed Senate	Oct. 4.
Conference agreed to (sent to conference)	Oct. 5.

(Four months on House Calendar after reporting.)

Elementary and secondary education (H.R. 13161):

Reported to House	Aug. 5.
Passed House	Oct. 6.
Passed Senate	Oct. 7.
Conference agreed to (sent to conference)	Oct. 10.

(Two months on House Calendar after reporting. Reported one month after fiscal year began.)

Higher education (H.R. 14644):

Reported to House	Apr. 29.
Passed House	May 2.
Reported in Senate	Oct. 5.
Passed Senate	Oct. 10.
Conference agreed to (sent to conference)	Oct. 14.

(Five months between time passed House and reported to Senate.)

Only two of the 1967 general appropriation bills were enacted before the start of the fiscal year. None cleared Congress in July. Only three cleared in August. None cleared in September. Seven cleared in October—four of those in the final week.

Stopgap continuing resolutions are not the most efficient arrangement under which to operate the Government. There is a certain amount of lost motion and uncertainty and hesitation when the bills drag out. Officials cannot plan ahead efficiently. It is an uneconomic situation.

Adjournment has not come before September in the last 8 years, nor earlier than October in the last 5 years. We have previously urged that study be given to the desirability of changing the Government's fiscal year to a calendar year basis.

Mr. Speaker, we hope to be able to work out a more satisfactory arrangement for reporting the bills in the next session.

I am inserting for those who may be interested, as ready reference, the various reporting and passage dates for the 12 regular appropriation bills.

The 12 regular annual appropriation bills for fiscal year 1967

Bill	Reporting schedule, Mar. 15, 1966	Reported to House	Passed House	Passed Senate	Final congressional action [1]
Interior	Mar. 31	Mar. 31	Apr. 6	May 12	May 19
Treasury-Post Office	Apr. 4	Apr. 4	do	May 23	June 15
Agriculture	Apr. 21	Apr. 22	Apr. 26	July 15	Aug. 24
Labor-HEW	Apr. 28	Apr. 28	May 5	Sept. 28	Oct. 21
Independent offices	May 5	May 5	May 10	Aug. 10	Aug. 24
District of Columbia	May 12	Sept. 9	Sept. 13	Oct. 12	Oct. 19
State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary	May 19	Sept. 30	Oct. 4	Oct. 14	Oct. 20
Defense	May 26	June 24	July 20 [2]	Aug. 18	Oct. 11
Public works	June 2	Sept. 15	Sept. 21	Oct. 7	Oct. 12
Legislative	do	June 3	June 7	July 28	Aug. 19
Foreign assistance	June 9	Sept. 16	Sept. 20	Oct. 5	Oct. 7
Military construction	June 16	Sept. 9	Sept. 14	Oct. 10	Oct. 17

[1] Adjournment day was Oct. 22.

[2] Scheduled for House floor action June 28, but developments precluded it.

NOTE.—Supplemental bill, for which no reporting date was scheduled, is not listed (it cleared on Oct. 22).

ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET PERFORMANCE, FISCAL YEAR 1966

Mr. Speaker, when the session began the Government was then operating under the 1966 budget which had been appropriated for in the previous session. The new budget from the President at the beginning of this session, for fiscal 1967, contained not only some supplementary proposals for fiscal 1966; it reflected an updating of the then current outlook for budget operations for fiscal year 1966, which has since closed out. Thus it is pertinent to briefly summarize the fiscal 1966 administrative budget results.

The 1966 budget, when first submitted in January of 1965, was in the red by $5.3 billion. Of course, all budgets are tentative, subject to constant change. They rest on many assumptions and contingencies. Dealing with the future, they necessarily involve many uncertainties.

The updating of the 1966 budget last January—a year after the first submission, and after Congress had acted on it—revised the deficit outlook to $6.4 billion. Revenues were up several billion, but expenditures, especially war costs, were up even more.

But the preliminarily final results reported by the Treasury sometime back show a decided improvement over the earlier published outlook. They were gratifying in that they showed a very considerable reduction in the earlier deficit projection—the $6.4 billion administrative budget deficit figure of last January was reduced by some $4.1 billion, down to $2.3 billion. Revenues were up $4.6 billion. Expenditures were up by $0.5 billion; importantly, nondefense spending was down $0.6 billion from the January figure. But defense spending was up by $1.1 billion.

The President and his associates labored long and hard and submitted what they considered a very tight budget. Holding expenditures $600 million below that in nondefense areas undoubtedly required continuous watchfulness. The $106.9 billion administrative spending in fiscal 1966 was about 15 percent of the gross national product—the same proportion, approximately, as in 1965. One has to go back 15 or 16 years, to a period before the Korean war brought about a change in the nature and size of national defense programs, to find a smaller budget in relation to the size of the Nation's economy.

In each year of the Johnson administration, the administrative budget deficit has been reduced below the prior year:

	Millions
Actual deficit, fiscal 1964	$8,226
Actual deficit, fiscal 1965	3,435
Actual deficit, fiscal 1966	2,286
Original estimate of deficit for 1967; subject, of course, to possible considerable change	1,847

Administrative budget results have been better than those for fiscal 1966 only 4 times in the past 16 years.

Each year of the Johnson administration the final results show a smaller deficit than earlier predicted. At the same time we have had to gear up to fight a major conflict in Vietnam. And a host of new civilian programs have also been undertaken. Lowering the budget deficit in the face of these facts is noteworthy and was made possible in large measure by the unprecedented national economic boom of these last few years.

The President is continuing his search for ways to save money and to hold expenditures to a minimum. He outlined his current program in his message to Congress of September 8 on the inflation situation. He has directed a number of surveys and inaugurated a number of policies to this end. He is having the whole range of programs studied to see where changed and changing circumstances make it possible to stretch out, delay, and withhold expenditures of funds already appropriated. This is a perfectly proper and wise course under the right circumstances. The law authorizes it. Common prudence justifies it. The necessities of war and the dangers of inflation demand it.

THE NATIONAL DEBT—PAY-AS-WE-GO

Mr. Speaker, commendable as these efforts are to bring about a balance in the budgets, the Treasury nonetheless has had a shortfall of revenues. Income was insufficient to pay as we go.

One of the most striking signs of national attitudes over the last 36 years or so is the decline in national self-discipline and restraint as manifested by a rather persistent unwillingness to keep our outgo within our income in times of unmatched national affluence. The budget was out of balance in 30 of the last 36 years, through depression, war, peace, recession, and prosperity. The flood of Treasury revenues from our unparalleled national prosperity over the last several years has not kept up with the mounting expenditures flowing from ever-increasing appropriations voted by a majority of the Members of the House and the Senate. And thus the national debt necessarily climbs when we borrow the money to cover the difference.

Appropriations at the session just concluded are more than double what they were in 1957, less than 10 years ago. More was appropriated for national defense alone in the session just closed than was appropriated for all the objects of government 11 years ago, in 1955. While of course the buying power of the dollar involved differ vastly, in only one year in our national history—and that was the war year of 1943—have our national appropriations exceeded those of this session—and then only by some $3 billion.

A pay-as-we-go policy has fallen by the wayside as we have nationally tended to relax our standards in distinguishing between our needs and our wants. We are to some extent an undisciplined people.

In the session just concluded, and even more so last year, Congress not only adopted many of the Great Society programs; it even outdid the President in some respects by going further than he recommended on a number of proposals. At times, we galloped when we should have walked or stood still. That applies to the President and it also applies to Congress.

Congress did, I believe, modify every major piece of legislation requested by the President, and balked on a number of them. But a heavy load of laws was added to the statute books. And the seedbeds of large and growing spending programs were sown.

In consequence of all this, we are suffering from some legislative indigestion; from spending beyond our income; and from too much inflation. And in further consequence, we face the possibility of a Federal tax increase next year.

Expenditures for the war in Vietnam will continue to mount upward, and expenditures for domestic purposes are mounting. Government revenues are going up, too, but unfortunately the increase in revenues is disproportionate to the increase in spending and will probably not be sufficient to achieve a pay-as-we-go basis.

In World War II, Federal budget spending equaled about 47 percent of the gross national product—GNP. In the Korean war period, it was around 20 percent. Today, it is down to about 15 percent. I am speaking of the administrative budget totals of spending.

In World War II, war costs took roughly 41 percent of the GNP. In the Korean war it was around 13 percent or so. Today, it is only about 8 percent.

We can pay as we go, and in my judgment we cannot at this time defend a policy which does less. Inflation is taking a bite out of all of our incomes and it threatens to take more. In a sense, inflation is nothing but a tax—and a most dangerous tax at that. A tax levied by the Government to slow down inflation and prevent our Government from going into a deep deficit is far preferable. No administration can afford to permit runaway inflation.

Every possible effort should be made by the President and Congress to hold the line on spending. Then, next year, if we are still confronted with going in the red by a considerable sum, in my judgment it may be necessary to support a tax increase as the best approach to a very difficult problem.

Mr. Speaker, I include certain tabulations in support and in elaboration of these points:

Summary of direct and guaranteed debt on significant dates

[Based upon statement of the public debt published monthly; consequently all figures are stated as of the end of a month]

Date	Classification	Total debt (including interest-bearing debt, matured debt on which interest has ceased, and debt bearing no interest)				General fund balance [2]
		Direct debt (gross)	Guaranteed debt [1] [2]	Total direct and guaranteed debt	Per capita [3]	
	WORLD WAR I					
Mar. 31, 1917	Prewar debt	$1,282,044,346.28		$1,282,044,346.28	$12.36	$74,216,460.05
Aug. 31, 1919	Highest war debt	26,596,701,648.01		26,596,701,648.01	250.18	1,118,109,534.76
Dec. 31, 1930	Lowest postwar debt	16,026,087,087.07		16,026,087,087.07	129.66	306,803,319.55
	WORLD WAR II					
June 30, 1940	Debt preceding defense program	42,967,531,037.68	$5,529,070,655.28	48,496,601,692.96	367.08	1,890,743,141.34
Nov. 30, 1941	Pre-Pearl Harbor debt	55,039,819,926.98	6,324,048,005.28	61,363,867,932.26	458.47	2,319,496,021.87
Feb. 28, 1946	Highest war debt	279,213,558,897.10	550,810,451.19	279,764,369,348.29	1,989.75	25,960,900,919.30
June 30, 1946	Debt at end of year in which hostilities ceased	269,422,099,173.26	476,384,859.30	269,898,484,032.56	1,908.79	14,237,883,295.31
Apr. 30, 1949	Lowest postwar debt [4]	251,530,468,254.82	22,851,485.16	251,553,319,739.98	1,690.29	3,995,156,916.79
	SINCE KOREA					
June 30, 1950	Debt at time of opening of hostilities in Korea (hostilities began June 24, 1950)	257,357,352,351.04	19,503,033.97	257,376,855,385.01	1,696.74	5,517,087,691.65
Dec. 31, 1952		267,391,155,979.65	53,969,565.31	267,445,125,544.96	1,687.90	6,064,343,775.84
Oct. 31, 1966	Highest debt [5]	326,888,405,229.41	498,127,050.00	327,386,532,279.41	[6] 1,656.85	6,416,594,081.20
Oct. 31, 1965	Debt a year ago	318,901,398,009.92	492,784,100.00	319,394,182,109.92	[7] 1,634.16	5,785,523,897.22
Sept. 30, 1966	Debt last month	324,748,022,885.87	501,993,500.00	325,250,016,385.87	[6] 1,649.15	8,610,455,369.18
Oct. 31, 1966	Debt this month	326,888,405,229.41	498,127,050.00	327,386,532,279.41	[6] 1,656.85	6,416,594,081.20

---

[1] Does not include securities owned by the Treasury.

[2] Includes outstanding matured principal of guaranteed debt of U.S. Government agencies for which cash to make payment is held by the Treasury of the United States in the general fund balance.

[3] Based upon estimates of the Bureau of the Census.

[4] Represents the lowest point of the debt at the end of any month following World War II. The lowest point of the debt on any day following that war was on June 27, 1949, when the debt was as follows:

Direct debt (gross)	$251,245,889,059.02
Guaranteed debt of U.S. Government agencies	23,876,001.12
Total direct and guaranteed debt	251,269,765,060.14

[5] Represents the highest point of the debt at the end of any month. The highest point of the debt on any day was on Oct. 28, 1966, when the debt was as follows:

Direct debt (gross)	$327,997,242,352.59
Guaranteed debt of U.S. Government agencies	498,128,100.00
Total direct and guaranteed debt (includes $266,214,343.03 not subject to statutory limitation)	328,495,370,452.59

[6] Subject to revision.

[7] Revised.

Federal, State, and local debt, on a per capita basis, selected fiscal years

Year	Per capita				Percent distribution			
	Total	Federal	State	Local	Total	Federal	State	Local
Gross debt:								
1940	$479	$326	$27	$127	100	67.9	5.7	26.4
1946	2,037	1,924	17	97	100	94.4	.8	4.8
1950	1,861	1,702	35	125	100	91.4	1.9	6.7
1953	1,895	1,682	49	164	100	88.7	2.6	8.7
1960	1,979	1,591	103	286	100	80.4	5.2	14.4
1961	1,988	1,579	109	301	100	79.4	5.5	15.1
1962	2,041	1,604	118	319	100	78.6	5.8	15.6
1963	2,085	1,622	123	341	100	77.8	5.9	16.3
1964 [1]	2,117	1,629	131	357	100	76.9	6.2	16.9

[1] Data for 1964 estimated by Tax Foundation.

Source: Tax Foundation "Facts and Figures," 13th edition.

NOTE.—Tax receipts data include social insurance taxes.

Administrative budget totals and public debt, 1930–66

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Administrative budget			Public debt at end of year [1]
	Receipts	Expenditures	Surplus (+) or deficit (−)	
1930	$4,058	$3,320	+$738	$16,185
1931	3,116	3,577	−462	16,801
1932	1,924	4,659	−2,735	19,487
1933	1,997	4,598	−2,602	22,539
1934	3,015	6,645	−3,630	27,734
1935	3,706	6,497	−2,791	32,824
1936	3,997	8,422	−4,425	38,497
1937	4,956	7,733	−2,777	41,089
1938	5,588	6,765	−1,177	42,018
1939	4,979	8,841	−3,862	45,890
1940	5,137	9,055	−3,918	48,497
1941	7,096	13,255	−6,159	55,332
1942	$12,547	$34,037	−$21,490	$76,991
1943	21,947	79,368	−57,420	140,796
1944	43,563	94,986	−51,423	202,626
1945	44,362	98,303	−53,941	259,115
1946	39,650	60,326	−20,676	269,898
1947	39,677	38,923	+754	258,376
1948	41,375	32,955	+8,419	252,366
1949	37,663	39,474	−1,811	252,798
1950	36,422	39,544	−3,122	257,377
1951	47,480	43,970	+3,510	255,251
1952	61,287	65,303	−4,017	259,151
1953	64,671	74,120	−9,449	266,123

See footnote at end of table.

Administrative budget totals and public debt, 1930–66

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Administrative budget			Public debt at end of year [1]
	Receipts	Expenditures	Surplus (+) or deficit (−)	
1954	$64,420	$67,537	−$3,117	$271,341
1955	60,209	64,389	−4,180	274,418
1956	67,850	66,224	+1,626	272,825
1957	70,562	68,966	+1,596	270,634
1958	68,550	71,369	−2,819	276,444
1959	67,915	80,342	−12,427	284,817
1960	77,763	76,539	+1,224	286,471
1961	$77,659	$81,515	−$3,856	$289,211
1962	81,409	87,787	−6,378	298,645
1963	86,376	92,642	−6,266	306,466
1964	89,459	97,684	−8,226	312,526
1965	93,072	96,507	−3,435	317,864
1966	104,631	106,917	−2,286	319,907

[1] Includes Government enterprise debt guaranteed by the U.S. Treasury.

NOTE.—The change in the public debt from year to year is not necessarily the same as the administrative budget surplus or deficit. It reflects also changes in the Government's cash on hand, and the use of corporate debt and investment transactions by certain Government enterprises.

Source: The Budget of the U.S. Government, 1967.

Defense and nondefense net budget expenditures for fiscal years 1953–67—Administrative budget expenditures

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Fiscal year	National defense functions			Other than national defense			Total net budget expenditures	
	Amount	As percent of budget totals	As percent of GNP	Amount	As percent of budget totals	As percent of GNP	Total	Percent of GNP
1953 actual (Korean war year)	$50,442	68.1	14.1	$23,678	31.9	6.6	$74,120	20.7
1954 actual	46,986	69.6	13.0	20,551	30.4	5.7	67,537	18.7
1955 actual	40,695	63.2	10.7	23,694	36.8	6.3	64,389	17.0
1956 actual	40,723	61.5	10.0	25,501	38.5	6.2	66,224	16.2
1957 actual	43,368	62.9	10.1	25,598	37.1	5.9	68,966	16.0
1958 actual	44,234	62.0	10.0	27,135	38.0	6.2	71,369	16.2
1959 actual	46,491	57.9	9.9	33,851	42.1	7.2	80,342	17.1
1960 actual	45,691	59.7	9.3	30,848	40.3	6.2	76,539	15.5
1961 actual	47,494	58.3	9.4	34,021	41.7	6.7	81,515	16.1
1962 actual	51,103	58.2	9.4	36,684	41.8	6.8	87,787	16.2
1963 actual	52,755	56.9	9.2	39,887	43.1	7.0	92,642	16.2
1964 actual	54,181	55.5	8.9	43,503	44.5	7.1	97,684	16.0
1965 actual	50,163	52.0	7.8	46,344	48.0	7.1	96,507	14.9
1966 actual	57,652	53.9	8.1	49,265	46.1	6.9	106,917	15.0

SUMMARY OF THE 15 APPROPRIATION BILLS OF THE SESSION

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I append a table showing the individual appropriation bills of the session, with the total of appropriations in them at the House, Senate, and conference agreement stages, in comparison with the President's budget requests for appropriations considered in connection with them:

Summary of action on budget estimates in appropriation bills, 89th Cong., 2d sess.

[Does not include any back-door appropriations, or permanent appropriations [1] under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills]

	Budget estimates to House	Passed House	Budget estimates to Senate	Passed Senate	Enacted	Increase (+) or decrease (−), latest stage of action compared to budget
BILLS FOR FISCAL 1967						
Interior	$1,329,960,500	$1,295,169,500	$1,340,260,500	$1,329,755,000	$1,321,615,800	−$18,644,700
Loan authorization	(26,000,000)	(26,000,000)	(26,000,000)	(26,000,000)	(26,000,000)	
Treasury-Post Office	7,246,720,000	7,210,177,135	7,246,720,000	7,210,049,135	7,196,429,135	−50,290,865
Agriculture	7,022,638,000	6,876,027,000	7,022,938,000	7,064,343,300	6,994,590,150	−28,347,850
Loan authorization	(702,100,000)	(852,000,000)	(702,100,000)	(932,000,000)	(932,000,000)	(+229,900,000)
Labor-HEW	10,083,184,500	10,573,272,500	10,083,184,500	10,473,309,500	10,463,244,500	+380,060,000
Independent offices	14,319,611,291	14,017,299,000	14,329,863,291	14,118,607,000	14,065,851,000	−264,012,291
Legislative	173,793,578	172,146,333	214,749,763	214,418,213	214,463,913	−285,850
Defense	57,664,353,000	58,616,445,000	57,664,353,000	58,189,872,000	58,067,472,000	+403,119,000
District of Columbia:						
Federal funds	53,394,000	52,394,000	53,394,000	53,394,000	53,394,000	
Loan authorization	(26,225,000)	(23,000,000)	(38,225,000)	(37,527,500)	(37,527,500)	(−697,500)
Military construction	1,114,947,000	1,019,340,000	1,114,947,000	986,518,000	979,570,000	−135,377,000
Foreign assistance	3,945,095,000	3,604,048,800	3,945,095,000	3,493,473,500	3,493,473,500	−451,621,500
Public works	4,167,073,000	4,110,932,000	4,167,073,000	4,139,244,000	4,134,511,000	−32,562,000
State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary	2,598,638,500	2,364,008,600	2,634,405,000	2,350,941,600	2,347,826,600	−286,578,400
Supplemental	5,122,760,629	4,919,076,929	5,191,413,629	5,096,338,579	5,025,264,579	−166,149,050
Subtotal, 1967 bills	114,842,168,998	114,830,336,797	115,008,396,683	114,720,263,827	[2]114,357,706,177	−650,690,506
SUPPLEMENTALS FOR FISCAL 1966						
Defense supplemental (Vietnam)	13,135,719,000	13,135,719,000	13,135,719,000	13,135,719,000	13,135,719,000	
2d supplemental	2,813,552,168	2,564,872,568	3,020,810,903	2,801,226,003	2,788,143,303	−232,667,600
Subtotal, 1966 bills	15,949,271,168	15,700,591,568	16,156,529,903	15,936,945,003	15,923,862,303	−232,667,600
CUMULATIVE TOTAL FOR THE SESSION						
House	130,791,440,166	130,530,928,365				−260,511,801
Senate			131,164,926,586	130,657,208,830		−507,717,756
Enacted			131,164,926,586		[2]130,281,568,480	−883,358,106

---

[1] Permanent appropriations were tentatively estimated in January budget at about $13,800,000,000 for fiscal year 1967.

[2] Includes $875,000,000 for fiscal 1968 (grants for mass transportation and urban renewal).

Congressman Tom Curtis' Contributions to Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, our debates during the closing days of this Congress over the enforcement of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 reemphasized the need for full, accurate, and objective information about Federal civil rights activities. Obviously Congress cannot rationally assess the administration of title VI of the 1964 act, or any other title of any act, on the basis of rumors, secondhand reports, and charges and countercharges. We need facts, including complete, systematically presented summaries of the actions of the Department of Justice, the Office of Education, and all other Federal agencies active in the field.

Thus our recent debates have shown again the great importance of title VIII of H.R. 14765, the Civil Rights Act of 1966, which passed this House in August but has unfortunately been shelved in the other body. Title VIII, which I sponsored at the urging of, and in consultation with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], would require the Attorney General to submit to Congress an annual report on the enforcement of, and all Federal activities pursuant to, all of our civil rights laws. Clearly such a report would have been valuable during our recent discussions of hospital and school desegregation guidelines. Clearly it could have great weight in our future debates over the problems toward which the 1966 bill was directed.

Mr. Speaker, my friend and colleague, THOMAS B. CURTIS, deserves great credit for recognizing the need for such a report and for developing the legislative language which was accepted by the House as title VIII. His advocacy of this title expresses both his deep concern for full, equitable enforcement of all of our civil rights laws, and his constant interest in improving congressional oversight and legislative procedures. The communication fostered by title VIII could vastly improve the administration of our laws, and hasten the attainment of equal rights for all Americans. This is just one example of the careful, constructive work for civil rights for which Mr. CURTIS has become so well known and so highly respected.

I would like to include in the RECORD at this point Mr. CURTIS' summary of title VIII, from an explanatory letter to his constituents on H.R. 14765:

TITLE VIII

I am very happy that Title VIII of the House-passed bill, as I said at the beginning, had its origins in my office. It was introduced at my request by Republican Representative CHARLES MATHIAS, of Maryland, a member of the Judiciary Committee and the Subcommittee studying the bill. The Title requires that the Attorney General submit to the Congress and the President an annual report concerning the "enforcement of and activities taken pursuant to" the 1966 Act and all laws of the United States designed to prevent discrimination on account of race, color, religion, sex or national origin. My interest in having the Executive Branch report to the Congress regarding its activities under various laws has been a continuing one, but was heightened by my participation as the ranking Republican on the Special Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress which recently reported the results of its study and pointed out that Congress had been lax at times in carrying out its legislative review responsibilities. The reporting precedent is an old one and has been well established. Unfortunately, however, except for the reports of the Civil Rights Commission, which by the way have been excellent, but are only general studies making inquiry into current and anticipated problem areas, we know all too little about the activities of the Attorney General in the civil rights area. The Attorney General has been given broad discretionary powers, especially under the new Civil Rights Act, to deal with discrimination which has produced, and will continue to produce, a large number of court actions, many government initiated negotiations between parties which are settled through administrative processes short of court actions, and many appeals by private citizens and groups to the Attorney General to act on their behalf. Federal activities under Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act alone involve most of the departments and agencies of the Executive. Because of the wide scope of these actions and powers, I believe that Title VIII is a significant addition to the Civil Rights Act of 1966. It is necessary to give the Congress a basis from which to exercise legislative review and to give to the people information which in the past has been either unavailable or not readily accessible. The report should provide a continuity to legislative consideration of the civil rights laws which has been lacking in the past because the House has never really made an accurate assessment of its past accomplishments or future challenges in the civil rights area.

Hon. A. Willis Robertson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I am a native Hoosier and proudly retain my permanent and legal residence in Indiana. Yet, while a Member of this body, I have a home in Fairfax County, Va.

One of the joys of living there has been being "represented" by the able senior Senator from Virginia, A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, who is soon to retire.

Further, my Senate assignments have brought me in close touch with this Virginia gentleman whose keen insight into ramifications of banking and currency matters and many others has been of great help to us all. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON moved quietly and efficiently among us, tending to his work, taking time to help his colleagues, and always speaking with authority and sincerity.

Senator WILLIS ROBERTSON is a Christian who believes in his religion, who practices its teachings, who knows the Bible in every way.

I am proud that I have had the opportunity of knowing Senator ROBERTSON and that I have had the privilege of serving with him in this distinguished body. He will be remembered here as he enjoys the leisure of life in the Old Dominion—and we shall miss him greatly.

Leif Erikson Remembered and Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, few will deny that Americans reserve a special place in their minds and hearts for men of discovery.

Their accomplishments compel this.

One such, Leif Erikson, stepped before us in history, but his image is as fresh today as are his exploits in the mind of schoolchild or adult.

On October 6, Johannes S. Newton, president, Leif Erikson Foundation, and I had the pleasure of joining Ambassadors of other nations, fellow Members of Congress and others desiring to honor the memory of this historymaker in a luncheon held on Capitol Hill.

With us at the head table were the Ambassadors of Poland, Sweden, the Netherlands, and Iceland as well as Ralph Cohen, of Scandinavian Airlines, who brought commemorative booklets for the occasion.

The famed historian-explorer, Dr. Helge Ingstad completed the head table. He received an award from the Leif Erikson Foundation and the ringing, standing applause of those who knew what his excavations on Newfoundland had meant in verifying those early Viking voyages.

President Newton and I had invited Speaker of the House JOHN W. MCCORMACK to take part in the luncheon. Although House duties prevented his attendance, we received these words and thoughts which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEIF ERICKSON DAY

The kind invitation extended to me by members of the Leif Erikson Association to attend their Leif Erikson Day luncheon was a distinct honor, because my long experience with Americans of Scandinavian descent has shown me their many admirable qualities, qualities which include their stalwart American patriotism combined with love for the European homelands, their personal rectitude, and their generosity and good will.

The President's Leif Erikson Day Proclamation states the matter well when it describes the ancient Nordic virtues as part of our own American heritage. Men and women of Norwegian, Swedish, and Danish birth or descent broke the sod of the great plains of North America and brought an abundant agriculture to our prairies. October 9th of each year is appropriately devoted to honoring the memory of the pioneering Scandinavian navigator, Leif Erikson, and pioneer Americans of Scandinavian antecedents.

Formal recognition of the magnificent achievement of Leif Erikson finally came two years ago when President Johnson, acting under the authority of a joint resolution approved by Congress in the second session of the 88th Congress, proclaimed October 9, 1964, Leif Erikson Day. The terms of the resolution authorized the issuance of a similar proclamation each year, and therefore one has been issued again for 1966's Leif Erikson Day.

Committee hearings were held on that resolution, and evidence relating to Leif Erikson's discovery of the North American continent was adduced by expert witnesses. Foremost among these was Dr. Helge Ingstad.

Scholars have carefully examined the literary evidence that exists for the discoveries in America by the Norsemen. There have been areas of disagreement, especially concerning the year of Leif Erikson's landing on our continent and the location of that landing here. The location of Leif's Vinland has been fixed by scholarly authorities at various points, but there has been no dispute about the fact that Leif did land at least once on the American continent, and did spend some time here, probably staying the winter, and returning to Greenland in the spring.

This literary evidence has now been corroborated by recent archeological investigations under the sponsorship of the National Geographic Society conducted in northern Newfoundland. On November 5, 1963, Dr. Helge Ingstad announced the discovery of the ruins of a Viking settlement predating Columbus's vogage to the New World by 500 years. His results were supported by experts of the National Geographic Society, the American Museum of Natural History, and the Smithsonian Institution.

Before he excavated the site at L'Anse Aux Meadows, a small fishing village near the northern tip of Newfoundland, it was Dr. Ingstad's belief that Leif Erickson's "Vinland" was farther north than the alleged locations in Cape Cod, Massachusetts, or in Rhode Island, places where wild grapes grow, the grapes and vines believed to have been referred to in the name "Vinland." Dr. Ingstad's belief was based on an old map, and on the linguistic research of a distinguished Swedish professor who had asserted that the first syllable of "Vinland" might refer to grass rather than to wild grapes.

The remains of the settlement which Dr. Ingstad found show that it was built like those which have been uncovered in Greenland. It was occupied for only a short time. The proof that the settlement was Viking in origin rests on carbon-dating evidence, together with the nature and details of the structures which, Dr. Junius Bird of the American Museum of Natural History, has said, "clearly cannot be attributed to either the Indians, Eskimos, or later European inhabitants of the area." He and other Smithsonian experts have also stated their belief that, "The settlement is of pre-Columbian Norse origin."

A primitive smithy and deposits of bog iron found at the site also confirm the Viking origin of the settlement. Eskimos and Indians, both prehistoric and modern, had no knowledge of extracting iron from the bog deposits. The Vikings did. Since later Europeans never used the technique, the inference that the Norsemen were there is strong indeed.

As seafarers, the Vikings were unexcelled. It is not likely that they made the voyage from their Greenland colonies to the mainland of America because of any lack of seamanship. They often sailed directly over the open ocean from Greenland to Scandinavia, as did Leif Erikson on several occasions. This distance is greater than that from Greenland to New England, and the course covered from Greenland to Scandinavia is through one of the most turbulent bodies of water in the world, the northern reaches of the Atlantic.

The descendants of the Vikings crossed that very same Atlantic to America centuries later. The contributions to the growth of the United States by the men and women of Scandinavia who came here as immigrants have been immense. Their descendants have continued that great tradition and even improved upon it, at the same time never forgetting how much their greater achievements owe to their forebears' sacrifices, iron will, determination of purpose, keenness of mind, moral fervor, and devotion to God, country, and family. In their achievements they have followed the precedent established for them by their first countryman in America, Leif Erikson.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a few years ago, the coveted Leif Erikson International Award was presented to Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission. Dr. Seaborg was with us at the October 6 luncheon and delivered this address which I also ask unanimous consent to be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Oceans of Truth

(Remarks by Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, at the Leif Erikson Foundation Luncheon, Washington, D.C., October 6, 1966)

It is a privilege for me to be here and have a small part in the worthwhile work that the Leif Erikson Foundation accomplishes through its encouragement of the constructive pioneering spirit.

While we meet here to further the work of the Leif Erikson Foundation, I realize that this gathering is taking place less than a week before a notable American holiday celebrating the birthday of another great explorer—Christopher Columbus. I've decided, therefore, to give both men due recognition and at the same time answer some questions which keep coming up in connection with the activities of this Foundation—namely, "What is the significance of the achievements of Leif Erickson and Columbus?" and "Does the recognition of one detract from that of the other?"

The great British historian, Gibbon, observed that "all that is human must retrograde if it does not advance." He was judging the Roman Empire and had the benefit of fifteen hundred years of historical perspective, but this theorem has been proved correct innumerable times. Nothing enables a civilization to achieve and maintain greatness more than the ability to produce those adventurous spirits who reconnoiter and conquer new fields from which new advances can be made.

Two such adventurous spirits to whom we owe a tremendous debt of gratitude are Leif Erikson and Christopher Columbus. It is unfortunate that the argument of who discovered America has for the most part consisted of polemics designed principally to refute. Hopefully, the question is now entering more fully into a dialogue intended to hail both Leif Erikson and Christopher Columbus for their achievements at no expense to either. I believe the quality of these achievements does not lie in the timing of their discoveries, but in a more important context, their similarity of purpose—the desire to transform and extend.

At this point, I believe I should mention that the Foundation does not claim that Leif Erikson was the first man to cross an unknown ocean to the New World, only that he did this about the year A.D. 1000. Indeed, recent archaeological investigations on the coast of Ecuador strongly suggest that the Japanese may have crossed the Pacific and landed in that area around 3000 B.C.

References to North America and the Vestervagen, the "westward way," have frequently been found in the Old Norse sagas. Certainly the Vikings in their longships were accomplished sailors, and in the era beginning around A.D. 800, they were capable of great voyages. Swedes dominated the Baltic region and penetrated into vast territories of Russia. Danes put ashore in England and then sailed on to France, Spain and even North Africa. Norwegian Vikings invaded Britain and Ireland and took their ships far south into the Mediterranean.

In a recent article in the National Geographic, Helge Ingstad tells of looking for signs of Vikings settlements in North America, and it was in the sagas that he found his best clue. They tell us that Leif Erikson built "large houses" there and that he "gave the land a name in accordance with the good things they found in it, calling it Vinland." After much searching, Ingstad came upon a meadow which turned out to be the Vinland of the saga, not the "land of vineyards" as we had thought but more likely "grass or meadow-land." Here on a northern shore of Newfoundland island his party uncovered the foundation of a Viking longhouse with its central fireplace and not far away were found iron smelters and forges. There were even the remains of a slate-lined ember pit in which coals were once kept glowing through the night for the next day's fire. An ember pit of the same kind had been found on Leif Erikson's boyhood farm in Greenland. Authorities have agreed that this was unquestionably a Viking settlement. Charcoal from the blacksmith's fireplace was subjected to radiocarbon analysis and two readings were obtained. One gave a date of A.D. 860, plus or minus 90 years, the other A.D. 1060, plus or minus 70 years—corresponding well with the expected period of the settlements.

It is now generally accepted that among the first Europeans to have sighted the land mass now occupied by the United States and Canada was the Icelander, Bjarni Herjulfsson, soon after 986. He sailed from Iceland to meet his father in Greenland and was driven by storms south and west of his objective to the eastern coast of North America. He did not put ashore but sailed north along the coast and eventually reached Greenland. From the sagas we are told that when he reported his find he was criticized by his listeners for not investigating the discovery. But these were the high centuries of Norse maritime adventure and Bjarni's story of what he had seen excited the ambitions of Leif Erikson.

Leif, described in one of the sagas as "big and strong, of striking appearance, shrewd and in every respect a temperate and fair-dealing man," bought Bjarni's ship. He retraced Bjarni's course and put ashore in the areas he called Helluland—or land of Flat Stones—Markland, Woodland, and Vinland. This voyage of Leif Erikson made in an open boat across uncharted waters with only the crudest of navigational instruments—a ship's bearing dial which checked due north at noon by means of a suncast shadow—speaks of great daring and fortitude.

Other voyagers followed; among them were Leif's brother, Thorvald, who may have been the first European to encounter American Indians whom the Norse called "Skraelings." Thorfinn Karlsefni next tried to set up a permanent colony in the new country and mounted a large expedition of three ships and 160 passengers including women. He even brought livestock. But the Indians, or Skraelings, gave the small colony no peace, and after three years Thorfinn returned to Greenland, taking with him his son Snorri, the first European born in America.

Bold and adventurous as the Vikings were, they were entering a hostile environment inadequately equipped to survive the rigors and hazards to which they would be exposed. Thus, the first European bid for a foothold in North America had failed in the attempt to establish a permanent colony.

Almost five hundred years passed before man again looked for the "westward way." The idea that broke the medieval chain of world notion at its strongest link was due to the energy and intellect of Christopher Columbus. From the information available, we gather he was born in Genoa, Italy, probably in 1451. By 1475, he had served as seaman on various ships in the Mediterranean. In 1476, he was headed for the Atlantic when raiders intercepted his ship off the Portuguese coast, a fateful accident that led him to Lisbon, then a center of maritime activity.

It was in Portugal that Columbus learned of the pioneering work in navigation of Prince Henry. He saw the caravel with its revolutionary reshaped hull and recutting of sails. And it was in Portugal that Columbus' idea was born—to sail west to Asia.

Columbus rested his argument on books, and several which he possessed are in existence with marginal notes in his handwriting: Marco Polo's Travels, the Imago Mundi by Cardinal d'Ailly and the Cosmographia of Pope Pius II. In addition, Columbus relied on the conviction of the Florentine geographer, Toscanelli, that the world was shaped like a pear or an orange. From these studies and his belief in a round world, Columbus concluded that the distance of a westward route to the extremity of Asia could not be much more than 3000 miles. He did not know of the Pacific Ocean and overestimated the size of the Asiatic continent, believing that it began somewhere about what is now known as California.

It is one thing to have an idea and quite another to persuade kings to risk their money on it. While John II of Portugal inherited his great-uncle Henry's zeal for navigation, he spurned Columbus' plan in favor of the more promising eastern route to India and China. Columbus made his way to Spain where his initial attempts to secure the necessary financial assistance were unsuccessful. At last, in 1492, Isabella agreed to provide funds for the venture. In terms of today's money the value of Columbus' fleet was $3,000. His salary was $300 a year and his two captains received $200 each. His crew members each received about $2.50 a month. All told, it cost approximately $7,000 to discover America—considerably less than our current attempt to get to the moon.

Shortly after August 3, 1492, Columbus sailed due west from the Canaries and with the aid of nautical instruments from Nuremberg, crossed the Atlantic at its widest part. On October 12, an island was sighted, the modern Watlings Island—thirteen miles long and six miles wide—to which Columbus gave the name San Salvador. On October 28, he reached northern Cuba and believed that this was the mainland of China or Japan. He looked in vain for the splendid cities with gold-roofed palaces which Marco Polo had described two centuries before.

Columbus had promised Asia and instead produced the new world. The objectors who had called him a visionary were right. But his persistency in following his error changed the axis of the globe.

Perhaps at first sight these early pioneering efforts by Leif Erikson and Christopher Columbus seem a long way off from the world in which we live with its celestial ambitions. But knowledge is continuous and we can trace its quest back uninterruptedly until we recognize the spirit of the space capsule in the Viking longship and the Spanish and Portuguese caravel. There is no end because every advance in knowledge has the effect of creating new and different problems and it is unlikely that the time will come when there are no more scientific and intellectual worlds to conquer.

Any phenomenon that is unknown or unpredictable is a bar to understanding and a difficulty to be overcome. Leif Erikson the Viking and Christopher Columbus the Italian understood this well. They crossed an unknown ocean and succeeded in stretching the human mind, in pulling man in new directions.

Why should we proceed to conquer? When is explanation needed? The answer, I believe, lies in the fact that man's innate tendency to lethargy and stagnation is overcome by the power of knowledge. It is knowledge that gives life and motion. It is knowledge that compels us to share the existence of societies different from our own; to recognize literature, music, painting, and science, all of those products of genius to which no single country can lay claim.

In the field of nuclear energy alone one realizes at once the different national backgrounds of its leading contributors. Names such as Hahn, Fermi, the Joliot-Curies, Rutherford, Bohr, Einstein, Szilard, Lawrence, Compton, Oppenheimer, Urey, and de Hevesy are all examples that scientific advancement is human—not national—advancement. No nation, indeed, no culture, has a monopoly on the scientific and intellectual talent that is required to provide more and more knowledge and, as a consequence, better understanding.

It is for this reason that in venturing to promote the pioneering spirit to advance human knowledge and hence human progress the Leif Erikson Foundation turns to all men in all nations. One of its major projects at this time is the creation of an annual publication which will review progress around the world in all significant fields and bring recognition to individuals, organizations and nations which have contributed to the cause of man by pioneering advances. The Foundation hopes that recognition of such work and more rapid dissemination of the knowledge it offers will generally stimulate more constructive pioneering efforts and bring them the necessary financial and political support.

I have been informed that the Leif Erikson Foundation is now in the process of organizing an international editorial board for its annual publication and will be seeking contributions of material through that board. I wish the Foundation much success in this worthwhile endeavor.

Impressed as we are today by the growing list of human achievements we must not become complacent. We must not become mesmerized by the daily recitations of our past and current successes. If we believe we have come a long way since the days of Leif Erikson or Christopher Columbus, surely a quick look around us will convince us that we have only scratched the surface of human potential. Surely, we still have a long way to go in solving some of what have been man's major problems through the ages. And concerning our knowledge of ourselves, of life and the forces of the universe, as Sir Isaac Newton once said "the great ocean of truth still lies all undiscovered before us."

Hon. Lindley Beckworth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for 24 years LINDLEY BECKWORTH has served his country, and the State of Texas, with honor and distinction. His services will be missed by this body, particularly by the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. His work on these committees was invaluable and his dedication to this House has produced a record of which he should be very proud.

As a member of the Texas delegation, LINDLEY BECKWORTH will be most sorely missed, not only as an able and effective legislator, but as a good friend.

On both sides of the aisle LINDLEY BECKWORTH commanded the respect of his colleagues. His conscientious devotion to our Nation and his labors in behalf of all Americans will not be forgotten by those of us who were privileged to work with the gentleman.

I join with my colleagues in wishing good luck, and happiness to my friend LINDLEY BECKWORTH. Though his service in this body is ending, I know his interest in the affairs of our country and in the State of Texas will not be lessened.

The 89th Congress: My Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully include in the RECORD my final report of the 89th Congress to the people of the Third Congressional District of New York:

THE 89TH CONGRESS: MY REPORT

The 89th Congress has justly been called the most productive in modern American history. It is responsible for the enactment of 650 Bills, milestone legislation in the vital areas of Education, Health, Social Security, Civil and Voting Rights, Urban Development and Housing, Transportation, Housing, Anti-Poverty, Immigration, Veterans' Benefits, Air and Water Pollution control, Conservation and Consumer protection, among others.

The 1965–66 Congress was an outstandingly creative legislature. Not only is its record of positive social legislation record-breaking; the measures it took to sustain our economic growth and prosperity were noteworthy.

Much legislation received my support. Some of it I co-authored. On the other hand, I have judiciously exercised my right to oppose measures (regardless of party line) I believed to be inimical to the interests of my constituents or to be fiscally unsound.

Besides supporting legislation of national import, during the past two years I have ceaselessly endeavored to provide leadership in the search for solutions to the problems that confront our district and our area. These include: increasing business activity and employment, industrial conversion; conservation of LI's natural resources; water pollution control; commuter transportation and consumer protection.

During both sessions of the 89th Congress I voted more than 700 times in the House. These votes were the expression of your voice in the process of self-government on the federal level. In the limited space following, I shall endeavor to give you a report on your 1965–66 Congress and of my activities in the House and in the district on your behalf.

MAJOR LEGISLATION, AFFECTING YOUR WELFARE, I VOTED FOR OR SPONSORED

Health: I co-authored the *Medicare Bill*, providing hospitalization, surgical and nursing care for our Senior Citizens. This "pay as you go insurance plan" for the elderly is probably the most important social legislation since the original social security law was enacted.

Education: The children of this nation are our greatest asset. The 89th Congress enacted more major education bills than any Congress in history. These included the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* and the *Higher Education Act*—two basic federal educational assistance programs. The first provides federal grants to improve local schools, which remain under local control; the second authorizes federal scholarships and preferential loans on the college level. *The Library Services and Construction Act*, which provides federal aid to community libraries, supports the very cornerstone of our education system. This federal assistance for education guarantees local administration and control of schools and is primarily designed to reach all children in this nation. I have always supported local autonomy and opposed federal intervention in public school administration, including federal compulsory busing of children.

Housing and Urban Development: The *Omnibus Housing Act*, which I supported, expands urban development and public housing programs, extends FHA loan insurance and encourages urban beautification. The *Demonstration Cities Act*, which received my vote, provides 1.3 billion in federal monies over a 2-year period for renewal projects in blighted neighborhoods reaching at the sources of crime in our city streets. The Glen Cove urban renewal project, among others, became possible because of such laws. They are a great boon to our community.

Transportation: Significant progress toward transporting people more rapidly and with greater safety was made by the 89th Congress. I contributed to this advance by introducing a bill to establish *a Civilian Air Academy* to meet our increasing shortage of commercial pilots and a resolution that prompted our State Department to successfully negotiate an *increased liability limit ($75,000) payable to survivors of international air disasters*. Your Congressman also supported the *1966 Mass Urban Transportation Act*, highway safety measures, and the important *1966 Motor Vehicle Safety Act*, which sets federal manufacturing safety standards for cars.

Immigration: Your Congressman cosponsored the *1965 Immigration and Nationality Act*. This realistic new law helps to re-unite families and removes the origin of a person as a criteria for his immigration to our shores. Many families in our district have been reunited with relatives because of this legislation.

Jet noise: I amended the budget in the Space Committee in order to add funds for jet noise abatement. This problem must be solved.

Human Rights: My first act in the 89th Congress was to vote against the seating of the Mississippi delegation. I enthusiastically supported and voted for the *Voting Rights Act of 1965* and the *1966 Civil Rights Act*. These two vital measures greatly furthered our national goal of full equality for *all* citizens.

Anti-Poverty: Amendments to the *Anti-Poverty Program*, which deepen and broaden our attempts to eliminate hard-core poverty and the cause of welfareism in our nation, received my support.

Headstart Centers and other federally sponsored projects to help the poor help themselves in our district attest the basic soundness of the program.

Veterans' Benefits: The new G.I. Bill which I co-authored, provides educational and other benefits to those in service after Jan. 31, 1955.

Social Security: Congress boosted social security benefits 7 percent and expanded the law's coverage; both measures I voted for.

Minimum Wage: Along with other Island Congressman, I voted to raise the minimum wage to $1.25 eliminating the need for supplemental welfare assistance to families earning less than $3,000 per year.

Conservation: My *Long Island Sound Bill*, still pending, provides for a master conservation plan for the entire Sound Area. It authorizes a comprehensive study of our needs and long-range planning designed to save and improve our remaining natural resources. A second proposal, which I introduced, would set *federal standards for waste disposal equipment on boats*, thus preventing further pollution of the Sound by pleasure craft. A third measure, also proposed by your Congressman calls for a Hudson River natural resources preservation program. I also voted for the *Water Pollution Control Act*, which authorizes federal grants for waste treatment plants.

Foreign aid: I authored a *major amendment to the 1966 Foreign Assistance Act*. The amendment, now a part of the Act, should cut wasteful spending and result in greater private business participation in the program.

Consumer protection: Following my 17-month inquiry which proved that widespread abuses by the giant trading stamp industry added almost $1,000,000,000 annually to the nation's food bill (accounting for almost 2 percent in the recent 4 percent rise in food prices), I initiated *a measure to curb these practices*. The measure provides adequate federal agency regulation of the industry, with stiff penalties for violations. It also gives you the opportunity of exchanging your stamps for premiums or cash.

To help ease the heavy financial burden carried by LI Commuters, I introduced a measure *to permit federal income tax deduction of commutation costs*.

Pet protection: My bill, now law, outlaws inhumane treatment of pets and should curb widespread abuses.

Vietnam, the search for peace: My conviction that military victory alone cannot bring a just and lasting peace to Vietnam has caused your Congressman to tirelessly lend his efforts toward achieving a climate in which a negotiated peaceful settlement could be realized. In this connection I have constantly urged a greater Congressional role in foreign policy and have also endorsed UN Ambassador Goldberg's call for reciprocal de-escalation. Besides authoring the new "G.I. Bill of Rights," which covers our Vietnam servicemen, I brought about a change in our Defense Department policy so that *no more than one immediate member of a family need serve in Vietnam at a time*.

Our economy: While our prosperity continues and the economy grows at a healthy rate, the demand of the Vietnam conflict on production has caused an inflationary factor to enter the picture. To help curb this trend, I have taken the following actions:

Attempted, with other economy-minded Congressmen of both parties, to cut almost $9 billion in non-essential spending from the federal budget.

Supported Administration moves to suspend the 7 percent investment credit and lower interest rates.

Initiated extensive inquiries in our area into the rising retail prices on bread and milk, and testified on price-rise causes before Congressional committees.

SOME OF YOUR CONGRESSMAN'S EFFORTS TO ENSURE THE WELL-BEING OF OUR DISTRICT

For business and industry

In July 1965, I led a tour of 17 members of the Armed Services and Space Committees through L.I. so that they could fully appreciate our area's production potential.

In October 1965, I accompanied Secretary of Defense McNamara and Senator ROBERT KENNEDY on a tour of L.I. industrial facilities.

I organized a Government Contract Procurement Seminar, attended by top federal officials and more than 400 area businessmen.

Looking forward to the time when defense production will no longer sustain our present prosperity and high employment level . . . I organized a major drive to make LI the center of the fast-growing Oceanography industry.

For community betterment

Your Congressman brought federal housing and urban development officials, as well as officials from other federal agencies, to conferences with local officials, to inform and coordinate available federal programs for our community.

I sponsored a series of "town hall" meetings on education, housing, Vietnam, etc., and brought federal officials to confer with mayors and supervisors on federal-local problems.

On drug addiction and crime

Aware of the complex nature of the narcotics addiction problem, and its effect on the crime rate, one of my first actions on taking office was to organize a Task Force on Narcotics. The task force of leading area doctors, law enforcement officials, psychologists, sociologists, lawyers, educators and other experts have formulated plans for a comprehensive, long-range attack on the drug addiction problem on all levels—causes, treatment, prevention and control. A March 1966 all-day conference at C. W. Post College, sponsored by the Task Force, marked the beginning of the comprehensive program for Nassau and Suffolk counties.

History will record the positive progressive steps which were taken by the 89th Congress to improve the conditions in which 197 million Americans enjoy the highest standard of living of any Nation in the World and to enable them to keep our Nation moving forward—and to take note of the needs of their fellowmen—the challenge which faces us and future generations of Americans.

Should you desire further information on the matters covered here, or on any other matters of interest to you, please do not hesitate to write to your Washington or District Congressional office.

Sincerely,

LESTER L. WOLFF.

SOME ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND KEY BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED BY CONGRESSMAN WOLFF IN THE 89TH CONGRESS

HR 7252—Medicare. *Passed. Now law.*

HR 144—To establish a special committee on Captive Nations.

HR 350—To reverse the transfer of the Naval Training Devices Center at Sands Point, New York.

HR 518—Expresses the sense of the House with respect to the Hague Protocol and the Warsaw Convention. (Raised airline insurance protection to $75,000.)

HR 677—To end nuclear proliferation.

H. Con. Res. 240—Expresses the Sense of Congress against persecution by Soviet Russia. *Now law.*

H. Con. Res. 737—To stabilize permanent UN peacekeeping force.

H. Con. Res. 742—Calls for free elections in Vietnam.

H.J. Res. 686—Proposes amendment to U.S. Constitution to provide that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons 18 or older.

H.J. Res. 1144—Authorizing the President to declare the week of Sept. 23, 1966 as Long Island Fair Week.

HR 3324—To amend the Immigration and Nationality Act. (New Immigration Bill) *passed now law.*

HR 3494—Authorizing the President to award posthumously the Congressional Medal of Honor to John F. Kennedy.

HR 6584—Implement Section II of Amendment 14 of the U.S. Constitution.

HR 9875—To regulate the transport and sale of cats and dogs intended for research or experimentation. (Pet Bill.) *Passed now law.*

HR 10861—To protect members of the armed forces and their families from threatening and harassing communications.

HR 11557—L.I. Sound Bill (comprehensive conservation measure). To protect L.I. Sound.

HR 11797—For federal standards of boat waste disposal (anti-pollution).

HR 12172—Provides educational assistance for veterans who have served in the Armed Forces since Oct. 1, 1963.

HR 12503—To enhance benefits of service in the Armed Forces and further extend higher education benefits by providing a broad program of higher educational benefits for veterans of service after Jan. 31, 1955. New GI Bill. *Passed now law.*

HR 13442—Provides for the establishment of a Civilian Aviation Academy.

HR 13530—Hudson River Area natural resources preservation program.

HR 16541—To allow individual federal income tax deductions for travel expenses to and from work by means of mass transportation facilities. (To alleviate burden of Commuter residents.)

HR 16782—Reimbursement of state and local governments by the federal government for real property taxes not collected on properties owned by foreign governments. (Soviet Residence in Glen Cove.)

HR 15750—The Foreign Assistance Act. I added a key amendment to this law.

Hon. Harry Flood Byrd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, it was my privilege to be assigned from my earliest days in the Senate to the Committee on Finance. There I began a warm and pleasant association with the late Harry Flood Byrd, who has been taken by death at his home in Virginia.

Senator Byrd had a courtly manner with all who dealt with him. He was scrupulously fair with everyone.

He was careful, frugal and conservative in all things—those which were his and those which were those of the Government in which he felt compelled to watch over. Yet, there was a warmth and a concern about Senator Byrd for his fellow men.

Senator Byrd was devoted to his State and Nation. He was devoted to this body. He dug deeply into the background of legislation and attended hearings faithfully. He studied and he pondered. He listened and he discussed. Then, he made up his mind.

When he left us due to ill health, he had given a third of a century to public service. He had left us all with inspiration and guidance. He had left us a legacy.

His own son came to fill the vacancy in this Senate. Thus, our loss is minimized. For we shall have HARRY FLOOD BYRD, JR., as a Member to carry on this meaningful, yet nostalgic, memory.

Foreign Investors Tax Act—H.R. 13103

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, at the end of the debate on the Foreign Investors Tax Act, I indicated that I had forgone making a speech in rebuttal to the statements of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] because the majority leader had urged that if I did so, we might lose the quorum then available on, or near, the Senate floor. At that time, however, I indicated that I would insert such a rebuttal in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This is that reply.

The portion of the conference report on the Foreign Investors Tax Act to which both the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] objected has been called the "Christmas tree" bill or the "grab bag" bill. Since these are quick and catchy names, these descriptions of the bill have also appeared frequently in the press. Of course, a description of this type is likely to be believed, or accepted as true, if repeated often enough. This is a well-known technique used to undermine a bill or provision, but that, of course, does not mean that the description is accurate.

It must have occurred to my many colleagues who voted with me on this conference report that if the opponents—who referred to it as being full of special interest provisions—can cite only three or four cases no matter how hard they try, their case must be questionable.

Let us examine the conference report from that point of view. First, as to title I of the bill which accounts for the first 10 sections and 100 pages of the bill, no questions have been raised. This is the Foreign Investors Tax Act portion of the bill and both the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] agree that this is good, desirable legislation. It will both help our balance of payments and improve the equity of the tax system as it applies to nonresident aliens and foreign corporations.

Problems have been raised as to the Long Act; namely, title III of the bill which deals with the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act—and I shall discuss them in just a moment—but I certainly do not believe that anyone can say that this represents special interest legislation. I realize that both of the Senators who led the attack on the bill have raised questions with respect to this portion of the bill, but these certainly are five more sections that cannot in any sense of the word be categorized as special interest provisions.

The remaining titles to the bill, title II and title IV as agreed to by the conferees, contain 18 sections. As near as I can tell, the entire discussion of special interest legislation as it is described revolves around four topics, accounting for seven sections of the bill. In other words, 11 more sections, make good structural changes in the law to which no question has been raised. Moreover, a review of these 11 sections discloses that in all cases they were either specifically endorsed by the Treasury Department or no objection was raised with respect to them. I shall attach to the end of my statement a brief description of these 11 clearly good structural changes.

Let us now examine the four remaining issues which apparently are responsible for the moniker which has been attached to this bill.

INVESTMENT CREDIT IN U.S. POSSESSIONS

One of these is the provision dealing with the investment credit in U.S. possessions. This amendment merely extends the application of the investment credit, now applicable to domestic investments, to investments in U.S. possessions for 1966 and subsequent years, on the same basis as the credit has been available here in the continental United States from 1962 forward. There have been statements to the effect that the Virgin Islands or Puerto Rico or some other possessions are already providing tax benefits with respect to their tax systems and, as a result, further tax benefits are not needed. This view represents a misunderstanding as to how the provision works. The tax credit provided by the bill is not available to offset Virgin Islands or Puerto Rican taxes. The investment credit can only be taken with respect to investments made by domestic corporations or U.S. citizens with respect to their U.S. tax—not on any tax which may be due a possession. In addition, this provision was carefully circumscribed so that it would not be available to any U.S. corporation or citizen already receiving special tax treatment under U.S. law with respect to investments in the possessions. This primarily is the exclusion for such income provided by section 931.

Corporations which receive the benefit of this provision will be domestic corporations with investments in possessions. They also must be corporations which are paying U.S. income tax with respect to those investments. The Finance Committee could not see why we should discriminate against investments of this type in our possessions. The committee could not see why these investments should be treated less favorably than investments here in the United States. I might add that investments made in possessions during the period when the domestic credit is suspended will not be eligible for the investment credit.

The principal objections which have been raised to this provision are that it is "retroactive" and also that it is "tailor made" for the Harvey Aluminum Co. First, let me say that this provision applies only to assets, the use of which has begun in the current year, 1966. In the past when practically any amendment beneficial to taxpayers has been enacted, it has been made effective as of the year in which the legislative action was taken. In other words, making this provision effective with respect to assets the use of which began in 1966 is wholly consistent with what has been almost the universal practice in this regard in the past. Moreover, when the domestic investment credit was first provided, it, too, was made effective back to the first of the year 1962 although this act did not become law until October 16, 1962. I see very little difference in the circumstances involving the two provisions, yet I heard no complaint about the domestic investment credit applying as of the first of the year in which enacted.

As to this provision being tailor made for one company, let me say that it should be obvious that in all of the various possessions of the United States certainly more than one company made investments during the calendar year 1966. It is ridiculous to assume that this provision will have application to only one company, and when tax returns for 1966 are filed, I am sure it will be shown that this charge is not true.

A bill to accomplish the objectives of the Senate amendment had been introduced in the House on August 24, 1965, giving everyone plenty of time to review its merits. The Finance Committee agreed to the amendment this year only after the Treasury Department advised the committee that it was consistent with administration policy.

SWAP FUND PROVISION

Let me now turn to the so-called swap fund amendment. The misunderstanding of the "possession" provision is only exceeded by the misunderstanding of the swap fund provision. Section 351 of the Internal Revenue Code provides that gain or loss is not to be recognized if property is transferred to a corporation by one person, or a group of persons, solely in exchange for stock or securities in the corporation, and immediately after the exchange the persons, or group of persons, is in control of the corporation.

In 1959 and 1960 and in the forepart of 1961 the Internal Revenue Service ruled that a group of persons holding stock in various companies could contribute this stock to a newly formed mutual fund corporation, and receive in exchange for their contribution shares of this mutual fund. These are the so-called swap funds, and the Service in these years ruled in 11 cases that there were no tax consequences resulting from the formation of one of these swap funds. It is true that beginning in 1961 the Service has not issued rulings on the tax status of the formation of swap funds. However, many private tax lawyers considered the formation of these funds to be a nontaxable transaction and operating on their advice a number of funds have been formed since that time.

Then, on July 14, 1966, the Treasury for the first time published regulations holding that the formation of these swap funds constituted a taxable transaction. At the time the Treasury took this position it offered closing agreements to existing swap funds which would provide that for past transactions, for all purposes of the tax laws, the formation of these funds would not constitute taxable transactions. In other words, for the future, the Treasury applied its position as to what the law said, but because of the uncertainty which had previously existed, it did not apply this position for the past. The effect of what Treasury did was to say that for the past, exchanges with swap funds were tax free, but for the future they were taxable.

Those concerned with swap funds initially made representations to members of the Finance Committee to the effect that the new regulations reversed the effect of the law even though there had been no change in the wording of the law. In other words, their position was that the Treasury was legislating by regulation. The majority of the Finance Committee voted to make it clear that swap funds were covered by section 351. I voted against this amendment in committee because I considered swap funds to be a loophole. While I understand the Treasury's opinion, nevertheless, I personally believe the Treasury's regulations do not reflect the clear wording of the law. In my opinion the tax-free formation of swap funds was provided for by the language of section 351.

I am glad to say that the conferees on the Foreign Investors Tax Act completely reversed the position on the Senate Finance Committee amendment. The action taken by the conferees makes it perfectly clear that the formation of swap funds will be viewed as a taxable transaction in all cases where exchanges are made on or after July 1, 1967. Moreover, in the case of funds requiring registration with the Securities and Exchange Commission, registration statements must be filed by December 31 of this year and the stock of prospective shareholders must be on deposit with the funds by May 1, 1967. It was the view of the conference that the various tax-free exchange provisions of the code should not permit the tax-free diversification of investment assets.

In other words, the conference committee action in this case completely confirms what the Treasury sought to do by regulation. Moreover, it provides a statutory basis for this action which, in my opinion, the regulations of the Treasury did not have. It is true that this will cover funds where registration statements are filed with the SEC up to the end of this year. However, this, too, is in keeping with the concept in the Treasury regulations which provided tax-free treatment for all funds in certain stages of process up to the time of the issuance of the regulations. This provides essentially the same treatment for funds which have been started before the end of this year.

It is also worth pointing out that the conference committee action not only gives a statutory base for the Treasury regulations, but that it, in several respects, provides a tighter rule than did the regulations. For example, under the conference committee action tax-free treatment is denied real estate swap funds and investment companies which have too few shareholders to be required to register with the SEC and the denial applies whether or not brokers or other intermediaries organize the fund where shareholders have rights to redeem their holdings at their option.

The conference committee action results in a much more restrictive provision than the Treasury regulations sought. As a result, it seems clear to me that what we have here is a "loophole closer" instead of a "loophole opener."

H.R. 10

Let us now turn to the third area of complaint with the Foreign Investors Tax Act. I refer here to the so-called H.R. 10 amendment, or the amendment which enlarges the deductions available to self-employed persons where amounts are set aside for their retirement years. I cannot say that I personally like this amendment. After all, the main thing that this amendment does is provide that when these self-employed persons set aside amounts for their retirement, they can deduct the full 10 percent of their wages up to a total of $2,500, rather than one-half of this amount. I do not like this amendment because the principal provision it repeals was my own amendment several years ago, which I fought for and obtained on the floor of the Senate. The thrust of my amendment was to treat contributions for self-employed persons' retirement essentially like contributions are treated under the social security and railroad retirement system. In both of these instances—and in those instances where private pension plans are provided on a contributory basis—the employer's share of the total contribution is deductible for tax purposes but the employee's share is not deductible. Since we were dealing with self-employed persons in a dual capacity, I felt, and the Congress agreed with me in 1962, that giving a deduction for half the contribution would place self-employed persons on a par with employees. However, this year H.R. 10, repealing my amendment, was passed by the House by a vote of 291 to 0. The provision as an amendment to the Foreign Investors Tax Act was also separately acted upon, on a favorable basis, by the Senate. I think it is clear—although I personally disagree—that the majority of both the House and the Senate favor this amendment. I am not one to believe, even when I am in the minority, that minority rule in this respect should govern.

In all fairness to the advocates of this amendment I must admit that there are many cases under the prior law where self-employed individuals are much more severely limited in the amounts they may set aside for their own retirement than is true of many of the well-paid employees and managers of many of our largest companies. Many of their plans are not contributory and, therefore, if one were to equate the self-employed individual with these persons, then the 50-percent deduction should not be required. Actually, in my judgment, the whole area of the tax treatment of private pension plans needed reconsideration before this amendment was acted upon, and will still need reconsideration after the adoption of this amendment. In some cases self-employed individuals will have advantages over employees and in other cases they will be at a disadvantage. In my view, we probably will eventually want to see whether it is possible to more nearly equalize the treatment. In the meanwhile, however, I see no reason why we should insist upon a minority view prevailing over the majority view.

PERCENTAGE DEPLETION

The fourth area of complaint is concerned with the provisions relating to percentage depletion. Of course, there are people who fundamentally disapprove of percentage depletion, as such. To them any amendment in the area of percentage depletion is automatically wrong if it gives 1 cent more of deduction to anyone, simply because they do not agree with the underlying principle involved in percentage depletion.

It seems to me that as long as we have percentage depletion in our tax system—and parenthetically I might add from my point of view this is something I hope is here for a long time to come—it is entirely appropriate that the percentage depletion rates be adjusted in a manner which allows for the competitive nature of the products. In other words, where two or more products are used for essentially the same purpose, good tax treatment—namely, the considerations of equity and fair competition—demands that they receive approximately the same percentage depletion deduction. This is no new, radical doctrine I am proposing here. This is, instead, the fundamental basis on which most of our percentage depletion rates are based at the present time.

Let us look now at the specific areas where the percentage depletion rates were changed, and I should point out that as a result of the conference committee action it is only a change in rates which occurred. No additional processes were classified as mining processes for any mineral. This is the area that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] was so concerned with a number of years ago. We have not in the slightest modified the concepts of the mining processes, on which percentage depletion is based, from the concepts in present law which remains as he provided by legislation in 1960.

The first area in which a percentage depletion rate was made was in the case of domestic deposits of clay, laterite, and nephelite syenite, but only to the extent that they are used for the extraction of alumina or aluminum compounds. The percentage depletion rate for these minerals was raised from 15 to 23 percent. This only seems fair since this is the percentage depletion rate which presently applies to domestic deposits of bauxite, the principal source of alumina and aluminum. It also is the rate which applies to another site to the extent that alumina and aluminum compounds are extracted from it. The Finance Committee believed that a good case could be made not only for these percentage depletion rate increases but also for more liberal treatment with respect to mining processes. However, the House conferees would not agree to any changes in mining processes. Nevertheless, it is hard for me to see how anyone could object to treating these different sources for alumina and aluminum the same as we already treat the principal source for alumina and aluminum.

The second percentage depletion rate change applies in the case of clam and oyster shells. Now I am aware of the fact that percentage depletion for clam and oyster shells is a source of amusement for many who are unacquainted with the extent to which clam and oyster shells in the entire gulf area are used as a substitute for limestone. The clam and oyster shells referred to in this act are those which have lain at the bottom of the sea for many hundreds or thousands of years. The ownership in these shells is in either the Federal or a State Government. The Government leases to private parties the right to remove these shells from certain specified areas. This gives them a right to property which is exhaustible and which is, therefore, eligible for percentage depletion. This is exactly the same concept which applies generally with respect to percentage depletion.

Clam and oyster shells of the type I have referred to already receive percentage depletion at the rate of 5 percent. However, clam and oyster shells in many cases are ground up and used for their calcium carbonate content in making cement.

Limestone—which also is essentially calcium carbonate—in other areas of the country is used for almost the identical purposes for which clam and oyster shells are used, yet limestone, except when used for road material or similar purposes, receives a 15-percent depletion rate. When it is used as gravel for making roads, the depletion rate is limited to 5 percent. All this amendment does is to give precisely the same treatment to clam and oyster shells which is already available in the other areas of the country where limestone is used for the same purposes. In other words, where clam and oyster shells are used as a substitute for gravel in making roads, the 5-percent depletion rate as at present will continue, but when clam and oyster shells are used for making cement, as in the case of limestone, the 15-percent rate will be available. Realistically, this does no more than give the same treatment to deposits of calcium carbonate found under water as is already accorded deposits of calcium carbonate found on land. This merely removes a competitive discrimination.

The final two percentage depletion rate changes represent very small changes indeed. The Senate action would have added sintering or burning to the processes classified as mining processes in the case of clay, shale, and slate used or sold as lightweight aggregates. These frequently are used for this purpose in concrete or in making cinder blocks. The Senate action, as a result of a floor amendment, would also have increased from 5 to 15 percent the percentage depletion rate applicable for clay and shale used in making sewer pipe and brick. In these cases the primary consideration was that other products used for similar purposes received a higher percentage depletion rate, or received more favorable treatment in the processes classified as mining processes.

In the case of clay used for sewer pipe, for example, this pipe is in competition with concrete sewer pipe and the materials used in making the cement which goes into the latter is eligible for 15-percent depletion rate. It was on this basis that the increase in the rate from 5 to 15 percent was justified on the Senate floor. In the conference committee consideration of this, however, it was noted that contrary to a clay sewer pipe, only 15 to 20 percent of a concrete sewer pipe consists of cement. The remaining aggregates are sand and gravel which receive a 5-percent depletion rate. Because of this additional information available to the conferees, which was not available at the time this matter was considered on the floor of the Senate, the Senate conferees agreed that the depletion rate should be adjusted upward by merely 2½ percent, rather than by the 10 percent which would have been provided by the Senate amendment. As I have suggested, this was agreed to because of the realization that in the case of the clay pipe, the area of competitive discrimination is limited to 15 to 20 percent of the total value of the pipe. This represents a modest change in the depletion rates and one which is justified on the basis of the present competitive situation.

The Senate amendment relating to lightweight aggregates dealt with the treatment processes which were to be considered part of the cost of mining in working out the percentage depletion allowance. The House conferees, as I have indicated, were not willing to make any change in the treatment process provisions but they could see the merit of a larger deduction for these products when used as lightweight aggregates. The conferees decided to take the direct approach of giving a slightly larger depletion allowance rather than the indirect approach of increasing the base on which the present depletion allowance would be based.

THE LONG PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN FUND ACT

It seems that the charges of special interest legislation which have been so freely flung at this bill evaporate into thin air once the facts are examined. Let me turn now to the area of political campaign contributions.

First, let me make it clear that this is an area on which the Senate Finance Committee has held hearings. An earlier version of the amendment adopted by the committee was presented in these hearings for consideration by the committee. This is also true of various other plans, including the tax deduction plan favored by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. I might also add that the problem of political campaign contributions has been discussed on the Senate floor not merely in connection with this bill but also in connection with earlier legislation. At the time we last raised the debt limitation the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] sought to amend that bill with his provision providing for political contribution deductions. The matter was extensively considered by the Senate at that time and rejected. However, this proposal was analyzed in hearings on political contributions held by the committee as I promised at the time.

This is a matter which has been considered extensively, not only in the current year but in past years as well. As the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] indicated, this is a problem which he had under study some 10 years ago. The problem with these past studies, however, is that they were just studies—no action was taken. I can well understand this, because the area of political campaign contributions is a multiple problem. It is a problem which, in part, is appropriately considered by one committee and, in part, by other committees. In the past it has been difficult to obtain action on this problem because of the feeling that it was impossible to act on any one of these problems until action had been completed on the others. This, in turn, prevented action by all of the committees. Senator CLARK made this aspect of the situation quite clear in his discussion of the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act.

I should make it clear that I do not consider the Long Act as a full answer to all of the problems in connection with political campaign contributions. First of all, this deals only with presidential campaigns. It may well be that after we see how this provision works in the case of presidential campaigns we may want to extend either this provision or some modified version of it, to cover congressional elections. I do not know the answer to this, and I think it would be unfortunate for us to reach an inflexible position in this regard until after we have tried this provision for a period of time in the case of presidential campaigns.

Second, I want to make it clear that in my view this bill does not replace the need for additional legislation regulating political contributions or requiring disclosure of the source of political campaign contributions. Moreover, this does not deal with other issues which we may have to face with respect to the division of television time or what organizations can properly make campaign expenditures. These are all issues, however, as to which it will be easier to come up with specific answers after my amendment is a part of the law, because it will give assurance of adequate financing for the most important of all political campaigns.

Nor do I contend that my provision itself even in the limited area in which it is intended to operate is, in all respects, necessarily a perfect answer to the problem. I am sure that modifications will be necessary as we gain experience under this provision. Nevertheless, I view the Long Act as major legislation which will give assurance that presidential candidates are not necessarily obligated to any financial interests as a result of the necessity to raise funds to finance their campaigns. There are sizable groups of citizens in our country who suspect that these financial contributions have influenced governmental decisions. We should remove this shadow and prevent the possibility of anything like this in the future. To me this is the most important aspect of my amendment.

I realize that some say, "But you haven't prevented the other campaign contributions from being made in addition to the funds provided by your bill." I have two answers to this: first, as I have already indicated, this is not the last time that I expect legislation to be passed with respect to political campaign contributions. I will be prepared to support limitations to outlaw private contributions to presidential campaigns when such legislation is before the Senate, and now that we have assurance of adequate financing for presidential campaigns, it will, for the first time from a practical point of view, really be possible to consider limitations such as I have referred to.

Obtaining funds on a very small basis from a very wide group of our citizens is the best possible way of being sure that no financial group can be said to have gained undue influence. Others have tried to find a way of obtaining this broad participation through tax deductions or credits. However, the effort which would be required to obtain these contributions in amounts as small as $1 from so many people raises the collection costs under these other devices to such an extent as to make them impractical. Moreover, a tax deduction or even a tax credit tends to provide more of an incentive for those in the higher income groups to make contributions, than for taxpayers of more modest means. This is a kind of selection that I think is undesirable in attempting to influence political contributions.

Some have objected to my plan because it requires individuals to check a box on their tax return. What are the alternatives that we most frequently hear? The suggestions most usually made are for a tax deduction or tax credit. These involve not merely a checkmark on the tax return but also the recording of specific contributions made, and still leaves us with the auditing problem of determining whether, in fact, the contributions were made. The tax problems in these alternative solutions are much more complex and difficult than the simple checkmark on the tax return which the amendment provides. Moreover, a tax deduction or credit to be verified must be checked with the party to whom the contribution was given. Who wants the internal revenue agents in examining his return to obtain information on his political affiliation?

In the absence of finding any other basis for objection to the Long Act, it is sometimes claimed that this is undesirable because individuals under this system are, in effect, designating how governmental funds are to be spent. To me the interesting thing about this argument is that those who make this charge fail to recognize that a deduction or tax credit for political contributions just as effectively takes money which would otherwise go into the Public Treasury and diverts it to another purpose. The only difference I can see in this regard is that the tax deduction or tax credit schemes divert the money just before it reaches the Treasury. Moreover, instead of diverting the money to the political campaigns, these deductions or credits merely recompense the taxpayer for part of the contribution he has already made. Moreover, frequently they repay the taxpayer needlessly for contributions he would have made in any case. There is no such waste under the amendment in this bill.

I have explained the mechanics of the Long Act previously, so I see no need to repeat it here. However, there are a few points that I would like to emphasize. First, this amendment treats equally all parties receiving 15 million votes or more. As a result, this will not favor the party in power.

Second. Provision is made for minority parties under this bill. Any party receiving 5 million votes or more—a 5-million deduction is provided not only for minority parties but for major parties as well—receives political campaign funds based upon its vote over 5 million, and if it reaches the 15-million vote level it is treated equally with the major parties. This is an honest attempt to give proper recognition to minority parties in this area of political contributions but not at the same time be unrealistic, and treat fragment parties on the same basis as major parties. I believe that this represents a fair solution to this problem, but I am certainly willing to consider modifications in the future should the need to do so be established.

Third. This amendment is limited in several respects. Major parties cannot receive more than an equal share of the funds based upon the vote in the last presidential election. Therefore, even if taxpayers should check their tax returns freely in this regard, only limited funds would be available for expenditure. The funds are available only for presidential campaigns, and the Comptroller General is specifically authorized to examine the statements presented to him and to audit the books of the political parties to be sure that the contributions are spent for presidential campaigns and not for congressional or gubernatorial campaigns, and not for personal use, distinct from political purposes.

Fourth. It has been said that this provision runs contrary to the limitation in present law limiting contributions to political committees to $3 million in any year. Those who say this cannot have examined the bill or present law very closely. Present law refers to contributions to political committees. The bill actually has nothing to do with contributions. The term "contribute" means to give or supply in common with others; to share in a joint effort. The financing by the Government after the passage of this bill is not a voluntary, joint effort to give funds. Rather, it is an appropriation of funds to which the parties have a right. Moreover, it is not part of a joint effort. As a result, it is not a contribution and, therefore, does not come under the limitation of present law. Moreover, it involves a payment to political "parties" not payments to political "committees." As a result, it should be clear the present $3 million limitation does not apply.

Fifth. Some have objected to the fact that the contribution in this case is divided between, or among, the major parties. Some have indicated that they would prefer making all of their contribution to one party or the other. This, of course, is not the way to assure good government. It may be a way of electing one party over another—by supplying it with a better financial base—but it does not assure good government. The way to assure good government is to be sure that sufficient campaign funds are available to both, or all, major parties, so that their positions can be fully understood by the electorate. It is only a well-informed electorate that can assure the continuation of our representative form of government.

Sixth. It has been suggested that there are no safeguards to prevent misuse of the funds made available to the political parties by this provision. Actually present law provides about as strict a fraud statute as can be imagined. Section 1001 of title 18 of the code specifies:

> Whoever, in any matter within the jurisdiction of any department or agency of the United States knowingly and willfully falsifies, conceals or covers up by any trick, scheme, or device a material fact, or makes any false, fictitious or fraudulent statements or representations, or makes or uses any false writing or documents knowing the same to contain any false, fictitious or fraudulent statement or entry shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

Certainly I would not object to other safeguards being written into the law to prescribe even more definitively how these funds may be used and how they may not be used, but I do feel that those who say there presently are no safeguards have overstated their case.

Contrary to the general impression that some have tried to create, this is not a hastily concocted scheme.

It has long been suggested that Government should find some way to help finance the cost of these campaigns. Theodore Roosevelt suggested nearly 60 years ago that this should be done with public funds. Later the Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures of presidential, vice-presidential, and senatorial candidates in 1936 suggested that private contributions to political campaigns be prohibited entirely and that instead all election expenses should be defrayed from public funds. In 1959, Jasper B. Shannon, professor of political science at the University of Nebraska, recommended a similar plan in his book "Money and Politics." Earlier this year Prof. John Kenneth Galbraith suggested, in connection with State offices, that the Government "provide every regularly nominated candidate with a public grant of sufficient size to enable him to get his name, merit if any, and platform before the people. These grants would be available to candidates for statewide office, the general court, and for the senate and house of representatives."

I introduced a bill on June 15 of this year to provide funds from the Treasury to help defray the cost of presidential campaigns. In doing this I was largely implementing a thought which had been before the people for discusion for nearly six decades. This is a matter which I have been studying for over a year and it is a matter which has been thoroughly analyzed by the Senate Finance Committee. The best minds of the staff of the Finance Committee and the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, the Senate Legislative Counsel, the experts of Treasury, as well as other advisors to the President, and the senior members of the House Committee on Ways and Means have all contributed meaningfully to the effort to find a proper answer. This is an important building block on which we can build a proper system for controlling political campaign contributions. Moreover, it is the first answer to this problem of financing political campaigns for which it has been possible to obtain majority support from Congress. This in itself is an important achievement in such a controversial field as this.

Let me conclude my comments on the presidential political campaign financing by saying that I consider this one of the most important and constructive pieces of legislation passed by Congress this year. I believe time will show that what I have said is true.

ELEVEN NONCONTROVERSIAL STRUCTURAL CHANGES

As I indicated previously, the bill includes 11 structural changes not relating to the Foreign Investors Tax Act but about which no questions have been raised. These are not hastily put-together provisions. For the most part they represent provisions which have been carefully studied by the tax committees and their staffs. Three of these provisions, for example, had been considered and were reported favorably by the House Committee on Ways and Means. Moreover, the provision relating to "straddles" had been the subject of an extensive technical study by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation in cooperation with the Treasury Department staff. The provision relating to per-unit retain allocations of cooperatives is a matter studied over a long period of time both by the affected industries and also by the technical staffs of Congress and the Treasury Department. Three of the structural changes constitute improvements in the interest equalization tax which have been carefully studied by the staffs. Another of the amendments provides for an annual report on contingent liabilities and assets available to cover them. This report is one Senator SALTONSTALL has sought for some time and is one which should aid all of us in getting a better insight of the Government's financial status. The Finance Committee had recommended the Saltonstall amendment to the Senate back in the 88th Congress and again in the 1st session of the 89th Congress. On both occasions the Senate approved the bill without objection.

These 11 amendments can be summarized, as follows:

First. Corporate acquisition of assets of another corporation: Under present income tax law, the purchase from an unrelated party by one corporation of at least 80 percent of the stock of another corporation followed by the liquidation of the acquired corporation within 2 years is treated as a purchase of the assets of the acquired corporation. This amendment expands the definition of "purchase" to include the purchase of stock from a 50-percent owned subsidiary if stock in the 50-percent owned subsidiary was also acquired by purchase. The change is to be effective with respect to acquisitions of stock made after December 31, 1965.

Second. Self-employed persons retirement plans—certain income of authors, inventors, and so forth: This amendment modifies present income tax law relating to self-employed individuals' retirement plans to permit authors, inventors, and so forth, to include gains—other than capital gains—from sales and other transfers of their works in their earned income base for the purpose of computing deductions for contributions to such plans. This change will be effective for taxable years ending after the date of enactment of the act.

Third. Exclusion of certain rents from personal holding company income: This amendment provides, for taxable years beginning after the date of enactment of the act—and certain earlier years at the election of the taxpayer—that rent received from the lease of tangible personal property manufactured by a taxpayer is not to be treated as personal holding company income.

Fourth. Straddles: This amendment provides that, with respect to straddle transactions entered into after January 25, 1965, the income from the lapse of an option which originated as part of a straddle is to be treated as a short-term capital gain—instead of ordinary income. This permits it to be netted against any capital loss which may result from the exercise of the other option in the straddle while retaining what in most respects is ordinary income treatment for any excess of net short-term capital gain over net long-term capital loss.

Fifth. The taxation of per-unit retain allocations of cooperatives: This amendment clarifies present law dealing with the taxation of cooperatives and patrons to assure that a current single tax is paid, at either the cooperative or patron level, with respect to per-unit retain certificates. In so doing, the amendment makes the treatment of these certificates generally comparable to the treatment of patronage dividends under present law.

Sixth. The excise tax on hearses: This amendment provides that the sale of an amublance, hearse, or combination ambulance-hearse vehicle is to be considered to be the sale of an automobile chassis or automobile body—rather than a truck chassis or body—for purposes of determining the manufacturers excise tax on motor vehicles. This change applies with respect to articles sold after the date of enactment of the act.

Seventh. Interest equalization tax—raw material source loans: Subsequent transfers of debt obligations to assure raw material sources are to be exempt from the interest equalization tax where the indebtedness is acquired without an intent on the part of the purchaser to sell it to other U.S. persons. This change is to be effective with respect to acquisitions of debt obligations made after the date of enactment.

Eighth. Interest equalization tax—certain acquisitions by insurance companies in developed countries: The present exemption for reverse asset pools of U.S. insurance companies is extended to allow the establishment of reserve asset pools where a U.S. insurance company commences activities in a developed country or where a less-developed country is designated as a developed country. This amendment is to take effect on the day after the date of enactment.

Ninth. Interest equalization tax—Euro-dollars: The President is given the authority to exempt from the interest equalization tax U.S. dollar loans of more than 1 year made by the foreign branches of U.S. banks. This change is to apply to acquisitions of debt obligations made after the date of enactment.

Tenth. Treasury bonds or certificates payable in foreign currency: This amendment expands the debt management authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the issuance of U.S. notes payable in foreign currencies. This authority already exists in the case of bonds and certificates of indebtedness.

Eleventh. Reports on Federal contingent liabilities and assets: This amendment—as modified in conference—requires the Secretary of the Treasury to submit a report to the Congress each year indicating the full contingent liabilities of the Federal Government and the assets of the Federal Government which might be made available to liquidate such liabilities. The report is to be made on the first day of each regular session of the Congress with respect to the close of the preceding June 30—beginning with June 30, 1967.

Hon. Lindley Beckworth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, for 24 years LINDLEY BECKWORTH has dedicated himself to the people of east Texas and to this body. We shall both sorely miss him. We shall miss not only his fine work as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and as chairman of the Civil Service Subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, but we shall miss his smiling countenance. We shall miss his warmth and ever-present wit. Most of all we shall miss his humanity. Mr. Speaker, I join with all my colleagues here in wishing my friend LINDLEY BECKWORTH, his wife and family, many, many more years of happiness and good health.

The 89th Congress: Issues and Achievements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the 89th Congress is symbolic of the continuing achievements and frustrations of the legislative process in America. When I first came to the Senate in late 1952, General Eisenhower had just been elected President and the Nation was faced with the aggravating dilemma of the Korean war and its awesome burden upon the economic and social development of the country. "Guns versus butter" was as poignant for the 83d Congress as it was for the 89th. Under the leadership of President Eisenhower, the United States was able then to resolve the Korean conflict and, at the same time, to move forward with important domestic programs. This is the same kind of dilemma that cast an even larger shadow on the 89th Congress.

The growing U.S. involvement in the Vietnam war and the inflationary trend in the Nation's economy were by far the dominant themes of the 89th Congress. In his state of the Union address of January 12, 1966, President Johnson called for a renewed emphasis of the war, but not at the expense of his Great Society.

> This Nation is mighty tough—

He stated—

> * * * to pursue our goals in the rest of the world while still building a great society here at home.

His budget request called for a $15.2 billion expansion of the war as well as a $3.3 billion increase in proposed domestic spending—a record fiscal budget of $112.8 billion.

One of the strong, continuing strands in traditional Republican Party philosophy is fidelity to sound fiscal policy. Our party refused to succumb to expediency. Once again, Republicans pointed out that no nation, regardless of its might, could continue to fight a war abroad without recognizing the need for economic adjustments at home. But the administration paid little attention to the warnings of an opposition representing but a third of the Congress. Major programs which swept through the Congress with bipartisan support in 1965, were supplemented by greater spending plans in 1966. But the facade of achievement was to be shattered by the reality of inflation. By the middle of 1966, the administration at last began to heed the growing cry for action—but its efforts were too little, too late. The last gasps of the 89th Congress were spent on suspension of the Investment Tax Credit and the Foreign Investors Tax Act, measures which may only add to confusion in our economy.

The administration and its majority in the Congress failed adequately to deal with the economic challenges imposed by America's role in world affairs. Nevertheless, the Congress accomplished some notable legislative achievements.

Indeed, the 89th Congress will be long remembered for its outstanding domestic record. Such programs as medicare, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Higher Education Act, the Voting Rights Act, a minimum wage for agriculture, the demonstration cities program, and many others, formed the framework for future advancements in every area of domestic concern. But the challenge of today and tomorrow will continue to be the ability of this Nation to move forward without destroying the stability of our economy or frustrating our efforts in defending freedom in Vietnam. This challenge will, indeed, it must, demand the continued and undivided attention of the Congress and the Nation if meaningful domestic and foreign achievements are to be consolidated.

THE NATION'S ECONOMY

As 1966 began, the American economy was working at capacity. After years of stable economic growth, it was near full employment. Although the United States was enjoying the benefits of continued prosperity, the economy had reached the point where any sizable increase in demand would result in substantial price increases.

Expenditures for Vietnam and the Great Society provided the impetus, and inflation became a reality. The cost-of-living index jumped from 111 percent in January of 1966 to 113.8 percent in August. Interest rates began to rise, the money market tightened, and a critical shortage of mortgage money in the homebuilding industry appeared. On September 22, 1966, in an address on the floor of the Senate, I pointed to some of the consequences that inflation had inflicted:

> It (inflation) has upset our financial markets; it has all but destroyed the longstanding blessing of low interest rates for investment; it has cut deeply into the budget of the American housewife; it has paralyzed home construction and financing.

The President, early in the 2d session, sought and received congressional approval of a $5.9 billion bill to accelerate certain types of taxpayments and to reimpose 1965 excise levies, but the measure was hardly adequate to counter the spending boom. Almost every leading economist in the Nation called for a restraint on spending or for a general tax increase, but the administration and its 2 to 1 majority in Congress refused to make this choice.

Instead, other tactics were employed with questionable results. The rigid wage-price guidelines proved inadequate to resist the rising cost of labor. Administration efforts to restrict the money supply by raising interest rates worked undue hardships, particularly on the homebuilding industry. Tight money greatly pinched the economy of California, where traditionally money has been more expensive than in States nearer the financial centers on the east coast.

The final tactic was a proposal to suspend certain tax incentives to business investment. In a major floor address, I contended that the effects of this proposal would not be prompt, its application inequitable, and its consequences uncertain. More important, the probable consequence would be felt deeply in the economy of California:

> The proposed legislation will result in the kind of large-scale unemployment and production cutbacks that mean economic disaster for states highly dependent on large industries. In my own State, there are over 500,000 people dependent on the aerospace and airline industries for their income. Are their jobs to be sacrificed in 1968 for the problems of 1966? It is a sad commentary on the policies of this administration when possible future unemployment must be used as a club to control present spending.

Neither the administration nor the Congress accepted several amendments which I offered to correct the deficiencies and inequities of this proposal. I opposed this measure on final passage.

What is needed is a more forthright approach to fiscal policy, to balance the budget, and, where necessary, to cut spending and increase revenue. In the course of this Congress, I have conscientiously opposed spending which I thought could be deferred or avoided during the present crisis in Vietnam. I opposed the Community Development District Act of 1966 because of its excessive high costs, as well as the Participation Sales Act—a piece of political sleight-of-hand that would covertly increase Federal spending by not having it appear in the Federal budget.

The leader of the Senate Republicans, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, sought a proposal to give the President of the United States the authority to control spending. It provided the Chief Executive with the power and the tools to withhold 20 percent of the congressional appropriation in the public works area. I regret exceedingly that only 17 of us supported this proposal.

While I supported these Republican efforts to reduce Government spending where possible, I also felt it necessary to support legislation aimed at stimulating and protecting the private sector of our economy. I cosponsored the quality stabilization bill, a proposal which would protect the small businessman from predatory and deceptive pricing. I introduced legislation to eliminate the danger of double taxation that might result from the use of installment sales. Rather than acting on these and other proposals aimed at stimulating the sagging portions of our economy, the majority chose to pass such inflationary packages as the Foreign Investors Tax Act—a proposal loaded with unrelated legislation for special interest groups and referred to by the Wall Street Journal as the "Christmas tree bill." I voted against it.

Too often, the voices of reason are drowned out by those who ignore the consequences of their decisions in this critical time. The stability of the economy became a crucial problem in the 89th Congress; but the administration ignored it until late in the session. I intend to insure that this problem is given first priority in the next year. America's strong economy is her most precious asset at home and a most effective weapon abroad.

AMERICA AND THE WORLD

Following the President's decision, in the summer of 1965, to commit large numbers of U.S. Forces to the defense of the Republic of South Vietnam, the attention of the 89th Congress shifted necessarily to foreign affairs. The struggle to resist aggression in a small nation halfway around the world brought into question the fundamentals of American policy throughout the world.

The costs of this struggle imposed an enormous burden on our economy which could not be borne without some reassessment of our commitments, both financial and military, in other parts of the world.

In some areas, a reassessment of foreign policy was overdue. I supported Senator DIRKSEN's successful proposal to reduce the administration's spending plans in the foreign aid program for this year. I also supported the Kennedy-Mundt amendment to provide for a thorough review of the entire program in order to make it both more efficient and more responsive to American foreign policy objectives throughout the world.

I did not agree, however, to the suggestion of the Democratic majority, that our sizable commitment in Asia must result in a unilateral withdrawal of troops from the NATO alliance. The United States must not abandon the vital concept of collective security. On September 22, 1966, I pointed out to the Senate that any change in the foreign policy of the United States was of great importance to the entire world, and that the aggressive designs of Communist China were clearly a threat to the peace of every continent. I noted furthermore:

> A great power must make its purposes clear lest its allies be confused and its enemies miscalculate its intentions. No nation, friend or foe, should have to grope for the basis of our international policy in this nuclear age.

The majority's proposal would have sown confusion among our allies in the Atlantic alliance.

Under strong Republican counterattack, the troop withdrawal proposal was allowed to die. The point apparently has been accepted by the administration that no such major step should be taken without full consultation with our allies and detailed consideration in congressional hearings and in the executive agencies.

The confusion produced by foreign misconception of our deep commitment to the defense of human freedom has undoubtedly led to a disastrous dip in American prestige in Europe and in many of the developing nations. It has also contributed to the creation of disruptive attitudes here at home. I have spoken out against many of these, particularly to refute the cynical view that our allies in Asia have no sincere interest in resisting Communist aggression. For their part the people of Vietnam have made it clear that they want no part of misnamed "Wars of national liberation." Following the remarkable participation by the Vietnamese people in the election of September 13, 1966, for a national consituent assembly, I told the Senate that:

> In Asia as elsewhere, the instruments of democracy are the strongest weapons available to man. They are a match for subversion, conspiracy, tyranny and terror. We sometimes fail to appreciate the true measure of their power.
>
> The Viet Cong may well have suffered their Dienbienphu at the polls.

The world must be left in little doubt that the primary purpose of our involvement in Vietnam is to put a stop to the poisonous idea that one nation can forcibly impose its idea of the future on another. The determination to fight tyranny has been a mainstay of American policy throughout our history. The world will not be fully free until the force behind this simple truth is clearly understood.

In Vietnam it is now clear that the Communist forces cannot achieve their objective by force of arms. It remains to show them that republican institutions will be strong enough to resist their political intrigues. The free people of Asia have put their faith in self-government and in their collective security arrangements with their allies, including the United States. We must not disabuse them of this trust.

All Californians, indeed, all Americans have a special interest in the affairs of Latin America. The United States must continue to encourage the development of free and growing nations in our hemisphere. But this objective must not preclude the protection of our own vital interests. In 1965, I succeeded in incorporating in the Foreign Assistance Act a provision authorizing the President to suspend foreign aid to nations which interfere with our fishing fleets on the high seas. This has all too frequently been a major problem in our relations with our southern neighbors. I also succeeded in amending the national minimum wage law to provide that its operations in the Panama Canal Zone would be carefully scrutinized and to insure that they will not contribute to further civil disturbances at that key point in our national communications.

THE LIFE OF THE CITY

With the violence and eruptions which afflicted large tracts of urban America, and with the increasing emphasis on domestic programs to assist the poor, the attention of the 89th Congress was drawn to our cities. In August of 1966, the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization held a number of hearings in an effort to clarify the Federal role in our cities. On August 22, I had the honor of appearing before that subcommittee to testify to the need for greater civil concern, for increased incorporation of private enterprise, for improved police-community relations, and for improved housing and education. I concluded with these words:

> The suggestions and programs I have referred to are possible solutions to the problems we face in our cities. I don't know the answers, but I do see the symptoms. And

> I know that my country cannot stand any growing pattern of violence, bloodshed, bigotry and hate. The ghettos of America cry out for our attention. We need to remove as many of the causes as we can. The problem is as multi-sided and complex as human life itself which is precisely what it is. We need the benefit of the wisest guidance possible.
>
> We need to try to improve human nature at the same time we seek to improve human environment. It is good that your Subcommittee is directing its attention, and the attention of our people, to a real danger in our midst. If you can lead in awakening an American civic conscience, sound solutions will be forthcoming giving new hope for our cities and our American society.

Some of the key legislative areas aimed at the urban crisis during the 89th Congress were poverty, housing, air and water pollution and transportation.

WAR ON POVERTY

The goal of the antipoverty program is to assist the underprivileged citizens of this Nation. Though I have supported the general aims of this program, a number of problems—political, administrative, and financial—have plagued its conduct.

The political problems centered around the use of poverty funds to support municipal political organizations and for other partisan purposes. To prevent such abuses, I cosponsored legislation to strengthen regulations preventing employees of the poverty program from engaging in partisan political activities. I am happy to say that the proposal was adopted into law.

Administrative and financial weaknesses were reflected in wasteful expenditures. As a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, I redoubled my efforts to give such expenditures the closest scrutiny. Republicans have constantly urged that both administrative and financial aspects of this program should not rest with government action alone, but should incorporate the efforts of private enterprise.

I introduced legislation to revise the purpose clause of the Economic Opportunity Act specifically to encourage the participation of private enterprise. This legislation was also adopted by the 89th Congress.

Additional Republican proposals which I cosponsored included the Human Investment Act, to allow a tax advantage to businesses participating in job training programs, and the Economic Opportunity Corporation, to create a private corporation engaged in the various programs under the Economic Opportunity Act. I regret that neither was acted upon during this session.

If the goals of this program are to be effectively achieved, our efforts should rest as much as possible with the resources and incentives of the private economy.

HOUSING

The need for improved housing conditions for low-income families posed an additional urban area of concern to the 89th Congress.

The demonstration cities bill contained the bulk of the housing and city proposals of the 89th Congress. The key feature of this legislation was to provide a coordinated and intensive attack on urban blight. As part of this attack, I introduced an amendment to provide assistance to those seeking to purchase homes in areas threatened by civil disturbance. The lack of almost all private financing in these areas punished those who desired to be property owners. The amendment, which was adopted by the Congress, will allow FHA assistance to such potential buyers.

In August of 1965, I introduced legislation to provide decent housing for the Hunters Point area in San Francisco. Subsequently, the administration advised me that this proposal could be handled administratively. I regret that its failure to act promptly may well have been one of the underlying causes of the recent disorders in that area.

Society cannot afford to leave this segment of its citizenry in the horrid conditions in vast tracts of our great cities. It is out of such an environment that grows the social disorganization and crime which costs society millions each year.

AIR AND WATER POLLUTION

The problems of air and water pollution were among the first urban areas to be seriously studied by the Congress. It was in 1955 that I introduced the first Federal legislation in the field—the Air Pollution Control Act—which provided for a program of research and technical assistance. It was signed into law by President Eisenhower. Additional measures have been passed since that time expanding the provisions of the original act.

During the 89th Congress, I cosponsored S. 306 to provide additional Federal action to abate air pollution. This successful proposal established standards to control pollutants and further, to authorize a national research program developing improved methods of disposing of solid wastes. I further joined in efforts to step up the Federal Government's water pollution control activities. S. 2947, the Clean Waters Restoration Act of 1966, provided additional funds for sewage treatment plants, additional incentives for State contributions, and a new program of research on industrial pollution.

There were other proposals in this area which I cosponsored, but which Congress did not act upon, including a measure to provide for tax incentives to those constructing pollution facilities.

TRANSPORTATION

In recent studies of the causes of urban blight, transportation has slowly become a topic of extreme importance. The McCone Commission studying the factors that entered into the Watts riot concluded:

> The lack of adequate transportation handicaps them (residents of Watts) in seeking and holding jobs, attending schools, shopping, and in fulfilling other needs. It has had a major influence in creating a sense of isolation, with its resultant frustrations, among the residents.

I supported the enactment of S. 3700 during this Congress, a bill which would expand Federal programs of aid in the development of urban mass transportation. I cosponsored two additional proposals—S. 2599 and S. 2935—both of which were aimed at increasing the research and development programs in urban transportation. In July of 1965, I introduced an amendment to H.R. 7997, the Independent Offices Appropriations proposal, to stimulate continued American investment in the unique development of helicopter transportation connecting cities and airports in a given metropolitan area.

In order to coordinate the principal transportation policies, functions, and operations of the Federal Government, Congress created a Department of Transportation. Though many administrative problems remain to be answered, I believe this department will be an important step in the formation of a national transportation policy and in the eventual solution of our many transportation difficulties.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND CIVIL PEACE

In early June of this year, I addressed the Senate:

> Mr. President, this country, within the last few years, has taken significant steps toward the fulfillment of our historic American concept of equality for all men. These steps are intended to help America set her own house in order and achieve domestic tranquility among our people. But the true significance of our efforts can be diminished, if not destroyed, by a few acts of useless violence or death in the streets of our cities.

There was reason for great distress throughout the country as reports of rioting and violence resounded from New York to Los Angeles, from Chicago to Lansing, from Cleveland to Atlanta. In the Senate, I said, also:

> These are events which no man, regardless of his sympathies, can cite with pride. They taint the achievements we have made in the past and they hinder our efforts for the future. They strike at the very goal to which, along with many of my distinguished colleagues, I have so long been devoted; equal justice and equal opportunity under the law.

These events and their effects became a matter of the greatest concern to the Congress as it faced issues in the fields of civil rights, crime, and election reform.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Since the first civil rights legislation was enacted during the Eisenhower years, forceful strides have been made toward equal justice under law. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, measures which I cosponsored, represent a fulfillment of the words of our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution. As I have stated on the floor of the Senate:

> America is approaching a period when the law and its enforcement will not be influenced by the color of a man's skin or by his creed, and equal justice will be a reality rather than a sham.

But the effects of the rioting and civil strife which afflicted our cities not only encouraged in justice, but cast a shadow over the favorable congressional atmosphere that had greeted civil rights legislation. The Civil Rights Act of 1966 was not voted upon in the Senate because of a filibuster. Another proposal to strengthen Federal prohibitions against discrimination in employment based on race, religion, or national origin died in the Senate. Several measures which I cosponsored to provide additional criminal and civil remedies for unlawful violence were not acted upon in committee.

But the challenge of our times is to move forward with human progress without threatening the domestic tranquillity of this Nation. Our nearly 200 million people, of diverse races, must live together in harmony. Our free society rests on the premise that every American must assume the responsibility of respecting the laws pursuant to our Constitution. If this be done, then I am hopeful that injustice can largely be met not by laws, but by the conscience of the American people.

CRIME AND VIOLENCE

The 89th Congress joined with the people of America in a growing concern for all forms of lawlessness in our society. There must always be a vigorous, coordinated, and efficient enforcement of our laws. I have supported, and will always support, all appropriate legislation to provide our peace officers with the tools they need to do the job that must be done.

I was a cosponsor of S. 1409 which would have provided a program of Federal assistance to State and local police forces in order to develop or demonstrate techniques and practices which will improve their effectiveness. I also cosponsored several proposals (S. 2113–2116) designed to improve the elimination of narcotics addiction—a major cause of crime. These proposals were incorporated in the passage of an all-encompassing narcotics measure—S. 2191. I also introduced a proposal (S. 2524) to control the indiscriminate and unregulated traffic in master keys. Although the proposal gained bipartisan support, it was not acted upon in committee.

It is regretful that additional legislative action was not taken in the fight against crime and lawlessness. It is the responsibility of the Congress, the administration and the Attorney General to gear up the Federal Establishment to combat the interstate traffic which exists in organized crime and violence.

ELECTION REFORM

An area which is susceptible to a subtler form of lawlessness is that of Federal campaigns and elections. Cries for election reforms arise each election year in Congress but rapidly fade the day after election. The 89th Congress was no exception. A number of proposals were offered to amend the Corrupt Practices Act, the Hatch Act, and establish Federal controls on campaign expenditures—none were acted upon.

I was one of a bipartisan group which sponsored S. 3435 which provided needed reforms in the field of election finance, including tightened campaign spending reporting laws, tax deduction for political gifts and a requirement that Members of Congress report their extracurricular gifts and income. This bill also died in committee.

An area which I felt demanded particular attention was that of fraud in Federal elections. On August 17, 1966, I introduced a bill to strengthen Federal laws to deal with those who would use false or fraudulent campaign materials. In the remarks which I made at the time I introduced this proposal, I stated:

> It is a sad commentary to the greatness of free America when a vote is cast out of ignorance. It is a high crime against our Nation, however, when a vote is mistakenly cast by reason of false or fraudulent propaganda. No representative government can continue to exist very long if willful deception is allowed to influence and to mislead the American voter.

I will again reintroduce this proposal in the next session of the Congress.

CALIFORNIA AND THE WEST

The press of population on the resources of the great American West demands increasing attention by thoughtful citizens everywhere in our country. Every day there is a net increase of 1,500 persons moving into our State; this fantastic proliferation of people has already made California the most populous and one of the most highly urbanized States in the Union. By the year 2000 there will be 50 million people in California, if the present rate of migration continues.

California's riches have been the magnet for this growth. But if our citizens are to enjoy the serenity of the seashore, the majesty of the Sierras, or the grandeur of our forests, we must make a massive effort to preserve them. This challenge is of a piece with the problem facing our cities. Man must be able to continue to draw from nature the inspiration that has formed so much of our civilization.

In the 89th Congress, I introduced a proposal endorsed by the administration and by many conservationists to create a national park in the mighty Redwoods of Del Norte County. The giant trees, some of which were alive in the time of Christ, offer a matchless opportunity for an appreciation of nature by all of the people, and an excellent prospect for recreation as well. This proposal will be a priority item for the 90th Congress, and, if the various organizations having a stake in the future of our northern coast can reach an acceptable agreement on the metes and bounds, I am confident that a park will be established.

The Congress did take action on my bill to continue acquisition of lands for the Point Reyes National Seashore, recognizing the need to preserve this scenic area for the benefit of all Californians in this and succeeding generations. In a related area the Congress recognized the urgency of preserving vanishing species of wildlife and took steps to prevent the extinction, such as lamentably was the future of the California grizzly bear.

The struggle to conserve our resources is nowhere more acute than in the critical need to supply California with adequate water supplies. In the past year I continued my efforts to reach agreement among the States of the West on the use of water in the Pacific Southwest project, and to provide the beginning for alternative sources of supply through desalination of sea water.

Although the Senate passed my proposal for Federal participation in a $444 million desalination plant to be located on a man-made island off the coast of Orange County, action was not completed in the House of Representatives. The provision of adequate water supplies for southern California remains a priority item.

The critical problem of water supply must be attacked from every conceivable angle, if our standard of living in California is to be maintained. Some notable achievements have already been recorded. The 89th Congress authorized and provided initial funds for the $426 million Auburn-Folsom reclamation legislation, which, along with Trinity and San Luis, will form a vital element in the Central Valley project.

After a long fight the Congress also approved the small reclamation projects amendments, which I supported, in order to provide more generous and realistic Federal aid for nongovernmental agencies building their own water supply and distribution systems.

The Congress also enacted my proposal for a joint project with the Republic of Mexico to bring under control the flood waters of the Tijuana River which runs along the border.

AGRICULTURE

Today, agriculture continues to hold a key place in our society because of its unique contribution to this Nation's greatness. California is the Nation's first agricultural State. Our farmers, however, are faced with a number of problems which constantly threaten their economic well-being. With the increasing number of farm liquidations, ranging from 80,000 to 90,000 per year, the national interest is directly affected. Several vital issues were presented for consideration in this second session of the 89th Congress.

It is unfortunate that agricultural policy in this country is often dependent on the whims of the executive branch, the Department of Agriculture, or the Department of Labor. The Johnson administration took several actions which were calculated to push farm prices down. The wholesale dumping of wheat and corn, the slashing of the Defense Department buying of butter and beef, and the using of import restrictions, only added to the farmers' instability. I believe we must seek to reduce Government involvement in agriculture without harming individual farmers. It is with this in mind that I cosponsored Senate Congressional Resolution 93, a measure to prohibit action by any Federal agency to discourage parity prices for any agricultural commodity. The worst blunder in the field of agriculture was the administration's mishandling of the farm labor supply during the critical harvest periods.

On July 12, 1966, the Senate passed S. 3467, allocating additional funds for school lunch programs and needy children. This bill will not only assist the dairy farmer to augment his meager income and to dispose of surplus milk, but will also help to provide proper nutritional benefits for our underprivileged children.

The cotton research and promotion bill—H.R. 1322—was also considered and passed by the Congress. It is estimated that from 12 to 14 million persons in the United States depend directly on cotton for at least a part of their livelihood. I worked actively for the passage of this proposal and believe that it will effectively improve the competitive position of our cotton industry in California and the Nation. I also cosponsored successful amendments to stimulate the olive and wine industries of California through trade and tax incentives.

Increases in world population have added a new dimension to the problems of American agriculture. This country, under Public Law 480, is now delivering surplus food and fiber to other nations of the world. The Food for Freedom Act of 1966 will extend Public Law 480. I have long supported the use of surplus commodities as a necessary adjunct to our aid program; however, as a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, I have always opposed any waste in our foreign aid program where contributions were not productive.

The farm people of this Nation have made and are continuing to make a vital contribution to our Nation's prosperity. I believe our efforts must seek to give these people an equitable share in the prosperity they have helped to create.

LABOR AND EMPLOYMENT

Although the economy reached the level of so-called full employment in the past 2 years, significant pockets of unemployment remained, particularly in crowded areas like Watts where the jobless rate has been estimated as high as 34 percent of the work force. The 89th Congress made major contributions to improve job placement and training through the amendments to the Manpower Development Training Act and programs of the antipoverty program. Only the inability of House-Senate conferees to reach agreement prevented enactment of a Republican effort to provide a sound nationwide unemployment compensation program recognizing the prerogatives of the State governments in this area.

A major achievement was enactment of a national minimum wage for agriculture, long a plank in the platform of the Republican Party of California. The final version of the law did not contain some of the provisions on child labor and comparable wage levels, which I had submitted in my own proposals. But, I was gratified that at last the Congress recognized at law the error in the outdated "double standard" in our policy, which has excluded agricultural workers from the benefits obtained by workers in industry and commerce. The minimum agricultural wage in Mississippi was recorded early in 1966 at 65 cents per hour, as compared with $1.42 in California, a differential which not only leaves the field workers in Mississippi with a wage below subsistence but provides ruinous competition for California agriculture.

The effort to establish a uniform national labor policy, which has long been the dream of the American workingman, made less progress in the 89th Congress than many of us had hoped for. Neither the proposal to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, nor my proposal for one national labor policy on picketing were brought to a vote on the Senate floor. My bill was repeatedly endorsed by President Eisenhower. These measures are entitled to a fair hearing and decision on their merits. I was the first elected official in California to oppose right-to-work laws. The people of California have repudiated them at the polls. I continue in my firm belief that this Nation must have one labor policy for the benefit of all, rather than a patchwork of laws tailored to the needs of special interest groups.

EDUCATION

The world is fast coming to recognize what Greek philosophers said thousands of years ago: there is nothing more precious than knowledge. In the 89th Congress this concept was given full recognition in the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Higher Education Act, and the International Education Act, all of which were designed to improve facilities available to growing American minds at every level. I strongly supported these measures, particularly some of the features most important to California, such as increased aid to junior colleges.

As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I took sharp issue with the administration's proposal to curtail the so-called impacted areas program. The Federal Government must continue to acknowledge its obligation to compensate local school districts for the tax burden imposed by the education of children of families brought into our State by Federal programs. There are over a quarter of a million Federal employees in the State of California; moreover, 45 percent of its land remains in Federal hands. The administration's proposed reductions would have meant an annual increase of over $1 million each to the taxpayers of San Francisco and Long Beach, over $3 million to Los Angeles and over $5 million to San Diego. In fact, in some school districts of California, such as China Lake, there would be almost no other source of revenue than this Federal aid. I am very pleased that the Congress saw fit to maintain this vital program.

Another major need is to provide continued and increased support for higher education. The post war population increase now appears in our college entrance statistics. Advanced education is increasingly important to our society. I was the cosponsor of a Republican proposal to provide tax relief for the costs of higher education. It has gained bipartisan support and should be given early consideration in the next session. There will also be a need to meet increased construction costs for our college campuses. I am mindful of the outstanding achievements of our California colleges, both State and private. They have played a major role in sustaining the high level of productivity and of cultural development in our State. They have, for example, been a major factor in the spending of over $5 billion in our State every year on research and development. Education is the foundation of American prosperity in the modern world, and no effort must be spared to keep it sound and constructive.

HEALTH

One of the most significant pieces of legislation to affect not only California but the entire Nation was medicare. I have long supported efforts to obtain a social security medical care program for the aged. Several years ago, I supported the Kerr-Mills Act which authorized 50-percent Federal financial participation with any State whose laws authorized across-the-board medical, hospital, and pharmaceutical care for people in need, the "need" to be set by State standards.

My belief is that pay-as-you-go hospital insurance under social security for people over 65 is a vastly sounder health program. In 1965, after cosponsoring the companion bill in the Senate, I was gratified when the Congress finally passed the House version of medicare. This program is benefiting directly more than 19 million Americans over the age of 65. It is benefiting indirectly all Americans by freeing younger generations from worrying about health care for their elderly parents and by guaranteeing each person some protection against catastrophic illness in his old age.

I also supported the passage of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 which increased social security cash benefits and expanded public assistance programs, and also S. 3008, a bill providing for planning authorizations for health services in fiscal 1967 and 1968. In addition, I cosponsored proposals which would, among other things, provide disability insurance for the blind, expand medicare to include State and local employees, establish a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health, and provide aid to children under foster care. Though these proposals were not acted upon, it is clear that continued attention will be demanded of the Congress in order to improve, develop, and expand the significant health services that have been established.

VETERANS

Prompted by the increasing involvement in Vietnam, the 89th Congress made one of its first orders of business a long-stalled program of readjustment assistance for veterans who served in the Armed Forces after January 31, 1955. The so-called cold war GI bill provided a permanent program of educational and vocational training assistance as well as direct and guaranteed loans for all such veterans.

In addition to supporting this proposal, I cosponsored several successful amendments to provide tax benefits to members of the Armed Forces under the excise tax bill and the Tax Adjustment Act. I also cosponsored proposals to provide indemnity insurance for members of the Armed Forces in combat zones, to increase home loan benefits to veterans, and to provide a comprehensive on-the-job training program for GI's.

As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I joined in efforts to forestall the administration's plans to close a number of veterans hospitals and homes. This congressional opposition eventually forced President Johnson to substantially curtail his original plans.

The 89th Congress also provided increases in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and their dependents as well as two bills increasing assistance for disabled veterans receiving vocational rehabilitation training.

Near the end of the session, I cosponsored a bill, which the Senate approved, to readjust and equalize assistance to veterans of Vietnam in a number of important areas. The words I spoke in support of this measure have and will forever guide my continuing efforts on behalf of this Nation's veterans:

> The Congress, acting on behalf of the people of the United States, would, by this bill, attempt to pay a small portion of the ineluctable obligation of honor, which this Nation must attempt, but with all its resources will never be fully able, to repay to those who have fought, and will continue to fight, in defense of freedom.

CONCLUSION

The areas which I have discussed were of major concern to the Members of the 89th Congress. Many of the problems, of course, remain unanswered. It is the responsibility of future Congresses to continue the never-ending search to fulfill our hopes for America. To this end, I will always direct my efforts in the U.S. Senate. The future of the American people will be bright, if all of us discharge our obligations of citizenship and work together toward constructive solutions to the problems which plague our country and loom over the horizon for all nations.

Speech by Senator John Sparkman, of Alabama, Before the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, El Paso, Tex., October 22, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, on last Saturday evening, paid a high honor to one of our colleagues, the Honorable John J. Sparkman, of Alabama, by conferring upon him the Minute Man Hall of Fame Award.

Senator Sparkman, throughout his many years in the House, and then in the Senate, has contributed greatly to national security and the ROA has given him deserved and proper recognition in calling attention to his service. As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, then known as the Military Affairs Committee, John Sparkman had a great deal to do with shaping the successful policies of our Nation during World War II. He had served in World War I as an enlisted man, and after the war, earning a commission in the Army Reserves, has maintained a close interest and activity in security affairs. He is a great patriot who has authored many bills for the welfare of the veteran and the military man. What ROA has said about John Sparkman, in the words of the citation which I quote here, I am sure we can all echo:

> Recognizing that The Honorable John J. Sparkman by precept and example, has sacrificially devoted his genius and leadership to the cause of National Security, and both in War and Peace, has given meaning, substance, and effectiveness to the Citizen-Soldier tradition, vital to the safety and welfare of the United States of America.

In response to this award, Senator Sparkman made a significant address at the annual fall conference of the Nation's Reserve leaders at El Paso, Tex.

I submit for insertion in the Record this address because of its timeliness and wisdom.

There being no objections, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. President and Vice Presidents, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am particularly honored by the distinction you accord me tonight. As a long time reserve officer and member of ROA, I have—I believe—more than an ordinary understanding of the significance of this award.

I served in the Army during World War I and was among those who emerged from that conflict aware of the nation's need for preparedness. I have remained in the reserves since, and through my activity in the training program of what was then the ORC—the Organized Reserve Corps—I achieved the rank of Colonel.

I am proud of the fact that I have been for many years and am now an active member of the Huntsville ROA chapter, one of the finest chapters in our association.

So I accept this honor with humility and with a deep awareness of its significance.

During the past two years we have seen assaults on the Reserve structure and proposals that would have obliterated it. Heartening to all of us, as Reservists, has been the loyalty and support which the members of Congress gave to ROA and to preserving its structure and integrity.

An encouraging step to come out of the controversy is the proposal for a ROA "Bill of Rights" which provides for new organization and support for a revitalized reserve for all the military services—Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

The ROA Bill of Rights was first introduced by Representative Charlie Bennett in the House and later developed in detail by the House Armed Services Committee and the Senate Preparedness Committee. It was reported favorably by the House committee by a vote of 34 to 1, and passed the House by a resounding 332 to 6 vote.

The Senate Committee has not, in the final days of Congress, been able to hold hearings on this important legislation. But there is strong sentiment for it in the Senate and it is my prediction that the bill will be enacted in the 90th Congress.

The bill rallies such support because the citizen-reservist structure provides a continuing long range measure of safety at a fraction of the active military cost, and its training contributes to character and discipline throughout the national community.

I have a personal, as well as official, interest in another ROA accomplishment—your Minute Man Memorial Building. For some years now, I have looked out of my window at the red brick buildings across the street, facing the Capitol and a block from the Supreme Court Building.

I share your pride in the building activity which will begin in just a few days outside my window, when ROA begins construction of its new national headquarters.

As Chairman of the Senate Office Building Commission, I approved the plans for the building.

America is traditionally a nation of peace. But however strong our yearnings for peace, I believe Americans recognize, as our first President told us, that to be prepared for war is the best way to preserve the peace. Preparedness is a permanent national policy.

The United States must maintain its military strength, extending throughout the national community, for the foreseeable future if we are to preserve and maintain the freedoms fashioned in the American formula. We must be aware that aggression strikes where weakness appears.

The Communist aggression of today may be pushed back, but aggression may recur in the next generation in another form and under another name.

As a member of the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives during the years of World War II, I recall vividly an appearance before that Committee by the then Chief of Staff of the Army, the distinguished soldier and statesman, General George C. Marshall.

What rings so loud and clear in my memory is a statement that General Marshall made concerning the great emergency expansion of the Army to meet the urgent needs of war:

"Without the 125,000 Reserve officers on our rolls," General Marshall said, "we would not have been able to build the Army so fast nor so strong."

This was a great tribute to that group of volunteers who went on to take their places among the nation's heroes and the nation's fallen unknowns.

Their willingness and ability to join shoulder-to-shoulder with their Regular comrades was then, as in the more distant past and in recent times, a decisive factor in keeping our nation free.

The reserves today in all the services—Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force and Coast Guard—though no more dedicated than their forebears, are far more effective fighting forces—better than when they answered the call in World War II, better than when they met the enemy in Korea, and better than in the challenging days of Berlin and Cuba.

They are more effective because their organization and training have been built upon the lessons of past wars, past crises, and past emergencies. They are better because their leaders are seasoned veterans of past mobilizations—officers who know what needs to be done and can motivate their men to do it.

Back during the Berlin Crisis of 1961, many of the recalled Reservists referred to themselves jokingly as the "41–51–61 Club." These are the men who, as voluntary members of our reserve components, were undergoing their third mobilization as civilian-soldiers. The club has many members in this audience, and many members who are still active members of the Ready Reserve.

But the Reserve has not waited for mobilization to perform active service for our nation. Our Naval Air Reservists are flying transport missions to Southeast Asia. The members of our Air Force Reserve are shouldering burdens in support of our combat forces in Southeast Asia. You can find Air Force Reserve airplanes and crews all over the world—wherever Military Airlift Command operates.

You can also find them working daily, here in the United States, helping to train Army airborne forces and carrying critical cargo for Tactical Air Command.

This is a sign not only of the presence of the true volunteer spirit among our Reservists but also of the great strides which our Reserves have made in increasing their readiness and capability.

There is a great concern today—and properly so—with cost effectiveness. How we can cut here and save so many millions, cut there and save another so many millions. Frankly, the best example of real cost effectiveness that I have seen is the strengthening of at least a portion of our reserve forces and the reliance on these forces as part of our in-being military establishment.

From letters I have received, I know that many Reservists feel the failure to order them to active duty is a reflection on their ability and patriotism. They feel a loss of prestige and dignity because, for the first time in history, the Reserves do not have an active part in a war being fought by the United States.

These feelings are groundless. As I look at it, our Reserves are playing a role which is even more important than that which they might play if mobilized.

The units of the Selected Reserve Force of the Army, and the priority training units of the reserves of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force—these are today our strategic reserve. For the first time, the ability and potential of our reserve forces have been fully recognized. For the first time on a large scale, the reserve forces are being entrusted with a major responsibility which has heretofore been the sole prerogative of the active establishment.

The central problem is the readiness of your capability. Because, traditionally, the Reserves have required a measure of time to get ready after the need was present.

You have demonstrated today that this "time-to-get-ready" factor is becoming less and less valid as a consideration—provided that the funds, equipment, and training facilities are available here at home on which our Reservists can build the needed degree of readiness. Units of the Air Reserve Forces are geared for immediate availability and can be in full operation in a matter of hours.

Army Reserve units are kept at a state of readiness commensurate with the mobilization requirement—whether it is a day, a month, or a longer period of time. The same is true among the Navy, Marine Corps and Coast Guard where varying missions require different degrees of availability. The progress of the Selected Reserve is evidence of progress which can be made by other elements of the reserve forces, when and if the support is made available.

The volunteer Reservist of today has every reason to be proud of his military status.

There is another side to the "cost effectiveness" factor—economic rather than military. It has special meaning today, and perhaps you have not given thought to its importance.

In a time when inflationary pressures are building up in the nation's economic boiler, the cost effectiveness factor helps to reduce those pressures. It helps to keep the economy stable and productive.

The strength and productivity of our economy form the sinews of defense. And we have demonstrated again and again, in time of war or when war is threatened, that the strength and productivity of the national economy are as important to the national security—and almost as great a deterrent—as is military armament itself.

So I commend you—and the nation commends you—for this double contribution you make to the economic as well as military strength of our country.

What is the world situation today in which you play this vital, dual role?

The problem is loaded with political as well as military implications. The President is at this moment in the South Pacific conferring with the leaders of the Pacific nations most vitally concerned with Viet Nam.

The war in Viet Nam is not a popular war, either in this country or abroad, because it presents these political as well as military problems. But the American people are agreed on the necessity for our military presence in Viet Nam—popular or not.

For it has always been the policy of our government and the will of our people to oppose Communist aggression—wherever and whenever it threatens peace and freedom in the world.

That threat exists in Viet Nam. And it is the policy and the will of this nation to oppose the aggressor.

We know that if we fail to push back the aggressor in Viet Nam, the Communists will pull the plug, and all Southeast Asia will go down the drain—not only Viet Nam but Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, Burma, and other countries.

Several weeks ago General Maxwell Taylor, one of our greatest military leaders and formerly the military adviser in Viet Nam, said that we could not tolerate a stalemate in Viet Nam. We will not tolerate a stalemate.

We are going to maintain the pressure in Viet Nam—and we are going to step it up if necessary—with all the force and determination necessary to turn back Communist aggression and win the final victory.

This is the job we can do and must do.

We have behind us the resolve and determination of the American people. Let us move ahead to the finish—and the sooner the better.

Night Driving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES P. FARNSLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, some time back a pioneer in the field of nighttime driving research, Dr. A. R. Lauer of the University of Iowa, did some extensive analysis of the causes and conditions involved in after-dark accidents.

Among the explanations advanced for the higher accident rate at night were greater driver fatigue, the use of intoxicants, improperly adjusted or maintained headlights or rear lights, fog or rain, and excessive speed. The evident difficulty with these explanations was that when the mishaps were thoroughly investigated, an unexplainable majority seemed to have happened for other reasons. In the final analysis it was determined that these accidents could be largely attributed to inadequate driver visibility due to darkness.

This conclusion should not come as a surprise. We know from experience that darkness sharply reduces visibility and that most of us overdrive our visibility at night. The majority of drivers are constantly gambling with what is ahead beyond their field of vision. All too often this gamble does not pay off.

Cities and States have spent millions of dollars on street and highway lighting. Unfortunately, thousands and thousands of miles of thoroughfares remain with little or no illumination. It is in these areas where our chance taking becomes a risk.

Some people contend that proper driver training will overcome the deficiencies of operating an automobile after dark. Others maintain that strict legislation and more rigorous controls will do the job. Experience tells us emphatically that this is only wishful thinking. People will comply with regulations up to a point, and then we will have evasion and open rebellion to unrealistic restrictions.

The obvious answer to all of this is to provide more illumination. Like signals or channelization, which provide positive controls, lighting is the final answer.

What about the cost? It will amount to about 1½ or 2 percent of the total construction figure. Naturally the initial outlay would be much heavier because of the great stretches of highways and numerous streets that currently are inadequately lit or have no illumination whatsoever. However, if this measure will save thousands of lives and provide comfortable and productive night transportation, the expense is secondary.

Statistical evidence is not the only proof that American motorists need help in order to see better after dark. A vast amount of research has been conducted in the laboratory and in the field which conclusively establishes the incontestible validity of proper illumination.

D. M. Fink, of the Institute of Transportation and Traffic Engineering at the University of California, states:

> Seeing conditions at night are among the most unsatisfactory and critical that the average person encounters. This one variable of driver visibility is outstanding in its influence on the unsafe operations of motor vehicles.

Dr. Lauer, director of the Driver Research Laboratory at Iowa State University, makes it even more emphatic:

> Regardless of what may be assigned as the ultimate cause of night accidents, the immediate origin is not seeing the hazard in time. Make it easy for the driver to see, and you will reduce his chances of accident by over fifty per cent.

I do not believe that the cost of installing or maintaining adequate lighting systems is prohibitive. Particularly not when measured in terms of greatly reduced fatalities and injuries on the streets and highways and vastly improved driving conditions for night operation of vehicles.

Hon. Walter Rogers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for 16 years this House has been fortunate to have the services of WALTER ROGERS. He has worked through these years with a diligence and dedication that is reflected in his record of accomplishments.

The people of the Panhandle, indeed of the entire State of Texas, have been so well served by this gentleman that his absence from the House of Representatives will be most keenly felt by them.

However, the citizens who were represented by WALTER ROGERS will not be the only ones to mark his absence. Those of us who have been privileged to serve through the years with him will not forget all the hard work, long hours, and wisdom that WALTER ROGERS has given to his country.

Two committees, Interior and Insular Affairs, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce, have been the better for his membership.

WALTER ROGERS worked as hard as any Congressman, but with a touch of humor that was a welcomed note in the long hours of deliberation. His constituents, the Texas delegation, and all the Congress will miss the capable leadership of my friend and colleague.

WALTER ROGERS was an outstanding Congressman. He is a good friend and a great American.

Minority Report on Activities of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, during the 2d session of the 89th Congress, the Republican members of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee made an outstanding record of constructive contribution and effective legislative work.

In every field—labor, education, poverty, health, railroad retirement, Federal Employees Compensation Act benefits, and veterans' affairs—the Republicans on this committee made significant contributions and, in a number of instances, originated the central concepts around which the legislation was built.

LABOR

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1966 (H.R. 13712—PUBLIC LAW 89-601)

The outstanding accomplishment of the 89th Congress in the labor field was the enactment of comprehensive amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act—H.R. 13712—bringing 8 million additional workers under the minimum wage law and gradually increasing the minimum to $1.60 by 1968. The original administration bill called for extension of coverage but no increase in the minimum—thus leaving the minimum at $1.25, well below the poverty level. The first bill calling for an increased minimum was a Republican bill—Senator JAVITS, S. 1770—and the measure which finally emerged from the Congress incorporated a number of other significant Republican initiatives, including:

First. Restriction on hazardous employment of children in agriculture—Senator JAVITS, amendment No. 606, paragraph 2, incorporated in the act as section 203(d)(2).

Second. Partial overtime exemption for nursing home employees—Senator PROUTY, incorporated in the act as section 201(b)(1).

Third. Requirement that the Secretary of Labor make specific legislative recommendations concerning prohibition of arbitrary discrimination in employment on account of age—Senators JAVITS, PROUTY, FANNIN, MURPHY, and GRIFFIN, incorporated in the act as section 606.

Fourth. Requiring the Secretary to study and report to the Congress on wages paid to handicapped workers in sheltered workshops—Senator JAVITS, incorporated in the act as section 605.

Fifth. Seasonal food processing overtime exemption of 20 weeks per year—Senators GRIFFIN and JAVITS, with Senator MORSE, incorporated in section 204 of the act.

Sixth. Extension of overtime exemption for certain employees of automobile and farm implement dealers not working in the principal building of the dealership—Senator JAVITS, included in the Senate report, pages 31-32.

Seventh. Cowboy exemption—Senator FANNIN, section 302(a) of the act.

METAL AND NONMETALLIC MINE SAFETY ACT (H.R. 8989—PUBLIC LAW 89-577)

This act, whose name conceals its true significance, creates a comprehensive scheme for establishing safety standards in every mine in the Nation—except for coal mines, which are already covered by the Coal Mine Safety Act. The term "mine," moreover, includes not only underground mines, which tend to be localized in a relatively few States, but also surface mines, including rock, sand, and gravel quarries and pits, which can be found throughout the country.

Republican amendments completely revised this bill, converting it from a highly controversial measure which could well lead to many administrative abuses, into a tight administrative setup which will be fully effective in promoting safety while at the same time insuring that administrative abuses and excesses will be kept to a minimum.

Minority amendments included:

First. Establishment of a Mine Safety Board of Review—Senators JAVITS and PROUTY, amendment No. 545, incorporated in the act as sections 10, 11, and 12.

Second. Vesting discretion in the Secretary of the Interior to decline to assert jurisdiction over smaller mines—Senator JAVITS, amendment No. 538, incorporated in section 3(b) of the act.

Third. Vesting of major enforcement responsibility in the Bureau of Mines—Senator PROUTY, section 17 of the act.

Fourth. Definition of conditions governed by the act as those which "could reasonably be expected to cause injury" rather than those which "could cause" such injury—Senator JAVITS, amendment No. 539, incorporated in sections 6(b) and 8(a) of the act.

Fifth. Establishment of procedure for promulgation of safety standards—Senator JAVITS, section 6(e) of the act.

Sixth. Establishment of procedure for judicial review of safety standards, and limiting such review to standards not recommended by an advisory committee—Senator JAVITS, section 6(e) of the act.

Seventh. Permission for a State to qualify for delegated authority without vesting full State authority in a "single State agency"—Senator JAVITS, amendment No. 540, incorporated in section 16(c) of the act.

Eighth. Requirement that a State safety plan, to qualify, must fully implement all assurances contained in it—Senator JAVITS, amendment No. 541, as amended, incorporated in section 16(d) of the act.

Ninth. Requirement that mine safety inspectors be experienced in the particular type of mining operation being inspected—Senator JAVITS, amendment No. 542, incorporated in section 17 of the act.

Tenth. State safety enforcement plans: Provision for delegation of enforcement authority to State agencies meeting Federal standards—Senators JAVITS, PROUTY, DOMINICK, and FANNIN, amendment No. 615, defeated by a vote of 41 to 40 on the Senate floor, but substantially adopted in the Senate-House conference as section 16 of the act.

EDUCATION

The Congress this year extended and expanded existing education programs—the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Higher Education Facilities Act—and enacted a new program, the International Education Act. These measures all had constructive Republican support, as indicated by both the major and minor minority-sponsored provisions which were accepted. Attention is particularly invited to the views of minority members, which are part of the committee reports, which review the history of the long-standing Republican support of education and which set forth our educational philosophy.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1966 (S. 3046; H.R. 13161—PUBLIC LAW 89-750)

Minority amendments to this bill which were enacted into law were as follows:

First. Establishment within the Office of Education of a Bureau for Education and Training of the Handicapped—Senator PROUTY.

Second. Clarifying the liaison relationship between Office of Education projects under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and Office of Economic Opportunity projects, thus eliminating OEO veto over OE programs—Senator JAVITS.

Third. Obligating the committee to consider in depth next year the education of Indians with a view to studying the transfer of such education from the Bureau of Indian Affairs—Senators DOMINICK and FANNIN.

Fourth. Removal of the restriction against junior colleges receiving impacted aid funds under Public Law 815 and Public Law 874—Senators MURPHY, DOMINICK, JAVITS, and JORDAN.

Fifth. Reduction to $2,500 of minimum title I project size, particularly to benefit sparsely settled areas—Senator DOMINICK.

Sixth. Authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make grants to local educational agencies teaching out-of-State children housed in Bureau of Indian Affairs dormitories—Senator DOMINICK.

Seventh. Inclusion of construction in title VI provisions for education of handicapped children—Senator JAVITS.

Eighth. Requirement of use of most recent aid for dependent children data beginning this year, instead of 1962 figures, in computing allocations—Senators JAVITS and PROUTY.

Ninth. Making the National Advisory Council on Education of Disadvantaged Children more effective by advancing its report date to January 31 of each year and requiring that reports also be submitted directly to the Congress—Senator JAVITS.

One final—but most controversial—provision was of great significance: the so-called Fountain amendment, which appeared only in the House version of the bill, would have prohibited the Office of Education from deferring funds to local educational agencies charged with violating the Civil Rights Act until after a full hearing had been held on such charges. No such amendment was included in the Senate version of the bill. It was feared that such a requirement might make it impossible to withhold funds from unlawfully segregated school systems, because the required hearing could be stalled, and then the local school agency could always file a new application. When the Senate-House conference reached an impasse on this issue, it was a Republican compromise proposal—Senator JAVITS—which was finally adopted, and which insured that while the Federal Government would retain the power to defer payments in Civil Rights Act cases, a prompt hearing—within 90 days—must be held.

HIGHER EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1966 (S. 3047; H.R. 14644—PUBLIC LAW 89–752)

This bill included the following minority amendments which were finally enacted into law:

First. Broadening the funding for junior and community colleges—Senators JAVITS and MURPHY.

Second. Adding industrial arts to title III of the National Defense Education Act, including necessary additional funds—Senator PROUTY.

Third. Providing that academic facilities will be usable by handicapped students—Senators JAVITS and PROUTY.

Fourth. Additional National Defense Education Act loan forgiveness for teachers of handicapped children—Senators JAVITS and PROUTY.

Fifth. Increased allocation of $25,000 minimum for smaller States for loan guarantee program—Senator PROUTY.

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1966 (S. 2874; H.R. 14643—PUBLIC LAW 89–698)

The following minority amendments to this bill were enacted into law:

First. Amending title XI of the National Defense Education Act to provide for programs on international affairs for secondary school teachers—Senator JAVITS.

Second. Authorizing the United States to accept foreign currencies from qualified students and teachers from less developed nations with currency conversion problems, to enable such students and teachers to study in this country—Senator JAVITS.

Third. Including Americans studying abroad in the guaranteed loan program under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965—Senator JAVITS.

NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE AND PROGRAM ACT OF 1966 (S. 2439; H.R. 16559—PUBLIC LAW 89–688)

Minority amendments enacted into law included:

First. Establishing a Federal matching grant program—Senator JAVITS.

Second. Including recreation as an aspect of the declaration of purpose—Senator MURPHY.

Third. Providing that the program shall only temporarily be part of the National Science Foundation—Senator JAVITS.

POVERTY

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1966 (H.R. 15111; S. 3164—PUBLIC LAW 89–794)

The laudable goals of the war on poverty too often remain unachieved because of administrative and organizational difficulties and program inflexibilities. The minority introduced numerous amendments to this year's bill designed to deal with these problems, and all such minority amendments survived the Senate-House conference and were enacted into law, either in their original form or in a form achieving basically the same goal.

These amendments:

First. Provided stricter standards of conduct and disciplinary enforcement in Job Corps centers, curtailment of unnecessary travel expenses generated by the assignment of enrollees to distant camps, and needed follow-up activities after an enrollee leaves the program—Senator MURPHY, incorporated in sections 104 (i) and (j) and section 111(a) of the act.

Second. Placed employees of community action and delegate agencies under certain Hatch Act restrictions limiting political activity—Senators MURPHY, PROUTY, DOMINICK, FANNIN, JAVITS, and others, compromise substitute incorporated into the act as section 603(a).

Third. Barred VISTA volunteers from political activity, by application of the Hatch Act—Senator MURPHY, incorporated in the act as section 804(c).

Fourth. Increased the independence and functions of the National Advisory Council—Senator PROUTY, incorporated into the act as section 605.

Fifth. Required that salaries paid to poverty program workers not exceed the rates of compensation paid for comparable work in the area, and that a list of employees paid $10,000 or more be made available annually to the Congress—Senators JAVITS and MURPHY, incorporated into the act as section 610–1 (a) and (b).

Sixth. Required that agencies administering manpower programs coordinate their efforts through the President's Committee on Manpower, and that the Secretary of Labor develop the capacity of the Federal-State Employment Service to support all federally assisted training and employment programs—Senator JAVITS, incorporated into the act as sections 611 (c) and (d).

Seventh. Permitted establishment of a limited number of youth employment and training programs on a combined residential and nonresidential basis, involving the use of funds and authority under both the Job Corps and Neighborhood Youth Corps—Senator JAVITS, incorporated into the act as section 111–1.

Eighth. Exempted Indian cooperatives located on reservations from the prohibition in title III–A barring loans to certain cooperatives—Senator FANNIN, incorporated into the act in section 305(f).

Ninth. A set of amendments provided for the full use of the resources of the private sector in the antipoverty effort and authorized contracts with private enterprise under various programs of the act—Senators JAVITS, PROUTY, and KUCHEL, incorporated in sections 2, 103 (b), 113(a), 114(c), and 619 of the act.

Tenth. Provided "special impact" work training and employment programs in those urban areas of the Nation having especially large concentrations of low-income persons—Senator JAVITS, with Senator KENNEDY of New York, incorporated into the act as a new part D of title I.

Eleventh. Earmarked certain funds for the Headstart program—Senator PROUTY, the principle of earmarking for Headstart retained in the bill in section 2(a)(2).

HEALTH

The Congress enacted only two major health bills this year, both of which, as approved by the Senate, contained important Republican contributions. The provisions for the mentally retarded, approved by the Senate but dropped in the House from the Comprehensive Health Planning and Public Health Services Amendments of 1966, Public Law 89–749, will be considered again next year.

ALLIED HEALTH PROFESSIONS PERSONNEL TRAINING ACT OF 1966 (S. 3102; H.R. 13196—PUBLIC LAW 89–751)

Republican amendments enacted into law included:

First. A new scholarship program for nurses—nursing educational opportunity grants—Senator JAVITS.

Second. A new program to encourage young people to enter the nursing profession—Senator JAVITS.

Third. Permitting funds under the Nurses Training Act for associate and diploma programs to be interchangeable with funds for baccalaureate and higher degree programs, in instances where either one of the programs has insufficient applications and the other is underfunded, thus facilitating the full use of presently authorized funds for construction of nursing schools—Senator JAVITS.

VETERANS

The principal veterans bill signed into law this year, the cold war GI bill—S. 9, Public Law 89–358—was supported by the minority in their votes in the Senate in keeping with the traditional bipartisan support for constructive veterans legislation. A Republican bill, S. 3805—Senator DOMINICK—would have amended the cold war GI bill to authorize payments of educational assistance allowances to eligible cold war veterans who began a summer course of education before June 1, 1966, but finished before June 30, 1966; this measure passed the Senate but not the House.

LIBRARIES

LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1966 (H.R. 14050; S. 3076—PUBLIC LAW 89–511)

Titles I, II, III, and part A of title IV of this act are substantially the same as similar sections of S. 2944, a bill earlier introduced by Senators JAVITS, COOPER, and PROUTY. The minority bill served as a pattern for the legislation later enacted.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT AND FECA

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1966 (H.R. 10721—PUBLIC LAW 89–488) AND RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT AMENDMENTS (H.R. 14355—PUBLIC LAW 89–700, AND H.R. 17285—PUBLIC LAW 89–699)

The FECA bill grants to Federal employees a number of benefits previously granted to retirees under social security, including, of particular significance, benefits to surviving children between the ages of 18 and 22 who are attending school as full time students—a type of benefit originated in a Republican bill—Senator JAVITS—in 1963—S. 1770, 88th Congress. In this connection, the FECA bill, as finally enacted into law, includes a minority amendment to incorporate a specific definition of "educational institution," so as to insure maximum coverage and avoid the need for involving the executive branch of the Federal Government in passing upon the qualifications of such institutions—Senator JAVITS, amendment No. 571, incorporated in section 7(c) of the act.

The same survivorship benefits were also provided by amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act—Public Law 89–700—in a measure based upon bills originally introduced by Senators JAVITS (S. 2597) and DOMINICK (S. 2889).

Hon. Harry F. Byrd, Sr., of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I was not present in the Senate when the announcement was made of the passing of our distinguished friend and former colleague, Senator Harry Flood Byrd, Sr.

Here was a man, Mr. President, of unswerving integrity and loyalty to the programs and policies that he believed in. Here was a man with whom one could disagree and yet he was never disagreeable—always the gentleman, always the warmhearted friend.

The country owes much to Senator Byrd for his long and distinguished public service. Mrs. Jackson joins me in conveying our deepest sympathy to his distinguished son and our colleague, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, JR., and the other members of the Byrd family.

Report to the People of the Second Congressional District of Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on October 13, I placed my voting record up to and including that date in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Incomplete though it was, I felt it was important to bring it to the attention of the people of the Second Congressional District of Nebraska. Now I am able to bring it up to date and together with the previous insertion will constitute my complete voting record for the 89th Congress:

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H.R. 51, establishment of Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore:	
362	Oct. 14	On amendment designed to add 478 acres to the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore. (Agreed to 182 to 147.)	No.
363	Oct. 14	On passage. (Passed 204 to 141.)	No.
		S. 3708, the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966:	
365	Oct. 14	On motion to recommit with instructions to strike $9,000,000 and title II regarding planned metropolitan development. (Rejected 149 to 175)	Yes.
366	Oct. 14	On passage. (Passed 178 to 141.)	No.
		S. 3675, providing for the determination of the amounts of claims of U.S. nationals against the Chinese Communist regime:	
368	Oct. 17	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 249 to 3.)	Yes.
		S. 985, to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain commodities:	
369	Oct. 17	A vote to adopt the conference report. (Agreed to 242 to 6.)	Yes.
		S. 2947, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act programs:	
370	Oct. 17	A vote to adopt the conference report. (Agreed to 247 to 0.)	Yes.
		H.R. 18381, supplemental appropriations:	
373	Oct. 18	On motion to recommit with instructions to prevent the Export-Import Bank from making loans to Communist countries. (Agreed to 167 to 121.)	Yes.
		H. Res. 1060, certifying the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities as to the failures of Milton Mitchell Cohen to give testimony before a duly authorized subcommittee of said committee:	
374	Oct. 18	On motion to recommit and send resolution to a select committee. (Rejected 90 to 181.)	No.
		H. Res. 1062, certifying the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities as to the failures of Jeremiah Stamler to give testimony before a duly authorized subcommittee of said committee:	
375	Oct. 18	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 54 to 182.)	No.
376	Oct. 18	On passage of resolution. (Rejected 174 to 37, quorum not present.)	Yes.
		H. Res. 1062, certifying the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities as to the failures of Jeremiah Stamler to give testimony before a duly authorized subcommittee of said committee:	
378	Oct. 19	On passage of resolution. (Agreed to 219 to 69.)	Yes.
		H.R. 5688, relating to crime and criminal procedure in the District of Columbia:	
379	Oct. 19	A vote to adopt the conference report. (Agreed to 208 to 79.)	Yes.
		H.R. 18233, authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, and flood control:	
380	Oct. 19	On motion to recommit with instructions regarding 2 bridges across the Mississippi River. (Rejected 89 to 196.)	No.
		S.J. Res. 167, to enable the United States to organize and hold an International Conference on Water for Peace in the United States in 1967 and authorize an appropriation therefor:	
381	Oct. 19	On passage. (Passed 196 to 79.)	Yes.
		H. Res. 1013, creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct:	
385	Oct. 19	On motion to table the measure. (Rejected 24 to 238.)	No.
386	Oct. 19	On passage of resolution. (Agreed to 256 to 0.)	Yes.
		S. 3708, the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966:	
389	Oct. 20	A vote to adopt the conference report. (Agreed to 142 to 126.)	No.
		H.R. 15111, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966:	
390	Oct. 20	A vote to adopt the conference report. (Agreed to 170 to 169.)	No.
		H.R. 18233, authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation and flood control:	
391	Oct. 20	On Senate amendment (substitute). (Agreed to 261 to 0.)	Yes.
		H.R. 13161, Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1966:	
392	Oct. 20	A vote to adopt the conference report. (Agreed to 185 to 76.)	No.
		H.R. 17607, investment credit and allowance of accelerated depreciation:	
393	Oct. 20	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 57 to 184.)	No.
394	Oct. 20	A vote to adopt the conference report. (Agreed to 161 to 76.)	Yes.
		H.R. 13103, the Foreign Investors Tax Act of 1966:	
395	Oct. 20	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 95 to 127.)	Yes.
396	Oct. 20	A vote to adopt the conference report. (Agreed to 171 to 46.)	No.
		H.R. 14644, the Higher Education Amendments of 1966:	
398	Oct. 21	A vote to adopt the conference report. (Agreed 222 to 13.)	Yes.
		H.R. 18381, supplemental appropriations:	
399	Oct. 21	On motion to recede and concur on Senate amendment No. 43 to allow the Export-Import Bank to grant credit to Communist countries at the discretion of the President. (Agreed to 129 to 102.)	No.

Walnut Log Exports—A Serious Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, as the 89th Congress began its work in 1965, an administrative decision of serious concern to my own State of Indiana and to an entire industry was made. It created a situation that warranted intensive consideration and prompt action. Unfortunately, while the situation received thorough discussion and study during the 89th Congress, the much-needed action was not taken and the problem remains as grave today as it was at the beginning of 1965.

I refer to the export of walnut logs, a unique American resource which is in such serious short supply it is threatened with exhaustion. On February 12, 1965, Secretary of Commerce Connor, shortly after taking office, announced that he would not extend export controls on walnut logs, controls that were imposed a year earlier by former Secretary Hodges after 2½ years of study by the Department of Commerce.

The control order issued by Secretary Hodges was in complete harmony with the terms of the Export Control Act of 1949. The pertinent provision of section 2 of that act declares that it is the policy of the United States to impose export controls to the extent necessary "to protect the domestic economy from the excessive drain of scarce materials and to reduce the inflationary impact of abnormal demand."

Section 3 of the act authorizes the President to "prohibit or curtail" the exportation of any commodities in order to implement this policy. Authority to implement the act was delegated to the Secretary of Commerce by the President.

During the 2½-year study before the order was initially imposed it was found that walnut log exports had increased by more than 1,500 percent between 1954 and 1960 and that the average price of logs for export had increased by 97 percent during the same period.

At the time the order was put into effect the associations of walnut veneer manufacturers voluntarily agreed to cut domestic consumption by reducing the standard thickness of veneer. This agreement was included in Secretary Hodges' order. The reduction in thickness resulted in many complaints from customers, the furniture and plywood manufacturers, and also caused much technological adjustment. Unpopular as it was the manufacturers stuck to the program and were able to reduce domestic consumption by 4 million board feet.

However, as a result of an underestimate on the amount of domestic usage by the Department of Commerce the "target" cutback for American manufacturers was set too low. The industry had said in effect that if exports were cut they would reduce their own usage by 5 million board feet. Based on 1963 Commerce Department estimates, usage was set at 20 million board feet—making a target of 15 million for domestic industry; yet actual 1963 usage was 23.5 million feet domestic. Thus a "target" of 15 million feet would mean a reduction of 8.5 million feet instead of 5 million.

But, Mr. President, it remains a fact that the domestic industry was able, in spite of handicaps which could be considered severe, to reduce usage by 4 million feet, reaching 80 percent of the expected 5 million feet of planned cutback. Had the 5 million reduction been based on the actual 1963 usage of 23.5 million with a target of 18.3 million, industry would have only exceeded that goal by a margin of 1 million board feet. Other factors such as the delay involved in converting equipment to cut the thinner veneer threw added burden on the industry to meet the requirement.

Yet the Secretary of Commerce cited industry's failure to meet the target as a major reason for not continuing the controls, while saying nothing of the basis on which the goal was set.

Following the Secretary's refusal to restore the controls or to hold administrative hearings into the matter, a Senate Commerce Subcommittee of which I was chairman held hearings in March of 1965.

At the opening of the hearings I predicted that the removal of the export controls would make a shambles of the orderly self-restraint which had been successfully practiced by the walnut veneer industry on a voluntary basis and that it would in time reduce the available supply of this beautiful wood to a volume below that otherwise available to the furniture industry.

Needless to say, Mr. President, while these hearings served to bring out the facts about the seriousness of the situation, the controls have not been reinstated. This, in spite of the fact that we are outrunning our supply of this precious resource. In fact it was demonstrated that a continuation of the present demand, especially for export, could result if unchecked in exhausting the supply in about 7 years.

The walnut log issue thus remains serious unfinished business and I regret that despite earnest efforts by industry, labor, and many in the Senate and House, the problem has gone unresolved in this Congress. I believe that it is a subject that deserves the highest priority when the 90th Congress convenes in January.

Although attempts were made to legislate in this area over the last 2 years, the fact remains that under present law authority already exists to alleviate the hardships placed on domestic labor and industry and to provide for the wise use of this wonderful resource. While I am informed that new legislation is being considered, the normal course of such action could require several years, and in the meantime the drain of this unique American resource will continue. In the meantime many other countries continue to protect their fine hardwoods through the use of embargoes or quotas.

As I have stated, Mr. President, the Export Control Act already provides for controls to prevent excessive drain of scarce materials and to reduce the inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand. Our hearings in this Congress demonstrated that both of these conditions exist; thus it still rests with the Secretary of Commerce to use the authority granted him to prevent the exhaustion of this beautiful national asset.

We cannot rest until this problem is resolved; it will again be the responsibility of Congress next year to dig in and assure that a solution is reached.

Activities of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I submit to the Senate a report of the activities of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia for the 2d session of the 89th Congress. This presentation provides in full a report in detail of the committee's activities for that period of time plus a statistical report for the full 89th Congress.

In the conduct of its legislative responsibilities, the Senate District Committee in some respects is not unlike a State legislature and city council combined, by virtue of the great variety of problems and proposals that come before it.

Mr. President, I am aware that few Members of this distinguished body aspire to serve on the District of Columbia Committee. However, I sincerely believe that my colleagues on the committee are deserving of the gratitude of the entire Congress, the people of the District of Columbia, and the people of the entire country for the hours they spend in attending to the business of the Nation's Capital City while carrying on their other major activities incident to their service in the Congress. May I further express my deep appreciation to my subcommittee chairmen who gave of their time and energy; namely, the very effective and hardworking senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who has been a keen student of District affairs for many years, and who is chairman of the Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety Subcommittee; the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], whose assistance in committee matters has been helpful to our committee as chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee; and the capable junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who has served as the committee's chairman of the very active Business and Commerce Subcommittee. To the other committee members, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], whose service as former Attorney General of the United States, made his work most valuable to the committee; the junior Senator from Vermont

[Mr. PROUTY], whose long and effective service was useful to the committee; and particularly to the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], whose experience in the House of Representatives and in the legislature of his home State and whose penetrating, effective, and diligent efforts have done much to assist the committee with its many problems. I wish to express my sincere thanks for the hours they gave to our committee.

I would also like to express my deep appreciation for the cooperation I received personally as committee chairman from the Honorable JOHN MCMILLAN, chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, and the individual members of his committee. Likewise, I wish to commend the cooperation and assistance that the staff members of the House District Committee have extended to the staff members of my committee during this Congress.

During the 2d session of the 89th Congress, the full committee considered a number of important bills. During the 89th Congress, the upsurge of crime in the District of Columbia was the foremost problem considered by the committee, and no single subject has received greater attention by the committee in more than 10 years. An in-depth examination of the need for strengthening the District of Columbia Criminal Justice Code, which was begun in the 87th Congress, extended through the 89th Congress. The committee held more than 7 days of hearings between April and August 1965, hearing 36 witnesses update hearings that had been held in the 87th and 88th Congresses. After careful study of various crime measures, the committee substantially amended H.R. 5688 as it passed the House, and reported it to the Senate, where it passed on August 31, 1965. Conferees met on at least 12 separate occasions during the 2d session to work out an agreement satisfactory to both bodies. The conference report on the omnibus crime bill was approved by the Senate on October 17, 1966.

Title I of H.R. 5688 deals with problems in the District which have resulted from the so-called Mallory rule. Under the terms of the bill, a completely voluntary statement or confession will not be ruled out at trial on the basis of delay alone in bringing a person before a Commissioner or other judicial officer. On the contrary, the period of delay to disqualify a confession will be reasonable and adequately defined and enmeshed with adequate safeguards for the detained person during police custody. The safeguards in title I are those set forth by the Supreme Court in the Miranda case, decided June 13, 1966. That case, while requiring a person to be provided legal counsel prior to questioning, and complete protection against self-incrimination, does not rule out reasonable interrogation by police officers.

In effect, title I provides that statements and confessions otherwise admissible shall not be inadmissible solely because of delay in taking an arrested person before a Commissioner or committing officer if, prior to questioning, the person is advised of his right to remain silent, that his statements may be used against him and that he has the right to assistance of counsel prior to and during questioning. Also, if the person waives his right to counsel during questioning, the aggregate period of questioning, in the absence of his attorney and prior to the time the person is taken before a Commissioner, shall not exceed 6 hours.

Title II provides a new insanity test that was approved by the American Law Institute. Under the test as approved, a person is not responsible for criminal conduct if at the time of such conduct, as a result of mental disease or defect, he lacks substantial capacity either to know or appreciate the wrongfulness of his conduct, or to conform his conduct to legal requirements.

Title II also establishes mental disease or defect as an affirmative defense, to be established by the defendant, and precludes the pleading of the defense by a person manifesting mental disease or defect only by repeated criminal or antisocial conduct. Also, the defendant is required to give notice of the intention to plead an insanity defense.

Title III allows a police officer to detain anyone who he has probable cause to believe is committing or has committed a crime, and to question him about his actions. The detention period is limited to 4 hours, after which the person detained must be arrested and charged with a crime, or released.

The specter of investigative arrests was alleviated by the action of the conferees in deleting language allowing the detention of a person who a police officer has cause to believe is about to commit a crime.

Other titles of the crime bill establish criteria for the detention of material witnesses; change the penalties, or establish minimum penalties for, certain crimes; revise and expand the laws dealing with obscene matter, and establish as a crime the false reporting of crimes to the police. Vetoed.

H.R. 11487, a major District of Columbia revenue-producing bill, was approved late in the 2d session. The House-passed bill would have increased revenues by $6 million, including an additional $4 million in income taxes, and $2 million from an increase on motor vehicle fuel. The latter amount is earmarked for highway construction. The Senate amended the House bill by increasing excise taxes and making cigarettes subject to the sales tax. As agreed to in conference, and subsequently approved—Public Law 89-610—the bill will provide new tax revenue in fiscal 1967 estimated in excess of $11 million. In addition to the increase in income taxes and motor vehicle fuel taxes, the revenue bill provides for increases in taxes on alcohol and spirits from $1.50 to $1.75 per gallon; beer, from $1.50 to $2 per barrel; motor vehicle excise tax from 2 to 3 percent; transient rooms from 4 to 5 percent; and cigarettes from 2 to 3 cents per pack, plus the imposition of the 3-percent sales tax on cigarette sales.

In addition, the authorized Federal payment to the District of Columbia is increased from $50 to $60 million. The Senate had voted to change the Federal payment authorization to a formula approach based on 25 percent of local taxes, but conferees for the Senate were unsuccessful in retaining this feature. Also, the borrowing authorization for capital improvements was increased from $225 to $250 million. Conferees were unable to retain, in lieu of a fixed sum, the Senate version for borrowing authorization, which would have substituted a formula based on 6 percent of total estimated annual general fund revenues.

Also, the full committee took action on H.R. 13703, to make technical amendments to titles 19 and 20 of the District of Columbia Code. The purpose of the bill is to correct certain errors in phraseology inadvertently made in the codification of part III of the District of Columbia Code—Public Law 89-567.

The full committee also acted to relieve the pressures on the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions caused by an increasing backlog of cases. The committee has been advised that this backlog delays jury trials of civil actions by as much as 18 months. Under the provisions of S. 2263, the number of judges in the Court of General Sessions was increased from 15 to 20—Public Law 89-598.

The Congress approved H.R. 17798, a bill that will require judgments obtained in the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions to be recorded in the recorder of deeds office in order to constitute a lien against real property—Public Law 89-745.

On another important legislative measure, the committee provided extensive study of a home rule bill for the District of Columbia. In the 89th Congress two home rule bills were introduced in the Senate—S. 268 and S. 1118. The committee updated previous hearings on both of these legislative proposals and heard from numerous witnesses. S. 1118 was reported by the committee in amended form, and was passed in the first session by the Senate. The House passed the bill with amendments; the Senate disagreed to those amendments and asked for a conference, but the House did not appoint conferees. The bill as it passed the Senate provided in some measure for self-government for the citizens of the District of Columbia. The provisions thereof provided for the election of the following: a city mayor; a city council of 19 members—5 to be elected at large; a school board consisting of 14 members; and a nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives.

The bill also provided that the Congress would retain full residual and ultimate legislative jurisdiction over the District of Columbia. In addition, the bill empowered the President to veto any act of the local government where such act adversely affects a Federal interest.

In order to meet the fiscal requirements of the city government, the bill provided authority for a regular annual payment by the Federal Government to the District of Columbia to be computed by means of a flexible formula. It was the committee's view that a formula method would provide a more equitable basis for measuring the Federal responsibility to the Nation's Capital as it would provide a built-in incentive to utilize local taxes to meet local needs. At the same time, local residents would be assured that the Federal Government will automatically recognize its obligation to provide additional revenues that are needed to meet legitimate increased expenditure requirements.

The Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety was active on a number of important and far-reaching bills in the 2d session of the 89th Congress.

One of the most significant matters acted upon was the District of Columbia Public Education Act introduced by the subcommittee chairman. H.R. 16958 will bring higher educational assistance to a population of more than 800,000 people in the District of Columbia.

The bill provides for a Federal City College offering both a 2-year and a 4-year liberal arts course, and also authorizes the establishment of the Washington Institute of Technology to be operated separately from the Federal City College.

The members of the board of higher education for the Federal City College would be composed of nine members appointed by the District of Columbia Commissioners. The board of trustees provided for under the bill for the Washington Institute of Technology would also be composed of nine members, but they will be appointed by the President of the United States rather than by the District of Columbia Commissioners.

The tuition charged by both institutions would be minimal—Public Law 89-791.

The subcommittee was also successful in obtaining final approval of the District of Columbia Minimum Wage Amendments Act of 1966. H.R. 8126 expands the District of Columbia minimum wage laws to cover men, expands the covered occupations to include, among others, employees of nursing homes, hospitals and eleemosynary institutions; and employees of religious, charitable, and nonprofit organizations; but it excludes from overtime coverage certain commission salesmen and service employees. The bill also provides that overtime be paid at time and one-half for employment over 42 hours, later cut to 40 hours. The bill provides step increases in the minimum wage, commencing with $1.25 minimum in 1967, and reaching $1.60 in 1969—Public Law 89-684.

The subcommittee also acted upon H.R. 3314, to require premarital blood tests and certification that applicants for marriage licenses are free from contagious syphilis—Public Law 89-682.

H.R. 8337 is a bill to permit the licensing as a licensed practical nurse, without written examination, of an otherwise qualified applicant who for the preceding year has lived in the District of Columbia and has been actively engaged in caring for the sick in the Washington metropolitan area, as well as in the District—Public Law 89-513.

This subcommittee also completed action on two bills requiring reports to be made to the police by physicians and hospitals. H.R. 9985 requires mandatory reporting of injuries caused by firearms—Public Law 89-776; H.R. 10304 requires reports to be made in cases of physical abuse to children—Public Law 89-775.

The Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety also obtained Senate approval of S. 1312, which would amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Service Act to authorize appropriations to reimburse the public school food services fund for lunches served to schoolchildren in accordance with the National School Lunch Act.

It also approved legislation (S. 2060) to amend the school census law to extend the scope of the census to all children in the District under the age of 18 years, and to permit the taking of the census when desirable, rather than on an annual basis.

These latter two bills passed the Senate, but were not acted upon by the House.

The 2d session of the 89th Congress was particularly active for the Subcommittee on Fiscal Affairs.

H.R. 15857 provides an average salary increase of 9.9 percent for police and firemen, and 8.9 percent for teachers and other school employees. The bill also makes extensive revisions of many aspects of the Teachers' Salary Act, including provision for extra-duty pay for teachers who coach or direct extracurricular or cocurricular activities; increases credit for outside experience from 5 to 9 years; requires that temporary teachers qualify within specified periods for probationary or permanent appointment; creates the position of teacher-aid to assist teachers in noninstructional activities, to augment the teacher-aid program existing by virtue of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The bill substitutes for the single salary concept for principals a multiple salary system by which principals' salaries would be determined by a formula based on workload factors. No changes were made in retirement benefits or widows' annuities or in the matter of recruiting incentives—Public Law 89-810.

The subcommittee also reported H.R. 8058, which amends the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act to clarify the status for tax purposes of offices maintained by corporations to do business with the United States and to consult with the Government on matters not directly related to sale of goods or services. The bill excludes from the term "trade or business" which would subject the corporation to taxation, sales of tangible personal property by a company that maintains an office in the District, or which has a representative with an office here, for the sole purpose of dealing with the United States for commercial or noncommercial purposes or of dealing with the District or persons for noncommercial purposes—Public Law 89-585.

The Subcommittee on Fiscal Affairs also acted during the 2d session of the 89th Congress on two bills to revise retirement benefits to teachers and to judges of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, Court of General Sessions, and Juvenile Court. H.R. 11439 affords District teachers the same approximately 4.6 percent cost-of-living increases in annuities provided all civil service retirees in the 1st session, and also provides additional increases for teacher retirees of 6½ percent for those whose annuities begin prior to October 1, 1956, and 1½ percent for those whose annuities began after that date—Public Law 89-494.

H.R. 1066 provides authority for retired judges to be afforded increases in retirement annuities based on cost-of-living which may become payable to Federal employees. It also allows a retired judge to perform judicial duties for up to 60 days a year, at regular salary minus retirement salary, and provides authority for retired judges who performed judicial duties during 1964-66 to receive up to 60 days' salary for each of those years—Public Law 89-587.

The Subcommittee also reported a bill (H.R. 12119) to authorize the replacement of the old highway bridge across the Potomac River at 14th Street with a new six-lane bridge—Public Law 89-627.

H.R. 11087 amends the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act and the Income and Franchise Tax Act to provide that certain transactions in the District by foreign corporations authorized to invest in real estate do not constitute "doing business" and to provide that, subject to certain limitations, income received by a foreign corporation from mortgage loans on District real estate is not subject to the franchise tax—Public Law 89-591.

House Joint Resolution 1178 authorizes the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to promulgate special regulations for the period of the Imperial Shrine convention in July 1967—Public Law 89-514.

The Judiciary Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia completed action on several bills during the second session.

H.R. 15860, the District of Columbia Bail Agency Act, creates a fact-gathering-and-reporting agency to provide judicial officers with reports containing information concerning individuals about whom the judicial officer is to make a bail determination. The purpose is to promote a system whereby worthy defendants and material witnesses will be able to secure their release from detention pending court appearances on nonfinancial conditions, and to provide a judicial officer with information about a person's background so he can make an appropriate bail determination.

The act implements the Federal Bail Reform Act of 1966, and supersedes the experimental District of Columbia bail project, which had operated for 3 years under a private grant—Public Law 89-519.

S. 1319 authorizes a work release program for defendants sentenced by the courts of the District of Columbia. Under this legislation, selected offenders will be eligible for release from prison at specified times to enable them to obtain or engage in gainful employment—Public Law 89-803.

S. 1611 transfers a number of functions from the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, the

Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and the Recorder of Deeds for the District of Columbia. The functions transferred by the bill are all of a nature which are customarily performed by a local court or local administrative agency—Public Law 89-493.

H.R. 647 simplifies the method of substituting trustees in mortgages. The owner and the lender will be able to name them by agreement, rather than having to go to court—Public Law 89-706.

The Judiciary Subcommittee also completed action on three bills affecting colleges in the District of Columbia. H.R. 16608 amends the charter of Southeastern University to enable it to receive the highest accreditation—Public Law 89-639; H.R. 16863 clarifies the corporate name of Georgetown University—Public Law 89-631; and H.R. 16940 amends the charter of Trinity College of Washington, D.C. to permit members of the laity to be elected to the board of trustees, and to permit board members to elect their successors—Public Law 89-628.

The Subcommittee on Business and Commerce considered several bills during the 2d session of the 89th Congress.

H.R. 959 amends the Fire and Casualty Act by requiring all domestic stock insurance companies authorized to do fidelity or surety business in the District of Columbia to maintain a paid-up capital stock of not less than $500,000, and a surplus of not less than $250,000—Public Law 89-399.

H.R. 8466 amends the Fire and Casualty Act to provide for the licensing and regulation of insurance premium finance companies in the District of Columbia—Public Law 89-403.

H.R. 9824 amends the District of Columbia Life Insurance Act to permit insurance companies to make prompt public announcement of financial standing—Public Law 89-559.

H.R. 10823 authorizes an increase in the maximum amount of credit life, health, and accident insurance with respect to debtors who have secured loans for educational or other purposes, in cases where the loans are to be repaid in installments. The $10,000 limit imposed on loans would not be applicable to educational loans. Insurance for educational loans may include the amount already advanced to the borrower and the balance of the commitment not yet advanced, less the repayments. Credit life, accident, and health provisions are similarly amended—Public Law 89-594.

H.R. 11664 confers additional jurisdiction upon the Superintendent of Insurance to regulate domestic stock insurance companies and to exempt such companies from certain provisions of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934—Public Law 89-402.

H.R. 13558 provides for the regulation of the professional practice of certified public accountants in the District of Columbia, including examination, licensure, and registration of certified public accountants—Public Law 89-578.

H.R. 14205 declares the Old Georgetown Market a historical site and directs the Commissioners to operate and maintain it as a public market. The Commissioners are authorized to enter into an agreement with the Secretary of the Interior to provide for the use of part of the property as a museum to be operated by the Secretary in connection with the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal—Public Law 89-600.

H.R. 15858 amends the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 to authorize early land acquisition for the purpose of acquiring a site for the replacement of Shaw Junior High School. The Board of Education owns the site that had been selected for the new school, but that site has been diverted from their use and control for other purposes—Public Law 89-569.

The Business and Commerce Subcommittee took action also on several bills which have not become public law. The following bills have passed the Senate but have not been acted upon in the House:

S. 1717 would provide for the registration of names assumed for the purposes of trade or business in the District of Columbia.

S. 2769 would create a parking board to acquire property in the District of Columbia and to construct and operate or provide for construction and operation of parking facilities in the District of Columbia. The purpose of the bill is to alleviate the congestion in the central business district and to provide adequate parking for employees, shoppers, and tourists.

The Business and Commerce Subcommittee also reported two bills involving motorists. S. 1713 would amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act to provide more stringent sanctions against uninsured District motorists involved in accidents in the District of Columbia. The bill would provide for the suspension of both the license and registration of the owner and operator of an uninsured vehicle involved in an accident or serious traffic violation. It would also require that security is to remain on deposit for 2 years and for suspension where security is not deposited and claims not settled. The bill would also require owners and operators to show proof of financial responsibility in addition to security, and to maintain such proof for 5 years.

H.R. 9918 would authorize creation of an unsatisfied judgment fund contributed to by uninsured District motorists. The fund would be available to judgment creditors unable to collect a judgment from an uninsured motorist. Recovery from the fund would be limited to District residents not covered by automobile liability insurance, which would be required to contain uninsured motorist coverage. Thus, recovery would be primarily limited to a relatively small group, consisting primarily of District residents who do not own cars and are injured while a pedestrian.

H.R. 9918 was considered on the floor of the Senate, but was not voted upon.

The Senate also passed and returned to the House H.R. 11428, which would amend the act relating to priority holders along the Washington Channel in the Southwest redevelopment project. The bill would extend the priorities to all businesses displaced from the waterfront area, but would clarify the position that the priorities are personal to priority holders or members of their families. The bill also would allow a new method of computing rents to be charged businesses relocating there.

Finally, the subcommittee held 6 days of hearings on S. 3549, S. 3558, and S. 2331, bills having to do with landlord-tenant relationships, particularly as applied to unsafe and unsanitary buildings.

Statistical summary of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, 89th Cong.

	Total	1st sess.	2d sess.
Number of bills, acts, resolutions, and nominations referred to committee	176	110	66
Number of bills, acts, resolutions, and nominations reported to the Senate	76	33	43
Number of bills, acts, resolutions, and nominations on which hearings were held	115	47	68
Number of bills which have become public or private law	46	14	32

Subcommittee hearings (1st and 2d sess.):	
Bills	48
Acts	33
Resolutions	5
Total	86
Full committee hearings (1st and 2d sess.):	
Bills	10
Acts	4
Nominations	15
Total	29
Total	115
Bills becoming public law	45
Bills becoming private law	1
Total	46
Studies and investigations	1
Subcommittee executive meetings:	
1st sess	9
2d sess	8
Total	17
Full committee executive meetings:	
1st sess	8
2d sess	8
Total	16

Hon. Leverett Saltonstall of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, one of the pillars of strength in the Senate will not be with us when the Senate convenes in January. All of us were sorry to learn some time ago of the decision of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr.

SALTONSTALL] to retire after the completion of his present term.

Senator SALTONSTALL has served his community, his State, and his Nation commencing in 1917. His record has been one of great honor and distinction. During this long period of public service his contributions have been legion. Since 1954 it has been my privilege to serve and work closely with him as a member of the Armed Services Committee. No one on the committee has been more conscientious or dedicated in doing the best for his country than the senior Senator from Massachusetts. He has never permitted partisanship to enter into his thinking or deliberations on national security affairs. He always demonstrated an unusual ability to work out solutions to knotty problems, which are a regular part of the committee menu. His counsel, advice, and assistance in these difficult situations will be sorely missed by all members of the committee, and the Senate as a whole.

On the personal side, we shall miss his warm, friendly manner. Above all else, we shall remember him as always being the gentleman—a man of complete integrity, who possessed the confidence and trust of everyone who had the privilege of knowing him.

Mrs. Jackson joins me in conveying to him and Mrs. Saltonstall our wish for many years of happiness.

Senator Donald Russell, of South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, an exceptional public servant will not be with us when the new Congress meets in January. Senator DONALD RUSSELL, of South Carolina, will have assumed his new duties as judge of the U.S. district court. I can predict with absolute confidence that DON RUSSELL will discharge his duties on the bench with the same brilliance, dedication, and integrity which have been the hallmarks of his life.

Although the junior Senator from South Carolina was a Member of this body for a comparatively brief span, I doubt that any Member of the Senate was more highly thought of by his colleagues. A man almost uniquely trained for the Senate through a distinguished career which included invaluable experience as assistant secretary of State, as president of the University of South Carolina, and as Governor of his State, DON RUSSELL will carry with him always the admiration and affection of his colleagues in the U.S. Senate.

The senior Senator from Wisconsin is happy to join all of those wishing great happiness and good health to Senator DONALD RUSSELL.

Report to the People of the 16th Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report to the people of the 16th Congressional District of New York on my voting record for the 2d session of the 89th Congress.

The report includes all rollcall votes. Its purpose is to collect in one place and in concise form, information which is scattered throughout thousands of pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I want to be able to provide any interested constituent with a simple compilation of my voting record.

The report follows:

Date	Roll No.	Measure, question and result	Vote
1966			
Jan. 27	3	H. Res. 665, to authorize the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities. (Yeas 290, nays 24.)	Yes.
Feb. 2	6	H. Res. 699, citing Robert M. Shelton for contempt of Congress. (Yeas 344, nays 28.)	Yes.
Feb. 2	7	H. Res. 700, motion to recommit resolution citing Calvin Fred Craig for contempt of Congress. (Yeas 57, nays 307.)	No.
Feb. 3	9	H. Res. 706, taking H.R. 30, regarding the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center, from the Speaker's table and agreeing to Senate amendments. (Yeas 201, nays 140.)	Yes.
Feb. 7	11	H.R. 12410, to enhance the benefits of service in the Armed Forces and further extend the benefits of higher education. (Yeas 381, nays 0.)	Yes.
Feb. 8	13	S. 1698, to establish a procedure for the review of proposed bank mergers so as to eliminate the necessity for the dissolution of merged banks. (Yeas 372, nays 17.)	Yes.
Feb. 9	15	H.R. 12563, providing for the participation of the United States in the Asian Development Bank. (Yeas 293, nays 80.)	Not voting.
Feb. 9	16	H.R. 706, amending the Railway Labor Act establishing special adjustment boards. (Yeas 380, unanimous.)	Yes.
Feb. 23	18	H. Res. 736, resolution providing for consideration of the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966. (Yeas 327, nays 50.)	Yes.
Feb. 23	19	H.R. 12752, motion to recommit with instructions on the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966. (Yeas 187, nays 207.)	No.
Feb. 23	20	H.R. 12752, final passage on the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966. (Yeas 246, nays 146.)	Yes.
Feb. 24	22	H.Res. 742 (H.R. 12169), to provide for consideration of a bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. (Yeas 360, nays 11.)	Yes.
Feb. 24	23	H.R. 12169, a bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes. (Yeas 169, nays 213.)	No.
Feb. 24	24	H.R. 12169, final passage on the bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. (Yeas 350, nays 27.)	Yes.
Mar. 1	26	H.R. 12889, to authorize defense appropriations during the fiscal year of 1966. (Yeas 393, nays 4.)	Yes.
Mar. 2	28	S. 1666, providing for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges. (Yeas 371, nays 23.)	Yes.
Mar. 2	30	H.R. 9963, promoting the economic development of Alaska via U.S. participation in the 1967 Alaskan Exposition. (Yeas 202, nays 173.)	Yes.
Mar. 3	33	H.R. 12322, motion to recommit bill to enable cottongrowers to establish, finance, and carry out a coordinated program to expand markets for cotton. (Yeas 185, nays 191.)	No.
Mar. 3	34	H.R. 12322, final passage on cotton bill. (Yeas 189, nays 183.)	Yes.
Mar. 15	36	H.R. 12752, adoption of conference report on Tax Adjustment Act of 1966. (Yeas 288, nays 102.)	Yes.
Mar. 16	38	H.R. 13546, on passage of the Supplemental Defense Appropriation Act of 1966. (Yeas 389, nays 3.)	Yes.
Mar. 16	40	H.R. 6785, promoting the observance of a uniform system of time throughout the United States (daylight savings time). (Yeas 292, nays 93.)	Yes.
Mar. 21	42	H.R. 13448, promoting Armed Forces mailing privileges. (Yeas 304.)	Not voting.
Mar. 22	44	H. Res. 774, providing for consideration of S. 2394, for the acquisition of an official residence for the Vice President of the United States. (Yeas 236, nays 135.)	Not voting.
Mar. 22	45	S. 2394, an act to provide for the acquisition of an official residence for the Vice President. On passage. (Yeas 197, nays 184.)	Not voting (for).
Mar. 29	48	H.R. 14012, on motion to recommit a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966. (Yeas 190, nays 198.)	No.
Mar. 29	49	H.R. 14012, on passage a bill making supplemental appropriations for the year ending June 30, 1966. (Yeas 269, nays 122)	Yes.
Mar. 30	50	S. 1404, on adoption of the conference report on act to promote the observance of a uniform system of time throughout the United States. (Yeas 282, nays 91.)	Yes.
Mar. 31	53	H. Res. 802, resolution providing for consideration of S. 2729, a bill to amend sec. 4(c) of the Small Business Act. (Yeas 363, nays 4.)	Yes.
Mar. 31	54	S. 2729, on passage of act to amend sec. 4(c) of the Small Business Act. (Yeas 373, nays 0.)	Yes.
Apr. 6	58	H.R. 14224, extending through May 31, 1966, the initial period for enrolling under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged. (Yeas 387, nays 0.)	Yes.
Apr. 6	59	H.R. 14122, adjusting the rates of basic compensation of certain Federal Government employees. (Yeas 393, nays 1.)	Yes.
Apr. 6	60	H.R. 14215, on motion to recommit bill making appropriations for Department of Interior and related agencies. (Yeas 157, nays 233.)	No.
Apr. 6	61	H.R. 14215, on passage bill making appropriations for Department of Interior and related agencies. (Yeas 370, nays 16.)	Yes.
Apr. 6	62	H.R. 14266, on motion to recommit bill making appropriations for Treasury, Post Office, and Executive Office of the President. (Yeas 127, nays 244.)	No.
Apr. 6	63	H.R. 14266, on passage bill making Post Office, Treasury, and Executive Office appropriations. (Yeas 368, nays 2.)	Yes.
Apr. 19	65	H.R. 7406, on committee amendment a bill authorizing construction, operation, and maintenance of 3d powerplant at Grand Coulee Dam, Columbia Basin project. (Yeas 240, nays 111.)	Yes.
Apr. 19	66	S. 1761, a bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of 3d powerplant at Grand Coulee Dam, Columbia Basin project. (Yeas 249, nays 79.)	Yes.
Apr. 20	68	H. Res. 756, expressing the disapproval of the House of Representatives of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966, therefore approving the Presidential reorganization plan. (Yeas 163, nays 220.)	No.
Apr. 26	70	H.R. 14596, on motion to recommit bill making appropriations for Department of Agriculture and related agencies. (Yeas 290, nays 98.)	Yes.
Apr. 26	71	H.R. 14596, on passage bill making appropriations for Department of Agriculture and related agencies. (Yeas 366, nays 23.)	Yes.
Apr. 27	74	H.R. 10065, a bill to more effectively prohibit discrimination in employment. On passage. (Yeas 300, nays 93.)	Yes.
Apr. 28	76	H.R. 13881, authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs and cats used in research. (Yeas 352, nays 10.)	Yes.
May 3	80	H.R. 14324, on motion to recommit bill authorizing appropriations to NASA. (Yeas 90, nays 271.)	Not voting.
May 3	81	H.R. 14324, on passage bill to authorize appropriations for NASA. (Yeas 349, nays 10.)	Not voting.
May 5	86	H.R. 14745, on motion to recommit bill authorizing appropriations for Departments of Labor and HEW. (Yeas 142, nays 236.)	No.

Date	Roll No.	Measure, question and result	Vote
1966			
May 5	87	H.R. 14745, on passage bill to authorize appropriations for Departments of Labor and HEW. (Yeas 355, nays 27.)	Yes.
May 10	91	H.R. 14921, Boland amendment on adding rent subsidy of $20,000,000 for Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1966. (Yeas 192, nays 188.)	Yes.
May 10	92	H.R. 14921, on passage of Independent Offices Appropriations Act of 1966. (Yeas 297, nays 82.)	Yes.
May 11	94	H.R. 14088, on passage of Military Medical Benefits Act. (Yeas 358, nays 0.)	Yes.
May 12	97	S. 1098, amending the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply. On passage. (Yeas 306, nays 27.)	Yes.
May 16	98	S. 693, on motion to suspend rules and pass the Foreign Agents Registration Act Amendments. (Yeas 285, nays 0.)	Yes.
May 16	100	H. Res. 852, resolution providing for consideration of bill H.R. 14544, providing for private financing of credit needs. (Yeas 184, nays 120.)	Yes.
May 18	105	H.R. 14215, on adoption of conference report for bill making appropriations for Department of Interior and related agencies. (Yeas 378, nays 10.)	Yes.
May 18	106	H.R. 14544, on motion to recommit bill to promote private financing of credit needs. (Yeas 180, nays 217.)	No.
May 18	107	H.R. 14544, on passage of bill to promote private financing of credit needs. (Yeas 206, nays 190.)	Yes.
May 26	113	H.R. 13712, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 as suggested by Anderson of Illinois amendment. (Yeas 195, nays 200.)	No.
May 26	114	H.R. 13712, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 as suggested by Ayres-Morris amendment. (Yeas 205, nays 194.)	No.
May 26	115	H.R. 13712, on motion to recommit bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. (Yeas 167, nays 232.)	No.
May 26	116	H.R. 13712, on passage a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend its protection to additional employees, and to raise the minimum wage. (Yeas 303, nays 93.)	Yes.
June 1	120	H.R. 9167, on motion to recommit a bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, enabling the courts to deal more effectively with narcotic addiction. (Yeas 198, nays 168.)	No.
June 1	121	H.R. 9167, on passage a bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, enabling the courts to deal more effectively with narcotic addiction. (Yeas 367, nays 1.)	Yes.
June 2	123	H.R. 14050, a bill to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act. On passage. (Yeas 337, nays 2.)	Yes.
June 6	124	H.R. 14643, on motion to suspend rules and pass bill to provide for the strengthening of American educational resources for international study and research. (Yeas 195, nays 90.)	Not voting.
June 6	125	H.R. 10, on motion to suspend rules and pass bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. (Yeas 291, nays 0.)	Yes.
June 7	127	H.R. 15456, on passage a bill making appropriations for legislative branch. (Yeas 341, nays 2.)	Yes.
June 7	128	S. 1357, on passage an act to revise existing bail practices in courts in the United States. (Yeas 319, nays 14.)	Yes.
June 8	130	H. Res. 882, on agreeing to resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 15202, temporarily increasing the public debt limit set forth in sec. 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act. (Yeas 205, nays 153.)	Yes.
June 8	131	H.R. 15202, on passage a bill to provide a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in sec. 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act. (Yeas 199, nays 165.)	Yes.
June 9	133	H.R. 14929, on 2d committee amendment a bill to provide food for freedom. (Yeas 193, nays 165.)	Not voting.
June 9	134	H.R. 14929, on motion to recommit bill to provide food for freedom. (Yeas 157, nays 200.)	Not voting.
June 9	135	H.R. 14929, on passage a bill to promote international trade in agricultural commodities. Food for freedom. (Yeas 333, nays 20.)	Not voting.
June 13	137	H.R. 14019, on passage a bill to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act. (Yeas 290, nays 3.)	Not voting.
June 14	141	S. 2950, on passage an act authorizing defense procurement during the fiscal year 1967. (Yeas 356, nays 2.)	Yes.
June 16	145	H.R. 14025, on 2d committee amendment a bill to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950. (Yeas 73, nays 275.)	Yes.
June 20	147	S. 1160, on motion to suspend rules and pass act to amend sec. 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act to clarify and protect the right of the public to information. (Yeas 307, nays 0.)	Yes.
June 20	148	H.R. 10860, on motion to suspend rules and pass a bill to promote the general welfare, public policy, and security of the United States. (Yeas 308, nays 1.)	Yes.
June 22	150	H.R. 15119, on passage of a bill to extend and improve the Federal-State unemployment compensation and program. (Yeas 375, nays 10.)	Yes.
June 23	152	H.R. 13196, on passage of the Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act. (Yeas 364, nays 0.)	Not voting.
June 27	154	H. Res. 875, on agreement to resolution providing for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 14904, to revise postal rates on certain 4th-class mail. (Yeas 222, nays 148.)	No.
June 27	155	H.R. 5426, on motion to recommit a bill to provide that common-law marriages may not be contracted in the District of Columbia. (Yeas 39, nays 328.)	No.
July 12	159	S. 2950, on adoption of conference report an act for Armed Forces procurement authorization. (Yeas 360, nays 2.)	Yes.
July 14	164	H.R. 15750, a motion to recommit for a bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended. (Yeas 191, nays 193.)	No.
July 14	165	H.R. 15750, on passage of bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended. (Yeas 237, nays 146.)	Yes.
July 20	171	H.R. 15941, on passage a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense. (Yeas 393, nays 1)	Yes.
July 21	173	S. 602, on adoption of conference report an act to amend the Small Reclamation Act of 1956. (Yeas 136, nays 204.)	Not voting.
July 25	175	H. Res. 910, on agreement to a resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 14765, the Civil Rights Act of 1966. (Yeas 200, nays 180.)	Yes.
Aug. 9	206	H.R. 14765, on Mathias amendment on the discrimination in housing amendment. (Yeas 237, nays 176.)	Not voting (for).
Aug. 9	207	H.R. 14765, on Cramer-Ashmore amendment (antiriot amendment). (Yeas 389, nays 25.)	Not voting.
Aug. 9	208	H.R. 14765, on Whitener amendment (discrimination against officials amendment). (Yeas 214, nays 201.)	Not voting (against).
Aug. 9	209	H.R. 14765, on motion to recommit to delete title IV, housing policy. (Yeas 190, nays 222.)	Not voting (against).
Aug. 9	210	H.R. 14765, on passage a bill to assure nondiscrimination in Federal State jury selection and service, etc. (Civil Rights Act.) (Yeas 259, nays 157.)	Yes.
Aug. 10	213	S. 3105, an act to authorize certain construction at military installations. On passage. (Yeas 390, nays 1.)	Yes.
Aug. 11	215	H.R. 14359, on motion to recommit a bill to authorize appropriations for construction of certain highways. (Yeas 173, nays 175.)	No.
Aug. 11	216	H.R. 14359, on passage a bill to authorize appropriations for the construction of certain highways. (Yeas 341, nays 1.)	Yes.
Aug. 15	218	S. 3688, on motion to suspend rules and pass a bill to stimulate the flow of mortgage credit for Federal Housing Administration and Veterans' Administration. (Yeas 314, nays 1.)	Not voting.
Aug. 15	219	H.R. 16114, on motion to suspend the rules and pass a bill to correct inequities with respect to the determination of basic compensation of employees of the Federal Government for purposes of certain employment benefits. (Yeas 3[illegible], nays 0.)	Not voting.
Aug. 15	220	H.R. 14604, on motion to suspend rules and pass a bill to authorize the study of facilities and services furnished visitors to Nation's Capital. (Yeas 209, nays 108.)	Not voting.
Aug. 15	221	H.R. 11555, on motion to suspend the rules and pass a bill to provide a border highway along the U.S. side of the Rio Grande to settle Chamizal boundary dispute. (Yeas 174, nays 133.)	Not voting.
Aug. 16	224	H.R. 14810, on motion to recommit a bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964. (Yeas 205, nays 161.)	No.
Aug. 16	225	H.R. 14810, on passage a bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964. (Yeas 236, nays 127.)	Yes.
Aug. 17	228	H.R. 13228, Springer amendment on bill to provide for a coordinated national safety program. (Yeas 168, nays 205.)	No.
Aug. 17	229	H.R. 13228, on passage of a bill to provide for a coordinated national safety program. (Yeas 371, nays 0.)	Yes.
Aug. 18	231	H.R. 14921, on motion to recommit conference report for an act for independent offices appropriations. (Yeas 176, nays 196.)	No.
Aug. 18	232	H.R. 13290, on passage of the Highway Safety Act. (Yeas 318, nays 3.)	Yes.
Aug. 22	233	S. 602, on adoption of conference report to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956. (Yeas 198, nays 81.)	Not voting (for).
Aug. 22	234	H.R. 16340, on motion to recommit a bill prohibiting picketing in the District of Columbia within 500 feet of any church. (Yeas 54, nays 237.)	Not voting.
Aug. 22	235	H.R. 16340, on passage of a bill prohibiting picketing in the District of Columbia within 500 feet of any church. (Yeas 249, nays 44.)	Not voting.
Aug. 24	238	H.R. 14596, on adoption of conference report an act making appropriations for Department of Agriculture and related agencies. (Yeas 325, nays 28.)	Not voting.
Aug. 25	241	H.R. 15941, on adoption of the conference report an act making appropriations for the Department of Defense. (Yeas 383, nays 1.)	Yes.
Aug. 25	242	H.R. 15941, Mahon motion on conference report on adoption of an act making appropriations for the Department of Defense. (Yeas 378, nays 3.)	Not voting.
Aug. 26	244	S. 3688, on adoption of conference report a bill to stimulate the flow of mortgage credit for the Federal Housing Administration and Veterans' Administration. (Yeas 237, nays 1.)	Not voting.
Aug. 26	245	S. 3700, on adoption of conference report on act to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964. (Yeas 156, nays 86.)	Yes.
Aug. 29	246	H.J. Res. 1284, on passage of joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1967. (Yeas 323, nays 6.)	Yes.
Aug. 30	251	H.R. 15963, Garmatz amendment on bill to establish a Department of Transportation. (Yeas 261, nays 117.)	Yes.
Aug. 30	252	H.R. 15963, on motion to recommit bill to establish a Department of Transportation. (Yeas 143, nays 238.)	No.
Aug. 30	253	H.R. 15963, on passage a bill to establish a Department of Transportation. (Yeas 336, nays 42.)	Yes.
Aug. 31	255	S. 3155, on adoption of conference report bill authorizing appropriations for construction of certain highways. (Yeas 360, nays 1.)	Yes.
Aug. 31	257	S. 3005, on adoption of conference report an act to provide for a coordinated national safety program. (Yeas 365, nays 0.)	Yes.
Aug. 31	258	S. 3052, adoption of conference report on bill to provide for a coordinated national highway safety program. (Yeas 360, nays 3.)	Yes.
Aug. 31	259	H.R. 16574, on passage a bill to amend the Peace Corps Act as amended. (Yeas 322, nays 15.)	Yes.
Sept. 1	261	H.R. 15750, on adoption of conference report an act to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended. (Yeas 217, nays, 127.)	Yes.
Sept. 1	262	H.R. 15098, on motion to recommit a bill to amend Public Law 89-284 relating to participation of United States in HemisFair exposition in 1968. (Yeas 147, nays 184.)	No.
Sept. 6	265	H.R. 15766, on motion to suspend rules and pass a bill to establish a National Commission of Reform of Federal Criminal Laws. (Yeas 259, nays 0.)	Yes.
Sept. 7	267	H.R. 13712, on motion to recommit conference report on act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. (Yeas 163, nays 183.)	Not voting (against).
Sept. 7	268	H.R. 13712, on adoption of conference report on act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. (Yeas 260, nays 89.)	Not voting (for).
Sept. 8	271	H.R. 14026, on motion to recommit a bill to prohibit insured banks from issuing negotiable interest-bearing or discounted notes, certificates of deposit or other evidences of indebtedness. (Yeas 130, nays 214.)	No.
Sept. 8	272	H.R. 14026, on passage of bill to prohibit insured banks from issuing negotiable interest-bearing or discounted notes, etc. (Yeas 271, nays 68.)	Yes.

Date	Roll No.	Measure, question and result	Vote
1966			
Sept. 12	274	H. Res. 1002, on agreeing to resolution providing for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 688) to the agreement for facilitating the international circulation of visual and auditory materials, etc. (Yeas 243, nays 2.)	Yes.
Sept. 12	275	H. Res. 1005, on agreeing to resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 11256 to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. (Yeas 244, nays 9.)	Yes.
Sept. 12	276	H. Res. 1004, on agreeing to resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 8664, to implement the agreement of importation of educational, etc., materials at Lake Success. (Yeas 242, nays 7.)	Yes.
Sept. 12	277	H. Res. 976, on agreeing to resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 11555, to provide a border highway along the U.S. bank of the Rio Grande in settlement of Chamizal boundary dispute. (Yeas 202, nays 48.)	Yes.
Sept. 13	279	H.R. 17636, on motion to recommit bill making appropriations for the District of Columbia. (Yeas 103, nays 217.)	No.
Sept. 13	280	H.R. 17636, on passage a bill making appropriations for the District of Columbia. (Yeas 320, nays 3.)	Yes.
Sept. 14	284	H.R. 17637, on passage of the military construction bill. (Yeas 346, nays 3.)	Yes.
Sept. 19	286	H.R. 8678, on motion to suspend the rules and pass a bill to establish in the State of Michigan the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore. (Yeas 248, nays 70.)	Yes.
Sept. 19	287	H.R. 17488, a motion to suspend the rules and pass a bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to increase rates of pensions for certain veterans and their widows. (Yeas 315, nays 2.)	Yes.
Sept. 19	288	H.R. 15183, on motion to suspend the rules and pass a bill to adjust the status of Cuban refugees to that of lawful permanent residents of the United States. (Yeas 300, nays 25.)	Yes.
Sept. 19	289	S.J. Res. 167, on motion to suspend the rules and pass a joint resolution to enable the United States to organize and hold an International Conference of Water for Peace in 1967. (Yeas 161, nays 154.)	Yes.
Sept. 19	290	S. 3423, on motion to suspend the rules and pass an act to provide for the establishment of Wolf Trap Farm Park in Fairfax County, Va. (Yeas 195, nays 105.)	Yes.
Sept. 20	293	H.R. 17788, on motion to recommit a bill making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies. (Yeas 186, nays 183.)	No.
Sept. 20	294	H.R. 17788, on passage a bill making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies. (Yeas 234, nays 141.)	Yes.
Sept. 21	296	H.R. 17787, on passage of the Public Works Appropriations Act of 1967. (Yeas 355, nays 25.)	Yes.
Sept. 21	298	H.R. 17195, on passage of a bill to amend the United States Code to strengthen the Reserve components of the Armed Forces and clarify the status of National Guard technicians. (Yeas 332, nays 6.)	Yes.
Sept. 22	300	H.R. 11555, on motion to recommit a bill to provide a border highway along the U.S. bank of the Rio Grande in settlement of the Chamizal dispute. (Yeas 149, nays 199.)	Not voting.
Sept. 22	301	H.R. 13825, on passage a bill to authorize the joint construction by the United States and Mexico of an international flood control project for the Tijuana River. (Yeas 294, nays 43.)	Not voting.
Sept. 29	317	H.R. 15111, on motion to strike the enacting clause on bill to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty. (Yeas 156, nays 208.)	No.
Sept. 29	318	H.R. 15111, on Ashbrook amendment "Limitation of Supergrades" on a bill to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty. (Yeas 257, nays 108.)	No.
Sept. 29	319	H.R. 15111, on motion to recommit a bill to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty. (Yeas 162, nays 203.)	No.
Sept. 29	320	H.R. 15111, on passage of bill to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty. (Yeas 210, nays 156.)	Yes.
Sept. 30	323	H.R. 17607, on Byrnes amendment on bill to suspend the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property. (Yeas 330, nays 2.)	Yes.
Sept. 30	324	H.R. 17607, on passage the investment credit bill. (Yeas 221, nays 118.)	Yes.
Sept. 30	325	H.R. 16076, on passage a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. (Yeas 313, nays 0.)	Yes.
Oct. 3	326	S. 985, on motion to suspend the rules and pass an act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce. (Yeas 300, nays 8.)	Yes.
Oct. 3	327	S. 3807, on motion to suspend rules and pass a bill to amend (Public Law 89–428, authorizing the Atomic Energy Commission to participate in large-scale combination nuclear power project of desalting. (Yeas 316, nays 1.)	Yes.
Oct. 3	328	H.R. 13447, on motion to suspend the rules and pass a bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to preserve, protect, and develop estuarine areas of the Nation which are valuable for conservation and recreation. (Yeas 209, nays 108.)	Yes.
Oct. 4	330	H.R. 18119, on motion to recommit a bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary and related agencies. (Yeas 152, nays 201.)	No.
Oct. 4	331	H.R. 18119, on passage, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the judiciary and related agencies. (Yeas 319, nays 38.)	Yes.
Oct. 5	335	H.R. 14929, on motion to recommit the conference report on an act to promote international trade in agricultural commodities to combat hunger and malnutrition to further economic development. (Yeas 306, nays 60.)	Yes.
Oct. 6	343	H.R. 13161, on Fountain amendment, a bill to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for our elementary and secondary schools. (Yeas 220, nays 116.)	Not voting.
Oct. 6	344	H.R. 13161, on motion to recommit a bill on elementary and secondary education. (Yeas 150, nays 185.)	Not voting (against).
Oct. 6	345	H.R. 13161, on passage of the elementary and secondary school bill. (Yeas 237, nays 97.)	Not voting (for).
Oct. 7	346	H.R. 17788, on adoption of conference report an act making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies. (Yeas 189, nays 80.)	Not voting (for).
Oct. 11	349	H.R. 15941, on Mahon motion on Senate amendment on conference report an act making appropriations for the Department of Defense. (Yeas 305, nays 42.)	Not voting.
Oct. 11	350	H.R. 17787, on motion to recommit the conference report on Public Works Appropriations Act of 1967. (Yeas 91, nays 255.)	Not voting.
Oct. 13	360	H.R. 12047, on passage a bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950. (Yeas 275, nays 64.)	Yes.
Oct. 14	362	H.R. 51, on Udall amendment a bill to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore. (Yeas 183, nays 147.)	Yes.
Oct. 14	363	H.R. 51, on passage a bill to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore. (Yeas 204, nays 141.)	Yes.
Oct. 14	365	S. 3708, on motion to recommit the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966. (Yeas 149, nays 175.)	No.
Oct. 14	366	S. 3708, on passage the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966. (Yeas 178, nays 141.)	Yes.
Oct. 17	368	S. 3675, on motion to suspend the rules and pass an act to amend title V of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949. (Yeas 249, nays 3.)	Not voting.
Oct. 17	369	S. 985, on adoption of conference report on the truth-in-packaging bill. (Yeas 242, nays 6.)	Not voting.
Oct. 17	370	S. 2947, on adoption of the conference report on an act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. (Yeas 247, nays 0.)	Not voting.
Oct. 18	373	H.R. 18381, on motion to recommit a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967. (Yeas 167, nays 121.)	Yes.
Oct. 18	374	H. Res. 1060, on motion to recommit a resolution certifying the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities citing Milton Mitchell Cohen for contempt of Congress. (Yeas 90, nays 181.)	No.
Oct. 18	375	H. Res. 1062, on motion to recommit a resolution certifying the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities citing Jeremiah Stamler for contempt of Congress. (Yeas 54, nays 182.)	No.
Oct. 18	376	H. Res. 1062, on agreeing to resolution certifying the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities citing Jeremiah Stamler for contempt of Congress. (Yeas 174, nays 37, quorum not established.)	Yes.
Oct. 19	378	H. Res. 1062, on agreeing to resolution certifying the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities citing Jeremiah Stamler for contempt of Congress. (Yeas 219, nays 69.)	Yes.
Oct. 19	379	H.R. 5688, on adoption of conference report on the District of Columbia anticrime bill. (Yeas 208, nays 79.)	Yes.
Oct. 19	380	H.R. 18233, on motion to recommit a bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation for certain public works for navigation and flood control. (Yeas 89, nays 196.)	No.
Oct. 19	381	S.J. Res. 167, on passage of joint resolution to enable the United States to organize and hold an International Conference of Water for Peace in 1967. (Yeas 196, nays 79.)	Yes.
Oct. 19	385	H. Res. 1013, on motion to lay on table a resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct. (Yeas 24, nays 238.)	No.
Oct. 19	386	H. Res. 1013, on agreeing to resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct. (Yeas 256, nays 0.)	Yes.
Oct. 20	389	S. 3708, on adoption of conference report for the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966. (Yeas 142, nays 126.)	Yes.
Oct. 20	390	H.R. 15111, on adoption of conference report on an act to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty. (Yeas 170, nays 109.)	Yes.
Oct. 20	391	H.R. 18233, on agreeing to Senate amendment on bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation and flood control. (Yeas 261, nays 0.)	Yes.
Oct. 20	392	H.R. 13161, on adoption of conference report on act for elementary and secondary education. (Yeas 185, nays 76.)	Yes.
Oct. 20	393	H.R. 17607, on motion to recommit conference report on act to suspend investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property. (Yeas 57, nays 184.)	No.
Oct. 20	394	H.R. 17607, on adoption of conference report on an act to suspend the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property. (Yeas 161, nays 76.)	Yes.
Oct. 20	395	H.R. 13103, on motion to recommit conference report on act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide equitable tax treatment for foreign investment in the United States. (Yeas 95, nays 127.)	No.
Oct. 20	396	H.R. 13103, on adoption of conference report on act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide equitable tax treatment for foreign investment in the United States. (Yeas 171, nays 46.)	Yes.
Oct. 21	398	H.R. 14644, on adoption of conference report an act to amend the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 to extend it for 3 years and to authorize assistance to developing institutions for an additional year. (Yeas 222, nays 13.)	Yes.
Oct. 21	399	H.R. 18381, on Mahon motion to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 43 on an act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967. (Yeas 129, nays 102.)	Yes.

What Is Happening in Our Country?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD a speech which I made before the chamber of commerce in Dallas, Tex., and which has evoked a tremendous reaction from the press and those who heard it. The speech follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and friends, I am not going to talk to you about Vietnam today. As a matter of fact, I'm not going to talk about legislation. I want to talk about something that is troubling me deeply—and I feel sure is troubling you—and that is what in the world is happening to this Country of ours?

Everywhere there seems to be an abandonment of the ancient values that have sustained and restrained the human race upon this earth. The old virtues which we were brought up to respect and copy in our daily lives, are now derided and called—at best, old-fashioned and out-of-date—and, at worst, "square".

And—here is what disturbs me most of all—instead of being outraged by what has been going on, our leaders—at least National—seem to be spending most of their time making up excuses for behavior which we were brought up to consider as obscene, illegal, perverse, irresponsible, riotous and even treasonous.

We hear a lot about freedom these days—and we hear very little about responsibility.

We hear a lot about the right to express one's self—and very little about the right of other people to avoid being offended by such expression.

We hear a lot about the underprivileged poor—but very little about the underprivileged taxpayer who is being made the scapegoat for the deserving and the undeserving poor alike.

We pussyfoot among a lot of high-sounding names. We call drunkards "alcoholics", we call homosexuals "deviates", we call draft-dodgers and slackers "pacifists", we call dope addicts "experimenters in personality extension", we call criminals "victims of society".

Some of this may be all right. Some of it may reflect a more compassionate attitude in our society. But I think the time has come when we should and must draw a line separating compassion from soft-headedness, permissiveness and timidity.

Near the end of his great book on the decline and fall of the Roman Empire, Edward Gibbon lists the reasons for the dissolution of the great political force which had held the civilized world together for more than 500 years. The principal reasons included—

Excessive spending by the central government.

Unwillingness of the young men to bear arms in defense of their Country.

Overindulgence in luxury.

Widespread sexual immorality and easy divorce, which destroyed the integrity of family life.

The spread of effeminacy—girls looking and acting like men, men looking and acting like girls.

Disregard for religion.

That was Rome, 1400 years ago. Does the picture seem to apply to the United States today?

I have no patience with the complacent Pollyannas who pooh-pooh the idea that our moral fabric is disintegrating, and who claim that conditions are no worse today than they were 50 years ago.

When most of us were young, women didn't live in constant fear of assault, robbery and rape. Parents could send their children down to the corner store without dying a thousand deaths until they returned. A man could walk his dog around his neighborhood at night without fear of being mugged, or beaten up, or murdered just for kicks.

We all remember when a rape was a front page story. Now, in most large cities, it's a run-of-the-mill story tucked away among the want ads and the minor traffic accidents. If a rapist wants to make the front pages he has to commit his crime in wholesale lots and in an especially spectacular manner. The competition is too great.

And violence? Violence is too common for mention. Here is a striking example of what I mean. A few months ago, a distinguished United States Senator—MILTON YOUNG, of North Dakota—was driving home from work in broad daylight. He was passing through Rock Creek Park, in Washington, when a rifle bullet smashed through his windshield, barely missing his head. It was not an accident, it was a deliberate attempt at murder. The officer investigating the case merely shrugged his shoulders and said—"Oh, we're getting more and more of that sort of thing these days." The attempted murderer was not caught, and never will be. The story rated just two paragraphs on an inside page of the Washington newspapers.

We all can remember—just a few years ago—when the attempted murder of a United States Senator—in plain daylight, in the Nation's Capital—would have caused a National scandal. Today it's routine—a ho-hum item—worth just two paragraphs in the local paper.

I don't blame the newspapers. If they were to cover all the violence in their communities in the way they used to cover it, they would have to have a special editor for rape, a special editor for armed assault, and so on.

Listen to these statistics for a moment,

In the United States today there is a forcible rape every 26 minutes—and these are just the rapes that are reported.

There is an armed robbery every five minutes.

There is an aggravated assault every three minutes.

There is a car theft every minute of every day of the year.

Violence has become a common thing in our daily lives. Blatant disregard for the rights and the freedom of others has become a commonplace thing. We talk about the latest murder and rape as casually as we used to talk about the opening of a new hamburger stand.

The decay of standards, of morals and of values is worse today than it ever has been, and we're not helping the situation if we are trying to hide our heads in the sand until it passes away. It's not going to pass away, unless we make it pass away.

Whose fault is it? In a way, it's everyone's fault. Too many of us have been talking about freedom without really knowing what freedom is all about.

Educators, politicians, clergymen, businessmen, and almost everyone else—have been demanding more and more freedom for more and more people—but they have failed to emphasize the responsibilities of freedom. They have failed to make it clear that freedom is meaningless if it interferes with somebody else's freedom. You can't gain freedom by taking it away from somebody else. Freedom is something you earn and deserve and build and create for yourself.

But most of all I blame the people who should have been giving this Country responsible leadership and instead have given it meaningless phrases.

I lay a great deal of the blame at the doorstep of National leaders who have all but incited certain elements of our society to riot—and have refused to condemn such riots until they became a political embarrassment.

For too many of our citizens freedom means freedom from unpleasantness, freedom from work, freedom from discipline, freedom from sacrifice, freedom from duty, freedom from responsibility, freedom from concern for your neighbor.

That isn't freedom at all.

Too many of our citizens demand the right to determine what is moral and what is not. They end up by determining that nothing is immoral—everything goes. They feel no obligation toward others who maintain traditional moral standards. They feel no responsibility for the young who are not prepared for exposure to the kind of immorality these persons preach and practice.

Too many citizens accept in others—and demand for themselves—more and more relaxed standards of conduct. Oddly enough, it hasn't made them any happier than their more disciplined ancestors were. The suicide rate goes up—the abortion rate goes up—the alcoholic rate goes up—all the usual signs of human misery and despair proliferate like the green bay tree. The more we throw restraint to the winds, the more our people find they are unable to restrain and discipline themselves.

We are appalled when we see rioting in our streets—and especially when we find the riots are being instigated in the name of freedom! What happens to the freedom of the innocent bystanders who are killed or maimed in the riot? What happens to the freedom of the widow and the orphans of the police officer who was killed in the performance of his duty? What happens to the freedom of the man whose car happened to make an attractive target for a molotov cocktail? Or the owner of the grocery store whose goods were looted off his shelves? Where are their rights? Who is standing up for them?

I want to tell you this—in the steaming jungles of Laos and Vietnam—in societies which we are pleased to consider primitive—I have seen more law and order, more respect for human rights, more respect for property, more respect for the dignity of human beings—than I can find in the streets of some of our American cities today.

In the jungles of Laos and Vietnam the very thought of a riot is impossible. The natives have far more regard for their own cultural concept of law and order and freedom to permit such indulgence in unreason.

Riot is the absolute opposite of freedom. It is chaos. And chaos and freedom cannot exist side by side. Freedom implies order. It implies law—a common law to protect all people, to sustain all rights, all ideals. Freedom is not selective, it is universal.

When men take the law into their own hands—when men, acting as individuals, decide for themselves which laws they will obey and which they will disobey, then we don't have freedom—we have a direct and aggravated assault on all freedoms. In every society of free men there must be lawgivers and law-abiders—and there must be penalties for those who will not abide.

The Supreme Court has preoccupied itself for years with the rights of the accused. It has all but rendered our police helpless. Now let us examine the situation. Do we have a serious problem with innocent persons being wrongly convicted? Do we really believe that our police are seizing every opportunity to "brutalize" suspects? Is this really the problem? No, of course it isn't. The real problem is the abuse of thousands of innocent, helpless people by hardened criminals. For every case of police brutality, there are 10,000 cases of criminal brutality to innocent victims. Why, then, cannot the Supreme Court address itself to this problem, rather than destroying the effectiveness of the police who are trying to protect us?

Just a few weeks ago, a Judge freed a woman who had confessed to killing her four-year-old child—freed the woman because her attorney was not present when she confessed her crime. The woman thanked the Judge and he reprimanded her. He said—"Don't thank me, thank the Supreme Court. You should go to jail for your crime." The woman went free.

More than four years ago, a musician committed a brutal murder of four people—a man, his wife and two children. That man's case is not settled. Do you know what the point of contention is? The murderer was living with his parents. The police obtained permission from the parents to search the house. They found the murder weapon in the man's musical instrument case. Four years later we are still wrangling about whether it was a legal search.

A few days ago a patrolman in Washington answered a fire alarm, and found a building burning. When he approached the fire, two men walked up to him and one man said, "This is the man that did it." The policeman said to the other man, "What do you have to say for yourself?" The second man said, "Yes, I set the fire." The Court threw this confession out on the basis that the patrolman should not have questioned the second man without a lawyer present. These are not unusual cases. They are common. Why must it be this way? Why cannot the Supreme Court turn its resources to solving the crime problem, rather than erecting legal means for the criminal to escape? Whose rights are more important—the general public's or the habitual criminal's? For after all, about 80 percent of serious crime is by repeat offenders.

The violence, the license, the lack of responsibility which infest our land have caused great divisions among our people. The extremists of both sides have been guilty—equally guilty—of opening in our culture gaping wounds without stopping to consider what medicines are available to heal such wounds—or even, whether such medicines actually exist.

What can we do about it?

There is no quick solution. We are a Nation in trouble. It took a long time for our society to grow sick. It's going to take a long time for it to get well.

We can make a start by taking our heads out of the ground and recognizing the growing crisis around us for what it is.

We can start relearning the art of self-discipline—and insisting that all elements within our society learn it, also.

We must re-learn and teach others that—in the common idiom—"There's no such thing as a free lunch." Our Democratic society is based on a system of earned rewards and earned punishments. There is no place in our society for rewards and punishments that are not earned.

We must learn to call things by their right names. Violence is violence—no matter what the cause in which it is perpetrated. Violence is a grievous breach of the law and must be treated as such.

I am sure that there have been—and probably are—many injustices in those communities where violence has broken out. Injustice should be rectified wherever it occurs. But it should be made clear that injustice cannot be rectified by the further injustice of mass violence—progress cannot be achieved by retrogression into savagery—laws cannot be written by recourse to lawlessness.

We must stop coddling the breakers of our laws—making up excuses for them—looking complacently the other way because it is safer and easier to ignore them.

We were a good society once—and though human nature didn't become perfect because of the knowledge of certain punishments, human wickedness was at least kept within reasonable bounds.

Then we tried the soft approach, in the hope it would make conditions better. This has failed. Conditions have become worse, not better, and they are growing worse with every passing day.

We must grow tougher in our approach.

Treason is still treason and should be treated as such. Anyone who gives aid and comfort to an enemy of the United States is flirting with the very essence of treason. The same goes for sedition . . . and for all those who preach sedition, who teach it to their students, or who seek to arouse sedition in others by burning their draft cards or defaming and disgracing the American Flag.

We must rediscover for ourselves—and teach to others—the truth that freedom is inseparable from responsibility. It is a difficult thing to win freedom—but it is even more difficult to live with it—and still more difficult to keep it. Freedom is indivisible. Any freedom that impairs and impedes the legitimate freedom of others is tyranny—whether it be in the form of an all-powerful dictator, or whether it be in the form of an oppressive and bigoted power structure, or whether it be in the form of a violent minority.

These solutions may sound impractical—even corny. Certainly they sound old-fashioned.

There is one further solution, and that lies in the commandment of Jesus Christ, to love thy neighbor as thyself.

He didn't say to love your neighbor more than yourself—and He didn't say to love your neighbor to the exclusion of yourself. He meant for men to love themselves—to respect their own persons—and to show the same love and respect to everyone else.

Of all God's commandments this has been the hardest for imperfect man to keep. But today the need to learn and obey this commandment has become urgent and it has become universal. In its observance is the only real solution of the violence and discord which threatens to tear us asunder.

For only through universal love—universal respect for the human family—universal understanding—universal compassion—can the curses finally be lifted.

Thank you and God bless you.

A Great Senator and Statesman Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the State of Massachusetts has provided our Nation with many outstanding public servants. None ranks higher than the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] who has chosen to retire.

His record is one of accomplishment. His name is synonymous with integrity. He combines great knowledge with great understanding.

It has been a privilege for me to serve with him and I appreciate more than I can say his help and counsel.

It is an understatement to say he will be sorely missed by the Senate. His absence will be felt by the country as well. But he leaves with the affection and respect of all who know him and I join with his countless friends in wishing him good health and happiness in the years ahead.

Vietnam and the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an address that I delivered at the Johns Hopkins University.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIETNAM AND THE UNITED NATIONS

I have come here from two weeks of politics in Montana. Elections in my State usually involve a great deal of personal exchange with voters. This year was no exception. Although not running myself, I found the campaign as intensive as Montana is extensive. It carried me into confrontation with many, many Americans over a trail of thousands of miles. I had occasion to speak to Montanans on the range, in the high mountains, along the roads, at ranch and reservation, and in village, town, and city.

Political campaigning is not, as it might appear to be, an exhausting pursuit. On the contrary, at least to the politically sensitized, it is a kind of restorative. It reactivates the ability to differentiate between what is important and what is grossly over-rated in the public affairs of the nation. That essential perspective, may I say, is frequently distorted in the political prisms of Washington.

A campaign may be designed to inform the voter but it also informs the campaigner. It unfolds the deep disquiets as well as the hopes which move in the political substructure of the nation. Each election campaign, in short, is a rediscovery of the human side of American public life.

I meet with you fresh from an exposure to a cross-section of American sentiment as it exists in Montana, where the frost has long been on the pumpkin and the snows of winter have already begun to gather. I meet with you still strongly seized with what lies closest to the heart of the people of my State.

I have found in 25 years of public life that on fundamental matters, there is not much difference between a Montanan outlook and the national outlook. I assume, therefore, that the basic concerns of the people of Montana are your basic concerns, just as basic hopes are also probably similar. In short, I assume that what is most important in Montana is also likely to be most important here.

In that vein, I wish that I might say that the legislative record of the 89th Congress or some specific aspect of it is of fundamental interest to Americans at this time. As you know, the Senate and House dealt with a great range of public problems during the past two years. These problems, having accumulated over a long time, had arisen to challenge not only the stability of the nation's political and social structure but even the adequacy of the nation's physical environment.

In my judgment, a very substantial legislative base has now been laid for meeting these problems. The record of the 89th Congress is, indeed, extraordinary in scope. The cognomen, "Great Congress" may well be apt. In any event, as a participant, I should like to think so.

Yet, in all honesty, I cannot claim that the legislative achievements of these two years are a response to what is most basic in the concerns and hopes of the people of the nation. I regret to say that these achievements, however significant, are obscured in the shadow which Viet Nam has cast over every aspect of the life of the nation.

The preoccupation of Americans remains Viet Nam and its implications. Every day, these implications grow more personal and direct for more youth and their families. The war is clearly the nexus of the national anxiety. And peace lies at the heart of the nation's hopes; peace—its honorable restoration at the earliest possible moment.

I know that you have heard a great deal of Viet Nam over many months. It is a subject from which you might welcome a measure of surcease. By the same token, I would prefer to consider some other less vexing question, perhaps even the outcome of the election. Yet I am impelled to return to this critical matter tonight.

As you may know, problems of foreign relations have concerned me for many years and, out of that concern, I have frequently addressed myself to the Vietnamese question. My views on the situation there are generally known and I do not intend to repeat them in detail here. Certainly, I have said time and again—in public statements as well as in the private councils of the government—that it does not matter much, at this late date, how we became involved in Viet Nam. The point is that we are involved, deeply involved, and we cannot and we will not withdraw in the absence of an honorable settlement of this question. Nevertheless, I believe (and I have so stated many times) that it would be to the benefit of all concerned if there could be an immediate contraction of the hostilities and, as soon as possible thereafter, their complete termination.

I have long been persuaded that the interests of the United States categorize us as a Pacific power but that those interests most certainly do not commend to us the role of Asian power. As a Pacific power rather than an Asian power (and the two are sometimes confused) it is, in my judgment, wholly in our national interest to remove American military installations and forces from the entire Southeast Asian mainland, as soon as that can be done—as soon as an honorable peace is assured.

May I say that that view accords with the President's proclaimed purpose in Viet Nam which is a settlement achieved by negotiations. At Manila, moreover, the pledge was made that there would be a withdrawal of American forces from Viet Nam within six months after a basis for peace is established. He has alluded, also, time and again, to the willingness of the United States to remove American bases not only from Viet Nam but from all of the Southeast Asian mainland.

This policy has not only been enunciated by the President; it has been reiterated by his subordinates. His Ambassador at the United Nations, for example, gave the President's policy its most comprehensive expression in the flexible proposals for a Vietnamese peace which he made at the opening of the current session of the General Assembly.

It has to be faced, however, that for all the words of peace, there is not only an absence of peace but no visible prospect for its restoration in the near future. Those with whom we are locked in this deadly struggle are either not persuaded of the honesty of our purpose in seeking the negotiation of an honorable peace or they are not interested in an honorable peace or they define an honorable peace in concepts so different from our own that, at this point, there is no basis for a reconciliation of positions.

May I add quickly that I assume that some such considerations are involved, because there are no certainties as to why proffers of negotiations have been rejected out of hand. The fact is that in the absence of a confrontation between all the participants—the direct and indirect participants—in this conflict, we cannot understand precisely the reasons for the reluctance to open negotiations. Nor can we define the dimensions of the gap which must be bridged before peace can be re-established.

At this time, only one point is clear. Despite the President's obvious willingness to confer or to negotiate, we have found no such willingness on the part of North Viet Nam, the Southern National Liberation Front, China, or the Soviet Union. We have been unable to enter into an exchange with any participants direct or indirect in the Vietnamese war—except those already in substantial sympathy or agreement with us.

And so, the echo of the words of peace is the continued din of war. The conflict in Viet Nam has not only failed to contract; it has steadily expanded. The process has been relentless. All the while, the options have shrunk; the alternatives have grown fewer.

It is not yet clear what it will take to produce a flicker in the lamp of peace, much less what will be required to end the war. Until the conflict is ended, however, it cannot be dismissed from our awareness. It cannot be brushed aside in favor of more pleasant or tractable subjects. It cannot be relegated by indifference to the inconsequential.

Viet Nam is, as I have stated, at the core of the concerns and hopes of the people of the nation. It involves, in a very pertinent sense, the well-being of every living American and the future of the United States. It is interlaced with the interests of this nation in Asia and the Pacific and throughout the world.

The war is already a hideous human tragedy for all concerned. It has destroyed tens of thousands of lives and has put to the torch of utter devastation an incalculable quantity of useful resources. It has already swept away many of man's most constructive works in Viet Nam, north and south. It has brought this nation about 40,000 casualties to date. It has required rising expenditures of public funds, and their diversion from productive works. In fact, the current costs of the Vietnamese war are variously estimated as running between one and two billion dollars a month.

Even more disturbing, the seeds of a much larger tragedy are obviously implanted in the Vietnamese situation. That the conflict can be confined to Viet Nam is far from assured. Actually, it already extends into Laos and there is ever-present the possibility of its eruption into a war of regional, continental or world-wide dimensions.

The conflict in Viet Nam may end, of course, long before it matriculates into war with China or universal nuclear catastrophe. That is certainly the rational hope. Whether or not it is an attainable hope is another matter. In any event, the Vietnamese conflict now, today, already has the capacity to shake the precarious base of civilized human survival. That will continue to be the case until the war begins to yield to rational settlement.

Whatever else it is, therefore, the war in Viet Nam is a most urgent warning to all nations. It flashes a danger signal with respect to the adequacy of the present international instruments of peace. These instruments have not only failed to prevent a breakdown of peace in Viet Nam; they also appear incapable of restoring peace in any prompt and generally acceptable fashion.

It is high time, therefore, to note with emphasis that the structure of international order which has evolved during the past twenty years is, to say the least, dangerously haphazard. As it is now, each state has its own formula for safeguarding the security of its people. Each state tends to blend into that formula, in various combinations, a supply of unilateral military power and a participation in a variety of bilateral and regional defense arrangements. Each nation adds to this mixture its own version of traditional diplomacy and modern variations thereon. Almost all nations complete the blend with a dash of the United Nations.

Of late, the role of the United Nations has become less and less pronounced. Indeed, with respect to Viet Nam the U.N. presence is scarcely discernible. It is true that the distinguished Secretary-General, U Thant, has taken public note of the conflict in Viet Nam and its dangers to the world. The Secretary-General is a man of peace and an exceptional diplomat. He has made clear that he is more than willing to place his dedication and his skills at the disposal of the disputants in Viet Nam. In his diplomatic role, he has outlined views which might provide at some point a basis for a settlement of the conflict and he has, otherwise, sought tactfully to engage the interest of various parties in a settlement.

With all due respect, however, the sincere efforts of the Secretary-General are hardly to be equated with bringing to bear on this situation the potentials of the United Nations. Viet Nam is, clearly, a breakdown in the peace within the meaning of the Charter. It contains, clearly, the threat of an expanding war. With these characteristics, it would appear that the conflict should long since have triggered the utilization of every resource of the United Nations in an effort to restore peace. Yet, I regret to say, that apart from the personal efforts of the Secretary-General, the U.N. reaction to Viet Nam has had something of the character of that of a disinterested, enervated or impotent on-looker. It is almost as though the conflict in Viet Nam were taking place not on the other side of this planet but rather on some other planet entirely.

It may be, of course, that the U.N. is unable to make a contribution to peace in Viet Nam. It may also be, however, that the failure to seek a contribution from the U.N. is a missing link in the restoration of peace in Viet Nam.

Whatever may be involved, the non-role of the United Nations in this situation ought not to go unnoticed. An embarrassed silence is no longer a sufficient response to the nation's needs or to the world's needs. Urgent though it is, there is more involved in these needs even than ending the war in Viet Nam. There is also at stake the prevention of a more monstrous conflict. There is also at stake the continued credibility and utility of what has heretofore been a fundamental instrument in the structure of world order.

In my judgment, it is high time to face up to the conspicuous absence of the U.N. from the Vietnamese dispute. We need to ask why, when the need for a peace-effort is maximal, the output of the U.N. is minimal. And we need, at the same time, to explore every possibility for the engagement of the organization in the effort to bring about a termination of the hostilities in Viet Nam.

The U.N. was an essential element, among others, in the Korean cease-fire. Why, then, its inconsequence in the problem of Viet Nam? In this connection, it is manifest that there have been striking changes in the structure of the U.N. since the Korean conflict. Whatever their virtues, it may be that these changes inhibit the engagement of the organization in Viet Nam.

The most sweeping change, of course, is that the U.N. has become a General Assembly-oriented organization at the same time, that the membership has grown to over 120 states. It will be recalled that originally there were 51 united nations. Among the present members, there are, as there have been since the outset, states-infinitesimal and states-immense and, in between, all of the gradations.

There are enormous differences of significance among these states insofar as the practical problems of maintaining peace are concerned. Yet, all 120 have equal access to available time in the General Assembly. All 120 have an equal share in the control of the purse. All 120 have an equal vote in decisions of the Assembly.

It is hardly an overstatement to note that the structure of the General Assembly is appallingly cumbersome. Nevertheless, the Assembly has made and it can continue to make important contributions of a long-range and peripheral nature to the strengthening of world peace. With all due respect, however, there is doubt that a body constituted as the General Assembly now is can play a significant—an executive—role in dealing with imminent threats of war or in the re-establishment of a peace that has broken down. In my judgment, the General Assembly is not competent for that purpose. In my judgment, it is delusive, at this time, to expect it to discharge functions of a kind which might be helpful in Viet Nam.

It is conceivable that alterations in the structure of the General Assembly might remedy its inadequacies for peace-keeping or peace-restoring purposes. Francis Plimpton, a former U.S. representative to the U.N. was right, perhaps, when he suggested that the organization was in need of "family planning." It might be that the use of a single spokesman for groups of small states would be helpful. It might be, too, that the clustering of smaller states into one vote on some power-projected formula would be helpful in insuring fiscal responsibility and a measure of realism in the significant political decisions of that body. I have no doubt that there are any number of technical changes which, given sufficient time, can be absorbed to great advantage into the structure of the General Assembly.

But in all frankness, I must say that insofar as Viet Nam is concerned, there is not a sufficient margin of time. Moreover, it is not at all certain that the kind of wholesale reconstitution of the General Assembly which would give it a peace-keeping function in Viet Nam and similar situations is either practical or desirable. As I have already noted, the General Assembly has other useful, long-range and peripheral functions of peace. Its value for those purposes should not be jeopardized by projecting it into situations for which it was not designed and for which it would have to be severely reshaped if it is to be effective.

It seems to me practical, therefore, to look elsewhere in the U.N. structure for a significant contribution to the restoration of peace in Viet Nam. The Charter clearly indicates that, veto or not, we should look first to the Security Council. It may be valid to assume that the Security Council is less useful as an instrument of peace-keeping when permanent powers are in disagreement. But it is not at all valid to assume that the Security Council is useless in those circumstances. That the Security Council may not be able to play the central role in questions of peace does not rule out its playing of any role.

Whatever differences may separate them with respect to Viet Nam, the permanent powers of the Security Council, I believe, have all expressed their grave concern with the situation and the urgent need to do something about it. That is an entirely adequate basis, it seems to me, on which to turn to the Council and seek from it a contribution to the restoration of peace in Viet Nam.

Let me make clear that miracles are not to be expected. All that can reasonably be asked is a wholehearted effort to do what can be done to further peace. The least that should be expected, or accepted, it seems to me, is a willingness on the part of the Council to confront the issue of Viet Nam and to confront it soon.

One cannot foresee, of course, what can be most helpfully done by the U.N. What ought to be clear at this point, however, is that doing nothing in the U. N. has not helped in Viet Nam. There are discernible lines of possible U. N. contribution which, it would seem, warrant the fullest exploration.

One of these lines, for example, leads from the Security Council to the International Court. All of the combatants in Viet Nam have affirmed, I believe, the fundamental relevance of the Geneva Accords of 1954 as the basis for settlement of the conflict. Certainly, the United States has done so.

We need to know, authoritatively and impartially, what the requirements may be in current circumstances for the reassertion of the Geneva Accords as a legal basis for a restoration of peace. We need to know, too, what must be done sooner or later by all the parties directly or indirectly involved in the Vietnamese conflict to comply with the Geneva Accords and so establish conditions for a just and acceptable peace. In the circumstances, therefore, it might be useful for the Security Council to ask an advisory opinion of the International Court on these questions.

It would seem to me, too, that the Security Council is an appropriate setting for a cards-on-the-table consideration of the present positions of all the participants—direct or indirect—and those deeply interested in the conflict in Viet Nam. Certain of the states such as the United States, the Soviet Union and France are present as permanent members of the Council. The problem of participation of the others is not insurmountable in the light of the experiences in the Korean case. In that instance, it will be recalled, an invitation was issued to Peking—a non-member of the U.N.—to come to the Security Council and Peking did present its case and participate briefly in its discussions.

If a consideration of the question of Viet Nam before the Security Council is to have maximum utility, there needs to be present not only the Soviet Union, France, the United States and other Security Council members but also China and North Viet Nam and the National Liberation Front, as well as Saigon. In a confrontation of this kind, we may begin, at last, to understand whether it is distrust, disinclination, disdain, density, or whatever which has so far stood in the way of negotiations for an honorable settlement. We may begin, at last, to measure rather than guess the gap which must be bridged in the restoration of peace in Viet Nam.

To be sure, the prospects of a refusal of the invitation are obvious. To be sure, the prospects of a high decible of propaganda and invective, if the invitations are accepted, are equally obvious. But these are risks which can readily be sustained when the stakes for all concerned are as high as they are in Viet Nam. Insofar as the United States is concerned, it is in the interest of this nation to welcome the confrontation. The open bar of world opinion is one before which we must never hesitate or fear to place this nation's policies.

The courses which I have indicated are illustrative of the possibilities of using the untapped resources of the United Nations to advance towards peace in Viet Nam. They may or may not be relevant at this time. A vigorous effort on the part of the U. N. may prove as futile as all other efforts to date, military and non-military, to terminate the conflict. But with the world enmeshed in the most dangerous international situation since Korea, we must seek by every avenue to facilitate the restoration of a just peace in Viet Nam. We owe that to the unfortunate people of that nation, to ourselves and to the world.

Activities of the Senate Committee on Finance—89th Congress, 2d Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD "Activities of the Senate Committee on Finance, 89th Congress, 2d Session."

There being no objection, the activities were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACTIVITIES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE, 89TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

During the Second Session of the 89th Congress, 199 Senate and House bills and resolutions were referred to the Committee on Finance. The Committee considered a number of these measures and filed 61 reports on a variety of legislative proposals. Forty-nine (49) of these bills have become public law. These are summarized in the following pages.

Many major pieces of legislation were handled by the Committee with dispatch.

REVENUE

This is particularly demonstrated by the Committee's quick response to the Presidential request resulting in the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966 (P.L. 89–368). This bill was referred to the Committee on February 24, 1966, and 19 days later was signed by the President. The Tax Adjustment Act of 1966 provides additional revenues required by the conflict in Vietnam. It will also help combat inflationary pressures in the domestic economy. The additional revenue is being raised by two methods: (1) Improvement of the tax collection procedures which result in a temporary increase in revenue by making tax payments more current; (2) Restoration of excise rates in effect on December 31, 1965, and imposition of a two-year moratorium on scheduled reductions in automobile and telephone excise taxes.

Another important Administration request which received expeditious handling was H.R. 15202, a bill which temporarily increased the debt limit to $330 billion beginning July 1, 1966, and ending June 30, 1967. The Committee received this bill on June 9, held hearings, and reported the bill. It was passed and subsequently signed by the President on June 24, 1966, becoming Public Law 89–472, only fifteen days after its referral to the Committee on Finance.

More recently the Committee had occasion to consider and act upon two major pieces of revenue legislation, H.R. 13103, the Foreign Investors Tax Act of 1966, and H.R. 17607, the Administration's anti-inflationary bill for suspension of investment credit and accelerated depreciation.

The Foreign Investors Tax Act is the culmination of the so-called Fowler Task Force which was initiated on October 2, 1963. A year later the Task Force made certain recommendations designed to increase foreign investment in the United States. These recommendations designed to increase foreign investment in the United States. These recommendations were embodied in H.R. 13103 and represent a substantial revision of tax treatment of foreign corporations and non-resident aliens, an area which has not been substantially revised for over thirty years.

The second major piece of tax legislation is H.R. 17607, a bill to temporarily suspend the investment credit and the use of accelerated depreciation. This bill is a part of a comprehensive program announced by the President to protect the uninterrupted growth of the economy and to combat inflation.

By removing tax incentives for investment in machinery, equipment, and buildings, the bill should ease inflationary pressures in those sectors where demand is straining present productive capacity. This action should also reduce pressures tending to raise interest rates and should promote an increased flow of credit into the home mortgage market. In the overall, this bill should go a long way as a depressant to the present inflationary temper.

Another significant bill is H.R. 11256, the Federal Tax Lien Act of 1966. This bill represents the first comprehensive revision and modernization of the provisions of the internal revenue laws concerned with the relationship of Federal tax liens to the interests of other creditors.

It partially adjusts the provisions in the internal revenue laws relating to the collection of taxes of delinquent persons to the more recent developments in commercial practice (permitted and protected under State law) and deals with a multitude of technical problems which have arisen over the past 50 years. The bill represents the culmination of a project initiated nearly 10 years ago by the American Bar Association.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

The Committee also considered and reported a bill to provide major improvements in the Federal-State unemployment compensation program. The bill, H.R. 15119, grew out of the broadest and most intense review Congress has given to the unemployment compensation program since it was enacted in 1935.

The changes in the program which would be made by the Senate bill extend coverage to additional jobs, establish a permanent program of extended benefits to exhaustees during periods of high unemployment, furnish the States a procedure for obtaining judicial review of certain determinations of the Secretary of Labor, improve the financing of the program, provide additional State requirements as to benefit amount, duration, eligibility and disqualification, and make other changes to strengthen and improve the Federal-State unemployment compensation program.

VETERANS

The Committee on Finance considered three major pieces of veterans legislation. In June of this year, it reported H.R. 14347 to liberalize the provisions for payment of dependency and indemnity compensation for parents and children. The Committee added two major provisions to this bill, the first of which allows certain VA beneficiaries to receive 1965 social security increases and all future social security increases without affecting their future VA payments. The second amendment would permit the payment of a $5,000 death gratuity without the VA beneficiaries' waiver of right to death compensation and dependency and indemnity benefits.

The two other important veterans bills are S. 3580, the Vietnam Era Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act, and H.R. 17488, the Veterans Pension Act of 1966.

The Vietnam Era veterans bill is designed to provide additional benefits to veterans who have served in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam era which are comparable to those benefits provided by Congress for wartime veterans. Under the bill, the Vietnam era is considered to have begun on the day of the Gulf of Tonkin incident. In light of the warlike conditions presently existing, this bill will afford appropriate benefits to members of our Armed Forces who are today subject to maximum risk of their lives and limbs.

H.R. 17488, the Veterans Pension Act of 1966, would provide an overall cost-of-living increase for pensioners under the so-called current pension program. It would also provide additional benefits for seriously disabled veterans and widows. Under the Committee's bill, over 1.8 million veterans, widows, and children would benefit from increases totaling $97.9 million. The recent recommendation of the President for cost-of-living increases in social security as well as the Administration's approval of cost-of-living raises for the military and civil service makes this increase for VA pensioners appropriate.

PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN FINANCING

The Committee, in connection with its consideration of H.R. 13103, the Foreign Investors Tax Act, added a provision which would provide for reimbursement of major political parties equally for expenses they incur in financing a Presidential campaign. Payments would be made from a fund made up of $1 amounts designated by taxpayers on their tax returns. The amount available for reimbursement would be limited to $1 for each vote cast for the major party candidates at the last Presidential election. Provision would also be made for reimbursing certain splinter parties.

REVENUE

H.R. 136: Rearranges the priority of liens in bankruptcy to subordinate Federal tax liens to statutory liens. Public Law 89–495 (7–5–66).

H.R. 3438: Provides for discharge in bankruptcy of Federal taxes due more than 3 years except withholding taxes and income taxes where no return was filed, or where fraud is involved. Public Law 89–496 (7–5–66).

H.R. 318: Imposes manufacturing excise tax on tires and innertubes (usually 10 cents per pound) at time of delivery to retail-owned store of manufacturer. Public Law 89–523 (8–1–66).

H.R. 327: Provides income tax exemption for certain nonprofit organizations operated to provide reserve funds for savings and loan associations, and subjects them to unrelated business income tax. Public Law 89–352 (2–2–66).

H.R. 6319: Provides for treatment of the recovery of losses arising from expropriation, intervention, or confiscation of properties by governments of foreign countries, as well as extends initial enrollment period in the supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged through May 31, 1966, and further provides for payment of supplemental insurance premiums by States' public assistance programs for those recipients who also may be receiving social security payments or railroad retirement benefits. Public Law 89–384 (4–8–66).

H.R. 8210: Provides for tax and customs exemption of the Euroepan Space Research Organization (and for tax exemption of their foreign employees). Public Law 89–353 (2–2–66).

H.R. 8445: Liberalizes the computation of benefits for retired judges of the Tax Court by basing their pension on the salary of the "office", rather than actual salary at time of retirement, thereby permitting pay raises to be passed on to retired judges. Public Law 89–354 (2–10–66).

H.R. 10625: Provides that retired servicemen are to be taxed only on amount they actually receive as retired pay. The amount of any reduction to provide survivor annuities would be excluded. Estate and gift tax exclusion are also provided. Public Law 89–365 (3–8–66).

H.R. 4665: Provides that the $100,000 and the $400,000 limitations on the deductibility of exploration expenditures may be exceeded if the taxpayer irrevocably elects to have the excess amount recaptured (a) after the mine reaches the production stage, (b) or earlier, if he receives bonus or royalty payments with respect to it or (c) when the mine is sold. Also allows foreign exploration expenses to continue to be deductible as under existing law and permits domestic exploration expenses to be deducted either under present law or under the rules of this bill. Public Law 89–570 (9–12–66).

H.R. 10185: Reduces estate tax fraud penalty under the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 from 50 percent of the tax to 50 percent of the deficiency. Public Law 89–359 (3–7–66).

H.R. 9883: Provides that distributions made within 2½ months after close of year may be treated as made on last day of year (applies similar rule retroactively to 1958 but makes the period 3½ months); permits passive income for the first 2 years of an elective corporation to exceed 20 percent (applies after 1962); and denies pass through privilege in the case of capital gains in excess of $25,000 realized by the elective corporation for first 3 years (applies prospectively). Public Law 89–388 (4–14–66).

H.R. 12752: Tax Adjustment Act of 1966. Principally provides for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, requires declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, accelerates current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, postpones certain excise tax rate reductions, as well as allows duty-free treatment for gifts of Vietnam servicemen and provides monthly social security payments to certain persons age 72 and over. Public Law 89–368 (3–15–16).

H.R. 8188: Provides a deduction for contributions or gifts to any nonprofit organization created and operated exclusively during calendar years 1966, 1967, and 1968 to consider proposals to revise State judicial systems and to support or oppose them, with remaining funds to be turned over to State governments. (On Senate Calendar.)

H.R. 13103: Foreign Investors Tax Act. Provides equitable tax treatment for foreign investment in the United States. Has numerous Committee and Floor amendments. Public Law 89–809 (11–13–66).

H.R. 483: Principally allows an interest in property which a surviving spouse receives as a result of a general or partial disclaimer by beneficiary under a will to qualify for the estate tax marital deduction under certain conditions. Public Law 89–621 (10–4–66).

H.R. 11256: Comprehensive revision and modernization of the provisions of the tax laws concerned with the relationship of Federal tax liens to the interests of other creditors would be effected. Public Law 89–719 (11–2–66).

H.R. 6958: Provides for central filing of income tax returns with automatic data processing centers. Public Law 89–713 (11–2–66).

H.R. 17607: Suspends the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property. Public Law 89–800 (11–8–66).

H.R. 11257: Relates to the income tax treatment of certain distributions pursuant to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956. (On Senate Calendar.)

H.R. 11660: Provides that no interest will be paid on tax refunds within 45 days after the return is filed, and the quick refund procedure presently available to taxpayers with a net operating loss carryback will be extended to taxpayers with an investment credit carryback. Public Law 89–721 (11–2–66).

H.R. 11782: Permits a dealer in property to take an income tax deduction for reasonable additions to a reserve for bad debts arising from his liability as a guarantor of debt obligations incurred in the ordinary course of his doing business. (Public Law 89–722 (11–2–66).

H.R. 16774: Permits accrued vacation pay to be deducted for two more years (until January 1, 1969) regardless of whether liability to a specific person for the pay has been established or whether the amount of liability to each individual can be computed with reasonable accuracy. Public Law 89–692 (10–15–66).

H.R. 14363: Establishes rules to facilitate the determination of which parent is entitled to the $600 deduction for children when the parents are divorced or separated. (On Senate Calendar.)

H.R. 7502: Treats casualty losses in a major disaster as ordinary gains and losses where property is destroyed or damaged as a result of a major disaster when the losses exceed the gains. (On Senate Calendar.)

H.R. 17271: Increases from $200 to $500 the monthly combat pay exclusion for commissioned officers serving in combat zones. Public Law 89–739 (11–2–66).

RECIPROCAL TRADE AND TARIFF

S. Con. Res. 100: Expresses the sense of Congress with respect to certain agreements which would necessitate the modification of duties or other import restrictions. (Awaiting House concurrence.)

H.R. 11029: Relates to the tariff treatment of certain woven fabrics. Public Law 89–405 (4–19–66).

H.R. 6568: Makes permanent the existing temporary suspension of duty on copra, palm nuts and palm kernels, and the oils crushed therefrom. Public Law 89–388 (4–13–66).

H.R. 7723: Provides for temporary free importation of lumber from certain tropical hardwoods. Public Law 89–392 (4–14–66).

H.R. 8436: Amends the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the dutiable status of watches, clocks and timing apparatus imported duty-free from the insular possessions of the U.S. Public Law 89–805 (11–10–66).

H.R. 11216: Insures tariff exemption for articles of U.S. manufacture which are assembled abroad, without regard to pre-existing intention to return the article to the United States; also imposes duty on almost-finished button blanks and provides duty-free entry for Montessori school teaching aids as well as certain other educational instruments. Public Law 89–806 (11–10–66).

H.R. 4599: Provides for the free entry of certain stained glass for the Congregation Emanuel of Denver, Colorado. Private Law 89–232 (4–14–66).

H.R. 5831: Provides for the free entry of certain stained glass and cement windows for Our Lady of the Angels Seminary of Glenmont, New York. Private Law 89–219 (3–7–66).

H.R. 8647: Provides for duty-free entry of parade uniforms for the use of Troubadors Drum and Bugle Corps of the Explorer Scout Post Numbered 152, Bridgeport, Connecticut. Private Law 89–241 (4–18–66).

H.R. 8376: Makes permanent the existing duty-free treatment for certain corkboard insulation. Public Law 89–431 (5–26–66).

H.R. 10998: Continues suspension of duty on heptanoic acid until August 8, 1969. Public Law 89–432 (5–31–66).

H.R. 11653: Makes permanent the existing suspension of duty on certain natural graphite. Public Law 89–433 (5–31–66).

H.R. 12262: Continues until the close of June 30, 1969, the existing suspension of duty on certain copying shoe lathes. Public Law 89–437 (5–31–66).

H.R. 12328: Continues suspension of duty on certain extracts suitable for tanning until September 30, 1969. Public Law 89–573 (9–13–66).

H.R. 12461: Continues suspension of duty on certain istle until September 5, 1969. Public Law 89–575 (9–13–66).

H.R. 12463: Extends until June 30, 1969, the suspension of duty on crude chicory and the reduction in ground chicory. Public Law 89–439 (5–31–66).

H.R. 12657: Continues the suspension of duty on certain alumina and bauxite until July 15, 1968. Public Law 89–440 (5–31–66).

H.R. 12864: Makes permanent the existing duty-free treatment of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders. Public Law 89–436 (5–31–66).

H.R. 12997: Extends until July 15, 1968, the suspension of duty on electrodes imported for use in producing aluminum. Public Law 89–434 (5–31–66).

H.R. 12676: Provides temporary suspension of duty on copper from February 6, 1966, until June 30, 1968. Public Law 89–468 (6–23–66).

H.J. Res. 688: Beirut Agreement. Implements the Agreement for Facilitating the International Circulation of Visual and Auditory Materials of an Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Character. Public Law 89–634 (10–8–66).

H.R. 8664: Florence Agreement. Implements the Agreement on Importation of Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials. Public Law 89–651 (10–14–66).

S. Res. 149: Requests the President to cause a study of imports of steel mill products to be undertaken by the Department of Commerce. (Staff of the committee has been instructed to conduct a study of imports of steel mill products into the United States, thus, in effect disposing of this resolution.)

VETERANS

S. 3580: Provides for service beginning August 5, 1964, and ending on date determined by Presidential proclamation: (1) burial allowance of $250; (2) wartime rates for compensation of service-connected disabilities; (3) pensions for non-service-connected disabilities; (4) service-connected presumption for psychotic conditions developing 2 years after discharge; and (5) free prescribed medicine to veterans requiring constant medical attention. (Awaiting House action.)

H.R. 11006: Provides $250 statutory burial allowances to all veterans who die from service-connected disabilities. Public Law 89–360 (3–7–66).

H.R. 11007: Allows Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to assume Administrator's duties in his absence or disability or if office is vacated; also, provides for redelegation of Administrator's delegated authority. Public Law 89–361 (3–7–66).

H.R. 11747: Allows immediate reduction of veteran's compensation, pension, and aid and attendance allowance only if readmission to hospital or other institution occurs within 6 months of prior confinement, where veteran left hospital without medical certification. Public Law 89–362 (3–7–66).

H.R. 3177: Allows compensation payment to widow with 8 or more children in the same benefit amount as a widow in similar circumstances would receive under the pension program. Public Law 89–466 (6–22–66).

H.R. 9961: Provides that where a veteran receiving pension under Chapter 15, Title 38, U.S. Code, disappears, the Administrator may pay the pension otherwise payable to his wife and children. Public Law 89–467 (6–22–66).

H.R. 14347: Provides 4-percent cost-of-living increase in dependency and indemnity compensation for parents and children; liberalizes income limitation; protects monthly rate of sole remarried parents, allows dependent parents to exclude VA pension payments from annual income; extends year-end adjustment in benefits due to increased retirement income to pension program; permits widows, children and parents of certain deceased servicemen to receive $5,000 death gratuity payment without reduction for prior compensation payments and with elimination of required waiver of future benefits. Public Law 89–730 (11–2–66).

H.R. 5852: Provides that widows of veterans dying from service-connected disability will receive compensation based on highest rank in which deceased served for at least 6 months. Public Law 89–622 (10–4–66).

H.R. 16557: Provides for refunds of certain amounts erroneously deducted for national service life insurance premiums from pay of former members of the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, and provides that certain payments under Title 38 shall be made at the rate in Philippine pesos as is equivalent to 50 cents for each dollar authorized. Public Law 89–641 (10–11–66).

H.R. 17488: Increases the rates of pension payable to certain veterans and their widows. (On Senate Calendar.)

PUBLIC DEBT

H.R. 15202: Provides for the period beginning on July 1, 1966, and ending on June 30, 1967, a temporary increase in the public debt limit. Public Law 89–472 (6–24–66).

RENEGOTIATION

H.R. 13431: Extends the Renegotiation Act of 1951 from June 30, 1966, to June 30, 1968. Public Law 89–480 (7–11–66).

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

H.R. 15119: Extends and improves the Federal-State unemployment compensation program, principally by extending coverage to about 2.3 million workers and providing Federally-financed extended benefits during period of recession or high unemployment. Assures judicial review of administrative determinations and adds Federal standards governing benefit amounts, levels and disqualification of workers for benefits. (Awaiting action of Conferees.)

HEARINGS ONLY

S. 1575. Establishes under Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, a Federal insurance program for private pension plans to insure beneficiaries against loss of benefits. (Hearing held 8–15–66.)

S.J. Res. 115: Requires that reports on imports into the United States include the landed value of articles imported. (Hearings held 8–31–66 and 9–1–66.)

S. 3522. Requires the Secretary of Agriculture to report to the Congress each year certain information relating to the import and export of agricultural commodities. (Hearings held 8–31–66 and 9–1–66.)

S. 3496. Authorizes appropriation of funds from the Treasury to help defray the costs of Presidential campaigns. (Hearings held 8–18–66 and 8–19–66.)

S. 2006. Allows a deduction or credit against tax for contributions to National and State political committees. (Hearings held 8–18–66 and 8–19–66.)

S. 2965. Allows an income tax credit or deduction for certain political contributions made by individuals. (Hearings held 8–18–66 and 8–19–66.)

S. 3014: Allows an income tax credit for contributions made by individuals to the National and State committees of political parties. (Hearings held 8–18–66 and 8–19–66.)

Report on the 55th Conference of the Interparliamentary Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to report upon the attendance of the congressional delegation at the 55th Conference of the Interparliamentary Union which took place at Teheran, Iran, from September 27 to October 4. The sessions, which were held in the modern and well-appointed Senate building in Teheran, were inaugurated on Tuesday, September 27, in the presence of His Imperial Majesty the Shahanshah of Iran, accompanied by the Empress Farah. Throughout the Conference the hospitality of His Imperial Majesty, the Iranian Government, and the Iranian parliamentary delegation was warm and gracious, and on behalf of the U.S. delegation I would like to express our deep appreciation.

The U.S. delegation consisted of the following Members of this House:

Representative Emilio Q. Daddario.
Representative Edward J. Derwinski.
Representative Robert McClory.
Representative John S. Monagan.
Representative Bradford Morse.
Representative Lucien N. Nedzi.
Representative Alexander Pirnie.
Representative W. Robert Poage.
Representative James C. Wright, Jr.

And the following Members of the Senate:

Senator Ross Bass.
Senator Hiram L. Fong.
Senator Philip A. Hart.
Senator Thomas H. Kuchel.
Senator A. Willis Robertson.
Senator Hugh Scott.
Senator Ralph Yarborough.

The Honorable Katharine St. George and the Honorable Homer T. Ferguson participated as honorary members of the U.S. delegation.

In the absence of the chairman of the U.S. group, the Honorable Herman Talmadge, who unfortunately was unable to attend, I had the honor of serving as chairman of the delegation.

Those Members assigned to participate in the proceedings of the various committees of the conference were:

Political and Disarmament Committee—Messrs. Pirnie and Daddario.

Parliamentary and Judicial Committee—Messrs. Kuchel and Nedzi.

Economic and Social Committee—Messrs. Poage and Hart.

Cultural Committee—Messrs. McClory and Yarborough.

Non-Self-Governing Territories Committee—Messrs. Scott and Monagan.

Representatives Daddario and Derwinski represented the United States at the meetings of the Interparliamentary Council.

The delegation was assisted by Dr. George B. Galloway, permanent Executive Secretary of the U.S. group, Mr. William B. Buffum, Department of State adviser, Mr. Charles Gellner, Chief, Foreign Affairs Division, Legislative Reference Service, Mr. Darrell St. Claire, Chief Clerk of the Senate, Miss Milrae Jensen, and Mrs. Carolyn C. Allnutt. Dr. Charles J. Zinn, vice president of the Association of Secretaries General, also accompanied the delegation.

In the general debate which opened the Conference a number of delegations, particularly those of the Soviet Union and other Communist countries, directed sharp criticism at U.S. policy in Vietnam.

The Soviet representative accused the United States of "criminal aggression" which he alleged constituted a threat to world peace. Other Communist speakers called for recognition of the National Liberation Front and a cessation of American bombing of North Vietnam.

I replied to these attacks by emphasizing that the United States was second to none in wanting peace in Vietnam and by recalling our repeated offers to go anywhere, at any time, and to discuss any proposals, if doing so would advance the cause of peace in Vietnam. I pointed out that the United States had offered to engage in unconditional discussions, or in negotiations on the basis of the Geneva accords. But the response of the other side to all efforts to bring peace to Vietnam was regrettably a harsh and unyielding negative.

I stressed that the United States would keep her solemn word to stay in Vietnam until aggression ceased. At the same time, I pointed out that we sought no gains in Vietnam, no territory, no bases, and no alliances and did not seek the destruction of North Vietnam or its government. Indeed, we are prepared to sit down tomorrow to negotiate the terms of American withdrawal if the other side is prepared in good faith to abandon its efforts to subvert South Vietnam.

Instead of circulating propaganda documents, I said, the Soviet Union should contribute to ending the conflict in southeast Asia by supporting unconditional discussions.

Subsequently, a French representative warned that Vietnam could lead to a third world war and said that the United States and Communist China were engaged in an imperialistic struggle for southeast Asia.

Senator Yarborough responded directly to this attack. He reminded the French representative that the people of the United States were united in seeking world peace. He said it was the small nations of the world who were unable to defend themselves against aggression by great powers that have the greatest stake in this conflict. If America deserted South Vietnam, no small nation would survive in southeast Asia. He asked if it was all right for Asians to commit aggression against Asians and all wrong for people who were not Asians to go to the defense of a small Asian country. In fact, any aggression was wrong, he said. The American people had been involved in a long, costly, and bloody conflict in Korea which they had not wanted. They did not want the costly and bloody conflict in Vietnam. But when they asked for peace talks, they were told they were hypocrites. Surely, parliamentarians must recognize, he said, that it was always useful to talk and to negotiate.

At a later stage, Senator Fong reverted to the Vietnam problem. He told the Conference that both ethically and politically he was a minority American. Nevertheless, he assured delegates that the course taken by the United States in Vietnam had the overwhelming support of Americans of all parties. The United States had historically supported the cause of liberty against what the Communists called wars of liberation—and he reminded delegates of the action taken by the United States in Greece and Turkey. He said the United States was determined to assist free people to work out their own destiny in their own way.

Some delegates had accused the United States of intervening in an internal struggle in Vietnam. But, said Senator Fong, "wars of national liberation" is Communist jargon for efforts to impose the will of the minority upon the majority and it depended on terror, sabotage, and subversion. Nevertheless, the United States was willing to sit down to negotiate immediately, he said.

A number of other statements were given which supported the actions of the United States in Vietnam. Representatives from Thailand, Ireland, Australia, New Zealand, and the Philippines endorsed our actions as necessary to cope with Communist aggression and to protect the independence of a small nation. The Irish representative reminded the Assembly of the Soviet Union's notorious record of aggression and imperialism in Eastern Europe, and the Belgian delegate noted that while there was much talk about bombing of North Vietnam, little was said of Vietcong aggression against the civilian population in South Vietnam.

Other speakers concentrated on such issues as European security, the Arab-Israeli dispute, and the Kashmir conflict. African states tended to concentrate on colonialism issues. There was widespread support on the part of many speakers for a stronger and more effective United Nations.

During the discussion of the agenda item relating to the role of parliaments in the preparation and control of economic development planning, the Honorable Jim Wright offered a proposal for the United States and the U.S.S.R. to settle their differences and join in a mutual effort to aid the underdeveloped world.

Messrs. Scott and Daddario, during the discussion of the agenda item on methods of strengthening regional security in conformity with the United Nations Charter, emphasized the traditional support the United States has given to regional organizations as instruments of peace and security and as channels for aiding economic progress of developing countries.

One of the highlights of the Conference was the election of the Honorable Emilio Q. Daddario to the important Executive Committee of the Inter-Parliamentary Union. Two of the seats on this

11-member Committee were to become vacant in 1966 upon the normal expiration of their terms—one held by a Western European and one by an Asian country. Four candidates were presented for these seats. Besides Mr. DADDARIO, there was a candidate presented by Finland and two presented by Asian countries, Iran and Pakistan. In the crucial balloting by the Council of the Union on October 3, Mr. DADDARIO received the highest number of votes of any candidate, followed by Mr. M. A. Matine-Daftary of Iran. The election of these two candidates was formally approved by the Conference on the following day. This was a happy climax to the successful participation of the U.S. delegation in this important Conference.

In conclusion Mr. Speaker, I wish to express in behalf of the entire U.S. delegation our admiration for Ambassador Armin Meyer, as well as our gratitude to him. He welcomed us with an excellent background briefing and gave constant assistance to our mission. His vast knowledge of the Middle East and his fine relations with the diplomatic community proved invaluable in our work. Further, he and Mrs. Meyer opened their residence to our daily use, enabling us to maintain closer contact within the Delegation and assuring necessary supporting services.

It should also be noted that Mr. Ernest J. Colantonio, Counselor for Administration, and his staff, were most efficient in carrying out necessary planning and administration incident to our visit.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD at the conclusions of my remarks the text of the speeches that were made by U.S. delegates during the plenary sessions and the resolutions that were approved at the final session of the 55th Interparliamentary Conference.

COOPERATION BETWEEN REGIONAL AND ECONOMIC SYSTEMS

(Address by EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, U.S. Delegate)

I am privileged to speak today on the subject of cooperation between regional economic groups and systems.

One of the great lessons we can learn from the rapidly developing technological age in which we live is that mankind remains interdependent. Man still controls his destiny.

Supersonic aircraft are ready to spring from the drawing board—to further shorten the time of travel. Communication, weather and navigation satellites compel us to set up cooperative systems—to the almost instantaneous advantage of us all. But science, having allowed us the opportunity to use these forces for the benefit of us all—has also placed in the hands of man the ability to destroy himself. The nuclear sword of Damocles hovers dangerously above us. Therefore instability which induces dissatisfactions (for whatever reasons), among the masses of humanity as they struggle for a better economic and social life does breed tension, unrest, rivalry—all ingredients of conflict. Yet to overcome these problems—so that people may achieve their aspirations—is such a gigantic task that no one nation can meet the challenge successfully alone. International cooperation, then, becomes both a necessity and a virtue.

The United States, as a result of its experience, welcomes efforts by various regional groups to meet common needs by common effort. We vigorously participate, as a result, in a number of regional groupings—economic, political, and military. In many instances the various objectives of these efforts overlap. NATO, for example, is not only a military alliance committed to a common defense but is also a political association within which its members discuss, as an example, ways and means to improve relations with members of the Warsaw Pact. Building bridges from west to east has become, then, an important and immediate objective of what started off to be a defensive military organization.

We only have to look at the European Common Market—or to the European Coal and Steel Community—to note successful efforts in meeting common economic problems. The United States applauds this even though it recognizes that the economic production of this combination can equal its own. We welcome and support such movements because we sincerely believe that healthy economies in all places throughout the world do contribute to universal well-being and to the common good. In our own hemisphere we are committed in a most intimate way to the Organization of American States. Here—recognizing that we have been endowed by nature more generously than most of the Americas—we have embarked on economic programs that will cost us billions of dollars. I do not say this with a spirit of self-satisfaction or pridefully. For we know that for all we do—it is by itself not enough, that there is more to be done, and that others must help. After all—our resources are great—but they are not boundless. And—there are many demands on them.

One such comes from our obligation under the SEATO treaty. We have already had enough talk here about one aspect of that. But we are also committed to a vast development in the Mekong—from which vast benefits will come to many countries in that area—and to the work of the Economic Commission for the Far East operating under the Economic and Social Committee of the U.N. This is work we would like to see develop in a peaceful atmosphere where man's efforts are turned to constructive work—for which there is so much need.

In some instances we are not full members of organizations—and still are anxious to see them succeed. One such is the Organization of African Unity. Here, interested in developing better roads, communications, and productive facilities, we have sent a team of top economists and fiscal experts to give a hand. A preliminary report gives great hope for the future.

All these efforts are underscored by one outstanding declaration. The state exists to serve man—not man to serve the state; and all efforts of governments should be directed toward the elevation of the dignity of man. We welcome, support, and encourage the further development of regional systems because they further that purpose. Perhaps nothing sums up all our feelings about these objectives better than a quotation of Hafiz—from the neighboring city of Shiraz—when he said:

"Oh cupbearer, fill the goblet and hand it around to us all."

A PARLIAMENTARY APPROACH TO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

(Address by JAMES C. WRIGHT, JR., U.S. Delegate)

An American speaking to such a group as this upon a function of our Congress must first acknowledge the irrepayable debt we owe to older cultures in the formulation of our system. Our structure of representative self-government—a Democracy within a Republic—springs from roots that stretch back through the centuries to the ancient forum of Athens, to the beleaguered fields of Runnymede, to the hope and chaos of the French Revolution, contemporary with our own; and the taproot itself derives its succor from the great religious prophets of the Middle Eastern land whose immortal precepts echo along time's endless corridors as a recurrent central theme in the great unfinished symphony that is America.

"Unfinished" because we still have much to learn. And much of what we know we've learned from lands you represent. Distillate of the centuries, melting pot of blending ethnic strains, we have gathered diverse and divergent strands of thread, woven them together into a single fabric, and from it fashioned a cloak of parliamentary government and economic practice that fits our needs.

Having received so much from the rest of you, it is natural I suppose that we would want to share something of ourselves with you—not merely our material wealth but that which is to us more precious.

It gratifies us that so many of the nations now reaching out for self-realization have embraced so warmly and accepted so hospitably our most treasured offering—the young men and women of our Peace Corps, in whose magnificent idealism our pride may perhaps be understood and forgiven.

It pleases us that some of your lands have found patterns for parliamentary productivity in the array of legislative reforms with which a creative Congress met the cruel crisis of economic depression beginning a generation ago and which have assisted our free economy to achieve a level of prosperity unprecedented in history.

But if America had nothing better to offer for your consideration today than fatuous self-congratulation—or bitter recriminations against others—then we already would have lost our message, and our mission, and our future.

So, let us be constructive, as together we strain against the bonds of suspicion and hostility in search of some common denominator of reason that will make sense to us all.

We are not so arrogant as to assume that our particular system of governmental checks and balances with its precise separation of powers forms the only acceptable road to national economic betterment.

But we *are* committed to the conviction that men *can* achieve their legitimate economic objectives without the surrender of their political liberties. And this is the test of the 20th Century.

If our American experience has value to underdeveloped nations, it is because we, too—only a few generations ago—were a struggling Republic with all the problems that beset the newborn. Our progenitors exalted education, respected religion, and dignified the individual. Unsophisticated though it may sound, most of us believe that economic development flowed largely as a consequence.

And, being impatient people ourselves, we understand your impatience with the slow and frustrating processes of evolutionary change. We share your impetuous desire to compress the time of development, in a race with the onrushing tides of technology, so that educational and economic opportunity may be real possibility, not for some unnamed distant generation, but for the children already born in our lands.

Today, speaking on behalf of the U.S. Delegation, I shall make a concrete proposal to hasten the realization of this goal.

With the world's population growing by geometric progression, adding in 30 years as many people as it took mankind 3,000 years to produce, the inescapable goal of us all must be not only to stabilize—but to expand the economic structure. The United States alone must produce 3 million additional jobs in the private economy each year in order merely to stand still.

When Congress passed the Full Employment Act of 1946, we had about 48 million of our people at work. Somebody suggested the future possibility of 60 million jobs, and the cynics scoffed in derision. At the moment, there are 74 million Americans gainfully employed.

And this is not enough that we can rest. Ours is the duty to demonstrate that the American experiment is not a flower that has begun to dae in the autumn of its existence, but a young and virile plant capable of producing buds of an even brighter color for each succeeding springtime.

Nor have we any illusion that we can settle the world's problems all alone. The ocean that Columbus crossed in 70 days now is spanned by spaceships in approximately 10 minutes. A fantastic compression of time has shrunk the planet Earth and made of the world a neighborhood which cannot forever endure half rich and half impoverished, or, in Lincoln's words, half slave and half free.

America has no desire to be the envy of the world. It will satisfy us fully if in some degree we may be found an inspiration to the world.

Victorious in two world wars, we have taken no territory, coveted no colony, sought no self-aggrandizement.

Through congressionally-sanctioned assistance of more than $100 billion for development in lands less fortunate, we have tried to express our faith in the future of free man. We ask no thanks for this. We ask only your respect and your assumption of the decency of our motives.

The hand of helpfulness went out even to the fallen foe. We have cast our bread upon the waters of local non-violent self-determination and it has come back to us thrice blessed.

At war's end, 21 years ago, our annual gross national product was something less than $200 billion. Today it strains toward the figure of $700 billion.

There are those who say that our rapid rate of growth is based upon a military economy. To some degree it is. But we carry the sword only that we may carry the torch, to be a lamp unto the feet of those who desire development and believe in freedom.

We say to our Russian friends with whom we labor to learn a measure of mutual understanding—to our kinsmen in Europe—to the descendants of our spiritual forebears here in the Orient——

Help us to remove the causes for fear; help us to remove the threats to peace; help us to achieve a coordinated deceleration of war and a united deemphasis upon armaments, and there will be riches untold to channel into constructive economic development.

For in this year alone the nations of the world will spend a quarter of a trillion dollars upon the unproductive implements of terror; while in your land and ours there are wants unsatisfied, dreams unrealized, hopes unfulfilled. There are schools to be built, hospitals, highways and dams. Rivers there are to be harnessed, parched and thirsty lands to be watered that their unremitting soil may yield produce for the growing populations of the world.

To our fellow delegates from the Soviet Union, we offer this friendly invitation:

Help bring your friends from Hanoi to the Conference table so that the guns may stop, and then join us in a mutual attack upon poverty, illiteracy and disease in all the underdeveloped world.

If you would know in advance what form a settlement would take, we will listen to any reasonable suggestion, but here is one you might consider:

Let us permit the people of Vietnam to determine their own destiny—by ballots and not by bullets—by reason and not by riot—through truly free elections supervised not by us and not by you, but by the United Nations.

We will abide by their results. Will you? Will Hanoi? Carry this message to your Supreme Soviet, and ask them to carry it to their friends in North Vietnam.

And to our fellow parliamentarians not only of Russia but of all the developed countries, we extend this invitation: When the immediate thorns of conflict have been thus removed, let us join together in an unprecedented program for the future of humanity. Let each of us reduce the amount he is currently spending on armaments by a common fixed percentage. Let us contribute these amounts jointly to a common fund, to be administered by the United Nations, or by this Inter-Parliamentary Union, to feed the hungry and clothe the naked, educate the illiterate and build the bases of peaceful pursuit in the underdeveloped nations of this war-weary world.

If any man doubts the sincerity of this offer, or questions whether the Government of the United States would embrace it—all you have to do is try us.

Before you decline it, consider the alternatives. And let us consider together the prayer of Aristophanes spoken among the ruins of the Greek Temples devastated by the Pelloponesian wars:

"From the murmur and subtlety of suspicion with which we vex one another, give us rest; make a new beginning, mingle again among the nations with the alchemy of love; and with some finer essence of forbearance temper our minds."

We can make a new beginning. And together we yet may see the dawn of that day promised by the ancient prophet when:

"Men shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation; and neither shall they learn war anymore".

Methods of Strengthening Regional Security in Conformity With the United Nations Charter

(Speech by Senator Hugh Scott, U.S. Delegate)

Regional security and world security are interwoven threads in the fabric of international peace. A geographic region strengthens the prospects for world peace if the relationships among states in that area are friendly and cooperative, and if it has effective machinery to settle any local disputes which do arise by peaceful means. In contrast, a region jeopardizes world peace if hostile relations persist among the nations in the area or the countries lack either the will or the machinery to solve their disputes without resort to force.

Similarly, the security of every geographic region is enhanced or diminished according to the level of world-wide international tension. No region can be secure when there is a threat of world war. Thus our search for methods to strengthen regional security leads to the consideration of both regional and world-wide measures. The prospects of peace will be greater when we view regional and world efforts as complementary, each contributing to the other. I am sure all of us would agree with the words of United Nations Secretary-General U Thant, "The work of regional organizations and the United Nations should be concerted, not competitive." For that reason it is important, as our topic suggests, that all of the measures be in conformity with the United Nations Charter.

The resolution which has been submitted by the Committee on Political Questions, International Security, and Disarmament on this question wisely recognizes that the attainment of peace and security requires action at the national, regional, and world-wide level. It also recognizes that this action must be in many different areas, including economics, science, and culture, as well as in the political and military spheres.

The United States has long held that the development of regional organizations is one of the most direct paths to regional security. In the past the emphasis of regional organizations has frequently been on organizing for collective security. In the future one of the main avenues which regional organizations might profitably explore concerns the pacific settlement of disputes. If regional organizations would strengthen their capability to help in the settlement of local political problems, these problems might be prevented from growing into military crises threatening the whole world. Such action would be wholly in conformity with the United Nations Charter, which encourages nations to use regional machinery for the pacific settlement of local disputes before referring them to the Security Council.

Another area in which regions can make a contribution to peace is through local arms control arrangements. The resolution before us specifically recommends the establishment of zones free of nuclear and missile weapons where the countries of that particular area so desire. It is our belief that the establishment of nuclear free zones can be beneficial when the initiative comes from within the area and when such zones hold the promise of being effective because they include the participation of all necessary states and appropriate verification measures. Accordingly we have welcomed the progress toward such zones in both Africa and Latin America. However, we have been cautious toward proposals where nuclear weapons play a significant role in the security systems of the area, as in Central Europe, for then the establishment of nuclear-free zones might result in a dangerous imbalance.

In our view, a regional approach might also be helpful in curbing conventional arms races which consume too large a proportion of the resources in many of the less developed lands. I would like to read the seventh point in the arms control program which President Johnson sent to the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Committee on January 27, 1966. He wrote:

> Seventh, as we focus on nuclear arms, let us not forget that resources are being devoted to non-nuclear arms races all around the world. These resources might better be spent on feeding the hungry, healing the sick and teaching the uneducated . . . We suggest therefore that countries, on a regional basis, explore ways to limit competition among themselves for costly weapons often sought for reasons of illusory prestige. The initiative for arrangements of this kind should, of course, come from the regions concerned. The interested countries should undertake not to acquire from any source, including production of their own as well as importation from others, military equipment which they proscribe. If such arrangements can be worked out and assurance can be given that they will be observed, the United States stands ready to respect them.

Finally, our delegation is happy to have included in the resolution the appeal for an agreement on the non-dissemination of nuclear weapons. Few events could endanger regional security more than the spread of nuclear weapons to states which do not already possess them. Where regional security problems already exist, tensions would skyrocket if one of the nations in the area suddenly had nuclear weapons at its disposal. On the other hand, if both nuclear and non-nuclear nations would join in a non-proliferation agreement, we would take another great stride toward halting and reversing the upward arms spiral.

If we can succeed in taking measures such as these to strengthen regional security, we will find we have also strengthened the security of our own nations and the prospects for peace throughout the whole world.

Remarks of Senator Hiram L. Fong, From the State of Hawaii, Delegate From the U.S. Group to the Interparliamentary Union

Mr. President and my fellow colleagues:

I am a first generation American citizen of Chinese ancestry. American citizens of Chinese ancestry comprise only about one-tenth of one percent (1/10th of 1%) of the population of the United States of America.

I am also a member of the Republican Party, which has only one-third (1/3rd) of the membership of the Congress. Ethnically and politically, I am a minority American.

Upon the granting of statehood to the Territory of Hawaii in 1959, I was elected a Senator of the United States of America from the State of Hawaii.

Two years ago, when President Johnson won four out of every five votes in my State, I was reelected United States Senator for a second term of six years.

This is my first attendance at an Interparliamentary Union Conference.

My attendance here as a delegate, as a Member of the United States Senate; as a member of a minority Party, and as an American citizen of Chinese parentage can be attributed to, or may I say, is a result of the abiding adherence by Americans regardless of race, creed or national origin, to that fundamental and natural concept of the Rule of Law—the Rule of Equity and Reason.

In my State of Hawaii, which is populated by almost every racial group of this earth, we have succeeded in living by the Rule of Law.

We believe in, and subscribe to, the Brotherhood of man and the Fatherhood of God. Our people live by these precepts in concord and in amity.

We know that the Spirit of Aloha, which is so much the Spirit of Brotherhood—of Friendship—of Good Will—toward your fellow man, and which is so much a part of our Hawaiian life and heritage, is the sure road to real and lasting peace for all mankind.

A people, so constituted and so inspired, cannot but have a deep feeling and understanding, of what is right and what is wrong in the relationships of man-to-man, people-to-people, and nation-to-nation.

It is the feeling of the people of my State, Mr. President, where there is so much of the spirit of love and good will, that the course my country has taken in the Vietnam situation is right and that this commitment to Vietnam is our comimtment to the Rule of Law.

This feeling is fortified by the overwhelming majority of Americans, be they of the majority Party, or as I am, of the minority Party. This is true despite the occasional demonstrations of a very small group of protestors.

Our commitment to freedom, which has involved resistance to Communist efforts to promote what they call "wars of liberation" in order to advance the Communist cause, has been a basic tenet of every American President of both Parties since World War II. In 1947 when Greece and Turkey were threatened by Communist guerillas, President Truman said: "The United States must support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures. We must assist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way".

President Eisenhower, whose Administration had to cope with overt Communist aggression against South Korea, said: "Americans, indeed, all free men, remember that in the final choice a soldier's pack is not so heavy a burden as a prisoner's chains".

And when President Kennedy took office, he proclaimed: "Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the sucecss of liberty".

Several Communist Delegations tell us that we are intervening in an internal struggle and that we have violated the Geneva Accord.

The facts, Mr. President, are quite the contrary. We are not deceived by Communist subterfuge to confuse the issue by labeling aggression as an indigenous revolt. The "war of national liberation", which is the Communist jargon for efforts to impose the will of the minority on the majority, depends on terror, sabotage, stealth, and subversion.

But North Vietnam, Mr. President, has done much more than that. Already by 1961 North Vietnam, in gross violation of the provisions of the Geneva Conference, had infiltrated 10,000 men into South Vietnam. In 1962, 13,000 more were sent. And by now, there are no less than 19 identified Regiments of regular North Vietnamese troops operating in South Vietnam. This, Mr. President, is aggression, pure and simple.

My government has made a commitment to help South Vietnam resist that aggression. President Johnson made this clear when he said: "Our objective is the independence of South Vietnam and its freedom from attack. We want nothing for ourselves—only that the people of South Vietnam be allowed to guide their own country in their own way". To this, I would add, that the U.S. eagerly desires to see full respect shown for the Geneva agreements and is ready to sit down in negotiations tomorrow to assure they are complied with.

Let there be no misunderstanding, Mr. President. The American Congress and the American people of both Parties overwhelmingly support the President.

We have made our commitment. We have kept it. We intend to continue to keep it. Nothing will deter us from this resolve. But while doing this, we are willing to talk, to discuss, to negotiate.

Someday, sometime, the channels of communication must open. It may come soon. It may come later. But, sooner or later, the spirit of love—of good will—of conciliation—of brotherhood—of respect for the Rule of Law will prevail. I hope and I pray that the views of this distinguished assembly dedicated as they are to peace and conciliation, will soon be heard in Hanoi and that the cooperated energies of both our peoples, marching shoulder-to-shoulder, will bring forth the promised millennium of happiness, of progress, of plenty and of peace.

The Will for Peace

(An address by the Honorable Alexander Pirnie, Member of Congress, Chairman of the U.S. Delegation to the Interparliamentary Union)

As Chairman of the American delegation to the 55th Interparliamentary Conference I have the honor to express appreciation to our Iranian hosts and all others who have made this gathering possible. As long as Parliaments continue to meet there is hope that we can meet the challenges of mankind.

The American delegation was greatly impressed by the call made in this chamber by His Imperial Majesty the Shahanshah of Iran this very morning. He urged this conference, as did our distinguished Chairman, to conduct this meeting in a climate of understanding reason and good-will. I can assure this assembly that such is the aim of the American delegation.

Some of the speakers this morning referred to an issue which weighs heavily on the hearts of all of us.

Let there be no misunderstanding. The United States is second to none in wanting peace in Viet Nam. Indeed, there is probably no parallel in recent history to the pressure for peace which my Government, with the welcome advice and assistance of many other countries and leaders, has exerted over the past year. We believe devoutly that there is no more urgent task confronting the statesmen of the world than finding a way to terminate the fighting in Viet Nam.

Our record in seeking an honorable solution speaks for itself. We have repeatedly offered to go anywhere, at any time, meet with anyone, and discuss any proposals if doing so would advance the cause of peace in Viet Nam. We have said we will engage in unconditional discussions or in negotiations on the basis of the Geneva Accords. In the some twenty-five efforts which have been made over the past three years to settle the conflict, the United States has consistently been cooperative. We have made many efforts of our own to get the problem to the conference table, both directly with Hanoi and through third parties. And we have responded affirmatively to the efforts of others, including the Afro-Asian 17-nation appeal last year and subsequent appeals by individual leaders.

The U.S. maintains literally a 24-hour-a-day watch on possibilities for peace in Viet Nam. We have not and will not fail to exploit any opening that may offer hope of leading to a solution of the problem. It was for these reasons that the United States enthusiastically supported the resolution approved by the IPU Council at Canberra on April 16 which is before this distinguished group for consideration in Tehran. It demonstrates that our attitude is consistent with the views and aspirations of this group and of most nations in the world.

The problem, however, is that it takes at least two parties to negotiate, and thus far the response of the other side to all efforts to bring peace to Viet Nam has been a harsh and unyielding negative. We cannot help but ask, what selfish reason leads North Viet Nam to persist in its refusal to talk. Is it pressure from Communist China? Is it a conviction that time is on its side, is it a hope that force will prevail, or is it a delusion that the United States is a "paper tiger"?

Hanoi's uncompromising attitude in the face of a world-wide desire for negotiations is startling. The report of our Secretary General on this point reads as follows:

"On the American side, there was a temporary suspension of the US air raids on North Vietnam at the beginning of 1966, and this coincided with a peace offensive. High officials were sent to different capitals to confirm that the United States was disposed at any time to enter into negotiations without conditions, either at Geneva or elsewhere, a position which has been reaffirmed at various times since then.

"These overtures, however, met with no response in Hanoi, where they were denounced as frauds. . . .

"In its refusal to enter into negotiations, the Hanoi Government is fully supported by Peking, which encourages North Vietnam in its resistance."

In this connection I am reminded of the old proverb "You can't clap with one hand."

North Viet Nam has persistently refused to engage in unconditional talks and has established pre-conditions for negotiations which in effect would mean turning the country over to Communist rule. The United States is absolutely confident that this is not the fate which the people of South Viet Nam seek for themselves. The recent elections there offer the best proof. Despite an intensive nation-wide Viet Cong campaign of propaganda and terror to keep the people from the polls, some eighty percent of the registered voters, or more than four million people, cast ballots for the parties of their choice. This repudiation of the Viet Cong came as no surprise because nearly a million Vietnamese had already voted with their feet by fleeing from Communist oppression in the North to South Viet Nam.

How long Hanoi will go on in seeking to impose rule by a small minority on the clear will of the majority remains to be seen. But let me say emphatically today—that as long as that happens, the United States will be there helping the gallant people of South Viet Nam to protect their right of self-determination.

If World War II taught us anything, it was this: aggression appeased is appression unleashed. We learned from the terrible tragedy of Munich that we must not, cannot, and will not permit a small nation struggling for its freedom to fall into the arms of a more powerful and aggressive neighbor.

We have given our solemn word to stay in Viet Nam until aggression ceases. And we will keep it. Those who interpret the right of free speech and dissent in my own country as a sign that America will abandon its pledge do not know my country well.

Let there be no mistake about it. Aggression is being waged against the Republic of Viet Nam. According to our best evidence, there are now no fewer than nineteen regiments of North Vietnamese regular Army troops in South Viet Nam. We as parliamentarians should be particularly mindful of what our colleagues who are closest to Viet Nam have to say about the problem. At its session in Seoul earlier this month the Asian Parliamentary Union agreed that

"External aggression by Communist forces seriously endangers the freedom and independence of the Vietnamese people and peace in the entire region. The Assembly commended the historic and timely decision of the Republic of Korea, Australia, Philippines, Thailand and other Asian Pacific countries to dispatch troops or to extend various types of assistance to the Republic of Viet Nam, and noted that to defeat aggression, aid to Viet Nam must be continued."

These, then, are the facts of the situation and the views of many of the free nations of Asia. This morning the delegate of the Soviet Union has again accused falsely the United States of committing aggression in Viet Nam.

I cannot let this distorted version of history go unchallenged. We seek no gains for ourselves in Viet Nam; no territory, no bases, no alliances. Nor do we seek the destruction of North Viet Nam or its government. Each and every one of our military operations in Viet Nam has been taken merely in response to steadily intensified military operations from the North and is designed for one purpose only: to halt the aggression. When that aggression stops, United States forces will gladly return home and American military bases there will be dismantled. We are prepared to sit down tomorrow to negotiate the terms of American withdrawal if the other side is prepared in good faith to abandon its efforts to subvert South Viet Nam.

Instead of circulating propaganda documents and indulging in harsh statement, the Soviet Union should contribute to ending the tragic conflict in Southeast Asia. It can do so by exercising its responsibility as Co-Chairman of the Geneva Conference to convene an international conference on Vietnam which it has failed to do. It can do so by joining in efforts to bring peace through United Nations action, which it has so far rejected. And, quite fundamentally it can do so by prevailing on its friends at Hanoi to leave their neighbors alone. We have a saying in the United States that it is not words but deeds that count. So I ask the Soviet representative, when his country will stop complaining and begin to take the steps within its power to bring peace about. It should join with the rest of our members in supporting the resolution adopted by the IPU Council at the Canberra session which calls for immediate discussion.

Limitations of time, Mr. President, make it impossible to do full justice to a problem of this gravity. I would conclude by re-emphasizing that we can have peace in Vietnam tomorrow if Hanoi really wants it.

The United States wants peace with honor in Viet Nam with all its heart. We will not grow weary in the search for a just settlement; but neither will we relent in our determination to do what is necessary to protect South Viet Nam and to help maintain stability in Asia until those bent on conquest abandon their aggression.

TEXT OF U.S. SENATOR YARBOROUGH'S REMARKS AT IPU CONFERENCE

TEHERAN, IRAN, September 7.—The following is the text of the remarks given by U.S. Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH of Texas at the opening session of the 55th conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union:

Mr. Chairman and members of this 55th Inter-Parliamentary Union Conference I join those of you who have spoken in paying tribute to the efficiency of our Secretariat and also to the generosity of this great country which has two and a half (millenia) of civilization. We in my country owe so much to your civilization through its transmission to us through Asia Minor, Greece, Rome and then Western Europe to America's shores.

I had thought in the few minutes left of our time for the United States, to speak mainly on the status of the NATO Treaty and the NATO Alliance, what it has done to maintain peace in this 21 years of time that has elapsed since World War II, a greater span of time than that which elapsed between World War I and World War II.

But after listening to these speeches of this afternoon, some of which I consider utterly irresponsible attacks upon my country, I intend to answer those now.

I would say here to the representative of France that in my own country, in the hard political battles out "on the stump" as we call it—where speakers speak against each other they sometimes resort to rather irresponsible statements against each other. But in the delegates to this Inter-Parliamentary Union from my country we have representatives of both parties and we come here as responsible representatives of our Congress to exercise restraint in a responsible way. We have delegates here who vote 80 percent of the time differently from the way I vote. But there's one thing that we all agree on and that is the wish for peace in this world and an end to aggression, and we all seek that though we are of opposite parties and vote opposite of each other some 80 percent of the time.

We're united in the belief that we do not want another world war. We're united in the belief that we're trying to pursue ways to avoid it. The way to avoid world war is not easy. I would say to the delegate from France that World War I and World War II did not arise from any acts from my country. They arose in Europe between European countries and despite our dislike of war and our lack of wish to get in those wars, events pulled us into both of them, on this side of the great republic that he represents, a nation that is dear in our history because France helped us in our own war for independence. And we are regretful of hearing these words we think are not indicative of the true situation, not indicative of a course of events that would lead to peace in this world.

Who has the biggest stake in this argument going on here today? The small nations of the world who are not able financially, militarilly and economically to defend themselves against aggression from a great power. Next to that who has a stake? Everyone of us who believe in this Inter-Parliamentary Union because parliaments are the representatives of the people, the elected reprepresentatives of the people, and if the people can't elect their representatives, our Inter-Parliamentary Union would cease to exist.

Suppose in response to some demand here, America withdrew every soldier, every person among its military personnel from South Vietnam within 30 days? How many months do you think it would be before the aggressors in South Vietnam had overrun South Vietnam from the north, then Laos, Cambodia, and Thailand and then later Malaysia and Burma. They'd all fall because of the aggression coming from the north, and we all know that that aggression even tackled India with its nearly five-hundred million population. No small nation would survive in Southeast Asia if we withdrew. They could not then elect representative parliaments.

And look at the present. Why, our friends here from Ceylon condemned us for having forces in Southeast Asia. He didn't mention the forty-five thousand from Korea. He didn't mention those from the Philippines. I ask him, is it alright for Asians to commit aggression against Asians? And all wrong for people who are not Asian to come on call to the defense of a small country that is Asian, just because the aggression is Asian? Or is aggression wrong wherever perpetuated by whatever people against whatever people? We go on the thesis that aggression of a great nation against a small one, or for that matter, any aggression against any nation, is wrong. We point back, my colleagues, to 1931 when there was aggression in Manchuria and in Manchuria there was a call for aid and none came. Then in 1936 when there was aggression by a dictator in Italy, not by the will of the good Italian people, but a dictator sent those armies into Ethiopia. And the noble emperor of Ethiopia, Haile Selasie, made a plea to the League of Nations that will ring down through the corridors of time; that was one of the most eloquent pleas ever made by a small nation for aid to stop the gross attacks from a great nation. It went unheeded, and the League of Nations died because it did an unjust thing when it did not come to Ethiopia's aid.

I say this small nation called us for aid. We had previously been attacked in Korea; we had experience there. We had been through a long, costly and bloody conflict in Korea that the American people didn't want. The American people don't want this conflict. It's costing us in money, three billion dollars a month. And I tell you sitting in the Congress of the United States I see projects in my state pulled down every month—because of this war—a new dam we want, a new public building, a new hospital or some needed public improvement. We have to give it up. We feel that impact in county after county of my state. We feel it everywhere. This aggression is something we don't want. The expense is something we don't want. Particularly the expense in blood of our men, our flesh and blood that we are losing there. We say "stop this aggression."

Over and over we say we will sit down and talk and the answer from the other side: "you are hyprocrites, we won't talk with you." That, my fellow delegates, is net the road to peace. And I ask those who condemn us to join us on the road to peace. Let us sit down and talk. What harm can be done? We know as parliamentarians we make no progress toward settling difficulties unless we sit down and talk about them. We've had appeals here today that, as parliamentarians, we compromise our differences. When parliamentarians are elected they learn to work things out peacefully; that is the function of parliaments. You talk and you try to come to an agreement on things. You have to compromise on some points you want. But there is one point that the small nation cannot give up without losing its own hope for the future, and that's the point that there must not be any aggression by any great power against these little nations in the world, simply because some big nation has the force either through open attack or through infiltration, either through an overt, massive attack over the border of a country as in the Korean case of subversion through or by circuitous routes through Laos with small forces coming in, as in the case of South Vietnam. They have developed a new kind of aggression and they say that since it is hidden and comes at night over secret trails it isn't aggression. I tell you when you slip forces into a country at night over secret trails under a jungle cover, that's aggression as much as if you push an army over the boundaries physically out in the open as was done in the case of Korea.

In closing, my fellow conferees, we know that man's knowledge has unlocked the forces of nature. Man has unlocked the forces of nature that have placed in his hands the power of his own self destruction. The holding of these powers in check is dependent upon the renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy. And it can be prevented only by the self-discipline of everyone, everyone in government, every nation. It is going to take great self-discipline to cause nations to withhold this instrument of destruction, not unleash it. If we want to stop the proliferation of nuclear weapons, we can't do it by this proliferation of verbal weapons of constant abuse of one nation against another. There must be self-restraint in words as well as self-restraint in dropping of destructive weapons. Self-restraint and responsibility build roads to peace. We parliamentarians should help build them, not destroy these methods of peace. I thank you.

Means of Strengthening Existing Relations With the Unwed Nations: Decision Adopted by the Inter-Parliamentary Council on September 26, 1966, at Its 99th Session

The Inter-Parliamentary Council,

Considering that, as the only existing voice of world parliamentary opinion, the Inter-Parliamentary Union can and should make a more significant contribution towards the work of the United Nations Organization,

1. Is convinced that, to this effect, a renewed effort should be made to develop existing links;

2. Feels that the potentialities for close collaboration with the Economic and Social Council offered under the consultative status (Category A) accorded to the Union could be better exploited;

3. Attaches great importance to the promising results of the special co-operative arrangements recently developed between IPU and Unesco in the mutual interest of both Organizations;

4. Invites the President and the Secretary General of the Inter-Parliamentary Union to initiate discussions with the Secretary General of the United Nations at the earliest appropriate time regarding the possibility of developing new forms of co-operation, such as, for instance:

(a) a yearly debate on major UN problems at Inter-Parliamentary Conferences, on the basis of a statement presented by the Secretary General of the UN or on his behalf;

(b) the presentation to the UN General Assembly, by the President of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, of the views of the world parliamentary community on questions pertaining to it under its Charter;

(c) the consultation of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, by one or the other UN organ, on matters falling within the former's specialized competence, particularly as regards the establishment, organization and functioning of parliamentary institutions;

5. Requests that the President report at an early forthcoming session on the action taken in implementation of this decision.

Relations and Cooperation Between Existing Regional Economic Groups and Systems: Resolution Adopted by the 55th Inter-Parliamentary Conference on October 4, 1966

The 55th Inter-Parliamentary Conference,

Considering that the strengthening of international economic relations including trade relations, contributes not only to economic and social progress in the world, but also to the consolidation of world peace,

Aware of the need to undertake urgent and effective measures to accelerate the progress of developing countries, and thus to promote world economy as a whole,

Recognizing the historical significance of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development for the elaboration and implementation of a new, dynamic international trade and development policy,

Convinced that implementation of the recommendations made by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development is of exceptional importance for the solution of international economic problems and world trade in particular, as well as for the intensification of economic relations and the expansion of trade among countries with differing socio-economic systems,

Recognizing that the existence of regional economic groups, properly applied, can contribute towards a better understanding of social problems and result in a general solution,

Convinced that differences between systems must not hinder the quest for a solution to mankind's common problems—the ultimate objective of all endeavours,

1. Calls upon all Parliaments to support the work of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and to take all appropriate measures to implement the policies and activities which it recommends;

2. Invites all Parliaments to give full assistance to the preparations for the convening of the Second Conference of the United Nations on Trade and Development in 1967 and thereby to contribute towards its success.

Methods of Strengthening Regional Security in Conformity With the United Nations Charter: Resolution Adopted by the 55th Inter-Parliamentary Conference on October 4, 1966

The 55th Inter-Parliamentary Conference,

Aware of the provision in the United Nations Charter whereby all members confirmed their decision to live together in peace with one another as good neighbours and to develop friendly relations among themselves,

Convinced that a strengthening of regional security and improved relations among the nations of various regions would favourably influence international relations and contribute towards the creation of an atmosphere conducive to safeguarding international peace and security,

Expressing its support of strengthening regional security by encouraging the States of the various regions to conclude agreements with a view to reducing world tension and the arms race,

Affirming that the observance of the principles of peaceful coexistence among nations and the development of co-operation in economy, science, culture and many other spheres of social life help to strengthen regional security,

1. Urges Governments to observe strictly in all countries the most important principles of international relationships—respect for the sovereignty of States and nations, non-interference in internal policy and acknowledgment of the sovereign right of nations to settle their own affairs—and to contribute in every way towards the application of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty, adopted at the XXth session of the UN General Assembly;

2. Recommends that all Governments and Parliaments give every support to:

(a) the conclusion of multilateral and bilateral nonaggression, peace and friendship pacts,

(b) the establishment of zones free of nuclear weapons in different parts of the world, when the countries of a particular area so desire;

3. Appeals most urgently to all Governments to conclude agreements on a complete test-ban and on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons so as to ensure that there be no increase in the number of States or associations of States having control of nuclear weapons in accordance with UN General Assembly Resolution 2028(XX) of November 19, 1965;

4. Recommends that all countries develop mutual relations of good-neighbourliness through economic, commercial, cultural and other exchanges thus contributing towards an atmosphere of trust among nations;

5. Requests all countries to take such measures as would lead to collective security;

6. Appeals to all countries to solve their conflicts by peaceful means alone and in accordance with the United Nations Charter.

Latvian Independence Day (November 18)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Latvians constitute one of the smallest nationality groups in Europe. Today there are less than 2 million of them in the Latvian Socialist Soviet Republic. These stouthearted people have never been powerful enough to defend their freedom against ruthless invaders of their homeland in the Baltic. Most of their modern history has followed an uneven course, and during much of the time they have been subjected to alien regimes in their homeland. Since the late 18th century Latvia had been part of czarist Russia. And when that defunct regime was overthrown in 1917, the Latvians asserted their long-hoped-for freedom and proclaimed their national independence on November 18 of 1918.

From that memorable day on, Latvians enjoyed freedom and independence for about two decades, before they were brought under the detested Soviet rule. During the interwar years they worked ceaselessly and diligently in making their homeland a safe haven for themselves. They rebuilt their war-ravaged country, reconstituted their democratic institutions and lived happily under their own elected government. Unfortunately this relatively short and happy interlude did not last long. The rise of aggressive dictatorship in Germany in the mid-1930's, and the evil designs of Stalin on Latvia, threatened Latvian independence. Early in the last war Stalin carried out his plan. The Red army overran and occupied Latvia in mid-1940; then it was annexed to the Soviet Union as one of its constituent republics. Thus Latvia's independence came to an end, and then began the unhappy period in the contemporary history of the Latvian people.

Since the end of the last war the Kremlin has tightened its firm hold over Latvia, thus making it a province of the Soviet Union. The people suffered heavily under the Stalin-instituted regime. Fortunately, however, since the death of Stalin in 1953, there has been gradual relaxation, and today the people experience a limited degree of freedom in certain spheres. But they still yearn for full freedom, and pray for the arrival of the day of their deliverance from the Communist totalitarian regime. On this anniversary our thoughts and wishes are with the Latvian people. We hope that they will attain their independence and live in peace in their homeland.

For All Desiring College Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this Congress has been truly an "education conscious Congress" for both the American people and our schools. In the years to come, teachers, students, and the Nation as a whole will reap the harvest of this legislation we passed during the 89th Congress.

We have enacted more than two dozen new education measures. This represents the greatest legislative commitment ever made by our Government to improve education and to help all phases of the varied educational system in this country.

As we prepare to adjourn, I would like to comment briefly on these programs for the parents and high school students in my State of Washington.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 provided badly needed assistance for the less fortunate children in our country's public and private schools. It also provided library resources, textbooks, and new programs which our schools find hard to start without the stimulus of the proper Federal support.

The Higher Education Act of 1965 expanded the higher education facilities program which will help build additional libraries, laboratories, and classrooms. The cold war GI bill will help our veterans finance their further education after giving their service to this country.

Mr. President, the particular field which holds special interest for me is the financial aid programs for students planning to attend college. In the past year, I have received considerable mail reflecting this concern. I believe more students would go to college if they knew of the wide range of programs now available to them.

The Higher Education Act of 1965 expanded and modified the existing and highly successful student loan program authorized by the original act of 1958. The National Defense Education Act's loans were supplemented by an expanded work-study program, by the educational opportunity grants for financially needy students and by the new guaranteed loan programs.

New close analysis of these programs indicates that even they are not adequate to cover college costs—still the second largest item in the budget of a normal family with one child in college. These programs, however, constitute a sound beginning to help solve the crisis of the college cost which confronts the parents, students, and the schools of this country.

For this reason, Mr. President, I have had my staff prepare a booklet describing the various types of financial aid and loans available to the young men and women of Washington State. At this point, I would like to insert in the RECORD pertinent parts of this booklet, which is now being mailed to high school students expecting to graduate this coming June from schools in the State of Washington.

There being no objection, the pertinent parts of the book were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Office of Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON]

A STUDENT'S GUIDE TO COLLEGE FINANCING, PLANNING FOR COLLEGE, SCHOLARSHIPS, OTHER OPPORTUNITIES

"Neither piety, virtue, nor liberty can long flourish in a community where education of youth is neglected."—COOPER.

DEAR STUDENT: During your high school days, most of you have asked yourself: "Can I afford to go to college?"

This is a common question among youth of high-school age and many parents ask me: "How can we afford to send our son or daughter to college?"

This booklet is both for you and your parents.

The costs of college are rising along with operating expenses of schools in this country. They have doubled in the past decade.

More students wish to continue their education beyond high school and many new colleges have been established.

But the financing of a college education is still the second largest item in a family's budget.

To meet these costs, there are many new opportunities and programs, both public and private.

We all realize that we must increase our investment in the young men and women of this country; therefore, I support these programs.

This booklet should help you plan more efficiently if you choose to continue your education beyond high school.

I have found, in my many conversations with parents and college students, that the high school student, with his creative imagination and individual initiative, can do much to develop his own financing for education beyond high school.

My office will be glad to assist you if there are any questions you or your parents may have.

Whatever the decision, as to your future plans, I wish you the best of success.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
U.S. Senator.

PLANNING FOR COLLEGE . . . IT'S UP TO YOU!

The senior year of high school is your year of decision. Both students and parents have many questions on college and other career opportunities for both school and work.

How much does college really cost? What about combining higher education with a military career? How can I become an apprentice in a trade, or learn a useful vocation? This guide will answer some of these questions for you while providing a listing of the major opportunities available to high school students like yourself.

The second largest expense in the average family's budget is sending a son or daughter to college. Only a home costs more. In Washington State a wide variety of educational opportunities are open to help defray these costs. More students like yourself would attend college if they knew of the many ways to finance a college education. These include, both public and private, financial aid programs. This guide is designed to help you choose ways to pay for college. It will explain the programs of borrowing for a college education. It will deal with scholarships and grant opportunities. It will list employment and other opportunities, which might include military service or work while attending college part or full-time.

Inquiries from parents, students and educators over the years have indicated a natural concern over rising college costs. Recently, new programs have been enacted by Congress to provide financial assistance to qualified high school graduates. These include additional scholarships and fellowships, low-interest insured loans, work-study programs and improvements in the National Defense Student Loan program for our nation's students.

This booklet tries to present the facts on various ways to finance a college education. If you are a prepared student with a purpose, the college door is open for you. We hope this information will help lead you through that door.

While you should remember that college costs are continually rising, you can generally estimate what it will cost you to go to college before you leave high school.

In addition, each college has a Student Financial Aid officer who knows both the costs of attending his college and all programs they have available to help you pay your way through college.

He is a most important person. If you know your choice of college, write him as soon as possible. It's wise to plan ahead, and the student financial aid officer is your best source of information. Each college and university administers its own individual student aid program in addition to those financed by government programs.

In Washington State, tuition and fees range between $140 and $1000 a year. Each college annually publishes a catalogue, which lists expenses of their school. Remember, look through this closely. With your parents' help, you may want to estimate how much you're going to need.

First, the catalogue will list costs of tuition, fees, room and board. All of these items in a college budget are easy to determine. Both you and your parents should know that the above four items generally add up to nearly one-half of the total expenses a student will spend in each academic year. This is true for both public or private colleges.

Don't forget to include miscellaneous expenses. Under this catch-all category will come such things as: books, supplies—such as paper and classroom equipment, membership fees for college clubs, clothing, laundry, travel and recreation.

The basic tuition and fee charges at public colleges and universities in Washington State, however, are far less if you are a state resident than they are for your out-of-state college classmates.

Room and board charges are typically uniform for both resident students and out-of-state students.

Fixed costs, then, include tuition, fees, room and board. But you must add on to these variable costs for books and supplies, and other living expenses.

EVALUATING YOUR NEEDS

Many students try to list their college expenses and needs without knowing the resources other than loans and scholarships. It is wise to take several steps after finding out what your total costs for college will be. First, many students, with the help of their parents, sit down and list student and family financial assets. It is wise to draw up a balance sheet similar to the following table. Don't forget to estimate expenditures and resources for the total four-year period of an under graduate college education.

Personal balance sheet

COSTS	
Tuition and fees	$--------
Room and board	--------
Books and supplies	--------
Other living expenses:	
Travel	--------
Clothing	--------
Laundry and cleaning	--------
Organizations	--------
Recreation	--------
Miscellaneous	--------
Total costs	--------
RESOURCES	
Student's own assets	--------
Student's earnings	--------
Parents' income available	--------
Parents' assets available (savings, insurance plans, investments, etc.)	--------
Other sources (specify):	
--------------------------------	--------
--------------------------------	--------
--------------------------------	--------
Total resources	--------
SUMMARY	
Total costs	--------
Minus total resources	--------
Amount of aid needed	--------

COLLEGE FINANCING

Once you have estimated college costs, start looking around at various financial aid possibilities. There are four main types of financial aid that may help you and your friends go through college.

1. Scholarship: This is an outright award usually given for superior academic performance. The award may be money or services, such as room and board.

2. Grant-in-aid: Like a scholarship, a grant-in-aid is usually given for an unusual aptitude in some special academic discipline such as science or language. Some schools call these scholarships, not requiring repayment.

3. Loan: These are funds given in advance for the payment of college expenses, and they can come from private or public sources. Low interest is usually charged and repayment is expected in a reasonable time after graduation.

4. Part-time work: Generally speaking, this will allow up to 15 hours a week of employment while enrolled in college, and full time during the summer if you have no classes.

Your high school counselor and college financial aid officers frequently will be able to help you work out a "package financial plan" which combines a variety of four programs.

For example, student aid may be any combination of the above four categories. You may want to have a "package plan" combining a scholarship, a loan and even a campus job. Some students receive a total $1,500 award from a college in the form of a $500 scholarship, a $500 loan repayable in installments after graduating and a campus job during the academic year for a $500 credit.

Let's take a further look at each of these programs.

BORROWING FOR COLLEGE

Consumer credit is a means of extending payment for a large obligation over a long period of time. If you want to borrow money to attend college, you should investigate throughly to make sure that you are obtaining the best possible terms. Today's money market has tightened some and interest costs are rising. Understand what the terms of repayment are. Your parents should be helpful in assisting you. Two main programs of borrowing exist: those offered by the government and those offered by private financial institutions. Let's look at them individually.

GOVERNMENT LOANS

The largest single source of government funds for student loans in Washington State and the rest of the country is the National Defense Education Act Student Loan Program. This program is administered by the college or university you will be attending.

Like other schools, your state's college and universities joined this program in 1959.

The Federal government provides 90 percent of the capital at the individual college. The college itself adds the remaining 10 percent. Washington State received for the 1966–67 academic year a total of $3,922,175 for the 22 colleges participating in the program.

Nationally accredited public and nonprofit technical institutes and business colleges are also in this program.

Before you can apply for an NDEA loan, you must meet the following requirements.

You must be enrolled at least half-time in college

You must maintain good academic standing

You must demonstrate financial need under criteria established by the college or university. Remember, each school sets its standards.

Under this program, you and other undergraduate students may borrow up to $1,000 each academic year. This may total, but not exceed, $5,000 (note: Graduate students may borrow up to $2,500 per year to a maximum of $10,000.)

Worried about repayment? Well, so was the Congress when they established the program. So they delayed the repayment period and interest. They begin nine months after you either finish your studies and graduate or leave school.

Repayment may be temporarily deferred to a later date if you do one of three things (1) Go back to full-time or part-time study, (2) Enter the Armed Forces or (3) Join the Peace Corps or the Domestic Peace Corps (VISTA).

An additional feature of NDEA loans is "forgiveness." This phrase simply means that you may be forgiven a portion of your loan. If you become a fulltime teacher in a public or non-profit private grade or high school or in an eligible college or university, your "forgiveness" includes, in the maximum, 50 percent of the loan, plus interest, at the rate of 10 percent for each year of teaching in eligible schools. So, if you borrow $5,000 for undergraduate study and then become a high school teacher for five years (cancelling 10 percent each year of this loan) you can cancel up to $2,500 plus interest—or half of the loan. Don't forget that your colleges or universities must approve and make the loans and is responsible for collections.

Action: Contact the Student Financial Aid Officer now at the school you plan to attend, requesting information on NDEA loans and loan application forms.

PRIVATE LOANS

Another new program of borrowing is the Guaranteed Loan Program. Its purpose is simple: to provide the means for college students to borrow money at low interest cost with the Federal government paying part of the interest for qualified students.

This program is new and, while many banks and other lending institutions in the State of Washington will know more details about the program soon, the new program will help families obtain an education for their son or daughter without straining the family budget.

In operation, students;

Apply for the loan;

The lender makes the loan directly to the student;

A State agency or private non-profit agency "guarantees" the loans—that is, protects the lender against loss in case the borrower defaults on his loan;

The Federal government pays a portion of the interest for eligible students.

The agency to administer the program for Washington State is the United Student Aid Funds, Inc., 845 Third Avenue, New York, New York 10022. The main difference between this program and the NDEA loan program is that the latter is run at the college and university level. The terms of the loan are, however, similar: undergraduates can borrow as much as $1,000 per academic year; graduate students up to $1,500. A student from a family with an adjusted income of less than $15,000 a year pays no interest while he is attending an eligible college, a business college, a technical or vocational school.

Eligible institutions also include collegiate or associate degree schools of nursing, and one-year programs of training to prepare students for employment in recognized occupations.

Repayment on these loans is deferred during the time a student continues his studies and may be deferred under various State agency programs while you serve in the Peace Corps or during military service.

Action: While the financial aid officer at the school where you are enrolled or plan to enroll should have information on this program, you can consult your family banker or other lender, or write directly to United Student Aid Funds, Inc. Also, I will be happy to send you more detailed information on this program.

LOANS TO PARENTS

Another alternative in solving college cost is funds given in the form of loans to your parents, principally through commercial banks, finance companies, savings and loan associations, and credit unions. This worthwhile program began when many bankers and other financial people saw the need for meeting college costs. Conditions vary from bank to bank and loans to parents are strictly commercial transactions, quite similar to installment credit or personal loans. Few loans are made directly to a student, and almost none to unemployed students.

The parent-borrower must be over 40 and generally under 65. Maximum loans are usually from $8,000 to $10,000 and the repayment schedule is usually longer than for ordinary installment transactions.

Your father or mother can be a good source of information on this subject.

Action: Consult with your parents. So they in turn can sit down with your family banker or officer of a similar financial institution. You also may want to see your guidance counselor.

SPECIALIZED LOANS

Several other government-sponsored programs are worth mentioning. First, if you are a young lady thinking about a nursing career, you might be interested in the Nurses Training Act of 1964, which has started a low-interest loan program up to $1,000 a year per student in all types of professional nursing schools. Terms are somewhat similar to those for NDEA loans previously mentioned with "forgiveness" feature of 10 percent for each year of fulltime employment as a professional nurse in any public or non-profit institution or agency.

Action: Contact the head of the Nursing School you might attend or write: The Surgeon General, Public Health Service, Washington, D.C.

The second program covers medical, dental, optometric and osteopathic students.

This program was made possible by the Health Professions Act of 1963. A student has three years after he finishes his studies before he must begin repayment.

Finally, local and state as well as national organizations of social, civic, fraternal associations, and labor unions frequently operate scholarship and loan programs for students living in their communities or related to their members. A number of religious groups conduct similar programs of student assistance. Don't forget to check these sources.

Action: Talk with your high school principal or guidance counselor, visit your public library and ask your parents' advice for these sources.

VOCATIONAL LOANS

Another new government loan program is designed to insure loan programs for students desiring vocational training in business, trade, technical and other vocational schools. Washington State has many fine vocational schools, and they now have more complete information available.

A student attending an approved school may borrow up to at least $1,000 each year for a period of at least two years. The provisions of this program are similar to the government guaranteed loan program.

Action: Contact the director of the vocational school you plan to attend or your state education agency—the State Department of Public Instruction in Olympia.

SCHOLARSHIPS

Education opportunity grants

This program is new. It is a program of awards administered by each college to a limited number of its undergraduate students. Students across the country who have exceptional financial need may qualify for these grants to attend college. Grants range from $200 to $800 a year. They can be no more than half the total assistance given the student by his college. The grants are not made on the basis of academic attainment, but primarily on the basis of financial need.

Action: Financial Aid Officers have more information on this program. Grants are awarded directly by the colleges.

The National Merit Scholarship program

Four-year scholarships are awarded under this national program. They may be used in any accredited college or university in the U.S. by students selected on the basis of competitive examination. A limited number of generous scholarships are awarded each year to competing Washington State students.

Action: Consult your high school principal or guidance counselor or write: National Merit Scholarship Corporation, 1580 Sherman Avenue, Evanston, Illinois.

OTHER OPPORTUNITIES

In addition to loans and scholarships, there are also programs of specialized assistance which we will briefly review here.

These programs can include such things as unemployment and special aid for young men and women whose fathers, now deceased, might have served their country in the armed forces.

Let's go through these programs.

College Work Study: This program of part-time employment for students has proven quite popular in recent years and provides federal support for student jobs to help pay college expenses. Under this work study program students may work up to 15 hours a week while attending classes full-time. They are paid for this work by the college or university which is reimbursed by the federal government for up to 90 percent of their earnings. During the summer or other vacation periods, students may work full time (40 hours per week) under this program. In general, the basic pay rate is $1.25 an hour, although up to $3.50 an hour may be paid for highly-specialized jobs. This could include work—for different students throughout the state—in a University of Puget Sound library, a laboratory on the Pullman campus of Washington State University, a dining hall at Western Washington State College in Bellingham, and maintenance work at Gonzaga University in Spokane. The work can also include off-campus jobs with public or private nonprofit organizations, including work in health, welfare and recreation programs.

Action: Contact the financial aid officer at your college.

SPECIALIZED ASSISTANCE

There are a wide variety of extra categories to cover the financial problems of potential college students. This is a partial listing of some additional opportunities you may care to explore.

ARMED FORCES ACADEMIES

A Congressman or United States Senator may nominate qualified men for appointment to Service Academies where they are able to prepare for a military career. Appointments are made to the Military Academy at West Point, New York; The Naval Academy at Annapolis, Maryland; the Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs, Colorado; the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, New York, and the Coast Guard Academy, New London, Connecticut. There are not always vacancies in all of these academies at any one time. (For the Coast Guard apply directly to Academy.)

Action: If you are interested in further information on any particular academy, write to your Congressman, or to me, Senator Warren G. Magnuson, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Remember, these appointments cover four-year scholarships with living allowances. Only students living in the State of Washington, of course, are eligible for my nomination. You may wish to consult your Congressman who represents the district in which you live.

WAR ORPHANS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT

Are you a son or daughter of a veteran who died from injury or disease or who was permanently or totally disabled during military service in World War II or the Korean Conflict? In addition, there are certain other conditions during the period of service which are covered by this program. Financial aid is given to attend colleges and universities and technical schools. You must be between the ages of 18 and 23 to be eligible.

Write requesting details to Veterans Administration Regional Office, Sixth and Lenora Building, Seattle, Washington 98121.

ARMED FORCES EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES

The Armed Forces offer education programs designed to assure our Nation a competent, trained officer corps.

1. The Army Reserve, Officers Training Corps (AROTC) will enroll male freshmen college student with a view to commissioning them as regular or reserve officers. For details write: Office of the Chief, U.S. Army Reserve and ROTC Affairs, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C.

2. Likewise the regular Navy Reserve Officers Training Corps (NROTC) enrolls male freshmen for eventual commissioning in either the Navy or Marine Corps. Also, the Navy enrolls male freshmen in the Contract Naval Reserve Officer's Training Corps (Contract NROTC) for commissioning upon graduation in the Navy or Marine Corps Reserve. Details about both regular reserve officer programs may be obtained from any Navy Recruiting Station or the Bureau of Naval Department, Washington, D.C.

3. The Air Force also maintains a Basic Air Force Reserve Officer's Training Corps (AFROTC) for entering male students. For details write: Commandant, AFROTC Headquarters, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama.

4. The Coast Guard appoints, after competitive examination, qualified young men as Coast Guard Cadets. Upon completion of a four-year course at the Academy at New London, Connecticut, a student receives a Bachelor of Science Degree and an Ensign Commission. For details write: Commandant, Coast Guard, Washington, D.C.

5. Although the United States Merchant Marine Academy is not a component of the Armed Forces, it is often referred to as the "fourth arm of defense." Merchant Marine Cadet-Midshipmen can expect to be deferred until graduation when they will become eligible for the Naval Reserve Commission. Academy graduates who are commissioned as Ensigns, USNR, are deferred from normal Selective Service actions, however, they are subject to the orders of the Reserve Component.

A person admitted as a Cadet-Midshipman to the United States Merchant Marine Academy obligates himself to serve in the Merchant Marine upon graduation for a period of at least 3 years as a licensed officer.

Upon entering, Cadet-Midshipmen select either the Nautical Science or the Marine Engineering program. Upon graduation, you receive a degree of Bachelor of Science, a license either as third officer or third assistant engineer, and may be granted a commission as Ensign, USNR, by the Department of the Navy. Candidates are selected on the basis of merit. Requirements are rigid. Nomination and entrance is largely by Congressional appointment and examination.

6. The Air Force Central Welfare Education Assistance Program provides four-year financial assistance through long-term, interest-free loans for a limited number of dependent children of Air Force members. Details from Personal Services Officer, Portland International Air Force Base, Portland, Oregon.

7. Unmarried dependent children, male and female, of certain categories of Air Force personnel, both retired and deceased, are eligible for loans and grants under the General Arnold Educational Fund. Details from the Director, Air Force Aid Society, Washington, D.C.

8. The Navy Wives Club Scholarship Foundation awards scholarships to certain children of enlisted members of the Navy, Marine Corps and Coast Guard. Details from the Wives Clubs Foundation, Bureau of Naval Personnel, Washington, D.C.

9. Army Relief Society offers aid to unmarried sons and daughters of deceased Regular Army Officers and enlisted men. Write the Society at 30 West 44th Street, New York, New York 10036.

10. Veterans Readjustment Benefits Act will provide benefits for veterans who have active military service after January 31, 1955. To be eligible for some of these benefits these veterans must have served more than 180 days and have been discharged under conditions other than dishonorable.

Veterans may enroll in courses of education in approved schools or colleges, including correspondence training. Eligible veterans receive entitlement for educational benefits at the rate of one month of entitlement for each month of active service after January 31, 1955, up to a maximum of 36 months of entitlement. While enrolled in full time training, the Veterans Administration will pay the veteran an educational allowance of $100 per month if single, $125 per month if he has one dependent and $150 per month if he has two or more dependents.

11. For more detailed information on the armed forces write me, for "A Guide to Services Responsibilities, Opportunities, and Benefits."

AID FOR HANDICAPPED

The Federal Government and the State of Washington administer a program of vocational counseling and training. For blind students, information is available from the Washington State Department of Public Instruction, Olympia, Washington.

Students with other than visual handicaps may obtain information from the Washington State Director of Vocational Rehabilitation. A booklet, Hope for the Handicapped, providing general information concerning opportunities for the handicapped, may be obtained from the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

SPECIAL COURSES

While graduate students have a wide variety of financial help open to them—made available because they are enrolled in a wide variety of special courses such as mathematics or Russian language study—under-graduates can, on occasion, qualify for special sources of financial aid.

Let's list a few examples to give you some ideas of additional sources of information. These include many government sponsored programs. A partial list follows:

Office of Education: Administers five fellowship programs. Three are on the graduate level. The first trains college teachers studying for a Ph. D. The second trains foreign language specialists. The third trains master's degree candidates preparing for elementary and secondary public school teaching. Still other smaller programs train teachers of the deaf and people who will train teachers of the mentally retarded.

Action: Consult your college catalogue, high school guidance counselor or write: Office of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., Washington, D.C.

National Institutes of Health: This government agency supports a research fellowship program based on national competition, and one in which training grants are given to colleges directly, to be awarded by them to students. Both programs are for research and training in basic biological and physical sciences, in certain social sciences, and in medical studies.

Action: Write: National Institutes of Health, 900 Rockville Pike, Bethesda, Maryland, or contact your college counselor.

OVERSEAS STUDY

The Institute of International Education, 809 United Nations Plaza, New York, New York 10017, administers a program of financial assistance and counseling for American students wishing to study abroad. Inquiries should be directed to the student financial aid officer of your college or to the Institute directly for information concerning its services.

GRADUATE STUDY

This booklet has attempted to list the major opportunities available to undergraduate students. If you are embarking on a four-year college career, it is never too early to plan a graduate program.

My office in Washington, D.C., has information on various fellowship opportunities and aids to advanced education, that is education beyond the normal four-years of college. Many programs, such as the National Defense Education Act loan program, are also designed to help graduate students. Again, your financial aid officer can be most helpful. If you have selected to pursue graduate study at the same institution where you will be doing undergraduate work, also contact the dean or director of the individual graduate school or college.

SPECIAL COURSES

If you have some special interest and plan to develop it in college, you may be eligible for specialized financial assistance.

For example, if you are a Science student you have a number of national scholarships available to you.

Here is a partial list of sources of scholarship information for science-oriented students:

Alcoa Foundation Scholarships, Aluminum Company of America, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

American Institute of Steel Construction, Inc., Committee for Education, 101 Park Avenue, New York 17, New York.

Elks National Foundation Scholarship Awards, 16 Court Street, Boston 8, Massachusetts.

Foundry Education Foundation Scholarships, Terminal Tower Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

U.S. Office of Education, Washington 25, D.C., will provide upon request "Selected Aerospace Career Scholarship Information" brochure.

Radio Corporation of America, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York 20, New York.

Procter and Gamble Scholarship Program, P.O. Box 599, Cincinnati 1, Ohio.

Hattie M. Strong Foundation Scholarships, 409 Cafritz Building, 1625 I Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

An intriguing program for the extremely bright science-minded is a program of student research assistantships, principally in biology, physics and chemistry. Undergraduates, including freshmen, are eligible. The National Science Foundation, Washington 25, D.C., will send you upon request, details about its program offering scholarships for about 5,000 students. Also at the college to which you are admitted, professors may be working on government-financed research projects and often they hire undergraduates to help out.

These mentioned, remember, are just a few of a host of student financial assistance programs operated by religious, civic, labor, trade and fraternal organizations, as well as by State and national levels of government.

INFORMATION ON FINANCES—FOR GUIDANCE COUNCELORS, AND STUDENTS AND THEIR PARENTS

Facing Facts About College Costs. A Guide for Parents and Pre-College Students. Prudential Insurance Company of America, Box No. 36, Education Department, Newark 1, New Jersey. 1962. Free.

Financial Assistance for College Students: Undergraduate Richard C. Mattingly. United States Office of Education. Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C. 1962. $1.25.

How About College Financing? A Guide for Parents of College-Bound Students. American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1605 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington 9, D.C. 1960. 30 cents.

Counselor's Manual for How About College Financing? A Manual for High School Counselors. American Personnel and Guidance Association. See address above. 1960. $1.00.

Lovejoy-Jones College Scholarship Guide. Clarence E. Lovejoy and Theodore S. Jones. Simon and Schuster, New York. 1957. $3.95, cloth; $1.95, paper.

The New American Guide To Scholarships, Fellowships and Loans. John Bradley. New American Library, N.Y. 1961. 75 cents.

Scholarships, Fellowships and Loans. S. Norman Feingold. Bellman Publishing Company, Inc., Cambridge, Massachusetts. Vol. 1, 1949; $6.00. Vol. 2, 1951; $5.00. Vol. 3, 1955; $10,00. Vol. 4, 1962; $10.00.

Student Financial Aid: Manual for Colleges and Universities. Homer D. Babbidge, Jr., American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1605 New Hampshire Ave., N.W., Washington 9, D.C. 1960. $1.50.

Need a Lift?, to Educational Opportunities, The American Legion, 14th ed. Indianapolis: The American Legion Education and Scholarship Program, Americanism Division, 1964, 100 pp. 25 cents.

Keeslar Oregon, A National Catalog of Scholarships and Other Financial Aid for Students Entering College, 2nd ed. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Company, Publishers, 1964.

Planning for College: A Complete Guide to Selection, Admissions, Financing, Margolius, Sidney, New York: Avon Books 1965. 304 pp.

Financing an Undergraduate Education, Office of Education, Washington, D.C., 21 pp.

Your College Education: How to Pay For It, Splaver, Sarah, New York: Julian Messner, 1964, 286 pp.

Complete Planning for College, Sulkin, Sidney, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1962, 268 pp.

ORGANIZATIONS PROVIDING SPECIALIZED INFORMATION

American Association of Junior Colleges 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington 6, D.C.

American College Testing Program Box 168, Iowa City, Iowa

American Council on Education 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington 6, D.C.

American Personnel and Guidance Association 1605 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington 9, D.C.

Association of American Colleges 1818 R Street, N.W., Washington 9, D.C.

Catholic College Admissions and Information Center Assumption College 500 Salisbury Street, Worcester, Massachusetts

College Admissions Assistance Center 41 East 65th Street, New York 21, New York

College Admissions Center 610 Church Street, Evanston, Illinois

College Entrance Examination Board 475 Riverside Drive, New York 25, New York

The Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges 1818 R Street, N.W., Washington 9, D.C.

National Merit Scholarship Corporation 1580 Sherman Avenue, Evanston, Illinois

GUIDES TO COLLEGE—FOR STUDENTS AND THEIR PARENTS

(NOTE.—Many, if not all of these publications, can be found in your High School or local library.)

Intercultural Affairs, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10036.

Study Abroad, UNESCO, Columbia University Press, New York, New York, $4.00.

Mapping Your Education—1966–1967 edition, a cooperative project of the High Schools and Collegiate Institutions of Oregon and Washington, Abbott, Kerns & Bell Company, 338 N.W. 9th Avenue, Portland, Oregon, $2.95.

A Handbook for College Bound Students and Their Counselors. The Association of College Admissions Counselors, 610 Church Street, Evanston, Illinois. 1961–1963. $2.00.

College Ahead! A Guide for High School Students and Their Parents. Eugene S. Wilson and Charles A. Bucher. Harcourt, Brace & Company, New York. Revised edition, 1961, $4.50.

The College Handbook: 1961–1963. College Entrance Examination Board, % Educational Testing Service, Box 592, Princeton, New Jersey; or Box 27896, Los Angeles 27, Calif. $2.50. (Describes member colleges of the College Entrance Examination Board.)

Four Big Years; The Importance of Selecting the Right College. Richard W. Smith and Howard P. Snethen. Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., Indianapolis and New York. 1960. $2.95.

How About College? A Guide for Parents of College-Bound Students. American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1605 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington 9, D.C. 1959. 25¢.

College Entrance Counselor. Louis K. Wechsler, Martin Blum and Sidney Friedman. Barnes & Noble, Inc., New York. 1961. $3.50 (paperback).

College Entrance Examinations. Louis K. Wechsler, Martin Blum and Sidney Friedman. Barnes & Noble, Inc., New York. 1961. $1.95 (paperback).

How To Get Into College. Frank H. Bowles. E. P. Dutton & Company, Inc., New York. Revised edition, 1960. $1.15 (paperback).

How To Visit Colleges. American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1605 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington 9, D.C.

Lovejoy's College Guide. Clarence E. Lovejoy. Simon and Schuster, New York. Revised edition, 1959. $2.50.

The New American Guide to Colleges. Gene R. Hawes. New American Library, New York. 1959. 75¢ (paperback).

Which College For You? Edward Hodnett. Harper and Brothers, New York. 1960. $2.95.

Comparative Guide to American Colleges, Cass, James and Birnbaum, Max. New York: Harper & Row, 1964. 556 pp.

If you are not going to college, you may be interested in an apprenticeship program that can help prepare you for a career in the skilled labor field. The Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, Department of Labor. (Regional Office at 1809 Smith Tower Building, 506 2nd Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98104) was created by the Congress to provide training opportunities for young people after they leave school. Since all apprentices are employed by the program sponsors (employer or area apprenticeship committee), interested high school graduates should contact the local employment service or a field office of the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, who will be able to refer them to employers using apprentices in the fields that interest them.

MAPPING YOUR EDUCATION IN WASHINGTON

A major source of student financial assistance is the institution of higher education itself which often makes available a variety of aid programs. For further information write to the institution of your choice now.

1. Central Washington State College, Ellensburg.
2. Eastern Washington State College, Cheney.
3. Gonzaga University, Spokane.
4. Fort Wright College of the Holy Names, Fort Wright, Spokane.
5. Pacific Lutheran University, Tacoma.
6. St. Martin's College, Olympia.
7. Highline College, 2634 S. 142nd Street, Seattle.
8. Northwest College, 11102 N. E. 53rd Street, Kirkland.
9. University of Puget Sound, Tacoma.
10. Seattle Pacific College, Seattle 99 (Camp Casey, Whidbey Island).
11. Walla Walla College, College Place.
12. Washington State University, Pullman.
13. Western Washington State College, Bellingham.
14. Walla Walla Community College, Walla Walla.
15. Whitworth College, Spokane.
16. Big Bend Community College, Moses Lake.
17. Centralia College, Centralia.
18. Clark College, Vancouver.
19. Columbia Basin College, Pasco.
20. Everett Junior College, Everett.
21. Grays Harbor College, Aberdeen.
22. Green River Community College, Auburn.
23. Seattle University, Seattle.
24. Lower Columbia College, Longview.
25. Olympic College, Bremerton.
26. Peninsula College, Port Angeles.
27. Shoreline Community College, Seattle.
28. Skagit Valley College, Mount Vernon.
29. Spokane Community College, Spokane.
30. Tacoma Community College, Tacoma.
31. Wenatchee Valley College, Wenatchee.
32. Yakima Valley College, Yakima.
33. Clover Park Community College, Lake Wood Center.
34. Whitman College, Walla Walla.
35. Edmonds Community College, Lynnwood.
36. Seattle Community College, Seattle, Wash.
37. Tacoma Catholic Junior College, Tacoma.
38. Bellevue Community College, Bellevue.
39. University of Washington, Seattle.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, perhaps James Fenimore Cooper expressed my thoughts best when he said, "Neither piety, virtue, nor liberty can long flourish in a community where education of youth is neglected."

The Fabulous 89th—The Promising 90th

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the coming holiday season signals the end of a busy, productive year for all Americans. It also heralds the start of a new year which promises to be just as busy and, we pray, even more productive; a year in which we find the secret of world peace.

This has been a year of furious activity for the Congress in seeking to fulfill the promises made to all our citizens. It has been a year of frustration, too; of higher prices, and of continuing crisis with the persistent tragedy in Vietnam overshadowing all our lives.

The 90th Congress, to convene in January, has a host of challenges to be met. As one who will be privileged to serve in that Congress, I renew my pledge to the people of the First Congressional District of Massachusetts and of the entire country to apply all of my energy and talents to the search for answers and solutions.

As we look forward to Christmas, we share in the joyous devotions of free, God-fearing people everywhere and we lift our hearts in prayer that 1967 will truly be the year of peace and prosperity, not only for America but for all the world.

Much was done in the last Congress to advance the cause of peace and to end the suffering and misery of the oppressed and underprivileged people of the world. The next Congress must do even more.

The 89th Congress will be remembered as one of the most remarkable in the first 200 years of our Republic. During its two sessions, every record was broken for legislation introduced and enacted, for votes and rollcalls taken, and for dollars spent.

New dimensions were added to the concept of Federal-State relations, especially in the fields of education and civil rights. Virtually every citizen, young or old, rich or poor, will feel the impact of the 89th Congress for generations to come.

Just a few of the highlights of what has come to be called the "fabulous" 89th include these accomplishments:

EDUCATION

Some 19 bills were passed in the field of education. Federal aid is now available in all phases of education, from preschool to postgraduate, and for both public and nonpublic schools. Some $9.6 billion was allocated for education by this Congress, almost twice as much as we spent in our entire 174-year history.

CONSERVATION

A number of landmark measures were enacted, especially in the field of water pollution, among the 20 major conservation bills passed by the 89th Congress. In line with proposals of my own, the Federal share toward the cost of community control programs has been increased and States will invest more. Coordinated programs for recreational and industrial development of waterways have also advanced, including a new study of the Connecticut River basin, a very scenic and important part of which lies in the First Congressional District of Massachusetts.

CIVIL RIGHTS

An important voting rights bill was enacted, setting up Federal safeguards against denial of constitutional suffrage guarantees. Safeguards against discrimination in hiring, recreation, and travel accommodations were also advanced.

LABOR

The Federal minimum wage was increased and a graduated scale set up for future increases. Increased benefits for social security were also approved.

HEALTH

Medicare was finally approved by the 89th Congress. In addition, some $8.2 billion was earmarked for various public health programs, health research, and medical care.

BUSINESS AND COMMERCE

The Congress enacted our State technical services program, offering a State-Federal data bank program that will be a big help to all firms. Certain SBA loans programs were also improved and augmented, and the new coinage system—approved after a long and bitter struggle in which I was able to play a leading role—has already prevented a serious coin shortage and a crisis in our silver stockpile. The Treasury estimates that without the change to nonsilver coins, our present annual coin production rate would have required 1.1 billion ounces of silver—more than six times the total free world production.

TRANSPORTATION

A new Department of Transportation was established to deal with the Nation's mushrooming traffic problems. Several important highway and traffic safety measures were enacted, covering everything from auto design standards to aid for classroom driver training.

IMMIGRATION

A sweeping revision in U.S. immigration laws was enacted, eliminating the outmoded country-of-origin quota system, with emphasis now on individual qualifications. Special provisions were also enacted to help reunite broken families. Ellis Island was made a national shrine, in line with legislation I had introduced previously, and we took official recognition of the Polish millennium.

HOW MUCH IT WILL COST

The 2d session of the 89th Congress approved expenditures of $144 billion, giving a 2-year total of about $253 billion—a peacetime record by any yardstick.

THE OUTLOOK FOR 1967

The major issue again will be the continuing problem in Vietnam and southeast Asia. We must continue the search for a swift and equitable solution, while at the same time take steps to avoid an economic recession if our defense requirements are reduced too quickly.

The 89th Congress was the Congress of social progress. The 90th Congress must be the Congress of economic progress.

I am proud to have been a Member of the 89th Congress and I am proud that my record is not the least significant in the log of that Congress. Of the almost incredible 394 total recorded yea-and-nay votes taken on legislation before the 89th Congress, I was able to respond to 368, giving me a voting attendance record of 93.4 percent. This has helped me to maintain an overall voting attendance record of 94.6 percent on the 1,046 such votes in the House of Representatives since I was a freshman in 1959.

It has been an exciting, rewarding, historic year for us in this body. The 89th Congress, in many ways, has truly been fabulous. It will be up to future generations of historians to judge the propriety and efficacy of our actions. But no historian need tell us that we labored long and mightily, or that our labors were devoted solely for the good of our people, our country, and our world.

As Shakespeare said: "What is past is prologue." And, although we are justly proud of the record of the 89th Congress, it becomes now merely a new, high standard for us, a standard to be maintained and a record to be surpassed.

Hon. Lera Thomas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a gentlewoman who served among us will not return to this Chamber when the new Congress convenes. Mrs. ALBERT THOMAS will be greatly missed by her many friends.

The courage with which LERA THOMAS undertook the completion of her husband's term in Congress is a lesson to us all. Her devotion in ably carrying on with the affairs of this country and the State of Texas during a time of great personal loss and sorrow cannot be adequately expressed. Mrs. THOMAS has won the admiration of her colleagues, and her presence here in this House was an example of dignity to all.

Together with my colleagues, I extend to Mrs. THOMAS our grateful thanks.

Healing Advanced by Orthotics and Prosthetics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, men, women, and children, as well as servicemen active in Vietnam are being restored to active and useful lives through the work of the members of the American Orthotics & Prosthetics Association. Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY recently wrote of this healing work, as have the Los Angeles Times through Medical Editor Jack Nelson and the San Diego Union and Copley papers through Medical Editor Cliff Smith. Their remarks which should be encouraging to many of our fellow citizens follow below:

TEXT OF TELEGRAM DATED WASHINGTON, D.C., OCTOBER 14, 1966

National Assembly of the American Orthotics and Prosthetics Association c/o Herbert B. Warburton, executive director, Holiday Inn-Riviera, 1600 North Indian Avenue, Palm Springs, California.

My personal interest in preventive medicine and in supporting the genius of American science in helping individuals who need equipment created by the members of the American Orthotics and Prosthetics Association has existed for many years. In the Senate I sponsored and worked on legislation to push forward the frontiers of medical knowledge. I am also very much aware of the need for preventive medicine and help for individuals seriously handicapped, especially our children.

Congressman JOHN TUNNEY in whose district you are meeting and whose facilities you are using joins me I know in emphasizing the importance to our senior citizens of developing new skills and equipment to help men and women live more normal and happy lives after accident or illness. The genius of American medical technique has made this possible. I wish to encourage continued pioneering in helping people develop the strength and remedial attitudes needed for full participation in our society.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

[From the San Diego Union, Oct. 16, 1966]

MEDICAL GROUP OPENS NATIONAL MEETING TODAY

PALM SPRINGS.—A national meeting on medical advances for Viet Nam veterans and others suffering loss of limbs and bodily functions through injury, accident and disease opens here today.

The annual meeting of the American Orthotics and Prosthetics Association will continue through Wednesday at the Holiday Inn-Riviera.

Orthotists, prosthetists and orthopedic surgeons from France, Germany, Great Britain, Japan and Canada and the United States will conduct lectures and discussion on the latest developments in treatment and rehabilitation of amputees and the crippled.

Orthotists are medical technicians who design, build and fit braces (orthoses) to support or correct musculo-skeletal diseases or deformities. Prosthetists are technicians who make and fit artificial limbs (prostheses).

The American Board for Certification in Orthotics and Prosthetics, Inc., will hold its annual convention in conjunction with the AOPA.

[From the San Diego Union, Oct. 17, 1966]

NEW HOPES SEEN FOR AMPUTEES—RECENT STRIDES RESULT IN BETTER LIMBS, PANEL SAYS

(By Cliff Smith)

PALM SPRINGS.—New ways of rehabilitating crippled and disfigured war casualties were discussed here yesterday by some of the men best able to help them.

The American Orthotics and Prosthetics Association—medical technicians who make and fit artificial limbs and braces—is holding its annual meeting here through tomorrow.

Several leaders in the organization agreed at a press conference that today's wounded soldier has a far better chance for regaining a normal life than his predecessors.

MANY FORMERLY DIED

In the Civil War, they noted, there were 56,000 men with amputated limbs of whom 80 per cent died because of the high infection rate. The few that survived got virtually no rehabilitating aid.

Of the thousands of World War I amputees, "only about 5 percent received artificial limbs," a spokesman said.

Those few prosthetics available were crudely fashioned of wood and rawhide.

All were totally nonfunctional.

The panelists said surprisingly little progress was made in time to benefit the 24,000 American amputees of World War II. Artificial legs scarcely were more than sculptured, stiff blocks of wood. Fitting mostly was poor and uncomfortable and limbs were clumsy.

LATER VICTIMS

A 1945 GI missing a hand amputated at the wrist got a leather artificial hand, stiff except for a springloaded thumb, or a simple hook with a lever for grasping objects, the panelists said.

It took months to fit leg amputees to get them walking again.

Today, a Viet Nam veteran with a shattered leg wakes up in a hospital, in many cases with an artificial leg already fitted to the injured limb.

If the amputation was below the knee, he may be walking within 24 hours; if above the knee, within three weeks.

His artificial leg will bend naturally at the ankle and the knee and the artificial foot lifting at the toe with every step.

His artificial arm will be made of a tough plastic. It will bend and even rotate effectively.

MORE FLEXIBILITY

He can obtain an artificial hand with three moving fingers. It will be covered with rubberized skin, modeled wrinkle-perfect to his other hand. When the artificial skin wears out he can replace it with another cosmetic glove.

He quickly can detach the hand and replace it with more than 15 steel and aluminum tools more effective for many manual tasks.

Progress in prosthetics and orthotics in the past five years has surpassed that of the last 50, the panel told a reporter.

"But we really only have scratched the surface," said Dr. Claude N. Lambert, a Chicago orthopedist. "A great many dramatic developments in the field are in the making because of technical progress".

Dr. J. Warren Perry, dean of the school of health and rehabilitation professions at the State University of New York, said the federal Vocational Rehabilitation Administration initiated recently a $5 million annual research project to adapt the technology of the U.S. space program to the needs of amputees and cripples.

[From the San Diego Union, Oct. 18, 1966]

Normal Lives for Amputees—Doctors Tell of Gains in Treating Children

(By Cliff Smith)

Palm Springs.—Twenty years ago the typical child without one or more of his limbs received large doses of pity but little help in preparing for a normal life.

Society tended to give him a sheltered existence, education in special schools apart from normal youngsters and plenty of "crutches" that dissuaded triumph over his handicap.

Two pioneers in the modern rehabilitation of children here yesterday told their new formula: no expressed pity, plenty of clinical help in achieving physical independence and a firm shove into the world of normal people.

But Drs. Alfred B. Swanson and Claude N. Lambert also complained that some elements of society still are "discriminating" against child amputees with pseudosympathy really aimed at segregating them from normal children.

Swanson, of Grand Rapids, Mich., and Lambert, of Chicago, are orthopedic surgeons. They have been the leading clinicians at the nation's first two child amputee clinics since their founding. They were in Palm Springs to address the annual meeting of the American Orthotics and Prosthetics Association.

Both agreed in an interview that there is every reason to integrate crippled and amputee children as soon as possible into normal life and seldom any excuse not to.

Both doctors like to cite the athletic achievements of their patients as evidence for their argument.

"One of our clinic boys with a unilateral, below-knee amputation has been an All-State center on his high school team for three years," said Lambert.

"Then last February the Illinois State Athletic Association adopted a regulation banning amputees from football. The association acted on a recommendation from the American Medical Association sports committee, which held that possible contact with a prosthesis endangered other players.

"As a result of the regulation, our handicapped Waukegan boy will be unable to accept a college athletic scholarship because it is contingent on his playing the last year of high school ball.

"Some of the things these kids can do is astounding. We had another boy, for instance, with one leg amputation above the knee and the other off below the knee. He played tackle on his high school team and also was named to the all-state team.

"Taking youngsters like this out of normal activities is simply discrimination—that's all you can logically call it."

Swanson told of an Iowa boy without hands who learned to throw a baseball so hard he became outfielder on his high school team. He said another patient, a 14-year-old boy born without hands or feet, recently asked for permission to play organized football.

"I know he expected me to say no but I surprised him and agreed," Swanson said. "I fully realize that he will never play competitive football but he will get to wear the uniform and he will feel a little more normal for it.

"We have had more than 1,000 juvenile amputees at the clinic since it was opened and nearly all of them have participated in sports. As much as possible, we send them to regular schools.

"To do anything else is to segregate them from society.

"Our whole philosophy is based on the concept that opportunities for amputees to be rehabilitated economically and personally will be greater if they compete with normal people and that there is no reason why the average amputee cannot compete effectively."

The clinic in Grand Rapids was founded in 1948; the Chicago clinic in 1952.

[From the San Diego Union, Oct. 19, 1966]

Mending of Broken Bodies Is Speeded—Expert Cites Needs

(By Cliff Smith)

Palm Springs.—Roy Snelson thinks of himself as a businessman employed by a county hospital and an engineer among broken human beings.

To Snelson, rehabilitation means inventiveness and free enterprise get-up-and-go techniques. He is determined to keep his hospital section from becoming "a dumping ground for patients."

Snelson is chief orthotist-prosthetist at Rancho Los Amigos Hospital of Downey, a 2,000-bed chronic disease unit in the Los Angeles County Hospital system.

He is an example of more than 300 nonphysician medical specialists attending the annual meeting of the American Orthotics and Prosthetics Association here.

Yesterday in an interview Snelson told how he and some 1,100 colleagues in the United States are working overtime to bring their fast-improving skills to the aid of growing numbers of patients in a multitude of categories.

"A lot of county hospital units like ours are more like poor farms and dumping grounds for difficult patients," Snelson said.

"I don't think there is any good reason for this. I think it's better for the patient and cheaper for the taxpayer to spend $65 a day per patient and restore his independence than to let him linger in the hospital at a cost of $9 a day."

Snelson said the impact of federal medicare is tremendous at his end of medicine.

"A great many amputees today are geriatric patients who have lost limbs because of diseases like diabetes and atherosclerosis," Snelson said. "The current average rehabilitation period for a geriatric amputee is 7½ months. But if you put a 70-year-old patient to bed for that long he's going to die. We have got to find more and better ways to get them active again. It's both a medical and economic necessity."

Broken thigh bones in adults over middle age pose a similar problem, Snelson said, in that it takes them up to six months to mend when immobilized in a conventional cast.

Snelson invented a cast hinged at the knee for such patients who are put through the motions of walking a few days after the break.

"Walking on the bone makes it heal faster," he said. "By this method we can get a person back to light work in one month. And he will never suffer any of the knee stiffness that long immobilization creates. We have treated 25 cases like this in the last four months and all were successful."

[From the San Diego Union, Oct. 20, 1966]

Business Success: Handicap Turned Into Advantage

(By Cliff Smith)

Palm Springs.—When you meet Jerry Leavy of San Jose he gives you a big smile and boldly offers a cold, steely "handshake" with one of his hooks.

Jerry has stumps for arms. But save your sympathy. He wouldn't trade places with any of you.

At 39, Jerry is the model of a successful businessman except for his handicap. He is co-owner of the A. J. Hosmer Corp. of Campbell, Calif., the largest U.S. manufacturer of artificial limb components.

He was in Palm Springs to exhibit his products at the annual meeting of the American Orthotics and Prosthetics Association which concluded yesterday.

Seeing and talking with Jerry is inspiring. He is optimism personified and his skill in manipulating his mechanical hands and arms is fascinating.

"WOULDN'T TRADE PLACES"

"I wouldn't trade places with anyone," he assured. "The way I look at it, I wouldn't have been nearly so successful without my handicap. I just tried to turn it in my favor and it worked."

Jerry whipped out his wallet and deftly produced pictures of his pretty wife and their three handsome children.

They live very comfortably. Jerry drives his own car and flies his own Cessna Skymaster. He takes frequent fishing trips, manipulating a spin-casting outfit with no trouble at all.

"I do just about every thing the average man does," he said. "And I never have trouble handling hot plates or losing gloves. The only special tool I normally use is a kind of button hook handy for buttoning my shirts."

Sometimes his handicap even turns up a bizarre advantage. On a recent Canadian fishing expedition, Jerry's companion was George H. Lambert of Baton Rouge, La., seated yesterday as the new president of AOPA.

Lambert has artificial legs. In the process of equipping for their trip, Lambert and Leavy, who are about the same size, bought two-piece long underwear. Lambert wore the tops and Leavy the bottoms.

Leavy fell out of a tree at the age of 14 and broke both arms severely. Wounds made by broken bones became infected and amputation of both limbs was necessary.

HOOKS FAVORED BY PROSTHETIST

A prosthetist urged Jerry's parents to equip him with hooks rather than cosmetic artificial hands, because they are more useful.

"My parents said 'No, we don't want those ghastly things,' " Jerry recalled. "Later when I tried the hooks I threw away the hands for good."

Jerry said it took him five years to develop full independence. One of the hardest things he had to learn was tying his shoe laces.

"It's tough trying to get people to leave you alone," he said. "Many people still are way off base in their thinking about amputees. Most of them still think of us as being helpless.

"Today there are clinics where a person can learn the degree of skill I had to acquire on my own. It takes only about a year now."

Jerry can tie a fancy windsor knot in his necktie and change the lures on his fine fishing line in jig time. He can change a flat tire, operate most of the machinery in his plant and he is great at two-finger typing.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Oct. 23, 1966]

Remarkable Progress in Artificial Limbs Told

(By Harry Nelson)

Spurred by an increasing number of Vietnam war amputees, Medicare and revolutionary new rehabilitation concepts, the designers of artificial limbs are engaged in a frantic burst of activity to meet new needs.

Some of the new devices and concepts were shown last week in Palm Springs where the American Orthotics and Prosthetics Assn. held its annual convention. Among the new research presentations were:

1—A Canadian modification of a Russian artificial hand which is operated partly by electricity generated by the patient's own muscles, partly by battery power.

2—Powered arm braces for paralyzed patients who can not feed themselves and perform similar arm movements for the first time.

3—Reports that fitting certain leg amputees with artificial limbs while they are still on the operating table—rather than waiting months as at present—produces amazing results and saves considerable money.

TECHNIQUE CALLED IPOP

The latter technique, called the immediate post-operative procedure (IPOP), not only enables an amputee to walk sooner, but apparently reduces pain considerably and has very great psychological benefits to the patient, according to authorities at the meeting.

The chief beneficiaries seem to be youngsters and healthy young adults, such as Vietnam war casualties, according to Dr. Claude Lambert, professor of orthopedic surgery at the University of Illinois.

But other experts, including Roy Snellson, chief of orthotic and prosthetic services at Rancho Los Amigos Hospital, Downey, said IPOP is a reasonable way to handle elderly patients, also, particularly diabetics who must have leg amputations because of complications that arise from the disease process.

Snellson said that 40 patients, most of them elderly, have received the IPOP procedure at Rancho during the past year. Rancho Los Amigos is a county hospital that specializes in the rehabilitation of patients with chronic diseases.

WALKS DAY AFTER OPERATION

Nationally, it is customary for a patient to wait an average of 7½ months after an amputation before being fitted with an artificial limb. Snellson said the IPOP patient is walking on his new limb the day after the operation and home within a week. Ordinarily, he said, a diabetic could be expected to be hospitalized about a month after amputation.

The artificial limb installed immediately following surgery is a temporary device. It is replaced with a permanent artificial limb in about a month or six weeks.

"When we tell a patient about to be amputated that he will be walking tomorrow he doesn't believe us," Dr. Lambert said in an interview. "But you should see the smile on his face the next day when he is walking on his new limb."

Bert Titus, director of the prosthetics department at Duke University, Durham, N.C., said 43 IPOP cases—all leg amputations—have been done at his center, ranging in age from a 2½-year-old child who had been run over by a car to a 72-year-old man with insufficient circulation in the legs.

The Canadian artificial hand was described by Dr. Gustave Gingras, executive director of the Rehabilitation Institute of Montreal. Strictly experimental, the device to date has been installed on only 12 persons in the United States and Canada.

At present the hand can be made to perform only one movement—open and close the four fingers against the thumb—but plans call for a wider range of movements including wrist motions and shoulder movement.

The present model, demonstrated by H. M. Hague, an ex-colonel who lost his arm in World War II, is suitable only for below-the-elbow amputations. Dr. Gingras said he eventually intends to design a full-length artificial arm.

The Russians were the first to develop a prosthesis that gets part of its electrical power from the patient's own muscles. Electrodes are placed on top of the muscle which is to be the source of power. When the patient flexes the muscle, electricity is generated and carried by wire to a transistor, which amplifies the energy 10,000 times. It then goes to a tiny electric motor inside the arm. Rechargeable batteries supply additional power.

Flexing the muscle one time causes the fingers to close. Flexing it again opens the fingers.

"For the first time I am exercising a limb that really is not there," Hague said.

Also on display at the meeting were several powered braces designed at Rancho Los Amigos for patients with paralyzed arms.

The braces are ingeniously designed to allow the patient to use what function he still possesses to control the movement of his arm to feed himself and do other chores.

For example, one nearly completely paralyzed patient controls his arm movements by touching the tip of his tongue to various switches arranged in front of his mouth. The switches activate motors which move the braced arms.

According to Titus, there are only about 1,200 certified orthotists (brace makers) and prosthetists (limb makers) in the United States, and the number being trained is not keeping pace with the need. Titus heads the board which certifies these professionals.

He said that general prosperity, the Vietnam war and Medicare are adding greatly to the demands for services. The Medicare program will pay for new devices or repair old ones if a physician deems it necessary.

Association officials said no one has any idea of the number of Americans who have or need such devices. The only concrete figure available is 80,000 amputations a year, mostly due to accidents.

Resurgence of Nazism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, recent events in West Germany are profoundly disturbing. A neo-Nazi party is emerging as can be seen in the results of the Hesse elections. It is not unlikely that this same party will receive a significant vote in the Bavarian elections to be held soon. At the same time, the man selected by the Christian Democratic Party as the Chancellor-designate of the West German Republic, Kurt Kiesinger, is a man with an admitted record of long Nazi Party membership.

These actions reflect, at best, an insensitivity to the attitudes of hundreds of millions of people all over the world and, at worst, a resurgence of the despotism that created a reign of terror and aggression unparalleled in history. These events and trends cannot be ignored.

It is ominous that though West Germany bans the Communist Party it permits a neo-Nazi party to function freely. At a period in history when West Germany avowedly seeks the good will and respect of the free nations in the world these events undermine that effort. Though the United States gives no direct financial aid to West Germany, we have supported the defense of her territorial integrity and have helped to make West Berlin a secure symbol of freedom in Europe.

West Germany cannot claim that the resurgence of neonazism is the product of international tension or domestic reverses. West Germany's economy is booming; unemployment is virtually nonexistent; and the economic problems she faced within the Common Market are largely resolved. It remains for the leaders and the people of West Germany, anxious for the confidence and cooperation of free nations elsewhere, to take appropriate action to reverse what appears to be a dangerous trend.

Report on the Activities of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, it has been my custom to report on the activities of our subcommittee at the end of each congressional session.

The following is an account of the subcommittee's activities during the 2d session of the 89th Congress, which I hope will prove informative to the Congress and to the public.

SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES LEGISLATION

Since 1962, the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements has conducted a continuing study of the U.S. ideological offensive in the cold war. An outgrowth of this study, and particularly of the subcommittee's concern with the role of the social and the behaviorial sciences in the formulation and implementation of U.S. foreign policy, was the introduction, in June 1966, of three far-reaching legislative proposals. The three bills proposed, respectively, first, the appointment of a commission to prepare the groundwork for a White House Conference on Social and Behavioral Sciences, H.R. 15457; second, the establishment, in the Executive Office, of an Office of Social Sciences, H.R. 15458; and, third, the creation of a National Social Sciences Foundation, H.R. 15459. All three of these were referred to the House Committee on Education and Labor.

In introducing this legislation, I expressed my hope that the three bills would provide a starting point for a dialog between the U.S. Government and the academic and professional communities regarding ways and means of curing the disorder which presently troubles us in these fields. I would hope that in this manner we can accomplish a thorough assessment of the status of the individual social and behavioral sciences, appraise the contribution which they can make to the furtherance of U.S. foreign policy objectives, and strengthen the role which these sciences play in the formulation and execution of our foreign policy.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION YEAR

In the fall of 1965, I had the honor to head the official U.S. House of Representatives delegation to the White House Conference on International Cooperation, held in Washington. Subsequent to the conference, the delegation's report on U.S. activities in the International Cooperation Year was published by our subcommittee. See committee print, "Report on Activities of the International Cooperation Year," June 1966. The report summarized the nearly 400 recommendations which emanated from the White House Conference and urged that the executive branch establish the necessary machinery to check on the implementation of these recommendations. In August 1966 the President appointed a special White House committee consisting of Budget Bureau Director Charles Schultz, Presidential Assistants Walt W. Rostow and Joseph Califano, and Mr. Raymond D. Nasher, of Dallas, Tex., to perform this task. The subcommittee plans to hold followup hearings on this subject next year.

UNITED NATIONS FINANCIAL SITUATION

One of the continuing concerns of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements has been the difficult financial situation which the United Nations has experienced over the past several years. As of February 8, 1966, the funds due the United Nations from its members for assessments imposed through the end of calendar year 1965 amounted to $154,601,162. Of this sum, $29.4 million was due in assessments made to finance the U.N.'s regular budget and Working Capital Fund. The remainder of the arrearages—$125.2 million—was attributable to the refusal of a handful of nations—notably the Soviet Union, other members of the Soviet bloc, and France—to pay their share of the U.N.'s two major peacekeeping operations: the United Nations force in the Middle East—UNEF—and the United Nations Operations in the Congo—ONUC.

In order to facilitate consideration of these issues and of related legislation, I directed the subcommittee staff to prepare, in an abbreviated form, first, a report on the financial condition of the U.N. and prospects for financing future U.N. peacekeeping operations; second, a summary description of the origins of the article 19 controversy; third, a chronology of its evolution; and, fourth, an outline of the U.S. Government's position with respect to this problem.

In an effort to shed further light on this subject, and to consider several major political issues confronting the U.N., our subcommittee held hearings in March and April of this year during which we received testimony from Hon. Arthur J. Goldberg, U.S. representative to the United Nations, and Hon. Joseph J. Sisco, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs.

The staff report described above, together with the record of our hearings, was published by our subcommittee as House Report No. 1564, entitled, "United Nations Financial Situation: Background and Consequences of the Article 19 Controversy Over the Financing of U.N. Peacekeeping Operations."

The larger question of the financial structure of the entire "U.N. family" of international organizations is presently being studied by a committee of 14 nations which was appointed by the last U.N. General Assembly, as well as by appropriate officials in the U.S. Department of State. At a later date our subcommittee will report on the outcome of those studies.

LEGISLATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

In addition to its continuing studies, the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements held hearings and acted upon a number of legislative measures. A brief description of each of these bills follows:

THE 1972 WINTER OLYMPIC GAMES IN UTAH

Last year the U.S. Olympic Committee recommended that the State of Utah be designated as the site of the 1972 winter Olympic games. In March of this year, the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movement held a hearing on Senate Concurrent Resolution 71, to approve the selection of the U.S. Olympic committee and to support its recommendations. The resolution was endorsed by the entire Utah congressional delegation, as well as by the Department of State.

The subcommittee agreed to report the resolution favorably. The measure was subsequently approved by the Congress and brought to the attention of the International Olympic Committee in Rome. The latter committee approved the selection of Utah for the 1972 Winter Olympics. For background, see Senate Concurrent Resolution 71 and House Report No. 1386.

HEMISFAIR

In 1965 the subcommittee considered and the Congress approved a bill—Public Law 89-284—to provide for U.S. participation in the HemisFair, 1968, International Exposition to be held in San Antonio, Tex.

On May 13, 1966, the President forwarded to the Speaker of the House of Representatives an executive communication transmitting the recommendations of the Secretary of Commerce on the manner in which and the extent to which the United States should participate in the HemisFair, 1968, Exposition.

Legislation embodying these recommendations was considered by our subcommittee, reported favorably, and approved by the Congress. The necessary funds were subsequently provided by the Congress to pay for the construction of the U.S. pavilion, and for the preparation of the exhibits, at HemisFair. For background, see Public Law 89-284, executive communication 2399, H.R. 15098, House Report No. 1740, and Public Law 89-685.

INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS YEAR, 1968

In December 1963, the General Assembly of the United Nations unanimously adopted a resolution designating the year 1968 as the International Human Rights Year to commemorate the 20th anniversary of the universal declaration of human rights.

On that occasion, and again in 1965, the General Assembly called on member states of the U.N. to join in that observance.

Also in 1965, the Committee on Human Rights of the U.S. National Citizens' Commission on International Cooperation recommended that a committee be appointed to undertake advance planning for the observance by the United States of the International Human Rights Year, and to carry through a program of activity at the State, local, and national level.

On August 11 and 17, 1966, the subcommittee held hearings on some 20 resolutions introduced in the House of Representatives, authorizing the appointment of a U.S. Human Rights Committee to plan and coordinate the observance by the United States of the International Human Rights Year.

On August 17, the subcommittee favorably reported the text of a bill proposed jointly by Representative **Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen**, of New Jersey, and myself. See H.R. 17083. The measure was subsequently approved by the full Committee on Foreign Affairs but failed to be considered by the House of Representatives before the adjournment. For background, see H.R. 17083 and House Report No. 2050.

WATER FOR PEACE

Water is one of mankind's most precious resources—and it is becoming one of the scarcest. Expanding population, climatic changes, and certain developments in methods of land utilization and cultivation are exerting increasing pressures on the available supply of potable water. Unless solutions are found to the resulting problems, relations between nations may become increasingly marred by conflicts over water.

In an effort to begin the search for such solutions, President Johnson proposed that the United States sponsor the first international conference on water problems. As chairman of the subcommittee, I was pleased to sponsor legislation embodying this proposal—House Joint Resolution 1169. Our subcommittee held hearings on this resolution, considered it in executive session, and reported it favorably to the Committee on Foreign Affairs which concurred in our recommendations.

Prior to the adjournment, both the House of Representatives and the Senate approved this legislation, clearing the way for U.S. sponsorship of the Water for Peace Conference in Washington, D.C., in May of next year. Some 1,200 delegates from nearly 100 countries, and about 2,800 observers, are expected to attend this meeting with the vast majority of them paying their own way and contributing their time and knowledge free of charge. For background, see House Joint Resolution 1169, Senate Joint Resolution 167, and House Report No. 1742.

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION CONFERENCE

Prior to adjournment, our subcommittee also held hearings on House Concurrent Resolution 1032 and its predecessor, House Concurrent Resolution 440, proposing the convening of a wildlife conservation conference under the auspices of the United Nations.

The need for such a conference, held at a governmental level, has long been recognized. National and regional wildlife conservation groups, stressing the need for greater governmental interest in wildlife preservation, have repeatedly recommended the holding of such a conference.

As a result of our hearings, the subcommittee favorably reported House Concurrent Resolution 1032, with amendments. Unfortunately, because of the lateness of the session, and the pressure of other legislation, neither the full Committee on Foreign Affairs nor the House of Representatives had an opportunity to consider this legislation.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, this, in brief, is my report on the activities of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements during the 2d session of the 89th Congress.

It has been a great privilege to serve as chairman of that subcommittee and to direct its work. I deeply appreciate the cooperation and assistance which I received in the discharge of those tasks from my able colleagues, members of the subcommittee: Hon. L. H. Fountain, Democrat, of North Carolina; Hon. Omar Burleson, Democrat, of Texas; Hon. Donald M. Fraser, Democrat, of Minnesota; Hon. Benjamin S. Rosenthal, Democrat, of New York; Hon. Edward R. Roybal, Democrat, of California; Hon. H. R. Gross, Republican, of Iowa; Hon. Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen, Republican, of New Jersey; and Hon. Edward J. Derwinski, Republican, of Illinois. They have done an outstanding job, which merits the gratitude and the respect of our citizenry.

I shall look forward to working with them in the next Congress.

Hon. Milward L. Simpson, of Wyoming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, it has been a real privilege for me to serve in the Senate with the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson]. I had the good fortune of working closely with him on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. While we did not agree on all matters coming before the committee, the Senator from Wyoming was always fair and forthright in his participation in the business of the committee. I always found him to be a man of great integrity, honor, and trustworthiness. I always found him to be completely reliable. We shall miss his presence on the committee and in the Senate.

Mrs. Jackson joins me in extending all good wishes to him and to Mrs. Simpson.

Achievements of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to call to the attention of the House the outstanding accomplishments of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries during the 2d session of the 89th Congress. This has been a tremendously productive session, and one in which we can all take pride.

As the House is aware, this is the first full session I have had the honor of serving as chairman. Our former colleague, Herbert C. Bonner of North Carolina, served as chairman from the beginning of the 84th Congress in 1955 until his death in November of 1965. His able leadership will long be remembered.

First, I would like to extend to my colleagues on the committee my appreciation for their fine cooperative efforts in making this session so successful. I sincerely believe that they are deserving of the gratitude of the entire Congress for devoting untold hours to the business of the committee, while carrying on their heavy everyday duties of their congressional offices.

May I further express my deep appreciation to my subcommittee chairmen who gave of their time and energy to achieve these outstanding accomplishments; namely, the very effective and hard-working gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Dingell], who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation; the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], who devoted long, arduous hours as chairman of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Navigation; our most capable ranking majority member, the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. Sullivan], who has faithfully served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Panama Canal; our hardworking and efficient colleague from North Carolina [Mr. Lennon], who has most capably directed the business of our Subcommittee on Oceanography; and the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Downing] who diligently and faithfully directed the affairs of the newly created Subcommittee on Maritime Education and Training. To all of these gentlemen I express my sincere thanks.

During the second session of this Congress the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine carried on its traditional role of striving to strengthen the American merchant marine to enable it to better serve our national interest in its dual capacity as a vital link in our transportation system and as a military and naval auxiliary in times of emergency.

Comprehensive hearings were held by the subcommittee to build a clear record as to the adequacy of the American merchant marine to meet the military support requirement of the war in Vietnam and the needs of our waterborne foreign commerce. Other important matters involved the status and future of the American merchant marine.

Other matters of considerable importance were accomplished by the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation, such as the 12-mile exclusive fishing rights legislation, S. 2218; the fish protein concentrate legislation, S. 2720; and the endangered species bill, H.R. 9424.

During the first session of this Congress one of the most significant pieces of legislation reported out of the committee was the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act, considered by the Subcommittee on Oceanography. It was not until the second session that this legislation was enacted into public law, on June 17, 1966. This legislation would provide for the first time the development, encouragement, and maintenance of a comprehensive, long-range and coordinated national program in marine sciences. In connection with this legislation, the subcommittee reported H.R. 16559, which would amend the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act to authorize the establishment and operation of sea grant colleges. This piece of legislation became public law late in the second session, on October 15, 1966.

Other matters of considerable importance were considered by the Subcommittees on Panama Canal; Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Navigation; and Maritime Education and Training. With respect to the latter, the subcommittee held lengthy hearings to look into the matter of manpower shortages in the American merchant marine, not only to the extent of the shortages and possible means of alleviating them, but also to inquire into the entire subject of education for sea services.

I have attempted to mention only a few of the highlights of the constructive record of the second session of this Congress. The committee staff is now preparing a detailed activity report which will be printed as a committee print in the near future.

Report to the People of the Second Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, the following is my voting record on major issues for the 2d session of the 89th Congress.

In the 89th Congress, as in the previous Congress, I voted for what I believe to be in the best interests of our citizens and for our future generations, and I shall continue to vote and fight for the principles on which our great country has been founded. I shall continue in my efforts to preserve our free enterprise system, to protect and preserve the American dollar. I shall fight to maintain a strong anti-Communist policy. I shall continue in my fight for prudent, responsible Government spending, and an end to deficit spending and unbalanced budgets:

Date	Issue	Vote
1966		
Feb. 2	Recommit the resolution of the Committee on Un-American Activities citing Calvin F. Craig for contempt of Congress to a select committee to examine the sufficiency of the contempt citations under existing rules of law and relevant judicial decisions.	Nay.
Feb. 3	Remove the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center bill from the Speaker's table	Nay.
Feb. 7	Peacetime veterans' benefits bill	Yea.
Feb. 8	Review of proposed bank mergers to eliminate the necessity for the dissolution of merged banks	Yea.
Feb. 9	Participation of United States in the Asian Development Bank	Yea.
Feb. 9	Amend the Railway Labor Act to establish special adjustments boards to resolve disputes otherwise referable to National Railroad Adjustment Board, and to make all awards.	Yea.
Feb. 23	Recommittal to eliminate postponement of certain excise tax deductions regarding motor vehicles and telephones	Yea.
Feb. 23	Tax Adjustment Act of 1966	Nay.
Feb. 24	Recommittal to put limitations on funds for Vietnam, Laos, Thailand, and Dominican Republic	Nay.
Feb. 24	Amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961	Yea.
Mar. 1	Authorizing appropriation for procurement for the Armed Forces	Yea.
Mar. 2	Appointment of additional circuit and district judges	Yea.
Mar. 2	Promote economic development of Alaska by providing U.S. participation in statewide exposition to be held in Alaska during 1967	Nay.
Mar. 3	Enable cottongrowers to establish, finance, and carry out a coordinated program of research and promotion; improve the competitive position of, and to expand markets for cotton.	Nay.
Mar. 15	Tax Adjustment Act, conference report	Nay.
Mar. 15	Supplemental Defense Appropriation Act	Yea.
Mar. 21	Armed services mailing privileges	Yea.
Mar. 22	Vice President's residence	Nay.
Mar. 29	Recommittal to delete additional appropriations for the rent supplemental program	Yea.
Mar. 29	Supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966	Nay.
Mar. 30	Promote observance of uniform system of time throughout the United States, conference report	Yea.
Mar. 31	Amend Small Business Act	Yea.
Apr. 6	Extend initial period for enrolling under medicare	Yea.
Apr. 6	Adjust rates, basic compensation of certain employees of Federal Government	Yea.
Apr. 6	Recommittal designed to limit total amount of expenditures authorized to the Department of the Interior	Yea.
Apr. 6	Making appropriations for Department of the Interior and related agencies for fiscal 1967	Nay.
Apr. 6	Recommittal designed to limit total expenditures authorized under the Post Office and Treasury appropriations bill	Yea.
Apr. 6	Appropriations for Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, final passage.	Yea.
Apr. 19	Amendment authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to prepare, maintain, and present annually to the President and Congress a financial statement for all projects authorized including 3d powerplant at Grand Coulee Dam.	Yea.
Apr. 19	Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain a 3d powerplant at Grand Coulee Dam, final passage	Nay.
Apr. 26	Recommit for consideration of amendment prohibiting any funds from Department of Agriculture appropriations to be used for the sale of agricultural commodities to any nation trading with North Vietnam.	Yea.
Apr. 26	Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967	Yea.
Apr. 27	Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1966	Yea.
Apr. 28	Transportation, sale, and handling of dogs and cats for research purposes	Yea.
May 3	Appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration	Yea.
May 5	Appropriations for Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies	Yea.
May 10	Amendment providing funds for rent supplement program and providing $1,500,000 for nursing home care of veterans	Nay.
May 10	Appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development.	Nay.
May 11	Military Medical Benefits Act	Yea.
May 12	To insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply	Nay.
May 16	Foreign Agents Registration Act amendments	Yea.
May 18	Participation Sales Act, final passage	Nay.
May 18	Interior and related agencies appropriations, 1967, conference report	Yea.
May 25	Amendment for limitations on gross sales under definition of enterprise title	Yea.
May 26	Amend the Fair Labor Standards Act, final passage	Yea.
June 1	Narcotic addiction bill, enabling courts to deal more effectively with problem	Yea.
June 2	Extend, amend the Library Services and Construction Act	Yea.
June 6	International Education Act of 1966	Yea.
June 6	Self-employed individuals, tax retirement amendments	Yea.
June 7	Legislative Appropriations Act, fiscal year 1967	Yea.
June 7	Bail Reform Act	Yea.
June 8	To increase the debt ceiling, final passage	Nay.
June 9	Food for freedom, final passage	Yea.
June 13	Amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926	Yea.
June 14	Defense procurement authorization	Yea.
June 20	Clarify and protect the right of the public to information	Yea.
June 20	Amend the Connally Hot Oil Act	Yea.
June 22	Unemployment Insurance Amendments of 1966	Yea.
June 23	Amend the Public Health Service Act	Yea.
June 27	Rule under which postal rate revision legislation (4th class mail) was considered	Nay.
July 14	Amend Foreign Assistance Act	Nay.
July 20	Defense Department appropriations, passage	Yea.
Aug. 9	Civil Rights Act of 1966, passage	Yea.
Aug. 9	Cramer-Ashmore antiriot amendment	Yea.
Aug. 9	Mathias amendment to housing section (title IV) exempting individual homeowner	Yea.
Aug. 9	Whitner amendment requiring written complaint of plaintiff bringing charges of discrimination	Yea.
Aug. 10	Military construction bill	Yea.
Aug. 11	Authorizing appropriations for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 for construction of certain highways	Yea.
Aug. 15	Amend National Housing Act to increase authority of Federal National Mortgage Association to obtain funds for use in expanding secondary market operations.	Yea.
Aug. 15	Amend Federal Employee Pay Act of 1945 to correct inequities with respect to the determination of basic compensation of the Federal Government for purposes of certain employment benefits.	Yea.
Aug. 15	Authorizing a study of facilities and services to be furnished visitors and students coming to the Nation's capitol, amended	Yea.
Aug. 15	Provide border highway along U.S. bank of the Rio Grande in connection with settlement of Chamizal boundary dispute between United States and Mexico.	Yea.
Aug. 16	Amend Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964	Yea.
Aug. 16	Recommittal motion designed to reduce funds for amended Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 from $175,000,000 to $150,000,000 in fiscal 1968	Yea.
Aug. 17	Amend Traffic Safety Act of 1966 to have President instead of Secretary of Commerce appoint a National Motor Vehicle Safety Advisory Council	Yea.
Aug. 17	National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, as amended, passage	Yea.
Aug. 18	Recommittal of independent offices appropriation conference report insisting on House disagreement to Senate amendment No. 35	Yea.
Aug. 18	Highway Safety Act of 1966, providing for safety research and development, safety programs, national driver registration, accident research, and a test facility.	Yea.
Aug. 22	Conference report broadening the scope of the Small Reclamation Projects Act	Nay.
Aug. 22	Prohibiting picketing in District of Columbia within 500 feet of any church	Yea.
Aug. 22	Recommittal of above picketing bill, with instructions to hold hearings	Yea.
Aug. 24	Department of Agriculture appropriations, conference report	Nay.
Aug. 25	Department of Defense appropriations, conference report	Yea.
Aug. 25	Disagreement to Senate amendment No. 5 of Department of Defense appropriations conference report, providing that the President may order members of Ready Reserve to active duty under certain circumstances, but without declaring a state of emergency.	Yea.
Aug. 26	To expand the purchasing authority of Federal National Mortgage Association (under the National Housing Act), conference report	Yea.
Aug. 26	Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 Amendments, conference report	Yea.
Aug. 29	Due to Democrat-controlled Congress' delay in completing action on fiscal year 1967 appropriations bills, took action for 2d time continuing appropriations for agencies whose appropriations had not been voted.	Yea.
Aug. 30	Amendment excluding Maritime Administration from jurisdiction of Department of Transportation	Not voting.

Date	Issue	Vote
1966		
Aug. 30	Recommittal motion, remove air accident investigation from Department of Transportation, instead place it in hands of National Transportation Safety Board.	Not voting.
Aug. 30	Propose establishment of new Cabinet-level Department of Transportation including agencies dealing with roads, railroads, and aviation, plus Coast Guard.	Not voting
Aug. 31	House adopted conference report on Federal-Aid Highway Act authorizing spending for Federal highway construction and beautification and for Interstate Highway System.	Yea.
Aug. 31	Conference report adopted on traffic safety bill providing Federal standards for motor vehicles and tires	Yea.
Aug. 31	House adopted conference report on highway safety bill authorizing 3-year, $322,000,000 program	Yea.
Aug. 31	Authorizes $110,000,000 for Peace Corps for fiscal year 1967	Yea.
Sept. 1	House adopted conference report on foreign aid authorization bill authorizing $3,500,000,000 foreign aid for fiscal year 1967	Nay.
Sept. 1	Authorized up to $10,000,000 for U.S. participation in HemisFair Exposition at San Antonio, Tex. After failure of recommittal motion, bill passed by voice vote. A yea vote on recommittal vote was in effect a vote to kill this bill.	Yea.
Sept. 6	Establishment of National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws	Not voting.
Sept. 7	House adopted conference report on minimum wage amendments	Yea.
Sept. 8	Provided for 1-year expansion of authority to Federal bank regulatory officials in regard to setting maximum limits on interest rates paid by banks, savings and loan institutions, etc.	Yea.
Sept. 12	House adopted rule for consideration of H.R. 11256 bill to amend Internal Revenue Code with respect to priority and effect of Federal tax liens and levies. After adoption of rule, bill passed by voice vote.	Not voting.
Sept. 13	District of Columbia appropriations	Yea.
Sept. 14	$1,000,000,000 appropriation for military construction	Yea.
Sept. 19	Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore authorized a 67,000 acre national lakeshore	Yea.
Sept. 19	Veterans pensions increased amounts of pensions paid to veterans with non-service-connected disabilities and to widows and dependent children of such deceased veterans.	Yea.
Sept. 19	Bill adjusted status of many Cuban refugees so they can obtain permanent resident status in the United States without physically leaving the United States and reentering.	Yea.
Sept. 19	Enable United States to organize and hold an international conference in 1967 on water for peace and authorize an appropriation for it. Resolution failed to pass under suspension of rules procedure which requires a ⅔ majority.	Nay.
Sept. 19	Wolf Trap Farm Park. Enable Interior Secretary to accept donations of land and cash for cultural park in Virginia near District of Columbia, and to authorize up to $600,000 in Federal spending in connection with the project. Bill failed to pass under suspension of rules procedure requiring a ⅔ majority.	Yea.
Sept. 20	$3,600,000,000 foreign aid appropriation and related programs for fiscal year 1967	Nay.
Sept. 21	$4,100,000,000 appropriation for Army Engineers and Interior Department public works projects; Atomic Energy Commission and various independent agencies.	Nay.
Sept. 22	Chamizal Highway, recommittal motion. After defeat of recommittal motion, bill passed by voice vote	Nay.
Sept. 22	Authorizing conclusion of joint agreement between United States and Mexico for international flood control project for Tijuana River with $12,600,000 for U.S. portion of project.	Yea.
Sept. 29	Poverty bill, motion to strike enacting clause. Yea vote on this motion in effect vote to kill bill	Yea.
Sept. 29	Poverty bill, amendment to limit supergrade jobs	Yea.
Sept. 29	Poverty bill, opportunity crusade recommittal motion. Yea vote on recommittal motion was vote to substitute Republican opportunity crusade bill provisions for Democratic poverty bill.	Yea.
Sept. 29	Poverty bill, rollcall. Authorized $1,750,000,000 for poverty program for fiscal year 1967, with increases for Operation Headstart and Neighborhood Youth Corps.	Nay.
Sept. 30	Investment credit suspension amendment exempted spending on air or water pollution control facilities from the suspension of 7 percent investment tax credit.	Yea.
Sept. 30	Investment credit suspension. Bill suspended for 16 months the 7 percent investment tax credit on purchases of machinery and equipment and 2 of 3 methods of accelerated depreciation on industrial and commercial buildings.	Yea.
Sept. 30	Expanded water pollution control programs and authorization of $2,700,000,000 for fiscal year 1967–71	Yea.
Oct. 3	Regulate interstate and foreign commerce re deceptive methods of packaging or labeling	Yea.
Oct. 3	Authorize AEC enter into cooperative arrangement for large-scale combination nuclear power desalting project	Yea.
Oct. 3	Authorize Interior Secretary in cooperation with States to preserve estuarine areas	Yea.
Oct. 4	Appropriation fiscal 1967 Departments State, Justice, Commerce, and judiciary and related agencies	Yea.
Oct. 5	Promote international trade in agricultural commodities. On motion to recommit to remove countries who trade with Cuba or North Vietnam	Yea.
Oct. 6	Strengthen and improve programs of assistance for elementary and secondary schools	Yea.
Oct. 11	Appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal 1967. On Mahon amendment to recede from disagreement to Senate amendment 5 and concur with his amendment re calling up active duty members of Ready Reserve.	Yea.
Oct. 14	Establishment of Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore	Nay.
Oct. 14	Demonstration city bill	Nay.
Oct. 17	Amend title V of International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 providing for determination of amounts of claims of nationals of United States against Chinese Communist regime.	Yea.
Oct. 18	Supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1967 to recommit with instructions that no funds be made available by Export-Import Bank to guarantee payment of any obligation incurred by any Communist country.	Yea. Yea.
Oct. 19	Creation of Select Committee on Standards and Conduct	Yea.
Oct. 20	Authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes which includes a study of the Great South Bay.	Yea.
Oct. 20	Amend Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide equitable tax treatment for foreign investment in U.S. conference report on adoption	Nay.
Oct. 21	Amend Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 to extend it for 3 years. On adoption conference report	Yea.

Polish Independence Day (November 16, 1918)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the birth and growth of an independent and sovereign state at the end of the First World War was the culmination of the Polish people's struggle for freedom. It also marked the attainment of a supreme goal for which all freedom-loving Poles had worked ceaselessly for more than 100 years.

Since the last partition of Poland at the end of the 18th century the unhappy Poles were subjected to alien regimes in their homeland. Under the autocratic rulers of Austria, Germany, and czarist Russia they lived as restless and discontented subjects. And whenever they tried to regain their freedom, they were powerless against their ruthless and powerful foes, and so their efforts ended in disasters and utter defeats. Still these stouthearted and gallant people were not disheartened and despondent; they looked forward to the day when their next effort would succeed. And their best chance came toward the end of the First World War. Late in 1918, as the defeat of the Austrian-German forces seemed certain, and as the czarist regime in Russia was already gone, the Poles were in a position to take their fate into their own hands and be masters of their own national destiny. That was the intent and spirit of the proclamation of Poland's independence by the Polish leaders on October 7, though the newly formed government notified the other sovereign governments of the existence of a free Polish state only on November 16. Since then, for 48 years all Poles have celebrated the anniversary of that day as their independence day. Even though the independence thus attained was lost in 1939, and at the end of the last war the Poles did not regain it, they still celebrate their independence day as the most memorable event in their modern history.

Salute to the Republic of Zambia, Second Anniversary of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, October will be the second anniversary of Zambia's independence, and I want to take this opportunity to send warmest felicitations to His Excellency Kenneth David Kaunda, President of the Republic of Zambia; and His Excellency Samuel C. Mbilishi, Ambassador to the United States from Zambia.

The story of Zambia's independence is a most interesting one, and is a tribute to the responsible leadership on the part of both Britain and Zambia, the former Northern Rhodesia. Though I will not go into detail on all the events surrounding that event, I would like to mention a few highlights in the creation of modern

Zambia. British control was extended over Southern and Northern Rhodesia in 1895 under the British South Africa Co. Self-government was granted Southern Rhodesia in 1923; the North was transferred to Britain's Colonial Office in 1924 as a protectorate.

An outstanding difference between the two Rhodesias was in the racial composition of the territories. The south had a substantial white minority which had continually sought autonomy from Britain. The north had fewer whites and was considered by Southern Rhodesia as the source of economic wealth. In 1953 the two Rhodesias were joined with Nyasaland—now Malawi—in the Central African Federation. That organization was strife ridden largely because of the denial of sufficient African participation in government and the major role played by the whites of Southern Rhodesia. In the north a two-stage election under a complex constitution was held in October and December 1962 and resulted in an African majority in the Legislative Council. The Council, controlled by the two African nationalist parties, strongly favored Northern Rhodesia's secession from the Federation and immediate self-government. On December 31, 1963, the Federation was dissolved. Independence was granted on October 24, 1964.

I need not dwell on the tremendous economic pressures under which Zambia has labored. I congratulate the Zambian people for their accomplishments during the past year as an independent nation, and commend them for their courage and dedication to the principle of equality for all men. Particularly, considering the difficult circumstances which they have faced since the Rhodesian unilateral declaration of independence last November 11, I salute Zambia's allegiance to the rule of law and her sincere belief in the correctness of her course.

Mr. Speaker, Zambia deserves the respect of freemen everywhere in her struggle to make independence a success for all Zambian citizens.

Hon. Maurine B. Neuberger, of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, with the retirement of our distinguished friend and colleague, Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER, our country and the Pacific Northwest in particular will have lost one of its stanchest conservationists. MAURINE NEUBERGER, like her late husband, Senator Richard Neuberger, played a leading role in the resource development of the Pacific Northwest. As a member of the State Legislature of Oregon, she was in the forefront of many of the hot battles affecting the wellbeing of the Northwest community.

Upon being elected to the Senate, she soon became a leader in the support of a long series of conservation measures. She was a coauthor of the wilderness legislation and was an important supporter of the bills which were enacted into law during her term establishing a long list of national parks.

She will long be remembered for her interest in conserving the health of the Nation as well as our national resources. It was largely through her efforts that the cigarette labeling legislation finally became law.

We who represent the Northwest will sorely miss her presence and her wonderful cooperation in the furtherance of our common legislative objectives. Mrs. Jackson joins me in wishing Senator NEUBERGER and her husband, Dr. Philip Solomon, happiness and success in the years ahead.

Adequate Street Lighting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES P. FARNSLEY
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, adequate lighting helps reduce the night traffic acident rate. It deters would-be criminals. It enables police to do a better job of crime detection. Yet the benefits which good lighting can bring are not being used to full advantage. On too many miles of our Nation's streets and highways, the motorist is forced to rely only on the headlights of his car for illumination. Too many sections of our Nation's cities afford the nighttime burglar or car thief a convenient cover of darkness.

Many believe that the cost of installing adequate lighting makes it an unrealistic solution, but too little attention is given to the staggering cost which crime and traffic accidents impose upon both their victims and to society as a whole. These are costs which could be dramatically reduced by lighting. For example, lighting engineers conducted a study of night accidents on boulevards in Chicago's park district and concluded that there was a 70-percent reduction in night accidents after Michigan Boulevard was relighted in 1949 to conform to the American Standard Practice for Street and Highway Lighting. Fatal and injury-producing accidents alone declined by more than 80 percent.

Relighting Chicago's boulevards cost $50,000 per mile—$24,000 for lamp posts and luminaries and $26,000 for cable and rebuilding of the underground wiring system. Had Chicago used an aboveground wiring system, expenses would have been considerably lower. If the cost seems high, consider this: accident costs are also high. The dollar figures used in determining accident "costs" represent only such readily measurable items as wage losses, medical expenses, insurance costs, and property damage. There is no way of calculating in exact economic terms the pain and suffering of one injured in an auto crash or the grief and loss felt by the family of one who has lost his life in an accident. Even so, this limited measure of costs averaged $22,600 per death, $1,250 per injury, and $190 per property-damage accident according to estimates made by the National Safety Council in 1954.

In the 12-month period before Chicago's boulevards were relighted, there were 40 fatal, 1,290 nonfatal, and 4,365 property-damage accidents on them at night. Using the National Safety Council's figures, the total cost of these accidents was $3.3 million. Had there been adequate roadway lighting, there would have been a 70-percent reduction in night accidents and a $2.3-million reduction in accident costs. Relighting the 205 miles of boulevards cost $50,000 per mile or $10.25 million. In other words, the $2.3 million annual reduction in accident costs paid for the initial cost of the relighting program in less than 5 years.

Reduction of accidents is a dramatic benefit, but it is not the only one. When a highway is lighted, the safe driving speed at night can be 10 to 20 miles per hour higher than when it is not. If the speed limit on a highway which carries 2,500 vehicles at night is raised from 45 to 60 miles per hour the economic value of time saved amounts to $6,000 per mile per year based on a very conservative estimate of 2 cents per vehicle minute. The highway's capacity is increased in other ways also. Motorists can make better use of passing opportunities and headways; driver performance on multilane highways and freeway interchanges is improved. In general, the driving task is made easier. There is less driver fatigue and less muscular and nervous tension. In addition, when roads are lighted they are used more at night. Nearby business realizes an increase in patronage.

In short, the expense involved in installing adequate lighting should not be used as a justification for not doing so. Budget limitations and the high initial expenditure required may seem to make good lighting impracticable for all but the most heavily used freeways. But a beginning can be made toward lighting all roads, two-lane and four-lane, urban and rural, which carry substantial amounts of traffic. In great Britain, for example, researchers have reported favorably on a lighting system designed for two-lane rural highways which departs from standard practice by using lamps spaced 270 feet apart, instead of the usual 120 feet. This spacing produces a pattern of alternating light and dark patches on the pavement which is enough to make larger objects visible to the approaching driver. The cost of this experimental system: half the normal cost.

Another productive approach is to begin by lighting areas where the accident exposure is comparatively great. Herbert A. Friede, an engineer formerly with the District of Columbia Highway Department, has recommended that at minimum the following "critical areas of driver decision" be lighted:

Freeway entrances and exits;

Interchanges and intersections;

Bridges, overpasses, and viaducts;

Tunnels and underpasses;

Guide sign locations;

Dangerous hills and curves;

Heavily traveled sections in urban and rural areas or where entrances, exits, or interchanges occur within 1 mile or less of each other;

Rest areas and connecting roads;

Railroad grade crossings; and

Elevated and depressed roadways.

Each of these approaches is relatively low in cost. Their value is increased by the ease with which they can be expanded into full lighting programs.

The time has come to abolish night on our highways. As a key part of our national effort toward traffic safety, let there be light—and let there be life.

Congressman McEwen Reports on Questionnaire Findings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. McEWEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, as a freshman Congressman in the 89th Congress, having succeeded the esteemed Clarence E. Kilburn upon his retirement after 25 years of service as Representative of the 31st Congressional District of New York, I have attempted to rapidly acquaint myself with the public opinion of my district and to remain abreast of the evolution of that opinion. As an aid in this task, I mailed a questionnaire to more than 100,000 of my constitutents.

Almost 10,000 replies were received from throughout the 5 counties which comprise the 31st New York District—Franklin, Jefferson, Lewis, Oswego, and St. Lawrence. This is a district of range and contrast, covering an area larger than that of six of our States; encompassing urban areas and great open farmlands; employing men in tasks ranging from heavy industry to dairy farming; populated by many ethnic groups from the native American Indians to recent immigrants; and including eight fine colleges and universities.

It is precisely because of this diversification, Mr. Speaker, that I find the results of this questionnaire to be particularly interesting. Indeed, the responses from throughout the five counties were nearly always almost identical. For instance, in each of the 5 counties and 14 of the 15 most populous areas in the district, the problem of adjusting to cost-of-living increases elicited the greatest response.

Again, and almost without exception, strong opposition was expressed on the question of high Government spending, particularly foreign aid and the war on poverty. In reply to the question, "Do you believe in the war on poverty as an effective means of helping the poor?" the districtwide responses were 62.9 percent "No" and 22.7 percent "Yes," with 14.4 percent failing to answer, and there was only a slight variation from this ratio when the various areas were taken separately.

There can be little room for doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, after viewing the results of this questionnaire, that the people of the 31st Congressional District of New York are disturbed by the present policies of our Government with regards to its inflationary policies, the high costs of the Great Society programs, the failure of the Government to balance its spending even at the cost of higher taxes, excessive foreign aid, the space program, the war on poverty, and the war in Vietnam.

The results of my questionnaire, on a districtwide basis, follow:

INFLATION AND COST OF LIVING

[In percent]

1. Have you felt the effects of an increase in the cost of living during the last year?

Very much	47.2
Some	37.9
A little	10.3
Not at all	1.7
No response	2.9

FEDERAL SPENDING

[In percent]

1. Should federal spending be reduced?

Yes	85.4
No	7.9
No response	6.6

2. If so, would you reduce spending in any one of the following areas?

Military	8.1
Space	43.5
Foreign aid	77.6
Public works	18.0
Poverty program	48.4
Education	9.3
No response	7.1

3. If Government action is necessary to hold the line against inflation, do you favor:

(a) Reducing government spending:

Yes	76.2
No	3.5
No response	20.3

(b) Reducing government spending and increasing taxes:

Yes	17.2
No	25.9
No response	56.9

(c) Increasing taxes without reducing government spending:

Yes	4.5
No	35.7
No response	59.8

(d) Price controls:

Yes	44.2
No	16.4
No response	39.4

(e) Wage controls:

Yes	38.6
No	17.0
No response	44.4

4. Faced with a choice of having higher taxes or increasing the national debt, which would you choose?

Higher taxes	56.3
Higher debt	21.9
No response	21.8

ADMINISTRATION POLICIES

[In percent]

1. Do you support the President's policies of publicly pressuring industry and labor leaders to hold prices and wages within "Administration guidelines"?

Yes	58.9
No	31.2
No response	9.8

2. Is the Congress dominated too much by the President?

Yes	58.0
No	27.2
No response	14.7

3. Should the minimum wage be raised and extended to farms and small business?

Yes	40.9
No	50.2
No response	8.9

GREAT SOCIETY PROGRAMS

[In percent]

1. Do you believe the war and the Great Society programs can be supported at the same time?

Yes	17.4
No	72.7
No response	9.9

2. Do you believe in the war on poverty as an effective means of helping the poor?

Yes	22.7
No	62.9
No response	14.4

3. Do you favor a reduction of the social welfare programs of the Great Society in order to finance the war in Vietnam?

Yes	48.8
No	39.0
No response	12.2

WAR IN VIETNAM

[In percent]

1. Which course of action do you favor with regard to the war in Vietnam?

(a) Withdraw our military forces:

Yes	22.9
No	25.4
No response	51.7

(b) Continue the present policy:

Yes	18.3
No	17.7
No reponse	63.0

(c) Take whatever military action necessary to achieve decisive victory:

Yes	60.1
No	7.3
No response	32.6

(d) Seek negotiations with Vietcong and North Vietnamese under their conditions:

Yes	7.2
No	29.7
No response	63.1

The 89th Congress Was One With Sensitive Social Conscience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow's historians will be writing about the 89th Congress for a long time.

Many of the laws enacted by this Congress will have a profound impact on the people of our country.

It has been a good Congress for the American people—particularly for the members of our society who need help. It has been a Congress with a sensitive social conscience.

My assessment of the 89th Congress is that the greatest progress has been made in five fields:

First. Medical care and health, principally through the monumental medicare law that has made treatment and hospitalization available without loss of dignity for millions of aged Americans.

Second. Civil rights, through the voting rights law of 1965 that has guaranteed all citizens one of the most sacred of their constitutional privileges.

Third. Help to cities, through such sweeping laws as those establishing Cabinet-level Departments of Housing and Urban Development and Transportation and the Demonstration Cities Act.

Fourth. Help to schools, principally through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Fifth. Help to the poor, through the broad range of programs offered by the war on poverty.

Congress this year appropriated less than the amount called for by the President's budget; this represents responsibility in the face of rising expenditures for the Vietnam war.

As always, the session left much undone that should be done when the new Congress convenes in January.

But the 90th Congress will have to go a long way to match the record of the 89th.

Export Subsidy for Maryland Tobacco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, one of the most serious economic threats to face the State of Maryland in many areas is represented by the adamant refusal of the Department of Agriculture to grant a subsidy to Maryland export tobacco.

Maryland tobacco farmers—caught in a Federal price support squeeze—voted last February to reject the USDA's price support program. Four months later, they were informed that as a result of their decision, they would be ineligible for export tobacco subsidies. Since there had been no precedent for such action and since the Department had failed to indicate the possibility of any consideration of an export subsidy, it would have been impossible for the tobacco farmers to know at the time of their vote that it would in any way affect future Department consideration.

The threat is that the hard-won foreign market will be substantially reduced and that the Maryland export tobacco industry will be severely damaged. The economic effect will not only be felt directly by the tobacco farmers and dealers, but by countless citizens of the five southern Maryland counties where tobacco is the prime cash crop and whose livelihood depends on the tobacco industry. One of these counties is already classified by the Department of Commerce as "depressed." None can afford the economic damage that the denial of export tobacco subsidy will produce.

The Maryland congressional delegation has been constant in its efforts to persuade the Agriculture Department to rescind its decision—a decision, which we believe to be purely administrative and without statutory basis.

I think it is apropos at this point that the major developments and current status of this problem be reviewed.

On June 17, 1966, shortly after the USDA decision was brought to its attention, the Maryland congressional delegation sent a letter to Secretary Freeman asking him to reconsider his decision.

On June 27, 1966, Secretary Freeman responded. His response left many unanswered questions and was both inconclusive and unsatisfactory.

Since that time, members of the delegation and their staff personnel have spent many hours in conference and consultation with officials of the Department of Agriculture, Maryland State and county officers, representatives of the Maryland Port Authority and the Steamship Trade Association, members of the banking fraternity, the American Farm Bureau, the American Tobacco Exporters Committee, agriculture officials at the University of Maryland and growers and dealers.

Virtually all of these organizations and individuals have gone on record in support of the position of the Maryland tobacco industry, and the belief that Maryland is being unjustly punished by the USDA's decision.

Mr. President, the correspondence which has accumulated on this subject is voluminous. But there are four letters which I feel are particularly significant. The first is the delegation letter to Secretary Freeman of June 17. The second is his response. The third is our letter to Mr. Freeman and the last is his reply to that letter. I believe they aptly demonstrate the detail we have gone to in stating the case for the industry and presenting Secretary Freeman's responses.

I ask unanimous consent that these letters be included in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that two statements and an article which appeared in the October 13 and October 19 issues of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD be included so that we can provide a comprehensive record of the developments of this case.

An undercurrent of discontent with the Department of Agriculture's unjust and punitive action has begun to develop throughout much of the State. The banner is being picked up by people of humble and prominent station. The call has been issued for action which would take the matter to the White House. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial which appeared in the Baltimore Sun be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEMAN SAYS "NO"

For several months now the State's congressmen have been trying to get Maryland growers included in the new program that pays an export subsidy on tobacco. This week Secretary of Agriculture Freeman told the State's senators the answer is "no." The reason is that before the subsidy program was begun Maryland growers voted to do without production controls and price supports. Mr. Freeman said he interprets the law to forbid the payment of an export subsidy to uncontrolled crops. If he interpreted it the other way, he said, there would be an "impact" on growers elsewhere who have accepted controls for price supports. In other words, he could have interpreted it the other way, but chose not to. (The law has been interpreted the other way for other commodities.)

Maryland tobacco is only 2 per cent of the total American crop. It competes overeas with foreign tobacco, not other American tobacco. What impact? The only real impact is the impact on the Southern Maryland economy. Tobacco is important to the five relatively poor counties where it is grown. Almost half the dollar value of the crop has traditionally come from exports. Now that is in jeopardy. Some foreign buyers have already indicated they will look elsewhere for a substitute. Maryland tobacco has been made suspect in their eyes.

The purpose of the export subsidy was to enlarge the market for American tobacco, and Maryland's should be included in the scheme. Maryland's congressional delegation has an obligation to go over Secretary Freeman's head to the White House or to Congress to get his rule reversed. If the purpose of the discrimination was to penalize Maryland growers for rejecting controls and and support, as some growers and exporters charge, the obligation to get the rule reversed is even greater.

I know these people, Mr. President. They are determined and hard working, proud, and resourceful. They recognize that their industry must survive if they are to survive. I can understand the bitterness of a man who has seen what he believes to be arbitrary action by the Agriculture Department seriously impair or destroy his opportunity to earn a living in the industry he knows best. And, I cannot blame the man who views the Agriculture Department and its representatives as enemies rather than friends when it appears they have first deceived him, then punished him when he exercised his free right to decline government aid and then, in apparent retribution, allow the market for his product to deteriorate while mouthing platitudes about the need for expansion of that same market.

Mr. President, I am proud to be the elected representative of these people, and to voice their views in the Halls of the Congress. It is the kind of pride and determination shown by these people which gives me and my fellow members of the Maryland congressional delegation renewed strength with which to carry on the fight. And carry on we will, I assure you.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Oct. 19, 1966]

EXPORT SUBSIDY FOR MARYLAND TOBACCO

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, last Thursday I addressed the Senate with regard to the severe losses to be suffered by five southern Maryland counties by reason of the Department of Agriculture refusal to grant the 5 cents per pound export subsidy for Maryland tobacco. We have 7,000 growers in this area of underemployment and poor economy.

Quite frankly, the pinch is already being felt in Maryland. Normally, 500,000 pounds of Maryland tobacco is exported in September, but this last month only 20,000 pounds went through the Port of Baltimore for export. This administrative decision of the Department of Agriculture to withhold the export subsidy affects a multimillion-dollar export crop. Experts predict that if Maryland tobacco remains noncompetitive in the export market, the Swiss, who now purchase most of our export crop, will be forced to seek substitutes from other countries.

The tobacco from my State has such unique long-burning and aromatic qualities that foreign cigarette packages carry the words "contains Maryland tobacco." Despite this, without the export subsidy, Maryland tobacco is doomed.

In June of this year, following the announcement of the Department of Agriculture of the exclusion of Maryland tobacco from the export subsidy program, the first meeting with Department officials was held in my office. Following that, memers of the Maryland delegation sent a letter of protest to Secretary Freeman. Since that initial action there have been a number of delegation meetings on the subject, and another is scheduled with Secretary Freeman.

An excellent article on the subject prepared by Helen Delich Bentley, was published in the Baltimore Sun of October 16. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun,
Oct. 16, 1966]

"MARYLAND TOBACCO ABROAD—FARMERS SEE A CRISIS

"(By Helen Delich Bentley)

"Maryland's tobacco farmers are crying that they may be put out of business because of bureaucratic red tape and what they see as a determination of the Federal bureaucrats to control everything.

"This situation, hitting hardest at the poorest—even depressed—area of the State, has arisen as the result of Maryland's farmers having voted last February not to continue their tobacco crops under Federal controls, because they didn't want another 15 per cent reduction in their production. Subsequently, a 5-cent-per-pound subsidy was instituted on all export tobacco. However, since Maryland farmers had refused crop control, they were not given the 5-cent subsidy even though, they point out, export subsidies are paid on other crops not under control of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

"Inasmuch as Government assistance is granted to other agricultural products exported even though they are not under CCC controls, the Maryland farmers see the move as a retaliatory measure.

"When the vote was taken, the Maryland farmers were not advised that a subsidy was in the offing for export tobacco, a matter they feel particularly aggrieved about because tobacco from this State has been exported longer than it has from any other.

"Maryland's 10,100,000 pounds exported in 1965 is close to the high for an individual state. Kentucky-Tennessee together shipped out 21,600,000 pounds of fire-cured tobacco in the same year. Flue-cured tobacco, which originates in Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida and Alabama, was purchased overseas to the tune of 395,586,000 pounds. Eight states contributed to the 53,011,000 pounds of burley that went to foreign markets.

"In dollar volume, almost half of the State's annual crop is shipped abroad. It affords and important source of revenue to the Maryland growers, dealers, shippers, bankers, and the port of Baltimore. Maryland's tobacco farmers produce about $22,000,000 worth annually, of which $10,000,000 is sold abroad.

"For many years, Maryland tobacco has constituted the principal ingredient in approximately 70 per cent of the popular-priced Swiss cigarette. It also has found acceptance and usage in cigarettes and for other purposes in West Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, Spain, and Portugal, among others. Already, Portugal has canceled a $100,000 order because of the lack of a 5-cent-per-pound subsidy on the Maryland tobacco. Inasmuch as no other state produces the same quality tobacco, the European manufacturers will not make up that difference by buying elsewhere in this country, but instead will work on a blend of tobaccos from Italy, Yugoslavia, and Japan which is the closest that can be achieved as a substitute to that from Maryland.

"The other two states excluded from the 5-cent subsidy, according to the Agriculture Department's press release of June 10, are Pennsylvania with its filter tobacco and Connecticut's cigar wrapper—also because those farmers balked at crop controls. The Amish in Pennsylvania resist any kind of government control. However, since their percentages of exports are comparatively negligible, these states are not as hard hit as is Maryland.

"The reason for the subsidy, the release said, is that the United States is selling less of the world's tobacco than ever although the over-all purchases have increased among foreign nations.

"In addition to raising the over-all amount of tobacco exported from the United States, the export subsidy also was instituted to help the balance-of-payments.

"However, say the tobacco men, that portion of the business that was Maryland's will be completely lost to the balance of payments if this State is continued to be denied the subsidy since the users of Maryland tobacco will go to Yugoslavia, Italy, Turkey, and other countries to whip up a blend of tobacco as near to Maryland's as possible.

"Other points they make are:

"1. The matter of production control is supposed to be voluntary in this country, not mandatory. The decision was strictly administrative, not a legal requirement.

"2. Even though there is no production control in the State this year, the actual amount to be marketed will be less than ever. Maryland is not in a position to double its production overnight as are North and South Carolina where there is still sufficient cheap labor. The Maryland tobacco region is too close to Washington and Baltimore, making the labor market very limited. Tobacco is still a product that must be handled by hand.

"3. Calvert county, one of the five counties hardest hit by this decision, is considered a depressed area and therefore should qualify for all Federal help possible.

"4. The 30,000,000-pound surplus about which the Agriculture Department was complaining in Maryland dates back to the drought year of 1963 and was created under the price support-production control program. That surplus tobacco happens to be generally undesirable because it was too dry. Drought conditions create bad tobacco crops. Mathematically it exists, but one crop failure could wipe out the entire surplus.

"5. Friendly foreign nations who prefer Maryland tobacco are being slapped in the face because others are given the 5-cent subsidy and they are forced either to pay more money or look for another product.

"For the first time, this year West German interests became a substantial buyer in the Maryland market after a German cigarette manufacturer adhered to the request of his customers, in the Bavarian region adjacent to Switzerland, and purchased the same mix. His sales shot up dramatically.

"Without the export subsidy, however, Maryland may be faced with a repetition of its experience of losing the French market during World War I when France was unable to obtain Maryland tobacco. The French cigarette manufacturers substituted tobacco grown in Madagascar for the Maryland portion of their blend and have continued to do so for 50-odd years.

"Say the tobacco men further: The problem is one for the entire State even though the farmers are concentrated in Anne Arundel, St. Marys, Prince Georges, Calvert, and Charles counties; the entire economy of these less-affluent counties is at stake; a negative response by the Commodity Credit Corporation could result in the entire State having to assist the hard-hit farmers."

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Oct. 13, 1966]

Mr. TYDINGS. Although repeatedly espousing the promulgation of policies to regain and expand foreign tobacco markets, the Department of Agriculture, on the other hand continues to deny the 5-percent export subsidy payment for Maryland tobacco.

In June of this year Agriculture officials emphasized that the United States has not shared in recent increases in world trade in tobacco. The U.S. share in free-world trade in tobacco has declined to 26 percent in 1965 from 35 percent during the years 1955 through 1959. Figures are available for Maryland tobacco exports from January to August of this year indicating a total volume of $4.93 million, as against $7.93 in 1965. If this downward trend continues the loss could well reach more than half a million dollars. When one realizes tobacco is the only cash crop for the five southern Maryland counties, several of which have been classified as depressed areas by the Department of Commerce Economic Development Administration, the full impact and seriousness of this drain of export income begins to come into proper focus. To make the situation even worse, nearly 18 million pounds worth approximately $14 million, is being held awaiting shipment in the hope that the Department of Agriculture will grant the export subsidy to Maryland tobacco.

When the Department of Agriculture has publicly stated that their program of export payments was initiated because "the United States has not shared in recent increases in world tobacco trade," it is difficult to understand the Department's position preventing the subsidy for Maryland.

Used for many years by the Swiss as the principal ingredient in their cigarettes, Maryland tobacco has been gaining acceptance in other foreign markets such as Netherlands, Belgium, West Germany, Spain, Portugal, and others. A copy of a letter from a Portugese tobacco company has been made available to me indicating a drastic cutback, and evidence is expected from sources in Switzerland. Since Switzerland buys close to 70 percent of Maryland tobacco, and there has thus far been a decline of 42 percent for this year in Swiss purchases, it is immediately evident that the loss of the tobacco subsidy for Maryland will effectively gut the foreign market, lower the U.S. share in world tobacco trade, and result in severely depressed economy for all of the five southern Maryland counties.

The Department of Agriculture's reason for denying the export subsidy for Maryland tobacco does not cite statutory language, rules, regulations, or precedent to support their decision. In addition, at a recent meeting between the Maryland delegation and Mr. Horace Godfrey, Executive Vice President of the Commodity Credit Corporation of the

Department of Agriculture, it was admitted that Department officials possess the authority to grant Maryland tobacco an export subsidy.

Title 15, United States Code, section 714 (f) "Export or cause to be exported, or aid in the development of foreign markets for agricultural commodities" appears to be a clear mandate of Agriculture's responsibility, and is certainly not consistent with their position of denial of the export subsidy to Maryland tobacco, and to confuse this with other portions of section 714c, "Specific powers of corporation," or to find against a subsidy for export of Maryland tobacco on the basis of other powers of the Corporation, is to nullify the responsibilities so ably defined in section 714(f).

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., June 17, 1966.

Hon. Orville L. Freeman,
Secretary of Agriculture, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: It has been called to our attention that the Department of Agriculture is about to announce an export subsidy program of five cents per pound for certain types of leaf tobacco produced in the United States. We have also been informed that because Maryland producers last February voted to remove production controls for the 1966 tobacco crop, which will be sold in 1967, all Maryland tobacco will be ineligible for the subsidy, including the 1965 and earlier crops which were grown under Department of Agriculture controls.

We strongly protest the exclusion of Maryland tobacco from the export subsidy program as discriminatory action designed to punish the Maryland producers for voting to remove controls for the 1966 crop.

As I am sure you know, the Maryland tobacco producer has in recent years been further and further restricted in the amount of acreage he may plant in tobacco. Plantings over the past several years have amounted to approximately 34,000 acres. In an attempt to cut the surplus, the Department recommended a 15% reduction for 1966, which would have limited production to about 30,000 acres. Knowing that he might be forced entirely out of tobacco production if continued to grow under the restriction of controls, the Maryland tobacco farmer last February voted in referendum to not participate in the Department's price support for crop year 1966. What he did not know, and what the Agriculture Department was morally obligated to tell him, was that at that time your Department had under active consideration the implementation of this export subsidy program. Had the Maryland tobacco producer known this and known that his vote to remove controls would make him ineligible for the proposed five-cents-per-pound subsidy, he would surely have voted to continue in the price support program.

Even though the Maryland tobacco producer did vote to remove controls, we do not believe the tobacco production in 1966 will exceed previous years, as predicted by the Department; in fact, we expect that it will be less. The Maryland tobacco industry in recent years has been under an increasing disadvantage due to extremely high land and labor costs. As a result, there is a built-in brake which may force tobacco production down to the 30,000-acre level recommended by your Department.

We have been told by the representatives of your Department that refusal to grant the export subsidy to Maryland tobacco is in no way a punishment for the removal of controls. We do not see how it can be anything but that. The Department apparently believes that the removal of controls for the 1966 crop presents the possibility of overproduction, which consequently could threaten the investment of the Commodity Credit Corporation in the surplus stores of tobacco, resulting in a reduction in price. Thus, in its desire to protect the Commodity Credit Corporation's investment in the earlier crops, your Department refuses to apply the export subsidy to Maryland tobacco.

But, we believe that the Department's estimate of last March that Maryland will plant in excess of 34,000 acres of tobacco this year because the crop has been removed from control is highly exaggerated. For the reasons cited heretofore, we believe 1966 production will be approximately in line with the 30,000 acres recommended by the Department. We note that this presumption will be subjected to more exacting examination next month when the Department releases estimates for the 1966 crop based primarily on plantings.

Furthermore, denial of the subsidy to Maryland tobacco constitutes a serious threat to the economy of that area. Out of a $22 million annual production, approximately $10 million worth is exported. On this basis, denial of a five-cent-per-pound export subsidy amounts to a $600,000 advantage which the Maryland tobacco community will be denied for 1966 exports. Even though Maryland tobacco is so fine in quality and taste it is known as "Maryland Tobacco," rather than by some other name such as flue cured, burley, or shade, it still must be competitive.

While it is true that the export subsidy would be passed on to the foreign purchaser, the lack of it will make Maryland tobacco non-competitive on the world market, and if Maryland tobacco is non-competitive in the world market, for even one year, it is threatened with the loss of substantial parts of its $10 million in annual sales.

Five counties in Maryland grow tobacco—and three of them are heavily dependent upon this crop to sustain their economy. Both the Federal and State governments have spent considerable effort and money in recent years to develop the economies of these counties, at least one of which is currently designated as a depressed area by the Economic Development Administration. It would be senseless for one Federal agency to undermine the efforts of others.

On the basis of the foregoing, we strongly urge you to reverse your decision to exclude Maryland tobacco from the proposed export subsidy program. We believe this is the only equitable action the Department can take.

Very sincerely,

Daniel B. Brewster, Joseph D. Tydings, U.S. Senators; Edward A. Garmatz, George H. Fallon, Samuel N. Friedel, Clarence D. Long, Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., Hervey G. Machen, Rogers C. B. Morton, Carlton R. Sickles, Members of Congress.

Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C., June 27, 1966.

Hon. Joseph D. Tydings,
U.S. Senate.

Dear Senator Tydings: This acknowledges the letter of June 17, 1966, signed by you and the other Members of the Maryland Delegation, regarding the exclusion of Maryland tobacco from the export payments announced on June 10, 1966, for most kinds of United States grown tobaccos.

We want to assure you that the exclusion of Maryland tobacco was in no way designed to punish producers of Maryland tobacco for their failure to approve marketing quotas in the referendum held February 25, 1966. Pennsylvania cigar-filler and cigar-wrapper tobaccos are not eligible for export payments since no price support is offered on the 1966 crop of these kinds of tobacco.

The Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act authorizes the Corporation, in the fulfillment of its purposes and in carrying out its annual budget programs submitted to and approved by the Congress, to export or cause to be exported, or aid in the development of foreign markets for agricultural commodities. The budget programs for the 1966 and 1967 fiscal years submitted to and approved by the Congress describe the export program of the Corporation in pertinent part as follows:

"Commodity export.—The Corporation promotes the export of agricultural commodities and products through sales, barters, payments, and other operations. Other than in barters for stockpiling purposes, such commodities and products may be those held in private trade channels as well as those acquired by the Corporation in its price-support operations."

The Agricultural Act of 1949 provides that no price support shall be made available for any crop of tobacco for which marketing quotas have been disapproved by producers.

Since CCC funds will be used in making export payments on tobacco, it seems to us that such payments should be restricted to those kinds of tobacco which growers have demonstrated a willingness to maintain supplies reasonably well in balance with demand. Production of Maryland tobacco during the past five years has exceeded disappearance (domestic consumption and exports) by about 34 million pounds. This has resulted in the accumulation of a burdensome surplus which necessitated the 15 percent reduction in farm acreage allotments for 1966. The growers voting in the February referendum rejected this needed adjustment.

The records show that 33,500 acres of Maryland tobacco were produced last year, and growers indicated their intentions as of March 1 to produce 34,000 acres this year. If farmers plant this acreage and obtain per acre yields in line with those obtained in prior years, a further build-up in supplies will result.

The 1965 and prior crops have largely been marketed and are no longer in farmers' hands. Since export payments are made to exporters, such payments would not be passed on to farmers in terms of higher prices for these tobaccos. Thus, we do not agree with your conclusion that the Maryland tobacco community has been denied a $600,000 advantage. On the other hand, it seems to us that export payments on the 1965 and prior crops would surely have an adverse effect on prices farmers will receive for the 1966 crop in the absence of price support.

The Maryland Tobacco Cooperative, which operates the Government's price support program for Maryland tobacco through contract with Commodity Credit Corporation, has in its inventory some 22 million pounds (farm sales weight) of tobacco from the 1957–65 crops. Since domestic use and exports of Maryland tobacco have averaged about 33 million pounds annually during the past five years, these loan holdings amount to about two-thirds of a year's usings. The absence of marketing quotas and price supports on the 1966 crop have a direct bearing on our ability to move these loan holdings into trade channels without substantial loss to CCC.

Although there have been discussions for some time on the need for programs to make U.S. tobacco more competitive in world markets, the export payment program announced June 10 was not seriously considered until early May of this year. Thus, the Department could not have told Maryland or any other tobacco growers that such a program was in the offing prior to the referendums held in February.

In view of these facts, we cannot extend the export payments announced on June 10 to include those kinds of tobacco on which price support is not offered for the 1966 crop.

Sincerely yours,

Orville L. Freeman.

U.S. Senate,
Committee on the Judiciary.

Hon. Orville L. Freeman,
Secretary, Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: Personally, and on behalf of all Marylanders concerned with growing and marketing tobacco, we wish to thank you for meeting with us last week to discuss the possible inclusion of Maryland tobacco in the export payments program. We are particularly grateful for your promise personally to review the present position of the Department.

We will not attempt to repeat here all the points we made last week. Suffice it to say that the Maryland delegation believes that the exclusion of Maryland tobacco from the export subsidy is not required by law nor warranted by the facts. We object to the exclusion of the 1966 crop because our farmers did not know at the time they voted against acreage limitations that Maryland would be treated any differently than any other State with respect to export subsidies.

We object, too, to the exclusion of the crops of 1965 and prior years when acreage controls were in effect in Maryland, as discriminatory and unfair to Maryland growers and handlers. If the reason for depriving Maryland growers of the export subsidy was their vote not to participate in the price support program, it is incomprehensible to us for the Department to withhold the subsidy for those participating crop years.

During our meeting you indicated that the most serious obstacle to extending the export subsidy to Maryland tobacco was the possibility that this action could depress the prices our farmers receive for the 1966 crop. Marylanders are willing to take their chances on this possibility, as we think it a remote one. Our basis for this conclusion is the following:

1. The Department of Agriculture estimates that the 1966 crop will be 2.5 million pounds less than the 1966 crop.

2. Based on 1956 to 1965 experience, between one-third and one-half of the income from the 1966 crop will come from exports. Swiss buyers purchased approximately two-thirds of all Maryland tobacco exported in 1964 and 1965. See Enclosure I. The Swiss consume approximately 6.3 million pounds of Maryland tobacco annually.

3. For the past twenty years, the Swiss have invariably purchased all of the Maryland tobacco that meets their quality standards. In recent years, they have had to reduce the percentage of Maryland tobacco in their blends because of the shortage of suitable tobacco. The Swiss purchase the following grades of Maryland tobacco: B1F, B2F, B3F, C1L, C2L, C3L, C4L, C1F, C2F, X1L, X2L, X1F, X2F, and X3F. For the years 1962 and prior, the Maryland Tobacco Cooperative has practically no stocks in these grades. Government loan stock holdings in these grades for the 1963, and 1964, and 1965 crops amount to 3.7 million pounds. If the Swiss were to buy every pound now in government loan stocks, they would still obtain only about half of their annual needs.

4. The tobacco now in loan stocks and potentially subject to subsidy is generally below the quality standards of Swiss buyers. Even with subsidy, the Swiss would be inclined to buy from these stocks only to the extent that 1966 and future crops failed to yield the quantity of prime leaf needed.

This information, we believe, amply supports our belief that the Swiss will buy all the quality tobacco they can obtain on the Maryland market next year, and that the application of an export subsidy to 1965 and prior crops would not of itself depress prices on the 1966 market.

Indeed, the available evidence strongly indicates that the absence of subsidy will adversely affect the price of Maryland tobacco in future years.

Maryland tobacco has been an important export crop since colonial times. From 1956 through 1965, between one-third and one-half of the income from every Maryland crop came from exports.

Officials of the Foreign Agricultural Service have expressed the opinion that the future of a healthy tobacco industry for Maryland lies in the preservation of the foreign market for the quality leaf.

The distressing fact is that Maryland tobacco exports have been declining while total United States exports of tobacco increase. Census Bureau figures show a decline of Maryland tobacco exports from 9.6 million in 1964 to 7.9 million in 1965, and to 4.9 million for the first eight months of 1966. Any increase in exports which may exist does not apply to Maryland.

A USDA report for June 1966 announced that the amount of Maryland tobacco consumed domestically "has not kept pace with expanded cigarette output." Many brands of American cigarettes no longer use Maryland tobacco at all, and the principal users, several non-filtered brands, utilize only one to two percent.

At the same time, FAS records show that a Maryland leaf is being grown in other countries, including Italy, Argentina, the Union of South Africa, and Madagascar. These countries could grow and market an unlimited quantity of tobacco at prices considerably less than our crops bring on the Maryland market. The lack of an export subsidy could well cause Maryland tobacco to become non-competitive.

Attached are copies of communications from major foreign buyers of Maryland tobacco, which demonstrate clearly that the absence of subsidy will place Maryland tobacco at a relative disadvantage on the foreign market, threaten the future of consumption abroad, and encourage the use of foreign-grown Maryland-type tobacco as a substitute.

You expressed the view last that dealers rather than growers might be the principal beneficiaries of a subsidy. It is our understanding that any subsidy paid on dealers' stocks of export tobacco under the Export Payments Program after July 6, 1966, must be passed on by the dealers to their foreign customers. Thus, the program would benefit the foreign purchaser directly and the domestic grower and dealer indirectly by expanding the market for Maryland tobacco.

Finally, Mr. Secretary, let us emphasize that there is ample legal basis for a decision to grant the subsidy to Maryland tobacco. The Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act does not limit subsidies to price-supported crops. In enacting Section 32 of PL–320, Section 612 c, Title 7—74th Congress in 1935, the Congress specifically authorized use of funds for export subsidies of non-controlled crops. An export subsidy was applied to wheat after wheat growers voted in a national referendum against a mandatory support program. Likewise, in 1958, an export subsidy was applied after corn producers rejected acreage allotments.

Several charts and articles are enclosed which illustrate the importance of maintenance and expansion of the foreign market for our tobacco. Specifically, we call to your attention the remarks of Chairman Cooley in the enclosed Congressional Record excerpt. Based on a careful consideration of all these factors, we sincerely urge that you grant the five cents per pound subsidy to Maryland tobacco.

Very sincerely,

Daniel B. Brewster, Joseph D. Tydings, U.S. Senators; Edward A. Garmatz, Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., Carlton R. Sickles, George H. Fallon, Samuel N. Friedel, Clarence D. Long, Rogers C. B. Morton, Hervey G. Machen, Members of Congress.

Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. Joseph D. Tydings,
U.S. Senate.

Dear Joe: This is with reference to our recent discussions, and a letter of November 3, 1966, signed by you and the other Members of the Maryland Delegation, concerning the extension of the export payment program to Maryland tobacco.

It is clear to me that the provisions of the law which provides that no price support shall be made available for any crop of tobacco for which marketing quotas have been disapproved by producers should be construed to preclude indirect price support such as export payments as well as direct price support through loans on the 1966 crop.

Your argument that it was inconsistent to deny the export payment to the 1965 and older crops since these crops were produced under marketing quotas was both articulate and persuasive.

I have given careful consideration to this point since our meeting. I have tried to evaluate the effect that this action would have on growers of Maryland tobacco and the over-all tobacco program.

There is no question in my mind that extending export payments to 1965 and prior crops of Maryland tobacco would provide no retroactive financial benefit to growers insofar as those crops are concerned. I am convinced that such action could and probably would have an adverse effect on growers' interest in the 1966 or even succeeding crops which may be marketed without the benefit of price support.

These potential adverse effects on growers are twofold. First, to whatever extent an export payment on 1965 and older crops would accelerate build-up of stocks by foreign buyers prior to next spring's sale of the unsupported 1966 crop, the demand would be decreased with inevitable price depressing effect. In this connection, it is interesting to note that the January-September exports of Maryland tobacco of 6,271,000 pounds (farm-sales weight) is 7 percent higher than the 5,841,000 pounds exported during the same period in 1965.

Second, the availability of the export payments on 1965 and older crops when the grower sells his 1966 crop would place the grower's tobacco in competition with private and Commodity Credit Corporation loan stocks. Such competition would be unfair to the grower as he would have to absorb the export payment in order to move his tobacco.

Despite our desire to move older stocks of tobacco to avoid deterioration and further accumulation of storage costs, we agreed with the management of the Maryland grower cooperative that prices on the 22 million pounds (about two-thirds of a year's usings) held under loan should be set at such level as to not encourage the purchase of these stocks at the expense of a reduced demand for the 1966 crop. Making an export payment available on 1965 and older crops would have the same effect on grower prices for the 1966 crop as a corresponding reduction in the sales prices of CCC loan stocks would have had.

There is another facet to this problem which I, as Secretary of Agriculture, cannot overlook. That is, the impact on the tobacco program as a whole. I do not know of any other commodity that has the potential of getting into as serious financial trouble with unlimited production as does tobacco. This has been well recognized by an overwhelming majority of tobacco producers in the United States. A point that cannot be overlooked is the attitude of tobacco producers who have voted strict production controls on themselves towards the Department extending the same competitive benefit in the form of export payments to a kind of tobacco on which there is no limit on production. I would be remiss in my responsibility if I took any action which might be detrimental to the unanimity of support the tobacco program has had for I truly believe it has served the industry well.

In view of these considerations, I must regretfully conclude that I cannot justify extending the export payment to Maryland tobacco.

Sincerely yours,

Orville L. Freeman.

The Louisville Traffic Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES P. FARNSLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, 85,881 passenger cars and trucks were registered in Louisville and Jefferson County in 1946. By the end of 1954 this figure had risen to 186,819 cars and trucks registered in Louisville and Jefferson County.

I was mayor of the city of Louisville between the years 1948 and 1953 inclusive. These years were in the middle of the above rapid increase of automobile and truck traffic. The city of Louisville during this period entered upon broad and comprehensive plans to improve the flow of traffic upon its existing street system. There were no freeways in existence in Louisville during those years. The program will be described in the following paragraph under the general headings of the major divisions of the program.

TRAFFIC SIGNALS

The entire traffic signal system of the city was renovated or replaced. The entire traffic signal system in the downtown area and in the areas immediately adjacent to the downtown area were interconnected for flexible progressive movement of traffic. Several cycles and several splits of cycle were employed to fit changing traffic patterns on the streets affected. All other traffic signals were converted to traffic-actuated controlls. No signals were permitted to operate at an isolated fixed time. All were either interconnected or traffic actuated.

PARKING

About 100 miles of streets were marked with no stopping 7 to 9 a.m. and 4 to 6 p.m. regulations. These no stopping regulations were rigidly enforced. Cars in violation were tagged and then towed to a city-owned parking lot. One effect of the rigid enforcement of these no stopping regulations was immediate improvement of traffic flow.

ONE-WAY STREETS

An alternate one-way grid pattern of streets was established in the downtown area. Pairs of one-way streets were extended from the central business district into the residential areas south, east, and west of the district. The Ohio River is immediately north of the business district. Pairs of one-way streets were also developed in other parts of the city where the volume of traffic warranted and where parallel streets were available.

UNBALANCED STREETS

Unbalanced traffic flow was established on two-way radial streets which did not lend themselves to pairing for one-way operation. Traffic counts indicated the change in direction of flow, and the lanes of the street were unbalanced during these periods to accommodate the heavier directional movement. Lane lights were installed on these streets in order to make this type of operation safe and understandable.

NEW STREET CONSTRUCTION

A number of streets were widened within existing rights-of-way increasing the number of usable lanes from three to four. Offsets were removed from a number of through major arterial streets. A large resurfacing program was undertaken on a priority basis. The priority list was established taking into account traffic volumes, street conditions, and esthetics.

STREET LIGHTING

A large street lighting program was undertaken. The street lights were changed from 6,000 lumen incandescent to 20,000 mercury vapor. For the first time in the history of Louisville, alleys were lighted to the same intensity as the streets.

The results of these various programs were obvious. The movement of traffic improved. Safety increased, and crime was reduced in the lighted areas.

Senator A. Willis Robertson, of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, for the past one-half century Senator A. Willis Robertson has provided able and energetic representation for the people of his beloved Virginia.

Throughout his long and distinguished career as State senator, commonwealth's attorney, Congressman, and U.S. Senator, Willis Robertson has earned the great respect and deep affection of those who have known him.

The senior Senator from Wisconsin has been privileged to work closely with Senator Robertson on the Banking and Currency Committee as well as on the Appropriations Committee. Although Senator Robertson and I have occasionally disagreed on questions before the Senate, I have always found him to be a man of fairness, decency, good humor, and dignity.

Both the Senate and the Nation will sincerely miss Senator Robertson. I am delighted to join my colleagues in wishing to Senator Willis Robertson good health and great happiness for many years to come.

Democrats Should Continue To Lead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in determining which party should receive support in this year's congressional elections, we must ask ourselves four questions:

First. Can Congress, after this election, continue to make progress in developing human and natural resources?

Second. Can Congress continue policies necessary for economic growth?

Third. Can Congress continue to work for human rights and equal opportunity?

Fourth. Can Congress continue working to build the international institutions of peace?

To each question, the reply is the same.

If Republicans win control, the answer is "No." If the Democrats maintain their present strength, the answer is "Yes."

During the last 2 years the progressive look of the Democrats has stood out in sharp contrast to the backward look of the Republicans in the 89th Congress.

This is particularly true regarding laws that will develop human and natural resources.

The record is clear. On legislation designed to improve the quality of living for people who really need help, the Democrats voted "yes." The Republicans voted "no."

The Democratic majority in Congress succeeded in passing, over the obstinate resistance of most Republicans, the following measures:

Medicare and improved social security benefits; a higher minimum wage; continuation of the war on poverty; housing, urban development, and demonstration cities; elementary and secondary education.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

Our record of economic growth is impressive, especially after the repeated recessions of the Eisenhower years. How many recessions have we had since January 1961? None.

A return to Republican control would mean a return to the dreary cycle of recession and inflation that characterized the 8 years under Eisenhower.

The Democrats under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, on the other hand, have put into practice the techniques of the "new economics" that are keeping our economy prosperous and stable.

Starting with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and continuing through the Voting Rights Act of 1965, great progress was made in civil rights in recent years.

Senate failure to pass the civil rights bill of 1966 reflected growing concern that Congress has moved too fast.

Great understanding is required by both parties if we are to maintain the momentum we have gathered.

Responsible political leadership will not attempt to exploit and feed on the concern that is being expressed by the white community. Unfortunately, some Republicans have not shown this kind of responsibility. We must remain on guard to keep from walking backward instead of forward.

DILEMMA POSED

Building international institutions of peace poses a dilemma at this time because of U.S. absorption with Vietnam.

But while there are differences of view about what should be done in Vietnam, the war should not become a lever to destroy our worthwhile efforts in the world.

Increased foreign aid, assistance in developing democratic social and political institutions in emerging nations and a strengthened United Nations all deserve our continued support.

The American voter must ask himself who is best equipped to cope with the problems of the United States in today's world.

The answer comes out loud and clear: the Democrats. We are the party with the compassion, the commonsense and the forward look to which the responsibility for running this country should continue to be entrusted.

Address to California Teachers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I recently addressed the north coast section of the California Teachers Association at their meeting in the Benbow Inn in Garberville, Calif. Due to limitations of time, I decided not to deliver the formal speech I had prepared and spoke extemporaneously concerning the development of a new program for financing education in the Nation.

Because I intend to introduce this proposal at the beginning of the 90th Congress, I thought the Members would be interested in my comments on this subject. I therefore include the speech I was unable to deliver in the RECORD at this point:

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN DON H. CLAUSEN, FOR DELIVERY TO THE NORTH COAST SECTION, CALIFORNIA TEACHERS ASSOCIATION, OCTOBER 8, 1966

In discussing with you some of my thoughts relating to education, I'm sure there is no doubt but what my objectives for advancing education in America are the same as yours. Certainly none of us can say he has all the answers needed to meet our goals, but I believe it behooves all of us to express our thoughts forthrightly, to establish a continuing dialogue and, hopefully, to put into action the best ideas to develop from this type of exchange.

The California Teachers Association is certainly one of the more stimulating factors in the efforts to improve education throughout the land. I've enjoyed visiting with many of you on occasion, but I must frankly say that I'd like to improve the line of communication with you. The problems facing California schools, as in the rest of the Nation, are among the most challenging of our time. They demand our continuing attention as we seek to find workable solutions.

I want you all to know of my strong desire to come up with some realistic answers to the questions being asked about the development and strengthening of our educational system. With this in mind, I should like to set forth some of my thinking—with particular emphasis on financing education.

I'm certain many of you are aware of my genuine concern, which I'm sure you share, over Federal control of our educational system. Therefore, I would like to offer you my thoughts as to how we can improve the financing of education without stringent Federal control.

For the past year, a number of my colleagues in the House and I have devoted a great deal of time to research in this field. The result is legislation being drafted now that I intend to introduce early in the next Congress.

Those of us who are familiar with State and local government are well aware of the increase in demands for services, rising costs, rapid population expansion and the increasing complexity of governmental finance. State and local expenditures are six to seven times more than they were 20 years ago and their outlays in the field of education are up about 8 times. I should note, parenthetically, that funds for education have been rising at about eight per cent per year—about double the Gross National Product growth—and experts tell us that they will be twice what they are today in six or seven years. The present financial resources of state and local governments are inadequate to meet this challenge.

We must act now to help the States meet their responsibilities and the preamble to the bill I mentioned reads: "To strengthen State and local governments, to provide the states with additional financial resources to improve elementary and secondary education by returning a portion of the Federal revenue to the States." I think that aptly describes the approach many of us believe to be the solution to many educational problems.

Throughout the country the property tax supplies around 45 percent of all State and local revenues. A property tax of that size is reaching the limit to which it can be tolerated.

A very disturbing note to me, came when I was told that the ratio of financial sharing between the State of California and local school districts has drifted from the expected 50–50 split. The ratio has now moved to where the property tax payer in local school districts is carrying nearly 65 percent of the burden and the State has decreased its share to 35 percent. This is shocking and unforgivable to me because I understand that welfare spending by the State has increased some 30 percent in the same period its educational effort was decreasing so significantly. I am hopeful that my legislation, when passed, can help remedy this tragic situation.

My proposal is that one percent of the Federal revenue from the Internal Revenue Code and the tariff schedules be returned to the States in the first year of the program; two percent in the second year; up to five per cent in the fifth year and thereafter to be earmarked for use as educational assistance. The money will be deposited in a trust fund administered and distributed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

In addition, the bill will work to provide incentives to those states, such as California, which have fallen behind in the educational effort. While half of the money would be returned to the States on a straight per-student basis, the other half would be distributed through a formula intended to measure the effort each State is putting into its educational programs.

State effort is defined in the bill as the per cent of gross personal income spent on public elementary and secondary education. The mathematics of the formula would work as follows: The per cent of gross personal income spent by the State on public elementary and secondary education would be multiplied by the number of enrolled students in public grade schools and high schools. The figure thus derived would be the basis for the State's apportionment of one-half of the funds made available.

Provisions are included in the bill to guarantee that the funds are spent on education. The States are required to submit an annual audit and their plans for spending the funds must be approved by the Comptroller General of the United States. If disapproved the States will have, of course, the right of appeal.

The benefits from this approach to solving a pressing problem are manifold. Overall administration of schools would be greatly simplified—the definite anticipated revenues you could plan for would greatly enhance administrative and personnel planning.

As a member of the Roads subcommittee of the House, I have observed the manner in which road engineers and administrators can better plan the building and development of our great freeway and interstate system of highways—all because they have a more accurate and positive method of anticipating tax revenues on a program similar to the one I am advocating for education.

Through my proposal it is estimated that California will ultimately receive nearly $600 million annually for educational purposes without the need for further overburdening of the property tax payer. The estimated totals for California are: $110 million in the first year; $220 million in the second year; $330 million in the third year: $439 million the fourth year; and $549 million in the fifth and succeeding years. Thus, this educational finance program can offer a significant improvement in educational assistance without any danger whatsoever of Federal control. The program will be an investment we Americans can make for our children—their well-being and their opportunities for tomorrow.

The approach I have outlined, in my judgment, will yield the greatest return for dollar expenditures at the same time it will utilize the maximum capabilities of each level of government—Federal, State and local. It will keep the door open for the maximum individuality, freedom of expression, and personal choice. Thus, it would encourage individual responsibility rather than undermining it.

We know that States are badly in need of relief, financially. They are attempting to meet their responsibilities though a severe imbalance has developed in the revenue structure at all levels of government due to the fact that the Federal government collects two-thirds of all tax revenues. My tax-sharing proposal would set an historic precedent for a whole new concept of Federal-State financial relationship. The idea of transferring funds collected by the Federal government to a lower level might well get us off the horns of the continuing dilemma faced by liberals and conservatives alike—that of finding solutions to national problems, while maximizing personal freedom.

I firmly believe in this new approach to a long-standing problem and I shall push it as vigorously as I can during the coming Congress. The preservation of our uniquely successful Federal system is incumbent upon all of us. Increasing emphasis on the role of State and local governments in that system, will strengthen our entire governmental structure. I hope I can count on your support in this endeavor.

New Law Will Have Far-Reaching Effects on Campaign Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, an important law passed during the closing days of the 89th Congress.

This law contains a provision which should have a profound effect on the financing of presidential campaigns. In brief, this is what it would do:

Beginning in 1968, taxpayers could check a box on their individual income tax returns if they wanted to contribute $1 of their tax to a presidential campaign fund.

The two major parties would receive equal shares of the fund's proceeds to cover certified presidential campaign expenses.

Minority parties also could be helped, although it may be necessary to make some changes next year to insure that the minority parties are fully protected. Under the present law, a minority party must have received more than 5 million votes in the preceding presidential election in order to be eligible.

If the party's vote was between 5 and 15 million in that preceding election, it would receive—in the following election—$1 for each vote over 5 million which it had received in the preceding election. If it received more than 15 million votes, it would share equally with the other parties in the subsequent election.

Contributions would be strictly voluntary. According to estimates brought out in congressional debate, the fund could raise as much as $100 million a year.

Its division between the two—or more—parties would be administered by the U.S. Comptroller General.

Any money left over after a presidential election would be returned to the U.S. Treasury.

If the fund didn't cover expenses for an election, the parties could be reimbursed with money checked off in future years.

While there should be certain refinements made in the law in future years, the important point was to establish the principle of public financing of political campaigns.

What does the law mean? It means simply that the people of this country, as individuals, have the chance to help finance, effortlessly and directly, the political campaigns.

It means that there will be decreased reliance by both parties on large contributions from organizations that all too often expect something in return.

It means that there will be greater freedom in the use of other contributions, now gulped up largely by the demands of campaigning, that are made directly to political parties.

It means, above all, that American politics will become cleaner and healthier than it is now.

Treatment of Tax Benefits Under Consolidated Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, shortly before the adjournment of the 89th Congress the Senate Committee on Finance reported out H.R. 7502. In connection with this bill the Finance Committee in 1965 held hearings on an amendment, No. 426, sponsored by Senator DIRKSEN. This amendment was not included in the bill as reported, and I thought it would be appropriate to indicate my understanding of the reasons for its omission.

I offered an amendment in 1963 dealing with the question as to how, for tax purposes, tax benefits derived from filing a consolidated tax return should be divided between, or among, the corporations filing the consolidated return. For example, if a net operating loss of one corporation is offset against the income of another, with a resultant decrease in tax for the group, can the corporation which would have had to pay the tax if separate returns had been filed, be able to pay the corporation whose loss was used for this tax benefit, and have this reflected in the earnings and profits accounts of these corporations for purposes of any future dividends which might be paid? In other words, the idea was that the members receiving the tax benefits from filing the consolidated return should be able to pay those who contributed the tax benefits and have this transfer between, or among, the corporations treated in the same way for all tax purposes as if the transfer were a tax payment by the paying corporation and a reduction in tax payments for the corporation receiving the payment.

At about the same time I offered my amendment, Senator DIRKSEN offered an amendment designed to apply essentially these same tax allocation principles in determining who made the tax payments in the case of a consolidated return in determining costs for purposes of the Federal regulatory agencies. Amendment No. 426 represented a combination of my earlier amendment and Senator DIRKSEN's earlier amendment.

Two developments made it unnecessary for the Committee on Finance to give further consideration to amendment No. 426 before the 89th Congress adjourned.

First, the Treasury Department suggested that for tax purposes the problem might be resolved administratively without the need for additional legislation. I am informed that the Treasury Department is considering regulations which, in general, follow the principle of my legislative proposal; that is, recognizing the validity of reimbursement arrangements based on the separate return tax principle.

Second, the U.S. court of appeals in United Gas Pipeline Co., against Federal Power Commission also seems to have concluded that the Federal Power Commission must follow much the same separate return principle in its regulatory activities. Two other court of appeals decisions seem to have much the same effect and the issue is now pending before the Supreme Court.

In view of the fact that the Treasury is currently considering one aspect of this treatment for proposed regulations and the Supreme Court has the other aspect of the problem under consideration, it seemed to me that it would be inappropriate for Congress to act on this matter at this time. I should make it clear, however, that I fundamentally believe this separate return principle is correct, and I believe this view will prevail in the regulatory and court consideration of this problem. Should it not, this is a matter which I believe Congress will again want to consider.

Senator Maurine Neuberger, of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in January the Senate will be missing not only one of our most charming but far more significantly one of our most capable and creative colleagues. Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER has voluntarily chosen to retire from public life.

As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, where I have been privileged to work closely with her, Senator NEUBERGER has been both an effective and articulate advocate for improved housing for lower income American families. She has consistently initiated and supported positive programs in behalf of consumer protection against fraud and deception.

Senator NEUBERGER has served unflaggingly the people of Oregon and the people of the United States with great dedication, determination and distinction. Both the Senate and the Nation will miss her outstanding leadership. The senior Senator from Wisconsin is very happy to join his colleagues in saluting Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER for her many contributions and to wish her good health and great happiness for many, many years.

Summary of the 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the 89th Congress has been one of the most important in this century. Its accomplishments will have a lasting impact on all of us and our communities. Its failures have left a long agenda for the future.

From its early swift decisions to its last frenzied debates, this has been a Congress of action—sometimes enlightened and sometimes myopic, sometimes purposeful and sometimes unsure, sometimes deliberate and rational, sometimes injudicious and rash. In all its moods, this Congress has reflected the combination of boldness and bewilderment which many Americans feel as we complete old tasks and open the door to new challenges.

The work of the 89th Congress may be capsuled in four general areas. In foreign affairs, the record is mixed: while affirming the main policy threads which the United States has adhered to throughout the cold war, we did not fully respond to the new conditions produced by other nations' development and shifts in alliances. In domestic affairs, this Congress has decisively answered many social problems which had existed too long, but at the same time has failed to advance to meet new difficulties. Similarly, we have not acted firmly against the inflation and imbalances which trouble our economy today. Finally in the field of government itself, the 89th Congress has placed new burdens on all levels of public administration, without enacting the reforms needed to keep our system creative and competent.

As this Congress closes its books, I would like to summarize some of its most important actions, my positions on many issues, and some of the initiatives I have proposed.

FOREIGN POLICY

Throughout 1965–66 the problems of foreign policy have overshadowed all other questions, as the conflict in southeast Asia has become more intense and ominous, and as tensions in other parts of the globe have posed additional challenges to our perception and world leadership.

While the Vietnamese war is tragic and regrettable, I believe that we must honor and fulfill our basic commitments to help preserve and promote the freedom of the people of South Vietnam. I have encouraged a sustained, intensive search for an honorable peace, at the same time supporting the geographically and tactically limited military efforts required to turn back outside aggression, discourage Red Chinese adventurism, and foster negotiations. Because a lasting peace in southeast Asia clearly cannot be secured through military action alone, but requires a broad program of social, economic, and political action and reform, I have supported this year increased economic aid programs and efforts to reform their operations, and have backed U.S. participation in the new, promising Asian Development Bank for long-term regional economic growth.

While the Vietnamese conflict has preempted public attention and our best diplomatic efforts, other serious trends in world affairs demand our active, enlightened leadership. In a series of statements, several of my colleagues and I have encouraged initiatives to strengthen the Atlantic alliance, and to redirect our foreign aid programs toward more private participation, long-range planning, and the fostering of political development. We have also urged revitalization of the Alliance for Progress and have proposed reforms to strengthen the Organization of American States as an agency of hemispheric mutual security.

As a member of the House Republican Task Force on the United Nations, I have worked to find means to resolve the U.N.'s persistent financial crisis, and to buttress it as a forum for world communication and an agency of humanitarian works. Last year I proposed that the United States establish a volunteer brigade of noncombatants to serve on standby duty for use in U.N. peacekeeping operations. I have also stated that the question of admitting Communist China to the U.N. should be considered in the context of Peking's willingness, not presently evident, to abide by the U.N. Charter and to respect the rights of present U.N. members, including Nationalist China.

On the important question of trade, I have supported steps to promote American industrial and agricultural exports, enhance our competitive position in world markets and improve our balance of payments. Concerning trade with Communist nations, I support present prohibitions on trade in strategic goods, and have voted to preserve the President's discretionary authority to approve trade in nonstrategic goods, for cash or short-term credit, with certain Communist countries when such trade is deemed in our national interest.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

The tremendous dollar cost of Vietnam, and of maintaining our defenses throughout the world, has been dramatized in the series of five defense appropriations considered by the 89th Congress. I joined the vast majority of my colleagues in supporting these measures, thus affirming our intention to back our forces in the field in southeast Asia and around the globe.

An additional step to buttress our Armed Forces was taken in 1965 when the Congress enacted a long-overdue military pay increase averaging 10.4 percent, and provided life insurance and other needed aid for servicemen and their families.

As the southeast Asian conflict has placed increasing personal burdens on American families, it has become more obvious that the selective service system must be reformed to end inequities and reduce confusion, contradictions, and poor administration. I have encouraged a thorough review of the draft, and recommended reforms in several areas. As additional Marylanders seek my aid with selective service problems each week, I am continuing to press for essential changes in the law and regulations.

VETERANS

The most important new assistance for veterans was the Cold War GI Act, passed early in 1965, which provided for veterans of the cold war and southeast Asian service the educational, financial, and medical benefits which they have earned, and which veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict found so helpful. Congress last year also enacted bills to increase compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities, and to improve vocational rehabilitation assistance.

EDUCATION

Giving education top priority, the 89th Congress enacted a series of significant measures to provide additional opportunities for students at all levels, support construction of needed facilities, and strengthen vocational education and training.

I was pleased to support the landmark Elementary and Secondary Education Act, passed in 1965 and expanded in 1966, which has already opened new doors to learning for children from low-income families, and is enabling State and local school administrators to experiment with supplemental educational programs, summer programs, and community education, as appropriate for each county or district. I also backed an extension and enlargement of the Library Services and Construction Act, a successful program designed to improve public libraries and make more books available to more Americans.

In helping higher education meet the demands of a swiftly growing student population, the 89th Congress built on the record of the 88th Congress by passing two measures to extend assistance for construction, for developing institutions, and for fellowships in essential areas of graduate study. I was especially glad that these bills recognized the vast importance of community colleges and gave them a fair share of Federal aid.

The 89th Congress did not, however, fully meet its responsibilities to students and their families. While the present program of NDEA loans was continued, and a limited program of educational opportunity grants was authorized, no action was taken on proposals to provide credits against Federal income tax to help offset the rising costs of tuition and fees. I have proposed such a program for 6 years, and will continue to press for its adoption.

The 89th Congress did assert itself in opposing the President's unwise proposals to reduce aid to impacted areas, and to curtail the school lunch and school milk programs. I firmly supported maintaining present levels of aid to federally impacted areas, which is the only general-purpose, unrestricted assistance given to such school districts. I am also pleased that the Congress moved to strengthen, rather than cripple, the important school lunch and milk programs.

ECONOMIC POLICY

The administration and the congressional majority began the 89th Congress in an expansionist spirit which continued into 1966 despite rising pressures on many economic fronts. They ended the second session without adequately coming to grips with the inflation such policies had helped to generate.

The major tax bill of 1965 was a 4-year, $4 billion reduction in excise taxes, some of which dated back to World War II. I supported these cuts, feeling that such selective taxes should be levied only in national emergencies. In 1965, too, I opposed an extension of the interest equalization tax, which I consider an undesirable weapon of control of business capital.

The administration's ambivalent attitude toward the economy was shown early in 1966 when the President submitted a budget of $112.8 billion and at the same time sought reinstatement of the excise taxes cut the year before. I opposed this step, although I did support the acceleration of tax payments also contained in the Tax Adjustment Act.

During the year, the administration advocated few restraints except occasional arbitrary applications of wage-price guidelines. Federal spending rose, Federal hiring increased, interest rates soared, and the cost of living zoomed upward. Congress was forced to relieve pressures on the construction industry by increasing the purchasing power of FNMA and by providing flexible authority for the fixing of maximum interest rates on some kinds of deposits. I supported both bills.

When the President did belatedly move against inflation, he recommended among other steps suspension of the 7-percent business investment credit. Since this step would not have a significant immediate effect, and since the administration refused to make available detailed economic predictions for the coming year, I voted against this bill. I do support, however, efforts to curtail or stretch out Federal spending, and to place responsible ceilings on Federal employment.

At hearings on inflation which I held in Catonsville in September; I gained a new appreciation of inflation's broad impact on all families, especially on those trying to make ends meet on inadequate, fixed incomes. Only a broad range of reforms, in policies and attitudes, can reverse the present damaging trends—and the administration, and a majority of the 89th Congress, did not achieve those reforms.

SENIOR CITIZENS

In 1965 Congress took a long step toward insuring adequate incomes for senior citizens through an omnibus bill which raised social security benefits 7 percent, expanded eligibility, and improved the Kerr-Mills program of cooperative Federal-State medical aid. In a vote specifically on title I, the medicare title, I voted for a noncompulsory health insurance program not tied to social security. On passage I supported the omnibus bill.

In the time since passage of this benefits increase, inflation has already consumed more than half of the increase. To avoid such undermining of income, I have proposed legislation providing for an automatic increase in social security and railroad retirement benefits whenever the cost-of-living index rises 3 percent or more. I have also proposed removing the earnings ceiling which has discouraged many senior citizens from continuing to work.

BUSINESS

In addition to broad economic steps, the 89th Congress enacted several items of special interest to business. These included a bill setting new standards for bank mergers; a greatly modified truth-in-packaging act, providing for voluntary standards of packaging; and a series of measures dealing with foreign investment in the United States and American investment abroad.

One measure with import for small businessmen was the bill to expand funds available for small business loans. Another is a bill to modify State taxation of interstate commerce and reduce the paperwork and threats of multiple-tax liability which now plague many interstate concerns. This measure, the product of 3 years of work by a special subcommittee, has been approved by the Judiciary Committee and will be ready for House action next year.

LABOR

The 89th Congress conspicuously failed in the field of labor law. Despite several paralyzing strikes which dramatized the need for overall reforms, the administration did not advance any constructive proposals for consideration.

The only labor law revision brought to the floor of the House, the narrow bill to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, was debated under parliamentary shackles which prevented any debate on related issues or any amendments. Under these conditions, I voted against repeal. Despite apparent administration indifference to broader reforms, I have continued to advocate formation of a special commission or board of inquiry, representing management, labor, and the public, to make full recommendations to Congress.

After considerable controversy over many provisions, the Congress did enact this year increases in the Federal minimum wage and expansions of its coverage. I supported passage of the bill, after voting for amendments to postpone the second-step increase from 1968 to 1969, and to exclude certain small businesses from coverage.

One measure left unfinished would have improved the unemployment compensation system. I supported the House bill, which made important changes within the traditional structure of Federal-State cooperation.

CITY DEVELOPMENT AND RENEWAL

The 89th Congress responded to the complex and stubborn problems of America's great cities by continuing and refining existing programs, and by approving a broad, new approach.

Present urban renewal and housing programs were extended and revised in the omnibus housing acts of 1965 and 1966, which advanced the shift in emphasis from massive renewal to spot renewal, rehabilitation of housing, and vigorous code enforcement. The 1965 bill's most questionable aspect was the rent supplements program, which permitted the Federal Government to pay part of the rent of families unable to find housing at reasonable cost. Even after amendment on the floor, this program would have permitted payments to persons with incomes far above the "poverty level," an approach I was unable to support.

The 1966 bill's major innovation was its title I, the demonstration cities title, providing financial incentives to cities which massed all Federal-aid housing and social programs in a concentrated assault on the problems of blighted neighborhoods. As it finally passed, the title contained firm safeguards for local control of plans, and for equitable allocation of funds among larger and smaller communities. While supporting it on passage, however, I opposed the authorization of $900 million for future operating funds at a time when the cities' planning had not been completed, no sensible estimates of funds desired were known, and no realistic assessment of the 1967 economic picture could be made.

The persistently controversial antipoverty program was debated in both sessions of the 89th Congress. In 1965, when our first annual review was made, I supported the program's continuation, on the grounds that 1 short year had shown both its merits and the need for reform of some of its operations. By 1966, however, it was clear that the changes for which I hoped had not been made. To protect successful programs like Headstart from bureaucratic confusion and misdirection, I voted to reassign most aspects of the antipoverty program to existing Cabinet departments already operating relatively smoothly in related fields.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

One of the first important measures passed by the 89th Congress was the Appalachian Regional Development Act, authorizing $1.1 billion for the economic growth of the 11-State Appalachian region, including Garrett, Allegany, and Washington Counties in the Sixth District. The act provides support for a new system of highways to improve access to the region, for health facilities, for vocational education, for reclamation of mining areas, and for development of timber and water resources.

In 1965 Congress also passed the Economic Development Act, designed to promote economic growth and regional planning in depressed areas. I have urged western Maryland officials to make full use of both acts and the aid which they provide.

TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY

Significant improvements in the American transportation picture should result from several 89th Congress actions. Foremost on the list are the Traffic Safety Act and the Highway Safety Act, congressional initiatives which provide for development of standards for auto and tire design, and for support of broad State highway safety programs and research. Together these acts should help to reduce the tragic toll on our highways.

A step toward rationalizing our national transportation complex was taken this year with establishment of the 13th Cabinet Department, the Department of Transportation. I supported this measure, but only after the House, recognizing the unique role of our merchant marine, had removed the Maritime Administration from the new Department.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The 89th Congress continued implementation of the American pledge to equal justice and equal rights for all citizens by enacting new civil rights legislation and overseeing the enforcement of existing laws.

As a member of the House Judiciary Committee, and of its subcommittee with civil rights jurisdiction, I was actively engaged in preparing bills presented to the House in both sessions. In 1965, the committee shaped and Congress passed the landmark Voting Rights Act, which struck down discriminatory voting qualifications and insured equal access to the polls for all adult citizens.

In 1966, the committee spent over 3 months discussing an omnibus civil rights bill primarily intended to secure equal justice by guaranteeing nondiscrimination in jury selection, Federal prosecution of criminal assaults based on race, and protection of first amendment rights of free speech, assembly, and petition. After rejection of the President's additional proposal to end discrimination in the sale or rental of all housing, I worked with other committee members to develop a moderate, equitable title IV which established the principle of nondiscrimination throughout the business of housing, and exempted both small owner-occupied apartments and rooming houses, and the sale or rental of almost all individual homes by owners not in the housing business, or their agents. This omnibus bill was approved by the House, with the addition of an amendment making it a Federal crime to use interstate commerce for the purpose of rioting or inciting civil disturbances. The bill did not become law because the Senate failed to act on it.

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

The House Judiciary Committee has considered many measures with lasting import. In addition to civil rights legislation, these included proposals in the fields of law enforcement, immigration, antitrust, claims, and constitutional amendments.

To modernize State and local law enforcement and improve public protection, the Congress in 1965 enacted the Law Enforcement Assistance Act, authorizing Federal aid for the training of police personnel and acquisition of new equipment. Additional committee bills set up special commissions to conduct broad reviews of our criminal laws and the administration of justice.

Another important measure reformed the 30-year-old immigration system by gradually abolishing the discriminatory national-origins quota system and establishing in its place a system of priorities based on family ties and special education or skills.

Ending over 176 years of uncertainty about presidential succession and continuity, the Congress enacted the proposed 25th amendment to the Constitution, spelling out procedures for cases of presidential disability, and for filling vacancies in the Vice-Presidency. I opposed the amendment because it provided that a new Vice President would be nominated by the President and confirmed by Congress, rather than being elected by the Congress. This procedure seemed to me to be less than representative and smacking of authoritarianism.

In this Congress the Judiciary Committee also debated the problem of equal representation in legislative bodies. After many years of discussion, the House approved a bill defining the permissible limits of population differences among congressional districts. I supported this bill, as an assertion of the congressional responsibility to put its own House in order. It is a national tragedy that the Senate failed to complete this job.

On a related point, I urged the Maryland Legislature repeatedly to solve the congressional districting problems of the Free State responsibly, rather than abdicating and handing the job to the courts.

AGRICULTURE

The most promising agricultural measure enacted by this Congress was the Food for Peace Act of 1966, which continued the existing program of commodity exports and shifted its emphasis from surplus disposal to the encouragement of production. By opening additional markets for agricultural goods, this program should bring greater prosperity to American farmers.

In general, however, the agricultural policies of the 89th Congress unfortunately perpetuated and elaborated on the present costly system of subsidies, quotas, and controls. I was unable to support the 1965 omnibus farm bill, and hope that we are approaching the point where such intricate legislative controls over agriculture can be reduced.

One particular area in which reforms are drastically needed is that of drought relief. After many discussions with Maryland farmers, I recommended this year a series of legislative and administrative steps to improve existing emergency programs, make them more equitable and uniform, and abolish the "mean tests" which currently deny assistance to too many farmers.

After years of persistent argument, Maryland dairy farmers won a significant fight this year when the Navy Department finally decided to close the Naval Academy dairy farm and end this case of Government competition with private enterprise. I supported this move in many exchanges with the Navy Department, and in testimony before a special subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee.

NATURAL RESOURCES

This Congress provided major new weapons in the fight to save our natural resources by enacting a series of laws to combat the serious, stubborn problem of water pollution. Primary among these were the Water Quality Act of 1965, which required establishment of water quality standards for interstate rivers, and the Clean Waters Restoration Act of 1966, which built on the 1965 measure by greatly expanding the Federal financial commitment to pollution control. The two measures increased Federal assistance for community sewage projects, and the 1966 act included provisions similar to my bill to raise dollar ceilings on Federal contributions and to encourage meaningful State participation.

The 89th Congress also approved a new program of grants to help develop rural water supply and waste disposal systems, and a measure to promote proper planning for use of the Nation's water resources.

Air pollution and the problems of solid waste disposal received attention, too, in a 1965 measure providing for the establishment of standards for air pollution by motor vehicles, and set up a research program to develop better ways to dispose of solid wastes and junked vehicles.

In the field of parks development, the 89th Congress took important steps by establishing Assateague National Seashore, the Tocks Island Recreation Area in Pennsylvania and New Jersey, the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area in West Virginia, and other new areas elsewhere in the Nation.

While not formally before the Congress, the question of planning for the Potomac River Basin commanded a great deal of my attention. Beginning in January 1965, when the President announced his intention to make the Potomac Basin a model of recreation and scenic beauty, the Interior Department and related agencies have been mapping plans toward the President's goal. After many discussions with Maryland conservationists, sportsmen, local officials, and area residents, and after a meeting on the subject which I held at the Antietam Battlefield in March 1965, I have recommended several specific steps. These include enactment of my bill to establish the Chesapeake and Ohio National Historical Park, the reconstruction of dam No. 6 on the canal, and increased attacks on water pollution. I have also repeatedly called for full and frank consultation between Federal and State officials, and the local officials and concerned citizens who should have an equal partnership in planning for the basin. In future weeks I trust that the Interior Department will consider carefully the advantages of developing progressive plans which completely recognize legitimate local interests, and which promote the gradual development of a coordinated park system including private, county, State, and Federal lands.

CIVIL SERVANTS

The 89th Congress passed a number of measures to assist the public servants whom the Government employs. The most important were the 1965 and 1966 salary increases, which brought Federal pay scales to more sensible levels, and the related increases in civil service retirement benefits. Of additional civil service measures enacted, one of the more significant was a bill to provide additional reimbursement for moving expenses for Federal employees and their families.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Having decided in 1965 to continue its direct authority over the District of Columbia, the Congress in 1966 enacted several significant District of Columbia bills. Among the most desirable were a new minimum wage bill, authorization for a 4-year public college and a vocational college, and approval of both a basic District of Columbia mass transit system and the Metropolitan Washington transit compact. An inequitable and possibly unconstitutional crime bill was approved late in the second session, but was vetoed by the President.

In the fall of 1965 the House, after bringing a moderate home rule bill to the floor via a discharge petition, reversed its field and rejected an elected mayor and city council for Washington, approving instead a bill so different from the Senate-passed home rule bill that compromise between the two proved impossible. While continuing to work for local self-government, I have sponsored new legislation to establish the office of Delegate from the District of Columbia as an intermediate step.

HISTORY AND THE HUMANITIES

The 89th Congress, recognizing the vital role of the arts and humanities in our national life, established in 1965 the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, empowered to give support to talent and scholarship in these fields.

This year the Congress also approved legislation, very similar to a bill I introduced, to establish an American Revolution Bicentennial Commission to plan, develop, and coordinate plans for the commemoration of our national bicentennial.

Two historical measures of particular interest to Maryland which I sponsored in this Congress were a resolution commemorating Repudiation Day, and a bill to provide a permanent site at Fort McHenry for the U.S.S. *Constellation*. The Repudiation Day resolution was passed by the House.

GOVERNMENTAL REFORM

While enacting a great amount of legislation which expanded Federal responsibilities, the 89th Congress generally failed either to make Federal operations more efficient and economical, or to strengthen the Congress as a legislative and supervisory body.

Concerned about the waste, contradictions, paperwork, and poor planning which so often impede Federal administration, many of my colleagues joined me last year in sponsoring my bill to set up a new Hoover-type Commission to review all Federal operations, cut redtape, improve coordination, and put the most advanced tools of management at the service of the public business. In a related step, more than 40 other Members and I this year advocated the creation of a National Commission on Public Management to survey means of applying the most advanced tools of management and systems analysis to public problems. Both of these bills should be seriously considered by the 90th Congress.

The need to reform congressional operations, to make the legislative branch a more effective instrument of Government, was recognized this year in an omnibus congressional reform bill, the product of more than 2 years of work by the special Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress. Many of the recommendations on individual and committee staffs, committee jurisdiction and workloads, and other points are similar to the suggestions I made last year in testifying before the joint committee.

The Congress, while postponing consideration of the reorganization bill until next year, also put off full debate on the vital question of congressional ethics. I feel that this topic, and the related issue of campaign financing, should receive the early and candid attention of the 90th Congress, so that popular doubts about congressional ethics can be ended and public confidence in the integrity of the first branch of Government can be assured.

MATHIAS ROLLCALL VOTES

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I would like to place in the RECORD at this point a compilation of my rollcall votes during both sessions of the 89th Congress:

Voting and attendance record, 89th Cong., 1st sess., 1965

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1965		
1	Jan. 4	Call of the House	Present.
2	Jan. 4	Election of the Speaker. (McCormack, 289; Ford, 139.)	Ford.
3	Jan. 4	H. Res. 1: To order a vote on the resolution authorizing the Speaker to administer the oath of office to the 5 Members-elect from Mississippi. (Passed 276 to 148.)	No.
4	Jan. 4	H. Res. 8: To order a vote on the resolution providing 3 changes in the rules of the House. (Passed 224 to 201.)	Yes.
6	Jan. 19	H. Res. 126: To dismiss a contest of the election of Representative Ottinger of New York. (Passed 245 to 102.)	Not voting.
7	Jan. 26	H.J. Res. 234: On a motion to recommit to committee the supplemental appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture in order to add a provision prohibiting the use of these funds to supply surplus farm commodities under title I to the United Arab Republic. (Passed 204 to 177.)	Yes.
10	Feb. 8	H.J. Res. 234: On a motion to instruct House conferees to insist on House provision in supplemental appropriations bill for Department of Agriculture relating to sale of certain surplus farm commodities to the United Arab Republic. (Defeated 161 to 241.)	Yes.
12	Feb. 9	H.R. 3818: To recommit to committee the bill to eliminate the requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit liabilities. (Defeated 93 to 289.)	No.
13	Feb. 9	H.R. 3818: On final passage of the bill to eliminate the requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit liabilities. (Passed 300 to 82.)	Yes.
16	Feb. 17	H.R. 2998: To authorize appropriations for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency for 3 years in the amount of $40,000,000. (Passed 302 to 63.)	Yes.
19	Feb. 18	H.R. 45: To recommit to committee the bill authorizing funds for the Inter-American Development Bank in order to reduce the amount from $750,000,000 to $725,000,000. (Defeated 142 to 237.)	Not voting.
20	Feb. 18	H.R. 45: On final passage of the bill authorizing an appropriation of $750,000,000 for the Inter-American Development Bank. (Passed 288 to 92.)	Yes.
23	Feb. 25	H. Res. 188: To recommit to committee the resolution providing funds for the Committee on Un-American Activities in order to hold hearings on justification of the funds. (Defeated 58 to 332.)	No.
24	Feb. 25	H. Res. 188: To pass the resolution providing $370,000 for operation of the Committee on Un-American Activities. (Passed 359 to 29.)	Yes.
28	Mar. 3	S. 3: On a motion to recommit to committee in order to substitute the provisions of H.R. 4466. (Defeated 100 to 323.)	No.
29	Mar. 3	S. 3: On final passage of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965. (Passed 257 to 165.)	Yes.
31	Mar. 10	H.R. 2: To approve the Drugs Abuse Control Amendment of 1965. (Passed 402 to 0.)	Yes.
33	Mar. 15	H.R. 4714: To suspend the rules and pass a bill authorizing an appropriation of $150,000 per year for the Advisory Council on the Arts. (Defeated 217 to 113, a ⅔ majority being necessary.)	Yes.
35	Mar. 16	H.R. 5505: On a motion to amend the Congressional Redistricting Act to provide that the number of Representatives that a State is entitled to may be elected at large pending reapportionment under this act and providing for at-large elections in States that have never established districts. (Defeated 147 to 255.)	Yes.
38	Mar. 17	H. Res. 276: On agreeing to the rule for taking up for consideration H.R. 5374, the bill to increase the salaries of the Justice of the Supreme Court. (Passed 202 to 183.)	Yes.
39	Mar. 17	H.R. 5374: To increase the salaries of the Justices of the Supreme Court from $39,000 to $42,500 and the salary of the Chief Justice from $40,000 to $43,000. (Defeated 177 to 203.)	Yes.
42	Mar. 22	H.R. 5688: On a motion to recommit to committee for further public hearings the bill on criminal legislation for the District of Columbia. (Defeated 166 to 216.)	Yes.
43	Mar. 22	H.R. 5688: On final passage of the bill relating to crime and criminal procedure in the District of Columbia. (Passed 250 to 131.)	No.
45	Mar. 23	H.R. 5721: To amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco. (Passed 206 to 170.)	No.
51	Mar. 26	On a motion calling for a vote (previous question) on the motion to consider the House Journal as read. (Passed 274 to 119.)	No.
52	Mar. 26	H.R. 2362: On a motion to recommit to committee the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to change the formula for the allocation of funds. (Defeated 149 to 267.)	No.
53	Mar. 26	H.R. 2362: On final passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. (Passed 263 to 153.)	Yes.
57	Mar. 31	H.R. 3708: To approve the Older Americans Act of 1965. (Passed 391 to 1.)	Yes.
58	Mar. 31	H.R. 1111: To approve the Water Resources Planning Act. (Passed 383 to 0.)	Yes.
60	Apr. 1	H.R. 4257: To approve the Manpower Act of 1965. (Passed 392 to 0.)	Not voting.[1]
62	Apr. 5	H.R. 980: To suspend the rules and pass the bill providing for the return of obscene mail and making it easier to keep this type of material out of homes. (Passed 360 to 21.)	Not voting.[1]
63	Apr. 5	H.R. 7064: To suspend the rules and authorize the appropriation of $1,000,000 for construction of a U.S. Embassy building in Saigon. (Passed 378 to 0.)	Not voting.[1]
64	Apr. 5	H.R. 7060: To approve the $6,600,000,000 appropriation bill for the Departments of Treasury and Post Office and for the Executive Office of the President. (Passed 344 to 7.)	Yes.
66	Apr. 6	H.R. 7091: To approve the $2,100,000,000 2d supplemental appropriation bill. (Passed 348 to 62.)	Yes.
70	Apr. 8	H.R. 6675: To recommit to committee the Social Security Amendments of 1965 as reported by the committee in order to substitute the provisions of H.R. 7057, a bill similar to H.R. 6675 but without the compulsory medicare provisions and without the increase in social security payroll taxes. (Defeated 191 to 236.)	Yes.

See footnote at end of table.

Voting and attendance record, 89th Cong., 1st sess., 1965—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1965		
71	Apr. 8	H.R. 6675: On final passage of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 and increasing the social security payroll taxes. (Passed 313 to 115.)	Yes.
72	Apr. 13	H.R. 2998: On adoption of the conference report on the authorization for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in the amount of $30,000,000 for 3 years. (Passed 315 to 65.)	Yes.
74	Apr. 13	H.J. Res. 1: On passage of the resolution proposing a constitutional amendment relative to Presidential disability and succession. (Passed 368 to 29.)	No.
76	Apr. 14	H. Res. 310: To provide $50,000 for additional expenses of Committee on Un-American Acitivities for an investigation of the Ku Klux Klan. (Passed 312 to 43.)	Yes.
78	Apr. 27	H.R. 6497: To recommit to the Committee on Banking and Currency for further consideration the bill to authorize an increase in the International Monetary Fund quota of the United States.	Not voting.[1]
79	Apr. 27	H.R. 6497: To pass the bill authorizing an increase of $1,035,000,000 in the U.S. quota for the International Monetary Fund. (Passed 301 to 88.)	Not voting.[1]
82	Apr. 28	S. 4: To approve the Water Quality Act of 1965 as amended by the House. (Passed 396 to 0.)	Not voting.[1]
84	Apr. 29	H.R. 7091: To agree to the conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill in the amount of $2,200,000,000. (Passed 316 to 55.)	Not voting.[1]
85	Apr. 29	H.R. 7091: To agree to the Senate amendment (No. 6) to the supplemental appropriation bill providing $942,000 to continue the Federal subsidy this fiscal year for helicopter service at New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles. (Defeated 144 to 228.)	Not voting.[1]
86	Apr. 29	H.R. 4714: To correct a technical error in Public Law 88–579 with the effect of authorizing annual appropriations for the National Council on the Arts of not more than $150,000. (Passed 239 to 115.)	Not voting.[1]
87	May 3	H.R. 2986 (S. 510): To extend the Community Health Services Act and to launch a nationwide immunization program against measles. (Passed 347 to 0.)	Not voting.[1]
90	May 4	H.R. 2985: To authorize the appropriation of $172,000,000 during the next 4 years to help pay the cost of staff members of community mental health centers. (Passed 389 to 0.)	Not voting.[1]
92	May 5	H.J. Res. 447: To pass the resolution transferring $700,000,000 to the Department of Defense for use in connection with military activities in southeast Asia.	Not voting.[1]
94	May 5	H.R. 7657 (S. 800): To approve the bill authorizing the appropriations for 1966 of $15,300,000,000 for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces. (Passed 395 to 0.)	Not voting.[1]
96	May 6	H. Res. 366: To adopt the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 7717, a bill to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. (Passed 389 to 0.)	Not voting.[1]
97	May 6	H.R. 7717: To approve the bill authoriz ng appropriations in the amount of $5,100,000,000 for the national aeronautics and space program. (Passed 389 to 11.)	Not voting.[1]
99	May 10	H.R. 2984: To approve an amendment to the Public Health Service Act to extend the health research facilities program and to authorize 3 additional Assistant Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare. (Passed 333 to 4.)	Not voting.[1]
101	May 12	S. 701: To approve the bill designed to implement the International Coffee Agreement signed at New York in 1962. (Passed 300 to 97.)	Not voting.[1]
104	May 20	H.R. 8122: To recommit to committee the Atomic Energy Commission's authorization bill in order to delete $91,500,000 for construction of a large seed and blanket reactor in cooperation with the State of California. (Defeated 43 to 313.)	Not voting.[1]
105	May 20	H.R. 8122: To approve the $2,500,000,000 authorization bill for the Atomic Energy Commission. (Passed 350 to 1.)	Not voting.[1]
109	May 25	H.R. 775 : To recommit to committee the foreign aid authorization bill in order to reduce the authorization for the Development Loan Fund by $131,000,060 and to change "free labor unions" to "free non-Communist-dominated labor unions" in connection with institutions to be developed through housing projects in Latin American countries. (Defeated 178 to 219.)	Not voting.[1]
110	May 25	H.R. 7750: To pass the foreign aid authorization bill in the amount of $2,000,000,000, making $3,400,000,000 available for fiscal 1966. (Passed 249 to 148.)	Not voting.[1]
112	May 26	H.R. 8370: To recommit to committee the Agriculture Department appropriation bill in order to add an amendment which would prohibit the use of funds to finance the exportation of any agricultural commodity to either the United Arab Republic or Indonesia under title I of Public Law 480. (Defeated 187 to 208.)	Not voting.[1]
113	May 26	H.R. 8370: To approve the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture in the amount of $5,700,000,000. (Passed 354 to 41.)	Not voting.[1]
116	June 1	H.R. 8639: To approve the appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and related agencies in the amount of $2,000,000,000. (Passed 322 to 60.)	Not voting.[1]
117	June 1	H.R. 3584: To approve the bill amending the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act. (Passed 335 to 43.)	Not voting.[1]
119	June 2	H.R. 8371: To approve the bill reducing and/or eliminating certain excise taxes. (Passed 401 to 6.)	Not voting.[1]
121	June 3	H.R. 7777: To approve the bill which would authorize the President to appoint Gen. William F. McKee (retired) to the Office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency as an exception to existing law. (Passed 228 to 137.)	Not voting.[1]
123	June 7	H.R. 3157: To approve a bill which would permit the spouse of a railroad employee to receive a spouse's annuity under the Railroad Retirement Act and social security benefits or railroad retirement benefits earned in her own right. (Passed 323 to 0.)	Yes.
126	June 8	H.R. 8775: To recommit to committee the legislative appropriation bill in order to delete $35,000 for the employment of 16 operators for automatic elevators in the Rayburn Office Building. (Defeated 149 to 244.)	Yes.
127	June 8	H.R. 7105: To adopt the bill extending and amending the Export Control Act. (Passed 387 to 1.)	Yes.
129	June 9	H. Res. 413: To adopt the rule under which to consider the bill increasing the debt limit to $328,000,000,000. (Passed 273 to 109.)	Yes.
130	June 9	H.R. 8464: To adopt the bill increasing the debt limit from $324,000,000,000 to $328,000,000,000. (Passed 229 to 164.)	No.
131	June 9	H. Con. Res. 285: To amend the resolution to allow the showing in the United States of the Kennedy film produced by the U.S. Information Agency in order to provide that no fee should be charged those who viewed the film. (Defeated 174 to 216.)	Yes.
132	June 9	H. Con. Res. 285: To adopt the resolution authorizing the showing in the United States of the film, "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lighting, Day of Drums," produced by the U.S. Information Agency for use abroad: Bill contains no provision against charging viewers a fee to see film produced by tax funds. (Passed 311 to 75.)	No.
141	June 16	H.R. 6927: To recommit to committee the bill establishing a Department of Housing and Urban Development in order to substitute the provision of H.R. 8822 establishing in the Executive Office an Office of Urban Affairs and Community Development. (Defeated 141 to 259.)	Yes.
142	June 16	H.R. 6927: To approve the bill establishing at Cabinet level a Department of Housing and Urban Development. (Passed 217 to 184.)	No.
143	June 16	H. Res. 416: To authorize each Member of the House to employ, on a temporary basis, a student intern without regard to present restrictions on number of employees and clerk-hire allowance. (Passed 229 to 153.)	Not voting.
145	June 21	H.R. 7743: To approve the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965, providing for a system of loan insurance to assist students to attend postsecondary business, trade, technical, and other vocational schools. (Passed 300–0.)	Yes.
146	June 21	H.R. 8620: To amend the Agricultural Act to take into consideration floods and other disasters in reference to feed grains, cotton, and wheat programs for 1965. (Passed 296 to 2.)	Yes.
147	June 21	H. Con. Res. 416: To approve the resolution in behalf of freedom for the people of the Baltic States. (Passed 298 to 0.)	Yes.
153	June 23	H.R. 9221: To approve the appropriation bill for the Department of Defense in the amount of $45,000,000,000. (Passed 407 to 0.)	Yes.
155	June 24	H.J. Res. 541: To extend the Area Redevelopment Act for a period of 2 months. (Passed 224 to 167.)	Yes.
157	June 28	H. Res. 425: To adopt the rule under which to consider H.R. 7984, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965. (Passed 230 to 115.)	Yes.
162	June 30	H.R. 7984: To substitute for sec. 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act the Stephens amendment relative to rent supplements making minor changes in that section. (Passed 240 to 179.)	No.
163	June 30	H.R. 7984: To delete from the Housing and Urban Development Act sec. 101, relative to rent supplements, and sec. 106, relative to a new grant program under urban renewal. (Defeated 202 to 208.)	Yes.
164	June 30	H.R. 7984: To approve the Housing and Urban Development Act containing the provision for rent supplements (subsidies) for middle-income groups. (Passed 245 to 169.)	Yes.
167	July 6	H. Res. 440: To adopt the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 6400, the Voting Rights Act: 10 hours of debate with the right to substitute the text of H.R. 7896 (the McCulloch-Ford bill) for H.R. 6400. (Passed 308 to 58.)	Yes.
175	July 9	H.R. 6400: To amend the voting rights bill to provide criminal penalties for giving false information on voting-eligibility status, or for paying or accepting money to register or vote. (Passed 253 to 165.)	Yes.
176	July 9	H.R. 6400; To amend the voting rights bill to permit the courts to remove the Federal examiner in a given county if it is proved that at least 50 percent of Negroes of voting age are registered. (Defeated 155 to 262.)	No.
177	July 9	H.R. 6400: To amend the voting rights bill to allow people illiterate in English to vote if they have completed the 6th grade in Spanish-language schools. (Defeated 202 to 216.)	No.
178	July 9	H.R. 6400: To recommit to committee the voting rights bill in order to substitute the provision of the Ford-McCulloch bill, H.R. 7896. (Defeated 171 to 248.)	No.
179	July 9	H.R. 6400: On final passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. (Passed 333 to 85.)	Yes.
181	July 12	H.R. 8856: To clarify the law relative to the Atomic Energy Commission to correct any conclusion that its activities, as authorized by Congress, are limited by local regulations relative to the generation, sale, or transmission of electric power. (Defeated 216 to 130, a ⅔ vote being necessary to suspend rules.)	No.
182	July 12	H.R. 242: To require that appointments to fill temporary summer positions in the Federal Government in the Washington area be apportioned among all the States. (Passed 336 to 22.)	No.
185	July 13	S. 559: To adopt the conference report on the legislation requiring a "caution" statement on packages of cigarettes. (Passed 285 to 103.)	No.
188	July 14	H.R. 8926: To amend the Coinage Act of 1965 to require the silver content of quarters and dimes to be minted under this act to be fixed at 40 percent. (Defeated 187 to 218.)	No.
189	July 14	H.R. 8926: On final adoption of the Coinage Act of 1965 reducing the amount of silver in our dimes, quarters, and half dollars. (Passed 255 to 151.)	Yes.
193	July 20	H.R. 9075: To approve the Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1965 increasing compensation for members of the Armed Forces. (Passed 410 to 0.)	Yes.
196	July 22	H.R. 8283: On a motion to recommit to committee the antipoverty bill of 1965 in order to delete the provision giving the Federal Poverty Administration the right to overrule Governors' vetoes of projects and to reduce the authorization for 1966 from $1,900,000,000 to $945,000,000, the amount for 1965. (Defeated 178 to 227.)	No.

See footnote at end of table.

Voting and attendance record, 89th Cong., 1st sess., 1965—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1965		
197	July 22	H.R. 8283: On final passage of the antipoverty bill of 1965 authorizing $1,900,000,000 for the program. (Passed 245 to 158.)	Yes.
199	July 26	H. Res. 437: On a motion (previous question) to halt debate and vote on the resolution calling for only 5 hours of debate on H.R. 77 (to repeal sec. 14(b) of Taft-Hartley) and prohibiting the consideration of meaningful amendments. (Passed 248 to 171.)	No.
203	July 27	H.R. 6675: To approve the conference report on the Social Security Amendments of 1965 including medicare and an increase in social security payroll taxes. (Passed 307 to 116.)	Yes.
204	July 27	H.R. 7984: To approve the conference report on the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 including the rent subsidy provision. (Passed 251 to 168.)	Yes.
205	July 27	H.R. 2985: To approve the conference report on the Mental Facilities and Centers Construction Act. (Passed 414 to 0.)	Yes.
208	July 28	H.R. 77: To recommit to the Committee on Education and Labor the bill to repeal sec. 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. (Defeated 200 to 223.)	Yes.
209	July 28	H.R. 77: To approve the bill repealing sec. 14(b) of Taft-Hartley law (which authorized States to prohibit compulsory union membership). (Passed 221 to 203.)	No.
212	July 29	H.R. 8856: To clarify the law relative to the Atomic Energy Commission to correct any conclusion that its activities, as authorized by Congress, are limited by local regulations relative to the generation, sale, or transmission of electric power. (Passed 225 to 125.)	Yes.
214	Aug. 2	S.J. Res. 81: To increase the amount of funds authorized for the Interstate Highway System for the fiscal year 1967 from $2,900,000,000 to $3,000,000,000 and authorizing the apportionment of these funds to the States. (Passed 313 to 11.)	Yes.
215	Aug. 2	H.R. 8027: To authorize the appropriation of $10,000,000 for fiscal 1966 to provide assistance in training State and local law-enforcement officers. (Passed 326 to 0.)	Yes.
216	Aug. 2	H.R. 6964: To approve the bill authorizing the Attorney General to transfer certain prisoners to residential community treatment centers, to grant them leave, and to permit them to work in private employment. (Passed 323 to 0.)	Yes.
218	Aug. 3	S. 1564 (H.R. 6400): To recommit to committee the conference report on the voting rights bill of 1965 in order to delete the provision which would permit the courts to remove the Federal examiner in a given political subdivision if it is proved that at least 50 percent of Negroes of voting age are registered. (Defeated 118 to 284.)	Yes.
219	Aug. 3	S. 1564 (H.R. 6400): To approve the conference report on the voting rights bill of 1965. (Passed 328 to 74.)	Yes.
220	Aug. 3	H.R. 8469: To provide certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund. (Passed 394 to 0.)	Yes.
221	Aug. 4	H.R. 8439: To adopt the conference report on the military construction authorization bill for 1966 in the amount of $1,700,000,000. (Passed 389 to 0.)	Yes.
222	Aug. 4	S. 1742: To amend the articles of agreement of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and its affiliate, the International Finance Corporation to permit the World Bank to lend to the IFC. (Passed 330 to 54.)	Not voting.
224	Aug. 5	H. Res. 498: To adopt the rule under which the House would consider H. R. 4750, the bill to provide a 2-year extension of the interest equalization tax. (Passed 329 to 44.)	No.
225	Aug. 5	H.R. 4750: To adopt the bill amended to extend for 19 months the interest equalization tax. (Passed 274 to 97.)	No.
228	Aug. 9	H.R. 9918: To adopt the substitute bill (H.R. 7174) in lieu of bill approved by committee relative to motor vehicle insurance in the District of Columbia, the substitute requiring all insured drivers to cover protection against uninsured drivers and requiring uninsured drivers to pay at least $40 a year into an unsatisfied-judgment claims fund. (Passed 173 to 156.)	Not voting.
230	Aug. 10	H.R. 10306: To amend the Selective Service Act to make it a crime to knowingly destroy or mutilate a draft card. (Passed 393 to 1.)	Yes.
234	Aug. 12	S. 1648: To amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act by making more areas eligible for grants for public works and development facilities, to increase the authorization from $400,000,000 to $500,000,000 and to change the limitation in the program from 5 years to 4 years. (Passed 196 to 194.)	No.
235	Aug. 12	S. 1648: To recommit to committee the Public Works and Economic Development Act in order to cut $85,000,000 from the cost by eliminating industrial and commercial loans and guarantees for working capital, to require the purchase of American-made products, and to provide for an annual review of expenditures by Congress. (Defeated 163 to 224.)	No.
236	Aug. 12	S. 1648: On final passage of the Public Works and Economic Development Act authorizing the expenditure of $3,300,000,000 (not including administrative costs) for the initial 5 years of the program. (Passed 264 to 138.)	Yes.
238	Aug. 16	H.R. 6431: To suspend the tariff duty on certain forms of nickel. (Passed 297 to 48.)	Not voting.
239	Aug. 16	H.R. 8635: To suspend the rules and pass the bill establishing a Federal Boxing Commission. (Passed 346 to 4.)	Not voting.
242	Aug. 19	H.R. 7750: To approve the conference report on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1965. (Passed 244 to 150.)	Yes.
243	Aug. 19	H.R. 8911: To recommit to committee for further consideration the omnibus farm bill. (Defeated 169 to 224.)	Yes.
244	Aug. 19	H.R. 9811: On final passage of the $3,300,000,000 Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 (omnibus farm bill). (Passed 221 to 172.)	No.
246	Aug. 24	H.R. 10586: To recommit to committee the bill making supplemental appropriations in the amount of $1,200,000,000 for the Department of Labor, and of Health, Education, and Welfare for fiscal year 1966. (Defeated 139 to 263.)	No.
248	Aug. 25	H.R. 2580: On an amendment to the Amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 which would place a restriction of 115,000 on the number of immigrants to be admitted from the Western Hemisphere. (Defeated 189 to 218.)	Paired no.
249	Aug. 25	H.R. 2580: On final passage of the bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act. (Passed 318 to 95.)	Paired yes.
252	Aug. 26	H.R. 9567: On final passage of the Higher Education Act of 1965. (Passed 367 to 22.)	Yes.
253	Aug. 30	H.R. 9022: To provide for Federal assistance in the construction and operation of elementary and secondary schools in areas affected by a major disaster and amend the law relative to impacted school areas. (Passed 304 to 37.)	Yes.
254	Aug. 31	H. Res. 551: On adoption of the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 9042, the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965. (Passed 364 to 23.)	Yes.
255	Aug. 31	H.R. 9042: On passage of the bill providing for the implementation of the agreement concerning automotive products between the United States and Canada. (Passed 280 to 113.)	Yes.
257	Sept. 1	H.R. 3141: To approve the health professions educational assistance amendments including provision for Federal scholarship grants. (Passed 340 to 47.)	Not voting.
259	Sept. 2	H.R. 5863: On passage of the bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research and development in high-speed ground transportation. (Passed 317 to 24.)	Not voting.
262	Sept. 7	H.R. 8439: On a motion to table a motion to discharge the Committee on Armed Services from further consideration of the bill, vetoed by the President, which authorized 1966 military construction funds. (Passed 320 to 19.)	Yes.
263	Sept. 7	H.R. 10775: To suspend the rules and pass the bill adopted by the committee (in lieu of vetoed bill) authorizing 1966 military construction funds. (Passed 347 to 0.)	Yes.
264	Sept. 7	H.R. 168: To increase the rates for service-connected compensation for veterans. (Passed 348 to 0.)	Yes.
265	Sept. 7	S.J. Res. 102: To authorize funds in the amount of $1,500,000 for the Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice and the District of Columbia Commission on Crime and Law Enforcement. (Passed 338 to 0.)	Yes.
269	Sept. 8	H.R. 10871: To approve the $3,400,000,000 foreign aid appropriation bill. (Passed 239 to 143.)	Paired yes.
273	Sept. 13	On a motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call of the House in rollcall 272. (Passed 225 to 126.)	Yes.
275	Sept. 13	On a motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call of the House in rollcall 274. (Passed 241 to 127.)	Yes.
279	Sept. 13	On a motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call of the House in rollcall 278. (Passed 256 to 123.)	Yes.
281	Sept. 13	On a motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call of the House in rollcall 280. (Passed 255 to 120.)	Yes.
282	Sept. 13	On a motion to lay on the table the motion that the Journal be approved as read. (Defeated 138 to 244.)	No.
283	Sept. 13	To order the previous question on the motion to approve the Journal as read. (Passed 257 to 126.)	Yes.
284	Sept. 13	On the motion to approve the Journal as read. (Passed 264 to 119.)	Yes.
285	Sept. 13	On a motion to adjourn the House. (Defeated 175 to 204.)	No.
286	Sept. 13	H. Res. 506: To discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of H.R. 10065 and to make it in order to consider the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1965 with 2 hours of general debate. (Passed 259 to 121.)	Yes.
287	Sept. 13	H. Res. 506: On a motion to lay on the table a motion to reconsider the vote by which H. Res. 506 was adopted. (Defeated 193 to 181.)	No.
288	Sept. 13	On a motion to adjourn. (Defeated 173 to 201)	No.
290	Sept. 13	On a motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call of the House in rollcall 289. (Passed 243 to 136.)	Yes.
291	Sept. 13	H. Res. 499: To discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of H.R. 7371 and to make it in order to consider amendments to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 with 4 hours of general deabate. (Passed 201 to 171.)	No.
292	Sept. 13	H. Res. 478: To discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of H.R. 9460 and to make it in order to consider the bill providing for the establishment of a National Foundation of the Arts and Humanities with 2 hours of general debate. (Passed 260 to 114.)	Yes
293	Sept. 13	H. Res. 536: To discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of H.R. 10281 and to make it in order to consider the bill adjusting salaries of Federal employees with 4 hours of general debate. (Passed 288 to 4.)	Yes.
296	Sept. 14	H.R. 2091: To recommit to committee the bill relating to the establishment of concession policies in the areas administered by the National Park Service. (Defeated 73 to 298.)	No.
299	Sept. 15	H.R. 8283: To recommit to conference committee the antipoverty bill and insisting on the retention in the bill of the veto power of State Governors in the form approved by the House. (Passed 209 to 180.)	Yes.
301	Sept. 15	H.R. 9460: To recommit to committee the bill providing for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, (Defeated 128 to 251.)	No.
303	Sept. 16	H. Res. 574: To lay on the table the resolution calling upon the Postmaster General to furnish to the House of Representatives the names of all persons employed by the Post Office as temporary employees during the summer of 1965. (Passed 186 to 180.)	No.
304	Sept. 16	S. 2042: On passage of the bill extending authority of the Atomic Energy Commission to indemnify licenses and contractors for public liability. (Passed 337 to 30.)	No.
306	Sept. 17	H.R. 9221: To adopt the conference report on the $46,800,000,000 Department of Defense appropriation bill. (Passed 380 to 0.)	Yes.
307	Sept. 17	H. Res. 585: To adopt the resolution as amended dismissing the election contests against the seated members of the Mississippi delegation in the House of Representatives. (Passed 228 to 143.)	No.
309	Sept. 20	H.R. 10873 (S. 2127): To provide life insurance for members of the Armed Forces at a cost of $2 per month for $10,000 of insurance and $1 per month for $5,000 of insurance. (Passed 380 to 0.)	Yes.

See footnote at end of table.

Voting and attendance record, 89th Cong., 1st sess., 1965—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1965		
310	Sept. 20	H. Res. 560: To express the sense of Congress approving the action of the President or the Organization of American States in combating Communist subversive aggression in the Western Hemisphere. (Passed 312 to 52.)	No.
313	Sept. 21	S. 4: To adopt the conference report on the Water Quality Act of 1965. (Passed 379 to 0.)	Yes.
315	Sept. 22	S. 2300: On a motion to delete the authorization for the Dickey-Lincoln School project, St. John River, Maine, and to provide for a survey for flood control and allied purposes of the St. John River by the Department of the Army. (Passed 207 to 185.)	Yes.
316	Sept. 22	H.R. 30: To approve the bill providing for the participation of the United States in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla., and to authorize appropriations for it not to exceed $15,000,000. (Passed 254 to 113.)	Yes.
318	Sept. 22	On a motion to adjourn. (Defeated 89 to 204.)	No.
320	Sept. 23	H.R. 7371: To add to amendments proposed by the Committee on Banking and Currency relative to the Bank Holding Act of 1965, an amendment to forbid any company that controls a bank to own nonbanking businesses. (Passed 199 to 178.)	Yes.
321	Sept. 23	H.Res. 580: To order the previous question on the adoption of the rule relative to H.R. 10232, the bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961. (Passed 279 to 70.)	Yes.
322	Sept. 23	H.R. 10232: To approve the bill amending the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act with respect to loans for rural water and sanitation facilities. (Passed 325 to 10.)	Yes.
324	Sept. 24	S. 306. On the motion to recommit to committee the Clean Air and Solid Waste Disposal Act in order to remove from the bill title II relating to solid waste disposal. (Defeated 80 to 220.)	Not voting.
325	Sept. 24	S. 306: On final passage of the Clean Air and Solid Waste Disposal Act. (Passed 294 to 4.)	Paired yes.
327	Sept. 27	H. Res. 515: To discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of the bill relative to home rule for the District of Columbia. (Passed 213 to 183.)	Yes.
328	Sept. 27	H. Res. 515: To adopt the resolution providing an open rule with 5 hours of general debate on legislation relative to home rule for the District of Columbia. (Passed 222 to 179.)	Yes.
330	Sept. 27	H.R. 4644: On the motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole for the consideration of legislation on home rule for the District of Columbia. (Passed 234 to 155.)	Yes.
336	Sept. 29	H.R. 4644: To strike out the enacting clause of the bill relating to home rule in the District of Columbia. (Defeated 179 to 219.)	No.
337	Sept. 29	H.R. 4644: To adopt the motion which in effect substituted the Sisk amendment (calling for a referendum in the District of Columbia on home rule) for the charter proposed in the Multer amendment to H.R. 4644. (Passed 227 to 174.)	No.
338	Sept. 29	H.R. 4644: On a motion to recommit to committee the District of Columbia home rule bill as amended. (Defeated 134 to 266.)	No.
339	Sept. 29	H.R. 4644: On passage of the District of Columbia home rule bill as amended to provide for a local referendum and for the election of a board to prepare a municipal charter (if the voters so desire) for submission to the voters and to the Congress. (Passed 283 to 117.)	Yes.
341	Sept. 30	H.R. 2580: To accept the conference report on the amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act, which report included a limitation of 120,000 persons per year from the Western Hemisphere. (Passed 320 to 69.)	Yes.
342	Sept. 30	H.R. 10281: On a motion to recommit to committee the Government employees pay raise bill in order to remove the provisions increasing salaries of Members of Congress, and certain top positions in the executive and judicial branches, and providing for a permanent system for establishing and maintaining these salaries. (Passed 238 to 140.)	No.
343	Sept. 30	H.R. 10281: On final passage of the Government employees pay raise bill, as amended, granting a 4-percent across-the-board increase. (Passed 370 to 7.)	Yes.
345	Oct. 1	H.J. Res. 642: To recommit to committee the bill authorizing the 3d Library of Congress building (James Madison Memorial) in order to direct the Architect of the Capitol to study the feasibility of including a visitor's center in this building or in the vicinity. (Defeated 17 to 321.)	Not voting.
346	Oct. 1	H.J. Res. 642 (S.J. Res. 69): On final passage of the resolution to authorize construction of a 3d building for the Library of Congress to be known as the James Madison Memorial Library. (Passed 328 to 5.)	Yes.
347	Oct 1	H.R. 10871: On a motion to recommit to conference the foreign aid appropriation bill and to insist upon the original House position that foreign aid is not to go to those nations which trade with North Vietnam. (Defeated 164 to 174.)	Not voting.
348	Oct. 1	H.R. 10871: On final passage of the conference report on foreign assistance appropriations for 1966 in the amount of $3,900,000,000. (Passed 204 to 127.)	Paired yes.
349	Oct 1	H.R. 3142 (S. 597): To amend Public Health Service Act to provide for a program of grants to assist in meeting needs of medical library services and facilities. (Passed 296 to 3.)	Not voting.
350	Oct. 1	H.R. 6519: To authorize $6,000,000 toward construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in St. Louis. (Passed 250 to 12.)	Not voting.
353	Oct. 7	S.J. Res. 32 To authorize a contribution of not more than $22,000,000 to certain residents of the Ryukyu Islands for claims against the United States due to actions or omissions of the Armed Forces between Aug. 15, 1945, and Apr. 28, 1952. (Passed 312 to 55.)	Yes.
354	Oct. 7	H.R. 2020: To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the southern Nevada water project. Passed 239 to 134.)	
356	Oct. 7	S. 2084: To recommit to committee the so-called highway beautification bill in order to give the States authority to zone commercial or industrial sites in rural areas under this act. (Defeated 153 to 230.)	Paired yes.
357	Oct. 7	S. 2084: On final passage of the so-called highway beautification bill as amended by the House. (Passed 245 to 138.)	Paired yes.
359	Oct. 8	H.R. 9811: To approve the conference report on the omnibus farm bill of 1965. (Passed 219 to 150.)	No.
363	Oct. 12	H. Res. 598: To adopt the rule for consideration of H.R. 11135 (sugar bill) with 4 hours of general debate and the opportunity to act on 2 amendments. (Passed 253 to 80.)	Not voting.
366	Oct. 13	H.R. 11135: To recommit to committee the sugar bill in order to provide for an import fee to obtain for the U.S. Treasury some of the profits now going to foreign sugar interests. (Defeated 160 to 230.)	Yes.
367	Oct. 13	H.R. 11135: On final passage of the sugar bill. (Passed 246 to 147.)	Yes.
369	Oct. 14	H.R. 11588: On an amendment to the supplemental appropriation bill to delete $6,000,000 for the rent subsidy program. (Passed 185 to 162.)	Yes.
370	Oct. 14	H.R. 11588: On final passage of the supplemental appropriation bill in the amount of $4,200,000,000. (Passed 242 to 100.)	Yes.
376	Oct. 20	H.R. 9567: To recommit to conference committee the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to delete that part of the bill which would establish a National Teacher Corps. (Defeated 152 to 226.)	Yes.
377	Oct. 20	H.R. 9567: On final passage of the Higher Education Act of 1965. (Passed 313 to 63.)	Yes.
378	Oct. 20	S. 2300: To approve the conference report on the Rivers and Harbors Act including the Dickey-Lincoln School project in Maine which will cost about $300,000,000 and which was deleted from the bill when it was passed originally by the House. (Passed 221 to 139.)	No.
380	Oct. 21	H.R. 11588: To approve the conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill for 1966. (Passed 251 to 84.)	Yes.
381	Oct. 21	H.R. 11588: To accept the Senate amendment to the supplemental appropriation bill providing funds for the Dickey-Lincoln public works project in Maine. (Passed 165 to 162.)	No.
383	Oct. 22	H.R. 11135: To adopt the conference report amending and extending the Sugar Act of 1948. (Passed 174 to 88.)	Yes.

---

[1] On official leave due to illness.

Voting and attendance record, 89th Cong., 2d sess., 1966

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1966		
3	Jan. 27	H. Res. 665: To authorize the expenditure of not more than $425,000 by the Committee on Un-American Activities for investigative purposes. (Passed 299 to 24.)	Yes.
6	Feb. 2	H. Res. 669: To adopt the resolution citing Robert M. Shelton for contempt of Congress. (Passed 344 to 26.)	No.
7	Feb. 2	H. Res. 700: On a motion to recommit to a select committee the contempt of Congress citation against Calvin F. Craig with instructions to examine the citation and the law relative to it and to report to the House. (Defeated 57 to 307.)	Yes.
9	Feb. 3	H. Res. 706: To adopt the resolution to take up H.R. 30, the Inter-American Culture and Trade Center (Florida) and to agree to the Senate amendments authorizing $9,500,000 for the project. (Passed 201 to 140.)	Yes.
11	Feb. 7	H.R. 12410 (S. 9): To suspend the rules and pass the bill providing educational benefits to veterans who entered service subsequent to Jan. 31, 1955. (Passed 381 to 0.)	Yes.
13	Feb. 8	H.R. 12173 (S. 1698): To approve the bill designed to establish a procedure for the review of proposed bank mergers so as to eliminate the necessity for the dissolution of merged banks, and for other purposes. (Passed 372 to 17.)	Yes.
15	Feb. 9	H.R. 12563: To suspend the rules and approve the bill providing for the participation of the United States in the Asian Development Bank. (Passed 292 to 80.)	Yes.
16	Feb. 9	H.R. 706: To approve the bill amending the Railway Labor Act to expedite action on disputes referred to the National Railroad Adjustment Board and to provide for judicial review. (Passed 380 to 0.)	Yes.
18	Feb. 23	H. Res. 736: To adopt the rule calling for consideration of the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966. (Passed 326 to 50.)	Yes.
19	Feb. 23	H.R. 12752: On motion to recommit the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966 in order to delete the provision increasing the excise tax on automobiles and telephone service to last year's levels. (Defeated 187 to 207.)	Yes.
20	Feb. 23	H.R. 12752: On final passage of the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966 with the increase in the excise taxes on automobiles and telephone service. (Passed 246 to 146.)	Yes.

Voting and attendance record, 89th Cong., 2d sess., 1966—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1966		
22	Feb. 24	H. Res. 742: To adopt the rule for consideration of H.R. 12169, the supplemental foreign assistance authorization bill. (Passed 359 to 11.)	Yes.
23	Feb. 24	H.R. 12169: On a motion to recommit to committee the supplementary foreign assistance authorization bill in order to earmark the amount of funds to go to each recipient country under the bill. (Defeated 169 to 213.)	No.
24	Feb. 24	H.R. 12169: On final passage of the $415,000,000 supplemental authorization for the economic assistance program of AID. (Passed 350 to 27.)	Yes.
26	Mar. 1	H.R. 12889: To authorize appropriations for the current fiscal year of $4,800,000,000 for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, vessels, etc., for the Department of Defense. (Passed 392 to 4.)	Yes.
28	Mar. 2	S. 1666: To approve the bill providing for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges. (Passed 371 to 23.)	Yes.
30	Mar. 2	H.R. 9663: To authorize the expenditure of $4,600,000 to help Alaska celebrate its centennial as a part of the United States. (Passed 202 to 173.)	No.
33	Mar. 3	H.R. 12322: To recommit to committee the bill establishing marketing orders for cotton in order to allow each producer 1 vote in the referendum regardless of amount of cotton produced. (Defeated 185 to 191.)	Yes.
34	Mar. 3	H.R. 12322: On final passage of the bill establishing a compulsory checkoff system of $1 a bale on cotton farmers to finance cotton promotion and research. (Passed 189 to 183.)	No.
36	Mar. 15	H.R. 12752: To adopt the conference report on the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966. (Passed 288 to 102.)	Not voting.
38	Mar. 15	H.R. 13546: To approve a $13,000,000,000 supplemental appropriation for the Department of Defense. (Passed 389 to 3.)	Not voting.
40	Mar. 16	H.R. 6785 (S. 1404): To adopt the bill on daylight saving time setting uniform dates for the changeover and requiring same time throughout each State. (Passed 292 to 93.)	Yes.
42	Mar. 21	H.R. 13448: To pass the bill designed to speed delivery of mail to servicemen overseas. (Passed 303 to 0.)	Not voting.
44	Mar. 22	H. Res. 794: To adopt the resolution calling for consideration of S. 2394, a bill authorizing $750,000 for the construction of a home for the Vice President. (Passed 236 to 135.)	Yes.
45	Mar. 22	S. 2394: To approve the authorization of $750,000 for the construction of a home for the Vice President. (Passed 197 to 184.)	Yes.
48	Mar. 29	H.R. 14012: To recommit to committee the supplemental appropriation bill in order to strike out the $12,000,000 appropriation for rent subsidies. (Defeated 190 to 198.)	Yes.
49	Mar. 29	H.R. 14012: To approve the supplemental appropriation bill including funds to initiate the National Teachers Corps and rent subsidies. (Passed 269 to 122.)	Yes.
50	Mar. 30	S. 1404: To adopt the conference report setting date for daylight saving time and requiring such time in the State unless legislators exempt the State. (Passed 281 to 91.)	Not voting.
53	Mar. 31	H. Res. 802: To adopt the rule under which to consider S. 2729, the bill amending the Small Business Act. (Passed 362 to 4.)	Yes.
54	Mar. 31	S. 2729: To adopt the bill authorizing an additional appropriation of $125,000,000 for SBA and increasing the amount of loans and commitments that may be outstanding. (Passed 362 to 4.)	Yes.
58	Apr. 6	H.R. 14224: To extend through May 31, 1966, the initial period for enrolling under the program of supplemental medical benefits of medicare. (Passed 387 to 0.)	Yes.
59	Apr. 6	H.R. 14122: To approve the bill increasing the salaries of Federal employees by an average amount of 2.9 percent. (Passed 393 to 1.)	Yes.
60	Apr. 6	H.R. 14215: On a motion to reduce expenditures authorized the Department of Interior for 1967 by 5 percent. (Defeated 156 to 232.)	Yes.
61	Apr. 6	H.R. 14215: To approve the $1,170,000,000 1967 appropriation bill for the Department of Interior. (Passed 370 to 16.)	Yes.
62	Apr. 6	H.R. 14266: On a motion to reduce expenditures authorized the Post Office and Treasury Departments for 1967 by 5 percent. (Defeated 127 to 244.)	Not voting.
63	Apr. 6	H.R. 14266: To approve the $7,000,000,000 1967 appropriation bill for the Post Office and Treasury Departments. (Passed 368 to 2.)	Not voting.
65	Apr. 19	H.R. 7406: To amend the bill providing for a 3d powerplant at Grand Coulee Dam in order to give recognition to basinwide accounting for the purpose of repaying obligations under the bill. (Passed 239 to 111.)	Not voting.[1]
66	Apr. 19	H.R. 7406 (S. 1761): To approve the bill providing for a 3d powerplant at Grand Coulee Dam. (Passed 246 to 78.)	Not voting.[1]
68	Apr. 20	H. Res. 756: To disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 1 calling for the transfer of the Community Relations Service from the Department of Commerce to the Justice Department. (Defeated 163 to 220.)	Not voting.[1]
70	Apr. 26	H.R. 14596: To recommit to committee the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill in order to prohibit the use of any appropriated funds for the sale of agricultural commodities to any nation which sells or furnishes to North Vietnam any equipment, materials, or commodities as long as North Vietnam is governed by the Communists. (Passed 290 to 98.)	Not voting.[1]
71	Apr. 26	H.R. 14596: To approve the $6,900,000,000 Department of Agriculture appropriation bill. (Passed 366 to 23.)	Not voting.[1]
74	Apr. 27	H.R. 10065: On final passage of the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1965. (Passed 299 to 94.)	Not voting.[1]
76	Apr. 28	H.R. 13881: To approve the bill providing for the regulation of the sale, transportation, and purchase of dogs and cats for research purposes. (Passed 352 to 10.)	Not voting.[1]
80	May 3	H.R. 14324: To recommit to committee the NASA authorization bill in order to earmark $20,000,000 in research and development funds for research on the reduction of aircraft noise. (Defeated 90 to 271.)	Not voting.[1]
81	May 3	H.R. 14324: On final passage of the $4,900,000,000 authorization bill for NASA. (Passed 349 to 10.)	Not voting.[1]
86	May 5	H.R. 14745: To recommit to committee the appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor and HEW and related agencies in order to reduce expenditures by 5 percent. (Defeated 143 to 236.)	Not voting.[1]
87	May 5	H.R. 14745: On final passage of the $10,000,000,000 appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor, HEW, and related agencies. (Passed 354 to 27.)	Not voting.[1]
91	May 10	H.R. 14921: To add to the 1967 independent offices appropriation bill $20,000,000 to finance the rent subsidy program. (Passed 192 to 188.)	Not voting.[1]
92	May 10	H.R. 14921: To approve the 1967 independent offices appropriation bill of $14,000,000,000 including funds for the rent subsidy program. (Passed 296 to 82.)	Not voting.[1]
94	May 11	H.R. 14088: To pass the bill authorizing an improved health benefits program for retired members and members of the uniformed services and their dependents. (Passed 356 to 0.)	Not voting.[1]
97	May 12	S. 1098: To approve the bill authorizing the Interstate Commerce Commission to take certain actions to help alleviate the national freight car shortage. (Passed 306 to 27.)	Not voting.[1]
98	May 16	S. 693: To approve the bill designed to strengthen the provisions of the Foreign Agents Registration Act by requiring public disclosure by persons acting for a foreign principal when their activities are political in nature. (Passed 285 to 0.)	Not voting.[1]
100	May 16	H. Res. 852: To adopt the rule providing for the consideration by the House of H.R. 14544, the bill relating to the sale of participations in Government agency loan pool. (Passed 184 to 120.)	Not voting.[1]
105	May 18	H.R. 14215: To approve the conference report on the $1,300,000,000 1965 appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior and related agencies. (Passed 378 to 10.)	Not voting.[1]
106	May 18	H.R. 14544: To recommit to committee the Participation Sales Act of 1966, in order to limit the interest to be paid on the "participations" to 4¼ percent. (Defeated 180 to 218.)	Not voting.[1]
107	May 18	H.R. 14544: On final passage of the Participation Sales Act of 1966. (Passed 206 to 190.)	Not voting.[1]
113	May 26	H.R. 13712: On an amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1966 (minimum wage), to exempt certain small businesses from coverage under the law. (Defeated 195 to 200.)	Yes.
114	May 26	H.R. 13712: On an amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1966, to extend from 1968 to 1969 the effective date of the $1.60 rate for those presently covered under the law. (Passed 205 to 194.)	Yes.
115	May 26	H.R. 13712: On a motion to recommit to committee the Fair Labor Standards Act to 1966 in order to exempt farm labor from coverage under the law and to give agricultural processing plants a 20-week exemption from the overtime provisions of the law instead of 14 weeks as stated in the bill. (Defeated 168 to 231.)	Yes.
116	May 26	H.R. 13712: On final passage of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1966 (minimum wage). (Passed 303 to 93.)	Yes.
120	June 1	H.R. 9167: To recommit to committee the narcotic addict rehabilitation bill in order to make any narcotics seller, or offender, between 22 and 26 punishable under the regular criminal laws. (Passed 198 to 168.)	Yes.
121	June 1	H.R. 9167: To approve the narcotic addict rehabilitation bill as amended. (Passed 367 to 1.)	Yes.
123	June 2	H.R. 14050: On final passage of the bill to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act. (Passed 336 to 2.)	Yes.
124	June 6	H.R. 14013: To suspend the rules and pass the International Education Act of 1966. (Passed 194 to 89.)	Paired yes.
125	June 6	H.R. 10: To suspend the rules and pass the bill amending the law relative to private pension and profit-sharing plans. (Passed 291 to 0.)	Not voting.
127	June 7	H.R. 15456: To approve the legislative appropriation bill for 1967 in the amount of $172,000,000 (for items considered by the House). (Passed 341 to 2.)	Yes.
128	June 7	S. 1357: To approve with House amendments the Bail Reform Act of 1966. (Passed 319 to 14.)	Yes.
130	June 8	H. Res. 882: To adopt a closed rule for consideration of the bill increasing the debt limit to $330,000,000,000. (Passed 205 to 153.)	Yes.
131	June 8	H.R. 15202: To approve the bill increasing the temporary public debt limit from $328,000,000,000 to $330,000,000,000. (Passed 199 to 165.)	No.
133	June 9	H.R. 14929: To approve the amendment to the food-for-freedom bill providing for a 40-year repayment period to foreign governments for credit sales of surplus agricultural products. (Defeated 165 to 198.)	No.
134	June 9	H.R. 14929: On a motion to recommit to committee the food-for-freedom bill in order to prohibit long-term credit sales of surplus agricultural products to any Communist country and to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from dumping grain on the market at less than 80 percent of parity plus carrying charges. (Defeated 157 to 200.)	No.
135	June 9	H.R. 14929: On final passage of the food-for-freedom bill. (Passed 333 to 20.)	Yes.
137	June 13	H.R. 14019: To approve the bill authorizing an appropriation of $27,600,000 for acquisition and improvement of Foreign Service building overseas. (Passed 290 to 3.)	Yes.
141	June 14	S. 2950: To approve the bill authorizing appropriations of $17,800,000,000 for the procurement in 1967 of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and for research and development and other purposes within the Department of Defense. (Passed 356 to 2.)	Yes.
145	June 16	H.R. 14025: To approve an amendment to the Defense Production Act extension granting to the President standby authority to impose controls on consumer credit. (Defeated 73 to 275.)	No.

See footnote at end of table.

***Voting and attendance record, 89th Cong., 2d sess., 1966*—Continued**

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1966		
147	June 29	S. 1160: To suspend the rules and approve the freedom-of-information bill. (Passed 307 to 0.)	Not voting.
148	June 20	H.R. 10860: To suspend the rules and approve the amendment to the Connally Hot Oil Act. (Passed 306 to 1.)	Not voting.
150	June 22	H.R. 15119: To approve the Unemployment Insurance Amendments of 1966. (Passed 374 to 10.)	Yes.
152	June 23	H.R. 13196: To approve the Allied Health Professions Personal Training Act of 1966. (Passed 364 to 0.)	Yes.
154	June 27	H. Res. 875: To discharge Committee on Rules from further consideration of H.R. 14904, the bill to revise the rates and size of parcel post packages, and make it in order for the House to consider the bill. (Passed 222 to 148.)	Yes.
155	June 27	H.R. 5426: To recommit to committee the bill prohibiting common law marriages in the District of Columbia. (Defeated 39 to 328.)	No.
159	July 12	S. 2950: To approve the conference report on the bill authorizing appropriations for the procurement of aircraft missiles, naval vessels, and for research and development. (Passed 358 to 2.)	Not voting.
164	July 14	H.R. 15750: To recommit to committee the foreign aid authorization bill in order to require annual authorizations aid to reduce the total amount in the bill by $250,000,000. (Defeated 191 to 193.)	Paired yes.
165	July 14	H.R. 15750: On final passage of the $4,100,000,000 foreign aid authorization bill. (Passed 237 to 146.)	Paired yes.
171	July 20	H.R. 15941: To approve the bill appropriating $58,600,000,000 for the Department of Defense in fiscal year 1967. (Passed 392 to 1.)	Yes.
173	July 21	S. 602: To adopt the conference report on the bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956. (Defeated 136 to 204.)	No.
175	July 25	H. Res. 910: To adopt the resolution discharging the Committee on Rules from further consideration of H.R. 14765, the Civil Rights Act, and to provide for consideration of the bill with 10 hours of general debate. (Passed 200 to 180.)	Yes.
206	Aug. 9	H.R. 14765: On the motion to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1966 in order to exempt from coverage the real estate broker or agent who has written instructions from the exempt person for whom he is acting. (Passed 237 to 176.)	Yes.
207	Aug. 9	H.R. 14765: On the motion to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1966 to make it illegal to use the facilities of interstate commerce to incite to riot or to commit any crime of violence or to assist or encourage other persons to do so. (Passed 389 to 25.)	Yes.
208	Aug. 9	H.R. 14765: On the motion to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1966 to require a written complaint by an individual before the Attorney General could file a school desegregation suit. (Passed 214 to 201.)	No.
209	Aug. 9	H.R. 14765: On a motion to recommit to committee the Civil Rights Act of 1966 in order to delete title IV relating to housing. (Defeated 190 to 220.)	No.
210	Aug. 9	H.R. 14765: On final passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1966. (Passed 259 to 157.)	Yes.
213	Aug. 10	S. 3105: To approve the military construction authorization in the amount of $1,060,000,000. (Passed 389 to 1.)	Yes.
215	Aug. 11	H.R. 14359: To recommit to committee the bill authorizing appropriations for the construction of highways in order to delete the provisions relative to the $493,000,000 authorization for beautification in fiscal years 1968–69. (Defeated 173 to 175.)	Not voting.
216	Aug. 11	H.R. 14359: To approve the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1966. (Passed 341 to 1.)	Not voting.
218	Aug. 15	S. 3688: To suspend the rules and pass the bill increasing the authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association to obtain funds for use in its secondary market operation. (Passed 314 to 1.)	Not voting.
219	Aug. 15	H.R. 16114: To suspend the rules and pass the bill designed to correct certain inequities in Federal employment with respect to overtime pay. (Passed 313 to 0.)	Not voting.
220	Aug. 15	H.R. 14604: To suspend the rules and pass the bill authorizing a study of facilities and services for visitors to the Nation's Capital. (Defeated 209 to 108, a ⅔ majority being necessary.)	Not voting.
221	Aug. 15	H.R. 11555: To suspend the rules and pass the bill authorizing a border highway along the U.S. bank of the Rio Grande River in and about El Paso, Tex. (Defeated 174 to 133, a ⅔ majority being necessary.)	Not voting.
224	Aug. 16	H.R. 14810: On a motion to recommit to committee the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1966 in order to reduce the authorization from $175,000,000 for fiscal 1968 and subsequent years to $150,000,000 for 1968 only. (Passed 205 to 161.)	Yes.
225	Aug. 16	H.R. 14810: To approve the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1966 as amended to include $150,000,000 for fiscal 1968 only. (Passed 235 to 127.)	Yes.
228	Aug. 17	H.R. 13228: On a motion to recommit to committee the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act in order to require that members of the National Motor Vehicle Safety Advisory Council be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate instead of being selected by the Secretary of Commerce. (Defeated 168 to 205.)	Yes.
229	Aug. 17	H.R. 13228: On final passage of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act. (Passed 371 to 0.)	Yes.
231	Aug. 18	H.R. 14921: To recommit to conference committee the independent offices appropriation bill to insist on the House's opposition to an amendment which calls for a permanent and indefinite appropriation of whatever seems to be necessary to subsidize the participation sales certificates. (Defeated 176 to 190.)	Yes.
232	Aug. 18	H.R. 13290: To approve the Highway Safety Act of 1966. (Passed 317 to 3.)	Yes.
233	Aug. 22	S. 602: To adopt the conference report on the bill to broaden the scope of the Small Reclamation Projects Act. (Passed 198 to 81.)	Paired no.
234	Aug. 22	H.R. 16340: To recommit to committee for the purpose of obtaining further views on the legislation to prohibit picketing within 500 feet of any church in the District of Columbia. (Defeated 55 to 237.)	Not voting.
235	Aug. 22	H.R. 16340: On final passage of the bill to prohibit picketing within 500 feet of any church in the District of Columbia. (Passed 249 to 44.)	Not voting.
238	Aug. 24	H.R. 14596: To adopt the conference report on the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture in the amount of $6,900,000,000. (Passed 325 to 28.)	Yes.
241	Aug. 25	H.R. 15941: To approve the conference report on the $58,000,000,000 Department of Defense appropriations bill except those amendments in disagreement. (Passed 383 to 1.)	Yes.
242	Aug. 25	H.R. 15941: On a motion that the House insist on its disagreement with the Senate amendment authorizing the President to call up individual members of the Ready Reserve. (Passed 378 to 3.)	Yes.
244	Aug. 26	S. 3688: To adopt the conference report on the bill to extend the purchasing authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association. (Passed 234 to 1.)	Yes.
245	Aug. 26	S. 3700: To adopt the conference report on the bill amending the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964. (Passed 156 to 86.)	Yes.
246	Aug. 29	H.J. Res. 1284: To extend the "continuing resolution" relative to appropriations from Aug. 31 to Sept. 30. (Passed 323 to 6.)	Yes.
251	Aug. 30	H.R. 15963: On a motion to exclude jurisdiction of maritime activities from the Secretary of Transportation; to eliminate the Maritime Administration from the new Department. (Passed 261 to 117.)	Yes.
252	Aug. 30	H.R. 15963: On a motion to recommit to committee the bill establishing a new Department of Transportation in order to remove the responsibility for investigating air accidents from the new Department. (Defeated 143 to 238.)	Yes.
253	Aug. 30	H.R. 15963: On final passage of the bill to establish a Department of Transportation in the President's Cabinet. (Passed 336 to 42.)	Yes.
255	Aug. 31	S. 3155: To adopt the conference report on the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1966. (Passed 359 to 1.)	Yes.
257	Aug. 31	S. 3005: To adopt the conference report on the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966. (Passed 365 to 0.)	Yes.
258	Aug. 31	S. 3052: To adopt the conference report on the Highway Safety Act of 1966. (Passed 366 to 3)	Yes.
259	Aug. 31	H.R. 16574: To amend the Peace Corps Act including authorization of $110,000,000 to finance the corps in fiscal year 1967. (Passed 322 to 15.)	Yes.
261	Sept. 1	H.R. 1575: To adopt the conference report on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966 in the amount of $3,500,000,000. (Passed 217 to 127.)	Yes.
262	Sept. 1	H.R. 15098: To recommit to the committee the bill relative to U.S. participation in the HemisFair 1968 Exposition in San Antonio and to authorize $10,000,000 for that purpose. (Defeated 147 to 184.)	Yes.
265	Sept. 6	H.R. 15766: To suspend the rules and pass the bill to establish a National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws. (Passed 259 to 0.)	Not voting.
267	Sept. 7	H.R. 13712: On a motion to recommit to conference the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1966 (minimum wage) with instructions to insist on House provision that the effective date of the $1.60 minimum be Feb. 1, 1969, rather than Feb. 1, 1968. (Defeated 163 to 183.)	Paired no.
268	Sept. 7	H.R. 13712: To adopt the conference report on the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1966. (Passed 259 to 89.)	Not voting.
271	Sept. 8	H.R. 14026: To recommit to committee for further consideration the temporary interest rate control measure. (Defeated 130 to 214.)	No.
272	Sept. 8	H.R. 14026: To approve the temporary interest rate control bill as amended by the substitution of the Stephen's amendment for the proposal submitted by the committee. (Passed 271 to 68.)	Yes.
274	Sept. 12	H. Res. 1002: To adopt the rule calling for consideration of H.J. Res. 688, to give effect to the Agreement for Facilitating the International Circulation of Visual and Auditory Materials of an Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Character. (Passed 242 to 2.)	Yes.
275	Sept. 12	H. Res. 1005: To adopt the rule calling for consideration of H.R. 11256, Federal Tax Lien Act of 1966. (Passed 243 to 9.)	Not voting.
276	Sept. 12	H. Res. 1004: To adopt the rule calling for consideration of H.R. 8864, to implement the Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials. (Passed 241 to 7.)	Not voting.
277	Sept. 12	H. Res. 976: To adopt the rule calling for consideration of H.R. 11555, providing for the Chamizal Memorial Highway in El Paso. (Passed 202 to 48.)	Not voting.
279	Sept. 13	H.R. 17636: To recommit to committee the District of Columbia appropriation bill in order to make a 5-percent across-the-board reduction. (Defeated 103 to 217.)	Not voting.
280	Sept. 13	H.R. 17636: To approve the District of Columbia appropriation bill. (Passed 320 to 3.)	Not voting.
284	Sept. 14	H.R. 17637: To approve the $1,000,000,000 military construction appropriation bill. (Passed 346 to 3.)	Yes.
286	Sept. 19	H.R. 8678: To suspend the rules and pass the bill to establish in the State of Michigan the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore. (Passed 247 to 70.)	Not voting.
287	Sept. 19	H.R. 17488: To suspend the rules and pass the bill to increase the rates of pensions payable to certain veterans, their widows, and other dependents. (Passed 315 to 2.)	Not voting.
288	Sept. 19	H.R. 15183: To suspend the rules and pass the bill adjusting the status of certain Cuban refugees. (Passed 300 to 25.)	Yes.
289	Sept. 19	S.J. Res. 167: To suspend the rules and pass the resolution authorizing the United States to organize and hold an International Conference on Water for Peace in the United States in 1967 and authorizing $1,200,000 for the project. (Defeated 161 to 154, a ⅔ vote being necessary for passage.)	Yes.
290	Sept. 19	S. 3423: To suspend the rules and pass the bill providing for the establishment of the Wolf Trap Farm Park in Fairfax County, Va. (Defeated 195 to 105, a ⅔ vote being necessary for passage.)	No.
293	Sept. 20	H.R. 17788: On a motion to recommit to committee the foreign aid appropriation bill in order to cut the economic assistance appropriation by $45,000,000 for a total of $212,000,000,000. (Passed 187 to 182.)	No.

See footnote at end of table.

Voting and attendance record, 89th Cong., 2d sess., 1966—Continued

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1966		
294	Sept. 20	H.R. 17788: On final passage of the $316,000,000,000 foreign assistance appropriation bill. (Passed 234 to 141.)	Yes.
296	Sept. 21	H.R. 17787: On final passage of the $4,100,000,000 public works appropriation bill. (Passed 354 to 25.)	Yes.
298	Sept. 21	H.R. 17195: To approve the Reserve Forces Bill of Rights and Vitalization Act. (Passed 332 to 6.)	Not voting.
300	Sept. 22	H.R. 1155: To recommit to committee the bill authorizing the construction of the Chamizal Memorial Highway in El Paso in order to require the city to pay 50 percent of the cost and to reduce the U.S. share from $12,000,000 to $8,000,000. (Defeated 149 to 199.)	Yes.
301	Sept. 22	H.R. 13825: To approve the bill authorizing the conclusion of an agreement for the joint construction by the United States and Mexico of a flood control project for the Tijuana River. (Passed 293 to 42.)	Yes.
317	Sept. 29	H.R. 15111: On a motion to strike out the enacting clause of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966. (Defeated 156 to 208.)	Yes.
318	Sept. 29	H.R. 15111: On an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966 to limit the number of supergrade positions in the Office of Economic Opportunity. (Passed 257 to 108.)	Yes.
319	Sept. 29	H.R. 15111: On the motion to recommit to committee the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966 in order to substitute the Opportunity Crusade Act of 1966. (Defeated 162 to 203.)	Yes.
320	Sept. 29	H.R. 15111: On final passage of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966. (Passed 210 to 156.)	No.
323	Sept. 30	H.R. 17607: To amend the bill on the suspension of the 7-percent investment credit in order to continue the credit and current depreciation rules on facilities to further water and air pollution abatement. (Passed 330 to 2.)	Yes.
324	Sept. 30	H.R. 17607: On final passage of the bill to suspend the 7-percent investment credit provision of the Reserve Act of 1962. (Passed 221 to 118.)	No.
325	Sept. 30	H.R. 16076: On final passage of the bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. (Passed 312 to 0.)	Not voting.
326	Oct. 3	S. 985 (H.R. 15440): To suspend the rules and pass the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act as amended by the House. (Passed 300 to 8.)	Yes.
327	Oct. 3	S. 3807 (H.R. 17558): To suspend the rules and pass the bill authorizing the Atomic Energy Commission to enter into a cooperative arrangement for a large-scale nuclear-power desalting project. (Passed 316 to 1.)	Yes.
328	Oct. 3	H.R. 13447: To suspend the rules and pass the bill authorizing the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States in developing accessible estuarine areas valuable for fishing, wildlife, conservation, etc., at a cost of $15,000,000. (Defeated 208 to 108, a ⅔ vote being necessary.)	No.
330	Oct. 4	H.R. 18119: On a motion to recommit to committee the appropriations bill for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce in order to effect an overall reduction of 5 percent. (Defeated 152 to 201.)	Yes.
331	Oct. 4	H.R. 18119: To approve the $2,300,000,000 appropriations bill for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce. (Passed 319 to 38.)	Yes.
335	Oct. 5	H.R. 14929: To recommit to conference the "Food for peace" in order to insist on the House opposition that no concessional sales of U.S. farm commodities be made to any nation which trades with Cuba or North Vietnam. (Passed 306 to 61.)	Yes.
343	Oct. 6	H.R. 13161: To amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to emphasize that there is nothing in the act requiring assignment or transportation of students to eliminate racial imbalance in order to qualify for benefits under the act. (Passed 221 to 116.)	No.
344	Oct. 6	H.R. 13161: To recommit to committee the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in order to limit the authorization for 1967 to $1,070,000,000 (the amount requested by the President) and to cut the amount for 1968 by about $1,000,000,000. (Defeated 150 to 185.)	No.
345	Oct. 6	H.R. 13161: On final passage of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1966. (Passed 237 to 97.)	Yes.
346	Oct. 7	H.R. 17788: To adopt the $2,900,000,000 conference report on the foreign aid appropriation. (Passed 189 to 8.)	Yes.
349	Oct. 11	H.R. 15941: To approve an amendment to the defense appropriation bill which would give the President the authority to call to active duty certain reservists under certain circumstances. (Passed 305 to 42.)	Yes.
350	Oct. 11	H.R. 17787: On a motion to recommit to conference the public works appropriations bill in order to cut back total funds appropriated to the amount originally approved by the House or a reduction of about $23,000,000. (Defeated 91 to 255.)	Yes.
360	Oct. 13	H.R. 12047: On the motion to approve the bill making it a Federal crime to aid a country with which we are in armed conflict or to obstruct the movement of personnel or supplies of the Armed Forces. (Approved 275 to 64.)	No.
362	Oct. 14	H.R. 51: On an amendment to the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore bill to add 478 acres to the proposed park. (Passed 182 to 147.)	Yes.
363	Oct. 14	H.R. 51: On final passage of the bill to establish the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore. (Passed 204 to 141.)	Yes.
365	Oct. 14	S. 3708: To recommit to committee the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act in order to strike $9,000,000 and title II (planned metropolitan development) from the bill. (Defeated 149 to 175.)	Not voting.
366	Oct. 14	S. 3708: On final passage of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act. (Passed 178 to 141.)	Paired yes.
368	Oct. 17	S. 3675: To suspend the rules and pass the bill to permit the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to handle claims of U.S. citizens against the Chinese Communist regime. (Passed 249 to 3.)	Yes.
369	Oct. 17	S. 985: To adopt the conference report on the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act. (Passed 242 to 6.)	Yes.
370	Oct. 17	S. 2947: To adopt the conference report on the bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. (Passed 247 to 0.)	Yes.
373	Oct. 18	H.R. 18381: To recommit to committee the supplemental appropriation bill in order to provide that no funds for the Export-Import Bank will be used to extend credit to Communist countries. (Passed 167 to 121.)	No.
374	Oct. 18	H. Res. 1060: To recommit the resolution citing Milton M. Cohen for contempt of Congress to a select committee for further consideration of the matter. (Defeated 90 to 81.)	Not voting.
375	Oct. 18	H. Res. 1062: To recommit the resolution citing Jeremiah Stamler for contempt of Congress to a select committee for further consideration of the matter. (Defeated 54 to 181.)	Not voting.
376	Oct. 18	H. Res. 1062: On final passage of resolution citing Jeremiah Stamler for contempt of Congress. (No quorum.)	Not voting.
378	Oct. 19	H. Res. 1062: To approve the resolution citing Jeremiah Stamler for contempt of Congress. (Passed 219 to 69.)	No.
379	Oct. 19	H.R. 5688: To adopt the conference report on the bill relating to crime and criminal procedure in the District of Columbia. (Passed 208 to 79.)	No.
380	Oct. 19	H.R. 18233: On a motion to recommit to committee the rivers and harbors authorization bill in order to limit the use of tolls revenue from 2 bridges across the Mississippi in Missouri and Illinois for public purposes other than the operation and maintenance of the bridge to the period ending Jan. 1, 1968. (Defeated 89 to 196.)	Yes.
381	Oct. 19	S.J. Res. 167: An adoption of the resolution to enable the United States to organize and hold an International Conference on Water for Peace in the United States in 1967. (Passed 196 to 79.)	Not voting.
385	Oct. 19	H. Res. 1013: On a motion to lay on the table the resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct. (Defeated 24 to 238.)	No.
386	Oct. 19	H. Res. 1013: On a motion to adopt the resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, as amended. (Passed 265 to 0.)	Yes.
389	Oct. 20	S. 3708: To approve the conference report on the Demonstration Development Act. (Passed 142 to 126.)	Paired yes.
390	Oct. 20	H.R. 15111: To approve the conference report on the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966. (Passed 170 to 109.)	Yes.
391	Oct. 20	H.R. 18233: To agree to the Senate amendment to the rivers and harbors bill. (Passed 261 to 0.)	Yes.
392	Oct. 20	H.R. 13161: To agree to the conference report on the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1966. (Passed 185 to 76.)	Yes.
393	Oct. 20	H.R. 17607: To recommit to conference the bill on the suspensions of investment credit and accelerated depreciation. (Defeated 57 to 184.)	Yes.
394	Oct. 20	H.R. 17607: To approve the conference report on the suspensions of investment credit and accelerated depreciation. (Passed 161 to 76.)	No.
395	Oct. 20	H.R. 13103: To recommit to conference the Foreign Investors Tax Act of 1966. (Defeated 95 to 127.)	Not voting.
396	Oct. 20	H.R. 13103: To approve the conference report on the Foreign Investors Tax Act of 1966. (Passed 171 to 46.)	Not voting.
398	Oct. 21	H.R. 14644: To approve the conference report on the Higher Education Amendments of 1966. (Passed 222 to 13.)	Yes.
399	Oct. 21	H.R. 18381: To accept the Senate amendment to the supplemental appropriation bill which gave the President authority to permit Export-Import Bank loans to Communist nations. (Passed 120 to 102.)	Not voting.

---

[1] On official leave due to illness.

The Honorable Jim Morrison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Louisiana, the Honorable JAMES H. MORRISON, will long be remembered not only in Washington but throughout the country. In view of the length of his service he was able to become an expert in the field in which he devoted his primary congressional interests, the post office and the civil service. He has devoted long hours, above and beyond the call of duty, to the welfare of the millions of Federal employees. He was their friend in court and an able friend indeed. Had he been reelected he would have been the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House, and I am sure that all of us who knew him would agree that he would have made a great chairman. I wish him every continued success, and I am sure that the great experience that he had in the Congress will be put to excellent public use in whatever endeavor Mr. MORRISON may pursue.

Mrs. Dorn joins me in wishing for him much continued success.

Senator Leverett Saltonstall of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senate will be without the leadership ability and legislative skill of one of our most respected colleagues when we convene in January. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL will voluntarily retire as a Member of this body.

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL thus concludes 41 years of great service to the people of his beloved Commonwealth. For 14 years in the Massachusetts House of Representatives, for three terms as Governor, and for 22 years in the U.S. Senate, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL has stood as the epitome of integrity, decency, and honesty for both his constituents and his colleagues.

I have admired firsthand the major contributions LEVERETT SALTONSTALL has made on the Senate Appropriations Committee. As a leader of the loyal opposition in the Senate he has always given priority to the common good above any narrow partisan interest. The high regard and respect for LEVERETT SALTONSTALL in the U.S. Senate is as bipartisan as the Senator himself.

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL has given tirelessly of his considerable energy and talents to his Nation and his Commonwealth. I am most happy to join my colleagues in wishing both Senator SALTONSTALL and his devoted wife of 50 years, Alice, good health and great happiness for many years to come.

Report to the People of the Seventh Ohio District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my report to the people of the Seventh Ohio District on my voting and attendance records for my first year as their Representative in the U.S. House of Representatives—the 2d session of the 89th Congress.

There were 399 calls of the House to which I responded 343 times, a score of 85 percent. Of these, 206 were routine quorum calls to which I was present and responded 185 times, a score of 90-percent attendance. These quorum calls are omitted in the interest of conserving space.

There were 193 rollcall votes for 185 of which I was present to vote, a score of 82 percent.

Ten of the missed votes were at scattered intervals throughout the session when I was forced to be absent to meet previously made commitments to my constituency and my travel schedule prevented my being in Washington at the time of the vote. On several of these occasions, I inserted statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD advising as to how I would have voted had I been present.

The bulk of these missed rollcall votes occurred during the last 6 days of the session when I was obliged to be absent in order to participate in the groundbreaking ceremonies for the Buck Creek flood control project at Springfield, Ohio, and to meet previous commitments in the Seventh District and elsewhere in the Nation.

During these 6 closing days of the session, 12 of the missed votes were on conference reports representing legislation on which I had previously voted, and 4 votes were on contempt of Congress citations.

On two of these conference report rollcall votes I was paired: For the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1966, and against the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966.

Six votes were on new substantive legislation on which I had not voted previously. In addition, there were two conference reports relating to these six items of legislation on which I was unable to vote.

The only two major bills on which I had no recorded vote were on the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 and the Foreign Investors Tax Act of 1966, the so-called Christmas tree bill. In both instances, I was unable to be present to hear the debate because of the commitments outlined above.

The description of the bills and the amendments or motions in the report are for purposes of identification only. No attempt is made to describe the legislation completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved. The descriptions used are, for the most part, taken from the official titles of the bill, which do not always reflect the nature or true purpose of the legislation. However, upon request, I will be pleased to furnish more complete information concerning any particular bill and the reasons for my vote.

I have been rated on my voting record by a number of organizations, ranging from Americans for Democratic Action to Americans for Constitutional Action.

The National Associated Businessman, a bipartisan organization, rates me at 100 percent for sound business voting for economy in our Government. The average for the Ohio Republican delegation is 97 percent.

The Americans for Constitutional Action has given me an 81-percent rating. The average for the Ohio Republican delegation is 85 percent.

The AFL–CIO Committee on Political Education—COPE—rates me at a flat zero on the basis of two votes cast this year. COPE rates the Ohio Republican delegation at an average of 8 percent.

Americans for Democratic Action rates me at 8 percent and rates the other Ohio Republicans at an average of 4.7 percent.

My voting record follows:

89th Cong., 2d sess.

Rollcall No.	Date 1966	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H. Res. 665, authorizing funds for expenses of House Un-American Activities Committee:	
3	Jan. 27	On resolution. (Adopted 299 to 24.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 699, citing Robert M. Shelton for contempt of Congress during Ku Klux Klan hearings:	
6	Feb. 2	On resolution. (Adopted 344 to 28.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 700, citing Calvin Fred Craig for contempt of Congress during Ku Klux Klan hearings:	
7	Feb. 2	On motion to recommit to special committee for study. (Rejected 57 to 307.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 706, agreeing to Senate amendments to H.R. 30, providing $9,500,000 for U.S. participation in Inter-American Cultural Center in Florida:	
9	Feb. 3	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 201 to 140.)	Nay.
		H.R. 12410, providing education and other benefits for veterans who served after expiration of Korean GI bill:	
11	Feb. 7	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 381 to 0.)	Yea.
		S. 1698, establishing a procedure for the review of proposed bank mergers:	
13	Feb. 8	On passage as amended. (Passed 372 to 17.)	Yea.
		H.R. 12563, authorizing United States to join Asian Development Bank and to pay $200 million subscription:	
15	Feb. 9	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 292 to 80.)	Nay.
		H.R. 706, providing for special boards to eliminate backlog of undecided claims before National Railroad Adjustment Board:	
16	Feb. 9	On passage. (Passed 380 to 0.)	Not voting.
		H. Res. 736, providing for consideration of H.R. 12752, Tax Adjustment Act of 1966:	
18	Feb. 23	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 326 to 50.)	Nay.
		H.R. 12752, Tax Adjustment Act of 1966:	
19	Feb. 23	On motion to recommit with instructions to delete section postponing auto and telephone excise tax cuts. (Rejected 187 to 207.)	Yea.
20	Feb. 23	On passage. (Passed 246 to 146.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 742, providing for consideration of H.R. 12169, authorizing supplemental foreign aid funds for southeast Asia including Vietnam in 1966:	
22	Feb. 24	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 359 to 11.)	Yea.
		H.R. 12169, authorizing supplemental foreign aid funds for southeast Asia including Vietnam in 1966:	
23	Feb. 24	On motion to recommit with instructions to specify countries where funds are to be spent. (Rejected 169 to 213.)	Yea.
24	Feb. 24	On passage. (Passed 350 to 27.)	Yea.
		H.R. 12889, authorizing supplemental funds in fiscal 1966 for military equipment for southeast Asia:	
26	Mar. 1	On passage. (Passed 392 to 4.)	Yea.
		S. 1666, providing for appointment of additional circuit and district judges:	
28	Mar. 2	On passage. (Passed 371 to 23.)	Yea.
		H.R. 9063, authorizing $4,600,000 in U.S. funds for Alaska exposition:	
30	Mar. 2	On passage. (Passed 202 to 173.)	Nay.
		H.R. 12322, authorizing referendum to compel cottongrowers to pay assessments for cotton research and promotion:	
33	Mar. 3	Motion to recommit with instructions to allow each producer 1 vote in referendum regardless of amount produced. (Rejected 185 to 191.)	Yea.
34	Mar. 3	On passage. (Passed 189 to 183.)	Nay.
		H.R. 12752, Tax Adjustment Act of 1966:	
36	Mar. 15	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 288 to 102.)	Nay.

89th Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date 1966	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H.R. 13546, making fiscal 1966 supplemental defense and foreign aid appropriations primarily for Vietnam:	
38	Mar. 15	On passage. (Passed 389 to 2.)	Yea.
		H.R. 6785, providing uniform date for beginning and ending of daylight saving time throughout the United States:	
40	Mar. 16	On passage. (Passed 292 to 93.)	Nay.
		H.R. 13448, providing the benefits of faster and less expensive mail service to servicemen overseas:	
42	Mar. 21	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 303 to 0.)	Not voting.
		H. Res. 774, providing for consideration of S. 2394, authorizing $750,000 residence for the Vice President:	
44	Mar. 22	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 236 to 135.)	Nay.
		S. 2394, authorizing $750,000 residence for the Vice President:	
45	Mar. 22	On passage. (Passed 197 to 184.)	Nay.
		H.R. 14012, making supplemental appropriations of $2,500,000,000, including funds for a new rent subsidy program and Teachers Corps for fiscal 1966:	
48	Mar. 29	Motion to recommit with instructions to delete $12,000,000 for rent subsidies. (Rejected 190 to 198.)	Yea.
49	Mar. 29	On passage. (Passed 269 to 122.)	Nay.
		S. 1404, providing uniform date for beginning and ending of daylight saving time throughout the United States:	
50	Mar. 30	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 281 to 91.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 802, providing for consideration of S. 2729, increasing lending authority of Small Business Administration and separating disaster loans from regular business funds:	
53	Mar. 31	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 362 to 4.)	Yea.
		S. 2729, increasing lending authority of Small Business Administration and separating disaster loans from regular business funds:	
54	Mar. 31	On passage. (Passed 372 to 0.)	Yea.
		H.R. 14224, extending initial period for enrollment in supplementary health insurance program for the aged:	
58	Apr. 6	On passage. (Passed 387 to 0.)	Yea.
		H.R. 14122, providing Federal pay increase:	
59	Apr. 6	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 393 to 1.)	Yea.
		H.R. 14215, making appropriations for Department of Interior and related agencies for fiscal 1967:	
60	Apr. 6	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce bill by 5 percent. (Rejected 156 to 232.)	Yea.
61	Apr. 6	On passage. (Passed 370 to 16.)	Yea.
		H.R. 14266, making appropriations for Post Office, Treasury, Executive Office and 2 independent agencies for fiscal 1967:	
62	Apr. 6	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce bill by 5 percent. (Rejected 127 to 244.)	Yea.
63	Apr. 6	On passage. (Passed 308 to 2.)	Yea.
		H.R. 7406, authorizing $390,000,000 for construction of 3d Grand Coulee Dam powerplant in Washington:	
65	Apr. 19	On amendment establishing a consolidated Columbia River basin accounting procedure. (Agreed to 239 to 111.)	Nay.
		S. 1761, authorizing construction of 3d Grand Coulee Dam powerplant:	
66	Apr. 19	On motion to insert text of House-passed H.R. 7406 in lieu of Senate-passed language. (Agreed to 246 to 78.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 756, disapproving transfer of the Community Relations Service from Department of Commerce to Department of Justice:	
68	Apr. 20	On agreeing to resolution. (Rejected 163 to 220.)	Yea.
		H.R. 14596, making appropriations for Department of Agriculture for fiscal 1967:	
70	Apr. 26	On motion to recommit with instructions to add amendment prohibiting sale of agricultural commodities by any nation trading with North Vietnam. (Agreed to 290 to 98.)	Yea.
71	Apr. 26	On passage. (Passed 366 to 23.)	Yea.
		H.R. 10065, to provide the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission with enforcement authority patterned after the National Labor Relations Board:	
74	Apr. 27	On passage. (Passed 299 to 94.)	Yea.
		H.R. 13881, requiring the licensing of buyers and sellers of dogs and cats used for research purposes:	
76	Apr. 28	On passage. (Passed 352 to 10.)	Yea.
		H.R. 14324, making appropriations of $5,000,000,000 for NASA for fiscal 1967:	
80	May 3	On motion to recommit with instructions to designate $20,000,000 for noise research. (Rejected 90 to 271.)	Yea.
81	May 3	On passage. (Passed 349 to 10.)	Yea.
		H.R. 14745, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare for fiscal 1967:	
86	May 5	On motion to recommit with instructions to limit expenditures to 95 percent of budget estimates. (Rejected 143 to 236.)	Yea.
87	May 5	On passage. (Passed 354 to 27.)	Yea.
		H.R. 14921, making appropriations for Independent Offices and HUD for fiscal 1967:	
91	May 10	On amendment providing $2,000,000 for rent subsidies. (Agreed to 192 to 188.)	Nay.
92	May 10	On passage. (Passed 296 to 82.)	Nay.
		H.R. 14088, providing for improved medical benefits for military personnel and dependents:	
94	May 11	On passage. (Passed 356 to 0.)	Yea.
		S. 1098, encouraging construction of more railroad boxcars by increasing rental rates:	
97	May 12	On passage. (Passed 306 to 27.)	Yea.
		S. 693, clarifying Foreign Agents Registration Act:	
98	May 16	On passage. (Passed 285 to 0.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 852, providing for consideration of H.R. 14544, Participation Sales Act; authorizing Federal borrowing not subject to debt and interest limits:	
100	May 16	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 184 to 120.)	Nay.
		H.R. 14215, making appropriations for Department of Interior and related agencies for fiscal 1967:	
105	May 18	On conference report. (Agreed to 378 to 10.)	Yea.
		H.R. 14544, Participation Sales Act, authorizing Federal borrowing not subject to debt and interest limits:	
106	May 18	On motion to recommit with instructions to limit interest on participation holdings to 4.75 percent. (Rejected 180 to 218.)	Yea.
107	May 18	On passage. (Passed 206 to 190.)	Nay.
		H.R. 13712, increasing Federal minimum wage to $1.60 an hour and extending coverage to additional employees:	
113	May 26	On amendment to exempt small retail firms and service stations. (Rejected 195 to 200.)	Yea.
114	May 26	On amendment delaying minimum wage increase to $1.60 an hour until Feb. 1, 1969. (Agreed to 205 to 194.)	Yea.
115	May 26	On motion to recommit with instructions to eliminate coverage of farmworkers and broaden seasonal industries' exemptions. (Rejected 168 to 231.)	Yea.
116	May 26	On passage. (Passed 303 to 93.)	Yea.
120	June 1	H.R. 9167, authorizing civil commitment of narcotic addicts for long-term rehabilitation:	
		On motion to recommit with instructions to exclude from benefits persons charged with selling or importing narcotics. (Agreed to 198 to 168.)	Yea.
121	June 1	On passage. (Passed 367 to 1.)	Yea.
		H.R. 14050, extending the Library Services and Construction Act:	
123	June 2	On passage. (Passed 336 to 2.)	Yea.
		H.R. 14643, authorizing $140 million for international studies at U.S. colleges and universities:	
124	June 6	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 194 to 89.)	Nay.
		H.R. 10, broadening Self-Employed Individuals Retirement Act:	
125	June 6	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 291 to 0.)	Yea.
		H.R. 15456, making appropriations for House of Representatives and related offices:	
127	June 7	On passage. (Passed 341 to 2.)	Yea.
		S. 1357, revising existing bail practices in U.S. courts:	
128	June 7	On passage. (Passed 319 to 14.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 882, providing for consideration of H.R. 15202, increasing temporary national debt limit to $330,000,000,000:	
130	June 8	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 205 to 153.)	Nay.
		H.R. 15202, increasing temporary national debt limit to $330,000,000,000:	
131	June 8	On passage. (Passed 199 to 165.)	Nay.
		H.R. 14929, Food for Freedom Act, promoting international trade in agricultural commodities:	
133	June 9	On amendment to extend credit from 20 to 40 years. (Agreed to 193 to 165.)	Nay.
134	June 9	On motion to recommit with instructions to prohibit credit sales to Communist countries and to change resale formula to prevent Government sales at less than 80 percent of parity. (Rejected 157 to 200.)	Yea.
135	June 9	On passage. (Passed 333 to 20.)	Yea.
		H.R. 14019, authorizing funds for acquisition and maintenance of Department of State buildings overseas:	
137	June 13	On passage. (Passed 290 to 3.)	Not voting.
		S. 2950, authorizing procurement of military weapons and providing 3.2 percent military pay increase:	
141	June 14	On passage. (Passed 356 to 2.)	Yea.
		H.R. 14025, extending the Defense Production Act:	
145	June 16	On amendment giving President power to impose consumer credit controls. (Rejected 73 to 275.)	Nay.
		S. 1160, freedom of information bill, providing for greater public access to Federal records:	
147	June 20	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 307 to 0.)	Not voting.
		H.R. 10860, allowing States to sell confiscated oil in interstate commerce:	
148	June 20	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 306 to 1.)	Not voting.

89th Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date 1966	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H.R. 15119, extending unemployment compensation benefits and preserving State control of system:	
150	June 22	On passage. (Passed 374 to 10.)	Not voting.
		H.R. 13196, authorizing program for training of health professions personnel:	
152	June 23	On passage. (Passed 364 to 0.)	Not voting.
		H. Res. 875, providing for consideration of H.R. 14904, increasing parcel post rates and size and weight restrictions; under procedure bypassing Rules Committee:	
154	June 27	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 222 to 148.)	Nay.
		H.R. 5426, prohibiting common law marriages in the District of Columbia:	
155	June 27	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 39 to 328.)	Nay.
		S. 2950, authorizing procurement of military weapons and providing 3.2-percent military pay raise:	
159	July 12	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 358 to 2.)	Yea.
		H.R. 15750, authorizing foreign aid:	
164	July 14	On motion to recommit with instructions to limit authorizations to 1 year instead of 2 years and to reduce Development Loan Fund from $1,000,000,000 to $750,000,000 annually. (Rejected 101 to 193.)	Yea.
165	July 14	On passage. (Passed 237 to 146.)	Nay.
		H.R. 15941, making appropriations for Department of Defense for fiscal 1967:	
171	July 20	On passage. (Passed 392 to 1.)	Yea.
		S. 602, increasing and extending small reclamation projects program:	
173	July 21	On agreeing to conference report extending program to all States. (Rejected 136 to 204.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 910, providing for consideration of H.R. 14765, Civil Rights Act of 1966; under procedure bypassing Rules Committee:	
175	July 25	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 200 to 180.)	Nay.
		H.R. 14765, Civil Rights Act of 1966:	
206	Aug. 9	On amendment to exempt agents acting under instructions of owners in the sale or rental of dwellings. (Agreed to 237 to 176.)	Yea.
207	Aug. 9	On amendment making it a Federal crime to incite riots. (Agreed to 389 to 25.)	Yea.
208	Aug. 9	On amendment requiring written complaint before Federal suit to desegregate public facilities can be filed. (Agreed to 214 to 201.)	Yea.
209	Aug. 9	On motion to recommit with instructions to delete housing provisions. (Rejected 190 to 222.)	Nay.
210	Aug. 9	On passage. (Passed 259 to 157.)	Yea.
		S. 3105, authorizing $1,000,000,000 for military construction in fiscal 1967:	
213	Aug. 10	On passage. (Passed 389 to 1.)	Yea.
		H.R. 14359, authorizing funds for highway construction:	
215	Aug. 11	On motion to recommit with instructions to delete $493,000,000 for highway beautification. (Rejected 173 to 175.)	Yea.
216	Aug. 11	On passage. (Passed 341 to 1.)	Yea.
		S. 3688, providing funds to FNMA for home financing:	
218	Aug. 15	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 314 to 1.)	Yea.
		H.R. 16114, increasing fringe benefits to Federal civilian firefighters:	
219	Aug. 15	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 313 to 0.)	Yea.
		H.R. 14604, authorizing $60,000 for study of visitors' services in District of Columbia:	
220	Aug. 15	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Rejected 209 to 108, a ⅔ majority being required.)	Nay.
		H.R. 11555, authorizing $12,000,000 for border highway in El Paso, Tex.:	
221	Aug. 15	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Rejected 174 to 133, a ⅔ majority being required.)	Nay.
		H.R. 14810, extending urban mass transportation program indefinitely at $175,000,000 per year:	
224	Aug. 16	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce funds to $150,000,000 and limit extension to 1 year, through fiscal 1968. (Agreed to 205 to 161.)	Yea.
225	Aug. 16	On passage. (Passed 235 to 127.)	Nay.
		H.R. 13228, Traffic Safety Act, establishing safety standards for autos and tires:	
228	Aug. 17	On amendment providing that members of the Safety Advisory Council be appointed by President instead of Commerce Secretary. (Rejected 168 to 205.)	Yea.
229	Aug. 17	On passage. (Passed 371 to 0.)	Yea.
		H.R. 14921, making appropriations for independent offices and HUD for fiscal 1967:	
231	Aug. 18	On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to eliminate participation sales program authorizing Federal borrowing not subject to debt and interest limits. (Rejected 176 to 190.)	Yea.
		H.R. 13290, Highway Safety Act, establishing highway safety program:	
232	Aug. 18	On passage. (Passed 317 to 3.)	Not voting.
		S. 602, increasing and extending small reclamation projects program:	
233	Aug. 22	On agreeing to second conference report restricting program to Western States. (Agreed to 198 to 81.)	Nay.
		H.R. 16340, prohibiting picketing near churches in District of Columbia during religious services:	
234	Aug. 22	On motion to recommit with instructions to hold public hearings and request Justice Department report and testimony from Attorney General. (Rejected 55 to 237.)	Nay.
235	Aug. 22	On passage. (Passed 249 to 44.)	Yea.
		H.R. 14596, making appropriations for Department of Agriculture for fiscal 1967:	
238	Aug. 24	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 325 to 28.)	Nay.
		H.R. 15941, making appropriations for Department of Defense for fiscal 1967:	
241	Aug. 25	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 383 to 1.)	Yea.
242	Aug. 25	On motion to disagree to Senate amendment authorizing President to call up individual reservists and National Guardsmen without declaring a national emergency. (Agreed to 378 to 3.)	Yea.
		S. 3688, providing funds to FNMA for home financing:	
244	Aug. 26	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 234 to 1.)	Not voting.
		S. 3700, extending urban mass transportation program for 3 years at $150,000,000 per year:	
245	Aug. 26	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 156 to 86.)	NVA.
		H.J. Res. 1284, funding certain Federal agencies until Congress enacts fiscal year appropriation bills:	
246	Aug. 29	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 323 to 6.)	Nay.
		H.R. 15963, establishing Department of Transportation:	
251	Aug. 30	On amendment to exclude Maritime Administration from the Department's jurisdiction. (Agreed to 261 to 117.)	Yea.
252	Aug. 30	On motion to recommit with instructions to assign air accident investigation functions to Transportation Safety Board. (Rejected 143 to 238.)	Yea.
253	Aug. 30	On passage. (Passed 336 to 42.)	Yea.
		S. 3155, authorizing funds for highway construction:	
255	Aug. 31	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 359 to 1.)	Yea.
		S. 3005, Traffic Safety Act, establishing safety standards for autos and tires:	
257	Aug. 31	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 265 to 0.)	Yea.
		S. 3052, Highway Safety Act, establishing highway safety program:	
258	Aug. 31	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 360 to 3.)	Yea.
		H.R. 16574, authorizing $100,000,000 for Peace Corps in fiscal 1967:	
259	Aug. 31	On passage. (Passed 322 to 15.)	Yea.
		H.R. 15750, authorizing foreign aid:	
261	Sept. 1	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 217 to 127.)	Nay.
		H.R. 15098, authorizing $10,000,000 for U.S. participation in HemisFair Exposition in Texas:	
262	Sept. 1	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 147 to 184.)	Yea.
		H.R. 15766, establishing a commission to study and recommend reform of Federal criminal laws:	
265	Sept. 6	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 259 to 0.)	Yea.
		H.R. 13712, increasing Federal minimum wage to $1.60 an hour and extending coverage to additional employees:	
267	Sept. 7	On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to insist on final effective date of Feb. 1, 1969, instead of 1968. (Rejected 163 to 183.)	Yea.
268	Sept. 7	On passage. (Passed 259 to 89.)	Nay.
		H.R. 14026, broadening authority of Federal banking officials to control interest rates:	
271	Sept. 8	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 130 to 214.)	Yea.
272	Sept. 8	On passage. (Passed 271 to 68.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 1002, providing for consideration of H.J. Res. 688, implementing Beirut Agreement on facilitating international circulation of visual and auditory material of educational, scientific, and cultural character:	
274	Sept. 12	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 242 to 2.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 1005, providing for consideration of H.R. 11256, to improve the Federal tax lien laws:	
275	Sept. 12	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 243 to 9.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 1004, providing for consideration of H.R. 8664, implementing Florence Agreement on duty-free entry of certain educational, scientific, and cultural materials:	
276	Sept. 12	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 241 to 7.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 976, providing for consideration of H.R. 11555, authorizing $12,000,000 for border highway in El Paso, Tex.:	
277	Sept. 12	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 202 to 48.)	Yea.

89th Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date 1966	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H.R. 17636, making appropriations for District of Columbia for fiscal 1967:	
279	Sept. 13	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce bill by 5 percent. (Rejected 103 to 217.)	Yea.
280	Sept. 13	On passage. (Passed 320 to 3.)	Yea.
		H.R. 17637, making appropriations for military construction for fiscal 1967:	
284	Sept. 14	On passage. (Passed 346 to 3.)	Yea.
		H.R. 8678, establishing of Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore in Michigan:	
286	Sept. 19	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 247 to 70.)	Nay.
		H.R. 17488, increasing non-service-connected disability and death pensions for veterans and their survivors:	
287	Sept. 19	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 315 to 2.)	Yea.
		H.R. 15183, permitting Cuban refugees to apply for permanent residence status:	
288	Sept. 19	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 300 to 25.)	Yea.
		S.J. Res. 167, authorizing $1.2 million for International Conference on Water for Peace:	
289	Sept. 19	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Rejected 161 to 154, a ⅔ majority being required.)	Yea.
		S. 3423, authorizing $600,000 to establish cultural and recreational area in Fairfax County, Va.:	
290	Sept. 19	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Rejected 195 to 105, a ⅔ majority being required)	Nay.
		H.R. 17788, making appropriations for foreign aid and other programs for fiscal 1967:	
293	Sept. 20	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce economic aid by 1.9 percent. (Agreed to 187 to 182.)	Yea.
294	Sept. 20	On passage. (Passed 234 to 141.)	Nay.
		H.R. 17787, making appropriations for public works for fiscal 1967:	
296	Sept. 21	On passage. (Passed 354 to 25.)	Yea.
		H.R. 17195, authorizing the President to call up reserves without declaring a national emergency and barring merger of Reserves and National Guard:	
298	Sept. 21	On passage. (Passed 332 to 6.)	Yea.
		H.R. 11555, authorizing $12,000,000 for border highway in El Paso, Tex.:	
300	Sept. 22	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce Federal funds to $8,000,000 and to require that El Paso or Texas pay 50 percent of highway cost. (Rejected 149 to 199.)	Yea.
		H.R. 13825, authorizing funds for Tijuana River flood control project:	
301	Sept. 22	On passage. (Passed 293 to 42.)	Yea.
		H.R. 15111, authorizing $1,750,000,000 for antipoverty program for fiscal 1967:	
317	Sept. 29	On motion to strike enacting clause. (Rejected 156 to 208.)	Yea.
318	Sept. 29	On amendment to limit supergrades to 1 for each 100 employees. (Agreed to 257 to 108.)	Yea.
319	Sept. 29	On motion to recommit with instructions to substitute Opportunity Crusade. (Rejected 162 to 203.)	Yea.
320	Sept. 29	On passage. (Passed 210 to 156.)	Nay.
		H.R. 17607, suspending 7-percent investment tax credit:	
323	Sept. 30	On Byrnes amendment continuing credit for construction of water and air pollution control facilities. (Agreed to 330 to 2.)	Yea.
324	Sept. 30	On passage. (Passed 221 to 118.)	Nay.
		H.R. 16076, authorizing funds for water pollution control:	
325	Sept. 30	On passage. (Passed 312 to 0.)	Yea.
		S. 985, establishing certain fair packaging and labeling standards:	
326	Oct. 3	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 300 to 8.)	Yea.
		S. 3807, authorizing $15,000,000 for nuclear power-desalting project:	
327	Oct. 3	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 316 to 1.)	Yea.
		H.R. 13447, authorizing $15,000,000 for estuarine areas:	
328	Oct. 3	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Rejected 208 to 108, a ⅔ majority being required.)	Yea.
		H.R. 18119, making appropriations for Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce for fiscal 1967:	
330	Oct. 4	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce all but FBI funds by 5 percent. (Rejected 152 to 201.)	Yea.
331	Oct. 4	On passage. (Passed 319 to 38.)	Yea.
		H.R. 14929, Food for Freedom Act, promoting international trade in agricultural commodities:	
335	Oct. 5	On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to insist on banning sales to nations trading with Cuba or North Vietnam. (Agreed to 306 to 61.)	Yea.
		H.R. 13161, authorizing $5.6 billion for Federal aid to elementary and secondary education for fiscal 1967–68:	
343	Oct. 6	On amendment allowing withholding of funds for noncompliance with Civil Rights Act of 1964 only after hearings and findings. (Agreed to 221 to 116.)	Yea.
344	Oct. 6	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce funds by $1,300,000,000. (Rejected 150 to 185.)	Yea.
345	Oct. 6	On passage. (Passed 237 to 97.)	Yea.
		H.R. 17788, making appropriations for foreign aid and other programs for fiscal 1967:	
346	Oct. 7	On agreeing to conference report appropriating $110,600,000 less than House bill. (Agreed to 189 to 89.)	Nay.
		H.R. 15941, making appropriations for Department of Defense for fiscal 1967:	
349	Oct. 11	On motion to agree to amendment in conference report authorizing President to call up reservists and guardsmen individually and by unit without declaring a national emergency. (Agreed to 305 to 42.)	Yea.
		H.R. 17787, making appropriations for public works for fiscal 1967:	
350	Oct. 11	On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to cut $23,600,000. (Rejected 91 to 255.)	Yea.
		H.R. 12047, amending the Internal Security Act to impose criminal punishment on those who support through contributions or goods any country in armed conflict with the United States:	
360	Oct. 13	On passage. (Passed 275 to 64.)	Yea.
		H.R. 51, establishing the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore:	
362	Oct. 14	On amendment adding 478 acres. (Agreed to 182 to 147.)	Nay.
363	Oct. 14	On passage. (Passed 204 to 141.)	Nay.

A Solemn Protest Against the Continued Persecution of Jews Living in Soviet Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Bergen County Committee To Help Russian Jewry held a rally at the Bergen County Vocational School in Hackensack. At this solemn gathering members of every faith and both political parties joined in a solemn protest against the continued persecution of Jews living in Soviet Russia. I regret to say that the Russians have apparently not recognized the strength and determination of the Jewish culture and religion. Judaism has been a source of strength to our own pluralistic society in the United States. This age-old faith can never be extinguished by persecution and pogrom. It always rises again like a phoenix from the ashes. I participated with my colleague, Senator CASE in this somber meeting of protest. It is my hope that the pressure of world opinion will force the Russian Government to abandon its policy of cultural genocide and to treat the Soviet Jews with the respect and the dignity they deserve.

On behalf of Senator CASE and myself, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks delivered at this rally be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RALLY SPONSORED BY THE BERGEN COUNTY COMMITTEE TO HELP RUSSIAN JEWRY, 200 HACKENSACK AVENUE, HACKENSACK, N.J.

Presentation of the colors: Jewish War Veterans led by County Commander David Schlags.

National anthem.

Psalm VIII, Isadore Freed, Composer; Cantor Marshall M. Glatzer, Temple Sinai, Tenafly, N.J.

Welcome by Philip Ball, Vice Chairman of the Committee and Program Chairman.

Mr. BALL. On behalf of the Bergen County Committee to help Soviet Jewry, I would like to welcome our distinguished guests, and to thank all of you for being with us this evening. Your presence here is evidence that you, too, believe that oppression must be met with protest, not with silence. We are particularly grateful to the governmental, civic, and religious leaders who have taken time from their already overburdened schedules to be here. Their participation adds to this cause not only the dignity of their offices, but their stature as just, committed, human beings.

We have revised the order of our program to allow one of those guests, Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, to speak first, since he must leave to meet an airline schedule.

During his twelve years in the Senate, New Jersey's senior senator has earned respect and commendation as a responsible and responsive representative of the people. He has been called one of the Country's ten ablest Senators, received the Jewish War Veteran's

John F. Kennedy Memorial Award as "a person of similar stature who has acted for the benefit of the people in all phases of activity"; and has been cited by the B'nai B'rith Anti Defamation League "for his contributions to the unending struggle for liberty and human dignity which is so vital to the safety, security, and serenity of our nation."

Ladies and Gentlemen, the Honorable CLIFFORD P. CASE.

Senator CASE. There is no better evidence of the continuing vitality of America's attachment to religious liberty than the deep and widespread concern expressed by Americans of all faiths over the anti-Semitic policies of the Soviet Union.

I have joined with colleagues in the United States Senate in unanimous condemnation of the Soviet policy of discrimination against Jewish culture, religion and community, and I know that we speak for the American people as a whole.

It is a sad but indisputable fact that, alone among all Soviet ethnic groups, the three million Jews of the Soviet Union are forbidden schools of their own and other institutions of Jewish learning. Yet these are essential if the ancient heritage of the Jews is to be perpetuated in full measure in that land.

And alone among all Soviet religious groups, the Jews are forbidden the right to have any form of nationwide federation of congregation or of clergy. Nor are they permitted religious and cultural ties wih Jewish communities outside the Soviet Union.

These are not the actions of a nation truly committed to equality, which the Soviet Government would have the world believe it is. Neither is that Government's refusal to permit Jews to leave the Soviet Union to be reunited with their families abroad.

So long as these conditions persist, Americans and all other lovers of freedom must and will protest. For protest, I am convinced, can be persuasive. So, too, can wise counsel, and I hope that Soviet leaders heard the calm words of Israel's Foreign Minister, Abba Eban, at the United Nations General Assembly.

As he put it, "In a Europe increasingly open to movement between its Eastern and Western parts, in a world in which barriers are falling and international contacts are being multiplied, the renewal of contact between kindred communities will become a natural corollary of peaceful co-existence."

As a co-worker of Ambassador Goldberg's at the U.N. General Assembly, I know that this kind of appeal to reason is a natural and necessary corollary to the appeal of conscience which we are voicing tonight. And to those whose plight we plead, we say with conviction: "You are not forsaken."

Mr. BALL. Thank you, Senator CASE.

I am now honored to present one of Bergen County's most eminent citizens—a former State Commander of the Jewish War Veterans, a former Mayor of Teaneck, an advocate of many worthy causes and a friend to many of us in the Audience: State Senator Matthew Feldman.

Senator MATTHEW FELDMAN. Why are we here today? What has brought us together? Dare we dream that a small group of Americans, meeting in a suburban city called Hackensack—which no one in the Kremlin has ever heard of—will somehow strike a magic chord of conscience which will compel the Soviet leaders to ease their policies of harassment of their Jewish population?

Certainly, there seems to be no logical reason to believe that the Russians can be moved on this issue. Only a few days ago, The New York Times published a story reporting that Israel had charged in the United Nations that the Soviet Union is practicing discrimination against its Jewish population.

The Soviet reply was somewhat predictable. Forty years ago, the British political scientist advised us: "States, like men, never protest their honor loudly unless they have a bad case to argue." And so the Soviets replied to the Israel charges by characterizing them as "specious, mendacious assertions and anti-Soviet slanders." And anyway, the Russians said, what about the way the Israelis treat their Arabs?

In this kind of environment, it just doesn't seem realistic to hope that something may yet come of the protests being raised by Americans against the treatment Jews are receiving in the Soviet Union.

Again I ask, why, then, are we here today, pursuing such an apparently hopeless cause? There are a couple of practical answers to that question, and one idealistic one.

First of all, the United States has consistently backed the Israeli demands for an investigation of the charges that the Soviet Union is continuously harassing Russia's two million Jews.

While no one in the Kremlin has ever heard of Hackensack, a few people in Washington have, so this rally makes a lot of sense after all—if for no other reason than as a reaffirmation of our fervent wish to have our government remain firm in its current position.

Then, of course, there is the possible effect of the cumulative weight of public protest; there are many small and big towns all over America where rallies like this continue to take place. And the protest may eventually find its way through the Iron Curtain because, it seems to me, the Russians are becoming somewhat more interested in friendship with America as their relationship with their erstwhile friend and neighbor, Communist China, continues to deteriorate.

So, perhaps the Russians will be in a more receptive mood about a number of American suggestions for changes that could improve relationships between our two countries. When that day comes—and perhaps it will be sooner than we think—it will be well for both governments to know that providing freedom to pursue and develop their religious life and religious institutions is vital to Russia's Jews.

But the underlying reason for our participation in this rally, I believe, is the matter of conscience. Even if these programs offered no promise whatsoever of relief, they would continue to take place because it is important to our sense of self-esteem and dignity that we take the time to protest grievous wrongs.

As a basic tenet of the Judaic-Christian code of ethics, conscience is one of the prime movers and motivators in our society.

To protest a wrong is the vital first step in the never-ending battle to overcome all wrongs in society. That first step takes a lot of courage in some instances, but nothing can proceed without it.

Ed Murrow demonstrated that kind of courage when he dared to publicly criticize the late Senator McCarthy at a time when the Senator was riding roughshod over the rights of many innocent Americans.

And Congressman CHARLES WELTNER of Georgia showed that kind of courage when he abandoned his re-election bid recently, rather than be bound by a party loyalty oath to support the odious campaign of that stain on the American conscience called Lester Maddox.

Of course, it doesn't take much courage to criticize the Soviet Union in Hackensack, New Jersey, but exercising the conscience is a good experience, whether or not courage is also involved. It's an activity which cleanses the soul and uplifts the spirit. In the final analysis, I think that's why we're here: Simply, to do what is right.

Somehow, it all must turn out to be meaningful—of that I am sure. The great scientist and humanist, Albert Einstein, had a lot of confidence in the power of the conscience. Perhaps we can take heart from his words. The man whose inventive ingenuity changed the course of history in our society wrote: "Real human progress depends not so much on inventive ingenuity as on conscience."

Mr. BALL. Thank you, Senator Feldman.

Our next guest, Monseigneur Henry Beck, serves as pastor of the Sacred Heart Church in Lyndhurst. He is a Professor of Religious History at Seton Hall University and at Drew University. Monseigneur Beck is a member of the American Bishops Ecumenical Commission for Dialogue with the Presbyterian and Reform Churches. He was a theological expert at the second Vatican Council in Rome in 1964 and 1965. We are honored to have him with us. Monseigneur Beck.

Monseigneur BECK. My brothers and my sisters: We are here this evening to bring our witness and our love to our brethren in the Soviet Union. I come personally on behalf of the Catholics of Bergen, Hudson, Essex and Union counties which comprise the Archdiocese of Newark. In their name I join with you in protest against the evils that have in the past beset and which in this day continue to beset our brothers and sisters of the Jewish faith. We Catholics have had a part in this. We open our hearts to you tonight, seeking your forgiveness and asking your pardon. One year ago, this coming October 28th, we opened our hearts to all the Jewish community wherever it is gathered upon this globe of ours. Then, solemnly at the II Vatican Council in Rome, we spoke on behalf of all Catholics everywhere: "The Church repudiates all persecutions against any man. Moreover, mindful of her common patrimony with the Jews, and motivated by the gospel's spiritual love and by no political considerations, she deplores the hatred, persecutions and displays of anti-Semitism directed against the Jews at any time and from any source." (*Declaration on the Non-Christian Religions*, n. 4).

Herein we speak from the very depth of our being. We cannot tolerate the horror of anti-Semitism for it runs contrary to our humanity and contrary to that love which we are beginning to learn from Christ. No doubt, we should have learned this earlier. But we are learning it now. And we are speaking to you with soul-felt conviction. Now, at long last, we speak in authentic response to our tradition. We join ourselves to you, our elder brothers. We decry with you that inhumanity which dogs your brothers and our brothers in the Soviet Union. We, too, are damaged when you are hurt. With you, we want to liberate all mankind from the incubus of hate, distrust and persecution. We want totally to be done with man's inhumanity to man. It is your conscience which demands this and it is our conscience which demands this.

We are one million five hundred thousand Catholics in these four counties of northern New Jersey. Our hearts bleed with yours in what your brothers and your sisters, our brothers and our sisters, suffer this night in the Soviet Union. It is not persecution to the blood, but it is a horror and we feel it with you. We recognize the heritage which you represent and we recognize that we belong to you and with you. Your God is our God. We have learned His blessed ways from you. Our deepest insights, our warmest love have come from you, from your fathers who are our fathers in that cradle of all civilization which is your Palestine and ours.

Henceforth, please God, we shall ever raise our voice when yours is silenced. We shall stand with you, shoulder to shoulder and heart to heart. You have given us love. What else can we do but give you love in return. Accept our love. Brothers and sisters in the Living God, we go forth together, resolved that your cause is ours, and your cause is the cause of all mankind. Thank you.

Mr. BALL. Thank you, Monseigneur Beck.

Reverend Arthur M. Frieberg, Pastor of the Trinity Lutheran Church in Tenafly is President of the Bergen County Council of Churches. Reverend Frieberg, we are delighted to have you with us.

Reverend FRIEBERG. Distinguished guests, my friends. I am happy to be here tonight. Perhaps I will be recognized by some of you. I used to live in Bergenfield and my name was listed right next to Rabbi Fishberg. So you might know what happened on many occasions; I would get a call and they'd ask, "Rabbi, can you tell me where the nearest Synagogue is?" And I'd say, "Well, that depends on where you are". And they'd tell me, and I'd give them directions. They never knew that they had a Lutheran Minister on the wire. Now I think that that was the spirit of genuine love in a very practical way.

It is a real pleasure for me to be here tonight and speak this freely to you and bring greetings on behalf of the more than 100 Protestant churches in Bergen County. We have 350 Protestant churches in the County, but a little over 100 belong to our Council. However, I think that what I am going to say would be symbolic of the thinking of all these churches. Being here tonight has made me look a little more closely into this terrible situation that exists in Soviet Russia with regard to your people, the freedom that is being denied them to express their religious faith and to retain their identity. This it seems to me is the basic issue in this whole situation. It is the identity of the Jewish people that is being destroyed by not allowing them properly to observe their religious festivals and to bring their children up in the ancient faith of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Joseph. And it is that which we deplore.

I am also happy that I can be here tonight because I think that any form of anti-Semitism is a devasting force. The persecution of any member of the human family is a contradiction of religion and unworthy of God's children. I, too, in some small way, perhaps, atone for that which has happened in the history of my own church, the Lutheran church. Luther was such a controversial figure and he was such a child of emotion at times. In the youth-time of his life he was very much in favor of the Jewish people, and then something happened in the 1540's when his mind was changed completely. And it is for this reason I express repentance and would rather look back to the earlier rather than the later Luther. For certainly our heart goes out to your people.

We have known some suffering, too, at the hands of the Soviet Government. One million Lutherans either died or were deported in the Ukraine Valley when Josef Stalin entered the picture of history. And that is no small number. We have learned from experience, too, behind the Iron curtain, that it is not easy to maintain your identity and religious faith even though you are permitted the outward observance of religious custom and tradition. For example, we know full well that even though we are allowed to conduct religious courses, yet certain rights and privileges are withdrawn from the youth if they are known to enroll in such a school. They have no chance to go on to higher education.

This sort of thing certainly should not exist in this twentieth century. And we should add our voice with yours in protest to this injustice which is being brought upon your people in the Soviet Union. And we would pray that God almighty might send his spirit into the midst of these people and enlighten their minds and hearts as only He can . . . and lead them in the paths of righteousness. And so tonight I would add this in closing, that we here in Bergen County in our churches will do everything within our power to further your cause around the world. May God bless you.

MUSICAL SELECTIONS

Jacqueline Maltin, Soprano: Roah V'roah—Shepherds and Maidens; Sadot Sheba' Emek—Fields of the Valley.

INTRODUCTION OF PLATFORM GUESTS

Mrs. Marvin Barsky, Rally Chairman, next introduced the many platform guests.

Mr. BALL. The leaders of Government on this platform are not here simply because of their offices. They have all demonstrated a concern for the needs of people and a willingness to fight injustice.

In the case of HARRISON WILLIAMS, an examination of his voting record and the bills he has sponsored demonstrate his concern particularly with the problems of the aged and the underprivileged. He was the chief sponsor and floor manager for the Domestic Peace Corps Bill, a co-sponsor of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and Medicare.

The lot of an estimated two million migrant workers has brightened since a Williams sub-committee secured a migrant health program, children's day care centers and better housing and sanitation facilities.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I take great pleasure in presenting Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS.

Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR. All of us here tonight, throughout the County, Jew and non-Jew alike, must have a deep concern about the treatment of the Jews in the Soviet Union—or the mis-treatment of any group anywhere.

There is ample evidence of the religious and cultural discrimination against the three million Jews in the Soviet Union. The paradox is that Soviet ideology, constitution, law and practices encourages other groups to perpetuate their group existence through cultural and educational institutions and activities in their own languages; but since 1948 when Stalin had destroyed all Jewish communal-cultural institutions there has been clear cut discriminatory practice against the Jewish minority group. The educational system was dismantled which had issued a total of 110 publications in the previous three years. The famed Jewish State Theater of Moscow was closed in 1949. Yiddish actors, writers, leaders were liquidated.

The essential elements of this policy were continued by Stalin's successors. For eleven years there were no books, no publications, no theaters.

Today—

There is not a single Yiddish school or a single Yiddish class in the U.S.S.R. although Soviet law requires the organization of such classes at the request of ten parents.

There are no schools, classes or courses in any language to enable Jews to learn something Jewish—history; culture; literature; and even their recent past, the martyrdom of Soviet Jews during the Nazi holocaust.

There is no Jewish publishing house nor a Jewish book distributing agency, but only token nods toward Yiddish literature. In 1959–61 five books published by classic Yiddish writers long dead were published in small editions; three more by living Soviet Jewish writers in 1964–65. Since 1961 there has been a Yiddish literary magazine, *Sovietish Heimland,* originally a bi-monthly and now a monthly. Much of its edition of 25,000 is for export.

Let's not commit the sin of silence.

I want to take this opportunity to commend our government and particularly our Ambassador Patricia Harris for the effective and couregeous participation in the debate at the U.N. last week protesting the Soviet treatment of its Jewish citizens.

I call upon the United Nations to continue and to strengthen its forums on the religious and cultural persecution of Jews in the Soviet Union. It is through this international forum that world opinion can make itself most effectively felt in the Soviet Union. It is such rallies as you have here tonight which will help dramatize the problem and eventually influence a humane solution.

Mr. BALL. Thank you, Senator WILLIAMS.

In September of 1965, Jews from all over the country gathered in Washington, D.C. to protest anti-semitism in the Soviet Union. One of the most striking features of the demonstration was the fervor of our youth. Barnard Kaplan is typical of the young people who within a few years will inherit the responsibility to continue today's fight for freedom—whenever and wherever it is threatened.

Mr. KAPLAN. The greatest problem that continually faces man is that of the future, a time unknown, distant, and far away, filled with pitfalls, conflicts, strife, and discord. Yet, as man progresses in time, he should also progress in his knowledge. Since men can learn from other men and the study of history is one of our most basic disciplines, the job of living should become easier and easier, and the next generation should live in a world of peace and prosperity. Yet, this has never been so, no generation has been free from war, none has gone without the burden of poverty, and none has existed in which all men were free and equal. In fact, living has become much harder, as our world becomes more complex so do splits among nations, and the gulf that exists between rich and poor and the persecution of minorities are no longer matters of money and hatred alone, but have definite sociological, educational, and psychological implications.

Jewish youth and indeed all the youth of today look towards the world of tomorrow, but all we can see is the world of yesterday: yesterday's wars, yesterday's jealousies, yesterday's economic problems, and yesterday's persecution. Humanity has not learned its lesson yet, but fortunately we have not given up and we are still willing to continue—and youth will *also* be struggling to attain these goals we hold so dear.

Youth tries to know what is going on. We are critical of what we see, but we are also doing something about it, besides reading the newspapers and giving a sigh of relief that we are not the ones involved. It is youth that is in the forefront of the struggle for civil rights. It was youth that built the State of Israel and it is youth that now, defends it so it can grow further. On the question of Soviet Jewry, youth have been activated by the Student Struggle for Soviet Jewry, while in Russia itself, Soviet Jewish youth have been among those openly showing their defiance to their government by going to synagogue on major holidays.

Youth is constantly searching to find the truth, the essence of a situation, to find the facts and deal with them logically, rationally, and in the way that will do the most good for humanity. You may think that youth is idealistic and we are, but we can afford to be and some group must possess the unreachable ideals. But before one can become an idealist, one must also be a realist, one must know what is happening, for it is only in this way that one knows what to idealize upon.

However, just as youth and idealism seem to be synonymous, so too are youth and problems, and of these, Jewish youth probably possesses its just share. Not only do we have the fears, anxieties and doubts common to all teenagers, but we are also faced with the problem of being Jewish in a mixed society. We often ask ourselves: When to assert our Jewish teachings and when not to? What can we do as Jewish youth and what can't we do? What are our responsibilities as a minority? What is the significance of our heritage in today's world? Which all comes down to the basic question—is being Jewish a burden or a blessing to us in this country, in this world, and in this era? We ask our elders, and do not receive sufficient answers. We talk among ourselves and can not reach definite conclusions. These unanswered problems serve as a stumbling block for Jewish youth, because of them we are kept from achieving our greatest potential. Yet, we keep on asking.

Even with this doubt, and especially because of our idealism, the community of American Jewish youth supports, without any qualifications, the struggle for Soviet Jewry to attain equality within the USSR, and all the other points which we have come here to protest tonight. This may seem an odd statement to make because of its relative simplicity. These principles shouldn't be taken for granted because it should not take a long memory on your part to remember what happened in a similar situation 25 years ago. An opportunity was missed there, let that be the example and let us learn for tomorrow's sake. And tomorrow will find today's youth in the positions of leadership and responsibility, we will want to know that we did all that we could and, perhaps, succeeded, which means that in the coming days of this struggle we will speak out, protest, and in any way inform anyone that is willing to listen what the facts are and what can and must be done. Youth will not be guilty of committing the greatest crime of all—the crime of silence.

Whenever social action has been taken, youth was there. Whenever social action will be taken, youth will be there. No matter the cause, as long as it is just, youth will be doing what it can and what it believes to be right.

The situation of our co-religionists in the Soviet Union typifies the many ills that face our world, which, if we do not stop now will spread and eventually destroy all, an injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.

The problems we face are many and the solutions, if any exist, will be difficult. But we shall strive, we shall seek, we shall find, and we will not yield.

Achenu Kol Beys Yisroel, Adolph Katchko, Composer Cantor Kurt Silbermann, Temple Emanu-El, Englewood.

All Israel who dwell in distress, our brother suffering in bondage, bowed down with sorrow; who are in danger out at sea, and on the land; may The Lord have mercy and compassion upon them.

Lead them forth from their sorrow to joy, and change their darkness to radiant light. Break their bonds and bring them to freedom.

Oh, hasten Thy wondrous work, O Lord, and bring it to pass. We seek Thee now at this very time and let us say, Amen.

Mr. Ball. Joseph Lesser of Tenafly has served as Chairman of the Bergen County Committee to Help Soviet Jewry since its inception. He is a member of the Bar of New York State and a Vice President of Temple Sinai of Bergen County.

Mr. Lesser: Honored guests, reverend clergy, friends:

The hour is late. I shall be brief.

Before this rally breaks up, it is necessary to say a few words about where your Bergen County Committee to Help Russian Jewry goes from here. This question occurs to each of us just as it occurred to a young member of Parliament at a similar rally more than 60 years ago in Manchester, England, protesting against Russian pogroms of Czarist days. Young Winston Churchill said at that rally:

"We do not quite know what practical steps can be taken. We have sympathy in abundance, indignation, and condemnation but what practical measures could we adopt which would have the effect of preventing a renewal of these ghastly barbarities in the future?"

Mr. Churchill responded by moving the adoption of a resolution declaring that "Russia has * * * placed herself outside the pale of humanity and the comity of nations." Mr. Churchill did what he could to help and so must we.

I want to emphasize however that the Soviet Government is not engaging in pogroms or physical outrages against its Jewish inhabitants like the Czarist Government or the Nazis but rather in religious and cultural attrition against the Jewish community and on this question the Soviet Government is sensitive to world opinion. This sensitivity is revealed in a mountain of defensive press releases and letters to foreign newspapers.

As a result of protests thus far the Soviet Government has:

(1) Permitted matzoths to be sold in large cities during Passover.

(2) Ended its campaign against alleged economic crimes.

(3) Withdrew the anti-Semitic book "Judaism Without Embellishment".

(4) Expanded the Yiddish magazine *Soviet Homeland* and published a Yiddish novel by a living Soviet Jewish writer.

(5) Indicated that a monument will be erected to the victims of Fascism at Babi Yar; and

(6) Condemned anti-Semitism, this is seen in Premier Kosygin's remarks in July, 1965 and the subsequent Pravda editorial.

Yet these are only "token" concessions to world public opinion. Our protests will be needed until there is a basic change in the Soviet policy of attrition against the Jews as a group.

In the days ahead our Bergen County Committee will broaden and intensify its efforts. Specifically we will engage in the following activities:

(1) Petitions of protest will be drafted and will be circulated for signature among our judges and lawyers appealing—through the good offices of our government—to the juridical authorities of the Soviet Union asking those authorities to comply with the mandate of the Soviet Constitution and laws to accord full and equal rights to the Jewish community.

(2) Similar petitions will be drafted and circulated for signature among other professional groups in the County—our educators and teachers, our writers and artists, our physicians and dentists, our scientists and engineers as well as among our labor union members and our civil rights workers.

(3) Our municipalities will be asked to adopt resolutions of protest.

(4) We will have periodic breakfasts in Washington, D.C., with our Congressional delegation at which State Department officials will be invited to report to us on current developments in the Soviet Union. While in Washington, we will ask the State Department to arrange meetings for us with Soviet Embassy officials at which we can make known our views and impress upon them the seriousness with which we regard this problem. We together with other interested groups will consider the advisability of picketing that Embassy at appropriate times.

(5) On Sunday, December 11—the anniversary of the adoption of the U.N. Declaration on Human Rights——our Committee will act as co-sponsor of a major assembly on this question which will be held at the New York City Center. In due course you will be informed concerning the details of this assembly and the role of our Bergen County group in assuring its success.

(6) In the early part of next year, we will be participating together with other groups in emphasizing the artistic contributions that Russian Jewry has made and demand, in the name of humanity, that the community be accorded freedom of cultural expression; and finally

(7) We will report back to you periodically on current conditions in the form of news releases to the general public, individual speakers at our business and civic organizations and at our churches and synagogues.

In a word, we shall be busy. This rally marks not the end but rather the beginning of our efforts.

Over 130 years ago an unknown and insignificant man in speaking to an apathetic world on behalf of another great cause relating to human freedom and dignity said:

"On this subject I do not wish to think, or speak, or write, with moderation * * * I am in earnest—I will not equivocate—I will not excuse—I will not retreat a single inch—and I will be heard."

William Lloyd Garrison was heard—he lit a fire that ended slavery in these States. So too we shall be heard—and those in Russia—on behalf of whom we speak will one day be free. The fact is that as of the present the Jews are neither permitted to leave the Soviet Union nor to enjoy a full Jewish life in the Soviet Union. They are not permitted to learn of their ancient heritage and hence cannot transmit that heritage to their children. Until this basic condition is changed, our protests are needed and with God's help they will be heard—we shall not be silent.

"Praise Unto Him," Heinrich Schalit, Composer, Cantor Irving Shulkes, Temple Emeth, Teaneck.

Rabbi Joseph Rudavsky delivered the closing benediction.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a very fine letter written by Mr. Herbert Levy, executive director of B'nai B'rith of Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia, be included in the Record. Mr. Levy quite eloquently explains the reason for the rally and I think it will be of interest to my colleagues.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

B'nai B'rith of Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, West Virginia,
Philadelphia, Pa., September 13, 1966.

Mr. Leonard L. Roemer,
Hackensack, N.J.

Subject: Soviet discrimination.

Dear Len: 1. Thank you very much for your letter of August 31. I am happy to note that our previous information was helpful.

2. As to the appeals for funds from the lodges, the policy, as you know, is to the effect that no funds from *fund raising* may be diverted until the Service Fund goal is met. I presume that funds derived from dues, which is for *lodge administrative purposes* could conceivably be used. However, I suggest that you discuss this with Harold Staenberg, District Service Fund Committee Chairman.

3. As to the various questions which you have listed, I shall try to provide some guidance.

Q. "One Jew asked me if we were not meddling with the internal affairs of a foreign nation" . . .

A. The demonstrations in which we take part are for the dual purpose of requesting our own government to use their good offices in appealing to the USSR in alleviating the plight of a segment of their population which had been discriminated against; and, on the other hand, to expose to our own countrymen the plight of Soviet Jewry. Soviet discrimination makes a distinction between the rights guaranteed by the Soviet constitution and those rights given to the Jews of the USSR.

I suppose it could be said that when we protested the annihilation of millions of people by Nazis it was, in a sense, "meddling in the internal affairs" of that government.

No doubt when the United Nations proposed the Genocide Convention to outlaw mass murder against ethnic groups by governments within their own borders, it was, in effect "meddling in the internal affairs" of governments.

We are not suggesting that the Soviets are proposing anti-Semitism by government decree; what we are stating is that the evidence is plain that they are discriminating against the Jew as a group, be it religiously or culturally.

As to the question—Why—to pick out Russia in counter-distinction to several other countries which are anti-Semitic, etc., the fact is that the Eastern countries do not prevent the Jews from fulfilling their role as citizens, nor for the most part discourage cultural and religious entity.

The USSR is the one major country, to my knowledge, which overtly is discriminating in this direction.

We face a most unusual situation as a Jewish people. In order for us to exercise the uniqueness of our religious, cultural and traditional heritage we must resist being swallowed up and assimilated. Assimilation does not necessarily mean inter-marriage. It can take the form of being influenced or paralyzed into inaction. It is possible, therefore, for a people in the diaspora to float into nothingness. If Jews are to remain Jewish in their commitments to social justice, in their forms of worship and individual liberty—they must be permitted fundamental human freedoms. It is these freedoms—these basic individual rights which are so sacred to Judaism—that we are striving to retain for the Soviet Jews—without negating one iota the duty one owes to one's country—wherever that may be.

Since Soviet Jews cannot speak for themselves, we must speak for them.

For hundreds of years, Jews in one country or another have been saved from slaughter, absorption and assimilation only because others who were Jewish—sometimes non-Jewish—cared.

Many of us realize now, only too well, how much we could have done to save millions during the Nazi period—but did not.

I do not like to contemplate a period 25 years from now when we look back on what we might have done to have saved Soviet Jewry from obliteration—but did not do—because somebody said, "We might be meddling with the internal affairs of a foreign nation."

Having said the above, I want to reiterate what I have previously told you and that is, that we must discipline ourselves against wild and unsupported generalized charges of anti-Semitism. We must focus our attention on precisely what we know to be the exact fact. That is, that the Jews of the Soviet Union are prevented from being Jewish . . . from participating in group effort in spite of the fact that the Soviet constitution permits it.

As to the lady who said that she could not understand why you are having a Rally since she knew someone who came back from Russia and said things were not "half-bad" for the Russian Jews, my reaction would be that certainly Jews as individuals do not suffer from the discrimination or anti-Semitism in any large degree. In fact, they do quite well, except in political life.

Jews, as Russians, are in the Arts and Sciences, in Medicine and Education. It is in the context of the Jews as a group—as a religious entity—as a people with a cultural heritage that the discrimination exists through government pressure. Within another generation or two Judaism will be but a memory for most, as it is at present for many.

The Soviets are very sensitive with regard to charges of anti-Semitism. They relate it to what they call German-Fascism Anti-Semitism and, they not only deny it, but they resent it. On the other hand there have been some unmistakable signs of sensitivity toward supported charges of discrimination which has led to some slight easing of their restrictions.

Do we have a right as Jews—as Americans—to protest the denial of these rights. I think we do.

Sincerely yours,

Herbert S. Levy,
Executive Director.

Representative Fraser Lists Projected Returns From Proposed Tax-Sharing Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to show the projected returns to Minneapolis and Minnesota from the Revenue Sharing Act, which I introduced on September 27. This bill is my version of the "Heller plan," named after Walter W. Heller, former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers.

If my bill is enacted, Minneapolis city government would receive more than $1.7 million in returned Federal tax money in the first year after passage.

Minneapolis public schools would receive nearly $1.4 million and the State government would receive more than $26.7 million.

After 10 years the figures would climb to some $7.2 million for city government, $5.7 million for city schools, and $111 million for State government.

The figures are based on current revenues and on the assumption that the first distribution from the Federal Government would be made September 30, 1967.

Based on today's tax levels, the initial return for the entire Nation would be about $3.4 billion, with some $62.6 million going to Minnesota.

Ten years later, according to my projections, the figures would be $14.2 billion and $260.8 million.

Under the Fraser-Heller plan, an amount equaling 6 percent of the Nation's State and local tax revenues would be returned to the States according to their population.

AUTOMATIC DISTRIBUTION

Then the States would automatically distribute to their local tax jurisdictions an amount proportionate to the taxes levied by those jurisdictions.

The initial amount would increase each year until it reached 25 percent of total State and local tax revenues. The amount would go no higher than 25 percent.

State and local taxes are growing far out of proportion to Federal taxes and too much of the growth is in property taxes. The Fraser-Heller plan is designed for the specific purpose of lessening the burden of local taxes.

My proposal would differ from several others based on the same principle but different revenue figures—such as a percentage of the aggregate taxable income as reported on individual income tax returns.

My plan would, I think, be tied to the most realistic measure of State and local tax burdens and would provide for automatic distribution within States, thus insuring fairness to all the taxing jurisdiction.

Minneapolis would benefit even more than the figures indicated.

Because a large part of State tax revenues—such as income tax and gasoline tax—is always turned back to the school districts and cities and counties to be spent locally, I think the State legislature would also turn over to local governments a large part of the $26.7 million turned back from the Federal Government to the State.

If this were done, the Minneapolis Board of Education, which already gets more than $10 million in State aid, might expect an additional $500,000 in State aid when my bill took effect.

EXTRA $250,000

The city of Minneapolis, which received $1.5 million in State shared taxes during the year ending December 31, 1965, and $3.4 million in State grants for highways during that same year, might expect another $250,000 in State aid as a result of the plan.

The tax-sharing concept has won wide endorsement from a number of sources: The U.S. conference of mayors; the New York Times; the National League of Cities; the Governors' conference; and two Republican groups, the Ripon Society and a task force of the Republican coordinating committee.

Salute to the Central African Republic's Sixth Anniversary of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the Central African Republic observes its sixth anniversary as an independent state on December 1. Though it became independent of France on August 13, 1960, the country is commemorating that event in December.

I would like to take this opportunity to send my warmest greetings and good wishes to His Excellency Col. Jean-Bedel Bokassa, President of the Central African Republic; and His Excellency Michel Gallin-Douathe, their Ambassador to the United States.

The Central African Republic is well aware of the long road before it, but its people can certainly take pride in their accomplishments over the past year.

With respect to the country's economic position, France has continued to be its most prominent trading partner. The United States has provided some assistance, but there is much more to be done.

The projected railway to link Bangui, its capital, with Yaounde and the port of Cuala in the Cameroon will greatly benefit this landlocked nation.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the American people join me in saluting the Central African Republic on its sixth anniversary. I wish the Central African Republic and its people another fruitful year on the path to development and prosperity.

Supplemental Report of Senate Minority Leader, Everett McKinley Dirksen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a summary of laws and treaties of general interest be published as a part of my remarks in the Record, and I ask also that it be published as a document.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AGRICULTURE

Planting of alternate crops in cases of natural disaster (Public Law 89–451; approved June 17, 1966): This law (H.R. 15151) permitted the planting of alternate crops on cotton, wheat, and feed grain acreage which is unplanted because of a natural disaster.

Cotton Research and Promotion Act (Public Law 89–502, approved July 13, 1966): This law (H.R. 12322) enabled cottongrowers to establish, finance, and carry out a coordinated program of research and promotion to improve the competitive position of, and to expand markets for, cotton by authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to issue a marketing order authorizing the collection of contributions for cotton producers of not more than $1 per bale. Also, the law provided that approval of the marketing order in the referendum by a vote of two-thirds of the volume represented would not be effective unless such vote also represented at least a majority of the producers voting in the referendum.

Simplification of laws administered by the Farm Credit Administration (Public Law 89–525, approved August 2, 1966): This law (S. 2822) amended various provisions of the laws administered by the Farm Credit Administration to simplify and improve operations.

Assignment of payments (Public Law 89–742; approved November 2, 1966): This law (H.R. 17588) amended section 8(g) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to expedite the process of signing assignments executed to secure loans from federally insured banks.

APPROPRIATIONS

Department of Defense supplemental appropriation, 1966 (Public Law 89–374; approved March 25, 1966): This law (H.R. 13546) made appropriations of $13,135,719,000 to the Department of Defense for the continued support of military operations in Southeast Asia in fiscal 1966; for military assistance funds to reimburse the military services for the procurement of goods provided; and for economic assistance to foreign countries.

Second supplemental appropriation bill, fiscal 1966 (Public Law 89–426; approved May 13, 1966): This law (H.R. 14012) provided $2,788,143,303 in supplemental appropriations for the various departments and agencies.

Included in this total was $140 million for subscriptions to the Asian Development Bank; $100,000 for payments under the rent supplement program plus an annual contract authority of $12 million for grants; and $1,168,478,120 to cover increased pay costs.

Interior Department appropriations, fiscal 1967 (Public Law 89–435; approved May 31, 1966): This law (H.R. 14215) made appropriations of $1,347,615,800 (including $26 million borrowing authority) for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for fiscal year 1967.

The Interior Department total was $872,911,400. For related agencies the total was $474,704,400, including funds for the Forest Service, the Public Health Service, the Indian Claims Commission, the National Capital Planning Commission, the National Capital Transportation Agency, and the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.

Treasury-Post Office Departments appropriations for fiscal 1967 (Public Law 89–474; approved June 29, 1966): This law (H.R. 14266) made appropriations of $7,196,429,135 for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for fiscal year 1967.

The Treasury Department total was $1,374,099,000. The Post Office Department total was $5,802,533,000. For the Executive Office of the President the total was $17,014,135, including the Emergency Fund for the President and expenses of management improvement. The total for independent agencies was $2,783,000, including funds for the Tax Court of the United States and the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

Continuing Appropriations, 1967 (Public Law 89–481; approved June 30, 1966): This law (H.J. Res. 1180) provided for financing continuing Government functions with respect to which annual appropriations bills had not been signed into law prior to August 31, 1966.

Legislative branch appropriations for fiscal 1967 (Public Law 89–545; approved August 27, 1966): This law (H.R. 15456) made appropriations in the amount of $214,463,913 for the legislative branch for fiscal year 1967. The Senate total was $39,655,180; the House, $77,676,145.

Other agencies for which appropriations were included in this law were the Library of Congress, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, and the Government Printing Office.

Continuing appropriations, 1967 (Public Law 89–549; approved August 31, 1966): This law (H.J. Res. 1284) provided for financing continuing Government functions with respect to which annual appropriations bills had not been signed into law prior to September 30, 1966.

Independent offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations, fiscal 1967 (Public Law 89–555; approved September 6, 1966): This law (H.R. 14921) made appropriations of $14,065,851,000 for the various independent executive offices and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for fiscal year 1967.

The appropriation for the Department of Housing and Urban Development was $641,219,000.

Among items included were: National Aeronautics and Space Administration, $4,968,000,000; Federal Aviation Agency, $903,831,500; General Services Administration, $547,961,000; National Science Foundation, $479,999,000; and Veterans' Administration, $5,958,807,000.

Department of Agriculture and related agencies, appropriations, fiscal 1967 (Public Law 89–556; approved September 7, 1966): This law (H.R. 14596) made appropriations of $6,994,590,150 for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for fiscal 1967. The total included $1,719,355,150 for general activities of the Department; $93,459,000 for REA and FHA; and $5,181,301,000 for the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, and Public Law 480.

Continuing appropriations, 1967 (Public Law 89–611; approved September 30, 1966): This law (H.J. Res. 1308) provided for financing continuing Government functions with respect to which annual appropriations bills had not been signed into law prior to October 22, 1966.

Defense Department appropriations for fiscal 1967 (Public Law 89–687; approved October 15, 1966): This law (H.R. 15941) made appropriations for the Defense Establishment of $58,067,472,000 for fiscal 1967. Of this appropriation, the Army received $17,165,065,000; the Navy, $16,826,700,000; the Air Force, $20,805,900,000; and the joint defense agencies, $3,269,807,000.

Public works appropriations for fiscal 1967 (Public Law 89–689; approved October 15, 1966): This law (H.R. 17787) made appropriations of $4,134,511,000 for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

Of this total appropriation, the Defense Department total was $1,341,097,000; the Interior Department, $466,049,000; the Atomic Energy Commission, $2,257,030,000; and Independent Offices, $70,335,000.

Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1967 (Public Law 89–691; approved October 15, 1966): This law (H.R. 17788) made appropriations of $3,493,473,500 for foreign aid and related agencies for fiscal 1967.

Included in this total were funds for the following: Foreign aid (mutual security), $2,936,490,500 (economic, $2,144,490,500; military, $792,000,000); foreign aid (other), $556,983,000 (including the Peace Corps, Army civil functions, investment in Inter-American Development Bank, and subscription to the International Development Association).

Among other things, the law restated the opposition of Congress to the seating in the United Nations of Communist China; restated a sense of Congress declaration condemning any attempt by foreign nations to create distinctions because of race or religion among American citizens in granting personal or commercial access to those nations; and contained restrictions on assistance to countries selling and/or shipping to Castro Cuba, North Vietnam, and the United Arab Republic, and on assistance to Communist countries.

Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1967 (Public Law 89–697; approved October 27, 1966): This law (H.R. 18381) provided $5,025,264,579 in supplemental appropriations for the various departments and agencies for fiscal 1967.

Among other things, the law made appropriations for: school lunch program, Commission on Political Activity of Government

Personnel, urban renewal, urban mass transportation, comprehensive city demonstration programs, elementary and secondary education, higher education, higher educational facilities construction, poverty program, 1968 HemisFair exposition, and the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center.

District of Columbia appropriations for fiscal 1967 (Public Law 89–743; approved November 2, 1966): This law (H.R. 17636) appropriated $404,598,200 for the District of Columbia to spend out of District of Columbia funds for fiscal 1967 and appropriated $53,394,000 as the Federal payment out of general revenues of the Federal Treasury for fiscal 1967.

ATOMIC ENERGY

Atomic Energy Commission appropriation authorization, 1967 (Public Law 89–428, approved May 21, 1966): This law (H.R. 14732) authorized appropriation of $2,259,958,000 for fiscal 1967 for the Atomic Energy Commission. For operating expenses, $1,964,128,000 was authorized, and for plant and capital equipment, $295,830,000.

Amendment to AEC Authorization Act pertaining to nuclear power-desalting facility (Public Law 89–648; approved October 13, 1966): This law (S. 3807) amended Public Law 89–428, the Atomic Energy Commission's fiscal year 1967 authorization act, to authorize the AEC to enter into a cooperative arrangement for a large-scale, combination, nuclear power-desalting project. The law also authorized appropriation of $15 million for the Commission's participation.

FINANCE AND TAXATION

Tax Adjustment Act of 1966 (Public Law 89–368; approved March 15, 1966): This law (H.R. 12752) provided:

Graduated Withholding. A six-bracket withholding system effective May 1, 1966, with rates ranging from 14 to 30 percent to replace the flat rate withholding system now in effect. To provide relief from overwithholding, additional "withholding allowances" are permitted commencing in 1967.

Corporate Speed-up. Corporations with tax liabilities of more than $100,000 would be required to pay their estimated tax in the year the income was earned. The present schedule which called for current tax payments by 1970 was speeded up so that these corporations would be current in 1967.

Excise taxes

Automobiles. The tax rate on automobiles, presently 6 percent, was increased as of the day after the date of enactment to 7 percent. The 7 percent rate continued in effect until April 1, 1968, when the rate would be reduced to 2 percent.

Telephones. The excise tax on telephone service, presently 3 percent, was increased temporarily, effective with respect to bills rendered after March 31, to 10 percent. The 10 percent rate would continue in effect until April 1, 1968, when it would be reduced to 1 percent.

Political Contributions. Indirect political contributions, including such items as expenditures for advertising in political publications, tickets to political banquets, and admissions to inaugural galas and similar events, were disallowed as a deduction for Federal income tax purposes.

Social Security for Persons Age 72. Social Security benefits for persons age 72 and over were provided for persons who did not have sufficient quarters of coverage to qualify for regular benefits. The benefit amount is $35 per month for a single person and $52.50 for a married couple. These amounts would be reduced by the amount of other pensions or annuities received under a governmental retirement system.

Gifts from Combat Zones. Exemption from customs duties was provided for gifts from members of the armed services on active duty in combat zones where the value of the gift package did not exceed $50 retail value. This special duty-free allowance would be available on gifts entered after the date of enactment and before 1968.

Participation Sales Act of 1966 (Public Law 89–429; approved May 24, 1966): This law (S. 3283) permitted the Federal National Mortgage Association (FNMA), as trustee, to sell to investors participation certificates, totaling a little less than $11 billion, at prevailing market interest rates, based on a pool or pools of notes or other obligations representing direct loans made or otherwise acquired by the following six Federal credit agencies: Farmers Home Administration (with respect only to loans for land acquisition, rural housing, and crop production), Office of Education (academic facility loans), Department of Housing and Urban Development (Federal National Mortgage Association, Federal Housing Administration, college housing loans, public facility loans, public housing loans, housing for elderly or handicapped loans, urban renewal loans, and public works planning advances), Veterans' Administration (direct loans and vendee loans), Small Business Administration, and Export-Import Bank of Washington. Sales of participation certificates on behalf of any agency were required to be specifically approved in advance in an appropriation act, and such authorization was limited to 2 years.

The law, in effect, would permit Federal borrowing without its showing up as part of the Federal debt.

Temporary increase in public debt limit (Public Law 89–472; approved June 24, 1966): This law (H.R. 15202) provided a temporary debt limit of $330 billion for the period July 1, 1966, to June 30, 1967. The temporary debt limit for fiscal 1966 was $328 billion. (The debt ceiling under permanent law is $285 billion.)

Extension of Federal Reserve direct purchase authority (Public Law 89–484; approved June 30, 1966): This law (S. 3368) amended section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act to extend for 2 years, to June 30, 1968, the present authority of the Federal Reserve Banks to purchase securities directly from the Treasury in amounts not to exceed $5 billion outstanding at any one time.

Amending the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (Public Law 89–485; approved July 1, 1966): This law (H.R. 7371) amended the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, among other things, to broaden the coverage of the law to include long-term trusts within the definition of "Company"; and repealed, under certain circumstances, provisions which exempted charitable, religious, and educational institutions, and companies registered before May 15, 1955, under the Investment Company Act of 1940 and their affiliates. The law also made a number of amendments to the regulatory provisions of the Act.

Income tax treatment of exploration expenditures in the case of mining (Public Law 89–570; approved September 12, 1966): This law (H.R. 4665) amended the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with reference to the income tax treatment of exploration expenditures in the case of mining.

Amendment of Merchant Marine Act, 1936, re construction differential subsidies (Public Law 89–589; approved September 19, 1966): This law (S. 2858) amended section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to extend for 2 years, to June 30, 1968, the present authority of the Secretary of Commerce to make construction-differential subsidy payments of a maximum of 55 percent on new merchant vessel construction.

Deletion of interest rate limitation on debentures issued by Federal intermediate credit banks (Public Law 89–595; approved September 20, 1966): This law (S.J. Res. 178) amended the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, to delete the interest rate limitation on debentures issued by Federal intermediate credit banks.

District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1966 (Public Law 89–610; approved September 30, 1966): This law (H.R. 11487) provided through various tax measures additional revenue for financing District government activities. Among other things, the law increased taxes on alcoholic beverages, cigarettes, income, and motor vehicle fuel. It also authorized an annual Federal payment of $60 million.

Interest on income tax refunds and quick refunds of investment credit carrybacks (Public Law 89–721; approved November 2, 1966): This law (H.R. 11660) amended existing law to provide that no interest is to be paid with respect to the refund of an overpayment of income tax if the refund is made within 45 days after the date the return is actually filed and amended existing law to extend to taxpayers with an investment credit carryback the quick refund procedure formerly available to taxpayers with a net operating loss carryback.

Combat pay exclusion (Public Law 89–739; approved November 2, 1966): This law (H.R. 17271) amended section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $200 to $500 the monthly combat pay exclusion for commissioned officers serving in combat zones.

GOVERNMENT

Bank Merger Act amendment (Public Law 89–356; approved February 21, 1966): This law (S. 1698) provided for the resolution of the conflict between the antitrust laws and the Bank Merger Act of 1960 resulting from the Supreme Court decisions in the Philadelphia and Lexington, Ky., bank merger cases in 1963 and 1964. The law furnished guidelines for the equitable disposition of certain cases now before the courts, and provided an orderly procedure for the litigation of such bank mergers as the Department of Justice may desire to contest in the future.

The law established a single set of standards—requiring consideration both of competitive factors and the public convenience and necessity—for the consideration of future mergers by the banking agencies under the Bank Merger Act and by the Department of Justice and the courts under the antitrust laws; provided for postponement for 30 days of consummation of mergers hereafter approved to give the Department of Justice an opportunity to enjoin them; and exempted mergers approved under the new standards and procedures from all provisions of the antitrust laws except the antimonopoly provisions of section 2 of the Sherman Act.

It exempted from all provisions of the antitrust laws except section 2 of the Sherman Act, mergers consummated before June 17, 1963, including three of the mergers now in court (First Security National Bank and Trust Company in Lexington, Ky., Manufacturers Hanover Trust Company in New York, and Continental Illinois National Bank and Trust Company in Chicago).

It exempted from all provisions of the antitrust laws except section 2 of the Sherman Act, mergers consummated after June 16, 1963, and before enactment of the law, except mergers against which antitrust suits had been brought before such enactment.

It required the courts to use the new standards of the law in all cases instituted under the antitrust laws after June 16, 1963, including the other three cases now pending in court (Third National Bank in Nashville, Tenn., Crocker Citizens National Bank in California, and Mercantile Trust Company in St. Louis).

Additional Federal judges and districts (Public Law 89–372; approved March 18, 1966): This law (S. 1666) provided for the appointment of 45 additional Federal circuit and district judges throughout the United

States and also created two new judicial districts in California.

Alaska Centennial (Public Law 89–375; approved March 26, 1966): This law (S. 2614) provided for U.S. participation in the 1967 statewide celebration of the Centennial of the Alaska Purchase, jointly with the State of Alaska through industrial, agricultural, educational, research, or commercial projects, or facilities which result in a permanent contribution to the economy of Alaska.

The law authorized appropriation of not to exceed $4 million in matching funds for projects of enduring economic value and appropriation of not to exceed $600,000 for Federal exhibits.

Discontinuance of the Postal Savings System (Public Law 89–377; approved March 28, 1966): This law (H.R. 8030) provided for the discontinuance of the Postal Savings System.

Vice President's official residence (Public Law 89–386; approved April 9, 1966): This law (S. 2394) authorized the construction, furnishing, and maintenance of an official residence of the Vice President of the United States. The law further provided that the site for such residence would be on 10 acres of the grounds of the U.S. Naval Observatory. The law authorized appropriation of $750,000 for total first cost, and also authorized annual appropriations for maintenance and operation.

Uniform Time Act of 1966 (Public Law 89–387; approved April 13, 1966): This law (S. 1404) required any State that adopted daylight saving time to begin the observance of such time at 2 a.m. on the last Sunday in April and end it at 2 a.m. on the last Sunday in October; left the States free to decide for themselves whether or not to observe daylight saving time on a statewide basis; barred so-called double daylight time; and included provisions creating new standard time zones, mainly for Alaska and Hawaii.

Bail Reform Act of 1966 (Public Law 89–465; approved June 22, 1966): This law (S. 1357) revised existing bail practices in the courts of the United States in order to assure that all persons, regardless of their financial status, shall not needlessly be detained pending their appearance to answer charges, to testify, or pending appeal, when detention serves neither the ends of justice nor the public interest.

Right of the public to Government information (Public Law 89–487; approved July 4, 1966): This law (S. 1160) amended section 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act, chapter 324, of the act of June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 238) to provide a true Federal public records statute by requiring the availability, to any member of the public, of all of the executive branch records described in its requirements, except those involving matters which are within nine stated exemptions. It also gave an aggrieved citizen a remedy by permitting an appeal to a U.S. district court.

Federal Employees' Compensation Act Amendments of 1966 (Public Law 89–488; approved July 4, 1966): This law (H.R. 10721) amended the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to liberalize and equalize employee injury benefits and to tie the benefits in with the Consumer Price Index.

American Revolution Bicentennial Commission (Public Law 89–491; approved July 4, 1966): This law (S.J. Res. 162) provided for the establishment of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission to prepare an overall program for commemorating the bicentennial, and to plan, encourage, develop, and coordinate observances and activities commemorating the historic events that preceded, and are associated with, the American Revolution.

Federal Salary and Fringe Benefits Act of 1966 (Public Law 89–504; approved July 18, 1966): This law (H.R. 14122) provided an average increase of 2.9 percent in the basic compensation of most Federal employees. The law also made significant amendments to the Civil Service Retirement Act to improve retirement benefits of Federal employees. The total cost of the pay raise and fringe benefits was estimated at $505.8 million annually. The pay raise was effective the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after July 1, 1966.

Reimbursement of certain moving expenses of Federal employees (Public Law 89–516; approved July 21, 1966): This law (H.R. 10607) amended the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for reimbursement of certain moving and storage expenses of Federal employees, in addition to expenses already allowed, when those employees are transferred from one official station to another.

Commission on Political Activity of Government Personnel (Public Law 89–617; approved October 3, 1966): This law (S. 1474) created a bipartisan commission (Commission on Political Activity of Government Personnel) to study Federal laws limiting political activity by officers and employees of Government.

Additional supergrade positions for certain departments and agencies (Public Law 89–632; approved October 8, 1966): This law (S. 2393) authorized additional GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18 positions in agencies or functions created or substantially expanded after June 30, 1965. The law increased such maximum number of positions from 2,400 to 2,577, and retained the existing 25-percent limitation with respect to GS–17, and 12-percent limitation with respect to GS–18.

Time of assembly of the 90th Congress (Public Law 89–704; approved November 2, 1966): This law (H.J. Res. 1322) provided that the 90th Congress shall assemble at noon on Tuesday, January 10, 1967.

HOUSING

Federal National Mortgage Association Amendments (Public Law 89–566; approved September 10, 1966): This law (S. 3688) amended the National Housing Act to stimulate the flow of mortgage credit for Federal Housing Administration and Veterans' Administration assisted residential construction.

The law provided new borrowing authority to the secondary mortgage facility of the Federal National Mortgage Association (FNMA) by authorizing it to issue debentures up to 15 times its capital instead of the current authority of 10 times; increased by $110 million, to $225 million, the capital stock of FNMA under its secondary mortgage market facility; and also increased FNMA's purchasing authority by authorizing an additional $1 billion in its special assistance function to purchase FHA and VA mortgages which did not exceed $15,000, with discretionary authority in high cost areas, to purchase such mortgages which did not exceed $17,500.

IMMIGRATION

Status of Cuban refugees (Public Law 89–732. Approved November 2, 1966): This law (H.R. 15183) provided for adjustment of the status of qualified Cuban refugees to that of lawful resident of the United States. Among other things, the alien will have been inspected and admitted or paroled into the United States subsequent to January 1, 1959, and will have been physically present in the United States for at least 2 years.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Interama (Public Law 89–355; approved February 19, 1966): This law (H.R. 30) authorized U.S. participation in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center (Interama) in cooperation with the Inter-American Center Authority, an agency of the State of Florida. Interama would provide a permanent international center for the governments and industries of the Western Hemisphere and of other areas of the world. The several States of the Union and foreign countries, except Communist de facto governments, would be invited to participate.

The law authorized appropriation of $7,500,000 for U.S. participation and not to exceed $1 million annually for each of the fiscal years 1967 and 1968 for the maintenance of U.S. installations and activities at Interama.

Asian Development Bank Act (Public Law 89–369; approved March 16, 1966): This law (H.R. 12563) authorized the President to accept membership for the United States in the Asian Development Bank and authorized appropriation, without fiscal year limitation, of $200 million for the purchase of twenty thousand shares of capital stock of the Bank. The law required congressional approval for certain specified future actions of the United States with respect to the Bank. (This law was a part of the President's program in coping with the problems of Southeast Asia, including Viet Nam.)

Supplemental foreign-aid authorization, fiscal 1966 (Public Law 89–371; approved March 18, 1966): This law (H.R. 12169) authorized supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1966 of $415 million for economic assistance programs in Southeast Asia and elsewhere. The law provided for Viet Nam, $274 million; Laos, $7.5 million; Thailand, $7.5 million; Dominican Republic, $25 million; and for the President's contingency fund, $100 million.

Emergency assistance to India (Public Law 89–406; approved April 19, 1966): This law (H.J. Res. 979) represented congressional endorsement and support of the President in making agricultural commodities under Public Law 480 available to India to assist that country in meeting pressing food shortages.

Foreign Agents Registration Act Amendments (Public Law 89–486; approved July 4, 1966): This laws (S. 693) amended the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, to strengthen the basic purposes of the original act in order to protect the interests of the United States by requiring complete public disclosure by persons acting for or in the interests of foreign principals where their activities are political in nature or border on the political.

Peace Corps Act Amendments (Public Law 89–572; approved September 13, 1966): This law (S. 3418) amended the Peace Corps Act, as amended, to authorize an appropriation of $110 million for Peace Corps activities in fiscal year 1967 and, among other things, amended the act to provide that unobligated balances continued available for the general purposes for which appropriated.

Foreign Assistance Act of 1966 (Public Law 89–583; approved September 19, 1966): This law (H.R. 15750) authorized an aggregate appropriation of $3,500,735,500 for fiscal 1967 for the foreign aid program. The authorization for economic assistance was $2,625,735,500; for military assistance, $875 million. The authorization was limited to 1 year and the authorizations for the Alliance for Progress and the Development Loan Fund were limited to 3 years.

Among other things, the law limited development loans to 10 countries—excluding the Alliance for Progress; technical assistance to 40; and supporting assistance to 13. Military assistance was limited to 40 countries.

The law retained the interest rate on development loans at 1 percent for the first 10 years and at 2½ percent after 10 years.

The law also provided a ceiling of $85 million for grants for defense articles for Latin America.

Foreign Service Buildings Act Amendments (Public Law 89–636; approved October 10, 1966): This law (H.R. 14019) amended the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize appropriations totaling $55,160,000 for construction and operations of Foreign

Service buildings abroad, to be available for fiscal years 1967 and 1968.

Twelve-mile fishery zone (Public Law 89–658; approved October 14, 1966): This law (S. 2218) established a 12-mile fishery zone contiguous to the territory of the United States.

LABOR

Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1966 (Public Law 89–601; approved September 23, 1966): This law (H.R. 13712) amended the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend its protection to approximately 8 million additional employees and to raise the minimum wage.

Among other things, the law extended coverage primarily by refinement of certain definitions and repeal or modification of a number of exemptions so as to narrow the act's exclusions; raised the minimum wage for workers previously covered to $1.40 an hour beginning February 1, 1967, and $1.60 an hour beginning February 1, 1968; established for newly covered workers (other than agricultural) a minimum wage of $1 an hour beginning February 1, 1967, $1.15 an hour beginning February 1, 1968, $1.30 an hour beginning February 1, 1969, $1.45 an hour beginning February 1, 1970, and $1.60 an hour beginning February 1, 1971; established for newly covered agricultural workers a minimum wage schedule; continued the uniform 40-hour standard workweek for workers previously covered; and established for newly covered workers a standard workweek schedule.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Supplemental military authorization, fiscal 1966 (Public Law 89–367; approved March 15, 1966): This law (H.R. 12889) authorized supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1966 of $4,857,450,000 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces. (This law was requested by the President because of the war in Viet Nam.)

Coast Guard authorization (Public Law 89–381; approved March 30, 1966): This law (H.R. 12762) authorized appropriation of $126,079,000 to the Coast Guard for fiscal 1967 to procure vessels and aircraft and to construct shore and offshore establishments.

Extension of the Defense Production Act (Public Law 89–482; approved June 30, 1966): This law (H.R. 14025) extended the Defense Production Act of 1950 for 2 years, to June 30, 1968, and increased the amount available for appropriations for the Joint Committee on Defense Production from $65,000 to $85,000 in any fiscal year.

Extending civil defense emergency authorities (Public Law 89–483; approved June 30, 1966): This law (H.R. 13125) further amended the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to extend the President's current authority to deal with the effects of an enemy attack upon the United States to June 30, 1970.

Authorization for aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, fiscal 1967 (Public Law 89–501; approved July 13, 1966): This law (S. 2950) authorized appropriations for fiscal 1967 of $17,480,759,000 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces. The law also provided an increase of 3.2 percent in the basic pay of members of the uniformed services.

Uniformed services savings deposit program (Public Law 89–538; approved August 14, 1966): This law (H.R. 14975) amended section 1035 of title 10, United States Code, and other laws, to authorize members of the uniformed services on duty outside the United States or its possessions to deposit their savings with a uniformed service at an interest rate not to exceed 10 percent, with a maximum balance of $10,000 upon which such interest may be paid.

Military construction authorization, fiscal 1967 (Public Law 89–568; approved September 12, 1966): This law (S. 3105) authorized the Secretaries of Defense, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, with total authorizations of $1,005,842,000, including deficiency authorizations of $9,323,000. Included also in this authorization was $511,196,000 for military family housing.

Disposal of industrial diamond stones from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (Public Law 89–723; approved November 2, 1966): This law (H.R. 13320) provided congressional approval of the disposition of approximately 1,800,000 carats of industrial diamond stones from the national and the supplemental stockpiles and waived the 6-month waiting period normally required before such disposal could be started.

Airlift of mail for members of the U.S. Armed Forces overseas (Public Law 89–725; approved November 2, 1966): This law (H.R. 13448) amended title 39, United States Code, with respect to mailing privileges of members of the U.S. Armed Forces and other Federal Government personnel overseas. Among other things, the law provided space-available air transportation on a worldwide basis for first-class letters and voice recordings to APO addresses, but restricted the second- and fourth-class mail carried by air only to combat zones designated by the President; provided first-zone air parcel post charges for air parcel post sent directly from Alaska and Hawaii to APO addresses in the Pacific; provided that parcels weighing not more than 5 pounds and measuring not more than 60 inches shall be carried at surface rates on a space-available basis to and from all APO addresses; and provided second-class publications will be airlifted only when mailed at or addressed to an Armed Forces post office in a combat area.

Special leave for a member of uniformed service (Public Law 89–735; approved November 2, 1966): This law (H.R. 15748) amended title 10, United States Code, to authorize a special 30-day period of leave for a member of a uniformed service who voluntarily extends his tour of duty in a hostile fire area. The authority would expire on June 30, 1968.

Disposal of nickel from the national stockpile (Public Law 89–740; approved November 2, 1966): This law (H.R. 17376) authorized disposal from the national stockpile of approximately 24.5 million pounds of stockpile grade nickel and waived the 6-month period normally required before such disposal could be started.

Appropriations for military construction, fiscal 1967 (Public Law 89–744; approved November 2, 1966): This law (H.R. 17637) made appropriations of $979,570,000 for construction at military installations in the United States and abroad, including $507,196,000 for military family housing projects, for fiscal 1967.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

Small Business Act Amendments of 1966 (Public Law 89–409; approved May 2, 1966): This law (S. 2729) amended the Small Business Act to increase by $125 million the authorization for the Small Business Administration for the amount of loans and commitments that may be outstanding in SBA's regular business loan program, disaster loan program, prime contract authority, and title IV loans under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and increased the authorization to SBA's present revolving fund by $125 million, in order to continue these lending functions through June 30, 1966.

The law established two revolving funds for financing SBA's lending functions effective July 1, 1966. One fund, for financing SBA's physical disaster loan program, had no authorization ceiling. The second, for other SBA programs, had three authorization ceilings: one, $400 million on SBA's functions pertaining to small business investment companies; two, $200 million on its loans to State and local development companies; and three, $1,400 million on the regular business loan program, displaced business disaster loans, trade adjustment loans, prime contract authority, and loans under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

Regulation of maximum rates of interest paid on savings (Public Law 89–597; approved September 21, 1966): This law (H.R. 14026) provided for the more flexible regulation of maximum rates of interest or dividends payable by banks and certain other financial institutions on deposits or share accounts, authorized higher reserve requirements on time deposits at member banks, and authorized open market operations in agency issues by the Federal Reserve banks.

U.S. participation in the Hemisphere 1968 Exposition (Public Law 89–685; approved October 15, 1966): This law (H.R. 15098) authorized appropriations not to exceed $7,500,000 and provided other necessary authorities and waivers to implement U.S. participation in the HemisFair Exposition in San Antonio in 1968. The law also declared it to be the policy of the United States not to authorize any further Federal participation in undertakings such as HemisFair, unless they are classified as first-category international expositions.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Cape Lookout National Seashore (Public Law 89–366; approved March 10, 1966): This law (S. 251) provided for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in the State of North Carolina and authorized appropriation of not to exceed $3,200,000 for the acquisition and development of the seashore.

Water Resources Research Act Amendments (Public Law 89–404; approved April 19, 1966): This law (S. 22) authorized appropriations to the Secretary of the Interior of $5 million for fiscal 1967, $6 million for fiscal 1968, $7 million for fiscal 1969, $8 million for fiscal 1970, $9 million for fiscal 1971, and $10 million for fiscal years 1972–1976, inclusive, to make grants for contracts and matching or other arrangements with educational institutions, private foundations or other institutions, with private firms and individuals, for the conduct of water research projects, and with local, State, and Federal Government agencies, to undertake research into water problems.

Mount Rogers National Recreation Area (Public Law 89–438; approved May 31, 1966): This law (H.R. 10366) provided for the establishment of the Mount Rogers National Recreation Area in the Jefferson National Forest in Virginia. It was expected that funds for land acquisition would come from the land and water conservation fund established by the act of September 3, 1964 (78 Stat. 897) when appropriated by the Congress from that fund. Total acquisition costs were estimated at $3,100,000, and development costs were estimated at $18,900,000.

Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 (Public Law 89–454; approved June 17, 1966): This law (S. 944) provided for a comprehensive, long-range, and coordinated national program in marine science, for establishment of a National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, and a Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources. The law also authorized appropriation of sums necessary to carry out the law, sums for any one fiscal year not to exceed $1,500,000.

Amendment of Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 (Public Law 89–553; approved September 2, 1966): This law (S. 602) amended the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, among other things, by setting a $6.5 million ceiling on the amount of a loan or combination loan and grant for any one project; by changing the formula for determining the interest rate for interest-bearing portions of loans under the law; by incorporating recently adopted cost-sharing policies applicable to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement; and by authorizing an additional $100 million to be appropriated to carry out the purpose of the program.

Soil information assistance for community planning and resource development (Public Law 89–560; approved September 7, 1966): This law (S. 902) authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to provide soil information assistance to States and other public agencies to assist them in community planning and resource development and authorized appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the law, such sums to remain available until expended.

Hudson River Basin Compact (Public Law 89–605; approved September 26, 1966): This law (H.R. 13508) directed the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and authorized certain steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program.

Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area (Public Law 89–664; approved October 15, 1966): This law (S. 491) provided for the establishment of the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area in the States of Wyoming and Montana, with authorizations not to exceed $355,000 for the acquisition of land and interests in land.

Preservation of added national historic properties (Public Law 89–665; approved October 15, 1966): This law (S. 3035) established a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the Nation. The law established, among other things, a national register of sites, structures, and the like which are significant in American history, architecture, archeology, and culture, and established an Advisory Council on Historic Preservation to advise the President and Congress. It also authorized appropriations not to exceed $32 million—$2 million in fiscal year 1967, and for fiscal 1968, 1969, and 1970, $10 million each year.

Point Reyes National Seashore, California (Public Law 89–666; approved October 15, 1966): This law (S. 1607) increased the amount authorized to be appropriated for land acquisition in connection with the Point Reyes National Seashore, California, from $14 million to $19,135,000 and clarified a provision with respect to location of a right-of-way for an access road to the area.

Guadalupe Mountains National Park, Texas (Public Law 89–667; approved October 15, 1966): This law (H.R. 698) provided for the establishment of the Guadalupe Mountains National Park in the State of Texas. The amount authorized to be appropriated was limited to $1,800,000 for the acquisition of lands and interests in lands, and not more than $10,362,000 for development of the park.

Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore, Michigan (Public Law 89–668; approved October 15, 1966): This law (H.R. 8678) provided for the establishment of the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore in the State of Michigan. The amount authorized to be appropriated was limited to $6,873,000 for the acquisition of lands and interests in lands, and not more than $6,348,000 for development of the lakeshore.

Conservation and protection of endangered species of fish and wildlife (Public Law 89–669; approved October 15, 1966): This law (H.R. 9424) provided for the conservation, protection, and propagation of native species of fish and wildlife, including migratory birds, that are threatened with extinction, and for consolidation of the authorities relating to the administration by the Secretary of the Interior of the National Wildlife Refuge System. A total authorization of $15 million was provided for acquisition of land (not more than $5 million in any one year), with a limitation of $750,000 to any one area.

Fish protein concentrate (Public Law 89–701; approved November 2, 1966): This law (S. 2720) authorized the Secretary of the Interior, through the use of experiment and demonstration plants, practicable and economic means for the production by the commercial fishing industry of fish protein concentrate. The law authorized appropriation of not to exceed $1 million for construction of one experiment and demonstration plant and $1,555,000 annually for 5 fiscal years beginning with fiscal 1968 for leasing one additional such plant and for operation and maintenance of such plants leased or constructed and for conducting the program authorized by the law.

PUBLIC WELFARE

Federal Coal Mine Safety Act Amendments of 1965 (Public Law 89–376; approved March 26, 1966): This law (H.R. 3584) amended the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act to extend the mandatory safety provisions of the act to mines regularly employing less than 15 men underground (previously exempt) and to strengthen certain other provisions of the act in order to increase the protection of lives and property in all underground coal mines.

The law provided for enlargement and intensification of coal mine safety educational programs, in cooperation with the States, and authorized appropriation of $500,000 for fiscal 1966 and each succeeding fiscal year for grants to the States.

Books and other materials for handicapped persons (Public Law 89–522; approved July 30, 1966): This law (S. 3093) amended the acts of March 3, 1931, and October 9, 1962, relating to the furnishing of books and other materials to the blind so as to authorize the furnishing of such books and other materials to other handicapped persons, and authorized appropriation of such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the law.

Transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and certain other animals for research purposes (Public Law 89–544; approved August 24, 1966): This law (H.R. 13881) authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and certain other animals intended to be used for purposes of research and experimentation. The law also authorized appropriation of such funds as Congress may from time to time provide.

Federal Metal and Nonmetallic Mine Safety Act (Public Law 89–577; approved September 16, 1966): This law (H.R. 8989) established a Federal program of systematic inspection (providing for joint Federal-State programs of inspection where a State has an approved plan) of such operations which affect commerce, and required the development, promulgation, and enforcement of health and safety standards, in mining and milling operations carried on in the metal and nonmetallic mineral industries.

Responsibility for administering the law was vested in the Bureau of Mines in the Department of the Interior, provision was made for a Federal Metal and Nonmetallic Mine Safety Board of Review to be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, and the Secretary of the Interior was required to make an annual report.

The law authorized appropriation, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, of such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the law.

Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (Public Law 89–642; approved October 10, 1966): This law (S. 3467), among other things, authorized appropriations not to exceed $110 million for fiscal 1967, $115 million for fiscal 1968, and $120 million for fiscal 1969 and 1970, for an extended special milk program; authorized for a pilot breakfast program not to exceed $7.5 million for fiscal 1967 and $10 million for fiscal 1968; authorized for a 4-year program for nonfood assistance to schools drawing attendance from areas in which poor economic conditions exist not to exceed $12 million for fiscal 1967, $15 million for fiscal 1968, and $18 million for fiscal 1969 and 1970.

Clean Air Act Amendments of 1966 (Public Law 89–675; approved October 15, 1966): This law (S. 3112) amended the Clean Air Act so as to authorize grants to air pollution control agencies for maintenance of air pollution control programs in addition to present authority for grants to develop, establish, or improve such programs; make the use of appropriations under the act more flexible by consolidating the appropriation authorizations under the act and deleting the provision limiting the total of grants for support of air pollution control programs to 20 percent of the total appropriation for any year.

The law authorized appropriation of $46 million for fiscal 1967, $66 million for fiscal 1968, and $74 million for fiscal 1969.

Amendment of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act (Public Law 89–699; approved October 30, 1966): This law (H.R. 17285) amended the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to provide for payment of supplemental annuities for career railroad employees and to increase benefit amounts, the program to run for 5 years.

Amendment of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act (Public Law 89–700; approved October 30, 1966): This law (H.R. 14355) amended the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to make certain technical changes and to provide for survivor benefits to children, ages 18 to 21, inclusive. The estimated yearly costs would be $7,800,000.

Veterinary Medical Education Act of 1966 (Public Law 89–709; approved November 2, 1966): This law (H.R. 3348) provided for assistance in the construction and renovation of schools of veterinary medicine by making these schools eligible for matching grants to pay up to two-thirds of the cost of new teaching facilities and up to one-half of renovation projects, and provided for loans for students at these schools on the same basis as is presently provided for students of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, optometry, pharmacy, and podiatry. The law authorized additional appropriations of $500,000 for fiscal 1967, $1,000,000 for fiscal 1968, and $1,500,000 for fiscal 1969 for carrying out the student loan program.

PUBLIC WORKS

Third powerplant, Grand Coulee Dam (Public Law 89–448; approved June 14, 1966): This law (S. 1761) authorized the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain a third powerplant at Grand Coulee Dam, Columbia Basin project, Washington State, making it the largest single hydroelectric development in the world, and authorized appropriation of $390 million for construction and necessary appurtenant works.

Library and Construction Act Amendments of 1966 (Public Law 89–511; approved July 19, 1966): This law (H.R. 14050) extended for 5 years, to June 30, 1971, and amended the Library Services and Construction Act of 1964. The total authorization for matching grants and Federal aid for the 5 years was $700 million.

Revenue bond financing by the Tennessee Valley Authority (Public Law 89–537; approved August 12, 1966): This law (H.R. 15225) amended section 15d of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 to increase from $750 million to $1,750 million the amount of revenue bonds which TVA may have outstanding to finance additions to its power system, an increase of $1 billion.

SPACE AND AERONAUTICS

National Aeronautics and Space Administration appropriations authorization, fiscal 1967 (Public Law 89–528; approved August 5, 1966): This law (H.R. 14324) authorized appropriations of $5,000,419,000 to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration as follows: (a) Research and development, $4,248,600,000; (b) construction of facilities, $95,919,000; and (c) administrative operations, $655,900,000. The law divided into 21 major categories all of NASA's research and development work. For the moon shot (Apollo) program, $2,974,200,000 was authorized.

TRANSPORTATION

Amendment of Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 (Public Law 89–562; approved September 8, 1966): This law (S. 3700) amended the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize appropriations of $150,000,000 for 2 additional years, 1968 and 1969, to finance urban mass transportation grants under the law. It also added new authority for (1) grants to State and public bodies for planning, engineering, and designing of mass transportation projects; (2) grants for fellowships for personnel in the mass transportation field; (3) grants to institutions of higher learning for comprehensive research; and (4) funds to be used by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to undertake studies and research on new systems of urban transportation.

National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–563; approved September 9, 1966):

This law (S. 3005) provided for a coordinated national safety program and establishment of safety standards for motor vehicles in interstate commerce to be administered by the Secretary of Commerce.

Title I provided for, among other things, the establishment of motor vehicle safety standards; grants for research, testing, development, and training to States, interstate agencies, and nonprofit institutions; penalties for violations; establishment of a National Traffic Safety Agency in the Department of Commerce for administration; and authorized appropriation for carrying out the provisions of the title, other than those related to tire safety, of not to exceed $11 million for fiscal 1967, $17 million for fiscal 1968, and $23 million for fiscal 1969.

Title II dealt entirely with tire standards. Appropriations were authorized for carrying out tire safety provisions in title I and in title II of not exceed $2,900,000 for fiscal 1967, $1,450,000 per fiscal year for fiscal 1968 and 1969.

Title III authorized the Secretary of Commerce to make a complete investigation and study of the need for a facility or facilities to conduct research, development, and testing in traffic safety and relating to the safety of machinery used on highways, and required the Secretary to report to Congress on the results not later than December 31, 1967. The law authorized appropriation of not to exceed $3 million for the investigation, study, and report, to remain available until expended.

Title IV directed the Secretary of Commerce to establish and maintain a national driver register.

Highway Safety Act of 1966 (Public Law 89–564; approved September 9, 1966): This law (S. 3052) established a 3-year, $322 million highway safety program. It authorized and directed the Secretary of Commerce to assist and cooperate with other Federal departments and agencies, State and local governments, private industry, and other interested parties to increase highway safety. The law provided that each State shall have a highway safety program approved by the Secretary, designed to reduce traffic accidents and deaths, injuries, and property damage resulting therefrom. The program would be carried out in accordance with uniform standards established by the Secretary in cooperation with the States.

The law provided, also, that the Secretary shall not approve any State highway safety program which does not (1) provide that the Governor of the State shall be responsible for the administration of the program; (2) authorize political subdivisions of such State to carry out local highway safety programs within their jurisdictions as a part of the State highway safety program, subject to approval by the Governor and the Secretary; (3) provide that at least 40 per centum of all Federal funds apportioned to such State for any fiscal year will be expended by the political subdivisions of such State in carrying out local highway safety programs authorized; (4) provide that the aggregate expenditure of funds of the State and political subdivisions thereof, exclusive of Federal funds, for highway safety programs will be maintained at a level which does not fall below the average level of such expenditures for its last two full fiscal years preceding the date of enactment; and (5) provide for comprehensive driver training programs, including (a) initiation of a State program for driver education in the school systems or for an expansion and improvement in such a program if already in existence; (b) training of qualified school instructors and their certification; (c) appropriate regulation of other driver training schools, including licensing of the schools and certification of their instructors; (d) adult driver training programs, and programs for retraining selected drivers; and (e) adequate research, development, and procurement of practice driving facilities, simulators, and other similar teaching aids for both school and other driver training use.

The Secretary was authorized to use funds appropriated to carry out highway safety research, including the use of such funds for (1) grants to State or local agencies, institutions, and individuals for training or education of highway safety personnel, (2) research fellowships in highway safety, (3) development of improved accident investigation procedures, (4) emergency service plans, (5) demonstration projects, and (6) related activities which are deemed by the Secretary to be necessary.

The law established in the Department of Commerce a National Highway Safety Advisory Committee, composed of the Secretary or an officer of the Department appointed by him, who shall be chairman, the Federal Highway Administrator, and twenty-nine members appointed by the President, no more than four of whom shall be Federal officers or employees.

For the comprehensive statewide programs, the law authorized appropriation of $67 million for fiscal 1967, $100 million for fiscal 1968, and $100 million for fiscal 1969.

For highway safety research and development, the law authorized appropriation of the additional sum of $10 million for fiscal 1967, $20 million for fiscal 1968, and $25 million for fiscal 1969.

Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966 (Public Law 89–574; approved September 13, 1966): This law (S. 3155) authorized appropriation of $3,400,000,000 for fiscal 1968, $3,800,000,000 for fiscal 1969, $3,600,000,000 per year for fiscal 1970 and 1971, and $2,685,000,000 for fiscal 1972 for constructing the Interstate Highway System.

In addition, the law authorized appropriations for the Federal-aid primary system and the Federal-aid secondary system and for their extension within urban areas, out of the highway trust fund, $1 billion for fiscal 1968 and $1 billion for fiscal 1969; for forest highways, $33 million for fiscal 1968 and $33 million for fiscal 1969; for public lands highways, $14 million for fiscal 1968 and $16 million for 1969; for forest development roads and trails, $170 million for fiscal 1968 and $170 million for fiscal 1969; for public lands development roads and trails, $3 million for fiscal 1968 and $5 million for fiscal 1969; for park roads and trails, $25 million for fiscal 1968 and $30 million for fiscal 1969; for parkways, $9 million for fiscal 1968 and $11 million for fiscal 1969; for Indian reservation roads and bridges, $19 million for fiscal 1968 and $23 million for fiscal 1969; and $50 million annually for emergency relief, of which 60 percent was authorized to come from the highway trust fund and the remaining 40 percent from the general fund of the Treasury.

The law required the standards for the Interstate System to provide for at least four traffic lanes; authorized studies of advance acquisition of rights-of-way to be reported by July 1, 1967; provided that a State may engage the services of private engineering firms to the extent necessary; authorized studies of relocation and reestablishment assistance for persons, concerns, and organizations displaced by highway construction to be reported by July 1, 1967; and declared a national policy to preserve parklands and historic sites and the beauty and value of such sites wherever possible.

The law authorized Alaska to use Federal-aid highway funds for construction of access and development roads on a Federal-aid system to encourage economic and other development, and authorized from the general fund an additional $14 million per year for highway construction and maintenance for fiscal years 1968 through 1972, inclusive.

Continuation of Federal airport program (Public Law 89–647; approved October 13, 1966): This law (S. 3096) amended the Federal Airport Act to extend the grants-in-aid program for airport development for 3 years, to June 30, 1970. The law authorized $75 million for each fiscal year 1968, 1969, and 1970. Out of this amount, $7 million would be earmarked each year for general aviation fields, and $1.5 million a year for Guam, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico.

Establishment of Department of Transportation (Public Law 89–670, approved October 15, 1966): This law (H.R. 15963) established a Cabinet-level Department of Transportation to which were transferred the major transportation agencies and functions of the Federal Government, other than the economic regulatory functions of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Federal Power Commission. However, neither the Federal Maritime Commission nor any of its functions were transferred to the new Department. All the transportation safety responsibilities previously vested in agencies throughout the Government were transferred to the Secretary, Administrators, and a newly created National Transportation Safety Board.

The principal operating agencies within the Department are a Federal Aviation Administration, a Federal Highway Administration, a Federal Railroad Administration, and the U.S. Coast Guard.

Agencies and functions transferred were (1) the Federal Aviation Agency; (2) the Bureau of Public Roads (Commerce Department); (3) the Office of the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation; (4) the U.S. Coast Guard (Treasury Department); (5) the Great Lakes Pilotage Association (Commerce); (6) the safety functions of the Civil Aeronautics Board; (7) Interstate Commerce Commission functions relating to railroad safety laws and hours of service of employees, motor carrier safety laws, transportation of explosives, and standard time zones and daylight saving time; (8) Army Corps of Engineers functions related to anchorages, bridges, and tolls; (9) the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation (Commerce); (10) the Alaska Railroad (Interior); (11) the functions, powers, and duties vested in the Secretary of Commerce by the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 and the Highway Safety Act of 1966.

TREATIES

Investments Disputes Convention (Ex. A, 89th Cong., 2d sess.; ratified May 16, 1966): This convention set up machinery for the settlement of disputes between private investors and foreign governments of countries where the investments were made by negotiation or arbitration.

Supplementary Income Tax Convention With the Netherlands (Ex. B, 89th Cong., 2d sess.; ratified June 21, 1966): Principal purposes of this supplementary convention were to enable the Government of the Netherlands to impose withholding taxes on dividends of United States citizens and corporations derived from Netherlands sources, to modernize the existing convention by bringing it more into line with more recent income tax conventions concluded by the United States, and to reflect certain principles expressed in the model income tax convention of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Supplementary Income Tax Protocol With the United Kingdom (Ex. C, 89th Cong., 2d sess.; ratified June 21, 1966): Provisions of this protocol were made necessary by enactment of the United Kingdom Finance Act of 1965 and covered primarily dividends, interest, and royalties derived from United Kingdom sources by United States citizens.

Protocol to Mexican Broadcasting Agreement (Ex. D, 89th Cong., 2d sess.; ratified June 21, 1966): This protocol extended the 1957 broadcasting agreement covering standard band broadcasting until December 31, 1967, or until such prior time as current negotiations with Mexico culminated in a new agreement. Importance of this protocol is that Mexico is not a party to the North American Regional Broadcasting Agreement of November 15, 1950.

Amendments to Convention of Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization (Ex. H, 89th Cong., 1st sess.; ratified June 21, 1966): The Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization is a purely consultative group and its recommendations are not binding on any member nation. The United States is particularly interested in the safety committee's current activities. Purpose of these amendments was to increase the number of council members from 16 to 18 nations and to provide for a more equitable geographic distribution of council members.

International Wheat Agreement Extension (Ex. F, 89th Cong., 2d sess.; ratified July 14, 1966): Extension of the present International Wheat Agreement for 1 year beyond its present expiration date of July 31, 1966, would permit pending negotiations to broaden the current agreement.

Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Convention (Ex. I, 89th Cong., 2d sess.; ratified July 19, 1966): Under the present convention each participating government enforced regulations with regard to its own nationals. The new protocols permit the International Commission to make proposals to insure the application of the convention and regulations adopted thereunder.

Treaty of Amity and Economic Relations With the Togo Republic (Ex. E, 89th Cong., 2d sess.; ratified September 28, 1966): This was the first treaty of its type signed by the United States and a newly independent African State. Its purpose was to provide protection for United States citizens, their property, and interests within the Togo Republic in return for similar protection given citizens of Togo in the United States.

International Convention on Load Lines, 1966 (Ex. S, 89th Cong., 2d sess.; ratified October 13, 1966): The 1966 Load Lines Convention brought up to date the convention signed in London in 1930. Load lines are marks placed on all ships of nations participating in the convention engaged in international voyages indicating a point beyond which it is not safe to load the vessel. The convention recognized that these load lines may vary from season to season and from ocean to ocean.

VETERANS

Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-358; approved March 6, 1966): This law (S. 9) provided a permanent program of educational assistance grants and guaranteed and direct home and farm loans for veterans with more than 180 days' service in the Armed Forces since January 31, 1955. Among other things, the law also provided for job counseling and employment placement service, Veterans' Administration hospital care of non-service-connected medical needs, and veterans preference in Federal employment. The benefits were substantially the same as those given veterans under the GI bills of World War II and the Korean war.

The estimated cost for fiscal year 1967 would be $373.4 million.

Military Medical Benefits Amendments of 1966 (Public Law 89-614; approved September 30, 1966): This law (H.R. 14088) amended chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize an improved health benefits program for retired members and members of the uniformed services and their dependents.

The estimated first full fiscal year cost was approximately $141.9 million.

Increased dependency and indemnity compensation for parents and children of veterans whose deaths are service connected (Public Law 89-730; approved November 2, 1966): This law (H.R. 14347) liberalized dependency and indemnity compensation to the surviving parents and children of a veteran who died as a result of service-connected causes.

Salute to Libya, 15th Anniversary of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to salute the Kingdom of Libya on the forthcoming celebration of its 15th anniversary of independence in December, and to send warmest felicitations to His Majesty Idris I, King of Libya; and His Excellency Fathi Abidia, Libya's Ambassador to the United States.

Since World War II, an amazing "rags to riches" story has taken place in the United Kingdom of Libya. The land that rests like a keystone in the arch of northern Africa has been subject to the domination of the Phoenicians, Greeks, Romans, Vandals, Arabs, Ottoman Turks, Italians and the occupation armies of Great Britain, France and the United States. Libya willingly accepted the United Nations resolution of 1949 which facilitated her independence and with great pride proclaimed the birth of the modern state of Libya on December 24, 1951.

In the early years, Libya faced every known obstacle: disease, a hostile climate, starvation, poor resources, illiteracy and a divided populace. Under the leadership of King Idris I, the Libyans began the long and difficult struggle to transform their ancient land into a modern state. Then in 1959, a new structure graced the horizon where once only the arch of Marcus Aurelius had stood: the steel girders and cables of the oil derrick. With the newfound wealth to assist the ambitious plans of the government, giant strides are being taken toward modernity with the eventual hope that Libya will soon regain the status enjoyed in the days of Carthage. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all America joins me today in congratulating the Kingdom of Libya on this important date in her history.

U.S. Senate Loses Two Dedicated Lawmakers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the departure of revered colleagues is an event always touched with sadness. Through voluntary retirement, the Senate is losing the services of two of its most dedicated lawmakers, MILWARD L. SIMPSON, the junior Senator from Wyoming, and LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, the senior Senator from Massachusetts.

The public careers of these legislators had interesting points in common. Before coming to the Senate, both served in the legislatures of their States; both also served with distinction as the Governors of their States. With this broad background of public service they were able to bring to their responsibilities as U.S. Senators a wealth of experience, of humanity, and of commonsense which is the foundation of wisdom. Both of these men enriched the deliberations of the Senate.

I had the privilege of close association with LEVERETT SALTONSTALL for two decades. We served together on the Select Committee on Small Business ever since that committee was established in 1950. He has been since 1959 the ranking Republican member and I, as chairman, can say with complete confidence that his counsel, freely offered and readily accepted, was an indispensable element in whatever success this committee may have had in its efforts to be helpful to the Nation's 4,500,000 small and independent business establishments.

Summary of Record and Accomplishments of the Committee on Ways and Means During the 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILBUR D. MILLS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means, during the 89th Congress, has again completed a busy and productive schedule. During this Congress, the committee considered and reported legislation in the majority of areas of its jurisdiction. As Members will recall, the jurisdiction of the committee is exceedingly broad and complex and includes matters which affect the day-to-day activities and well-being of all of our citizens.

The nature of the measures falling within the jurisdiction of this committee is such that the committee necessarily proceeds with the utmost caution, responsibility, and prudence. Laws on the subject of taxes, tariffs, social security, unemployment compensation, and fiscal matters generally have a great impact on the economy of the Nation and on the well-being of its citizens.

To illustrate the intensive activity of the committee and its accomplishments during the Congress just completed, certain of the major measures which were reported by the committee are listed briefly, followed by a complete statistical and summary report of the entire record of the committee.

Probably the most significant legislative enactment which was reported by the committee, and one which historically will have the greatest impact in the years to come on the lives of our citizens was the Social Security Amendments of 1965, which included the hospital insurance program and the voluntary supplementary medical plan, in addition to across-the-board increases in social security benefits, and many major changes in practically all of the titles of the Social Security Act.

In the field of taxation, the committee reported bills which became law, in most of the major facets of this part of its jurisdiction. For example, the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965, a major legislative enactment, repealed and thus eliminated the vast majority of excise taxes imposed at the Federal level. Moreover, it made administrative improvements in the remaining Federal excise taxes.

In the field of income taxes, the committee reported the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966, which made major improvements in the withholding provisions of the Federal income tax law, both as to individuals and as to corporations, and also played a part in the anti-inflationary program of the administration. Moreover, in the field of income taxes, the committee reported and there was enacted legislation to suspend temporarily the 7-percent investment credit and certain methods of rapid depreciation, a major anti-inflation weapon. Also, the committee reported and there was enacted into law the Foreign Investors Tax Act of 1966, which made certain major changes with regard to the income tax treatment of income of foreigners residing in the United States, as well as other major tax changes.

In the field of unemployment compensation, the committee reported and the House of Representatives passed the Unemployment Compensation Amendments of 1966, which would have made major improvements and extensions in the unemployment compensation program. However, the conferees on the part of the Senate and the House were unable to reach agreement and this measure ultimately died in conference and did not become law.

In the field of tariffs and trade, the committee reported and there was enacted into law legislation for the implementation of the so-called Florence and Beirut agreements, matters which had been pending for a number of years.

In addition to the foregoing examples, the Committee on Ways and Means reported and there was passed by the House of Representatives a very large number of relatively minor bills or bills which were restricted in their provisions to particular facets of the jurisdiction of the committee.

As I have pointed out repeatedly in the past, and can again state without reservation, the members of the Committee on Ways and Means have been conscientious in attending to their duties and have devoted themselves diligently to completing the heavy work of the committee. The members of the committee have pursued their responsibilities with sincerity and have been diligent in attendance at the meetings of the committee. Because of the pending workload of the committee, it was again necessary to conduct many extended executive sessions throughout both sessions of the Congress in addition to the public hearings which the committee has conducted.

While we as individual members of the committee have, of course, not always agreed on all of the measures considered by the committee, certainly every member of this committee can take pride in the work which he has done and in the record which has been established.

During the course of this Congress, the Committee on Ways and Means held public or executive hearings on a total of 73 days exclusive of executive sessions, and has directly received testimony from more than 649 individuals during those hearings. In addition, comments, recommendations, and statements of views were received for the printed record from many hundreds of other interested persons and organizations. For the information of the interested public, there follows a table which shows the subject of these public hearings, the number of days involved, the number of witnesses, and the number of volumes which were published.

TABLE 1.—*Hearings held by Committee on Ways and Means, 89th Cong.*

1ST SESSION

Subject	Number of days	Number of witnesses	Number of pages	Number of volumes
Medical care for the aged (executive hearing)	11	50	898	2
International Coffee Agreement (executive hearing)	2	8	47	1
United States-Canada Automotive Products Agreement	3	16	312	1
Duty exemption for returning American residents	2	22	171	1
Temporary increase in debt ceiling (executive hearing)	2	4	38	1
Interest Equalization Tax Extension Act of 1965 (executive hearing), along with written comments submitted	3	57	115	1
Removal of tax barriers to foreign investment in the United States (see also 2d sess.)	2	33	161	1
Proposed amendments to Firearms Acts	11	53	898	2
Alteration of duties on importation of coconut oil	1	9	91	1
Unemployment compensation, H.R. 8282 (see also 2d sess.)	16	138	2,191	5
Written statements by interested individuals and organizations on Treasury Department report on private foundations		81	771	2

2D SESSION

Subject	Number of days	Number of witnesses	Number of pages	Number of volumes
1966 tax proposals of the President	3	11	190	1
Written statements by interested individuals and organizations on H.R. 11297, the Foreign Investors Tax Act of 1965 (see also 1st sess. and below)		38	204	1
Duty-free entry of certain copper	1	10	56	1
Priority of Federal tax liens and levies	1	3	242	1
Foreign Investors Tax Act of 1966	1	1	46	1
Unemployment compensation, H.R. 8282	2	9	150	1
Written statements by interested individuals and organizations on H.R. 13431, to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951		11	29	1
Temporary increase in debt ceiling (executive hearing)	2	2	103	1
Implementation of Florence and Beirut agreements	2	24	258	1
Written statements by interested individuals and organizations on H.R. 6958, Treasury proposal to amend Internal Revenue Code to promote savings under the automatic data processing system		12	24	1
Administration's proposal on airway user charges	2	6	130	1
Unrelated debt-financed income of tax-exempt organizations	1	6	60	1
President's proposal on suspension of investment credit and application of accelerated depreciation	5	47	519	1
Total	73	649	7,713	31

In addition to the public hearings during the 89th Congress, the Committee on Ways and Means met in executive session 193 times, covering 144 days. This included approximately 48 sessions covering 31 days on the subject of medical care for the aged and social security.

Of the 21,899 public and private bills and resolutions introduced in the House during the course of this Congress, there was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means a total of 3,161 bills and resolutions, in addition to the 56 executive communications. Of this total, there were 1,741 tax bills, 763 social security bills, 532 tariff bills, and 125 miscellaneous bills. This total represents approximately one-sixth of all the public bills and resolutions introduced in the House of Representatives during this Congress.

During the 89th Congress, the committee favorably reported to the House a total of 109 bills, which includes 34 tax bills, 5 social security bills, 62 tariff bills, and 8 bills of a miscellaneous character. Of the 109 bills reported to the House, 103 passed the House and 66 were enacted into law.

The table which follows gives a further detailed history of the action of the Congress with respect to these measures:

TABLE 2.—*Bills and resolutions referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, 89th Cong., 1st and 2d sess., by category and action thereon*

	Tax	Social security	Tariff	Other	Total
Bills referred to committee	1,741	763	532	125	3,161
Bills reported to House	31	6	62	10	109
Bills passed House	30	3	59	9	101
Bills reported to Senate	22	2	42	9	75
Bills passed Senate	19	2	42	9	72
Bills enacted into law	19	1	42	8	70

Table 3, below, shows the numbers of the public bills reported by the committee in each of the subject categories reflected in table 2.

TABLE 3

TAXES

H.R. 10, H.R. 318, H.R. 327, H.R. 483, H.R. 4260, H.R. 4665, H.R. 4750, H.R. 6319, H.R. 6413, H.R. 6958, H.R. 7030, H.R. 7502, H.R. 8188, H.R. 8244, H.R. 8371, H.R. 9280, H.R. 9883, H.R. 10185, H.R. 10625, H.R. 11256, H.R. 11257, H.R. 11660, H.R. 11765, H.R. 11782, H.R. 12752, H.R. 13103, H.R. 14363, H.R. 16775, H.R. 17271, H.R. 17607, H.R. 18230.

TARIFF AND TRADE

H.R. 1035, H.R. 4493, H.R. 5768, H.R. 5950, H.R. 6431, H.R. 6568, H.R. 7621, H.R. 7723, H.R. 7969, H.R. 8147, H.R. 8376, H.R. 8436, H.R. 8664, H.R. 9042, H.R. 10998, H.R. 11029, H.R. 11216, H.R. 11653, H.R. 12262, H.R. 12318, H.R. 12328, H.R. 12461, H.R. 12463, H.R. 12657, H.R. 12676, H.R. 12864, H.R. 12997, HR. 13116, H.R. 13363, H.R. 16077, H.R. 16092, H.R. 16160, H.J. Res. 688, S. 701, and 28 private bills as shown in the table following the summaries of public bills below.

SOCIAL SECURITY (INCLUDING OLD-AGE, SURVIVORS' AND DISABILITY INSURANCE, UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION, PUBLIC ASSISTANCE, ETC.)

H.R. 6675, H.R. 13445, H.R. 14224, H.R. 15119, H.R. 18085, H.R. 18225.

OTHER (INCLUDING RENEGOTIATION, PUBLIC DEBT, ETC.)

H.R. 8210, H.R. 8445, H.R. 8464, H.R. 9570, H.R. 11158, H.R. 13431, H.R. 15202, S. 801, S. 1013, S. 1760.

Mr. Speaker, for the further information of the Members, there follows a summary of each of the public bills reported to the House of Representatives by the Committee on Ways and Means during the 89th Congress, listed in numerical order and showing the status of each bill at adjournment, followed by a table describing the 28 private bills reported by the committee in the 89th Congress:

SUMMARIES OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS REPORTED BY COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS IN NUMERICAL ORDER—89TH CONGRESS

PUBLIC BILLS

H.R. 10 (Mr. Keogh); see H.R. 13103. As reported to and passed by the House of Representatives on June 6, 1966, this bill amended the provisions of the "Self-Employed Individuals' Tax Retirement Act of 1962" by: (1) repealing the provision limiting the deduction from gross income, for income tax purposes, which a self-employed individual may take with respect to contributions to a retirement plan on his own behalf to 50 percent of the contribution (but retaining the provision restricting the contribution to the lesser of 10 percent of earned income or $2,500), and (2) permitting the self-employed individual to include in earned income all of his net profits when his income is earned from a business in which both the performance of personal services and capital are material income-producing factors, provided that the personal services of the self-employed person involved is a material income-producing factor. The provisions of the House bill were adopted by the Senate as an amendment to H.R. 13103 and became law as a part of that legislation, amended to be effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1967.

H.R. 318 (Mr. Jennings); Public Law 89-523, app. August 1, 1966. The purpose of this bill was to provide that the manufacturers' excise tax on tires and inner tubes in the case of manufacturer-owned (or importer owned) retail stores be imposed at the time of delivery to these stores, rather than at the time these tubes or tires are sold.

The bill was enacted into law as unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 327 (Mr. Keogh); Public Law 89-352, app. February 2, 1966. As unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and enacted into law, the purpose of this bill was to exempt from income taxation mutual, nonprofit organizations organized before September 1, 1957, and operated to provide reserves for building and loan associations, cooperative banks, and mutual savings banks, if at least 85 percent of their income is attributable to providing such reserve funds and to investments. The legislation extended this tax-exempt status to organizations which are similar in essential respects to those which were already exempt. Prior law exempted such organizations only if they provide both reserves for, and insurance of shares and deposits of, member associations.

The bill also provided that net income derived by such organizations (both that of the organizations exempted by this bill and that of the similar organizations already exempt) which is not related to the provision of reserves or insurance will be taxed as unrelated business income. This latter provision confines the privilege of tax exemption to income derived from the specific services upon which that exemption is based.

H.R. 483 (Mr. Herlong); Public Law 89-621, app. October 4, 1966. As unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill provided that, for estate tax purposes an interest in property which a surviving spouse receives as a result of a disclaimer by a beneficiary under a will would qualify for the estate tax marital deduction where certain conditions are met. The amendments made by the Senate, modifying the provisions of the House bill, were accepted by the House.

H.R. 1035 (Mr. Gubser); passed October 11, 1966. As unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill would make duty-free the importation of bagpipes and parts thereof. The Committee was advised that there is no commercial production of bagpipes in the United States, and favorable Departmental reports were received on the legislation.

H.R. 4260 (Mr. Keogh); passed House June 17, 1965. As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House, this bill amends the real estate investment trust provisions of present law to provide that the term "real estate investment trust" means a corporation as well as an unincorporated trust or unincorporated association. Real estate investment corporations which meet the conditions specified in the statute now applicable to real estate investment trusts would be eligible for the "pass through" type of tax treatment, where 90 percent or more of their income is distributed, in substantially the same manner as regulated investment companies. Thus, where the specified conditions are met, the distributed income would be taxed to the shareholder in the real estate corporation and not to the corporation itself. The income taxed to the shareholder, as presently provided in the case of real estate investment trusts, would be treated as ordinary income (not eligible for the dividend exclusion) except in the case of capital gains which would be treated in the same manner as is presently provided for real estate investment trusts.

H.R. 4493 (Mrs. Griffiths); Public Law 89-61, app. June 30, 1965. The purpose of this bill, which was enacted into law in the form reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, was to continue for 2 years, to the close of June 30, 1967, the existing suspension of duties on scrap of various metals. Favorable departmental reports were received on this legislation, and the committee was advised that the conditions which prompted the initial suspension of the duty on metal scrap, and the continuations thereof to the present time, have not changed. The committee was unanimous in recommending enactment of the bill.

H.R. 4665 (Mr. Ullman); Public Law 89-570, app. September 12, 1966. As unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill provided income tax deductions without limitation for exploration expenditures for minerals (other than coal, oil, and gas) paid before the beginning of the development stage of the mine, the deduction to the elective and limited to expenditures for exploration in the United States. (Under prior law such deductions were allowed up to a maximum of $100,000 a year, with an overall maximum of $400,000 for each taxpayer.) The bill provided for the "recapture" of the amounts deducted under the provision (i.e., in effect adding the amounts deducted back into income). Substantive amendments to the House bill were adopted by the Senate, and under the conference agreement and as the bill became law, the application of the unlimited deduction provision was extended to include exploration expenditures with respect to coal, and the provision of the House bill limiting the deduction to expenditures in the United States was modified to permit the deduction of foreign exploration expenditures (subject to the $100,000 annual and $400,000 overall limitations, without recapture). Also, provisions were included relating to the effect of certain tax-free transfers of mineral property.

H.R. 4750 (Mr. Mills); Public Law 89–243, app. October 9, 1965. This bill extended to July 31, 1967, the interest equalization tax (which, in the absence of legislation, would have terminated on December 31, 1965) and broadened its application to include debt obligations having a maturity of 1 or more years (instead of 3 years or more). The tax, originally enacted as a part of the overall program to improve our balance-of-payments position, increases the cost of foreign borrowing in the case of securities and debt obligations in this country by approximately 1 percent. The Committee on Ways and Means was of the opinion that the tax had proven to be useful in our efforts to counter the deficit in our balance of payments, and its extension was urged by the Administration.

H.R. 5768 (Mr. Herlong); Public Law 89–229, app. October 1, 1965. As unanimously reported to the House and as enacted into law, the purpose of this bill was to continue for 3 years, until the close of November 7, 1968, the existing suspension of duties on certain classifications of spun silk yarn. This suspension of duty, which has been in effect continuously since November 1959, was originally enacted in order to enable domestic producers to import fine silk yarns free of duty so as to make it more economical for them to produce fine-yarn fabrics in competition with imported similar fabrics. The committee was advised that the continuation of the suspension is justified on the basis of the same reasons that prompted the original suspension.

A provision added to the bill by the Senate, creating a special tariff category for certain textured yarn composed of continuous manmade fibers, was deleted by the Conference Committee, but the President was requested to cause a study to be made of the matter with a report and recommendations to be made to the Congress not later than Feb. 1, 1966.

H.R. 5950 (Mr. Pelly); passed House October 21, 1966. The purpose of this bill as unanimously reported to and passed by the House is to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit the duty-free treatment of limestone imported to be used in the manufacture of cement, by authorizing the elimination or reduction of duty under the provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, without the staging that would otherwise be required. Imports of the limestone involved in the bill are presently localized along the Canadian border, principally in the region of the Great Lakes and the State of Washington, and do not move in significant quantities any great distances inland (the cost of transportation restricting its movement to short distances).

H.R. 6319 (Mr. Boggs); Public Law 89–384; app. April 8, 1966. As unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House, the purpose of this bill was to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide, in the case of recoveries of foreign expropriation losses, a new set of rules generally limiting the tax on the recovery to the benefit previously received in deducting the loss (but applying current tax rates). In hardship situations the bill also made provision for payment of the tax on recoveries in 10 equal annual installments bearing interest at 4 percent. A special rule is provided in the case of life insurance companies, and the bill also makes provision for taxing recoveries with respect to foreign expropriation losses where a benefit from a tax deduction was received by one corporation holding securities in another whose property was expropriated.

A Senate amendment adding a provision extending through May 31, 1966, the initial enrollment period for coverage under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged was amended to, in effect, substitute the language of H.R. 14224 (infra), and the bill was enacted with this amendment only.

H.R. 6413 (Mr. Sisk); passed House October 7, 1966. As unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House, this legislation would provide for the tax-free withdrawal from bonded wine cellars of wine and wine products, containing not more than 21 percent alcohol, when rendered unfit for beverage use. Under existing law a drawback of all but $1 of tax per gallon is permitted in the case of distilled spirits rendered unfit for beverage use, but there is no comparable provision in the case of wines. Wines withdrawn in such cases would be used for salted cooking wines, in medicinal preparations or in food flavoring products, in producing agricultural feed, etc.

H.R. 6431 (Mr. Schneebeli); Public Law 89–204, app. September 27, 1965. As unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means and subsequently enacted into law, this legislation provided for the suspension, through June 30, 1967, of the duty on certain forms of nickel, and authorized the President to proclaim the continuance of such duty-free treatment after June 30, 1967, in order to carry out a trade agreement entered into under the authority of section 201 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. The committee was advised that the United States is heavily dependent upon imports for its supplies of nickel, and that the duty on these products constitutes a significant cost burden on U.S. manufacturers, particularly producers of stainless steel and alloy steels, and that removal of the duty would help to improve the competitive position in the domestic as well as the export market of U.S. products manufactured from imported nickel-bearing raw materials. Favorable departmental reports were received on the legislation.

H.R. 6568 (Mr. Keogh); Public Law 89–388, app. April 13, 1966. As enacted, this legislation made permanent the existing temporary duty-free treatment or lower rates of duty applicable to copra, palm nuts, and palm-nut kernels, their oils, and specified fatty acids, salts, and other chemical products derived from the oils. The bill as enacted also provided relief with respect to certain coconut oil imported on or before June 11, 1965, which had been released from customs custody as being within the duty-free quota under the Philippine trade agreement.

H.R. 6675 (Mr. Mills); Public Law 89–97, app. July 30, 1965. Following is a brief summary of the provisions of this legislation, the "Social Security Amendments of 1965":

First, a coordinated approach for health insurance and medical care for the aged under the Social Security Act by establishment of:

(1) A basic plan providing protection against the costs of hospital and related care financed through a separate payroll tax and a separate trust fund;

(2) A voluntary "supplementary" plan providing payments for physicians' and other medical and health services financed through $3 monthly premiums by individual participants matched equally by Federal Government revenue contributions, with certain corollary changes in the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to the deduction of medical expenses for income tax purposes; and

(3) A greatly expanded medical assistance program for the needy and medically needy which combines all the vendor medical provisions for the aged, blind, disabled, and families with dependent children under a uniform program and matching formula in a single new title.

Second, expansion of the services for maternal and child health, crippled children, and the mentally retarded, and establishment of a 5-year program of "special project grants" to provide comprehensive health care and services for needy children of school age or preschool age.

Third, revision and improvement of the benefit and coverage provisions and the financing structure of the Federal old-age, survivors', and disability insurance system by—

(1) Increasing benefits by 7 percent across the board with a $4 minimum increase for retired workers aged 65 or over;

(2) Continuing benefits to age 22 for children attending school;

(3) Providing actuarially reduced benefits for widows at age 60;

(4) Liberalizing the definition of "disability" for disability insurance benefit purposes; establishing an alternative insured status provision for young workers who are blind and disabled; and providing an offset of disability insurance benefits under certain circumstances;

(5) Paying benefits on a transitional basis to certain persons currently 72 or over who are otherwise ineligible;

(6) Increasing the amount an individual is permitted to earn without losing benefits;

(7) Amending the coverage provisions by—(*a*) including self-employed physicians; (*b*) covering cash tips; (*c*) liberalizing the income treatment for self-employed farmers; (*d*) improving certain State and local coverage provisions; (*e*) exempting certain religious groups opposed to insurance;

(8) Revising the tax schedule and the earnings base so as to fully finance the changes made; and

(9) Making other miscellaneous improvements.

Fourth, improvement and expansion of the public assistance programs by—

(1) Increasing the Federal matching share for cash payments for the needy aged, blind, disabled, and families with dependent children;

(2) Eliminating limitations on Federal participation in public assistance to aged individuals in tuberculosis and mental disease hospitals under certain conditions;

(3) Affording the States broader latitude in disregarding certain earnings in determining need for aged recipients of public assistance; and

(4) Making other improvements in the public assistance titles of the Social Security Act.

H.R. 6958 (Mr. Mills); before President for approval. This legislation, which was introduced at the request of the Treasury Department, was designed to increase substantially the savings possible under the Internal Revenue Service's new automatic data processing system by permitting the Treasury Department to require taxpayers to mail their tax returns directly to the regional automatic data processing service centers, of which there are presently seven, rather than filing them in one of the 58 offices of the District Directors as under prior law. The bill as unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means contained several provisions made necessary or desirable by the change in the place for filing tax returns, including a provision permitting a taxpayer who desires to file his return in person to continue to do so by hand-carrying it to his local Internal Revenue Service office. The Service estimated that the elimination of double handling and shipping costs and the maximization of economies inherent in volume processing made possible by the bill will produce an annual saving in administrative costs of nearly $4 million. In addition, direct filing will reduce the time required for making refunds and will make it possible for the Service to commerce audit and collection activities at an earlier time.

The Senate passed the bill without change in the provisions of the House bill, but added a provision amending section 1861 of the Social Security Act relating to the determination of "reasonable cost" of services of extended care facilities for purposes of reimbursement under the provisions for medical care insurance for the aged. The substitute text adopted in conference, which, in general, require that regulations under the health insurance program relating to the reasonable cost of extended care services furnished by any proprietary facility specifically recognize a reasonable return on equity capital invested in the facility used for the furnishing of the services (such equity capital to include any necessary working capital so invested), was agreed to by both bodies and the bill was enacted into law with the inclusion of this provision.

H.R. 7030 (Mr. Battin); passed House October 21, 1966. As unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that if a farmer pays an assessment levied by a soil or water conservation or drainage district which is attributable to the acquisition by the district of depreciable property, the amount paid can be deducted for income tax purposes on an amortized basis over a 10-year period. However, if the taxpayer's share of the assessment for the depreciable assets is more than 10 percent of the total amount assessed against all members, his deduction would be limited to 10 percent of the total assessment.

H.R. 7502 (Mr. Ullman); reported to Senate October 21, 1966. The purpose of this bill as unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House is to amend the provisions of existing law relating to the income tax treatment of casualty losses to provide that if property is destroyed or damaged by a storm, flood, or other casualty which is designated by the President of the United States as a major disaster then, if the losses exceed the gains, both the losses and the gains will be treated as ordinary for tax purposes.

Under present law, uninsured business losses (or those from property held for the production of income) arising from a fire or other casualty are treated as ordinary losses without regard to any gains the taxpayer may have. This rule is not changed by the bill. In the case of major disasters, the bill supplements this rule of existing law to provide substantially similar loss treatment for partially insured business property (or property held for the production of income). This loss treatment also is provided in the case of major disasters for losses of personal assets held for over 6 months (such as a personal residence), whether or not it is covered by any insurance.

The Finance Committee reported the bill with numerous amendments, and at adjournment the bill was pending on the Senate Calendar.

H.R. 7621 (Mr. Dow); see Public Law 89-241 (H.R. 7969). As unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House on June 9, 1965, the purpose of this bill was to close a tariff loophole by amending the Tariff Schedules of the United States to limit the term "button blanks" to raw or crude blanks suitable for manufacture into buttons. The substance of this bill was adopted by the Senate as an amendment to H.R. 7969 (*infra*), the "Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act of 1965", and it became law as a part of that legislation.

H.R. 7723 (Mr. King of California); Public Law 89–392, app. April 14, 1966. As unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and as enacted into law, this legislation provided for the suspension of duties on certain tropical hardwood lumbers until Jan. 1, 1968. The provision of the House bill authorizing the President, in certain circumstances, to proclaim the continuance beyond that date of such duty-free treatment was deleted in the Senate, and this amendment was accepted by the House. The products covered by the bill are certain hardwood lumbers which the Tariff Commission has determined to be tropical forestry commodities of kinds not produced in significant quantities in the United States.

H.R. 7969 (Mr. Mills); Public Law 89–241, app. October 7, 1965. The purpose of this legislation, the "Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act of 1965," was to provide for the correction of certain errors which, through oversight, inadvertence, or lack of adequate information, had been made by the Tariff Commission in preparing the Tariff Schedules of the United States (TSUS).

TSUS was the product of many years of work by the Tariff Commission under legislative directive to compile a revision and consolidation of the laws prescribing the tariff status of imported articles with a view to their simplification. Duty changes were to be avoided except where required as an incident to the accomplishment of the purposes of the legislation. The result of the Tariff Commission efforts was a revised set of tariff schedules which the Congress ultimately adopted by the Tariff Classification Act of 1962. After some revision under legislative criteria, the new schedules became effective on August 31, 1963.

Since the adoption of the new schedules, a number of errors had come to light, and the purpose of H.R. 7969 was to gather these errors together and make corrections in one bill, rather than deal with them piecemeal.

H.R. 8147 (Mr. Mills); Public Law 89–62, app. June 30, 1965. As enacted into law, this legislation made permanent the previously temporary reduction to $100 in the amount of goods that a returning resident of the United States may bring back into this country free of duty, and changed the basis of valuation from wholesale value to fair retail value. The bill also contained provisions which, among other things, (1) reduced the quantity of alcoholic beverages that may be included in the exemption from 1 wine gallon to 1 quart (except in the case of persons returning from the Virgin Islands, Guam, or American Samoa) and limited the exercise of this privilege to persons age 21 or over; (2) reestablished and made permanent with certain changes the special temporary exemption provisions which had previously applied to U.S. residents returning from the Virgin Islands and extended those provisions to also include persons returning from American Samoa or Guam; and (3) limited the exemption to articles accompanying the individual on his return to the United States.

The legislation was recommended by the administration as one of several steps proposed by the President to deal with the continuing deficit in our balance of payments. The Secretary of the Treasury advised the Committee on Ways and Means that the temporary reduction in duty-free exemption had been effective in bringing about balance-of-payments savings, and the committee concluded that this action was warranted.

H.R. 8188 (Mr. Betts); reported to Senate July 22, 1966. As reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, the purpose of this bill was to provide income tax deductions for gifts made in 1966 and 1967 to nonprofit organizations supporting or opposing the reorganization of the judicial branch of a State or local government through initiatives or referendums on constitutional amendments occurring in those years. The bill was reported in the Senate with several amendments, and at adjournment was pending on the Senate Calendar.

H.R. 8210 (Mr. Miller); Public Law 89–353; app. February 2, 1966. As unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and as enacted, this bill provided that at the discretion of the President the European Space Research Organization (ESRO), an organization of 11 Western European countries engaged in the planning of scientific activities in the peaceful use of outer space which is interested in establishing a small satellite telemetry command station near Fairbanks, Alaska, may be designated by the President as an international organization for purposes of the International Organizations Immunities Act. Upon such a designation, the organization, to the extent provided by the President, will be exempt from customs duties on property imported for the activities it engages in, from income taxes, from withholding taxes on wages, and from excise taxes on services and facilities. In addition, the employees of the international organization (other than nationals of the United States) may not be subject to U.S. income tax on the income they received from ESRO.

H.R. 8244 (Mr. Herlong); passed House October 21, 1966. The purpose of this bill, as unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, was to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that in determining the ordinary retail price of a cigar in its principal market for the purpose of assessing the Federal excise tax on cigars (which is based on the ordinary retail price of a cigar in its principal market), the amount to be excluded from the retail price on account of a State or local tax which is not an even number of cents shall be rounded up to the next highest full cent, except where rounding would result in reducing the Federal excise tax to a level below that which would be imposed in the absence of a State or local tax.

H.R. 8371 (Mr. Mills); Public Law 89–44, app. June 21, 1965. This legislation, the "Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965," represented a comprehensive overhaul of the Federal excise tax structure, and provided for the repeal, either outright or on a scheduled basis, of four of the five retailers' excise taxes, most of the manufacturers' excise taxes, and a number of the other excise taxes. Substantially all of the remaining excise taxes represent either user charges, regulatory taxes, or the sumptuary taxes on alcohol, cigarettes, and cigars. The rates of tax on alcoholic beverages and cigarettes were made permanent, as was the tax on transportation of persons by air. The act contained a number of structural changes, generally consisting of administrative changes to simplify application of the law for both the taxpayers and the Internal Revenue Service.

(*See* H.R. 12752, *infra,* for later action postponing rate reductions in excise tax on passenger automobiles and telephone service.)

H.R. 8376 (Mr. Schneebeli); Public Law 89–431, app. May 26, 1966. The purpose of this bill, which was unanimously reported to the House and enacted into law without amendment, was to make permanent the existing duty-free treatment for certain corkboard insulation. The Committee on Ways and Means was advised that there is no longer any production of corkboard insulation in the United States and that the former domestic producers have become importers in order to supply and continue their businesses as applicators and suppliers of corkboard insulations.

H.R. 8436 (Mr. Mills); before President for approval. This legislation, as enacted into law, established a system of Federal quotas to limit the number of watch and watch movements containing foreign components which may be imported duty-free from the Virgin Islands, Guam and American Samoa. The quota in any calendar year is to be equal to one-ninth of the total United States watch consumption for the prior year, and is to be divided among the insular possessions, with the largest share to go to the Virgin Islands in recognition of their already-established watch industry. (Seven-eighths of the quota amount goes to the Virgin Islands and the remaining one-eighth is to be divided, two-thirds to Guam and one-third to American Samoa.) The need for the legislation arose out of the sudden growth of watch assembly operations in the insular possessions and the mounting increases in shipments of watches and watch movements from there to the United States, making it obvious that the practice was being used to avoid import duties providing protection for U.S. industry and labor.

Also included in the bill as enacted were provisions permitting the free entry of one variable pressure water channel for the use of Stevens Institute of Technology and one ionosonde for the University of Illinois.

H.R. 8445 (Mr. Mills); Public Law 89–354, app. February 2, 1966. As unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and enacted into law, the purpose of this bill was to eliminate an inequity in the provisions prescribing the formula for computing retired pay for judges of the Tax Court of the United States. Under prior law the retired pay of a judge of the Tax Court, unlike the retired pay of judges of other Federal courts, was based on the salary payable to him as judge "at the time he ceases to be a judge" rather than on the salary of the office, the normal basis utilized in computing retired pay for judges of the U.S. district courts and of the U.S. Court of Claims.

This legislation eliminated this disparate treatment in the law by providing for the calculation of retired pay of Tax Court judges in a manner similar to that presently provided for judges of the other Federal tribunals.

H.R. 8464 (Mr. Mills); Public Law 89–49, app. June 24, 1965. This legislation, which was enacted into law without amendment, provided a temporary increase in the public debt limit to $328 billion for the period beginning July 1, 1965, and ending on June 30, 1966. In the absence of legislation, the debt limitation would have reverted on July 1, 1965, to the permanent limit of $285 billion.

In the report of the Committee on Ways and Means on this bill, it was noted that the committee had requested the Treasury Department and the Bureau of the Budget to determine whether in their view there are guidelines for establishing a new permanent debt ceiling which would be realistic in light of the present level of the debt, and to report back to the committee on this subject.

H.R. 8664 (Mr. Mills); Public Law 89–651, app. October 14, 1966. The purpose of this legislation was to implement the Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials, commonly referred to as the Florence Agreement. The Florence Agreement is an international agreement, sponsored by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), which was opened for signature on November 22, 1950, and was designed to facilitate the free flow of educational, scientific, and cultural materials by the removal of barriers that impede the international movement of such materials.

The agreement provides for the accomplishment of its purposes through provision for the duty-free importation of educational, scientific, and cultural materials. H.R. 8664, which was enacted into law as unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, amended the Tariff Schedules of the United States, with certain procedural safeguards, to permit the duty-free treatment envisaged by the agreement to the extent that the materials provided for therein were not already free of duty.

H.R. 9042 (Mr. Mills); Public Law 89–283, app. October 21, 1965. This legislation, the "Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965," provided for the implementation of the Agreement Concerning Automotive Products Between the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada, signed by President Johnson and Prime Minister Pearson on January 16, 1965.

The legislation provided authority to the President to carry out the U.S. undertaking under the Automotive Products Agreement to remove the U.S. duties on imports of Canadian motor vehicles and original equipment for new motor vehicles. Canada removed its duties from U.S. imports on January 18, 1965. The Agreement was the culmination of the efforts of representatives of both governments to solve a problem which had led to actions that threatened a trade war between the two countries.

H.R. 9280 (Mr. Talcott); passed House October 21, 1966. As unanimously reported to the House, this bill would exempt from the 11-percent excise tax on the sale by the manufacturer, producer, or importer of shells, cartridges and firearms (other than pistols and revolvers) shells and other devices designed specifically for use in frightening or herding birds without injuring them. Such shells and cartridges, which contain delayed-action explosives not useful for hunting purposes, are used by farmers and others to protect crops from wild birds, for herding wild birds into sanctuaries, and for other purposes, and the Committee on Ways and Means was of the opinion that such shells or cartridges were not of the type Congress had in mind when it imposed this tax.

H.R. 9570 (Mr. Jennings); Public Law 89–184, app. September 15, 1965. The purpose of this bill, which was reported to the House unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means and was enacted into law without amendment, was to amend the Federal Firearms Act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to relieve applicants from certain provisions of the act if he determines that the granting of relief would not be contrary to the public interest, and that the applicant would not be likely to conduct his operations in an unlawful manner. The committee concluded, after examination of a situation which had been brought to its attention, that under certain circumstances it would be desirable to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to grant relief from the disabilities imposed under the Federal Firearms Act in the case of felony convictions, where the felony concerned did not involve the use of firearms or other weapons or any violation under the Federal or National Firearms Act. The Departments of the Treasury and Justice submitted reports interposing no objection to the enactment of this legislation.

H.R. 9883 (Mr. Thompson of Texas); Public Law 89–389, app. April 14, 1966. This bill, which was reported to the House unanimously, revised the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the special option for small business corporations and their shareholders to be taxed basically like partnerships and their partners. The amendments of the Senate, making minor technical changes in the provisions of the House bill and adding a provision repealing the special option for partnerships and proprietorships to be taxed basically like corporations, were accepted by the House and the bill became law as thus amended.

H.R. 10185 (Mr. Utt); Public Law 89–359, app. March 7, 1966. As unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, and as enacted into law, this bill amended the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that if any part of a deficiency with respect to estate tax liability is due to fraud with intent to evade tax, the penalty to be imposed is 50 percent of the total amount of the deficiency, rather than 50 percent of the total tax liability. This action conformed the rule under the 1939 Code to the rule applicable in the case of estate tax deficiencies under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

H.R. 10625 (Mr. Mills); Public Law 89–365; app. March 8, 1966. As unanimously reported to the Committee on Ways and Means and as enacted, this bill made a series of amendments to the Internal Revenue Code designed to provide essentially the same tax treatment under the retired serviceman's family protection plan where provision is made for annuities for surviving spouses or certain child beneficiaries as already is provided in the case of the civil service retirement program and other qualified pension plans. Both the Department of the Treasury and the Department of Defense favored this legislation.

H.R. 10998 (Mr. Boggs); Public Law 89–432, app. May 31, 1966. This bill, which was enacted into law without amendment, continued through Aug. 8, 1969, the existing suspension of import duty on heptanoic acid. This duty has been continuously suspended since 1960, on a temporary basis, and the Committee on Ways and Means is advised that there is no production of this acid in the United States.

H.R. 11029 (Mr. Keogh); Public Law 89–405; app. April 19, 1966. This legislation was designed to close certain loopholes in the U.S. Tariff Schedules which enable foreign manufacturers to so manipulate the manufacture of certain fabrics as to avoid higher duties that would apply in the absence of such manipulation. Like other legislation designed to frustrate tariff avoidance practices, the purpose of this bill was to assure the full payment of the duty actually intended to apply to particular products.

H.R. 11158 (Mr. Mills); passed House October 21, 1966. The purpose of this bill, as unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, is to provide an improved method of financing, managing, and accounting for certain administrative service operations provided by the Department of the Treasury to its bureaus and offices, by establishing a working capital fund for that Department. The fund would be a revolving fund of working capital employed to finance administrative service operations servicing more than one appropriation or activity and meeting the test of being more advantageous and economically performed as central services. Under the bill as reported, a $1 million limitation would be placed on the capital in the working fund.

H.R. 11216 (Mr. Mills); before President for approval. The purpose of this bill, as unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House, was to eliminate an impediment to allowance in duty under item 807.00 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to U.S. products previously exported and returned to this country as components of articles assembled abroad. A clause in item 807.00 denied the benefit afforded unless the particular U.S. products contained in the returned assembled article are, prior to their exportation, identified to the U.S. Customs as being intended for assembly abroad and returned to the United States as components of particular articles. This requirement proved to be onerous both to the U.S. exporters and to the customs authorities. The bill eliminated the requirement, which was not a feature of the law prior to the adoption of the new Tariff Schedules.

Under the conference agreement on the bill, the House-passed bill was retained with technical changes in the effective date, and provisions were included in the bill (1) relating to the duty treatment of acrylic resin and polyester resin buttons (finished or unfinished) which are the product of an insular possession of the United States and which are manufactured or produced from button blanks or unfinished buttons which were the product of any foreign country, (2) providing duty-free treatment for enumerated articles (whether or not in sets) which are fabricated to specification and designed for the classroom instruction for children and imported exclusively for the use of the institution involved and not for distribution, sale, or other commercial use, (3) providing for the free entry of certain scientific instruments for specified educational institutions, and (4) providing for the free entry of certain articles donated by Canadians to the International Peace Garden, Dunseith, North Dakota.

H.R. 11256 (Mr. Mills); before President for approval. This legislation, the "Federal Tax Lien Act of 1966"; amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the priority and effect of Federal tax liens and levies, represents the first comprehensive revision and modernization of the provisions of the internal revenue laws concerned with the relationships of Federal tax liens to the interests of other creditors.

The bill, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, was designed to conform the lien provisions of the internal revenue laws to the concepts developed in the Uniform Commercial Code (promulgated over ten years ago by the American Law Institute and the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, a revised version being already law in over 40 States), and represents an effort to adjust provisions relating to the collection of taxes of delinquent persons to the developments in commercial practice (permitted and protected under State law) and to deal with a multitude of technical problems which have risen over the past fifty years. The legislation represents the culmination of a project initiated approximately ten years ago by those concerned with the relationship of the tax lien provisions to the interests of other creditors.

H.R. 11257 (Mr. Multer); reported to Senate October 13, 1966. As unanimously reported to the House, this bill would extend the tax-free treatment originally provided with respect to distributions required as the result of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, to distributions of property acquired on or before April 12, 1965, which must be made as a result of the 1966 amendments to that act. The treatment would be made available only if all of the distributions made in kind are made on a pro rata basis to all shareholders. The bill was reported to the Senate without change in the House-passed provisions but with the addition of a provision amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a special deduction for additions to an extraordinary loss reserve for amounts which State law or regulations require a mortgage guaranty insurance company to add to such a reserve, but not in excess of 50 percent of earned premiums, with certain limitations. At adjournment the bill was pending on the Senate Calendar.

H.R. 11653 (Mr. Harvey of Michigan); Public Law 89-433, app. May 31, 1966. As unanimously reported to the House and enacted into law, the purpose of this bill was to make permanent the existing temporary suspension of duty on natural amorphous graphite, crude and refined, valued at $50 per ton or less. The committee was advised that since 1959 there has been no commercial production of this mineral, which has a wide variety of industrial uses and on which the duty has been continuously suspended, on a temporary basis, since 1960, and thus concluded that provision for permanent suspension of duty is warranted.

H.R. 11660 (Mr. Mills); before President for approval. The purpose of this legislation, which was enacted into law as unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, was to make two changes in the tax laws. First, the provisions of law regarding payment of interest with respect to refunds of overpayments of income tax, which provide that no interest is to be paid if the refund is made within 45 days after the last date prescribed for the filing of the return, were supplemented by the addition of a provision that no interest is to be paid with respect to such refunds if the refund is made within 45 days after the date the return is actually filed. Secondly, the bill extended to taxpayers with an investment credit carryback the quick refund procedure already available to taxpayers with a net operating loss carryback. Under the new provision, a taxpayer will be permitted to file an application for a quick refund of tax to the extent he can use a carryback of the investment credit in any of the three prior years.

H.R. 11765 (Mr. Keogh); See H.R. 13103. As unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House, this bill provided that any gain on the lapse of an option granted by a taxpayer as part of a "straddle" (a combination of an option to buy and an option to sell a predetermined amount of a specified security at a fixed price for a limited period of time) is to be treated as a short-term capital gain (rather than ordinary income). The treatment would not apply to dealers (persons who hold securities for sale to customers in the ordinary course of their trade or business).

The Senate passed the substance of the bill as an amendment to H.R. 13103, *supra*, and it became law as a part of that legislation.

H.R. 11782 (Mr. Schneebeli); before President for approval. This bill, which was enacted into law in the form reported to the House, amended the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a taxpayer who is a dealer in property may take an income tax deduction for reasonable additions to a reserve for bad debts which arise from his contingent liability as a guarantor, endorser, or indemnitor of debt obligations arising out of the sale by him of real property or tangible personal property (including related services) in the ordinary course of the dealer's business. This is to be the only deduction allowable for additions to a reserve for bad debts for obligations of this type.

H.R. 12262 (Mr. Mills); Public Law 89-437, app. May 31, 1966. This bill, which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means and enacted into law, without amendment, continued for 3 years, through June 30, 1969, the existing suspension of duty on copying lathes used for making rough or finished shoe lasts from models of shoe lasts and capable of producing more than one size shoe from a single size model of a shoe last. There is no domestic production of these lathes, and the committee was advised by the Department of Labor that "the sole effect of permitting restoration of the * * * duty on this article would be to increase costs to domestic shoe manufacturers."

H.R. 12318 (Mr. Burke); see H.R. 11216. The purpose of this bill, as unanimously reported to the House, was to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States by providing for the free importation of certain specialized educational equipment (teaching aids needed under the Montessori method of instruction). The Tariff Schedules already provide duty free treatment of teaching aids used in ordinary classroom instruction, but these provisions do not include some teaching aids needed for special instruction under unique methods. Under the bill, the articles must be imported exclusively for the use of the institution involved, and not for distribution, sale, or other commercial use, in order to qualify for the duty-free treatment. The provision was passed by the Senate as an amendment to H.R. 11216, *supra*, and became law as part of that legislation.

H.R. 12328 (Mr. Keogh); Public Law 89-573, app. September 13, 1966. As unanimously reported to the House and enacted into law, this bill extended for 3 years, through September 30, 1969, the period during which certain extracts suitable for tanning (including extracts of hemlock or eucalyptus) may be imported free of duty. The duty on these tanning extracts has been suspended continuously, on a temporary basis, for several years, and the Committee on Ways and Means was advised that there is no information to indicate that the considerations which originally led to the suspension are not also pertinent at the present time.

H.R. 12461 (Mr. Betts); Public Law 89-575, app. September 13, 1966. This bill, which was reported unanimously and enacted into law without amendment, continued for 3 years, through September 5, 1969, the existing suspension of duty on processed istle fiber. This suspension of duty has been in effect continuously, on a temporary basis, since 1957. The Committee on Ways and Means was advised that conditions continue to warrant the suspension of duty, the object of which has been to reduce the burden of higher prices on domestic users of these fibers.

H.R. 12463 (Mr. Boggs); Public Law 89-439, app. May 31, 1966. This bill, which was reported unanimously and enacted into law without amendment, would continue for 3 years, through June 30, 1969, the existing suspension of duty on crude chicory roots and the existing reduced rate of duty on chicory roots, ground for otherwise prepared. The Committee on Ways and Means is advised that no chicory has been grown in the United States since 1954.

H.R. 12657 (Mr. Boggs); Public Law 89-440, app. May 31, 1966. As unanimously reported to the House and as enacted into law, this bill continued for an additional 2 years, to the close of July 15, 1968, the suspension of duty applicable to alumina when imported for use in producing aluminum and the suspension of duties on calcined bauxite and bauxite ore.

H.R. 12676 (Mr. Monagan); Public Law 89-468, app. June 23, 1966. The purpose of this legislation, which was enacted into law as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, was to suspend temporarily, for the period February 9, 1966, through June 30, 1968, the duties applicable to unwrought copper (except nickel silver), copper waste and scrap, and copper articles imported to be used in remanufacture by melting. The bill also suspended for the same period the duties applicable to the copper content of certain copperbearing ores and materials.

H.R. 12752 (Mr. Mills); Public Law 89-368, app. March 15, 1966. This legislation, the "Tax Adjustment Act of 1966", was designed to contribute revenues to aid in financing the increased costs of government associated with operations in Vietnam in such a manner as to avoid the creation of serious inflationary pressures. As reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, the provisions of the bill, which were based upon the President's recommendations with certain important modifications, fell into two categories—those not affecting tax liability but relating to procedures for tax collection, and those providing a 2-year moratorium on scheduled rate reductions for excise taxes on passenger automobile and telephone service.

As enacted into law, the major provisions of the bill were: (1) a graduated withholding tax on wage income, insuring that in most cases amounts withheld will more closely approximate final tax liability; (2) quarterly payments of estimated self-employment tax; (3) acceleration of corporation income tax payments, under which quarterly payments of corporations with estimated income tax liability greater than $100,000 will reach a current basis in 1967; (4) a requirement that the total of amounts withheld from wages and quarterly payments of estimated tax must generally equal 80 percent or more of the tax shown on the return; (5) a "moratorium" on the reductions in rates of taxes on passenger automobiles and on telephone and teletypewriter services provided in the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965 (H.R. 8371, *supra*), the rates as scheduled under that Act to be restored as of April 1, 1968; (6) a new section in title II of the Social Security Act providing a cash benefit of $35 per month, with certain limitations, to persons not otherwise eligible for benefits under that title becoming aged 72 before 1968, with an additional $17.50 for an eligible spouse; (7) an increase from $10 to $50 in the retail value of gifts that may be sent duty-free by servicemen in combat zones; and (8) a provision disallowing the deduction for income tax purposes, of certain indirect contributions to political parties.

H.R. 12864 (Mr. MILLS); Public Law 89-436, app. May 1, 1966. As unanimously reported and as enacted into law, this bill amended the Tariff Schedules of the United States to make permanent the existing duty-free treatment of personal and household effects brought into the United States under U.S. Government orders. This duty-free importation privilege has been in effect continuously since 1942 by means of temporary continuations. Its principal effect has been to avoid the imposition of undue administrative burdens upon persons evacuated to the United States, thus constituting an important morale factor and inducement to overseas service.

H.R. 12997 (Mr. FULTON of Tennessee); Public Law 89-434, app. May 31, 1966. The purpose of this legislation was to continue until the close of July 15, 1968, the existing suspension of duty on electrodes imported for use in producing aluminum. This temporary provision was originally enacted as a part of the Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act of 1965, and the Committee on Ways and Means was advised that the considerations which led the Congress to suspend the duties on these electrodes at that time still exist.

H.R. 13103 (Mr. MILLS); before President for approval. This legislation, the "Foreign Investors Tax Act of 1966," as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, provided an extensive revision of the methods for taxing income derived from the United States by foreign individuals and corporations. It was the first systematic revision of the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to this subject in over 25 years. The provisions of the bill, as approved by the Committee and passed by the House, were designed to provide more equitable tax treatment for foreign investment in the United States. The changes were also designed to stimulate foreign investment in this country by modifying existing tax rules which were not consistent with sound tax policy and which acted as barriers to such investment. The measure was a part of the President's program to improve the United States balance of payments, and its provisions were largely based on the report of the task force on "Promoting Increased Foreign Investment in U.S. Corporate Securities and Increased Foreign Financing for U.S. Corporations Operating Abroad."

For the most part the changes made in the Senate to those provisions of the House-passed bill which were concerned with the taxation of foreign corporations and nonresident aliens were of a perfecting or technical nature. That portion of the measure therefore, which is Title I of the Public Law, reflects the House provisions with relatively minor amendments.

The Senate also included and added as Titles II and III of the measure a number of amendments to other areas of the Internal Revenue Code. As a result of the Senate amendments, the measure, as finally approved, contains rules relating to the application of the investment credit to property used in possessions of the United States; the basis of property received on liquidation of certain subsidiary corporations; the tax treatment of swap funds under section 351 of the Code; liberalization of the provisions of the Self-Employed Individuals Tax Retirement Act of 1962; exclusion of certain rents from personal holding company income; an increase in depletion rates for certain clay-bearing alumina, mollusk shells and certain shale, clay and slate; the tax treatment of straddle transactions; the taxation of per-unit retain allocations; excise tax rates on ambulances and hearses; and certain exclusions from the application of the interest equalization tax.

Title III of the Public Law contains the amendment, added in the Senate, which is designed to obtain public support for Presidential election campaign financing by giving taxpayers an opportunity to designate on their annual income tax returns that $1 of their income tax liability is to be placed in a Presidential Election Campaign Fund, from which funds are to be made available to defray expenses incurred by political parties in presenting candidates for President and Vice President. Amounts would be payable from the fund only to those political parties where candidates received at least 5,000,000 votes in preceding presidential elections.

Title IV contains the Senate amendments providing authority for the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the issuance of United States notes denominated in foreign currencies, and also requiring the Secretary to submit a report to the Congress each year indicating the amount of the contingent liabilities and unfunded liabilities of the Federal Government and the assets of the Federal Government which might be made available to liquidate such liabilities.

H.R. 13116 (Mrs. GRIFFITHS); passed House October 21, 1966. As unanimously reported to the House, this bill would restore to certain unfinished nonmalleable cast iron machine parts the tariff rate which was applicable to such parts immediately prior to the effective date of the Tariff Schedules of the United States. The general provision for cast iron castings previously applicable (under which such castings were dutiable at the rate of 3 percent ad valorem) was not continued in the TSUS because it was ambiguous in certain respects, and special provisions for such products were created in order to continue the substance of the past tariff treatment. However, no special provision was created to cover the parts covered by this bill and they are now dutiable under items providing a higher rate of duty. The bill would restore the 3-percent rate to such products.

H.R. 13363 (Mr. KING of California); passed House October 21, 1966. This bill, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, would continue from February 4, 1966, through December 30, 1966, the time in which importers may file requests for reclassification of imports under certain lower tariff-rate provisions of the Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act of 1965. That act had provided for the restoration of lower rates of duty with respect to certain articles, and further provided that these changes in rates would be retroactive to August 30, 1963, if the importer would file his request for such changed tariff treatment within 120 days after the act was approved by the President. The committee was advised that the time provided was not sufficient for the processing of all the entries, and concluded that an extension of the filing period was justified.

H.R. 13431 (Mr. MILLS); Public Law 89-480, app. June 30, 1966. This legislation, which was enacted into law without amendment, extended for 2 years, through June 30, 1968, the Renegotiation Act of 1951, under which the Government can recapture excessive profits on certain Government contracts and subcontracts, without change in the existing provisions of that act.

H.R. 13455 (Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania); reported to House October 18, 1966. The purpose of this bill is to amend the definition of the term "physician" for purposes of the supplementary medical insurance program (part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act) to include a doctor of podiatry or surgical chiropody, thereby covering the services of such doctors under the medicare program (but excluding routine foot care such as the treatment of corns or calluses, etc.).

H.R. 14224 (Mr. MILLS); see Public Law 89-384 (H.R. 6319). As reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill provided for an extension, through May 31, 1966, of the initial period for enrollment under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged. The bill also provided that a State which enters into an agreement under which public assistance recipients aged 65 and over may be enrolled in supplementary medical insurance, may, at its option, include as enrollees persons who are on the Social Security or Railroad Retirement benefit rolls.

Subsequent to House passage of this bill, the proceedings were vacated and the language of H.R. 14224 was adopted as an amendment to a Senate amendment to H.R. 6319, to which the Senate agreed, and the provision became law as a part of that legislation.

H.R. 14363 (Mrs. GRIFFITHS); reported to Senate October 18, 1966. As unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House, this bill would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide specific rules designed to facilitate the determination of entitlement to the $600 deduction for dependents in the case of children of divorced or separated parents. Under the provisions of existing law, this determination has become a source of annoyance to taxpayers and has created a serious administrative burden on the Internal Revenue Service, which the bill was designed to alleviate. The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, and at adjournment was pending on the Senate Calendar.

H.R. 15119 (Mr. MILLS); sent to conference October 12, 1966. This bill, the "Unemployment Insurance Amendment of 1966", was designed to provide major improvements in the Federal-State unemployment compensation program, and was the product of the broadest and most intense review the Committee on Ways and Means has given to the unemployment compensation program since it was enacted in 1935 as part of the Social Security Act.

The changes in the program provided by the bill as reported by the committee would extend coverage to additional jobs, establish a permanent program of extended benefits during periods of high unemployment, furnish the States a procedure for obtaining judicial review of certain determinations of the Secretary of Labor, improve the financing of the program, provide additional State requirements, and make other changes to strengthen and improve the Federal-State unemployment compensation program.

The Senate passed the bill with numerous substantive amendments to the House-passed version, and the Committee of Conference did not arrive at an agreement on these matters prior to the adjournment of Congress.

H.R. 15202 (Mr. MILLS); Public Law 89-472, app. June 24, 1966. This legislation, which was enacted into law without amendment, provided a further temporary increase in the public debt limit to $330 billion for the period beginning on July 1, 1966, and ending on June 30, 1967. In the absence of legislation, the debt limit would have reverted on July 1, 1966, to the permanent limit of $285 billion.

H.R. 16077 (Mr. Boggs); passed House October 21, 1966. As reported to the House, this bill would authorize the President in a trade agreement to eliminate or provide for the reduction of duty on dicyandiamide, without staging as would otherwise be required. The present rate of duty on imports of dicyandiamide is 10½ percent ad valorem. The committee was advised that dicyandiamide is not produced in the United States, and is obtained principally from a Canadian plant. It is used primarily to make melamine, which in turn is used in the manufacture of certain types of plastic.

H.R. 16092 (Mr. King of California); reported to House October 14, 1966. As reported to the House, this bill would suspend, through June 30, 1968, the import duty on electronic receiving tubes (except cathode-ray tubes).

H.R. 16160 (Mr. Ullman); passed House October 21, 1966. The purpose of this bill, as unanimously reported to and passed by the House, was to provide for the tariff treatment of fresh Chinese gooseberries at a rate equivalent to the general tariff level applied to berries rather than the level applied to "other fruits." This would have the effect of changing the applicable rate of duty for fresh Chinese gooseberries from 17.5 percent ad valorem to 0.75 cents per pound. The Committee on Ways and Means was advised that imports of these berries, which are now primarily from New Zealand, are small in volume and relatively high in price, and do not directly compete with any domestic product.

H.R. 16774 (Mr. Mills); Public Law 89–692, app. October 15, 1966. This legislation, which was unanimously reported and enacted into law without amendment, continued for 2 years the tax treatment which had been available for taxable years ending before January 1, 1967, under which a deduction for accrued vacation pay is not to be denied solely because the liability for it to a specific person has not been fixed or because the liability for it to each individual cannot be computed with reasonable accuracy. This action postponed for 2 more years the effective date of Revenue Ruling 54–608, thus giving the Congress further time to consider the problem of the deduction of accrued vacation pay and of other similar accrual-type deductions.

H.R. 17271 (Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin); before President for approval. The purpose of this legislation, which was unanimously reported and enacted into law without amendment, was to increase from $200 to $500 per month the special exclusion, for income tax purpose, granted to commissioned officers for pay received for services in combat zones or for related hospitalization. Pay received by enlisted personnel for service in a combat zone was already fully tax exempt. These exemption provisions had not been revised since the Korean conflict and military pay raises since that time had distorted the intended balance in the provisions. The bill was designed to corerct the resulting tax inequity.

H.R. 17607 (Mr. Mills); before President for approval. The purpose of this legislation, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, was to suspend for a temporary period two tax incentives for investment in plant and equipment and other investment property; namely, the 7-percent investment credit, and, in the case of buildings (not eligible for the credit) certain forms of accelerated depreciation. The bill was a part of the Administration's program to moderate the pace of the economy to a more sustainable level of economic growth.

As finally approved, the measure suspends the investment credit for the period Oct. 10, 1966, through Dec. 31, 1967. The investment credit will continue to apply, however, to investments up to $20,000 made by a taxpayer or a business during the suspension period. It also suspends the use of the double declining balance and sum of the years' digits methods of accelerated depreciation on buildings which are constructed or ordered during the suspension period. An exception is provided, however, to permit the use of these methods on buildings constructed during the suspension period provided that they do not cost more than $50,000. This exception may not exceed $50,000 per taxpayer.

As a result of a committee amendment, added to the bill on the floor of the House, a specific exception is provided to permit use of the investment credit during the suspension period with respect to investment in air and water pollution control facilities.

Rules are also included to provide exceptions to the suspension of the credit and accelerated depreciation with respect to property whose physical construction was begun before the beginning of the suspension period or which is constructed or acquired pursuant to a contract which was binding on the taxpayer before the beginning of the suspension period and at all times thereafter.

As a result of amendments added to H.R. 17607 in the Senate, two other provisions were included in the bill, as finally approved. The first of these authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to issue a new type of retirement bond at interest rates up to 5 percent. The second amendment is designed to clarify the tax consequences of a merger of the professional football leagues and to indicate that the antitrust laws are not to apply to a joint agreement by which member clubs of two or more professional football leagues combine their operations in an expanded single league.

H.R. 18085 (Mr. Mills); reported to House October 17, 1966. The purpose of this bill as reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means was to amend title II of the Social Security Act to liberalize the present provisions governing the length of time a family relationship must have existed in order for survivors' insurance benefits to be payable on the basis of that relationship. The bill would reduce from 1 year to 6 months the period for which an insured individual's wife, husband, or stepchild (not otherwise qualified) must have occupied that status in order to qualify as a "widow," "widower" or "stepchild" for benefit purposes.

H.R. 18225 (Mr. Mills); reported to House October 11, 1956. The purpose of this bill, which was reported to the House after an extensive examination of the operation of title XIX of the Social Security Act, was to place certain limitations on Federal participation and require certain modifications in the medical assistance programs of the States. The bill would exclude from Federal matching the medical assistance supplied to the relatives of medically needy children. (The medical assistance for the children themselves would still be subject to Federal participation.) Under the bill the so-called comparability section of title XIX would be modified so that there could be separate eligibility and benefit requirements for the age 65 and over group and for the under age 65 groups. This would mean, for instance, that a State could "buy-in" under the Supplementary Medical Insurance (SMI) program (part B or medicare) for its aged but would not have to provide comparable benefits for its under age 65 group. The bill would also permit the States to "buy-in" under the SMI program for their Kerr-Mills and other medically indigent aged. (Under existing law, this "buy-in" is limited to cash recipients.) As a corollary to this, the bill would deny Federal participation under title XIX as to the medically indigent aged whom the States could "buy-in" for under SMI. Another provision would modify the "maintenance of effort" requirement of the 1965 amendments so that the States would be given the option of meeting this requirement on the basis of money payments alone. Additionally, the bill would make the special 175-percent Federal matching as to skilled medical personnel available as to such personnel administering title XIX in State health departments where it is not the single State agency designated under the program.

H.R. 18230 (Mr. Watts); see H.R. 13103. This bill amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that in determining the basis of property received in the liquidation of a subsidiary corporation, stock purchased by a corporation from a subsidiary is to be treated as purchased (irrespective of the attribution rules under sec. 318 of the code), if the stock was in fact purchased. The bill also eliminates an existing tax avoidance possibility by providing that installment notes are, under certain circumstances, to be treated as "disposed of" for purposes of section 453(d) (the installment sales provision).

The substance of this bill was adopted in the Senate as an amendment to H.R. 13103, *supra*, agreed to in conference, and became law as a part of that legislation.

H.J. Res. 688 (Mr. Mills); Public Law 89–634, app. October 8, 1966. The purpose of this resolution, which was enacted into law as unanimously reported to the House by the committee, was to implement the Agreement for Facilitating the International Circulation of Visual and Auditory Materials of an Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Character, approved at Beirut in 1948 (known as the Beirut Agreement). It authorized the President to designate a Federal agency or agencies to assume the responsibility of carrying out the provisions of the agreement, and added new provisions to the Tariff Schedules of the United States to permit duty-free treatment for articles that are determined to be visual or auditory materials of an educational, scientific, or cultural character within the meaning of the agreement. The Committee on Ways and Means was informed that enactment of this legislation would have the effect of increasing the institutional use abroad of certified American educational films and comparable materials, and was further of the opinion that full participation of the United States in the agreement would promote and increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and those of other nations.

S. 701 (Senator Mansfield (by request); Public Law 89–23, app. May 22, 1965. As amended by the Committee on Ways and Means and enacted into law, the purpose of this legislation was to grant the President the authority that would permit the United States to carry out its obligations under the International Coffee Agreement of 1962, which had previously been signed by the United States and ratified by the Senate.

S. 801 (Senators Boggs and Dominick); Public Law 89–677, app. October 15, 1966. The purpose of this legislation was to provide authority, within certain limitations, for Federal agencies to use foreign currencies held by the United States which have been or may be reserved or set aside for specified programs or activities of any agency of the Government. Under the bill, it is required that reimbursement be made to the Treasury from applicable appropriations of the agency concerned, and that foreign currencies so used be replaced when needed for the purposes for which originally reserved which has been provided on a temporary, annual basis for the last 3 fiscal years, and by virtue of which the Committee on Ways and Means was advised it has been possible to defer or avoid the purchase for dollars of a considerable amount of foreign currencies, resulting in a significant, beneficial contribution to the balance-of-payments situation.

S. 1013 (Senator SALTONSTALL); see H.R. 13103. As unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill would require the Secretary of the Treasury to submit annually to the Congress a brief report setting forth the amounts of the contingent and unfunded liabilities of the Federal Government, including those of agencies and instrumentalities of the Government.

A similar provision adopted by the Senate as an amendment to H.R. 13103, *supra*, was modified in conference to require that a report setting forth the aggregate and individual amounts of the contingent liabilities and the unfunded liabilities of the Government be made on the first of each regular session of the Congress with respect to the close of the preceding June 30 (beginning with June 30, 1967, and became law as a part of that legislation.

S. 1760 (Senator FULBRIGHT); before President for approval. The purpose of this legislation was to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to conclude the settlement of a debt arising from a loan by the United States to Greece in 1929, on which no payments have been made since the early years of World War II. Under the terms of the settlement, Greece will repay at interest $13,155,921 in 82 annual installments; the latter with one exception will each amount to approximately $329,000, and the payments thus will total about $26.7 million. The bill provides that the sums so paid by Greece shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States, and it authorizes the appropriation of amounts equivalent to the sums so deposited for use in financing educational and cultural exchange programs authorized by the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 in relation to Greece and the people of Greece.

Both the Department of Labor and the Department of State recommended this legislation and requested its prompt enactment.

PRIVATE BILLS

Twenty-eight private bills were reported by the Committee on Ways and Means during this Congress, 19 of which were enacted into law (2 as a part of other bills). Most of these bills provided for the duty-free entry of certain scientific instruments for the use of specified educational institutions. A listing of the private bills reported by the committee, noted as to the items covered by each and the status of the bill at adjournment, follows:

Private bill No. and author	Date enacted and law No. or status of bill at adjournment	Item for which duty-free entry provided	Institution or organization involved
H.R. 1317 (Mr. Gubser)	Private Law 89-198 (approved Nov. 2, 1965).	Mass spectrometer	Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.
H.R. 1386 (Mr. Lipscomb)	Private Law 89-172 (approved Oct. 30, 1965).	do	Pomona College, Claremont, Calif.
H.R. 2565 (Mr. O'Hara of Illinois)	Private Law 89-199 (approved Nov. 2, 1965).	do	University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
H.R. 3126 (Mr. Pelly)	Private Law 89-181 (approved Oct. 31, 1965).	do	University of Washington.
H.R. 4590 (Mr. Rogers of Colorado)	Private Law 89-232 (approved Apr. 14, 1966).	(1) Stained glass (2) Chipped colored glass windows	Congregation Emanuel, Denver, Colo. St. Ann's Church, Las Vegas, Nev.
H.R. 4832 (Mr. Karsten)	Private Law 89-174 (approved Oct. 30, 1965).	Mass spectrometer	St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.
H.R. 5831 (Mr. O'Brien)	Private Law 89-219 (approved Mar. 7, 1966).	Stained glass and cement windows	Our Lady of the Angels Seminary, Glenmont, N.Y.
H.R. 6666 (Mr. Moorhead)	Private Law 89-208 (approved Nov. 8, 1965).	Spectrograph system	University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.
H.R. 6906 (Mr. Stratton)	Private Law 89-193 (approved Nov. 1, 1965).	Mass spectrometer and split-pole spectrograph.	University of Rochester, Rochester, N.Y.
H.R. 7608 (Mr. Jarman)	Private Law 89-187 (approved Oct. 31, 1965).	Distribution machine	University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.
H.R. 8232 (Mr. Steed)	Private Law 89-195 (approved Nov. 1, 1965).	Mass spectrometer-gas chromatograph	Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Okla.
H.R. 8272 (Mr. Thompson of New Jersey)	Private Law 89-175 (approved Oct. 30, 1965).	Isotope separator	Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.
H.R. 8647 (Mr. Irwin)	Private Law 89-241 (approved Apr. 18, 1966).	Authentic troubador uniforms	Troubadors Drum & Bugle Corps, Bridgeport, Conn.
H.R. 9351 (Mr. Reifel)	Private Law 89-196 (approved Nov. 1, 1965).	Shadomaster measuring projector	University of South Dakota.
H.R. 9587 (Mr. Aspinall)	Private Law 89-197 (approved Nov. 1, 1965).	Craig countercurrent distribution apparatus.	Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colo.
H.R. 9588 (Mr. Boggs)	Private Law 89-177 (approved Oct. 30, 1965).	Rotating chair	Louisiana State University Medical Center, New Orleans, La.
H.R. 9903 (Mr. Giaimo)	Private Law 89-209 (approved Nov. 8, 1965).	(1) Multigap magnetic spectrograph (2) Mass spectrometer (3) Mass spectrometer (4) Digital polarimeter (5) Photomicroscope (6) Rheogoniometer	Yale University. Do. Ohio State University. Smith College. Utah State Training School. Catholic University of America.
H.R. 11753 (Mr. Bray)	Passed House Oct. 21, 1966	Mass spectrometer	Indiana University.
H.R. 11941 (Mrs. Bolton)	Reported to House Oct. 12, 1966 (see H.R. 11216).	Weissenberg rheogoniometer	Case Institute of Technology.
H.R. 12110 (Mr. Minshall)	Passed House Oct. 21, 1966	Ship model	Lutheran Church of the Covenant, Maple Heights, Ohio.
H.R. 12197 (Mr. McCormack)	do	Rheogoniometer	Tufts University, Boston, Mass.
H.R. 13035 (Mr. Rumsfeld)	do	Triaxial apparatus and rheogoniometer	Northwestern University.
H.R. 13190 (Mr. Conte)	do	Carillon	Northfield and Mount Hermon Schools, East Northfield, Mass.
H.R. 13739 (Mr. Nix)	do	Magnetic spectrograph	University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
H.R. 14388 (Mr. Thompson of New Jersey)	do	Mass spectrometer and rheogoniometer	Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.
H.R. 14610 (Mr. Ichord)	do	Double neutron diffractometer	University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
H.R. 14893 (Mr. Rostenkowski)	Passed House Oct. 21, 1966 (See H.R. 8436).	Ionosonde	University of Illinois.
H.R. 15888 (Mr. Tunney)	Passed House Oct. 21, 1966	Carillon	University of California at Riverside.

NOTE.—Free entry provisions were enacted for additional articles as enumerated below following Senate inclusion of the provisions in the public bills specified and their acceptance under the conference agreements on the bills:

H.R. 11216

Item	Institution or organization	Similar bills before Committee on Ways and Means
Mass spectrometer	University of Nebraska	
Do	Utah State University	H.R. 13243 (Mr. Burton of Utah).
Do	University of Hawaii	
Weissenberg rheogoniometer	University of Utah	
Canadian gifts	International Peace Garden, Dunseith, N. Dak.	H.R. 7050 (Mr. Redlin).

H.R. 8436

Item	Institution or organization	Similar bills before Committee on Ways and Means
Variable pressure water channel	Stevens Institute of Technology	H.R. 17507 (Mr. Daniels).

Report of Hon. John H. Buchanan, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BUCHANAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the 89th Congress, and looking forward with anticipation to the 90th, I am submitting the following report to the people of the 6th District of Alabama:

REPORT TO THE PEOPLE

The period from Thanksgiving to Christmas is a time of great significance to all of us. At our house in this season we are particularly thankful for the people of the Sixth District of Alabama.

Betty and I are convinced it is our privilege to represent in Washington the finest people in the land, for which we give thanks to God and to each of you.

It is our prayer that the joy and peace of the Christmas season shall fill your home this year.

HALFWAY TO 1984

As the 89th Congress has ended and 1966 draws to a close, we are halfway to 1984. Eighteen years ago, in 1948, George Orwell wrote his famous political novel, "1984" which described an England and a world in the tight grip of totalitarianism. The book's antihero, "Big Brother," has come to stand for an all-powerful central government which controls totally the citizens of a state.

Eighteen years have now passed since the publication of "1984" with another 18 years to go before we arrive at 1984. I believe it is no exaggeration to say Big Brother has come to this country and to suggest that we are halfway to 1984 in time, and in space too. Let us see just how close to that fateful year we are by examining the 2d session of the 89th Congress.

If all the legislation considered in the 89th Congress had been passed, we would have been catapulted down the road to "big brotherism." And the individual, whose integrity, imagination and drive built this great Nation, would have been reduced to a mere cipher. Fortunately, some measures were defeated or modified. As the 1966 elections drew near, proportion began to replace distortion and by the end of the year Congress looked less and less like a rubberstamp and more and more like one of the three equal branches of our Government.

The major international challenge was the war in Vietnam. Our troops stand on far distant shores in southeast Asia and elsewhere as sentinels of freedom and against tyranny. On the homefront, we were faced with rising inflation and a myriad of "Big Brother" domestic proposals which created deep uneasiness among the populace of this Nation. In the view of many of us, these proposals fell short of reaching the source of the problem, while encouraging the Federal Government to take away each individual's opportunity to solve his own problems and to help solve those of his neighbors. What our Nation needs least is Federal programs which, however well intentioned, would regulate, restrict, and eventually eliminate the will of the people to solve their own problems.

VIETNAM AND "BIG RED 1"

One of the highlights of my service in the 89th Congress was the inspiring opportunity to view firsthand our efforts in Vietnam and to meet the valiant men of the "Big Red 1." Let me emphasize that trip was not made at Government expense, rather, many fine people of Birmingham helped finance the trip privately.

I spent much of my time with the 1st Infantry Division, which has been adopted by the city of Birmingham, and wish every citizen of the Sixth District could have been there with me to witness the high morale, the dedication and rugged bravery of these men. They know how to fight, they know why they are fighting and they believe they can succeed in their mission. I believe it too.

Although we are using a bewildering variety of ultramodern weapons in Vietnam, the foot soldier is still of paramount importance. As in wars past, the infantryman is the core of our fighting force and in my conversations with the officers and men of the 1st Infantry Division, they all displayed traditional American determination and conviction that victory can be attained. They base victory on the assumption that we will hit key targets in North Vietnam, that we will halt the supply routes into South Vietnam and that we will stop "Charlie"—the Vietcong—no matter what he does.

Strong, steady military action by the United States is mandatory if we are to win in Vietnam and if the civic action program of our troops is to succeed.

And civic action is important. Our servicemen are working with the Vietnamese to help build schools, roads, hospitals, and most important of all, build up their own self-respect and self-reliance. Because of this program, our men are winning the trust and confidence of the people—which we must have if we are to help them establish a stable and prosperous government.

I believe it is imperative that we hit, and hit hard, the Communists in North Vietnam, but it is equally important that we clean out the Communists in South Vietnam who have encircled Saigon like a great cancer. That cancer must be completely and permanently removed if South Vietnam is to survive as a free nation.

AT THE WHITE HOUSE

On June 29 of this year, I had the opportunity to personally tell the President of my observations on my trip to Vietnam and to express the sentiments of the great majority of the people of the Sixth District of Alabama and America about the war in Vietnam. The place was the White House—the occasion was a 3½-hour meeting in the Cabinet Room between the President and 30 Members of Congress who had visited Vietnam. The time was the first day of the bombing of strategic targets in Hanoi and Haiphong. Each of us was given opportunity to voice our judgment on this and other matters pertaining to the conflict in Vietnam.

In my judgment, the President made the right decision in ordering the bombing of oil depots in Hanoi and Haiphong and the followup attacks on other key targets, including missile sites. Such use of our airpower serves to shorten, rather than lengthen, the war in Vietnam.

I urged the President, and shall continue to urge, that military pressure be increased upon the Communist aggressor, and expressed the hope that the bombings would be the first in a series of bold new steps in support of the American troops who are fighting with such courage and distinction.

What is at stake in southeast Asia is human freedom itself. If Communist tyranny succeeds in its aggression in Vietnam, the peace, freedom, and security of the whole world will be further, and gravely, threatened. The commitment of our Government leaders to human freedom and to victory over godless communism must measure up to that of the young Americans who are giving their all to protect human dignity and liberty in Vietnam, southeast Asia, in all the free world. This is a mission in which we must not fail.

FEDERAL SPENDING AND INFLATION

Inflation has been and continues to be an issue of prime importance to the citizenry of this Nation. But through much of 1966, the President would take no action—indeed, the administration repeatedly denied that we were in an inflationary spiral. In September 1966, after months of debate and indecision, President Johnson finally submitted a special anti-inflation message to Congress. But he failed to aim his program at the root cause of the inflation.

Instead, he called for a suspension of tax credit for new buildings and new equipment. These tax proposals will probably raise business taxes by about $2.5 billion a year once they take hold.

Overspending by business is not the real cause of the money crisis which confronts this country. The President himself mentioned the key problem when he stated in his anti-inflation message that there would have to be cuts in nonwar spending by the Federal Government. This is precisely what was and is needed and many of us had been urging such measures all year long.

But, I wonder, where will the cuts be made, and how deep will they be?

It may be presumed that Great Society programs will be the last to be trimmed. Certainly the President is not going to admit that he has asked for too much money for projects like the war on poverty—although solid evidence has accumulated that he has.

It is true that the Johnson administration has attempted to cut back—but on time-tested projects like the school-lunch program, public works projects, vocational education, and so forth—while still insisting that we should spend nearly $3 billion in new foreign aid. I voted against the foreign aid bill and against an increase in the national debt limit to $330 billion, because Congress has a constitutional obligation to act as the keeper of the public purse.

In short, a reduction in Federal spending, not an increase in income taxes, is the best way to stop inflation. It is up to Congress to trim spending if the administration will not. And quite frankly, there is every reason to think that the Johnson administration is not very interested in spending less so that Americans may enjoy a little more.

For those who think this is a harsh judgment, consider these statistics: In the last 6 years, during the Kennedy-Johnson administration, Government spending has gone up 40 percent. But the greatest rise has not been in defense but in nondefense spending which has increased 80 percent since 1960.

It is clearly up to the Congress to encourage the administration to practice restraint and common sense economics. It is the duty and obligation of the Congress to point out that Government spending is the root cause of much of this Nation's current economic difficulties. This is the kind of anti-inflation message which is needed and which Congress must deliver for the people if the President will not.

THE WAR ON POVERTY AND PUBLIC WELFARE

While our local Birmingham effort seems to be one of the better ones, on a nationwide basis, rarely has a Federal program become so embroiled in waste, mismanagement, and misuse. The antipoverty program has a billion dollar budget but is spending millions on salaries and considerably less in direct aid to the poor. In some cases, towns who want help do not receive it while towns who do not want Federal largesse are inundated with money. In other instances, hard evidence has been produced that subversive elements and leftwing radicals are using antipoverty funds to achieve their own ends.

In other welfare areas, I voted for continued vocational education.

I voted against the Federal aid program for elementary and secondary schools because such aid inevitably leads to Federal control and domination. On the other hand, I have introduced a bill to strengthen State and local governments by returning a part of Federal revenue to them. These additional financial resources would be used to improve elementary and secondary education at the State and local levels.

CIVIL RIGHTS

In the opinion of many, there is a greater need for civil responsibilities than for more civil rights legislation in this land of ours. The cry of "black power" is heard from coast to coast and statistics show that there have been 38 racial riots in our Nation's cities in the first 9 months of 1966. In six cities, National Guardsmen had to be called to stop the rioting.

Against such a background, then, the civil rights bill of 1966 seemed particularly inappropriate and died unmourned in the Senate.

The additional legislation that is needed in this field is the bill I joined in introducing which would make it a Federal offense to travel into another State to incite or foment riots or violence, or to use the telephone or mail to do so.

An antiriot bill is needed. Mob action must not be condoned or encouraged. Protection must not be accorded those who are bent upon civil disobedience and even civil chaos. I believe it is past time to bring those responsible for fomenting riots and violence on an interstate basis under penalty of Federal law.

BUCHANAN LEGISLATION

In the 89th Congress, I introduced various bills which I believe would help solve problems which face our Nation.

Regarding the rising cost of living, I introduced legislation dealing with income tax deductions. One would remove the limitations on the amount deductible for medical, dental, and related expenses. A second bill would permit the taxpayer to deduct certain expenses in connection with his education, that of his spouse, or any dependent at a college or university. I believe that such expenses as tuition, lab and library fees, textbooks, and rooming should be deductible from a citizen's income tax. A third bill would increase the personal income tax exemption from $600 to $1,000. The increased exemption would also apply to the spouse and any dependent.

In several instances civil service legislation which I joined in introducing became law, as was the case with the elimination of excise taxes on various items.

I have also introduced legislation amending the Social Security Act to permit blind persons to earn up to $300 a month without any reduction in aid due them.

In addition, I proposed legislation which would provide a cost-of-living increase in social security benefits. It would mean an increase equal to the rise in the cost-of-living index whenever that index goes up by 3 percent or more.

In the field of national security, I joined in introducing the Pool bill, which passed the House by an overwhelming margin. This legislation provided fines and prison sentences for anyone who gives assistance to forces hostile to the United States, or who obstructs U.S. military personnel or their transportation. Such civil disobedience cannot be permitted when we are fighting Communist aggression in Vietnam.

Another Buchanan bill would have extended the license for radio stations from 3 to 6 years and abolished the renewal requirements for licenses for police cars and other special radio services in our cities. At present, all radio stations must go through rigorous and bureaucratic renewal procedures every 3 years.

I also proposed two pieces of legislation designed to strengthen the principle of States rights. The first would establish rules of interpretation governing the effect of acts of Congress on State laws. In effect, the bill provides that an act of Congress would not preempt a State law in the same field unless the act explicitly states that this is its purpose and intention.

The second item was House Concurrent Resolution 447, which would reaffirm congressional support of and faith in the 10th amendment to the Constitution. I am convinced that such reaffirmation is urgently needed to counterbalance the increasing federalization and centralization of powers which is steadily eroding States rights and responsibilities as well as individual independence and self-reliance.

OTHER LEGISLATION

I supported a new GI bill of rights, extending educational benefits to veterans who have served in our Armed Forces since 1955. It is my belief that the men fighting in Vietnam deserve the same treatment as those who fought for freedom in the Korean war and the Second World War.

I supported legislation establishing safety standards for cars and tires.

I opposed the rent subsidy program which will put lower income families in middle-income houses—at Federal expense.

I voted against the appropriation of $750,000 to build a palatial residence for the Vice President.

I voted for a 5-year program to build and operate libraries.

I voted against the speeding up of the collection of withholding taxes. This is apparently another bookkeeping device of the administration to avoid the realities of economic life, and the requirements of fiscal responsibility.

COMMITTEE WORK

As a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I have become increasingly concerned about the infiltration of the civil rights movement by subversive and extremist elements. Consequently, I have repeatedly stated on the floor of the House that in my judgment an investigation of the civil rights movement would be timely and would constitute a service to the Nation.

Over the last few years, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has stated that while the civil rights movement was not Communist initiated and is not Communist controlled, the Communists have been doing all they can to infiltrate and influence the movement—and have succeeded to some extent.

In my view, no one should have more interest in cleansing the civil rights movement of Communist influence than those persons in and out of the movement, who have an honest interest in the rights of Negroes and the general welfare of this Nation.

In a related area, there was an encouraging development late in the session. Having pressed for such action for many months, I was delighted when the

House Committee on Un-American Activities ordered a preliminary inquiry looking into Communist and extremist influence over the riots which have afflicted our cities.

This is the first step toward a full committee investigation which I am convinced is needed. Chairman Ed Willis appointed me codirector of this inquiry, to serve with the Honorable William Tuck, a former Governor of Virginia, who is ranking majority member of our committee. This probe is currently in progress.

Finally, the investigative hearings on the Ku Klux Klan have been concluded and the committee has reported legislation arising out of these hearings and findings.

My other major committee is the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. One of the most important projects of the Census and Statistics Subcommittee, of which I am ranking minority member, is to help clear away the so-called paperwork jungle in the Federal Government.

It has been reported, for example, that Government paperwork eats up about 7 percent of the Federal budget—some $7 billion in fiscal 1966. Almost 30 percent of all Federal employees find much of their time occupied by paperwork.

The subcommittee has been holding hearings in an attempt to reduce the paperwork and I can report that some progress has been made—although much remains to be done. As you can see, "Big Brother" assumes many different forms in extending his hold on our Government and life.

Second, I serve on the Manpower Subcommittee, which has the responsibility to work toward more effective and efficient use of manpower by the Federal Government.

For example, at the initiative of this committee, some 74,000 professional military people are in process of being replaced and released for combat duty by some 60,000 civilians. These men were serving in the continental United States, doing janitorial work, tending bar in officers clubs, and so forth. In addition to the obvious reduction in the draft requirement, millions of dollars in savings will also result from this increased use of combat-trained military personnel for military assignments while civilians will perform support-type jobs such as carpentry, trucking, statistics and accounting.

The work of my third subcommittee, Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits, has produced considerable legislation. Several bills which I have introduced or cosponsored have been adopted into law and have eliminated certain inequities which had been suffered by retired civil servants who depend upon Congress for their pensions and other retirement needs.

IN CONCLUSION

As I said at the beginning of this report, there is still time to arrest and to reverse the trend toward big brotherism. It is not true that only the Federal Government can solve the problems of education, medicine, employment, production, transportation, and all the other facets of American life. This country is the greatest country in the world because our economic system of private competitive enterprise has produced more jobs, more savings, more homes, higher salaries, higher profits, more opportunity, and less discrimination than any other in the history of man. Given the chance, private enterprise, working with Government and individuals, will carry this Nation to new heights of prosperity and progress. If we all work to that end, 1984 will not be the nightmare George Orwell predicted it would be back in 1948.

For myself, I look forward to working in the House of Representatives and serving the people of the Sixth District of Alabama and all the people of this great Nation in the years ahead, years which can be the brightest and most prosperous in U.S. history if we abandon the concept that big brother knows best. The story of America proves conclusively that he does not, never has, and never will.

Senator Milward Simpson, of Wyoming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a warm and good friend will not be with us when the new Congress convenes in January. Senator Milward Simpson, of Wyoming, will retire from this body. I am most happy to join my colleagues in wishing him well.

The people of Wyoming have given to Milward Simpson the two highest honors within their power. He served his State for 4 years as an able and popular Governor. In 1962 he was elected to this body. Now of his own choice he has decided to leave the Senate.

During his 4 years in the U.S. Senate, it is highly unlikely that any Member of this body ever earned the combination of affection and respect from his colleagues which Milward Simpson did. Although the senior Senator from Wisconsin occasionally found himself on differing sides of a question from Senator Simpson, I found him invariably to be the perfect opponent—a man of great integrity, totally without bitterness, and absolutely fair. Senator Simpson was always an effective and forceful exponent of his political philosophy, but even more importantly he has always exemplified those remarkable personal qualities of charity, kindness, and decency.

I want to wish Senator Milward Simpson good health and much happiness in the years ahead. The Senate and country will miss him greatly.

Report of Senator Joseph D. Tydings for the 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, at the close of this 2d session of the historic 89th Congress, and at the end of my 2d year representing my State of Maryland in the Senate, I want to summarize the work of this Congress and to review my own legislative efforts as a Member of it.

The achievements of this Congress include new programs for the cities, rural areas, education, health, conservation, economic opportunity, and human rights. By enacting more than 50 major measures to meet America's most urgent problems, this Congress has made a record which will stand for decades as one of the most progressive in our Nation's history.

PEOPLE IN CITIES

One hundred and thirty-five million people—70 percent of our Nation's population—now live in urban areas. By the end of this century, 90 percent of all our people—more than 300 million—will live in cities. To accommodate these new city dwellers, we must, within the next 35 years, literally build a second America—putting in place as many houses, schools, parks, apartments, offices, and public facilities as we have built in all the time since the Pilgrims arrived in America.

This Congress acted boldly and effectively to meet that challenge.

We created at Cabinet level the Department of Housing and Urban Development to administer more efficiently and economically the Federal programs affecting metropolitan areas.

We passed the Housing and Urban Development Act to revise and make more effective urban renewal and public housing programs, to provide greater help to housing projects for the elderly, to give incentive for the preservation of urban open spaces, and to encourage, through the rent supplement program, the construction by private interests of low-cost decent housing for the elderly, handicapped, and families of low income.

We enacted the Demonstration Cities Act, which complements the urban renewal program and provides for the rehabilitation—rather than the destruction—of entire sections of city slum areas and the improvement of educational, social, and economic conditions of people living in those areas.

We passed the High Speed Ground Transportation Act to provide for development of modern high-speed rail transportation for the people, like most Marylanders, who live in heavily traveled and heavily populated urban corridors. And we extended the Mass Transportation Act to aid intracity transportation systems.

Finally, we created the Cabinet-level Department of Transportation to unite in one Department the nearly 90,000 employees now administering $6 billion worth of Federal transportation programs, such as the interstate highway and airport aid programs, the Coast Guard and St. Lawrence Seaway, and the highway and auto safety programs.

AGRICULTURE

While Congress moved to meet the problems of the cities, it also enacted new programs to help assure a greater degree of prosperity in our Nation's rural areas. Although only 30 percent of America's families live in rural areas, they include almost half of all American families with incomes under $3,000 and have almost twice the proportion of substandard housing found in urban America.

This Congress acted decisively to meet those problems. The Food and Agriculture Act provides improved and extended feed grain, wheat, dairy, wool, and cotton programs and other provisions designed to bolster farm income. The Rural Water System and Sanitation Act of 1965 expands Farmers Home Administration assistance in rural areas through loans and grants for rural water supply and waste disposal systems. The Food for Peace Act of 1966 was substantially revised and enlarged in order to reduce farm surpluses further and, by emphasizing food sales, to increase farm income.

The new economic, education, and housing programs created by the Economic Opportunity Act——the war on poverty legislation—the Housing and Urban Development Act, and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act also directly benefit rural areas as well as cities.

OUR PEOPLE'S HEALTH

Everyone in the Nation will benefit from the programs enacted by this Congress in the fields of health and medical care. The Medicare Act of 1965 establishes a basic hospital insurance program under social security for the 19 million Americans now over 65, plus a voluntary supplementary health insurance program to cover other medical expenses. The same law increased old-age and survivors benefits under social security by 7 percent. The medicare law directly and immediately benefits the nearly 300,000 Marylanders who are already over 65.

The Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke Act authorizes a 3-year program to plan and develop a series of regional medical programs to fight these three dread diseases.

Two new safety acts will provide new protections for the health and safety of workers in the mining industry.

The Air Pollution Control Act has expanded our national effort against the growing health threat from air pollution, particularly by requiring exhaust control devices on new cars beginning with the 1968 models.

Congress also enacted the Health Professions Education Act to expand construction and scholarship grants and loans to dental, medical, and other health personnel training institutions and their students.

The Community Health Services Act expands programs for public health services, including vaccinations, immunizations, disease prevention, health clinics for migrant workers and provides grants to the States for health services.

To deal with the problems of mental health, Congress enacted the Mental Health and Retardation Act to provide staffing aid grants for personnel serving in community mental health centers. A new Drug Control Act was also enacted to tighten controls over certain depressant and stimulant drugs.

Alarmed at the accidents on our highways, which killed 49,000 Americans last year alone, and the inadequate safety provisions in automobiles, Congress enacted the Highway Safety Act, to establish a $322 million highway safety program in cooperation with the States, and the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act, to establish safety standards for motor vehicles, tires, and equipment beginning with the 1968 models.

EDUCATION

No problem facing America requires more attention than education. More than 600,000 new classrooms will be needed to meet the 6-million-pupil increase in our Nation's grade and high school enrollment during the next decade, and more than 1.5 million of today's classrooms are already over 30 years old. By 1970 our colleges must be prepared for a 50-percent increase in enrollments.

President Johnson has called this "the education Congress" because of the number and significance of bills it passed to meet this crisis in education.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, for example, is the first general aid to education program ever enacted by Congress. It provides Federal grants to improve grade and high school education, with special emphasis on school districts with large numbers of children in poverty-stricken families.

In the Higher Education Act, Congress authorized an expanded 3-year program of aid to colleges and universities to build classrooms, libraries, laboratories, and similar educational facilities and equipment. It also provides for increased educational opportunities through a new program of scholarship grants and student loans.

The Library Services and Construction Act authorizes additional Federal aid to the Nation's libraries for construction and expanded services, especially for handicapped persons.

To foster broad American cultural programs in art, music, and drama, Congress created a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities.

THE ECONOMY

Our Nation's economy continued to achieve record levels of growth and prosperity this year, for the fifth year in succession. But to keep pace with the million new workers annually entering the labor force, and to help convert the tax-eating, hard-core unemployed into taxpaying members of American society, Congress took effective action.

Acting to eliminate poverty and unemployment in our economy, this Congress provided job training and opportunities where they were most needed. The Manpower Development and Training Act was expanded to help the unemployed learn new skills to qualify them for jobs. The Public Works and Economic Development Act provides an expanded program of grants and loans to communities for public works, industrial development facilities, and similar projects. The State Technical Services Act establishes a program of Federal-State-local technical service centers for disseminating findings of technological and scientific importance to commerce and industry.

Of particular importance to Maryland, the Appalachian Regional Development Act authorizes a comprehensive 6-year program to assist in the economic development of the 12-State Appalachian region, which includes Garrett, Allegany, and Washington Counties in Maryland.

To raise the lowest income levels in America above the poverty level, Congress passed the Minimum Wage Act Amendments of 1966 to increase the minimum wage from $2,600 a year for a full year of 40 hours a week to $2,912 in 1967 and $3,328 in 1968. The bill will improve the living standards of the 29 million Americans already covered by the minimum wage law plus 8.1 million workers covered for the first time.

In both the first and second sessions of this Congress, the war on poverty program, first enacted in 1963, was reviewed, revised, and expanded in both cities and rural areas, in order to make possible more productive lives for many thousands of Americans, particularly young ones, who by reason of their birth or environment have not had an equal opportunity to develop their natural abilities and make their full contribution to our national life.

Last year alone the antipoverty program provided more than $10 million for such Maryland projects to help the least well-off citizens of our State to develop their skills.

Faced with a serious slump in the housing industry created by the tight money conditions which existed in the economy this year, Congress enacted new legislation to pump more than $4 billion additional into the home mortgage market and to increase the amount of private financing available for home mortgage purposes by limiting interest rate competition between banks and other savings institutions.

CONSUMERS

This Congress acted to see that American consumers get clear, accurate information about the products they buy and new protections against unsafe products. Congress passed the Truth in Packaging Act, to forbid the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging and labeling. It enacted the Child Safety Act to prescribe new safety requirements on drugs which might poison children and bans from interstate commerce toys containing dangerous substances.

Last year Congress reduced excise taxes on scores of items, including automobiles, air conditioners, home appliances, cosmetics, luggage, sporting goods, and TV sets. Although a portion of these taxes were restored in 1966 to meet the cost of the Vietnam war, almost all remain below their pre-1965 level.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES AND ARMED FORCES PERSONNEL

Both because the Federal Government is a major employer in Maryland, employing hundreds of thousands and paying retirement benefits to 230,000 retired residents of our State, and because the quality of national government in large part depends on the quality of our civil service, Maryland residents have a particular interest in the pay raise and retirement benefit legislation passed by this Congress. In addition, the presence of a number of large defense installations in Maryland and the membership of a great many Marylanders in the Armed Forces make the military pay and benefit increases enacted especially relevant to our State.

In both 1965 and 1966, Congress enacted significant pay and retirement increases for both the civil service and our Armed Forces, including increased benefits for retirees of both the civil service and the Armed Forces. Included in the civilian pay raise legislation was an increase in the Government's contribution to the Federal group health insurance plans, thereby reducing the cost of health insurance for Federal employees.

The Military Medical Benefits Act of 1966 expanded medical care and health benefits provided for dependents of military personnel and for retired personnel and their dependents.

In a major breakthrough for veterans and American education, Congress enacted the peacetime GI bill of rights, which will provide veterans not covered by the Korean or World War II bill of rights substantial direct financial assistance for education. It also makes them eligible for new medical and home loan programs and job preference benefits.

Congress also enacted a bill I introduced to compensate Federal employees—as private industry compensates its own employees—for their moving expenses when they are transferred to a new location.

Congress also voted substantial increases in the benefits provided retired railroad workers.

CONSERVATION

This Congress probably set a record for the amount and diversity of the conservation legislation it enacted.

The Water Pollution Control Act vastly expands our national effort to remove pollution from interstate rivers and lakes by providing a 4-year, $3.7 billion program to aid State and local governments in preventing water pollution.

The Flood Control, Rivers, and Harbors Act provides new programs to preserve and improve the economic value of our rivers and harbors, and to provide flood control and beach erosion and hurricane protection. The Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act authorizes $1.5 million annually for expanded oceanographic research and the development of food, minerals, and other resources of the seas. The Saline Water Conversion Act extended Federal programs to investigate alleviating our Nation's water shortage by the conversion of salt water into fresh water.

The Highway Beautification Act provides controls over advertising and clutter on federally aided highways and offers incentive grants to the States for improvement of scenic areas along them. The Historic Site Preservation Act establishes a program to locate and preserve historic sites.

Congress also enacted numerous bills authorizing the establishment of parks and recreation areas, including the preservation of Assateague Island National Seashore on the Maryland-Virginia coast, and the Piscataway Park across from Mount Vernon in Prince Georges County.

HUMAN RIGHTS AND LIBERTIES

The many new programs to reduce unemployment, lower welfare costs, and a more secure, healthy, and comfortable life for all Americans do not tell the whole story of the 89th Congress. Among its finest hours were those in which it made new breakthroughs to secure and protect basic human rights.

For example, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 guarantees every American citizen the right to vote. It has already resulted in the registration and voting of tens of thousands of our citizens who would otherwise have continued to be indefinitely disenfranchised.

The Immigration Reform Act replaces the arbitrary and unfair family-splitting national origins quota system of immigration with a system which gives preference to relatives of American citizens and asks not, "Where did you come from?" but "What can you do for America?"

To provide a more fruitful and comfortable life for older Americans, an Administration on Aging was created in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to develop programs at Federal and State levels related to the needs of older Americans.

To help protect the basic right of every American to security against crime, the Law Enforcement Assistance Act was enacted in 1965 and extended and expanded in 1966 to provide Federal grants to help State and local law enforcement agencies prevent crime and detect and apprehend criminals.

MY OWN LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES

Aside from working for the enactment of this record legislative program, my responsibilities as a representative of Maryland, as a member of three committees, and as chairman of two Senate subcommittees consumed a great deal of my time and energies during these 2 years.

In my capacity as subcommittee chairman this year alone, I chaired 34 days of hearings on the bills before the Judicial Improvements Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee and the Business and Commerce Subcommittee of the Senate District of Columbia Committee. In addition, as a member of the Senate Public Works Committee, the Senate Judiciary Committee, and the Senate District of Columbia Committee, I participated in countless additional days of hearings and committee meetings on bills and projects important to both Maryland and the Nation.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

The Public Works Committee has responsibility for conservation, water and air pollution, highways, and public buildings projects of all kinds. I served this year as a member of three subcommittees of the Public Works Committee: the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, the Subcommittee on Flood Control, Rivers and Harbors, and the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds. As a committee member I was able to secure enactment of several bills I introduced dealing with the acute problems which Maryland shares with the Nation in such matters as water and air pollution, highway construction, and coastal erosion.

Bills I introduced as a member of the Public Works Committee included:

Senate bill 3226, provides Federal grants to train local government personnel in the management and operation of modern sewage disposal systems. It became law as an amendment to the Water Pollution Control Act of 1966.

Senate bill 3240, which also became law as part of the Water Pollution Control Act, provides for a study of tidal estuaries, like the area in which the Chesapeake Bay meets the ocean, where a great deal of the breeding of marine life and waterfowl takes place. We know that tidal estuaries are vital to our marine industries and waterfowl sports, but we know very little about the nature of those areas or the extent and effect of water pollution on them.

Senate bill 3225, providing for stemming the pollution from boats and marinas in our recreational waters, was not enacted, because, subsequent to my introduction of the bill, the Departments of Commerce and Interior expressed their intention to utilize the provisions of existing law, for the first time, to accomplish the same purpose.

Senate bill 3798, to provide for a study on prevention of the terribly expensive and destructive coastal erosion which strikes on Maryland's Eastern Shore and every coastal State in the Nation, though not enacted this year, is cosponsored by 16 other Senators. I am very optimistic about the chances of its enactment next year.

The substance of an amendment I proposed to the National Highways Act also became law this session. The amendment is designed to help control the soil erosion which accompanies interstate highway construction, unnecessarily destroying the land and contributing in a major fashion to the pollution of our rivers and streams.

THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

The Senate Judiciary Committee considers such diverse questions as immigration, criminal law, patent policy, civil rights, judicial reform, and constitutional amendment. I am a member of four subcommittees of the Judiciary Committee: the Subcommittees on Refugees and Escapees, Juvenile Delinquency, Constitutional Amendments, and Improvements in Judicial Machinery—of which I am chairman.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

The Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee devoted most of its efforts to the question of reasonable Federal legislation to control the presently nearly limitless distribution and sale of firearms in this country. Despite the great weight of public opinion in favor of such reasonable controls, and provision of complete safeguards for the interests of sportsmen and gun collectors, the subcommittee was unsuccessful in winning enactment of an effective gun bill in this Congress. I intend to continue my efforts for such a law next year.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMPROVEMENTS IN JUDICIAL MACHINERY

For the past year and a half I have been serving as the chairman of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, which is responsible for legislation regarding the organization and operation of the Federal judicial system. During the 2d session of the 89th Congress I chaired 18 days of subcommittee hearings on subjects ranging from a proposal to establish appellate review of criminal sentences to an amendment of the judicial code to permit Indian tribes special rights to sue in the Federal courts. Since I became chairman, the subcommittee has worked on the following matters:

First, the U.S. Commissioner system. Commissioners play in an important role in the administration of criminal justice and are the only Federal judicial officers many citizens ever see, but they are hampered by statutory provisions which have remained substantially unchanged for almost a century.

The subcommittee study of the Commissioner system was greatly assisted by a number of Marylanders: Chief Judge Roszel Thomsen and Judge Edward Northrop, of the U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland; U.S. Commissioners F. Archie Meatyard and George Burgess; former Commissioner, now State judge, Samuel W. H. Meloy; and former chief judge of the supreme bench of Baltimore City, Emory H. Niles.

After 5 days of exploratory hearings a bipartisan group of nine Senators joined me in introducing a bill, S. 3475, to abolish the Office of the U.S. Commissioner and to establish in its place the Federal Magistrate, thus making the first level of the Federal judicial system a more effective instrument of justice.

S. 3475 has now been endorsed by the American Bar Association, the Judicial Conference of the United States, and a number of law professors and attorneys. I hope that the next session of Congress will see its enactment.

Second, the problems relating to retirement and removal of Federal judges. The Federal judiciary has been a zealous protector of our freedoms, and its independence from political pressure has been one of the great achievements of the American system of government. But, if the judiciary needs a procedure to police its own ranks, Congress has a responsibility to help the judges develop it. That has been the subcommittee's purpose in pursuing this project. Six days of hearings have documented the present Federal procedures for retirement and removal and examined various State removal systems. At all stages of its proceedings, the subcommittee is working closely with the Judicial Conference of the United States

Third, congressional reference cases. Each year a number of claims for private relief legislation come to the Congress raising complex issues of fact which must be resolved. The traditional congressional reliance on the Court of Claims as an adviser on these cases was ended in 1962, however, by a Supreme Court decision which precluded the Court of Claims from rendering advisory opinions. To meet the continued need for such advice, the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery participated in the development of H.R. 1665, which was enacted into law during the last days of the session. This legislation provides adequate review of claims for individuals seeking private relief legislation.

Fourth, multidistrict litigation. On occasion, a number of cases presenting common questions of fact are filed in different judicial districts. I introduced and held hearings on a bill based on a recommendation of the Judicial Conference to provide a method for the efficient handling of pretrial matters in such cases. Work on this legislation will continue next session.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS SUBCOMMITTEE

During this Congress the Senate considered three constitutional amendments and joined with the House in proposing one of them to the State for ratification.

The amendment submitted to the States, and already ratified by a number of them, will provide a definite and workable system for determining when and under what conditions the Vice President may act for the President when the President is disabled. It will soon become part of the Constitution.

Twice the Senate considered, and twice rejected, a proposal to reverse the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote ruling, which requires State legislatures to be apportioned fairly to truly represent the population of their States.

The third amendment the Senate considered, and which it also defeated, was a vaguely worded proposal relating to prayer in the public schools. The leaders of nearly every one of the Nation's churches and many leading constitutional lawyers criticized the ambiguous and inscrutable language of the proposal and advised against its passage, because, they warned, it posed a threat to religious freedom in America.

I was persuaded by these arguments to oppose the amendment. It language was so unclear that even its sponsors could not agree on its meaning and implications. I believe it would have abridged and jeopardized the religious freedom we cherish. Instead, I voted for a Senate resolution which pointed out that the Supreme Court's rulings forbid only the prescription of particular religious activities by public school authorities, and do not forbid a period of silent contemplation in the public schools during which each child may pray.

The prayer in public schools issue is complicated by widespread misunderstanding of what the Supreme Court actually ruled in the school prayer cases. I believe that the way to end that confusion is not by amending our Bill of Rights, as this proposal would have done, but py putting religion into our lives and those of our children on a daily basis through our families and churches. I will continue, as a Senator and as a citizen, to work toward that end.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON REFUGEES AND ESCAPEES

The Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees considers legislation dealing with the problems created by migrations due to foreign political upheavals, war, and natural disasters. As a member of this subcommittee, I supported the creation of a special office in the Department of State to look after refugee matters, and helped secure passage of legislation this year to reduce the expense and inconvenience which would otherwise be necessary for refugees from the Castro regime to become United States citizens.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMITTEE

Since the Washington metropolitan area includes not only the Nation's Capital, but also includes the populous Maryland suburbs of Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties, the conditions in and government of the District of Columbia are of special importance to Maryland.

I have three subcommittee assignments as a result of my membership on the District Committee. I am chairman of the Business and Commerce Subcommittee, a member of the Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee, and I am also a member of the District of Columbia Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

I was severely disappointed that the home rule bill for the District of Columbia, which was passed by the Senate last year, was blocked by the House of Representatives. As long as the government of the District must be carried on without the voice of the people who are affected by it, and the Congress must squander days of debate on issues which have relevance only to the District, neither the District nor the Nation is well served. I will continue to work for home rule.

Although several of the bills I introduced in the Senate regarding the District became law, one of my bills, which had great significance for many Marylanders as well as District residents, was not passed by the House even though it was passed unanimously by the Senate. That was Senate bill 2769, to provide adequate public parking in the District of Columbia for the hundreds of thousands of commuters, shoppers, and tourists who daily drive into downtown Washington. This bill, too, is high on my legislative agenda for next year.

TRANSPORTATION

The problems Maryland faces in meeting its transportation needs led me to introduce a number of bills, several of which were enacted as amendments to other legislation, to help our Nation's urban centers balance their highway systems with safe, fast, frequent, and dependable rapid transit systems.

First. Senate bill 2599 will provide Federal grants for research and development of new, cheaper, faster, and safer transportation systems for our cities. It became law as an amendment to the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1966.

Second. Senate bill 3227 will provide Federal grants for the training of local mass transit personnel in modern management methods. It also became law as part of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1966.

Third. Senate bill 2339 would allow a State or local government to use part of its Federal interstate highway funds to build rapid mass transit systems, such as subways or monorails, to supplement its local highway systems. This bill has helped focus attention on the question of where we go with our national transportation program after completion of the present interstate highway system in 1972.

As chairman of the Special Senate Judiciary Subcommittee appointed to consider the legislation to create the Maryland-District of Columbia-Virginia interstate subway compact, I conducted the hearings on and managed the passage of that bill in the Senate. Once operating, the Washington metropolitan area subway, which is only the second entirely new urban transportation system undertaken in the United States in the last half century, will go a long way toward ending the traffic jams which endanger and harass suburbanites, tourists and District residents, and which have imperiled the economic and cultural life of the National Capital.

FAMILY PLANNING AGAINST THE POPULATION EXPLOSION

Few people these days need be reminded of the problems which the world faces as a result of the inability of people who wish to limit their families to do so. In order to make family planning possible for those who desire it, but might not otherwise be able to undertake it, I introduced two bills this year, S. 2992 and S. 2993, both of which were enacted in substance as amendments to other legislation during this session.

Senate bill 2992 authorizes the administrators of our foreign aid program to support voluntary family planning programs in countries which receive our foreign aid and request such family planning programs. Experts on our foreign aid program have long advised that the birth rate in many countries is so high that the aid we give is used up merely maintaining the low standard of living and industrialization which already exists in those countries. My bill, to help by voluntary means to bring the birth rate in these underdeveloped countries more closely into line with their ability to support themselves, became law as an amendment to this year's foreign aid bill and this year's food-for-peace bill.

S. 2993 authorizes the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to make Federal assistance available in the United States to State and local governments and to nonprofit organizations for the dissemination of family planning information, and, in poverty areas, of family planning materials, to individuals who voluntarily seek and request them. The substance of S. 2993 became law as part of the Comprehensive Health Services Act of 1966.

MARYLAND MATTERS

In addition to bills of national importance, I have been pleased during this Congress to have been able to introduce and help secure passage of legislation for the special benefit of Maryland. For example, together with Senator BREWSTER, I introduced and Congress passed a bill for a federally financed 5-year study of fresh water availability on the Delmarva Peninsula. Senator BREWSTER and I also introduced and Congress passed another bill to authorize the construction of a hydraulic model for the study of the Chesapeake Bay Basin. But as one of Maryland's Senators, I also worked on a great number of matters which involve Maryland's government, citizens, and industries and the Federal Government.

Maryland's seven Congressmen and two Senators continued throughout this session the practice I suggested last year of working as a team to intercede for Maryland and her people on many issues with the Federal Government. But each of us also worked on a great number of projects and cases which did not involve the efforts of the entire delegation. A few examples of the hundreds of instances in which I dealt with the Federal Government on behalf of our State include:

First, agriculture: Helping Maryland agriculture has been a priority project in my office since my election as a Senator. For example, in 1965, I helped block a multimillion-dollar grant by the Area Redevelopment Administration to the New Castle, Pa., area for the establishment of a broiler complex which would have directly and unfairly competed with Maryland's poultry industry. I also succeeded in preventing the imposition of an unreasonable Federal poultry inspection regulation which could have jeopardized the Delmarva poultry industry, and have successfully worked to retain the handler pool which the Maryland dairy farmers want under milk order No. 4. Currently, I am negotiating with the Department of Agriculture to obtain an export subsidy for Maryland tobacco, in order to preserve our competitive position in the world market.

Second, housing for the elderly: I have been able to assist numerous Maryland communities and organizations in obtaining millions of dollars in Federal assistance for the construction of nonprofit, low-cost housing for the elderly. Projects I have assisted include $3.85 million in assistance to a Presbyterian elderly housing program in Baltimore, $3.69 million for a nonprofit elderly housing project in Rockville, nearly $2 million for the city of Crisfield, and $200,000 for an elderly housing project sponsored by St. John's Episcopal Church of Havre de Grace.

Third, Annapolis: In view of the importance to our State and Nation of our historic capital of Annapolis, I have devoted special efforts to cooperating with its city officials in obtaining Federal assistance to improve and preserve it. For example, I helped obtain Federal assistance for the Annapolis urban beautification program, $105,000 for the restoration of Paca House Gardens, an $88,000 Federal grant for construction of sewer facilities, and designation of Annapolis by the Interior Department as a national landmark. My special project for Annapolis this year has been to promote it to the State Department as a stopping off point for important foreign visitors to this country, as Williamsburg, Va., is now used, prior to their coming to Washington. In furtherance of this idea, I arranged a special tour of Annapolis this summer for Federal and State officials, including Governor Tawes and Mr. James Symington, U.S. Chief of Protocol.

Fourth, military installations: The multibillion-dollar importance of the defense industry and the presence of many Armed Forces facilities in Maryland have brought me into frequent contact with the Department of Defense regarding Maryland matters. For example, I have met with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, and other defense officials and officials from Cecil County, to urge the Department of Defense to locate a proposed new Naval Recruit Training Center at the Bainbridge Naval Training Center. Although the final location for the new center remains in question, a $1.2 million new WAVE barracks has been approved for Bainbridge.

I was also able to help officials of Harford County obtain a right-of-way for the county over a portion of the Aberdeen Proving Ground for Sod Run sewer line and 75 acres of the proving ground for construction of a sewage treatment plant. During the severe drought which jeopardized Emmitsburg's water supply, I was able to arrange for Civil Defense authorities to provide water pumping equipment to meet that emergency.

Fifth, small business: I was able to help get the first Small Business Administration development loan approved in Maryland, or $350,000, for the construction of a brick plant at Joppa; and was able to help secure a number of other SBA loans for Maryland enterprises, such as a ski tow at Marsh Mountain in Garrett County. In addition, I was able to persuade the Small Business Administration to establish an SBA development loan center in Baltimore.

Sixth, economic development: I helped Calvert County obtain a $50,000 grant from the Economic Development Administration for a feasibility study of an industrial park to employ up to 1,000 people in Calvert County. I am currently working to obtain approval of Economic Development Administration grants for such projects as a community complex in Knoxville and a maritime industrial park in Crisfield.

Seventh, health: Federal assistance I have been able to obtain for Maryland includes a Federal grant for a program for schizophrenic children at Linwood Children's Center in Ellicott City and substantial Federal assistance for Cecil County to construct a courthouse-public health center in Elkton.

Eighth, war on poverty: As the war on poverty has matured, increasing amounts of funds—more than $10 million this year alone—have been made available to practically every county in Maryland for the establishment of programs such as remedial education for slum children, work experience programs for teenagers, job training opportunities for school dropouts, and job locating assistance for unemployed low-income workers.

Of all the hundreds of Maryland matters I have worked on since becoming a Senator, however, none was more satisfying than working through the State Department and directly with the Soviet Government to secure the release of Maryland Peace Corpsman Tom Dawson, who was arrested by the Soviet authorities when he crossed into Soviet territory by accident while on Peace Corps duty in Iran this fall.

THESE 2 YEARS

No summary can encompass all that a Senator has done or tried to do during any session of Congress. The hundreds of hours of committee hearings and meetings to consider and amend legislation, the debates in the Senate, the rollcalls—nearly 500 this Congress—speeches in the Senate, throughout Maryland, and across the country, and the hours of work on Maryland matters with Federal agencies simply defy description. But no summary would be complete without notice of the inspiration and enormous help I have had from the leaders of the Senate, Senator MANSFIELD and Senator DIRKSEN, from the committee chairmen, and from my fellow Senators.

I have been proud and honored to be able to represent Maryland in the Senate during these tumultuous, critically important years for our Nation, and to have been able to contribute my energy and ideas to our State and Nation.

Financial Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the spirit of financial disclosure and conflict of interest legislation, I herewith state that my 1965 U.S. income tax return, form 1040—being the most recent return filed by me—shows on page 1, line 5, income of $29,322.82—as shown by W-2—under $30,000 because $30,000 salary rate not applicable to complete calendar year 1965.

Line 6 shows other income of $2,059.71 consisting principally of schedule "C" income as a partner in the law firm of Hungate & Grewach, Troy, Mo., said firm founded in 1956.

Total net income for all sources—including congressional salary, said law firm, and speaker's honoraria—shown on page 1, line 7, form 1040 for the year 1965 is $31,381.53. The principal difficulty in elaborating in more detail is that the law firm income is based on a partnership return with my law partner, P. J. Grewach of Troy, Mo., and the individual tax return is a joint return filed with my wife, Dorothy. Neither Mr. Grewach nor Mrs. Hungate has filed for Congress and therefore do not regard their private business as public property.

In addition to this, my wife and I jointly own real estate in Troy, Mo., of an approximate total market value of $30,000, and being two residences against which there are deeds of trust totaling approximately $13,500; a residence in Virginia of the approximate market value of $39,000 against which there is a secured indebtedness of $30,000.

In addition, we own some eight rooms of household and kitchen furniture, and other personal property including two automobiles—in the low-priced three, a bird dog and two saxophones.

Senator Ross Bass, of Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as we complete the work of the 89th Congress and look forward to the new Congress in January, I, for one, shall miss greatly the counsel and contributions of the junior Senator from Tennessee, Ross BASS.

During his 2 years in the Senate, Senator BASS showed the same determination and devotion which had marked his five consecutive terms in the House. Ross BASS was an always effective and frequently eloquent spokesman for the forgotten people of his State and Nation He cared much and worked hard for the forgotten farmer and the people of rural America. For this alone, the senior Senator from Wisconsin will always respect and admire Senator BASS. But in addition Senator BASS was always a tireless fighter for justice and equality of opportunity for all our citizens. For this, Senator BASS has earned the respect and admiration of all Americans who seek to make America truly the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Senator BASS is still a young, energetic, and exceptionally qualified man. I am sure that he will continue to make significant contributions to his State and his Nation.

The Honorable Charles L. Weltner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, in the 90th Congress we shall not be privileged to have the services of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable CHARLES L. WELTNER. I would not suggest for a moment that we did not have different points of views on many vital issues which affect our great country, but I do want to testify to the honesty, integrity, and sincerity of the Congressman who represented the Atlanta district so ably. Differ as you may with his opinions and actions, CHARLIE WELTNER was always honest and aboveboard in his dealings and he never left one in doubt as to his position, nor did he question the honesty of your opinions or your views even though these views may have been diametrically opposed to his own. These are qualities which make life much more bearable and which certainly makes service in the Congress more meaningful.

Mrs. Dorn joins me in wishing for him every future success and much happiness.